




Office of the  
New York City Comptroller  
**Scott M. Stringer**

---

# MAKING THE GRADE



NEW YORK CITY AGENCY REPORT CARD ON  
MINORITY / WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

---


**2014**

---



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
HISTORY OF NEW YORK CITY'S M/WBE PROGRAM.....	3
AGENCY GRADES.....	4
<i>THE NEXT GENERATION OF LOCAL LAW 1</i> .....	6
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CITY AGENCIES.....	6
SPOTLIGHT: M/WBE PROCUREMENT AT THE COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE....	7
<i>IMPROVING TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY:</i>	
<i>DATA ENTRY AND WEB PRESENCE</i> .....	7
CONCLUSION.....	8
APPENDICES	
<i>APPENDIX A: AGENCY GRADE BOOK</i> .....	9
<i>APPENDIX B: DATA AND METHODOLOGY</i> .....	43
<i>APPENDIX C: WORKSHEETS</i> .....	47
ENDNOTES.....	82



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

New York City is home to some 305,000 women-owned firms and 403,000 minority-owned firms – by far the largest and most diverse clustering of such businesses in the United States.<sup>1</sup> Yet despite the importance of minority and women-owned business enterprises (M/WBEs) to New York City’s economy and targeted government efforts to support their growth, these businesses continue to receive a disappointingly small share of City government procurement contracts.

Each year, New York City spends billions of taxpayer dollars to purchase goods and services – everything from office supplies and heavy machinery to professional services and food for the City’s 1.1 million school children. However, in Fiscal Year 2014, only 3.9 percent of the City’s \$17.8 billion procurement budget went to M/WBEs, a slight increase from the 2.7 percent share in Fiscal Year 2013 but a decline from the already small 5 percent share achieved in Fiscal Year 2012.<sup>2</sup>

This is bad news for both taxpayers and our economy. A robust M/WBE program not only makes government more efficient for taxpayers by increasing competition in procurement, but also helps to foster an inclusive, competitive economy of shared prosperity throughout the five boroughs. Minority and women-owned business enterprises are crucial job engines in communities of color, and are also an increasingly important component of the city’s overall economic future.<sup>3</sup>

In an effort to increase transparency and boost agency performance around M/WBE spending, New York City Comptroller Scott M. Stringer is introducing “Making the Grade,” an annual review that will analyze and grade City mayoral agencies based on their M/WBE spending in the prior fiscal year. It is intended as a diagnostic tool for agencies to measure their success in diversifying vendors using the framework of Local Law 1 of 2013 (“LL 1”), a law that updated M/WBE participation goals for certain procurements by mayoral agencies as of July 1, 2013 and set new goals in two additional industry sectors.

Unlike LL 1, these grades are based not on contracts awarded by City agencies, but on *actual* spending processed through the City’s centralized Financial Management System (FMS). This is an important distinction because some contracts extend over multiple years and actual dollars spent can change throughout the life of a project. Thus, while LL 1 compliance reports are generated based on the value of registered contracts signed with vendors (i.e. an agency’s *projected* spending), it is critically important to track actual dollars spent in order to measure the true impact on businesses.

This report assigns grades to 31 mayoral agencies and the Comptroller’s Office. To calculate each grade, the Office of the Comptroller relied on information entered into FMS by agency staff. The Fiscal Year 2014 spending data for each agency was compared against the LL 1 citywide contracting participation goals for M/WBEs. A full description of the methodology is available in Appendix B.

The results are stark: only two agencies scored a B, nine agencies received a C, and 21 of the 32 received either D’s or F’s. Overall, the Citywide grade of D is a reflection of the failure of the City to achieve its M/WBE participation goals. A list of agency grades is available on page 5, and individual agency grade sheets appear in Appendix A.

The primary goal of this first-ever series of agency letter grades for M/WBE procurement is to encourage agencies to boost their M/WBE spending. However, this report also recommends a series of broader improvements to the City’s M/WBE program, including:

- **Expanding the Promise of Local Law 1:** While LL 1 represents a significant step in improving the City’s M/WBE program, the “next generation” of the program could do even more to boost these businesses. Enhancements could include:

- Boosting the number of agencies required to prepare and submit M/WBE utilization plans beyond those that procure over \$5 million annually;
  - Expanding certification efforts for the Emerging Business Enterprise (EBE) program which promotes city contracting opportunities for socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, and documenting any obstacles to and recommendations for increasing participation;
  - Requiring enhanced training for M/WBE officers to support their successful implementation of LL 1 goals and/or compliance with the Annual Agency M/WBE Utilization Plan, if applicable.
- **Exploring “Tier II” Spending:** To expand opportunities for M/WBEs, the City could consider expanding the program to track M/WBE spending further down the supply chain of vendors (also known as “Tier II” spending).
  - **Increasing Transparency:** Most mayoral agencies have no specific information for or about M/WBEs on their websites. Agencies should be required to:
    - Disclose their spending with M/WBEs in real terms and as a percentage of total supplier spending;
    - Publish Annual Agency M/WBE Utilization Plans online, for agencies that are required to create and submit these plans;
    - Create M/WBE programs and issue annual progress reports, for agencies that are not required to submit annual utilization plans; and
    - Make information relevant to M/WBEs available on their website, including how to apply for certification as an M/WBE and how to obtain information about procurement opportunities.
  - **Improving Data Entry:** Agencies very often fail to “tag” M/WBE contracts appropriately, making it difficult, if not impossible, to accurately track them. Agencies must redouble efforts to appropriately identify M/WBE contracts so existing spending can be tracked more effectively, thereby increasing the level of transparency and accountability.

Next year’s “Making the Grade” report will acknowledge progress made by agencies in adopting the recommendations above.

In addition to making recommendations for agencies across City government, Comptroller Stringer has established a steering committee within the Comptroller’s Office to track and evaluate M/WBE spending and establish goals for the Office in line with Local Law 1’s citywide participation goals. The Office will also embark on a series of reforms to its procurement processes that will focus on boosting outreach to M/WBEs and EBEs and identifying potential obstacles to their success.

## HISTORY OF NEW YORK CITY'S M/WBE PROGRAM

As detailed in then-Manhattan Borough President Stringer's 2013 report *Growing Gotham*, New York's efforts to boost procurement to M/WBEs are not new.

In 1992, the City completed its first disparity study: a formal analysis designed to assess the availability of M/WBE businesses that are capable of performing City work in different sectors and determine whether these businesses are underrepresented in City procurement.<sup>4</sup> The study found that M/WBEs received a disproportionately small share of City contracts. As a result, Mayor David Dinkins signed an executive order directing 20 percent of City procurement to M/WBEs and allowing contracts to be awarded to these businesses that bid up to 10 percent higher than the lowest bid.<sup>5</sup>

Despite Mayor Dinkins' assertion that the program was responsible for increasing the percentage of City contracts awarded to M/WBEs from 9 percent in 1990 to 17.5 percent in 1993, Mayor Rudolph Giuliani eliminated the 10 percent allowance upon entering office in 1994.<sup>6</sup>

In December 2005, the City Council issued another disparity study that once again found that qualified


M/WBE firms were receiving a disproportionately small share of City contracts.<sup>7</sup> This finding led to the passage of Local Law 129 of 2005 (LL 129),<sup>8</sup> which set non-binding goals<sup>9</sup> for New York City Mayoral Agencies to award a certain percentage of smaller contracts (between \$5,000 and \$1 million) to M/WBEs, and Local Law 12 of 2006, which created a program for Emerging Business Enterprises (EBEs).<sup>10</sup>

Local Law 129 was in effect from Fiscal Years 2007 to 2013, during which time the number of certified M/WBE firms rose from 1,236 to 3,700, an increase of 200 percent, and the number of M/WBEs awarded prime contracts also steadily increased.<sup>11</sup>

For all of these successes, however, LL 129 failed to move the needle in a meaningful way on the share of City contract dollars awarded to M/WBEs. The chart below, with data from the *Annual Procurement Indicator Report* for Fiscal Year 2014 published by the Mayor's Office of Contract Services (MOCS), shows the M/WBE share of City procurement from FY 2007 to FY 2014.

While the trend line was positive in the early years of the program—rising from 1.6 percent of procurement in FY 2007 to 5 percent in FY 2012—the share has since declined to 2.7 percent in FY 2013 and then 3.9 percent in FY 2014 when M/WBEs received less than \$690 million of the City's \$17.8 billion procurement budget.<sup>12</sup>

### FY 2007 - 2014 M/WBE Share



Last year, spurred on by the shortcomings of Local Law 129, the Council passed significant amendments to the City’s M/WBE program. These reforms, known as Local Law 1 of 2013 (LL 1), went into effect in FY 2014.

Two of the most important revisions in LL 1 were removing the \$1 million cap on contracts subject to the non-binding goals and permitting agencies to meet participation goals through both prime contracting and subcontracting. Taken together, these reforms increased the overall value of program-eligible contracts by over 400 percent.<sup>13</sup> Thus, while several of LL 1’s participation goals (shown below) appear lower than prior goals set by LL 129, the goals below apply to a much broader set of contracts, making the net value of the goals in total dollars significantly higher.<sup>14</sup>

### Local Law 1 Participation Goals

Category	Construction	Professional Services	Standard Services	Goods (<\$100K)
Black Americans	8%	12%	12%	7%
Hispanic Americans	4%	8%	6%	5%
Asian Americans	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Women	18%	17%	10%	25%
Emerging	6%	6%	6%	6%

In addition to expanding the pool of contracts subject to M/WBE goals, Local Law 1 increased transparency. It required agencies and contractors to report and justify their contracting participation goals on a quarterly basis and mandated that the Department of Small Business Services post an updated list of certified M/WBEs with expanded business histories online.

Agencies that procured goods and services in excess of \$5 million during the previous fiscal year continue to be required to submit agency utilization plans that, at a minimum, include the following<sup>15</sup>:

1. The agency’s participation goals for MBEs, WBEs and EBEs for the year;
2. An explanation for any agency goal that differs from the participation goal for the relevant group and industry classification as outlined in LL 1;

3. A list of the names and titles of agency personnel responsible for implementation of the agency utilization plan;
4. Methods and relevant activities proposed for achieving the agency’s participation goals; and
5. Any other information that the agency or the commissioner deems relevant or necessary.

## AGENCY GRADES

Comptroller Stringer is committed to boosting M/WBE procurement. A core part of that effort is improving transparency surrounding M/WBE spending and accountability by City agencies subject to Local Law 1.

The 31 mayoral agencies that are the focus of this report account for the majority of the City’s M/WBE spending, although it is worth noting that several large agencies – including the Department of Education – are not subject to the parameters of LL 1 and are thus excluded from this report.<sup>16</sup>

We also graded the Comptroller’s Office and outlined a series of steps to improve our internal procurement processes. Additionally, we created a citywide grade to measure the success of the M/WBE program overall. Table A provides the assigned grades for the agencies covered by this report.

The grades are based on actual spending by City agencies, which is critical. While Local Law 1 compliance reports measure progress towards goals in agency utilization plans, they are based on projected spending off the registered value of contracts that can often span multiple years, rather than actual spending with M/WBEs, which is a more meaningful measure of success.

**Table A – Agency List by M/WBE Spending as a Percent of LL 1 Participation Goals**

AGENCIES	ACRONYM	GRADE
Department of Cultural Affairs	DCLA	<b>B</b>
Landmarks Preservation Commission	LPC	<b>B</b>
Administration for Children's Services	ACS	<b>C</b>
Civilian Complaint Review Board	CCRB	<b>C</b>
Commission on Human Rights	CCHR	<b>C</b>
Department of City Planning	DCP	<b>C</b>
Department of Health and Mental Hygiene	DOHMH	<b>C</b>
Department of Probation	DOP	<b>C</b>
Department of Youth and Community Development	DYCD	<b>C</b>
Law Department	LAW	<b>C</b>
Office of the New York City Comptroller	OCC	<b>C</b>
Business Integrity Commission	BIC	<b>D</b>
Department for the Aging	DFTA	<b>D</b>
Department of Buildings	DOB	<b>D</b>
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	DCAS	<b>D</b>
Department of Consumer Affairs	DCA	<b>D</b>
Department of Correction	DOC	<b>D</b>
Department of Design and Construction	DDC	<b>D</b>
Department of Homeless Services	DHS	<b>D</b>
Department of Parks And Recreation	DPR	<b>D</b>
Department of Small Business Services	SBS	<b>D</b>
Department of Transportation	DOT	<b>D</b>
Fire Department	FDNY	<b>D</b>
Housing Preservation and Development	HPD	<b>D</b>
Human Resources Administration	HRA	<b>D</b>
NYC Taxi and Limousine Commission	TLC	<b>D</b>
Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings	OATH	<b>D</b>
Office of Emergency Management	OEM	<b>D</b>
Department of Environmental Protection	DEP	<b>F</b>
Department of Finance	DOF	<b>F</b>
Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications	DOITT	<b>F</b>
Department of Sanitation	DSNY	<b>F</b>

Note that two mayoral agencies—the New York City Police Department (NYPD) and the Department of Investigation (DOI)—are not given grades because of a prior agreement not to publicly display vendor data in Checkbook NYC for security reasons.<sup>17</sup> As a result, industry classifications are not assigned to NYPD and DOI transactions.

What we do know is that the total amount of M/WBE spending by these agencies is low. DOI directed \$25,250 to M/WBEs out of a total procurement budget of \$12,628,396—a total of 0.2 percent. NYPD's M/WBE performance is also low, with \$14,454,246 of M/WBE

spending in a procurement budget of \$555,849,888—a total of 2.6 percent.<sup>18</sup>

An individual grade sheet for each agency appears in Appendix A. To calculate each grade, the Office of the Comptroller relied on information entered into the City's centralized Financial Management System (FMS) by agency staff, and then exported to Checkbook NYC – the Comptroller's online budget transparency website. The Fiscal Year 2014 spending data for each agency was extracted, analyzed by the population and industry categories established in LL 1, and then compared against the LL 1 citywide M/WBE participation goals.



Certain spending not subject to LL 1 – such as payroll and land acquisitions – was removed from the grade calculations, along with categories where specific agencies had no relevant business (i.e., construction participation goals were removed from the calculation of agencies that perform no construction). The results were then weighted to account for the agency’s spending in different industry categories (professional services, standard services, construction, and goods). For example, if an agency spent 50 percent of its procurement budget on construction, then 50 percent of its grade is based on meeting the construction participation goals under LL 1. After weighting, scores were assigned a value and converted into a letter grade. The complete methodology appears in Appendix B and the calculation worksheets appear in Appendix C.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CITY AGENCIES

The primary goal of this report is to increase utilization of M/WBEs by enhancing transparency in agency procurement. The recommendations listed below are designed to advance that broad goal through:

1. Legislative improvements to further strengthen the City’s M/WBE program; and
2. A series of steps agencies can take to improve internal policies and procedures, transparency, and data collection.

### *THE NEXT GENERATION OF LOCAL LAW 1*

Local Law 1 represents a major improvement over Local Law 129. It removes the \$1 million cap on prime contracts for construction and professional services, allows agencies to establish participation goals on standardized service contracts, and reduces the cap on goods contracts to “less than” \$100,000. However, LL 1 still has shortfalls that minimize its ultimate impact on M/WBE procurement.

For instance, while there are well over 100 City agencies, only mayoral agencies with annual procurement budgets over \$5 million are required to prepare and submit agency utilization plans outlining their expected M/WBE procurement for the coming year. Smaller agencies and other Mayoral-controlled entities—including several not held accountable to LL 1, such as the Department of Education and the New York City Economic Development Corporation—spend billions

of dollars annually on procurement. As a result, the City should consider expanding the number of agencies subject to Local Law 1 or a similar M/WBE program that includes transparency requirements.

In addition, Local Law 1 has done little to advance the City’s Emerging Business Enterprise (EBE) program which promotes city contracting opportunities for socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.<sup>19</sup> Since the inception of the EBE program in 2007, only three businesses have been certified and only 22 applications have been received from vendors. Currently only two EBE vendors are certified in the database of the Department of Small Business Services.<sup>20</sup> Steps should be taken to improve outreach, education, recruitment, and reporting related to certification, as detailed in the City Comptroller’s 2013 audit.<sup>21</sup>

The City should not only explore expanding the agencies that are required to submit utilization plans under Local Law 1, but also expanding the universe of spending that falls under the participation goals. For example, human service contracts were not given participation goals in LL 1. However, given that human service agencies are vital engines of economic growth that accounted for 17 percent of the total contract-dollars awarded in Fiscal Year 2014, a total of \$3.1 billion, it is worth examining how and whether this spending can be leveraged to support M/WBEs.<sup>22</sup>

More broadly, the City’s current M/WBE program does not address diversity among the sub-contractors used by vendors, also known as “Tier II” spending. The Comptroller’s Office has used the lever of corporate governance to prod American corporations to disclose more information about their supplier diversity programs, which offer companies a competitive advantage.<sup>23</sup>

New York City government should likewise explore how to integrate “Tier II” diversity into the next generation of the City’s M/WBE procurement program, which carries the potential to significantly expand M/WBE utilization in the City. The National Minority Supplier Development Council (NMSDC) has developed best practices for minority supplier development<sup>24</sup> that include requiring vendors to report their supplier diversity numbers. This creates a second level of opportunity for M/WBEs that could potentially have greater access to both public and private sector contracts.

Last, all mayoral agencies have an M/WBE officer and an Agency Chief Contracting Officer that oversee M/WBE procurement. These officers should receive

specialized training and support to expand their M/WBE programs and learn from industry best practices.

### **IMPROVING TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY: DATA ENTRY AND WEB PRESENCE**

The data used by the Office of the Comptroller to develop the grade book is based on information entered into FMS by agency staff. Unfortunately, a significant portion of the data—from industry codes that define the “type” of contract to classification of the M/WBE group that was awarded the contract—is either incomplete or misclassified.

Transparency is only as good as the data that supports it. To that end, agencies need to do a better job cataloging contracts—both by type and by award winner—and have a system in place to ensure that contractors are appropriately tagged in order to determine their success or failure in achieving the goals of Local Law 1.

In addition to improving data entry, *all* agencies – not only those spending over \$5 million on LL 1 eligible procurement – should be required to develop and publish annual utilization plans that chart a course for greater use of M/WBEs in procurement and to measure and report results.

Lastly, agencies must significantly improve and expand their internet outreach to all potential vendors, including M/WBEs. The Comptroller’s Office reviewed the websites of the agencies graded in this report and found that most have no specific online information for M/WBEs.

At a minimum, agencies’ websites should provide a dedicated and easy-to-find M/WBE page that includes the following information:

1. Online resources with a link to M/WBE resources from the Department of Small Business Services;
2. A contact for vendors with questions about the agency’s procurement processes and opportunities;
3. Agency goals and utilization plan; and
4. Quarterly M/WBE spending in dollars and as a percentage of total LL 1 eligible spending.

boost M/WBE procurement within the Comptroller’s Office itself.

Upon entering office in January 2014, the Comptroller hired the City’s first-ever Chief Diversity Officer, whose mandate is to develop innovative solutions that will improve supplier diversity not only in City government, but throughout the private sector—from small businesses to the boardrooms of America’s largest corporations.<sup>25</sup>

The Comptroller’s plan to improve procurement starts with an internal steering committee, whose role is to track and evaluate internal M/WBE spending across the many bureaus of the office, as well as to develop goals and recommendations to boost the participation of M/WBEs and EBEs. The Committee will meet quarterly to review each bureau’s:

1. Total spending by industry;
2. M/WBE spending by industry;
3. M/WBE availability within the industry;
4. M/WBE outreach efforts; and
5. M/WBE participation goals.

This data will enable us to make progress in achieving our goals, while also providing us with useful comparisons from year to year.

In addition, we will embark on a series of reforms to our procurement processes that will focus on boosting outreach to M/WBEs and EBEs and identifying and addressing potential obstacles to their success. Those reforms include consultation among the Chief Diversity Officer, Agency Chief Contracting Officer and contract managers on pre-solicitation outreach activities for M/WBEs and EBEs.

Lastly, the Comptroller will provide greater transparency by publishing the Office’s annual utilization plan. While mayoral agencies that spend over \$5 million in LL 1 eligible procurement annually are required to produce annual utilization plans, none of the agencies publicize these plans.<sup>26</sup>

## **SPOTLIGHT: M/WBE PROCUREMENT AT THE COMPTROLLER’S OFFICE**

Comptroller Stringer is committed to increasing business opportunities for M/WBEs and EBEs at City agencies. Part of this effort is implementing a plan to

## CONCLUSION

In the midst of the first great wave of progressive politics in America, Louis Brandeis wrote, “Publicity is justly commended as a remedy for social and industrial diseases...Sunlight is...the best of disinfectants.”<sup>27</sup> This idea still resonates over a century later, and is at the foundation of why we established our grading system. Although agencies may feel the sting of taking a bad grade home on their report card, the intent is to boost M/WBE procurement by increasing transparency and accountability.

It is clear that all agencies, including the Comptroller’s Office, have work to do, including improving data that is reported in FMS in order to better track M/WBE spending, making agency utilization plans public, and leveraging agency websites to provide targeted information and outreach to M/WBEs.

Local Law 1 ushered in a new era in the City’s effort to increase efficiency and boost economic development opportunities for New York’s minority and women-owned businesses. But if the goals of Local Law 1 are to become a reality for business owners throughout the five boroughs, we must demand better performance from City agencies and encourage further innovation in their efforts to contract with M/WBEs.

Our success in achieving the goals of Local Law 1 is not only important for the businesses that stand to benefit, but also for the broader city economy. Greater competition for City procurement will help to drive down costs, while increased M/WBE spending will support smaller businesses in many communities of color that suffer from disproportionately high rates of unemployment.<sup>28</sup>

This first set of letter grades is designed to do just that. We hope and expect more agencies will be able to make the grade on next year’s report card.

## APPENDIX A: AGENCY GRADE BOOK

CITYWIDE GRADE.....	10
ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES.....	11
BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION.....	12
CIVILIAN COMPLAINT REVIEW BOARD.....	13
COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS.....	14
DEPARTMENT FOR THE AGING.....	15
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDINGS.....	16
DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING.....	17
DEPARTMENT OF CITYWIDE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.....	18
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS.....	19
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION.....	20
DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS.....	21
DEPARTMENT OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION.....	22
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.....	23
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE.....	24
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE.....	25
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESS SERVICES.....	26
DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS.....	27
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION.....	28
DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION.....	29
DEPARTMENT OF SANITATION.....	30
DEPARTMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS SERVICES.....	31
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.....	32
DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.....	33
FIRE DEPARTMENT.....	34
HOUSING PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT.....	35
HUMAN RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION.....	36
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION.....	37
LAW DEPARTMENT.....	38
NYC TAXI AND LIMOUSINE COMMISSION.....	39
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS.....	40
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT.....	41
OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK CITY COMPTROLLER.....	42



# M/WBE LETTER GRADE New York Citywide


FISCAL YEAR 2014

## Letter Grade Overview

Citywide, procurement with M/WBEs is low across the board. There was particularly low utilization of M/WBEs in professional services, and Black American firms saw little business across all sectors. Overall, the citywide grade was a D.

## About Citywide Grade

This citywide grade was calculated based on an average of all 32 agencies included in this report.



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$5,000,584	2.48%	\$76,884,877	38.13%	\$25,920,799	25.71%	\$29,524,367	6.51%	\$2,383,039,238
Professional Services	\$3,568,014	2.08%	\$96,087,525	No Goal	\$1,785,015	1.56%	\$13,897,322	5.73%	\$1,311,174,996
Standard Services	\$4,531,953	2.88%	\$18,587,884	47.17%	\$4,020,937	5.10%	\$27,107,869	20.64%	\$1,259,173,711
Goods Under 100K	\$3,346,351	10.13%	\$8,195,660	21.71%	\$5,680,792	24.08%	\$22,288,274	18.89%	\$432,377,598
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$16,446,902</b>		<b>\$199,755,946</b>		<b>\$37,407,543</b>		<b>\$92,817,832</b>		<b>\$5,385,765,543</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES

## Letter Grade Overview


ACS substantially surpassed the spending goal for Asian American firms in standard services and essentially met goals for goods with Women-owned businesses. However, the agency fell short in other industries within those groups, as well as with Hispanic American businesses overall, leading to a lower overall grade of C.

## About ACS

The Administration for Children's Services (ACS) is responsible for protecting and strengthening the city's children, youth and families by providing quality child welfare, juvenile justice, early child care and education services.

## Doing Business with ACS

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/acs/html/business/business.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$6,800	14.15%	\$17,252	71.79%	\$6,000	5.55%	\$570,729
Professional Services	\$743,079	49.61%	\$2,008,270	No Goal	\$148,036	14.83%	\$204,185	9.62%	\$9,378,853
Standard Services	\$441,375	33.01%	\$832,866	249.14%	\$49,470	7.40%	\$129,562	11.63%	\$9,689,903
Goods Under 100K	\$109,245	49.76%	\$115,306	45.96%	\$51,172	32.63%	\$761,584	97.13%	\$2,098,890
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$1,293,699</b>		<b>\$2,963,243</b>		<b>\$265,930</b>		<b>\$1,101,331</b>		<b>\$21,738,375</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>C</b>		<b>A</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.



FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION

## Letter Grade Overview


BIC primarily spends in one category, professional services, where it did a poor job procuring with the three minority groups that have participation goals. While the agency did procure goods with Asian American businesses, its failure to spend with virtually any other minority group resulted in a low score with a grade of a D.

## About BIC

The Business Integrity Commission (BIC) regulates and monitors the trade waste hauling industry and the wholesalers and businesses operating in the City's public wholesale markets, and ensures the integrity of businesses in these industries.

## Doing Business with BIC

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/bic/html/home/home.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$1,243,318	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$425	0.17%	\$264,518
Standard Services	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$90,877
Goods Under 100K	\$0	0.00%	\$11,168	85.87%	\$0	0.00%	\$1,433	3.53%	\$149,967
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$0</b>		<b>\$1,254,486</b>		<b>\$0</b>		<b>\$1,858</b>		<b>\$505,362</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>C</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE CIVILIAN COMPLAINT REVIEW BOARD

## Letter Grade Overview


CCRB has a small procurement budget which is principally comprised of standard services and goods. The agency did extremely well with procurement from Women-owned businesses across industries while falling short with other groups. Specifically, CCRB had no spending with Hispanic American businesses which had a large impact on its final grade of C.

## About CCRB

The Civilian Complaint Review Board (CCRB) is an independent agency with the authority to investigate allegations of police misconduct and recommend action directly to the police commissioner.

## Doing Business with CCRB

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/ccrb/html/home/home.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$4,945
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$0	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$7,730	95.84%	\$39,714
Standard Services	\$482	3.06%	\$550	13.96%	\$0	0.00%	\$61,208	466.37%	\$69,004
Goods Under 100K	\$7,530	46.73%	\$14,127	76.71%	\$0	0.00%	\$27,799	48.31%	\$180,739
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$8,012</b>		<b>\$14,677</b>		<b>\$0</b>		<b>\$96,737</b>		<b>\$294,400</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>D</b>		<b>C</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>A</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

## Letter Grade Overview


CCHR has a small procurement budget which is principally comprised of standard services and goods. While their procurement with Hispanic American and Black American businesses met and exceeded goals in standard services respectively, the agency did no procurement with Asian American businesses and very little with Women-owned businesses, bringing its overall grade to a C.

## About CCHR

The City Commission on Human Rights (CCHR) investigates an average of 1,000 allegations of discrimination in employment, housing and public accommodations, as well as bias-related harassment each year. In addition, the CCHR initiates investigations and prosecutions of systemic Human Rights Law violations.

## Doing Business with CCHR

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/cchr/html/home/home.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$0	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$27,797
Standard Services	\$19,933	190.61%	\$0	0.00%	\$5,100	97.53%	\$198	2.28%	\$61,916
Goods Under 100K	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$99	2.59%	\$102	0.53%	\$76,385
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$19,933</b>		<b>\$0</b>		<b>\$5,199</b>		<b>\$300</b>		<b>\$166,098</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>A</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>C</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT FOR THE AGING

FISCAL YEAR 2014

## Letter Grade Overview


DFTA failed to spend significantly with any of the three eligible groups within its main industry of procurement: professional services. The agency exceeded goals with both Black American and Women-owned businesses in standard services procurement, yet failed to spend with any Asian American businesses in any industry. These combined factors led to a D.

## About DFTA

The Department for the Aging (DFTA) promotes, administers and coordinates the development and provision of services for older New Yorkers to help them maintain their independence and participation in their communities.

## Doing Business with DFTA

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dfta/html/home/home.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$114,183
Professional Services	\$30,640	18.21%	\$0	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$52,680	22.10%	\$1,318,593
Standard Services	\$51,520	120.15%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$42,119	117.87%	\$263,691
Goods Under 100K	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$1,521	10.38%	\$1,068	1.46%	\$290,602
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$82,160</b>		<b>\$0</b>		<b>\$1,521</b>		<b>\$95,866</b>		<b>\$1,987,069</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>D</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.

% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.



FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDINGS

## Letter Grade Overview


DOB is the only agency that procured entirely with M/WBEs in an industry (Asian American businesses in construction). However, this spending represents only a small percentage of its overall procurement spending, and the agency failed to spend with M/WBEs in any significant way in its two most heavily weighted industries: professional services and standard services. These factors resulted in a grade of D.

## About DOB

The Department of Buildings (DOB) ensures the safe and lawful use of more than 975,000 buildings and properties by enforcing the City's Building Code, the City's Zoning Resolution, New York State Labor Law and New York State Multiple Dwelling Law. DOB enforces compliance with these regulations and promotes worker and public safety through its review and approval of building plans, permitting and licensing functions, and inspections.

## Doing Business with DOB

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dob/html/home/home.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$17,105	1250.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$1,715,769	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$197,113	15.45%	\$5,590,736
Standard Services	\$0	0.00%	\$9,630	4.46%	\$1,321	0.31%	\$150,156	20.88%	\$7,030,831
Goods Under 100K	\$4,102	5.86%	\$111,785	139.63%	\$31,163	62.28%	\$203,026	81.15%	\$650,629
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$4,102</b>		<b>\$1,854,289</b>		<b>\$32,484</b>		<b>\$550,294</b>		<b>\$13,272,197</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.

% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

## Letter Grade Overview


DCP had no procurement with Black American businesses in any industry and only marginal procurement with Hispanic American businesses in one category: goods. However, the agency's procurement with Asian American businesses in goods and with Women-owned businesses in both goods and professional services raised the overall grade to a C.

## About DCP

The Department of City Planning (DCP) promotes strategic growth, transit-oriented development and sustainable communities to enhance quality of life in the City, in part by initiating comprehensive planning and zoning changes for individual neighborhoods and business districts, as well as by establishing citywide policies and zoning regulations.

## Doing Business with DCP

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/home.html>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$2,378	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$56,590	408.23%	\$22,576
Standard Services	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$60,099
Goods Under 100K	\$0	0.00%	\$38,482	104.92%	\$2,533	11.05%	\$37,007	32.29%	\$380,438
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$0</b>		<b>\$40,859</b>		<b>\$2,533</b>		<b>\$93,597</b>		<b>\$463,112</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>A</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>A</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.



FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF CITYWIDE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

## Letter Grade Overview


DCAS spent with almost every minority group in every industry. However, the agency failed to reach participation goals in all categories except construction services with Asian American businesses. Further, while nearly three-quarters of the agency's procurement is in goods, DCAS did not procure at anywhere near the goal levels with any M/WBE in this category. As a result, its overall grade was a D.

## About DCAS

The Department of Citywide Administrative Services (DCAS) ensures that City agencies have the necessary resources to serve the public. DCAS supports City agencies in recruiting and training employees; establishes and enforces equal employment opportunity procedures; provides facilities management; purchases, sells and leases non-residential property; purchases goods and services; and implements energy conservation programs in City facilities.

## Doing Business with DCAS

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcas/html/business/mwbe.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$2,379,451	32.84%	\$16,178,101	223.26%	\$1,038,754	28.67%	\$1,765,789	10.83%	\$69,218,302
Professional Services	\$76,664	5.05%	\$98,602	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$1,190,363	55.29%	\$11,298,041
Standard Services	\$755,565	5.55%	\$406,270	11.93%	\$1,180,796	17.34%	\$1,213,919	10.70%	\$109,938,003
Goods Under 100K	\$233,101	0.96%	\$2,631,111	9.52%	\$581,356	3.37%	\$5,246,490	6.07%	\$336,763,805
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$3,444,780</b>		<b>\$19,314,084</b>		<b>\$2,800,907</b>		<b>\$9,416,561</b>		<b>\$527,218,150</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>C</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

## Letter Grade Overview


DCA exceeded goals for Hispanic American businesses in construction and goods, and with Women-owned businesses in standard services. However, the agency failed to spend with any of the three eligible groups in its largest area of procurement: professional services. This resulted in a D grade.

## About DCA

The Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) empowers consumers and businesses to ensure a fair and vibrant marketplace. DCA enforces the Consumer Protection Law and other related business laws throughout New York City. The agency licenses and regulates more than 78,000 businesses in 55 different industries.

## Doing Business with DCA

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dca/html/home/home.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$6,776	461.95%	\$0	0.00%	\$29,895
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$1,755,128	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$16,652,769
Standard Services	\$51,195	40.18%	\$0	0.00%	\$12,421	19.50%	\$106,655	100.44%	\$891,617
Goods Under 100K	\$0	0.00%	\$42,336	66.07%	\$55,991	139.80%	\$147,586	73.70%	\$555,071
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$51,195</b>		<b>\$1,797,464</b>		<b>\$75,188</b>		<b>\$254,240</b>		<b>\$18,129,351</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.



# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

FISCAL YEAR 2014

## Letter Grade Overview


DOC exceeded goals for Hispanic American businesses in construction but spent virtually no money with other groups in this industry. In goods and standard services, the agency performed much better, spending with all four groups. Despite this, its inconsistent spending across groups and particularly poor performance with Black American businesses brought the agency's grade to a D.

## About DOC

The Department of Correction (DOC) provides for the care, custody and control of adults accused of crimes or convicted and sentenced to one year or less of incarceration.

## Doing Business with DOC

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/doc/html/contracting/contracting.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$90,325	1.66%	\$4,259,765	156.66%	\$0	0.00%	\$63,626,701
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$961,865	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$124,778	9.75%	\$6,441,483
Standard Services	\$50,600	2.98%	\$190	0.04%	\$325,881	38.42%	\$1,206,838	85.37%	\$12,552,753
Goods Under 100K	\$106,572	6.14%	\$569,921	28.73%	\$572,996	46.21%	\$1,080,639	17.43%	\$22,467,310
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$157,172</b>		<b>\$1,622,301</b>		<b>\$5,158,642</b>		<b>\$2,412,255</b>		<b>\$105,088,247</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>A</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS

## Letter Grade Overview

DCLA performed exceptionally well with Hispanic American businesses in construction, professional services and goods, and with Asian American businesses in construction and goods. This led to its B grade - the highest of any agency. However, its weak performance with Women-owned businesses in any industry and with Black Americans in any industry except goods held the agency back from achieving an A.


## About DCLA

The Department of Cultural Affairs (DCLA) provides financial support and technical assistance to the City's cultural community, including the 33 City-owned cultural institutions comprising the Cultural Institutions Group (CIG) and more than 1,100 other non-profit organizations serving constituencies in all neighborhoods of the City.

## Doing Business with DCLA

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcla/html/home/home.shtml>

**DCLA GRADE**



Issued by:  
Office of the New York City Comptroller

## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$474,922	225.76%	\$128,527	122.19%	\$0	0.00%	\$2,026,178
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$28,000	No Goal	\$136,036	139.98%	\$0	0.00%	\$1,050,770
Standard Services	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$4,806	3.85%	\$0	0.00%	\$2,073,697
Goods Under 100K	\$236,702	261.22%	\$147,304	142.24%	\$59,715	92.26%	\$154,154	47.63%	\$696,610
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$236,702</b>		<b>\$650,226</b>		<b>\$329,084</b>		<b>\$154,154</b>		<b>\$5,847,255</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>C</b>		<b>A</b>		<b>A</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

## Letter Grade Overview


As one of the largest procurement agencies, DDC performed very poorly with Black American across all industries and with Women-owned businesses in all industries except goods. Despite its notable success in exceeding goals with Asian American businesses for standard services, its overall grade is a D.

## About DDC

The Department of Design and Construction (DDC) manages a design and construction portfolio of more than \$9 billion of the City's capital program. Projects range from roadways, sewers and water mains to health and human service facilities, as well as cultural institutions and libraries.

## Doing Business with DDC

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/ddc/html/business/business.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$12,680	0.02%	\$35,331,966	54.20%	\$12,552,457	38.51%	\$15,025,616	10.24%	\$752,004,218
Professional Services	\$1,234,640	8.63%	\$18,730,872	No Goal	\$306,435	3.21%	\$4,463,849	22.01%	\$94,555,654
Standard Services	\$15,693	0.70%	\$5,109,438	911.82%	\$427,191	38.12%	\$15,744	0.84%	\$13,110,380
Goods Under 100K	\$3,986	3.58%	\$39,398	30.98%	\$48,445	60.94%	\$417,718	105.09%	\$1,080,365
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$1,266,999</b>		<b>\$59,211,674</b>		<b>\$13,334,527</b>		<b>\$19,922,928</b>		<b>\$860,750,617</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>B</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

## Letter Grade Overview


DEP spent with all groups and in all industries. However, it failed to spend significantly with any M/WBEs in its three largest industries: construction, professional services and standard services. This low overall spending resulted in a failing grade.

## About DEP

The Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) protects public health and the environment by supplying clean drinking water, collecting and treating wastewater, and reducing air, noise and hazardous materials pollution.

## Doing Business with DEP

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dep/html/businesses/doingbiz.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$2,510,962	4.27%	\$11,715,794	19.93%	\$78,728	0.27%	\$2,633,120	1.99%	\$718,032,699
Professional Services	\$47,670	0.10%	\$12,398,176	No Goal	\$5,000	0.02%	\$80,812	0.12%	\$391,966,128
Standard Services	\$458,148	1.97%	\$571,582	9.81%	\$239,908	2.06%	\$587,142	3.03%	\$192,266,015
Goods Under 100K	\$308,478	25.75%	\$524,824	38.34%	\$399,127	46.65%	\$3,754,385	87.76%	\$12,124,943
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$3,325,258</b>		<b>\$25,210,376</b>		<b>\$722,764</b>		<b>\$7,055,458</b>		<b>\$1,314,389,784</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.

% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.



# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

FISCAL YEAR 2014

## Letter Grade Overview


DOF's low procurement with M/WBEs in its largest procurement industries, professional and standard services, resulted in its failing grade. The agency exceeded the goal for Hispanic American businesses in goods procurement, but failed to meet goals in any other instance.

## About DOF

The Department of Finance collects over \$30 billion in revenue for the City and assesses more than one million properties currently valued at over \$800 billion.

## Doing Business with DOF

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dof/html/home/home.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Professional Services	\$74,003	4.34%	\$885,866	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$43,920	1.82%	\$13,209,327
Standard Services	\$30,000	0.94%	\$139,764	17.56%	\$36,708	2.31%	\$1,365	0.05%	\$26,319,237
Goods Under 100K	\$13,648	14.13%	\$3,284	2.98%	\$292,797	424.52%	\$111,247	32.26%	\$958,461
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$117,651</b>		<b>\$1,028,914</b>		<b>\$329,505</b>		<b>\$156,532</b>		<b>\$40,487,025</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE

## Letter Grade Overview


DOHMH had success with Asian American businesses in construction and goods procurement and to a lesser degree with standard services. However, it fell short with Black American and Women-owned businesses in most industries, leading to an overall grade of C.

## About DOHMH

The Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DOHMH) protects and promotes the physical and mental health of New Yorkers. It provides information and recommendations to policy makers, health care providers, and New Yorkers in general, and also provides direct health services and enforces health regulations.

## Doing Business with DOHMH

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/doh/html/vendors/acco-home.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$58,915	81.24%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$847,631
Professional Services	\$16,500	0.51%	\$6,195,336	No Goal	\$691,769	31.99%	\$209,900	4.57%	\$19,914,786
Standard Services	\$0	0.00%	\$163,327	67.99%	\$0	0.00%	\$4,887	0.61%	\$7,838,738
Goods Under 100K	\$245,667	31.25%	\$867,569	96.58%	\$388,940	69.28%	\$954,904	34.02%	\$8,771,780
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$262,167</b>		<b>\$7,285,147</b>		<b>\$1,080,709</b>		<b>\$1,169,692</b>		<b>\$37,372,935</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>A</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.

% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.



FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESS SERVICES

## Letter Grade Overview


DHS spent with all groups in goods and did exceptionally well with Asian American businesses in construction. However, in its largest area of procurement, standard services, it failed to spend significantly with any M/WBE group. This brought the agency's overall grade to a D.

## About DHS

The Department of Homeless Services (DHS) manages city-run and provider-run shelter facilities for single adults, adult families, and families with children. DHS also provides homeless prevention services through community-based programs and street outreach services with options for placement into safe havens and stabilization beds.

## Doing Business with DHS

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dhs/html/about/contracts.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$2,684,640	612.71%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$2,792,323
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$46,717	No Goal	\$525	0.07%	\$0	0.00%	\$9,308,431
Standard Services	\$56,419	0.95%	\$28,290	1.90%	\$0	0.00%	\$1,524,418	30.65%	\$48,133,947
Goods Under 100K	\$40,202	55.29%	\$66,751	80.32%	\$32,508	62.59%	\$187,457	72.18%	\$711,880
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$96,621</b>		<b>\$2,826,397</b>		<b>\$33,033</b>		<b>\$1,711,876</b>		<b>\$60,946,581</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>B</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.

% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS

## Letter Grade Overview


A vast majority of DoITT's procurement spending is in professional services, where the agency did a poor job spending with all M/WBE groups. Despite strong spending with Hispanic American and Asian American businesses in goods and with Women-owned businesses in standard services, the agency's overall spending in these industries was too low to impact its failing grade.

## About DoITT

The Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications (DoITT) ensures the sustained, efficient delivery of IT services, infrastructure and telecommunications services to City agencies.

## Doing Business with DoITT

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/doitt/html/business/business.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$159,982,686
Professional Services	\$21,250	0.04%	\$28,746,793	No Goal	\$22,800	0.06%	\$693,955	0.86%	\$444,835,817
Standard Services	\$5,006	0.06%	\$1,534	0.08%	\$1,338,568	33.45%	\$11,436,161	171.47%	\$53,914,359
Goods Under 100K	\$15,067	6.63%	\$334,335	128.78%	\$383,568	236.39%	\$679,892	83.80%	\$1,832,413
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$41,323</b>		<b>\$29,082,662</b>		<b>\$1,744,936</b>		<b>\$12,810,008</b>		<b>\$660,565,275</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.



FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

## Letter Grade Overview


DPR did not perform particularly well with any group across all industries, but did spend with every minority group in most industries. The agency's weakest spending was with Black American businesses, where it failed to spend virtually anything in its largest industry - construction services. This contributed to its overall grade of D.

## About DPR

The Department of Parks & Recreation (DPR) maintains a municipal park system of more than 29,000 acres, including more than 1,900 parks, nearly 1,000 playgrounds, over 600,000 street trees and two million park trees.

## Doing Business with DPR

<http://www.nycgovparks.org/opportunities/business>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$6,090	0.04%	\$5,951,595	35.33%	\$2,795,852	33.19%	\$5,155,471	13.60%	\$196,692,392
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$3,519,621	No Goal	\$29,362	1.63%	\$803,769	20.93%	\$18,234,609
Standard Services	\$108,855	2.20%	\$345,089	27.87%	\$2,089	0.09%	\$4,262,952	103.30%	\$36,548,547
Goods Under 100K	\$234,294	36.14%	\$483,937	65.31%	\$476,805	102.96%	\$1,488,580	64.29%	\$6,578,741
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$349,239</b>		<b>\$10,300,242</b>		<b>\$3,304,108</b>		<b>\$11,710,772</b>		<b>\$258,054,290</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION

FISCAL YEAR 2014

## Letter Grade Overview


DOP performed well with goods procurement from Women-owned businesses. However, the agency fell short of goals with other groups in this category, particularly with Hispanic Americans. DOP exceeded goals with Hispanic Americans in standard services, but the agency's failure to spend meaningfully with any groups in professional services brought its overall grade to a C.

## About DOP

The Department of Probation (DOP) supervises people on probation and expands opportunities for them to move out of the criminal and juvenile justice systems through meaningful education, employment, health services, family engagement, and civic participation.

## Doing Business with DOP

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/prob/html/home/home.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$14,023
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$0	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$1,683	4.19%	\$234,889
Standard Services	\$14,416	74.70%	\$0	0.00%	\$33,760	349.89%	\$898	5.58%	\$111,736
Goods Under 100K	\$29,148	53.26%	\$16,800	26.86%	\$0	0.00%	\$197,262	100.93%	\$538,582
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$43,564</b>		<b>\$16,800</b>		<b>\$33,760</b>		<b>\$199,843</b>		<b>\$899,230</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>C</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>C</b>		<b>B</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.

% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF SANITATION

## Letter Grade Overview

DSNY performed well with Asian American and Women-owned businesses while procuring goods in FY 2014. Yet its spending with M/WBEs in all other industries was low, with almost no spending in its two largest procurement industries: professional and standard services. Also, procurement with Black American and Hispanic American businesses was extremely low across all industries resulting in a failing grade.

## About DSNY

The Department of Sanitation (DSNY) promotes a healthy environment through the efficient management of solid waste and the development of environmentally sound long-range planning for handling refuse, including recyclables.

## Doing Business with DSNY

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dsny/html/business/business.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$317,446	11.33%	\$0	0.00%	\$166,622	2.64%	\$34,548,447
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$2,810,787	No Goal	\$18,250	0.19%	\$199,836	0.99%	\$115,911,901
Standard Services	\$156,423	0.63%	\$24,318	0.39%	\$4,455	0.04%	\$405	0.00%	\$207,006,117
Goods Under 100K	\$121,003	24.61%	\$635,212	113.05%	\$133,730	38.08%	\$1,672,342	95.24%	\$4,461,321
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$277,426</b>		<b>\$3,787,762</b>		<b>\$156,435</b>		<b>\$2,039,205</b>		<b>\$361,927,786</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.

% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS SERVICES

## Letter Grade Overview

SBS failed to spend in construction with any group in a meaningful way. While the agency exceeded goals with Women-owned businesses in standard services, nearly met goals with Women-owned businesses in professional services, and did reasonably well with Asian American and Hispanic American businesses in goods procurement, the spending levels were not enough to raise its grade above a D.


## About SBS

The Department of Small Business Services (SBS) makes it easier for businesses in New York City to form, operate, and grow by providing direct assistance to business owners, fostering neighborhood development in commercial districts, and linking employers to a skilled and qualified workforce.

## Doing Business with SBS

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/sbs/html/about/doingbusinesswithsbs.shtml>

**SBS GRADE**



Issued by:  
Office of the New York City Comptroller

## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$1,440	0.10%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$17,779,191
Professional Services	\$118,350	35.53%	\$454,520	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$440,702	93.38%	\$1,762,632
Standard Services	\$37,543	3.12%	\$20,000	6.65%	\$77,606	12.91%	\$1,795,757	179.17%	\$8,091,701
Goods Under 100K	\$2,010	8.66%	\$19,270	72.61%	\$14,420	86.94%	\$6,058	7.30%	\$289,970
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$157,903</b>		<b>\$495,230</b>		<b>\$92,026</b>		<b>\$2,242,517</b>		<b>\$27,923,495</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>B</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.



FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## Letter Grade Overview


DOT did very little business with M/WBEs in its largest industry: construction. The agency's final grade would have been boosted by strong performance across all groups in goods procurement - but with a very small percentage of its total spending in this category - the final grade is a D.

## About DOT

The Department of Transportation (DOT) is responsible for the condition and operation of approximately 6,000 miles of streets, highways and public plazas, 788 bridge structures, and the nine boats for the Staten Island Ferry program. DOT operates 12,300 traffic signals and over 300,000 street lights, and maintains 69 million linear feet of markings on city streets and highways. DOT also manages sidewalk repair and oversees the on-street parking system.

## Doing Business with DOT

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dot/html/about/doing-business.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$5,119	0.02%	\$2,944,521	11.21%	\$1,197,664	9.12%	\$0	0.00%	\$324,177,818
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$6,119,304	No Goal	\$380,131	7.42%	\$70,878	0.65%	\$57,450,341
Standard Services	\$1,011	0.01%	\$1,845,827	38.36%	\$40,613	0.42%	\$246,793	1.54%	\$158,249,214
Goods Under 100K	\$536,245	94.05%	\$288,635	44.30%	\$240,511	59.06%	\$2,408,421	118.28%	\$4,671,291
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$542,374</b>		<b>\$11,198,287</b>		<b>\$1,858,919</b>		<b>\$2,726,091</b>		<b>\$544,548,664</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE

## DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

### Letter Grade Overview


DYCD did an excellent job in procurement with Black American businesses in its two largest spending categories: professional services and goods. However, the agency failed to meet any of its goals for Asian American and Women-owned businesses. This brought the agency's overall grade to a C.

### About DYCD

The Department of Youth and Community Development (DYCD) supports youth and adults through contracts with community-based organizations throughout New York City. DYCD provides after school programs, summer programs, youth employment initiatives, services for homeless and runaway youth, and family support, among others.

### Doing Business with DYCD

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dycd/html/resources/contracting.shtml>



### Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Professional Services	\$536,259	290.89%	\$554,320	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$1,000	0.38%	\$444,674
Standard Services	\$3,364	7.14%	\$4,914	41.69%	\$2,235	9.48%	\$379	0.97%	\$381,931
Goods Under 100K	\$34,257	90.60%	\$9,618	22.26%	\$57,090	211.39%	\$36,563	27.08%	\$402,623
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$573,880</b>		<b>\$568,851</b>		<b>\$59,324</b>		<b>\$37,942</b>		<b>\$1,229,228</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>A</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>C</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
 % = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.



# M/WBE LETTER GRADE FIRE DEPARTMENT

FISCAL YEAR 2014

## Letter Grade Overview


FDNY had extremely strong performance with standard services procurement from Asian American businesses and did well with Hispanic American businesses in goods procurement. However it fell short of goals in all other categories and barely spent with M/WBEs in construction or professional services. Low performance in these categories brought the agency to a D grade.

## About FDNY

The Fire Department (FDNY) responds to fires, public safety and medical emergencies, natural disasters and terrorist acts to protect the lives and property of City residents and visitors. The Department advances fire safety through its fire prevention, investigation and education programs, and contributes to the City's homeland security efforts.

## Doing Business with FDNY

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/fdny/html/contracting/index.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$353	0.02%	\$0	0.00%	\$19,780	0.39%	\$28,217,816
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$466,027	No Goal	\$32,411	1.31%	\$155,272	2.94%	\$30,379,963
Standard Services	\$2,225	0.04%	\$6,816,362	479.59%	\$23	0.00%	\$656,060	13.85%	\$39,901,969
Goods Under 100K	\$296,650	29.03%	\$340,510	29.16%	\$1,007,470	138.02%	\$1,821,108	49.90%	\$11,133,347
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$298,875</b>		<b>\$7,623,252</b>		<b>\$1,039,904</b>		<b>\$2,652,220</b>		<b>\$109,633,095</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>A</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE HOUSING PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

## Letter Grade Overview


HPD procured with every group in every industry type, exceeding goals with Black American and Hispanic American businesses for goods, and with Hispanic Americans for construction. However, the overall dollars spent with each group across all industries were relatively small and not enough to raise the agency's grade above a D.

## About HPD

Using a variety of preservation, development and enforcement strategies, the Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) strives to improve the availability, affordability, and quality of housing in New York City. HPD works with private, public and community partners to expand the supply and affordability of the City's housing stock and keep people in their homes.

## Doing Business with HPD

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/hpd/html/vendors/local-business-participation.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$86,283	4.94%	\$1,071,705	61.41%	\$3,845,024	440.65%	\$4,751,970	121.02%	\$12,059,715
Professional Services	\$24,941	2.85%	\$3,228,917	No Goal	\$3,375	0.58%	\$25,550	2.06%	\$4,006,458
Standard Services	\$1,886,633	5.75%	\$2,000,568	24.40%	\$128,184	0.78%	\$523,474	1.92%	\$268,812,820
Goods Under 100K	\$528,094	395.07%	\$140,217	91.79%	\$278,643	291.84%	\$262,138	54.91%	\$700,489
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$2,525,949</b>		<b>\$6,441,407</b>		<b>\$4,255,226</b>		<b>\$5,563,131</b>		<b>\$285,579,482</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.



FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE HUMAN RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION

## Letter Grade Overview


HRA's most significant procurement industries - professional services and standard services - saw some spending with each group. However, its relatively small amount of spending with M/WBEs across the board gave the agency a failing grade with all groups except Women-owned businesses, leaving the overall grade at a D.

## About HRA

The Human Resources Administration (HRA) assists individuals and families to achieve and sustain their maximum degree of self-sufficiency. HRA provides cash assistance and access to employment services at 24 Job Centers, the Family Services Call Center and its satellites, and the Special Project Center.

## Doing Business with HRA

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/hra/html/business/business.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$266,776
Professional Services	\$622,264	15.05%	\$3,874,116	No Goal	\$5,459	0.20%	\$4,064,477	69.39%	\$25,888,774
Standard Services	\$248,860	4.18%	\$255,043	17.15%	\$78,472	2.64%	\$1,742,478	35.14%	\$47,256,951
Goods Under 100K	\$173,851	20.76%	\$300,493	31.40%	\$284,135	47.51%	\$393,303	13.15%	\$10,809,604
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$1,044,975</b>		<b>\$4,429,653</b>		<b>\$368,066</b>		<b>\$6,200,258</b>		<b>\$84,222,105</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>C</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

## Letter Grade Overview


LPC does a very small amount of procurement, however it had relative success with M/WBE spending. Strong spending with Asian American businesses in construction and Hispanic American businesses in professional and standard services resulted in a B.

## About LPC

The Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) designates, regulates and protects the City's architectural, historic and cultural resources, which include 1,332 individual landmarks and more than 30,000 properties in 109 historic districts and 20 extensions to existing historic districts. The Agency reviews applications to alter landmark structures, investigates complaints of illegal work and initiates action to compel compliance with the Landmarks Law.

## Doing Business with LPC

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/lpc/html/home/home.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$39,250	683.13%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$32,570
Professional Services	\$4,497	253.24%	\$0	No Goal	\$5,426	458.36%	\$0	0.00%	\$4,875
Standard Services	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$10,109	733.39%	\$496	21.61%	\$12,368
Goods Under 100K	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$393	3.13%	\$49,822
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$4,497</b>		<b>\$39,250</b>		<b>\$15,536</b>		<b>\$889</b>		<b>\$99,635</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>D</b>		<b>A</b>		<b>A</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





# M/WBE LETTER GRADE LAW DEPARTMENT

FISCAL YEAR 2014

## Letter Grade Overview


The Law Department exceeded goals for standard services with Women-owned businesses and for goods with Asian American and Hispanic American businesses. However, in its largest spending category - professional services - the agency failed to spend with two of the three eligible minority groups. This brought its overall grade to a C.

## About Law

The Law Department is responsible for all of the legal affairs of the City of New York. The Department represents the City, the Mayor, other elected officials and the City's agencies in all affirmative and defensive civil litigation.

## Doing Business with Law

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/law/html/opportunities/opportunities.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$0	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$778,210	20.02%	\$22,088,709
Standard Services	\$96,349	17.44%	\$7,028	5.09%	\$15,117	5.47%	\$1,391,041	302.19%	\$3,093,636
Goods Under 100K	\$9,067	14.84%	\$215,845	309.12%	\$49,173	112.68%	\$26,148	11.98%	\$572,590
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$105,416</b>		<b>\$222,873</b>		<b>\$64,289</b>		<b>\$2,195,399</b>		<b>\$25,754,935</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>C</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>B</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE NYC TAXI AND LIMOUSINE COMMISSION

## Letter Grade Overview


TLC's procurement is primarily comprised of professional services where it did not spend with any group. The agency's spending with M/WBEs in other industries was also fairly limited, with the exception of Asian American and Hispanic American businesses in goods. TLC spent very little with Black American and Women-owned businesses across the board, which contributed to a D grade overall.

## About TLC

The Taxi and Limousine Commission licenses and regulates all aspects of New York City's medallion (yellow) taxicabs, for-hire vehicles (community-based liveries and black cars), commuter vans, paratransit vehicles (ambulettes) and certain luxury limousines.

## Doing Business with TLC

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/tlc/html/home/home.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$0	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$4,340,325
Standard Services	\$26,950	7.71%	\$2,965	3.39%	\$6,105	3.49%	\$4,975	1.71%	\$2,871,138
Goods Under 100K	\$470	0.59%	\$82,403	90.08%	\$131,953	230.80%	\$58,508	20.47%	\$870,087
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$27,420</b>		<b>\$85,368</b>		<b>\$138,058</b>		<b>\$63,483</b>		<b>\$8,081,550</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.

% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.



FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS

## Letter Grade Overview


OATH had relatively poor performance with M/WBE procurement in two of the three industries where it spends: professional and standard services. While the agency's spending in goods was significant with all groups, it was not enough to pull its grade above a D.

## About OATH

The Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings (OATH) is an independent, central court that consists of four tribunals: the OATH Tribunal, the Environmental Control Board (ECB), the OATH Taxi & Limousine Tribunal and the OATH Health Tribunal.

## Doing Business with OATH

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/oath/html/home/home.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	0.00%	\$137,969	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$20,397	12.62%	\$792,454
Standard Services	\$13,390	10.38%	\$740	2.30%	\$0	0.00%	\$1,788	1.66%	\$1,058,756
Goods Under 100K	\$56,358	207.99%	\$32,161	103.85%	\$11,862	61.29%	\$68,548	70.83%	\$218,168
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$69,748</b>		<b>\$170,870</b>		<b>\$11,862</b>		<b>\$90,733</b>		<b>\$2,069,378</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>D</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

## Letter Grade Overview


With the exception of goods procurement, OEM spent very little with any M/WBE group in any industry. Within goods, which accounts for nearly a quarter of its procurement, the agency did relatively well with Asian American and Hispanic American businesses. However, its lack of procurement with M/WBEs in standard and professional services as well as limited spending with Black American businesses across all industries resulted in a D grade.

## About OEM

The Office of Emergency Management (OEM) coordinates and supports multi-agency responses to emergency conditions and other potential incidents that affect public health and safety in the City, including severe weather, natural hazards and disasters, power outages, transportation incidents, labor disruptions, aviation disasters and acts of terrorism.

## Doing Business with OEM

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/oem/html/about/rfp.shtml>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Professional Services	\$17,259	3.70%	\$104,855	No Goal	\$0	0.00%	\$9,249	1.40%	\$3,758,400
Standard Services	\$0	0.00%	\$1,589	3.59%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$1,471,762
Goods Under 100K	\$605	0.55%	\$112,859	89.31%	\$93,067	117.83%	\$82,410	20.87%	\$1,290,673
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$17,864</b>		<b>\$219,303</b>		<b>\$93,067</b>		<b>\$91,659</b>		<b>\$6,520,835</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>C</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.

% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.



# M/WBE LETTER GRADE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER

FISCAL YEAR 2014

## Letter Grade Overview


Over 90 percent of the Comptroller's Office procurement is in professional services, where spending occurred with all M/WBE groups. However, the Comptroller's Office spent very little with any minority group in standard services or goods and barely spent with Black American businesses in any industry. This brought the Office's overall grade to a C.

## About OCC

The Comptroller is the City of New York's Chief Financial Officer, responsible for providing an independent voice to safeguard the fiscal health of the City, rooting out waste, fraud and abuse in City government and ensuring the effective performance of City agencies to achieve their goals of serving the needs of all New Yorkers.

## Doing Business with OCC

<http://comptroller.nyc.gov/forms-n-rfps/rfps-n-solicitations/>



## Agency Fiscal Year 2014 Spending within Local Law 1\*

	Black American		Asian American		Hispanic American		Women		Non M/WBE
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Construction	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
Professional Services	\$6,200	0.29%	\$283,721	No Goal	\$730,323	51.56%	\$1,301,190	43.23%	\$15,384,909
Standard Services	\$8,530	15.95%	\$3,365	25.16%	\$1,092	4.08%	\$18,574	41.68%	\$414,102
Goods Under 100K	\$3,973	9.33%	\$20,961	43.07%	\$6,438	21.16%	\$7,087	4.66%	\$569,929
Total LL1 Spending	<b>\$18,703</b>		<b>\$308,047</b>		<b>\$737,853</b>		<b>\$1,326,852</b>		<b>\$16,368,940</b>
Weighted Grade	<b>F</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>C</b>		<b>C</b>		<b>N/A</b>

\$ = the dollar amount spent in the Local Law 1 eligible category.  
% = the percentage of the Local Law 1 target that was achieved.

\* Letter grades are calculated using a weighted average of agency spending across population groups and sectors. All dollars and percents are based on Local Law 1 and exclude categories described in Appendix B: Methodology. For a complete worksheet detailing how this agency grade was calculated, see Appendix C: Worksheets.



## APPENDIX B: DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Comptroller Stringer is committed to boosting M/WBE procurement in City agencies. A core part of that effort is improving transparency surrounding M/WBE spending and accountability for City agencies.

This report focuses on 31 mayoral agencies that account for the vast majority of M/WBE spending. In addition, we have graded the Comptroller’s Office and outlined a series of steps to improve our internal procurement process.

Two agencies that are required to submit utilization plans under Local Law 1 (LL 1) and have significant spending, the Police Department (NYPD) and the Department of Investigation (DOI), are not given grades due to a prior agreement not to publically display vendor data for security reasons. Therefore their spending cannot be attributed to any given industry group subject to LL 1.

In addition, results for Emerging Business Enterprises or “EBEs”—companies owned by individuals who have experienced economic and social disadvantage—are not included in the grading because the program has only certified three EBEs since its inception in 2007.<sup>29</sup> As a result, almost no spending goes to EBEs, leaving the program in need of considerable reform.

As described in the Methodology section below, our grades are the result of a six-step process that compares agency spending with M/WBE certified vendors to total agency procurement spending in four industry categories established by Local Law 1: Construction, Professional Services, Standard Services, and Goods (contracts less than \$100,000). The ratio of M/WBE spending to total spending is then compared to the specific citywide participation goals laid out in LL 1<sup>30</sup> to determine a final grade based on performance.

### ***DATA***

#### **Availability:**

The Fiscal Year 2014 spending transactions used in this report were downloaded from Checkbook NYC. The analysis calculates spending by the agency listed as the contracting agency – the agency that registered a given contract and is directly responsible for not only setting contract-specific participation goals, but monitoring the contractor’s progress in meeting those goals.

**Labeling:**

Data is labeled in FMS to correspond to Local Law 1 terminology as follows:

**Included**

#	Field Name		Value
1	Minority Group	=	Black American or
			Asian American or
			Hispanic American or
			Women or
			Non-M/WBE
2	Industry	=	Construction or
			Professional Services or
			Standard Services
3	Industry	= and <	Goods
	Contract Classification		\$100,000

**Excluded**

#	Field Name		Value
1	Minority Group	=	Individual & Others
2	Industry	=	Human Services or
			Unknown Industry Information
3	Industry	= and >	Goods
	Contract Classification		\$100,000
4	Expense Type	=	Costs Associated with Financing or
			Land Acquisition – Condemnation or
			Interest on Land Acquisition or
			Payments to Counterparties or
			Small Bills-Condemnation Awards

“Unknown contracts” are generally contracts for which the industry classification cannot be determined.

**Responsibility for Completeness:**

The Checkbook NYC data used in this report originated from the City’s Financial Management System (FMS). In a significant percentage of spending, no award category was available in FMS, making it difficult to correctly identify the industry in which the spending took place.

To correct for this missing data, the Comptroller’s Office examined data from the expense category field in FMS and matched entries with industry data where possible. Using expense category data is less reliable than contract type and award category data, but including it provides a more accurate overall picture of agency spending even with the inclusion of data classified by expense category, a percentage of spending could not be classified using this method and was therefore excluded from the calculations.

The Comptroller’s Office urges agencies to improve their reporting of contract type and award category codes so that the City can more accurately determine the impact of LL 1 on M/WBE spending. In coming years, this grade report will reflect progress (or the lack thereof) made by agencies regarding such reporting.

**METHODOLOGY**

The following methodology was used to calculate each agency’s grade. Each agency’s individual grade calculation can be found in Appendix C.

**Step 1:**

To calculate the FY 2014 M/WBE eligible spending per industry, or the denominator, the transactions for Construction, Professional Services, Standard Services, and Goods (less than \$100,000) were added and totaled. Transactions labeled Individuals & Others, Human Services, Unknown and the five expense categories listed above were not included.



**Step 2:**

Our analysis includes a weighted-average proportional to the spending in a given industry. For example, if 75% of an agency’s M/WBE eligible disbursements are Professional Services, 15% Standard Services, 0% Construction, and 10% Goods (less than \$100,000), then that agency’s final grade is most influenced by the Professional Services spending, where the agency spends the greatest amount.

For each industry—Construction, Professional Services, Standard Services, & Goods (less than \$100,000)—we divided the spending by Step 1 to determine the percentage of total eligible spending in a given industry category.

**Step 3:**

To calculate the FY 2014 LL 1 spending with M/WBE vendors, or the numerator, the transactions for each industry—Construction, Professional Services, Standard Services, & Goods (less than \$100,000)—were added and totaled for Black American, Asian American, Hispanic American, and Women owned businesses, respectively.

**Step 4:**

The FY 2014 LL 1 M/WBE spending as a percent of the eligible spending was calculated by dividing M/WBE spending (Step 3) by total eligible spending (Step 1), per Industry, and by M/WBE category.

**Step 5:**

To determine M/WBE spending as a percentage of relevant LL 1 participation goals, we divided Step 4 by LL 1 participation goals. For example, if an agency spent 4% of its FY 14 construction funds with a certain M/WBE category when the LL 1 goal is 8%, then that agency only reached 50% of the target. Note that Asian American Professional Services is not calculated since LL 1 has no goal for that category.

**Step 6:**

Each M/WBE category was then assigned a score based on its weighted-average across the four industries as illustrated in the following chart.

<b>If average is:</b>	<b>Then assign score</b>
80% - 100+%	5
60% - 79%	4
40% - 59%	3
20% - 39%	2
0% - 19%	1

Next, the average of the four scores was assigned a final grade, as illustrated in the following chart.

<b>If average is:</b>	<b>Then assign grade</b>
4.25 - 5.00	<b>A</b>
3.25 - 4.00	<b>B</b>
2.25 - 3.00	<b>C</b>
1.25 - 2.00	<b>D</b>
0.00 - 1.00	<b>F</b>



## **Grading Scale Rationale:**

The goal of this report is to drive behavioral change in agency procurement practices. With this in mind, assigning letter grades allows agencies to easily see where their efforts to do business with M/WBEs have succeeded or failed – creating a simple metric to help bring positive changes to procurement practices.

The model employed here is designed to reduce the boost agencies would receive from doing exceptionally well in one category if they are performing poorly in others, and instead reflects the principle that agencies must focus on meeting participation goals across all M/WBE categories, in all industries that make up their procurement.

## APPENDIX C: WORKSHEETS

CITYWIDE GRADE.....	48
ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES.....	49
BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION.....	50
CIVILIAN COMPLAINT REVIEW BOARD.....	51
COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS.....	52
DEPARTMENT FOR THE AGING.....	53
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDINGS.....	54
DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING.....	55
DEPARTMENT OF CITYWIDE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.....	56
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS.....	57
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION.....	58
DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS.....	59
DEPARTMENT OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION.....	60
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.....	61
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE.....	62
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE.....	63
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESS SERVICES.....	64
DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS.....	65
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION.....	66
DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION.....	67
DEPARTMENT OF SANITATION.....	68
DEPARTMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS SERVICES.....	69
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.....	70
DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.....	71
FIRE DEPARTMENT.....	72
HOUSING PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT.....	73
HUMAN RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION.....	74
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION.....	75
LAW DEPARTMENT.....	76
NYC TAXI AND LIMOUSINE COMMISSION.....	77
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS.....	78
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT.....	79
OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK CITY COMPTROLLER.....	80



# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET New York Citywide


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	A
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	B
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	C
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	D
< 20	1	< 1.25	F



## Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$5,732,193,766	\$2,520,369,865	\$1,426,512,873	\$1,313,422,354	\$471,888,674

## Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	43.97%	24.89%	22.91%	8.23%
AA		No Goal		

## Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$5,000,584	\$3,568,014	\$4,531,953	\$3,346,351
Asian American	\$76,884,877	\$96,087,525	\$18,587,884	\$8,195,660
Hispanic American	\$25,920,799	\$1,785,015	\$4,020,937	\$5,680,792
Women	\$29,524,367	\$13,897,322	\$27,107,869	\$22,288,274

## Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.20%	0.25%	0.35%	0.71%
Asian American	3.05%	6.74%	1.42%	1.74%
Hispanic American	1.03%	0.13%	0.31%	1.20%
Women	1.17%	0.97%	2.06%	4.72%

## Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	2.48%	2.08%	2.88%	10.13%
Asian American	38.13%	No Goal	47.17%	21.71%
Hispanic American	25.71%	1.56%	5.10%	24.08%
Women	6.51%	5.73%	20.64%	18.89%

## Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	3.10%	F	1	<b>1.25</b>
Asian American	39.09%	D	2	
Hispanic American	14.85%	F	1	
Women	10.57%	F	1	





# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET

## ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$27,362,578	\$600,781	\$12,482,423	\$11,143,176	\$3,136,198

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	2.20%	45.62%	40.72%	11.46%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$743,079	\$441,375	\$109,245
Asian American	\$6,800	\$2,008,270	\$832,866	\$115,306
Hispanic American	\$17,252	\$148,036	\$49,470	\$51,172
Women	\$6,000	\$204,185	\$129,562	\$761,584

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	5.95%	3.96%	3.48%
Asian American	1.13%	16.09%	7.47%	3.68%
Hispanic American	2.87%	1.19%	0.44%	1.63%
Women	1.00%	1.64%	1.16%	24.28%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	49.61%	33.01%	49.76%
Asian American	14.15%	No Goal	249.14%	45.96%
Hispanic American	71.79%	14.83%	7.40%	32.63%
Women	5.55%	9.62%	11.63%	97.13%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score <b>2.75</b>
Black American	41.78%	C	3	
Asian American	196.83%	A	5	
Hispanic American	15.09%	F	1	
Women	20.38%	D	2	



# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET

## BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$1,761,706	\$0	\$1,508,261	\$90,877	\$162,568

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	0.00%	85.61%	5.16%	9.23%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Asian American	\$0	\$1,243,318	\$0	\$11,168
Hispanic American	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Women	\$0	\$425	\$0	\$1,433

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Asian American	0.00%	82.43%	0.00%	6.87%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Women	0.00%	0.03%	0.00%	0.88%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Asian American	0.00%	No Goal	0.00%	85.87%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Women	0.00%	0.17%	0.00%	3.53%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	0.00%	F	1	<b>1.5</b>
Asian American	55.08%	C	3	
Hispanic American	0.00%	F	1	
Women	0.47%	F	1	





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET


## CIVILIAN COMPLAINT REVIEW BOARD

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$413,826	\$4,945	\$47,444	\$131,243	\$230,195

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	1.19%	11.46%	31.71%	55.63%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$0	\$482	\$7,530
Asian American	\$0	\$0	\$550	\$14,127
Hispanic American	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Women	\$0	\$7,730	\$61,208	\$27,799

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.37%	3.27%
Asian American	0.00%	0.00%	0.42%	6.14%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Women	0.00%	16.29%	46.64%	12.08%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	3.06%	46.73%
Asian American	0.00%	No Goal	13.96%	76.71%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Women	0.00%	95.84%	466.37%	48.31%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	26.96%	D	2	<b>2.75</b>
Asian American	53.20%	C	3	
Hispanic American	0.00%	F	1	
Women	185.77%	A	5	



# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



## Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$191,530	\$0	\$27,797	\$87,147	\$76,586

## Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	0.00%	14.51%	45.50%	39.99%
AA		No Goal		

## Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$0	\$19,933	\$0
Asian American	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Hispanic American	\$0	\$0	\$5,100	\$99
Women	\$0	\$0	\$198	\$102

## Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	22.87%	0.00%
Asian American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	5.85%	0.13%
Women	0.00%	0.00%	0.23%	0.13%

## Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	190.61%	0.00%
Asian American	0.00%	No Goal	0.00%	0.00%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	97.53%	2.59%
Women	0.00%	0.00%	2.28%	0.53%

## Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	86.73%	A	5	<b>2.5</b>
Asian American	0.00%	F	1	
Hispanic American	45.41%	C	3	
Women	1.25%	F	1	





# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET

## DEPARTMENT FOR THE AGING


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$2,166,616	\$114,183	\$1,401,913	\$357,330	\$293,191

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	5.27%	64.71%	16.49%	13.53%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$30,640	\$51,520	\$0
Asian American	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Hispanic American	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,521
Women	\$0	\$52,680	\$42,119	\$1,068

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	2.19%	14.42%	0.00%
Asian American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.52%
Women	0.00%	3.76%	11.79%	0.36%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	18.21%	120.15%	0.00%
Asian American	0.00%	No Goal	0.00%	0.00%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.38%
Women	0.00%	22.10%	117.87%	1.46%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	31.60%	D	2	<b>1.5</b>
Asian American	0.00%	F	1	
Hispanic American	1.40%	F	1	
Women	33.94%	D	2	





# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET

## DEPARTMENT OF BUILDINGS


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$15,713,366	\$17,105	\$7,503,618	\$7,191,938	\$1,000,706

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	0.11%	47.75%	45.77%	6.37%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,102
Asian American	\$17,105	\$1,715,769	\$9,630	\$111,785
Hispanic American	\$0	\$0	\$1,321	\$31,163
Women	\$0	\$197,113	\$150,156	\$203,026

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.41%
Asian American	100.00%	22.87%	0.13%	11.17%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%	3.11%
Women	0.00%	2.63%	2.09%	20.29%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.86%
Asian American	1250.00%	No Goal	4.46%	139.63%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.31%	62.28%
Women	0.00%	15.45%	20.88%	81.15%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	0.37%	F	1	<b>1.5</b>
Asian American	23.54%	D	2	
Hispanic American	4.11%	F	1	
Women	22.10%	D	2	





# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET

## DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$773,664	\$0	\$81,544	\$60,099	\$632,022

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	0.00%	10.54%	7.77%	81.69%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Asian American	\$0	\$2,378	\$0	\$38,482
Hispanic American	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,533
Women	\$0	\$56,590	\$0	\$37,007

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Asian American	0.00%	2.92%	0.00%	6.09%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.40%
Women	0.00%	69.40%	0.00%	5.86%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Asian American	0.00%	No Goal	0.00%	76.11%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.02%
Women	0.00%	408.23%	0.00%	23.42%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	0.00%	F	1	<b>2.5</b>
Asian American	69.50%	B	4	
Hispanic American	6.55%	F	1	
Women	62.16%	B	4	



# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET

## DEPARTMENT OF CITYWIDE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$562,194,482	\$90,580,397	\$12,663,669	\$113,494,552	\$345,455,863

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	16.11%	2.25%	20.19%	61.45%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$2,379,451	\$76,664	\$755,565	\$233,101
Asian American	\$16,178,101	\$98,602	\$406,270	\$2,631,111
Hispanic American	\$1,038,754	\$0	\$1,180,796	\$581,356
Women	\$1,765,789	\$1,190,363	\$1,213,919	\$5,246,490

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	2.63%	0.61%	0.67%	0.07%
Asian American	17.86%	0.78%	0.36%	0.76%
Hispanic American	1.15%	0.00%	1.04%	0.17%
Women	1.95%	9.40%	1.07%	1.52%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	32.84%	5.05%	5.55%	0.96%
Asian American	223.26%	No Goal	11.93%	9.52%
Hispanic American	28.67%	0.00%	17.34%	3.37%
Women	10.83%	55.29%	10.70%	6.07%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	7.12%	F	1	<b>1.5</b>
Asian American	45.25%	C	3	
Hispanic American	10.19%	F	1	
Women	8.88%	F	1	





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET


## DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$20,487,419	\$36,671	\$18,407,898	\$1,061,887	\$980,964

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	0.18%	89.85%	5.18%	4.79%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$0	\$51,195	\$0
Asian American	\$0	\$1,755,128	\$0	\$42,336
Hispanic American	\$6,776	\$0	\$12,421	\$55,991
Women	\$0	\$0	\$106,655	\$147,586

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	4.82%	0.00%
Asian American	0.00%	9.53%	0.00%	4.32%
Hispanic American	18.48%	0.00%	1.17%	5.71%
Women	0.00%	0.00%	10.04%	15.05%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	40.18%	0.00%
Asian American	0.00%	No Goal	0.00%	53.95%
Hispanic American	461.95%	0.00%	19.50%	114.15%
Women	0.00%	0.00%	100.44%	60.18%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	2.08%	F	1	<b>1.25</b>
Asian American	25.45%	D	2	
Hispanic American	7.30%	F	1	
Women	8.09%	F	1	



# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET

## DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$114,438,617	\$67,976,791	\$7,528,125	\$14,136,262	\$24,797,439

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	59.40%	6.58%	12.35%	21.67%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$0	\$50,600	\$106,572
Asian American	\$90,325	\$961,865	\$190	\$569,921
Hispanic American	\$4,259,765	\$0	\$325,881	\$572,996
Women	\$0	\$124,778	\$1,206,838	\$1,080,639

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.36%	0.43%
Asian American	0.13%	12.78%	0.00%	2.30%
Hispanic American	6.27%	0.00%	2.31%	2.31%
Women	0.00%	1.66%	8.54%	4.36%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	2.98%	6.14%
Asian American	1.66%	No Goal	0.04%	28.73%
Hispanic American	156.66%	0.00%	38.42%	46.21%
Women	0.00%	9.75%	85.37%	17.43%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	1.70%	F	1	<b>2</b>
Asian American	7.73%	F	1	
Hispanic American	107.82%	A	5	
Women	14.96%	F	1	





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET


## DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	A
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	B
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	C
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	D
< 20	1	< 1.25	F



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$7,217,421	\$2,629,627	\$1,214,806	\$2,078,503	\$1,294,485

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	36.43%	16.83%	28.80%	17.94%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$236,702
Asian American	\$474,922	\$28,000	\$0	\$147,304
Hispanic American	\$128,527	\$136,036	\$4,806	\$59,715
Women	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$154,154

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	18.29%
Asian American	18.06%	2.30%	0.00%	11.38%
Hispanic American	4.89%	11.20%	0.23%	4.61%
Women	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.91%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	261.22%
Asian American	225.76%	No Goal	0.00%	142.24%
Hispanic American	122.19%	139.98%	3.85%	92.26%
Women	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	47.63%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	46.85%	C	3	<b>3.5</b>
Asian American	129.57%	A	5	
Hispanic American	85.74%	A	5	
Women	8.54%	F	1	



FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET


## DEPARTMENT OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$954,486,745	\$814,926,937	\$119,291,451	\$18,678,445	\$1,589,911

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	85.38%	12.50%	1.96%	0.17%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$12,680	\$1,234,640	\$15,693	\$3,986
Asian American	\$35,331,966	\$18,730,872	\$5,109,438	\$39,398
Hispanic American	\$12,552,457	\$306,435	\$427,191	\$48,445
Women	\$15,025,616	\$4,463,849	\$15,744	\$417,718

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	1.04%	0.08%	0.25%
Asian American	4.34%	15.70%	27.35%	2.48%
Hispanic American	1.54%	0.26%	2.29%	3.05%
Women	1.84%	3.74%	0.08%	26.27%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.02%	8.63%	0.70%	3.58%
Asian American	54.20%	No Goal	911.82%	30.98%
Hispanic American	38.51%	3.21%	38.12%	60.94%
Women	10.24%	22.01%	0.84%	105.09%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	1.11%	F	1	<b>2</b>
Asian American	73.33%	B	4	
Hispanic American	34.13%	D	2	
Women	11.69%	F	1	





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET


## DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	A
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	B
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	C
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	D
< 20	1	< 1.25	F



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$1,350,961,066	\$734,971,303	\$404,497,786	\$194,122,795	\$17,369,183

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	54.40%	29.94%	14.37%	1.29%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$2,510,962	\$47,670	\$458,148	\$308,478
Asian American	\$11,715,794	\$12,398,176	\$571,582	\$524,824
Hispanic American	\$78,728	\$5,000	\$239,908	\$399,127
Women	\$2,633,120	\$80,812	\$587,142	\$3,754,385

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.34%	0.01%	0.24%	1.78%
Asian American	1.59%	3.07%	0.29%	3.02%
Hispanic American	0.01%	0.00%	0.12%	2.30%
Women	0.36%	0.02%	0.30%	21.62%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	4.27%	0.10%	1.97%	25.37%
Asian American	19.93%	No Goal	9.81%	37.77%
Hispanic American	0.27%	0.02%	2.06%	45.96%
Women	1.99%	0.12%	3.03%	86.46%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	2.96%	F	1	<b>1</b>
Asian American	18.18%	F	1	
Hispanic American	1.04%	F	1	
Women	2.66%	F	1	





# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET

## DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$42,163,323	\$0	\$14,213,116	\$26,527,074	\$1,423,134

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	0.00%	33.71%	62.92%	3.38%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$74,003	\$30,000	\$13,648
Asian American	\$0	\$885,866	\$139,764	\$3,284
Hispanic American	\$0	\$0	\$36,708	\$292,797
Women	\$0	\$43,920	\$1,365	\$111,247

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.52%	0.11%	0.96%
Asian American	0.00%	6.23%	0.53%	0.23%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.14%	20.57%
Women	0.00%	0.31%	0.01%	7.82%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	4.34%	0.94%	13.70%
Asian American	0.00%	No Goal	17.56%	2.88%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	2.31%	411.48%
Women	0.00%	1.82%	0.05%	31.27%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	2.52%	F	1	<b>1</b>
Asian American	16.82%	F	1	
Hispanic American	15.34%	F	1	
Women	1.70%	F	1	





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET


## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$47,239,743	\$906,546	\$27,028,292	\$8,006,952	\$11,297,954

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	1.92%	57.22%	16.95%	23.92%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$16,500	\$0	\$245,667
Asian American	\$58,915	\$6,195,336	\$163,327	\$867,569
Hispanic American	\$0	\$691,769	\$0	\$388,940
Women	\$0	\$209,900	\$4,887	\$954,904

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.06%	0.00%	2.17%
Asian American	6.50%	22.92%	2.04%	7.68%
Hispanic American	0.00%	2.56%	0.00%	3.44%
Women	0.00%	0.78%	0.06%	8.45%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.51%	0.00%	31.06%
Asian American	81.24%	No Goal	67.99%	95.99%
Hispanic American	0.00%	31.99%	0.00%	68.85%
Women	0.00%	4.57%	0.61%	33.81%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	7.72%	F	1	<b>2.25</b>
Asian American	84.24%	A	5	
Hispanic American	34.77%	D	2	
Women	10.80%	F	1	



# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESS SERVICES


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$65,658,188	\$5,476,963	\$9,355,673	\$49,743,074	\$1,082,478

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	8.34%	14.25%	75.76%	1.65%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$0	\$56,419	\$40,202
Asian American	\$2,684,640	\$46,717	\$28,290	\$66,751
Hispanic American	\$0	\$525	\$0	\$32,508
Women	\$0	\$0	\$1,524,418	\$187,457

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.11%	3.71%
Asian American	49.02%	0.50%	0.06%	6.17%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%	3.00%
Women	0.00%	0.00%	3.06%	17.32%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.95%	53.06%
Asian American	612.71%	No Goal	1.90%	77.08%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.07%	0.00%	60.06%
Women	0.00%	0.00%	30.65%	69.27%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	1.59%	F	1	<b>2</b>
Asian American	62.76%	B	4	
Hispanic American	1.00%	F	1	
Women	24.36%	D	2	





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET


## DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	A
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	B
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	C
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	D
< 20	1	< 1.25	F



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$704,293,371	\$159,982,686	\$474,320,614	\$66,695,628	\$3,294,442

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	22.72%	67.35%	9.47%	0.47%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$21,250	\$5,006	\$15,067
Asian American	\$0	\$28,746,793	\$1,534	\$334,335
Hispanic American	\$0	\$22,800	\$1,338,568	\$383,568
Women	\$0	\$693,955	\$11,436,161	\$679,892

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%	0.46%
Asian American	0.00%	6.06%	0.00%	10.15%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	2.01%	11.64%
Women	0.00%	0.15%	17.15%	20.64%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.04%	0.06%	6.53%
Asian American	0.00%	No Goal	0.08%	126.86%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.06%	33.45%	232.86%
Women	0.00%	0.86%	171.47%	82.55%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	0.06%	F	1	<b>1</b>
Asian American	1.84%	F	1	
Hispanic American	4.30%	F	1	
Women	17.20%	F	1	



FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET


## DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$283,718,651	\$210,601,401	\$22,587,361	\$41,267,533	\$9,262,357

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	74.23%	7.96%	14.55%	3.26%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$6,090	\$0	\$108,855	\$234,294
Asian American	\$5,951,595	\$3,519,621	\$345,089	\$483,937
Hispanic American	\$2,795,852	\$29,362	\$2,089	\$476,805
Women	\$5,155,471	\$803,769	\$4,262,952	\$1,488,580

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.26%	2.53%
Asian American	2.83%	15.58%	0.84%	5.22%
Hispanic American	1.33%	0.13%	0.01%	5.15%
Women	2.45%	3.56%	10.33%	16.07%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.04%	0.00%	2.20%	36.14%
Asian American	35.33%	No Goal	27.87%	65.31%
Hispanic American	33.19%	1.63%	0.09%	102.96%
Women	13.60%	20.93%	103.30%	64.29%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	1.53%	F	1	<b>1.75</b>
Asian American	35.21%	D	2	
Hispanic American	28.14%	D	2	
Women	28.89%	D	2	





# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET

## DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	A
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	B
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	C
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	D
< 20	1	< 1.25	F



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$1,193,196	\$14,023	\$236,572	\$160,809	\$781,792

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	1.18%	19.83%	13.48%	65.52%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$0	\$14,416	\$29,148
Asian American	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$16,800
Hispanic American	\$0	\$0	\$33,760	\$0
Women	\$0	\$1,683	\$898	\$197,262

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	8.96%	3.73%
Asian American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.15%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	20.99%	0.00%
Women	0.00%	0.71%	0.56%	25.23%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	74.70%	53.26%
Asian American	0.00%	No Goal	0.00%	26.86%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	349.89%	0.00%
Women	0.00%	4.19%	5.58%	100.93%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	44.97%	C	3	<b>3</b>
Asian American	21.95%	D	2	
Hispanic American	47.16%	C	3	
Women	67.71%	B	4	



# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET DEPARTMENT OF SANITATION


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	A
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	B
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	C
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	D
< 20	1	< 1.25	F



## Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$368,188,615	\$35,032,515	\$118,940,773	\$207,191,719	\$7,023,609

## Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	9.51%	32.30%	56.27%	1.91%
AA		No Goal		

## Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$0	\$156,423	\$121,003
Asian American	\$317,446	\$2,810,787	\$24,318	\$635,212
Hispanic American	\$0	\$18,250	\$4,455	\$133,730
Women	\$166,622	\$199,836	\$405	\$1,672,342

## Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.08%	1.72%
Asian American	0.91%	2.36%	0.01%	9.04%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.02%	0.00%	1.90%
Women	0.48%	0.17%	0.00%	23.81%

## Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.63%	24.61%
Asian American	11.33%	No Goal	0.39%	113.05%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.19%	0.04%	38.08%
Women	2.64%	0.99%	0.00%	95.24%

## Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	0.82%	F	1	<b>1</b>
Asian American	5.10%	F	1	
Hispanic American	0.81%	F	1	
Women	2.39%	F	1	





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET


## DEPARTMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS SERVICES

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$30,911,170	\$17,780,631	\$2,776,205	\$10,022,607	\$331,727

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	57.52%	8.98%	32.42%	1.07%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$118,350	\$37,543	\$2,010
Asian American	\$1,440	\$454,520	\$20,000	\$19,270
Hispanic American	\$0	\$0	\$77,606	\$14,420
Women	\$0	\$440,702	\$1,795,757	\$6,058

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	4.26%	0.37%	0.61%
Asian American	0.01%	16.37%	0.20%	5.81%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.77%	4.35%
Women	0.00%	15.87%	17.92%	1.83%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	35.53%	3.12%	8.66%
Asian American	0.10%	No Goal	6.65%	72.61%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	12.91%	86.94%
Women	0.00%	93.38%	179.17%	7.30%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	4.30%	F	1	<b>1.75</b>
Asian American	3.29%	F	1	
Hispanic American	5.12%	F	1	
Women	66.56%	B	4	





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET


## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$560,874,336	\$328,325,121	\$64,020,653	\$160,383,458	\$8,145,103

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	58.54%	11.41%	28.60%	1.45%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$5,119	\$0	\$1,011	\$536,245
Asian American	\$2,944,521	\$6,119,304	\$1,845,827	\$288,635
Hispanic American	\$1,197,664	\$380,131	\$40,613	\$240,511
Women	\$0	\$70,878	\$246,793	\$2,408,421

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.58%
Asian American	0.90%	9.56%	1.15%	3.54%
Hispanic American	0.36%	0.59%	0.03%	2.95%
Women	0.00%	0.11%	0.15%	29.57%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.02%	0.00%	0.01%	94.05%
Asian American	11.21%	No Goal	38.36%	44.30%
Hispanic American	9.12%	7.42%	0.42%	59.06%
Women	0.00%	0.65%	1.54%	118.28%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	1.38%	F	1	<b>1.25</b>
Asian American	20.52%	D	2	
Hispanic American	7.16%	F	1	
Women	2.23%	F	1	





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET


## DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$2,469,225	\$0	\$1,536,253	\$392,822	\$540,150

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	0.00%	62.22%	15.91%	21.88%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$536,259	\$3,364	\$34,257
Asian American	\$0	\$554,320	\$4,914	\$9,618
Hispanic American	\$0	\$0	\$2,235	\$57,090
Women	\$0	\$1,000	\$379	\$36,563

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	34.91%	0.86%	6.34%
Asian American	0.00%	36.08%	1.25%	1.78%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.57%	10.57%
Women	0.00%	0.07%	0.10%	6.77%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	290.89%	7.14%	90.60%
Asian American	0.00%	No Goal	41.69%	22.26%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	9.48%	211.39%
Women	0.00%	0.38%	0.97%	27.08%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	201.94%	A	5	<b>2.75</b>
Asian American	30.44%	D	2	
Hispanic American	47.75%	C	3	
Women	6.32%	F	1	



# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET FIRE DEPARTMENT


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



## Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$123,290,574	\$28,237,949	\$31,033,673	\$47,376,639	\$16,642,313

## Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	22.90%	25.17%	38.43%	13.50%
AA		No Goal		

## Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$0	\$2,225	\$296,650
Asian American	\$353	\$466,027	\$6,816,362	\$340,510
Hispanic American	\$0	\$32,411	\$23	\$1,007,470
Women	\$19,780	\$155,272	\$656,060	\$1,821,108

## Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.78%
Asian American	0.00%	1.50%	14.39%	2.05%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.10%	0.00%	6.05%
Women	0.07%	0.50%	1.38%	10.94%

## Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%	25.46%
Asian American	0.02%	No Goal	479.59%	25.58%
Hispanic American	0.00%	1.31%	0.00%	121.07%
Women	0.39%	2.94%	13.85%	43.77%

## Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	3.45%	F	1	<b>2</b>
Asian American	250.90%	A	5	
Hispanic American	16.67%	F	1	
Women	12.06%	F	1	





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET


## HOUSING PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$304,365,195	\$21,814,695	\$7,289,241	\$273,351,678	\$1,909,581

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	7.17%	2.39%	89.81%	0.63%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$86,283	\$24,941	\$1,886,633	\$528,094
Asian American	\$1,071,705	\$3,228,917	\$2,000,568	\$140,217
Hispanic American	\$3,845,024	\$3,375	\$128,184	\$278,643
Women	\$4,751,970	\$25,550	\$523,474	\$262,138

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.40%	0.34%	0.69%	27.65%
Asian American	4.91%	44.30%	0.73%	7.34%
Hispanic American	17.63%	0.05%	0.05%	14.59%
Women	21.78%	0.35%	0.19%	13.73%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	4.94%	2.85%	5.75%	395.07%
Asian American	61.41%	No Goal	24.40%	91.79%
Hispanic American	440.65%	0.58%	0.78%	291.84%
Women	121.02%	2.06%	1.92%	54.91%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	8.07%	F	1	<b>1.5</b>
Asian American	27.55%	D	2	
Hispanic American	34.13%	D	2	
Women	10.79%	F	1	



# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET

## HUMAN RESOURCES

### ADMINISTRATION


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



#### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$96,265,056	\$266,776	\$34,455,089	\$49,581,805	\$11,961,386

#### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	0.28%	35.79%	51.51%	12.43%
AA		No Goal		

#### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$622,264	\$248,860	\$173,851
Asian American	\$0	\$3,874,116	\$255,043	\$300,493
Hispanic American	\$0	\$5,459	\$78,472	\$284,135
Women	\$0	\$4,064,477	\$1,742,478	\$393,303

#### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	1.81%	0.50%	1.45%
Asian American	0.00%	11.24%	0.51%	2.51%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.02%	0.16%	2.38%
Women	0.00%	11.80%	3.51%	3.29%

#### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	15.05%	4.18%	20.76%
Asian American	0.00%	No Goal	17.15%	31.40%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.20%	2.64%	47.51%
Women	0.00%	69.39%	35.14%	13.15%

#### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	10.12%	F	1	<b>1.5</b>
Asian American	19.83%	F	1	
Hispanic American	7.33%	F	1	
Women	44.57%	C	3	





# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET

## LANDMARKS PRESERVATION

### COMMISSION


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	A
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	B
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	C
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	D
< 20	1	< 1.25	F



#### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$159,807	\$71,820	\$14,798	\$22,974	\$50,215

#### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	44.94%	9.26%	14.38%	31.42%
AA		No Goal		

#### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$4,497	\$0	\$0
Asian American	\$39,250	\$0	\$0	\$0
Hispanic American	\$0	\$5,426	\$10,109	\$0
Women	\$0	\$0	\$496	\$393

#### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	30.39%	0.00%	0.00%
Asian American	54.65%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Hispanic American	0.00%	36.67%	44.00%	0.00%
Women	0.00%	0.00%	2.16%	0.78%

#### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	253.24%	0.00%	0.00%
Asian American	683.13%	No Goal	0.00%	0.00%
Hispanic American	0.00%	458.36%	733.39%	0.00%
Women	0.00%	0.00%	21.61%	3.13%

#### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	23.45%	D	2	<b>3.25</b>
Asian American	338.34%	A	5	
Hispanic American	147.88%	A	5	
Women	4.09%	F	1	



# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET

## LAW DEPARTMENT


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	A
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	B
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	C
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	D
< 20	1	< 1.25	F



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$28,342,913	\$0	\$22,866,919	\$4,603,171	\$872,823

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	0.00%	80.68%	16.24%	3.08%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$0	\$96,349	\$9,067
Asian American	\$0	\$0	\$7,028	\$215,845
Hispanic American	\$0	\$0	\$15,117	\$49,173
Women	\$0	\$778,210	\$1,391,041	\$26,148

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	2.09%	1.04%
Asian American	0.00%	0.00%	0.15%	24.73%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.33%	5.63%
Women	0.00%	3.40%	30.22%	3.00%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	17.44%	14.84%
Asian American	0.00%	No Goal	5.09%	309.12%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	5.47%	112.68%
Women	0.00%	20.02%	302.19%	11.98%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	3.29%	F	1	<b>2.25</b>
Asian American	53.55%	C	3	
Hispanic American	4.36%	F	1	
Women	65.60%	B	4	





FISCAL YEAR 2014


# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET NYC TAXI AND LIMOUSINE COMMISSION

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



## Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$8,395,879	\$0	\$4,340,325	\$2,912,133	\$1,143,420

## Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	0.00%	51.70%	34.69%	13.62%
AA		No Goal		

## Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$0	\$26,950	\$470
Asian American	\$0	\$0	\$2,965	\$82,403
Hispanic American	\$0	\$0	\$6,105	\$131,953
Women	\$0	\$0	\$4,975	\$58,508

## Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	0.93%	0.04%
Asian American	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	7.21%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	11.54%
Women	0.00%	0.00%	0.17%	5.12%

## Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	7.71%	0.59%
Asian American	0.00%	No Goal	3.39%	90.08%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	3.49%	230.80%
Women	0.00%	0.00%	1.71%	20.47%

## Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	2.75%	F	1	<b>1.5</b>
Asian American	27.83%	D	2	
Hispanic American	32.64%	D	2	
Women	3.38%	F	1	





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET


## OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$2,412,592	\$0	\$950,820	\$1,074,674	\$387,098

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	0.00%	39.41%	44.54%	16.04%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$0	\$13,390	\$56,358
Asian American	\$0	\$137,969	\$740	\$32,161
Hispanic American	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11,862
Women	\$0	\$20,397	\$1,788	\$68,548

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	1.25%	14.56%
Asian American	0.00%	14.51%	0.07%	8.31%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.06%
Women	0.00%	2.15%	0.17%	17.71%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.00%	10.38%	207.99%
Asian American	0.00%	No Goal	2.30%	103.85%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	61.29%
Women	0.00%	12.62%	1.66%	70.83%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	38.00%	D	2	<b>1.5</b>
Asian American	29.19%	D	2	
Hispanic American	9.83%	F	1	
Women	17.08%	F	1	





FISCAL YEAR 2014

# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET


## OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$6,969,696	\$0	\$3,889,763	\$1,473,350	\$1,606,583

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	0.00%	55.81%	21.14%	23.05%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$17,259	\$0	\$605
Asian American	\$0	\$104,855	\$1,589	\$112,859
Hispanic American	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$93,067
Women	\$0	\$9,249	\$0	\$82,410

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.44%	0.00%	0.04%
Asian American	0.00%	2.70%	0.11%	7.02%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.79%
Women	0.00%	0.24%	0.00%	5.13%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	3.70%	0.00%	0.54%
Asian American	0.00%	No Goal	3.59%	87.81%
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	115.86%
Women	0.00%	1.40%	0.00%	20.52%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	2.19%	F	1	<b>1.75</b>
Asian American	47.52%	C	3	
Hispanic American	26.71%	D	2	
Women	5.51%	F	1	



# M/WBE LETTER GRADE WORKSHEET

## OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER


FISCAL YEAR 2014

Reference: Local Law 1 Target Spending Percent

Reference: Grading Scale

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American (BA)	8%	12%	12%	7%
Asian American (AA)	8%	No Goal	3%	8%
Hispanic American (HA)	4%	8%	6%	5%
Women (W)	18%	17%	10%	25%
C: Construction PS: Professional Services SS: Standard Services G: Goods				

Weighted %	Score	Avg Score	Grade
≥ 80	5	≥ 4.25	<b>A</b>
≥ 60	4	≥ 3.25	<b>B</b>
≥ 40	3	≥ 2.25	<b>C</b>
≥ 20	2	≥ 1.25	<b>D</b>
< 20	1	< 1.25	<b>F</b>



### Step 1: Total Eligible Spending Per Industry

Total Eligible Spending	C	PS	SS	G
\$18,821,880	\$0	\$17,706,343	\$445,663	\$669,874

### Step 2: Weighted Matrix (Industry Spending/Total Eligible Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
BA, HA, W	0.00%	94.07%	2.37%	3.56%
AA		No Goal		

### Step 3: Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	\$0	\$6,200	\$8,530	\$3,973
Asian American	\$0	\$283,721	\$3,365	\$20,961
Hispanic American	\$0	\$730,323	\$1,092	\$6,438
Women	\$0	\$1,301,190	\$18,574	\$7,087

### Step 4: Actual Spending Percentage (Actual LL1 M/WBE Spending/Industry Spending)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.04%	1.91%	0.59%
Asian American	0.00%	1.60%	0.75%	3.13%
Hispanic American	0.00%	4.12%	0.25%	0.96%
Women	0.00%	7.35%	4.17%	1.06%

### Step 5: LL1 M/WBE Spending as Percentage of Target Achieved (Actual Spending Percentage/LL1 Target)

Category	C	PS	SS	G
Black American	0.00%	0.29%	15.95%	8.47%
Asian American	0.00%	No Goal	25.16%	39.11%
Hispanic American	0.00%	51.56%	4.08%	19.22%
Women	0.00%	43.23%	41.68%	4.23%

### Step 6: Final Score

Category	Weighted %	Grade	Score	Average Score
Black American	0.95%	F	1	<b>2.25</b>
Asian American	33.54%	D	2	
Hispanic American	49.28%	C	3	
Women	41.80%	C	3	



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Comptroller Scott M. Stringer thanks Carra Wallace, Chief Diversity Officer; Wendy Garcia, Deputy Chief Diversity Officer; Andrew L. Kalloch, Deputy Policy Director; Jessica Silver, Director of Strategic Operations; Adrissha Wimberly, Special Assistant; and Tiffany Simon, Intern, for their leadership in researching and writing this report.

Comptroller Stringer also recognizes the important contributions to this report made by: Edward Sokolowski, Director of Information Services Program Unit; Troy Chen, Director of Financial Management Services; Michael Bott, Assistant Comptroller for Technology/CIO; Lisa Flores, Deputy Comptroller for Contracts and Procurement; Christian Stover, Executive Director/Legal Counsel for Contracts and Procurement; David Saltonstall, Assistant Comptroller for Policy; Adam Eckstein, Policy Analyst; Susan Scheer, Special Assistant for Policy; Jimmy Yan, Special Counsel; Kay Diaz, General Counsel; Marvin Peguese, Deputy General Counsel; Shauna-Kay Gooden, Assistant General Counsel; Richard Friedman, Deputy General Counsel/ACCO; Alaina Gilligo, First Deputy Comptroller; Michele Mark Levine, Deputy Comptroller for Accountancy; Tim Mulligan, Deputy Comptroller of Budget; Michael Nitzky, Director of Communications; Eric Sumberg, Deputy Communications Director and Press Secretary; Antonnette Brumlik, Senior Web Administrator; and Archer Hutchinson, Creative Lead and Web Developer.

Comptroller Stringer extends a special thank you to the members of his Advisory Council on Economic Growth through Diversity and Inclusion who provided invaluable guidance and input during the drafting of this report.

## ENDNOTES

1. U.S. Census Bureau. “Statistics for All U.S. Firms by Industry, Gender, Ethnicity, and Race for the U.S., States, Metro Areas, Counties, and Places,” 2007 Survey of Business Owners, SB0700CSA01.
2. Mayor’s Office of Contract Services, “Annual Procurement Indicators: Fiscal Year 2014,” available: <http://www.nyc.gov/html/mocs/downloads/pdf/Fiscal%202014%20Annual%20Indicators%20Report.pdf>.
3. <http://www.mbda.gov/sites/default/files/DisparitiesinCapitalAccessReport.pdf>; A 2010 study from the U.S. Department of Commerce found, “Minority-owned businesses continue to be the engine of employment in emerging and minority communities,” and that their success is essential to “reduce national unemployment levels, and in particular the high rate of unemployment in minority communities.”
4. See New York City Council Resolution 0003-2002, available: <http://legistar.council.nyc.gov/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=437055&GUID=7C38AEBA-1CAA-436B-80E8-30253BBC28FA&Options=&Search=>.
5. <http://www.nytimes.com/1990/10/16/nyregion/dinkins-offers-a-plan-to-help-small-business.html>; <http://www.nytimes.com/1992/02/11/nyregion/dinkins-plan-gives-minority-concerns-more-in-contracts.html>; Dinkins declared that M/WBEs received only 7 percent of the \$2.3 billion in contracts reviewed in the study.
6. <http://www.nytimes.com/1994/01/25/nyregion/giuliani-revamps-minority-program-on-city-contracts.html>.
7. <http://www.villagevoice.com/content/printVersion/464840/>.
8. <http://www.nyc.gov/html/ddc/downloads/pdf/obo/law05129.pdf>.
9. In *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.*, 488 U.S. 469 (1989), the Supreme Court held that a municipal “set-aside” program which give preference to minority business enterprises (MBE) in the awarding of municipal contracts was unconstitutional under the Equal Protection Clause. The Court held that such programs must be reviewed under a “strict scrutiny” standard, which means that the municipality has the burden of showing that the policy is: (a) justified by a compelling state interest; (b) is narrowly tailored; and (c) is the least restrictive means of achieving that goal. See also *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña*, 515 U.S. 200 (1995), (extending the holding of *Croson* to federal affirmative action programs that use racial and ethnic criteria as a basis for decisionmaking).

As a result, most municipal affirmative action programs, including New York City’s M/WBE programs, are predicated on formal disparity studies that establish a framework for non-binding goals. See *Johnson v. Transportation Agency*, 480 U.S. 616, 638 (1987) (upholding an affirmative action plan that “requires women to compete with all other qualified applicants. No persons are automatically excluded from consideration; all are able to have their qualifications weighed against those of other applicants.” (emphasis in original)).

10. NYC Charter § 1304(e)(6)(c); Emerging Business Enterprises are defined as businesses in which (i) at least fifty-one percent of the ownership interest is held by United States citizens or permanent resident aliens and where such persons have demonstrated, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the commissioner, that they are “socially and economically disadvantaged.” A person who is “socially and economically disadvantaged” has “experienced social disadvantage in American society as a result of causes not common to persons who are not socially disadvantaged, and whose ability to compete in the free enterprise system has been impaired due to diminished capital and credit opportunities as compared to others in the same business area who are not socially disadvantaged.” Notably, an individual’s race, national origin, or gender, standing alone, does not qualify the person as “socially disadvantaged.” Rather, the commissioner of SBS

is tasked with considering criteria developed for federal programs established to promote opportunities for businesses owned by persons who are socially and economically disadvantaged. The net worth of a “socially and economically disadvantaged” person must be less than \$1 million.

11. [http://www.nyc.gov/html/mocs/downloads/pdf/Fiscal%202013%20Procurement%20Indicators%20complete%20text%2010%2021\\_for%20web.pdf](http://www.nyc.gov/html/mocs/downloads/pdf/Fiscal%202013%20Procurement%20Indicators%20complete%20text%2010%2021_for%20web.pdf).
12. Annual Procurement Indicators: Fiscal Year 2014.
13. <http://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/011-13/mayor-bloomberg-signs-legislation-help-strengthen-minority-women-owned-business-enterprise>.
14. The new participation goals outlined in LL 1 (and which form the framework for the agency grades issued in this report) are based on the most recent disparity study conducted by MOCS. In addition, note that a legislative error made the WBE goal in professional services 37 percent. The correct figure is 17 percent, as shown. The study used to establish goals under LL 129 was commissioned by the City Council .
15. NYC Administrative Code 6-129(g)(1).
16. Further examination of these agencies M/WBE procurement efforts will take place at a later date.
17. The criteria used to determine which Mayoral agencies subject to LL 1 have been assigned grades can be found in Appendix B: Methodology.
18. DOI and NYPD M/WBE spending totals are either “unclassified” or “unknown”, meaning some spending might be in industries that are not subject to Local Law 1. These numbers should not be used in comparison to graded agencies that have been evaluated only on LL 1 eligible spending.
19. Office of the New York City Comptroller. “Audit Report on the Administration of the Emerging Business Enterprise Program by the Department of Small Business Services,” MD13-077A, June 6, 2013, available: [https://comptroller.nyc.gov/reports/audit/?r=06-06-13\\_MD13-077A](https://comptroller.nyc.gov/reports/audit/?r=06-06-13_MD13-077A); Under §1304 of Chapter 56 of the New York City Charter, a socially disadvantaged individual is defined as a person who has experienced social disadvantage in the United States as a result of causes not common to persons who are not socially disadvantaged. An economically disadvantaged individual is defined as a socially disadvantaged person whose ability to compete in the free enterprise system has been impaired due to diminished capital and credit opportunities as compared to others in the same or similar line of business who are not socially disadvantaged.
20. <http://mtprawvwsbswtp1-1.nyc.gov/Search.aspx>.
21. *Id.*
22. “Annual Procurement Indicators Report: Fiscal Year 2014,” pp. 1, 20.
23. <http://comptroller.nyc.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Supplier-Diversity-Letter.pdf>
24. National Minority Supplier Development Council, “Best Practices in Minority Supplier Development: Guidelines,” 2014.
25. A key component of the Comptroller’s effort is the creation of the Advisory Council on Economic Growth through Diversity and Inclusion.
26. Utilization plans are distinct from Agency Procurement Plans, which are updated annually and published on MOCS’ website. Section 129(g) of the New York Administrative Code requires the SBS, in consultation with the City Chief Procurement Officer, to publish a plan and schedule for each agency detailing the anticipated contracting actions for the upcoming fiscal year that form the basis for the agency utilization

plan. See: [http://www.nyc.gov/html/mocs/html/research/m/wbe\\_plan.shtml](http://www.nyc.gov/html/mocs/html/research/m/wbe_plan.shtml).

27. <http://www.law.louisville.edu/library/collections/brandeis/node/196>.

28. [http://www.bls.gov/web/empsit/cpsee\\_e16.htm](http://www.bls.gov/web/empsit/cpsee_e16.htm); <http://www.bls.gov/lau/ptable14full2013.pdf>.

29. “Audit Report on the Administration of the Emerging Business Enterprise Program by the Department of Small Business Services.”


30. While Local Law 129 targets apply to spending related to contracts entered into prior to FY 2014, our grades apply the new targets laid out in Local Law 1 to all agency spending in FY 2014.











**NEW YORK CITY COMPTROLLER**  
**SCOTT M. STRINGER**

MUNICIPAL BUILDING • 1 CENTRE STREET, 5TH FLOOR • NEW YORK, NY 10007

PHONE (212) 669-3500 FAX (212) 669-8878

[WWW.COMPTROLLER.NYC.GOV](http://WWW.COMPTROLLER.NYC.GOV)

