CHAPTER 6.0 - MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE RELEVANT MARKET AREA, UTILIZATION AND DISPARITY ANALYSES

CHAPTER 6.0 – MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE RELEVANT MARKET AREA, UTILIZATION AND DISPARITY ANALYSES

This chapter presents an overview of the processes used to identify and analyze the relevant market area and procurement activity of the Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska (hereinafter "Municipality"). A total of 30 prime contracts and 10 subcontract awards were received electronically which included prime contractor and subcontractor data collected by the Municipality's Office of Equal Opportunity.

The analysis was based on the business categories that included subcontractor utilization.

Below is a list of the actual number of contracts and subcontracts for each business category analyzed for the study:

PRIME CONTRACTS

| Business Category | Contract Amounts | # of Contracts |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Construction | \$10,879,110 | 20 |
| Architectural & Engineering | \$ 860,354 | 1 |
| Professional Services | \$ 4,007,752 | 9 |
| Total | \$15,747,2160 | 30 |

SUBCONTRACTS

| Business Category | Contract Amounts | # of Contracts |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Construction | \$491,788 | 8 |
| Architectural & Engineering | \$ 10,000 | 1 |
| Professional Services | \$ 59,085 | 1 |
| Total | \$560,873 | 10 |

6.1 Market Area Analysis

For this study, the relevant market area was defined as those United States counties in which the Municipality expended 75 percent or more of total expenditures during the study period. The significance of the relevant market area is that further analysis within the context of this study will focus primarily on activity occurring within the respective relevant market areas.

During the study period, the Municipality spent over \$15.7 million on federally funded contracts, utilizing 23 individual firms on 30 contracts. Counties within Anchorage, Alaska received over 90 percent of the federally funded contract dollars awarded during the study period. Exhibit 6-1 presents dollar amounts and percentages of firms as well as contracts for the Municipality's relevant market area. The utilization, availability and disparity analyses will use only the contracts included in the relevant market area.

Exhibit 6-1
Relevant Market Area
Municipality of Anchorage
Fiscal Years 2002 - 2006

| | Anchorage, AK | TOTALS |
|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Total Dollars | \$15,747,215 | \$15,747,215 |
| Percent of Dollars | 98.90% | 98.90% |
| Percent of Contracts | 90.91% | 90.91% |
| Percent of Firms Utilized | 88.46% | 88.46% |

Source: Municipality of Anchorage for the period of October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2006.

6.2 Prime Contractor Utilization Analysis

The prime contractor utilization analysis of all federally funded contracts were based on the electronic and hardcopy data that was provided by the Municipality for federally funded contracts awarded during the five-year study period October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2006.

For each business category the Wilson Group conducted a utilization analysis of all DBE and non-DBE prime and subcontractors during the study period.

6.2.1 Construction

The utilization analysis of prime contractor's for Construction projects is shown in Exhibit 6-2. During the five year study period, the Municipality awarded over \$10.8 million in construction contracts. Only one contract was awarded to a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) in the amount of \$7,413. This contract represented .07 percent of the total federal dollars expended by the Municipality for Construction projects. One Hispanic American-owned firm received the sole contract awarded to a DBE for a Construction project.

6.2.2 Architectural & Engineering

The utilization analysis of prime contractors for Architectural & Engineering projects is shown in Exhibit 6-3. Only one Architectural & Engineering contract was awarded during the study period. That sole contract was awarded to a non-DBE. DBEs did not receive any of the total federal dollars expended by the Municipality for Architectural & Engineering projects.

6.2.3 Professional Services

In the Professional Services category, non-DBEs received contracts totaling over \$4.0 million. Nine service providers received contracts. The utilization analysis of prime contractors for Professional Services is shown in Exhibit 6-4. During the five year study period, only one contract was awarded to a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) in the amount of \$377,912. This contract represented 9.43 percent of the total federal dollars expended by the Municipality for Professional Services projects. One Alaska Native Corporation owned firm received the sole contract awarded to a DBE for a Professional Services project.

Exhibit 6-2 Construction Prime Contractor Utilization Municipality of Anchorage Fiscal Years 2002 - 2006

| | African Americans | AK Native Corporations | AK Tribal Corporations | American Indian/AK Native | Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | Hispanic Americans | Nonminority Women | Total DBEs | Non-DBEs | TOTALS |
|---|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Total Prime Contractor Dollars Percent of Dollars | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,413 | \$0 | \$7,413 | \$10,871,697 | \$10,879,110 |
| | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.07% | 0.00% | 0.07% | 99.93% | 100.00% |
| Total Number of Contracts Percent of Contracts | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 20 |
| | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00 % | 0.00% | 0.00% | 5.00 % | 0.00% | 5.00 % | 95.00% | 100.00% |
| Individual Firms Utilized | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 16 |
| Percent of Firms | 0.00 % | 0.00% | 0.00 % | 0.00% | 0.00% | 6.25 % | 0.00% | 6.25 % | 93.75% | 100.00% |

Source: Municipality of Anchorage for the period of October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2006.

Exhibit 6-3
Architectural & Engineering
Prime Contractor Utilization
Municipality of Anchorage
Fiscal Years 2002 – 2006

| | African Americans | AK Native Corporations | AK Tribal Corporations | American Indian/AK Native | Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | Hispanic Americans | Nonminority Women | Total DBEs | Non-DBEs | TOTALS |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| All Primes Utilized Percent of Dollars | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$860,354 | \$860,354 |
| | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| Contracts Total Percent of Contracts | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00 % | 0.00 % | 100.00 % | 100.00 % |
| Individual Firms Utilized Percent of Firms | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 100.00 % | 100.00 % |

Exhibit 6-4 Professional Services Prime Contractor Utilization Municipality of Anchorage Fiscal Years 2002 – 2006

| | African Americans | AK Native Corporations | AK Tribal Corporations | American Indian/AK Native | Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | Hispanic Americans | Nonminority Women | Total DBEs | Non-DBEs | TOTALS |
|---|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Total Prime Contractor Dollars Percent of Dollars | \$0 | \$377,912 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$377,912 | \$3,629,840 | \$4,007,752 |
| | 0.00% | 9.43% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 9.43% | 90.57% | 100.00% |
| Total Number of Contracts Percent of Contracts | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 9 |
| | 0.00% | 11.11% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00 % | 0.00% | 0.00% | 11.11% | 88.89% | 100.00% |
| Individual Firms Utilized Percent of Firms | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| | 0.00% | 16.67% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 16.67 % | 83.33% | 100.00% |

6.3 **Subcontractor Utilization Analysis**

Subcontractor utilization data were provided by the Municipality in both electronic and hardcopy format. From the data, the Wilson Group conducted the subcontractor utilization analyses by business category for the Municipality of all federally funded subcontracts awarded by prime contractors during the period of October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2006.

6.3.1 Construction

The utilization analysis of subcontractors for Construction projects is shown in Exhibit 6-5. During the five year study period, DBE's participated as subcontractors in eight construction contracts. The value of the subcontracts totaled over \$491,000 or 4.52 percent of the total federal funds expended by the Municipality for Construction projects. The most utilized DBEs were owned by non-minority Women receiving over \$239,000 or 2.20 percent, followed by American Indian/Alaska Natives receiving over \$144,000 or 1.33 percent of the contract dollars awarded.

6.3.2 <u>Architectural & Engineering</u>

The utilization analysis of subcontractors for the relevant market area for Architectural & Engineering projects is shown in Exhibit 6-6. During the five year study period there was one prime contract and one subcontract awarded. A DBE firm was awarded the only subcontract for \$10,000 or 1.16 percent of the total federal funds expended by the Municipality for Architectural & Engineering projects. The DBE firm utilized was owned by an Asian Indian/Pacific Islander.

6.3.3 <u>Professional Services</u>

The utilization analysis of subcontractors for the relevant market area for Professional Services is shown in Exhibit 6-7. During the five year study period, a DBE firm was awarded the only subcontract for \$59,085 or 1.47 percent of the total federal funds expended for Professional Services. The DBE firm utilized was owned by a non-minority Woman.

Exhibit 6-5 Construction Subcontractor Utilization Municipality of Anchorage Fiscal Years 2002 - 2006

| | African Americans | AK Native Corporations | AK Tribal Corporations | American Indian/AK Native | Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | Hispanic Americans | Nonminority Women | DBE Totals |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| All Subs Utilized Percent of Subcontract Dollars Percent of Total Contract Dollars | \$5,831 | \$0 | \$0 | \$144,468 | \$0 | \$101,939 | \$239,550 | \$491,788 |
| | 1.19% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 29.38% | 0.00% | 20.73% | 48.71% | 100.00% |
| | 0.05% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 1.33% | 0.00% | 0.94% | 2.20 % | 4.52% |
| SubContracts Total Percent of Contracts | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 8 |
| | 12.50% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 25.00 % | 0.00% | 50.00% | 12.50% | 100 % |
| Individual Firms Utilized Percent of Firms | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| | 16.67% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 33.33% | 0.00% | 33.33% | 16.67% | 100% |

Exhibit 6-6 Architectural & Engineering Subcontractor Utilization Municipality of Anchorage Fiscal Years 2002 - 2006

| | African Americans | AK Native Corporations | AK Tribal Corporations | American Indian/AK Native | Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | Hispanic Americans | Nonminority Women | DBE Totals |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| All Subs Utilized Percent of Subcontract Dollars Percent of Total Contract Dollars | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,000 |
| | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 100.00% |
| | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 1.16% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 1.16% |
| SubContracts Total Percent of Contracts | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 100% |
| Individual Firms Utilized Percent of Firms | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 100.00 % | 0.00% | 0.00% | 100 % |

Source: Municipality of Anchorage for the period of October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2006.

Exhibit 6-7 Professional Services Subcontractor Utilization Municipality of Anchorage Fiscal Years 2002 - 2006

| | African Americans | AK Native Corporations | AK Tribal Corporations | American Indian/AK Native | Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | Hispanic Americans | Nonminority Women | DBE Totals |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| All Subs Utilized Percent of Subcontract Dollars Percent of Total Contract Dollars | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$59,085 | \$59,085 |
| | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 1.47% | 1. 47% |
| SubContracts Total Percent of Contracts | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 100.00 % | 100 % |
| Individual Firms Utilized Percent of Firms | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | 0.00% | 0.00 % | 0.00 % | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 100.00 % | 100 % |

6.4 **Goals Analyses**

The Wilson Group conducted a goal analysis for each business category of all contracts awarded by the Municipality. During FY2002 through FY2005 the Municipality operated a race conscious/race neutral DBE program by setting goals on specific projects. Effective January 10, 2006 the Municipality began operating a DBE Program where zero goals were assigned to specific projects. This analysis will show the impact to DBE participation based upon projects having assigned or unassigned DBE goals.

The following sections provide the results of the project goal analyses conducted for each business category.

6.4.1 Construction

During the five year study period, Exhibit 6-8 shows that the Municipality projected a DBE goal of approximately \$423,000 or 3.89 percent and awarded to DBEs over \$491,000 or 4.52 percent of the total amount of federally funded dollars expended on Construction projects.

The analysis for Construction projects shows that of the 20 contracts awarded, 5 or 25 percent of the contracts were assigned a DBE goal and 15 or 75 percent did not have one assigned. Contracts awarded with an assigned DBE goal totaled over \$6.0 million or 55.6 percent of the total federal dollars expended on Construction projects. Of this amount, DBEs received approximately \$423,000 or 3.89 percent of the total federal dollars expended. The total amount of contracts awarded that did not have an assigned DBE goal was over \$4.8 million or 44.4 percent; of this amount, DBEs received approximately \$296,000 or 6.13 percent of the contracts.

Construction DBE Goal Comparison - FY2002-2005 vs. FY2006

Exhibit 6-9 shows that during FY2002 through FY2005 the Municipality awarded a total of 17 Construction contracts with five having assigned DBE goals. The total amount of contracts awarded during this period were over \$9.2 million of which the Municipality assigned a DBE goal of approximately \$423,000 or 4.58 percent of the total federal dollars expended on Construction

Exhibit 6-8 Construction Fiscal Years 2002-2006 Project Goal Utilization Analysis Municipality of Anchorage

| Fiscal Year | Bid No. | Contract Amount | Contract Goal Amount | Contract Goal | Achieved Contract Goal Amount | Achieved Goal % | Dollars Over/Under Goal | % of Dollars Over/Under Goal |
|----------------|----------|--------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | | | 2003 | | | | |
| 2003 | 231043 | \$1,012,071.00 | \$70,844.97 | 7.00% | \$27,000.00 | 2.67% | (\$43,844.97) | -4.33% |
| 2003 | 231084 | \$3,206.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | | \$1,015,277 | \$70,845 | 6.98% | \$27,000 | 2.66% | (\$43,845) | -4.32% |
| | | | | 2004 | | | | |
| 2004 | 240410 | \$7,413.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| 2004 | 240763 | \$1,996,651.57 | \$139,765.61 | 7.00% | \$128,888.15 | 6.46% | (\$10,877.46) | -0.54% |
| 2004 | 240941 | \$6,500.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | | \$2,010,565 | \$139,766 | 6.95% | \$128,888 | 6.41% | (\$10,877) | -0.54% |
| | | | | 2005 | <u> </u> | | | |
| 2005 | 250122 | \$864.40 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| 2005 | 250201 | \$24,213.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| 2005 | 250292 | \$1,254.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| 2005 | 250615 | \$371,908.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| 2005 | 250616 | \$2,282,050.92 | \$159,743.56 | 7.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | (\$159,743.56) | -7.00% |
| 2005 | 250711 | \$1,574,112.62 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| 2005 | 250914 | \$253,311.68 | | 7.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | (\$17,731.82) | -7.00% |
| 2005 | 250920 | \$500,000.00 | \$35,000.00 | 7.00% | \$39,700.00 | 7.94% | \$4,700.00 | 0.94% |
| 2005 | 250963 | \$169,364.32 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| 2005 | 251110 | \$5,070.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| 2005 | 251138 | \$1,012,038.30 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| 2005 | 251143 | \$20,302.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | | \$6,214,489 | \$212,475 | 3.42% | \$39,700 | 0.64% | (\$172,775) | -2.78% |
| | | | | 2006 | | | | |
| 2006 | 260965 | \$1,630,102.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$296,200.00 | 18.17% | \$296,200.00 | 18.17% |
| 2006 | 9999999 | \$6,830.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| 2006 | 99999998 | \$1,847.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | | \$1,638,779 | \$0 | 0.00% | \$296,200 | 18.07% | \$296,200 | 18.07% |
| TOTALS | | \$10,879,110 | \$423,086 | 3.89% | \$491,788 | 4.52% | \$68,702 | 0.63% |

Exhibit 6-9 DBE Project Goal Utilization Analysis Construction Municipality of Anchorage FY2002 - FY2006

| Fiscal Year | Total # of Contracts | Total Contract Dollars Awarded | DBE Assigned Goal | Projected DBE Goal Amount | Actual DBE Goal Achieved | Actual DBE Goal Amount Achieved | Total # of Contracts w/ Goals | Total Contract Dollars Awarded w/Goals | Total DBE Dollars | Percent of Total Contract Dollars w/Goals Awarded to DBEs | Total # of Contracts w/out Goals | Total Contract | Total # of Contracts w/out Goals Awarded to DBEs | Total Contract Dollars w/out Goals Awarded to DBEs | Total DBE Dollars | Percent of Total Contract Dollars w/out Goals Awarded to DBEs |
|----------------|-------------------------|---|-------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|----------------------|--|---|----------------|--|---|----------------------|--|
| 2002 | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 0 | \$0 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% |
| 2003 | 2 | \$1,015,277 | 6.98% | \$70,845 | 2.66% | \$27,000 | 1 | \$1,012,071 | \$70,845 | 7.00% | 1 | \$3,206 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% |
| 2004 | 3 | \$2,010,565 | 6.95% | \$139,766 | 6.41% | \$128,888 | 1 | \$1,996,651 | \$139,766 | 7.00% | 2 | \$13,913 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% |
| 2005 | 12 | \$6,214,489 | 3.42% | \$212,475 | 0.64% | \$39,700 | 3 | \$3,035,363 | \$212,475 | 0.00% | 9 | \$3,179,127 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% |
| Subtotal | 17 | \$9,240,331 | 4.58% | \$423,086 | 2.12% | \$195,588 | 5 | \$6,044,085 | \$423,086 | 7.00% | 12 | \$3,196,246 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% |
| 2006 | 3 | \$1,638,779 | 0.00% | \$0 | 18.07% | \$296,200 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 3 | \$1,638,779 | 3 | \$1,638,779 | \$296,200 | 18.07% |
| Total | 20 | \$10,879,110 | 3.89% | \$423,086 | 4.52% | \$491,788 | 5 | \$6,044,085 | \$423,086 | 7.00% | 15 | \$4,835,025 | 3 | \$1,638,779 | \$296,200 | 6.13% |

projects. The actual contracts awarded to DBEs were over \$195,000 or 2.12 percent of the total federal dollars expended. The 12 contracts without assigned DBE goals were awarded to non-minority firms.

During FY2006 a total of three Construction contracts were awarded, all without assigned DBE goals. The total amount of contracts awarded during FY2006 was over \$1.6 million of which approximately \$296,000 or 18.07 percent were awarded to DBEs.

6.4.2 Architectural & Engineering

During the five year study period, Exhibit 6-10 shows that the Municipality awarded one Architectural & Engineering contract and a DBE goal was not assigned to the project. However, a DBE firm did receive \$10,000 or 1.16 percent of the total dollars expended on the project.

Exhibit 6-10
Architectural & Engineering
Fiscal Years 2002-2006
Project Goal Utilization Analysis
Municipality of Anchorage

| Fiscal Year | Bid No. | Contract Amount | Contract Goal Amount | Contract Goal | Achieved Contract Goal Amount | Achieved Goal % | Dollars Over/Under Goal | % of Dollars Over/Under Goal |
|----------------|---------|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | | | 2003 | 3 | | | |
| 2003 | 230433 | \$860,354.00 | \$0.00 | 0 | \$10,000.00 | 1.16% | \$10,000.00 | 1.16% |
| TOTALS | | \$860,354.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$10,000.00 | 1.16% | \$10,000.00 | 1.16% |

Source: Municipality of Anchorage for the period of October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2006.

6.4.3 Professional Services

During the five year study period, Exhibit 6-11 shows that the Municipality awarded nine Professional Services contracts totaling approximately \$4.0 million. The Municipality assigned a 0.31 percent DBE goal and awarded a DBE firm approximately \$59,000 or 1.47 percent of the total federal dollars expended for Professional Services.

Exhibit 6-11 Professional Services Fiscal Years 2002-2006 Project Goal Utilization Analysis Municipality of Anchorage

| Fiscal Year | Bid No. | Contract Amount | Contract Goal Amount | Contract Goal | Achieved Contract Goal Amount | Achieved Goal % | Dollars Over/Under Goal | % of Dollars Over/Under Goal | | | |
|----------------|-----------|-----------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | 2002 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2002 | 221655 | \$1,141,143.80 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | | | |
| 2002 | 221701 | \$174,831.70 | \$12,238.22 | 7.00% | \$59,085.00 | 33.80% | \$46,846.78 | 26.80% | | | |
| | | \$1,315,976 | \$12,238 | 0.93% | \$59,085 | 4.49% | \$46,847 | 3.56% | | | |
| 2003 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2003 | 230705 | \$34,677.22 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | | | |
| 2003 | 231511 | \$22,531.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | | | |
| | | \$57,208 | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | | | |
| | | | | 2004 | | | | | | | |
| 2004 | 240141 | \$377,911.83 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | | | |
| 2004 | 240338 | \$574,970.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | | | |
| | | \$952,882 | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | | | |
| | | | | 2005 | | | | | | | |
| 2005 | 250627 | \$543,154.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | | | |
| 2005 | 250793 | \$712,776.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | | | |
| 2005 | 999999877 | \$425,756.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | | | |
| | | \$1,681,686 | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | | | |
| TOTALS | _ | \$4,007,752 | \$12,238 | 0.31% | \$59,085 | 1.47% | \$46,847 | 1.17% | | | |

Source: Municipality of Achorage for the period of October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2006.

Professional Services DBE Goal Comparison - FY2002-2005 vs. FY2006

Exhibit 6-12 shows that during FY2002 through FY2005 the Municipality awarded a total of nine Professional Services contracts with one assigned DBE goal. The total amount of contracts awarded during this period were over \$4 million of which the Municipality projected a DBE goal of approximately \$12,000 or 0.31 percent of the total federal dollars expended for Professional Services. The eight contracts without assigned DBE goals were awarded to non-minority firms

During FY2006 there were no contracts awarded for Professional Service projects.

Exhibit 6-12 DBE Project Goal Utilization Analysis Professional Services Municipality of Anchorage FY2002 - FY2006

| Fiscal Year | Total # of Contracts | Total Contract Dollars Awarded | DBE Assigned Goal | Projected DBE Goal Amount | Actual DBE Goal Achieved | Actual DBE Goal Amount Achieved | Total # of Contracts w/ Goals | Dollars | Total DBE Dollars | Percent of Total Contract Dollars w/Goals Awarded to DBEs | Total # of | Total Contract Dollars Awarded w/out Goals | Total # of Contracts w/out Goals Awarded to DBEs | Total Contract Dollars w/out Goals Awarded to DBEs | Total DBE Dollars | Percent of Total Contract Dollars w/out Goals Awarded to DBEs |
|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|---|------------|---|---|---|-------------------------|--|
| 2002 | 2 | \$1,315,976 | 0.93% | \$12,238 | 4.49% | \$59,085 | 1 | \$174,832 | \$59,085 | 33.80% | 1 | \$1,141,144 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% |
| 2003 | 2 | \$57,208 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 2 | \$57,208 | 0 | | \$0 | 0.00% |
| 2004 | 2 | \$952,882 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 2 | \$952,882 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% |
| 2005 | 3 | \$1,681,686 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 3 | \$1,681,686 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% |
| Subtotal | 9 | \$4,007,752 | 0.31% | \$12,238 | 0.00% | \$59,085 | 1 | \$174,832 | \$59,085 | 0.00% | 8 | \$3,832,920 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% |
| 2006 | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 0 | \$0 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% |
| Total | 9 | \$4,007,752 | 0.31% | \$12,238 | 1.47% | \$59,085 | 1 | \$174,832 | \$59,085 | 33.80% | 8 | \$3,832,920 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.00% |

6.5 Prime Contractor Utilization Threshold Analyses

For further comparison of DBE utilization, the Wilson Group conducted a threshold analysis of prime contractor contracts awarded by the Municipality. This was accomplished by evaluating the contracts awarded based on the following dollar ranges:

- Contracts in the amount of \$100,000 or less
- Contracts in the amount of \$100,001 to \$500,000
- Contracts in the amount of \$500,001 to \$1,000,000
- Contracts in the amount of \$1,000,001 to \$5,000,000
- Contracts over \$5,000,000

The following sections provide the results of the prime contractor utilization threshold analysis conducted for each business category.

6.5.1 Construction

Exhibit 6-13 shows the threshold analysis conducted of Construction prime contracts awarded by the Municipality. A total of 20 Construction prime contracts were awarded by the Municipality with 10 or 50 percent of the contracts awarded in the dollar range of \$100,000 or less. DBEs received one or 10 percent of the contracts awarded in the dollar range of \$100,000 or less. As contract amounts increased above \$100,000 DBE participation significantly decreased. There were four contracts awarded in the \$100,001 to \$500,000 dollar range with no DBE participation, zero contracts awarded in the \$500,001 to \$1 million dollar range, six contracts awarded in the \$1,000,001 to \$5 million dollar range with no DBE participation and zero contracts awarded in the above \$5 million dollar range. DBEs received one or five (5) percent of the Construction prime contracts awarded while non-DBEs received 19 or 95 percent. Among DBEs, a Hispanic American owned firm received the one Construction contract awarded by the Municipality.

Exhibit 6-13 Construction Fiscal Years 2002-2006 Prime Contractor Utilization Threshold Percentage of Total Dollars Ethnic Classification Municipality of Anchorage

| Threshold | African Americans | AK Native Corporations | AK Tribal Corporations | American Indian/AK Native | Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | Hispanic Americans | Nonminority Women | Total DBEs | Non-DBEs | Total Dollars Awarded |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--------------------------|
| \$100,000 or Less # of Contracts Percent of Dollars Percent of Contracts | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$7,413 1 9.57% 10.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$7,413 1 9.57% 10.00% | \$70,086 9 90.43% 90.00% | \$77,499 10 |
| \$100,001 to \$500,000 # of Contracts Percent of Dollars Percent of Contracts | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$1,294,584 4 100.00% 100.00% | \$1,294,584 4 |
| \$500,001 to \$1,000,000 # of Contracts Percent of Dollars Percent of Contracts | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 |
| \$1,000,001 to \$5,000,000 # of Contracts Percent of Dollars Percent of Contracts | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$9,507,026 6 100.00% 100.00% | \$9,507,026 6 |
| Above \$5,000,000 # of Contracts Percent of Dollars Percent of Contracts | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 |
| Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,413 | \$0 | \$7,413 | \$10,871,697 | \$10,879,110 |

6.5.2 **Architectural & Engineering**

There was one Architectural & Engineering contract issued during the study period for \$860,354. Therefore, no threshold analysis is necessary.

One Architectural & Engineering prime contract was awarded by the Municipality to a non-DBE firm for \$860,354.

6.5.3 Professional Services

Exhibit 6-14 shows the threshold analysis conducted of Professional Services prime contracts awarded by the Municipality. Nine Professional Services prime contracts were awarded by the Municipality. One contract in the \$100,001 to \$500,000 dollar range was awarded to a DBE owned firm. All other contracts were awarded to non-DBEs.

Exhibit 6-14 Professional Services Fiscal Years 2002-2006 Prime Contractor Utilization Threshold Percentage of Total Dollars Ethnic Classification Municipality of Anchorage

| Threshold | African Americans | AK Native Corporations | AK Tribal Corporations | American Indian/AK Native | Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | Hispanic Americans | Nonminority Women | Total DBEs | Non-DBEs | Total Dollars Awarded |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| \$100,000 or Less # of Contracts Percent of Dollars Percent of Contracts | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$57,208 2 100.00% 100.00% | \$57,208 2 |
| \$100,001 to \$500,000 # of Contracts Percent of Dollars Percent of Contracts | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$377,912 1 38.62% 33.33% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$377,912 1 38.62% 33.33% | \$600,588 2 61.38% 66.67% | \$978,500 3 |
| \$500,001 to \$1,000,000 # of Contracts Percent of Dollars Percent of Contracts | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$1,830,900 3 100.00% 100.00% | \$1,830,900 3 |
| \$1,000,001 to \$5,000,000 # of Contracts Percent of Dollars Percent of Contracts | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$0 0 0.00% 0.00% | \$1,141,144 1 100.00% 100.00% | \$1,141,144 1 |
| Total | \$0 | \$377,912 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$377,912 | \$3,629,840 | \$4,007,752 |

6.6 <u>Disparity Analysis</u>

The objective of this section is to determine if DBEs were underutilized or overutilized on federally funded contracts awarded by the Municipality.

The Wilson Group conducted a disparity analysis for each business category to determine the differences between the utilization of DBEs and the availability of such firms within the relevant market area. The data presented in the Availability and Utilization Analyses was used as the basis to determine if DBEs received a fair and equitable share of the contracts awarded by the Municipality. This is determined through the disparity index calculation that results in a comparison of the availability of DBEs with the utilization of such firms.

The disparity index is obtained by dividing the percent of utilization by the percent of availability and multiplying the result by 100. A disparity index of 100 indicates a balance between utilization and availability. A disparity index of less than 100 may indicate that firms are underutilized or overutilized if greater than 100. An index of less than 80 may indicate significant underutilization and an index of 0.00 indicates zero utilization.

This section provides the results of the disparity analyses based on the utilization and availability of DBEs in the Municipality's relevant market area for each business category.

6.6.1 Construction

The disparity analysis for Construction contracts is shown in Exhibit 6-15. During the five year study period, all DBEs with the exception of non-minority Women were significantly underutilized. The disparity analysis shows that overall non-minority Women were overutilized with a disparity index of 115.89. Alaska Native Corporations, Alaska Tribal Corporations, and Asian Indian/Pacific Islander firms were not utilized as subcontractors. The availability analysis indicates that there were no Alaska Tribal Corporations available to perform Construction projects. Below is a summary of the analysis for the overall study period:

Exhibit 6-15 **Subcontractor Disparity Analysis** Construction Fiscal Years 2002-2006 **Municipality of Anchorage**

| Ethnicity Classifications | # of Awarded Contracts | Contract Dollars | % of Dollars ¹ | % of Firms Available ² | Disparity Index ³ | Disparity Impact Under/Over Utilization | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | 2003 | | | | | | | |
| African Americans | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 2.30% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| AK Native Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 3.20% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| AK Tribal Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| American Indian/AK Natives | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 6.70% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 1.00% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| Hispanic Americans | 1 | \$27,000 | 2.66% | 2.30% | 115.62 | Overutilization | | | | |
| Nonminority Women | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 1.90% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| 2004 | | | | | | | | | | |
| African Americans | 1 | \$5,831 | 0.29% | 2.30% | 12.61 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| AK Native Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 3.20% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| AK Tribal Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| American Indian/AK Natives | 1 | \$108,693 | 5.41% | 6.70% | 80.69 | Underutilization | | | | |
| Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 1.00% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| Hispanic Americans | 1 | \$14,364 | 0.71% | 2.30% | 31.06 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| Nonminority Women | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 1.90% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| 2005 | | | | | | | | | | |
| African Americans | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 2.30% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| AK Native Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 3.20% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| AK Tribal Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| American Indian/AK Natives | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 6.70% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 1.00% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| Hispanic Americans | 1 | \$39,700 | 0.64% | 2.30% | 27.78 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| Nonminority Women | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 1.90% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| | | | 2006 | | | | | | | |
| African Americans | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 2.30% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| AK Native Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 3.20% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| AK Tribal Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| American Indian/AK Natives | 1 | \$35,775 | 2.18% | 6.70% | 32.58 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 1.00% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| Hispanic Americans | 1 | \$20,875 | 1.27% | 2.30% | 55.38 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| Nonminority Women | 1 | \$239,550 | 14.62% | 1.90% | 769.35 | Overutilization | | | | |
| | | | OVERALL | | | | | | | |
| African Americans | 1 | \$5,831 | 0.05% | 2.30% | 2.33 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| AK Native Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 3.20% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| AK Tribal Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| American Indian/AK Natives | 2 | \$144,468 | 1.33% | 6.70% | 19.82 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 1.00% | 0.00 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| Hispanic Americans | 4 | \$101,939 | 0.94% | 2.30% | 40.74 | * Underutilization | | | | |
| Nonminority Women | 1 | \$239,550 | 2.20% | 1.90% | 115.89 | Overutilization | | | | |

¹ The percentage of dollars from the prime utilization.

² The percentage of available firms.

³ The disparity index is % utilization divided by % availability multiplied by 100. * Significantly underutilized - disparity index below 80.00.

African Americans

• FY2002 through FY2006 - significantly underutilized as a subcontractor with a disparity index of 2.33.

Alaska Native Corporations

• FY2002 through FY2006 - were not utilized as a subcontractor for Construction projects, resulting in a disparity index of 0.00. The availability analysis indicates that 3.20 percent of the firms available were Alaska Native Corporations.

Alaska Tribal Corporations

• FY2002 through FY2006 - were not utilized as a subcontractor for Construction projects, resulting in a disparity index of 0.00. The availability analysis indicates that there were no firms available.

American Indian/Alaska Natives

• FY2002 through FY2006 - significantly underutilized as a subcontractor with a disparity index of 19.82.

Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders

 FY2002 through FY2006 - were not utilized as a subcontractor for Construction projects, resulting in a disparity index of 0.00. According to the availability analysis 1.00 percent of the available subcontracting firms were Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders.

Hispanic Americans

• FY2002 through FY2006 - significantly underutilized as a subcontractor with a disparity index of 40.74.

Non-minority Women

• FY2002 through FY2006 - overutilized as a subcontractor with a disparity index of 115.89.

6.6.2 Architectural & Engineering

The disparity analysis for Architectural & Engineering subcontracts is shown in Exhibit 6-16. During the five year study period, all DBEs were significantly underutilized. In FY2003, the Municipality awarded one contract in the amount of \$860,354 resulting in a \$10,000 subcontract award to an Asian Indian/Pacific Islander owned firm. Below is a summary of the analysis for the five year study period:

Exhibit 6-16 Subcontractor Disparity Analysis Architectural & Engineering Fiscal Years 2002-2006 Municipality of Anchorage

| Ethnicity Classifications | # of Awarded Contracts | Contract Dollars | % of Dollars ¹ | % of Firms Available ² | Disparity Index ³ | Disparity Impact Under/Over Utilization |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| | | 20 | 03 | | | |
| African Americans | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 1.90% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| AK Native Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 7.70% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| AK Tribal Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| American Indian/AK Natives | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 5.80% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | 1 | \$10,000 | 1.16% | 5.80% | 20.04 | * Underutilization |
| Hispanic Americans | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 3.90% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| Nonminority Women | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 15.40% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| | | OVE | RALL | | | |
| African Americans | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 1.90% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| AK Native Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 7.70% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| AK Tribal Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| American Indian/AK Natives | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 5.80% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | 1 | \$10,000 | 1.16% | 5.80% | 20.04 | * Underutilization |
| Hispanic Americans | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 3.90% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| Nonminority Women | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 15.40% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |

Source: Municipality of Anchorage for the period of October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2006.

African Americans

• FY2002 through FY2006 - were not utilized as a subcontractor for Architectural & Engineering projects, resulting in a disparity index of 0.00. According to the availability analysis 1.90 percent of the available subcontracting firms were African Americans.

Alaska Native Corporations

 FY2002 through FY2006 - were not utilized as a subcontractor for Architectural & Engineering projects, resulting in a disparity index of 0.00. According to the availability analysis 7.70 percent of the available subcontracting firms were Alaska Native Corporations.

Alaska Tribal Corporations

 FY2002 through FY2006 - were not utilized as a subcontractor for Architectural & Engineering projects, resulting in a disparity index of 0.00. The availability analysis indicates that there were no firms available.

¹ The percentage of dollars from the prime utilization.

² The percentage of available firms.

³ The disparity index is % utilization divided by % availability multiplied by 100.

^{*} Significantly underutilized - disparity index below 80.00.

American Indian/Alaska Natives

 FY2002 through FY2006 - were not utilized as a subcontractor for Architectural & Engineering projects. According to the availability analysis 5.80 percent of the available subcontracting firms were American Indian/Alaska Natives.

Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders

• FY2002 through FY2006 - significantly underutilized as a subcontractor with a disparity index of 20.04.

Hispanic Americans

 FY2002 through FY2006 - were not utilized as a subcontractor for Architectural & Engineering projects, resulting in a disparity index of 0.00. According to the availability analysis 3.90 percent of the available subcontracting firms were American Indian/Alaska Natives.

Non-minority Women

 FY2002 through FY2006 - were not utilized as a subcontractor for Architectural & Engineering projects, resulting in a disparity index of 0.00.
 According to the availability analysis 15.40 percent of the firms available were non-minority Women.

6.6.3 **Professional Services**

The disparity analysis for Professional Services subcontracts is shown in Exhibit 6-17. During the five year study period, all DBEs were significantly underutilized. During FY 2002, non-minority Women were overutilized with a disparity index of 160.35. This is a result of one subcontract being awarded to a non-minority Woman owned firm. Utilization of non-minority Women was 4.49 percent for FY 2002 based on the total dollars expended during this period in comparison to the overall utilization for the five year study period of 1.47 percent.

African Americans

 FY2002 through FY2006 - were not utilized as a subcontractor for Professional Services projects, resulting in a disparity index of 0.00. According to the availability analysis 0.40 percent of the firms available were African Americans.

Alaska Native Corporations

 FY2002 through FY2006 - were not utilized as a subcontractor for Professional Services projects, resulting in a disparity index of 0.00. According to the availability analysis 6.50 percent of the firms available were Alaska Native Corporations.

Exhibit 6-17 Subcontractor Disparity Analysis Professional Services Fiscal Years 2002-2006 Municipality of Anchorage

| Ethnicity Classifications | # of Awarded Contracts | racts Dollars Dollars ¹ | | % of Firms Available ² | Disparity Index ³ | Disparity Impact Under/Over Utilization |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| | | 20 | 02 | | | |
| African Americans | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 0.40% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| AK Native Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 6.50% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| AK Tribal Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| American Indian/AK Natives 0 | | \$0 | 0.00% | 4.50% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders 0 | | \$0 | 0.00% | 1.20% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| Hispanic Americans | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 0.80% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| Nonminority Women | 1 | \$59,085 | 4.49% | 2.90% | 154.82 | Overutilization |
| | | OVE | RALL | | | |
| African Americans | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 0.40% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| AK Native Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 6.50% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| AK Tribal Corporations | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| American Indian/AK Natives | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 4.50% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 1.20% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| Hispanic Americans | 0 | \$0 | 0.00% | 0.80% | 0.00 | * Underutilization |
| Nonminority Women | 1 | \$59,085 | 1.47% | 2.90% | 50.84 | * Underutilization |

Source: Municipality of Achorage for the period of October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2006.

Alaska Tribal Corporations

• FY2002 through FY2006 - were not utilized as a subcontractor for Professional Services projects, resulting in a disparity index of 0.00. The availability analysis indicates that there were no firms available.

American Indian/Alaska Natives

 FY2002 through FY2006 - were not utilized as a subcontractor for Professional Services projects, resulting in a disparity index of 0.00. According to the availability analysis 4.50 percent of the firms available were American Indian/Alaska Natives.

Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders

 FY2002 through FY2006 - were not utilized as a subcontractor for Professional Services projects, resulting in a disparity index of 0.00. According to the availability analysis 1.20 percent of the firms available were Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders.

¹ The percentage of dollars from the prime utilization.

² The percentage of available firms.

³ The disparity index is % utilization divided by % availability multiplied by 100.

^{*} Significantly underutilized - disparity index below 80.00

Hispanic Americans

• FY2002 through FY2006 - were not utilized as a subcontractor for Professional Services projects, resulting in a disparity index of 0.00. According to the availability analysis 0.80 percent of the firms available were Hispanic Americans.

Non-minority Women

• FY2002 through FY2006 - significantly underutilized as a subcontractor with a disparity index of 50.84.

| ALASKA AVAILABILITY AND DISPARITY STUDY |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| CHAPTER 7.0 – ALASKA RAILROAD CORPORATION RELEVANT MARKET AREA AND UTILIZATION ANALYSES |
| RELEVANT WARKET AREA AND UTILIZATION ANALTSES |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

CHAPTER 7.0 – ALASKA RAILROAD CORPORATION

This chapter presents an overview of the processes used to identify and analyze the procurement activity of the Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC) on federally funded projects. As with all agencies, contract and/or payments to prime contractors, consultants and vendors are easy to identify and access; the identification of subcontractor data is more challenging. During the course of the study, the Wilson Group worked with the ARRC to identify and collect prime contractor and subcontractor data for the study period.

Through the collection of vendor payments and a manual review of contract files, the ARRC was able to identify 277 contracts issued over the five-year study period. Below is a list of the number of contracts for each business category analyzed.

PRIME CONTRACTS

| Business Category | Contract Amounts | # of Contracts |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Construction | \$28,675,433 | 81 |
| Architectural & Engineering | \$ 4,430,813 | 27 |
| Professional Services | \$10,400,722 | 169 |
| Total | \$43,506,968 | 277 |

7.1 Market Area Analysis

The relevant market area was defined as those United States counties in which the Alaska Railroad Corporation expended 75 percent or more of total expenditures during the study period. The significance of the relevant market area is that it establishes the geographical boundaries for the DBE program.

During the study period, the ARRC spent over \$43.5 million on federally funded contracts, utilizing 134 individual firms on 277 contracts. Counties within the State of Alaska received over 80 percent of the federally funded contract dollars awarded during the study period. Exhibit 7-1 presents dollar amounts and percentages of firms as well as contracts for the ARRC's relevant market area.

Exhibit 7-1
Relevant Market Area
Alaska Railroad Corporation
Fiscal Years 2002 – 2006

| | State of Alaska | Totals |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Total Dollars | \$43,506,968 | \$43,506,968 |
| Percent of Dollars | 85.69% | 85.69% |
| Percent of Contracts | 79.14% | 79.14% |
| Percent of Firms Utilized | 75.56% | 75.56% |

Source: Alaska Railroad Corporation for the period of October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2006.

7.2 Prime Contractor Utilization Analysis

The prime contractor utilization analysis of all federally funded contracts were based on the electronic and hardcopy data that was provided by the ARRC for federally funded contracts awarded during the five-year study period October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2006.

The overall utilization analysis of prime contractors for the ARRC is shown in Exhibit 7-2. DBEs were awarded \$3.4 million or 7.98 percent of the total federal dollars expended by the ARRC during the five year study period. The most utilized DBEs were owned by non-minority Women, receiving \$2.7 million or 6.26 percent of the total amount of federally funded contracts awarded. ANCs were second, receiving \$515,520 or 1.18 percent. Firms owned by African Americans and Alaska Tribal Corporations did not receive any prime contracting federal dollars spent within the five year study period.

7.3 Subcontractor Utilization Analysis

The ARRC does not have a formal or informal recordkeeping process to collect subcontractor data; therefore, it required ARRC staff to review hard copy files to generate a list of utilized subcontractors. After the five-month review, ARRC was able to identify 22 subcontracts awarded in the construction industry over the study period. Based on previous experience in conducting disparity studies and the construction industry practices, the Wilson Group determined the data was insufficient to conduct any substantive analyses or draw any supportable conclusions.

Exhibit 7-4 Business Categories Combined Prime Contractor Utilization Alaska Railroad Corporation Fiscal Years 2002 – 2006

| | African Americans | AK Native Corporations | AK Tribal Corporations | American Indian/AK Native | Asian Indian/Pacific Islanders | Hispanic Americans | Nonminority Women | Total DBEs | Non-DBEs | TOTALS |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Total Prime Contractor Dollars | \$0 | \$515,520 | \$0 | \$197,947 | \$22,494 | \$12,384 | \$2,723,993 | \$3,472,339 | \$40,034,629 | \$43,506,968 |
| Percent of Dollars | 0.00% | 1.18% | 0.00% | 0.45% | 0.05% | 0.03% | 6.26% | 7.98% | 92.02% | 100.00% |
| Total Number of Contracts Percent of Contracts | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 32 | 245 | 277 |
| | 0.00% | 0.36 % | 0.00% | 1.08% | 0.00% | 0.36 % | 3.61% | 11.55% | 88.45% | 1 00.00% |
| Individual Firms Utilized Percent of Firms | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 19 | 115 | 134 |
| | 0.00% | 2.24% | 0.00% | 4.48% | 0.75% | 0.75% | 5.97% | 14.18% | 85.82% | 100.00% |

Source: Alaska Railroad Corporation for the period of October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2006.