Appendices to "The Effects of Legal Representation on Tenant Outcomes in Housing Court: Evidence from New York City's Universal Access Program"

Mike Cassidy and Janet Currie

Princeton University

March 2023

A.1 Regression Discontinuity Analysis

As a supplementary exercise to subject the main results to more stringent scrutiny, we conduct a regression discontinuity event study analysis focusing on the ten months before and after the ramp up of UA in the 20 zip codes that comprise the first three treated cohorts. The running variable is the number of calendar months since the empirical UA start month (with UA start equal to month zero). The discontinuity instrument is an indicator for whether the filing date is at or after the month of the UA ramp up. The design is a fuzzy regression discontinuity because exposure to UA increases the probability of attorney representation but does not guarantee it. Since the exact date when the increased probability of representation occurs is somewhat blurry, a "donut" of cases filed within a month on either side of the empirical UA start month are omitted.

The estimating equation, again estimated by TSLS, is a straightforward modification of Equation (1):

$$Y_{i} = \gamma_{0} + \gamma_{1}m_{i} + \gamma_{2}(m_{i} \times R_{i}) + \gamma_{3}R_{i}$$

+ γ_{4} HC_i + γ_{5} PLUTO_{a(i)} + γ_{6} PLUTO_{b(i)} (A.1)
+ $zip_{i} + borough_{i} + \omega_{i}$

where m_i is the running variable, i.e., the number of months relative to the UA start month for case *i*'s borough-zip-code-cohort. The instrument for R_i (the indicator for tenant representation) is UA_i (empirical UA treatment) as before, and $m_i \times R_i$ is instrumented with $m_i \times UA_i$. We do not include the borough-by-month fixed effects in the RD specification due to collinearity with the running variable. This RD design is an exacting test of our general identification assumptions since the sample is much smaller, consisting of only the 36,856 cases filed within +/-10 months UA start for the treated zip codes in the first three UA cohorts.

The key results of the regression discontinuity exercise are shown in Figure A.4.¹ Despite the more restrictive sample, Figure A.4 shows clear evidence of UA-coincident jumps in the probability that respondents have representation, as well as discontinuous declines in the probability of judgment with possession, the probability of a warrant issuance, and the log judgment amount. The probability that a warrant is executed appears to be on a more steeply declining path following UA implementation, but there is no sharp break.

Moreover, there is little evidence that UA implementation changed the composition of the housing court caseload, at least over the time frame we examine here. Appendix Figure

¹The corresponding regression estimates appear in Table A.9.

A.5 shows that the density of cases is fairly smooth through the UA implementation "jump" point. Appendix Figure A.6 shows that there is little change in salient characteristics of cases filed in housing court around the time of UA introduction; in particular, primary claim amounts and the share of cases that involve nonpayment are quite similar in the preand post-UA periods. There is a slight but not statistically significant short-term rise in landlord cases per unit, but this returns to the long-term trend by 10 months out. Hence, the regression discontinuity framework supports the identifying assumption that the pool of housing court cases remained similar before and after the implementation of UA.

A.2 Universal Access Empirical Start Date Instrument Algorithm

As discussed in the main text, we devise an algorithm to identify empirical UA start dates (specifically, start months). Our main instrumental variable is then an indicator for case filing subsequent to empirical program start. For each borough and zip-code cohort:

- 1. Calculate the share of tenants with counsel in our main sample for each month.
- 2. Smooth the data by fitting a local mean regression with a bandwidth of one month for each borough-cohort and generate smoothed predicted tenant representation rates for each borough-cohort-month.
- Identify candidate start months by calculating lagging (t-1 to t) and leading (t to t+1) changes in smoothed representation rates. Candidate start months are then defined as those whose (a) lead-lag differential change is greater than one percentage point, and (b) leading change is positive.
- 4. If a borough-cohort has several consecutive candidate start months, keep only the first month in the streak as a candidate.
- 5. Calculate the absolute nine-month leading change in smoothed representation rates (t to t+9).
- 6. Refine the candidate start list to include only those months beginning a nine-month period with a cumulative increase in tenant representation of at least nine percentage points. (9 percent is the mean tenant representation rate in our sample, so this represents a 100 percent increase relative to the mean.)
- 7. If more than one candidate start date remains for a borough-cohort, select the month whose relative nine-month leading change (i.e., percent change) is the largest among all the candidates. UA start is the first day of that month.

Table 1, Column 2, lists the resulting empirical start dates.

This procedure is similar to the "fixed point" algorithm of Card, Mas and Rothstein (2008) for identifying tipping points. As a robustness check, we additionally adapt their algorithm to our setting using the following two-step procedure:

- 1. Fit the de-meaned monthly change in tenant representation rates by borough and cohort to a quartic polynomial in filing month. Identify candidate roots of this polynomial subject to the constraint that the overall change in representation rates between the baseline period average (January to June 2016) to the month preceding the candidate root is less than 10 percentage points. If there is more than one candidate root, select the root where the derivative of a quartic in borough-cohort representation is greatest.
- 2. Fit a second borough-cohort de-meaned representation rate monthly change quartic for months within a 9-month bandwidth centered at each borough-cohort's step 1 root. Identify the roots of this polynomial subject to (a) the derivative of a (raw, not demeaned) quartic in borough-cohort representation is greater than 10 percentage points, and (b) it occurs between July 2016 and December 2018 (to avoid boundary issues). If there is more than one candidate root, select the one that occurs first chronologically. This point is the tipping point.
- Table 2, Column 4, lists the resulting tipping-point start dates.

A.3 Data Appendix

A.3.1 Covariates Definitions

Our covariates, grouped by data source, consist of the following.

1. Housing Court

- Petitioner counsel: a 0–1 indicator for whether the landlord (petitioner) is represented by a lawyer.
- Nonpayment: a 0–1 indicator for whether the case is a nonpayment case. Most LT cases are nonpayment cases (the omitted category here); all other cases are classified as "holdover," meaning that the purported violation is for something other than nonpayment of rent (e.g., staying past the end of a lease).
- Court Borough: a categorical variable denoting the county in which the case is filed. New York City has five county housing courts, one for each of its five geographical boroughs: Bronx, Kings (Brooklyn), New York (Manhattan), Queens, and Richmond (Staten Island). There are also two specialized courts that also handle housing cases, which are each assigned to the borough in which they are located: Harlem (New York) and Red Hook (Kings).
- Specialized Court Indicators: separate indicators for whether the case is filed is in the Harlem or Red Hook courts.
- Time Effects: our main specifications include (court) borough-by-month fixed effects to flexibly control for secular trends and idiosyncratic shocks.
- Respondent Count == 1: an indicator for whether there is a single (as opposed to multiple) respondents in a case.
- Petitioner Count == 1: an indicator for whether there is a single (as opposed to multiple) petitioners in a case.
- NYCHA: a 0–1 indicator for whether the case involves the New York City Housing Authority (public housing).
- Specialty designation: a 0–1 indicator for the whether the case is flagged by the courts for having an attribute of interest (e.g., co-ops, condos). Excludes those cases flagged for specialty zips (for reasons of collinearity with our instruments).
- Log(Primary Claim Amount): the natural logarithm of the total monetary claim by the landlord against the tenant, in real January 2021 dollars adjusted using the monthly Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers and winsorized at the

first and ninety-ninth percentiles (and with one dollar added to all claims before taking the log so as not to exclude cases with claim amounts of zero.)

2. Census American Community Survey

ACS data comes from 2019 Five-Year Estimates. Unless otherwise noted, all ACS variables refer to the characteristics of an address' census block group.

- A vector of census block group demographic attributes: total population, median household income, household poverty rate, total housing units, renter share of housing units, median gross rent, and population shares that are Hispanic, Black, Asian, White, ages 0–17, ages 65+, and female, as well as census tract shares of non-citizens and naturalized citizens (citizenship data is not available at the block group level). All CBG covariates are transformed into categorical quartiles defined within our sample and appended with a fifth "unknown" category to avoid dropping observations with missing data.
- In several analyses, we also categorize CBG's with a series of indicators describing the block group's majority (≥ 0.5 share) race is Hispanic, Black, White, or Asian.
- All monetary variables from the ACS are in real 2019 dollars.

3. **PLUTO**

PLUTO data comes from version 21v1 (February 2021). All PLUTO variables describe the characteristics of a housing unit's tax lot or building. Unless otherwise noted, all quartile covariates are defined within-sample. All indicator and categorical variables are appended with an "unknown" category to avoid dropping observations with missing data. All monetary variables from PLUTO are in real 2019 dollars.

- Zoning district: four categories describing the tax lot's primary zoning classification (low-, medium-, and high-density residential; other (e.g., commercial, manufacturing))
- Land use: five categories describing the tax lot's land use designation and summarizing its building class (1–2 family; multi-family walkup; multi-family elevator; mixed residential-commercial; other (e.g., commercial)).
- Single building: a 0–1 indicator for whether a tax lot contains a single building.
- Residential units: categorical quartiles describing the total number of residential units in a tax lot.

- Year built: three categories describing the year a building completed construction (<1947; 1947–1973; 1974–2021). Buildings with six or more units constructed in the 1947–1973 period are likely to be rent stabilized.
- Building altered: a 0–1 indicator for whether a building was altered in a manner that changed its value after initial construction.
- Lot area: categorical quartiles of the total area of the tax lot, measured in millions of square feet.
- Building-to-lot area ration: categorical quartiles of the total building floor area ratio divided by the tax lot area. Also known as built floor area ratio.
- Property assessed total: categorical quartiles the total assessed value of the tax lot, measured in millions of dollars, as recorded in the Department of Finance's (DOF) FY22 Tentative Assessment Roll.
- Landlord characteristics: categorical quartiles (appended with unknowns) of property owner's number of NYC properties, number of NYC buildings, number of NYC residential units, sum of assessed total value, within-sample housing court cases, and within-sample housing court cases per number of residential units.
- Rent Stabilization Eligible: a 0–1 indicator for whether a housing unit is likely to be rent stabilized, which means that the NYC Rent Guidelines Board sets limits on allowable annual rent increases. Buildings meeting the following criteria are likely to be rent stabilized in NYC: (1) constructed between 1947 and 1973, inclusive, (2) contains six or more units, and (3) is not a co-op, condo, or NYCHA. Note that not every unit in a rent-stabilized building is necessarily rent stabilized, as historically some units became deregulated when rent exceeded certain thresholds. In addition, though less common, newer buildings may be temporarily rent stabilized if they receive 421-a or J-51 tax exemptions. Rent stabilization is the primary form of rent control in NYC (a smaller number of units are "rent controlled") (NYC Rent Guidelines Board, 2022; NYU Furman Center, 2022).

A Note on Dispositions: Disposition, or whether a case has been officially closed by the court, is not an informative outcome in the housing court data. During the course of our analysis, we found that it is common for cases to remain open but "dormant" for inconsistent and often long (over a year) periods after the involved parties have ceased actively pursuing them. In particular, OCA implemented "mass disposals" of dormant cases on two particular dates during our study period. Per OCA, we believe we are the first to raise this issue in the academic literature. This issue is important because, in the cross-section, it is not clear whether a non-disposed case is right-censored or concluded.

A.4 Complier Characterization

To characterize compliers, we use a procedure similar to that described by Angrist and Pischke (2008), Abadie (2003), Dahl, Kostøl and Mogstad (2014), and Dobbie, Goldin and Yang (2018). There are two steps. First, we estimate the share of the sample that are compliers. Second, we identify their average characteristics.

The complier share is the proportion of tenants whose treatment status depends on the instrument: those tenants who have a lawyer if and only if UA is operating in their zip code. Using potential outcomes notation, $R_i(UA_i = 1) > R_i(UA_i = 0)$. The complier share (CS) can thus be estimated from the Wald first stage (i.e., first stage without covariates):

$$CS = R_i(UA_i = 1) - R_i(UA_i = 0)$$
$$= (\widehat{\pi}_0 + \widehat{\pi}_1 \times 1) - (\widehat{\pi}_0 + \widehat{\pi}_1 \times 0)$$
$$= \widehat{\pi}_1$$

where $\hat{\pi}_0$ and $\hat{\pi}_1$ are the intercept and slope coefficients, respectively, from the Wald first stage.

Similarly, always-takers are those who are treated even without UA, $AS = \hat{\pi}_0$, and nevertakers are those who are do not have a lawyer even with UA, $NS = 1 - \hat{\pi}_0 - \hat{\pi}_1$. Using this simple linear Wald first stage, we estimate that the complier share is 15.8 percent. Always-takers comprise 7.7 percent of the sample, while never-takers represent 76.5 percent.

While it is impossible to identify individual compilers, describing their average characteristics is a straightforward application of Bayes' rule.

For a binary characteristic, X, the mean is a probability, $E(X) = 1 \cdot Pr(X)$. Letting C be an indicator for complier, and NC for non-complier, what we want to estimate is E(X|C) =Pr(X = 1|C = 1). This expression cannot be evaluated directly, because compliance is based on unobserved counterfactuals. Fortunately, Bayes' Rule allows a reformulation in terms of known quantities $Pr(X = 1|C = 1) = \frac{Pr(X \cap C)}{Pr(C)} = \frac{Pr(C|X)Pr(X)}{Pr(C)}$. All of the quantities in the last expression are estimable the data. Pr(X) is just the mean of X in the full sample. $Pr(C) = \hat{\pi}_1$ is the complier share of the sample, estimated above. Pr(C|X) = Pr(C =1|X = 1) is the complier share in the subpopulation with the characteristic of interest, $\hat{\pi}_1^X$, estimated from the Wald first stage in the subsample with X = 1.

Similarly, the non-complier, NC, mean is $E(X = 1 | C = 0) = \frac{Pr(X=1 \cap C=0)}{1 - Pr(C)} = \frac{Pr(X=1)(1 - Pr(C=1 | X=1))}{1 - Pr(C=1)} = \frac{Pr(X=1) - Pr(X=1)Pr(C=1 | X=1)}{1 - Pr(C=1)}.$

For continuous characteristics, we partition the covariate into discrete deciles, repeat the above algorithm for each decile, and then take a weighted average. We calculate standard errors and perform a formal mean comparison using 200 bootstrap replications.

A.5 References

- **Abadie, Alberto.** 2003. "Semiparametric Instrumental Variable Estimation of Treatment Response Models." *Journal of Econometrics*, 113(2): 231–263.
- Angrist, Joshua D., and Jorn-Steffen Pischke. 2008. Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion. Princeton University Press.
- Card, David, Alexandre Mas, and Jesse Rothstein. 2008. "Tipping and the Dynamics of Segregation." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(1): 177–218.
- Dahl, Gordon B., Andreas Ravndal Kostøl, and Magne Mogstad. 2014. "Family Welfare Cultures." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 129(4): 1711–1752.
- **Dobbie, Will, Jacob Goldin, and Crystal S. Yang.** 2018. "The Effects of Pretrial Detention on Conviction, Future Crime, and Employment: Evidence from Randomly Assigned Judges." *American Economic Review*, 108(2): 201–40.
- NYC Rent Guidelines Board. 2022. "Rent Stabilized Building Lists." Accessed 24 May 2022. https://rentguidelinesboard.cityofnewyork.us/resources/ rent-stabilized-building-lists.
- NYU Furman Center. 2022. "Directory of NYC Housing Programs: Rent Stabilization." Accessed 24 May 2022. https://furmancenter.org/coredata/directory/entry/ rent-stabilization.

A.6 Supplementary Tables

	UA In	dicator	UA Intensity		
	Main	Addr FE	Main	Addr FE	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
Respondent Counsel	$\begin{array}{c} 0.124^{**} \\ (0.006) \end{array}$	0.118^{**} (0.008)	0.158^{**} (0.037)	0.157^{**} (0.027)	
Judgment with Possession	-0.040^{**}	-0.039^{**}	-0.085^{**}	-0.070^{**}	
	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.022)	(0.023)	
Log Judgment Amount	-0.263^{**}	-0.297^{**}	-0.494^{**}	-0.447^{**}	
	(0.042)	(0.060)	(0.094)	(0.123)	
Warrant Issued	-0.040^{**}	-0.040**	-0.080^{**}	-0.069^{**}	
	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.021)	(0.024)	
Warrant Executed	-0.010^{**}	-0.007	-0.014	-0.008	
	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.009)	(0.011)	
Observations Covariates Zip FE Borough × Month FE	727,692 Yes Yes Ves	456,788 Yes Yes Ves	403,483 Yes Yes	202,409 Yes Yes No	
Address FE	No	Yes	No	Yes	

Table A.1: First Stage and Reduced Form Results: Universal Access toCounsel and Housing Court Outcomes

Outcomes are listed in rows. Analytical specifications are indexed by column. All results are for the main sample. Unit of observation is a housing court case. Each cell in Columns 1 and 2 reports the coefficient on an indicator for empirical UA treatment (i.e., the instrument in the main IV results) from a separate regression of the row-enumerated outcome on the covariates and fixed effects summarized at the bottom of the table. Columns 3 and 4 report analogous results for the UA intensity instrument (UA households served by zip-year, divided by 1000). Standard errors clustered by zip code are given in parentheses. * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01

	С	NC	Diff
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Nonpayment	0.822	0.878	-0.056**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[-12.265]
L Deine ener Oleine	C 499	C 099	0.401**
Log Primary Claim	(0.001)	(0.000)	-0.491*** [-13 123]
	(0.001)	(0.000)	[10.120]
Bronx	0.332	0.361	-0.029**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[-8.406]
Kinga (Prooklym)	0.220	0.265	0.055**
Kings (Brooklyn)	(0.320)	(0.205)	[10, 760]
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[10.100]
New York (Manhattan)	0.141	0.215	-0.075**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[-12.408]
Outcome	0.196	0.147	0.091
Queens	(0.120)	(0.147)	-0.021
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[1.040]
Richmond (Staten Island)	0.032	0.020	0.012^{**}
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[9.103]
NVCHA	0 101	0.911	0 110**
NICHA	(0.101)	(0.211)	[-20, 594]
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[20.004]
CT Naturalized Pct.	0.176	0.190	-0.014**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[-10.787]
CT Noncitizen Pet	0.150	0 165	-0.015**
OT Noncitizen 1 et.	(0.000)	(0.000)	[-15.291]
	()	()	[]
CBG Hispanic Pct.	0.394	0.420	-0.026**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[-9.156]
CBG Black Pet	0.373	0.342	0.032**
ODO DIACK I CO.	(0.000)	(0.000)	[8.790]
	· /	()	L J
CBG Asian Pct.	0.069	0.069	0.001
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[0.392]
CBG White Pct	0 154	0 143	0.011**
obd White Fet.	(0.000)	(0.000)	[3.567]
	· /	· · ·	r .
CBG 0-17 Years Pct.	0.231	0.230	0.001
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[1.289]
CBG 65+ Years Pct	0.125	0.131	-0.006**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[-6.880]
	. /	. ,	
CBG Female Pct.	0.538	0.541	-0.003**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[-3.592]

Table A.2A: Complier Characteristics

This table summarizes the average observable characteristics of tenants who are compliers with the empirical universal access to counsel instrument (an indicator equal to one if UA is operating in a tenant's borough and zip code cohort at the time of case filing.) Compliers are tenants whose legal representation is affected by the instrument: that is, those who have lawyers when UA is operating, but not otherwise. Non-compliers are always- and never-takers. Columns 1 and 2 give the complier and non-complier means, respectively, for the row-enumerated characteristics. Standard errors, computed from 200 bootstrap replications are in parentheses. Column 3 gives the differences in means, with test statistics in brackets. The algorithm for estimating these means is described in Appendix A.4. * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01

	C (1)	NC (2)	Diff (3)
CBG HH Median Income/1000 (in 2019\$)	48.45	48.03	0.42
	(0.14)	(0.01)	[1.08]
	0.000	0.004	0.000
CBG Poverty Pct.	0.282	0.284	-0.002
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[-0.957]
CBG Rental Units Pct	0.828	0.868	-0.040**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[-15.257]
	()	· · · ·	
CBG Median Gross Rent/1000 (in 2019\$)	1.32	1.20	0.12^{**}
	(0.00)	(0.00)	[16.38]
Dant Stabilization Elizible	0.090	0 191	0.051**
Rent Stabilization Eligible	0.080	(0.000)	-0.051***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[-14.000]
Specialty Designation	0.030	0.042	-0.011**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[-3.868]
Zone Dist.: Res. Low Density	0.287	0.186	0.101**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[13.508]
Zono Dist · Ros Modium Donsity	0.625	0.637	0.011*
Zone Dist., Res. Medium Density	(0.025)	(0.001)	[_2 /31]
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[-2.401]
Zone Dist.: Res. High Density	0.086	0.110	-0.024**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[-9.363]
			o ozołuk
Land Use: 1-2 Family	0.096	0.044	0.052**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[10.285]
Land Use: Multi-Family Walkup	0.270	0.244	0.026**
Long tool from Long tool of	(0.000)	(0.000)	[6.138]
Land Use: Multi-Family Elevator	0.391	0.485	-0.094**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[-16.421]
Land User Mired Pag. Comm	0.100	0.910	0.020**
Land Use. Mixed ResComm.	(0.199)	(0.219)	[_4 291]
	(0.000)	(0.000)	[1.201]
Building-to-Lot Area Ratio	2.92	3.43	-0.52**
	(0.00)	(0.00)	[-24.39]
Lot Assessed Value/ 1000000 (in 2021\$)	6.29	11.17	-4.88**
	(0.11)	(0.00)	[-14.40]
Landlord Units	29023 76	43507 92	$-1.4e \pm 04^{**}$
	(8.3e+05)	(30987.85)	[-15.64]
		(/	. ,
Landlord Cases Per Units	0.79	0.83	-0.04**
	(0.00)	(0.00)	[-6.61]
Eiled Marth	6 100	6 100	0.007
r neu Month	0.169	(0.102)	0.067
	(0.001)	(0.000)	[1.009]
Filed Year	2017.378	2017.197	0.181**
	(0.001)	(0.000)	[7.757]

Table A.2B: Complier Characteristics

This table summarizes the average observable characteristics of tenants who are compliers with the empirical universal access to counsel instrument (an indicator equal to one if UA is operating in a tenant's borough and zip code cohort at the time of case filing.) Compliers are tenants whose legal representation is affected by the instrument: that is, those who have lawyers when UA is operating, but not otherwise. Non-compliers are always- and never-takers. Columns 1 and 2 give the complier and non-complier means, respectively, for the row-enumerated characteristics. Standard errors, computed from 200 bootstrap replications are in parentheses. Column 3 gives the differences in means, with test statistics in brackets. The algorithm for estimating these means is described in Appendix A.4. * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01

	Ma	Main		ess FE
	OLS	UA IV	OLS	UA IV
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Respondent Counsel (First Stage)		0.125**		0.119**
		(0.006)		(0.008)
Judgment with Possession	-0.086**	-0.314**	-0.064**	-0.333**
	(0.006)	(0.041)	(0.008)	(0.055)
Log Judgment Amount	0.116^{**}	-2.081**	-0.119*	-2.512**
	(0.039)	(0.291)	(0.047)	(0.406)
Warrant Issued	-0.082**	-0.316**	-0.059**	-0.340**
	(0.005)	(0.037)	(0.008)	(0.057)
Warrant Executed	-0.031**	-0.077**	-0.009**	-0.057
	(0.002)	(0.020)	(0.003)	(0.034)
Observations	$623,\!050$	$623,\!050$	$402,\!075$	$402,\!075$
First-Stage F Stat		515.52		242.82
Covariates	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Zip FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Borough \times Month FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Address FE	No	No	Yes	Yes

Table A.3: Main Results: Respondent Counsel and Housing Court Outcomes, Excluding Queens

Outcomes are listed in rows. Analytical specifications are indexed by column. All results are for the main sample, excluding cases from Queens. Unit of observation is a housing court case. Each cell in Columns 1–4 reports the coefficient on respondent (tenant) counsel from a separate regression of the row-enumerated outcome on the covariates and fixed effects summarized at the bottom of the table. Columns 1 and 3 report the ordinary least squares linear associations between outcomes and tenant counsel. Columns 2 and 4 report two-stage least squares instrumental variable results for tenant counsel, using an indicator for empirical UA treatment (i.e., program roll out) as the instrument (equal to one if UA is operating in a case's zip code at the time of filing). Supercolumns group specifications by the major fixed effects, while Columns 3 and 4 additionally control for address fixed effects. First row reports first-stage results with tenant (respondent) counsel as the dependent variable. Standard errors clustered by zip code are given in parentheses. * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01

	Ma	Main		ess FE
	OLS	UA IV	OLS	UA IV
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Respondent Counsel (First Stage)		0.173**		0.175**
		(0.008)		(0.009)
Judgment with Possession	-0.204**	-0.387**	-0.159**	-0.426**
	(0.007)	(0.041)	(0.010)	(0.050)
Log Judgment Amount	-0.413**	-2.401**	-0.546**	-2.858**
	(0.039)	(0.302)	(0.060)	(0.507)
Warrant Issued	-0.191**	-0.370**	-0.149**	-0.410**
	(0.007)	(0.040)	(0.011)	(0.052)
Warrant Executed	-0.049**	-0.086**	-0.024**	-0.099**
	(0.002)	(0.025)	(0.003)	(0.035)
Observations	$431,\!038$	$431,\!038$	218,780	218,780
First-Stage F Stat		527.59		355.67
Covariates	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Zip FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Borough \times Month FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Address FE	No	No	Yes	Yes

Table A.4: Main Results: Respondent Counsel and Housing Court Outcomes, Excluding NYCHA and Cases without Activity beyond Initial Filing

Outcomes are listed in rows. Analytical specifications are indexed by column. All results are for the main sample, excluding NYCHA cases and those with no activity beyond initial filing. Unit of observation is a housing court case. Each cell in Columns 1–4 reports the coefficient on respondent (tenant) counsel from a separate regression of the row-enumerated outcome on the covariates and fixed effects summarized at the bottom of the table. Columns 1 and 3 report the ordinary least squares linear associations between outcomes and tenant counsel. Columns 2 and 4 report two-stage least squares instrumental variable results for tenant counsel, using an indicator for empirical UA treatment (i.e., program roll out) as the instrument (equal to one if UA is operating in a case's zip code at the time of filing). Supercolumns group specifications by the major fixed effects included. Columns 1 and 2 control for zip and court borough by month fixed effects, while Columns 3 and 4 additionally control for address fixed effects. First row reports first-stage results with tenant (respondent) counsel as the dependent variable. Standard errors clustered by zip code are given in parentheses. * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01

	Empirical UA Treatment (Main IV)						Intens	ity IV	
		All Years FY18–19			FY18–19				
	No Covs (1)	Zip FE (2)	No Time (3)	No Covs (4)	$\operatorname{Zip} \operatorname{FE}(5)$	Main (6)	Addr. FE (7)	No Covs (8)	Zip FE (9)
Respondent Counsel	0.158^{**} (0.015)	0.128^{**} (0.007)	0.127^{**} (0.006)	0.162^{**} (0.016)	0.110^{**} (0.006)	0.107^{**} (0.006)	0.095^{**} (0.009)	0.083^{**} (0.012)	0.132^{**} (0.034)
Judgment with Possession	-0.235^{**} (0.081)	-0.542^{**} (0.035)	-0.590^{**} (0.040)	-0.221^{*} (0.085)	-0.712^{**} (0.125)	-0.437^{**} (0.081)	-0.327^{**} (0.108)	-0.208^{*} (0.103)	-0.977^{**} (0.160)
Log Judgment Amount	-0.758 (0.532)	-3.009^{**} (0.276)	-3.255^{**} (0.320)	-0.809 (0.570)	-4.175^{**} (0.458)	-2.535^{**} (0.423)	-2.641^{**} (0.433)	$1.736 \\ (0.920)$	-5.489^{**} (1.066)
Warrant Issued	-0.114 (0.077)	-0.508^{**} (0.041)	-0.555^{**} (0.040)	-0.083 (0.088)	-0.663^{**} (0.118)	-0.439^{**} (0.070)	-0.270^{**} (0.089)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.081\\ (0.120) \end{array}$	-0.798^{**} (0.131)
Warrant Executed	-0.040 (0.032)	-0.166^{**} (0.011)	-0.186^{**} (0.014)	-0.026 (0.032)	-0.171^{**} (0.044)	-0.117^{*} (0.052)	0.165^{*} (0.080)	-0.171^{*} (0.083)	-0.586^{**} (0.225)
Observations First-Stage F-Stat	727,703	727,692 377.95	727,692 459.37	403,495	403,483 338.32	$\begin{array}{c} 403,\!483 \\ 314.51 \end{array}$	202,409 109.72	$403,495 \\48.10$	$403,\!483$ 15.15
Covariates Zip FE	No No	No Yes	Yes Yes	No No	No Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No No	No Yes
Borough \times Month FE Address FE	No No	No No	No No	No No	No No	No No	No Yes	No No	No No

Table A.5: IV Results: Additional Specifications

Outcomes are listed in rows. Analytical specifications are indexed by column. Unit of observation is a housing court case. Each cell reports the coefficient on tenant counsel from a separate instrumental variable regression of the row-enumerated outcome on the covariates and fixed effects summarized at the bottom of the table. Top supercolumns group specifications by the instrument used. Colums 1–7 use the main instrument: an indicator for empirical UA treatment (equal to one if UA is operating in a case's borough and zip code at the time of filing). Columns 8 and 9 use the UA intensity instrument (UA households served by zip-year, divided by 1000). Second-level supercolumns group specifications by the years included. Columns 1–3 include all years (i.e., the main sample), while Columns 4–9 limit the analysis to the subsample of cases filed in City Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019, (for comparability with the UA intensity instrument). The first row reports first-stage results with tenant (respondent) counsel as the dependent variable. Standard errors clustered by zip code are given in parentheses. * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01

	Full		Zip-Month Panel				
	OLS	OLS	BJS	CS	CD	SA	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
Respondent Counsel	0.122**	0.122**	0.124**	0.117**	0.129**	0.123**	
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.002)	(0.013)	(0.008)	(0.003)	
Judgment with Possession	-0.045**	-0.045**	-0.046**	-0.043**	-0.040**	-0.045**	
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.003)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.003)	
Log Judgment Amount	-0.301**	-0.303**	-0.300**	-0.236**	-0.259**	-0.297**	
	(0.041)	(0.042)	(0.039)	(0.056)	(0.065)	(0.040)	
Warrant Issued	-0.041**	-0.042**	-0.041**	-0.041**	-0.037**	-0.040**	
	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.003)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.003)	
Warrant Executed	-0.007*	-0.008**	-0.010**	-0.014**	-0.010**	-0.010**	
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	
Obs.	$727,\!692$	$7,\!483$	$7,\!496$	$7,\!460$	$7,\!496$	$7,\!483$	
Zip FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Month FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Covariates	No	No	No	No	No	No	

Table A.6: Alternative Difference-in-Differences Estimators for Two-Way Fixed Effects with Staggered Treatment: Zip-Month Panel Results

This table assesses the robustness of our first-stage and reduced form results to recently proposed alternatives estimators of average treatment effects on the treated for two-way fixed effects models, where treatment is a function of cohort and time indicators and adoption is staggered across time. Outcomes are listed in rows. Estimators are indexed by column. Each cell represents a distinct estimate of the overall static ATT. Column 1 gives the full sample OLS TWFE estimate, where the unit of observation is an individual housing court case (pooled cross section), as in the main analysis. Columns 2–6 are estimated in a panel collapsed at the zip-month level, with results weighted by the number of observations in each cell. Column 2 reproduces the standard OLS TWFE estimate for the zip-month panel. Column 3 gives the Borusyak, Jaravel, Spiess (2022) estimator. Column 4 gives the Callaway and Sant'Anna (2021) estimator. Column 5 gives the de Chaisemartin and D'Haultfoeuille (2020) estimator. Column 6 gives the Sun and Abraham (2021) estimator. For simplicity, no time- or group-varying covariates are included in any model. For treated zips, pre-treatment outcomes are set to pre-treatment mean for all pre-treatment months. For the CD (2020) estimator, reported number of observations is the total observations in zip-month panel, since the manner in which this estimator counts observations used in estimation is not comparable with the other estimators (Stata reports that 3.6 million outcome and treatment first differences are used in the estimation). Standard errors clustered by zip code are given in parentheses. * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01

Respondent	Judgment	Log	Warrant	Warrant
Counsel	with	Judgment	Issued	Executed
	Possession	Amount		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Above In-Sar	nple Median			
0.127^{**}	-0.341**	-2.420**	-0.346**	-0.126**
(0.007)	(0.073)	(0.361)	(0.057)	(0.016)
$364,\!174$				
[363.53]				
0.120^{**}	-0.330**	-1.957^{**}	-0.310**	-0.036
(0.006)	(0.052)	(0.372)	(0.052)	(0.028)
$363,\!511$				
[390.66]				
0.007	-0.010	-0.463	-0.036	-0.090^{++}
$\{0.4267\}$	$\{0.9097\}$	$\{ 0.3713 \}$	$\{0.6388\}$	$\{0.0059\}$
ligible				
0.087**	-0.494**	-2.436*	-0.429*	0.046
(0.008)	(0.161)	(1.000)	(0.182)	(0.056)
89,726	()	· · · ·		()
[115.85]				
0.128**	-0.310**	-2.118**	-0.312**	-0.089**
(0.007)	(0.042)	(0.283)	(0.038)	(0.021)
637,964	· · · ·		· · · ·	, ,
[384.59]				
-0.041^{++}	-0.184	-0.318	-0.117	0.136^{+}
$\{0.0001\}$	$\{0.2703\}$	$\{0.7595\}$	$\{0.5299\}$	$\{0.0228\}$
	Respondent Counsel (1) Above In-Sar 0.127^{**} (0.007) 364,174 [363.53] 0.120^{**} (0.006) 363,511 [390.66] 0.007 $\{0.4267\}$ ligible 0.087^{**} (0.008) 89,726 [115.85] 0.128^{**} (0.007) 637,964 [384.59] -0.041^{++} $\{0.0001\}$	RespondentJudgment withCounselwith.Possession(1)(2)Above In-Sample Median 0.127^{**} -0.341^{**}(0.007)(0.073)364,174[363.53] 0.120^{**} -0.330^{**}(0.006) (0.052) 363,511[390.66] 0.007 [390.66] 0.007 -0.010 $\{0.4267\}$ [0.007]-0.010 $\{0.4267\}$ ligible 0.087^{**} -0.494^{**} (0.008) (0.161) $89,726$ $[115.85]$ 0.128^{**} -0.310^{**} (0.007) (0.042) $637,964$ $[384.59]$ -0.184 $\{0.2703\}$	RespondentJudgmentLogCounselwithJudgmentPossessionAmount (1) (2) (3) Above In-Sample Median 0.127^{**} -0.341^{**} -2.420^{**} (0.007) (0.073) (0.361) $364,174$ $[363.53]$ 0.120^{**} -0.330^{**} -1.957^{**} (0.006) (0.052) (0.372) $363,511$ $[390.66]$ 0.007 -0.010 -0.463 $[0.4267]$ $\{0.9097\}$ $\{0.3713\}$ ligible 0.087^{**} -0.494^{**} -2.436^{*} (0.008) (0.161) (1.000) $89,726$ $[115.85]$ 0.128^{**} -0.310^{**} $[115.85]$ 0.128^{**} -0.310^{**} -2.118^{**} (0.007) (0.042) (0.283) $637,964$ $[384.59]$ -0.184 -0.318 $\{0.0001\}$ $\{0.2703\}$ $\{0.7595\}$	RespondentJudgmentLogWarrantCounselwithJudgmentIssued.PossessionAmount.(1)(2)(3)(4)Above In-Sample Median 0.127^{**} -0.341^{**} -2.420^{**} 0.007 (0.073)(0.361)(0.057) $364,174$ $[363.53]$ 0.120^{**} -0.330^{**} -1.957^{**} (0.006) (0.052)(0.372)(0.052) $363,511$ $[390.66]$ 0.007 -0.010 -0.463 $[0.087^{**}$ -0.494^{**} -2.436^{*} -0.429^{*} (0.008) (0.161)(1.000)(0.182) $89,726$ $[115.85]$ 0.128^{**} -0.310^{**} $(1.1585]$ 0.128^{**} -0.310^{**} -0.312^{**} (0.007) (0.042)(0.283)(0.038) $637,964$ $[384.59]$ -0.041^{++} -0.184 -0.318 -0.041^{++} -0.184 -0.318 -0.117 $\{0.0001\}$ $\{0.2703\}$ $\{0.7595\}$ $\{0.5299\}$

Table A.7A: Heterogeneity Analysis: IV Results

Unit of observation is a housing court case. Outcomes are listed in columns. Rows index the characteristics and levels defining the subsamples among which the heterogeneity analysis is conducted. Each cell in a characteristic-level row reports the coefficient on tenant counsel from a separate TSLS instrumental variable regression of the column-enumerated outcome on main specification controls (corresponding to Column 2 in Table 3), and empirical UA treatment as the instrument, for the subsample defined by the characteristic-level row. Standard errors clustered by zip code are given in parentheses. Number of observations and first-stage F-statistic (in brackets) reported below SE's in Column 1. First column reports first-stage results with tenant (respondent) counsel as the dependent variable. Difference row gives the difference in means of the binary contrast provided; if only one level of a characteristic is reported, the contrast is with the implied inverse omitted category. P-values for the differences in means reported in braces below the point estimates. Stars attached to coefficients indicate statistical significance with respect to zero, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01; crosses attached to differences in means reflect statistical significance of differences in coefficients between subgroups, +p < 0.05, ++p < 0.01.

		Respondent Counsel	Judgment with	Log Judgment	Warrant Issued	Warrant Executed
		Counser	Possession	Amount	ibbuou	Encourou
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(2)	Case Character	istics				
	Nonpayment					
	Yes	0.116^{**}	-0.362**	-2.659^{**}	-0.366**	-0.081**
		(0.006)	(0.044)	(0.311)	(0.042)	(0.018)
		$632,\!302$				
		[362.23]				
	No	0.170^{**}	-0.110	0.269	-0.088	-0.093
		(0.017)	(0.062)	(0.244)	(0.071)	(0.049)
		95,387				
		[97.97]				
	Difference	-0.054^{++}	-0.252^{++}	-2.928^{++}	-0.279^{++}	0.012
		$\{0.0031\}$	$\{0.0009\}$	$\{0.0000\}$	$\{0.0007\}$	$\{0.8152\}$
	Landlord Cases P	Por Units Abov	a In-Sampla I	Median (evcl	uding NV($(\mathbf{H} \mathbf{A})$
	Ves	0 117**	-0 434**	-2 712**	-0 408**	-0.093**
	105	(0.008)	(0.045)	(0.493)	(0.400)	(0.030)
		288 286	(0.010)	(0.155)	(0.010)	(0.000)
		[222, 97]				
	No	0.143^{**}	-0.303**	-1 946**	-0 288**	-0 074**
	110	(0.008)	(0.041)	(0.236)	(0.035)	(0.026)
		275.867	(0.011)	(0.200)	(0.000)	(0.020)
		[323 42]				
	Difference	-0.026^+	-0.131^{+}	-0.766	-0.121^{+}	-0.019
	Dinoronoo	$\{0.0179\}$	$\{0.0320\}$	$\{0.1605\}$	$\{0.0370\}$	$\{0.6344\}$
		(0.01.0)	[0:00=0]	[012000]	[0.0010]	[0:0011]
	Primary Claim A	bove In-Sample	e Median			
	Yes	0.125^{**}	-0.422**	-3.064**	-0.411**	-0.114**
		(0.007)	(0.048)	(0.405)	(0.054)	(0.023)
		363,848				
		[351.36]				
	No	0.121**	-0.221**	-1.168**	-0.228**	-0.047
		(0.007)	(0.050)	(0.225)	(0.046)	(0.026)
		363,840				
		[324.26]				
	Difference	0.004	-0.201^{++}	-1.896^{++}	-0.183^{++}	-0.067
		$\{0.7004\}$	$\{0.0037\}$	$\{0.0000\}$	$\{0.009\}$	$\{0.0553\}$
		. ,	. ,	. ,	. ,	. ,

Table A.7B: Heterogeneity Analysis: IV Results

Unit of observation is a housing court case. Outcomes are listed in columns. Rows index the characteristics and levels defining the subsamples among which the heterogeneity analysis is conducted. Each cell in a characteristic-level row reports the coefficient on tenant counsel from a separate TSLS instrumental variable regression of the column-enumerated outcome on main specification controls (corresponding to Column 2 in Table 3), and empirical UA treatment as the instrument, for the subsample defined by the characteristic-level row. Standard errors clustered by zip code are given in parentheses. Number of observations and first-stage F-statistic (in brackets) reported below SE's in Column 1. First column reports first-stage results with tenant (respondent) counsel as the dependent variable. Difference row gives the difference in means of the binary contrast provided; if only one level of a characteristic is reported, the contrast is with the implied inverse omitted category. P-values for the differences in means reported in braces below the point estimates. Stars attached to coefficients indicate statistical significance with respect to zero, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01; crosses attached to differences in means reflect statistical significance of differences in coefficients between subgroups, +p < 0.05, ++p < 0.01.

	Respondent	Judgment	Log	Warrant	Warrant
	Counsel	with	Judgment	Issued	Executed
		Possession	Amount		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(3) Citizenship					
CT Noncitizen Pct. Abo	ove In-Sample l	Median			
Yes	0.125^{**}	-0.371^{**}	-2.377**	-0.363**	-0.108^{**}
	(0.006)	(0.040)	(0.251)	(0.040)	(0.027)
	362,738				
	[432.59]				
No	0.124^{**}	-0.299**	-1.928^{**}	-0.299**	-0.055*
	(0.012)	(0.064)	(0.453)	(0.057)	(0.022)
	364,944				
	[111.13]				
Difference	0.000	-0.072	-0.450	-0.064	-0.053
	$\{0.9705\}$	$\{0.3425\}$	$\{0.3848\}$	$\{0.3588\}$	$\{ 0.1334 \}$
(4) Bace					
CBG Hispanic Majority	0.123**	-0.316**	-2.300**	-0.336**	-0.101**
0 = 0	(0.006)	(0.054)	(0.388)	(0.044)	(0.027)
	292,455	()	()	()	
	[390.87]				
Difference	-0.003	0.014	-0.308	-0.027	-0.040
	$\{0.8132\}$	$\{0.8460\}$	$\{0.4902\}$	$\{0.6967\}$	$\{0.3300\}$
CBG Black Majority	0 128**	-0 310**	-9 118**	-0 282**	-0.056
ODG Diack Majority	(0.011)	(0.057)	(0.304)	(0.068)	(0.045)
	211 142	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.010)
	[137.59]				
Difference	0.005	0.022	0.049	0.060	0.036
	$\{0.6813\}$	$\{0.7646\}$	$\{0.9109\}$	$\{0.4453\}$	$\{0.4743\}$
CBG White Majority	0.119**	-0.357**	-2.191**	-0.357**	-0.057
	(0.016)	(0.079)	(0.581)	(0.090)	(0.066)
	72,078				
Diff	[57.42]	0.020	0.050	0.099	0.000
Difference	-0.005	-0.039	-0.050	-0.033	(0.029)
	{0.7743}	{0.6714}	{0.9391}	{0.7337}	{0.6790}
CBG Asian Majority	0.129**	-0.522	0.308	-0.598	-0.237*
.	(0.027)	(0.416)	(1.558)	(0.510)	(0.104)
	14,018	· /	× /	× /	· /
	[22.35]				
Difference	0.005	-0.202	2.446	-0.276	-0.154
	$\{0.8630\}$	$\{0.6291\}$	$\{0.1225\}$	$\{0.5894\}$	$\{0.1459\}$

Table A.7C: Heterogeneity Analysis: IV Results

Unit of observation is a housing court case. Outcomes are listed in columns. Rows index the characteristics and levels defining the subsamples among which the heterogeneity analysis is conducted. Each cell in a characteristic-level row reports the coefficient on tenant counsel from a separate TSLS instrumental variable regression of the column-enumerated outcome on main specification controls (corresponding to Column 2 in Table 3), and empirical UA treatment as the instrument, for the subsample defined by the characteristic-level row. Standard errors clustered by zip code are given in parentheses. Number of observations and first-stage F-statistic (in brackets) reported below SE's in Column 1. First column reports first-stage results with tenant (respondent) counsel as the dependent variable. Difference row gives the difference in means of the binary contrast provided; if only one level of a characteristic is reported, the contrast is with the implied inverse attached to coefficients indicate statistical significance with respect to zero, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01; crosses attached to differences in means reflect statistical significance of differences in coefficients between subgroups, +p < 0.05, ++p < 0.01.

UA Zip	Adjacent
(1)	(2)
0.070^{**}	0.001
(0.015)	(0.002)
-0.313^{**}	-2.954
(0.078)	(13.117)
-2.762^{**}	-24.804
(0.491)	(114.940)
-0.349^{**}	-6.405
(0.062)	(27.401)
-0.113^{**}	-5.881
(0.035)	(24.117)
398,425	577,372
21.92	0.06
Yes	Yes
Yes	Yes
Yes	Yes
	UA Zip (1) 0.070^{**} (0.015) -0.313^{**} (0.078) -2.762^{**} (0.491) -0.349^{**} (0.062) -0.113^{**} (0.035) 398,425 21.92 Yes Yes Yes Yes No

Table A.8: UA Spillovers: IV Estimates

This table repeats the TSLS analysis of Table 3, Column 2, but splits the sample into UA zips in the first three cohorts (Column 1) and zip codes adjacent to these target zips (Column 2). The empirical UA instrument is redefined such that a zip is considered treated at the date UA begins in the first zip with which it is geographically contiguous (including itself). Non-adjacent (i.e., never-treated) zips are included as controls in both subsamples. Outcomes are listed in rows. Unit of observation is a housing court case. Each cell reports the coefficient on respondent (tenant) counsel from a separate TSLS regression of the row-enumerated outcome on the covariates and fixed effects summarized at the bottom of the table. First row reports first-stage results with tenant (respondent) counsel as the dependent variable. Standard errors clustered by zip code are given in parentheses. * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Respondent Counsel	0.066**	0.063**	0.064**
-	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.014)
Judgment with Possession	-1.295*	-1.285	-1.300
	(0.576)	(0.637)	(0.620)
			X
Log Judgment Amount	-5.580	-5.174	-5.639
	(3.204)	(3.559)	(3.606)
		1 000	1 000*
Warrant Issued	-1.250*	-1.222	-1.236*
	(0.535)	(0.570)	(0.553)
Warrant Executed	0 103	0 101	0 111
Wallant Executed	(0.100)	(0.110)	-0.111
	(0.100)	(0.110)	(0.111)
Observations	36,856	36,855	36,855
First-Stage F-Stat	31.93	25.57	22.79
Bandwidth	[-10, 10]	[-10, 10]	[-10, 10]
Donut	[-1,1]	[-1,1]	[-1,1]
Covariates	No	Zip FE	Non-Time
Polynomial	Linear	Linear	Linear
Diff. Slopes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Running Var.	Month	Month	Month

Table A.9: Regression Discontinuity Results: Months Since UA Start

This table summarizes fuzzy regression discontinuity results for the relationship between tenant counsel and housing court outcomes. The running variable is months since empirical Universal Access zip code start month at time of case filing. Outcomes are listed in rows. Analytical specifications are indexed by column, with features summarized at the bottom of the table. All results are for the RD subsample of cases from the first three UA zip cohorts filed within +/-10 months of UA start in each zip. As in the main IV analysis, the instrument that defines threshold-crossing is empirical UA treatment, an indicator equal to one if UA is in operation in a given case's zip code at the date of filing. All specification allow for separate slopes of the local linear regressions on each side of the threshold and exclude a donut of +/-1 month around UA start. Unit of observation is a housing court case. Each cell in the first row reports first-stage OLS results for the UA instrument with tenant (respondent) counsel as the dependent variable. Each cell in all following rows reports the coefficient on tenant counsel from a separate regression of the row-enumerated outcome. Standard errors clustered by zip code are given in parentheses. * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01

A.7 Supplementary Figures

Figure A.1



The figure depicits the zip codes comprising NYC's five boroughs. Black lines delineate zip code tabulation areas. Red lines highlight UA ZCTA's. Limits of shading bins are 0, 50, 75, 90 100 percentiles of UA household count from NYC DSS annual reports, divided by total housing court filings by zip.



Figure A.2







Figure A.3

Figure A.4

Regression Discontinuity Results: Main Outcomes

Running Variable: Months Relative to Empirical UA Start Date Adjusted for Zip Code Fixed Effects



Running variable is months relative to UA empirical start date. Bandwidth months [-10,-2] and [2,10]. Sample consists of subset of main sample cases from first three UA zip code cohorts. Controls for zip code fixed effects. Excluded donut [-1,-1] plotted for reference with X's.





Figure A.6

Regression Discontinuity: Covariates

Running Variable: Months Relative to Empirical UA Start Date Adjusted for Zip Code Fixed Effects



