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# NORTH CAROLINA COLLEGE \& UNIVERSITY QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS 

## A. Introduction

The quantitative analysis of a disparity study measures and compares the availability of firms in each race/ethnicity/gender group within North Carolina Colleges and Universities ("NC-CC/Univ") geographical and product market areas to the utilization of each race/ethnicity/gender group, measured by the payments to these groups by NCCC/Univ.

Research Question: Statistical Analysis
Is there a disparity that is statistically significant between the percentage of available, qualified, and willing MWBE firms, in the Relevant Geographic and Product Markets, and the percentage of dollars spent with MWBE firms in those same markets during the Study Period?

The outcome of the comparison shows us whether there is a disparity between availability and utilization and whether that disparity is an overutilization, an underutilization, or in parity (the amount to be expected). Further, the disparity is tested to see if it is statistically significant. Legal precedents have clearly established that the presence of such significant statistical disparities create an inference of discrimination adversely affecting the participation of the underutilized firms. Finally, the regression analysis contained in the Volume I (DOA) Chapter VI Private Sector Analysis tests for other explanations for the disparity to determine if it is likely that the disparity is caused by race/ethnicity/gender status, or other factors. If there is statistically significant underutilization of MWBEs that is likely caused by race/ethnicity/gender, then GSPC will determine as part of its findings whether there is a basis for an inference of discrimination and consideration by NC-CC/Univ for the use of narrowly tailored race- and gender-conscious remedies.

## B. Data Assessment and Requests

GSPC conducted several meetings with various departments oversee or maintain both State of North Carolina centralized data (i.e. eProcurement, Office for Historically Underutilized Businesses ("HUB Office"), and Interscope). In addition, GSPC interviewed NC-CC/Univ staff who maintain data unique to the community colleges and universities. The following 58 Community Colleges and 21 Universities and Affiliated Institutions we included in data collection and analysis.

## * NC-CC/Univ Community Colleges

| Alamance Community College |
| :--- |
| Asheville-Buncombe Technical Community College |
| Beaufort County Community College |
| Bladen Community College |
| Blue Ridge Community College |
| Brunswick Community College |

ATtORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS
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| Caldwell Community College and Technical Institute |
| :--- |
| Cape Fear Community College |
| Carteret Community College |
| Catawba Valley Community College |
| Central Carolina Community College |
| Central Piedmont Community College |
| Cleveland Community College |
| Coastal Carolina Community College |
| College of The Albemarle |
| Craven Community College |
| Davidson County Community College |
| Durham Technical Community College |
| Edgecombe Community College |
| Fayetteville Technical Community College |
| Forsyth Technical Community College |
| Gaston College |
| Guilford Technical Community College |
| Halifax Community College |
| Haywood Community College |
| Isothermal Community College |
| James Sprunt Community College |
| Johnston Community College |
| Lenoir Community College |
| Martin Community College |
| Mayland Community College |
| McDowell Technical Community College |
| Mitchell Community College |
| Montgomery Community College |
| Nash Community College |
| Pamlico Community College |
| Piedmont Community College |
| Pitt Community College |
| Randolph Community College |
| Richmond Community College |
| Roanoke-Chowan Community College |
| Robeson Community College |
| Rockingham Community College |
| Rowan-Cabarrus Community College |
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| Sampson Community College |
| :--- |
| Sandhills Community College |
| South Piedmont Community College |
| Southeastern Community College |
| Southwestern Community College |
| Stanly Community College |
| Surry Community College |
| Tri-County Community College |
| Vance-Granville Community College |
| Wake Technical Community College |
| Wayne Community College |
| Western Piedmont Community College |
| Wilkes Community College |
| Wilson Community College |

* Universities and Related Institutions

| Appalachian State University |
| :--- |
| East Carolina University |
| Elizabeth City State University |
| Fayetteville State University |
| NC A\&T State University |
| NC Arboretum |
| NC School of Science and Mathematics |
| NC School of the Arts |
| NC-CC/Univ Central University |
| NC-CC/Univ State University |
| UNC Asheville |
| UNC Chapel Hill |
| UNC Charlotte |
| UNC General Administration |
| UNC Greensboro |
| UNC Hospitals |
| UNC Pembroke |
| UNC Wilmington |
| UNC-TV |
| Western Carolina University |
| Winston-Salem State University |

The objective of the data assessment meetings was for GSPC to get a better understanding of how NCCC/Univ's data is kept and how best to request the data needed for the Study. Following the data assessment meetings, GSPC presented written requests for the data, detailing the type and fields of data needed to complete the quantitative analysis.

The initial award data that GSPC requested from the NC-CC/Univ was incomplete. Many of the NCCC/Univ do not maintain award data, or if they do, it was not consistently kept. GSPC therefore attempted to obtain payment data from the State Controller's Office for both the state agencies and the NC-CC/Univ. The State Controller's Office only maintains payment data for the state agencies, and there is not centralized payment data maintained for the NC-CC/Univ. Therefore, GSPC has to obtain payment data individually from each of the 58 Community Colleges and 21 Universities and Related Institutions. ${ }^{1}$

All the payment data requested was in electronic format from the individual NC-CC/Univ. The data was uploaded to GSPC where they were catalogued and stored in GSPC's cloud repository. The data collected was used to develop data files containing purchasing history for each major Industry Category:

- Construction
- Architecture and Engineering
- Professional Services
- Other Services
- Goods

The NC-CC/Univ did not maintain all subcontractor data, but GSPC was able to obtain subcontractor data on minority and women owned business enterprises ("MWBE") only, as reported to the HUB Office. GSPC verified gender and ethnicity of vendors and completed necessary information about vendor address, Industry Category, and other related areas. Gender and ethnicity verification were based on official certification listings.

GSPC uses vendor zip codes to identify the County where the business is located to determine whether a vendor will be included in the Relevant Market Area analysis. Vendor addresses are also used for conducting vendor surveys. Some files submitted by NC-CC/Univ did not contain the necessary information, including vendor physical addresses, which were compensated for by obtaining them from Dun and Bradstreet Hoover's databases or simply searching the business name on the internet.

## C. Data Assignment, Cleanup and Verification

After the completion of data collection, the data were electronically and manually "cleaned" to find duplicates and removing all unrelated payments such as payment to personnel, nonprofit organizations, and governmental agencies. The data cleanup also included the following five (5) tasks:

[^0]- Assigning and verifying ethnicity, race \& gender of each firm;
- Assigning each firm to an Industry Category based upon the kind of work that the firm performs;
- Utilizing zip codes to determine the closes firm location to or within the State;
- Matching files electronically to pick up addresses, ethnicity/race/gender, and/or Industry Category; and
- Filling in any additional necessary data on firms.

File cleanup was first done electronically by linking information provided by NC-CC/Univ to certain indicators, like purchase order number or cross-referencing information with other files to fill in missing fields. This cleansing and re-tabulating process produced a lower total amount than the designated budget for each category since many vendors/purchases were excluded from the study, as payments that went to local governments, utility companies, not-for profits, and universities/colleges.

## 1. Assignment of Race/Gender/Ethnicity

To identify all minority owned firms, GSPC utilized only those which were certified through the following certification process:

Carolinas-Virginia Minority Supplier Development Council<br>DBE Certified Vendors<br>HUB Certified Vendors<br>Indian American Businesses (tribal certification)

An assignment of race/gender/ethnicity, priority is given to race/ethnicity, so that all minority owned firms were categorized according to their race/ethnicity and not by gender. Nonminority Females were categorized as Caucasian Nonminority Female. Firms with no race/ethnicity/gender indicated, Nonminority male owned firms, and publicly owned corporations are categorized as Non-MWBE firms.

## 2. Assignment of Industry Categories

To place firms in the proper Industry Categories, GSPC used the internal NC-CC/Univ business classification but verified the results after assigning vendors to the category of Construction, Architecture and Engineering, Professional Services, Other Services or Goods. In assigning vendors to Industry Categories, GSPC categorized vendors based on vendor classification in NAICS, if possible. Vendor NAICS codes were obtained from review of vendors in Dun and Bradstreet or search of vendor on the internet. Hoover produces the largest publicly available database of business establishments in the U.S. Hoover's establishment data includes the business name, address, phone number, NAICS code, business type, and other descriptive information, which is continuously updated and verified. Any remaining firms without NAICS codes were researched using the internet to ascertain the correct Industry Category, as not all firms NAICS codes were obtainable.

## 3. Master Vendor File

NC-CC/Univ provided data files reflecting all related purchases over $\& 5,000$ during the Study Period. Based on the submitted files, GSPC created two master files. One showing utilization data, or payments while another produced a partial list of available vendors. The purpose of the Master Vendor File was to collect, in one data file, a listing of all firms that are ready, willing, and able to do business with NC-CC/Univ. It includes internal lists from NC-CC/Univ as well as outside governmental lists. The availability files 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, e.g. making sure there were no inconsistent ethnicities. 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:

- Carolinas-Virginia Minority Supplier Development Council
- DBE Certified Vendors
- NC-CC/Univ Subcontract Data
- HUB Certified Vendors
- Indian American Businesses (tribal certification)
- SBE Certified Vendors
- Colleges and Universities Prime Data

Availability is determined by using all the unique firms in the Master Vendor File.

## D. Relevant Market Analysis

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 law. ${ }^{2}$ In line with antitrust precepts, United States Supreme Court, Justice Sandra Day O'Connor in Croson, specifically criticized Richmond, Virginia, for making Minority Business Enterprises (MBEs) all over the country eligible to participate in its set-aside programs. 3 The Court reasoned that a mere statistical disparity between the overall minority population in Richmond, Virginia, which was 50\% Black American, and the award of prime contracts to minority owned firms, $0.67 \%$ of which were Black 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 contracting work (including prime and subcontractors) and the percentage of total City contracting dollars awarded to minority firms.

[^1]
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The Relevant Market has been determined for each of the major Industry Categories:

- Construction
- Architecture and Engineering
- Professional Services
- Other Services
- Goods

For each Industry Category GSPC measured the "Relevant Market" by the area where at least $75 \%$ of NCCC/Univ's dollars were paid during the Study Period. In analyzing the Relevant Market data, GSPC tabulated the percentage of dollars paid. Postal Zip Codes were used to identify the County location of each vendor. Counties were used in calculating the Relevant Market Area starting with the State of NC-CC/Univ and then radiating out, if necessary, to reach approximating $75 \%$ area.

Table 1 shows that the threshold of $75 \%$ was surpassed in Construction, A\&E and Professional Services with payments to firms located in North Carolina. In Other Services and Goods, the payments were just short of the $75 \%$ threshold. GSPC determined that it is appropriate to have one consistent Relevant Market across all Industry Categories as the State of North Carolina.

GSPC presents a breakdown of NC-CC/Univ payments by County where payees are located in Appendix A.

Table 1: Relevant Market Area - State of North Carolina
Prime Construction, Architecture and Engineering, Professional Services, Other Services and Goods (Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018)

NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study

| Categories | Total Amount of <br> Payments to Firms in <br> NC | Percent of Payments to <br> Firms in NC |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Construction | $\$$ | $2,304,726,246$ | $97.76 \%$ |
| A \& E | $\$$ | $440,150,460$ | $86.01 \%$ |
| Professional Services | $\$$ | $632,740,116$ | $76.58 \%$ |
| Other Services | $\$$ | $3,027,916,125$ | $71.13 \%$ |
| Goods | $\$$ | $2,018,657,210$ | $72.31 \%$ |

Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020

## E. Availability Analysis

## 1. Methodology

The methodology utilized to determine the availability of businesses for public contracting is crucial to understanding whether a disparity exists within the Relevant Market. Availability is a benchmark to examine whether there are any disparities between the utilization of MWBEs and their availability in the marketplace.

Availability is the determination of the percentage of MWBEs that are "ready, willing, and able" to provide goods or services to NC-CC/Univ.

Croson and subsequent decisions give only general guidance as to how to measure availability. One common theme from the court decisions is that being qualified to perform work for a jurisdiction is one of the key indices of an available firm. In addition, the firm must have demonstrated that it is both willing and able to perform the work.

The measures of availability utilized in this Study incorporate all the criteria of availability required by Croson:
$>$ The firm does business within an industry group from which NC-CC/Univ makes certain purchases.
$>$ The firm's owner has taken steps (such as registering, bidding, certification, prequalification, etc.) to demonstrate interest in doing business with government.
> The firm is located within a Relevant Market area such that it can do business with NC-CC/Univ.

MWBE availability is a percentage and is computed by dividing the number of firms in each MWBE group by the total number of businesses in the pool of firms for that Industry Category. Once these Availability Estimates were calculated, GSPC compared them to the percentage of firms utilized in the respective Industry Categories to generate the disparity indices which will be discussed later in this analysis.

## 2. Measurement Basis for Availability

There are numerous approaches to measuring available, qualified firms. GSPC has established a methodology of measuring availability based upon demonstrated interest in doing business with governments in the Relevant Market and in the relevant Industry Categories. In determining those firms to be included in the availability pool, GSPC included the entire "Master Vendor File," which consisted of the following:
attorneys and Public Policy Consultants
> Carolinas-Virginia Minority Supplier Development Council
> DBE Certified Vendors
> NC-State Subcontract Data
$>$ HUB Certified Vendors
> Indian American Businesses (tribal certification)
> SBE Certified Vendors
> Colleges and Universities Prime Data

## 3. Capacity

The ability or capacity to perform the work is tested in the Regression Analysis conducted in Volume I (DOA) Chapter VI chapter - Private Sector Analysis. The regression analysis shows whether race/ethnicity/gender factors are impediments overall to the success of MWBEs in obtaining awards in the marketplace and whether, but for those factors, firms would have the capacity to provide goods and services on a level higher than what is presently being utilized.

## 4. Availability Estimates

Below are the Availability Estimates for the Study. The data is separated into the five (5) major Industry Categories: Construction, Architecture and Engineering, Professional Services, Other Services and Goods. Figures 1-5 show the number of firms by race/gender/ethnicity as compared with the total number of firms. All availability (not broken down by Industry Category) and counts of availability are contained in Appendix B.

The availability analyzed from the Master Vendor File includes all unique vendors in each Industry Category. The NC-CC/Univ Relevant Market availability in Figure 1 below shows that, in Construction, Black American owned firms make up $14.65 \%$ of all Construction firms, Nonminority Female owned firms make up $13.64 \%$. Asian American owned firms are 1.12\%, while Hispanic American and American Indian owned firms have availability of $4.38 \%$ and $2.39 \%$, respectively, in Construction within the Relevant Market. In total, MWBEs account for $36.19 \%$ of all available firms in Construction.

Figure 1: Availability Estimates - Construction
In the Relevant Market
NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study


Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020
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 Vol. II Community Colleges \& Universities Quantitative AnalysisAs set out in the availability Figure 2, Black American owned firms make up $6.41 \%$ of Architecture and Engineering firms and Nonminority Female owned firms make up 10.52\%. Non-MWBE owned firms account for about $77.03 \%$, while Asian American owned firms have $2.42 \%$. Hispanic American owned firms have $2.42 \%$ and American Indian owned firms have $1.21 \%$ availability in this category. MWBEs are $22.97 \%$ of all available firms in Architecture and Engineering.

Figure 2: Availability Estimates- Architecture and Engineering
In the Relevant Market
NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study


Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020
attorneys and Public Policy Consultants
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As set out in the availability Figure 3, Black American owned firms make up $18.42 \%$ of Professional Services firms and Nonminority Female owned firms make up $9.55 \%$. Asian Americans have $2.86 \%$, Hispanic American owned firms have $2.00 \%$ and American Indian owned firms have $1.89 \%$ availability in this category. MWBEs are $34.32 \%$ of all available firms in Professional Services.

Figure 3: Availability Estimates-Professional Services
In the Relevant Market
NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study


Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020
attorneys and Public Policy Consultants

Other Services availabilities are reflected in Figure 4 so that businesses owned by Black Americans make up $15.86 \%$ and Nonminority Female owned $9.05 \%$ of the firms. Non-MWBEs account for $71.38 \%$ of all availability, while Asian American 1.30\%. Hispanic American owned firms have $1.72 \%$ and American Indian owned firms have $0.69 \%$ availability in this Industry Category. MWBEs total $28.62 \%$ of all available firms in Other Services.

Figure 4: Availability Estimates-Other Services
In the Relevant Market
NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study


Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020
attorneys and Public Policy Consultants

Goods availabilities are reflected in Figure 5 so that businesses owned by Hispanic Americans make up $1.71 \%$ and Nonminority Female owned $9.27 \%$ of the firms. Non-MWBEs account for $79.07 \%$ of all availability, while Asian American owned firms have 1.09\%. Black American owned firms have $8.18 \%$ and American Indian owned firms have $0.68 \%$ availability in this category. MWBEs total $20.93 \%$ of all available firms in Goods.

Figure 5: Availability Estimates -Goods
In the Relevant Market
NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study


Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020
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## F. Utilization Analysis

## 1. Prime Utilization

The relevant payment history for NCCC/Univ has been recorded based upon the paid amounts provided by NC-CC/Univ. In the Prime Utilization tables below, the dollars and percentage of dollars paid in each of the five (5) major procurement

PRIME UTILIZATION is the percentage of actual payments made directly by NC-CC/Univ during the Study Period to MWBEs in comparison to all actual payments made directly to all vendors by NC-CC/Univ during the Study Period. categories have been broken out by race/ethnicity and gender for each year of the Study Period. The total of each race/ethnicity/gender group represented in the MWBE category will, when added to the Non-MWBE Category, equal the Total Column.

As indicated in Tables 2 and 3, a total of seventy-three (73) MBEs received $\$ 45.9$ million during the Study Period, while ninety-two (92) Nonminority Female owned firms were paid $\$ 183.8$ million. Two-thousand and one hundred and eleven $(2,111)$ non-MWBE firms were paid over $\$ 2.08$ billion. MWBEs received $9.97 \%$ of the total prime Construction paid dollars. The average paid to MWBE firms was $\$ 1.39$ million as compared to $\$ 982,950$ to Non-MWBE firms over the Study Period.

Table 2: Prime Utilization - Construction by Number of Firms
In the Relevant Market Number of Businesses by Business Ownership and Fiscal Year

FY 2014-2018
NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study

|  | African American |  | Asian American |  | Hispanic <br> American |  | American Indian |  | Total MBE |  | Nonminority Female |  | Total M/WBE |  | Non-M/WBE |  | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2014 | 18 | 1.94\% | 1 | 0.11\% | 3 | 0.32\% | 6 | 0.65\% | 28 | 3.01\% | 47 | 5.05\% | 75 | 8.06\% | 855 | 91.94\% | 930 | 21.17\% |
| 2015 | 16 | 1.74\% | 1 | 0.11\% | 7 | 0.76\% | 9 | 0.98\% | 33 | 3.58\% | 47 | 5.10\% | 80 | 8.69\% | 841 | 91.31\% | 921 | 20.97\% |
| 2016 | 26 | 2.71\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 5 | 0.52\% | 6 | 0.63\% | 37 | 3.86\% | 45 | 4.69\% | 82 | 8.55\% | 877 | 91.45\% | 959 | 21.83\% |
| 2017 | 28 | 2.83\% | 2 | 0.20\% | 7 | 0.71\% | 8 | 0.81\% | 45 | 4.55\% | 52 | 5.26\% | 97 | 9.81\% | 892 | 90.19\% | 989 | 22.51\% |
| 2018 | 23 | 3.87\% | 2 | 0.34\% | 5 | 0.84\% | 3 | 0.51\% | 33 | 5.56\% | 36 | 6.06\% | 69 | 11.62\% | 525 | 88.38\% | 594 | 13.52\% |
| Total 2014-2018 | 111 | 2.53\% | 6 | 0.14\% | 27 | 0.61\% | 32 | 0.73\% | 176 | 4.01\% | 227 | 5.17\% | 403 | 9.17\% | 3990 | 90.83\% | 4393 | 100.00\% |
| Total Unique <br> Number of <br> Businesses | 45 | 1.98\% | 2 | 0.09\% | 14 | 0.62\% | 12 | 0.53\% | 73 | 3.21\% | 92 | 4.04\% | 165 | 7.25\% | 2111 | 92.75\% | 2276 | 100.00\% |

Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020

* Total unique number represents the number of unduplicated firms during the Study Period.
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Table 3: Prime Utilization - Construction by Dollars
In the Relevant Market

Distribution of Dollars by Business Ownership and Fiscal Year (Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018)
NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study

| Business Ownership Classification |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |
| Black American | \$ | 3,443,834 | \$ | 6,847,610 | \$ | 7,450,794 | \$ | 3,517,546 | \$ | 4,296,375 | \$ | 25,556,158 |
| Asian American | \$ | 47,615 | \$ | 97,044 | \$ | 59,510 | \$ | 93,136 | \$ | 27,253 | \$ | 324,557 |
| Hispanic American | \$ | 914,079 | \$ | 195,840 | \$ | 1,000,105 | \$ | 613,270 | \$ | 274,902 | \$ | 2,998,196 |
| American Indian | \$ | 7,554,980 | \$ | 4,369,334 | \$ | 3,095,119 | \$ | 1,521,579 | \$ | 521,286 | \$ | 17,062,298 |
| TOTAL MINORITY | \$ | 11,960,507 | \$ | 11,509,828 | \$ | 11,605,527 | \$ | 5,745,531 | \$ | 5,119,816 | \$ | 45,941,209 |
| Nonminority Female | \$ | 13,397,439 | \$ | 13,934,021 | \$ | 57,929,538 | \$ | 81,913,035 |  | 16,603,296 | \$ | 183,777,329 |
| TOTAL M/WBE | \$ | 25,357,946 | \$ | 25,443,849 | \$ | 69,535,065 | \$ | 87,658,566 | \$ | 21,723,112 | \$ | 229,718,538 |
| NON-M/WBE | \$ | 397,379,922 | \$ | 436,806,663 | \$ | 378,244,959 | \$ | 541,916,725 |  | 320,659,438 | \$ | 2,075,007,707 |
| TOTAL FIRMS | \$ | 422,737,868 | \$ | 462,250,512 | \$ | 447,780,024 | \$ | 629,575,291 | \$ | 342,382,550 | \$ | 2,304,726,246 |
| Business Ownership Classification |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | TOTAL |
|  |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |
| Black American |  | 0.81\% |  | 1.48\% |  | 1.66\% |  | 0.56\% |  | 1.25\% |  | 1.11\% |
| Asian American |  | 0.01\% |  | 0.02\% |  | 0.01\% |  | 0.01\% |  | 0.01\% |  | 0.01\% |
| Hispanic American |  | 0.22\% |  | 0.04\% |  | 0.22\% |  | 0.10\% |  | 0.08\% |  | 0.13\% |
| American Indian |  | 1.79\% |  | 0.95\% |  | 0.69\% |  | 0.24\% |  | 0.15\% |  | 0.74\% |
| TOTAL MINORITY |  | 2.83\% |  | 2.49\% |  | 2.59\% |  | 0.91\% |  | 1.50\% |  | 1.99\% |
| Nonminority Female |  | 3.17\% |  | 3.01\% |  | 12.94\% |  | 13.01\% |  | 4.85\% |  | 7.97\% |
| TOTAL M/WBE |  | 6.00\% |  | 5.50\% |  | 15.53\% |  | 13.92\% |  | 6.34\% |  | 9.97\% |
| NON-M/WBE |  | 94.00\% |  | 94.50\% |  | 84.47\% |  | 86.08\% |  | 93.66\% |  | 90.03\% |
| TOTAL FIRMS |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |

Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020

As shown in Tables 4 and 5, in A\&E there were eighteen (18) MBEs that shared a total amount of \$10.6 million which was $2.41 \%$ of the total A\&E paid dollars. Twenty-two (22) Nonminority Female owned firms were paid $3.04 \%$ or $\$ 13.4$ million of the total A\&E dollars. The average paid to MWBE firms was $\$ 600,398$ as compared to $\$ 690,106$ to Non-MWBE firms over the Study Period.

Table 4: Prime Utilization - Architecture \& Engineering by Number of Firms
In the Relevant Market
Number of Businesses by Business Ownership and Fiscal Year
FY 2014-2018
NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study

|  | African American |  | Asian American |  | Hispanic <br> American |  | American Indian |  | Total MBE |  | Nonminority <br> Female |  | Total M/WBE |  | Non-M/WBE |  | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2014 | 4 | 1.55\% | 2 | 0.78\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 6 | 2.33\% | 7 | 2.71\% | 13 | 5.04\% | 245 | 94.96\% | 258 | 19.05\% |
| 2015 | 3 | 1.09\% | 3 | 1.09\% | 2 | 0.72\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 8 | 2.90\% | 14 | 5.07\% | 22 | 7.97\% | 254 | 92.03\% | 276 | 20.38\% |
| 2016 | 6 | 2.01\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 1 | 0.34\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 7 | 2.35\% | 11 | 3.69\% | 18 | 6.04\% | 280 | 93.96\% | 298 | 22.01\% |
| 2017 | 4 | 1.42\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 1 | 0.36\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 5 | 1.78\% | 14 | 4.98\% | 19 | 6.76\% | 262 | 93.24\% | 281 | 20.75\% |
| 2018 | 5 | 2.07\% | 1 | 0.41\% | 2 | 0.83\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 8 | 3.32\% | 11 | 4.56\% | 19 | 7.88\% | 222 | 92.12\% | 241 | 17.80\% |
| Total 2014-2018 | 22 | 1.62\% | 6 | 0.44\% | 6 | 0.44\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 34 | 2.51\% | 57 | 4.21\% | 91 | 6.72\% | 1263 | 93.28\% | 1354 | 100.00\% |
| Total Unique <br> Number of <br> Businesses | 11 | 1.71\% | 4 | 0.62\% | 3 | 0.47\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 18 | 2.80\% | 22 | 3.42\% | 40 | 6.22\% | 603 | 93.78\% | 643 | 100.00\% |

Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020

* Total unique number represents the number of unduplicated firms during the Study Period.
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Table 5: Prime Utilization - Architecture \& Engineering by Dollars
In the Relevant Market
Distribution of Dollars by Business Ownership and Fiscal Year
(Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018)
NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study

| Business Ownership Classification |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |
| Black American | \$ | 2,710,626 | \$ | 1,783,224 | \$ | 1,350,117 | \$ | 1,023,323 | \$ | 632,423 | \$ | 7,499,713 |
| Asian American | \$ | 315,773 | \$ | 404,354 | \$ | 258,396 | \$ | 625,627 | \$ | 192,906 | \$ | 1,797,057 |
| Hispanic American | \$ | 114,379 | \$ | 353,036 | \$ | 400,663 | \$ | 317,709 | \$ | 112,124 | \$ | 1,297,911 |
| American Indian | \$ | 6,500 | \$ |  | \$ | 6,000 | \$ | 16,600 | \$ | 5,800 | \$ | 34,900 |
| TOTAL MINORITY | \$ | 3,147,278 | \$ | 2,540,614 | \$ | 2,015,176 | \$ | 1,983,259 | \$ | 943,253 | \$ | 10,629,580 |
| Nonminority Female | \$ | 2,349,845 | \$ | 3,411,092 | \$ | 2,280,622 | \$ | 3,367,656 | \$ | 1,977,150 | \$ | 13,386,364 |
| TOTAL M/WBE | \$ | 5,497,123 | \$ | 5,951,706 | \$ | 4,295,797 | \$ | 5,350,915 | \$ | 2,920,403 | \$ | 24,015,944 |
| NON-M/WBE | \$ | 69,086,384 | \$ | 70,263,329 |  | 106,120,554 | \$ | 91,064,086 | \$ | 79,600,163 | \$ | 416,134,516 |
| TOTAL FIRMS | \$ | 74,583,507 | \$ | 76,215,035 | \$ | 110,416,351 | \$ | 96,415,002 | \$ | 82,520,566 | \$ | 440,150,460 |
| Business Ownership Classification |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | TOTAL |
|  |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |
| Black American |  | 3.63\% |  | 2.34\% |  | 1.22\% |  | 1.06\% |  | 0.77\% |  | 1.70\% |
| Asian American |  | 0.42\% |  | 0.53\% |  | 0.23\% |  | 0.65\% |  | 0.23\% |  | 0.41\% |
| Hispanic American |  | 0.15\% |  | 0.46\% |  | 0.36\% |  | 0.33\% |  | 0.14\% |  | 0.29\% |
| American Indian |  | 0.01\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.01\% |  | 0.02\% |  | 0.01\% |  | 0.01\% |
| TOTAL MINORITY |  | 4.22\% |  | 3.33\% |  | 1.83\% |  | 2.06\% |  | 1.14\% |  | 2.41\% |
| Nonminority Female |  | 3.15\% |  | 4.48\% |  | 2.07\% |  | 3.49\% |  | 2.40\% |  | 3.04\% |
| TOTAL M/WBE |  | 7.37\% |  | 7.81\% |  | 3.89\% |  | 5.55\% |  | 3.54\% |  | 5.46\% |
| NON-M/WBE |  | 92.63\% |  | 92.19\% |  | 96.11\% |  | 94.45\% |  | 96.46\% |  | 94.54\% |
| TOTAL FIRMS |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |

Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020

As shown in Tables 6 and 7, in Professional Services there were nine (9) MBEs that shared a total amount of $\$ 1.9$ million which was $0.32 \%$ of the total Professional Services paid dollars. Eleven (11) Nonminority Female owned firms were paid $0.25 \%$ or $\$ 1.6$ million of the total Professional Services dollars. The average paid to MWBE firms was $\$ 180,133$, substantially less than the $\$ 575,079$ average paid to Non-MWBE firms over the Study Period.

Table 6: Prime Utilization - Professional Services by Number of Firms
In the Relevant Market
Number of Businesses by Business Ownership and Fiscal Year
FY 2014-2018
NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study

|  | African American |  | Asian American |  | Hispanic <br> American |  | American Indian |  | Total MBE |  | Nonminority <br> Female |  | Total M/WBE |  | Non-M/WBE |  | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2014 |  | 0.78\% | 1 | 0.26\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 4 | 1.03\% | 3 | 0.78\% | 7 | 1.81\% | 380 | 98.19\% | 387 | 18.13\% |
| 2015 | 5 | 1.08\% | 2 | 0.43\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 7 | 1.51\% | 5 | 1.08\% | 12 | 2.59\% | 452 | 97.41\% | 464 | 21.73\% |
| 2016 | 4 | 0.80\% | 1 | 0.20\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 5 | 1.00\% | 9 | 1.80\% | 14 | 2.81\% | 485 | 97.19\% | 499 | 23.37\% |
| 2017 | 5 | 1.04\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 5 | 1.04\% | 6 | 1.25\% | 11 | 2.29\% | 469 | 97.71\% | 480 | 22.48\% |
| 2018 | 1 | 0.33\% | 1 | 0.33\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 2 | 0.66\% | 3 | 0.98\% | 5 | 1.64\% | 300 | 98.36\% | 305 | 14.29\% |
| Total 2014-2018 | 18 | 0.84\% | 5 | 0.23\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 23 | 1.08\% | 26 | 1.22\% | 49 | 2.30\% | 2086 | 97.70\% | 2135 | 100.00\% |
| Total Unique <br> Number of <br> Businesses | 6 | 0.54\% | 3 | 0.27\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 9 | 0.81\% | 11 | 0.99\% | 20 | 1.80\% | 1094 | 98.20\% | 1114 | 100.00\% |

Griffin \& Strong, P.C.

* Total unique number represents the number of unduplicated firms during the Study Period.
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Table 7: Prime Utilization - Professional Services by Dollars
In the Relevant Market
FY 2014-2018
NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study

| Business Ownership Classification | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (\$) | (\$) | (\$) | (\$) | (\$) | (\$) |
| Black American | \$ 350,759 | \$ 264,075 | \$ 397,316 | \$ 538,854 | \$ 246,291 | \$ 1,797,295 |
| Asian American | \$ 6,270 | \$ 126,900 | \$ 29,866 | \$ | \$ 35,473 | \$ 198,510 |
| Hispanic American | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| American Indian | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| TOTAL MINORITY | \$ 357,029 | \$ 390,975 | \$ 427,183 | \$ 538,854 | \$ 281,764 | \$ 1,995,804 |
| Nonminority Female | \$ 166,437 | \$ 346,503 | \$ 476,513 | \$ 203,286 | \$ 414,117 | \$ 1,606,856 |
| TOTAL M/WBE | \$ 523,466 | \$ 737,478 | \$ 903,696 | \$ 742,141 | \$ 695,881 | \$ 3,602,661 |
| NON-M/WBE | \$ 107,305,658 | \$ 173,544,287 | \$ 151,580,413 | \$ 122,216,126 | \$ 74,490,970 | \$ 629,137,455 |
| TOTAL FIRMS | \$ 107,829,124 | \$ 174,281,765 | \$ 152,484,109 | \$ 122,958,267 | \$ 75,186,851 | \$ 632,740,116 |
| Business Ownership Classification | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | TOTAL |
|  | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) |
| Black American | 0.33\% | 0.15\% | 0.26\% | 0.44\% | 0.33\% | 0.28\% |
| Asian American | 0.01\% | 0.07\% | 0.02\% | 0.00\% | 0.05\% | 0.03\% |
| Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| TOTAL MINORITY | 0.33\% | 0.22\% | 0.28\% | 0.44\% | 0.37\% | 0.32\% |
| Nonminority Female | 0.15\% | 0.20\% | 0.31\% | 0.17\% | 0.55\% | 0.25\% |
| TOTAL M/WBE | 0.49\% | 0.42\% | 0.59\% | 0.60\% | 0.93\% | 0.57\% |
| NON-M/WBE | 99.51\% | 99.58\% | 99.41\% | 99.40\% | 99.07\% | 99.43\% |
| TOTAL FIRMS | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |

# State of North Carolina Department of Administration 2020 Disparity Study Vol. II Community Colleges \& Universities Quantitative Analysis 

As indicated in Tables 8 and 9, one hundred eighty-seven (187) MWBEs represented $2.41 \%$ of all firms paid dollars in Other Services, averaging \$255,254 per firm. In comparison, 7,567 non-MWBE firms represented $97.59 \%$ of all firms in Other Services, averaging \$393,839 per firm.

Table 8: Prime Utilization - Other Services by Number of Firms
In the Relevant Market
Number of Businesses by Business Ownership and Fiscal Year
FY 2014-2018
NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | African American |  | Asian American |  | Hispanic <br> American |  | American Indian |  | Total MBE |  | Nonminority Female |  | Total M/WBE |  | Non-M/WBE |  | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2014 | 7 | 0.47\% | 1 | 0.07\% | 1 | 0.07\% | 2 | 0.14\% | 11 | 0.74\% | 20 | 1.35\% | 31 | 2.10\% | 1447 | 97.90\% | 1478 | 19.06\% |
| 2015 | 6 | 0.35\% | 2 | 0.12\% | 2 | 0.12\% | 2 | 0.12\% | 12 | 0.70\% | 31 | 1.81\% | 43 | 2.50\% | 1674 | 97.50\% | 1717 | 22.14\% |
| 2016 | 7 | 0.40\% | 2 | 0.11\% | 3 | 0.17\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 12 | 0.69\% | 24 | 1.38\% | 36 | 2.07\% | 1704 | 97.93\% | 1740 | 22.44\% |
| 2017 | 7 | 0.39\% | 4 | 0.22\% | 5 | 0.28\% | 2 | 0.11\% | 18 | 1.01\% | 27 | 1.51\% | 45 | 2.52\% | 1742 | 97.48\% | 1787 | 23.05\% |
| 2018 | 9 | 0.87\% | 1 | 0.10\% | 2 | 0.19\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 12 | 1.16\% | 20 | 1.94\% | 32 | 3.10\% | 1000 | 96.90\% | 1032 | 13.31\% |
| Total 2014-2018 | 36 | 0.46\% | 10 | 0.13\% | 13 | 0.17\% | 6 | 0.08\% | 65 | 0.84\% | 122 | 1.57\% | 187 | 2.41\% | 7567 | 97.59\% | 7754 | 100.00\% |

[^2]Table 9: Prime Utilization - Other Services by Dollars
In the Relevant Market
FY 2014-2018
NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study

| Business Ownership Classification | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |
| Black American | \$ | 507,269 | \$ | 607,508 | \$ | 244,297 | \$ | 707,040 | \$ | 928,635 | \$ | 2,994,749 |
| Asian American | \$ | 809,307 | \$ | 934,453 | \$ | 141,017 | \$ | 622,204 | \$ | 120,348 | \$ | 2,627,328 |
| Hispanic American | \$ | 12,028 | \$ | 90,308 | \$ | 87,295 | \$ | 143,759 | \$ | 31,026 | \$ | 364,416 |
| American Indian | \$ | 684,006 | \$ | 427,399 | \$ | 401,577 | \$ | 360,341 | \$ | 271,200 | \$ | 2,144,523 |
| TOTAL MINORITY | \$ | 2,012,610 | \$ | 2,059,669 | \$ | 874,185 | \$ | 1,833,343 | \$ | 1,351,209 | \$ | 8,131,016 |
| Nonminority Female | \$ | 15,221,538 | \$ | 5,374,126 | \$ | 7,024,992 | \$ | 5,753,738 | \$ | 6,227,196 | \$ | 39,601,591 |
| TOTAL M/WBE | \$ | 17,234,148 | \$ | 7,433,795 | \$ | 7,899,177 | \$ | 7,587,081 | \$ | 7,578,405 | \$ | 47,732,607 |
| NON-M/WBE | \$ | 564,049,507 | \$ | 690,262,812 | \$ | 772,444,500 | \$ | 612,959,093 | \$ | 340,467,606 | \$ | 2,980,183,518 |
| TOTAL FIRMS | \$ | 581,283,655 | \$ | 697,696,607 | \$ | 780,343,677 | \$ | 620,546,175 | \$ | 348,046,011 | \$ | 3,027,916,125 |
| Business Ownership Classification |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | TOTAL |
|  |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |
| Black American | 0.09\% |  |  | 0.09\% |  | 0.03\% |  | 0.11\% |  | 0.27\% |  | 0.10\% |
| Asian American | 0.14\% |  |  | 0.13\% |  | 0.02\% |  | 0.10\% |  | 0.03\% |  | 0.09\% |
| Hispanic American | 0.00\% |  |  | 0.01\% |  | 0.01\% |  | 0.02\% |  | 0.01\% |  | 0.01\% |
| American Indian | 0.12\% |  |  | 0.06\% |  | 0.05\% |  | 0.06\% |  | 0.08\% |  | 0.07\% |
| TOTAL MINORITY | 0.35\% |  |  | 0.30\% |  | 0.11\% |  | 0.30\% |  | 0.39\% |  | 0.27\% |
| Nonminority Female | 2.62\% |  |  | 0.77\% |  | 0.90\% |  | 0.93\% |  | 1.79\% |  | 1.31\% |
| TOTAL M/WBE | 2.96\% |  |  | 1.07\% |  | 1.01\% |  | 1.22\% |  | 2.18\% |  | 1.58\% |
| NON-M/WBE | 97.04\% |  |  | 98.93\% |  | 98.99\% |  | 98.78\% |  | 97.82\% |  | 98.42\% |
| TOTAL FIRMS | 100.00\% |  |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |

As indicated in Tables 10 and 11, forty-seven (47) MWBEs represented $1.99 \%$ of all firms to be paid dollars in Goods, averaging \$3,876,323 per firm. In comparison, 2,312 non-MWBE firms represented $98.01 \%$ of all firms in Goods, averaging $\$ 794,320$ per firm.

Table 10: Prime Utilization - Goods by Number of Firms
In the Relevant Market
Number of Businesses by Business Ownership and Fiscal Year FY 2014-2018
NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study

|  | African American |  | Asian American |  | Hispanic <br> American |  | American Indian |  | Total MBE |  | Nonminority Female |  | Total M/WBE |  | Non-M/WBE |  | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2014 | 3 | 0.34\% | 2 | 0.23\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 5 | 0.57\% | 8 | 0.91\% | 13 | 1.49\% | 862 | 98.51\% | 875 | 19.65\% |
| 2015 | 3 | 0.30\% | 3 | 0.30\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 6 | 0.61\% | 15 | 1.52\% | 21 | 2.13\% | 963 | 97.87\% | 984 | 22.10\% |
| 2016 | 3 | 0.29\% | 2 | 0.20\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 5 | 0.49\% | 14 | 1.37\% | 19 | 1.86\% | 1003 | 98.14\% | 1022 | 22.95\% |
| 2017 | 3 | 0.31\% | 2 | 0.21\% | 1 | 0.10\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 6 | 0.62\% | 15 | 1.54\% | 21 | 2.16\% | 953 | 97.84\% | 974 | 21.87\% |
| 2018 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 9 | 1.51\% | 9 | 1.51\% | 589 | 98.49\% | 598 | 13.43\% |
| Total 2014-2018 | 12 | 0.27\% | 9 | 0.20\% | 1 | 0.02\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 22 | 0.49\% | 61 | 1.37\% | 83 | 1.86\% | 4370 | 98.14\% | 4453 | 100.00\% |
| Total Unique <br> Number of <br> Businesses | 6 | 0.25\% | 4 | 0.17\% | 1 | 0.04\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 11 | 0.47\% | 36 | 1.53\% | 47 | 1.99\% | 2312 | 98.01\% | 2359 | 100.00\% |

Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020

* Total unique number represents the number of unduplicated firms during the Study Period.
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Table 11: Prime Utilization -Goods by Dollars
In the Relevant Market
FY 2014-2018
NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study

| Business Ownership Classification |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |  | (\$) |
| Black American | \$ | 4,608,364 | \$ | 31,648,409 | \$ | 13,548,481 | \$ | 13,464,052 | \$ | 175,196 | \$ | 63,444,502 |
| Asian American | \$ | 8,529,515 | \$ | 13,542,020 | \$ | 14,102,886 | \$ | 11,197,479 | \$ | 1,342,411 | \$ | 48,714,312 |
| Hispanic American | \$ | 737,620 | \$ | 731,409 | \$ | 821,764 | \$ | 1,128,330 | \$ | 1,318,164 | \$ | 4,737,286 |
| American Indian | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 14,855 | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | 14,855 |
| TOTAL MINORITY | \$ | 13,875,499 | \$ | 45,921,838 | \$ | 28,487,986 | \$ | 25,789,861 | \$ | 2,835,771 | \$ | 116,910,954 |
| Nonminority Female | \$ | 13,892,976 | \$ | 17,161,072 | \$ | 9,795,833 | \$ | 14,260,299 | \$ | 10,166,070 | \$ | 65,276,250 |
| TOTAL M/WBE | \$ | 27,768,474 | \$ | 63,082,910 | \$ | 38,283,819 | \$ | 40,050,160 | \$ | 13,001,841 | \$ | 182,187,204 |
| NON-M/WBE | \$ | 341,137,269 | \$ | 389,600,288 | \$ | 445,816,292 | \$ | 342,205,033 | \$ | 317,711,124 | \$ | 1,836,470,006 |
| TOTAL FIRMS | \$ | 368,905,743 | \$ | 452,683,197 | \$ | 484,100,111 | \$ | 382,255,193 | \$ | 330,712,966 | \$ | 2,018,657,210 |
| Business Ownership Classification |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | TOTAL |
|  |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |  | (\%) |
| Black American |  | 1.25\% |  | 6.99\% |  | 2.80\% |  | 3.52\% |  | 0.05\% |  | 3.14\% |
| Asian American |  | 2.31\% |  | 2.99\% |  | 2.91\% |  | 2.93\% |  | 0.41\% |  | 2.41\% |
| Hispanic American |  | 0.20\% |  | 0.16\% |  | 0.17\% |  | 0.30\% |  | 0.40\% |  | 0.23\% |
| American Indian |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |
| TOTAL MINORITY |  | 3.76\% |  | 10.14\% |  | 5.88\% |  | 6.75\% |  | 0.86\% |  | 5.79\% |
| Nonminority Female |  | 3.77\% |  | 3.79\% |  | 2.02\% |  | 3.73\% |  | 3.07\% |  | 3.23\% |
| TOTAL M/WBE |  | 7.53\% |  | 13.94\% |  | 7.91\% |  | 10.48\% |  | 3.93\% |  | 9.03\% |
| NON-M/WBE |  | 92.47\% |  | 86.06\% |  | 92.09\% |  | 89.52\% |  | 96.07\% |  | 90.97\% |
| TOTAL FIRMS |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% |

Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020
GSPC presents utilization by Community College and University in Appendix D.

## 2. Total Utilization (Prime and Subcontractor Payments)

NC-CC/Univ tracks subcontracting dollars allocated to MWBEs but does not completely track Non-MWBE subcontractors. GSPC conducted a total utilization analysis by combining prime contract dollars with subcontract dollars, after subtracting subcontract dollars from prime contract dollars on a contract-by-contract basis. 5 This analysis was only conducted for construction which had levels of reported subcontracting.

TOTAL UTILIZATION is the percentage of dollars awarded to combined Prime Contractors (in the Relevant Market) and Subcontractors, by ethnic/gender category, after removing MWBE subcontract dollars from prime dollars on a contract by contract basis.

[^3]
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MBEs received $\$ 65,940,776$ during the Study Period, $2.86 \%$ of the total Construction paid dollars, while Nonminority Female owned firms were paid a total of $\$ 222,482,937,9.65 \%$ of the total Construction paid dollars. MWBEs received $12.51 \%$ of the total Construction paid dollars (Table 12).

Table 12: Total Utilization - Construction by Dollars (Prime \& Subcontractor Combined)

## In the Relevant Market

NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study

| Business Ownership Classification | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (\$) | (\$) | (\$) | (\$) | (\$) | (\$) |
| Black American | \$ 4,023,503 | \$ 6,847,610 | \$ 9,167,646 | \$ 6,336,118 | \$ 9,044,658 | \$ 35,419,535 |
| Asian American | \$ 47,615 | \$ 97,044 | \$ 293,322 | \$ 102,880 | \$ 794,466 | \$ 1,335,327 |
| Hispanic American | \$ 1,722,818 | \$ 195,840 | \$ 1,918,638 | \$ 2,144,966 | \$ 4,682,535 | \$ 10,664,796 |
| Native American | \$ 7,572,864 | \$ 4,369,334 | \$ 3,435,236 | \$ 2,355,057 | \$ 788,626 | \$ 18,521,117 |
| TOTAL MINORITY | \$ 13,366,800 | \$ 11,509,828 | \$ 14,814,842 | \$ 10,939,021 | \$ 15,310,285 | \$ 65,940,776 |
| Nonminority Female | \$ 13,888,566 | \$ 13,934,021 | \$ 67,096,250 | \$ 93,959,562 | \$ 33,604,538 | \$ 222,482,937 |
| TOTAL M/WBE | \$ 27,255,366 | \$ 25,443,849 | \$ 81,911,092 | \$ 104,898,583 | \$ 48,914,823 | \$ 288,423,712 |
| NON-M/WBE | \$ 395,482,503 | \$ 436,806,663 | \$ 365,868,932 | \$ 524,676,708 | \$ 293,467,728 | \$ 2,016,302,533 |
| TOTAL FIRMS | \$ 422,737,868 | \$ 462,250,512 | \$ 447,780,024 | \$ 629,575,291 | \$ 342,382,550 | \$ 2,304,726,246 |
| Business Ownership Classification | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | TOTAL |
|  | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) |
| Black American | 0.95\% | 1.48\% | 2.05\% | 1.01\% | 2.64\% | 1.54\% |
| Asian American | 0.01\% | 0.02\% | 0.07\% | 0.02\% | 0.23\% | 0.06\% |
| Hispanic American | 0.41\% | 0.04\% | 0.43\% | 0.34\% | 1.37\% | 0.46\% |
| Native American | 1.79\% | 0.95\% | 0.77\% | 0.37\% | 0.23\% | 0.80\% |
| TOTAL MINORITY | 3.16\% | 2.49\% | 3.31\% | 1.74\% | 4.47\% | 2.86\% |
| Nonminority Female | 3.29\% | 3.01\% | 14.98\% | 14.92\% | 9.81\% | 9.65\% |
| TOTAL M/WBE | 6.45\% | 5.50\% | 18.29\% | 16.66\% | 14.29\% | 12.51\% |
| NON-M/WBE | 93.55\% | 94.50\% | 81.71\% | 83.34\% | 85.71\% | 87.49\% |
| TOTAL FIRMS | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |
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## G. Determination of Disparity

This section of the report addresses the crucial question of whether, and to what extent, there is disparity between the utilization of MWBEs as measured against their availability in the NC-CC/Univ marketplace.

> DISPARITY INDICES calculate the difference between the percentage of NCCC/Univ's UTILIZATION of MWBEs during the Study Period and the AVAILABILITY percentage of MWBEs.

## 1. Methodology

The statistical approach to answer this question is to assess the existence and extent of disparity by comparing the MWBE utilization percentages (by dollars) to the percentage of the total pool of MWBE firms in the relevant geographic and product areas. The actual disparity derived as a result of employing this approach is measured by use of a Disparity Index (DI).

The Disparity Index is defined as the ratio of the percentage of MWBE firms utilized (U) divided by the percentage of such firms available in the marketplace, (A):

Let: U =Utilization percentage for the MWBE group
A =Availability percentage for the MWBE group
DI =Disparity Index for the MWBE group
DI $=\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{A}$

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 hundred. Overutilization is when the Disparity Index is over one hundred. Parity or the absence of disparity is when the Disparity Index is one hundred (100.00) which indicates that the utilization percentage equals the availability percentage. In situations where there is availability, but no utilization, the corresponding disparity index will be zero. 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 Industry Category and for each race/gender/ethnicity group.

## 2. 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. 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 80.00 is considered to be a statistically significant underutilization, and any disparity index over 100.00 is considered to be overutilized. The disparity indices impact as designated in the tables below as "overutilization", "underutilization", or "parity" have been bolded to indicate such statistically significant impact.

Typically, the determination of whether a disparity is "substantially significant" can be based on any disparity index that is less than 80.00. Further, GSPC uses a statistical 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 test estimates the probability that the typical disparity index departs from unity, and the magnitude of the calculated test statistic indicates whether there is typically underutilization or overrepresentation. Statistical significance tests were performed for each disparity index derived for each MWBE group, and in each Industry Category.

The existence of a statistically significant disparity between the availability and utilization of minority or Nonminority Female owned businesses that is determined to likely be the result of the owners' race, gender, or ethnicity will establish an inference that ongoing effects of discrimination are adversely affecting market outcomes for underutilized groups. Accordingly, such findings will impact the recommendations provided in this Study. GSPC will, in such a case, make recommendations for consideration of appropriate and narrowly tailored race/ethnicity/gender-neutral remedies for this discrimination to give all firms equal access to public contracting within NC-CC/Univ. GSPC will also, if appropriate, recommend narrowly
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tailored race/ethnicity/gender-conscious remedies to remedy identified barriers and forms of discrimination likely affected by such discrimination. 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 upon 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 purchasing processes of NC-CC/Univ.

## 3. Prime Disparity Indices

Table 13 provides prime disparity ratios over the Study Period in the Relevant Market. Detailed disparity tables by year and over the Study Period corresponding to Tables 13 are in Appendix C. In Table 13, there was statistically significant underutilization in prime contracts for all MWBEs groups, except Asian American owned firms in Goods. Non-MWBEs were overutilized.

Table 13 : Disparity Indices - Prime
Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Study

| Business Ownership <br> Classification | Construction | Architecture <br> \& Engineering | Professional <br> Services | Other <br> Service | Goods |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Black American | $7.57^{*}$ | $26.59^{*}$ | $1.54^{*}$ | $0.62^{*}$ | $38.43^{*}$ |
| Asian American | $1.25^{*}$ | $16.88^{*}$ | $1.10^{*}$ | $6.67^{*}$ | 220.45 |
| Hispanic American | $2.97^{*}$ | $12.19^{*}$ | $0.00^{*}$ | $0.70^{*}$ | $13.75^{*}$ |
| American Indian | $31.02^{*}$ | $0.66^{*}$ | $0.00^{*}$ | $10.32^{*}$ | $0.11^{*}$ |
| TOTAL MBE | $8.84^{*}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 3 9 ^ { * }}$ | $1.27^{*}$ | $1.37^{*}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 6 \mathbf { * } ^ { * }}$ |
| Nonminority Female | $58.44^{*}$ | $28.91^{*}$ | $2.66^{*}$ | $14.45^{*}$ | $34.87^{*}$ |
| TOTAL MWBE | $\mathbf{2 7 . 5 4 *}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 7 5 *}$ | $1.66^{*}$ | 5.518 | $\mathbf{4 3 . 1 3 ^ { * }}$ |
| NON-MWBE | 141.09 | 122.74 | 151.40 | 137.88 | 115.05 |

Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020
These same disparity results(inly overutilization of MWBEs was Asian Americans in Goods) held across all five procurement categories for projects less than $\$ 500,000$ and less than $\$ 1,000,000$ (Appendix E).

## Legend:

* Statistically significant disparity (Confidence interval of 95\% and probability of error of less than 5\%).
**Very small number to produce statistical significance
Significant Disparity (Disparity percentage below 80\%).
Disparity (Disparity percentage $80 \%$ to $99.9 \%$ ).
Overutilized (Disparity percentage over 100\%).
No color is parity
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## 4. Total (Prime and Subcontractor) Utilization Disparity Indices

Table 14 provides total utilization (prime plus subcontractor) disparity ratios over the Study Period in the Relevant Market for Construction. There was no total utilization analysis for areas outside of Construction because there was little to no reported subcontracting in those areas. Detailed prime disparity tables by year and over the Study Period corresponding to Table 14 are in Appendix C.

In Table 14, there was underutilization in total utilization of all MWBE groups. Non-MWBEs were overutilized.

Table 14: Disparity Indices - Construction and Professional Services (Prime plus Subcontractor)
Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year
NC-CC/Univ Colleges and Universities Disparity Stu

| Business Ownership <br> Classification | Construction |
| :--- | :---: |
| Black American | $10.49^{*}$ |
| Asian American | $5.16^{*}$ |
| Hispanic American | $10.57^{*}$ |
| American Indian | $33.68^{*}$ |
| TOTAL MBE | $12.69^{*}$ |
| Nonminority Female | $70.75^{*}$ |
| TOTAL M/WBE | $\mathbf{3 4 . 5 8 *}$ |
| NON-M/WBE | 137.10 |

Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020

## Legend:

* Statistically significant disparity (Confidence interval of $95 \%$ and probability of error of less than $5 \%$ ).
**Very small number to produce statistical significance
Significant Disparity (Disparity percentage below 80\%).
Disparity (Disparity percentage 8o\% to $99.9 \%$ ).
Overutilized (Disparity percentage over 100\%).
No color is parity
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## H. Conclusion

With one exception, every MWBE group was significantly underutilized in each category throughout the Study Period as prime contractors (except Asian Americans in Goods), and in every ethnic and gender group in Prime plus Subcontractor (except Asian Americans in Goods).

The findings of the NC-CC/Univ quantitative analysis coincides with the findings of the State DOA Agencies' quantitative analysis. In addition, the findings of the Legal, Policy (including the HUB Survey), Marketplace Disparities, and Anecdotal analyses apply to the NC-CC/Univ purchases and procurements.

The Recommendations made in the Executive Summary of the Disparity Study apply to the NC-CC/Univ which should result in unified remedial programs administered by the HUB Office.
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## APPENDIX A PAYMENTS BY COUNTY TO DETERMINE RELEVANT MARKET

## Appendix A - Payments By County of Firm Location

The tables in Appendix A (Tables A-1 through A-5) presents payments by counties in the State of North Carolina for all NC-CC/Univ prime spending, broken down by the five procurement categories. The counties are arranged from the highest dollar value to the lowest dollar value. The first percentage column is the percentage of NC-CC/Univ prime spending with firms in that county and the last column is the cumulative percentage of NC-CC/Univ spending with firms for that county and the counties above it.

Table A-1
North Carolina Disparity Study
NC-CC/Univ Prime Construction by Counties
(Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018)

| County, State | Amount |  | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WAKE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 520,486,720 | 22.08\% | 22.08\% |
| MECKLENBURG COUNTY, NC | \$ | 399,816,543 | 16.96\% | 39.04\% |
| PITT COUNTY, NC | \$ | 262,499,631 | 11.13\% | 50.17\% |
| ROBESON COUNTY, NC | \$ | 212,170,589 | 9.00\% | 59.17\% |
| FORSYTH COUNTY, NC | \$ | 175,949,045 | 7.46\% | 66.63\% |
| DURHAM COUNTY, NC | \$ | 165,706,117 | 7.03\% | 73.66\% |
| GUILFORD COUNTY, NC | \$ | 164,175,182 | 6.96\% | 80.62\% |
| NEW HANOVER COUNTY, NC | \$ | 54,638,719 | 2.32\% | 82.94\% |
| NASH COUNTY, NC | \$ | 51,943,287 | 2.20\% | 85.14\% |
| BUNCOMBE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 40,401,049 | 1.71\% | 86.86\% |
| CUMBERLAND COUNTY, NC | \$ | 22,669,072 | 0.96\% | 87.82\% |
| ORANGE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 19,592,311 | 0.83\% | 88.65\% |
| CATAWBA COUNTY, NC | \$ | 15,261,406 | 0.65\% | 89.30\% |
| SURRY COUNTY, NC | \$ | 12,420,241 | 0.53\% | 89.82\% |
| WATAUGA COUNTY, NC | \$ | 11,643,757 | 0.49\% | 90.32\% |
| YADKIN COUNTY, NC | \$ | 9,686,832 | 0.41\% | 90.73\% |
| ONSLOW COUNTY, NC | \$ | 9,362,440 | 0.40\% | 91.13\% |
| GASTON COUNTY, NC | \$ | 9,002,303 | 0.38\% | 91.51\% |
| LEE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 8,367,577 | 0.35\% | 91.86\% |
| DAVIDSON COUNTY, NC | \$ | 8,305,647 | 0.35\% | 92.22\% |
| CABARRUS COUNTY, NC | \$ | 7,023,911 | 0.30\% | 92.51\% |
| HENDERSON COUNTY, NC | \$ | 6,531,293 | 0.28\% | 92.79\% |
| FRANKLIN COUNTY, NC | \$ | 6,316,879 | 0.27\% | 93.06\% |
| WAYNE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 6,215,530 | 0.26\% | 93.32\% |
| JOHNSTON COUNTY, NC | \$ | 6,088,963 | 0.26\% | 93.58\% |
| HARNETT COUNTY, NC | \$ | 5,972,460 | 0.25\% | 93.83\% |
| UNION COUNTY, NC | \$ | 5,943,099 | 0.25\% | 94.09\% |
| IREDELL COUNTY, NC | \$ | 5,802,421 | 0.25\% | 94.33\% |
| WILSON COUNTY, NC | \$ | 5,444,925 | 0.23\% | 94.56\% |
| LENOIR COUNTY, NC | \$ | 5,240,022 | 0.22\% | 94.79\% |

Table A-1 (cont.)

| ASHE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $5,146,700$ | $0.22 \%$ | $95.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CARTERET COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $4,857,895$ | $0.21 \%$ | $95.21 \%$ |
| JACKSON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $4,782,852$ | $0.20 \%$ | $95.41 \%$ |
| MARTIN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $4,110,937$ | $0.17 \%$ | $95.59 \%$ |
| ROWAN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $3,353,067$ | $0.14 \%$ | $95.73 \%$ |
| RUTHERFORD COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $3,044,267$ | $0.13 \%$ | $95.86 \%$ |
| PASQUOTANK COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $2,757,981$ | $0.12 \%$ | $95.98 \%$ |
| RANDOLPH COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $2,689,515$ | $0.11 \%$ | $96.09 \%$ |
| LINCOLN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $2,326,131$ | $0.10 \%$ | $96.19 \%$ |
| ALAMANCE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $2,316,089$ | $0.10 \%$ | $96.29 \%$ |
| BURKE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $2,245,114$ | $0.10 \%$ | $96.38 \%$ |
| WILKES COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $2,040,314$ | $0.09 \%$ | $96.47 \%$ |
| BEAUFORT COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $1,994,467$ | $0.08 \%$ | $96.55 \%$ |
| ROCKINGHAM COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $1,967,035$ | $0.08 \%$ | $96.64 \%$ |
| CRAVEN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $1,925,469$ | $0.08 \%$ | $96.72 \%$ |
| HAYWOOD COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $1,767,776$ | $0.07 \%$ | $96.79 \%$ |
| STANLY COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $1,668,509$ | $0.07 \%$ | $96.86 \%$ |
| CLEVELAND COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $1,548,363$ | $0.07 \%$ | $96.93 \%$ |
| JONES COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $1,488,273$ | $0.06 \%$ | $96.99 \%$ |
| MCDOWELL COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $1,410,016$ | $0.06 \%$ | $97.05 \%$ |
| CALDWELL COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $1,392,047$ | $0.06 \%$ | $97.11 \%$ |
| MONTGOMERY COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $1,200,370$ | $0.05 \%$ | $97.16 \%$ |
| DUPLIN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $1,110,293$ | $0.05 \%$ | $97.21 \%$ |
| MACON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $1,109,165$ | $0.05 \%$ | $97.26 \%$ |
| PERSON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 994,346 | $0.04 \%$ | $97.30 \%$ |
| AVERY COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 916,833 | $0.04 \%$ | $97.34 \%$ |
| COLUMBUS COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 882,832 | $0.04 \%$ | $97.37 \%$ |
| CAMDEN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 874,587 | $0.04 \%$ | $97.41 \%$ |
| MOORE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 769,059 | $0.03 \%$ | $97.44 \%$ |
| MADISON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 748,737 | $0.03 \%$ | $97.48 \%$ |
| STOKES COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 746,859 | $0.03 \%$ | $97.51 \%$ |
| RICHMOND COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 712,041 | $0.03 \%$ | $97.54 \%$ |
| POLK COUNTY, NC | $\$ 30,620$ | $0.03 \%$ | $97.56 \%$ |  |
| EDGECOMBE COUNTY, NC | 453,618 | $0.02 \%$ | $97.58 \%$ |  |
| CHATHAM COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 340,557 | $0.02 \%$ | $97.60 \%$ |
| DARE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 373,846 | $0.02 \%$ | $97.62 \%$ |
| PENDER COUNTY, NC | 348,874 | $0.02 \%$ | $97.63 \%$ |  |
| SAMPSON COUNTY, NC | $0.01 \%$ | $97.65 \%$ |  |  |
|  | $\$$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\$$ |  |  |  |

Table A-1 (cont.)

| YANCEY COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 250,861 | $0.01 \%$ | $97.66 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| CHEROKEE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 188,996 | $0.01 \%$ | $97.67 \%$ |
| HALIFAX COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 188,636 | $0.01 \%$ | $97.68 \%$ |
| PERQUIMANS COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 188,296 | $0.01 \%$ | $97.68 \%$ |
| GRANVILLE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 179,890 | $0.01 \%$ | $97.69 \%$ |
| MITCHELL COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 176,319 | $0.01 \%$ | $97.70 \%$ |
| SWAIN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 148,709 | $0.01 \%$ | $97.71 \%$ |
| GREENE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 132,738 | $0.01 \%$ | $97.71 \%$ |
| BLADEN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 127,489 | $0.01 \%$ | $97.72 \%$ |
| BRUNSWICK COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 115,882 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.72 \%$ |
| CHOWAN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 106,826 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.73 \%$ |
| HERTFORD COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 96,950 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.73 \%$ |
| SCOTLAND COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 93,952 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.73 \%$ |
| TYRRELL COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 87,200 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.74 \%$ |
| ANSON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 75,916 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.74 \%$ |
| CURRITUCK COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 55,938 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.74 \%$ |
| WASHINGTON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 53,919 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.75 \%$ |
| VANCE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 43,761 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.75 \%$ |
| CASWELL COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 37,995 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.75 \%$ |
| NORTHAMPTON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 37,894 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.75 \%$ |
| HOKE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 37,032 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.75 \%$ |
| BERTIE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 29,878 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.75 \%$ |
| ALLEGHANY COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 21,654 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.75 \%$ |
| ALEXANDER COUNTY, NC | 20,549 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.76 \%$ |  |
| PAMLICO COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 60,300 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.76 \%$ |
| GATES COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 5,400 | $0.00 \%$ | $97.76 \%$ |
| DAVIE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $0.00 \%$ | $97.76 \%$ |  |

Table A-2
North Carolina Disparity Study
NC-CC/Univ Prime Architecture \& Engineering by Counties
(Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018)

| County, State | Amount | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MECKLENBURG COUNTY, NC | \$ 153,461,328 | 29.99\% | 29.99\% |
| WAKE COUNTY, NC | \$ 132,410,944 | 25.87\% | 55.86\% |
| PITT COUNTY, NC | \$ 52,939,508 | 10.34\% | 66.20\% |
| DURHAM COUNTY, NC | \$ 32,136,221 | 6.28\% | 72.48\% |
| FORSYTH COUNTY, NC | \$ 19,988,889 | 3.91\% | 76.39\% |
| GUILFORD COUNTY, NC | \$ 10,791,245 | 2.11\% | 78.50\% |
| ORANGE COUNTY, NC | \$ 9,407,850 | 1.84\% | 80.34\% |
| SURRY COUNTY, NC | \$ 4,999,987 | 0.98\% | 81.31\% |
| ONSLOW COUNTY, NC | \$ 3,214,448 | 0.63\% | 81.94\% |
| CHATHAM COUNTY, NC | \$ 2,939,740 | 0.57\% | 82.52\% |
| BUNCOMBE COUNTY, NC | \$ 2,557,378 | 0.50\% | 83.02\% |
| NEW HANOVER COUNTY, NC | \$ 2,319,820 | 0.45\% | 83.47\% |
| CUMBERLAND COUNTY, NC | \$ 1,932,023 | 0.38\% | 83.85\% |
| CLEVELAND COUNTY, NC | \$ 1,808,729 | 0.35\% | 84.20\% |
| NASH COUNTY, NC | \$ 1,462,891 | 0.29\% | 84.49\% |
| ROBESON COUNTY, NC | \$ 1,250,208 | 0.24\% | 84.73\% |
| WILSON COUNTY, NC | \$ 1,011,493 | 0.20\% | 84.93\% |
| GASTON COUNTY, NC | \$ 668,864 | 0.13\% | 85.06\% |
| CRAVEN COUNTY, NC | \$ 459,485 | 0.09\% | 85.15\% |
| BURKE COUNTY, NC | \$ 443,373 | 0.09\% | 85.23\% |
| LINCOLN COUNTY, NC | \$ 365,093 | 0.07\% | 85.31\% |
| ALAMANCE COUNTY, NC | \$ 315,663 | 0.06\% | 85.37\% |
| CABARRUS COUNTY, NC | \$ 302,435 | 0.06\% | 85.43\% |
| MOORE COUNTY, NC | \$ 284,650 | 0.06\% | 85.48\% |
| CARTERET COUNTY, NC | \$ 279,095 | 0.05\% | 85.54\% |
| AVERY COUNTY, NC | \$ 259,674 | 0.05\% | 85.59\% |
| RANDOLPH COUNTY, NC | \$ 251,112 | 0.05\% | 85.64\% |
| CATAWBA COUNTY, NC | \$ 189,126 | 0.04\% | 85.67\% |
| DARE COUNTY, NC | \$ 162,730 | 0.03\% | 85.71\% |
| WATAUGA COUNTY, NC | \$ 153,574 | 0.03\% | 85.74\% |

Table A-2 (cont.)

| GRANVILLE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 139,761 | $0.03 \%$ | $85.76 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| HAYWOOD COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 128,409 | $0.03 \%$ | $85.79 \%$ |
| STANLY COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 121,625 | $0.02 \%$ | $85.81 \%$ |
| DAVIDSON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 121,587 | $0.02 \%$ | $85.84 \%$ |
| BEAUFORT COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 116,807 | $0.02 \%$ | $85.86 \%$ |
| UNION COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 116,358 | $0.02 \%$ | $85.88 \%$ |
| ROWAN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 107,509 | $0.02 \%$ | $85.90 \%$ |
| BRUNSWICK COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 78,938 | $0.02 \%$ | $85.92 \%$ |
| JACKSON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 59,305 | $0.01 \%$ | $85.93 \%$ |
| LEE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 45,076 | $0.01 \%$ | $85.94 \%$ |
| ROCKINGHAM COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 43,555 | $0.01 \%$ | $85.95 \%$ |
| IREDELL COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 42,955 | $0.01 \%$ | $85.95 \%$ |
| YADKIN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 41,069 | $0.01 \%$ | $85.96 \%$ |
| SAMPSON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 38,220 | $0.01 \%$ | $85.97 \%$ |
| DUPLIN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 38,032 | $0.01 \%$ | $85.98 \%$ |
| MCDOWELL COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 28,521 | $0.01 \%$ | $85.98 \%$ |
| HENDERSON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 23,500 | $0.00 \%$ | $85.99 \%$ |
| PERSON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 18,941 | $0.00 \%$ | $85.99 \%$ |
| WAYNE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 12,461 | $0.00 \%$ | $85.99 \%$ |
| EDGECOMBE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 11,026 | $0.00 \%$ | $86.00 \%$ |
| CLAY COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 10,950 | $0.00 \%$ | $86.00 \%$ |
| YANCEY COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 7,554 | $0.00 \%$ | $86.00 \%$ |
| MARTIN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 6,928 | $0.00 \%$ | $86.00 \%$ |
| JOHNSTON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 6,600 | $0.00 \%$ | $86.00 \%$ |
| RICHMOND COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 6,200 | $0.00 \%$ | $86.00 \%$ |
| MACON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 6,000 | $0.00 \%$ | $86.00 \%$ |
| HALIFAX COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 5,000 | $0.00 \%$ | $86.01 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table A-3
North Carolina Disparity Study
NC-CC/Univ Prime Professional Services by Counties
(Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018)

| County, State | Amount | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PITT COUNTY, NC | \$ 154,572,487 | 18.71\% | 18.71\% |
| WAKE COUNTY, NC | \$ 150,045,524 | 18.16\% | 36.87\% |
| DURHAM COUNTY, NC | \$ 102,457,567 | 12.40\% | 49.27\% |
| MECKLENBURG COUNTY, NC | \$ 91,404,278 | 11.06\% | 60.33\% |
| ROBESON COUNTY, NC | \$ 36,718,915 | 4.44\% | 64.77\% |
| GUILFORD COUNTY, NC | \$ 36,173,006 | 4.38\% | 69.15\% |
| CHATHAM COUNTY, NC | \$ 16,248,914 | 1.97\% | 71.12\% |
| FORSYTH COUNTY, NC | \$ 13,829,585 | 1.67\% | 72.79\% |
| ORANGE COUNTY, NC | \$ 12,418,657 | 1.50\% | 74.30\% |
| BUNCOMBE COUNTY, NC | \$ 5,698,589 | 0.69\% | 74.99\% |
| ALAMANCE COUNTY, NC | \$ 2,718,888 | 0.33\% | 75.31\% |
| WAYNE COUNTY, NC | \$ 1,585,137 | 0.19\% | 75.51\% |
| WILSON COUNTY, NC | \$ 1,563,099 | 0.19\% | 75.70\% |
| CATAWBA COUNTY, NC | \$ 1,027,755 | 0.12\% | 75.82\% |
| NEW HANOVER COUNTY, NC | \$ 960,649 | 0.12\% | 75.94\% |
| CUMBERLAND COUNTY, NC | \$ 856,323 | 0.10\% | 76.04\% |
| DAVIDSON COUNTY, NC | \$ 395,711 | 0.05\% | 76.09\% |
| RUTHERFORD COUNTY, NC | \$ 310,117 | 0.04\% | 76.12\% |
| HENDERSON COUNTY, NC | \$ 307,253 | 0.04\% | 76.16\% |
| UNION COUNTY, NC | \$ 270,089 | 0.03\% | 76.19\% |
| DARE COUNTY, NC | \$ 255,591 | 0.03\% | 76.23\% |
| ROWAN COUNTY, NC | \$ 225,007 | 0.03\% | 76.25\% |
| ROCKINGHAM COUNTY, NC | \$ 218,069 | 0.03\% | 76.28\% |
| CASWELL COUNTY, NC | \$ 189,901 | 0.02\% | 76.30\% |
| ONSLOW COUNTY, NC | \$ 183,285 | 0.02\% | 76.32\% |
| WATAUGA COUNTY, NC | \$ 179,900 | 0.02\% | 76.35\% |
| BRUNSWICK COUNTY, NC | \$ 149,905 | 0.02\% | 76.36\% |
| SURRY COUNTY, NC | \$ 131,467 | 0.02\% | 76.38\% |
| JOHNSTON COUNTY, NC | \$ 106,968 | 0.01\% | 76.39\% |
| CABARRUS COUNTY, NC | \$ 106,097 | 0.01\% | 76.41\% |

Table A-3 (cont.)

| CLEVELAND COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 102,873 | $0.01 \%$ | $76.42 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| COLUMBUS COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 100,211 | $0.01 \%$ | $76.43 \%$ |
| CALDWELL COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 88,234 | $0.01 \%$ | $76.44 \%$ |
| BEAUFORT COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 86,700 | $0.01 \%$ | $76.45 \%$ |
| RANDOLPH COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 83,288 | $0.01 \%$ | $76.46 \%$ |
| MARTIN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 78,615 | $0.01 \%$ | $76.47 \%$ |
| CRAVEN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 71,623 | $0.01 \%$ | $76.48 \%$ |
| IREDELL COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 63,584 | $0.01 \%$ | $76.49 \%$ |
| JACKSON COUNTY, NC | $\$ \$ 61,483$ | $0.01 \%$ | $76.50 \%$ |  |
| AVERY COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 56,000 | $0.01 \%$ | $76.50 \%$ |
| CARTERET COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 55,161 | $0.01 \%$ | $76.51 \%$ |
| PENDER COUNTY, NC | $\$ \$$ | 54,996 | $0.01 \%$ | $76.52 \%$ |
| EDGECOMBE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 50,500 | $0.01 \%$ | $76.52 \%$ |
| MOORE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 49,562 | $0.01 \%$ | $76.53 \%$ |
| BURKE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 48,896 | $0.01 \%$ | $76.53 \%$ |
| PERSON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 38,103 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.54 \%$ |
| FRANKLIN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 36,421 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.54 \%$ |
| BLADEN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 35,790 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.55 \%$ |
| DAVIE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 29,557 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.55 \%$ |
| NASH COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 29,000 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.55 \%$ |
| GRANVILLE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 27,195 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.56 \%$ |
| DUPLIN COUNTY, NC | $\$ \$ 24,500$ | $0.00 \%$ | $76.56 \%$ |  |
| LEE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 23,200 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.56 \%$ |
| HAYWOOD COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 21,950 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.57 \%$ |
| MACON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 20,736 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.57 \%$ |
| STANLY COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 18,143 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.57 \%$ |
| GASTON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 17,925 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.57 \%$ |
| ALLEGHANY COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 17,400 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.57 \%$ |
| HARNETT COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 10,000 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.58 \%$ |
| TRANSYLVANIA COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 7,579 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.58 \%$ |
| MADISON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 7,000 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.58 \%$ |
| PAMLICO COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 5,159 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.58 \%$ |
| LENOIR COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 5,000 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.58 \%$ |
| SCOTLAND COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 5,000 | $0.00 \%$ | $76.58 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table A-4
North Carolina Disparity Study
NC-CC/Univ Prime Other Services by Counties
(Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018)

| County, State | Amount |  | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  | $1,035,660,448$ | $24.33 \%$ | $24.33 \%$ |
| PITT COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $737,362,804$ | $17.32 \%$ | $41.65 \%$ |
| WAKE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $219,982,738$ | $5.17 \%$ | $46.82 \%$ |
| ROBESON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $193,082,651$ | $4.54 \%$ | $51.35 \%$ |
| MECKLENBURG COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $172,462,349$ | $4.05 \%$ | $55.40 \%$ |
| GUILFORD COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $156,497,708$ | $3.68 \%$ | $59.08 \%$ |
| FORSYTH COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $129,579,314$ | $3.04 \%$ | $62.12 \%$ |
| ORANGE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $121,231,617$ | $2.85 \%$ | $64.97 \%$ |
| DURHAM COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $33,501,062$ | $0.79 \%$ | $65.76 \%$ |
| BUNCOMBE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $22,729,522$ | $0.53 \%$ | $66.29 \%$ |
| LINCOLN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $22,483,966$ | $0.53 \%$ | $66.82 \%$ |
| ALAMANCE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $16,159,164$ | $0.38 \%$ | $67.20 \%$ |
| IREDELL COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $13,815,596$ | $0.32 \%$ | $67.52 \%$ |
| CHATHAM COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $13,234,143$ | $0.31 \%$ | $67.83 \%$ |
| CABARRUS COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $10,578,570$ | $0.25 \%$ | $68.08 \%$ |
| RANDOLPH COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $9,985,190$ | $0.23 \%$ | $68.32 \%$ |
| JOHNSTON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $9,947,439$ | $0.23 \%$ | $68.55 \%$ |
| PASQUOTANK COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $9,167,346$ | $0.22 \%$ | $68.77 \%$ |
| LEE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $7,981,652$ | $0.19 \%$ | $68.95 \%$ |
| BRUNSWICK COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $7,981,472$ | $0.19 \%$ | $69.14 \%$ |
| NEW HANOVER COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $7,921,522$ | $0.19 \%$ | $69.33 \%$ |
| HENDERSON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $5,927,042$ | $0.14 \%$ | $69.47 \%$ |
| MOORE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $5,526,327$ | $0.13 \%$ | $69.60 \%$ |
| CUMBERLAND COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $5,412,193$ | $0.13 \%$ | $69.72 \%$ |
| CATAWBA COUNTY, NC | $\$, 127,933$ | $0.12 \%$ | $69.84 \%$ |  |
| UNION COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $4,259,689$ | $0.10 \%$ | $69.94 \%$ |
| WAYNE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | $3,640,595$ | $0.09 \%$ | $70.03 \%$ |
| ROWAN COUNTY, NC | $\$, 304,122$ | $0.08 \%$ | $70.11 \%$ |  |
| WATAUGA COUNTY, NC | $3,225,873$ | $0.08 \%$ | $70.18 \%$ |  |
| VANCE COUNTY, NC | $3,044,755$ | $0.07 \%$ | $70.25 \%$ |  |
| LENOIR COUNTY, NC | $\$$ |  |  |  |

Table A-4 (cont.)
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|ll|l|l|}\hline \text { FRANKLIN COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 2,219,631 & 0.05 \% & 70.31 \% \\ \hline \text { BLADEN COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 2,168,259 & 0.05 \% & 70.36 \% \\ \hline \text { HARNETT COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 2,049,443 & 0.05 \% & 70.41 \% \\ \hline \text { HAYWOOD COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 2,019,375 & 0.05 \% & 70.45 \% \\ \hline \text { CALDWELL COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 1,854,309 & 0.04 \% & 70.50 \% \\ \hline \text { PERSON COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 1,813,611 & 0.04 \% & 70.54 \% \\ \hline \text { DAVIDSON COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 1,730,806 & 0.04 \% & 70.58 \% \\ \hline \text { WILKES COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 1,374,328 & 0.03 \% & 70.61 \% \\ \hline \text { SAMPSON COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 1,293,188 & 0.03 \% & 70.64 \% \\ \hline \text { CRAVEN COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 1,103,190 & 0.03 \% & 70.67 \% \\ \hline \text { MACON COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 1,031,743 & 0.02 \% & 70.69 \% \\ \hline \text { JACKSON COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 1,027,511 & 0.02 \% & 70.72 \% \\ \hline \text { RICHMOND COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 987,499 & 0.02 \% & 70.74 \% \\ \hline \text { POLK COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 967,561 & 0.02 \% & 70.76 \% \\ \hline \text { EDGECOMBE COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 966,859 & 0.02 \% & 70.79 \% \\ \hline \text { ONSLOW COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 891,046 & 0.02 \% & 70.81 \% \\ \hline \text { NASH COUNTY, NC } & \$ & 858,288 & 0.02 \% & 70.83 \% \\ \hline \text { CARTERET COUNTY, NC } & \$ & \$ & 247,319 & 0.02 \%\end{array}\right]$

Table A-4 (cont.)

| DUPLIN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 247,372 | $0.01 \%$ | $71.08 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AVERY COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 218,298 | $0.01 \%$ | $71.09 \%$ |
| TRANSYLVANIA COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 199,344 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.09 \%$ |
| CHOWAN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 174,799 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.10 \%$ |
| STOKES COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 163,350 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.10 \%$ |
| HERTFORD COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 162,904 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.10 \%$ |
| DARE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 161,854 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.11 \%$ |
| SCOTLAND COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 140,285 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.11 \%$ |
| PERQUIMANS COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 126,640 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.11 \%$ |
| WASHINGTON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 99,991 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.12 \%$ |
| SWAIN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 85,008 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.12 \%$ |
| TYRRELL COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 80,000 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.12 \%$ |
| DAVIE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 73,160 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.12 \%$ |
| HOKE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 72,535 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.12 \%$ |
| MADISON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 57,219 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.12 \%$ |
| BERTIE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 17,936 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.12 \%$ |
| CASWELL COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 16,200 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.12 \%$ |
| GREENE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 15,500 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.13 \%$ |
| PAMLICO COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 14,702 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.13 \%$ |
| MITCHELL COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 13,059 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.13 \%$ |
| MCDOWELL COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 9,348 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.13 \%$ |
| CURRITUCK COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 5,770 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.13 \%$ |
| GATES COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 5,161 | $0.00 \%$ | $71.13 \%$ |
| KINGS COUNTY, NY | $\$$ | $186,533,595$ | $4.38 \%$ | $75.51 \%$ |

Table A-5
North Carolina Disparity Study
NC-CC/Univ Prime Good by Counties
(Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018)

| County, State |  | Amount | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PITT COUNTY, NC | \$ | 418,502,139 | 14.99\% | 14.99\% |
| MECKLENBURG COUNTY, NC | \$ | 409,920,710 | 14.68\% | 29.67\% |
| WAKE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 269,093,636 | 9.64\% | 39.31\% |
| DURHAM COUNTY, NC | \$ | 209,842,144 | 7.52\% | 46.83\% |
| GUILFORD COUNTY, NC | \$ | 193,575,664 | 6.93\% | 53.76\% |
| ROBESON COUNTY, NC | \$ | 76,755,992 | 2.75\% | 56.51\% |
| ALAMANCE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 75,998,677 | 2.72\% | 59.23\% |
| WATAUGA COUNTY, NC | \$ | 58,819,086 | 2.11\% | 61.34\% |
| ORANGE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 48,260,841 | 1.73\% | 63.07\% |
| FORSYTH COUNTY, NC | \$ | 44,008,843 | 1.58\% | 64.64\% |
| CABARRUS COUNTY, NC | \$ | 30,778,720 | 1.10\% | 65.75\% |
| LENOIR COUNTY, NC | \$ | 27,464,900 | 0.98\% | 66.73\% |
| NEW HANOVER COUNTY, NC | \$ | 21,361,511 | 0.77\% | 67.50\% |
| MOORE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 20,363,244 | 0.73\% | 68.23\% |
| PERSON COUNTY, NC | \$ | 12,601,060 | 0.45\% | 68.68\% |
| NASH COUNTY, NC | \$ | 11,959,021 | 0.43\% | 69.10\% |
| BUNCOMBE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 9,897,241 | 0.35\% | 69.46\% |
| CATAWBA COUNTY, NC |  | 9,042,389 | 0.32\% | 69.78\% |
| STANLY COUNTY, NC |  | 8,222,572 | 0.29\% | 70.08\% |
| SURRY COUNTY, NC | \$ | 7,449,184 | 0.27\% | 70.34\% |
| HARNETT COUNTY, NC | \$ | 6,863,701 | 0.25\% | 70.59\% |
| CUMBERLAND COUNTY, NC | \$ | 4,318,223 | 0.15\% | 70.75\% |
| UNION COUNTY, NC | \$ | 4,155,872 | 0.15\% | 70.89\% |
| DAVIDSON COUNTY, NC | \$ | 3,956,670 | 0.14\% | 71.04\% |
| MONTGOMERY COUNTY, NC |  | 2,501,922 | 0.09\% | 71.13\% |
| STOKES COUNTY, NC |  | 2,386,617 | 0.09\% | 71.21\% |
| WILSON COUNTY, NC |  | 2,223,476 | 0.08\% | 71.29\% |
| ASHE COUNTY, NC |  | 2,108,214 | 0.08\% | 71.37\% |
| SAMPSON COUNTY, NC |  | 2,047,345 | 0.07\% | 71.44\% |
| RANDOLPH COUNTY, NC |  | 2,027,069 | 0.07\% | 71.51\% |

Table A-5 (cont.)

| CRAVEN COUNTY, NC | \$ | 1,800,290 | 0.06\% | 71.58\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROWAN COUNTY, NC | \$ | 1,680,277 | 0.06\% | 71.64\% |
| JOHNSTON COUNTY, NC | \$ | 1,377,786 | 0.05\% | 71.69\% |
| WAYNE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 1,249,448 | 0.04\% | 71.73\% |
| CHATHAM COUNTY, NC | \$ | 1,230,540 | 0.04\% | 71.77\% |
| IREDELL COUNTY, NC | \$ | 1,173,278 | 0.04\% | 71.82\% |
| PASQUOTANK COUNTY, NC | \$ | 1,078,117 | 0.04\% | 71.86\% |
| LINCOLN COUNTY, NC | \$ | 1,041,961 | 0.04\% | 71.89\% |
| LEE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 941,893 | 0.03\% | 71.93\% |
| ROCKINGHAM COUNTY, NC | \$ | 861,912 | 0.03\% | 71.96\% |
| CLEVELAND COUNTY, NC | \$ | 743,087 | 0.03\% | 71.98\% |
| GASTON COUNTY, NC | \$ | 707,904 | 0.03\% | 72.01\% |
| DARE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 650,206 | 0.02\% | 72.03\% |
| BRUNSWICK COUNTY, NC | \$ | 611,271 | 0.02\% | 72.05\% |
| HENDERSON COUNTY, NC | \$ | 587,445 | 0.02\% | 72.08\% |
| ONSLOW COUNTY, NC | \$ | 580,429 | 0.02\% | 72.10\% |
| JACKSON COUNTY, NC | \$ | 451,805 | 0.02\% | 72.11\% |
| WILKES COUNTY, NC | \$ | 367,452 | 0.01\% | 72.13\% |
| SWAIN COUNTY, NC | \$ | 349,868 | 0.01\% | 72.14\% |
| COLUMBUS COUNTY, NC | \$ | 335,545 | 0.01\% | 72.15\% |
| HAYWOOD COUNTY, NC | \$ | 321,806 | 0.01\% | 72.16\% |
| CALDWELL COUNTY, NC | \$ | 293,414 | 0.01\% | 72.17\% |
| BEAUFORT COUNTY, NC | \$ | 226,867 | 0.01\% | 72.18\% |
| MCDOWELL COUNTY, NC | \$ | 209,502 | 0.01\% | 72.19\% |
| EDGECOMBE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 206,075 | 0.01\% | 72.20\% |
| BURKE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 202,487 | 0.01\% | 72.20\% |
| CHEROKEE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 193,708 | 0.01\% | 72.21\% |
| RUTHERFORD COUNTY, NC | \$ | 181,159 | 0.01\% | 72.22\% |
| BLADEN COUNTY, NC | \$ | 177,076 | 0.01\% | 72.22\% |
| YADKIN COUNTY, NC | \$ | 175,547 | 0.01\% | 72.23\% |
| FRANKLIN COUNTY, NC | \$ | 168,648 | 0.01\% | 72.23\% |
| PERQUIMANS COUNTY, NC | \$ | 164,439 | 0.01\% | 72.24\% |
| MARTIN COUNTY, NC | \$ | 160,809 | 0.01\% | 72.25\% |
| NORTHAMPTON COUNTY, NC | \$ | 156,241 | 0.01\% | 72.25\% |
| MACON COUNTY, NC | \$ | 153,097 | 0.01\% | 72.26\% |
| VANCE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 150,054 | 0.01\% | 72.26\% |
| CARTERET COUNTY, NC | \$ | 119,520 | 0.00\% | 72.27\% |
| GRANVILLE COUNTY, NC | \$ | 118,130 | 0.00\% | 72.27\% |

Table A-5 (cont.)

| AVERY COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 116,172 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.28 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HALIFAX COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 105,814 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.28 \%$ |
| DUPLIN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 99,218 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.28 \%$ |
| CURRITUCK COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 93,346 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.29 \%$ |
| HERTFORD COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 79,456 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.29 \%$ |
| WASHINGTON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 71,618 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.29 \%$ |
| PENDER COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 60,493 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.29 \%$ |
| BERTIE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 50,536 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.30 \%$ |
| RICHMOND COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 44,194 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.30 \%$ |
| YANCEY COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 37,370 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.30 \%$ |
| DAVIE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 36,060 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.30 \%$ |
| TRANSYLVANIA COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 30,842 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.30 \%$ |
| ALEXANDER COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 23,925 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.30 \%$ |
| MITCHELL COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 20,000 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.30 \%$ |
| CHOWAN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 17,471 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.30 \%$ |
| TYRRELL COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 15,600 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.30 \%$ |
| WARREN COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 14,861 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.30 \%$ |
| MADISON COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 9,592 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.30 \%$ |
| GREENE COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 8,025 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.30 \%$ |
| SCOTLAND COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 6,186 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.31 \%$ |
| POLK COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 5,330 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.31 \%$ |
| GRAHAM COUNTY, NC | $\$$ | 5,328 | $0.00 \%$ | $72.31 \%$ |

## State of North Carolina Department of Administration 2020 Disparity Study Vol. II Community Colleges \& Universities Quantitative Analysis

## APPENDIX B DETAILED AVAILABILITY ANALYSIS

## Appendix B - NC-CC/Univ Detailed Availability

The tables in Appendix B (Tables B-1 through B-5) present detailed MWBE availability corresponding to the availability percentages in Figures 1-5 in the NC-CC/Univ Quantitative Analysis chapter. The availability methodology for creating the Master Vendor table for these availability tables is contained in the Quantitative Analysis chapter.

Table B-1
Availability of Firms by Business Ownership in Market Area

## Construction

North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Business Ownership Classification | Number of Firms | Percent of Firms |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Black American | 522 | $14.65 \%$ |
| Asian American | 40 | $1.12 \%$ |
| Hispanic American | 156 | $4.38 \%$ |
| American Indian | 85 | $\mathbf{2 . 3 9 \%}$ |
| TOTAL MBE | 803 | $\mathbf{2 2 . 5 4 \%}$ |
| Nonminority Female | 486 | $\mathbf{1 3 . 6 4 \%}$ |
| TOTAL M/WBE | $\mathbf{1 , 2 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 1 9 \%}$ |
| NON-M/WBE | $\mathbf{2 , 2 7 3}$ | $63.81 \%$ |
| TOTAL FIRMS | $\mathbf{3 , 5 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |

Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020

Table B-2
Availability of Firms by Business Ownership in Market Area

## Architecture \& Engineering

North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Business Ownership Classification | Number of Firms | Percent of Firms |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Black American | 53 | $6.41 \%$ |
| Asian American | 20 | $2.42 \%$ |
| Hispanic American | 20 | $2.42 \%$ |
| American Indian | 10 | $1.21 \%$ |
| TOTAL MBE | $\mathbf{1 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 4 5 \%}$ |
| Nonminority Female | 87 | $10.52 \%$ |
| TOTAL M/WBE | $\mathbf{1 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 9 7 \%}$ |
| NON-M/WDBE | 637 | $\mathbf{7 7 . 0 3 \%}$ |
| TOTAL FIRMS | $\mathbf{8 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |
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Table B-3
Availability of Firms by Business Ownership in Market Area
Professional Services
North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Business Ownership Classification | Number of Firms | Percent of Firms |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Black American | 322 | $18.42 \%$ |
| Asian American | 50 | $2.86 \%$ |
| Hispanic American | 35 | $2.00 \%$ |
| American Indian | 26 | $1.49 \%$ |
| TOTAL MBE | $\mathbf{4 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 7 7 \%}$ |
| Nonminority Female | 167 | $9.55 \%$ |
| TOTAL M/WBE | $\mathbf{6 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 . 3 2 \%}$ |
| NON-M/WDBE | 1,148 | $65.68 \%$ |
| TOTAL FIRMS | $\mathbf{1 , 7 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |
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Table B-4
Availability of Firms by Business Ownership in Market Area
Prime Data, Other Services
North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Business Ownership Classification | Number of Firms | Percent of Firms |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Black American | 878 | $15.86 \%$ |
| Asian American | 72 | $1.30 \%$ |
| Hispanic American | 95 | $1.72 \%$ |
| American Indian | 38 | $0.69 \%$ |
| TOTAL MBE | $\mathbf{1 , 0 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 5 7 \%}$ |
| Nonminority Female | 501 | $9.05 \%$ |
| TOTAL M/WBE | $\mathbf{1 , 5 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 6 2 \%}$ |
| NON-M/WDBE | $\mathbf{3 , 9 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 . 3 8 \%}$ |
| TOTAL FIRMS | $\mathbf{5 , 5 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |
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Table B-5
Availability of Firms by Business Ownership in Market Area
Prime Data, Goods

## North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Business Ownership Classification | Number of Firms | Percent of Firms |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Black American | 254 | $8.18 \%$ |
| Asian American | 34 | $1.09 \%$ |
| Hispanic American | 53 | $1.71 \%$ |
| American Indian | 21 | $0.68 \%$ |
| TOTAL MBE | $\mathbf{3 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 6 5 \%}$ |
| Nonminority Female | $\mathbf{2 8 8}$ | $9.27 \%$ |
| TOTAL M/WBE | $\mathbf{6 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 . 9 3 \%}$ |
| NON-M/WDBE | $\mathbf{2 , 4 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 . 0 7 \%}$ |
| TOTAL FIRMS | $\mathbf{3 , 1 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |
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## APPENDIX C DETAILED DISPARITY INDICES BY YEAR

## Appendix C - NC CC/Univ Detailed Disparity Indices

The tables in Appendix C (Tables C-1 through C-10) presents disparity ratios on North Carolina projects by year over the Study Period. The only overutilization was for Asian Americans in Prime Goods (Table C5) and in Total Utilization (prime plus subcontractor) for Goods (Table C-10).

Table C-1
Disparity Results, Relevant Market Area
Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Prime Construction Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018 North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 0.81\% | 14.65\% | 5.56 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.01\% | 1.12\% | 1.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.22\% | 4.38\% | 4.94 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 1.79\% | 2.39\% | 74.89 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 2.83\% | 22.54\% | 12.55 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.17\% | 13.64\% | 23.23 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 6.00\% | 36.19\% | 16.58 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 94.00\% | 63.81\% | 147.31 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 1.48\% | 14.65\% | 10.11 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.02\% | 1.12\% | 1.87 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.04\% | 4.38\% | 0.97 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.95\% | 2.39\% | 39.61 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 2.49\% | 22.54\% | 11.05 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.01\% | 13.64\% | 22.09 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 5.50\% | 36.19\% | 15.21 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 94.50\% | 63.81\% | 148.08 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 1.66\% | 14.65\% | 11.35 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.01\% | 1.12\% | 1.18 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.22\% | 4.38\% | 5.10 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.69\% | 2.39\% | 28.97 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 2.59\% | 22.54\% | 11.50 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 12.94\% | 13.64\% | 94.82 | Underutilization |  |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 15.53\% | 36.19\% | 42.91 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 84.47\% | 63.81\% | 132.37 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 0.56\% | 14.65\% | 3.81 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.01\% | 1.12\% | 1.32 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.10\% | 4.38\% | 2.22 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.24\% | 2.39\% | 10.13 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.91\% | 22.54\% | 4.05 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 13.01\% | 13.64\% | 95.36 | Underutilization |  |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 13.92\% | 36.19\% | 38.48 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 86.08\% | 63.81\% | 134.89 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 1.25\% | 14.65\% | 8.56 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.01\% | 1.12\% | 0.71 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.08\% | 4.38\% | 1.83 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.15\% | 2.39\% | 6.38 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.50\% | 22.54\% | 6.63 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 4.85\% | 13.64\% | 35.54 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 6.34\% | 36.19\% | 17.53 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 93.66\% | 63.81\% | 146.77 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 1.11\% | 14.65\% | 7.57 | Underutilization | * | p < 0.05 |
|  | Asian American | 0.01\% | 1.12\% | 1.25 | Underutilization | * | p < 0.05 |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.13\% | 4.38\% | 2.97 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | American Indian | 0.74\% | 2.39\% | 31.02 | Underutilization | * | p < 0.05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.99\% | 22.54\% | 8.84 | Underutilization | * | p< 0.05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 7.97\% | 13.64\% | 58.44 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 9.97\% | 36.19\% | 27.54 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 90.03\% | 63.81\% | 141.09 | Overutilization |  |  |
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Table C-2
Disparity Results, Relevant Market Area

| Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Prime Architecture \& Engineering |
| :---: |
| Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018 |
| North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study |


| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 3.63\% | 6.41\% | 56.71 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.42\% | 2.42\% | 17.51 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.15\% | 2.42\% | 6.34 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.01\% | 1.21\% | 0.72 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 4.22\% | 12.45\% | 33.88 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.15\% | 10.52\% | 29.95 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 7.37\% | 22.97\% | 32.08 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 92.63\% | 77.03\% | 120.26 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 2.34\% | 6.41\% | 36.51 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.53\% | 2.42\% | 21.94 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.46\% | 2.42\% | 19.15 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.21\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 3.33\% | 12.45\% | 26.76 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 4.48\% | 10.52\% | 42.54 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 7.81\% | 22.97\% | 33.99 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 92.19\% | 77.03\% | 119.69 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 1.22\% | 6.41\% | 19.08 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.23\% | 2.42\% | 9.68 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.36\% | 2.42\% | 15.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.01\% | 1.21\% | 0.45 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.83\% | 12.45\% | 14.65 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.07\% | 10.52\% | 19.63 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 3.89\% | 22.97\% | 16.93 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 96.11\% | 77.03\% | 124.78 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 1.06\% | 6.41\% | 16.56 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.65\% | 2.42\% | 26.83 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.33\% | 2.42\% | 13.63 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.02\% | 1.21\% | 1.42 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 2.06\% | 12.45\% | 16.52 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.49\% | 10.52\% | 33.20 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 5.55\% | 22.97\% | 24.16 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 94.45\% | 77.03\% | 122.62 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.77\% | 6.41\% | 11.96 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.23\% | 2.42\% | 9.67 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.14\% | 2.42\% | 5.62 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.01\% | 1.21\% | 0.58 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.14\% | 12.45\% | 9.18 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.40\% | 10.52\% | 22.78 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 3.54\% | 22.97\% | 15.40 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 96.46\% | 77.03\% | 125.23 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 1.70\% | 6.41\% | 26.59 | Underutilization | * | $\mathrm{p}<.05$ |
|  | Asian American | 0.41\% | 2.42\% | 16.88 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.29\% | 2.42\% | 12.19 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | American Indian | 0.01\% | 1.21\% | 0.66 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 2.41\% | 12.45\% | 19.39 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.04\% | 10.52\% | 28.91 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 5.46\% | 22.97\% | 23.75 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 94.54\% | 77.03\% | 122.74 | Overutilization |  |  |
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Table C-3
Disparity Results, Relevant Market Area
Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Prime Professional Services Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018
North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical <br> Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 0.33\% | 18.42\% | 1.77 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.01\% | 2.86\% | 0.20 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.33\% | 24.77\% | 1.34 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.15\% | 9.55\% | 1.62 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.49\% | 34.32\% | 1.41 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.51\% | 65.68\% | 151.53 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 0.15\% | 18.42\% | 0.82 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.07\% | 2.86\% | 2.55 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.22\% | 24.77\% | 0.91 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.20\% | 9.55\% | 2.08 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.42\% | 34.32\% | 1.23 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.58\% | 65.68\% | 151.62 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 0.26\% | 18.42\% | 1.41 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.02\% | 2.86\% | 0.68 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.28\% | 24.77\% | 1.13 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.31\% | 9.55\% | 3.27 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.59\% | 34.32\% | 1.73 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.41\% | 65.68\% | 151.36 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 0.44\% | 18.42\% | 2.38 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.00\% | 2.86\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.44\% | 24.77\% | 1.77 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.17\% | 9.55\% | 1.73 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.60\% | 34.32\% | 1.76 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.40\% | 65.68\% | 151.35 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.33\% | 18.42\% | 1.78 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.05\% | 2.86\% | 1.65 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.37\% | 24.77\% | 1.51 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.55\% | 9.55\% | 5.77 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.93\% | 34.32\% | 2.70 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.07\% | 65.68\% | 150.86 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 0.28\% | 18.42\% | 1.54 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Asian American | 0.03\% | 2.86\% | 1.10 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.32\% | 24.77\% | 1.27 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.25\% | 9.55\% | 2.66 | Underutilization | * | $\mathrm{p}<.05$ |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.57\% | 34.32\% | 1.66 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.43\% | 65.68\% | 151.40 | Overutilization |  |  |
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Table C-4
Disparity Results, Relevant Market Area
Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Prime Other Services Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018 North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 0.09\% | 15.86\% | 0.55 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.14\% | 1.30\% | 10.70 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 1.72\% | 0.12 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.12\% | 0.69\% | 17.14 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.35\% | 19.57\% | 1.77 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.62\% | 9.05\% | 28.93 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 2.96\% | 28.62\% | 10.36 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 97.04\% | 71.38\% | 135.94 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 0.09\% | 15.86\% | 0.55 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.13\% | 1.30\% | 10.30 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.01\% | 1.72\% | 0.75 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.06\% | 0.69\% | 8.92 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.30\% | 19.57\% | 1.51 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.77\% | 9.05\% | 8.51 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 1.07\% | 28.62\% | 3.72 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 98.93\% | 71.38\% | 138.60 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 0.03\% | 15.86\% | 0.20 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.02\% | 1.30\% | 1.39 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.01\% | 1.72\% | 0.65 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.05\% | 0.69\% | 7.50 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.11\% | 19.57\% | 0.57 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.90\% | 9.05\% | 9.95 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 1.01\% | 28.62\% | 3.54 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 98.99\% | 71.38\% | 138.67 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 0.11\% | 15.86\% | 0.72 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.10\% | 1.30\% | 7.71 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.02\% | 1.72\% | 1.35 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.06\% | 0.69\% | 8.46 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.30\% | 19.57\% | 1.51 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.93\% | 9.05\% | 10.24 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 1.22\% | 28.62\% | 4.27 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 98.78\% | 71.38\% | 138.38 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.27\% | 15.86\% | 1.68 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.03\% | 1.30\% | 2.66 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.01\% | 1.72\% | 0.52 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.08\% | 0.69\% | 11.35 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.39\% | 19.57\% | 1.98 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 1.79\% | 9.05\% | 19.77 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 2.18\% | 28.62\% | 7.61 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 97.82\% | 71.38\% | 137.04 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 0.10\% | 15.86\% | 0.62 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Asian American | 0.09\% | 1.30\% | 6.67 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.01\% | 1.72\% | 0.70 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | American Indian | 0.07\% | 0.69\% | 10.32 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.27\% | 19.57\% | 1.37 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 1.31\% | 9.05\% | 14.45 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 1.58\% | 28.62\% | 5.51 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 98.42\% | 71.38\% | 137.88 | Overutilization |  |  |
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Table C-5
Disparity Results, Relevant Market Area
Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Prime Goods
Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018
North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 1.25\% | 8.18\% | 15.28 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 2.31\% | 1.09\% | 211.22 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.20\% | 1.71\% | 11.72 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 3.76\% | 11.65\% | 32.27 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.77\% | 9.27\% | 40.62 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 7.53\% | 20.93\% | 35.97 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 92.47\% | 79.07\% | 116.95 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 6.99\% | 8.18\% | 85.49 | Underutilization |  |  |
|  | Asian American | 2.99\% | 1.09\% | 273.28 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.16\% | 1.71\% | 9.47 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 10.14\% | 11.65\% | 87.04 | Underutilization |  |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.79\% | 9.27\% | 40.88 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 13.94\% | 20.93\% | 66.59 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 86.06\% | 79.07\% | 108.84 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 2.80\% | 8.18\% | 34.22 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 2.91\% | 1.09\% | 266.13 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.17\% | 1.71\% | 9.95 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.45 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 5.88\% | 11.65\% | 50.49 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.02\% | 9.27\% | 21.82 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 7.91\% | 20.93\% | 37.79 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 92.09\% | 79.07\% | 116.46 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 3.52\% | 8.18\% | 43.07 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 2.93\% | 1.09\% | 267.60 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.30\% | 1.71\% | 17.30 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 6.75\% | 11.65\% | 57.89 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.73\% | 9.27\% | 40.23 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 10.48\% | 20.93\% | 50.07 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 89.52\% | 79.07\% | 113.22 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.05\% | 8.18\% | 0.65 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.41\% | 1.09\% | 37.08 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.40\% | 1.71\% | 23.36 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.86\% | 11.65\% | 7.36 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.07\% | 9.27\% | 33.15 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 3.93\% | 20.93\% | 18.79 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 96.07\% | 79.07\% | 121.49 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 3.14\% | 8.18\% | 38.43 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Asian American | 2.41\% | 1.09\% | 220.45 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.23\% | 1.71\% | 13.75 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.11 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 5.79\% | 11.65\% | 49.69 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.23\% | 9.27\% | 34.87 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 9.03\% | 20.93\% | 43.13 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 90.97\% | 79.07\% | 115.05 | Overutilization |  |  |

Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020

Table C-6
Disparity Results, Relevant Market Area
Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Total Utilization Construction Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018 North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 0.95\% | 14.65\% | 6.49 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.01\% | 1.12\% | 1.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.41\% | 4.38\% | 9.31 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 1.79\% | 2.39\% | 75.07 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 3.16\% | 22.54\% | 14.03 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.29\% | 13.64\% | 24.08 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 6.45\% | 36.19\% | 17.82 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 93.55\% | 63.81\% | 146.61 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 1.48\% | 14.65\% | 10.11 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.02\% | 1.12\% | 1.87 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.04\% | 4.38\% | 0.97 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.95\% | 2.39\% | 39.61 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 2.49\% | 22.54\% | 11.05 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.01\% | 13.64\% | 22.09 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 5.50\% | 36.19\% | 15.21 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 94.50\% | 63.81\% | 148.08 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 2.05\% | 14.65\% | 13.97 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.07\% | 1.12\% | 5.83 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.43\% | 4.38\% | 9.78 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.77\% | 2.39\% | 32.15 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 3.31\% | 22.54\% | 14.68 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 14.98\% | 13.64\% | 109.82 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 18.29\% | 36.19\% | 50.55 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 81.71\% | 63.81\% | 128.04 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 1.01\% | 14.65\% | 6.87 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.02\% | 1.12\% | 1.46 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.34\% | 4.38\% | 7.78 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.37\% | 2.39\% | 15.68 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.74\% | 22.54\% | 7.71 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 14.92\% | 13.64\% | 109.38 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 16.66\% | 36.19\% | 46.04 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 83.34\% | 63.81\% | 130.60 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 2.64\% | 14.65\% | 18.03 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.23\% | 1.12\% | 20.66 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 1.37\% | 4.38\% | 31.23 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.23\% | 2.39\% | 9.65 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 4.47\% | 22.54\% | 19.84 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 9.81\% | 13.64\% | 71.94 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 14.29\% | 36.19\% | 39.48 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 85.71\% | 63.81\% | 134.32 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 1.54\% | 14.65\% | 10.49 | Underutilization | * | $\mathrm{p}<.05$ |
|  | Asian American | 0.06\% | 1.12\% | 5.16 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.46\% | 4.38\% | 10.57 | Underutilization | * | p< 0.05 |
|  | Native American | 0.80\% | 2.39\% | 33.68 | Underutilization | * | p< 0.05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 2.86\% | 22.54\% | 12.69 | Underutilization | * | $\mathrm{p}<.05$ |
|  | Nonminority Female | 9.65\% | 13.64\% | 70.75 | Underutilization | * | p< 0.05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 12.51\% | 36.19\% | 34.58 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 87.49\% | 63.81\% | 137.10 | Overutilization |  |  |
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Table C-7
Disparity Results, Relevant Market Area
Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Total Utilization A\&E Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018 North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 3.63\% | 6.41\% | 56.71 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.42\% | 2.42\% | 17.51 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.15\% | 2.42\% | 6.34 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.01\% | 1.21\% | 0.72 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 4.22\% | 12.45\% | 33.88 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.15\% | 10.52\% | 29.95 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 7.37\% | 22.97\% | 32.08 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 92.63\% | 77.03\% | 120.26 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 2.34\% | 6.41\% | 36.51 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.53\% | 2.42\% | 21.94 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.46\% | 2.42\% | 19.15 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.00\% | 1.21\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 3.33\% | 12.45\% | 26.76 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 4.48\% | 10.52\% | 42.54 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 7.81\% | 22.97\% | 33.99 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 92.19\% | 77.03\% | 119.69 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 1.22\% | 6.41\% | 19.08 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.23\% | 2.42\% | 9.68 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.36\% | 2.42\% | 15.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.01\% | 1.21\% | 0.45 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.83\% | 12.45\% | 14.65 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.07\% | 10.52\% | 19.63 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 3.89\% | 22.97\% | 16.93 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 96.11\% | 77.03\% | 124.78 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 1.44\% | 6.41\% | 22.41 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.81\% | 2.42\% | 33.65 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 2.06\% | 2.42\% | 85.00 | Underutilization |  |  |
|  | Native American | 0.08\% | 1.21\% | 6.39 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 4.38\% | 12.45\% | 35.19 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 4.82\% | 10.52\% | 45.85 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 9.21\% | 22.97\% | 40.07 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 90.79\% | 77.03\% | 117.88 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.77\% | 6.41\% | 11.96 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.23\% | 2.42\% | 9.67 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.14\% | 2.42\% | 5.62 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.01\% | 1.21\% | 0.58 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.14\% | 12.45\% | 9.18 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.40\% | 10.52\% | 22.78 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 3.54\% | 22.97\% | 15.40 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 96.46\% | 77.03\% | 125.23 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 1.79\% | 6.41\% | 27.87 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Asian American | 0.44\% | 2.42\% | 18.37 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.67\% | 2.42\% | 27.83 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Native American | 0.02\% | 1.21\% | 1.74 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 2.92\% | 12.45\% | 23.48 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.33\% | 10.52\% | 31.68 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 6.26\% | 22.97\% | 27.24 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 93.74\% | 77.03\% | 121.70 | Overutilization |  |  |
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Table C-8
Disparity Results, Relevant Market Area
Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Total Utilization Professional Services
Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018 North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 0.33\% | 18.42\% | 1.77 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.01\% | 2.86\% | 0.20 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.33\% | 24.77\% | 1.34 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.15\% | 9.55\% | 1.62 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.49\% | 34.32\% | 1.41 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.51\% | 65.68\% | 151.53 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 0.15\% | 18.42\% | 0.82 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.07\% | 2.86\% | 2.55 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.22\% | 24.77\% | 0.91 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.20\% | 9.55\% | 2.08 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.42\% | 34.32\% | 1.23 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.58\% | 65.68\% | 151.62 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 0.26\% | 18.42\% | 1.41 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.02\% | 2.86\% | 0.68 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.28\% | 24.77\% | 1.13 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.31\% | 9.55\% | 3.27 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.59\% | 34.32\% | 1.73 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.41\% | 65.68\% | 151.36 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 0.44\% | 18.42\% | 2.38 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.00\% | 2.86\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.44\% | 24.77\% | 1.77 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.17\% | 9.55\% | 1.73 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.60\% | 34.32\% | 1.76 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.40\% | 65.68\% | 151.35 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.33\% | 18.42\% | 1.78 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.05\% | 2.86\% | 1.65 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.37\% | 24.77\% | 1.51 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.55\% | 9.55\% | 5.77 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.93\% | 34.32\% | 2.70 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.07\% | 65.68\% | 150.86 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 0.28\% | 18.42\% | 1.54 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Asian American | 0.03\% | 2.86\% | 1.10 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Native American | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.32\% | 24.77\% | 1.27 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.25\% | 9.55\% | 2.66 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.57\% | 34.32\% | 1.66 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.43\% | 65.68\% | 151.40 | Overutilization |  |  |
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Table C-9
Disparity Results, Relevant Market Area
Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Total Utilization Other Services Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018 North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 0.09\% | 15.86\% | 0.55 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.14\% | 1.30\% | 10.70 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 1.72\% | 0.12 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.12\% | 0.69\% | 17.14 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.35\% | 19.57\% | 1.77 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.62\% | 9.05\% | 28.93 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 2.96\% | 28.62\% | 10.36 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 97.04\% | 71.38\% | 135.94 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 0.09\% | 15.86\% | 0.55 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.13\% | 1.30\% | 10.30 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.01\% | 1.72\% | 0.75 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.06\% | 0.69\% | 8.92 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.30\% | 19.57\% | 1.51 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.77\% | 9.05\% | 8.51 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 1.07\% | 28.62\% | 3.72 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 98.93\% | 71.38\% | 138.60 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 0.03\% | 15.86\% | 0.20 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.02\% | 1.30\% | 1.39 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.01\% | 1.72\% | 0.65 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.06\% | 0.69\% | 8.66 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.12\% | 19.57\% | 0.61 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.90\% | 9.05\% | 10.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 1.02\% | 28.62\% | 3.58 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 98.98\% | 71.38\% | 138.66 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 0.11\% | 15.86\% | 0.72 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.10\% | 1.30\% | 7.71 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.02\% | 1.72\% | 1.35 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.06\% | 0.69\% | 8.46 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.30\% | 19.57\% | 1.51 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.93\% | 9.05\% | 10.24 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 1.22\% | 28.62\% | 4.27 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 98.78\% | 71.38\% | 138.38 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.40\% | 15.86\% | 2.51 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.03\% | 1.30\% | 2.66 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.01\% | 1.72\% | 0.52 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.08\% | 0.69\% | 11.35 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.52\% | 19.57\% | 2.65 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 1.80\% | 9.05\% | 19.93 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 2.32\% | 28.62\% | 8.12 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 97.68\% | 71.38\% | 136.84 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 0.11\% | 15.86\% | 0.72 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Asian American | 0.09\% | 1.30\% | 6.67 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.01\% | 1.72\% | 0.70 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Native American | 0.07\% | 0.69\% | 10.62 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.29\% | 19.57\% | 1.46 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 1.31\% | 9.05\% | 14.48 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 1.60\% | 28.62\% | 5.58 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 98.40\% | 71.38\% | 137.85 | Overutilization |  |  |
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Table C-10
Disparity Results, Relevant Market Area
Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Total Utilization Goods Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018 North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 1.25\% | 8.18\% | 15.28 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Assian American | 2.31\% | 1.09\% | 211.22 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.20\% | 1.71\% | 11.72 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 3.76\% | 11.65\% | 32.27 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.77\% | 9.27\% | 40.62 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 7.53\% | 20.93\% | 35.97 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 92.47\% | 79.07\% | 116.95 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 6.99\% | 8.18\% | 85.49 | Underutilization |  |  |
|  | Asian American | 2.99\% | 1.09\% | 273.28 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.16\% | 1.71\% | 9.47 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 10.14\% | 11.65\% | 87.04 | Underutilization |  |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.79\% | 9.27\% | 40.88 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 13.94\% | 20.93\% | 66.59 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 86.06\% | 79.07\% | 108.84 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 2.80\% | 8.18\% | 34.22 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 2.91\% | 1.09\% | 266.13 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.17\% | 1.71\% | 9.95 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.45 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 5.88\% | 11.65\% | 50.49 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.02\% | 9.27\% | 21.82 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 7.91\% | 20.93\% | 37.79 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 92.09\% | 79.07\% | 116.46 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 5.02\% | 8.18\% | 61.40 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 2.96\% | 1.09\% | 270.62 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.50\% | 1.71\% | 29.26 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.05\% | 0.68\% | 7.25 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 8.53\% | 11.65\% | 73.20 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 4.75\% | 9.27\% | 51.21 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 13.28\% | 20.93\% | 63.46 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 86.72\% | 79.07\% | 109.67 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.05\% | 8.18\% | 0.65 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.41\% | 1.09\% | 37.08 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.55\% | 1.71\% | 32.28 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Native American | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.01\% | 11.65\% | 8.66 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.07\% | 9.27\% | 33.15 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 4.08\% | 20.93\% | 19.51 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 95.92\% | 79.07\% | 121.30 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 3.43\% | 8.18\% | 41.90 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Asian American | 2.42\% | 1.09\% | 221.03 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.30\% | 1.71\% | 17.48 | Underutilization | * | $\mathrm{p}<.05$ |
|  | Native American | 0.01\% | 0.68\% | 1.48 | Underutilization | * | $\mathrm{p}<.05$ |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 6.15\% | 11.65\% | 52.81 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.43\% | 9.27\% | 36.95 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 9.58\% | 20.93\% | 45.78 | Underutilization | * | $\mathrm{p}<.05$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 90.42\% | 79.07\% | 114.35 | Overutilization |  |  |
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# APPENDIX D <br> UTILIZATION BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY 

## Appendix D - Utilization by Colleges and Universities

Table D-1 shows utilization by North Carolina Colleges and Universities.

The highest MBE utilization in percentage terms for a college or university was Guilford Technical Community College, with $53.4 \%$. The highest WBE utilization in percentage terms was Alamance Community College, with $53.10 \%$. The highest M/WBE percentage utilization was Guilford Technical Community College, with $55.61 \%$

The highest spending in absolute dollars terms with MBEs Guilford Technical Community College, with $\$ 62,136,698$. The highest spending with WBEs $(\$ 75,199,074)$ and M/WBEs $(\$ 88,519,938)$ was North Carolina State.

Table C-1
Prime Utilization by Colleges and Universities, Relevant Market Area Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year Using Payment Dollars, FY 2014-2018
North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| College/University | Firm Ownership | Amount |  | Percent of Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alamance CC | African-American Firms | \$ | 63,816 | 0.22\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 40,342 | 0.14\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 104,158 | 0.35\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 15,723,034 | 53.10\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 15,827,192 | 53.45\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 13,783,435 | 46.55\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 29,610,628 | 100.00\% |
| Albemarle-College | African-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 377,782 | 3.63\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 377,782 | 3.63\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 31,782 | 0.31\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 409,564 | 3.94\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 9,993,017 | 96.06\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 10,402,582 | 100.00\% |
| Appalachian State University | African-American Firms | \$ | 383,918 | 0.16\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 45,686 | 0.02\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | 75,195 | 0.03\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 504,799 | 0.21\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 57,914,664 | 24.41\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 58,419,463 | 24.62\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 178,824,335 | 75.38\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 237,243,798 | 100.00\% |


| Appalachian State University PO | African-American Firms | \$ | 69,631 | 0.10\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 425,397 | 0.63\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 495,028 | 0.74\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 1,238,797 | 1.84\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 1,733,824 | 2.57\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 65,614,874 | 97.43\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 67,348,698 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Asheville Buncombe Technical Community College | African-American Firms | \$ | 34,722 | 0.08\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 206,472 | 0.50\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | 22,831 | 0.06\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 264,025 | 0.64\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 1,614,427 | 3.89\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 1,878,451 | 4.53\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 39,605,156 | 95.47\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 41,483,608 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Beaufort County CC | African-American Firms | \$ | 7,365 | 0.08\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 78,948 | 0.87\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | 49,721 | 0.55\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 136,034 | 1.50\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 340,794 | 3.75\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 476,828 | 5.24\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 8,620,277 | 94.76\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 9,097,105 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Bladen Community College | African-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 24,193 | 0.29\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | 14,675 | 0.17\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 38,868 | 0.46\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 202,721 | 2.41\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 241,589 | 2.87\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 8,168,948 | 97.13\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 8,410,537 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Blue Ridge Community College | African-American Firms | \$ | 13,174 | 0.11\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 74,706 | 0.61\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 87,880 | 0.72\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 648,493 | 5.29\% |


|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 736,373 | 6.01\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 11,524,864 | 93.99\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 12,261,237 | 100.00\% |
| Brunswick CC | African-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 295,985 | 3.00\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 295,985 | 3.00\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 41,926 | 0.42\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 337,912 | 3.42\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 9,539,056 | 96.58\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 9,876,968 | 100.00\% |
| Caldwell Community College | African-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 54,296 | 0.25\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 54,296 | 0.25\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 532,416 | 2.41\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 586,712 | 2.66\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 21,486,833 | 97.34\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 22,073,546 | 100.00\% |
| Cape Fear | African-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 12,600 | 15.12\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 12,600 | 15.12\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 70,717 | 84.88\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 83,317 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Carteret CC | African-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 95,053 | 2.19\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 95,053 | 2.19\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 195,962 | 4.52\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 291,015 | 6.72\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 4,042,147 | 93.28\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 4,333,162 | 100.00\% |
| Catawba CC | African-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |

attorneys and public policy consultants

|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ |  | 0.00\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 8,800 | 0.03\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 8,800 | 0.03\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 32,387,550 | 99.97\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 32,396,350 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Central Carolina CC | African-American Firms | \$ | 6,516 | 0.02\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 197,422 | 0.62\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 203,939 | 0.64\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 1,556,108 | 4.89\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 1,760,047 | 5.53\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 30,077,233 | 94.47\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 31,837,280 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Central Piedmont CC | African-American Firms | \$ | 886,798 | 0.98\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 1,121,872 | 1.25\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | 27,000 | 0.03\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | 559,877 | 0.62\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 2,595,547 | 2.88\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 14,375,341 | 15.96\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 16,970,888 | 18.84\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 73,125,172 | 81.16\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 90,096,060 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Cleveland CC | African-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 361,195 | 100.00\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 361,195 | 100.00\% |
| Coastal Carolina Community College | African-American Firms | \$ | 104,660 | 0.30\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 125,290 | 0.36\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 229,950 | 0.66\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 1,295,804 | 3.74\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 1,525,753 | 4.40\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 33,119,275 | 95.60\% |


|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 34,645,029 | 100.00\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Craven Community College | African-American Firms | \$ | 327,134 | 2.40\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 309,148 | 2.27\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | 83,552 | 0.61\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 719,833 | 5.29\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 236,685 | 1.74\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 956,518 | 7.03\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 12,656,666 | 92.97\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 13,613,184 | 100.00\% |


| Davidson County CC | African-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 785,522 | 2.44\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 785,522 | 2.44\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 589,360 | 1.83\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 1,374,883 | 4.26\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 30,877,348 | 95.74\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 32,252,230 | 100.00\% |


| Durham_Tech_CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | 728,278 | $2.46 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 157,866 | $0.53 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | 64,658 | $0.22 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{9 5 0 , 8 0 2}$ | $3.22 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $1,285,287$ | $4.35 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 2 3 6 , 0 8 9}$ | $7.57 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 , 3 1 3 , 5 3 2}$ | $92.43 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 , 5 4 9 , 6 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |


| East Carolina University | African-American Firms | $\$$ | $1,556,101$ | $0.53 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 445,627 | $0.15 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | 800,135 | $0.27 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 8 0 1 , 8 6 3}$ | $0.95 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $6,967,416$ | $2.37 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{9 , 7 6 9 , 2 7 8}$ | $3.33 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $283,867,395$ | $96.67 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 3 , 6 3 6 , 6 7 4}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Edgecombe | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 66,824 | $0.59 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |


|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 , 8 2 4}$ | $0.59 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 990,840 | $8.80 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 5 7 , 6 6 4}$ | $9.39 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $10,205,596$ | $90.61 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 , 2 6 3 , 2 5 9}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Elizabeth_City_State_Univ | African-American Firms | $\$$ | 315,335 | $0.74 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 170,873 | $0.40 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 6 , 2 0 7}$ | $1.14 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 553,349 | $1.29 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 3 9 , 5 5 7}$ | $2.43 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $41,747,974$ | $97.57 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 , 7 8 7 , 5 3 0}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Fayetteville State University | African-American Firms | $\$$ | $1,522,443$ | $7.11 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 116,899 | $0.55 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | 14,400 | $0.07 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | $4,270,552$ | $19.96 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 9 2 4 , 2 9 5}$ | $27.69 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 425,666 | $1.99 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 3 4 9 , 9 6 1}$ | $29.67 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $15,048,565$ | $70.33 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 , 3 9 8 , 5 2 5}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Fayetteville Tech CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | $2,882,434$ | $2.87 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | 144,294 | $0.14 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 0 2 6 , 7 2 8}$ | $3.01 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $4,217,105$ | $4.20 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{7 , 2 4 3 , 8 3 4}$ | $7.21 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $93,254,091$ | $92.79 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 , 4 9 7 , 9 2 5}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Forsyth Technical Community <br> College | African-American Firms | $\$$ | $1,648,340$ | $0.83 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 222,291 | $0.11 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | 11,182 | $0.01 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 8 1 , 8 1 3}$ | $0.94 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 , 0 7 0 , 8 1 2}$ | $1.04 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 9 5 2 , 6 2 5}$ | $1.98 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $195,468,528$ | $98.02 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 , 4 2 1 , 1 5 3}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Gaston College | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 50,813 | $0.15 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 , 8 1 3}$ | $0.15 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 544,352 | $1.59 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 5 , 1 6 5}$ | $1.74 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $33,635,518$ | $98.26 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 , 2 3 0 , 6 8 3}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Guilford TCC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | $60,102,087$ | $51.65 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | $2,006,090$ | $1.72 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | 28,521 | $0.02 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 , 1 3 6 , 6 9 8}$ | $53.40 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $2,570,293$ | $2.21 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 , 7 0 6 , 9 9 1}$ | $55.61 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $51,649,729$ | $44.39 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$ 1 1 6 , 3 5 6 , 7 2 0}$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |


| Halifax | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 54,953 | $0.53 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 , 9 5 3}$ | $0.53 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 17,812 | $0.17 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $\mathbf{7 2 , 7 6 5}$ | $0.70 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $10,385,273$ | $99.30 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 , 4 5 8 , 0 3 7}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Haywood CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 69,563 | $0.96 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 , 5 6 3}$ | $0.96 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 1 8 , 3 8 3}$ | $3.02 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 7 , 9 4 6}$ | $3.98 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $6,943,500$ | $96.02 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{7 , 2 3 1 , 4 4 6}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Isothermal CC | African-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 94,894 | 0.63\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 94,894 | 0.63\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 18,974 | 0.13\% |


|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 3 , 8 6 8}$ | $0.76 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $14,939,409$ | $99.24 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 , 0 5 3 , 2 7 7}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| James Sprunt CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | 21,595 | $0.53 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 41,686 | $1.01 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 , 2 8 1}$ | $1.54 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 , 2 8 1}$ | $1.54 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $4,048,100$ | $98.46 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 1 1 1 , 3 8 2}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Johnston CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | 12,556 | $0.04 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 275,945 | $0.77 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 8 , 5 0 0}$ | $0.81 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $4,136,272$ | $11.60 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 4 2 4 , 7 7 3}$ | $12.41 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $31,239,770$ | $87.59 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 , 6 6 4 , 5 4 2}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Lenoir CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | 7,989 | $0.06 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 81,321 | $0.65 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | 31,500 | $0.25 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 0 , 8 1 1}$ | $0.96 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 112,954 | $0.90 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 3 , 7 6 5}$ | $1.86 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $12,318,262$ | $98.14 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 , 5 5 2 , 0 2 7}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Martin CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 261,219 | $2.89 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 1 , 2 1 9}$ | $2.89 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 264,731 | $2.93 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 5 , 9 5 1}$ | $5.83 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 4 9 9 , 4 7 7}$ | $94.17 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{9 , 0 2 5 , 4 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |


| Mayland Community College | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 31,933 | $0.34 \%$ |


attorneys and public policy consultants

|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 25,150,955 | 100.00\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NC A\&T University | African-American Firms | \$ | 5,957,428 | 22.18\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 389,346 | 1.45\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 6,346,774 | 23.63\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 631,831 | 2.35\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 6,978,605 | 25.98\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 19,884,044 | 74.02\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 26,862,649 | 100.00\% |


| NC School of Arts | African-American Firms | $\$$ | 517,426 | $1.24 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 281,529 | $0.68 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\$$ | $\mathbf{7 9 8 , 9 5 5}$ | $1.92 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $2,563,101$ | $6.16 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 3 6 2 , 0 5 6}$ | $8.08 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $38,240,950$ | $91.92 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 , 6 0 3 , 0 0 6}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| NC State University | African-American Firms | $\$$ | $5,515,752$ | $0.27 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | $1,697,641$ | $0.08 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | $5,550,104$ | $0.27 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | 557,368 | $0.03 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 , 3 2 0 , 8 6 4}$ | $0.65 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $75,199,074$ | $3.67 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 , 5 1 9 , 9 3 8}$ | $4.32 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$ 1,961,921,645$ | $95.68 \%$ |  |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 0 5 0 , 4 4 1 , 5 8 4}$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |


| North Carolina Central University | African-American Firms | $\$$ | $1,686,870$ | $1.48 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 696,388 | $0.61 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | 507,034 | $0.44 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 8 9 0 , 2 9 2}$ | $2.53 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $1,241,847$ | $1.09 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 1 3 2 , 1 3 9}$ | $3.62 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $109,952,177$ | $96.38 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 4 , 0 8 4 , 3 1 6}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Pamlico Community College | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | - |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - |



| Piedmont Community College | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 89,468 | $0.46 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{8 9 , 4 6 8}$ | $0.46 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 5 2 , 8 2 0}$ | $1.30 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 2 , 2 8 8}$ | $1.76 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $19,070,976$ | $98.24 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 , 4 1 3 , 2 6 4}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Pitt CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | 400,963 | $0.07 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 341,722 | $0.06 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | 57,134 | $0.01 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 9 , 8 2 0}$ | $0.13 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 358,315 | $0.06 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 5 8 , 1 3 5}$ | $0.19 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $596,354,756$ | $99.81 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 7 , 5 1 2 , 8 9 1}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Randolph Community College | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 4 3 , 4 8 9}$ | $1.33 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 3 , 4 8 9}$ | $1.33 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 396,793 | $2.16 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 0 , 2 8 2}$ | $3.49 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $17,705,513$ | $96.51 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 , 3 4 5 , 7 9 5}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Richmond Community College | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 89,695 | $0.58 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | $2,018,290$ | $13.08 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 1 0 7 , 9 8 4}$ | $13.66 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 133,361 | $0.86 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 2 4 1 , 3 4 6}$ | $14.52 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $13,192,974$ | $85.48 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 , 4 3 4 , 3 2 0}$ | $100.00 \%$ |

attorneys and public Policy Consultants

| Roanoke-Chowan Community College | African-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 5,919 | 0.28\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 5,919 | 0.28\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 2,141,454 | 99.72\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 2,147,373 | 100.00\% |


| Robeson CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 866,625 | $7.56 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | 758,355 | $6.62 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 6 2 4 , 9 8 0}$ | $14.18 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 69,062 | $0.60 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 6 9 4 , 0 4 1}$ | $14.78 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $9,764,875$ | $85.22 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 , 4 5 8 , 9 1 7}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Rockingham CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | 160,812 | $1.48 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 34,414 | $0.32 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 5 , 2 2 5}$ | $1.80 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $\mathbf{7 1 2 , 4 9 5}$ | $6.56 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 7 , 7 2 0}$ | $8.36 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $9,955,381$ | $91.64 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 , 8 6 3 , 1 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |


| Rowan-Cabarrus Community <br> College | African-American Firms |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 468,645 | 0.179 |


| Sampson Community College | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 74,200 | $0.69 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 , 2 0 0}$ | $0.69 \%$ |
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|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 485,584 | $4.51 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 9 , 7 8 4}$ | $5.19 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $10,218,810$ | $94.81 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 , 7 7 8 , 5 9 4}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Sandhills CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 608,636 | $3.06 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 8 , 6 3 6}$ | $3.06 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 319,667 | $1.61 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 8 , 3 0 3}$ | $4.67 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $18,964,726$ | $95.33 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 , 8 9 3 , 0 2 9}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| South Piedmont CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | 5,359 | $0.05 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | $1,144,700$ | $11.44 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 5 0 , 0 5 9}$ | $11.50 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 193,223 | $1.93 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 3 4 3 , 2 8 2}$ | $13.43 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $\mathbf{8 , 6 6 0 , 6 2 9}$ | $86.57 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 , 0 0 3 , 9 1 1}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Southeastern CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 892,861 | $6.60 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{8 9 2 , 8 6 1}$ | $6.60 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 342,362 | $2.53 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 2 3 5 , 2 2 3}$ | $9.12 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $12,301,893$ | $90.88 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 , 5 3 7 , 1 1 6}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Southwestern CC | African-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 154,483 | 0.82\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 154,483 | 0.82\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 64,360 | 0.34\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 218,843 | 1.16\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 18,698,208 | 98.84\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 18,917,051 | 100.00\% |


| Stanly Community College | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |


|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 184,623 | 1.27\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 184,623 | 1.27\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 537,621 | 3.70\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 722,244 | 4.97\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 13,811,285 | 95.03\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 14,533,529 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Surry CC | African-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 180,803 | 1.15\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 180,803 | 1.15\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 553,477 | 3.52\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 734,280 | 4.66\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 15,008,627 | 95.34\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 15,742,907 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Tri-County Community College | African-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 54,100 | 2.03\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 54,100 | 2.03\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 325,246 | 12.20\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 379,345 | 14.23\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 2,286,506 | 85.77\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 2,665,851 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| UNC Asheville | African-American Firms | \$ | 80,081 | 0.11\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 867,682 | 1.18\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | 16,000 | 0.02\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 963,763 | 1.31\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 1,699,696 | 2.31\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 2,663,459 | 3.62\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 70,896,676 | 96.38\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 73,560,135 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| UNC Chapel Hill | African-American Firms | \$ | 996,236 | 0.09\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 237,563 | 0.02\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | 523,224 | 0.05\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | 159,637 | 0.01\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 1,916,661 | 0.17\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 15,516,983 | 1.39\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 17,433,643 | 1.56\% |

attorneys and public Policy Consultants

|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$ 1,100,965,087$ | $98.44 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\$ \mathbf{1 , 1 1 8 , 3 9 8 , 7 3 1}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| UNC Charlotte | African-American Firms | $\$$ | $8 \mathbf{8 6 7 , 2 8 9}$ | $0.15 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 867,605 | $0.15 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | 63,402 | $0.01 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | 953,251 | $0.16 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 5 1 , 5 4 7}$ | $0.46 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $48,391,024$ | $8.16 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 , 1 4 2 , 5 7 2}$ | $8.62 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $541,998,816$ | $91.38 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 3 , 1 4 1 , 3 8 8}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| UNC General Admin | African-American Firms | $\$$ | $7 \mathbf{7 2 , 8 3 3}$ | $0.30 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | 16,225 | $0.07 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{8 9 , 0 5 8}$ | $0.37 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 17,683 | $0.07 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 6 , 7 4 1}$ | $0.44 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 4 , 0 9 8 , 6 9 7}$ | $99.56 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 , 2 0 5 , 4 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |


| UNC Hospitals | African-American Firms | $\$$ | 289,259 | $0.03 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | $10,407,334$ | $1.11 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ |  | - |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | 5,400 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 , 7 0 1 , 9 9 3}$ | $1.14 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $1,733,220$ | $0.18 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 , 4 3 5 , 2 1 3}$ | $1.32 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $926,971,234$ | $98.68 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 9 , 4 0 6 , 4 4 7}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| UNC Pembroke | African-American Firms | $\$$ | 561,211 | $1.17 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 134,876 | $0.28 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | 7,850 | $0.02 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | $3,885,992$ | $8.12 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 5 8 9 , 9 2 9}$ | $9.59 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 944,492 | $1.97 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 5 3 4 , 4 2 0}$ | $11.57 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $42,302,344$ | $88.43 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 , 8 3 6 , 7 6 4}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| UNC TV - Chiller | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | - |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - |


|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 227,329 | 100.00\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 227,329 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| UNC TV- Lobby | African-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 219,811 | 100.00\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 219,811 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| UNC Wilmington | African-American Firms | \$ | 5,246,745 | 2.74\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 1,847,360 | 0.96\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | 6,375 | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 7,100,480 | 3.71\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 8,906,735 | 4.65\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 16,007,215 | 8.35\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 175,618,556 | 91.65\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 191,625,771 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Univ of NC at Greensboro | African-American Firms | \$ | 2,406,954 | 2.69\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | 5,800 | 0.01\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 2,412,754 | 2.70\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 3,241,831 | 3.62\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 5,654,585 | 6.32\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 83,845,054 | 93.68\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 89,499,639 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Vance-Granville CC | African-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Asian-American Firms | \$ | 27,512 | 0.39\% |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | American Indian Firms | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
|  | Total MBE Firms | \$ | 27,512 | 0.39\% |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | \$ | 155,908 | 2.22\% |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | \$ | 183,420 | 2.62\% |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | \$ | 6,826,532 | 97.38\% |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | \$ | 7,009,952 | 100.00\% |


| Wake Tech CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | $7,288,580$ | $2.49 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 638,382 | $0.22 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | 520,925 | $0.18 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | $5,689,477$ | $1.94 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 , 1 3 7 , 3 6 5}$ | $4.83 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $7,407,963$ | $2.53 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 , 5 4 5 , 3 2 8}$ | $7.35 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$ \mathbf{2 7 1 , 4 1 3 , 5 9 4}$ | $92.65 \%$ |  |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 2 , 9 5 8 , 9 2 3}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Wayne CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | $1,368,959$ | $6.30 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | 14,232 | $0.07 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 3 8 3 , 1 9 2}$ | $6.36 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 8 0 , 7 2 8}$ | $1.29 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 6 6 3 , 9 2 0}$ | $7.65 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $20,072,536$ | $92.35 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 , 7 3 6 , 4 5 6}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Western Carolina Univ | African-American Firms |  | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | $16,364,422$ | $11.83 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | 8,003 | $0.01 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | 239,407 | $0.17 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 , 6 1 1 , 8 3 2}$ | $12.01 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $5,650,698$ | $4.09 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 , 2 6 2 , 5 3 0}$ | $16.10 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $116,011,264$ | $83.90 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 8 , 2 7 3 , 7 9 4}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Wilkes CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 117,405 | $2.74 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 7 , 4 0 5}$ | $2.74 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 794,763 | $18.53 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{9 1 2 , 1 6 8}$ | $21.27 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $3,376,741$ | $78.73 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 2 8 8 , 9 0 9}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Wilson CC | African-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 99,306 | $1.13 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{9 9 , 3 0 6}$ | $1.13 \%$ |


|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | 91,856 | $1.05 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 1 , 1 6 1}$ | $2.17 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $8,598,797$ | $97.83 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 7 8 9 , 9 5 8}$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| Winston-Salem State University | African-American Firms | $\$$ | $1,286,080$ | $1.06 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Asian-American Firms | $\$$ | 722,075 | $0.59 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic-American Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | American Indian Firms | $\$$ | - | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Total MBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 0 0 8 , 1 5 5}$ | $1.65 \%$ |
|  | Nonminority-Female Firms | $\$$ | $1,526,868$ | $1.25 \%$ |
|  | Total M/WBE Firms | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 5 3 5 , 0 2 3}$ | $2.90 \%$ |
|  | Non-M/WBE Firms | $\$$ | $118,193,141$ | $97.10 \%$ |
|  | Total Prime Procurement | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 1 , 7 2 8 , 1 6 4}$ | $100.00 \%$ |
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## APPENDIX E DISPARITIES ON PROJECTS LESS THAN \$500,000 AND LESS THAN \$1,000,000

ATTORNEYS AND PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANTS

## Appendix E - NC-CC/Univ Disparity for projects under \$500,000 and under \$1,000,000

The tables in Appendix E present disparity ratios on NC-CC/Univ projects by year over the Study Period for projects under \$500,000 (Tables E-1 through E-5) and under \$1,000,000 (Tables E-6 through E-10). The only overutilization was for Asian Americans in Goods (Tables E-5 and E-10). The tables are based on purchase order data.

Table E-1
Disparity Results (<\$500,000), Relevant Market Area Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Prime Construction Using Purchase Orders, FY 2014-2018 North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 1.39\% | 14.65\% | 9.47 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.03\% | 1.12\% | 2.75 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.22\% | 4.38\% | 4.99 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.06\% | 2.39\% | 2.46 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.70\% | 22.54\% | 7.52 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.49\% | 13.64\% | 25.60 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 5.19\% | 36.19\% | 14.34 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 94.81\% | 63.81\% | 148.58 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 0.59\% | 14.65\% | 4.06 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.17\% | 1.12\% | 15.38 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.12\% | 4.38\% | 2.83 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.14\% | 2.39\% | 5.66 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.03\% | 22.54\% | 4.55 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 5.73\% | 13.64\% | 42.03 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 6.76\% | 36.19\% | 18.68 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 93.24\% | 63.81\% | 146.12 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 1.90\% | 14.65\% | 13.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.10\% | 1.12\% | 9.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.66\% | 4.38\% | 15.14 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.21\% | 2.39\% | 8.62 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 2.87\% | 22.54\% | 12.75 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 8.25\% | 13.64\% | 60.48 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 11.13\% | 36.19\% | 30.75 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 88.87\% | 63.81\% | 139.27 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 0.56\% | 14.65\% | 3.82 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.07\% | 1.12\% | 6.48 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.56\% | 4.38\% | 12.85 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.33\% | 2.39\% | 13.78 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.52\% | 22.54\% | 6.76 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 5.67\% | 13.64\% | 41.58 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 7.20\% | 36.19\% | 19.89 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 92.80\% | 63.81\% | 145.43 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.99\% | 14.65\% | 6.76 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.01\% | 1.12\% | 1.15 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.33\% | 4.38\% | 7.50 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.94\% | 2.39\% | 39.45 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 2.27\% | 22.54\% | 10.08 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 7.65\% | 13.64\% | 56.08 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 9.92\% | 36.19\% | 27.43 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 90.08\% | 63.81\% | 141.16 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 1.09\% | 14.65\% | 7.46 | Underutilization | * | $\mathrm{p}<.05$ |
|  | Asian American | 0.08\% | 1.12\% | 7.14 | Underutilization | * | p< 0.05 |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.39\% | 4.38\% | 8.80 | Underutilization | * | $\mathrm{p}<.05$ |
|  | American Indian | 0.31\% | 2.39\% | 13.12 | Underutilization | * | $\mathrm{p}<.05$ |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.87\% | 22.54\% | 8.30 | Underutilization | * | p< 0.05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 6.12\% | 13.64\% | 44.87 | Underutilization | * | p< 0.05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 7.99\% | 36.19\% | 22.09 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 92.01\% | 63.81\% | 144.18 | Overutilization |  |  |
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Table E-2
Disparity Results (<\$500,000), Relevant Market Area
Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Prime Architecture \& Engineering Using Purchase Orders, FY 2014-2018 North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 1.77\% | 6.41\% | 27.63 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 1.26\% | 2.42\% | 52.24 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.56\% | 2.42\% | 23.24 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.21\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 3.60\% | 12.45\% | 28.87 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 11.96\% | 10.52\% | 113.74 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 15.56\% | 22.97\% | 67.73 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 84.44\% | 77.03\% | 109.63 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 0.22\% | 6.41\% | 3.46 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.25\% | 2.42\% | 10.31 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.19\% | 2.42\% | 7.75 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.21\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.66\% | 12.45\% | 5.29 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 6.99\% | 10.52\% | 66.46 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 7.65\% | 22.97\% | 33.30 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 92.35\% | 77.03\% | 119.90 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 2.54\% | 6.41\% | 39.63 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.27\% | 2.42\% | 11.20 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 1.01\% | 2.42\% | 41.72 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.21\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 3.82\% | 12.45\% | 30.67 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 6.93\% | 10.52\% | 65.86 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 10.75\% | 22.97\% | 46.78 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 89.25\% | 77.03\% | 115.87 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 2.90\% | 6.41\% | 45.25 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.29\% | 2.42\% | 12.14 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 1.18\% | 2.42\% | 48.91 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.03\% | 1.21\% | 2.63 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 4.41\% | 12.45\% | 35.39 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 9.64\% | 10.52\% | 91.65 | Underutilization |  |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 14.05\% | 22.97\% | 61.15 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 85.95\% | 77.03\% | 111.59 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.26\% | 6.41\% | 4.02 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.63\% | 2.42\% | 25.85 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.37\% | 2.42\% | 15.34 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.05\% | 1.21\% | 4.19 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.30\% | 12.45\% | 10.47 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 7.05\% | 10.52\% | 67.02 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 8.35\% | 22.97\% | 36.36 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 91.65\% | 77.03\% | 118.98 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 1.64\% | 6.41\% | 25.63 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Asian American | 0.45\% | 2.42\% | 18.50 | Underutilization | * | $p<.05$ |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.71\% | 2.42\% | 29.33 | Underutilization | * | $p<.05$ |
|  | American Indian | 0.02\% | 1.21\% | 1.33 | Underutilization | * | $p<.05$ |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 2.82\% | 12.45\% | 22.61 | Underutilization | * | $p<.05$ |
|  | Nonminority Female | 8.24\% | 10.52\% | 78.30 | Underutilization | * | $p<.05$ |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 11.05\% | 22.97\% | 48.11 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 88.95\% | 77.03\% | 115.48 | Overutilization |  |  |
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Table E-3

| Busine | Disparity R Ownership Cl Us <br> North Caro | ts (<\$500 ication by urchase Colleges | ooo), Re <br> Fiscal Ye <br> ders, FY <br> Universi | elevant ear, Prim Y 2014-2 ities Dis | Market Ar ne Profess 018 parity Stu | iona <br> dy | rvices |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| 2014 | Black American | 0.84\% | 18.42\% | 4.58 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.04\% | 2.86\% | 1.41 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.88\% | 24.77\% | 3.57 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.11\% | 9.55\% | 1.11 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.99\% | 34.32\% | 2.89 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.01\% | 65.68\% | 150.76 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 0.23\% | 18.42\% | 1.27 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.39\% | 2.86\% | 13.67 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.62\% | 24.77\% | 2.52 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Noomminority Female | 0.21\% | 9.55\% | 2.23 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.84\% | 34.32\% | 2.44 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.16\% | 65.68\% | 150.99 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 0.77\% | 18.42\% | 4.15 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.00\% | 2.86\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.77\% | 24.77\% | 3.09 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.29\% | 9.55\% | 3.03 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 1.05\% | 34.32\% | 3.07 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 98.95\% | 65.68\% | 150.66 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 0.57\% | 18.42\% | 3.09 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.00\% | 2.86\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.57\% | 24.77\% | 2.30 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.45\% | 9.55\% | 4.73 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 1.02\% | 34.32\% | 2.97 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 98.98\% | 65.68\% | 150.71 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.07\% | 18.42\% | 0.39 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.00\% | 2.86\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.07\% | 24.77\% | 0.29 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.68\% | 9.55\% | 7.07 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.75\% | 34.32\% | 2.17 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.25\% | 65.68\% | 151.13 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 0.51\% | 18.42\% | 2.79 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Asian American | 0.08\% | 2.86\% | 2.86 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.60\% | 24.77\% | 2.40 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.35\% | 9.55\% | 3.62 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.94\% | 34.32\% | 2.74 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.06\% | 65.68\% | 150.83 | Overutilization |  |  |
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Table E-4
Disparity Results (<\$500,000), Relevant Market Area Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Prime Other Services Using Purchase Orders, FY 2014-2018 North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of <br> Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 0.03\% | 15.86\% | 0.18 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.00\% | 1.30\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.01\% | 1.72\% | 0.79 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.69\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.04\% | 19.57\% | 0.21 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 1.41\% | 9.05\% | 15.56 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 1.45\% | 28.62\% | 5.07 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 98.55\% | 71.38\% | 138.06 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 0.02\% | 15.86\% | 0.10 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.00\% | 1.30\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.05\% | 1.72\% | 2.95 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.69\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.07\% | 19.57\% | 0.34 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 1.82\% | 9.05\% | 20.05 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 1.88\% | 28.62\% | 6.57 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 98.12\% | 71.38\% | 137.46 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 0.03\% | 15.86\% | 0.21 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.05\% | 1.30\% | 4.02 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.10\% | 1.72\% | 5.67 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.69\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.18\% | 19.57\% | 0.93 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 1.99\% | 9.05\% | 22.03 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 2.18\% | 28.62\% | 7.61 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 97.82\% | 71.38\% | 137.04 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 0.01\% | 15.86\% | 0.08 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.26\% | 1.30\% | 20.05 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.04\% | 1.72\% | 2.51 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.69\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.32\% | 19.57\% | 1.62 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.67\% | 9.05\% | 29.50 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 2.99\% | 28.62\% | 10.44 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 97.01\% | 71.38\% | 135.91 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.14\% | 15.86\% | 0.86 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.00\% | 1.30\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.04\% | 1.72\% | 2.15 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.69\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.17\% | 19.57\% | 0.89 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.61\% | 9.05\% | 28.80 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 2.78\% | 28.62\% | 9.72 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 97.22\% | 71.38\% | 136.20 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 0.04\% | 15.86\% | 0.26 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Asian American | 0.07\% | 1.30\% | 5.62 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.05\% | 1.72\% | 3.04 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.69\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.17\% | 19.57\% | 0.85 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.14\% | 9.05\% | 23.64 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 2.31\% | 28.62\% | 8.06 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 97.69\% | 71.38\% | 136.86 | Overutilization |  |  |
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Table E-5
Disparity Results (<\$500,000), Relevant Market Area Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Prime Goods Using Purchase Orders, FY 2014-2018 North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 6.03\% | 8.18\% | 73.79 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 1.34\% | 1.09\% | 122.82 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.01\% | 1.71\% | 0.74 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 7.39\% | 11.65\% | 63.42 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 1.70\% | 9.27\% | 18.33 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 9.09\% | 20.93\% | 43.44 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 90.91\% | 79.07\% | 114.97 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 1.42\% | 8.18\% | 17.36 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 1.64\% | 1.09\% | 149.52 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.09\% | 1.71\% | 5.53 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 3.15\% | 11.65\% | 27.03 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.28\% | 9.27\% | 24.58 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTALM/WBE | 5.43\% | 20.93\% | 25.95 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 94.57\% | 79.07\% | 119.60 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 13.60\% | 8.18\% | 166.31 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Asian American | 4.89\% | 1.09\% | 446.36 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.08\% | 1.71\% | 4.86 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.02\% | 0.68\% | 2.50 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 18.59\% | 11.65\% | 159.47 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.00\% | 9.27\% | 21.56 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTALM/WBE | 20.58\% | 20.93\% | 98.36 | Underutilization |  |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 79.42\% | 79.07\% | 100.43 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 0.33\% | 8.18\% | 4.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 4.02\% | 1.09\% | 366.86 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.22\% | 1.71\% | 12.67 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 4.56\% | 11.65\% | 39.12 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.77\% | 9.27\% | 29.86 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 7.33\% | 20.93\% | 35.02 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 92.67\% | 79.07\% | 117.20 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.06\% | 8.18\% | 0.73 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 1.29\% | 1.09\% | 117.91 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 1.09\% | 1.71\% | 64.02 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 2.44\% | 11.65\% | 20.96 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nomminority Female | 2.05\% | 9.27\% | 22.13 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 4.50\% | 20.93\% | 21.48 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 95.50\% | 79.07\% | 120.78 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 4.78\% | 8.18\% | 58.47 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Asian American | 2.90\% | 1.09\% | 264.76 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.25\% | 1.71\% | 14.49 | Underutilization | * | $\mathrm{p}<.05$ |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.63 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 7.93\% | 11.65\% | 68.05 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.20\% | 9.27\% | 23.68 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 10.13\% | 20.93\% | 48.39 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 89.87\% | 79.07\% | 113.66 | Overutilization |  |  |

Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020

Table E-6
Disparity Results ( $<\$ 1,000,000$ ), Relevant Market Area
Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Prime Construction
Using Purchase Orders, FY 2014-2018
North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than $80 \%$ | Statistical Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 2.21\% | 14.65\% | 15.06 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.03\% | 1.12\% | 2.33 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.18\% | 4.38\% | 4.22 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.05\% | 2.39\% | 2.09 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTALMBE | 2.47\% | 22.54\% | 10.95 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.71\% | 13.64\% | 27.17 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 6.17\% | 36.19\% | 17.06 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 93.83\% | 63.81\% | 147.03 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 1.20\% | 14.65\% | 8.21 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.13\% | 1.12\% | 11.56 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.09\% | 4.38\% | 2.13 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.10\% | 2.39\% | 4.25 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTALMBE | 1.53\% | 22.54\% | 6.77 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 7.65\% | 13.64\% | 56.07 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 9.18\% | 36.19\% | 25.36 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 90.82\% | 63.81\% | 142.33 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 1.56\% | 14.65\% | 10.67 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.08\% | 1.12\% | 7.39 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.54\% | 4.38\% | 12.43 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.17\% | 2.39\% | 7.08 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTALMBE | 2.36\% | 22.54\% | 10.47 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 6.77\% | 13.64\% | 49.65 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 9.13\% | 36.19\% | 25.24 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 90.87\% | 63.81\% | 142.40 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 0.46\% | 14.65\% | 3.13 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.06\% | 1.12\% | 5.31 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.46\% | 4.38\% | 10.54 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.27\% | 2.39\% | 11.30 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.25\% | 22.54\% | 5.55 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 5.37\% | 13.64\% | 39.38 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 6.62\% | 36.19\% | 18.30 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 93.38\% | 63.81\% | 146.33 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.83\% | 14.65\% | 5.63 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.01\% | 1.12\% | 0.96 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.27\% | 4.38\% | 6.25 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.78\% | 2.39\% | 32.89 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTALMBE | 1.90\% | 22.54\% | 8.41 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 7.63\% | 13.64\% | 55.91 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 9.52\% | 36.19\% | 26.32 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 90.48\% | 63.81\% | 141.78 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 1.25\% | 14.65\% | 8.56 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Asian American | 0.07\% | 1.12\% | 5.80 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.31\% | 4.38\% | 7.15 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | American Indian | 0.25\% | 2.39\% | 10.66 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.89\% | 22.54\% | 8.37 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 6.21\% | 13.64\% | 45.51 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 8.10\% | 36.19\% | 22.38 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 91.90\% | 63.81\% | 144.02 | Overutilization |  |  |

Griffin \& Strong, P.C. 2020

Table E-7

| Busin | Disparity Ownership Cl <br> North Ca | lts $(<\$ 1,00$ <br> ation by Fis <br> Purchase <br> Colleges | ,000), Re <br> cal Year, <br> ders, FY <br> Universit | levant M Prime A 2014-20 ies Disp | arket Area <br> chitecture <br> 18 <br> arity Study | \& En | neering |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| 2014 | Black American | 1.23\% | 6.41\% | 19.15 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.88\% | 2.42\% | 36.21 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.39\% | 2.42\% | 16.11 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.21\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 2.49\% | 12.45\% | 20.01 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 8.29\% | 10.52\% | 78.84 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 10.79\% | 22.97\% | 46.95 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 89.21\% | 77.03\% | 115.82 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 0.17\% | 6.41\% | 2.60 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.19\% | 2.42\% | 7.75 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.14\% | 2.42\% | 5.83 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.21\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.50\% | 12.45\% | 3.98 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 5.26\% | 10.52\% | 49.97 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 5.75\% | 22.97\% | 25.04 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 94.25\% | 77.03\% | 122.36 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 1.88\% | 6.41\% | 29.41 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.20\% | 2.42\% | 8.31 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.75\% | 2.42\% | 30.96 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.21\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 2.83\% | 12.45\% | 22.76 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 5.14\% | 10.52\% | 48.88 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 7.98\% | 22.97\% | 34.72 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 92.02\% | 77.03\% | 119.47 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 2.47\% | 6.41\% | 38.52 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.25\% | 2.42\% | 10.34 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 1.01\% | 2.42\% | 41.64 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.03\% | 1.21\% | 2.24 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 3.75\% | 12.45\% | 30.13 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 8.21\% | 10.52\% | 78.02 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 11.96\% | 22.97\% | 52.06 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 88.04\% | 77.03\% | 114.30 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.15\% | 6.41\% | 2.33 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.36\% | 2.42\% | 15.03 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.22\% | 2.42\% | 8.92 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.03\% | 1.21\% | 2.44 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.76\% | 12.45\% | 6.09 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 4.10\% | 10.52\% | 38.97 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 4.86\% | 22.97\% | 21.14 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 95.14\% | 77.03\% | 123.52 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 1.20\% | 6.41\% | 18.68 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Asian American | 0.33\% | 2.42\% | 13.48 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.52\% | 2.42\% | 21.38 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | American Indian | 0.01\% | 1.21\% | 0.97 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 2.05\% | 12.45\% | 16.47 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 6.00\% | 10.52\% | 57.07 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 8.06\% | 22.97\% | 35.06 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 91.94\% | 77.03\% | 119.37 | Overutilization |  |  |
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Table E-8

| Busine | Using Purchase Orders, FY 2014-2018 <br> North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| 2014 | Black American | 0.69\% | 18.42\% | 3.72 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.03\% | 2.86\% | 1.15 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.72\% | 24.77\% | 2.90 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.09\% | 9.55\% | 0.90 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.80\% | 34.32\% | 2.34 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.20\% | 65.68\% | 151.04 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 0.17\% | 18.42\% | 0.94 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.29\% | 2.86\% | 10.14 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.46\% | 24.77\% | 1.87 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.16\% | 9.55\% | 1.66 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.62\% | 34.32\% | 1.81 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.38\% | 65.68\% | 151.32 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 0.55\% | 18.42\% | 2.98 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.00\% | 2.86\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.55\% | 24.77\% | 2.22 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.21\% | 9.55\% | 2.18 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.76\% | 34.32\% | 2.21 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.24\% | 65.68\% | 151.11 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 0.42\% | 18.42\% | 2.31 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.00\% | 2.86\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.42\% | 24.77\% | 1.71 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.34\% | 9.55\% | 3.53 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.76\% | 34.32\% | 2.22 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.24\% | 65.68\% | 151.11 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.04\% | 18.42\% | 0.23 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.00\% | 2.86\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.04\% | 24.77\% | 0.17 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.39\% | 9.55\% | 4.13 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.44\% | 34.32\% | 1.27 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.56\% | 65.68\% | 151.60 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 0.37\% | 18.42\% | 1.99 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Asian American | 0.06\% | 2.86\% | 2.04 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.00\% | 2.00\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 1.49\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.43\% | 24.77\% | 1.72 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 0.25\% | 9.55\% | 2.58 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 0.67\% | 34.32\% | 1.96 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 99.33\% | 65.68\% | 151.24 | Overutilization |  |  |
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Table E-9
Disparity Results (<\$1,000,000), Relevant Market Area Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Prime Other Services Using Purchase Orders, FY 2014-2018 North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 0.02\% | 15.86\% | 0.12 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 1.01\% | 1.30\% | 77.94 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.01\% | 1.72\% | 0.52 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.69\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.04\% | 19.57\% | 5.32 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.73\% | 9.05\% | 30.17 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 3.77\% | 28.62\% | 13.18 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 96.23\% | 71.38\% | 134.81 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 0.01\% | 15.86\% | 0.07 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.58\% | 1.30\% | 44.37 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.04\% | 1.72\% | 2.15 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.69\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.63\% | 19.57\% | 3.20 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 1.32\% | 9.05\% | 14.60 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 1.95\% | 28.62\% | 6.80 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 98.05\% | 71.38\% | 137.36 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 0.02\% | 15.86\% | 0.15 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.04\% | 1.30\% | 2.85 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.07\% | 1.72\% | 4.02 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.69\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.13\% | 19.57\% | 0.66 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 1.41\% | 9.05\% | 15.63 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 1.54\% | 28.62\% | 5.40 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 98.46\% | 71.38\% | 137.93 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 0.01\% | 15.86\% | 0.07 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.21\% | 1.30\% | 16.19 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.03\% | 1.72\% | 2.03 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.69\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.26\% | 19.57\% | 1.31 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.16\% | 9.05\% | 23.82 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 2.41\% | 28.62\% | 8.43 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 97.59\% | 71.38\% | 136.71 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.10\% | 15.86\% | 0.62 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.00\% | 1.30\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.03\% | 1.72\% | 1.54 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.69\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.12\% | 19.57\% | 0.64 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 3.48\% | 9.05\% | 38.41 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 3.60\% | 28.62\% | 12.58 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 96.40\% | 71.38\% | 135.05 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 0.03\% | 15.86\% | 0.19 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Asian American | 0.34\% | 1.30\% | 25.91 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.04\% | 1.72\% | 2.21 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.69\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 0.41\% | 19.57\% | 2.07 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.11\% | 9.05\% | 23.27 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 2.51\% | 28.62\% | 8.78 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 97.49\% | 71.38\% | 136.57 | Overutilization |  |  |
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Table E-10

## Disparity Results (<\$500,000), Relevant Market Area Business Ownership Classification by Fiscal Year, Prime Goods Using Purchase Orders, FY 2014-2018 North Carolina Colleges \& Universities Disparity Study

| Fiscal Year | Business Ownership | Percent of Dollars | Percent of Available Firms | Disparity Index | Disparate Impact of Utilization | Less than 80\% | Statistical Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Black American | 3.90\% | 8.18\% | 47.68 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.87\% | 1.09\% | 79.36 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.87\% | 1.71\% | 50.98 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 5.64\% | 11.65\% | 48.37 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.05\% | 9.27\% | 22.13 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 7.69\% | 20.93\% | 36.75 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 92.31\% | 79.07\% | 116.74 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2015 | Black American | 1.11\% | 8.18\% | 13.58 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 1.28\% | 1.09\% | 116.98 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.14\% | 1.71\% | 8.17 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 2.53\% | 11.65\% | 21.71 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 1.90\% | 9.27\% | 20.47 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 4.43\% | 20.93\% | 21.16 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 95.57\% | 79.07\% | 120.86 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2016 | Black American | 10.88\% | 8.18\% | 133.01 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Asian American | 4.42\% | 1.09\% | 404.21 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.18\% | 1.71\% | 10.61 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.01\% | 0.68\% | 1.85 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 15.50\% | 11.65\% | 132.95 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.21\% | 9.27\% | 23.81 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 17.70\% | 20.93\% | 84.59 | Underutilization |  |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 82.30\% | 79.07\% | 104.08 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2017 | Black American | 0.26\% | 8.18\% | 3.19 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 3.75\% | 1.09\% | 342.12 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.47\% | 1.71\% | 27.28 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 4.47\% | 11.65\% | 38.37 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.42\% | 9.27\% | 26.06 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 6.89\% | 20.93\% | 32.92 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 93.11\% | 79.07\% | 117.75 | Overutilization |  |  |
| 2018 | Black American | 0.04\% | 8.18\% | 0.48 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Asian American | 0.85\% | 1.09\% | 77.25 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.82\% | 1.71\% | 47.77 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.00 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 1.70\% | 11.65\% | 14.59 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Nonminority Female | 1.52\% | 9.27\% | 16.37 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 3.22\% | 20.93\% | 15.38 | Underutilization | * |  |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 96.78\% | 79.07\% | 122.40 | Overutilization |  |  |
| Total | Black American | 3.70\% | 8.18\% | 45.20 | Underutilization | * | p<. 05 |
|  | Asian American | 2.43\% | 1.09\% | 222.02 | Overutilization |  |  |
|  | Hispanic American | 0.45\% | 1.71\% | 26.58 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | American Indian | 0.00\% | 0.68\% | 0.46 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL MBE | 6.58\% | 11.65\% | 56.49 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Nonminority Female | 2.05\% | 9.27\% | 22.10 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | TOTAL M/WBE | 8.63\% | 20.93\% | 41.25 | Underutilization | * | p< 05 |
|  | Non-M/WBE | 91.37\% | 79.07\% | 115.55 | Overutilization |  |  |
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Although all of the Community Colleges utilize Colleague to maintain their purchasing data, there is no centralized ability to access the data. Only the individual NC-CC/Univ have access to their own data.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ D. Burman. "Predicate Studies: The Seattle Model," Tab E of 11-12 Minority and Women Business Programs Revisited (ABA Section of Public Contract law, Oct. 1990)
    ${ }^{3}$ City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Company, 488 U.S. 469, 709 S. Ct. 706 (1989)

[^2]:    * Total unique number represents the number of unduplicated firms during the Study Period.

[^3]:    ${ }_{5}$ So, for example, if there was one Asian American owned prime (\$100) with one nonminority subcontractor (\$30) and two Asian subcontractors had $\$ 20$ in subcontracts, then in total utilization: ( $\$ 100-\$ 50$ ) $=\$ 50$ attributed to Asian American prime dollars and $\$ 20$ attributed to Asian American subcontractor dollars for a total of $\$ 70$ paid to Asian American owned firms.

