From: Letavish, George
To: Irving, Toni
Subject: NRI Budget
Date: Thursday, August 23, 2012 7:30:00 PM

I'll check again with fresh eyes in the morning, but I'm pretty sure that original budget I sent is correct.

The difference is due to the fact that the $280k added in Pilsen/Little Village is greater than the $242K we're reallocating from CAP plus increased admin costs from the 15% formula.

We added $242,840 in 3 neighborhoods from CAP reallocation, $36,426 in new admin costs from those 3 programs, $280,000 in Pilsen/Little Village for M+J, and $42,000 in new associated admin costs for the M+J program. That's a combined *$601,266 in additions*.

We took away $115,000 from Woodlawn ($100,000 PLAN & $15k admin costs), $70k from Hermosa's reentry, $22,760.86 from their M+J (6% reduction), and $13,914.13 in reduced admin costs from these 2 cuts in Hermosa. That's *$221,675 in reductions.*

Our difference is *$379,591, and $242,840 of that is CAP money.* That leaves a positive change of *+$136,751.*

The new lead for Maywood wouldn't change anything. It would just be shifting those same admin costs from the Village of Maywood to a different organization, but for our purposes, we can think of it as admin costs being spent for that community.

However, there is still $119,660.40 leftover in CAP money. **The questions for the purpose of this chart are the assumptions of whether or not we can also allocate $36,426 in CAP funding towards the new administrative costs from restoring those 3 programs with CAP money; and, can we also use CAP money towards the restoration of Pilsen/Little Village's M+J and increased M+J administrative costs. If we can have some flexibility with CAP and get access to the entire $2.5M, then under this proposal we would only need another $17k.** And that is before looking into any more cuts to ILAACP.

George