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LONG ISLAND INDEX 2006

L O N G I S L A N D I N D E X 2 0 0 6
Welcome to the *Long Island Index 2006*, our third annual indicators report on the Long Island region.

The *Long Island Index* seeks to increase understanding about Long Island: where we stand now and where we are heading, economically, socially and politically.

In particular we focus on Long Island as a region: comparable to others, similar to some, unique in many ways...and importantly, in competition with other regions in attracting both opportunity and talent.

To succeed in this competition a region must meet many needs. It must have:

- Good jobs, plus the human talent to fill those jobs.
- Efficient public services. Effective and responsive government.
- Public safety. And a healthy and beautiful environment.

Importantly, the conditions for success—or failure—are interconnected and mutually reinforcing. Businesses that offer good jobs attract creative and energetic people. Talented people help businesses grow. The resulting prosperity gives a region the resources to provide good schools and other public services that make it yet more attractive: a vital cycle.

This has been the success story of the post-war American suburb, and Long Island is one of the nation’s earliest and most prominent examples.

Long Island continues to do a good job educating its young people and providing, overall, a high quality of life. But it is clear that our region faces challenges. Housing costs and taxes are becoming more onerous. Too many young people are leaving; too many others are considering doing so. Average pay is growing more slowly than in comparable regions, indicating a lack of professional opportunity.

Recognizing these challenges, and finding ways to address them, is essential if our region is to remain a vibrant and prosperous place to live.
Long Island and Its Suburban Peers

Our challenges are not unique. Throughout this year’s Index charts are presented comparing Long Island to selected “peer” counties. One such chart appears here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nassau</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>Long Island</th>
<th>Bergen NJ</th>
<th>Fairfax VA</th>
<th>Westchester NY</th>
<th>Silicon Valley</th>
<th>Fairfield CT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 2004</td>
<td>1,317,054</td>
<td>1,445,497</td>
<td>2,762,551</td>
<td>891,649</td>
<td>996,176</td>
<td>917,956</td>
<td>2,440,000</td>
<td>884,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area in sq. miles</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density per sq. mile</td>
<td>4.589</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>2,522</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>1,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity, 2004 in %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Alone</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Alone</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other/Two or More Races</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # Households, 2004</td>
<td>437,274</td>
<td>486,552</td>
<td>923,826</td>
<td>331,503</td>
<td>368,475</td>
<td>332,865</td>
<td>811,624</td>
<td>328,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # Municipalities, 2002*</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income, 2004</td>
<td>$78,762</td>
<td>$71,956</td>
<td>$75,177**</td>
<td>$70,957</td>
<td>$88,133</td>
<td>$88,500</td>
<td>$88,500</td>
<td>$73,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes Per Capita 2002</td>
<td>$2,815</td>
<td>$2,115</td>
<td>$2,450</td>
<td>$2,316</td>
<td>$1,547</td>
<td>$2,584</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Distribution, 2004 in %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-34 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and older</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment, Bachelor’s +, Age 25 +, 2004</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Value, 2004</td>
<td>$420,903</td>
<td>$368,460</td>
<td>$394,682</td>
<td>$408,697</td>
<td>$415,418</td>
<td>$476,462</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$422,495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In many categories the data for our region are consistent with those of our peers, but at the high end of the range. This is particularly true with respect to Nassau County, which has the least remaining open space, the highest population density and the highest per capita taxes. Nassau developed earlier than other areas, and it is possible to read some of these data as indicating a future toward which younger suburbs may be heading.

*See www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/go021x1.pdf for more information.

**This figure will not match the figure in the indicators section, because that figure has been adjusted to represent a household of four.
The Long Island Index is a project that gathers and publishes data on the Long Island region. Our operating principle is: “Good information presented in a neutral manner can move policy.” The Index does not advocate specific policies. Instead, our goal is to be a catalyst for action, by engaging the community in thinking about our region and its future.

Specifically, the Index seeks to:

- Measure where we are and show trends over time.
- Encourage regional thinking.
- Compare our situation with other similar regions.
- Increase awareness of issues and an understanding of their interrelatedness.
- Inspire Long Islanders to work together in new ways to achieve shared goals.

The governing board of the Long Island Index is the Advisory Committee, composed of leaders from Long Island’s business, labor, academic and nonprofit sectors.

The Rauch Foundation acts as the convener of the Advisory Committee and the financial underwriter of the project.

What Are Indicators?

Indicators are facts that help show how a region is doing, the way the unemployment rate helps show the health of the economy. Measuring these kinds of data helps communities:

- Identify existing conditions.
- Measure progress toward goals.
- Mobilize action to improve the region.

Indicator projects have been highly successful in bringing communities together to pursue shared goals. Such projects have been carried out in over 200 U.S. cities and regions, from Boston to Chicago to Silicon Valley.

The first two annual Indexes focused attention on Long Island’s “brain drain” and issues relating to Long Island land use, particularly in relation to the problem of affordable housing. Index findings have helped raise awareness of these issues and have been cited extensively, in local and national news media. Published on our website, the Indexes, as well as public opinion polls and other reports, have been widely referenced by users ranging from scholars and public policy analysts to high school students.

How Indicators Are Chosen

The Advisory Committee began by identifying 12 fundamental goals for the region. Goals include things like a growing, prosperous economy and a well-educated populace. (They are listed on the following page). The Advisory Committee then brought in a Technical Committee, composed of experts in the fields of economics, demographics, education, transportation, etc. Together these committees identified 30 measurable indicators that could be used to show how we are doing in relation to each goal, and to track our progress over time.
LONG ISLAND GOALS

OUR GROWING ECONOMY NURTURES INNOVATION AND PROSPERITY

GOAL 1: GROWTH AND PROSPERITY
Our economy grows and results in an improved quality of life for all.

GOAL 2: SUPPORTIVE BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT
Long Island provides a business friendly environment for companies to grow.

GOAL 3: INNOVATIVE ECONOMY
Our economy incubates, supports and retains companies.

OUR COMMUNITIES PROMOTE LIVABILITY AND INCREASE HOUSING CHOICE AND MOBILITY

GOAL 4: VIBRANT COMMUNITIES
We create exciting communities and downtown centers that offer people a wide choice of places to live, work and play.

GOAL 5: AFFORDABLE HOUSES
We generate housing options that are affordable to people of all ages and income levels.

GOAL 6: TRANSPORTATION CHOICES
We increase mobility by investing in an integrated, regional transportation system and by encouraging creative problem solving to find transportation alternatives.

OUR INCLUSIVE SOCIETY PROMOTES QUALITY HEALTHCARE AND EDUCATION

GOAL 7: HEALTHY PEOPLE
All people have access to quality affordable health care that focuses on disease and illness prevention.

GOAL 8: EDUCATIONAL READINESS
All students are prepared to learn at each stage of the educational pipeline.

OUR COMMUNITIES PROTECT THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVE RESOURCES

GOAL 9: NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION
We promote the conservation and efficient use of the region’s natural resources.

GOAL 10: PROTECT NATURE
We meet high standards for improving our air and water quality, and protecting and maintaining our open spaces.

OUR REGION DEVELOPS BETTER GOVERNANCE AND GREATER CIVIC PARTICIPATION

GOAL 11: MATCHING RESOURCES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
Long Island’s counties, towns, villages, and other jurisdictions manage their revenue to provide quality local and regional services.

GOAL 12: CIVIC ENGAGEMENT
All residents and business people are actively engaged in local civic life.
1. Each section opens with one of the 12 fundamental goals.
2. Next are key findings. These are the indicators, specific measures of how we are doing.
   Example: The largest industry cluster on Long Island is Health with more than 150,000 employees.
   The findings are presented through both written and graphic analyses.
3. Next is “Why is this important?” This explains why the indicator is a good measure of progress toward a particular goal.
4. “How are we doing?” puts the information in context.

The Index begins with a Special Analysis focusing on a particular topic. This year’s topic is taxation and governance.
Ask most anyone on Long Island and they’ll tell you: the trouble with taxes is they are too high. But vital issues concerning taxes go far beyond the pain of the individuals who must pay them.

These issues are far-reaching and interconnected. Taxes that are too high encourage the flight of human talent and businesses to less costly areas, with potentially devastating effects on a region’s competitiveness. Yet taxes can be too low. A region that lacks the revenues to provide excellent schools and other services may suffer the same kind of exodus.

Long Island faces challenges on both counts. But we are not alone. We share these challenges with regions across the country.

The following pages examine data about what we are paying, and what we are getting for it; surveys the effects of taxation in terms of public attitudes; and considers a variety of approaches that are being studied – and in some cases implemented – to address these challenges.
Local Government is Big Business

Long Island’s governance structure, shaped over centuries, consists of 901 different entities, including 2 cities, 2 counties, 13 towns, 95 villages, 127 school districts, and many other special purpose units. There are 126 municipal corporations in Nassau County, including 1 county, 2 cities, 3 towns, 64 villages, and 56 school districts. In Suffolk County, there are 113 municipal corporations, including 1 county, 10 towns, 31 villages, and 71 school districts. By contrast the closest county in terms of municipal corporations is Westchester, with 96.

Here is an overview of who is spending what:

- Total expenditures among these governments in 2003 were $15.9 billion, about equally divided between Nassau and Suffolk Counties.
- Almost one half of the spending was by school districts. Just under one-third was by counties.
- Overall expenditures have risen 13% in the last five years. The rise has been quite consistent among entities, with two exceptions: Nassau County and Nassau towns. The rate of growth of expenditures varied significantly between Nassau and Suffolk governments – a 3% overall increase in Nassau compared to a 24% overall increase in Suffolk. This is primarily explained by the fact that overall spending by the Nassau County government decreased between the comparison years by 18%, whereas Suffolk County government expenditures increased 19%. Every other type of government in Suffolk increased spending at a faster rate than the comparable governments in Nassau except for fire districts, which grew slightly faster in Nassau.

The largest increase in both counties, in terms of total spending, occurred within school districts. Clearly, school district spending was the major force driving increased spending by local governments on Long Island over the five-year period.

**COST OF GOVERNMENT IN SUFFOLK COUNTY BY TYPE OF GOVERNMENT, 2003**

TOTAL COST = $8.091 BILLION

(THERE ARE NO CITIES IN SUFFOLK)

- Schools 53%
- Fire Districts 2%
- County 29%
- Towns 15%
- Villages 2%

Source: Data are collected from the New York State Office of State Comptroller by the Center for Governmental Research.

**COST OF GOVERNMENT IN NASSAU COUNTY BY TYPE OF GOVERNMENT, 2003**

TOTAL COST = $7.873 BILLION

- Schools 45%
- Fire Districts 1%
- County 34%
- Cities 1%
- Towns 11%
- Villages 7%

Source: Data are collected from the New York State Office of State Comptroller by the Center for Governmental Research.
The following pie chart shows the highest costing services provided by local governments in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. These top ten expenses increased at a faster rate over the five-year period than the total of all expenditures (i.e., 16% for the top ten expenditures versus 13% for all expenditures for all governments). This increase was undoubtedly driven by the fact that educational/ instructional salaries is such a large component of cost, and that grew by 18% on Long Island over the five years. Employee benefits grew by 30% for all governments. The fastest growing service provided was Shared Services, with a 63% increase over the five year period. Examples of shared services are human resources, finance, information technology and procurement.

PERCENT CHANGE IN EXPENDITURES BY TYPE OF GOVERNMENT, NASSAU/SUFFOLK, 1998 TO 2003, $BILLIONS, 2003 DOLLARS

Source: Data are collected from the New York State Office of the State Comptroller, The Center for Governmental Research

COST OF SERVICES * PROVIDED AS PERCENT OF TOTAL COST, NASSAU/SUFFOLK, 2003 TOTAL COST = $15.964 BILLION

Source: Data are collected from the New York State Office of the State Comptroller, The Center for Governmental Research

PERCENT CHANGE IN COST OF SERVICES PROVIDED, NASSAU AND SUFFOLK COUNTIES, 1998 TO 2003

Source: Data are collected from the New York State Office of the State Comptroller, The Center for Governmental Research

* See www.osc.state.ny.us/localgov/pubs/arm/armJan05.pdf for a definition of these services
How Local Governments Pay for Themselves

Local governments in Nassau rely on local revenues for 83% of their total revenues, while those in Suffolk obtain only 73% of their revenues from local sources. The difference is primarily due to Suffolk receiving greater revenues from the state for education.

In short, residents of Long Island are directly bearing three-quarters of the cost of local government. Thus, every dollar saved by reducing the cost of government on Long Island would result in a direct savings to local residents, on average, of approximately seventy-five cents.

Both counties are predominantly dependent on real property tax for local revenue. Revenues in the “All Other” category constitute the second largest category. Included in the “All Other” category are over a hundred different small and medium revenue sources. Suffolk County is more reliant on sales tax as a revenue source than Nassau County. 18% of Suffolk County’s revenue comes from sales tax versus 14% in Nassau County. This has significant policy implications to the extent that local governments want local taxes to be more or less “regressive.” Sales taxes tend to be regressive. Property taxes are progressive in theory, although not when less affluent communities levy higher rates than more affluent areas, as often happens.
**Rising Property Taxes**

Long Islanders paid an average of $7,477 in property taxes last year, up from $7,099 in 1995 (adjusted for inflation), a 5.3% increase.

When viewed as a percent of median family income, taxes have climbed from 8% in 1995 (adjusted for inflation) to 8.6% in 2005, a 7.5% increase.

Not all Long Islanders pay the same property tax rates. Property taxes as a percentage of average home prices are higher in lower income school districts than in middle and upper income school districts, and higher in lower income minority districts than in lower income white districts.
What We’re Paying: Peer Counties

Long Island taxes are indeed high, but not uniquely so. Instead, high taxes appear to be typical of mature, prosperous suburbs.

- Long Island’s property taxes are 2.5 times the national average.
- In comparison with selected peer counties, Nassau taxes are the highest.
- Suffolk taxes are in line with those of peer counties.

What We’re Getting: High Quality Services for Most Residents

The taxes we pay must also be viewed in relation to the government services we receive: the quality of our schools, public safety, sanitation, libraries, parks, etc. A high level of services enhances our day-to-day lives, and makes our region a more desirable place to live and work.

- A large majority of residents (73%) rate local services as good or excellent.

Sources: SUNY Stony Brook Center for Regional Policy Studies and the Long Island Regional Planning Board, and the 2002 Census of Governments.
On average, Long Island students outperform students across the state.

While many Long Islanders enjoy high quality schools, Long Island schools designated as high need are underperforming in comparison to all Long Island schools districts.

Additionally, not all Long Islanders have the same level of satisfaction with their schools. Only 36% of residents in high need school districts rate their schools as excellent or good. In contrast, 72% of residents in low need districts rate their schools as excellent or good.
Based on the most recent Long Island Index poll, the danger of high taxes to our region’s future is growing.

The charts on this page tell the story:
- Long Islanders rate taxes our biggest problem by far.
- Only 35 percent rate the quality of local services as good or excellent in relation to what we are paying in taxes.

The public’s growing impatience with taxes may also be seen in the near record number of school budgets that were defeated last year. During first-time budget votes in 2005, 36% of school budgets on Long Island failed in contrast to 12% of school budgets in the rest of New York State.
**Taxes and High Housing Costs: A Troubling Combination**

Long Island’s high housing costs combine with taxes to threaten our region’s competitiveness.

- Difficulty in meeting housing costs is growing, especially among middle income families. In 2005, 57% of middle income families reported difficulty in paying rent or mortgage, a jump from just 41% in 2004. And the percentage of all Long Islanders reporting difficulty in paying rent or mortgage has increased from 35% in 2003 to 54% in 2005.

- A large and growing number of Long Islanders (56%) expects to move from Long Island to a place with lower costs. 70% of people aged 18-34 and 73% of African Americans said that they are somewhat or very likely to leave in the next 5 years.

The young new homeowner faces the burden of high taxes on top of crushing mortgages. The long-time homeowner, with a house now worth many times what he paid for it, may find himself with a strong incentive to “cash out” and move where taxes are lower. These are the two age groups most likely to leave. The younger group represents the professional future of Long Island, while the elder represents our region’s highest income earners.
Developing new policies to make our taxes more fair and less burdensome is a difficult challenge but critical to the future of our region. Fortunately, there are signs that Long Islanders may be receptive to change and considering new ways of paying for the services we enjoy. The goal is a balanced tax structure that is efficient, effective and fair—it should raise revenue in line with the growth of the economy, provide adequate levels of support for necessary services, and promote equity based on ability to pay.

**Tax Sharing**

One strategy for addressing inequity by spending roughly the same amount on each student in a county would be to fund schools using an income tax in place of a portion of the current property tax. 55% of respondents thought that this was a good idea.

The idea of pooling commercial property taxes, and distributing them evenly among all school districts, was favored by 76%.

**Consolidation**

Consolidation is designed to lower costs through economies of scale and eliminating duplicative functions. Consolidation is believed to have great potential for reducing costs; however, it requires structural changes in that one or more of the entities either changes or eliminates its governing structure. Home rule legislation, the desire to retain local autonomy and control, and precedents created by laws and past practices in New York State make it more difficult to achieve savings through consolidation than through aggressive cooperation and collaboration among entities.
What’s Happening in Other Regions?

A variety of approaches have been studied—and in some cases implemented—in other regions in the attempt to ameliorate tax problems.

“The Minnesota Miracle”

The Fiscal Disparities Act, which has become known as the “Minnesota Miracle,” was designed to address the wide wealth gap between communities in the Twin Cities region. There the Mall of America and other commercial properties brought huge tax revenues to Bloomington, while nearby towns languished in a spiral of rising taxes and economic decline. Under the plan each town contributes a portion of its commercial tax revenues to a regional pool, thereby spreading these revenues across the region. The program is credited with reducing inequality and helping to keep older towns solvent.

The measure faced four years of legal challenges, and unsurprisingly still faces opposition from some residents in “donor” towns. The legislation was adopted in 1971; some doubt it could be passed today.

Replacing Property Taxes in Michigan

Education inequity was a severe problem in Michigan, with a huge and rising gap in school funding between wealthy and less affluent communities. Yet for twenty years voters rejected proposed constitutional amendments to redress the problem. By 1993, with local property taxes 34% above the national average and funding inequities continuing to increase, the state legislature acted on its own.

The state eliminated $7 billion in local property taxes for schools, and then presented voters with two choices for restoring the revenues: one relying more on a sales tax, the other on an income tax. Voters chose the former.

The program has been successful in closing the gap between the wealthiest and poorest schools. Also, property taxes are much closer to the national average. However, since sales taxes follow the business cycle more closely than comparatively stable property taxes, a faltering Michigan economy has hurt school funding.

Prop. 13: A cautionary tale

In California in 1978, voters incensed by high property taxes passed a referendum that cut local property taxes by two-thirds and capped future growth at 1%. The result was a shift from local to state control of education, along with an increased dependence on income taxes.

These, however, unlike more stable property taxes, rise and fall readily with business cycles. In the wake of dramatic drops in state revenues in the early 1990’s and 2000’s, California schools experienced drastic declines in funding. Per capita spending on grades K-12 fell from seventh in the nation to 46th.
**Challenge to the Region**

Taxation is truly a fateful issue. Consider that our nation traces its very existence to a tax dispute.

Today Long Islanders are registering a high and growing level of dissatisfaction with their taxes, naming this the region’s *Number One* problem, rejecting school budgets in near record numbers.

It is a complex problem, difficult of solution. Taxation is woven into the entire fabric of society; it dramatically affects, and in turn is affected by, everything from economic conditions to educational opportunity to how our land is used.

The problem is complicated by 60 years of postwar sprawl and centuries-old home rule laws; by our region’s vast overlapping network of local government entities; by federal and state laws that mandate certain local expenditures; and more.

As a result, developing new policies to make our taxes more fair and less burdensome is a daunting challenge.

Yet, Long Islanders appear ready for change, with majorities signaling support for a range of innovative tax policies.

The future of our region depends on our ability to effect needed changes. Suburbia has matured. We must find new ways to come together; to debate the issues, define and evaluate the trade-offs, and provide solutions that work for the people of Long Island.
**GROWING, INCLUSIVE ECONOMY**

**GOAL 1: GROWTH AND PROSPERITY**

*Our economy grows and results in an improved quality of life for all.*

---

**GROWTH IN WAGES OVER PAST 10 YEARS**

Growth in Long Island Wages (4.5%) Outstrips National Wage Increases (3.2%), but Lags Peer Counties *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Pay per Employee, Long Island and U.S., 1995-2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$37,518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Why is this important?**

Average pay per employee is a basic measure of job quality and a key component of Long Island’s economic vitality. Increasing inflation-adjusted average pay per employee reflects rising levels of education and productivity.

**How are we doing?**

Average pay per employee on Long Island increased 4.5% between 2004 and 2005. Nationally, average wages rose about 3.2% during this same time period. Since 1995, average pay per employee on Long Island has increased by almost 23%, the same as the national rate. In 2005, average pay per employee on Long Island was $4,916 higher than it was nationally. In both 1995 and 2005 Long Island jobs paid about 12% more than the national average.

---

*See page 21 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator.*
While we still compare well to the nation in terms of average pay per employee, Long Island’s average wages are lower than any of our peer counties. They fall 40% below those of Santa Clara County; 37% below those of Fairfield County, 21% below those of Fairfax County, 19% below those of Westchester County and 18% below those of Bergen County.

**UNIONIZATION RATES OVER TIME**

Long Island Has a Higher Percentage of Union Employees Than the State or Nation

**Why is this important?**

Collective bargaining agreements give employees more leverage in asking for compensation, and can help shelter them from drastic compensation cuts during an economic downturn.

**How are we doing?**

The total share of employees on Long Island covered by collective bargaining agreements declined by 5.9% from 1994 to 2004. The average share of employees covered by collective bargaining agreements over the last ten years, 27.7%, is the same as the share covered in 2004.

### SHARE OF LONG ISLAND AND U.S. EMPLOYEES COVERED BY A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, 1994-2004

**SHARE OF EMPLOYEES COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Long Island</th>
<th>New York State</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Current Population Survey, Collaborative Economics

While approximately equal numbers of public and private sector employees on Long Island are covered by collective bargaining agreements, a far greater share of public sector employees work under these agreements than their private sector counterparts: in 2004 72.1% of public sector employees were covered compared to 14.8% of private sector employees.
TRENDS IN PRODUCTIVITY

Why is this important?

Value added per employee is a proxy measure of productivity. It is the sum of revenue less inputs and other costs such as contracted labor and materials, divided by employment. Increasing value added is a prerequisite for rising wages.

How are we doing?

Regional value added per employee rose 2.2% in inflation-adjusted terms from 2004 to 2005, following an unusually high increase of 4.3% from 2003 to 2004. Between 1995 and 2005, value added per employee on Long Island increased 22%. Nationally, value-added increased slightly faster, by 23%, over this same period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Long Island</th>
<th>Fairfield County</th>
<th>Silicon Valley</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
<th>Bergen County</th>
<th>Fairfax County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$109,743</td>
<td>$140,775</td>
<td>$123,144</td>
<td>$118,634</td>
<td>$116,187</td>
<td>$96,963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Economy.com; Collaborative Economics

* See page 24 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator.
INDUSTRY CLUSTERS

Government and Military and Health Sectors Still Dominate Region’s Economy*

**Why is this important?**

Long Island’s industry clusters make up approximately 42% of Long Island’s employment base. An industry cluster is a geographic concentration of interdependent firms in related industries and includes a significant number of companies that sell their products and services outside the region. The above bubble chart illustrates three key dimensions of Long Island’s industry clusters: the cluster’s employment concentration, relative to the nation (vertical axis), change in employment concentration from 2000 to 2005 (horizontal axis) and employment size in 2005 (size of circle). Employment concentration measures the percentage of employment on Long Island compared to the same cluster, nationally. A concentration greater than one indicates that Long Island has a comparative employment advantage. The change in employment concentration shows which industries are becoming more or less concentrated in the region, as compared to the nation, and indicates structural changes in the regional economy. Average annual employment shows the size of the cluster.

Breakdown of Long Island employment by industry gives us a better sense of what percentage of the economy each industry cluster comprises. Share of employment and share of payroll by Long Island’s industry clusters shows which industries generate the greatest amount of economic impact on the region.

Change in average pay per employee by cluster tells us which industries are experiencing real average wage gains and declines.

---

* See page 22 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator. NB: change in employment concentration is analyzed this year.
How are we doing?

Technically not an industry cluster, Government and Military, including all public school employees, comprises the largest segment of the region’s economy. Government and Military employment grew 0.7% from 2000 to 2005 for a total of 203,350 employees in 2005. At the same time the cluster lost employment concentration compared to the nation.

The largest industry cluster on Long Island is Health, with almost 154,000 employees. Health-related employment is about 28% more concentrated on Long Island than it is nationally. However, the cluster has lost concentration since 2000 when Health on Long Island was 35% more concentrated than the US. Health employment grew at an annual rate of 1.5% between 2000 and 2005, outpacing average regional job growth (0.5%) during the same period.

Long Island has six industry clusters, out of eleven, with employment concentrations that are greater than one. Education and Training, excluding public school employees, and Business Services are the two most concentrated clusters on Long Island—both are about 30% more concentrated on Long Island than they are nationally. The largest and most highly concentrated segment of Business Services is Legal Services which makes up 29% of the cluster, and is 85% more concentrated than the US average. Finance and Insurance is about 23% more concentrated on Long Island than nationally. From 2000 to 2005, Finance and Insurance lost concentration, from being 34% more concentrated than the US to 23% more concentrated today. Visitors was the fastest growing cluster from 2000-2005, with 2.8% annual growth. This cluster is still less concentrated than the national average. Technical Manufacturing had the highest rate of employment loss from 2000 to 2005 (-4.8%). However, the cluster still managed to gain ground compared to the national average—growing from 23% more concentrated to 24% more concentrated than the national average.
Government and military employment make up 16% of our economy and provide just over 16% of payroll in the region. Private industry clusters make up about 42% of all employment and about 47% of payroll on Long Island. Industries that are not clusters comprise 42% of our economy and include industries such as construction and real estate, retail and miscellaneous manufacturing. Industry clusters such as finance and insurance, business services, creative services, information services and technical manufacturing have tremendous impact on our economy because their share of payroll is greater than their share of employment. Of these clusters, finance and insurance has the greatest economic impact, employing 6% of the region’s workers but generating 11% in payroll for the region.
The majority of Long Island’s industry clusters pay more than the regional average wage of $46,331 and a majority also saw a greater than 10% pay increase between 2000 and 2005. Only Technical Manufacturing saw wages decline.
GOAL 2: SUPPORTIVE BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT

Long Island provides a business friendly environment for companies to grow.

**Why is this important?**

Job gains or losses measure regional economic vitality. This chart shows annual average private non-farm employment, government and military, and total employment on Long Island during the past eleven years.

**How are we doing?**

Long Island added about 13,546 private sector jobs growing from 1.24 million in 2004 to 1.26 million in 2005; this is an increase of 1.1%. Of the net 13,546 new jobs, 13,568 were added in private industry, while government and military sectors lost 23 jobs.

Long Island’s total employment increased by about 13.2% or by about 152,850 jobs between 1995 and 2005. Private industry employment increased 13.9% and Government & Military employment increased 9.1% over this time period.

*See page 25 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator.
VENTURE CAPITAL FINANCING
VC Funding Rises in Past Year, but is Still Low

Why is this important?
New venture capital investment is a leading indicator of innovation. Companies that have passed the screen of venture capitalists are innovative, are entrepreneurial, and have growth potential. Typically, only firms with potential for exceptionally high rates of growth over a 5- to 10-year period will attract venture capital. These firms are usually highly innovative in their technology and market focus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Long Island</th>
<th>Silicon Valley</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$1,793</td>
<td>$9,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$25,202</td>
<td>$117,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$4,210</td>
<td>$16,310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: PricewaterhouseCoopers/Thomson Venture Economics/National Venture Capital Association/MoneyTree® Survey; Collaborative Economics

PEER REGION COMPARISONS: VENTURE CAPITAL INVESTMENT AS A SHARE OF VENTURE CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN ALL US FIRMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Long Island</th>
<th>Silicon Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: PricewaterhouseCoopers/Thomson Venture Economics/National Venture Capital Association/MoneyTree® Survey; Collaborative Economics
How are we doing?

Venture capital investments made to Long Island firms during the first three quarters of 2005 rose 24% compared to venture capital investments made to Long Island firms in 2004, but are still low compared to total venture capital investments across the US and in Silicon Valley firms. The three industries that received venture capital funding in Long Island in 2005, ordered by share of total venture capital, were Medical Devices and Equipment (75%), Software (22%), and Healthcare Services (3%).

Between 1995 and 2005, venture capital investment in Long Island firms peaked at $400 million during 2000. During this period, venture capital was more widely distributed across industries than in recent years. The industries that received the greatest share of regional venture capital investment were Telecommunications (22%), Industrial/Energy (16%), Media and Entertainment (16%), Electronics/Instrumentation (11%), and Software (10%).
Why is this important?

Federal R&D investment in Long Island’s universities, labs and private sector helps to drive regional innovation. Federal R&D dollars support the development of technologies that create enormous economic benefits for the regions in which they are developed and for the nation as a whole. According to RAND, “Specific federal R&D activities are often deeply rooted in the communities in which they are conducted. Such activities attract new businesses to these areas, thereby stimulating local economies and improving the quality of local schools. High-technology start-up companies often co-locate with Federal laboratories and major federally-funded R&D activities at universities.”
**How are we doing?**

The total amount of Federal R&D dollars given varies annually as new projects are granted, and older ones are completed. This indicator measures the actual dollars given on an annual basis. In 2004 $1 billion dollars of Federal R&D funds were distributed to Long Island, the most awarded in over a decade.

The Department of Energy (DOE), the Department of Defense (DOD), and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) are by far the largest Federal contributors of R&D dollars to the region. While Long Island generally receives a little less than 1% of all Federal R&D funding, the DOE has given an increasing share of its R&D funding to Long Island, reaching a peak of 8% in 2004. Brookhaven National Laboratory received the largest award from the DOE, and the largest overall—59% of all Long Island R&D. Northrop Grumman and Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory were the two other entities that received large portions of Long Island funding at 31% and 3% respectively.
**GOAL 4:**

**VIBRANT COMMUNITIES**

*We create exciting communities and downtown centers that offer people a wide choice of places to live, work, and play.*

---

**HOUSEHOLD INCOME DISTRIBUTION**

Long Island Household Incomes Fall at all Levels from 2003 to 2004*

**Why is this important?**

This measure shows how Long Island’s standard of living among households at different income levels has changed from year to year. It tracks the income of a representative four-person household at the 80th percentile, the median and the 20th percentile of the income distribution. Household income includes income from wages, investments, Social Security and welfare payments for all people residing in a household.

**How are we doing?**

From 2003 to 2004, household incomes (inflation adjusted) fell for households at all levels. Income for households at the 20th percentile had the largest decline, dropping by 7.8%. The median household income fell 1.4% and households at the 80th percentile felt the least drop, with less than a 1% decline.

Looking at the larger trend from 1997 to 2004 incomes for households at the 20th percentile have dropped 0.4%, while the median income rose by 5.8% and income at the 80th percentile rose by 2.5%.

* See page 29 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator.
**LONG ISLAND’S CHANGING POPULATION**

**Population Continues to Grow and Diversify**

**Why is this important?**

The level of population growth is a fundamental benchmark of how attractive Long Island is as a place to live. New residents require more housing and services, but can also add to the vibrancy of growing communities, increase sales for local businesses and provide additional tax revenues. Increasing diversity can provide a cultural richness that many people value, but can also add to social tensions. In addition, some economists have found that workforce diversity leads to a stronger regional economy.

**How are we doing?**

Long Island’s population continues to grow at a modest pace. Since 2000, however, annual population estimates by the U.S. Census Bureau indicate that the rate of growth has declined in each of the last four years, from 25,000 new residents in 2001 to 6,000 in 2004. Most of Long Island’s population growth results from natural increase, or the number of births less the number of deaths of people for people who already live here. And while the annual Census estimates indicate that there are still more people moving to Long Island than moving away, all of these net increase are accounted for by people immigrating from overseas. Within the United States, there are more people moving away from Long Island to other parts of the country than the reverse.

---

**LONG ISLAND ANNUAL POPULATION CHANGE, 2000-2004**

---

**PEER COUNTY COMPARISONS: PERCENT CHANGE IN POPULATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Long Island</th>
<th>Bergen County</th>
<th>Fairfield County</th>
<th>Fairfax County</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995-2000</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2004</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: US Census Estimates, Regional Plan Association

* See page 30 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator. Population growth was added this year.
VIBRANT, LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

LONG ISLAND CONTINUES TO AGE*

Why is this important?

Age distribution can have a dramatic effect on the size of the workforce and the types of services that are required on Long Island. A growing population under 18 indicates the need for child care and school services, while an increase in those over 65 implies a need for more medical services and senior housing.

How are we doing?

Population estimates by age are consistent with the expected aging of the population as the “baby boom” generation moves through their 40s and 50s and as medical advances increase life expectancy. From 1990 to 2004, persons 55 and older increased from 23% of the population to 25% of the population. In fact during this same time period, people in all age groups except 20-34 years old were a greater share of the population.

*See page 30 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator.

PEER COUNTY COMPARISONS: PERCENT OF POPULATION BY RACE AND ETHNICITY, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Long Island</th>
<th>Bergen County</th>
<th>Fairfield County</th>
<th>Fairfax County</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: US Census Estimates, Regional Plan Association

POPULATION BY AGE GROUPS ON LONG ISLAND, 1990 AND 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-19 Years Old</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-34 Years Old</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54 Years Old</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and Older</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: US Census Estimates, Regional Plan Association
Why is this important?

The level of crime in our communities directly impacts our quality of life and sense of well-being. Even if you are safe from direct harm, crime still has an impact. We spend billions annually caring for gunshot victims, abused children, or victims of fraud. This figure does not include the loss of productivity from promising members of our society. Community bonds and trust are often broken as a result of crime and violence. By developing programs that build strong, viable economies and effective crime prevention, communities can work together to keep crime at a minimum and foster a strong sense of community.

How are we doing?

Over the last 5 years, Long Island has experienced a decrease in the property crime rate and a leveling off of the violent crime rate. Between 2000 and 2004, property crime on Long Island was reduced by 17%. Violent crime was reduced by 4%. At the same time, the region saw an increase in the general population. In the US, between 2000 and 2003 (2004 data is not available), property crime was reduced by 1% and violent crime was reduced by 6%.

---

**PEER COUNTY COMPARISONS: PERCENT OF POPULATION BY AGE, 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Long Island</th>
<th>Bergen County</th>
<th>Fairfield County</th>
<th>Fairfax County</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
<th>NYS</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-19 Years Old</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-34 Years Old</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54 Years Old</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and Older</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRENDS IN PROPERTY AND VIOLENT CRIME**

Lower Crime Rates Mirror State and National Trends

**CRIME PER 1000 POPULATION, LONG ISLAND 2000-2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Property Crime</th>
<th>Violent Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPERTY CRIME**

- Property Crime
- Violent Crime

Sources: [www.criminaljustice.state.ny.us](http://www.criminaljustice.state.ny.us) and U.S. Census

---

**PEER COUNTY COMPARISONS: CRIME PER 1000 POPULATION, 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Long Island</th>
<th>Bergen County</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
<th>NY State Excluding NYC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Census Estimates; Regional Plan Association

---

**Why is this important?**

The level of crime in our communities directly impacts our quality of life and sense of well-being. Even if you are safe from direct harm, crime still has an impact. We spend billions annually caring for gunshot victims, abused children, or victims of fraud. This figure does not include the loss of productivity from promising members of our society. Community bonds and trust are often broken as a result of crime and violence. By developing programs that build strong, viable economies and effective crime prevention, communities can work together to keep crime at a minimum and foster a strong sense of community.

**How are we doing?**

Over the last 5 years, Long Island has experienced a decrease in the property crime rate and a leveling off of the violent crime rate. Between 2000 and 2004, property crime on Long Island was reduced by 17%. Violent crime was reduced by 4%. At the same time, the region saw an increase in the general population. In the US, between 2000 and 2003 (2004 data is not available), property crime was reduced by 1% and violent crime was reduced by 6%.
Why is this important?

In 2004, according to the U.S. Census Bureau’s Housing Vacancy Survey, 85.7 percent of Long Island households were owner-occupied. But homeownership costs have skyrocketed beyond the reach of vast numbers of first-time homebuyers. A combination of factors, including record low mortgage interest rates, flexible mortgage practices, larger house sizes, diminishing amounts of land, and high demand have driven home prices to their highest levels ever. The scarcity of affordable housing has become one of the most significant challenges facing Long Island.

How are we doing?

The cost of housing on Long Island has increased dramatically over the past ten years. In 1995, the median price of a single family home in Nassau County was $173,000 and in Suffolk County was $133,000. In 2005, the median price of a single family home has increased to $490,000 in Nassau and $390,000 in Suffolk.

According to Fannie Mae, a home is considered affordable if the purchase price is no more than 2.5 times the buyer’s annual household income. The ratio of median home price to median family income on Long Island has increased from 2.2 in 1996 to 4.8 in 2005. According to this standard, the majority of Long Island homeowners could not afford to purchase the home they currently live in.

Sources: 2004 American Community Survey; SUNY Stony Brook Center for Regional Policy Studies; Long Island Regional Planning Board

---

**Housing Affordability Continues to Decline**

We generate housing options that are affordable to people of all ages and income levels.

---

**Goal 5:**

**Affordable Homes**

---

**Peer County Comparisons: Ratio of Median Home Price to Median Family Income, 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Nassau County</th>
<th>Suffolk County</th>
<th>Bergen County</th>
<th>Fairfield County</th>
<th>Fairfax County</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Price Ratio</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2004 American Community Survey; SUNY Stony Brook Center for Regional Policy Studies; Long Island Regional Planning Board

---

* See page 34 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator.
**HOMELESS ON LONG ISLAND**

**Decrease in Number of Homeless**

**Why is this important?**

The number of homeless in a community is an important measure of how a community cares for the most vulnerable members of its population. Homeless subpopulations on Long Island include the severely mentally ill, chronic substance abusers, veterans, persons with HIV/AIDS, victims of domestic violence and youth under 18 years of age. Increasing the availability of affordable rental housing and supportive housing for persons transitioning from institutional living will help alleviate the number of homeless.

**How are we doing?**

The Nassau Suffolk Coalition for the Homeless, a non-profit organization on Long Island, conducted a point in time count of the unsheltered homeless on January 24th and 25th 2005 between 1 PM and 8 PM. While overall the total number of homeless people on Long Island has decreased in the past year, there was an increase in the number of homeless individuals. A decrease occurred in the number of homeless persons in families with children. According to the Nassau Suffolk Coalition for the Homeless, the increase in homeless individuals may have been in part due to the closure of 12 adult homes displacing over 600 individuals. While over $40 million dollars was spent to house the homeless in shelters and hotels in 2004, resources are needed in order to create permanent supportive housing for people with mental illness and substance abuse.
**TRENDS IN TRANSIT RIDERSHIP**

Transit Ridership Declines for a Third Year*

*See page 37 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator.

**Why is this important?**

Increased transit ridership helps reduce traffic congestion by taking motor vehicles off the road. An efficient transit system helps provide quicker access to jobs, helps to improve the overall livability of our communities and reduces pollution.

**How are we doing?**

While many people continue to use the Long Island Rail Road (LIRR) to travel, there are less people utilizing this service in 2004 than in 1995. In 1995, the LIRR provided 97.7 million trips and in 2004 the LIRR provided 96.9 million trips. This represents a 1% decline. At the same time, bus ridership saw a 23% increase from 29.3 million trips in 1995 to 36 million trips in 2004.

---

**GOAL 6: TRANSPORTATION CHOICES**

We increase mobility by investing in an integrated, regional transportation system and by encouraging creative problem solving to find transportation alternatives.

---

**WHAT PEOPLE IN THE REGION ARE SAYING**

Would you prefer to see an increase in LOCAL government spending to build and maintain roads OR to expand and maintain public transportation such as local buses and vans?

- 5% Don’t Know
- 39% Public Transportation
- 55% Roads
- 1% Refused

---

**PEER AGENCY COMPARISONS: TRANSIT RIDERSHIP IN MILLIONS OF TRIPS 1996-2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Island Rail &amp; Bus</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>127.6</td>
<td>132.1</td>
<td>135.4</td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>137.9</td>
<td>136.5</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>133.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro-North Rail</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ Transit Rail &amp; Bus</td>
<td>191.2</td>
<td>197.4</td>
<td>206.5</td>
<td>212.1</td>
<td>218.6</td>
<td>225.9</td>
<td>225.4</td>
<td>222.3</td>
<td>225.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: National Transit Database, Annual Unlinked Passenger Trips, 2004; Regional Plan Association
**MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS**

Motor Vehicle Registrations Pick Up in 2004*

**Why is this important?**

The more motor vehicles registered in an area, the more cars on the road, leading to increased traffic congestion and longer commutes for everyone. Time spent commuting represents time we can’t spend pursuing other activities.

**How are we doing?**

Motor vehicle registrations increased by 16,000 in 2004; however, overall registration increased at a relatively low rate in comparison to the population over the last 4 years. While historically Long Islanders own an increasing number of vehicles per person, this trend is being reversed in some suburban areas.

In 2000, 1,915,769 registered vehicles (89%) on Long Island were passenger vehicles and 119,718 (6%) were commercial vehicles. This remains virtually unchanged in 2004 with 1,938,495 (90%) registered vehicles being reported as passenger vehicles and 105,236 (5%) reported as commercial vehicles. The other 4% of registered vehicles are trailers and motorcycles.

### Peer County Comparison: Motor Vehicle Registrations and Population, 2000 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Long Island</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,145,956</td>
<td>2,753,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,154,359</td>
<td>2,815,129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: NYSDMV, US Census Estimates, Regional Plan Association

* See page 38 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator.
PERCENTAGE OF ADOLESCENT BIRTHS
Disparities Persist Despite Progress among African Americans*

Why is this important?
There is well-documented evidence that teen mothers face a future of limited educational and economic opportunities compared to other teens. Children of teen mothers are more likely to have behavioral problems and poor academic outcomes and they are more likely to engage in sex at an early age and become teen parents themselves. The estimated annual cost to U.S. taxpayers of births for 15 to 17 year olds is close to $7 billion in lost tax revenues and increased government spending.

How are we doing?
The percentage of adolescent births on Long Island has remained steady at about 1% since 2000. Adolescent births among African Americans on Long Island decreased from 4.1% to 3.7% between 2000 and 2004, while adolescent births among Hispanics on Long Island increased from 3.4% to 3.6% over this same time period. Asians and Whites continue to have the lowest levels of adolescent births on Long Island.

PEER COUNTY COMPARISON: ADOLESCENT BIRTHS PER 1000 BIRTHS IN 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nassau County</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk County</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax County</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annie E. Casey Foundation, CLIKS Database, www.aecf.org/kidscount/

*See page 42 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator. NB: we used a slightly different indicator this year, “percentage of adolescent births” versus “percentage of births to teens”, making comparisons to last year’s indicator difficult. See Appendix A for more information.
TOTAL AMBULATORY CARE SENSITIVE CONDITION HOSPITAL DISCHARGES
Preventable Emergency Room Visits That Result in Hospitalization Increase*

Why is this important?
Ambulatory care sensitive (ACS) conditions represent conditions like ear infections, adult asthma, high blood pressure and diabetes that could be prevented with timely medical care in the 0-64 age population. Prior care could prevent the onset of certain illnesses, help control an acute episodic illness or condition, or manage a chronic disease or condition. When these conditions are undetected or untreated they can result in emergency room visits and consequent hospitalizations.

How are we doing?
The rate of hospital discharges with ACS conditions on Long Island has increased by almost 25% since 1997 from 17,668 ACS discharges to 22,117 ACS discharges in 2004. A persistently high rate of ACS discharges has been observed in several Nassau/Suffolk communities, potentially indicating a lack of access to primary care by residents in these communities. These differences tend to be associated with socioeconomic status.

Sources: North Shore-LIJ Health System Planning Office Analysis; New York State Department of Health Office of Statewide Planning and Research Cooperative System

*See page 40 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator. NB: this year’s indicator reflects year-end database updates for 2003 figures, thus the trend between 2002 and 2003 is different from last year’s indicator.
4TH GRADE ENGLISH PERFORMANCE

Long Island Students Continue to Outperform Students Statewide, but Achievement Gap Persists Between High-Need Districts and Long Island Districts on Average*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENT OF STUDENTS IN LONG ISLAND SCHOOL Districts PERFORMING AT OR ABOVE STATE STANDARDS, 4TH GRADE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS 2000-2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Need</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*See page 43 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator. NB: methodological changes this year make comparisons to last year’s indicator difficult. See Appendix A for more information.

GOAL 8: EDUCATIONAL READINESS

All students are prepared to learn at each stage of the educational pipeline.
Why is this important?

According to the NYS Education Department, the Grade 4 English Language Arts (ELA) exam reflects a benchmark that identifies those students who should pass, and those who may have difficulty passing the Regents Exam, now a requirement for high school graduation.

How are we doing?

On the whole, Long Island students are performing well on the Grade 4 ELA and Long Island school districts have displayed consistent growth in helping 4th graders reach proficiency and mastery levels required on this exam. However, a significant disparity between high need school districts and all school districts on Long Island remains. While high need districts have experienced marked improvement in the number of children meeting or exceeding state standards on this exam in the past five years, they still fall 15% below Long Island districts on average on the 2004 ELA exam. Additionally, these districts fall behind statewide averages. This “achievement gap” remains closely tied to the areas of Long Island that have been racially and ethnically segregated and economically disadvantaged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEER COUNTY COMPARISON: PERCENT OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS SCORING AT OR ABOVE GRADE LEVEL ON 2004 GRADE 4 ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS EXAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


8TH GRADE MATH PERFORMANCE

Long Island Students Continue to Outperform Students Statewide, but Achievement Gap Persists Between High-Need Districts and Long Island Districts on Average*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENT OF STUDENTS IN LONG ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICTS performing at or above state standards, 8TH GRADE MATHEMATICS 2000-2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*See page 43 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator. NB: methodological changes this year make comparisons to last year’s indicator difficult. See Appendix A for more information.
Why is this important?
According to the NYS Education Department the Grade 8 Mathematics exam reflects a benchmark that identifies those students who should pass, and those who may have difficulty passing the Regents Exam, now a requirement for high school graduation.

How are we doing?
On the whole, Long Island students are performing well on the 8th Grade Math Exam and Long Island school districts have displayed consistent growth in helping 8th graders reach proficiency and mastery levels required on this exam. While high need districts have experienced marked improvement in the number of children meeting or exceeding state standards on this exam in the past five years, they still fall 31% behind Long Island districts on average on the 2004 Mathematics exam. Additionally, these districts fall behind statewide averages. This “achievement gap” remains closely tied to the areas of Long Island that have been racially and ethnically segregated and economically disadvantaged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEER COUNTY COMPARISON: PERCENT OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS SCORING AT OR ABOVE GRADE LEVEL ON 2004 GRADE 8 MATH EXAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

More Students Designated LEP*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENT OF STUDENTS IN LONG ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY 2000-2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Why is this important?
Not all children experience economic and social conditions that allow them to perform their best in our public school system. Limited English Proficiency is an indicator of students at risk of performing poorly in school. It also reflects Long Island’s changing population and the resulting increase in disparity across school districts.

*See page 44 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator. NB: methodological changes this year make comparisons to last year’s indicator difficult. See Appendix A for more information.
How are we doing?

Between 2000 and 2004, there was an 18% increase in the percentage of limited English proficient students in Long Island school districts from 3.7% to 4.4%. Long Island’s high need school districts continue to have a higher percentage of students with limited English proficiency than students in other districts on Long Island. In 2004, 14.4% of students in high need districts had limited English proficiency. This is more than three times the rate of LEP students in all districts on Long Island.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer County Comparison: Percent of Students with Limited English Proficiency in 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Why is this important?

Not all children experience economic and social conditions that allow them to perform their best in our public school system. Living under the poverty level is an indicator of students at risk of performing poorly in school. It also reflects Long Island’s changing population and the resulting increase in disparity across school districts.

How are we doing?

Between 2000 and 2004, there was a 56% increase in the percentage of students living below the poverty level in Long Island schools, from 4.9% to 7.7%. Long Island’s school districts experience a greater number of students living below the poverty level than districts in Westchester County, but a smaller number than districts across New York State. Disparities persist for school districts on Long Island. In 2004, 17.9% of students in high need districts lived below the poverty level. Students in high need districts are more than twice as likely as students in all districts on Long Island to live below the poverty level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer County Comparison: Percent of Students Living Below the Poverty Line in 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* See page 44 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator. NB: methodological changes this year make comparisons to last year’s indicator difficult. See Appendix A for more information.
GOAL 9: NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION:

We promote the conservation and efficient use of the region’s natural resources.

TRENDS IN ENERGY CONSUMPTION
Natural Gas and Electricity Consumption on the Rise*

Why is this important?
While experts say that current supplies of all forms of energy are adequate to meet demand, it is predicted that some forms of fossil fuel energy will become more expensive in the future as they become scarcer. As supplies decrease and prices increase, Long Islanders will need to find new ways to meet consumer energy demands by becoming more energy independent and less reliant on oil and other fossil fuels.

RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL NATURAL GAS CONSUMPTION ON LONG ISLAND, 1999-2004, INDEXED TO 100

RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL ELECTRICITY CONSUMPTION ON LONG ISLAND, 1998-2004 INDEXED TO 100

* See page 45 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator. NB: natural gas consumption was added this year.
**How are we doing?**

Despite increasing energy costs, Long Islanders continue to consume high levels of electricity, natural gas and oil. Long Island is highly dependent on oil and natural gas to generate electricity, heat homes and businesses and provide gasoline for the large number of cars and vehicles on Long Island.

Long Islanders consume a considerable amount of electricity and recent figures show no signs of a potential decline. Between 1998 and 2004, residential electricity consumption increased by over 20%. Commercial and industrial electricity consumption increased by 13%.

Between 1999 and 2004, Long Islanders consumed increasing amounts of natural gas. Residential natural gas consumption increased nearly 19% and commercial and industrial natural gas consumption increased nearly 13%.

Annually, approximately 545,000 Long Island residential homes are heated by oil consuming 490.14 million gallons. An additional 396.77 million gallons of oil is consumed by commercial and industrial use and 403.29 million gallons is used to generate electricity. 2,152,344 registered vehicles consume 1,257.36 million gallons of oil.

As the cost of oil and natural gas continue to rise, Long Island’s heavy dependence on these fossil fuels places Long Island’s economy at risk. Long Islanders need to look towards using energy as efficiently as possible and increasing utilization of renewable energy technologies.

---

**Why is this Important?**

There is a finite amount of high quality groundwater available to meet human needs and those of the Island’s ecosystems. Increasing demand for water hastens the loss of the high quality water stored in the aquifers. Increased water use accelerates the spread of contamination into the deeper portions of the aquifer system and increases the risk of saltwater intrusion affecting coastal communities.

**How are we doing?**

Water use in Suffolk County continued to climb and in Nassau County declined. Between 1998 and 2003 consumption in Suffolk County increased 19% while water consumption in Nassau County declined 5%.

Water use is influenced by numerous factors. Water use within the Suffolk County Water Authority area rose due to increased development, an expansion of the service area and no formal water conservation program.

---

*TRENDS IN WATER CONSUMPTION Increases in Suffolk and Decreases in Nassau*

---

> * See page 46 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator.
Per person water use in Nassau County was 154 gallons per person day in the year 2002. In the same year, the per person water use in the Suffolk County Water Authority service was 158 gallons per person per day.

**GARBAGE AND RECYCLING RATES**

**Steady Decline in Recycling Rates**

**Why is this important?**

Waste generation and recycling are good indicators of how well the region is managing its natural resources. Less waste generation and more recycling means less garbage filling up our landfills, less potential for air and water contamination and less need for exporting our excess waste off-island. It also means that we won’t have to use up valuable remaining open space to build new landfills and waste incineration facilities.

As an island, how we manage our solid waste is of much greater importance than mainland regions since the total amount of space we have available to us to “store” that waste is physically, geographically limited.

**How are we doing?**

From 2002 through 2004 the amount of per person residential waste produced on Long Island has increased by 2.9%, though it went down in 2004 from a high of 5.15 pounds per person per day in 2003. In addition, Long Islanders recycled 27% less waste in 2004 than they did in 2002. Long Islanders are producing more garbage and recycling less, causing increasing demand on our waste incineration facilities and increasing dependency on off-island waste management.

**TRENDS IN PESTICIDE USE**

**Long Island Pesticide Use Continues to Rise, Though Not as Much as Westchester County**

**Why is this important?**

In a 2000 report by the New York State Attorney General’s office, several key findings drew a grim picture of Long Island’s green spaces. Researchers found that golf courses and public schools on Long Island were the greenest parts of the region, primarily due to the overt use of pesticides. Pesticides pose health risks such as nervous system toxicity, carcinogenicity and damage to the endocrine, immune and reproductive systems. They pose environmental risks to the air, water and soil.

Pesticide use is reported in pounds or gallons depending on the type of pesticides being used.
How are we doing?

Pesticide use on Long Island continues to be high compared with the rest of New York State. According to pesticide data collected by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) for 2003 (the most recent year available), Suffolk and Nassau counties, respectively, are the first and fifth highest counties in the state for the amount of pesticides sold reported by pounds. Suffolk County dropped to second highest for the amount of pesticides sold reported by gallons, and Nassau ranked third.

The combined commercial application of pesticides and sales for agricultural purposes on Long Island is rising on a per capita basis. From 2002 to 2003 it increased roughly 17% per capita for pesticides reported in pounds and 7% for pesticides reported in gallons. Pesticide use and sales also increased on a statewide basis at the same rate, for gallons and for pounds.

In Westchester County, however, the amount of pesticides used or sold is increasing faster than on Long Island and in New York State overall. From 2002 to 2003, the combined per capita commercial application of pesticides and sales for agricultural purposes in Westchester grew by almost 40% for pesticides reported in pounds, and 72% for pesticides reported in gallons.

* See Appendix A for more information
GOVERNANCE

GOAL 11: MATCHING RESOURCES AND RESPONSIBILITY

Long Island’s counties, towns, villages, and other jurisdictions manage their revenue to provide quality local and regional services.

FRAGMENTED GOVERNMENT

Long Island is divided into numerous categories of local government entities: 2 cities, 2 counties, 13 towns, 95 villages, 127 school districts, and many, many other special purpose units. There are 126 municipal corporations in Nassau County, including 1 county, 2 cities, 3 towns, 64 villages, and 56 school districts. In Suffolk County there are 113 municipal corporations, including 1 county, 10 towns, 31 villages, and 71 school districts. By contrast the closest county in terms of municipal corporations is Westchester, with 96 municipal corporations.

In total, when special purpose units of government are included (e.g. library districts, fire districts, water districts, sanitation districts, lighting districts, highway districts, etc.) there are 901 local government entities on Long Island, (476 in Suffolk county and 425 in Nassau County).

FRAGMENTED GOVERNMENT ON LONG ISLAND

* The total number of fire districts on Long Island is higher than the total number of fire agencies as some districts share fire agencies

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Nassau County Planning Commission (Basemap copyright 2003 County of Nassau, NY) Long Island Regional Planning Board, NYS Office of Real Property Services
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THE COST OF FIRE PROTECTION
High Cost of Fire Protection: Increasing Costs, Decreasing Fires

Why is this important?

Fire departments provide a range of services to a community including suppressing fires, performing rescues and providing EMS services. In 2004, public fire departments responded to 1,550,500 fires in the U.S. Nationwide about 4,000 people and about 100 firefighters die on duty each year. More than 20,000 civilians and firefighters are injured each year. In addition, fire causes about $10 billion in losses from nearly 2 million annual fires.

Since 1979, the U.S. Fire Administration (USFA) has been part of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). In March 2003, FEMA became part of the Department of Homeland Security, bringing the firefighter community into an all-hazards mission to threats against the homeland —both natural and man-made. While terrorism response is a new and very real component of a modern fire department, the old enemy - house and building fires and wildfires —remain the greatest threat to our communities, our people and their property.

While improvements in technology and material have made protective equipment better, new technology in addition to a patchwork of voluntary guidelines and federal requirements have also driven up costs in the past years.

How are we doing?

According to Newsday’s 2005 special report on Long Island fire departments, the number of fires being fought by Long Island’s 179 fire agencies has decreased by 78% from 6,899 fires in 1980 to 1,541 fires in 2003. Yet, the cost of Long Island fire protection has increased by 123% from $143.1 million in 1980 to $319.7 million in 2003. Long Island’s volunteer fire departments cost three times as much to operate as the average volunteer department in the Northeast.

Additionally, Long Island’s 179 fire agencies have more fire trucks and apparatus than New York City and the city and county of Los Angeles combined, which protect almost three times as much land and six times as many people and answer more than 12 times as many calls for help. The New York City Fire Department owns one heavy rescue truck for each of its five boroughs, plus a single spare for use citywide. Long Island fire agencies own 146 heavy rescue trucks which can cost $750,000 or more apiece.
On Long Island, there is no regional coordination of equipment purchases or training. Nationwide, stressed departments in growing areas have frequently turned to consolidation, and one of the first results has been a decrease in equipment.

PER CAPITA AND PER HOUSEHOLD PROPERTY TAXES
Higher Than All Peer Regions*

Why is this important?
Property taxes affect disposable income, cost of living and the overall affordability of a region. These indicators of tax burden are adjusted for population and differences in incomes across peer counties and the Long Island region, giving a more accurate reflection of local tax burden.

* See page 51 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator.
How are we doing?

In 2002, Nassau had the highest tax burden among peer counties, about 25% greater than neighboring Suffolk. Property taxes per resident in Nassau were 9% greater than in Westchester, the next highest region, and 46% greater than Fairfax, the peer county with the lowest per capita property tax.

Per household property taxes follow a similar trend, although Suffolk comes in third highest in terms of per household property taxes versus 5th highest in per capita property taxes. Nassau led all peer counties in property taxes per household in 2002, followed by Westchester, which raised 17% less, Suffolk, which raised 25% less and Fairfax, again the lowest, which raised 49% less.

GOAL 12: CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

All residents and business people are actively engaged in local civic life.

SCHOOL BUDGET VOTES

Voters Continue to Show Their Discontent with School District Budgets*

What People in the Region Are Saying

In your view, how serious a problem are high property taxes in Suffolk/Nassau County?

- Not At All Serious: 1%
- Not Very Serious: 2%
- Somewhat Serious: 14%
- Very Serious: 42%
- Extremely Serious: 34%
- Don’t Know: 2%

Why is this important?

Over 60% of property taxes on Long Island go toward funding our local public schools. Voting for or against the school budget is one of the clearest ways that a community can express their content or discontent with how school finances are being managed.

* See page 52 of Long Island Index 2005 for previous indicator.
How are we doing?

The 2004-2005 school year saw a growing number of financial scandals in Long Island’s school districts. Increasing scandals and increasing taxes brought a record number of voters to the polls in 2005. 2004 saw a record number of 46 first time school budget failures and nearly the same number of budgets (45) failed the first time around in 2005.

Additionally, Long Island school budgets continue to fail at three times the rate of school budgets throughout the state. As of September 2005, the Federal government began investigating the financial management of all school districts on Long Island.
All public opinion data in this report are from *At The Breaking Point? Taxation and Governance on Long Island*, November 2005, a regional public opinion poll conducted by Stony Brook University’s Center for Survey Research for the Rauch Foundation in July and August of 2005. A full copy of the poll report is available at www.longislandindex.org.

**INTRODUCTION**

While Long Island may geographically extend to include Kings (Brooklyn and vicinity) and Queens Counties, this indicators report specifically focuses on Nassau and Suffolk Counties. Kings and Queens Counties are technically studied as part of the New York Metropolitan Statistical Area. All demographic, government and household data are based on US Census 2004 County Estimates, the 2002 Census of Governments, 2004 American Community Survey Data Profiles and the March 2004 Supplement of the Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey (CPS).

**SPECIAL ANALYSIS**

**COST OF GOVERNMENT**

*Local Government is Big Business and How Local Governments Pay for Themselves*

The information about revenue sources and expenditures of local governments and school districts provided in this report is based primarily on the Center for Governmental Research (CGR)’s analysis of data provided by the New York State Office of State Comptroller (OSC). Every governmental entity is required to submit an annual report to the OSC that contains detailed expenditure and revenue information. This information is reported based upon a uniform chart of accounts designated by the State Comptroller. Thus, although local government finance officers can exercise some discretion about which account codes to use, the OSC data is the best source of information to allow a true “apples for apples” comparisons among all layers of governments. For example, revenue account code 1001 is used to designate real property taxes, thus, every government and school district that collects Real Property Taxes reports that with the same account code. The same is true for expenses. For example, all governments report their expenses for Hospital and Medical Insurance under account code 9060.8.

CGR obtained data from the OSC at the detailed account code level and created a database that could be used to compare expenditures and revenues across all governments and school districts in Nassau and Suffolk counties. The most recent data available from OSC at the time CGR built its database came from fiscal year 2003. CGR also obtained the data for fiscal year 1998 in order to identify changes over a five year time period. The 1998 dollars have been inflation-adjusted to constant 2003 dollars.

The OSC data will not exactly match information provided by each government and school district in its public budget documents, mainly because the budgets represent revenue and spending plans, whereas the OSC data is based upon actual figures as reported by the finance officer of each government and school district. OSC revenue and expenditure totals for each entity do not necessarily match either, due to differences between when revenues and expenses are recorded for accounting purposes. Despite these minor differences, the OSC data is the best and most consistent means of making fiscal comparisons across the many different types of governments found on Long Island.

The analysis on the number of local governments on Long Island examined expenditure and revenue information for 359 units of local government on Long Island for which CGR could obtain detailed data from OSC. The number of governments by county were: Nassau: 1 county, 2 cities, 3 towns, 64 villages, 54 school districts, and 38 fire districts; Suffolk: 1 county, 10 towns, 30 villages, 71 school districts, and 85 fire districts.

There are also 109 special purpose units of governments (authorities, special districts, library districts and agencies) identified in the OSC database. However, data for these were not uniformly available, thus CGR did not include special purpose units in this analysis. Excluding the special purpose units will not have a significant impact on the conclusions summarized in this analysis, because, for the 71
special purpose units for which data was available for 2003, the total expenditures for those units was $207 million, which only represents 1% of the total of $15.9 billion expended by the 359 units of local governments discussed in this analysis.

Rising Property Taxes

Average residential property taxes and percent of median family income were compiled by the Long Island Regional Planning Board and the Center for Regional Policy Studies at Stony Brook University. Average residential real property taxes from 1995 through 2005 are derived from information on county property tax warrants issued by the Suffolk County Legislature and the Nassau County Assessor’s Office. Average assessed values are extracted from the assessment role of the Suffolk County Treasurer’s Office updated through June of 2005 and the assessment role of the Nassau County Assessor’s Office for 2005. The Suffolk County Legislative Budget Review Office assisted in the calculation of average property taxes in Suffolk County.

Median Family Income data are estimates from the U.S. Census. Median Family Income for Nassau-Suffolk for 2004 assumes a 1.5 percent increase from 2003 figures given by the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey. The 2004 Median Family Income is inflated by 2 percent for 2005.

Average residential property assessments were compiled by the Center for Regional Policy Studies at Stony Brook University and the Long Island Regional Planning Board by calculating from Nassau and Suffolk property assessment roles updated to 2005. School property tax rates for 2004-2005 in Nassau are provided on the county property tax warrants, provided by the Nassau County Department of Assessment. Average total property taxes for Nassau county are estimated assuming that school district taxes are 66 percent of the total tax bill.

In Suffolk, total property taxes for 2004 are given for all parcels on the Suffolk County Treasurer’s assessment role. This data is inflated by 5 percent to reflect increases for 2005. Data on average price of a single family home (New York State Property Type Classification and Ownership Code number “210”: “One Family Year-Round Residences”) for Nassau and Suffolk counties for 2005 are calculated from the New York State Office of Real Property Tax Service SalesWeb. Nassau figures are for 2005 through July. Suffolk figures are for 2005 through June.

Data is for single-family homes that are sold at “arms length” (i.e. not under special circumstances such as one family member selling to another). Two measures are used to determine whether school districts fall into lower, middle, or upper income categories. This is so because in several districts in Nassau and Suffolk there is substantial property wealth supporting school districts even though median household income may be close to the middle range for the region. This is most obvious on Suffolk’s east end, where expensive second homes often provide substantial property wealth while the majority of year-round residents are close to or below the countywide median household income.

Lower Income School Districts are school districts with less than 95 percent of the countywide median household income, unadjusted ($74,823 in Nassau and $68,358 in Suffolk) and less than 110 percent of countywide average home price ($489,500 in Nassau and $422,950 in Suffolk).

Middle Income School Districts in Nassau are those districts with between 95 percent and 135 percent of countywide median household income, unadjusted ($74,823-$106,328) or between 110 percent and 200 percent of the countywide average home value ($489,500-$890,000). Middle Income Districts in Suffolk are those districts with between 95 percent and 125 percent of countywide median household income, unadjusted ($68,358-$89,945) or between 110 percent and 200 percent of the countywide average home value ($422,950 and $769,000). The limit for middle income districts is 125 percent of median household income in Suffolk (as opposed to 135 percent in Nassau) because Suffolk does not have as many very high income households. With household income more clustered in the middle,
125 percent of median household income is a better cutoff between upper and middle income than 135 percent of median household income.

Upper Income School Districts in Nassau are districts with either 135 percent or more of countywide median household income in 2004, unadjusted ($106,328), or more than double the average home price countywide ($890,000). Upper Income School districts in Suffolk are districts with either 125 percent or more of countywide median household income, unadjusted ($89,945) or more than double the average home price countywide ($769,000).

All countywide category averages are weighted for the number of residential parcels in each district. Predominantly minority districts are those districts in which black and Hispanic pupils make up 50 percent or more of total pupils. Predominantly white districts are those districts in which white pupils make up 50 percent or more of total pupils.

What We’re Paying: Peer Counties

Property taxes per capita were compiled by the Center for Regional Policy Studies at Stony Brook University and the Long Island Regional Planning Board using data from the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2002 Census of Governments, Washington D.C.

What We’re Getting: High Quality Services for Most Residents

Data on school district performance on the 4th grade English Language Arts exam and the 8th grade mathematics exam were compiled from the New York State Education Department’s Chapter 655 Report, Volume 2.

The designated Long Island High Need Districts are based on New York State’s Need/Resource Capacity (N/RC) Category Codes, which are 1. New York City Public Schools; 2. Large City Districts, 3. High Need Urban-Suburban Districts; 4. High Need Rural Districts; 5. Average Need Districts; and 6. Low Need Districts. These categories are based on their N/RC Index. The N/RC Index is a measure of a district’s ability to meet the needs of its students with local resources. This measure is calculated by dividing a district’s estimated poverty percentage by its Combined Wealth Ratio. The list of High Needs/Low Resource School Districts are as follows (in ranking order), 1. Amityville; 2. Brentwood; 3. Central Islip; 4. Copiague; 5. Freeport; 6. Hempstead; 7. Roosevelt; 8. Westbury; 9. William Floyd; 10. Wyandanch.

What’s Happening in Other Regions


“Proposition 13: A Cautionary Tale”: Data compiled by the Alliance for Regional Stewardship.

GROWING INCLUSIVE ECONOMY

Growth in Wages over Past 10 Years

Regional average pay for the U.S., Long Island and peer counties were provided by Economy.com. The data were analyzed by Collaborative Economics. Average pay per employee was calculated by dividing total annual payroll by total private non-farm (TPNF) employment. All values reported are adjusted for inflation by Economy.com.

Unionization Rates over Time

Rates of employment coverage by collective bargaining agreements come from The Union Membership and Coverage Database, available at www.unionstats.com. This internet data resource provides private and public sector union membership, coverage, and density estimates compiled...
from the Current Population Survey (CPS) using BLS methods. The Database, constructed by Barry Hirsch (Trinity University) and David Macpherson (Florida State University), is updated annually. Data were analyzed by Collaborative Economics.

**Trends in Productivity**

Value-added data were provided by Economy.com and analyzed by Collaborative Economics. Value added is the sum of compensation paid to labor within a sector and profits accrued by firms. Regional value-added estimates were constructed using productivity estimates at higher geographic levels (state and national) and applying them to employment and wage/income data at the metropolitan level.

**Industry Clusters**

Data were provided by Economy.com and analyzed by Collaborative Economics. Employment figures given are total employment, total private employment non-farm, and government & military on an annual basis from 1995 – 2005. Note: Appendix B identifies the specific sub-sectors that comprise each cluster. All pay figures were derived by dividing total wages for a cluster by the number of employees in that cluster.

Federal, state and local government includes all civilian employees of government, including teachers and other employees of public schools, public junior colleges and state-run colleges and universities. It also includes employees of local special districts. Military employment includes uniformed members of the military; related employment, such as non-uniformed workers for the Defense Department, is classified as federal government.

**Trends in Employment**

Data were provided by Economy.com and analyzed by Collaborative Economics. Employment figures given are total private employment non-farm, and government and military employment from 1995 – 2005.

**Venture Capital Financing**

Data are from the PricewaterhouseCoopers/Thomson Venture Economics/National Venture Capital Association/MoneyTree™ Survey and analyzed by Collaborative Economics.

**Research and Development Investment**

Data were provided by the RAND Corporation and analyzed by Collaborative Economics. Figures are inflation-adjusted and represent the total amount of Federal R&D dollars that went to Long Island research universities, labs and corporations on an annual basis. Annual data is reported in fiscal years.

**VIBRANT, LIVABLE COMMUNITIES**

Photo courtesy of SHoP Architects, and photographer Seong Kwon.

**Household Income Distribution**

Data are from the March 2005 Supplement of the Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey (CPS) for Nassau and Suffolk Counties and analyzed by Collaborative Economics. Household income includes both earned and unearned income for all persons living in the same household. Household income is adjusted for household size by doubling household income and dividing it by the square root of the number of household residents. All reported incomes are inflation-adjusted using the New York-Northern New Jersey- Long Island, NY-NJ-CT-PA area Consumer Price Index published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Though the data presented are the best available at the regional level, data are derived from an annual sample of as few as 500 households. Household incomes are averaged over a three-year period to increase the reliability of reported income estimates. Data are
more useful for tracking long-term trends than for noting specific year-to-year movements. Over time, specific households move up and down the distribution. Data on this “mobility” are not available at the regional level.

**Long Island’s Changing Population**
Data were compiled by the Regional Plan Association from the U.S. Census Estimates.

**Long Island Continues to Age**
Data were compiled by the Regional Plan Association from the U.S. Census Estimates.

**Trends in Property and Violent Crime**
Data were compiled from www.criminaljustice.state.ny.us and the U.S. Census.

**Housing Affordability**
Prepared by the Center for Regional Policy Studies at Stony Brook University and The Long Island Regional Planning Board from data provided by the U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, the New York State Office of Real Property Tax Services SalesWeb, the Long Island Board of Realtors, Multiple Listing Service of Long Island, Nassau/Suffolk Regional Planning Board and Newsday “Long Island at the Crossroads”. The New York Metropolitan Region Consumer Price Index was used to adjust figures for inflation.

**Homeless on Long Island**
Data are from the 2005 Continuum of Care Exhibit 1 document submitted annually to HUD. Point in time counts of homeless were completed by the Nassau Suffolk Coalition for the Homeless on January 24th and 25th 2005 between 1PM and 8PM.

**Trends in Transit Ridership**
Data were compiled by the Regional Plan Association from the National Transit Database, Annual Unlinked Passenger Trips, 2004.

**Motor Vehicle Registrations**
Data were compiled by the Regional Plan Association from U.S. Census Estimates and the New York State Department of Motor Vehicles

**HEALTHY, EDUCATED POPULATIONS**

**Percentage of Adolescent Births**
Data were compiled and analyzed by North Shore-LIJ Health System Planning Office and from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, CLIKS Database at www.aecf.org/kidscount. Data on the cost of U.S. taxpayers for births to 15-17 year olds come from the National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy at www.teenpregnancy.org.

Differences in analysis from the 2005 Long Island Index: Data from the 2006 Long Island Index included the percent of births to mothers under age 18. The 2005 Long Island Index teen birth indicator included the percent of births to mothers under age 20.

**Total Ambulatory Care Sensitive Condition Hospital Discharges**
Data were provided and analyzed by North Shore-LIJ Health System Planning Office based on information from the New York State Department of Health Office of Statewide Planning and Research Cooperative System (SPARCS) inpatient data 1997-2004.

**4TH Grade English Performance**
Data are from the NYSED Chapter 655 Volume 2 Report. The designated Long Island High Need Districts are based on New York State’s Need/Resource Capacity (N/RC) Category Codes, which are 1. New York City Public Schools; 2. Large City Districts, 3. High Need Urban-Suburban Districts; 4. High Need Rural Districts; 5. Average Need Districts; and 6. Low Need Districts. These categories are based on their N/RC Index. The N/RC Index is a measure of a district’s ability to meet the needs of its stu-


8TH Grade Math Performance

Data are from the NYSED Chapter 655 Volume 2 Report. The designated Long Island High Need Districts are based on New York State’s Need/Resource Capacity (N/RC) Category Codes, which are 1. New York City Public Schools; 2. Large City Districts, 3.High Need Urban-Suburban Districts; 4. High Need Rural Districts; 5. Average Need Districts; and 6. Low Need Districts. These categories are based on their N/RC Index. The N/RC Index is a measure of a district’s ability to meet the needs of its students with local resources. This measure is calculated by dividing a district’s estimated poverty percentage by its Combined Wealth Ratio. The list of High Needs/Low Resource School Districts are as follows (in ranking order), 1. Amityville; 2. Brentwood; 3. Central Islip; 4. Copiague; 5. Freeport; 6. Hempstead; 7. Roosevelt; 8. Westbury; 9. William Floyd; 10. Wyandanch.


Percent of Students With Limited English Proficiency

Data are from the New York State Chapter 655 Report, Volume 2. Limited English Proficiency rate is defined as the number of limited English proficient students (English language learners) as defined by Section 154.2(a) of the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education divided by the total district enrollment in grades PreK-12, expressed as a percentage for 2003-2004.


The 2005 Long Island Index data on 2004 Limited English Proficiency was actually 2003 data that was reported in 2004. The 2006 Long Island Index includes 2004 data that was reported in 2005.

Poverty Index

Data are from the New York State Chapter 655 Report, Volume 2. Poverty Index is defined as the number of children aged 5 to 17 years in families living below the poverty level, divided by the total number of children within the district boundaries who are 5 to 17 years of age. Poverty is defined by the U.S. Census of Population as a measure of whether a family’s income is below the designated poverty threshold.


The 2005 Long Island Index data on 2004 Poverty was actually 2003 data that was reported in 2004. The 2006 Long Island Index includes 2004 data that was reported in 2005.

ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP

Photo courtesy of the Long Island Pine Barrens Society

Trends in Energy Consumption

Data on electricity consumption are from the Long Island Power Authority. Data on natural gas consumption are from Keyspan East Corporation. Data on oil consumption are from the Oil and Heat Institute of Long Island.
**Trends in Water Consumption**

Data on water consumption were compiled by the Nassau County Planning Federation. Water use in each county was calculated based upon population figures cited by the water utilities or based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau.

The years 2000 and 2002 were compared to compute per capita water use. Also, to compare peak pumpage between the two counties, peak years of total pumpage for each county were compared.

**Garbage and Recycling Rates**

Data and analysis were provided by the Waste Reduction and Management Institute, Stony Brook University.

**Trends in Pesticide Use**

Data are from the NYS 2002 and 2003 Pesticides Sales and Use Reports Database, available at http://www.dec.state.ny.us/website/dshm/prl/2002prl.html and http://www.dec.state.ny.us/website/dshm/prl/2003prl.html. Map prepared by Steve Romalewski, mapping consultant. Note: Commercial applicators include anyone who applies pesticides for hire such as lawn and garden applicators; exterminators; custodial and groundskeeping staff in schools, office buildings and other structures; and municipal employees who apply pesticides in such places as parks or on roadsides. Sales for crop production data represent the intended location of use of pesticides that are sold or offered for sale to farmers who apply pesticides only on property he or she owns or rents for the purpose of producing an agricultural commodity.

**GOVERNANCE**

Photo by Jim Johnson, local photographer

**Fragmented Government**

Data were collected from the U.S. Census Bureau, the Nassau County Planning Commission (Basemap copyright, 2003, County of Nassau, NY), the Long Island Regional Planning Board, and the New York State Office of Real Property Services. Map prepared by Steve Romalewski, mapping consultant.

**The Cost of Fire Protection**

Data on Long Island fire departments are from *Fire Alarm*, a special report conducted by Newsday in November 2005. The report can be found on-line at www.newsday.com/news/specials/nyf-infibre,0,3691882.story

**Per Capita and Per Household Property Taxes**

Prepared by the Center for Regional Policy Studies at Stony Brook University and the Long Island Regional Planning Board using data from the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2002 Census of Governments.

**School Budget Votes**

Data were collected from the New York State Department of Education at www.emsc.nysed.gov. Map prepared by Steven Romalewski, mapping consultant.
APPENDIX B: INDUSTRY CLUSTER DEFINITIONS

Cluster definitions were provided by Collaborative Economics for the Long Island Index 2006.

Finance and Insurance
5211 Monetary Authorities - Central Bank
5221 Depository Credit Intermediation
5222 Nondepository Credit Intermediation
5223 Activities Related to Credit Intermediation
5231 Securities and Commodity Contracts Intermediation and Brokerage
5232 Securities and Commodity Exchanges
5239 Other Financial Investment Activities
5241 Insurance Carriers
5242 Agencies, Brokerages, and Other Insurance Related Activities
5251 Insurance and Employee Benefit Funds
5259 Other Investment Pools and Funds
5412 Accounting, Tax Preparation, Bookkeeping, and Payroll Services

Creative Services
5122 Sound Recording Industries
5413 Architectural, Engineering and Related Services
5414 Specialized Design Services
5416 Management, Scientific, and Technical Consulting Services
5418 Advertising and Related Services
7111 Performing Arts Companies
7112 Spectator Sports
7114 Agents and Managers for Artists
7115 Independent Artists, Writers and Performers

Diversified Manufacturing
3149 Other Textile Product Mills
3169 Other Leather and Allied Product Manufacturing
3256 Soap, Cleaning Compound, and Toilet Preparation Manufacturing
3259 Other Chemical Product and Preparation Manufacturing
3322 Cutlery and Handtool Manufacturing
3323 Architectural and Structural Metals Manufacturing
3325 Hardware Manufacturing
3332 Industrial Machinery Manufacturing
3333 Commercial and Service Industry Machinery Manufacturing
3335 Metalworking Machinery Manufacturing
3339 Other General Purpose Machinery Manufacturing

Education and Training
5111 Newspaper, Periodical, Book and Directory Publishers
6111 Elementary and Secondary Schools
6112 Junior Colleges
6113 Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools
6114 Business Schools and Computer and Management Training
6115 Technical and Trade Schools
6116 Other Schools and Instruction
6117 Educational Support Services

Information and Communication Services
5112 Software Publishers
5152 Cable and Other Subscription Programming
5161 Internet Publishing and Broadcasting
5171 Wired Telecommunications Carriers
5172 Wireless Telecommunications Carriers (except Satellite)
5173 Telecommunications Resellers
5175 Cable and Other Program Distribution
5179 Other Telecommunications
5181 Internet Service Providers and Web Search Portals
5182 Data Processing, Hosting, and Related Services
5191 Other Information Services
5415 Computer Systems Design and Related Services

Health
3391 Medical Equipment and Supplies Manufacturing
5417 Medical and Diagnostic Laboratories
6211 Offices of Physicians
6212 Offices of Dentists
6213 Offices of Other Health Practitioners
6214 Outpatient Care Centers
6215 Medical and Diagnostic Laboratories
6216 Home Health Care Services
6219 Other Ambulatory Health Care Services
6221 General Medical and Surgical Hospitals
6222 Psychiatric and Substance Abuse Hospitals
6223 Specialty (except Psychiatric and Substance Abuse) Hospitals
6231 Nursing Care Facilities
6232 Residential Mental Retardation, Mental Health and Substance Abuse Facilities
6233 Community Care Facilities for the Elderly
6239 Other Residential Care Facilities
8122 Death Care Services

Transportation Services
3366 Ship and Boat Building
4811 Scheduled Air Transportation
4812 Nonscheduled Air Transportation
4821 Rail Transportation
4831 Deep Sea, Coastal, and Great Lakes Water Transportation
4832 Inland Water Transportation
4851 Urban Transit Systems
4852 Intercity and Rural Bus Transportation
4853 Taxi and Limousine Service
4854 School and Employee Bus Transportation
4859 Other Transit and Ground Passenger Transportation
4881 Support Activities for Air Transportation
4882 Support Activities for Rail Transportation
4883 Support Activities for Water Transportation
4884 Support Activities for Road Transportation
4885 Freight Transportation Arrangement
4889 Other Support Activities for Transportation
4922 Local Messengers and Local Delivery

Visitors and Tourism
4870 Scenic and Sightseeing Transportation
5615 Travel Arrangement and Reservation Services
7121 Museums, Historical Sites, and Similar Institutions
7131 Amusement Parks and Arcades
7132 Gambling Industries
7139 Other Amusement and Recreation Industries
7211 Traveler Accommodation
7212 RV (Recreational Vehicle) Parks and Campgrounds
7221 Full-Service Restaurants
7222 Limited-Service Eating Places
7224 Drinking Places (Alcoholic Beverages)

Business Services
3231 Printing and Related Support Activities
5331 Lessors of Nonfinancial Intangible Assets (except Copyrighted Works)
5411 Legal Services
5419 Other Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
5511 Management of Companies and Enterprises
5611 Office Administrative Services
5612 Facilities Support Services
5614 Business Support Services
5619 Other Support Services

Technology Manufacturing
3341 Computer and Peripheral Equipment Manufacturing
3342 Communications and Equipment Manufacturing
3343 Audio and Video Equipment Manufacturing
3344 Semiconductor and Other Electronic Component Manufacturing
3345 Navigational, Measuring, Electromedical, and Control Instruments Manufacturing
3346 Manufacturing and Reproducing Magnetic and Optical Media
3353 Electrical Equipment Manufacturing
3364 Aerospace Product and Parts Manufacturing
Nassau County Cities, Towns, Villages and Hamlets
The Long Island Index Website was developed to be your resource for accurate information about the Long Island region. The information is presented in a neutral manner. The data, trends, surveys, polls, charts, graphs, analysis and reports about the Long Island region are what make up the Long Island Index.

You can get this information by logging on to www.longislandindex.org

All the details behind the report including the latest Poll Reports, Surveys, and Special Analysis Research used in developing the Index are available to you. Download the whole report or just the charts and graphs you need. See and download the latest press releases about the Index, or search for specific information. Do your own analysis and form your own conclusions using actual data from the Index.

Find the complete news coverage of Index topics that you are interested in. Sign up to receive automatic updates about the Index or even take an online survey.

Community Profiles
Learn about your community by using the detailed tables that show the demographic changes from 1990 to 2000, based on the most recent US Census data. View or copy the pie charts and bar graphs that are automatically displayed by clicking on categories such as Race/Ethnicity, Age, or Income/Poverty. It’s where you can get the latest demographic information about any community in the region, and compare it with NYS or the metro region.

What Every Lier Should Know
This series of articles examining aspects of life on Long Island, based on information from the Long Island Index are written by Index Director, Carrie Meek Gallagher.

Don’t wait for critical information to come to you, get online and get it. It’s just a mouse click away.
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