

UNSUCCESSFUL BIDDER PROTEST POLICY

Phone: (517) 373-8080
<http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa>

House Bills 4954 (H-2) and 4955 (H-3) as referred
Sponsor: Rep. Steve Marino
1st Committee: Commerce and Tourism
2nd Committee: Ways and Means
Complete to 9-8-20

Analysis available at
<http://www.legislature.mi.gov>

SUMMARY:

Together, the bills would amend the Management and Budget Act to modify the protest process and procedures for unsuccessful bidders for state contracts, including developing protest procedures for those involved in the process (HB 4954) and requiring all procurement contract awards to be publicly announced (HB 4955).

House Bill 4954 would require DTMB to develop a protest process for an unsuccessful bidder to protest an award decision under the act. The process would have to be clearly stated on DTMB's website and referred to in all requests for proposals issued by DTMB. The process would have to include all of the following:

- The time and manner in which the unsuccessful bidder must file the protest.
- The specific information that must be included in the protest.
- The specific statute, procurement policy, or solicitation instruction that was violated in the award decision.

If the process provided for a protest period extension, obtaining information under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) would not be a valid reason for a protest period extension.

Failure of a bidder to do any of the following would not be a valid reason to protest an award, and any protest based on these circumstances could be rejected without further investigation:

- Properly follow solicitation submission instructions.
- Properly and completely submit a solicitation response to DTMB by the due date and time.
- Provide mandatory samples, descriptive literature, or other required documents by the date and time specified.
- Provide a required deposit or performance bond by the date and time specified.
- Submit a protest within the time stipulated in the solicitation.
- Properly use the submission method, including electronic systems, specified in the solicitation submission instructions.

The above would not be an exclusive list of reasons a protest could be denied. The chief procurement officer or his or her designee could deny a protest for other reasons established in policy.

The chief procurement officer, or his or her designee, would have to investigate and provide a written response to the protesting party to all protests that meet the requirements of the bill. DTMB could not finalize an award of a contract or purchase order under a disputed solicitation until it issued a final decision on a timely protest. However, if there were a threat to public

health, safety, or welfare, or danger of immediate and substantial harm to state property from delay in making an award, then the chief procurement officer could proceed with an award and document the justification for doing so.

Proposed MCL 18.1266

House Bill 4955 would require DTMB, and all state agencies to which DTMB has delegated its procurement authority under the act, to publicly announce all procurement contract awards resulting from publicly posted solicitations within 48 hours of awarding the contract. The 48-hour period would exclude weekends and public holidays. DTMB or the procuring state agency would have to make available on a website at no cost both of the following regarding the procurement contract award:

- The name of the vendor that was awarded the procurement contract.
- The total dollar amount of the procurement contract award.

Proposed MCL 18.1262a

FISCAL IMPACT:

House Bill 4954 would have no fiscal impact on DTMB, other state departments and agencies, or local units of government. DTMB currently has an established process for vendor protests and it is posted on the department's website. Any additional information required by the bill to be made available on the website would have no additional cost.

House Bill 4955 would have no fiscal impact on DTMB, other state departments and agencies, or local units of government.

POSITIONS:

The Department of Technology, Management, and Budget indicated support for the bills. (6-23-20)

Legislative Analyst: Emily S. Smith
Fiscal Analyst: Michael Cnossen

■ This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House Fiscal Agency staff for use by House members in their deliberations, and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.