

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

There are eight Agency Procurement Indicators reported on in the Fiscal 2000 Mayor's Management Report:

- Prompt Payment
- Contract Performance Evaluations and Defaulted Contracts
- Procurements Awarded
- Procurement Processing Cycle Times
- Competitiveness in Procurements
- Performance-Based Contracting
- Retroactive Contracts
- Agency Procurement Actions

Each of these Indicators is more fully described below. The Indicators for Performance-Based Contracting and Retroactive Contracts appear in the Fiscal 2000 Mayor's Management Report for the first time. In addition, the Contract Performance Evaluations Indicator has been expanded to include data on defaulted contracts, and the Competitiveness in Procurements Indicator has been expanded to include the negotiated acquisition procurement method. Data for the eight Indicators, which are presented in the Citywide Indicators section of Volume II of the Fiscal 2000 Mayor's Management Report, include all Mayoral operating agencies.

FISCAL 2000 AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS

Prompt Payment

This section includes Prompt Payment Indicators, which reflect agency timeliness in processing invoice payments to the City's contractors. This information, which is maintained in the City's Financial Management System (FMS), is provided by the Financial Information Services Agency (FISA) and includes all payments from both general and capital funds made during Fiscal 2000 for all Mayoral operating agencies. Agency specific data are provided for the percent of all invoice payments, both in terms of the dollar value and the number of invoices, which were paid "on time" (i.e., generally within 30 calendar days of the required date) and by the "grace period" (i.e., within 45 calendar days of the required date for the period July 1, 1999 through December 31, 1999 and within 37 calendar days for the period January 1, 2000 through June 30, 2000); and the interest paid to contractors. Agency data are totaled to present an overall picture of prompt payment.

As required by the City Charter, the Procurement Policy Board (PPB) Rules (Rules) concerning prompt payment took effect in 1991, requiring all City agencies to include in their contracts a standard clause stating the City's policy to pay invoices in a timely fashion, or to pay interest on the amounts not paid on time. Certain categories of payment, however, are not subject to interest even if not paid on time (e.g., advance payments to not-for-profit human service contractors). The Rules establish the maximum time for payment to a contractor from the point when the contractor has completed performance, the agency has declared that performance was satisfactory and the contractor has submitted an invoice with appropriate supporting documentation. The Rules also specify the length of time allowed to determine that performance is acceptable and to determine that invoices are properly submitted. After these determinations, the City, in most cases, is permitted 30 calendar days to process payments. The Rules allow 60 days for contract changes and 60 days for substantial completion payments or final payments for construction contracts. If disputes arise between the agency and the contractor concerning payment documents or performance, the time required to make corrections or resolve disputes is excluded from the permitted agency processing time. Up until December 31, 1999, the Rules provided a 15-day grace period. If a payment was not made on time, but within the grace period, there was no interest paid. The PPB adopted a change in its Rules which phased out this "interest-free" 15-day grace period by reducing it to 7 days, effective January 1, 2000, and eliminated it entirely, effective July 1, 2000. The PPB works with agencies that are having problems making timely contractor payments to increase the efficiency of their invoice and payment processing.

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

As evidenced in the data presentations below and in the separate chart which follows, since the introduction of the Prompt Payment Indicators in the Preliminary Fiscal 1996 Mayor's Management Report through Fiscal 1999, agencies, overall, had shown steady improvement in the timeliness of contractor payments. This trend, however, did not continue for Fiscal 2000 and is attributable to a number of systemic factors, some of which will continue into Fiscal 2001:

- As a result of the transition to a Y2K compliant City Financial Management System (FMS), the City in general and the agencies in particular needed to adapt to the protocols of the new system, and go through the normal learning curve experience which typically results in a temporary decrease in performance. This was the reason that Prompt Payment Indicator data was not able to be presented in the Preliminary Fiscal 2000 Mayor's Management Report.
- The PPB Rules were changed to reduce the "interest-free" grace period from 15 days to 7 days, effective January 1, 2000. This 8 day reduction in the grace period meant that interest began to accrue within 37 days of the required date rather than within 45 days. The Prompt Payment Indicators will be further impacted in Fiscal 2001 when the grace period is eliminated in its entirety and interest will therefore begin to accrue within just 30 days of the required date. Agencies are continuing to adapt their systems to accommodate this change, which in total will reduce the "interest-free" payment period by 33%.

As a consequence of the above factors, prompt payment performance levels for Fiscal 2000 and prior fiscal years are not comparable.

Trend in Prompt Payment Performance (a)

	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000
Invoice Value Paid on Time	84%	85%	91%	92%	95%	90%
Invoice Value Paid by Grace Period	95%	96%	98%	99%	99%	98%
Invoices Paid on Time	58%	60%	81%	81%	85%	78%
Invoices Paid by Grace Period	91%	88%	95%	94%	96%	91%(b)
Interest Paid to Contractors	\$603,600	\$395,400	\$290,900	\$272,786	\$118,318	\$378,762(b)

Percentage figures in the table above are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

(a) Data for Fiscal 1995 and 1996 reflect data for all City agencies; data for Fiscal 1997, 1998, 1999 and 2000 reflect data for Mayoral operating agencies only.

(b) If Fiscal 2000 performance is calculated by applying the original 15-day grace period, the percent of invoices paid by the grace period would increase to 93%, reducing the amount of interest that would be paid to contractors by approximately \$24,000.

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

Contract Performance Evaluations and Defaulted Contracts

This section includes the following Contract Performance Evaluation Indicators for all Mayoral operating agencies for those contracts for which comprehensive, fully documented Evaluations of Contractor Performance were required to be completed (i.e., submitted and entered into the VENDEX system) for Fiscal 2000 (i.e., the contract expiration, completion or termination date, as applicable, or the last day of the twelve-month contract period, occurred between March 3, 1999 and March 2, 2000): Total Number of Contract Performance Evaluations which were Required to be Completed for Fiscal 2000; Number and Percent of Total Required Contract Performance Evaluations which were Completed; and Number and Percent of Total Contract Performance Evaluations Completed which were Rated as Unsatisfactory. Agency data are totaled to present an overall picture of contract performance evaluation. (Evaluations submitted outside of the 120-day period, described below, are also entered into the VENDEX system and included in the data reported below.) In addition, for the first time, data, which was provided by the agencies, is presented on the number of contracts which were defaulted.

As required by the City Charter, the Administrative Code and the Procurement Policy Board (PPB) Rules, agencies are responsible for monitoring and evaluating the performance of all contractors. Pursuant to established Mayor's Office of Contracts procedures:

- Contract performance evaluations are required to be completed for the categories listed below only where vendor performance is unsatisfactory, in which case a Report of Unsatisfactory Vendor Performance (i.e., "Form 5") is to be filed for entry into the VENDEX system.
 - Procurements of goods by means of competitive sealed bidding.
 - Procurements at or below the small purchase limits set forth in the PPB Rules.
- Contract performance evaluations are required to be completed for all other procurements as follows:
 - A comprehensive, fully documented Evaluation of Contractor Performance (i.e., "Form 1, 2, 2S, 3 or 4", as applicable) is to be filed for entry into the VENDEX system within 120 days, prior in certain cases, or subsequent to the contract's expiration, completion or termination date.
 - In addition, for each such contract with an original or amended term of greater than 12 months, a comprehensive, fully documented Evaluation of Contractor Performance also is to be filed for entry into the VENDEX system within 120 days, prior in some cases, or subsequent to the last day of each twelve-month period following the contract's effective date. (Where the interim and final performance evaluations are due within the same 120-day period, only one evaluation need be prepared.)
 - Agencies monitor and conduct performance evaluations in order to have the requisite information timely available for determining whether an existing contract should be renewed, continued, or terminated or whether a corrective action plan is needed to assure that the contractor fully complies with its contractual responsibilities. This is particularly relevant for the renewal of human service contracts, where evaluations may be conducted prior to the expiration/ anniversary date so that the results can be used to make the renewal determination.

The overall results from this Indicator, which are presented in the separate chart which follows, are positive and reflect improvement from last year due to the continued emphasis placed by the agencies on completing contract performance evaluations.

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

Procurements Awarded (See Notes)

This section includes data on the number and total original maximum dollar amount of procurements awarded during the twelve-month period ending June 30, 2000, except as noted below, for all Mayoral operating agencies for all categories of contracts: goods, construction and/or construction-related services, human services and other. Agency data are totaled to present an overall picture of procurements awarded. However, the data presented, which are maintained in the City's Financial Management System (FMS), excludes small purchases, purchase orders, and the encumbrances imposed for multi-year contracts that had been awarded prior to Fiscal 2000. The data presented should therefore not be relied upon as a statement of the full level of goods, construction, and services actually funded by the City during Fiscal 2000.

Procurement Processing Cycle Times

This section includes data on the average number of calendar days that was required to process contracts awarded from "typical" procurements during the twelve-month period ending June 30, 2000 for all Mayoral operating agencies utilizing key methods of award (i.e., competitive sealed bids, competitive sealed proposals and negotiated acquisition). The data presented was provided by the agencies. Agency data are totaled to present an overall picture of procurement processing cycle times.

In order to meaningfully reflect the efficiency of the procurement process itself, processing cycle time is measured from the date that a solicitation was publicly released (i.e., the date on which the Invitation for Bids or Request for Proposals was issued; or, as applicable, the date on which a notice of intent to enter into negotiations was published in the City Record, or, where public notice was not required, the date on which vendors were solicited) through the date the procurement was completed by the agency (i.e., the date on which a contract was submitted to the Comptroller's Office for registration). The processing cycle time for contracts awarded from "atypical" procurements, for example, those that were substantially delayed due to litigation, court injunctions, vendor protests, vendor criminal investigations, adverse responsibility determinations or similarly aberrational circumstances, are excluded so that the average time calculations are representative of typical procurements.

The overall results from this Indicator, which are presented in the separate chart which follows, continue to be positive regarding processing efficiencies.

Competitiveness in Procurements (See Notes)

This section includes data reflecting the level of vendor competitiveness achieved by all Mayoral operating agencies for all contracts awarded by competitive sealed bids or competitive sealed proposals and, for the first time, negotiated acquisition*, and for construction and/or construction-related services contracts awarded by any method of award (e.g., competitive sealed bids, competitive sealed proposals, negotiated acquisition, sole source, renewal, line-item appropriation, etc.) during Fiscal 2000. The data, which are maintained in the City's Financial Management System (FMS), includes for each of these groupings: Total Number of Contracts Awarded; Total Dollar Value of Contracts Awarded; Number and Percent of Total Contracts Awarded for which there were 3 or more Responses; and Dollar Value and Percent of Total Dollar Value of Contracts Awarded for which there were 3 or more Responses. Agency data are totaled to present an overall picture of vendor competitiveness. (*Excludes contracts for which negotiated acquisition was used to either extend an existing contract for a limited period of time, or to continue a multi-phase construction-related services contract for an ongoing complex construction project. Under these circumstances, the Procurement Policy Board Rules contemplate conducting negotiations with only the incumbent contractor.)

The overall results from this Indicator, which are presented in the separate charts which follow, continue to show a robust level of vendor competitiveness, stronger in most areas than last year.

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

Performance-Based Contracting

This is a new Agency Procurement Indicator included for the first time in the Fiscal 2000 Mayor's Management Report. Currently, many City contracts concentrate on operational details (e.g., how many employees at what salary), which can be quite extensive, taking up many pages of the contract. This approach diverts the focus of both the contracting agency and the vendor from the real issues, "What are the agency's goals and are they being achieved?" Under performance-based contracting, the emphasis is shifted from the means employed by a contractor to reach desired goals, to whether the agency achieved its goals by contracting with the vendor. Correspondingly, the payment structure for these contracts rewards vendors that achieve the agency's goals rather than just reimbursing them for expenditures made. An additional benefit of performance-based contracting is that as the City changes its focus from the means of performance to the outcome produced, the City's costs for managing contracts will decrease, while the quality of services will increase.

Typically, the critical question in determining if a contract is performance-based is whether the contract provides the contractor with financial incentives and/or disincentives that are tied to the goals that the agency is seeking to achieve through the contract. Thus, a contract is considered to be performance-based if it incorporates one or more of the following payment methods in whole or in large part:

- Performance-based outcome measures and related financial incentives and/or disincentives (e.g., the contractor would complete a construction project by a prescribed date but would receive a 10% bonus for completing it substantially ahead of schedule; the contractor would maintain a 95% occupancy level in an SRO but would be assessed a 2% penalty if that level was not maintained).
- Unit payments tied to outcomes (e.g., the contractor would receive a prescribed fee per foot of road reconstructed).
- Milestone payments tied to outcomes (e.g., the contractor would receive a prescribed payment when a client is placed in employment and another payment when the client has been retained in employment for 90 days).
- Liquidated damages tied to outcomes (e.g., the contractor would be penalized \$100 per day for each day that an audit report is not submitted by the prescribed due date).

This Indicator includes data reflecting the level of performance-based contracting for all Mayoral operating agencies for new contracts awarded for services and construction during Fiscal 2000. The data presented, which has been provided by the agencies, includes: Total Number of Contracts Awarded; Total Dollar Value of Contracts Awarded; Number and Percent of Total Contracts Awarded which were Performance-Based; and Dollar Value and Percent of Total Dollar Value of Contracts Awarded which were Performance-Based.

The results from this Indicator, which are presented in the separate chart which follows, are both constructive and instructive. Even though this is a first-time Indicator, the results reflect the City's focus in this emerging area, particularly in the nascent efforts in human services contract awards. This is very much a long-term investment, and at present, a "work in progress." Steady strides are expected as performance-based contracting becomes institutionalized by the agencies and vendors across the broad spectrum of the City's procurements.

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

Retroactive Contracts (See Notes)

This is a new Agency Procurement Indicator included for the first time in the Fiscal 2000 Mayor's Management Report. This Indicator includes data reflecting the level of contract retroactivity (i.e., contracts which started prior to the completion of the procurement process, that is, the date on which a contract was registered by the Comptroller's Office*) for all Mayoral operating agencies for all new and renewal contracts, except emergency contracts and accelerated procurement contracts, awarded during Fiscal 2000. The data presented, which are maintained in the City's Financial Management System (FMS), includes: Total Number of Contracts Awarded; Total Dollar Value of Contracts Awarded; Number and Percent of Total Contracts Awarded which were Retroactive; Dollar Value and Percent of Total Dollar Value of Contracts Awarded which were Retroactive; and Average Number of Days that Elapsed Between the Contract Start Date and the Contract Registration Date. (* The date on which a contract was formally registered by the Comptroller's Office may be after the Charter legal registration date and, therefore, the contract may not be retroactive at all or may be less retroactive than reported.)

As in the case of the other first-time Indicator, Performance-Based Contracting, the results from this new Indicator, which are presented in the separate chart which follows, are both constructive and instructive. These initial results will provide an important benchmark against which performance in subsequent years will be measured. It is anticipated that providing this focus will substantially and steadily improve performance, much as has been experienced since the Prompt Payment Indicator was first introduced in the MMR.

The results also reflect, as in the case of the Prompt Payment Indicator, the systemic impact of the transition to a Y2K compliant City Financial Management System (FMS). The City in general and the agencies in particular needed to adapt to the protocols of the new system, and go through the normal learning curve experience which typically results in a temporary decrease in performance.

Given the importance of timely contracts to the City's procurement process, the Mayor's Office of Contracts (MOC) will work with the agencies in implementing the following approach to improve agency performance in this new area:

- Agencies with low performance rates will develop corrective action plans.
- MOC will provide agencies with regular status reports about their retroactive contracts so that progress can be monitored on an ongoing basis.

Agency Procurement Actions (See Notes)

Section 12c(5) of the Charter requires that the Mayor's Management Report include for each agency a summary of the contracts entered into during the previous fiscal year (e.g., Fiscal 2000), categorized by the method of award used and the dollar value. This information is maintained in the City's Financial Management System (FMS) and is presented in the separate chart which follows. It should be noted, however, that the manner in which contracting data are maintained in FMS precludes analysis or meaningful conclusions about contracting trends from use of that database alone. For example, FMS reflects the total dollar amount of a contract in whatever year the contract was registered. Thus, depending upon when particular multi-year contracts expire and need to be re-let, there will be an increase in contracting activity reflected in FMS for the year in which the new multi-year contracts are registered, with no contracting activity reflected during the intervening years even though the goods, services or construction provided for in these contracts continue to be funded and provided.

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

Notes:

- Information is from the City's Financial Management System (FMS) and reflects updates by the agencies.
- Contracts are included if the Contract ID includes the year 2000 and the Start Date is on or after 7/1/99.
- Small Purchase procurements are excluded.
- To exclude purchase orders from New York State requirements contracts while retaining contracts with other governments, contracts with Award Method 25 for "Intergovernmental Purchases" are excluded unless the Enterprise Information Number (EIN) of the Vendor appears on a Mayor's Office of Contracts table of Government EINs.
- HPD: Certain HPD contracts showing NYCHA as the contractor were excluded because they are not procurements and, with the exception of 2, they were in fact entered into FMS by NYCHA, not HPD; certain HPD contracts were excluded as being "technical" registrations, required when OMB changed their funding from expense to capital; and 24 HPD emergency construction-related contracts where the Contract ID includes the year 2000, but the Start Date is before 7/1/99, were excluded.
- All contract assignments were excluded, as these are not procurements, but a change in vendor pursuant to the terms of the original contract.
- Force Accounts were excluded because they are not procurements.
- Contracts that are payments to landlords pursuant to leases were excluded as being real property transactions, not procurements.

**H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT
PROMPT PAYMENT
Fiscal 2000**

Agency	Invoice Value Paid on Time	Invoice Value Paid by Grace Period	Invoices Paid on Time	Invoices Paid by Grace Period	Interest Paid to Contractors
Police Department	71%	92%	75%	92%	\$50,029
Fire Department	49%	82%	58%	81%	\$78,288
Department of Correction	66%	90%	67%	91%	\$6,694
Department of Probation	85%	96%	91%	98%	\$201
Department of Juvenile Justice	94%	100%	92%	99%	\$0
Department of Transportation	79%	95%	60%	82%	\$29,817
Department of Environmental Protection	85%	98%	90%	99%	\$7,122
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	68%	89%	80%	93%	\$18,417
Department of Design and Construction	88%	99%	88%	98%	\$993
Department of Sanitation	94%	99%	86%	97%	\$19,309
Department of Parks and Recreation	88%	96%	73%	84%	\$8,857
Landmarks Preservation Commission	92%	96%	96%	99%	\$87
Department of Business Services	82%	93%	93%	97%	\$12,720
Department of Cultural Affairs	85%	88%	81%	86%	\$44
Department of Health/Office of the Chief Medical Examiner	93%	100%	84%	96%	\$3,538
Department of Mental Health	98%	98%	93%	96%	\$0
Human Resources Administration	99%	100%	94%	98%	\$10,323
Administration for Children Services	96%	98%	75%	88%	\$31,516
Department of Homeless Services	90%	93%	74%	82%	\$63,915
Department of Employment	99%	100%	99%	100%	\$0
Department of Youth and Community Development	92%	95%	91%	95%	\$3,911
Department for the Aging	94%	98%	89%	96%	\$80
Department of Consumer Affairs	80%	99%	90%	100%	\$0
Department of Buildings	88%	98%	90%	98%	\$743
Taxi and Limousine Commission	90%	100%	97%	100%	\$0
Law Department	63%	99%	77%	96%	\$178
Department of Finance	89%	96%	83%	93%	\$4,915
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	57%	96%	60%	85%	\$26,948
Department of City Planning	87%	100%	96%	99%	\$0
Department of Records and Information Services	87%	100%	96%	100%	\$0
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications	78%	93%	67%	87%	\$117
Commission on Human Rights	89%	100%	87%	99%	\$0
Department of Investigation	98%	99%	97%	98%	\$0
TOTAL	90%	98%	78%	91%	\$378,762

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT
CONTRACT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS* & DEFAULTED CONTRACTS
Fiscal 2000

Agency	Total # of Contract Performance Evaluations Which Were Required to be Completed for Fiscal 1999	# and % of Total Required Contract Performance Evaluations Which Were Completed		# and % of Total Contract Performance Evaluations Completed Which Were Rated as Unsatisfactory		Number of Contracts Defaulted
		Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	
Police Department	51	47	92%	3	6%	0
Fire Department	60	43	72%	1	2%	2
Department of Correction	37	34	92%	0	0%	0
Department of Probation	23	23	100%	0	0%	0
Department of Juvenile Justice	8	8	100%	0	0%	0
Civilian Complaint Review Board	1	0	0%	0	NA	0
Department of Transportation	259	230	89%	6	3%	0
Department of Environmental Protection	395	269	68%	2	1%	1
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	221	220	100%	9	4%	0
Department of Design & Construction	292	231	79%	10	4%	2
Department of Sanitation	99	72	73%	0	0%	0
Department of Parks & Recreation	260	248	95%	5	2%	15
Landmark Preservation Commission	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
Department of Business Services	6	4	67%	0	0%	0
Department of Cultural Affairs	4	4	100%	0	0%	0
Department of Health	161	137	85%	0	0%	0
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Alcoholism Services	306	290	95%	0	0%	0
Human Resources Administration	280	189	68%	2	1%	1
Administration for Children's Services	595	438	74%	2	0%	0
Department of Homeless Services	221	207	94%	2	1%	0
Department of Employment	103	60	58%	2	3%	0
Department of Youth & Community Development	701	689	98%	4	1%	0
Department for the Aging	460	441	96%	2	0%	0
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT
CONTRACT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS* & DEFAULTED CONTRACTS
Fiscal 2000

Agency	Total # of Contract Performance Evaluations Which Were Required to be Completed for Fiscal 1999	# and % of Total Required Contract Performance Evaluations Which Were Completed		# and % of Total Contract Performance Evaluations Completed Which Were Rated as Unsatisfactory		Number of Contracts Defaulted
		Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	
Department of Buildings	3	3	100%	0	0%	0
Taxi & Limousine Commission	4	4	100%	0	0%	0
Law Department	20	14	70%	3	21%	0
Department of Finance	42	20	48%	1	5%	0
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	61	57	93%	2	4%	0**
Department of City Planning	1	1	100%	0	0%	0
Department of Records and Information Services	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications	58	51	88%	1	2%	0
City Commission on Human Rights	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
Department of Investigation	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
City Civil Service Commission	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
TOTAL	4,732	4,034	85%	57	1%	21

* Includes contracts for which comprehensive, fully documented Evaluations of Contractor Performance were required to be completed.

** Excludes contracts awarded by the Department of Citywide Administrative Services/Division of Municipal Supply Services.

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

PROCUREMENTS AWARDED*

NUMBER OF AWARDS AND DOLLAR AMOUNTS

Fiscal 2000

Agency		Contracts For:				TOTAL
		Goods	Construction and/or Construction-Related Services	Human Services	Other	
Police Department	Quantity	5	3	0	10	18
	Value	\$738,808	\$1,059,415	\$0	\$5,547,420	\$7,345,643
Fire Department	Quantity	1	3	1	23	28
	Value	\$826,572	\$5,028,196	\$436,018	\$27,681,460	\$33,972,246
Department of Correction	Quantity	4	2	4	13	23
	Value	\$1,278,427	\$3,105,910	\$1,175,976	\$10,267,439	\$15,827,752
Department of Probation	Quantity	1	0	14	1	16
	Value	\$245,280	\$0	\$7,519,808	\$99,500	\$7,864,588
Department of Juvenile Justice	Quantity	0	0	8	2	10
	Value	\$0	\$0	\$8,724,593	\$136,525	\$8,861,118
Civilian Complaint Review Board	Quantity	0	0	0	0	0
	Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Department of Transportation	Quantity	1	48	0	60	109
	Value	\$32,676	\$286,639,779	\$0	\$43,334,136	\$330,006,591
Department of Environmental Protection	Quantity	1	106	0	65	172
	Value	\$1,538,700	\$509,053,884	\$0	\$78,386,943	\$588,979,527
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	Quantity	0	57	67	28	152
	Value	\$0	\$21,737,061	\$10,109,851	\$7,377,796	\$39,224,708
Department of Design & Construction	Quantity	0	193	0	0	193
	Value	\$0	\$1,267,339,221	\$0	\$0	\$1,267,339,221
Department of Sanitation	Quantity	2	30	0	23	55
	Value	\$853,889	\$149,945,184	\$0	\$92,205,582	\$243,004,655
Department of Parks & Recreation	Quantity	0	196	2	22	220
	Value	\$0	\$105,731,663	\$175,000	\$18,538,514	\$124,445,177
Landmark Preservation Commission	Quantity	0	0	0	0	0
	Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Department of Business Services	Quantity	0	0	0	2	2
	Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,047,500	\$6,047,500
Department of Cultural Affairs	Quantity	0	0	0	0	0
	Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Department of Health	Quantity	0	0	47	15	62
	Value	\$0	\$0	\$37,803,745	\$5,028,046	\$42,831,791
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Alcoholism Services	Quantity	0	0	160	5	165
	Value	\$0	\$0	\$180,959,411	\$816,220,548	\$997,179,959
Human Resources Administration	Quantity	0	2	118	36	156
	Value	\$0	\$5,734,250	\$505,405,062	\$14,900,031	\$526,039,343
Administration for Children's Services	Quantity	0	0	335	49	384
	Value	\$0	\$0	\$1,372,662,521	\$25,855,414	\$1,398,517,935
Department of Homeless Services	Quantity	0	9	47	6	62
	Value	\$0	\$2,000,375	\$238,179,327	\$1,094,426	\$241,274,128
Department of Employment	Quantity	0	0	61	1	62
	Value	\$0	\$0	\$24,240,598	\$64,400	\$24,304,998
Department of Youth & Community Development	Quantity	0	0	485	1	486
	Value	\$0	\$0	\$116,485,043	\$28,100	\$116,513,143

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

PROCUREMENTS AWARDED*

NUMBER OF AWARDS AND DOLLAR AMOUNTS

Fiscal 2000

Agency		Contracts For:				TOTAL
		Goods	Construction and/or Construction-Related Services	Human Services	Other	
Department for the Aging	Quantity	4	0	285	16	305
	Value	\$137,000	\$0	\$137,710,764	\$1,858,792	\$139,706,556
Department of Consumer Affairs	Quantity	0	0	0	0	0
	Value	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Department of Buildings	Quantity	0	0	0	3	3
	Value	\$0	0	\$0	\$3,602,437	\$3,602,437
Taxi & Limousine Commission	Quantity	0	0	0	4	4
	Value	\$0	0	\$0	\$684,514	\$684,514
Law Department	Quantity	0	0	0	46	46
	Value	\$0	0	\$0	\$9,213,684	\$9,213,684
Department of Finance	Quantity	0	0	0	4	4
	Value	\$0	0	\$0	\$7,540,673	\$7,540,673
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	Quantity	840	55	0	25	920
	Value	\$574,751,637	\$70,563,359	\$0	\$253,023,422	\$898,338,418
Department of City Planning	Quantity	0	0	0	1	1
	Value	\$0	0	\$0	\$39,725	\$39,725
Department of Records and Information Services	Quantity	0	0	0	0	0
	Value	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications	Quantity	0	0	0	13	13
	Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$19,860,219	\$19,860,219
City Commission on Human Rights	Quantity	0	0	0	0	0
	Value	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Department of Investigation	Quantity	0	0	0	0	0
	Value	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City Civil Service Commission	Quantity	0	0	0	0	0
	Value	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL	Quantity	859	704	1,634	474	3,671
	Value	\$580,402,990	\$2,427,938,297	\$2,641,587,718	\$1,448,637,246	\$7,098,566,250

* Excludes small purchases, purchase orders, and the encumbrances imposed for multi-year contracts that had been awarded prior to Fiscal 2000.

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

Procurement Processing Cycle Times

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CALENDAR DAYS TO PROCESS CONTRACTS*

Fiscal 2000

Agency	Contracts Awarded via Competitive Sealed Bids		Contracts Awarded via Competitive Sealed Proposals		Contracts Awarded via Negotiated Acquisition	
	Contracts	Average Days	Contracts	Average Days	Contracts	Average Days
Police Department	9	119	1	193	3	92
Fire Department	11	82	0	--	0	--
Department of Correction	3	178	1	90	0	--
Department of Probation	0	--	0	--	1	70
Department of Juvenile Justice	1	30	0	--	5	229
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	--	0	--	0	--
Department of Transportation	45	169	15	355	0	--
Department of Environmental Protection	95	163	2	551	6	369
Department of Housing Preservation and Development	21	142	0	--	1	212
Department of Design and Construction	121	94	28	235	6	174
Department of Sanitation	32	101	0	--	0	--
Department of Parks and Recreation	163	85	1	203	0	--
Landmarks Preservation Commission	0	--	0	--	0	--
Department of Business Services	0	--	0	--	0	--
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	--	0	--	0	--
Department of Health/Office of the Chief Medical Examiner	9	162	7	438	2	351
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Alcoholism Services	0	--	12	297	29	315
Human Resources Administration	25	113	0	--	64	193
Administration for Children's Services	33	186	10	304	0	--
Department of Homeless Services	11	154	0	--	2	84
Department of Employment	1	44	0	--	45	188
Department of Youth and Community Development	1	72	268	272	7	84

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

Procurement Processing Cycle Times

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CALENDAR DAYS TO PROCESS CONTRACTS* Fiscal 2000

Agency	Contracts Awarded via Competitive Sealed Bids		Contracts Awarded via Competitive Sealed Proposals		Contracts Awarded via Negotiated Acquisition	
	Contracts	Average Days	Contracts	Average Days	Contracts	Average Days
Department for the Aging	0	--	84	137	7	200
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	--	0	--	0	--
Department of Buildings	0	--	3	365	0	--
Taxi and Limousine Commission	0	--	1	64	0	--
Law Department	3	144	0	--	9	156
Department of Finance	4	174	0	--	0	--
Department of Citywide Administrative Services**	57	163	4	320	1	90
Department of City Planning	0	--	0	--	0	--
Department of Records and Information Services	0	--	0	--	0	--
Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications	5	99	1	141	9	253
City Commission on Human Rights	0	--	0	--	0	--
Department of Investigation	0	--	0	--	0	--
Civil Service Commission	0	--	0	--	0	--
TOTAL CONTRACTS/OVERALL AVERAGE DAYS	650	123	438	251	197	211

*Includes contracts awarded from "typical" procurements utilizing key methods of award.

**Excludes contracts awarded by the Department of Citywide Administrative Services/Division of Municipal Supplies

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

COMPETITIVENESS IN PROCUREMENTS: CONTRACTS AWARDED BY COMPETITIVE SEALED BID Fiscal 2000

A G E N C Y	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Bids			
			Quantity	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. of Total Value
Police Department	11	\$2,776,272	4	36%	\$1,371,186	49%
Fire Department	19	\$25,139,012	13	68%	\$12,429,972	49%
Department of Correction	13	\$12,421,492	8	62%	\$9,401,665	76%
Department of Probation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Juvenile Justice	1	\$71,525	1	100%	\$71,525	100%
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Transportation	52	\$221,298,987	42	81%	\$202,069,501	91%
Department of Environmental Protection	106	\$404,938,003	84	79%	\$378,195,576	93%
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	42	\$17,793,115	36	86%	\$8,254,760	46%
Department of Design & Construction	136	\$400,194,228	133	98%	\$395,903,558	99%
Department of Sanitation	45	\$231,806,017	36	80%	\$217,590,870	94%
Department of Parks & Recreation	167	\$106,643,141	157	94%	\$103,753,081	97%
Landmark Preservation Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Business Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Health	9	\$11,389,642	3	33%	\$5,144,561	45%
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Alcoholism Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Human Resources Administration	31	\$19,081,046	27	87%	\$18,855,253	99%
Administration for Children's Services	31	\$29,332,924	23	74%	\$27,882,425	95%
Department of Homeless Services	10	\$2,395,591	6	60%	\$2,100,475	88%
Department of Employment	1	\$353,000	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of Youth & Community Development	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department for the Aging	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

COMPETITIVENESS IN PROCUREMENTS: CONTRACTS AWARDED BY COMPETITIVE SEALED BID Fiscal 2000

A G E N C Y	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Bids			
			Quantity	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. of Total Value
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Buildings	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Taxi & Limousine Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Law Department	3	\$5,524,192	2	67%	\$5,288,692	96%
Department of Finance	3	\$4,960,975	3	100%	\$4,960,975	100%
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	896	\$651,059,728	760	85%	\$535,336,609	82%
Department of City Planning	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Records and Information Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications	6	\$16,650,192	2	33%	\$9,232,267	55%
City Commission on Human Rights	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Investigation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
City Civil Service Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
TOTAL	1,582	\$2,163,829,080	1,340	85%	\$1,937,842,950	90%

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

COMPETITIVENESS IN PROCUREMENTS: CONTRACTS AWARDED BY COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL Fiscal 2000

A G E N C Y	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Proposals			
			Quantity	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. of Total Value
Police Department	1	\$2,700,000	0	0%	\$0	0%
Fire Department	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Correction	1	\$1,648,865	1	100%	\$1,648,865	100%
Department of Probation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Juvenile Justice	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Transportation	24	\$91,886,692	22	92%	\$91,738,636	100%
Department of Environmental Protection	4	\$37,349,206	3	75%	\$24,316,706	65%
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Design & Construction	35	\$49,463,361	29	83%	\$44,763,361	90%
Department of Sanitation	1	\$7,049,286	1	100%	\$7,049,286	100%
Department of Parks & Recreation	3	\$2,260,000	2	67%	\$1,260,000	56%
Landmark Preservation Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Business Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Health	16	\$10,784,169	9	56%	\$6,000,000	56%
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Alcoholism Services	10	\$817,972,953	4	40%	\$816,747,453	100%
Human Resources Administration	6	\$9,744,270	0	0%	\$0	0%
Administration for Children's Services	156	\$1,033,757,802	156	100%	\$1,033,757,802	100%
Department of Homeless Services	3	\$77,005,815	1	33%	\$64,356,414	84%
Department of Employment	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Youth & Community Development	17	\$6,433,643	13	76%	\$1,909,730	30%
Department for the Aging	85	\$35,288,081	2	2%	\$2,112,288	6%

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

COMPETITIVENESS IN PROCUREMENTS: CONTRACTS AWARDED BY COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL Fiscal 2000

A G E N C Y	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Proposals			
			Quantity	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. of Total Value
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Buildings	3	\$3,602,437	3	100%	\$3,602,437	100%
Taxi & Limousine Commission	1	\$353,080	1	100%	\$353,080	100%
Law Department	1	\$75,000	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of Finance	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	5	\$9,598,500	5	100%	\$9,598,500	100%
Department of City Planning	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Records and Information Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications	1	\$1,056,000	1	100%	\$1,056,000	100%
City Commission on Human Rights	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Investigation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
City Civil Service Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
TOTAL	373	\$2,198,029,160	253	68%	\$2,110,270,558	96%

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

COMPETITIVENESS IN PROCUREMENTS: CONTRACTS AWARDED BY COMPETITIVE NEGOTIATED ACQUISITION* Fiscal 2000

A G E N C Y	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Proposals			
			Quantity	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. of Total Value
Police Department	3	\$670,996	1	33%	\$220,996	33%
Fire Department	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Correction	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Probation	1	\$99,500	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of Juvenile Justice	5	\$8,224,593	5	100%	\$8,224,593	100%
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Transportation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Environmental Protection	9	\$69,987,181	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	1	\$5,727,100	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of Design & Construction	14	\$787,951,300	12	86%	\$776,570,000	99%
Department of Sanitation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Parks & Recreation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Landmark Preservation Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Business Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Health	2	\$2,049,154	2	100%	\$2,049,154	100%
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Alcoholism Services	20	\$11,148,760	8	40%	\$6,457,018	58%
Human Resources Administration	19	\$374,648,686	19	100%	\$374,648,686	100%
Administration for Children's Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Homeless Services	1	\$2,037,741	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of Employment	42	\$20,227,764	42	100%	\$20,227,764	100%
Department of Youth & Community Development	1	\$29,706	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department for the Aging	8	\$288,994	8	100%	\$288,994	100%

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

COMPETITIVENESS IN PROCUREMENTS: CONTRACTS AWARDED BY COMPETITIVE NEGOTIATED ACQUISITION* Fiscal 2000

A G E N C Y	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Proposals			
			Quantity	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. of Total Value
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Buildings	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Taxi & Limousine Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Law Department	41	\$3,572,963	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of Finance	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of City Planning	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Records and Information Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications	1	\$1,373,355	1	100%	\$1,373,355	100%
City Commission on Human Rights	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Investigation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
City Civil Service Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
TOTAL	168	\$1,288,037,793	98	58%	\$1,190,060,560	92%

*Excludes 108 contracts with a value of \$79,158,618 for which negotiated acquisition was used either to extend an existing contract for a limited period of time or to continue a multi-phase construction-related services contract for an on-going complex construction project. Under these circumstances, the PPB Rules contemplate conducting negotiations with only the incumbent contractor.

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

COMPETITIVENESS IN PROCUREMENTS: CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION AND/OR CONSTRUCTION-RELATED SERVICES AWARDED BY ANY METHOD OF AWARD Fiscal 2000

A G E N C Y	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Bids/Proposals			
			Quantity	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. of Total Value
Police Department	3	\$1,059,415	3	100%	\$1,059,415	100%
Fire Department	3	\$5,028,196	2	67%	\$402,951	8%
Department of Correction	2	\$3,105,910	2	100%	\$3,105,910	100%
Department of Probation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Juvenile Justice	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Transportation	48	\$286,639,779	36	75%	\$268,146,656	94%
Department of Environmental Protection	106	\$509,053,884	83	78%	\$367,586,067	72%
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	57	\$21,737,061	46	81%	\$9,624,688	44%
Department of Design & Construction	193	\$1,267,339,221	175	91%	\$1,225,866,909	97%
Department of Sanitation	30	\$149,945,184	28	93%	\$137,715,578	92%
Department of Parks & Recreation	196	\$105,731,663	152	78%	\$92,779,665	88%
Landmark Preservation Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Business Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Health	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Alcoholism Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Human Resources Administration	2	\$5,734,250	2	100%	\$5,734,250	100%
Administration for Children's Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Homeless Services	9	\$2,000,375	9	100%	\$2,000,375	100%
Department of Employment	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Youth & Community Development	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department for the Aging	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

COMPETITIVENESS IN PROCUREMENTS: CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION AND/OR CONSTRUCTION-RELATED SERVICES AWARDED BY ANY METHOD OF AWARD Fiscal 2000

A G E N C Y	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Bids/Proposals			
			Quantity	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. of Total Value
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Buildings	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Taxi & Limousine Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Law Department	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Finance	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	55	\$70,563,359	47	85%	\$61,361,417	87%
Department of City Planning	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Records and Information Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
City Commission on Human Rights	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Investigation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
City Civil Service Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
TOTAL	704	\$2,427,938,297	585	83%	\$2,175,383,879	90%

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT
PERFORMANCE-BASED CONTRACTING*
Fiscal 2000

Agency	New Services Contracts and Construction Contracts Awarded					
	Total Number	Number and Percent Performance- Based		Total Dollar Value	Dollar Value and Percent Performance- Based	
		Quantity	Percent		Value	Percent
Administration for Children's Services	187	75	40%	\$1,060,432,408	\$791,452,979	75%
	0	—	—	\$0	—	—
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	—	—	\$0	—	—
Civil Service Commission	0	—	—	\$0	—	—
Department for the Aging	435	18	4%	\$131,972,123	\$23,916,467	18%
Department of Buildings	3	3	100%	\$3,602,437	\$3,602,437	100%
Department of Business Services	0	—	—	\$0	—	—
Department of City Planning	0	—	—	\$0	—	—
Department of Citywide Administrative Services**	55	0	0%	\$101,142,000	\$0	0%
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	—	—	\$0	—	—
Department of Correction	21	4	19%	\$31,828,033	\$1,175,976	4%
Department of Cultural Affairs	1	0	0%	\$300,870	\$0	0%
Department of Design and Construction	198	158	80%	\$1,272,000,000	\$1,231,000,000	97%
Department of Employment	70	50	71%	\$26,938,598	\$22,879,364	85%
Department of Environmental Protection	105	97	92%	\$462,202,580	\$364,888,794	79%
Department of Finance	4	0	0%	\$7,308,041	\$0	0%
Department of Health/Office of the Chief Medical Examiner	75	36	48%	\$48,283,312	\$23,380,945	48%
Department of Homeless Services	14	11	79%	\$68,972,671	\$68,711,770	100%
Department of Housing Preservation and Development	161	98	61%	\$109,826,339	\$87,403,950	80%
Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications	16	16	100%	\$48,716,547	\$48,716,547	100%
Department of Investigation	0	—	—	\$0	—	—
Department of Juvenile Justice	9	9	100%	\$8,796,118	\$8,796,118	100%
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Alcoholism Services	164	24	15%	\$185,481,199	\$22,197,435	12%
Department of Parks and Recreation	227	197	87%	\$124,055,621	\$103,300,796	83%
Department of Probation	17	7	41%	\$8,000,000	\$1,100,000	14%

**H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT
PERFORMANCE-BASED CONTRACTING*
Fiscal 2000**

Agency	New Services Contracts and Construction Contracts Awarded					
	Total Number	Number and Percent Performance- Based		Total Dollar Value	Dollar Value and Percent Performance- Based	
		Quantity	Percent		Value	Percent
Department of Records and Information Services	0	—	—	\$0	—	—
Department of Sanitation	49	49	100%	\$295,959,890	\$295,959,890	100%
Department of Transportation	109	48	44%	\$330,006,591	\$92,092,073	28%
Department of Youth and Community Development	743	270	36%	\$138,909,135	\$17,452,868	13%
Fire Department	19	19	100%	\$26,133,099	\$26,133,099	100%
Human Resources Administration	141	141	100%	\$522,301,879	\$522,301,879	100%
Landmarks Preservation Commission	0	—	—	\$0	—	—
Law Department	46	2	4%	\$9,213,684	\$1,675,000	18%
Police Department	21	14	67%	\$23,037,978	\$3,381,268	15%
Taxi and Limousine Commission	4	3	75%	\$684,514	\$438,080	64%
TOTAL	2894	1349	47%	\$ 5,046,105,667	\$ 3,761,957,735	75%

*Includes contracts for which comprehensive, fully documented Evaluations of Contractor Performance were required to be completed.

**Excludes contracts awarded by the Department of Citywide Administrative Services/Division of Municipal Supply Services.

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

RETROACTIVE CONTRACTS* CONTRACTS WITH A START DATE BEFORE THEIR REGISTRATION DATE Fiscal 2000

A G E N C Y	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Proposals				
			Quantity	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. of Total Value	Avg. Days Retro- active
Police Department	16	\$6,697,268	3	19%	\$892,552	13%	162
Fire Department	25	\$27,294,929	8	32%	\$1,522,337	6%	72
Department of Correction	23	\$15,827,752	11	48%	\$7,187,621	45%	165
Department of Probation	16	\$7,864,588	16	100%	\$7,864,588	100%	127
Department of Juvenile Justice	10	\$8,861,118	9	90%	\$6,211,118	70%	40
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Transportation	106	\$328,440,891	95	90%	\$303,491,729	92%	71
Department of Environmental Protection	168	\$582,261,372	39	23%	\$42,977,354	7%	73
Department of Housing							
Preservation & Development	127	\$36,847,484	95	75%	\$26,184,586	71%	197
Department of Design & Construction	192	\$1,266,339,221	8	4%	\$47,737,989	4%	39
Department of Sanitation	53	\$240,937,675	12	23%	\$11,515,420	5%	53
Department of Parks & Recreation	218	\$123,945,625	23	11%	\$12,309,162	10%	14
Landmark Preservation Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Business Services	2	\$6,047,500	2	100%	\$6,047,500	100%	220
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Health	61	\$41,439,791	59	97%	\$40,474,603	98%	207
Department of Mental Health, Mental							
Retardation, & Alcoholism Services	165	\$997,179,959	158	96%	\$991,649,753	99%	73
Human Resources Administration	156	\$526,039,343	139	89%	\$516,676,330	98%	121
Administration for Children's Services	384	\$1,398,517,935	369	96%	\$1,368,869,509	98%	95
Department of Homeless Services	62	\$241,274,128	59	95%	\$240,487,378	100%	60
Department of Employment	62	\$24,304,998	62	100%	\$24,304,998	100%	151
Department of Youth & Community Development	488	\$118,113,970	481	99%	\$116,261,960	98%	76

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

RETROACTIVE CONTRACTS* CONTRACTS WITH A START DATE BEFORE THEIR REGISTRATION DATE Fiscal 2000

A G E N C Y	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Proposals				
			Quantity	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. of Total Value	Avg. Days Retro- active
Department for the Aging	305	\$139,706,556	214	70%	\$76,724,842	55%	88
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Buildings	3	\$3,602,437	3	100%	\$3,602,437	100%	11
Taxi & Limousine Commission	4	\$684,514	4	100%	\$684,514	100%	118
Law Department	45	\$9,172,154	43	96%	\$9,137,154	100%	152
Department of Finance	4	\$7,540,673	4	100%	\$7,540,673	100%	77
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	920	\$898,338,418	11	1%	\$232,721,568	26%	88
Department of City Planning	1	\$39,725	1	100%	\$39,725	100%	105
Department of Records and Information Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications	13	\$19,860,219	8	62%	\$16,813,143	85%	48
City Commission on Human Rights	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Investigation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
City Civil Service Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
TOTAL	3,629	\$7,077,180,245	1,936	53%	\$4,119,930,545	58%	97

* Includes all new and renewal contracts except emergency contracts and accelerated procurement contracts.

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

AGENCY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS

Fiscal 2000

Agency and Award Method	Number of Contract Actions	Contract Actions Revised Maximum Amount
PUBLIC SAFETY		
Police Department		
Competitive Sealed Bid	11	\$2,842,272
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	1	\$2,700,000
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	1	\$550,000
Emergency	2	\$648,375
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	3	\$725,521
Other (b)	0	\$0
Fire Department		
Competitive Sealed Bid	19	\$25,139,012
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	1	\$444,068
Emergency	3	\$6,897,167
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	5	\$1,611,850
Department of Correction		
Competitive Sealed Bid	13	\$16,555,492
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	1	\$1,648,865
Renewal	3	\$381,419
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	4	\$1,175,976
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	2	\$200,000
Department of Probation		
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	12	\$7,263,032
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	3	\$502,056
Negotiated Acquisition	1	\$99,500
Other (b)	0	\$0
Department of Juvenile Justice		
Competitive Sealed Bid	1	\$71,525
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	1	\$65,000
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	1	\$300,000
Negotiated Acquisition	5	\$8,224,593
Other (b)	2	\$200,000

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

AGENCY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS

Fiscal 2000

Agency and Award Method	Number of Contract Actions	Contract Actions Revised Maximum Amount
Civilian Complaint Review Board		
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	0	\$0
INFRASTRUCTURE		
Department of Transportation		
Competitive Sealed Bid	52	\$226,612,577
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	24	\$95,410,527
Renewal	28	\$12,721,659
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	3	\$1,565,700
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	2	\$5,032,676
Department of Environmental Protection		
Competitive Sealed Bid	106	\$408,532,495
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	4	\$37,349,206
Renewal	38	\$28,825,462
Sole Source	2	\$902,706
Emergency	4	\$6,810,373
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	11	\$108,155,514
Other (b)	7	\$2,200,481
Department of Housing Preservation & Development		
Competitive Sealed Bid	42	\$17,793,115
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	33	\$11,365,127
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	25	\$2,377,224
Line Item Appropriation (a)	11	\$351,142
Negotiated Acquisition	41	\$7,342,100
Other (b)	0	\$0
Department of Design & Construction		
Competitive Sealed Bid	136	\$401,827,712
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	35	\$49,463,361
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	7	\$21,100,342
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	14	\$787,951,300
Other (b)	1	\$8,629,990

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

AGENCY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS

Fiscal 2000

Agency and Award Method	Number of Contract Actions	Contract Actions Revised Maximum Amount
COMMUNITY SERVICES		
Department of Sanitation		
Competitive Sealed Bid	45	\$231,824,218
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	1	\$7,049,286
Renewal	6	\$1,491,918
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	2	\$2,066,980
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	1	\$651,708
Department of Parks & Recreation		
Competitive Sealed Bid	167	\$106,752,119
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	3	\$2,260,000
Renewal	40	\$15,414,832
Sole Source	1	\$75,000
Emergency	2	\$499,551
Line Item Appropriation (a)	7	\$615,794
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	0	\$0
Landmark Preservation Commission		
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	0	\$0
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SERVICES		
Department of Business Services		
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	2	\$6,047,500
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	0	\$0
Department of Cultural Affairs		
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	0	\$0

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

AGENCY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS

Fiscal 2000

Agency and Award Method	Number of Contract Actions	Contract Actions Revised Maximum Amount
HEALTH SERVICES		
Department of Health		
Competitive Sealed Bid	9	\$11,396,642
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	16	\$10,784,169
Renewal	15	\$13,999,554
Sole Source	2	\$240,000
Emergency	1	\$1,392,000
Line Item Appropriation (a)	12	\$1,557,572
Negotiated Acquisition	2	\$2,049,154
Other (b)	5	\$1,554,700
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Alcoholism Services		
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	10	\$818,712,885
Renewal	114	\$157,456,640
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	1	\$200,000
Negotiated Acquisition	20	\$14,062,635
Other (b)	20	\$22,427,321
HUMAN SERVICES AND EDUCATION		
Human Resources Administration		
Competitive Sealed Bid	31	\$19,190,744
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	6	\$9,851,840
Renewal	32	\$85,790,124
Sole Source	2	\$94,764
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	3	\$178,000
Negotiated Acquisition	79	\$412,545,912
Other (b)	3	\$13,829,168
Administration for Children's Services		
Competitive Sealed Bid	31	\$32,223,026
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	156	\$1,033,757,802
Renewal	193	\$341,017,006
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	4	\$287,821
Department of Homeless Services		
Competitive Sealed Bid	10	\$2,395,591
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	3	\$77,005,815
Renewal	36	\$140,919,695
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	1	\$71,000
Negotiated Acquisition	1	\$2,037,741
Other (b)	11	\$19,517,570

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

AGENCY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS

Fiscal 2000

Agency and Award Method	Number of Contract Actions	Contract Actions Revised Maximum Amount
Department of Employment		
Competitive Sealed Bid	1	\$353,000
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	16	\$3,384,234
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	1	\$100,000
Negotiated Acquisition	42	\$20,119,589
Other (b)	2	\$240,000
Department of Youth & Community Development		
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	17	\$6,689,160
Renewal	356	\$96,763,362
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	106	\$16,614,365
Negotiated Acquisition	7	\$2,435,368
Other (b)	0	\$0
Department for the Aging		
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	85	\$37,310,759
Renewal	119	\$102,238,479
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	91	\$12,517,922
Negotiated Acquisition	8	\$329,645
Other (b)	2	\$380,000
REGULATORY SERVICES		
Department of Consumer Affairs		
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	0	\$0
Department of Buildings		
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	3	\$3,602,437
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	0	\$0

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

AGENCY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS

Fiscal 2000

Agency and Award Method	Number of Contract Actions	Contract Actions Revised Maximum Amount
Taxi & Limousine Commission		
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	1	\$353,080
Renewal	3	\$331,434
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	0	\$0
CITYWIDE ADMINISTRATION		
Law Department		
Competitive Sealed Bid	3	\$5,524,192
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	1	\$75,000
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	1	\$41,530
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	41	\$3,807,963
Other (b)	0	\$0
Department of Finance		
Competitive Sealed Bid	3	\$4,960,975
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	1	\$2,579,698
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	0	\$0
Department of Citywide Administrative Services		
Competitive Sealed Bid	896	\$650,392,711
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	5	\$9,598,500
Renewal	5	\$706,786
Sole Source	2	\$530,871
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	1	\$465,000
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	11	\$340,543,090
Department of City Planning		
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	1	\$39,725
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	0	\$0

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

AGENCY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS

Fiscal 2000

Agency and Award Method	Number of Contract Actions	Contract Actions Revised Maximum Amount
Department of Records and Information Services		
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	0	\$0
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications		
Competitive Sealed Bid	6	\$16,650,192
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	1	\$1,056,000
Renewal	3	\$1,096,844
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	1	\$1,373,355
Other (b)	2	\$186,328
City Commission on Human Rights		
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	0	\$0
Department of Investigation		
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	0	\$0
City Civil Service Commission		
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line Item Appropriation (a)	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other (b)	0	\$0

Notes:

(a) Allocation made during the budget process by Borough Presidents and/or Council Members for a contractor-specific line-item budget appropriation.

(b) Contract actions in this category may include the following methods of award: required/authorized source; required method, including awards to a preferred source; demonstration projects; and certain government-to-government procurements.

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT CAPITAL PROJECTS -- FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS

(All numbers in thousands)

AGENCY	FY 1999 Annual Actual	Fiscal Year 2000		FY 2001 Annual Plan
		Annual Plan	Annual Actual	
POLICE DEPARTMENT	\$46,452	\$29,109	\$9,470	\$179,637
FIRE DEPARTMENT	\$66,267	\$152,174	\$52,390	\$226,095
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION o Managing Agency	\$74,289 \$23,514	\$121,927 \$40,738	\$56,614 \$5,968	\$282,349 \$38,405
DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE JUSTICE	\$1,833	\$4,984	(\$21)	\$12,819
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION o Managing Agency	\$699,287 \$529,214	\$852,708 \$443,382	\$543,225 \$415,309	\$1,351,984 \$718,710
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION o Managing Agency	\$671,622 \$330,256	\$1,344,490 \$612,377	\$984,950 \$687,951	\$2,903,398 \$1,580,265
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT o Managing Agency	\$259,336 \$266,736	\$412,600 \$317,458	\$307,242 \$315,792	\$463,751 \$329,872
SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY o Managing Agency	\$1,399,735 \$1,204,700	\$1,359,715 \$1,130,862	\$1,105,041 \$847,779	\$1,844,974 \$1,678,521
NEW YORK CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY	\$7,369	\$53,362	\$8,258	\$61,878
DEPARTMENT OF SANITATION o Managing Agency	\$62,828 \$30,064	\$125,309 \$135,819	\$199,063 \$191,563	\$247,522 \$150,154
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION o Managing Agency	\$173,641 \$170,399	\$234,073 \$163,178	\$153,773 \$129,466	\$371,415 \$212,536
PUBLIC LIBRARIES	\$16,524	\$97,512	\$10,675	\$189,251
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION o Managing Agency	\$58,898 \$60,224	\$374,765 \$280,750	\$26,489 \$37,226	\$668,248 \$495,561
DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS	\$62,386	\$249,430	\$26,303	\$470,076

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT CAPITAL PROJECTS -- FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS

(All numbers in thousands)

AGENCY	FY 1999 Annual Actual	Fiscal Year 2000		FY 2001 Annual Plan
		Annual Plan	Annual Actual	
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH	\$11,021	\$53,133	\$24,458	\$52,704
NEW YORK CITY HEALTH AND HOSPITALS CORPORATION	\$56,044	\$144,076	\$22,300	\$221,748
HUMAN RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION	\$52,951	\$127,350	\$62,460	\$102,108
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESS SERVICES	\$11,887	\$15,708	\$11,112	\$45,896
DEPARTMENT FOR THE AGING	\$2,651	\$8,458	\$1,152	\$24,046
DEPARTMENT OF CITYWIDE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	\$74,381	\$144,195	\$106,327	\$310,949
o Managing Agency	\$45,008	\$107,018	\$102,337	\$359,346
DEPARTMENT OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION				
o Managing Agency	\$848,186	\$898,684	\$916,531	\$1,210,729

NOTE: Between May 9 and June 19, 2000, as the City approached its constitutional debt limit and the ability to secure additional financing through State legislation remained uncertain, restrictions were placed on capital commitments. In a measure to conserve the City's existing financing authority, only contracts that were critical to public health and safety or legal mandates were advanced.

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

CAPITAL PROJECTS -- MANAGEMENT INDICATORS

INDICATORS	FY 1999	Fiscal Year 2000		FY 2001
	Annual Actual	Annual Plan	Annual Actual	Annual Plan
POLICE DEPARTMENT				
o Projects Started				
- Design	0	0	0	4
- Construction	10	25	20	38
o Projects Completed	68	52	52	106
FIRE DEPARTMENT				
o Projects Started				
- Design	10	0	0	0
- Construction	14	3	3	2
o Projects Completed	13	3	3	1
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION				
o Projects Started				
- Design	9	2	11	19
- Construction	26	58	14	10
o Projects Completed	18	33	2	1
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
o Projects Started				
- Design	4	28	29	N/A
- Construction	17	14	12	N/A
o Projects Completed	38	34	32	N/A
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION				
o Projects Started				
- Design	56	68	40	227
- Construction	90	235	75	134
o Projects Completed	82	141	52	89
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT				
o Projects Started				
- Design	86	129	118	206
- Construction	356	360	389	441
o Projects Completed	313	323	364	575

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

CAPITAL PROJECTS -- MANAGEMENT INDICATORS

INDICATORS	FY 1999	Fiscal Year 2000		FY 2001
	Annual Actual	Annual Plan	Annual Actual	Annual Plan
SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY				
o Projects Started				
- Design	34	27	55	9
- Construction	50	23	43	11
o Projects Completed	56	24	38	8
DEPARTMENT OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION				
o Projects Started				
- Design	356	174	640	187
- Construction	454	324	591	304
o Projects Completed	434	448	641	325
DEPARTMENT OF SANITATION				
o Projects Started				
- Design	12	13	13	10
- Construction	14	16	16	13
o Projects Completed	16	13	13	12
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION				
o Projects Started				
- Design	168	202	146	N/A
- Construction	248	298	86	N/A
o Projects Completed	217	222	156	N/A
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION				
o Projects Started				
- Design	23	9	5	4
- Construction	26	9	9	10
o Projects Completed	8	12	10	12
DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS				
o Projects Started				
- Design	18	3	3	10
- Construction	31	2	0	3
o Projects Completed	44	9	8	0

H. AGENCY PROCUREMENT

CAPITAL PROJECTS -- MANAGEMENT INDICATORS

INDICATORS	FY 1999	Fiscal Year 2000		FY 2001
	Annual Actual	Annual Plan	Annual Actual	Annual Plan
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH				
o Projects Started				
- Design	14	0	0	0
- Construction	11	0	0	0
o Projects Completed				
	0	0	0	0
NEW YORK CITY HEALTH AND HOSPITALS CORPORATION				
o Projects Started				
- Design	0	4	4	0
- Construction	2	3	0	0
o Projects Completed				
	0	4	0	3
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESS SERVICES				
o Projects Started				
- Design	6	6	10	10
- Construction	7	8	3	7
o Projects Completed				
	13	8	7	7
DEPARTMENT OF CITYWIDE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES				
o Projects Started				
- Design	20	22	24	31
- Construction	34	36	43	42
o Projects Completed				
	24	25	24	26

NOTE: Between May 9 and June 19, 2000, as the City approached its constitutional debt limit and the ability to secure additional financing through State legislation remained uncertain, restrictions were placed on capital commitments. In a measure to conserve the City's existing financing authority, only contracts that were critical to public health and safety or legal mandates were advanced.