MINORITY OWNED AND LOCAL SMALL BUSINESS TASK FORCE
MEETING MINUTES
April 15, 2015 – 5:30 p.m.

6th Floor Council Conference Room, Council Office Building

Members Present:  Members Absent
Mayra Bayonet  Leon Hollings  Cherian Eapen
Margo Briggs  Herman Taylor  Bethsaida Wong
Warren Fleming
Janice Freeman
Julian Haffner

County Staff Present:
Karen L. Federman-Henry, Office of the County Attorney
Mary Anne Paradise, County Council
Linda Price, County Council

I. Call to Order
The meeting began at 5:33 p.m. Due to lack of a quorum, the meeting was officially called to order by Task Force Chair Taylor at 5:55 p.m.

II. Briefing - Disparity Study - Rodney Strong
Mr. Rodney Strong, Griffin & Strong, P.C, via internet conferencing, provided an overview of the 2014 Disparity Study (see Attachment 1). Task Force members engaged in a question and answer session with Mr. Strong following his presentation. The following observations and clarifications were made:

- Mr. Strong indicated that in 2005, the study was more cautious and legally intensive because of political and legal attacks at the time; now, he perceives that the County wants to take bolder steps to increase MFD participation and that a different mechanism is needed to enforce benchmarks.
- Mr. Hollins commented on the Equal Business Opportunities ordinance enacted in Atlanta, Georgia and inquired on its success. Mr. Strong said the ordinance has been extremely successful and that elected officials are totally committed, but noted that African Americans are not represented well in high value contracts.
- Mr. Fleming asked about the success of joint ventures versus prime subcontracting. Mr. Strong said that both approaches work, but that prime subcontracting allows MFD businesses to grow. A joint venture allows the company to have personnel on a project and gain experience into being a prime contractor.
- Ms. Freeman inquired if it is difficult to get prime contractors interested in MFD programs. Mr. Strong said it is important to expose prime contractors to MFD contractors. He suggested that economic development should be used more aggressively. Regarding the legal aspect, he said more favorable decisions have been reached in recent years, but there are still legal concerns regarding how to craft MFD programs.
• Mr. Haffner inquired if there is a reluctance to adopt goals related to the MFD program and what recommended goals are for each category. Mr. Strong responded that a significant disparity must be shown, and suggested that the participation goal be equal to the availability of MFDs.

• Mr. Taylor asked if Montgomery County has a non-discrimination policy, and Mr. Strong indicated there is a clause included in the procurement process. Mr. Taylor asked Staff to look into whether the County has a commercial non-discrimination policy.

• Mr. Hollins commented on the 2010 Memphis disparity study, and asked if a bidder rotation for contracts under $100,000 would work in Montgomery County. Mr. Strong noted that Memphis has a less cumbersome procurement process and buyers make calls directly. This process works better for goods providers.

• Ms. Bayonet asked how ethnicity is addressed. Mr. Strong said benchmarks can be established, with the objective to reach parity between availability and utilization of MFDs.

• Mr. Haffner asked if there were successful policies related to accessing capital. Mr. Strong said this is an issue that remains to be dealt with, but suggested that small firms work with the Small Business Administration, and that targeted areas are needed. He noted that Atlanta established a loan fund for the redevelopment of the city in which only MFDs could participate.

• Ms. Freeman asked how the Procurement Office could improve training. Mr. Strong said part of the Office’s mission should be to increase supplier diversity. The Office should make it clear that staff need to consider MFD businesses.

III. Approval of Minutes
The minutes from the April 1, 2015, meeting were unanimously approved by all Task Force members present.

IV. Group Discussion
• Mr. Haffner stated that the group could make bold recommendations
• Mr. Taylor said the Task Force should hear how the County will act on issues raised regarding the procurement process, and that the process must change. A more robust way to include MFDs in contracts is needed, through more aggressive use of the Department of Economic Development (DED).
• The May 6 meeting will include an overview from the Department of Economic Development. Task Force members expressed their desire to have Ms. Sternbach and Mr. Bang, from DED present at the meeting if possible.
• Mr. Hollins volunteered to draft language to transmit to the Council on behalf of the Task Force regarding their review of Bill 61-14.

V. Public Comment
There were no comments from public meeting participants.

The meeting adjourned at 7:16 p.m
STUDY TEAM

- Dr. Gregory Price, Senior Economist
- Winston Terrell Group, Anecdotal Supervisor
- Cardell Orrin, Data Analyst
- Leronia Josey & Associates, Anecdotal Interviews
- Oppenheim Research, Inc., Telephone Survey
- 1st Choice Staffing, Data Entry
TECHNICAL APPROACH

Legal Analysis → Policy and Procurement Process Review → Collecting and Cleaning Data → Relevant Market Analysis

Utilization Analysis → Availability Analysis → Disparity Analysis → Private Sector Analysis

Anecdotal Evidence Collection and Analysis → Final Report with Recommendations
## Disparities in Prime Contracting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Professional Services</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic American</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ● **POs, DPOs, and P-card**
- 🔧 **POs and P-card Only**
- 🔥 **DPOs and P-card Only**

*April 15, 2015*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Professional Services</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic American</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Disparity Found**
- **No Disparity**
MFD PRIME UTILIZATION COMPARISON (FROM PO’S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2001-2003%</th>
<th>2007-2012%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>26.11</td>
<td>26.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>8.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>31.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

April 15, 2015
Utilization in Dollars (Prime Contracting, Purchase Orders)
Relevant Market Availability (Average across all categories)

- African American: 10%
- Asian American: 3%
- Hispanic American: 3%
- Native American: 5%
- White Female: 79%
- Non-MFD
## Minority and Women Owned Business Availability vs. Awards (PO’S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>26.26%</td>
<td>21.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>17.97%</td>
<td>7.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>24.18%</td>
<td>12.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*April 15, 2015*
REGRESSION ANALYSIS

MFD FIRMS

Are:
MORE LIKELY to need start-up and expansion financing
LESS LIKELY to secure bank loans and venture capital
LESS LIKELY to become self employed

But Are:
JUST AS LIKELY to pursue public contracting
And

DISPARITIES are explained by their race, gender, and disabled status
ANECDOTAL EVIDENCE

FOCUS GROUP
PUBLIC HEARING
INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS
PURCHASING PRACTICES REVIEW
EMAIL COMMENTS
TELEPHONE SURVEY

✓ Good old Boy Network
✓ Cumbersome Proposals
✓ Need Set-asides
✓ Fear Retaliation
✓ More Transparency and Feedback
✓ County is Fair
✓ Bonding Impediments
✓ Not Interested in MFDs
OPPORTUNITY

• Annual goals for African-Americans
• Narrowly-tailored

GOALS

REMEDIATION

OUTREACH

MONITORING

• Economic Development Contract Goals
• MFD Participation on Private Sector Projects

• Performance Reviews
• Program training
• SOP

• MFD Collaboration
• Joint-Venture Contracts

April 15, 2015
1. Annual Goals for African American Participation

African American owned firms are the only race/ethnic/gender group that was underutilized in every procurement category, in every year of the study.
2. Standard Operating Procedures for Procurement and MFD Officer

GSPC’s research found that there was a perception of Montgomery County as a closed, exclusionary, informal network, that we believe is the result of lack of standardized organization and training, and lack of transparency of process.
3. Program Training and Monitoring
Procurement training should be reviewed and revised to include more extensive training on non-discriminatory practices and MFD participation/goals.
4. Performance Reviews and Evaluations

County employees and user departments should be evaluated based on the quality, transparency and overall effectiveness of their programs and attempts to reach goals.
5. Private Sector Initiatives

Montgomery County should consider private sector initiatives, such as including MFD goals in their economic development contracts.
6. Promote MFD Collaboration/Joint-Venture Contracts

In order to encourage participation on high-dollar contracts, Montgomery County should look for instances in which MFD capacity can be increased to match contract size.