



CITIZENS UNION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

**CREATING A MORE EQUITABLE AND OBJECTIVE
DISCRETIONARY FUNDING PROCESS IN NEW YORK CITY**

May 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	Page 1
II.	Acknowledgments	Page 3
III.	Summary of Major Findings and Recommendations	Page 4
IV.	Recent Reforms and the Need for Further Reform	Page 11
V.	Current Allocation Process	Page 14
	A. Capital Funding	<i>Page 17</i>
	B. Expense Funding	<i>Page 19</i>
VI.	The Individual Winners and Losers in Discretionary Funding, FY 2012	Page 23
VII.	Four Years of Winners and Losers by District, FY 2009 – FY 2012	Page 27
VIII.	How the Lack Of Objective Formulas Makes the Public Lose Out	Page 30
IX.	Funding Allocations and Leadership in the Council	Page 34
X.	Funding Decisions of Members Running for Higher Office	Page 36
XI.	Recommendations	Page 38
	APPENDIX A – Capital Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012	
	APPENDIX B – Expense Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012	
	APPENDIX C – Need Indicators and District Funding, FY 2009 – 2012	

I. INTRODUCTION

The New York City Council has an important role in providing feedback and approving the mayor's budget for the city, which in FY 2012 totaled \$65.9 billion.¹ The authority of the City Council in the budget process, however, is limited in many areas. During the budget negotiation process, the Council largely relies on agencies and the mayor's Office of Management and Budget for detailed information about planned expenditures. This dependence is due to the fact that the budget submitted by the mayor to the Council contains large, single "units of appropriation" that actually encompass many different programs. The Council thus has little influence over specific city programs, which has perhaps led to the development of City Council sponsored initiatives, which is known as the discretionary funding process. This process has created a meaningful role for the Council in directing relatively little money – less than one percent of the city's annual budget.

The City Council allocates two different pots of funds for discretionary spending – one for capital projects and one for expense funding. Each pot is allocated both by the Council at large and by individual members from funds provided to them by the Speaker of the City Council. Capital funds in FY2012 totaled about \$428 million, and expense funds totaled about \$150 million for a combined total of nearly \$579 million. Discretionary funds are used for local projects in several categories: "capital," such as renovating schools, building parks, or other construction; "expense," such as providing a local nonprofit funding for an after school program; and for the council at large to allocate to citywide initiatives that were not included by the mayor in the executive budget.

The provision of discretionary funding for legislators is not unusual, as has been seen historically with earmarks for members of Congress and member items given to New York State legislators. In New York City, public scrutiny of discretionary funding has increased, though it has largely focused on expense funding rather than capital funding, which alone totaled \$428 million in FY2012.

The level of scrutiny over expense funds has resulted in some welcomed changes to the council's discretionary funding process. The Council, led by Speaker Christine Quinn, enacted reforms in 2006 providing greater transparency of funding decisions, and again between 2008 and 2010 following a federal investigation into the use of fictitious names of organizations as false place holders and increased concern regarding conflicts of interest and council members' relationships with the organizations they fund. The latter changes resulted in increased pre-clearance of organizations requesting funding that involved working more closely with the Mayor's Office of Contracts; increased disclosure of the organizations seeking funds and their applications, as well as the purpose and amount of the funds; and a more open and competitively-based process.

¹ FY 2012 Adopted Expense Budget for the city of New York. Office of Management and Budget. June 30, 2012. Available at: http://www.nyc.gov/html/omb/downloads/pdf/erc6_11.pdf

Relationships between individual council members and the organizations they fund as well as potential conflicts of interest are also now disclosed due to the reform efforts.

This report details the allocation process for both expense and capital discretionary funds, giving a detailed breakdown of funding received by individual districts and members of the City Council. It also analyzes whether the allocation process to members reflects the socioeconomic status of communities, and finds that the process is largely political, with no correlation between funding and the relative status of districts as determined by certain commonly-used indicators. This report additionally examines the distribution of funds by members seeking higher office and the transparency regarding discretionary funding provided to borough presidents. In light of our findings, Citizens Union presents a number of recommendations intended to create a more equitable and objective provision of funds to communities, as well as further increase transparency and accountability beyond the reforms enacted in recent years.

II. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was written and researched by Rachael Fauss, Policy and Research Manager. It was edited by Dick Dadey, Executive Director; Alex Camarda, Director of Public Policy and Advocacy; and Adelia Harrison, Executive Assistant. Research and writing assistance was provided by Citizens Union interns Sara Dennis, Lillian Smith and Kevin Maloney.

Citizens Union would like to thank its Municipal Affairs Committee for its thoughtful engagement, framing and vetting of the important recommendations in this document, in particular co-chairs and CU Board members Luis Garden Acosta and John Avlon.

III. SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Citizens Union believes that the current discretionary funding process, while improved from a decade ago, remains flawed and needs additional reform. While recent reforms in the City Council have improved the vetting of organizations receiving funding and provided additional disclosure, the distribution process to members remains politicized and does not address the relative socioeconomic status of districts by any understood objective measure.

Major Findings

A summary of our major findings is as follows:

- 1. Most discretionary funds – which include capital and expense funding – are not distributed using an objective formula, but rather based on political relationships, which contributes to wide variances in funding among council districts.**
 - a. Capital funds** – Capital funding is awarded to members of the Council at the discretion of the Speaker, in consultation with other members, with no base level of funding.
 - i. Capital funds totaled \$428 million in FY 2012**, with nearly \$34 million distributed solely through the Speaker’s List, \$254 million distributed by individual members through their “member items,” and nearly \$140 million distributed jointly by members or borough delegations, or jointly with additional Speaker’s List funds.
 - ii. From FY 2009 to FY 2012, capital funds totaled \$1.8 billion**, with \$1 billion distributed by individual members, and \$644 million distributed jointly by members or borough delegations.²
 - iii. Of the fifty-one members of the Council, the ten members receiving the most funds to distribute received 33 percent – one-third or \$85 million – of individual capital funds in FY 2012.** The ten members at the bottom end of the spectrum received only \$28 million or 11 percent of the total funds for their capital projects.
 - iv. If capital funds were distributed equally, each member would have received about \$8.3 million in FY 2012.** Only five members received this much or more in FY 2012 – Domenic Recchia, Jr. (D-Brooklyn), Erik Martin Dilan (D-Brooklyn), Lew Fidler (D- Brooklyn), Inez Dickens (D-Manhattan), and Christine Quinn (D-Manhattan) in her local capacity representing Council District 3. While Citizens Union believes that simply dividing funds equally is not the ideal method of distributing funds, this illustrates that the current system benefits select members, sometimes at the expense of the greater whole.

² The remaining funds include technical adjustments over the four year period.

- b. Expense funds** – While there is a “base” level of expense funding of about \$340,000 for each councilmember to distribute, much of the expense funding is distributed through council-determined citywide initiatives or other items done in consultation with, and at the discretion of, the Speaker.
- i. **Expense funds totaled \$150 million for the Council in FY 2012**, allocated as follows:
 - a. \$100 million distributed by the Council at large through citywide initiatives to address issues and needs that are not necessarily identified programmatically in the city’s budget;
 - b. \$32.6 million distributed by individual members as “member items” of which:
 - \$17 million was distributed equally through base funding; and
 - \$15 million was given to members at the discretion of the Speaker;
 - c. \$16 million distributed through the “Speaker’s List” which is distributed at the discretion of the Speaker. Members of the Council or outside organizations can apply for funding from the Speaker’s List; and
 - d. \$500,000 distributed jointly by members or borough delegations.
 - ii. **The Speaker of the City Council distributed \$31 million in expense funds in FY 2012**, which included the Speaker’s List (\$16 million) and an additional \$15 million in funds that were distributed to individual members over the base allocation of \$340,000 each.
 - iii. **From FY 2009 to FY 2012, expense funds totaled \$777 million for the Council**, with \$579 million distributed by the Council at large through citywide initiatives, \$121 million distributed through the “Speaker’s List,” \$140 million distributed by individual members, and \$22 million distributed jointly by members or borough delegations.
 - iv. Similar to capital funding, of the fifty-one members of the council, **the ten members receiving the most to distribute received 31 percent or nearly a third of individual expense items**, for a total of \$10 million, in spite of the base amount of \$340,000 given to all members in FY 2012. The ten council members receiving the least expense funds to distribute received only \$4 million or 12 percent of funds.
 - v. **If the \$50 million in non-citywide initiatives, which includes the Speaker’s List and individually distributed member items, were shared equally, each member would have received about \$974,000 in FY 2012.** Only five members received this much or more in FY 2012 from the current individual funds pot – Domenic Recchia, Jr. (D-Brooklyn), Lew Fidler (D- Brooklyn), Leroy Comrie, Jr. (D-Queens), James Oddo (R-Staten Island), and Joel Rivera (D-Bronx). While Citizens Union believes that simply dividing funds equally is not the ideal method of distributing funds, this illustrates that the current system benefits select members sometimes at the expense of the greater whole.

- c. **Combined expense and capital funds** – Both in the short-term and over a longer period, the loss of funds to individual districts adds up, and the lack of objective policies regarding funding contributes to the inequity in funding.
 - i. **Discretionary funds totaled \$579 million in FY 2012, including capital and expense funds. From FY 2009 – 2012, they totaled nearly \$2.6 billion.**
 - ii. **Of the fifty-one council districts, the ten districts receiving the most combined capital and expense funds to distribute received 33 percent of the individual funds, or nearly \$94 million in FY 2012.** The 10 recipients of the least amount of combined capital and expense funds received only about \$33 million. The top 10 members receiving the most capital funding were generally among the top 15 recipients of expense funding in FY 2012.
 - iii. **The Speaker of the Council distributed \$459 million in capital and expense funds through the Speaker’s list or to individual members in FY 2012.** This is largely due to the lack of an articulated policy regarding distribution of capital funds, which are currently distributed to members solely at the discretion of the Speaker, though Speaker’s List funds are distributed in consultation with other members and organizations can apply for funds.
 - iv. **The variance in funding over four years from FY 2009 to FY 2012 was about \$58 million from highest to lowest funded district.** Domenic Recchia, Jr. (D-Brooklyn) in Council District 47 received nearly \$68 million in capital and expense funds, and Councilmembers Daniel Halloran (R-Queens) and Tony Avella (D-Queens) together received about \$10 million for Council District 19.
2. **Discretionary funding allocations are not based on objective measures using socioeconomic indicators, creating inequity among many districts.** There is no correlation between expense funding allocation and district socioeconomic status according to each of the following sample indicators:
 - i. Median Household Income
 - ii. Unemployment
 - iii. Needy Populations (under 18 and over 65)
 - iv. Receipt of Foodstamps
 - v. Persons under the Poverty Level
- a. **Regarding median income, there is little correlation between need and receipt of discretionary funding, with low-income districts in some cases receiving a larger amount of funds, and in other cases ranking near the bottom.**
 - i. Two of the three *lowest* council districts in median income – District 17 (Maria del Carmen Arroyo, D-Bronx), ranked the lowest and District 15 (Joel Rivera, D-Bronx) ranked the 3rd lowest – were among the top fifteen recipients of expense funding, with Rivera ranking 6th in funding from FY 2009 to FY 2012 and Arroyo ranking 13th. Yet the 2nd *lowest* council district in median income – District 16 (Helen Foster, D-Bronx) – ranked 47th out of 51 districts from FY 2009 to FY 2012 in expense funding and the lowest in FY 2012 for expense funding.

- ii. Three of the ten districts with *highest* median household income were also among the top ten recipients of expense funding (Districts 3, 50 and 46: Democrat Speaker Christine Quinn of Manhattan, Republican James Oddo of Staten Island, and Democrat Lew Fidler of Brooklyn respectively).
 - b. Regarding indicators examined by Citizens Union other than median income, there is also little correlation between socioeconomic status of districts and funding.**
 - iii. While some members with districts ranking high among several socioeconomic indicators are among those receiving more than the average amount of funding (if distributed equally) such as Democrat Maria del Carmen Arroyo (District 17 in the Bronx), others with similar socioeconomic rankings are among the bottom half of recipients of discretionary expense funds, such as Democrat Fernando Cabrera (District 14 in the Bronx), Democrat Darlene Mealy (District 41 in Brooklyn) and Democrat Melissa Mark-Viverito (District 8 in Manhattan).
 - iv. Conversely, Democrat Mark Weprin (District 23 in Queens), Democrat Lew Fidler (District 46 in Brooklyn) and Republican James Oddo (District 50 in Staten Island) have populations that rank low according to several socioeconomic indicators, and receive above average funding.
- 3. While efforts have been made to increase transparency of discretionary expense funds for council members, discretionary capital funding and borough presidents' discretionary funding items lack the same level of disclosure.**
 - a. City Council capital funding line items are only released in a PDF budget document, making independent analysis difficult. **There is no online searchable database for capital funds**, nor is information provided about organizations that applied for funding but were not awarded funds.
 - b. Borough presidents' discretionary funding line items are not disclosed in the city budget**, though it should be noted that Borough President Stringer has independently released capital and expense funding line items as well as a list of groups that applied for funding.
- 4. Members may use discretionary funds strategically when looking at running for higher citywide office, more often funding groups that are headquartered or with their place of business located outside of their home borough.**
 - a. **The average amount of funding provided by members running for citywide office to groups headquartered outside of their borough was nearly 21 percent, versus 7.6 percent for those with no known ambitions for higher office.** It should be noted, however, that some funds are distributed to groups that provide citywide services and may be headquartered or have their place of business in a borough other than the member's home area. Citizens Union therefore offers this analysis not as conclusive evidence of funding decisions, but rather to note an observed trend.

Citizens Union Recommendations

Citizens Union recognizes that the city budget process is largely controlled by the executive branch. City Council involvement in the budget process is often confined to the margins and seeks to address needs or gaps in funding for local communities. Discretionary funding has filled this void, becoming an integral part of social service networks in communities, and has also become embedded in our city's budget process. If the city budget process were more transparent, and the Council had a more significant role in deciding the city budget and funding priorities, it is possible that discretionary funds would not be needed. Recognizing, however, that discretionary funding is likely to continue to exist until the City Council is able to exercise more budgetary authority and there are more meaningful avenues for community input, Citizens Union recommends the following reforms to create a more effective and objective discretionary funding system to better serve all New Yorkers:

- 1. Reforms made in recent years by the Council should be FORMALIZED IN THE CITY COUNCIL RULES to ensure their likely continuance when the next Council is elected and Speaker selected.**

- 2. GREATER EQUITY AND OBJECTIVITY should be a part of the process of awarding discretionary funding to council members.** While council members would retain the ability to decide which services or projects are funded, the total amount received should no longer be determined entirely at the Speaker's discretion.
 - a. Expense funding, not including citywide initiatives, should be distributed to council members in the following manner:**
 - i. using a larger base amount for each member equal to 50 percent of the total expense discretionary funding pot for local initiatives, divided equally among members; and**
 - ii. the remaining 50 percent of the funds no longer distributed subjectively, but rather through an agreed-upon formula that takes into account socioeconomic indicators among other objective considerations.**

This would not, however, preclude the ability of individual members or borough delegations to jointly distribute funds to organizations which serve a broader population than the immediate council district in which they are located.

For example, of the \$50 million in such expense funding in FY 2012 (which includes individual member's local initiatives, Youth and Aging initiatives, as well as the Speaker's List), \$25 million would be distributed equally to members, and \$25 million would be distributed based on a funding formula. Only \$17 million, or roughly a third, is currently distributed equally through a \$340,000 base allocation to members, and there is no objective formula for distribution of the remaining \$33 million.

- b. All citywide expense initiatives should be distributed based on objective measures,** building on the Council's use of funding formulas for initiatives such as Domestic Violence Empowerment (DoVE), Immigrant Opportunities, Housing Preservation, and Food Pantries, among others.
- c. All capital funding should be awarded to individual council members using an agreed-upon formula that takes into consideration socioeconomic indicators, among other objective considerations.** This would not limit the ability of members or borough delegations to jointly distribute funds for projects which serve a broader population than the immediate council district in which they are located.
- d. Objective formulas for expense and capital funding allocations should be developed through a deliberative and public process to ensure that funding formulas consider and balance various types of socioeconomic indicators and other objective measures.** Formulas should be adjusted every four years after the elections by the newly-elected Council through an open and consultative process. An objective formula could incorporate several different socioeconomic indicators. Among those the Council should examine are:
 - foodstamp recipients;
 - individuals receiving free or reduced price school lunches;
 - Medicaid recipients;
 - individuals under the poverty line;
 - individuals under 18 and over 65 (recognizing the Council's historic awarding of funds to individual members for Aging and Youth programs);
 - rising number of new students in need of classrooms; and
 - facilities providing services in the district.

To ensure investments are made with the greatest impact in mind and address a variety of needs, capital funding formulas should also consider potential long-term benefits to communities in terms of job growth and attracting business; the number of individuals who would benefit; and the current presence and quality of facilities or equipment (i.e. the number of parks or homeless shelters in or serving districts, or neighborhoods whose schools need repairs or have a large influx of students requiring new schools to be built), among other measures.

- 3. TRANSPARENCY of funding decisions should be enhanced for capital and expense funding, as well as borough presidents' discretionary funds.**
 - a. The searchable database of expense funds sponsored by council members and the organizations which applied for funding should be expanded to include capital funds;** this database should be updated at least three days prior to the passage of the city budget.

- b. Discretionary line items and their sponsoring member should be disclosed and made available to the public at least three days prior to their passage** as part of the city budget in a downloadable and searchable spreadsheet form to allow for easier outside analysis. Currently only expense line items are made available to the public prior to budget votes, which are released 24 hours in advance.
 - c. Greater information should be provided regarding the intended purpose of discretionary funds. A more detailed and standardized statement of need should be submitted for every organization receiving funding through the contract process with city agencies** to demonstrate how the funding would be utilized to meet said need. Such need statements from contracts should be made publicly available on the Council website through the online searchable database.
 - d. Discretionary spending of the borough presidents, for both capital and expense funds, should be released in an itemized format similar to the Council's Schedule C, as well as in a searchable spreadsheet and web-based database** for funded organizations and projects, as well as organizations that applied but were not funded. This information should be made available on the borough presidents' individual websites as well as through the Office of Management and Budget's website.
- 4. GREATER INNOVATION should be utilized in the discretionary funding process.** Citizens Union supports greater use of pilot programs to improve the current system such as the participatory budgeting project taking place in four council districts during the current FY 2013 budget cycle. Citizens Union, however, withholds judgment on the expansion of this particular pilot program citywide until greater data is available regarding its effectiveness.

IV. RECENT REFORMS AND THE NEED FOR FURTHER REFORM

Discretionary funding has been the subject of increasing public scrutiny in New York City, and the City Council, led by Speaker Christine Quinn, has responded with a series of welcomed and needed reforms, beginning in 2006. Presented below are the date and substance of the reforms.

2006

Speaker Christine Quinn announced that discretionary funding would be allocated each year as part of the city budget and names of sponsoring council members would be identified.³ For the first time, the City Council put the list of all of the organizations or programs that receive city funding, known as "Schedule C," online for expense funding.

2007

The Council in the fall of 2007 began using "transparency resolutions," which provided information regarding changes to discretionary funds that were adopted outside of the regular budget process. Transparency resolutions are public documents voted on at Council proceedings, and are available online through the Council's website.⁴

2008

The lack of oversight in the discretionary funding process came into sharp relief in 2008 when, as a result of a federal investigation, it was revealed that the City Council used fictitious names of organizations to serve as false place holders for \$17.4 million in taxpayer dollars since 2001.⁵ There was also growing concern regarding members' relationships with the organizations receiving funding, and organizations' financial accounting abilities.⁶ This crisis prompted the City Council and Speaker to revise the system of review and decision-making for discretionary funding and adopt a series of reforms⁷ including:

³ Mark Berkey-Gerard, "Reforming - and Not Reforming - the Budget Process," July 10, 2006, *Gotham Gazette*, Available at: <http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/iotw/20060710/200/1904>

⁴ For budget transparency resolutions from FY 2009 to present, see that Council's website at: http://council.nyc.gov/html/budget/past_transp.shtml For resolutions prior to FY 2009, see the Council's website at: http://council.nyc.gov/html/budget/budget_fy_08.shtml

⁵ Sara Kugler, "NYC Pol Caught in Slush Fund Probe," *Associated Press*, April 5, 2008, Available at: <http://www.foxnews.com/wires/2008Apr05/0,4670,CouncilSlushFunds,00.html>

⁶ "City Council Member Martinez Resigning in Deal with Feds." *Manhattan Times*. July 13, 2009. Available at: http://www.manhattantimesnews.com/index.php?option=com_myblog&show=City-Council-Member-Martinez-is-resigning-in-deal-with-feds.html&Itemid=57&lang=en

⁷ "Speaker Quinn, Council Budget Team Present Best Practices for Budget Allocation Process," *Office of Communications, New York City Council*, May 7, 2008, Available at: http://council.nyc.gov/html/releases/039_050708_BudgetBestPractices.shtml

- i. increasing pre-clearance requirements for organizations requesting funding through the Mayor's Office of Contract Services (MOCS);
- ii. heightening disclosure for organizations funded by Council members regarding conflicts of interest;
- iii. increasing the amount of information in budgetary documents such as Schedule C;
- iv. posting of Schedule C online at least 24 hours before budget adoption; and
- v. appointing an Independent Council Compliance Officer who reports to the General Counsel.

2009

Additional information was provided by the City Council in Schedule C such as organizations' federal tax identifiers, whether they had met pre-clearance or qualification requirements, and whether there was a fiscal conduit organization involved.⁸

2010

Further reforms⁹ were adopted by the Council that required:

- a commitment to create an online searchable database of discretionary funding allocations and applications for discretionary funding;
- enhancements to the current vetting process by requiring information regarding prior funding sources, and requiring non-profits that were created in 2009 or 2010 to be limited to \$15,000 in total cumulative funding and an individual maximum of \$7,500 per council member;
- limiting the hiring of consultants;
- limiting City Council members' ability to sublet office space;
- mandatory training of smaller community-based organizations funded through the discretionary funding process; and
- limiting funding via fiscal conduits to no more than \$10,000 or less than \$1,000, as well as vetting of conduits and limits on number of organizations receiving funding through these means.

The City Council has also developed an online application process for organizations seeking discretionary funds, opening up the process for more applicants.¹⁰ Organizations can select whether they wish to be funded by an individual member, borough delegation, through the Speaker's List, or through the borough presidents. After

⁸ City Council Fiscal Year 2010 Adopted Expense Budget: Adjustments Summary/Schedule C. Available at: http://council.nyc.gov/downloads/pdf/fy_2010_sched_c_final.pdf

⁹ "Further Protecting The Integrity Of The Use Of Public Funds, Speaker Quinn Announces Budget Reforms," Office of Communications, New York City Council, April 30, 2010, Available at: http://council.nyc.gov/html/releases/discretionary_04_30_10.shtml

¹⁰ FY 2013 information is available at: http://council.nyc.gov/html/budget/fy2013_budgetapplication.shtml

applications are processed, hearings have been held by borough delegations, for example, asking applicants for more information about the proposed projects or programs.

The City Council has also put in place an online searchable database.¹¹ The database provides disclosure of expense funding from FY 2009 – FY 2012, and is searchable by member and organization name. The database includes expense projects that were funded as part of the budget, as well as the “unfunded” applications. The council additionally provides a downloadable Excel spreadsheet for expense funding for each fiscal year.

The Council’s online database does not include capital discretionary funds, however, and a downloadable spreadsheet is not available for capital allocations. Capital funding by individual council member is available on a PDF through the Office of Management and Budget’s website, titled “Supporting Detail for Fiscal Year 2012 Changes to the Executive Capital Budget.”¹² While individual budget lines list the sponsoring council member, the presentation in a large PDF (41 pages for FY 2012) makes independent analysis difficult. The document does not total items by member, but rather lists total funding through separate city agencies.

While the recent reforms made by the City Council are laudable, further reforms are needed to increase the equity and objectivity of allocation to members, increase transparency, and provide further accountability. Citizens Union believes that the findings of this report support the need for continued reform, and calls on the City Council to enact the recommendations detailed in Section XI of this report.

¹¹ Available at: http://council.nyc.gov/html/budget/council_disclosure_funding.shtml

¹² For FY 2012, see: http://www.nyc.gov/html/omb/downloads/pdf/adopt11_capresowork.pdf

V. CURRENT ALLOCATION PROCESS

City Council

Funds made available for discretionary projects of the City Council are a result of negotiations between the speaker of the City Council and the mayor. The Council has also restored funding to agencies and programs which have been cut as a result of Program to Eliminate the Gap (PEG) efforts, and these PEG restorations are a part of the negotiations between the Council and the mayor regarding the total amount of expense funds available for the Council to allocate. Given the Council's responsibility of approving the city budget, as well as its inability to exercise meaningful oversight of the substance of the budget given the lack of publicly available programmatic detail, it can be argued that the amount of discretionary funds agreed to through negotiations between the Council by the mayor help to build consensus in support of the mayor's proposed budget.

The authority of the City Council in the budget process is limited in many areas. During the budget negotiation process, the Council largely relies on agencies and the mayor's Office of Management and Budget for detailed information about planned expenditures. This dependence is due to the fact that the budget submitted by the mayor to the Council contains large, single "units of appropriation" that actually encompass many different programs. The Council thus has little influence over specific city programs, which has perhaps led to the development of City Council sponsored initiatives, which is known as the discretionary funding process. This process has created a meaningful role for the Council in directing relatively little money – less than one percent of the city's annual budget.

While most allocations to outside groups in the city budget or through contracts must meet the requirements of the Procurement Policy Board (PPB), discretionary funds are given an exemption. Section §1-02(e) of the PPB Rules states the following:

"The source selection requirements of these Rules shall not apply to contract awards made from line item appropriations and/or discretionary funds to community-based not-for-profit organizations or other public service organizations identified by elected City officials other than the Mayor and the Comptroller...the appropriate elected official, his or her designee...shall certify that all procedural requisites established by the elected official or by the agency administering the contract have been met."¹³

Borough Presidents

The borough presidents also receive discretionary funding, with capital and expense funding determined through formulas which are spelled out under Chapter 9, section 211 and Chapter 6, section 102(b) of the City Charter, respectively.

¹³ Procurement Policy Board Rules, Available at:

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/mocs/ppb/downloads/pdf/April2010rulesmodifiedMar2011pdf.pdf>

Borough capital budgets are currently funded at a rate of five percent of the new discretionary appropriations proposed in the mayor's capital budget for the ensuing fiscal year divided among the five boroughs. The division of the five percent is based on the average of each borough's share of the total population of the city and the average of each borough's share of the total land area of the city, or through a formula in local law.¹⁴

A similar arrangement is in place for expense allocations for the borough presidents. According to the City Charter, "five percent of the total amount of discretionary increases¹⁵ which the mayor includes in the executive expense budget for the ensuing fiscal year is allocated among the boroughs by a formula based on factors related to population and need."¹⁶ The division of the five percent of the total amount of discretionary increases as presented in the City Charter is based on the average of each borough's share of the total population of the city, each borough's share of the total land area of the city, and each borough's share of the total population of the city below 125 percent of the poverty level, or as provided through a formula in local law.

The borough president's individual funding items are not available in city budget documents, as there is no separate schedule provided with line items as is done for the City Council's discretionary items. The total capital allocation for borough presidents was reported to be \$63 million in 2011.¹⁷ The amount of expense funds allocated to the Borough Presidents is unknown, though it was reported that \$350,000 in expense funds existed for Brooklyn Borough President Marty Markowitz to distribute. It is not known if this was all that he was given or if more existed elsewhere in the budget. Borough President Markowitz has received particular criticism for his ties to nonprofit organizations and his funding has been scrutinized in the press.¹⁸

¹⁴ New York City Charter, Chapter 6, Section 102b, p. 46

¹⁵ The definition of "discretionary increases" is complex, and ultimately seems to result in a very small amount of money. It is the total amount of general fund expenditures of city funds, state funds, and federal funds over which the city has substantial discretion to be proposed in the ensuing fiscal years except debt service and minus the sum of:

- 1) proposed expenditures to operate programs at current service levels;
- 2) proposed increases in those expenditures to accommodate projected caseload increases for current programs;
- 3) proposed increases to those expenditures for current programs that are the result of federal, state or local laws or judicial decisions;
- 4) proposed increases in expenditures for new programs as required by federal, state, or local law; and
- 5) all proposed expenditures beyond those needed to operate programs at current service levels excluding those modified in the budget process (except actual but unanticipated caseload increases or unanticipated increases as a result of federal, state or local law or judicial decisions and actual but unanticipated increases for new programs, and any budgetary increase that was financed by a decrease in the executive expense budget).

¹⁶ New York City Charter, Chapter 6, Section 102 5b, p. 16

¹⁷ Isabel, Vincent, and Klein, Melissa. "Marty 'Barkowitz,'" New York Post. July 31, 2011. Available at: http://www.nypost.com/p/news/local/brooklyn/marty_bark_owitz_wDuDAJt0Qhj11QAv6kCQP

¹⁸ For example, see:

http://www.nypost.com/p/news/local/brooklyn/marty_bark_owitz_wDuDAJt0Qhj11QAv6kCQP#ixzz1gdmYmZZr

Manhattan Borough President Scott Stringer laudably has posted on his website line items of funded capital and expense discretionary projects, as well as groups which applied but were not funded, similar to what is provided by the City Council for expense funds.¹⁹ Other borough presidents provide information on their websites about how to request funding, but not the ultimate determinations of who received funds or which organizations have requested funding.²⁰ Below is a summary of discretionary funding allocated by Borough President Stringer, as provided on his website.

Manhattan Borough President Discretionary Funding, FY 2007-2012			
Fiscal Year	Capital Program	Borough Needs Program (Expense Funding)	Cultural Tourism Program
FY2007	\$28,841,000	\$1,331,500	\$75,000
FY2008	\$14,358,000	\$1,346,500	\$39,200
FY2009	\$41,502,500	\$1,339,000	\$49,000
FY2010	\$18,573,000	\$1,157,541	\$38,600
FY2011	\$35,153,000	\$911,298	\$44,100
FY2012	\$10,053,000	\$921,298	N/A

Executive Use of Discretionary Funding

Under the city’s PPB rules, the mayor is not authorized to distribute discretionary funds. Mayors have, however, provided funds from the city budget to projects sponsored by individual council members and borough presidents. From 2002 to 2008, it was reported that the Bloomberg administration gave nearly \$20 million to more than 500 groups on behalf of more than two dozen council members who were political allies of the mayor.²¹ This allocation has been discontinued, however, as the PPB rules do not allow these distributions, and there was doubt as to whether the council members had actually requested the money.²²

¹⁹ For more information see the Manhattan Borough President’s website, at http://www.mbpo.org/free_details.asp?id=242. Application information for Manhattan is available at: http://www.mbpo.org/free_details.asp?id=58 and http://www.mbpo.org/free_details.asp?id=59

²⁰ See for example see application information for Brooklyn, http://www.brooklyn-usa.org/pages/RSC/capital_budget_12.htm; the Bronx <http://bronxboropres.nyc.gov/budget.html>; and Queens http://www.queensbp.org/content_web/budget/budget.shtml. No information is provided for applications from organizations in Staten Island from the Staten Island Borough President’s website.

²¹ Barbaro, Michael and Rivera, Ray. “City Hall Broke Rules Funneling Money to Groups.” August 3, 2009. The New York Times. Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/04/nyregion/04funds.html>

²² Barbaro, Michael and Rivera, Ray. “City Hall Broke Rules Funneling Money to Groups.”

A. Capital Funding

Each member of the City Council has historically received capital funding which they can allocate at their discretion. Unlike expense funding, there is no base allocation for members of the Council for capital funds. Organizations may apply directly for support, though they are distributed at the discretion of the Speaker in consultation with other members, often contingent upon evidence of broad support among members. Capital funding also differs from expense funding in that the pool of money is significantly larger, at \$428 million in FY 2012, versus \$150 million for expense funds. Capital funding is also distributed more on an individual basis by members of the Council rather than through joint efforts, with 59 percent of funds or nearly \$254 million distributed individually by members, versus only \$32.6 million or 21 percent of expense funds distributed by individual members in FY 2012.

City Council Capital Discretionary Funding, FY 2009-2012²³				
Fiscal Year	Total Pot of Capital Funds	Speaker's List (those not jointly sponsored)	Capital Funds Distributed Individually by Members	Jointly Sponsored or Delegation Capital Funds²⁴
FY 2009²⁵	\$505,022,000	\$16,086,000	\$295,057,000	\$173,669,000
FY 2010	\$444,251,000	\$28,132,000	\$258,176,000	\$143,836,000
FY 2011	\$427,717,000	\$43,365,000	\$210,472,000	\$152,914,000
FY 2012	\$428,246,000	\$34,095,000	\$253,715,000	\$139,694,000
Total FY 2009 - 2012	\$1,805,236,000	\$121,678,000	\$1,017,420,000	\$610,113,000

²³ Citizens Union tallies from OMB Supporting Detail for Changes to the Executive Capital Budget Documents, available at:

http://www.nyc.gov/html/omb/downloads/pdf/adopt11_capresowork.pdf

http://www.nyc.gov/html/omb/downloads/pdf/adopt10_capresowork.pdf

http://www.nyc.gov/html/omb/downloads/pdf/adopt09_capresowork.pdf

http://www.nyc.gov/html/omb/downloads/pdf/adopt08_capresowork.pdf

²⁴ Includes some funds jointly sponsored through the "Speaker's List."

Given that there is roughly ten times more capital money available to individual members as opposed to expense funds, Citizens Union believes that capital funding requires a great deal more scrutiny than it has been given in recent years. There is currently no publicly available Council policy regarding the distribution of capital funds to individual members of the Council. Unlike expense funds, information about the projects and organizations receiving capital discretionary funds is only released to the public in a large PDF, making individual analysis difficult, which may partly explain why these funds have received less scrutiny. There is also no information available regarding the organizations which have requested capital funding but were not funded in the budget, as is available for expense funds, though there is an application process for organizations where they can request capital funds from individual members, borough delegations, or the Speaker's List.

Like expense funds, there is a large range between the largest and smallest allocations of funds received by individual members to distribute. The least amount of capital funds received by members to distribute in FY 2012 was \$2,075,000 for Councilmember Daniel Halloran, with the most going to Domenic Recchia, Jr., a total of \$10,900,000. If all capital funds were distributed equally, each member would have received about \$8.3 million to distribute in FY 2012. Only five members received this much or more in FY 2012 – Domenic Recchia, Jr. (D-Brooklyn), Erik Martin Dilan (D-Brooklyn), Lew Fidler (D-Brooklyn), Inez Dickens (D-Manhattan), and Christine Quinn (D-Manhattan) in her local capacity. While Citizens Union believes that simply dividing funds equally is not the ideal method of distributing funds, this illustrates that the current system benefits select members sometimes at the expense of the greater whole. The detailed breakdown by council member for fiscal years 2009 through 2012 is in Appendix A.

The scope of capital projects is defined by city guidelines, which were clarified and reformed a decade ago.²⁶ Capital funds are used for larger projects that have a longer life span and are not for operating costs, such as construction projects. Certain projects are not eligible, such as lease payments, maintenance, demolition, fundraising, title insurance, and interest costs, among other items. Projects must cost a minimum of \$35,000, except for real property costs (land or a building), which must be a minimum of \$500,000. Items can be combined, however, so as long as individual items cost a minimum of \$110 they can be "bundled." The useful life of projects must be 5 years, meaning that certain items such as laptops are not eligible.

The city has in place strict guidelines and procedures for deciding who is eligible to receive capital funding. For projects that are not on city-owned property, recipients of capital funding must be a legally recognized nonprofit organization and the project must be for a defined city purpose. Prior to receiving any capital funds, the nonprofit must

²⁵ Note: 2009 Funds were not split between future fiscal years in publicly available budget documents. Citizens Union tallied funds allotted only for the immediate fiscal year for FY 2010-2012, as projected costs often change.

²⁶For more information, see the Independent Budget Office's Report on Capital Funding, Available at: <http://www.ibo.nyc.ny.us/iboreports/IBOCBG.pdf>

enter into a City Purpose Covenant. The City Purpose Covenant is a legal agreement between the city and a not-for-profit, stating that the project requesting the capital funds will operate in a way that is useful to the city for the entirety of its agreed upon operating time.²⁷ Non-profits also must also have a separate, pre-existing contract with the city for operating funds (expense funding). Institutions such as private schools, however, are excluded from receiving capital funding.

B. Expense Funding

Each member of the City Council receives a guaranteed baseline of discretionary funding for expense projects. In FY 2012, each member received a minimum of \$80,000 in expense funding for any purpose, along with \$108,750 per member for Department for the Aging services and \$151,714 for Department of Youth and Community Development services.²⁸ This left each member with an overall minimum of \$340,464 to distribute at his or her discretion, typically within his or her own district (though some members have chosen to distribute funds citywide or borough-wide, particularly if planning a run for higher office, as detailed in Section X, and members can also jointly allocate funding). The amount of additional funding received for distribution, however, can vary drastically from member to member, as the Speaker can supplement the base level of funding provided to members.

The Council's handbook, *Discretionary Funding Policies and Procedures*,²⁹ describes five types of initiatives used by the Council for expense funds:

- 1. Local Initiatives – Member:** Each member of the Council receives an amount each year to be used at the Member's discretion to meet local needs in the member's district. These are referred to as "local initiatives" or "member items" and are sponsored by individual council members. The individual line items in the city budget designate the sponsoring council member. The base amount of funding is \$80,000 per district, with additional funding provided to members at the discretion of the Speaker. Uses of local initiative funding are not limited to any particular purpose or agency, except as otherwise restricted by Council policy, PPB rules, and applicable law. These funds totaled nearly \$20 million in FY 2012.
- 2. Local Initiatives – City Council:** Organizations may apply for funding directly to the Speaker, or Members may request that the Speaker fund an organization whose scope of services exceeds their individual ability to fund, or which serves a larger geographical area. This is often referred to as the "Speaker's list," which is designated "CC" for City Council in the line item appropriations. These funds totaled \$16 million in FY 2012.

²⁷ For more information, see the FY 2011 Capital Funding Guidelines issued by the City Council, Available at: http://council.nyc.gov/html/budget/PDFs/fy11_guidelines.pdf

²⁸ New York City Council. *Discretionary Funding Policies and Procedures*. February 2011. Available at: <http://council.nyc.gov/html/budget/PDFs/DiscretionaryFundingPoliciesFY12.pdf>

²⁹ New York City Council. *Discretionary Funding Policies and Procedures*. February 2011.

3. **Member Aging Discretionary Funds:** Each member receives a fixed annual amount to fund senior services in his or her district through the Department for the Aging. Each member received \$108,750 in FY 2012. The individual line items in the city budget designate the sponsoring council member. These funds totaled \$5.5 million in FY 2012.
4. **Member Youth Discretionary Funds:** Each member also received \$151,714 in FY 2012 for the provision of services for youth through the Department of Youth and Community Development. The individual line items in the city budget designate the sponsoring council member. These funds totaled \$7.7 million in FY 2012.
5. **Initiatives:** The Council may also initiate programs for the purpose of addressing community needs that it feels are not met by existing city agency programming, or to extend the reach of agency programs to underserved communities or populations. In most, but not all, cases, the Council will provide funding to specific non-profit providers. Initiatives are almost always citywide in scope, although they may be targeted to meet specific high-need communities or populations. The method of allocating funding varies by initiative. In some cases, for example, an historical provider or providers is renewed annually. In other cases individual members or borough delegations may allocate initiative funds in an amount determined by an analysis of community need. These funds totaled \$100 million in FY 2012.

This report focuses on the distribution of funds for items sponsored by individual members, categories 1, 3 and 4 as described above, though the table on the next page notes the overall funds available to the City Council to distribute to organizations throughout the city. Individually sponsored items together totaled \$33 million in FY 2012.

It should be noted that items distributed through citywide initiatives (category 5 on the previous page), which total two-thirds of expense funds, and the Speaker's List (category 2) have provided some additional funds to districts and communities beyond the amount given to each member, though they are distributed at the discretion of the Speaker in consultation with other members. Specifically for citywide initiatives, which are programmatic in nature, many have utilized funding formulas and targeting based on socioeconomic indicators in their distribution, which in part offset the inequitable distribution of individual funds. Examples of such initiatives include:

- DoVE (Domestic Violence Empowerment) – Utilizes a formula based on reported incidents of domestic violence, which is weighted by low-income immigrant population;
- Immigrant Opportunities – Utilizes a formula based on immigrant population (recent immigrants and those with limited English proficiency) and poverty;
- Housing Preservation – Utilizes a formula based on Housing & Vacancy Survey data on housing conditions, tenancy, and poverty; and
- Food Pantries – Based on district poverty levels.

The use of such funding formulas and objective measures for citywide initiatives is laudable, and demonstrates that using such indicators is plausible for more City Council funded programs and projects.

The disclosure of all expense funding has improved in recent years, and Citizens Union’s analysis of individual member’s funding was aided by the Council’s release of expense discretionary funds in Excel spreadsheets. As previously noted, expense funds are also available in a searchable online database.³⁰ Below is a table of the total amount of expense funds available in the different categories. The detailed breakdown by council member for fiscal years 2009 through 2012 is in Appendix B.

City Council Expense Discretionary Funding, FY 2009-2012³¹					
Fiscal Year	Total Amount of Expense Funds	Citywide Initiatives	Speaker’s List	Expense Funds Distributed Individually (Youth, Aging and Local Initiatives)	Jointly Sponsored or Delegation Expense Funds
FY 2009	\$215,624,182	\$166,963,249	\$17,876,714.00	\$38,208,439	\$7,602,494
FY 2010	\$224,311,464	\$174,413,500	\$18,830,044.52	\$37,414,295	\$8,756,059
FY 2011	\$187,455,097	\$137,527,600	\$17,845,000	\$31,890,622	\$5,254,477
FY 2012	\$150,339,871	\$100,431,400	\$16,606,000	\$32,611,496	\$459,798
TOTAL, FY 2009 –2012	\$777,730,614	\$579,335,749	\$71,157,758.52	\$140,124,852	\$22,072,828

The total amount of funds available to the City Council for expense projects has decreased over recent years to only about \$150 million in FY 2012, down from \$224 million in FY 2010. The portion of these funds known as “member items” – items sponsored solely by individual members of the council – saw a decrease of only about 15 percent, decreasing to \$32.6 million in FY 2012 from \$38 million in FY 2009. This \$32.6 million included \$17 million distributed equally to members through the base funding for local, Aging and Youth initiatives, and the remaining \$15 was given to members to distribute at the discretion of the Speaker. The portion of funds distributed jointly by members or through delegations saw the largest decrease from \$7.6 million to just under \$460,000, perhaps reflecting the desire of each member to retain funds associated only with him or her as overall funds decreased.

³⁰ Available at: http://council.nyc.gov/html/budget/council_disclosure_funding.shtml

³¹ Funds tallied using spreadsheets made available to the public on the City Council website for individual, joint, and Speaker’s List funds. Additional information provided by the Council to Citizens Union was used for total amount of expense funds and citywide initiatives.

http://council.nyc.gov/downloads/excel/funded_disclosure_FY2012.xls

http://council.nyc.gov/downloads/excel/funded_disclosure_FY2011.xls

http://council.nyc.gov/downloads/excel/funded_disclosure_FY2010.xls

http://council.nyc.gov/downloads/excel/funded_disclosure_FY2009.xls

The Speaker of the City Council distributed a total of \$31 million in discretionary expense funds in FY 2012, which included the Speaker's List (\$16 million) and an additional \$15 million in funds that were distributed to individual members over the base allocation at the discretion of the Speaker. It should be noted that the Speaker's List is distributed by the Speaker in consultation with other members, however, and organizations can apply to receive such funds.

If the individual funds, joint funds and the Speaker's List were distributed equally to members, each member would have received \$974,065 to distribute, not including funds distributed by the Council at large through citywide initiatives. Only five members received this much or more in FY 2012 under the current allocation process – Domenic Recchia, Jr. (D-Brooklyn), Lew Fidler (D- Brooklyn), Leroy Comrie, Jr. (D-Queens), James Oddo (R-Staten Island), and Joel Rivera (D-Bronx). The least received by individual council members to distribute was \$362,651 each by Helen Foster and Larry Seabrook, while the most received was \$1,632,564 by Domenic Recchia, Jr.³² While Citizens Union believes that simply dividing funds equally is not the ideal method of distributing funds, this illustrates that the current system benefits select members sometimes at the expense of the greater whole.

There are several proposed explanations for the large variation in expense funding given to individual members. Council Speaker Christine Quinn has stated that success in obtaining more funds is due to knowing how to navigate the system, thus it should not be unexpected that more experienced members and those in leadership positions are provided the most discretionary funding to distribute.³³ Others, like Councilmember Leroy Comrie, Jr., have suggested that the relative need of the district is an important factor in the distribution of discretionary funds.³⁴ Despite this statement, it appears that the funds beyond the base amount are distributed to members on a case-by-case basis at the discretion of the Speaker, rather than following a fixed policy. This report in Section VIII examines the correlation between commonly-used socioeconomic indicators and receipt of funds for distribution, as well as the correlation between leadership positions and receipt of funding in the Council. As noted above, however, many citywide initiatives have utilized formulas in their distribution, which in part offset the inequitable distribution of individual funds.

³² This does not include delegation or jointly distributed funds, as there is no way to determine what portion was funded by a particular member.

³³ Gross, Courtney. *Who Got What: FY 2011*. *Gotham Gazette*. June 30, 2010.
<http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/searchlight/20100630/203/3301>

³⁴ Gross, Courtney *Dividing the Wealth*. *Gotham Gazette*. June 25, 2007.
<http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/searchlight/20070625/203/2214>

VI. INDIVIDUAL COUNCIL WINNERS AND LOSERS IN DISCRETIONARY FUNDING, FY 2012

With a process for awarding discretionary funds to members of the City Council that is neither objective nor equitable, inevitably there are some losers and some winners among the members of the Council. The real winners and losers in this process, however, are the New Yorkers that live in the various Council districts whose ability to receive needed services and capital improvements is based largely on their elected representative's political relationships, or inability to be an effective representative for their district, rather than on an objective process. As noted previously, however, beyond the funds distributed individually by members, citywide initiatives and the Speaker's List have provided some additional funds to districts beyond the amount given to each district's council member.

The Speaker, as the chosen leader of the City Council, plays an important citywide role and represents a consensus view of the Council, but also exerts influence on members of the Council through the discretionary funding process. The ability to distribute funds to individual members also gives the Speaker a powerful tool that can be used to forge consensus in support of important policy decisions of the Council. This can aid the Council in being a more effective unified legislative body against a far more powerful mayor. But it is also true that such a system can be used to reward loyal members and punish those who are not in line with the Speaker's policy or legislative goals.

The following charts show the winners and losers for the most recent fiscal year, 2012, for expense and capital funds separately. Members are ranked from 1 to 51 (there are 51 members of the Council), with the members receiving the most funds to distribute ranked 1st, and the member receiving the least ranked 51st. These funds totaled \$32.6 million in FY 2012, and only consider items sponsored by individual members, not delegation or jointly funded projects, as the amount contributed by individual members for jointly sponsored items is not disclosed in the publicly available budget documents. Detailed lists of allocations by district are available in Appendix A. Beyond the pure dollar variances, this report also looks at the relative socioeconomic status of districts in Section VIII.

Please note that this section tallies only capital funds for Speaker Christine Quinn designated "Quinn," which are her local district projects, and the separate "Speaker's List" of capital funds if not included. As described previously, "Speaker" designated capital funds are distributed more on a citywide basis or in other districts or boroughs. Regarding expense funds, what is commonly referred to as the "Speaker's List" is also not included, as individual members and organizations providing citywide services apply to the Speaker for such funds.

Ten Highest Recipients of Capital Funding FY 2012			
District	Council Member	Capital Funding, FY 2012	Funding Rank
47	Dominic Recchia, Jr.	\$10,900,000	1
37	Erik Martin Dilan	\$10,550,000	2
46	Lewis Fidler	\$9,560,000	3
9	Inez Dickens	\$9,365,000	4
3	Christine C. Quinn*	\$8,385,000	5
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	\$7,896,000	6
13	James Vacca	\$7,500,000	7
7	Robert Jackson	\$7,101,000	8
6	Gale Brewer	\$6,808,000	9
27	Leroy Comrie, Jr.	\$6,685,000	10
<i>Total:</i>		<i>\$84,750,000</i>	

Ten Highest Recipients of Expense Funding, FY 2012			
District	Council Member	Expense Funding, FY 2012	Funding Rank
47	Domenic Recchia, Jr.	\$1,632,564	1
46	Lewis Fidler	\$1,235,464	2
27	Leroy Comrie, Jr.	\$1,117,121	3
50	James Oddo	\$1,092,131	4
15	Joel Rivera	\$998,651	5
9	Inez Dickens	\$942,114	6
37	Erik Martin Dilan	\$864,464	7
18	Annabel Palma	\$857,651	8
3	Christine Quinn*	\$847,464	9
5	Jessica Lappin	\$790,964	10
<i>Total:</i>		<i>\$9,982,588</i>	

Ten Lowest Recipients of Capital Funding, FY 2012			
District	Council Member	Capital Funding, FY 2012	Funding Rank
19	Daniel Halloran	\$2,075,000	51
43	Vincent Gentile	\$2,500,000	50
12	Larry Seabrook	\$2,610,000	49
26	Jimmy Van Bramer	\$2,665,000	48
35	Letitia James	\$2,695,000	47
10	Ydanis Rodriguez	\$3,040,000	46
16	Helen Foster	\$3,099,000	45
25	Daniel Dromm	\$3,104,000	44
39	Brad Lander	\$3,195,000	43
14	Fernando Cabrera	\$3,255,000	42
<i>Total:</i>		<i>\$28,238,000</i>	

* Does not include Speaker's List funds.

Ten <i>Lowest</i> Recipients of Expense Funding, FY 2012			
District	Council Member	Expense Funding, FY 2012	Funding Rank
16	Helen Foster	\$362,651	51/50
12	Larry Seabrook	\$362,651	51/50
42	Charles Barron	\$399,462	49
6	Gale Brewer	\$403,464	48
41	Darlene Mealy	\$406,464	47
43	Vincent Gentile	\$410,464	46
19	Daniel Halloran	\$415,321	45
20	Peter Koo	\$418,821	44
2	Rosie Mendez	\$419,664	43
1	Margaret Chin	\$435,464	42
	<i>Total:</i>	<i>\$4,037,426</i>	

The ten recipients of the most *expense* funding in total were allotted nearly a third (31 percent or \$10 million to distribute, versus only \$4 million for the bottom ten recipients of funds, or 12 percent) of individual expense funds, in spite of the base amount given to all members of \$340,000.

For *capital* funds, the proportion given to the ten recipients of the most funds to distribute was similar, with these ten members receiving one third of individual (33 percent or nearly \$85 million, versus only \$28 million for the bottom ten recipients of funds to distribute, or 11 percent).

Generally, the same council members were the top recipients in both capital and expense funding, though some members switched places with others in terms of rank. Capital funding is a much larger pool of funds, and council members that received a large amount of capital funding to distribute also tended to receive a large amount of expense funding. The ten recipients of the most capital funding were generally among the fifteen recipients of the most expense funding in FY 2012, with the exception of Councilmember Gale Brewer who ranked 9th for capital funds and 48th for expense funds (when combining funds, Brewer ranked 11th, as capital funds are a much larger pool of funds).

The tables on the following page show the ten recipients of the most and least funds to distribute when adding together the capital and expense funding distributed individually by members. As stated previously, these funds do not include delegation or jointly funded projects, as the amount contributed by individual members toward these items is not publicly available.

Ten Highest Recipients of Individual Funding for Distribution, Combined Expense and Capital, FY 2012					
District	Council Member	Total Funds, Capital and Expense, FY 2012	Combined Funding Rank FY 2012	Capital Funding Rank	Expense Funding Rank
47	Domenic Recchia, Jr.	\$12,532,564	1	1	1
37	Erik Martin Dilan	\$11,414,464	2	2	7
46	Lewis Fidler	\$10,795,464	3	3	2
9	Inez Dickens	\$10,307,114	4	4	6
3	Christine Quinn*	\$9,232,464	5	5	9
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	\$8,579,526	6	6	15
13	James Vacca	\$8,232,659	7	7	12
7	Robert Jackson	\$7,836,464	8	8	11
27	Leroy Comrie, Jr.	\$7,802,121	9	10	3
50	James Oddo	\$7,403,131	10	11	4
<i>Total:</i>		<i>\$93,739,971</i>			

Ten Lowest Recipients of Individual Funding for Distribution, Combined Expense and Capital, FY 2012					
District	Council Member	Total Funds, Capital and Expense, FY 2012	Combined Funding Rank FY 2012	Capital Funding Rank	Expense Funding Rank
19	Daniel Halloran	\$2,490,321	51	51	45
43	Vincent Gentile	\$2,910,464	50	50	46
12	Larry Seabrook	\$2,972,651	49	49	50
35	Letitia James	\$3,176,964	48	47	37
26	Jimmy van Bramer	\$3,191,421	47	48	35
16	Helen Foster	\$3,461,651	46	45	51
10	Ydanis Rodriguez	\$3,524,464	45	46	36
25	Daniel Dromm	\$3,633,321	44	44	34
39	Brad Lander	\$3,655,464	43	43	40
14	Fernando Cabrera	\$3,812,651	42	42	30
<i>Total:</i>		<i>\$32,829,372</i>			

When looking at the ten council members receiving the least overall funding for distribution, generally those who received the least in capital funding were on the bottom half for expense funding as well. There is a large disparity between the ten highest recipients and ten lower recipients of the combined discretionary funds for distribution – Domenic Recchia, Jr. received nearly \$9.6 million more in *combined* expense and capital funds than Councilmember Daniel Halloran who received the least amount of capital and expense funds at about \$2.5 million.

* Does not include Speaker's List funds.

This variance could be explained in part because of Councilmember Domenic Recchia's role as chair of the Council's Finance Committee, who funds projects both inside and outside his district, and because Councilmember Daniel Halloran is a newly elected Republican member of the City Council. This makes the point that the more powerful members of the Council get more discretionary money to spend. Regardless of their different posts, the needs of their respective council districts and constituents should not be treated so differently simply because of their influence in the Council.

Detailed lists of funding by Councilmember for fiscal years 2009 through 2011 are available in the appendices.

VII. FOUR YEARS OF WINNERS AND LOSERS BY DISTRICT FY 2009 – FY 2012

The current awarding of funds largely at the discretion of the Speaker of the Council has been in effect for several decades, and over time has had the effect of creating inequities among certain communities, which involves considerable sums of money. While members are able to fund groups both in their communities and located outside of their districts, funding decisions are often political, rather than based solely on an easily and publicly identified objective formula, and it is reasonable to assume that members provide funds mostly to groups that serve their own constituents. Therefore, when one member receives a significantly larger portion of funds than another, there is both a public perception of unfairness, as well as the reality of some communities being underserved.

The range in funding from the most funded and least funded districts for both capital and expense funds for the last four fiscal years was very large. The variance was \$58 million, with Councilmember Domenic Recchia, Jr. in District 47 receiving nearly \$68 million, and Councilmembers Halloran and Avella representing Council District 19 receiving about \$10 million. While the officials representing a district may change over time, newer members tend to receive fewer funds, meaning that a change in representation rarely means an increase in funds for a particular district – at least in the short term.

The following pages show a listing of the total amount of funds received by the 51 districts of the City Council, including both expense and capital discretionary funds that were distributed individually by members representing those districts.

**DISCRETIONARY FUNDING BY DISTRICT
 COMBINED EXPENSE AND CAPITAL, FY 2009 - 2012**

District	Councilmember(s) representing district	Combined Funding, Capital and Expense	Combined Capital and Expense Rank	Total Capital Funds Received	Capital Funding Rank	Total Expense Funds Received	Expense Funding Rank
47	Domenic M. Recchia, Jr.	\$68,295,107	1	\$62,648,000	1	\$5,647,107	1
37	Erik Martin Dilan	\$37,958,507	2	\$34,370,000	2	\$3,588,507	9
46	Lewis A. Fidler	\$36,015,507	3	\$30,704,000	4	\$5,311,507	2
9	Inez E. Dickens	\$34,837,407	4	\$30,767,000	3	\$4,070,407	5
50	James S. Oddo	\$31,616,758	5	\$27,095,000	8	\$4,521,758	3
23	Mark Weprin, David Weprin	\$31,480,327	6	\$28,311,000	6	\$3,169,327	12
3	Christine C. Quinn*	\$31,457,607	7	\$27,955,000	7	\$3,502,607	10
6	Gale Brewer	\$31,224,757	8	\$29,483,000	5	\$1,741,757	51
27	Leroy Comrie	\$30,679,978	9	\$26,265,000	9	\$4,414,978	4
13	James Vacca	\$28,084,513	10	\$25,083,000	11	\$3,001,513	15
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	\$27,997,818	11	\$24,917,000	13	\$3,080,818	13
31	James Sanders, Jr.	\$27,714,678	12	\$25,065,000	12	\$2,649,678	22
12	Larry Seabrook	\$27,300,818	13	\$25,315,000	10	\$1,985,818	42
5	Jessica Lappin	\$26,356,557	14	\$23,717,000	14	\$2,639,557	23
15	Joel Rivera	\$26,078,693	15	\$22,015,000	18	\$4,063,693	6
7	Robert Jackson	\$25,722,107	16	\$22,680,000	16	\$3,042,107	14
8	Melissa Mark-Viverito	\$25,592,507	17	\$23,103,000	15	\$2,489,507	27
49	Deborah Rose, Kenneth Mitchell, Michael McMahon	\$25,526,607	18	\$21,830,000	19	\$3,696,607	8
2	Rosie Mendez	\$24,169,057	19	\$22,239,000	17	\$1,930,057	45
28	Ruben Wills, Thomas White, Jr.	\$23,942,778	20	\$21,134,000	20	\$2,808,778	17
34	Diana Reyna	\$23,784,107	21	\$21,002,000	21	\$2,782,107	18
36	Albert Vann	\$22,223,007	22	\$19,451,000	22	\$2,772,007	19
18	Annabel Palma	\$21,281,568	23	\$17,808,000	24	\$3,473,568	11
11	G. Oliver Koppell	\$21,196,193	24	\$19,118,000	23	\$2,078,193	39
22	Peter F. Vallone, Jr.	\$20,453,464	25	\$16,465,000	30	\$3,988,464	7
51	Vincent Ignizio	\$20,173,107	26	\$17,423,000	26	\$2,750,107	21
45	Jumaane Williams, Kendall Stewart	\$19,660,857	27	\$17,507,000	25	\$2,153,857	37
20	Peter Koo, John Liu	\$19,363,828	28	\$17,403,000	27	\$1,960,828	43

* Does not include Speaker's List funds.

**DISCRETIONARY FUNDING BY DISTRICT
 COMBINED EXPENSE AND CAPITAL, FY 2009 - 2012**

District	Councilmember(s) representing district	Combined Funding, Capital and Expense	Combined Capital and Expense Rank	Total Capital Funds Received	Capital Funding Rank	Total Expense Funds Received	Expense Funding Rank
10	Ydanis Rodriguez, Miguel Martinez	\$19,222,307	29	\$16,585,000	28	\$2,637,307	24
33	Stephen Levin, David Yassky	\$19,182,357	30	\$16,417,000	31	\$2,765,357	20
41	Darlene Mealy	\$18,653,357	31	\$16,574,000	29	\$2,079,357	38
24	James Gennaro	\$18,323,328	32	\$15,961,000	32	\$2,362,328	29
32	Eric Ulrich, Joseph Addabbo, Jr.	\$18,197,328	33	\$15,881,000	33	\$2,316,328	30
39	Brad Lander, Bill de Blasio	\$17,908,007	34	\$15,037,000	37	\$2,871,007	16
38	Sara Gonzalez	\$17,823,007	35	\$15,309,000	36	\$2,514,007	26
25	Daniel Dromm, Helen Sears	\$17,761,328	36	\$15,517,000	35	\$2,244,328	33
44	David Greenfield, Simcha Felder	\$17,731,507	37	\$15,566,000	34	\$2,165,507	35
30	Elizabeth Crowley, Anthony Como	\$17,110,222	38	\$14,952,000	38	\$2,158,222	36
29	Karen Koslowitz, Melinda Katz	\$17,057,771	39	\$14,790,000	39	\$2,267,771	31
4	Daniel Garodnick	\$16,174,443	40	\$14,217,000	41	\$1,957,443	44
1	Margaret Chin, Alan Gerson	\$16,131,757	41	\$14,371,000	40	\$1,760,757	50
35	Letitia James	\$15,516,007	42	\$13,306,000	43	\$2,210,007	34
14	Fernando Cabrera, Maria Baez	\$15,402,293	43	\$13,017,000	45	\$2,385,293	28
16	Helen Foster	\$15,376,043	44	\$13,536,000	42	\$1,840,043	47
21	Julissa Ferreras, Hiram Monserrate	\$15,084,578	45	\$13,035,000	44	\$2,049,578	40
26	Jimmy Van Bramer, Eric Gioia	\$14,628,278	46	\$12,641,000	46	\$1,987,278	41
48	Michael Nelson	\$14,110,007	47	\$11,577,000	47	\$2,533,007	25
40	Mathieu Eugene	\$13,001,607	48	\$10,750,000	48	\$2,251,607	32
42	Charles Barron	\$11,679,847	49	\$9,822,000	49	\$1,857,847	46
43	Vincent Gentile	\$11,382,507	50	\$9,550,000	50	\$1,832,507	48
19	Daniel Halloran, Tony Avella	\$9,897,328	51	\$8,136,000	51	\$1,761,328	49

VIII. HOW THE LACK OF OBJECTIVE FORMULAS MAKES THE PUBLIC LOSE OUT

In fiscal years 2009 to 2012, the socioeconomic status of each district and its residents had no correlation to the amount of discretionary funding received by individual members of the council to distribute according to several commonly-used socioeconomic indicators. It should be noted, however, that Council citywide initiatives have offset this to some degree, though no systematic analysis has been conducted of the amount of funding the City Council as a whole has provided to communities and neighborhoods throughout in the city via the various discretionary funding mechanisms.

Though many objective criteria could be used, Citizens Union examined several socioeconomic indicators in making this determination, including:³⁵

- median household income of each council district,
- unemployment,
- populations of school age and retired persons (persons 18 and younger and over 65),
- number of persons receiving foodstamps; and
- persons with income below the poverty level.

Citizens Union chose to examine districts' relative populations 18 and under and over 65 in particular due to the Council's program of awarding a base level of funds to members for Department of Youth and Community Development and Department for the Aging programs. This analysis was conducted solely correlating members' *expense* funds with the socioeconomic indicators, as expense funds cover service delivery such as job training, HIV testing, and other programs that correlate more directly with available indicators of need.³⁶ As noted previously, however, the top and bottom recipients of expense funds are generally the same as the top and bottom recipients of capital funds.

Two of the three *lowest* council districts in median income – District 17 (Maria del Carmen Arroyo, D-Bronx), ranked the lowest and District 15 (Joel Rivera, D-Bronx) ranked the 3rd lowest – were among the top fifteen recipients of expense funding, with Rivera ranking 6th in funding from FY 2009 to FY 2012 and Arroyo ranking 13th. Yet the 2nd *lowest* council district in median income – District 16 (Helen Foster, D-Bronx) – ranked near the bottom at 47th out of 51 districts from FY 2009 to FY 2012 in expense funding and the lowest in FY 2012 for expense funding.

³⁵ Data regarding unemployment, receipt of foodstamps and income below the poverty level taken from www.infoshare.org, a project of Community Studies of New York, Inc., using 2005-2009 Census (ACS 5-yr average) from American Community Survey, Census Bureau, and US Commerce Dept. Data regarding persons 18 and younger and 65 and older also from infoshare.org, using 2010 Census data. Median income data from Gotham Gazette: <http://www.gothamgazette.com/city/district>

³⁶ As noted in the recommendations in Section XI, Citizens Union recommends that both capital and expense funding allocations consider need, but believes that capital funding allocations should take into consideration other factors beyond the indicators listed in this section such as the presence of facilities and equipment in the district, and long-term benefits such as job growth, etc.

The opposite is true as well; three of the ten districts with highest median household income were also among the ten highest in overall funding (Districts 3, 50 and 46: Democratic Speaker Christine Quinn from Manhattan, Republican Minority Leader James Oddo from Staten Island, and Democrat Lew Fidler of Brooklyn respectively). Other districts, however, such as 4 and 6 in Manhattan, represented by Daniel Garodnick and Gale Brewer, while having high median incomes, received near the bottom in expense funds from FY 2009 to 2012. Please note for the Speaker Christine Quinn, the funding rank does not include the “Speaker’s List,” rather only funds associated with allocations for Council District 3.

Districts with <i>Lowest</i> Median Income			
District	Current Council Member	Median Household Income	Expense Funding Rank, FY 2009-2012
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	\$21,100	13
16	Helen Foster	\$21,468	47
15	Joel Rivera	\$23,186	6
14	Fernando Cabrera	\$25,815	28
41	Darlene Mealy	\$29,212	38
10	Ydanis Rodriguez	\$29,816	24
36	Albert Vann	\$30,390	19
7	Robert Jackson	\$32,009	14
37	Erik Martin Dilan	\$32,170	9
42	Charles Barron	\$33,083	46

Districts with <i>Highest</i> Median Income			
District	Current Council Member	Median Household Income	Expense Funding Rank, FY 2009-2012
4	Daniel Garodnick	\$114,509	44
6	Gale Brewer	\$96,563	51
5	Jessica Lappin	\$91,436	23
3	Christine Quinn*	\$80,441	10
51	Vincent Ignizio	\$80,290	21
19	Daniel Halloran	\$66,675	49
23	Mark Weprin	\$66,505	12
50	James Oddo	\$65,223	3
2	Rosie Mendez	\$64,247	45
46	Lewis Fidler	\$62,078	2

For indicators other than median income, as show in the tables on the following pages, it is also clear that there is no correlation between funds allocated to each member and the relative socioeconomic status of his or her district, though need can be defined in ways other than the ones suggested by Citizens Union in this report. In the categories of unemployed persons, needy populations (18 and under and over 65), receipt of foodstamps and persons with income below the poverty level, again districts ranking high on socioeconomic indicators often do not receive proportional discretionary funding.

While some members, such as Democrat Maria del Carmen Arroyo (District 14 - Bronx) have districts that top several socioeconomic indicators and are among those receiving more than the average amount of funding for distribution (if distributed equally), others with similar socioeconomic status such as Democrat Fernando Cabrera (District 14 - Bronx), Democrat Darlene Mealy (District 41- Brooklyn) and Democrat Melissa Mark-Viverito (District 8 - East Harlem) are among the bottom half of fund recipients for funds to distribute for their districts. Conversely, Democrat Mark Weprin (District 23 - Queens), as well as Lew Fidler and James Oddo rank low among the socioeconomic indicators, and receive above average funding for distribution for their districts.

* Does not include Speaker’s List funds.

Districts with Highest Unemployment

District	Current Council Member	Unemployed, 18-64	Funding Rank, FY 2009-2012
14	Fernando Cabrera	10,127	28
10	Ydanis Rodriguez	9,744	24
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	9,190	13
16	Helen Foster	8,482	47
7	Robert Jackson	8,328	14
8	Melissa Mark-Viverito	8,236	27
9	Inez E. Dickens	8,206	5
35	Letitia James	8,172	34
12	Larry Seabrook	8,129	42
36	Albert Vann	7,959	19

Districts with Lowest Unemployment

District	Current Council Member	Unemployed, 18-64	Funding Rank, FY 2009-2012
51	Vincent Ignizio	3,570	21
4	Daniel Garodnick	4,031	44
50	James S. Oddo	4,068	3
48	Michael Nelson	4,134	25
5	Jessica Lappin	4,200	23
33	Stephen Levin	4,253	20
44	David Greenfield	4,394	35
47	Domenic Recchia, Jr.	4,455	1
23	Mark Weprin	4,563	12
46	Lewis A. Fidler	4,912	2

Districts with Highest Number of Persons Under 18 and Over 65

District	Current Council Member	Persons 18 and under, and above 65	Funding Rank, FY 2009-2012
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	84,887	13
12	Larry Seabrook	74,243	42
44	David Greenfield	73,874	35
49	Deborah Rose	70,449	8
13	James Vacca	68,825	15
27	Leroy Comrie, Jr.	68,601	4
31	James Sanders, Jr.	67,760	22
18	Annabel Palma	67,215	11
42	Charles Barron	66,751	46
11	G. Oliver Koppell	65,896	39

Districts with Lowest Number of Persons Under 18 and Over 65

District	Current Council Member	Persons 18 and under, and above 65	Funding Rank, FY 2009-2012
3	Christine C. Quinn*	35,893	10
2	Rosie Mendez	37,506	45
22	Peter F. Vallone, Jr.	39,105	7
40	Mathieu Eugene	44,021	32
1	Margaret Chin	44,559	50
5	Jessica Lappin	44,733	23
10	Ydanis Rodriguez	46,330	24
26	Jimmy Van Bramer	47,394	41
29	Karen Koslowitz	47,796	31
25	Daniel Dromm	48,692	33

Districts with Highest Receipt of Foodstamps

District	Current Council Member	Households receiving foodstamps	Funding Rank, FY 2009-2012
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	21,929	13
16	Helen Foster	21,124	47
15	Joel Rivera	19,990	6
14	Fernando Cabrera	18,633	28
10	Ydanis Rodriguez	14,710	24
8	Melissa Mark-Viverito	13,699	27
36	Albert Vann	13,498	19
18	Annabel Palma	13,255	11
41	Darlene Mealy	13,160	38
48	Michael Nelson	12,998	25

Districts with Lowest Receipt of Foodstamps

District	Current Council Member	Households receiving foodstamps	Funding Rank, FY 2009-2012
4	Daniel Garodnick	1,478	44
19	Daniel Halloran	1,625	49
51	Vincent Ignizio	1,687	21
23	Mark Weprin	1,811	12
5	Jessica Lappin	1,972	23
30	Elizabeth Crowley	3,247	36
6	Gale Brewer	3,578	51
46	Lewis A. Fidler	3,588	2
50	James S. Oddo	3,865	3
29	Karen Koslowitz	4,130	31

* Does not include Speaker's List funds.

Districts with *Highest* Poverty Level

District	Current Council Member	Persons with income under the poverty level	Overall Funding Rank, FY 2009-2012
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	67,689	13
16	Helen Foster	65,073	47
15	Joel Rivera	61,618	6
14	Fernando Cabrera	54,158	28
8	Melissa Mark-Viverito	50,975	27
42	Charles Barron	45,873	46
41	Darlene Mealy	45,391	38
37	Erik Martin Dilan	44,750	9
34	Diana Reyna	44,265	18
36	Albert Vann	43,530	19

Districts with *Lowest* Poverty Level

District	Current Council Member	Persons with income under the poverty level	Overall Funding Rank, FY 2009-2012
51	Vincent Ignizio	7,561	21
5	Jessica Lappin	8,631	23
4	Daniel Garodnick	8,967	44
19	Daniel Halloran	9,550	49
23	Mark Weprin	10,330	12
46	Lewis A. Fidler	13,316	2
50	James S. Oddo	14,196	3
6	Gale Brewer	14,550	51
29	Karen Koslowitz	14,661	31
30	Elizabeth Crowley	14,955	36

IX. FUNDING ALLOCATIONS AND LEADERSHIP IN THE COUNCIL

Council leadership and chairs of influential committees generally receive greater funding for distribution, particularly for expense funds. Those who are committee chairs or are in conference leadership position receive these positions in large part due to their connection with the Speaker, their political skills and abilities, or other political connections, so it stands to reason that they would also receive other perks such as a larger amount of discretionary funding (committee chairs and others in leadership positions also receive stipends or “lulus” on top of their salaries). The Speaker, Majority Leader, Deputy Majority Leader, Minority Leader, and Majority Whip are generally among the highest recipients of expense and capital discretionary funding for distribution. Chairs of committees that are influential in the budget process are also usually among the leaders in funding, such as the Finance Committee Chair. Youth Services and Aging Committee chairs also play an influential role in expense discretionary funding, since the constituencies at the focus of each committee are key recipients of discretionary funding of the Council. It should be noted, however, that holding a leadership post or chairing an important committee gives one the opportunity to not only direct funds, but also to add one’s name to projects identified by other colleagues in the council.

The table below shows the levels of discretionary funds received by those in leadership positions for FY 2012. Note that these tallies include those distributed individually for the members, and does not include joint or delegation funds.

Council Leadership Discretionary Funding, FY 2012						
Position	Councilmember	Total Funding, Expense and Capital	Capital Funds Only	Capital Funding Rank	Expense Funds Only	Expense Funding Rank
Speaker	Christine Quinn (District Funds)	\$9,232,464	\$8,385,000	5	\$847,464	9
	<i>Speaker’s List</i>	<i>\$50,701,000</i>	<i>\$34,095,000</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>\$16,606,000</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Majority Leader	Joel Rivera	\$5,784,651	\$4,786,000	23	\$998,651	5
Minority Leader	James Oddo	\$7,403,131	\$6,311,000	11	\$1,092,131	4
Majority Whip	Inez Dickens	\$10,307,114	\$9,365,000	4	\$942,114	6
Deputy Majority Leader (also Land Use Chair)	Leroy Comrie, Jr.	\$7,802,121	\$6,685,000	10	\$1,117,121	3
Finance Committee Chair	Domenic Recchia, Jr.	\$12,136,564	\$10,900,000	1	\$1,236,564	1
Aging Committee Chair	Jessica Lappin	\$5,664,964	\$4,874,000	21	\$790,964	10
Youth Committee Chair	Lewis Fidler	\$10,795,464	\$9,560,000	3	\$1,235,464	2

To the extent that those in leadership positions sponsor funding for citywide benefit appears to depend on the councilmember and the position. Finance chair Domenic Recchia, Jr. (D-Brooklyn) allocated approximately 25 percent of his \$1,632,564 in expense funds to citywide organizations, as described in greater detail in the next section, while the rest of his funding went to borough-wide services or organizations within his district. Speaker Christine Quinn (D-Manhattan) and Minority Leader James Oddo (R-Staten Island) allocated expense funds to organizations serving citywide needs or in other boroughs as well, but kept the overwhelming majority of funding for district and borough programs.³⁷

³⁷ Note: Borough-wide funding is grouped with district funding due to the larger impact it could have on the councilmember's constituents.

X. FUNDING DECISIONS OF MEMBERS RUNNING FOR HIGHER OFFICE

In examining council members' distribution of funds outside of their district, Citizens Union examined members with campaigns for citywide office in 2009 and the discretionary expense funding allocations in the budget immediately preceding the election. Citizens Union did not examine capital funding allocations, as they are a much larger pool of funds and could have been allocated for reasons other than those mentioned in this report. In determining whether the organization receiving funding was located in the member's home borough, Citizens Union used publicly available information regarding the address of the headquarters or place of business of the organization that is provided on its website. Citizens Union recognizes, however, that there may be organizations which provide citywide services and are located outside the member's district or home borough, and offers this analysis not as conclusive evidence of funding decisions, but rather to note an observed trend.

The seven council members who ran in the 2009 primary or general election for citywide office were Tony Avella (mayor), Melinda Katz (comptroller), John Liu (comptroller), David Weprin (comptroller), David Yassky (comptroller), Bill de Blasio (public advocate), and Eric Gioia (public advocate). The distribution of discretionary funding was compared to a sample of five council members not running for higher office or known to have ambitions for higher office during that election cycle. The council members in that sample were Al Vann, G. Oliver Koppell, Michael Nelson, Gale Brewer, and Mathieu Eugene. Overall, candidates for citywide office had a larger percentage of their funding go to citywide organizations or organizations with headquarters or places of business outside of their borough rather than to organizations located within their home borough.

While it is understandable that members might choose to fund organizations that provide services on a citywide basis with headquarters or places of business located in another borough, as their constituents may travel for those services or be provided those services on a local basis, the discrepancy in funding between members with ambitions for higher office and those without such ambitions raises questions as to the intended purpose of such funds. By distributing discretionary funding to organizations with headquarters outside of their district or home borough – particularly to organizations which have a citywide scope – legislators are able raise their profile beyond their typical base of support. Those running for citywide office could also be seen as effective politicians, explaining in part the reasons for distributing funding to organizations headquartered outside of their district or borough.

While the data varies by member within each group (those running for office and those not seeking higher office), on average council members who were also candidates for citywide office appeared to distribute more discretionary funding to organizations headquartered outside of their home district or borough. It is also possible that David Weprin's high citywide distribution is due to his role as Finance Chair, however even

without him, the average is still considerably higher for citywide office candidates at 17.6 percent of funding being distributed citywide rather than 7.6 percent for those with no known ambitions for higher office.

The tables below demonstrate the portions of expense discretionary funds provided to organizations headquartered or with places of business located in the member’s home district or borough versus organizations located in other boroughs. As stated previously, Citizens Union recognizes that there may be organizations which provide citywide services and offer local programming but are headquartered outside the member’s district or home borough, and therefore offers this analysis not as conclusive evidence of funding decisions, but rather to note an observed trend.

Candidates for Citywide Office: Expense Funding Breakdown		
Councilmember	Percent of Funded Organizations Headquartered in Home Borough	Percent of Funded Organizations Headquartered Outside of Home Borough
Eric Gioia	87.00%	13.00%
Bill de Blasio	89.50%	10.50%
David Yassky	92.00%	8.00%
David Weprin	60.20%	39.80%
John Liu	78.10%	21.90%
Melinda Katz	69.10%	30.90%
Tony Avella	78.80%	21.20%
Average	79.24%	20.76%

Candidates Not Running for Citywide Office: Expense Funding Breakdown		
Councilmember	Percent of Funded Organizations Headquartered in Home Borough	Percent of Funded Organizations Headquartered Outside of Home Borough
Al Vann	98.60%	1.40%
G. Oliver Koppell	100.00%	0%
Michael Nelson	79.10%	20.90%
Gale Brewer	90.90%	9.10%
Mathieu Eugene	93.50%	6.50%
Average	92.42%	7.58%

XI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Citizens Union recognizes that the city budget process is largely controlled by the executive branch. City Council involvement in the budget process is often confined to the margins and seeks to address needs or gaps in funding for local communities. Discretionary funding has filled this void, becoming an integral part of social service networks in communities, and has also become embedded in our city's budget process. If the city budget process were more transparent, and the Council had a more significant role in deciding the city budget and funding priorities, it is possible that discretionary funds would not be needed. Recognizing, however, that discretionary funding is likely to continue to exist until the City Council is able to exercise more budgetary authority and there are more meaningful avenues for community input, Citizens Union recommends the following reforms to create a more effective and objective discretionary funding system to better serve all New Yorkers:

- 1. Reforms made in recent years by the Council should be FORMALIZED IN THE CITY COUNCIL RULES to ensure their likely continuance when the next Council is elected and Speaker selected.**
- 2. GREATER EQUITY AND OBJECTIVITY should be a part of the process of awarding discretionary funding to council members.** While council members would retain the ability to decide which services or projects are funded, the total amount received should no longer be determined entirely at the Speaker's discretion.
 - a. Expense funding, not including citywide initiatives, should be distributed to council members in the following manner:**
 - iii. using a larger base amount for each member equal to 50 percent of the total expense discretionary funding pot for local initiatives, divided equally among members; and**
 - iv. the remaining 50 percent of the funds no longer distributed subjectively, but rather through an agreed-upon formula that takes into account socioeconomic indicators among other objective considerations.**

This would not, however, preclude the ability of individual members or borough delegations to jointly distribute funds to organizations which serve a broader population than the immediate council district in which they are located.

For example, of the \$50 million in such expense funding in FY 2012 (which includes individual member's local initiatives, Youth and Aging initiatives, as well as the Speaker's List), \$25 million would be distributed equally to members, and \$25 million would be distributed based on a funding formula. Only \$17 million, or roughly a third, is currently distributed equally through a \$340,000 base allocation to members, and there is no objective formula for distribution of the remaining \$33 million.

- b. All citywide expense initiatives should be distributed based on objective measures,** building on the Council's use of funding formulas for initiatives such as Domestic Violence Empowerment (DoVE), Immigrant Opportunities, Housing Preservation, and Food Pantries, among others.
- c. All capital funding should be awarded to individual council members using an agreed-upon formula that takes into consideration socioeconomic indicators, among other objective considerations.** This would not limit the ability of members or borough delegations to jointly distribute funds for projects which serve a broader population than the immediate council district in which they are located.
- d. Objective formulas for expense and capital funding allocations should be developed through a deliberative and public process to ensure that funding formulas consider and balance various types of socioeconomic indicators and other objective measures.** Formulas should be adjusted every four years after the elections by the newly-elected Council through an open and consultative process. An objective formula could incorporate several different socioeconomic indicators. Among those the Council should examine are:
 - foodstamp recipients;
 - individuals receiving free or reduced price school lunches;
 - Medicaid recipients;
 - individuals under the poverty line;
 - individuals under 18 and over 65 (recognizing the Council's historic awarding of funds to individual members for Aging and Youth programs);
 - rising number of new students in need of classrooms; and
 - facilities providing services in the district.

To ensure investments are made with the greatest impact in mind and address a variety of needs, capital funding formulas should also consider potential long-term benefits to communities in terms of job growth and attracting business; the number of individuals who would benefit; and the current presence and quality of facilities or equipment (i.e. the number of parks or homeless shelters in or serving districts, or neighborhoods whose schools need repairs or have a large influx of students requiring new schools to be built), among other measures.

- 3. TRANSPARENCY of funding decisions should be enhanced for capital and expense funding, as well as borough presidents' discretionary funds.**
 - a. The searchable database of expense funds sponsored by council members and the organizations which applied for funding should be expanded to include capital funds;** this database should be updated at least three days prior to the passage of the city budget.

- b. Discretionary line items and their sponsoring member should be disclosed and made available to the public at least three days prior to their passage** as part of the city budget in a downloadable and searchable spreadsheet form to allow for easier outside analysis. Currently only expense line items are made available to the public prior to budget votes, which are released 24 hours in advance.
 - c. Greater information should be provided regarding the intended purpose of discretionary funds. A more detailed and standardized statement of need should be submitted for every organization receiving funding through the contract process with city agencies** to demonstrate how the funding would be utilized to meet said need. Such need statements from contracts should be made publicly available on the Council website through the online searchable database.
 - d. Discretionary spending of the borough presidents, for both capital and expense funds, should be released in an itemized format similar to the Council's Schedule C, as well as in a searchable spreadsheet and web-based database** for funded organizations and projects, as well as organizations that applied but were not funded. This information should be made available on the borough presidents' individual websites as well as through the Office of Management and Budget's website.
- 4. GREATER INNOVATION should be utilized in the discretionary funding process.** Citizens Union supports greater use of pilot programs to improve the current system such as the participatory budgeting project taking place in four council districts during the current FY 2013 budget cycle. Citizens Union, however, withholds judgment on the expansion of this particular pilot program citywide until greater data is available regarding its effectiveness.

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX A: Capital Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012 – LISTED BY YEAR

CAPITAL FUNDING BY MEMBER, FY 2012			
District	Councilmember	Capital Funds Received and Distributed Individually	Capital Funds Rank
47	Domenic Recchia, Jr.	\$10,900,000	1
37	Erik Martin Dilan	\$10,550,000	2
46	Lewis Fidler	\$9,560,000	3
9	Inez Dickens	\$9,365,000	4
3	Christine Quinn*	\$8,385,000	5
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	\$7,896,000	6
13	James Vacca	\$7,500,000	7
7	Robert Jackson	\$7,101,000	8
6	Gale Brewer	\$6,808,000	9
27	Leroy Comrie, Jr.	\$6,685,000	10
50	James Oddo	\$6,311,000	11
24	James Gennaro	\$6,287,000	12
36	Albert Vann	\$6,153,000	13
44	David Greenfield	\$5,956,000	14
11	G. Oliver Koppel	\$5,893,000	15
2	Rosie Mendez	\$5,173,000	16
8	Melissa Mark-Viverito	\$5,139,000	17
30	Elizabeth Crowley	\$5,058,000	18
28	Ruben Willis	\$5,000,000	19
38	Sara Gonzalez	\$4,900,000	20
5	Jessica Lappin	\$4,874,000	21
4	Daniel Garodnick	\$4,802,000	22
15	Joel Rivera	\$4,786,000	23
18	Annabel Palma	\$4,579,000	24
31	James Sanders, Jr.	\$4,555,000	25

* Does not include Speaker's List funds.

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX A: Capital Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012 – LISTED BY YEAR

CAPITAL FUNDING BY MEMBER, FY 2012			
District	Councilmember	Capital Funds Received and Distributed Individually	Capital Funds Rank
29	Karen Koslowitz	\$4,500,000	26
32	Eric Ulrich	\$4,305,000	27
21	Julissa Ferreras	\$4,215,000	28
41	Darlene Mealy	\$4,103,000	29
51	Vincent Ignizio	\$4,035,000	30
23	Mark Weprin	\$4,019,000	31
45	Jumaane Williams	\$3,970,000	32
49	Deborah Rose	\$3,850,000	33
22	Peter Vallone, Jr.	\$3,702,000	34
48	Michael Nelson	\$3,640,000	35
20	Peter Koo	\$3,625,000	36
33	Stephen Levin	\$3,540,000	37
40	Mathieu Eugene	\$3,500,000	38
42	Charles Barron	\$3,472,000	39
1	Margaret Chin	\$3,425,000	40
34	Diana Reyna	\$3,360,000	41
14	Fernando Cabrera	\$3,255,000	42
39	Brad Lander	\$3,195,000	43
25	Daniel Dromm	\$3,104,000	44
16	Helen Foster	\$3,099,000	45
10	Ydanis Rodriguez	\$3,040,000	46
35	Letitia James	\$2,695,000	47
26	Jimmy Van Bramer	\$2,665,000	48
12	Larry Seabrook	\$2,610,000	49
43	Vincent Gentile	\$2,500,000	50
19	Daniel Halloran	\$2,075,000	51

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX A: Capital Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012 – LISTED BY YEAR

CAPITAL FUNDING BY MEMBER, FY 2011			
District	Councilmember	Capital Funds Received and Distributed Individually	Capital Funds Rank
37	Erik Martin Dilan	\$8,100,000	1
3	Christine Quinn*	\$7,506,000	2
50	James Oddo	\$7,314,000	3
47	Domenic Recchia, Jr.	\$7,265,000	4
6	Gale Brewer	\$6,676,000	5
15	Joel Rivera	\$6,433,000	6
46	Lewis Fidler	\$6,400,000	7
13	James Vacca	\$5,875,000	8
27	Leroy Comrie, Jr.	\$5,850,000	9
9	Inez Dickens	\$5,675,000	10
36	Albert Vann	\$5,527,000	11
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	\$5,104,000	12
31	James Sanders	\$5,000,000	13
5	Jessica Lappin	\$4,993,000	14
49	Deborah Rose	\$4,710,000	15
11	G. Oliver Koppel	\$4,640,000	16
28	Thomas White	\$4,510,000	17
7	Robert Jackson	\$4,400,000	18
8	Melissa Mark-Viverito	\$4,279,000	19
41	Darlene Mealy	\$4,265,000	20
29	Karen Koslowitz	\$4,260,000	21
34	Diana Reyna	\$4,255,000	22
32	Eric Ulrich	\$4,200,000	23
12	Larry Seabrook	\$4,100,000	24

* Does not include Speaker's List funds.

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX A: Capital Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012 – LISTED BY YEAR

CAPITAL FUNDING BY MEMBER, FY 2011			
District	Councilmember	Capital Funds Received and Distributed Individually	Capital Funds Rank
45	Jumaane Williams	\$4,050,000	25
26	Jimmy Van Bramer	\$4,050,000	26
51	Vincent Ignizio	\$4,006,000	27
33	Stephen Levin	\$3,919,000	28
18	Annabel Palma	\$3,820,000	29
2	Rosie Mendez	\$3,714,000	30
4	Daniel Garodnick	\$3,635,000	31
38	Sara Gonzalez	\$3,625,000	32
22	Peter Vallone, Jr.	\$3,550,000	33
16	Helen Foster	\$3,306,000	34
21	Julissa Ferreras	\$3,250,000	35
35	Letitia James	\$3,237,000	36
44	David Greenfield	\$3,175,000	37
20	Peter Koo	\$3,035,000	38
40	Mathieu Eugene	\$3,000,000	39
14	Fernando Cabrera	\$2,760,000	40
10	Ydanis Rodriguez	\$2,650,000	41
39	Brad Lander	\$2,585,000	42
24	James Gennaro	\$2,525,000	43
30	Elizabeth Crowley	\$2,415,000	44
48	Michael Nelson	\$2,414,000	45
19	Daniel Halloran	\$2,018,000	46
1	Margaret Chin	\$2,006,000	47
42	Charles Barron	\$1,850,000	48
43	Vincent Gentile	\$1,750,000	49
23	Mark Weprin	\$1,590,000	50
25	Daniel Dromm	\$1,200,000	51

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX A: Capital Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012 – LISTED BY YEAR

CAPITAL FUNDING BY MEMBER, FY 2010			
District	Councilmember	Capital Funds Received and Distributed Individually	Capital Funds Rank
47	Domenic Recchia, Jr.	\$20,970,000	1
12	Larry Seabrook	\$10,055,000	2
6	Gale Brewer	\$8,668,000	3
37	Erik Martin Dilan	\$8,200,000	4
3	Christine Quinn*	\$7,943,000	5
27	Leroy Comrie, Jr.	\$7,880,000	6
31	James Sanders, Jr.	\$7,400,000	7
34	Diana Reyna	\$7,203,000	8
9	Inez Dickens	\$6,767,000	9
50	James Oddo	\$6,580,000	10
25	Helen Sears	\$6,190,000	11
15	Joel Rivera	\$5,955,000	12
46	Lewis Fidler	\$5,950,000	13
5	Jessica Lappin	\$5,945,000	14
28	Thomas White, Jr.	\$5,836,000	15
41	Darlene Mealy	\$5,656,000	16
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	\$5,300,000	17
51	Vincent Ignizio	\$5,157,000	18
18	Annabel Palma	\$5,100,000	19
49	Kenneth Mitchell	\$5,060,000	20
39	Bill de Blasio	\$4,893,000	21
11	G. Oliver Koppel	\$4,714,000	22
45	Kendall Stewart	\$4,700,000	23
23	David Weprin	\$4,642,000	24

* Does not include Speaker's List funds.

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX A: Capital Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012 – LISTED BY YEAR

CAPITAL FUNDING BY MEMBER, FY 2010			
District	Councilmember	Capital Funds Received and Distributed Individually	Capital Funds Rank
7	Robert Jackson	\$4,481,000	25
8	Melissa Mark-Viverito	\$4,429,000	26
2	Rosie Mendez	\$4,364,000	27
13	James Vacca	\$4,319,000	28
33	David Yassky	\$4,215,000	29
30	Elizabeth Crowley	\$4,204,000	30
10	Miguel Martinez	\$4,165,000	31
20	John Liu	\$4,087,000	32
22	Peter Vallone, Jr.	\$4,073,000	33
1	Alan Gerson	\$3,831,000	34
4	Daniel Garodnick	\$3,605,000	35
36	Albert Vann	\$3,531,000	36
14	Maria Baez	\$3,500,000	37
40	Mathieu Eugene	\$3,500,000	38
44	Simcha Felder	\$3,450,000	39
48	Michael Nelson	\$3,358,000	40
38	Sara Gonzalez	\$3,324,000	41
24	James Gennaro	\$3,299,000	42
35	Letitia James	\$3,249,000	43
16	Helen Foster	\$3,111,000	44
29	Melinda Katz	\$2,985,000	45
26	Eric Gioia	\$2,914,000	46
42	Charles Barron	\$2,230,000	47
32	Eric Ulrich	\$2,125,000	48
19	Tony Avella	\$2,043,000	49
21	Julissa Ferreras	\$1,520,000	50
43	Vincent Gentile	\$1,500,000	51

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX A: Capital Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012 – LISTED BY YEAR

CAPITAL FUNDING BY MEMBER, FY 2009			
District	Councilmember	Capital Funds Received and Distributed Individually	Capital Funds Rank
47	Domenic Recchia, Jr.	\$23,513,000	1
23	David Weprin	\$18,060,000	2
8	Melissa Mark-Viverito	\$9,256,000	3
2	Rosie Mendez	\$8,988,000	4
9	Inez Dickens	\$8,960,000	5
46	Lewis Fidler	\$8,794,000	6
12	Larry Seabrook	\$8,550,000	7
49	Michael McMahan	\$8,210,000	8
31	James Sanders, Jr.	\$8,110,000	9
5	Jessica Lappin	\$7,905,000	10
37	Erik Martin Dilan	\$7,520,000	11
13	James Vacca	\$7,389,000	12
6	Gale Brewer	\$7,331,000	13
50	James Oddo	\$6,890,000	14
10	Miguel Martinez	\$6,730,000	15
7	Robert Jackson	\$6,698,000	16
20	John Liu	\$6,656,000	17
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	\$6,617,000	18
34	Diana Reyna	\$6,184,000	19
27	Leroy Comrie, Jr.	\$5,850,000	20
28	Thomas White, Jr.	\$5,788,000	21
32	Joseph Addabbo, Jr.	\$5,251,000	22
22	Peter Vallone, Jr.	\$5,140,000	23
1	Alan Gerson	\$5,109,000	24
25	Helen Sears	\$5,023,000	25
15	Joel Rivera	\$4,841,000	26

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX A: Capital Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012 – LISTED BY YEAR

CAPITAL FUNDING BY MEMBER, FY 2009			
District	Councilmember	Capital Funds Received and Distributed Individually	Capital Funds Rank
45	Kendall Stewart	\$4,787,000	27
33	David Yassky	\$4,743,000	28
39	Bill de Blasio	\$4,364,000	29
18	Annabel Palma	\$4,309,000	30
36	Albert Vann	\$4,240,000	31
51	Vincent Ignizio	\$4,225,000	32
35	Letitia James	\$4,125,000	33
3	Christine Quinn*	\$4,121,000	34
21	Hiram Monserrate	\$4,050,000	35
16	Helen Foster	\$4,020,000	36
11	G. Oliver Koppel	\$3,871,000	37
24	James Gennaro	\$3,850,000	38
43	Vincent Gentile	\$3,800,000	39
14	Maria Baez	\$3,502,000	40
38	Sara Gonzalez	\$3,460,000	41
30	Anthony Como	\$3,275,000	42
29	Melinda Katz	\$3,045,000	43
26	Eric Gioia	\$3,012,000	44
44	Simcha Felder	\$2,985,000	45
41	Darlene Mealy	\$2,550,000	46
42	Charles Barron	\$2,270,000	47
4	Daniel Garodnick	\$2,175,000	48
48	Michael Nelson	\$2,165,000	49
19	Tony Avella	\$2,000,000	50
40	Mathieu Eugene	\$750,000	51

* Does not include Speaker's List funds.

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX B: Expense Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012 – LISTED BY YEAR

EXPENSE FUNDING BY MEMBER, FY 2012			
District	Councilmember	Expense Funds Received and Distributed Individually	Expense Funds Rank
47	Domenic Recchia, Jr.	\$1,632,564	1
46	Lewis Fidler	\$1,235,464	2
27	Leroy Comrie, Jr.	\$1,117,121	3
50	James Oddo	\$1,092,131	4
15	Joel Rivera	\$998,651	5
9	Inez Dickens	\$942,114	6
37	Erik Martin Dilan	\$864,464	7
18	Annabel Palma	\$857,651	8
3	Christine C. Quinn*	\$847,464	9
5	Jessica Lappin	\$790,964	10
7	Robert Jackson	\$735,464	11
13	James Vacca	\$732,659	12
36	Albert Vann	\$711,964	13
51	Vincent Ignizio	\$698,131	14
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	\$683,526	15
22	Peter Vallone, Jr.	\$688,321	15
30	Elizabeth Crowley	\$664,715	17
33	Stephen Levin	\$655,464	18
49	Deborah Rose	\$650,631	19
34	Diana Reyna	\$637,464	20
38	Sara Gonzalez	\$628,464	21
8	Melissa Mark-Viverito	\$613,714	22
32	Eric Ulrich	\$603,321	23
31	James Sanders, Jr.	\$588,321	24
28	Ruben Wills	\$584,521	25

* Does not include Speaker's List funds.

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX B: Expense Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012 – LISTED BY YEAR

EXPENSE FUNDING BY MEMBER, FY 2012			
District	Councilmember	Expense Funds Received and Distributed Individually	Expense Funds Rank
23	Mark Weprin	\$580,321	26
40	Mathieu Eugene	\$567,964	27
48	Michael Nelson	\$560,964	28
24	James Gennaro	\$560,321	29
14	Fernando Cabrera	\$557,651	30
44	David Greenfield	\$555,464	31
21	Julissa Ferreras	\$539,221	32
29	Karen Koslowitz	\$531,264	33
25	Daniel Dromm	\$529,321	34
26	Jimmy van Bramer	\$526,421	35
10	Ydanis Rodriguez	\$484,464	36
35	Letitia James	\$481,964	37
45	Jumaane Williams	\$471,464	38
4	Daniel Garodnick	\$460,464	39
39	Brad Lander	\$460,464	40
11	G. Oliver Koppel	\$452,651	41
1	Margaret Chin	\$435,464	42
2	Rosie Mendez	\$419,664	43
20	Peter Koo	\$418,821	44
19	Daniel Halloran	\$415,321	45
43	Vincent Gentile	\$410,464	46
41	Darlene Mealy	\$406,464	47
6	Gale Brewer	\$403,464	48
42	Charles Barron	\$399,462	49
12	Larry Seabrook	\$362,651	50
16	Helen Foster	\$362,651	51

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX B: Expense Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012 – LISTED BY YEAR

EXPENSE FUNDING BY MEMBER, FY 2011			
District	Councilmember	Expense Funds Received and Distributed Individually	Expense Funds Rank
47	Domenic M. Recchia, Jr.	\$1,371,839	1
46	Lewis A. Fidler	\$1,244,089	2
27	Leroy Comrie, Jr.	\$1,118,121	3
50	James S. Oddo	\$1,089,131	4
15	Joel Rivera	\$998,901	5
22	Peter F. Vallone, Jr.	\$978,321	6
9	Inez E. Dickens	\$940,464	7
37	Erik Martin Dilan	\$881,339	8
18	Annabel Palma	\$857,651	9
3	Christine C. Quinn*	\$852,464	10
13	James Vacca	\$712,651	11
7	Robert Jackson	\$710,464	12
28	Thomas White Jr.	\$703,571	13
51	Vincent Ignizio	\$702,131	14
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	\$683,526	15
36	Albert Vann	\$682,839	16
33	Stephen Levin	\$672,339	17
49	Deborah Rose	\$672,130	18
34	Diana Reyna	\$651,839	19
5	Jessica Lappin	\$612,664	20
8	Melissa Mark-Viverito	\$592,964	21
31	James Sanders, Jr.	\$578,321	22
32	Eric Ulrich	\$578,321	23
40	Mathieu Eugene	\$577,339	24
48	Michael Nelson	\$577,339	25

* Does not include Speaker's List funds.

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX B: Expense Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012 – LISTED BY YEAR

EXPENSE FUNDING BY MEMBER, FY 2011			
District	Councilmember	Expense Funds Received and Distributed Individually	Expense Funds Rank
24	James Gennaro	\$543,321	26
38	Sara Gonzalez	\$539,839	27
23	Mark Weprin	\$534,321	28
25	Daniel Dromm	\$528,321	29
21	Julissa Ferreras	\$528,321	30
29	Karen Koslowitz	\$528,321	31
26	Jimmy Van Bramer	\$528,321	32
44	David Greenfield	\$502,339	33
41	Darlene Mealy	\$502,339	34
14	Fernando Cabrera	\$498,151	35
35	Letitia James	\$487,339	36
45	Jumaane Williams	\$477,339	37
10	Ydanis Rodriguez	\$460,464	38
11	G. Oliver Koppell	\$457,651	39
4	Daniel Garodnick	\$453,114	40
39	Brad Lander	\$427,339	41
20	Peter Koo	\$416,321	42
19	Daniel Halloran	\$415,321	43
42	Charles Barron	\$414,703	44
2	Rosie Mendez	\$414,664	45
43	Vincent Gentile	\$377,339	46
6	Gale Brewer	\$367,964	47
1	Margaret Chin	\$363,464	48
16	Helen Foster	\$362,651	49
12	Larry Seabrook	\$362,276	50
30	Elizabeth Crowley	\$358,321	51

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX B: Expense Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012 – LISTED BY YEAR

EXPENSE FUNDING BY MEMBER, FY 2010			
District	Councilmember	Expense Funds Received and Distributed Individually	Expense Funds Rank
46	Lewis A. Fidler	\$1,451,789	1
47	Domenic M. Recchia, Jr.	\$1,357,289	2
50	James S. Oddo	\$1,331,581	3
27	Leroy Comrie, Jr.	\$1,134,321	4
9	Inez E. Dickens	\$1,119,914	5
22	Peter F. Vallone, Jr.	\$1,073,907	6
23	David Weprin	\$1,052,771	7
49	Kenneth Mitchell	\$1,028,431	8
15	Joel Rivera	\$1,017,701	9
39	Bill de Blasio	\$989,289	10
3	Christine C. Quinn*	\$959,264	11
37	Erik Martin Dilan	\$926,789	12
18	Annabel Palma	\$896,976	13
28	Thomas White, Jr.	\$827,771	14
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	\$807,976	15
7	Robert Jackson	\$788,764	16
13	James Vacca	\$754,913	17
51	Vincent Ignizio	\$753,430	18
33	David Yassky	\$736,639	19
34	Diana Reyna	\$728,764	20
36	Albert Vann	\$715,789	21
48	Michael Nelson	\$701,789	22
38	Sara Gonzalez	\$681,789	23
8	Melissa Mark-Viverito	\$677,414	24

* Does not include Speaker's List funds.

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012

APPENDIX B: Expense Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012 – LISTED BY YEAR

EXPENSE FUNDING BY MEMBER, FY 2010			
District	Councilmember	Expense Funds Received and Distributed Individually	Expense Funds Rank
5	Jessica Lappin	\$664,864	25
10	Miguel Martinez	\$647,464	26
30	Elizabeth Crowley	\$637,271	27
14	Maria Baez	\$628,701	28
24	James Gennaro	\$623,771	29
45	Kendall Stewart	\$607,139	30
29	Melinda Katz	\$602,771	31
35	Letitia James	\$601,789	32
25	Helen Sears	\$590,271	33
11	G. Oliver Koppell	\$587,101	34
44	Simcha Felder	\$576,289	35
41	Darlene Mealy	\$547,139	36
20	John Liu	\$542,771	37
2	Rosie Mendez	\$537,614	38
4	Daniel Garodnick	\$532,414	39
12	Larry Seabrook	\$530,101	40
43	Vincent Gentile	\$526,789	41
42	Charles Barron	\$526,653	42
40	Mathieu Eugene	\$513,639	43
31	James Sanders, Jr.	\$513,121	44
6	Gale Brewer	\$497,414	45
1	Alan Gerson	\$493,914	46
19	Tony Avella	\$482,771	47
32	Eric Ulrich	\$479,771	48
26	Eric Gioia	\$474,621	49
21	Julissa Ferreras	\$469,121	50
16	Helen Foster	\$463,951	51

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX B: Expense Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012 – LISTED BY YEAR

EXPENSE FUNDING BY MEMBER, FY 2009			
District	Councilmember	Expense Funds Received and Distributed Individually	Expense Funds Rank
46	Lewis A. Fidler	\$1,380,165	1
49	Michael McMahon	\$1,345,415	2
47	Domenic M. Recchia, Jr.	\$1,285,415	3
22	Peter F. Vallone, Jr.	\$1,247,915	4
9	Inez E. Dickens	\$1,067,915	5
15	Joel Rivera	\$1,048,440	6
27	Leroy Comrie, Jr.	\$1,045,415	7
10	Miguel Martinez	\$1,044,915	8
50	James S. Oddo	\$1,008,915	9
23	David Weprin	\$1,001,914	10
39	Bill de Blasio	\$993,915	11
31	James Sanders, Jr.	\$969,915	12
37	Erik Martin Dilan	\$915,915	13
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	\$905,790	14
18	Annabel Palma	\$861,290	15
3	Christine C. Quinn*	\$843,415	16
7	Robert Jackson	\$807,415	17
13	James Vacca	\$801,290	18
34	Diana Reyna	\$764,040	19
12	Larry Seabrook	\$730,790	20
33	David Yassky	\$700,915	21
14	Maria Baez	\$700,790	22
48	Michael Nelson	\$692,915	23
28	Thomas White, Jr.	\$692,915	24
38	Sara Gonzalez	\$663,915	25

* Does not include Speaker's List funds.

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX B: Expense Funding Received by Members, FY 2009 – 2012 – LISTED BY YEAR

EXPENSE FUNDING BY MEMBER, FY 2009			
District	Councilmember	Expense Funds Received and Distributed Individually	Expense Funds Rank
36	Albert Vann	\$661,415	26
32	Joseph Addabbo, Jr.	\$654,915	27
16	Helen Foster	\$650,790	28
35	Letitia James	\$638,915	29
24	James Gennaro	\$634,915	30
41	Darlene Mealy	\$623,415	31
29	Melinda Katz	\$605,415	32
8	Melissa Mark-Viverito	\$605,415	33
45	Kendall Stewart	\$597,915	34
25	Helen Sears	\$596,415	35
51	Vincent Ignizio	\$596,415	36
40	Mathieu Eugene	\$592,665	37
20	John Liu	\$582,915	38
11	G. Oliver Koppell	\$580,790	39
5	Jessica Lappin	\$571,065	40
2	Rosie Mendez	\$558,115	41
44	Simcha Felder	\$531,415	42
42	Charles Barron	\$517,029	43
43	Vincent Gentile	\$517,915	44
21	Hiram Monserrate	\$512,915	45
4	Daniel Garodnick	\$511,451	46
30	Anthony Como	\$497,915	47
6	Gale Brewer	\$472,915	48
1	Alan Gerson	\$467,915	49
26	Eric Gioia	\$457,915	50
19	Tony Avella	\$447,915	51

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX C: NEED INDICATORS AND DISTRICT FUNDING, TOTAL IN FY 2009-2012

NEED INDICATORS AND EXPENSE FUNDING BY DISTRICT, FY 2009–2012³⁸

Sorted by Median Income, Lowest to Highest

District	Current Council Member	Expense Funding, FY 2009-2012	Expense Funding Rank, FY2009-2012	Median Household Income	Unemployed, 18-64	Persons 65 and older	Persons 18 and under	Households receiving food stamps	Persons with income under poverty level
17	Maria del Carmen Arroyo	\$3,080,943	13	\$21,100	9,190	18,451	66,436	21,929	67,689
16	Helen Foster	\$1,840,043	47	\$21,468	8,482	12,507	53,129	21,124	65,073
15	Joel Rivera	\$4,063,693	6	\$23,186	7,718	12,362	51,959	19,990	61,618
14	Fernando Cabrera	\$2,385,293	28	\$25,815	10,127	11,221	42,725	18,633	54,158
41	Darlene Mealy	\$2,079,357	38	\$29,212	7,169	15,869	45,299	13,160	45,391
10	Ydanis Rodriguez	\$2,638,307	24	\$29,816	9,744	15,552	30,778	14,710	40,874
36	Albert Vann	\$2,772,007	19	\$30,390	7,959	14,986	37,776	13,498	43,530
7	Robert Jackson	\$3,042,107	14	\$32,009	8,328	20,198	36,600	12,331	42,007
37	Erik Martin Dilan	\$3,588,507	9	\$32,170	4,951	12,607	49,575	12,359	44,750
42	Charles Barron	\$1,857,849	46	\$33,083	7,591	18,118	48,633	12,459	45,873
34	Diana Reyna	\$2,782,107	18	\$33,622	5,510	14,512	36,554	12,772	44,265
8	Melissa Mark-Viverito	\$2,489,507	27	\$33,794	8,236	22,104	39,806	13,699	50,975
18	Annabel Palma	\$3,473,568	11	\$34,347	6,232	17,534	49,681	13,255	41,754
47	Domenic M. Recchia Jr.	\$5,647,107	1	\$35,861	4,455	27,339	35,948	12,849	28,490
9	Inez E. Dickens	\$4,070,407	5	\$38,031	8,206	18,976	36,514	10,800	39,345
38	Sara Gonzalez	\$2,514,007	26	\$38,117	6,047	13,011	40,414	9,392	40,813
44	David Greenfield	\$2,165,507	35	\$38,234	4,394	20,786	53,088	9,959	37,868
40	Mathieu Eugene	\$2,251,607	32	\$38,631	6,901	12,981	31,040	8,295	28,562
48	Michael Nelson	\$2,533,007	25	\$41,164	4,134	27,909	35,623	12,998	31,107
35	Letitia James	\$2,210,007	34	\$41,631	8,172	15,748	38,909	9,230	35,082
22	Peter F. Vallone Jr.	\$3,988,464	7	\$42,290	6,075	16,490	22,615	4,223	19,929
26	Jimmy Van Bramer	\$1,987,278	41	\$43,451	6,551	16,627	30,767	7,211	24,630
21	Julissa Ferreras	\$2,049,578	40	\$44,097	6,072	13,943	43,014	7,114	29,105
11	G. Oliver Koppell	\$2,078,193	39	\$45,650	5,704	24,643	41,253	8,702	25,605
25	Daniel Dromm	\$2,244,328	33	\$45,762	6,106	17,061	31,631	6,406	26,019

³⁸ Data regarding unemployment, receipt of foodstamps and income below the poverty level taken from www.infoshare.org, a project of Community Studies of New York, Inc., using 2005-2009 Census (ACS 5-yr average) from American Community Survey, Census Bureau, and US Commerce Dept. Data regarding persons 18 and younger and 65 and older also from Infoshare using 2010 Census data. Median income data from Gotham Gazette: <http://www.gothamgazette.com/city/district>.

CITIZENS UNION DISCRETIONARY FUNDING REPORT, APRIL 2012
APPENDIX C: NEED INDICATORS AND DISTRICT FUNDING, TOTAL IN FY 2009-2012

NEED INDICATORS AND EXPENSE FUNDING BY DISTRICT, FY 2009–2012³⁸

Sorted by Median Income, Lowest to Highest

District	Current Council Member	Expense Funding, FY 2009-2012	Expense Funding Rank, FY2009-2012	Median Household Income	Unemployed, 18-64	Persons 65 and older	Persons 18 and under	Households receiving food stamps	Persons with income under poverty level
12	Larry Seabrook	\$1,985,818	42	\$45,974	8,129	25,319	48,924	8,058	25,476
20	Peter Koo	\$1,960,828	43	\$46,982	7,146	24,707	29,923	5,965	22,091
13	James Vacca	\$3,001,505	15	\$48,815	6,083	26,468	42,357	6,774	24,734
45	Jumaane Williams	\$2,153,857	37	\$49,624	6,317	18,124	35,717	5,610	19,418
28	Ruben Wills	\$2,809,078	17	\$49,910	7,828	15,455	39,829	5,289	20,894
43	Vincent Gentile	\$1,832,507	48	\$49,988	5,861	26,177	37,673	5,934	23,920
24	James Gennaro	\$2,362,328	29	\$52,501	6,233	22,179	36,348	5,326	18,357
33	Stephen Levin	\$2,765,357	20	\$53,123	4,253	15,381	44,189	8,285	41,887
30	Elizabeth Crowley	\$2,158,222	36	\$53,869	5,539	21,714	36,814	3,247	14,955
31	James Sanders Jr.	\$2,649,678	22	\$54,012	6,411	19,367	48,393	8,153	23,657
49	Deborah Rose	\$3,696,607	8	\$55,162	5,476	19,850	50,599	7,528	27,356
32	Eric Ulrich	\$2,316,328	30	\$56,289	5,741	20,152	39,321	4,144	16,398
39	Brad Lander	\$2,871,007	16	\$57,914	4,958	14,907	40,155	6,317	29,184
29	Karen Koslowitz	\$2,267,771	31	\$58,387	5,186	22,280	25,516	4,130	14,661
27	Leroy Comrie, Jr.	\$4,414,978	4	\$58,659	7,422	23,960	44,641	4,921	15,565
1	Margaret Chin	\$1,760,757	50	\$60,196	5,541	21,180	23,379	8,122	30,749
46	Lewis A. Fidler	\$5,311,507	2	\$62,078	4,912	21,933	39,216	3,588	13,316
2	Rosie Mendez	\$1,930,057	45	\$64,247	7,232	18,702	18,804	6,536	25,225
50	James S. Oddo	\$4,521,758	3	\$65,223	4,068	24,323	35,260	3,865	14,196
23	Mark Weprin	\$3,169,327	12	\$66,505	4,563	23,918	30,911	1,811	10,330
19	Daniel Halloran	\$1,761,328	49	\$66,675	5,354	27,038	30,491	1,625	9,550
51	Vincent Ignizio	\$2,750,107	21	\$80,290	3,570	18,471	34,625	1,687	7,561
3	Christine C. Quinn*	\$3,502,607	10	\$80,441	7,367	20,125	15,768	4,680	20,207
5	Jessica Lappin	\$2,639,557	23	\$91,436	4,200	24,972	19,761	1,972	8,631
6	Gale Brewer	\$1,741,757	51	\$96,563	5,413	28,648	25,045	3,578	14,550
4	Daniel Garodnick	\$1,957,443	44	\$114,509	4,031	29,539	20,359	1,478	8,967

* Does not include Speaker's List funds.