



Issue Date April 17, 2007
------------------------------

Audit Report Number 2007-NY-1005
-------------------------------------

TO: Nelson R. Bregon, General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, D

FROM: *Edgar Moore*  
Edgar Moore, Regional Inspector General for Audit, 2AGA

SUBJECT: Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, New York, New York,  
Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery Assistance Funds

## **HIGHLIGHTS**

### **What We Audited and Why**

Pursuant to a congressional mandate, we performed the eighth of our ongoing audits of the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation's (the auditee) administration of the \$2.783 billion in Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery Assistance funds provided to the State of New York in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City. The auditee disbursed approximately \$76.7 million of these funds during our audit period, April 1, 2006 through September 30, 2006.

Our audit objectives were to determine whether the auditee (1) disbursed Block Grant Disaster Recovery Assistance funds in accordance with the guidelines established under U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) - approved partial action plans, (2) expended Block Grant Disaster Recovery Assistance funds for eligible planning and administrative expenses in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, and (3) had a financial management system in place that adequately safeguards funds.

### **What We Found**

The auditee generally disbursed the \$76.7 million in Disaster Recovery Assistance funds in accordance with HUD-approved action plans, expended Disaster Recovery

Assistance funds for eligible planning and administrative expenses in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, and maintained a financial management system that adequately safeguarded the funds. However, the auditee can take actions to better monitor Small Firm Attraction and Retention Grant program recipients' compliance with program requirements throughout the term of the grant, and provide greater assurance that funds disbursed in the Cultural Enhancement Fund program further program objectives.

### **What We Recommend**

We recommend that HUD's general deputy assistant secretary for community planning and development (1) ensure the recovery of the \$6,000 erroneous Small Firm Attraction and Retention Grant program payment, (2) require the auditee to strengthen controls in the Small Firm Attraction and Retention Grant program to more effectively identify any grant recipients who do not remain at eligible business premises as stipulated by the grant, and (3) monitor and evaluate the establishment of outcome-based performance measures for the Cultural Enhancement Fund program to ensure that funded activity will have a positive impact upon the long-term revitalization of lower Manhattan.

For each recommendation without a management decision, please respond and provide status reports in accordance with HUD Handbook 2000.06, REV-3. Please furnish us copies of any correspondence or directives issued because of the audit.

### **Auditee's Response**

We discussed the contents of the report with the auditee during the audit and at an exit conference on April 3, 2007, and the auditee provided written comments on April 11, 2007. Auditee officials generally agreed with our findings, and advised that they are taking or plan corrective action to address the recommendations.

The complete text of the auditee's response can be found in appendix B of this report.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Background and Objectives	4
Results of Audit	
Finding 1: Grant Funds Were Generally Administered in Accordance With HUD Regulations	6
Scope and Methodology	10
Internal Controls	11
Appendixes	
A. Schedule of Questioned Costs and Funds to Be Put to Better Use	12
B. Auditee Comments and OIG's Evaluation	13
C. Schedule of Program Funding and Disbursements as of September 30, 2006	16

## BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

---

Following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in lower Manhattan, Congress authorized \$3.483 billion in Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery Assistance funds to assist with the recovery and revitalization of lower Manhattan. On November 26, 2001, Congress designated \$700 million in Block Grant funding for New York City out of the Emergency Response Fund that Congress had appropriated.<sup>1</sup> On January 10, 2002, Congress appropriated an additional \$2 billion for Block Grant funding, earmarking at least \$500 million to compensate small businesses, nonprofit organizations, and individuals for their economic losses.<sup>2</sup> On August 2, 2002, Congress appropriated an additional \$783 million in Block Grant funding.<sup>3</sup>

The Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (auditee), created in December 2001 as a subsidiary of the Empire State Development Corporation to function as a joint city-state development corporation, was designated by the State of New York to administer the \$2.783 billion appropriated in the January and August 2002 Emergency Supplemental Acts. The Empire State Development Corporation administers the remaining \$700 million. A 16-member board of directors, appointed equally by the governor of New York and the mayor of New York City, oversees the auditee's affairs. The Empire State Development Corporation performs all accounting functions for the auditee, including payroll, payments to the auditee's vendors, and drawing down funds from HUD.

Planned expenditures of Disaster Recovery Assistance funds are documented in action plans that receive public comment and are approved by HUD. HUD approved 14 partial action plans as of September 30, 2006 that provided for the allocation of approximately \$2.71 billion, or 98 percent of the \$2.783 billion appropriated, to various programs and activities (see appendix C for amounts by program). As of September 30, 2006, the auditee had disbursed over \$1.148 billion, or 42 percent of the \$2.71 billion allocated.

For the period April 1, 2006 through September 30, 2006, we reviewed the auditee's planning and administrative expenses, monitoring procedures, and disbursements made in the following programs:

**Utility Restoration and Infrastructure Rebuilding:** As of September 30, 2006, HUD approved \$750 million for this program to provide financial assistance directly to energy and telecommunications service providers for the reimbursement of qualified emergency and temporary restoration costs, as

---

<sup>1</sup> 2001 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States, Pub. L. 107-38, 115 Stat. 220 and Pub. L. 107-73 Section 434 (2001).

<sup>2</sup> The Department of Defense and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States Act 2002 (Emergency Supplemental Act 2002), Pub. L. 107-117, 115 Stat. 2336 (2002).

<sup>3</sup> The 2002 Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States, Pub. L. 107-206.

well as, for costs associated with the permanent restoration of the utility infrastructure damaged in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. Additionally, the program seeks to prevent costs borne by the utility service providers from being passed on to the customers.

World Trade Center (WTC) Memorial and Cultural: As of September 30, 2006, HUD approved approximately \$594 million for this program to fund the planning, selection, coordination and construction of a memorial, and memorial center. In addition, funds were earmarked for planning and possible construction of memorial-related improvements, and museum and cultural uses on the World Trade Center site and adjacent areas, complementing the commercial redevelopment and infrastructure improvements by the Port Authority, the owner of the World Trade Center Site.

Business Recovery Grant: As of September 30, 2006, HUD approved \$224.5 million for this program to provide economic loss compensation for small businesses and not-for-profits, based on a percentage of gross revenue and the business's location within the eligible area. Of the approved amount, \$10 million was allocated for repayment to the City and State for the Retail Recovery Grant and the Lower Manhattan Non-Retail Recovery programs. These programs provided economic loss compensation to small business in lower Manhattan during the fall of 2001 while federal funding was being secured.

Small Firm Attraction and Retention Grant: As of September 30, 2006, HUD approved \$50 million for this program to help retain and create jobs at assisted firms.

Our audit objectives were to determine whether the auditee (1) disbursed Block Grant Disaster Recovery Assistance funds in accordance with the guidelines established under HUD-approved partial action plans, (2) expended Block Grant Disaster Recovery Assistance funds for eligible planning and administrative expenses in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, and (3) had a financial management system in place that adequately safeguards funds.

## RESULTS OF AUDIT

---

### Finding 1: Grant Funds Were Generally Administered in Accordance With HUD Regulations

The auditee generally disbursed the \$76.7 million in Disaster Recovery Assistance funds in accordance with HUD-approved action plans, expended Disaster Recovery Assistance funds for eligible planning and administrative expenses in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, and maintained a financial management system that adequately safeguarded the funds. However, opportunities exist to strengthen internal controls over the disbursement of funds. For example, an incorrect calculation resulted in an erroneous \$6,000 overpayment to a grant recipient in the Small Firm Attraction and Retention Grant program, and additional monitoring procedures would ensure that grant recipients comply with the grant provisions throughout the term of the grant. In addition, the development of outcome-based performance measures for the Cultural Enhancement Fund program needs to be monitored and evaluated to ensure that the disbursement of these funds most effectively achieves program objectives. These improvements will help to ensure adherence to OMB Circular A-87, which states that governmental units are responsible for the efficient and effective administration of Federal awards through the application of sound management practices.

---

#### Error in Calculating the Grant

On January 31, 2005, the auditee entered into a subrecipient agreement with its parent company to provide funds for the Small Firm Attraction & Retention Grant program. Grants are disbursed in two parts – the first part is made upon the initial approval of the grant and the second part is made 18 months subsequent to the first payment, with the amount of the grants based upon the location and the number of employees in the firm. During our audit period, the subrecipient disbursed almost \$8.1 million to 226 grant recipients. We reviewed 27 of these grant recipients and found that incorrect disbursements were made in two cases. The first error was corrected after the grant recipient notified the subrecipient of an underpayment. A second error occurred because the 18th month installment payment had been calculated using the wrong location. A similar error occurred for the initial grant amount, resulting in an incorrect payment. As a result, the grant recipient was overpaid \$6,000. When we notified the subrecipient of the errors, it sent a letter to the grant recipient requesting repayment of the \$6,000. The recipient responded that it plans to repay the erroneous payment.

#### Procedures to Monitor Recipient Compliance Can Be Strengthened

OMB Circular A-87 states that governmental units are responsible for the efficient and effective administration of Federal awards through the application of sound management practices. As such, procedures to ensure that Small Firm Attraction

and Retention Grant program recipients complied with grant provisions should be strengthened. In addition to meeting initial eligibility requirements, grant recipients are required to remain at their business location for five years. Grants were awarded to eligible businesses in two installments: upon approval of a grant application and 18 months subsequent to the first installment. While the subrecipient generally had strong controls over the initial approval of grant recipients and for second installment payments, it had not established written procedures to periodically ensure that grant recipients complied with the five-year retention requirement.

In response to this observation, in January 2007, the subrecipient amended its program monitoring procedures to include mailing compliance letters no more than six months before the end of the five-year period to verify that the business had remained at the eligible premises. While this amended procedure, which has not been implemented, partly responds to our concern, these procedures can be strengthened. As amended, the procedures allow almost three years to pass between the time of the final payment (18 months after the initial payment) and the planned issuance of the compliance letters. This lapse in time can prevent identification of noncompliant recipients and initiation of corrective action in a timely manner.

### **Outcome-Based Measures Are Needed to Assess the Cultural Enhancement Fund Program**

The auditee identified supporting cultural life as an important lower Manhattan redevelopment objective. Consequently, \$28 million<sup>4</sup> has been allocated to the Cultural Enhancement Fund program, which was approved on the basis that it would serve as a catalyst for increased residential, commercial, retail, and other neighborhood activities, which would in turn, spur the long-term economic development of lower Manhattan.

The intended effect of these grants is consistent with one of the uses of Community Development Block Grant funds: economic redevelopment, however, the scope of the effort requires that adequate performance measures be established to track and evaluate the outcome of the funded activities. The auditee incorporated agreement specific performance measures in the 26 subrecipient agreements it has executed under this program as of February 2007; however, these measures primarily will evaluate monthly progress of each project against its planned timeframes. As such, these measures do not provide a comprehensive framework to evaluate the overall program's long-term effect upon the economic revitalization of lower Manhattan, which is a key objective of the Disaster Recovery Assistance funds and the program.

---

<sup>4</sup> Partial action plan 11, approved March 27, 2006, allocated \$35 million; however, this was subsequently amended to \$28 million.

In its August 2006 periodic monitoring report of the auditee, HUD noted that the use of arts-related activities on a scale as large as envisioned in the Cultural Enhancement Fund program as a tool for comprehensive revitalization has little Community Development Block Grant precedent. In response, the auditee noted that it planned to identify and develop performance and outcome measures to evaluate the effects of this project on the long-term revitalization of lower Manhattan. Accordingly, in September 2006, the auditee approved an amendment to one of its economic impact service contracts to include the evaluation of the Cultural Enhancement Fund program. The amendment, through a work order, provided that the consultant would identify quantitative performance indicators, develop a standard method for calculating indicators, create forms for collecting data from grant recipients, set up a database to track information, and calculate and report on program activities, economic impacts and performance measures. These services were to be provided no later than December 2007 at a cost not to exceed \$30,000. However, the development of these measures should be monitored and evaluated by HUD to ensure that they will provide an effective means with which to evaluate this program's effect upon the long-term revitalization of lower Manhattan before all allocated funds are disbursed.

## Conclusion

The auditee generally administered grant funds in accordance with HUD regulations, but there are opportunities to improve controls. Six thousand dollars erroneously disbursed to a grant recipient in the Small Firm Attraction and Retention Grant program should be recovered. This was caused by an incorrect calculation of the amount to which the grant recipient was entitled. In addition, the auditee can strengthen its ability to detect potential grant recipient noncompliance and affect recovery of funds by periodically confirming grant recipients' locations throughout the term of the grant. Further, given the extent of activities to which funds are allocated under the Cultural Enhancement Fund program, development and implementation of outcome-based performance measures is necessary to ensure that funds expended will achieve the intended results.

## Recommendations

We recommend that HUD's general deputy assistant secretary for community planning and development require the auditee to:

- 1A. Ensure recovery of the \$6,000 overpayment made to a grant recipient under the Small Firm Attraction and Retention Grant program.
- 1B. Strengthen controls over the calculation and disbursement of Small Firm Attraction and Retention grants to prevent overpayments.
- 1C. Strengthen controls to identify Small Firm Attraction and Retention grant recipients who do not remain at eligible business premises for five years as



stipulated in the grant agreement by requesting periodic confirmations from all grant recipients.

- 1D. Finalize development and implementation of outcome-based performance measures against which to evaluate how the Cultural Enhancement Fund program achieves the objectives of the Disaster Recovery Assistance Funds. Progress against such measures should be incorporated in periodic reporting to HUD so that HUD can evaluate the extent to which these funds are being effectively spent.

In addition, we recommend that HUD's general deputy assistant secretary for community planning and development:

- 1E. Evaluate the outcome based performance measures and tracking systems developed by the auditee to ensure that they are effective in measuring the achievements of the Cultural Enhancement Fund Program in contributing to the long-term revitalization of lower Manhattan.

## SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

---

During the audit period, April 1, 2006, through September 30, 2006, the auditee disbursed \$76.7 million of the \$2.783 billion in Disaster Recovery Assistance funds for activities related to the rebuilding and revitalization of lower Manhattan. We tested \$31 million, representing approximately 40 percent of the amount disbursed for the period.

To achieve our audit objectives, we reviewed applicable laws, regulations, and program requirements; HUD-approved partial action plans; and the auditee's accounting books and records. We examined and tested the documentation supporting disbursements related to the following:

<u>Program</u>	<u>Amount disbursed April 1 through Sept. 30, 2006</u>	<u>Amount tested</u>
Utility Restoration and Infrastructure Rebuilding	\$ 1.24 million	\$ 1.24 million
World Trade Center Memorial and Cultural	\$46.18 million	\$22.88 million
Business Recovery Grant	\$ 5.06 million	\$ 5.06 million
Small Firm Attraction and Retention Grant	\$ 8.09 million	\$ 1.74 million

We also reviewed \$145,491 in the auditee's planning and administrative expenses, along with their policies and procedures for monitoring the above programs.

The audit covered the period from April 1, 2006, through September 30, 2006, and was expanded when necessary. For example, we reviewed the Cultural Enhancement Fund program, for which HUD approved \$35 million<sup>5</sup> as of September 30, 2006. The purpose of this program is to provide cultural facilities or programming in lower Manhattan to spur long-term revitalization. While funds were not disbursed for this program during our audit period, we are concerned that the auditee has not identified and developed performance measures to evaluate the effects of these projects on the long-term revitalization of the downtown area.

We performed our on-site work at the auditee's office in lower Manhattan and at the auditee's parent company, the Empire State Development Corporation, in midtown Manhattan, New York from October 2006 through March 2007.

We performed our review in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

---

<sup>5</sup> The auditee later amended the action plan reducing the allocation by \$7 million to \$28 million, of which \$27.4 million has been obligated.

# INTERNAL CONTROLS

---

Internal control is an integral component of an organization's management that provides reasonable assurance that the following objectives are being achieved:

- Effectiveness and efficiency of operations,
- Reliability of financial reporting, and
- Compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

Internal controls relate to management's plans, methods, and procedures used to meet its mission, goals, and objectives. Internal controls include the processes and procedures for planning, organizing, directing, and controlling program operations. They include the systems for measuring, reporting, and monitoring program performance.

---

## Relevant Internal Controls

We determined the following internal controls were relevant to our audit objectives:

- Program operations - Policies and procedures that management has implemented to reasonably ensure that a program meets its objectives.
- Compliance with laws and regulations - Policies and procedures that management has implemented to reasonably ensure that resource use is consistent with laws and regulations.
- Safeguarding resources - Policies and procedures that management has implemented to reasonably ensure that resources are safeguarded against waste, loss, and misuse.
- Validity and reliability of data - Policies and procedures that management has implemented to reasonably ensure that valid and reliable data are obtained, maintained, and fairly disclosed in reports.

We assessed the relevant controls identified above.

A significant weakness exists if management controls do not provide reasonable assurance that the process for planning, organizing, directing, and controlling program operations will meet the organization's objectives.

## Significant Weaknesses

Based on our review, we believe there are no significant weaknesses.

## APPENDIXES

---

### Appendix A

#### SCHEDULE OF QUESTIONED COSTS

---

Recommendation number	Ineligible 1/
1A	\$6,000
Total	<u>\$6,000</u>

1/ Ineligible costs are costs charged to a HUD-financed or HUD-insured program or activity that the auditor believes are not allowable by law; contract; or federal, state, or local policies or regulations.

## Appendix B

# AUDITEE COMMENTS AND OIG'S EVALUATION

---

### Ref to OIG Evaluation

### Auditee Comments



**LMDC**  
Remember Rebuild Renew

Lower Manhattan Development Corp.  
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor New York, NY 10006  
Tel: 212.962.2300 Fax: 212.962.2431 TTY: 212.962.0045  
www.renewnyc.com

April 10, 2007

Edgar Moore  
Regional Inspector General for Audit  
U.S. Department of Housing and  
Urban Development  
26 Federal Plaza, Room 3430  
New York, NY 10278

Dear Mr. Moore,

The Lower Manhattan Development Corporation ('LMDC') has reviewed the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Inspector General Draft Audit Report that was provided to us on April 10, 2007. The LMDC understands the importance of your review of activities associated with the use of CDBG funds and your recommendations. The attached document presents LMDC management's responses to the draft Audit Report.

Sincerely,

Daniel A. Ciniello  
Senior Vice President - Operations

Attachment

# Appendix B

## AUDITEE COMMENTS AND OIG'S EVALUATION

### Ref to OIG Evaluation

### Auditee Comments

#### LMDC Response to HUD OIG Draft Report

LMDC has reviewed the draft audit report from the HUD Office of the Inspector General (OIG) covering the period from April through September 2006. As you know, the LMDC has and will continue to work diligently to insure Disaster Assistance funds are safeguarded and disbursed for eligible HUD-approved expenses. This report reflects that effort in that no significant weaknesses were identified. Our responses to your recommendations are provided below.

*HUD IG Recommendation 1A: Ensure recovery of the \$6,000 overpayment made to a grant recipient under the Small Firm Attraction and Retention Grant program.*

LMDC's Subrecipient began collection procedures as soon as the overpayment was detected. We have been notified by the grant recipient's legal counsel that the \$6,000 overpayment will be returned by April 30, 2007. LMDC and its Subrecipient will monitor this recovery process.

*HUD IG Recommendation 1B: Strengthen controls over the calculation and disbursement of Small Firm Attraction and Retention grants to prevent overpayments.*

We and our Subrecipient believe this is an isolated incident and the current procedures for ensuring that SFARG grants are accurately disbursed to eligible businesses are sufficient. However, our Subrecipient has discussed this matter with processing personnel to reinforce understanding of the procedures currently in place.

*HUD IG Recommendation 1C: Strengthen controls to identify Small Firm Attraction and Retention grant recipients, who do not remain at eligible business premises for five years as stipulated in the grant agreement by requesting periodic confirmations from all grant recipients.*

Our Subrecipient believes that its existing policy of sending confirmations to SFARG recipients six months prior to the end of the five-year grant period struck a prudent balance involving the timing and the cost and effort involved in performing this single confirmation follow up for each grant. However, while increasing the frequency of follow up as recommended will result in greater administrative costs, our Subrecipient will amend its SFARG confirmation approach. Initial confirmations will be sent to SFARG recipients three years after the initial disbursement, with a second confirmation four years after initial disbursement, requiring the recipient to confirm that they still remain at the business location. Supporting documentation, such as a current period's utility bill, to accompany a recipient's confirmation reply may also be sought. As currently is the case, recapture efforts will occur when noncompliance is noted.

*HUD IG Recommendation 1D: Finalize development and implementation of outcome-based performance measures against which to evaluate how the Cultural Enhancement Fund program achieves the objectives of the Disaster Recovery Assistance Funds. Progress against such measures should be incorporated in periodic reporting to HUD so that HUD can evaluate the extent to which these funds are being effectively spent.*

LMDC includes performance based measures in each of our subrecipient agreements. We will continue to develop and implement a framework to measure the achievements of the Cultural Enhancement Fund program.

Comment 1

Comment 1

Comment 2

Comment 1

### **OIG Evaluation of Auditee Comments**

- Comment 1 The auditee has agreed to take recommended action.
- Comment 2 While the auditee believes that its current procedures are adequate, the auditee has agreed to take the recommended action. The amended procedures will more readily identify recipients that may not comply with the retention requirement. This action will strengthen the auditee's detection controls for noncompliant recipients, and therefore, enhance recovery of grant funds from any of these recipients.

## Appendix C

### SCHEDULE OF PROGRAM FUNDING AND DISBURSEMENTS AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2006

<b>Program</b>	<b>Budget as of Sept. 30, 2006</b>	<b>Audit period disbursements April 1 - Sept. 30, 2006</b>	<b>Cumulative disbursed as of Sept. 30, 2006</b>	<b>Balance remaining as of Sept. 30, 2006</b>
Business Recovery Grant	\$224,500,000	\$5,067,395	\$218,940,531	\$5,559,469
Job Creation and Retention	150,000,000	11,992,204	74,558,219	75,441,781
Small Firm Attraction	50,000,000	8,094,500	15,753,500	34,246,500
Residential Grant (Housing Assistance)	280,500,000		235,853,904	44,646,096
Employment Training Assistance	500,000		345,909	154,091
Memorial Design & Installation	350,000		299,969	50,031
Columbus Park Renovation	998,571			998,571
Marketing History/Heritage Museums	4,664,000	470,156	3,118,146	1,545,854
Downtown Alliance Streetscape	4,000,000		4,000,000	
New York Stock Exchange Area Improvements	25,160,000	508	5,468,975	19,691,025
Neighborhood Parks and Open Space	46,981,689		9,720,492	37,261,197
Hudson River Park Improvements	72,600,000	189,391	2,669,050	69,930,950
Millennium High School	3,007,500			3,007,500
West Street Pedestrian Connection	22,955,811		12,842,870	10,112,941
Lower Manhattan Communications Outreach	1,000,000		887,777	112,223
Pace Green Roof Project	100,000			100,000
Chinatown Tourism and Marketing	1,160,000		919,925	240,075
Lower Manhattan Information	2,570,000		1,752,391	817,609
World Trade Center Memorial and Cultural	594,017,180	46,181,133	263,456,355	330,560,825
Lower Manhattan Tourism	4,176,000	165,000	3,951,650	224,350
East River Waterfront Project	150,000,000	127,652	157,731	149,842,269
Local Transportation & Ferry Service	9,000,000			9,000,000
East Side K-8 School	20,000,000	14,172	14,172	19,985,828
Fitterman Hall Reconstruction	15,000,000			15,000,000
Chinatown Local Development Corporation	7,000,000			7,000,000
Affordable Housing	50,000,000	7,153	7,153	49,992,847
Public Service Activities	7,296,900	272,278	4,729,207	2,567,693
Administration & Planning	115,000,000	2,877,938	64,256,172	50,743,828
Disproportionate Loss of Workforce	33,000,000		32,999,997	3
Utilities Restoration and Infrastructure	735,000,000	1,242,245	191,555,423	543,444,577
Cultural Enhancement Fund	35,000,000			35,000,000
The Drawing Center	10,000,000			10,000,000
Fulton Corridor Revitalization	38,000,000			38,000,000
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$2,713,537,651</b>	<b>\$76,701,725</b>	<b>\$1,148,259,518</b>	<b>\$1,565,278,133</b>