State of Minnesota Joint Availability and Disparity Study

FINAL REPORT

Submitted To:

Metropolitan Mosquito Control District

Submitted By:

MGT OF AMERICA, INC.

October 23, 2009

Revised January 11, 2010

State of Minnesota Joint Availability and Disparity Study

Metropolitan Mosquito Control District

FINAL REPORT

Submitted by:

2123 Centre Pointe Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32308-4930
(850) 386-3191

October 23, 2009

Revised January 11, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1-1

1.1 Technical Approach 1-2
1.2 Report Organization 1-2

2.0 LEGAL REVIEW 2-1

2.1 Introduction 2-1
2.2 Standards of Review for Race-Specific and Gender-Specific Programs 2-2
2.3 To Withstand Strict Scrutiny, an MBE Program Must Be Based on Thorough Evidence Showing a Compelling Governmental Interest 2-5
2.4 Sufficiently Strong Evidence of Significant Statistical Disparities Between Qualified Minorities Available and Minorities Utilized Will Satisfy Strict Scrutiny and Justify a Narrowly Tailored M/WBE Program 2-7
2.5 The Governmental Entity or Agency Enacting an M/WBE Program Must Be Shown to Have Actively or Passively Perpetuated the Discrimination 2-13
2.6 To Withstand Strict Scrutiny, an M/WBE Program Must Be Narrowly Tailored to Remedy Identified Discrimination 2-16
2.7 Small Business Procurement Preferences 2-20
2.8 Geographical Business Preferences 2-21
2.9 Conclusions 2-25

3.0 RELEVANT MARKET AREA, UTILIZATION AND AVAILABILITY ANALYSES 3-1

3.1 Methodology 3-1
3.2 Construction 3-7
3.3 Architecture and Engineering 3-10
3.4 Professional Services 3-12
3.5 Other Services 3-14
3.6 Goods and Supplies 3-16
3.7 Summary 3-18

4.0 DISPARITY ANALYSIS 4-1
4.1 Methodology 4-1
4.2 Disparity Indices 4-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

PAGE

5.0 ANECDOTAL ANALYSIS 5-1

5.1 Methodology 5-1
5.2 Demographics 5-2
5.3 Barriers to Doing Business with Governmental Units 5-8
5.4 Certification Process 5-17
5.5 Prompt Payment 5-20
5.6 Access to Capital 5-21
5.7 Bonding and Insurance Process 5-22
5.8 Discrimination 5-25
5.9 Other Focus Groups, Public Hearings, and Personal Interview Comments 5-30
5.10 Suggested Remedies 5-31
5.11 Conclusion 5-34

6.0 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 6-1

6.1 Findings for M/WBE Utilization and Availability 6-1
6.2 Recommendations 6-5
6.3 Selected Best Practices 6-8

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Telephone Survey Instrument
Appendix B: Telephone Survey Results
Appendix C: Regression Analysis
Appendix D: Personal Interview Guide
Appendix E: Focus Group Guide
Appendix F: US Census Survey of Business Owners
Appendix G: Census Disparity Analysis

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.0 INTRODUCTION

On August 4, 2008 the Commissioner of Administration for the state of Minnesota contracted MGT of America, Inc. (MGT), to conduct a Joint Availability and Disparity Study for the Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Council, Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District, and the Metropolitan Airports Commission, later referred to as the Governmental Units. The purpose of the disparity study was to:

- Examine what, if any, barriers may have resulted in disparities in the utilization of available minority-owned, woman-owned, and targeted group business enterprises (M/WBE and TGBs) and examine and summarize related findings from other studies that encompass each of the Governmental Units' relevant marketplaces.

- Identify from the most accurate sources the availability of M/WBEs and TGBs that are ready, willing, and able to do business with each of the Governmental Units' members in the relevant market areas.

- Analyze state funded contracting and procurement data of each of the Governmental Units to determine their respective utilization, as well as each of the Governmental Units member's utilization as a whole, of M/W/BEs and TGBs.

- Determine the extent to which any identified disparities in the utilization of available M/WBEs and TGBs by each of the Governmental Units' members might be impacted by discrimination.

- Recommend programs to remedy the effects of any discrimination identified, and to reduce or eliminate any other marketplace barriers that adversely affect the contract participation of such M/WBEs and TGBs.

Governmental entities like the members of the Governmental Units have authorized disparity studies in response to the *City of Richmond v. J. A. Croson Co.*[1] (*Croson*) decision to determine whether there is a compelling interest for remedial procurement programs. Recommendations resulting from such studies are used to narrowly tailor any resulting programs to specifically address findings of underutilization attributable to unfair business practices.

The findings, analyses, and recommendations of the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District (MMCD) study are found in this report. Throughout the chapters that follow, MGT presents its findings, analyses, and recommendations. This chapter summarizes the objectives for the study, the technical approach used to accomplish the objectives, the major tasks undertaken, and an overview of the organization of the report.

[1] *City of Richmond v. J. A. Croson, Co*., 488 U.S. 469 (1989).

1.1 Technical Approach

In conducting the study and preparing recommendations, MGT followed a carefully designed work plan that allowed MGT study team members to fully analyze availability, utilization, and disparity with regard to M/WBE and TGB participation. MGT's approach has been tested in over 125 jurisdictions and proven reliable to meet the study's objectives. The work plan consisted of, but was not limited to, the following major tasks:

- Conducting a legal review.
- Establishing data parameters and finalizing a work plan.
- Reviewing policies, procedures, and programs.
- Conducting market area and utilization analyses.
- Determining the availability of qualified firms.
- Analyzing the utilization and availability data for disparity and statistical significance.
- Conducting a telephone survey.
- Collecting and analyzing anecdotal information.
- Conducting a statistically valid regression analysis.
- Providing information on best practices related to small and M/WBE business development.
- Identifying narrowly tailored race- and gender-based and race- and gender-neutral remedies.
- Preparing the final report for this study.

1.2 Report Organization

The study for the Mosquito Control District reviewed MMCD's contract and procurement data from the period of January 1, 2002, through December 31, 2007. In addition to this introductory chapter, this report contains the following sections:

- **Chapter 2.0** presents an overview of controlling legal precedents that impact remedial procurement programs and guide disparity study methodology..
- **Chapter 3.0** presents the methodology used to determine the MMCD's relevant market area and statistical analysis of vendor utilization by the Mosquito Control District as well as the availability of firms for procurement activities.

- **Chapter 4.0** provides a discussion of the levels of disparity for prime contractors and a review of the multivariate analysis for the MMCD.

- **Chapter 5.0** presents an analysis of anecdotal data and information based on the telephone survey, personal interviews, focus groups, and public hearings.

  Chapter 6.0 provides a summary of the findings presented in this report with conclusions, commendations, and recommendations.[2]

MGT recommends reading the report in its entirety to understand the basis for the recommendations presented in **Chapter 6.0**.

To understand the procurement and contracting data provided to MGT for analysis, a Utilization Detail Report is provided under a separate cover. The Utilization Detail Report is categorized by year, vendor name, ethnicity, business category, and sum of dollars used in each analysis.

[2] **Chapter 6.0** is designed to provide a summary of the overall report, conclusions drawn from the study, and MGT's recommendations. **Chapter 6.0** serves as an Executive Summary for the study.

2.0 LEGAL REVIEW

2.0 LEGAL REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides legal background for the State of Minnesota Joint Availability and Disparity Study. The material that follows does not constitute legal advice to the state of Minnesota on minority- and woman-owned business enterprise (M/WBE) programs, affirmative action, or any other matter. Instead, it provides a context for the statistical and anecdotal analyses that appear in subsequent chapters of this report.

The Supreme Court decisions in *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Company*[1] (*Croson*) and later cases have established and applied the constitutional standards for an affirmative action program. This chapter identifies and analyzes those decisions, summarizing how courts evaluate the constitutionality of race- and gender-specific programs. Decisions of the Eighth Circuit, which includes Minnesota, offer the most directly binding authority, but where those decisions leave issues unsettled, the review considers decisions from other circuits.

By way of a preliminary outline, the courts have determined that an affirmative action program involving governmental procurement of goods or services must meet the following standards:

- A remedial, race-conscious program is subject to strict judicial scrutiny under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.
  - Strict scrutiny has two basic components: a compelling governmental interest in the program and narrow tailoring of the program.
  - To survive the strict scrutiny standard, a remedial, race-conscious program must be based on a compelling governmental interest.
    - "Compelling interest" means the government must prove past or present racial discrimination requiring remedial attention.
    - There must be a specific "strong basis in the evidence" for the compelling governmental interest.
    - Statistical evidence is preferred and possibly necessary as a practical matter; anecdotal evidence is permissible and can offer substantial support, but it more than likely cannot stand on its own.
  - A program designed to address the compelling governmental interest must be narrowly tailored to remedy the identified discrimination.
    - "Narrow tailoring" means the remedy must fit the findings.
    - The evidence showing compelling interest must guide the tailoring very closely.

[1] 488 U.S. 469 (1989).

- Race-neutral alternatives must be considered first.

- A lesser standard, intermediate judicial scrutiny, applies to programs that establish gender preferences.
  - To survive the intermediate scrutiny standard, a remedial, gender-conscious program must serve important governmental objectives and be substantially related to the achievement of those objectives.
  - The evidence does not need to be as strong and the tailoring does not need to be as specific under the lesser standard.

2.2 Standards of Review for Race- and Gender-Specific Programs

2.2.1 Race-Specific Programs: The Croson *Decision*

Croson established the framework for testing the validity of programs based on racial discrimination. In 1983, the Richmond City Council (the Council) adopted a Minority Business Utilization Plan (the Plan) following a public hearing in which citizens testified about historical societal discrimination. In adopting the Plan, the Council also relied on a study indicating that "while the general population of Richmond was 50 percent black, only 0.67 percent of the City's prime construction contracts had been awarded to minority businesses in the 5-year period from 1978 to 1983."[2]

The evidence before the Council also established that a variety of state and local contractor associations had little or no minority business membership. The Council relied on statements by a Council member whose opinion was that "the general conduct of the construction industry in this area and the State, and around the nation, is one in which race discrimination and exclusion on the basis of race is widespread."[3] There was, however, no direct evidence of race discrimination on the part of the city in its contracting activities, and no evidence that the city's prime contractors had discriminated against minority-owned subcontractors.[4]

The Plan required the city's prime contractors to subcontract at least 30 percent of the dollar amount of each contract to one or more minority-owned business enterprise (MBE). The Plan did not establish any geographic limits for eligibility. Therefore, an otherwise qualified MBE from anywhere in the United States could benefit from the 30 percent set-aside.

J.A. Croson Company, a non-MBE mechanical plumbing and heating contractor, filed a lawsuit against the city of Richmond alleging that the Plan was unconstitutional because it violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. After a considerable record of litigation and appeals, the Fourth Circuit struck down the Richmond Plan and the Supreme Court affirmed this decision.[5] The Supreme Court determined that strict scrutiny was the appropriate standard of judicial review for MBE programs, so that a race-conscious program must be based on a compelling governmental interest and be narrowly tailored to

[2] Id. at 479-80.
[3] Id. at 480.
[4] Id.
[5] Id. at 511.

achieve its objectives. This standard requires a firm evidentiary basis for concluding that the underutilization of minorities is a product of past discrimination.[6]

2.2.2 Gender-Specific Programs

The Supreme Court has not addressed the specific issue of a gender-based classification in the context of a woman-owned business enterprise (WBE) program. *Croson* was limited to the review of an MBE program. In evaluating gender-based classifications, the Court has used what some call "intermediate scrutiny," a less stringent standard of review than the "strict scrutiny" applied to race-based classifications. Intermediate scrutiny requires that classifying persons on the basis of sex "must carry the burden of showing an exceedingly persuasive justification for the classification."[7] The classification meets this burden "only by showing at least that the classification serves 'important governmental objectives and that the discriminatory means employed' are 'substantially related to the achievement of those objectives.'"[8]

Several federal courts have applied intermediate scrutiny to WBE programs and yet have found the programs to be unconstitutional.[9] Nevertheless, in *Coral Construction v. King County*, the Ninth Circuit upheld a WBE program under the intermediate scrutiny standard.[10] Even using intermediate scrutiny, the court in *Coral Construction* noted that some degree of discrimination must be demonstrated in a particular industry before a gender-specific remedy may be instituted in that industry. As the court stated, "the mere recitation of a benign, compensatory purpose will not automatically shield a gender-specific program from constitutional scrutiny."[11] Indeed, one court has questioned the concept that it might be easier to establish a WBE program than it is to establish an MBE program.[12]

More recently, the Tenth Circuit, on the second appeal in *Concrete Works of Colorado v. City of Denver* (*Concrete Works IV*),[13] approved the constitutionality of a WBE program based on evidence comparable to that supporting an MBE program that the court also upheld in the same decision. Unlike *Coral Construction*, however, *Concrete Works IV* offered no independent guidance on the level of evidence required to support a WBE program.

---

[6] Id. at 493.
[7] *Mississippi Univ. for Women v. Hogan*, 458 U.S. 718, 724 (1982) (quoting *Kirchberg* v. *Feenstra,* 450 U.S. 455, 461 (1981)); see also *United States* v. *Virginia,* 518 U. S. 515, 531 (1996), *Tuan Anh Nguyen v. INS*, 533 U.S. 53, 60 (2001).
[8] *Mississippi Univ. for Women, supra,* at 724 (quoting *Wengler v. Druggists Mut. Ins. Co.,* 446 U.S. 142, 150 (1980)); see also *Virginia, supra,* at 533, *Nguyen, supra,* at 60.
[9] See *Assoc. Util. Contrs. v. Baltimore*, 83 F. Supp. 2d 613 (D Md 2000); *Eng'g Contrs. Ass'n of S. Florida, Inc. v. Dade County*, 122 F.3d 895 (11th Cir. 1997); *Builders Ass'n of Greater Chicago v. County of Cook*, 256 F.3d 642 (7th Cir. 2001). The Eighth Circuit did not address the application of intermediate scrutiny to WBE participation in the federal DBE program in *MnDOT*, 345 F.3d 964 (8th Cir. 2003); cert. denied, 158 L.Ed. 2d 729 (2004) – 541 U.S. 1041 *Sherbrooke Turf, Inc. v*.
[10] *Coral Constr. Co. v. King County*, 941 F.2d 910 (9th Cir. 1991), cert. denied, 502 U.S. 1033 (1992).
[11] Id. at 932.
[12] *Builders Ass'n of Greater Chicago*, 256 F.3d at 644. See also *States Paving Co. v. Washington State DOT,* 407 F.3d 983, 991, n.6 (9th Cir. 2005) (rejecting need for separate analysis of WBE program under intermediate scrutiny).
[13] 321 F.3d 950 (10th Cir. 2003).

2.2.3 An Overview of the Applicable Case Law

Croson did not find a compelling justification for a complete MBE program, and more recent decisions of the Eighth Circuit have not had to address the question squarely. *Croson* found the city of Richmond's evidence to be inadequate as a matter of law. Nevertheless, more recent cases in other federal circuits have addressed applications of the law that were not considered in *Croson*. Thus, it becomes necessary to look to the decisions of other federal circuits to predict what level of evidence might be required to establish an affirmative action program.

The discussion in this review will also attend closely to the most relevant decisions in the area of government contracting. Justice O'Connor, distinguishing her majority opinion on affirmative action in law school admissions from her opinions in government contracting cases, wrote:

> *Context matters when reviewing race-based governmental action under the Equal Protection Clause. . . . Not every decision influenced by race is equally objectionable and strict scrutiny is designed to provide a framework for carefully examining the importance and the sincerity of the reasons advanced by the governmental decision maker for the use of race in that particular context.*[14]

Further, some caution must be exercised in relying upon opinions of the federal district courts, which make both findings of fact and holdings of law. As to holdings of law, the district courts are ultimately subject to rulings by their circuit courts. As to matters of fact, their decisions depend heavily on the precise record before them, in these cases frequently including matters such as evaluations of the credibility and expertise of witnesses. Such findings are not binding precedents outside of their districts, even if they indicate the kind of evidence and arguments that might succeed elsewhere.

Finally, the ways in which municipalities participate in national disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE) programs is a specialized issue distinct from that of supporting municipal programs, even if the same kinds of evidence and same levels of review apply. In *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña,*[15] the Supreme Court did decide that federal DBE programs should be examined by the same strict scrutiny standard that *Croson* mandated for state and local programs. Nevertheless, cases considering national DBE programs have many important distinctions from cases considering municipal programs, particularly when it comes to finding a compelling governmental interest.[16] The national DBE cases have somewhat more application in determining whether a local program is narrowly tailored (to be discussed in **Section 2.6**).[17]

---

[14] *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306, 327 (2003).

[15] *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña*, 515 U.S. 200-227 (1995).

[16] See *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Slater*, 228 F.3d 1147-1165 (10th Cir. 2000), cert. granted in part sub nom., *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Mineta*, 532 U.S. 967 (2001); cert. dismissed as improvidently granted, 534 U.S. 103 (2001); *Sherbrooke Turf,* 345 F.3d at 970-1.

[17] Recently the Ninth Circuit ruled in *Western States Paving Co. v. Washington State DOT* that specific evidence of discrimination was necessary at a state level in order for the implementation of race-conscious goals to be narrowly tailored. *States Paving Co.,* 407 F.3d at 997-8. In *Northern Contracting v. Illinois DOT*, the district court, while not striking down the program, also required the Illinois DOT to develop local evidence of discrimination sufficient to justify the imposition of race-conscious goals. In this sense, for these cases narrow tailoring still requires factual predicate information to support race-conscious program elements in a DBE program. *N. Contr. v. Illinois*, No. 00 4515 (ND IL 2004), decided 3/3/04 (2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3226) 139-160.

Thus, the majority of this review will be based on decisions of the federal circuit courts applying *Croson* to city or county programs designed to increase participation by M/WBEs in government contracting. This is not a large body of case law. While other cases are useful as to particular points, only a small number of circuit court cases have reviewed strictly local M/WBE programs and given clear, specific, and binding guidance about the adequacy of a complete factual record including thorough, local disparity studies with at least some statistical analysis. Further, in one of the three directly applicable circuit court cases, the Third Circuit evaded the issue of compelling justification after lengthy discussion, holding that the Philadelphia M/WBE program was unconstitutional because it was not narrowly tailored.[18]

Ultimately, only two circuit court decisions since *Croson* have passed definitively on thorough, strictly local disparity studies: *Engineering Contractors Association of South Florida, Inc*.,[19] and *Concrete Works IV*.[20] In *Engineering Contractors*, the Eleventh Circuit ultimately upheld the district court finding that Dade County's disparity studies were not adequate to support an M/WBE program, at least in the face of rebuttal evidence.[21] By contrast, in *Concrete Works IV*, the Tenth Circuit, after holding that the district court had used an improper standard for weighing the evidence, went on to evaluate the evidence and determine that it was adequate as a matter of law to establish a compelling justification for Denver's program. The Supreme Court refused to hear the appeal in *Concrete Works IV*,[22] although the refusal in itself has no precedential effect. The dissent to that denial, written by Justice Scalia with the Chief Justice joining, argues that these cases may mark a split in approach among the circuits that will need to be reconciled.

The Eighth Circuit has not ruled on an M/WBE program supported by a disparity study. The most relevant case from the Eighth Circuit, *Sherbooke Turf*, involved the federal DBE program, and primarily discussed narrow tailoring rather than the necessary elements of a factual predicate study. Consequently, results from other circuit court decisions are discussed for the purpose of being instructive, although they are not binding on the Eighth Circuit.

2.3 To Withstand Strict Scrutiny, a Race-Based Program Must Be Based on Thorough Evidence Showing a Compelling Governmental Interest

For government contracting programs, courts have yet to find a compelling governmental interest for affirmative action other than remedying discrimination in the relevant marketplace. In other arenas, diversity has served as a compelling governmental interest for affirmative action. For example, the Ninth Circuit upheld race-based admission standards at an experimental elementary school in order to provide a more real world education experience.[23] More recently, in *Petit v. City of Chicago*, the Seventh Circuit relied on *Grutter*

[18] *Contractors Ass'n of E. Penn. Inc. v. City of Philadelphia,* 91 F.3d 586, 605 (3rd Cir. 1996).
[19] 122 F.3d 895.
[20] 321 F.3d 950.
[21] Compare *Cone Corp. v. Hillsborough County*, 908 F.2d 908 (11th Cir. 1990), an earlier decision of the Eleventh Circuit reversing summary judgment against an MBE program where more limited statistical evidence was found adequate to require a trial on the merits in the face of a relatively weak challenge.
[22] *Concrete Works of Colo. v. City of Denver*, Scalia, J. dissenting, 540 U.S. 1027, 1027-35 (2003).
[23] *Hunter v. Regents of the Univ. of Cal., 190 F.3d 1061* (9th Cir. 1999).

v. Bollinger in stating that urban police departments had "an even more compelling need for diversity" than universities and upheld the Chicago program "under the *Grutter* standards."[24]

The recent holding that other compelling interests may support affirmative action does not yet appear to have any application to public contracting.[25] The Eighth Circuit in *Sherbrooke Turf v. Minnesota D.O.T.* did not consider any other compelling interests for the DBE program outside of remedying discrimination.[26]

Croson identified two necessary factors for establishing racial discrimination sufficiently to demonstrate a compelling governmental interest in establishing an M/WBE program. First, there needs to be identified discrimination in the relevant market.[27] Second, "the governmental actor enacting the set-aside program must have somehow perpetuated the discrimination to be remedied by the program,"[28] either actively or at least passively with the "infusion of tax dollars into a discriminatory industry."[29]

Although the Supreme Court in *Croson* did not specifically define the methodology that should be used to establish the evidentiary basis required by strict scrutiny, the Court did outline governing principles. Lower courts have expanded the Supreme Court's *Croson* guidelines and have applied or distinguished these principles when asked to decide the constitutionality of state, county, and city programs that seek to enhance opportunities for minorities and women.

2.3.1 Post-Enactment Evidence

The Supreme Court in *Croson* found pre-enactment evidence of discrimination insufficient to justify the program. The defendant in *Croson* did not seek to defend its program based on post-enactment evidence. However, following *Croson,* a number of circuits did defend the use of post-enactment evidence to support the establishment of a local public affirmative action program.[30] Some cases required both pre-enactment and post-enactment evidence.[31]

The Supreme Court case in *Shaw v. Hunt*[32] raised anew the issue of post-enactment evidence in defending local public sector affirmative action programs. *Shaw* involved the use of racial factors in drawing voting districts in North Carolina. In *Shaw*, the Supreme Court rejected the use of reports providing evidence of discrimination in North Carolina because the reports were not developed before the voting districts were designed. Thus, the critical issue was whether the legislative body believed that discrimination had existed before the districts were drafted.[33] Following the *Shaw* decision, two districts courts

---

[24] *Petit v. City of Chicago,* 352 F.3d 1111, 1114 (7th Cir. 2003).
[25] *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306 (2003). For an argument that other bases could serve as a compelling interest in public contracting, see Michael K. Fridkin, "The Permissibility of Non-Remedial Justifications for Racial Preferences in Public Contracting," 24 *N. Ill. U. L. Rev*. 509-510 (Summer 2004).
[26] *Sherbrooke Turf Inc.*, 345 F.3d at 969-971.
[27] *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 492.
[28] *Coral Construction*, 941 F.2d at 916.
[29] Id.
[30] See *Eng'g Contrs. Ass'n of S. Florida, Inc. v. Dade County*, 122 F.3d 895, 911 (11th Cir. 1997); *Contrs. Ass'n of E. Philadelphia v. Philadelphia*, 6 F.3d 990, 1009 n.18 (2nd Cir. 1993); *Concrete Works of Colorado, Inc. v. City and County of Denver*, 36 F.3d 1513, 1521 (10th Cir. 1994).
[31] See *Coral Construction Co. v. King County*, 941 F.2d 910-920 (9th Cir. 1991).
[32] *Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. 899 (1996).
[33] Id. at 910.

rejected the use of post-enactment evidence in the evaluation of the constitutionality of local minority business programs.[34]

2.3.2 Agency Evidence

An agency contemplating an M/WBE program should have evidence expressly and specifically linked to the agency itself. The Fifth Circuit criticized the city of Jackson for commissioning a disparity study but not adopting the findings of the study.[35] A district court in New Jersey struck down a set-aside involving New Jersey casino licenses that was based on the factual predicate study for the state of New Jersey M/WBE program, which did not cover the casino industry.[36]

2.4 Sufficiently Strong Evidence of Significant Statistical Disparities Between Qualified Minorities Available and Minorities Utilized Will Satisfy Strict Scrutiny and Justify a Narrowly Tailored M/WBE Program

The Supreme Court in *Croson* stated that "where gross statistical disparities can be shown, they alone in a proper case may constitute *prima facie* proof of a pattern or practice of discrimination."[37] But the statistics must go well beyond comparing the rate of minority presence in the general population to the rate of prime construction contracts awarded to MBEs. The Court in *Croson* objected to such a comparison, indicating that the proper statistical evaluation would compare the percentage of qualified MBEs in the relevant market with the percentage of total municipal construction dollars awarded to them.[38]

To meet this more precise requirement, courts have accepted the use of a disparity index.[39] The Supreme Court in *Croson* recognized statistical measures of disparity that compared the number of qualified and available M/WBEs with the rate of municipal construction dollars actually awarded to M/WBEs in order to demonstrate discrimination in a local construction industry.[40] The Ninth Circuit has stated, "In our recent decision [*Coral Construction*] we emphasized that such statistical disparities are 'an invaluable tool' in demonstrating the discrimination necessary to establish a compelling interest."[41]

2.4.1 Determining Availability

To perform proper disparity analysis, the government must determine "availability"—the number of qualified minority contractors willing and able to perform a particular service for the municipality. In *Croson*, the Court stated:

---

[34] *AUC v. Baltimore,* 83 F. Supp. 2d 613, 620-22 (D. Md. 2000); *West Tenn. ABC v. Memphis City Schools*, 64 F. Supp. 2d 714, 718-21 (W.D. Tenn. 1999).
[35] *Scott v. City Of Jackson*, 199 F.3d 206, 218 (1999).
[36] *Ass'n. for Fairness in Business, Inc. v. New Jersey,* 82 F. Supp. 2d 353, 361 (D.N.J. 2000).
[37] *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 501, quoting *Hazelwood School Division v. United States*, 433 U.S. 299, 307-308 (1977).
[38] Id. at 502.
[39] See *Engineering Contractors Ass'n of South Florida, Inc.,* 122 F.3d at 914; *Concrete Works IV,* 321 F.3d at 964-69.
[40] *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 503-504.
[41] *Ass'd. General Contrs. of California, Inc. v. Coalition for Economic Equity*, 950 F.2d 1401, 1414 (9th Cir. 1991) (*AGCC II*) citing *Coral Construction*, 941 F.2d at 918; see also *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 509.

> *Where there is a significant statistical disparity between the number of qualified minority contractors willing and able to perform a particular service and the number of such contractors actually engaged by the locality or the locality's prime contractors, an inference of discriminatory exclusion could arise.*[42]

An accurate determination of availability also permits the government to meet the requirement that it "determine the precise scope of the injury it seeks to remedy" by its program.[43] Following *Croson's* statements on availability, lower courts have considered how legislative bodies may determine the precise scope of the injury sought to be remedied by an MBE program. Nevertheless, the federal courts have not provided clear guidance on the best data sources or techniques for measuring M/WBE availability.

Different forms of data used to measure availability give rise to particular controversies. Census data have the benefit of being accessible, comprehensive, and objective in measuring availability. In *Contractors Ass'n of Eastern Pennsylvania, Inc.,* the Third Circuit, while noting some of the limitations of census data, acknowledged that such data could be of some value in disparity studies.[44] In that case, the city of Philadelphia's consultant calculated a disparity using data showing the total amount of contract dollars awarded by the City, the amount that went to MBEs, and the number of African American construction firms. The consultant combined these data with data from the Census Bureau on the number of construction firms in the Philadelphia Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area.[45] Despite the district court's reservations about mixing data sources, the Third Circuit appeared to have been prepared to accept such data had it ruled on the showing of a compelling interest.

At least one commentator has suggested using bidder data to measure M/WBE availability,[46] but *Croson* does not require the use of bidder data to determine availability. In *Concrete Works,* in the context of the plaintiffs' complaint that the city of Denver had not used such information, the Tenth Circuit noted that bid information also has its limits. [47] Firms that bid may not be qualified or able, and firms that do not bid may be qualified and able, to undertake agency contracts.

2.4.2 Racial Classifications

In determining availability, choosing the appropriate racial groups to consider becomes an important threshold interest.[48] In *Croson*, the Supreme Court criticized the city of Richmond's inclusion of "Spanish speaking, Oriental, Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut persons" in its affirmative action program.[49] These groups had not previously participated in City contracting and "The random inclusion of racial groups that, as a practical matter, may never have suffered from discrimination in the construction industry in Richmond suggests that perhaps the City's purpose was not in fact to remedy past discrimination."[50] To

---

[42] *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 509 (emphasis added).
[43] Id. at 498.
[44] *Contractors Assn v. Philadelphia*, 91 F.3d 586, 604 (3rd Cir 1996).
[45] *Contractors Association of Eastern Pennsylvania, Inc.*, 91 F.3d at 604.
[46] LaNoue, George R., "Who Counts? Determining the Availability of Minority Businesses for Public Contracting After *Croson*," 21 *Harv. J. L. and Pub. Pol.* 793, 833-834 (1998).
[47] *Concrete Works IV*, 321 F.3d at 983-84.
[48] Racial groups, as the term is used herein, include both racial and ethnic categories.
[49] 488 U.S. at 506.
[50] Id.

evaluate availability properly, data must be gathered for each racial group in the marketplace. The Federal Circuit has also required that evidence as to the inclusion of particular groups be kept reasonably current.[51]

2.4.3 Relevant Market Area

Another issue in availability analysis is the definition of the relevant market area. Specifically, the question is whether the relevant market area should be defined as the area from which a specific percentage of purchases is made, the area in which a specific percentage of willing and able contractors may be located, or the area determined by a fixed geopolitical boundary.

The Supreme Court has not yet established how the relevant market area should be defined, but some circuit courts have done so, including the Tenth Circuit in *Concrete Works II*, the first appeal in the city of Denver litigation.[52] Concrete Works of Colorado, a non-M/WBE construction company, argued that *Croson* precluded consideration of discrimination evidence from the six-county Denver Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), so Denver should use data only from within the city and county of Denver. The Tenth Circuit, interpreting *Croson*, concluded, "The relevant area in which to measure discrimination . . . is the local construction market, but that is not necessarily confined by jurisdictional boundaries."[53] The court further stated, "It is important that the pertinent data closely relate to the jurisdictional area of the municipality whose program we scrutinize, but here Denver's contracting activity, insofar as construction work is concerned, is closely related to the Denver MSA."[54]

The Tenth Circuit ruled that because more than 80 percent of Denver Department of Public Works construction and design contracts were awarded to firms located within the Denver MSA, the appropriate market area should be the Denver MSA, not the city and county of Denver alone.[55] Accordingly, data from the Denver MSA were "adequately particularized for strict scrutiny purposes."[56]

2.4.4 Firm Qualifications

Another availability consideration is whether M/WBE firms are qualified to perform the required services. In *Croson*, the Supreme Court noted that although gross statistical disparities may demonstrate *prima facie* proof of discrimination, "when special qualifications are required to fill particular jobs, comparisons to the general population (rather than to the smaller group of individuals who possess the necessary qualifications) may have little probative value."[57] The Court, however, did not define the test for determining whether a firm is qualified.

Considering firm qualifications is important not only to assess whether M/WBEs in the relevant market area can provide the goods and services required, but also to ensure proper comparison between the number of qualified M/WBEs and the total number of

---

[51] *Rothe Development Co. v. U.S. Dept. of Defense*, 262 F.3d 1306, 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2003).
[52] *Concrete Works II*, 36 F.3d at 1520.
[53] Id.
[54] Id.
[55] Id.
[56] Id.
[57] *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 501 (quoting *Hazelwood School Dist. v. United States*, 433 U.S. 299, 308, n.13 (1977)).

similarly qualified contractors in the marketplace.[58] In short, proper comparisons ensure the required integrity and specificity of the statistical analysis. For instance, courts have specifically ruled that the government must examine prime contractors and subcontractors separately when the M/WBE program is aimed primarily at one or the other.[59]

2.4.5 Willingness

Croson requires that an "available" firm must be not only qualified but also willing to provide the required services.[60] In this context, it can be difficult to determine whether a business is willing. Courts have approved including businesses in the availability pool that may not be on the government's certification list. In *Concrete Works II*, Denver's availability analysis indicated that while most MBEs and WBEs had never participated in City contracts, "almost all firms contacted indicated that they were interested in [municipal work]."[61] In *Contractors Association of Eastern Pennsylvania, Inc.*, the Third Circuit explained, "[i]n the absence of some reason to believe otherwise, one can normally assume that participants in a market with the ability to undertake gainful work will be 'willing' to undertake it."[62] The court went on to note:

> *[P]ast discrimination in a marketplace may provide reason to believe the minorities who would otherwise be willing are discouraged from trying to secure the work. . . . [I]f there has been discrimination in City contracting, it is to be expected that [African American] firms may be discouraged from applying, and the low numbers [of African American firms seeking to prequalify for City-funded contracts] may tend to corroborate the existence of discrimination rather than belie it.*[63]

2.4.6 Ability

Another availability consideration is whether the firms being considered are able to perform a particular service. Those who challenge affirmative action often question whether M/WBE firms have the "capacity" to perform particular services.

The Eleventh Circuit accepted a series of arguments that firm size has a strong impact on "ability" to enter contracts, that M/WBE firms tend to be smaller, and that this smaller size, not discrimination, explains the resulting disparity.[64] This emphasis of factoring in business capacity was reinforced in a recent case, *Rothe Development Corp v. Department of Defense*, in front of the Federal Circuit involving the Federal 1207 small, disadvantaged business (SDB) program. The *Rothe* decision criticized elements of factual predicate studies used to support the 1207 program that did not factor the size and capacity of firms in evaluating disparity.[65]

---

[58] See *Hazelwood School Dist*., 433 U.S. at 308; Contractors Ass'n. 91 F.3D at 603.
[59] *W. H. Scott Constr. Co. v. City of Jackson*, 199 F.3d 206, 218 (5th Cir.1999).
[60] *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 509.
[61] *Concrete Works II*, 36 F.3d at 1529, quoting, *Appellant's Appendix*.
[62] *Contractors Association of Eastern Pennsylvania, Inc.*, 91 F.3d at 603 (in original quotation marks).
[63] Id. at 603-04.
[64] *Eng'g. Contr. of S. Florida, Inc.* 122 F.3d at 917-18, 924.
[65] *Rothe Development Corp v. Department of Defense*, 2008-1017 (Fed Cir 2008), at 34.

By contrast, the Tenth Circuit in *Concrete Works II* and *IV* recognized the shortcomings of this treatment of firm size.[66] *Concrete Works IV* noted that the small size of such firms can itself be a result of discrimination.[67] The Tenth Circuit acknowledged the city of Denver's argument that a small construction firm's precise capacity can be highly elastic.[68] Under this view, the relevance of firm size may be somewhat diminished. Further, the Eleventh Circuit was dealing with a statute which itself limited remedies to M/WBEs that were smaller firms by definition.[69]

2.4.7 Statistical Evidence of Discrimination in Disparity Studies

While courts have indicated that anecdotal evidence may suffice without statistical evidence, no case without statistical evidence has been given serious consideration by any circuit court. In practical effect, courts require statistical evidence. Further, the statistical evidence needs to be held to appropriate professional standards.[70]

The Eighth Circuit has stated that, "Numbers must be *statistically significant* before one can properly conclude that any apparent racial disparity results from some factor other than random chance."[71] The Eleventh Circuit has addressed the role of statistical significance in assessing levels of disparity in public contracting. Generally, disparity indices of 80 percent or higher—indicating close to full participation—are not considered significant.[72] The court referenced the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's disparate impact guidelines, which establish the 80 percent test as the threshold for determining a *prima facie* case of discrimination.[73] According to the Eleventh Circuit, no circuit that has explicitly endorsed using disparity indices has held that an index of 80 percent or greater is probative of discrimination, but they have held that indices below 80 percent indicate "significant disparities."[74]

In support of the use of standard deviation analyses to test the statistical significance of disparity indices, the Eleventh Circuit observed that "[s]ocial scientists consider a finding of two standard deviations significant, meaning there is about one chance in 20 that the explanation for the deviation could be random and the deviation must be accounted for by some factor other than chance."[75] With standard deviation analyses, the reviewer can determine whether the disparities are substantial or statistically significant, lending further statistical support to a finding of discrimination. On the other hand, if such analyses can account for the apparent disparity, the study will have little if any weight as evidence of discrimination.

---

[66] *Concrete Works II*, 36 F.3d at 1528-29; *Concrete Works IV*, 321 F.3d at 980-92.
[67] *Concrete Works IV*, 321 F.3d at 982.
[68] Id. at 981.
[69] *Eng'g Contrs. Ass'n of S. Florida, Inc*., 122 F.3d at 900.
[70] See *Contrs. Ass'n of E. Pennsylvania, Inc.*, 91 F.3d at 599-601.
[71] *Kohlbeck v. City of Omaha*, 447 F.3d 552, 557 (8th Cir. 2006) quoting *Taylor v. Teletype Co.,* 648 F. 2d 1129, 1133 (8th Cir. 19 (emphasized in original)).
[72] *Eng'g Contrs. Ass'n of S. Florida, Inc*., 122 F.3d at 914.
[73] Id. at 914, citing 29 C.F.R. § 1607.4D (concerning the disparate impact guidelines and threshold used in employment cases).
[74] *Eng'g Contrs. Ass'n of S. Florida, Inc*., 122 F.3d at 914, citing *Contrs. Ass'n of E. Pennsylvania, Inc.*, 6 F.3d at 1005 (crediting disparity index of 4 percent) and *Concrete Works II*, 36 F.3d at 1524 (crediting disparity indices ranging from 0 percent to 3.8 percent).
[75] *Eng'g Contrs. Ass'n of S. Florida, Inc*., 122 F.3d at 914 quoting *Peightal v. Metropolitan Dade County*, 26 F.3d 1545, 1556 n.16 (11th Cir. 1994) (quoting *Waisome v. Port Authority*, 948 F.2d 1370, 1376 (2nd Cir. 1991)).

Further, the interpretations of the studies must not assume discrimination has caused the disparities, but must account for alternative explanations of the statistical patterns.[76] The Third and Fifth Circuits have also indicated that statistics about prime contracting disparity have little, if any, weight when the eventual M/WBE program offers its remedies solely to subcontractors.[77]

2.4.8 Anecdotal Evidence of Discrimination in Disparity Studies

Most disparity studies present anecdotal evidence along with statistical data. The Supreme Court in *Croson* discussed the relevance of anecdotal evidence and explained: "[E]vidence of a pattern of individual discriminatory acts can, if supported by appropriate statistical proof, lend support to a local government's determination that broader remedial relief is justified."[78] Although *Croson* did not expressly consider the form or level of specificity required for anecdotal evidence, the Ninth Circuit has addressed both issues.

In *Coral Construction*, the Ninth Circuit addressed the use of anecdotal evidence alone to prove discrimination. Although King County's anecdotal evidence was extensive, the court noted the absence in the record of any statistical data in support of the program. Additionally, the court stated, "While anecdotal evidence may suffice to prove individual claims of discrimination, rarely, if ever, can such evidence show a *systemic pattern of discrimination necessary for the adoption of an affirmative action plan*."[79] The court concluded, by contrast, that "the combination of convincing anecdotal and statistical evidence is potent."[80]

Regarding the appropriate form of anecdotal evidence, the Ninth Circuit in *Coral Construction* noted that the record provided by King County was "considerably more extensive than that compiled by the Richmond City Council in *Croson*."[81] The King County record contained "affidavits of at least 57 minority or [female] contractors, each of whom complain[ed] in varying degree[s] of specificity about discrimination within the local construction industry".[82] The *Coral Construction* court stated that the M/WBE affidavits "reflect[ed] a broad spectrum of the contracting community" and the affidavits "certainly suggest[ed] that ongoing discrimination may be occurring in much of the King County business community."[83]

In *Associated General Contractors of California v. Coalition for Economic Equity (AGCC II)*, the Ninth Circuit discussed the specificity of anecdotal evidence required by *Croson*.[84] Seeking a preliminary injunction, the contractors contended that the evidence presented by the city of San Francisco lacked the specificity required by both an earlier appeal in that case and by *Croson.*[85] The court held that the City's findings were based on substantially more evidence than the anecdotes in the two prior cases, and "were clearly based upon

---

[76] *Eng'g Contrs. Ass'n of S. Florida, Inc.,* 122 F 3d at 922.
[77] *Contrs. Ass'n of E. Pennsylvania, Inc.,* 91 F.3d at 599 (3rd Cir.); *W.H. Schott Constr. Co.,* 199 F. 3d at 218 (5th Cir.).
[78] *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 509.
[79] *Coral Construction*, 941 F.2d at 919 (emphasis added).
[80] Id. See also *AGCC II*, 950 F.2d at 1414-1415.
[81] *Coral Construction*, 941 F.2d at 917.
[82] Id. at 917-18.
[83] Id.
[84] *AGCC II*, 950 F.2d at 1414-1415.
[85] See *AGCC II*, 950 F.2d at 1403-1405.

dozens of specific instances of discrimination that are laid out with particularity in the record, as well as significant statistical disparities in the award of contracts."[86]

The court also ruled that the City was under no burden to identify specific practices or policies that were discriminatory.[87] Reiterating the City's perspective, the court stated that the City "must simply demonstrate the existence of past discrimination with specificity; there is no requirement that the legislative findings specifically detail each and every instance that the legislative body ha[d] relied upon in support of its decision that affirmative action is necessary."[88]

Not only have courts found that a municipality does not have to specifically identify all the discriminatory practices impeding M/WBE utilization, but the Tenth Circuit in *Concrete Works IV* also held that anecdotal evidence collected by a municipality does not have to be verified. The court stated:

> *There is no merit to [the plaintiff's] argument that witnesses' accounts must be verified to provide support for Denver's burden. Anecdotal evidence is nothing more than a witness' narrative of an incident told from the witness' perspective and including the witness' perceptions…Denver was not required to present corroborating evidence and [the plaintiff] was free to present its own witnesses to either refute the incidents described by Denver's witnesses or to relate their own perceptions on discrimination in the Denver construction industry.*[89]

2.5 The Governmental Entity or Agency Enacting an M/WBE Program Must Be Shown to Have Actively or Passively Perpetuated the Discrimination

In *Croson*, the Supreme Court stated, "It is beyond dispute that any public entity, state or federal, has a compelling interest in assuring that *public* dollars, drawn from the tax contributions of all citizens, do not serve to finance the evil of *private* prejudice."[90] *Croson* provided that the government "can use its spending powers to remedy private discrimination, if it identifies that discrimination with the particularity required by the Fourteenth Amendment."[91] The government agency's active or passive participation in discriminatory practices in the marketplace may show the compelling interest. Defining passive participation, *Croson* stated:

> *Thus, if the city could show that it had essentially become a "passive participant" in a system of racial exclusion practiced by elements of the local construction industry, we think it clear that the city could take affirmative steps to dismantle such a system*.[92]

---

[86] *AGCC II, 950 F.2d*. at 1416. This evidence came from 10 public hearings and "numerous written submissions from the public." Id. at 1414.
[87] Id. at 1416, n.11.
[88] Id. at 1416.
[89] *Concrete Works IV*, 321 F.3d at 989.
[90] *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 492 (emphasis added).
[91] *Croson,* 488 U.S. at 492. See generally Ayres, Ian and Frederick E. Vars, "When Does Private Discrimination Justify Public Affirmative Action?" 98 *Columbia Law Review* 1577 (1998).
[92] *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 492.

The Tenth Circuit decision in *Adarand* concluded that evidence of private sector discrimination provided a compelling interest for a DBE program.[93] Later cases have reaffirmed that the government has a compelling interest in avoiding the financing of private discrimination with public dollars.[94]

Relying on this language in *Croson,* a number of local agencies have increased their emphasis on evidence of discrimination in the private sector. This strategy has not always succeeded. In the purest case, Cook County did not produce a disparity study but instead presented anecdotal evidence that M/WBEs were not solicited for bids in the private sector.[95] Cook County lost the trial and the resulting appeal.[96] Similarly, evidence of private sector discrimination presented in litigation was found inadequate in the Philadelphia and Dade County cases.[97] The Third Circuit stated, in discussing low MBE participation in a local contractors association in the city of Philadelphia, that "racial discrimination can justify a race-based remedy only if the city has somehow participated in or supported that discrimination."[98] Nevertheless, recently in *Concrete Works IV,* the Tenth Circuit upheld the relevance of data from the private marketplace to establish a factual predicate for M/WBE programs.[99] That is, courts mainly seek to ensure that M/WBE programs are based on findings of active or passive discrimination in the government contracting marketplace, and not simply attempts to remedy general societal discrimination.

Courts also seek to find a causal connection between a statistical disparity and actual underlying discrimination. In *Engineering Contractors*, one component of the factual predicate was a study comparing entry rates into the construction business for M/WBEs and non-M/WBEs.[100] The analysis provided statistically significant evidence that minorities and women entered the construction business at rates lower than would be expected, given their numerical presence in the population and human and financial capital variables. The study argued that those disparities persisting after the application of appropriate statistical controls were most likely the result of current and past discrimination. Even so, the Eleventh Circuit criticized this study for reliance on general census data and for the lack of particularized evidence of active or passive discrimination by Dade County, holding that the district court was entitled to find that the evidence did not show compelling justification for an M/WBE program.[101]

The Seventh Circuit has perhaps set a higher bar for connecting private discrimination with government action. The trial court in the Cook County case extensively considered evidence that prime contractors simply did not solicit M/WBEs as subcontractors and considered carefully whether this evidence on solicitation served as sufficient evidence of discrimination, or whether instead it was necessary to provide further evidence that there was discrimination in hiring M/WBE subcontractors.[102] The Seventh Circuit held that this

---

[93] *Adarand Contrs., Inc.,* 228 F.3d at 1155, 1164-65.
[94] *Associated Gen. Contrs. of Ohio, Inc. v. Drabik,* 214 F.3d 730, 734-35 (6th Cir. 2000). See also *Concrete Works II*, 36 F.3d at 1529; *Coral Constr. Co.*, 941 F.2d at 916.
[95] *Builders Ass'n of Greater Chicago v. County of Cook*, 123 F. Supp. 2d 1087, 1117 (N.D. I.L. 2000).
[96] *Builders Ass'n of Greater Chicago v. County of Cook*, 123 F. Supp. 2d 1087 (N.D. I.L. 2000); 256 F.3d 642, 648 (7th Cir. 2001).
[97] *Contrs. Ass'n of E. Pennsylvania, Inc.,* 91 F.3d at 599-602; *Engineering Contrs. Ass'n of S. Florida, Inc*., 122 F.3d at 920-926.
[98] *Contrs. Ass'n of E. Pennsylvania, Inc.*, 91 F.3d at 602; see also *Webster v. Fulton County*, 51 F. Supp. 2d 1354, 1363 (N.D. G.A. 1999).
[99] *Concrete Works IV,* 321 F.3d at 976.
[100] *Engineering Contractors Ass'n of South Florida, Inc*., 122 F.3d at 921-22.
[101] Id. at 922.
[102] *Builders Ass'n of Chicago*, 123 F.Supp. 2d at 1112-1116.

evidence was largely irrelevant.[103] Beyond being anecdotal and partial, evidence that contractors failed to solicit M/WBEs on Cook County contracts was not the same as evidence that M/WBEs were denied the opportunity to bid.[104] Furthermore, such activities on the part of contractors did not necessarily implicate the county as even a passive participant in such discrimination as might exist because there was no evidence that the county knew about it.[105]

Interestingly, some courts have been willing to see capital market discrimination as part of the required nexus between private and public contracting discrimination, even if capital market discrimination could arguably be seen as simply part of broader societal discrimination. In *Adarand v. Slater*, the Tenth Circuit favorably cited evidence of capital market discrimination as relevant in establishing the factual predicate for the federal DBE program.[106] The same court, in *Concrete Works IV,* found that barriers to business formation were relevant insofar as this evidence demonstrated that M/WBEs were "precluded from the outset from competing for public construction contracts."[107] Along related lines, the court also found a regression analysis of census data to be relevant evidence showing barriers to M/WBE formation.[108] A recent district court case upheld the state of North Carolina MWBE program in road construction based largely on similar private sector evidence supplemented by evidence from databases covering private sector commercial construction.[109]

Courts have come to different conclusions about the effects of M/WBE programs on the private sector evidence itself. For instance, is M/WBE participation in public sector projects higher than on private sector projects simply because the M/WBE program increases M/WBE participation in the public sector, or is such a pattern evidence of private sector discrimination? The Seventh Circuit raised the former concern in the recent Cook County litigation.[110] *Concrete Works IV*, however, expressly cited as evidence of discrimination that M/WBE contractors used for business with the city of Denver were not used by the same prime contractors for private sector contracts.[111]

Finally, is evidence of a decline in M/WBE utilization following a change in or termination of an M/WBE program relevant and persuasive evidence of discrimination? The Eighth Circuit in *Sherbrooke Turf* and the Tenth Circuit in *Concrete Works IV* did find that such a decline in M/WBE utilization was evidence that prime contractors were not willing to use M/WBEs in the absence of legal requirements.[112] Other lower courts have arrived at similar conclusions.[113]

---

[103] *Builders Ass'n of Greater Chicago*, 256 F.3d at 645.
[104] Id.
[105] Id.
[106] *Adarand Contrs., Inc.*, 228 F.3d at 1169-70.
[107] *Concrete Works IV*, 321 F.2d at 977. The district court had rejected evidence of credit market discrimination as adequate to provide a factual predicate for an M/WBE program. *Concrete Works of Colorado, Inc. v. City of Denver*, 86 F.Supp. 2d 1042, 1072-73 (D Co. 2000) (*Concrete Works III*).
[108] Id. at 967.
[109] *H.B. Rowe v. North Carolina DOT*, No. 5:03-CV-278-BO(3) (ED NC 2008). The court, however, was very brief in discussing what factors nt he study accounted for its ruling.
[110] *Builders Ass'n of Greater Chicago*, 256 F.3d at 645.
[111] *Concrete Works IV*, 321 F.3d at 984-85.
[112] *Concrete Works IV*, 321 F.3d at 985; *Sherbrooke Turf, Inc.*, 345 F.3d at 973.
[113] See *Northern Contracting, Inc. v. Illinois*, No. 00 4515 (ND IL 2004) – 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3226 150-1.

2.6 To Withstand Strict Scrutiny, an M/WBE Program Must Be Narrowly Tailored to Remedy Identified Discrimination

The discussion of compelling interest in the court cases has been extensive, but narrow tailoring may be the more critical issue. Many courts have held that even if a compelling interest for the M/WBE program can be found, the program has not been narrowly tailored.[114] Moreover, *Concrete Works IV,*[115] a case that did find a compelling interest for a local M/WBE program, did not consider the issue of narrow tailoring. Instead, the Tenth Circuit held that the plaintiffs had waived any challenge to the original ruling of the district court[116] that the program was narrowly tailored.

Nevertheless, the federal courts in general, and the Eighth Circuit in particular, have found that the DBE program established pursuant to federal regulations (49 CFR, Part 26) and issued under the Transportation Equity Act (TEA-21) (1998) has been narrowly tailored to serve a compelling interest.[117] The federal courts had previously ruled that there was a factual predicate for the federal Department of Transportation (DOT) DBE program, but that in its earlier versions the program was not narrowly tailored.[118] The more recent rulings provide some guidance as to what program configurations the courts will judge to be narrowly tailored. The Eighth Circuit in particular has identified the following elements of narrow tailoring: "the efficacy of alternative remedies, the flexibility and duration of the race-conscious remedy, the relationship of the numerical goals to the relevant labor market, and the impact of the remedy on third parties".[119]

2.6.1 Race-Neutral Alternatives

Concerning race-neutral alternatives, the Supreme Court in *Croson* concluded that a governmental entity must demonstrate that it has evaluated the use of race-neutral means to increase MBE participation in contracting or purchasing activities. In upholding the narrow tailoring of federal DBE regulations, the Eighth Circuit noted that those regulations "place strong emphasis on 'the use of race-neutral means to increase minority business participation in government contracting'."[120] The Tenth Circuit had noted that the DBE regulations provided that "if a recipient can meet its overall goal through race-neutral means, it must implement its program without the use of race-conscious contracting measures, and enumerate a list of race-neutral measures."[121] Those measures included "helping overcome bonding and financing obstacles, providing technical assistance, [and] establishing programs to assist start-up firms."[122]

---

[114] *Contrs. Ass'n of E. Pennsylvania, Inc.*, 91 F.3d at 606; *Eng'g Contrs. Ass'n of S. Florida, Inc*., 122 F.3d at 926-929; *Verdi v. DeKalb County Sch. Dist.*, 135 Fed. Appx. 262, 268, 2005 WL 38942 (11th Cir. 2005).
[115] *Concrete Works IV*, 321 F.3d at 992-93.
[116] *Concrete Works of Colo., Inc. v. City of Denver,* 823 F.Supp. 821, 844-845 (D.Co. 1993)(*Concrete Works I*).
[117] *Adarand Constrs., Inc.*, 228 F.3d at 1158, 1187; *Sherbrooke Turf Inc.*, 345 F.3d at 968-969, 974; *W. States Paving Co. v. Wash. State DOT*, 407 F.3d 983 (9th Cir. 2005).
[118] Inre Sherbrooke Sodding, 17 F. Supp. 2d 1026, 1034-35, 1037 (D.Minn. 1998) (*Sherbrooke I*) (finding the program was not narrowly tailored). In 1996, before the new DBE regulations, the district court in Colorado, upon remand from the 1995 U.S. Supreme Court, had made a similar ruling in *Adarand Constrs., Inc . v. Peña,* 965 F. Supp. 1556, 1581 (D.Co. 1997)
[119] *Sherbrooke Turf, Inc.*, 345 F. 3d at 971, citing *U.S. v. Paradise*, 480 U.S. 149, 171, 187 (1987)); see also *Kohlbeck v. City of Omaha*, 447 F.3d 552, 555 (8th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Sherbrooke Turf*).
[120] *Sherbrooke Turf, Inc.*, 345 F. 3d at 972, quoting *Adarand Constrs., Inc.*, 515 U.S. at 237-38.
[121] *Adarand Constrs., Inc.*, 228 F.3d. at 1179 (parentheses removed).
[122] Id.

Strict scrutiny does not mandate that every race-neutral measure be considered and found wanting. The Eighth Circuit also affirmed that "Narrow tailoring does not require exhaustion of every conceivable race neutral alternative," but it does require "serious, good faith consideration of workable race-neutral alternatives."[123]

2.6.2 Flexibility and Duration of the Remedy

The Eighth Circuit also found that "the revised DBE program has substantial flexibility."[124]

> *A State may obtain waivers or exemptions from any requirement and is not penalized for a good faith failure to meet its overall goal. In addition, the program limits preferences to small businesses falling beneath an earnings threshold, and any individual whose net worth exceeds $ 750,000 cannot qualify as economically disadvantaged.*[125]

DBE and M/WBE programs achieve flexibility by using waivers and variable project goals to avoid merely setting a quota. *Croson* favorably mentioned the contract-by-contract waivers in the federal DOT DBE program.[126] Virtually all successful MBE programs have this waiver feature in their enabling legislation. As for project goals, the approved DBE provisions set aspirational, nonmandatory goals; expressly forbid quotas; and use overall goals as a framework for setting local contract goals, if any, based on local data. All of these factors have impressed the courts that have upheld the constitutionality of the revised DOT DBE program.[127]

With respect to program duration, in *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña*, the Supreme Court wrote that a program should be "appropriately limited such that it will not last longer than the discriminatory effects it is designed to eliminate."[128] The Eighth Circuit also noted the limits in the DBE program, stating that "the DBE program contains built-in durational limits," in that a "State may terminate its DBE program if it meets its annual overall goal through race-neutral means for two consecutive years."[129] The Eighth Circuit also found durational limits in the fact that "TEA-21 is subject to periodic congressional reauthorization. Periodic legislative debate assures all citizens that the deviation from the norm of equal treatment of all racial and ethnic groups is a temporary matter, a measure taken in the service of the goal of equality itself."[130]

Other appellate courts have noted several possible mechanisms for limiting program duration: such as required termination if goals have been met,[131] decertification of MBEs who achieve certain levels of success, or mandatory review of MBE certification at regular, relatively brief periods.[132] Governments thus have some duty to ensure that they update their evidence of discrimination regularly enough to review the need for their programs and

---

[123] *Sherbrooke Turf, Inc.*, 345 F. 3d at 972, quoting *Grutter*, 123 S. Ct. at 2344-45. See also *Coral Constr. Co.*, 941 F.2d at 923; *AGCC II*, 950 F.2d at 1417.
[124] *Sherbrooke Turf, Inc.*, 345 F. 3d at 972.
[125] Id. at 972, citing, 49 C.F.R. § 26.67(b).
[126] *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 488-489. *Coral Constr. Co.*, 941 F.2d at 924-925.
[127] See *Coral Constr. Co.,* 941 F. 2d at 924-925.
[128] 515 U.S. at 238 (internal quotations and citations omitted).
[129] *Sherbrooke Turf, Inc.*, 345 F. 3d at 972, citing 49 C.F.R. § 26.51(f)(3).
[130] Id., quoting, *Grutter*, 123 S. Ct. at 2346.
[131] *Sherbrooke Turf, Inc.*, 345 F.3d at 972.
[132] *Adarand Constrs. Inc.*, 228 F.3d at 1179-1180.

to revise programs by narrowly tailoring them to fit the fresh evidence.[133] It is still an open question whether all of these provisions are necessary in every case.

2.6.3 Relationship of Goals to Availability

Narrow tailoring under the *Croson* standard requires that remedial goals be in line with measured availability. Merely setting percentages without a carefully selected basis in statistical studies, as the city of Richmond did in *Croson* itself, has played a strong part in decisions finding other programs unconstitutional.[134]

By contrast, the Eighth, Ninth, and Tenth Circuits have approved the goal-setting process for the DOT DBE program, as revised in 1999.[135] The approved DOT DBE regulations require that goals be based on one of several methods for measuring DBE availability.[136] The Eighth Circuit noted that the "DOT has tied the goals for DBE participation to the relevant labor markets," insofar as the "regulations require grantee States to set overall goals based upon the likely number of minority contractors that would have received federally assisted highway contracts but for the effects of past discrimination."[137] The Eighth Circuit acknowledged that goal setting was not exact, but nevertheless, the exercise…

> *requires the States to focus on establishing realistic goals for DBE participation in the relevant contracting markets. This stands in stark contrast to the program struck down in Croson, which rested upon the completely unrealistic assumption that minorities will choose a particular trade in lockstep proportion to their representation in the local population.*[138]

Moreover, the approved DBE regulations use built-in mechanisms to ensure that DBE goals are not set excessively high relative to DBE availability. For example, the approved DBE goals are to be set-aside if the overall goal has been met for two consecutive years by race-neutral means. The approved DBE contract goals also must be reduced if overall goals have been exceeded with race-conscious means for two consecutive years. The Eighth Circuit courts found these provisions to be narrowly tailored, particularly when implemented according to local disparity studies that carefully calculate the applicable goals.[139]

2.6.4 Burden on Third Parties

Narrow tailoring also requires minimizing the burden of the program on third parties. The Eight Circuit stated the following with respect to the revised DBE program:

> *Congress and DOT have taken significant steps to minimize the race based nature of the DBE program. Its benefits are directed at all small businesses owned and controlled by the socially and economically disadvantaged. While TEA21 creates a rebuttable presumption that members of certain racial minorities fall within that class, the presumption is rebuttable, wealthy*

---

[133] *Rothe Dev. Co.,* 262 F.3d at 1323-1324 (commenting on the possible staleness of information after seven, 12, and 17 years).
[134] See *Builders Ass'n of Greater Chicago*, 256 F.3d at 647; *Kohlbeck,* 447 F.3d at 556-557.
[135] *Adarand Constrs. Inc.*, 228 F.3d at 1181-1182; *Sherbrooke Turf, Inc.*, 345 F.3d at 971-973. *W. States Paving Co.,* 407 F.3d at 994-995.
[136] 49 C.F.R., § 26.45 (2006).
[137] *Sherbrooke Turf, Inc.*, at 972, 345 F, 3d citing, 49 C.F.R. § 26.45(c)-(d) (Steps 1 and 2).
[138] Id. at 972, quoting, *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 507.
[139] Id. at 973-974.

> *minority owners and wealthy minority-owned firms are excluded, and certification is available to persons who are not presumptively disadvantaged but can demonstrate actual social and economic disadvantage. Thus, race is made relevant in the program, but it is not a determinative factor.*[140]

Waivers and good faith compliance are also tools that serve this purpose of reducing the burden on third parties.[141] The DOT DBE regulations have also sought to reduce the program burden on non-DBEs by avoiding DBE concentration in certain specialty areas.[142] These features have gained the approval of the only circuit court to have discussed them at length as measures of lowering impact on third parties.[143]

2.6.5 Over-Inclusion

Narrow tailoring also involves limiting the number and type of beneficiaries of the program. As noted above, there must be evidence of discrimination to justify a group-based remedy, and over-inclusion of uninjured individuals or groups can endanger the entire program.[144] Federal DBE programs have succeeded in part because regulations covering DBE certification do not provide blanket protection to minorities.[145]

Critically, the MBE program must be limited in its geographical scope to the boundaries of the enacting government's marketplace. The Supreme Court indicated in *Croson* that a local agency has the power to address discrimination only within its own marketplace. One fault of the Richmond MBE programs was that minority firms were certified from around the United States.[146]

In *Coral Construction*, the Ninth Circuit concluded that the King County MBE program failed this part of the narrow tailoring test because the definition of MBEs eligible to benefit from the program was overbroad. The definition included MBEs that had had no prior contact with King County if the MBE could demonstrate that discrimination occurred "in the particular geographic areas in which it operates."[147] This MBE definition suggested that the program was designed to eradicate discrimination not only in King County but also in the particular area in which a non-local MBE conducted business. In essence, King County's program focused on the eradication of society-wide discrimination, which is outside the power of a state or local government. "Since the County's interest is limited to the eradication of discrimination within King County, the only question that the County may ask is whether a business has been discriminated against in King County."[148]

In clarifying an important aspect of the narrow tailoring requirement, the court defined the issue of eligibility for MBE programs as one of participation, not location. For an MBE to reap the benefits of an affirmative action program, the business must have been discriminated against in the jurisdiction that established the program.[149] As a threshold matter, before a business can claim to have suffered discrimination, it must have attempted

---

[140] *Sherbrooke Turf, Inc.* 345 F. 3d at 972-73, citing, *Grutter*, 123 S. Ct. at 2345-46; *Gratz v. Bollinger*, 123 S. Ct. 2411, 2429 (2003)
[141] See 49 CFR, § 26.53 (2006).
[142] See 49 CFR, § 26.33 (2006).
[143] *Adarand Constrs. Inc.*, 228 F.3d at 1183.
[144] See *Builders Ass'n of Greater Chicago*, 256 F.3d at 647-648.
[145] *Sherbrooke Turf, Inc.*, 345 F.3d 972-73.
[146] *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 508.
[147] *Coral Constr. Co.,* 941 F. 2d at 925 (internal modifications and citations omitted).
[148] Id. (emphasis omitted).
[149] Id.

to do business with the governmental entity.[150] It was found significant that "if the County successfully proves malignant discrimination within the King County business community, an MBE would be presumptively eligible for relief if it had previously sought to do business in the County."[151]

To summarize, according to the Ninth Circuit, the presumptive rule requires that the enacting governmental agency establish that systemic discrimination exists within its jurisdiction and that the MBE is, or has attempted to become, an active participant in the agency's marketplace.[152] Since King County's definition of an MBE permitted participation by those with no prior contact with King County, its program was overbroad. By useful contrast, *Concrete Works II* held that the more extensive but still local designation of the entire Denver MSA constituted the marketplace to which the programs could apply.[153]

2.7 Small Business Procurement Preferences

Small business procurement preferences have existed since the 1940s. The first small business program had its origins in the Smaller War Plants Corporation (SWPC), established during World War II.[154] The SWPC was created to channel war contracts to small business. In 1947, Congress passed the Armed Forces Procurement Act, declaring that "[i]t is the policy of Congress that a fair proportion of the purchases and contracts under this chapter be placed with small business concerns."[155] Continuing this policy, the 1958 Small Business Act requires that government agencies award a "fair proportion" of procurement contracts to small business concerns.[156]

Section 8(b)(11) of the Small Business Act authorizes the Small Business Administration (SBA) to set-aside contracts for placement with small business concerns. The SBA has the power:

> *to make studies and recommendations to the appropriate Federal agencies to insure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for property and services for the Government be placed with small-business enterprises, to insure that a fair proportion of Government contracts for research and development be placed with small-business concerns, to insure that a fair proportion of the total sales of Government property be made to small-business concerns, and to insure a fair and equitable share materials, supplies, and equipment to small-business concerns.*[157]

Every acquisition of goods and services anticipated to be between $3,000 and $100,000 is set aside exclusively for small business unless the contracting officer has a reasonable expectation of fewer than two bids by small businesses.[158]

---

[150] Id.
[151] Id.
[152] Id.
[153] *Concrete Works II,* 36 F.3d at 1520.
[154] See, generally, Hasty III, Thomas J., "Minority Business Enterprise Development and the Small Business Administration's 8(a) Program: Past, Present, and (Is There a) Future?" 145 Mil. L. Rev. I.
[155] 10 U.S.C. § 2301 (1976) quoting, *J.H. Rutter Rex Mfg. Co. v. United States*, 706 F. 2d 702, 704 (5th Cir. 1983).
[156] 15 USC 631(a).
[157] 15 U.S.C. § 637(b)(11).
[158] 18 C.F.R. § 19.502-2 (2006).

There has been only one constitutional challenge to the long-standing federal small business enterprise (SBE) programs. In *J.H. Rutter Rex Manufacturing Co. v. United States*,[159] a federal vendor unsuccessfully challenged the Army's small business set-aside program as in violation of the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, as well as the Administrative Procedures Act and the Armed Forces Procurement Act.[160] The court held that classifying businesses as small was not a "suspect classification" subject to strict scrutiny. Instead the court ruled:

> *Since no fundamental rights are implicated, we need only determine whether the contested socio-economic legislation rationally relates to a legitimate governmental purpose. Our previous discussion adequately demonstrates that the procurement statutes and the regulations promulgated thereunder are rationally related to the sound legislative purpose of promoting small businesses in order to contribute to the security and economic health of this Nation.*[161]

A large number of state and local governments have maintained small business preference programs for many years.[162] No district court cases were found overturning a state or local small business preference program. One reason for the low level of litigation in this area is that there is significant organizational opposition to SBE programs. There are no reported cases of Associated General Construction (AGC) litigation against local SBE programs. And the legal foundations that have typically sued M/WBE programs have actually promoted SBE procurement preference programs as a race-neutral substitute for M/WBE programs.

There has been one state court case in which an SBE program was struck down as unconstitutional. The Cincinnati SBE program called for maximum practical M/WBE participation and required bidders to use good faith effort requirements to contract with M/WBEs up to government-specified M/WBE availability. Failure to satisfy good faith effort requirements triggered an investigation of efforts to provide opportunities for M/WBE subcontractors. In *Cleveland Construction v. Cincinnati,*[163] the state court ruled that the Cincinnati SBE program had race and gender preferences and had deprived the plaintiff of constitutionally protected property interest without due process of law. The city acknowledged that it had not offered evidence to satisfy strict scrutiny because it felt that it had been operating a race-neutral program.

2.8 Geographical Business Preferences

The constitutional analysis of geographical business preferences is somewhat less clear than SBE programs. Again, local business preferences are widespread and some have been in place for almost two decades (for example, the City of Oakland Local Business

---

[159] 706 F.2d 702 (5th Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 464 U.S. 1008 (1983).

[160] *J.H. Rutter Rex Mfg. Co. v. United States,* 534 F. Supp. 331, 332 (E.D. La. 1982), app'd 706 F. 2d 702 ("Administrative Procedures Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 552(a)(1)(E) (1976) and the "fair proportion" language of the Armed Forces Procurement Act, 10 U.S.C. § 2301 et seq. (1976), and the Small Business Act, 15 U.S.C. § 631 et seq. (1976)").

[161] *J.H. Rutter Rex Mfg. Co.,* 706 F.2d at 713 (internal citations omitted and emphasis added). See also *Dandridge v. Williams*, 397 U.S. 471, 485-86 (1970).

[162] See Fla. Stat. § 287.001 et req. (starting small business program in 1985); Minn. Stat. § 137.31 (Univ. of Minn. Started in 1979); N.J. Stat. § 52:32-17 et req. (small business program started in 1983).

[163] See instead *Cleveland Constr. Inc. v. Cincinnati*, 2006 Ohio App. LEXIS 6410, *P1-*P19 (Ohio Ct. App. Dec. 8, 2006).

Enterprise (LBE) program started in 1979).[164] More common is the preference for small local businesses, which is an even more widespread practice. While called small business programs, these programs often set-aside contracts for bidding by local SBEs.

There are no federal court cases expressly stating that local business preference programs are unconstitutional. However, local business preferences should be distinguished from preferences for hiring local residents, which have been struck down on constitutional grounds. But LBE programs could be subject to some doubt on constitutional grounds. The three bases for constitutional challenges are the Equal Protection Clause, Dormant Commerce Clause, and the Privileges and Immunities Clause.

2.8.1 Equal Protection Clause

A challenge to an LBE program under the Equal Protection Clause is straightforward. The content of the Equal Protection Clause has been discussed above. All challenges to local purchasing preferences based on the Equal Protection Clause have failed. Federal courts have ruled that programs to favor local companies do not involve a suspect classification, and can be justified as having a rational basis under the Equal Protection Clause. For example, Pennsylvania enacted a statute requiring the purchase of Pennsylvania steel.[165] A challenge was made to the Pennsylvania Steel Products Procurement Act, as a "blatant attempt at economic protectionism," in violation of the Equal Protection Clause. But the federal court found that Pennsylvania's distinction between domestic and foreign steel products was "rationally related to a legitimate governmental purpose," that is, to support a struggling industry that contributed significant employment and tax revenue to the State.

2.8.2 The Dormant Commerce Clause

The next objection to LBE programs comes from the Commerce Clause. Article One of the Constitution confers upon Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce.[166] The Supremacy Clause of the Constitution grants to the federal government the power to preempt state laws that conflict with federal laws. The Supreme Court has found implicit in the Constitution "a self-executing limitation on the power of the States to enact laws imposing substantial burdens on such commerce."[167] Consequently, a state statute is unconstitutional under what has become known as the Dormant Commerce Clause if it poses undue burdens on interstate commerce.[168] It follows that under the Dormant Commerce Clause, "discrimination against interstate commerce in favor of local business or investment is *per se* invalid, save in a narrow class of cases in which the municipality can demonstrate, under rigorous scrutiny, that it has no other means to advance a legitimate local interest."[169]

The Dormant Commerce Clause has been justified on both economic and political grounds. On economic grounds the Dormant Commerce Clause "prohibits economic

---

[164] *See, e.g.,* City of Detroit's Detroit-Based Business Program (Executive Order No. 2003-4), City of San Francisco Minority/Women Local Business Enterprise Program (San Francisco Ordinance, CHAPTER 12D), City of Oakland Local Business Enterprise Program (City Ordinance 9739), City of New York Local Business Enterprise Program (New York Administrative Code § 6-108.1program).

[165] *Trojan Technologies v. Pennsylvania*, 916 F.2d 903 (3d Cir 1990).

[166] U.S. Const., art. I., 8 (reading, "Congress shall have Power ... to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes ...").

[167] *S.-C. Timber Dev., Inc. v. Wunnicke*, 467 U.S. 82, 87 (1984); see also *New Energy Co. of Ind. v. Limbach*, 486 U.S. 269, 273 (1988).

[168] *See Big Country Foods, Inc. v. Bd. of Educ. Anchorage Sch. Dist.*, 952 F.2d 1173, 1177 (9th Cir. 1992).

[169] *C & A Carbone v. Town of Clarkstown*, 511 U.S. 383, 392 (1994).

protectionism."[170] From a political standpoint, a state law that only harms interests from other states "is not likely to be subjected to those political restraints which are normally exerted on legislation where it affects adversely some interests within the state."[171]

Historically, the Supreme Court employed a two-part test for the Dormant Commerce Clause: (1) does the state regulation discriminate against interstate commerce on its face; or, (2) are the burdens imposed on interstate commerce excessive relative to the alleged local benefits.[172] A statute that fails either part of this test (the "Pike test") is invalid under the Dormant Commerce Clause. LBE programs facially discriminate against interstate commerce and, thus, should fail the Pike test.
But there is an important exception to the Dormant Commerce Clause relevant to an LBE program. The "Market Participant" doctrine allows a state to pass 'protectionist' legislation so long as the state is participating in the market as a buyer or seller of goods and services, rather than regulating the market.[173] Thus, the Commerce Clause was not intended to prohibit a state from favoring its own citizens over others when acting as a market participant. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that governments enjoy unrestricted ability to select their trading partners.[174] Indeed, in light of "the long recognized right of trader or manufacturer, engaged in an entirely private business, freely to exercise his own independent discretion as to parties with whom he will deal" and that "when acting as proprietors, States should similarly share existing freedoms from federal constraints, including the inherent limits of the Commerce Clause."[175]

The U.S. Supreme Court has clarified, however, that the Market Participant doctrine does not allow a state to impose conditions "that have a substantial regulatory effect outside of that particular market."[176] Note that the line between market participant and market regulator has not always been clear. Nevertheless, under the Market Participant Exception, LBE programs should pass constitutional hurdles.

Finally, under the Commerce Clause, the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that when local preferences are required under federal grants there is no Dormant Commerce Clause issue, ruling that "where state or local government action is specifically authorized by Congress, it is not subject to the Commerce Clause even if it interferes with interstate commerce."[177]

Given these results, it is not surprising that no federal court case was found overturning, or even challenging, an LBE program under the Dormant Commerce Clause.

2.8.3 <u>Privileges and Immunities Clause</u>

The most serious risk to an LBE program comes from the Privileges and Immunities Clause. The U.S. Supreme Court has identified the original purpose of the Privileges and Immunities Clause as prohibiting discrimination on the basis of state citizenship. Historically, the U.S. Supreme Court has applied a two-part test under the Privileges and Immunities Clause: (1)

---

[170] *New Energy Co. of Ind. v. Limbach*, 486 U.S. 269, 274 (1988).
[171] *S.C. St. Hwy. Dept. v. Barnwell Bros*., Inc., 303 U.S. 177, 185 n. 2 (1938).
[172] *Pike v. Bruce Church, Inc*., 397 U.S. 137 (1970).
[173] *S.-C. Timber Dev., Inc*., 467 U.S. at 93 (holding that "if a state is acting as a market participant, rather than as a market regulator, the dormant Commerce Clause places no limitation on its activities").
[174] *Perkins v. Lukens Steel*, 310 U.S. 113, 127 (1940).
[175] Reeves, Inc. v. Stake, 447 U.S. 429, 439 (1980).
[176] *S.-C. Timber Dev., Inc. v. Wunnick*e, 467 U.S. 82, 97 (1984).
[177] *White v. Massachusetts Council of Construction Employers*, Inc. 460 U.S. 204, 213 (1983).

did the state or local government violate a fundamental right, and (2) did the state or local government have a substantial reason for doing so.[178]

While similar and interrelated with the Dormant Commerce Clause, the Immunities Clause and the Commerce Clause provide different constitutional protections. The Dormant Commerce Clause is a judicially-created doctrine designed to prevent economic protectionism while the Privileges and Immunities Clause is a Constitutional provision created to protect individual rights.

A clarification of the application of the Immunities Clause to a local preference came in *United Building & Constr. Trades v. Camden*.[179] In *Camden*, a municipal ordinance required that at least 40 percent of the employees of contractors and subcontractors working on city construction projects be Camden residents. The Court devised a three-part test to evaluate the constitutionality of such an ordinance under the Privileges and Immunities Clause:

- The jurisdiction must document "substantial reason" for the preference.
- The jurisdiction must demonstrate that non-residents can be held partly responsible for the documented problem.
- The proposed remedy must be narrowly tailored.

The U.S. Supreme Court held that the *Camden* ordinance might be unconstitutional and remanded the case for consideration under the specified legal standard. There were three significant element of the Court's holding. First, the *Camden* Court ruled that the Market Participant exception does not apply to Privileges and Immunities analysis. Second, the Court ruled that the Immunities Clause does apply to laws that discriminate on the basis of municipal residency, not simply state residency. Third, the Court ruled that only those rights fundamental to interstate harmony were protected by the Immunities Clause. In *Camden*, the Court found that employment was a fundamental right under the Immunities Clause, but direct public employment was not.[180] Hence, employment by a city vendor was a fundamental right while employment by the city itself was not a fundamental right. All of these results would seem to operate against a constitutional finding sustaining an LBE program.

The application of *Camden* can be seen in *Hudson County Building and Construction v. Jersey City*,[181] which involved a program requiring city vendors to make good faith efforts to hire 51 percent city residents. The district court again noted that there is no fundamental right to direct government employment, but there is a fundamental right to private employment with government contractors. Consequently, the program did unduly burden out-of-state residents. While Jersey City provided data on unemployment and poverty in Jersey City, the evidence did not show "that out-of-state workers [were] a cause of unemployment and poverty within its borders." Thus, just reciting data on unemployment and poverty will not be enough to overcome an Immunities Clause challenge.

---

[178] *Toomer v. Witsell*, 334 U.S. 385, 395-96 (1948).
[179] *United Building & Constr. Trades v. Camden*, 465 U.S. 208 (1984).
[180] *McCarthy v. Philadelphia Civil Service Commission*, 424 U.S. 645 (1976) (upholding a municipal ordinance that required all Philadelphia city government employees to be residents of the city).
[181] 960 F.Supp. 823, 831 (Dist Ct D NJ 1996).

But note that *Camden* involved a preference for hiring city residents, not a local business enterprise program. Arguably, there should be no distinction between public contracting and direct government hiring under the Privileges and Immunities Clause; that is, public contracts are like public jobs, public works and other government benefits that are owned by the residents. Public contracts are not a fundamental right for Immunities Clause analysis.

In addition, while local hiring programs may face challenge under the Immunities Clause, the Supreme Court has held that the Privileges and Immunities Clause does not protect corporations.[182] Consequently, an Immunities Clause challenge should only arise relative to an individual seeking to contract with a local government. But local contracting programs can and should have a clear statement of the economic basis of the program to protect it from challenge by an individual vendor on the basis of the Immunities Clause.
It is worth observing that no case was found overturning, or even challenging, an LBE program based upon the Immunities Clause.[183] Only municipal resident hiring programs have been challenged on Immunities Clause grounds.

2.8.4 Implications for Geographical Preferences

In conclusion, no constitutional challenges have succeeded with regard to an LBE program. An LBE program should survive: (1) a challenge under the Equal Protection Clause because LBE programs generally have a rational basis for their existence, (2) a challenge under the Dormant Commerce Clause based upon the Market Participant exception, and (3) a challenge under the Immunities Clause because the clause does not apply to corporations, public contracts are not a fundamental right, and an agency should be able to provide economic justification for an LBE program. No cases were found overturning preferences based on firm location in a distressed area, such as the federal HUBZone program.

2.9 Conclusions

As summarized earlier, when governments develop and implement a contracting program that is sensitive to race and gender, they must understand the case law that has developed in the federal courts. These cases establish specific requirements that must be addressed so that such programs can withstand judicial review for constitutionality and prove to be just and fair. Under the developing trends in the application of the law, state governments must engage in specific fact-finding processes to compile a thorough, accurate, and specific evidentiary foundation to determine whether there is, in fact, discrimination sufficient to justify an affirmative action plan. Further, state governments must continue to update this information and revise their programs accordingly.

While the Supreme Court has yet to return to this exact area of law to sort out some of the conflicts, the circuit courts have settled on the core standards. Though there are differences among the circuits in the level of deference granted to the finder of fact, these differences do not appear to be profound. The differences in the individual outcomes have been

[182] *Paul v. Virginia*, 75 U.S. (8 Wall.) 168, 177, 181, (1869);) This result was reaffirmed by the Supreme Court in *Western & Southern Life Ins. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization*, 451 U.S. 648, (1981).
[183] One state court case challenging an LBE program, argued that an Illinois School Board did not have the authority under state statutes to authorize an LBE program. *Best Bus Joint Venture v. The Board of Education of the City of Chicago*, First District Appellate Court No. 1-96-2927 (May 9, 1997).

overwhelmingly different in the level of evidence, mostly concerning the rigor with which disparity studies have been conducted and then used as the foundation for narrowly tailored remedies. Most significantly, nationally and in the Eighth Circuit, the DBE program has been consistently upheld as a narrowly tailored remedial program. Ultimately, MBE and WBE programs can withstand challenges if state governments comply with the requirements outlined by the courts.

3.0 RELEVANT MARKET AREA, UTILIZATION, AND AVAILABILITY ANALYSES

3.0 RELEVANT MARKET AREA, UTILIZATION, AND AVAILABILITY ANALYSES

This chapter presents the results of MGT's analysis of the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District (MMCD) payment activity occurring between January 2002 and December 2007. In this chapter, MGT analyzes the utilization of firms by MMCD in comparison with the firms that are available to do business with MMCD. The results of the utilization and availability analyses ultimately determine whether minority-, woman-, or nonminority-owned businesses were underutilized or overutilized in MMCD's funded projects.

This chapter consists of the following sections:

3.1 Methodology
3.2 Construction
3.3 Architecture and Engineering
3.4 Professional Services
3.5 Other Services
3.6 Goods and Supplies
3.7 Summary

3.1 Methodology

This section describes the methodology used for the collection of data that provide the framework for analyzing the utilization and availability of minority-, woman-, and nonminority-owned firms for this study. The descriptions of business categories and minority- and woman-owned business enterprise (M/WBE) classifications are also presented in this section. In addition, the procedures for determining the utilization and availability of firms are presented herein.

3.1.1 Business Categories

The MMCD prime utilization and availability of M/WBEs were analyzed for five business categories: construction, architecture and engineering, professional services, other services, and goods and supplies. A description of each business category follows.

Construction

Construction refers to any construction-related services including, but not limited to:

- General building contractors engaged primarily in the construction of commercial buildings.
- Light maintenance construction services such as carpentry work; electrical work; installation of carpeting; air conditioning repair, maintenance, and installation; plumbing; and renovation.
- Other related services such as water-lining and maintenance, asbestos abatement, drainage, dredging, grading, hauling, landscaping (for large

construction projects such as boulevards and highways), paving, roofing, and toxic waste clean-up.

Architecture and Engineering

This business category encompasses all services performed by a:

- State-licensed architect.
- Professional engineer.
- Firm owned by parties with such designations.

Professional Services

This business category includes:

- Financial services.
- Legal services.
- Medical services.
- Educational services.
- Other professional services.

Other Services

Other services include:

- Janitorial and maintenance services.
- Uniformed guard services.
- Computer services.
- Certain job shop services.
- Printing.
- Graphics, photographic services.
- Landscaping.
- Other nontechnical or unlicensed services

Goods and Supplies

Goods and Supplies include:

- Office goods.
- Medical supplies.
- Miscellaneous building materials.
- Equipment.
- Vehicles.
- Computers.

Certain purchases were excluded from analysis in this study. Examples include:

- Administrative items such as utility payments, leases for real estate, insurance, or banking transactions.
- Salary and fringe benefits, payments for food, parking, or conference fees.
- Government entities including nonprofit local organizations, state agencies, and federal agencies.

Firms were assigned to a particular category based on the MMCD's chart of accounts, as well as the MMCD's financial management systems. However, based on feedback from MMCD, certain purchases were reclassified according to vendor name rather than the type of purchase and/or payment description.

3.1.2 M/WBE Classifications

In this study, businesses classified as M/WBEs are firms at least 51 percent owned and controlled by members of one of five groups: African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and nonminority women. These groups are defined according to the United States (U.S.) Census Bureau as follows:

- **African Americans:** U.S. citizens or lawfully admitted permanent residents having an origin in any of the black racial groups of Africa.
- **Hispanic Americans:** U.S. citizens or lawfully admitted permanent residents of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish or Portuguese cultures or origins regardless of race.
- **Asian Americans:** U.S. citizens or lawfully admitted permanent residents who originate from the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands.
- **Native Americans:** U.S. citizens or lawfully admitted permanent residents who originate from any of the original peoples of North America and who maintain cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.
- **Women:** U.S. citizens or lawfully admitted permanent residents who are non-Hispanic white females. Minority women were included in their respective minority category.

The M/WBE determinations reflected in this report are based on the source data discussed below in **Section 3.1.3**. If the business owner classification was unclear in the source data, MGT conducted additional research to determine the proper business owner classification. This additional research included requesting assistance from business organizations and industry trade associations that maintain membership lists. Firms that were identified in the source data as non-M/WBEs and firms for which there was no indication of M/WBE classification in the source data were considered to be nonminority-owned firms in the analysis conducted for this study.

3.1.3 Collection and Management of Data

Electronic-copy payment data within the study period for the business categories mentioned above were reviewed and collected.

Payment Data Collection

Using the electronic data provided by MMCD, MGT developed a master list of MMCD's payment activity during the study period. The master list was comprised of data sets obtained from MMCD, and contained MMCD payment data. These files were as follows:

- **MMCD Payment Data:** files containing purchase orders and payments made to vendors during the study period.
- **Chart of Accounts:** a list of the MMCD's accounts payable and title descriptions.

Data from the electronic file were combined to create the master file of the MMCD's payment activity for the study period. The electronic list provided the following data that MGT used for analysis:

- Name of firm paid.
- Payment amount of the transaction.
- Payment post and close date of the purchase order and/or payment.
- A description of the goods or services provided and/or payment from which the business category of the procurement could be derived.

Once collected and transferred into the MGT database, the data were processed as follows:

- Exclusion of records not relevant to the study. Examples of payment activity excluded from analysis include duplicate payment records; contracts out of the time frame of the study; contracts awarded to nonprofits and government entities; and utility payments such as water, gas, and electricity.
- Identification of the county in which the vendor operated. To accomplish this, the ZIP code of the vendor was matched against an MGT ZIP code database of all United States counties.
- Identification of the vendor's business category.

The total number of payment records analyzed for the study period is shown below in **Exhibit 3-1**.

EXHIBIT 3-1
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
NUMBER OF ANALYZED RECORDS
WITHIN THE ELECTRONIC PAYMENT DATA
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

BUSINESS CATEGORY	# OF RECORDS
Architecture and Engineering	124
Construction	296
Other Services	3,869
Professional Services	2,001
Goods and Supplies	6,413

Source: Payment activity compiled from MMCD's data.

Availability (Vendor) Data Collection

Determining the availability of firms is a critical element in developing disparity analyses. Therefore, MGT analyzes the availability of firms at the prime contractor level for all business categories.

For the purposes of this study, MGT defines prime contractors as firms that (1) have performed prime contract work for MMCD or (2) have registered to do business with MMCD. These firms are considered to be available because they have either performed or indicated their willingness to perform prime contract work for MMCD within the state of Minnesota market area.

In addition, MGT's subconsultant, The Innovative Edge, LLC, collected numerous lists from local area agencies (such as chambers of commerce and business development agencies) to assist with the development of MGT's master M/WBE list. This list is used to update and cross reference ethnic/gender/racial classification information.

This process generated a listing of 1,112 entries; however, a significant number of the entries were names of MMCD employees, nonprofit organizations, governmental agencies, and duplicate entries. Employee names were identified and excluded from further analysis. MGT also excluded business listings for firms where there were incomplete data. As a result, the availability analyses were based on a pool of 683 firms.

3.1.4 Market Area Methodology

In order to establish the appropriate geographic boundaries for the statistical analysis, relevant market areas were determined for each of the business categories included in the study by using all counties in the state of Minnesota.

Overall Market Area

A United States county is the geographical unit of measure selected for determining market area. The use of counties as geographical units is based on the following considerations:

- The courts have accepted counties as a standard geographical unit of analysis in conducting equal employment opportunity and disparity analysis.

- County boundaries are externally determined and, thus, free from any researcher bias that might result from any arbitrary determinations of geographical units of analysis.

- Census and other federal and state data are routinely collected and reported by county.

The counties that constituted MMCD's market area were determined by evaluating the total dollars expended by MMCD in each business category. The results were then summarized by county according to the location of each firm that provided goods or services to MMCD.

Relevant Market Area

After the relevant market area was determined for each business category, the first step in this part of the analysis was the calculation of the payments awarded in each of the counties included in MMCD's payment data. The counties were listed according to the number of firms awarded gross value dollars, and then by the dollar amounts paid.

The data used to determine the overall and relevant market areas for MMCD business categories were as follows:

- Number of individual firms.
- Percentage of total firms.
- Payments made to vendors.
- Percentage of total dollars.

3.1.5 Utilization Methodology

The prime level utilization analyses of construction, architecture and engineering, professional services, other services, and goods and supplies firms were based on information derived from MMCD's payment data file for activity occurring between January 2002 and December 2007.

In addition to determining the relevant market area, MGT calculated the total payments in each county according to business category. MGT's analysis shows that the MMCD's relevant market includes the entire state of Minnesota.

3.1.6 Availability Methodology

To evaluate disparate results in the distribution of contracts and payments, if any, it is necessary to identify available M/WBEs in the local area for each business category. This determination, referred to as "availability," has been an issue in recent court cases. If the availability of minority- and woman-owned firms is overstated or understated, a distortion of the disparity determination will result. This distortion occurs because the quantitative measure of disparity is a direct ratio between utilization and availability.

Several methodologies may be used to determine availability, including analysis of vendor data and bidder data. The use of bidder data is preferable to vendor data because it considers firms that have expressed a readiness, willingness, and ability to provide goods and/or services to procuring entities, even when they have not been

successful in doing so. Discriminatory barriers may, under certain circumstances, preclude such firms from submitting bids. For MGT's analysis, MGT used firms that performed work for, as well as registered to do business with, the MMCD.

As indicated previously in this chapter, MGT utilized various sources to determine prime availability in order to develop the appropriate availability data within the relevant market area. All of the data were then compiled into the database (specific to each agency) for analysis.

3.2 Construction

This section presents MGT's analysis of MMCD's utilization in the construction business category, as well as the utilization and availability of firms.

3.2.1 Utilization Analysis

For firms located in the MMCD's relevant market area, the following analyses were conducted:

- Utilization analysis of all M/WBE and non-M/WBE prime contractors' purchase orders by year for the study period.
- Utilization analysis of the number of unique prime contractors payments, according to race/ethnicity/gender classifications.

The utilization analysis of prime construction contractors in the MMCD's relevant market area is shown in **Exhibit 3-2**. M/WBEs were not hired/selected for any of the construction projects for the MMCD (which totaled $942,000) during the study period.

EXHIBIT 3-2
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
CONSTRUCTION
UTILIZATION ANALYSIS OF PRIME CONTRACTORS
IN THE RELEVANT MARKET AREA
DOLLARS AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL DOLLARS PAID
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATIONS
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

Calendar Year	African Americans		Hispanic Americans		Asian Americans		Native Americans		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms		Total Dollars
	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$
2002	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$21,097.08	100.00%	$21,097.08
2003	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$28,178.27	100.00%	$28,178.27
2004	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$28,275.70	100.00%	$28,275.70
2005	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$88,408.89	100.00%	$88,408.89
2006	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$50,104.19	100.00%	$50,104.19
2007	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$726,252.07	100.00%	$726,252.07
Total	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$942,316.20**	**100.00%**	**$942,316.20**

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD covering the period from January 2002 through December 2007.
[1] Percent of total dollars paid annually to prime contractors.

In **Exhibit 3-3**, MGT shows that 36 unique firms received payments from the MMCD during the study period.

EXHIBIT 3-3
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
CONSTRUCTION
NUMBER OF UNIQUE PRIME CONTRACTORS IN THE RELEVANT MARKET AREA
PAYMENTS BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATIONS
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

Calendar Year	African Americans		Hispanic Americans		Asian Americans		Native Americans		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms		Total Firms
	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#
2002	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	11	100.00%	11
2003	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	11	100.00%	11
2004	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	11	100.00%	11
2005	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	12	100.00%	12
2006	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	19	100.00%	19
2007	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	14	100.00%	14
Unique Firms over Six Years [2]	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**36**	**100.00%**	**36**

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD covering the period from January 2002 through December 2007.
[1] Percentage of total firms.
[2] "Unique Firms" counts a firm only once for each year it receives work. Since a firm could be used in multiple years, the "Unique Firms" for the entire study period may not equal the sum of all years.

3.2.2 Availability Analysis

The availability of construction firms was determined by analyzing the MMCD's Master Vendor List. **Exhibit 3-4** shows that 36 firms (all were non-M/WBEs) were available to provide construction related services to the MMCD.

EXHIBIT 3-4
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
CONSTRUCTION
AVAILABILITY OF PRIME CONTRACTORS IN THE RELEVANT MARKET AREA
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATIONS
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms		Total Firms
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**36**	**100.00%**	**36**

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD covering the period from January 2002 through December 2007.
[1] Minority women-owned firms are included in their respective minority classifications.

3.3 Architecture and Engineering

This section presents MGT's analysis for the architecture and engineering business category. This analysis is based on MMCD payments to firms providing architecture and engineering services. In this section, the results of the utilization and availability analyses of M/WBEs and non-M/WBEs as architecture and engineering consultants are shown in exhibits 3-5 through 3-7.

3.3.1 Utilization Analysis

Exhibit 3-5 presents the utilization analysis of architecture and engineering prime consultants in MMCD's market area and shows that nonminority firms received $337,444, or 100 percent, of the payments for architecture and engineering services.

EXHIBIT 3-5
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING
UTILIZATION ANALYSIS OF PRIME CONSULTANTS PAYMENTS AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL DOLLARS
IN THE RELEVANT MARKET AREA
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATIONS
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

Calendar Year	African Americans		Hispanic Americans		Asian Americans		Native Americans		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms		Total Dollars
	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$
2002	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$2,342.22	100.00%	$2,342
2003	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0
2004	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$14,238.71	100.00%	$14,239
2005	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0
2006	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$30,523.70	100.00%	$30,524
2007	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$290,339.62	100.00%	$290,340
Total	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$337,444.25**	**100.00%**	**$337,444.25**

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD covering the period from January 2002 through December 2007.
[1] Percent of total dollars paid annually to prime consultants.

Exhibit 3-6 shows the distribution of architecture and engineering prime level consultants that performed work for MMCD during the study period. There were three unique architecture and engineering firms, all of which were owned by non-M/WBEs.

EXHIBIT 3-6
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING
NUMBER OF UNIQUE PRIME CONSULTANTS IN THE
RELEVANT MARKET AREA
PAYMENTS BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATIONS
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

Calendar Year	African Americans		Hispanic Americans		Asian Americans		Native Americans		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms		Total Firms
	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#
2002	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1
2003	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
2004	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	100.00%	2
2005	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
2006	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1
2007	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	100.00%	2
Unique Firms over Six Years [2]	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**3**	**100.00%**	**3**

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD covering the period from January 2002 through December 2007.
[1] Percentage of Total Consultants.
[2] "Unique Firms" counts a firm only once for each year it receives work. Since a firm could be used in multiple years, the "Unique Firms" for the entire study period may not equal the sum of all years.

3.3.2 Availability

The data for measuring the availability of prime architecture and engineering firms were extracted from the MMCD's Master Vendor List. **Exhibit 3-7** shows the available pool of architecture and engineering prime consultants consisted of three firms. None of the firms were minority- or woman-owned.

EXHIBIT 3-7
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING
AVAILABILITY OF PRIME CONTRACTORS
IN THE RELEVANT MARKET AREA
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATIONS
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms		Total Firms
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**3**	**100.00%**	**3**

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD covering the period from January 2002 through December 2007.
[1] Minority woman-owned firms are included in their respective minority classifications.

3.4 Professional Services

This section presents MGT's analysis for the professional services business category. This analysis is based on MMCD purchase orders for providing professional services. In this section, the results of the utilization and availability analyses of M/WBEs and non-M/WBEs as prime professional service consultants in the MMCD MSA are shown. **Exhibit 3-8** shows that M/WBEs received 1.81 percent of the $297,000 that was paid for professional services. Asian American-owned firms received 1.25 percent, followed by African American-owned firms which received .44 percent, and Native American-owned firms which received .13 percent.

EXHIBIT 3-8
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
UTILIZATION ANALYSIS OF PRIME CONSULTANTS
IN THE RELEVANT MARKET AREA
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATIONS
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

Calendar Year	African Americans		Hispanic Americans		Asian Americans		Native Americans		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms		Total Dollars
	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$
2002	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$2,292.52	4.56%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$2,292.52	4.56%	$48,001.99	95.44%	$50,295
2003	$1,306.32	1.64%	$0.00	0.00%	$1,417.47	1.78%	$374.80	0.47%	$0.00	0.00%	$3,098.59	4.05%	$76,580.38	96.11%	$79,679
2004	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$36,409.14	100.00%	$36,409
2005	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$53,462.17	100.00%	$53,462
2006	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$41,871.38	100.00%	$41,871
2007	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$35,533.90	100.00%	$35,534
Total	**$1,306.32**	**0.44%**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$3,709.99**	**1.25%**	**$374.80**	**0.13%**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$5,391.11**	**1.81%**	**$291,858.96**	**98.19%**	**$297,250.07**

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD covering the period from January 2002 through December 2007.
[1] Percent of total dollars paid annually to prime consultants.

Exhibit 3-9 shows the distribution of individual professional services prime consultants that performed work for MMCD during the study period. Nonminority professional service firms were utilized in greater proportions than M/WBEs and accounted for 84.62 percent of paid firms. The analysis of the number of firms utilized shows that, during the study period, M/WBEs represented 15.38 percent. Each M/WBE categorized by race/ethnic/ gender classifications represented 3.85 percent of the firms utilized except Hispanic American which represented zero percent.

EXHIBIT 3-9
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
NUMBER OF UNIQUE PRIME CONSULTANTS
IN THE RELEVANT MARKET AREA
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATIONS
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

Calendar Year	African Americans		Hispanic Americans		Asian Americans		Native Americans		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms		Total Firms
	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#
2002	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	11	100.00%	11
2003	1	9.09%	0	0.00%	1	9.09%	1	9.09%	0	0.00%	3	27.27%	8	72.73%	11
2004	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	6	100.00%	6
2005	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	8	100.00%	8
2006	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	10.00%	1	10.00%	9	90.00%	10
2007	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	6	100.00%	6
Unique Firms over Six Years [2]	**1**	**3.85%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**1**	**3.85%**	**1**	**3.85%**	**1**	**3.85%**	**4**	**15.38%**	**22**	**84.62%**	**26**

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD covering the period from January 2002 through December 2007.
[1] Percentage of Total Vendors.
[2] "Unique Firms" counts a firm only once for each year it receives work. Since a firm could be used in multiple years, the "Unique Firms" for the entire study period may not equal the sum of all years.

3.4.1 Availability

The data for measuring the availability of professional service firms were extracted from the MMCD's Master Vendor List. Of the 30 professional service vendors that were available for work with the MMCD, over 83 percent were nonminority firms. The five M/WBE firms available to provide professional services were owned by one African American, two Asian Americans, one Native American, and one nonminority woman. **Exhibit 3-10** shows number of available professional services firms.

EXHIBIT 3-10
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
AVAILABILITY OF PRIME CONSULTANTS
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATIONS
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms		Total Firms
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	**1**	**3.33%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**2**	**6.67%**	**1**	**3.33%**	**1**	**3.33%**	**5**	**16.67%**	**25**	**83.33%**	**30**

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD covering the period from January 2002 through December 2007.
[1] Minority women-owned firms are included in their respective minority classifications.

3.5 Other Services

The utilization and availability analyses of other services procurements are examined in this section. The other services data that were analyzed were obtained from MMCD.

3.5.1 Utilization Analysis

This section presents the utilization analysis of other services vendors, which includes an analysis of the number of payments and the number of individual firms utilized differentiated by race, ethnicity, and gender. The results of the utilization analysis are presented in **Exhibit 3-11**. As shown, M/WBEs received .49 percent of the other services payments made by MMCD during the study period.

Of the M/WBE groups, firms owned by Hispanic Americans were the most successful, receiving $31,949 (.30%), and Natives Americans received $20,000 (.19%) out of a total of $10.7 million in payments.

EXHIBIT 3-11
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
OTHER SERVICES
UTILIZATION ANALYSIS OF FIRMS
IN THE RELEVANT MARKET AREAS
PAYMENTS AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL DOLLARS
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATIONS
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

Calendar Year	African Americans		Hispanic Americans		Asian Americans		Native Americans		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms		Total Dollars
	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$
2002	$0.00	0.00%	$24,014.58	1.22%	$0.00	0.00%	$5,328.00	0.27%	$0.00	0.00%	$29,342.58	2.53%	$1,937,659.74	98.51%	$1,967,002
2003	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$5,566.42	0.48%	$0.00	0.00%	$5,566.42	0.48%	$1,153,598.64	99.52%	$1,159,165
2004	$0.00	0.00%	$3,484.84	0.21%	$0.00	0.00%	$4,852.47	0.30%	$0.00	0.00%	$8,337.31	0.51%	$1,629,608.86	99.49%	$1,637,946
2005	$0.00	0.00%	$2,313.26	0.12%	$0.00	0.00%	$1,326.20	0.07%	$0.00	0.00%	$3,639.46	0.19%	$1,871,453.55	99.81%	$1,875,093
2006	$0.00	0.00%	$145.00	0.01%	$0.00	0.00%	$2,183.27	0.08%	$0.00	0.00%	$2,328.27	0.09%	$2,606,845.87	99.91%	$2,609,174
2007	$0.00	0.00%	$1,991.32	0.13%	$0.00	0.00%	$1,034.34	0.07%	$0.00	0.00%	$3,025.66	0.20%	$1,482,838.81	99.80%	$1,485,864
Total	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$31,949.00**	**0.30%**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$20,290.70**	**0.19%**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$52,239.70**	**0.49%**	**$10,682,005.47**	**99.51%**	**$10,734,245.17**

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD covering the period from January 2002 through December 2007.
[1] Percent of total dollars paid annually to firms.

Exhibit 3-12 shows that there were 75 unique firms who provided other services to MMCD. Three M/WBE unique firms (4% of all unique firms) provided other services to MMCD.

EXHIBIT 3-12
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
OTHER SERVICES
NUMBER OF UNIQUE FIRMS
IN THE RELEVANT MARKET AREA
PAYMENTS BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATIONS
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

Calendar Year	African Americans		Hispanic Americans		Asian Americans		Native Americans		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms		Total Firms
	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#
2002	0	0.00%	1	3.03%	0	0.00%	2	6.06%	0	0.00%	3	9.09%	30	90.91%	33
2003	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	2.78%	0	0.00%	1	2.78%	35	97.22%	36
2004	0	0.00%	1	2.70%	0	0.00%	1	2.70%	0	0.00%	2	5.41%	35	94.59%	37
2005	0	0.00%	1	2.86%	0	0.00%	1	2.86%	0	0.00%	2	5.71%	33	94.29%	35
2006	0	0.00%	1	3.45%	0	0.00%	1	3.45%	0	0.00%	2	6.90%	27	93.10%	29
2007	0	0.00%	1	2.38%	0	0.00%	1	2.38%	0	0.00%	2	4.76%	40	95.24%	42
2008	0	0.00%	1	2.38%	0	0.00%	1	2.38%	0	0.00%	2	4.76%	31	93.94%	33
Unique Firms over Six Years [2]	**0**	**0.00%**	**1**	**1.33%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**2**	**2.67%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**3**	**4.00%**	**72**	**96.00%**	**75**

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD covering the period from January 2002 through December 2007.
[1] Percentage of total firms.
[2] "Unique Firms" counts a firm only once for each year it receives work. Since a firm could be used in multiple years, the "Unique Firms" for the entire study period may not equal the sum of all years.

3.5.2 Availability

The data used to measure the availability of vendors were extracted from the MMCD's Master Vendor List. **Exhibit 3-13** shows the available other services vendors located in the MMCD MSA. Of the 65 available other services firms, 4.62 percent were M/WBE firms. Among the M/WBEs, Native American-owned firms were 3.08 percent and Hispanic American-owned firms were 1.54 percent of available firms.

EXHIBIT 3-13
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
OTHER SERVICES
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATIONS
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms		Total Firms
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	**0**	**0.00%**	**1**	**1.54%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**2**	**3.08%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**3**	**4.62%**	**62**	**95.38%**	**65**

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD covering the period from January 2002 through December 2007.

3.6 Goods and Supplies

The utilization and availability analyses of goods and supplies vendors are examined in this section. The other services data that was analyzed was obtained from MMCD.

3.6.1 Utilization Analysis

This section presents the utilization analysis of goods and supplies vendors, which includes an analysis of the number of payments and the number of individual firms utilized differentiated by race, ethnicity, and gender. The results of the utilization analysis are presented in **Exhibit 3-14**. As shown, M/WBEs received $20,658 or 2.39 percent of the goods and supplies payments made by MMCD during the study period.

EXHIBIT 3-14
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
GOOD AND SUPPLIES
UTILIZATION ANALYSIS OF VENDORS
IN THE RELEVANT MARKET AREAS
PAYMENTS AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL DOLLARS
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATIONS
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

Calendar Year	African Americans		Hispanic Americans		Asian Americans		Native Americans		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms		Total Dollars
	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$	%[1]	$
2002	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$112,668.34	100.00%	$112,668.34
2003	$0.00	0.00%	$55.64	0.04%	$917.23	0.63%	$0.00	0.00%	$4,069.00	2.79%	$5,041.87	3.46%	$140,780.54	96.54%	$145,822.41
2004	$0.00	0.00%	$4,031.76	2.69%	$249.01	0.17%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$4,280.77	2.85%	$145,743.00	97.15%	$150,023.77
2005	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$6,531.45	5.01%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$6,531.45	5.01%	$123,714.56	94.99%	$130,246.01
2006	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$2,529.67	1.43%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$2,529.67	1.43%	$174,544.07	98.57%	$177,073.74
2007	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$1,934.56	1.99%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$1,934.56	1.99%	$95,348.18	98.01%	$97,282.74
2008	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$340.61	0.65%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$340.61	0.65%	$51,917.68	99.35%	$52,258.29
Total	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$4,087.40**	**0.47%**	**$12,502.53**	**1.44%**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**	**$4,069.00**	**0.47%**	**$20,658.93**	**2.39%**	**$844,716.37**	**97.61%**	**$865,375.30**

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD covering the period from January 2002 through December 2007.
[1] Percent of total dollars paid annually to vendors.

Exhibit 3-15 shows that there were 142 unique firms who provided good and supplies to MMCD. Three unique M/WBE firms (2.11% of all unique firms) provided goods and supplies to MMCD.

EXHIBIT 3-15
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
GOODS AND SUPPLIES
NUMBER OF UNIQUE VENDORS
IN THE RELEVANT MARKET AREA
PAYMENTS BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATIONS
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

Calendar Year	African Americans		Hispanic Americans		Asian Americans		Native Americans		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms		Total Firms
	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#
2002	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	67	100.00%	67
2003	0	0.00%	1	1.49%	1	1.49%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	2.99%	65	97.01%	67
2004	0	0.00%	1	1.52%	1	1.52%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	3.03%	64	96.97%	66
2005	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.47%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.47%	67	98.53%	68
2006	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.54%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.54%	64	98.46%	65
2007	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.61%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.61%	61	98.39%	62
2008	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.61%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.61%	44	97.78%	45
Unique Firms over Six Years [2]	**0**	**0.00%**	**1**	**0.70%**	**1**	**0.70%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**1**	**0.70%**	**3**	**2.11%**	**139**	**97.89%**	**142**

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD covering the period from January 2002 through December 2007.
[1] Percentage of total firms.
[2] "Unique Vendors" counts a firm only once for each year it receives work. Since a firm could be used in multiple years, the "Unique Firms" for the entire study period may not equal the sum of all years.

3.6.2 Availability

The data used to measure the availability of vendors were extracted from the MMCD's Master Vendor List. **Exhibit 3-16** shows the available goods and supplies vendors located in the MMCD relevant market area. Of the 143 available goods and supplies vendors, 2.1 percent are M/WBE firms.

EXHIBIT 3-16
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
GOODS AND SUPPLIES
AVAILABILITY OF VENDORS
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATIONS
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms		Total Firms
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	**0**	**0.00%**	**1**	**0.70%**	**1**	**0.70%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**1**	**0.70%**	**3**	**2.10%**	**140**	**97.90%**	**143**

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD covering the period from January 2002 through December 2007.
[1] Minority woman-owned firms are included in their respective minority classifications

3.7 Summary

Exhibit 3-17 summarizes the analysis results presented in this chapter.

EXHIBIT 3-17
SUMMARY OF M/WBE UTILIZATION
BY BUSINESS CATEGORY

Business Category	African American	Hispanic American	Asian American	Native American	Nonminority Women	Total M/WBE
Construction Prime Contractors						
Utilization Dollars	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Utilization Percent	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Availability Percent	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Architecture and Engineering Prime Consultants						
Utilization Dollars	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Utilization Percent	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Availability Percent	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Professional Services Prime Consultants						
Utilization Dollars	$1,306	$0	$3,710	$375	$0	$5,391
Utilization Percent	0.44%	0.00%	1.25%	0.13%	0.00%	1.81%
Availability Percent	3.33%	0.00%	6.67%	3.33%	3.33%	16.67%
Other Services Firms						
Utilization Dollars	$0	$31,949	$0	$20,291	$0	$52,240
Utilization Percent	0.00%	0.30%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.49%
Availability Percent	0.00%	1.54%	0.00%	3.08%	0.00%	4.62%
Goods and Supplies Vendors						
Utilization Dollars	$0	$4,087	$12,503	$0	$4,069	$20,659
Utilization Percent	0.00%	0.47%	1.44%	0.00%	0.47%	2.39%
Availability Percent	0.00%	0.70%	0.70%	0.00%	0.70%	2.10%

Source: **Chapter 3.0**, Analysis Results.

4.0 DISPARITY ANALYSIS

4.0 DISPARITY ANALYSIS

This chapter examines the issue of disparity within each business category of payment. Disparity, in this context, is the analysis of the differences between the utilization of minority- and nonminority women-owned business enterprises (M/WBEs) and the availability of those firms. Accordingly, MGT of America, Inc. (MGT), used disparity indices to examine whether M/WBEs received a proportional share of dollars based on the availability of M/WBEs in the relevant market area.

This chapter consists of the following sections:

- **Section 4.1** describes the methodology used by MGT to test for the presence or absence of disparity in each of the business categories.
- **Section 4.2** applies the disparity indices to the business categories and determines the presence or absence of statistically significant disparity in the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District (MMCD) payment activity.

4.1 Methodology

MGT used the results of the availability and utilization information presented in **Chapter 3.0** of this report as the basis to determine if M/WBEs received a proportional share of payments by MMCD. This determination is made primarily through the disparity index calculation which compares the availability of firms with the utilization of those firms. The disparity index also provides a value that can be given a commonly accepted substantive interpretation.

4.1.1 Disparity Index

MGT pioneered the use of disparity indices as a means of quantifying the disparity in utilization relative to availability. The use of a disparity index for such calculations is supported by several post-*Croson* cases, most notably *Contractors Association of Eastern Pennsylvania v. City of Philadelphia*.[1] Although a variety of similar indices could be utilized, MGT's standard for choosing its particular index methodology is that it must yield a value that is easily calculable, understandable in its interpretation, and universally comparable, such that a disparity in utilization within M/WBE categories can be assessed with reference to the utilization of non-M/WBEs.

[1] *Contractors Association of Eastern Pennsylvania, Inc. v. City of Philadelphia,* 91 F 3d at 603.

For this study, the ratio of the percentage of utilization[2] to the percentage of availability multiplied by 100 serves as the measure of choice, as shown in the formula:

$$\textbf{(1) Disparity Index} = \frac{\%Um_1p_1}{\%Am_1p_1} \times 100$$

Where: Um_1p_1 = utilization of M/WBE_1 for $payment_1$
Am_1p_1 = availability of M/WBE_1 for $payment_1$

Due to the mathematical properties involved in the calculations, a disparity index value of 0.00 for a given race, ethnicity, or gender of firm category indicates absolutely no utilization and, therefore, absolute disparity. An index of 100 indicates that vendor utilization is perfectly proportionate to availability for a particular group in a given business category, indicating the absence of disparity—that is, the proportion of utilization relative to availability one would expect, all things being equal. In general, firms within a business category are considered underutilized if the disparity indices are less than 100, and overutilized if the indices are above 100.

Since there is no standardized measurement to evaluate the levels of underutilization or overutilization within a payment context, MGT has appropriated the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's (EEOC) "80 percent rule" in *Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures*. In context of employment discrimination, an employment disparity ratio below 80 indicates a "substantial disparity" in employment. The Supreme Court has accepted the use of the 80 percent rule in *Connecticut* v. *Teal* (*Teal*), 457 U.S. 440 (1982), and in *Teal* and other affirmative action cases, the terms "adverse impact," "disparate impact," and "discriminatory impact" are used interchangeably to characterize values of 80 and below.

4.2 Disparity Indices

Tables showing disparity indices results for construction, architecture and engineering, professional services, and other services are analyzed in this section. As mentioned before, the tables are based on the utilization and availability of M/WBEs and non-M/WBEs in MMCD's relevant market area as shown in **Chapter 3.0**.

4.2.1 Construction

Disparity Analysis of Construction Prime Vendors

Exhibit 4-1 shows the disparity indices for prime construction firms based on MMCD's payments data. Non-M/WBE firms had a disparity index of 100.00 for all years combined. During the study period no M/WBE firms were utilized or available at the prime contractor level to work on construction projects for MMCD.

[2] Percentage of utilization is based on procurement dollars and the percentage of availability is based on the number of firms.

EXHIBIT 4-1
DISPARITY ANALYSIS OF CONSTRUCTION PRIME VENDORS BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATION JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

Business Owner Classification	% of Dollars[1]	% of Available Firms[2]	Disparity Index[3]	Disparate Impact of Utilization
2002				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	100.00%	100.00	Overutilization
2003				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	100.00%	100.00	Overutilization
2004				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	100.00%	100.00	Overutilization
2005				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	100.00%	100.00	Overutilization
2006				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	100.00%	100.00	Overutilization
2007				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	100.00%	100.00	Overutilization
All Years				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	100.00%	100.00	Overutilization

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD from January 2002 through December 2007.

[1] The percentage of dollars is taken from the prime utilization exhibit previously shown in **Chapter 3.0**.

[2] The percentage of available contractors is taken from the availability exhibit previously shown in **Chapter 3.0**.

[3] The disparity index is the ratio of % utilization to % availability times 100.

* An asterisk is used to indicate a substantial level of disparity – index below 80.00.

N/A denotes that in these cases due to the mathematical constraint of division by zero. This occurred because there is zero utilization in this category. Because the utilization percentage is the denominator in the final calculation, the existence of disparity can be inferred due to the prima facie evidence of zero utilization levels

4.2.2 Architecture and Engineering

This section presents the results of the disparity analysis for the architecture and engineering business category for prime consultants within the relevant market area.

Architecture and Engineering Consultants

Exhibit 4-2 shows the disparity indices for architecture and engineering consultants. Non-M/WBE firms had a disparity index of 100.00 for all years combined even with underutilization in 2002, 2003, and 2005. There were no M/WBE firms utilized or available for any of MMCD's architecture and engineering projects during the study period.

EXHIBIT 4-2
DISPARITY ANALYSIS OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATION JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

Business Owner Classification	% of Dollars[1]	% of Available Firms[2]	Disparity Index[3]	Disparate Impact of Utilization
2002				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	100.00%	100.00	Overutilization
2003				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	0.00%	100.00%	0.00	* Underutilization
2004				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	100.00%	100.00	Overutilization
2005				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	0.00%	100.00%	0.00	* Underutilization
2006				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	100.00%	100.00	Overutilization
2007				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	100.00%	100.00	Overutilization
All Years				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	100.00%	100.00	Overutilization

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD from January 2002 through December 2007.

[1] The percentage of dollars is taken from the prime utilization exhibit previously shown in **Chapter 3.0**.

[2] The percentage of available contractors is taken from the availability exhibit previously shown in **Chapter 3.0**.

[3] The disparity index is the ratio of % utilization to % availability times 100.

* An asterisk is used to indicate a substantial level of disparity – index below 80.00.

N/A denotes that in these cases due to the mathematical constraint of division by zero. This occurred because there is zero utilization in this category. Because the utilization percentage is the denominator in the final calculation, the existence of disparity can be inferred due to the prima facie evidence of zero utilization levels.

4.2.3 Professional Services

This section presents the results of the disparity analysis for the professional services business category for prime consultants.

Professional Services Consultants

Exhibit 4-3 shows the disparity indices for professional services consultants. Non-M/WBE firms had a disparity index of 117.82 for all years combined. African American-, Asian American-, Native American-, and nonminority women-owned firms had disparity indices of 13.18, 18.72, 3.78, and 0.0 for all years, respectively, which indicates that they were underutilized. Hispanic American-owned firms were neither utilized nor available for any of MMCD's professional services projects.

EXHIBIT 4-3
DISPARITY ANALYSIS OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONSULTANTS IN THE RELEVANT MARKET AREA BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATION JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

Business Owner Classification	% of Dollars[1]	% of Available Firms[2]	Disparity Index[3]	Disparate Impact of Utilization
2002				
African Americans	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	4.56%	6.67%	68.37	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	95.44%	83.33%	114.53	Overutilization
2003				
African Americans	1.64%	3.33%	49.18	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	1.78%	6.67%	26.68	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.47%	3.33%	14.11	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	96.11%	83.33%	115.33	Overutilization
2004				
African Americans	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	6.67%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	83.33%	120.00	Overutilization
2005				
African Americans	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	6.67%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	83.33%	120.00	Overutilization
2006				
African Americans	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	6.67%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	83.33%	120.00	Overutilization
2007				
African Americans	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	6.67%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	83.33%	120.00	Overutilization
All Years				
African Americans	0.44%	3.33%	13.18	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	1.25%	6.67%	18.72	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.13%	3.33%	3.78	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	3.33%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	98.19%	83.33%	117.82	Overutilization

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD from January 2002 through December 2007.

[1] The percentage of dollars is taken from the prime utilization exhibit previously shown in **Chapter 3.0**.

[2] The percentage of available contractors is taken from the availability exhibit previously shown in **Chapter 3.0**.

[3] The disparity index is the ratio of % utilization to % availability times 100.

* An asterisk is used to indicate a substantial level of disparity – index below 80.00.

N/A denotes that in these cases due to the mathematical constraint of division by zero. This occurred because there is zero utilization in this category. Because the utilization percentage is the denominator in the final calculation, the existence of disparity can be inferred due to the prima facie evidence of zero utilization levels.

4.2.4 Other Services

Exhibit 4-4 shows the disparity indices for firms that provided other services. Non-M/WBE firms had a disparity index of 104.33 for all years combined even with underutilization in 2002., Hispanic American- and Native American-owned firms had disparity indices of 19.35 and 6.14 for all years, respectively, which indicates that they were underutilized. African American-, Asian American-, and nonminority women-owned firms were neither utilized nor available for any of MMCD's other services-related projects.

EXHIBIT 4-4
DISPARITY ANALYSIS OF OTHER SERVICES VENDORS IN THE RELEVANT MARKET AREA BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATION JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

Business Owner Classification	% of Dollars[1]	% of Available Firms[2]	Disparity Index[3]	Disparate Impact of Utilization
2002				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	1.22%	1.54%	79.36	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.27%	3.08%	8.80	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	98.51%	95.38%	103.27	Overutilization
2003				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	1.54%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.48%	3.08%	15.61	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.52%	95.38%	104.34	Overutilization
2004				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.21%	1.54%	13.83	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.30%	3.08%	9.63	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.49%	95.38%	104.31	Overutilization
2005				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.12%	1.54%	8.02	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.07%	3.08%	2.30	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.81%	95.38%	104.64	Overutilization
2006				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.01%	1.54%	0.36	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.08%	3.08%	2.72	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.91%	95.38%	104.75	Overutilization
2007				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.13%	1.54%	8.71	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.07%	3.08%	2.26	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.80%	95.38%	104.63	Overutilization
All Years				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.30%	1.54%	19.35	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.19%	3.08%	6.14	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.51%	95.38%	104.33	Overutilization

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD from January 2002 through December 2007.

[1] The percentage of dollars is taken from the prime utilization exhibit previously shown in **Chapter 3.0.**

[2] The percentage of available contractors is taken from the availability exhibit previously shown in **Chapter 3.0**.

[3] The disparity index is the ratio of % utilization to % availability times 100.

* An asterisk is used to indicate a substantial level of disparity – index below 80.00.

N/A denotes that in these cases due to the mathematical constraint of division by zero. This occurred because there is zero utilization in this category. Because the utilization percentage is the denominator in the final calculation, the existence of disparity can be inferred due to the prima facie evidence of zero utilization levels

4.2.5 Goods and Supplies

Exhibit 4-5 shows the disparity indices for firms that provide goods and supplies. Asian American-owned firms had a disparity index of 206.6 for all years combined, which indicates that they were overutilized. Non-M/WBE firms had a disparity index of 99.70 for all years combined indicating overall underutilization even with overutilization in 2006 and 2007. African American and Native American owned firms were neither utilized nor available for any of the MMCD's goods and supplies purchases.

EXHIBIT 4-5
DISPARITY ANALYSIS OF GOODS AND SUPPLIES VENDORS IN THE RELEVANT MARKET AREA BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATION JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

Business Owner Classification	% of Dollars[1]	% of Available Firms[2]	Disparity Index[3]	Disparate Impact of Utilization
2002				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.70%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.70%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.70%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	97.90%	102.14	Overutilization
2003				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.04%	0.70%	5.46	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.63%	0.70%	89.95	Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	2.79%	0.70%	399.02	Overutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	96.54%	97.90%	98.61	Underutilization
2004				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	2.69%	0.70%	384.30	Overutilization
Asian Americans	0.17%	0.70%	23.74	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.70%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	97.15%	97.90%	99.23	Underutilization
2005				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.70%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	5.01%	0.70%	717.10	Overutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.70%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	94.99%	97.90%	97.02	Underutilization
2006				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.70%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	1.43%	0.70%	204.29	Overutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.70%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	98.57%	97.90%	100.68	Overutilization
2007				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.70%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	1.99%	0.70%	284.37	Overutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	0.70%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	98.01%	97.90%	100.11	Overutilization
All Years				
African Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Americans	0.47%	0.70%	67.54	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	1.44%	0.70%	206.60	Overutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.47%	0.70%	67.24	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	97.61%	97.90%	99.70	Underutilization

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD from January 2002 through December 2007.

[1] The percentage of dollars is taken from the prime utilization exhibit previously shown in **Chapter 3.0.**

[2] The percentage of available contractors is taken from the availability exhibit previously shown in **Chapter 3.0**.

[3] The disparity index is the ratio of % utilization to % availability times 100.

* An asterisk is used to indicate a substantial level of disparity – index below 80.00.

N/A denotes that in these cases due to the mathematical constraint of division by zero. This occurred because there is zero utilization in this category. Because the utilization percentage is the denominator in the final calculation, the existence of disparity can be inferred due to the prima facie evidence of zero utilization levels

4.2.6 Conclusions Based on Disparity Indices

This chapter used disparity indices to compare the availability and utilization findings from **Chapter 3.0**. The disparity indices for each of the business categories indicate whether disparity exists for each ethnic or gender group.

Exhibit 4-6 summarizes the findings of M/WBE underutilization.

EXHIBIT 4-6
SUMMARY OF M/WBE UNDERUTILIZATION

Business Category	African American	Hispanic American	Asian American	Native American	Nonminority Women
Construction Prime Contractors	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Architecture and Engineering Prime Consultants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Professional Services Prime Consultants	YES *	N/A	YES *	YES *	YES *
Other Services Firms	N/A	YES *	N/A	YES *	N/A
Goods and Supplies Vendors	N/A	YES *	NO	N/A	YES *

Source: MGT developed a payment and vendor database for MMCD from January 2002 through December 2007.
* An asterisk is used to indicate a substantial level of disparity – index below 80.00.
N/A denotes that in these cases due to the mathematical constraint of division by zero. This occurred because there is zero utilization in this category. Because the utilization percentage is the denominator in the final calculation, the existence of disparity can be inferred due to the prima facie evidence of zero utilization levels.

5.0 ANECDOTAL ANALYSIS

5.0 ANECDOTAL ANALYSIS

Anecdotal research is a widely accepted research methodology that is based upon observations, interviews, and surveys. The collection and analysis of anecdotal data are performed to determine whether underutilization of minority- and woman-owned firms results from objective, nonbiased bidding and purchasing procedures or from discriminatory practices. It is used in conjunction with other research tools to foster clarity and as support for findings.

Unlike other chapters in this report, the conclusions derived from anecdotal analysis do not rely solely on quantitative data. Anecdotal analysis also utilizes qualitative data to describe the context of the examined social, political, and economic environment in which all businesses and other relevant entities applicable to the study operate.

The following sections present MGT's approach to collecting anecdotal data, the methods employed in collecting these data, and the quantitative and qualitative results of the data collected.

This chapter is organized into the following sections:

5.1 Methodology
5.2 Demographics
5.3 Barriers to Doing Business with the Governmental Units
5.4 Certification Process
5.5 Prompt Payment
5.6 Access to Capital
5.7 Bonding and Insurance
5.8 Discrimination
5.9 Other Focus Group, Public Hearing, and Personal Interview Responses
5.10 Suggestions
5.11 Conclusions

5.1 Methodology

The blueprint for collecting and analyzing anecdotal information for this study was identified by the U.S. Supreme Court in *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson, 488 U.S. 469, 109 S.Ct. 706 (1989)* (*Croson*). Specifically, race-conscious programs must be supported by strong documentation of discrimination, including evidentiary findings that go beyond the demographics of a community. Anecdotal information can bolster the quantitative analyses of contract expenditures to explain whether or not minority business creation, growth, and retention are negatively affected by discrimination. In *Croson*, the Court held that anecdotal accounts of discrimination could help establish a compelling interest for a local government to institute a race-conscious remedy. Moreover, such information can provide a local entity with a firm basis for fashioning a program that is narrowly tailored to remedy identified forms of marketplace discrimination and other barriers to minority- and woman-owned business enterprise (M/WBE) participation in contract opportunities. However, it should be cautioned that the following comments are the perceptions and opinions of individuals, and the evidentiary weight of these opinions depends on how much they are corroborated by statements of others and the quantitative data in the report. Further discussion of anecdotal testimony is contained in **Chapter 2.0** Legal Review.

MGT's experience conducting disparity studies has shown that multiple methods of anecdotal data collection provide more comprehensive information than methodologies using a single-pronged approach. For this reason, MGT used a combination of surveys, focus groups, public hearing, and face-to-face interviews to collect anecdotal information and to identify issues that were common to businesses in the market area. MGT was also able to draw inferences from these data as to the prevalence of obstacles perceived as limiting the participation of M/WBEs in the Governmental Units procurement transactions.

The focus of the telephone survey, face-to-face interviews, focus groups, and public hearing was to identify the respondents' experiences conducting business with the Governmental Units. MGT solicited participation and responses from businesses that have done, or attempted to do, business with the Governmental Units between the years 2002 and 2007.

5.1.1 Telephone Survey

During the months of March through May 2009, MGT surveyed firms listed in the master vendor database to solicit responses from business owners and representatives about their firms and their experiences doing business with the Governmental Units. MGT attempted to collect data in proportion to the distribution of M/WBEs and non-M/WBEs in the relevant market area. Oppenheim Research, LLC, completed telephone interviews with owners and representatives from 552 firms.

Disparity study surveys are commonly plagued by sample size limitations, especially in the case of attempting to gather a representative sample from minority populations where low minority population numbers pose problems. (For example, Native American-owned business populations in most municipalities are insufficient in number to permit a valid and representative sample.) This problem is compounded when analyses are stratified further by business type. Insufficient sample sizes can pose problems for the statistical confidence of the results. Although MGT's goal is to report data samples that can satisfy the 95 percent confidence level, this does not mean that data should not be reported because of slightly reduced confidence intervals, especially when extreme due diligence has been exercised in attempting to meet the 95 percent standard. **Exhibit 5-1** reveals that the effort was, indeed, diligent for this study and shows the disposition of the telephone canvassing efforts.

EXHIBIT 5-1
STATE OF MINNESOTA
DISPOSITION OF TELEPHONE CALLS

Result	Number
Firms Called	1,073
Disconnected/Wrong Number	135
Refused	85
Answer Machine	31
Completed Interviews	552

Source: Oppenheim Research Services, 2007.

5.1.2 Focus Groups and Public Hearing

A total of four focus groups were conducted in Saint Paul in January 2009. The focus groups were conducted in the Lake Superior conference room at the State Administration Building. Focus groups were voice recorded after all participants agreed to be recorded.

MGT conducted one public hearing with owners and representatives of firms located throughout the state. The public hearing was held January 27, 2009. There were 42 attendees and a total of 14 speakers gave testimony. MGT facilitated the hearing with Kasdan Communications, a Minnesota-based minority business that provided administrative support, coordination, and assistance during the hearing.

Each attendee was given an agenda that included the purpose of the public hearing and the public testimony process. Speakers were given a public hearing testimony form for completion and submission prior to being called to testify. All testimony was documented by a professional court reporter. Testimony transcription service was provided by Shaddix & Associates, a Minnesota-based nonminority woman-owned firm.

5.1.3 Personal Interviews

The personal interview guide used in interviewing businesses included questions designed to establish a business profile for each business. Interviewers gathered information concerning the primary line of business, ethnicity of the owner, organizational status, number of employees, the year the business was established, gross revenues during selected calendar and/or fiscal years, and the owner's current level of education. The guide also included questions that tried to determine information about the firms' experiences attempting and conducting business with the Governmental Units (both directly and as a subcontractor); as well as experiences related to the Targeted Group Business program, and instances of discrimination experienced by the firm while attempting to do business with the Governmental Units. The interviewers made no attempt to prompt or guide responses from the participants, although follow-up questions were asked to obtain further clarification or information as necessary. At the conclusion of the interviews, each participant was asked to sign an affidavit attesting that their responses were given freely and were true and accurate reflections of their experience with the Governmental Units.

The personal interviews were conducted during the months of April through June 2009 with a cross-section of the business community around the state. Study participants were randomly selected from MGT's Master Vendor Database. Using the Master Vendor list and other resources available, 65 firms participated. Kasdan Communications e-mailed, telephoned, or faxed confirmation letters to all firms that agreed to be interviewed. The interviews were conducted either at the firm owner's office, at a location designated by the firm owner, or over the phone as requested by the firm owner. Interviews ranged in length from 25 to 45 minutes.

5.2 Demographics

The survey instruments created for this study contained items requesting information on the business owners' demographic characteristics, the companies' experience when

attempting to do business with the Governmental Units, and their experiences related to access to capital, insurance, and bonding to support business activities.

Using the telephone survey (**Appendix A**), MGT reached a broader segment of a population in a more cost-effective and time-efficient manner than possible through face-to-face interviews. However, the face-to-face interviews—which are structured settings where an interviewer uses an interview guide (**Appendix D**) to solicit input from participants—provided more latitude for additional information gathering on issues that are unique to the respondents' experiences.

5.2.1 Characteristics of the Sample Telephone Survey

As stated in **Section 5.1**, it should be cautioned that the following comments are the perceptions and opinions of individuals, and the evidentiary weight of these opinions depends on how much they are corroborated by statements of others and the quantitative data in the report. Further discussion of anecdotal testimony is contained in the legal chapter for this report.

Exhibit 5-2 provides an ethnic and gender profile of those business owners who participated in the telephone survey.

EXHIBIT 5-2
STATE OF MINNESOTA
SURVEY DEMOGRAPHICS
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER OF OWNER

Q1. Respondent's Gender										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	MWBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Male	10	19	7	3	31	70	281	15	9	375
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	73.08%	70.00%	33.33%	23.31%	36.27%	85.41%	78.95%	81.82%	67.93%
CATEGORY%	2.67%	5.07%	1.87%	0.80%	8.27%	18.67%	74.93%	4.00%	2.40%	100.00%
Female	5	7	3	6	102	123	48	4	2	177
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	26.92%	30.00%	66.67%	76.69%	63.73%	14.59%	21.05%	18.18%	32.07%
CATEGORY%	2.82%	3.95%	1.69%	3.39%	57.63%	69.49%	27.12%	2.26%	1.13%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

As demonstrated in **Exhibit 5-3**, business owners and representatives who participated in the telephone survey represented mainly construction or construction-related services (45 percent or 251 of 552 firms) and 117 of 552 firms (21 percent) reported that their businesses provided goods, equipment, and supplies to the Governmental Units. Based upon these responses, 108 of 552 respondents (20 percent) categorized their business as providing professional services, and 74 of 552 respondents (13 percent) reported that their businesses were other services firms.

EXHIBIT 5-3
STATE OF MINNESOTA
SURVEY DEMOGRAPHICS
BUSINESS INDUSTRY
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER OF OWNER

Q7. Company's primary line of business										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Building Construction	4	4	1	3	12	24	87	4	1	116
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	15.38%	10.00%	33.33%	9.02%	12.44%	26.44%	21.05%	9.09%	21.01%
CATEGORY%	3.45%	3.45%	0.86%	2.59%	10.34%	20.69%	75.00%	3.45%	0.86%	100.00%
Special Trade Contractor	2	1	1	2	36	42	88	1	4	135
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	3.85%	10.00%	22.22%	27.07%	21.76%	26.75%	5.26%	36.36%	24.46%
CATEGORY%	1.48%	0.74%	0.74%	1.48%	26.67%	31.11%	65.19%	0.74%	2.96%	100.00%
Professional Services	4	8	2	1	32	47	56	3	2	108
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	30.77%	20.00%	11.11%	24.06%	24.35%	17.02%	15.79%	18.18%	19.57%
CATEGORY%	3.70%	7.41%	1.85%	0.93%	29.63%	43.52%	51.85%	2.78%	1.85%	100.00%
General/Personal Services	5	11	4	3	20	43	25	4	2	74
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	42.31%	40.00%	33.33%	15.04%	22.28%	7.60%	21.05%	18.18%	13.41%
CATEGORY%	6.76%	14.86%	5.41%	4.05%	27.03%	58.11%	33.78%	5.41%	2.70%	100.00%
Supplies and Equipment	0	2	2	0	32	36	72	7	2	117
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	7.69%	20.00%	0.00%	24.06%	18.65%	21.88%	36.84%	18.18%	21.20%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	1.71%	1.71%	0.00%	27.35%	30.77%	61.54%	5.98%	1.71%	100.00%
No Response	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.75%	0.52%	0.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.36%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Source: Responses from Telephone Survey, Oppenheim Research, 2007.
CAT denotes calculation based on category and DEMO findings denotes calculation based on demographic (such as ethnicity/gender) findings.

Exhibit 5-4 shows that firms that responded to the survey generated varying levels of revenue. About 27 percent (151 of 552) of the firms reported revenue of $1 million or less and almost 70 percent (384 of 552) of firms reported revenues greater than $1 million.

Regarding company gross revenues, 71 M/WBE respondents reported annual earnings of $1 million or less. Of the 71 respondents, nonminority women represented 57, seven were African American, and six were Asian Americans.

EXHIBIT 5-4
STATE OF MINNESOTA
SURVEY RESPONDENTS
REVENUE
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER OF OWNER

Q25. Which category best approximates your company's 2006 gross revenues?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Up to $50,000	2	0	0	0	17	19	11	0	0	30
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	56.67%	25.00%	36.67%	0.00%	0.00%	5.43%
CATEGORY%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.78%	63.33%	3.34%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$50,001 to $100,000	2	0	0	0	6	8	12	0	1	21
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	10.53%	57.14%	0.00%	9.09%	3.80%
CATEGORY%	9.52%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.51%	38.10%	3.65%	0.00%	4.76%	100.00%
$100,001 to $300,000	0	3	0	0	8	11	16	0	0	27
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	11.54%	0.00%	0.00%	29.63%	14.47%	59.26%	0.00%	0.00%	4.89%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	6.02%	40.74%	4.86%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$300,001 to $500,000	1	2	0	0	14	17	7	0	0	24
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	58.33%	22.37%	29.17%	0.00%	0.00%	4.35%
CATEGORY%	4.17%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%	10.53%	70.83%	2.13%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$500,001 to $1,000,000	2	1	1	0	12	16	29	1	3	49
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	3.85%	10.00%	0.00%	24.49%	21.05%	59.18%	5.26%	27.27%	8.88%
CATEGORY%	4.08%	2.04%	2.04%	0.00%	9.02%	32.65%	8.81%	2.04%	6.12%	100.00%
$1,000,001 to $3,000,000	2	3	1	0	25	31	48	1	1	81
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	11.54%	10.00%	0.00%	30.49%	40.79%	58.54%	5.26%	9.09%	14.67%
CATEGORY%	2.47%	3.70%	1.23%	0.00%	18.80%	38.27%	14.59%	1.23%	1.23%	100.00%
$3,000,001 to $5,000,000	2	6	1	4	24	37	42	0	3	82
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	23.08%	10.00%	44.44%	29.27%	48.68%	51.22%	0.00%	27.27%	14.86%
CATEGORY%	2.44%	7.32%	1.22%	4.88%	18.05%	45.12%	12.77%	0.00%	3.66%	100.00%
$5,000,001 to $10,000,000	0	4	4	2	13	23	32	3	0	58
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	15.38%	40.00%	22.22%	22.41%	30.26%	55.17%	15.79%	0.00%	10.51%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	6.90%	6.90%	3.45%	9.77%	39.66%	9.73%	5.17%	0.00%	100.00%
Over $10 million	3	7	2	2	9	23	125	13	2	163
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	26.92%	20.00%	22.22%	5.52%	30.26%	76.69%	68.42%	18.18%	29.53%
CATEGORY%	1.84%	4.29%	1.23%	1.23%	6.77%	14.11%	37.99%	7.98%	1.23%	100.00%
No Response/DK	1	0	1	1	5	8	7	1	1	17
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	0.00%	10.00%	11.11%	29.41%	10.53%	41.18%	5.26%	9.09%	3.08%
CATEGORY%	5.88%	0.00%	5.88%	5.88%	3.76%	47.06%	2.13%	5.88%	5.88%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	24.05%	253.95%	59.49%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	100.00%	34.96%	100.00%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Source: Responses from Telephone Survey, Oppenheim Research, 2009.
CAT denotes calculation based on category and DEMO findings denotes calculation based on demographic (such as ethnicity/gender) findings.

5.2.2 Focus Group and Public Hearing Demographics

Ideally the most desired demographics of participants would include a composite of female and male, minority and nonminority business owners that had contracted with or attempted to contract with the Governmental Units. Of the total focus groups, there were ten African Americans, two Hispanic Americans, four Asian Americans, one Native American, and four nonminority women participants The makeup of the focus group sessions included firms that provided construction remodeling, structural engineering, surveying, excavating, asphalt paving, market research, and computer and electrical

supplies. The sessions were organized using the format and questions as shown in **Appendix E**.

To solicit participants, the focus group sessions were promoted to the following organizations, and groups:

- Certified vendors in the Targeted Group Business (TGB) directory
- Minnesota American Indian Chamber of Commerce (MAICC)
- Minnesota Hmong Chamber of Commerce
- Metropolitan Economic Development Association
- National Association of Minority Contractors, Upper Midwest Chapter (NAMC)
- Minnesota Minority Supplier Development Council (MMSDC)
- Asian American Chamber of Commerce
- Asian American Press
- African Development Center
- American Indian Neighborhood Development Corp.
- Diversity Information Resources
- Latino Communications Network
- Latino Midwest News
- Metropolitan Consortium of Community Developers
- National Black MBA Assoc., Twin City Chapter
- Neighborhood Development Center
- Northside Residents Redevelopment Council
- Riverview Economic Development Association
- SCORE Minnesota District Office
- WomenVenture
- Minnesota Chamber of Commerce
- Associated General Contractors of Minnesota
- Economic Growth Center

Follow-up telephone calls were made to the above organizations to confirm they had received the announcement and forwarded it electronically. Confirmation letters were sent via e-mail to those business owners who agreed to participate. All confirmed participants had done business or attempted to do business with the one or more of the Governmental Units.

The focus group session was formatted as an open discussion. The questions focused on how to obtain information about Governmental Units procurement opportunities such as the state's website, networking/word-of-mouth, etc., and whether the information is helpful. In addition, participants were asked, "What do you feel interferes with your ability to do business with the Governmental Units?", and "What are your recommendations for improving the process?"

5.2.3 Public Hearing Demographics

The following industries were represented: building construction, architectural and engineering, special trade contractors, professional services, other services, and goods and equipment suppliers. Of the individuals providing testimony during the public hearing, two were African American, one was Asian American, one was Native American, six were nonminority women, and four were nonminority males.

5.2.4 Personal Interview Demographics

From the pool of firms contacted, a total of 65 interviews occurred. Both minority and nonminority firms agreed to participate in the structured interviews. Firms included in the pool of firms contacted were randomly selected from the Governmental Units vendor lists.

5.3 Barriers to Doing Business with the Governmental Units

In the normal course of business, entrepreneurs may face certain barriers when establishing and operating a business enterprise. Several factors may also prevent a business from being selected for a contract or purchase order. In this section, MGT reviews participant responses concerning barriers they faced in the procurement process and factors that frequently prevented them from winning contracts or purchase orders.

5.3.1 Procurement Process

Questions in the telephone survey were designed to gather business owners' perceptions about the Governmental Units' procurement process and their experiences doing business with the Governmental Units. Analysis of the responses showed that the majority of firms responded to questions about barriers to doing business with the Governmental Units.

Listed below are a few of the key issues reported by M/WBE respondents regarding each Governmental Unit. M/WBE firms overwhelmingly responded that performance bond requirements were a barrier to doing business with each Governmental Unit. Detailed results for each Governmental Unit are located in **Appendix B**.

- Department of Administration
  - Slow payment or nonpayment, 81 percent or 26 of 32 respondents
  - Selection process, 52 percent or 51 of 98 respondents
- Metropolitan Airports Commission
  - Prequalification requirements, 50 percent or 22 of 44 respondents
  - Performance bond requirements, 72 percent or 26 of 36 respondents
- Metropolitan Council
  - Financing, 81 percent or 21 of 26 respondents
  - Contracts too large, 59 percent or 39 of 66 respondents
- Department of Transportation
  - Slow payment or nonpayment, 75 percent or 27 of 36 respondents
  - Financing, 73 percent or 19 of 26 respondents

- Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission
  - Insurance requirements, 65 percent or 15 of 23 respondents
  - Limited knowledge of purchasing policies, 57 percent or 25 of 44 respondents
- Metropolitan Mosquito Control
  - Compete with large companies, 55 percent or 58 of 106 respondents
  - Limited time given to prepare bid package, 59 percent or 22 of 37 respondents

5.3.1.1 Survey Responses

In the survey, respondents were requested to provide their opinions and perceptions about the Governmental Units' bid and payment processes. The results presented below detail aggregate responses by race, ethnicity, and gender of business ownership for those items.

5.3.1.2 Focus Group, Public Hearing, and Personal Interview Responses

As in the telephone survey, questions in the focus groups and public hearing were designed to gather business owners' perceptions and opinions of the Governmental Units procurement process and their experiences doing business with the Governmental Units.

As stated in **Section 5.1**, it should be cautioned that the following comments are the perceptions and opinions of individuals, and the evidentiary weight of these opinions depends on how much they are corroborated by statements of others and the quantitative data in the report. Further discussion of anecdotal testimony is contained in the legal chapter for this report.

Obstacles in the Procurement Process are noted as excessive procedures that create problems in the business owners' attempts to comply with the requirements of the procurement process.

- A nonminority woman electrical contractor indicated that the state of Minnesota has caps on electrical contracts. She said that if a business generates under $34 million a year, it is considered a small business in the state of Minnesota, which she thinks is kind of outrageous. In her opinion, a small business should be under a million dollars. She said that her small business cannot compete with a business that generates $34 million a year.

- A nonminority woman professional services firm owner submitted a grant to the Metropolitan Council and the Metropolitan Council cancelled our bid without providing an explanation and stated that the bidding process is really an unfair closed process. She said that, "we have inquired very nicely asking the contract manager to see the bids, to see the cost proposals, to see who won

the bid and learn what was allocated?" She stated that she is told by the contract manager, "…sure you can, but it has to be contracted first, the contract has to be signed. "The consultant is frustrated because her queries are "put off and put off and put off."

- A nonminority-owned professional services firm testified that as a targeted vendor his business has experienced problems with bidding process. He stated that his business is supposed to receive the six percent discount, however, when his business bids on some projects and when the bid opening comes, he is told, "Oh, we don't recognize targeted vendors."

- A nonminority woman supplier of small procurement items that has been awarded purchase orders through Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, and the private sector said that the Governmental Units expect vendors to bid low. In some cases, the vendors have bid so low that the margin of profit is all but diminished.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business architectural firm who has contracted with the Department of Administration, the Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Council stated that competition of firms, her firm's size, and fees, most often prevent her firm from winning contracts.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business professional services firm said that it's not as easy to approach the government as it is private industry.

- A nonminority male president of a company that supplies construction equipment to the Department of Administration, the Department of Transportation and the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission said that the State of Minnesota has gotten away from qualifying bidders. Out of state companies bid lower, but don't meet the OSHA safety requirements and don't provide the mandated training that is to take place at the time of delivery of supplied equipment.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business architectural firm who has contracted with the Department of Administration, the Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Council said that the Governmental Units request financial statements, but don't guarantee privacy of information.

- An African American male special construction services business owner who has provided services as a prime contractor for the Minnesota Department of Administration and the Metropolitan Airports Commission said that the biggest obstacle faced by TGBs in the state of Minnesota is getting prime contractors to give them a chance to work on projects with them.

- A nonminority woman owner of an IT consulting firm who has contracted as a prime contractor with the Minnesota Department of Administration said that an obstacle that prevents her firm from winning contract is low bids. Her firm can't go below a certain rate and make a profit.

- An Asian professional services business owner said that an obstacle for targeted businesses in the State of Minnesota is not having access to the decision makers in the procurement process.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business professional services IT staffing firm said that RFP response time interferes with her firms ability to bid on Governmental Units projects. The RFPs entail an overwhelming amount of extra work. You have to answer yes to 8 out of 10 – 15 qualifying questions. Unless you know the managers, you're not going.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business professional services IT consulting firm said that name recognition and size is an obstacle faced by her firm.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business professional services graphic design firm who has contracted with the Department of Administration said that several factors frequently prevent her firm from winning contracts and listed the following reasons: 1) General Contractors want to work with larger agencies, 2) Contract ceiling at $100,000. – probably designed for a specific agency, and 3) Budgetary companies; would rather do the work internally.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business professional services transportation firm said that charging for reviews of bids online is a practice that has prevented her from bidding. In addition, most projects are multi-level projects (under one umbrella), you have to be connected to bid on the project. In addition, she said that small businesses struggle with balancing time and don't have time to do procurement searches. You have to be part of a network to learn about projects.

Contract Bundling is noted as a problem when projects with a variety of scopes are packaged into one large contract. This practice places the project out of the reach of small business and relegates them to the status of a subcontractor.

- A nonminority male founder of a professional services firm that has been a prime contractor to the Department of Administration, Metropolitan Council, and the private sector said that the larger size projects has been an obstacle conducting business with the Governmental Units.

- A nonminority woman specialty trades contractor that has been a prime contractor with the Metropolitan Airports Commission and a subcontractor on projects with Department of Administration and the Metropolitan Council said that project size and lack of unbundling has prevented her company from bidding on certain Governmental Units projects. The Governmental Units leave it up to the primes to breakdown the projects, but the primes don't.

Competing with Large Companies is noted as a barrier where small and local firm compete on the few opportunities available with larger firms from out of state.

- A nonminority woman professional services firm owner said that her company is a technical company and competes with large companies, and many of the projects are outsourced.

- A nonminority male supplier services firm owner stated that his firm has six employees and they all pay their fair share of State of Minnesota sales tax, income tax, and other taxes. However, unfortunately, a lot of orders (bids) are awarded to targeted vendors and some business goes out of state. He thinks that a preference should be given to Minnesota corporations. Business should be kept in Minnesota where the company pays Minnesota income tax and sales tax.

- A nonminority male founder of a professional services firm that has been a prime contractor to the Minnesota Department of Administration, Metropolitan Council, and the private sector said that his firm doesn't bid on projects – it's more a situation of quality selection, i.e. "Have you handled that size of project before?"

Specifications and Qualifications is noted as a barrier where excessive requirements or poorly defined project requirements can create problems for bidders.

- A nonminority male professional services firm testified that as a woman–owned business his wife owns it and works in the business full time- his business is forced to order all of their supplies through MINNCOR.

- A nonminority woman owner of a professional services marketing firm who has bid to the Department of Administration and the Department of Transportation said that requests for proposals (RFP) are poorly written.

- A nonminority male partner in his Native American wife's professional services business testified that sometimes lack of knowledge by people that are writing the RFPs is a factor.. For example in some state bids; there is copying and pasting of information and terminology into the RFP that doesn't fit the job. The information is inaccurate, necessitating calls to the government department to clarify information. In this person's opinion, the RFP process is overcomplicated and there's nobody in the contracting office with any technical expertise.

- A nonminority woman sales and marketing manager for a female owned firm that provides small procurement items said that her business product doesn't have an existing category in the specifications that buyers use. .

- A nonminority male professional service provider said, "What's been echoed here and what's been said a lot here tonight is the size of the RFPs. We would recommend that less is more. Forty to 80 pages is a ridiculous size and length. And we would argue, as professional writers, that what can be -- what is currently said in 40 to 80 pages can frankly be done, frankly, in under ten

pages. Lack of specifics in the RFP, what actually is being asked, and what the contract is actually for." The firm owner went on to say, "when we have not won or when we saw the projects that we did not win executed, it was completely different than what the RFP asked for"..

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has contracted with the Department of Administration, Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Council said that the Governmental Units can improve the procurement and selection process by looking more at a company's qualifications rather than size.

TGB Subcontracting Goals are related experiences of businesses trying to achieve goals through the Targeted Group Business Program.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has contracted with the Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Council said that she doesn't believe that prime contractor will work with TGBs without an incentive. "They're watching their bottom-line."

- A nonminority male professional services firm stated that he has lost a significant amount of business to the Targeted Group Businesses with the bid preference at six percent. Therefore, when his firm loses business to a targeted group that gets a six percent preferential treatment, it's very difficult to do business He said that he lost a quarter of a million dollars in this last quarter to Targeted Groups. There were some possible $30,000 contracts he lost by $1.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has contracted with the Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Council said that she has noticed primes willing to work with TGBs; however believes that sometimes they won't if they can to go with someone bigger or do it themselves.

- A nonminority woman special trade contractor that has been a subcontractor on a project with the Department of Administration and the Metropolitan Council said you can tell the prime contractors who feel forced to use TGBs. You can also tell the ones embracing it, tolerating it, or totally against it and feel as though the program is being pushed on them. If there were no TGB programs or goals, she doesn't think that primes would use TGBs on purpose because the primes feel as though they have pulled themselves up by their bootstraps. They view the program as a slight and have the attitude that they won't be told what to do. The Good Faith Effort is too confusing and not enforced. It could be unenforceable. The terms are too gray – should be mandatory, or why bother having a program. There are too many loopholes. She said that she has been told by nonminority male prime contractors that it was better when it was mandatory. You had to reach a certain goal within a certain period; it leveled the playing field. Half the time, it seems as though the primes are making the bids just for the good faith effort. In addition, there is a lot of paperwork for the good faith effort without good results. It's not a win-win situation.

- A nonminority woman special trade contractor that has contracted with the private sector but not the Governmental Units said that most primes don't use firms because of goals – they use the firm because it does good business.

- A nonminority woman supplier of small procurement items that has been awarded purchase orders through Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, and the private sector said that primes will go with pricing and service no matter what – if you're a small or minority owned firm.

- A Native American specialty trades contractor that has subcontracted on projects for Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Council, Metropolitan Airports Commission, Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission, and the private sector said that goals are sometimes set at 11 percent for women and 3 percent for minorities, which prevented him from receiving a contract. Case in point is the Waste Water Treatment Plant administrated by the Metropolitan Council.

- A Native American specialty trades contractor that has subcontracted on projects for Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Council, Metropolitan Airports Commission, Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission, and the private sector said he doesn't think that primes will utilize TGBs without programs and goals because they would have no reason to do so. They always make a good faith effort – then go with the lowest price. They will be less likely to comply.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner who has not contracted with the Governmental Units said that she does get more calls from primes but it hasn't resulted in work. She added that "Yes and no – to primes doing business with TGBs without goals – It's easy to overlook people who don't have resources to market themselves."

Restrictive Selection Process was viewed as a problem when the specifications are too rigid and appear to eliminate competition in the bidding or selection process.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has contracted with the Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Council said that combined with procurement restrictions that all services to be performed by the prime contractor make it impossible for a female or minority firm to compete.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has been awarded contracts and purchase orders from the Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation and the private sector said that Minnesota Department of Administration sold the Minnesota Department of Corrections the Governmental Units printing equipment – now the inmates do most of the printing for State agencies. She stated that the inmates doing the work aren't trained to run the presses. The printing equipment at Minnesota Department of Corrections doesn't have a four-color process, therefore Minnesota Department of Corrections forces State agencies

to contract printing with them and once Minnesota Department of Corrections receives the printing orders, they outsource the printing.

- A Hispanic male professional services business owner who has not contracted with the Governmental Units said that the certification criteria related to personal and business information has prevented him from contracting with the Governmental Units. In addition, he said that timelines to submit RFPs is too quick. i.e. within 5 business days. It's as if the RFPs are designed for a specific company in mind.

Practices Primes Use to Avoid Using TGBs refers to tactics prime contractors use to avoid utilizing TGBs on state projects.

- A nonminority male specialty trades contractor who has supplied goods and services to the Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Airports Commission, and the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission said that prime contractors avoid using TGBs by requiring a specific talent or need that the TGB can't fill. For instance, the prime will request a number 22 item and there's only one company that provides the number 22 item.

- A nonminority male founder of a professional services firm that has been a prime contractor to the Minnesota Department of Administration, Metropolitan Council, and the private sector said that primes have gotten around using small, minority, disadvantaged, disabled or woman businesses by using their associates instead.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has contracted with the Department of Administration, Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Council said that primes are awarded contracts by the Metropolitan Council and the Metropolitan Airports Commission with TGBs subcontractors; however after the contract is awarded, the primes don't use the TGB firms.

Favoritism is noted when firms have a perception that some firms are given advantages over other firms.

- A nonminority woman business owner who provides landscaping services stated that a top Department of Transportation person once told her "I must protect "his landscapers". The nonminority female was on the plan-holders list also.

- A Hispanic male professional services business owner who has not contracted with the Governmental Units said favoritism is shown to those firms that have had business relationships in the past.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has contracted with the Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Council said that once a person has left the Governmental Units to work for a private company,

opportunities or contracts follow them. They are selected by former colleagues of the Governmental Units for procurement opportunities.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has contracted with the Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Council said that favoritism is not necessarily a negative that they put together the best team they can. A subcontractor should prove value to a prime contractor.

- A nonminority woman specialty trades contractor that has been a subcontractor on projects for the Department of Administration and the Metropolitan Council said that all of the Governmental Units and the private sector show favoritism through relationships that have been established. They go with what they know and the lowest bidder.

Procurement Participation Programs refer to efforts to assist M/WBEs. This section addresses M/WBEs perception of the program effectiveness.

- A nonminority male who is a partner in his Native American wife's professional services business testified that through his own experience, being a Targeted Group company has a very low success rate, and that the six percent in a lot of cases doesn't really play into it. He doesn't see that as being a detriment.

- A nonminority male specialty trades contractor who has supplied goods and services to the Department of Administration, a Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Airports Commission, and the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission said that certified TGBs have a competitive advantage because the prime contractors need to fill so many slots; they fill the slots with TGBs just to meet goals. The practice isn't bad, it's just a distraction.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business professional services medical staffing firm that contracts primarily to the private sector said that her firm has not had the opportunity to work with the Governmental Units said that she has been certified as a TGB for three years and the certification program has not helped her.

- A nonminority woman partner in a specialty trades contractor, union shop with 30 full time employees, that has worked as a subcontractor on projects for the Department of Administration, Metropolitan Airports Commission, and the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission said that she has used her TGB status when bidding on projects, but certification hasn't helped. She also said that there has been no change in the willingness of primes to use TGBs and that primes are interested in the bottom line – low dollar wins bid. In addition, she said that she has never felt her firm has ever been at a disadvantage because her company is female owned. She and her partner have never felt like the 'odd ball out'.

- An Asian female professional services IT business owner that has been a prime contractor to the Department of Administration, Metropolitan Council and the private sector said that certification helps in the private sector, but she is

not sure about the Governmental Units. She is TGB certified; however hasn't made her project outcome better. She has noticed that primes want to use more TGBs but it is according to 'who knows who – relationships'. She doesn't think that primes will utilize TGBs if there are no programs or goals because, "They will not seek the targeted group. They will work with who they are familiar with."

- A Hispanic male professional services business owner who has not contracted with the Governmental Units said that he thinks certification helps when mandated, because it makes businesses aware that there are goals. However, he doesn't think that primes will utilize TGBs without programs or goals because the primes will opt to keep business internal unless they can't handle the business. "It adds more to the bottom-line."

- A nonminority male founder of a professional services firm that has been a prime contractor to the Minnesota Department of Administration, Metropolitan Council, and the private sector said that five years ago, his firm was female owned and on several occasions, that was an advantage to winning projects.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has private sector contracts, but has not contracted with the Governmental Units said that they are TGB vendors, but it hasn't helped. Referring to primes as a Tier 1 business, she said that she hasn't seen willingness of Tier 1 businesses to use Tier 2 (her business) businesses. In reference to primes working with TGBs if there are no goals, she expressed that, "primes just want who's going to be nimble, quick, fast, and can help them out."

5.4 Certification Process

The sections which follow provide additional anecdotal comments based on survey results and other anecdotal data collection methods. As stated in **Section 5.1**, it should be cautioned that the following comments are the perceptions and opinions of individuals, and the evidentiary weight of these opinions depends on how much they are corroborated by statements of others and the quantitative data in the report. Further discussion of anecdotal testimony is contained in the legal chapter for this report.

5.4.1 Survey Responses

The survey requested that respondents indicate whether they were certified and comment on the impact of certification and doing business with the Governmental Units. Frequencies in responses are provided in **Exhibit 5-5**.

Exhibit 5-5 shows that 155 of 552 (28 percent) survey respondents were certified businesses in the Targeted Vendor Program. Of all M/WBE respondents, 51 businesses were certified as MBE and 62 firms were certified as nonminority female owned businesses. Thirteen businesses were certified as Economically Disadvantaged Businesses.

When sample respondents were asked if the business was certified in any programs for individuals with disabilities, (such as Small Business Administration, federal disability programs, etc.) 26 responded positively (**Exhibit 5-5**). Nineteen nonminority women-owned firms, three African American-owned firms, two non-M/WBE-owned firms, one Native American-owned firm, and one Asian American-owned firm were certified with disabilities (based on these programs).

EXHIBIT 5-5
STATE OF MINNESOTA
CERTIFICATION AND IMPACT
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CATEGORY

Q16. Is your Business certifed with the State of Minnesota's Targeted Vendor Program?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	7	17	7	6	70	107	43	1	4	155
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	65.38%	70.00%	66.67%	52.63%	55.44%	13.07%	5.26%	36.36%	28.08%
CATEGORY%	4.52%	10.97%	4.52%	3.87%	45.16%	69.03%	27.74%	0.65%	2.58%	100.00%
No	6	9	3	3	55	76	260	16	4	356
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	34.62%	30.00%	33.33%	41.35%	39.38%	79.03%	84.21%	36.36%	64.49%
CATEGORY%	1.69%	2.53%	0.84%	0.84%	15.45%	21.35%	73.03%	4.49%	1.12%	100.00%
Don't Know	2	0	0	0	8	10	26	2	3	41
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.02%	5.18%	7.90%	10.53%	27.27%	7.43%
CATEGORY%	4.88%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	19.51%	24.39%	63.41%	4.88%	7.32%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%
Q17. Are you certified as a Minority Business Enterprise?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	5	14	4	4	24	51	2	0	3	56
DEMOGRAPHIC%	71.43%	82.35%	57.14%	66.67%	34.29%	47.66%	4.65%	0.00%	75.00%	36.13%
CATEGORY%	8.93%	25.00%	7.14%	7.14%	42.86%	91.07%	3.57%	0.00%	5.36%	100.00%
No	2	3	3	2	45	55	41	1	1	98
DEMOGRAPHIC%	28.57%	17.65%	42.86%	33.33%	64.29%	51.40%	95.35%	100.00%	25.00%	63.23%
CATEGORY%	2.04%	3.06%	3.06%	2.04%	45.92%	56.12%	41.84%	1.02%	1.02%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.43%	0.93%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.65%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	7	17	7	6	70	107	43	1	4	155
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	4.52%	10.97%	4.52%	3.87%	45.16%	69.03%	27.74%	0.65%	2.58%	100.00%
Q17. Are you certified as an Economically Disadvantaged Business?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	1	2	2	9	3	0	1	13
DEMOGRAPHIC%	28.57%	11.76%	14.29%	33.33%	2.86%	8.41%	6.98%	0.00%	25.00%	8.39%
CATEGORY%	15.38%	15.38%	7.69%	15.38%	15.38%	69.23%	23.08%	0.00%	7.69%	100.00%
No	4	15	6	4	67	96	40	0	3	139
DEMOGRAPHIC%	57.14%	88.24%	85.71%	66.67%	95.71%	89.72%	93.02%	0.00%	75.00%	89.68%
CATEGORY%	2.88%	10.79%	4.32%	2.88%	48.20%	69.06%	28.78%	0.00%	2.16%	100.00%
Don't Know	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.43%	1.87%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	1.94%
CATEGORY%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	7	17	7	6	70	107	43	1	4	155
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	4.52%	10.97%	4.52%	3.87%	45.16%	69.03%	27.74%	0.65%	2.58%	100.00%

EXHIBIT 5-5 (Continued)
STATE OF MINNESOTA
CERTIFICATION AND IMPACT
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CATEGORY

Q17. Are you certified as a Woman Business Enterprise?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	9	4	3	62	78	1	0	2	81
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	52.94%	57.14%	50.00%	88.57%	72.90%	2.33%	0.00%	50.00%	52.26%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	11.11%	4.94%	3.70%	76.54%	96.30%	1.23%	0.00%	2.47%	100.00%
No	7	8	3	3	7	28	41	1	2	72
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	47.06%	42.86%	50.00%	10.00%	26.17%	95.35%	100.00%	50.00%	46.45%
CATEGORY%	9.72%	11.11%	4.17%	4.17%	9.72%	38.89%	56.94%	1.39%	2.78%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.43%	0.93%	2.33%	0.00%	0.00%	1.29%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	7	17	7	6	70	107	43	1	4	155
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	4.52%	10.97%	4.52%	3.87%	45.16%	69.03%	27.74%	0.65%	2.58%	100.00%
Q17. Are you certified as a Disabled Business Enterprise?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	1	0	1	19	24	2	0	0	26
DEMOGRAPHIC%	42.86%	5.88%	0.00%	16.67%	27.14%	22.43%	4.65%	0.00%	0.00%	16.77%
CATEGORY%	11.54%	3.85%	0.00%	3.85%	73.08%	92.31%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	4	16	7	5	50	82	41	0	4	127
DEMOGRAPHIC%	57.14%	94.12%	100.00%	83.33%	71.43%	76.64%	95.35%	0.00%	100.00%	81.94%
CATEGORY%	3.15%	12.60%	5.51%	3.94%	39.37%	64.57%	32.28%	0.00%	3.15%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.43%	0.93%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	1.29%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	7	17	7	6	70	107	43	1	4	155
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	4.52%	10.97%	4.52%	3.87%	45.16%	69.03%	27.74%	0.65%	2.58%	100.00%

Source: Responses from Telephone Survey, Oppenheim Research, 2007.
CAT denotes calculation based on category and DEMO findings denotes calculation based on demographic (such as ethnicity/gender) findings.

5.4.2 Focus Group, Public Hearing and Personal Interviews Responses

As stated in **Section 5.1**, it should be cautioned that the following comments are the perceptions and opinions of individuals, and the evidentiary weight of these opinions depends on how much they are corroborated by statements of others and the quantitative data in the report. Further discussion of anecdotal testimony is contained in the legal chapter for this report.

As presented in **Sections 5.1.2** and **5.1.3**, a total of four focus groups, one public hearing, and 65 personal interviews were conducted. Of those discussions, businesses presented the following comments about certification and the benefits of certification.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has contracted with the Department of Administration, Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Council said certification has had an effect on her company's ability to be competitive. She has entered opportunities to work with primes and have built lasting relationships – still working with primes outside of TGB and DBE requirements. She doesn't know if primes are less or more like to work with TGBs. In her opinion, the private sector is less interested, except for Xcel Energy.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has been awarded contracts and purchase orders from the Department of Administration, Department of Transportation and the private sector said that certification has helped, because her company is awarded contracts due to the 6 percent preference that it would not get otherwise.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that does 50 percent of her business with municipalities but has not been able to contract with the Governmental Units said that certification hasn't had any effect on her business.

- A nonminority woman supplier of small procurement items that has been awarded purchase orders through Department of Administration, Department of Transportation, and the private sector said that certification does help. More corporations require certification by outside agencies. Government certifications help in the private sector.

- A Native American specialty trades contractor that has subcontracted on projects for Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Council, Metropolitan Airports Commission, Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission, and the private sector said that certification has helped his business. The difference between the private sector and public sector is that in the public sector, if the owner of the company sets a participation goal – it's complied. With the Governmental Units, it's based on the good faith effort.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner who has not contracted with the Governmental Units said that the process would help if it worked. She added that in November 2008, she sent her paperwork to the Minnesota Department of Administration, but hasn't heard anything.

5.5 Prompt Payment

This section provides commentary on whether payment to vendors is taking place in a timely manner.

As stated in **Section 5.1**, it should be cautioned that the following comments are the perceptions and opinions of individuals, and the evidentiary weight of these opinions depends on how much they are corroborated by statements of others and the quantitative data in the report. Further discussion of anecdotal testimony is contained in the legal chapter for this report.

5.5.1 Survey Responses

The telephone survey included questions about what is considered to be a reasonable amount of time for payment after invoice. When respondents were asked to identify the time frame for prompt payment after invoice to be received from the Governmental Units, approximately 360 of 462 respondents (78 percent) stated that 30 to 60 days was typical; and 79 of 460 respondents (17 percent) stated that 60 to 90 days to receive

payment for completed services was typical. Detailed responses for each Governmental Unit are located in **Appendix B**.

5.5.2 Focus Group, Public Hearing, and Personal Interview Responses

As stated in **Section 5.1**, it should be cautioned that the following comments are the perceptions and opinions of individuals, and the evidentiary weight of these opinions depends on how much they are corroborated by statements of others and the quantitative data in the report. Further discussion of anecdotal testimony is contained in the legal chapter for this report.

Comments related to payments by the Governmental Units and prime contractors include:

- A nonminority woman partner in a specialty trades contractor, union shop with 30 full time employees that has worked as a subcontractor on projects for the Department of Administration, Metropolitan Airports Commission, and the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission said that she often receives delayed payments from prime contractors.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has contracted with the Department of Administration, Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Council said that she sometimes receives delayed payment from prime contractors.

5.6 Access to Capital

5.6.1 Survey Results

This analysis summarizes responses from the survey participants regarding their experiences in obtaining capital to support their business operations in general, and their ability to secure bonding and to obtain insurance when needed to conduct projects. Responses regarding barriers or obstacles that companies encountered when attempting to do business in general or when attempting to obtain a loan, insurance, or bonding were of particular interest.

- Of the 130 that applied for commercial loans, 125 (96 percent) were approved.

- Of M/WBEs, 46 (37 percent) were approved, compared to 79 (63 percent) of non-M/WBEs.

- Of M/WBEs, one of two (50 percent) WBEs was denied commercial loans because of insufficient business history; whereas, one (50 percent) of the two African Americans was denied because of other reasons.

5.6.2 Focus Group, Public Hearing and Personal Interview Responses

As stated in **Section 5.1**, it should be cautioned that the following comments are the perceptions and opinions of individuals, and the evidentiary weight of these opinions

depends on how much they are corroborated by statements of others and the quantitative data in the report. Further discussion of anecdotal testimony is contained in the legal chapter for this report.

With regards to access to capital, respondents provided these comments:

- An African American male general contracting business owner said that bonding requirements prohibit his firm from doing business, because of low capital. He receives information too late and doesn't have the resources to reach out and get bidding information, due to the size of his company. RFPs aren't user friendly to small businesses.

- An African American female professional services business owner stated that the biggest obstacle for targeted businesses in Minnesota is not having the working capital. "Being able to get the resources to do large scale projects."

- An African male special trade construction small business owner said, "If you don't have capital, you can't grow." Financing in terms of being able to launch a project. You have to finance the project until the client pays you. Heritage Park project in Minneapolis put several companies out of business. The General Contractors feel, why should they pay 30 days when they can get more float by paying in 60 or 90 days.

5.7 Bonding and Insurance Process

Bonding and insurance requirements were noted as being challenges for M/WBEs and small business owners.

5.7.1 Survey Results

Telephone survey participants were asked to respond to items pertaining to bonding and insurance. A detailed report on bonding limits can be found in **Appendix B**. **Exhibit 5-6** reports these findings.

EXHIBIT 5-6
STATE OF MINNESOTA GOVERNMENTAL UNITS
BONDING REQUIREMENTS
BY RACE/ETHNICITY /GENDER CATEGORY

Q22. Are you required to have bonding for the type of work that your company bids?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	8	11	5	7	44	75	168	11	3	257
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	42.31%	50.00%	77.78%	33.08%	38.86%	51.06%	57.89%	27.27%	46.56%
CATEGORY%	3.11%	4.28%	1.95%	2.72%	17.12%	29.18%	65.37%	4.28%	1.17%	100.00%
No	7	15	5	2	89	118	159	8	8	293
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	57.69%	50.00%	22.22%	66.92%	61.14%	48.33%	42.11%	72.73%	53.08%
CATEGORY%	2.39%	5.12%	1.71%	0.68%	30.38%	40.27%	54.27%	2.73%	2.73%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.61%	0.00%	0.00%	0.36%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Source: Responses from Telephone Survey, Oppenheim Research, 2007.
CAT denotes calculation based on category and DEMO findings denotes calculation based on demographic (such as ethnicity/ gender) findings.

When asked if bonding was required for the type of work their company provides, 257 participants (47 percent) responded yes. Of M/WBEs, 23 (34 percent) reported their current aggregate bonding limit and 23 reported that their single bonding limit was greater than $5 million.

5.7.2 Focus Group, Public Hearing, and Personal Interview Responses

- An African American male general contracting business owner said that the procurement and selection process can be improved by removing bonding requirements lowering the requirements for small businesses and helping with price points so that you don't have to bid too low. He suggested that Government Units follow through to make sure that small businesses get contracts.

- A nonminority woman specialty trades business owner said that based on her experience as a subcontractor - prime contractors want bonding from subcontractors... If a businesses isn't bondable it can't get the contract. She stated that it's difficult to get bonding because of finances. Although her firm's projects are small in dollar amount, her firm has to secure an expensive bond, "You have to have a $1 million to get a $1million bond."

- An African American male partner in a construction services firm said that bonding is an issue for his company because there are six owners credit taken into consideration and several of those partners have marginal credit ratings.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business said that bonding is not a barrier; however, there is a preconceived notion that the government requires bonding.

- An African American male general contracting business owner said that bonding requirements prohibit his firm from doing business, because of low capital.

- A nonminority woman general contractor said that she "has not had the opportunity to bid on projects because of the bonding requirements. Prime contractors want bonding. It's difficult to get bonding because of financing. She has never done a large project. She said that you have to have a million dollars to get a million dollar bond. Most of her work is with the private sector.

5.7.3 Insurance Requirements

- A nonminority male project manager for a nonminority woman owned land surveyor and civil engineering (professional services) firm that has subcontracted for general contractors whose clients include the Department of Transportation, the Metropolitan Council, and the Metropolitan Airports Commission (may only be a DBE) said that his firm has an issue with the amount of coverage of liability insurance his firm has to carry. He said that per claim coverage is required rather than a per project basis and that the firm is forced to carry liability insurance beyond its scope of services.

- A white project manger of a female-owned and controlled civil engineering firm stated that the amount of insurance coverage required is per claim rather than on a per project basis. Some insurance requirements are beyond the scope of services for subcontractor's portion of contract.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business architectural firm who has contracted with the Department of Administration, the Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Council said insurance requirements are unfair, because her nine employee firm is required to carry the same amount of insurance as a company with 35 people.

- A nonminority woman owner of a professional services marketing firm said insurance requirements are out of scope of what the RFPs call for. The requested amount of insurance is excessive considering project size,

- A nonminority woman owner of an IT consulting firm who has contracted as a prime contractor with the Minnesota Department of Administration said that the State of Minnesota upped the requirements for errors and omissions and professional liability insurance to 2 million dollars. The increase is too large for a small business. The OET (Office of Enterprise Technology). It's a huge expense to carry the insurance for a full year while you're waiting for a contract and don't have one.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business professional services graphic design firm who has contracted with the Department of Administration said that the State of Minnesota insists on errors and omissions insurance. The insurance is costly – approximately $1,000 per year. It's a sticking point for bidding on contracts.

5.8 Discrimination

Twenty-three (5 percent) respondents indicated that they had experienced discrimination in their business dealings due to race or ethnicity of the owner. Of the participating firms, 26 percent (6 of 23) indicated that they had experienced discrimination often from the state of Minnesota, developers, or in the relevant market area since 2002. Of those firms that noted discriminatory experiences, four (57 percent) African American-owned firms often experienced discriminatory behavior from the state of Minnesota or developers since 2002 due to the race or ethnicity of the business owner. Five (42 percent) WBE participants expressed seldom experiencing discrimination due to their gender.

Of the participants that expressed that they had experienced discrimination, eight (35 percent) respondents were more likely to cite verbal comments made by representatives of the Governmental Units, compared to three (13 percent) who reported that comments were made by developers. Three M/WBE respondents reported that the discrimination occurred during the bidding process and before and after contract award. Five M/WBEs (38 percent) reported that discrimination occurred during "other" times.

When asked if complaints were filed, respondents reported that one complaint was filed by a non-M/WBE (4.35 percent of all respondents) for racial discrimination, and one complaint was filed by a nonminority female for gender discrimination.

5.8.1 Focus Group, Public Hearing, and Personal Interview Responses

As stated in **Section 5.1**, it should be cautioned that the following comments are the perceptions and opinions of individuals, and the evidentiary weight of these opinions depends on how much they are corroborated by statements of others and the quantitative data in the report. Further discussion of anecdotal testimony is contained in the legal chapter for this report.

Stereotypical Attitudes is highlighted as the motivation behind actions that are based upon preconceived notions about how an individual will behave based upon its (his/her) identification (being identified) with a particular racial, ethnic, gender, and/or age-related group.

- An African American male general contracting business owner said that he knows discrimination is there, but he attempts not to make it foremost in his life. It's subtle but always there like 'Minnesota Nice'. He stated that he had experienced discrimination by being blatantly excluded from the bidding process. He was invited before the pre-bid to be part of the development team and give input on the project. They hired the architect who then used his input on the job. The procurement officer said that he didn't know that his firm wanted to work on the project. He said that he had experienced discrimination in the private sector via banks when going through the loan process to secure working capital.

- There have been construction meetings when we are the only women present and the men invite us to sit on their laps. I have several documented examples of government inspectors enforcing specifications in purely discriminatory

ways. I have shared documentation with MNDOT'S Office of Civil Rights on how the good old boys are treated differently to be successful with design and inspection.

- A nonminority woman Sales and Marketing Manager for a professional services firm that provides staffing services for disabled individuals said that there definitely is a misconception that quality could be compromised or extra supervision would be needed, because the targeted group is less able to do the work.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business architectural firm who has contracted with the Department of Administration, the Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Council said that through her experience, sometime the prime contractors are not as respectful as they could be.

- An African American male special construction services business owner who has provided services as a prime contractor for the Minnesota Department of Administration and the Metropolitan Airports Commission said that he has experienced discriminatory behavior in regards to his ethnicity via a written statement that he received from the Minnesota Department of Administration during the bidding process, before the contract was awarded. He did not file a complaint. He has also experienced discriminatory behavior because mechanical prime contractors feel comfortable with people they use.

5.8.2 Informal Networks

- A nonminority male project manager for a nonminority woman owned land surveyor and civil engineering (professional services) firm that has been a subcontractor for a general contractor whose clients include the Department of Transportation, the Metropolitan Council, and the Metropolitan Airports Commission (may only be a DBE) said that he does feel there is an informal network that gives advantages to select businesses. He said if vendor is providing a product, he doesn't see the informal network that often. He said, "If you don't have relationships, it's hard to get the business. If a firm is used in the past, they will go with them again."

- A nonminority woman owner of a small architectural firm who has contracted with the Department of Administration, the Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Council believes that that there is information (recommendations) passed between the Governmental Units on who to contract with. In addition, she said that she knows there is an informal network among small businesses, which through word of mouth recommends or condemns a business's performance.

- A nonminority woman sales and marketing manager for a female owned firmed that provides small procurement items believes that within certain industries, there may be an old boys' network. That some businesses get leads and opportunities through the network that other businesses don't hear about.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small architectural firm who has contracted with the Department of Administration, the Department of Transportation, and

the Metropolitan Council said that advantages are given to business that have worked with the Governmental Units before.

- A nonminority woman owner of an engineering and design firm said that there is an informal network within the Governmental Units. It's obvious when the same group of firms show up for bidding every time. It's developed into a pattern over the years. They've worked together a long time – the relationships are established.

- An African American male special construction services business owner who has provided services as a prime contractor for the Minnesota Department of Administration and the Metropolitan Airports Commission believes that there is an informal network that gives an advantage to select businesses. The way that it operates is through the questions in the specifications. The questions are put in to eliminate certain companies. The questions are not related to experience, but instead related to the amount of work done in a specific amount of time.

- A nonminority woman owner of an IT consulting firm who has contracted as a prime contractor with the Minnesota Department of Administration said that she feels there is an informal network that gives an advantage to select businesses. It's not a huge learning curve in business. Networks just happen. They are not meant to be negative.

- A nonminority male president of a company that supplies construction equipment to the Department of Administration, the Department of Transportation and the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission said that he thinks there is an informal network that gives advantages to select businesses and that business is conducted during breakfasts and dinners.

- An African American male general contracting business owner said that he believes that there is an informal network that give an advantage to select businesses. The way it operates in the government is through people dining and lunching together and talking about upcoming projects. People in private clubs and unions will tell contractors about opportunities before the opportunities are publicized – helping to position select contractors in the winning position.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner who has contracted with the Minnesota Department of Administration, the Minnesota Department of Transportation and the Minnesota Mosquito Control believes that an informal network is not that frequent in Minnesota because business is very competitive.

- An African American female professional services business owner stated that there is an informal network. It's the "Good ole boys and Good ole Girls network. They don't have to send contracts out. They use partnered list. They use who they want to."

- An African American male partner in a building construction firm said that there is an informal network that gives an advantage to select businesses. The way

that it works in the Governmental Units is that companies like Ryan Construction and Knutson Construction have the ability to influence senators and legislatures. Small businesses don't have that advantage.

- An African American general contractor who has worked with the Metropolitan Airports Commission as a prime contractor feels there is an informal network that gives advantages to select businesses. "America has been founded on networks, political parties and special interest groups."

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business professional services IT consulting firm said that she feels there is an informal network that gives advantages to select businesses and it operates by the bids being broken down so they don't have to go through the bidding process. They can call a select business to get the job done. It's less paperwork and less time.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business professional services transportation firm said that there is an informal network that gives advantages to select businesses, but networking is part of doing business i.e. Chamber of Commerce and Rotary Clubs, and industry related organizations.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business small procurement items supplier firm that has supplied items to the Metropolitan Council said that she believes there is an informal network that gives an advantage to businesses. She believes that it occurs through word of mouth, "For example, a vendor will work with one agency or department and will refer a select business to another department for a contract."

- A nonminority male special trade contractor who has supplied goods and services to the Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Airports Commission, and the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission believes that there is an informal network within the Governmental Units that steer opportunities under the bid dollar limit to specific companies.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business professional services medical staffing firm that contracts primarily to the private sector whose firm has not had the opportunity to work with the Governmental Units said that the prime vendors chosen by Governmental Units are the same vendors all the time. There is no policing to make sure TGBs are being utilized. There is no transparency.

- A nonminority woman partner in a specialty trades contractor, union shop with 30 full time employees that has worked as a subcontractor on projects for the Minnesota Department of Administration, Metropolitan Airports Commission, and the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission said that she feels there is an informal network that gives an advantage to select businesses, but she doesn't know how it operates.

- An Asian (Indian Sub-continent) female professional services IT business owner that has been a prime contractor to the Department of Administration, Metropolitan Council and the private sector said it's about who knows who and

if you have relationship with them - that's human nature. Relationships start in schools and colleges. Someone will call on your behalf. If you're not from the area you have to build the relationships – it's not the same.

- A Hispanic male professional services business owner who has not contracted with the Governmental Units said that he feels there is not an informal network that gives an advantage to select businesses.

- A nonminority male founder of a professional services firm that has been a prime contractor to the Department of Administration, Metropolitan Council, and the private sector said that there may be an informal network before the contracting process, but it's not a professional group.

- An African America male specialty trades contractor that has contracted with the Department of Administration, Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Council, Metropolitan Airports Commission, and private sector said that he feels there is an informal network that gives an advantage to select businesses. In the Governmental Units, it spreads out across the board. "People do business with who they are familiar with. It's human nature to do so. People go to the same firms to do business with over and over. It's the buddy-buddy system."

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has private sector contracts, but has not contracted with the Governmental Units said that there is an informal network that gives an advantage to select businesses. She said that, "There are people the Governmental Units have worked with that they will continue to work with. Although I don't think that it is intentional – it does happen. The powers that be are very comfortable with the arrangement."

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has been awarded contracts and purchase orders from the Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation and the private sector said that the informal network that gives an advantage to select businesses operates through buyers from the Governmental Units taking to each other and referring select companies. She added that it's not necessarily a bad thing (practice), but it gives an advantage to select businesses.

- A nonminority woman supplier of small procurement items that has been awarded purchase orders through Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, and the private sector said that yes she feels there are informal networks that gives advantages to select businesses, and added, "That's the whole premise of networking."

- A Native American special trade contractor that has subcontracted on projects for Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Council, Metropolitan Airports Commission, Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission, and the private sector said that he does not think that there is an informal network that gives an advantage to select businesses.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner who has not contracted with the Governmental Units said that she feels there is an informal network that gives an advantage to select businesses, stating, and "Networking business groups spread rumors about other businesses. Governmental Units should be fairer, because you can't go on the basis of peer hearsay."

5.8.3 Reverse Discrimination

- A nonminority male president of a company that supplies construction equipment to the Department of Administration, Department of Transportation and the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission stated that with TGBs getting a 6 percent bidding advantage, his margins are small that his business would have to take a loss. There's no way for him to compete. He added that TGBs getting a 6 percent advantage is reverse discrimination.

- A nonminority male special trade contractor who has supplied goods and services to the Department of Administration, Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Airports Commission, and the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission said that he does not believe that he has ever experienced reversed discrimination.

- A nonminority male founder of a professional services firm that has been a prime contractor to the a Department of Administration, Metropolitan Council, and the private sector said that several times minority and female firms have gotten projects due to their targeted group status and that that is a form of reverse discrimination.

5.9 Other Focus Groups, Public Hearing, and Personal Interview Comments

As stated in **Section 5.1**, it should be cautioned that the following comments are the perceptions and opinions of individuals, and the evidentiary weight of these opinions depends on how much they are corroborated by statements of others and the quantitative data in the report. Further discussion of anecdotal testimony is contained in the legal chapter for this report. As presented in **Sections 5.1.2** and **5.1.3**, a total of four focus groups, one public hearing, and 65 personal interviews were conducted. Of the total focus groups, there were ten African Americans, two Hispanic Americans, four Asian Americans, one Native American, and four nonminority women participants. Of the individuals providing testimony during the public hearing, two were African Americans, one was Asian American, one Native American, six were nonminority women, and four were nonminority males.

5.9.1 Unions

- A nonminority woman partner in a specialty trades contractor, union shop with 30 full time employees that has worked as a subcontractor on projects for the Minnesota Department of Administration, Metropolitan Airports Commission, and the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission said that her company is a union company and has to pay union wages. Non-union companies pay

prevailing wage which is significantly less. She said that her business is unable to compete with the non-union wages.

- A nonminority woman Sales and Marketing Manager for a professional services firm that provides staffing services for disabled individuals said that in the private sector, when there's a labor union, her firm doesn't want to alienate the unions.

- An African American male special construction services business owner who has provided services as a prime contractor for the Minnesota Department of Administration and the Metropolitan Airports Commission said that his type of business doesn't have unions and his firm pays prevailing wage. Within his industry, more often companies that provide other services and are large with unions are awarded contracts.

- A nonminority woman business owner in the special trade contracting industry said that her firm is non-union and the fact that the unions don't pay prevailing wage is unfair.

- An African American male general contracting business owner said that he believes that unions and labor agreements are a challenge because the contracts tend to go to the people primes know. It's a set process not to reach out to new people. Even if you join a union, you're just a new kid on the block. It's about race and who you know.

- An African American male partner in a building construction firm said that unions make the projects very costly.

- A nonminority woman owner of a small business professional services firm said that union shops get DFL (Democrat – Farm Labor) contracts during election years – maybe always.

5.10 Suggested Remedies

This section captures ideas and recommendations presented by those who participated in the anecdotal process. Some of the recurring concerns addressed by participants led to the following recommendations:

- A nonminority male special trade contractor who has supplied goods and services to the Department of Administration, Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Airports Commission, and the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission suggested that to improve the procurement process, the Governmental Units should get more funding, because some bids or projects are never let because of lack of funding.

- An Asian female professional services IT business owner that has been a prime contractor to the Department of Administration, Metropolitan Council and the private sector suggested 1) Governmental Units should give feedback why contract was not awarded, so firm can improve next bid, and 2) When a

contract is up for bid it should go to the incumbent. Don't put it out for bid if the incumbent is doing a good job on the project: within budget and to the Governmental Unit's satisfaction. Don't force the agency to put contract out for bid. However, if the incumbent's prices increase or there are performance issues – bid it out.

- A nonminority male founder of a professional services firm that has been a prime contractor to the Department of Administration, Metropolitan Council, and the private sector suggested that the Governmental Units qualify not by the size of the firm – the firm can still do large projects. He suggested 1) Eliminate the size of the project requirements. His opinion is that state standards are too high.

- An African America male specialty trades contractor that has contracted with the Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Council, Metropolitan Airports Commission, and private sector had the following suggestions:

  1) TGB and DBE goals should be the same percentage across the board for all Governmental Units, i.e. 6 percent for all.

  2) There has been some outreach, but there needs to be more training to learn where RFQs are, etc.

  3) Post RFP submission needs feedback. The feedback can be used for better future pricing. Small firms don't have 10 – 15 people doing bid quotes.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has contracted with the Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Council suggested the following:

  1) There should be follow up to insure TGBs are actually being utilized.

  2) Governmental Units should have a set aside TGB percent.

  3) Primes should receive an incentive for using the TGBs.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has contracted with the Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Council suggested the following:

  1) Enforcing goals. Make sure that primes are utilizing TGBs after the contract is signed.

  2) Check at the end of the project that the TGB goals have been met.

  3) Provide a central website for proposals for all of the Governmental Units. It's challenging going into every Governmental Units website.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has been awarded contracts and purchase orders from the Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation and the private sector said Metropolitan Council, Metropolitan Airports Commission, Minnesota Mosquito Control and the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission has never contacted her company and suggested that they send out more RFQs. She added the "State is a huge organization. Governmental Units would be helpful to have a list of buyers and how to contact them in one place.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner that has contracted with the Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, and the private sector as a prime contractor suggested the following:

  1) Prime contractor opportunities are not announced. She would like to see RFPs from primes for professional services projects.

  2) Ensure timeline between proposal and response time is adequate.

  3) Have staff more available for questions.

  4) Vendor conferences are good.

  5) RFP criteria should have 30 percent score based on qualifications

  6) RFP should list budget so that bidders don't over bid project.

  7) Insurance requirements: Have different levels of insurance for the scope of services and business size.

  8) Have more meet and greets for professional services.

- A nonminority woman supplier of small procurement items that has been awarded purchase orders through Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, and the private sector suggested that the Governmental Units consider the value added to a project in addition to pricing. "It seems as though they settle on lowest price – no matter what."

- A Native American special trade contractor that has subcontracted on projects for Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Council, Metropolitan Airports Commission, Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission, and the private sector said that more enforcement of the 'good faith effort' is needed.

- A nonminority woman professional services business owner who has not contracted with the Governmental Units suggested that the firms be notified when projects are being considered so that companies can bid and compete. She also suggested "keeping politics out of the selection process."

5.11 Conclusion

Between the telephone survey, focus groups, public hearing, and personal interviews, MGT interviewed 678 business owners or community representatives that have done business with, or attempted to do business with, the Governmental Units. In comparison, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals accepted anecdotal information from 57 interviewees in *Coral Construction*. Several conclusions can be drawn from the anecdotal information gathering that has been discussed in this chapter.

1. There was a consensus from persons who gave testimony that although the Governmental Units has a Targeted Group Program, M/WBEs are not experiencing improvement in the amount of business conducted with the Governmental Units. It was felt that should there be no goals program, nonminority-owned prime firms would not use small, minority, or female-owned firms.

2. There was a general consensus among participants that an informal network of firms existed, constituting a barrier for M/WBE and SBE firms. Enforcement and monitoring aspects of the Targeted Group Program should be strengthened to include penalties for noncompliance.

3. Outreach by the Governmental Units is of major importance to the majority of respondents. Respondents associated minimal outreach with their inability to become aware of contracting opportunities. M/WBEs felt they are not receiving enough information regarding the contracting process necessary to do business with the Governmental Units, and they would benefit if the process were better-defined.

6.0 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.0 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, MGT provides findings, commendations, and recommendations for the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District (MMCD). The study consisted of fact-finding to examine the extent to which the MSFC. race- and gender-conscious and race- and gender-neutral remedial efforts had effectively eliminated ongoing effects of any past discrimination affecting MMCD.'s relevant marketplace; as well as analyzing MMCD procurement trends and practices for the study period from January 2002 through December 2007; and evaluating various options for future program development.

The results of this study and conclusions drawn are presented in detail in **Chapters 2.0** through **5.0** of this report. The following sections summarize the study's findings, and related major recommendations. Commendations are also noted in those instances in which the MMCD already has procedures, programs, and policies in place that respond to findings. Selected best practices are described at the end of this chapter. These best practices expand on the findings and recommendations that are marked with an asterisk (*).

6.1 Findings for M/WBE Utilization and Availability

FINDING 6-1: Historical M/WBE & Non M/WBE Prime Utilization

Exhibit 6-1 below shows M/WBE and Non-M/WBE Prime utilization in the 1999 Minnesota disparity study. M/WBE Prime Utilization was .012 percent of the dollar value of MMCD expended on products, equipment and supplies.

EXHIBIT 6-1
M/WBE PRIME UTILIZATION
PRODUCTS, EQUIPMENT & SUPPLIES
MINNESOTA MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
FY1995-97

ETHNICITY	NUMBER OF CONTRACTS	PERCENT OF CONTRACTS	AMOUNT OF DOLLARS	PERCENT OF DOLLARS
African Americans	0	0.00%	$0	0.00%
Asian Americans	3	1.60%	$19,726	0.41%
Hispanic Americans	1	0.53%	$298	0.01%
Native Americans	3	1.60%	$2,814	0.06%
Nonminority Women	7	3.72%	$34,045	0.71%
Non-M/WBE	174	92.55%	$4,719,403	98.81%
TOTAL	188	100.00%	$4,766,285	100.00%

Source: MTA, *State of Minnesota Disparity Study*, 1999

FINDING 6-2: M/WBE Prime Utilization, Availability and Disparity

The dollar value of M/WBE prime utilization by MMCD over the study period is shown in **Exhibit 6-2**: Groups that showed disparity using vendor/bidder availability are indicated by a YES in Exhibit 6-2. N/A indicates that there was no vendor/bidder availability for that group for that procurement category during the study period.

- M/WBEs were awarded no prime construction contracts during the study period.
- M/WBEs were awarded no architectural and engineering prime construction contracts during the study period..
- Four M/WBEs won prime professional services consultant contracts for $5,391.11 (1.81% of the total dollars expended).
- Three M/WBEs won prime other services contracts for $52,239.70 (.49% of the total dollars expended).
- Three M/WBEs won prime goods and supplies contracts for $20,658.93 (2.39% of the total dollars expended).

EXHIBIT 6-2
M/WBE PRIME UTILIZATION, AVAILABILITY AND DISPARITY
MINNESOTA MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2007

Business Category	African American	Hispanic American	Asian American	Native American	Nonminority Women	Total M/WBE
Construction Prime Contractors						
Utilization Dollars	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Utilization Percent	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Availability Percent	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Disparity	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Architecture and Engineering Prime Consultants						
Utilization Dollars	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Utilization Percent	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Availability Percent	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Disparity	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Professional Services Prime Consultants						
Utilization Dollars	$1,306	$0	$3,710	$375	$0	$5,391
Utilization Percent	0.44%	0.00%	1.25%	0.13%	0.00%	1.81%
Availability Percent	3.33%	0.00%	6.67%	3.33%	3.33%	16.67%
Disparity	**YES**	N/A	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	
Other Services Firms						
Utilization Dollars	$0	$31,949	$0	$20,291	$0	$52,240
Utilization Percent	0.00%	0.30%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.49%
Availability Percent	0.00%	1.54%	0.00%	3.08%	0.00%	4.62%
Disparity	N/A	**YES**	N/A	**YES**	N/A	
Goods and Supplies Vendors						
Utilization Dollars	$0	$4,087	$12,503	$0	$4,069	$20,659
Utilization Percent	0.00%	0.47%	1.44%	0.00%	0.47%	2.39%
Availability Percent	0.00%	0.70%	0.70%	0.00%	0.70%	2.10%
Disparity	N/A	**YES**	NO	N/A	**YES**	

Source: Utilization findings are taken from the exhibit previously shown in **Chapter 3.0 and Chapter 4.0**. Availability is based on bidder/vendors.
N/A-not applicable.
BOLD indicates substantial disparity

FINDING 6-3 Census Measure of Availability and Disparity

Using the Census[1] availability and the percentage of utilization for M/WBE firms in Chapter 3.0, there was disparity for most M/WBE groups. A breakdown of disparity using Census availability is located in Appendix G.

FINDING 6-4: Anecdotal Comments

Among the M/WBEs who responded to questions about barriers to doing business, the biggest concern was competing with large firms (58 respondents, 30 percent of respondents). Other key issues noted were as follows:

- Selection process (41 M/WBE respondents, 21.76 percent).
- Contracts too large (34 M/WBE respondents, 17.61 percent).
- Bid specifications (27 M/WBE respondents, 13.98 percent).

Twenty-three M/WBEs (11.92 percent of M/WBE respondents) reported discriminatory experiences with in the private sector over the past five years. Thirty-eight M/WBEs (19.69 percent of M/WBE respondents) felt that an informal network had excluded them from work on agency projects.

FINDING 6-5: Regression Analysis of Firm Revenue and Capacity

In a statistical analysis of survey data from the state of Minnesota that controlled for the effects of variables related to company demographics (such as, company capacity, ownership level of education, and experience), M/WBE status had a negative effect on 2007 company earnings of African Americans and nonminority Women.

FINDING 6-6: Other Public Sector Evidence

The utilization of M/WBEs by other public sector entities in Minnesota provides some evidence of M/WBE availability and capacity in the marketplace.[2] Between January 1, 2002 and December 31, 2006:

- Thirty-two M/WBEs won 76 prime construction contracts for $26.24 million on City of St Paul projects (14.06 % of the total).

- 161 M/WBEs won 475 construction subcontracts on City of St Paul Housing and Redevelopment Authority projects for $39.0 million (8.6 % of the total).

- Six M/WBEs won 19 prime architecture and engineering contracts for $2.19 million on City projects (11.32 % of the total).

- Fifteen M/WBEs won 30 prime professional services contracts for $868,155 on City projects (5.1 % of the total).

[1] Refer to **Appendix F** for the availability findings based on U.S. Census, Survey of Business Owners (SBO).
[2] MGT, *A Disparity Study for the City of Saint Paul and the Housing and Redevelopment Authority, Minnesota* (2008), chapter 4.

FINDING 6-7: Private Sector Evidence

There is some evidence of important private sector disparities in the state of Minnesota that are relevant to the factual predicate for any M/WBE initiatives by the Governmental Units.

- The utilization of M/WBE firms on private sector commercial construction projects in the city of St Paul was significantly lower and generally below most measures of M/WBE availability in the marketplace. Over the study period, M/WBEs won less than 2 percent of private sector commercial construction subcontracts.[3]

- Two recent studies using Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data and Current Population Survey (CPS) data found statistically significant disparities in earnings from and entry into self employment for women and minorities in the state of Minnesota.[4]

6.2 Recommendations

Recommendation 6-1: Disparity Study and Private Sector Analysis

The Governmental Units elected not to conduct a private sector analysis, which has increasingly become an important part of the factual predicate for M/WBE initiatives. Nevertheless, because several recent studies have been conducted in the state of Minnesota there is some private sector evidence, discussed above. However, the factual predicate for any M/WBE initiatives for the Governmental Units could be strengthened with some additional private sector analysis, in particular analysis of commercial construction databases for the state of Minnesota and additional analysis of census data.

Recommendations for Race-Neutral Alternatives

RECOMMENDATION 6-2: Vendor Rotation*

MMCD should consider the selective use of vendor rotation to expand utilization of under-utilized M/WBE groups. Some political jurisdictions use vendor rotation arrangements to limit habitual repetitive purchases from incumbent majority firms and to ensure that S/M/WBEs have an opportunity to bid along with majority firms. Generally a diverse team of firms are prequalified for work and then team alternate undertaking projects. A number of agencies, including the City of Indianapolis, Fairfax County, Virginia, the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, and Miami-Dade County, use vendor rotation to encourage utilization of under-utilized M/WBE groups, particularly in professional services.

[3] MGT, *A Disparity Study for the City of Saint Paul and the Housing and Redevelopment Authority, Minnesota* (2008), chapter 8.
[4] MGT, *A Disparity Study for the City of Saint Paul and the Housing and Redevelopment Authority, Minnesota* (2008), chapter 10; NERA, *Race, Sex and Business Enterprise: Evidence from the State of Minnesota* (2005), chapter VI.

RECOMMENDATION 6-3: SBE Program for Subcontracts

Small business programs are an important component of race-neutral alternatives to address identified disparities in purchasing. MMCD should be commended for setting SBE goals and good faith efforts on subcontracts. MMCD should consider imposing mandatory subcontracting clauses where such clauses would promote S/M/WBE utilization, and be consistent with industry practice.[5]

RECOMMENDATION 6-4: Geographical Preferences and HUBZones

The federal HUBZone program is another variant of an SBE program that provides incentives for SBEs located in distressed areas. For example, under the 1997 Small Business Reauthorization Act, the federal government started the federal HUBZone program. To qualify as a HUBZone firm, a small business must meet the following criteria: (1) it must be owned and controlled by U.S. citizens; (2) at least 35 percent of its employees must reside in a HUBZone; and (3) its principal place of business must be located in a HUBZone.[6] The same preferences that can be given to SBEs can be given to HUBZone firms, such as contract set-asides.

HUBZone programs can serve as a vehicle for encouraging M/WBE contract utilization. In the state of Minnesota, there are 80 women and minority HUBZone firms, representing 49.3 percent of total HUBZone firms.[7]

M/WBE Policy Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION 6-5: Narrowly Tailored S/M/WBE Program

This study provides evidence to support the establishment of a moderate program to promote M/WBE utilization. This conclusion is based primarily on statistical disparities in current M/WBE utilization; substantial disparities in the private marketplace, evidence of discrimination in business formation and revenue earned from self-employment, some evidence of passive participation in private sector disparities, and some anecdotal evidence of discrimination. MMCD should tailor its women and minority participation policy to remedy each of these specific disparities.

The case law involving federal Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) programs provide important insight into the design of local M/WBE programs. In January 1999, the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) published its final DBE rule in Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 26 (49 CFR 26). The federal courts have consistently found the DBE regulations to be narrowly tailored.[8] The federal DBE program has the features in **Exhibit 6-3** that contribute to this characterization as a narrowly tailored remedial procurement preference program. MMCD should adopt these features in any new narrowly tailored M/WBE program.

---

[5] San Diego as part of its Subcontractor Outreach Program (SCOPe) has mandatory outreach, mandatory use of subcontractors, and mandatory submission of an outreach document. Whether a contract has subcontracting is determined by the engineer on the project.
[6] 13 C.F.R. 126.200 (1999).
[7] Based on the SBA pro-net database located at http://dsbs.sba.gov/dsbs/search/dsp_dsbs.cfm.
[8] *Adarand v. Slater*, 228 F.3d 1147 (10th Cir. 2000), *Gross Seed. v. State of Nebraska*, 345 F.3d 968 (8th Cir. 2003); cert denied, 158 L.Ed. 2d 729 (2004), *Northern Contracting v. Illinois DOT,* 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19868 (ND IL 2005).

EXHIBIT 6-3
NARROWLY TAILORED M/WBE PROGRAM FEATURES

Narrowly Tailored Goal-Setting Features	DBE Regulations
MMCD should not use quotas.	49 CFR 26(43)(a)
MMCD should use race- or gender-conscious set-asides only in cases where other methods are inadequate to address the disparity.	49 CFR 26(43)(b)
MMCD should meet the maximum amount of its M/WBE goals through race-neutral means.	49 CFR 26(51)(a)
MMCD should use M/WBE contract goals only where race-neutral means are not sufficient.	49 CFR 26(51)(d)
MMCD should use M/WBE goals only where there are subcontracting possibilities.	49 CFR 26(51)(e)(1)
If MMCD estimates that it can meet the entire M/WBE goal with race-neutral means, then MMCD should not use contract goals.	49 CFR 26(51)(f)(1)
If it is determined that MMCD is exceeding its goal, then MMCD should reduce the use of M/WBE contract goals.	49 CFR 26(51)(f)(2)
If MMCD exceeds goals with race-neutral means for two years, then MMCD should not set contract goals the next year.	49 CFR 26(51)(f)(3)
If MMCD exceeds M/WBE goals with contract goals for two years, then MMCD should reduce use of contract goals the next year.	49 CFR 26(51)(f)(4)
If MMCD uses M/WBE goals, then MMCD should award only to firms that made good faith efforts.	49 CFR 26(53)(a)
MMCD should give bidders an opportunity to cure defects in good faith efforts.	49 CFR 26(53)(d)

RECOMMENDATION 6-6: Annual Aspirational M/WBE Goals

The Metropolitan Mosquito Control District should set annual aspirational goals by business category, not rigid project goals. To establish a benchmark for goal setting, aspirational goals should be based on relative M/WBE availability. The primary means for achieving these aspirational goals should be an SBE program, outreach, and adjustments in MMCD procurement policy. As in the USDOT DBE program goals on particular projects should in general vary from overall aspirational goals.

RECOMMENDATION 6-7: Target Group Participation

Minnesota Statute Sec. 16C.16, Subd. 6 allow for Targeted Group incentives for groups for which there are identified disparities. The following groups in Exhibit 6-4 have identified disparities by procurement category using either vendor/bidder and/or census measures of availability. Disparity tables based on vendor/bidder data are located in Exhibit 6-2 above and in Chapter 4. Disparity tables based on census availability are located in Appendix J. MGT recommends that MMCD include the groups designated with a YES as Targeted Groups by the commissioner of Administration**.**

EXHIBIT 6-4
TARGETED GROUP PARTICIPATION
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
2009

Targeted Group by Business Category	African American	Hispanic American	Asian American	Native American	Nonminority Women
Construction Prime Contractors					
Disparity	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Architecture and Engineering					
Disparity	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Professional Services Prime Consultants					
Disparity	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Other Services Firms					
Disparity	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Goods and Supplies Vendors					
Disparity	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES

RECOMMENDATION 6-8: Request for Proposal Language*

The Metropolitan Mosquito Control District should consider putting in its Request for Proposals (RFPs), particularly for large projects, language asking proposers about their strategies for M/WBE inclusion on the project. A number of agencies, including the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, have had success in soliciting creative responses to these requests, even in areas such as large-scale insurance contracts.

6.3 Selected Best Practices

6.3.1 Purchasing Cards

A number of agencies promote the utilization of M/WBEs on purchasing cards. The Commonwealth of Virginia and the city of Hampton, Virginia, for example, require the purchasing card vendor to report on M/WBE utilization by agency staff. A number of universities, including the University of Wisconsin at Madison, target M/WBE vendors for purchasing card transactions for travel.

6.3.2 Small Purchases

Small purchases secured through informal procurement methods are an area in which buyers can become particularly comfortable with incumbent vendors. In 1992, the U.S. Department of Defense started the "Rule of One," requiring solicitation of at least one M/WBE on small procurement. It has become standard across many agencies (such as the Commonwealth of Virginia; state of Arizona; state of Texas; Charlotte, North Carolina; Hampton, Virginia; Columbia, South Carolina; and others) to require the solicitation of small and M/WBE firms for small purchases.

6.3.3 SBE Set-Asides

The federal government aims to set aside every acquisition of goods and services anticipated to be between $2,500 and $100,000 for small businesses. In response to litigation and state constitution amendments limiting affirmative action, such as Proposition 209, many agencies have adopted SBE programs. A number of agencies (Phoenix, Arizona; Broward County, Florida; Dade County, Florida; Tampa, Florida; North Carolina Department of Transportation; Port Authority of New York and New Jersey) set aside contracts for SBEs.

City of Phoenix, Arizona. The city of Phoenix, which uses the United States Small Business Administration (SBA) small business size standards, has a modest SBE set-aside program. The SBE program only accounted for 0.5 percent of total M/WBE utilization in construction subcontracting, and 0.2 percent of total M/WBE utilization in goods and supplies. However, there was strong M/WBE utilization in the city SBE program. In the SBE program, over 92.9 percent and 89.1 percent of the dollars went to M/WBEs in construction subcontracting and goods and supplies, respectively. Firms that were certified as both M/WBEs and SBEs were awarded $98.1 million in contract dollars.

Other SBE set-asides include:

- The city of Tampa, Florida, SBE program is a set-aside program for firms with less than 25 employees and less than $2 million in revenue.[9]
- The city of San Diego, California, set aside all construction contracts up to $250,000.
- Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) set aside contracts up to $50,000.
- Hillsborough County, Florida, set aside construction contracts up to $200,000.

6.3.4 Small Business Enterprise Bid Preferences

A number of agencies have bid preferences for SBEs (Dade County, Florida; Port Authority of New York and New Jersey; SMUD; city of Sacramento, California; city of Oakland, California; East Bay Municipal Utility District). SBE bid preferences operate along similar lines as M/WBE bid preferences. A typical example is a bid preference of 5

[9] Small Business Enterprise (SBE) Program Executive Order No. 2002-48 (December 18, 2002).

percent on contracts under $100,000 (Sacramento, California; SMUD; Los Angeles County, California).

Port of Portland Bid Preferences for Small Business. The Port of Portland (Port) found that a bid preference of 5 percent had no impact on contract outcomes, but a bid preference of 10 percent did impact contract outcomes.

6.3.5 Other SBE Prime Contractors Assistance

Los Angeles Unified School District, California. With 763 SBE certified firms, the Los Angeles School District achieved 39 percent SBE utilization ($321 million) and 19 percent MBE utilization in FY 2003-04.[10]

City of Charlotte, North Carolina. The city of Charlotte has a comprehensive SBE program including SBE set-asides and business assistance. In addition, the city of Charlotte sets departmental goals for SBE utilization, sets SBE goals on formal and informal contracts, and makes SBE utilization part of department performance review utilization numbers.

North Carolina Department of Transportation Fully Operated Rental Agreements. Under these arrangements a firm may bid an hourly rate for using certain equipment and the necessary staff. In these field-let contracts, engineers select the firm with the appropriate equipment and the lowest bid rate. If that firm is not available, the engineers select the next lowest hourly rate. This rental agreement technique is used primarily to supplement NCDOT equipment in the event of NCDOT equipment failure or peak demand for NCDOT services. The rental agreement technique is attractive to small contractors because the typical small firm has much better knowledge of its own hourly costs than it does of the costs to complete an entire project.

Port Authority of New York and New Jersey Financial Advisors Program. The Port Authority has encouraged the use of M/WBEs in finance through its financial advisory call in program which targets small firms to serve as a pool of advisors for the Port Authority Chief Financial Officer. The financial advisors address debt issuance, financial advisory services, real estate transactions and green initiatives. There are three to four firms in each of these categories in the financial advisory call in program.

6.3.6 Bidder Rotation

Some political jurisdictions use bidder rotation schemes to limit habit purchases from majority firms and to ensure that M/WBEs have an opportunity to bid along with majority firms. A number of agencies, including the city of Indianapolis, Indiana; Fairfax County, Virginia; the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey; and Miami-Dade County, Florida, use bid rotation to encourage M/WBE utilization, particularly in A&E. Some examples of bidder rotation from other agencies include:

Miami-Dade County, Florida. Miami-Dade County, Florida, uses small purchase orders for the Community Business Enterprise program and rotates on that basis. In addition, Miami-Dade County utilizes an Equitable Distribution Program, whereby a pool of

[10] Los Angeles Unified School District, Facilities Services Division, *Small Business Program, Fourth Quarter and Fiscal Year-End Report: 2003-2004*.

qualified A&E professionals are rotated awards of county miscellaneous A&E services as prime contractors and subcontractors.

DeKalb County, Georgia. DeKalb County, Georgia, has used a form of bidder rotation called a bidder box system to promote M/WBE utilization. This system selects a group of bidders from the list of county registered vendors to participate in open market procurements. Under the bidder rotation system, the buyer identifies the commodity or service by entering an item box number. Using this item box, the computer selects five to six firms. The lowest responsible bidder is awarded the contract. M/WBEs were afforded an increased number of bid opportunities than would ordinarily be the case with a sequential selection process.

Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. The Port Authority has a Quick Bid rotation system for small contracts less than $500,000. In this program, the agency solicits bids via telephone and fax from a minimum of six contractors on a rotating basis. The period between bid, award, and contract start is generally not more than six weeks. Bidders are provided free construction documents with which to prepare their bids.[11]

6.3.7 State Contracts

The use of state contracts can impede M/WBE utilization, even when M/WBEs are the low bidder. Purchase of state contracts is particularly an issue with car purchases, a procurement where there can be a significant number of M/WBE vendors. Fulton County, Georgia, addressed this problem by removing car purchases from the category of purchases from state contracts.

6.3.8 Mandatory Subcontracting

As part of their SBE subcontracting program, some agencies impose mandatory subcontracting clauses which would promote SBE utilization and be consistent with industry practice.

City of Columbia, South Carolina. The city of Columbia Subcontractor Outreach Program established in 2003 applies to city contracts of $200,000 or more. A prime must subcontract a minimum percentage of its bid. The minimums are set out in **Exhibit 6-4**.

[11] Port Authority of NY & NJ, Engineering Department, *2002 Construction Program*, at 8.

EXHIBIT 6-5
MINIMUM SUBCONTRACTING REQUIREMENTS FOR
COLUMBIA SUBCONTRACTOR OUTREACH PROGRAM

PROJECTS	MINIMUM SUBCONTRACTING
Parks	20%
Pipelines (water and sewer)	20%
Pump Stations	20%
Street Improvements	20%
Traffic Signals/Street Lighting	20%
Buildings Project by Project	Not to exceed 49%
Miscellaneous Projects	20%

Source: City of Columbia, Subcontracting Outreach Program (March 2003).

Bidders must make affirmative efforts in outreach to DBEs, Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises (DVBEs), and Other Business Enterprises (OBEs) (defined as a business that does not qualify as either a DBE or a DVBE). A bidder will be deemed non-responsive for failure to meet the subcontractor goal, failure to document their outreach efforts, or failure to meet 80 out of 100 points for good faith efforts. Points are granted on a pass/fail basis, awarding either zero or full points.

City of San Diego, California. As part of its Subcontractor Outreach Program, San Diego requires mandatory outreach, mandatory use of subcontractors, and mandatory submission of an outreach document. Whether a contract has mandatory subcontracting is determined by the engineer on the project.

County of Contra Costa, California. The Contra Costa County Outreach Program sets mandatory subcontracting minimums on a contract-by-contract basis.[12] The Contra Costa County Outreach Program requires that M/WBEs be considered by contractors as possible sources of supply and subcontracting opportunities.

[12] Contra Costa County, Outreach Program, Ordinance Section 3-2 et seq.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TELEPHONE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX A
MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
TELEPHONE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

3/24/09

Hello. My name is _____ , and I am calling (from Oppenheim Research) on behalf of the Minnesota Department of Administration, Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Council, Metropolitan Airports Commission, Metropolitan Mosquito Control, and Minnesota Sports Facilities Commission (referred as Governmental Units).

We are conducting a survey to determine the business climate in the Governmental Units. Is this && (Company's name)? IF YES, CONTINUE.
Have I reached (VERIFY TELEPHONE NUMBER)?_____? IF YES, CONTINUE

IF NO, TERMINATE
May I speak with the owner please?
IF OWNER IS PUT ON THE LINE: CONTINUE WITH INTRODUCTION
IF TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER PARTY (CEO, MANAGER, ETC):
Are you able to answer questions concerning ownership? IF YES, CONTINUE
IF NO, SCHEDULE A CALL BACK WHEN THE OWNER OR CEO MAY BE AVAILABLE AND LEAVE TELEPHONE NUMBER. IF NOBODY IS AVAILABLE TO ANSWER QUESTIONS: SCHEDULE CALL BACK DATE AND TIME

We have been asked by the Governmental Units to contact area businesses to get their opinions about the business climate in the state of Minnesota. Your company's name and phone number has been provided to us by the Governmental Units to help them learn more about local businesses so they can better respond to local business needs. Your opinions are important to us, and all your responses will be kept confidential.

This call may be monitored to evaluate my performance.

Q.1 Gender DO NOT ASK [REQUIRE ANSWER]

(5)
Male 1
Female .. 2

Q.2 What is your title? [REQUIRE ANSWER]

(6)
Owner/CEO/President 1
Manager/Financial Officer .. 2
Other 3

Q.3 May I have your name or initials just in case we have any further questions?

[REQUIRE ANSWER]_____ (7-81)

Q.4 Is more than 50 percent of your company owned and controlled by a woman or women? [REQUIRE ANSWER]

(82)
Yes .. 1
No 2
DK ... 3

Q.5 Which of the following categories would you consider to be the ethnic origin of the controlling owners or controlling party? Would you say: [REQUIRE ANSWER]

(83)
Anglo/Caucasian 1
African American 2
Asian or Pacific Islander 3
Hispanic American 4
Native American/Alaskan Native .. 5
Other 6
No Response 7

Q.6 What is the highest level of education completed by the owner of your company? Would you say: READ LIST [REQUIRE ANSWER]

(84)
Some high school 1
High school graduate 2
Trade or technical education .. 3
Some college 4
College degree 5
Post graduate degree 6
No response 7

Q.7 Which ONE of the following is your company's primary line of business?

[REQUIRE ANSWER]

(85)
Building Construction (general contractor) –Specify 1
Special Trade Contractor (electrical, painting, etc.) –Specify 2
Professional Services – Specify 3
General/Personal Services (security, training, maintenance, etc.)-Specify . 4
Supplies and Equipment (small procurement items) –Specify 5
No Response 6

[S - IF THE ANSWER IS 2, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 9]
[S - IF THE ANSWER IS 3, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 10]
[S - IF THE ANSWER IS 4, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 11]
[S - IF THE ANSWER IS 5, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 12]
[S - IF THE ANSWER IS 6, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 13]

[A - IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 7 IS NOT 1, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 13]

Q.8 Building Construction (general contractor) [REQUIRE ANSWER]

_____ (86-185)

[A - IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 7 IS NOT 2, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 13]

Q.9 Special Trade Contractor (electrical, painting, etc.) [REQUIRE ANSWER]

_____ (186-285)

[A - IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 7 IS NOT 3, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 13]

Q.10 Professional Services [REQUIRE ANSWER]
_____ (286-385)

[A - IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 7 IS NOT 4, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 13]

Q.11 General/Personal Services (security, training, maintenance, etc.)
[REQUIRE ANSWER]_____ (386-485)

[A - IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 7 IS NOT 5, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 13]

Q.12 Supplies and Equipment (small procurement items) [REQUIRE ANSWER]
_____ (486-585)

Q.13 In what year was your company established?

9999=DK
4 Digits [REQUIRE ANSWER]_____ (586-589)

Q.14 How many years of experience in your company's business line does the primary owner of your firm have?

If DK Code as 99
(2 digits) [REQUIRE ANSWER]_____ (590-591)

Q.15 Excluding yourself, (if owner), on average, how many employees does your company keep on the payroll, including full-time and part-time staff?

999999=DK
6 Digits [REQUIRE ANSWER]_____ (592-597)

Q.16 Is your business certified with the State of Minnesota's Targeted Vendor Program (TVB)? [REQUIRE ANSWER] (598)

Yes .. 1
No 2
DK ... 3

[S - IF THE ANSWER IS NOT 1, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 18]

Q.17 Are you certified as:

READ CHOICES

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK

[REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MBE (Minority Business Enterprise)	1	2	3 (599)
EDB (Economically Disadvantaged Business)	1	2	3 (1029)
SBE (Small Business Enterprise)	1	2	3 (601)
WBE (Woman Business Enterprise)	1	2	3 (602)
DBE (Disabled Business Enterprise)	1	2	3 (1030)

Q.18 Is your business certified with any other state or agency?

[REQUIRE ANSWER]

(603)
Yes .. 1
No 2
DK ... 3

Q.19 Have you had any contracts with one of the following agencies as a prime contractor since 2006?

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK

[REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (965)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (966)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (967)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (968)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (969)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (970)

Q.20 When you were a prime contractor what was the average amount of time that it typically took to receive payment for your services on projects funded by one or more of the following agencies?

1=Less than 30 days
2=30-60 days
3=60-90 days
4=90-120 days
5=Over 120 days
6=NA

[REQUIRE ANSWER][READ ONLY ANSWERS CORRESPONDING TO SUB-QUESTIONS ANSWERED 1 IN QUESTION 19]

	Less than 30 days	30-60 days	60-90 days	90-120 days	Over 120 days	NA
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4	5	6 (971)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6 (972)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4	5	6 (973)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4	5	6 (974)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4	5	6 (975)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4	5	6 (976)

Q.21 Which of the following categories best approximates your 2006 company calendar year revenues as a result of working as a prime contractor for:

1=None or 0
2=Up to $50,000
3=$50,001 to $100,000
4=$100,001 to $300,00
5=$300,001 to $500,000
6=$500,001 to $1,000,000
7=$1,000,001 to $3,000,000
8=$3,000,001 to $5,000,000
9=$5,000,001 to $10,000,000
10=Over $10 million
11=No Response/DK

[REQUIRE ANSWER][READ ONLY ANSWERS CORRESPONDING TO SUB-QUESTIONS ANSWERED 1 IN QUESTION 19]

	None or 0	up to $50,000	$50,001 to $100,000	$100,001 to $300,000	$300,001 to $500,000	$500,001 to $1,000,000	$1,000,001 to $3,000,000	$3,000,001 to $5,000,000	$5,000,001 to $10,000,000	Over $10 million	No Response/DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11 (977-978)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11 (979-980)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11 (981-982)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11 (983-984)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11 (985-986)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11 (987-988)

Q.22 Are you required to have bonding for the type of work that your company bids? [REQUIRE ANSWER]

(604)
Yes .. 1
No 2
DK ... 3

[S - IF THE ANSWER IS NOT 1, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 25]

Q.23 What is your current aggregate bonding limit? [REQUIRE ANSWER]

(605)
Below $100,000 1
$100,001 to $250,000 2
$250,000 to $500,000 3
$500,001 to 1million 4
$1,000,001 to $1,500,000 .. 5
$1,500,001 to 3 million 6
3 million to 5 million 7
Over 5 million 8
No Response 9

Q.24 What is your current single project bonding limit? [REQUIRE ANSWER]

(606)

Below $100,000 1
$100,001 to $250,000 2
$250,001 to $500,000 3
$500,001 to 1 million 4
$1,000,001 to $1,500,000 .. 5
$1,500,001 to 3 million 6
3 million to 5 million 7
Over 5 million 8
No Response 9

Q.25 Which of the following categories best approximates your company's gross revenues for calendar year 2006? [REQUIRE ANSWER]

(607-608)

up to $50,000? 1
$50,001 to $100,000? 2
$100,001 to $300,000? 3
$300,001 to $500,000? 4
$500,001 to $1,000,000? 5
$1,000,001 to $3,000,000? 6
$3,000,001 to $5,000,000? 7
$5,000,001 to $10,000,000? ... 8
Over $10 million? 9
No Response 10

Q.26 Have you experienced discriminatory behavior from the **private** sector in the last five years? [REQUIRE ANSWER]

(629)

Yes .. 1
No 2
DK ... 3

[S - IF THE ANSWER IS NOT 1, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 31]

Q.27 How did you become aware of the discrimination that you experienced? [REQUIRE ANSWER]

MULTI RESPONSE

(630)

Verbal comment 1
Written statement 2
Action taken against company .. 3
DK 4

Q.28 Do you feel that the discrimination was due to the: [REQUIRE ANSWER]

MULTI RESPONSE

(631)

Owner's race or ethnicity .. 1
Owner's sex 2
DK 3

Q.29 When did discrimination occur? [REQUIRE ANSWER]

(632)
During bidding process .. 1
After contract award 2
No answer / DK 3

Q.30 Did you file a complaint? [REQUIRE ANSWER]

(633)
Yes .. 1
No 2
DK ... 3

Q.31 For the following statements, please indicate whether you Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree Disagree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree.

There is an informal network of prime and subcontractors that has excluded my company from doing business with:

Do you Agree or Disagree?
Is that strongly or just Agree/Disagree?

1=Strongly Agree
2=Agree
3=Neither Agree/Disagree
4=Disagree
5=Strongly Disagree
6=DK

[REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4	5	6 (642)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6 (643)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4	5	6 (644)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4	5	6 (645)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4	5	6 (646)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4	5	6 (647)

Q.32 Sometimes a prime contractor will include a minority or women subcontractors on a bid to satisfy the "good faith effort" requirement, and then drop the company as a subcontractor after winning the award for no legitimate reason.

Do you Agree or Disagree?
Is that strongly or just Agree/Disagree?

[REQUIRE ANSWER]

(752)
Strongly Agree 1
Agree 2
Neither Agree Nor Disagree .. 3
Disagree 4
Strongly Disagree 5

Q.33 "Some prime contractors change their bidding procedures and sub-contracting practices when they are not participating in a contract where TVB goals are applied."

Do you Agree or Disagree?
Is that strongly or just Agree/Disagree?
[REQUIRE ANSWER]

(753)
Strongly Agree 1
Agree 2
Neither Agree nor Disagree .. 3
Disagree 4
Strongly Disagree 5

Q.34 Approximately what percentage of your company's 2006 gross revenues came from doing business with the one or more of the following agencies: MN Dept of Transportation , Metropolitan Council , Metropolitan Mosquito Control, Metropolitan Airports Commission , MN Sports Facilities Commission?
[REQUIRE ANSWER]_____ (754-763)

Q.35 Since 2006, has your company applied for a commercial (business) bank loan? [REQUIRE ANSWER]

(779)
Yes .. 1
No 2
DK ... 3

[S - IF THE ANSWER IS NOT 1, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 38]

Q.36 Were you approved or denied for a commercial (business) bank loan?
[REQUIRE ANSWER]

(780)
Approved .. 1
Denied 2
DK 3

[S - IF THE ANSWER IS NOT 2, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 38]

Q.37 Which of the following do you think was the reason for your being denied a loan? [REQUIRE ANSWER]

(781)
Insufficient Documentation (ID) 1
Insufficient Business History (IBH) .. 2
Confusion about the Process (C) 3
Race or Ethnicity of Owner (RE) 4
Gender of Owner (G) 5
DK 6

Q.38 I will now read you a list of factors that may prevent companies from bidding or obtaining work on a project. In your experience, have any of the following been a barrier to obtaining work on projects for any of the following organizations as a prime or sub-contractor:

A. Prequalification requirements?

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK [REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (785)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (786)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (787)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (788)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (789)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (790)

Q.39 B. Performance bond requirements

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK [REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (791)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (792)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (793)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (794)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (795)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (796)

Q.40 C. Financing?

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK [REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (803)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (804)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (805)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (806)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (807)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (808)

Q.41 D. Insurance requirements?

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK [REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (809)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (810)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (811)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (812)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (813)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (814)

Q.42 E. Bid specifications?

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK [REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (815)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (816)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (817)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (818)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (819)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (820)

Q.43 F. Limited time given to prepare bid package or quote?

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK [REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (821)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (822)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (823)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (824)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (825)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (826)

Q.44 G. Limited knowledge of purchasing contracting policies and procedures?

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK [REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (827)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (828)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (829)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (830)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (831)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (832)

Q.45 H. Lack of experience?

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK [REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (833)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (834)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (835)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (836)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (837)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (838)

Q.46 I. Lack of personnel?

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK

[REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (839)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (840)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (841)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (842)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (843)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (844)

Q.47 J. Contract too large?

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK [REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (845)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (846)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (847)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (848)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (849)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (850)

Q.48 K. Selection process?

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK [REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (851)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (852)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (853)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (854)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (855)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (856)

Q.49 L. Competing with large companies?

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK [REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (857)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (858)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (859)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (860)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (861)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (862)

Q.50 M. Collusion with competitors

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK

[REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (1031)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (1032)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (1033)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (1034)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (1035)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (1036)

Q.51 N. Fraud/fronting

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK [REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (1037)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (1038)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (1039)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (1040)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (1041)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (1042)

Q.52 O. Slow payment or nonpayment

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK [REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (1043)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (1044)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (1045)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (1046)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (1047)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (1048)

Q.53 P. Unnecessary Restrictive contract specifications

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK [REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (1049)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (1050)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (1051)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (1052)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (1053)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (1054)

Q.54 As a prime or subcontractor did you experience discriminatory behavior from one of the following **public sector** agencies in the last five years when bidding on a contract?

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK
4=NA-Did not Bid [REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK	NA-Did not Bid
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4 (863)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (864)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (865)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (866)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (867)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (868)

Q.55 What was the most noticeable way you became aware of the discrimination against your company by:

1=Verbal Comment
2=Written Statement
3=Action taken against the company
4=DK

[REQUIRE ANSWER][READ ONLY ANSWERS CORRESPONDING TO SUB-QUESTIONS ANSWERED 1 IN QUESTION 54]

	Verbal Comment	Written Statement	Action taken against the company	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4 (869)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (870)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (871)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (872)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (873)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (874)

Q.56 What of the following do you consider the main reason for your company being discriminated against by:
1=Owner's race or ethnicity
2=Owner's sex
3=Time in business
4=Company size
5=Company experience
6=DK

[REQUIRE ANSWER][READ ONLY ANSWERS CORRESPONDING TO SUB-QUESTIONS ANSWERED 1 IN QUESTION 54]

	Owner's race or ethnicity	Owner's sex	Time in business	Company size	Company experience	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4	5	6 (875)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6 (876)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4	5	6 (877)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4	5	6 (878)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4	5	6 (879)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4	5	6 (880)

Q.57 Have you experienced **Harassment/sabotage** as a form of discrimination when you have worked with:

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK
4=NA-Did not bid

[REQUIRE ANSWER][READ ONLY ANSWERS CORRESPONDING TO SUB-QUESTIONS ANSWERED 1 IN QUESTION 54]

	Yes	No	DK	NA-Did not bid
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4 (881)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (882)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (883)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (884)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (885)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (886)

Q.58 Have you experienced **Unequal or unfair treatment** as a form of discrimination when you have worked with:

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK
4=NA-Did not bid

[REQUIRE ANSWER][READ ONLY ANSWERS CORRESPONDING TO SUB-QUESTIONS ANSWERED 1 IN QUESTION 54]

	Yes	No	DK	NA-Did not bid
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4 (887)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (888)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (889)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (890)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (891)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (892)

Q.59 Have you experienced **Bid shopping or bid manipulation** as a form of discrimination when you have worked with:

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK
4=NA-Did not bid

[REQUIRE ANSWER][READ ONLY ANSWERS CORRESPONDING TO SUB-QUESTIONS ANSWERED 1 IN QUESTION 54]

	Yes	No	DK	NA-Did not bid
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4 (893)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (894)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (895)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (896)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (897)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (898)

Q.60 Have you experienced **Double standards in performance** as a form of discrimination when you have worked with:

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK
4=NA-Did not bid

[REQUIRE ANSWER][READ ONLY ANSWERS CORRESPONDING TO SUB-QUESTIONS ANSWERED 1 IN QUESTION 54]

	Yes	No	DK	NA-Did not bid
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4 (899)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (900)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (901)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (902)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (903)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (904)

Q.61 Have you experienced **Denial of opportunity to bid** as a form of discrimination when you have worked with:

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK
4=NA-Did not bid

[REQUIRE ANSWER][READ ONLY ANSWERS CORRESPONDING TO SUB-QUESTIONS ANSWERED 1 IN QUESTION 54]

	Yes	No	DK	NA-Did not bid
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4 (905)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (906)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (907)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (908)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (909)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (910)

Q.62 Have you experienced **Unfair denial of contract award** as a form of discrimination when you have worked with:

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK
4=NA-Did not bid

[REQUIRE ANSWER][READ ONLY ANSWERS CORRESPONDING TO SUB-QUESTIONS ANSWERED 1 IN QUESTION 54]

	Yes	No	DK	NA-Did not bid
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4 (917)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (918)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (919)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (920)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (921)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (922)

Q.63 Have you experienced **Unfair termination** as a form of discrimination when you have worked with:

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK
4=NA-Did not bid

[REQUIRE ANSWER][READ ONLY ANSWERS CORRESPONDING TO SUB-QUESTIONS ANSWERED 1 IN QUESTION 54]

	Yes	No	DK	NA-Did not bid
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4 (929)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (930)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (931)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (932)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (933)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (934)

Q.64 Have you experienced **some other** form of discrimination when you have worked with:

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK
4=NA-Did not bid

[REQUIRE ANSWER][READ ONLY ANSWERS CORRESPONDING TO SUB-QUESTIONS ANSWERED 1 IN QUESTION 54]

	Yes	No	DK	NA-Did not bid
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4 (953)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (954)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (955)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (956)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (957)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (958)

Q.65 When did the discrimination occur when your company worked for:
READ CHOICES

1=During bidding process
2=After contract awarded
3=No experience
4=No response

[REQUIRE ANSWER][READ ONLY ANSWERS CORRESPONDING TO SUB-QUESTIONS ANSWERED 1 IN QUESTION 54]

	During bidding process	After contract awarded	No Experience	No Response
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4 (959)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (960)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (961)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (962)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (963)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (964)

Q.66 Since 2006, how many times has your company submitted a bid or proposal to be a subcontractor for a project with one of the following agencies?

1=None
2=1-10
3=11-25
4=26-50
5=51-100
6=Over 100

[REQUIRE ANSWER

	None	1-10	11-25	26-50	51-100	Over 100
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4	5	6 (989)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6 (990)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4	5	6 (991)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4	5	6 (992)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4	5	6 (993)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4	5	6 (994)

Q.67 Since 2006, have you worked as a subcontractor on a project with:

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK

[REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3 (995)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3 (996)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3 (997)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3 (998)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3 (999)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3 (1000)

[D - IF THE ANSWER TO SUB-QUESTION 1 OF QUESTION 67 IS NOT 1, AND...]
[D - IF THE ANSWER TO SUB-QUESTION 2 OF QUESTION 67 IS NOT 1, AND...]
[D - IF THE ANSWER TO SUB-QUESTION 3 OF QUESTION 67 IS NOT 1, AND...]
[D - IF THE ANSWER TO SUB-QUESTION 4 OF QUESTION 67 IS NOT 1, AND...]
[D - IF THE ANSWER TO SUB-QUESTION 5 OF QUESTION 67 IS NOT 1, AND...]
[D - IF THE ANSWER TO SUB-QUESTION 6 OF QUESTION 67 IS NOT 1, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION 72]

Q.68 Since 2006, when you were a subcontractor what was the average amount of time that it typically took to receive payment for your services on projects funded by:

1=Less than 30 days
2=30-60 days
3=60-90 days
4=90-120 days
5=Over 120 days
6=NA

[REQUIRE ANSWER][READ ONLY ANSWERS CORRESPONDING TO SUB-QUESTIONS ANSWERED 1 IN QUESTION 67]

	Less than 30 days	30-60 days	60-90 days	90-120 days	Over 120 days	NA
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4	5	6 (1001)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6 (1002)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4	5	6 (1003)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4	5	6 (1004)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4	5	6 (1005)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4	5	6 (1006)

Q.69 In your opinion, how frequently have prime contractors that you've subcontracted with delayed payment for the work or services that you performed? [REQUIRE ANSWER]

(1007)
Very Often 1
Often 2
Sometimes 3
Seldom 4
Never 5
No Response (DK)/NA .. 6

Q.70 As a subcontractor, your working experience with prime contractors has been: READ CHOICES [REQUIRE ANSWER]

(1008)
Excellent 1
Good 2
Fair 3
Poor 4
No Response (DK)/NA .. 5

Q.71 Since 2006, have you ever submitted a bid for a contract, were informed that you were the lowest bidder, and then found out that another prime or subcontractor was actually doing the work for:

1=Yes
2=No
3=DK
4=NA-Did not Bid

[REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK	NA-Did not Bid
MN Dept of Administration	1	2	3	4 (1009)
MN Dept of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (1010)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (1011)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (1012)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (1013)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (1014)

Q.72 That completes our interview. Thank you and have a nice day.

INTERIVEWER ID #
2 DIGITS _____ (1027-1028)

APPENDIX B: TELEPHONE SURVEY RESULTS

APPENDIX B
MINNESOTA JOINT AVAILABILITY AND DISPARITY STUDY
TELEPHONE SURVEY RESULTS

Q1. Respondent's Gender

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	MWBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Male	10	19	7	3	31	70	281	15	9	375
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	73.08%	70.00%	33.33%	23.31%	36.27%	85.41%	78.95%	81.82%	67.93%
CATEGORY%	2.67%	5.07%	1.87%	0.80%	8.27%	18.67%	74.93%	4.00%	2.40%	100.00%
Female	5	7	3	6	102	123	48	4	2	177
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	26.92%	30.00%	66.67%	76.69%	63.73%	14.59%	21.05%	18.18%	32.07%
CATEGORY%	2.82%	3.95%	1.69%	3.39%	57.63%	69.49%	27.12%	2.26%	1.13%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q2. Respondent's Title

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	MWBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Owner/CEO/President	13	23	9	6	119	170	253	5	7	435
DEMOGRAPHIC%	86.67%	88.46%	90.00%	66.67%	89.47%	88.08%	76.90%	26.32%	63.64%	78.80%
CATEGORY%	2.99%	5.29%	2.07%	1.38%	27.36%	39.08%	58.16%	1.15%	1.61%	100.00%
Manager/Financial Officer	2	3	1	2	13	21	68	11	4	104
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	11.54%	10.00%	22.22%	9.77%	10.88%	20.67%	57.89%	36.36%	18.84%
CATEGORY%	1.92%	2.88%	0.96%	1.92%	12.50%	20.19%	65.38%	10.58%	3.85%	100.00%
Other	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	3	0	13
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	0.75%	1.04%	2.43%	15.79%	0.00%	2.36%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.69%	7.69%	15.38%	61.54%	23.08%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q4. Is firm more than 50% owned and controlled by a woman or women?

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	MWBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	11	4	5	133	156	0	0	3	159
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	42.31%	40.00%	55.56%	100.00%	80.83%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%	28.80%
CATEGORY%	1.89%	6.92%	2.52%	3.14%	83.65%	98.11%	0.00%	0.00%	1.89%	100.00%
No	12	15	6	4	0	37	329	18	7	391
DEMOGRAPHIC%	80.00%	57.69%	60.00%	44.44%	0.00%	19.17%	100.00%	94.74%	63.64%	70.83%
CATEGORY%	3.07%	3.84%	1.53%	1.02%	0.00%	9.46%	84.14%	4.60%	1.79%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.26%	9.09%	0.36%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q6. Highest level of education completed by the owner?

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	MWBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
High school graduate	0	0	1	1	10	12	16	0	1	29
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	11.11%	7.52%	6.22%	4.86%	0.00%	9.09%	5.25%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	3.45%	3.45%	34.48%	41.38%	55.17%	0.00%	3.45%	100.00%
Trade or technical education	1	1	0	1	6	9	11	0	1	21
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	3.85%	0.00%	11.11%	4.51%	4.66%	3.34%	0.00%	9.09%	3.80%
CATEGORY%	4.76%	4.76%	0.00%	4.76%	28.57%	42.86%	52.38%	0.00%	4.76%	100.00%
Some college	3	3	1	1	39	47	52	0	1	100
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	11.54%	10.00%	11.11%	29.32%	24.35%	15.81%	0.00%	9.09%	18.12%
CATEGORY%	3.00%	3.00%	1.00%	1.00%	39.00%	47.00%	52.00%	0.00%	1.00%	100.00%
College degree	6	14	6	3	55	84	201	5	5	295
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	53.85%	60.00%	33.33%	41.35%	43.52%	61.09%	26.32%	45.45%	53.44%
CATEGORY%	2.03%	4.75%	2.03%	1.02%	18.64%	28.47%	68.14%	1.69%	1.69%	100.00%
Post graduate degree	5	8	2	3	23	41	47	7	2	97
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	30.77%	20.00%	33.33%	17.29%	21.24%	14.29%	36.84%	18.18%	17.57%
CATEGORY%	5.15%	8.25%	2.06%	3.09%	23.71%	42.27%	48.45%	7.22%	2.06%	100.00%
No response	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	1	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.61%	36.84%	9.09%	1.81%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	70.00%	10.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q7. Company's primary line of business

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Building Construction	4	4	1	3	12	24	87	4	1	116
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	15.38%	10.00%	33.33%	9.02%	12.44%	26.44%	21.05%	9.09%	21.01%
CATEGORY%	3.45%	3.45%	0.86%	2.59%	10.34%	20.69%	75.00%	3.45%	0.86%	100.00%
Special Trade Contractor	2	1	1	2	36	42	88	1	4	135
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	3.85%	10.00%	22.22%	27.07%	21.76%	26.75%	5.26%	36.36%	24.46%
CATEGORY%	1.48%	0.74%	0.74%	1.48%	26.67%	31.11%	65.19%	0.74%	2.96%	100.00%
Professional Services	4	8	2	1	32	47	56	3	2	108
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	30.77%	20.00%	11.11%	24.06%	24.35%	17.02%	15.79%	18.18%	19.57%
CATEGORY%	3.70%	7.41%	1.85%	0.93%	29.63%	43.52%	51.85%	2.78%	1.85%	100.00%
General/Personal Services	5	11	4	3	20	43	25	4	2	74
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	42.31%	40.00%	33.33%	15.04%	22.28%	7.60%	21.05%	18.18%	13.41%
CATEGORY%	6.76%	14.86%	5.41%	4.05%	27.03%	58.11%	33.78%	5.41%	2.70%	100.00%
Supplies and Equipment	0	2	2	0	32	36	72	7	2	117
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	7.69%	20.00%	0.00%	24.06%	18.65%	21.88%	36.84%	18.18%	21.20%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	1.71%	1.71%	0.00%	27.35%	30.77%	61.54%	5.98%	1.71%	100.00%
No Response	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.75%	0.52%	0.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.36%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q13. In what year was your company established?

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Before 1970	0	2	0	0	17	19	124	10	3	156
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	12.78%	9.84%	37.69%	52.63%	27.27%	28.26%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	1.28%	0.00%	0.00%	10.90%	12.18%	79.49%	6.41%	1.92%	100.00%
1971-1980	1	6	4	2	22	35	63	4	2	104
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	23.08%	40.00%	22.22%	16.54%	18.13%	19.15%	21.05%	18.18%	18.84%
CATEGORY%	0.96%	5.77%	3.85%	1.92%	21.15%	33.65%	60.58%	3.85%	1.92%	100.00%
1981-1990	4	7	2	1	27	41	67	3	1	112
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	26.92%	20.00%	11.11%	20.30%	21.24%	20.36%	15.79%	9.09%	20.29%
CATEGORY%	3.57%	6.25%	1.79%	0.89%	24.11%	36.61%	59.82%	2.68%	0.89%	100.00%
1991-2000	3	4	2	4	33	46	49	2	1	98
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	15.38%	20.00%	44.44%	24.81%	23.83%	14.89%	10.53%	9.09%	17.75%
CATEGORY%	3.06%	4.08%	2.04%	4.08%	33.67%	46.94%	50.00%	2.04%	1.02%	100.00%
Since 2001	7	7	2	2	34	52	26	0	4	82
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	26.92%	20.00%	22.22%	25.56%	26.94%	7.90%	0.00%	36.36%	14.86%
CATEGORY%	8.54%	8.54%	2.44%	2.44%	41.46%	63.41%	31.71%	0.00%	4.88%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q14. How many years of experience in your company's business line does the primary owner have?

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
1 - 10 years	1	2	1	1	20	25	14	2	2	43
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	7.69%	10.00%	11.11%	15.04%	12.95%	4.26%	10.53%	18.18%	7.79%
CATEGORY%	2.33%	4.65%	2.33%	2.33%	46.51%	58.14%	32.56%	4.65%	4.65%	100.00%
11 -25 years	7	17	5	4	68	101	109	7	4	221
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	65.38%	50.00%	44.44%	51.13%	52.33%	33.13%	36.84%	36.36%	40.04%
CATEGORY%	3.17%	7.69%	2.26%	1.81%	30.77%	45.70%	49.32%	3.17%	1.81%	100.00%
26-50 years	7	6	4	4	41	62	193	6	4	265
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	23.08%	40.00%	44.44%	30.83%	32.12%	58.66%	31.58%	36.36%	48.01%
CATEGORY%	2.64%	2.26%	1.51%	1.51%	15.47%	23.40%	72.83%	2.26%	1.51%	100.00%
51-100 years	0	1	0	0	4	5	13	4	1	23
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	3.01%	2.59%	3.95%	21.05%	9.09%	4.17%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	4.35%	0.00%	0.00%	17.39%	21.74%	56.52%	17.39%	4.35%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q15. Excluding owner, on average, how many employees does your company keep on payroll, including full-time and part-time staff?

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
0-10 employees	11	14	2	5	89	121	132	4	4	261
DEMOGRAPHIC%	73.33%	53.85%	20.00%	55.56%	66.92%	62.69%	40.12%	21.05%	40.00%	47.37%
CATEGORY%	4.21%	5.36%	0.77%	1.92%	34.10%	46.36%	50.57%	1.53%	1.53%	100.00%
11-25 employees	1	7	6	2	24	40	72	2	4	118
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	26.92%	60.00%	22.22%	18.05%	20.73%	21.88%	10.53%	40.00%	21.42%
CATEGORY%	0.85%	5.93%	5.08%	1.69%	20.34%	33.90%	61.02%	1.69%	3.39%	100.00%
26-50 employees	1	3	2	1	17	24	41	1	0	66
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	11.54%	20.00%	11.11%	12.78%	12.44%	12.46%	5.26%	0.00%	11.98%
CATEGORY%	1.52%	4.55%	3.03%	1.52%	25.76%	36.36%	62.12%	1.52%	0.00%	100.00%
51-100 employees	1	1	0	1	1	4	38	4	2	48
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	3.85%	0.00%	11.11%	0.75%	2.07%	11.55%	21.05%	20.00%	8.71%
CATEGORY%	2.08%	2.08%	0.00%	2.08%	2.08%	8.33%	79.17%	8.33%	4.17%	100.00%
Over 101 employees	1	1	0	0	2	4	46	8	0	58
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	1.50%	2.07%	13.98%	42.11%	0.00%	10.53%
CATEGORY%	1.72%	1.72%	0.00%	0.00%	3.45%	6.90%	79.31%	13.79%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	10	551
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CATEGORY%	2.7%	4.7%	1.8%	1.6%	24.1%	35.0%	59.7%	3.4%	1.8%	100.0%

Q16. Is your Business certifed with the State of Minnesota's Targeted Vendor Program?

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	7	17	7	6	70	107	43	1	4	155
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	65.38%	70.00%	66.67%	52.63%	55.44%	13.07%	5.26%	36.36%	28.08%
CATEGORY%	4.52%	10.97%	4.52%	3.87%	45.16%	69.03%	27.74%	0.65%	2.58%	100.00%
No	6	9	3	3	55	76	260	16	4	356
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	34.62%	30.00%	33.33%	41.35%	39.38%	79.03%	84.21%	36.36%	64.49%
CATEGORY%	1.69%	2.53%	0.84%	0.84%	15.45%	21.35%	73.03%	4.49%	1.12%	100.00%
Don't Know	2	0	0	0	8	10	26	2	3	41
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.02%	5.18%	7.90%	10.53%	27.27%	7.43%
CATEGORY%	4.88%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	19.51%	24.39%	63.41%	4.88%	7.32%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q17. Are you certified as a Minority Business Enterprise?

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	5	14	4	4	24	51	2	0	3	56
DEMOGRAPHIC%	71.43%	82.35%	57.14%	66.67%	34.29%	47.66%	4.65%	0.00%	75.00%	36.13%
CATEGORY%	8.93%	25.00%	7.14%	7.14%	42.86%	91.07%	3.57%	0.00%	5.36%	100.00%
No	2	3	3	2	45	55	41	1	1	98
DEMOGRAPHIC%	28.57%	17.65%	42.86%	33.33%	64.29%	51.40%	95.35%	100.00%	25.00%	63.23%
CATEGORY%	2.04%	3.06%	3.06%	2.04%	45.92%	56.12%	41.84%	1.02%	1.02%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.43%	0.93%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.65%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	7	17	7	6	70	107	43	1	4	155
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	4.52%	10.97%	4.52%	3.87%	45.16%	69.03%	27.74%	0.65%	2.58%	100.00%

Q17. Are you certified as an Economically Disadvantaged Business?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	1	2	2	9	3	0	1	13
DEMOGRAPHIC%	28.57%	11.76%	14.29%	33.33%	2.86%	8.41%	6.98%	0.00%	25.00%	8.39%
CATEGORY%	15.38%	15.38%	7.69%	15.38%	15.38%	69.23%	23.08%	0.00%	7.69%	100.00%
No	4	15	6	4	67	96	40	0	3	139
DEMOGRAPHIC%	57.14%	88.24%	85.71%	66.67%	95.71%	89.72%	93.02%	0.00%	75.00%	89.68%
CATEGORY%	2.88%	10.79%	4.32%	2.88%	48.20%	69.06%	28.78%	0.00%	2.16%	100.00%
Don't Know	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.43%	1.87%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	1.94%
CATEGORY%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	7	17	7	6	70	107	43	1	4	155
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	4.52%	10.97%	4.52%	3.87%	45.16%	69.03%	27.74%	0.65%	2.58%	100.00%

Q17. Are you certified as a Small Business Enterprise?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	5	4	4	30	46	23	0	3	72
DEMOGRAPHIC%	42.86%	29.41%	57.14%	66.67%	42.86%	42.99%	53.49%	0.00%	75.00%	46.45%
CATEGORY%	4.17%	6.94%	5.56%	5.56%	41.67%	63.89%	31.94%	0.00%	4.17%	100.00%
No	4	11	3	2	38	58	17	1	1	77
DEMOGRAPHIC%	57.14%	64.71%	42.86%	33.33%	54.29%	54.21%	39.53%	100.00%	25.00%	49.68%
CATEGORY%	5.19%	14.29%	3.90%	2.60%	49.35%	75.32%	22.08%	1.30%	1.30%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	1	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	5.88%	0.00%	0.00%	2.86%	2.80%	6.98%	0.00%	0.00%	3.87%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	7	17	7	6	70	107	43	1	4	155
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	4.52%	10.97%	4.52%	3.87%	45.16%	69.03%	27.74%	0.65%	2.58%	100.00%

Q17. Are you certified as a Woman Business Enterprise?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	9	4	3	62	78	1	0	2	81
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	52.94%	57.14%	50.00%	88.57%	72.90%	2.33%	0.00%	50.00%	52.26%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	11.11%	4.94%	3.70%	76.54%	96.30%	1.23%	0.00%	2.47%	100.00%
No	7	8	3	3	7	28	41	1	2	72
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	47.06%	42.86%	50.00%	10.00%	26.17%	95.35%	100.00%	50.00%	46.45%
CATEGORY%	9.72%	11.11%	4.17%	4.17%	9.72%	38.89%	56.94%	1.39%	2.78%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.43%	0.93%	2.33%	0.00%	0.00%	1.29%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	7	17	7	6	70	107	43	1	4	155
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	4.52%	10.97%	4.52%	3.87%	45.16%	69.03%	27.74%	0.65%	2.58%	100.00%

Q17. Are you certified as a Disabled Business Enterprise?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	1	0	1	19	24	2	0	0	26
DEMOGRAPHIC%	42.86%	5.88%	0.00%	16.67%	27.14%	22.43%	4.65%	0.00%	0.00%	16.77%
CATEGORY%	11.54%	3.85%	0.00%	3.85%	73.08%	92.31%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	4	16	7	5	50	82	41	0	4	127
DEMOGRAPHIC%	57.14%	94.12%	100.00%	83.33%	71.43%	76.64%	95.35%	0.00%	100.00%	81.94%
CATEGORY%	3.15%	12.60%	5.51%	3.94%	39.37%	64.57%	32.28%	0.00%	3.15%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.43%	0.93%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	1.29%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	7	17	7	6	70	107	43	1	4	155
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	4.52%	10.97%	4.52%	3.87%	45.16%	69.03%	27.74%	0.65%	2.58%	100.00%

Q18. Is your business certified with any other state or agency?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	8	4	4	34	53	47	3	5	108
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	30.77%	40.00%	44.44%	25.56%	27.46%	14.29%	15.79%	45.45%	19.57%
CATEGORY%	2.78%	7.41%	3.70%	3.70%	31.48%	49.07%	43.52%	2.78%	4.63%	100.00%
No	12	18	6	5	98	139	267	15	5	426
DEMOGRAPHIC%	80.00%	69.23%	60.00%	55.56%	73.68%	72.02%	81.16%	78.95%	45.45%	77.17%
CATEGORY%	2.82%	4.23%	1.41%	1.17%	23.00%	32.63%	62.68%	3.52%	1.17%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	1	1	18
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.75%	0.52%	4.56%	5.26%	9.09%	3.26%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.56%	5.56%	83.33%	5.56%	5.56%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q19. Depart of Admin - Have you had any contracts as a prime contractor contract since 2006										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	6	1	1	22	32	75	2	2	111
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	23.08%	10.00%	11.11%	16.54%	16.58%	67.57%	10.53%	18.18%	20.11%
CATEGORY%	1.80%	5.41%	0.90%	0.90%	19.82%	28.83%	22.80%	1.80%	1.80%	100.00%
No	13	20	9	8	105	155	245	17	7	424
DEMOGRAPHIC%	86.67%	76.92%	90.00%	88.89%	78.95%	80.31%	57.65%	89.47%	63.64%	76.81%
CATEGORY%	3.07%	4.72%	2.12%	1.89%	24.76%	36.56%	74.47%	4.01%	1.65%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	6	6	9	0	2	17
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	3.1%	52.9%	0.0%	18.2%	3.1%
CATEGORY%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.3%	35.3%	2.7%	0.0%	11.8%	100.0%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	59.49%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	100.00%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q19. MN Depart of Trans - Have you had any contracts as a prime contractor contract since 2006	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	5	1	3	16	28	87	8	4	127
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	19.23%	10.00%	33.33%	12.03%	14.51%	26.44%	42.11%	36.36%	23.01%
CATEGORY%	2.36%	3.94%	0.79%	2.36%	12.60%	22.05%	68.50%	6.30%	3.15%	100.00%
No	12	21	9	6	115	163	238	11	6	418
DEMOGRAPHIC%	80.00%	80.77%	90.00%	66.67%	86.47%	84.46%	72.34%	57.89%	54.55%	75.72%
CATEGORY%	2.87%	5.02%	2.15%	1.44%	27.51%	39.00%	56.94%	2.63%	1.44%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	1	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.50%	1.04%	1.22%	0.00%	9.09%	1.27%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	28.57%	57.14%	0.00%	14.29%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q19. Met Council - Have you had any contracts as a prime contractor contract since 2006	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	4	6	1	1	11	23	57	2	1	83
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	23.08%	10.00%	11.11%	8.27%	11.92%	17.33%	10.53%	9.09%	15.04%
CATEGORY%	4.82%	7.23%	1.20%	1.20%	13.25%	27.71%	68.67%	2.41%	1.20%	100.00%
No	11	20	9	8	119	167	265	17	8	457
DEMOGRAPHIC%	73.33%	76.92%	90.00%	88.89%	89.47%	86.53%	80.55%	89.47%	72.73%	82.79%
CATEGORY%	2.41%	4.38%	1.97%	1.75%	26.04%	36.54%	57.99%	3.72%	1.75%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	0	2	12
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.26%	1.55%	2.13%	0.00%	18.18%	2.17%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	58.33%	0.00%	16.67%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q19. Mosquito Control - Have you had any contracts as a prime contractor contract since 2006	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	1	0	16
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.50%	1.04%	3.95%	5.26%	0.00%	2.90%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	12.50%	81.25%	6.25%	0.00%	100.00%
No	15	26	10	9	131	191	314	18	10	533
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	98.50%	98.96%	95.44%	94.74%	90.91%	96.56%
CATEGORY%	2.81%	4.88%	1.88%	1.69%	24.58%	35.83%	58.91%	3.38%	1.88%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.61%	0.00%	9.09%	0.54%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q19. Airports Commission - Have you had any contracts as a prime contractor contract since 2006	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	2	0	2	17	22	46	4	2	74
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	7.69%	0.00%	22.22%	12.78%	11.40%	13.98%	21.05%	18.18%	13.41%
CATEGORY%	1.35%	2.70%	0.00%	2.70%	22.97%	29.73%	62.16%	5.41%	2.70%	100.00%
No	14	24	10	7	115	170	278	15	8	471
DEMOGRAPHIC%	93.33%	92.31%	100.00%	77.78%	86.47%	88.08%	84.50%	78.95%	72.73%	85.33%
CATEGORY%	2.97%	5.10%	2.12%	1.49%	24.42%	36.09%	59.02%	3.18%	1.70%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	0	1	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.75%	0.52%	1.52%	0.00%	9.09%	1.27%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	14.29%	71.43%	0.00%	14.29%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q19. Sports Facilities - Have you had any contracts as a prime contractor contract since 2006	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	2	0	0	3	6	11	2	0	19
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	2.26%	3.11%	3.34%	10.53%	0.00%	3.44%
CATEGORY%	5.26%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%	15.79%	31.58%	57.89%	10.53%	0.00%	100.00%
No	14	24	10	9	129	186	311	17	10	524
DEMOGRAPHIC%	93.33%	92.31%	100.00%	100.00%	96.99%	96.37%	94.53%	89.47%	90.91%	94.93%
CATEGORY%	2.67%	4.58%	1.91%	1.72%	24.62%	35.50%	59.35%	3.24%	1.91%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	0	1	9
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.75%	0.52%	2.13%	0.00%	9.09%	1.63%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	11.11%	77.78%	0.00%	11.11%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q20. Depart of Admin - As a prime contractor what was the average time to receive payment?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Less than 30 days	0	1	0	0	4	5	11	1	1	18
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	18.18%	15.63%	14.67%	50.00%	50.00%	16.22%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	5.56%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	27.78%	61.11%	5.56%	5.56%	100.00%
30-60 days	2	5	1	1	16	25	61	1	1	88
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	83.33%	100.00%	100.00%	72.73%	78.13%	81.33%	50.00%	50.00%	79.28%
CATEGORY%	2.27%	5.68%	1.14%	1.14%	18.18%	28.41%	69.32%	1.14%	1.14%	100.00%
60-90 days	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.80%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
90-120 days	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.90%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.67%	0.00%	0.00%	1.80%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	2	6	1	1	22	32	75	2	2	111
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	1.80%	5.41%	0.90%	0.90%	19.82%	28.83%	67.57%	1.80%	1.80%	100.00%

Q20. Depart of Trans - As a prime contractor what was the average time to receive payment?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Less than 30 days	1	1	0	0	4	6	17	3	1	27
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	21.43%	19.54%	37.50%	25.00%	24.32%
CATEGORY%	3.70%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%	14.81%	22.22%	62.96%	11.11%	3.70%	100.00%
30-60 days	2	4	1	3	11	21	66	4	2	93
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	80.00%	100.00%	100.00%	68.75%	75.00%	75.86%	50.00%	50.00%	83.78%
CATEGORY%	2.15%	4.30%	1.08%	3.23%	11.83%	22.58%	70.97%	4.30%	2.15%	100.00%
60-90 days	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.25%	3.57%	2.30%	12.50%	25.00%	3.94%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	40.00%	20.00%	20.00%	100.00%
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.30%	0.00%	0.00%	1.57%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	3	5	1	3	16	28	87	8	4	127
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.36%	3.94%	0.79%	2.36%	12.60%	22.05%	68.50%	6.30%	3.15%	100.00%

Q20. Met Council- As a prime contractor what was the average time to receive payment?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Less than 30 days	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	9
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	15.79%	0.00%	0.00%	7.09%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
30-60 days	4	6	1	1	9	21	45	2	1	69
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	81.82%	91.30%	78.95%	100.00%	100.00%	54.33%
CATEGORY%	5.80%	8.70%	1.45%	1.45%	13.04%	30.43%	65.22%	2.90%	1.45%	100.00%
60-90 days	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	18.18%	8.70%	5.26%	0.00%	0.00%	3.94%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	4	6	1	1	11	23	57	2	1	83
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	65.35%
CATEGORY%	4.82%	7.23%	1.20%	1.20%	13.25%	27.71%	68.67%	2.41%	1.20%	100.00%

Q20. Mosquito Control - As a prime contractor what was the average time to receive payment										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Less than 30 days	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	1	6	13
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	4.35%	33.33%	100.00%	37.50%	38.24%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.69%	7.69%	38.46%	7.69%	46.15%	100.00%
30-60 days	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	0	10	21
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	4.35%	66.67%	0.00%	62.50%	61.76%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.76%	4.76%	47.62%	0.00%	47.62%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	1	16	34
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	8.70%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.88%	5.88%	44.12%	2.94%	47.06%	100.00%

Q20. Airports Commission - As a prime contractor what was the average time to receive payment?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Less than 30 days	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	1	1	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.76%	9.09%	6.52%	25.00%	50.00%	9.46%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	28.57%	42.86%	14.29%	14.29%	100.00%
30-60 days	1	2		2	13	18	41	3	1	63
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	76.47%	81.82%	89.13%	75.00%	50.00%	85.14%
CATEGORY%	1.59%	3.17%	0.00%	3.17%	20.63%	28.57%	65.08%	4.76%	1.59%	100.00%
60-90 days	0	0		0	2	2	1	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.76%	9.09%	2.17%	0.00%	0.00%	4.05%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.17%	0.00%	0.00%	1.35%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	1	2	0	2	17	22	46	4	2	74
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	29.73%	62.16%	5.41%	2.70%	100.00%

Q20. Sports Facilities - As a prime contractor what was the average time to receive payment?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Less than 30 days	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	16.67%	9.09%	14.29%	50.00%	15.15%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	40.00%	20.00%	100.00%
30-60 days	1	2	0	0	2	5	9	11	1	26
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	83.33%	81.82%	78.57%	50.00%	78.79%
CATEGORY%	3.85%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	7.69%	19.23%	34.62%	42.31%	3.85%	100.00%
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	7.14%	0.00%	6.06%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	1	2			3	6	11	14	2	33
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	3.03%	6.06%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	18.18%	33.33%	42.42%	6.06%	100.00%

Q21. Depart of Admin - Which category best approximates your 2006 revenue?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
None or 0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%	3.13%	4.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.60%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Up to $50,000	0	1	0	0	12	13	28	1	2	44
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	54.55%	40.63%	37.33%	50.00%	100.00%	39.64%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	2.27%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%	29.55%	63.64%	2.27%	4.55%	100.00%
$50,001 to $100,000	1	0	0	1	4	6	11	0	0	17
DEMOGRAPHIC%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	18.18%	18.75%	14.67%	0.00%	0.00%	15.32%
CATEGORY%	5.88%	0.00%	0.00%	5.88%	23.53%	35.29%	64.71%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$100,001 to $300,000	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	0	0	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	6.25%	8.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.21%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$300,001 to $500,000	1	1	1	0	0	3	6	0	0	9
DEMOGRAPHIC%	50.00%	16.67%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.38%	8.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.11%
CATEGORY%	11.11%	11.11%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$500,001 to $1,000,000	0	2	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.25%	8.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.21%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$1,000,001 to $3,000,000	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%	6.25%	2.67%	0.00%	0.00%	3.60%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$3,000,001 to $5,000,000	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	6.25%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	6.31%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	28.57%	71.43%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$5,000,001 to $10,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.33%	0.00%	0.00%	3.60%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Over $10 million	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.13%	2.67%	50.00%	0.00%	3.60%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No Response/DK	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.67%	0.00%	0.00%	1.80%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	2	6	1	1	22	32	75	2	2	111
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	1.80%	5.41%	0.90%	0.90%	19.82%	28.83%	67.57%	1.80%	1.80%	100.00%

Q21. Depart of Trans - Which category best approximates your 2006 revenue?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
None or 0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	1	0	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	6.25%	7.14%	4.60%	12.50%	0.00%	6.31%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	14.29%	28.57%	57.14%	14.29%	0.00%	100.00%
Up to $50,000	1	0	0	1	9	11	24	1	2	38
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	56.25%	39.29%	27.59%	12.50%	50.00%	34.23%
CATEGORY%	2.63%	0.00%	0.00%	2.63%	23.68%	28.95%	63.16%	2.63%	5.26%	100.00%
$50,001 to $100,000	0	1	1	0	3	5	12	1	0	18
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%	0.00%	18.75%	17.86%	13.79%	12.50%	0.00%	16.22%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	5.56%	5.56%	0.00%	16.67%	27.78%	66.67%	5.56%	0.00%	100.00%
$100,001 to $300,000	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.25%	7.14%	5.75%	0.00%	0.00%	6.31%
CATEGORY%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	28.57%	71.43%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$300,001 to $500,000	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.25%	7.14%	2.30%	12.50%	0.00%	4.50%
CATEGORY%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	40.00%	40.00%	20.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$500,001 to $1,000,000	0	2	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	9
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.14%	8.05%	0.00%	0.00%	8.11%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	77.78%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$1,000,001 to $3,000,000	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	0	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.57%	5.75%	25.00%	0.00%	7.21%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	62.50%	25.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$3,000,001 to $5,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	0	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.05%	12.50%	0.00%	7.21%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	87.50%	12.50%	0.00%	100.00%
$5,000,001 to $10,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.60%	0.00%	0.00%	3.60%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Over $10 million	0	0	0	1	1	2	13	1	0	16
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	6.25%	7.14%	14.94%	12.50%	0.00%	14.41%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.25%	6.25%	12.50%	81.25%	6.25%	0.00%	100.00%
No Response/DK	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	2	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.57%	4.60%	0.00%	50.00%	6.31%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	57.14%	0.00%	28.57%	100.00%
Total	3	5	1	3	16	28	87	8	4	127
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.36%	3.94%	0.79%	2.36%	12.60%	22.05%	68.50%	6.30%	3.15%	100.00%

Q21. Met Council - Which category best approximates your 2006 revenue?

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
None or 0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	4.35%	3.51%	0.00%	0.00%	3.61%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Up to $50,000	0	0	0	1	4	5	18	0	0	23
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	36.36%	21.74%	31.58%	0.00%	0.00%	27.71%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.35%	17.39%	21.74%	78.26%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$50,001 to $100,000	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	0	0	12
DEMOGRAPHIC%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	18.18%	13.04%	15.79%	0.00%	0.00%	14.46%
CATEGORY%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$100,001 to $300,000	1	2	1	0	2	6	4	0	0	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	25.00%	33.33%	100.00%	0.00%	18.18%	26.09%	7.02%	0.00%	0.00%	12.05%
CATEGORY%	10.00%	20.00%	10.00%	0.00%	20.00%	60.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$300,001 to $500,000	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	25.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.70%	3.51%	0.00%	0.00%	4.82%
CATEGORY%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$500,001 to $1,000,000	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	2	0	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	8.70%	3.51%	100.00%	0.00%	7.23%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	100.00%
$1,000,001 to $3,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.02%	0.00%	0.00%	4.82%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$3,000,001 to $5,000,000	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.35%	15.79%	0.00%	0.00%	12.05%
CATEGORY%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	90.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$5,000,001 to $10,000,000	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.70%	1.75%	0.00%	0.00%	3.61%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Over $10 million	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.51%	0.00%	0.00%	2.41%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No Response/DK	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	1	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	4.35%	7.02%	0.00%	100.00%	7.23%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	66.67%	0.00%	16.67%	100.00%
Total	4	6	1	1	11	23	57	2	1	83
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	4.82%	7.23%	1.20%	1.20%	13.25%	27.71%	68.67%	2.41%	1.20%	100.00%

Q21. Mosquito Control - Which category best approximates your 2006 revenue?

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Up to $50,000	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	0	1	12
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	66.67%	0.00%	100.00%	66.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%	8.33%	83.33%	0.00%	8.33%	100.00%
$50,001 to $100,000	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	26.67%	0.00%	0.00%	27.78%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	80.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$500,001 to $1,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	5.56%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	2	2	15		1	18
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	11.11%	83.33%	0.00%	5.56%	100.00%

Q21. Airports Commission - Which category best approximates your 2006 revenue?

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
None or 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.17%	0.00%	0.00%	2.20%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Up to $50,000	0	0	2	0	8	10	24	1	1	36
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	47.06%	45.45%	38.10%	25.00%	50.00%	39.56%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	5.56%	0.00%	22.22%	27.78%	66.67%	2.78%	2.78%	100.00%
$50,001 to $100,000	0	0	0	0	5	5	13	1	0	19
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	29.41%	22.73%	20.63%	25.00%	0.00%	20.88%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	26.32%	26.32%	68.42%	5.26%	0.00%	100.00%
$100,001 to $300,000	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.88%	9.09%	6.35%	0.00%	0.00%	6.59%
CATEGORY%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$300,001 to $500,000	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.10%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$500,001 to $1,000,000	0	1	0	0	2	3	6	1	0	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.76%	13.64%	9.52%	25.00%	0.00%	10.99%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	30.00%	60.00%	10.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$1,000,001 to $3,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.35%	0.00%	0.00%	4.40%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$3,000,001 to $5,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.35%	0.00%	0.00%	4.40%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$5,000,001 to $10,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.17%	0.00%	0.00%	2.20%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Over $10 million	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.17%	25.00%	0.00%	3.30%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	100.00%
No Response/DK	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.88%	4.55%	3.17%	0.00%	50.00%	4.40%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	25.00%	100.00%
Total	1	2	2	0	17	22	63	4	2	91
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	1.10%	2.20%	2.20%	0.00%	18.68%	24.18%	69.23%	4.40%	2.20%	100.00%

Q21. Sports Facilities - Which category best approximates your 2006 revenue?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Up to $50,000	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	1	0	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	45.45%	50.00%	0.00%	42.11%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	62.50%	12.50%	0.00%	100.00%
$50,001 to $100,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%	0.00%	0.00%	21.05%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$300,001 to $500,000	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.26%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$500,001 to $1,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	18.18%	50.00%	0.00%	15.79%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	100.00%
$1,000,001 to $3,000,000	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.26%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$3,000,001 to $5,000,000	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.26%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Over $10 million	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.26%
CATEGORY%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	1	2	0	0	3	6	11	2	0	19
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	5.26%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%	15.79%	31.58%	57.89%	10.53%	0.00%	100.00%

Q22. Are you required to have bonding for the type of work that your company bids?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	8	11	5	7	44	75	168	11	3	257
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	42.31%	50.00%	77.78%	33.08%	38.86%	51.06%	57.89%	27.27%	46.56%
CATEGORY%	3.11%	4.28%	1.95%	2.72%	17.12%	29.18%	65.37%	4.28%	1.17%	100.00%
No	7	15	5	2	89	118	159	8	8	293
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	57.69%	50.00%	22.22%	66.92%	61.14%	48.33%	42.11%	72.73%	53.08%
CATEGORY%	2.39%	5.12%	1.71%	0.68%	30.38%	40.27%	54.27%	2.73%	2.73%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.61%	0.00%	0.00%	0.36%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q23. What is your current aggregate bonding limit?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Below $100,000	1	1	0	0	3	5	3	0	0	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	12.50%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%	6.58%	1.79%	0.00%	0.00%	3.10%
CATEGORY%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%	62.50%	37.50%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$100,001 to $250,000	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.22%	1.32%	1.79%	0.00%	0.00%	1.55%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$250,001 to $500,000	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.22%	2.63%	1.19%	9.09%	0.00%	1.94%
CATEGORY%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	40.00%	40.00%	20.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$500,001 to $1 million	3	2	0	1	2	8	8	1	0	17
DEMOGRAPHIC%	37.50%	18.18%	0.00%	14.29%	4.44%	10.53%	4.76%	9.09%	0.00%	6.59%
CATEGORY%	17.65%	11.76%	0.00%	5.88%	11.76%	47.06%	47.06%	5.88%	0.00%	100.00%
$1,000,001 to $1,500,000	0	0	2	1	6	9	8	0	0	17
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	14.29%	13.33%	11.84%	4.76%	0.00%	0.00%	6.59%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	11.76%	5.88%	35.29%	52.94%	47.06%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$1,500,001 to $3 million	0	0	0	2	15	17	21	1	1	40
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	33.33%	22.37%	12.50%	9.09%	33.33%	15.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%	37.50%	42.50%	52.50%	2.50%	2.50%	100.00%
$3 million to $5 million	0	2	1	1	2	6	18	2	0	26
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	18.18%	20.00%	14.29%	4.44%	7.89%	10.71%	18.18%	0.00%	10.08%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	7.69%	3.85%	3.85%	7.69%	23.08%	69.23%	7.69%	0.00%	100.00%
Over $5 million	3	6	2	2	10	23	95	6	2	126
DEMOGRAPHIC%	37.50%	54.55%	40.00%	28.57%	22.22%	30.26%	56.55%	54.55%	66.67%	48.84%
CATEGORY%	2.38%	4.76%	1.59%	1.59%	7.94%	18.25%	75.40%	4.76%	1.59%	100.00%
No Response	0	0	0	0	5	5	10	0	0	15
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	6.58%	5.95%	0.00%	0.00%	5.81%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	8	11	5	7	45	76	168	11	3	258
DEMOGRAPHIC%	3.10%	4.26%	1.94%	2.71%	17.44%	39.38%	65.12%	4.26%	1.16%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	3.10%	4.26%	1.94%	2.71%	17.44%	29.46%	65.12%	4.26%	1.16%	100.00%

Q24. What is your current single project bonding limit?	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Below $100,000	1	1	0	0	3	5	3	0	0	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	12.50%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%	6.58%	1.79%	0.00%	0.00%	3.10%
CATEGORY%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%	62.50%	37.50%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$100,001 to $250,000	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.22%	1.32%	1.19%	0.00%	0.00%	1.16%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$250,001 to $500,000	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	1	0	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.22%	2.63%	2.98%	9.09%	0.00%	3.10%
CATEGORY%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	25.00%	62.50%	12.50%	0.00%	100.00%
$500,001 to $1 million	3	2	0	1	2	8	4	0	0	12
DEMOGRAPHIC%	37.50%	18.18%	0.00%	14.29%	4.44%	10.53%	2.38%	0.00%	0.00%	4.65%
CATEGORY%	25.00%	16.67%	0.00%	8.33%	16.67%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$1,000,001 to $1,500,000	0	0	2	1	5	8	9	0	0	17
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	14.29%	11.11%	10.53%	5.36%	0.00%	0.00%	6.59%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	11.76%	5.88%	29.41%	47.06%	52.94%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$1,500,001 to $3 million	0	0	0	2	14	16	19	1	1	37
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	31.11%	21.05%	11.31%	9.09%	33.33%	14.34%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.41%	37.84%	43.24%	51.35%	2.70%	2.70%	100.00%
$3 million to $5 million	0	2	1	1	2	6	21	2	0	29
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	18.18%	20.00%	14.29%	4.44%	7.89%	12.50%	18.18%	0.00%	11.24%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	6.90%	3.45%	3.45%	6.90%	20.69%	72.41%	6.90%	0.00%	100.00%
Over $5 million	3	6	2	2	10	23	92	6	1	122
DEMOGRAPHIC%	37.50%	54.55%	40.00%	28.57%	22.22%	30.26%	54.76%	54.55%	33.33%	47.29%
CATEGORY%	2.46%	4.92%	1.64%	1.64%	8.20%	18.85%	75.41%	4.92%	0.82%	100.00%
No Response	0	0	0	0	7	7	13	1	1	22
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	15.56%	9.21%	7.74%	9.09%	33.33%	8.53%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	31.82%	31.82%	59.09%	4.55%	4.55%	100.00%
Total	8	11	5	7	45	76	168	11	3	258
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	3.10%	4.26%	1.94%	2.71%	17.44%	29.46%	65.12%	4.26%	1.16%	100.00%

Q25. Which category best approximates your company's 2006 gross revenues?	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Up to $50,000	2	0	0	0	17	19	11	0	0	30
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	56.67%	25.00%	36.67%	0.00%	0.00%	5.43%
CATEGORY%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.78%	63.33%	3.34%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$50,001 to $100,000	2	0	0	0	6	8	12	0	1	21
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	10.53%	57.14%	0.00%	9.09%	3.80%
CATEGORY%	9.52%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.51%	38.10%	3.65%	0.00%	4.76%	100.00%
$100,001 to $300,000	0	3	0	0	8	11	16	0	0	27
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	11.54%	0.00%	0.00%	29.63%	14.47%	59.26%	0.00%	0.00%	4.89%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	6.02%	40.74%	4.86%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$300,001 to $500,000	1	2	0	0	14	17	7	0	0	24
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	58.33%	22.37%	29.17%	0.00%	0.00%	4.35%
CATEGORY%	4.17%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%	10.53%	70.83%	2.13%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
$500,001 to $1,000,000	2	1	1	0	12	16	29	1	3	49
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	3.85%	10.00%	0.00%	24.49%	21.05%	59.18%	5.26%	27.27%	8.88%
CATEGORY%	4.08%	2.04%	2.04%	0.00%	9.02%	32.65%	8.81%	2.04%	6.12%	100.00%
$1,000,001 to $3,000,000	2	3	1	0	25	31	48	1	1	81
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	11.54%	10.00%	0.00%	30.49%	40.79%	58.54%	5.26%	9.09%	14.67%
CATEGORY%	2.47%	3.70%	1.23%	0.00%	18.80%	38.27%	14.59%	1.23%	1.23%	100.00%
$3,000,001 to $5,000,000	2	6	1	4	24	37	42	0	3	82
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	23.08%	10.00%	44.44%	29.27%	48.68%	51.22%	0.00%	27.27%	14.86%
CATEGORY%	2.44%	7.32%	1.22%	4.88%	18.05%	45.12%	12.77%	0.00%	3.66%	100.00%
$5,000,001 to $10,000,000	0	4	4	2	13	23	32	3	0	58
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	15.38%	40.00%	22.22%	22.41%	30.26%	55.17%	15.79%	0.00%	10.51%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	6.90%	6.90%	3.45%	9.77%	39.66%	9.73%	5.17%	0.00%	100.00%
Over $10 million	3	7	2	2	9	23	125	13	2	163
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	26.92%	20.00%	22.22%	5.52%	30.26%	76.69%	68.42%	18.18%	29.53%
CATEGORY%	1.84%	4.29%	1.23%	1.23%	6.77%	14.11%	37.99%	7.98%	1.23%	100.00%
No Response/DK	1	0	1	1	5	8	7	1	1	17
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	0.00%	10.00%	11.11%	29.41%	10.53%	41.18%	5.26%	9.09%	3.08%
CATEGORY%	5.88%	0.00%	5.88%	5.88%	3.76%	47.06%	2.13%	5.88%	5.88%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	24.05%	253.95%	59.49%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	100.00%	34.96%	100.00%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q26. Have you experienced discriminatory behavior in the private sector in last 5 years?	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	1	1	2	16	23	6	1	0	30
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	10.00%	22.22%	12.03%	11.92%	1.82%	5.26%	0.00%	5.43%
CATEGORY%	10.00%	3.33%	3.33%	6.67%	53.33%	76.67%	20.00%	3.33%	0.00%	100.00%
No	12	25	8	6	116	167	318	17	11	513
DEMOGRAPHIC%	80.00%	96.15%	80.00%	66.67%	87.22%	86.53%	96.66%	89.47%	100.00%	92.93%
CATEGORY%	2.34%	4.87%	1.56%	1.17%	22.61%	32.55%	61.99%	3.31%	2.14%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	1	1	1	3	5	1	0	9
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	11.11%	0.75%	1.55%	1.52%	5.26%	0.00%	1.63%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	11.11%	11.11%	33.33%	55.56%	11.11%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q27. How did you become aware of the discrimination that you experienced?	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Verbal Comment	2	0	1	0	10	13	2	1	0	16
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	62.50%	56.52%	33.33%	100.00%	0.00%	53.33%
CATEGORY%	12.50%	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	62.50%	81.25%	12.50%	6.25%	0.00%	100.00%
Action Taken Against Company	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	18.75%	17.39%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%
CATEGORY%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	1	0	1	3	5	2	0	0	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	50.00%	18.75%	21.74%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	23.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	14.29%	42.86%	71.43%	28.57%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Verbal and Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	3.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Verbal, Written and Action	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	4.35%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	3	1	1	2	16	23	6	1	0	30
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	10.00%	3.33%	3.33%	6.67%	53.33%	76.67%	20.00%	3.33%	0.00%	100.00%

Q28. Do you feel that the discrimination was due to the:	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Owner's race or ethnicity	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.70%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Owner's sex	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	62.50%	43.48%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	1	0	0	1	5	7	4	1	0	12
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	31.25%	30.43%	66.67%	100.00%	0.00%	40.00%
CATEGORY%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%	41.67%	58.33%	33.33%	8.33%	0.00%	100.00%
Owner's race or ethnicity and sex	2	0	0	1	1	4	1	0	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	6.25%	17.39%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%
CATEGORY%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	3	1	1	2	16	23	6	1	0	30
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	10.00%	3.33%	3.33%	6.67%	53.33%	76.67%	20.00%	3.33%	0.00%	100.00%

Q29. When did discrimination occur?	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
During bidding process	2	0	1	2	9	14	4	0	0	18
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	56.25%	60.87%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%
CATEGORY%	11.11%	0.00%	5.56%	11.11%	50.00%	77.78%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
After contract award	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	8.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No answer/DK	1	1	0	0	5	7	2	1	0	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	31.25%	30.43%	33.33%	100.00%	0.00%	33.33%
CATEGORY%	10.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	70.00%	20.00%	10.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	3	1	1	2	16	23	6	1	0	30
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	10.00%	3.33%	3.33%	6.67%	53.33%	76.67%	20.00%	3.33%	0.00%	100.00%

Q30. Did you file a complaint?	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	18.75%	13.04%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	13.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	3	1	1	2	13	20	5	1	0	26
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	81.25%	86.96%	83.33%	100.00%	0.00%	86.67%
CATEGORY%	11.54%	3.85%	3.85%	7.69%	50.00%	76.92%	19.23%	3.85%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	3	1	1	2	16	23	6	1	0	30
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	10.00%	3.33%	3.33%	6.67%	53.33%	76.67%	20.00%	3.33%	0.00%	100.00%

Q31. Depart of Admin - There is an informal network of prime and subcontractors that has excluded my company from doing business:	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Strongly Agree	4	0	1	1	15	21	9	0	2	32
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	0.00%	10.00%	11.11%	11.28%	10.88%	2.74%	0.00%	18.18%	5.80%
CATEGORY%	12.50%	0.00%	3.13%	3.13%	46.88%	65.63%	28.13%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Agree	3	8	0	0	13	24	35	2	1	62
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	30.77%	0.00%	0.00%	9.77%	12.44%	10.64%	10.53%	9.09%	11.23%
CATEGORY%	4.84%	12.90%	0.00%	0.00%	20.97%	38.71%	56.45%	3.23%	0.00%	100.00%
Neither Agree/Disagree	1	6	1	3	17	28	38	5	1	72
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	23.08%	10.00%	33.33%	12.78%	14.51%	11.55%	26.32%	9.09%	13.04%
CATEGORY%	1.39%	8.33%	1.39%	4.17%	23.61%	38.89%	52.78%	6.94%	0.00%	100.00%
Disagree	6	10	7	4	60	87	165	9	7	268
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	38.46%	70.00%	44.44%	45.11%	45.08%	50.15%	47.37%	63.64%	48.55%
CATEGORY%	2.24%	3.73%	2.61%	1.49%	22.39%	32.46%	61.57%	3.36%	0.00%	100.00%
Strongly Disagree	0	2	0	1	21	24	71	2	0	97
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%	11.11%	15.79%	12.44%	21.58%	10.53%	0.00%	17.57%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	2.06%	0.00%	1.03%	21.65%	24.74%	73.20%	2.06%	0.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	1	0	1	0	7	9	11	1	0	21
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	5.26%	4.66%	3.34%	5.26%	0.00%	3.80%
CATEGORY%	4.76%	0.00%	4.76%	0.00%	33.33%	42.86%	52.38%	4.76%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	0.00%	100.00%

Q31. Depart ofTrans - There is an informal network of prime and subcontractors that has excluded my company from doing business:										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Strongly Agree	4	0	1	0	14	19	8	1	2	30
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	10.53%	9.84%	2.43%	5.26%	18.18%	5.43%
CATEGORY%	13.33%	0.00%	3.33%	0.00%	46.67%	63.33%	26.67%	3.33%	0.00%	100.00%
Agree	4	9	0	2	12	27	34	1	1	63
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	34.62%	0.00%	22.22%	9.02%	13.99%	10.33%	5.26%	9.09%	11.41%
CATEGORY%	6.35%	14.29%	0.00%	3.17%	19.05%	42.86%	53.97%	1.59%	0.00%	100.00%
Neither Agree/Disagree	0	6	1	2	21	30	40	5	1	76
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	23.08%	10.00%	22.22%	15.79%	15.54%	12.16%	26.32%	9.09%	13.77%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	7.89%	1.32%	2.63%	27.63%	39.47%	52.63%	6.58%	0.00%	100.00%
Disagree	6	9	7	4	60	86	162	10	7	265
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	34.62%	70.00%	44.44%	45.11%	44.56%	49.24%	52.63%	63.64%	48.01%
CATEGORY%	2.26%	3.40%	2.64%	1.51%	22.64%	32.45%	61.13%	3.77%	0.00%	100.00%
Strongly Disagree	0	2	0	1	19	22	71	1	0	94
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%	11.11%	14.29%	11.40%	21.58%	5.26%	0.00%	17.03%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	2.13%	0.00%	1.06%	20.21%	23.40%	75.53%	1.06%	0.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	1	0	1	0	7	9	14	1	0	24
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	5.26%	4.66%	4.26%	5.26%	0.00%	4.35%
CATEGORY%	4.17%	0.00%	4.17%	0.00%	29.17%	37.50%	58.33%	4.17%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	0.00%	100.00%

Q31. Met Council - There is an informal network of prime and subcontractors that has excluded my company from doing business:										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Strongly Agree	0	0	0	0	12	12	7	0	0	19
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.02%	8.89%	2.13%	0.00%	0.00%	4.09%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	63.16%	63.16%	36.84%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Agree	4	0	1	0	12	17	31	0	0	48
DEMOGRAPHIC%	400.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	9.02%	12.59%	9.42%	0.00%	0.00%	10.32%
CATEGORY%	8.33%	0.00%	2.08%	0.00%	25.00%	35.42%	64.58%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Neither Agree/Disagree	3	9	0	9	26	47	41	2	9	99
DEMOGRAPHIC%	300.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	19.55%	34.81%	12.46%	200.00%	0.00%	21.29%
CATEGORY%	3.03%	10.71%	0.00%	10.71%	26.26%	47.47%	41.41%	2.02%	10.71%	100.00%
Disagree	1	6	1	6	56	70	165	5	6	246
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	42.11%	51.85%	50.15%	500.00%	0.00%	52.90%
CATEGORY%	0.41%	2.53%	0.41%	2.53%	22.76%	28.46%	67.07%	2.03%	2.53%	100.00%
Strongly Disagree	6	9	7	9	19	50	71	10	9	140
DEMOGRAPHIC%	600.00%	0.00%	700.00%	0.00%	14.29%	37.04%	21.58%	1,000.00%	0.00%	30.11%
CATEGORY%	4.29%	6.77%	5.00%	6.77%	13.57%	35.71%	50.71%	7.14%	6.77%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	2	0	2	8	12	14	1	2	29
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.02%	8.89%	4.26%	100.00%	0.00%	6.24%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%	7.69%	27.59%	41.38%	48.28%	3.45%	7.69%	100.00%
Total	1	0	1	0	133	135	329	1	0	465
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.22%	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	28.60%	29.03%	70.75%	0.22%	0.00%	100.00%

Q31. Mosquito Control - There is an informal network of prime and subcontractors that has excluded my company from doing business:										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Strongly Agree	3	0	1	0	10	14	5	0	2	21
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	7.52%	7.25%	1.52%	0.00%	18.18%	3.80%
CATEGORY%	14.29%	0.00%	4.76%	0.00%	47.62%	66.67%	23.81%	0.00%	9.52%	100.00%
Agree	4	9	0	1	10	24	32	2	1	59
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	34.62%	0.00%	11.11%	7.52%	12.44%	9.73%	10.53%	9.09%	10.69%
CATEGORY%	6.78%	15.25%	0.00%	1.69%	16.95%	40.68%	54.24%	3.39%	1.69%	100.00%
Neither Agree/Disagree	1	6	1	3	29	40	47	5	1	93
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	23.08%	10.00%	33.33%	21.80%	20.73%	14.29%	26.32%	9.09%	16.85%
CATEGORY%	1.08%	6.45%	1.08%	3.23%	31.18%	43.01%	50.54%	5.38%	1.08%	100.00%
Disagree	6	10	7	4	57	84	161	10	7	262
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	38.46%	70.00%	44.44%	42.86%	43.52%	48.94%	52.63%	63.64%	47.46%
CATEGORY%	2.29%	3.82%	2.67%	1.53%	21.76%	32.06%	61.45%	3.82%	2.67%	100.00%
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0	1	19	21	69	1	0	91
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	11.11%	14.29%	10.88%	20.97%	5.26%	0.00%	16.49%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	1.10%	0.00%	1.10%	20.88%	23.08%	75.82%	1.10%	0.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	1	0	1	0	8	10	15	1	0	26
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	6.02%	5.18%	4.56%	5.26%	0.00%	4.71%
CATEGORY%	3.85%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	30.77%	38.46%	57.69%	3.85%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q31. Airports Commission - There is an informal network of prime and subcontractors that has excluded my company from doing business:										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Strongly Agree	4	0	1	0	12	17	6	0	2	25
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	9.02%	8.81%	1.82%	0.00%	18.18%	4.53%
CATEGORY%	16.00%	0.00%	4.00%	0.00%	48.00%	68.00%	24.00%	0.00%	8.00%	100.00%
Agree	3	9	0	1	15	28	35	2	2	67
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	34.62%	0.00%	11.11%	11.28%	14.51%	10.64%	10.53%	18.18%	12.14%
CATEGORY%	4.48%	13.43%	0.00%	1.49%	22.39%	41.79%	52.24%	2.99%	2.99%	100.00%
Neither Agree/Disagree	1	6	1	3	22	33	42	5	0	80
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	23.08%	10.00%	33.33%	16.54%	17.10%	12.77%	26.32%	0.00%	14.49%
CATEGORY%	1.25%	7.50%	1.25%	3.75%	27.50%	41.25%	52.50%	6.25%	0.00%	100.00%
Disagree	6	10	7	4	57	84	162	10	7	263
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	38.46%	70.00%	44.44%	42.86%	43.52%	49.24%	52.63%	63.64%	47.64%
CATEGORY%	2.28%	3.80%	2.66%	1.52%	21.67%	31.94%	61.60%	3.80%	2.66%	100.00%
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0	1	19	21	72	1	0	94
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	11.11%	14.29%	10.88%	21.88%	5.26%	0.00%	17.03%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	1.06%	0.00%	1.06%	20.21%	22.34%	76.60%	1.06%	0.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	1	0	1	0	8	10	12	1	0	23
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	6.02%	5.18%	3.65%	5.26%	0.00%	4.17%
CATEGORY%	4.35%	0.00%	4.35%	0.00%	34.78%	43.48%	52.17%	4.35%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q31. Sports Facilities - There is an informal network of prime and subcontractors that has excluded my company from doing business:										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Strongly Agree	3	0	1	0	12	16	5	0	2	23
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	9.02%	8.29%	1.52%	0.00%	18.18%	4.17%
CATEGORY%	13.04%	0.00%	4.35%	0.00%	52.17%	69.57%	21.74%	0.00%	8.70%	100.00%
Agree	4	9	0	1	12	26	32	2	1	61
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	34.62%	0.00%	11.11%	9.02%	13.47%	9.73%	10.53%	9.09%	11.05%
CATEGORY%	6.56%	14.75%	0.00%	1.64%	19.67%	42.62%	52.46%	3.28%	1.64%	100.00%
Neither Agree/Disagree	1	6	1	3	23	34	45	5	1	85
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	23.08%	10.00%	33.33%	17.29%	17.62%	13.68%	26.32%	9.09%	15.40%
CATEGORY%	1.18%	7.06%	1.18%	3.53%	27.06%	40.00%	52.94%	5.88%	1.18%	100.00%
Disagree	6	10	7	4	59	86	162	10	7	265
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	38.46%	70.00%	44.44%	44.36%	44.56%	49.24%	52.63%	63.64%	48.01%
CATEGORY%	2.26%	3.77%	2.64%	1.51%	22.26%	32.45%	61.13%	3.77%	2.64%	100.00%
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0	1	19	21	70	1	0	92
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	11.11%	14.29%	10.88%	21.28%	5.26%	0.00%	16.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	1.09%	0.00%	1.09%	20.65%	22.83%	76.09%	1.09%	0.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	1	0	1	0	8	10	15	1	0	26
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	6.02%	5.18%	4.56%	5.26%	0.00%	4.71%
CATEGORY%	3.85%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	30.77%	38.46%	57.69%	3.85%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q32. Prime contractor will include minority or women subcontractors to satisfy "good faith efforts" , then drop the company after award.										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Strongly Agree	7	1	2	1	16	27	6	0	9	42
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	3.85%	20.00%	11.11%	12.03%	13.99%	1.82%	0.00%	83.00%	7.63%
CATEGORY%	16.62%	2.37%	4.75%	2.37%	37.98%	64.09%	14.24%	0.00%	21.67%	100.00%
Agree	3	7	0	1	19	30	36	0	1	67
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	26.92%	0.00%	11.11%	14.29%	15.54%	10.94%	0.00%	9.09%	12.14%
CATEGORY%	4.48%	10.45%	0.00%	1.49%	28.36%	44.78%	53.73%	0.00%	1.49%	100.00%
Neither Agree/Disagree	1	7	1	2	22	33	64	7	0	104
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	26.92%	10.00%	22.22%	16.54%	17.10%	19.45%	36.84%	0.00%	18.84%
CATEGORY%	0.96%	6.73%	0.96%	1.92%	21.15%	31.73%	61.54%	6.73%	0.00%	100.00%
Disagree	3	9	7	3	39	61	135	8	5	209
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	34.62%	70.00%	33.33%	29.32%	31.61%	41.03%	42.11%	45.45%	37.86%
CATEGORY%	1.44%	4.31%	3.35%	1.44%	18.66%	29.19%	64.59%	3.83%	2.39%	100.00%
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0	0	10	11	35	0	0	46
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	7.52%	5.70%	10.64%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	2.17%	0.00%	0.00%	21.74%	23.91%	76.09%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	1	1	0	2	27	31	53	4	2	90
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	3.85%	0.00%	22.22%	20.30%	16.06%	16.11%	21.05%	18.18%	16.30%
CATEGORY%	1.11%	1.11%	0.00%	2.22%	30.00%	34.44%	58.89%	4.44%	2.22%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q33. Prime Contractors change bidding and subcontract practices when not in TVB contract										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Strongly Agree	6	2	2	1	20	31	9	0	5	45
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	7.69%	20.00%	11.11%	15.04%	16.06%	2.74%	0.00%	45.45%	8.15%
CATEGORY%	2.67%	0.30%	2.00%	1.23%	0.11%	0.08%	0.01%	0.00%	4.13%	100.00%
Agree	1	8	0	1	18	28	46	0	1	75
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	30.77%	0.00%	11.11%	13.53%	14.51%	13.98%	0.00%	9.09%	13.59%
CATEGORY%	0.44%	1.18%	0.00%	1.23%	0.10%	0.08%	0.04%	0.00%	0.83%	100.00%
Neither Agree/Disagree	1	7	1	2	25	36	57	7	0	100
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	26.92%	10.00%	22.22%	18.80%	18.65%	17.33%	36.84%	0.00%	18.12%
CATEGORY%	0.44%	1.04%	1.00%	2.47%	0.14%	0.10%	0.05%	1.94%	0.00%	100.00%
Disagree	3	8	7	3	32	53	114	8	2	177
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	30.77%	70.00%	33.33%	24.06%	27.46%	34.65%	42.11%	18.18%	32.07%
CATEGORY%	1.33%	1.18%	7.00%	3.70%	0.18%	0.14%	0.11%	2.22%	1.65%	100.00%
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0	0	6	7	21	0	0	28
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	4.51%	3.63%	6.38%	0.00%	0.00%	5.07%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.15%	0.00%	0.00%	0.03%	0.02%	0.02%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	0	0	2	32	38	82	4	3	127
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	24.06%	19.69%	24.92%	21.05%	27.27%	23.01%
CATEGORY%	1.78%	0.00%	0.00%	2.47%	0.18%	0.10%	0.08%	1.11%	2.48%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	6.67%	3.85%	10.00%	11.11%	0.75%	0.52%	0.30%	5.26%	9.09%	100.00%

Q34. Percentage of 2006 revenues from DOA, DOT, MC, MMCD, MAC, OR MSFC										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
0-20%	12	20	8	9	116	165	285	15	8	473
DEMOGRAPHIC%	85.71%	76.92%	80.00%	100.00%	88.55%	86.84%	60.13%	83.33%	100.00%	85.69%
CATEGORY%	2.54%	4.23%	1.69%	1.90%	24.52%	34.88%	87.96%	3.17%	1.69%	100.00%
21-40%	0	2	2	0	6	10	26	1	0	37
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	7.69%	20.00%	0.00%	4.58%	5.26%	70.27%	5.56%	0.00%	6.70%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	5.41%	5.41%	0.00%	16.22%	27.03%	8.02%	2.70%	0.00%	100.00%
41-60%	0	4	0	0	4	8	4	1	0	13
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	15.38%	0.00%	0.00%	3.05%	4.21%	30.77%	5.56%	0.00%	2.36%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	30.77%	0.00%	0.00%	30.77%	61.54%	1.23%	7.69%	0.00%	100.00%
61-80%	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	1	0	12
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.29%	1.58%	66.67%	5.56%	0.00%	2.17%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	2.47%	8.33%	0.00%	100.00%
81-100%	2	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.53%	2.11%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.91%
CATEGORY%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	80.00%	0.31%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	14	26	10	9	131	190	324	18	8	540
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	59.89%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.59%	4.81%	1.85%	1.67%	24.26%	35.19%	100.00%	3.33%	1.48%	100.00%

Q35. Has your company applied for commercial bank loan since 2006?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	5	12	2	6	42	67	101	2	5	175
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	46.15%	20.00%	66.67%	31.58%	34.72%	30.70%	10.53%	45.45%	31.70%
CATEGORY%	2.86%	6.86%	1.14%	3.43%	24.00%	38.29%	100.00%	1.14%	2.86%	100.00%
No	10	14	8	3	89	124	220	14	5	363
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	53.85%	80.00%	33.33%	66.92%	64.25%	66.87%	73.68%	45.45%	65.76%
CATEGORY%	2.75%	3.86%	2.20%	0.83%	24.52%	34.16%	100.00%	3.86%	1.38%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	3	1	14
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.50%	1.04%	2.43%	15.79%	9.09%	2.54%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	14.29%	100.00%	21.43%	7.14%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	100.00%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q36. Were you approved or denied for a commercial bank loan?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Approved	3	12	2	6	37	60	96	2	4	162
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	88.10%	89.55%	95.05%	100.00%	80.00%	92.57%
CATEGORY%	1.85%	7.41%	1.23%	3.70%	22.84%	37.04%	100.00%	1.23%	2.47%	100.00%
Denied	2	0	0	0	5	7	4	0	1	12
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.90%	10.45%	3.96%	0.00%	20.00%	6.86%
CATEGORY%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	41.67%	58.33%	100.00%	0.00%	8.33%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.99%	0.00%	0.00%	0.57%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	5	12	2	6	42	67	101	2	5	175
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.86%	6.86%	1.14%	3.43%	24.00%	38.29%	100.00%	1.14%	2.86%	100.00%

Q37. Which of the following do you think was the reason for denial?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Insufficient Business History	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	1	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	4.48%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	33.33%
CATEGORY%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	75.00%	100.00%	0.00%	25.00%	100.00%
Confusion about the Process	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	2.99%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	2.99%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%
CATEGORY%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	33.33%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	2	0	0	0	5	7	4	0	1	12
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	10.45%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	41.67%	58.33%	100.00%	0.00%	8.33%	100.00%

Q38a. Depart of Admin Barrier - Prequalification requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	2	2	3	15	23	25	0	3	51
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	7.69%	20.00%	33.33%	11.28%	11.92%	7.60%	0.00%	27.27%	9.24%
CATEGORY%	1.96%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	41.67%	45.10%	100.00%	0.00%	8.33%	100.00%
No	10	23	8	4	88	133	227	14	5	379
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	88.46%	80.00%	44.44%	66.17%	68.91%	69.00%	73.68%	45.45%	68.66%
CATEGORY%	2.64%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	41.67%	35.09%	100.00%	0.00%	8.33%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	1	0	2	30	37	77	5	3	122
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	3.85%	0.00%	22.22%	22.56%	19.17%	23.40%	26.32%	27.27%	22.10%
CATEGORY%	3.28%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	41.67%	30.33%	100.00%	0.00%	8.33%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	41.67%	34.96%	100.00%	0.00%	8.33%	100.00%

Q38a. Depart of Trans Barrier - Prequalification requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	2	3	14	23	25	0	3	51
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	7.69%	20.00%	33.33%	10.53%	11.92%	7.60%	0.00%	27.27%	9.24%
CATEGORY%	3.92%	3.92%	3.92%	5.88%	27.45%	45.10%	49.02%	0.00%	5.88%	100.00%
No	9	23	8	6	87	133	227	15	7	382
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	88.46%	80.00%	66.67%	65.41%	68.91%	69.00%	78.95%	63.64%	69.20%
CATEGORY%	2.36%	6.02%	2.09%	1.57%	22.77%	34.82%	59.42%	3.93%	1.83%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	1	0	0	32	37	77	4	1	119
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	24.06%	19.17%	23.40%	21.05%	9.09%	21.56%
CATEGORY%	3.36%	0.84%	0.00%	0.00%	26.89%	31.09%	64.71%	3.36%	0.84%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q38a. Met Council Barrier - Prequalification requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	2	3	16	25	20	0	3	48
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	7.69%	20.00%	33.33%	12.03%	12.95%	6.08%	0.00%	27.27%	8.70%
CATEGORY%	4.17%	4.17%	4.17%	6.25%	33.33%	52.08%	41.67%	0.00%	6.25%	100.00%
No	10	22	8	4	83	127	210	13	4	354
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	84.62%	80.00%	44.44%	62.41%	65.80%	63.83%	68.42%	36.36%	64.13%
CATEGORY%	2.82%	6.21%	2.26%	1.13%	23.45%	35.88%	59.32%	3.67%	1.13%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	2	0	2	34	41	99	6	4	150
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	0.00%	22.22%	25.56%	21.24%	30.09%	31.58%	36.36%	27.17%
CATEGORY%	2.00%	1.33%	0.00%	1.33%	22.67%	27.33%	66.00%	4.00%	2.67%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q38a. Mosquito Control Barrier - Prequalification requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	2	2	3	11	19	16	0	3	38
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	7.69%	20.00%	33.33%	8.27%	9.84%	4.86%	0.00%	27.27%	6.88%
CATEGORY%	2.63%	5.26%	5.26%	7.89%	28.95%	50.00%	42.11%	0.00%	7.89%	100.00%
No	8	22	8	3	74	115	179	13	3	310
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	84.62%	80.00%	33.33%	55.64%	59.59%	54.41%	68.42%	27.27%	56.16%
CATEGORY%	2.58%	7.10%	2.58%	0.97%	23.87%	37.10%	57.74%	4.19%	0.97%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	2	0	3	48	59	134	6	5	204
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	7.69%	0.00%	33.33%	36.09%	30.57%	40.73%	31.58%	45.45%	36.96%
CATEGORY%	2.94%	0.98%	0.00%	1.47%	23.53%	28.92%	65.69%	2.94%	2.45%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q38a. Airports Commission Barrier - Prequalification requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	2	2	3	14	22	19	0	3	44
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	7.69%	20.00%	33.33%	10.53%	11.40%	5.78%	0.00%	27.27%	7.97%
CATEGORY%	2.27%	4.55%	4.55%	6.82%	31.82%	50.00%	43.18%	0.00%	6.82%	100.00%
No	9	22	8	5	83	127	205	13	5	350
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	84.62%	80.00%	55.56%	62.41%	65.80%	62.31%	68.42%	45.45%	63.41%
CATEGORY%	2.57%	6.29%	2.29%	1.43%	23.71%	36.29%	58.57%	3.71%	1.43%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	2	0	1	36	44	105	6	3	158
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	7.69%	0.00%	11.11%	27.07%	22.80%	31.91%	31.58%	27.27%	28.62%
CATEGORY%	3.16%	1.27%	0.00%	0.63%	22.78%	27.85%	66.46%	3.80%	1.90%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q38a. Sports Facilities Barrier - Prequalification requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	2	2	3	12	20	18	0	3	41
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	7.69%	20.00%	33.33%	9.02%	10.36%	5.47%	0.00%	27.27%	7.43%
CATEGORY%	2.44%	4.88%	4.88%	7.32%	29.27%	48.78%	43.90%	0.00%	7.32%	100.00%
No	8	22	8	3	76	117	180	13	3	313
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	84.62%	80.00%	33.33%	57.14%	60.62%	54.71%	68.42%	27.27%	56.70%
CATEGORY%	2.56%	7.03%	2.56%	0.96%	24.28%	37.38%	57.51%	4.15%	0.96%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	2	0	3	45	56	131	6	5	198
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	7.69%	0.00%	33.33%	33.83%	29.02%	39.82%	31.58%	45.45%	35.87%
CATEGORY%	3.03%	1.01%	0.00%	1.52%	22.73%	28.28%	66.16%	3.03%	2.53%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q39b. Depart of Admin Barrier - Performance bond requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	1	5	2	16	27	10	0	1	38
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	50.00%	22.22%	12.03%	13.99%	3.04%	0.00%	9.09%	6.88%
CATEGORY%	7.89%	2.63%	13.16%	5.26%	42.11%	71.05%	26.32%	0.00%	2.63%	100.00%
No	8	24	4	5	85	126	234	14	7	381
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	92.31%	40.00%	55.56%	63.91%	65.28%	71.12%	73.68%	63.64%	69.02%
CATEGORY%	2.10%	6.30%	1.05%	1.31%	22.31%	33.07%	61.42%	3.67%	1.84%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	1	1	2	32	40	85	5	3	133
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	3.85%	10.00%	22.22%	24.06%	20.73%	25.84%	26.32%	27.27%	24.09%
CATEGORY%	3.01%	0.75%	0.75%	1.50%	24.06%	30.08%	63.91%	3.76%	2.26%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q39b. Depart of Trans Barrier - Performance bond requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	1	5	2	15	26	9	0	1	36
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	50.00%	22.22%	11.28%	13.47%	2.74%	0.00%	9.09%	6.52%
CATEGORY%	8.33%	2.78%	13.89%	5.56%	41.67%	72.22%	25.00%	0.00%	2.78%	100.00%
No	8	24	4	7	86	129	241	15	9	394
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	92.31%	40.00%	77.78%	64.66%	66.84%	73.25%	78.95%	81.82%	71.38%
CATEGORY%	2.03%	6.09%	1.02%	1.78%	21.83%	32.74%	61.17%	3.81%	2.28%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	1	1	0	32	38	79	4	1	122
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	3.85%	10.00%	0.00%	24.06%	19.69%	24.01%	21.05%	9.09%	22.10%
CATEGORY%	3.28%	0.82%	0.82%	0.00%	26.23%	31.15%	64.75%	3.28%	0.82%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q39b. Met Council Barrier - Performance bond requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	1	5	2	12	23	7	0	1	31
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	50.00%	22.22%	9.02%	11.92%	2.13%	0.00%	9.09%	5.62%
CATEGORY%	9.68%	3.23%	16.13%	6.45%	38.71%	74.19%	22.58%	0.00%	3.23%	100.00%
No	9	23	4	5	86	127	222	13	6	368
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	88.46%	40.00%	55.56%	64.66%	65.80%	67.48%	68.42%	54.55%	66.67%
CATEGORY%	2.45%	6.25%	1.09%	1.36%	23.37%	34.51%	60.33%	3.53%	1.63%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	2	1	2	35	43	100	6	4	153
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	10.00%	22.22%	26.32%	22.28%	30.40%	31.58%	36.36%	27.72%
CATEGORY%	1.96%	1.31%	0.65%	1.31%	22.88%	28.10%	65.36%	3.92%	2.61%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q39b. Mosquito Control Barrier - Performance bond requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	1	5	2	11	22	7	0	1	30
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	50.00%	22.22%	8.27%	11.40%	2.13%	0.00%	9.09%	5.43%
CATEGORY%	10.00%	3.33%	16.67%	6.67%	36.67%	73.33%	23.33%	0.00%	3.33%	100.00%
No	6	23	4	4	73	110	188	13	5	316
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	88.46%	40.00%	44.44%	54.89%	56.99%	57.14%	68.42%	45.45%	57.25%
CATEGORY%	1.90%	7.28%	1.27%	1.27%	23.10%	34.81%	59.49%	4.11%	1.58%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	2	1	3	49	61	134	6	5	206
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	7.69%	10.00%	33.33%	36.84%	31.61%	40.73%	31.58%	45.45%	37.32%
CATEGORY%	2.91%	0.97%	0.49%	1.46%	23.79%	29.61%	65.05%	2.91%	2.43%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q39b. Airports Commission Barrier- Performance bond requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	1	5	2	12	23	7	0	1	31
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	50.00%	22.22%	9.02%	11.92%	2.13%	0.00%	9.09%	5.62%
CATEGORY%	9.68%	3.23%	16.13%	6.45%	38.71%	74.19%	22.58%	0.00%	3.23%	100.00%
No	7	23	4	6	84	124	215	13	7	359
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	88.46%	40.00%	66.67%	63.16%	64.25%	65.35%	68.42%	63.64%	65.04%
CATEGORY%	1.95%	6.41%	1.11%	1.67%	23.40%	34.54%	59.89%	3.62%	1.95%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	2	1	1	37	46	107	6	3	162
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	7.69%	10.00%	11.11%	27.82%	23.83%	32.52%	31.58%	27.27%	29.35%
CATEGORY%	3.09%	1.23%	0.62%	0.62%	22.84%	28.40%	66.05%	3.70%	1.85%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q39b. Sports Facilities Barrier - Performance bond requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	1	5	2	12	23	8	0	1	32
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	50.00%	22.22%	9.02%	11.92%	2.43%	0.00%	9.09%	5.80%
CATEGORY%	9.38%	3.13%	15.63%	6.25%	37.50%	71.88%	25.00%	0.00%	3.13%	100.00%
No	6	23	4	4	75	112	190	13	5	320
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	88.46%	40.00%	44.44%	56.39%	58.03%	57.75%	68.42%	45.45%	57.97%
CATEGORY%	1.88%	7.19%	1.25%	1.25%	23.44%	35.00%	59.38%	4.06%	1.56%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	2	1	3	46	58	131	6	5	200
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	7.69%	10.00%	33.33%	34.59%	30.05%	39.82%	31.58%	45.45%	36.23%
CATEGORY%	3.00%	1.00%	0.50%	1.50%	23.00%	29.00%	65.50%	3.00%	2.50%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q40c. Depart of Admin Barrier - Financing										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	4	0	3	2	11	20	6	0	0	26
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	0.00%	30.00%	22.22%	8.27%	10.36%	1.82%	0.00%	0.00%	4.71%
CATEGORY%	15.38%	0.00%	11.54%	7.69%	42.31%	76.92%	23.08%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	8	25	7	5	91	136	239	14	8	397
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	96.15%	70.00%	55.56%	68.42%	70.47%	72.64%	73.68%	72.73%	71.92%
CATEGORY%	2.02%	6.30%	1.76%	1.26%	22.92%	34.26%	60.20%	3.53%	2.02%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	1	0	2	31	37	84	5	3	129
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	0.00%	22.22%	23.31%	19.17%	25.53%	26.32%	27.27%	23.37%
CATEGORY%	2.33%	0.78%	0.00%	1.55%	24.03%	28.68%	65.12%	3.88%	2.33%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q40c. Depart of Trans Barrier - Financing										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	0	3	2	11	19	7	0	0	26
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	0.00%	30.00%	22.22%	8.27%	9.84%	2.13%	0.00%	0.00%	4.71%
CATEGORY%	11.54%	0.00%	11.54%	7.69%	42.31%	73.08%	26.92%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	8	25	7	7	91	138	244	16	10	408
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	96.15%	70.00%	77.78%	68.42%	71.50%	74.16%	84.21%	90.91%	73.91%
CATEGORY%	1.96%	6.13%	1.72%	1.72%	22.30%	33.82%	59.80%	3.92%	2.45%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	1	0	0	31	36	78	3	1	118
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	23.31%	18.65%	23.71%	15.79%	9.09%	21.38%
CATEGORY%	3.39%	0.85%	0.00%	0.00%	26.27%	30.51%	66.10%	2.54%	0.85%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q40c. Met Council Barrier - Financing										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	4	0	3	2	12	21	5	0	0	26
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	0.00%	30.00%	22.22%	9.02%	10.88%	1.52%	0.00%	0.00%	4.71%
CATEGORY%	15.38%	0.00%	11.54%	7.69%	46.15%	80.77%	19.23%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	8	24	7	5	87	131	225	13	7	376
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	92.31%	70.00%	55.56%	65.41%	67.88%	68.39%	68.42%	63.64%	68.12%
CATEGORY%	2.13%	6.38%	1.86%	1.33%	23.14%	34.84%	59.84%	3.46%	1.86%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	2	0	2	34	41	99	6	4	150
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	0.00%	22.22%	25.56%	21.24%	30.09%	31.58%	36.36%	27.17%
CATEGORY%	2.00%	1.33%	0.00%	1.33%	22.67%	27.33%	66.00%	4.00%	2.67%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q40c. Mosquito Control Barrier - Financing										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	0	3	2	10	18	5	0	0	23
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	0.00%	30.00%	22.22%	7.52%	9.33%	1.52%	0.00%	0.00%	4.17%
CATEGORY%	13.04%	0.00%	13.04%	8.70%	43.48%	78.26%	21.74%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	6	24	7	4	75	116	189	13	6	324
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	92.31%	70.00%	44.44%	56.39%	60.10%	57.45%	68.42%	54.55%	58.70%
CATEGORY%	1.85%	7.41%	2.16%	1.23%	23.15%	35.80%	58.33%	4.01%	1.85%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	2	0	3	48	59	135	6	5	205
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	7.69%	0.00%	33.33%	36.09%	30.57%	41.03%	31.58%	45.45%	37.14%
CATEGORY%	2.93%	0.98%	0.00%	1.46%	23.41%	28.78%	65.85%	2.93%	2.44%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q40c. Airports Commission Barrier - Financing										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	0	3	2	11	19	5	0	0	24
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	0.00%	30.00%	22.22%	8.27%	9.84%	1.52%	0.00%	0.00%	4.35%
CATEGORY%	12.50%	0.00%	12.50%	8.33%	45.83%	79.17%	20.83%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	7	24	7	6	86	130	218	13	8	369
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	92.31%	70.00%	66.67%	64.66%	67.36%	66.26%	68.42%	72.73%	66.85%
CATEGORY%	1.90%	6.50%	1.90%	1.63%	23.31%	35.23%	59.08%	3.52%	2.17%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	2	0	1	36	44	106	6	3	159
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	7.69%	0.00%	11.11%	27.07%	22.80%	32.22%	31.58%	27.27%	28.80%
CATEGORY%	3.14%	1.26%	0.00%	0.63%	22.64%	27.67%	66.67%	3.77%	1.89%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q40c. Sports Facilities Barrier - Financing										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	0	3	2	10	18	6	0	0	24
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	0.00%	30.00%	22.22%	7.52%	9.33%	1.82%	0.00%	0.00%	4.35%
CATEGORY%	12.50%	0.00%	12.50%	8.33%	41.67%	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	6	24	7	4	78	119	191	13	6	329
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	92.31%	70.00%	44.44%	58.65%	61.66%	58.05%	68.42%	54.55%	59.60%
CATEGORY%	1.82%	7.29%	2.13%	1.22%	23.71%	36.17%	58.05%	3.95%	1.82%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	2	0	3	45	56	132	6	5	199
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	7.69%	0.00%	33.33%	33.83%	29.02%	40.12%	31.58%	45.45%	36.05%
CATEGORY%	3.02%	1.01%	0.00%	1.51%	22.61%	28.14%	66.33%	3.02%	2.51%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q41d. Depart of Admin Barrier - Insurance requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	1	0	12	17	11	0	1	29
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	7.69%	10.00%	0.00%	9.02%	8.81%	3.34%	0.00%	9.09%	5.25%
CATEGORY%	6.90%	6.90%	3.45%	0.00%	41.38%	58.62%	37.93%	0.00%	3.45%	100.00%
No	10	23	9	7	89	138	234	14	7	393
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	88.46%	90.00%	77.78%	66.92%	71.50%	71.12%	73.68%	63.64%	71.20%
CATEGORY%	2.54%	5.85%	2.29%	1.78%	22.65%	35.11%	59.54%	3.56%	1.78%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	1	0	2	32	38	84	5	3	130
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	0.00%	22.22%	24.06%	19.69%	25.53%	26.32%	27.27%	23.55%
CATEGORY%	2.31%	0.77%	0.00%	1.54%	24.62%	29.23%	64.62%	3.85%	2.31%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q41d. Depart of Trans Barrier - Insurance requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	1	0	12	17	9	0	1	27
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	7.69%	10.00%	0.00%	9.02%	8.81%	2.74%	0.00%	9.09%	4.89%
CATEGORY%	7.41%	7.41%	3.70%	0.00%	44.44%	62.96%	33.33%	0.00%	3.70%	100.00%
No	9	23	9	9	89	139	241	15	9	404
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	88.46%	90.00%	100.00%	66.92%	72.02%	73.25%	78.95%	81.82%	73.19%
CATEGORY%	2.23%	5.69%	2.23%	2.23%	22.03%	34.41%	59.65%	3.71%	2.23%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	1	0	0	32	37	79	4	1	121
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	24.06%	19.17%	24.01%	21.05%	9.09%	21.92%
CATEGORY%	3.31%	0.83%	0.00%	0.00%	26.45%	30.58%	65.29%	3.31%	0.83%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q41d. Met Council Barrier - Insurance requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	1	0	12	17	9	0	1	27
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	7.69%	10.00%	0.00%	9.02%	8.81%	2.74%	0.00%	9.09%	4.89%
CATEGORY%	7.41%	7.41%	3.70%	0.00%	44.44%	62.96%	33.33%	0.00%	3.70%	100.00%
No	10	22	9	7	86	134	221	13	6	374
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	84.62%	90.00%	77.78%	64.66%	69.43%	67.17%	68.42%	54.55%	67.75%
CATEGORY%	2.67%	5.88%	2.41%	1.87%	22.99%	35.83%	59.09%	3.48%	1.60%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	2	0	2	35	42	99	6	4	151
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	0.00%	22.22%	26.32%	21.76%	30.09%	31.58%	36.36%	27.36%
CATEGORY%	1.99%	1.32%	0.00%	1.32%	23.18%	27.81%	65.56%	3.97%	2.65%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q41d. Mosquito Control Barrier - Insurance requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	1	0	10	15	7	0	1	23
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	7.69%	10.00%	0.00%	7.52%	7.77%	2.13%	0.00%	9.09%	4.17%
CATEGORY%	8.70%	8.70%	4.35%	0.00%	43.48%	65.22%	30.43%	0.00%	4.35%	100.00%
No	7	22	9	6	75	119	187	13	5	324
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	84.62%	90.00%	66.67%	56.39%	61.66%	56.84%	68.42%	45.45%	58.70%
CATEGORY%	2.16%	6.79%	2.78%	1.85%	23.15%	36.73%	57.72%	4.01%	1.54%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	2	0	3	48	59	135	6	5	205
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	7.69%	0.00%	33.33%	36.09%	30.57%	41.03%	31.58%	45.45%	37.14%
CATEGORY%	2.93%	0.98%	0.00%	1.46%	23.41%	28.78%	65.85%	2.93%	2.44%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q41d. Airports Commission Barrier - Insurance requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	1	0	11	16	8	0	1	25
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	7.69%	10.00%	0.00%	8.27%	8.29%	2.43%	0.00%	9.09%	4.53%
CATEGORY%	8.00%	8.00%	4.00%	0.00%	44.00%	64.00%	32.00%	0.00%	4.00%	100.00%
No	8	22	9	8	85	132	215	13	7	367
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	84.62%	90.00%	88.89%	63.91%	68.39%	65.35%	68.42%	63.64%	66.49%
CATEGORY%	2.18%	5.99%	2.45%	2.18%	23.16%	35.97%	58.58%	3.54%	1.91%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	2	0	1	37	45	106	6	3	160
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	7.69%	0.00%	11.11%	27.82%	23.32%	32.22%	31.58%	27.27%	28.99%
CATEGORY%	3.13%	1.25%	0.00%	0.63%	23.13%	28.13%	66.25%	3.75%	1.88%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q41d. Sports Facilities Barrier - Insurance requirements										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	1	0	10	15	7	0	1	23
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	7.69%	10.00%	0.00%	7.52%	7.77%	2.13%	0.00%	9.09%	4.17%
CATEGORY%	8.70%	8.70%	4.35%	0.00%	43.48%	65.22%	30.43%	0.00%	4.35%	100.00%
No	7	22	9	6	78	122	190	13	5	330
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	84.62%	90.00%	66.67%	58.65%	63.21%	57.75%	68.42%	45.45%	59.78%
CATEGORY%	2.12%	6.67%	2.73%	1.82%	23.64%	36.97%	57.58%	3.94%	1.52%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	2	0	3	45	56	132	6	5	199
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	7.69%	0.00%	33.33%	33.83%	29.02%	40.12%	31.58%	45.45%	36.05%
CATEGORY%	3.02%	1.01%	0.00%	1.51%	22.61%	28.14%	66.33%	3.02%	2.51%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q42e. Depart of Admin Barrier - Bid specifications										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	4	5	1	23	35	30	0	3	68
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	15.38%	50.00%	11.11%	17.29%	18.13%	9.12%	0.00%	27.27%	12.32%
CATEGORY%	2.94%	5.88%	7.35%	1.47%	33.82%	51.47%	44.12%	0.00%	4.41%	100.00%
No	10	21	5	6	80	122	213	14	5	354
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	80.77%	50.00%	66.67%	60.15%	63.21%	64.74%	73.68%	45.45%	64.13%
CATEGORY%	2.82%	5.93%	1.41%	1.69%	22.60%	34.46%	60.17%	3.95%	1.41%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	1	0	2	30	36	86	5	3	130
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	0.00%	22.22%	22.56%	18.65%	26.14%	26.32%	27.27%	23.55%
CATEGORY%	2.31%	0.77%	0.00%	1.54%	23.08%	27.69%	66.15%	3.85%	2.31%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q42e. Depart of Trans Barrier - Bid specifications										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	4	5	1	26	38	28	1	3	70
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	15.38%	50.00%	11.11%	19.55%	19.69%	8.51%	5.26%	27.27%	12.68%
CATEGORY%	2.86%	5.71%	7.14%	1.43%	37.14%	54.29%	40.00%	1.43%	4.29%	100.00%
No	9	21	5	8	79	122	223	14	7	366
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	80.77%	50.00%	88.89%	59.40%	63.21%	67.78%	73.68%	63.64%	66.30%
CATEGORY%	2.46%	5.74%	1.37%	2.19%	21.58%	33.33%	60.93%	3.83%	1.91%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	1	0	0	28	33	78	4	1	116
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	21.05%	17.10%	23.71%	21.05%	9.09%	21.01%
CATEGORY%	3.45%	0.86%	0.00%	0.00%	24.14%	28.45%	67.24%	3.45%	0.86%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q42e. Met Council Barrier - Bid specifications										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	4	5	1	20	32	27	0	3	62
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	15.38%	50.00%	11.11%	15.04%	16.58%	8.21%	0.00%	27.27%	11.23%
CATEGORY%	3.23%	6.45%	8.06%	1.61%	32.26%	51.61%	43.55%	0.00%	4.84%	100.00%
No	10	20	5	6	80	121	202	13	4	340
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	76.92%	50.00%	66.67%	60.15%	62.69%	61.40%	68.42%	36.36%	61.59%
CATEGORY%	2.94%	5.88%	1.47%	1.76%	23.53%	35.59%	59.41%	3.82%	1.18%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	2	0	2	33	40	100	6	4	150
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	0.00%	22.22%	24.81%	20.73%	30.40%	31.58%	36.36%	27.17%
CATEGORY%	2.00%	1.33%	0.00%	1.33%	22.00%	26.67%	66.67%	4.00%	2.67%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q42e. Mosquito Control Barrier - Bid specifications										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	4	5	1	15	27	21	0	3	51
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	15.38%	50.00%	11.11%	11.28%	13.99%	6.38%	0.00%	27.27%	9.24%
CATEGORY%	3.92%	7.84%	9.80%	1.96%	29.41%	52.94%	41.18%	0.00%	5.88%	100.00%
No	7	20	5	5	68	105	173	13	3	294
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	76.92%	50.00%	55.56%	51.13%	54.40%	52.58%	68.42%	27.27%	53.26%
CATEGORY%	2.38%	6.80%	1.70%	1.70%	23.13%	35.71%	58.84%	4.42%	1.02%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	2	0	3	50	61	135	6	5	207
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	7.69%	0.00%	33.33%	37.59%	31.61%	41.03%	31.58%	45.45%	37.50%
CATEGORY%	2.90%	0.97%	0.00%	1.45%	24.15%	29.47%	65.22%	2.90%	2.42%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q42e. Airports Commission Barrier - Bid specifications										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	4	5	1	18	30	23	0	3	56
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	15.38%	50.00%	11.11%	13.53%	15.54%	6.99%	0.00%	27.27%	10.14%
CATEGORY%	3.57%	7.14%	8.93%	1.79%	32.14%	53.57%	41.07%	0.00%	5.36%	100.00%
No	8	20	5	7	80	120	199	13	5	337
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	76.92%	50.00%	77.78%	60.15%	62.18%	60.49%	68.42%	45.45%	61.05%
CATEGORY%	2.37%	5.93%	1.48%	2.08%	23.74%	35.61%	59.05%	3.86%	1.48%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	2	0	1	35	43	107	6	3	159
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	7.69%	0.00%	11.11%	26.32%	22.28%	32.52%	31.58%	27.27%	28.80%
CATEGORY%	3.14%	1.26%	0.00%	0.63%	22.01%	27.04%	67.30%	3.77%	1.89%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q42e. Sports Facilities Barrier - Bid specifications										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	4	5	1	17	29	22	0	3	54
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	15.38%	50.00%	11.11%	12.78%	15.03%	6.69%	0.00%	27.27%	9.78%
CATEGORY%	3.70%	7.41%	9.26%	1.85%	31.48%	53.70%	40.74%	0.00%	5.56%	100.00%
No	7	20	5	5	71	108	175	13	3	299
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	76.92%	50.00%	55.56%	53.38%	55.96%	53.19%	68.42%	27.27%	54.17%
CATEGORY%	2.34%	6.69%	1.67%	1.67%	23.75%	36.12%	58.53%	4.35%	1.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	2	0	3	45	56	132	6	5	199
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	7.69%	0.00%	33.33%	33.83%	29.02%	40.12%	31.58%	45.45%	36.05%
CATEGORY%	3.02%	1.01%	0.00%	1.51%	22.61%	28.14%	66.33%	3.02%	2.51%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q43f. Depart of Admin Barrier - Limited time to prepare bids										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	4	2	4	1	15	26	20	1	2	49
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	7.69%	40.00%	11.11%	11.28%	13.47%	6.08%	5.26%	18.18%	8.88%
CATEGORY%	8.16%	4.08%	8.16%	2.04%	30.61%	53.06%	40.82%	2.04%	4.08%	100.00%
No	8	23	6	5	84	126	222	13	6	367
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	88.46%	60.00%	55.56%	63.16%	65.28%	67.48%	68.42%	54.55%	66.49%
CATEGORY%	2.18%	6.27%	1.63%	1.36%	22.89%	34.33%	60.49%	3.54%	1.63%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	1	0	3	34	41	87	5	3	136
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	0.00%	33.33%	25.56%	21.24%	26.44%	26.32%	27.27%	24.64%
CATEGORY%	2.21%	0.74%	0.00%	2.21%	25.00%	30.15%	63.97%	3.68%	2.21%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q43f. Depart of Trans Barrier - Limited time to prepare bids										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	2	4	1	16	26	22	1	2	51
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	40.00%	11.11%	12.03%	13.47%	6.69%	5.26%	18.18%	9.24%
CATEGORY%	5.88%	3.92%	7.84%	1.96%	31.37%	50.98%	43.14%	1.96%	3.92%	100.00%
No	8	23	6	7	85	129	229	14	8	380
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	88.46%	60.00%	77.78%	63.91%	66.84%	69.60%	73.68%	72.73%	68.84%
CATEGORY%	2.11%	6.05%	1.58%	1.84%	22.37%	33.95%	60.26%	3.68%	2.11%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	1	0	1	32	38	78	4	1	121
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	3.85%	0.00%	11.11%	24.06%	19.69%	23.71%	21.05%	9.09%	21.92%
CATEGORY%	3.31%	0.83%	0.00%	0.83%	26.45%	31.40%	64.46%	3.31%	0.83%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q43f. Met Council Barrier - Limited time to prepare bids										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	2	4	1	14	24	17	1	1	43
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	40.00%	11.11%	10.53%	12.44%	5.17%	5.26%	9.09%	7.79%
CATEGORY%	6.98%	4.65%	9.30%	2.33%	32.56%	55.81%	39.53%	2.33%	2.33%	100.00%
No	9	22	6	5	82	124	210	12	6	352
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	84.62%	60.00%	55.56%	61.65%	64.25%	63.83%	63.16%	54.55%	63.77%
CATEGORY%	2.56%	6.25%	1.70%	1.42%	23.30%	35.23%	59.66%	3.41%	1.70%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	2	0	3	37	45	102	6	4	157
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	0.00%	33.33%	27.82%	23.32%	31.00%	31.58%	36.36%	28.44%
CATEGORY%	1.91%	1.27%	0.00%	1.91%	23.57%	28.66%	64.97%	3.82%	2.55%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q43f. Mosquito Control Barrier - Limited time to prepare bids										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	2	4	1	12	22	13	1	1	37
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	40.00%	11.11%	9.02%	11.40%	3.95%	5.26%	9.09%	6.70%
CATEGORY%	8.11%	5.41%	10.81%	2.70%	32.43%	59.46%	35.14%	2.70%	2.70%	100.00%
No	6	21	6	4	70	107	181	12	5	305
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	80.77%	60.00%	44.44%	52.63%	55.44%	55.02%	63.16%	45.45%	55.25%
CATEGORY%	1.97%	6.89%	1.97%	1.31%	22.95%	35.08%	59.34%	3.93%	1.64%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	3	0	4	51	64	135	6	5	210
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	11.54%	0.00%	44.44%	38.35%	33.16%	41.03%	31.58%	45.45%	38.04%
CATEGORY%	2.86%	1.43%	0.00%	1.90%	24.29%	30.48%	64.29%	2.86%	2.38%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q43f. Airports Commission Barrier - Limited time to prepare bids										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	2	4	1	13	23	17	1	2	43
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	40.00%	11.11%	9.77%	11.92%	5.17%	5.26%	18.18%	7.79%
CATEGORY%	6.98%	4.65%	9.30%	2.33%	30.23%	53.49%	39.53%	2.33%	4.65%	100.00%
No	7	22	6	6	82	123	203	12	6	344
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	84.62%	60.00%	66.67%	61.65%	63.73%	61.70%	63.16%	54.55%	62.32%
CATEGORY%	2.03%	6.40%	1.74%	1.74%	23.84%	35.76%	59.01%	3.49%	1.74%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	2	0	2	38	47	109	6	3	165
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	7.69%	0.00%	22.22%	28.57%	24.35%	33.13%	31.58%	27.27%	29.89%
CATEGORY%	3.03%	1.21%	0.00%	1.21%	23.03%	28.48%	66.06%	3.64%	1.82%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q43f. Sports Facilities Barrier - Limited time to prepare bids										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	2	4	1	12	22	14	1	1	38
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	40.00%	11.11%	9.02%	11.40%	4.26%	5.26%	9.09%	6.88%
CATEGORY%	7.89%	5.26%	10.53%	2.63%	31.58%	57.89%	36.84%	2.63%	2.63%	100.00%
No	6	21	6	4	74	111	182	12	5	310
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	80.77%	60.00%	44.44%	55.64%	57.51%	55.32%	63.16%	45.45%	56.16%
CATEGORY%	1.94%	6.77%	1.94%	1.29%	23.87%	35.81%	58.71%	3.87%	1.61%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	3	0	4	47	60	133	6	5	204
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	11.54%	0.00%	44.44%	35.34%	31.09%	40.43%	31.58%	45.45%	36.96%
CATEGORY%	2.94%	1.47%	0.00%	1.96%	23.04%	29.41%	65.20%	2.94%	2.45%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q44g. Depart of Admin Barrier - Limited knowledge policies and procedures										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	3	2	1	22	31	26	0	2	59
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	11.54%	20.00%	11.11%	16.54%	16.06%	7.90%	0.00%	18.18%	10.69%
CATEGORY%	5.08%	5.08%	3.39%	1.69%	37.29%	52.54%	44.07%	0.00%	3.39%	100.00%
No	10	22	7	6	80	125	216	14	6	361
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	84.62%	70.00%	66.67%	60.15%	64.77%	65.65%	73.68%	54.55%	65.40%
CATEGORY%	2.77%	6.09%	1.94%	1.66%	22.16%	34.63%	59.83%	3.88%	1.66%	100.00%
Don't Know	2	1	1	2	31	37	87	5	3	132
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	3.85%	10.00%	22.22%	23.31%	19.17%	26.44%	26.32%	27.27%	23.91%
CATEGORY%	1.52%	0.76%	0.76%	1.52%	23.48%	28.03%	65.91%	3.79%	2.27%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q44g. Depart of Trans Barrier - Limited knowledge policies and procedures										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	3	2	1	23	32	20	0	2	54
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	11.54%	20.00%	11.11%	17.29%	16.58%	6.08%	0.00%	18.18%	9.78%
CATEGORY%	5.56%	5.56%	3.70%	1.85%	42.59%	59.26%	37.04%	0.00%	3.70%	100.00%
No	9	22	7	8	82	128	231	15	8	382
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	84.62%	70.00%	88.89%	61.65%	66.32%	70.21%	78.95%	72.73%	69.20%
CATEGORY%	2.36%	5.76%	1.83%	2.09%	21.47%	33.51%	60.47%	3.93%	2.09%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	1	1	0	28	33	78	4	1	116
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	10.00%	0.00%	21.05%	17.10%	23.71%	21.05%	9.09%	21.01%
CATEGORY%	2.59%	0.86%	0.86%	0.00%	24.14%	28.45%	67.24%	3.45%	0.86%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q44g. Met Council Barrier - Limited knowledge policies and procedures										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	3	2	1	19	28	21	0	2	51
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	11.54%	20.00%	11.11%	14.29%	14.51%	6.38%	0.00%	18.18%	9.24%
CATEGORY%	5.88%	5.88%	3.92%	1.96%	37.25%	54.90%	41.18%	0.00%	3.92%	100.00%
No	10	21	7	6	79	123	206	13	5	347
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	80.77%	70.00%	66.67%	59.40%	63.73%	62.61%	68.42%	45.45%	62.86%
CATEGORY%	2.88%	6.05%	2.02%	1.73%	22.77%	35.45%	59.37%	3.75%	1.44%	100.00%
Don't Know	2	2	1	2	35	42	102	6	4	154
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	7.69%	10.00%	22.22%	26.32%	21.76%	31.00%	31.58%	36.36%	27.90%
CATEGORY%	1.30%	1.30%	0.65%	1.30%	22.73%	27.27%	66.23%	3.90%	2.60%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q44g. Mosquito Control Barrier - Limited knowledge policies and procedures										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	3	2	1	16	25	16	0	2	43
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	11.54%	20.00%	11.11%	12.03%	12.95%	4.86%	0.00%	18.18%	7.79%
CATEGORY%	6.98%	6.98%	4.65%	2.33%	37.21%	58.14%	37.21%	0.00%	4.65%	100.00%
No	7	20	7	5	67	106	176	13	4	299
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	76.92%	70.00%	55.56%	50.38%	54.92%	53.50%	68.42%	36.36%	54.17%
CATEGORY%	2.34%	6.69%	2.34%	1.67%	22.41%	35.45%	58.86%	4.35%	1.34%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	3	1	3	50	62	137	6	5	210
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	11.54%	10.00%	33.33%	37.59%	32.12%	41.64%	31.58%	45.45%	38.04%
CATEGORY%	2.38%	1.43%	0.48%	1.43%	23.81%	29.52%	65.24%	2.86%	2.38%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q44g. Airports Commission Barrier - Limited knowledge policies and procedures										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	3	2	1	17	26	20	0	2	48
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	11.54%	20.00%	11.11%	12.78%	13.47%	6.08%	0.00%	18.18%	8.70%
CATEGORY%	6.25%	6.25%	4.17%	2.08%	35.42%	54.17%	41.67%	0.00%	4.17%	100.00%
No	8	21	7	7	80	123	201	13	6	343
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	80.77%	70.00%	77.78%	60.15%	63.73%	61.09%	68.42%	54.55%	62.14%
CATEGORY%	2.33%	6.12%	2.04%	2.04%	23.32%	35.86%	58.60%	3.79%	1.75%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	2	1	1	36	44	108	6	3	161
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	7.69%	10.00%	11.11%	27.07%	22.80%	32.83%	31.58%	27.27%	29.17%
CATEGORY%	2.48%	1.24%	0.62%	0.62%	22.36%	27.33%	67.08%	3.73%	1.86%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q44g. Sports Facilities Barrier - Limited knowledge policies and procedures										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	3	2	1	16	25	17	0	2	44
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	11.54%	20.00%	11.11%	12.03%	12.95%	5.17%	0.00%	18.18%	7.97%
CATEGORY%	6.82%	6.82%	4.55%	2.27%	36.36%	56.82%	38.64%	0.00%	4.55%	100.00%
No	7	20	7	5	71	110	178	13	4	305
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	76.92%	70.00%	55.56%	53.38%	56.99%	54.10%	68.42%	36.36%	55.25%
CATEGORY%	2.30%	6.56%	2.30%	1.64%	23.28%	36.07%	58.36%	4.26%	1.31%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	3	1	3	46	58	134	6	5	203
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	11.54%	10.00%	33.33%	34.59%	30.05%	40.73%	31.58%	45.45%	36.78%
CATEGORY%	2.46%	1.48%	0.49%	1.48%	22.66%	28.57%	66.01%	2.96%	2.46%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q45h. Depart of Admin Barrier - Lack of experience										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	0	1	0	12	15	16	0	1	32
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	9.02%	7.77%	4.86%	0.00%	9.09%	5.80%
CATEGORY%	6.25%	0.00%	3.13%	0.00%	37.50%	46.88%	50.00%	0.00%	3.13%	100.00%
No	10	25	9	7	90	141	231	14	7	393
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	96.15%	90.00%	77.78%	67.67%	73.06%	70.21%	73.68%	63.64%	71.20%
CATEGORY%	2.54%	6.36%	2.29%	1.78%	22.90%	35.88%	58.78%	3.56%	1.78%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	1	0	2	31	37	82	5	3	127
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	0.00%	22.22%	23.31%	19.17%	24.92%	26.32%	27.27%	23.01%
CATEGORY%	2.36%	0.79%	0.00%	1.57%	24.41%	29.13%	64.57%	3.94%	2.36%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q45h. Depart of Trans Barrier - Lack of experience										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	0	1	0	14	18	15	1	1	35
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	10.53%	9.33%	4.56%	5.26%	9.09%	6.34%
CATEGORY%	8.57%	0.00%	2.86%	0.00%	40.00%	51.43%	42.86%	2.86%	2.86%	100.00%
No	8	25	9	9	91	142	240	14	9	405
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	96.15%	90.00%	100.00%	68.42%	73.58%	72.95%	73.68%	81.82%	73.37%
CATEGORY%	1.98%	6.17%	2.22%	2.22%	22.47%	35.06%	59.26%	3.46%	2.22%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	1	0	0	28	33	74	4	1	112
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	21.05%	17.10%	22.49%	21.05%	9.09%	20.29%
CATEGORY%	3.57%	0.89%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	29.46%	66.07%	3.57%	0.89%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q45h. MetrCouncil Barrier - Lack of experience										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	0	1	0	12	16	15	0	1	32
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	9.02%	8.29%	4.56%	0.00%	9.09%	5.80%
CATEGORY%	9.38%	0.00%	3.13%	0.00%	37.50%	50.00%	46.88%	0.00%	3.13%	100.00%
No	9	24	9	7	87	136	217	13	6	372
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	92.31%	90.00%	77.78%	65.41%	70.47%	65.96%	68.42%	54.55%	67.39%
CATEGORY%	2.42%	6.45%	2.42%	1.88%	23.39%	36.56%	58.33%	3.49%	1.61%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	2	0	2	34	41	97	6	4	148
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	0.00%	22.22%	25.56%	21.24%	29.48%	31.58%	36.36%	26.81%
CATEGORY%	2.03%	1.35%	0.00%	1.35%	22.97%	27.70%	65.54%	4.05%	2.70%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q45h. Mosquito Control Barrier - Lack of experience										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	0	1	0	8	11	9	0	1	21
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	6.02%	5.70%	2.74%	0.00%	9.09%	3.80%
CATEGORY%	9.52%	0.00%	4.76%	0.00%	38.10%	52.38%	42.86%	0.00%	4.76%	100.00%
No	7	23	9	6	76	121	188	13	5	327
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	88.46%	90.00%	66.67%	57.14%	62.69%	57.14%	68.42%	45.45%	59.24%
CATEGORY%	2.14%	7.03%	2.75%	1.83%	23.24%	37.00%	57.49%	3.98%	1.53%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	3	0	3	49	61	132	6	5	204
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	11.54%	0.00%	33.33%	36.84%	31.61%	40.12%	31.58%	45.45%	36.96%
CATEGORY%	2.94%	1.47%	0.00%	1.47%	24.02%	29.90%	64.71%	2.94%	2.45%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q45h. Airports Commission Barrier - Lack of experience										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	0	1	0	12	15	13	0	1	29
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	9.02%	7.77%	3.95%	0.00%	9.09%	5.25%
CATEGORY%	6.90%	0.00%	3.45%	0.00%	41.38%	51.72%	44.83%	0.00%	3.45%	100.00%
No	8	24	9	8	86	135	212	13	7	367
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	92.31%	90.00%	88.89%	64.66%	69.95%	64.44%	68.42%	63.64%	66.49%
CATEGORY%	2.18%	6.54%	2.45%	2.18%	23.43%	36.78%	57.77%	3.54%	1.91%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	2	0	1	35	43	104	6	3	156
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	7.69%	0.00%	11.11%	26.32%	22.28%	31.61%	31.58%	27.27%	28.26%
CATEGORY%	3.21%	1.28%	0.00%	0.64%	22.44%	27.56%	66.67%	3.85%	1.92%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q45h. Sports Facilities Barrier - Lack of experience										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	0	1	0	9	12	10	0	1	23
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	6.77%	6.22%	3.04%	0.00%	9.09%	4.17%
CATEGORY%	8.70%	0.00%	4.35%	0.00%	39.13%	52.17%	43.48%	0.00%	4.35%	100.00%
No	7	23	9	6	79	124	190	13	5	332
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	88.46%	90.00%	66.67%	59.40%	64.25%	57.75%	68.42%	45.45%	60.14%
CATEGORY%	2.11%	6.93%	2.71%	1.81%	23.80%	37.35%	57.23%	3.92%	1.51%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	3	0	3	45	57	129	6	5	197
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	11.54%	0.00%	33.33%	33.83%	29.53%	39.21%	31.58%	45.45%	35.69%
CATEGORY%	3.05%	1.52%	0.00%	1.52%	22.84%	28.93%	65.48%	3.05%	2.54%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q46i. Depart of Admin Barrier - Lack of personnel										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	1	1	1	9	14	8	0	0	22
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	3.85%	10.00%	11.11%	6.77%	7.25%	2.43%	0.00%	0.00%	3.99%
CATEGORY%	9.09%	4.55%	4.55%	4.55%	40.91%	63.64%	36.36%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	10	24	9	6	93	142	239	14	8	403
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	92.31%	90.00%	66.67%	69.92%	73.58%	72.64%	73.68%	72.73%	73.01%
CATEGORY%	2.48%	5.96%	2.23%	1.49%	23.08%	35.24%	59.31%	3.47%	1.99%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	1	0	2	31	37	82	5	3	127
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	0.00%	22.22%	23.31%	19.17%	24.92%	26.32%	27.27%	23.01%
CATEGORY%	2.36%	0.79%	0.00%	1.57%	24.41%	29.13%	64.57%	3.94%	2.36%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q46i. Depart of Trans Barrier - Lack of personnel										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	1	1	1	9	14	10	0	0	24
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	3.85%	10.00%	11.11%	6.77%	7.25%	3.04%	0.00%	0.00%	4.35%
CATEGORY%	8.33%	4.17%	4.17%	4.17%	37.50%	58.33%	41.67%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	9	24	9	8	95	145	245	15	10	415
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	92.31%	90.00%	88.89%	71.43%	75.13%	74.47%	78.95%	90.91%	75.18%
CATEGORY%	2.17%	5.78%	2.17%	1.93%	22.89%	34.94%	59.04%	3.61%	2.41%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	1	0	0	29	34	74	4	1	113
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	21.80%	17.62%	22.49%	21.05%	9.09%	20.47%
CATEGORY%	3.54%	0.88%	0.00%	0.00%	25.66%	30.09%	65.49%	3.54%	0.88%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q46i. Met Council Barrier - Lack of personnel										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	1	1	1	9	14	9	0	0	23
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	3.85%	10.00%	11.11%	6.77%	7.25%	2.74%	0.00%	0.00%	4.17%
CATEGORY%	8.70%	4.35%	4.35%	4.35%	39.13%	60.87%	39.13%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	10	23	9	6	89	137	223	13	7	380
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	88.46%	90.00%	66.67%	66.92%	70.98%	67.78%	68.42%	63.64%	68.84%
CATEGORY%	2.63%	6.05%	2.37%	1.58%	23.42%	36.05%	58.68%	3.42%	1.84%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	2	0	2	35	42	97	6	4	149
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	0.00%	22.22%	26.32%	21.76%	29.48%	31.58%	36.36%	26.99%
CATEGORY%	2.01%	1.34%	0.00%	1.34%	23.49%	28.19%	65.10%	4.03%	2.68%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q46i. Mosquito Control Barrier - Lack of personnel										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	1	1	1	7	12	5	0	0	17
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	3.85%	10.00%	11.11%	5.26%	6.22%	1.52%	0.00%	0.00%	3.08%
CATEGORY%	11.76%	5.88%	5.88%	5.88%	41.18%	70.59%	29.41%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	7	22	9	5	77	120	192	13	6	331
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	84.62%	90.00%	55.56%	57.89%	62.18%	58.36%	68.42%	54.55%	59.96%
CATEGORY%	2.11%	6.65%	2.72%	1.51%	23.26%	36.25%	58.01%	3.93%	1.81%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	3	0	3	49	61	132	6	5	204
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	11.54%	0.00%	33.33%	36.84%	31.61%	40.12%	31.58%	45.45%	36.96%
CATEGORY%	2.94%	1.47%	0.00%	1.47%	24.02%	29.90%	64.71%	2.94%	2.45%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q46i. Airports Commission Barrier - Lack of personnel										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	1	1	1	9	14	9	0	0	23
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	3.85%	10.00%	11.11%	6.77%	7.25%	2.74%	0.00%	0.00%	4.17%
CATEGORY%	8.70%	4.35%	4.35%	4.35%	39.13%	60.87%	39.13%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	8	23	9	7	88	135	216	13	8	372
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	88.46%	90.00%	77.78%	66.17%	69.95%	65.65%	68.42%	72.73%	67.39%
CATEGORY%	2.15%	6.18%	2.42%	1.88%	23.66%	36.29%	58.06%	3.49%	2.15%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	2	0	1	36	44	104	6	3	157
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	7.69%	0.00%	11.11%	27.07%	22.80%	31.61%	31.58%	27.27%	28.44%
CATEGORY%	3.18%	1.27%	0.00%	0.64%	22.93%	28.03%	66.24%	3.82%	1.91%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q46i. Sports Facilities Barrier - Lack of personnel										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	1	1	1	8	13	5	0	0	18
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	3.85%	10.00%	11.11%	6.02%	6.74%	1.52%	0.00%	0.00%	3.26%
CATEGORY%	11.11%	5.56%	5.56%	5.56%	44.44%	72.22%	27.78%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	7	22	9	5	80	123	195	13	6	337
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	84.62%	90.00%	55.56%	60.15%	63.73%	59.27%	68.42%	54.55%	61.05%
CATEGORY%	2.08%	6.53%	2.67%	1.48%	23.74%	36.50%	57.86%	3.86%	1.78%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	3	0	3	45	57	129	6	5	197
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	11.54%	0.00%	33.33%	33.83%	29.53%	39.21%	31.58%	45.45%	35.69%
CATEGORY%	3.05%	1.52%	0.00%	1.52%	22.84%	28.93%	65.48%	3.05%	2.54%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q47j. Depart of Admin Barrier - Contract too large										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	7	4	4	2	25	42	22	1	0	65
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	15.38%	40.00%	22.22%	18.80%	21.76%	6.69%	5.26%	0.00%	11.78%
CATEGORY%	10.77%	6.15%	6.15%	3.08%	38.46%	64.62%	33.85%	1.54%	0.00%	100.00%
No	6	21	6	5	77	115	225	13	8	361
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	80.77%	60.00%	55.56%	57.89%	59.59%	68.39%	68.42%	72.73%	65.40%
CATEGORY%	1.66%	5.82%	1.66%	1.39%	21.33%	31.86%	62.33%	3.60%	2.22%	100.00%
Don't Know	2	1	0	2	31	36	82	5	3	126
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	3.85%	0.00%	22.22%	23.31%	18.65%	24.92%	26.32%	27.27%	22.83%
CATEGORY%	1.59%	0.79%	0.00%	1.59%	24.60%	28.57%	65.08%	3.97%	2.38%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q47j. Depart of Trans Barrier - Contract too large										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	7	4	4	3	23	41	26	1	0	68
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	15.38%	40.00%	33.33%	17.29%	21.24%	7.90%	5.26%	0.00%	12.32%
CATEGORY%	10.29%	5.88%	5.88%	4.41%	33.82%	60.29%	38.24%	1.47%	0.00%	100.00%
No	4	21	6	6	80	117	230	14	10	371
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	80.77%	60.00%	66.67%	60.15%	60.62%	69.91%	73.68%	90.91%	67.21%
CATEGORY%	1.08%	5.66%	1.62%	1.62%	21.56%	31.54%	61.99%	3.77%	2.70%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	1	0	0	30	35	73	4	1	113
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	22.56%	18.13%	22.19%	21.05%	9.09%	20.47%
CATEGORY%	3.54%	0.88%	0.00%	0.00%	26.55%	30.97%	64.60%	3.54%	0.88%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q47j. Met Council Barrier - Contract too large										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	7	4	4	2	22	39	26	1	0	66
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	15.38%	40.00%	22.22%	16.54%	20.21%	7.90%	5.26%	0.00%	11.96%
CATEGORY%	10.61%	6.06%	6.06%	3.03%	33.33%	59.09%	39.39%	1.52%	0.00%	100.00%
No	6	20	6	5	76	113	207	12	7	339
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	76.92%	60.00%	55.56%	57.14%	58.55%	62.92%	63.16%	63.64%	61.41%
CATEGORY%	1.77%	5.90%	1.77%	1.47%	22.42%	33.33%	61.06%	3.54%	2.06%	100.00%
Don't Know	2	2	0	2	35	41	96	6	4	147
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	7.69%	0.00%	22.22%	26.32%	21.24%	29.18%	31.58%	36.36%	26.63%
CATEGORY%	1.36%	1.36%	0.00%	1.36%	23.81%	27.89%	65.31%	4.08%	2.72%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q47j. Mosquito Control Barrier - Contract too large										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	7	4	4	2	17	34	16	1	0	51
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	15.38%	40.00%	22.22%	12.78%	17.62%	4.86%	5.26%	0.00%	9.24%
CATEGORY%	13.73%	7.84%	7.84%	3.92%	33.33%	66.67%	31.37%	1.96%	0.00%	100.00%
No	3	19	6	4	66	98	182	12	6	298
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	73.08%	60.00%	44.44%	49.62%	50.78%	55.32%	63.16%	54.55%	53.99%
CATEGORY%	1.01%	6.38%	2.01%	1.34%	22.15%	32.89%	61.07%	4.03%	2.01%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	3	0	3	50	61	131	6	5	203
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	11.54%	0.00%	33.33%	37.59%	31.61%	39.82%	31.58%	45.45%	36.78%
CATEGORY%	2.46%	1.48%	0.00%	1.48%	24.63%	30.05%	64.53%	2.96%	2.46%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q47j. Airports Commission Barrier - Contract too large										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	7	4	4	2	20	37	18	1	0	56
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	15.38%	40.00%	22.22%	15.04%	19.17%	5.47%	5.26%	0.00%	10.14%
CATEGORY%	12.50%	7.14%	7.14%	3.57%	35.71%	66.07%	32.14%	1.79%	0.00%	100.00%
No	4	20	6	6	76	112	208	12	8	340
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	76.92%	60.00%	66.67%	57.14%	58.03%	63.22%	63.16%	72.73%	61.59%
CATEGORY%	1.18%	5.88%	1.76%	1.76%	22.35%	32.94%	61.18%	3.53%	2.35%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	2	0	1	37	44	103	6	3	156
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	7.69%	0.00%	11.11%	27.82%	22.80%	31.31%	31.58%	27.27%	28.26%
CATEGORY%	2.56%	1.28%	0.00%	0.64%	23.72%	28.21%	66.03%	3.85%	1.92%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q47j. Sports Facilities Barrier - Contract too large										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	7	4	4	2	19	36	17	1	0	54
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	15.38%	40.00%	22.22%	14.29%	18.65%	5.17%	5.26%	0.00%	9.78%
CATEGORY%	12.96%	7.41%	7.41%	3.70%	35.19%	66.67%	31.48%	1.85%	0.00%	100.00%
No	3	19	6	4	68	100	184	12	6	302
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	73.08%	60.00%	44.44%	51.13%	51.81%	55.93%	63.16%	54.55%	54.71%
CATEGORY%	0.99%	6.29%	1.99%	1.32%	22.52%	33.11%	60.93%	3.97%	1.99%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	3	0	3	46	57	128	6	5	196
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	11.54%	0.00%	33.33%	34.59%	29.53%	38.91%	31.58%	45.45%	35.51%
CATEGORY%	2.55%	1.53%	0.00%	1.53%	23.47%	29.08%	65.31%	3.06%	2.55%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q48k. Depart of Admin Barrier - Selection process										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	6	9	6	2	28	51	42	2	3	98
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	34.62%	60.00%	22.22%	21.05%	26.42%	12.77%	10.53%	27.27%	17.75%
CATEGORY%	6.12%	9.18%	6.12%	2.04%	28.57%	52.04%	42.86%	2.04%	3.06%	100.00%
No	6	16	4	5	70	101	202	12	5	320
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	61.54%	40.00%	55.56%	52.63%	52.33%	61.40%	63.16%	45.45%	57.97%
CATEGORY%	1.88%	5.00%	1.25%	1.56%	21.88%	31.56%	63.13%	3.75%	1.56%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	1	0	2	35	41	85	5	3	134
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	0.00%	22.22%	26.32%	21.24%	25.84%	26.32%	27.27%	24.28%
CATEGORY%	2.24%	0.75%	0.00%	1.49%	26.12%	30.60%	63.43%	3.73%	2.24%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q48k. Depart of Trans Barrier - Selection process										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	6	7	6	2	26	47	44	2	3	96
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	26.92%	60.00%	22.22%	19.55%	24.35%	13.37%	10.53%	27.27%	17.39%
CATEGORY%	6.25%	7.29%	6.25%	2.08%	27.08%	48.96%	45.83%	2.08%	3.13%	100.00%
No	5	18	4	7	74	108	208	13	7	336
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	69.23%	40.00%	77.78%	55.64%	55.96%	63.22%	68.42%	63.64%	60.87%
CATEGORY%	1.49%	5.36%	1.19%	2.08%	22.02%	32.14%	61.90%	3.87%	2.08%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	1	0	0	33	38	77	4	1	120
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	24.81%	19.69%	23.40%	21.05%	9.09%	21.74%
CATEGORY%	3.33%	0.83%	0.00%	0.00%	27.50%	31.67%	64.17%	3.33%	0.83%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q48k. Met Council Barrier - Selection process										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	6	7	6	2	24	45	43	2	3	93
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	26.92%	60.00%	22.22%	18.05%	23.32%	13.07%	10.53%	27.27%	16.85%
CATEGORY%	6.45%	7.53%	6.45%	2.15%	25.81%	48.39%	46.24%	2.15%	3.23%	100.00%
No	6	17	4	5	72	104	186	11	4	305
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	65.38%	40.00%	55.56%	54.14%	53.89%	56.53%	57.89%	36.36%	55.25%
CATEGORY%	1.97%	5.57%	1.31%	1.64%	23.61%	34.10%	60.98%	3.61%	1.31%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	2	0	2	37	44	100	6	4	154
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	0.00%	22.22%	27.82%	22.80%	30.40%	31.58%	36.36%	27.90%
CATEGORY%	1.95%	1.30%	0.00%	1.30%	24.03%	28.57%	64.94%	3.90%	2.60%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q48k. Mosquito Control Barrier - Selection process										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	6	7	6	2	20	41	36	2	3	82
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	26.92%	60.00%	22.22%	15.04%	21.24%	10.94%	10.53%	27.27%	14.86%
CATEGORY%	7.32%	8.54%	7.32%	2.44%	24.39%	50.00%	43.90%	2.44%	3.66%	100.00%
No	3	16	4	4	61	88	159	11	3	261
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	61.54%	40.00%	44.44%	45.86%	45.60%	48.33%	57.89%	27.27%	47.28%
CATEGORY%	1.15%	6.13%	1.53%	1.53%	23.37%	33.72%	60.92%	4.21%	1.15%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	3	0	3	52	64	134	6	5	209
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	11.54%	0.00%	33.33%	39.10%	33.16%	40.73%	31.58%	45.45%	37.86%
CATEGORY%	2.87%	1.44%	0.00%	1.44%	24.88%	30.62%	64.11%	2.87%	2.39%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q48k. Airports Commission Barrier - Selection process										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	6	7	6	2	22	43	40	2	3	88
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	26.92%	60.00%	22.22%	16.54%	22.28%	12.16%	10.53%	27.27%	15.94%
CATEGORY%	6.82%	7.95%	6.82%	2.27%	25.00%	48.86%	45.45%	2.27%	3.41%	100.00%
No	4	17	4	6	71	102	181	11	5	299
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	65.38%	40.00%	66.67%	53.38%	52.85%	55.02%	57.89%	45.45%	54.17%
CATEGORY%	1.34%	5.69%	1.34%	2.01%	23.75%	34.11%	60.54%	3.68%	1.67%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	2	0	1	40	48	108	6	3	165
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	7.69%	0.00%	11.11%	30.08%	24.87%	32.83%	31.58%	27.27%	29.89%
CATEGORY%	3.03%	1.21%	0.00%	0.61%	24.24%	29.09%	65.45%	3.64%	1.82%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q48k. Sports Facilities Barrier - Selection process										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	6	7	6	2	21	42	36	2	3	83
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	26.92%	60.00%	22.22%	15.79%	21.76%	10.94%	10.53%	27.27%	15.04%
CATEGORY%	7.23%	8.43%	7.23%	2.41%	25.30%	50.60%	43.37%	2.41%	3.61%	100.00%
No	3	16	4	4	64	91	160	11	3	265
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	61.54%	40.00%	44.44%	48.12%	47.15%	48.63%	57.89%	27.27%	48.01%
CATEGORY%	1.13%	6.04%	1.51%	1.51%	24.15%	34.34%	60.38%	4.15%	1.13%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	3	0	3	48	60	133	6	5	204
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	11.54%	0.00%	33.33%	36.09%	31.09%	40.43%	31.58%	45.45%	36.96%
CATEGORY%	2.94%	1.47%	0.00%	1.47%	23.53%	29.41%	65.20%	2.94%	2.45%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q49l. Depart of Admin Barrier - Compete with large companies										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	9	11	4	4	44	72	55	1	4	132
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	42.31%	40.00%	44.44%	33.08%	37.31%	16.72%	5.26%	36.36%	23.91%
CATEGORY%	6.82%	8.33%	3.03%	3.03%	33.33%	54.55%	41.67%	0.76%	3.03%	100.00%
No	4	14	6	3	57	84	192	13	4	293
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	53.85%	60.00%	33.33%	42.86%	43.52%	58.36%	68.42%	36.36%	53.08%
CATEGORY%	1.37%	4.78%	2.05%	1.02%	19.45%	28.67%	65.53%	4.44%	1.37%	100.00%
Don't Know	2	1	0	2	32	37	82	5	3	127
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	3.85%	0.00%	22.22%	24.06%	19.17%	24.92%	26.32%	27.27%	23.01%
CATEGORY%	1.57%	0.79%	0.00%	1.57%	25.20%	29.13%	64.57%	3.94%	2.36%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q49l. Depart of Trans Barrier - Compete with large companies										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	8	10	4	5	45	72	53	2	4	131
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	38.46%	40.00%	55.56%	33.83%	37.31%	16.11%	10.53%	36.36%	23.73%
CATEGORY%	6.11%	7.63%	3.05%	3.82%	34.35%	54.96%	40.46%	1.53%	3.05%	100.00%
No	3	15	6	4	58	86	203	13	6	308
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	57.69%	60.00%	44.44%	43.61%	44.56%	61.70%	68.42%	54.55%	55.80%
CATEGORY%	0.97%	4.87%	1.95%	1.30%	18.83%	27.92%	65.91%	4.22%	1.95%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	1	0	0	30	35	73	4	1	113
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	22.56%	18.13%	22.19%	21.05%	9.09%	20.47%
CATEGORY%	3.54%	0.88%	0.00%	0.00%	26.55%	30.97%	64.60%	3.54%	0.88%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q49l. Met Council Barrier - Compete with large companie s										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	8	10	4	3	38	63	48	1	4	116
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	38.46%	40.00%	33.33%	28.57%	32.64%	14.59%	5.26%	36.36%	21.01%
CATEGORY%	6.90%	8.62%	3.45%	2.59%	32.76%	54.31%	41.38%	0.86%	3.45%	100.00%
No	4	14	6	4	60	88	185	12	3	288
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	53.85%	60.00%	44.44%	45.11%	45.60%	56.23%	63.16%	27.27%	52.17%
CATEGORY%	1.39%	4.86%	2.08%	1.39%	20.83%	30.56%	64.24%	4.17%	1.04%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	2	0	2	35	42	96	6	4	148
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	0.00%	22.22%	26.32%	21.76%	29.18%	31.58%	36.36%	26.81%
CATEGORY%	2.03%	1.35%	0.00%	1.35%	23.65%	28.38%	64.86%	4.05%	2.70%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q49l. Mosquito Control Barrier - Compete with large companies										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	8	10	4	3	33	58	43	1	4	106
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	38.46%	40.00%	33.33%	24.81%	30.05%	13.07%	5.26%	36.36%	19.20%
CATEGORY%	7.55%	9.43%	3.77%	2.83%	31.13%	54.72%	40.57%	0.94%	3.77%	100.00%
No	2	13	6	3	49	73	155	12	2	242
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	50.00%	60.00%	33.33%	36.84%	37.82%	47.11%	63.16%	18.18%	43.84%
CATEGORY%	0.83%	5.37%	2.48%	1.24%	20.25%	30.17%	64.05%	4.96%	0.83%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	3	0	3	51	62	131	6	5	204
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	11.54%	0.00%	33.33%	38.35%	32.12%	39.82%	31.58%	45.45%	36.96%
CATEGORY%	2.45%	1.47%	0.00%	1.47%	25.00%	30.39%	64.22%	2.94%	2.45%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q49l. Airports Commission Barrier - Compete with large com panies										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	8	10	4	4	39	65	48	1	4	118
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	38.46%	40.00%	44.44%	29.32%	33.68%	14.59%	5.26%	36.36%	21.38%
CATEGORY%	6.78%	8.47%	3.39%	3.39%	33.05%	55.08%	40.68%	0.85%	3.39%	100.00%
No	3	14	6	4	57	84	178	12	4	278
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	53.85%	60.00%	44.44%	42.86%	43.52%	54.10%	63.16%	36.36%	50.36%
CATEGORY%	1.08%	5.04%	2.16%	1.44%	20.50%	30.22%	64.03%	4.32%	1.44%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	2	0	1	37	44	103	6	3	156
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	7.69%	0.00%	11.11%	27.82%	22.80%	31.31%	31.58%	27.27%	28.26%
CATEGORY%	2.56%	1.28%	0.00%	0.64%	23.72%	28.21%	66.03%	3.85%	1.92%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q49l. Sports Facilities Barrier - Compete with large companies										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	8	10	4	3	35	60	43	1	4	108
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	38.46%	40.00%	33.33%	26.32%	31.09%	13.07%	5.26%	36.36%	19.57%
CATEGORY%	7.41%	9.26%	3.70%	2.78%	32.41%	55.56%	39.81%	0.93%	3.70%	100.00%
No	2	13	6	3	51	75	157	12	2	246
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	50.00%	60.00%	33.33%	38.35%	38.86%	47.72%	63.16%	18.18%	44.57%
CATEGORY%	0.81%	5.28%	2.44%	1.22%	20.73%	30.49%	63.82%	4.88%	0.81%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	3	0	3	47	58	129	6	5	198
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	11.54%	0.00%	33.33%	35.34%	30.05%	39.21%	31.58%	45.45%	35.87%
CATEGORY%	2.53%	1.52%	0.00%	1.52%	23.74%	29.29%	65.15%	3.03%	2.53%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q50m. Depart of Admin Barrier - Collusion with competitors										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	2	1	17	24	12	0	4	40
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	7.69%	20.00%	11.11%	12.78%	12.44%	3.65%	0.00%	36.36%	7.25%
CATEGORY%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	2.50%	42.50%	60.00%	30.00%	0.00%	10.00%	100.00%
No	9	23	8	6	81	127	231	13	4	375
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	88.46%	80.00%	66.67%	60.90%	65.80%	70.21%	68.42%	36.36%	67.93%
CATEGORY%	2.40%	6.13%	2.13%	1.60%	21.60%	33.87%	61.60%	3.47%	1.07%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	1	0	2	35	42	86	6	3	137
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	3.85%	0.00%	22.22%	26.32%	21.76%	26.14%	31.58%	27.27%	24.82%
CATEGORY%	2.92%	0.73%	0.00%	1.46%	25.55%	30.66%	62.77%	4.38%	2.19%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q50m. Depart of Trans Barrier - Collusion with competitors										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	2	1	19	26	15	0	4	45
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	7.69%	20.00%	11.11%	14.29%	13.47%	4.56%	0.00%	36.36%	8.15%
CATEGORY%	4.44%	4.44%	4.44%	2.22%	42.22%	57.78%	33.33%	0.00%	8.89%	100.00%
No	7	23	8	8	80	126	236	15	6	383
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	88.46%	80.00%	88.89%	60.15%	65.28%	71.73%	78.95%	54.55%	69.38%
CATEGORY%	1.83%	6.01%	2.09%	2.09%	20.89%	32.90%	61.62%	3.92%	1.57%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	1	0	0	34	41	78	4	1	124
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	25.56%	21.24%	23.71%	21.05%	9.09%	22.46%
CATEGORY%	4.84%	0.81%	0.00%	0.00%	27.42%	33.06%	62.90%	3.23%	0.81%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q50m. Met Council Barrier - Collusion with competitors										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	2	1	14	21	13	0	4	38
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	7.69%	20.00%	11.11%	10.53%	10.88%	3.95%	0.00%	36.36%	6.88%
CATEGORY%	5.26%	5.26%	5.26%	2.63%	36.84%	55.26%	34.21%	0.00%	10.53%	100.00%
No	9	22	8	6	81	126	217	13	3	359
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	84.62%	80.00%	66.67%	60.90%	65.28%	65.96%	68.42%	27.27%	65.04%
CATEGORY%	2.51%	6.13%	2.23%	1.67%	22.56%	35.10%	60.45%	3.62%	0.84%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	2	0	2	38	46	99	6	4	155
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	7.69%	0.00%	22.22%	28.57%	23.83%	30.09%	31.58%	36.36%	28.08%
CATEGORY%	2.58%	1.29%	0.00%	1.29%	24.52%	29.68%	63.87%	3.87%	2.58%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q50m. Mosquito Control Barrier - Collusion with competitors										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	2	1	13	20	13	0	4	37
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	7.69%	20.00%	11.11%	9.77%	10.36%	3.95%	0.00%	36.36%	6.70%
CATEGORY%	5.41%	5.41%	5.41%	2.70%	35.14%	54.05%	35.14%	0.00%	10.81%	100.00%
No	6	21	8	5	69	109	181	13	2	305
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	80.77%	80.00%	55.56%	51.88%	56.48%	55.02%	68.42%	18.18%	55.25%
CATEGORY%	1.97%	6.89%	2.62%	1.64%	22.62%	35.74%	59.34%	4.26%	0.66%	100.00%
Don't Know	7	3	0	3	51	64	135	6	5	210
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	11.54%	0.00%	33.33%	38.35%	33.16%	41.03%	31.58%	45.45%	38.04%
CATEGORY%	3.33%	1.43%	0.00%	1.43%	24.29%	30.48%	64.29%	2.86%	2.38%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q50m. Airports Commission Barrier - Collusion with competitors										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	2	1	14	21	12	0	4	37
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	7.69%	20.00%	11.11%	10.53%	10.88%	3.65%	0.00%	36.36%	6.70%
CATEGORY%	5.41%	5.41%	5.41%	2.70%	37.84%	56.76%	32.43%	0.00%	10.81%	100.00%
No	7	22	8	7	80	124	209	13	4	350
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	84.62%	80.00%	77.78%	60.15%	64.25%	63.53%	68.42%	36.36%	63.41%
CATEGORY%	2.00%	6.29%	2.29%	2.00%	22.86%	35.43%	59.71%	3.71%	1.14%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	2	0	1	39	48	108	6	3	165
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	7.69%	0.00%	11.11%	29.32%	24.87%	32.83%	31.58%	27.27%	29.89%
CATEGORY%	3.64%	1.21%	0.00%	0.61%	23.64%	29.09%	65.45%	3.64%	1.82%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q50m. Sports Facilities Barrier - Collusion with competitors										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	2	1	14	21	14	0	4	39
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	7.69%	20.00%	11.11%	10.53%	10.88%	4.26%	0.00%	36.36%	7.07%
CATEGORY%	5.13%	5.13%	5.13%	2.56%	35.90%	53.85%	35.90%	0.00%	10.26%	100.00%
No	6	21	8	5	72	112	182	13	2	309
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	80.77%	80.00%	55.56%	54.14%	58.03%	55.32%	68.42%	18.18%	55.98%
CATEGORY%	1.94%	6.80%	2.59%	1.62%	23.30%	36.25%	58.90%	4.21%	0.65%	100.00%
Don't Know	7	3	0	3	47	60	133	6	5	204
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	11.54%	0.00%	33.33%	35.34%	31.09%	40.43%	31.58%	45.45%	36.96%
CATEGORY%	3.43%	1.47%	0.00%	1.47%	23.04%	29.41%	65.20%	2.94%	2.45%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q51n. Depart of Admin Barrier - Fraud/fronting										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	1	0	0	8	10	2	0	1	13
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	6.02%	5.18%	0.61%	0.00%	9.09%	2.36%
CATEGORY%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	61.54%	76.92%	15.38%	0.00%	7.69%	100.00%
No	10	22	9	7	91	139	239	14	7	399
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	84.62%	90.00%	77.78%	68.42%	72.02%	72.64%	73.68%	63.64%	72.28%
CATEGORY%	2.51%	5.51%	2.26%	1.75%	22.81%	34.84%	59.90%	3.51%	1.75%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	3	1	2	34	44	88	5	3	140
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	11.54%	10.00%	22.22%	25.56%	22.80%	26.75%	26.32%	27.27%	25.36%
CATEGORY%	2.86%	2.14%	0.71%	1.43%	24.29%	31.43%	62.86%	3.57%	2.14%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q51n. Depart of Trans Barrier - Fraud/fronting										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	1	0	0	10	12	4	0	1	17
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	7.52%	6.22%	1.22%	0.00%	9.09%	3.08%
CATEGORY%	5.88%	5.88%	0.00%	0.00%	58.82%	70.59%	23.53%	0.00%	5.88%	100.00%
No	9	23	9	8	90	139	243	15	9	406
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	88.46%	90.00%	88.89%	67.67%	72.02%	73.86%	78.95%	81.82%	73.55%
CATEGORY%	2.22%	5.67%	2.22%	1.97%	22.17%	34.24%	59.85%	3.69%	2.22%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	2	1	1	33	42	82	4	1	129
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	7.69%	10.00%	11.11%	24.81%	21.76%	24.92%	21.05%	9.09%	23.37%
CATEGORY%	3.88%	1.55%	0.78%	0.78%	25.58%	32.56%	63.57%	3.10%	0.78%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q51n. Met Council Barrier - Fraud/fronting										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	1	0	0	8	10	2	0	1	13
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	6.02%	5.18%	0.61%	0.00%	9.09%	2.36%
CATEGORY%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	61.54%	76.92%	15.38%	0.00%	7.69%	100.00%
No	10	22	9	7	89	137	221	13	6	377
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	84.62%	90.00%	77.78%	66.92%	70.98%	67.17%	68.42%	54.55%	68.30%
CATEGORY%	2.65%	5.84%	2.39%	1.86%	23.61%	36.34%	58.62%	3.45%	1.59%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	3	1	2	36	46	106	6	4	162
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	11.54%	10.00%	22.22%	27.07%	23.83%	32.22%	31.58%	36.36%	29.35%
CATEGORY%	2.47%	1.85%	0.62%	1.23%	22.22%	28.40%	65.43%	3.70%	2.47%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q51n. Mosquito Control Barrier - Fraud/fronting										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	1	0	0	5	7	2	0	1	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	3.76%	3.63%	0.61%	0.00%	9.09%	1.81%
CATEGORY%	10.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	70.00%	20.00%	0.00%	10.00%	100.00%
No	7	22	9	6	78	122	190	13	5	330
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	84.62%	90.00%	66.67%	58.65%	63.21%	57.75%	68.42%	45.45%	59.78%
CATEGORY%	2.12%	6.67%	2.73%	1.82%	23.64%	36.97%	57.58%	3.94%	1.52%	100.00%
Don't Know	7	3	1	3	50	64	137	6	5	212
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	11.54%	10.00%	33.33%	37.59%	33.16%	41.64%	31.58%	45.45%	38.41%
CATEGORY%	3.30%	1.42%	0.47%	1.42%	23.58%	30.19%	64.62%	2.83%	2.36%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q51n. Airports Commission Barrier - Fraud/fronting										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	1	0	0	7	9	3	0	1	13
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	5.26%	4.66%	0.91%	0.00%	9.09%	2.36%
CATEGORY%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	53.85%	69.23%	23.08%	0.00%	7.69%	100.00%
No	8	22	9	8	88	135	215	13	7	370
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	84.62%	90.00%	88.89%	66.17%	69.95%	65.35%	68.42%	63.64%	67.03%
CATEGORY%	2.16%	5.95%	2.43%	2.16%	23.78%	36.49%	58.11%	3.51%	1.89%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	3	1	1	38	49	111	6	3	169
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	11.54%	10.00%	11.11%	28.57%	25.39%	33.74%	31.58%	27.27%	30.62%
CATEGORY%	3.55%	1.78%	0.59%	0.59%	22.49%	28.99%	65.68%	3.55%	1.78%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q51n. Sports Facilities Barrier - Fraud/fronting										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	1	0	0	7	9	3	0	1	13
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	5.26%	4.66%	0.91%	0.00%	9.09%	2.36%
CATEGORY%	7.69%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	53.85%	69.23%	23.08%	0.00%	7.69%	100.00%
No	7	22	9	6	80	124	191	13	5	333
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	84.62%	90.00%	66.67%	60.15%	64.25%	58.05%	68.42%	45.45%	60.33%
CATEGORY%	2.10%	6.61%	2.70%	1.80%	24.02%	37.24%	57.36%	3.90%	1.50%	100.00%
Don't Know	7	3	1	3	46	60	135	6	5	206
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	11.54%	10.00%	33.33%	34.59%	31.09%	41.03%	31.58%	45.45%	37.32%
CATEGORY%	3.40%	1.46%	0.49%	1.46%	22.33%	29.13%	65.53%	2.91%	2.43%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q52o. Depart of Admin Barrier - Slow or nonpayment										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	4	3	1	2	16	26	6	0	0	32
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	11.54%	10.00%	22.22%	12.03%	13.47%	1.82%	0.00%	0.00%	5.80%
CATEGORY%	12.50%	9.38%	3.13%	6.25%	50.00%	81.25%	18.75%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	7	21	8	5	82	123	238	14	8	383
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	80.77%	80.00%	55.56%	61.65%	63.73%	72.34%	73.68%	72.73%	69.38%
CATEGORY%	1.83%	5.48%	2.09%	1.31%	21.41%	32.11%	62.14%	3.66%	2.09%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	2	1	2	35	44	85	5	3	137
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	7.69%	10.00%	22.22%	26.32%	22.80%	25.84%	26.32%	27.27%	24.82%
CATEGORY%	2.92%	1.46%	0.73%	1.46%	25.55%	32.12%	62.04%	3.65%	2.19%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q52o. Depart of Trans Barrier - Slow or nonpayment										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	2	1	2	19	27	8	1	0	36
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	10.00%	22.22%	14.29%	13.99%	2.43%	5.26%	0.00%	6.52%
CATEGORY%	8.33%	5.56%	2.78%	5.56%	52.78%	75.00%	22.22%	2.78%	0.00%	100.00%
No	7	22	8	7	82	126	244	14	10	394
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	84.62%	80.00%	77.78%	61.65%	65.28%	74.16%	73.68%	90.91%	71.38%
CATEGORY%	1.78%	5.58%	2.03%	1.78%	20.81%	31.98%	61.93%	3.55%	2.54%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	2	1	0	32	40	77	4	1	122
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	7.69%	10.00%	0.00%	24.06%	20.73%	23.40%	21.05%	9.09%	22.10%
CATEGORY%	4.10%	1.64%	0.82%	0.00%	26.23%	32.79%	63.11%	3.28%	0.82%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q52o. Met Council Barrier - Slow or nonpayment										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	2	1	1	14	21	9	0	0	30
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	10.00%	11.11%	10.53%	10.88%	2.74%	0.00%	0.00%	5.43%
CATEGORY%	10.00%	6.67%	3.33%	3.33%	46.67%	70.00%	30.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	7	21	8	6	81	123	220	13	7	363
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	80.77%	80.00%	66.67%	60.90%	63.73%	66.87%	68.42%	63.64%	65.76%
CATEGORY%	1.93%	5.79%	2.20%	1.65%	22.31%	33.88%	60.61%	3.58%	1.93%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	3	1	2	38	49	100	6	4	159
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	11.54%	10.00%	22.22%	28.57%	25.39%	30.40%	31.58%	36.36%	28.80%
CATEGORY%	3.14%	1.89%	0.63%	1.26%	23.90%	30.82%	62.89%	3.77%	2.52%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q52o. Mosquito Control Barrier - Slow or nonpayment										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	2	1	1	10	17	5	0	0	22
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	10.00%	11.11%	7.52%	8.81%	1.52%	0.00%	0.00%	3.99%
CATEGORY%	13.64%	9.09%	4.55%	4.55%	45.45%	77.27%	22.73%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	5	20	8	5	71	109	190	13	6	318
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	76.92%	80.00%	55.56%	53.38%	56.48%	57.75%	68.42%	54.55%	57.61%
CATEGORY%	1.57%	6.29%	2.52%	1.57%	22.33%	34.28%	59.75%	4.09%	1.89%	100.00%
Don't Know	7	4	1	3	52	67	134	6	5	212
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	15.38%	10.00%	33.33%	39.10%	34.72%	40.73%	31.58%	45.45%	38.41%
CATEGORY%	3.30%	1.89%	0.47%	1.42%	24.53%	31.60%	63.21%	2.83%	2.36%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q52o. Airports Commission Barrier - Slow or nonpayment										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	2	1	2	15	23	8	0	0	31
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	10.00%	22.22%	11.28%	11.92%	2.43%	0.00%	0.00%	5.62%
CATEGORY%	9.68%	6.45%	3.23%	6.45%	48.39%	74.19%	25.81%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	6	21	8	6	78	119	215	13	8	355
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	80.77%	80.00%	66.67%	58.65%	61.66%	65.35%	68.42%	72.73%	64.31%
CATEGORY%	1.69%	5.92%	2.25%	1.69%	21.97%	33.52%	60.56%	3.66%	2.25%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	3	1	1	40	51	106	6	3	166
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	11.54%	10.00%	11.11%	30.08%	26.42%	32.22%	31.58%	27.27%	30.07%
CATEGORY%	3.61%	1.81%	0.60%	0.60%	24.10%	30.72%	63.86%	3.61%	1.81%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q52o. Sports Facilities Barrier - Slow or nonpayment										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	2	1	1	10	17	6	0	0	23
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	7.69%	10.00%	11.11%	7.52%	8.81%	1.82%	0.00%	0.00%	4.17%
CATEGORY%	13.04%	8.70%	4.35%	4.35%	43.48%	73.91%	26.09%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	5	20	8	5	75	113	191	13	6	323
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	76.92%	80.00%	55.56%	56.39%	58.55%	58.05%	68.42%	54.55%	58.51%
CATEGORY%	1.55%	6.19%	2.48%	1.55%	23.22%	34.98%	59.13%	4.02%	1.86%	100.00%
Don't Know	7	4	1	3	48	63	132	6	5	206
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	15.38%	10.00%	33.33%	36.09%	32.64%	40.12%	31.58%	45.45%	37.32%
CATEGORY%	3.40%	1.94%	0.49%	1.46%	23.30%	30.58%	64.08%	2.91%	2.43%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q53p. Depart of Admin Barrier - Unnecessary restrictive contract specifications										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	5	3	2	25	38	38	0	4	80
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	19.23%	30.00%	22.22%	18.80%	19.69%	11.55%	0.00%	36.36%	14.49%
CATEGORY%	3.75%	6.25%	3.75%	2.50%	31.25%	47.50%	47.50%	0.00%	5.00%	100.00%
No	9	20	6	5	76	116	207	14	4	341
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	76.92%	60.00%	55.56%	57.14%	60.10%	62.92%	73.68%	36.36%	61.78%
CATEGORY%	2.64%	5.87%	1.76%	1.47%	22.29%	34.02%	60.70%	4.11%	1.17%	100.00%
Don't Know	3	1	1	2	32	39	84	5	3	131
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	10.00%	22.22%	24.06%	20.21%	25.53%	26.32%	27.27%	23.73%
CATEGORY%	2.29%	0.76%	0.76%	1.53%	24.43%	29.77%	64.12%	3.82%	2.29%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q53p. Depart of Trans Barrier - Unnecessary restrictive contract specifications										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	4	5	4	2	26	41	39	1	4	85
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	19.23%	40.00%	22.22%	19.55%	21.24%	11.85%	5.26%	36.36%	15.40%
CATEGORY%	4.71%	5.88%	4.71%	2.35%	30.59%	48.24%	45.88%	1.18%	4.71%	100.00%
No	7	20	5	7	77	116	213	14	6	349
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	76.92%	50.00%	77.78%	57.89%	60.10%	64.74%	73.68%	54.55%	63.22%
CATEGORY%	2.01%	5.73%	1.43%	2.01%	22.06%	33.24%	61.03%	4.01%	1.72%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	1	1	0	30	36	77	4	1	118
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	3.85%	10.00%	0.00%	22.56%	18.65%	23.40%	21.05%	9.09%	21.38%
CATEGORY%	3.39%	0.85%	0.85%	0.00%	25.42%	30.51%	65.25%	3.39%	0.85%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q53p. Met Council Barrier - Unnecessary restrictive contract specifications										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	5	4	1	24	37	34	0	3	74
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	19.23%	40.00%	11.11%	18.05%	19.17%	10.33%	0.00%	27.27%	13.41%
CATEGORY%	4.05%	6.76%	5.41%	1.35%	32.43%	50.00%	45.95%	0.00%	4.05%	100.00%
No	8	19	5	6	73	111	196	13	4	324
DEMOGRAPHIC%	53.33%	73.08%	50.00%	66.67%	54.89%	57.51%	59.57%	68.42%	36.36%	58.70%
CATEGORY%	2.47%	5.86%	1.54%	1.85%	22.53%	34.26%	60.49%	4.01%	1.23%	100.00%
Don't Know	4	2	1	2	36	45	99	6	4	154
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	7.69%	10.00%	22.22%	27.07%	23.32%	30.09%	31.58%	36.36%	27.90%
CATEGORY%	2.60%	1.30%	0.65%	1.30%	23.38%	29.22%	64.29%	3.90%	2.60%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q53p. Mosquito Control Barrier - Unnecessary restrictive contract specifications										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	5	4	1	20	33	28	0	3	64
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	19.23%	40.00%	11.11%	15.04%	17.10%	8.51%	0.00%	27.27%	11.59%
CATEGORY%	4.69%	7.81%	6.25%	1.56%	31.25%	51.56%	43.75%	0.00%	4.69%	100.00%
No	6	18	5	5	62	96	168	13	3	280
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	69.23%	50.00%	55.56%	46.62%	49.74%	51.06%	68.42%	27.27%	50.72%
CATEGORY%	2.14%	6.43%	1.79%	1.79%	22.14%	34.29%	60.00%	4.64%	1.07%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	3	1	3	51	64	133	6	5	208
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	11.54%	10.00%	33.33%	38.35%	33.16%	40.43%	31.58%	45.45%	37.68%
CATEGORY%	2.88%	1.44%	0.48%	1.44%	24.52%	30.77%	63.94%	2.88%	2.40%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q53p. Airports Commission Barrier - Unnecessary restrictive contract specifications										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	5	4	2	22	36	30	0	4	70
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	19.23%	40.00%	22.22%	16.54%	18.65%	9.12%	0.00%	36.36%	12.68%
CATEGORY%	4.29%	7.14%	5.71%	2.86%	31.43%	51.43%	42.86%	0.00%	5.71%	100.00%
No	7	19	5	6	73	110	193	13	4	320
DEMOGRAPHIC%	46.67%	73.08%	50.00%	66.67%	54.89%	56.99%	58.66%	68.42%	36.36%	57.97%
CATEGORY%	2.19%	5.94%	1.56%	1.88%	22.81%	34.38%	60.31%	4.06%	1.25%	100.00%
Don't Know	5	2	1	1	38	47	106	6	3	162
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	7.69%	10.00%	11.11%	28.57%	24.35%	32.22%	31.58%	27.27%	29.35%
CATEGORY%	3.09%	1.23%	0.62%	0.62%	23.46%	29.01%	65.43%	3.70%	1.85%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q53p. Sports Facilities Barrier - Unnecessary restrictive contract specifications										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	5	4	1	21	34	28	0	3	65
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	19.23%	40.00%	11.11%	15.79%	17.62%	8.51%	0.00%	27.27%	11.78%
CATEGORY%	4.62%	7.69%	6.15%	1.54%	32.31%	52.31%	43.08%	0.00%	4.62%	100.00%
No	6	18	5	5	65	99	171	13	3	286
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	69.23%	50.00%	55.56%	48.87%	51.30%	51.98%	68.42%	27.27%	51.81%
CATEGORY%	2.10%	6.29%	1.75%	1.75%	22.73%	34.62%	59.79%	4.55%	1.05%	100.00%
Don't Know	6	3	1	3	47	60	130	6	5	201
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	11.54%	10.00%	33.33%	35.34%	31.09%	39.51%	31.58%	45.45%	36.41%
CATEGORY%	2.99%	1.49%	0.50%	1.49%	23.38%	29.85%	64.68%	2.99%	2.49%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q54. Depart of Admin Barrier - Public sector discriminatory behavior										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	0	0	0	8	9	5	0	1	15
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.02%	4.66%	1.52%	0.00%	9.09%	2.72%
CATEGORY%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	53.33%	60.00%	33.33%	0.00%	6.67%	100.00%
No	10	23	10	6	82	131	218	14	6	369
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	88.46%	100.00%	66.67%	61.65%	67.88%	66.26%	73.68%	54.55%	66.85%
CATEGORY%	2.71%	6.23%	2.71%	1.63%	22.22%	35.50%	59.08%	3.79%	1.63%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	4	4	17	1	1	23
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.01%	2.07%	5.17%	5.26%	9.09%	4.17%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	17.39%	17.39%	73.91%	4.35%	4.35%	100.00%
NA-Did not bid	4	3	0	3	39	49	89	4	3	145
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	11.54%	0.00%	33.33%	29.32%	25.39%	27.05%	21.05%	27.27%	26.27%
CATEGORY%	2.76%	2.07%	0.00%	2.07%	26.90%	33.79%	61.38%	2.76%	2.07%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q54. Depart of Trans Barrier - Public sector discriminatory behavior										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	1	0	0	4	7	3	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	3.01%	3.63%	0.91%	0.00%	9.09%	1.99%
CATEGORY%	18.18%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%	63.64%	27.27%	0.00%	9.09%	100.00%
No	9	21	9	8	88	135	231	15	9	390
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	80.77%	90.00%	88.89%	66.17%	69.95%	70.21%	78.95%	81.82%	70.65%
CATEGORY%	2.31%	5.38%	2.31%	2.05%	22.56%	34.62%	59.23%	3.85%	2.31%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	1	0	12
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.50%	1.04%	2.74%	5.26%	0.00%	2.17%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	75.00%	8.33%	0.00%	100.00%
NA-Did not bid	4	4	1	1	39	49	86	3	1	139
DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	15.38%	10.00%	11.11%	29.32%	25.39%	26.14%	15.79%	9.09%	25.18%
CATEGORY%	2.88%	2.88%	0.72%	0.72%	28.06%	35.25%	61.87%	2.16%	0.72%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q54. Met Council Barrier - Public sector discriminatory behavior	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	1	0	0	3	4	6	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	2.26%	2.07%	1.82%	0.00%	9.09%	1.99%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%	36.36%	54.55%	0.00%	9.09%	100.00%
No	10	21	9	6	82	128	202	12	6	348
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	80.77%	90.00%	66.67%	61.65%	66.32%	61.40%	63.16%	54.55%	63.04%
CATEGORY%	2.87%	6.03%	2.59%	1.72%	23.56%	36.78%	58.05%	3.45%	1.72%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	1	1	12
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.50%	1.04%	2.43%	5.26%	9.09%	2.17%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	66.67%	8.33%	8.33%	100.00%
NA-Did not bid	5	4	1	3	46	59	113	6	3	181
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	15.38%	10.00%	33.33%	34.59%	30.57%	34.35%	31.58%	27.27%	32.79%
CATEGORY%	2.76%	2.21%	0.55%	1.66%	25.41%	32.60%	62.43%	3.31%	1.66%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q54. Mosquito Control Barrier - Public sector discriminatory behavior	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.61%	0.00%	9.09%	0.54%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	100.00%
No	9	20	9	5	68	111	174	12	5	302
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	76.92%	90.00%	55.56%	51.13%	57.51%	52.89%	63.16%	45.45%	54.71%
CATEGORY%	2.98%	6.62%	2.98%	1.66%	22.52%	36.75%	57.62%	3.97%	1.66%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	1	1	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.50%	1.04%	1.82%	5.26%	9.09%	1.81%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	10.00%	10.00%	100.00%
NA-Did not bid	6	6	1	4	63	80	147	6	4	237
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	23.08%	10.00%	44.44%	47.37%	41.45%	44.68%	31.58%	36.36%	42.93%
CATEGORY%	2.53%	2.53%	0.42%	1.69%	26.58%	33.76%	62.03%	2.53%	1.69%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q54. Airports Commission Barrier - Public sector discriminatory behavior	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.01%	2.07%	0.91%	0.00%	9.09%	1.45%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%
No	9	22	9	7	80	127	197	12	6	342
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	84.62%	90.00%	77.78%	60.15%	65.80%	59.88%	63.16%	54.55%	61.96%
CATEGORY%	2.63%	6.43%	2.63%	2.05%	23.39%	37.13%	57.60%	3.51%	1.75%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	1	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.75%	0.52%	1.22%	5.26%	9.09%	1.27%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	14.29%	57.14%	14.29%	14.29%	100.00%
NA-Did not bid	6	4	1	2	48	61	125	6	3	195
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	15.38%	10.00%	22.22%	36.09%	31.61%	37.99%	31.58%	27.27%	35.33%
CATEGORY%	3.08%	2.05%	0.51%	1.03%	24.62%	31.28%	64.10%	3.08%	1.54%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q54. Sports Facilities Barrier - Public sector discriminatory behavior	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.75%	0.52%	0.91%	0.00%	9.09%	0.91%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
No	9	20	9	5	72	115	175	12	6	308
DEMOGRAPHIC%	60.00%	76.92%	90.00%	55.56%	54.14%	59.59%	53.19%	63.16%	54.55%	55.80%
CATEGORY%	2.92%	6.49%	2.92%	1.62%	23.38%	37.34%	56.82%	3.90%	1.95%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	1	1	9
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.75%	0.52%	1.82%	5.26%	9.09%	1.63%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	11.11%	66.67%	11.11%	11.11%	100.00%
NA-Did not bid	6	6	1	4	59	76	145	6	3	230
DEMOGRAPHIC%	40.00%	23.08%	10.00%	44.44%	44.36%	39.38%	44.07%	31.58%	27.27%	41.67%
CATEGORY%	2.61%	2.61%	0.43%	1.74%	25.65%	33.04%	63.04%	2.61%	1.30%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q55. Depart of Admin - Aware of discrimination against company	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Verbal Comment	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	4	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	33.33%	20.00%	0.00%	26.67%	26.67%
CATEGORY%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	37.50%	12.50%	0.00%	50.00%	100.00%
Written Statement	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	0	8	16
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	62.50%	55.56%	60.00%	0.00%	53.33%	53.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	31.25%	31.25%	18.75%	0.00%	50.00%	100.00%
Action taken against company	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	11.11%	20.00%	100.00%	20.00%	20.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	16.67%	16.67%	50.00%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	8	9	5	1	15	30
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	3.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	26.67%	30.00%	16.67%	3.33%	50.00%	100.00%

Q55. Depart of Trans - Aware of discrimination against company										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Verbal Comment	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	2	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	33.33%	0.00%	28.57%	0.00%	27.78%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	40.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Written Statement	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	11.11%	66.67%	42.86%	0.00%	33.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	33.33%	50.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Action taken against company	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	2	1	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	33.33%	33.33%	28.57%	100.00%	38.89%
CATEGORY%	28.57%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	42.86%	14.29%	28.57%	14.29%	100.00%
Total	2	1	0	0	4	7	3	7	1	18
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	77.78%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	38.89%	16.67%	38.89%	5.56%	100.00%

Q55. Met Council - Aware of discrimination against company										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Verbal Comment	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	22.22%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%
CATEGORY%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Written Statement	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	11.11%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	18.18%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Action taken against company	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	11.11%	33.33%	0.00%	100.00%	27.27%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	44.44%	200.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%	36.36%	54.55%	0.00%	9.09%	100.00%

Q55. Mosquito Control - Aware of discrimination against company										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Written Statement	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Action taken against company	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	66.67%	50.00%	0.00%	100.00%	66.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	1	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	50.00%	33.33%	0.00%	16.67%	100.00%

Q55. Airports Commission - Aware of discrimination against company										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Verbal Comment	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Written Statement	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	22.22%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Action taken against company	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	11.11%	33.33%	0.00%	100.00%	37.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	44.44%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	50.00%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%

Q55. Sports Facilities - Aware of discrimination against company										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Written Statement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Action taken against company	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	33.33%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%

Q56. Depart of Admin - Perceived reason for discrimination against company										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Owner's race or ethnicity	0	0	0	0	1	1	4		1	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	11.11%	80.00%	0.00%	100.00%	40.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	16.67%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
Owner's sex	0	0	0	0	3	3	0		0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
Time in business	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
Company size	1	0	0	0	1	2	0		0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	13.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
Company experience	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	2	2	0		0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	13.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	8	9	5		1	15
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	60.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%

Q56. Depart of Trans - Perceived reason for discrimination against company										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Owner's race or ethnicity	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	66.67%	0.00%	100.00%	45.45%
CATEGORY%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	40.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
Owner's sex	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	42.86%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Company experience	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	14.29%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	18.18%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	2	1	0	0	4	7	3	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	18.18%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%	63.64%	27.27%	0.00%	9.09%	100.00%

Q56. Met Council - Perceived reason for discrimination against company										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Owner's race or ethnicity	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	100.00%	36.36%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	25.00%	100.00%
Owner's sex	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Company experience	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%
CATEGORY%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	44.44%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%	36.36%	54.55%	0.00%	9.09%	100.00%

Q56. Mosquito Control - Perceived reason for discrimination against company										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Owner's race or ethnicity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	11.11%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	11.11%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%

Q56. Airports Commission - Perceived reason for discrimination against company										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Owner's race or ethnicity	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	50.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	25.00%	100.00%
Owner's sex	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Time in business	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	44.44%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%

Q56. Sports Facilities - Perceived reason for discrimination against company										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Owner's race or ethnicity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Time in business	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	1	1	3		1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	11.11%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%

Q57. Depart of Admin - Experienced Harassment/sabotage										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
No	1	0	0	0	6	7	5	0	1	13
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	77.78%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	86.67%
CATEGORY%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	53.85%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
NA-Did not bid	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	8	9	5	0	1	15
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	60.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%

Q57. Depart of Trans - Experienced Harassment/sabotage										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
No	0	1	0	0	3	4	3	0	1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	44.44%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	72.73%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	50.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
Total	2	1	0	0	4	7	3	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	77.78%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	63.64%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%

Q57. Met Council - Experienced Harassment/sabotage										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
No	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	0	1	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	90.91%
CATEGORY%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	30.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	44.44%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	36.36%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%

Q57. Mosquito Control - Experienced Harassment/sabotage										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%

Q57. Airports Commission - Experienced Harassment/sabotage										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	1	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	87.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	42.86%	42.86%	42.86%	0.00%	14.29%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%

Q57. Sports Facilities - Experienced Harassment/sabotage										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
No	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%

Q58. Depart of Admin - Unequal or unfair treatment										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	0	0	0	4	5	1	0	1	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	55.56%	20.00%	0.00%	100.00%	46.67%
CATEGORY%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	57.14%	71.43%	14.29%	0.00%	14.29%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	0	0	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%	33.33%	80.00%	0.00%	0.00%	46.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	42.86%	42.86%	57.14%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA-Did not bid	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	8	9	5	0	1	15
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	53.33%	60.00%	33.33%	0.00%	6.67%	100.00%

Q58. Depart of Trans - Unequal or unfair treatment										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	0	0	0	3	5	1	0	1	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	71.43%	33.33%	0.00%	100.00%	63.64%
CATEGORY%	28.57%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	42.86%	71.43%	14.29%	0.00%	14.29%	100.00%
No	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	28.57%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	2	1	0	0	4	7	3	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	18.18%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%	63.64%	27.27%	0.00%	9.09%	100.00%

Q58. Met Council - Unequal or unfair treatment										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	50.00%	33.33%	0.00%	100.00%	45.45%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
No	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	50.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	54.55%
CATEGORY%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%	36.36%	54.55%	0.00%	9.09%	100.00%

Q58. Mosquito Control - Unequal or unfair treatment										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	100.00%	66.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	1	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	33.33%	0.00%	16.67%	100.00%

Q58. Airports Commission - Unequal or unfair treatment										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	100.00%	37.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	62.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%	60.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	37.50%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%

Q58. Sports Facilities - Unequal or unfair treatment										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%	0.00%	100.00%	25.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	37.50%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	37.50%	0.00%	100.00%	62.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%

Q59. Depart of Admin - Bid shopping or bid manipulation										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%
CATEGORY%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	6	6	5	0	1	12
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	66.67%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	80.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	41.67%	0.00%	8.33%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	8	9	5	0	1	15
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	53.33%	60.00%	33.33%	0.00%	6.67%	100.00%

Q59. Depart of Trans - Bid shopping or bid manipulation										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	28.57%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%
CATEGORY%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	1	1	0	0	3	5	2	0	1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	50.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	71.43%	66.67%	0.00%	100.00%	72.73%
CATEGORY%	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%	62.50%	25.00%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%
Total	2	1	0	0	4	7	3	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	18.18%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%	63.64%	27.27%	0.00%	9.09%	100.00%

Q59. Met Council - Bid shopping or bid manipulation										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	18.18%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	0	1	9
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	50.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	81.82%
CATEGORY%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	22.22%	66.67%	0.00%	11.11%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%	36.36%	54.55%	0.00%	9.09%	100.00%

Q59. Mosquito Control - Bid shopping or bid manipulation										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	18.18%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	66.67%	50.00%	0.00%	100.00%	36.36%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	1	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.67%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	33.33%	0.00%	16.67%	100.00%

Q59. Airports Commission - Bid shopping or bid manipulation										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	66.67%	0.00%	100.00%	62.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%

Q59. Sports Facilities - Bid shopping or bid manipulations										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	33.33%	0.00%	100.00%	60.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%

Q60. Depart of Admin - Double standards in performance										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	1	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	55.56%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	40.00%
CATEGORY%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	83.33%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	0	0	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%	33.33%	80.00%	0.00%	0.00%	46.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	42.86%	42.86%	57.14%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA-Did not bid	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	8	9	5	0	1	15
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	53.33%	60.00%	33.33%	0.00%	6.67%	100.00%

Q60. Depart of Trans - Double standards in performance	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	1	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	71.43%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	40.00%
CATEGORY%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	83.33%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	100.00%
No	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	28.57%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	26.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	2	1	0	0	4	7	3	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	18.18%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%	63.64%	27.27%	0.00%	9.09%	100.00%

Q60. Met Council - Double standards in performance	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	28.57%	55.56%	0.00%	100.00%	57.14%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	25.00%	62.50%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%
No	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	28.57%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	35.71%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	7.14%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	1	0	0	3	4	9	0	1	14
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%	57.14%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	28.57%	64.29%	0.00%	7.14%	100.00%

Q60. Airports Commission - Double standards in performance	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	37.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	62.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%

Q60. Sports Facilities - Double standards in performance	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	20.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%

Q61. Depart of Admin - Denial of opportunity to bid	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	0	0	0	3	4	2	0	0	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%	44.44%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%
CATEGORY%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	0	1	9
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	62.50%	55.56%	60.00%	0.00%	100.00%	60.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	55.56%	55.56%	33.33%	0.00%	11.11%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	8	9	5	0	1	15
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	53.33%	60.00%	33.33%	0.00%	6.67%	100.00%

Q61. Depart of Trans - Denial of opportunity to bid	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	4	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	14.29%	100.00%	0.00%	36.36%	36.36%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	12.50%	37.50%	0.00%	50.00%	100.00%
No	2	1	0	0	3	6	0	1	7	14
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	85.71%	0.00%	100.00%	63.64%	63.64%
CATEGORY%	14.29%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	42.86%	0.00%	7.14%	50.00%	100.00%
Total	2	1	0	0	4	7	3	1	11	22
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	9.09%	4.55%	0.00%	0.00%	18.18%	31.82%	13.64%	4.55%	50.00%	100.00%

Q61. Met Council - Denial of opportunity to bid	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	2	2	5		0	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	50.00%	83.33%	0.00%	0.00%	63.64%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	28.57%	71.43%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	0	1	0	0	1	2	1		1	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	50.00%	16.67%	0.00%	100.00%	36.36%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	100.00%
Total	0	1	0	0	3	4	6		1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%	36.36%	54.55%	0.00%	9.09%	100.00%

Q61. Mosquito Control - Denial of opportunity to bid	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	2	2	2		0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	66.67%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	33.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	3	3	2		1	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.67%	0.00%	33.33%	100.00%

Q61. Airports Commission - Denial of opportunity to bid	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	2	2	2		0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	66.67%		0.00%	50.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	2	2	1		1	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	33.33%		100.00%	50.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	4	4	3		1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%		100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%

Q61. Sports Facilities - Denial of opportunity to bid	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	40.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	1	1	3		1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%

Q62. Depart of Admin - Unfair denial of contract award	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	0	0	0	3	4	1		0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%	44.44%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%
CATEGORY%	20.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	4	4	4		1	9
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	44.44%	80.00%	0.00%	100.00%	60.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
NA-Did not bid	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	8	9	5		1	15
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	6.67%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Q62. Depart of Trans - Unfair denial of contract award	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	22.22%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
No	2	1	0	0	2	5	2	0	1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	55.56%	66.67%	0.00%	100.00%	72.73%
CATEGORY%	25.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Total	2	1	0	0	4	7	3	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	77.78%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	18.18%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Q62. Met Council - Unfair denial of contract award	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
No	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	1	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	50.00%	57.14%	0.00%	100.00%	63.64%
CATEGORY%	14.29%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	54.55%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	9.09%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Q62. Mosquito Control - Unfair denial of contract award	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	66.67%	50.00%	0.00%	100.00%	66.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	1	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.67%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Q62. Airports Commission - Unfair denial of contract award	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	42.86%	100.00%	33.33%	0.00%	100.00%	83.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	1	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	116.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Q62. Sports Facilities - Unfair denial of contract award	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	100.00%	80.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	25.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	33.33%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%

Q63. Depart of Admin - Unfair termination	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	22.22%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%
CATEGORY%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	6	6	11	0	1	18
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	66.67%	84.62%	0.00%	100.00%	360.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	61.11%	0.00%	5.56%	100.00%
NA-Did not bid	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	11.11%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	8	9	13	0	1	23
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	4.35%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	34.78%	39.13%	56.52%	0.00%	4.35%	100.00%

Q63. Depart of Trans - Unfair termination	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
No	2	1	0	0	3	6	3	0	1	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	30.00%	66.67%	30.00%	0.00%	100.00%	43.48%
CATEGORY%	20.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	30.00%	60.00%	30.00%	0.00%	10.00%	100.00%
Total	2	1	0	0	3	6	7	0	1	14
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%	66.67%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	60.87%
CATEGORY%	14.29%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	42.86%	50.00%	0.00%	7.14%	100.00%

Q63. Met Council - Unfair termination	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	4.35%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	0	1	0	0	3	4	5	0	1	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	44.44%	83.33%	0.00%	100.00%	43.48%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%	0.00%	10.00%	100.00%
Total	0	1	0	0	3	4	6	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	44.44%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	47.83%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%	36.36%	54.55%	0.00%	9.09%	100.00%

Q63. Mosquito Control - Unfair termination	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
No	0	0	0	3	3	6	3	0	1	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.67%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	30.00%	30.00%	60.00%	30.00%	0.00%	10.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	3	3	6	3	0	1	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.67%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	30.00%	30.00%	60.00%	30.00%	0.00%	10.00%	100.00%

Q63. Airports Commission - Unfair termination										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
No	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	44.44%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	80.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	44.44%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	80.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%

Q63. Sports Facilities - Unfair termination										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
No	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	11.11%	60.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	11.11%	60.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%

Q64. Depart of Admin - Experienced other form of discrimination										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	0	0	0	5	6	0	0	1	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	62.50%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	140.00%
CATEGORY%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	71.43%	85.71%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	22.22%	71.43%	0.00%	0.00%	140.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	28.57%	71.43%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA-Did not bid	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	8	9	5	0	1	15
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	33.33%	0.00%	100.00%	300.00%
CATEGORY%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	53.33%	60.00%	33.33%	0.00%	6.67%	100.00%

Q64. Depart of Trans - Experienced other form of discrimination										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%	44.44%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%	80.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
No	1	1	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	50.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	33.33%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	120.00%
CATEGORY%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	2	1	0	0	4	7	3	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%	77.78%	27.27%	0.00%	100.00%	220.00%
CATEGORY%	18.18%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%	63.64%	27.27%	0.00%	9.09%	100.00%

Q64. Met Council - Experienced other form of discrimination										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%	33.33%	20.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%	60.00%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
No	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	83.33%	0.00%	0.00%	120.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	83.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	1	0	0	3	4	6	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%	44.44%	54.55%	0.00%	100.00%	220.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%	36.36%	54.55%	0.00%	9.09%	100.00%

Q64. Mosquito Control - Experienced other form of discrimination	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	33.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	22.22%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	1	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	33.33%	0.00%	16.67%	100.00%

Q64. Airports Commission - Experienced other form of discrimination	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	4	4	1	0	1	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	33.33%	0.00%	100.00%	75.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	66.67%	16.67%	0.00%	16.67%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%

Q64. Sports Facilities - Experienced other form of discrimination	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	33.33%	0.00%	100.00%	37.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	100.00%
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	62.50%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%

Q65. Depart of Admin - When did the discrimination occur?	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
During bidding process	1	0	0	0	7	8	4	0	1	13
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	87.50%	88.89%	80.00%	0.00%	100.00%	86.67%
CATEGORY%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	53.85%	61.54%	30.77%	0.00%	7.69%	100.00%
No experience	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No response	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	1	0	0	0	8	9	5	0	1	15
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	53.33%	60.00%	33.33%	0.00%	6.67%	100.00%

Q65. Depart of Trans - When did the discrimination occur?	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
During bidding process	1	1	0	0	4	6	3	0	1	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	50.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	85.71%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	90.91%
CATEGORY%	10.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	60.00%	30.00%	0.00%	10.00%	100.00%
After contract award	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%
CATEGORY%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	2	1	0	0	4	7	3	0	1	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	18.18%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%	63.64%	27.27%	0.00%	9.09%	100.00%

Q65. Met Council - When did the discrimination occur?	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
During bidding process	0	1	0	0	3	4	9	0	1	14
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	28.57%	64.29%	0.00%	7.14%	100.00%
Total	0	1	0	0	3	4	9	0	1	14
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	28.57%	64.29%	0.00%	7.14%	100.00%

Q65. Mosquito Control - When did the discrimination occur?	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
During bidding process	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	1	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.67%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	33.33%	0.00%	16.67%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	1	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.67%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	33.33%	0.00%	16.67%	100.00%

Q65. Airports Commission - When did the discrimination occur?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
During bidding process	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	1	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%

Q65. Sports Facilities - When did the discrimination occur?										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
During bidding process	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	25.00%	60.00%	0.00%	100.00%	83.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
Total	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	25.00%	60.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%

Q66. Depart of Admin - Times submitted bid as a subcontractor since 2006										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
None	10	13	2	6	93	124	215	0	8	347
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	50.00%	20.00%	66.67%	69.92%	64.25%	65.35%	0.00%	72.73%	65.10%
CATEGORY%	2.88%	3.75%	0.58%	1.73%	26.80%	35.73%	61.96%	0.00%	2.31%	100.00%
1-10	5	9	5	3	30	52	92	0	3	147
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	34.62%	50.00%	33.33%	22.56%	26.94%	27.96%	0.00%	27.27%	27.58%
CATEGORY%	3.40%	6.12%	3.40%	2.04%	20.41%	35.37%	62.59%	0.00%	2.04%	100.00%
11-25	0	2	2	0	3	7	15	0	0	22
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	7.69%	20.00%	0.00%	2.26%	3.63%	4.56%	0.00%	0.00%	4.13%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	9.09%	9.09%	0.00%	13.64%	31.82%	68.18%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
26-50	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	0.75%	1.04%	0.91%	0.00%	0.00%	0.94%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
51-100	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.75%	1.04%	0.91%	0.00%	0.00%	0.94%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Over 100	0	1	0	0	5	6	1	0	0	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	3.76%	3.11%	0.30%	0.00%	0.00%	1.31%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	71.43%	85.71%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	0	11	533
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.81%	4.88%	1.88%	1.69%	24.95%	36.21%	61.73%	0.00%	2.06%	100.00%

Q66. Depart of Trans - Times submitted bid as a subcontractor since 2006										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
None	10	15	2	4	90	121	190	13	6	330
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	57.69%	20.00%	44.44%	67.67%	62.69%	57.75%	68.42%	54.55%	59.78%
CATEGORY%	3.03%	4.55%	0.61%	1.21%	27.27%	36.67%	57.58%	3.94%	1.82%	100.00%
1-10	2	6	6	4	21	39	81	3	4	127
DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	23.08%	60.00%	44.44%	15.79%	20.21%	24.62%	15.79%	36.36%	23.01%
CATEGORY%	1.57%	4.72%	4.72%	3.15%	16.54%	30.71%	63.78%	2.36%	3.15%	100.00%
11-25	0	3	1	1	5	10	23	1	0	34
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	11.54%	10.00%	11.11%	3.76%	5.18%	6.99%	5.26%	0.00%	6.16%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	8.82%	2.94%	2.94%	14.71%	29.41%	67.65%	2.94%	0.00%	100.00%
26-50	0	0	0	0	4	4	12	1	0	17
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.01%	2.07%	3.65%	5.26%	0.00%	3.08%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	23.53%	23.53%	70.59%	5.88%	0.00%	100.00%
51-100	3	1	0	0	5	9	9	0	1	19
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	3.76%	4.66%	2.74%	0.00%	9.09%	3.44%
CATEGORY%	15.79%	5.26%	0.00%	0.00%	26.32%	47.37%	47.37%	0.00%	5.26%	100.00%
Over 100	0	1	1	0	8	10	14	1	0	25
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	3.85%	10.00%	0.00%	6.02%	5.18%	4.26%	5.26%	0.00%	4.53%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	4.00%	4.00%	0.00%	32.00%	40.00%	56.00%	4.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q66. Met Council - Times submitted bid as a subcontractor since 2006										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
None	10	16	3	6	95	130	227	15	9	381
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	61.54%	30.00%	66.67%	71.43%	67.36%	69.00%	78.95%	81.82%	69.02%
CATEGORY%	2.62%	4.20%	0.79%	1.57%	24.93%	34.12%	59.58%	3.94%	2.36%	100.00%
1-10	3	6	6	2	24	41	78	3	1	123
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	23.08%	60.00%	22.22%	18.05%	21.24%	23.71%	15.79%	9.09%	22.28%
CATEGORY%	2.44%	4.88%	4.88%	1.63%	19.51%	33.33%	63.41%	2.44%	0.81%	100.00%
11-25	1	2	0	1	4	8	10	0	1	19
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	7.69%	0.00%	11.11%	3.01%	4.15%	3.04%	0.00%	9.09%	3.44%
CATEGORY%	5.26%	10.53%	0.00%	5.26%	21.05%	42.11%	52.63%	0.00%	5.26%	100.00%
26-50	0	1	0	0	3	4	6	1	0	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	2.26%	2.07%	1.82%	5.26%	0.00%	1.99%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%	36.36%	54.55%	9.09%	0.00%	100.00%
51-100	0	1	1	0	4	6	8	0	0	14
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	3.85%	10.00%	0.00%	3.01%	3.11%	2.43%	0.00%	0.00%	2.54%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	7.14%	7.14%	0.00%	28.57%	42.86%	57.14%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Over 100	1	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.26%	2.07%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.72%
CATEGORY%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q66. Mosquito Control - Times submitted bid as a subcontractor since 2006		African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
None		11	20	5	7	120	163	266	16	8	453
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	73.33%	76.92%	50.00%	77.78%	90.23%	84.46%	80.85%	84.21%	72.73%	82.07%
	CATEGORY%	2.43%	4.42%	1.10%	1.55%	26.49%	35.98%	58.72%	3.53%	1.77%	100.00%
1-10		2	6	4	2	11	25	54	2	3	84
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	13.33%	23.08%	40.00%	22.22%	8.27%	12.95%	16.41%	10.53%	27.27%	15.22%
	CATEGORY%	2.38%	7.14%	4.76%	2.38%	13.10%	29.76%	64.29%	2.38%	3.57%	100.00%
11-25		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	6
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.52%	5.26%	0.00%	1.09%
	CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	83.33%	16.67%	0.00%	100.00%
26-50		0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.75%	0.52%	0.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.36%
	CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
51-100		1	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	5
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.04%	0.91%	0.00%	0.00%	0.91%
	CATEGORY%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Over 100		1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	2
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.75%	1.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.36%
	CATEGORY%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total		15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q66. Airports Commission - Times submitted bid as a subcontractor since 2006		African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
None		11	16	4	5	98	134	232	15	9	390
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	73.33%	61.54%	40.00%	55.56%	73.68%	69.43%	70.52%	78.95%	81.82%	70.65%
	CATEGORY%	2.82%	4.10%	1.03%	1.28%	25.13%	34.36%	59.49%	3.85%	2.31%	100.00%
1-10		4	7	5	3	26	45	80	3	1	129
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	26.67%	26.92%	50.00%	33.33%	19.55%	23.32%	24.32%	15.79%	9.09%	23.37%
	CATEGORY%	3.10%	5.43%	3.88%	2.33%	20.16%	34.88%	62.02%	2.33%	0.78%	100.00%
11-25		0	1	0	1	4	6	10	0	0	16
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	11.11%	3.01%	3.11%	3.04%	0.00%	0.00%	2.90%
	CATEGORY%	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	6.25%	25.00%	37.50%	62.50%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
26-50		0	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	0	6
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.75%	0.52%	1.22%	5.26%	0.00%	1.09%
	CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	66.67%	16.67%	0.00%	100.00%
51-100		0	2	1	0	1	4	3	0	1	8
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	7.69%	10.00%	0.00%	0.75%	2.07%	0.91%	0.00%	9.09%	1.45%
	CATEGORY%	0.00%	25.00%	12.50%	0.00%	12.50%	50.00%	37.50%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%
Over 100		0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	3
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.26%	1.55%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.54%
	CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total		15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q66. Sports Facilities - Times submitted bid as a subcontractor since 2006		African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
None		12	19	5	7	108	151	251	16	7	425
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	80.00%	73.08%	50.00%	77.78%	81.20%	78.24%	76.29%	84.21%	63.64%	76.99%
	CATEGORY%	2.82%	4.47%	1.18%	1.65%	25.41%	35.53%	59.06%	3.76%	1.65%	100.00%
1-10		3	6	4	2	24	39	69	3	4	115
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	23.08%	40.00%	22.22%	18.05%	20.21%	20.97%	15.79%	36.36%	20.83%
	CATEGORY%	2.61%	5.22%	3.48%	1.74%	20.87%	33.91%	60.00%	2.61%	3.48%	100.00%
11-25		0	0	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	5
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.75%	1.04%	0.91%	0.00%	0.00%	0.91%
	CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
26-50		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.72%
	CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
51-100		0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.52%	0.61%	0.00%	0.00%	0.54%
	CATEGORY%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total		15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q67. Depart of Admin - Worked as a subcontractor since 2006		African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes		1	5	2	1	14	23	36	1	0	60
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	19.23%	20.00%	11.11%	10.53%	11.92%	10.94%	5.26%	0.00%	10.87%
	CATEGORY%	1.67%	8.33%	3.33%	1.67%	23.33%	38.33%	60.00%	1.67%	0.00%	100.00%
No		13	21	8	6	118	166	290	17	11	484
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	86.67%	80.77%	80.00%	66.67%	88.72%	86.01%	88.15%	89.47%	100.00%	87.68%
	CATEGORY%	2.69%	4.34%	1.65%	1.24%	24.38%	34.30%	59.92%	3.51%	2.27%	100.00%
Don't Know		1	0	0	2	1	4	3	1	0	8
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	0.75%	2.07%	0.91%	5.26%	0.00%	1.45%
	CATEGORY%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	12.50%	50.00%	37.50%	12.50%	0.00%	100.00%
Total		15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
	DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q67. Depart of Trans - Worked as a subcontractor since 2006										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	3	6	1	3	28	41	65	3	1	110
DEMOGRAPHIC%	20.00%	23.08%	10.00%	33.33%	21.05%	21.24%	19.76%	15.79%	9.09%	19.93%
CATEGORY%	2.73%	5.45%	0.91%	2.73%	25.45%	37.27%	59.09%	2.73%	0.91%	100.00%
No	12	20	9	6	102	149	260	15	10	434
DEMOGRAPHIC%	80.00%	76.92%	90.00%	66.67%	76.69%	77.20%	79.03%	78.95%	90.91%	78.62%
CATEGORY%	2.76%	4.61%	2.07%	1.38%	23.50%	34.33%	59.91%	3.46%	2.30%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	1	0	8
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.26%	1.55%	1.22%	5.26%	0.00%	1.45%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%	37.50%	50.00%	12.50%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q67. Met Council - Worked as a subcontractor since 2006										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	4	1	1	20	27	42	1	0	70
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	15.38%	10.00%	11.11%	15.04%	13.99%	12.77%	5.26%	0.00%	12.68%
CATEGORY%	1.43%	5.71%	1.43%	1.43%	28.57%	38.57%	60.00%	1.43%	0.00%	100.00%
No	13	22	9	7	108	159	283	17	11	470
DEMOGRAPHIC%	86.67%	84.62%	90.00%	77.78%	81.20%	82.38%	86.02%	89.47%	100.00%	85.14%
CATEGORY%	2.77%	4.68%	1.91%	1.49%	22.98%	33.83%	60.21%	3.62%	2.34%	100.00%
Don't Know	1	0	0	1	5	7	4	1	0	12
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	3.76%	3.63%	1.22%	5.26%	0.00%	2.17%
CATEGORY%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%	41.67%	58.33%	33.33%	8.33%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q67. Mosquito Control - Worked as a subcontractor since 2006										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.52%	1.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.91%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	80.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	15	25	10	7	129	186	318	18	11	533
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	96.15%	100.00%	77.78%	96.99%	96.37%	96.66%	94.74%	100.00%	96.56%
CATEGORY%	2.81%	4.69%	1.88%	1.31%	24.20%	34.90%	59.66%	3.38%	2.06%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	2	4	6	7	1	0	14
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	3.01%	3.11%	2.13%	5.26%	0.00%	2.54%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	28.57%	42.86%	50.00%	7.14%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q67. Airports Commission - Worked as a subcontractor since 2006	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	3	2	1	14	21	30	1	1	53
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	11.54%	20.00%	11.11%	10.53%	10.88%	9.12%	5.26%	9.09%	9.60%
CATEGORY%	1.89%	5.66%	3.77%	1.89%	26.42%	39.62%	56.60%	1.89%	1.89%	100.00%
No	13	23	8	7	117	168	295	17	10	490
DEMOGRAPHIC%	86.67%	88.46%	80.00%	77.78%	87.97%	87.05%	89.67%	89.47%	90.91%	88.77%
CATEGORY%	2.65%	4.69%	1.63%	1.43%	23.88%	34.29%	60.20%	3.47%	2.04%	100.00%
Don't Know	1	0	0	1	2	4	4	1	0	9
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	1.50%	2.07%	1.22%	5.26%	0.00%	1.63%
CATEGORY%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	22.22%	44.44%	44.44%	11.11%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q67. Sports Facilities - Worked as a subcontractor since 2006	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	1	0	0	4	6	20	1	1	28
DEMOGRAPHIC%	6.67%	3.85%	0.00%	0.00%	3.01%	3.11%	6.08%	5.26%	9.09%	5.07%
CATEGORY%	3.57%	3.57%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	21.43%	71.43%	3.57%	3.57%	100.00%
No	14	25	10	7	124	180	304	17	10	511
DEMOGRAPHIC%	93.33%	96.15%	100.00%	77.78%	93.23%	93.26%	92.40%	89.47%	90.91%	92.57%
CATEGORY%	2.74%	4.89%	1.96%	1.37%	24.27%	35.23%	59.49%	3.33%	1.96%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	2	5	7	5	1	0	13
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	3.76%	3.63%	1.52%	5.26%	0.00%	2.36%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	15.38%	38.46%	53.85%	38.46%	7.69%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	15	26	10	9	133	193	329	19	11	552
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.72%	4.71%	1.81%	1.63%	24.09%	34.96%	59.60%	3.44%	1.99%	100.00%

Q68. Depart of Admin - As a subcontract what is the average amount of time to receive payments?	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Less than 30 days	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.78%	0.00%	0.00%	1.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
30-60 days	1	4	2	1	10	18	29	1	0	48
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	80.00%	100.00%	100.00%	71.43%	78.26%	80.56%	100.00%	0.00%	80.00%
CATEGORY%	2.08%	8.33%	4.17%	2.08%	20.83%	37.50%	60.42%	2.08%	0.00%	100.00%
60-90 days	0	1	0	0	2	3	4	0	0	7
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	13.04%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	11.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	42.86%	57.14%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
90-120 days	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.78%	0.00%	0.00%	1.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Over 120 days	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	8.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.33%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.78%	0.00%	0.00%	1.67%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	1	5	2	1	14	23	36	1	0	60
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	1.67%	8.33%	3.33%	1.67%	23.33%	38.33%	60.00%	1.67%	0.00%	100.00%

Q68. Depart of Trans - As a subcontract what is the average amount of time to receive payments?	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Total	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.57%	2.44%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	5.45%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	83.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
30-60 days	3	5	1	3	15	27	43	3	1	74
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	83.33%	100.00%	100.00%	53.57%	65.85%	66.15%	100.00%	100.00%	67.27%
CATEGORY%	4.05%	6.76%	1.35%	4.05%	20.27%	36.49%	58.11%	4.05%	1.35%	100.00%
60-90 days	0	1	0	0	8	9	10	0	0	19
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	21.95%	15.38%	0.00%	0.00%	17.27%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	5.26%	0.00%	0.00%	42.11%	47.37%	52.63%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
90-120 days	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.57%	2.44%	6.15%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	80.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Over 120 days	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.71%	7.32%	3.08%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%	60.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.54%	0.00%	0.00%	0.91%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	3	6	1	3	28	41	65	3	1	110
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.73%	5.45%	0.91%	2.73%	25.45%	37.27%	59.09%	2.73%	0.91%	100.00%

Q68. Met Council - As a subcontract what is the average amount of time to receive payments?

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Less than 30 days	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%	3.70%	2.38%	0.00%	0.00%	2.86%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
30-60 days	1	3	1	1	12	18	33	1	0	52
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	75.00%	100.00%	100.00%	60.00%	66.67%	78.57%	100.00%	0.00%	74.29%
CATEGORY%	1.92%	5.77%	1.92%	1.92%	23.08%	34.62%	63.46%	1.92%	0.00%	100.00%
60-90 days	0	1	0	0	4	5	6	0	0	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	18.52%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	15.71%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%	45.45%	54.55%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
90-120 days	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.43%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Over 120 days	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	7.41%	2.38%	0.00%	0.00%	4.29%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.38%	0.00%	0.00%	1.43%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	1	4	1	1	20	27	42	1	0	70
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	1.43%	5.71%	1.43%	1.43%	28.57%	38.57%	60.00%	1.43%	0.00%	100.00%

Q68. Mosquito Control - As a subcontract what is the average amount of time to receive payments?

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
30-60 days	0	1	0	0	5	6	4	0	0	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	60.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	0	1	0	0	5	6	4	0	0	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	60.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%

Q68. Airports Commission - As a subcontract what is the average amount of time to receive payments?

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
30-60 days	1	2	2	1	6	12	22	1	1	36
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	66.67%	100.00%	100.00%	42.86%	57.14%	73.33%	100.00%	100.00%	67.92%
CATEGORY%	2.78%	5.56%	5.56%	2.78%	16.67%	33.33%	61.11%	2.78%	2.78%	100.00%
60-90 days	0	1	0	0	4	5	6	0	0	11
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	23.81%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.75%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%	45.45%	54.55%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
90-120 days	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	9.52%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.77%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Over 120 days	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	9.52%	3.33%	0.00%	0.00%	5.66%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.33%	0.00%	0.00%	1.89%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	1	3	2	1	14	21	30	1	1	53
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	1.89%	5.66%	3.77%	1.89%	26.42%	39.62%	56.60%	1.89%	1.89%	100.00%

Q68. Sports Facilities - As a subcontract what is the average amount of time to receive payments?

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Less than 30 days	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	15.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.71%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
30-60 days	1	1	0	0	3	5	16	1	1	23
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	83.33%	80.00%	100.00%	100.00%	82.14%
CATEGORY%	4.35%	4.35%	0.00%	0.00%	13.04%	21.74%	69.57%	4.35%	4.35%	100.00%
60-90 days	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	16.67%	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.14%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	1	1	0	0	4	6	20	1	1	28
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	3.57%	3.57%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	21.43%	71.43%	3.57%	3.57%	100.00%

Q69. How frequently have primes you subcontracted with delayed payment for services

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Very Often	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%	1.96%	5.43%	0.00%	0.00%	4.05%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	83.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Often	0	3	1	0	6	10	18	0	0	28
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	16.22%	19.61%	19.57%	0.00%	0.00%	18.92%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	10.71%	3.57%	0.00%	21.43%	35.71%	64.29%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Sometimes	0	1	1	1	11	14	14	0	0	28
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	16.67%	50.00%	33.33%	29.73%	27.45%	15.22%	0.00%	0.00%	18.92%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	3.57%	3.57%	3.57%	39.29%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Seldom	1	1	0	1	11	14	20	1	1	36
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	16.67%	0.00%	33.33%	29.73%	27.45%	21.74%	33.33%	50.00%	24.32%
CATEGORY%	2.78%	2.78%	0.00%	2.78%	30.56%	38.89%	55.56%	2.78%	2.78%	100.00%
Never	2	1	0	1	8	12	35	2	1	50
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	16.67%	0.00%	33.33%	21.62%	23.53%	38.04%	66.67%	50.00%	33.78%
CATEGORY%	4.00%	2.00%	0.00%	2.00%	16.00%	24.00%	70.00%	4.00%	2.00%	100.00%
Total	3	6	2	3	37	51	92	3	2	148
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.03%	4.05%	1.35%	2.03%	25.00%	34.46%	62.16%	2.03%	1.35%	100.00%

Q70. As a subcontractor, your working experience with primes has been:	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Excellent	1	0	1	1	9	12	18	0	1	31
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	0.00%	50.00%	33.33%	24.32%	23.53%	19.57%	0.00%	50.00%	20.95%
CATEGORY%	3.23%	0.00%	3.23%	3.23%	29.03%	38.71%	58.06%	0.00%	3.23%	100.00%
Good	0	6	0	1	23	30	63	3	1	97
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	33.33%	62.16%	58.82%	68.48%	100.00%	50.00%	65.54%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	6.19%	0.00%	1.03%	23.71%	30.93%	64.95%	3.09%	1.03%	100.00%
Fair	2	0	1	1	4	8	11	0	0	19
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	0.00%	50.00%	33.33%	10.81%	15.69%	11.96%	0.00%	0.00%	12.84%
CATEGORY%	10.53%	0.00%	5.26%	5.26%	21.05%	42.11%	57.89%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Poor	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%	1.96%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.68%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	3	6	2	3	37	51	92	3	2	148
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.03%	4.05%	1.35%	2.03%	25.00%	34.46%	62.16%	2.03%	1.35%	100.00%

Q71. Depart of Admin - submitted lowest bid but not given the work	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	1	2	1	0	3	7	3	0	0	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	33.33%	50.00%	0.00%	8.11%	13.73%	3.26%	0.00%	0.00%	6.76%
CATEGORY%	10.00%	20.00%	10.00%	0.00%	30.00%	70.00%	30.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	2	4	1	1	27	35	66	3	1	105
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	66.67%	50.00%	33.33%	72.97%	68.63%	71.74%	100.00%	50.00%	70.95%
CATEGORY%	1.90%	3.81%	0.95%	0.95%	25.71%	33.33%	62.86%	2.86%	0.95%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	1.96%	1.09%	0.00%	0.00%	1.35%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA - Did not bid	0	0	0	1	7	8	22	0	1	31
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	18.92%	15.69%	23.91%	0.00%	50.00%	20.95%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.23%	22.58%	25.81%	70.97%	0.00%	3.23%	100.00%
Total	3	6	2	3	37	51	92	3	2	148
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.03%	4.05%	1.35%	2.03%	25.00%	34.46%	62.16%	2.03%	1.35%	100.00%

Q71. Depart of Trans - submitted lowest bid but not given the work	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	2	2	0	0	9	13	10	0	0	23
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	24.32%	25.49%	10.87%	0.00%	0.00%	15.54%
CATEGORY%	8.70%	8.70%	0.00%	0.00%	39.13%	56.52%	43.48%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	1	4	2	1	26	34	72	3	2	111
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	66.67%	100.00%	33.33%	70.27%	66.67%	78.26%	100.00%	100.00%	75.00%
CATEGORY%	0.90%	3.60%	1.80%	0.90%	23.42%	30.63%	64.86%	2.70%	1.80%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	2.70%	5.88%	1.09%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	25.00%	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA - Did not bid	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	0	0	10
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%	1.96%	9.78%	0.00%	0.00%	6.76%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	90.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	3	6	2	3	37	51	92	3	2	148
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.03%	4.05%	1.35%	2.03%	25.00%	34.46%	62.16%	2.03%	1.35%	100.00%

Q71. Met Council - submitted lowest bid but not given the work	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	1	1	0	2	4	2	0	0	6
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	16.67%	50.00%	0.00%	5.41%	7.84%	2.17%	0.00%	0.00%	4.05%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	3	5	1	1	30	40	69	3	1	113
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	83.33%	50.00%	33.33%	81.08%	78.43%	75.00%	100.00%	50.00%	76.35%
CATEGORY%	2.65%	4.42%	0.88%	0.88%	26.55%	35.40%	61.06%	2.65%	0.88%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	3
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	2.70%	3.92%	1.09%	0.00%	0.00%	2.03%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA - Did not bid	0	0	0	1	4	5	20	0	1	26
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	10.81%	9.80%	21.74%	0.00%	50.00%	17.57%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.85%	15.38%	19.23%	76.92%	0.00%	3.85%	100.00%
Total	3	6	2	3	37	51	92	3	2	148
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.03%	4.05%	1.35%	2.03%	25.00%	34.46%	62.16%	2.03%	1.35%	100.00%

Q71. Mosquito Control - submitted lowest bid but not given the work										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%	1.96%	1.09%	0.00%	0.00%	1.35%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	2	5	2	1	18	28	46	3	1	78
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	83.33%	100.00%	33.33%	48.65%	54.90%	50.00%	100.00%	50.00%	52.70%
CATEGORY%	2.56%	6.41%	2.56%	1.28%	23.08%	35.90%	58.97%	3.85%	1.28%	100.00%
NA - Did not bid	1	1	0	2	18	22	45	0	1	68
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	16.67%	0.00%	66.67%	48.65%	43.14%	48.91%	0.00%	50.00%	45.95%
CATEGORY%	1.47%	1.47%	0.00%	2.94%	26.47%	32.35%	66.18%	0.00%	1.47%	100.00%
Total	3	6	2	3	37	51	92	3	2	148
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.03%	4.05%	1.35%	2.03%	25.00%	34.46%	62.16%	2.03%	1.35%	100.00%

Q71. Airports Commission - submitted lowest bid but not given the work										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	5
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%	3.92%	3.26%	0.00%	0.00%	3.38%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	2	4	2	1	30	39	62	3	1	105
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	66.67%	100.00%	33.33%	81.08%	76.47%	67.39%	100.00%	50.00%	70.95%
CATEGORY%	1.90%	3.81%	1.90%	0.95%	28.57%	37.14%	59.05%	2.86%	0.95%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	2.70%	5.88%	1.09%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	25.00%	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA - Did not bid	1	1	0	0	5	7	26	0	1	34
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	13.51%	13.73%	28.26%	0.00%	50.00%	22.97%
CATEGORY%	2.94%	2.94%	0.00%	0.00%	14.71%	20.59%	76.47%	0.00%	2.94%	100.00%
Total	3	6	2	3	37	51	92	3	2	148
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.03%	4.05%	1.35%	2.03%	25.00%	34.46%	62.16%	2.03%	1.35%	100.00%

Q71. Sports Facilities - submitted lowest bid but not given the work										
	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Nonminority Woman	M/WBE	Nonminority Male	Other	No Response	Total
Yes	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	4
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	2.70%	3.92%	2.17%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
No	2	5	1	1	23	32	50	3	2	87
DEMOGRAPHIC%	66.67%	83.33%	50.00%	33.33%	62.16%	62.75%	54.35%	100.00%	100.00%	58.78%
CATEGORY%	2.30%	5.75%	1.15%	1.15%	26.44%	36.78%	57.47%	3.45%	2.30%	100.00%
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
DEMOGRAPHIC%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%	1.96%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.68%
CATEGORY%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA - Did not bid	1	1	0	2	12	16	40	0	0	56
DEMOGRAPHIC%	33.33%	16.67%	0.00%	66.67%	32.43%	31.37%	43.48%	0.00%	0.00%	37.84%
CATEGORY%	1.79%	1.79%	0.00%	3.57%	21.43%	28.57%	71.43%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	3	6	2	3	37	51	92	3	2	148
DEMOGRAPHIC%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
CATEGORY%	2.03%	4.05%	1.35%	2.03%	25.00%	34.46%	62.16%	2.03%	1.35%	100.00%

APPENDIX C: REGRESSION ANALYSIS

APPENDIX C
REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Whereas **Chapter 5.0** and **6.0** reported findings of disparity and nondisparity related to the utilization of vendors in the State of Minnesota's (State) procurement activities according to selected race, ethnicity, and gender categories, this section reports findings from a telephone survey of a sample of 554[1] firms representative of the State's vendors examined in the study to assess race, ethnicity, and gender effects on vendor revenue during the 2006 tax year. To determine these effects, MGT applied a multivariate regression model to survey findings.

There are two key questions for consideration in this analysis: 1. Do minority- and woman-owned firms tend to earn significantly less revenue than firms owned by nonminority males? 2. If "yes," are their lower revenues due to race or gender status or to other factors?

Case law and social science research provide some guidance for addressing these questions. From research literature, we know that in addition to race and gender, factors such as firm capacity, owner experience, and education bear a relation to a firm's gross revenues. When multiple factors come into play, sometimes a multivariate statistical analysis can improve our understanding of more complex relationships among factors affecting company earnings. In this study, we employ linear regression to analyze variables, including race and gender that can affect a firm's success.

C.1 An Overview of Multivariate Regression and Description of Analytical Model

Multivariate regression was employed to examine the influence of selected company and business characteristics, especially owner race and gender, on 2006 gross revenues reported by 509 firms participating in a telephone survey administered during April 2009 and May 2009. For this analysis, gross revenue was the dependent variable, or the variable to be explained by the presence, absence, or strength of "selected characteristics" variables, known as "independent" or "explanatory" variables.

Since disparity analysis is an established domain of research, the selection of the independent company characteristics variables for this study was based on an extensive review of disparity study research literature. Most economic studies of discrimination are based on the seminal work of Nobel Prize recipient Gary Becker, "The Economics of Discrimination."[2] Becker was the first to define discrimination in financial and economic terms. Since Becker, labor economists and statistical researchers including Blinder and Oaxaca, Corcoran and Duncan, Gwaltney and Long, Reimers, Saunders, Darity and Myers, Hanuschek, Hirsch, Topel and Blau, and others have adopted a standard in disparity study research of using company earnings, or revenue, as the dependent

[1] In order to provide an accurate and complete regression analysis some responses had to be removed. For example if a person surveyed did not answer the revenue or race question, this response was removed. This number reflects those changes.

[2] Becker, Gary. 1971, second edition. "The Economics of Discrimination." The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, p. 167.

variable in race and gender discrimination analysis.[3] Comparable worth studies have also proposed regression models using gross revenue as the dependent variable for policy analysis,[4] and the U.S. Department of Commerce employs regression analysis (included in 48 CFR 19) to establish price evaluation adjustments for small disadvantaged businesses in federal procurement programs.[5]

The Regression Model Variables

Timothy Bates[6] used at least five general determinants, including firm capacity, managerial ability, manager/owner experience, and demographic characteristics such as race and gender, to explain statistical variations in firm gross revenues. These are elaborated below in terms of the dependent/independent variable relationship regression seeks to resolve.

Dependent Variable

For this analysis, the dependent variable (the variable to be explained by the independent variables in the model) was defined operationally as "firm 2006 gross revenues." Ideally, this variable is measured as the exact dollar figure for gross revenues. However, years of experience in conducting information and opinion surveys with companies have shown us that firms tend to be reluctant to release precise dollar figures but more responsive when inquiries about earnings are presented as a dollar range. Accordingly, to encourage greater participation in this study's telephone survey, nine company gross revenue categories were defined, ranging from Category 1, "Up to $50,000" to Category 9, "More than $10 million."

Independent Variables

The independent (i.e., explanatory) variables were those characteristics hypothesized as contributing to the variation in the dependent variable (2006 gross revenues). For this study, independent variables included:

- *Number of full-time employees* – The more employees a company has, the greater product volume it is likely to have to generate higher revenues.

- *Owner's years of experience* – The longer a company owner has been in a particular business, the more likely it is that the owner has knowledge of how to acquire contracts and the skills and experience to succeed in that business.

[3] "Race and Gender Discrimination Across Urban Labor Markets," 1996. Ed. Susan Schmitz. Garland Publishers, New York, New York, p. 184.
[4] Gunderson, Morley. 1994. "Male-Female Wage Differentials and Policy Responses." In "Equal Employment Opportunity: Labor Market Discrimination and Public Policy," pp. 207-227.
[5] "Federal Acquisition Regulations for Small Disadvantaged Businesses; Notice and Rules." June 30, 1998. Memorandum for Office of Federal Procurement Policy, Economic and Statistics Administration, Department of Commerce.
[6] Bates, Timothy. "The Declining Status of Minorities in the New York State Construction Industry." Reprinted from *Economic Development Quarterly*, Vol. 12., No. 1, February 1998, pp. 88-100.

- *Owner's level of education* – The research literature consistently reports a positive relationship between education and level of income.

- *Age of company* – It is argued that a company's longevity is an indicator of both success and the owner's managerial ability.

- *Race/ethnic group/gender of firm owners* – The proposition to be tested was whether there was a statistically significant relationship between race/ethnicity/gender of minority firm owners and firm revenue. In the analysis, the category "Non-M/WBE" served as a reference group against which all other race and gender groups were compared.

Finally, since companies tend to be organized around a business concentration (e.g., Construction, Professional Services, Goods and Supplies), type of business was introduced as a moderator variable to determine if the model, given adequate sample size, behaved differently as a predictor of gross revenue when respondents' line of business was considered.

Participants' responses to the survey provided the data to examine the relative importance of these factors. The operational relationship between these constructs (i.e., firm capacity, capability, experience, race, and gender) and measures derived from survey items is presented in **Exhibit C-1**.

EXHIBIT C-1
MODEL CONSTRUCTS, VARIABLES, AND MEASURES

MODEL CONSTRUCTS	VARIABLES	MEASURES
Capacity	Number of Employees	Number of Full-time and Part-time Employees Reported
	Private Contracting	Percent of Total Revenue from Private Sources
Owner's Managerial Ability	Owner's Education	Level of Education (from "some high school" to "postgraduate degree")
	Owner's Experience	Years of Experience
	Company Age	2008 Minus Reported "Year of Establishment"
Demographics	Business Owner Groups	African American, Hispanic American, Asian American, Native American, Nonminority Woman, and Non-M/WBE Firms
	Gender of Company Owner	Gender of Company Majority Owner or Shareholder

Source: State of Minnesota telephone survey data methodology.

Exploring Variable Relationships: How Regression Analysis Works

Multiple regression analysis permits simultaneous examination not only of the effects on the dependent variable of ***all*** independent variables in the multivariate model, but also the effect of each unique variable (i.e., controlling for the effects of the other independent variables in the equation). The effect of each predictor (independent) variable on the

dependent variable is expressed as the magnitude of the change in the dependent variable (Y) for each unit change in the independent variable (X) plus an "error term." Since the independent variable is never a perfect predictor of the dependent variable—that is, X is expressed as an imperfect predictor of Y such that one unit change in X ***never*** leads to one unit change in Y—the "error term," ε, is postulated to acknowledge the residual change in the value of Y that X cannot explain.

The goal in sound regression modeling, therefore, is to minimize residual values associated with the independent variables and to maximize their explanatory power. In other words, a good model that seeks to explain what causes revenue earnings, in this case, will hypothesize a combination of independent variables based on solid research findings having sufficient explanatory power to account for case-by-case differences in company revenue, while minimizing that portion of variation in revenue values that the independent variable cannot explain (i.e., minimizing the difference between Y values predicted by the X's in the model and *actual* Y values).

C.2 Assessing Variables in the Model

As suggested earlier, in a model with multiple independent, or predictor, variables, the effect of each individual independent variable is expressed as the expected change in the dependent variable (y) for each unit change in the independent variable (x), holding constant (or controlling for) the values of all the other independent variables (i.e., the effect on Y of the other X's in the equation). When X and Y values are plotted on a graph, linear regression attempts to find a straight line of best fit (also known as the least-squares line) that minimizes the differences between actual Y and predicted Y values as a function of X. The slope of this line represents the statistical relationship between the predicted values of Y based on X. The point at which this regression line crosses the Y axis (otherwise known as the constant) represents the predicted value of Y when X = 0. If the effect of X on Y is determined to be statistically significant (e.g., a significance level of $p < 0.05$ asserts that the calculated relationship between X and Y could occur due to chance only 5 times in 100), it can be asserted that X may indeed play a role in determining the value of Y (in the case of this study, company revenues). For example, if the slope coefficient of the variable representing one of the specific racial groups is determined to be statistically significant, then, all other things being equal, the hypothesis that race of the owner of a firm affects the annual revenue of the firm has only a 5 percent chance of being false. In disparity research, theory asserts that the negative effect of race on revenue earnings associated with being a minority-owned business is likely a product of discrimination.

Multivariate Regression Model

Mathematically, the multivariate linear regression model is expressed as:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_I X_I + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \ldots + \varepsilon$$

Where: Y = annual firm gross revenues

β_0 = the constant, representing the value of Y when $X_I = 0$

β_I = coefficient representing the magnitude of X_I's effect on Y

X_I = the independent variables, such as capacity, experience, managerial ability, race, and gender

ε = the error term, representing the variance in Y unexplained by X_I

This equation describes the hypothesized relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables and was used to test the hypothesis that there is no difference in 2006 revenue earnings for M/WBE firms when compared with non-M/WBE firms. Traditionally, the hypothesis of no difference (known as the null hypothesis) is represented as: $H_0 : Y_1 = Y_2$.

We can reject the null hypothesis if the analysis indicates that race and gender have been found to affect firm revenue (i.e., $H_1 : Y_1 \neq Y_2$, the alternate hypothesis). Results are statistically significant if it is determined that the probability of achieving this difference due to chance was less than 5 in 100 (i.e., $p < 0.05$).

Multivariate Regression Model Results

The regression model tested the effects of selected demographic and business characteristic variables on revenue earnings elicited from firms participating in the study. According to the following categories:[7]

1 = Up to $50,000	4 = $300,001 to $500,000	7 = $3,000,001 to $5 million
2 = $50,001 to $100,000	5 = $500,001 to $1 million	8 = $5,000,001 to $10 million
3 = $100,001 to $300,000	6 = $1,000,001 to $3 million	9 = Greater than $10 million

The tests for multicollinearity among independent variables and variance inflation due to outlier observations revealed no substantive problems with the data.[8] Initial analyses

[7] Despite the ordinal nature of the dependent variable, findings are reported based on a linear regression analysis; specifically, Ordinary Least Squares (OLS). Menard (1995) notes this as an acceptable and common practice, "particularly when the dependent variable has five or more [ordered] categories. Since this [OLS] is probably the easiest approach for readers to understand, sometimes other approaches are tried, just to confirm that the use of OLS does not…distort the findings." In this case, the nine categories of revenue were also analyzed using ordered Logit (SPSS 11.5), with nearly identical findings to those achieved with OLS with respect to magnitude of effect of the independent variables and both sign and significance. For further discussion, see Menard, S., "Applied logistic regression analysis," (*Sage university papers series. Quantitative applications in the social sciences;* no. 07-106), Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 1995.

[8] Multicollinearity refers to excessive intercorrelation among the independent variables in a multiple regression model, which obscures the effect of each on the dependent variable to the extent that they behave as one variable and may measure two highly correlated components of the same theoretical factor. Outliers are observations in a data set that are substantially different from the bulk of the data, perhaps because of a data entry error or some other cause that would reasonably explain a data anomaly.

also determined that one independent variable, percentage of business in the private sector, made no substantive contribution to the model, and was, therefore, removed. These adjustments yielded values for the variables listed in **Exhibit C-2.**

EXHIBIT C-2
STATE OF MINNESOTA TELEPHONE SURVEY DATA
RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Coefficients			
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients
	B	Std. Error	Beta
(Constant)	7.736	0.380	
African Americans (n=15	-1.192	0.546	-0.079
Hispanic Americans (n=10)	1.165	0.668	0.062
Asian American (n=26)	0.484	0.414	0.043
Native Americans (n=9)	0.731	0.711	0.037
Nonminority Females (n=133)	-0.940	0.216	-0.167
Company Age	0.017	0.004	-0.192
Number of Employees	0.000	0.000	0.072
High School	-0.547	0.424	-0.051
Some College	-1.073	0.285	-0.183
College Degree	-0.241	0.241	-0.050
Owner's Years of Experience	0.001	0.008	0.004
Special Trade Contractor	-0.570	0.258	-0.102
Professional Services	-2.560	0.285	-0.418
Generl/Personal Services	-1.251	0.316	-0.177
Supplies and Equipment	-2.161	0.267	-0.367

Source: State of Minnesota telephone survey.
Bold type indicates statistically significant results ($p \leq 0.05$).

Results

- The model testing the effects of the variables listed in **Exhibit G-2** on revenue reported by companies participating in the telephone survey explained 36.3 percent of the variance of the revenue variable ($R^2_j = 0.363$, $F = 19.558$, df = 15,515, $p \leq 0.000$).

- When controlling for the effects of variables related to company demographics (i.e. company capacity, ownership level of education and experience), M/WBE status had a negative effect on 2006 company earnings for African Americans and nonminority females.

- Among the company characteristics variables, other than M/WBE status, revenue for all groups increased as a function of company age, owner's experience, and number of employees.

- Industry type of firm ownership had a significant impact on company revenues.

Deriving Predicted Revenue for Race/Gender/Ethnicity Categories

Values from **Exhibit C-2** were inserted into the regression model in order to derive predicted revenue categories for each race/ethnicity/gender group. The following equation illustrates how predicted revenue would be calculated for an Asian American in the Professional Services business category.[9]

Gross Revenues = 7.736 + 0.484 Asian American + 0.017 Company Age + 0.000 Number of Employees – 0.547 High School – 1.073 Some College - 0.241 College Degree – 0.001 Owner's Experience – 2.560 Professional Services.

For instance, using **Exhibit C-3** below to interpret the effect or race/ethnicity/gender on predicted gross revenue for an Asian American in the Professional Services, holding all other variables constant, we would add the value of the constant (7.736) to the coefficient value for an Asian American (0.484) and the Professional Services business category (−2.560) to obtain a predicted revenue value of 5.660 (rounded to 6, representing the category "$1,000,001 to $3 million"). Similarly, to derive the effect or race/ethnicity/gender on predicted gross revenue for an Asian American in the Building Construction industry category, holding all other variables constant, we would simply note the value of the constant and add it to the Asian American coefficient (8.219, rounded to 8, representing the category "$5,000,001 to $10 million").

EXHIBIT C-3
GROSS REVENUE CATEGORIES FROM TELEPHONE SURVEY

Race/Ethnicity/Gender	Overall	Building Construction	Special Trade	Professional Services	General/Personal Services	Supplies and Equipment
Nonminority Males (n=329)	6	8	7	5	6	6
African Americans (n=15)	5	7	6	4	5	4
Hispanic Americans (n=10)	7	9	8	6	8	7
Asian Americans (n=26)	6	8	8	6	7	6
Native Americans (n=9)	7	8	8	6	7	6
Nonminority Females	5	7	6	4	6	5

Gross Revenue Categories:		
1 = Up to $50,000	4 = $300,001 to $500,000	7 = $3,000,001 to $5 million
2 = $50,001 to $100,000	5 = $500,001 to $1 million	8 = $5,000,001 to $10 million
3 = $100,001 to $300,000	6 = $1,000,001 to $3 million	9 = Greater than $10 million

Summary of Survey Findings

Regarding the positive significant effects of the non-race/ethnicity/gender variables—company age and number of employees—it would be expected that a firm's revenue might be positively related to its size and age, supporting the logical conclusion that larger, more established firms tend to do more business. However, even when these impacts were considered, African American and nonminority female firms responding to the telephone survey earned significantly less revenue in 2006 than did their non-M/WBE counterparts, supporting the conclusion that M/WBE status is negatively related to earnings when compared with earnings for non-M/WBEs.

[9] To derive coefficients for the race, ethnicity, and gender categories, the "Non-M/WBE" category was used as the reference variable, coded as value "0."

APPENDIX D: PERSONAL INTERVIEW GUIDE

APPENDIX D
PERSONAL INTERVIEW GUIDE
MINNESOTA JOINT AVAILABILITY AND DISPARITY STUDY

Interviewer: _____ **Date:** _____ **Time:** _____

Place: _____

Contact Name: _____

Contact Title: _____

Name of Company: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ **State:** _____ **Zip Code:** _____

Telephone: _____ **Fax:** _____

Email Address: _____ **Business Hours:** _____

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT

Please read the following to interviewee.

This interview is on behalf of Minnesota Department of Administration, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Council, Metropolitan Airports Commission, Metropolitan Mosquito Control, and Minnesota Sports Facilities Commission (referred as Governmental Units). This interview is part of a comprehensive study of the Governmental Units' procurement of services and products. The Governmental Units are committed to improving business with all their vendors. The questions we ask and your responses on your firm and industry are designed to provide us with information that can be used to improve business relationships with all vendors including businesses owned by individuals, as well as, small, minority, women, disadvantaged, and non-minority businesses.

Responses to this questionnaire will be held in strict confidence, and will not be distributed to any other firm or person with your firm's identity revealed. However, in the case of a court order, all documentation will be turned over to the court.

First, I will ask you some questions about your business.

Then I will ask you about characteristics of the company's ownership.

Finally, I will ask about your experiences doing business with the Governmental Units and its members.

BEGIN QUESTIONS – PLEASE BE SURE THAT THE RESPONDENT IS SPECIFIC IN PROVIDING THE GOVERNMENTAL UNITS MEMBER

As a reminder the members of the Governmental Units are as follows:

Minnesota Department of Administration

Minnesota Department of Transportation

Metropolitan Council

Metropolitan Airports Commission

Metropolitan Mosquito Control

Minnesota Sports Facilities Commission

Q1. Which *ONE* of the following is your company's primary line of business?

READ LIST

❑ [1] Building Construction (general contractor) –

Specify: _____

❑ [2] Special Trade Contractor (electrical, painting, heavy construction, etc.) –

Specify: _____

❑ [3] Professional Services –

Specify: _____

❑ [4] General/Personal Services (security, training, maintenance, etc.) –

Specify: _____

❑ [5] Supplies and Equipment (small procurement items) –

Specify: _____

❑ [9] No Response

Q2. In what year was your company established? _____.

❑ [9999] No Response **(**Don't Know)

Q3. Is company a sole proprietor, partnership, corporation or other?

____ ❑[1] Sole proprietor
____ ❑[2] Corporation
____ ❑[3] Limited Liability Corporation
____ ❑[7] Other (Specify)_____
____ ❑[4] Partnership
____ ❑[5] Limited Liability Partnership
____ ❑[6] Non-Profit Organization
____ ❑[9] No Response

Q4. Excluding yourself, (if owner), on average, how many employees does your company keep on the payroll?

_____❑[1] Full Time _____❑[2] Part-time/Cyclical ❑ [999999] No Response **6 digits**

Q5. Which of the following categories best approximates your company's gross revenues for calendar year 2006?

READ LIST

____ ❑[1] up to $50,000?
____ ❑[2] $50,001 to $100,000?
____ ❑[3] $100,001 to $300,000?
____ ❑[4] $300,001 to $500,000?
____ ❑[5] $500,001 to $1,000,000?
____❑[6] $1,000,001 to $3,000,000?
____❑[7] $3,000,001 to $5,000,000?
____ ❑[8] $5,000,001 to $10,000,000?
____ ❑[10] Over $10 million?
____ ❑[99] No Response

Q6. Is 51 percent of your company owned and controlled by a woman or women?

____ ❑[1] Yes ____ ❑[2]No ____ ❑[9] No Response

Q7. Is 51 percent of your company owned and controlled by someone who is disabled?

____ ❑[1] Yes ____ ❑[2]No ____ ❑[9] No Response

Q8. Which of the following categories would you consider to be the race or ethnic origin of the owner or controlling party? Would you say:

NOTE: IF RESPONDENT HAS A BI-RACIAL OR MULTI-RACIAL BACKGROUND, HAVE THEM IDENTIFY THE CATEGORY TO WHICH THEY MOST CLOSELY IDENTIFY.
READ LIST

❑[0] Anglo/Caucasian
❑[1] African/African American
❑[2]Asian
❑[3] Hispanic or Latino
❑[4] American Indian or Alaska Native
❑[5]Other (please specify)_____
❑[9] No Response

Q9. What is the highest level of education completed by the owner of your company? Would you say:

READ LIST

____ ❑[1] Some high school
____ ❑[2] High school graduate
____ ❑[3] Trade or technical education
____ ❑[4] Some college
____❑[5] College degree
____❑[6] Post graduate degree
____ ❑[9] No Response

Q10. How many years of experience in your company's business line do the primary owner of your firm have?

_____ Years (2 digits)

Q11. Are you in the same line of business as when you established your business?

____ ❑[1] Yes ____ ❑[2] No ____ ❑[9] No

Explain.

Q12. Are you required to have bonding for the type of work your company bids or proposes on?

____ ❑[1] Yes ____ ❑[2] No Skip to Q14 ____ ❑[99] DK Skip to Q14 (2 digits)

Q13. What is your current aggregate bonding limit?

❑[1] Below $100,000
❑[2] $100,001 to $250,000
❑[3] $250,001 to $500,000
❑[4] $500,001 to $1million
❑[5] $1,000,001 to $1,500,000
❑[6] 1,500,001 to $3 million
❑[7] $3,000,001 to $5 million
❑[8] Over $5 million
❑[9] None

Q14. What is your current single project bonding limit?

❑[1] Below $100,000
❑[2] $100,001 to $250,000
❑[3] $250,001 to $500,000
❑[4] $500,001 to $1million
❑[5] $1,000,001 to $1,500,000
❑[6] 1,500,001 to $3 million
❑[7] $3,000,001 to $5 million
❑[8] Over $5 million
❑[9] None

Q15. Since January 1, 2006, how many times has your company done the following in the public sector and private sector?

A. Submitted bids or proposals for projects as a prime contractor on projects for:

	Yes	No	1-10	11-25	26-50	51-100	Over 100	DK	NA
MN Department of Administration	1	2						9	99 (712)
MN Department of Transportation	1	2						9	99 (713)
Metropolitan Council	1	2						9	99 (714)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2						9	99 (715)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2						9	99 (716)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2						9	99 (717)
Private Sector	1	2						9	99

B. Awarded contracts as a prime contractor on projects for:

	Yes	No	1-10	11-25	26-50	51-100	Over 100	DK	NA
MN Department of Administration	1	2						9	99 (712)
MN Department of Transportation	1	2						9	99 (713)
Metropolitan Council	1	2						9	99 (714)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2						9	99 (715)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2						9	99 (716)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2						9	99 (717)
Private Sector	1	2						9	99

C. Submitted a quote for goods, services, equipment on contracts/purchase orders for:

	Yes	No	1-10	11-25	26-50	51-100	Over 100	DK	NA
MN Department of Administration	1	2						9	99 (712)
MN Department of Transportation	1	2						9	99 (713)
Metropolitan Council	1	2						9	99 (714)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2						9	99 (715)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2						9	99 (716)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2						9	99 (717)
Private Sector	1	2						9	99

D. Awarded a contract for goods, services, equipment on contracts/purchase orders for:

	Yes	No	1-10	11-25	26-50	51-100	Over 100	DK	NA
MN Department of Administration	1	2						9	99 (712)
MN Department of Transportation	1	2						9	99 (713)
Metropolitan Council	1	2						9	99 (714)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2						9	99 (715)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2						9	99 (716)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2						9	99 (717)
Private Sector	1	2						9	99

PLEASE BE SURE THAT THE RESPONDENT IS SPECIFIC IN PROVIDING THE GOVERNMENTAL UNITS MEMBER

Q16. Are there any factors (such as insurance bonding requirements, size of project) that have interfered with your ability to bid or provide a quote on a member of the Governmental Units' projects?

_____❑[1] Yes _____❑[2] No _____❑[99] DK

If yes, please provide as much detail as possible.

Q17. Do any of the members of the Governmental Units have any practices or procedures that have prevented you from bidding or receiving any contracts or purchase orders?

_____❑[1] Yes _____❑[2] No _____❑[99] DK

[Get details.]

Q18. Have any of the members of the Governmental Units made any attempts to encourage you to bid on their procurement?

_____❑[1] Yes _____❑[2] No _____❑[99] DK

If so, describe the outreach efforts. If not, please indicate any outreach efforts you would like to see implemented.

Q19. Have any of the members of the Governmental Units been helpful when you have questions or need information about the procurement process? (Explain.)

_____❑[1] Yes _____❑[2] No _____❑[99] DK

If yes, please provide as much detail as possible.

Q18a. If yes, has the information provided been timely and accurate?

[Get details.]

Q20. Do you feel as though your company has ever been treated unfairly in the selection process by the members of the Governmental Units?

	Yes	No	DK	NA
MN Department of Administration	1	2	3	4 (712)
MN Department of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (713)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (714)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (715)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (716)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (717)

[If yes, get examples!]

Q21. In you opinion, on a scale from 1 to 5, 5 being *Extremely Fair*, please indicate the members of the Governmental Units fairness in the selection process?

	Extremely Fair	Fair	Neutral	Unfair	Extremely Unfair	DK
MN Department of Administration	1	2	3	4	5	99
MN Department of Transportation	1	2	3	4	5	99
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4	5	99
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4	5	99
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4	5	99
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4	5	99

[Get examples!]

Q22. To the best of your knowledge, have you ever been the low bidder on a project and not been awarded the contract or purchase order by a member of the Governmental Units?

_____❑[1] Yes _____❑[2] No _____❑[99] DK

[If yes, get details.]

Q23. What factors would you say most frequently prevent you from winning contracts or purchase orders?

[Get details.]

Q24. Have you ever protested a contract or purchase order award?

_____❑[1] Yes _____❑[2] No _____❑[99] DK

[If yes, get details.]

Q25. Do you think your company will be retaliated against if you lodge a complaint with a member of the Governmental Units?

_____❑[1] Yes _____❑[2] No _____❑[99] DK

Q25a. If so, why?

Q26. What can the members of the Governmental Units do to improve the procurement and selection process?

Q27. Do you think that unions and/or project labor agreements have been a barrier in getting contracts?

_____❑[1] Yes _____❑[2] No _____❑[99] DK

Q27a. If so, why?

READ THE FOLLOWING:

The next set of questions is designed for firms that have served as a subcontractor to a prime contractor.

Q28. Have you ever served as a subcontractor on a member of the Governmental Units' projects or in the private sector?

	Yes	No	DK	NA
MN Department of Administration	1	2	3	4 (712)
MN Department of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (713)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (714)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (715)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (716)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (717)
Private Sector	1	2	3	4 (718)

(If respondent answers NO, ask Q28. and then skip to Question #33)

If respondent answers YES, ask Q28. and continue on.)

Q28a. Are there any factors (such as lack of information or financing) that prevent your firm from serving as a subcontractor on a member of the Governmental Units' projects?

	Yes	No	DK	NA
MN Department of Administration	1	2	3	4 (712)
MN Department of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (713)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (714)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (715)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (716)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (717)
Private Sector	1	2	3	4 (718)

Q29. How often have you served as a subcontractor on these projects?

	Yes	No	1-10	11-25	26-50	51-100	Over 100	DK	NA
MN Department of Administration	1	2						9	99 (712)
MN Department of Transportation	1	2						9	99 (713)
Metropolitan Council	1	2						9	99 (714)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2						9	99 (715)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2						9	99 (716)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2						9	99 (717)
Private Sector	1	2						9	99

Q30. Have you ever been informed that you were the low bidder as a subcontractor for a member of the Governmental Units' project or services, were awarded a contract, and then found out that another subcontractor was performing the work?

A.

	Yes	No	DK	NA
MN Department of Administration	1	2	3	4 (712)
MN Department of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (713)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (714)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (715)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (716)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (717)

Q30a. If yes, can you explain the circumstances of the situation?

Q30b. What action did you take?

Q31. Do you think prime contractors show any favoritism toward particular subcontractors when it comes to procuring services and products for Governmental Unit projects or in the private sector?

	Yes	No	DK	NA
MN Department of Administration	1	2	3	4 (712)
MN Department of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (713)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (714)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (715)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (716)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (717)
Private Sector	1	2	3	4 (718)

Q31a. If yes, can you explain how they show favoritism?

Q32. In your opinion, how frequently have prime contractors that you've subcontracted with to perform work or provide services, delayed payment for the work or services that you performed?

_____❑[1] Always
_____❑[2] Often
_____❑[3] Sometimes
_____❑[4] Seldom
_____❑[5] Never
_____❑[6] Not Applicable

READ THE FOLLOWING:

The next set of questions is designed for firms that are minority or woman owned. If the respondent is not an M/WBE, skip to Question 43.

Q33. Do you think certification has an effect on the ability to your company to compete with other businesses?

Why or why not?

Q34. Do you notice any difference in the willingness of primes to use small, minority, disadvantaged, disabled, or woman businesses in the public or private sector? If so, explain the differences.

Q35. Do you think primes will use small, minority, disadvantaged, or woman businesses if there are no Targeted Group Business (TGB) programs/goals?

Why or why not?

Q36. What do you feel are the biggest obstacles faced by small, minority, disadvantaged, disabled or woman businesses in the State of Minnesota? Elaborate.

Q37. As a prime or subcontractor did you experience discriminatory behavior from one of the following agencies or the private sector in the last five years when bidding on a contract?

Yes=1
No=2
DK=3
NA-Did not bid=4

[REQUIRE ANSWER]

	Yes	No	DK	NA-Did not Bid
MN Department of Administration	1	2	3	4 (646)
MN Department of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (647)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (648)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (649)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (650)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (651)
Private Sector	1	2	3	4 (652)

Q38. What was the most noticeable way you became aware of the discrimination against your company by:

READ CHOICES

Verbal Comment=1
Written Statement=2
Action Taken Against the Company=3
DK=4

[REQUIRE ANSWER][READ ONLY ANSWERS CORRESPONDING TO SUB-QUESTIONS ANSWERED 1 IN QUESTION 37]

	Verbal Comment	Written Statement	Action taken against the company	DK
MN Department of Administration	1	2	3	4 (657)
MN Department of Transportation	1	2	3	4 (658)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4 (659)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4 (660)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4 (661)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4 (662)
Private Sector	1	2	3	4 (663)

Q39. What of the following do you consider the main reason for your company being discriminated against by:

READ CHOICES

Owner's race or ethnicity=1
Owner's sex=2
Time in business=3
Company size=4
Company experience=5
Owner's disability=6
DK=9

	Owner's race or ethnicity	Owner's sex	Time in business	Company size	Company experience	Owner's disability	DK
MN Department of Administration	1	2	3	4	5	6	9 (668)
MN Department of Transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6	9 (669)
Metropolitan Council	1	2	3	4	5	6	9 (670)
Metropolitan Airports Commission	1	2	3	4	5	6	9 (671)
Metropolitan Mosquito Control	1	2	3	4	5	6	9 (672)
MN Sports Facilities Commission	1	2	3	4	5	6	9 (673)
Private Sector	1	2	3	4	5	6	9 (674)

Q39a. When did discrimination occur: (READ LIST)

_____❑1 During bidding process (before the contract award)
_____❑2 After contract awarded
_____❑4 Other _____
_____❑9 No answer/DK

If compliant filed, find out where

Q40. Do you feel as though you have experienced discriminatory behavior from other public or private sector organizations? Elaborate.

The next set of questions is designed for nonminority male and businesses. (If respondent is not a white male, skip to Question #47)

Q41. Do you think your company has ever suffered from reverse discrimination? If so, can you provide any details?

Q42. Do you think the ability of small, minority, disadvantaged, disabled or woman businesses to get certified gives them a competitive advantage? Why or why not?

Q43. Are you aware of any practices that prime contractors use to get around having to small, minority, disadvantaged, disabled or woman businesses? Describe.

Q44. Do you notice any differences in the willingness of primes to use small, minority, disadvantaged, disabled or woman businesses in the public and private sector? If so, explain the differences.

Q45. What are the biggest obstacles faced by your firm in conducting business with any of the members of the Governmental Units?

Q46. Do you think small, minority, disadvantaged, disabled, or woman businesses face challenges not faced by white males? If so, what.

The final two questions are designed for all to respond.

FINAL QUESTIONS – ALL FIRMS

Q47. Do you feel there is an informal network that gives an advantage to select businesses?

_____ ❑[1] Yes _____ ❑[2] No _____ ❑[99] DK

If yes, how does it operates? Please have the respondent indicate the Governmental Unit.

Q48. Is there anything that we have not covered that you feel will be helpful to this study? Do you have any addition comments that you feel will be helpful to this study?

_____❑[1] Yes _____❑[2] No _____❑[99] DK

Q48 a. If yes, What are your comments

A F F I D A V I T

_____

HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE TESTIMONY I GAVE IS TRUE AND AN ACCURATE REFLECTION OF MY PAST EXPERIENCES IN PROCUREMENT AND BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES WITH THE MINNESOTA GOVERNMENTAL UNITS.

ADDITIONALLY, THIS TESTIMONY WAS GIVEN FREELY AND I HAVE NOT BEEN COERCED OR RECEIVED ANY REMUNERATION FOR MY COMMENTS.

_____

SIGNATURE

_____

DATE

_____

SIGNATURE OF INTERVIEWER AS WITNESS

_____

DATE

APPENDIX E: FOCUS GROUP GUIDE

APPENDIX E
MINNESOTA AVAILABILITY AND DISPARITY STUDY
FOCUS GROUP GUIDE

Interviewer: _____ **Date:** _____ **Time:** _____

Place: _____

Group: _____

_____

Hello and thank you for coming to this focus group to provide input that will be used as a part of a comprehensive study of the Minnesota Departments of Administration and Transportation, Metropolitan Council, Metropolitan Airports Commission, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District and Minnesota Sports Facilities Commission (Governmental Units) procurement of services and products.

My name is _____ and I am a local subconsultant hired by MGT of America, Inc. We have been asked to gather opinions from business owners about the business climate in the Governmental Units. We are looking to obtain information on your experiences if any, when attempting to do business with the Governmental Units identified earlier.

I thought we might begin with introductions. Why don't you start and we will work around the room (name, what kind of work you do, and anything else you'd like us to know about you).

We are very glad that you are all here and appreciate you taking time out of your busy day to participate in this meeting.

We are going to be taking notes throughout the session. In addition, we would like to record this session if there are no objections. Responses to this questionnaire will be held in strict confidence, and will not be distributed to any other firm or person with your firm's identity revealed. However, in the case of a court order, all documentation will be turned over to the court.

The Process

The recordings and notes of these focus groups will only be reviewed by Governmental Units and MGT staff. We will use the information to summarize the discussions that took place during these focus groups. Individual names will not be identified nor will remarks or comments be attributed to a specific individual. Once all of the analysis for the focus groups is completed, the results will be aggregated and will be incorporated with other data from this phase of the study. These findings will be used in reviewing the Governmental Units' procurement practices and the procurement environment of the Governmental Units. We hope that everyone feels free to participate and to add as much insight as possible. We have ample time, so feel free to contribute to the discussion as we go along.

A. Welcome and brief background about the purpose of focus groups (see above).

- Introductions – have each participate state:
  - Name
  - Company's primary line of business
  - Certification status (if applicable)
  - Years in business

Be sure to note ethnic group, gender, and certification status (if applicable). This can be noted on the sign-in sheet.

B. Key Point to Discuss

- This is an open discussion involving all to participate. Goal is to have everyone participate in the discussion.

- Encourage participants to express thoughts and opinions freely.

- Stress that the intent is to focus on issues related to contracting (such as construction, construction related services – architecture, engineering, professional services, operational services), the procurement of supplies, materials and equipment, and the business climate in the Governmental Units.

- Individuals and participants will not be identified by name when providing feedback and findings to the Governmental Units staff.

B. Facilitation Logistics

- **Facilitators:** The facilitator has primary responsibility for working with the group to solicit responses to questions.

- **Facilitation Time:** Approximately 1½ hours.

- **Major Issues** will be recorded by tape recorder (if there are no objections), personal notes, and flipchart pages.

- **Date, Time, and Location:** To be determined

- **Materials Needed:**

  1. Flip Chart or Easel Paper
  2. Focus Group Guide (attached)
  3. List of Participants (sign-in sheet to be provided)
  4. Markers
  5. Audio Recorder

C. Discussion

- **Establish Scope:** We are going to discuss several items at this point. Our primary goal is to discuss your (local area business owners) opinions about the business climate in the Governmental Units.

1. Please discuss how you get information about any of the Governmental Units procurement opportunities (such as, State's website, networking/word-of-mouth, etc). Is this information helpful?

2. If you have been awarded a contract with any of the Governmental Units, on a scale from 1 to 5 (*1 being Extremely Positive to 2 being Extremely Negative),* rate your experience in doing business with the Governmental Unit(s) as a contractor. *Be sure that the responses identify their experience (such as the name of the project, type of project, type of contractor (procurement vendor, prime, subcontractor) etc.). Also, be sure that the respondent explains the reason for his/her rating.*

3. How could the Governmental Units improve its procurement system to enable businesses to participate more effectively on any of the Governmental Units public projects or procurement activities? *Be sure to specify public projects or procurement.*

4. On a scale from 1 to 5 (*1 being Extremely Positive to 2 being Extremely Negative),* rate your experience in doing business as a vendor or as a contractor, or subcontractor on any of the Governmental Units public projects. *Be sure that the responses identify whether they are referring to a procurement or contract, also ask request specifics about the project (project name, type of project, time period of project). Also, be sure that the respondent explains the reason for his/her rating.*

5. On a scale from 1 to 5 (*1 being Extremely Positive to 2 being Extremely Negative),* rate your experience in selling to or contracting with <u>other</u> local government agencies or the private sector. *Be sure that the responses identify their experience (such as the name of the entity, type of project, etc.). Also, be sure that the respondent explains the reason for his/her rating.*

6. In the past five years, how much of your contracts have come from any of the Governmental Units public projects? Procurement? General Contractors? Other Public Entities? From your own networks?

7. What do you feel most interferes with your ability to do business with the any of the Governmental Units on public and development projects (barriers of doing business, such as labor agreements, financing, bond requirements, etc.) or procurement activities? *Be sure that they specify public projects or procurement activities.*

8. What policies or practices do you think the Governmental Units should adopt to assist a company with doing more business with any of the Governmental Units?

9. Please discuss your understanding of the Targeted Vendor Program. Do you feel the services provided by the MN Department of Administration through this Program to be helpful? Please explain.

10. Please provide your opinion on the certification process. How could the certification process for doing business with the State of Minnesota be improved?

11. In the past five (5) years, what have been some of the important partnerships that you have had with contractors or vendors on public and private projects?

12. What business assistance services provided by any of the Governmental Units have you used? Did you find them helpful? Please explain.

APPENDIX F: US CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS

APPENDIX F
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS FOR THE STATE OF MINNESOTA AND THE MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL MSA

F.1 U.S. Census Survey of Business Availability of Firms within the State of Minnesota by NAICS Codes/Business Categories

Availability of All Firms within the State of Minnesota

EXHIBIT F-1
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATION
BASED ON ALL SECTORS
BASED ON PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	525	0.59%	643	0.72%	1,828	2.05%	487	0.55%	16,102	18.08%	19,585	21.99%	69,498	78.01%	89,083

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived from white men-owned firms within the State of Minnesota, based on the U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Business Owners (SBO).

Availability of Construction Firms within the State of Minnesota

EXHIBIT F-2
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATION
BASED ON NAICS CODE 23 - CONSTRUCTION
BASED ON PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	18	0.13%	113	0.79%	S	0.00%	71	0.50%	1,069	7.48%	1,271	8.89%	13,023	91.11%	14,294

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived from white men-owned firms within the State of Minnesota, based on the U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Business Owners (SBO).

EXHIBIT F-3
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATION
BASED ON NAICS CODE 23 - CONSTRUCTION
BASED ON PAID AND NON-PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	**413**	**0.81%**	**495**	**0.97%**	**268**	**0.52%**	**373**	**0.73%**	**3,668**	**7.15%**	**5,217**	**10.18%**	**46,048**	**89.82%**	**51,265**

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid and non-paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived from white men-owned firms within the State of Minnesota, based on the U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Business Owners (SBO).

Availability of Professional Services Firms Including Architecture and Engineering Firms within the State of Minnesota

EXHIBIT F-4
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATION
BASED ON NAICS CODE 54 - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES INCLUDING ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING SERVICES
BASED ON PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	**71**	**0.54%**	**S**	**0.00%**	**281**	**2.13%**	**S**	**0.00%**	**2,876**	**21.81%**	**3,228**	**24.48%**	**9,958**	**75.52%**	**13,186**

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived from white men-owned firms within the State of Minnesota, based on the U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Business Owners (SBO).
S denotes that findings were withheld because estimate did not meet publication standards.

EXHIBIT F-5
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BASED ON NAICS CODE 54 - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES INCLUDING ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING SERVICES
BASED ON PAID AND NON-PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	**659**	**1.18%**	**594**	**1.07%**	**1,310**	**2.35%**	**S**	**0.00%**	**17,272**	**31.04%**	**19,835**	**35.64%**	**35,815**	**64.36%**	**55,650**

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid and non-paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived from white men-owned firms within the State of Minnesota, based on the U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Business Owners (SBO).
S denotes that findings were withheld because estimate did not meet publication standards.

Availability of Other Services Firms within the State Of Minnesota

EXHIBIT F-6
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BASED ON NAICS CODES 56 AND 81- OTHER SERVICES
OTHER SERVICES
BASED ON PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	**92**	**0.85%**	**503**	**4.64%**	**S**	**0.00%**	**62**	**0.57%**	**2,734**	**25.22%**	**3,391**	**31.29%**	**7,448**	**68.71%**	**10,839**

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived from white men-owned firms within the State of Minnesota, based on the U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Business Owners (SBO).
S denotes that findings were withheld because estimate did not meet publication standards.

EXHIBIT F-7
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BASED ON NAICS CODES 56 AND 81- OTHER SERVICES
OTHER SERVICES
BASED ON PAID AND NON-PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	**1,179**	**1.84%**	**892**	**1.39%**	**1,619**	**2.53%**	**236**	**0.37%**	**25,921**	**40.53%**	**29,847**	**46.67%**	**34,108**	**53.33%**	**63,955**

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid and non-paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived from white men-owned firms within the State of Minnesota, based on the U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Business Owners (SBO).

Availability of Goods and Supplies Firms within the State of Minnesota

EXHIBIT F-8
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BASED ON NAICS CODES 42, 44, AND 45- RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE
GOODS AND SUPPLIES
BASED ON PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	**79**	**0.46%**	**104**	**0.61%**	**261**	**1.52%**	**S**	**0.00%**	**3,077**	**17.93%**	**3,521**	**20.51%**	**13,644**	**79.49%**	**17,165**

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived from white men-owned firms within the State of Minnesota, based on the U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Business Owners (SBO).
S denotes that findings were withheld because estimate did not meet publication standards.

EXHIBIT F-9
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BASED ON NAICS CODES 42, 44, AND 45- RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE GOODS AND SUPPLIES
BASED ON PAID AND NON-PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	694	1.25%	458	0.82%	1,053	1.89%	S	0.00%	21,642	38.88%	23,847	42.84%	31,812	57.16%	55,659

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid and non-paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived from white men-owned firms within the State of Minnesota, based on the U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Business Owners (SBO).
S denotes that findings were withheld because estimate did not meet publication standards.

F.2 U.S. Census Survey of Business Availability of Firms within the Minneapolis-Saint Paul MSA by NAICS Codes/Business Categories

Availability of Construction Firms within the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)

EXHIBIT F-10
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS-SAINT PAUL MSA
BASED ON NAICS CODE 23 - CONSTURCTION
BASED ON PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms[3]
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	18	0.19%	90	0.95%	S	0.00%	18	0.19%	735	7.76%	861	9.09%	8,615	90.91%	9,476

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived by subtracting all M/WBE firms from total firms.
[3] Total firms derived from the U.S. Census Bureau and Survey of Business Owners (SBO).
S denotes that findings were withheld because estimate did not meet publication standards.

EXHIBIT F-11
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS-SAINT PAUL MSA
BASED ON NAICS CODE 23 - CONSTURCTION
BASED ON PAID AND NON-PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms[3]
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	**381**	**1.26%**	**315**	**1.04%**	**195**	**0.65%**	**113**	**0.37%**	**2,310**	**7.65%**	**3,314**	**10.98%**	**26,867**	**89.02%**	**30,181**

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived by subtracting all M/WBE firms from total firms.
[3] Total firms derived from the U.S. Census Bureau and Survey of Business Owners (SBO).
S denotes that findings were withheld because estimate did not meet publication standards

Availability of Professional Services Including Architecture and Engineering Firms within the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)

EXHIBIT F-12
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS-SAINT PAUL MSA
BASED ON NAICS CODES 54– PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
INCLUDING ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING FIRMS
BASED ON PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms[3]
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	**71**	**0.58%**	**S**	**0.00%**	**248**	**0.00%**	**67**	**0.55%**	**2,425**	**19.77%**	**2,811**	**22.92%**	**9,454**	**77.08%**	**12,265**

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived by subtracting all M/WBE firms from total firms.
[3] Total firms derived from the U.S. Census Bureau and Survey of Business Owners (SBO).

EXHIBIT F-13
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS-SAINT PAUL MSA
BASED ON NAICS CODES 54 – PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
INCLUDING ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING FIRMS
BASED ON PAID AND NON-PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms[3]
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	640	N/A	471	N/A	1,227	N/A	242	0.51%	13,940	29.38%	16,520	34.81%	30,934	65.19%	47,454

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid and non-paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived by subtracting all M/WBE firms from total firms.
[3] Total firms derived from the U.S. Census Bureau and Survey of Business Owners (SBO).

Availability of Other Services Firms within the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)

EXHIBIT F-14
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS-SAINT PAUL MSA
BASED ON NAICS CODES 56 AND 81 – OTHER SERVICES FIRMS
OTHER SERVICES
BASED ON PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms[3]
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	593	1.42%	760	1.82%	S	0.00%	440	1.05%	16,945	40.52%	18,738	44.81%	23,076	55.19%	41,814

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived by subtracting all M/WBE firms from total firms.
[3] Total firms derived from the U.S. Census Bureau and Survey of Business Owners (SBO).
S denotes that findings were withheld because estimate did not meet publication standards

EXHIBIT F-15
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS-SAINT PAUL MSA
BASED ON NAICS CODES 56 AND 81 – OTHER SERVICES FIRMS
OTHER SERVICES
BASED ON PAID AND NON-PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms[3]
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	593	1.37%	760	1.76%	1,414	3.27%	440	1.02%	16,945	39.20%	20,152	46.62%	23,076	53.38%	43,228

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived by subtracting all M/WBE firms from total firms.
[3] Total firms derived from the U.S. Census Bureau and Survey of Business Owners (SBO).

Availability of Goods and Supplies Firms within the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)

EXHIBIT F-16
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS-SAINT PAUL MSA
BASED ON NAICS CODES 42, 44, AND 45 – RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE
GOODS AND SUPPLIES
BASED ON PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms[3]
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	50	0.39%	50	0.39%	256	1.98%	5	0.04%	1,940	15.02%	2,301	17.82%	10,614	82.18%	12,915

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived by subtracting all M/WBE firms from total firms.
[3] Total firms derived from the U.S. Census Bureau and Survey of Business Owners (SBO).

EXHIBIT F-17
U.S. CENSUS SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS
AVAILABILITY OF FIRMS
WITHIN THE CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS-SAINT PAUL MSA
BASED ON NAICS CODES 42, 44, AND 45 – RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE GOODS AND SUPPLIES
BASED ON PAID AND NON-PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

	African Americans[1]		Hispanic Americans[1]		Asian Americans[1]		Native Americans[1]		Nonminority Women		M/WBE Subtotal		Non-M/WBE Firms[2]		Total Firms[3]
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	603	1.51%	316	0.79%	944	2.37%	87	0.22%	14,369	36.08%	16,319	40.97%	23,508	59.03%	39,827

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Survey of Business Owners, based on firms with paid and non-paid employees only.
[1] Minority men and women firms are included in their respective minority classifications.
[2] Number of non-M/WBE firms derived by subtracting all M/WBE firms from total firms.
[3] Total firms derived from the U.S. Census Bureau and Survey of Business Owners (SBO).

APPENDIX G: CENSUS DISPARITY ANALYSIS

APPENDIX G
CENSUS DISPARITY ANALYSIS BASED ON PAID AND NON-PAID EMPLOYEES FOR THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

EXHIBIT G-1
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
DISPARITY ANALYSIS OF PRIME CONTRACTORS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATION
BASED ON NAICS CODE 23 – CONSTRUCTION
PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

Business Owner Classification	% of Dollars[1]	% of Available Firms[2]	Disparity Index[3]	Disparate Impact of Utilization
2002				
African Americans	0.00%	0.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.79%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.50%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	7.48%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	91.11%	109.76	Overutilization
2003				
African Americans	0.00%	0.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.79%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.50%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	7.48%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	91.11%	109.76	Overutilization
2004				
African Americans	0.00%	0.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.79%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.50%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	7.48%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	91.11%	109.76	Overutilization
2005				
African Americans	0.00%	0.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.79%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.50%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	7.48%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	91.11%	109.76	Overutilization
2006				
African Americans	0.00%	0.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.79%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.50%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	7.48%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	91.11%	109.76	Overutilization
2007				
African Americans	0.00%	0.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.79%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.50%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	7.48%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	91.11%	109.76	Overutilization
All Years				
African Americans	0.00%	0.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.79%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.00%	0.50%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	7.48%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	91.11%	109.76	Overutilization

Source: **Chapter 4.0** - Disparity Analysis and **Appendix F** - US Census SBO data.

[1] The percentage of dollars is taken from the prime utilization exhibit previously shown.

[2] The percentage of available contractors is taken from the Census availability in Appendix F

[3] The disparity index is the ratio of % utilization to % availability times 100. An asterisk is used to indicate a substantial level of disparity index below 80.00.

S denotes that findings were withheld because estimate did not meet publication standards

EXHIBIT G-2
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
DISPARITY ANALYSIS OF PRIME CONTRACTORS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BY RACE/ETHNICITY/GENDER CLASSIFICATION
BASED ON NAICS CODE 23 – CONSTRUCTION
PAID AND NONPAID EMPLOYEES

Business Owner Classification	% of Dollars[1]	% of Available Firms[2]	Disparity Index[3]	Disparate Impact of Utilization
2002				
African Americans	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.97%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.52%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	0.73%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	7.15%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	89.82%	111.33	Overutilization
2003				
African Americans	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.97%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.52%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	0.73%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	7.15%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	89.82%	111.33	Overutilization
2004				
African Americans	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.97%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.52%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	0.73%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	7.15%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	89.82%	111.33	Overutilization
2005				
African Americans	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.97%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.52%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	0.73%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	7.15%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	89.82%	111.33	Overutilization
2006				
African Americans	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.97%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.52%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	0.73%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	7.15%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	89.82%	111.33	Overutilization
2007				
African Americans	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.97%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.52%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	0.73%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	7.15%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	89.82%	111.33	Overutilization
All Years				
African Americans	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.97%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	0.52%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	0.73%	0.00	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	7.15%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	89.82%	111.33	Overutilization

Source: **Chapter 4.0** - Disparity Analysis and **Appendix F** - US Census SBO data.

[1] The percentage of dollars is taken from the prime utilization exhibit previously shown.

[2] The percentage of available contractors is taken from the Census availability in Appendix F

[3] The disparity index is the ratio of % utilization to % availability times 100. An asterisk is used to indicate a substantial level of disparity index below 80.00.

EXHIBIT G-3
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
DISPARITY ANALYSIS OF A & E PRIME CONSULTANTS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BASED ON NAICS CODE 54 - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES INCLUDING ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING SERVICES
BASED ON PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

Business Owner Classification	% of Dollars[1]	% of Available Firms[2]	Disparity Index[3]	Disparate Impact of Utilization
2002				
African Americans	0.00%	0.54%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	21.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	75.52%	132.42	Overutilization
2003				
African Americans	0.00%	0.54%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	21.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	0.00%	75.52%	0.00	* Underutilization
2004				
African Americans	0.00%	0.54%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	21.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	75.52%	132.42	Overutilization
2005				
African Americans	0.00%	0.54%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	21.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	0.00%	75.52%	0.00	* Underutilization
2006				
African Americans	0.00%	0.54%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	21.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	75.52%	132.42	Overutilization
2007				
African Americans	0.00%	0.54%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	21.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	75.52%	132.42	Overutilization
All Years				
African Americans	0.00%	0.54%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	21.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	75.52%	132.42	Overutilization

Source: **Chapter 4.0** - Disparity Analysis and **Appendix F** - US Census SBO data.

[1] The percentage of dollars is taken from the prime utilization exhibit previously shown.

[2] The percentage of available contractors is taken from the Census availability in Appendix F

[3] The disparity index is the ratio of % utilization to % availability times 100. An asterisk is used to indicate a substantial level of disparity index below 80.00.

S denotes that findings were withheld because estimate did not meet publication standards

EXHIBIT G-4
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
DISPARITY ANALYSIS OF A & E PRIME CONSULTANTS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BASED ON NAICS CODE 54 - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES INCLUDING ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING SERVICES
BASED ON PAID AND NON-PAID EMPLOYEES

Business Owner Classification	% of Dollars[1]	% of Available Firms[2]	Disparity Index[3]	Disparate Impact of Utilization
2002				
African Americans	0.00%	1.18%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	1.07%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.35%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	31.04%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	64.36%	155.38	Overutilization
2003				
African Americans	0.00%	1.18%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	1.07%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.35%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	31.04%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	0.00%	64.36%	0.00	* Underutilization
2004				
African Americans	0.00%	1.18%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	1.07%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.35%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	31.04%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	64.36%	155.38	Overutilization
2005				
African Americans	0.00%	1.18%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	1.07%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.35%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	31.04%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	0.00%	64.36%	0.00	* Underutilization
2006				
African Americans	0.00%	1.18%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	1.07%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.35%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	31.04%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	64.36%	155.38	Overutilization
2007				
African Americans	0.00%	1.18%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	1.07%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.35%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	31.04%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	64.36%	155.38	Overutilization
All Years				
African Americans	0.00%	1.18%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	1.07%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.35%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	31.04%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	64.36%	155.38	Overutilization

Source: **Chapter 4.0** - Disparity Analysis and **Appendix F** - US Census SBO data.

[1] The percentage of dollars is taken from the prime utilization exhibit previously shown.

[2] The percentage of available contractors is taken from the Census availability in Appendix F

[3] The disparity index is the ratio of % utilization to % availability times 100. An asterisk is used to indicate a substantial level of disparity index below 80.00.

S denotes that findings were withheld because estimate did not meet publication standards

EXHIBIT G-5
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
DISPARITY ANALYSIS OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES PRIME CONSULTANTS WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BASED ON NAICS CODE 54 - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES INCLUDING ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING SERVICES
BASED ON PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

Business Owner Classification	% of Dollars[1]	% of Available Firms[2]	Disparity Index[3]	Disparate Impact of Utilization
2002				
African Americans	0.00%	0.54%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	4.56%	2.13%	213.89	Overutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	21.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	95.44%	75.52%	126.38	Overutilization
2003				
African Americans	1.64%	0.54%	304.48	Overutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	1.78%	2.13%	83.48	Underutilization
Native Americans	0.47%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	21.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	96.11%	75.52%	127.27	Overutilization
2004				
African Americans	0.00%	0.54%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	21.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	75.52%	132.42	Overutilization
2005				
African Americans	0.00%	0.54%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	21.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	75.52%	132.42	Overutilization
2006				
African Americans	0.00%	0.54%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	21.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	75.52%	132.42	Overutilization
2007				
African Americans	0.00%	0.54%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.13%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	21.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	75.52%	132.42	Overutilization
All Years				
African Americans	0.44%	0.54%	81.62	Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Asian Americans	1.25%	2.13%	58.57	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.13%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	21.81%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	98.19%	75.52%	130.01	Overutilization

Source: **Chapter 4.0** - Disparity Analysis and **Appendix F** - US Census SBO data.

[1] The percentage of dollars is taken from the prime utilization exhibit previously shown.

[2] The percentage of available contractors is taken from the Census availability in Appendix F

[3] The disparity index is the ratio of % utilization to % availability times 100. An asterisk is used to indicate a substantial level of disparity index below 80.00.

S denotes that findings were withheld because estimate did not meet publication standards

EXHIBIT G-6
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
DISPARITY ANALYSIS OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES PRIME CONSULTANTS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BASED ON NAICS CODE 54 - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES INCLUDING
ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING SERVICES
BASED ON PAID AND NONPAID EMPLOYEES

Business Owner Classification	% of Dollars1	% of Available Firms[2]	Disparity Index[3]	Disparate Impact of Utilization
2002				
African Americans	0.00%	1.18%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	1.07%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	4.56%	2.35%	193.64	Overutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	31.04%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	95.44%	64.36%	148.30	Overutilization
2003				
African Americans	1.64%	1.18%	138.45	Overutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	1.07%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	1.78%	2.35%	75.57	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.47%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	31.04%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	96.11%	64.36%	149.34	Overutilization
2004				
African Americans	0.00%	1.18%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	1.07%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.35%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	31.04%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	64.36%	155.38	Overutilization
2005				
African Americans	0.00%	1.18%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	1.07%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.35%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	31.04%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	64.36%	155.38	Overutilization
2006				
African Americans	0.00%	1.18%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	1.07%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.35%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	31.04%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	64.36%	155.38	Overutilization
2007				
African Americans	0.00%	1.18%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	1.07%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.35%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	31.04%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	64.36%	155.38	Overutilization
All Years				
African Americans	0.44%	1.18%	37.11	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	1.07%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	1.25%	2.35%	53.02	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.13%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	31.04%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	98.19%	64.36%	152.56	Overutilization

Source: **Chapter 4.0** - Disparity Analysis and **Appendix F** - US Census SBO data.

[1] The percentage of dollars is taken from the prime utilization exhibit previously shown.

[2] The percentage of available contractors is taken from the Census availability in Appendix F

[3] The disparity index is the ratio of % utilization to % availability times 100. An asterisk is used to indicate a substantial level of disparity index below 80.00.

S denotes that findings were withheld because estimate did not meet publication standards

EXHIBIT G-7
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
DISPARITY ANALYSIS OF VENDORS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BASED ON NAICS CODES 56 AND 81- OTHER SERVICES
BASED ON PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

Business Owner Classification	% of Dollars[1]	% of Available Firms[2]	Disparity Index[3]	Disparate Impact of Utilization
2002				
African Americans	0.00%	0.85%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	1.22%	4.64%	26.31	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.27%	0.57%	47.35	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	25.22%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	98.51%	68.71%	143.36	Overutilization
2003				
African Americans	0.00%	0.85%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	4.64%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.48%	0.57%	83.95	Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	25.22%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.52%	68.71%	144.83	Overutilization
2004				
African Americans	0.00%	0.85%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.21%	4.64%	4.58	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.30%	0.57%	51.79	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	25.22%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.49%	68.71%	144.79	Overutilization
2005				
African Americans	0.00%	0.85%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.12%	4.64%	2.66	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.07%	0.57%	12.36	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	25.22%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.81%	68.71%	145.25	Overutilization
2006				
African Americans	0.00%	0.85%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.01%	4.64%	0.12	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.08%	0.57%	14.63	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	25.22%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.91%	68.71%	145.40	Overutilization
2007				
African Americans	0.00%	0.85%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.13%	4.64%	2.89	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.07%	0.57%	12.17	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	25.22%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.80%	68.71%	145.23	Overutilization
All Years				
African Americans	0.00%	0.85%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.30%	4.64%	6.41	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Native Americans	0.19%	0.57%	33.05	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	25.22%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.51%	68.71%	144.82	Overutilization

Source: **Chapter 4.0** - Disparity Analysis and **Appendix F** - US Census SBO data.

[1] The percentage of dollars is taken from the prime utilization exhibit previously shown.

[2] The percentage of available contractors is taken from the Census availability in Appendix F

[3] The disparity index is the ratio of % utilization to % availability times 100. An asterisk is used to indicate a substantial level of disparity index below 80.00.

S denotes that findings were withheld because estimate did not meet publication standards

EXHIBIT G-8
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
DISPARITY ANALYSIS OF VENDORS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BASED ON NAICS CODES 56 AND 81- OTHER SERVICES
BASED ON PAID AND NON-PAID EMPLOYEES

Business Owner Classification	% of Dollars[1]	% of Available Firms[2]	Disparity Index[3]	Disparate Impact of Utilization
2002				
African Americans	0.00%	1.84%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	1.22%	1.39%	87.53	Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.53%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.27%	0.37%	73.40	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	40.53%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	98.51%	53.33%	184.71	Overutilization
2003				
African Americans	0.00%	1.84%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	1.39%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.53%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.48%	0.37%	130.13	Overutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	40.53%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.52%	53.33%	186.61	Overutilization
2004				
African Americans	0.00%	1.84%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.21%	1.39%	15.25	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.53%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.30%	0.37%	80.28	Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	40.53%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.49%	53.33%	186.55	Overutilization
2005				
African Americans	0.00%	1.84%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.12%	1.39%	8.85	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.53%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.07%	0.37%	19.17	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	40.53%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.81%	53.33%	187.14	Overutilization
2006	0.00%			
African Americans	0.00%	1.84%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.01%	1.39%	0.40	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.53%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.08%	0.37%	22.68	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	40.53%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.91%	53.33%	187.34	Overutilization
2007	0.00%			
African Americans	0.00%	1.84%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.13%	1.39%	9.61	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.53%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.07%	0.37%	18.86	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	40.53%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.80%	53.33%	187.13	Overutilization
All Years	0.00%			
African Americans	0.00%	1.84%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.30%	1.39%	21.34	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	2.53%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.19%	0.37%	51.23	* Underutilization
Nonminority Women	0.00%	40.53%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	99.51%	53.33%	186.59	Overutilization

Source: **Chapter 4.0** - Disparity Analysis and **Appendix F** - US Census SBO data.

[1] The percentage of dollars is taken from the prime utilization exhibit previously shown.

[2] The percentage of available contractors is taken from the Census availability in Appendix F

[3] The disparity index is the ratio of % utilization to % availability times 100. An asterisk is used to indicate a substantial level of disparity index below 80.00

EXHIBIT G-9
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
DISPARITY ANALYSIS OF VENDORS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BASED ON NAICS CODES 42, 44, AND 45- RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE GOODS AND SUPPLIES
BASED ON PAID EMPLOYEES ONLY

Business Owner Classification	% of Dollars[1]	% of Available Firms[2]	Disparity Index[3]	Disparate Impact of Utilization
2002				
African Americans	0.00%	0.46%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.61%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	1.52%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	17.93%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	79.49%	125.81	Overutilization
2003				
African Americans	0.00%	0.46%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.04%	0.61%	6.30	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.63%	1.52%	41.37	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	2.79%	17.93%	15.57	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	96.54%	79.49%	121.46	Overutilization
2004				
African Americans	0.00%	0.46%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	2.69%	0.61%	443.55	Overutilization
Asian Americans	0.17%	1.52%	10.92	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	17.93%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	97.15%	79.49%	122.22	Overutilization
2005				
African Americans	0.00%	0.46%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.61%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	5.01%	1.52%	329.80	Overutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	17.93%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	94.99%	79.49%	119.50	Overutilization
2006				
African Americans	0.00%	0.46%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.61%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	1.43%	1.52%	93.95	Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	17.93%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	98.57%	79.49%	124.01	Overutilization
2007				
African Americans	0.00%	0.46%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.61%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	1.99%	1.52%	130.78	Overutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	17.93%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	98.01%	79.49%	123.30	Overutilization
All Years				
African Americans	0.00%	0.46%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.47%	0.61%	77.96	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	1.44%	1.52%	95.02	Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.47%	17.93%	2.62	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	97.61%	79.49%	122.80	Overutilization

Source: **Chapter 4.0** - Disparity Analysis and **Appendix F** - US Census SBO data.

[1] The percentage of dollars is taken from the prime utilization exhibit previously shown.

[2] The percentage of available contractors is taken from the Census availability in Appendix F

[3] The disparity index is the ratio of % utilization to % availability times 100. An asterisk is used to indicate a substantial level of disparity index below 80.00.

S denotes that findings were withheld because estimate did not meet publication standards

EXHIBIT G-10
METROPOLITAN MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT
DISPARITY ANALYSIS OF VENDORS
WITHIN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
BASED ON NAICS CODES 42, 44, AND 45- RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE GOODS AND SUPPLIES
BASED ON PAID AND NON-PAID EMPLOYEES

Business Owner Classification	% of Dollars[1]	% of Available Firms[2]	Disparity Index[3]	Disparate Impact of Utilization
2002				
African Americans	0.00%	1.25%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.82%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.00%	1.89%	0.00	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	38.88%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	100.00%	57.16%	174.96	Overutilization
2003				
African Americans	0.00%	1.25%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.04%	0.82%	4.64	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	0.63%	1.89%	33.25	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	2.79%	38.88%	7.18	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	96.54%	57.16%	168.91	Overutilization
2004				
African Americans	0.00%	1.25%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	2.69%	0.82%	326.59	Overutilization
Asian Americans	0.17%	1.89%	8.77	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	38.88%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	97.15%	57.16%	169.97	Overutilization
2005				
African Americans	0.00%	1.25%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.82%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	5.01%	1.89%	265.06	Overutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	38.88%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	94.99%	57.16%	166.19	Overutilization
2006				
African Americans	0.00%	1.25%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.82%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	1.43%	1.89%	75.51	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	38.88%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	98.57%	57.16%	172.46	Overutilization
2007				
African Americans	0.00%	1.25%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.00%	0.82%	0.00	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	1.99%	1.89%	105.11	Overutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.00%	38.88%	0.00	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	98.01%	57.16%	171.48	Overutilization
All Years				
African Americans	0.00%	1.25%	0.00	* Underutilization
Hispanic Americans	0.47%	0.82%	57.40	* Underutilization
Asian Americans	1.44%	1.89%	76.37	* Underutilization
Native Americans	0.00%	S	N/A	N/A
Nonminority Women	0.47%	38.88%	1.21	* Underutilization
Non-M/WBE Firms	97.61%	57.16%	170.79	Overutilization

Source: **Chapter 4.0** - Disparity Analysis and **Appendix F** - US Census SBO data.

[1] The percentage of dollars is taken from the prime utilization exhibit previously shown.

[2] The percentage of available contractors is taken from the Census availability in Appendix F

[3] The disparity index is the ratio of % utilization to % availability times 100. An asterisk is used to indicate a substantial level of disparity index below 80.00.

S denotes that findings were withheld because estimate did not meet publication standards