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Abdulla Al Shehhi
Planners have historically marginalized and held the needs of Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, and Transsexuals (LGBTs) in prejudice. This only became apparent in the aftermath of the 1999 formation of the Gays and Lesbians in Planning (GALIP) division of the American Planning Association (APA), where many planners voiced their objections through letters to the editor of the APA’s Planning Magazine. Never-the-less, this marginalization and prejudice may have begun in the middle of the 20th century, when LGBT enclaves began to come to prominence. While current literature does not suggest that LGBTs currently face direct prejudice by planners, the case still is a case of neglect (Doan, 2011; Forsyth, 2011).

The formation of LGBT enclaves is perhaps attributable to the LGBTs complex needs and their plight towards a tight knit community, while simultaneously entertaining the desire for spatial separation from other adjacent communities. Moreover, a measure of anonymity, and the presence of such sexually non-conformist communities may have attributed to the success and the continuation of these enclaves (Doan, 2011). The complex needs of the LGBT community stem from the fact that this community is formed from members of every imaginable demographic (except the heterosexual one) and socio-economic background. This also is attributable to the difficulty in the identification and service of LGBT enclaves. As such, a bi-pronged approach was necessary to undertake this thesis.

The first part of this thesis introduces and assesses a new methodology for the identification of LGBT enclaves through assessing the presence of LGBT residential clusters. Previous researchers have employed many methods, and used many datasets, such as the confidential version of the National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) (Smart & Klein, 2013), the locations of gay bars, interviews with LGBTs, and locations advertised in LGBT periodicals (Mattson, 2014). This methodology relies on a combination of datasets, including the American Community Survey (ACS), the current locations of the LGBT bars, the locations of LGBT community centers, advocacy organizations, and hospices, crime statistics from the New York Police Department (NYPD), and the times and dates of popular LGBT events such as Pride. The primary analysis will depend on NYC Taxi & Limousine Commission (TLC) data to ascertain movements and trends, between the aforementioned locales and presumably, the LGBT enclaves. This method, however, is only applicable to New York City, as it is, at the time of writing this document, the only city in the US with publically available taxi data. As such, this method may not be viable for use in other cities unless this kind of data becomes available to the researcher.
The second part of this thesis analyzes these clusters through the presence of Quality of Life Indicators as the indicative factor pursued here, and is examined within a range of socioeconomic, cultural, demographical, and geopolitical categories.

The final output of this thesis will be to verify the validity of the use of taxi cab origin-destination as a method of locating residential clusters of minority populations. In essence, this thesis answers the question of whether the use of taxicab origin-destination analysis is a valid method of locating clusters of minorities. The information obtained will be used to characterize and assess the identified LGBT clusters within the context of the aforementioned Quality of Life Indicators. This will lead to a set of recommendations aimed at improving the LGBTs quality of life, if need be.
While the presence of LGBTs in every community is timeless, their need for isolated communities is only recent, as indicated by the communities’ ascension to prominence in the 1950s (Forsyth, 2011). This need is furthered by the fact that many LGBTs flee seemingly less accepting rural locales to the more-accepting, and presumably safer, urban areas. The presence of sexual non-conformists only served to make urban LGBT enclaves more attractive. The failure of planners to account for this, as well as their neglect of such enclaves, lead these communities to face the forces of gentrification and decay all by themselves (Doan, 2011).

The gender, ethnic, and sexual variations within the LGBT community, and the resulting patterns of spatial variation and discrimination, are also often unaccounted for by planners. For example, queer places today often fail to accommodate members of sexual minorities within the LGBT community, such as bisexuals and transsexuals and other non-conformists (Doan, 2011). In a case study of the West Village in New York City, gay men of color were often ostracized in the northern section of Christopher Street (the site of the 1969 Stonewall Riots) either directly by rude glances or indirectly by the refusal of the bars in the area to sell specific kinds of liquor (such as Hennessey) or play specific genres of music (such as rap) (Irazábal & Huerta, 2015). This spatial variation is also seen in the neighborhoods where different members of the LGBT community choose to live. For example, lesbians are prone to live in neighborhoods with close proximity to schools and lower rents, since they are more likely to have child custody (Doan, 2011).

On another note, it is often the stereotype that LGBTs tend to live in affluent neighborhoods, and have a high disposable income, especially gay white males. This stereotype was further promulgated by the mass media’s portrayal of the LGBT community, where LGBT characters are often, and predominantly, affluent white gay men, as seen on popular television series such as Queer as Folk (2000 – 2005), Will & Grace (1998 – 2006), and even in the recent movie Stonewall (2015), which presented a ‘white-washed’ version of the actual events that took place in the 1969 Stonewall Riots. The inaccuracy of this claim is showcased in the case of the South of Market (SoMa), and the Tenderloin districts of San Francisco, where gay men were only able to afford to live in these enclaves by forgoing certain luxuries, such as autonomous living, in their search for a safer, more secure, neighborhood. Moreover, it is often a challenge for planners who come into contact with the LGBT community to account for the fact that individuals of varying genders and sexualities prefer to live separately while simultaneously desiring a unified community (Forsyth, 2011).
BACKGROUND

LGBT enclaves is that the fluidity of gender and sexuality predominant in these enclaves often translates to the identity of spaces. While this is often misunderstood by planners, it also makes it difficult for them account for the immediate needs of the LGBT community, especially given their fast-paced, and transient, nature. This is also exacerbated by the fact that planning processes are often slow and laden with bureaucracy. This also often leads to the failure of often well-intentioned urban policies, or cause them to provide more harm than good. Such was the case of Manchester’s gay village, situated on Canal Street, where the mayor of Manchester touted the area as popular tourist destination. This lead to a sudden influx of heterosexual tourists that resulted in LGBTs relocating, partly due to the fact that they did not feel safe in this area anymore (Al Shehhi, 2016).

Such unintended consequences have become a matter of course. Yet, some locales may use planning methods maliciously against LGBT enclaves. In 1999, the Giuliani administration of New York City used zoning laws to target adult-themed business. This legislative exercise was also used to particularly target gay establishments. Ann Forsyth also claims that the failure of planners and historic preservationists to account for buildings, and spaces, that often have monumental, or historic value to the LGBT community, lead some communities to disappear (Al Shehhi, 2016).

Moreover, planning by nature is predominantly heteronormative. Heteronormativity is defined as “the set of norms that make heterosexuality seem natural or right and that organize homosexuality as its binary opposite. This set of norms works to maintain the dominance of heterosexuality by preventing homosexuality from being a form of sexuality that can be taken for granted or go unmarked” (Doan, 2011; p. 14). This heteronormativity is shown in the perception of suburbs being where bi-parental, heterosexual, nuclear families reside, preferably in single-family owner-occupied houses. Moreover, they were thought of as non-Latino, White, and middle to upper-class communities (Anacker, 2011).

These challenges are somewhat ameliorated by United States’ Supreme Court’s ruling in favor of equal marriage rights in 2015, as well as the recognition of the same-sex couple households, both married and un-married, in the United States’ Census and American Community Survey (Al Shehhi & Giamarino, 2015). Moreover, the United States Census Bureau heeded calls towards improved estimates of same-sex couple households, where the Office of Personnel Management has required information on same-sex couples after the 2013 repeal of the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) by the United States Supreme Court (Lewis et al, 2015).

Robert Beauregard once claimed that planners
stand for those who need them,¹ and we, as planners, have not stood with one of our most vulnerable populations, a population that is a part of all genders, ethnicities, income brackets, ages and education levels. I explored some of the challenges facing planning for LGBTs, and in this thesis, I examine one facet of a problem with many faces and dimensions: where do LGBTs live and what are these places like? While there has been some literature supporting the isolation of LGBT enclaves, with claims that the socio-spatial separation provides the LGBT community with a spatio-political platform in which they can further the struggle for their rights (Irazábal & Huerta, 2015). Others claim that these enclaves are fading away, with LGBTs vying towards more heteronormative locales (Brown, 2013; Ghaziani, 2014; Madhani, 2014).

I begin this thesis with this background section, detailing some historical overview of the development of LGBT enclaves and the challenges they face through the neglect of planners. The following section details a review of current literature, examining what experts in planning, geography, and sociology have to say about this topic, in both their past and current research. In the methodology section, I devise a method of identifying LGBT enclaves through the use of taxi cab origin-destination analysis, and detail the steps towards the analysis of the data I procure. The results section details the results of the application of the enclave identification exercise. The following section undertakes an analysis of demographics, safety and security, and the possibility of gentrification. Through this analysis, I make recommendations based on how the results and analysis relate to my hypothesis. Finally, I strive to prove the null hypothesis, that there is no difference in where LGBTs live, be it in an enclave or not, to maintain academic integrity and to further the goal of an unbiased methodology and analysis.

¹ This was in a speech he gave at an orientation event at Columbia University’s Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation in September 2015.
LITERATURE REVIEW

The past few decades saw the introduction of LGBT populations into research done by geographers, sociologists, anthropologists, and planners (Moore, 2015). While this work attempts to introduce a new methodology to identify LGBT enclaves, and performs several analyses on identified enclaves in New York City, it was necessary to obtain a theoretical background prior to undertaking the quantitative analysis. The observed literature covered various themes that I to condense and synthesize to my research exercise.

Urban planning is a predominantly heteronormative field, where heteronormativity is the set of beliefs and practices that pertain to heterosexuality as a matter of norm, and moral ‘right’, and excludes any belief or practice that deviates from that heterosexuality, such as homosexuality and all that is related to it. Heteronormativity maintains the superiority of heterosexuality by disallowing homosexuality to be perceived as morally ‘right’ and happen as a matter of course (Doan, 2011). Drawing from that heteronormativity, LGBTs faced significant marginalization and disenfranchisement from the planning community. While I previously outlined the backlash1 the formation of GALIP in the APA, it was only within the context of the planning community.

The first obstacle LGBTs had to face in order to gain any form of acceptance was to assimilate into predominantly heteronormative institutions. LGBTs would only be accepted into mainstream society as long as they don’t pose a threat to heteronormativity and dominance of heterosexuality. As such, LGBTs fought the hardest to be included into the two most traditional heteronormative institutions, marriage, and the military (Kreis, 2012). This desire to assimilate into heterosexual institutions, coupled with the demonization of LGBTs, forced them to cluster in areas where no one else wanted to live, giving rise to what is called the ‘gay ghetto’ (Kreis, 2012; Savage et al, 1999). This, arguably, provided LGBTs with a strong isolated spatial platform in which to launch their political struggle (Irazábal & Huerta, 2015; Nash et al, 2014).

Yet, the dominant question is what makes a ‘gayborhood’?2 The mere concentration of LGBT residences is not enough of a dominant factor, it is more the confluence of LGBT residences and the support infrastructure needed to maintain and serve the LGBT community.

---

1 While there was massive backlash to the formation of GALIP, there also was some support to this formation. I have chosen to omit mentioning that support for the purpose of this thesis, and to highlight the marginalization and prejudice the LGBT community faced as recently as 15 years ago, see also Doan, P. 2011.

2 I will use both ‘LGBT enclaves’ and ‘gayborhoods’ interchangeably in this document. While it may be argued that this disregards lesbian enclaves, most texts I reviewed used ‘LGBT enclaves’, ‘LGBT neighborhoods’, and ‘gayborhoods’ interchangeably.
These included the necessary commercial and social establishments required to maintain the isolation of the ‘gayborhood’ from surrounding neighborhoods. Other factors included shared history, unified action, mutual norms, and the existence of discernable social groups within the community. These enclaves were also frequently compared to ethnic enclaves, as the measures used to discern them mimicked those used to identify ethnic enclaves. One factor that seemed to be unique to LGBT enclaves is the spatial distribution of sexual orientations and genders (Forsyth, 2011).

LGBT enclaves are also not immune to the internal tensions that plague heteronormative neighborhoods. In a recent case study of New York’s West Village, it was found that LGBT Youth of Color were often excluded, either directly by denial of entry, or indirectly, by rude glances, from many establishments in the northern section of Christopher Street (Irazábal & Huerta, 2015). While some authors suggest LGBT enclaves would be more welcoming to foreign born populations and ethnic diversity, and have shown some statistics to support that (Anacker, 2011), other have noted the presence of rampant discrimination in the LGBT community, going as far as calling it ‘shameful’ (West, 2014; Irazábal & Huerta, 2015).

A multitude of authors agree that LGBT enclaves are a function of urban areas, and act as destinations for LGBTs who flee their oftentimes more conservative smaller locales to these enclaves, drawn by the promise of anonymity through the presence of many sexual non-conformists (Doan, 2011; Irazábal & Huerta, 2015; Badgett et al, 2013; Moore, 2015; Kreis, 2012; and Nash et al, 2014). It soon came to be understood that the ‘gay’ identity was hinged on being in an urban environment that was only possible through migration. This sense of mobility formed a cornerstone in which LGBT enclaves were examined, where it is only possible for anyone, especially LGBTs, to mobilize, using economic, social, and cultural capital (Nash et al, 2014).

The presence of LGBT enclaves, coupled with the success in assimilating into the main North American heteronormative institutions of marriage and the military, as well as neoliberal culture, essentially the aesthetics of the middle-class and “monogamous, consumerist coupledom” (Nash et al, 2014, p.760), introduced the nouveau concept of ‘homonormativity’. Much of the literature argues around homonormativity, where its presence, as an institution, further marginalized sexual non-conformists while positively affecting the lives of gay white men (Brown, 2009). This was further confirmed in the events after the Obergefell v. Hodges ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States. After the effective legalization of same-sex marriage, the Ford Foundation, one of the biggest funders of LGBT community effort, withdrew their
funding, citing that the main challenges were over (Hudson, 2015). The effective message this action gave was that only homonormative LGBTs were worthy of support (Al Shehhi, 2016).

Further, some authors argue that the ‘gayborhood’, or the ‘gay ghetto’, became obsolete for homonormatives, who tend to currently assimilate in both urban and surprisingly mostly suburban heteronormative neighborhoods (Anacker, 2011). This paved the way for sexual non-conformists, who were excluded from the LGBT enclaves, to inhabit them now (Nash et al, 2014). Moreover, LGBT enclaves are currently shrinking due to a multitude of reasons, including the influx of heterosexual couples who are drawn to both the touristic and cosmopolitan values of these enclaves (Doan, 2011; Nash, 2014). Moreover, the introduction of online social platforms, such as dating mobile applications, rendered moot the necessity of a dedicated space in which LGBTs can meet and mingle (Ghaziani, 2014, Nash, 2014). It, however, became arguable that the advent of these online communities eroded the physical community, in the sense that the support network made available through physical interaction in physical spaces was no more.²

It is also becoming increasingly unaffordable for LGBTs to inhabit their enclaves, due to the ravages of gentrification. The neglect of planners, coupled with the improvements that LGBTs often bring to the previously decrepit neighborhoods, often brought accompanying gentrification (Doan, 2011). More so, gentrification can also occur when new stylistic practices are brought into the urban streetscape that effectively displace poorer LGBTs, people of color, and sex workers (Mattson, 2014). The stereotype in which LGBTs are shown as high-income individuals is false, where there are claims that many gays were only able to live in some of the gayborhoods of San Francisco due to willingness to share housing (Forsyth, 2011). Moreover, other studies have shown that the poverty rates of African American same-sex couples are twice that of opposite-sex couples of the same demographics. Also, a third of lesbian couples and a fifth of gay couples without a high school diploma are below the poverty line, compared to less than a fifth of opposite-sex married couples (Badgett et al, 2013).

Yet, while there is some literature suggesting that the LGBT enclaves of the past are slowly fading away, and coming irrelevant through societal progress and tolerance, however their study is still an important endeavor. The US Census currently does not provide for an accurate estimate of LGBT populations and households, with the only discernable method

---

² Cade Hobbick, in a panel titled Planning For, With, and By The LGBT Community. February 2016. Columbia University GSAPP.
available is to enumerate the same-sex couple households appearing on the American Community Survey (ACS). The effect of the shift of LGBT enclaves towards obsolescence is alarming on many levels, where these enclaves are indicative of tolerance and progress, and the effect that their disappearance will have on urban planners and policy makers who support these communities, is unknown. Also, much of the government-funded LGBT service infrastructure is based in areas of concentration of LGBT populations, and the erosion of these neighborhoods may have unknown effects on this infrastructure. Finally, as mentioned above, these neighborhoods act as a spatio-political platform for LGBT activists, and the loss of these spaces may have huge consequences on the continuing struggle for the equality of sexual non-conformist populations (Nash et al, 2014).

More so, this thesis addresses some of the tangled arguments in planning theory and practice: whether we, as planners, should plan for people or for places. How do we plan for the improvement of ailing neighborhoods without incurring the negative effects of gentrification and displacement? Finally, how do we plan for an invisible population?

4 There are some claims that recent analysis indicates that 28% of same-sex couple households could be mis-categorized opposite-sex couple households, see Florida, 2014.

5 These questions were extracted from Dr. Clara Irazábal and Dr. David Kings commentary during my thesis jury on April 11, 2016.
Section 1. Tracking and Identification

One of the main data items for this thesis to properly assess LGBT enclaves was information about the general neighborhoods where LGBTs live. The main challenge was that the US Census does not identify households where LGBTs live, except through the identification of households where both the primary and secondary householder are of the same sex. This excluded single LGBTs, bisexuals in heteronormative relationships and transsexuals. More so, couples are not sufficiently representative of the LGBT population to enable their use as factors for an overall analysis (Wilmark et al, 2014). Therefore, I sought alternative methods of identification.

LGBT bars act as focal points to the LGBT community. They have historically been departure points for most of the gay rights movements. They also function as avenues of socializing and they anchor the gayborhoods they are in (Mattson, 2014). Moreover, the authors of the literature on LGBT enclaves collectively believed that LGBT enclaves are centered on LGBT bars, where, due to the perceived demand, LGBT bars were made available (Adriaenssens, 2011). However, given the unique circumstances of New York City, where the average cost of living is higher than the typical US city, and where the famous gayborhoods are either gentrified or in the process of gentrifying (Chelsea, West Village, Greenwich Village, and Hell’s Kitchen); it did not seem logical that the average LGBT would be able to afford to live there. As such, it became imperative to locate enclaves that are potentially separate from LGBT bars and historic LGBT enclaves.

I employed an innovative method to track these enclaves, given that no current measure of location is provided by state sources, such as the census, and other sources only pursue the more famous neighborhoods in their respective cities. The premise I pursued was that while LGBTs may not be able to live in close vicinity to LGBT bars, and given how important these bars are to the LGBT community, LGBTs will still travel to them. This, to my knowledge, is the first instance such a premise was used to determine the location of LGBT enclaves. Following that logic, and given that the standard methods of travel in New York City are varied, and diverge according to a plethora of factors, which include, but are not limited to:

1. Location,
2. Cost,
3. Time,
4. Convenience
5. Weather conditions, and
6. Origin and destination.

The assessment that was undertaken accommodated those factors and the various transportation options that ensued.
In New York City there are various transportation options to be chosen that range from walking to hailing a cab to using individual or shared private and public transportation. However, the only transportation method that can be tracked in New York City using publically available data is the taxi. Unlike cities like London, England, for example, subway users in New York City do not ‘swipe-out’ of a station as they leave the system. Therefore, there is no way of knowing where users go to after boarding a subway train at a particular station. The Taxi and Limousine Commission of New York (TLC) provides data on all taxi cab trips from 2009 to 2015 on its website.\(^1\) However, taxi cabs in New York City are split into two categories as follows:

1. Yellow Cabs (service to all the five boroughs), and
2. Green Cabs (service in Manhattan only above 110th street on the West Side, and 96th street on the East Side, and all the remaining four boroughs, excluding the airports).

METHODOLOGY

The green cabs were introduced in the summer of 2013 to help under-served areas in New York City (NYC.gov, 2016). Also, the data available for download on the TLC website were only for the years between 2009 and mid-2015 at the time of the analysis. When Al Shehhi and Giamarino (2015) ran a similar analysis for the years before the green cabs were introduced (2009 – 2013), the sheer volume of yellow cab trips in Manhattan alone simply overwhelmed the rest of the boroughs, making it impossible to identify any enclaves outside Manhattan except in a trial run of 2014 data. As such, I chose to run the analysis only in 2014, given that the 2015 data, at the time of analysis, was still incomplete.

The number of yellow-cab trips each month exceeded 150 million, and given the TLC provided the data in Excel CSV format, the data had to be filtered before they could be analyzed. Therefore, I first geocoded every LGBT bar in New York City. Then, noticing that the bars tended to visually cluster in specific areas (see Figure 2), and were usually in places where bars with predominantly heterosexual clientele were right next door, I set up a 50-foot buffer around them. This buffer is generally sufficient to include nearby street corners, where many people tend to hail taxis from. I then only considered trips that either originated or terminated in these buffers.

The yellow cab data was parsed through using the following parameters:

1. Start hour
2. End hour
3. Minimum latitude
4. Maximum latitude
5. Minimum longitude
6. Maximum longitude
7. Pickup or drop-off

After geocoding the bars and setting up the 50-foot buffers, I created square polygons around them in order to make it easier to discern the corner points of the polygons and to run the analysis (see Figure 2) using the Feature Envelope to Polygon tool on ESRI ArcMap 10.2.1, after which I used the Feature Vertices to Points tool to export the corner points of the eighty-five polygons I accumulated.

I then created all the command lines on Excel™

3 This was done through the use of a program authored by Jeremy White (http://www.blueshirt.com)
4 This denotes the start time of all trips to be considered, where for example 19 is inputted for 7 pm
5 This denotes the end time of all trips to be considered, where for example 23 is inputted for 11 pm
6 Points 4, 5, 6, and 7 form a polygon in which all trips all considered and all others that do not fall in this polygon are discarded
7 The command ‘pickup’ specifies that the software only parse out the trips where the pickup point was within the aforementioned polygon and the command ‘drop-off’ specifies that the software only parse out the trips where the drop-off point within the aforementioned polygon

This was according to the dataset used in OutgoingNYC.com
Figure 2. Map of all LGBT bars in New York City in 2014 (source: outgoingNYC).
and by inputting the parameters I had identified, I was able to export a list of commands and have Canopy™ run them on the MacOS Terminal. The result of this operation was eighty-five different Excel™ CSV files that were then compiled into a one-month pickup or drop-off file using a simple Python script (see appendix A for all command lines used).

With regard to this step of the analysis, I performed an operation on each kind of trip file, where the compiled files fell into the following categories per month:

1. Yellow cab pickup trips (trips that originated around LGBT bars) – 24 hours
2. Yellow cab drop-off trips (trips that terminated around LGBT bars) – 24 hours
3. Green cab pickup trips (trips that originated around LGBT bars) – 24 hours
4. Green cab drop-off trips (trips that terminated around LGBT bars) – 24 hours

The number of trips for both categories of taxis in New York City exceeded two billion, and at the end of this part of my methodology, I had forty-eight files for compiled trips around LGBT bars and a total of approximately 3,500,000 trips to examine.

As a control mechanism, I also separately examined trips that originated and terminated within 50-feet of a bar that seemed to serve predominantly heterosexual male clientele. This bar was located using a simple search for the most ‘bro’ bar in New York City. An article on a website called the ‘Bro Bible’ recommended a few bars, however, the only bar that seemed to exclusively serve male heterosexual clientele was known as the Iron Horse. It advertised female bartenders undertaking pseudo-sexually provocative performances at the bar, as well as other deals to attract heterosexual male clientele there. This fit in well with my methodology as the majority of LGBT bars in New York City were those that predominantly served gay male clientele (OUTgoingNYC, 2016; BroBible.com, 2014).

In order to further refine my findings and contextualize them, I only considered trips that either originated (if terminating near an LGBT bar) or terminated (if originating near an LGBT bar) in land uses that contained residential populations, according to New York City’s Department of City Planning’s (DCP) Primary Land Use Tax Lot Output (PLUTO) database. Moreover, I also refined the times of the trips as follows:


9 Land Uses considered were:
1. Land Use 01: One & Two Family Buildings
2. Land Use 02: Multi-Family Walk-Up Buildings
3. Land Use 03: Multi-Family Elevator Buildings
4. Land Use 04: Mixed Residential & Commercial Buildings
1. 10:00 pm to 4:30 am for trips originating near LGBT bars
2. 8:00 pm to 2:00 am for trips terminating near LGBT bars

The logic behind this choice is that customers are more likely to go home at those times than others, and customers are more likely to come from their homes to the bars as well. Moreover, I also discarded any trips terminating near LGBT bars for those that originated near LGBT bars, and trips that either originated or terminated outside the bounds of New York City’s five boroughs.

After geocoding the trips, and running the analysis, I ended up with a shapefile that displayed the ‘homes’ as x-y coordinates. That shapefile was then spatially joined with another shapefile that displayed the block groups of New York City, using the ‘sum’ parameter. The result of this is a shapefile showing the block groups with an attribute that contained a count of the instances where an LGBT ‘home’ occurred in that block group (see Table 1). Finally, I also chose the block group level of representation because it is the smallest geographical area that can be used to assess and display both US Census and American Community Survey data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>QN</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5891</td>
<td>BK</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Example attribute table of a block group shapefile spatially joined with a point-data shapefile

I then ran a GetisOrd Hotspot Analysis on the count of homes in those block groups, using the “Inverse-Distance-Squared” parameter, where ArcMap would run an analysis examining each point in each block group where the closer a multitude of points are to each other, the higher the score. The result would be a hotspot map indicating, at 99%, 95%, and 90% levels of confidence that these block groups indicate non-random clustering.

After compiling all the trips, I converted all the shapefiles containing the statistically significant clusters of LGBT homes into point features using the ‘Feature to Point’ tool on ArcMap. I merged them all into one ‘master’ shapefile that contained all the point data and spatially joined that shapefile to the NYC block groups file. The resulting shapefile would contain all of New York City’s block groups with a count of how many times each of them appeared as a statistically significant cluster of LGBT homes in the previous stage of analysis. I then extracted the block groups that appeared five times or more (given the four different taxi-cab data sets per month as previously explained).

---

10 The US Census Bureau defines block groups as “statistical divisions of census tracts, [and] are generally defined to contain between 600 and 3,000 people”. https://www.census.gov/geo/reference/gtc/gtc_bg.html
METHODOLOGY

Section 2. Analysis

The second stage of the methodology covers the analysis of the LGBT enclaves. The first step I undertook was to look at the following information obtained from the 2014 American Community Survey:

1. Per-capita income
2. Ethnicity
3. Population (disaggregated to Female and Male)
4. Median household income
5. Educational attainment
6. Household characteristics (presence of same-sex couple households)

The purpose of this is to discern the economic, ethnic, and social characteristics of the LGBT enclaves. It will provide context for the following analyses and a framework for the recommendations and conclusions.

The second stage of the analysis was to discern crime-trends in the LGBT enclaves, where New York City's Police Department provides crime data according to the following categories:

1. Murder: ‘The willful (non-negligent) killing of one human being by another’
2. Assault: ‘An unlawful attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury. This type of assault usually is accompanied by the use of a weapon or by means likely to produce death or great bodily harm’
3. Robbery: ‘The taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or threat of force or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear’
4. Grand Larceny: ‘The unlawful taking, carrying, leading, or riding away of property from the possession or constructive possession of another’
5. Rape: ‘The carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will’
6. Burglary: ‘The unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or a theft’
7. Grand Larceny of Motor Vehicle: ‘The theft of articles from a motor vehicle, whether locked or unlocked’

The crime categories that were utilized in this analysis were:

1. Murder
2. Robbery

---

2 Id. p. 23
3 Id. p. 21
4 Id. p. 31
5 Id. p. 17
6 Interestingly, the FBI does not consider raped males to be raped, instead, these crimes are classified as assaults. Id. p. 20
7 Id. p. 28
8 Id. p. 33
3. Felony assault, and
4. Rape

The reason these crimes were selected were because they directly affect the physical safety of the inhabitants of the enclaves. They also relate to whether a person would feel safe in their immediate environment. Researchers from MIT ran an exercise\(^9\) in 2014 where they surveyed the public to discern how safe people felt in different areas of different cities, culminating in an online map\(^10\) that showcases a plethora of values for different visually perceived safeties. The results crime analysis will be compared to the values of this map.

The NYPD crimes were geocoded onto a map where I performed a similar analysis to the one undertaken for the taxi-cab data. The aim was to discern whether LGBT enclaves were located in hot-spot or cold-spot areas of crime. However, given that the NYPD geocodes crime on either the closest street corner to where the crime took place or on a specific street segment, depending on the crime report, the inverse-distance squared parameter could not be used for analysis. Gaido, Moon, and Paty (2015) analyzed crime data in New York City they utilized the ‘Fixed-Distance Band’ parameter, where in the

Analysis ArcMap uses a user-determined distance to assess clustering and statistical significance.

In order to determine this distance, the Getis-Ord General G function on ArcMap (as opposed to the Gi*, that is used to determine the hot-spots), will be used with a Fixed-Distance Band parameter in increasing increments of 100 ft. (from 100 ft. to 2,500 ft.). After each analysis, the G-score will be assessed and the incremental value with the highest G-score will be taken as the optimum distance to be used in the Hotspot Analysis.

The final measure of analysis I undertook was to assess the presence of LGBT community centers, advocacy organizations, and hospices. The locations of these were determined through utilizing the New York State Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Health and Human Services Network and these locations were then geocoded onto a map. A spatial distance analysis was undertaken and this analysis was compared to the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the enclaves, and was used to make policy recommendations to New York City.

---

9 StreetScore - Predicting the Perceived Safety of One Million Streetscapes. Nikhil Naik, Jade Philipoom, Ramesh Raskar and César A. Hidalgo. CVPR Workshop on Web-scale Vision and Social Media (2014)
10 http://streetscore.media.mit.edu/
Results and Preliminary Analysis

The identification exercise of the LGBT enclaves was generally successful, and the block groups identified as being LGBT enclaves in New York City appear to be dispersed between three of the five boroughs (see map 1). There were no LGBT enclaves in both Staten Island and the Bronx that appeared in this analysis. This may be due to a variety of reasons, where in the case of Staten Island, taxi cabs are often reluctant to take passengers to the island even though they are required by law to do so. This reluctance can manifest into pickup bias where taxi cabs may refuse to carry Staten Islanders. With regard to the Bronx, it is a borough that is very well served by public transit, and given that three quarters of the LGBT bars of New York City were within a quarter-mile radius of a subway stop, it is conceivable that the majority of LGBT clientele at LGBT bars opted to use the cheaper and more accessible subway system over a taxicab.

There were 356 block groups that appeared as LGBT enclaves, with a total population of 562,596 persons. Given that the population of New York City was roughly 8.5 million in 2014 (US Census)\(^1\) and roughly 6.2 million were over the age of 21 (US Census), this analysis represents just over 6.5% percent of the city’s population. Moreover, and according to a Gallup poll released in 2015, only 3.8% of Americans identify as LGBT (Newport, 2015). The percentage of adults who identify as LGBT in the New York Metropolitan Area (New York-Newark-Jersey City, N.Y.-N.J.-P.A.) was not so much higher than the national average, at 4.0%, indicating that the LGBT population of New York City is likely to approximately be 250,000\(^2\) (Newport et al, 2015).

Block groups with high concentrations of LGBTs tended to cluster together, with only a few that were isolated from the rest of the LGBT enclaves, however, given that block groups can reach populations of about 3,000 individuals, it is conceivable that the isolated block groups function as LGBT enclaves on their own.


\(^2\) Assuming a total population of 6.2 million.
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Map 1. The LGBT Enclaves and bars of New York City
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With regard to the control analysis undertaken, the majority of the residential origin and destination points appeared south of 59th street in Manhattan, most of which were also in areas identified as those of LGBT clusters. This refutes the assumption that in New York City LGBT enclaves are segregated. However, many pickup and drop off points also occur far from a few of the LGBT clusters, such as those in Brooklyn, Queens, and northern Manhattan. This control exercise further reinforces the fact that bar-goers are also likely to use the subway system if there’s a link to their area of residence, given that only one data point appears in the Bronx. Whether this control measure invalidates the taxicab origin-destination methodology is debatable because the analysis did locate clusters in well-known and historic LGBT enclaves, such as Harlem and Jackson Heights in Queens. This control only realistically refuted the segregation assumption taken.

The United States Census Data Analysis

The United States Census data, obtained from the American Community Survey, yielded some interesting findings. The first factor that was examined with population, where populations in block groups reached values exceeding 10,000 individuals in some cases. Most of the block groups attributable to LGBT enclaves had populations ranging from 2,000 to 3,000, with some having lower populations and others with higher populations. A few outliers had populations reaching 10,000. The mean population was approximately 1,500, and the data formed a relatively normal distribution tailing towards the left (see Map 2).

The second parameter to be examined was the sex ratio of the enclaves, in an attempt to discern predominantly male or predominantly female enclaves. Also, the population examined was that aged 21 years and older, since the legal age to enter bars is 21 (23 U.S. Code § 158). Discerning enclaves where individuals do not identify as either ‘female’ or ‘male’ was impossible because the American Community Survey, when asking for gender, only gives a ‘female’ and ‘male’ option (see appendix). As such, a sex ratio examination was undertaken, with the gender-ratio calculated using the following formula:

\[
\text{Sex Ratio} = \frac{\text{Population of Males}}{\text{Population of Females}}
\]

The resulting number provided a ratio of males to females, so, for example, a ratio of 0.8 indicates that there are eighty males to every one hundred females in a given block group. The median ratio for the enclaves was 0.86 males to every female, however, there were some block groups with ratios as low as 0.2 and as high as 40. While I am inclined to believe that this may indicate predominantly gay or lesbian enclaves, further analysis must be undertaken to further understand these block groups.
Map E1: Residential origin and destination points corresponding to the Iron Horse Bar in 2014.
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Sources: OUTgoing NYC, TLC Trip Record Data, NYC PLUTO, and 2014 ACS
Map by: Abdulla Al Shehhi
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The third measure of analysis using the American Community Survey was the racial/ethnic distribution of the LGBT enclaves. While the US Census Bureau has an extensive classification system for ethnicities, it was simplified in this research to the following categories:

1. African American,
2. Asian,
3. Hispanic or Latino, and
4. White (non-Hispanic or Latino).

The reason for this is that these four races/ethnicities represent the largest ethnic groups in the United States (US Census), and the presence of another dominant ethnic group in a block group in New York City is unlikely. The method that was applied here is to examine the populations pertaining to each ethnic group, and represent the population that was the largest in each enclave. The results appear to indicate that the largest racial/ethnic presence within the LGBT enclaves is of Whites, followed by Hispanic or Latinos, Asians, and finally African Americans. Also, diverse enclaves tended to cluster together in pockets, as can be noted from map 4, and as can be seen from the patterns between Hispanic or Latino enclaves, and Asian enclaves. African American enclaves were few and generally far between. A more in-depth analysis would have to be run to examine ethnic diversity within the block groups themselves, however, it appears to be safe to say that the enclaves currently lack diversity, and have some form of racial/ethnic segregation.

The fourth measure of analysis that was undertaken was education, where the percentage of the population having a bachelor degree or higher, and who were over the age of 25\(^1\) were considered. While many of the enclaves had high percentages of individuals over the age of 25 and with college degrees, the case was that enclaves with large numbers of minority members were less likely to have high percentages of individuals who went to college.

\(^{1}\) This age was selected as it is the age used by the US Census Bureau to assess whether someone had a bachelor degree and above.
RESULTS AND PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

Sex Ratio (Adults Age 21 and Over)
Males to Females

- LGBT Enclaves
- Up to 0.2
- 0.2 - 0.4
- 0.4 - 0.6
- 0.6 - 0.8
- 0.8 - 1.0
- 1.0 - 2.0
- More than 2.0

The LGBT Enclaves of New York City

- LGBT Bar

Largest Ethnic Presence

- Asian
- Black
- Latino
- White

Map 4. Ethnic Distribution of LGBT Enclaves (Source: 2014 ACS)
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Map 5. Percent of population 25 years or older with a bachelor degree or higher (source: 2014 ACS).
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Leading on from education, income was examined in a bi-pronged approach. The first approach was examining median household income per block group. The median household income for New York City in 2014 (in 2014 adjusted dollars) was US$52,223 (Roberts, 2014), and the enclaves seemed to tend towards a median household income higher than that of the median household income for New York City, however, those below that median, on average, were ethnic minority enclaves. Therefore, a more exact measure of analysis had to be undertaken, where per-capita income was examined.

When mapping the per-capita income of the enclaves, a more telling picture emerged. Block groups with lower income tended to be those with a majority of ethnic minorities, as well as those pertaining to lower education levels. However, that said, the appearance of block groups with extremely high per-capita incomes was rare, with one outlier the Chelsea neighborhood indicating a per-capita income of $380,045; which was more than seven times as high as the median household income. Also, given the diversity of income within the block groups, a median value for per-capita income could not be established, rather, most incomes fell from $50,000 to $150,000 per annum.

**Crime Data Analysis**
The next stage of analysis examined crime data from the New York Police Department through the year of 2014. As was previously mentioned, the four crimes examined were murder, rape, robbery, and assault.

With regard to murders and rapes in 2014, the relatively few number of data points made the hot-spot clustering analysis impossible, as murders and rapes in New York City that year were numerically insufficient for pertinent statistical analysis. The instances of these crimes were, however, geocoded onto a map and a superficial examination ensued.

The occurrence of murders and rapes within the vicinity of the LGBT enclaves was rare, with only a relative few of each occurring within the enclaves in 2014. This leads to the assumption that the higher occurrence of these crimes within the Manhattan enclaves was due to reasons other than the fact that these are areas of concentration of LGBT residents. Further analysis of these individual crimes would be necessary to discern that. Moreover, given that NYPD does not release data on hate crimes, such analysis would have to be run through the use of past news coverage.
Murders and Rapes (2014)

LGBT Enclaves
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Both the assault and robbery categories were sufficiently enumerated to convey a sense of density of occurrence portrayed through a hotspot analysis. With regard to assault, only a few of the enclaves were within the hotspots for assault found in the analysis, while others were adjacent to hotspots while being relatively safer themselves. It also appears that the assault hotspots occurred for reasons other than that a specific location was a LGBT enclave, given that the hotspots which the LGBT enclaves intersected were part of a broader geographic area.

The main example here is the hotspot occurring towards the north west of Manhattan and the south west of the Bronx, where the enclaves occurring in this hotspot seemed to be embroiled in the danger of a wider area. Moreover, the fact that some enclaves exist just outside of this hotspot seems to indicate that enclaves may tend to gravitate towards safer areas. This is further exemplified through observing the enclaves in the Queens corridor, where only the eastern edge is part of an assault hotspot, and even then, the clustering of block groups with significant LGBT populations is less. On the other hand, and with regard to the hotspot occurring south west of Central Park in Manhattan, the area is a known tourist destination, which may indicate why this area shows up as an assault hotspot.

More so, a more contextual approach with regard to the cold spots shows that higher-income areas (namely both the Upper East and West Sides of Manhattan) are also safer from assault. This may be due to the prevalence of higher security measures (both police presence and private security) in these more influential neighborhoods. More so, and as previously mentioned, an analysis featuring the prevalence of LGBT hate crime and more specifically sexual assault should be undertaken to discern the actual safety of the enclaves.

With regard to robberies, a slightly more telling picture emerged. The hotspots appearing were much more widespread, completely engulfing most of the enclaves they bordered. The entire north side of Manhattan, for example, showed up as a hotspot for robberies, and all enclaves occurring there were within that hotspot. The LGBT enclaves of Queens, on the other hand, were spread between both cold and hot spots of robbery, further reinforcing the theory that LGBT enclaves within themselves are not reasons for an increase of criminal density. Rather, the propensity and density is far more complex than to be caused by one reason – the presence of LGBTs in a specific area.

When compared to the Street Score map, there appeared to be no relationship between the presence of a crime hotspot and the perceived safety, rather, participants in the Street Score research perceived roads and industrial areas as unsafe, while their perception of residential areas was generally safe.
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Community and Support Services

One of the best ways the LGBT community can be aided is through the provision of support infrastructure, such as community centers, hospices, and even advocacy organizations. They can create a welcoming environment for congregation, as opposed to LGBT bars that can be discriminatory and unwelcoming. Moreover, their presence can indicate an awareness that seemingly vulnerable LGBT populations exist in certain areas, and their absence can indicate either neglect or unawareness.

The locations of the centers affiliated with the New York State Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Health and Human Services Network provided a snapshot of the presence of support infrastructure in the LGBT enclaves that were studied. A superficial view of these locations indicate that support infrastructure was more likely to be located in the more well-known and long-existing LGBT enclaves. The lesser known, poorer, and more ethnically diverse LGBT enclaves had fewer support infrastructure, with some areas having none.

This can especially be seen in the LGBT enclaves occurring in the northern segment of Manhattan, as well as Williamsburg in Brooklyn, where no support infrastructure exists. Queens is only served by two centers, while there are two centers in Brooklyn that do not appear to be close to any enclave. This can be an indication that the identification exercise did not accurately represent all the LGBT enclaves of New York City. That said, it still does not explain why the northern areas of Manhattan are underserved.
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Map 10. LGBT Community and Support Centers in New York City in 2014 (source: NYS LGBT HHSN Annual Report).
Limitations of the Methodology and Analysis

The main limitation of using taxi data to assess mobility is that it eliminates the factor of accessibility. The fact remains that not everyone in New York City uses taxis after leaving bars or even to get to bars, and this methodology ignores everyone who used alternative methods of transportation to travel to and from LGBT bars. This includes, but is not limited to, pedestrians, cyclists, users of public transit, and private vehicle users (including those who used other, privately provided taxi services, such as Uber and Gett). More so, this methodology does not account for pickup bias, which, in essence, is taxi drivers refusing service to some passengers, such as those who are clearly heavily intoxicated, amongst other reasons. Finally, with regard to the methodology, the main assumption is that everyone leaving an LGBT bars is firstly LGBT and secondly, going home. I have attempted to counteract this using a few measures, such as:

1. Isolating pick up and drop off times to specific intervals where users are most likely to be coming from or heading to their homes,
2. Further isolating trips that only originated from or terminated at residential land uses, and eliminating those that took place between bars,
3. Through the statistical and spatial clustering nature of the analysis, and assuming that most of the patrons of LGBT bars are LGBT, heterosexuals will be discarded through the employment of statistical constraints in the hotspot analysis. While the control measure indicated that LGBT enclaves are not isolated or separated from the greater community, the larger assumption here is that LGBTs tend to spatially cluster, and given the Inverse-Distance Squared tool utilized on ArcMap, these clusters of origin/destination points are given larger statistical weight in the analysis.

The second area of limitation was one that was associated with the American Community Survey. Firstly, the survey data is in the form of estimates, and is not an accurate count. However, it does provide a fairly accurate approximation of the then current status quo. Secondly, the American Community Survey only asks for male or female categories in the survey form (see appendix), and as such, eliminates the ability to enumerate and locate gender non-conformists and transgendered folk, which in turns makes a US Census based analysis of their neighborhoods and living situations close to impossible. The only method in which this may be possible is locating them through personal qualitative interviews.

With regard to the control exercise, the result reinforced the limitations of the methodology. The data points identified were mainly centered in Manhattan, tended to fall in higher income,
White-centric block groups, and rarely included lower-income diverse block groups outside of Manhattan. The reinforcement here is that of the exclusion of lower-income individuals who cannot afford, or choose not to use, a taxi. Moreover, the fact that only one data point occurred in the Bronx furthered the deduction that given the relative accessibility of the Bronx through public transit, travelers to the Bronx were more likely to use that method to reach their destination. With regard to Staten Island, given taxicab bias in picking up passengers heading to the island, even though taxicabs are required to take a passenger to any destination within the five boroughs once the passenger is in the car (§54-20, Drivers of Taxicabs and Liveries, NYC.gov).

That said, the introduction of the Borough Cabs (Green Cabs) in 2013 served particularly ameliorative benefits, in both the service of underserved areas of this city, but also in this thesis exercise. The fact remains that if not for the green cab data, no enclaves outside of Manhattan would have been identified except, perhaps, by separating Manhattan-centric trips to the rest of the city and running two separate analyses on them.

Finally, an important distinction to make with regard to LGBT populations is their visibility.

Lesbian populations are generally far less visible than gay populations, given their higher likelihood of discrimination for being female as well as their sexual orientation. This visibility is characterized by the appearance of the neighborhoods with gay areas visibly displaying the rainbow flag and gay establishments such as bookstores, cafes, and other establishments (Moore, 2015; Doan, 2011). While measures that can be taken to make lesbian populations visible include using same-sex couple household data from the American Community Survey coupled with factors such as gender-ratio (assuming lesbians prefer to live separately from gays, see Forsyth, 2011), it is more difficult to make trans populations visible. Given that the US Census does not currently ask for gender categories outside the traditional binary of male and female, tracking trans populations through the US Census is all but impossible. Given this limitation, this thesis fails to account for trans populations and leaves the question of whether they prefer to live within gay and/or lesbian clusters unanswered. Further research may attempt to answer this through undertaking personal interviews with trans-folk and using the identified neighborhoods, if any, as departure points.

Final Analysis

A cursory glance over the results of the demographic, crime, and support systems analysis indicated that higher-income and less ethnically diverse block groups had higher degrees of support, in terms of community centers, hospices, and advocacy organizations, and tended to be safer than other LGBT enclaves. While I stated that a causal relationship between crime levels and LGBT enclaves could not be substantiated without further research, the case remains that high-income, predominantly white neighborhoods tended to have fewer instances of the crime categories that were examined.

With regard to the population of LGBTs in New York City, Gallup polls indicate that the population is approximately 250,000 (Newport et al, 2015). While the population of the block groups that were examined exceeded 550,000, only 474,589 were over the age of 21, and the married population with their spouse present was 148,323. While the married population is age 15 and over (in the 2014 ACS data), the population that is not married (either never married, separated, divorced, or widowed) is approximately 414,273 (2014 American Community Survey).

While these numbers do little to indicate whether the entire population of LGBTs live in these enclaves, it can be deduced that the mean percentage of married couples of the LGBT block groups in Manhattan, Queens, and Brooklyn is 29.57%, and therefore, the approximate number of unmarried individuals over the age of 21 in the LGBT block groups is 334,254; which is higher than the 250,000 estimate of LGBTs. While this relation of population is tenuous, it may be a further indication of the assimilation of the LGBT community to greater society in New York City.

In the case of ethnic segregation, a more detailed demographic analysis was undertaken. In the first instance, the LGBT enclaves were divided into White majority and non-White majority enclaves. The reason for this is that there appeared to be a delineated segmentation between White majority and non-White majority enclaves. Approximately 82% of the LGBT block groups had a majority population of Whites, and the remaining block groups were divided between African American, Asian, and Hispanic or Latino majority groups. The White-majority block groups had relatively low level of diversity, with Asians forming the largest minority at 13.66% of the total population, followed closely by Hispanic or Latinos at 10.25% (see chart 1).
With regard to the non-White majority enclaves, the population of Whites was at 14.36%, indicating that there still was a significant presence of Whites in these enclaves. The largest population was that of Hispanic or Latinos, at 48.76%, followed by Asians at 23.89%. African Americans in these more diverse enclaves were still fewer than Whites, with an overall presence of 11%.

With regard to income, and on average, White-majority block groups had higher incomes than those with non-White majorities, with the maximum per-capita income in a White majority block group exceeding $350,000 per annum, and the maximum per-capita income in a non-White majority block group not exceeding $100,000. Incomes in White majority block groups tended to follow a left-tailed normal distribution, with some income brackets spiking at specific intervals. On the other hand, incomes in non-White majority block groups were much more veered towards the right of the normal distribution, indicating a trend towards very low income (see Charts 2 & 3).
The previously discussed data further reinforces the fact that there is racial/ethnic and income based segregation within the LGBT enclaves, where enclaves with White majorities have higher income, on average, and lower presence of racial/ethnic minorities. The exception to this is White-majority enclaves with significant Asian minorities, which may have high incomes. On the other hand, enclaves with non-White majorities still have significant White presence, at 14% on average, yet have relatively low incomes that do not exceed the $100,000 mark.

This is not far from the status-quo for heteronormative society in the United States, where this racial/ethnic and income based segregation is only a reflection of society at large, and not specifically the LGBT society (Al Shehhi, 2016).
This research paper started with a very simple question – “is it better for a LGBT person to live with other LGBTs in a secluded environment, than for them to assimilate into society”, yet as I undertook the research, the question started becoming exceedingly complex. Firstly, what are LGBT enclaves, and secondly, where are they in New York City? What are these enclaves like and are these parameters enough to answer the original question? Those, and many more questions arose in the writing of this paper, and I hope to have answered some of them, if only in the case of New York City.

This paper proved the effectiveness of a new methodology that can be used to assess the residential patterns of untracked minorities through an origin-destination analysis of popular gathering points. In the case that was examined, LGBT populations and neighborhoods were tracked using LGBT bars as departure and destination points. Potential LGBT enclaves were uncovered and the fact that some neighborhoods existed outside of the immediate range of LGBT bars proves the point that there is a discernable chance that the block groups identified are LGBT enclaves or at the very least have clusters of LGBT populations.

This paper further proved that LGBT enclaves do not have a mutually inclusive relationship with LGBT bars, where they’re not necessarily in the same locations and they do not follow each other. It also proved that these enclaves are not as simple they are made out to be, they are complex, nuanced, and share many characteristics with heteronormative neighborhoods. More so, it showed that assimilation into heteronormative neighborhoods is a cause for caution for LGBTs, especially the non-conformists of them.

This paper therefore answered the question of where LGBT clusters in New York City are. Moreover, it also described the locations of these clusters using a socio-economic, demographic, and crime analysis. Linking these analyses to the literature reviewed, a platform on which the first question this paper asked could be answered was formed. This answer is complex. It is yes, if one was a homo-normative, White, gay man. It is no, if one was a sexual and/or gender non-conformist person of color, and maybe, for perhaps everyone in between. The fact remains that both the data and the literature indicated that discrimination exists within the LGBT society, and that that discrimination may translate from social spaces, such as bars, to residential areas (Irazábal & Huerta, 2015; Al Shehhi, 2016). The ramifications of this ethnic segregation range from personal safety to income segregation. Yet, they appear to be a symptom of an already discriminatory social scape rather than inherent discrimination within the LGBT society. That said, it also refutes the argument that a marginalized group is somehow
immune to discriminating against others within the group.

One of the major obstacles LGBTs face today is the prevalence of both hetero and homo normativity. When coupled with planning, which is a normative field, non-conformists are relegated to the sidelines by the mere nature of the profession that may regulate their very lives. Planning must begin to address the fact that the traditional normative family of the past is not the caste in which to place all non-traditional family units. Planners must not force LGBTs into that same caste, substituting a husband and a wife for a husband and a husband, and a wife and a wife. This not only further marginalizes a disenfranchised community, but also creates a new layer of discrimination that non-conformists within the LGBT community face at the hands of homo-normatives based on the fear of exclusion from heteronormative society.

The main addition this thesis introduced to the planning field is that planners are now able to begin identifying areas in which minorities exist. They are able to discern what kind of outreach and services they should tally and target, and whether new approaches to specific, measurable, areas should be implemented. For example, and from a public health standpoint, males who have sex with males (MSMs) are more likely to contract STDs if they live within an enclave (Brown, 2013), therefore, targeting LGBT specific hospices to areas that have been identified as enclaves and feature sex ratios that tend toward higher numbers of males would be pertinent.

That said, this methodology is only the starting point. The areas identified in this research are those that future researchers must target with personal surveys and outreach. They are areas that LGBTs are most likely to live in, as opposed to others. Personal surveys will enable future researchers and planners to identify further minorities that this methodology and traditional census tools disregard, such as sexual and gender non-conformists. This identification may be the first step towards protection, inclusion, and creating a better life for these folk.

One of the main areas planners should be concerned with in the short term in New York City is the targeting of social services and outreach to the identified underserved enclaves. Planners should engage with the LGBT centers in underserved areas and discern the needs they can address and the subsequent service they can provide. Planners should also begin addressing LGBT populations in community meetings and outreach. This serves to bring LGBT populations to the forefront of their community’s attention, and to alert both planners and communities to the diverse needs their LGBT population may have.
The academic and educational community should also include LGBTs in the categories of marginalized communities that planning students are taught about. It was often the case that many planning students were unaware that the LGBT community was a marginalized community that needs their support as planners. Further research into planning for and with LGBTs should be undertaken, and the role of heteronormativity in both planning academia and the profession should be addressed.

In the long term, planners should be cognizant of the fact that the traditional definitions of households, communities, and couples are a thing of the past. The role of heteronormativity in the planning profession should only be as an example of the past. Moreover, planner should engage in a continuous discussion with members of the LGBT community and closely follow their movement and trends. Given how vulnerable the community is to displacement and the ravages of gentrification, measures should be undertaken to protect these communities from displacement, and if displacement happens, the planning community should attempt to alleviate the negative effects as much as possible.

This thesis is only the beginning. It falls on the shoulders of future researchers and planners to continue this discussion in any forum possible. Community meetings, academic talks, and even classroom discussions should start paying attention to LGBTs, and how they are another very vulnerable population in any city. No aid will come to LGBTs if such discussions don’t happen, for help cannot be tendered if those who provide aid do not know of its need.
In the case of New York City, if this methodology is to be repeated, then the 2015 data from the TLC should be accommodated and used to contrast different potential enclaves. It would also provide a good measure of whether an enclave has shifted during the course of the study. Moreover, a closer look at the enclaves should be taken. A full land use analysis may be a good step forward. More pertinently, a contextual analysis of the gender and racial/ethnic composition must be undertaken to further understand the enclaves. Finally, qualitative surveys can be undertaken in both the enclaves and the LGBT bars in the city. Researchers can compare and contrast all findings, and discern the most likely block groups in the city to house LGBTs.

If this methodology is to be replicated in other cities, taxi data must be made available. That said, taxis must ideally also be as accessible, as a baseline, as in New York City. In the case of London, for example, where taxis are more expensive and less accessible than in New York City, this methodology may not be as accurate. With regard to other modes of transportation that can be tracked, such as public transportation, this methodology would only be successful if origins and destinations can be tracked, and the fact that a majority of users at a particular origin or departure point are LGBTs.

Finally, other control measures can be added to this methodology, such as comparing the neighborhoods this methodology identifies to anecdotal neighborhoods. Another control variable in the case of other minorities this thesis does not track, is looking at the prevalence of outlets a particular minority utilizes in their neighborhoods and have no need to travel far to; such as places of worship for religious groups, or perhaps specific food and beverage outlets for religious minorities.


The American Community Survey

This booklet shows the content of the American Community Survey questionnaire.

Start Here

Respond online today at:
https://respond.census.gov/acs

OR

Complete this form and mail it back as soon as possible.

This form asks for information about the people who are living or staying at the address on the mailing label and about the house, apartment, or mobile home located at the address on the mailing label.

If you need help or have questions about completing this form, please call 1-800-354-7271. The telephone call is free.

¿NECESITA AYUDA? Si usted habla español y necesita ayuda para completar su cuestionario, llame sin cargo alguno al 1-877-833-5625. Usted también puede completar su entrevista por teléfono con un entrevistador que habla español. O puede responder por Internet en: https://respond.census.gov/acs

For more information about the American Community Survey, visit our website at: http://www.census.gov/acs/www/

Please print today's date.
Month Day Year

Please print the name and telephone number of the person who is filling out this form. We may contact you if there is a question.
Last Name
First Name

Area Code + Number

How many people are living or staying at this address?

• INCLUDE everyone who is living or staying here for more than 2 months.
• INCLUDE yourself if you are living here for more than 2 months.
• INCLUDE anyone else staying here who does not have another place to stay, even if they are here for 2 months or less.
• DO NOT INCLUDE anyone who is living somewhere else for more than 2 months, such as a college student living away or someone in the Armed Forces on deployment.

Number of people

Fill out pages 2, 3, and 4 for everyone, including yourself, who is living or staying at this address for more than 2 months. Then complete the rest of the form.
**Person 3**

1. **What is Person 3's name?**
   - Last Name (Please print)
   - First Name
   - MI

2. **How is this person related to Person 1?**
   - Mark (X) ONE box.
   - Husband or wife
   - Biological son or daughter
   - Adopted son or daughter
   - Stepson or stepdaughter
   - Brother or sister
   - Father or mother
   - Grandchild
   - Parent-in-law
   - Son-in-law or daughter-in-law
   - Other relative
   - Roomer or boarder
   - Housemate or roommate
   - Unmarried partner
   - Foster child
   - Other nonrelative

3. **What is Person 3's sex?**
   - Mark (X) ONE box.
   - Male
   - Female

4. **What is Person 3's age and what is Person 3's date of birth?**
   - Please report babies as age 0 when the child is less than 1 year old. Print numbers in boxes.
   - Age (in years)
   - Month
   - Day
   - Year of birth

   **NOTE:** Please answer BOTH Question 5 about Hispanic origin and Question 6 about race. For this survey, Hispanic origins are not races.

5. **Is Person 3 of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?**
   - No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
   - Yes, Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano
   - Yes, Puerto Rican
   - Yes, Cuban
   - Yes, another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin – Print origin, for example, Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadorian, Spaniard, and so on.

6. **What is Person 3's race?**
   - Mark (X) one or more boxes.
   - White
   - Black or African Am.
   - American Indian or Alaska Native – Print name of enrolled or principal tribe
   - Asian Indian
   - Chinese
   - Filipino
   - Other Asian – Print race, for example, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani, Cambodian, and so on.
   - Japanese
   - Korean
   - Vietnamese
   - Other Pacific Islander – Print race, for example, Fijian, Tongan, and so on.
   - Native Hawaiian
   - Guamanian or Chamorro
   - Samoan
   - Other Pacific Islander – Print race, for example, Fijian, Tongan, and so on.
   - Some other race – Print race

---

**Person 4**

1. **What is Person 4's name?**
   - Last Name (Please print)
   - First Name
   - MI

2. **How is this person related to Person 1?**
   - Mark (X) ONE box.
   - Husband or wife
   - Biological son or daughter
   - Adopted son or daughter
   - Stepson or stepdaughter
   - Brother or sister
   - Father or mother
   - Grandchild
   - Parent-in-law
   - Son-in-law or daughter-in-law
   - Other relative
   - Roomer or boarder
   - Housemate or roommate
   - Unmarried partner
   - Foster child
   - Other nonrelative

3. **What is Person 4's sex?**
   - Mark (X) ONE box.
   - Male
   - Female

4. **What is Person 4's age and what is Person 4's date of birth?**
   - Please report babies as age 0 when the child is less than 1 year old. Print numbers in boxes.
   - Age (in years)
   - Month
   - Day
   - Year of birth

   **NOTE:** Please answer BOTH Question 5 about Hispanic origin and Question 6 about race. For this survey, Hispanic origins are not races.

5. **Is Person 4 of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?**
   - No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
   - Yes, Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano
   - Yes, Puerto Rican
   - Yes, Cuban
   - Yes, another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin – Print origin, for example, Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadorian, Spaniard, and so on.

6. **What is Person 4's race?**
   - Mark (X) one or more boxes.
   - White
   - Black or African Am.
   - American Indian or Alaska Native – Print name of enrolled or principal tribe
   - Asian Indian
   - Chinese
   - Filipino
   - Other Asian – Print race, for example, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani, Cambodian, and so on.
   - Japanese
   - Korean
   - Vietnamese
   - Other Pacific Islander – Print race, for example, Fijian, Tongan, and so on.
   - Native Hawaiian
   - Guamanian or Chamorro
   - Samoan
   - Other Pacific Islander – Print race, for example, Fijian, Tongan, and so on.
   - Some other race – Print race
What is Person 5’s name?
Last Name (Please print) | First Name | MI

How is this person related to Person 1? Mark (X) ONE box.
- Husband or wife
- Biological son or daughter
- Adopted son or daughter
- Stepson or stepdaughter
- Brother or sister
- Father or mother
- Grandchild
- Parent-in-law

What is Person 5’s sex? Mark (X) ONE box.
- Male
- Female

What is Person 5’s age and what is Person 5’s date of birth?
Age (in years) | Month | Day | Year of birth

NOTE: Please answer BOTH Question 5 about Hispanic origin and Question 6 about race. For this survey, Hispanic origins are not races.

Is Person 5 of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?
- No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
- Yes, Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano
- Yes, Puerto Rican
- Yes, Cuban
- Yes, another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin – Print origin, for example, Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadorian, Spaniard, and so on.

What is Person 5’s race? Mark (X) one or more boxes.
- White
- Black or African Am.
- American Indian or Alaska Native – Print name of enrolled or principal tribe
- Asian Indian
- Chinese
- Filipino
- Other Asian – Print race, for example, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani, Cambodian, and so on.
- Japanese
- Korean
- Vietnamese
- Other Pacific Islander – Print race, for example, Fijian, Tongan, and so on.
- Native Hawaiian
- Guamanian or Chamorro
- Samoan
- Other non-Hispanic, non-Latino, non-Spanish origin – Print race
- Some other race – Print race.

If there are more than five people living or staying here, print their names in the spaces for Person 6 through Person 12. We may call you for more information about them.

Person 6
Last Name (Please print) | First Name | MI

Sex
- Male
- Female
Age (in years)

Person 7
Last Name (Please print) | First Name | MI

Sex
- Male
- Female
Age (in years)

Person 8
Last Name (Please print) | First Name | MI

Sex
- Male
- Female
Age (in years)

Person 9
Last Name (Please print) | First Name | MI

Sex
- Male
- Female
Age (in years)

Person 10
Last Name (Please print) | First Name | MI

Sex
- Male
- Female
Age (in years)

Person 11
Last Name (Please print) | First Name | MI

Sex
- Male
- Female
Age (in years)

Person 12
Last Name (Please print) | First Name | MI

Sex
- Male
- Female
Age (in years)
# Housing

Please answer the following questions about the house, apartment, or mobile home at the address on the mailing label.

1. Which best describes this building?
   - Include all apartments, flats, etc., even if vacant.
   - A mobile home
   - A one-family house detached from any other house
   - A one-family house attached to one or more houses
   - A building with 2 apartments
   - A building with 3 or 4 apartments
   - A building with 5 to 9 apartments
   - A building with 10 to 19 apartments
   - A building with 20 to 49 apartments
   - A building with 50 or more apartments
   - Boat, RV, van, etc.

2. About when was this building first built?
   - 2000 or later – Specify year
   - 1990 to 1999
   - 1980 to 1989
   - 1970 to 1979
   - 1960 to 1969
   - 1950 to 1959
   - 1940 to 1949
   - 1939 or earlier

3. When did PERSON 1 (listed on page 2) move into this house, apartment, or mobile home?
   - Month Year

---

### Supplemental Questions for HOUSES or MOBILE HOMES

**Answer questions 4 – 6 if this is a HOUSE OR A MOBILE HOME; otherwise, SKIP to question 7a.**

4. How many acres is this house or mobile home on?
   - Less than 1 acre → SKIP to question 6
   - 1 to 9.9 acres
   - 10 or more acres

5. IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, what were the actual sales of all agricultural products from this property?
   - None
   - $1 to $999
   - $1,000 to $2,499
   - $2,500 to $4,999
   - $5,000 to $9,999
   - $10,000 or more

6. Is there a business (such as a store or barber shop) or a medical office on this property?
   - Yes
   - No

7. a. How many separate rooms are in this house, apartment, or mobile home?
   - Rooms must be separated by built-in archways or walls that extend out at least 6 inches and go from floor to ceiling.
   - INCLUDE bedrooms, kitchens, etc.
   - EXCLUDE bathrooms, porches, balconies, foyers, halls, or unfinished basements.
   - Number of rooms

   b. How many of these rooms are bedrooms?
   - Count as bedrooms those rooms you would list if this house, apartment, or mobile home were for sale or rent. If this is an efficiency/studio apartment, print “0”.
   - Number of bedrooms

---

8. Does this house, apartment, or mobile home have –
   - a. hot and cold running water? Yes No
   - b. a flush toilet? Yes No
   - c. a bathtub or shower? Yes No
   - d. a sink with a faucet? Yes No
   - e. a stove or range? Yes No
   - f. a refrigerator? Yes No
   - g. telephone service from which you can both make and receive calls? Include cell phones. Yes No

9. At this house, apartment, or mobile home – do you or any member of this household own or use any of the following computers?
   - EXCLUDE GPS devices, digital music players, and devices with only limited computing capabilities, for example: household appliances.
   - a. Desktop, laptop, netbook, or notebook computer Yes No
   - b. Handheld computer, smart mobile phone, or other handheld wireless computer Yes No
   - c. Some other type of computer Specify

10. At this house, apartment, or mobile home – do you or any member of this household access the Internet?
    - Yes, with a subscription to an Internet service
    - Yes, without a subscription to an Internet service → SKIP to question 12
    - No Internet access at this house, apartment, or mobile home → SKIP to question 12

11. At this house, apartment, or mobile home – do you or any member of this household subscribe to the Internet using –
    - a. Dial-up service? Yes No
    - b. DSL service? Yes No
    - c. Cable modem service? Yes No
    - d. Fiber-optic service? Yes No
    - e. Mobile broadband plan for a computer or a cell phone? Yes No
    - f. Satellite Internet service? Yes No
    - g. Some other service? Specify service

---
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How many automobiles, vans, and trucks of one-ton capacity or less are kept at home for use by members of this household?

- None
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6 or more

Which FUEL is used MOST for heating this house, apartment, or mobile home?

- Gas: from underground pipes serving the neighborhood
- Gas: bottled, tank, or LP
- Electricity
- Fuel oil, kerosene, etc.
- Coal or coke
- Wood
- Solar energy
- Other fuel
- No fuel used

 LAST MONTH, what was the cost of electricity for this house, apartment, or mobile home?

Last month’s cost – Dollars

- Included in rent or condominium fee
- No charge or electricity not used

 LAST MONTH, what was the cost of gas for this house, apartment, or mobile home?

Last month’s cost – Dollars

- Included in rent or condominium fee
- Included in electricity payment entered above
- No charge or gas not used

 IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, what was the cost of water and sewer for this house, apartment, or mobile home?

If you have lived here less than 12 months, estimate the cost.

Past 12 months’ cost – Dollars

- Included in rent or condominium fee
- No charge

 IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, what was the cost of oil, coal, kerosene, wood, etc., for this house, apartment, or mobile home? If you have lived here less than 12 months, estimate the cost.

Past 12 months’ cost – Dollars

- Included in rent or condominium fee
- No charge or these fuels not used

IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, did you or any member of this household receive benefits from the Food Stamp Program or SNAP (the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program)? Do NOT include WIC, the School Lunch Program, or assistance from food banks.

- Yes
- No

Is this house, apartment, or mobile home part of a condominium?

- Yes
- No

 Is this house, apartment, or mobile home – Mark (X) ONE box.

- Owned by you or someone in this household with a mortgage or loan?
- Owned by you or someone in this household free and clear (without a mortgage or loan)?
- Rented?
- Occupied without payment of rent?

^{Skip to C on the next page}
### Housing (continued)

#### B

**18.** What is the monthly rent for this house, apartment, or mobile home?
- Monthly amount – Dollars

#### C

**19.** About how much do you think this house and lot, apartment, or mobile home (and lot, if owned) would sell for if it were for sale?
- Amount – Dollars

**20.** What are the annual real estate taxes on this property?
- Annual amount – Dollars

**21.** What is the annual payment for fire, hazard, and flood insurance on this property?
- Annual amount – Dollars

**22.** Do you or any member of this household have a mortgage, deed of trust, contract to purchase, or similar debt on this property?
- Yes
- No

**b.** How much is the regular monthly mortgage payment on this property?
- Monthly amount – Dollars

**c.** Does the regular monthly mortgage payment include payments for real estate taxes on this property?
- Yes
- No

**d.** Does the regular monthly mortgage payment include payments for fire, hazard, or flood insurance on this property?
- Yes
- No

**23.** Do you or any member of this household have a second mortgage or a home equity loan on this property?
- Yes
- No

**b.** How much is the regular monthly payment on all second or junior mortgages and all home equity loans on this property?
- Monthly amount – Dollars

**24.** What are the total annual costs for personal property taxes, site rent, registration fees, and license fees on this mobile home and its site? Exclude real estate taxes.
- Annual costs – Dollars

**E**

Answer questions about PERSON 1 on the next page if you listed at least one person on page 2. Otherwise, SKIP to page 28 for the mailing instructions.
Person 1

Please copy the name of Person 1 from page 2, then continue answering questions below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where was this person born?

- [ ] In the United States – Print name of state.
- [ ] Outside the United States – Print name of foreign country, or Puerto Rico, Guam, etc.

Is this person a citizen of the United States?

- [ ] Yes, born in the United States → SKIP to question 10a
- [ ] Yes, born in Puerto Rico, Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, or Northern Marianas
- [ ] Yes, born abroad of U.S. citizen parent or parents
- [ ] Yes, U.S. citizen by naturalization – Print year of naturalization
- [ ] No, not a U.S. citizen

When did this person come to live in the United States? Print numbers in boxes.

- [ ] Year

At any time IN THE LAST 3 MONTHS, has this person attended school or college? Include only nursery or preschool, kindergarten, elementary school, home school, and schooling which leads to a high school diploma or a college degree.

- [ ] No, has not attended in the last 3 months → SKIP to question 11
- [ ] Yes, public school, public college
- [ ] Yes, private school, private college, home school

What grade or level was this person attending?

Mark (X) ONE box.

- [ ] Nursery school, preschool
- [ ] Kindergarten
- [ ] Grade 1 through 12 – Specify grade 1 – 12
- [ ] College undergraduate years (freshman to senior)
- [ ] Graduate or professional school beyond a bachelor’s degree (for example: MA or PhD program, or medical or law school)

This question focuses on this person's BACHELOR’S DEGREE. Please print below the specific major(s) of any BACHELOR’S DEGREES this person has received. (For example: chemical engineering, elementary teacher education, organizational psychology)

What is the highest degree or level of school this person has COMPLETED? Mark (X) ONE box. If currently enrolled, mark the previous grade or highest degree received.

- [ ] No schooling completed
- [ ] Nursery school
- [ ] Kindergarten
- [ ] Grade 1 through 11 – Specify grade 1 – 11
- [ ] 12th grade – NO DIPLOMA
- [ ] Regular high school diploma
- [ ] GED or alternative credential

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE

- [ ] Some college credit, but less than 1 year of college credit
- [ ] 1 or more years of college credit, no degree
- [ ] Associate’s degree (for example: AA, AS)
- [ ] Bachelor’s degree (for example: BA, BS)

AFTER BACHELOR’S DEGREE

- [ ] Master’s degree (for example: MA, MS, MEng, MED, MSW, MBA)
- [ ] Professional degree beyond a bachelor’s degree (for example: MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD)
- [ ] Doctorate degree (for example: PhD, EdD)

What is this person’s ancestry or ethnic origin?

(For example: Italian, Jamaican, African Am., Cambodian, Cape Verdean, Norwegian, Dominican, French Canadian, Haitian, Korean, Lebanese, Polish, Nigerian, Mexican, Taiwanese, Ukrainian, and so on.)

Does this person speak a language other than English at home?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No → SKIP to question 15a

What is this language?

(For example: Korean, Italian, Spanish, Vietnamese)

How well does this person speak English?

- [ ] Very well
- [ ] Well
- [ ] Not well
- [ ] Not at all

Did this person live in this house or apartment 1 year ago?

- [ ] Person is under 1 year old → SKIP to question 16
- [ ] Yes, this house → SKIP to question 16
- [ ] No, outside the United States and Puerto Rico – Print name of foreign country, or U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, etc., below; then SKIP to question 16
- [ ] No, different house in the United States or Puerto Rico

Where did this person live 1 year ago?

Address (Number and street name)

Name of city, town, or post office

Name of U.S. county or municipio in Puerto Rico

Name of U.S. state or ZIP Code
**Person 1 (continued)**

16. Is this person CURRENTLY covered by any of the following types of health insurance or health coverage plans? Mark “Yes” or “No” for EACH type of coverage in items a–h.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Coverage</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Insurance through a current or former employer or union (of this person or another family member)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Insurance purchased directly from an insurance company (by this person or another family member)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Medicare, for people 65 and older, or people with certain disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Medicaid, Medical Assistance, or any kind of government-assistance plan for those with low incomes or a disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. TRICARE or other military health care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. VA (including those who have ever used or enrolled for VA health care)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Indian Health Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Any other type of health insurance or health coverage plan – Specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. a. Is this person deaf or does he/she have serious difficulty hearing?
   - Yes |
   - No

   b. Is this person blind or does he/she have serious difficulty seeing even when wearing glasses?
      - Yes |
      - No

   Answer question 18a – c if this person is 5 years old or over. Otherwise, SKIP to the questions for Person 2 on page 12.

18. a. Because of a physical, mental, or emotional condition, does this person have serious difficulty concentrating, remembering, or making decisions?
    - Yes |
    - No

   b. Does this person have serious difficulty walking or climbing stairs?
      - Yes |
      - No

   c. Does this person have difficulty dressing or bathing?
      - Yes |
      - No

   Answer question 19 if this person is 16 years old or over. Otherwise, SKIP to the questions for Person 2 on page 12.

19. Because of a physical, mental, or emotional condition, does this person have difficulty doing errands alone such as visiting a doctor’s office or shopping?
    - Yes |
    - No

20. What is this person’s marital status?
    - Now married
    - Widowed
    - Divorced
    - Separated
    - Never married – SKIP to 1

21. In the PAST 12 MONTHS did this person get...
    - Married?
    - Widowed?
    - Divorced?

22. How many times has this person been married?
    - Once
    - Two times
    - Three or more times

23. In what year did this person last get married?
    - Year

   Answer question 24 if this person is 5 years old or over. Otherwise, SKIP to question 25a.

24. Has this person given birth to any children in the past 12 months?
    - Yes |
    - No

25. a. Does this person have any of his/her own grandchildren under the age of 18 living in this house or apartment?
       - Yes |
       - No – SKIP to question 26

   b. Is this grandparent currently responsible for most of the basic needs of any grandchildren under the age of 18 who live in this house or apartment?
      - Yes |
      - No – SKIP to question 26

26. Has this person ever served on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces, Reserves, or National Guard? Mark (X) ONE box.
    - Never served in the military – SKIP to question 28a
    - Only on active duty for training in the Reserves or National Guard – SKIP to question 28a
    - Now on active duty

27. When did this person serve on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces? Mark (X) a box for EACH period in which this person served, even if just for part of the period.
    - September 2001 or later
    - August 1990 to August 2001 (including Persian Gulf War)
    - May 1975 to July 1990
    - Vietnam era (August 1964 to April 1975)
    - February 1955 to July 1964
    - Korean War (July 1950 to January 1955)
    - January 1947 to June 1950
    - World War II (December 1941 to December 1946)
    - November 1941 or earlier

28. a. Does this person have a VA service-connected disability rating?
       - Yes (such as 0%, 10%, 20%, ... , 100%)
       - No – SKIP to question 29a

   b. What is this person’s service-connected disability rating?
      - 0 percent
      - 10 or 20 percent
      - 30 or 40 percent
      - 50 or 60 percent
      - 70 percent or higher
Person 1 (continued)

29. LAST WEEK, did this person work for pay at a job (or business)?
   - Yes → SKIP to question 30
   - No – Did not work (or retired)

b. LAST WEEK, did this person do ANY work for pay, even for as little as one hour?
   - Yes
   - No → SKIP to question 35a

30. At what location did this person work LAST WEEK? If this person worked at more than one location, print where he or she worked most last week.
   a. Address (Number and street name)
   If the exact address is not known, give a description of the location such as the building name or the nearest street or intersection.
   b. Name of city, town, or post office
   c. Is the work location inside the limits of that city or town?
      - Yes
      - No, outside the city/town limits
   d. Name of county
   e. Name of U.S. state or foreign country
   f. ZIP Code

31. How did this person usually get to work LAST WEEK? If this person usually used more than one method of transportation during the trip, mark (X) the box of the one used for most of the distance.
   - Car, truck, or van
   - Motorcycle
   - Bus or trolley bus
   - Bicycle
   - Streetcar or trolley car
   - Walked
   - Subway or elevated
   - Worked at home → SKIP to question 39a
   - Railroad
   - Ferryboat
   - Taxicab
   - Other method

32. How many people, including this person, usually rode to work in the car, truck, or van LAST WEEK?
   Person(s)
   Answer question 32 if you marked "Car, truck, or van" in question 31. Otherwise, SKIP to question 33.

33. What time did this person usually leave home to go to work LAST WEEK?
   Hour: Minute: a.m. p.m.
   Answer questions 33 – 38 if this person did NOT work last week. Otherwise, SKIP to question 39a.

34. How many minutes did it usually take this person to get from home to work LAST WEEK?
   Minutes

35. a. LAST WEEK, was this person on layoff from a job?
   - Yes → SKIP to question 35c
   - No
   b. LAST WEEK, was this person TEMPORARILY absent from a job or business?
   - Yes, on vacation, temporary illness, maternity leave, other family/personal reasons, bad weather, etc. → SKIP to question 38
   - No → SKIP to question 36
   c. Has this person been informed that he or she will be recalled to work within the next 6 months OR been given a date to return to work?
   - Yes → SKIP to question 37
   - No

36. During the LAST 4 WEEKS, has this person been ACTIVELY looking for work?
   - Yes
   - No → SKIP to question 38

37. LAST WEEK, could this person have started a job if offered one, or returned to work if recalled?
   - Yes, could have gone to work
   - No, because of own temporary illness
   - No, because of all other reasons (in school, etc.)

38. When did this person last work, even for a few days?
   - Within the past 12 months
   - 1 to 5 years ago → SKIP to
   - Over 5 years ago or never worked → SKIP to question 47

39. a. During the PAST 12 MONTHS (52 weeks), did this person work 50 or more weeks? Count paid time off as work.
   - Yes → SKIP to question 40
   - No
   b. How many weeks DID this person work, even for a few hours, including paid vacation, paid sick leave, and military service?
      - 50 to 52 weeks
      - 48 to 49 weeks
      - 40 to 47 weeks
      - 27 to 39 weeks
      - 14 to 26 weeks
      - 13 weeks or less

40. During the PAST 12 MONTHS, in the WEEKS WORKED, how many hours did this person usually work each WEEK?
   Usual hours worked each WEEK
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Answer questions 41 – 46 if this person worked in the past 5 years. Otherwise, SKIP to question 47.

41 – 46 CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB ACTIVITY. Describe clearly this person's chief job activity or business last week. If this person had more than one job, describe the one at which this person worked the most hours. If this person had no job or business last week, give information for his/her last job or business.

Was this person –
Mark (X) ONE box.

an employee of a PRIVATE FOR-PROFIT company or business, or of an individual, for wages, salary, or commissions?

an employee of a PRIVATE NOT-FOR-PROFIT, tax-exempt, or charitable organization?

a local GOVERNMENT employee (city, county, etc.)?

a state GOVERNMENT employee?

SELF-EMPLOYED in own NOT INCORPORATED business, professional practice, or farm?

SELF-EMPLOYED in own INCORPORATED business, professional practice, or farm?

working WITHOUT PAY in family business or farm?

For whom did this person work?
If now on active duty in the Armed Forces, mark (X) this box and print the branch of the Armed Forces.

Name of company, business, or other employer

What kind of business or industry was this?
Describe the activity at the location where employed. (For example: hospital, newspaper publishing, mail order house, auto engine manufacturing, bank)

Is this mainly –
Mark (X) ONE box.

manufacturing?

wholesale trade?

retail trade?

other (agriculture, construction, service, government, etc.)?

45 What kind of work was this person doing? (For example: registered nurse, personnel manager, supervisor of order department, secretary, accountant)

46 What were this person’s most important activities or duties? (For example: patient care, directing hiring policies, supervising order clerks, typing and filing, reconciling financial records)

INCOME IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS
Mark (X) the ‘Yes’ box for each type of income this person received, and give your best estimate of the TOTAL AMOUNT during the PAST 12 MONTHS. (NOTE: The ‘past 12 months’ is the period from today’s date one year ago up through today.)
Mark (X) the ‘No’ box to show types of income NOT received.

If net income was a loss, mark the “Loss” box to the right of the dollar amount.

For income received jointly, report the appropriate share for each person — or, if that’s not possible, report the whole amount for only one person and mark the “No” box for the other person.

a. Wages, salary, commissions, bonuses, or tips from all jobs. Report amount before deductions for taxes, bonds, dues, or other items.

b. Self-employment income from own nonfarm businesses or farm businesses, including proprietorships and partnerships. Report NET income after business expenses.

c. Interest, dividends, net rental income, royalty income, or income from estates and trusts. Report even small amounts credited to an account.

d. Social Security or Railroad Retirement.

Mark (X) the “Yes” box for each type of income this person received, and give your best estimate of the TOTAL AMOUNT during the PAST 12 MONTHS. (NOTE: The ‘past 12 months’ is the period from today’s date one year ago up through today.)
Mark (X) the “No” box to show types of income NOT received.

If net income was a loss, mark the “Loss” box to the right of the dollar amount.

For income received jointly, report the appropriate share for each person — or, if that’s not possible, report the whole amount for only one person and mark the “No” box for the other person.

• a. Wages, salary, commissions, bonuses, or tips from all jobs. Report amount before deductions for taxes, bonds, dues, or other items.

• b. Self-employment income from own nonfarm businesses or farm businesses, including proprietorships and partnerships. Report NET income after business expenses.

• c. Interest, dividends, net rental income, royalty income, or income from estates and trusts. Report even small amounts credited to an account.

e. Supplemental Security Income (SSI).

f. Any public assistance or welfare payments from the state or local welfare office.

g. Retirement, survivor, or disability pensions. Do NOT include Social Security.

h. Any other sources of income received regularly such as Veterans’ (VA) payments, unemployment compensation, child support or alimony. Do NOT include lump sum payments such as money from an inheritance or the sale of a home.

What was this person’s total income during the PAST 12 MONTHS? Add entries in questions 47a to 47h; subtract any losses. If net income was a loss, enter the amount and mark (X) the “Loss” box next to the dollar amount.

Continue with the questions for Person 2 on the next page. If no one is listed as person 2 on page 2, SKIP to page 28 for mailing instructions.
The balance of the questionnaire has questions for Person 2, Person 3, Person 4, and Person 5. The questions are the same as the questions for Person 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Bar</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Secondary Audience</th>
<th>Year Opened</th>
<th>Year Closed</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bum Bum Bar</td>
<td>14 Roosevelt Ave.</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>Woodside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Evolution</td>
<td>19 Roosevelt Ave.</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>Jackson Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Tea</td>
<td>Pier 40 West Houston @ West Side Highway</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>West Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend’s Tavern</td>
<td>11 Roosevelt Avenue</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>Jackson Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XES Lounge</td>
<td>157 W 24th St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Flatiron-Union Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym</td>
<td>167 8th Ave.</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Flatiron-Union Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barracuda</td>
<td>275 W 22nd St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Flatiron-Union Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICON</td>
<td>84 33rd St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escuelita</td>
<td>301 W 39th St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Bar</td>
<td>355 West 52nd Street</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxers NYC</td>
<td>37 West 20th Street</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Flatiron-Union Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK Lounge</td>
<td>405 W 39Th St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posh</td>
<td>405 W 51st St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPM New York</td>
<td>512 West 42nd Street</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Flatiron-Union Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro</td>
<td>104 Dyckman St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Washington Heights North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Box</td>
<td>40-08 74th Street</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>Elmhurst-Maspeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langston Nightclub</td>
<td>1073 Atlantic Ave</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>Clinton Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle Charlie’s Piano Bar</td>
<td>139 E. 45th Street</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Turtle Bay-East Midtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cock</td>
<td>29 2nd Ave</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>East Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hangar</td>
<td>115 Christopher St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>West Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyramid</td>
<td>101 Avenue A</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>East Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Lounge</td>
<td>225 W 19th St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Flatiron-Union Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greenhouse</td>
<td>150 Varick St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>SoHo-TriBeCa-Civic Center-Little Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius’</td>
<td>159 W 10th St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>West Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Bar</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Secondary Audience</td>
<td>Year Opened</td>
<td>Year Closed</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockbar</td>
<td>185 Christopher St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>West Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adonis Lounge</td>
<td>221 East 58th Street</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Turtle Bay-East Midtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs Bar</td>
<td>192 E 2nd St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>East Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolve</td>
<td>221 E 58th St.</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Turtle Bay-East Midtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve Ultra Lounge</td>
<td>2354 Arthur Kill Rd</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staten Island</td>
<td>Rossville-Woodrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritz Bar</td>
<td>369 West 46th Street</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Tell Mama</td>
<td>343 West 46th Street</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPiN New York</td>
<td>304 Park Avenue South</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Hudson Yards-Chelsea-Flatiron-Union Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence NYC</td>
<td>311 W 57th St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger’s Bar</td>
<td>363 Fifth Avenue</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>Park Slope-Gowanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucho’s Club</td>
<td>39-18 68th Street</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>Woodside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrage</td>
<td>401 West 47th Street</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedlam Bar &amp; Lounge</td>
<td>40 Avenue C</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Lower East Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Strings Attached</td>
<td>40 W 40th St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Midtown-Midtown South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cubbyhole</td>
<td>281 W 12th St</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>West Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>236 E 58th St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Turtle Bay-East Midtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candle Bar</td>
<td>309 Amsterdam Ave</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1959-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Upper West Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool Box</td>
<td>1742 2nd Ave.</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Yorkville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidetracks</td>
<td>4508 Queens Boulevard</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>Hunters Point-Sunnyside-West Maspeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FairyTail Lounge</td>
<td>500 West 48th Street</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Eagle NYC</td>
<td>554 W 28th St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Hudson Yards-Chelsea-Flatiron-Union Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>559 Lorimer St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>North Side-South Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie’s Crisis</td>
<td>59 Grove St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>West Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branded Saloon</td>
<td>603 Vanderbilt Ave</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>Prospect Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 48</td>
<td>605 W 48th Street</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Bar</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Secondary Audience</td>
<td>Year Opened</td>
<td>Year Closed</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovegun</td>
<td>617 Grand St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>East Williamsburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacha New York</td>
<td>618 West 46th St</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space New York</td>
<td>637 W 50th St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Ibiza</td>
<td>637 W 50th St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar-Tini Ultra Lounge</td>
<td>642 10th Ave</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonewall</td>
<td>53 Christopher St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>West Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware Bar NYC</td>
<td>697 10th Ave</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxers HK</td>
<td>742 9th Ave</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlas Social Club</td>
<td>753 9th Ave</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westway</td>
<td>75 Clarkson</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>West Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boots and Saddles (v1)</td>
<td>76 Christopher St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>West Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Colors Bar</td>
<td>15 Roosevelt Avenue</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>Kew Gardens Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaming Saddles Saloon</td>
<td>793 Ninth Avenue</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Monster</td>
<td>80 Grove St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>West Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hombres Lounge</td>
<td>28 37th Avenue</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>Jackson Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Duplex</td>
<td>61 Christopher St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>West Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pieces</td>
<td>8 Christopher St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>West Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucky Chengs (v2)</td>
<td>95 Delancey</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Trans</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Chinatown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite</td>
<td>992 Amsterdam Ave</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Morningside Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Avenue Saloon</td>
<td>656 9th Ave.</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrietta Hudson</td>
<td>438 Hudson St</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>West Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ty's</td>
<td>114 Christopher St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>West Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiler Room</td>
<td>86 E 4th St.</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>East Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey's</td>
<td>536 Driggs Avenue</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>North Side-South Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>447 E 13th St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>East Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowhere</td>
<td>322 E 14th St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>East Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td>348 W 52nd St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Queen Vic</td>
<td>68 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>East Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Bloc</td>
<td>505 E 6th St.</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>East Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandy's Piano Bar</td>
<td>235 East 84th St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Yorkville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijou Theater</td>
<td>82 East 4 St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>East Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Bar</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Secondary Audience</td>
<td>Year Opened</td>
<td>Year Closed</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Side Club</td>
<td>227 East 56 St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Turtle Bay-East Midtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Hommes</td>
<td>217 West 80 St</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Upper West Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feathers</td>
<td>77 Kinderkamack Rd</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lips</td>
<td>227 E 56th Street</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Turtle Bay-East Midtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happyfun Hideaway</td>
<td>1211 Myrtle Ave</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>Bushwick South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This n’ That</td>
<td>108 N 6th Street</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>North Side-South Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dive Bar Lounge</td>
<td>667 W 10th Avenue</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leatherman</td>
<td>111 Christopher Street</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>West Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excelsior (v2)</td>
<td>563 5th Avenue</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>Park Slope-Gowanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pint</td>
<td>34 Wayne Street</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Last Shag</td>
<td>348 Franklin Avenue</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Theater</td>
<td>234 41st Street</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Midtown-Midtown South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albatross Bar</td>
<td>36-19 24th Avenue</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>Steinway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boots and Saddles (v2)</td>
<td>100A Seventh Avenue South</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>West Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-at-Large/ Black Party</td>
<td>1260 Atlantic Avenue</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>Crown Heights North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandem</td>
<td>236 Troutman Street</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>Bushwick North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ramble</td>
<td>Central Park</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>park-cemetery-etc-Manhattan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Parking</td>
<td>4168 Broadway</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Washington Heights South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmo</td>
<td>156 7th Avenue</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Hudson Yards-Chelsea-Flatiron-Union Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End Lounge</td>
<td>955 West End Avenue</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>Morningside Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowadays</td>
<td>56-06 Cooper Avenue</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>Ridgewood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCRIPTS USED

Script used to run all commands compiled in a separate Excel™ CSV file

```
print 'importing modules...'
import csv
import os
print 'finished importing modules...'
inputLocation = '/Users/abdollalshehhi/Desktop/CabDataWorkspace/'
outputLocation = inputLocation

pointsFile = inputLocation + 'Command_Lines.csv'

with open(pointsFile, 'rb') as baseData:
    reader = csv.reader(baseData, delimiter = ',')
    Commands = list(reader)

for y in Commands[0:]:
    print str(y)
    for z in y:
        print z
        os.system(str(z))
print ''

print 'done'
```

Script used to combine all output files

```
# first file:
for line in open("/Users/abdollalshehhi/Desktop/CabDataWorkspace/green/g1401_dout.csv","a"):
    fout.write(line)

# now the rest:
for num in range(1,85):
    f = open("/Users/abdollalshehhi/Desktop/CabDataWorkspace/green/dropoff1401/1401_0d.csv")
    next(f) # skip the header
    for line in f:
        fout.write(line)
f.close() # not really needed
fout.close()
```
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