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**Title:** A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the city of New York, in relation to requiring agencies to develop and utilize a preferred vendor list to provide community-integrated translation and interpretation services and reporting in relation thereto

1. **Introduction**

On June 27, 2022, the Committee on Economic Development, chaired by Council Member Amanda Farías, the Committee on Contracts, chaired by Council Member Julie Won, and the Committee on Oversight & Investigations, chaired by Council Member Gale Brewer, will hold a joint oversight and legislative hearing entitled: *A Good Food Purchasing Program for Citywide Food Procurement & Developing Preferred Vendor Lists for Community-Based Translation Services.* This hearing includes two pieces of legislation—one related to food policy and one related to translation services.

The Committees seek testimony from the Mayor’s Office of Food Policy (MOFP), the Mayor’s Office of Contract Services (MOCS), and advocates, experts and practitioners on food policy and translation services.

1. **Background - Food Procurement**

***Local Law 50 of 2011***

In 2011, the City Council passed Local Law 50 (“Local Law 50”), which encouraged city agencies and vendors to purchase food products grown or produced in New York State by establishing specific procurement tools favoring such food products.

These procurement tools included:

(1) developing guidelines for contracting agencies that purchase food in accordance with New York State’s procurement rules;

(2) publishing such guidelines on MOCS’s website;

(3) training agency contracting personnel on the implementation of those guidelines;

(4) monitoring each agency’s implementation of those guidelines; and

(5) submitting an annual report to the Council detailing each agency’s efforts to implement those guidelines.[[1]](#footnote-2)

Since the passage of Local Law 50, agencies that purchase food have sent surveys to food vendors requesting details regarding the local food products sold to the city by those vendors, as required by the law.[[2]](#footnote-3) In general, response rates to these surveys have been low. In FY 2017, 11 out of 59 vendors who were sent surveys responded (representing $65 million out of $615 million in covered contract value);[[3]](#footnote-4) in FY 2018, 3 out of 66 vendors responded (representing $15 million out of $3.1 billion in covered contract value);[[4]](#footnote-5) in FY 2019, 9 of 97 vendors responded (representing $35.6 million out of $188 million in covered contract value);[[5]](#footnote-6) in FY 2020, 23 out of 93 vendors responded (representing $16.3 million out of $185 million in covered contract value); and in FY 2021, 2 out of 35 vendors responded (representing $4.6 million out of $133 million in covered contract value). These figures are represented in the following chart:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fiscal Year** | **# of vendors who replied** |  **# of vendors who were sent surveys** | **Response Rate (based on # of vendors)** | **Value of contracts who replied (in millions)** | **Value of contracts who were sent surveys (in millions)** | **Response rate (based on contract value)** |
| 2017 | 11 | 59 | 18.64% | $66.5 | $615 | 10.81% |
| 2018 | 3 | 66 | 4.55% | $15 | $3,100 | 0.48% |
| 2019 | 9 | 97 | 9.28% | $35.6 | $188 | 18.94% |
| 2020 | 23 | 93 | 24.73% | $16.3 | $185 | 8.81% |
| 2021 | 2 | 35 | 5.71% | $4.6 | $133 | 3.46% |

Since only a small subset of vendors respond to the survey, it is difficult to establish the effectiveness of the procurement tools made available by Local Law 50.

On January 14, 2020, the Committee on Contracts held an oversight hearing on the implementation of Local Law 50. At the hearing, MOCS identified several challenges to obtaining survey responses.[[6]](#footnote-7) First, the law does not require vendors to complete the survey.[[7]](#footnote-8) Second, “[m]any vendors do not anticipate filling out the survey at the beginning of a new contract, so they do not track the appropriate data throughout the year.”[[8]](#footnote-9) For such vendors, responding to the survey would mean retroactively obtaining the necessary data at the end of the reporting period.[[9]](#footnote-10) Finally, MOCS noted that the reporting process is particularly difficult for human services providers who procure food indirectly from sub-contractors.[[10]](#footnote-11) These providers “lack complete information on the sourcing patterns of their subcontractors/suppliers and may have few tools at their disposal to encourage information provision.”[[11]](#footnote-12)

In addition, MOCS identified several steps it planned to take to improve the response rate and quality of the information provided through the surveys.[[12]](#footnote-13) Specifically, MOCS noted that it would soon transition to a “digitized environment” that would enable more consistent tracking of contracts subject to Local Law 50.[[13]](#footnote-14) In addition, MOCS committed to administering the survey more frequently and giving vendors a clearer picture of the information they intend to request.[[14]](#footnote-15) Finally, MOCS stated that over time, enhancing the recordkeeping functions of PASSPort may allow the information required by Local Law 50 to be collected in real time in the regular course of business, eliminating the need for the survey altogether.[[15]](#footnote-16)

Some suggestions from advocates to amend Local Law 50 include expanding menu planning to incorporate New York State food menus into meals served by agencies,[[16]](#footnote-17) developing agency guidelines to increase the percentage of locally-procured food,[[17]](#footnote-18) and additional planning to revise purchasing practices to enable agencies to procure more food from New York.[[18]](#footnote-19)

 Increasing local food procurement expands the local economy by supporting New York’s farmers, improves the health of New Yorkers by quickly getting fresh locally-harvested food to New York’s tables, and supports the local and regional environment by preserving New York’s farmland.[[19]](#footnote-20)

***The Good Food Purchasing Program***

Local Law 50 aims to provide New Yorkers with fresh and healthy food that is sustainably produced and transported.[[20]](#footnote-21) Accordingly, where practicable, city agencies should afford a preference to New York State food products in their purchasing decisions. Pursuant to Local Law 50, required solicitation guidelines apply to any solicitation valued at more than $100,000 for food or food-related services (e.g., catering), and to any solicitation for social services through which more than $100,000 of food would be purchased annually in fulfillment of the contract.[[21]](#footnote-22)

The Good Food Purchasing Program (“GFPP”) would assist City agencies in achieving those sustainable food purchasing goals.[[22]](#footnote-23) The GFPP is a metric-based, flexible framework that promotes five core values in food purchasing:

1. Local Economies: Support small, diverse, family and cooperatively owned, and mid-sized agricultural and food processing operations within the local area or region.
2. Environmental Sustainability: Sourcing from producers that employ sustainable production systems that reduce or eliminate synthetic pesticides and fertilizers. The aim is to also avoid the use of hormones as well as the routine administration of antibiotics and use of genetically engineered foods. Furthermore, the focus on environmental sustainability will help conserve soil and water and protect and enhance wildlife habitats and biodiversity. This in turn will hopefully reduce water consumption, food waste and greenhouse gas emissions while reducing the food production’s carbon footprint.
3. Valued Workforce: Provide safe and healthy working conditions and fair compensation for all food chain workers and producers from production to consumption.
4. Animal Welfare: Provide humane care for farm animals by improving overall wellbeing through better rearing practices and/or reducing total numbers raised to be sourced for food.
5. Nutrition: Promoting health and well-being by offering generous portions of vegetables, fruit, whole grains and minimally processed foods, while reducing salt, added sugars, saturated fats, and red meat consumption, and eliminating artificial additives. In addition to the nutritional components, GFFP seeks to improve equity, affordability, accessibility, and consumption of high quality culturally relevant “Good Food” in city communities.[[23]](#footnote-24)

Currently, the Mayor’s Office of Food Policy (“MOFP”) coordinates institutional procurement of food and food services. Ten city agencies, led by the Department of Education, administer over 238,000,000 meals and snacks annually via $250 million in contracts.[[24]](#footnote-25) In addition to schools, city-contracted food is also distributed “directly or through nonprofit partners in homeless shelters, childcare centers, correctional facilities, and public hospitals.”[[25]](#footnote-26) In addition, the city applies several strategies for using these procurement guidelines to promote awarding contracts to minority and women-owned enterprises, improve energy efficiency and maximize utilization of recycled products.[[26]](#footnote-27)

The proposed legislation before the committee (Int. No. 517) would empower MOFP and sustainable food advocates through the establishment of good food purchasing standards for city agencies to follow.[[27]](#footnote-28) This program would be assisted by a good food advisory board that would evaluate bids and offer guidance to food procurement agencies on the quality of those bids with respect to the good food purchasing standards.[[28]](#footnote-29)

***New York State “Good Food NY” Bill (S7534/A8580)***

Notably, there was a bill in the New York State Senate’s Procurement and Contracts Committee during the 2021-2022 legislative session that would have permitted municipalities in the state to award food contracts to bidders who meet certain values-based procurement standards at up to 10 percent higher than the lowest responsible bidder who did not meet such standards.[[29]](#footnote-30) It remains to be seen whether this so-called “Good Food NY” bill will pass during the next legislative session, but Int. No. 517 would not be inconsistent with the proposals in this bill.

1. **Background – Translation and Interpretation Services**

In a typical year, the City spends roughly $19 million on translation and interpretation services.[[30]](#footnote-31) In 2017, the City enacted Local Law 30, (“Local Law 30”) which requires the translation of certain city documents into the 10 non-English languages that are most spoken in New York City by individuals with limited English proficiency.[[31]](#footnote-32) As a practical matter, most of the contracts for these non-English language translation and interpretation services go to large language companies outside of New York who provide general translation services, but may not provide appropriate translation for many of the various nonstandard dialects spoken by many of the city’s immigrant communities.[[32]](#footnote-33) As a result many immigrant New Yorkers or those with limited English proficiency turn to their friends and families or community-based non-profits which are not funded by the city to conduct those translation services.[[33]](#footnote-34)

During the height of the pandemic, many of the city’s communities with limited English proficiency relied upon informal volunteer translators such as the Chinese Translation Pod to assist with vaccine appointments and scheduling.[[34]](#footnote-35) These volunteer services fill a need that is not being met by the City under the existing translation framework, in spite of the requirements set by Local Law 30.

In 2020, former New York City Comptroller Scott Stringer proposed developing a Community Legal Interpreter Bank (“CLIB”) which would “recruit, train and dispatch legal interpreters to legal services organizations across the city.”[[35]](#footnote-36) Other municipalities, like Washington, DC, offer CLIBs which are primarily staffed by community-based translation and interpretation service providers.[[36]](#footnote-37) Many of these translators and interpreters are based in the communities that they serve, worker-owned and more culturally responsive than larger translation and interpretation services companies that provide such services.[[37]](#footnote-38)

The proposed legislation before the committee (Proposed Int. No. 136-A) would require the administration to create a preferred vendor list of community-based translators and interpreters to fill agency contracts below the small purchase limits.[[38]](#footnote-39) The list would enable the city to identify preferred vendors for translation and interpretation contracts up to $100,000 or up to $500,000 for vendors who are certified Minority or Women-Owned Business Enterprises.[[39]](#footnote-40)

1. **Legislative Analysis**

*Int. No. 517*

Int. No. 517 would create a good food purchasing program and advisory board to establish standards and goals for the purchase of food products in public institutions that meet sourcing, production, and quality guidelines. The advisory board would include the commissioners of agencies that execute food procurement contracts, seven members appointed by the Mayor and seven members appointed by the Speaker with knowledge of the good food purchasing program value categories.

The advisory board would conduct baseline assessments of each agency’s food procurement processes, then develop and submit a five-year plan with one-year, three-year and five-year benchmarks towards achieving the standards and goals of the good food purchasing program. The advisory board would evaluate contract bids that are submitted in response to food procurement contract requests for proposal with respect to whether each bid would further the good food purchasing standards, and each agency would be permitted to consider the board’s assessments. The advisory board would submit annual progress reports on the implementation of the good food purchasing program with recommendations, post the report on the website of the Mayor’s Office of Food Policy and hold a public hearing about its findings.

*Proposed Int. No. 136-A*

Proposed Int. No. 136-A would require contracting agencies to develop a preferred vendor list of providers of community-integrated translation and interpretation services and utilize such list to procure translation and interpretation services that are not in excess of the small purchase limit. The community-integrated translation and interpretation services procured pursuant to this bill would not include telephonic interpretation services. It would also require the City Chief Procurement Officer to issue a quarterly report to the Mayor and the Speaker of the Council on agencies’ procurements of translation and interpretation services, including their use of the preferred vendor list.

Int. No. 517

By The Speaker (Council Member Adams) and Council Members Farías and Won

..Title

A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the city of New York, in relation to creating a good food purchasing program..Body

Be it enacted by the Council as follows:

Section 1. Chapter 1 of title 6 of the administrative code of the city of New York is amended by adding a new section 6-130.1 to read as follows:

§ 6-130.1. Good Food Purchasing Program. a. Definitions. For the purposes of this section, the following terms have the following meanings:

Animal welfare. The term “animal welfare” means the value category that represents sourcing from vendors that provide humane care for farm animals by implementing high-welfare rearing practices and/or sourcing fewer animal products overall.

Environmental sustainability. The term “environmental sustainability” means the value category that represents sourcing from producers that: (i) employ sustainable production systems that reduce or eliminate synthetic pesticides and fertilizers; (ii) avoid the use of hormones, non-therapeutic antibiotics, and genetic engineering; (iii) conserve soil and water; (iv) protect and enhance wildlife habitat and biodiversity; and (v) reduce on-farm energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions and/or source fewer food items that have a high carbon and water footprint.

Health. The term “health” means a value category that represents promoting the well-being of city residents served by agencies that prepare and/or distribute food to the public by offering essential fats, whole grains, whole plant-based and lean proteins, vegetables and fresh fruits; reducing sodium, added sugars and saturated fats; and eliminating artificial additives, trans and hydrogenated fats, ultra-processed foods and sugar-sweetened beverages.

Local economies. The term “local economies” means the value category that represents, to the extent permitted under subdivision 8-a of section 103 of the general municipal law, sourcing from and supporting diverse, family- and cooperatively-owned, small- and mid-sized agricultural and food processing operations within the local area and/or region.

Good food purchasing program. The term “good food purchasing program” means a program that sets standards and goals for food procurement by city agencies and provides a comprehensive set of tools, technical support and a verification system to assist city agencies in meeting those goals over time.

Value categories. The term “value categories” means the five values that are the basis for the food procurement standards and goals included in the good food purchasing program, which are environmental sustainability, local economies, health, valued workforce and animal welfare.

Valued workforce. The term “valued workforce” means the value category that represents sourcing from vendors that guarantee the rights of workers to freedom of association and collective bargaining, free from any interference, coercion, or reprisal, to better ensure safe and healthy working conditions and fair compensation; and ensure farmers have the opportunity to obtain a fair price for their products that covers the cost of production and fair remuneration for their management and labor.

b. Standards. The mayor’s office of food policy shall establish a good food purchasing program that shall be based on value categories. For procurements during a declared citywide, statewide or national emergency, such standards shall remain in place, where feasible. The mayor’s office of food policy shall reevaluate the standards and goals of such program at least every three years.

c. Good food purchasing advisory board. The implementation of the good food purchasing program established pursuant to subdivision b shall be overseen by a good food purchasing advisory board. The mayor’s office of food policy shall convene such advisory board. Agencies shall provide the advisory board with necessary materials, including applicable contracts and bids for contracts, in a timely fashion to allow it to complete the work required by this section. Such advisory board shall include the following members:

1. The commissioner of each agency that executes food procurement contracts or such commissioner’s designee;

2. Seven members appointed by the mayor, including an individual with knowledge regarding all five value categories, an environmental sustainability advocate, an expert in nutrition, an individual representing food system workers, an advocate with expertise in animal welfare, an individual representing local farm owners and an individual representing local farm workers; and

3. Seven members appointed by the speaker of the council, including an individual with knowledge regarding all five value categories, an environmental sustainability advocate, an expert in nutrition, an individual representing food system workers, an advocate with expertise in animal welfare, an individual representing local farm owners and an individual representing local farm workers.

d. Baseline assessment and report. On or before July 1, 2023, and annually thereafter, the advisory board shall conduct a baseline assessment of the food procurement process for each agency that executes food procurement contracts and publish a report with its findings. Such baseline assessment shall evaluate the food procurement contracts of each agency and how such contracts meet the goals of the good food purchasing program. The reports required pursuant to this subdivision shall be posted on the website of the mayor’s office of food policy.

e. Agency procurement goals and plans. Within six months of completing the initial baseline assessment required by subdivision d, the advisory board shall consult with the mayor’s office of food policy and any other relevant entities with expertise in value categories and procurement in the city, as necessary, to develop and submit to each agency a three-year plan that includes one-year, three-year and five-year benchmarks to measure each agency’s progress toward achieving the good food purchasing program goals. Such plan shall include a process for each agency to consult with the advisory board regarding incorporating good food purchasing program standards into the agency’s requests for proposals, at the agency’s discretion. Such plans shall be reevaluated and revised by the advisory board every three years thereafter based on the progress of each agency in achieving the good food purchasing standards.

f. Bid assessment. The advisory board shall evaluate food procurement contract bids in excess of the small purchase limits that are submitted in response to the requests for proposal of each agency that solicits food procurement contracts. Each bid shall be evaluated and scored under the good food purchasing standards. The board shall complete such evaluation and score and submit it to the relevant agency for consideration within 30 days of receipt of the complete bid. Each agency may consider the advisory board’s assessment and score as part of its evaluation of the food procurement bids it receives. Such evaluations and scores shall also be posted on the website of the mayor’s office of food policy.

g. Progress Report. On or before December 31, 2023, and annually thereafter, the advisory board shall submit a report and recommendations to each agency that solicits food procurement contracts regarding its progress toward achieving the good food purchasing standards and hold a public hearing regarding the results of the progress report. Such report shall also be submitted to the mayor and the speaker of the council and posted to the website of the mayor’s office of food policy.

§ 2. This local law takes effect 120 days after it becomes law.
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Int. 1660-2019

Proposed Int. No. 136-A

By Council Members Won, Hudson, Brewer, Ung, Lee, Joseph, Ossé, Velázquez, Gennaro, Nurse, Schulman, Menin, Krishnan, Avilés, Narcisse, Dinowitz, Louis, Farías, De La Rosa, Restler, Brannan, Ayala, Bottcher, Riley, Rivera, Hanif and Vernikov

..Title

A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the city of New York, in relation to requiring agencies to develop and utilize a preferred vendor list to provide community-integrated translation and interpretation services and reporting in relation thereto

..Body

Be it enacted by the Council as follows:

Section 1. Chapter 1 of title 6 of the administrative code of the city of New York is amended to add a new section 6-147 to read as follows:

§ 6-147 Preferred vendor list to provide for community-integrated translation and interpretation services. a. Definitions. For the purposes of this section, the following terms have the following meanings:

Community-integrated translation and interpretation services. The term “community-integrated translation and interpretation services” means translation and interpretation services that community-based organizations provide and does not include telephonic interpretation services.

Covered agency. The term “covered agency” means every city agency that provides direct public services or emergency services.

b. Each covered agency shall develop a preferred vendor list of providers of community-integrated translation and interpretation services for at least 100 languages, including both common and esoteric languages as identified by the office of the language services coordinator, and utilize such list to procure translation and interpretation services not in excess of the small purchase limit provided in section 3-08 of title 9 of the rules of the city of New York.

c. Reporting required. No more than 180 days after the effective date of the local law that

added this section, and quarterly thereafter, the city chief procurement officer shall submit to the mayor and the speaker of the council and publish on the mayor’s office of contract services website a report regarding the city’s procurement of translation and interpretation services during the prior quarter. Such quarterly report shall include the following information regarding procurements for translation and interpretation services, disaggregated by covered agency:

1. The number of procurements for translation and interpretation services, disaggregated by language;

2. The number of small purchase procurements for translation and interpretation services, disaggregated by language;

3. The number of small purchase procurements for translation and interpretation services in which the city used a vendor that appears on a preferred vendor list as required by subdivision b, disaggregated by language;

4. The total dollar value of procurements for translation and interpretation services that utilized telephonic interpretation services;

5. The total dollar value of small purchase procurements that utilized a vendor that appears on a preferred vendor list as required by subdivision b; and

6. The total dollar value of small purchase procurements that did not utilize a vendor that appears on any such preferred vendor list.

§ 2. This local law takes effect 120 days after it becomes law, except that the city chief procurement officer shall take such measures as are necessary for the implementation of this local law, including the promulgation of any rules, before such date.
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