



**Maryland Joint  
Legislative Committee**

*The Voice of Merit Construction*

March 4, 2026

**Mike Henderson**

*President  
Greater Baltimore Chapter  
mhenderson@abcbaltimore.org*

**Chris Garvey**

*President & CEO  
Chesapeake Shores Chapter  
cgarvey@abc-chesapeake.org*

**Dan Bond CAE**

*President & CEO  
Metro Washington Chapter  
dbond@abcmetrowashington.org*

**Jennifer Harris**

*Chairman  
Joint Legislative Committee  
jharris@pecklaw.com*

**Matthew Tefteau**

*Director of Government Affairs  
Metro Washington Chapter  
mteffeau@abcmetrowashington.org*

Additional representation by:  
**Harris Jones & Malone, LLC**

6901 Muirkirk Meadows Drive  
Suite F  
Beltsville, MD 20705  
(T) (301) 595-9711  
(F) (301) 595-9718

**To: Senate Budget and Taxation Committee**

**Subject: SB 943- State Procurement- Competitive Sealed Bids and Proposals- In-State Evaluation Preference (Buy Maryland, Buy Local Act)**

**Position: Oppose**

**Dear Chair and Members of the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee:**

On behalf of the **Associated Builders and Contractors (ABC)**, Maryland's construction trade association representing merit shop contractors and subcontractors across Maryland, we respectfully oppose **SB 943** as currently drafted.

While we appreciate the intent to support Maryland businesses and strengthen the state's economy, **SB 943** would fundamentally alter Maryland's long-standing competitive procurement framework by shifting contract awards away from lowest-cost, quality-based evaluations toward in-state preference factors, including local employment metrics and projected tax impact.

Our joint legislative subcommittee has reviewed the bill and identified several policy concerns. **We would welcome the opportunity to work with the bill sponsor to explore potential amendments that preserve fairness and fiscal responsibility while supporting Maryland's economic goals.**

State procurement laws are designed to ensure fairness, transparency, and the best value for Maryland taxpayers. SB 943 would require all competitive bids and proposals to be evaluated using new "standardized criteria" emphasizing in-state economic impact rather than cost and merit alone. This approach could:

- Allow higher-cost contracts to be awarded over lower-cost bids based solely on geographic preference.
- Reduce incentives for bidders to submit their most competitive pricing or innovative solutions.
- Increase overall program and project costs for Maryland agencies and, ultimately, taxpayers.

Additionally, the bill would require bidders to compile detailed economic impact data for every procurement, regardless of size or scope. Collecting and reviewing this information would add unnecessary administrative burdens and





staffing costs for agencies and vendors alike — disproportionately impacting smaller contractors and subcontractors.

Maryland’s hard-bid, lump-sum procurement strategy has proven highly effective in promoting responsible public spending, particularly in Southern Maryland. Although SB 943 is framed as providing “local support,” most jurisdictions already maintain local preference policies that are best administered and enforced at the county level rather than imposed statewide.

Further, many Maryland jurisdictions have transitioned to Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) delivery methods for public school construction projects, utilizing a best-value approach. While portions of SB 943 appear to mirror elements of a CMAR-style evaluation, counties currently retain greater discretion and control over scoring and selection processes than would be provided under this legislation.

ABC strongly supports policies that grow Maryland jobs and strengthen our state’s economy. However, SB 943, as drafted, risks undermining open competition, increasing costs, and creating administrative inefficiencies in Maryland’s procurement system. Procurement decisions should remain transparent, competitive, and rooted in true best value — balancing price, quality, performance, and accountability without arbitrary geographic weighting.

For these reasons, we respectfully request an **unfavorable report** on SB 943.

Thank you for your consideration

Matt Teffeau  
Director of Government Affairs

