City of

Savannah

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - FINAL REPORT

COMPREHENSIVE DISPARITY STUDY
CITY OF SAVANNAH, GEORGIA

APRIL, 2016

GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.

235 Peachtree Street, N.E. Suite 400 | Atlanta, Georgia 30303 | 404-584-9777 | fax: 404-584-9730 | www.gspclaw.com

INTRODUCTION

In 2015 the City of Savannah ("City of Savannah" or "City") contracted with Griffin & Strong, P.C. ("GSPC") to conduct a comprehensive disparity study ("Study") to examine and analyze the procurement policies and practices of the City and its prime contractors. GSPC sought to ascertain the participation and utilization of minority and women owned businesses ("M/WBE") that are eligible to contract with the City of Savannah.

The City of Savannah, and other governmental entities across the country, authorize disparity studies in response to City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co., 488 U.S. 469 (1989) and subsequent cases in order to determine whether there is a compelling interest for the creation or continuation of remedial procurement programs, based upon race, gender, and ethnicity. In order for the legal requirements of Croson to be satisfied, GSPC must determine whether the City has been a passive or active participant in discrimination with regard to the access of M/WBEs to its procurement processes, or whether its existing program, the City's Minority/ Women owned Business Enterprise ("M/ WBE") Program, has eliminated the need for any such remedial programs.

To achieve these ends, GSPC analyzed the contracting and subcontracting activities of the City and its prime contractors during the five (5) year period beginning January 1, 2010, to December 31, 2014 ("Study Period"), and evaluated various options for future program development. The goal of the Study was to determine whether there exists a statistically significant disparity between the number of available M/WBEs in the Savannah marketplace and the dollars awarded to these firms by the City or its prime contractors. The Study also was used to determine if a legal predicate exists to maintain or create any remedial programs under Croson and its progeny.

OBJECTIVE

The principal objectives of this Study were:

- to determine whether there are current discriminatory practices, or the present effects of past discriminatory practices in the City's solicitation and award of contracts;
- to determine if a legally justifiable need continues to exist for any or all of the City's M/WBE remedial efforts with regard to the awarding of contracts; and
- to provide recommendations for actions to be taken by the City as a result of the findings of the Study, including serious consideration of race-neutral program options.

RODNEY K. STRONG, ESQ.
CEO, Griffin & Strong, P.C.

DR. GREGORY PRICE
Senior Economist, Morehouse College

MICHELE CLARK JENKINS
J.D., Senior Director and Project Manager, Griffin & Strong, P.C.

IMANI STRONG
Deputy Project Manager, Griffin & Strong, P.C.

LORRENCE O'BRIEN
Xander Consulting, Anecdotal Interviews and Purchasing Practices Review

A.L. BURRUSS INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC SERVICE AND RESEARCH
at Kennesaw State University, Online Surveys

CAROLYN BLACKSHEAR
Multi-Line Business Services, Anecdotal Interviews

ABOUT THE PROJECT TEAM

GRIFFIN & STRONG, P.C. is a professional corporation based in Atlanta, Georgia, that is actively engaged in the practice of law, as well as governmental and private consulting. Since the firm's inception in 1992, the public policy consulting division has been continuously directed and controlled by Rodney K. Strong. Attorney Strong has an extensive background in the area of public contracting with specific experience conducting disparity studies. Gregory Price, Ph.D., served as Senior Economist for this Study and reviewed all quantitative aspects of the Study. Dr. Price is an expert in quantitative research and analysis. Michele Clark Jenkins, as the Project Manager, was responsible for the day-to-day aspects of the Study and for executing the methodology. Mrs. Jenkins has extensive experience in managing disparity studies, bench-markings, and goal settings. Imani Strong served as Deputy Project Manager and qualitative research coordinator of the Study. Ms. Strong's expertise in anthropology and prior experience on GSPC studies made her an asset to the execution of this Study, particularly in the analysis of the anecdotal evidence. Susan Johnson handled the administration of the Study particularly with regard to subcontractor tracking and payments.

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE PROJECT TEAM

XANDER CONSULTING is a Savannah, GA based management and technical services consulting firm, providing services in program and project administration, strategic planning, business development, and business and technical writing. Xander Principal, Lorrence O'Brien has over 25 years of diversified consulting experience. For this study, Mr. O'Brien conducted the purchasing policies, practices, and procedures interviews as well as anecdotal interviews with professional services firms.

MULTI-LINE BUSINESS SERVICES - Principal Consultant, Carolyn Blackshear, conducted the bulk of the anecdotal interviews for this study. Multi-Line Business Services is a full service business management and secretarial center and Ms. Blackshear has more than 35 years of experience in administrative and business management, as well as a long track-record in volunteering and community engagement in the City of Savannah.

A.L. BURRUSS INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC SERVICE AND RESEARCH AT KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY conducted the online survey for this project. The A.L. Burruss Institute of Public Service and Research draws upon the expertise of the academic departments of Kennesaw State University by providing opportunities for faculty, from diverse research fields, to participate in applied research projects on an as-needed basis. Similarly, Kennesaw State University students, serving as student assistants, interns, co-ops and as interviewers in the Telephone Survey Research Laboratory, have contributed experience in day-to-day operations at the Institute or at government agencies and community organizations.

LEGAL BASIS FOR THE STUDY

Disparity studies are a creation of the courts in response to challenges against minority business enterprise programs that were enacted to remedy perceived past or present discrimination. Laws that, on their face, favor one class of citizens over another, may run afoul of the 14th Amendment, which was the basis of the U.S. Supreme Courts' decisions in the City of Richmond v. J. A. Croson Company, 488 U.S. 469; 109 S. Ct. 706; 102 L. Ed. 2d 854; 1989 U.S. LEXIS 579; 57 U.S.L.W. 4132; 53 Fair Empl. Prac. Cas. (BNA) 197; 48 Empl. Prac. Dec. (CCH) P38,578; 36 Cont. Cas. Fed. (CCH) P76,005 and its progeny.

In its Croson decision, the Supreme Court ruled that the City of Richmond's Minority Business Enterprise (hereinafter "MBE") program failed to satisfy the requirements of "strict scrutiny" in order to have a race-conscious program. "Strict scrutiny" is a level of judicial review that has two (2) prongs: 1-A Compelling Governmental Interest and 2-A Narrowly Tailored Remedy. The City of Richmond failed to show that its minority set-aside program was "necessary" to remedy the effects of discrimination in the marketplace. In fact, the City of Richmond had not established the necessary factual predicate to infer that discrimination in contracting had occurred. The Court reasoned that a mere statistical disparity between the overall minority population in Richmond (50 percent African American) and awards of prime contracts to minority owned firms (0.67 percent to African American firms) was an irrelevant statistical comparison and insufficient to raise an inference of discrimination. Regarding the evidence that Richmond provided to support its goal program, the Court emphasized the distinction between "societal discrimination", which it found to be an inappropriate and inadequate basis for social classification, and the type of identified discrimination that can support and define the scope of race-based relief. The Court noted that a generalized assertion that there has been past discrimination in an entire industry provided no guidance to determine the present scope of the injury a race-conscious program would seek to remedy. The Court emphasized that "there was no direct evidence of race discrimination on the part of the City in letting contracts or any evidence that the City's prime contractors had discriminated against minority owned subcontractors." Id, at 480.

In summary, the Court concluded there was no prima facie case of a constitutional or statutory violation by anyone in the construction industry. Justice O'Connor did opine, however, on what evidence might indicate a proper statistical comparison:

"[W]here 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. Croson, 488 U.S. at 509."

In other words, the statistical comparison would be one between the percentage of MBEs in the marketplace qualified to do contracting work (including prime contractors and subcontractors) and the percentage of total City contracting dollars awarded to minority firms. The relevant question among lower federal courts has been how to determine this particular comparison.

Additionally, the Court stated that identified anecdotal accounts of past discrimination also could provide the basis to establish a compelling interest

for local governments to enact race-conscious remedies. However, conclusory claims of discrimination by City officials, alone, would not suffice. In order to uphold a race- or ethnicity-based program, there must be a determination that a strong basis in evidence exists to support the conclusion that the remedial use of race is necessary. A strong basis in evidence cannot rest on an amorphous claim of societal discrimination, on simple legislative assurances of good intention, or congressional findings of discrimination in the national economy.

Regarding the second prong of the strict scrutiny test, the Court ruled that Richmond's MBE program was not narrowly tailored to redress the effects of discrimination. First, the Court held that Richmond's MBE program was not remedial in nature because it provided preferential treatment to minorities such as Eskimos and Aleuts, groups for which there was no evidence of discrimination in Richmond. Thus, the scope of the City's program was too broad. Second, the Court ruled that the thirty percent (30%) goal for MBE participation in the Richmond program was a rigid quota not related to identified discrimination. Specifically, the Court criticized the City for its lack of inquiry into whether a particular minority business, seeking racial preferences, had suffered from the effects of past discrimination. Third, the Court expressed disappointment that the City failed to consider race-neutral alternatives to remedy the under-representation of minorities in contract awards. Finally, the Court highlighted the fact that the City's MBE program contained no sunset provisions for a periodic review process intended to assess the continued need for the program. Croson, 488 at 500.

Thus, in order for states, municipalities, and other local governments to satisfy the narrow tailoring prong of the strict scrutiny test, the Croson Court suggested analyzing the following five factors:

1. Whether the MBE program covers minorities for which there is evidence of discrimination (i.e. statistical disparity, anecdotal evidence, etc.);

2. Whether the size of the MBE participation goal is flexible and contains waiver provisions for prime contractors who make a "good faith" effort to satisfy MBE utilization goals, but are unsuccessful in finding any qualified, willing and able MBEs;

3. Whether there was a reasonable relationship between the numerical goals set and the relevant labor pool of MBEs capable of performing the work in the marketplace;

4. Whether race-neutral alternatives were considered before race-conscious remedies were enacted; and

5. Whether the MBE program contains sunset provisions or mechanisms for periodic review to assess the program's continued need.

OPEN

FINDINGS

FINDING 1: Overall M/WBE Prime Utilization

As the table below shows, the City of Savannah spent $336,716,422 in the Relevant Market during the study period and 6% of this amount, or $22,349,948 was spent with M/WBE firms as prime contractors. The City spent $13,315,278 on Construction subcontracting with M/WBE firms, roughly 70% of their entire expenditure with subcontractors in this category. This shows that while M/WBE firms are receiving a disproportionately high percentage of subcontractor work, they are not participating as primes at nearly the same numbers and, thus, are missing out on lucrative higher dollar contracts.

Table 1
City of Savannah Disparity Study
Summary of Utilization

	Construction	Professional Services	General Services	Goods and Supplies	Totals
Prime (from $25,000 and over Awards)					
African American	$953,794.65	$576,781.00	$1,137,449.05	$1,008,005.40	$3,676,030.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	$2,431,082.00	$0	$0	$0	$2,431,082.00
Asian Indian	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Hispanic	$7,852,192.00	$0	$404,600.00	$0	$8,256,792.00
American Indian and Alaskan Native	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Women	$7,209,190.62	$5,730.1	$338,496.74	$432,626.80	$7,986,044.26
Non-MWBE	$94,556,319.77	$13,289,589.19	$102,059,059.36	$104,461,505.64	$314,366,473.96
Total	$113,002,579.04	$13,872,100.29	$103,939,605.15	$105,902,137.84	$336,716,422.32
Sub (from Prime Vendor Questionnaire sample responses)					
African American	$8,897,666.00	$0	$0	$0	$8,897,666.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Asian Indian	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Hispanic	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
American Indian and Alaskan Native	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Women	$4,417,612.00	$0	$0	$0	$4,417,612.00
Non-MWBE	$5,819,767.00	$0	$0	$0	$5,819,767.00
Total	$19,135,045.00	$0	$0	$0	$19,135,045.00

FINDING 2: Underutilization of M/WBEs as Primes

GSPC found that M/WBEs, as a group were underutilized in every category of work as prime contractors. African American, American Indian and women owned firms were underutilized in every area of prime contracting. Asian or Pacific Islanders were underutilized in every area except Construction where they were underutilized, but not statistically significantly so. Asian Indian firms were underutilized in Construction, but at parity in other areas. Hispanic owned firms were underutilized in every area except Construction, where they were overutilized. Non-M/WBE owned firms were overutilized in each category.

Table 2
City of Savannah Disparity Study
Summary of Statistically Significant M/WBE
Underutilization in Prime Contracting

Construction	Professional Services	General Services	Goods and Supplies
African American	**African American**	**African American**	**African American**
Asian or Pacific Islander (not statically significant)	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**
Asian Indian			
	Hispanic	**Hispanic**	**Hispanic**
American Indian	**American Indian**	**American Indian**	**American Indian**
Woman	**Woman**	**Woman**	**Woman**

FINDING 3: Disparity Analysis of M/WBEs as Subcontractors

GSPC found that Asian/Pacific Islander, Asian Indian, Hispanic, and American Indian owned firms were underutilized to a statistically significant degree in Construction Subcontracting. Non-M/WBE owned firms were underutilized, but not to a statistically significant degree and African American owned firms were overutilized, but not to a statistically significant degree. Women were overutilized, which was statistically significant.

Table 3
City of Savannah
Summary of Disparity Analysis of M/WBEs
Construction Subcontracting
(From Prime Vendor Questionnaire Sample)

Construction
African American- Overutilized (not statistically significant)
Asian or Pacific Islander - Underutilized
Asian Indian - Underutilized
Hispanic- Underutilized
American Indian - Underutilized
Women - Overutilized
Non-M/WBE – Underutilized (not statistically significant)

FINDING 4: Regression Analysis

GSPC's regression analysis controlled for non-race/ethnicity/gender factors such as the age of the owner, education of the owner, years in business, etc. and explicitly links a business firm owner's race/ethnicity/gender to public contracting outcomes in the City of Savannah market area. It was found that a firm owner's race, ethnicity, and gender have a statistically significant and adverse effect on their likelihood of entering the Savannah market area as a new firm and of securing public contracting and subcontracting opportunities relative to non-minority owned firms.

The results also suggested that, with respect to African American owned firms, the City of Savannah may be a passive participant in private discrimination, as African American owned firms are more likely to report financing—which is typically secured in private credit markets—to be a barrier to securing contracts with the City of Savannah. We also find that being a minority owned firm increases the likelihood of having a perception that the process by which bids are selected by the City of Savannah is not fair and transparent, which could discourage participation from minority owned firms in the public contracting process—exacerbating racial/ethnic/gender disparities in public contracting outcomes for the City of Savannah.

FINDING 5: Anecdotal Evidence

Anecdotal evidence assisted GSPC greatly in both getting a better picture of the empirical data and understanding the perceptions of the business community in the Savannah, GA marketplace. Through the anecdotal interviews, online surveys, public hearing, focus group, and public comment, GSPC determined the following perceptions:

A recurrent theme throughout the focus group and public hearing was the perceived lack of buy-in to the program by City procurement staff, project managers, and former M/WBE Program staff. Furthermore, many expressed a belief that there is an informal network in Savannah in the private sector and also, notably, in the public sector. The perceptions of M/WBE stigma, informal networks, and a closed marketplace emerged most strongly in the anecdotal interviews and public hearings. The focus group illustrated a need for closer monitoring of projects, largely due to a lack of buy-in from prime contractors to the objectives of the program and a pervasive mistrust in the M/WBE community for the City's certification and prime-led educational courses.

FINDING 6: Purchasing Practices Policies and Procedure Findings

It is clear that, though there are provisions in the Ordinance for joint outreach and engagement between the M/WBE Program and the Purchasing Department, the purchasing officials at the City of Savannah are not integrated into the monitoring and reporting processes. The Study team heard more than once that the Purchasing Department does not deal with subcontractor or M/WBE issues, payment or otherwise, but the same officials expressed views that primes "would prefer to work with people they know" and that M/WBEs "estimate a project in their head based on the way they have always estimated…whereas prime contractors estimate to the dollar."

The divide in responsibilities leaves out a crucial "checks and balances" provision for small purchases as well as enabling the Purchasing Department to abdicate responsibility for being a crucial first line of defense against M/WBE nonpayment, misuse of the program, and contributes to a lack of buy-in from the purchasing officials to the objectives of the M/WBE Program. Though the local preference program is administered by Purchasing, there is no communication or connection between that preference program and the M/WBE Program. In fact, there was little understanding in either the program or the Purchasing Department of how the local preference program impacts local M/WBEs in particular.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: Narrow Tailoring of M/WBE Programs

There is dramatic underutilization of all M/WBEs as prime contractors in all work categories in awards with the City of Savannah, except with regard to Hispanic owned firms in Construction. There is also underutilization of all M/WBE groups in subcontracting, except African American owned firms in Construction. The Study found that the statistically significant disparities were caused by race, ethnicity, and gender status. In addition, there is discrimination in the Savannah Relevant Market based upon race, ethnicity, and gender, particularly toward African Americans. Anecdotally, the Study revealed an overwhelming perception that there is an internal network of firms that the City utilizes and that there are barriers for all new entrants, but particularly for minority and women owned firms. This was borne out in comments made to the Study team by Purchasing staff that the Study should take into account that firms have already been working for the City as contractors. GSPC also heard anecdotally, which matched with the statistical data, that there are barriers to M/WBEs being awarded prime contracts. GSPC received comments from Purchasing personnel that equated all M/WBEs to subcontractors, stating that the group as a whole had shortcomings that prevented them from being prime contractors. GSPC was also told that there were few subcontracting opportunities available and that although minority and women owned firms may be getting some of those opportunities, they are being shut out of the prime contracting awards that they have the capacity to perform. GSPC found that there may be limited subcontracting opportunities for M/WBEs because of the high threshold for contract goals in Construction and Professional Services and the lack of any contract goals for Services. As a result of all of its findings, GSPC recommends that the City institute remedial activities to improve the access of minority and women owned firms to the City's contract awards. We recommend that the City implement each of the remedies which are listed below.

Recommendation 2: M/WBE Prime Preference Program

The City should focus on refining the current M/WBE prime preferences under the City of Savannah Code of Ordinances §2.4061 and increasing outreach efforts to M/WBEs to invite and encourage them to bid as primes.

Recommendation 3: Joint Venture Contracts/M/WBE Teams

In order to encourage participation on high-dollar contracts, the City of Savannah should look for instances in which M/WBE capacity can be increased to match contract size. M/WBE capacity can be increased by encouraging joint ventures. For example, in Oregon, the Northeast Urban Trucking Consortium, an organization composed of seven M/WBE independent trucking firms with 15 trucks, joined together to win a $2 million trucking contract. M/WBE collaboration can be encouraged by citing consortium examples in newsletters and increasing outreach for projects where such collaboration may be effective.

Savannah may also cautiously encourage joint ventures between M/WBEs and non-minority firms on large-scale projects. It must be noted that this type of joint venture poses potential illicit "front" risks, and the City must examine these joint ventures carefully.

Recommendation 4: Adjustment of Goal-Setting Thresholds

Though there is a bid/quote solicitation list, which the M/WBE Program must update regularly to include newly certified firms, the practice does not seem to be to utilize this list, and the M/WBE Program is afforded no oversight of the quote process. In addition to requiring three quotes for purchases under $1,000, the City should consider lowering the oversight thresholds, requiring any purchases over $25,000 to have a set goal in Construction, Professional Services, and Services, if there are identifiable subcontracting opportunities.

Recommendation 5: Performance Reviews and Evaluations

City procurement staff should be evaluated regularly based on the quality, transparency, and effectiveness of their attempts to reach procurement goals and achieve the overall goals of the M/WBE Programs in place.

Recommendation 6: Bonding Assistance Programs

Due to the results of the Private Sector Analysis, GSPC believes that it is important for the City of Savannah to provide additional resources to M/WBE firms. The City of Savannah should implement a program of supportive services which will provide bonding assistance, financial assistance, technical assistance, outreach, and networking opportunities to M/WBE firms. This supportive services program should be developed and administered by the City of Savannah on either an in-house or outsourced basis. The Georgia Department of Transportation outsources these services to a third-party provider, but they administer the contract carefully.

Another Georgia municipality, the City of Atlanta, has formed a public-private partnership called the Greater Atlanta Economic Alliance to provide these services. Regardless of whether the City of Savannah chooses to administer the program with internal or outsourced resources, any program will involve forming agreements with local banks to provide funding to small, minority, and women owned businesses, coordinating technical assistance seminars with the Small Business Administration and local small business development centers and finally structuring relationships with the SBA's bonding assistance program. Further, the City should conduct extensive and regular outreach which will endeavor to make business owners in Savannah aware of the supportive services available.

Recommendation 7: Tracking M/WBE Participation

Tracking M/WBE participation is a crucial aspect of narrow tailoring race/gender-conscious activities to any finding of discrimination. Without the ability to measure participation accurately, the City cannot determine whether its efforts are effective or not. Some jurisdictions utilize "Balanced Scorecard" to gauge the effectiveness of their respective efforts, including measuring:

- Growth in M/WBE prime contracting
- Growth in M/WBE subcontracting to prime contractors
- Growth in the number of M/WBEs winning first awards
- Growth in percentage of M/WBE utilization
- Number of firms that receive bonding
- Number of joint ventures involving M/WBEs

In order to do this, the City must begin maintaining more of its data in electronic formats, and specifically improve its tracking of M/WBE participation by also tracking non-M/WBE participation. Since participation is measured in percentages of the whole, the City must know the participation of all vendors in order to determine to what extent M/WBEs are participating in the procurement process

Recommendation 8: Collaboration between the City's M/WBE Program and Purchasing

It is clear from interviews with the Purchasing Department and M/WBE Program staff that the Purchasing Department is not involved in any way with the M/WBE Program and that M/WBE Program staff are not always aware of the policies that govern the purchasing process at the City. This isolation between the two departments makes the program vulnerable because the Purchasing Department has no involvement with subcontractors, subcontractor payments, or fraud prevention and the M/WBE Program is not granted the level of oversight necessary to properly implement the goals and measures it intends to set in place.

The anecdotal, the statistical, and the purchasing policies and practices evidence all indicate that the M/WBE Program is not organizationally situated to be able to effectively administer a first-class contract compliance program. Our analysis of various contract compliance programs from around the country indicate that unless the administrator charged with the responsibility for obtaining M/WBE participation has the organizational stature to require compliance within the administration, a program will be ineffective. In order to have an effective program, it is first necessary for the M/WBE Program Coordinator to be placed in a position to report directly to the City Manager and have oversight of the purchasing process; meaning that contracts cannot be let until the M/WBE Program Coordinator has signed off on them for compliance. The power to stop payments in the incidence of a violation of the ordinance or fraudulent activity in the program must also lie with the M/WBE Program. Governments which grant this power to their offices of contract compliance give them a tool which allows them to bring contractors to the table to resolve issues and disputes in a timely manner. It is certainly possible to put some type of time limit or some type of post-facto procedure in place to limit the discretion of the M/WBE Program Coordinator. However, for a great many day-to-day disputes notification of suspension of payment will bring the parties to the table and allow the M/WBE coordinator to resolve the issue without any further action by the City. The power to temporarily stop payments for an M/WBE coordinator is an important basic tool. Further the local preference program should be combined with the administration of the M/WBE Program as both are contract compliance functions.

Recommendation 9: Oversight Committee

It is important that major stakeholders (including representatives of general contractors and M/WBE contractors) take part in discussions about the City's Local and M/WBE Programs. Consequently, the City should provide a vehicle for stakeholder input in the review of any local or M/WBE goals.

Recommendation 10: Procurement Staff Awareness Training

To further the goal of integrating the processes between the M/WBE Program and the Purchasing Department, GSPC recommends that the City implement mandatory purchasing staff training on M/WBE goals and measures, and be included in the outreach efforts to M/WBE firms. This will create better relationships between purchasing staff and the M/WBE community and will allow the City's program to operate in conjunction with the procurement process. Any existing procurement training should be reviewed and revised to include more extensive training on non-discriminatory practices and M/WBE participation/goals.

Recommendation 11: Good Faith Efforts

"Good Faith Efforts" are a mechanism to determine whether prime contractors have engaged in various forms of outreach to M/WBE potential subcontractors. An allowance for the prime contractor to demonstrate a failure to meet goals after good faith efforts is a requirement for narrow tailoring under Croson. Prime contractors must be able to show where they have sent emails or letters and make their bid documents available, so that M/WBE firms can familiarize themselves with the way that they are approaching the project. Finally, firms must be able to demonstrate to the M/WBE Program Coordinator that they have exhausted all avenues, while being transparent about the pricing that they have received from all subcontractors on the project, to engage M/WBE firms. Savannah should allow prime contractors, in certain, infrequent circumstances to forgo portions of their M/WBE participation goals if they are genuinely unable to meet the requirements, but only after the foregoing has been properly verified.

CONCLUSION

The City of Savannah appears to have come a long way in recognizing and attempting to remedy any inequities in contracting. The City reports that it has accomplished the following:

1. Eliminated practice of "self-identification" and implemented standards requiring all companies registering with the City as "diverse" to upload proof of certification.

2. Developed specialized training tracks for M/WBEs and micro/small businesses.

3. Required bids/proposals to include proof of certification for all companies participating in the project as M/WBEs.

4. Required staff to document direct contact with M/WBE subcontractors to confirm the company's agreement to participate in a bid and the type of work to be performed.

5. Implemented new standards for monitoring, including more frequent site visits and more detailed reporting to ensure work is performed by M/WBEs in accordance with the City contract.

CONCLUSION

However, there still appears to be a very strong insider network and attitude that desires to keep working with the same firms. The end result will be that new, young, and innovative firms, both M/WBE and Non-M/WBE, will not be drawn to the City of Savannah. It also may mean that the City is not getting the best value for its contracts.

Overall, the City may implement the recommendations above as a mechanism to establish meaningful dialogue and interaction with its M/WBE businesses and to provide resources. It is especially important for the City's growth that it encourage prime contractors to diversify their use of subcontractors through a strong, fully supported M/WBE Program and equally important that M/WBEs are fully considered capable of performing as prime contractors. If the City accepts GSPC's recommendations for narrowly-tailored remedies, then it is recommended that the City of Savannah's Code of Ordinances be revised to reflect those modifications through legislation, where required.

Griffin & Strong, P.C.
April, 2016

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION 7
A. Objective 8
B. Technical Approach 8
C. Report Organization 9
D. Project Team 9
II. LEGAL ANALYSIS 12
A. Background and Introduction 12
B. The Croson Decision 12
C. Procedural Posture, Permissible Evidence, and Burdens of Proof 15
1. Standing 15
2. Equal Protection Clause Standards and Judicial Standards of Review 19
3. Evidentiary Requirements 27
4. Post-Enactment Evidence 34
5. Remedies-- Narrowly Tailored 35
6. Burdens of Production and Proof 37
D. The Latest Developments 38
1. Associated General Contractors of America, San Diego Chapter v. California DOT, 713 F.3d 1187 (9th Cir. 2013). 38
2. Northern Contracting, Inc. v. State of Illinois, et al., 473 F.3d 715 (7th Cir. 2007) 40
3. Rothe Dev. Corp. v. Dep't of Def., 545 F.3d 1023 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 40
4. H.B. Rowe Company, Incorporated v. W. Lyndo Tippett, et. Al, 615 F.3d 233 (2010) 41
E. Conclusion 43
F. Statement of Authority 44
III. PURCHASING PRACTICES, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES 46
A. Introduction 46
B. Purchasing Review 46
C. M/WBE Program 47
D. Interviews with Purchasing and M/WBE Program Staff 49
1. Fairness of the Process 49
2. Knowledge of Discrimination 50
3. Network Contracting 53

E. Findings 54
IV. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS 57
A. Introduction 57
B. Data Assessment 58
C. Data Set-Up 59
D. Manual Data Entry 59
E. Data Collection and Creation of Databases 60
1. The City of Savannah's Procurements 60
2. Electronic Data 60
3. Data Entry Verification 61
4. Data Source Description 61
5. Data Cleanup and Verification 64
F. Contract Classifications 65
G. Relevant Market Analysis 65
H. Availability Analysis 72
1. Capacity 73
I. Utilization Analysis 84
1. Prime Utilization over $25,000 85
2. Prime Utilization for Small Purchase from $3,000 to $25,000 104
3. Prime Utilization for POs from $1,000-$3,000 111
4. Subcontractor Utilization 120
J. Disparity Indices 123
K. Determining the Significance of Disparity Indices 130
L. Conclusion 131
V. ANALYSIS OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR 132
A. Introduction 132
B. Data 133
C. Statistical and Econometric Framework 135
D. The Relative New Firm Entry Propensities of Minority Firm Owners in the City of Savannah 136
E. Are Minority and Women-owned Firms Less Likely to Compete for Contracts in the City of Savannah? 138
F. Minority and Women-owned Firms and Prime Contracting in the City of Savannah 141
G. Minority and Women-owned Firms and Subcontracting in the City of Savannah 143
H. Do Minority and Women-owned Firms Face Additional Barriers in Submitting Bids and Securing Contracts with the City of Savannah? 145
I. Conclusion 152

VI. ANECDOTAL ANALYSIS 153
A. Introduction 153
B. Public Hearing 153
C. Anecdotal Interview. 154
1. Discrimination and Misuse of the Program 154
2. Informal Networks 156
3. M/WBE Stigma 157
D. Focus Group 158
E. Responses to Survey of Business Owners 161
F. Email Comments 165
VII. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 166
A. Findings 166
B. Recommendations 170
VIII. CONCLUSION 176

Table of Figures

Table 1 Relevant Market – Construction (Bidders) 67
Table 2 Relevant Market – Construction (Award Dollars) 68
Table 3 Relevant Market – Professional Services (Bidders) 69
Table 4 Relevant Market – Professional Services (Award Dollars) 69
Table 5 Relevant Market – General Services (Bidders) 70
Table 6 Relevant Market – General Services (Award Dollars) 70
Table 7 Relevant Market – Goods & Supplies (Bidders) 71
Table 8 Relevant Market – Goods & Supplies (Award Dollars) 71
Table 9 Award Thresholds – All Work Categories 73
Table 10 Award Thresholds – Construction 74
Table 11 Award Thresholds – Professional Services 74
Table 12 Award Thresholds – General Services 75
Table 13 Award Thresholds – Goods & Supplies 75
Table 14 Survey of Business Owners Response to Question 11 77
Table 15 Unutilized Capacity by Ethnicity 78
Table 16 Unutilized Capacity of Ethnicity based upon Reported Annual Revenues for 2014 79
Table 17 Availability – Construction 82
Table 18 Availability – Professional Services 82
Table 19 Availability – General Services 83
Table 20 Availability – Goods & Supplies 84
Table 21 Prime Utilization $25,000 and over – Construction (Number of Firms) 86
Table 22 Prime Utilization $25,000 and over – Construction (Dollars) 87
Table 23 Prime Utilization $25,000 and over – Professional Services (Number of Firms) 88
Table 24 Prime Utilization $25,000 and over – Professional Services (Dollars) 89
Table 25 Prime Utilization $25,000 and over – General Services (Number of Firms) 90
Table 26 Prime Utilization $25,000 and over – General Services (Dollars) 91
Table 27 Prime Utilization $25,000 and over – Goods & Supplies (Number of Firms) 92
Table 28 Prime Utilization $25,000 and over – Goods & Supplies (Dollars) 93

Table 29 Prime Utilization $100,000 and over – Construction (Number of Firms) 95
Table 30 Prime Utilization $100,000 and over – Construction (Dollars) 96
Table 31 Prime Utilization $25,000 to $100,000 – Construction (Number of Firms) 97
Table 32 Prime Utilization $25,000 to $100,000 – Construction (Dollars) 98
Table 33 Prime Utilization $75,000 and over – Professional Services (Number of Firms) 100
Table 34 Prime Utilization $75,000 and over – Professional Services (Dollars) 101
Table 35 Prime Utilization $25,000 to $75,000 – Professional Services (Number of Firms) 102
Table 36 Prime Utilization $25,000 to $75,000 – Professional Services (Dollars) 103
Table 37 Small Purchases $3,000 to $25,000 – Construction (Number of Firms) 104
Table 38 Small Purchases $3,000 to $25,000 – Construction (Dollars) 105
Table 39 Small Purchases $3,000 to $25,000 – Professional Services (Number of Firms) 106
Table 40 Small Purchases $3,000 to $25,000 – Professional Services (Dollars) 107
Table 41 Small Purchases $3,000 to $25,000 – General Services (Number of Firms) 108
Table 42 Small Purchases $3,000 to $25,000 – General Services (Dollars) 109
Table 43 Small Purchases $3,000 to $25,000 – Goods & Supplies (Number of Firms) 110
Table 44 Small Purchases $3,000 to $25,000 – Goods & Supplies (Dollars) 111
Table 45 POs $1,000 to $3,000 – Construction (Number of Firms) 112
Table 46 POs $1,000 to $3,000 – Construction (Dollars) 113
Table 47 POs $1,000 to $3,000 – Professional Services (Number of Firms) 114
Table 48 POs $1,000 to $3,000 – Professional Services (Dollars) 115
Table 49 APOs $1,000 to $3,000 – General Services (Number of Firms) 116
Table 50 APOs $1,000 to $3,000 – General Services (Dollars) 117
Table 51 APOs $1,000 to $3,000 – Goods & Supplies (Number of Firms) 118
Table 52 APOs $1,000 to $3,000 – Goods & Supplies (Dollars) 119
Table 53 Subcontractor Utilization – Construction (Number of Firms) 121
Table 54 Subcontractor Utilization – Construction (Dollars) 122
Table 55 Disparity Indices – Construction (Prime) 125
Table 56 Disparity Indices – Construction (Subcontractor) 126
Table 57 Disparity Indices – Professional Services (Prime) 127
Table 58 Disparity Indices – General Services (Prime) 128
Table 59 Disparity Indices – Goods & Supplies (Prime) 129

Table 60 Covariate Summary 134

Table 61 Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds Ratio): Business Enterprise Ownership Status and New Firm Entry 138

Table 62 Ordinal Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds Ratio): Minority or Woman Ownership Status and Prime Bid Submissions 140

Table 63 Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds Ratio): Minority or Woman Ownership Status and Prime Contracting 142

Table 64 Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds Ratio): Minority or Woman Ownership Status and Prime Subcontracting 144

Table 65 Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds Ratio): Minority or Woman Ownership Status, Pre-Qualification Requirements, and Bid Submissions 146

Table 66 Ordinal Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds Ratio): Minority or Woman Ownership Status, Pre-Qualification Requirements, and Bid Submissions 147

Table 67 Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds Ratio): Minority or Woman Ownership Status, Bid Bond Requirements, and Bid Submissions 148

Table 68 Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds Ratio): Minority or Woman Ownership Status, Financing Requirements, and Bid Submissions 149

Table 69 Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds Ratio): Minority or Woman Ownership Status, Informal Networks, and Bid Submissions 150

Table 70 Summary of Anecdotal Interview Themes 158

Table 71 Survey of Business Owners Response to Question 45 162

Table 72 Survey of Business Owners Response to Question 48 163

Table 73 Survey of Business Owners Response to Question 51 164

Table 74 Summary of Utilization 166

Table 75 Summary of Statistically Significant M/WBE Underutilization in Prime Contracting 167

Table 76 Summary of Disparity Analysis of M/WBEs in Construction Subcontracting 168

I. INTRODUCTION

In 2015 the City of Savannah ("City of Savannah" or "City") contracted with Griffin & Strong, P.C. ("GSPC") to conduct a comprehensive disparity study ("Study") to examine and analyze the procurement policies and practices of the City and its prime contractors. GSPC sought to ascertain the participation and utilization of minority and women-owned businesses ("M/WBE") that are eligible to contract with the City of Savannah.

The City of Savannah, and other governmental entities across the country, authorize disparity studies in response to City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co., 488 U.S. 469 (1989) and subsequent cases in order to determine whether there is a compelling interest for the creation or continuation of remedial procurement programs, based upon race, gender, and ethnicity. In order for the legal requirements of Croson to be satisfied, GSPC must determine whether the City has been a passive or active participant in discrimination with regard to the access of M/WBEs to its procurement processes, or whether its existing program, the City's Minority/Women-owned Business Enterprise ("M/WBE") Program, has eliminated the need for any such remedial programs.

To achieve these ends, GSPC analyzed the contracting and subcontracting activities of the City and its prime contractors during the five (5) year period beginning January 1, 2010, to December 31, 2014 ("Study Period"), and evaluated various options for future program development. The goal of the Study was to determine whether there exists a statistically significant disparity between the number of available M/WBEs in the Savannah marketplace and the dollars awarded to these firms by the City or its prime contractors. The Study also will be used to determine if a legal predicate exists to maintain or create any remedial programs under Croson and its progeny.

A. Objective

The principal objectives of this Study were:

- to determine whether there are current discriminatory practices, or the present effects of past discriminatory practices in the City's solicitation and award of contracts;
- to determine if a legally justified need continues to exist for any or all of the City's M/WBE remedial efforts with regard to the awarding of contracts; and
- to provide recommendations for actions to be taken by the City as a result of the findings of the Study, including serious consideration of race-neutral program options.

B. Technical Approach

In conducting this Study and preparing its recommendations, GSPC followed a carefully designed work plan that allowed Study team members to fully analyze availability, utilization, and disparity with regard to M/WBE participation. The final work plan consisted of, but was not limited to, the following major tasks:

- establishing data parameters and finalizing a work plan;
- legal analysis;
- policy and procurement process review and M/WBE Program analysis;
- collecting electronic data, inputting manual data, organizing, and cleaning data, as well as filling any data gaps;
- conducting market area analyses;
- conducting utilization analyses;
- determining the availability of qualified firms;
- analyzing the utilization and availability data for disparity and statistical significance;
- conducting private sector analysis including credit and self-employment analysis;
- collecting and analyzing anecdotal information; and
- preparing a final report that presents race- and gender-neutral and narrowly tailored race- and gender-based remedies if indicated by the findings.

C. Report Organization

This report is organized into the following sections, which provide the results of GSPC's analytical findings as to the utilization and availability of firms to perform work for the City. In addition to this introductory chapter, this report includes:

- Chapter II, which is an overview of the legal history and basis for the Study;
- Chapter III, which provides a review of the City of Savannah's purchasing policy and remedial policy;
  Chapter IV, which presents the methodology used in the collection of statistical data from the City and the analyses of the data as it relates to relative M/WBE availability and utilization analyses. It also includes a discussion on levels of disparity for the City's prime contractors and subcontractors;
- Chapter V, which analyzes whether there is discrimination in the private sector;
- Chapter VI, which outlines the qualitative analyses: the analysis of anecdotal data collected from the telephone survey, personal interviews, focus groups and public meetings;
- Chapter VII, which presents GSPC's detailed findings and recommendations;
- Chapter VIII, which is GSPC's conclusion; and
- Chapter IX, which is the Appendices.

D. Project Team

- Rodney K. Strong, Esq., CEO, Griffin & Strong, P.C.
- Dr. Gregory Price, Senior Economist, Morehouse College
- Michele Clark Jenkins, J.D., Senior Director and Project Manager, Griffin & Strong, P.C.
- Imani Strong, Deputy Project Manager, Griffin & Strong, P.C.
- Lorrence O'Brien, Xander Consulting, Anecdotal Interviews and Purchasing Practices Review
- A.L. Burruss Institute of Public Service and Research at Kennesaw State University, Online Surveys
- Carolyn Blackshear, Multi-Line Business Services, Anecdotal Interviews

About the Project Team—Griffin & Strong, P.C.

Griffin & Strong, P.C. is a professional corporation based in Atlanta, Georgia, that is actively engaged in the practice of law, as well as governmental and private consulting. Since the firm's inception in 1992, the public policy consulting division has been continuously directed and controlled by Rodney K. Strong. Attorney Strong has an extensive background in the area of public contracting with specific experience conducting disparity studies. Gregory Price, Ph.D., served as Senior Economist for this Study and reviewed all quantitative aspects of the Study. Michele Clark Jenkins, as the Project Manager, was responsible for the day-to-day aspects of the Study and for executing the methodology. Mrs. Jenkins has extensive experience in managing disparity studies, bench-markings, and goal settings. Imani Strong served as Deputy Project Manager and qualitative research coordinator of the Study. Ms. Strong's expertise in anthropology and prior experience on GSPC studies made her an asset to the execution of this Study, particularly in the analysis of the anecdotal evidence. Susan Johnson handled the administration of the Study particularly with regard to subcontractor tracking and payments.

Other Members of the Project Team

- **Xander Consulting** is a Savannah, GA based management and technical services consulting firm, providing services in program and project administration, strategic planning, business development, and business and technical writing. Xander Principal, Lorrence O'Brien has over 25 years of diversified consulting experience. For this study, Mr. O'Brien conducted the purchasing policies, practices, and procedures interviews as well as anecdotal interviews with professional services firms.
- **Multi-Line Business Services -** Principal Consultant, Carolyn Blackshear, conducted the bulk of the anecdotal interviews for this study. Multi-Line Business Services is a full service business management and secretarial center and Ms. Blackshear has more than 35 years of experience in administrative and business management, as well as a long track-record in volunteering and community engagement in the City of Savannah.

- **A.L. Burruss Institute of Public Service and Research at Kennesaw State University** conducted the online survey for this project. The A.L. Burruss Institute of Public Service and Research draws upon the expertise of the academic departments of Kennesaw State University by providing opportunities for faculty, from diverse research fields, to participate in applied research projects on an as-needed basis. Similarly, Kennesaw State University students, serving as student assistants, interns, co-ops and as interviewers in the Telephone Survey Research Laboratory, have contributed experience in day-to-day operations at the Institute or at government agencies and community organizations.

II. LEGAL ANALYSIS

A. Background and Introduction

Disparity studies are a creation of the courts in response to challenges against minority business enterprise programs that were enacted to remedy perceived past or present discrimination. Laws that, on their face, favor one class of citizens over another, may run afoul of the 14th Amendment, which was the basis of the U.S. Supreme Courts' decisions in the City of Richmond v. J. A. Croson Company, 488 U.S. 469; 109 S. Ct. 706; 102 L. Ed. 2d 854; 1989 U.S. LEXIS 579; 57 U.S.L.W. 4132; 53 Fair Empl. Prac. Cas. (BNA) 197; 48 Empl. Prac. Dec. (CCH) P38,578; 36 Cont. Cas. Fed. (CCH) P76,005 and its progeny.

B. The Croson Decision

In its Croson decision, the Supreme Court ruled that the City of Richmond's Minority Business Enterprise (hereinafter "MBE") program failed to satisfy the requirements of "strict scrutiny" in order to have a race-conscious program. "Strict scrutiny" is a level of judicial review that has two (2) prongs: 1-A Compelling Governmental Interest and 2-A Narrowly Tailored Remedy. The City of Richmond failed to show that its minority set-aside program was "necessary" to remedy the effects of discrimination in the marketplace. In fact, the City of Richmond had not established the necessary factual predicate to infer that discrimination in contracting had occurred. The Court reasoned that a mere statistical disparity between the overall minority population in Richmond (50 percent African-American) and awards of prime contracts to minority-owned firms (0.67 percent to African-American firms) was an irrelevant statistical comparison and insufficient to raise an inference of discrimination. Regarding the evidence that Richmond provided to support its goal program, the Court emphasized the distinction between "societal discrimination", which it found to be an inappropriate and inadequate basis for social classification, and the type of identified discrimination that can support and define the scope of race-based relief. The Court noted that a generalized assertion that there has been past discrimination in an entire industry provided no guidance to determine the present scope of the injury a race-conscious program would seek to remedy. The Court emphasized that "there was no

direct evidence of race discrimination on the part of the City in letting contracts or any evidence that the City's prime contractors had discriminated against minority-owned subcontractors." Id, at 480.

In summary, the Court concluded there was no prima facie case of a constitutional or statutory violation by anyone in the construction industry. Justice O'Connor did opine, however, on what evidence might indicate a proper statistical comparison:

> [W]here 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. Croson, 488 U.S. at 509.

In other words, the statistical comparison would be one between the percentage of MBEs in the marketplace qualified to do contracting work (including prime contractors and subcontractors) and the percentage of total City contracting dollars awarded to minority firms. The relevant question among lower federal courts has been how to determine this particular comparison. See discussion of statistical comparison, infra.

Additionally, the Court stated that identified anecdotal accounts of past discrimination also could provide the basis to establish a compelling interest for local governments to enact race-conscious remedies. However, conclusory claims of discrimination by City officials, alone, would not suffice. In order to uphold a race- or ethnicity-based program, there must be a determination that a strong basis in evidence exists to support the conclusion that the remedial use of race is necessary. A strong basis in evidence cannot rest on an amorphous claim of societal discrimination, on simple legislative assurances of good intention, or congressional findings of discrimination in the national economy.

Regarding the second prong of the strict scrutiny test, the Court ruled that Richmond's MBE program was not narrowly tailored to redress the effects of discrimination. First, the Court held that Richmond's MBE program was not remedial in nature because it provided preferential treatment to minorities such as Eskimos and Aleuts, groups for which there was no evidence of discrimination in Richmond. Thus, the scope of the City's program was too broad. Second, the Court ruled that the thirty percent (30%) goal for MBE participation in the Richmond program was a rigid quota not related to identified discrimination. Specifically, the Court criticized the City for its lack of inquiry into whether a particular minority business, seeking racial preferences, had suffered from the effects of past discrimination. Third, the Court expressed disappointment that the City failed to consider race-neutral alternatives to remedy the under-representation of minorities in contract awards. Finally, the Court highlighted the fact that the City's MBE program contained no sunset provisions for a periodic review process intended to assess the continued need for the program. Croson, 488 at 500.

Thus, in order for states, municipalities, and other local governments to satisfy the narrow tailoring prong of the strict scrutiny test, the Croson Court suggested analyzing the following five factors:

1. Whether the MBE program covers minorities for which there is evidence of discrimination (i.e. statistical disparity, anecdotal evidence, etc.);
2. Whether the size of the MBE participation goal is flexible and contains waiver provisions for prime contractors who make a "good faith" effort to satisfy MBE utilization goals, but are unsuccessful in finding any qualified, willing and able MBEs;
3. Whether there was a reasonable relationship between the numerical goals set and the relevant labor pool of MBEs capable of performing the work in the marketplace;
4. Whether race-neutral alternatives were considered before race-conscious remedies were enacted; and
5. Whether the MBE program contains sunset provisions or mechanisms for periodic review to assess the program's continued need.

C. Procedural Posture, Permissible Evidence, and Burdens of Proof

1. Standing

Legal "standing" is an absolute requirement of one who brings an action in any federal court of the United States or any State court called upon to decide a matter upon federal law. U.S. Const. Art. III, § 2, Cl 1; Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992). Though "some of its elements express merely prudential considerations that are part of judicial self-government, the core component of standing is an essential and unchanging part of the case-or-controversy requirement of Article III. Lujan, 504 U.S. at 560.

> [S]tanding contains three elements. First, the plaintiff must have suffered an injury in fact -- an invasion of a legally protected interest which is . . . concrete and particularized . . . [; s]econd, there must be a causal connection between the injury and the conduct complained of . . . [; and t]hird, it must be likely, as opposed to merely speculative, that the injury will be redressed by a favorable decision [of the Court wherewith the matter is brought]. Lujan, 504 U.S. at 560-61, (internal punctuation and citations omitted).

Following the Croson decision, courts have entertained numerous legal challenges to M/WBE set-aside programs. Standing has been important in a number of these challenges, because it has been pivotal in determining a party's relevance in a lawsuit. If, however, an M/WBE Program is properly constructed and administered, there should be no legitimate claims of reverse discrimination by majority contractors resulting in a lawsuit. Under the traditional standing analysis, in order to satisfy the "injury in fact" requirement, plaintiffs must establish a causal connection between the injury, the ordinance, and the likelihood that the injury will be redressed by a favorable decision. Moreover, the courts may not tolerate a lawsuit unless the plaintiff shows some "concrete and particularized" injury that is in fact imminent and which amounts to something more than "conjectural or hypothetical" injury. Price v. City of Charlotte, 93 F.3d 1241, 1247 (4th Circuit 1996). See Cone Corp. v. Hillsborough County, 157 F.R.D. 533 (M.D. Fla. 1994)

(Court imposed Rule 11 sanctions based on plaintiffs' complaint which failed to establish injury in fact). See also Lujan, 504 U.S. at 560 (1992).

In the Price case, seven police officers successfully brought a 42 U.S.C. 1983 suit against the City of Charlotte, NC, because of their claim that the City employed race-based criteria that precluded them from being considered for promotion to sergeant following their having taken the exam, and that said action violated the Equal Protection clause of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Noteworthy is the fact that those suing the City of Charlotte were far enough down in their test results on the sergeant's exam that they would have not been promoted to the two positions given to lower test performing African Americans regardless of the City's employment of race-based criteria in awarding promotions. In response to the City pointing this fact out, the seven police officers responded that:

> The actual injury they suffered was their race-based exclusion from equal consideration for the promotion to sergeant, not the fact that they failed to obtain a promotion. . . . [T]heir injuries derive from the City's unconstitutional use of race to decide promotions in the police department, not from an ultimate denial of a promotion. Price, 93 F.3d at 1245.

In Northeastern Florida General Contractors v. City of Jacksonville, Fla., 508 U.S. 656 (11th Cir. 1993), the United States Supreme Court granted certiorari because of the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals' ruling regarding the petitioner's (Appellant) lack of standing. In that case the Eleventh Circuit ruled that the Petitioner lacked standing "because it failed to allege that one or more of its members would have been awarded a contract but for the challenged ordinance. Under these circumstances, the Court of Appeals concluded, there is no injury. . . ." (Northeastern Florida General Contractors, 508 U.S. at 664 (internal quotation marks omitted)), and such ruling was contrary to that which was held by the Ninth Circuit and D.C. Circuit Courts of Appeals when presented with similar questions of law. Northeastern Florida General Contractors, 508 U.S. at 660.

In this case, The City of Jacksonville enacted an ordinance which required that 10% of the amount spent on city contracts be set aside each fiscal year for so-called "Minority Business Enterprises" (MBE's). Jacksonville defined an MBE as a business whose ownership was at least 51% "minority" or female, and a "minority" was in turn defined as a person who is or considers himself to be African American, Spanish-speaking, Oriental, Indian, Eskimo, Aleut, or handicapped. Once projects were earmarked for MBE bidding by the city's chief purchasing officer, they were "deemed reserved for minority business enterprises only." . . . The ordinance also provided for waiver or reduction of the 10% set-aside under certain circumstances. The Northeastern Florida Chapter of the Associated General Contractors of America (AGC), is an association of individuals and firms in the construction industry whose members do business in Jacksonville, and most of them did not qualify as MBE's under the city's ordinance. AGC filed an action against the city and its mayor claiming that Jacksonville's ordinance violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (both on its face and as applied). In its complaint, AGC alleged that many of its members "regularly bid on and perform construction work for the City of Jacksonville," and that they "would have . . . bid on . . . designated set aside contracts but for the restrictions imposed" by the ordinance. See Northeastern Florida General Contractors, 508 U.S. at 659 (Emphasis added).

Noteworthy is the fact that Justice Thomas' opinion in Northeastern Florida Chapter of Associated General Contractors of America, modified the traditional standing requirement for contractors challenging local and state government minority preference schemes. The Court relaxed the injury in fact requirements by holding that:

> [w]hen the government erects a barrier that makes it more difficult for members of one group to obtain a benefit than it is for members of another group, a member of the former group seeking to challenge the barrier need not allege that he would have obtained the benefit but for the barrier in order to establish standing. The "injury in fact" in an equal protection case of this variety is the denial of equal treatment resulting from the imposition of the barrier, not the ultimate inability to obtain the benefit. . . . And in the context of a challenge to a set-aside program, the "injury in fact" is the inability to compete on an equal footing in the bidding

process, not the loss of a contract. Northeastern Florida General Contractors, 508 U.S. at 666 (internal citations omitted).

Restated, as long as the non-minority contractor can show that they were "able and qualified to bid" on a contract subject to the City's ordinance, the "injury in fact" arises from an inability to compete with M/WBEs on an equal footing due to the ordinance's "discriminatory policy." See Contractors Assn. of Eastern Pennsylvania v. City of Philadelphia, 6 F.3d 990, 995 (3rd Cir. 1993); Concrete Works of Colorado v. City and County of Denver, 36 F.3d 1513, 1518 (10th Cir. 1994);(concrete works submitted and the ordinance prevented it from competing on an equal basis.); Webster v. Fulton County, 51 F.Supp. 2d 1354 (Plaintiff Greenthumb demonstrated that it was able to bid on contracts and a discriminatory policy prevented it.). "To establish standing, therefore, a party challenging a set-aside program...need only demonstrate that it is able and ready to bid on contracts and that a discriminatory policy prevents it from doing so on an equal footing." Northeastern Florida Chapter of Associated General Contractors of America, 508 U.S. 666.

In Adarand, the Supreme Court continued to find standing in cases in which the challenging party made "an adequate showing that sometime in the relatively near future it will bid on another government contract." Adarand Constructors v. Pena, 515 U.S. 200, 211 (1995). That is, if the challenging party is very likely to bid on future contracts, and must compete for such contracts against MBEs, then that contractor has standing to bring a lawsuit.

Finally, the United States Supreme Court, in Hunt v. Washington State Apple Adver. Comm., 432 U.S. 333 (1977), established a three-prong test to determine whether an association has associational standing to bring a lawsuit on behalf of its members. It wrote that a court must determine whether an association's "members would otherwise have standing to sue in their own right; (b) the interests it seeks to protect are germane to the organization's purpose; and (c) neither the claim asserted nor the relief requested requires the participation in the lawsuit of the

individual members." 432 U.S. at 343. The federal courts in the Eleventh Circuit have adhered to this standard through numerous cases. See, Florida State Conference of the N.A.A.C.P. et al v. Browning, 522 F.3d 1153 (2008); Touchstone v McDermott, 234 F.3d 1133 (2000).

2. Equal Protection Clause Standards and Judicial Standards of Review

The second preliminary matter that courts address is the standard of equal protection review that governs their analysis. The Fourteenth Amendment provides that "No state shall . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws". U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1.

Courts determine the appropriate standard of equal protection review by "[f]irst. . . [determining] whether a state or local government has developed the program, or whether Congress has authorized the program's creation", then by examining the protected classes embodied in the statute. S. J. Groves & Sons Company v. Fulton County et al, 920 F.2d 752, 767 (11th Cir. 1991). The courts apply strict scrutiny to review an ordinance's race-based preference scheme and inquire whether the law is narrowly tailored to achieve a compelling governmental interest. S. J. Groves, 920 F.2d at 767; City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Company, 488 U.S. 469 (1989). Conversely, gender-based classifications are evaluated under the intermediate scrutiny rubric, which provides that the statute must be substantially related to an important governmental objective. Mississippi Univ. for Women v. Hogan, 458 U.S. 718(1982). See Engineering Contractors Ass'n of South Florida, Inc., et al v. Metropolitan Dade County, et al, 122 F.3d 895 (11th Cir. 1997). (Eleventh Circuit explaining U.S. v. Virginia, 518 U.S. 515 (1996) and the appropriate gender-based affirmative action equal protection analysis). Therefore, race-conscious affirmative action is subject to a higher standard of judicial review than gender-conscious affirmative action. See also, Ensley Branch N.A.A.C.P. v. George Seibels, 31 F.3d 1548 (11th Cir. 1994).

a) Strict Scrutiny

In order for a local government to enact a constitutionally valid M/WBE ordinance which applies to awards of its contracts, it must show a compelling governmental interest. This compelling interest must be proven by particularized findings of discrimination. The strict scrutiny test ensures that the means used to address the compelling goal of remedying discrimination "fit" so closely that there is little likelihood that the motive for the racial classification is illegitimate racial prejudice or stereotype. Croson, Supra; Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 906. See also, Adarand Constructors, 515 U.S. at 235; Hopwood v. State of Texas, 78 F.3d 932, 951 (5th Cir. 1996). Only after legislative or administrative findings of constitutional or statutory violations, local governments have a compelling interest in remedying discrimination.

The Courts have ruled that general societal discrimination is insufficient to justify the use of race-based measures to satisfy a compelling governmental interest. Adarand Constructors, 515 U.S. at 227; Croson, 488 U.S. at 496-97. See Miller v. Johnson, 515 U.S. 900, 904 (1995). Rather, there must be some showing of prior discrimination by the governmental actor involved, either as an "active" or "passive" participant. Croson, 488 U.S. at 498; Engineering Contractors, Supra. Even if the governmental unit did not directly discriminate, it can take corrective action. "[I]f the County could show that it had essentially become a "passive participant' in a system of racial exclusion practiced by elements of the local construction industry," the Supreme Court has made it "clear that the [County] could take affirmative steps to dismantle such a system." Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 907.

The governmental entity must point to specific instances or patterns of identifiable discrimination in the area and in the industry to which the plan applies. A prima facie case of intentional discrimination is deemed sufficient to support a local government's affirmative action plan. However, generalized assertions that there has been past discrimination in an entire industry provides no guidance for a legislative body to determine the precise scope of the injury it seeks to redress. Croson, 488 U.S. at 498-99. See Miller, 515 U.S. at 921.

Since all racial classifications are viewed as legally suspect, the governing body must show a "strong basis in evidence" of discrimination in order to justify any enactment of race-conscious legislation. Merely stating a "benign" or "remedial" purpose does not constitute a "strong basis in evidence" that the remedial plan is necessary, nor does it establish a prima facie case of discrimination. Thus, the local government must identify the discrimination it seeks to redress, (Croson, 488 U.S. at 500-01), and particularized findings of discrimination must also be set forth. Although Croson places the burden on the government to demonstrate a "strong basis in evidence," the Fourteenth Amendment does not require a court to make an ultimate judicial finding of discrimination before the government may take affirmative steps to eradicate discrimination. A particularized showing of discrimination in a marketplace and a determination that a state or local government is a "passive participant" in that marketplace discrimination establishes a compelling governmental interest. The City and County of Denver, Colorado were able to establish a compelling interest by demonstrating they were a passive participant in private discrimination. Concrete Works of Colorado, Supra.

In Concrete Works, the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the District Court's granting of summary judgment for the City of Denver, which had determined that Denver's factual showing of past race and gender discrimination justified its compelling government interest in remedying the discrimination. In reversing, the Tenth Circuit held that factual issues of dispute existed about the accuracy of Denver's public and private discrimination data, but noted that Denver had shown evidence of discrimination in both the award of public contracts and within the Denver metropolitan statistical area ("MSA") that was particularized and geographically based. On remand, Denver needed only to come forward with evidence that its ordinance was narrowly tailored, whereupon it became Concrete Works' burden to show that there was no such strong basis. Concrete Works, Supra.

Conversely, in Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 901, the Eleventh Circuit upheld a District Courts ruling that Metropolitan Dade County's MBE program was unconstitutional, even though the Eleventh Circuit had previously held it so prior to the decision by the Croson court. See, South Florida Chapter of the Associated General Contractors of Amr., Inc. v. Metropolitan Dade County, FL et al, 723 F.2d 846 (11th Cir.1984). The District Court in Engineering Contractors was

presented with an alternative explanation for significant underutilization of M/WBEs that regression analyses supported to the satisfaction of both the District Court and the Eleventh Circuit. Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 918.

The Sixth Circuit signaled in Drabik, that statistical proof of under-utilization would be insufficient in and of itself to supply the justification for the utilization of a non-race-neutral measure in public contracting practices. Associated Gen. Contrs. of Ohio, Inc. v. Drabik, 214 F.3d 730, 735 (6th Cir. 2000). The Drabik court, did not read the Croson Court as permitting remedial action of a non-race neutral type simply because of statistical findings of underutilization of those minority companies that were in the ready, willing and able to perform a public contracting need category, but rather required that "governments . . . identify discrimination with some specificity before they may use race-conscious relief; explicit findings of a constitutional or statutory violation must be made." (Internal Punctuation omitted.) Drabik, 214 F.3d at 735. Moreover, the Drabik Court signaled that the government would need to present evidence demonstrating "pervasive, systematic, and obstinate discriminatory conduct" in order to satisfy Croson. Drabik, 214 F.3d at 737.

The types of evidence routinely presented to show the existence of a compelling interest include statistical and anecdotal evidence. Croson, 488 U.S. at 501. See, Engineering Contractors, Supra. Where gross statistical disparities exist, they alone may constitute prima facie proof of a pattern or practice of discrimination. Anecdotal evidence, such as testimony from minority contractors, is most useful as a supplement to strong statistical evidence. Concrete Works, 36 F.3d at 1520. See Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 907; Ensley Branch v. Seibels, 31 F.3d at 1565. Nevertheless, anecdotal evidence is rarely so dominant that it can, by itself, establish discrimination under Croson. The "combination of anecdotal and statistical evidence," however, is viewed by the courts as "potent." Coral Construction Co. v. King County, 941 F.2d 910, 920 (9th Cir. 1991).

If there is a strong basis in evidence to justify a race- or ethnicity-based program, the next step of the strict scrutiny test is to determine whether the M/WBE Program is narrowly tailored to redress the effects of discrimination. In Croson, the Court considered four factors:

(a) whether the city has first considered race-neutral measures, but found them to be ineffective;
(b) the basis offered for the goals selected;
(c) whether the program provides for waivers; and,
(d) whether the program applies only to MBEs who operate in the geographic jurisdiction covered by the program.

Other considerations include the flexibility and duration of the program; that is, whether the program contains a sunset provision or other mechanism for periodic review of its effectiveness. These mechanisms ensure that the program does not last longer than necessary to serve its intended remedial purpose. Furthermore, such mechanisms keep pure the relationship of numerical goals to the relevant labor market, as well as the impact of the relief on the rights of third parties. Adarand Constructors, 515 U.S. at 238.

Finally, the Court in Croson did provide that "local governments may in some circumstances use affirmative action to eradicate the effects of public discrimination." Ensley Branch N.A.A.C.P., 31 F.3d at 1569, (quoting, Croson, 488 U.S. at 491-93). The Court went on to say that in making sure that those programs do not go too far "they must be scrutinized strictly. In making this evaluation, . . . [one should] consider":

(a) the necessity for the relief and the efficacy of alternative remedies;
(b) the flexibility and duration of the relief, including the availability of waiver provisions;
(c) the relationship of the numerical goals to the relevant labor market; and
(d) the impact of the relief on the rights of innocent third parties.

Ensley Branch N.A.A.C.P., 31 F.3d at 1569; Webster, 51 F. Supp. 2d at 1362 (N. D. Ga. 1999).

b) Intermediate Scrutiny - Gender

In Coral Construction Company v. King County, 941 F.2d 910, (9th Cir. 1991), cert. denied, 502 U.S. 1033, 122 S.Ct. 875 (1992), the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals applied an intermediate scrutiny standard in reviewing the WBE section of the County's ordinance. In the Third Circuit, the U.S. Court of Appeals applied an intermediate level of review in its ruling in Contractors Association of Eastern Pennsylvania, Inc. v. City of Philadelphia, 6 F.3d 990, (3rd Cir. 1993). However, in the Sixth Circuit, "gender based affirmative action plans are subject to strict scrutiny when challenged under the Equal Protection Clause." Brunet v. City of Columbus, 1 F.3d 390, 403-04 6th Cir. (1993); Conlin v. Blanchard, 890 F.2d 811, 816 (6th Cir. 1989). The Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals in Ensley Branch NAACP v. Seibels, addressed the issue in a Title VII action. In this decision, the Eleventh Circuit rejected the argument that, based on Croson, the Supreme Court intended strict scrutiny to apply to gender-conscious programs challenged under the Equal Protection Clause. Ensley Branch N.A.A.C.P. v. George Seibels, 31 F.3d 1548, 1579 (11th Cir. (1994)). This split in the circuits occurred after the Supreme Court's ruling in Croson, and acquired further justification as a result of the U.S. Supreme Court's opinion in U.S. v. Virginia, Supra. In the Virginia opinion, more commonly referred to as the VMI decision, the Supreme Court held, "parties who seek to defend gender-based government action must demonstrate an "exceedingly persuasive justification' for that action." Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 90, (quoting VMI, 116 S. Ct. at 2274). Nevertheless, the Eleventh Circuit remains steadfast in its resolve that intermediate scrutiny is the correct level of review of gender-based affirmative action programs. As justification for its resolve, the Eleventh Circuit reported in Engineering Contractors:

> There is a long line of directly applicable Supreme Court precedents applying traditional intermediate scrutiny to gender classifications. More specifically, the Supreme Court held in Mississippi University for Women v. Hogan that intermediate scrutiny was the appropriate test to apply to a gender-based classification favoring women, which is the same type of classification created by the County's WBE program. Instead of overruling Mississippi University for Women, the VMI Court cited that case as "immediately in point" and the "closest

> guide" for the VMI decision itself. The Supreme Court is not in the practice of overruling its own precedents by citing them with approval, and we decline to hold that the Court did so in the VMI case. Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 908.

The Court went on to cite to Supreme Court case law that permitted an appellate court to hold to or abandon its precedent, as it would, when faced with a quandary such as that which was brought about with the change in nomenclature used by the Supreme Court here-above. The Court concluded its discussion of the issue by announcing, "[u]nless and until the Supreme Court tells us otherwise, intermediate scrutiny remains the applicable constitutional standard in gender discrimination cases, and a gender preference may be upheld so long as it is substantially related to an important governmental objective." Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 908.

In Engineering Contractors, the government stated that its important governmental objective in creating its WBE program was "to "redress discrimination against women." The Eleventh Circuit remarked, "[t]hat stated objective is typical, and it is unquestionably a sufficiently "important" one to sustain a gender-conscious affirmative action program." Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 908. The Court next cited to a case from the Ninth Circuit with a similar objective, and then to its holding in Ensley Branch N.A.A.C.P. v. George Seibels, which was that, "the government interest prong of the inquiry can be satisfied by a showing of societal discrimination in the relevant economic sector." Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 909. However, the Court in Engineering Contractors quickly moved to the same stance that it had in Ensley Branch N.A.A.C.P, when looking at gender-based programs when it concluded that, "the true test of an affirmative action program is usually not the nature of the government's interest, but rather the adequacy of the evidence of discrimination offered to show that interest." Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 909.

"[A] gender-conscious affirmative action program can rest safely on something less than the 'strong basis in evidence' required to bear the weight of a race- or ethnicity-conscious program", but the Supreme Court has not provided us with a label as it did in race-based programs, and the body of case law is less developed. Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 909.

The Eleventh Circuit agreed with the Third Circuit's holding in Contractors Assn. of Eastern Pennsylvania v. City of Philadelphia, 6 F.3d 990 (1993), that intermediate scrutiny requires that evidence be probative, but added that "probative" must be "sufficient as well." Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 909-10.

c) Passive Participation

Strict scrutiny requires a strong basis in evidence of either active participation by government in prior discrimination or passive participation by government in discrimination by local industry. Croson, 488 U.S. at 491-92. In Dade County, the court noted again that the measure of evidence required for a gender classification is less clear. The court agreed with the Third Circuit's holding that intermediate scrutiny requires that evidence be probative but here the court added that probative must be "sufficient as well." Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 909-10. The Supreme Court in Croson opined that municipalities have a compelling interest in ensuring that public funds do not serve to finance private discrimination. Local governments may be able to take remedial action when they possess evidence that their own spending practices exacerbate a pattern of private discrimination. Croson, 488 U.S. at 502; Webster, 51 F. Supp.2d at 1363.

Subsequent lower court rulings have provided more guidance on passive participation by local governments. In Concrete Works, Supra, the Tenth Circuit held that it was sufficient for the local government to demonstrate that it engaged in passive participation in discrimination rather than showing that it actively participated in the discrimination. Thus, the desire for a government entity to prevent the infusion of public funds into a discriminatory industry is enough to satisfy the requirement.

The court in Concrete Works stated "neither Croson nor its progeny clearly state whether private discrimination that is in no way funded with public tax dollars can, by itself, provide the requisite strong basis in evidence necessary to justify a municipality's affirmative action program.

Although we do not read Croson as requiring the municipality to identify an exact linkage between its award of public contracts and private discrimination, such evidence would at least enhance the municipality's factual predicate for a race/gender-conscious program. Concrete Works, 36 F.3d at 1529. Other courts continue to struggle with this issue.

In Croson, the Supreme Court concluded that state and local governments have a compelling interest to remedy identified past and present discrimination within their jurisdictions. Thus, courts have to assess whether a public entity has the requisite factual support for its M/WBE Program in order to satisfy the particularized showing of discrimination required by Croson. This factual support can be developed from anecdotal and statistical evidence.

3. Evidentiary Requirements

a) Anecdotal Evidence

The majority decision in Croson impliedly endorsed the inclusion of personal accounts of discrimination. Croson, 488 U.S. at 480, (noting as a weakness in the City's case that the Richmond City Council heard "no direct evidence of race-conscious discrimination on the part of the city in letting contracts or any evidence that the City's prime contractors had discriminated against minority-owned subcontractors"). However, according to the Croson standard, selective anecdotal evidence about MBE experiences alone would not provide an ample basis in evidence to demonstrate public or private discrimination in a municipality's construction industry. See Concrete Works, 36 F. 3d.1513 (10th Cir. 1994). See also, Middleton et al v. City of Flint, 92 F.3d 396, 405 (6th Cir. 1996) (Anecdotal evidence is most useful as a supplement to strong statistical evidence . . . ."(internal citations omitted)). Nonetheless, personal accounts of actual discrimination or the effects of discriminatory practices may complement empirical evidence. In addition, anecdotal evidence of a governmental entity's institutional practices that provoke discriminatory market conditions is particularly probative. Thus, courts have required the inclusion of anecdotal evidence of past or present discrimination. See Contractors Ass'n., 6 F.3d at 990, 1002-03 (3rd Cir. 1993) (weighing Philadelphia's anecdotal evidence); Coral Constr.Co. v.

King Cnty, 941 F.2d 910, 919 (9th Cir. 1991) ("[The combination of convincing anecdotal and statistical evidence is potent"); Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 925-26, (We have found [anecdotal] . . . evidence to be helpful in the past, but only when it was combined with and reinforced by sufficiently probative statistical evidence.).

In Coral Construction Company v. King County, the Ninth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals concluded that "the combination of convincing anecdotal and statistical evidence" was potent. Coral Constr. Co., 941 F.2d at 919. In a separate case, the Third Circuit suggested that a combination of empirical and anecdotal evidence was necessary for establishing a prima facie case of discrimination. Contractors Assn. of Eastern Pennsylvania v. City of Philadelphia, 6 F. 3d 990, 1003 (3rd Cir. 1993). In addition, the Ninth Circuit approved the combination of statistical and anecdotal evidence used by the City of San Francisco in enacting its M/WBE ordinances. Associated General Contractors of California, Inc. v. Coal. for Economic Equity, et al, 950 F.2d 1401 (9th Cir. 1991), cert. denied, 503 U.S. 985, 112 S.Ct. 1670 (1992).

On the other hand, neither empirical evidence alone nor selected anecdotal evidence alone provides a strong enough basis in evidence to demonstrate public or private discrimination in a municipality's construction industry to meet the Croson standard. Concrete Works, 36 F. 3d at 1513. For example, in O'Donnell Construction v. District of Columbia, the Court reversed the denial of a preliminary injunction for the plaintiff because the District of Columbia failed to prove a "strong basis in evidence" for its MBE program. O'Donnell Constr. Co. v. District of Columbia, 963 F.2d 420 (D.C. Cir. 1992). The Court held in favor of the plaintiff because much of the evidence the District offered in support of its program was anecdotal. The Court opined that "anecdotal evidence is most useful as a supplement to strong statistical evidence--which the Council did not produce in this case." O'Donnell, 963 F.2d 420, 427 (D.C. Cir. 1992).

In Engineering Contractors, the federal District Court held that, "we have found that kind of evidence [anecdotal] to be helpful in the past, but only when it was combined with and reinforced by sufficiently probative statistical evidence. Engineering Contractors Ass'n, 122 F. 3d at 925. Accordingly, a combination of statistical disparities in the utilization of M/WBEs and

particularized anecdotal accounts of discrimination are required to satisfy the factual predicate. Therefore, any study should include anecdotal evidence of past and present discrimination in order to establish the factual predicate by these guidelines.

b) Statistical Data

The Court in Croson explained that an inference of discrimination may be made with empirical evidence that demonstrates "a significant statistical disparity between the number of qualified minority contractors . . . and the number of such contractors actually engaged by the locality or the locality's prime contractors. Croson, 488 U.S. at 509. A predicate to governmental action is a demonstration that gross statistical disparities exist between the proportion of MBEs awarded government contracts and the proportion of MBEs in the local industry "willing and able to do the work," in order to justify its use of race-conscious contract measures. Ensley Branch, 31 F.3d at 1565. In order to adequately assess statistical evidence, there must be evidence identifying the basic qualifications of minority contractors "willing and able to do the job" and the Court must determine, based upon these qualifications, the relevant statistical pool with which to make the appropriate statistical comparisons. Engineering Contractors Ass'n, 122 F. 3d. at 925 (11th Cir. 1997). Although subsequent lower court decisions have provided considerable guidelines for statistical analyses sufficient for satisfying the Croson factual predicate, there are multiple ways that the courts have accepted for conducting statistical analyses.

c) Availability

The attempted methods of calculating M/WBE availability have varied from case to case. In Contractors Association of Eastern Pennsylvania v. City of Philadelphia, 6 F.3d 990 (3rd Cir. 1993), the Third Circuit stated that available and qualified minority-owned businesses comprise the "relevant statistical pool" for purposes of determining availability. The Court permitted availability to be based on the metropolitan statistical area ("MSA") and local list of the Office of Minority Opportunity; for non-M/WBEs, which itself was based on census data. In Associated

General Contractors of America v. City of Columbus, 936 F.Supp. 1363 (S. D. Ohio 1996), the City's consultants collected data on the number of M/WBE firms in the Columbus MSA in order to calculate the percentage of available M/WBE firms. This is referred to as the rate of availability. Three sources were considered to determine the number of M/WBEs "ready, willing and able" to perform construction work for the city. Associated General Contractors of America v. City of Columbus, 936 F. Supp. 1363 (1996). (Reversed on related grounds, 172 F.3d 411 (6th Cir. 1999)). However, the Court found that none of the measures of availability purported to measure the number of M/WBEs who were qualified and willing to bid as a prime contractor on City construction projects because neither the City Auditor Vendor Payment History file, Subcontractor Participation Reports, or Contract Document Database of the City were attentive to which firms were able to be responsible or provide either a bid bond or performance bond. The Court observed that the anecdotal evidence collected demonstrated that only a fraction of all collection firms were capable of meeting these requirements. The Court wrote, "[t]here is no basis in the evidence for an inference that qualified M/WBE firms exist in the same proportions as they do in relation to all construction firms in the market." Associated General Contractors of Am., 936 F. Supp. at 1389. The Court wondered aloud why the City did not simply use the records it already maintains "of all firms which have submitted bids on prime contracts" since it represents "a ready source of information regarding the identity of the firms which are qualified to provide contracting services as prime contractors." Id.

The issue of availability also was examined by the Eleventh Circuit in Contractors Association of South Florida, Inc., et al v. Metropolitan Dade County, et al, 122 F.3d 895 (11th Cir. 1997). Here, the Court opined that when reliance is made upon statistical disparity, and special qualifications are necessary to undertake a particular task, the relevant statistical pool must include only those minority-owned firms qualified to provide the requested services. Moreover, these minority firms must be qualified, willing and able to provide the requested services. If the statistical analysis includes the proper pool of eligible minorities, any resulting disparity, in a proper case, may constitute prima facie proof of a pattern or practice of discrimination.

In an opinion by the Sixth Circuit in Associated General Contractors v. Drabik, the Court of Appeals ruled that the State of Ohio failed to satisfy the strict scrutiny standard to justify the

state's minority business enterprise act, by relying on statistical evidence that did not account for which firms were qualified, willing and able to perform on construction contracts. The court stated that "although Ohio's most compelling statistical evidence compares the percentage of contracts awarded to minorities to the percentage of minority-owned businesses…the problem is that the percentage of minority-owned businesses in Ohio (7% of 1978) did not take into account which were construction firms and those who were qualified, willing and able to perform on state construction contracts." Drabik, 214 F.3d at 736 (2000). Although this was more data than was submitted in Croson, it was still insufficient under strict scrutiny, according to the court. Id.

d) Utilization

Utilization is a natural corollary of availability, in terms of statistical calculation. In Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 914, the City's consultants calculated the percentage of City contracting dollars that were paid to M/WBE construction firms. This is referred to as the rate of utilization. From this point, one can determine if a disparity exists and, if so, to what extent.

e) Disparity Index and Croson

To demonstrate the under-utilization of M/WBEs in a particular area, parties can employ a statistical device known as the "disparity index." See Contractors Assn., 6 F.3d at 1005 (Third Circuit joining the First, Ninth, and Eleventh Circuits in relying on disparity indices to determine whether a municipality satisfies Croson's evidentiary burden). The disparity index is calculated by dividing the percentage of available M/WBE participation (amount of contract dollars) by the percentage of M/WBEs in the relevant population of local firms. A disparity index of one (1) demonstrates full M/WBE participation, whereas the closer the index is to zero, the greater the M/WBE under-utilization. Some courts multiply the disparity index by 100, thereby creating a scale between 0 and 100, with 100 representing full M/WBE utilization. Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 914.

Courts have used these M/WBE disparity indices to apply the "strong basis in evidence" standard in Croson. Based on a disparity index of 0.22, the Ninth Circuit upheld the denial of a preliminary injunction to a challenger of the City of San Francisco's MBE plan based upon an equal protection claim. AGC v. Coal. for Economic Equity, 950 F.2d 1401, 1414 (9th Cir. 1991). Accordingly, the Third Circuit held that a disparity of 0.04 was "probative of discrimination in City contracting in the Philadelphia construction industry." Contractors Ass'n., 6 F.3d at 1005.

f) Standard Deviation

The number calculated via the disparity index is then tested for its validity through the application of a standard deviation analysis. Standard deviation analysis measures the probability that a result is a random deviation from the predicted result (the more standard deviations, the lower the probability the result is a random one). Social scientists consider a finding of two standard deviations significant, meaning that 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. The Eleventh Circuit has directed that " 'where the difference between the expected value and the observed number is greater than two or three standard deviations', then the hypothesis that [employees] were hired without regard to race would be suspect." Peightal v. Metropolitan Dade County, 26 F.3d 1545, 1556 (11th Cir. 1994) (quoting Hazelwood School District et al. v. United States, 433 U.S. 308, quoting Castaneda v. Partida, 430 U.S. 482, 497 n.17, 97 S.Ct. 1272, 1281 n.17, (1977)).

g) Statistical Regression Analysis

The statistical significance of certain quantitative analyses was another issue that arose in the Webster case. The District Court indicated that the appropriate test should resemble the one employed in the Engineering Contractors case, wherein two standard deviations or any disparity ratio that was higher than .80 (which is insignificant), should be used. The Webster court criticized the Fulton County expert for failing to use a regression analysis to determine the cause

of the disparity. The court likewise discredited the post-disparity study for failing to use regression analysis to determine if underutilization was due to firm size or inability to obtain bonding and financing.

The Webster court noted that the Court of Appeals in Engineering Contractors affirmed the District Court's conclusion that the disparities offered by Dade County's experts in that case were better explained by firm size than by discrimination. Webster, 51 F. Supp. 2d at 1365. Dade County conducted a regression analysis to control for firm size after calculating disparity indices with regard to the utilization of BBEs, HBEs and WBEs in the Dade County market, by comparing the amount of contracts awarded to the amount each group would be expected to receive based on the group's bidding activity and the awardee success rate. Although there were a few unexplained disparities that remained after controlling for firm size, the District Court concluded (and the Court of Appeals affirmed) that there was no strong basis in evidence for discrimination for BBEs and HBEs and that the quantitative analysis did not sufficiently demonstrate the existence of discrimination against WBEs in the relevant economic sector. Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 917. Specifically, the court noted that finding a single unexplained negative disparity against BBEs for the years 1989-1991 for a single SIC code was not enough to show discrimination.

h) Geographic Scope of the Data

The Croson Court observed that because discrimination varies across market areas, state and local governments cannot rely on national statistics of discrimination in the disputed industry to draw conclusions about prevailing market conditions in their respective regions. Croson, 488 U.S. at 504. However, to confine the permissible data to a governmental entity's strict geographical borders would ignore the economic reality that contracts are awarded to firms located in adjacent areas. Thus, courts closely scrutinize pertinent data related to the jurisdictional area of the state or municipality.

Generally, the scope of the statistical analyses pertains to the geographic market area from which the governmental entity offerors come. In addition, disparities concerning utilization, firm size, and formation are also relevant in determining discrimination in a marketplace. It has been deemed appropriate to examine the existence of discrimination against M/WBEs even when these areas go beyond the geographical boundaries of the local jurisdictions. See Contractors Association of Eastern Pennsylvania v. City of Philadelphia, 91 F.3d 586, 604 (3rd Cir. 1996).

Court decisions have allowed jurisdictions to utilize evidence of discrimination from nearby public entities and from within the relevant private marketplace. Nevertheless, extra-jurisdictional evidence must still pertain to the operation of an industry within geographic boundaries of the jurisdiction. As the court wrote in Tennessee Asphalt v. Farris, "[s]tates and lesser units of local government are limited to remedying sufficiently identified past and present discrimination within their own spheres of authority." Tennessee Asphalt Co. v. Farris, 942 F.2d 969 974 (6th Cir. 1991).

4. Post-Enactment Evidence

In Croson, the Court stated that a state or local government "must identify that discrimination . . . with some specificity before they may use race-conscious relief." Croson, 488 U.S. at 504. However, the Court declined to require that all relevant evidence of such discrimination be gathered prior to the enactment of the program. Pre-enactment evidence refers to evidence developed prior to the enactment of an M/WBE Program by a governmental entity. Such evidence is critical to any affirmative action program because, absent any pre-enactment evidence of discrimination, a state or local government would be unable to satisfy the standards established in Croson. Post-enactment evidence is that which has been developed since the affirmative action program was enacted and therefore was not specifically relied upon as a rationale for the government's race/gender-conscious efforts. As such, post-enactment evidence has been another source of controversy in contemporary litigation, though most subsequent rulings have interpreted Croson's evidentiary requirement to include post-enactment evidence. Significantly, crucial exceptions exist in rulings from the federal district courts.

Early post-Croson decisions permitted the use of post-enactment evidence to determine whether an M/WBE Program complies with Croson. See, e.g., Contractors Assn., 6 F.3d, at 1003-04 (3rd Cir. 1993); Harrison & Burrows Bridge Constructors, Inc. v. Cuomo, 981 F.2d 50, 60 (2d Cir. 1992); Coral Constr., 941 F.2d at 921. In Ensley, the Eleventh Circuit explicitly held that post-enactment evidence is properly introduced in the record and relied upon by district courts in determining the constitutionality of government race/gender-conscious programs. This holding was reaffirmed in Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d at 911.

Although Croson requires that a public employer show strong evidence of discrimination when defending an affirmative action plan, the Supreme Court has never required that, before implementing affirmative action, the employer not have proved that it has discriminated. On the contrary, further finding of discrimination need neither precede nor accompany the adoption of affirmative action. Ensley Branch, 31 F.3d at 1565.

Post-enactment evidence seems necessary to determine the program's success for narrow tailoring and continued need after the program's initial term has expired. Contractor's Association of Eastern PA., Inc. v. City of Philadelphia, 91 F.3d 606, 606 (3rd Cir. 1996).

5. Remedies-- Narrowly Tailored

Under the Croson framework, any race-conscious plan must be narrowly tailored to ameliorate the effects of past discrimination. Croson's progeny provide significant guidance on how remedies should be narrowly tailored. "Generally, while 'goals' are permissible, unyielding preferential 'quotas' will normally doom an affirmative action plan." Virdi v. DeKalb County School District, 135 Fed. Appx. 262 (2005). See also Tuttle v. Arlington County School Board, 195 F.3d 698 (4th Cir. 1999).

Not unlike other U.S. District Courts and U.S. Courts of Appeal throughout the United States, Eleventh Circuit courts have, citing to United States v. Paradise, 480 U.S. 149, 171 (1987), also

recognized four considerations in determining whether a plan is narrowly tailored. See Peightal, 940 F.2d 1394, 1406 (11th Cir. 1991); Engineering Contractors, 122 F.3d. 895, 927 (citing Ensley Branch, 31 F.3d at 1569). They are:

(a) consideration of race neutral alternatives,
(b) flexibility of plan,
(c) relationship of plan's numerical goals to relevant market, and
(d) effect of plan on third parties.

Post-Croson cases articulated the general guidelines listed below in construing the elements of the narrow tailoring prong:

(a) Relief is limited to minority groups for which there is identified discrimination;
(b) Remedies are limited to redressing the discrimination within the boundaries of the enacting jurisdiction;
(c) The goals of the programs should be flexible and provide waiver provisions;
(d) Race and/or gender neutral measures should be considered; and
(e) The program should include provisions or mechanisms for periodic review and sunset.

M/WBE Programs must be designed so that the benefits of the programs are targeted specifically toward those firms that faced discrimination in the local marketplace. To withstand a challenge, relief must extend only to those minority groups for which there is evidence of discrimination. See Drabik, 214 F.3d at 735. Consequently, M/WBE firms from outside the local market must show that they have unsuccessfully attempted to do business within the local marketplace in order to benefit from the program.

Croson requires that there not only be a strong basis in evidence for a conclusion that there has been discrimination, but also for a conclusion that the particular remedy is made necessary by the discrimination. In other words, there must be a "fit" between past/present harm and the

remedy. The Sixth Circuit said in Drabik, "outdated evidence does not reflect prior unremedied or current discrimination", (Internal quotations and citations omitted). Drabik, 214 F.3d at 730.

Inherent in the above discussion is the notion that M/WBE Programs and remedies must maintain flexibility with regard to local conditions in the public and private sectors. Courts have suggested project-by-project goal setting and waiver provisions as means of ensuring fairness to all vendors. As an example, the Fourth Circuit had little problem rejecting the Banneker scholarship program at the University of Maryland because it had no "sunset" provision. "The program thus could remain in force indefinitely based on arbitrary statistics unrelated to constitutionally permissible purposes. Podberesky, 38 F.3d at 160. Additionally, some courts have indicated that goals need not directly correspond to current availability if there are findings that availability has been adversely affected by past discrimination. Lastly, "review" or "sunset" provisions are necessary components to guarantee that remedies do not out-live their intended remedial purpose.

6. Burdens of Production and Proof

The Croson Court struck down the City of Richmond's minority set-aside program because the City failed to provide an adequate evidentiary showing of past and present discrimination. Croson, 488 U.S. at 498-506. So did the State of Ohio in Associated Gen. Contrs. of Ohio, Inc. v. Drabik, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22042. Since the Fourteenth Amendment only allows race-conscious programs that narrowly seek to remedy particularized discrimination, the Court held that state and local governments "must identify that discrimination . . . with some specificity before they may use race-conscious relief." The Court's rationale for judging the sufficiency of the City's factual predicate for affirmative action legislation was whether there existed a "strong basis in evidence for its [government's] conclusion that remedial action was necessary." Croson, 488 U.S. at 500 (quoting Wygant v. Jackson Bd. of Educ., 476 U.S. 267, 277, 106 S.Ct. 1842, 1849(1986)).

Croson places the initial burden of production on the state or local governmental actor to demonstrate a "strong basis in evidence" that its race- and gender-conscious contract program is aimed at remedying identified past or present discrimination. A state or local affirmative action program that responds to discrimination is sustainable against an equal protection challenge so long as it is based upon strong evidence of discrimination. A municipality may establish an inference of discrimination by using empirical evidence that proves a significant statistical disparity between the number of qualified M/WBEs, the number of M/WBE contractors actually contracted by the government, or by the entity's prime contractors. Furthermore, the quantum of evidence required for the governmental entity must be determined on a case-by-case basis and in the context and breadth of the M/WBE Program it advanced. See Concrete Works, 36 F.3d 1513 (10th Cir. 1994). If the local government is able to do this, then the burden shifts to the challenging party to rebut the municipality's showing. See Contractors v. Philadelphia, 6 F.3d at 1007.

> Once the governmental entity has shown acceptable proof of a compelling interest in remedying past discrimination and illustrated that its plan is narrowly tailored to achieve this goal, the party challenging the affirmative action plan bears the ultimate burden of proving that the plan is unconstitutional. Mazeske v. City of Chicago, 218 F.3d 820 (7th Cir. 2000); Sherbrooke Turf, Inc. v. Minn. DOT, 345 F.3d 964 (8th Cir. 2003). See also, Engineering Contractors, 112 F.3d at 916.

D. The Latest Developments

1. Associated General Contractors of America, San Diego Chapter v. California DOT, 713 F.3d 1187 (9th Cir. 2013).

On April 16, 2013, in a case styled, Associated General Contractors of America, San Diego Chapter v. California DOT, the United States Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit upheld the constitutionality of the California Department of Transportation's (Caltrans) Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) program. The Caltrans program implements the federal DBE

Program. The federal program applies to state and local government recipients of federal funds from the U. S. Department of Transportation (DOT) through the U. S. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Caltrans had engaged a consulting firm to conduct a disparity study and significantly the court found the information in the disparity study probative and ruled that Caltrans met the burden of strict scrutiny.

The Ninth Circuit stated in pertinent part:

> Based on review of public records, interviews, assessments as to whether a firm could be considered available, for Caltrans contracts, as well as numerous other adjustments, the firm concluded that minority- and women-owned businesses should be expected to receive 13.5% of contract dollars from Caltrans-administered federally assisted contracts...[The disparity study] accounted for the factors mentioned in Western States Paving. Western States Paving Co. v. Washington State DOT, 407 F.3d 983 (9th Cir. 2005); Geod Corp. v. NJ Transit Corp., 746 f.supp.2d 642 (NJ Dist. 2010); M.K. Weeden Constr., Inc. v. Mont. Dep't of Trans., 2013 U.S.Dist.LEXIS 126286, as well as others, adjusting availability data based on capacity to perform work and controlling for previously administered affirmative action programs...The substantial statistical disparities alone would give rise to an inference of discrimination, and certainly Caltrans' statistical evidence combined with anecdotal evidence passes constitutional muster.

This decision is important because it is the most recent validation of the efficacy of a properly conducted disparity study in allowing a governmental actor to survive the constitutional test of strict scrutiny when its narrowly tailored programs are challenged.

2. Northern Contracting, Inc. v. State of Illinois, et al., 473 F.3d 715 (7th Cir. 2007)

In Northern Contracting, Inc. v. State of Illinois, et al., 473 F.3d 715 (7th Cir. 2007), the Seventh Circuit upheld a public entity's race-specific program, in large part, because the program was narrowly-tailored to achieve the state's compelling interest in remedying the effects of past and current discrimination. The court found that the program was narrowly-tailored because of the sophistication of the availability analysis used by the public entity. In that case, the Illinois Department of Transportation ('IDOT") had requested that its consultant perform a "custom census" in order to determine the availability of minority- and women-owned firms in the state. Consequently, IDOT used the availability figure to prepare its Disadvantaged Business Enterprise ("DBE") plan for Fiscal Year 2005. The custom census included a survey of Dun and Bradstreet's "Marketplace" database, along with the list of minority- and women-owned firms maintained by IDOT. The consultant then contacted a random sample of two groups: 1) businesses from the combined database list of minority- and women-owned firms; and, 2) businesses in the state that did not identify themselves as minority- or women-owned firms. The consultant determined that 22.8% of the firms in the first group were, in fact, owned by White men and 14.5% of the businesses in the second group were owned by minorities and women who had chosen not to self-identify. Based upon these results, the consultant calculated a relative rate of availability at 22.77%. Northern Contracting, Inc., 473 F.3d at 718.

3. Rothe Dev. Corp. v. Dep't of Def., 545 F.3d 1023 (Fed. Cir. 2008)

In this case, a non-minority woman contractor brought suit against the Department of Defense, because it had submitted the lowest bid on a contract that was awarded to a Socially Disadvantaged Business Enterprise bidder. Congress permitted an SDBE to receive a 10% adjustment in excess of the amount bid against other non-disadvantaged competitors for government contracts. Though the case had been appealed multiple times to the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals, the last appeal brought with it a facial validity challenge from Rothe.

> Although the party challenging a statute bears the ultimate burden of persuading the court that it is unconstitutional, the government first bears a burden to produce strong evidence supporting the legislature's decision to employ race-conscious action. . . . . "The court must review the government's evidentiary support to determine whether the legislative body had a 'strong basis in evidence' to believe that remedial action based on race was necessary." (Internal punctuation and citations omitted). Rothe Dev. Corp., 545 F.3d at 1036

Although Croson places the burden on the government to demonstrate a "strong basis in evidence," the Fourteenth Amendment does not require a court to make an ultimate judicial finding of discrimination before the government may take affirmative steps to eradicate discrimination. However, the courts have said that such prerequisite particularized finding of discrimination "need not incriminate itself with a formal finding of discrimination prior to using a race-conscious remedy." Rothe Dev. Corp., 545 F.3d at 1043 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (citing, Dean v. City of Shreveport, 438 F.3d 448, 455 (5th Cir. 2006)).

This case is important because it caused the dismantling of the Department of Defenses' DBE program and, if it had had wide-spread authority or if it had established a trend in the courts, could have had a chilling effect on all federal DBE programs. However, this case has been narrowly interpreted only to apply to this case and no other jurisdictions have followed its outcome.

4. H.B. Rowe Company, Incorporated v. W. Lyndo Tippett, et. Al, 615 F.3d 233 (2010)

Denied a contract because of its failure to demonstrate good faith efforts to meet participation goals for minority and women-owned subcontractors, H. B. Rowe Company, Incorporated ("Rowe"), a prime contractor brought an action, asserting that the goals set forth in North Carolina statute (N.C. Gen. Stat. § 136-28.4 (1990), violate the Equal Protection Clause, and sought injunctive relief as well as money damages. After extensive discovery and a bench

trial, the District Court held the challenged statutory scheme constitutional both on its face and as applied. The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals held that it agreed with the district court that the State produced a strong basis in evidence justifying the statutory scheme on its face, and as applied to African American and Native American subcontractors, and that the State demonstrated that the scheme was narrowly tailored to serve its compelling interest in remedying discrimination against these racial groups. But the Court did not agree with the District Court that the same was true as applied to other minority groups and women-owned businesses.

Reviewing the results of the research firm's (that had conducted a disparity study) testing, together with the data concerning the events in subcontractor inclusion during the program's suspension period, the Court was able to see that (1) the State's use of a goals program for inclusion of African-American, Native-American, and non-minority women-owned businesses was supported by a statistically strong basis, and that (2) the newly revised North Carolina statute which called for frequent goal setting was constitutional. The Court of Appeals noticed prominently that the State's program had been going on since 1983, and had only achieved the inclusion numbers adduced in the 2004 study performed by the commissioned national researcher. H. B. Rowe, 615 F.3d 250.

Furthermore, the Court's rejection of Rowe's challenge of the North Carolina statute on the grounds of its lack of flexibility was thwarted by Rowe's failure to make a good faith effort to include minority subcontractors. The Court of Appeals wrote,

> Prime contractors can bank any excess minority participation for use against future goals over the following two years. Given the lenient standard and flexibility of the "good faith" requirement, it comes as little surprise that as of July 2003, only 13 of 878 good faith submissions--including Rowe's--had failed to demonstrate good faith efforts. H. B. Rowe, 615 F.3d at 253-54.

The importance of this case is that it solidified a trend that began in the other appellate courts of this country. When presented with a viable challenge to a state's statute as it concerns M/WBE Programs, the program will not only have to adhere to the requirements of Croson at the

statute's initial enactment, but also when the program's continuation is at issue. Such continuation must be well supported by more than just conjecture as to its necessity. There will need to be statistically sound collection of data from appropriate sources; testing of that data once collected to ensure high confidence; and anecdotal corroboration of findings to disprove other explanations for apparent disparities.

In Rowe, The Court also reported that the State, in fact, though it was not challenged on the basis of its having failed to do so, sought out race neutral measures in an attempt to overcome the effects of past and present racial exclusion. H. B. Rowe, 615 F.3d at 252. The Court also supported (but did not mandate) that the State conduct a new disparity study every five years. H. B. Rowe, 615 F.3d at 253.

E. Conclusion

The Croson decision was handed down more than 25 years ago and still the law in the area of minority contracting and race/gender conscious programs has not been settled. Croson certainly changed the face of remedial programs but only set standards and not methodologies for achieving such standards. Since then the case law opinions of the U.S. Supreme Court and U.S. Circuit Courts have refined the requirements and most courts have followed trends, with some exceptions. GSPC has adopted a methodology based upon its legal analysis that can withstand legal scrutiny.

F. Statement of Authority

Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena, 515 U.S. 200 (1995)

Associated Gen. Contrs. of Amer., San Diego Chapter v. California DOT, 713 F.3d 1187 (9th Cir. 2013)

Associated Gen. Contrs. of Ohio, Inc. v. Drabik, 214 F.3d 730 (6th Cir. 2000)

Brunet v. City of Columbus, 1 F.3d 390 (6th Cir. 1993).

Castaneda v. Partida, 430 U.S. 482 (1977)

City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Company, 488 U.S. 469 (1989).

Concrete Works of Colorado v. City and County of Denver, 36 F.3d 1513 (1994)

Conlin v. Blanchard, 890 F.2d 811 (6th Cir. 1989).

Contractors Ass'n of Eastern Pennsylvania v. City of Philadelphia, 6 F.3d 990 (1993)

Contractors Assn. of Eastern Pennsylvania v. City of Philadelphia, 6 F.3d 990 (3rd Cir. 1993).

Coral Construction Co. v. King County, 941 F.2d 910 (9th Cir. 1991)

Engineering Contractors Ass'n of South Florida, Inc. v. Metropolitan Dade County, 122 F.3d 895 (11th Cir. 1997)

Ensley Branch N.A.A.C.P. v. George Seibels, 31 F.3d 1548 (11th Cir. 1994).

Florida State Conference of the N.A.A.C.P. et al v. Browning, 522 F.3d 1153 (11th Cir. 2008).

Fullilove v. Kluznick, 448 U.S. 448 (1980).

H.B. Rowe Company v. W. Lyndo Tippett, 615 F.3d 233 4th Cir. (2010)

Hopwood v. State of Texas, 78 F.3d 932, 951 (5th Cir. 1996).

Hunt v. Wash. State Apple Adver. Comm'n, 432 U.S. 333 (1977).

Katzenbach v. Morgan, 384 U.S. 641 (1966).

Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555 (1992).

Middleton et al v. City of Flint, 92 F.3d 396 (6th Cir. 1996).

Miller v. Johnson, 515 U.S. 900 (1995)

Mississippi Univ. for Women v. Hogan, 458 U.S. 718 (1982).

Northeastern Florida General Contractors v. City of Jacksonville, Fla., 508 U.S. 656 (1993).

Northern Contracting, Inc. v. State of Illinois, et al., 473 F.3d 715 (7th Cir. 2007)

O'Donnell Constr. Co. v. District of Columbia, 963 F.2d 420 (D.C. Cir. 1992)

Peightal v. Metropolitan Dade County, 26 F.3d 1545 (11th Cir. 1994)

Price v. City of Charlotte, 93 F.3d 1241 (4th Circuit 1996).

Rothe Dev. Corp. v. Dep't of Def., 545 F.3d 1023 (Fed Cir. 2008)

S. J. Groves & Sons Company v. Fulton County et al, 920 F.2d 752 (11th Cir. 1991)

South Florida Chapter of the Associated Gen. Contrs of Amr., Inc. v. Metropolitan Dade County, FL et al, 723 F.2d 846 (11th Cir.1984).

Tennessee Asphalt Co. v. Faris, 942 F.2d 969 (6th Cir. 1991)

Touchston v. McDermott, 234 F.3d 1133 (11th Cir. 2000)

U.S. v. Virginia, 518 U.S. 515 (1996).

U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1.

U.S. Const. Art. III, § 2, Cl 1.

United States v. Paradise, 480 U.S. 149 (1987)

University of California Regents v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1978).

Virdi v. DeKalb County School District, 135 Fed. Appx. 262 11th Cir. (2005)

Webster Greenthumb v. Fulton County, 51 F. Supp.2d 1354 (N. Dist. Ga. 1999)

Wygant v. Jackson Bd. of Educ., 476 U.S. 267 (1986).

III. PURCHASING PRACTICES, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

A. Introduction

The objective of the "Purchasing Practices, Policies, and Procedures" chapter of this Study is to review the governing codes and policies of the City of Savannah in relation to purchasing and to ascertain whether or not, in policy or practice, there are barriers to small, minority, or women-owned businesses. In addition, it will examine the familiarity of personnel with written procurement policies and determine whether there are any inconsistencies between policy and practice, particularly in relation to preference programs. Often, where there is policy, there is also room for interpretation and discretionary practice. These areas will be examined closely as well for any effect they may have on the overall ability of minority and women-owned businesses to obtain contracts with the City of Savannah.

B. Purchasing Review

Savannah has seven (7) bureaus plus the Finance Department. Each bureau has departments under it, resulting in a total of forty-four (44) departments at the City of Savannah. The Purchasing Department falls under the Finance Department. Savannah has a centralized purchasing system, with all purchases facilitated by three (3) buyers and the Assistant Purchasing Director in the Purchasing Department. Each buyer is assigned bureaus for which they do the purchasing. Also, the Purchasing Director handles all major RFPs and large construction procurements. All procurements are governed by the requirements for purchases and contracts set forth in §3-205 of the Charter of the City of Savannah contained in the Code of Ordinances of the City of Savannah (Code 1977, §2-405).

Purchases that are $1,000 or under are purchased through APOs (unless under an annual contract) and are not subject to bids or a requirement to obtain quotes. However, they must be approved by the department head. Purchases that are $1,000.01-$3,000 must have approval by the Purchasing Department and three (3) quotes are secured unless they are sole source or

emergency purchases. Purchases $3,000.01-$25,000 must have the City Manager's approval and three (3) quotes, unless they are sole source or emergency purchases. Purchases over $25,000 must be approved by City Council and must be competitively bid unless they are a sole source or emergency procurement.

The City accepts bids via Requests for Proposal ("RFP"), Requests for Statement of Qualifications ("RFSQ"), and Invitations for Bid ("IFB") (which are awarded to the lowest responsible, responsive bidder). Requests for quotes are done at the department level where formal bids are not required. A contract may be sole sourced ("awarded without competition") at the discretion of the purchasing agent, provided that the determination that there is only one source is in writing, "after conducting a good faith review of available sources" (§2-4064). Sole-sourced contracts are made a part of the public record with contractors' names and contract amounts.

C. M/WBE Program

The Code §2-4042(22) defines a Minority-Owned Business Enterprise ("MBE") as a business that has been certified to be at least 51 percent owned, managed, operated and controlled by one or more African-American, Asian or Pacific Islander, Asian-Indian, Hispanic, or American Indian and Alaskan Native individuals, and, in §2-4042(35), defines a Women-Owned Business Enterprise ("WBE") as a business that has been certified to be at least 51 percent owned, managed, operated and controlled by one or more women who are not a member of a racial minority or, in the case of publicly owned business, at least 51 percent of the stock is owned by one or more women, and whose daily business operations are managed and directed by one or more of the women owners.

M/WBE goals apply only to subcontracting construction contracts that are $100,000 or more and to RFPs for professional services contracts that are $75,000 or more. Sometimes there are no goals established, if it is determined that there are no subcontracting opportunities within a specific National Institute of Government Purchasing ("NIGP") category. In purchases where

three (3) bids are required, departments must obtain at least one quotation from an M/WBE, if available, for purchases between $1,000 and $25,000. This is stated as a requirement on the Best Bid justification form. M/WBE Contract Compliance monitors the goals on construction contracts that are $100,000 or more and professional services contracts that are $75,000 or more, but has no oversight over contracts that only require the three (3) quotes. Using the Supplier List, M/WBE goals are calculated by dividing the number of M/WBE certified firms in a given trade (or within a specific NIGP Code) into the total number of firms in the same trade (or within that specific NIGP Code) for a given project. The M/WBE Contract Compliance Officer also monitors and audits projects with M/WBE goals all the way to completion.

The City of Savannah also has a local preference program, but that program does not operate in conjunction with the M/WBE Program. It is administered by Purchasing. It is stated in the Savannah City Ordinance Section 2-4061(7) that there is a preference for local minority business enterprise or local women business enterprises as primes. Local M/WBEs can also satisfy the local preference goals. The City offers all eligible bidders the opportunity to meet local preference criteria, but M/WBEs must be certified as an M/WBE in the system.

In the procurement of supplies and services, the ordinance requires that when the lowest bid among those provided by "responsive and responsible" local vendors is within two percent or $10,000.00, whichever is less, or within $500.00 of the lowest responsive and responsible non-local bidder, the local bidder may be given the opportunity to match the bid. When the lowest bid provided by a "responsive and responsible" local M/WBE is within three percent or $10,000.00, whichever is less, or within $500.00 of the lowest bidder, the local M/WBE will be given the opportunity to match the bid. When these conditions are met by the lowest bidder located locally within a Community Development Block Grant ("CDBG") target area, that bidder shall be allowed to match the lowest bid. If the CDBG vendor is also M/WBE, the contract will be awarded to the M/WBE firm in the CDBG target area should they agree to match the lowest bid. When more than one bid meets the "responsive and responsible" requirement and is within 3% of the lowest bid, preference is first to the local M/WBE in a CDBG area, then to the local non-M/WBE in a CDBG area, then to the local M/WBE (non-CDBG), then to any local vendor (§ 2-4091).

All vendors must be pre-qualified to bid on projects that exceed $500,000. The pre-qualification process will "examine the qualifications" of the bidders and the project team will make the final determination. The M/WBE Program Coordinator is included on the pre-qualification team.

Construction projects under $100,000 are subject to the local preference program and construction contracts $100,000 or over and professional services $75,000 or over are subject to local preference and M/WBE goals. M/WBE participation is a factor in awarding competitive bids that are subject to goals, and compliance with the goals is a preliminary consideration for bid eligibility. Professional services (such as engineering, surveying, auditing, etc.) projects estimated to exceed $75,000 will include the M/WBE Program Office in the goal-setting and scope of work process. The City's M/WBE Program policy states that the M/WBE Program Office and Purchasing Department must jointly implement outreach activities to M/WBE firms. For goods, services, materials, and supplies, the Purchasing Director is instructed to include M/WBEs from the M/WBE Program in bid/quote solicitation lists.

D. Interviews with Purchasing and M/WBE Program Staff

1. Fairness of the Process

GSPC conducted interviews with staff from Purchasing, Economic Development, and the M/WBE Program. These interviews reflected how various City employees understood and applied the City's contracting laws, rules, and procedures. Staff that were interviewed are not identified by name but are indicated by the identification code PPI-1, PPI-2, PPI-3, etc.

PPI-3 works in business development for the City and feels that the City's purchasing practices are fair and clear. PPI-2 also feels that the purchasing process is fair. According to PPI-2, preference is given to local and M/WBE firms bidding as primes where bidders are chosen by the "lowest qualified bidder" standard. It is unclear whether local M/WBE firms are given greater weight in the bidding process as subcontractors; however, the ordinance is clear that local

M/WBEs are given preference over non-local M/WBEs and local non-M/WBEs alike in prime contracting.

There is a two-stage bidding process, according to PPI-1, that requires bidders to provide their M/WBE participation percentages separately. If a bidder does not meet the required percentages, the bids are rejected and not opened. PPI-1 recalls that most complaints they hear are either about M/WBE goals being "too high or too low, city projects taking too long to get started and departments making the decision to extend deadlines when they only have one bidder."

Procurement staff have the option to renew annual contracts for up to four years dependent on the results of the "Vendor Performance Reports" the department uses to evaluate suppliers for automatic extension. There are some suppliers, according to PPI-2, that are selected repeatedly based on what they provide, such as the supplier who provides outdoor toilets for the St. Patrick's Day celebration and the firm that provides chemicals for water and sewer because they are "one of a few nationally." PPI-2 also reports that contractors have expressed frustration about general contractor licensing requirements and bonding. Though some contractors complain that bonding is a barrier, PPI-3 does not agree because "if you want to be in business, you should have money for bonding." PPI-5, on the other hand, states that bonding is the "number one barrier" to M/WBE participation, asserting that there is perceived discrimination in the private sector and resultant denial of the opportunity to bid by the City.

2. Knowledge of Discrimination

PPI-4 cites the following as major issues facing M/WBE firms in Savannah:

- discrimination in bonding
- primes' use of "pass-throughs" or "fronts"
- "double standards" in performance evaluation
- discrimination in payments (slow and/or nonpayment)

- stereotypical attitudes on the part of buyers at the City
- substitutions of subcontractors after award

PPI-5 also cites slow payments as a barrier and, like PPI-4, double standards for performance and stereotypical attitudes that negatively impact M/WBEs. PPI-5 listed some contractor issues, such as the use of fronts, price discrimination by suppliers, and discrimination in the provision of financing as "industry-wide" concerns, but had not received formal complaints from business owners in the City of Savannah.

PPI-4 notes that the program is "needed" but that the "feeling isn't mutual" across all City personnel. End-user discrimination, PPI-5 claims, is "subtle, but it exists." The User Department, according the PPI-5, will provide the language for bids and then change the scope to "reduce or eliminate" the proposed work for M/WBE subcontractors. "Everyone is not on the team," PPI-5 says of City personnel.

PPI-2 indicates that they are unaware of any issues of discrimination but does not deal with contractors in general or M/WBE firms in particular. Most of the complaints PPI-2 hears are from suppliers that miss the proposal deadline. PPI-1 also indicated that the M/WBE Program staff is more likely to hear of issues or complaints from M/WBE firms.

There is a stark distinction at the City between the roles of M/WBE staff and those of purchasing. Though there is a good awareness of the processes within each department of their own areas of responsibility, the two departments are not jointly involved in the verification or monitoring process, and this could create some opportunities for missteps in the process. The detachment between the two departments, with PPI-1 stating that subcontractor payment issues are not dealt with by the City's purchasing staff because the "contract is not with the sub, it's with the prime," leaves the M/WBE Program to deal with all issues related to payment and any sort of subcontractor or M/WBE issues without the involvement of Purchasing. Statements from the purchasing personnel were clear and consistent that they have no involvement with subcontractors or with the M/WBE Program. Purchasing personnel consistently expressed a

hands off, disassociation towards the M/WBE Program. Given the fact that the two departments are across town from each other may cause the M/WBE Program to be isolated from the purchasing process.

The merit of the M/WBE Program, in PPI-3's opinion, is that it provides "training in estimating" and outreach to register more M/WBEs with the City "so they can increase their chances of obtaining work." They note that the process includes the M/WBE Program Coordinator visiting prime and subcontractors to monitor any issues and this is taken into account when prime contractors are graded on their past performance and considered for future bids. PPI-4, on the other hand, believes that the program is essential due to prime contractors' apparent resistance to letting new firms through the door for consideration. PPI-4 does agree, however, that M/WBEs are hurt by not registering and becoming certified with the City and that one challenge is that many firms lack financial statements and do not want to provide their financial information. PPI-4 stated that M/WBE Program is working through this issue by providing training sessions and increasing its outreach. However, it was also stated that M/WBEs do not want to submit financial statements, not because they do not have them, but because of their mistrust of the City having so much information.

PPI-5 advocates for expanding the M/WBE Program's "infrastructure," stating that there are only three staff members "in a program with a $400 million Capital Improvement Project." PPI-5 also believes that the lack of formal complaints received by the City from M/WBE subcontractors is a result of the "fear of losing future work" but "you can see it [marketplace discrimination]...nothing has to be said." However, PPI-5 states, the fact the City does not have a "good faith efforts" policy when it comes to finding M/WBE subcontractors to meet participation goals, is a good aspect of the process. Another major barrier is that, though many M/WBEs have "good trade experience," they need assistance in "doing business" and understanding the bidding process.

3. Network Contracting

PPI-3 believes that M/WBE contractors face disadvantages and challenges because of size and capacity and a lack of skills, such as those in estimating construction contracts. For example, they state that M/WBE contractors will "estimate a project in their head based on the way they have always estimated the cost of materials from so-and-so, and how long it might take to finish the job" whereas "prime contractors" estimate "to the dollar." Because of this, PPI-3 asserts that primes believe M/WBE subcontractors to be overbilling, which causes friction.

PPI-3 stated that prime contractors are not "necessarily" discriminating against M/WBE firms, rather, "they don't like being told what to do" in terms of having M/WBE participation. "They would prefer to work with people they know and have been working with in the past." PPI-4 states the same, indicating that "prime contractors would rather work with people they know and have been working with." However, PPI-4 considers this to be a barrier. PPI-4 notes that "in order for them [primes] to get work, they must comply with the set M/WBE participation goals," and so considers the program to be a necessity.

PPI-5 believes, along the lines of PPI-3 and PPI-4's assertions regarding prime contractors desiring to do business only with firms that they know, that there is a "good old boy network" in contracting at the City. PPI-5's concerns were supported by the Study team's initial interviews with purchasing staff, in which they were asked if the study "took into account" whether firms had previously held contracts with the City as a positive advantage, which suggests that this is sometimes a factor in the selection process.

One member of the purchasing staff stated to the Study team in initial interviews that it is common practice for buyers to use "who they know" in selecting firms for quotes. This staff member went on to state that they don't necessarily tap "friends" for quotes, but business owners with whom they are familiar. This City employee also stated that they advise new and small businesses to put themselves "in front of" buyers to be invited to provide quotes on low dollar purchases. But, it has already been stated to GSPC that prime contractors do not make themselves

available to unknown firms by not returning phone calls and not accepting unsolicited subcontractor bids. Utilizing known firms as common and accepted practice within purchasing is not understood by City procurement personnel to be an issue of discrimination or barrier creation; however, the M/WBE Program staff are aware of this practice and have the opposite view. Another staff member noted that they can tell without looking what subcontractors will be on a prime contractor's award file, because they so regularly utilize the same firms.

E. Findings

Though it is clear that there is sufficient understanding amongst purchasing officials at the City of Savannah of the actual requirements in the Code of Ordinances, the practices that are made discretionary for purchasing agents and prime contractors alike pose a problem for full engagement of the diverse business community. The thresholds of awards that are $100,000 or more for construction and $75,000 or more for professional services, for the application of M/WBE goals is unusually high, based on GSPC's exposure to other M/WBE Programs, and non-existent outside of construction and professional services contracts. For purchases under those thresholds, only three quotes are required. The fact that purchasing agents are able to only select quotes from "people that they know" leaves a large area of contracting subject to their personal networks and preferences, which may lead to the exclusion of M/WBEs and any new entrants. Though there is a bid/quote solicitation list, which the M/WBE Program must update regularly to include newly certified firms, the quotation process does not seem to be to utilizing this list and the M/WBE Program is afforded no oversight of the quote process to assure compliance.

Although there are provisions in the Ordinance for joint outreach and engagement between the M/WBE Program and the Purchasing Department, the purchasing officials at the City of Savannah are not integrated into the monitoring and reporting processes of M/WBEs. The Study team heard more than once that the Purchasing Department does not deal with subcontractor or M/WBE issues, payment or otherwise, when perhaps everyone in purchasing should be vested and accountable in the success of remedial programs in order for them to truly take hold. This divide in responsibilities leaves out a crucial "checks and balances" provision for small purchases as well as enabling the Purchasing Department to abdicate responsibility for

being a crucial first line of defense against misconduct that may ensue as a result of a lack of investment, communication, and engagement.

Although some are more accepting of it than others, there appears to be a widespread understanding amongst personnel at the City of Savannah that "who you know" makes a difference and it was suggested to GSPC in its interviews with purchasing staff that it should give more weight to firms that are already doing business with the City. Also, the tendency and preference of prime contractors to choose subcontractors in their networks is well-documented anecdotally among the staff. It was reported to GSPC by PPI-6, in data assessment interviews, that if a certain prime is working on a job, the same subcontractors will always work with that prime. This pervasive culture of using the same firms that are known is a barrier to entry to both M/WBEs and any new entrants.

Although the local preference program is administered by Purchasing, there is no communication or connection between that preference program and the M/WBE Program. In fact, there was little understanding in either the program or the Purchasing Department of how the local preference program impacted local M/WBEs in particular.

Overall, Savannah has taken productive strides in the allocation of a specific M/WBE Program with designated officers assigned to outreach and goal-setting. It has also taken several steps, such as including M/WBE personnel in the pre-qualification process, and setting stringent requirements for M/WBE subcontractor participation by primes on high-dollar contracts. However, the failure to allow good faith efforts provisions in the compliance with M/WBE goals may cause closer judicial scrutiny to any race/gender-conscious program.

Another issue may be the acceptance of informal networks by certain personnel, both inside the department and in the private sector, as well as the discretion afforded to purchasing agents on small contracts that leaves room for businesses to potentially be excluded from participation in the procurement process in the City of Savannah.

Also, the lack of engagement with M/WBE firms across the board was apparent in the markedly different accounts of awareness of exclusion and discrimination. Members of the Purchasing Department were almost entirely unaware of any exclusionary practices or even the perception of discrimination, whereas M/WBE Program personnel were very much aware. The program's functioning might be improved by an equal understanding and sensitivity throughout the City staff of the issues facing M/WBE firms specifically, and small businesses and new entrants in general. Also, it is recommended that the M/WBE Program Office have oversight in the obtaining of quotes from M/WBEs where that is a requirement. It is also highly recommended that the threshold for the application of M/WBE goals for construction and professional services be lowered in accordance with the Study Findings and Recommendations in Chapter VII of this Study and that the same goals apply to general services and goods and supplies (where there are subcontracting opportunities). This will open the door to more participation on the types of smaller-dollar contracts that can enable small and disadvantaged businesses to grow and flourish. Finally, combining the administration of the local preference program and the M/WBE Program would synchronize those programs to be for the benefit of all rather than setting them apart with the perception of polarization.

IV. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

A. Introduction

The quantitative, or statistical, portion of this disparity study is made up of several key statistical components, all of which are based upon exacting data collection and the processing of information collected from the City and other appropriate sources related to the City's contracting history from the January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2014 Study Period, as well as current data.

The first step in statistical analysis is to determine the geographic area where 75-85% of the firms bidding with the City of Savannah are located, which is called the "relevant market." **This determination is essential because the analysis will encompass only firms located within the geographic relevant market of each business category.** Within the relevant market, GSPC compares the percentage of firms in each race, ethnicity, and gender group that are ready, willing and able; called "availability" to perform within each business category to the percentage of dollars awarded by the City; called "utilization" to those same groups and categories. In that comparison, GSPC will determine whether Savannah underutilized or overutilized a particular group, or whether they were at parity; called "simple disparity". GSPC must then establish if the difference between the availability percentage and the utilization percentage, the "disparity," is significant enough to be meaningful. These analyses below, along with the public and private regression analyses performed in Chapter V for the private sector, are used to determine whether or not discrimination exists in the City of Savannah's marketplace and whether or not the City has been an active or passive participant in such discrimination.

Finally, a full disparity analysis requires a consideration of the extent to which contracting/subcontracting outcomes are conditioned on race/ethnicity/gender, and are not merely random. If indeed race/ethnicity/gender are found to condition contracting/subcontracting outcomes in a statistically significant way, there is an implication that any observed disparities reflect discrimination in the market for contracting/subcontracting with public authorities such as the City of Savannah.

If it is determined that there is any statistically significant disparity between the availability and utilization of M/WBE firms, and such disparity was likely caused by race/gender/ethnicity, then GSPC will make such recommendations regarding appropriate and narrowly-tailored race/ethnicity/gender-neutral remedies in order to attempt to provide all firms with equal access to the City's contracts. If appropriate, GSPC may also recommend narrowly-tailored race/ethnicity/gender-conscious remedies. In the event that no statistically significant disparity exists between the availability and utilization of M/WBE firms that was likely caused by race/gender/ethnicity, then GSPC may still make certain recommendations to enhance and support the continuation of outreach, small business development, and non-discrimination policies in the City's procurement processes.

A thorough statistical disparity analysis involves several tasks related to the identification, collection and assessment of data. Data are key to determining accurate outcomes in a disparity study. As such, it is important to properly track and document a chain of data that can be checked, double-checked, and verified in a successful disparity study.

B. Data Assessment

Griffin & Strong, P.C. conducted data assessment meetings on April 8, 9, and 10, 2015, regarding the City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study. Meetings were scheduled with the Chief Financial Officer, Purchasing Director, two Contract Analysts, Director of Information Technology, SEC Administrator, and the M/WBE Program Coordinator and the M/WBE Contract Compliance Coordinator. At the beginning of each meeting, GSPC's Project Manager explained what a disparity study was and its objectives. She further detailed the kind of data that would be necessary to conduct the study.

The purpose of each of these meetings was to determine what data the City of Savannah has, in what format, and how GSPC can obtain the data. Further, the objective was for GSPC to get a better understanding of how procurement operates in order to execute the methodology that has been approved by the City of Savannah. It was also important for GSPC's team to get to know

procurement personnel and understand how to operate the study in a manner least intrusive to the City's personnel. GSPC's Data Assessment Report is attached hereto as Appendix A.

C. Data Set-Up

Following approval of the Data Assessment Report, GSPC developed and executed a Data Collection Plan and submitted data requests to the City. The Data Collection Plan set out the process for collecting manual and electronic data for statistical analyses. In addition, it included a plan for collecting data needed for the anecdotal portions of the study which included surveys, public hearings, focus groups, and interviews. GSPC's Data Collection Plan is attached hereto as Appendix B.

D. Manual Data Entry

Most data had to be entered manually, including bidder, supplier, 25k + awards, small purchases, M/WBE Reports, and the results from the Prime Vendor Questionnaire conducted by GSPC. Payment data, P.O.s $1,000-$3,000, and the M/WBE list were the only information available electronically. Manual data entry began in April and continued into December, 2015.

Because so much of the data was manually entered, the process of matching or relating the data files in order to add the necessary information from one file to the other also required substantial manual work, sometimes having to manually review as many as 10,000 entries to remove duplicates.

E. Data Collection and Creation of Databases

1. The City of Savannah's Procurements

In order to create and execute a data collection plan, GSPC needed to understand the City of Savannah's procurement process and how they maintain their data. During the original data assessment, City of Savannah procurement, finance, IT, and M/WBE Program personnel described the process by which awards are made by the City and how the information on each contract is captured. The City has a centralized purchasing system, with all purchases facilitated by three (3) Buyers and the Assistant Purchasing Director in the Purchasing Department. Each Buyer is assigned bureaus for which they do the purchasing.

- Purchases that are $1,000 or under are purchased through APOs (unless under a blanket contract) and are not subject to bids or a requirement to obtain quotes. However, they must be approved by the department head.
- Purchases that are $1,001-$3,000 must have approval by the Purchasing Department and three (3) quotes unless they are sole source or emergency contracts.
- Purchases $3,001-$25,000 must have the City Manager's approval and three (3) quotes unless they are sole source or emergency contracts.
- Purchases over $25,000 must be approved by City Council and are subject to competitive bidding. The City solicits bids as RFPs, RFQs, and IFBs (lowest responsible, responsive bidder. Where bids are obtained by quotes, the departments obtain their own quotes.

GSPC utilized the foregoing purchasing thresholds to determine how it would collect and analyze the data.

2. Electronic Data

Electronic data supplied by the City of Savannah and other data collected by GSPC were catalogued and stored in GSPC's computer systems subsequent to the data collection effort. The data entered were used to develop databases containing contracting history for each business

type, for both prime contracting and subcontracting on behalf of the City of Savannah. GSPC related all of the databases collected in order to cross-reference information among the files, including matching addresses, work categories, and M/WBE identification.

3. Data Entry Verification

GSPC examined each list to make sure that they were consistent in ethnicity identifications and work categories. Independent sources were used to resolve any inconsistencies and entire lists were verified by comparison to other databases, rather than verifying just a sample of each list.

4. Data Source Description

The following describes the databases created by GSPC and used for the analyses contained in this Study:

a) Bidders' List

The Bidders' List is a compilation of electronic bid tabulations (PDF format) as taken from the City's website and entered manually by GSPC data entry personnel. Bidder information only provides details about the prime vendors. The firms on the Bidders' List were included in the Master Vendor File and the Bidders' List was used to calculate the Relevant Market.

b) Award List

The Award List is a data file of all awards of $25,000 or more made during the Study Period. This data file was compiled from the minutes of the City Council and was manually entered by GSPC data entry personnel. It was used to create the mailing list for the Prime Vendor

Questionnaire, conduct the Threshold Analysis, and all the firms on the Award List, that were located within the Relevant Market, were included in the Availability Estimates. Firms in this unique prime database were counted once in each of the work categories in which they performed work (one category per contract) for purposes of availability[1], but each award made to a firm was counted in the Threshold Analysis and in Utilization[2].

c) Master Vendor File

The purpose of the Master Vendor File is to collect, in one database, a listing of all firms that are ready, willing, and able to do business with the City. It includes internal lists from the City of Savannah as well as outside lists, such as Georgia Department of Transportation, State of South Carolina and Chatham County. By including the outside vendor lists GSPC has a broader inclusion of firms that have expressed an interest in doing business with government. Although GSPC may not have picked up every available firm in the Relevant Market, it has included such a broad sample that the percentages are reliable and no sample bias would be indicated.

The Master Vendor file is a compilation of all lists of vendors used to determine availability estimates. It was also used to match and verify data in other data files, particularly to make sure that information assigned to firms for utilization calculations matched the information assigned to firms for availability calculations. This is important to make sure that GSPC is comparing like-data to like-data. The Master Vendor File contains the lists of firms from the following data sources:

[1] The Minutes explained the type of work to be performed and in most cases included the GL Budget Code. From this information GSPC assigned each contract to a work category of construction, professional services, general services, or goods & supplies. Airport contracts were not part of GSPC's Scope of Work and were not included in any of the analyses. Also not included in the analyses were governmental and not-for-profit entities.

[2] No zero contracts were included in utilization analysis because GSPC did not have a basis to match these zero contracts to any payments made against them. The same is true of negative awards that were adjustments to previous awards. In most cases, it was not clear what contract they were adjusting.

i. Savannah Data Files[3]

- $25,000+ Awardees (from the Study Period)
- Bidders (from the Study Period)
- Certified M/WBEs (Current)
- Subcontractors from Prime Vendor Questionnaire (from the Study Period)
- Payments from A/P file (from the Study Period)
- Purchase Order Payees (from the Study Period)
- Small Purchase Payees (from the Study Period)

ii. Other Data Files

- Chatham County Vendors (Current)
- Georgia Department of Transportation DBE, Pre-Qualified and Subcontractors (Current)
- State of South Carolina Vendors (Current)

d) Prime Vendor Questionnaire

The Prime Vendor Questionnaire referenced above was conducted through a mail questionnaire prepared by GSPC and sent to all awardees for all contract awards during the Study Period. A copy of the questionnaire is attached as Appendix C. All 568 City of Savannah $25,000+ awardees from FY2010-FY2014 (taken from the minutes of the City of Savannah City Council) were sent the questionnaire through The Print Shop (a local Savannah mailing house). GSPC contacted those firms that did not respond via e-mail as a reminder. 77 unique firms responded to the questionnaire. This was a response rate of 13.56% which is a sufficient response to infer

[3] GSPC did not use the Vendor or Supplier databases because neither data file could provide the work categories of firms. Although the Supplier database contains work codes for firms, it is the result of encouragement for firms to register in as many categories that they want to be notified of instead of categories that they perform in. Some firms registered in more than 100 categories. Without information on the type of work that firms performed GSPC could not include those firms in the analysis.

reliable conclusions about all firms and no discernable response bias can be inferred by the firms that failed to return the questionnaire.

The results of the Prime Vendor Questionnaire were utilized to calculate Subcontractor Utilization, to include subcontractors in availability estimates. In addition, the subcontractor race/ethnicity/gender identification was used to verify like information provided by the City of Savannah in various databases.

5. Data Cleanup and Verification

After the completion of data collection, the data were electronically and manually "cleaned" to eliminate duplicates, fill in unpopulated fields, and resolve any anomalies. In the cleanup process, GSPC made the assumption that any vendor that was not otherwise identified as an ethnic minority or Caucasian women-owned business is owned by a non-M/WBE. In addition, when a firm owner appeared in multiple categories, GSPC counted race and ethnicity over gender, resulting in only Caucasian women-owned firms in the women-owned category.

In some cases, after electronically matching firms, not all of the firms were identified by business categories; therefore, GSPC undertook to manually assign business categories to firms in accordance with the Contract Classifications set forth below based upon award descriptions, project names, and budget codes. In addition, some firms did not electronically match for race/ethnicity/gender, so GSPC undertook to manually match firms to the City's certified M/WBE, the County of Chatham, or the GDOT DBE lists.

The business category was not able to be identified for all firms in the Master Vendor File and these firms, most of which were unmatched duplicates to firms already included in the Master Vendor File, were excluded from the availability analysis. However, since both M/WBEs and non-M/WBEs were equally likely to be in this category, the omission of these firms should not introduce any bias into the analysis.

F. Contract Classifications

Firms were identified and classified into the following four (4) work categories:

- Construction – "The process of building, altering, repairing, improving, or demolishing any public structure or building, or other public improvements of any kind to any public real property. It does not include the routine operation, routine repair or routine maintenance of existing structures, buildings or real property."[4]

- Professional Services– "Services which require licensure as a prerequisite to participation for a profit and which involve predominantly mental or intellectual labor and skill, including but not limited to, architect, engineer, surveyor, doctor, attorney, and accountants."[5]

- General Services – services other than Professional Services.

- Goods and Supplies – supplies, goods, parts and other tangible products.

G. Relevant Market Analysis[6]

The relevant market is the geographic area where 75-85% of the firms bidding with the City of Savannah are located. The now commonly-held idea that the relevant market area should encompass at least seventy-five to eighty-five percent of the "qualified" vendors that serve a particular sector has its origins in antitrust lawsuits. In line with antitrust precepts, United States Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, in Croson, reasoned that a mere statistical disparity between the overall minority population in Richmond, Virginia, which was 50% African

[4] City of Savannah Minority and Women Business Enterprise Program (M/WBE) Policy, June, 2009, Section VI. DEFINITIONS
[5] Ibid.
[6] Determination of the City of Savannah's Product Market could not be refined more than the four (4) work categories because of insufficient data to determine reliable NIGP or NAICS codes.

American, and the award of prime contracts to minority-owned firms, 0.67% of which were African American-owned firms, was an insufficient statistical comparison to raise an inference of discrimination. Justice O'Connor also wrote that the relevant statistical comparison is one between the percentage of Minority Business Enterprises in the marketplace [or Relevant Market] who were qualified to perform work (including prime and subcontractors) and the percentage of total City dollars awarded to minority firms.

In this study, the relevant market has been determined using bidders for each of the major procurement categories using the same relevant market for both primes and subcontractors:

- Construction
- Professional Services
- General Services
- Goods & Supplies

For each procurement category, GSPC measured the "relevant market" by the area where at least 75% of the bidders are located. GSPC gives this method greater weight than other potential methods for two reasons. First, in our view, it more accurately defines where firms come from that are offering their services to the City of Savannah, and reflects the spirit of the Supreme Court's test, which asserts that qualified firms in the area demonstrate that they are "ready, willing and able" to do business with governmental or other entities. Second, an emphasis on the percentage of monetary awards or payments in a market ignores the possibility that a few firms dominate contracting. It also concentrates the relevant market only in areas where the City of Savannah is already spending money, perhaps because of discrimination, and ignores those areas where there are firms that have, at least, expressed an interest in doing business with the City of Savannah but who may have not had the opportunity, again perhaps because of discrimination. However, for purposes of comparison only, GSPC also determined what the Relevant Geographical Market would be using $25,000+ Award dollars.

Tables 1, 3, 5, and 7 summarize the geographic area where at least 75% of bidders offering their services, or providing their goods, are located. Tables 2, 4, 6, and 8 summarize the

geographic area where at least 75% of award dollars were spent. In all of the tables, the shaded areas are within the Relevant Market. In analyzing the relevant market data, GSPC tabulated the percentage of usage beginning with the City of Savannah, and expanding out according to proximity. If the number of firms bidding did not reach the 75% benchmark, then GSPC began counting firms located in all of Chatham County, then the Savannah MSA, then the State of Georgia. If the 75% benchmark was still not reached, GSPC began counting the bidders in the surrounding states (in the order of the surrounding state where the most bidders are located to the surrounding state where the least number of bidders is located). If the benchmark was still not reached, GSPC included the bidders in the entire U.S. For the purposes of comparison, the same procedure was utilized for award dollars in Tables 2, 4, 6, and 8.

Tables 1 and 2 below show the Geographic Relevant Market for Construction is the State of Georgia when calculated by the percentage of bidders and by percentage of award dollars. This indicates that, based on location, firms are equally likely to get awards if they bid and it does not indicate a local advantage.

Table 1
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Relevant Market - Construction
(Bidders)

Construction Total by Bidders	396			
	#	%	Cum#	Cum%
City of Savannah	**148**	**37%**	**148**	**37%**
Chatham County	**28**	**7%**	**176**	**44%**
Savannah MSA (Bryan and Effingham)	**15**	**4%**	**191**	**48%**
State of Georgia	**115**	**29%**	**306**	**77%**
State of Florida	28	7%	334	84%
State of South Carolina	20	5%	354	89%
State of North Carolina	6	2%	360	91%
State of Tennessee	6	2%	366	92%
State of Alabama	3	1%	369	93%
U.S.	27	7%	396	100%
Total	396	100%		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Table 2
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Relevant Market - Construction
(Award Dollars)

Construction Total by Awards	116			
	#	%	Cum#	Cum%
City of Savannah	**42**	**36%**	**42**	**36%**
Chatham County	**12**	**10%**	**54**	**47%**
Savannah MSA (Bryan and Effingham)	**7**	**6%**	**61**	**53%**
State of Georgia	**31**	**27%**	**92**	**79%**
State of Florida	1	1%	93	80%
State of South Carolina	5	4%	98	84%
State of North Carolina	1	1%	99	85%
State of Tennessee	1	1%	100	86%
State of Alabama	4	3%	104	90%
U.S.	12	10%	116	100%
Total	116	100%		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Tables 3 and 4 below show the Geographic Relevant Market for Professional Services is the States of Georgia, South Carolina, Florida, and North Carolina when calculated by the percentage of bidders and the entire U.S. by percentage of award dollars. This indicates that, based on location, firms outside of the Relevant Market are slightly more likely to win awards if they bid and there is no advantage to local firms that bid.

Table 3
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Relevant Market – Professional Services
(Bidders)

Professional Services by Bidders	208			
	#	%	Cum#	Cum%
City of Savannah	**67**	**32%**	**67**	**32%**
Chatham County	**4**	**2%**	**71**	**34%**
Savannah MSA (Bryan and Effingham)	**2**	**1%**	**73**	**35%**
State of Georgia	**58**	**28%**	**131**	**63%**
State of South Carolina	**11**	**5%**	**142**	**68%**
State of Florida	**11**	**5%**	**153**	**74%**
State of North Carolina	**9**	**4%**	**162**	**78%**
State of Tennessee	1	0%	163	78%
State of Alabama	0	0%	163	78%
U.S.	**54**	26%	217	104%
Total	217	104%		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Table 4
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Relevant Market – Professional Services
(Award Dollars)

Professional Services by Awards	45			
	#	%	Cum#	Cum%
City of Savannah	**14**	**31%**	**14**	**31%**
Chatham County	**1**	**2%**	**15**	**33%**
Savannah MSA (Bryan and Effingham)	**0**	**0%**	**15**	**33%**
State of Georgia	**15**	**33%**	**30**	**67%**
State of South Carolina	**0**	**0%**	**30**	**67%**
State of Florida	**3**	**7%**	**33**	**73%**
State of North Carolina	**0**	**0%**	**33**	**73%**
State of Tennessee	**0**	**0%**	**33**	**73%**
State of Alabama	**0**	**0%**	**33**	**73%**
U.S.	**12**	**27%**	**45**	**100%**
Total	45	100%		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Tables 5 and 6 below show the Geographic Relevant Market for General Services is the States of Georgia, Florida, and South Carolina, North Carolina, and Alabama when calculated by the percentage of bidders and the entire U.S. by percentage of award dollars. This indicates that,

based on location, firms outside of the Relevant Market are more likely to win awards if they bid and there is no advantage to local firms that bid.

Table 5
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Relevant Market – General Services
(Bidders)

General Services by Bidders	684			
	#	%	Cum#	Cum%
City of Savannah	**193**	**28%**	**193**	**28%**
Chatham County	**32**	**5%**	**225**	**33%**
Savannah MSA (Bryan and Effingham)	**22**	**3%**	**247**	**36%**
State of Georgia	**158**	**23%**	**405**	**59%**
State of Florida	**39**	**6%**	**444**	**65%**
State of South Carolina	**27**	**4%**	**471**	**69%**
State of North Carolina	**22**	**3%**	**493**	**72%**
State of Alabama	**18**	**3%**	**511**	**75%**
State of Tennessee	8	1%	519	76%
U.S.	165	24%	684	100%
Total	684	100%		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Table 6
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Relevant Market – General Services
(Award Dollars)

General Services by Awards	217			
	#	%	Cum#	Cum%
City of Savannah	**58**	**27%**	**58**	**27%**
Chatham County	**12**	**6%**	**70**	**32%**
Savannah MSA (Bryan and Effingham)	**10**	**5%**	**80**	**37%**
State of Georgia	**46**	**21%**	**126**	**58%**
State of Florida	**10**	**5%**	**136**	**63%**
State of South Carolina	**6**	**3%**	**142**	**65%**
State of North Carolina	**4**	**2%**	**146**	**67%**
State of Alabama	**4**	**2%**	**150**	**69%**
State of Tennessee	**0**	**0%**	**150**	**69%**
U.S.	**67**	**31%**	**217**	**100%**
Total	217	100%		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Tables 7 and 8 below show that the Geographic Relevant Market for Goods & Supplies is the entire U.S. when calculated by the percentage of bidders and by percentage of award dollars. This indicates that, based on location, firms are equally likely to get awards if they bid, however there is an indication that local firms that bid for Goods & Supplies have a slightly decreased chance of winning the award.

Table 7
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Relevant Market – Goods & Supplies
(Bidders)

Goods & Materials by Bidders	757			
		%	Cum#	Cum%
City of Savannah	156	21%	156	21%
Chatham County	44	6%	200	26%
Savannah MSA (Bryan and Effingham)	11	1%	211	28%
State of Georgia	188	25%	399	53%
State of Florida	65	9%	464	61%
State of South Carolina	34	4%	498	66%
State of North Carolina	17	2%	515	68%
State of Alabama	16	2%	531	70%
State of Tennessee	9	1%	540	71%
U.S.	217	29%	757	100%
Total	757	100%		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Table 8
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Relevant Market – Goods & Supplies
(Award Dollars)

Goods & Materials by Awards	326			
		%	Cum#	Cum%
City of Savannah	59	18%	59	18%
Chatham County	17	5%	76	23%
Savannah MSA (Bryan and Effingham)	7	2%	83	25%
State of Georgia	86	26%	169	52%
State of Florida	24	7%	193	59%
State of South Carolina	12	4%	205	63%
State of North Carolina	10	3%	215	66%
State of Alabama	13	4%	228	70%
State of Tennessee	4	1%	232	71%
U.S.	94	29%	326	100%
Total	326	100%		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

H. Availability Analysis

There are numerous approaches to measuring available, qualified firms. Each measurement is, in fact, a sample of all the ready, willing, and able firms in the Relevant Market. Samples are intended to be representative of the universe of available firms in terms of percentages, therefore it is important to utilize various data sources that provide both M/WBE and non-M/WBE firms in order to test that balance, or percentages of firms likely to be available in the marketplace.

In order to best test the readiness and willingness of firms, GSPC has established a methodology of measuring availability based upon demonstrated interest in doing business with government entities. This means that GSPC only uses firms that are registered to do business with at least one governmental entity.

The ability or capacity to perform the work is tested below in the Threshold Analysis and the Regression Analysis conducted in Chapter V below. All of the data sources were combined into a Master Vendor File (the contents of which are set forth in 4(c) above).

Typically, GSPC would determine a separate availability estimate for primes and subcontractors if it determined that either there are certain types of services and goods that are only secured from subcontractors in the Utilization Analysis, or that that the Threshold Analysis indicates that the capacity of prime contractors is substantially different from subcontractors. As will be seen, GSPC determined that neither was the case, therefore the same availability applies to both primes and subcontractors.

1. Capacity

The Private Sector Analysis concludes that but for discrimination in the credit market M/WBEs would have the capacity to compete for awards in the Savannah marketplace. In order to assist in getting a clearer picture of the size of contracts awarded by the City and the capacity necessary to compete, GSPC conducted a threshold analysis. See Tables below.

Overall, there were 1,396 awards made by the City of Savannah from 2010-2014 in the category of "$25,000 and over awards" for a total amount of $361,551,329. The average dollar amount awarded was $258,990, however, 83.67% of all prime awards were under $250,000 with the majority of awards under $100,000.

Table 9
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Award Thresholds – All Work Categories

All Work Categories			
Award Threshold	**Number of Awards**	**Percent of Awards**	**Total Dollars**
Under 100,000	898	64.33%	$39,905,964.21
100,000 ≥ 250,000	270	19.34%	41,966,217.86
250,000 ≥ 500,000	133	9.53%	45,039,926.55
500,000 ≥ 750,000	30	2.15%	18,406,856,59
750,000 ≥ 1,000,000	23	1.64%	20,245,295.61
1,000,000 ≥ 2,500,000	21	1.50%	34,076,797.20
2,500,000 ≥ 5,000,000	15	1.07%	49,922,413.82
Over 5,000,000	6	0.43%	111,981,961.31
Total	1,396	100.00%	361,551,333.15

Griffin & Strong, P.C 2016

Average: $ 258,990. 92

In Construction there were a total of 288 contracts for a total of $119,415, 421 over the Study Period. The average contract was $414, 637 with 78.47% of all contracts under $250,000.

Table 10
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Award Thresholds – Construction

Construction			
Award Threshold	**Number of Awards**	**Percent of Awards**	**Total Dollars**
Under 100,000	168	58.33%	$7,514,353.08
100,000 ≥ 250,000	58	20.14%	$8,903,736.75
250,000 ≥ 500,000	19	6.60%	$6,516,643.57
500,000 ≥ 750,000	14	4.86%	$8,402,872.64
750,000 ≥ 1,000,000	9	3.13%	$8,070,771.61
1,000,000 ≥ 2,500,000	9	3.13%	$14,814,226.00
2,500,000 ≥ 5,000,000	8	2.78%	$25,888,386.15
Over 5,000,000	3	1.04%	$39,304,431.31
Total	288	100.00%	$119,415,421.11

Griffin & Strong, P.C 2016

Average: $ 414,636.88

Table 11
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Award Thresholds – Professional Services

Professional Services			
Award Threshold	**Number of Awards**	**Percent of Awards**	**Total Dollars**
Under 75,000	59	54.13%	$2,310,736.45
75,000 ≥ 250,000	36	33.03%	$5,432,193.29
250,000 ≥ 500,000	10	9.17%	$3,479,923.40
500,000 ≥ 750,000	0	0.00%	$0.00
750,000 ≥ 1,000,000	0	0.00%	$0.00
1,000,000 ≥2,500,000	2	1.83%	$3,217,692.00
2,500,000 ≥5,000,000	2	1.83%	$5,493,563.00
Over 5,000,000	0	0.00%	$0.00
Total	109	100.00%	$19,934,108.14

Griffin & Strong, P.C 2016

Average: $ 182,881.73

General Services contracts were also concentrated in awards under $250,000. 85.98% were under $250,000 but those contracts only accounted for 16.85% of all General Services contracts in the $25,000 or more award category.

Table 12
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Award Thresholds – General Services

General Services			
Award Threshold	**Number of Awards**	**Percent of Awards**	**Total Dollars**
Under 100,000	223	67.99%	$9,815,619.58
100,000 ≥ 250,000	59	17.99%	$9,716,520.58
250,000 ≥ 500,000	30	9.15%	$10,387,955.20
500,000 ≥ 750,000	5	1.52%	$3,332,730.20
750,000 ≥ 1,000,000	3	0.91%	$2,745,074.00
1,000,000 ≥ 2,500,000	3	0.91%	$3,724,241.00
2,500,000 ≥ 5,000,000	1	0.30%	$3,511,000.00
Over 5,000,000	3	0.91%	$72,683,430.00
Total	328	100.00%	$115,916,570.56

Griffin & Strong, P.C 2016

Average: $ 354,484.93

In Goods & Supplies, again the overwhelming majority: 84.07 % of all Goods & Supplies awards were under $250,000, while that represented 35.92% of the dollars.

Table 13
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Award Thresholds – Goods & Supplies

Goods & Supplies			
Award Threshold	**Number of Awards**	**Percent of Awards**	**Total Dollars**
Under 100,000	442	65.77%	$19,753,044.34
100,000 ≥ 250,000	123	18.30%	$18,425,974.00
250,000 ≥ 500,000	74	11.01%	$24,655,404.38
500,000 ≥ 750,000	11	1.64%	$6,671,253.75
750,000 ≥ 1,000,000	11	1.64%	$9,429,450.00
1,000,000 ≥ 2,500,000	7	1.04%	$12,320,638.20
2,500,000 ≥ 5,000,000	4	0.60%	$15,029,464.67
Over 5,000,000	0	0.00%	$0.00
Total	672	100.00%	$106,285,229.34

Griffin & Strong, P.C 2016

Average: $ 158,162.54

Since the majority of Savannah's prime awards were substantially under $300,000, GSPC compared the 2014 revenues of Caucasian Males to that of M/WBEs according to GSPC's survey of business owners[7] from Table 14 below. Approximately 80% of the Caucasian male- owned firms had gross revenues of $300,000 or over as compared to 58.33% of women-owned businesses, 25.42% of African American-owned businesses, and 25.00% of Asian or Pacific Islander-owned businesses. Hispanic-owned businesses had 83.1% of firms with revenues exceeding $300,000. This was higher than any other group.

[7] See Appendix D, Question 11.

Table 14
City of Savannah Disparity Study
Survey of Business Owners
Response to Question 11
(by race and gender)

Q11 Company gross revenues for calendar year 2014										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Women	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
$50,000 or less	4 3.1%	6 12.5%	19 32.2%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	32 12.0%
$50,001 - $100,000	3 2.4%	6 12.5%	8 13.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	17 6.4%
$100,001 - $300,000	10 7.9%	6 12.5%	14 23.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	2 11.8%	35 13.1%
$300,001 - $500,000	11 8.7%	4 8.3%	2 3.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	18 6.7%
$500,001 - $1,000,000	13 10.2%	4 8.3%	4 6.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	23 8.6%
$1,000,001 - $3,000,000	20 15.7%	8 16.7%	3 5.1%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	34 12.7%
$3,000,001 - $5,000,000	9 7.1%	4 8.3%	2 3.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	16 6.0%
$5,000,001 to $10,000,000	13 10.2%	5 10.4%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	2 11.8%	22 8.2%
over $10 million	35 27.6%	3 6.3%	3 5.1%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	3 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 58.8%	55 20.6%
Don't know	9 7.1%	2 4.2%	3 5.1%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	15 5.6%
Total	127 100.0%	48 100.0%	59 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	267 100.0%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

In reviewing the highest awards to each ethnic group, GSPC observed the following in the table below: In each ethnicity group represented, approximately 25% of its capacity has been unutilized by the City of Savannah in the awards between 2010-2014.

Table 15
City of Savannah Disparity Study
Unutilized Capacity by Ethnicity
(from $25,000 and over award data and
Question 11 responses from Survey of Business Owners)

City of Savannah Disparity Study Unutilized Capacity by Ethnicity			
Race/Ethnicity	Highest Award	% Surveyed with Revenues in Excess of the Highest Award (Unutilized capacity)[8]	Category of next highest awards
African American	$375,000	22.03%	$500,000 or more
Asian or Pacific Islander	$1,485,000	25.00%	$3-5 Million
Asian-Indian	0	n/a	n/a
Hispanic American	$1,781,995	50.00%	$3-5 Million
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	n/a	n/a
Women	$1,165,675	25.00%%	$3-5 Million
Non-M/WBE	$28,051,221	0%	$10 Million or more

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

In addition, with the average Savannah contract at $258,000 and 83.67% of all contracts being under $250,000, GSPC referenced Survey Question 11 to determine what percentage of M/WBEs and non-M/WBE's had capacities in excess of the average contract based on annual revenues. In each ethnicity, there is at least a 25% capacity above the average contract, and on average, M/WBEs had 43% capacity in excess of the average contract.

[8] Reflects an "at least" percentage

Table 16
City of Savannah Disparity Study
Unutilized Capacity by Ethnicity based upon Reported Annual Revenues for 2014
(from Question 11 responses from Survey of Business Owners)

Threshold	Non-M/WBE		Women		African American		Asian or Pacific Islander	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
under $300,000	17	13.39%	18	37.50%	41	69.49%	2	50.00%
$300,000 or over	101	79.53%	28	58.33%	15	25.42%	1	25.00%
Don't know	9	7.09%	2	4.17%	3	5.08%	1	25.00%
Total	127	100.00%	48	100.00%	59	100.00%	4	100.00%

	Asian-Indian		Hispanic		American Indian or Alaskan Native		Multi-Racial		Total M/WBE	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
under $300,000	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	1	25.00%	1	100.00%	64	52.03%
$300 or over	1	100.00%	5	83.33%	3	75.00%	0	0.00%	53	43.09%
Don't know	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	6	4.88%
Total	1	100.00%	6	100.00%	4	100.00%	1	100.00%	123	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C.

For the foregoing reasons related to unrealized capacity, the finding in the Private Sector analysis that M/WBEs had capacity that has been undermined by discrimination, GSPC determined that M/WBE capacity is sufficient to bid and be awarded the substantial majority of contracts as primes from the City of Savannah. In addition, given that the majority of M/WBE utilization by the City is in the area of subcontracting, GSPC determined that prime and subcontractor availability should not be separated, but should be represented by one availability estimate.

Tables 17-20 provide the number and percentage of available firms by work category in the respective Relevant Market using the Master Vendor File. The results have been disaggregated by race, ethnicity and gender ownership according to the City's definitions of race.

The City of Savannah Minority and Women Business Enterprise Program Policy (June 2009), defines a minority and Minority Business Enterprise or MBE as:

> Minority - citizen of the United States or a lawfully admitted resident alien, who is a member of any of the following groups: a. African American – All persons having origins in any of the Black racial groups of African descent as well as those identified as Jamaican, Trinidadian, and West Indian; b. Asian or Pacific Islander – All persons having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian Subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands. This area includes, for example, China, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands and Samoa; c. Asian-Indian – All persons whose origins are from India, Pakistan and Bangladesh; d. Hispanic – All persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race; 6 e. American Indian and Alaskan Native – All persons having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintain cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community; to include Aleuts and Eskimo and f. Other – All persons belonging to an ethnic or minority group identified by the Georgia or U.S. Supreme Court as a "discrete and insular" minority afforded special protection under the Equal Protection Clause of the U.S. Constitution because of inherent personal characteristics, legislation about who is subject to strict scrutiny.
>
> Minority Business Enterprise or MBE – An entity or institution that is certified as at least 51% owned and controlled by one or more minority individuals, or, in the case of a publicly owned business, at least 51% of the stock is owned by one or more minority individuals. The ownership interest must be real and continuous, and not created solely to meet the minority-owned business or contractor provisions of this Policy. This definition shall

include educational and other non-profit entities, designated as such under section 501(c) of the U.S. Tax Code, that have a recognized historical association with a minority.

It defines a Women-Owned Business Enterprise or WBE as:

A business entity that is certified as at least 51% owned and controlled by one or more women who are not members of a minority group, or in the case of a publicly owned business, at least 51% of the stock is owned by one or more women who are not members of a minority group, and certified as such. The ownership interest must be real, and continuous, and not created solely to meet the women-owned business or contractor provisions of this Policy. This definition shall include educational and other non-profit entities, designated as such under section 501(c) of the U.S. Tax Code, that have a recognized historical association with women.

Note that some of the analyses may include "Unidentified M/WBE" category. This means that the firm was certified as an MBE or DBE but that GSPC was not able to identify the specific ethnicity of the owner.

In the work category of Construction, African American firms represent the largest number of available firms in the relevant market with 43.24% of all construction firms, followed by non-M/WBEs with 32.35% of firms. Women were the third largest group with 12.87%.

Table 17
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Availability – Construction
In the Relevant Market – GA
(Master Vendor File)

Savannah Availability Construction		
Race/Ethnicity	#	%
African American	941	43.24%
Asian or Pacific Islander	49	2.25%
Asian-Indian	45	2.07%
Hispanic American	88	4.04%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	16	0.74%
Women	280	12.87%
Unidentified M/WBE	53	2.44%
Total M/WBE	1472	67.65%
Non-M/WBE	704	32.35%
TOTALS	2176	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

In Professional Services, non-M/WBEs dominate with 76.25% of all firms with women-owned firms following at 10.71% and African Americans at 9.66%.

Table 18
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Availability – Professional Services
In the Relevant Market – GA, FL, NC, SC
(Master Vendor File)

Savannah Availability Professional Services		
Race/Ethnicity	#	%
African American	83	9.66%
Asian or Pacific Islander	11	1.28%
Asian-Indian	0	0.00%
Hispanic American	10	1.16%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	0.12%
Women	92	10.71%
Unidentified M/WBE	7	0.81%
Total M/WBE	204	23.75%
Non-M/WBE	655	76.25%
TOTALS	859	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Again, in General Services, non-M/WBEs account for 63.24% followed by African American-owned firms at 19.85% and women-owned firms at 12.57%.

Table 19
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Availability – General Services
In the Relevant Market – GA, AL, FL, NC, SC
(Master Vendor File)

Savannah Availability General Services		
Race/Ethnicity	#	%
African American	270	19.85%
Asian or Pacific Islander	11	0.81%
Asian-Indian	0	0.00%
Hispanic American	17	1.25%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	14	1.03%
Women	171	12.57%
Unidentified M/WBE	17	1.25%
Total M/WBE	500	36.76%
Non-M/WBE	860	63.24%
TOTALS	1360	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Non-M/WBE owned firms are the substantial majority in the Goods & Supplies category. All non-M/WBE owned firms total 5.98%.

Table 20
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Availability – Goods & Supplies
In the Relevant Market – Entire U.S.
(Master Vendor File)

Savannah Availability Goods & Services		
Race/Ethnicity	#	%
African American	30	1.69%
Asian or Pacific Islander	4	0.23%
Asian-Indian	0	0.00%
Hispanic American	1	0.06%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	0.06%
Women	63	3.56%
Unidentified M/WBE	7	0.40%
Total M/WBE	106	5.98%
Non-M/WBE	1666	94.02%
TOTALS	1772	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

I. Utilization Analysis

To determine utilization, GSPC conducted the following analysis both by number of firms and by dollars expended:

- Prime Awards $25,000 and over
  - Total for each work category
  - Awards $25,000 to $100,000 for Construction only
  - Awards $100,000 and over for Construction only
  - Awards $25,000 to $75,000 for Professional Services only
  - Awards $75,000 and over for Professional Services only
- Small Purchase $3,000-$25,000
- APOs $1,000-$3,000

  Those small-dollar (below $25,000) contracts are broken out in thresholds by type of purchase. We analyzed purchases $1,000 to $3,000 through purchase orders and included them with purchases $3,000 to $25,000.
- Subcontractor Awards (from the Prime Vendor Questionnaire)

1. Prime Utilization over $25,000

e) All Prime Awards over $25,000

Purchases over $25,000 must be approved by City Council and must be competitively bid unless they are a sole source or emergency procurement. GSPC obtained award data on purchases $25,000 or above by accessing the narratives from the City Council Minutes from 2010-2014 and manually entering the extracted data.

Tables 21 and 22 below show that M/WBE firms received 15% of all Construction contracts (in the Relevant Market) during the Study Period and about 16.32% of the dollars. This indicates that on average, prime contracts to M/WBE firms were relatively equivalent in size to non-M/WBE firms. This does not mean that the percentage of utilization is in line with availability, only that for the contracts obtained by M/WBE firms, amounts are balanced.

A closer look at the Construction Utilization Tables show that seven African American-owned firms attained $953,795 in awards during the Study Period or about 1% of all Construction utilization dollars and that Asian-Indian-Owned firms and American Indian/Alaskan Native owned firms had no utilization of the Study Period.

The highest M/WBE utilization was among Hispanic and women-owned firms. One Hispanic American owned firm was awarded $7.85 Million or 6.95% for construction work and six women-owned firms were awarded a total of $7.21 Million or 6.38%. One Asian or Pacific Islanders owned firm received 2.15% of Construction contracts or $2.43 Million.

Table 21
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Prime Utilization $25,000 and over - Construction
In the Relevant Market of GA
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	2.00	5.41%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	1.00	2.70%	0.00	0.00%	4.00	10.81%
2011	4.00	8.16%	1.00	2.04%	0.00	0.00%	1.00	2.04%	0.00	0.00%	4.00	8.16%
2012	2.00	5.41%	1.00	2.70%	0.00	0.00%	1.00	2.70%	0.00	0.00%	2.00	5.41%
2013	2.00	5.00%	1.00	2.50%	0.00	0.00%	1.00	2.50%	0.00	0.00%	4.00	10.00%
2014	2.00	5.00%	1.00	2.50%	0.00	0.00%	1.00	2.50%	0.00	0.00%	3.00	7.50%
TOTAL*	7.00	7.00%	1.00	1.00%	0.00	0.00%	1.00	1.00%	0.00	0.00%	6.00	6.00%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	7.00	18.92%	30.00	81.08%	37.00	37.00%
2011	10.00	20.41%	39.00	79.59%	49.00	49.00%
2012	6.00	16.22%	31.00	83.78%	37.00	37.00%
2013	8.00	20.00%	32.00	80.00%	40.00	40.00%
2014	7.00	17.50%	33.00	82.50%	40.00	40.00%
TOTAL*	15.00	15.00%	85.00	85.00%	100.00	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

Table 22
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Prime Utilization $25,000 and over - Construction
In the Relevant Market of GA
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$205,800.00	0.95%	$ 0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$3,374,913.69	15.52%
2011	$416,668.00	2.21%	$ 609,270.00	3.22%	$0	0.00%	$922,960.00	4.88%	$0	0.00%	$1,240,523.58	6.57%
2012	$126,894.00	0.97%	$ 1,491,270.00	11.35%	$0	0.00%	$505,100.00	3.85%	$0	0.00%	$127,604.31	0.97%
2013	$0.00	0.00%	$ 330,542.00	1.54%	$0	0.00%	$4,180,487.00	19.45%	$0	0.00%	$2,107,724.71	9.81%
2014	$204,432.65	0.54%	$ 0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$2,243,645.00	5.95%	$0	0.00%	$358,424.33	0.95%
TOTAL	$953,794.65	0.84%	$ 2,431,082.00	2.15%	$0	0.00%	$7,852,192.00	6.95%	$0	0.00%	$7,209,190.62	6.38%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	
2010	$ 3,580,713.69	16.46%	$18,171,003.83	83.54%	$21,751,717.52	19.25%
2011	$ 3,189,421.58	16.88%	$15,705,353.86	83.12%	$18,894,775.44	16.72%
2012	$ 2,250,868.31	17.14%	$10,884,938.65	82.86%	$13,135,806.96	11.62%
2013	$ 6,618,753.71	30.79%	$14,877,018.28	69.21%	$21,495,771.99	19.02%
2014	$ 2,806,501.98	7.44%	$34,918,005.15	92.56%	$37,724,507.13	33.38%
TOTAL	$ 18,446,259.27	16.32%	$94,556,319.77	83.68%	$113,002,579.04	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

In Professional Services, M/WBE received 9.09% of all awards and a lesser percentage of 4.16% of all dollars awarded. This indicates that M/WBE awards, on average, were substantially less than the awards made to non-M/WBEs. In fact, three African American and one women-owned firms were the only M/WBE group to obtain Professional Services contracts in the amount of 6.82% and 2.27% respectively.

Table 23
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Prime Utilization $25,000 and over – Professional Services
In the Relevant Market of GA, FL, NC, SC
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	2.00	12.50%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
2011	1.00	9.09%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
2012	1.00	7.69%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
2013	1.00	5.56%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	1.00	5.56%
2014	1.00	6.25%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
TOTAL*	3.00	6.82%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	1.00	2.27%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	2.00	12.50%	14.00	87.50%	16.00	36.36%
2011	1.00	9.09%	10.00	90.91%	11.00	25.00%
2012	1.00	7.69%	12.00	92.31%	13.00	29.55%
2013	2.00	11.11%	16.00	88.89%	18.00	40.91%
2014	1.00	6.25%	15.00	93.75%	16.00	36.36%
TOTAL*	4.00	9.09%	40.00	90.91%	44.00	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

Table 24
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Prime Utilization $25,000 and over – Professional
In the Relevant Market of GA, FL, NC, SC
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$107,465.00	5.72%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2011	$39,750.00	0.82%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2012	$95,215.00	7.50%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2013	$95,215.00	2.12%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$5,730.10	0.13%
2014	$239,136.00	17.55%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
TOTAL	$576,781.00	4.16%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$5,730.10	0.04%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	
2010	$ 107,465.00	5.72%	$1,770,900.43	94.28%	$1,878,365.43	13.54%
2011	$ 39,750.00	0.82%	$4,822,809.26	99.18%	$4,862,559.26	35.05%
2012	$ 95,215.00	7.50%	$1,174,784.50	92.50%	$1,269,999.50	9.16%
2013	$ 100,945.10	2.24%	$4,397,593.00	97.76%	$4,498,538.10	32.43%
2014	$ 239,136.00	17.55%	$1,123,502.00	82.45%	$1,362,638.00	9.82%
TOTAL	$ 582,511.10	4.20%	$13,289,589.19	95.80%	$13,872,100.29	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Tables 25 and 26 show that M/WBE's received 5% of the awards in General Services but only 1.09% or $1.88 Million of the $103.94 Million awarded during the Study Period. African American-owned firms and women-owned firms were the only M/WBEs to receive any awards in this area.

Table 25
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Prime Utilization $25,000 and over – General Services
In the Relevant Market of GA, AL, FL, NC, SC
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	2.00	9.52%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
2011	2.00	8.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
2012	2.00	9.09%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	1.00	4.55%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
2013	4.00	13.79%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	1.00	3.45%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
2014	3.00	14.29%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
TOTAL*	4.00	5.88%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	1.00	1.47%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	2.00	9.52%	19.00	90.48%	21.00	30.88%
2011	2.00	8.00%	23.00	92.00%	25.00	36.76%
2012	3.00	13.64%	19.00	86.36%	22.00	32.35%
2013	5.00	17.24%	24.00	82.76%	29.00	42.65%
2014	3.00	14.29%	18.00	85.71%	21.00	30.88%
TOTAL*	5.00	7.35%	65.00	92.65%	70.00	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

Table 26
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Prime Utilization $25,000 and over – General Services
In the Relevant Market of GA, AL, FL, NC, SC
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$112,116.00	0.39%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$251,090.62	0.87%
2011	$160,916.00	0.48%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$87,406.12	0.26%
2012	$163,520.00	1.85%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$202,300.00	2.28%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2013	$344,895.10	1.20%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$202,300.00	0.70%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2014	$356,001.95	9.20%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
TOTAL	$1,137,449.05	1.09%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$404,600.00	0.39%	$0	0.00%	$338,496.74	0.33%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	
2010	$ 363,206.62	1.26%	$28,374,318.47	98.74%	$28,737,525.09	27.65%
2011	$ 248,322.12	0.74%	$33,464,207.67	99.26%	$33,712,529.79	32.43%
2012	$ 365,820.00	4.13%	$8,496,255.03	95.87%	$8,862,075.03	8.53%
2013	$ 547,195.10	1.90%	$28,208,986.51	98.10%	$28,756,181.61	27.67%
2014	$ 356,001.95	9.20%	$3,515,291.68	90.80%	$3,871,293.63	3.72%
TOTAL	$ 1,880,545.79	1.81%	$102,059,059.36	98.19%	$103,939,605.15	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

In Goods and Materials, again only African American, women, and non-M/WBEs were awarded contracts. M/WBE's got 1.27% of the awards and 1.36% of the $105.90 Million.

Table 27
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Prime Utilization $25,000 and over – Goods & Supplies
In the Relevant Market of the Entire U.S.
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	2.00	1.56%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
2011	2.00	1.82%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
2012	2.00	2.15%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	1.00	1.08%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
2013	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	1.00	0.93%
2014	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	1.00	0.87%
TOTAL*	4.00	1.27%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	1.00	0.32%	0.00	0.00%	2.00	0.63%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	2.00	1.56%	126.00	98.44%	128.00	40.63%
2011	2.00	1.82%	108.00	98.18%	110.00	34.92%
2012	3.00	3.23%	90.00	96.77%	93.00	29.52%
2013	1.00	0.93%	107.00	99.07%	108.00	34.29%
2014	1.00	0.87%	114.00	99.13%	115.00	36.51%
TOTAL*	7.00	2.22%	308.00	97.78%	315.00	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

Table 28
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Prime Utilization $25,000 and over – Goods & Supplies
In the Relevant Market of the Entire U.S.
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$437,820.00	1.49%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2011	$138,953.00	0.70%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2012	$431,232.40	3.52%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2013	$0.00	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$112,706.00	0.75%
2014	$0.00	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$319,920.80	1.09%
TOTAL	$1,008,005.40	0.95%	$ -	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$432,626.80	0.41%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	
2010	$ 437,820.00	1.49%	$28,886,919.44	98.51%	$29,324,739.44	27.69%
2011	$ 138,953.00	0.70%	$19,814,884.01	99.30%	$19,953,837.01	18.84%
2012	$ 431,232.40	3.52%	$11,826,222.21	96.48%	$12,257,454.61	11.57%
2013	$ 112,706.00	0.75%	$15,008,609.34	99.25%	$15,121,315.34	14.28%
2014	$ 319,920.80	1.09%	$28,924,870.64	98.91%	$29,244,791.44	27.61%
TOTAL	$ 1,440,632.20	1.36%	$104,461,505.64	98.64%	$105,902,137.84	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

f) Construction Prime Utilization $100,000 and Over

M/WBE participation is a factor in awarding competitive bids that are subject to goals in awards $100,000 and over, and compliance with the goals is a preliminary consideration for bid eligibility. GSPC separated the awards that were $100,000 or over from those under $100,000 in order to see whether there was a difference between the percentages of M/WBE prime Construction awards. Tables 29 and 30 demonstrate the number of firms and the dollars awarded on Construction contracts $100,000 and above; and Tables 31 and 32 demonstrate the number of firms and dollars awarded on Construction contracts between $25,000 and $100,000.

The comparison shows a 7% percentage difference between the number of M/WBE firms awarded prime contracts $100,000 or over at 19.61% and the 12.68% in prime contracts under $100,000. However, the percentage of dollars awarded at both levels was substantially the same: 16.30% $100,000 or above and 16.76% for under $100,000. This indicates a higher rate of contracts awarded to M/WBE primes $100,000 or more as compared to under $100,000. However, in comparing the number of firms to the dollars awarded at each level, M/WBE's are awarded less valuable contracts than non-M/WBEs in awards that are $100,000 or over and are awarded more valuable contracts than non-M/WBEs in awards that are under $100,000.

Table 29
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Prime Utilization $100,000 and over - Construction
In the Relevant Market of GA
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	1	5.88%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	17.65%
2011	2	10.53%	1	5.26%	0	0.00%	1	5.26%	0	0.00%	2	10.53%
2012	1	6.67%	1	6.67%	0	0.00%	1	6.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2013	0	0.00%	1	5.56%	0	0.00%	1	5.56%	0	0.00%	3	16.67%
2014	1	5.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	5.00%	0	0.00%	2	10.00%
TOTAL*	4	7.84%	1	1.96%	0	0.00%	1	1.96%	0	0.00%	4	7.84%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	4	23.53%	13	76.47%	17	33.33%
2011	6	31.58%	13	68.42%	19	37.25%
2012	3	20.00%	12	80.00%	15	29.41%
2013	5	27.78%	13	72.22%	18	35.29%
2014	4	20.00%	16	80.00%	20	39.22%
TOTAL*	10	19.61%	41	80.39%	51	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

Table 30
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Prime Utilization $100,000 and over - Construction
In the Relevant Market of GA
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$180,000.00	0.87%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$3,266,041.00	15.73%
2011	$367,788.00	2.09%	$609,270.00	3.46%	$0.00	0.00%	$922,960.00	5.25%	$0.00	0.00%	$1,079,076.00	6.13%
2012	$126,894.00	1.06%	$1,485,000.00	12.41%	$0.00	0.00%	$505,100.00	4.22%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2013	$0.00	0.00%	$200,700.00	1.01%	$0.00	0.00%	$4,095,473.00	20.52%	$0.00	0.00%	$1,929,246.00	9.67%
2014	$204,433.00	0.56%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$2,162,545.00	5.92%	$0.00	0.00%	$275,266.00	0.75%
TOTAL	$879,115.00	0.82%	$2,294,970.00	2.15%	$0.00	0.00%	$7,686,078.00	7.20%	$0.00	0.00%	$6,549,628.00	6.13%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	
2010	$3,446,041.00	16.59%	$17,320,258.00	83.41%	$20,766,299.00	19.44%
2011	$2,979,094.00	16.94%	$14,610,842.00	83.06%	$17,589,936.00	16.47%
2012	$2,116,994.00	17.69%	$9,847,670.00	82.31%	$11,964,664.00	11.20%
2013	$6,225,419.00	31.19%	$13,732,484.00	68.81%	$19,957,903.00	18.68%
2014	$2,642,244.00	7.23%	$33,895,626.00	92.77%	$36,537,870.00	34.21%
TOTAL	$17,409,791.00	16.30%	$89,406,881.00	83.70%	$106,816,672.00	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

g) Construction Prime Utilization $25,000 to $100,000

Table 31
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Prime Utilization $25,000 to $100,000 - Construction
In the Relevant Market of GA
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	1	4.17%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.17%	0	0.00%	2	8.33%
2011	1	4.35%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	13.04%
2012	0	0.00%	1	4.55%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	9.09%
2013	0	0.00%	1	4.17%	0	0.00%	1	4.17%	0	0.00%	2	8.33%
2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.35%	0	0.00%	2	8.70%
TOTAL*	2	2.82%	1	1.41%	0	0.00%	1	1.41%	0	0.00%	5	7.04%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	4	16.67%	20	83.33%	24	33.80%
2011	4	17.39%	19	82.61%	23	32.39%
2012	3	13.64%	19	86.36%	22	30.99%
2013	4	16.67%	20	83.33%	24	33.80%
2014	3	13.04%	20	86.96%	23	32.39%
TOTAL*	9	12.68%	62	87.32%	71	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

Table 32
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Prime Utilization $25,000 to $100,000 - Construction
In the Relevant Market of GA
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$25,800.00	2.62%	$0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	$108,873.00	11.05%
2011	$48,880.00	3.75%	$0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	$161,448.00	12.37%
2012	$0.00	0.00%	$6,270.00	0.54%	0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	$127,604.00	10.90%
2013	$0.00	0.00%	$129,842.00	8.44%	0.00	0.00%	$85,014.00	5.53%	0.00	0.00%	$178,479.00	11.61%
2014	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	$81,100.00	6.83%	0.00	0.00%	$83,158.00	7.01%
TOTAL	$74,680.00	1.21%	$136,112.00	2.20%	0.00	0.00%	$166,114.00	2.69%	0.00	0.00%	$659,562.00	10.66%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	
2010	$134,673.00	13.67%	$850,746.00	86.33%	$985,419.00	15.93%
2011	$210,328.00	16.12%	$1,094,511.00	83.88%	$1,304,839.00	21.09%
2012	$133,874.00	11.43%	$1,037,268.00	88.57%	$1,171,142.00	18.93%
2013	$393,335.00	25.58%	$1,144,534.00	74.42%	$1,537,869.00	24.86%
2014	$164,258.00	13.84%	$1,022,379.00	86.16%	$1,186,637.00	19.18%
TOTAL	$1,036,468.00	16.76%	$5,149,439.00	83.24%	$6,185,907.00	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Like Construction contracts at the $100,000 level, Professional Services awards (such as engineering, surveying, auditing, etc.) projects estimated to exceed $75,000 will include the M/WBE Program Office in the goal-setting and scope of work process. Again, GSPC compared those awards $75,000 or over against awards between $25,000 and $75,000 with regard to M/WBE participation in Tables 33-36. Here there is a dramatic difference between the percentage of both firms and dollars presented to M/WBE firms. On awards $75,000 or more M/WBE firms received 4.17% of the awards compared to only 1.97% of the dollars. Under $75,000, M/WBE firms received 10.34% of the awards compared to 20.13% of the dollars.

This indicates that the higher the awards, the less likely M/WBEs are to obtain awards on par with non-M/WBEs and the lower the award, the more likely M/WBE awards are to surpass those awarded to non-M/WBEs.

h) Professional Services Prime Utilization $75,000 and Over

Table 33
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Prime Utilization $75,000 and over – Professional Services
In the Relevant Market of GA, FL, NC, SC
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2011	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2012	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2013	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2014	1	20.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
TOTAL*	1	4.17%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	8	100.00%	8	33.33%
2011	0	0.00%	7	100.00%	7	29.17%
2012	0	0.00%	4	100.00%	4	16.67%
2013	0	0.00%	11	100.00%	11	45.83%
2014	1	20.00%	4	80.00%	5	20.83%
TOTAL*	1	4.17%	23	95.83%	24	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

Table 34
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Prime Utilization $75,000 and over – Professional Services
In the Relevant Market of GA, FL, NC, SC
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2011	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2012	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2013	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2014	$239,136.00	22.95%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
TOTAL	$239,136.00	1.97%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	
2010	$0.00	0.00%	$1,520,870.00	100.00%	$1,520,870.00	12.50%
2011	$0.00	0.00%	$4,646,067.00	100.00%	$4,646,067.00	38.19%
2012	$0.00	0.00%	$819,905.00	100.00%	$819,905.00	6.74%
2013	$0.00	0.00%	$4,137,780.00	100.00%	$4,137,780.00	34.01%
2014	$239,136.00	22.95%	$802,967.00	77.05%	$1,042,103.00	8.57%
TOTAL	$239,136.00	1.97%	$11,927,589.00	98.03%	$12,166,725.00	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

i) Professional Services Prime Utilization $25,000 to $75,000

Table 35
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Prime Utilization $25,000 to $75,000 – Professional Services
In the Relevant Market of GA, FL, NC, SC
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2011	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2012	1	11.11%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2013	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%
2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
TOTAL*	2	6.90%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	3.45%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	2	25.00%	6	75.00%	8	27.59%
2011	1	25.00%	3	75.00%	4	13.79%
2012	1	11.11%	8	88.89%	9	31.03%
2013	2	25.00%	6	75.00%	8	27.59%
2014	0	0.00%	12	100.00%	12	41.38%
TOTAL*	3	10.34%	26	89.66%	29	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

Table 36
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Prime Utilization $25,000 to $75,000 – Professional Services
In the Relevant Market of GA, FL, NC, SC
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$107,465.00	30.06%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2011	$39,750.00	18.36%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2012	$95,215.00	21.15%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2013	$95,215.00	26.39%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$5,730.00	1.59%
2014	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
TOTAL	$337,645.00	19.80%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$5,730.00	0.34%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	
2010	$107,465.00	30.06%	$250,030.00	69.94%	$357,495.00	20.96%
2011	$39,750.00	18.36%	$176,742.00	81.64%	$216,492.00	12.69%
2012	$95,215.00	21.15%	$354,880.00	78.85%	$450,095.00	26.39%
2013	$100,945.00	27.98%	$259,813.00	72.02%	$360,758.00	21.15%
2014	$0.00	0.00%	$320,535.00	100.00%	$320,535.00	18.80%
TOTAL	$343,375.00	20.13%	$1,362,000.00	79.87%	$1,705,375.00	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

2. Prime Utilization for Small Purchase from $3,000 to $25,000

Purchases $3,000.01-$25,000 ("Small Purchases") must have the City Manager's approval and three (3) quotes, unless they are sole source or emergency purchases. At least one of the quotes is required to come from an M/WBE. GSPC obtained the data for Small Purchases from PDFs of the Small Purchase Award Memos sent to the City Manager for approval. GSPC manually entered this data into electronic spreadsheets in order to conduct the analysis.

Tables 37 and 38 demonstrate that out of the $377, 655 in Small Purchases spent in Construction, close to 90% of the firms and the dollars went to non-M/WBE firms.

Table 37
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Small Purchases $3,000 to $25,000 - Construction
In the Relevant Market of GA
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Unidentified M/WBE		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2011	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	2.04%	0	0.00%
2012	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2013	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.49%
2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.03%	4	4.12%
TOTAL*	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	1.21%	4	1.61%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0%
2011	1	5.56%	17	94.44%	18	45%
2012	0	0.00%	4	100.00%	4	10%
2013	3	50.00%	3	50.00%	6	15%
2014	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	3%
TOTAL*	4	10.00%	36	90.00%	40	100%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

Table 38
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Small Purchases $3,000 to $25,000 - Construction
In the Relevant Market of GA
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Unidentified M/WBE		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$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%
2011	$11,311.00	4.99%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2012	$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%
2013	$0.00	0.00%	$7,052.00	6.56%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$30,134.00	28.03%
2014	$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%
TOTAL	$11,311.00	3.00%	$7,052.00	1.87%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$30,134.00	7.98%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	$	%	$	
2010	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0%
2011	$11,311.00	4.99%	$215,165.17	95.01%	$226,476.17	60%
2012	$0.00	0.00%	$27,309.00	100.00%	$27,309.00	7%
2013	$37,186.00	34.58%	$70,338.38	65.42%	$107,524.38	28%
2014	$0.00	0.00%	$16,345.00	100.00%	$16,345.00	4%
TOTAL	$48,497.00	12.84%	$329,157.55	87.16%	$377,654.55	100%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

In Professional Services, only 3.13% of awards went to M/WBEs, but an increased number of 10% of $904,493 went to M/WBEs as exhibited in Tables 39 and 40.

Table 39
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Small Purchases $3,000 to $25,000 – Professional Services
In the Relevant Market of GA, FL, NC, SC
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Unidentified M/WBE		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2011	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2012	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2013	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	10.53%
TOTAL*	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	3.13%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0%
2011	0	0.00%	20	100.00%	20	31%
2012	0	0.00%	2	100.00%	2	3%
2013	0	0.00%	26	100.00%	26	41%
2014	2	10.53%	17	89.47%	19	30%
TOTAL*	2	3.13%	62	96.88%	64	100%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

Table 40
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Small Purchases $3,000 to $25,000 – Professional Services
In the Relevant Market of GA, FL, NC, SC
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Unidentified M/WBE		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$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%
2011	$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%
2012	$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%
2013	$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%
2014	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$23,514.95	10.37%
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%	$23,514.95	2.60%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	$	%	$	
2010	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0%
2011	$0.00	0.00%	$735,109.73	206.46%	$356,059.73	39%
2012	$0.00	0.00%	$10,109.72	100.00%	$10,109.72	1%
2013	$0.00	0.00%	$311,666.33	100.00%	$311,666.33	34%
2014	$23,514.95	10.37%	$203,142.72	89.63%	$226,657.67	25%
TOTAL	$23,514.95	2.60%	$880,978.50	97.40%	$904,493.45	100%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Tables 41 and 42 show again that only 2.12% of contracts, but 5.06% of dollars went to M/WBEs for a total of $178,756 out of $3.5 Million.

Table 41
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Small Purchases $3,000 to $25,000 – General Services
In the Relevant Market of GA, AL, FL, NC, SC
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Unidentified M/WBE		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2011	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	2.04%	0	0.00%
2012	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2013	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.49%
2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.03%	4	4.12%
TOTAL*	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	1.21%	4	1.61%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0%
2011	2	2.04%	96	97.96%	98	40%
2012	0	0.00%	8	100.00%	8	3%
2013	1	1.49%	66	98.51%	67	27%
2014	5	5.15%	92	94.85%	97	39%
TOTAL*	7	2.82%	241	97.18%	248	100%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

Table 42
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Small Purchases $3,000 to $25,000 – General Services
In the Relevant Market of GA, AL, FL, NC, SC
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Unidentified M/WBE		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$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%
2011	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$23,100.00	1.80%	$0.00	0.00%
2012	$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%
2013	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$33,619.68	3.75%
2014	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$5,000.00	0.39%	$117,036.47	9.07%
TOTAL	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$28,100.00	0.80%	$150,656.15	4.26%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	$	%	$	
2010	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0%
2011	$23,100.00	1.80%	$1,258,310.39	98.20%	$1,281,410.39	36%
2012	$0.00	0.00%	$60,336.27	100.00%	$60,336.27	2%
2013	$33,619.68	3.75%	$864,089.34	96.25%	$897,709.02	25%
2014	$122,036.47	9.46%	$1,167,650.68	90.54%	$1,289,687.15	36%
TOTAL	$178,756.15	5.06%	$3,355,776.68	94.94%	$3,534,532.83	99%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

In Goods & Supplies less than 1% of awards went to M/WBEs and similarly less than 1% of the $12.7 Million spent in Small Purchases went to M/WBEs.

Table 43
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Small Purchases $3,000 to $25,000 – Goods & Supplies
In the Relevant Market of the Entire U.S.
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Unidentified M/WBE		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2011	1	0.39%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2012	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.89%
2013	0	0.00%	1	0.36%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.74%
TOTAL*	1	0.13%	1	0.13%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	0.53%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0%
2011	1	0.39%	257	99.61%	258	34%
2012	1	1.89%	52	98.11%	53	7%
2013	1	0.36%	278	99.64%	279	37%
2014	2	0.74%	270	99.26%	272	36%
TOTAL*	5	0.80%	748	99.20%	754	100%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

Table 44
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Small Purchases $3,000 to $25,000 – Goods & Supplies
In the Relevant Market of the Entire U.S.
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Unidentified M/WBE		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$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%
2011	$5,816.83	0.19%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2012	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$16,627.08	3.82%
2013	$0.00	0.00%	$24,340.00	0.49%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$17,200.00	0.35%
2014	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$17,055.00	0.40%
TOTAL	$5,816.83	0.05%	$24,340.00	0.19%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$50,882.08	0.40%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	$	%	$	
2010	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0%
2011	$5,816.83	0.19%	$3,110,168.30	99.81%	$3,115,985.13	24%
2012	$16,627.08	3.82%	$418,142.64	96.18%	$434,769.72	3%
2013	$41,540.00	0.84%	$4,892,205.33	99.16%	$4,933,745.33	39%
2014	$17,055.00	0.40%	$4,227,715.77	99.60%	$4,244,770.77	33%
TOTAL	$81,038.91	0.64%	$12,660,556.99	99.36%	$12,741,595.90	100%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

3. Prime Utilization for POs from $1,000-$3,000[9]

Purchases that are $1,000.01-$3,000 must have approval by the Purchasing Department and three (3) quotes are secured unless they are sole source or emergency purchases. At least one of the quotes must come from an M/WBE. This data was presented to GSPC in electronic format.

[9] Purchases under $1,000 were not included in this Study.

In the Construction tables below, M/WBEs were awarded less than 2.78% of the purchases, but less than 1% of the $1.0 Million spent in this area.

Table 45
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
POs $1,000 to $3,000 – Construction
In the Relevant Market of GA
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Unidentified M/WBE/MBE		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2011	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2012	1	1.27%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.27%	1	1.27%
2013	0	0.00%	1	1.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
TOTAL*	1	0.69%	1	0.69%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.69%	1	0.69%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0%
2011	0	0.00%	26	100.00%	26	18%
2012	3	3.80%	76	96.20%	79	55%
2013	1	1.67%	59	98.33%	60	42%
2014	0	0.00%	53	100.00%	53	37%
TOTAL*	4	2.78%	140	97.22%	144	100%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

Table 46
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
POs $1,000 to $3,000 – Construction
In the Relevant Market of GA
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Unidentified M/WBE/MBE		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$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%
2011	$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%
2012	$1,985.00	0.52%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$3,200.00	0.83%	$1,685.00	0.44%
2013	$0.00	0.00%	$2,523.00	0.78%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2014	$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%
TOTAL	$1,985.00	0.20%	$2,523.00	0.25%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$3,200.00	0.32%	$1,685.00	0.17%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	$	%	$	
2010	$0.00.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0%
2011	$0.00.00	0.00%	$68,854.04	100.00%	$68,854.04	7%
2012	$6,870.00	1.78%	$378,163.36	98.22%	$385,033.36	38%
2013	$2,523.00	0.78%	$319,244.86	99.22%	$321,767.86	32%
2014	$0.00.00	0.00%	$231,511.34	100.00%	$231,511.34	23%
TOTAL	$9,393.00	0.93%	$997,773.60	99.07%	$1,007,166.60	100%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Tables 47 and 48 indicate that M/WBEs received less than 1% of the $220,469 spent in Professional Services against receiving 1. 52% of the purchase awards.

Table 47
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
POs $1,000 to $3,000 – Professional Services
In the Relevant Market of GA, FL, NC, SC
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Unidentified M/WBE/MBE		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2011	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2012	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2013	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	3.13%
2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
TOTAL*	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.52%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0%
2011	0	0.00%	9	100.00%	9	14%
2012	0	0.00%	9	100.00%	9	14%
2013	1	3.13%	31	96.88%	32	48%
2014	0	0.00%	30	100.00%	30	45%
TOTAL*	1	1.52%	65	98.48%	66	100%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

Table 48
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
APOs $1,000 to $3,000 – Professional Services
In the Relevant Market of GA, FL, NC, SC
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Unidentified M/WBE/MBE		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$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%
2011	$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%
2012	$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%
2013	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$1,600.00	1.80%
2014	$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%
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%	$1,600.00	0.73%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	$	%	$	
2010	$0.00.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0%
2011	$0.00.00	0.00%	$21,205.02	100.00%	$21,205.02	10%
2012	$0.00.00	0.00%	$15,539.45	100.00%	$15,539.45	7%
2013	$1,600.00	1.80%	$87,421.48	98.20%	$89,021.48	40%
2014	$0.00.00	0.00%	$94,702.74	100.00%	$94,702.74	43%
TOTAL	$1,600.00	0.73%	$218,886.69	99.28%	$220,468.69	100%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

In General Services, M/WBEs received 2.63% of the awards, but received an increased dollar percentage of 12.73% of the dollars spend. So out of $3.9 Million, M/WBE's received approximately $500,000.

Table 49
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
APOs $1,000 to $3,000 – General Services
In the Relevant Market of GA, AL, FL, NC, SC
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Unidentified M/WBE/MBE		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2011	2	2.44%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.22%
2012	6	3.09%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.52%
2013	3	1.57%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	1.05%	2	1.05%
2014	3	1.65%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.55%
TOTAL*	6	1.58%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.53%	2	0.53%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0%
2011	3	3.66%	79	96.34%	82	22%
2012	7	3.61%	187	96.39%	194	51%
2013	7	3.66%	184	96.34%	191	50%
2014	4	2.20%	178	97.80%	182	48%
TOTAL*	10	2.63%	370	97.37%	380	100%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

Table 50
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
APOs $1,000 to $3,000 – General Services
In the Relevant Market of GA, AL, FL, NC, SC
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Unidentified M/WBE/MBE		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$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%
2011	$21,606.00	9.12%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$4,083.00	1.72%
2012	$129,441.96	11.34%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$18,669.80	1.64%
2013	$151,227.79	12.21%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$5,691.00	0.46%	$17,762.00	1.43%
2014	$150,044.00	11.47%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$1,125.00	0.09%
TOTAL	$452,319.75	11.53%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$5,691.00	0.15%	$41,639.80	1.06%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	$	%	$	
2010	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0%
2011	$25,689.00	10.84%	$211,242.14	89.16%	$236,931.14	6%
2012	$148,111.76	12.98%	$993,264.12	87.02%	$1,141,375.88	29%
2013	$174,680.79	14.11%	$1,063,430.94	85.89%	$1,238,111.73	32%
2014	$151,169.00	11.56%	$1,156,442.66	88.44%	$1,307,611.66	33%
TOTAL	$499,650.55	12.73%	$3,424,379.86	87.27%	$3,924,030.41	100%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

In Goods & Supplies, M/WBEs received only 1.17% of the awards and only 1.53% of the dollars in this area.

Table 51
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
APOs $1,000 to $3,000 – Goods & Supplies
In the Relevant Market of the Entire U.S.
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Unidentified M/WBE/MBE		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2011	1	0.52%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.52%	1	0.52%
2012	1	0.28%	1	0.28%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.57%
2013	2	0.59%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.30%	3	0.89%
2014	2	0.60%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.30%
TOTAL*	3	0.44%	1	0.15%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.15%	3	0.44%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0%
2011	3	1.57%	188	98.43%	191	28%
2012	4	1.14%	348	98.86%	352	51%
2013	6	1.78%	331	98.22%	337	49%
2014	3	0.89%	333	99.11%	336	49%
TOTAL*	8	1.17%	677	98.83%	685	100%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

Table 52
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
APOs $1,000 to $3,000 – Goods & Supplies
In the Relevant Market of the Entire U.S.
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Unidentified M/WBE/MBE		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$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%
2011	$6,800.00	1.05%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$1,300.00	0.20%	$1,860.00	0.29%
2012	$12,900.00	0.64%	$1,564.00	0.08%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$15,169.69	0.75%
2013	$31,208.00	1.46%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$1,300.00	0.06%	$9,157.82	0.43%
2014	$13,646.38	0.67%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$1,020.00	0.05%
TOTAL	$64,554.38	0.94%	$1,564.00	0.02%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$2,600.00	0.04%	$27,207.51	0.40%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	$	%	$	
2010	$0.00.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0%
2011	$9,960.00	1.53%	$640,183.34	98.47%	$650,143.34	9%
2012	$29,633.69	1.46%	$1,994,309.45	98.54%	$2,023,943.14	30%
2013	$41,665.82	1.94%	$2,101,883.67	98.06%	$2,143,549.49	31%
2014	$14,666.38	0.72%	$2,019,720.49	99.28%	$2,034,386.87	30%
TOTAL	$95,925.89	1.40%	$6,756,096.95	98.60%	$6,852,022.84	100%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

4. Subcontractor Utilization

Subcontractor utilization is the percentage of awards made by prime contractors to M/WBE subcontractors during the Study Period in comparison to all awards made to all subcontractors by prime contractors during the Study Period.

The City of Savannah does not track all subcontractor awards[10], therefore, it was necessary for GSPC to request information on subcontractor utilization directly from the prime contractors through a "Prime Vendor Questionnaire."

GSPC sent the Prime Vendor Questionnaire to every prime awardee during the Study Period. A copy of the correspondence and questionnaire sent to awardees is attached as Appendix C.

All 568 City of Savannah $25,000+ awardees from FY2010-FY2014 (taken from the minutes of the City of Savannah City Council) were sent the questionnaire through The Print Shop (a local Savannah mailing house). GSPC contacted those firms that did not respond via e-mail as a reminder. 77 unique firms responded to the questionnaire. This was a response rate of 13.56% which is a sufficient response to infer reliable conclusions about all firms and no discernable response bias can be inferred by the firms that failed to return the questionnaire.

These firms were asked to list the names of subcontractors and the dollar amount of contracts awarded. The analysis of responses to the survey is then used to draw inferences regarding minority and women-owned business participation on construction subcontracting by the prime contractors.[11]

[10] The contract analysts maintain for 01437 which certifies labor standards and prevailing wage requirements with subcontractors, but does not specify award amounts to subcontractors. In addition, the Contract Compliance Office maintains M/WBE verification forms, but only for M/WBEs. An analysis of subcontractor utilization requires a comparison of M/WBE utilization to non-M/WBE utilization.

[11] The responses from Professional Services and Services were not sufficient to draw inferences to all

Table 53 demonstrates that M/WBEs make up more than half of all subcontractors with 45.10% of all subcontractors being non-M/WBE's followed by 29.41% African American-owned firms and 25.49% women-owned firms. It is important to note that there were no Asian or Pacific Islander, Asian-Indian, Hispanic American, or American Indian and Alaskan Native owned firms utilized as subcontractors. Although in absolute numbers, some of those groups may have been represented. The fact that our sample failed to indicate any means that there were few if any actually utilized. In comparison with Table 54, M/WBEs received increased value in receiving 69.59% of the dollars, but only 54.90% of the subcontracting awards.

Table 53
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Subcontractor Utilization - Construction
In the Relevant Market of the U.S.
From the Prime Vendor Questionnaire
(Number of Firms)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	8	47.06%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	8	47.06%
2011	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	50.00%
2012	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2013	5	20.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	16.00%
2014	3	30.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	40.00%
TOTAL*	15	29.41%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	13	25.49%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	16	94.12%	1	5.88%	17	33.33%
2011	3	75.00%	1	25.00%	4	7.84%
2012	1	33.33%	2	66.67%	3	5.88%
2013	9	36.00%	16	64.00%	25	49.02%
2014	7	70.00%	3	30.00%	10	19.61%
TOTAL*	28	54.90%	23	45.10%	51	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

*TOTAL represents the number of unique firms during the Study Period

subcontracting. Typically, there is little or no subcontracting in small contracts and goods & supplies.

Table 54
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Subcontractor Utilization - Construction
In the Relevant Market of the U.S.
From the Prime Vendor Questionnaire
(Dollars)

	African American		Asian or Pacific Islander		Asian-Indian		Hispanic American		American Indian and Alaskan Native		Women	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
2010	$637,579.00	41.36%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$902,240.00	58.53%
2011	$50,330.00	64.14%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$20,558.00	26.20%
2012	$231,749.00	55.61%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%
2013	$647,671.00	18.55%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$227,956.00	6.53%
2014	$7,330,337.00	53.87%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$3,266,858.00	24.01%
TOTAL	$8,897,666.00	46.50%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$4,417,612.00	23.09%

	Total M/WBE		Non-M/WBE		TOTAL	
FY	$	%	$	%	$	
2010	$1,539,819.00	99.90%	$1,600.00	0.10%	$1,541,419.00	8.06%
2011	$70,888.00	90.34%	$7,584.00	9.66%	$78,472.00	0.41%
2012	$231,749.00	55.61%	$184,984.00	44.39%	$416,733.00	2.18%
2013	$875,627.00	25.08%	$2,615,369.00	74.92%	$3,490,996.00	18.24%
2014	$10,597,195.00	77.88%	$3,010,230.00	22.12%	$13,607,425.00	71.11%
TOTAL	$13,315,278.00	69.59%	$5,819,767.00	30.41%	$19,135,045.00	100.00%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

J. Disparity Indices

To assess the existence and extent of disparity, GSPC compared the M/WBE $25,000 and over awards utilization percentages to the percentage of the total pool of M/WBE firms in the relevant geographic area.

The Disparity Index is defined as the ratio of the percentage of dollars awarded to each M/WBE group (U) divided by the percentage of such firms available in the marketplace, (A):

Let: U =Utilization percentage for the M/WBE group

A =Availability percentage for the M/WBE group

DI =Disparity Index for the M/WBE group

DI = U/A or Utilization divided by Availability

When the DI is one, which indicates that the utilization percentage equals the availability percentage, there is parity or an absence of disparity. In situations where there is availability, but no utilization, the corresponding disparity index will be zero. In cases where there is utilization, but no availability, the resulting disparity index is designated by the infinity (∞) symbol. Finally, in cases where there is neither utilization nor availability, the corresponding disparity index is undefined and designated by a dash (-) symbol. Disparity analyses are presented separately for each procurement category and for each race, ethnicity and gender group. They are also broken out by year, for each year of the Study Period.

The results obtained by a disparity analysis will result in one of three conclusions: overutilization, underutilization or parity. Underutilization is when the Disparity Index is below one. Overutilization is when the Disparity Index is over one. Parity is when the Disparity Index is one. When the overutilization or underutilization is statistically significant, it is indicated in a bold color.

The disparity indices for prime contractors in Construction are contained in Table 55 below. Women-owned businesses were overutilized in 2010 and underutilized each of the other years of the Study Period. Hispanic American owned firms were overutilized in 2011, 2013, and 2014. All other M/WBE groups were underutilized every year of the Study Period. Non-M/WBEs were overutilized every year of the Study Period in Construction. In total, Hispanic American and non-M/WBE firms were overutilized over the Study Period and all other M/WBE groups were underutilized in Construction.

For Construction subcontractors in Table 56, women-owned firms were overutilized in 2010, 2011, and 2014. African American-owned firms were overutilized in 2011, 2012, and 2014. All other M/WBE groups were underutilized every year of the Study Period.

In Professional Services in Table 57, African American-owned firms were overutilized in 2014, but over the entire Study Period were underutilized. Every other M/WBE groups was underutilized each year of the Study Period.

In General Services, as a prime in Table 58, non-M/WBEs were overutilized every year of the Study and no M/WBE group was overutilized.

Table 59 shows that African American-owned firms were overutilized in 2012, but over the Study Period were underutilized, along with other M/WBE groups, except Asian-Indian-Owned firms which were in parity.

It should be noted that the availability estimates in tables 55-59 are based upon a compilation of data sources from 2010-2015 (see Master Vendor File section on page 62-63).

Table 55
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Disparity Indices – Construction (Prime)

ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER GROUP	UTILIZATION % (U)	AVAILABILITY % BASED ON MASTER VENDOR FILE (AMV)	DISPARITY INDEX (U/AMV)	DISPARATE IMPACT OF UTILIZATION FOR U/AMV
FY 2010				
African American	0.95%	43.24%	0.02	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	2.25%	0.00	Underutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	2.07%	0.00	Underutilized
Hispanic American	0.00%	4.04%	0.00	Underutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.74%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	15.52%	12.87%	1.21	Overutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	2.44%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	16.46%	67.65%	0.24	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	83.54%	32.35%	2.58	Overutilized
FY 2011				
African American	2.21%	43.24%	0.05	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.22%	2.25%	1.43	Overutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	2.07%	0.00	Underutilized
Hispanic American	4.88%	4.04%	1.21	Overutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.74%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	6.57%	12.87%	0.51	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	2.44%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	16.88%	67.65%	0.25	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	83.12%	32.35%	2.57	Overutilized
FY 2012				
African American	0.97%	43.24%	0.02	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	11.35%	2.25%	5.04	Overutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	2.07%	0.00	Underutilized
Hispanic American	3.85%	4.04%	0.95	Underutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.74%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	0.97%	12.87%	0.08	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	2.44%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	17.14%	67.65%	0.25	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	82.86%	32.35%	2.56	Overutilized
FY 2013				
African American	0.00%	43.24%	0.00	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.54%	2.25%	0.68	Underutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	2.07%	0.00	Underutilized
Hispanic American	19.45%	4.04%	4.81	Overutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.74%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	9.81%	12.87%	0.76	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	2.44%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	30.79%	67.65%	0.46	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	69.21%	32.35%	2.14	Overutilized
FY 2014				
African American	0.54%	43.24%	0.01	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	2.25%	0.00	Underutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	2.07%	0.00	Underutilized
Hispanic American	5.95%	4.04%	1.47	Overutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.74%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	0.95%	12.87%	0.07	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	2.44%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	7.44%	67.65%	0.11	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	92.56%	32.35%	2.86	Overutilized
TOTALS				
African American	0.84%	43.24%	0.02	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.15%	2.25%	0.96	Underutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	2.07%	0.00	Underutilized
Hispanic American	6.95%	4.04%	1.72	Overutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.74%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	6.38%	12.87%	0.50	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	2.44%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	16.32%	67.65%	0.24	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	83.68%	32.35%	2.59	Overutilized

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Table 56
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Disparity Indices – Construction (Subcontractor)

ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER GROUP	UTILIZATION % (U)	AVAILABILITY % BASED ON MASTER VENDOR FILE (AMV)	DISPARITY INDEX (U/AMV)	DISPARATE IMPACT OF UTILIZATION FOR U/AMV
FY 2010				
African American	41.36%	43.24%	0.96	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	2.25%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Asian-Indian	0.00%	2.07%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Hispanic American	0.00%	4.04%	0.00	**Underutilized**
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.74%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Women	58.53%	12.87%	4.55	**Overutilized**
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	2.44%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Total MWBE/DBE	99.90%	67.65%	1.48	**Overutilized**
Non-MWBE/DBE	0.10%	32.35%	0.00	**Underutilized**
FY 2011				
African American	64.14%	43.24%	1.48	**Overutilized**
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	2.25%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Asian-Indian	0.00%	2.07%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Hispanic American	0.00%	4.04%	0.00	**Underutilized**
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.74%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Women	26.20%	12.87%	2.04	**Overutilized**
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	2.44%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Total MWBE/DBE	90.34%	67.65%	1.34	**Overutilized**
Non-MWBE/DBE	9.66%	32.35%	0.30	**Underutilized**
FY 2012				
African American	55.61%	43.24%	1.29	**Overutilized**
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	2.25%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Asian-Indian	0.00%	2.07%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Hispanic American	0.00%	4.04%	0.00	**Underutilized**
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.74%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Women	0.00%	12.87%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	2.44%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Total MWBE/DBE	55.61%	67.65%	0.82	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	44.39%	32.35%	1.37	**Overutilized**
FY 2013				
African American	18.55%	43.24%	0.43	**Underutilized**
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	2.25%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Asian-Indian	0.00%	2.07%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Hispanic American	0.00%	4.04%	0.00	**Underutilized**
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.74%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Women	6.53%	12.87%	0.51	**Underutilized**
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	2.44%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Total MWBE/DBE	25.08%	67.65%	0.37	**Underutilized**
Non-MWBE/DBE	74.92%	32.35%	2.32	**Overutilized**
FY 2014				
African American	53.87%	43.24%	1.25	**Overutilized**
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	2.25%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Asian-Indian	0.00%	2.07%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Hispanic American	0.00%	4.04%	0.00	**Underutilized**
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.74%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Women	24.01%	12.87%	1.87	**Overutilized**
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	2.44%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Total MWBE/DBE	77.88%	67.65%	1.15	**Overutilized**
Non-MWBE/DBE	22.12%	32.35%	0.68	**Underutilized**
TOTALS				
African American	46.50%	43.24%	1.08	Overutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	2.25%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Asian-Indian	0.00%	2.07%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Hispanic American	0.00%	4.04%	0.00	**Underutilized**
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.74%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Women	23.09%	12.87%	1.79	**Overutilized**
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	2.44%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Total MWBE/DBE	69.59%	67.65%	1.03	Overutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	30.41%	32.35%	0.94	Underutilized

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Table 57
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Disparity Indices – Professional Service (Prime)

ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER GROUP	UTILIZATION % (U)	AVAILABILITY % BASED ON MASTER VENDOR FILE (AMV)	DISPARITY INDEX (U/AMV)	DISPARATE IMPACT OF UTILIZATION FOR U/AMV
FY 2010				
African American	5.72%	9.66%	0.59	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	1.28%	0.00	Underutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.00%	1.16%	0.00	Underutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.12%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	0.00%	10.71%	0.00	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	5.72%	23.74%	0.24	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	94.28%	76.25%	1.24	Overutilized
FY 2011				
African American	0.82%	9.66%	0.08	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	1.28%	0.00	Underutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.00%	1.16%	0.00	Underutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.12%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	0.00%	10.71%	0.00	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	0.82%	23.74%	0.03	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	99.18%	76.25%	1.30	Overutilized
FY 2012				
African American	7.50%	9.66%	0.78	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	1.28%	0.00	Underutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.00%	1.16%	0.00	Underutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.12%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	0.00%	10.71%	0.00	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	7.50%	23.74%	0.32	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	92.50%	76.25%	1.21	Overutilized
FY 2013				
African American	2.12%	9.66%	0.22	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	1.28%	0.00	Underutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.00%	1.16%	0.00	Underutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.12%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	0.13%	10.71%	0.01	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	2.24%	23.74%	0.09	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	97.76%	76.25%	1.28	Overutilized
FY 2014				
African American	17.55%	9.66%	1.82	Overutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	1.28%	0.00	Underutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.00%	1.16%	0.00	Underutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.12%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	0.00%	10.71%	0.00	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	17.55%	23.74%	0.74	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	82.45%	76.25%	1.08	Overutilized
TOTALS				
African American	4.16%	9.66%	0.43	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	1.28%	0.00	Underutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.00%	1.16%	0.00	Underutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.12%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	0.04%	10.71%	0.00	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	4.20%	23.74%	0.18	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	95.80%	76.25%	1.26	Overutilized

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Table 58
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Disparity Indices – General Services (Prime)

ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER GROUP	UTILIZATION % (U)	AVAILABILITY % BASED ON MASTER VENDOR FILE (AMV)	DISPARITY INDEX (U/AMV)	DISPARATE IMPACT OF UTILIZATION FOR U/AMV
FY 2010				
African American	0.39%	19.85%	0.02	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	Underutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.00%	1.25%	0.00	Underutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	1.03%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	0.87%	12.57%	0.07	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	1.25%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	1.26%	36.76%	0.03	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	98.74%	63.24%	1.56	Overutilized
FY 2011				
African American	0.48%	19.85%	0.02	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	Underutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.00%	1.25%	0.00	Underutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	1.03%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	0.26%	12.57%	0.02	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	1.25%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	0.74%	36.76%	0.02	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	99.26%	63.24%	1.57	Overutilized
FY 2012				
African American	1.85%	19.85%	0.09	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	Underutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	2.28%	1.25%	1.82	Overutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	1.03%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	0.00%	12.57%	0.00	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	1.25%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	4.13%	36.76%	0.11	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	95.87%	63.24%	1.52	Overutilized
FY 2013				
African American	1.20%	19.85%	0.06	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	Underutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.70%	1.25%	0.56	Underutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	1.03%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	0.00%	12.57%	0.00	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	1.25%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	1.90%	36.76%	0.05	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	98.10%	63.24%	1.55	Overutilized
FY 2014				
African American	9.20%	19.85%	0.46	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	Underutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.00%	1.25%	0.00	Underutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	1.03%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	0.00%	12.57%	0.00	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	1.25%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	9.20%	36.76%	0.25	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	90.80%	63.24%	1.44	Overutilized
TOTALS				
African American	1.09%	19.85%	0.05	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	0.81%	0.00	Underutilized
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.39%	1.25%	0.31	Underutilized
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	1.03%	0.00	Underutilized
Women	0.33%	12.57%	0.03	Underutilized
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	1.25%	0.00	Underutilized
Total MWBE/DBE	1.81%	36.76%	0.05	Underutilized
Non-MWBE/DBE	98.19%	63.24%	1.55	Overutilized

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Table 59
City of Savannah, Georgia Disparity Study
Disparity Indices – Goods & Supplies (Prime)

ETHNICITY/RACE AND GENDER GROUP	UTILIZATION % (U)	AVAILABILITY % BASED ON MASTER VENDOR FILE (AMV)	DISPARITY INDEX (U/AMV)	DISPARATE IMPACT OF UTILIZATION FOR U/AMV
FY 2010				
African American	1.49%	1.69%	0.88	Underutilized
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	0.23%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.06%	0.00	**Underutilized**
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.06%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Women	0.00%	3.56%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	0.40%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Total MWBE/DBE	1.49%	5.98%	0.25	**Underutilized**
Non-MWBE/DBE	98.51%	94.02%	1.05	Overutilized
FY 2011				
African American	0.70%	1.69%	0.41	**Underutilized**
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	0.23%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.06%	0.00	**Underutilized**
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.06%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Women	0.00%	3.56%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	0.40%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Total MWBE/DBE	0.70%	5.98%	0.12	**Underutilized**
Non-MWBE/DBE	99.30%	94.02%	1.06	Overutilized
FY 2012				
African American	3.52%	1.69%	2.08	**Overutilized**
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	0.23%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.06%	0.00	**Underutilized**
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.06%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Women	0.00%	3.56%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	0.40%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Total MWBE/DBE	3.52%	5.98%	0.59	**Underutilized**
Non-MWBE/DBE	96.48%	94.02%	1.03	Overutilized
FY 2013				
African American	0.00%	1.69%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	0.23%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.06%	0.00	**Underutilized**
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.06%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Women	0.75%	3.56%	0.21	**Underutilized**
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	0.40%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Total MWBE/DBE	0.75%	5.98%	0.13	**Underutilized**
Non-MWBE/DBE	99.25%	94.02%	1.06	Overutilized
FY 2014				
African American	0.00%	1.69%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	0.23%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.06%	0.00	**Underutilized**
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.06%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Women	1.09%	3.56%	0.31	**Underutilized**
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	0.40%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Total MWBE/DBE	1.09%	5.98%	0.18	**Underutilized**
Non-MWBE/DBE	98.91%	94.02%	1.05	Overutilized
TOTALS				
African American	0.95%	1.69%	0.56	**Underutilized**
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	0.23%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Asian-Indian	0.00%	0.00%	-	-
Hispanic American	0.00%	0.06%	0.00	**Underutilized**
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.00%	0.06%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Women	0.41%	3.56%	0.12	**Underutilized**
Unidentified MWBE/DBE	0.00%	0.40%	0.00	**Underutilized**
Total MWBE/DBE	1.36%	5.98%	0.23	**Underutilized**
Non-MWBE/DBE	98.64%	94.02%	1.05	Overutilized

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

K. Determining the Significance of Disparity Indices

The determination that a particular ethnic or gender group has been overutilized or underutilized is not, standing alone, proof of discrimination. This section discusses the significance of the disparity indices.

Typically, the determination of whether a disparity is "statistically significant" can be based on the depth of the disparity in that any disparity index that is less than .80 is considered to be a statistically significant underutilization and any disparity index over 1.10 is considered to be a statistically significant overutilization3. The disparity indexes impact as designated in the following tables as "overutilization", "underutilization", or "parity" have been bolded to indicate such statistically significant impact.

However, our approach to determining whether a measured disparity is significant in the general population versus being merely an artifact of our sample is nonparametric, meaning that we do not assume the data or population have any characteristic structure or parameters. In particular, we use a Wilcoxon test that considers whether or not the typical disparity index across all vendor categories is equal to unity. This constitutes a null hypothesis of "parity" and the Wilcoxon test estimates the probability that the typical disparity index departs from unity, and the magnitude of the calculated z-score indicates whether there is typically underutilization ($z < 0$) or overrepresentation ($z > 0$).

For all instances of the estimated disparity indices reported in the tables above, the Wilcoxon test rejected the null hypothesis of parity, and the z-score for the typical disparity index was negative, suggesting underrepresentation in all the relevant contracting categories on average. As the Wilcoxon test is based upon the median or typical value in the distribution of disparity indices, the finding of underrepresentation overall applies to all groups except non-M/WBEs as they are at the top of the disparity index distribution, with a disparity index that is on average greater than unity.

The existence of a statistically significant disparity between the availability and utilization of minority or women-owned businesses that is determined to likely be the result of the owners' race, gender, or ethnicity will impact the recommendations provided as a result of this study. GSPC will, in such a case, make recommendations for appropriate and narrowly-tailored race/ethnicity/gender-neutral remedies for this discrimination to give all firms equal access to public contracting with the City. GSPC will also, if appropriate, recommend narrowly- tailored race/ethnicity/gender-conscious remedies. If no statistically significant disparity is found to exist or if such a disparity is not determined to be a likely result of firm owners' race, ethnicity, or gender on their success in the marketplace, GSPC may still make recommendations to support the continuation of engagement, outreach, small business development, and non-discrimination policies in the procurement processes of the City of Savannah.

L. Conclusion

Every M/WBE group was underutilized in each category as primes, except that Hispanic American owned firms were overutilized in Construction. In subcontracting, every M/WBE group was underutilized in each category, except that African American owned firms were overutilized in Construction.

Since 64.33% of all Construction and 54.13% of all Professional Services contracts are under the threshold for the application of goals; and Services and Goods are not subject to any goals, there are limited subcontracting opportunities that are included in the City's remedial program. In addition, the City's prime contracts are small enough for a substantial majority of firms to be capable of performing, with 83.67% under $250,000 and the average awarded contract ($25,000 or over) was $258,990.92. Therefore, the City has an opportunity to encourage more participation of M/WBE prime contractors on City awarded contracts.

To increase subcontracting opportunities, the City could reduce the dollar threshold for goals in Construction and Professional Services and include contract goals for Services.

V. ANALYSIS OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR

A. Introduction

In this section, GSPC considers the market entry, public contracting and subcontracting outcomes and experiences of minority-owned relative to non-minority and non-women-owned firms in the relevant market area for the City of Savannah. Our analysis utilizes data from business firms that are either willing, able, or have actually contracted/subcontracted with the City of Savannah, with the aim of determining if the likelihood of successful contracting/subcontracting with the City of Savannah is conditioned in a statistically significant manner on the race, ethnicity, or gender status of firm owners. Such an analysis is a useful and important complement to estimating simple disparity indexes, which assume all things important for success and failure are equal among business firms competing for public contracts, and are based on unconditional moments—statistics that do not necessarily inform causality or the source of differences across such statistics. As simple disparity indexes do not condition on possible confounders of new firm entry and success and failure in public sector contracting/subcontracting by business firms, they are only suggestive of disparate treatment, and their implied likelihood of success/failure could be biased.

Our analysis posits that there are possible confounders of success and failure in the entry of new firms in the market and public sector contracting/subcontracting that are sources of heterogeneity among business firms that lead to differences in success and failure. Failure to condition on the sources of heterogeneity in success/failure in new firm formation and public sector contracting/subcontracting outcomes can leave simple disparity indexes devoid of substantive policy implications. Disparate outcomes could possibly reflect in part or in whole outcomes driven by disparate business firm characteristics that matter fundamentally for success/failure in the formation of new firms and public sector contracting/subcontracting outcomes. If the race, ethnicity, or gender status of a firm owner conditions lower likelihoods of success/failure, this would be suggestive of these salient characteristics causing the observed disparities.

B. Data

Our analysis is based on survey data compiled by GSPC, and constitutes a two-stage cluster sample of firms from the Supplier lists provided by the City of Savannah. All 1,941 firms in the Supplier List that had email addresses were asked to respond to the survey that was sent by email. The GSPC survey categorized four primary lines of business: Construction Services, Professional Services, General Services and Goods & Materials. 269 firms responded to the questionnaire.

The GSPC survey was a 53 item questionnaire that captured data on firm and individual owner characteristics. The basic research questions the extent to which a business firm owner's race, ethnicity, and gender status conditions success/failure in City of Savannah public contracting opportunities. As such, our use of the data in the GSPC survey is limited to measured covariates that in our view are best suited for evaluating the extent to which a business firm owner's race, ethnicity and gender status are a possible cause of public contracting disparities between minority-owned and non-minority and non-women-owned firms. Table 60 reports a summary of covariates from the GSPC survey that are relevant to the analysis. The first ten covariates will serve as dependent variables to be explained, and the remainder are control or independent variables, that will inform the regression models in our analysis of public contracting disparities in the City of Savannah. For each covariate captured/measured in the GSPC survey, the mean, standard deviation, and number of observations is reported.

Table 60
Covariate Summary

Covariate	Description	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
Number of prime contractor bids submitted to City of Savannah: 2010 - 2014	Categorical Variable: 1 = Zero bids 2 = 1 - 10 bids 3 = 11 - 25 bids 4 = 26 - 50 bids 5 = 51 - 100 bids 6 = More than 100 bids	1.91	0.841	257
Firm entered market: 2010 - 2015	*Binary Variable*: 1 = Yes	0.249	0.433	269
Served as a prime contractor on a City of Savannah project: 2010 - 2014	*Binary Variable*: 1 = Yes	0.294	0.456	269
Served as a subcontractor on a City of Savannah project: 2010 - 2014	*Binary Variable*: 1 = Yes	0.219	0.414	269
Pre-qualification requirements are a barrier to submitting bids and securing contracts from City of Savannah	*Binary Variable*: 1= Yes	0.123	0.329	269
Performance bond requirements are a barrier to submitting bids and securing contracts from City of Savannah	*Binary Variable:* 1 = Yes	0.089	0.285	269
Bid bond requirements are a barrier to submitting bids and securing contracts from City of Savannah	*Binary Variable:* 1 = Yes	0.097	0.296	269
Financing is a barrier to submitting bids and securing contracts from City of Savannah	*Binary Variable:* 1 = Yes	0.089	0.286	269
Informal networks are a barrier to submitting bids and securing contracts from City of Savannah	*Binary Variable:* 1 = Yes	0.093	0.291	269
Selection process is a barrier to submitting bids and securing contracts from City of Savannah	*Binary Variable*: 1 = Yes	0.256	0.437	269
Majority firm owner is African American	*Binary Variable:* 1 = Yes	0.223	0.417	269
Majority firm owner is Asian-Indian	*Binary Variable*: 1 = Yes	0.004	0.061	269
Majority firm owner is Asian or Pacific Islander	*Binary Variable*: 1 = Yes	0.015	0.121	269
Majority firm owner is Hispanic	*Binary Variable:* 1 = Yes	0.022	0.148	269
Majority firm owner is Native American or Alaskan	*Binary Variable*: 1 = Yes	0.015	0.121	269
Majority firm owner is Bi/Multi-Racial	*Binary Variable:* 1 = Yes	0.004	0.061	269
Majority firm owner is Other Race	*Binary Variable:* 1 = Yes	0.063	0.244	269
Majority firm owner is a Woman	*Binary Variable:* 1 = Yes	0.297	0.458	269
Firm is a Certified Women or Minority Enterprise	*Binary Variable:* 1 = Yes	0.308	0.463	269
Firm is Certified with City of Savannah	*Binary Variable:* 1 = Yes	0.197	0.398	269
Firm owner has more than twenty years of experience	*Binary Variable:* 1 = Yes	0.691	0.463	269
Firm has more than ten employees	*Binary Variable:* 1 = Yes	0.498	0.501	269
Firm owner has a baccalaureate degree	*Binary Variable*: 1 = Yes	0.401	0.491	269

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

C. Statistical and Econometric Framework

Methodologically, the GSPC statistical and econometric analysis of public contracting disparities in the City of Savannah conditioned on the race, ethnicity, and gender status of business firm owners utilizes a Categorical Regression Model (CRM) framework.[12] As the covariates measuring public contracting activity and success in Table 1 are categorical responses to questionnaire items (e.g. public contracting bid ranges, yes, no), a CRM views the categories as latent variables with probability/likelihood thresholds that are conditioned on other covariates. As our primary interest is in the extent to which the race or gender status of a firm's owner is relevant, or not, for public contracting outcomes in the City of Savannah, we include control covariates in our regression models that measure a firm owner's race/ethnicity/gender. In the case where there are more than two categories and the succession of categories has a natural ordered ranking, a CRM permits a determination as to how particular covariates condition the likelihood/probability of being in the highest valued category relative to the lower-valued categories. In the case of just two categorical but not naturally ordered categories, the CRM reduces to a Binary Regression Model (BRM).[13]

For all the CRM/BRM parameter estimates below, we report them as "Odds Ratios," which measure the ratio of the probability of success and the probability of failure relative to the omitted group in all our specifications—non-minority and non-women-owned firms. When the odds ratio is greater (less) than unity for a parameter, the measured characteristic has the effect of increasing (decreasing) the likelihood of the outcome under consideration relative to non-minority and non-

[12] See: Richard D. McKelvey and William Zavoina. 1975. "A Statistical Model for the Analysis of Ordinal Level Dependent Variables," Journal *of Mathematical Sociology*, 4: pp. 103 - 120.

[13] More formally, if the latent realization of an outcome is Y_i^*, ranging from $-\infty$ to ∞, a structural and conditional specification for Y_i^* is $Y_i^* = X_i \beta + \varepsilon_i$, where X is a vector of exogenous covariates, β is a vector of coefficients measuring the effects of particular covariates on the realization of Y_i^*, and ε_i is a random error. For categorical and ordinal outcomes $m = 1 \cdots J$, $Y_i = m$ if $\tau_{m-1} \leq Y_i^* < \tau_m$, where the τ_i are thresholds for the particular realizations of $Y_i^* = m$. Conditional on X the likelihood/probability that Y_i takes on a particular realization is $Pr(Y_i = m \mid X) = \Phi(\tau_m - X\beta) - \Phi(\tau_{m-1} - X\beta)$, where Φ is the cumulative density function of ε.

women-owned firms. We determine the statistical significance of the outcomes, i.e., overutilization or underutilization, on the basis of the estimated coefficient's probability value—or P-value. The P-value is the probability of obtaining an estimate of the coefficient by chance alone, assuming that the null hypothesis of the variable having a zero effect is true. As a convention, GSPC rejects the null hypothesis of no effect, and concludes the estimated coefficient is statistically significant as long as P-value ≤ .10, which we highlight in bold for all parameter estimates.

The response rate was approximately 14 percent. As nonresponse probabilities are unknown, we estimate all parameters from our CRM/BRM specifications with bootstrapped standard errors to minimize/eliminate the bias that can result from the sample being unrepresentative of the population of interest due to nonresponse.[14] To the extent that bootstrapped standard errors enable consistent estimation of parameters given misspecification that could result from the omission of sampling and nonresponse weights, CRM/BRM parameter estimates with bootstrapped standard error effects can mitigate/eliminate the bias caused by a sample that may not be fully representative of the population of interest.[15]

D. The Relative New Firm Entry Propensities of Minority Firm Owners in the City of Savannah

We first examine the effects of minority or women ownership status on an individual's participation in the private sector as a relatively new business firm in the City of Savannah. To the extent that new minority and women-owned firms have a lower likelihood of market entry relative to non-minority and women-owned firms, it would suggest that discrimination against minority and women-owned firms is sufficiently present to warrant consideration of public sector legal remedies, such as affirmative action and minority set-aside contracting, that would improve the prospects for the entry of new minority and women-owned firms in the market. Such a perspective on discrimination suggests that entry barriers impede the formation of minority and

[14] See: Bradley Efron and Robert J. Tibshirani. 1993. *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*, Chapman and Hall, NY.

[15] See: Silvia Goncalves and Halbert White. 2005. "Bootstrap Standard Error Estimates for Linear Regression," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100: pp. 970 -979. and Stanislav Kolenikov. 2010. "Resampling Variance Estimation for Complex Survey Data," *Stata Journal*, 10: pp. 165 – 199.

women-owned firms. The counterfactual is that in the absence of such entry barriers, manifested perhaps as discrimination against minority and women-owned firms in access to capital, credit, etc., minority and women-owned firms would be able to enter the market, and compete with non-minority-owned firms in bidding and securing public contracts from government agencies.

To determine if race or gender status is a barrier to the formation of new businesses in the City of Savannah, Table 61 reports the estimated parameters of a Logit BRM with a binary variable for a firm establishing itself between the years 2010 – 2015 as the dependent variable, or within the five previous years of our analysis. As standard control covariates, we include the race/ethnicity of the firm's majority owner, and whether or not the owner has a baccalaureate degree. As a goodness-of-fit measure, Pseudo-R^2 is reported.[16]

With respect to the race or gender status of the firm, the estimated coefficient is statistically significant and greater than one only for firms owned by African Americans. This suggests that firms owned by African Americans are more likely to be new entrants to the Savannah market relative to non-minority and women-owned firms, a result that does not appear to be the case for the other minority and women-owned firms in the Savannah market area. To the extent that market experience is an important determinant of success in bidding and securing public contracts, the relatively higher probability of being a new firm for those owned by African Americans may be of consequence. This is particularly the case if successful public contract bidding follows from having market tenure that translates into acquiring significant knowledge/experience about bidding and securing public contracts.

[16] Pseudo- R^2 is not to be interpreted as the R^2 in standard Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimation, as OLS precedes our minimizing variance to get parameter estimates. Probit specifications are likelihood-based, and higher values of Pseudo-R^2 indicate that the specified model is an increasingly better alternative to a null model with only an intercept.

Table 61
Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds Ratio):
Business Enterprise Ownership Status and New Firm Entry
in City of Savannah Market Area

Regressand: Firm entered market: 2010-2015 (binary) **Regressors:**	**Coefficient**	**Standard Error**	**P-value**
Constant	0.276	0.085	**0.0001**
Firm owner has a baccalaureate degree	1.11	0.321	0.3700
Majority firm owner is African American	2.26	1.14	0.1042
Majority firm owner is Asian-Indian	0.0001	0.00001	**0.0001**
Majority firm owner is Asian or Pacific Islander	0.0001	0.00001	0.0001
Majority firm owner is Hispanic	3.98	34.49	0.8743
Majority firm owner is Native American or Alaskan	1.54	14.49	0.9632
Majority firm owner is Bi/Multi-Racial	0.0002	0.00001	**0.0001**
Majority firm owner is Other Race	1.15	0.812	0.8402
Majority firm owner is a Woman	0.7141	0.2489	0.3344
Number of observations	269		
$Pseudo - R^2$	0.039		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

E. Are Minority and Women-owned Firms Less Likely to Compete for Contracts in the City of Savannah?

One reason disparities in public contracting outcomes between minority-owned, non-minority and women-owned firms could exist is that relative to non-minority-owned businesses, minority and women-owned firms are less likely to submit bids for public contracts. To determine if this is the case in the City of Savannah, Table 62 reports Ordinal Logit parameter estimates of

a CRM with the number of prime contracting bids submitted by a firm to the City of Savannah between 2010 - 2014 as the dependent variable. As standard control covariates we include, in addition to whether the firm owner has a baccalaureate degree, measures for the number of employees the business employs, and the number of years of experience the firm owner has.

The parameter estimates in Table 62 suggest that relative to non-minority and women-owned firms, only those owned by African Americans and Asian-Indians submit fewer prime bid submissions, as the estimated odds ratio is statistically significant and less than one in these instances. To the extent that public contract success is proportional to the number of submissions, this suggests that firms owned by African Americans and Asian-Indians could have public contract success disparities relative to non-minority and women-owned firms as a consequence of submitting fewer bids for public contracts in the City of Savannah.

Table 62
Ordinal Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds ratio):
Minority or Women ownership status and Prime Bid Submissions
In City of Savannah Market Area

Regressand: Number of contractor bids submitted: 2010-2014 **Regressors:**	**Odds Ratio**	**Standard Error**	**P-value**
Firm owner has more than twenty years of experience	1.834	0.3694	**0.0031**
Firm has more than ten employees	1.786	0.3734	**0.0063**
Firm owner has a baccalaureate degree	1.635	0.4548	**0.0767**
Majority firm owner is African American	0.5410	0.1657	**0.0452**
Majority firm owner is Asian-Indian	0.0001	0.0001	**0.00001**
Majority firm owner is Asian or Pacific Islander	0.8982	0.6913	0.8894
Majority firm owner is Hispanic	0.2779	0.2291	0.1216
Majority firm owner is Native American or Alaskan	0.3707	2.317	0.8746
Majority firm owner is Bi/Multi-Racial	0.7036	0.1779	0.1653
Majority firm owner is Other Race	0.0021	0.0014	0.6432
Majority firm owner is a Woman	1.015	0.2366	0.9471
Firm is certified with the City of Savannah	2.36	0.7194	**0.0055**
Number of observations	257		
$Pseudo - R^2$	0.046		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

F. Minority and Women-owned Firms and Prime Contracting in the City of Savannah

To the extent that frequency of public contract bids reflects past experience as a prime contractor, minority and women-owned firms can potentially become frequent prime contract bidders by actually gaining experience as succesful prime contractors. As such, the low-frequency of prime bids by minority and women-owned firms need not be a concern if they are actually gaining valuable experience as prime contractors that will translate into frequent contract bids and success later. To explore if this is the case in the City of Savannah, Table 63 reports Logit BRM parameter estimates where the dependent variable is whether or not a firm served as a prime contractor in the City of Savanah between 2010 – 2014.

The parameter estimates in Table 63 suggest that relative to non-minority and women-owned firms, those owned by African Americans, Asian-Indians, Hispanics, and Bi/Multi-Racials, are less likely to have served as prime contractors, as the estimated odds ratio is statistically significant and less than one in these instances. To the extent that public contract success is proportional to prior experience as a prime contractor, this suggests that any public contract success disparities of firms owned by African Americans, Asian-Indians, Hispanics, and Bi/Multi-Racials reflect past constraints on public contract success, as current success is correlated with the experience gained from past success.

Table 63
Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds ratio):
Minority or Women ownership status and Prime Contracting
with City of Savannah

Regressand: Served as a prime contractor on a City of Savannah project: 2010-2014 **Regressors:**	**Odds Ratio**	**Standard Error**	**P-value**
Constant	0.4364	0.2111	**0.0872**
Firm owner has more than twenty years of experience	0.9288	0.3997	0.8643
Firm has more than ten employees	1.677	0.5241	**0.0985**
Firm owner has a baccalaureate degree	0.7899	0.2547	0.4658
Majority firm owner is African American	0.1557	0.0095	**0.0325**
Majority firm owner is Asian-Indian	0.0001	0.00001	**0.00001**
Majority firm owner is Asian or Pacific Islander	0.7309	7.721	0.9768
Majority firm owner is Hispanic	0.0001	0.00001	**0.00001**
Majority firm owner is Native American or Alaskan	0.3812	3.164	0.9085
Majority firm owner is Bi/Multi-Racial	5.913	5.348	**0.00001**
Majority firm owner is Other Race	1.125	0.7689	0.8715
Majority firm owner is a Woman	1.402	0.4803	0.3249
Firm is certified with the City of Savannah	1.311	0.5678	0.5324
Number of observations	269		
Pseudo - R^2	0.103		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

G. Minority and Women-owned Firms and Subcontracting in the City of Savannah

To the extent that submitting and winning public contract bids requires experience, which can also be gained through subcontracting with lead prime firms, minority and women-owned firms can potentially become more frequent and successful prime contract bidders by acquiring experience as subcontractors. As such, the low-frequency of prime bid submission and lower likelihood of being a prime contractor by minority and women-owned firms need not be concern if they are gaining valuable subcontracting experience that will translate into high frequency contract bids and success later. To explore if this is the case in the City of Savannah, Table 64 reports Logit BRM parameter estimates where the dependent variable is whether or not a firm served as a subcontractor for the City of Savannah between 2010 – 2014.

The parameter estimates in Table 64 suggest that relative to non-minority and women-owned firms, those owned by African Americans, Asian-Indians, and Bi/Multi-Racials are less likely to have served as subcontractors, as the estimated odds ratio is statistically significant and less than one in these instances. To the extent that public contract success is proportional to prior experience as a subcontractor, this suggests that any public contract success disparities of firms owned by African Americans, Asian-Indians, Hispanics, and Bi/Multi-Racials reflect constraints on access to subcontracting opportunities, as success with respect to securing prime contracts is plausibly correlated with the experience gained from performing as a subcontractor on public contracts.

Table 64
Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds ratio):
Minority or Women ownership status and Prime Subcontracting
in City of Savannah Market Area

Regressand: Served as subcontractor on a City of Savannah Project: 2010-2014 **Regressors:**	**Odds Ratio**	**Standard Error**	**P-value**
Constant	0.3237	0.1077	**0.0014**
Firm owner has more than twenty years of experience	0.9303	0.2867	0.8155
Firm has more than ten employees	1.084	0.2711	0.7469
Firm owner has a baccalaureate degree	0.8588	0.2468	0.5962
Majority firm owner is African American	0.3331	0.1183	**0.0021**
Majority firm owner is Asian-Indian	0.0001	0.00001	**0.0013**
Majority firm owner is Asian or Pacific Islander	0.0001	0.00001	**0.0001**
Majority firm owner is Hispanic	1.384	10.747	0.9674
Majority firm owner is Native American or Alaskan	1.419	11.104	0.9649
Majority firm owner is Bi/Multi-Racial	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Majority firm owner is Other Race	0.2031	1.425	0.8205
Majority firm owner is a Woman	0.8143	0.3562	0.6397
Firm is certified with the City of Savannah	3.411	1.464	**0.0047**
Number of observations	269		
$Pseudo - R^2$	0.072		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

H. Do Minority and Women-owned Firms Face Additional Barriers in Submitting Bids and Securing Contracts with the City of Savannah?

The differential success in public contracting/subcontracting conditional on being a minority-owned firm implied by the parameter estimates reported in Tables 65-67 are suggestive of race/ethnicity alone conditioning City of Savannah public contracting outcomes. Such an implication follows from the statistically significant odds ratios estimated in Tables 65-67 being sensitive to the race/ethnic status of firm owners in a manner that lowers their likelihood of success in public contracting outcomes relative to non-minority firm owners—the comparison group in all the parameter estimates.

Of course, race/ethnicity alone, if at all, need not be the only barrier preventing minority and women-owned firms from realizing public contracting success likelihoods that are similar to those of non-minority and women-owned firms. Tables 65-69 report Logit BRM parameter estimates where the dependent variable measures the extent to which firm owners agree that there exist barriers to submitting bids and securing public contracts from the City of Savannah with respect to: Pre-Qualification Requirements, Performance Bond Requirements, Bid Bond Requirements, Financing, and Informal Networks.

Table 65
Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds ratio):
Minority or Women ownership status, Pre-Qualification Requirements, and Bid Submissions in City of Savannah Market Area

Regressand: Pre-qualification requirements are a barrier to submitting bids and securing contracts from the City **Regressors:**	**Odds Ratio**	**Standard Error**	**P-value**
Constant	0.1461	0.0716	**0.0001**
Firm owner has more than twenty years of experience	1.918	0.8506	0.1428
Firm has more than ten employees	0.4538	0.2457	0.1455
Firm owner has a baccalaureate degree	0.7403	0.408	0.5853
Majority firm owner is African American	1.217	0.5925	**0.0463**
Majority firm owner is Asian-Indian	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Majority firm owner is Asian/Pacific Islander	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Majority firm owner is Hispanic	3.336	19.382	0.8364
Majority firm owner is Native American or Alaskan	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Majority firm owner is Bi/Multi-Racial	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Majority firm owner is Other Race	1.072	3.104	0.9811
Majority firm owner is a Woman	0.6375	0.3307	0.3868
Number of observations	269		
$Pseudo - R^2$	0.058		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Table 66
Ordinal Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds ratio):
Minority or Women ownership status, Performance Bond Requirements, and Bid Submissions in City of Savannah Market Area

Regressand: Performance bond requirements are a barrier to submitting bids and securing contracts from the City of Savannah **Regressors:**	**Odds Ratio**	**Standard Error**	**P-value**
Constant	0.0684	0.056	**0.001**
Firm owner has more than twenty years of experience	2.23	1.206	0.1377
Firm has more than ten employees	0.3992	0.2499	0.1438
Firm owner has a baccalaureate degree	0.4434	0.1977	**0.0683**
Majority firm owner is African American	2.694	1.586	**0.0824**
Majority firm owner is Asian-Indian	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Majority firm owner is Asian or Pacific Islander	4.578	36.812	0.8504
Majority firm owner is Hispanic	2.466	17.627	0.8993
Majority firm owner is Native American or Alaskan	5.709	36.815	0.7875
Majority firm owner is Bi/Multi-Racial	0.00001	0.00001	**0.00001**
Majority firm owner is Other Race	2.387	13.328	0.8768
Majority firm owner is a Woman	0.5093	0.371	0.3542
Firm is certified with the City of Savannah	1.514	1.061	0.5535
Number of observations	269		
$Pseudo - R^2$	0.125		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Table 67
Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds ratio):
Minority or Women ownership status, Bid Bond Requirements, and Bid Submissions
in City of Savannah Market Area

Regressand: Bid bond requirements are a barrier to submitting bids and securing contracts from the City of Savannah **Regressors:**	**Odds Ratio**	**Standard Error**	**P-value**
Constant	0.1065	0.0702	**0.001**
Firm owner has more than twenty years of experience	1.317	0.8115	0.6547
Firm has more than ten employees	0.4824	0.3529	0.3191
Firm owner has a baccalaureate degree	0.3783	0.2692	0.1738
Majority firm owner is African American	2.946	1.589	**0.0453**
Majority firm owner is Asian-Indian	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Majority firm owner is Asian or Pacific Islander	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Majority firm owner is Hispanic	2.331	12.013	0.8702
Majority firm owner is Native American or Alaskan	3.882	42.476	0.9015
Majority firm owner is Bi/Multi-Racial	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Majority firm owner is Other Race	2.046	11.258	0.8963
Majority firm owner is a Woman	0.6728	0.4351	0.5409
Firm is certified with the City of Savannah	1.437	5.691	0.9276
Number of observations	269		
$Pseudo - R^2$	0.112		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Table 68
Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds ratio):
Minority or Women ownership status, Financing Requirements, and Bid Submissions
in City of Savannah Market Area

Regressand: Financing is a barrier to submitting bids and securing contracts from the City of Savannah **Regressors:**	**Odds Ratio**	**Standard Error**	**P-value**
Constant	0.0197	0.0191	**0.0001**
Firm owner has more than twenty years of experience	2.395	1.953	0.2844
Firm has more than ten employees	0.7594	0.6249	0.7388
Firm owner has a baccalaureate degree	0.508	0.2306	0.1362
Majority firm owner is African American	9.821	7.385	0.0024
Majority firm owner is Asian-Indian	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Majority firm owner is Asian or Pacific Islander	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Majority firm owner is Hispanic	11.336	79.594	0.7292
Majority firm owner is Native American or Alaskan	6.398	77.822	0.8791
Majority firm owner is Bi/Multi-Racial	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Majority firm owner is Other Race	0.0001	0.0001	**0.0001**
Majority firm owner is a Woman	2.386	1.032	**0.0447**
Firm is certified with the City of Savannah	0.9568	0.6623	0.9495
Number of observations	269		
$Pseudo - R^2$	0.226		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Table 69
Logit Parameter Estimates (Odds ratio):
Minority or Women ownership status, Informal Networks, and Bid Submissions
in City of Savannah Market Area

Regressand: Informal networks are a barrier to submitting bids and securing contracts from the City of Savannah **Regressors:**	**Odds Ratio**	**Standard Error**	**P-value**
Constant	0.0385	0.0299	**0.0001**
Firm owner has more than twenty years of experience	1.257	0.6373	0.6514
Firm has more than ten employees	1.138	0.6581	0.8329
Firm owner has a baccalaureate degree	1.979	0.7209	**0.0611**
Majority firm owner is African American	3.601	2.147	**0.0327**
Majority firm owner is Asian-Indian	0.00001	0.00001	**0.00001**
Majority firm owner is Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00001	0.00001	**0.00001**
Majority firm owner is Hispanic	0.00001	0.00001	**0.00001**
Majority firm owner is Native American or Alaskan	0.00001	0.00001	**0.00001**
Majority firm owner is Other Race	2.269	13.829	0.8936
Majority firm owner is a Woman	0.9755	0.8351	0.9772
Firm is certified with the City of Savannah	1.221	0.8051	0.9773
Number of observations	269		
$Pseudo - R^2$	0.073		

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

The parameter estimates in Tables 65-69 suggest that relative to non-minority and women-owned firms, those owned by African Americans are more likely to face barriers in submitting bids and securing public contracts with the City of Savannah as a result of Pre-Qualification Requirements, Performance Bond Requirements, Bid Bond Requirements, Financing, and Informal Networks. For firms owned by African Americans, the estimated odds ratio is statistically significant and greater than one in these instances. For firms owned by women, the estimated odds ratio is also positive and statistically significant in the case of Financing, suggesting that relative to non-minority firms, firms owned by women face financing barriers with respect to submitting bids and securing public contracts with the City of Savannah. It is plausible that public contracting success by firms is proportional to perceptions of fairness, and transparency in the public contracting process. In this context, the results in Tables 65-69 suggest that any efforts to enhance confidence in the legitimacy of the process by which bids are selected could improve public contracting outcomes for minority and women-owned firms in the City of Savannah.

A policy relevant counterfactual is also implied by the Logit Parameter estimates in Table 68. The results suggest that in the absence of financing barriers, manifested perhaps as discrimination against African American-owned firms in credit markets—a major source of financing—African American-owned firms would be able to compete with non-minority-owned firms in bidding and securing public contracts from the City of Savannah. In general, that being a African American-owned firm increases the likelihood of financing being a barrier to securing public contracts with the City of Savannah lends some support to the "but-for" justification for affirmative action in public procurement.[17] The statistically significant and positive effect of being a African American-owned firm on the likelihood of financing being a barrier to securing contracts with the City of Savannah suggests that private discrimination in the market for credit undermines their capacity to compete with other firms. This motivates a private discrimination justification for Affirmative Action in City of Savannah procurement policies; otherwise, the City

[17] See Ian Ayres and Fredrick E. Vars, "When Does Private Discrimination Justify Public Affirmative Action?" Columbia *Law Review*, 98(7), November 1988, pp. 1577 – 1641. The "But-for" rationale for affirmative action in public procurement posits that government is a passive participant in private discrimination when it does not adjust its affirmative action goal to account for how private discrimination (e.g. in credit markets) has reduce minority firm availability. In this context, government rejecting minority-owned firms because of credit constraints renders government a passive participant in discrimination against minority-owned firms.

of Savannah is a passive participant in the private discrimination against minority and women-owned firms with respect to its procurement practices.

I. Conclusion

GSPC's analysis of disparities in public contracting and subcontracting outcomes in the City of Savannah aimed to provide some policy relevant insight to observed unconditional disparity indexes. Our analysis explicitly links a business firm owner's race/ethnicity/gender to public contracting outcomes in the City of Savannah market area. Our focus on minority firm owners' success likelihoods relative to non-minority firm owners in entering the market as new business owners, realizing public contracting and subcontracting opportunities, provides a framework to rationalize observed simple disparity indexes. Indeed we find that in general, a firm owner's race, ethnicity, and gender have a statistically significant and adverse effect on the probability/likelihood of entering the Savannah market area as a new firm, securing public contracting and subcontracting opportunities relative to non-minority and women-owned firms. Our results also suggest that at least with respect to African American-owned firms, the City of Savannah may be a passive participant in private discrimination, as African American-owned firms are more likely to report financing—which is typically secured in private credit markets—to be a barrier to securing contracts with the City of Savannah. We also find that being a minority-owned firm increases the probability/likelihood of having a perception that the process by which bids are selected by the City of Savannah is not fair and transparent, which could discourage participation from minority and women-owned firms in the public contracting process—exacerbating racial/ethnic/gender disparities in public contracting outcomes for the City of Savannah.

VI. ANECDOTAL ANALYSIS

A. Introduction

Griffin & Strong, PC ("GSPC") employed various methods of qualitative research gathering to provide anecdotal evidence for the City of Savannah ("City") disparity study. Among them were two hundred sixty-nine online surveys, an informational meeting and public hearing attended by business owners in the community, thirty anecdotal interviews conducted by our local partners, and a focus group of minority business owners. It is with this research that the firm intends to provide support for its conclusions and the findings in the statistical section of the study.

B. Public Hearing

A public hearing was held at the Coastal Georgia Center on 305 Fahm Street on July 28, 2015 at 6pm and was attended by twenty-five people. The hearing began with an introduction by Rodney Strong from GSPC, detailing the purpose and format of the proceedings.

PH-1[18] states that Savannah's written policy is "one of the best written policies I've ever seen but the action going into effect, I haven't seen that part of it." His belief is that the City staff did not buy into the program, choosing not to execute the policy exactly as it was written or choosing to exercise discretion in a way that adversely affects small and minority firms. One such area for discretion is goal-setting. PH-3 says of the program that large, out of town firms come into town and must choose between "thirty firms fighting over five percent" of the project, indicating that the smaller, local businesses do not get a big enough piece of the pie. He cites an instance where a $37 million project was let with a seven percent goal, stating that "the prime wasn't interested in taking 20%, wasn't interested in taking 15%, only in taking 7%" and that the goals will be met exactly as they are written. Of this, he says that "when you put these percentages out there, the primes are trying to fill that and no more."

[18] Individuals are not identified by name in this Study. Instead they have been given codes that align with the type of anecdotal data they gave us e.g. for Public Hearing participants the code PH-1, PH-2, PH-3, etc. was given.

PH-4 discusses the "dilution of the individuals in the program," referring to the inclusion of "certain other socially (and) economically disadvantaged individuals," namely "women who are not minority." His careful language led up to his overall point that minority businesses are competing for a "five percent or ten percent" goal with non-minority women-owned businesses (PH-4). "It seems as if it's not quite enough to get the job done," PH-4 states. He then states the need for a secure certification process, and technical and financial assistance for M/WBE firms.

When PH-6 encouraged enhancing "economic growth, business development, viability of the minority and woman construction industry", PH-1 stated again that not all minority-owned firms lack those aspects and that "everybody is not on the same level." "I believe," PH-1 states, "that there is a belief with some people that African-American firms, Indian firms are not capable of doing things even though they have a proven track record" (PH-1).

In response to this point, PH-7, a minority janitorial contractor since 2013, spoke up to state that "it's financial", and citing insurance and wage requirements, implored the City to produce a program "to help (businesses) get on their feet." Expressing admiration for firms like PH-6 and PH-1, he stated that he is trying to get to their level, but there are many financial hurdles for him to jump to get to that point.

C. Anecdotal Interview.

1. Discrimination and Misuse of the Program

Several firms interviewed told of their experiences with discrimination and misuse of the M/WBE Program by majority prime contractors. Among them, AI-9[19] states that to reduce competition, firms refuse to meet their M/WBE goal by hiring firms in "their line of work" but will hire a minority subcontractor to do the lower level work. He states that these firms know that without M/WBE participation, "they will have more in their bottom line", and they feel that

[19] "AI" stands for Anecdotal Interview and is used as an alias for the interviewees and participants

minorities and women firms "are a burden on them" AI-9 concludes by saying that M/WBEs must "work twice as hard just to be even." AI-1 claims that the biggest obstacle facing women-owned firms is that construction is "still a man's industry" and "getting the door open is still a hard job" (AI-1).

Serious allegations of firms that use family members as "fronts" for M/WBE certification or certified firms as "pass-throughs" also arose during interviews with business owners. AI-18 states that he had "three white prime contractors to tell me that they could not use me because their wife or daughter had a company in their name" and that they were going to use them "to keep the money in the family" (AI-18). He says that now the M/WBE Program will investigate and that to his knowledge most of those activities have stopped. However, AI-2 believes that majority contractors resent having to use minority, women-owned businesses, and they would not use them if they could get around it.

> "One way they try to get around using us is to come to us 4-5 days before the bid is due knowing that is not adequate time for us to prepare a proper bid when they have had the notice a minimum of 3 to 4 weeks. Sometimes they will even report back to the City that they were not able to locate a qualified minority subcontractor" (AI-2).

AI-18 states that on "one of the larger projects" her firm was named as a subcontractor and "when the work began I was not used" (AI-18). "They found someone else who would do the work for less than my quote which means they could make more money for them" (AI-18). AI-6 is convinced that, if there were no requirement in place, primes would not use minorities or women because they often claim they cannot locate qualified subcontractors. AI-6 states that primes will claim "ignorance…they claim they don't have contact information to reach them…they even make up phony documents to show they sent out invitations, with very small print" (AI-6). Of this type of activity, AI-12 states that,

> "If they needed a licensed Mechanical Contractor then, a licensed Mechanical Contractor should be hired. Instead, some primes will use a company that is in the same business but may not be required to have a license or certification but can do the work" (AI-12).

2. Informal Networks

One third of interviewees believe that there is an informal network at work in Savannah's marketplace, both in public and private contracting. "The Good Old Boys are getting all the work," AIL-1 states, "just give us a fair shake. We are not asking for any favors…Just don't block us." She goes on to state that the City projects are written to sole source. "They can give work to who they like and want to have it by writing the specifications" (AIL-1). AI-12 believes that this network is a "major challenge that prevents us from winning" and states that majority contractors "are not going to let us in the inner circle" (AI-12).

In the public sector, AI-13 states that the City "favors some companies over others" and that some firms are "doing repetitive work" and being awarded "numerous contracts" (AI-13). AI-15, though he does not feel the City favors some companies over others, feels strongly that the City "is not minority friendly" and cites a belief that they "have the same company providing multiple services." AI-15 would like to see the City create a program that would bring in an outside firm to monitor and assist minority participants in their trade to help firms become primes and monitor payments to subcontractors. AIL-9, a majority contractor, believes that people, regardless of race or gender, can do well in Savannah if they are business savvy. He does not think there is an "Old Boy" network doing business in Savannah and states that he is willing to work with M/WBE firms.

AIL-2[20] has done quite a bit of work for the City and says the City has always been helpful. She praises the M/WBE Program but says there is much more work to do. She says the City is trying harder to support local businesses as compared to the County. AIL-2 is very aware of the "Good Old Boy" network and has lost work because of it. For his part, AI-6 feels that the procurement process will never be equal. "The persons that are in the system share a social community, church and business life together and our only interaction with them is limited to strictly business," states AI-6. AI-5 echoed this statement, saying that primes have "formed work and social relationships that they are comfortable with…and because of their prior work, they

[20] The designations "AI" and "AIL" are meant to distinguish between the two interviewers who conducted the anecdotal evidence gathering.

favor them," before going on to state that they should be "open to giving other firms an opportunity to work with them when they are qualified" (AI-5).

AIL-6, a non-minority prime contractor, thinks the City's M/WBE policy can be positive and negative. He states that M/WBE requirements can cause higher costs for the primes. The primes cannot go with the lowest subcontractor bid because they have to meet the M/WBE percentage requirements, and M/WBE contractors can have higher bids, so the primes lose their leverage in pricing with their subcontractors. AIL-6 believes that monitoring ties the hands of the prime general contractor. He told of a situation where a MBE subcontractor performed unsatisfactory work. The prime general contractor was willing to pay most of the cost for the subcontractor to correct the work, but the subcontractor refused and contacted the Mayor saying the prime would not pay them. "The City should stay out of it that way," AIL-6 states. However, he says that the program overall is good because "the good old boys came to do work in Savannah" and locals could not get work. With the program came "monitoring and mentoring…now it's just about meeting percentages."

AIL-10, another majority contractor, says that he has worked with M/WBE firms for years. "If you know your stuff, I will work with you." He says he does not know where all the "hype" is coming from "about M/WBE firms not getting their fair share of work" (AIL-10). He states that prime firms are willing to work with qualified M/WBE firms but that "You work with people you know" (AIL-10).

3. M/WBE Stigma

Interviewees such as AIL-1 and AI-5 believe strongly that there is a "stigma" associated with being classified as an M/WBE. AIL-1 wonders whether her WBE certification is beneficial with the City of Savannah. She suspects that some men hold her WBE certification status against her, so she uses her initials instead of her name in the title of her business so that she can better compete. "The City wants us to fill in the paperwork whether we are a WBE.....for what? They award the projects to whoever they want to have them" (AIL-1).

AI-5 believes that the City should begin to "judge each company fairly regardless of race" and that many majority contractors "put every African American firm in the same category" (AI-5). These stereotypes are harmful, he states, because "your capabilities are questioned" so some M/WBE firms do not become certified. AI-5 goes on to state that certification is sometimes made more difficult because "you are made to look like you need help and might not be as qualified as you claim" (AI-5).

Table 70
Summary of Anecdotal Interview Themes

	Certified?	Certification Useful?	But-For, Primes would use DBEs	Discrimination / Fraud	Selection Process Fair?	Informal Network	City Outreach Effective?	Bonding/ Contract Size Issues?	Number Responding	% of Total
African-American									**16**	**50%**
Yes	16	9	0	5	1	8	3	8		
No	0	4	9	2	7	1	10	0		
Caucasian Male									**8**	**25%**
Yes	0	0	3	1	1	5	1	1		
No	8	0	0	1	0	3	1	0		
Caucasian Women									**7**	**22%**
Yes	4	2	1	0	1	1	1	0		
No	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0		
Hispanic-American									**1**	**3%**
Yes	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0		
No	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		
Total									**32**	**100%**

Griffin & Strong PC 2016

*A breakdown of responses to anecdotal interview questions. The interviews themselves encompassed more than what is shown above, but these were the prevailing themes.

D. Focus Group

Griffin & Strong, P.C. held a focus group at the Savannah Entrepreneurial Center on July 27, 2015. There were initially two participants present, one an electrical contractor and another construction firm owner, both African-Americans. They appeared to be familiar with one another and friendly. Fifteen minutes into the session, three African-American contractors entered, the first, a trucking company owner, with his wife and partner and their secretary. Eleven firms RSVP'd and confirmed as attending, however, only three kept the appointment.

The firm owners went around the room and introduced themselves, listing out between them a few projects in the works with the City, the County and the School Board. The representative from the construction firm stated that he has been a part of disparity studies before for the City of Savannah and seemed to be familiar with the process and purpose of the study. For those who were not, the moderator, Griffin & Strong P.C.'s Deputy Project Manager Imani Strong, provided a description of the study and the purpose of the focus group, which is to create an open forum for discussion in a private setting around the topic of contracting in and with the City of Savannah.

The first question asked of the minority business owners was if they have experienced any barriers to participation in Savannah. T "Have you read the laws?" the firs businessman asks, referring to the policies and procedures underpinning Savannah's M/WBE Program. When the moderator answers in the affirmative, he asks how Savannah's program measures up to other cities. "It starts with us if we're going to make a difference," FG-1 states. He then rose to close the door at the electrician's behest, signaling to the room that his speech was for their ears only, not to be heard by whatever Savannah staff might be still wandering the halls of the Entrepreneurial Center after-hours. "It starts with us," he states, taking his seat, "then it goes to them. We are not unified enough to battle them. We can be, but we're not. I started when Floyd Adams was going out and Otis Johnson was coming in. They have different rules set up to get what you're talking about and until that changes we're not going to meet it."

FG-2 then speaks up, saying that he has done two projects with a major contractor and that they have "unique ways of doing business" and the loopholes that are used to get by the M/WBE Program, "can't be watched" (FG-2). FG-2 states that the "big corporations that have been here sixty years" have to be "watched" and that the disadvantages to M/WBEs run deep in terms of capital. "How many minorities can put up bonding?" he asks (FG-2).

FG-1 states that the reason that he does not bid for the City is that they have "the wrong people in place" who "don't have our (minority business') interest in mind. He doesn't "need the

stress," FG-1 continues. FG-1 suggests that M/WBEs themselves should be the ones to monitor the jobs that go out to bid to ensure that M/WBE firms are in fact working on them. "Until they do that, nothing is going to happen" FG-1 states, noting that the people "downtown" with an interest in minority business have "positions and no power." FG-2 agrees, stating that "you have people that, instead of policing the other guys, are policing me as a minority contractor", referring to wage requirements and audited financial statements required of his firm to work on the job and get certified.

Bonding isn't a problem for FG-1, except for the amount. When a general contractor does a job, he states, "He gets bonding." He states that Dunn, a major contractor in Savannah, offers courses on getting bonding and he took the classes. "I don't feel like being made a fool out of," the elder contractor said of his decision not to bid City contracts for the last ten years. "Used to be when black folk wanted to make a move they went to the church," he said of Savannah's attempts to reach out to the minority community, but that will not work anymore because preachers know "nothing" about construction (FG-1). He says, of the City's program, that he doesn't want to be a millionaire but can "say that I haven't seen anybody come out of there as a millionaire yet" (FG-1).

FG-1 and FG-2 recall a program held in the Entrepreneurial Center with members of the School Board and the City who came to speak to minority contractors about opportunities, leading them to talk about an event at the Civic Center that had security guards because they "thought the contractors would start something." These self-led meetings, FG-2 said, do the opposite: they build community. FG-1 states that the City should be paying for community-led and operated programs and should facilitate these opportunities. FG-2 says that 'we have the talent" in terms of an M/WBE contractor base that could assist with the M/WBE Program and provide mentor-protégé opportunities to one another, but their programs ran out of money. The contractors present do not trust majority firms not to use their private information gathered in the educational programs incorrectly. "They will ask for it and once class is done your info will be used to get projects," says FG-2. When asked if this was the reason for the reticence surrounding certification, there was a swift "yes" throughout the room.

They referred to two well-known contractors who sued majority firms for fraudulent activity to do with the M/WBE Program, stating that "they put his back up against the wall" and, of a women-owned business, "she did the right thing (FG-1, FG-2). FG-2 admires these actions because he has "come out of a job broke…it happens all the time." Slow payment is a problem, and so is underbidding. "They can get the job done at any rate they want" FG-2 says of larger firms, but with the wage requirements, small firms "can't compete."

FG-2 states that his name has been used on a contract that was "notarize with my signature" and he knew nothing about it. FG-3 states, however, that his name was listed on a bid and he "got a call, asking if that was legit," to which FG-2 states that "that's a good policing job." FG-3 says that "nobody should be able to "list you, sign a contract, get it notarized, and you not know about it" (FG-3). FG-1 referred to another majority contractor that "got in trouble" for having subcontractors listed as M/WBEs that were in fact majority firms. However, FG-3 notes, it would be hard to identify because there are "so many outside firms getting these jobs that we don't even know them" (FG-3). He states that he "just bid the other day and a company out of Florida got it" and he wondered where their minority participation was in Savannah. "They shouldn't be able to bring minorities from out of town because it defeats the purpose" (FG-3).

FG-1 then recalls receiving a call a month prior from a man who would pay him twice as much as his normal rate for a job "but the next thing out of his mouth was that they will have their office set up in two months" in order to get local preference. "Out-of-towners may come here and open businesses downtown" FG-1 states, to which FG-2 replies that "a lot of them hand business to a woman to get M/WBE certifications" and have ties with the unions that the smaller businesses don't. "All they have to do is get an office and a P.O. box," says FG-1.

E. Responses to Survey of Business Owners

A recurrent theme throughout the focus group and public hearing was the perceived lack of buy-in to the program by City procurement staff, project managers, and former M/WBE Program staff. Furthermore, many expressed a belief that there is an informal network in Savannah in the private sector and also, notably, in the public sector. That this perception is

pervasive among the African-American community in particular is supported by evidence from the 269 online surveys conducted in Savannah, which state that an overwhelming 56% of African-American respondents believe that an informal network in Savannah exists and that 67% of these believe that it has a disproportionate impact on women and minority-owned businesses. At the same time, while around 30% of Caucasian males and Caucasian women believe that there is an informal network, over 60% of those respondents in both demographics did not express an opinion or disagreed when asked if it had a disproportionate effect on M/WBEs.

Table 71
City of Savannah Disparity Study
Survey of Business Owners
Response to Question 45
(by race and gender)

Q45 Do you believe there is an informal network of prime and subcontractors in Savannah that monopolize the public contracting process?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									Total
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Women	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	
Yes	42 33.3%	14 29.8%	32 56.1%	3 75.0%	0 0.0%	2 33.3%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	5 29.4%	100 38.0%
No	46 36.5%	11 23.4%	6 10.5%	1 25.0%	1 100.0%	3 50.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	6 35.3%	75 28.5%
Don't know	38 30.2%	22 46.8%	19 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	1 100.0%	6 35.3%	88 33.5%
Total	126 100.0%	47 100.0%	57 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	263 100.0%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

Table 72
City of Savannah Disparity Study
Survey of Business Owners
Response to Question 48
(by race and gender)

Q48 Exclusion from this informal network has a disproportionate impact on women and minority-owned businesses.								
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify							
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Women	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Other (specify)	Total
Strongly agree	3 7.1%	3 21.4%	11 35.5%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	18 18.2%
Agree	7 16.7%	2 14.3%	10 32.3%	2 66.7%	1 50.0%	1 50.0%	2 40.0%	25 25.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	23 54.8%	6 42.9%	8 25.8%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	1 20.0%	40 40.4%
Disagree	3 7.1%	3 21.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 6.1%
Strongly disagree	6 14.3%	0 0.0%	2 6.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 40.0%	10 10.1%
Total	42 100.0%	14 100.0%	31 100.0%	3 100.0%	2 100.0%	2 100.0%	5 100.0%	99 100.0%

Griffin & Strong PC 2016

The belief that M/WBE firms are stigmatized was equally polarized. Though nearly 50% of Caucasian Males did not express an opinion, and the majority of those who did disagreed, the prevailing belief among African-American and Hispanic business owners at 63% and 60% respectively was that minority and women-owned firms are stigmatized and stereotyped as less competent.

Table 73
City of Savannah Disparity Study
Survey of Business Owners
Response to Question 51
(by race and gender)

Q51 In general, minority and women-owned businesses tend to be viewed by the general public as less competent than Non-M/WBE-owned businesses.										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									Total
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Women	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	
Strongly agree	5 4.0%	6 12.8%	16 28.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	28 10.7%
Agree	14 11.1%	12 25.5%	19 33.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 60.0%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	1 5.9%	52 19.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	60 47.6%	17 36.2%	16 28.6%	3 75.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 58.8%	106 40.6%
Disagree	32 25.4%	11 23.4%	5 8.9%	1 25.0%	1 100.0%	2 40.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	4 23.5%	57 21.8%
Strongly disagree	15 11.9%	1 2.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 11.8%	18 6.9%
Total	126 100.0%	47 100.0%	56 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	5 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	261 100.0%

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

F. Email Comments

The perceptions of M/WBE stigma, informal networks, and a closed marketplace emerged most strongly in the anecdotal interviews and public hearings. The focus group illustrated a need for monitoring of projects, largely due to a lack of buy-in from prime contractors to the objectives of the program. Email comments gathered throughout the study illustrated this. One email comment indicated that "equal opportunity laws have gone too far, resulting in discrimination against majority owned businesses, those businesses owned by white men" (EC-5). Another inquired whether "minorities" are in fact a minority in the City and questions "if the city needs to be pushing business contracts to a race which actually makes up over 50% of the population?" (EC-2). The forums of online surveys and email comments lend themselves to the free expression of opinions, and these opinions indicate that, though they might not be the majority, the City of Savannah is perceived as a closed "who you know" marketplace and the M/WBE Program is not deemed necessary by some of the primes who are intended to assist with it.

VII. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Findings

FINDING 1: Overall M/WBE Prime Utilization

As Table 74 below shows, the City of Savannah spent $336,716,422 in the relevant market during the study period and 6% of this amount, or $22,349,948 was spent with M/WBE firms as prime contractors. The City spent $13,315,278 on Construction subcontracting with M/WBE firms, roughly 70% of their entire expenditure with subcontractors in this category. This shows that while M/WBE firms are receiving a disproportionately high percentage of subcontractor work, they are not participating as primes at nearly the same numbers and, thus, are missing out on lucrative higher dollar contracts.

Table 74
City of Savannah Disparity Study
Summary of Utilization

	Construction	Professional Services	General Services	Goods & Supplies	Totals
Prime					
African-American	$953,794.65	$576,781.00	$1,137,449.05	$1,008,005.40	$3,676,030.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	$2,431,082.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$2,431,082.00
Asian-Indian	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Hispanic American	$7,852,192.00	$0.00	$404,600.00	$0.00	$8,256,792.00
American Indian and Alaskan Native	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Women	$7,209,190.62	$5,730.10	$338,496.74	$432,626.80	$7,986,044.26
Non-MWBE	$94,556,319.77	$13,289,589.19	$102,059,059.36	$104,461,505.64	$314,366,473.96
Total	$113,002,579.04	$13,872,100.29	$103,939,605.15	$105,902,137.84	$336,716,422.32
Sub					
African-American	$8,897,666.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$8,897,666.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Asian-Indian	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Hispanic American	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
American Indian and Alaskan Native	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Women	$4,417,612.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$4,417,612.00
Non-MWBE	$5,819,767.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$5,819,767.00
Total	$19,135,045.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$19,135,045.00

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

FINDING 2: Underutilization of M/WBEs as Primes

GSPC found that M/WBEs, as a group were underutilized in every category of work as prime contractors. African-American, American-Indian and women-owned firms were underutilized in every area of prime contracting. Asian or Pacific Islanders were underutilized in every area except Construction where they were underutilized, but not statistically significantly so. Asian Indian firms were underutilized in Construction, but at parity in other areas. Hispanic owned firms were underutilized in every area except Construction, where they were overutilized. Non-M/WBE owned firms were overutilized in each category.

Table 75
City of Savannah Disparity Study
Summary of Statistically Significant M/WBE
Underutilization in Prime Contracting

CONSTRUCTION	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	GENERAL SERVICES	GOODS AND MATERIALS
African American	African American	African American	African American
Asian or Pacific Islander (not statistically significant)	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian or Pacific Islander
Asian-Indian			
	Hispanic	Hispanic	Hispanic
American Indian	American Indian	American Indian	American Indian
Woman	Woman	Woman	Woman

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

FINDING 3: Disparity Analysis of M/WBEs as Subcontractors

GSPC found that Asian/Pacific Islander, Asian Indian, Hispanic, and American Indian owned firms were underutilized to a statistically significant degree in Construction Subcontracting. Non-M/WBE owned firms were underutilized, but not to a statistically significant degree and African American-owned firms were overutilized, but not to a statistically significant degree. Women were overutilized, which was statistically significant.

Table 76
City of Savannah
Summary of Disparity Analysis of M/WBEs
Construction Subcontracting
(From Prime Vendor Questionnaire Sample)

CONSTRUCTION
African American - Overutilized (not statistically significant)
Asian or Pacific Islander – Underutilized
Asian Indian – Underutilized
Hispanic American - Underutilized
American Indian - Underutilized
Women - Overutilized
Non-M/WBE – Underutilized (not statistically significant)

Griffin & Strong, P.C. 2016

FINDING 4: Regression Analysis

GSPC's regression analysis controlled for non-race/ethnicity/gender factors such as the age of the owner, education of the owner, years in business, etc. and explicitly links a business firm owner's race/ethnicity/gender to public contracting outcomes in the City of Savannah market area. It was found that a firm owner's race, ethnicity, and gender have a statistically significant and adverse effect on their likelihood of entering the Savannah market area as a new firm and of

securing public contracting and subcontracting opportunities relative to non-minority-owned firms.

The results also suggested that, with respect to African-American-owned firms, the City of Savannah may be a passive participant in private discrimination, as African-American-owned firms are more likely to report financing—which is typically secured in private credit markets—to be a barrier to securing contracts with the City of Savannah. We also find that being a minority-owned firm increases the likelihood of having a perception that the process by which bids are selected by the City of Savannah is not fair and transparent, which could discourage participation from minority-owned firms in the public contracting process—exacerbating racial/ethnic/gender disparities in public contracting outcomes for the City of Savannah.

FINDING 5: Anecdotal Evidence

Anecdotal evidence assisted GSPC greatly in both getting a better picture of the empirical data and understanding the perceptions of the business community in the Savannah, GA marketplace. Through the anecdotal interviews, online surveys, public hearing, focus group, and public comment, GSPC determined the following perceptions:

A recurrent theme throughout the focus group and public hearing was the perceived lack of buy-in to the program by City procurement staff, project managers, and former M/WBE Program staff. Furthermore, many expressed a belief that there is an informal network in Savannah in the private sector and also, notably, in the public sector. The perceptions of M/WBE stigma, informal networks, and a closed marketplace emerged most strongly in the anecdotal interviews and public hearings. The focus group illustrated a need for monitoring of projects, largely due to a lack of buy-in from prime contractors to the objectives of the program and a pervasive mistrust in the M/WBE community for the City's certification and prime-led educational courses.

FINDING 6: Purchasing Practices Policies and Procedure Findings

It is clear that, though there are provisions in the Ordinance for joint outreach and engagement between the M/WBE Program and the Purchasing Department, the purchasing officials at the City of Savannah are not integrated into the monitoring and reporting processes. The Study team heard more than once that the Purchasing Department does not deal with subcontractor or M/WBE issues, payment or otherwise, but the same officials expressed views that primes "would prefer to work with people they know" and that M/WBEs "estimate a project in their head based on the way they have always estimated…whereas prime contractors estimate to the dollar."

The divide in responsibilities leaves out a crucial "checks and balances" provision for small purchases as well as enabling the Purchasing Department to abdicate responsibility for being a crucial first line of defense against M/WBE nonpayment, misuse of the program, and contributes to a lack of buy-in from the purchasing officials to the objectives of the M/WBE Program. Though the local preference program is administered by Purchasing, there is no communication or connection between that preference program and the M/WBE Program. In fact, there was little understanding in either the program or the Purchasing Department of how the local preference program impacts local M/WBEs in particular.

B. Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Narrow Tailoring of M/WBE Programs

There is dramatic underutilization of all M/WBEs as prime contractors in all work categories in awards with the City of Savannah, except with regard to Hispanic American-owned firms in Construction. There is also underutilization of all M/WBE groups in subcontracting, except African American-owned firms in Construction. The Study found that the statistically significant disparities were caused by race, ethnicity, and gender status. In addition, there is

discrimination in the Savannah Relevant Market based upon race, ethnicity, and gender, particularly toward African Americans. Anecdotally, the Study revealed an overwhelming perception that there is an internal network of firms that the City utilizes and that there are barriers for all new entrants, but particularly for minority and women owned firms. This was borne out in comments made to the Study team by Purchasing staff that the Study should take into account that firms have already been working for the City as contractors. GSPC also heard anecdotally, which matched with the statistical data, that there are barriers to M/WBEs being awarded prime contracts. GSPC received comments from Purchasing personnel that equated all M/WBEs to subcontractors, stating that the group as a whole had shortcomings that prevented them from being prime contractors. GSPC was also told that there were few subcontracting opportunities available and that although minority and women owned firms may be getting some of those opportunities, they are being shut out of the prime contracting awards that they have the capacity to perform. GSPC found that there may be limited subcontracting opportunities for M/WBEs because of the high threshold for contract goals in Construction and Professional Services and the lack of any contract goals for Services. As a result of all of its findings, GSPC recommends that the City institute remedial activities to improve the access of minority and women owned firms to the City's contract awards. We recommend that the City implement each of the remedies which are listed below.

Recommendation 2: M/WBE Prime Preference Program

The City should focus on refining the current M/WBE prime preferences under the City of Savannah Code of Ordinances §2.4061 and increasing outreach efforts to M/WBEs to invite and encourage them to bid as primes.

Recommendation 3: Joint Venture Contracts/M/WBE Teams

In order to encourage participation on high-dollar contracts, the City of Savannah should look for instances in which M/WBE capacity can be increased to match contract size. M/WBE capacity can be increased by encouraging joint ventures. For example, in Oregon, the Northeast

Urban Trucking Consortium, an organization composed of seven M/WBE independent trucking firms with 15 trucks, joined together to win a $2 million trucking contract. M/WBE collaboration can be encouraged by citing consortium examples in newsletters and increasing outreach for projects where such collaboration may be effective.

Savannah may also cautiously encourage joint ventures between M/WBEs and non-minority firms on large-scale projects. It must be noted that this type of joint venture poses potential illicit "front" risks, and the City must examine these joint ventures carefully.

Recommendation 4: Adjustment of Goal-Setting Thresholds

The City should consider lowering the oversight thresholds, requiring any purchases over $25,000 to have a set goal in Construction, Professional Services, and Services, if there are identifiable subcontracting opportunities. In addition, for purchases under the thresholds, there is a requirement to obtain three quotes, one of which must be solicited from a certified M/WBE. Though there is a bid/quote M/WBE solicitation list, which is updated regularly to include newly certified firms, the practice does not seem to be to utilize this list, and the M/WBE Program is afforded no oversight of the quote process.

Recommendation 5: Performance Reviews and Evaluations

City procurement staff should be evaluated regularly based on the quality, transparency, and effectiveness of their attempts to reach procurement goals and achieve the overall goals of the M/WBE Programs in place.

Recommendation 6: Bonding Assistance Programs

Due to the results of the Private Sector Analysis, GSPC believes that it is important for the City of Savannah to provide additional resources to M/WBE firms. The City of Savannah should implement a program of supportive services which will provide bonding assistance, financial

assistance, technical assistance, outreach, and networking opportunities to M/WBE firms. This supportive services program should be developed and administered by the City of Savannah on either an in-house or outsourced basis. The Georgia Department of Transportation outsources these services to a third-party provider, but they administer the contract carefully. Another Georgia municipality, the City of Atlanta, has formed a public-private partnership called the Greater Atlanta Economic Alliance to provide these services. Regardless of whether the City of Savannah chooses to administer the program with internal or outsourced resources, any program will involve forming agreements with local banks to provide funding to small, minority, and women-owned businesses, coordinating technical assistance seminars with the Small Business Administration and local small business development centers and finally structuring relationships with the SBA's bonding assistance program. Further, the City should conduct extensive and regular outreach which will endeavor to make business owners in Savannah aware of the supportive services available.

Recommendation 7: Tracking M/WBE Participation

Tracking M/WBE participation is a crucial aspect of narrow tailoring race/gender-conscious activities to any finding of discrimination. Without the ability to measure participation accurately, the City cannot determine whether its efforts are effective or not. Some jurisdictions utilize "Balanced Scorecard" to gauge the effectiveness of their respective efforts, including measuring:

- Growth in M/WBE prime contracting
- Growth in M/WBE subcontracting to prime contractors
- Growth in the number of M/WBEs winning first awards
- Growth in percentage of M/WBE utilization
- Number of firms that receive bonding
- Number of joint ventures involving M/WBEs

In order to do this, the City must begin maintaining more of its data in electronic formats, and specifically improve its tracking of M/WBE participation by also tracking non-

M/WBE participation. Since participation is measured in percentages of the whole, the City must know the participation of all vendors in order to determine to what extent M/WBEs are participating in the procurement process

Recommendation 8: Collaboration between the City's M/WBE Program and Purchasing

It is clear from interviews with the Purchasing Department and M/WBE Program staff that the Purchasing Department is not involved in any way with the M/WBE Program and that M/WBE Program staff are not always aware of the policies that govern the purchasing process at the City. This isolation between the two departments makes the program vulnerable because the Purchasing Department has no involvement with subcontractors, subcontractor payments, or fraud prevention and the M/WBE Program is not granted the level of oversight necessary to properly implement the goals and measures it intends to set in place.

The anecdotal, the statistical, and the purchasing policies and practices evidence all indicate that the M/WBE Program is not organizationally situated to be able to effectively administer a first-class contract compliance program. Our analysis of various contract compliance programs from around the country indicate that unless the administrator charged with the responsibility for obtaining M/WBE participation has the organizational stature to require compliance within the administration, a program will be ineffective. In order to have an effective program, it is first necessary for the M/WBE Program Coordinator to be placed in a position to report directly to the City Manager and have oversight of the purchasing process; meaning that contracts cannot be let until the M/WBE Program Coordinator has signed off on them for compliance. The power to stop payments in the incidence of a violation of the ordinance or fraudulent activity in the program must also lie with the M/WBE Program. Governments which grant this power to their offices of contract compliance give them a tool which allows them to bring contractors to the table to resolve issues and disputes in a timely manner. It is certainly possible to put some type of time limit or some type of post-facto procedure in place to limit the discretion of the M/WBE Program Coordinator. However, for a great many day-to-day disputes

notification of suspension of payment will bring the parties to the table and allow the M/WBE coordinator to resolve the issue without any further action by the City. The power to temporarily stop payments for an M/WBE coordinator is an important basic tool. Further the local preference program should be combined with the administration of the M/WBE Program as both are contract compliance functions.

Recommendation 9: Oversight Committee

It is important that major stakeholders (including representatives of general contractors and M/WBE contractors) take part in discussions about the City's Local and M/WBE Programs. Consequently, the City should provide a vehicle for stakeholder input in the review of any local or M/WBE goals.

Recommendation 10: Procurement Staff Awareness Training

To further the goal of integrating the processes between the M/WBE Program and the Purchasing Department, GSPC recommends that the City implement mandatory purchasing staff training on M/WBE goals and measures, and be included in the outreach efforts to M/WBE firms. This will create better relationships between purchasing staff and the M/WBE community and will allow the City's program to operate in conjunction with the procurement process. Any existing procurement training should be reviewed and revised to include more extensive training on non-discriminatory practices and M/WBE participation/goals.

Recommendation 11: Good Faith Efforts

"Good Faith Efforts" are a mechanism to determine whether prime contractors have engaged in various forms of outreach to M/WBE potential subcontractors. An allowance for the prime contractor to demonstrate a failure to meet goals after good faith efforts is a requirement

for narrow tailoring under Croson. (See page 14 of the Legal Analysis). Prime contractors must be able to show where they have sent emails or letters and make their bid documents available, so that M/WBE firms can familiarize themselves with the way that they are approaching the project. Finally, firms must be able to demonstrate to the M/WBE Program Coordinator that they have exhausted all avenues, while being transparent about the pricing that they have received from all subcontractors on the project, to engage M/WBE firms. Savannah should allow prime contractors, in certain, infrequent circumstances to forgo portions of their M/WBE participation goals if they are genuinely unable to meet the requirements, but only after the foregoing has been properly verified.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The City of Savannah appears to have come a long way in recognizing and attempting to remedy any inequities in contracting. The City reports that it has accomplished the following:

a. Eliminated practice of "self-identification" and implemented standards requiring all companies registering with the City as "diverse" to upload proof of certification.
b. Developed specialized training tracks for M/WBEs and micro/small businesses.
c. Required bids/proposals to include proof of certification for all companies participating in the project as M/WBEs.
d. Required staff to document direct contact with M/WBE subcontractors to confirm the company's agreement to participate in a bid and the type of work to be performed.
e. Implemented new standards for monitoring, including more frequent site visits and more detailed reporting to ensure work is performed by M/WBEs in accordance with the City contract.

However, there still appears to be a very strong insider network and attitude that desires to keep working with the same firms. The end result will be that new, young, and innovative firms, both M/WBE and Non-M/WBE, will not be drawn to the City of Savannah. It also may mean that the City is not getting the best value for its contracts.

Overall, the City may implement the recommendations above as a mechanism to establish meaningful dialogue and interaction with its M/WBE businesses and to provide resources. It is especially important for the City's growth that it encourage prime contractors to diversify their use of subcontractors through a strong, fully supported M/WBE Program and equally important that M/WBEs are fully considered capable of performing as prime contractors. If the City accepts GSPC's recommendations for narrowly-tailored remedies, then it is recommended that the City of Savannah's Code of Ordinances be revised to reflect those modifications through legislation, where required.

Griffin & Strong, P.C.
February, 2016

IX. APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CITY OF SAVANNAH, GEORGIA
2015 DISPARITY STUDY
DATA ASSESSMENT REPORT

Griffin & Strong, P.C. ("GSPC") conducted data assessment meetings during April 8, 9, 10, 2015 , regarding the City of Savannah, Georgia ("Savannah") Disparity Study. This report summarizes those meetings and sets forth action items and preliminary questions to be answered. It is necessary to issue a data assessment report prior to completing the data collection plan in order to confirm that GSPC has the correct understanding of how and where data is kept by Savannah.

I. Scope Statement

The purpose of this disparity study ("Study") is to determine whether there is a disparity between the number of minority and women owned businesses ("M/WBEs") in the Savannah marketplace and the dollars that Savannah awards to such M/WBE firms, such that Savannah is an active or passive participant in past or present discrimination.

The Study will collect and analyze relevant data on "ready, willing and able" vendors in the areas of:

1. construction services
2. professional services
3. goods & materials
4. general services

The dollars spent with these same types of businesses (whether as prime contractors or subcontractors) will also be collected and analyzed.

The study period for the disparity study has been determined as a five (5) year study period from January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2014.

II. Data Assessment Meetings

GSPC conducted data assessment meetings to ascertain the location, types, and constraints on the data needed for the disparity study, as well as obtain a basic

understanding of Savannah's purchasing practices, based upon the following interview schedule:

April 8, 2015 –	David E. Maxwell, Chief Financial Officer
	Molly F. Huhn, Purchasing Director
	Kathy Maggioni, Contract Analyst
April 9, 2015	Cam Mathis, Director Information Technology
	MarRonde Lumpkin-Lotson, SEC Administrator
	Nathaniel Miller, M/WBE Contract Compliance Coordinator
	DeLisa Espada, M/WBE Coordinator
April 10, 2015	Ann Trammell, Contract Analyst

III. Preliminary Purchasing Practices

Savannah has seven (7) bureaus plus the Finance Department. Each bureau has departments under it with a total of 44 departments at the City of Savannah.

Purchasing falls under the Finance Department. Savannah has a centralized purchasing system, with all purchases facilitated by three (3) buyers (two positions are currently vacant, but anticipated to be filled on June 1, 2015) and the Assistant Purchasing Director in the Purchasing Department. Each buyer is assigned bureaus for which they do the purchasing. Also, the Purchasing Director handles all major RFPs and large construction procurements.

Purchases that are $1,000 or under are purchased through APOs (unless under an annual contract) and are not subject to bids or a requirement to obtain quotes. However they must be approved by the department head. The APO system will not accept any purchase over $1,000.

Issue: Since the APO system is different than other purchases coming through the P.O. system and since small purchases under $1,000 are not subject to competitive bidding and are difficult to track, it was determined that APO purchases would be excluded from the disparity study. The Study will still include purchases under $1,000 that are made under annual contracts because those would be paid through the P.O. system and not as APOs.

Purchases that are $1,000.01-$3,000 must have approval by the purchasing department and three (3) quotes are secured unless they are sole source or

emergency purchases.

Purchases $3,000.01-$25,000 must have the City Manager's approval and three (3) quotes unless they are sole source or emergency purchases.

Purchases over $25,000 must be approved by City Council and must be competitively bid unless they are a sole source or emergency procurement. The City bids as RFPs, RFSQs, and IFBs (lowest responsible, responsive bidder). Request for quotes are done at the department level.

Every purchase begins with a requisition. The requester goes into the supplier portal to enter their requisition and "go shopping". A justification form is signed by the department head and the requisition is approved by the department head in the system (the requisition may also have to go to other chains of approval as well, like Research and Budget, depending on the type of purchase). Any purchase over $3,000 must be approved by the City Manager. The City Manager does not, as a matter of routine, approve requisitions. She approved the small purchase agenda items as submitted by the Purchasing Department. In all cases, the requisition is approved by the department head before it is routed to Purchasing, regardless of the amount of the requisition. If the amount of the requisition is unknown, the requisition will not be finalized until the event is bid. If the quotes obtained by a department exceeds $25,000 then the item will be bid out formally. When in doubt, purchasing errs on the side of formally bidding a project.

If there is already an annual contract in place for a particular product or service, the requester still creates a requisition and a P.O. is still issued. It doesn't matter if there is a template in the system or not. The system will reflect an annual contract in place and the P.O. is processed. If there is a template in place, the item will flip to a P.O. automatically without a buyer having to actually flip the requisition. If GSPC is matching annual contracts to P.O.s it may not be possible to track the contract back to the event.

Contract Analysts process payments to prime contractors for large construction projects using a payment voucher, not a P.O.

IV. M/WBE Program

M/WBE goals apply only to construction contracts that are $100,000 or more and to RFPs for professional services contracts that are $75,000 or more. Sometimes there

are no goals established, if it is determined that there are no subcontracting opportunities within a specific NIGP category. When three (3) bids are required departments must obtain at least one quotation from a Minority or Woman-owned business if available for purchases between $1,000 and $25,000. This is stated on the Best Bid justification form. M/WBE Contract compliance does not have any oversight over contracts that only require the three (3) quotes.

Using the Supplier List (see definition below), M/WBE goals are calculated by dividing the number of M/WBE certified firms in a given trade (or within a specific NIGP Codes) into the total number of firms in the same trade (or within that specific NIGP Code) for a given project.

Savannah also has a local preference program, but that program does not operate in conjunction with the M/WBE Program. It is administered by Purchasing. It is stated in the Savannah City Ordinance Section 2-4061(7) that there is a preference for local minority business enterprise or local women business enterprises as primes. Local M/WBEs can also satisfy the local preference goals. Savannah offers all eligible bidders the opportunity to meet local preference criteria, but they must be certified as an MWBE in the system.

V. Data Assessment

A. General Data

Savannah maintains its data in a centralized ERP system called "Lawson" which is currently managed by Joy Wilkinson. This system took over from "Lotus Notes" and "CCS" in 2011.

Commodity Code System: Savannah's utilizes NIGP codes.

Issue: Firms on the Supplier List are encouraged to select NIGP codes not only in the areas that they perform in, but also in areas that they are interested in. There is no primary NIGP code listing so there is no way to know if firms actually perform in the areas that they are listed under. GSPC can attempt to minimize the impact of this by attempting to match as many firms as possible in the areas where they actually perform by listing them only in the NIGP codes that they bid in or are awarded in; match them to primary codes that they are registered in for other jurisdictions; and match the obvious words in their names to what they do (e.g. XYZ Construction, assumed to be a construction company; ABE Hauling, assume to be a trucking

company, etc.) GSPC will work with its Sr. Economist, Dr. Gregory Price to make sure that any solutions with not bias the analysis. Note: It may not be practical to contact and get a response from every firm to confirm their primary areas of work within the constraints of this Study, however, once GSPC has reviewed the data files and is able to determine how many firms cannot be matched to work codes, it can better assess if verification can be obtained, other than by sampling to determine our margin of error.

B. Specific Data files

It was determined in this meeting that GSPC will need from Savannah:

- Interface Listing Report – (Study Period)
- Events List – (issued during Study Period)
- Supplier List (current)
- Vendor List (current)
- Awards (made during Study Period)
- P.O's & Voucher Lists (made during the Study Period)
- Contract numbers (from the Study Period)
- Payments (made during Study Period)
- Bidders list (during the Study Period)
- Subcontractor data (during the Study Period)
- Certified M/WBE list (current)
- Work code keys and descriptions

1. Interface Listing Report -Requisitions

All requisitions, regardless of amount, are entered into Lawson. It includes a requisition number of 5-6 digits. Most large construction projects do not come with a requisition.

2. Events List

If a project is bid or written up for City Manager approval, , it is sent to "Rich Client" and it is given an event number unless it is between $1,000.01 and $3,000, then it keeps the requisition number until the project is awarded and then given a P.O. number. Every event line item must have a (only one) NIGP code. There can be no bid or award without an NIGP code in Rich Client.

3. Supplier List

The supplier list is a kind of registered vendor list. It is a self-identifying system. Firms are supposed to attach e-verify and save affidavit forms to their accounts upon registration. Buyers do not typically award events without those documents uploaded and will contact the suppliers to get that information into the system. Information provided here is self-identified with no back up documentation required. There are about 5,383 firms on the Supplier List, but this includes duplicates.

This is the data file that is used to determine M/WBE goals. Firms are encouraged to register in not just NIGP codes that they perform work in, but in all areas that they have interest in.

4. Vendor List

The Vendor List is an accounts payable list and is maintained by the Finance Department. A firm must be on this list in order to have payments processed, but a firm can be on this list even though they are not on the supplier list. If a firm is issued a contract, it also must have a vendor number and not just a supplier number. This file would also have EIN numbers on every firm.

The Vendor List also indicates M/WBE status, but is not reliable since many times firms may be on the certified list, but not identify in the Vendor List. City staff adds information based on information provided by the requesters or in some cases, vendors. Purchasing can add a firm to the list, but they cannot change the entries.

5. Awards

The Purchasing Department has copies of small purchase agendas approved by the City Manager in PDF form but not in spreadsheets for at least the last few years.

Issue: For all other purchases, Savannah may not maintain a separate award data file, so GSPC will either have to reverse engineer payments (match payments to POs and POs to events), but this will not capture amounts of awards that have not yet been paid, or GSPC will have to manually enter award data from paper contracts.

It is possible that the City Manager's Office (Margaret Williams) keeps a spread sheet of all awards approved by the City Manager from $3,000.01- $25,000 for at least the last year. GSPC will try to get a copy of that excel spreadsheet if there is not electronic award file.

C. P.O.s & Vouchers

Once a project is awarded, it is given a P.O. number. Both Smart Office and Rich Client can generate P.O. numbers. It depends on where the item is awarded. Note that we were mistaken that annual contracts are given a voucher number. Annual contracts are issued P.O. numbers. Large construction awards may be given a payment voucher number. If the P.O. field is blank in the payment files, it is because there is a voucher number instead.

D. Contract Numbers

A one-time purchase does not get a contract number. Only annual contracts have contract numbers. These numbers are only used by the Purchasing Department and do not go into the payments file in Finance.

E. Payments

The Payment files are maintained by the Finance Department.

With the new Lawson system came new vendor ID numbers; however the payment files still have the old vendor ID number as a field. The new system added one digit to the event code.

There are no NIGP codes in the payment files. The identifiers are P.O. numbers, voucher numbers, and event numbers.

Payment files will also include employee payments and expenses and other payments that are not from competitive bids; however, GSPC can filter those out using the GL Codes, to which finance will provide us a key.

F. Bidders

Bid tabulations are available in PDF form on the Savannah website back to 2011. Bid tabulations include all events. GSPC has begun to enter these and there are addresses on some but many do not have addresses for bidders, just their names. Prior to 2011, bid tabs are listed on the Savannah website as “closed” or “historical bids,” but may need the name or bid number. If needed, the RFPs themselves are available only in hard copies; however, ITBs may be available

electronically as they can be submitted that way. Large construction bids cannot be submitted electronically. They can only be submitted manually. Event files are kept for one year and then they are moved to archives.

It is important to note that the same event can have several components. For example, a large construction projects over $500,000 have an RFSQ which prequalifies bidders. Those bidders that are qualified will then bid. There will then be a list of bidders that were compliant with the M/WBE goals (doesn't list M/WBEs but just lists them as compliant) and finally, the opening of the cost proposals.

G. Subcontractors

The Savannah M/WBE Program's Contractor Compliance Coordinator manages city contracts that have goals. Contracts are managed from award to project completion with subcontractor relations, payments, formal agreements, and outreach/education. Primes report subcontractor utilization on a form 1437 which are housed with the Contract Analyst and the M/WBE Contract Compliance Coordinator. GSPC will review this information to make sure that all M/WBE and non-M/WBE subcontractor information needed is included.

The Contract analysts also maintain a list of subcontractors (no payment information) for purposes of 1230 subcontractor verification forms for Public Works and Water Resources and Development Services. This data is maintained in paper form in individual files and subcontractors can be located by providing them with the project name or CIP number.

Also, M/WBEs that were included as subcontractors in the bids are specifically identified with the percentages of the bid awarded in the City Council minutes.

Prior to release of a bid, the buyer assigns NIGP codes to each line item (which could be subcontracted) in order to attract subcontractors who might have interest in the bid, even though Purchasing does not track subcontractors. Only one commodity code can be attached to a line item in Rich Client; however additional commodity codes can also be attached to the event to cast a wider net.

GSPC will have to conduct a prime vendor questionnaire, or a questionnaire to the subcontractors themselves to obtain subcontractor payment data.

H. Certified M/WBE list

Savannah updates the certified list every quarter. GSPC will be provided a recently updated list from which to conduct its analysis.

MBEs are listed only as MBEs on the certified list, but the M/WBE Program can supply ethnicities from the certification applications.

M/WBEs are certified only in areas where they can perform the work, with a maximum of four (4) NIGP codes.

APPENDIX B

CITY OF SAVANNAH, GEORGIA

DATA COLLECTION PLAN

The data collection plan utilizes the information gathered in the Data Assessment Report, and sets forth a preliminary plan for actual retrieval of the data.

A. Prime Vendor Questionnaire

Assigned	Task	Start	Finish	Completed
Igs/Tj/mcj	Prepare questions for Prime Vendor Questionnaire – primary purpose is to obtain subcontractor data, as well as information on the prime itself to verify the City's data.	4/20/15	4/14/15	
Igs	Prepare letter for signature by City Manager to accompany the questionnaire (letter should be dated 6/1/15)	4/27/15	5/1/15	
Igs	Obtain data file of all payments for City of Savannah (excluding goods, which typically have no subcontracting) from David Maxwell; and the Event list from Molly Huhn in Purchasing.	5/4/15	5/15/15	
Tj	Clean data files to prepare for mail merge	5/18/15	5/29/15	
Sj to Mailing House	Send survey instrument to mailing house to do mail merge a)Vendor Name & Address and b) Contract information, then questionnaires sent by mailing house with a return date of 7/1/15	6/1/15	6/1/15	
Ams/ra	Phone follow up on all unreturned questionnaires	6/22/15	6/26/15	
	ALL COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRES IN BY	7/15/15		
	ALL COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRES ENTERED BY	8/1/15		

B. Survey of Business Owners

Assigned	Task	Start	Finish	Completed
Igs/price	Prepare questions for Survey of Business Owners primary use is for Private Sector Analysis and Anecdotal Evidence	4/15/15	5/1/15	
Mcj	Obtain City of Savannah's current Supplier (from Molly Huhn in Purchasing) and Vendor files (from David Maxwell in Finance) and obtain the State of Georgia (firms in City of Savannah and contiguous counties)	4/15/15	4/22/15	
Tj/pc	Clean data files	4/27/15	5/1/15	
Mcj/tj/price	Take a random stratified sample of firms in each of the major purchasing category construction, professional services, other services, or goods	5/4/15	5/4/15	
Survey Research Firm	Send questions and sample information to Survey Research Firm to conduct the telephone survey of 200 firms	5/11/15	5/11/15	
	ALL SURVEYS RECEIVED BY GSPC	6/22/15		

C. Collection of Manual Data

1. If award data is not provided by the City electronically, this is a contingent plan to collect it manually.

Assigned	Task	Start	Finish	Completed
Igs/mcj	Request award data for awards between $3,000.01-$25,000 from Margaret Williams in City Manager's Office	6/8/15	6/26/15	
Igs/mcj	Request hard copies of all hard copy contracts from Molly Huhn, Purchasing for the entire study period. GSPC will receive in boxes or will go to archives is stored there.	6/8/15	7/10/15	
Igs/mcj	Develop data collection form, both in hard copy and in Access.	7/13/15	7/14/15	
Igs/mcj/cb	Train data collection supervisor and hire and train temporary data entry personnel	7/17/15	7/17/15	
Igs/mcj/cb	Enter data using 4 temporary entry data personnel in City of Savannah's offices.	7/20/15	7/31/15	
	ALL AWARD DATA ENTERED	7/31/15		

2. Bid Tabulations

Assigned	Task	Start	Finish	Completed
Mcj/tj/pc	Download all bid tabulations from the Savannah Purchasing website & print	4/13/15	5/5/15	
Mcj/tj	Develop data collection form, both in hard copy and in Access.	4/15/15	4/21/15	
Igs/mcj	Train data collection supervisor and hire and train temporary data entry personnel	4/22/15	4/24/15	
Igs/pc	Enter data using 2 temporary entry data personnel in Griffin & Strong's offices	4/27/15	6/26/15	
	ALL BID TABULATIONS ENTERED	6/26/15		

3. Subcontractor Names & Addresses

Assigned	Task	Start	Finish	Completed
Mcj/tj	Request subcontractor names and addresses from Kathy Maggioni (water services) and Ann Trammell (public works) in hard copies or pdf	4/13/15	5/5/15	
Igs/mcj	Develop data collection form, both in hard copy and in Access.	4/15/15	4/21/15	
Igs/mcj	Train data collection supervisor and hire and train temporary data entry personnel	4/22/15	4/24/15	
Igs/mcj	Enter data using 2 temporary entry data personnel in GSPC's offices. (Note: if data is not provided in pdfs and has to be entered from hard copies, GSPC will collect data in Savannah's offices at the same time that award data is entered in July, 15 (See C(1) above.	4/27/15	5/29/15	
	ALL SUBCONTRACTOR DATA ENTERED	5/29/15		

D. Collect Electronic Data

Assigned	Task	Start	Finish	Completed
Mcj/igs	Submit request for electronic data including the following to Molly Huhn in Purchasing, specifying fields of information needed: a. Interface Listing Report (Study Period)- with list of requisitions b. Events data files (Current)– with list of events and event numbers c. Supplier List (Current) d. Awards List(Study Period) (if it exists in electronic format or PDF) e. Contract File (Study Period)– includes contract numbers f. Work code keys and descriptions.	4/21/15	5/15/15	
Mcj/igs	Submit request for electronic data, including the following to David Maxwell in Finance, specifying fields of information needed: a. Payments (Study Period) (If possible filter out employee payments, travel, expenses, legal settlements, purchase of land, and if possible non-competitive contracts, if not, GSPC will filter out using GL codes. b. GL codes and descriptions c. Vendor List (Current) d. P.O's & Vouchers (Study Period)	4/21/15	5/15/15	
Mcj/igs	Submit request for electronic data, including the following to MarRonde Lumpkin-Lotson in MWBE Program, specifying fields of information needed: a. Updated MWBE List with ethnic identities from certification application.			
	ALL ELECTRONIC DATA COLLECTED	5/15/15		

E. Purchasing Practices, Policies & Procedures Interviews

Assigned	Task	Start	Finish	Completed
Lob	Contact Purchasing buyers and departments to make appoints to be interviewed	4/13/15	4/24/15	
Lob	Conduct approx. 60 minute interviews with each department or persons to ascertain their understanding of both policy and practices	4/27/15	5/6/15	
Lob	Interviews will be written up as completed	4/27/15	5/6/15	
	PURCHASING PRACTICES INTERVIEWS COMPLETED	5/6/15		

F. Anecdotal Evidence

Assigned	Task	Start	Finish	Completed
Igs/mcj/tj	Take random sample of Relevant market Vendors, ask Molly Huhn and MarRhonde Lumpkin-Lotson for outspoken vendors and civil leaders to interview in addition to the sample.	4/14/15	6/8/15	
Cb	Set up in-person interviews	6/8/15	6/29/15	
Cb	Conduct interviews using a script but receiving information not on script as well (interviews are recorded) and write up summary of interviews, particularly documenting any accounts of marketplace discrimination	6/29/15	7/20/15	
	Conduct public hearing	7/13/15	7/20/15	
	ANECDOTAL EVIDENCE	7/20/15		

G. Private Sector Analysis

Assigned	Task	Start	Finish	Completed
Price	Collect publicly available data e.g. census and economic data as useful	6/22/15	9/21/15	
	PRIVATE SECTOR DATA COLLECTED	9/21/15		

H. External Data

Assigned	Task	Start	Finish	Completed
Igs/mcj	Request electronic vendor data from State of Georgia, Chatham County, and Chatham County Public Schools to be used for availability estimates	4/15/15	5/15/15	
lgs	Research and request recent disparity studies (executive summaries) from nearby jurisdictions	6/1/15	6/26/15	
	EXTERNAL DATA COLLECTED	6/26/15		

I. Miscellaneous Reports & Data

Assigned	Task	Start	Finish	Completed
Mcj	Request all annual reports from Molly Huhn and MarRhonde Lumpkin-Lotson	4/15/15	5/15/15	
	MISCELLANEOUS REPORTS & DATA COLLECTED	5/15/15		

Personnel Assigned Key

Mcj – Michele Clark Jenkins, Project Manager

Igs-Imani Strong, Deputy Project Manager

Tj-Tanesha Jones, Data analyst

Sj-Susan Johnson, Project Administrator

Ams-Andrea Stokes, Administration Support/Data Entry

Ra-Rachel Anderson, Administration Support/Data Entry

Lob-Larry O'Brien, Local Subcontractor

Cb-Carol Blackshear, Local Subcontractor

Pc-Paul Cheng, Data Entry

Price-Dr. Gregory Price, Senior Economist

Respectfully submitted this 14th day of April, 2015

By Michele Clark Jenkins
Project Manager
Griffin & Strong, P.C.

APPENDIX C

Prime Vendor Questionnaire
Savannah Disparity Study - 2015

Prime Vendor Name_____ Prime Vendor Savannah Vendor ID#_____

Prime Vendor Address_____City_____ ST_____Zip_____

Prime Vendor Phone_____Prime Vendor Email_____

Prime Vendor MWBE/DBE Status (Circle all applicable) Non-Minority Male Non-Minority Female African American Asian or Pacific Islander

Asian-Indian Hispanic American Indian and Alaskan Native If certified, list one current Certifying Agency _____

Project/Contract Number_____ Project/Contract Description _____Project/Contract Date_____

Prime Vendor Event NIGP Code _____Contract Work Category (circle one) Construction Professional Services General Services Goods & Supplies

If no subcontractors were used on this project, please check here: _____

Subcontractor/ Subconsultant Savannah Vendor ID No.	Subcontractor/ Subconsultant Name	Subcontractor City, State, Zip	MWBE/DBE Status of Subcontractor (see list above)	Scope of Work Performed (Description)	Subcontractor Work Category (Required) NIGP or Choose one – (see list above)	Total Amount Paid to Subcontract or ($)	Estimated Remaining Amount to be paid to Subcontract or	If amounts remaining to be paid to Subcontractor, provide estimated date of final payment (mm/yy)	If an amount remaining to be paid to Subcontractor is such amount fixed or on an as-needed basis	Full Prime Contract amount, including amendments

Please return questionnaire by September 18, 2015 to: Savannah Disparity Study, c/o Griffin & Strong, P.C., P. O. Box 368, Kennesaw, GA 30144, or email to SavannahStudy@gspclaw.com, or fax to 404-584-9730.

Question #1: How many years has your firm been in operation? _____

Question #2: How many employees do you have on staff? _____

Question #3: How many full-time employees do you have? _____

Question #4: How many part-time employees do you have? _____

For the following financial questions, please circle the appropriate response.

Question #5: What was the gross revenue of your company for 2014? Circle the correct range.

Under $100,000	$100,000-$249,000	$250,000-$499,000	$500,000-$749,000	$750,000-$999,999	$1,000,000-$4,999,999	$5,000,000-$9,999,999	$10,000,000 and over

Question #6: What was the bonding capacity of your company for each of the following years? Circle the correct range.

2010	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**
$500,000 to $1,000,000	$500,000 to $1,000,000	$500,000 to $1,000,000	$500,000 to $1,000,000	$500,000 to $1,000,000
$1,000,001 to $1,500,000	$1,000,001 to $1,500,000	$1,000,001 to $1,500,000	$1,000,001 to $1,500,000	$1,000,001 to $1,500,000
$1,500,001 to $2,000,000	$1,500,001 to $2,000,000	$1,500,001 to $2,000,000	$1,500,001 to $2,000,000	$1,500,001 to $2,000,000
$2,000,001 to $2,500,000	$2,000,001 to $2,500,000	$2,000,001 to $2,500,000	$2,000,001 to $2,500,000	$2,000,001 to $2,500,000
$2,500,001 to $3,000,000	$2,500,001 to $3,000,000	$2,500,001 to $3,000,000	$2,500,001 to $3,000,000	$2,500,001 to $3,000,000
$3,000,001 and greater	$3,000,001 and greater	$3,000,001 and greater	$3,000,001 and greater	$3,000,001 and greater

The following questions concern information about the owner of the company. Please circle the correct response where appropriate.

Question #7: How old is the oldest person or persons that owns at least 51% of the company?_____

Question #8: What is the gender of the person or persons that own more than 51% of the company?

1) Male
2) Female

Question #9: What is the highest level of education of the person or persons that own more than 51% of the company?

1) Some High School
2) High School Graduate
3) Some College
4) College Graduate
5) Some Post-Graduate Education
6) Graduate Degree (MA, PhD, MD etc.)

APPENDIX D

CITY OF SAVANNAH

DISPARITY STUDY

SURVEY OF BUSINESS OWNERS

CONDUCTED BY THE BURRUSS INSTITUTE AT KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY

Q1 Which one of the following is your company's primary line of business?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Construction Services	36 28.1%	16 34.0%	13 21.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	2 33.3%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	3 17.6%	72 26.9%
Professional Services	38 29.7%	13 27.7%	33 55.0%	1 25.0%	1 100.0%	2 33.3%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	8 47.1%	97 36.2%
General Services	14 10.9%	7 14.9%	8 13.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	2 11.8%	33 12.3%
Goods & Materials	37 28.9%	11 23.4%	6 10.0%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	2 33.3%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	4 23.5%	63 23.5%
No Response	3 2.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 1.1%
Total	128 100.0%	47 100.0%	60 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	268 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q2 In what year range was your company established?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Before 1961	26 20.3%	4 8.3%	3 5.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	6 35.3%	40 14.9%
1960-1979	21 16.4%	8 16.7%	5 8.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 11.8%	36 13.4%
1980-1989	30 23.4%	10 20.8%	4 6.7%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	3 17.6%	51 19.0%
1990-1999	14 10.9%	8 16.7%	8 13.3%	1 25.0%	1 100.0%	2 33.3%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	37 13.8%
2000-2009	28 21.9%	9 18.8%	22 36.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 50.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	4 23.5%	67 24.9%
2010-2015	7 5.5%	9 18.8%	17 28.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	34 12.6%
Don't know	2 1.6%	0 0.0%	1 1.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 1.5%
Total	128 100.0%	48 100.0%	60 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	269 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q3 Is your company a sole proprietor, partnership, corporation, or other?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Sole proprietor	8 6.3%	2 4.2%	16 27.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	27 10.1%
Corporation	92 71.9%	31 64.6%	24 40.7%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	3 50.0%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	13 76.5%	171 63.8%
Limited Liability Corporation	25 19.5%	13 27.1%	17 28.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 50.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	2 11.8%	61 22.8%
Partnership	1 0.8%	0 0.0%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 0.7%
Limited Liability Partnership	0 0.0%	1 2.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 0.4%
Non-Profit Organization	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 11.8%	3 1.1%
Other (specify)	2 1.6%	1 2.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 1.1%
Total	128 100.0%	48 100.0%	59 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	268 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q4 On average, how many employees does your company keep on the payroll, including full-time and part-time staff?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
1-10	50 39.1%	28 59.6%	44 73.3%	3 75.0%	0 0.0%	3 50.0%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	4 23.5%	135 50.4%
11-30	26 20.3%	12 25.5%	6 10.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	47 17.5%
31-50	10 7.8%	3 6.4%	3 5.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	18 6.7%
51-75	7 5.5%	2 4.3%	2 3.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	12 4.5%
76-100	5 3.9%	0 0.0%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 2.2%
Over 100	29 22.7%	2 4.3%	3 5.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	12 70.6%	48 17.9%
Don't know	1 0.8%	0 0.0%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 0.7%
Total	128 100.0%	47 100.0%	60 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	268 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q5 On average, how many racial or ethnic minority employees does your company keep on the payroll, including full-time and part-time staff?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									Total
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	
1-5	57 47.9%	30 65.2%	42 70.0%	3 75.0%	0 0.0%	3 50.0%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	4 23.5%	142 55.0%
6-10	15 12.6%	3 6.5%	4 6.7%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	24 9.3%
11-15	4 3.4%	1 2.2%	2 3.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 2.7%
16-20	6 5.0%	0 0.0%	2 3.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	11 4.3%
21 or More	26 21.8%	3 6.5%	9 15.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	2 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 41.2%	48 18.6%
Don't know	11 9.2%	9 19.6%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	4 23.5%	26 10.1%
Total	119 100.0%	46 100.0%	60 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	258 100.0%

Q6 On average, how many women employees does your company keep on the payroll, including full-time and part-time staff?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi Racial	Other (specify)	Total
1-5	70 56.9%	37 77.1%	43 75.4%	3 75.0%	1 100.0%	4 66.7%	4 100.0%	0 0.0%	4 23.5%	166 63.8%
6-10	11 8.9%	6 12.5%	5 8.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	24 9.2%
11-15	5 4.1%	2 4.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 2.7%
16-20	4 3.3%	1 2.1%	1 1.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	7 2.7%
21 or More	25 20.3%	1 2.1%	6 10.5%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	8 47.1%	42 16.2%
Don't know	8 6.5%	1 2.1%	2 3.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 17.6%	14 5.4%
Total	123 100.0%	48 100.0%	57 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	0 0.0%	17 100.0%	260 100.0%

Q9 What is the highest level of education completed by the owner of your company?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Some High School	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 0.4%
High School Graduate	5 4.1%	8 16.7%	4 6.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	18 6.9%
Some College	14 11.5%	11 22.9%	12 20.3%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	2 12.5%	45 17.2%
College Graduate	64 52.5%	19 39.6%	19 32.2%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 18.8%	108 41.4%
Post Graduate Degree	26 21.3%	8 16.7%	20 33.9%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	2 33.3%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	5 31.3%	63 24.1%
Trade or Technical Certificate	2 1.6%	0 0.0%	2 3.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 2.3%
Don't Know	11 9.0%	2 4.2%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 37.5%	20 7.7%
Total	122 100.0%	48 100.0%	59 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	16 100.0%	261 100.0%

Q10 How many years of experience in your company's business line does the primary owner of your company have?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
1-5	2 1.6%	0 0.0%	4 6.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	8 3.0%
6-10	2 1.6%	10 20.8%	6 10.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	18 6.7%
11-15	6 4.7%	7 14.6%	8 13.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	3 17.6%	25 9.3%
16-20	10 7.8%	8 16.7%	11 18.3%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	32 11.9%
More than 20	105 82.0%	22 45.8%	30 50.0%	3 75.0%	0 0.0%	5 83.3%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	9 52.9%	177 65.8%
Don't know	3 2.3%	1 2.1%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 23.5%	9 3.3%
Total	128 100.0%	48 100.0%	60 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	269 100.0%

Q11 Company gross revenues for calendar year 2014										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									Total
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	
$50,000 or less	4 3.1%	6 12.5%	19 32.2%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	32 12.0%
$50,001 - $100,000	3 2.4%	6 12.5%	8 13.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	17 6.4%
$100,001 - $300,000	10 7.9%	6 12.5%	14 23.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	2 11.8%	35 13.1%
$300,001 - $500,000	11 8.7%	4 8.3%	2 3.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	18 6.7%
$500,001 - $1,000,000	13 10.2%	4 8.3%	4 6.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	23 8.6%
$1,000,001 - $3,000,000	20 15.7%	8 16.7%	3 5.1%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	34 12.7%
$3,000,001 - $5,000,000	9 7.1%	4 8.3%	2 3.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	16 6.0%
$5,000,001 to $10,000,000	13 10.2%	5 10.4%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	2 11.8%	22 8.2%
over $10 million	35 27.6%	3 6.3%	3 5.1%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	3 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 58.8%	55 20.6%
Don't know	9 7.1%	2 4.2%	3 5.1%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	15 5.6%
Total	127 100.0%	48 100.0%	59 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	267 100.0%

Q12 Company public sector gross (government) revenues for calendar year 2014.										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
$50,000 or less	23 18.3%	17 35.4%	26 44.8%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	71 26.8%
$50,001 - $100,000	10 7.9%	9 18.8%	6 10.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 17.6%	29 10.9%
$100,001 - $300,000	14 11.1%	2 4.2%	8 13.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	25 9.4%
$300,001 - $500,000	9 7.1%	6 12.5%	4 6.9%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	21 7.9%
$500,001 - $1,000,000	16 12.7%	3 6.3%	4 6.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	24 9.1%
$1,000,001 - $3,000,000	14 11.1%	0 0.0%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	16 6.0%
$3,000,001 - $5,000,000	3 2.4%	2 4.2%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	7 2.6%
$5,000,001 to $10,000,000	4 3.2%	3 6.3%	2 3.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 11.8%	12 4.5%
over $10 million	16 12.7%	0 0.0%	2 3.4%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	2 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	8 47.1%	29 10.9%
Don't know	17 13.5%	6 12.5%	4 6.9%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 17.6%	31 11.7%
Total	126 100.0%	48 100.0%	58 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	265 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q13 Are you required to have bonding for the type of work your company bids?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	35 27.3%	11 22.9%	16 26.7%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	3 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 17.6%	70 26.0%
No	84 65.6%	33 68.8%	41 68.3%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	3 50.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	12 70.6%	181 67.3%
Don't know	9 7.0%	4 8.3%	3 5.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 11.8%	18 6.7%
Total	128 100.0%	48 100.0%	60 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	269 100.0%

Q14 What is your current aggregate bonding limit?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian - Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial	Other (specify)	Total
Below $100,000	1 2.9%	1 9.1%	4 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 8.6%
$100,001 to $500,000	5 14.3%	1 9.1%	2 12.5%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	9 12.9%
$500,001 to $1,000,000	2 5.7%	2 18.2%	2 12.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 10.0%
$1,000,001 to $1,500,000	3 8.6%	0 0.0%	1 6.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 5.7%
Over $1,500,000	21 60.0%	6 54.5%	3 18.8%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	2 66.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 66.7%	35 50.0%
Don't know	3 8.6%	1 9.1%	4 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	9 12.9%
Total	35 100.0%	11 100.0%	16 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	70 100.0%

Q15 What is your current single project bonding limit?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial	Other (specify)	Total
Below $100,000	1 2.9%	0 0.0%	2 12.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 5.7%
$100,001 to $500,000	4 11.4%	1 9.1%	3 18.8%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	9 12.9%
$500,001 to $1,000,000	4 11.4%	2 18.2%	1 6.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 10.0%
$1,000,001 to $1,500,000	2 5.7%	2 18.2%	1 6.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 8.6%
Over $1,500,000	18 51.4%	3 27.3%	5 31.3%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 66.7%	30 42.9%
Don't know	6 17.1%	3 27.3%	4 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	14 20.0%
Total	35 100.0%	11 100.0%	16 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	70 100.0%

Q16_1 From 2010-2014, how many times has your company submitted bids or proposals for projects as prime contractor on – City of Savannah Public Projects										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
None	31 24.2%	14 29.2%	23 38.3%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	3 50.0%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	4 23.5%	80 29.7%
1-10	64 50.0%	24 50.0%	32 53.3%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	3 50.0%	1 25.0%	1 100.0%	10 58.8%	136 50.6%
11-25	17 13.3%	7 14.6%	3 5.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	2 11.8%	30 11.2%
26-50	5 3.9%	2 4.2%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	8 3.0%
51-100	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 0.4%
Over 100	2 1.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 0.7%
Don't know	9 7.0%	1 2.1%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	12 4.5%
Total	128 100.0%	48 100.0%	60 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	269 100.0%

Q16_2 From 2010-2014, how many times has your company submitted bids or proposals for projects as prime contractor on – Private Sector Projects										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
None	28 24.8%	13 29.5%	19 39.6%	2 66.7%	1 100.0%	3 60.0%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	3 21.4%	71 30.5%
1-10	21 18.6%	9 20.5%	19 39.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 20.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	3 21.4%	54 23.2%
11-25	7 6.2%	10 22.7%	6 12.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 7.1%	25 10.7%
26-50	5 4.4%	2 4.5%	2 4.2%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 7.1%	11 4.7%
51-100	10 8.8%	5 11.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 20.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 7.1%	17 7.3%
Over 100	28 24.8%	4 9.1%	1 2.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	3 21.4%	37 15.9%
Don't know	14 12.4%	1 2.3%	1 2.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 14.3%	18 7.7%
Total	113 100.0%	44 100.0%	48 100.0%	3 100.0%	1 100.0%	5 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	14 100.0%	233 100.0%

Q16_3 From 2010-2014, how many times has your company submitted bids or proposals for projects as prime contractor on – Other Public Sector (non-City Projects)										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
None	25 22.3%	12 28.6%	18 36.0%	2 66.7%	1 100.0%	1 20.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	2 14.3%	62 26.7%
1-10	29 25.9%	12 28.6%	24 48.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 40.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	4 28.6%	72 31.0%
11-25	11 9.8%	7 16.7%	4 8.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 20.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	24 10.3%
26-50	10 8.9%	5 11.9%	2 4.0%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	1 20.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 14.3%	21 9.1%
51-100	8 7.1%	3 7.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 7.1%	12 5.2%
Over 100	15 13.4%	1 2.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	3 21.4%	20 8.6%
Don't know	14 12.5%	2 4.8%	2 4.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	2 14.3%	21 9.1%
Total	112 100.0%	42 100.0%	50 100.0%	3 100.0%	1 100.0%	5 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	14 100.0%	232 100.0%

Q17_1 From 2010-2014, has your company performed any work as a prime contractor for City of Savannah Public Projects?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	43 48.9%	21 63.6%	5 14.3%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	1 100.0%	7 58.3%	79 44.9%
No	39 44.3%	12 36.4%	30 85.7%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	3 25.0%	89 50.6%
Don't know	6 6.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 16.7%	8 4.5%
Total	88 100.0%	33 100.0%	35 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	12 100.0%	176 100.0%

Q17_2 From 2010-2014, has your company performed any work as a prime contractor for Private Sector Projects?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	48 67.6%	24 80.0%	17 63.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	7 77.8%	100 69.9%
No	20 28.2%	6 20.0%	10 37.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 22.2%	40 28.0%
Don't know	3 4.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 2.1%
Total	71 100.0%	30 100.0%	27 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	9 100.0%	143 100.0%

Q17_3 From 2010-2014, has your company performed any work as a prime contractor for Other Public Sector (non-City projects)?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	48 65.8%	23 82.1%	13 44.8%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	3 75.0%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	6 60.0%	95 64.2%
No	22 30.1%	5 17.9%	16 55.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	2 66.7%	0 0.0%	3 30.0%	49 33.1%
Don't know	3 4.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 10.0%	4 2.7%
Total	73 100.0%	28 100.0%	29 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	10 100.0%	148 100.0%

Q18_1 From 2010-2014, did your company use a subcontractor or sub-consultant on projects in City of Savannah Public Projects?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	19 44.2%	5 23.8%	2 40.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 42.9%	29 36.7%
No	23 53.5%	16 76.2%	3 60.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	4 57.1%	48 60.8%
Don't know	1 2.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 2.5%
Total	43 100.0%	21 100.0%	5 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%	7 100.0%	79 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q18_2 From 2010-2014, did your company used a subcontractor or sub-consultant on projects in Private Sector Projects?									
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify								
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	33 68.8%	10 41.7%	8 47.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	4 57.1%	56 56.0%
No	15 31.3%	14 58.3%	9 52.9%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	3 42.9%	43 43.0%
Don't know	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.0%
Total	48 100.0%	24 100.0%	17 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	7 100.0%	100 100.0%

Q18_3 From 2010-2014, did your company use a subcontractor or sub-consultant on projects in Other Public Sector (non-City Projects)?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	32 68.1%	12 52.2%	6 46.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 50.0%	54 57.4%
No	14 29.8%	11 47.8%	7 53.8%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 66.7%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	3 50.0%	39 41.5%
Don't know	1 2.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.1%
Total	47 100.0%	23 100.0%	13 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	6 100.0%	94 100.0%

Q19_1 How frequently do you use minority or woman-owned subcontractors or sub-consultants on City of Savannah Public Projects?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Very Often	9 47.4%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	12 41.4%
Often	5 26.3%	2 40.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 24.1%
Seldom	4 21.1%	1 20.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 17.2%
Never	1 5.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 3.4%
Don't know	0 0.0%	2 40.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 66.7%	4 13.8%
Total	19 100.0%	5 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	29 100.0%

Q19_2 How frequently do you use minority or woman-owned subcontractors or sub-consultants on Private Sector Projects?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Very Often	2 6.1%	2 20.0%	3 37.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	8 14.3%
Often	16 48.5%	4 40.0%	4 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	25 44.6%
Seldom	11 33.3%	3 30.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	15 26.8%
Never	2 6.1%	0 0.0%	1 12.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 5.4%
Don't know	2 6.1%	1 10.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 50.0%	5 8.9%
Total	33 100.0%	10 100.0%	8 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%	56 100.0%

Q19_3 How frequently do you use minority or woman-owned subcontractors or sub-consultants on Other Public Sector (non-City Projects)?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Very Often	6 18.8%	1 8.3%	3 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 66.7%	12 22.2%
Often	11 34.4%	5 41.7%	2 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	18 33.3%
Seldom	12 37.5%	3 25.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	17 31.5%
Never	1 3.1%	1 8.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 3.7%
Don't know	2 6.3%	2 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	5 9.3%
Total	32 100.0%	12 100.0%	6 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	54 100.0%

Q20 Did you serve as a subcontractor on a City of Savannah project between 2010 and 2014?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	32 25.4%	13 27.7%	9 15.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 33.3%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	59 22.3%
No	94 74.6%	34 72.3%	50 84.7%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	4 66.7%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	16 94.1%	206 77.7%
Total	126 100.0%	47 100.0%	59 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	265 100.0%

Q21 How often have you served as a subcontractor on a City project from 2010-2014?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
1-10 times	24 77.4%	10 76.9%	8 88.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	47 81.0%
11-25 times	6 19.4%	2 15.4%	1 11.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	9 15.5%
26-50 times	0 0.0%	1 7.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.7%
Don't know	1 3.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.7%
Total	31 100.0%	13 100.0%	9 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	58 100.0%

Q22 Have you been invited to participate in bids for public contracts with prime contractors that you may have worked with in the private sector?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	57 45.6%	25 53.2%	16 26.7%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	2 33.3%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	6 35.3%	109 41.1%
No	47 37.6%	16 34.0%	41 68.3%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	4 66.7%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	8 47.1%	121 45.7%
Don't know	21 16.8%	6 12.8%	3 5.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	1 100.0%	3 17.6%	35 13.2%
Total	125 100.0%	47 100.0%	60 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	265 100.0%

Q23 What is the amount of time that it typically takes to receive payment from the City of Savannah?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Less than 30 days	10 23.8%	7 33.3%	4 80.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%	3 42.9%	26 33.3%
30-60 days	24 57.1%	12 57.1%	1 20.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 28.6%	39 50.0%
60-90 days	5 11.9%	1 4.8%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 14.3%	8 10.3%
Don't know	3 7.1%	1 4.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 14.3%	5 6.4%
Total	42 100.0%	21 100.0%	5 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%	7 100.0%	78 100.0%

Q24 How would you rate the quality of interaction with Savannah on contract opportunities?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Extremely satisfied	13 10.2%	3 6.4%	8 13.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	4 25.0%	29 10.9%
Satisfied	39 30.7%	9 19.1%	7 11.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 33.3%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	3 18.8%	61 22.9%
Somewhat satisfied	10 7.9%	5 10.6%	4 6.7%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	2 12.5%	23 8.6%
Neutral	31 24.4%	19 40.4%	28 46.7%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	6 37.5%	88 33.1%
Somewhat dissatisfied	12 9.4%	7 14.9%	6 10.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	2 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	28 10.5%
Dissatisfied	9 7.1%	2 4.3%	4 6.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 6.3%	16 6.0%
Extremely dissatisfied	13 10.2%	2 4.3%	3 5.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	21 7.9%
Total	127 100.0%	47 100.0%	60 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	16 100.0%	266 100.0%

Q25_1 Encountered in your attempts to obtain work on projects for the City of Savannah - Pre-qualification requirements										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	16 100.0%	4 100.0%	9 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	33 100.0%
Total	16 100.0%	4 100.0%	9 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	33 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q25_2 Encountered in your attempts to obtain work on projects for the City of Savannah - Performance bond requirements										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	7 100.0%	2 100.0%	10 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	24 100.0%
Total	7 100.0%	2 100.0%	10 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	24 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q25_3 Encountered in your attempts to obtain work on projects for the City of Savannah - Bid bond requirements										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	8 100.0%	2 100.0%	12 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	26 100.0%
Total	8 100.0%	2 100.0%	12 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	26 100.0%

Q25_4 Encountered in your attempts to obtain work on projects for the City of Savannah - Financing										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	2 100.0%	4 100.0%	15 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	24 100.0%
Total	2 100.0%	4 100.0%	15 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	24 100.0%

Q25_5 Encountered in your attempts to obtain work on projects for the City of Savannah - Insurance requirements										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	5 100.0%	3 100.0%	6 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	14 100.0%
Total	5 100.0%	3 100.0%	6 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	14 100.0%

Q25_6 Encountered in your attempts to obtain work on projects for the City of Savannah - Bid specifications										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	28 100.0%	10 100.0%	12 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	55 100.0%
Total	28 100.0%	10 100.0%	12 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	55 100.0%

Q25_7 Encountered in your attempts to obtain work on projects for the City of Savannah - Limited time given to prepare bid package or quote										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	8 100.0%	2 100.0%	12 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	25 100.0%
Total	8 100.0%	2 100.0%	12 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	25 100.0%

Q25_8 Encountered in your attempts to obtain work on projects for the City of Savannah - Limited knowledge of purchasing / contracting policies and procedures										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	14 100.0%	4 100.0%	13 100.0%	0 0.0%	**0** 0.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	36 100.0%
Total	14 100.0%	4 100.0%	13 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	36 100.0%

Q25_9 Encountered in your attempts to obtain work on projects for the City of Savannah - Lack of experience										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	9 100.0%	2 100.0%	8 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	19 100.0%
Total	9 100.0%	2 100.0%	8 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	19 100.0%

Q25_10 Encountered in your attempts to obtain work on projects for the City of Savannah - Lack of personnel										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	3 100.0%	5 100.0%	5 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	15 100.0%
Total	3 100.0%	5 100.0%	5 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	15 100.0%

Q25_11 Encountered in your attempts to obtain work on projects for the City of Savannah - Contract too large										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									Total
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	
Yes	8 100.0%	8 100.0%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	21 100.0%
Total	8 100.0%	8 100.0%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	21 100.0%

Q25_12 Encountered in your attempts to obtain work on projects for the City of Savannah - Contract too expensive to bid										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	4 100.0%	2 100.0%	4 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 100.0%
Total	4 100.0%	2 100.0%	4 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 100.0%

Q25_13 Encountered in your attempts to obtain work on projects for the City of Savannah - Informal networks										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	9 100.0%	3 100.0%	11 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	25 100.0%
Total	9 100.0%	3 100.0%	11 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	25 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q25_14 Encountered in your attempts to obtain work on projects for the City of Savannah - Selection process										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	36 100.0%	10 100.0%	14 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%	69 100.0%
Total	36 100.0%	10 100.0%	14 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%	69 100.0%

Q25_15 Encountered in your attempts to obtain work on projects for the City of Savannah - Competing with large companies										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	25 100.0%	15 100.0%	28 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	76 100.0%
Total	25 100.0%	15 100.0%	28 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	76 100.0%

Q25_16 Encountered in your attempts to obtain work on projects for the City of Savannah - None										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	48 100.0%	16 100.0%	9 100.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	9 100.0%	87 100.0%
Total	48 100.0%	16 100.0%	9 100.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	9 100.0%	87 100.0%

Q26 Is your company a certified minority or woman-owned business?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	33 70.2%	40 70.2%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	5 83.3%	3 75.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	83 60.6%
No	0 0.0%	14 29.8%	17 29.8%	3 75.0%	1 100.0%	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	17 100.0%	54 39.4%
Total	0 0.0%	47 100.0%	57 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	137 100.0%

Q27_1 Are you a certified MBE (Minority Business Enterprise)?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	4 12.5%	33 86.8%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	4 80.0%	2 66.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	44 55.0%
No	0 0.0%	28 87.5%	5 13.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 20.0%	1 33.3%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	36 45.0%
Total	0 0.0%	32 100.0%	38 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	5 100.0%	3 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	80 100.0%

Q27_2 Are you a certified WBE (Women Business Enterprise)?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	25 75.8%	10 27.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 40.0%	2 66.7%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	40 50.0%
No	0 0.0%	8 24.2%	27 73.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	3 60.0%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	40 50.0%
Total	0 0.0%	33 100.0%	37 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	5 100.0%	3 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	80 100.0%

Q27_3 Are you a certified DBE (Disadvantaged Business Enterprise)?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	9 28.1%	18 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 40.0%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	30 38.5%
No	0 0.0%	23 71.9%	18 50.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	3 60.0%	2 66.7%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	48 61.5%
Total	0 0.0%	32 100.0%	36 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	5 100.0%	3 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	78 100.0%

Q28_1 Why is your company not certified? - We do not meet one or more of the requirements for certification										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native Other (specify)	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	8 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	12 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	8 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	12 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q28_2 Why is your company not certified? - The process of certification is confusing										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	5 100.0%	3 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	12 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	5 100.0%	3 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	12 100.0%

Q28_3 Why is your company not certified? - Certification is too expensive										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	4 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	4 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q28_4 Why is your company not certified? - I do not want the City to have information about my company										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									Total
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	
Yes	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	2 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	2 100.0%

Q28_5 Why is your company not certified? - I have not had time to get certified/the process is too time-consuming										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	8 100.0%	6 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	17 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	8 100.0%	6 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	17 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q28_6 Why is your company not certified? - Certification does not benefit and/or will negatively impact my company										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	3 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	3 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q28_7 Why is your company not certified? - Other (specify)										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	7 100.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 100.0%	18 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	7 100.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 100.0%	18 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q29 Do you believe that there is favoritism or disparate treatment in the certification process?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	7 14.9%	12 21.1%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	2 11.8%	24 17.5%
No	0 0.0%	16 34.0%	19 33.3%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	4 66.7%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	3 17.6%	45 32.8%
Don't know	0 0.0%	24 51.1%	26 45.6%	3 75.0%	0 0.0%	2 33.3%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	12 70.6%	68 49.6%
Total	0 0.0%	47 100.0%	57 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	137 100.0%

Q30_1 Are you certified with any of the following agencies? - City of Savannah										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	24 75.0%	24 64.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	3 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	53 67.9%
No	0 0.0%	4 12.5%	10 27.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	15 19.2%
Don't know	0 0.0%	4 12.5%	3 8.1%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 12.8%
Total	0 0.0%	32 100.0%	37 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%	3 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	78 100.0%

Q30_2 Are you certified with any of the following agencies? - Chatham County										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	19 63.3%	12 36.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	33 46.5%
No	0 0.0%	6 20.0%	18 54.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	26 36.6%
Don't know	0 0.0%	5 16.7%	3 9.1%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	1 50.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	12 16.9%
Total	0 0.0%	30 100.0%	33 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	71 100.0%

Q30_3 Are you certified with any of the following agencies? - Federal Small Business Administration										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	9 34.6%	17 51.5%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	28 41.2%
No	0 0.0%	11 42.3%	13 39.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 75.0%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	28 41.2%
Don't know	0 0.0%	6 23.1%	3 9.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	1 33.3%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	12 17.6%
Total	0 0.0%	26 100.0%	33 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%	3 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	68 100.0%

Q30_4 Are you certified with any of the following agencies? - Women's Business Enterprise National Council										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	3 11.5%	3 10.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 11.1%
No	0 0.0%	17 65.4%	26 86.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	47 74.6%
Don't know	0 0.0%	6 23.1%	1 3.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	9 14.3%
Total	0 0.0%	26 100.0%	30 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	63 100.0%

Q30_5 Are you certified with any of the following agencies? - Georgia Department of Transportation										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	12 42.9%	18 51.4%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 40.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	34 47.2%
No	0 0.0%	11 39.3%	13 37.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 40.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	26 36.1%
Don't know	0 0.0%	5 17.9%	4 11.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 20.0%	1 50.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	12 16.7%
Total	0 0.0%	28 100.0%	35 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	5 100.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	72 100.0%

Q30_6 Are you certified with any of the following agencies? - Savannah-Hilton Head International Airport										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	6 23.1%	3 10.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	14 21.5%
No	0 0.0%	14 53.8%	23 76.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	39 60.0%
Don't know	0 0.0%	6 23.1%	4 13.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	12 18.5%
Total	0 0.0%	26 100.0%	30 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%	3 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	65 100.0%

Q30_7 Are you certified with any of the following agencies? - Other (specify)										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	2 18.2%	6 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 75.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	13 36.1%
No	0 0.0%	6 54.5%	8 44.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	14 38.9%
Don't know	0 0.0%	3 27.3%	4 22.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	9 25.0%
Total	0 0.0%	11 100.0%	18 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	36 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q31 Do you feel as though you experienced discriminatory behavior from the private sector?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	4 8.5%	14 25.5%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	22 16.3%
No	0 0.0%	32 68.1%	26 47.3%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	15 88.2%	83 61.5%
Don't know	0 0.0%	11 23.4%	15 27.3%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	30 22.2%
Total	0 0.0%	47 100.0%	55 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	135 100.0%

Q32 Did you apply for a commercial (business) bank loan between 2010-2014?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									Total
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	
Yes	27 21.3%	11 23.9%	13 23.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 33.3%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	56 21.4%
No	74 58.3%	31 67.4%	39 69.6%	3 75.0%	1 100.0%	4 66.7%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	13 76.5%	168 64.1%
Don't know	26 20.5%	4 8.7%	4 7.1%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 17.6%	38 14.5%
Total	127 100.0%	46 100.0%	56 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	262 100.0%

Q33 How many times did you apply for a commercial (business) bank loan from 2010-2014?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
1-10	26 96.3%	9 75.0%	13 92.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	52 89.7%
Don't know	1 3.7%	3 25.0%	1 7.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	6 10.3%
Total	27 100.0%	12 100.0%	14 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	58 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q34 How many times were you approved for a commercial (business) bank loan from 2010-2014?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
None	1 3.7%	0 0.0%	9 64.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	11 19.3%
1-10	25 92.6%	8 72.7%	4 28.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	40 70.2%
Don't know	1 3.7%	3 27.3%	1 7.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	6 10.5%
Total	27 100.0%	11 100.0%	14 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	57 100.0%

Q35 What was the largest commercial loan you received from 2010-2014?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
$50,000 or less	3 11.5%	3 25.0%	1 20.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 14.9%
$50,001 - $100,000	4 15.4%	1 8.3%	1 20.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 14.9%
$100,001 - $300,000	6 23.1%	1 8.3%	2 40.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	9 19.1%
$300,001 - $500,000	4 15.4%	2 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 12.8%
$500,001 - $1,000,000	2 7.7%	1 8.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 8.5%
$1,000,001 - $3,000,000	5 19.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 12.8%
$3,000,001 - $5,000,000	1 3.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 2.1%
over $10,000,000	1 3.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 2.1%
Don't know	0 0.0%	4 33.3%	1 20.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	6 12.8%
Total	26 100.0%	12 100.0%	5 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	47 100.0%

Q36 How many times were you denied a commercial (business) bank loan from 2010-2014?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
None	25 96.2%	9 75.0%	2 40.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	38 80.9%
1-10	1 3.8%	1 8.3%	2 40.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 10.6%
Don't know	0 0.0%	2 16.7%	1 20.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	4 8.5%
Total	26 100.0%	12 100.0%	5 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	47 100.0%

Q37 How many times have you sought venture capital from 2010-2014?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
None	91 71.7%	37 78.7%	40 70.2%	3 75.0%	0 0.0%	6 100.0%	3 75.0%	1 100.0%	9 52.9%	190 72.0%
1-10	5 3.9%	2 4.3%	11 19.3%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	20 7.6%
Don't know	31 24.4%	8 17.0%	6 10.5%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	8 47.1%	54 20.5%
Total	127 100.0%	47 100.0%	57 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	264 100.0%

Q38_1 Between 2010-2014, did your company apply and receive any of the following? - Business start-up loan?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Never applied	107 96.4%	45 97.8%	49 87.5%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	5 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	15 100.0%	231 95.1%
Applied - Never approved	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 10.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 2.5%
Applied - Some approved	0 0.0%	1 2.2%	1 1.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 0.8%
Applied - All approved	4 3.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 1.6%
Total	111 100.0%	46 100.0%	56 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	5 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	15 100.0%	243 100.0%

Q38_2 Between 2010-2014, did your company apply and receive any of the following? - Operating capital loan?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Never applied	85 76.6%	37 82.2%	39 69.6%	4 100.0%	0 0.0%	4 66.7%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	14 93.3%	186 76.5%
Applied - Never approved	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	9 16.1%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	11 4.5%
Applied - Some approved	4 3.6%	2 4.4%	3 5.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 4.1%
Applied - All approved	22 19.8%	6 13.3%	5 8.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 6.7%	36 14.8%
Total	111 100.0%	45 100.0%	56 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	15 100.0%	243 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q38_3 Between 2010-2014, did your company apply and receive any of the following? - Equipment loan?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Never applied	80 74.8%	34 77.3%	47 82.5%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	4 66.7%	3 75.0%	1 100.0%	13 86.7%	187 78.2%
Applied - Never approved	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 5.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 1.3%
Applied - Some approved	1 0.9%	1 2.3%	3 5.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 6.7%	8 3.3%
Applied - All approved	26 24.3%	9 20.5%	4 7.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 6.7%	41 17.2%
Total	107 100.0%	44 100.0%	57 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	15 100.0%	239 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q38_4 Between 2010-2014, did your company apply and receive any of the following? - Commercial/Professional liability insurance?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Never applied	40 35.1%	14 33.3%	24 42.9%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	4 66.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	6 42.9%	91 37.6%
Applied - Never approved	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 3.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 0.8%
Applied - Some approved	1 0.9%	2 4.8%	2 3.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 2.5%
Applied - All approved	73 64.0%	26 61.9%	28 50.0%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	1 16.7%	3 75.0%	1 100.0%	8 57.1%	143 59.1%
Total	114 100.0%	42 100.0%	56 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	14 100.0%	242 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_1_2 For the BUSINESS START-UP loan applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Insufficient business history										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_1_4 For the BUSINESS START-UP loan applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Credit history										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_1_5 For the BUSINESS START-UP loan applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Other (specify)										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_1_6 For the BUSINESS START-UP loan applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Don't know										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	1 100%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	1 100%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_2_1 For the OPERATING CAPITAL loan applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Insufficient documentation										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	100%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Total	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	100%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_2_2 For the OPERATING CAPITAL loan applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Insufficient business history										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									Total
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	
Yes	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 100.0%

Q39_2_3 For the OPERATING CAPITAL loan applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Confusion about process										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_2_4 For the OPERATING CAPITAL loan applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Credit history										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	1	0	6	0	1	1	1	0	0	10
	100%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100%	100%	100%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Total	1	0	6	0	1	1	1	0	0	10
	100%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100%	100%	100%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_2_5 For the OPERATING CAPITAL loan applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Other (specify)										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	1 100%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	1 100%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_2_6 For the OPERATING CAPITAL loan applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Don't know										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	2 100%	1 100%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%
Total	2 100%	1 100%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_3_2 For the EQUIPMENT loan applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Insufficient business history										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_3_4 For the EQUIPMENT loan applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Credit history										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	4 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	4 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_3_5 For the EQUIPMENT loan applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Other (specify)										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_3_6 For the EQUIPMENT loan applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Don't know										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									Total
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	
Yes	1 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%
Total	1 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_4_2 For the COMMERCIAL/PROFESSIONAL LIABILITY INSURANCE applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Insufficient business history										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									Total
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	
Yes	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_4_4 For the COMMERCIAL/PROFESSIONAL LIABILITY INSURANCE applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Credit history										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									Total
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	
Yes	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_4_5 For the COMMERCIAL/PROFESSIONAL LIABILITY INSURANCE applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Other (specify)										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q39_4_6 For the COMMERCIAL/PROFESSIONAL LIABILITY INSURANCE applications that were denied, what reasons were given? - Don't know										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	1 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%
Total	1 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q40 Do you believe that your race, gender, or ethnicity was a factor in any of the denials of your loan or insurance applications?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	5 31.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 21.4%
No	5 100.0%	1 50.0%	11 68.8%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	22 78.6%
Total	5 100.0%	2 100.0%	16 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	28 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q41_1 From 2010-2014, have you experienced discriminatory behavior from the City due to the GENDER of your firm's owner(s)?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	11 8.8%	1 2.1%	3 5.5%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	17 6.5%
No	114 91.2%	46 97.9%	52 94.5%	3 75.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	3 75.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	243 93.5%
Total	125 100.0%	47 100.0%	55 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	260 100.0%

Q41_2 From 2010-2014, have you experienced discriminatory behavior from the City due to the RACE of your firm's owner(s)?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	15	4	4	1	0	0	1	0	1	26
	11.9%	8.5%	7.1%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	5.9%	9.9%
No	111	43	52	3	1	6	3	1	16	236
	88.1%	91.5%	92.9%	75.0%	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	100.0%	94.1%	90.1%
Total	126	47	56	4	1	6	4	1	17	262
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q41_3 From 2010-2014, have you experienced discriminatory behavior from the City due to the ETHNICITY of your firm's owner(s)?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Yes	10 8.0%	1 2.1%	3 5.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	16 6.1%
No	115 92.0%	46 97.9%	53 94.6%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	3 75.0%	1 100.0%	16 94.1%	245 93.9%
Total	125 100.0%	47 100.0%	56 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	261 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q42 How often has your company experienced this racial, gender, or ethnicity discriminatory behavior from the City?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Seldom	5 31.3%	2 40.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 25.0%
Often	8 50.0%	1 20.0%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	13 46.4%
Very Often	2 12.5%	0 0.0%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	5 17.9%
Don't know	1 6.3%	2 40.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 10.7%
Total	16 100.0%	5 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	28 100.0%

Q43 From 2010-2014, were you told by THE CITY that you could not bid because of lack of experience with THE CITY?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									Total
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	
Yes	4 3.2%	0 0.0%	4 7.3%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	9 3.4%
No	111 88.1%	44 93.6%	46 83.6%	3 75.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	3 75.0%	1 100.0%	16 94.1%	231 88.5%
Don't know	11 8.7%	3 6.4%	5 9.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	21 8.0%
Total	126 100.0%	47 100.0%	55 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	261 100.0%

Q44 How often have you experienced discrimination by the city based on your supposed lack of contracting experience with the city?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Seldom	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 44.4%
Often	3 75.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 44.4%
Don't know	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 11.1%
Total	4 100.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	9 100.0%

Q45 Do you believe there is an informal network of prime and subcontractors in Savannah that monopolize the public contracting process?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									Total
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	
Yes	42 33.3%	14 29.8%	32 56.1%	3 75.0%	0 0.0%	2 33.3%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	5 29.4%	100 38.0%
No	46 36.5%	11 23.4%	6 10.5%	1 25.0%	1 100.0%	3 50.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	6 35.3%	75 28.5%
Don't know	38 30.2%	22 46.8%	19 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	1 100.0%	6 35.3%	88 33.5%
Total	126 100.0%	47 100.0%	57 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	263 100.0%

Q46 My company's exclusion from this network has discouraged or prevented us from BIDDING ON contracts with the City.										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Strongly agree	15 35.7%	3 21.4%	5 15.6%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 20.0%	26 26.0%
Agree	11 26.2%	5 35.7%	10 31.3%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 40.0%	32 32.0%
Neither agree nor disagree	12 28.6%	2 14.3%	10 31.3%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 40.0%	27 27.0%
Disagree	4 9.5%	4 28.6%	5 15.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	13 13.0%
Strongly disagree	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 6.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 2.0%
Total	42 100.0%	14 100.0%	32 100.0%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	5 100.0%	100 100.0%

Q47 My company's exclusion from this network has prevented us from WINNING contracts with the City.										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Strongly agree	9 21.4%	3 21.4%	5 15.6%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 20.0%	20 20.0%
Agree	12 28.6%	4 28.6%	11 34.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 20.0%	30 30.0%
Neither agree nor disagree	18 42.9%	2 14.3%	12 37.5%	2 66.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	3 60.0%	38 38.0%
Disagree	2 4.8%	5 35.7%	3 9.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 10.0%
Strongly disagree	1 2.4%	0 0.0%	1 3.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 2.0%
Total	42 100.0%	14 100.0%	32 100.0%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	5 100.0%	100 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q48 Exclusion from this informal network has a disproportionate impact on women and minority-owned businesses.										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Strongly agree	3 7.1%	3 21.4%	11 35.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	18 18.2%
Agree	7 16.7%	2 14.3%	10 32.3%	2 66.7%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	2 40.0%	25 25.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	23 54.8%	6 42.9%	8 25.8%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 20.0%	40 40.4%
Disagree	3 7.1%	3 21.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 6.1%
Strongly disagree	6 14.3%	0 0.0%	2 6.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 40.0%	10 10.1%
Total	42 100.0%	14 100.0%	31 100.0%	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	5 100.0%	99 100.0%

GS GRIFFIN & STRONG P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

Q49 Double standards in qualification and performance make it more difficult for minority and women-owned businesses to win bids or contracts.										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									Total
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	
Strongly agree	2 1.6%	2 4.3%	13 23.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	18 6.9%
Agree	3 2.4%	5 10.6%	16 28.6%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	26 9.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	63 50.0%	26 55.3%	17 30.4%	3 75.0%	0 0.0%	2 33.3%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	9 52.9%	123 46.9%
Disagree	24 19.0%	11 23.4%	7 12.5%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	2 33.3%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	2 11.8%	49 18.7%
Strongly disagree	34 27.0%	3 6.4%	3 5.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 29.4%	46 17.6%
Total	126 100.0%	47 100.0%	56 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	262 100.0%

Q50 Sometimes, a prime contractor will include a minority or a woman subcontractor on a bid to meet the "good faith effort" requirement, then drop the company as a subcontractor after winning the award.										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									Total
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	
Strongly agree	7 5.6%	4 8.5%	12 21.4%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	26 9.9%
Agree	24 19.0%	14 29.8%	17 30.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 50.0%	1 25.0%	1 100.0%	3 17.6%	63 24.0%
Neither agree nor disagree	63 50.0%	25 53.2%	23 41.1%	3 75.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	10 58.8%	127 48.5%
Disagree	17 13.5%	4 8.5%	3 5.4%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 17.6%	28 10.7%
Strongly disagree	15 11.9%	0 0.0%	1 1.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	18 6.9%
Total	126 100.0%	47 100.0%	56 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	262 100.0%

Q51 In general, minority and women-owned businesses tend to be viewed by the general public as less competent than non-minority male-owned businesses.										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									Total
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	
Strongly agree	5 4.0%	6 12.8%	16 28.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	28 10.7%
Agree	14 11.1%	12 25.5%	19 33.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 60.0%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	1 5.9%	52 19.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	60 47.6%	17 36.2%	16 28.6%	3 75.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 58.8%	106 40.6%
Disagree	32 25.4%	11 23.4%	5 8.9%	1 25.0%	1 100.0%	2 40.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	4 23.5%	57 21.8%
Strongly disagree	15 11.9%	1 2.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 11.8%	18 6.9%
Total	126 100.0%	47 100.0%	56 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	5 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	261 100.0%

Q52 I believe that some non-minority prime contractors only utilize MWBE companies when required to do so by the City										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Strongly agree	27 21.4%	12 25.5%	27 47.4%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	2 33.3%	3 75.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	72 27.4%
Agree	25 19.8%	16 34.0%	14 24.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	1 100.0%	7 41.2%	65 24.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	60 47.6%	19 40.4%	14 24.6%	3 75.0%	1 100.0%	2 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	9 52.9%	108 41.1%
Disagree	10 7.9%	0 0.0%	2 3.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	12 4.6%
Strongly disagree	4 3.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.9%	6 2.3%
Total	126 100.0%	47 100.0%	57 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	17 100.0%	263 100.0%

Q53 What is your title?										
	Q7 Person or persons that own at least 51% of the company identify									
	Caucasian Male	Caucasian Female	African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian-Indian	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Bi-Racial or Multi-Racial (specify)	Other (specify)	Total
Owner/CEO/President	53 42.7%	30 63.8%	49 86.0%	1 25.0%	1 100.0%	2 33.3%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	4 25.0%	143 55.0%
Manager/Financial Officer	30 24.2%	7 14.9%	3 5.3%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	2 12.5%	46 17.7%
Other (specify)	41 33.1%	10 21.3%	5 8.8%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	3 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 62.5%	71 27.3%
Total	124 100.0%	47 100.0%	57 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	16 100.0%	260 100.0%