2004 Regular Session 4lr1521

SB 238/03 - EHE CF 4lr1404 By: Delegate McIntosh Introduced and read first time: January 26, 2004 Assigned to: Health and Government Operations Committee Report: Favorable with amendments House action: Adopted Read second time: March 18, 2004 CHAPTER 1 AN ACT concerning 2 **Procurement - Construction Contracts - Maryland Construction Quality** 3 **Assurance Act Procurement - Competitive Sealed Proposals - Use** FOR the purpose of authorizing the best value contracting method of procurement for 4 certain construction contracts; requiring a best value request for proposals to 5 contain certain information; requiring proposals submitted in response to a best 6 value request for proposals to contain certain information, including information 7 8 pertaining to certain required prelisted subcontractors; requiring proposals 9 submitted in response to a best value request for proposals to be evaluated in a 10 certain manner by certain evaluation teams; providing the legislative intent and 11 scope of this Act; defining certain terms; requiring the adoption of certain regulations; establishing that this Act is to be known as the Maryland 12 Construction Quality Assurance Act; and generally relating to the Maryland 13 Construction Quality Assurance Act repealing the requirement that a head of a 14 15 unit of State government make a certain determination before using the 16 competitive sealed proposal method of procurement under certain circumstances; and generally relating to the use of competitive sealed proposals 17 18 in procurement. 19 BY repealing and reenacting, with amendments, Article - State Finance and Procurement 20 21 Section 13-102 13-104(a) Annotated Code of Maryland 22 23 (2001 Replacement Volume and 2003 Supplement)

Unofficial Copy

24 BY adding to

25

Article State Finance and Procurement

1	Section 13 501 through 13 510, inclusive, to be under the new subtitle "Subtitle
2	5. Maryland Construction Quality Assurance Act"
3	Annotated Code of Maryland
4	(2001 Replacement Volume and 2003 Supplement)
5	Preamble
6	WHEREAS, The purpose of the Maryland Construction Quality Assurance Act is
7	to authorize competitive best value contracting for certain public construction
8	contracts in order to provide State procurement units with an effective policy for
9	improving construction project delivery; and
10	WHEREAS, Extensive experience with this procurement method by federal
11	government agencies, the Maryland Stadium Authority, and local contracting
	agencies demonstrates that competitive best value contracting provides substantial
	benefits for State agencies, the contracting community, and taxpayers; and
14	WHEREAS, By permitting State contracting agencies to consider and evaluate
15	important performance and qualification factors, best value contracting enables
16	procurement units to improve quality and cost efficiency and obtain better overall
17	value in State construction contracts; and
18	WHEREAS, Evaluation of key qualification factors, including past performance,
19	management capabilities, and project staffing, can assist contracting agencies in
20	achieving the most advantageous results for the State, while promoting greater
21	accountability among the contractors and subcontractors who benefit from public
22	works projects; and
23	WHEREAS, Competitive best value contracting gives procurement units an
24	effective tool for promoting the use of minority owned businesses, woman owned
25	businesses, and small businesses in Maryland, important public policy goals
26	established by Title 14, Subtitle 3 of the State Finance and Procurement Article; and
27	WHEREAS, Use of the competitive best value method encourages construction
28	firms to maintain high performance operations by promoting investments in areas
	such as apprenticeship training, quality control, and safety, and such investments
30	benefit State projects and the contracting community; and
31	WHEREAS, Future public works contracts for the State will be used to renovate
	and expand Maryland's infrastructure system, and procurement units responsible for
	administering these vital contracts must have access to the most effective
	procurement methods available to obtain the best results for the State; now,
35	therefore,
36	
37	MARYLAND, That the Laws of Maryland read as follows:

1 **Article - State Finance and Procurement** 2 13 102. Except as provided in [Subtitle 3 and Subtitle 4] SUBTITLES 3, 4, AND 5 of 3 (a) 4 this title, all procurement by units shall be by competitive sealed bids unless one of 5 the following methods specifically is authorized: competitive sealed proposals under § 13 104 or § 13 105 of this (1)6 7 subtitle: (2)8 noncompetitive negotiation under § 13 106 of this subtitle; 9 (3)sole source procurement under § 13-107 of this subtitle; 10 (4) emergency or expedited procurement under § 13-108 of this subtitle; (5)small procurement under § 13 109 of this subtitle; 11 12 (6)an intergovernmental cooperative purchasing agreement under § 13 13 110 of this subtitle; 14 (7)auction bids under § 13-111 of this subtitle; or 15 (8)an unsolicited proposal under § 13 107.1 of this subtitle. 16 (1)In awarding a procurement contract for human, social, cultural, or 17 educational service, the preferred method is by competitive sealed proposals under § 18 13 104 of this subtitle. 19 (2)In awarding a procurement contract for a lease of real property, the 20 preferred method is by competitive sealed proposals under § 13 105 of this subtitle. 21 (3)Procurement under an intergovernmental cooperative purchasing 22 agreement is appropriate in situations where the State is expected to achieve a better price as the result of economies of scale or to otherwise benefit by purchasing in 24 cooperation with another governmental entity. 25 SUBTITLE 5. MARYLAND CONSTRUCTION QUALITY ASSURANCE ACT. 26 13 501. 27 (A) IN THIS SUBTITLE THE FOLLOWING WORDS HAVE THE MEANINGS 28 INDICATED. 29 "COMPETITIVE BEST VALUE CONTRACTING" MEANS A METHOD OF 30 PROCUREMENT THAT: UTILIZES THE SOLICITATION OF COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSALS; (1)32 AND

_	11101 00112	J _ J _ J	REQUIRES THE EVALUATION OF PRICE PROPOSALS AND TECHNICAL AKE CONTRACT AWARDS THAT REPRESENT THE BEST VALUE TO IT UNIT AND THE STATE.
_		TION C	GEMENT PLAN" MEANS A PLAN FOR MANAGING THE ONTRACT WHICH DEMONSTRATES THE OFFEROR'S TECHNICAL AND COMPETENCY FOR THE PROJECT AND INCLUDES:
7		(1)	KEY MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL PROPOSED FOR THE PROJECT;
8		(2)	PROPOSED PROJECT SCHEDULE;
9		(3)	QUALITY CONTROL PROGRAMS; AND
10		(4)	SAFETY PROGRAMS.
11 12	(D) STATE UN		MEANS A MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE CERTIFIED BY THE LE 14, SUBTITLE 3 OF THIS ARTICLE.
15 16	CONTRACT PROJECTS	TOR'S O SIMILA ARS AN	PERFORMANCE" MEANS INFORMATION AND DATA ON A R SUBCONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE ON CONSTRUCTION R IN SIZE AND SCOPE TO THE PROCUREMENT CONTRACT FOR THE D INCLUDES THE DEGREE TO WHICH THE CONTRACTOR OR
18		(1)	COMPLETED PROJECTS SAFELY, ON TIME, AND ON BUDGET;
19		(2)	COMPLIED WITH PROJECT PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS;
20 21		(3) 3 OF TH	FULFILLED CONTRACTING GOALS ESTABLISHED BY TITLE 14, IS ARTICLE; AND
22		(4)	COMPLIED WITH APPLICABLE LAWS AND REGULATIONS.
25	CONTRACT SUFFICIEN	TOR'S O	CT STAFFING PLAN" MEANS A PLAN DEMONSTRATING A R SUBCONTRACTOR'S CAPABILITY TO RECRUIT AND RETAIN BERS OF QUALIFIED CONSTRUCTION CRAFT PERSONNEL FOR THE ROJECT AND SHALL INCLUDE:
27 28		(1) INING C	SOURCES TO BE USED BY THE CONTRACTOR OR SUBCONTRACTOR CRAFT PERSONNEL;
29 30	SUBCONTI	(2) RACTOR	TYPES OF TRAINING PROVIDED BY THE CONTRACTOR OR
31		(3)	IDENTIFICATION OF TRAINING PROVIDERS;
	REGISTER		THE DEGREE TO WHICH APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING PROGRAMS H THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR OR STATE APPRENTICESHIP ED; AND

1 2	(5) THE AMOUNT OF TIME AND RESOURCES INVESTED IN APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS AND OTHER CRAFT TRAINING PROGRAMS.
5	(G) "TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA" MEANS PAST PERFORMANCE, MANAGEMENT PLAN, PROJECT STAFFING PLAN, PROPOSED PLAN FOR MEETING THE CONTRACTING GOALS ESTABLISHED BY TITLE 14, SUBTITLE 3 OF THIS ARTICLE, OR OTHER TECHNICAL CRITERIA LISTED IN THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS ISSUED UNDER THIS SUBTITLE.
10	(H) "TECHNICAL PROPOSAL" MEANS A PROPOSAL CONTAINING INFORMATION AND DATA REGARDING THE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA OF AN OFFEROR AND THE OFFEROR'S PRELISTED SUBCONTRACTORS FOR THE PROCUREMENT CONTRACT. 13-502.
14 15 16	DUE TO THE INHERENT COMPLEXITIES AND UNIQUE DEMANDS OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTING, INCLUDING THE NEED IN THE CONTRACTOR SELECTION PROCESS TO CAREFULLY CONSIDER AND EVALUATE CERTAIN PERFORMANCE AND QUALIFICATION FACTORS, IT IS THE POLICY OF THE STATE TO UTILIZE COMPETITIVE BEST VALUE CONTRACTING FOR CONSTRUCTION PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS TO THE GREATEST EXTENT POSSIBLE.
18	13-503.
	A PRIMARY PROCUREMENT UNIT MAY UTILIZE THE COMPETITIVE BEST VALUE CONTRACTING METHOD FOR CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS VALUED AT \$2,500,000 OR MORE.
22	13-504.
	(A) WHEN A PROCUREMENT IS BASED ON COMPETITIVE BEST VALUE CONTRACTING, A PRIMARY PROCUREMENT UNIT SHALL SEEK COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSALS BY ISSUING A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS UNDER THIS SECTION.
26	(B) A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS UNDER THIS SECTION SHALL INCLUDE:
27	(1) THE DATE, TIME, AND PLACE FOR SUBMITTING THE PROPOSAL;
-	(2) A STATEMENT REQUIRING AN OFFEROR TO SUBMIT A SEPARATE PRICE PROPOSAL AND TECHNICAL PROPOSAL ACCORDING TO THE FORMAT SET FORTH IN THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS;
31	(3) THE PROJECT SPECIFICATIONS; AND
	(4) EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN § 13 505 OF THIS SUBTITLE, THE FOLLOWING PRICE AND TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA AND THEIR RESPECTIVE WEIGHTS FOR EVALUATION PURPOSES:
35	(I) PRICE 70%;
36	(II) PAST PERFORMANCE 13%:

1	(III) MANAGEMENT PLAN 5%;
2	(IV) PROJECT STAFFING PLAN 5%; AND
3	(V) FULFILLMENT OF CONTRACTING GOALS ESTABLISHED BY TITLE 14, SUBTITLE 3 OF THIS ARTICLE 7%.
7	(C) A PRIMARY PROCUREMENT UNIT SHALL GIVE PUBLIC NOTICE OF A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS UNDER THIS SECTION IN THE SAME MANNER AS REQUIRED FOR AN INVITATION FOR COMPETITIVE SEALED BIDS UNDER § 13-103 OF THIS TITLE.
9	13 505.
12 13	(A) THE PROCUREMENT OFFICER MAY DETERMINE, IN WRITING, THAT IT IS IN THE INTEREST OF THE STATE TO INCLUDE ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA OR ASSIGN WEIGHTS TO THE CRITERIA DIFFERENT FROM THOSE SET FORTH IN § 13 504(B)(4) OF THIS SUBTITLE, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:
15 16	(1) THE RELATIVE WEIGHT OF PRICE MAY NOT BE LESS THAN 50% OF THE TOTAL WEIGHT;
17 18	(2) THE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA SET FORTH IN \S 13 504(B)(4) OF THIS SUBTITLE MAY NOT BE EXCLUDED; AND
	(3) ANY ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA THAT ARE RELEVANT TO THE SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF THE CONTRACT OR OTHERWISE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE STATE.
	(B) TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA AND RELATIVE WEIGHTS ASSIGNED UNDER THIS SECTION MUST BE CLEARLY SET FORTH IN THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.
25	13-506.
28	(A) TECHNICAL PROPOSALS SUBMITTED UNDER THIS SUBTITLE MUST INCLUDE THE QUALIFICATIONS AND CAPABILITIES OF THE OFFEROR AND ANY PRELISTED SUBCONTRACTOR AND BE RESPONSIVE TO THE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA ESTABLISHED IN THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.
	(B) IN ADDITION TO ALL OTHER INFORMATION RESPONSIVE TO THE REQUIREMENTS IDENTIFIED IN THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL, AN OFFEROR SUBMITTING A PROPOSAL UNDER THIS SUBTITLE SHALL INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:
	(1) A LIST OF ALL SUBCONTRACTORS PROPOSED FOR THE PROCUREMENT CONTRACT WHOSE SUBCONTRACTS ARE VALUED AT \$500,000 OR MORE:

- 1 (2) A LIST OF MBE FIRMS AND OTHER FIRMS THAT THE OFFEROR
- 2 PROPOSES FOR MEETING THE CONTRACTING GOALS ESTABLISHED BY TITLE 14.
- 3 SUBTITLE 3 OF THIS ARTICLE: AND
- 4 (3) AN IDENTIFICATION OF THE TYPE OF WORK TO BE PERFORMED BY
- 5 EACH PRELISTED SUBCONTRACTOR.
- 6 (C) AN OFFEROR MAY NOT PRELIST ALTERNATE SUBCONTRACTORS.
- 7 (D) AN OFFEROR MAY NOT SUBSTITUTE AN ALTERNATE SUBCONTRACTOR
- 8 FOR A PRELISTED SUBCONTRACTOR WITHOUT THE EXPRESS WRITTEN
- 9 AUTHORIZATION OF THE PROCUREMENT OFFICER PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT
- 10 OF WORK.
- 11 13 507.
- 12 (A) PRICE PROPOSALS SHALL REMAIN SEALED UNTIL ALL TECHNICAL
- 13 PROPOSALS HAVE BEEN EVALUATED.
- 14 (B) (1) TECHNICAL PROPOSALS SHALL BE EVALUATED AND SCORED BY A
- 15 TECHNICAL EVALUATION TEAM CONSISTING OF AT LEAST THREE PERSONS
- 16 EXPERIENCED IN CONSTRUCTION PROCUREMENT.
- 17 (2) EACH TECHNICAL FACTOR SPECIFIED IN THE REQUEST FOR
- 18 PROPOSALS SHALL BE GIVEN A NUMERICAL SCORE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE
- 19 WEIGHT ASSIGNED TO IT IN THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS BASED ON THE
- 20 EVALUATION PROCESS CONDUCTED BY THE TECHNICAL EVALUATION TEAM.
- 21 (3) TECHNICAL EVALUATION SCORES SHALL BE BASED ON AN
- 22 EVALUATION OF THE OFFEROR AND ITS PRELISTED SUBCONTRACTORS BASED ON
- 23 RELEVANT INFORMATION AND DATA OBTAINED BY THE TECHNICAL EVALUATION
- 24 TEAM.
- 25 (4) IF AN OFFEROR OR A LISTED SUBCONTRACTOR IS A NEW BUSINESS
- 26 AND DOES NOT HAVE A PERFORMANCE RECORD SUFFICIENT TO EVALUATE ITS PAST
- 27 PERFORMANCE, THE TECHNICAL EVALUATION TEAM SHALL CONSIDER THE PAST
- 28 PERFORMANCE OF THE OFFEROR'S OR SUBCONTRACTOR'S OFFICERS, MANAGEMENT,
- 29 AND OWNERS OR PARTNERS.
- 30 (5) WHEN AN OFFEROR IS A JOINT VENTURE, THE TECHNICAL
- 31 EVALUATION TEAM SHALL CONSIDER THE QUALIFICATIONS OF ALL ENTITIES
- 32 INCLUDED IN THE JOINT VENTURE.
- 33 (6) A TOTAL TECHNICAL EVALUATION SCORE SHALL BE OBTAINED BY
- 34 ADDING THE SCORES ON ALL TECHNICAL EVALUATION FACTORS.
- 35 (C) ONCE A TOTAL TECHNICAL EVALUATION SCORE HAS BEEN DETERMINED,
- 36 PRICE PROPOSALS SHALL BE OPENED AND SCORED AS FOLLOWS:

- **HOUSE BILL 280** THE OFFEROR SUBMITTING THE LOWEST PRICE SHALL RECEIVE THE 1 2 MAXIMUM PRICE SCORE, ACCORDING TO THE PERCENTAGE VALUE STATED FOR 3 PRICE IN THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS; AND THE PRICE PROPOSED BY EACH SUCCESSIVE OFFEROR SHALL BE 5 SCORED RELATIVE TO THE LOWEST PRICE. ACCORDING TO THE FOLLOWING 6 FORMULA: (I) THE LOWEST PRICE OFFERED SHALL BE DIVIDED BY THE NEXT 8 LOWEST PRICE: 9 \oplus THE RESULTING FIGURE SHALL BE MULTIPLIED BY THE 10 PERCENTAGE VALUE FOR PRICE STATED IN THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS: AND $\frac{(III)}{(III)}$ THE PRICE SCORE OF EACH ADDITIONAL OFFEROR SHALL BE 12 CALCULATED IN THE SAME MANNER. (D) THE PRICE SCORE AND FINAL TECHNICAL SCORE OF EACH PROPOSAL 13 14 SHALL BE COMBINED FOR A TOTAL SCORE. THE OFFEROR WITH THE HIGHEST TOTAL SCORE SHALL BE AWARDED 15 (E) 16 THE PROCUREMENT CONTRACT, PROVIDED THE OFFEROR'S PROPOSAL IS 17 RESPONSIVE TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS AND SPECIFICATIONS AND THE 18 OFFEROR IS DETERMINED TO BE A RESPONSIBLE CONTRACTOR. 19 13-508. (A) AN UNSUCCESSFUL OFFEROR SHALL RECEIVE. AT THE REQUEST OF THE 20 21 OFFEROR, A DEBRIEFING BY THE PROCUREMENT OFFICER, WHO SHALL PROVIDE, AT 22 A MINIMUM: 23 THE PRICE AND FINAL TECHNICAL SCORE OF THE SUCCESSFUL (1)24 OFFEROR: (2)THE FINAL TECHNICAL SCORE OF THE OFFEROR REQUESTING THE 26 DEBRIEFING: AND THE OVERALL RANKING OF ALL OFFERORS, IF A RANKING WAS (3)
- 29 (B) THE DEBRIEFING BY THE PROCUREMENT OFFICER MAY NOT DISCLOSE
- 30 ANY INFORMATION PROHIBITED FROM DISCLOSURE BY LAW.
- 31 13 509.

28 DEVELOPED.

- TO THE EXTENT THAT THE REGULATIONS SET FORTH IN COMAR 21.05.03 32
- 33 GOVERNING COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSALS ARE CONSISTENT WITH THIS
- 34 SUBTITLE, THESE REGULATIONS SHALL APPLY.
- THE BOARD MAY DEVELOP ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS NECESSARY TO 35
- 36 CARRY OUT THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SUBTITLE.

1	13 510.
2	THIS SUBTITLE MAY BE CITED AS THE "MARYLAND CONSTRUCTION QUALITY ASSURANCE ACT".
4	<u>13-104.</u>
5	(a) Competitive sealed proposals may be used if:
6 7	(1) the procurement is for human, social, cultural, or educational services:
11	(2) with the approval of the head of a unit, the procurement officer determines that specifications cannot be prepared that allow an award based on the lowest bid price, the lowest evaluated bid price or, if the procurement is subject to § 11-202(3) of this article, the bid most favorable to the State; or
12	(3) the head of the unit determines [that:
	(i) the need to use a method other than competitive sealed bids is sufficiently compelling to override the general public policy that favors awarding procurement contracts on the basis of competitive sealed bids; and
16 17	7/1 =
18 19	SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act shall take effect October 1, 2004.