

**Table G-7: The Construction of Community District Geography in 2000 Census Files
New York City
February 2002**

Community District boundaries are not coterminous with census tract boundaries. Although it is usually possible to achieve coterminality between Community District boundaries and census blocks, selected tables from the short-form questionnaire and all of the tables from the long-form questionnaire in 2000 are not available at the block level. Therefore, for many items, direct aggregation of census blocks into Community Districts was not possible. Instead, these tables were derived from census tract data. Because many census tracts are split two or more ways by Community District boundaries, census tract data had to be allocated in order to accurately portray the actual boundaries of Community Districts.

In cases where census tracts are split by Community Districts, the geographic distribution of total population and housing units was computed for 2000. For example, Bronx Census Tract 0167 had 12 blocks, 9 in Community District 3 (population of 1,634) and 3 in Community District 4 (population of 188). In this instance, the population percentage “split” would be 89.7 percent to CD 3 and 10.3 percent to CD 4. This “split” was applied to all of the cells in the population tables for census tract 0167. Each cell in the age distribution of Table SF1 P-111, for example, was “split” – 89.7 percent to CD 3 and 10.3 percent to CD 4. This procedure resulted in the creation of two “pseudo-tracts” for census tract 0167, one in CD 3 and another in CD 4. The same process was applied to housing items based on the percentage “split” of total housing units.

Users of Community District tables should be aware that the “pseudo-tract” allocation method can produce totals that are different from tables created by aggregating blocks. When the percentage “splits” are applied to table cells, fractional populations are created, which are then rounded into whole numbers of persons. These rounded numbers are then aggregated up to create table totals. For instance, age table SF1 P-111 will differ from age table SF1 P-104 because the former is built from “pseudo-tracts” and the latter from blocks.

Among tables derived from “pseudo-tracts,” discrepancies from table to table are a result of different numbers of table categories and different degrees of rounding error. Such discrepancies, while frequently negligible, can be significant in a small number of cases where the number of table categories and the degree of rounding error act to compound differences. Large, complex tables, such as SF1 P-111 through SF1 P-115B, involve detailed age, sex and race cross-classifications and are most prone to these difficulties. Such tables should be used carefully. In instances where large discrepancies occur, users are advised to focus on the general distribution of a variable and not on the exact number of persons reported in a single table category.