

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

10 West Market Street, Suite 1300 ♦ Indianapolis, Indiana 46204 ♦ (317) 423.8980



**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
MINORITY AND WOMEN'S BUSINESS ENTERPRISES DIVISION**

**STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF UTILIZATION OF STATE CONTRACTS
FOR THE STATE OF INDIANA**

PURSUANT TO I.C. 4-13-16.5-2

JULY 1, 2002 – JUNE 30, 2005

TECHNICAL REPORT

JUNE 29, 2006

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

Table of Contents

1.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
2.	INTRODUCTION	4
2.1.	STATUTORY AUTHORITY AND CASE LAW	4
2.2.	KEY CONTEXTUAL DEFINITIONS	6
3.	BACKGROUND	8
3.1.	PURPOSE OF DISPARITY STUDIES	8
3.2.	PRIOR DISPARITY STUDIES	8
3.2.1.	<i>Urban Institute Study</i>	8
3.2.2.	<i>Mason-Tillman Study</i>	9
3.2.3.	<i>City of Indianapolis Study</i>	10
3.2.4.	<i>Internal State of Indiana Analysis</i>	10
3.2.5.	<i>State of Indiana 2004-2005 Study</i>	11
4.	RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	12
4.1.	STUDY APPROACH	12
4.2.	AGENCY CLASSIFICATIONS	13
4.3.	INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATIONS	13
4.4.	ETHNICITY CLASSIFICATIONS	14
5.	QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS	15
5.1.	STUDY PERIOD UTILIZATION	15
5.2.	INDUSTRY-SPECIFIC UTILIZATION	17
5.3.	ETHNICITY-SPECIFIC UTILIZATION	18
5.4.	DISPARITY MEASUREMENTS	18
6.	QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS	22
6.1.	MWBE SURVEY HIGHLIGHTS	22
6.2.	VENDOR SURVEY HIGHLIGHTS	22
7.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	24
8.	ABOUT BUCHER + CHRISTIAN CONSULTING, INC.	26
9.	TECHNICAL APPENDIX	27
9.1.	LISTING OF INCLUDED OFFICES, AGENCIES, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS	27
9.2.	LISTING OF EXCLUDED OFFICES, AGENCIES, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS	30
9.3.	MWBE AND VENDOR SURVEY RESULTS	32
9.4.	MWBE OPEN-ENDED SURVEY RESULTS	36
9.5.	VENDOR OPEN-ENDED SURVEY RESULTS	59
9.6.	MWBE AND VENDOR SAMPLE SURVEY	68
9.7.	FISCAL YEAR 2003 UTILIZATION BY STATE AGENCY	71
9.8.	FISCAL YEAR 2004 UTILIZATION BY STATE AGENCY	72
9.9.	FISCAL YEAR 2005 UTILIZATION BY STATE AGENCY	73
9.10.	UTILIZATION BY INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION AND STATE AGENCY	74
9.11.	FLAWED/ALTERNATIVE DISPARITY CALCULATIONS	77
9.12.	LISTING OF OBJECT CODE INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATIONS	81
9.13.	LISTING OF NAICS CODE INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATIONS	104

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

1. Executive Summary

The State of Indiana is required to conduct a statistical analysis of state contracting every five years. The data from procurement and contractual activity of 100+ state offices, agencies, boards and commissions for fiscal year 2002 through fiscal year 2005 were analyzed over a nine month period. The analysis produced nearly \$4.3 billion in included expenditures (excluding wages and benefits paid to state employees, social service assistance, tax refunds, bond payments, etc.) over the three fiscal years under examination. The participation percentages, or the level to which minority-owned (MBE) and women-owned (WBE) business enterprises are utilized in state contracting and procurement, ranged from a yearly low of 2.23% to a high of 2.88%. The table below summarizes these findings:

**State of Indiana
Statistically Adjusted MBE and WBE Utilization Rates**

	MBE Utilization %	WBE Utilization %
Fiscal Year 2003	2.35% \$33,071,478.42	2.27% \$31,950,169.90
Fiscal Year 2004	2.37% \$37,259,448.67	2.23% \$34,989,058.21
Fiscal Year 2005	2.88% \$37,498,618.50	2.35% \$30,612,436.84

In addition to calculating the actual dollars spent, it is also necessary to calculate the disparity, or difference between the actual and anticipated amounts that should have been spent for MBEs and WBEs. This additional analysis showed that disparity existed for MBEs and WBEs. Thusly, despite the real-dollar gains made by MBEs over the past three fiscal years, both MBEs and WBEs operate in an environment by which they are not receiving their share of anticipated state business activity.

Also, the consultant conducted an anecdotal analysis, surveying MBEs, WBEs and vendors, all of whom are registered with the State of Indiana. These findings showed that MBEs and WBEs feel that the MWBE program is important and gives their business a competitive advantage. Additionally, minority and women business owners responded that they felt their businesses would not be utilized by the larger state prime contractors if such a diversity program did not exist.

The detailed industry classification disparity calculations show disparity index values of between 0.161 (FY2004 WBE Professional Services) and 0.804 (FY2003 WBE Construction). Each of the eighteen instances (2 categories [MBEs & WBEs], 3 industry classifications and 3 fiscal years) show various degrees of underutilization or proper utilization, but a statistically valid relationship exists in five situations, FY2003-FY2004 MBE Procurement (2) and FY2003-FY2005 WBE Professional Services (3). In all eighteen areas under examination it can be said that MBEs and WBEs are not receiving their proportional share of work with the State of Indiana, save one, but in the five instances, the relationship cannot be attributed to a chance relationship within the data.

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

2. Introduction

The desire for units of government to provide a more level playing field for minority-owned (MBE) and women-owned (WBE) business enterprises is a compelling interest. To that end, state and local governments, with the guidance of various Supreme Court precedents, have crafted programs with that expressed intent – to increase the number and value of government contracts going to women-owned and minority-owned firms. With that increased presence in the state government contracting process, these firms may become more empowered and work to reverse the effects of past or present, direct or passive discriminatory practices pervasive in many aspects of the government procurement and contract process.

The State’s interest in increasing access to minority-owned and women-owned business enterprises exists within the dispassionate application of the State’s procurement laws and administrative regulations. The State of Indiana’s approach provides a scoring enhancement to prime bidders who include MBEs and WBEs in their proposal for services. This participation is detailed in a MWBE participation plan that shows the name and dollar value of the sub-contracting work targeted toward certified businesses. Each procurement activity has a set participation goal, revised yearly, described in the following table:

**State of Indiana
Minority and Women’s Business Enterprise Participation Goals
July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006**

	MBE Participation	WBE Participation
Construction	6%	6%
Professional Services	7%	10%
Supplies	3%	3%

* The study related to these participation goals is explained in Section 3.2.3

2.1. Statutory Authority and Case Law

The key area of Indiana statute governing the programs, governing committees and relevant programmatic definitions is I.C. 4-13-16.5. In addition to legislative statutory governance, the Indiana Administrative Code governs other aspects of Minority and Women’s Business Enterprises in 25 IAC 5-1-1 through 25 IAC 5-8-1.

The authority to administer the MWBE program is vested in the Indiana Department of Administration’s Division of Minority and Women’s Business Enterprises. In addition to this area within the Executive branch administrative apparatus, a separate entity was created in 1983 by Public Law 34. The Governor’s Commission on Minority Business Development was charged with the duty to explore ways MBEs and WBEs may achieve greater equality within the state procurement and contracting process.

Renamed the Governor’s Commission on Minority and Women’s Business Enterprises and acting under the authority of I.C. 4-13-16.5-2, under section 2(f)(7), one of the duties of the Commission is to establish annual goals for the use of minority and women’s business

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

enterprises on contracts awarded by the state. The established annual goals must be derived from statistical analysis of utilization of state contracts awarded to minority and women's business enterprises. This utilization study is required to be updated every five (5) years.

In order to remain compliant with the duty of the Commission to establish annual goals for the use of minority and women's business enterprises as defined in I.C. 4-13-16.5-2(f)(7), the State of Indiana's Department of Administration and the Governor's Commission on Minority & Women's Business Enterprises have identified the need to complete another statistical analysis utilization study on state contracts. This study was commissioned to fulfill that obligation to provide an analysis to assist the Commission with performing their statutory participation goal-setting duty.

With respect to the qualifications of Bucher + Christian Consulting, Inc. (the "consultant"); to perform the analysis, this project was overseen by senior statistical advisor Dr. Jeffrey Gropp, Assistant Professor of Economics at DePauw University in Greencastle, Indiana. Dr. Gropp is experienced in statistical modeling and developed the modified approach used in the study. The project initiation, planning, execution and control was provided by the Bucher + Christian Project Management Office (PMO), headed by Project Executive and PMO Director Leticia Turner, PMP. Day-to-day project management and analysis was provided by Jeff D. Lilly, MPA with the guidance of the PMO. Mr. Lilly has worked as a statistical and management consultant in numerous agencies within the State of Indiana, as well as with agencies in the States of Iowa and Wisconsin, and has conducted numerous quantitative and qualitative public program evaluations. Under the direction of the PMO, the project team of degreed professionals collected and analyzed data in a uniform and professional manner.

The other key parameters governing the construction and application of MBE and WBE programs come in the form of case law handed down by the United States Supreme Court. Several key cases, described below, create a patchwork of guidance regarding the use of race-conscious and gender-conscious programs for hiring, government procurement and even college admissions. Examples of relevant cases are:

Regents of the University of California v. Bakke (1978): The first of a series of affirmative action cases. The Court held that colleges and universities that had an interest in providing greater opportunities for minorities came at the expense of the rights of the majority. This was the first Supreme Court case dealing with what would then become known as reverse discrimination. The Court also held that race was an allowable and legitimate admissions component, and the use of a strict quota system was not constitutional.

United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO-CLC v. Weber (1979): This case allowed the private sector to apply a voluntary racial preference in hiring. The Court held that a temporary imbalance in employment and higher education admissions helped to counteract past injustices.

Fullilove v. Klutznick (1980): An important case dealing with government contracting, the Court held that federal funds could be set aside for a certain percentage of minority-owned businesses, provided they are not party to discriminatory practices. Important, is that these 'set-aside programs' could only exist as long as the imbalance existed.

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson and Co. (1989): The Court applied the strict-scrutiny standard to state and local affirmative action programs. This then forced state and local governments to prove their programs were serving a compelling government interest and narrowly tailored to meet that end.

Adarand Constructors v. Peña (1995): This case essentially applied the same strict-scrutiny (compelling interest and narrowly tailored) found in *Croson* to federal government programs.

2.2. Key Contextual Definitions

Minority Business Enterprise (MBE): An individual, partnership, corporation, limited liability company, or joint venture of any kind that is owned and controlled by one or more persons that are US citizens and members of a minority group. The term “owned and controlled” means that 51% of the minority enterprise needs to be owned by a member of a minority group, the minority must have control over the management and daily operational activities of the business and an interest in capital, assets, profits and losses of the business proportionate to the percentage of ownership. The term “minority group” means Blacks, American Indians, Hispanics, Asian Americans, and other similar minorities defined by 13 CFR 124.103. The definitions for Minority Business Enterprise, owned and controlled, and minority group are cited from I.C. 4-13-16.5-1.

Women’s Business Enterprise (WBE): A business that is one of the following:

1. Sole proprietorship owned and controlled by a woman
2. A partnership or joint venture owned and controlled by a woman in whom women hold at least 51 percent ownership, and at least one female business owner controls the management and daily operations of the business.
3. A corporation or other entity in which at least one female business owner controls the management and daily business operations and 51 percent of the business is owned by women, or a woman owns at least 51 percent of the stock, for firms that issue stock.

The definition for Women’s Business Enterprise is cited from I.C. 4-13-16.5-1.3.

NON: A term used to define those expenditures or businesses that are not associated with a MBE or WBE.

MWBE: A term used to collectively identify minority-owned and women-owned business enterprises. This is not an official state designation.

MBE/WBE Capacity: Minority and/or women business enterprises that are ready, willing and able to conduct business with the State of Indiana during the study period. More specifically, this capacity listing consists of four (4) main components:

1. All firms certified as MBEs or WBEs by the Indiana Department of Administration. Certification requires that a MBE or WBE be a registered bidder with the State of Indiana.

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

2. All firms certified as MBEs or WBEs by the City of Indianapolis, Indiana, not included in the State of Indiana certified listing.
3. All firms certified as MBEs or WBEs by the City of Fort Wayne, Indiana, not included in the State of Indiana or City of Indianapolis listings.
4. All firms certified as MBEs or WBEs by the City of Evansville, Indiana, not included in the State of Indiana, City of Indianapolis or City of Fort Wayne listings.

IDOA MWBE staff conducts extensive outreach efforts to ensure that all qualified Indiana MWBEs are solicited to become certified.

Total Capacity: Total capacity, or the study population, was defined by taking the total number of firms from the State of Indiana bidder listing. This was an appropriately robust, yet constitutionally permissible approach to defining capacity, as this listing is a compilation of those firms who have expressed an interest in doing business with the State. Thus, this indication fulfills the study's approach to ascertain the firms who are "ready, willing and able" to conduct business with the State of Indiana. Again, advice from legal counsel and other studies support this approach.

Utilization: The degree, in terms of dollars spent or total number of firms, to which the State of Indiana conducts primary or sub-contractual business activity with certified MBEs and WBEs.

Disparity: The difference between capacity and utilization. In an ideal environment, capacity and utilization would be identical and the disparity measure would be zero. For the purposes of a disparity study, a disparity measure less than zero (a negative number) suggests underutilization of MBE and/or WBE firms, and a disparity measure of greater than zero suggests overutilization.¹

Warrant: The term used by the State of Indiana, and other units of government, for a check or electronic funds transfer to a vendor.

¹ Indiana Department of Administration, Minority and Women's Business Enterprises Division. Statistical Analysis of Utilization Study for Indiana Contracts Between January 1, 2004 and April 15, 2005. 16 May 2005, 5. Quoting Klacik, Drew. A Disparity Analysis for City of Indianapolis Expenditures between January 1, 1999 and October 4, 2002.

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

3. Background

3.1. Purpose of Disparity Studies

The purpose of disparity analysis, for many years, was for advocacy groups or academic institutions to examine, explain or bring attention to the potentially significant differences in government contracting, with respect to minorities (and women). In the wake of the *Crosby* decision, impacting the use of race-conscious programs in the selection of state and local government contractors and purchasing, another purpose became necessary – for jurisdictions to ensure compliance or to bring their programs back into line. This concerned effort on the part of state and local governments to protect themselves from lawsuits, generated an expanded body of disparity study literature, by academic institutions, think-tanks and private consulting firms. This type of analysis is now a common programmatic evaluation component for states and localities, with many jurisdictions now requiring disparity studies be conducted on a regular basis.

Not all disparity analyses are alike. All seek to examine differences between minority and/or women contracting/purchasing balanced against government expenditure, but there are many ways to show such a situation does, or does not, exist. Thusly, it may be difficult to compare among disparity studies conducted for different jurisdictions, even if done during the same period of time. One study that sought to aggregate disparity study information, detailed later in this section, examined a potential population of ninety-two (92) disparity studies and used fifty-seven (57), or 62 percent, due to the disparate methodologies employed.

3.2. Prior Disparity Studies

3.2.1. Urban Institute Study

An oft-cited document, produced by the Urban Institute in 1997, examined state and local government expenditures and found that minority-owned firms only received fifty-seven cents of every dollar they would have been expected to receive.² This study utilizes a secondary method of examining the disparity studies of other jurisdictions, of which fifty-eight (58) were included in the Institute's analysis. This study provides an important first step into understanding the disparity measurement and how it relates to capacity and utilization, and the subsequent social and economic impacts when great disparity exists. The most important issue regarding this study, though, is that women-owned businesses were not part of the scope and received no attention.

² The Urban Institute. Do Minority-Owned Businesses Get a Fair Share of Government Contracts? Washington D.C.: 1997, 7.

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

Other key findings in the study include a listing of barriers to increased minority participation in government contracting.³ These include:

- Failure of government to break large contracts down into smaller projects so that minority firms, which tend to be smaller, can compete;
- Extensive granting of waivers from minority sub-contracting requirements to majority contractors;
- Ineffective screening for false minority firms;
- Limited notice of contract competitions;
- Bid shopping on the part of majority prime contractors, who disclose minority firms' subcontracting bids to their majority competitors so they can be underbid.

3.2.2. Mason-Tillman Study

In 1999, Mason Tillman Associates was engaged in a utilization study on the State of Indiana contracts awarded to MBE and WBE organizations for fiscal years 1995 through 1997. Due to a 2004 legislative change to the enabling statute, the scope of this study, beyond the most recent analysis contained herein, contained “contract and purchasing dollars from the Indiana Department of Administration, the State Office Building Commission, the Indiana Department of Transportation, the Indiana Lottery Commission and the Indiana Riverboat Casinos.”⁴ The study found the following:

	Utilization	Availability	Disparity Ratio	Strength of Relationship #
Construction MBE	7.30%	11.47%	0.64	< 0.05*
Construction WBE	5.26%	5.93%	0.89	Not Significant
Professional Services MBE	6.54%	24.24%	0.27	< 0.05*
Professional Services WBE	2.32%	10.70%	0.22	< 0.05*
Supplies MBE	1.76%	6.03%	0.29	< 0.05*
Supplies WBE	2.40%	9.44%	0.25	< 0.05*

* Denotes a statistically significant underutilization relationship at the 95% confidence level

Strength of relationship is defined as the probability that the outcome is not due to chance. The closer to zero the strength of relationship, the higher the confidence the relationship actually exists.

³ *Ibid*, 8.

⁴ Mason Tillman Associates, Ltd. “State of Indiana Statistical Analysis of Utilization.” May 2000, 1.

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

3.2.3. City of Indianapolis Study

The City of Indianapolis contracted with the Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, housed at Indiana University-Purdue University of Indianapolis to conduct an analysis of disparity of City expenditures between January 1, 1999 and October 4, 2002. The unit of analysis for this report, unlike many other disparity studies, was the individual warrant, or check, amount paid to vendors, not the contracted amount. The approach used was the model adopted for this current State of Indiana analysis, based on its approach of counting actual expenditures versus contracted dollar amounts. The methodology of which is discussed in a later section of this report. The MBE and WBE disparity findings for the City of Indianapolis were⁵:

City of Indianapolis Results – MBE	Estimated Share	Actual Share	Disparity Rate	Significant
Construction	26.8%	6.6%	-20.2%	Yes
Procurement	5.6%	1.3%	-1.5%	Yes
Professional Services	17.5%	2.8%	-14.7%	Yes
Other Services	8.8%	1.3%	-7.5%	Yes

City of Indianapolis Results – WBE	Estimated Share	Actual Share	Disparity Rate	Significant
Construction	15.2%	7.8%	-7.4%	Yes
Procurement	2.8%	0.8%	-2.0%	Yes
Professional Services	9.5%	1.5%	-8.0%	Yes
Other Services	4.0%	1.7%	-2.3%	Yes

3.2.4. Internal State of Indiana Analysis

On August 23, 2004, the State of Indiana issued new MBE and WBE participation goals. The basis of these goals was an analysis conducted using data from the United States Census Bureau. The result of this analysis resulted in the drastic reduction of proposed MBE and WBE participation goals. The goals were originally based upon the availability percentages presented in the Mason-Tillman analysis (see prior table). These goals ranged from a low of

⁵ Center for Urban Policy and the Environment. "A Disparity Analysis for City of Indianapolis Expenditures between January 1, 1999 and October 4, 2002." 2005, 27-33.

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

5.93% to a high of 24.24%. Instead, the following table shows results of this analysis, compared to that of the prior table and its proposed amounts.

Industry Classification	MBE	WBE
Construction	3%	2%
Professional Services	5%	5%
Goods and Supplies	2%	3%

3.2.5. State of Indiana 2004-2005 Study

The Indiana Department of Administration conducted an analysis with the technical assistance of the School of Public and Environmental Affairs Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, housed at Indiana University-Purdue University of Indianapolis, of state procurement data from January 1, 2004 to April 15, 2005. The study grouped State expenditures into three categories: construction, professional services and supplies, as well as stratifying the data by MBE and WBE certification. This approach was similar to the study methodology devised for the City of Indianapolis that examined actual expenditures, versus contracted amounts. The results of the State of Indiana study were the following:

State of Indiana Results	Dollars Actual Share	Dollars Estimated Share	Disparity Number
Construction MBE	2.15%	8.28%	-6.13%
Construction WBE	0.89%	7.41%	-6.52%
Professional Services MBE	6.95%	10.40%	-3.45%
Professional Services WBE	0.70%	11.14%	-10.44%
Supplies MBE	2.80%	3.96%	-1.16%
Supplies WBE	0.61%	3.81%	-3.20%

The study's findings noted that during the twenty-month study period, disparity existed in all six areas in the above table, ranging from -1.16% for minority suppliers to -10.44% for women-owned professional services firms.

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

4. Research Design and Methodology

4.1. Study Approach

Due to the increased amount of disparity study literature in the public domain, and the State of Indiana's prior commissioning of such studies, the key measures of utilization, capacity and disparity are not new conventions. Great effort was expended to craft a methodology that could be replicable, so that future State of Indiana studies may be longitudinally compared. Drawing heavily from the methodology employed by the State of Indiana IUCUPE analysis, which used the City of Indianapolis disparity study approach, the consultant devised the following specific research design components.

The actual expenditures were taken directly from warrant data provided by the Office of Auditor of State from July 1, 2002 (beginning of Fiscal Year 2003) to June 30, 2005 (end of Fiscal Year 2005). The advantage of this approach is that taking expenditure information reduces the amount of potential error introduced into the analysis by differences between contracted amounts and the actual dollars paid to contractors and suppliers. The agency list utilized by the consultant was taken from the State of Indiana master agency account listing from the Office of the Auditor of State, and did contain groups that were not part of the study scope. A listing of included and excluded offices, agencies, boards, commissions, groups and organizations can be found in the Technical Appendix.

Unlike the City of Indianapolis analysis, the warrant data provided by the Auditor of State does not provide a specific nexus between a check written to a specific vendor and a contract or other procurement document. In order to keep as close to the City of Indianapolis methodology as possible, the following process was used:

1. The consultant examined the contract documents for each agency included in the study and noted where there was minority-owned or women-owned business participation, both in prime and sub-contractual arrangements.
2. Prime participation by either a MBE or WBE was noted as 100% and MBE and WBE sub-contractors were noted as a percentage of the total contract value.
3. Using tax-identification numbers, state-specific accounting conventions and other analytical processes, the consultant then matched those contract amounts with warrants and applied the appropriate pro-rata share of the contract to each warrant pertaining to that business transaction. If non-certified MBE and WBE participation was found on a specific contract, those amounts were counted as *bona fide* participation, as was prior practice.
4. Once that data were collected, the consultant totaled the amount of dollar utilization on an aggregate (statewide) and per-agency basis for MBEs and WBEs. This dollar utilization (versus total spend) amount will provide the numerator of the fraction used to calculate the percentage utilization (participation or dollars spent) for each agency, as well as across the whole of State government.

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

5. Total spend amounts (all included warrants) were then calculated to create the denominator of the MBE and WBE utilization fractions.

4.2. Agency Classifications

In conformance with I.C. 4-13.16.5-1 the analysis was to examine contracts⁶ at State Agencies⁷. The Division of Minority and Women's Business Enterprises of the Indiana Department of Administration, in consultation the IDOA staff attorneys, guidance from the Office of Indiana Attorney General Steve Carter, and after review of specific statutory enabling language, developed a listing of included agencies for the disparity study. This consultation and review process produced seven (7) key considerations that were considered in determining whether a group was included or excluded from the study. These exclusionary considerations are:

- Other Branch of State Government or Separately Elected Office
- Non-Governor Appointed Board or Commission
- Agency Merged or Repealed
- State Funded College, State Funded University or State Funded School
- Body Corporate and Politic
- Non-governmental Entity
- Operating Division or Component of Agency Already Included

From this process, a listing of included and excluded entities was created. A complete listing of included entities can be found in the Technical Appendix. The consultant did not decide which groups to exclude or include in the analysis. This data was provided as part of the baseline information at the beginning of the engagement.

4.3. Industry Classifications

The study utilized three main industry classifications – construction, procurement and professional services. Stratified utilization figures for the entire study period (Fiscal Year 2003 – Fiscal Year 2005) are detailed later in the report.

⁶ "Contract" is defined in this section of the Indiana Code as "any contract awarded by a state agency for construction projects or the procurement of good and services, including professional services."

⁷ "State Agency" is defined in this section of the Indiana Code as "any authority, board, branch, commission, committee, department, division, or other instrumentality of the executive, including the administrative, department of government."

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

4.4. Ethnicity Classifications

In addition to examining on a per fiscal year and per agency basis and by industry classification, data were stratified by ethnicity. These ethnic groups, as specified in the State of Indiana tracking system are African American, Asian Indian, Asian Pacific Islander, Caucasian Woman, Hispanic and Native American. There is also a null category titled None Specified. The vast majority of the data collected in this study did not have an ethnicity indicator associated with the vendor receiving a check from the State of Indiana. To that end, there is a null category entitled “None Specified” that contains non-qualifying firms and MWBE contractors

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

5. Quantitative Analysis

5.1. Study Period Utilization

The data from the Auditor of State (AOS) mainframe database provided in-study (non-excluded) expenditures and warrants written. The table below provides the breakdown on a per fiscal year basis for statewide in-study expenditures, MBE dollar participation (and percent), WBE dollar participation (and percent) and NON dollar participation (and percent). The tables below do not include statistical adjustments which are explained and detailed later in this section, thusly these utilization figures detail only data which can be sourced back to an individual MBE or WBE prime contractor or MBE/WBE sub-contractual data that was collected at each Agency visit.

MBE Utilization

	MBE Dollar Participation	MBE % Participation	Total Expenditures
Fiscal Year 2003	\$28,022,912.51	1.99%	\$1,407,751,810.22
Fiscal Year 2004	\$33,197,657.01	2.12%	\$1,568,847,179.23
Fiscal Year 2005	\$30,600,447.32	2.35%	\$1,303,645,712.52
Entire Study Period	\$91,821,016.84	2.15%	\$4,280,244,701.98

WBE Utilization

	WBE Dollar Participation	WBE % Participation	Total Expenditures
Fiscal Year 2003	\$31,544,341.46	2.24%	\$1,407,751,810.22
Fiscal Year 2004	\$33,779,980.45	2.15%	\$1,568,847,179.23
Fiscal Year 2005	\$26,108,217.56	2.00%	\$1,303,645,712.52
Entire Study Period	\$91,432,539.46	2.14%	\$4,280,244,701.98

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

NON Utilization

	NON Dollar Participation	NON % Participation	Total Expenditures
Fiscal Year 2003	\$1,348,184,556.25	95.77%	\$1,407,751,810.22
Fiscal Year 2004	\$1,501,869,541.78	95.73%	\$1,568,847,179.23
Fiscal Year 2005	\$1,246,937,047.65	95.65%	\$1,303,645,712.52
Entire Study Period	\$4,096,991,145.68	95.72%	\$4,280,244,701.98

When examining the utilization data on a per-fiscal year basis, the MBE and WBE percentages range from a high of 2.35% (FY2005 MBE) to a low of 1.99% (FY2003 MBE), with an average per fiscal year participation percentage amount of 2.15% for MBEs and 2.14% of WBEs respectively.

Like many studies that employ a multi-tiered approach to data collection, there is a need to adjust the data after the primary collection method is completed. The purpose of these adjustments is very important to tell the whole MBE/WBE participation story. These adjustments are either MBE/WBE participation amounts from State of Indiana source documents or percentages from verified spend amounts, but due to the warrant-based study approach employed, the MBE and WBE participation cannot be matched to a specific warrant or group of warrants. Thus, leaving the data without these amounts included would potentially vastly understate the MBE and WBE participation and bias the disparity calculations.

Acknowledging the State of Indiana’s accounting and reporting system is not fully equipped to implement a warrant-based analysis of disparity, the consultant created three (3) statistical adjustments to the data to compensate for utilization that is included in the total spend (expenditure) amounts, but unable to be captured due to data limitations. These three adjustments are based upon other source data either provided by the State of Indiana or collected by the consultant. The first adjustment seeks to capture purchase order activity that has MBE or WBE sub-contractual activity attached to it. Not until recently has the state’s procurement system, PeopleSoft, been outfitted to capture such information, so the adjustment is quite small – only increasing the participation percentages for MBEs and WBEs by several hundredths of a percent. The entire adjustment across all years is just under \$850,000 or less than 0.1% of the total amount of purchasing activity included in the analysis.

The second adjustment to the data seeks to capture the influence of bulk purchasing activity on the participation percentages for MBEs and WBEs. These purchasing arrangements, commonly referred to as QPAs (quantity purchasing agreements), typically require the successful bidder to have MBE and WBE sub contractual participation in order to be awarded a contract. Through an analysis of nearly 800 QPA contracts, the consultant arrived at an estimate of 3% participation for MBEs and 2% participation for WBEs. These

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

percentage adjustments increase MBE and WBE participation between \$470,000 and \$4.8 million, depending on the fiscal year and M/W designation.

A final Public Works adjustment was made due to data access limitations. The statistical adjustments were taken into account in the disparity calculations. The consultant reviewed the Quarterly Report of Contracting with Minority Business Enterprises (State Form 45129) maintained by the Public Works Division of the Department of Administration for the study period. This data included MBE data for the entire study period, but WBE data were only available for fiscal year 2005.

**State of Indiana
Statistically Adjusted MBE and WBE Utilization Rates**

	MBE Participation %	WBE Participation %
Fiscal Year 2003	2.35% \$33,071,478.42	2.27% \$31,950,169.90
Fiscal Year 2004	2.37% \$37,259,448.67	2.23% \$34,989,058.21
Fiscal Year 2005	2.88% \$37,498,618.50	2.35% \$30,612,436.84

5.2. Industry-Specific Utilization

The data for industry classification is equivalent to the “Entire Study Period” line in the Statewide Utilization Conclusions section of the analysis. Data included in this section do not include statistical adjustments.

Utilization by Industry Classification

	Construction	Procurement	Professional Services	Unassigned	Grand Total
MBE Dollar Spend	\$21,989,779.51	\$25,195,319.22	\$36,232,734.63	\$8,403,183.48	\$91,821,016.84
MBE %	23.95%	27.44%	39.46%	9.15%	100.00%
WBE Dollar Spend	\$41,772,284.88	\$26,787,253.48	\$10,240,156.30	\$12,632,844.80	\$91,432,539.46
WBE %	45.69%	29.30%	11.20%	13.82%	100.00%
NON Dollar Spend	\$2,152,600,402.17	\$937,952,841.72	\$539,859,145.42	\$466,578,756.37	\$4,096,991,145.68
NON %	52.54%	22.89%	13.18%	11.39%	100.00%
Total Dollar Spend	\$2,216,362,466.56	\$989,935,414.42	\$586,332,036.35	\$487,614,784.65	\$4,280,244,701.98

* Percentages total left-to-right

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

	Construction	Procurement	Professional Services	Unassigned	Grand Total
MBE Dollar Spend	\$21,989,779.51	\$25,195,319.22	\$36,232,734.63	\$8,403,183.48	\$91,821,016.84
MBE %	0.99%	2.55%	6.18%	1.72%	
WBE Dollar Spend	\$41,772,284.88	\$26,787,253.48	\$10,240,156.30	\$12,632,844.80	\$91,432,539.46
WBE %	1.88%	2.71%	1.75%	2.59%	
NON Dollar Spend	\$2,152,600,402.17	\$937,952,841.72	\$539,859,145.42	\$466,578,756.37	\$4,096,991,145.68
NON %	97.12%	94.75%	92.07%	95.69%	
Total Dollar Spend	\$2,216,362,466.56	\$989,935,414.42	\$586,332,036.35	\$487,614,784.65	\$4,280,244,701.98
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	

* Percentages total top to bottom

5.3. Ethnicity-Specific Utilization

Due to data limitations, the ethnicity utilization measurement is for prime contractors only. The State of Indiana does not have a system for tracking sub-contractual ethnicity.

Prime Contractor Utilization by Ethnicity

African American	\$26,892,608.47
Asian Indian	\$14,799,913.19
Asian Pacific Islander	\$5,837,249.12
Caucasian Woman	\$60,514,822.00
Hispanic	\$12,228,343.49
Native American	\$10,401,821.62
None Specified	\$4,149,569,944.09
Total	\$4,280,244,701.98

Due to the manner in which the ethnicity data are categorized and the lack on inclusion of sub-contractual participation, the total amount of ethnicity detailed in the above table does not equal the total amount of WBE or MBE utilization found elsewhere in the report.

5.4. Disparity Measurements

The disparity measurements, calculated by Dr. Jeffrey Gropp of the Department of Economics and Management at DePauw University in Greencastle, Indiana, detail a relatively consistent picture of the perceived disparity within the state procurement and contracting process. The data is disaggregated by industry classification and fiscal year. This provides an important distinction with respect to seeing any potential changes in the state's performance where viewing aggregated data may obscure such trends.

Some important definitions are

Percent of Actual Expenditures: This column represents the actual amount of MBE or WBE expenditures, divided by the number of warrants issued to vendors.

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

Actual Expenditures: The actual dollar amount of MBE or WBE expenditures issued during the study period.

Percent of Available Firms: This is a capacity calculation that looks at the number of total firms in Indiana, expressed as a percent, and the number of corresponding MBE or WBE firms. Additionally, the amount of MBE and WBE firms under each industry classification was assumed to remain constant over the study period due to the lack of available fiscal year-end capacity information. To that end, capacity data was defined by using the most recent and available MWBE data available.

Anticipated Expenditure: This is a calculated column, taking the total amount spent per time period for each industry classification and multiplying by the percent of available firms.

Disparity Index: Another calculated column that looks at the balance between the actual and anticipated spending amounts or percents, a disparity index of 0.80 or less indicates of underutilization of a specific constituent group.

Outcome: If the disparity index is less than 0.80, this column reads “underutilization.” Correspondingly, an amount of 0.81 or greater creates an “overutilization” outcome. If the disparity index reads 0.80 exactly, then the constituent group is properly utilized.

Other Important Definitions Include:

Test for Significance: A statistical calculation known as a z-score that seeks to explain the deviation of the analyzed data from its distribution’s mean (average). This is expressed in units of standard deviation. These z-scores set the stage for the calculation of statistical significance of the direct impact of utilization determination.

p-Value Proportion Test: This statistical test derives itself from the z-score calculation. There is an inverse relationship between the score, where a higher z-score yields a lower p-value. A p-value of 0.05 or less is considered statistically significant, meaning that the relationship identified by the statistical analysis can be considered not attributable by chance with 95% confidence.

Statistically Significant: This is a Yes or No field. If the p-value is 0.05 or less, a Yes is placed in the column. In all other instances a No is placed in the column. Important to note is that if a relationship is found to not be statistically significant, it does not mean that a relationship does not exist. Rather, in order to keep the potential of a chance relationship from occurring, it cannot be said that the relationship cannot be established within 5% error. This is the standard procedure for most social science research to establish statistical reliability among relationships.

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

In keeping with the consistent application of the ready, willing and able standard the disparity results calculated with the State of Indiana bidder and WBE/MBE registrants. An alternative disparity calculation, utilizing data from the United States Economic Census was

The Economic Census data would tend to overstate the number of firms in Indiana because it cannot be assumed that all business concerns are ready, willing and able to conduct business with the State of Indiana. Additionally, the industry classification used to define capacity came from the State of Indiana bidder listing. NAICS codes were used to create a sample of nearly 7,000 of the 14,000-plus businesses in the bidder listing. The following summary tables show the disparity outcomes for fiscal years 2003 through fiscal year 2005 for both minority-owned and women-owned businesses. Italicized type in the tables indicates a statistically significant relationship.

Minority and Women-Owned Business Enterprise Disparity Measurements Using Bidder/Certified Data Method

MBE Construction	
Fiscal Year 2003	Underutilization
Fiscal Year 2004	Underutilization
Fiscal Year 2005	Underutilization
MBE Procurement	
Fiscal Year 2003	<i>Underutilization</i>
Fiscal Year 2004	<i>Underutilization</i>
Fiscal Year 2005	Underutilization
MBE Professional Services	
Fiscal Year 2003	Underutilization
Fiscal Year 2004	Underutilization
Fiscal Year 2005	Underutilization

WBE Construction	
Fiscal Year 2003	Overutilization
Fiscal Year 2004	Underutilization
Fiscal Year 2005	Underutilization
WBE Procurement	
Fiscal Year 2003	Underutilization
Fiscal Year 2004	Underutilization
Fiscal Year 2005	Underutilization
WBE Professional Services	
Fiscal Year 2003	<i>Underutilization</i>
Fiscal Year 2004	<i>Underutilization</i>
Fiscal Year 2005	<i>Underutilization</i>

* Italics indicate a statistically significant relationship at the 0.05 confidence level

The detailed industry classification disparity calculations show disparity index values of between 0.161 (FY2004 WBE Professional Services) and 0.804 (FY2003 WBE Construction). Each of the eighteen instances detailed in the prior tables show various degrees of underutilization or proper utilization, but a statistically significant relationship exists in five of those situations, FY2003-FY2004 MBE Procurement (2) and FY2003-FY2005 WBE Professional Services (3). In all eighteen areas under examination, save one (FY2003 WBE Construction with an index value of 0.804) it can be said that MBEs and WBEs are not receiving their proportional share of work with the State of Indiana, but in the aforementioned five instances, this relationship cannot be attributed to a chance relationship within the data.

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

Detailed disparity information by industry classification show the following relationships and expected levels of governmental expenditure, as well as percentage of firms ready, willing and able to perform work for the State.

Construction						
	Percent of Actual MBE Expenditures	MBE Actual Expenditure	Percent of Available MBE Firms	Anticipated MBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)	Outcome
Fiscal Year 2003	1.01%	\$ 7,729,475.56	4.62%	\$ 35,245,425.82	0.219	Underutilization
Fiscal Year 2004	1.04%	\$ 9,863,772.75	4.62%	\$ 43,573,985.31	0.226	Underutilization
Fiscal Year 2005	0.83%	\$ 5,370,146.82	4.62%	\$ 30,009,385.53	0.179	Underutilization
	Percent of Actual WBE Expenditures	Actual WBE Expenditure	Percent of Available WBE Firms	Anticipated WBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)	Outcome
Fiscal Year 2003	2.37%	\$ 18,065,246.34	2.94%	\$ 22,475,344.00	0.804	Overutilization
Fiscal Year 2004	1.59%	\$ 15,048,670.44	2.94%	\$ 27,786,309.47	0.542	Underutilization
Fiscal Year 2005	2.20%	\$ 14,303,268.93	2.94%	\$ 19,136,419.76	0.747	Underutilization

Procurement						
	Percent of Actual MBE Expenditures	MBE Actual Expenditure	Percent of Available MBE Firms	Anticipated MBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)	Outcome
Fiscal Year 2003	4.26%	\$ 18,341,473.32	7.16%	\$ 30,811,808.03	0.595	<i>Underutilization</i>
Fiscal Year 2004	4.63%	\$ 20,485,697.37	7.16%	\$ 31,682,184.99	0.647	<i>Underutilization</i>
Fiscal Year 2005	5.66%	\$ 23,020,995.78	7.16%	\$ 29,110,083.12	0.791	Underutilization
	Percent of Actual WBE Expenditures	Actual WBE Expenditure	Percent of Available WBE Firms	Anticipated WBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)	Outcome
Fiscal Year 2003	2.81%	\$ 12,080,098.48	10.29%	\$ 44,284,651.84	0.273	Underutilization
Fiscal Year 2004	3.75%	\$ 16,586,873.83	10.29%	\$ 45,535,611.89	0.364	Underutilization
Fiscal Year 2005	3.45%	\$ 14,026,395.98	10.29%	\$ 41,838,826.70	0.335	Underutilization

Professional Services						
	Percent of Actual MBE Expenditures	MBE Actual Expenditure	Percent of Available MBE Firms	Anticipated MBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)	Outcome
Fiscal Year 2003	2.73%	\$ 5,844,372.82	4.99%	\$ 10,667,411.20	0.548	Underutilization
Fiscal Year 2004	2.75%	\$ 6,415,789.72	4.99%	\$ 11,636,293.72	0.551	Underutilization
Fiscal Year 2005	3.60%	\$ 8,869,381.90	4.99%	\$ 12,295,845.78	0.721	Underutilization
	Percent of Actual WBE Expenditures	Actual WBE Expenditure	Percent of Available WBE Firms	Anticipated WBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)	Outcome
Fiscal Year 2003	0.83%	\$ 1,783,627.92	4.46%	\$ 9,536,590.22	0.187	<i>Underutilization</i>
Fiscal Year 2004	0.72%	\$ 1,677,591.17	4.46%	\$ 10,402,764.35	0.161	<i>Underutilization</i>
Fiscal Year 2005	0.93%	\$ 2,299,531.53	4.46%	\$ 10,992,399.23	0.209	<i>Underutilization</i>

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

6. Qualitative Analysis

To supplement the data derived from the quantitative analysis, the consultant included a survey component to the study. Per the courts, a valid disparity study must also use anecdotal evidence to help explain, interpret and support the statistical findings. The consultant administered surveys to State of Indiana-certified MBEs and WBEs, as well as to a control group of State of Indiana registered vendors. The consultant administered a total of 620 valid surveys, of which 386 were completed by either a state-certified MBE or a state-certified WBE. The survey instruments used by the consultant can be found in the Technical Appendix.

6.1. MWBE Survey Highlights

When asked what their company's primary line of business was, 14.77% of MWBEs responded construction, with 58.81% answering professional services and the remaining 25.91% engaging in procurement activities (supplies and equipment). Of the 386 completed surveys, 44.56% indicated they were a minority-owned business, with 67.36% answering they were a woman-owned enterprise. These totals may not equal 100% since there are instances where a business may be both minority-owned and women-owned, although no specific State of Indiana designation exists for MWBEs.

Almost all (94.04%) of MWBE respondents indicated they considered themselves to be a small business according to SBA guidelines, with close to 60% of MWBEs indicating they have been a prime contractor with the State of Indiana. This amount shrinks to 40.52% when the MWBEs were asked if they had ever submitted a bid, quote or proposal to the State of Indiana. Just over sixty percent (62.95%) of MWBEs answered that they had performed work or expressed an interest in becoming a sub-contractor on a State of Indiana project, with over 50% of respondents indicating that they had actually been a sub-contractor between zero and twenty times.

MWBE survey respondents feel the certification process impacts their competitive ability, with 66.06% indicating a yes answer to this question, and 37.56% feel that certification gives their business a competitive advantage. Equally telling is that 57.25% of MWBE respondents indicated that if there were no MWBE participation goals, prime contractors would not use minority-owned or women-owned businesses.

6.2. Vendor Survey Highlights

There are some significant differences between the vendor survey answers and that of their MWBE colleagues. The industry classifications provide the first divergence. The table below shows that MWBEs are more likely to provide professional services to the State of Indiana and the vendor group leans more toward supplies and equipment (procurement). There are also almost double the percent of MWBE respondents who indicated they are in the construction business.

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

Industry Classification	MWBEs	VENDORS
Construction	6.41%	14.77%
Procurement	44.44%	58.81%
Professional Services	49.15%	25.91%
No Answer	0.00%	0.52%

Vendors are also more likely to make phone calls, send mailings and meet with State officials when trying to obtain State contracts, compared to MWBEs (23.32% and 17.33% respectively). Also, vendors are 1.3 times more likely to utilize the IDOA internet portal to review and check for State solicitations.

The vendor and MWBE percentages become more in line when asked the same questions, but for sub-contracts and not prime contractual arrangements. Vendors are still more web-savvy with 24.7% using the internet to check for solicitations, compared to 21.32% of MWBEs. The other marketing methods employed by vendors and MWBEs were within no more than five percentage points of each other.

Vendors are also only half as likely to have performed work or expressed an interest in being a subcontractor for a State of Indiana project. Only 32.48% of vendors responded yes, compared to 62.95% of MWBEs for the same question.

Please see the Technical Appendix for a complete listing of all questions and answers, as well as detailed open-ended responses from both MWBE and vendor survey respondents.

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

Disparity exists for MBE and WBE prime and sub-contracts across industry classifications and fiscal years. Although the underutilization is not statistically significant for each constituent group for every fiscal year under evaluation, definite structural patterns of underutilization create a difficult competitive environment for minority-owned and women-owned businesses.

The purpose of this analysis was not to recommend curative measures to reduce disparity for MBEs and WBEs alike. Rather, the recommendations from this report lend themselves to creating a data collection and reporting system that allows internal and external evaluations of MBE and WBE actual contract and purchase order expenditures to be conducted in an efficient and timely fashion. The current patchwork system of disparate contract listings, agency-specific internal MBE and WBE tracking lists and the lack of a specific nexus between contracts and individual warrant payments does not allow for ease of collection or analysis.

The consultant suggests the following recommendations in order for future analyses to be conducted in a more expeditious and cost-effective manner:

- Implement a state-wide system of tracking MBE and WBE prime and sub-contractual actual payment activity. This system should be linked to the Auditor of State payment system. Such a system would allow the seamless tracking of the contracting and procurement process from the time a contract is executed to the time warrants are paid from encumbered funds.
- Continue the PeopleSoft implementation where purchase orders cannot be generated without entering MBE and WBE participation data into the system. This will allow tracking at the warrant level, and the ability to apply specific pro rata percentages of subcontractor participation to warrants. This will also ensure only certified vendors are calculated in any utilization totals. This process will provide the basis for additional future analyses by supplying purchase order MBE and WBE sub-contractor participation.
- Create a nexus or unique indicator that runs the entire procurement process, from the execution of a contract to the issuance of payments for services. The current system of stand-alone data sources (contract databases, AOS warrant system, etc.) would then be integrated and reporting would become much easier.
- Conduct a comprehensive survey of registered bidders (and/or vendors) to assess the true capacity and other information on those businesses deemed to be ready, willing and able to conduct business with the State of Indiana. If the State invests the resources and time to survey its vendors and bidders on certain characteristics, then the ability to ascertain true capacity of those ready, willing and able to do business with the State would become easier and more efficient. This is of great importance, as a proper and true measurement of State of Indiana capacity will provide the most accurate representation of any real

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

disparity in contracting over a given study period, as well as drive the statistical calculations that create the resulting disparity calculations.

- Continue the process toward a contract audit procedure that seeks to determine whether prime contractors actually paid their MBE and WBE sub-contractors the amounts asserted in their MWBE participation plan. This process is currently under way, but it is also important for the State to have the ability to sanction those prime contractors who do not pay MBEs and WBEs the full amounts in their commitment letters.

If these recommendations are realized, the ability of the State of Indiana or a third-party consultant to conduct an analysis of disparity greatly increases, as does the comfort level and validity of the findings.

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

8. About Bucher + Christian Consulting, Inc.

Company Overview

Bucher + Christian is a business solutions firm that leverages technology to assist in the solution of business problems. Founded in 1998, Bucher + Christian currently maintains a staff of nearly 300 full time consultants. The organization has quickly become one of the largest consulting companies based in the Midwest. Head-quartered in Indianapolis, Bucher + Christian maintains offices in Washington D.C, Cleveland, Cincinnati, and a global delivery center in St. Petersburg, The Russian Federation.

In 2005, the Indianapolis Business Journal (IBJ) recognized Bucher + Christian as the largest enterprise systems integrator in the State of Indiana; 5th Largest IT solutions firm providing services in Indiana and 2nd Largest Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) in Indiana. Our engagement model consists of the following key attributes and goals:

- Provide strategic consulting services to global entities with global expert resources
- Offer the highest quality solutions and resources at reasonable cost through the management of our own internal fixed and variable costs
- Provide business analysis services to private and public entities and propose technical/business/policy solutions based on the results of the analysis.
- Offer implementation and project delivery solution options including on-site/local/off-shore consulting through our global delivery centers.

Bucher + Christian, Government Solutions Practice

Our Government Solutions Practice was established to focus efforts on local, state, and federal government engagements. Bucher + Christian's government practice assists our government clients in the delivery of quality, speed, cost reduction and innovation. Within state and local government agencies and the U.S. federal government our solutions are designed to provide government modernization and thought leadership. Our holistic approach offers advantages in the following areas:

- Project Management
- Business Analysis
- Technology Transformation
- Emerging Government Trends
- Business Continuity
- Process Optimization
- Homeland and Enterprise Security
- Staff Augmentation

Indiana Department of Administration
 Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

9. Technical Appendix

9.1. Listing of Included Offices, Agencies, Boards and Commissions

Agency #	Agency Name
80	ACCOUNTS, BOARD OF
61	ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF
255	AIRPORT AUTHORITY
230	ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO COMMISSION
705	ARTS COMMISSION, INDIANA
270	ATTORNEY TRUST ACCOUNT BOARD
351	BOARD OF ANIMAL HEALTH
675	BRANCHVILLE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
57	BUDGET AGENCY
450	CARTER HOSPITAL
420	CENTRAL STATE HOSPITAL
105	CIVIL DEFENSE
258	CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION
240	CORONERS TRAINING BOARD
635	CORRECTIONAL INDUSTRIAL FACILITY
32	CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE
36	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
615	DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION
385	DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
71	DISABILITY - STATE PERSONNEL
497	DIV OF DISABILITY, AGING & REHAB SERVICES
501	DIV OF FAMILY/CHILDREN SERVICES
500	DIVISION OF FAMILY AND CHILDREN
410	DIVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH
74	EMPLOYEE APPEALS COMMISSION
495	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT
425	EVANSVILLE HOSPITAL
415	EVANSVILLE PSYCHIATRIC CHILD CENTER
405	FAMILY/SOCIAL SERVICES ADMIN
208	FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
305	FIRE AND BUILDING SERVICES
465	FORT WAYNE HOSPITAL
190	GAMING COMMISSION
195	GAMING RESEARCH, DEPARTMENT OF
35	GOV PLAN CONUCIL FOR PEOPLE W/ DISABILITIES
30	GOVERNOR
41	HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITY AUTHORITY
275	HEALTH PROFESSIONS SERV BUREAU
400	HEALTH, BOARD OF

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

607	HENRYVILLE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
719	HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION
735	HISTORICAL BUREAU
265	HORSE RACING COMMISSION
728	HUMAN RESOURCE INVESTMENT COUNCIL
20	HUMAN SERVICES BOARD COORDINATION
502	IN DEPT OF CHILD SERVICES
795	INDEP ST UNIV, BOARD OF INCORPORATION
217	INDIANA BOARD OF TAX REVIEW
670	INDPLS JUV CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
515	INDUSTRY DIVISION - PEN PRODUCTS
85	INFO TECHNOLOGY OVERSIGHT COMMISSION
65	INFORMATION SYSTEMS DIVISION
210	INSURANCE DEPARTMENT
286	INTEGRATED PUBLIC SAFETY COMMISSION
225	LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF
320	LAKE MICHIGAN MARINA DEVEL COMMISSION
103	LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING BOARD
730	LIBRARY, INDIANA STATE
38	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR
215	LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE, DEPARTMENT OF
619	LOGANSPORT JUVE INTAKE/DIAG FACILITY
435	LOGANSPORT STATE HOSPITAL
667	MADISON CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
430	MADISON HOSPITAL
682	MAXIMUM CONTROL FACILITY
618	MIAMI CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
235	MOTOR VEHICLES, BUREAU OF
470	MUSCATATUCK HOSPITAL
300	NATURAL RESOURCES, DEPARTMENT OF
645	NEW CASTLE CORRECTION FACILITY
460	NEW CASTLE ST DEV CENTER
616	NORTH CENTRAL JUVENILE CORR FACILITY
490	NORTHERN INDIANA HOSPITAL
496	OFFICE OF ENVIRON ADJUDICATION
720	OFFICE OF FAITH-BASED COMM INIT
56	OFFICE OF FEDERAL GRANTS & PROCURMNT
75	OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
55	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT & BUDGET
67	OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY
630	PENDLETON CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
655	PENDLETON JUVENILE COR FACILITY
70	PERSONNEL, DEPARTMENT OF
690	PLAINFIELD CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
660	PLAINFIELD JUV CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
250	PROFESSIONAL LICENSING AGENCY

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

245	PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
703	PROPRIETARY EDUCATION, COMMISSION
44	PROTECTION/ADVOCACY COMMISSION
64	PUBLIC ACCESS COUNSELOR
62	PUBLIC RECORDS COMMISSION
285	PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING INSTITUTE
650	PUTNAMVILLE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
695	RECEPT/DIAGNOSTIC CENTER
90	REVENUE, DEPARTMENT OF
440	RICHMOND HOSPITAL
685	ROCKVILLE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
718	SCHOOL LUNCH DIVISION
480	SILVERCREST HOSPITAL
580	SOLDIERS/SAILORS CHILDRENS HOME
68	STATE HOUSE BUILDING DIVISION
100	STATE POLICE
104	STATE POLICE BUILDING COMMISSION
620	STATE PRISON
715	STUDENT ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
58	TOBACCO USE PREVEN & CESS BOARD
800	TRANSPORTATION, DEPARTMENT OF
205	UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR
200	UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
160	VETERAN AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF
570	VETERANS' HOME
722	VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL BOARD
42	VOLUNTARY ACTION COMMISSION
665	WABASH VALLEY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
315	WAR MEMORIALS COMMISSION
34	WASHINGTON LIAISON OFFICE
680	WESTVILLE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
681	WESTVILLE TRANSITION UNIT
218	WOMEN'S COMMISSION
640	WOMENS PRISON
707	WORK FORCE LITERACY OFFICE
220	WORKERS COMPENSATION BOARD
510	WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
617	YOUTH REHAB FACILITY

Indiana Department of Administration
 Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

9.2. Listing of Excluded Offices, Agencies, Boards and Commissions

Agency #	Agency Name
110	ADJUTANT GENERAL
147	AMERICAN VETERANS OF WW2
23	APPEALS COURT
46	ATTORNEY GENERAL
50	AUDITOR OF STATE
780	BALL STATE UNIVERSITY
550	BLIND, SCHOOL FOR THE
24	CLERK, SUPREME/COURT OF APPEALS
280	COMMISSION ON HEALTH POLICY
560	DEAF, SCHOOL FOR THE
140	DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS
505	EDUCATION EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS
700	EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF
3	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
263	HOUSING & COMM DEV AUTHORITY
260	IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
708	IN ED COMPACT COMMISSION
63	INDIANA ELECTION COMMISSION
261	INDIANA FINANCE AUTHORITY
770	INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
750	INDIANA UNIVERSITY
755	INDIANA UNIVERSITY MED CENTER
26	JUDICIAL CENTER
13	JUDICIAL NOMINATING COMMISSION
322	KANKAKEE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION
102	LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADEMY BUILDING
17	LEGISLATIVE SERVICES AGENCY
885	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEV
15	LOBBY REGISTRATION COMMISSION
325	MAUMEE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION
340	MOTOR VEHICLES COMMISSION
66	OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION
290	POLLUTION PREVENTION INSTITUTE
262	PORT COMMISSION
39	PROSECUTING ATTORNEY
605	PUBLIC DEFENDER
610	PUBLIC DEFENDER COUNCIL
72	PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT FUND
760	PURDUE UNIVERSITY
40	SECRETARY OF STATE
4	SENATE
775	SOUTHERN INDIANA, UNIVERSITY OF
330	ST JOSEPH RIVER BASIN COMM

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

878	STATE FAIR COMMISSION
22	SUPREME COURT
28	TAX COURT
740	TEACHERS RETIREMENT FUND
48	TREASURER OF STATE
19	UNIFORM LAW COMMISSION
170	VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
790	VINCENNES UNIVERSITY
710	VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL COLLEGE
310	WHITE RIVER STATE PARK COMM

There are other agencies that are included in the study, found in the prior Appendix that did not have any applicable associated spend information and did not appear on the utilization tables for the state agencies. Thusly, they are not considered excluded for the purposes of the definition of the project, but rather included, but without spend information.

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

9.3. MWBE and Vendor Survey Results

	SURVEY QUESTIONS		VENDORS	MWBEs	NOTES
	Total Surveys Completed		252	386	
1)	<i>What is your company's primary line of business?</i>				
	Construction		6.41%	14.77%	
	Professional Services		44.44%	58.81%	
	Supplies/Equipment		49.15%	25.91%	
	No Answer/Refused		0.00%	0.52%	
2)	<i>Do you consider your business to be a minority business? (If yes, with what group(s) is your company certified?)</i>				
	Yes		5.56%	44.56%	
		Federal Gov't	0.83%	12.92%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
		State Gov't	3.33%	51.08%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
		Local Gov't	1.25%	27.08%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
		Private Org	0.83%	7.69%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
		None Listed	93.75%	1.23%	
	No		78.63%	41.97%	
	No Answer/Refused		15.81%	13.47%	
3)	<i>Do you consider your business to be a women-owned business? (If yes, with what group(s) is your company certified?)</i>				
	Yes		15.48%	67.36%	
		Federal Gov't	1.64%	9.30%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
		State Gov't	5.33%	64.34%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
		Local Gov't	2.46%	20.16%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
		Private Org	1.23%	4.39%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
		None Listed	89.34%	1.81%	
	No		69.04%	16.84%	
	No Answer/Refused		15.48%	15.80%	
4)	<i>Is your business considered a small business according to the SBA guidelines?</i>				
	Yes		73.50%	94.04%	
	No		24.36%	3.37%	
	No Answer/Refused		2.14%	2.59%	
5)	<i>Does your target market include the following?</i>				
		Federal Gov't	21.72%	13.62%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
		State Gov't	35.40%	29.68%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
		Local Gov't	8.21%	19.57%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
		Private Org	34.31%	36.38%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
	No Answer/Refused		0.36%	0.74%	
6)	<i>What percentage of your gross revenue is derived through business with the State of Indiana?</i>				
	0%	0%	14.38%	48.05%	
	0%-20%		27.25%	31.95%	
	21%-40%		1.72%	6.49%	
	41%-60%		2.15%	3.12%	
	61%-80%		1.07%	2.34%	
	81%-99%		1.07%	4.16%	
	100%		50.21%	0.78%	
	No Answer/Refused	No Answer	2.15%	3.12%	

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

	SURVEY QUESTIONS		VENDORS	MWBEs	NOTES
**	<i>Has your company been a prime contractor with the State of Indiana or has your company had an interest in being a prime contractor?</i>				
	Yes		69.23%	57.77%	
	No		12.39%	27.72%	
	No Answer/Refused		18.38%	14.51%	
7)	<i>Which of the following marketing techniques have you employed to obtain state contracts?</i>				
	Attend pre-bid meetings/RFI sessions		19.03%	18.92%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
	Phone calls/mailings/meetings with state officials		23.32%	17.33%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
	Attend networking/matchmaking events		8.85%	21.30%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
	Membership in trade organizations		11.80%	14.63%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
	Regular review of state solicitations on the internet		37.00%	27.82%	<i>Checked more than one answer</i>
	Other/None				
8)	<i>Have you ever submitted a bid, quote, or proposal to the State of Indiana?</i>				
	No		23.08%	25.19%	
	Yes		61.97%	40.52%	
	No Answer/Refused		14.96%	34.29%	
9)	<i>Of your submissions to the State of Indiana, what percentages of the following have been awarded?</i>				
	<i>Bids & Quotes</i>				
	0%		14.53%	18.39%	
	1%-20%		13.25%	7.51%	
	21%-40%		4.27%	2.59%	
	41%-60%		7.26%	3.37%	
	61%-80%		4.27%	1.04%	
	81%-99%		2.56%	0.78%	
	100%		5.13%	2.59%	
	No Answer/Refused		48.72%	63.73%	
	<i>Proposals</i>				
	0%		11.54%	10.36%	
	1%-20%		8.55%	2.07%	
	21%-40%		2.14%	1.30%	
	41%-60%		5.56%	1.04%	
	61%-80%		2.14%	0.78%	
	81%-99%		0.85%	0.78%	
	100%		2.99%	1.04%	
	No Answer/Refused	No Answer	66.24%	82.64%	

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

	SURVEY QUESTIONS		VENDORS	MWBEs	NOTES
10)	<i>In your bids, quotes and/or proposals to the State of Indiana do you identify minority and/or women owned business with whom you intend to subcontract?</i>				
	Yes		19.23%	20.47%	
	0%		3.23%	3.70%	
	1%-20%		19.35%	9.26%	
	21%-40%		6.45%	3.70%	
	41%-60%		3.23%	9.26%	
	61%-80%		3.23%	3.70%	
	81%-99%		3.23%	1.85%	
	100%		61.29%	68.52%	
	No		37.61%	12.44%	
	No Answer/Refused		43.16%	67.10%	
11)	<i>On the winning bids, quotes and/or proposals, did you utilize the MBW and/or WBE specified in your submission for the fully proposed amount?</i>				
	Yes		12.82%	9.33%	
	No		5.56%	1.81%	
		If no, why not?			
	No Answer/Refused		81.62%	88.86%	
12)	<i>Are there any factors that have interfered with your ability to submit a bid, quote and/or proposal to the State of Indiana?</i>				
	See Open Ended Survey Results				
13)	<i>Has your company ever performed work as a subcontractor on a State of Indiana contract or has your company had an interest in being a subcontractor?</i>				
	Yes		32.48%	62.95%	
	No		33.33%	14.51%	
	No Answer/Refused		34.19%	22.54%	
14)	<i>Which of the following marketing techniques have you employed to obtain state subcontracts?</i>				
	Attend pre-bid meetings/RFI sessions		16.87%	15.34%	Checked more than one answer
	Phone calls/mailings/meetings with state officials		17.47%	12.27%	Checked more than one answer
	Phone calls/mailings/meetings with prime contractors		23.49%	23.93%	Checked more than one answer
	Attend networking/matchmaking events		7.83%	15.95%	Checked more than one answer
	Membership in trade organizations		9.64%	11.20%	Checked more than one answer
	Regular review of state solicitations on the internet		24.70%	21.32%	Checked more than one answer
	Other/None				
15)	<i>How often have your served as a subcontractor for the State of Indiana?</i>				
	0	0	13.68%	30.31%	
	1-20		11.54%	20.47%	
	21-40		0.43%	1.30%	
	41-60		0.85%	0.78%	
	61-80		0.00%	0.26%	
	81-100		1.28%	0.78%	
	100+		0.43%	0.78%	
	No Answer/Refused	No Answer	71.79%	45.34%	

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

SURVEY QUESTIONS		VENDORS	MWBEs	NOTES
16	<i>Have you ever been listed as the subcontractor on an awarded contract and not performed the work?</i>			
	Yes		2.56%	4.66%
		If yes, number of times		
		1	16.67%	44.44%
		2	16.67%	11.11%
		3	0.00%	5.56%
		15	0.00%	5.56%
		No Answer	66.67%	33.33%
		Why?		
	No		27.35%	41.97%
	No Answer/Refused		70.09%	53.37%
17)	<i>Are there any factors that interfered with your ability to attain business as a subcontractor with the State of Indiana?</i>			
	See Open Ended Survey Results			
18)	<i>Skip - Go to 19. Are you certified with the Indiana Department of Administration as a minority or women-owned business?</i>			
19)	<i>Do you think certification has an effect on the ability of your company to compete with other businesses?</i>			
	Yes		7.26%	66.06%
	No		8.55%	26.68%
		If no, why not?		
	No Answer/Refused		84.19%	7.25%
20)	<i>Do you think prime contractors would use minority or women-owned business if there were no MWBE goals?</i>			
	Yes		6.41%	24.87%
	No		7.69%	57.25%
	No Answer/Refused		85.90%	17.88%
21)	<i>What are the obstacles your firm faces in the State of Indiana contracting process?</i>			
22)	<i>Do you think certification of minority and women-owned businesses with the State of Indiana gives those businesses a competitive advantage?</i>			
	Yes		0.43%	37.56%
		Why?		
	No		0.85%	14.51%
		Why not?		
	No Answer/Refused		98.72%	47.93%
23)	<i>What are the obstacles your firm faces in the State of Indiana contracting process?</i>			
	See Open Ended Survey Results			
	<i>Is there anything that we have not covered that you feel will be helpful to this study? Describe?</i>			
	See Open Ended Survey Results			

Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

9.4. MWBE Open-Ended Survey Results

Companies Conducting Business as Prime Contractors

7. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING MARKETING TECHNIQUES HAVE YOU EMPLOYED TO OBTAIN STATE CONTRACTS?

“OTHER” COMMENTS:

- Word of mouth
- General networking
- Bridge meetings
- Online bidding
- Online RFI sessions
- The state government contacted him and put him on projects. Did not have to submit anything.
- Respond to RFPs from treasurer’s office
- Respond to RFQs sent out from state
- Networking
- Contact buyers & incumbent
- Work through NAWBO organization
- Get most business through word-of-mouth with contractors they know
- Follow up with prime vendor and IDOA on prior bids to get info on who bid
- Attend NAWBO meetings
- Looks on “bid board” for jobs (4th floor south)
- Use RFP service to look for bids
- Contacted directly by dealers
- Go to INDOT EDI meetings (Jan thru March)
- Classes through INDOT
- State solicitations by fax
- Phone calls from state & schools
- Local meeting for enterprise zone in bottom half of the state
- Emails from the State on upcoming bids are not in their field
- Read newspapers to keep abreast of developments on stadium, etc.
- Ads in newspapers
- Receive faxed info
- Networking through past clients who have moved into government positions
- Responded to RFI
- Look on internet, but not regularly
- Sign up with company to provide leads
- Doing great work so get referrals and call backs
- Partners in Contracting networking
- Word of mouth & event sponsorship
- With prompting from emails or alerts, look at state solicitations on the internet
- Partners in Contracting watches for bids
- Partners in Contracting
- Some review of Internet – not regular
- Got copies of previous bid for same job to see how it was put together
- Word of mouth through present clients
- Run clean operation leads to word of mouth
- Personal contacts
- Do follow-up, give bids, but not successful
- Partners in Contracting but no success
- Contact with directors of rehab centers
- Applied to be WBE which led to case management contracts
- Some review of state solicitations on internet conferences
- Look at information on internet after getting notices. Just beginning to explore this.
- Research, procurement conference, Partners in Contracting, direct contact with agencies
- Emails, contact monthly with 14 agents at state level
- Network with other local design firms to get a bid but nothing yet
- Attend events (not state run) where people from companies of related businesses are
- Procurement offices in different divisions
- Attended MWBE diversity conference with suppliers

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- Work with IRMC and their networking meetings
- Being keynote at a conference led to invitation to bid
- Attend 4B meetings at beginning of each bidding cycle
- Email bids from state. Good on access
- Go to events, marketing
- Indiana Minority Development
- Directory listings, emails and calls from others
- Chamber of Commerce; Indy Diversity Council events
- Certified by state fairgrounds to do business with fairgrounds
- Get all of their work through the state board of accounts (CPA)
- State prisons come to her with contracts
- Contact with other prime contractors
- Receive faxes for upcoming bids
- Purchasers contact them directly

7. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING MARKETING TECHNIQUES HAVE YOU EMPLOYED TO OBTAIN STATE CONTRACTS?

"NONE" COMMENTS:

- Specialized to working with local government
- No longer certified as a WBE because they did not get any state contracts
- Not aware of these
- Too time consuming
- Too far to travel to meetings
- Companies from northern Indiana don't feel welcome. They are not in the political loop.
- State should have a coffee only for the MWBEs (not vendors) to discuss problems and see where main problems lie.
- Want more training
- Deal directly with the institutions (DOC)
- New to the process
- Deal directly with the customer
- Have not been contacted with any information. Small companies can't devote a lot of time to this.
- State has no need for her type of services
- Haven't figured out the process yet
- No local work from state. In her area it is all union.
- Not actively pursuing yet.
- Don't have time
- Have not actively pursued business
- Just got internet; too small a company
- RFP process is not worth the time for a small company
- Too much time
- Doesn't pursue state business. Closing company.
- Not much state work in the southern counties
- Can't afford the time it takes. Small company.
- Haven't seen anything in their area of work
- Not actively pursuing state business. Can't find anything in their line of work
- Have never had any luck in the past. Never hear back from bids
- Bid jobs are usually too far away from the southern counties
- No bids; only work through QPAs
- Time and figuring out how the state works
- A year ago business was slow, so signed up as WBE (wanting to sell direct to the army after did a job), but then got busy again and didn't follow through
- Internet solicitations do not apply to our business (lawn care)
- Conference for MWBEs with purchasers in Gary 2 years ago. Not very successful for her
- Because work with casinos keeps her busy now
- Not right fit generally. Specific niche that is airport related
- Time, small business, don't have the resources and when have tried it has not panned out
- Airport board meetings, networking

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

**11. ON THE WINNING BIDS, QUOTES AND/OR PROPOSALS, DID YOU UTILIZE THE MBE AND/OR WBE SPECIFIED IN YOUR SUBMISSION FOR THE FULLY PROPOSED AMOUNT?
"NO" COMMENTS**

- If they need to have a research company for some sub work, they cannot use an MWBE because none are available
- No subcontracting
- QPAs – 2 direct didn't need MWBE participation; 1 contract not yet started
- Don't know the process

12. ARE THERE ANY FACTORS THAT HAVE INTERFERED WITH YOUR ABILITY TO SUBMIT A BID, QUOTE AND/OR PROPOSAL TO THE STATE OF INDIANA?

- Lack of knowledge
- Lack of knowledge about the contracting process and lack of time
- Lack of knowledge of opportunities
- Unsure of the proper channels & procedures in the state contracting process
- Lack of understanding of the process; New to working with the State; Lack of help in learning the process from the State
- Newly certified, still learning the process
- New to the state contracting process
- Lack of personnel; the bidding process is very cumbersome
- The contract process is cumbersome; paperwork
- No relevant contracts
- No relevant contracts
- Lack of relevant contracts
- No relevant contracts available in her line of business
- No available contracts for the company's line of work
- Lack of relevant contracts; Bonding; Access to state offices by FedEx
- Lack of contracts requiring work relevant to their line of business
- Lack of available contracts for their specialty
- Lack of personnel; too small to handle a contract by themselves; Bonding
- Small size of the company; lack of personnel
- Company size, lack of time
- Small size; New to the business
- The scope of the work on the state level is too large for his business
- The size of the company is too small to handle/get state contracts
- Prequalification; limit on work set by the state
- Delays on updating company's line of business code on the state listings
- Companies work with who they know
- Paperwork
- New to the business
- Public finances & bond markets are very political
- Lack of awareness of contracts requiring her line of work
- Lack of exposure
- Distance; Perception of out-of-state companies being limited in working in Indiana
- Lack of information and communication by the state; Lack of time
- Capacity issues
- Lack of contracts in his locality
- Issues with registering; Too small to be a prime contractor; Criteria to be get on bid lists are restrictive to out of state companies
- Language issues in the contracts; Lack of personnel
- Have not yet needed to seek business in Indiana; Out of state company
- Haven't looked for prime contracting; Just dealt with primes as a subcontractor
- Time and personnel
- Misunderstanding and mislabelling of the company's specialization
- Discouragement and disappointment
- Services they specialize in are not specifically looked for in any contracts
- Incompetent, poorly worded RFPs and bid packages
- Awareness of opportunities
- Requirements are too difficult for small businesses and in some cases unneeded
- Not all the bids had pre-bid conferences
- State does a good job.
- Had to hire a lobbyist to 'get in the door' for stadium work

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- Hard to get information on open bids/contracts, so have not won any yet
- It is too much work for a small business to deal with the state
- Bids/quote work is too time consuming
- Not easy to get state work/ hard to “get in the loop”
- The whole process takes too long for a small company
- Very little of their work seems to apply to the state
- Not listed correctly in MWBE directory
- Does not receive any response back from bids
- State should help with work when not a union shop; all local work is union and too small a company to pay union wages
- Sometimes the MWBE on the list is not really a legitimate minority and they get business that should go to true minorities; They just have a ‘front’ company to make it look like they are a minority
- So far his type of business hasn’t been needed by the State. State does their own background checks when needed
- It is frustrating that the state wants minorities to be subs, not primes. Being a minority prime does not give them any benefit
- WBEs are often not taken seriously; sometimes it is more of a hindrance than a help
- Bid bonds and performance bonds are a problem
- Never heard back on bids submitted
- Too small a company to be competitive
- Specs are usually written by the previous bid holder, who then gets the job
- Hard to compete when too many jobs go out of state
- Has to pay for printing samples for the bid, whether she wins or not, and this is too expensive for a small company
- Bonding is a problem; you have to be worth more than the cost of the job to get bonded; impossible for a small business
- Large jobs are union. If not a union shop, can’t get state work
- Competition/price—getting the low bid
- Don’t usually hear back from the state on submitted bids
- They aren’t a union shop—can’t afford to pay union wages, so can’t get most jobs
- For certain businesses like marketing, you are still forced to sub out so you have to sub to a competitor and that doesn’t make any sense. This often forces them not to submit a bid.
- They get tons of emails regarding bids that have nothing to do with their business. This is a waste of state \$ and a waste of the company’s time.
- Jobs in the highway sector of construction are politically controlled—i.e. require political donations
- There’s not much work in southern IN for the state. Since they have to pay shipping, this prohibits them from being competitive on most jobs
- The state’s category list is too broad—they should be listed as ‘office cleaning’, but there isn’t a specific enough category, so they get too many emails for jobs that don’t pertain to them, such as for janitorial supplies like trash bags.
- Not really pursuing state business
- They are non-union, so won’t be used on union contracts. The state should do something about this. The prime union companies control this.
- It is difficult to get bids when their company is not categorized correctly. They don’t get the bid information that applies to them.
- The state doesn’t have smaller contracts anymore. They are lumped together into one big contract forcing small companies to be a sub of a sub of a
- Sub... Then they never get paid.
- There is not much state work in Southern Indiana
- This company was very angry about the toll road issue with the DOT. Another out of state company undercut them and the DOT let them have the
- Business, going against the Buy Indiana program and in spite of the Indiana Impact statement.
- The state won’t tell you a budget up front
- RFPs are disjointed and disorganized
- They continue to get emails for jobs that don’t relate to their business and don’t get emails that do relate
- When they submit bids, they never hear back, so don’t know why they lost it. It takes a lot of work, so they should at least hear the results
- Small businesses can not be competitive in the office supplies area
- They don’t hear back on bids—they would like to know who won and at what cost so they know if they were even close
- They get emails for work that isn’t appropriate for them
- Classification of companies needs to be more specialized
- Most work is in central IN, and they are too far north to be able to compete
- They just don’t know yet where they fit in with state business
- When you don’t win the QPA bid, you have to wait 4 years to bid again
- Had a big problem with the state sending their business OUT OF STATE, when his business was fully qualified. It was worth \$180K. The out of state
- Company ended up not being able to fulfill the job. He was very angry about this. Why should work go out of state when a qualified or even better
- Qualified company is in state?

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- Too much paperwork and takes too long. The price of steel went up significantly in the 6 months it took for the state to get back with him to award the
- Contract!
- Specs with quote are too difficult to address – no time for it/not interested. E.g. tote bag with exact handle length.
- Also, a formality required because of law; contracts already decided.
- “Promotions” categories does not describe what her company does well, so receives fax solicitations that are not relevant.
- State bid process ridiculously complicated. Would rather work on relationships rather than submit bids on internet.
- Lack of knowledge
- Bid process is same for big and small businesses. In a one-person operation (especially since has double certification in two businesses), not possible to compete since do not have the time.
- Time needed to target markets difficult.
- Finding out what is available. Certified in the fall 05, so still learning. Bids are for dump trucks, not hauling freight.
- Never hear about bids. Used to be listed as construction – mistaken, but finally fixed - Is a design firm, but now there are no warnings/announcements of bids.
- Time – 30-40 hours to respond to a request. Takes a lot of time to respond to all, within timeframe
- Requests - 19 pages – are cumbersome, tedious, and without a legal background they are difficult to fill out
- State may assume company size is too small
- State seems to have vendors it wants to use. RFI process is a formality.
- Received a contract from Work Force Dev. But didn't do the project because the state said it did not have the budget for it --- seemed a weak excuse since had sent it out to bid and contacted it.
- Don't know what to do
- Not knowing about bids; would like notification from state
- Not big enough
- Some facilities are supposed to send bids as MBE
- Solicitations received not related to what she can bid on and she doesn't know how to go about looking for contracts
- Networking meetings seem geared to construction, not to marketing and research
- Not many meetings in Lake County
- Company out of Ohio got contract – it had filed for bankruptcy – why not to an Ind. MBE?
- Don't know about bids
- None – self-selects, won't submit a bid if can't handle it herself – doesn't want employees
- Funding too small seemingly, so trying now as subcontractor
- Interference by minority legislators manipulating the process/contracts to favor their friends; minority legislators setting up front companies; changing that would end major obstacle
- Got into casinos first – overwhelmed, so concentrating on those contracts and making sure get everything right before pursuing state contracts – that will be the next step
- Bonding was difficult
- Niche company – so have to sort through pages on the Internet to find relevant bids
- Bids written with the specs of the company that gets the bid – frustrating –
- Quotes are too cumbersome to pursue – not good enough opportunity to put in the work
- State is still interested primarily in bottom dollar; state can't evaluate quality
- Niche market – doesn't always come up in RFPs
- Can't contract on bids – come in on repairs – they don't fit into categories
- Racial jokes at matchmaking events don't help – lost five accounts because of prejudice in Kentucky
- Ivy Tech bid – spent so much time and then contract given to a buddy in the system; why bother being certified – it doesn't benefit
- Had contracts with state since 1997, now state wants those contracts as RFPs – so waiting to hear outcome of first proposal (case management)
- Just trying to find fit – and not being based in Indiana makes it more difficult
- Don't see any opportunities
- Never been asked to submit – do work for city, but none for the state
- Networking sessions all about construction and supplies, not about professional services – if not in political game, then already decided; doesn't want to work with non-ethical people, so won't play the political game – all in who you know – networking
- Understanding bid process with state
- State doesn't want what she offers
- Networking sessions don't help
- Confusion of bid process – how complicated – inadequate and inaccurate information in the bid package
- Don't have time for paperwork – return on another job more than return on paperwork for state bid with slim chance of getting contract; if time, will work on it
- No bids in her field – business through clients coming to her, then paid by state
- When state doesn't tell anyone about a bid – found out on Friday, for Monday due date – then had to resubmit, because none done right in time; Now state just puts bids on Internet without warning – vendors are not being told and only five companies do this work

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- No areas yet for his business
- Large companies have greater chance with name recognition and more resources and experience in preparing proposals; trying for a year, so far unsuccessful; need smaller scope bids to get a bid
- Would like to have the opportunity to bid
- Solicited to get certified and got contract – no bid process – case management
- Better knowledge of process
- Proposals written for specific firms – you can identify company name by specs
- Busy in other areas and lack of knowledge – will take some time to figure it out; not yet primary focus; hoping to get in with an Indianapolis women's group that seems focused on learning how the system works
- Haven't been asked to – tried to talk to state about services - not bid out; a larger national firm has all the state business
- Can't get to people who offer tenders for what she does; instead, she gets lots of other stuff not relevant
- Doesn't get notification of events and when she asks, gets no response
- New certification, learning the ropes – with new government – changes and a lot is in transition – all turned upside down; trying to get hold of Jodi Williams about prequalification – stuck
- Tough applications to complete
- No business in Indiana – business in other states
- One of primary complaints about MWBE program: if MWBE is a prime, they get no credit for MWBE participation and have to sub out
- Not knowing about bids, not asked, state solicitations don't match
- Bids ridiculous – the items asked for – specifications are more involved than time and energy to put into bid – pages long for something that could be much simpler
- Need better understanding of bid process – hoping attending pre-bid meeting in a week will help; Also Indy GO helped them go through MBE process
- Requirements too specific – (e.g. minimum employees state in bid specs as 15) – need to lighten up on minimum employees and other specs to allow cooperation across two or three firms to submit a bid
- Competition and the lack of responsiveness from individuals in the state who have favored persons to call – they don't take calls from the other contractors
- RFP are written so vaguely – only those who were involved in the planning process beforehand can follow – no chance of winning if not in that planning process
- Didn't go to lowest bidder (him) and then gave to another arbitrarily. On one bid was told it was going to be done in-house, and then was done by another. On another – expected announcement Dec. 1, then told Feb 1 it would be done in-house
- Bonding – DPW certification needed bonding four years ago, so couldn't do it; MWBE certified after being in business 20 years, but business was better before being certified
- Hard to get to the right person in procurement – INDOT takes 30 minutes to find right person
- Field restricted – at state level, some requirements exclude her on specific bids
- Emails not tied to well to what they do; not knowing where and how to submit
- Bid bonding takes out a lot of MWBEs
- No – just been working on state contracts for 18 months
- Small company – not bonded – have small bond only 8A on one and getting another then easier; working to get more bonding – bonding at least \$500,000 now, not \$150,000
- Requirement that as WBE have to contract with other WBE – as very small company with specific skill is a deterrent to participate
- Road work as electrical too expensive
- Can't afford bonding
- No bid because not right kind of equipment for project at state fairgrounds, but found equipment for this year, so will try to bid
- Jobs not within your category – more of a sub
- Invite to bid – not related to recruitment, but construction /building
- Not big enough to qualify for requirements
- No - Too busy to run business
- By time hear of project, already designed so too late – a lighting consulting firm
- Don't know process – never received any info
- Don't get adequate information, since all their work is custom (to specs) – though MWBE office better than ever before.
- Because they are a small business, they don't have the ability to satisfy all requests on a proposal as a large company could.
- Small companies are not financially equipped for larger bids so they can't go in as a prime—they need to partner
- They get undercut by so much \$, they figure the contract awards are predetermined. Bidding is very cut-throat—almost impossible to get in.
- State has not identified artwork as a need yet. She would like to supply art and sculpture to the Dome and Convention Center.
- They never get bid notifications from the state.
- They are a small software company, so they to be automatically disqualified. Jobs usually go to large firms.
- They are not listed in the correct category. There is a bug in the IDOA system, listing companies based on the last bid, not on their business category.
- You are not a known commodity until you have been awarded a contract. You need recognition.

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

- If you are not a union shop, you can not get work on a union awarded contract. This is discriminatory and should not be allowed by the state.
- INDOT should correct the union vs. non-union issue. This overrules the m/wbe program. This is supposed to be a right to work state.

Companies Conducting Business as Subcontractors

14. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING MARKETING TECHNIQUES HAVE YOU EMPLOYED TO OBTAIN STATE SUBCONTRACTS?

“OTHER” COMMENTS

- Word of mouth
- Networking
- Networking
- They get the state newsletter
- They get faxed info on upcoming contracts
- She has access to the “plan rooms” to see the jobs coming up
- Indianapolis BAR, Recorder

14. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING MARKETING TECHNIQUES HAVE YOU EMPLOYED TO OBTAIN STATE SUBCONTRACTS?

“NONE” COMMENTS

- Have not yet looked into working with the state.
- Have not pursued state business yet.
- Not sought business with Indiana contracts yet.
- INDOT comes to them
- Don't need to do anything—too busy already
- They deal directly with prime vendors
- Too small a company—no one available to go out and solicit state business
- They are only certified to help their existing clients
- Most job opportunities emailed to them do not apply to their work

16. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN LISTED AS THE SUBCONTRACTOR ON AN AWARDED CONTRACT AND NOT PERFORMED THE WORK?

“YES- WHY?” COMMENTS

- Prices were too high; prime contractors changed to different subs with lower prices.
- Listed on contracts as subs without their knowledge.
- The Prime just chose not to use them after they were awarded the contract
- She doesn't know why she wasn't used, but did contact the state about it and apparently nothing was done
- No enforcement by IDOA
- Wilful abuse
- This is getting better—state does call now on awarded bids to see if sub received the work
- State did not get back to her
- Don't know why, but they lost a lot of money
- After they did the bid, the prime said they chose another sub. The state lets them get away with it. This happens 90% of the time they are listed as a sub.
- Contractor said they chose another company, but he thinks they didn't really use any sub—just used their name on the bid
- Although this has never happened to her, she has been asked to be a “fake” many times!!! She refused.
- Scope of project changed
- Prime said it “forgot”
- Her name being used on contracts, even without her permission or knowledge
- Prime didn't order from her
- Assume haven't gotten the contract yet – things move slowly
- Prime didn't get back to us to do the work. They lost some contracts that were quite large.

17. ARE THERE ANY FACTORS THAT INTERFERED WITH YOUR ABILITY TO ATTAIN BUSINESS AS A SUBCONTRACTOR WITH THE STATE OF INDIANA?

- New to the business. Lack of personnel.
- Length of the contract process; complexity.

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- Bias against out-of-state companies.
- Distance from Indiana state business.
- Distance from Indiana.
- In-state business preference keeping her from getting her foot in the door.
- Lack of contracts needing her line of expertise.
- Not yet ready to conduct business for the state.
- Primes don't tend to use subs dealing with his expertise.
- Lack of familiarity with Indiana primes.
- Prequalification problems.
- Primes stay with companies they know. MBEs still excluded for a large part.
- Prequalifications requiring previous work for the state in order to be eligible to work on present or future contracts.
- Size of business.
- Networking difficulties with potential prime contractors; could not find a state facilitator.
- Finances; Bonding capacities.
- Lack of experience knowing how to get state business—need more info and guidelines to obtaining contracts.
- Their commodity does not match what is needed in their locality, by the DOT.
- Their landscaping business does not have power-seeding equipment, which is what is usually needed.
- Can't reach correct person to figure out how to get state business. They have made phone calls to Mickey Mower and Wynn Moses (state rep), but have not had any luck.
- Work awarded is not based on WBE, it is solely of low price and qualifications
- Unions hold them back—this wbe is not in the Union. She doesn't get work unless the Unions are too busy
- Need to tell the State not to require Union workers for subs
- They need to know who the Prime vendors for the state are, in their area of the state
- A small company can only do small jobs
- Can't get insurance for large jobs, so are left out
- Process should be made easier for small business. Networking is crucial and small companies don't have this time/resources
- Company too small to compete. Need to be low-bidder regardless of certification
- Need to be low-bidder regardless of certification
- Some Primes are 'good-ole-boys' that don't want a WBE company for a sub
- State pays too slowly—often 120 days. If primes don't get paid, then subs don't get paid. She has lost a lot of \$ because of this
- Often the prime contractor only gives them 2 days to prepare for a bid, which isn't enough time. That is how they get away with saying there are no available m/wbe subs.
- IDOA shouldn't allow primes to change the use of the sub from what was on the contract bid
- Can't seem to get started with the state of Indiana, however, they get plenty of business with Kentucky. Why is that?
- Unions!!!
- Primes call 3 hrs before a bid is due on purpose, so you can't accept—don't have time.
- A m/wbe may be on the initial contract, but then they put a change order thru, which does not have to have m/wbe participation
- Too political
- Still not paid—over 45 days.
- More trouble than it's worth to do state business—too much red tape
- They can't always make the right contact to know what business is available; don't always know when the bid meetings occur
- They need to develop relationships with primes
- Just received certification
- Pre-existing relationships or other companies more knowledgeable when certain subcontracts go to others -- In this company's case, there was no bidding for subcontracting, but company was subcontracted for a specific dollar amount; actual business far exceeded that amount.
- Not aware of subcontracts for this business in its area – lots of road work notices, but all for north and central IN, not SE.
- No time to sit with the powers that be.
- Trucking they do is general hauling, not construction
- Info from primes comes two days before due. Trying to be better prepared.
- Don't hear about options
- Most work is for landlords directly, rather than the state.
- Lack of work requests for their services - Can't imagine, given documentation, that solicitations are less targeted.
- Not an effect of cert. – Certified 5 months ago, no effect either way.
- Awareness of opportunities – find out too late
- Time consuming - not worth the effort; made more difficult with INDOT prequalification – lots of extra work, without much benefit
- Easier to get private contracts
- Lack of prime interest
- One solicitation from a prison, then changed employees and contractor didn't follow up

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- Distance from Indianapolis - in southern Indiana, so; one of few certified in field; if could joint venture with someone in Indianapolis would
- Difficult to find opportunities in her field; if were more opportunities would be more worthwhile to look
- Difficult to attend Indianapolis sessions – 2 hours away
- Bonding
- Don't know about bids – emails from city of Indianapolis works, but not from the state. Was on service to find relevant bids, but that was too expensive
- If a commodity is included in a bid, that is what is subbed out, not the professional service
- Don't know why – no explanation provided
- No – been requested as subcontractor, but the prime didn't get the contract
- Hide and seek in terms of website – website not very navigable; takes time to go through all the docs to find out scope of work and if relevant to own business – not user friendly
- Trying to find enough working capital
- Need connections to get a job – Good ole boys network up here – close to Chicago; best opportunities with the Federal National Guard
- We don't see solicitations related to our line of business
- It's hard – big companies know everybody
- We're too expensive
- Not aware of any
- She furnishes materials – not the right fit
- Submitted proposals, but they are non-union – and union primes won't use non-union subs. Why can primes eliminate non-unions – if do so, that should be included in the contract bid - not using non-union is a violation of participation goal
- Too small; big RFPs for asbestos inspectors – no way to get to local contracts on the system, which is what her company could do; used to review Internet solicitations, but not anymore – not worth it since can't get the contracts
- One time, she bid 10,000 cheaper than posted bid – called and told “we'll check on it”
- With new state effort on using MWBEs they are getting more solicitations
- Credit limit
- Not sure why – state asks someone else to fulfill
- Not pursued state work because so much paperwork that is repetitive!
- Knowledge of how to get in contact with companies and RFP, bids, whole system
- Changes coming in case management – said to be on back burner for now
- New and narrow niche – categorizations too broad – no category for computer forensics
- Still working on getting list of contractors
- A lot of door knocking/calls – interested in partnering as WBE – some not interested at all, others are helpful an work with us; need increased comfort with primes – need to get foot in door with primes
- Not knowing who primes are
- Looking for ways to diversify client base towards private pay, social security, because state moving to RFP for case management
- Better knowledge of process
- OK, once you are known to the primes.
- Seems to be political
- Don't fit into a category – for permitting; talked to Claudia Cummings, but nothing changed; people can't look her up in current systems
- State has own print shop, so difficult to get business from state
- Only 24 hours in a day and long distance
- Just getting to the right proposals; difficult to find out who to contact – will have opportunity to make contacts at pre-bid meeting already scheduled
- Need to find out who the primes are that are getting state business – and finding the time to do it
- Being new – one year old; starting to see people are calling them. First year focused on getting name out and marketing – plus pre-bid meetings are focused on construction, not professional services
- Opposed to subcontracting on affirmative action issues, but decided others with less experience were exploiting MWBE, so they would too. Got first sub contract to start in summer 06.
- Agencies don't take her seriously – in business 20 years – fill out forms, but no call backs; faxes come 1-2 days before a bid due; one even came two days after bid due; she has been included on contracts without being asked!
- Not yet- just certified in Jan. 06
- Type of work (site development) not road projects
- Too busy with other sectors so far
- Contractors bid, but subs never know if contract is awarded or not. Did receive a letter from IDOA on a prime that had listed her company she had not even submitted a bid
- Listed as a sub 4-5 times, but never hear back – signed good faith agreement; don't know if prime got contract or not. Feel like she is just being used – She has never met any of the primes, but has to trust them, but don't know if telling the truth
- Not relevant – got certification because work with low-income tax properties – she doesn't try to get state business
- Niche (non-emergency medical transport) narrow – fair at Govt Center 05 not helpful as result

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- Submitted professional services bulletins – no requirement for MWBE participation – got nowhere – now have goals, but bulletins don't include her kind of work – civil engineering – before bidding on construction engineering items and site utility work – but primes have their own equipment so no need for that area. So got out of construction and went to nursing school, and then changed company to consulting – still difficult
- Not able to compete on price with larger companies – bigger companies own asphalt plants so they have cheaper pricing – state needs to set aside jobs, otherwise just talking.
- Primes asking for pricing – but as small business prices are higher, but the big companies get to say they have contacted MBE.
- Too early to know
- Don't know what to do – WBE not helped – talked with Claudia – told to register with IPW (pre-certified) – turned down in the past because of bonding; then told to tell state only registering as a subcontractor – oh, ok, think can do that. Filled out form, told have to type out because using computer jumped the page number from bottom of one page to top of next; so did this and sent it in just this week – asking herself – is all this supposed to help?
- Local DNR parks deal with contractors directly and prisoners do all construction work for 15 years in parks.
- Primes haven't given him jobs – Big boys have volume and low mark up; subs have higher costs – not same advantages – priced out of contract; if under bid then lost because of money, if lowest bid gets job, will make up with other items – don't have same opportunity as a prime
- A few contacted us – but use us to get MWBE participation;
- Accepted bids are so low, figure must be rigged
- Realize state effort for MWBEs, but matter of timing – consulting, not construction or office supplies; state effort of out their structure
- What state willing to pay is too low for staff salaries – and state requires additional staff training – not cost effective for them
- The certification process takes too long
- You have to be known to get in—select contractors get the jobs. Why are companies asked to bid and then rejected because they haven't done state business before?
- Being forced to hire a m/wbe gives these companies a chance

Minority and Women Owned Businesses

19. DO YOU THINK CERTIFICATION HAS AN EFFECT ON THE ABILITY OF YOUR COMPANY TO COMPETE WITH OTHER BUSINESSES?

“NO; WHY NOT?” COMMENTS

- There is still a threshold to be overcome. Amount of business with the state depends on the company's adeptness at moving through the contract process.
- Have not seen any advantages.
- Have not seen an effect yet.
- It's a formality. Hasn't really had an effect.
- Have not seen an effect as of yet.
- Have not received any preferential treatment.
- Just have to be competitive; a lot of second tier marketing going on.
- Minority certification has just not influenced peoples' minds about doing business with her company.
- No contracts in his area.
- No real push by the state to use minority suppliers.
- They don't know it; waivers.
- Business depends on the majority firms and on the government pressure utilized.
- Reward is too small for large amount of work
- They do work with local firms anyway, no need to be certified
- Certification is very little help
- Certification is only one little “plus”—you have to have all of the qualifications for your industry and that is why you are hired
- Too much work to obtain state contracts
- Certification is a slow process
- Helps if you are a sub, but not if you are a prime
- (in another industry), helps as a prime, but not as a sub
- No, haven't received any work from it
- They would have the same business anyway
- Too small to compete with large companies. State should assist or no reason to have small companies certified.
- Never got bids because he is not 'local'—politics involved
- Nothing has changed
- Not yet—out of state companies don't seem to recognize the WBE status
- Helps only with non-state jobs

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- Hasn't helped them in any way yet
- No the state does not fulfill their requirements and does not care
- Price matters more than certification
- Certification nice, but still have to go through the same channels...still need to be competitive
- No business gained
- Yes, but most clients don't care; don't rely on it; helps in airport as contractors won't use subs unless required
- Neutral – hasn't hurt or helped
- Haven't seen anything about what she can go after (nursing)
- Haven't received any jobs
- See no effect
- No results - lots of notices that need MWBE, but no positive outcomes
- Hasn't helped
- Private organizations don't care about certification – they mostly care about bonding and insurance; some larger corporations (Duke, ACORN) like to see certification
- Nothing to do with ability to do the job
- Not helped or hurt
- No gain as a result of certification – certification isn't determining quality to get business
- Not in his market
- It's politics
- They have no competition, but MWBE is a great program
- Hard work and reputation matters, not certification
- Fancy title – MWBE, DBE, etc. but can do without titles – bad label or help? Government requirements – rather not have label and be best for job (like today's Scarlet Letter)
- Not realized the effect – have to work harder
- Thought it would help, but it hasn't
- No influence – doesn't mean anything – may say want percentage but in the end it is all price
- No – competitors in case management have to be certified too
- No – done nothing
- Usually benefits the state (fulfills their participation rates), not their business
- No effect yet
- Used up a lot of time to certify – with no benefits – no participation in anything resulted; a feel good program – designed to make MWBEs feel they are in the system, but a sham, smoke and mirrors
- If listed as permits, then would get calls; vendors who use her don't think of her as a WBE, based on merit
- Very small co – been to a couple networking sessions, enjoyable, but not fruitful; casinos too far away; in business before certification
- Haven't found right place to use it; not had impact had hoped for – thought state would help get her business over the hump
- Regulations help, but have to be "fair" – w/o MWBEs, old boys' network would continue
- Not so far
- Primes in Indiana have never contacted us to partner on work (out of state business)
- Most don't know about certification – it is more about how to present the business and sell self
- Would like to think so, but the more get into it, the differences between primes and sub a problem (MWBEs having to find subs to make participation)
- Been in business 37 years, so well established
- Not sure – waiting to see
- Would like to think so for all the work did for certification, but haven't seen it yet
- We just do our work – certification doesn't affect that
- So unique – the only one who does what she does; she has certification because companies like to say she is WBE
- Certification has had no benefit
- Received contract before had certification
- Did same thing before certified – seems to be no incentive for certification
- No effect so far – not one job
- Certification not an issue in most business – only used for quotes to the state (25% of business)
- Not so far – no work from it – Fedders – large job IPFW – they don't care about MWBE – only look at low dollar
- When it works, it would be helpful; but if do the work and then the prime doesn't give you the work, it is not helpful. Certification is sometimes a hindrance; just wants to go after business
- MBE, but not getting work; even goals not important because of good faith effort – if I am high on items, then prime doesn't have to use – defeats certification. Same crews, same jobs, but MWBE – add MBE %age to trucking, hourly wage, not giving MBE chance to work
- Work in private sector and it doesn't seem to matter
- Only one who does what he does – no competition; first focus was qualified and good at job; occasionally an advantage – but not what always gets us hired (MWBE goals)
- 1 prime called back – fraudulent because promo travel materials, where use comes in later

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- M/WBEs are supposed to have advantages, but not sure that happens. There tends to be a weeding out process that excludes m/WBEs.
- Not yet, but recently certified. The primes complain about the m/wbe requirements.

21. WHAT ARE THE OBSTACLES YOUR FIRM FACES IN THE STATE OF INDIANA CONTRACTING PROCESS?

- Process needs to be simplified. Amount of paperwork.
- Cumbersome processes; paperwork requirements.
- There is still a decided advantage going to medium to large companies over small companies.
- State does not seem to want to do business with smaller businesses.
- Out of state firms receive less information about upcoming Indiana contracts.
- Distance.
- Distance from Indiana.
- No offices in Indiana.
- Distance from market.
- Out of state companies are handicapped in the bidding process: 10% in-state preference.
- Preference given to in-state companies. No office in Indiana.
- Information on state contracts is less than clear on the internet.
- Not politically connected. Does not have the ear of the decision makers. Does not make big donations. Her business is registered as professional, but contractors are not made aware of that status.
- Dealing with the minority office of the IDOA. Poor communication about certification renewal; other problems with the Indiana contract process.
- Lack of personnel.
- Her line of work is not usually sought after in state contracts.
- Lack of relevant contracts: There seems to be a focus on food products and construction in state contracts.
- Her specialization will never be utilized in any state contracts unless the government opens up its own casinos.
- Lack of understanding of the process.
- Building relationships with other businesses and the state.
- Having to float services for the state/prime contractor, with the delays on payments, was hard on the business.
- Not having access to key decision makers. Not getting informed about upcoming contracts/RFPs in time to prepare for them.
- Hard to get into the state contracting network. Companies work with who they know.
- Ensuring companies comply with requirements of the state.
- Time delay in going through the contract process.
- No standard categories exist that cover their obscure services, so they are not sought after.
- Lack of personnel/time to prepare bids, proposals.
- Lack of knowledge of the process.
- Small capability; Lack of exposure.
- Making contact with majority firms; marketing.
- Awards of contracts or subcontracting, based on past performance, hinders newer companies from getting involved in state work.
- Lack of resources to attend meetings, prepare bid packages.
- You have to be 'in the loop'. Helps to be in the NAWBO org and in an Outreach program.
- State doesn't update the company info often enough. Their phone & address had changed and took a long time to get it updated, preventing them from being reached.
- Her bids are always too high to get the work. Bids go to low-bid regardless of certification.
- Certification process is too painful, takes too long and have to submit too much information
- Prime vendors can meet their m/wbe goals in other ways—don't need to use subs
- Too complicated to become certified/ takes too long
- Don't know how to get on the "procurement list"
- She may not have spent enough time to understand the whole process, but it should be explained to newly certified companies.
- They were actually able to get a big job when the salesman identified them as a wbe, but this did not come thru the state.
- No obstacles but certification is only a "plus"—they have good quality
- Time-consuming to get certified (this is a recent certification); required to turn in 2 binders of info—had to hire an attorney.
- Too much work
- Their only local contract used a painting company out of Chicago instead of them—this isn't right, and they got away with it.
- In smaller communities, Primes are 'let off the hook' when there aren't enough m/wbe firms in the area, even though one of them could do the job
- Primes use who they want to use, regardless of m/wbe status
- Why don't all contracts require minority sub participation?
- Wish goals were higher for m/wbe participation
- Low bid is more important than certification
- Firms that aren't local have to include shipping charges which price them out of competition

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- Too political—decision is made prior to bidding process
- Can't afford union wages—contracts have all been union
- State is making changes in her area of business (disabilities), so there is only 1 provider for case management. She will have to work for this provider or not do state business. This will put people out of work.
- She is often asked to submit bids, but then never hears back from the state
- Just time and effort
- Price/low-bid is more important than certification
- Being certified has only helped them in non-state work
- Contractors prefer to sub out to people they know as opposed to picking from the m/wbe list
- It is a 'man's world' in construction industry and hard for WBEs to get work
- The M/WBE list classifications need to be improved and more detailed, for the sake of both primes and subs. They get too many emails for regular printing when all they so is screen printing.
- It is difficult finding out the status of bids
- Too small to compete with large companies that always get the jobs
- Bids are awarded to vendors even though their product does not meet specifications
- Being a private business is an obstacle when dealing with FSSA and DHHS depts.—they want to work with non-for-profit organizations for contracts. (this was for an interpreter for the deaf)
- Some people abuse the m/wbe certification, i.e. not really owned by a minority.
- Too soon in the process to tell—new to the program
- Certification cost them \$5,000 and has meant nothing to the state.
- Small companies can't do large quantity purchasing, so they can't compete on price with the large companies who can afford this
- The networking software is not user friendly
- Unions threaten her and want her to join and pay dues.
- Many m/wbe's are not true minorities
- The primes don't always use m/wbe subs now, even with the goals. They know how to get around it.
- Primes use the companies they are familiar with for subs, regardless of their certification.
- Communication with the state is a problem—hard to get 'in the loop'
- Once certified shouldn't have to prove it on each bid.
- RFQ for Enviro Agency– 7 pages, then rescinded; refaxed next day w/ date of submission changed by one day – ludicrous.
- State does not tell subcontractor if contract has been awarded, after spent much time and effort to make submission.
- Process goes on and on; who has time for it?
- Just getting started
- Quoting off the internet is futility – as a bidder among 20. Company chooses not to compete in this arena
- Not having contracts available in SE IN.
- Not being aware of opportunities
- None – just do good work and provide good service
- Not big enough to move around – to staff what state looks for in big companies. Cut the hoops and jumps for small businesses would be great. Process focused on big companies which hurts small businesses of all kinds (not just MWBE)
- Getting to know how system works. Gone to networking meetings, but they were focused on construction, not hauling freight
- Getting better – no longer so Indianapolis focused – more outreach is happening to N. Indiana...Still needs to get better.
- None at moment
- Finding the right connections – hear of others getting contracts.
- Pricing too high for bids
- Do not have a lot of trucks available to get contracts.
- In two years, increase awareness and build relationships between sub & prime.
- Getting past the good ole boys – especially in out-of-state
- Understanding how the whole process works. How to be more efficient – need to find out who to work with and which paperwork is worth doing
- Haven't tried
- Size; certification is weak help
- All of it – not given a fair chance, bids are not looked at fairly
- Process made complicated; contracts issued are so huge, MWBE small firms can't get them; ought to allow two or three companies to join together (one take lead, others as subs) to submit bid – would allow more instate firms, since many large firms are out of state
- Good ole' boy network
- Her services – nursing – are not on the Internet
- Better pricing for larger firms – lost out often because not getting same pricing for supplies as larger competition
- Hard to find info on contracts
- Not enough opportunities to be a prime
- Don't know where to search for opportunities
- Huge obstacle: bids are more geared for larger companies
- None – just competition which isn't an obstacle – just the way it is, American way

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- Not part of the good ole boy network
- Difficult for MBE to branch out of Lake County – professional services contracts awarded very politically
- Didn't contract with the prime that won the contract
- Lots of phone calls from primes just trying to meet quota – he will take time to get estimates for primes, but no jobs ever come of the process
- None really – had good luck, because know the system – started company Aug 23, 05, certification filed Sept 14, approved Oct 28, and bid immediately – 8 bids since
- Getting name out – the opportunity to bid
- How to make sense of process – being smaller, how to integrate with larger companies
- None – since got into casinos first, haven't pursued state contracts yet
- Lengthy process to submit bids as prime – bond money requirements, resources to respond is deterrent for SBs overall – sucks up all resources and low probability of getting contract; subcontracting works better for small organizations
- Need better means of finding what opportunities are available
- Matter of identifying right bid – watching and then being able to be competitive
- Good ole boys network – she's not local, no family ties to community – those ties especially important in contracting in northwest Ind.
- The ability to capture the right type of bid requests
- Our time – lengthy but not really difficult – Plainer English and getting to what state wants faster would help (a lot of bureaucracy) – 3 weeks of work to get bid done – also, it is like shooting in the dark
- None - have not tried
- Cumbersome for small businesses without a lot of resources – difficult
- Bonding
- Being competitive in price and most primes do not use MBEs
- State doesn't do work, this person is interested in; and pay
- State not open to non-Indianapolis companies – knows two WBEs who gave an address of someone in Indianapolis or opened an office there and got business from the state
- None – just need to get out to get more business
- Repairs are not put out for bids
- Some bids seem to have inside track – bid process not functional because some have internal contacts – underhanded – was low on 3 bids, each time city had reason not to go forth with project to keep blacks from getting work – excuses don't add up on merits
- Too small plus insurance – dollar limits too high - \$5m for a \$7000 job is too expensive – carry \$1-2m
- Buddy System
- Trying to find quality MBE/WBE participants – difficult to find MBEs who are interested; did find some but it took time
- Would like state to have a line in specs “equal to or better” – would open doors and opportunity, since can't get fair pricing from vendor if have to have specific item (brand name, specs, etc.)
- Front end – length of time from bid to award to notice to proceed; contract side – waiting 180 days to get paid – could go out of business in that time
- Just getting known
- Competition against big companies – just want a small piece
- Complexity
- Don't know – no opportunity to bid
- Design services decided way ahead – not advertised and they go to large firms. Look at who is working with large companies and it is with new minorities that they have set up – politically connected – so that there is a direct link between prime and specific minorities; also a lot of WBEs are male companies with wife listed as owner, but does no work--- so why fight a losing battle?
- Understanding bid process and if don't do everything right then end up late – small company can't afford to pay someone to know what state wants you to do
- State says company is too small – she doesn't think so
- Bids go to same people – hard to break into that network; bids have inaccurate info and info that is very specific, especially in safety supplies, hard to get part numbers
- Getting past the good ole boy network – other businesses out of state, not necessarily Indiana businesses
- Competitive – slow, not started yet; others more established get the business; doesn't have a market that state seeks out much
- Would like to be notified when bids in her field come up
- Wondering about RFP results in case management – shift to one contractor for all cases, and others will then sub or go out of state business
- System not set up for small businesses – don't see how linking between prime and sub happens – so seems like “magic”
- Still learning how to access systems and right people
- Small business getting involved with moderate to large companies; bids over \$100,000 are too big for his company – can't compete with larger companies
- None that know of
- Primes don't want to pay the subs – before (contracting) or after they do the work

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- Certification process needs to be less cumbersome – why need husband's tax returns? She's not associated with the business; still helpful to have gone through the process to be certified
- Impressed with amount of communication, but do get a lot of info
- Named person in north Indiana who never returned her phone calls on Gov's commission – tried to get in touch to talk about issues, but if no call back, hard to do
- Cumbersome process, especially for one not trained in business (is a care giver)
- New process of going with larger companies for case management not necessarily the best – sees the high turnover and things get overlooked
- Being aware of /trying to find out about info on up coming bids
- Politics – seem to go out of state, no seeming preference for instate
- Thinks state looking for minority not women businesses
- Need category for what she does; will keep certification with hope that someday change in categories will happen
- Haven't aggressively gone into Indiana, so can't say (out of state business)
- Can't get to bids – trying for a year - getting mad and questioning what is going on
- Communication and coordination – getting hold of people: process goes like this: website to phone message to voicemail to no call backs; when finally get a voice, that person no longer covers that area
- Knowing who to call, contact; still listed as construction but really service too – install and repair; it is like a maze, one step forward, three steps back
- Long distance – out of state business
- Should focus on good old boy network and not punish MWBEs by making them subcontract out to other MWBEs
- Just certified in O5, so young – don't know yet. Don't have the funding – cash flow and bonding.
- Had low prices and not gotten the bids – don't know what the competition is or if it is the good old boys network at work
- Auto detailing company that is woman owned – a lot of people making contract decisions are men – thinks certification will help
- WBE should not need to find subs as well to make participation – it further complicates the ability of MWBEs to participate in those projects, because so few MBE printers out there, especially when looking for good quality work; should be able to submit a bid as WBE that fulfills the 10% requirement
- Location (Lake Co) and lack of recognition - far from Indy and Chicago pull; plus Lake Co corrupt – good old boys
- Not sure
- Knowing things before they go public, because once they are public, usually only one or two companies have possibility to win
- One with certification – just being competitive and doing a good job
- Nothing to protect MBE when change rules mid-process to give contracts to preferred non-MBE contractors
- Spent so much time on state bids that lost work; sees certification as a problem, so got out
- Racism
- Most want more trucks than she has now – too small; cash flow; so not competitive yet
- Haven't been lucky yet
- Just finding out about opportunities
- Trying to figure out how to provide value add (trees, nursery) by supplying materials for someone else to install, given the environment – haven't found it yet
- Bid bonds – Buy Indiana – their company probably will open a site in Indiana, but then Buy Indiana requirements are that 75% of payroll must be in Indiana – so difficult; will have to open a new company and get newly certified – so more hoops, and looks like only in business for 4 months when really 12 years
- Process has worked, but no follow-up – if she told when primes get contract then she could follow up with prime and on good faith agreement signed between sub and prime
- Not relevant – haven't tried
- Difficult to get business; if company looking for certification, it helps, but otherwise, no.
- Just job timing – one has to start when another is ending for her to take the jobs
- So many certifications necessary – with percentage of participation and all take time
- DBE/WBE means nothing – slightly better chance than non D – and still a lot of work; making others believe it is still the old boys network
- Pricing – tighten up on primes and do set asides (e.g. – crack sealing – saw state doing it and not doing it well since it is not really what they do – should contract out smaller pieces such as crack sealing for MWBEs)
- Certification is biggest hurdle now done, but not getting lots of jobs because of bonding
- Requirement to subcontract when small and a very specific skill
- WBE doesn't matter if only real value is low dollar. Another contract – hired with Mexican labor (out of state) – she is union – show tried to get MWBE – agent ok on trying, but she doesn't get any work
- Not Indiana-based company, so don't get the Indiana address privileges; can't afford an Indiana office, but so close to Indiana and yet so difficult to get work from the state
- Pleased in past two years – state is really helping with networking, meetings; just now going to pursue this area, so we'll see; 9.5 years in business, generally been called for business, haven't had to go out for it.
- Wonders why he keeps certification – not useful, but maybe it will make a difference some day
- Only use because have to –too many think MWBE means bad quality
- Time

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

- Not well enough connected to be approached early enough
- No info on how system works
- Mountain of paper work
- Subcontractors if bid more than \$100k have to be pre-qualified by state INDot – not true in other states (even as subcontractors)
- Should raise money bar for prequalification
- Getting to the right people and getting them to know about us – identified as subcontractor. submit letter with prime contractor., but not notified who winds prime contract so never know if included or not in contract
- The obstacle is not knowing about contracts, esp. the smaller ones.
- The m/wbe percentages on state contracts are too small.
- Being a wbe is an obstacle—women in this field construction) are still perceived as not being able to get the job done.
- Only difficulty is getting M/WBE subcontracting on their own QPAs
- Being a small company with only so much funding
- No obstacles for them—the state fairgrounds has a process that works.
- They lose jobs because they are union
- Can't get in front of anyone face to face, to be considered for Convention Center work
- Just the learning curve for a new company.
- Individual purchasers don't seem as concerned about meeting goals as the state is.
- Too much paperwork involved, and much is repetitious

**22. DO YOU THINK CERTIFICATION OF MINORITY AND WOMEN OWNED BUSINESSES WITH THE STATE OF INDIANA GIVES THOSE BUSINESSES A COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE?
“YES” COMMENTS**

- M/wbe's are suppose to get a 15% advantage
- M/wbe's often have “fake” minority owners

**22. DO YOU THINK CERTIFICATION OF MINORITY AND WOMEN OWNED BUSINESSES WITH THE STATE OF INDIANA GIVES THOSE BUSINESSES A COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE?
“NO” COMMENTS**

- Not in this business(forklift sales)
- No-don't think so, but don't really know for sure

23. WHAT ARE THE OBSTACLES YOUR FIRM FACES IN THE STATE OF INDIANA CONTRACTING PROCESS?

- Copies of POs from the state were delayed 6 months, and received after the work was already completed.

Final Question (All Businesses and Agencies)

28. IS THERE ANYTHING THAT WE HAVE NOT COVERED THAT YOU FEEL WILL BE HELPFUL TO THIS STUDY? DESCRIBE?

- The state needs to condense the requirements of a bid package into checklists included in the bid package
- The state should continue to offer opportunities for education about the state contracting process, but also should increase/expand the locations where the education is provided.
- More branching out in state contracts needed; more education/mentoring of subs in the contracting process needed.
- More education needed about the contracting process.
- Minority companies need to educate themselves & learn the rules of the game.
- Tougher rule enforcement by the state is needed in the contracting process.
- The opportunities are there. However, the majority of minority claims are small. More education/training/workshops are needed on how to get involved in state contracts. Small firms in general also need help/training in managing contracts after they are awarded them.
- Capacity of MBEs needs more work to determine true number of MBEs capable and willing to do business with the state. The state needs to conduct outreach programs or workshops to educate minority business owners about certification.
- State should increase minority participation requirements.
- Indiana needs to increase minority participation. More communication is needed by Indiana with out-of-state companies.
- It would be valuable to know the distribution of awarded contracts based on company size.
- It would be helpful for the compositions of the companies and their awarded contracts to be published & made available.

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- Would like the state to make available a list of the prices they are paying for each service or product in their awarded contracts.
- The state should institute a separation of the available contracts to different groups of companies based on company size.
- Increase/improve communication/information on available contracts.
- The state needs to be more proactive in getting contract info out to small businesses.
- Certification allows her to compete, forces companies to take a look at her business.
- Break up the larger bids into smaller contracts.
- Making the move to DesignBuild would be a bad move: Would cut out smaller businesses even more.
- Reverse auctions are also a bad process: Proposals sent online where bidders see opposing bid prices causes a bidding war which would equal lower prices, but would also be more likely to equal lower quality of work as well as hurt the smaller companies.
- The State needs to improve classifications of services/products provided by companies.
- Some effort needed in placing companies under correct categories. His company is listed under construction when they provide a professional service.
- The reason they pursued certification in Indiana was per a customer/client's request to help them fulfill their minority participation requirements.
- Reasons for not pursuing prime contracting: Concerned about the inconsistency in timing of payments from the state; Concerned about the amount of risk involved.
- The fact that Indiana does not use Fuel Cost adjustments and it should.
- MBE certification hurts just as often as it helps. Indiana primes feel that MBEs should work for less. Certification has also become a prerequisite for doing business with the state if you are a minority business.
- Emails/alerts could be sent out to companies about available/upcoming contracts that are relevant to their business.
- M/WBE goals have had a positive effect in spreading state money out to more/smaller companies.
- The issue that the state needs to enforce the prime contractors' use of the companies listed as subs on the contracts.
- MBEs are still not getting work despite state requirements.
- Verification/Enforcement is needed that Prime contractors are using the subs they list in their contracts.
- Reduction in paperwork needed.
- Question to be asked of prime contractors: What percent of the contracts for prime contractors, in the private sector, goes to minority business?
- Minorities hold many political positions, little economic power.
- Participation goals are still too low. No accountability in the contracting process. The system is corrupt.
- Time delay in contract process basically asking contracted companies to float services for the state.
- Force Indiana corporations to purchase supplies in-state/from Indiana companies- especially in Public utilities. Minority = not qualified to many businesses and state officials. Contributions are expected by state officials in order to get awarded work/contracts. Refusal to cooperate with this has prevented them from getting any contracts.
- Centralized vs. Decentralized contracts: Decentralization would help smaller companies; Example: More than one contract dealing with telecommunication would allow more companies to compete for business with the state.
- Increase capacity of minority/women owned firms that majority firms can/should look to for subcontracting.
- More time and effort put into preparing RFPs, ensuring relevant and applicable information included.
- Need to differentiate between procurement/construction and professional service in solicitation processes. More advance warning/info needed for professional service contracts.
- The state needs to do more for the small businesses; they are the engine of the economy.
- White women(WBEs) are doing more business(subcontracting) than MBEs. Contractors are not paying subcontractors on time/at all in many cases.
- Placed as subs on bids without their knowledge. Met with Claudia and the DOA MBE Department to discuss both how this happened and how to prevent this from happening again.
- Make prebid conferences mandatory. Primes receive contracts without attending the meetings.
- Businesses should not be awarded contracts without MBE/WBE participation.(Period!)
- Before recertification, MBEs should be questioned about ever having done business with the state, what amount, and which contracts.
- Took too long to get certified, but this was fixed by Claudia Cummings. Earl Morgan was also helpful.
- Took too long to get certified.
- They can get bids in Georgia, but not in Indiana! They need more info on who is in charge of the bidding.
- When they get letters from the Prime Vendors, they are very vague in their needs. State should require more specifics to save time and money.
- The State's Supportive Services are important to them.
- The Airport exemplifies the best use of minority and women owned businesses.
- She would like the State to have a meeting only for WBEs to see if everyone is having the same problems and get them addressed.
- It is felt that the Primes use MBEs totally over WBEs, whenever possible.
- Use of small businesses is not promoted enough: for ex., the 15% "set aside" to reduce the bid down 15% for small companies to compete is no longer being done; RFQs require 80% of the work done by yourself preventing a small company from getting the work
- Difficult for a supplier to get minority participation via the supplier route

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- State programs are fine
- New m/wbes will need help getting jobs/will need more support from IDOA
- Wondering how many other states require m/wbe certification, because it does not do them any good outside of IN
- For casinos, such as Argosy, the state requires an m/wbe sub, but they go outside the state or they use a fake broker "front" company that is certified so they still get the credit for using an m/wbe sub but in reality, it isn't happening, and local state m/wbes are losing out. The state knows this is going on and lets it happen.
- The state has a good minority program and tries to do a good job, but wish they would force the Primes to adhere to the goals/requirements for using minority subs
- Small companies can't compete price-wise
- Certification has given her small company more exposure
- The minority plan looks good on paper—hope it really works. They are a new company.
- The state needs to force the Primes to adhere to the m/wbe rules.
- Slow cash flow from the state makes it difficult for small companies to do business with them.
- Bids are awarded to out of state vendors
- Some state depts. (FSSA, DHHS, DNR) are informing contractors that the next contract will only be opened to non-for-profit organizations. This will eliminate a good portion of the m/wbes.
- Slow cash flow from state is a problem for small companies
- IDOA should enforce m/wbe reqmts with the Prime vendors—not fair to small m/wbe companies
- Web site needs to be better targeted for specific company categories
- They are frustrated that even though they are an m/wbe prime, they still have to sub out to other m/wbe companies, often to a competitor. They get no credit for being an m/wbe, even though the state gets credit for their m/wbe requirements with the federal government by using them.
- Small companies can not work on large contracts and now many small contracts are being lumped together into 1 big contract. This is putting small companies out of business.
- The IDOA must enforce the m/wbe goals if they are going to have them
- Northern companies will call them (a WBE southern company) for contracts knowing full well that they can't come north, just to be able to say they tried to contact a WBE sub and they refused the work. The IDOA then let's them get away with this since they put forth an effort to use a minority sub.
- The DOT is very bad about following the m/wbe goals and the IDOA lets them get away with it
- If the State is serious about assisting m/wbe companies, then they should have a process in place to notify the companies when they have relative jobs/contracts
- The state makes it too hard to work with them. They have to buy samples at high cost and ship them, and then the state doesn't return the samples.
- There are many fake m/wbes that shouldn't be certified—too much corruption. She has tried to talk to the IDOA about this, but nothing changes.
- Unions rule, unless you are a large enough company to compete on your own
- It takes too long for the IDOA to fix the sub problem and then the administration changes and they start over.
- IDOA is moving in a positive direction
- Takes too long to get paid by the state, i.e. over 120 days, but is getting better.
- State has improved in the last 6 months. The system needs to still be more user-friendly for all.
- Happy with certification process (helps with her clients), but too difficult to get state contracts.
- Terms of payment not given – 90 days is long time to float large \$ amounts.
- Frustrations mounted so didn't respond to solicitation; agency called. When said didn't have the item, was told specs did not have to be exact.
- She believes in Buy Indiana, but wishes the state of Indiana would too. Jobs given out of state – lower pricing offset by freight.
- Only certified in 2005 – just getting started. Attending an event in March for the Arena.
- On website – 3500 certifications – have to scroll L/R to see name, then scroll for city, and then what they offer. Contractors won't take time to scroll through to find what they need – confusing and not direct.
- His company not categorized. Should group certifications by industry categories.
- Because name doesn't mean much to most, sort list by service offered and then can work from there.
- Certification is not put out front as much as it should be – not pushed enough.
- Thought hauling freight would fall under state outsourcing, but haven't found own slot yet.
- In Indiana, SOI certification does not count toward National Supplier Development Certification, though other states' certification does count. Why are they not linked in Indiana? Target, Wal-Mart, etc. use NSD cert.
- More info to MWBEs. I shouldn't be so hard to find out participation amounts in bids – official goals and actual usage. This info should be online.
- Just trying to stay in play. State needs to continue to contact small companies and ensure that larger companies are contacting smaller ones. This is in the rules, but state should ensure that rules are not circumvented.
- No bids received as an interior design firm. Done work with state, but through landlords. WMBE office gives different answer each time one calls
- Give more specific info when sign up for certification
- Went to meeting seminar at Barnes & Thornburg when announcement of Buy Indiana. No results.
- Purchasers know about MWBE requirements, but there needs to be pressure put on upper-level management – that is where MWBE contracts don't get fulfilled – when they have to sign off on purchasing contracts.

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- Works with casinos, but otherwise certification hasn't helped as much as thought it would.
- Suggestion: Remove "bulk of business in Indiana" requirement. Now can't get in/a toehold. Practice is discriminatory.
- If DOA analyzed purchases and figured out which could go to small businesses, it would allow the small businesses to compete, because they would have the infrastructure to handle these projects.
- We get the information about networking sessions, but timing does not always work out to attend
- Would like to be able to sit down with someone to learn and understand the process
- Certification last time around was quick and easy....vastly improved over first time. No complaints second time around
- Type of distribution – cigarettes and tobacco wholesale – not a market with the state; if get second business certified, will try to contract with state
- MBE is a sham – go through certification and then it is virtually impossible to attain contracts. A waste of time
- More effort to help MWBEs through business process – how to make proposal, bonding process, getting bids submitted – Only large companies can do all this – a lot of hoops; So a waste of time to spend on proposal when wouldn't be considered much
- Make it easier!
- Should give firms credit for using MWBEs; set asides create toxic relations – should get bonuses for using MWBEs rather than define percentage. Certification leads to resentment by those that are not
- Prequalification is really difficult for small companies – just another hoop, when should be making it easier, especially for Indiana businesses
- People not willing to change – status quo – hard for new companies to get in
- Trying to figure out how WBE works for a health care company – WBE helped with getting local bond bank money, but nothing else – She can't tell why casinos don't contact her -- She figures her services are not listed on the Internet, so she needs to find the need and find the people who have a quota to use her services
- Appreciates greater effort to include more Indiana businesses
- Suggest consider if small MWBE bids within 10 % of low bid (and second) award to MBE because they have to pay more for supplies. E.g. lost one bid by \$29.00
- Appreciates state saying will include MWBEs, but state needs to put more meat behind it. Be serious about enforcing it. If can't perform because of size or whatever, at least let MWBE be supplier.
- Some contractors won't deal with him because he is black; others call because they know he will do the work and is honest
- Since January, received 2" of bids that come in night before or even same day as bid is due, just to get a no so can say tried to get participation
- Make more information available – consulting on contracts would be helpful – person doesn't know where to go, so needs someone to help show what is available, etc.
- Knows others who worked hard to get some business, so assume something is out there; also doesn't believe in women having an advantage, so not really committed to pursuing MWBE jobs, but with the army contract, she need to have certification
- Conduct focus groups – conversations with small businesses to learn more about their experience with the program
- It looks like the MWBE office is really trying
- Have heard from non-MWBEs that the state requires primes to use MWBEs, but if the MWBE does not perform, it is the prime that is fully responsible. State doesn't assess how well MWBE companies perform.
- Organizations in place (IDOA, IBDC?) could do more to help MBEs – don't see them doing much to help MBEs
- State needs to allocate money to assist MBEs - State needs to give MBEs opportunities to show what they can do. Certification ends in May 07, and no contracts yet
- Would like to see small, minority businesses (that are qualified) get more business – not a fair shake for minorities – person named contractors who do not use minority firms
- If not certified, wouldn't be looked at; certification with state took 2 years, took one year w/ Indianapolis
- Bid as subcontractor on DOC faith-based infrastructure, made it through process and was selected – then DOC withdrew RFP – shouldn't release RFP if won't do it, because of all the time to develop a proposal
- Certification only the initial step and then have to market self to contractors. She praised state officials who really help MWBEs, answering questions, etc.
- A lot is political – people have to show soliciting MWBEs, but they don't have to use them – loopholes – irritating, a farce: contracts expensive to bid; information about bid and specs provided only last minute or not at all; process didn't go as told; didn't get follow-up; finally told someone else got it
- Everyone really helpful so far when call with questions
- New administration better than previous administration
- Got certification to go after casinos; got one job so far – a start
- State work based on who one knows and political connections; for small organizations almost impossible to penetrate that barrier; difficult to gain competitive edge against companies with whole departments dedicated to relationship building with politicians and players in contract process; not much different in private sector, but is barrier because is difficult to develop and sustain those relationships going into the RFP.
- Certification process was rigorous and necessary
- In some ways, we made our own problem by having MWBE – if quit labelling would win out eventually – non-MWBEs feel MWBEs get special treatment even if they don't.
- Not off top of head – wished had time to prepare

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- MBEs without a lot of state contracts – an inch thick of paper for one RFP is intimidating, some businesses might decide not to pursue
- Distance is an issue – state focuses on Indianapolis rather than Lake Co. when awarding contracts
- Helpful for MWBEs to have list of state agencies and contact info
- More help from MWBE office on what is available and on what agencies have particular requirements so business can focus/target their efforts more
- Keep up the work – still a ways to go
- In repair/replacement market – state has convoluted system to get to a price – not worth effort; e.g. an inquiry, needs requisition and then bid – so this person is called, gets the information to write the requisition and then the state puts it out to bid using info he has gathered, but he doesn't get the bid necessarily; state talks the talk, but doesn't walk the walk – frustrations for both the prime and MWBE
- Reach out to companies – many select the same ones over and over – comfort level, understandable, but it does not perform up to mission of MWBE
- SCORE – Sr Corps of Retired Executives – excellent resource for Small Bus questions, but not able to answer questions on MWBE
- No business from state – don't know why
- Certification on DBE rejected, told to redo, then couldn't show total control of company because truck came from mentor – misapplication of the law; now DOT controls – 3 years trying for certification, should take 90 days
- Time zone is limiting factor – now always on different time
- Payment process important for small firms ability to do business – other MWBEs say state and primes are slow to pay, so she looks for private sector if she can – MWBEs have to pay workers and supplies, but primes don't pay them promptly
- Would like to see training opportunities for MWBEs – marketing, banking, accounting, government regulation, about how to run a small business
- Does the state mail out bids? We never hear from MWBE people, but we come to events and give out cards –experience and good name, so wonder why never hear
- Designations not clear enough, so get a lot of RFPs that are not relevant, and state sends information certified, so have to wait in line and don't know if information will be relevant or not
- State sent out a letter and email in the fall saying certification renewals would all go through INDOT now – a big mistake! Plus, now have to be precertified by INDOT for their work – includes new accounting stuff; INDOT known for being slow – we just went backwards on how to chose design – now design is at district level – return to good ole boy network
- If have lower price bid, MWBE presumed not to be as qualified as large firm
- Certified in public works, city, state, etc. – how much more do you want? State dictates what can make (being told how much overtime can pay), but won't dictate project moving forward, so with delays, it often means that she can only make half of what she can make if private sector
- Process of renewing too slow – took 22 months (1 ½ years ago), and completed only after outsourced; city took 6 months
- Would like a class offered by the state on how to submit bids and process – not generic, but actually go through process - station by station
- As an example – submitted bid – sent it all back because changed bid process, but didn't get addendum on the change
- Biggest obstacle in state is that most small companies can't afford 90-120 day on payroll – have to pay for material upfront and for labor
- Find ways to help very small companies get contracts
- Been to matchmaking events – talked with primes and repeatedly told too small, yet can't get bigger if no contracts
- Confusing how to obtain info on internet, because so many entities – different agencies – some posted, some don't know how to find – it is almost a full-time job and frustrating when can't find things
- Person does check IDOA website, because lists identify MWBE participation, but asking for heavy equipment or portable toilets, not safety equipment
- Networking events got nowhere – membership in trade organizations doesn't help
- State does good job sending out info on bids, but too much paperwork! – a one-woman business – casinos require a lot less paperwork
- Purchasing people know about MWBE requirements, but need to put pressure on upper-level management – that is where MWBE contracts don't get fulfilled, upper-level management has to sign off on purchasing contracts
- Beginner program for companies that are new to state contracts; assign a mentor/coach to help for a few months as work through process
- Add question to the survey: would you like to be contacted about the results of this survey/study? And take down email address
- Goals give incentive to primes; give MWBEs competitive edge – a good thing
- Not sure of process
- In business 18 years, without MWBE program in first five years, would not have had a chance to build to where company is today. Construction is such an old boys network
- Got certification for casino business
- Everything is great with Indiana – we love Indiana (out of state business)
- Most valuable – networking events led to his leads – event for all types of businesses, only one-two primes in his niche – to improve, suggests doing more specialized networking sessions, then could maximize time
- Difficult to break into primes who have their own MWBEs – difficult for newly certified to get in – been trying for a year

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- If state wants to help MWBEs develop, then concentrate on networking events to bridge gap between primes and subs, because if don't know subs, won't use them
- State doesn't follow through with prime to enforce MWBE policies; primes often refuse to pay the required amounts
- Success outside Indiana, but not in Indiana; state needs to look at goals for Indiana purchasing, if to keep jobs in state (as ads and campaign promises say); but she sees state going out of state even if multiple companies in state can do the work
- Largest client wanted them to get certified, and that client has benefited; program is worthwhile, but their company in business for 22 years, so they haven't really used it
- Heard IN dept of Homeland Security being investigated – wonders if that is why can't get info
- Need system to notify businesses of relevant tenders; on email list for Ireland – gets heads-up emails for relevant tenders; gets more from Ireland than from Indiana
- As a new person, an orientation would be helpful on how to get prequalification (found out from a prime contractor, but the person I was referred to no longer does that); website hard to find info on it; questions on applications – can't find someone to ask
- Got certified because did research in Indianapolis for federal entity and wanted to make sure would have certification if got contract again (out of state company)
- Would like to see more aggressive pairing of primes and MWBEs – impression that primes have their “pet subs” (tokens to get points)
- Concerned – is an international company in E. Europe, Asia, and all over US, in business 17 years, public and private sector, but can't figure out how to get state of Indiana business
- Thought Opportunity Indiana initiative would be the first opportunity to get in – first sessions provided good, solid info and then it turned into a joke – come down from Lake Co. session would last 15 minutes and then leader said we'll send everything else out if packets or we can't say much because all decisions not made. Joke since new administration. Has no sense that state cares about MWBEs. Sent employees to Indy for programs, but recently is a waste of time; She is a woman, Democrat, and from Lake County. No sorting mechanism between bureaucrats and legitimate info to help
- It seems that the state could do a better job of promoting certified businesses, thereby encouraging prime contractors to use M/WBE services.
- Certification has not helped with getting state business, but has helped in manufacturing (Toyota has 10% participation and casinos). She heard Gov. Daniels talk about being open to other vendors – that almost caused her to write him a letter – He has no idea what it is like on the ground! She's been to monthly meetings with contacts in state agencies, requested info, etc. and nothing. Went to traveling state show in Evansville and asked why not getting quotes; she met lots of new contacts that said they would get quotes announcements to her, but then nothing.
- Just bid on an item, but did not get the contract – asked if could find out what the accepted price was. First time person wouldn't tell; second time has received an answer yet. Who gets contracts and at what rate should be public knowledge (knowing rate more important than business name). If she missed a contract by pennies, then she would know it is worth trying again to submit a bid. Without that info, you don't know where you stand
- Entire application process is very confusing – be more clear in questions; the way they are asked often leads to wrong answers; process is discouraging; she kept at it, but others might give up
- Certification has opened doors in DOC; is a useful tool as state is getting more money to make improvements related to MWBE participation – no subcontracts yet, but calls; requiring MWBE participation allows smaller companies to get toe in the door; sees certification as a marketing tool for small companies
- State sponsored marketing events geared to construction services – not professional services
- MBEs should not have to subcontract to other MWBEs
- State should be liable for what happens – if not making info public about what is going on
- State sends out names of MWBE, then contractors contact them, but don't hear back because contractors have the MWBE form for participation; many contractors don't use MWBEs.
- Before certification, she had a lot of work in private sector, then economy weakened, made lots of bids, but no call backs – she couldn't find jobs, because contractors wanted to use her minority status, which meant piecemeal jobs and then using her name
- List companies that submitted bids and their subcontractors – then contractors wouldn't fake subcontractor names
- Invoices – other states assign a project manager to each project who has to approve and oversee work and participation by MWBEs
- Make procurement people more visible and accessible at INDOT and across the board
- WBE office needs more communication and training opportunities about how to get jobs, how to bid, the whole process
- Continue to promote WMBE requirements
- NAIC code does say nursery production, but get a lot of requests for herbicide and fertilizer
- Need to inform subs of awarded contract – otherwise state not being serious – to trust primes! (Primes using database to ID her)
- Heard of another MBE, who was awarded bid at INDOT, and then circumvented when contract pulled back
- Started in business 20 years ago; in 2003-04 certification process was ludicrous – set up for someone who is faking it – trying to buy into business; she couldn't answer a lot of questions because it was 20 years ago when she started her business; seemed easier for MBE to get approval
- State needs to bring more info – pre-bid conferences to southern Indiana – can't drive to Indy for events; be more inclusive – regional – linked to Louisville, but Ky doesn't consider S. Indiana as part of Ky, so in limbo – not seen as part of Indiana or Kentucky

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- Certification has had no benefit.
- Market niche – concession stand – difficult to transfer to the state – works with casinos
- No – the MWBE office is doing a terrific job
- Discouraging – the time and work involved in making proposals and no work comes from it – then think have to get out of state bidding process
- Barrier on professional services – INDOT expects work history with two years – point system stacked against small businesses
- With recertification, company changed name from construction to consulting – name still not changed on system
- INDOT EDI entrepreneurial training session has been wonderful (Five Stars) – Jan to March each year
- Getting solicited for pricing from primes, but not getting the work; Illinois a lot better
- Union is a burden for small company if have to use union then pay prevailing wages then their employees get them and get spoiled. Otherwise, get regular pay – open shop – difficult for small companies to compete and get jobs
- Certification 1st time was a breeze, people nice, received information and responded, could talk to people; before – sent materials into dark hole
- Casinos use us – Horseshoe uses local and WBEs – is good
- Big boys want smaller ones out of business – they could consider as a mentoring process and involve MWBE in project, but they don't – small companies can't bid big projects
- Pepper Chicago used MWBEs – but not Lake Co companies
- Not dug in deep enough yet to know more
- Turned in 45 quotes – primes since Dec, but no calls or info
- Big Boys also MBEs, but not DBE.
- Find ways to ensure MBEs, DBEs get the work
- Re-examine – good faith effort: since Big Boys can always quote lower, send quotes but don't use them – so what good are quotes.
- Now – just paperwork; small co overhead higher, credit line, lower financing rate, greater discounts on rentals, supplies. Concrete \$65/yard, but for them it is \$80/yd, so costs are higher for small businesses.
- Bids need to be more transparent
- RFPs come out late – not enough time for small co to respond (w/ limited staff)
- State shouldn't be relying on relationships – should be fair – lps get out before everyone knows – not fair
- Quote shouldn't be like writing a book
- Need to know the right people – time and energy (devoted people) to write proposals – too much for small company, but if are a sub can't grow co.
- Not good for state because adds costs through middlemen when only big companies can get contracts; should break down contracts to smaller chunks
- Not working – contact her to see if willing to work, given letter (commitment) and never hear back; now she ignores calls coming in
- Should be able to measure WMBE use as subcontractors – subcontractors should be contacted when prime gets a contract (if have letters of commitment in application)
- She did follow-up at the beginning with primes; always told haven't heard; later she'd find out the prime did get the contract; she feels they use her/MWBEs – so now she doesn't respond to requests.
- No balance – something needs to be done – no positive impact until casinos; got 10-15 businesses in area certified; service – not contractors in construction or supply; MWBE program not well focused for services
- Certification process not meant for small 5-10 employee companies, because used and abused by front companies – there fore the process has become too complicated for small companies to complete; nothing in certification for small companies; obligations to contact, so do, but primes don't then work with the MWBEs;
- Proof of status as WBE, but frustrating; WBE certification did provide business with case pricing from suppliers – the one good thing that came from certification
- Just certified – she just needs to increase her knowledge – hasn't had time
- Great on diversity fairs – been to several, but geared to construction or cleaning/office supplies; not designed for design services; linked with architects and interior designers – design community not targeted in MBE outreach
- Suggestion from another state – a benefit of certification is reimbursement up to \$5000 for training costs, research, software, dues, etc. to enhance business
- Needed certification to get into casinos – told had to go through INDOT
- WBENC – WBE National Council registry is not recognized in Indiana – requires certification by INDOT; WBENC allows support for conferences, etc., INDOT doesn't.
- In business so long (20 years) – not any stumbling blocks now
- Our advantage/disadvantage is have a large showroom and resources not available to competitors. A state agency comes in to their trade show and works with them for an hour –in business, this would result in a PO for the business; but with state agency, the state sends out their info – having gained knowledge and service from them – for competitive bids
- Bids in a hurry – not enough info; don't get back any info – no courtesy about whether bid accepted or not and if hear anything it is long after the decision
- This company expects to be a partner and treated as such, with respect
- She spent 10 minutes and is paid at \$200/hour – would like mechanism in survey to be auto sent (if checked) the summary report

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- WMBE program provides useful encouragement for prime contractors and state agencies; with new administration, MWBE designation and efforts are working
- State buyers do a good job and appreciate support they give. Claudia has done a great job making the processes better.
- M/Wbe subs are still being listed on the contract and not getting the work. State needs better follow-up—better auditing of this process.
- Would like state to post list of RFI sessions and list of folks who attended on procurement website.
- Don't know if they are to show the m/wbe proposed \$amount or the %--this is unclear.
- On the RFS, any updates should be clearly identified, so they don't have to go through the entire request.
- The shortened turn-around time favors large companies. Small companies need more time to find and make connections.
- It seems like the wholesale specialty foods are not really something the state wants.
- Fledgling firms do not know about certification and what it can do for them. Need more info.
- Bonding issues keep small companies out of the running. State needs to find ways to help small companies be competitive.
- It would be helpful to have the construction market buyers participate in the networking events too.
- It is hard for primes to subcontract sometimes because of the proportion of dollars allotted.
- There is less opportunity to connect face to face today. It was better when everyone met monthly in Indy to submit bids
- Certification has helped her business
- The m/wbe program is great. They are glad the casinos need to have a % m/wbe.
- Indianapolis does not care much about Evansville.
- Wants the state to send out the contact information of those attending the networking events. Michelle at the m/wbe office said that would happen.
- The State needs to add a business category for "culture/art", especially if they want to see themselves as cultural centers.
- Being able to check for bids online is great.
- Impressed with the networking events and presentations by NAWBO
- During the certification process, the state should ask for the companies email address, not the contact's email. That person doesn't always stay with the company, and then communication ends.
- Little people get over-looked.
- Attending all of the pre-bid meetings requires a lot of time.
- A better classification of business categories needs to be defined. For example, instead of just "transportation", further breakdown as "request for taxi services" and "transportation of commodities", etc....

Indiana Department of Administration
 Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

9.5. Vendor Open-Ended Survey Results

Companies Conducting Business as Prime Contractors

**7. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING MARKETING TECHNIQUES HAVE YOU EMPLOYED TO OBTAIN STATE CONTRACTS?
 "OTHER" COMMENTS**

- They get selection emails from DNR, INDOT
- They get emails from Opportunity Indiana, calls from DNR or their local district office
- Vendor trade show
- Opportunity Indiana sends them emails
- They get emails from the DNR
- IDOA emails notification of contracts to them—this works well
- They get faxed invitations to bid
- They get email notifications when their work is needed
- Personal connections
- Contacted to bid on personal service contracts.
- State contacts her.
- Subscribes to a bid service.
- Meetings once a year; Direct mail.
- Word of mouth; the state contacted them whenever the state had work for them.
- State contacts them for business.
- Have not pursued it yet.
- Word of mouth.
- State contacts him.
- Reporting service.
- Don't pursue government work.
- Employee referrals.
- Several internet search engines.
- Attend trade shows.
- People search out their company.
- Existing relationship.
- Phone calls(direct contact).
- Sales force.
- Marketing through website.
- Catalogues.
- Search programs/ services on the internet.
- Market to a multi-state trade organization.
- Attend trade shows.
- Trade shows.
- Mail catalogues.
- Networking.
- Word of mouth.
- Invited to bid by DOT.

**7. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING MARKETING TECHNIQUES HAVE YOU EMPLOYED TO OBTAIN STATE CONTRACTS?
 "NONE; WHY NOT" COMMENTS**

- Have not pursued any work with Indiana yet.
- Not ready to deal with the state.
- Haven't looked into it yet.
- Not understanding how or when to pursue contracts.
- No bids, only work thru QPAs
- Only work off POs
- Takes too much time to find what they need on the web site
- They have not yet pursued state business but would like to
- Not really pursuing state business because it takes too much time
- Not pursuing it—takes too much time and they are too busy

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

**11. ON THE WINNING BIDS, QUOTES AND/OR PROPOSALS, DID YOU UTILIZE THE MBE AND/OR WBE SPECIFIED IN YOUR SUBMISSION FOR THE FULLY PROPOSED AMOUNT.
“NO” COMMENTS**

- M/WBE subs are not always available, when the contract is finally awarded.
- Depending on the size of a contract—when the contract is large, it is hard to find enough work for a sub to fill that %, or to find a sub (usually small companies) that can do enough of the work to earn that high a %.
- It is sometimes difficult to find a m/wbe company for their specific needs, i.e. photography
- Can't always find a wbe sub in advertising to fulfill their state goal%
- They sell packaged software so there are no sub contractors

12. ARE THERE ANY FACTORS THAT HAVE INTERFERED WITH YOUR ABILITY TO SUBMIT A BID, QUOTE AND/OR PROPOSAL TO THE STATE OF INDIANA?

- General reluctance to work with the state.
- Did personal service contracts – not in a procurement process.
- There are not enough postings of jobs she could do.
- Have toned down to part-time, moving towards retirement.
- Not looking for what they sell.
- Out of state 15% handicap.
- No timely response to bids from the state. Bids due and responded to by a certain date are responded to after a delay of a few months, hampering the process.
- No contracts relevant to them.
- Scope of project.
- Haven't seen any relevant contracts.
- Distance; business strategy.
- Too complicated of a process.
- Just bought the company.
- Lack of local offices.
- Indiana's website is difficult to navigate.
- Just haven't targeted state work yet.
- Have not actively pursued state work.
- No relevant contracts; Registered with all 50 states at the company's start, have not done business with all of them.
- Lack of time.
- Not seeking his line of work.
- Preference for in-state companies.
- The minority preference and small business preference.
- The preference for MBE and WBE businesses.
- Usually only deal through purchase orders.
- No relevant contracts.
- More administrative hurdles for out-of-state companies: time consuming.
- No relevant contracts.
- Lack of knowledge of any relevant contracts.
- The MBE & WBE participation requirements.
- No relevant contracts.
- In-state preference. Restrict business from going out-of-state. Lack of capacity to pursue more work.
- Too restrictive.
- Distance. Small company.
- Delay on getting projects started.
- When you don't win the QPA bid, you have to wait 4 years to bid again
- Had a big problem with the state sending their business OUT OF STATE, when his business was fully qualified. It was worth \$180K. The out of state company ended up not being able to fulfill the job. He was very angry about this. Why should work go out of state when a qualified or even better qualified company is in state?
- Too much paperwork and takes too long. The price of steel went up significantly in the 6 months it took for the state to get back with him to award the contract!
- They are a small business according to the SBA guidelines, but not according to the state. This hurts them by eliminating the small business preferential with the state. There is a small mark-up in his business so they can't compete with other small businesses getting the 15% preferential. He is caught in the middle.
- The state has lowered the compensation rate for IT temporary positions, making it difficult to meet the m/wbe guidelines. This has limited their ability to sub out to a qualified m/wbe.
- They are too small of a company-only 2 people, to do much state business
- Not big enough for insurance costs on some of the larger contracts

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- They are having trouble getting defined with the state in their target market. They seem to be in the wrong category, or the categories need to be more refined. They keep getting emails for jobs that have nothing to do with their business (industrial test equipment).
- The state expects them to solve problems in the bid proposal, but then they don't get the contract and the state keeps their ideas
- Often there is not enough time given for them to respond to a bid proposal, indicating that the state already has a preferred vendor
- For an advertising bid, the state does not provide enough information for an accurate proposal
- When the state goes direct to a manufacturer, they get cut out of the business
- There is a lot of paperwork involved—too much work—and then they lost \$ on the job
- Gov Daniels' privatizing of the prison kitchens has eliminated a lot of business opportunities with state
- Submitted bid 2 months ago and haven't heard back
- The bidding process has changed—takes too long and the prices change from bid time to award time.
- They are too small of a company to do state-wide business, so can't handle most contracts
- The whole bidding process takes too much time for a small company
- They used to get emails from the state regarding their business opportunities, but don't receive them anymore
- The state needs a better category grouping of companies. They get grouped with the category of "landscaping" when they should be under "tractors" or John Deere equipment
- They have trouble understanding the state's web site. They have to go thru too much unrelated information in order to find contracts in their industry. Contract opportunities should be listed by industry, not agency.
- They are often asked to bid on contracts that are not in their vicinity, just to fulfill the primes quota
- Local dealers no longer get preference
- It seems like you need to know somebody to get state business
- They can't get information on bidding opportunities in their industry (signs, awards, specialty items)
- Compared to the private business, the bidding process with the state is too cumbersome and complex and you make less money.
- Government bureaucracy
- The competitive bidding process takes time and then they don't even get a call back regarding the bid. Even though they may not get the job, it is a courtesy for the state to respond.
- They think that the actual selection of a prime is already made but the state has to fulfill getting 3 bids. They are just being used.
- The state needs better classification categories. They don't get emails that match their business.
- It is too much work to go thru for a small company and very little payback
- There seems to be prior determined preferences on who the state will use, so why waste their time bidding?
- They would like to do more business with the state. They don't sub out but try to find m/wbe staff.
- They get emails from the state on upcoming contracts, but the categories aren't precise enough to correspond to their business. This takes up too much of their time.
- No problems for them—the state responds to their bids promptly
- They get emails for upcoming bids, but they are outside of their territory
- Only works off 1 contract
- Don't really know how to use the state's website to increase her business
- Time constraints
- For a small company, this just takes too much time
- They used to receive emails for upcoming bids but don't anymore.
- They have lost 2 contracts because the state is hiring minority primes regardless of the cost, and this is in spite of the fact that they are a wbe. This discourages them from submitting future bids. The wbe firms should be treated equally with the MBE firms.
- They don't know how to get state business anymore. It seems that the state is geared more towards large companies now
- He would like to do more state business but doesn't know how.
- Pricing
- He gets emails for upcoming bids, but not the specs. There is a problem downloading specs from these emails.
- No state business yet, but would like to
- Aren't really doing much state business-their focus is more preconstruction services
- Only the occasional change in paperwork
- The state is taking their business to other states, instead of using in-state companies. This is not right—should not be happening.
- Manufacturers are going around the dealers, to sell directly to the state.
- It is hard for a 1-person business to take the amount of time needed to do state business
- Would like to know how to get 'into the loop' for state business
- The state only does business with companies that can cover the entire state. Most small companies can only cover a portion of the state, so they lose the job.
- It can be a problem finding m/wbe subs in the construction industry

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

Companies Conducting Business as Subcontractors

**14. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING MARKETING TECHNIQUES HAVE YOU EMPLOYED TO OBTAIN STATE SUBCONTRACTS?
“OTHER” COMMENTS**

- Word of mouth
- Networking
- Gets calls from the Prime contractors

**14. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING MARKETING TECHNIQUES HAVE YOU EMPLOYED TO OBTAIN STATE SUBCONTRACTS?
“NONE; WHY NOT?” COMMENTS**

- Do not pursue state work anymore.
- Have not needed to pursue state work.
- They don't pursue any more business than what they already have on an ongoing basis
- Not actively pursuing state business—too busy as is

**16. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN LISTED AS THE SUBCONTRACTOR ON AN AWARDED CONTRACT AND NOT PERFORMED THE WORK?
“WHY?” COMMENTS**

- Yes, the contract listed the main manufacturer, but after awarded, the Prime shopped around for a better price and got away with it.
- The prime used another company or did the work themselves
- Has had contracts given to someone else occasionally, but she stays on top of it so this doesn't happen very often.

17. ARE THERE ANY FACTORS THAT INTERFERED WITH YOUR ABILITY TO ATTAIN BUSINESS AS A SUBCONTRACTOR WITH THE STATE OF INDIANA?

- The opportunity for profits just isn't there.
- No relevant contracts.
- Difference of processes/practices between how state contracting works vs. federal government.
- Lack of more relevant work.
- The Indiana online procurement site/tools.
- They are a supplier, haven't dealt with any contracting.
- Still not paid—over 45 days.
- More trouble than it's worth to do state business—too much red tape
- Not enough capital \$
- The state's "no substitution" specifications hurts them. I.e. the contract only lists one manufacturer. This does not promote competitive bidding
- There are too many closed and proprietary specs.
- The state needs more specific classifications or categories of business. They do not get emails that correspond to their specific business. They want to do state business.

Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

Non-Minority Owned Businesses

22. **DO YOU THINK CERTIFICATION OF MINORITY AND WOMEN OWNED BUSINESSES WITH THE STATE OF INDIANA GIVES THOSE BUSINESSES A COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE? "YES; WHY?" COMMENTS**

- The government is targeting small or small disadvantaged businesses for state contracts.
- Set asides.
- The process is set up to give them a price advantage.
- State requirements automatically give some business to minorities regardless if they are the low bidder.
- Minority and WBE companies having contact info available to primes on the state web sites makes it easier for primes to look to one of them for subcontracting.
- Women run businesses better than men.
- Because it gives his company a disadvantage, so it must give them an advantage.
- State requirements guarantees some work to them.
- They can bid at a higher dollar level.
- Small businesses have no restrictions on which contracts they bid on. Minority businesses do seem to be given a preference.
- If you're not certified you're not even in the door.
- Contracts being set aside for them.
- Certification brings their business to the front of the line.
- They did not do business with WBEs or MBEs until it became a requirement. Now, they look at WBEs/MBEs when any new business comes along.
- Given priority by what they are instead of by their capabilities.
- Getting additional points in the ratings.
- Point ratings for the proposals – advantage given to minority businesses.
- One of their customers, a WBE, got a contract strictly b/c she was a WBE.
- Not being a WBE or a MBE hurts his business; Reverse discrimination going on.
- Certain amount of work is required to go to them.
- To reach quotas one must do a certain amount of business with minorities.
- Different point scale for them.
- Specific requirements/encouragements to use them for subcontracting.
- They are paid preference.
- Preference for using MBEs/WBEs shown in the contracting process.
- Requirements for using them.
- MBE/WBE participation requirements are a part of bidding paperwork.
- Set asides.
- Their bid ratings are given higher point totals than their prices deserve.
- Certification and state listings puts them at the forefront for Primes looking for subs.
- Certain percentage of state business set aside for them.
- Guaranteed business.
- Preferential treatment in the scoring of their proposals.
- Mandate on certain percentage of business goes to them.
- Considers status instead of their capabilities.
- Indiana's contract process is set up to give them an advantage.
- Set aside business – other companies with lower prices passed over in favor of MBEs or WBEs.
- They are given more opportunities/work than their prices/bids would normally deserve.
- Singled out based on their certification and sought more often for work.
- Lost out on business to WBEs and MBEs in the past.
- Why would they have those certifications if they weren't going to favor them.
- MBE and WBE set asides.
- They get a preference as a MBE or WBE.
- Gives them a chance to be competitive in their bidding.
- People tend to work with the certified companies more.
- MBE participation requirements; Primes have to look for MBE subs.
- Lost out on a contract they had held for years to a WBE. The contact with the Minority Department of the IDOA was/is only available 15 minutes out of the month.
- Governments are always trying to help minorities.
- If you don't have minority participation, you don't get the job.
- That is the nature of the certification.
- Gives them an opening; puts them at the front of the line.

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- Lot of the contracts have requirements for MBE or WBE participation.
- Certification puts them on par with competing businesses.
- Set asides for them. Discounts given to MBEs and WBEs.
- Set asides.
- Most bids have set asides to give business to MBEs and WBEs.
- Percentage participation requirements on the contracts.
- Given priority over non-certified companies.
- Preferential treatment is given to MBEs and WBEs in the contracting process.
- Agencies will look at MBEs and WBEs first.
- Having to reduce their prices on bids to match the adjusted bid ratings given to MBEs and WBEs.
- Given preference over other equal or near equal bids.
- Bid point rating advantage.
- They get looked at first by the state.
- Lost bids to non-local companies based on their being WBE or MBE, not on price or capabilities.
- The mandated percentage requirements for MBE/WBE participation.
- The state leans towards using MBEs and WBEs.
- They are looked at first for subcontracting.
- Discounts on their bids.
- Given preference on bids.
- Minority companies that submit bids against them that are equal or slightly higher are usually awarded the contract.
- Makes larger companies that do business with the state give business to smaller companies.
- Certain percentage supposed to go to MBEs and WBEs.
- Business goes to MBEs that wouldn't without requirements.
- Bucks up a company's credentials.
- Viewed very favorably by state governments.
- Set asides make it easier for MBEs and WBEs to get into state work/contracts.
- Allows them to charge higher prices; Gives them priority on some contracts.
- Gets their names out to businesses.
- They have to be used.
- Larger companies required to business with them in order to business with the state.
- Companies are given preference when they use MBE or WBE subs.
- They win bids b/c they are MBEs/WBEs, not on their capabilities/bids.
- They get their names out to Primes looking for subs.
- Allows those businesses to compete.
- The state directs a certain amount of their business to minorities, but this hasn't affected his company's business with the state.
- M/wbe's are suppose to get a 15% advantage
- M/wbe's often have "fake" minority owners
- Only because of the state requirements.
- Yes, for small companies
- Yes, because often the work ends up going out of state for an m/wbe sub, and this is not right. State work should be done in state whenever possible. This has gotten better lately though.
- Yes, on bigger contracts, the m/wbe companies are always given the sub work.
- Yes, but this doesn't really affect them
- WBEs in construction are very feisty
- They definitely get a preference at the federal level
- WBE companies are definitely given a preference in their industry (advertising)
- Unfortunately the m/wbe program is not about creating more job opportunities for minorities, but rather, it is only about who the owner is. Often the owner is just a fake front anyway. The program should be about creating m/wbe jobs and the state should look at how many minorities you are employing, not only what owner you are subbing out to. For example, a company with 20 minority employees would lose the job to a company with one minority owner and no minority employees.
- The state goals force them to sub out to a competitor
- Occasionally they lose business because of this
- In construction industry, they have an advantage if they are a sub
- Often companies that are better able to do the job are cast aside in order to meet the m/wbe quota.
- This ends up costing the state more \$ many times because they end up having to contract with larger firms in order to have someone who can afford to sub out to m/wbe firms.
- Yes, minority firms get the preference, even over superior companies
- Only slightly advantageous because of the goals required. In their industry this forces them to go out of state to find an m/wbe sub which isn't fair to in-state companies.
- Yes, they don't do state business yet, but think they will get certified as a MBE because there is a definite advantage
- Yes, only because of the % advantage
- Yes, they lost a big job because of the state requirements to use a m/wbe sub

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- Yes, for a small firm especially, they have more opportunities
- Yes, because of the extra % advantage, but they have not lost business because of it
- At the federal level, but have not lost business because of it. However, they often see m/wbe companies that have false 'fronts' or ownership—aren't really minority owned.
- This has helped them gain business as a sub
- Increases job opportunities for women
- In the security industry minority firms seem to have an advantage
- There are very few women owned construction firms to choose from for the state goal requirements, so those few do have a big advantage
- Both federal and state assist them
- M/wbes get more 'weight' – esp. on Federal contracts, but they have not lost business to them
- Possibly, because of state goals
- Yes, esp. in federal govt work

**22. DO YOU THINK CERTIFICATION OF MINORITY AND WOMEN OWNED BUSINESSES WITH THE STATE OF INDIANA GIVES THOSE BUSINESSES A COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE?
"NO; WHY NOT?" COMMENTS**

- Advantage goes to Indiana companies.
- Things seem fair.
- All comes down to bottom dollar.
- Always comes down to price.
- Product based.
- Have not seen any evidence of an advantage.
- It makes it fair for all.
- They haven't had any contract with MBEs or WBEs, haven't noticed any advantage.
- There is competition either way.
- Fair to everybody.
- Never seen an effect.
- Hasn't been in his experience.
- Hasn't seen an effect.
- Process/requirements too difficult to become certified.
- People can get around any requirements for participation.
- Not in this business(forklift sales)
- Don't think so, but don't really know for sure
- They used to be WBE certified and it did not give them any advantage
- Not in this industry (marine service)
- Not in their industry—have never lost a job because of it
- Being a small business is helpful, but not being a WBE. WBEs are under utilized because they are usually too small and need financial backing.
- Prime minorities do not need to be certified since there is no advantage—it doesn't count for anything if you are the prime.
- No, everything is based on the low bid in the printing industry
- Not in the telecommunications industry
- There is no m/wbe competition in the septic tank industry
- Can't find any m/wbes in the environmental testing industry
- Small businesses do not have an advantage, regardless of certification

23. WHAT ARE THE OBSTACLES YOUR FIRM FACES IN THE STATE OF INDIANA CONTRACTING PROCESS?

- Delay in payments from the state.
- Had to resort to using a collection agency on one occasion when the state was over a year late in paying.
- Too much work in her line of work goes to out of state companies.
- Set asides are arbitrary. People find a way around them. The premise is good, the process is not.
- People claiming small business preference that do not actually qualify.
- Minority business obstacle; in-state company preference.
- Important to publish the plan holder list. Make it available to companies so more companies can bid on contracts. State contracts should be handled like the federal government does: Take the architects/designers of the projects out of the contract process after the design is complete.
- The MBE/WBE Participation program can and has been taken advantage of by some MBEs/WBEs.
- State procurement uses very loose rules to qualify as an Indiana business.
- Copies of POs from the state were delayed 6 months, and received after the work was already completed

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- We do business in all 50 states and with the federal government. Indiana does not stick out as being uniquely worse than any other state.

Final Question (All Businesses and Agencies)

28. IS THERE ANYTHING THAT WE HAVE NOT COVERED THAT YOU FEEL WILL BE HELPFUL TO THIS STUDY? DESCRIBE?

- Should consider the value of the personal service contracts and analyze them separately.
- The state should give more business to WBEs/MBEs.
- States are improving accessibility to upcoming/available contracts.
- Even when they overcame the out-of-state handicap with a lower bid, the contract still went to the instate company.
- Indicates some corruption in the process.
- It is such a time consuming process to find MBEs or WBEs to do business with in order to fulfill participation requirements. The state listings of MBEs/WBEs needs more work to keep it up to date and usable.
- Complete overhaul needed. Submitted bids should be responded to within a couple weeks. Should fire everybody there and bring in new people that know what they are doing.
- Just dealt with subs, a supplier for the subs.
- Labor union influence should be reduced/eliminated to improve competition, thereby saving the state some money.
- They are a sub/supplier for subs.
- Electronic registering of companies will increase the bidders' pool.
- Certification processes require/waste too much time and effort to go through it.
- The categories of the web postings are too broad. Time is wasted on looking at contracts that don't pertain to his line of work.
- The contractors experience should be given more weight in the evaluation criteria.
- Do a better job of keeping the MBE certification accurate and honest.
- More qualifications/stringent certifications should be required of bidders. Every project should require a building permit.
- The certification paperwork is too complicated/time consuming.
- Small business set asides are few and fare between, and that needs to change/increase.
- Need tighter minority certification requirements.
- The MBE participation program is a sham/ludicrous: The process to become certified is too difficult; the info requested for certification is an invasion of privacy; the state should go with the federal certification.
- Don't agree that MBE/WBE primes should get zero credit for being a MBE/WBE: they are required to sub out with another MBE/WBE.
- Businesses should get work based on their capabilities and not on certifications/classifications. Winning bids due to being a MBE or WBE is unfair to other companies.
- The state has done a good job at providing contacts, making payments, and at just generally working well with them.
- Takes too long to get paid by the state, i.e. over 120 days, but is getting better.
- They have no way to use an m/wbe sub when they manufacture and ship their own product.
- It is time-consuming to have to prove that they don't have anyone they can sub to
- The only WBE sub they can sub to, is not certified with the state.
- This company said they were very happy with the state!
- It takes too long to get paid by the state
- On phased projects, i.e. a 3yr project, the state holds the retainage dollars. It could be 4 yrs before they get the \$.
- Many contracts are too vague, so it makes it hard to quote a price without some pertinent information. For example, it is hard to quote shipping costs, when the state doesn't clarify where they are shipping to.
- Are generally happy with state, but they find it hard to build relationships.
- They can never be a sub on an IT contract because they are not a minority or women owned business. This doesn't seem fair.
- They were displaced from a contract solely because they were not m/wbe owned.
- The state wants a 1-way indemnification, which a small company can not do.
- The state asks for too much personal salary information
- The I-69 project put them in extreme personal danger from protestors—the state should have provided protection for them
- The state does not understand the advertising business. The people doing the bids need to be trained on how the advertising industry does their business
- On a large contract, it is hard to sub out the whole 10% worth of the contract amount to a small m/wbe firm. They end up having to use (and hence manage) multiple firms to do the work they could have done in the first place, resulting in more overhead costs.
- RFP preparers should allow his company (MZD Advertising/Harry Davis) to show them how to better prepare bids for the advertising industry, so that the proper information is given in the RFP. The state prepares do not understand the advertising business.
- Many m/wbes are just fake fronts, which hurts the program.

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- The state may not need an M/WBE program, but just a small business program to give all small businesses an advantage.
- It is hard for a small business that isn't a minority or women owned to compete for state contracts.
- The length of time it takes to award contracts is too long, sometimes 6 months. On commodity products, the price can and does changes in that length of time.
- They get too many requests to bid on small quantities, even sometimes just one item, when their business deals with truckloads of a commodity
- The bidding process used to be smoother, prior to 2000. The old "monthly" food bidding was better for this industry
- The m/wbe program should not be a gift—the program should be helping these small companies to grow and prosper
- The program tends to lose good service when you have to sub out to companies that are not as qualified. This then reflects poorly on the prime vendor.
- Bidding is done by part, in their industry, and prices change frequently, so the price may be different from the start of the bidding process to the time it is awarded. The long prevents them from giving a competitive bid. The process should b different for the commodities industry.
- They have to be a multi-state business to survive.
- The state tries to handle purchased items, like the service industry—this does not work!
- When they were the low-bidder on a contract, the state kept re-doing the bidding process until they dropped out and wouldn't award them the contract. This indicates that the state had already decided who they wanted.
- The state wants to pay them by credit card so they automatically lose 2% to do business that way
- Other states handle the commodity business by having an annual contract with a manufacturer, so that the state can just go to the local dealer when they need something. Why doesn't Indiana do this?
- Too much politics is involved
- Dump fees should not be the responsibility of the septic tank company--should be the state's charge
- Due to some turn-over in the state procurement process over the last few years, contracts have to be explained over and over again to the new personnel. When there is continuity in the contracting officer that manages and supports a contract, it usually goes smoother for everyone.
- State cut-backs have eliminated a lot of security jobs
- State purchasing is becoming more and more decentralized. This causes more work, having to deal with multiple agencies.
- Once again on a different survey: the state has become more decentralized resulting in too many different people to contact for state work
- The federal 508 compliancy requirement for the handicapped is causing a problem with the state contracts. The state of Indiana does not allow the same provisions that the federal government does, and IN is the only state that does not seem to fully understand the intent. In addition, this 508 compliancy ought to be included in the specifications on the contract, so that every company bidding fully understands and includes the cost of this compliancy into their bid. Otherwise, one company may bid lower, win the contract, but not be compliant.

Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

9.6. MWBE and Vendor Sample Survey

**State of Indiana
Disparity Study
Anecdotal Evidence Survey**

Interviewer: _____ **Date:** _____ **Time:** _____

Hello my name is [name of interviewer], and I am with Bucher + Christian Consulting. I am calling on behalf of the state of Indiana DOA/MWBE office and we are conducting a disparity study. We are required to interview a portion of the companies and agencies that participate in the State procurement process. You have been randomly selected to participate in our survey. Do you have a few minutes in which we can ask questions related to your experience with the State procurement process?

<p>Name of Company/Agency: _____</p> <p>Contact Name: _____</p> <p>Contact Title: _____</p> <p>Address: _____</p> <p>City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____</p> <p>Telephone: _____ FAX: _____</p> <p>E-mail: _____ Business Hours: _____</p>

Business Profile

1. What is your company's primary line of Business?
 Construction
 Professional Services
 Supplies and/or Equipment
2. Do you consider your business to be a Minority Business?
 Yes; Are you certified as an MBE with:
 Federal Gov. State Gov.
 Local Gov. Private Org.
 No
3. Do you consider your business to be a Woman-owned Business?
 Yes; Are you certified as a WBE with:
 Federal Gov. State Gov.
 Local Gov. Private Org.
 No
4. Is your business considered a small business according to the SBA guidelines?

Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

- Yes
 No
5. Does your target market include the following?
 Federal Gov. State Gov.
 Local Gov. Private Sector
6. What percentage of your gross revenue is derived through business with the State of Indiana?
 % (Estimate is OK)
- **Has your company been a Prime Contractor with the state of Indiana or has your company had an interest in being a Prime Contractor?
 Yes, then go to Q7
 No, then proceed to Q13

Companies Conducting Business as Prime Contractors

7. Which of the following marketing techniques have you employed to obtain State contracts?
 Attend pre-bid meetings/RFI sessions
 Phone calls/mailings/meetings with State officials
 Attend networking/matchmaking events
 Membership in trade organizations
 Regular review of State solicitations on the Internet
 Other _____
 None; Why not? _____
8. Have you ever submitted a bid, quote, or proposal to the State of Indiana?
 Yes
 No (Go to question #12)
9. Of your submissions to the State of Indiana, what percentages of the following have been awarded?
Bids and Quotes _____% (Estimate is OK)
Proposals _____% (Estimate is OK)
10. In your bids, quotes and/or proposals to the State of Indiana do you identify minority and/or women owned businesses with whom you intend to subcontract?
 Yes; _____ % of bids that include participation (Estimate is OK)
 No
11. On the winning bids, quotes and/or proposals, did you utilize the MBE and/or WBE specified in your submission for the fully proposed amount.
 Yes
 No; If no, why? _____
12. Are there any factors that have interfered with your ability to submit a bid, quote and/or proposal to the State of Indiana?

Companies Conducting Business as Subcontractors

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

13. Has your company ever performed work as a subcontractor on a State of Indiana contract or has your company had an interest in being a subcontractor?

- Yes
- No, (go to question 17)]

14. Which of the following marketing techniques have you employed to obtain State subcontracts?

- Attend pre-bid meetings/RFI sessions
- Phone calls/mailings/meetings with State officials
- Phone calls/mailings/ meetings with prime contractors
- Attend networking/matchmaking events
- Membership in trade organizations
- Regular review of State solicitations on the Internet
- Other _____
- None; Why not? _____

15. How often have you served as a subcontractor for the State of Indiana?

Count ____ (Estimate is OK)

16. Have you ever been listed as the subcontractor on an awarded contract and not performed the work?

- Yes; # times _____ (Estimate is OK); Why? _____
- No

17. Are there any factors that interfered with your ability to attain business as a subcontractor with the State of Indiana?

Non-minority Owned Businesses

22. Do you think certification of minority and women owned businesses with the State of Indiana gives those businesses a competitive advantage?

- Yes; Why? _____
- No; Why not? _____

23. What are the obstacles your firm faces in the State of Indiana contracting process?

BUCHER + CHRISTIAN

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

9.7. Fiscal Year 2003 Utilization by State Agency

Agency/Business Unit	MBE	MBE%	WBE	WBE%	NON	NON%	TOTAL
ACCOUNTS, STATE BOARD OF	\$ 5,040.07	2.90%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 168,917.75	97.10%	\$ 173,957.82
ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF (+ IOT AND PUBLIC WORKS)	\$ 321,888.61	0.62%	\$ 109,181.03	0.21%	\$ 51,181,055.47	99.16%	\$ 51,612,125.11
AGRICULTURE, INDIANA STATE DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 386.40	0.06%	\$ 633,631.83	99.94%	\$ 634,018.23
ANIMAL HEALTH, BOARD OF	\$ 6,230.59	1.24%	\$ 4,493.63	0.89%	\$ 491,906.84	97.87%	\$ 502,631.06
ARTS COMMISSION	\$ 723.00	1.61%	\$ 207.00	0.46%	\$ 43,971.79	97.93%	\$ 44,901.79
BOARD OF TAX REVIEW, INDIANA	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 9,565.00	22.69%	\$ 32,592.87	77.31%	\$ 42,157.87
BUDGET AGENCY	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 7,355.02	1.25%	\$ 579,718.17	98.75%	\$ 587,073.19
CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, INDIANA	\$ 20,279.80	14.06%	\$ 442.50	0.31%	\$ 123,506.79	85.63%	\$ 144,229.09
COMMERCE, DEPARTMENT OF (NOW IEDC)	\$ 598,240.22	14.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 3,674,904.13	86.00%	\$ 4,273,144.35
CORONERS TRAINING BOARD	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 214.33	100.00%	\$ 214.33
CORRECTION, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 10,351,432.80	28.92%	\$ 2,173,152.12	6.07%	\$ 23,264,404.63	65.00%	\$ 35,788,989.55
CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE	\$ 208,857.70	7.01%	\$ 14,517.00	0.49%	\$ 2,755,548.44	92.50%	\$ 2,978,923.14
DOC / PEN PRODUCTS	\$ 27,324.94	0.14%	\$ 353,478.91	1.79%	\$ 19,413,888.79	98.08%	\$ 19,794,692.64
EMPLOYEE APPEALS COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,703.95	100.00%	\$ 1,703.95
ENVIRONMENTAL ADJUDICATION, OFFICE OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 72,657.61	100.00%	\$ 72,657.61
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 429,966.91	2.92%	\$ 39,014.97	0.27%	\$ 14,250,734.37	96.81%	\$ 14,719,716.25
FAITH-BASED AND COMMUNITY INITIATIVES, OFFICE OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 42,479.28	100.00%	\$ 42,479.28
FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 2,094.65	0.28%	\$ 7,400.00	1.00%	\$ 732,656.75	98.72%	\$ 742,151.40
FIRE AND BUILDING SERVICES DEPARTMENT	\$ 3,066.00	0.53%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 572,205.98	99.47%	\$ 575,271.98
FAMILY AND SOCIAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION	\$ 1,315,286.10	0.70%	\$ 3,200,143.16	1.69%	\$ 184,707,957.84	97.61%	\$ 189,223,387.09
GAMING COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 5,250.00	0.74%	\$ 705,136.31	99.26%	\$ 710,386.31
GAMING RESEARCH, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 700.00	100.00%	\$ 700.00
GOVERNOR, OFFICE OF THE	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 95,197.23	100.00%	\$ 95,197.23
GOVERNOR'S PLANNING COUNCIL FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	\$ 8,983.42	5.82%	\$ 670.00	0.43%	\$ 144,704.13	93.75%	\$ 154,357.55
HEALTH PROFESSIONS SERVICE BUREAU	\$ 2,000.00	0.27%	\$ 42,247.74	5.73%	\$ 692,623.35	94.00%	\$ 736,871.09
HEALTH, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 262,241.25	1.42%	\$ 18,641.09	0.10%	\$ 18,210,547.35	98.48%	\$ 18,491,429.69
HIGHER EDUCATION, COMMISSION FOR	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 367,328.62	9.26%	\$ 3,598,589.07	90.74%	\$ 3,965,917.69
HISTORICAL BUREAU, INDIANA	\$ 6,723.50	13.28%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 43,920.82	86.72%	\$ 50,644.32
HOMELAND SECURITY, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 8,399.25	2.89%	\$ 1,165.82	0.40%	\$ 281,221.40	96.71%	\$ 290,786.47
HORSE RACING COMMISSION	\$ 8,874.27	1.01%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 867,671.25	98.99%	\$ 876,545.52
INSPECTOR GENERAL	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 4,178.80	100.00%	\$ 4,178.80
INSURANCE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 11.97	0.00%	\$ 657,836.28	100.00%	\$ 657,848.25
INTEGRATED PUBLIC SAFETY COMMISSION	\$ 570.61	0.02%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 3,278,021.36	99.98%	\$ 3,278,591.97
LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 1,958.20	0.52%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 373,234.76	99.48%	\$ 375,192.96
LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADEMY BOARD	\$ 46,607.16	4.04%	\$ 1,414.66	0.12%	\$ 1,105,198.96	95.84%	\$ 1,153,220.78
LIBRARY, INDIANA STATE	\$ 4,669.40	0.82%	\$ 7,195.13	1.27%	\$ 554,949.64	97.91%	\$ 566,814.17
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S OFFICE	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 187,450.30	100.00%	\$ 187,450.30
LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 3,955.65	1.38%	\$ 2,989.50	1.04%	\$ 280,618.37	97.58%	\$ 287,563.52
MANAGEMENT & BUDGET, OFFICE OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
MOTOR VEHICLES, BUREAU OF	\$ 18,345.87	0.08%	\$ 116,920.55	0.52%	\$ 22,353,340.45	99.40%	\$ 22,488,606.87
PERSONNEL, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 3,569.89	2.22%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 157,375.36	97.78%	\$ 160,945.25
POLICE, STATE	\$ 32,501.66	0.15%	\$ 80,713.09	0.37%	\$ 21,761,423.41	99.48%	\$ 21,874,638.16
PROFESSIONAL LICENSING AGENCY	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 255,744.53	100.00%	\$ 255,744.53
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS, DIVISION OF	\$ 4,473.00	0.54%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 822,031.48	99.46%	\$ 826,504.48
PROPRIETARY EDUCATION, COMMISSION	\$ 3,730.11	41.45%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 5,268.00	58.55%	\$ 8,998.11
PUBLIC ACCESS COUNSELOR, OFFICE OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 4,590.66	100.00%	\$ 4,590.66
PUBLIC RECORDS, INDIANA COMMISSION ON	\$ 12,407.56	4.90%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 240,694.00	95.10%	\$ 253,101.56
PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING INSTITUTE	\$ 12,384.64	4.23%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 280,424.00	95.77%	\$ 292,808.64
REVENUE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 382,254.11	2.16%	\$ 358,858.71	2.03%	\$ 16,931,935.77	95.81%	\$ 17,673,048.59
SOLDIERS/SAILORS CHILDRENS HOME	\$ 1,174.83	0.07%	\$ 2,173.75	0.13%	\$ 1,731,532.57	99.81%	\$ 1,734,881.15
STUDENT ASSISTANCE COMMISSION	\$ 2,800.00	0.23%	\$ 66,650.44	5.38%	\$ 1,169,705.58	94.40%	\$ 1,239,156.02
TOBACCO USE PREVENTION & CESSATION BOARD	\$ 25,384.97	0.29%	\$ 173,405.12	1.95%	\$ 8,695,370.14	97.76%	\$ 8,894,160.23
TRANSPORTATION, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 13,519,472.73	1.41%	\$ 23,709,916.80	2.48%	\$ 918,879,313.01	96.11%	\$ 956,108,702.54
UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR	\$ 1,285.36	0.57%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 222,850.64	99.43%	\$ 224,136.00
UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION	\$ 9,695.83	0.48%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 2,026,139.27	99.52%	\$ 2,035,835.10
VETERANS AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 2,508,907.96	100.00%	\$ 2,508,907.96
VETERANS' HOME	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 446,918.89	11.13%	\$ 3,567,075.08	88.87%	\$ 4,013,993.97
VOL ACTION COMM	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
WAR MEMORIALS COMMISSION	\$ 104,065.83	12.38%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 736,790.19	87.62%	\$ 840,856.02
WORKERS COMPENSATION BOARD	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 18,059.75	100.00%	\$ 18,059.75
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 243,952.02	1.96%	\$ 222,532.84	1.79%	\$ 11,989,527.42	96.25%	\$ 12,456,012.28
TOTAL SPEND UTILIZATION	\$ 28,022,912.51		\$ 31,544,341.46		\$ 1,348,184,556.25		\$ 1,407,751,810.22
	1.99%		2.24%		95.77%		
TIER-TWO PEOPLESOFT ADJUSTMENT	\$ 167,422.67		\$ 93,029.04				
QPA ADJUSTMENT	\$ 469,199.10		\$ 312,799.40				
PUBLIC WORKS ADJUSTMENT	\$ 4,411,944.14		\$ -				
ADJUSTED TOTAL SPEND UTILIZATION	\$ 33,071,478.42		\$ 31,950,169.90		\$ 1,342,730,161.90		\$ 1,407,751,810.22
	2.35%		2.27%		95.38%		
	MBE		WBE		NON		

BUCHER + CHRISTIAN

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

9.8. Fiscal Year 2004 Utilization by State Agency

Agency/Business Unit	MBE	MBE%	WBE	WBE%	NON	NON%	TOTAL
ACCOUNTS, STATE BOARD OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 9,039.30	2.85%	\$ 307,952.34	97.15%	\$ 316,991.64
ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF (+ IOT AND PUBLIC WORKS)	\$ 404,958.94	0.76%	\$ 160,082.24	0.30%	\$ 53,056,454.66	98.95%	\$ 53,621,495.84
AGRICULTURE, INDIANA STATE DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO COMMISSION	\$ 723.80	0.08%	\$ 2,681.37	0.29%	\$ 913,598.15	99.63%	\$ 917,003.32
ANIMAL HEALTH, BOARD OF	\$ 18,169.18	4.28%	\$ 3,470.67	0.82%	\$ 402,897.77	94.90%	\$ 424,537.62
ARTS COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 42,673.30	100.00%	\$ 42,673.30
BOARD OF TAX REVIEW, INDIANA	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 7,402.50	21.99%	\$ 26,267.66	78.01%	\$ 33,670.16
BUDGET AGENCY	\$ 31,072.48	1.37%	\$ 2,624.42	0.12%	\$ 2,234,169.48	98.51%	\$ 2,267,866.38
CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, INDIANA	\$ 6,610.78	3.45%	\$ 310.64	0.16%	\$ 184,921.74	96.39%	\$ 191,843.16
COMMERCE, DEPARTMENT OF (NOW IEDC)	\$ 646,607.52	14.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 3,972,017.48	86.00%	\$ 4,618,625.00
CORONERS TRAINING BOARD	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 199,483.92	100.00%	\$ 199,483.92
CORRECTION, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 8,142,787.62	24.14%	\$ 3,047,129.86	9.03%	\$ 22,545,248.80	66.83%	\$ 33,735,166.28
CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE	\$ 60,352.67	1.38%	\$ 1,299.75	0.03%	\$ 4,319,729.53	98.59%	\$ 4,381,381.95
DOC / PEN PRODUCTS	\$ 125,840.74	0.52%	\$ 88,709.88	0.37%	\$ 23,841,677.25	99.11%	\$ 24,056,227.87
EMPLOYEE APPEALS COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,014.66	100.00%	\$ 1,014.66
ENVIRONMENTAL ADJUDICATION, OFFICE OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 85,317.46	100.00%	\$ 85,317.46
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 366,670.47	1.89%	\$ 87,367.48	0.45%	\$ 18,982,354.96	97.66%	\$ 19,436,392.91
FAITH-BASED AND COMMUNITY INITIATIVES, OFFICE OF	\$ 2,137.00	14.26%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 12,849.69	85.74%	\$ 14,986.69
FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 6,032.60	1.15%	\$ 10,000.00	1.91%	\$ 508,084.50	96.94%	\$ 524,117.10
FIRE AND BUILDING SERVICES DEPARTMENT	\$ 87,295.54	11.66%	\$ 1,250.00	0.17%	\$ 659,922.98	88.17%	\$ 748,468.52
FAMILY AND SOCIAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION	\$ 2,484,717.34	1.14%	\$ 3,546,696.19	1.63%	\$ 211,687,961.42	97.23%	\$ 217,719,374.96
GAMING COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 26,400.00	3.50%	\$ 727,950.30	96.50%	\$ 754,350.30
GAMING RESEARCH, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 4,244.68	10.45%	\$ 27,500.00	67.71%	\$ 8,868.63	21.84%	\$ 40,613.31
GOVERNOR, OFFICE OF THE	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 41,155.39	100.00%	\$ 41,155.39
GOVERNOR'S PLANNING COUNCIL FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 5,619.00	4.81%	\$ 111,163.03	95.19%	\$ 116,782.03
HEALTH PROFESSIONS SERVICE BUREAU	\$ 285.96	0.03%	\$ 2,550.95	0.26%	\$ 965,415.59	99.71%	\$ 968,252.50
HEALTH, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 119,718.97	0.68%	\$ 34,396.55	0.19%	\$ 17,487,528.00	99.13%	\$ 17,641,643.52
HIGHER EDUCATION, COMMISSION FOR	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 317,078.29	9.49%	\$ 3,023,535.93	90.51%	\$ 3,340,614.22
HISTORICAL BUREAU, INDIANA	\$ 5,637.17	9.84%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 51,644.80	90.16%	\$ 57,281.97
HOMELAND SECURITY, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 16,281.82	1.76%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 906,762.35	98.24%	\$ 923,044.17
HORSE RACING COMMISSION	\$ 907.52	0.12%	\$ 495.00	0.07%	\$ 759,412.51	99.82%	\$ 760,815.03
INSPECTOR GENERAL	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,698.74	100.00%	\$ 1,698.74
INSURANCE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 26.36	0.00%	\$ 726,537.20	100.00%	\$ 726,563.56
INTEGRATED PUBLIC SAFETY COMMISSION	\$ 5,771.77	0.09%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 6,160,336.48	99.91%	\$ 6,166,108.25
LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 15,392.36	4.17%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 353,346.78	95.83%	\$ 368,739.14
LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADEMY BOARD	\$ 903.82	0.09%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 965,731.50	99.91%	\$ 966,635.32
LIBRARY, INDIANA STATE	\$ 2,571.00	1.00%	\$ 4,816.50	1.88%	\$ 248,630.97	97.11%	\$ 256,018.47
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S OFFICE	\$ 1,025.49	0.46%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 223,058.98	99.54%	\$ 224,084.47
LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 3,432.86	1.10%	\$ 1,042.50	0.33%	\$ 307,660.72	98.57%	\$ 312,136.08
MANAGEMENT & BUDGET, OFFICE OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
MOTOR VEHICLES, BUREAU OF	\$ 48,109.79	0.30%	\$ 130,559.21	0.81%	\$ 15,886,355.38	98.89%	\$ 16,065,024.38
PERSONNEL, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 4,119.80	1.49%	\$ 5,594.28	2.03%	\$ 266,510.06	96.48%	\$ 276,224.14
POLICE, STATE	\$ 13,858.53	0.06%	\$ 21,897.65	0.10%	\$ 21,309,649.35	99.83%	\$ 21,345,405.53
PROFESSIONAL LICENSING AGENCY	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 359,106.11	100.00%	\$ 359,106.11
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS, DIVISION OF	\$ 755.52	0.06%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,289,588.14	99.94%	\$ 1,290,343.66
PROPRIETARY EDUCATION, COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 7,675.72	100.00%	\$ 7,675.72
PUBLIC ACCESS COUNSELOR, OFFICE OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 5,954.08	100.00%	\$ 5,954.08
PUBLIC RECORDS, INDIANA COMMISSION ON	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 241,246.71	100.00%	\$ 241,246.71
PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING INSTITUTE	\$ 4,788.00	3.87%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 118,967.31	96.13%	\$ 123,755.31
REVENUE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 306,073.77	1.89%	\$ 363,866.89	2.25%	\$ 15,522,455.64	95.86%	\$ 16,192,396.30
SOLDIERS/SAILORS CHILDRENS HOME	\$ 16,206.78	2.07%	\$ 4,525.00	0.58%	\$ 762,916.88	97.35%	\$ 783,648.66
STUDENT ASSISTANCE COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 18,250.84	1.24%	\$ 1,451,497.84	98.76%	\$ 1,469,748.68
TOBACCO USE PREVENTION & CESSATION BOARD	\$ 700.00	0.01%	\$ 179,857.02	2.95%	\$ 5,910,853.34	97.04%	\$ 6,091,410.36
TRANSPORTATION, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 17,224,703.36	1.59%	\$ 24,998,754.30	2.31%	\$ 1,038,073,709.38	96.09%	\$ 1,080,297,167.04
UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR	\$ 2,088.22	1.22%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 169,133.20	98.78%	\$ 171,221.42
UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 500.00	0.03%	\$ 1,865,323.97	99.97%	\$ 1,865,823.97
VETERANS AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 116,357.55	100.00%	\$ 116,357.55
VETERANS' HOME	\$ 13,579.29	0.42%	\$ 487,692.49	15.03%	\$ 2,744,057.37	84.55%	\$ 3,245,329.15
VOL ACTION COMM	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
WAR MEMORIALS COMMISSION	\$ 157,288.34	11.42%	\$ 132.75	0.01%	\$ 1,219,613.67	88.57%	\$ 1,377,034.76
WORKERS COMPENSATION BOARD	\$ 153.48	0.87%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 17,500.55	99.13%	\$ 17,654.03
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 2,845,082.02	13.88%	\$ 180,360.56	0.88%	\$ 17,476,033.88	85.24%	\$ 20,501,476.46
TOTAL SPEND UTILIZATION	\$ 33,197,657.01		\$ 33,779,980.45		\$ 1,501,869,541.78		\$ 1,568,847,179.23
	2.12%		2.15%		95.73%		
TIER-TWO PEOPLESOFT ADJUSTMENT	\$ 167,422.67		\$ 93,029.04				
QPA ADJUSTMENT	\$ 1,674,073.09		\$ 1,116,048.73				
PUBLIC WORKS ADJUSTMENT	\$ 2,220,295.90		\$ -				
ADJUSTED TOTAL SPEND UTILIZATION	\$ 37,259,448.67		\$ 34,989,058.21		\$ 1,496,598,672.36		\$ 1,568,847,179.23
	2.37%		2.23%		95.39%		
	MBE		WBE		NON		

BUCHER + CHRISTIAN

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

9.9. Fiscal Year 2005 Utilization by State Agency

Agency/Business Unit	MBE	MBE%	WBE	WBE%	NON	NON%	TOTAL
ACCOUNTS, STATE BOARD OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 20,103.26	9.08%	\$ 201,385.46	90.92%	\$ 221,488.72
ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF (+ IOT AND PUBLIC WORKS)	\$ 470,416.66	2.88%	\$ 337,841.67	2.07%	\$ 15,501,911.15	95.04%	\$ 16,310,169.48
AGRICULTURE, INDIANA STATE DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO COMMISSION	\$ 5,327.97	1.02%	\$ 24.84	0.00%	\$ 519,262.94	98.98%	\$ 524,615.75
ANIMAL HEALTH, BOARD OF	\$ 15,330.85	4.40%	\$ 14,638.36	4.20%	\$ 318,322.22	91.40%	\$ 348,291.43
ARTS COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 960.00	0.98%	\$ 96,625.34	99.02%	\$ 97,585.34
BOARD OF TAX REVIEW, INDIANA	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 84,405.00	69.04%	\$ 37,850.41	30.96%	\$ 122,255.41
BUDGET AGENCY	\$ 24,206.05	0.66%	\$ 4,510.95	0.12%	\$ 3,623,111.94	99.21%	\$ 3,651,828.94
CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, INDIANA	\$ 10,715.25	8.64%	\$ 4,569.75	3.69%	\$ 108,683.86	87.67%	\$ 123,968.86
COMMERCE, DEPARTMENT OF (NOW IEDC)	\$ 558,020.89	14.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 3,427,842.62	86.00%	\$ 3,985,863.51
CORONERS TRAINING BOARD	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 275,720.92	100.00%	\$ 275,720.92
CORRECTION, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 2,348,674.93	12.88%	\$ 2,909,523.01	15.96%	\$ 12,975,160.23	71.16%	\$ 18,233,358.17
CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE	\$ 281,461.65	4.33%	\$ 43,176.60	0.66%	\$ 6,170,705.10	95.00%	\$ 6,495,343.35
DOC / PEN PRODUCTS	\$ 35,398.07	0.16%	\$ 36,887.00	0.16%	\$ 22,562,140.64	99.68%	\$ 22,634,425.71
EMPLOYEE APPEALS COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 154.23	100.00%	\$ 154.23
ENVIRONMENTAL ADJUDICATION, OFFICE OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 59,997.82	100.00%	\$ 59,997.82
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 398,439.64	2.42%	\$ 279,262.86	1.69%	\$ 15,802,372.27	95.89%	\$ 16,480,074.76
FAITH-BASED AND COMMUNITY INITIATIVES, OFFICE OF	\$ 247.17	3.50%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 6,822.34	96.50%	\$ 7,069.51
FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 3,408.75	0.74%	\$ 6,893.00	1.49%	\$ 453,454.36	97.78%	\$ 463,756.11
FIRE AND BUILDING SERVICES DEPARTMENT	\$ 78,528.43	14.84%	\$ 40.26	0.01%	\$ 450,729.99	85.16%	\$ 529,298.68
FAMILY AND SOCIAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION	\$ 5,444,102.70	1.98%	\$ 4,475,802.78	1.63%	\$ 264,973,836.99	96.39%	\$ 274,893,742.47
GAMING COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 32,885.00	3.69%	\$ 857,737.06	96.31%	\$ 890,622.06
GAMING RESEARCH, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 5,000.00	24.39%	\$ 15,503.94	75.61%	\$ 20,503.94
GOVERNOR, OFFICE OF THE	\$ 3,894.79	3.56%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 105,476.94	96.44%	\$ 109,371.73
GOVERNOR'S PLANNING COUNCIL FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	\$ 1,000.00	0.31%	\$ 123,903.63	37.99%	\$ 201,218.20	61.70%	\$ 326,121.83
HEALTH PROFESSIONS SERVICE BUREAU	\$ 156,906.14	20.23%	\$ 10,047.77	1.30%	\$ 608,838.50	78.48%	\$ 775,792.41
HEALTH, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 610,140.59	3.66%	\$ 48,601.38	0.29%	\$ 15,992,763.31	96.04%	\$ 16,651,505.28
HIGHER EDUCATION, COMMISSION FOR	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 42,145.07	1.31%	\$ 3,183,499.70	98.69%	\$ 3,225,644.77
HISTORICAL BUREAU, INDIANA	\$ 1,080.02	7.37%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 13,578.34	92.63%	\$ 14,658.36
HOMELAND SECURITY, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 18,109.36	1.58%	\$ 1,223.66	0.11%	\$ 1,128,395.17	98.32%	\$ 1,147,728.19
HORSE RACING COMMISSION	\$ 29,239.00	5.18%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 534,922.76	94.82%	\$ 564,161.76
INSPECTOR GENERAL	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,241.00	100.00%	\$ 1,241.00
INSURANCE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 31,469.45	5.74%	\$ 37.90	0.01%	\$ 516,983.61	94.26%	\$ 548,490.96
INTEGRATED PUBLIC SAFETY COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 2,005,058.91	100.00%	\$ 2,005,058.91
LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 9,457.08	4.51%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 200,314.72	95.49%	\$ 209,771.80
LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADEMY BOARD	\$ 19,798.94	1.97%	\$ 3,518.89	0.35%	\$ 980,918.90	97.68%	\$ 1,004,236.73
LIBRARY, INDIANA STATE	\$ 3,681.31	1.32%	\$ 4,122.12	1.48%	\$ 270,049.28	97.19%	\$ 277,852.71
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S OFFICE	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 207,150.18	100.00%	\$ 207,150.18
LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 6,245.99	2.07%	\$ 28,669.82	9.48%	\$ 267,497.88	88.45%	\$ 302,413.69
MANAGEMENT & BUDGET, OFFICE OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
MOTOR VEHICLES, BUREAU OF	\$ 66,636.23	0.45%	\$ 2,640.15	0.02%	\$ 14,782,430.41	99.53%	\$ 14,851,706.79
PERSONNEL, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 8,027.64	4.98%	\$ 2,969.22	1.84%	\$ 150,208.91	93.18%	\$ 161,205.77
POLICE, STATE	\$ 135,713.86	0.81%	\$ 121,858.90	0.73%	\$ 16,464,472.48	98.46%	\$ 16,722,045.24
PROFESSIONAL LICENSING AGENCY	\$ 2,329.04	1.95%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 116,810.23	98.05%	\$ 119,139.27
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS, DIVISION OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 44.13	0.01%	\$ 721,139.09	99.99%	\$ 721,183.22
PROPRIETARY EDUCATION, COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 3,055.45	31.73%	\$ 6,572.63	68.27%	\$ 9,628.08
PUBLIC ACCESS COUNSELOR, OFFICE OF	\$ 359.69	15.16%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 2,012.75	84.84%	\$ 2,372.44
PUBLIC RECORDS, INDIANA COMMISSION ON	\$ 469.60	0.29%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 161,317.15	99.71%	\$ 161,786.75
PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING INSTITUTE	\$ 32,505.42	18.69%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 141,396.49	81.31%	\$ 173,901.91
REVENUE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 427,186.30	3.04%	\$ 444,447.28	3.16%	\$ 13,189,840.42	93.80%	\$ 14,061,474.00
SOLDIERS/SAILORS CHILDRENS HOME	\$ 18,889.62	1.38%	\$ 3,075.00	0.23%	\$ 1,343,680.10	98.39%	\$ 1,365,644.72
STUDENT ASSISTANCE COMMISSION	\$ 2,900.00	0.25%	\$ 7,695.22	0.67%	\$ 1,141,404.36	99.08%	\$ 1,151,999.58
TOBACCO USE PREVENTION & CESSATION BOARD	\$ 10,858.50	0.24%	\$ 83,362.64	1.86%	\$ 4,376,002.26	97.89%	\$ 4,470,223.40
TRANSPORTATION, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 18,248,936.95	2.19%	\$ 15,976,922.63	1.92%	\$ 799,508,659.32	95.89%	\$ 833,734,518.90
UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR	\$ 2,945.30	0.81%	\$ 18,540.86	5.10%	\$ 342,292.48	94.09%	\$ 363,778.64
UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION	\$ 361.46	0.03%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,078,792.60	99.97%	\$ 1,079,154.06
VETERANS AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 191.13	0.18%	\$ 108,761.34	99.82%	\$ 108,952.47
VETERANS' HOME	\$ 111,899.68	1.76%	\$ 661,171.43	10.39%	\$ 5,590,109.83	87.85%	\$ 6,363,180.94
VOL ACTION COMM	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
WAR MEMORIALS COMMISSION	\$ 66,492.40	3.11%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 2,072,064.65	96.89%	\$ 2,138,557.05
WORKERS COMPENSATION BOARD	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 20,148.90	100.00%	\$ 20,148.90
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 898,633.95	7.41%	\$ 263,448.94	2.17%	\$ 10,961,692.02	90.41%	\$ 12,123,774.91
TOTAL SPEND UTILIZATION	\$ 30,600,447.32		\$ 26,108,217.56		\$ 1,246,937,047.65		\$ 1,303,645,712.52
	2.35%		2.00%		95.65%		
TIER-TWO PEOPLESOFT ADJUSTMENT	\$ 167,422.67		\$ 93,029.04				
QPA ADJUSTMENT	\$ 3,645,922.51		\$ 2,430,615.01				
PUBLIC WORKS ADJUSTMENT	\$ 3,084,826.00		\$ 1,980,575.24				
ADJUSTED TOTAL SPEND UTILIZATION	\$ 37,498,618.50		\$ 30,612,436.84		\$ 1,235,534,657.18		\$ 1,303,645,712.52
	2.88%		2.35%		94.78%		
	MBE		WBE		NON		

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

9.10. Utilization by Industry Classification and State Agency

Agency/Business Unit	Construction				TOTAL
	MBE	MBE %	WBE	WBE %	
ACCOUNTS, STATE BOARD OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF (+ IOT AND PUBLIC WORKS)	\$ 9,717,066.04	6.89%	\$ 1,980,575.24	1.40%	\$ 129,284,017.61
ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
ANIMAL HEALTH, BOARD OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
ARTS COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
BOARD OF TAX REVIEW, INDIANA	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
BUDGET AGENCY	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, INDIANA	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
COMMERCE, DEPARTMENT OF (NOW IEDC)	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
CORONERS TRAINING BOARD	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
CORRECTION, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 11,975.20	2.22%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 526,713.59
CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
EMPLOYEE APPEALS COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
ENVIRONMENTAL ADJUDICATION, OFFICE OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
FAITH-BASED AND COMMUNITY INITIATIVES, OFFICE OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
FIRE AND BUILDING SERVICES DEPARTMENT	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
FAMILY AND SOCIAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION	\$ 27,778.07	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 8,632,613.73
GAMING COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
GAMING RESEARCH, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
GOVERNOR, OFFICE OF THE	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
GOVERNOR'S PLANNING COUNCIL FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
HEALTH PROFESSIONS SERVICE BUREAU	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
HEALTH, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 5,886,046.89
HIGHER EDUCATION, COMMISSION FOR	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
HISTORICAL BUREAU, INDIANA	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
HOMELAND SECURITY, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
HORSE RACING COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
INSPECTOR GENERAL	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
INSURANCE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
INTEGRATED PUBLIC SAFETY COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADEMY BOARD	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 285,968.75
LIBRARY, INDIANA STATE	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S OFFICE	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
MOTOR VEHICLES, BUREAU OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
PEN PRODUCTS	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 3,181,509.67
PERSONNEL, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
POLICE, STATE	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 147,254.29
PROFESSIONAL LICENSING AGENCY	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS, DIVISION OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
PROPRIETARY EDUCATION, COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
PUBLIC ACCESS COUNSELOR, OFFICE OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
PUBLIC RECORDS, INDIANA COMMISSION ON	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING INSTITUTE (REPEALED IN 2005)	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
REVENUE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 4,295,975.30
SOLDIERS/SAILORS CHILDRENS HOME	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 425,800.00
STUDENT ASSISTANCE COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
TOBACCO USE PREVENTION & CESSATION BOARD	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
TRANSPORTATION, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 12,232,960.20	0.60%	\$ 39,791,709.64	1.95%	\$ 1,993,074,076.90
UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
VETERANS AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
VETERANS' HOME	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 643,515.00
VOL ACTION COMM	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
WAR MEMORIALS COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
WORKERS COMPENSATION BOARD	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 6,216,910.44
TOTALS	\$ 21,989,779.51		\$ 41,772,284.88		\$ 2,152,600,402.17
	0.99%		1.88%		97.12%
	MBE		WBE		NON

BUCHER + CHRISTIAN

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

Agency/Business Unit	Procurement							TOTAL
	MBE	MBE %	WBE	WBE %	NON	NON %		
ACCOUNTS, STATE BOARD OF	\$ 506.07	0.11%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 442,904.08	99.89%	\$ 443,410.15	
ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF (+ IOT AND PUBLIC WORKS)	\$ 487,504.42	0.51%	\$ 183,582.13	0.19%	\$ 94,152,897.59	99.29%	\$ 94,823,984.14	
ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO COMMISSION	\$ 723.80	0.05%	\$ 2,870.19	0.22%	\$ 1,319,943.89	99.73%	\$ 1,323,537.88	
ANIMAL HEALTH, BOARD OF	\$ 36,662.67	3.41%	\$ 13,096.52	1.22%	\$ 1,026,259.12	95.38%	\$ 1,076,018.31	
ARTS COMMISSION	\$ 723.00	0.88%	\$ 207.00	0.25%	\$ 80,968.00	98.86%	\$ 81,898.00	
BOARD OF TAX REVIEW, INDIANA	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 14,475.00	18.66%	\$ 63,113.22	81.34%	\$ 77,588.22	
BUDGET AGENCY	\$ 47,417.31	2.24%	\$ 7,355.02	0.35%	\$ 2,063,411.29	97.41%	\$ 2,118,183.62	
CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, INDIANA	\$ 31,206.15	8.47%	\$ 1,083.89	0.29%	\$ 336,344.19	91.24%	\$ 368,634.23	
COMMERCE, DEPARTMENT OF (NOW IEDC)	\$ 1,448,371.90	14.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 8,897,141.43	86.00%	\$ 10,345,513.33	
CORONERS TRAINING BOARD	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 311,637.82	100.00%	\$ 311,637.82	
CORRECTION, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 185,000.00	0.47%	\$ 150,000.00	0.38%	\$ 38,856,760.01	99.15%	\$ 39,191,760.01	
CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE	\$ 277,978.11	2.93%	\$ 16,408.75	0.17%	\$ 9,201,453.03	96.90%	\$ 9,495,839.89	
EMPLOYEE APPEALS COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,824.43	100.00%	\$ 1,824.43	
ENVIRONMENTAL ADJUDICATION, OFFICE OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 184,410.00	100.00%	\$ 184,410.00	
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 922,710.53	2.34%	\$ 200,728.34	0.51%	\$ 38,384,973.85	97.16%	\$ 39,508,412.71	
FAITH-BASED AND COMMUNITY INITIATIVES, OFFICE OF	\$ 2,137.00	3.49%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 59,098.16	96.51%	\$ 61,235.16	
FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 11,536.00	0.90%	\$ 173.00	0.01%	\$ 1,276,932.92	99.09%	\$ 1,288,641.92	
FIRE AND BUILDING SERVICES DEPARTMENT	\$ 148,720.74	10.52%	\$ 1,250.00	0.09%	\$ 1,263,528.95	89.39%	\$ 1,413,499.69	
FAMILY AND SOCIAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION	\$ 3,430,439.29	0.00%	\$ 7,192,159.25	0.00%	\$ 225,727,796.57	0.00%	\$ 236,350,395.11	
GAMING COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 31,650.00	1.80%	\$ 1,722,136.25	98.20%	\$ 1,753,786.25	
GAMING RESEARCH, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 4,244.68	8.37%	\$ 30,000.00	59.14%	\$ 16,484.26	32.49%	\$ 50,728.94	
GOVERNOR, OFFICE OF THE	\$ 144.79	0.11%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 127,855.29	99.89%	\$ 128,000.08	
GOVERNOR'S PLANNING COUNCIL FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	\$ 8,983.42	2.82%	\$ 6,289.00	1.97%	\$ 303,256.89	95.21%	\$ 318,529.31	
HEALTH PROFESSIONS SERVICE BUREAU	\$ 3,285.96	0.18%	\$ 26,550.95	1.46%	\$ 1,788,390.17	98.36%	\$ 1,818,227.08	
HEALTH, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 384,297.47	3.26%	\$ 53,102.16	0.45%	\$ 11,345,737.05	96.29%	\$ 11,783,136.68	
HIGHER EDUCATION, COMMISSION FOR	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,625,170.35	100.00%	\$ 1,625,170.35	
HISTORICAL BUREAU, INDIANA	\$ 12,360.67	11.52%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 94,938.57	88.48%	\$ 107,299.24	
HOMELAND SECURITY, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 27,837.00	1.35%	\$ 2,117.70	0.10%	\$ 2,029,885.51	98.55%	\$ 2,059,840.21	
HORSE RACING COMMISSION	\$ 35,430.61	1.87%	\$ 495.00	0.03%	\$ 1,855,806.06	98.10%	\$ 1,891,731.67	
INSPECTOR GENERAL	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 5,832.74	100.00%	\$ 5,832.74	
INSURANCE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 7,189.91	0.55%	\$ 38.33	0.00%	\$ 1,292,606.26	99.44%	\$ 1,299,834.50	
INTEGRATED PUBLIC SAFETY COMMISSION	\$ 1,134.38	0.01%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 9,617,676.16	99.99%	\$ 9,618,810.54	
LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 24,720.31	3.71%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 641,864.03	96.29%	\$ 666,584.34	
LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADEMY BOARD	\$ 65,106.56	2.76%	\$ 4,933.55	0.21%	\$ 2,292,629.01	97.04%	\$ 2,362,669.12	
LIBRARY, INDIANA STATE	\$ 7,063.71	0.89%	\$ 16,133.75	2.03%	\$ 769,628.82	97.07%	\$ 792,826.08	
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S OFFICE	\$ 1,025.49	0.26%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 400,547.73	99.74%	\$ 401,573.22	
LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 10,179.76	2.10%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 474,743.39	97.90%	\$ 484,923.15	
MOTOR VEHICLES, BUREAU OF	\$ 77,959.21	0.18%	\$ 249,378.94	0.57%	\$ 43,228,234.98	99.25%	\$ 43,555,573.13	
PEN PRODUCTS	\$ 157,745.13	0.33%	\$ 449,083.31	0.95%	\$ 46,835,070.51	98.72%	\$ 47,441,898.95	
PERSONNEL, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 14,375.69	3.56%	\$ 5,594.28	1.39%	\$ 383,650.00	95.05%	\$ 403,619.97	
POLICE, STATE	\$ 97,706.29	0.21%	\$ 118,126.50	0.25%	\$ 47,148,201.80	99.54%	\$ 47,364,034.59	
PROFESSIONAL LICENSING AGENCY	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 383,083.59	100.00%	\$ 383,083.59	
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS, DIVISION OF	\$ 5,228.52	0.23%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 2,266,883.40	99.77%	\$ 2,272,111.92	
PROPRIETARY EDUCATION, COMMISSION	\$ 3,730.11	18.29%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 16,667.93	81.71%	\$ 20,398.04	
PUBLIC ACCESS COUNSELOR, OFFICE OF	\$ 359.69	4.85%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 7,049.05	95.15%	\$ 7,408.74	
PUBLIC RECORDS, INDIANA COMMISSION ON	\$ 6,154.50	1.21%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 502,109.99	98.79%	\$ 508,264.49	
PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING INSTITUTE (REPEALED IN 2005)	\$ 49,596.06	9.79%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 457,137.10	90.21%	\$ 506,733.16	
REVENUE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 627,870.53	2.72%	\$ 648,842.44	2.82%	\$ 21,769,046.63	94.46%	\$ 23,045,759.60	
SOLDIERS/SAIORS CHILDRENS HOME	\$ 27,165.18	1.03%	\$ 678.75	0.03%	\$ 2,612,860.70	98.95%	\$ 2,640,704.63	
STUDENT ASSISTANCE COMMISSION	\$ 4,300.00	0.38%	\$ 66,483.28	5.91%	\$ 1,054,887.24	93.71%	\$ 1,125,670.52	
TOBACCO USE PREVENTION & CESSATION BOARD	\$ 25,784.97	0.20%	\$ 53,500.35	0.41%	\$ 13,028,415.27	99.40%	\$ 13,107,700.59	
TRANSPORTATION, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 13,440,483.11	4.56%	\$ 16,036,530.92	5.44%	\$ 265,274,595.92	90.00%	\$ 294,751,609.95	
UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR	\$ 4,409.78	1.01%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 431,450.41	98.99%	\$ 435,860.19	
UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION	\$ 9,695.83	1.00%	\$ 500.00	0.05%	\$ 954,841.48	98.94%	\$ 965,037.31	
VETERANS AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 3.90	0.00%	\$ 2,648,748.04	100.00%	\$ 2,648,751.94	
VETERANS' HOME	\$ 43,592.74	0.52%	\$ 1,105,406.78	13.31%	\$ 7,155,972.81	86.16%	\$ 8,304,972.33	
VOL ACTION COMM	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	
WAR MEMORIALS COMMISSION	\$ 263,224.57	9.39%	\$ 132.75	0.00%	\$ 2,538,914.58	90.60%	\$ 2,802,271.90	
WORKERS COMPENSATION BOARD	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 26,073.26	100.00%	\$ 26,073.26	
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 2,711,295.61	12.33%	\$ 98,291.75	0.45%	\$ 19,172,360.14	87.22%	\$ 21,981,947.50	
TOTALS	\$ 25,195,319.22	2.55%	\$ 26,787,253.48	2.71%	\$ 937,952,841.72	94.75%	\$ 989,935,414.42	
	MBE		WBE		NON			

BUCHER + CHRISTIAN

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

Agency/Business Unit	Professional Services						TOTAL
	MBE	MBE %	WBE	WBE %	NON	NON %	
ACCOUNTS, STATE BOARD OF	\$ 4,534.00	2.95%	\$ 11,324.19	7.37%	\$ 137,725.79	89.67%	\$ 153,583.98
ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF (+ IOT AND PUBLIC WORKS)	\$ 10,324.50	0.06%	\$ 14,218.25	0.08%	\$ 16,866,265.98	99.85%	\$ 16,890,808.73
ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 210.00	0.05%	\$ 464,227.23	99.95%	\$ 464,437.23
ANIMAL HEALTH, BOARD OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 16,204.18	100.00%	\$ 16,204.18
ARTS COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 37,870.64	100.00%	\$ 37,870.64
BOARD OF TAX REVIEW, INDIANA	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 15,150.00	64.82%	\$ 8,224.00	35.18%	\$ 23,374.00
BUDGET AGENCY	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 7,135.37	0.33%	\$ 2,188,168.12	99.67%	\$ 2,195,303.49
CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, INDIANA	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 15,507.41	100.00%	\$ 15,507.41
COMMERCE, DEPARTMENT OF (NOW IEDC)	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
CORONERS TRAINING BOARD	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 64,825.74	100.00%	\$ 64,825.74
CORRECTION, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 19,738,697.56	52.33%	\$ 6,359,920.71	16.86%	\$ 11,619,169.38	30.81%	\$ 37,717,787.65
CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE	\$ 173,719.95	22.23%	\$ 6,122.00	0.78%	\$ 601,461.75	76.98%	\$ 781,303.70
EMPLOYEE APPEALS COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 984.00	100.00%	\$ 984.00
ENVIRONMENTAL ADJUDICATION, OFFICE OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 3,208.91	100.00%	\$ 3,208.91
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 45,533.27	1.64%	\$ 15,533.14	0.56%	\$ 2,722,342.20	97.81%	\$ 2,783,408.61
FAITH-BASED AND COMMUNITY INITIATIVES, OFFICE OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 450.00	100.00%	\$ 450.00
FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 20,520.00	10.76%	\$ 170,197.35	89.24%	\$ 190,717.35
FIRE AND BUILDING SERVICES DEPARTMENT	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 219,676.68	100.00%	\$ 219,676.68
FAMILY AND SOCIAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION	\$ 3,110,244.18	0.00%	\$ 1,318,794.73	0.00%	\$ 295,089,057.97	0.00%	\$ 299,518,096.88
GAMING COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 236,796.01	100.00%	\$ 236,796.01
GAMING RESEARCH, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
GOVERNOR, OFFICE OF THE	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 19,840.00	100.00%	\$ 19,840.00
GOVERNOR'S PLANNING COUNCIL FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	\$ 1,000.00	1.60%	\$ 38,220.56	61.17%	\$ 23,257.85	37.23%	\$ 62,478.41
HEALTH PROFESSIONS SERVICE BUREAU	\$ 140,000.00	47.02%	\$ 26,247.74	8.82%	\$ 131,483.71	44.16%	\$ 297,731.45
HEALTH, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 313,659.78	1.21%	\$ 17,993.40	0.07%	\$ 25,628,475.95	98.72%	\$ 25,960,129.13
HIGHER EDUCATION, COMMISSION FOR	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 700,025.54	10.46%	\$ 5,990,892.42	89.54%	\$ 6,690,917.96
HISTORICAL BUREAU, INDIANA	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 3,210.92	100.00%	\$ 3,210.92
HOMELAND SECURITY, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 15,580.83	100.00%	\$ 15,580.83
HORSE RACING COMMISSION	\$ 56.72	0.87%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 6,464.68	99.13%	\$ 6,521.40
INSPECTOR GENERAL	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 420.80	100.00%	\$ 420.80
INSURANCE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 293,486.37	100.00%	\$ 293,486.37
INTEGRATED PUBLIC SAFETY COMMISSION	\$ 5,208.00	3.48%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 144,340.40	96.52%	\$ 149,548.40
LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 219,956.81	100.00%	\$ 219,956.81
LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADEMY BOARD	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 78,548.65	100.00%	\$ 78,548.65
LIBRARY, INDIANA STATE	\$ 1,865.00	1.04%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 178,171.08	98.96%	\$ 180,036.08
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S OFFICE	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 87,514.11	100.00%	\$ 87,514.11
LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 15,739.88	6.62%	\$ 221,958.26	93.38%	\$ 237,698.14
MOTOR VEHICLES, BUREAU OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 860,107.04	100.00%	\$ 860,107.04
PEN PRODUCTS	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,200.00	0.04%	\$ 2,810,130.22	99.96%	\$ 2,811,330.22
PERSONNEL, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 119,668.55	100.00%	\$ 119,668.55
POLICE, STATE	\$ 1,160.00	0.04%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 2,801,727.15	99.96%	\$ 2,802,887.15
PROFESSIONAL LICENSING AGENCY	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 291,532.10	100.00%	\$ 291,532.10
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS, DIVISION OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 54,199.82	100.00%	\$ 54,199.82
PROPRIETARY EDUCATION, COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
PUBLIC ACCESS COUNSELOR, OFFICE OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 4,370.84	100.00%	\$ 4,370.84
PUBLIC RECORDS, INDIANA COMMISSION ON	\$ 6,575.00	36.79%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 11,296.15	63.21%	\$ 17,871.15
PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING INSTITUTE (REPEALED IN 2005)	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 48,996.28	100.00%	\$ 48,996.28
REVENUE, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 290,834.35	2.35%	\$ 175,433.24	1.42%	\$ 11,907,617.75	96.23%	\$ 12,373,885.34
SOLDIERS/SAILORS CHILDRENS HOME	\$ 1,174.83	0.42%	\$ 8,350.00	2.96%	\$ 272,945.88	96.63%	\$ 282,470.71
STUDENT ASSISTANCE COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 21,618.94	1.13%	\$ 1,883,834.40	98.87%	\$ 1,905,453.34
TOBACCO USE PREVENTION & CESSATION BOARD	\$ 9,500.00	0.32%	\$ 326,869.15	11.09%	\$ 2,609,797.25	88.58%	\$ 2,946,166.40
TRANSPORTATION, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 11,594,591.07	7.61%	\$ 634,467.30	0.42%	\$ 140,208,691.46	91.98%	\$ 152,437,749.83
UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 61,042.18	100.00%	\$ 61,042.18
UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 3,465,327.76	100.00%	\$ 3,465,327.76
VETERANS AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 10,350.54	100.00%	\$ 10,350.54
VETERANS' HOME	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 109,421.50	27.43%	\$ 289,548.34	72.57%	\$ 398,969.84
VOL ACTION COMM	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
WAR MEMORIALS COMMISSION	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 6,935.71	100.00%	\$ 6,935.71
WORKERS COMPENSATION BOARD	\$ 153.48	1.20%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 12,629.33	98.80%	\$ 12,782.81
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF	\$ 783,902.94	8.00%	\$ 395,640.67	4.04%	\$ 8,622,430.48	87.97%	\$ 9,801,974.09
TOTALS	\$ 36,232,734.63		\$ 10,240,156.30		\$ 539,859,145.42		\$ 586,332,036.35
	6.18%		1.75%		92.07%		
	MBE		WBE		NON		

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

9.11. Flawed/Alternative Disparity Calculations

The consultant investigated multiple approaches to determine the existence or non-existence of disparity. Ultimately the approach included in the main body of the report was found to be the most accurate and statistically sound method. The consultant has included the following approaches as examples which have been found to be statistically flawed as they overstate the general population of companies, including those that fall outside of the “ready, willing and able” scope. The consultant does not recommend using the data in this appendix for any goal setting initiatives that might result from this study.

***Census Data Approach**

*This approach uses US Economic Census data to determine the number of firms in Indiana as well as those owned by women and minorities. This approach was deemed not to be in full compliance with the ready, willing and able standard required by the governing case law. The U.S. Economic Census data creates a potentially vast overstatement of women-owned businesses, and thusly creates an artificially low disparity index. When examining the number of registered and certified WBEs with the State of Indiana, there are less than 2,000, while over 14,000 registered bidders. The proportion of approximately one-seventh, versus over forty percent creates a disconnect with the data.

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

*Census Data Approach

Construction					
	Percent of Actual MBE Expenditures	MBE Actual Expenditure	Percent of Available MBE Firms	Anticipated MBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)
Fiscal Year 2003	1.01%	\$ 7,729,475.56	0.89%	\$ 6,810,706.09	1.135
Fiscal Year 2004	1.04%	\$ 9,863,772.75	0.89%	\$ 8,420,088.57	1.171
Fiscal Year 2005	0.83%	\$ 5,370,146.82	0.89%	\$ 5,798,911.49	0.926
	Percent of Actual WBE Expenditures	Actual WBE Expenditure	Percent of Available WBE Firms	Anticipated WBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)
Fiscal Year 2003	2.37%	\$ 18,065,246.34	7.45%	\$ 56,871,319.79	0.318
Fiscal Year 2004	1.59%	\$ 15,048,670.44	7.45%	\$ 70,310,118.13	0.214
Fiscal Year 2005	2.20%	\$ 14,303,268.93	7.45%	\$ 48,422,549.07	0.295
Procurement					
	Percent of Actual MBE Expenditures	MBE Actual Expenditure	Percent of Available MBE Firms	Anticipated MBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)
Fiscal Year 2003	4.26%	\$ 18,341,473.32	1.95%	\$ 8,384,755.02	2.187
Fiscal Year 2004	4.63%	\$ 20,485,697.37	1.95%	\$ 8,621,608.95	2.376
Fiscal Year 2005	5.66%	\$ 23,020,995.78	1.95%	\$ 7,921,668.07	2.906
	Percent of Actual WBE Expenditures	Actual WBE Expenditure	Percent of Available WBE Firms	Anticipated WBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)
Fiscal Year 2003	2.81%	\$ 12,080,098.48	40.08%	\$ 172,397,508.40	0.070
Fiscal Year 2004	3.75%	\$ 16,586,873.83	40.08%	\$ 177,267,421.24	0.094
Fiscal Year 2005	3.45%	\$ 14,026,395.98	40.08%	\$ 162,876,056.99	0.086
Professional Services					
	Percent of Actual MBE Expenditures	MBE Actual Expenditure	Percent of Available MBE Firms	Anticipated MBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)
Fiscal Year 2003	2.73%	\$ 5,844,372.82	2.65%	\$ 5,666,346.14	1.031
Fiscal Year 2004	2.75%	\$ 6,415,789.72	2.65%	\$ 6,180,999.94	1.038
Fiscal Year 2005	3.60%	\$ 8,869,381.90	2.65%	\$ 6,531,342.70	1.358
	Percent of Actual WBE Expenditures	Actual WBE Expenditure	Percent of Available WBE Firms	Anticipated WBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)
Fiscal Year 2003	0.83%	\$ 1,783,627.92	26.77%	\$ 57,270,886.57	0.031
Fiscal Year 2004	0.72%	\$ 1,677,591.17	26.77%	\$ 62,472,594.84	0.027
Fiscal Year 2005	0.93%	\$ 2,299,531.53	26.77%	\$ 66,013,578.75	0.035

Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

****Bidder-Vendor Data Approach**

**This approach uses a combination of Bidder and Vendor data to determine the number of firms to factor into the study. This approach was deemed not to be in full compliance with the ready, willing and able standard required by the governing case law. The data contained in the vendor listing contains data where the State of Indiana went to and made direct purchases and the vendor did not choose to solicit the State for business. Additionally, the data contained in the vendor database did not contain an indicator that would allow the consultant to assign an industry classification to it. Thusly, extrapolations would have had to been made from bidder data or other outside sources, injecting potential bias into the calculations.

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

**Bidder-Vendor Data Approach

Construction					
	Percent of Actual MBE Expenditures	MBE Actual Expenditure	Percent of Available MBE Firms	Anticipated MBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)
Fiscal Year 2003	1.01%	\$ 7,729,475.56	4.62%	\$ 35,245,425.82	0.636
Fiscal Year 2004	1.04%	\$ 9,863,772.75	4.62%	\$ 43,573,985.31	0.656
Fiscal Year 2005	0.83%	\$ 5,370,146.82	4.62%	\$ 30,009,385.53	0.519
	Percent of Actual WBE Expenditures	Actual WBE Expenditure	Percent of Available WBE Firms	Anticipated WBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)
Fiscal Year 2003	2.37%	\$ 18,065,246.34	1.02%	\$ 7,755,407.11	2.329
Fiscal Year 2004	1.59%	\$ 15,048,670.44	1.02%	\$ 9,588,024.19	1.570
Fiscal Year 2005	1.90%	\$ 12,322,693.69	1.02%	\$ 6,603,268.27	1.866
Procurement					
	Percent of Actual MBE Expenditures	MBE Actual Expenditure	Percent of Available MBE Firms	Anticipated MBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)
Fiscal Year 2003	4.26%	\$ 18,341,473.32	3.46%	\$ 14,868,059.77	1.234
Fiscal Year 2004	4.63%	\$ 20,485,697.37	3.46%	\$ 15,288,055.14	1.340
Fiscal Year 2005	5.66%	\$ 23,020,995.78	3.46%	\$ 14,046,902.26	1.639
	Percent of Actual WBE Expenditures	Actual WBE Expenditure	Percent of Available WBE Firms	Anticipated WBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)
Fiscal Year 2003	2.81%	\$ 12,080,098.48	4.97%	\$ 21,369,302.63	0.565
Fiscal Year 2004	3.75%	\$ 16,586,873.83	4.97%	\$ 21,972,946.17	0.755
Fiscal Year 2005	3.45%	\$ 14,026,395.98	4.97%	\$ 20,189,083.85	0.695
Professional Services					
	Percent of Actual MBE Expenditures	MBE Actual Expenditure	Percent of Available MBE Firms	Anticipated MBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)
Fiscal Year 2003	2.68%	\$ 5,728,172.82	1.34%	\$ 2,869,464.83	1.996
Fiscal Year 2004	2.68%	\$ 6,242,239.72	1.34%	\$ 3,130,087.99	1.994
Fiscal Year 2005	3.45%	\$ 8,505,181.90	1.34%	\$ 3,307,503.24	2.571
	Percent of Actual WBE Expenditures	Actual WBE Expenditure	Percent of Available WBE Firms	Anticipated WBE Expenditure	Disparity Index (< 0.80 = Disparity)
Fiscal Year 2003	0.83%	\$ 1,783,627.92	1.20%	\$ 2,565,281.28	0.695
Fiscal Year 2004	0.68%	\$ 1,577,591.17	1.20%	\$ 2,798,276.54	0.564
Fiscal Year 2005	0.81%	\$ 1,999,531.53	1.20%	\$ 2,956,884.52	0.676

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

9.12. Listing of Object Code Industry Classifications

Industry Code Classifications

- C = Construction
- P = Procurement (Supplies, Other Services)
- PS = Professional Services
- EXCL = Excluded from Study

Object Code	Long Description	Short Description	Industry Classification
531100	Land/Buildings	Land/Bui	C
531101	Land/Buildings	Land/Bui	C
535000	Construction Material	Construc	C
535001	Construction Material	Construc	C
560100	Assoc Cost-Land	Assoc Co	C
560400	Resurface,Restore	Resurfac	C
560900	Condemnation	Condemna	C
561000	Purch Land-Fed Id Req	Purch La	C
561100	Land Damage-Improvement	Land Dam	C
561200	Relocation Expense-Hwy	Relocati	C
561400	Other L/A/Cost (Noc)	Other L/	C
562000	Bridge Repl-Programmed	Bridge R	C
562100	Bridge Reconstruction	Bridge R	C
563000	Non-Interest Resurf Pro	Non-Inte	C
563001	Non-Interstate Resurfac	Non-Inte	C
563100	Interest Resurf Program	Interest	C
564000	Intelligent Veh Hwy Sys	Intellig	C
564400	Fed Aid-Construction	Fed Aid-	C
565100	Roadside Improv Program	Roadside	C
565200	Major Hwy Improv Progra	Major Hw	C
565201	Mjr Hwy Improve Prgm	Mjr Hwy	C
566000	Road Constr Program	Road Con	C
568000	Park Facilities Program	Park Fac	C
568001	Park Facilities 08/96	Park Fac	C
E56000	Land / Buildings Roll Up	Land/Bldg	C
520200	Mail Sorting	Mail Sor	P
520201	Mail Sorting	Mail Sor	P
528000	Time Clock Service	Time Clo	P

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

529900	Services Noc	Services	P
529901	Services Noc	Services	P
531400	Street Sweeping	Street S	P
531500	Snow/Ice Removal	Snow/Ice	P
531501	Snow/Ice Removal	Snow/Ice	P
531600	Tree Trimming	Tree Tri	P
531601	Tree Trimming	Tree Tri	P
531700	Mowing	Mowing	P
532000	Bridge Painting	Bridge P	P
532001	Bridge Painting	Bridge P	P
532400	Telephone Equip/Serv	Telephon	P
532401	Telephone Equip/Serv	Telephon	P
532500	Ditch Cleaning	Ditch Cl	P
532600	Resurfacing	Resurfac	P
532700	Landscaping	Landscap	P
533000	Hwy Bridge Maintenance	Hwy Brid	P
533100	Repair Bldg/Structure	Repair B	P
533101	Repair Bldg/Structure	Repair B	P
533200	Repair Motor Vehicle	Repair M	P
533201	Repair Motor Vehicle	Repair M	P
533300	Repair Shop Equipment	Repair S	P
533301	Repair Shop Equipment	Repair S	P
533500	Razing/Demolition Cost	Razing/D	P
533600	Repair Aircraft	Repair A	P
533700	Repair Educational Equ	Repair E	P
533800	Repair Recreational Equ	Repair R	P
533900	Repair Office Equip	Repair O	P
533901	Repair Office Equip	Repair O	P
534400	Laundry,Linen Svc	Laundry,	P
534401	Laundry,Linen Svc	Laundry,	P
534600	Maint,Repair,Insp Noc	Maint,Re	P
534601	Maint,Repair,Insp Noc	Maint,Re	P
534700	Pest Control	Pest Con	P
534701	Pest Control	Pest Con	P
534800	Janitorial Svc	Janitori	P
534801	Janitorial Svc	Janitori	P
534900	Marine Svc/Repair	Marine S	P
535200	Courier Service	Courier	P
535201	Courier Service	Courier	P

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

536000	Food Processing	Food Pro	P
536001	Food Processing	Food Pro	P
536100	Repair Fence	Repair F	P
536200	Road Illumination	Road Ill	P
538400	Cleaning Services	Cleaning	P
538401	Cleaning Services	Cleaning	P
570600	Job Search	Job Search	P
570601	Job Search	Job Search	P
570700	Relocation	Relocation	P
570701	Relocation	Relocation	P
520400	Freight & Express	Freight	P
520401	Freight & Express	Freight	P
520600	Dues & Subscriptions	Dues & S	P
520601	Dues & Subscriptions	Dues & S	P
520700	Legal Advertising	Legal Ad	P
520701	Legal Advertising	Legal Ad	P
521100	Gasoline Credit Cards	Gasoline	P
521101	Gasoline Credit Cards	Gasoline	P
521200	Samples/Evidence	Samples/	P
521201	Samples/Evidence	Samples/	P
521700	Beepers & Bellboys	Beepers	P
521701	Beepers & Bellboys	Beepers	P
521800	Vehicular Telephones	Vehicula	P
521801	Vehicular Telephones	Vehicula	P
521900	Telecomm Telephone Exp	Telecomm	P
522000	Local Telephone Service	Local Te	P
522001	Local Telephone Service	Local Te	P
522100	Long Distance Telephone	Long Dis	P
522101	Long Distance Telephone	Long Dis	P
522200	Computer Data Trans	Computer	P
522201	Computer Data Trans	Computer	P
524000	Lock Box Rental	Lock Box	P
524001	Lock Box Rental	Lock Box	P
530100	Advertising	Advertis	P
530101	Advertising	Advertis	P
530200	Printing/Binding	Printing	P
530201	Printing/Binding	Printing	P
530500	Large-Scale Computer	Large-Sc	P
530501	Large-Scale Computer	Large-Sc	P

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

530600	Agy In/Output Device	Agy In/O	P
530601	Agy In/Output Device	Agy In/O	P
530700	Data Preparation Equip	Data Pre	P
531000	Dp Storage Media	Dp Stora	P
531200	Office Equipment	Office E	P
531201	Office Equipment	Office E	P
531300	Equipment	Equipmen	P
531401	Street Sweepers	Sweepers	P
531900	Rentals Noc	Rentals	P
531901	Rentals Noc	Rentals	P
532100	Fire Tornado & Marine	Fire Tor	P
532200	Auto Insurance	Auto Ins	P
532201	Auto Insurance	Auto Ins	P
532300	Surety Bond-Officials	Surety B	P
532800	Guard Rail	Guard Ra	P
533400	Manufacturing Costs	Manufact	P
533401	Manufacturing Costs	Manufact	P
534000	Office Copier	Office C	P
534001	Office Copier	Office C	P
534100	Burial Exp-St Depend	Burial E	P
535300	Herbicide	Herbicid	P
535500	Micrographics Equip	Microgra	P
535501	Micrographics Equip	Microgra	P
535600	Film Processing Costs	Film Pro	P
535601	Film Processing Costs	Film Pro	P
535800	Distribution Proc Equ	Distribu	P
536300	Pavement Markings	Pavement	P
536400	Erect Signals	Erect Si	P
536401	Erect Signals	Erect Si	P
536600	Erect Signs	Erect Si	P
536601	Erect Signs	Erect Si	P
536800	Repair Weigh/Rest Area	Repair W	P
536801	Repair Weigh/Rest	Repair W	P
536900	Curb Repair	Curb Rep	P
537000	Agreements & Fees	Agreemen	P
537001	Agreements & Fees	Agreemen	P
537100	Hosp-Lab Test	Hosp-Lab	P
537101	Hosp-Lab Test	Hosp-Lab	P
537200	Hosp-Home Health Care	Hosp-Hom	P

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

537300	Hosp-Equip Repair	Hosp-Equ	P
537301	Hosp-Equip Repair	Hosp-Equ	P
537400	Hosp-Sewing Equip Repa	Hosp-Sew	P
537500	Word Process Equip	Word Pro	P
537600	Minicomputers	Minicomp	P
538000	Data Process Equip	Data Pro	P
538300	Personal Computer	Personal	P
538301	Personal Computer	Personal	P
538600	Training Fee-St Wards	Training	P
538700	Move/Transport Exp	Move/Tra	P
538701	Move/Transport Exp	Move/Tra	P
538800	Security Alarms	Security	P
538801	Security Alarms	Security	P
539100	Work Shops	Work Sho	P
539101	Work Shops	Work Sho	P
539800	Hosp-Contractual Noc	Hosp-Con	P
539801	Hosp-Contractual Noc	Hosp-Con	P
540100	Stationery/Office Supp	Statione	P
540101	Stationery/Office Supp	Statione	P
540200	Food	Food	P
540201	Food	Food	P
540300	Livestock Supply	Livestoc	P
540301	Livestock Supply	Livestoc	P
540400	Medical/Med Lab Supp	Medical/	P
540401	Medical/Med Lab Supp	Medical/	P
540500	Laundry,Cleaning Supp	Laundry,	P
540501	Laundry,Cleaning Supp	Laundry,	P
540600	Mtr Vehicle Fuel/Lube	Mtr Vehi	P
540601	Mtr Vehicle Fuel/Lube	Mtr Vehi	P
540700	Heating Fuel	Heating	P
540701	Heating Fuel	Heating	P
540800	Refrigeration Supply	Refriger	P
540801	Refrigeration Supply	Refriger	P
540900	Dental/Dental Lab Supp	Dental/D	P
541000	Educ Supp,Magazines	Educ Sup	P
541001	Educ Supp,Magazines	Educ Sup	P
541100	Recreational Supply	Recreati	P
541101	Recreational Supply	Recreati	P
541200	Ag/Botanical Supply	Ag/Botan	P

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

541201	Ag/Botanical Supply	Ag/Botan	P
541300	Wearing Apparel	Wearing	P
541301	Wearing Apparel	Wearing	P
541400	Power Plant Supply	Power Pl	P
541401	Power Plant Supply	Power Pl	P
541500	Household Supply	Househol	P
541501	Household Supply	Househol	P
541600	Manufacturing Supply	Manufact	P
541601	Manufacturing Supply	Manufact	P
541700	Aircraft Supply,Parts	Aircraft	P
541701	Aircraft Supply,Parts	Aircraft	P
541800	Weapons,Ammo,Rng Items	Weapons,	P
541801	Weapons,Ammo,Rng Items	Weapons,	P
541900	State Flags	State Fl	P
542000	Camera Supply	Camera S	P
542001	Camera Supply	Camera S	P
542100	Lumber,Building Supply	Lumber,B	P
542101	Lumber,Building Supply	Lumber,B	P
542200	Plumbing,Drainage Mat	Plumbing	P
542201	Plumbing,Drainage Mat	Plumbing	P
542300	Electrical Supply	Electric	P
542301	Electrical Supply	Electric	P
542400	Painting Supply	Painting	P
542401	Painting Supply	Painting	P
542500	Aggregate,Hwy Material	Aggregat	P
542501	Aggregate,Hwy Material	Aggregat	P
542600	Copier Supply, Paper	Copier S	P
542601	Copier Supply, Paper	Copier S	P
542700	Draft/Engineer Supply	Draft/En	P
542701	Draft/Engineer Supply	Draft/En	P
542800	Data Processing Supply	Data Pro	P
542801	Data Processing Supply	Data Pro	P
542900	Research/Test Supply	Research	P
542901	Research/Test Supply	Research	P
543000	Iron & Steel	Iron & S	P
543100	Auto Parts/Supply	Auto Par	P
543101	Auto Parts/Supply	Auto Par	P
543200	Repair Parts/Supply	Repair P	P
543201	Repair Parts/Supply	Repair P	P

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

543300	Small Tools/Implements	Small To	P
543301	Small Tools/Implements	Small To	P
543400	Shop Machine Parts	Shop Mac	P
543401	Shop Machine Parts	Shop Mac	P
543500	Acetylene/Oxygen	Acetylen	P
543501	Acetylene/Oxygen	Acetylen	P
543600	Alcohol/Antifreeze	Alcohol/	P
543601	Alcohol/Antifreeze	Alcohol/	P
543700	Weed/Bush Chemicals	Weed/Bus	P
543800	Nursery Products	Nursery	P
543801	Nursery Products	Nursery	P
543900	Sod	Sod	P
544000	Bridge Materials	Bridge M	P
544100	Guard Rail/Posts	Guard Ra	P
544101	Guard Rail/Posts	Guard Ra	P
544200	Fencing/Posts	Fencing/	P
544300	Asphalt/Tars	Asphalt/	P
544301	Asphalt/Tars	Asphalt/	P
544400	Bituminous Mixtures	Bitumino	P
544401	Bituminous Mixtures	Bitumino	P
544500	Cement & Concrete	Cement &	P
544501	Cement & Concrete	Cement &	P
544600	Signs/Posts	Signs/Po	P
544601	Signs/Posts	Signs/Po	P
544700	Signals/Parts	Signals/	P
544800	Aircraft Fuel/Lube	Aircraft	P
544801	Aircraft Fuel/Lube	Aircraft	P
544900	Roadway Illumination Pa	Roadway	P
545000	Salt/Sodium Chloride	Salt/Sod	P
545001	Salt/Sodium Chloride	Salt/Sod	P
545100	Calcium Chloride	Calcium	P
545200	Sand/Cinders	Sand/Cin	P
545300	Roadway Pipe/Tile	Roadway	P
545400	Equip Paint/Supply	Equip Pa	P
545401	Equip Paint/Supply	Equip Pa	P
545500	Micrographics Supply	Microgra	P
545501	Micrographics Supply	Microgra	P
545600	Auto License Plates	Auto Lic	P
545601	Auto License Plates	Auto Lic	P

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

545700	Info Proc Storage Media	Info Pro	P
545800	Rdway Paint/Supply	Rdway Pa	P
545900	Safety Supply	Safety S	P
545901	Safety Supply	Safety S	P
546000	Hsp-Acetylene/Oxygen	Hsp-Acet	P
546001	Hsp-Acetylene/Oxygen	Hsp-Acet	P
546100	Livestock/Other Animal	Livestoc	P
546101	Livestock/Other Animal	Livestoc	P
546200	Hsp-Drugs/Medicines	Hsp-Drug	P
546201	Hsp-Drugs/Medicines	Hsp-Drug	P
546300	Hsp-Lab Supply	Hsp-Lab	P
546400	Hsp-Electrocardiology	Hsp-Elec	P
546500	Hsp-Electroencephalogram	Hsp-Elec	P
546600	Hsp-Radiology	Hsp-Radi	P
546700	Hsp-Other Medical Supp	Hsp-Othe	P
546800	Hsp-Laundry Supply	Hsp-Laun	P
546801	Hsp-Laundry Supply	Hsp-Laun	P
546900	Hsp-Housekeep Supply	Hsp-Hous	P
546901	Hsp-Housekeep Supply	Hsp-Hous	P
547000	Hsp-Occu Therapy Supp	Hsp-Occu	P
547001	Hsp-Occu Therapy Supp	Hsp-Occu	P
547100	Hsp-Child Occup Supp	Hsp-Chil	P
547300	Hsp-Linens,Clothing	Hsp-Line	P
547301	Hsp-Linens,Clothing	Hsp-Line	P
547400	Hsp-Dietary Supp/Food	Hsp-Diet	P
547401	Hsp-Dietary Supp/Food	Hsp-Diet	P
547500	Hsp-Barber/Beauty Shop	Hsp-Barb	P
547600	Hsp-Oxygen,Dispensary	Hsp-Oxyg	P
547700	Awards/Gifts	Awards/G	P
547701	Awards/Gifts	Awards/G	P
548001	Institu/Alcoholic Pat	Institu/	P
548100	Weigh Station/Rest Area	Weigh St	P
548101	Weigh Station/Rest Area	Weigh St	P
548200	Road Maint Heating Fuel	Road Mai	P
548400	Printing Non-Form	Printing	P
548401	Printing-Non Form	Printing	P
548900	Printing Forms	Printing	P
548901	Printing Forms	Printing	P
549000	Badges,Pins,Id Tags	Badges,P	P

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

549001	Badges,Pins,Id Tags	Badges,P	P
549100	Personal Hygiene Items	Personal	P
549101	Personal Hygiene Items	Personal	P
549200	Photo,Painting,Rel Art	Photo,Pa	P
549201	Photo,Painting,Rel Art	Photo,Pa	P
549900	Materials,Supp,Parts Noe	Material	P
549901	Materials,Supp,Parts N	Material	P
550100	Office Equipment	Office E	P
550101	Office Equipment	Office E	P
550200	Hshold,Kitchen,Ldry	Hshold,K	P
550201	Hshold,Kitchen,Ldry	Hshold,K	P
550300	Office Furniture	Office F	P
550301	Office Furniture	Office F	P
550500	Automobiles	Automobi	P
550501	Automobiles	Automobi	P
550600	Station Wagon/Carryall	Station	P
550601	Station Wagon/Carryall	Station	P
550700	Pick-Up Trucks	Pick-Up	P
550701	Pick-Up Trucks	Pick-Up	P
550800	Medium/Heavy Trucks	Medium/H	P
550801	Medium/Heavy Trucks	Medium/H	P
550900	Graders	Graders	P
551000	Mowers	Mowers	P
551001	Mowers	Mowers	P
551100	Transportation Equipmen	Transpor	P
551101	Transportation Equipmen	Transpor	P
551200	Snow Plows/Scrapers	Snow Plo	P
551300	Construct/Engineer Equ	Construc	P
551301	Construct/Engineer Equ	Construc	P
551400	Building/Plant Equip	Building	P
551401	Building/Plant Equip	Building	P
551500	Manufacturing Equipment	Manufact	P
551600	Design/Locate Engi Equip	Design/L	P
551700	Test/Engineer Equip	Test/Eng	P
551701	Test/Engineer Equip	Test/Eng	P
551800	Pavement Maint Equip	Pavement	P
551801	Pavment Maint Equip	Pavment	P
551900	Speedmeter	Speedmet	P
552000	Traffic Counters	Traffic	P

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

552100	Medical/Lab Equip	Medical/	P
552101	Medical/Lab Equip	Medical/	P
552200	Educational Equipment	Educatio	P
552201	Educational Equipment	Educatio	P
552300	Rec Equip/Playgrounds	Rec Equi	P
552301	Rec Equip/Playgrounds	Rec Equi	P
552400	Snow Blowers	Snow Blo	P
552500	Striping Machines	Striping	P
552600	Tractors	Tractors	P
552601	Tractors	Tractors	P
552700	Rest Area Equipment	Rest Are	P
552701	Rest Area Equipment	Rest Are	P
552800	Aircraft Equipment	Aircraft	P
552900	Spreaders	Spreader	P
552901	Spreaders	Spreader	P
553000	Radio Equipment	Radio Eq	P
553001	Radio Equipment	Radio Eq	P
553100	Air Conditioners	Air Cond	P
553200	Agricultural Equip	Agricult	P
553300	Farm Equipment	Farm Equ	P
553400	Boats/Motors/Other Mar	Boats/Mo	P
553500	Kitchen Equipment	Kitchen	P
553600	Weapons/Rel Riot Ctrl	Weapons/	P
553700	Weigh Station Equipment	Weigh Eq	P
553800	Landscaping Equipment	Landscap	P
553801	Landscaping Equip	Landscap	P
553900	Shop Equipment	Shop Equ	P
553901	Shop Equipment	Shop Equ	P
554000	Large-Scale Computers	Large-Sc	P
554001	Large-Scale Computers	Large-Sc	P
554100	Camera Equipment	Camera E	P
554101	Camera Equipment	Camera E	P
554200	Fire Fighting Equipment	Fire Fig	P
554300	Trash Dumpster	Trash Du	P
554400	Traffic Maintenance Equ	Traffic	P
554401	Traffic Maintenance Eq	Traffic	P
555400	Personal Computer	Personal	P
555401	Personal Computer	Personal	P
555500	Micrographics Equip	Microgra	P

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

555501	Micrographics Equip	Microgra	P
555600	Word Processors	Word Pro	P
555700	Minicomputers	Minicomp	P
555701	Minicomputers	Minicomp	P
555800	Data Preparation Equip	Data Pre	P
555801	Data Preparation Equip	Data Pre	P
555900	Distributed Proc Equip	Distribu	P
556000	Telecommunication Equip	Telecomm	P
556001	Telecommunication Equip	Telecomm	P
556100	Agy In/Output Devices	Agy In/O	P
556101	Agy In/Output Devices	Agy In/O	P
556200	Computer Furniture	Computer	P
556201	Computer Furniture	Computer	P
559900	Equipment Noc	Equipmen	P
559901	Equipment Noc	Equipmen	P
560200	Structures O/T Fed	Structur	P
560201	Structures O/T Fed	Structur	P
560300	Nonstructural Improve	Nonstruc	P
560301	Nonstructural Improve	Nonstruc	P
565000	Safety Improv Program	Safety I	P
573400	Pymt Landlord-House Assc	Pymt Lan	P
573401	Pymt Landlord-House Assc	Pymt Lan	P
573800	Spec Equ Inc Prosthet	Spec Equ	P
573900	Transportation (135Fd)	Transpor	P
577000	Environmental Permits	Env Permit	P
577100	Governors Mansion Exp	Governor	P
577700	Prescription (135Fd)	Prescrip	P
581400	Emp Fares,Fees,Phone	Emp Fare	P
581401	Emp Fares,Fees,Phone	Emp Fare	P
592500	Fare,Fee,Tele-St Fd	Fare,Fee	P
592501	Fare,Fee,Tele-St Fd	Fare,Fee	P
592600	Fare,Fee,Tele-Fed Fd	Fare,Fee	P
592601	Fare,Fee,Tele-Fed Fd	Fare,Fee	P
A13118	INV - Office Supplies	INV - 401	P
A13119	INV - Uniforms	INV - 413	P
A14001	Equipment Assets	Equipment	P
A14002	Software Assets	Software	P
A14003	Furniture Assets	Furniture	P
A14004	Capital Lease Land	CL Land	P

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

A14006	Capital Lease CIP	CL CIP	P
A14007	Capital Lease Bldgs & Improv	CL B& I	P
A14008	Capital Lease Furn Mach Equip	CL FME	P
A14100	Midrange, Hardware, Operating	Mid Hrd Op	P
A14103	Midrange, Hardware, Maintenanc	Mid Hrd Mn	P
A14104	Midrange, Software Licenses	Mid Sft Li	P
A14106	Midrange, Hardware, Misc.	Mid Hrd Ms	P
A14107	Midrange, Storage	Mid Storag	P
A14110	Mainframe, Software Licenses	Main Sft L	P
A14118	Mainframe, Hardware, Operating	Main Hrd	P
A14119	Mainframe, CMOS, Operating	Main CMOS	P
A14121	Mainframe, Storage	Main Stor	P
A14122	Mainframe, Hardware, Misc.	Main Hrd M	P
A14123	Mainframe, I/O Devices	Main I/O	P
A14126	L.A.N., Hardware Maintenance	LAN Hrd	P
A14127	L.A.N., Storage	LAN Stor	P
A14128	L.A.N., Hardware, Operating	LAN Hrd Op	P
A14129	L.A.N., Software Licenses	LAN Sft L	P
A14130	L.A.N., Hardware, PC's	LAN Hrd	P
A14131	L.A.N., Hardware, Misc.,	L.A.N.	P
A14134	General, Office Furniture	Furniture	P
A14135	General, Office Equipment	Equip	P
A14207	Network: Telecomm., Equipment:	Network	P
A14208	Network: Infrastructure, Equip	Network	P
A14209	Network: Comm.Server	Network	P
A14210	Network: Infrastructure, Equip	Network	P
A14211	Network:Data Equipment, SIGN	Network	P
A14212	Midrange, Hdw., Unix-Internet	Midrange	P
A14213	Network: Scanners, Hdw., Misc.	Network	P
A14214	Short Term Prepaid Assets	ST-Lease	P
A14500	Office Equipment	Office EQ	P
A14600	Vehicle	Vehicle	P
A14900	Info Tech Equip and Software	ITEQ & SW	P
A14999	Capital Leases	Cap Leases	P
E00012	Stationary	Stationary	P
E00013	Food	Food	P
E00014	Laundry	Laundry	P
E00015	Wearing Apparel	Wear Ap	P
E00016	Household Supplies	Household	P

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

E00017	Ammo	Ammo	P
E54000	Supplies Roll Up	Supplies	P
E54001	SUPPLIES	SUPPLIES	P
E55000	Equipment Roll Up	Equipment	P
E55001	EQUIPMENT	EQUIPMENT	P
523000	License Examinations	License	PS
523001	License Examinations	License	PS
523100	Notary Public Fees	Notary P	PS
523101	Notary Public Fees	Notary P	PS
530800	Data Preparation	Data Pre	PS
530801	Data Preparation	Data Pre	PS
530900	Inform Proc Consult	Inform P	PS
530901	Inform Proc Consult	Inform P	PS
531800	Mental Hlth Community	Mental H	PS
531801	Mental Hlth Community	Mental H	PS
532900	Insurance Noc	Insuranc	PS
534200	Medical Svc-St Depend	Medical	PS
534201	Medical Svc-St Depend	Medical	PS
534300	Support-St Depend	Support-	PS
534301	Support-St Depend	Support-	PS
534500	Repair Tech/Lab Equip	Repair T	PS
534501	Repair Tech / Lab Equip	Repair T	PS
535100	Training	Training	PS
535101	Training	Training	PS
535400	Hazard Waste Removal	Hazard W	PS
535401	Hazard Waste Removal	Hazard W	PS
535900	Test Animal/Farm Produc	Test Ani	PS
537700	Time Share Service	Time Sha	PS
537800	Software Acq/Maint	Software	PS
537801	Software Acq/Maint	Software	PS
537900	Data File Acq/Maint	Data Fil	PS
537901	Data File Acq/Maint	Data Fil	PS
538200	Dp Facility Mgmt	Dp Facil	PS
538500	Other Service Fees	Other Se	PS
538501	Other Service Fees	Other Se	PS
538900	Accounting Service	Accounti	PS
539000	Management Consultants	Manageme	PS
539001	Management Consultants	Manageme	PS
539200	Medical Consultants	Medical	PS

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

539201	Medical Consultants	Medical	PS
539900	Contractual Services No	Contract	PS
539901	Contractual Services No	Contract	PS
547200	Hsp-Personnel Instruct	Hsp-Pers	PS
547201	Hsp-Personnel Instruct	Hsp-Pers	PS
550400	Real Estate Appurtenant	Real Est	PS
561300	Profession Svc(Land Acq	Professi	PS
565500	Fed Aid-Consultants	Fed Aid-	PS
565501	Fed Aid-Consultants	Fed Aid-	PS
567400	Formal Contract	Formal C	PS
567500	Consulting Service	Consulti	PS
573600	Case Svc-Hlth/Medical	Case Svc	PS
573601	Case Svc-Hlth/Medical	Case Svc	PS
573700	Case Svc-Cit,Cty,St,Fd	Case Svc	PS
573701	Case Svc-Cit,Cty,St,Fd	Case Svc	PS
574700	Patient Svcs (135Fd)	Patient	PS
575000	Adoption Expenses	Adoption	PS
577400	Dental Svc (135Fd)	Dental S	PS
577500	Physician Svc (135Fd)	Physicia	PS
577600	Lab/X-Ray Svc (135Fd)	Lab/X-Ra	PS
577800	Optometric Services	Optometr	PS
E53000	Contracted Services Roll Up	Contracts	PS
E53001	OTHER CONTRACT	CONTRACT	PS
E53002	OTHER SERVICES FOR ROLL UP	OTHER SER	PS
E57001	CONTRACTUAL	CONTRACTUA	PS
510100	Salaries & Wages	Salaries	EXCL
510101	Salaries & Wages	Salaries	EXCL
510200	Salaries & Wages - Overtime	Non AOS Ob	EXCL
510201	Salaries & Wages - Overtime	Non AOS Ob	EXCL
512000	Workmens Compensation	Workmens	EXCL
512001	Workmens Compensation	Workmens	EXCL
513000	Perf St Pd Em Contr	Perf St	EXCL
513001	Perf St Pd Em Contr	Perf St	EXCL
513500	Teacher Retitement	Teacher	EXCL
513501	St Aid Pd Emp Contr	St Aid P	EXCL
514000	Medicare	Medicare	EXCL
514001	Medicare	Medicare	EXCL
514100	Unity Traditional	Unity Tr	EXCL
514200	Afscme Traditional	Afscme T	EXCL

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

514300	Traditional Dental	Traditio	EXCL
514301	Traditional Dental	Traditio	EXCL
514901	Legislative Retirement	Legislat	EXCL
515000	Social Security	Social S	EXCL
515001	Social Security	Social S	EXCL
515101	Police Hlth Ins	Police H	EXCL
515200	Blue Cross Hlth Ins	Blue Cro	EXCL
515201	Blue Cross Hlth Ins	Blue Cro	EXCL
515300	Life Insurance	Life Ins	EXCL
515301	Life Insurance	Life Ins	EXCL
515401	Anchor Health	Anchor H	EXCL
515701	Cons/Abc Officer Ret	Cons/Abc	EXCL
515800	PERF State Share	PERF State	EXCL
515801	PERF State Share	PERF State	EXCL
515900	Cons/Excise Hlth	Cons/Exc	EXCL
515901	Cons/Excise Hlth Ins	Cons/Exc	EXCL
516000	Arnett Health	Arnett H	EXCL
516001	Arnett Health	Arnett H	EXCL
516100	Maxicare Health	Maxicare	EXCL
516101	Maxicare Health	Maxicare	EXCL
516400	Humana	Humana	EXCL
516401	Humana	Humana	EXCL
517001	Welborn Health	Welborn	EXCL
517100	Disability	Disabili	EXCL
517101	Disability	Disabili	EXCL
517400	Vision Care	Vision C	EXCL
517401	Vision Care	Vision C	EXCL
517500	M-Plan Health Ins	M-Plan H	EXCL
517501	M-Plan Health Ins	M-Plan H	EXCL
517600	Health Source Ins	Health S	EXCL
517601	Health Source Ins	Health S	EXCL
517700	Dentacare	Dentacar	EXCL
517701	Dentacare	Dentacar	EXCL
517800	Employee Assistance	Employee	EXCL
517801	Employee Assistance	Employee	EXCL
517900	Death Benefits	Death Be	EXCL
517901	Death Benefits	Death Be	EXCL
518000	Inmate Wages	Inmate W	EXCL
518001	Inmate Wages	Inmate W	EXCL

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

518100	Deferred Compensation Matching	DC_Match	EXCL
518101	Deferred Comp - State Match	DefCompMat	EXCL
518200	Advantage Health	Advantage	EXCL
518201	Advantage Health	Advantage	EXCL
518300	Delta Dental	Delta	EXCL
518301	Delta Care Dental	DC Dental	EXCL
518400	Delta Dental	Delta	EXCL
518401	Delta Dental Trad	DDT	EXCL
519600	Spec Judge Fee Ss#	Spec Jud	EXCL
519700	Spec Judge Fee Id#	Spec Jud	EXCL
519800	Personal Svc Id#	Personal	EXCL
519801	Personal Svc Id#	Personal	EXCL
519900	Personal Svc Ss#	Personal	EXCL
519901	Personal Svc Ss#	Personal	EXCL
520100	Post Box Rent/Meters	Post Box	EXCL
520101	Post Box Rent/Meters	Post Box	EXCL
520300	Utilities	Utilitie	EXCL
520301	Utilities	Utilitie	EXCL
520500	Subsistence	Subsiste	EXCL
520501	Subsistence	Subsiste	EXCL
520800	Reward,Gateage	Reward,G	EXCL
520801	Reward,Gateage	Reward,G	EXCL
520900	Ct Cost/Sheriff Fee	Ct Cost/	EXCL
520901	Ct Cost/Sheriff Fee	Ct Cost/	EXCL
521400	Us Gov Docs/Pamphlets	Us Gov D	EXCL
521401	Us Gov Docs/Pamphlets	Us Gov D	EXCL
521500	Legislator Expense	Legislat	EXCL
524400	Interest	Interest	EXCL
524401	Interest	Interest	EXCL
528500	Us Property Expense	Us Prope	EXCL
528600	Property Tax	Property	EXCL
530300	Inform Process Form	Inform P	EXCL
530400	Cdp Billback	Cdp Bill	EXCL
530401	Cdp Billback	Cdp Bill	EXCL
535700	Computer Svc Billback	Computer	EXCL
549800	Default Discount Lost	Default	EXCL
570300	Refund Local Unit	Refund L	EXCL
570400	Afdc	Afdc	EXCL
570500	Afdc-Up	Afdc-Up	EXCL

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

570800	Subsistence	Subsistenc	EXCL
570900	Tenants Utility Allowanc	Tenants	EXCL
571000	St Contr-Retirement	St Contr	EXCL
571001	St Contr-Retirement	St Contr	EXCL
571100	Retire Benefit/Pension	Retire B	EXCL
571300	Landlords-Vacancy Loss	Landlord	EXCL
571500	State Contr-Health Ins	State Co	EXCL
571600	Landlords-Damages	Landlord	EXCL
571700	Emp Lg-Term Disab Ins	Emp Lg-T	EXCL
571800	St Emp Physical Exam	St Emp P	EXCL
571801	St Emp Physical Exam	St Emp P	EXCL
572000	Med/Hosp-Comp Cases	Med/Hosp	EXCL
572001	Med/Hosp-Comp Cases	Med/Hosp	EXCL
572100	Reimb-Local Units	Reimb-Lo	EXCL
572101	Reimb-Local Units	Reimb-Lo	EXCL
572200	Fed Indirect Cost	Fed Indi	EXCL
572201	Fed Indirect Cost	Fed Indi	EXCL
572300	St Indirect Cost	St Indir	EXCL
572301	St Indirect Cost	St Indir	EXCL
572500	Grants	Grants	EXCL
572501	Grants	Grants	EXCL
572600	Training Stipend	Training	EXCL
572601	Training Stipend	Training	EXCL
572700	Reimb-Training	Reimb-Tr	EXCL
572701	Reimb-Training	Reimb-Tr	EXCL
572800	Trng-Nongovern Entity	Trng-Non	EXCL
572900	Grts-Nongovern Entity	Grts-Non	EXCL
572901	Grts-Nongovern Entity	Grts-Non	EXCL
573000	Welf Distri-Child Supp	Welf Dis	EXCL
573100	Welf-Case Service	Welf-Cas	EXCL
573101	Welf-Case Service	Welf-Cas	EXCL
573200	Examine St Accts	Examine	EXCL
573201	Examine St Accts	Examine	EXCL
574000	Unemployment Compensati	Unemploy	EXCL
574001	Unemployment Compensat	Unemploy	EXCL
574100	Indemnity,Property Dama	Indemnit	EXCL
574200	Merit Money/Contest Pr	Merit Mo	EXCL
574201	Merit Money/Contest Pri	Merit Mo	EXCL
574400	Unemploy Comp-Fmr Emp	Unemploy	EXCL

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

574401	Unemploy Comp-Fmr Emp	Unemploy	EXCL
574500	Welfare Disbursing Agen	Welfare	EXCL
574600	Pub Trans-St Ward/Clien	Pub Tran	EXCL
575100	Tax Refunds	Tax Refu	EXCL
575101	Tax Refunds	Tax Refu	EXCL
575200	Refunds O/T Tax	Refunds	EXCL
575201	Refunds O/T Tax	Refunds	EXCL
575400	Welf-Reim Cty Adp Cost	Welf-Rei	EXCL
575500	Prior Period Adjustment	Prior Peri	EXCL
575600	Welf-Reim Cty Equ Rent	Welf-Rei	EXCL
576000	Judgements/Settlements	Judgemen	EXCL
576001	Judgements/Settlements	Judgemen	EXCL
577200	Inpat Hsp-Anesthesia	Inpat Hs	EXCL
577300	Outpat Hsp-Clinic	Outpat H	EXCL
577901	Bond Retirement	Bond Ret	EXCL
578000	Investments	Investme	EXCL
578200	Nontaxable Reimbursement	Nontaxab	EXCL
578201	Nontaxable Reimb	Nontaxab	EXCL
578500	Criminal Justice	Criminal	EXCL
578501	Criminal Justice	Criminal	EXCL
578601	Public Instruction	Public I	EXCL
579000	Loans	Loans	EXCL
579001	Loans	Loans	EXCL
579100	Purchase Savings Bonds	Purchase	EXCL
579101	Purchase Savings Bonds	Purchase	EXCL
579200	Emp Salary Garnishment	Emp Sala	EXCL
579201	Emp Salary Garnishment	Em Sa	EXCL
579300	Hoosier Lottery Interce	Hoosier	EXCL
579700	Empl/Payroll Deduct Disp	Empl/Pay	EXCL
579800	Distribution	Distribu	EXCL
579801	Distribution	Distribu	EXCL
579900	Funds Transfer	Funds Tr	EXCL
579901	Funds Transfer	Funds Tr	EXCL
580100	Mileage-Special Judge	Mileage-	EXCL
580200	Reim Exp-Special Judge	Reim Exp	EXCL
581500	Perdiem Inlieu Subsis	Perdiem	EXCL
581501	Perdiem Inlieu Subsis	Perdiem	EXCL
581600	Mileage Reimb Only	Mileage	EXCL
581601	Mileage Reimb Only	Mileage	EXCL

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

581700	Motor Pool Charges	Motor Po	EXCL
581701	Motor Pool Charges	Motor Po	EXCL
581800	Hsp-Prdiem-Admin/Stores	Hsp-Prdi	EXCL
581900	Hsp-Prdiem-Med Records	Hsp-Prdi	EXCL
582000	Hsp-Prdiem-Security/Mnt	Hsp-Prdi	EXCL
582100	Hsp-Prdiem-Psychology	Hsp-Prdi	EXCL
582200	Hsp-Prdiem-Dietary	Hsp-Prdi	EXCL
582400	Hsp-Prdiem-Actvty Thpy	Hsp-Prdi	EXCL
582500	Hsp-Prdiem-Ed/Sp/Hear	Hsp-Prdi	EXCL
582600	Hsp-Prdiem-Insvc Trng	Hsp-Prdi	EXCL
582700	Hsp-Prdiem-Soc Svc	Hsp-Prdi	EXCL
583000	Hsp-Prdiem-Nursing	Hsp-Prdi	EXCL
583100	Hsp-Prdiem-Other	Hsp-Prdi	EXCL
584800	Hsp-Mile-Admin/Stores	Hsp-Mile	EXCL
584900	Hsp-Mile-Med Rcds	Hsp-Mile	EXCL
585300	Hsp-Mile-Ldry/Sew	Hsp-Mile	EXCL
585400	Hsp-Mile-Actvty Thpy	Hsp-Mile	EXCL
585500	Hsp-Mile-Ed/Sp/Hear	Hsp-Mile	EXCL
585700	Hsp-Mile-Soc Svc	Hsp-Mile	EXCL
586000	Hsp-Mile-Nursing	Hsp-Mile	EXCL
586100	Hsp-Mile-Other	Hsp-Mile	EXCL
586200	Hsp-Nonml-Admin/Store	Hsp-Nonm	EXCL
586300	Hsp-Nonml-Med Rcds	Hsp-Nonm	EXCL
586400	Hsp-Nonml-Sec/Mnt	Hsp-Nonm	EXCL
586500	Hsp-Nonml-Psychology	Hsp-Nonm	EXCL
587100	Hsp-Nonml-Soc Svc	Hsp-Nonm	EXCL
587400	Hsp-Nonml-Nursing	Hsp-Nonm	EXCL
587500	Hsp-Nonml-Other	Hsp-Nonm	EXCL
592400	Trav-Mileage-St Fd	Trav-Mil	EXCL
592401	Trav-Mileage-St Fd	Trav-Mil	EXCL
592700	Trav-Mileage-Fed Fd	Trav-Mil	EXCL
592701	Trav-Mileage-Fed Fd	Trav-Mil	EXCL
593000	Hsp-Mile-Sec/Mnt	Hsp-Mile	EXCL
593100	Hsp-Mile-Psychology	Hsp-Mile	EXCL
594200	Hsp-Nonml-Admin/Stores	Hsp-Nonm	EXCL
594800	Hsp-Nonml-Actvty Thpy	Hsp-Nonm	EXCL
595100	Hsp-Nonml-Soc Svc	Hsp-Nonm	EXCL
599000	Net Zero Sdo Reimburse	Net Zero	EXCL
900001	Appropriation Transfer	Approp Tsf	EXCL

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

A00001	All Federal Categories	All	EXCL
A12110	Accounts Receivable: Fund Tran	A/C F Tran	EXCL
A12115	Accounts Receivable: Cash Due	A/C Cash	EXCL
A12924	Travel Advances	Trvl Adv	EXCL
A13110	Inventory: Telecommunications	Inv Tel	EXCL
A13111	REMOVE NEVER USED	NA	EXCL
A13115	Inventory: Data Processing	Inv Data	EXCL
A13116	INV - Household Supplies	INV - 415	EXCL
A13117	INV - Preventive Maintenance	INV - PM	EXCL
A13120	INV - In Transit Account	IN-In Tran	EXCL
A13121	INV - Ammunition & Tact Supp	INV - 418	EXCL
A14005	Capital Lease Infra NON DEP	CL Infr ND	EXCL
A14009	Capital Lease Infra DEPREC	CL In DEP	EXCL
A14099	Pre-Paid, Maintenance	Pre-Paid	EXCL
A15001	ACD: Equipment Assets	ACD: Equip	EXCL
A15002	ACD: Software Assets	ACD: Softw	EXCL
A15003	ACD: Furniture Assets	ACD: Furni	EXCL
A15007	ACD Cap Lease Bldgs & Improv	ACD CL BI	EXCL
A15008	ACD Cap Lease Fur Mach Eq	ACD CL FME	EXCL
A15009	ACDCap Lease Infra DEPREC	ACD CL Inf	EXCL
A15099	ACD: Pre-Paid Maintenance	Pre-Paid	EXCL
A15100	ACD: Midrange, Hardware, Operat	Adc	EXCL
A15103	ACD: Midrange, Hrdw., Maintena	Adc	EXCL
A15104	ACD: Midrange, Software Licens	Adc	EXCL
A15106	ACD: Midrange, Hardware, Misc.	Adc	EXCL
A15107	ACD: Midrange, Storage	Adc	EXCL
A15110	ACD: Mainframe, Software Licen	Adc	EXCL
A15118	ACD: Mainframe, Hrdw., Operati	Adc	EXCL
A15119	ACD: Mainframe, CMOS, Operatin	Adc	EXCL
A15121	ACD: Mainframe, Storage	Adc	EXCL
A15122	ACD: Mainframe, Hardware, Misc	Adc	EXCL
A15123	ACD: Mainframe, I/O Devices	Adc	EXCL
A15126	ACD: L.A.N., Hardware Maintena	Adc	EXCL
A15127	ACD: L.A.N., Storage	Adc	EXCL
A15128	ACD: L.A.N., Hardware, Operati	Adc	EXCL
A15129	ACD: L.A.N., Software Licenses	Adc	EXCL
A15130	ACD: L.A.N., Hardware, PC's	Adc	EXCL
A15131	ACD: L.A.N., Hardware, Misc.	ACD: L.A.N	EXCL
A15134	ACD: General, Office Furniture	Adc	EXCL

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

A15135	ACD: General, Office Equipment	Adc	EXCL
A15200	ACD: Buildings	ACD_Build	EXCL
A15207	ACD: Telecomm., Equipment: ACD	Adc	EXCL
A15208	ACD: Network: Infrastructure,	Adc	EXCL
A15209	ACD: Tele., Equip: Comm.Server	Adc	EXCL
A15210	ACD: Network: Infrastructure,	Adc	EXCL
A15211	ACD: Network:Data-S.I.G.N.	Network	EXCL
A15212	ACD: Midrange, Hwd.,Unix-Inter	Midrange	EXCL
A15213	ACD: Ntwk, Scan, Hwd., Misc.	Network	EXCL
A15214	Short Term Prepaid Amort	ST-Amortiz	EXCL
A15300	ACD: Building Improvements	ACD_Imprv	EXCL
A15500	Accum Depr Office Equipment	ACD: OFFEQ	EXCL
A15600	Accum Depr Vehicles	ACD: Autos	EXCL
A15700	Accum Depr Construction EQ	ACD Con EQ	EXCL
A15900	Accum Depr Info Tech Equip	ACD: ITEQ	EXCL
A15999	ACD Capital Leases	ACD Cap Le	EXCL
ALL	All	All	EXCL
E00001	Transfer Account Roll Up	Transfer	EXCL
E00002	Balance Sheet Transfers	Bal Sh Tra	EXCL
E00003	Depreciation - System	Dep - Sys	EXCL
E00004	Depreciation - Expense	Deprec	EXCL
E00005	Combined Fringes	Fringe	EXCL
E00006	Contra Asset Account	Contra A	EXCL
E00007	Trade In, Gain or Loss on Sale	GorL Trade	EXCL
E00008	Contra Lease Payable	Contra Lea	EXCL
E00009	Contra Lease Interest	Contra Lea	EXCL
E00010	Lease Interest	Lease Int	EXCL
E00011	Scrap and Inventory Count	Scrap	EXCL
E00018	Unrecognized Gain / Loss	Unrec. G/L	EXCL
E00019	Provision for Revaluation	Prov. Reva	EXCL
E00020	Reversal of Depreciation	Rev. Depr	EXCL
E00021	Mortgage - Others	Mrtgge Oth	EXCL
E00022	Mortgage - Comp	Mrtgge-Comp	EXCL
E00023	Recognized Gain	Rec. Gain	EXCL
E00024	Unrealized Gain	Unrlzd Gai	EXCL
E00025	Unrealized Loss	Unrlzd Los	EXCL
E00026	Inventory Issue	Inv Issue	EXCL
E00027	Inventory Adjustment	Inv Adjust	EXCL
E10000	All Expense Accounts	All Exp	EXCL

B U C H E R + C H R I S T I A N

Indiana Department of Administration Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts

E19999	Point 1 Roll Up	Point 1	EXCL
E29999	Points 2 through 9	Pts 2 9	EXCL
E51000	Roll Up For Personal Services	Personal S	EXCL
E51001	PERSONNEL	Personal	EXCL
E51002	FRINGE BENEFITS	Fringe Ben	EXCL
E52000	Other Services Roll Up	Other Svc	EXCL
E52001	OTHER	OTHER	EXCL
E57000	Grants, Workers Comp Roll Up	Grnts/Comp	EXCL
E57002	INDIRECT COST	INDIRECT C	EXCL
E57003	OTHER GRANTS	OTHER GRAN	EXCL
E57990	BCM Rev Est	BCM Rev Es	EXCL
E58000	In State Travel Roll Up	In State	EXCL
E58001	TRAVEL	TRAVEL	EXCL
E59000	Out of State Travel Roll Up	Travel	EXCL
E59001	OUT STATE SUB RU	OUT STATE	EXCL
F00001	Appropriation Offset	Appr Offst	EXCL
F00002	Allotment Offset	Allt Offst	EXCL
F00003	Revenue Offset	Rev Offst	EXCL
F00004	Reserve for Pre-Encumbrances	Res Pre-en	EXCL
F00005	Reserve for Encumbrances	Res Enc	EXCL
F00006	Expenditure Hold	Hold	EXCL
F00007	Fund Balance: Restricted,State	FB:State	EXCL
F00008	Project/Grant Offset	P/G Off	EXCL
F00009	Organization Offset	Org Off	EXCL
L00001	Contingency	Contingeny	EXCL
L00002	Leases Payable	Leases Pay	EXCL
L12111	Adjustment Account	Adjustment	EXCL
L20100	Accounts Payable	A/P	EXCL
L20500	Accrued Liabilities	A/L	EXCL
R40000	Revenue Accounts Rollup	Rev Roll	EXCL
S00001	CrossRoads	XRoads	EXCL
S00002	State Boat Excise	State Boat	EXCL
S00003	Revenue	Revenue	EXCL
S00004	Lake Enhancement Account/DNR	Lake Enhan	EXCL
S00005	Annual DNR Fees	DNR	EXCL
S00006	Primary Rd & St Account	Prim. R&S	EXCL
S00007	Local Rd & St Fund	Local R/S	EXCL
S00008	Anti Terrorism, State Police	AntiTerror	EXCL
S00009	Educational Institute Plates	Ed Inst Pl	EXCL

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

S00010	Heritage Trust/DNR	HeritageTR	EXCL
		CONSTRUCTION	25
		PROCUREMENT	437
		PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	59
		EXCLUDED	327

- IDOA approved the classification of each object code into one of the four industry classifications. This process involved several processes of review by the consultant and various members of IDOA staff.
- Additionally, due to agency-specific misclassification of warrant data, specific warrants were manually removed by the consultant that were found to be in included object codes but were excluded by the study definition of “included expenditures.”

**Indiana Department of Administration
Statistical Analysis of Utilization of State Contracts**

9.13. Listing of NAICS Code Industry Classifications

NAICS Code	Code Description	Industry Classification
11	Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	Procurement
21	Mining	Procurement
22	Utilities	Procurement
23	Construction	Construction
31	Manufacturing	Procurement
32	Manufacturing	Procurement
33	Manufacturing	Procurement
42	Wholesale Trade	Procurement
44	Retail Trade	Procurement
45	Retail Trade	Procurement
48	Transportation and Warehousing	Procurement
49	Transportation and Warehousing	Procurement
51	Information	Professional Services
52	Finance and Insurance	Professional Services
53	Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	Professional Services
54	Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	Professional Services
55	Management of Companies and Enterprises	Professional Services
56	Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services	Professional Services
61	Educational Services	Professional Services
62	Healthcare and Social Assistance	Professional Services
71	Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	Professional Services
72	Accommodation and Food Services	Professional Services
81	Other Services (except Public Administration)	Professional Services