



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
INDEPENDENT BUDGET OFFICE

110 WILLIAM STREET, 14TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10038
(212) 442-0632 • FAX (212) 442-0350 • EMAIL: ibo@ibo.nyc.ny.us
<http://www.ibo.nyc.ny.us>

Capital Spending by Community Board and Project Type

At the request of the Municipal Arts Society Planning Center, the Independent Budget Office analyzed capital spending by project type at the community board level. [The linked files](#) (in Microsoft Excel 97/2003-compatible format) present the number of individual projects identified and capital commitments by their geographic location.

The city's 59 community boards have three functions under the City Charter: (1) they assess local needs and provide input into the development of the budget; (2) they review land use and zoning applications; (3) they monitor local service delivery by city agencies. Additional information about and maps of community boards can be found at <http://www.nyc.gov/html/cau/html/cb/main.shtml>.

The city's capital budget and plan is organized by *project type*. Generally speaking, the project type refers to the agency that owns and/or uses, maintains and operates the capital asset in question (see the legend included with the spreadsheets). Spending is eligible for inclusion in the capital budget when it is for an asset with a useful life of at least five years *and* costs at least \$35,000. The capital budget is funded by bonds issued by the city, which must be paid back on a schedule that corresponds to the useful life of the asset, as defined in State law.

Overview. The analysis covers fiscal years 2004 through 2007. Capital commitments during those four years totaled \$29.5 billion (all funds; \$25.2 billion in city funds), ranging from slightly under \$5.0 billion in 2004 to \$10.4 billion in 2007. Capital commitments represent, in most cases, contracts registered with the Comptroller; note that commitments are not the same as expenditures, which represent disbursements of funds and typically lag commitments, depending on the project duration and the contract terms. Negative amounts represent cancelled or rescinded contracts or appropriations.

Distribution of Capital Project Lines and Commitments by Geographic Area, 2004-2007

Dollars in millions

Borough	Projects		Capital Commitments	
	Number	Percent	Amount	Percent
Citywide	1,797	14.5%	\$9,898	33.6%
Bronx	1,927	15.5%	\$5,229	17.7%
Brooklyn	2,815	22.7%	\$4,200	14.2%
Manhattan	2,185	17.6%	\$3,599	12.2%
Queens	2,506	20.2%	\$4,879	16.5%
Staten Island	1,042	8.4%	\$1,225	4.2%
Missing	151	1.2%	\$458	1.6%
TOTAL	12,423	100%	\$29,488	100%

SOURCE: IBO.

There were a total of 12,423 unique projects (about 45 percent of projects spanned more than one year). By “project” we mean a project ID in the capital plan, which may represent a discreet project, such as a single building, or a component of a multiphase project, or a continuing program, such as regular vehicle acquisition or facility repairs.

The data used in this analysis was extracted from the city’s Financial Management System (FMS). Each project is coded in FMS to indicate what community board or boards it serves. Some projects are coded as “citywide” and others as “boroughwide”. On average 15 percent of individual projects—representing slightly more than one-third of total spending commitments—were classified as "citywide" each year; another 58 percent were classified as boroughwide. Slightly less than one-quarter (24 percent) of total projects were classified as serving one community board; another 2 percent were classified as serving more than one community board. Finally, 1 percent of individual project lines were not classified (a blank field).

Excluding citywide project lines, the share of individual projects counted as borough-wide ranged from 63 to 74 percent, averaging 69 percent; the share assigned to one community board ranged from 23 percent to 35 percent, averaging 28 percent. Finally, 2.5 percent of project lines were assigned to more than one CB in a borough.¹

Geographic Distribution by Borough				
<i>Excluding Citywide and Missing Project IDs</i>				
Borough	Projects	Borough-wide	One CB	More than one CB
Bronx	1,927	74.1%	23.2%	2.7%
Brooklyn	2,815	73.6%	24.3%	2.1%
Manhattan	2,185	61.8%	35.4%	2.8%
Queens	2,506	69.4%	28.1%	2.6%
Staten Island	1,042	62.9%	34.5%	2.7%
TOTAL	10,475	69.2%	28.3%	2.5%

SOURCE: IBO.

Geographic Distribution by Project Type. Several project types were predominantly classified as citywide. The most significant of these were Department of Transportation waterway bridges (the East and Harlem River bridges), agencywide technology projects (project types DP and PU), agency vehicle and equipment acquisitions, capital funding provided to New York City Transit, and funding for construction of the city’s third water tunnel. These projects provide citywide benefits.

School Construction Authority (SCA) projects are also predominantly classified as boroughwide. The number of individual SCA projects grew from 1,336 in 2004 to 3,950 in 2007. This was a result of both more detailed reporting by the SCA, and by an actual increase in the number of projects, as commitments rose from \$841 million in 2004 to \$3.0 billion in 2007. Other projects that were classified

¹ The distribution is skewed toward the borough-wide level because 97 percent of School Construction Authority projects—which total 47 percent of all project IDs—are classified as boroughwide by the SCA. Excluding School Construction Authority projects, the share of projects classified as boroughwide ranges from 31 percent to 38 percent, averaging 35 percent; the share assigned to one community board ranged from 56 percent to 64 percent, averaging 60 percent; 5.4 percent of project lines were assigned to more than one CB in a borough.

as boroughwide included capital funding for the Staten Island Railroad, upgrades of wastewater treatment plants, and siting of certain facilities of the Administration for Children’s Services (CS), Department of Correction (C), Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (HL), Health and Hospitals Corporation hospitals (HO), and major “flagship” parks.

Project types that most often served one or more individual community boards were libraries, cultural organizations, senior centers, economic development projects, street and highway bridges, sewers, streets, and parks.

Projects and Capital Commitments by Agency

Dollars in millions

Agency	Number of Projects	Commitments, 2004-07	Percent of Spending by:			
			Citywide	Borough	One or More CBs	Missing
DEP	1,430	\$9,663	29.1%	24.6%	46.1%	0.3%
School Construction	5,713	\$7,998	27.6%	72.2%	0.2%	0.0%
Transportation	749	\$2,187	50.6%	4.2%	42.7%	2.5%
DCAS	861	\$2,012	56.6%	8.0%	34.9%	0.6%
Housing	272	\$1,439	71.0%	3.7%	20.2%	5.1%
Parks & Recreation	996	\$1,079	6.7%	23.6%	69.4%	0.4%
Economic Development	185	\$886	12.4%	6.3%	81.2%	0.1%
HHC	91	\$848	9.7%	31.7%	57.4%	1.2%
Sanitation	127	\$557	62.4%	12.7%	24.8%	0.1%
Fire	246	\$501	51.3%	29.7%	19.0%	0.0%
Cultural Affairs	315	\$497	0.0%	0.5%	99.5%	0.0%
DOITT	85	\$395	77.7%	13.1%	0.0%	9.2%
Police	252	\$264	55.7%	19.9%	23.7%	0.7%
MTA	11	\$246	73.1%	26.8%	0.1%	0.0%
Correction	150	\$224	10.7%	26.3%	63.1%	0.0%
Health & Mental Hygiene	163	\$203	15.3%	45.6%	29.7%	9.4%
Libraries	210	\$184	1.6%	14.7%	83.5%	0.2%
CUNY	256	\$98	2.7%	46.6%	50.7%	0.0%
Homeless Services	93	\$73	19.2%	0.8%	73.0%	7.1%
Human Resources	93	\$60	37.8%	8.1%	48.5%	5.6%
Children’s Services	46	\$39	41.4%	43.2%	15.5%	0.0%
Aging	68	\$25	0.8%	59.8%	39.2%	0.2%
Juvenile Justice	11	\$9	-24.9%	17.6%	103.7%	3.6%
TOTAL	12,423	\$29,488	33.6%	32.9%	32.7%	0.8%

SOURCE: IBO.

One project type that was generally classified as serving individual community boards, but which should probably have been classified as boroughwide, was courts. Some other projects appear to have been classified in a particular community board or boards more on the basis of the localized nature of their construction impacts rather than their service area: a prominent example is the Croton Water Filtration

Plant, which is classified in the two Bronx community boards that its construction most directly affects, although its ultimate service area will be much larger once it is completed.

Finally, some project types were classified as citywide but obviously had much more localized impacts. The most notable example is the Department of Housing Preservation and Development capital program. Capital project lines correspond to programs, rather than individual projects, however, so the geographic distribution of capital spending would require more detail than was available in FMS. A separate analysis of the location of affordable housing units funded under the Mayor's New Housing Marketplace Plan is available from IBO, at <http://www.ibo.nyc.ny.us/iboreports/NHMPsupplement.pdf>.

Use of the Data. Users of the attached files should bear in mind certain limitations in what conclusions and inferences can be drawn from it.

As discussed above (p. 2), the term "project" as we use it here covers a variety of different meanings. Users of the tables should not necessarily infer anything about the cost of a particular project from the data.

Committed amounts under \$35,000 in any one year usually represent commitments against a larger total; readers should not infer that a project has been inappropriately included in the capital budget rather than the expense budget.

No detail on individual projects is provided in these tables. For detailed project-specific information users should consult the six-volume *Capital Project Detail Data* report which accompanies the Executive Budget each year, and which is available from the Office of Management and Budget.

IBO prepared this data at the request of The Municipal Arts Society Planning Center (www.mas.org). IBO does not necessarily endorse any analysis or policy conclusions that they or any other user draws from it.