

## Table of Figures

Table 1: Summary of Statistically Significant Underutilization in Prime Contracting	14
Table 2: Summary of Statistically Significant Underutilization in Subcontracting	15
Table 3: Summary of MFD Prime Utilization Comparison Between 2001-03 and 2007-12	15
Table 4: Commodities and Services Purchased by Montgomery County	58
Table 5: Relevant Market - Construction	74
Table 6: Relevant Market- Professional Services	75
Table 7: Relevant Market - Services	75
Table 8: Relevant Market - Goods	76
Table 9: Prime Availability-Construction	77
Table 10: Prime Availability-Professional Services	77
Table 11: Prime Availability-Services	78
Table 12: Prime Availability-Goods	78
Table 13: Prime Availability for Disabled- Owned Firms, All Categories	79
Table 14: Prime Contractor Utilization-Construction (MD/DC/VA)	81
Table 15: Prime Contractor Utilization-Professional Services	82
Table 16: Prime Contractor Utilization-Services	83
Table 17: Prime Contractor Utilization-Goods	84
Table 18: Construction Prime Utilization by Firm Number	85
Table 19: Professional Services Prime Utilization by Firm Number	86
Table 20: Services Prime Utilization by Firm Number	86
Table 21: Goods Prime Utilization by Firm Number	87
Table 22: Construction-Disabled owned Firms	88
Table 23: Professional Services-Disabled owned Firms	88
Table 24: Services- Disabled Owned-Firms	89
Table 25: Goods-Disabled owned Firms	89
Table 26: Disabled Owned Firms Utilization by Firm Number	90
Table 27: Construction Utilization by DPO	91
Table 28: Professional Services Utilization by DPO	92
Table 29: Services Utilization by DPO	92
Table 30: Goods Utilization by DPO	92
Table 31: "Other" Work Category Utilization by DPO	93
Table 32: Disabled owned Prime Utilization by DPO	93
Table 33: Utilization for Construction P-Card Purchases	94
Table 34: Utilization for Professional Services P-Card Purchases	94
Table 35: Utilization for Services P-Card Purchases	95
Table 36: Utilization for Goods P-Card Purchases	95
Table 37: Utilization for Other (No Business Category) P-Card Purchases	96
Table 38: Subcontractor Utilization-Construction	97
Table 39: Subcontractor Utilization-Construction	97
Table 40: Subcontractor Utilization-Services	99
Table 41: Subcontractor Utilization-Goods	100
Table 42: Construction Subcontractor Utilization by Firm Number	101
Table 43: Professional Services Subcontractor Utilization by Firm Number	102
Table 44: Services Subcontractor Utilization by Firm Number	102
Table 45: Goods Subcontractor Utilization by Firm Number	103
Table 46: Disparity Indices for Construction-Prime Contracting	106

Table 47: Disparity Indices for Professional Services-Prime Contracting	107
Table 48: Disparity Indices for Services-Prime Contracting	108
Table 49: Disparity Indices for Goods-Prime Contracting	109
Table 50: Disparity Index, Construction	110
Table 51: Disparity Index, Professional Services	111
Table 52: Disparity Index, Services	112
Table 53: Disparity Index, Goods	113
Table 54: Construction P-Card Disparity Index	114
Table 55: Professional Services P-Card Disparity Index	115
Table 56: Services P-Card Disparity Index	116
Table 57: Goods P-Card Disparity Index	117
Table 58: Disparity Indices for Construction Subcontracting	119
Table 59: Disparity Indices for Professional Services-Subcontracting	120
Table 60: Disparity Indices for Services Subcontracting	121
Table 61: Disparity Indices for Goods Subcontracting	122
Table 62: Covariate Summary	125
Table 63: Probit Parameter Estimates :	129
Table 64: Ordinal Probit Parameter Estimates (Odds ratio):	131
Table 65: Ordinal Probit Parameter Estimates (Odds ratio):	133
Table 66: Ordinal Probit Parameter Estimates (Odds ratio):	135
Table 67: Probit Parameter Estimates (Marginal Effects):	137
Table 68: Probit Parameter Estimates (Marginal Effects):	139
Table 69: Probit Parameter Estimates (Marginal Effects):	141
Table 70: Probit Parameter Estimates (Marginal Effects):	143
Table 71: Probit Parameter Estimates (Marginal Effects):	144
Table 72: Probit Parameter Estimates (Marginal Effects):	146
Table 73: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates:	155
Table 74: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates	156
Table 75: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates	157
Table 76: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates	158
Table 77: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates	159
Table 78: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates	160
Table 79: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates	161
Table 80: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates:	162
Table 81: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates	164
Table 82: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates	165
Table 83: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates	166
Table 84: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates:	167
Table 85: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates	168
Table 86: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates:	169
Table 87: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates	170
Table 88: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates:	171
Table 89: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates	172
Table 90: Heteroscedastic Probit Parameter Estimates	173
Table 91: Telephone Survey of Vendors	178
Table 92: Disposition of Telephone Survey Calls	179
Table 93: Number of Bids or Proposals Submitted to Montgomery County from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2012	182

Table 94: Number of Bids or Proposals Submitted on Other Public Procurements (not Montgomery County) from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2012	183
Table 95: Whether Firm Performed as a Prime Contractor for Montgomery County since July 1, 2007	184
Table 96: Whether Firm Performed as a Prime Contractor for Other Public Sector (non-County) Contracts since July 1, 2007	185
Table 97: Whether the Firm Performed as a Subcontractor for Montgomery County since July 1, 2007	186
Table 98 : Of the firms that responded “yes” in Table 97 how often has the firm performed as a Subcontractor for Montgomery County since July 1, 2007?	186
Table 99: Amount of Time it typically takes to receive payment for services on Montgomery County Projects	188
Table 100: How would you rate the quality of interaction with Montgomery County on contract opportunities?	188
Table 101: Obstacles to Bidding - Pre-qualification Requirements	190
Table 102: Obstacles to Bidding - Performance bond requirements	190
Table 103: Obstacles to Bidding -Bid bond requirements	191
Table 104: Obstacles to Bidding -Financing	191
Table 105: Obstacles to Bidding -Insurance requirements	192
Table 106: Obstacles to Bidding - Bid specifications	192
Table 107: Obstacles to Bidding -Limited time given to prepare bid package or quote	193
Table 108: Limited knowledge of purchasing/contracting policies and procedures	193
Table 109: Lack of experience	194
Table 110: Lack of personnel	194
Table 111: Contract too large	195
Table 112: Contract too expensive to bid	195
Table 113: Informal networks	196
Table 114: Selection process	196
Table 115: Competing with large companies	197
Table 116: There is an informal network of prime and subcontractors in Montgomery County	198
Table 117: Exclusion from this network has kept my company from bidding or has interfered with our ability to contract in the public (government) or private sector.	199
Table 118: Although exclusion from this informal network adversely affects a majority of small businesses, the adverse impact is probably felt the greatest among women-, disabled-, and minority owned businesses.	200
Table 119: Double standards in qualification and performance make it more difficult for minority, women, and Disabled owned businesses to win bids or contracts.	201
Table 120: Sometimes a prime contractor will include a Minority, Women, or Disabled Subcontractor to Meet the "Good Faith Effort" requirement, then drop the company as a Subcontractor after Winning the Award.	202
Table 121: Some Non-Minority (male) prime contractors change their bidding procedures when they are not required to hire minority, women, and/or Disabled owned businesses.	202
Table 122: In general, minority, women, and Disabled owned businesses tend to be viewed by the general public as less competent than Non-MFD businesses.	203
Table 123: Has Your Firm experienced any Discriminatory Behavior from Montgomery County since 2007?	204
Table 124: Distribution of Comments from Anecdotal Interviewees	221

Table 125: Utilization Totals	223
Table 126: Utilization Totals, Disabled	223
Table 127: Summary of Prime Availability Within the Relevant Market	226
Table 128: Comparison of IFB and RFPs from 2001-03 to 2007-2012 in Construction	230
Table 129: Comparison of IFB and RFPs from 2001-03 to 2007-2012 in Professional Services	231
Table 130: Comparison of IFB and RFPs from 2001-03 to 2007-2012 in Services	231
Table 131: Comparison of IFB and RFPs from 2001-03 to 2007-2012 in Goods	232