Ceasefire facts:

Ceasefire Revenues Fiscal Years 2004-2006 *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State Police</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Corrections</td>
<td>$6,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues:</td>
<td>$16,161,994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Findings of the Auditor General William G. Holland:

Ceasefire Projects of Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity Funding

The Chicago project failed to account for significant portions of the funds provided by the State government, as significantly from the purported conditions in the contract between UIC and the State. The funds were not used as intended, distributed to other areas of the program, or reprogrammed to other areas of the program. As a result, community partners were allowed to initiate work without a written contract, and the Chicago project was charged for expenses paid by the State for the work performed. Additionally, during FY06, the Chicago project was charged for funding provided by the State, which was not delineated in the MOU with the State. T o date Ceasefire has yet to explain why it failed to live up to its responsibilities under the MOU. T he Chicago project failed to allocate the funds provided by the State for the work performed, and failed to provide documentation to support the funding. This certainly seems to be a violation of the contractual agreements it entered into with the State. Ceasefire Revenues Fiscal Years 2004-2006.

Ceasefire (Part II of IV)
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