

# REFORMING LOCAL MEMBER ITEMS IN NEW YORK CITY

*by The Office of Manhattan Borough President Scott M. Stringer*

**JULY 2011**



Office of the Manhattan  
Borough President

**Scott M. Stringer**  
Manhattan Borough President



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

Manhattan Borough President Scott M. Stringer thanks David Saltonstall and Stephen Corson for their work as the primary writers and researchers of this report.

Borough President Stringer thanks Deputy Borough President Rosemonde Pierre-Louis and other staff members who contributed to this report, including: Alaina Gilligo, Cuong Nguyen, Sascha Puritz, Shira Gans, Susannah Vickers, Linda Felstein, Shaan Khan, Jimmy Yan, Josh Getlin, Audrey Gelman, Jessica Silver, Brian Cook, and Sandy Myers.

Borough President Stringer also thanks interns Angelina Liang, Christina Burrows, Elena Ruyter, Jonathan Epstein, Madison Gardiner, Max Bookman, Simon Vance, and Simone Greenbaum for their hard work with special acknowledgement of interns Anqi Yang and Shane Myers who provided significant research and substantive contributions to this report.



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

I. Executive Summary.....1

II. Background.....3

III. Findings.....4

IV. Recommendations.....6

V. Methodology.....9

VI. Appendices.....10



## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At a time of dwindling government resources, New York City must be more committed than ever to allocating tax dollars in a way that is transparent, equitable and free of political favoritism. Unfortunately, the decades-old system of distributing City Council member items, or discretionary funds, falls short on all these counts, despite efforts aimed at reform in recent years.

Many government watchdog groups and some Council Members have long asserted that allocation of these tax dollars remains a murky and subjective process, in which funding decisions are too often based on a member's political standing within the Council.<sup>1</sup> Under the current system, some districts receive more than four times the amount of discretionary member items than others. The result is a chilling effect on open debate, not just among elected officials but non-profit leaders as well.

This report recommends that the time has come for New York City to abolish the existing system of allocating member items and implement genuine reforms. The goal of these reforms is to add new levels of transparency and equity to the system, while also providing stable and sufficient funding for the many non-profit organizations that rely on these public dollars. Hundreds of thousands of the City's neediest residents are provided critical services every day by New York's vibrant non-profit community, which includes many small, immigrant-based groups that are often severely disadvantaged in accessing public funds. Any system of allocation that emerges needs to recognize the importance of this good work and allow for future funding of worthy programs.

The need for reform should not be confused with the good work done every day by individual members of the New York City Council. Those elected leaders who do well under the current system should not be blamed for successfully navigating the existing political channels; nor should those who do poorly be criticized. It is the system that is flawed and must be fixed.

As a basis for reform, the Office of Manhattan Borough President Scott M. Stringer undertook the most comprehensive study to date of New York City member items, covering each of the last four fiscal years. The findings lay bare the deep inequities within the current system: Some Council Districts receive \$1.2 million more in member item disbursements than others.<sup>2</sup> The report also found that disbursements have no correlation to a Council Dis-

trict's economic needs: Some of the wealthiest districts in the city receive substantially more than some of the poorest, based on median household income. [See Appendix One]

Significantly, as part of the report, the Office of the Manhattan Borough President contacted the nine other largest cities in the country and found that no other municipality distributes such disparate sums of money within legislative districts, on such a large scale, or grants individual legislators such broad authority to make funding decisions. The cities contacted were Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, Philadelphia, Phoenix, San Antonio, San Diego, Dallas and San Jose.

The report tallies publicly available information on member items in each district over the last four fiscal years. It ranks each district from highest to lowest, both in raw dollars received and on a per constituent basis. The result is a comprehensive, citywide guide to member items, showing the deep disparities that exist under the current system, and a solid blueprint for reform.

The report makes several recommendations, including:

**1. The current system of member items should be abolished in New York City.** Instead, those funds should be transferred to mayoral agencies for distribution as Community Grants.

As a starting point, the Mayor's Office of Contract Services (MOCS) should convene a working group of diverse elected leaders, good government groups and non-profit representatives to develop a new process for awarding Community Grants. The working group's process should provide for a number of criteria including but not limited to:

- A baseline allocation in the City budget of Community Grant funding, now set at \$49.6 million, that guarantees a set level of support to non-profit service providers each year.
- A formula that assures Community Grants are distributed on an equal basis across all 51 Council Districts, or through an empirical, needs-based formula that targets areas of greatest economic need.
- A process that recognizes the importance of small community organizations and ensures the opportunity for their participation, as well as limits on how much any one organization can receive.
- Appropriate mechanisms for incorporating input from local elected officials, community leaders and stakeholders. Local elected officials are often best positioned to gauge the value of individual

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.gothamgazette.com/print/2214>

<sup>2</sup> Throughout this report, we refer to the Council District as the receiving entity of member items. We acknowledge that in certain limited instances, individual Council members may allocate discretionary funds to organizations or entities outside of their districts.

community groups and the needs of their communities, and therefore should play an advisory role on specific allocations within their districts.

Whatever system MOCS develops for distributing member item dollars should apply equally to Borough Presidents.

**2. In the short-term, while new rules are promulgated to end the current system, the City should commit to distribute member items through a set formula.** This formula could grant the same sum to every Council District. Or, a formula could be crafted that takes into account a Council District's population and level of economic need.

The federal government already uses similarly progressive, needs-based formulas to distribute anti-poverty and other funds.<sup>3</sup>

**3. All member items/Community Grants should be published in a format that is easily accessible to all online.** Currently, member items are published in .pdf format, which makes summations, comparisons and sorting of member item data extremely time intensive. Providing this information in a more transparent, user-friendly format will allow the public to better judge how their tax dollars are spent.

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d05622t.pdf>

## II. BACKGROUND

Member items are annual grants, also known as discretionary funds, distributed by City Council “members” each year to non-profit organizations and other local groups in each Council District. In the current fiscal year (FY12), which began July 1, 2011, the Council approved a total of \$49.6 million in member items to some 4,335 organizations, including senior centers, tenant associations, arts groups, after-school programs and myriad other qualified charities, based on an analysis of City Council “Schedule C” budget documents by the Office of the Manhattan Borough President.

Of that sum, \$16.6 million was distributed through the Speaker’s Office directly to organizations and to city-wide projects, while the remaining \$33 million was divided among the Council’s 51 members for distribution. Each Council District received a baseline sum of \$260,464 to spend on youth and senior services as part of that \$33 million. Anything above that sum was awarded at the discretion of the Speaker’s Office.

The City’s five Borough Presidents also receive some discretionary allocations, virtually all of which must be spent on programs supported by the Department for the Aging. The funds are distributed to the boroughs through a set formula that is based on population, land mass and poverty.

For many of the city’s smaller, locally-based non-profit groups, these grants provide a vital means of support. New York City’s vibrant non-profit community provides services to hundreds of thousands of our City’s neediest residents and adds immeasurably to the City’s quality of life. The non-profit sector is also a critical source of jobs, employing an estimated 500,000 New Yorkers – over 15 percent of the city’s non-government workforce; the annual payroll of New York City’s non-profits tops \$20 billion.<sup>4</sup>

Non-profits also serve as a consistent source of employment for people of color: 79 percent of the non-profit workforce categorize their race/ethnicity as Black, Hispanic, Asian or other. The sector also increased its employment of college educated workers at a substantially quicker pace than other employers.<sup>5</sup>

For these reasons, the Borough President’s recommendations aim to preserve a permanent, baselined sum of money that these groups could still access, albeit through a modified application process outside the City Council and the five Borough Presidents.

<sup>4</sup> The Fiscal Policy Institute, April 2009: [http://www.fiscalpolicy.org/FPI\\_NonprofitSectorNYC.pdf](http://www.fiscalpolicy.org/FPI_NonprofitSectorNYC.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> Ibid

For decades, the City Council distributed these funds through an informal system with little or no oversight or disclosure. That lack of oversight led to some abuses, typically involving Council Members who steered member item funds to charities that employed friends or relatives, or who otherwise used the system to enhance their financial or political standing.<sup>6</sup>

More recently, City Council Speaker Christine Quinn’s office instituted a series of reforms that tightened regulations.<sup>7</sup> Recipients must now be pre-qualified by outside governmental agencies; Council Members must sign no-conflict statements before granting money to a community group; and all grants and grantees must be listed every year in the City’s budget under Schedule C, among other reforms. The Council also now posts individual member items on its website, although not in a form that allows data to be easily sorted.<sup>8</sup>

What has not changed, however, is the City’s basic member item system and the broad disparities it creates. This fiscal year, the City Council is dividing some \$33 million in member items between its 51 members. The Council District at the top of that totem pole received \$1,630,064 – or more than four times the amount of those at the bottom.

Other notable attempts to reform the member item process have included Public Advocate Bill de Blasio’s Open Government NYC database,<sup>9</sup> which discloses the grant applications submitted by elected officials in the early stages of the member item process. However, inclusion in this database is strictly voluntary. In addition to Borough President Stringer, five New York City Council members have so far opted to include themselves in the Open Government NYC database.

Governor Andrew Cuomo’s current budget actually eliminated all funding for new member items, establishing a new standard in state government.<sup>10</sup> This builds on then-Attorney General Cuomo’s earlier efforts to reform the member items process on the state level through the launch of the “Project Sunlight” initiative.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.citizensunion.org/www/cu/site/hosting/news\\_release/04\\_04\\_08.html](http://www.citizensunion.org/www/cu/site/hosting/news_release/04_04_08.html)

<sup>7</sup> [http://council.nyc.gov/html/releases/039\\_050708\\_BudgetBestPractices.shtml](http://council.nyc.gov/html/releases/039_050708_BudgetBestPractices.shtml)

<sup>8</sup> <http://council.nyc.gov/html/budget/FY%202012%20Schedule%20C%20Final%20Merge.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.pubadvocate.nyc.gov/open-govt>

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.governor.ny.gov/press/033111budget>

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.sunlightny.com/snl1/app/index.jsp>

### III. FINDINGS

As a basis for recommending reforms, the Office of the Manhattan Borough President set out to bring a new level of transparency to member items. The result is the most comprehensive picture to date of recent member item allocations. Some findings include:

**Per Constituent Disparities:** As previously stated, the Borough President’s analysis found significant disparities in per constituent member item allocations across New York City’s 51 Council Districts, which have roughly equal populations. In one Council District in Brooklyn, for instance, the member item allocation equaled \$10.30 per constituent, the highest in the Council in FY 12. At the other end of the spectrum, five Council Members received less than a quarter of that sum on a per constituent basis in FY 12.

**Widening Gap:** In recent years, the disparities have grown worse, not better. The gap between the Council District receiving the least amount of member item dollars and the most has grown wider every year in the last four years – from \$904,500 in FY 2009, to \$1.3 million in the current fiscal year.

**Total Spending on Rise in Districts:** As the gap has widened, the total sum spent on member items in individual Council Districts has also increased in each of the last four fiscal years. In fiscal year 2009, Council Districts received an average member item total of \$600,724; in fiscal year 2010, Council Districts received an average member item total of \$623,211; and in fiscal year 2011, Council Districts received an average member item total of \$631,163.

In fiscal year 2012, Council Districts received an average of \$638,479.

**Geographic Fault Lines:** Underscoring disbursement disparities on a per constituent basis, the Borough President’s analysis found numerous geographic “fault lines” between districts that literally border each other. In Brooklyn, for instance, one of the most richly rewarded districts received \$1,235,464 in FY 12. Meanwhile, one neighboring Council District with a much lower median household incomes received only \$471,464.

For a complete listing of member item distributions by district from FY 09 through FY 12, as well as the district’s rank in each year, please refer to Appendix One.

**No Relationship to Need:** Beyond simple district-by-district comparisons, the Borough President’s Office used a basic linear correlation to demonstrate that there is no statistical relationship between a Council District’s need and its member item allocation.<sup>12</sup> This simple statistic underscores that factors other than need determine how many member item dollars the citizens of any given Council District will receive.

Table 1 illustrates the broad disparities that currently exist in how member item dollars are distributed:

<sup>12</sup> Using total member item dollars received per Council District as the dependent variable and a Council District’s median income as the independent variable, the Borough President’s Office found r-squared values of .011 for Fiscal Year 2011, .007 for Fiscal Year 2010 and .003 for Fiscal Year 2009. An r-squared value of one indicates a perfect relationship while an r-squared value of zero indicates no relationship.

**Table 1**  
**FY 12 Member Item Distribution**

District	FY 12 Allocation	FY 12 Rank	\$/Constituent <sup>13</sup>	\$/Constituent Rank
47	\$1,630,064.00	1	\$10.30	1
46	\$1,235,464.00	2	\$7.42	2
27	\$1,117,121.00	3	\$6.88	3
50	\$1,092,131.00	4	\$6.87	4
15	\$998,651.00	5	\$6.04	5
9	\$942,114.00	6	\$5.61	6
37	\$864,464.00	7	\$5.57	7
18	\$857,651.00	8	\$5.14	8
3	\$847,464.00	9	\$4.98	10
5	\$790,964.00	10	\$5.11	9
7	\$735,464.00	11	\$4.56	11
13	\$732,651.00	12	\$4.27	14

<sup>13</sup> Throughout this report, we refer to the Council District as the receiving entity of member items. We acknowledge that in certain limited instances, individual Council Members may allocate discretionary funds to organizations or entities outside of their districts.

**Table 1 (continued)**  
**FY 12 Member Item Distribution**

<b>District</b>	<b>FY 12 Allocation</b>	<b>FY 12 Rank</b>	<b>\$/Constituent</b>	<b>\$/Constituent Rank</b>
36	\$711,964.00	13	\$4.44	12
51	\$698,131.00	14	\$4.27	14
22	\$688,321.00	15	\$4.31	13
17	\$683,651.00	16	\$4.10	18
30	\$664,715.00	17	\$4.21	16
33	\$655,464.00	18	\$4.07	19
49	\$650,631.00	19	\$3.80	22
34	\$637,464.00	20	\$4.14	17
38	\$628,464.00	21	\$3.96	20
8	\$613,714.00	22	\$3.58	27
32	\$603,321.00	23	\$3.63	25
31	\$598,321.00	24	\$3.63	25
28	\$584,821.00	25	\$3.90	21
23	\$580,321.00	26	\$3.71	24
40	\$567,964.00	27	\$3.76	23
24	\$560,321.00	28	\$3.46	31
14	\$557,651.00	29	\$3.56	28
44	\$555,464.00	30	\$3.36	32
48	\$550,964.00	31	\$3.55	29
21	\$539,221.00	32	\$3.30	33
29	\$531,264.00	33	\$3.50	30
26	\$526,421.00	34	\$3.14	35
25	\$502,571.00	35	\$3.06	38
10	\$485,464.00	36	\$3.21	34
35	\$481,964.00	37	\$3.14	35
45	\$471,464.00	38	\$3.12	37
4	\$460,464.00	39	\$2.93	39
39	\$460,464.00	39	\$2.91	40
11	\$452,651.00	41	\$2.71	42
1	\$434,464.00	42	\$2.73	41
2	\$419,664.00	43	\$2.67	44
20	\$418,821.00	44	\$2.66	45
19	\$415,321.00	45	\$2.68	43
43	\$410,464.00	46	\$2.37	48
41	\$406,464.00	47	\$2.64	46
6	\$403,464.00	48	\$2.24	49
42	\$399,464.00	49	\$2.40	47
12	\$362,651.00	50	\$2.05	51
16	\$362,651.00	50	\$2.16	50

## IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Despite recent changes, member items clearly remain a political, carrot-and-stick tool that creates deep inequities in how much funding each Council District receives, regardless of its needs. Perpetuating an unfair status quo that is fully financed by city tax dollars should not be an option.

The Manhattan Borough President therefore recommends:

**1. The current system of member items should be abolished in New York City.** Instead, those funds should be transferred to mayoral agencies for distribution as Community Grants.

As a starting point, the Mayor's Office of Contract Services (MOCS) should convene a working group of diverse elected leaders, good government groups and non-profit representatives to develop a new process for awarding Community Grants. The working group's process and criteria should, at a minimum, provide for:

- a. A baseline allocation in the City budget of Community Grant funding, now set at \$49.6 million, that guarantees a set level of support to non-profit service providers each year.
- b. A formula that assures Community Grants are distributed on an equal basis across all 51 Council Districts, or through an empirical, needs-based formula that targets areas of greatest economic need.
- c. A process that recognizes the importance of small community organizations and ensures the opportunity for their participation, as well as limits on how much any one organization can receive.
- d. Appropriate mechanisms for incorporating input from local elected officials, community leaders and stakeholders. Local elected officials are often best positioned to gauge the value of individual community groups and the needs of their communities, and therefore should play an advisory role on specific allocations within their districts.
- e. An assessment process that focuses on outcomes and measurable services delivered by grant recipients.
- f. An application process that is driven by merit-based performance measures, not by political influence.
- g. Sufficient support and technical resources within MOCS to help applicants navigate the new application process.

Whatever system MOCS develops for distributing member item dollars should apply equally to Borough Presidents.

**2. In the short-term, while new rules are promulgated to end the current system, the City should commit to distribute member items through a set formula.** Council Districts could be awarded the same amount each year through a formula that equalizes allocations. Alternately, a progressive, needs-based formula that takes into account a district's population and its economic blueprint -- much as the Federal government already does with many of its programs -- could be developed.<sup>14</sup>

Numerous good government advocates and some Council Members have long asserted that political factors significantly influence the amount of member item funds that a district will receive. It is important for the integrity of the process to remove politics from the equation as much as possible and create a system that does not allow taxpayer dollars to be used as either a punishment or a reward.

**Equalization Formula:** Granting each Council District the same amount of member item dollars would go a long way toward restoring integrity to the system and removing the perception of political favoritism. That is an approach favored in San Antonio, Texas, and would mark an improvement over the current system. Certainly, if the City Council chose to go in this direction, the status quo would be significantly re-ordered.

Had each Council Member received the same, \$638,479 average sum this fiscal year, 32 Council members toward the bottom of the current list would have received more member item funding; the 19 at the top would have received less.

**Needs-based Formula:** Another approach would be to distribute funds based on a formula that takes into account a district's population and level of economic need. There are many valid ways to weight such a formula. But as a tool for discussion, and to give the debate some empirical framework, the Borough President's office crafted a formula for reform that accounts for variations in a district's population and its median household income.

The result is a disbursement policy that is founded on demographic data, and which for the first time directs the most money toward communities with the greatest needs [for details on formula, see section on Methodology]. In general, the "disbursement gap" narrows dramatically under this new formula. Those at the high and low ends of the spectrum are separated by a couple hundred thousand dollars -- instead of more than a million dollars, as they are now -- while the vast majority moves closer to the midpoint.

Table 2, below, illustrates how a needs-based formula would change member item disbursements using FY 12 as an example.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d05622t.pdf>

<sup>15</sup> See Appendices Two and Three for similar tables for FY 10 and FY 09

**Table 2**  
**Member Item Disbursements – FY 12, with Needs-based Formula**

<b>District</b>	<b>FY 12 Allocation</b>	<b>FY 12 Rank</b>	<b>Formula Amount</b>	<b>Formula Rank</b>
8	\$613,714.00	22	\$754,100.20	1
16	\$362,651.00	50	\$746,207.30	2
17	\$683,651.00	16	\$744,885.89	3
18	\$857,651.00	8	\$744,769.35	4
42	\$399,464.00	49	\$743,860.76	5
15	\$998,651.00	5	\$741,778.90	6
7	\$735,464.00	11	\$733,905.75	7
36	\$711,964.00	13	\$731,968.08	8
47	\$1,630,064.00	1	\$727,889.29	9
14	\$557,651.00	29	\$724,954.15	10
37	\$864,464.00	7	\$721,760.25	11
41	\$406,464.00	47	\$719,745.54	12
34	\$637,464.00	20	\$719,158.91	13
10	\$485,464.00	36	\$714,290.04	14
12	\$362,651.00	50	\$669,252.05	15
43	\$410,464.00	46	\$662,082.07	16
13	\$732,651.00	12	\$658,220.55	17
49	\$650,631.00	19	\$657,985.50	18
9	\$942,114.00	6	\$651,265.87	19
26	\$526,421.00	34	\$650,236.79	20
11	\$452,651.00	41	\$649,758.80	21
32	\$603,321.00	23	\$647,838.90	22
44	\$555,464.00	30	\$646,181.71	23
31	\$598,321.00	24	\$644,554.14	24
25	\$502,571.00	35	\$644,216.38	25
21	\$539,221.00	32	\$642,565.12	26
24	\$560,321.00	28	\$639,112.47	27
33	\$655,464.00	18	\$637,330.84	28
22	\$688,321.00	15	\$634,802.58	29
38	\$628,464.00	21	\$632,728.62	30
39	\$460,464.00	39	\$631,954.34	31
30	\$664,715.00	17	\$631,450.67	32
20	\$418,821.00	44	\$630,676.39	33
48	\$550,964.00	31	\$626,275.64	34
35	\$481,964.00	37	\$623,016.56	35
45	\$471,464.00	38	\$617,802.03	36
40	\$567,964.00	27	\$617,454.40	37
28	\$584,821.00	25	\$615,781.40	38
6	\$403,464.00	48	\$578,814.08	39
3	\$847,464.00	9	\$559,502.54	40

**Table 2 (continued)**  
**Member Item Disbursements – FY 12, with Needs-based Formula**

<b>District</b>	<b>FY 12 Allocation</b>	<b>FY 12 Rank</b>	<b>Formula Amount</b>	<b>Formula Rank</b>
46	\$1,235,464.00	2	\$552,391.82	41
51	\$698,131.00	14	\$546,505.73	42
27	\$1,117,121.00	3	\$544,364.61	43
1	\$434,464.00	42	\$537,597.57	44
50	\$1,092,131.00	4	\$537,356.60	45
2	\$419,664.00	43	\$534,478.73	46
4	\$460,464.00	39	\$533,903.95	47
23	\$580,321.00	26	\$532,213.18	48
19	\$415,321.00	45	\$529,637.52	49
5	\$790,964.00	10	\$529,121.99	50
29	\$531,264.00	33	\$524,351.88	51

**3. All member items should be published in a format that is easily accessible to all online.** Currently, member items are published in .pdf format, which makes summations, comparisons and sorting of member item data extremely time intensive. Disseminating official City data by

sortable spreadsheet is a disclosure method that is currently employed by dozens of City agencies, and the Council should do the same. Providing this information in a more transparent, user-friendly format will allow the public to better judge how their tax dollars are spent.

## V. METHODOLOGY

Since data on member items is only released as an unsortable .pdf file, the Manhattan Borough President's staff manually transcribed each individual member item from the last three fiscal years into spreadsheets in order to sort and analyze member item data.

Like any manual transcription project of this scale, the possibility of human errors cannot be discounted. Thus, to ensure a credible transcription of member item data from the City Council Finance Division's original .pdf files, random samples were drawn from the transcribed spreadsheets and compared to the City Council's original .pdf files to measure the integrity of the collected data.<sup>16</sup>

- For FY 09, 350 lines out of 3,960 total lines of data were randomly selected and vetted against the collected data. The random sample returned an accuracy rate of 96.57 percent.
- For FY 10, 351 lines out of 4,021 total lines of data were randomly selected and vetted against the collected data. The random sample returned an accuracy rate of 99.43 percent.
- For FY 11, 352 lines out of 4,143 total lines of data were randomly selected and vetted against the collected data. The random sample returned an accuracy rate of 97.73 percent.
- For FY 12, 353 lines out of 4,336 total lines of data were randomly selected and vetted against the col-

<sup>16</sup> P = .05, +/- 5%

lected data. The random sample returned an accuracy rate of 99.54 percent.

These results provide well-founded confidence that the transcription of member item data was reliable.

This report introduces a needs-based formula that re-configures member item distributions on the basis of population and median income. The formula uses a sum of all member item allocations, minus the amount distributed by the Speaker's office to city-wide projects, as the baseline total from which district allocations are calculated.

Based on that sum, the prototype formula gives a 50 percent weight to a Council District's population and a fifty percent weight to a Council District's median income. The 50 percent allocation based on population was determined using the proportion of a Council District's population from the total City population. The 50 percent allocation based on median income was derived by first calculating a 1/51st share of the baseline total and then shifting fifteen percent of that share from Council Districts in the top quartile to the Council Districts in the bottom quartile. Council Districts in the second and third quartiles receive an unadulterated 1/51st share.

Finally, all demographic data used in this report, including estimated population, median household income and race was retrieved from [www.gothamgazette.com](http://www.gothamgazette.com). The source of this demographic data is Professor Andrew A. Beveridge, Queens College, City University of New York. The demographic data used in this report represents 2006 levels and may have changed slightly since then.

## VI. APPENDIX

### Appendix 1 Member Item Distribution by Council District (CD)/District Rankings FY 09 – FY 12

CD	FY12 Amount	FY12 Rank	FY11 Amount	FY11 Rank	FY10 Amount	FY10 Rank	FY09 Amount	FY09 Rank
1	\$434,464.00	42	\$364,464.00	49	\$369,464.00	46	\$360,464.00	47
2	\$419,664.00	43	\$414,664.00	45	\$413,164.00	40	\$413,164.00	37
3	\$847,464.00	9	\$843,464.00	10	\$842,964.00	11	\$708,464.00	13
4	\$460,464.00	39	\$453,114.00	40	\$407,964.00	41	\$404,000.00	40
5	\$790,964.00	10	\$612,664.00	20	\$540,414.00	26	\$463,614.00	31
6	\$403,464.00	48	\$367,964.00	48	\$372,964.00	45	\$365,464.00	45
7	\$735,464.00	11	\$710,464.00	12	\$687,264.00	15	\$634,964.00	18
8	\$613,714.00	22	\$592,964.00	21	\$562,964.00	24	\$460,464.00	33
9	\$942,114.00	6	\$1,235,464.00	3	\$1,005,464.00	5	\$885,464.00	7
10	\$485,464.00	36	\$460,464.00	38	\$647,464.00	18	\$647,464.00	17
11	\$452,651.00	41	\$457,651.00	39	\$462,651.00	37	\$473,339.00	30
12	\$362,651.00	50	\$362,651.00	50	\$493,651.00	31	\$623,339.00	19
13	\$732,651.00	12	\$712,651.00	11	\$632,651.00	19	\$671,339.00	15
14	\$557,651.00	29	\$498,151.00	35	\$582,651.00	22	\$528,339.00	25
15	\$998,651.00	5	\$998,901.00	6	\$924,901.00	8	\$875,989.00	8
16	\$362,651.00	50	\$403,151.00	46	\$367,651.00	47	\$403,339.00	41
17	\$683,651.00	16	\$683,526.00	15	\$683,526.00	16	\$648,339.00	16
18	\$857,651.00	8	\$857,651.00	9	\$792,526.00	12	\$678,839.00	14
19	\$415,321.00	45	\$415,321.00	43	\$358,321.00	50	\$340,464.00	49
20	\$418,821.00	44	\$416,321.00	42	\$418,321.00	39	\$400,464.00	42
21	\$539,221.00	32	\$528,321.00	29	\$360,988.00	48	\$340,464.00	49
22	\$688,321.00	15	\$978,321.00	7	\$978,321.00	6	\$1,112,964.00	4
23	\$580,321.00	26	\$534,321.00	28	\$966,051.00	7	\$894,464.00	6
24	\$560,321.00	28	\$543,321.00	26	\$518,321.00	28	\$527,464.00	26
25	\$502,571.00	35	\$528,321.00	29	\$465,821.00	36	\$413,964.00	36
26	\$526,421.00	34	\$528,321.00	29	\$358,321.00	50	\$360,464.00	47
27	\$1,117,121.00	3	\$1,118,121.00	4	\$1,054,321.00	4	\$1,012,464.00	5
28	\$584,821.00	25	\$703,321.00	13	\$703,321.00	14	\$585,464.00	22
29	\$531,264.00	33	\$515,721.00	41	\$478,321.00	33	\$460,464.00	33
30	\$664,715.00	17	\$358,961.00	51	\$508,321.00	30	\$390,464.00	44
31	\$598,321.00	24	\$578,321.00	23	\$559,321.00	25	\$834,964.00	11
32	\$603,321.00	23	\$578,321.00	23	\$360,321.00	49	\$547,464.00	24
33	\$655,464.00	18	\$672,339.00	17	\$620,339.00	20	\$603,464.00	20
34	\$637,464.00	20	\$651,839.00	19	\$612,464.00	21	\$591,589.00	21
35	\$481,964.00	37	\$487,339.00	36	\$477,339.00	34	\$493,964.00	29
36	\$711,964.00	13	\$673,839.00	16	\$581,339.00	23	\$516,464.00	27
37	\$864,464.00	7	\$881,339.00	8	\$733,589.00	13	\$733,464.00	12

**Appendix 1 (continued)**  
**Member Item Distribution by Council District (CD)/District Rankings**  
**FY 09 – FY 12**

CD	FY12 Amount	FY12 Rank	FY11 Amount	FY11 Rank	FY10 Amount	FY10 Rank	FY09 Amount	FY09 Rank
38	\$628,464.00	21	\$539,839.00	27	\$517,339.00	29	\$503,964.00	28
39	\$460,464.00	39	\$427,339.00	41	\$888,839.00	10	\$867,714.00	9
40	\$567,964.00	27	\$582,339.00	22	\$407,339.00	43	\$363,964.00	45
41	\$406,464.00	47	\$502,339.00	33	\$432,839.00	38	\$340,464.00	49
42	\$399,464.00	49	\$414,703.00	44	\$407,703.00	42	\$390,828.00	43
43	\$410,464.00	46	\$378,339.00	47	\$402,339.00	44	\$410,464.00	39
44	\$555,464.00	30	\$498,339.00	34	\$471,839.00	35	\$432,464.00	35
45	\$471,464.00	38	\$477,339.00	37	\$490,839.00	32	\$412,964.00	38
46	\$1,235,464.00	2	\$1,244,339.00	2	\$1,327,340.00	1	\$1,244,964.00	1
47	\$1,630,064.00	1	\$1,372,839.00	1	\$1,212,839.00	2	\$1,140,464.00	3
48	\$550,964.00	31	\$567,339.00	25	\$539,339.00	27	\$585,464.00	22
49	\$650,631.00	19	\$672,130.00	23	\$897,131.00	9	\$1,210,464.00	2
50	\$1,092,131.00	4	\$1,087,931.00	5	\$1,207,131.00	3	\$863,964.00	10
51	\$698,131.00	14	\$702,131.00	14	\$677,130.00	17	\$461,464.00	32

**Appendix 2**  
**FY 11 Member Item Distribution**

<b>Council District</b>	<b>FY 11 Allocation</b>	<b>FY 11 Rank</b>	<b>\$/Constituent</b>	<b>\$/Constituent Rank</b>
47	\$1,372,839	1	8.67	1
46	\$1,244,339	2	7.47	2
09	\$1,235,464	3	7.35	3
27	\$1,118,121	4	6.88	4
50	\$1,087,931	5	6.85	5
15	\$998,901	6	6.04	7
22	\$978,321	7	6.13	6
37	\$881,339	8	5.68	8
18	\$857,651	9	5.14	9
03	\$843,464	10	4.96	10
13	\$712,651	11	4.15	17
07	\$710,464	12	4.4	12
28	\$703,321	13	4.69	11
51	\$702,131	14	4.29	13
17	\$683,526	15	4.09	18
36	\$673,839	16	4.2	15
33	\$672,339	17	4.18	16
49	\$672,130	18	3.92	20
34	\$651,839	19	4.24	14
05	\$612,664	20	3.96	19
08	\$592,964	21	3.46	25
40	\$582,339	22	3.86	21
32	\$578,321	23	3.48	24
31	\$578,321	23	3.51	23
48	\$567,339	25	3.65	22
24	\$543,321	26	3.36	29
38	\$539,839	27	3.4	27
23	\$534,321	28	3.42	26
26	\$528,321	29	3.15	36
25	\$528,321	29	3.21	32
21	\$528,321	29	3.23	31
29	\$515,721	32	3.39	28
41	\$502,339	33	3.26	30
44	\$498,339	34	3.01	38
14	\$498,151	35	3.18	33
35	\$487,339	36	3.17	34
45	\$477,339	37	3.16	35
10	\$460,464	38	3.04	37
11	\$457,651	39	2.74	40

**Appendix 2 (continued)**  
**FY 11 Member Item Distribution**

<b>Council District</b>	<b>FY 11 Allocation</b>	<b>FY 11 Rank</b>	<b>\$/Constituent</b>	<b>\$/Constituent Rank</b>
04	\$453,114	40	2.88	39
39	\$427,339	41	2.7	41
20	\$416,321	42	2.64	43
19	\$415,321	43	2.68	42
42	\$414,703	44	2.49	45
02	\$414,664	45	2.63	44
16	\$403,151	46	2.41	46
43	\$378,339	47	2.18	49
06	\$367,964	48	2.05	50
01	\$364,464	49	2.29	47
12	\$362,651	50	2.05	50
30	\$358,961	51	2.27	48

**Appendix 3**  
**FY 2010 Member Item Distribution**

<b>Council District</b>	<b>FY 10 Allocation</b>	<b>FY 10 Rank</b>	<b>\$/Constituent</b>	<b>\$/Constituent Rank</b>
46	\$1,327,340	1	7.97	1
47	\$1,212,839	2	7.66	2
50	\$1,207,131	3	7.6	3
27	\$1,054,321	4	6.49	4
09	\$1,005,464	5	5.98	7
22	\$978,321	6	6.13	6
23	\$966,051	7	6.18	5
15	\$924,901	8	5.59	9
49	\$897,131	9	5.23	10
39	\$888,839	10	5.62	8
03	\$842,964	11	4.96	11
18	\$792,526	12	4.75	12
37	\$733,589	13	4.73	13
28	\$703,321	14	4.69	14
07	\$687,264	15	4.26	16
17	\$683,526	16	4.09	18
51	\$677,130	17	4.14	17
10	\$647,464	18	4.28	15
13	\$632,651	19	3.69	22
33	\$620,339	20	3.85	20
34	\$612,464	21	3.98	19
14	\$582,651	22	3.72	21
36	\$581,339	23	3.62	23
08	\$562,964	24	3.28	27
31	\$559,321	25	3.4	26
05	\$540,414	26	3.49	24
48	\$539,339	27	3.47	25
24	\$518,321	28	3.2	31
38	\$517,339	29	3.26	28
30	\$508,321	30	3.22	30
12	\$493,651	31	2.79	37
45	\$490,839	32	3.25	29
29	\$478,321	33	3.14	32
35	\$477,339	34	3.11	33
44	\$471,839	35	2.85	34
25	\$465,821	36	2.83	35
11	\$462,651	37	2.77	38
41	\$432,839	38	2.81	36
20	\$418,321	39	2.65	40
02	\$413,164	40	2.62	41

**Appendix 3 (continued)**  
**FY 2010 Member Item Distribution**

<b>Council District</b>	<b>FY 10 Allocation</b>	<b>FY 10 Rank</b>	<b>\$/Constituent</b>	<b>\$/Constituent Rank</b>
04	\$407,964	41	2.6	42
42	\$407,703	42	2.45	43
40	\$407,339	43	2.7	39
43	\$402,339	44	2.32	44
06	\$372,964	45	2.07	51
01	\$369,464	46	2.32	44
16	\$367,651	47	2.19	48
21	\$360,988	48	2.21	47
32	\$360,321	49	2.17	49
26	\$358,321	50	2.14	50
19	\$358,321	50	2.31	46

**Appendix 4**  
**FY 2009 Member Item Distribution**

<b>Council District</b>	<b>FY 09 Allocation</b>	<b>FY 09 Rank</b>	<b>\$/Constituent</b>	<b>\$/Constituent Rank</b>
46	\$ 1,244,964.00	1	7.48	1
49	\$ 1,210,464.00	2	7.06	3
47	\$ 1,140,464.00	3	7.2	2
22	\$ 1,112,964.00	4	6.97	4
27	\$ 1,012,464.00	5	6.23	5
23	\$ 894,464.00	6	5.72	6
9	\$ 885,464.00	7	5.27	10
15	\$ 875,989.00	8	5.3	9
39	\$ 867,714.00	9	5.48	7
50	\$ 863,964.00	10	5.44	8
31	\$ 834,964.00	11	5.25	11
37	\$ 733,464.00	12	4.73	12
3	\$ 708,464.00	13	4.17	14
18	\$ 678,839.00	14	4.07	15
13	\$ 671,339.00	15	3.91	17
17	\$ 648,339.00	16	3.88	19
10	\$ 647,464.00	17	4.28	13
7	\$ 634,964.00	18	3.94	16
12	\$ 623,339.00	19	3.52	23
33	\$ 603,464.00	20	3.75	22
34	\$ 591,589.00	21	3.84	20
48	\$ 585,464.00	22	3.77	21
28	\$ 585,464.00	22	3.9	18
32	\$ 547,464.00	24	3.29	25
14	\$ 528,339.00	25	3.37	24
24	\$ 527,464.00	26	3.26	26
36	\$ 516,464.00	27	3.22	27
38	\$ 503,964.00	28	3.18	29
35	\$ 493,964.00	29	3.21	28
11	\$ 473,339.00	30	2.83	32
5	\$ 463,614.00	31	3	31
51	\$ 461,464.00	32	2.82	33
8	\$ 460,464.00	33	2.68	35
29	\$ 460,464.00	33	3.02	30
44	\$ 432,464.00	35	2.61	37
25	\$ 413,964.00	36	2.52	40
2	\$ 413,164.00	37	2.62	36
45	\$ 412,964.00	38	2.73	34
43	\$ 410,464.00	39	2.37	44
4	\$ 404,000.00	40	2.57	38

**Appendix 4 (continued)**  
**FY 2009 Member Item Distribution**

<b>Council District</b>	<b>FY 09 Allocation</b>	<b>FY 09 Rank</b>	<b>\$/Constituent</b>	<b>\$/Constituent Rank</b>
16	\$ 403,339.00	41	2.41	42
20	\$ 400,464.00	42	2.54	39
42	\$ 390,828.00	43	2.35	45
30	\$ 390,464.00	44	2.47	41
6	\$ 365,464.00	45	2.03	51
40	\$ 363,964.00	46	2.41	42
26	\$ 360,464.00	47	2.15	49
1	\$ 360,464.00	47	2.27	46
41	\$ 340,464.00	49	2.21	47
21	\$ 340,464.00	49	2.08	50
19	\$ 340,464.00	49	2.2	48



**SCOTT M. STRINGER**

**MANHATTAN BOROUGH PRESIDENT**

Municipal Building One Centre Street, 19th Floor New York, NY 10007

Tel: 212.669.8300 Fax: 212.669.4306

Northern Manhattan Office 163 West 125th Street, 5th Floor New York, NY 10027

Tel: 212.531.1609 Fax: 212.531.4615

[www.mbpo.org](http://www.mbpo.org)