

**RESULTS FROM THREE SURVEYS
IN NEW YORK CITY HOUSING
COURTS**

FEBRUARY 2007

**PREPARED BY
KIRA KRENICHYN, PH.D. AND NICOLE SCHAEFER-MCDANIEL, M.A.
CENTER FOR HUMAN ENVIRONMENTS
GRADUATE CENTER OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
365 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10016**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

**Laura K. Abel
Deputy Director, Poverty Program
Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law**

**Michael N. Berger, Associate
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP**

**Elizabeth M. Eaton, Associate
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP**

**Honorable Fern A. Fisher, Administrative Judge
Civil Court of the City of New York**

**Ernie Belzaguy, Deputy Chief Clerk of Housing Court
Civil Court of the City of New York**

**Harvey Epstein, Associate Director
Housing Conservation Coordinators**

**Louise Seeley, Esq.
Executive Director, Citywide Task Force on Housing Court**

**Heléne Clark, Ph.D.
Director, ActKnowledge**

SURVEY RESEARCHERS:

Arielle Goldberg, Project Coordinator
Frances Victory, Project Coordinator

Louis Abrams
Jose Albors
Naomi Aldrich
Jennifer Armas
Shira Auerbach
Michelle Billies
Sandra Borri
Mia Josepha Budescu
Stephanie Campos
Norma Chang
Ida Cheng
Anita Christy
Matt Colford
Yah Demann
Rebekah Diller
Katie Dillon
Jason Douglas
Catherine Etzel
Madonna Fleming
Lila Ford
Nicholas Fribourg
Sarah Ha
Dana Hayden
Adam Krotman
Jamie Labuka

Jessica Lau
Maurice Leach
Carmen Manrara
Mariam Missaghi
Whitney Missildine
Loriane Morgan
Deirdre Nash
Heather Navo
Kathryn Nielson
Kevin Ozgercin
Philip Palmisano
Anthoula Poulakos
Morgan Ramses
Max Rettig
Nick Sollom
Collette Sosnowy
Yvonne Telesford
Richard Thomas
Karen Torres
Sonia Toure
Janice Turner
Debora Upegui
Jean-Baptiste Velut
Joshua Wodin
Helen Zubieta

NEW YORK CITY HOUSING COURT SURVEYS 2005-2006 OVERVIEW

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of three surveys conducted in New York City to answer questions about certain characteristics of tenants who were the subject of eviction proceedings in the City's Housing Courts in 2005 and 2006.

The surveys were conducted by the Center for Human Environments (CHE) at the City University of New York Graduate Center with funding administered by the Brennan Center for Justice at NYU Law School and made available by the New York City Council.

The results will be provided to the New York City Council for consideration when evaluating proposals to establish a right to counsel for senior citizen tenants facing eviction in Housing Court.

The overarching questions that the surveys sought to answer were:

- ✓ What are the characteristics of tenants who are the subject of eviction proceedings in Housing Court, specifically, do they have legal representation, what are their household incomes, and what are their household compositions?
- ✓ How many tenants age 62 and over are the subject of eviction proceedings in Housing Court?
- ✓ Of the tenants age 62 and older who are the subject of eviction proceedings in Housing Court, how many are unrepresented and have annual household incomes under \$25,000?

Structure of surveys – As noted above, CHE conducted three surveys, which are referred to in this report as Phase One, Phase Two, and Phase Three. In Phase One (conducted in December 2005) and Phase Three (conducted in April through May 2006), we sought to obtain information about certain specific characteristics of tenants age 62 and over in Housing Court. In Phase Two (conducted in March 2006), we sought to estimate the number of tenants age 62 and over in Housing Court.

Timing – Phase One and Phase Three were conducted in Fall 2005 and Spring 2006, respectively, in order to capture possible seasonal variations. The Chief Clerk of Housing Court had explained that these weeks were also typical in terms of both the numbers and the characteristics of tenants in Housing Court.

Location – Phase One and Phase Three were conducted in the hallways of courthouses outside of Housing Court parts. Phase Two was conducted inside of Housing Court parts in each of the boroughs, where judges granted permission for surveyors to be present and to interview all tenants after their cases had been heard.

Targeting subjects – In Phase One and Phase Three, surveyors were instructed to: a) interview as many tenants as possible, and b) interview as many older tenants as possible (e.g., if a surveyor could only interview one person and had to choose between a younger and older person, the surveyor first approached the older person).

This focus on older subjects in Phase One and Phase Three enabled the surveyors to gather a sample large enough to break down information by two or more categories, such as age, legal representation, and income. With a smaller sample, it might not have been possible to break down information in this way, or the numbers might have been too small to bear meaningful interpretation. Because of the interest in tenants over the age of 62, the goal was to interview as many people as possible in that age category.

In contrast to Phase One and Phase Three, the surveyors' goal during Phase Two was to interview all tenants who appeared in a Housing Court part. This approach allowed for a systematic estimate of the percentage of tenants age 62 and over, and for inquiry into whether they had legal representation, and their incomes.

In Phase Two, the surveyors sought to obtain a sample that is qualitatively representative of tenants in New York City Housing Courts. Phase Two was conducted in housing parts recommended by the Administrative Judge of the Civil Court of the City of New York. According to the Chief Clerk, tenants are assigned randomly to judges and parts, so this approach should have yielded an accurate estimate of the number of tenants in Housing Court.

Survey instruments – The survey instruments used for this study were informed by an earlier study, Community Training & Resource Center and City-Wide Task Force on Housing Court, *Housing Court, Evictions, and Homelessness: The Costs of Establishing a Right to Counsel* (1993), and were designed to capture essential information in a short time frame. CHE, with advice from the Brennan Center, constructed survey questions to address a range of current questions about the characteristics of tenants who are the subject of eviction proceedings in Housing Court. The survey instruments for each of the three surveys were also reviewed by an advisory group of housing advocates and revised accordingly.

The survey instrument for Phase Three was also revised based on the implementation of the Phase One survey (for example, subjects seemed to find the responses to a question about income confusing in Phase One, so that question was revised for Phase Three).

All surveys were translated into Spanish and conducted in Spanish with non-English-speaking subjects. Surveys were conducted by trained researchers from CHE and by staff from Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton, and Garrison. (Survey instruments are included as an appendix to this report.)

Time to complete the survey instruments – All surveys were brief in length, one side of a page or less, and could be completed within roughly two or three minutes. The survey instrument for Phase Two in March was very short, in order to ensure that surveys could be done quickly and systematically and that time limitations would not prevent completion of potential surveys or interrupt court proceedings.

Additional data – For all three phases, additional data were obtained from the clerks of the Housing Courts in order to report survey samples as percentages of *all tenants* who appeared in Housing Courts on the days that surveys were conducted.

In the following sections, we provide additional detail about the surveys, and the results.

NOTE ON MARGINS OF ERROR

For each survey phase, the “margin of error” is reported based on the total number of responses. The margin of error is a measure of confidence in the percent likelihood of getting the same answers if the survey were conducted multiple times within the same population. The larger a margin of error, the less confidence there is that the findings in the survey are the same as would actually be reflected in the population that the sample represents, in this case tenants who are defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.

The margin of error is based on probability and is calculated based on the overall sample size, so for questions where there are fewer responses, the margin of error will increase. For this reason, we do not report a margin of error for sub-samples of the overall sample. While margins of error for sub-samples would be informative, we cannot assume that the results for small sub-samples can be generalized to the entire population of tenants in New York City Housing Courts.

For example, in Phase One a total of 444 tenants were interviewed, 58 of whom were age 62 or older. 36 of those 58 tenants age 62 or older had incomes under \$25,000, and 13 of those 36 tenants said that they were represented by a lawyer. In other words, 2.9% (13 people) of the entire survey sample of 444 tenants were age 62 or older with incomes under \$25,000 who said that they were represented by a lawyer.

In this example, the margin of error is + or - 27.2% and our confidence level is 95%. The data give us useful information, but we cannot assume that we would get the same percentage if the survey questions were asked to the entire population of people age 62 and over defending against eviction, or to all tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts. We know that 2.9% of *this subsample* are tenants age 62 or older with incomes under \$25,000 and with legal representation, but the “true” percentage of tenants in this subcategory could vary greatly within the population of tenants in Housing Court. The subsample is too small to know whether the percentage would be close to 2.9% if the survey were conducted with more tenants.

This report notes throughout that data derived from small subgroups of each survey should not be generalized, as explained here.

PART I: PHASE ONE SURVEY – DECEMBER 2005

PHASE ONE SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Phase One surveys were conducted in Housing Courts in all five boroughs during the month of December 2005. Surveys were conducted on at least two occasions for each borough, with the exception of Staten Island, where surveys were conducted once; fewer housing cases are heard in Staten Island compared to other boroughs, and housing cases are not scheduled every day. Researchers approached individuals in or near (usually in the hallway right outside of the court room) the resolution parts of each court, where most housing cases are heard and resolved. Potential survey respondents were asked if they would respond to a brief survey, which would take up to a few minutes.

It should be noted that this sampling strategy was not intended to result in a comprehensive census of all tenants who go to Housing Court. Nor should the survey sample be thought of as a representative sample—that is, a sample that reflects the characteristics of all tenants in Housing Court. Rather, this sample may reflect the types of tenants who were more likely to respond to our survey for different reasons; some tenants seemed too distraught to respond after leaving a court room, others refused for unspecified reasons, and in some cases lawyers stated that they did not want their conversation with their clients interrupted. In addition, surveyors were not always able to approach all tenants for a possible interview, given the nature of the survey and the social life of the courthouses; the survey takes a few minutes, it is not always feasible to conduct surveys in the courtrooms, and conducting surveys in the hallways sometimes meant not being able to approach all tenants. However, the refusal rate was very low, and surveyors interviewed as systematically as possible in the circumstances, so we believe it can be considered fairly representative.

PHASE ONE SURVEY SAMPLE

444 surveys were completed in Phase One. We contacted the clerk's office at each courthouse to determine the numbers of cases scheduled and defaulted on the days of our survey. Based on these numbers, the total number of actual cases for the days we surveyed in all courts was 2,869; the 444 surveys conducted represent 15.5% of those cases. Table 1 shows the numbers of cases heard by borough, numbers of surveys completed for each borough, surveys in each borough as a percent of cases heard, and surveys in each borough as a percent of the total survey sample. Note that the number of cases heard in Housing Court, and therefore surveys as a percent of cases heard, are only for days on which surveys were administered.

TABLE 1: PHASE ONE NUMBERS OF CASES HEARD ON SURVEY DAYS AND SURVEYS COMPLETED BY BOROUGH

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Number of Cases Heard in Housing Court on Survey Days</i>	<i>Number of Surveys Completed</i>	<i>Surveys as Percent of Cases Heard</i>	<i>Surveys as Percent of Total Sample</i>
Bronx (3 survey days)	1,141	143	12.5%	32.2%
Brooklyn (2 survey days)	576	164	28.5%	36.9%
Manhattan (2 survey days)	625	66	10.6%	14.9%
Queens (2 survey days)	434	63	14.5%	14.2%
Staten Island (1 survey day)	93	8	8.6%	1.8%
Total:	2,869	444	15.5%	100%

In addition, Table 2 below shows the numbers of calendared cases, numbers of defaults, and defaults as percents of cases that were calendared by borough, for the days on which we conducted Phase One surveys.

TABLE 2: PHASE ONE DEFAULTED CASES AS PERCENT OF CALENDARED CASES BY BOROUGH (FOR SURVEY DAYS ONLY)

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Number of Calendared Cases</i>	<i>Number of Defaults</i>	<i>Defaults as Percent of Calendared Cases</i>
Bronx (3 survey days)	1212	71	5.9%
Brooklyn (2 survey days)	662	86	13.0%
Manhattan (2 survey days)	664	39	5.9%
Queens (2 survey days)	440	6	1.4%
Staten Island (1 survey day)	98	5	5.1%
Total:	3,076	207	6.7%

PHASE ONE SURVEY RESULTS

The 444 surveys reported in this section represented cases where the landlord had brought the tenant to court. The margin of error for this sample size is +/- 4.7% at 95% confidence.

Responses to each of the survey questions are reported in this section. In addition, this section presents further analysis of some of the characteristics of tenants aged 62 and older who responded to this survey. These characteristics included household income (whether it was under \$25,000); legal representation for tenants 62 and older with household incomes under \$25,000; for those in the previous category who did have legal representation, then what type (private, legal aid/legal services, or other); whether tenants 62 and older with incomes less than \$25,000 lived with children; and age breakdowns for tenants 62 and older and with household incomes less than 25,000.

Percentages reported here are based on the total number of responses for each question, rather than the total sample size of 444. The number of responses for each question is not always equal to 444, because some questions were not answered by all respondents. In many cases, this is by design; some questions did not apply to all respondents—for example, tenants would report the type of lawyer they had only if they answered “yes” to the question, “Do you have a lawyer for this housing case?” In addition, some respondents declined to answer some questions on a survey, such as the questions regarding income; respondents were less likely to answer questions about income because of their sensitive nature.

➤ **Type of Case**

77.1% (340) of tenants who answered the question, “Why are you here?” reported that a landlord brought them to court because they were not able to pay the rent, while 21.8% (96) reported that the landlord was seeking eviction for another reason.

➤ **Legal Representation**

23.9% (105) of tenants whose landlord was seeking their eviction and who answered the question, “Do you have a lawyer for this housing case?” reported that they had a lawyer for their current housing case, compared to 76.1% (335) that reported that they did not have a lawyer.

Of the 105 tenants who had a lawyer, 59.4% (60) were using legal aid representation, 31.7% (32) had a private lawyer, and 8.9% (9) reported that they had representation from someone other than a private lawyer or legal aid.

➤ **Household Size**

A breakdown of responses for household size is shown in Table 3 below

**TABLE 3:
HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

<i>Number of People in Household</i>	<i>Number of Responses</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 433)</i>
1	85	19.6%
2	113	26.0%
3	106	24.4%
4	61	14.1%
5	44	10.2%
6	12	2.8%
7	6	1.4%
8	4	0.9%
9	2	0.5%

➤ **Tenants Living with Children**

Of the tenants whose landlord was seeking their eviction and who answered the question, "How many children under 18 years [live in your home]?" 78.9% (239) reported living with children under 18, compared to 21.1% (64) who reported not living with children.

Of those who reported living with children under the age of 18, 36.4% (87) have one child, 34.3% (82) have two children, 17.2% (41) have three children, and 12.1% (29) have four or more.

➤ **Tenants Aged 62 and Older**

People age 62 years or older represented 15.40% (58) of the tenants whose landlord was seeking their eviction and who answered the question, "Are you 62 or over?" 84.6% (318) of the tenants whose landlord was seeking their eviction and who answered the question reported that they were not 62 years old or older.

In addition, 6.1% (15) of the tenants younger than 62 years old whose landlord was seeking their eviction and who answered the question, "Is anyone else in the household 62 or over?" lived with someone over 62 years, while 93.9% (232) did not live with someone 62 or older.

➤ **Household Income**

In this section, each of the figures for income that were reported in our survey are compared to comparable findings from the 2004 American Community Survey, which are also shown in Table 4. Note that the income categories for the American Community Survey do not match exactly to the categories used for this survey.

71.6% (293) of the tenants whose landlord was seeking their eviction and who answered the question about household income reported a total household yearly income of less than \$25,000. In contrast, the 2004 American Community Survey found that 32.9% of the households in New York City had incomes of less than \$25,000.”

45.7 % (174) of the tenants whose landlord was seeking their eviction and who answered the question about household income reported a total household yearly income of less than \$15,000. The 2004 American Community Survey found that 20.5% of the total New York City population has a household income of less than \$15,000.”

17.8% (45) of the tenants whose landlord was seeking their eviction and who answered the question about household income reported a yearly income of more than \$35,000. The 2004 American Community Survey found that 56.2% of households in New York City had incomes of \$35,000 or more.

10.3% (19) reported a total household yearly income of more than \$45,000. The 2004 American Community Survey found that 42.7% of households in New York City had incomes of \$50,000 or more.

Therefore, our Phase One survey found a higher proportion of the tenants to be low-income, compared with the entire New York City population surveyed by the 2004 American Community Survey.

➤ **Age and Income**

36 tenants indicated that they are both aged 62 and older and that their household incomes are under \$25,000 a year, which is 8.1% of the entire survey sample (444) or 67.9% of tenants 62 and older who answered the income question (53).

➤ **Age, Income, and Legal Representation**

13 (36.1%) of the 36 tenants who were 62 or older with household incomes under \$25,000 indicated that were being represented by lawyers. This is 2.9% of the entire survey sample (444).

Of these 13 tenants:

- ✓ 11 indicated that they were represented by a legal aid/legal services lawyer
- ✓ 1 indicated that s/he was represented by a private lawyer
- ✓ 1 indicated that s/he was represented by someone other than a legal aid/legal services lawyer or private lawyer

➤ **Age, Income, and Living with Children**

8 (22.2%) of the 36 tenants who were 62 or older with household incomes under \$25,000 indicated that they, were living with children. This is 1.8% of the entire survey sample (444).

Table 4: Incomes by Borough (from the 2004 American Community Survey)

County/ Borough	Total Households	% of Households with Income Below \$15,000	% of Households with Income Between \$15,000 and \$24,999	% of Households with Income Between \$25,000 and \$34,999	% of Households with Income Between \$35,000 and \$49,999	% of Households with Income \$50,000 or Above
Bronx	468,354	30.1%	14.8%	14.0%	13.3%	27.8%
Brooklyn	871,251	23.0%	14.8%	11.2%	13.3%	37.7%
Manhattan	712,479	19.5%	9.2%	9.3%	11.2%	50.7%
Queens	769,476	14.8%	11.4%	11.1%	15.8%	46.8%
Staten Island	162,984	10.6%	10.6%	7.2%	13.5%	58.1%
Total for NYC	2,984,544	20.5%	12.4%	11.0%	13.5%	42.7%

➤ **Breakdown by Age of Tenants Age 62 and Older**

Of survey respondents who were 62 and older, 23 listed their age. The breakdown by age is presented in Table 5 below.

TABLE 5: AGE BREAKDOWN OF TENANTS 62 AND OLDER

<i>Tenant Age</i>	<i>Frequency of Response</i>
62	1
63	2
64	3
65	3
66	3
68	3
69	1
70	1
71	1
73	1
74	1
75	1
82	1
84	1

➤ **Breakdown by Age of Tenants Aged 62 and Older with Household Incomes Less than \$25,000**

Out of the 36 survey respondents who were 62 or older with household incomes less than \$25,000, 14 listed their age. The breakdown is presented in Table 6 below.

TABLE 6: AGE BREAKDOWN OF TENANTS 62 AND OLDER WITH HOUSEHOLD INCOMES UNDER \$25,000

<i>Tenant Age</i>	<i>Frequency of Response</i>
62	1
63	2
65	1
66	1
68	1
69	1
70	1
71	1
73	1
74	1
75	1
82	1
84	1

➤ **Disability Benefits**

The survey also asked whether respondents received any of the following benefits, receipt of which can make a tenant eligible for the Disability Rent Increase Exemption: Federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Federal Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI), US Department of Veterans Affairs disability pension or compensation, Medicaid-related disability assistance, or disability-related benefits but the tenant was unable to specify which kind.

13.0% (56) of tenants whose landlord was seeking their eviction and who answered the question about disability benefits receive SSI; 8.1% (35) receive SSDI; 3.7% (16) receive US Department of Veterans Affairs disability pension or compensation; 8.6% (37) receive Medicaid-related disability assistance; and 4.4% (19) receive some disability-related benefits but the tenant was not sure which kind. 73.0% (314) reported that they do not receive any of these benefits. ¹

Finally, tenants were asked "If you answered 'none of the above' to #5, does anyone in your household receive any of these benefits? If so, which ones?" 4.5% (14) of the tenants whose landlord was seeking their eviction and who answered this question reported that someone else in the household received some type of disability benefit.² These included: child SSI Medicaid (4), child SSI Medicaid Disability (1), Medicaid (3), renter assistance (1), Social Security (3), SSDI (1), and welfare (1).

¹ Participants could receive more than one type of disability, thus the percentages will add up to more than 100%.

² The percentage of other household benefits is the only one that is calculated from the total sample size of 444, because respondents were asked to fill in an answer only if they answered "no" to other types of benefits.

PHASE ONE CONCLUSIONS

The Phase One survey results presented in this section data about the characteristics of tenants in New York City Housing Court who are facing eviction. The survey was in-depth aimed at learning about the income and legal representation of those over 62 and with disabilities. It was administered to access as many tenants as possible, including enough in these target categories to provide preliminary data on their characteristics.

The Phase One survey instrument was streamlined based on responses to this survey. Exactly how well survey questions work is best learned through implementing the survey in the field. The Phase One survey was therefore used to design the survey instrument implemented in Phase Three.

The Phase One survey was not aimed purely at obtaining a proportional representation of who appears in Housing Court by age. Therefore, it should not be assumed that the proportion of those over 62 surveyed exactly match the proportion who were there. Because of the nature of the survey—e.g., it took two to three minutes, it took place in the hallways where it is difficult to interview tenants systematically—surveyors were not able to approach tenants in a systematic fashion (e.g. every person, every other person, or every third person). Phase Two of this research was a less in-depth survey—that is, with fewer questions—implemented in a sample of housing parts, where surveyors were able to approach tenants in a systematic fashion in order to obtain a representative sample. The results of Phase Two are reported in the section that follows.

PART II: PHASE TWO SURVEY— MARCH 2006

PHASE TWO SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The goal of the Phase Two survey was to estimate numbers of tenants in Housing Court facing possible eviction who are aged 62 and older. In addition, tenants who responded that they were age 62 or older were also asked whether they were represented by lawyers for their cases, and they were asked their income. This survey was conducted during the week of March 6th, for two days in each borough/courthouse, excluding Staten Island. Surveys were conducted for one day in Staten Island Housing Court during the week of March 13th.

The sampling strategy for the Phase Two survey was to survey within a group of parts in each courthouse. Judge Fern Fisher, the Administrative Judge of the Civil Court of the City of New York, nominated parts based on judges she thought would be likely to cooperate with the survey. In the case of Staten Island, there is only one housing part. Paralegals were trained to conduct the survey and went to each of the parts, where they surveyed all tenants who agreed to participate; surveyors reported low refusal rates. Numbers of questions on the survey were kept to a minimum in order to be as minimally invasive as possible and to ensure that surveyors were able to interview as many possible tenants without time constraints.

We sampled numbers of parts as follows: 4 parts in the Bronx, 3 parts in Brooklyn, 3 parts in Manhattan, 2 parts in Queens, and 1 part in Staten Island.

This sampling strategy was based on the following assumptions: 1) The numbers of parts above is proportional to the size of each court, since some courts are larger and therefore have higher numbers of litigants in Housing Court. 2) Litigants' assignment to parts is random—that is, we have no reason to believe that tenants in one part are any different from tenants in another, for example by income, age, or type of case. 3) The survey sample is gathered in a systematic way, in this case every tenant who appeared in a part during the survey. 4) The survey is conducted at times that are representative of the variations in numbers and characteristics of people who go to Housing Court, such as different days of the week, and different times of year.

In sum, representativeness is important; we wanted to be sure that our sample was representative of the numbers and characteristics of people in Housing Court by courthouse, part, and times of week and year. We therefore selected more parts in larger courthouses, we confirmed that litigants are assigned to parts randomly, and surveyors were systematic in approaching tenants (surveyors reported low rates of refusal by tenants when they were asked to respond to the survey). We also conducted the surveys on a Monday and one additional day of the week, because Mondays have the heaviest volume, accounting for variations in days of the week. Based on a phone conversation with Ernie Belzaguy, the Chief Clerk, the only variations during the year are a slow-down in the summer and are major holidays, so this was representative of a typical week.

PHASE TWO SURVEY SAMPLE

642 surveys were completed in Phase Two with tenants whose landlords had brought them to court.³ We contacted the clerk's office at each courthouse to determine the numbers of cases scheduled and defaulted on the days of our survey. Based on these numbers, the total number of actual cases for the days we surveyed in all courts was 1,429; the 642 surveys conducted represent 44.9% of those cases. Table 7 shows the numbers of cases heard by borough, numbers of surveys completed for each borough, surveys in each borough as a percent of cases heard, and surveys in each borough as a percent of the total survey sample. Note that the number of cases heard in Housing Court, and therefore surveys as a percent of cases heard, are only for days on which surveys were administered.

TABLE 7: PHASE TWO NUMBERS OF CASES HEARD ON SURVEY DAYS AND SURVEYS COMPLETED BY BOROUGH

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Number of Cases Heard in Housing Court on Survey Days</i>	<i>Number of Surveys Completed</i>	<i>Surveys as Percent of Cases Heard</i>	<i>Surveys as Percent of Total Sample</i>
Bronx (2 survey days)	486	221	45.5%	34.4%
Brooklyn (2 survey days)	369	165	44.7%	25.7%
Manhattan (2 survey days)	408	148	36.3%	23.1%
Queens (2 survey days)	112	89	79.5%	13.9%
Staten Island (1 survey day)	54	19	35.2%	3.0%
Total:	1,429	642	44.9%	100%

In addition, Table 8 below shows the numbers of calendared cases, numbers of defaults, and defaults as percents of cases that were calendared by borough, for the days on which we conducted surveys.

TABLE 8: PHASE TWO DEFAULTED CASES AS PERCENT OF CALENDARED CASES BY BOROUGH (FOR SURVEY DAYS ONLY)

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Number of Calendared Cases</i>	<i>Number of Defaults</i>	<i>Defaults as Percent of Calendared Cases</i>
Bronx (2 survey days)	506	20	4.0%
Brooklyn (2 survey days)	541	24	4.4%
Manhattan (2 survey days)	496	9	1.8%
Queens (2 survey days)	191	7	3.7%
Staten Island (1 survey day)	55	1	1.8%
Total:	1789	61	3.4%

³ Some surveys were completed for tenants who answered "no" to the question "Has your landlord brought you to court?" Those surveys were discarded from this analysis.

PHASE TWO RESULTS

The 642 surveys reported in this section represented cases where the landlord had brought the tenant to court. The margin of error for this sample size is +/- 3.9% at 95% confidence.

Responses to the Phase Two survey done in courtrooms in March 2006 are presented in this section. Tenants were asked whether they were 62 or older. If they responded that they were age 62 or older, they were also asked about their legal representation (whether they were represented by a lawyer for their case) and annual household income (more or less than \$25,000). Results presented here therefore also include characteristics of tenants age 62 and older: legal representation, income, and legal representation for tenants age 62 and older with incomes under \$25,000.

➤ Tenants Age 62 or Over

6.4% (41) of tenants who responded to the question, "Are you 62 or over?" answered "yes". 637 tenants responded to this question.

Table 9 below shows a breakdown of tenants age 62 and older by approximate age (tenants were asked their year of birth, and we calculated approximate age from their answers; 34 tenants provided their year of birth).

TABLE 9: PHASE TWO TENANTS 62 OR OLDER SPECIFIC AGE BREAKDOWNS

<i>Tenant Age</i>	<i>Number of Responses</i>
95	1
91	1
81	2
78	1
75	1
74	1
73	1
71	2
70	1
69	2
68	3
67	1
66	2
65	5
64	3
63	3
62	2
61	2
Total	34

Finally, Table 10 below shows a breakdown of tenants age 62 and older by borough.

TABLE 10: PHASE TWO TENANTS 62 OR OLDER BY BOROUGH

<i>Tenants 62 and Older by Borough</i>	<i>Number Age 62 and Older</i>	<i>Percent of Borough Sample</i>
Bronx	6	2.7
Brooklyn	14	8.5
Manhattan	13	8.8
Queens	6	6.7
Staten Island	2	10.5
Total	41	--

➤ **Legal Representation for Tenants Age 62 or Over**

39 seniors reported whether they have a lawyer for their housing case. Seven of those (17.9%) reported that they had a lawyer.

➤ **Yearly Household Income for Tenants Age 62 or Over**

36 seniors reported their yearly household income. Twenty-two (61.1%) reported that their yearly incomes are less than \$25,000.

➤ **Legal Representation and Income for Tenants Age 62 or Over**

Of the 32 unrepresented seniors, 30 reported their income. 17 (56.7%) indicated that their yearly income is less than \$25,000. 13 (43.3%) indicated their yearly income is greater than \$25,000.

PHASE TWO CONCLUSIONS

The goal of Phase Two of this research was to obtain an estimate of the percentage of tenants facing eviction in New York City Housing Courts. Using a strategy of interviewing tenants within courtrooms, we interviewed 44.9%, or roughly half, of tenants who appeared in the selected group of courtrooms on the days that the surveys took place. Refusal rates were low, and other possible reasons for non-participation may have included language, psychological distress, lack of time, or lack of interest.

The percentage of people age 62 and older found in this survey (6.4%) should be regarded as the best possible estimate of seniors in Housing Court from this study; Phases One and Three found higher estimates of people in this age group, because their samples represented a smaller proportion of tenants in Housing Court on survey days, and because surveyors were more likely to approach tenants who appeared to be older.

Phase Two of this research also provided some additional information about legal representation and income of tenants age 62 and older. However, because a small number of tenants in this sample were age 62 and older, their reported legal representation status and incomes cannot necessarily be generalized to the larger group of tenants age 62 and older in New York City Housing Courts (see "Note on Margins of Error" on page 4 of this report). The survey conducted in Phase Three of this research was intended to represent a larger group of tenants age 62 and older, so that more can be learned about this group. Phase Three is reported in the following section (however, keep in mind that some of the breakdowns reported even with the larger group of tenants age 62 and older still produce quite small sub-samples of the survey sample, so interpretations bear caution).

PART III: PHASE THREE SURVEY – APRIL-MAY 2006

PHASE THREE SURVEY METHODOLOGY

In this Phase Three of this research, surveys were conducted over a period of two weeks in the spring of 2006 in order to understand characteristics of tenants whose landlords have brought them to Housing Court. Characteristics included whether they had legal representation; type of legal representation; household composition, including children under age 18; age (whether they were 62 or older); zip code of residence; sources of income; amount of income; racial or ethnic background; and military status.

The Phase Three survey was based on the Phase One survey conducted in December 2005. The December 2005 survey instrument was informed by the 1993 *Housing Court, Evictions and Homelessness* study, and designed to capture essential information in a short time frame. CHE, advised by the Brennan Center, constructed additional survey questions to address the current concerns and questions regarding representation in Housing Court. After conducting the December 2005 survey, the survey instrument was once again revised based on feedback from surveyors (e.g., regarding ease or difficulty of asking questions when in the field) and on feedback from interested stakeholders (e.g., regarding additional information that they felt was needed). The survey was translated into Spanish, so that it could be conducted in either English or Spanish.

Surveys were conducted in Housing Courts in all five boroughs over two weeks in April and May of 2006. Conversations with the Chief Clerk of Housing Court indicated that these weeks would reflect typical weeks in terms of numbers and characteristics of tenants in Housing Court. Surveys were conducted daily for these two weeks in each borough, with the exception of Staten Island, where surveys were conducted on days in two occasions. Fewer housing cases are heard in Staten Island compared to other boroughs, and housing cases are not scheduled every day; surveys were conducted there on two consecutive weeks when housing cases were scheduled. Further, different types of cases are heard on alternating weeks, so this strategy allowed sampling of different types of cases.

Lastly, this section of the report discusses the experiences and observations of surveyors who conducted this research. As they conducted the surveys, they noted conditions that they felt should be reported in addition to the quantitative results of the surveys. Therefore, they were asked to submit written reflections, which are summarized here.

PHASE THREE SURVEY SAMPLE

1,787 surveys were completed in Phase Three, all of which were tenants whose landlords had brought them to court.⁴ We contacted the clerk's office at each courthouse to determine the numbers of cases scheduled and defaulted on the days of our survey. Based on these numbers, the total number of actual cases for the days we surveyed in all courts was 12,784; the 1,787 surveys conducted represent 14.0% of those cases. Table 11 shows the numbers of cases heard by borough, numbers of surveys completed for each borough, surveys in each borough as a percent of cases heard, and surveys in each borough as a percent of the total survey sample. Note that the number of cases heard in Housing Court, and therefore surveys as a percent of cases heard, are only for days on which surveys were administered.

TABLE 11: PHASE THREE NUMBERS OF CASES HEARD ON SURVEY DAYS AND SURVEYS COMPLETED BY BOROUGH

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Number of Cases Heard in Housing Court</i>	<i>Number of Surveys Completed</i>	<i>Surveys as Percent of Cases Heard</i>	<i>Surveys as Percent of Total Sample</i>
Bronx (10 survey days)	4936	520	10.5%	29.1%
Brooklyn (10 survey days)	3974	438	11.0%	24.5%
Manhattan (10 survey days)	2043	366	17.9%	20.5%
Queens (10 survey days)	1721	438	25.5%	24.5%
Staten Island (2 survey days)	110	25	22.7%	1.4%
Total:	12,784	1,787	14.0%	100%

In addition, Table 12 below shows the numbers of calendared cases, numbers of defaults, and defaults as percents of cases that were calendared by borough, for the days on which we conducted surveys.

TABLE 12: PHASE THREE DEFAULTED CASES AS PERCENT OF CALENDARED CASES BY BOROUGH (FOR SURVEY DAYS ONLY)

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Number of Calendared Cases</i>	<i>Number of Defaults</i>	<i>Defaults as Percent of Calendared Cases</i>
Bronx (10 survey days)	5158	222	4.3%
Brooklyn (10 survey days)	4162	188	4.5%
Manhattan (10 survey days)	2289	246	10.7%
Queens (10 survey days)	1840	119	6.5%
Staten Island (2 survey days)	118	8	6.8%
Total:	13,567	783	5.8%

⁴ Some surveys were completed for tenants who answered "no" to the question "Has your landlord brought you to court?" Those surveys were discarded from this analysis.

Phase Three surveyors also recorded numbers of refusals when they approached tenants and asked them if they would agree to be surveyed. Reasons for refusals included apparent language barriers, tenants appearing distressed, tenants reporting that they were too tired or frustrated, or tenants reporting that they could not or did not want to take the time to answer the survey. The total number of tenants approached (the sum of recorded refusals and surveys completed) was 2,372. The 1,787 surveys completed represented 75.3% of tenants approached. This is shown in Table 13 below.

TABLE 13: PHASE THREE REFUSALS, NUMBERS OF TENANTS APPROACHED, AND SURVEYS COMPLETED BY BOROUGH

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Number of Recorded Refusals</i>	<i>Number of Surveys Completed</i>	<i>Number of Tenants Approached</i>	<i>Surveys as Percent of Tenants Approached</i>
Bronx (10 survey days)	116	520	636	81.8%
Brooklyn (10 survey days)	147	438	575	76.2%
Manhattan (10 survey days)	135	366	501	73.1%
Queens (10 survey days)	189	438	627	69.9%
Staten Island (2 survey days)	8	25	33	75.8%
Total:	595	1,787	2,372	75.3%

PHASE THREE SURVEY RESPONSES

A total of 1787 surveys were completed in housing court. All of these cases were housing cases where the landlord had brought the tenant to court. The margin of error for this sample size is +/- 2.3% at 95% confidence. Responses to the Phase Three survey are presented in this section.

➤ ***Borough of Residence***

The following table indicates the boroughs in which the respondents live.

TABLE 14: PHASE THREE TENANTS' BOROUGHS OF RESIDENCE

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent of Total Survey Sample</i>
Manhattan	366	20.5%
Brooklyn	438	24.5%
Bronx	520	29.1%
Queens	438	24.5%
Staten Island	25	1.4%
Total	1787	100%

Refer to pages 29 through 35 for a detailed breakdown by ZIP code per borough.

➤ ***Legal Representation***

Of the 1767 people who answered this question, 1362 (76.2%) tenants did not have a lawyer for their housing case. 277 (68.4%) of the 405 respondents who had a lawyer had a legal aid/legal services lawyer while 113 (27.9%) had a private lawyer [note: 15 tenants did not specify their legal representation]. The survey also included the question, "Is the lawyer also your landlord's lawyer?" for tenants who reported having a lawyer, because tenants sometimes interact with a landlord's lawyer and may believe that person to be their own lawyer (e.g., thinking that the lawyer is assigned by the court). Of the 405 respondents who had legal representation, 13 (3.2%) reported that their lawyer was also their landlord's lawyer, thus leaving 392 (96.8%) respondents who had their own lawyer. Of these respondents, 380 specified the type of lawyer: 272 (71.6%) had a legal aid/legal services lawyer and 108 (28.4%) had a private lawyer.

➤ **Household Composition**

1780 people answered the question regarding household composition. Respondents reported that, including the respondent, between one and 11 people lived in their apartment, with an average of 2.9 (SD=1.61).

TABLE 15: PHASE THREE HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

<i>Number of People in Household</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 1780)</i>
1	404	22.7%
2	450	25.3%
3	402	22.6%
4	256	14.4%
5	149	8.4%
6	75	4.2%
7	25	1.4%
8	10	0.6%
9	3	0.2%
10	5	0.3%
11	1	0.1%

➤ **Children in Household**

1688 tenants reported whether they lived with children under 18. Their responses are shown in the table below.

TABLE 16: PHASE THREE CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD UNDER THE AGE 18

<i>Number of Children Under 18</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 1688)</i>
None	661	39.2%
1	409	24.4%
2	327	19.4%
3	169	10.0%
4	62	3.7%
5	23	1.4%
6	11	0.7%
7	1	0.1%
8	3	0.2%
9	2	0.1%

➤ **Tenants Age 62 or Older**

205 respondents (11.5%) indicated that they were 62 years or older. 182 of those tenants reported their specific date of birth; ages as calculated from reported year of birth (2006 minus year of birth) are shown below.

TABLE 17: PHASE THREE TENANTS AGE 62 YEARS OR OLDER

Tenant Age	Frequency	Percent (Out of 182)
62 (born in 1944)	12	6.6%
63 (born in 1943)	21	11.5%
64 (born in 1942)	19	10.4%
65 (born in 1941)	20	11.0%
66 (born in 1940)	13	7.1%
67 (born in 1939)	11	6.0%
68 (born in 1938)	5	2.7%
69 (born in 1937)	7	3.8%
70 (born in 1936)	3	1.6%
71 (born in 1935)	5	2.7%
72 (born in 1934)	8	4.4%
73 (born in 1933)	4	2.2%
74 (born in 1932)	10	5.5%
75 (born in 1931)	7	3.8%
76 (born in 1930)	4	2.2%
77 (born in 1929)	4	2.2%
78 (born in 1928)	5	2.7%
79 (born in 1927)	5	2.7%
80 (born in 1926)	4	2.2%
81 (born in 1925)	3	1.6%
82 (born in 1924)	1	0.5%
84 (born in 1922)	3	1.6%
85 (born in 1921)	1	0.5%
87 (born in 1919)	2	1.1%
88 (born in 1918)	1	0.5%
89 (born in 1917)	1	0.5%
92 (born in 1914)	1	0.5%
94 (born in 1912)	1	0.5%
95 (born in 1911)	1	0.5%

➤ **Other Household Members Age 62 or Older**

Of the 1550 respondents who indicated that they were not seniors themselves, 57 (3.7%) indicated that another person in their household was 62 years or over.

➤ **Amount of Income**

1687 respondents reported their yearly income. This includes the responses of those tenants who reported their monthly incomes instead of their yearly incomes. These are shown in the table below, which also gives comparisons to the 2004 American Community Survey, where applicable. The Phase Three survey found a higher proportion of the tenants we surveyed to be low-income, compared with the entire New York City population surveyed by the 2004 American Community Survey. (Also see Table 4 on page 10 for incomes reported by the 2004 American Community Survey.)

TABLE 18: PHASE THREE TENANT INCOME AMOUNTS

<i>Yearly Household Income</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 1687)</i>	<i>Percent from 2004 American Community Survey</i>
Less than \$15,000	735	43.6%	20.5%
Between \$15,000 and \$24,999	401	23.8%	12.4%
Between \$25,000 and \$34,999	261	15.5%	11.0%
Between \$35,000 and \$44,999	140	8.3%	N/A
More than \$45,000	150	8.9%	N/A

➤ **Source of Income**

Tenants were also asked to specify their source of income. Percentages refer to the number of tenants of the entire sample (1787) who chose that response⁵. Please note the respondents were able to report more than one source of income.

TABLE 19: PHASE THREE TENANT SOURCES OF INCOME

<i>Source of Income</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 1787)</i>
Employment	1001	56.0%
Public assistance	443	24.8%
Social security	259	14.5%
Veteran's benefits	9	0.5%
Pension	47	2.6%
Disability	180	10.1%
Workers compensation	7	0.4%
Unemployment	23	1.3%
Section 8	14	0.8%
Child support	13	0.7%
SSI	10	0.6%
Other (e.g., alimony, family, friends)	67	3.7%

⁵ Percentages reflect the entire sample size (1787) since each respondent chose at least one source of income.

➤ **Racial or Ethnic Background**

1779 respondents indicated their race and/or ethnicity.

TABLE 20: PHASE THREE TENANT RACIAL OR ETHNIC BACKGROUND

<i>Race</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 1779)</i>	<i>NYC 2000 Census Data</i>
White	190	10.7%	35%
Black/African American	870	48.9%	24.5%
Hispanic/Latino	481	27.0%	27.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	34	1.9%	9.8%
American Indian/Alaska Native	7	0.4%	0.2%
Mixed	98	5.5%	Not available
Other	99	5.6%	0.7%

Note: Surveyors reported that some respondents hesitated to report their race, wanted to know why we asked this question, or made remarks such as “we’re all human beings.” Therefore, even though most of the survey sample answered this question, we should be cautious in interpreting this set of data. Further, we have compared these reports to New York City census data (available at <http://home2nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/census/demonyc.pdf>). According to this comparison, Whites and Asian/Pacific Islanders are underrepresented in New York City Housing Courts, and Black/African American tenants are overrepresented; these are likely possibilities. The percent of people who reported “Other” on our survey is greater than those who reported this category on the New York City census; we can speculate that this group reflects those who preferred not to place themselves in one of the other categories because of personal beliefs (or their category did not occur in the list of responses).

➤ **Military Status**

17 (1.0%) respondents of the 1757 who answered the question were currently serving in the military. 74 (4.2%) respondents of the 1742 who answered a follow-up question noted that they were veterans. 3 tenants indicated that they were both an active member of the military and a veteran.

PHASE THREE TENANTS, SENIORS, AND LEGAL REPRESENTATION BY BOROUGH AND ZIP CODE

1,375 (76.9%) of the 1,787 tenants surveyed did not have legal representation. Out of the 205 seniors, 130 (63.4%) did not have legal representation. Being without legal representation was defined as not having a lawyer and not having the same lawyer as the tenant's landlord. Here, we provide breakdowns by borough and ZIP code for tenants and seniors, including their legal representation status. Please note that percentages may not add up due to missing data on tenants' ZIP codes.

➤ **Manhattan**

In Manhattan, there were a total of 366 tenants. 268 (73.2%) did not have legal representation. Out of the 56 seniors, 34 (60.7%) did not have legal representation.

TABLE 21: PHASE THREE LEGAL REPRESENTATION IN MANHATTAN BY ZIP CODE

ZIP Code	Number of Tenants	Tenants without Representation	Number of Seniors⁶	Seniors without Representation
10001	2	2 (100%)	0	n/a
10002	14	6 (42.9%)	4 (28.6%)	1 (25%)
10003	5	4 (80%)	4 (80%)	1 (25%)
10009	11	4 (36.4%)	2 (18.2%)	1 (50%)
10010	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
10011	4	3 (75%)	0	n/a
10012	1	0	1	0
10013	2	1 (50%)	0	n/a
10014	3	2 (66.7%)	0	n/a
10016	4	3 (75%)	0	n/a
10017	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
10019	5	3 (60%)	0	n/a
10020	1	0	0	n/a
10021	1	0	0	n/a
10022	3	2 (66.7%)	0	n/a
10024	2	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	0
10025	17	10 (58.8%)	4 (23.5%)	1 (25%)
10026	23	17 (73.9%)	1 (4.3%)	1 (100%)
10027	33	24 (72.7%)	5 (15.2%)	2 (40%)
10028	3	2 (66.7%)	2 (66.7%)	1 (50%)
10029	26	23 (88.5%)	3 (11.5%)	2 (66.7%)
10030	25	19 (76.0%)	3 (12.0%)	3 (25%)
10031	40	30 (75.0%)	3 (7.5%)	3 (100%)
10032	37	27 (73.0%)	7 (18.9%)	5 (71.4%)
10033	24	18 (75.0%)	3 (12.5%)	2 (66.7%)
10034	17	15 (88.2%)	2 (11.8%)	0
10035	2	2 (100%)	1 (50.0%)	1 (50%)
10036	5	5 (100%)	1 (20.0%)	1 (100%)
10037	3	3 (100%)	2 (66.7%)	2 (100%)
10038	2	0	1 (50%)	n/a
10039	11	11 (100%)	3 (27.3%)	3 (100%)
10040	19	15 (78.9%)	3 (15.8%)	2 (66.7%)
10044	2	2 (100%)	0	n/a

⁶ Percentage refers to number of tenants.

➤ **Brooklyn**

In Brooklyn, there were 438 tenants. 311 (71.0%) did not have legal representation. Out of the 69 seniors, 38 (55.1%) did not have legal representation.

TABLE 22: PHASE THREE LEGAL REPRESENTATION IN BROOKLYN BY ZIP CODE

ZIP Code	Number of Tenants	Tenants without Representation	Number of Seniors	Seniors without Representation
11121	1	0	1	n/a
11127	1	0	0	n/a
11201	5	3 (60.0%)	2 (40.0%)	2 (100%)
11203	15	11 (73.3%)	4 (26.7%)	3 (75%)
11204	5	4 (80.0%)	0	n/a
11205	4	3 (75.0%)	2 (50.0%)	1 (50%)
11206	16	12 (75.0%)	3 (18.8%)	2 (66.7%)
11207	15	11 (73.3%)	3 (20.0%)	2 (66.7%)
11208	17	14 (82.4%)	1 (5.9%)	1 (100%)
11210	14	10 (71.4%)	2 (14.3%)	1 (50%)
11211	5	5 (100%)	0	n/a
11212	27	17 (63.0%)	5 (18.5%)	2 (40.0%)
11213	31	25 (80.6%)	2 (6.5%)	2 (100%)
11214	4	4 (100%)	0	n/a
11215	3	1 (33.3%)	0	n/a
11216	31	20 (64.5%)	6 (19.4%)	2 (33.3%)
11217	7	5 (71.4%)	5 (71.4%)	4 (80%)
11218	7	4 (57.1%)	0	n/a
11220	9	5 (55.6%)	1 (11.1%)	0
11221	27	18 (66.7%)	4 (14.8%)	2 (50%)
11222	3	1 (33.3%)	0	n/a
11223	4	2 (50.0%)	3 (75.0%)	0
11224	11	9 (81.8%)	2 (18.2%)	1 (50%)
11225	26	16 (61.5%)	5 (19.2%)	2 (40%)
11226	30	25 (83.3%)	2 (6.7%)	1 (50%)
11229	2	1 (50.0%)	0	n/a
11230	12	6 (50.0%)	2 (16.7%)	0
11231	5	3 (60.0%)	2 (40.0%)	2 (100%)
11232	3	3 (100%)	0	n/a
11233	30	23 (76.7%)	2 (6.7%)	1 (50%)
11234	5	5 (100%)	1 (20.0%)	1 (100%)
11235	5	4 (80.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0
11236	15	13 (86.7%)	4 (26.7%)	4 (100%)
11237	14	5 (35.7%)	1 (7.1%)	0
11238	13	10 (76.9%)	2 (15.4%)	1 (50%)
11239	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a

➤ **Bronx**

In the Bronx, there were 520 tenants. 413 (79.4%) did not have legal representation. Out of the 47 seniors, 34 (72.3%) did not have legal representation.

TABLE 23: PHASE THREE LEGAL REPRESENTATION IN THE BRONX BY ZIP CODE

ZIP Code	Number of Tenants	Tenants without Representation	Number of Seniors	Seniors without Representation
10351	2	1 (50.0%)	0	n/a
10355	4	4 (100%)	1 (25.0%)	1 (100%)
10356	4	4 (100%)	0	n/a
10357	14	8 (57.1%)	0	n/a
10358	10	9 (90.0%)	2 (20.0%)	2 (100%)
10359	1	0	1	n/a
10407	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
10418	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
10451	30	18 (60.0%)	1 (3.3%)	0
10542	34	31 (91.2%)	3	3 (100%)
10453	42	32 (76.2%)	6 (14.3%)	4 (66.7%)
10454	9	9 (100%)	3 (33.3%)	3 (100%)
10455	16	15 (93.8%)	3 (18.8%)	3 (100%)
10456	44	34 (77.3%)	3 (6.8%)	2 (66.7%)
10457	36	25 (69.4%)	3 (8.3%)	3 (100%)
10458	37	31 (83.8%)	1 (2.7%)	1 (100%)
10459	15	12 (80.0%)	1 (6.7%)	0
10460	30	21 (70.0%)	5 (16.7%)	2 (40.0%)
10461	7	6 (85.7%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (100%)
10462	7	7 (100%)	0	n/a
10463	11	8 (72.7%)	2 (18.2%)	1 (50%)
10465	4	3 (75.0%)	0	n/a
10466	28	23 (82.1%)	4 (14.3%)	3 (75%)
10467	30	27 (90.0%)	3 (10.0%)	2 (66.7%)
10468	29	19 (65.5%)	1 (3.4%)	0
10469	4	4 (100%)	0	n/a
10470	2	1 (50%)	0	n/a
10472	22	18 (81.8%)	2 (9.1%)	2 (100%)
10473	20	16 (80.0%)	1 (5.0%)	1 (100%)
10474	3	3 (100%)	0	n/a
10475	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
10747	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11351	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11355	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11368	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11374	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11386	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11415	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11453	1	0	0	n/a

➤ **Staten Island**

In Staten Island, there were 25 tenants. 17 (68.0%) did not have legal representation. The one senior did not have legal representation.

TABLE 24: PHASE THREE LEGAL REPRESENTATION IN STATEN ISLAND BY ZIP CODE

ZIP Code	Number of Tenants	Tenants without Representation	Number of Seniors	Seniors without Representation
10301	8	4 (50.0%)	0	n/a
10302	1	2 (100%)	0	n/a
10303	1	0	0	n/a
10305	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
10306	8	5 (62.5%)	0	n/a
10309	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
10310	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
10314	4	4 (100%)	1 (25.0%)	1 (100%)

➤ **Queens**

In Queens, there were 438 tenants. 366 (83.6%) did not have legal representation. Out of the 32 seniors, 23 (71.9%) did not have legal representation.

TABLE 25: PHASE THREE LEGAL REPRESENTATION IN QUEENS BY ZIP CODE

ZIP Code	Number of Tenants	Tenants without Representation	Number of Seniors	Seniors without Representation
11048	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11101	7	7 (100%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (100%)
11102	6	5 (83.3%)	3 (50.0%)	3 (100%)
11103	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11104	7	6 (85.7%)	0	n/a
11105	4	3 (75.0%)	3 (75.0%)	0
11106	4	3 (75.0%)	0	n/a
11208	1	0	0	n/a
11213	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11237	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11268	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11272	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11317	1	0	0	n/a
11345	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11347	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11354	7	6 (85.7%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (100%)
11355	12	11 (91.7%)	2 (16.7%)	2 (100%)
11356	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11358	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11360	2	2 (100%)	0	n/a
11361	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11362	1	0	0	n/a
11364	3	3 (100%)	0	n/a
11365	2	2 (100%)	0	n/a
11367	16	12 (75.0%)	1 (6.3%)	0
11368	25	22 (88.0%)	0	n/a
11369	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11370	2	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (100%)
11371	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11372	9	8 (88.9%)	3 (33.3%)	2 (66.7%)
11373	9	8 (88.9%)	0	n/a
11374	12	12 (100%)	1 (8.3%)	1 (100%)
11375	10	8 (80.0%)	3 (30.0%)	2 (66.7%)
11377	16	16 (100%)	2 (12.5%)	2 (100%)
11378	5	1 (20.0%)	0	n/a
11379	2	1 (50.0%)	0	n/a
11385	13	10 (76.9%)	0	n/a
11411	2	2 (100%)	1 (50.0%)	1 (100%)

TABLE 26: PHASE THREE LEGAL REPRESENTATION IN QUEENS BY ZIP CODE (CONTINUED)

ZIP Code	Number of Tenants	Tenants without Representation	Number of Seniors	Seniors without Representation
11412	2	0	0	n/a
11413	4	3 (75.0%)	0	n/a
11414	3	3 (100%)	0	n/a
11415	3	3 (100%)	0	n/a
11416	3	2 (66.7%)	0	n/a
11517	4	3 (75.0%)	0	n/a
11418	7	4 (57.1%)	0	n/a
11419	3	3 (100%)	0	n/a
11420	5	4 (80.0%)	0	n/a
11421	6	5 (83.3%)	0	n/a
11422	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11423	17	14 (82.4%)	0	n/a
11426	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11427	4	4 (100%)	0	n/a
11428	4	2 (50.0%)	0	n/a
11429	1	0	0	n/a
11431	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11432	21	19 (90.5%)	1 (4.8%)	0
11433	8	6 (75.0%)	1 (12.5%)	0
11434	22	20 (90.9%)	0	n/a
11435	19	16 (84.2%)	6 (31.6%)	4 (66.7%)
11436	3	2 (66.7%)	0	n/a
11451	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11461	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11470	1	0	0	n/a
11563	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11634	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11635	2	0	0	n/a
11690	1	1 (100%)	0	n/a
11691	43	35 (81.4%)	2 (4.7%)	1 (50%)
11692	30	28 (93.3%)	1 (3.3%)	1 (100%)
11693	3	2 (66.7%)	0	n/a
11694	8	7 (87.5%)	0	n/a

PHASE THREE CHARACTERISTICS OF SENIORS

The following data represent characteristics of the 205 respondents who indicated that they were 62 years and older.

➤ *Seniors by Borough*

The 205 respondents age 62 and older were surveyed in each of the boroughs as follows.

TABLE 27: PHASE THREE SENIORS BY BOROUGH

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 205)</i>
Manhattan	56	27.3%
Brooklyn	69	33.7%
Bronx	47	22.9%
Queens	32	15.6%
Staten Island	1	0.5%

➤ *ZIP Codes of Seniors in Manhattan*

52 tenants age 62 and older in Manhattan listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 28: PHASE THREE ZIP CODES OF SENIORS IN MANHATTAN

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 52)</i>
10002	4	7.7%
10003	1	1.9%
10009	2	3.8%
10012	1	1.9%
10024	1	1.9%
10025	4	7.7%
10026	1	1.9%
10027	5	9.6%
10028	1	1.9%
10029	3	5.8%
10030	3	5.8%
10031	3	5.8%
10032	7	13.5%
10033	3	5.8%
10034	2	3.8%
10035	1	1.9%
10036	1	1.9%
10037	2	3.8%
10038	1	1.9%
10039	3	5.8%
10040	3	5.8%

➤ **ZIP Codes of Seniors in Brooklyn**

67 tenants age 62 and older in Brooklyn listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 29: PHASE THREE ZIP CODES OF SENIORS IN MANHATTAN

ZIP Code	Frequency	Percent (Out of 67)
11121	1	1.5%
11201	3	4.5%
11203	4	6.0%
11205	2	3.0%
11206	3	4.5%
11207	3	4.5%
11208	1	1.5%
11210	2	3.0%
11212	5	7.5%
11213	2	3.0%
11216	6	9.0%
11217	5	7.5%
11220	1	1.5%
11221	4	6.0%
11223	1	1.5%
11224	2	3.0%
11225	5	7.5%
11226	2	3.0%
11230	2	3.0%
11231	2	3.0%
11233	2	3.0%
11234	1	1.5%
11235	1	1.5%
11236	4	6.0%
11237	1	1.5%
11238	2	3.0%

➤ **ZIP Codes of Seniors in the Bronx**

All 47 tenants age 62 and older in the Bronx listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 30: PHASE THREE ZIP CODES OF SENIORS IN THE BRONX

ZIP Code	Frequency	Percent (Out of 47)
10355	1	2.1%
10358	2	4.3%
10359	1	2.1%
10451	1	2.1%
10452	3	6.4%
10453	6	12.8%
10454	3	6.4%
10455	3	6.4%
10456	3	6.4%
10457	3	6.4%
10458	1	2.1%
10459	1	2.1%
10460	5	10.6%
10461	1	2.1%
10463	2	4.3%
10466	4	8.5%
10467	3	6.4%
10468	1	2.1%
10472	2	4.3%
10473	1	2.1%

➤ **ZIP Codes of Seniors in Staten Island**

TABLE 31: PHASE THREE ZIP CODES OF SENIORS IN STATEN ISLAND

ZIP Code	Frequency	Percent (Out of 1)
10314	1	100%

➤ **Legal Representation of Seniors**

Of the 204 seniors who responded to the question about legal representation, 76 (37.3%) mentioned that they had a lawyer. 70 seniors specified the type of lawyer: 25 (35.7%) had a private lawyer and 45 (64.3%) had a legal aid/legal services lawyer. One senior with a lawyer indicated that his/her lawyer was also his/her landlord's lawyer; this means that this person did not actually have his/her own lawyer. The 69 seniors with their own lawyers reported that 25 (36.2%) had a private lawyer and 44 (63.8%) had a legal aid/legal services lawyer.

➤ **Household Composition of Seniors**

204 seniors reported the number of people in the household. The seniors lived on average with 2.0 (SD=1.3) people.

TABLE 32: PHASE THREE HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION OF SENIORS

<i>Number of People in Household</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 204)</i>
1	95	46.5%
2	56	27.4%
3	22	10.8%
4	17	8.4%
5	11	5.4%
6	2	1.0%
7	1	0.5%

➤ **Children in Household and Seniors**

181 seniors indicated the number of children who live with them.

TABLE 33: PHASE THREE CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD AND SENIORS

<i>Number of Children Under 18</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 181)</i>
None	141	77.9%
1	21	11.6%
2	14	7.7%
3	3	1.7%
4	2	1.1%

➤ **Amounts of Income of Seniors**

195 seniors reported their yearly income.

TABLE 34: PHASE THREE AMOUNTS OF INCOME OF SENIORS

<i>Yearly Income</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 195)</i>
Less than \$15,000	107	54.9%
Between \$15,000 and \$24,999	48	24.6%
Between \$25,000 and \$34,999	26	13.3%
Between \$35,000 and \$44,999	6	3.1%
More than \$45,000	8	4.1%

➤ **Sources of Income of Seniors**

Seniors were also asked to specify their source of income. Percentages refer to the total number of seniors (205). Please note the respondents were able to report more than one source of income.

TABLE 35: PHASE THREE SENIORS' SOURCE OF INCOME

<i>Source of Income</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 205)</i>
Employment	46	22.4%
Public assistance	15	7.3%
Social security	129	62.9%
Veteran's benefits	2	1.0%
Pension	27	13.2%
Disability	37	18.0%
Workers compensation	2	1.0%
Section 8	1	0.5%
SSI	3	1.5%
Other (e.g., family, friends)	8	3.9%

➤ **Racial or Ethnic Background of Seniors**

203 seniors reported their race or ethnicity.

TABLE 36: PHASE THREE SENIORS RACES AND ETHNICITIES

<i>Race</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 203)</i>
White	34	16.7%
Black/African American	93	45.8%
Hispanic/Latino	44	21.7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	6	3.0%
American Indian/Alaska Native	1	0.5%
Mixed	9	4.4%
Other	16	7.8%

➤ **Military Status of Seniors**

One senior (0.5%) out of the 199 who answered the question about military service was currently serving in the military. 20 (9.8%) of the 197 seniors who responded noted that they were veterans. One tenant reported being an active member of the military and a veteran.

**PHASE THREE SENIORS WITH YEARLY HOUSEHOLD INCOMES BETWEEN
\$15,000 AND \$24,999**

There were 48 seniors with yearly incomes between \$15,000 and \$24,999. This section focuses on their responses.

➤ ***Seniors with Incomes Between \$15,000 and \$24,999 by Borough***

The breakdown by borough for this group of respondents is in the table below.

**TABLE 37: PHASE THREE SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999 BY
BOROUGH**

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 48)</i>
Manhattan	9	18.8%
Brooklyn	16	33.3%
Bronx	16	33.3%
Queens	7	14.6%

The following tables list the ZIP codes per borough.

➤ ***Manhattan ZIP Codes of Seniors with Incomes Between \$15,000 and \$24,999***

8 of this group of tenants in Manhattan listed their ZIP codes.

**TABLE 38: PHASE THREE MANHATTAN ZIP CODES OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN
\$15,000 AND \$24,999**

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 8)</i>
10002	1	12.5%
10009	1	12.5%
10012	1	12.5%
10027	1	12.5%
10028	1	12.5%
10029	1	12.5%
10032	1	12.5%
10033	1	12.5%

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

➤ **Brooklyn ZIP Codes of Seniors with Incomes Between \$15,000 and \$24,999**

All 16 of this group of tenants in Brooklyn listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 39: PHASE THREE BROOKLYN ZIP CODES OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

ZIP Code	Frequency	Percent (Out of 16)
11201	1	6.3%
11203	1	6.3%
11206	2	12.5%
11207	1	6.3%
11208	1	6.3%
11212	2	12.5%
11216	1	6.3%
11220	1	6.3%
11221	1	6.3%
11223	1	6.3%
11224	1	6.3%
11230	1	6.3%
11234	1	6.3%
11236	1	6.3%

➤ **Bronx ZIP Codes of Seniors with Incomes Between \$15,000 and \$24,999**

16 of this group of tenants in the Bronx listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 40: PHASE THREE BRONX ZIP CODES OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

ZIP Code	Frequency	Percent (Out of 16)
10453	4	25.0%
10454	1	6.3%
10456	1	6.3%
10457	2	12.5%
10458	1	6.3%
10460	2	12.5%
10466	3	18.8%
10467	1	6.3%
10473	1	6.3%

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

➤ **Queens ZIP Codes of Seniors with Incomes Between \$15,000 and \$24,999**

7 of this group of tenants in Queens listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 41: PHASE THREE QUEENS ZIP CODES OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 7)</i>
11367	1	14.3%
11372	2	28.6%
11374	1	14.3%
11375	1	14.3%
11692	1	14.3%

➤ **Legal Representation of Seniors with Incomes Between \$15,000 and \$24,999**

30 (62.5%) of these 48 respondents did not have a lawyer for their housing case. 11 (68.8%) of the 16 respondents who had a lawyer had a legal aid/legal services lawyer while 5 (31.3%) had a private lawyer. Of the 16 respondents who had legal representation, none reported that their lawyer was also their landlord's lawyer.

➤ **Household Composition of Seniors with Incomes Between \$15,000 and \$24,999**

The 48 seniors reported that, on average, 2.2 (SD=1.3) people lived in their apartments.

TABLE 42: PHASE THREE HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Number of People in Household</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 48)</i>
1	20	41.7%
2	13	27.1%
3	5	10.4%
4	6	12.5%
5	4	8.3%

➤ **Children in Household and Seniors with Incomes Between \$15,000 and \$24,999**

43 of these seniors responded to the question of living with a child under 18.

TABLE 43: PHASE THREE CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD AND SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Number of Children Under 18</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 43)</i>
None	31	72.1%
1	7	16.3%
2	5	11.6%

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

➤ **Ages of Seniors with Incomes Between \$15,000 and \$24,999**

45 of these seniors listed their age.

TABLE 44: PHASE THREE AGES OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Tenant age</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 45)</i>
62 (born in 1944)	2	4.4%
63 (born in 1943)	8	17.8%
64 (born in 1942)	5	11.1%
65 (born in 1941)	7	15.6%
66 (born in 1940)	4	8.9%
67 (born in 1939)	5	11.1%
68 (born in 1938)	1	2.2%
70 (born in 1936)	1	2.2%
71 (born in 1935)	1	2.2%
72 (born in 1934)	1	2.2%
73 (born in 1933)	1	2.2%
74 (born in 1932)	2	4.4%
77 (born in 1929)	1	2.2%
78 (born in 1928)	1	2.2%
79 (born in 1927)	2	4.4%
92 (born in 1914)	1	2.2%
94 (born in 1912)	1	2.2%

➤ **Amounts of Income of Seniors with Incomes Between \$15,000 and \$24,999**

Tenants were also asked to specify their source of income. Percentages refer to all specified seniors (48) who chose that response. Please note the respondents were able to report more than one source of income.

TABLE 45: PHASE THREE AMOUNTS OF INCOME OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Source of Income</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 48)</i>
Employment	12	25.0%
Public assistance	3	6.3%
Social security	35	72.9%
Pension	9	18.8%
Disability	5	10.4%
Workers compensation	1	2.1%
SSI	1	2.1%
Other (friends)	2	4.2%

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

➤ **Racial or Ethnic Backgrounds of Seniors with Incomes Between \$15,000 and \$24,999**

All 48 respondents indicated their race.

TABLE 46: PHASE THREE RACE OR ETHNICITY OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Race</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 48)</i>
White	10	20.8%
Black/African American	23	47.9%
Hispanic/Latino	12	25.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	2.1%
Mixed	1	2.1%
Other	1	2.1%

➤ **Military Status of Seniors with Incomes Between \$15,000 and \$24,999**

One (2.1%) of these seniors was currently serving in the military. Six (12.5%) respondents of the 48 who answered a follow-up question noted that they were veterans. One tenant reported being an active member of the military and a veteran.

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

**PHASE THREE SENIORS WITH YEARLY HOUSEHOLD INCOMES BETWEEN
\$25,000 AND \$34,999**

There were 26 seniors with yearly incomes between \$15,000 and \$24,999. This section focuses on their responses.

➤ ***Seniors with Incomes Between \$25,000 and \$34,999 by Borough***

The breakdown by borough of this group of respondents is in the table below.

**TABLE 47: PHASE THREE SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999 BY
BOROUGH**

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 26)</i>
Manhattan	5	19.2%
Brooklyn	9	34.6%
Bronx	7	26.9%
Queens	4	15.4%
Staten Island	1	3.8%

The following tables list the ZIP codes per borough for these respondents.

➤ ***Manhattan ZIP Codes of Seniors with Incomes Between \$25,000 and \$34,999***

4 tenants in Manhattan listed their ZIP codes.

**TABLE 48: PHASE THREE MANHATTAN ZIP CODES OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN
\$25,000 AND \$34,999**

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 4)</i>
10003	1	25.0%
10025	1	25.0%
10034	1	25.0%
10037	1	25.0%

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

➤ **Brooklyn ZIP Codes of Seniors with Incomes Between \$25,000 and \$34,999**

All 9 tenants in Brooklyn listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 49: PHASE THREE BROOKLYN ZIP CODES OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 9)</i>
11201	1	11.1%
11203	1	11.1%
11207	1	11.1%
11210	1	11.1%
11217	1	11.1%
11221	1	11.1%
11226	1	11.1%
11236	1	11.1%
11237	1	11.1%

➤ **Bronx ZIP Codes of Seniors with Incomes Between \$25,000 and \$34,999**

7 tenants in the Bronx listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 50: PHASE THREE BRONX ZIP CODES OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 7)</i>
10355	1	14.3%
10359	1	14.3%
10453	1	14.3%
10455	1	14.3%
10457	1	14.3%
10467	1	14.3%
10472	1	14.3%

➤ **Staten Island ZIP Codes of Seniors with Incomes Between \$25,000 and \$34,999**

The one senior in Staten Island fell into this income group and provided the zip code below.

TABLE 51: PHASE THREE STATEN ISLAND ZIP CODES OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 1)</i>
10314	1	100%

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

➤ **Queens ZIP Codes of Seniors with Incomes Between \$25,000 and \$34,999**

All 4 tenants in this group in Queens listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 52: PHASE THREE QUEENS ZIP CODES OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

ZIP Code	Frequency	Percent (Out of 4)
11101	1	25.0%
11105	1	25.0%
11355	1	25.0%
11370	1	25.0%

➤ **Legal Representation of Seniors with Incomes Between \$25,000 and \$34,999**

17 (65.4%) of these 26 tenants did **not** have a lawyer for their housing case. The seven respondents who had a lawyer specified the type: 4 (55.1%) had a legal aid/legal services lawyer and 3 (42.9%) had a private lawyer. None reported that their lawyer was also their landlord's lawyer.

➤ **Household Compositions of Seniors with Incomes Between \$25,000 and \$34,999**

Respondents in this group reported that between one and seven people lived in their apartment, with an average of 2.7 (SD=1.7).

TABLE 53: PHASE THREE HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITIONS OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

Number of People in Household	Frequency	Percent (Out of 26)
1	8	30.8%
2	6	23.1%
3	5	19.2%
4	3	11.5%
5	2	7.7%
6	1	3.8%
7	1	3.8%

➤ **Children in Household and Seniors with Incomes Between \$25,000 and \$34,999**

22 of these seniors reported the number of children living with them.

TABLE 54: PHASE THREE CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD AND SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

Number of Children Under 18	Frequency	Percent (Out of 22)
None	15	68.2%
1	2	9.1%
2	4	18.2%
3	1	4.5%

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

➤ **Ages of Seniors with Incomes Between \$25,000 and \$34,999**

20 seniors in this group reported their age.

TABLE 55: PHASE THREE AGES OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

<i>Tenant Age</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 20)</i>
62 (born in 1944)	1	5.0%
63 (born in 1943)	1	5.0%
64 (born in 1942)	3	15.0%
65 (born in 1941)	4	20.0%
66 (born in 1940)	2	10.0%
67 (born in 1939)	1	5.0%
68 (born in 1938)	1	5.0%
69 (born in 1937)	1	5.0%
73 (born in 1933)	2	10.0%
74 (born in 1932)	3	30.0%
79 (born in 1927)	1	5.0%

➤ **Sources of Income of Seniors with Incomes Between \$25,000 and \$34,999**

Tenants were also asked to specify their source of income. Percentages refer to the number of tenants of the entire sample (26) who chose that response. Please note the respondents were able to report more than one source of income.

TABLE 56: PHASE THREE SOURCES OF INCOME OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

<i>Source of Income</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 26)</i>
Employment	14	53.8%
Public assistance	1	3.8%
Social security	11	42.3%
Pension	6	23.1%
Disability	3	11.5%
Other (family)	3	11.5%

➤ **Racial or Ethnic Backgrounds of Seniors with Incomes Between \$25,000 and \$34,999**

All 26 respondents in this group indicated their race or ethnicity.

TABLE 57: PHASE THREE CHILDREN RACE OR ETHNICITY OF SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

<i>Race</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 26)</i>
White	4	15.4%
Black/African American	12	46.2%
Hispanic/Latino	4	15.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	3.8%
Mixed	3	11.5%
Other	2	7.7%

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

➤ ***Military Status of Seniors with Incomes Between \$25,000 and \$34,999***

None of the seniors in this group were currently serving in the military. 25 answered the question about being a veteran: 3 (11.5%) noted that they were veterans.

*****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.***

**PHASE THREE UNREPRESENTED TENANTS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN
\$15,000 AND \$24,999**

1362 tenants reported that they did not have legal representation. 13 reported that they had a lawyer who was also the landlord's lawyer; this means that these tenants did not actually have their own lawyer. Out of those 1375 tenants without legal representation, 316 had incomes between \$15,000 and \$24,999 [see table below for income distribution for all unrepresented tenants].

1301 unrepresented tenants indicated their incomes:

**TABLE 58: PHASE THREE BREAKDOWN OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS WITH INCOMES
BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999**

<i>Yearly Income</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 1301)</i>
Less than \$15,000	546	42.0%
Between \$15,000 and \$24,999	316	24.3%
Between \$25,000 and \$34,999	203	15.6%
Between \$35,000 and \$44,999	109	8.4%
More than \$45,000	127	9.8%

This section focuses on the 316 unrepresented tenants with incomes between \$15,000 and \$24,999.

➤ ***Unrepresented Tenants with Incomes Between \$15,000 and \$24,999 by Borough***

The breakdown of this group of tenants by borough is in the table below.

**TABLE 59: PHASE THREE UNREPRESENTED TENANTS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND
\$24,999 BY BOROUGH**

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 316)</i>
Manhattan	44	13.9%
Brooklyn	82	25.9%
Bronx	100	31.6%
Queens	83	26.3%
Staten Island	7	2.2%

The following tables list the ZIP codes per borough.

➤ **Manhattan ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Tenants with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**
 41 tenants in Manhattan listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 60: PHASE THREE MANHATTAN ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 41)</i>
10002	2	4.9%
10003	1	2.4%
10009	1	2.4%
10025	1	2.4%
10026	3	7.3%
10027	7	17.1%
10028	1	2.4%
10029	2	4.9%
10030	3	7.3%
10031	3	7.3%
10032	5	12.2%
10033	4	9.8%
10034	2	4.9%
10036	2	4.9%
10039	3	7.3%
10040	1	2.4%

➤ **Brooklyn ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Tenants with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**
 80 tenants in Brooklyn listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 61: PHASE THREE BROOKLYN ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

ZIP Code	Frequency	Percent (Out of 80)
11201	1	1.3%
11203	5	6.3%
11204	2	2.5%
11205	1	1.3%
11206	3	3.8%
11207	3	3.8%
11208	2	2.5%
11210	3	3.8%
11211	1	1.3%
11212	4	5.0%
11213	3	3.8%
11215	1	1.3%
11216	7	8.8%
11217	1	1.3%
11218	1	1.3%
11221	6	7.5%
11225	5	6.3%
11226	7	8.8%
11229	1	1.3%
11230	3	3.8%
11231	1	1.3%
11232	2	2.5%
11233	8	10.0%
11234	1	1.3%
11235	1	1.3%
11236	2	2.5%
11237	2	2.5%
11238	3	3.8%

➤ **Bronx ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Tenants with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**

97 tenants in the Bronx listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 62: PHASE THREE BRONX ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 97)</i>
10355	1	1.0%
10356	1	1.0%
10357	2	2.1%
10358	3	3.1%
10451	7	7.2%
10452	8	8.2%
10453	7	7.2%
10454	1	1.0%
10455	3	3.1%
10456	11	11.3%
10457	7	7.2%
10458	8	8.2%
10459	3	3.1%
10460	6	6.2%
10461	2	2.1%
10462	2	2.1%
10463	1	1.0%
10466	5	5.2%
10467	9	9.3%
10468	2	2.1%
10469	1	1.0%
10472	5	5.2%
10473	2	2.1%

➤ **Staten Island ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Tenants with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**

7 tenants in Staten Island listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 63: PHASE THREE STATEN ISLAND ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 7)</i>
10301	1	14.3%
10305	1	14.3%
10306	4	57.1%
10314	1	14.3%

➤ **Queens ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Tenants with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**

81 tenants in Queens listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 64: PHASE THREE QUEENS ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

ZIP Code	Frequency	Percent (Out of 81)
11101	1	1.2%
11102	1	1.2%
11104	2	2.5%
11105	1	1.2%
11268	1	1.2%
11354	1	1.2%
11355	4	4.9%
11360	1	1.2%
11364	1	1.2%
11367	1	1.2%
11368	10	12.3%
11370	1	1.2%
11371	1	1.2%
11372	2	2.5%
11373	2	2.5%
11374	4	4.9%
11377	4	4.9%
11379	1	1.2%
11385	2	2.5%
11411	1	1.2%
11421	2	2.5%
11422	1	1.2%
11423	2	2.5%
11426	1	1.2%
11428	1	1.2%
11432	7	8.6%
11433	1	1.2%
11434	6	7.4%
11436	1	1.2%
11691	4	4.9%
11692	10	12.3%
11694	3	3.7%

➤ **Household Compositions of Unrepresented Tenants with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**

Respondents reported that between one and ten people lived in their apartment, with an average of 3.0 (SD=1.7). All 316 in this group responded to this question.

TABLE 65: PHASE THREE HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITIONS OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Number of People in Household</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 316)</i>
1	64	20.3%
2	80	25.3%
3	72	22.8%
4	50	15.8%
5	27	8.5%
6	11	3.5%
7	8	2.5%
8	2	0.6%
9	1	0.3%
10	1	0.3%

➤ **Children in Households and Unrepresented Tenants with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**

295 of these unrepresented tenants indicated the number of children living with them.

TABLE 66: PHASE THREE CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD AND UNREPRESENTED TENANTS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Number of Children Under 18</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 295)</i>
None	108	36.6%
1	85	28.8%
2	52	17.6%
3	34	11.5%
4	9	3.1%
5	5	1.7%
6	1	0.3%
7	1	0.3%

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

➤ **Ages of Unrepresented Tenants with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**

28 of these respondents (8.9%) indicated that they were 62 years and older. All seniors reported their age. 15 (4.7%) reported that another person in their household was 62 years or over.

TABLE 67: PHASE THREE AGES OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Tenant Age</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 28)</i>
62 (born in 1944)	1	3.6%
63 (born in 1943)	5	17.9%
64 (born in 1942)	3	10.7%
65 (born in 1941)	3	10.7%
66 (born in 1940)	3	10.7%
67 (born in 1939)	3	10.7%
68 (born in 1938)	1	3.6%
71 (born in 1935)	1	3.6%
72 (born in 1934)	1	3.6%
73 (born in 1933)	1	3.6%
74 (born in 1932)	2	7.1%
77 (born in 1929)	1	3.6%
79 (born in 1927)	1	3.6%
82 (born in 1924)	1	3.6%
92 (born in 1914)	1	3.6%

➤ **Sources of Income of Unrepresented Tenants with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**

Tenants were also asked to specify their source of income. Percentages refer to the number of tenants of the entire sample (316) who chose that response. Please note the respondents were able to report more than one source of income.

TABLE 68: PHASE THREE SOURCES OF INCOME OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Source of Income</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 316)</i>
Employment	234	74.1%
Public assistance	49	15.5%
Social security	38	12.0%
Veteran's benefits	2	0.6%
Pension	12	3.8%
Disability	22	7.0%
Workers compensation	2	0.6%
Unemployment	3	0.9%
Child support	2	0.6%
SSI	1	0.3%
Other (e.g., family, friends)	12	3.8%

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

➤ **Racial or Ethnic Backgrounds of Unrepresented Tenants with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**

All 316 respondents indicated their race.

TABLE 69: PHASE THREE RACE OR ETHNICITY OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Race</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 316)</i>
White	30	9.5%
Black/African American	166	52.5%
Hispanic/Latino	90	28.5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	6	1.9%
American Indian/Alaska Native	1	0.3%
Mixed	14	4.4%
Other	9	2.8%

➤ **Military Status of Unrepresented Tenants with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**

5 (1.6%) respondents of the 315 who answered the question were currently serving in the military. 16 (5.2%) respondents of the 310 who answered a follow-up question noted that they were veterans. One tenants indicated that s/e was an active member of the military and a veteran.

**PHASE THREE UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN
\$15,000 AND \$24,999**

There were a total of 130 unrepresented seniors. The table below lists their yearly income. Please note that only a total of 125 reported their incomes.

**TABLE 70: PHASE THREE BREAKDOWN OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES
BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999**

<i>Yearly Income</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 125)</i>
Less than \$15,000	69	55.2%
Between \$15,000 and \$24,999	30	24.0%
Between \$25,000 and \$34,999	17	13.6%
Between \$35,000 and \$44,999	4	3.2%
More than \$45,000	5	4.0%

This section focuses on the 30 unrepresented seniors with incomes between \$15,000 and \$24,999.

➤ ***Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes Between \$15,000 and \$24,999 by Borough***

The breakdown by borough of this group of tenants is in the table below.

**TABLE 71: PHASE THREE UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND
\$24,999 BY BOROUGH**

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 30)</i>
Manhattan	4	13.3%
Brooklyn	10	33.3%
Bronx	12	40.0%
Queens	4	13.3%

The following tables list the ZIP codes per borough.

➤ ***Manhattan ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999***

4 tenants in Manhattan listed their ZIP codes.

**TABLE 72: PHASE THREE MANHATTAN ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH
INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999**

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 4)</i>
10027	1	25.0%
10028	1	25.0%
10032	1	25.0%
10033	1	25.0%

➤ **Brooklyn ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**
 10 tenants in Brooklyn listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 73: PHASE THREE BROOKLYN ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 10)</i>
11201	1	10.0%
11203	1	10.0%
11206	2	20.0%
11207	1	10.0%
11208	1	10.0%
11212	1	10.0%
11221	1	10.0%
11234	1	10.0%
11236	1	10.0%

➤ **Bronx ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**
 All 12 tenants in the Bronx listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 74: PHASE THREE BRONX ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 12)</i>
10453	3	25.0%
10454	1	8.3%
10456	1	8.3%
10457	2	16.7%
10458	1	8.3%
10466	2	16.7%
10467	1	8.3%
10473	1	8.3%

➤ **Queens ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**
 3 tenants in Queens listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 75: PHASE THREE QUEENS ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 3)</i>
11372	1	33.3%
11374	1	33.3%
11692	1	33.3%

➤ **Household Compositions of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**

Respondents reported that between one and five people lived in their apartment, with an average of 2.0 (SD=1.3).

TABLE 76: PHASE THREE HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITIONS OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Number of People in Household</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 30)</i>
1	13	43.3%
2	10	33.3%
3	2	6.7%
4	3	10.0%
5	2	6.7%

26 seniors indicated the number of children living with them.

TABLE 77: PHASE THREE HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN AND UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Number of Children Under 18</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 26)</i>
None	19	73.1%
1	5	19.2%
2	2	7.7%

➤ **Ages of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**

28 of these seniors listed their age.

TABLE 78: PHASE THREE AGES OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Tenant Age</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 28)</i>
62 (born in 1944)	1	3.6%
63 (born in 1943)	5	17.9%
64 (born in 1942)	3	10.7%
65 (born in 1941)	3	10.7%
66 (born in 1940)	3	10.7%
67 (born in 1939)	3	10.7%
68 (born in 1938)	1	3.6%
71 (born in 1935)	1	3.6%
72 (born in 1934)	1	3.6%
73 (born in 1933)	1	3.6%
74 (born in 1932)	2	7.1%
77 (born in 1929)	1	3.6%
79 (born in 1927)	1	3.6%
82 (born in 1924)	1	3.6%
92 (born in 1914)	1	3.6%

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

➤ **Sources of Income of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**

Tenants were also asked to specify their source of income. Percentages refer to the number of tenants of the entire sample (30) who chose that response. Please note the respondents were able to report more than one source of income.

TABLE 79: PHASE THREE SOURCES OF INCOME OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Source of Income</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 30)</i>
Employment	7	23.3%
Public assistance	3	10.0%
Social security	21	70.0%
Pension	7	23.3%
Disability	3	10.0%
Workers compensation	1	3.3%
SSI	1	3.3%
Other (friends)	2	6.7%

➤ **Racial or Ethnic Backgrounds of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**

All respondents indicated their race.

TABLE 80: PHASE THREE RACE AND ETHNICITY OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Race</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 30)</i>
White	4	13.3%
Black/African American	15	50.0%
Hispanic/Latino	8	26.7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	3.3%
Mixed	1	3.3%
Other	1	3.3%

➤ **Military Status of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999**

One (3.3%) respondent was currently serving in the military. 4 (13.3%) noted that they were veterans. One tenant reported being an active member of the military and a veteran.

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

There were 17 unrepresented seniors with incomes between \$25,000 and \$34,999. This section focuses on these tenants.

➤ ***Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes Between \$25,000 and \$34,999 by Borough***

The breakdown by borough of this group of tenants is in the table below.

TABLE 81: PHASE THREE UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999 BY BOROUGH

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 17)</i>
Manhattan	3	17.6%
Brooklyn	6	35.3%
Bronx	4	23.5%
Queens	3	17.6%
Staten Island	1	5.9%

The following tables list the ZIP codes per borough.

➤ ***Manhattan ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999***

2 tenants in Manhattan listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 82: PHASE THREE MANHATTAN ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 2)</i>
10003	1	50.0%
10037	1	50.0%

➤ ***Brooklyn ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999***

6 tenants in Brooklyn listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 83: PHASE THREE BROOKLYN ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (out of 6)</i>
11201	1	16.7%
11203	1	16.7%
11210	1	16.7%
11217	1	16.7%
11226	1	16.7%
11236	1	16.7%

➤ **Bronx ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999**

4 tenants in the Bronx listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 84: PHASE THREE BRONX ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

ZIP Code	Frequency	Percent (Out of 4)
10355	1	25.0%
10455	1	25.0%
10457	1	25.0%
10472	1	25.0%

➤ **Staten Island ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999**

There was one senior on Staten Island who fell into this income group and who provided a ZIP code.

TABLE 85: PHASE THREE STATEN ISLAND ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

ZIP Code	Frequency	Percent (Out of 1)
10314	1	100%

➤ **Queens ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999**

All 3 tenants in Queens listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 86: PHASE THREE QUEENS ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

ZIP Code	Frequency	Percent (Out of 3)
11101	1	33.3%
11355	1	33.3%
11370	1	33.3%

➤ **Household Compositions of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999**

Respondents reported that between one and six people lived in their apartment, with an average of 2.4 (SD=1.6).

TABLE 87: PHASE THREE HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITIONS OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

Number of People in Household	Frequency	Percent (Out of 17)
1	7	41.2%
2	3	17.6%
3	3	17.6%
4	2	11.8%
5	1	5.9%
6	1	5.9%

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

13 of these seniors listed the number of children living with them.

TABLE 88: PHASE THREE HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN AND UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

<i>Number of Children Under 18</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 13)</i>
None	9	69.2%
1	1	7.7%
2	2	15.4%
3	1	7.7%

➤ ***Ages of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999***

12 of these seniors listed reported their age.

TABLE 89: PHASE THREE HOUSEHOLD HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN AND UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

<i>Tenant Age</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 12)</i>
63 (born in 1943)	1	8.3%
64 (born in 1942)	2	16.7%
65 (born in 1941)	2	16.7%
66 (born in 1940)	1	8.3%
67 (born in 1939)	1	8.3%
68 (born in 1938)	1	8.3%
69 (born in 1937)	1	8.3%
73 (born in 1933)	1	8.3%
74 (born in 1932)	1	8.3%
79 (born in 1927)	1	8.3%

➤ ***Sources of Income of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999***

Tenants were also asked to specify their source of income. Percentages refer to the number of tenants of the entire sample (17) who chose that response. Please note the respondents were able to report more than one source of income.

TABLE 90: PHASE THREE SOURCES OF INCOME OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

<i>Source of Income</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 17)</i>
Employment	9	52.9%
Public assistance	1	5.9%
Social security	8	47.1%
Pension	4	23.5%
Disability	2	11.8%
Other (family)	3	17.6%

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

➤ **Racial or Ethnic Background of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999**

All respondents indicated their race or ethnicity.

TABLE 91: PHASE THREE RACE OR ETHNICITY OF UNREPRESENTED SENIORS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

<i>Race</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 17)</i>
White	3	17.6%
Black/African American	9	52.9%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	5.9%
Mixed	2	11.8%
Other	2	11.8%

➤ **Military Status of Unrepresented Seniors with Incomes Between \$25,000 and \$34,999**

None of these seniors were currently serving in the military. 3 (18.8%) respondents of the 16 who the question noted that they were veterans. No tenant indicated actively serving the military and being a veteran.

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

**UNREPRESENTED TENANTS IN THE MILITARY WITH INCOMES BETWEEN
\$15,000 AND \$24,999**

14 tenants were unrepresented and at the time of the survey currently serving in the military. The table below lists their yearly income.

TABLE 92: PHASE THREE BREAKDOWN OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS IN THE MILITARY WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Yearly Income</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 14)</i>
Less than \$15,000	6	42.9%
Between \$15,000 and \$24,999	5	35.7%
Between \$25,000 and \$34,999	1	7.1%
Between \$35,000 and \$44,999	2	14.3%

This section focuses on the five unrepresented tenants currently in the military with incomes between \$15,000 and \$24,999.

➤ ***Unrepresented Tenants in the Military with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,999 by Borough***

The breakdown by borough of this group is below.

TABLE 93: PHASE THREE UNREPRESENTED TENANTS IN THE MILITARY WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999 BY BOROUGH

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 5)</i>
Manhattan	1	20.0%
Bronx	1	20.0%
Queens	3	60.0%

The following tables list the ZIP codes per borough.

➤ ***Manhattan ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Tenants in the Military with Incomes \$15,000-\$24,999***

TABLE 94: PHASE THREE MANHATTAN ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS IN THE MILITARY WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 1)</i>
10033	1	100%

➤ ***Bronx ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Tenants in the Military with Incomes \$15,000-\$24,999***

TABLE 95: PHASE THREE BRONX ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS IN THE MILITARY WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 1)</i>
10472	1	100%

➤ **Queens ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Tenants in the Military with Incomes \$15,000-\$24,999**

TABLE 96: PHASE THREE QUEENS ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS IN THE MILITARY WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 3)</i>
11104	1	33.3%
11374	1	33.3%
11422	1	33.3%

➤ **Household Compositions of Unrepresented Tenants in the Military with Incomes \$15,000-\$24,999**

Respondents reported that between one and five people lived in their apartment, with an average of 3.2 (SD=1.80\).

TABLE 97: PHASE THREE HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITIONS OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS IN THE MILITARY WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Number of People In Household</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 5)</i>
1	1	20.0%
2	1	20.0%
3	1	20.0%
5	2	40.0%

Five reported whether they lived with children under 18 years of age. Three of these five reported that they lived with children under 18.

TABLE 98: PHASE THREE HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN AND UNREPRESENTED TENANTS IN THE MILITARY WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Number of Children Under 18</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 5)</i>
None	2	40.0%
1	1	20.0%
2	2	40.0%

➤ **Ages of Unrepresented Tenants in the Military with Incomes \$15,000-\$24,999**

One respondent (20.0%) was 62 years and older. That tenant was born in 1932 (74 years of age).

➤ **Sources of Income of Unrepresented Tenants in the Military with Incomes \$15,000-\$24,999**

Tenants were also asked to specify their source of income. Percentages refer to the number of tenants of the entire sample (5) who chose that response. Please note the respondents were able to report more than one source of income.

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

TABLE 99: PHASE THREE SOURCES OF INCOME OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS IN THE MILITARY WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Source of Income</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 5)</i>
Employment	2	40.0%
Public assistance	1	20.0%
Social security	1	20.0%

➤ ***Racial or Ethnic Backgrounds of Unrepresented Tenants in the Military with Incomes \$15,000- \$24,999***

All respondents indicated their race or ethnicity.

TABLE 100: PHASE THREE RACE AND ETHNICITY OF UNREPRESENTED TENANTS IN THE MILITARY WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Race</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 5)</i>
Black/African American	3	60.0%
Hispanic/Latino	2	40.0%

➤ ***Military Status of Unrepresented Tenants in the Military with Incomes \$15,000- \$24,999***

While all tenants were currently serving in the military, only one (20.0%) reported being a veteran.

<i>**Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.</i>
--

**UNREPRESENTED TENANTS IN THE MILITARY WITH INCOMES BETWEEN
\$25,000 AND \$34,999**

There was only one unrepresented tenant in the military with an income between \$25,000 and \$34,999. That tenant lived in Brooklyn (ZIP code 11216). That tenant lived alone with no children under 18 years of age. Further, this tenant was not a senior. This tenant's income came from employment. The tenant's race was African American and s/he reported being a veteran.

UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

There were 58 unrepresented veterans. 56 reported their incomes.

TABLE 101: PHASE THREE BREAKDOWN OF UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Yearly Income</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 56)</i>
Less than \$15,000	15	26.8%
Between \$15,000 and \$24,999	16	28.6%
Between \$25,000 and \$34,999	12	20.2%
Between \$35,000 and \$44,999	4	7.1%
More than \$45,000	9	15.5%

This section focuses on the 16 unrepresented veterans with incomes between \$15,000 and \$24,999.

➤ ***Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,000 by Borough***

The breakdown of this group of tenants by borough is in the table below.

TABLE 102: PHASE THREE UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999 BY BOROUGH

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 16)</i>
Manhattan	4	25.0%
Brooklyn	1	6.3%
Bronx	4	25.0%
Queens	6	37.5%
Staten Island	1	6.3%

The following tables list the ZIP codes per borough.

➤ ***Manhattan ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes - \$15,000 - \$24,000***

All 4 tenants in Manhattan listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 103: PHASE THREE UNREPRESENTED MANHATTAN ZIP CODES OF VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (out of 4)</i>
10029	1	25.0%
10032	1	25.0%
10033	1	25.0%
10039	1	25.0%

➤ **Brooklyn ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,000**

TABLE 104: PHASE THREE BROOKLYN ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 1)</i>
11235	1	100%

➤ **Bronx ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,000**

All 4 tenants in the Bronx listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 105: PHASE THREE BRONX ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 4)</i>
10453	2	50.0%
10461	1	25.0%
10467	1	25.0%

➤ **Staten Island ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,000**

TABLE 106: PHASE THREE STATEN ISLAND ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 1)</i>
10314	1	100%

➤ **Queens ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,000**

5 tenants in Queens listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 107: PHASE THREE QUEENS ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 5)</i>
11368	2	40.0%
11374	1	20.0%
11423	1	20.0%
11428	1	20.0%

➤ **Household Compositions of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,000**

Respondents reported that between one and nine people lived in their apartment, with an average of 2.4 (SD=1.6).

TABLE 108: PHASE THREE HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITIONS OF UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Number of People in Household</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 16)</i>
1	8	50.0%
2	3	18.8%
3	2	12.5%
4	1	6.3%
5	1	6.3%
9	1	6.3%

13 reported whether or not they lived with a child under 18.

TABLE 109: PHASE THREE HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN AND UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Number of Children Under 18</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 13)</i>
None	8	61.5%
1	4	30.8%
2	1	7.7%

➤ **Ages of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$15,000-\$24,000**

3 respondents (5.2%) indicated that they were 62 years and older.

TABLE 110: PHASE THREE AGES OF UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Tenant Age</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 3)</i>
63 (born in 1943)	1	33.3%
72 (born in 1934)	1	33.3%
74 (born in 1932)	1	33.3%

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

➤ **Sources of Income of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,000**

Tenants were also asked to specify their source of income. Percentages refer to the number of tenants of the entire sample (16) who chose that response. Please note the respondents were able to report more than one source of income.

TABLE 111: PHASE THREE SOURCES OF INCOME OF UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Source of Income</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 16)</i>
Employment	11	68.8%
Social security	4	25.0%
Veteran's benefits	1	6.3%
Pension	3	18.8%
Disability	2	12.5%
SSI	1	6.3%

➤ **Racial or Ethnic Backgrounds of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,000**

All 16 respondents indicated their race or ethnicity.

TABLE 112: PHASE THREE RACE AND ETHNICITY OF UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$15,000 AND \$24,999

<i>Race</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 16)</i>
White	3	18.8%
Black/African American	8	50.0%
Hispanic/Latino	4	25.0%
Mixed	1	6.3%

➤ **Military Status of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$15,000 - \$24,000**

While all tenants were veterans, one respondent reported currently serving in the military.

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

There were 12 unrepresented veterans with incomes between \$25,000 and \$34,999. This section focuses on these tenants.

➤ ***Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999 by Borough***

The breakdown of this group of tenants by borough is in the table below.

TABLE 113: PHASE THREE UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999 BY BOROUGH

<i>Borough</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 12)</i>
Manhattan	1	8.3%
Brooklyn	3	25.0%
Bronx	5	41.7%
Queens	3	25.0%

The following tables list the ZIP codes per borough.

➤ ***Manhattan ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999***

The ZIP code for the one tenant in Manhattan is below.

TABLE 114: PHASE THREE MANHATTAN ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 1)</i>
10039	1	100%

➤ ***Brooklyn ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999***

3 tenants in Brooklyn listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 115: PHASE THREE BROOKLYN ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

<i>ZIP Code</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 3)</i>
11216	1	33.3%
11217	1	33.3%
11236	1	33.3%

➤ **Bronx ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999**

All 5 tenants in the Bronx listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 116: PHASE THREE BRONX ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

ZIP Code	Frequency	Percent (Out of 5)
10355	1	20.0%
10407	1	20.0%
10451	1	20.0%
10452	1	20.0%
10472	1	20.0%

➤ **Queens ZIP Codes of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999**

All 3 tenants in Queens listed their ZIP codes.

TABLE 117: PHASE THREE QUEENS ZIP CODES OF UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

ZIP Code	Frequency	Percent (Out of 3)
11370	1	33.3%
11374	1	33.3%
11692	1	33.3%

➤ **Household Compositions of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999**

Respondents reported that between one and four people lived in their apartment, with an average of 2.2 (SD=0.9).

TABLE 118: PHASE THREE HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITIONS OF UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

Number of People in Household	Frequency	Percent (Out of 12)
1	3	25.0%
2	5	41.7%
3	3	25.0%
4	1	8.3%

11 tenants reported whether they lived with children.

TABLE 119: PHASE THREE HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN AND UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

Number of Children Under 18	Frequency	Percent (Out of 11)
None	6	54.5%
1	3	27.3%
2	1	9.1%
3	1	9.1%

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

➤ ***Ages of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999***

Three of these tenants were seniors. Two reported their age: one was 63 (born in 1943) and one was 67 (born in 1939).

➤ ***Sources of Income of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999***

Tenants were also asked to specify their source of income. Percentages refer to the number of tenants of the entire sample (12) who chose that response. Please note the respondents were able to report more than one source of income.

TABLE 120: PHASE THREE SOURCES OF INCOME OF UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

<i>Source of Income</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 12)</i>
Employment	8	66.7%
Public assistance	1	8.3%
Social security	1	8.3%
Disability	1	8.3%
Other (Housing Stability Plus)	2	16.7%

➤ ***Racial or Ethnic Backgrounds of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999***

All 12 respondents indicated their race.

TABLE 121: PHASE THREE SOURCES OF INCOME OF UNREPRESENTED VETERANS WITH INCOMES BETWEEN \$25,000 AND \$34,999

<i>Race</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (Out of 12)</i>
White	2	16.7%
Black/African American	8	66.7%
Hispanic/Latino	1	8.3%
Mixed	1	8.3%

➤ ***Military Status of Unrepresented Veterans with Incomes \$25,000 - \$34,999***

All 12 of these tenants were veterans and one (8.3%) was currently serving in the military.

****Note that percentages derived from small subgroups of will have higher margins of error and therefore may not reflect the larger population of tenants defending against eviction in New York City Housing Courts.**

PHASE THREE CONCLUSIONS

The Phase Three survey results presented in this section data about the characteristics of tenants in New York City Housing Court who are facing eviction. The survey was in-depth and aimed at learning about the income and legal representation of those over 62 and with disabilities. It was administered to access as many tenants as possible, including enough in these target categories to provide preliminary data on their characteristics.

The Phase Three survey instrument was streamlined based on responses to the Phase One survey. In Phase Three, surveyors spent more days in Housing Courts and therefore were able to obtain an even larger survey sample than with Phase One. Both the Phase One and the Phase Three surveys provide the most accurate data within this study regarding the characteristics of tenants in New York City Housing Courts. However, results should be interpreted and applied with caution with regard to smaller subgroups of this survey, because smaller subgroups will have larger margins of error, as this report explains on page 4.

PHASE THREE SURVEYORS' REFLECTIONS

As surveyors conducted the Phase Three surveys, they spent many hours as field researchers, which gave them the opportunity to observe some of the conditions of New York City Housing Courts. They felt that those conditions should be reported in a qualitative way, in addition to the quantitative survey results. After the surveys were completed, surveyors were therefore asked to submit written reflections on their experiences. Those reflections are summarized in this section.

Surveyors made observations about imbalances of power in Housing Courts, and they felt that the courts helped to reinforce societal stratifications of race, class, and gender. As one surveyor observed, cases drag on and wear down tenants, many of whom are single women of color on low, fixed incomes, whose cases are hurt by the fact that they have to take time off from work to spend the day in court. Language barriers, for Spanish-speaking tenants in particular, which seemed to be most pronounced in the Bronx, also added to the power imbalances.

A Legal Aid lawyer summarized the Housing Court system to a surveyor; judges are overloaded with 60-70 cases per day and want to resolve most of them by lunchtime, so they superficially read contracts between tenants and landlords. Surveyors sometimes noted that judges were condescending to tenants, and tenants were deferential to judges. Judges frequently instruct tenants, landlords, and lawyers (most of whom are landlords' lawyers) to go into the hallways to speak to one another, and surveyors noted that the hallways had moods of tension, anxiety, "paranoia," and "palpable emotion". Lawyers behaved inappropriately and "harassed", "badgered," or "bullied" tenants in the hallways.

Some surveyors made observations that they frequently saw someone who appeared to be a landlord's lawyer working with a tenant, and tenants seemed as if they felt that they had no choice but to come to an agreement. They heard comments by lawyers to tenants such as, "that's never going to happen," or "tell that to the judge; don't tell me." One surveyor observed an interaction in which a lawyer asked a tenant, "so noise isn't an issue any longer?" The tenant said that noise was in fact still a problem, the lawyer replied using legal jargon that he could not put that into a stipulation, and then again asked the tenant, "so noise isn't an issue any longer?" Another surveyor reported watching a white male landlord harass a black female tenant, who was crying, while the lawyer only watched; the landlord asked the woman why she would only take temporary jobs that did not allow her to pay the rent and told her that someone else who could pay rent should occupy her apartment. Another lawyer watched as a landlord pointed his finger and yelled at a woman holding an infant. In yet another case, a landlord's lawyer interrupted a survey interview to speak to a tenant; the surveyor stepped aside and listened as the lawyer asked the tenant why she could not pay her rent, since her rent was inexpensive. The tenant also began to cry, the lawyer went away, and the surveyor and a court officer were left to comfort the tenant.

Some lawyers told surveyors that tenants do not need representation for these types of cases (while they were in fact representing landlords). One landlord's lawyer told a surveyor that he supported the project, because he knows that other lawyers representing landlords behave in sneaky ways in order to "get one over" on tenants. There were indications that landlords were interested in removing tenants from apartments in order to raise rent. A surveyor observed lawyers who intimidated a woman and told her that she could not win her case, but they also told her that the landlord would pay her to end a lawsuit, provided she leave her apartment. Another tenant, who lived in a gentrifying

neighborhood in Manhattan, was brought to court after his landlord entered the apartment to make repairs and noticed several beds in the apartment; there was one more tenant than the lease allowed living in the apartment. The landlord also claimed that the tenant had another primary residence. The tenant showed the surveyor that he had documentation to support his case, but he did not know what to do with it.

One landlord followed a surveyor and interrupted her interviews, until she told the landlord that she was going to ask a court officer to intervene and the landlord left her alone. Some landlords were pleasant to surveyors, while some were hostile. Some landlords said that they felt they should have their own survey and seemed upset that only tenants' issues were being addressed. There were "stereotypical rants" by landlords who felt that tenants have too many rights, and one referred to tenants as "scum". One surveyor commented on the "other side of the coin" – that landlords are not always the bad guys.

Legal Aid and/or other similar services are insufficient, according to what some tenants told surveyors. Some felt that they had a good lawyer, but others suggested that the services are inadequate because they are free of charge. Some tenants had stories of phone calls not returned, or such long delays that they had to go to court before they were able to obtain legal representation. One woman reported that she called an office at 8:50 a.m., was told to call back at 9:00 a.m., and when she called at 9:10 she was told that no one was available. Some tenants said that their incomes were too high, so they were not eligible for services. There were complaints that one organization had given bad advice, and tenants' experiences with that organization were unpleasant.

NEW YORK CITY HOUSING COURT SURVEYS 2005-2006 CONCLUSIONS

The results presented in this report represent three surveys conducted in New York City Housing Courts between December 2005 and May 2006. The goals of this research were to understand characteristics of tenants who are the subject of eviction proceedings in Housing Court, and to obtain an estimate of the number and percentage of these tenants who are age 62 and older. The research also sought to determine the percentage of tenants, age 62 and older, who are unrepresented and have incomes under \$25,000.

In Phase One and Phase Three of this research, conducted in December 2005 and April-May of 2006, the goal was to gather an adequate sample size of tenants in eviction proceedings in Housing Court, in order to illuminate these characteristics. Both the Phase One and Phase Three surveys provide the most accurate data within this study regarding the characteristics of tenants in New York City Housing Courts. However, we caution once again that the numbers of tenants within some of those subgroups are very small and therefore cannot necessarily be generalized to the larger population of all tenants in New York City Housing Courts.

In addition, in Phase One and Phase Three, the survey researchers were instructed to over-sample tenants over the age of 62. That is, they were more likely to approach someone who appeared older. This also allowed breakdowns of data for tenants age 62 and older, because they were a particular group of interest for this research. The Phase One and Phase Three surveys were not aimed purely at obtaining a proportional representation of who appears in Housing Court by age. Furthermore, surveyors were not able to approach tenants in a systematic fashion in Phases One and Three because of the nature of those surveys, which took place in the hallways of Housing Courts. Therefore, we believe that the percent of seniors found in this survey sample (11.5%) and the percent found in the December 2005 survey sample (15.4%) are both over-estimates of the actual occurrence of tenants age 62 and older in New York City Housing Courts.

Phase Two of this research was a less in-depth survey—that is, with fewer questions—implemented in a sample of housing parts, where surveyors were able to approach tenants in a systematic fashion in order to obtain a representative sample. In Phase Two of this research, a shorter survey was conducted in courtrooms rather than hallways, and tenants were interviewed more systematically. This represents the most accurate estimate for this research of the occurrence of seniors. This survey found that 6.4% of tenants who are the subject of eviction proceedings in Housing Court were age 62 and over.

Because Phase One and Phase Three captured larger groups of tenants age 62 and older, those two surveys best answer the question, of tenants defending against eviction in Housing Courts age 62 and older, what percent are also unrepresented, and have incomes under \$25,000?

- In Phase One there were 58 people who reported that they were age 62 and older, and 23, or 39.7%, of those 58 seniors also reported that they were unrepresented and had incomes under \$25,000.

- In Phase Three there were 205 people who reported that they were age 62 and older, and 99 of those 205 seniors, or 48.3%, also reported that they were unrepresented and had incomes under \$25,000.

Without further research, such as a longitudinal study, we cannot say exactly why the Phase One and Phase Three estimates are different or which is the better estimate. We can speculate that there may be seasonal differences among tenants who come to Housing Court to defend against eviction, but we do not know what those may be. It may also be that the size of the subgroup of tenants age 62 and older was of insufficient size for Phase One, and therefore the estimate from Phase Three is more likely to be accurate.

Phases One and Three also respectively found 23.9% and 23.8% of tenants who reported that they had legal representation for their cases. These percentages were higher than expected. One reason for the possible over-estimate of tenants with legal representation could be because we over-sampled seniors, who are more likely to have lawyers.

The Brennan Center also made follow-up phone calls to seven lawyers who are housing law experts to ask them: a) if they believed the percentages found to be accurate, b) if not, why they thought the inaccuracy occurred, c) whether they felt that tenants might believe that their landlords' lawyer was their lawyer, and d) why tenants might be confused in this way. According to these phone calls our estimate of tenants in general and seniors specifically with lawyers were probably higher than percentages actually found in Housing Courts in New York City. Tenants might be confused about whether they have a lawyer, even if they answered "no" to the question whether the landlord's attorney is also their attorney. Possible reasons for the confusion include:

- ✓ Tenants may believe that non-advocates who offer to assist them are lawyers.
- ✓ Tenants may be confused about whether they have lawyers because of the stress and numbers of lawyers present in Housing Court; tenants may assume that they have a lawyer because there is a lawyer present.
- ✓ Tenants may be confused that the court's lawyer is their lawyer.
- ✓ Tenants may say that they have a lawyer because they are hopeful that they will have one in the future.

Possible other reasons for the over-estimate include:

- ✓ Data from Manhattan may skew the overall percentages, because tenants in Manhattan are more likely to have the financial resources to hire lawyers. (We can only speculate that tenants in Manhattan courts are more likely to have lawyers, and our sampling strategy did not account for this possibility.)
- ✓ Tenants with lawyers may be more likely to be waiting in hallways, where we did our Phase One and Three surveys.
- ✓ Surveyors may have surveyed too few individuals with limited English proficiency, who may be less likely to have attorneys.
- ✓ The Department for the Aging recently piloted a program that provided lawyers to one hundred seniors.

Finally, surveyors' reflections provide some qualitative documentation of conditions in New York City Housing Courts, which surveyors felt reinforced societal imbalances of power by race, class, and gender. Their observations were not done systematically; they were submitted after all surveys had been completed, in response to some surveyors'

wishes that their experiences and perceptions be passed along. Therefore, their reflections should be regarded as information that is supplemental to the survey data but not definitive in and of itself. Ideally, those observations would be used to guide further research if more observational data in New York City Housing Courts were to be gathered. Data from Phase One, Phase Two, and Phase Three of this survey may be used to inform policy decisions regarding New York City Housing Courts.