

**The Florida Senate**  
**BILL ANALYSIS AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

(This document is based on the provisions contained in the legislation as of the latest date listed below.)

---

Prepared By: The Professional Staff of the Committee on Governmental Oversight and Accountability

---

BILL: SB 684

INTRODUCER: Senator Hays

SUBJECT: Preference in Award of State Contracts

DATE: April 1, 2013

REVISED: \_\_\_\_\_

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	McKay	McVaney	GO	<b>Pre-meeting</b>
2.			CA	
3.			AP	
4.			RC	
5.				
6.				

**I. Summary:**

SB 684 specifies that an existing preference for Florida-based businesses that currently applies to public entity purchases of commodities and services also applies to the purchase of construction services. The bill also provides that this preference preempts any local preference regulation in contracts for construction services in which state-appropriated funds are spent.

This bill substantially amends section 287.084 of the Florida Statutes.

**II. Present Situation:**

**Procurement of Commodities and Services**

Chapter 287, F.S., regulates state agency<sup>1</sup> procurement of personal property and services. The Department of Management Services (department) is responsible for overseeing state purchasing activity, including professional and construction services, as well as commodities needed to support agency activities, such as office supplies, vehicles, and information technology.<sup>2</sup> The department establishes statewide purchasing rules and negotiates contracts and purchasing agreements that are intended to leverage the state’s buying power.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 287.012(1), F.S., defines agency as “any of the various state officers, departments, boards, commissions, divisions, bureaus, and councils and any other unit of organization, however designated, of the executive branch of state government. ‘Agency’ does not include the university and college boards of trustees or the state universities and colleges.”

<sup>2</sup> See ss. 287.032 and 287.042, F.S.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

Depending on the cost and characteristics of the needed goods or services, agencies may utilize a variety of procurement methods, which include:<sup>4</sup>

- Single source contracts, which are used when an agency determines that only one vendor is available to provide a commodity or service at the time of purchase;
- Invitations to bid, which are used when an agency determines that standard services or goods will meet needs, wide competition is available, and the vendor's experience will not greatly influence the agency's results;
- Requests for proposal, which are used when the procurement requirements allow for consideration of various solutions and the agency believes more than two or three vendors exist who can provide the required goods or services; and
- Invitations to negotiate, which are used when negotiations are determined to be necessary to obtain the best value and involve a request for highly complex, customized, mission-critical services.

For contracts for commodities or services in excess of \$35,000, agencies must utilize a competitive solicitation process.<sup>5</sup> Section 287.012(6), F.S., provides that competitive solicitation means "the process of requesting and receiving two or more sealed bids, proposals, or replies submitted by responsive vendors in accordance with the terms of a competitive process, regardless of the method of procurement."

Local governmental units are not subject to the provisions of chapter 287, F.S.

#### *Florida In-state Preference*

State agencies, universities, colleges, school districts, and other political subdivisions are required to grant a preference in the award for contracts for the purchase of personal property, when competitive solicitation is required and when the lowest responsible and responsive bid, proposal, or reply is by a vendor whose principal place of business is in another state, or political subdivision of that state.<sup>6</sup> The preference is mandatory and is utilized by the procuring entity to award a preference to the lowest responsible and responsive vendor having a principal place of business in this state. The preference awarded is the same preference provided by the out-of-state bidder's home state.

If the lowest responsible and responsive bid, proposal, or reply is by a vendor whose principal place of business is another state, or political subdivision of that state, and that state does not award a preference for in-state vendors, state agencies, universities, colleges, school districts, and other political subdivisions must award a 5 percent preference to Florida based vendors.<sup>7</sup>

A vendor whose principal place of business is outside of this state must submit with the bid, proposal, or reply documents a written opinion of an attorney at law licensed to practice law in

---

<sup>4</sup> See ss. 287.012(6) and 287.057, F.S.

<sup>5</sup> Section 287.057(1), F.S., requires all projects that exceed the Category Two (\$35,000) threshold contained in s. 287.017, F.S., to be competitively bid.

<sup>6</sup> Section 287.084(1)(a), F.S.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

that foreign state as to the preferences, if any, granted by the law of that state to a business entity whose principal place of business is in that foreign state.<sup>8</sup>

Florida's preference law does not apply to transportation projects for which federal aid funds are available,<sup>9</sup> or to counties or cities.<sup>10</sup> It also does not apply in the award of contracts for the purchase of construction services.

### **Procurement of Construction Services**

Chapter 255, F.S., specifies the procedures to be followed in the procurement of construction services for public property and publicly owned buildings. The department is responsible for establishing by rule the following:<sup>11</sup>

- Procedures for determining the qualifications and responsibility of potential bidders prior to advertisement for and receipt of bids for building construction contracts;
- Procedures for awarding each state agency construction project to the lowest qualified bidder;
- Procedures to govern negotiations for construction contracts and contract modifications when such negotiations are determined to be in the best interest of the state; and
- Procedures for entering into performance-based contracts for the development of public facilities those contracts are determined to be in the best interest of the state.

State contracts for construction projects that are projected to cost in excess of \$200,000 must be competitively bid.<sup>12</sup> Counties, municipalities, special districts, or other political subdivisions seeking to construct or improve a public building must competitively bid the project if the projected cost is in excess of \$300,000.<sup>13</sup>

Section 255.0525, F.S., requires the solicitation of competitive bids or proposals for any state construction project that is projected to cost more than \$200,000 to be publicly advertised in the Florida Administrative Weekly<sup>14</sup> at least 21 days prior to the established bid opening. If the construction project is projected to exceed \$500,000, the advertisement must be published at least 30 days prior to the bid opening in the Florida Administrative Weekly, and at least once 30 days prior to the bid opening in a newspaper of general circulation in the county where the project is located.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Section 287.084(2), F.S.

<sup>9</sup> Section 287.084(1)(b), F.S.

<sup>10</sup> Section 287.084(1)(c), F.S.

<sup>11</sup> Section 255.29, F.S.

<sup>12</sup> See chapters 60D-5.002 and 60D-5.0073, F.A.C.; see also s. 255.0525, F.S.

<sup>13</sup> See s. 255.20(1), F.S. For electrical work, local governments must competitively bid projects estimated to cost more than \$75,000.

<sup>14</sup> The Florida Administrative Weekly was renamed the Florida Administrative Register during the 2012 Session. Chapter 2012-63, L.O.F.

<sup>15</sup> For counties, municipalities, and political subdivisions, similar publishing provisions apply. Section 255.0525(2), F.S.

*Florida Preference to State Residents*

Section 255.04, F.S., provides that every board of the state, county, or municipality that is charged with the duty of erecting or constructing any public administrative or institutional building must give preference, in the purchase of material and in letting contracts for the construction of such building, to materialmen, contractors, builders, architects, and laborers who reside within the state whenever such material can be purchased or the services or such materialmen, contractors, builders, architects, and laborers can be employed at no greater expense than that which would obtain if such purchase was made from, or contract let, or employment given to a person residing outside of the state.

Another statute provides a preference for the employment of state residents in construction contracts funded by money appropriated with state funds. Such contracts must contain a provision requiring the contractor to give preference to the employment of state residents in the performance of the work if state residents have substantially equal qualifications<sup>16</sup> to those of non-residents.<sup>17</sup> If a construction contract is funded by local funds, the contract may contain such a provision.<sup>18</sup> In addition, the contractor required to employ state residents must contact the Department of Economic Opportunity to post the contractor's employment needs in the state's job bank system.<sup>19</sup>

**III. Effect of Proposed Changes:**

The bill amends the existing preference to Florida businesses in the purchase of commodities and services in Ch. 287, F.S., by applying the preference to construction services, and expanding the required application of the preference to counties and municipalities.

The bill adds a preemption provision that applies to any competitive solicitation in which payment for personal property or construction services is to be made partially or wholly from state-appropriated funds. The provision applies to any local ordinance or regulation that restricts a contractor who possesses a certificate of competency issued by the Department of Business and Professional Regulation<sup>20</sup> from competing for an award based upon:

- The vendor maintaining an office or place of business within a particular local jurisdiction;
- The vendor hiring employees or subcontractors from within a particular local jurisdiction; or
- The vendor's prior payment of local taxes, assessments, or duties within a particular local jurisdiction.

In any solicitation subject to this provision, the public entity must disclose in the solicitation whether payment will come from state-appropriated funds, the amount of such funds, and the percentage of such funds compared to the total cost.

---

<sup>16</sup> Section 255.099(1)(a), F.S., defines substantially equal qualifications as the "qualifications of two or more persons among whom the employer cannot make a reasonable determination that the qualifications held by one person are better suited for the position than the qualifications held by the other person or persons."

<sup>17</sup> Section 255.099(1), F.S.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

<sup>19</sup> Section 255.099(1)(b), F.S.

<sup>20</sup> Section 489.105(8), F.S.

The bill takes effect July 1, 2013.

#### IV. Constitutional Issues:

##### A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

The mandates provision of Art. VII, s. 18 of the State Constitution may apply because this bill requires cities and counties to spend money or take an action that requires the expenditure of money; however, an exemption may apply if the bill results in an insignificant fiscal impact to county or municipal governments. The exceptions to the mandates provision of Art. VII, s. 18 of the State Constitution appear to be inapplicable because the bill does not articulate a threshold finding of serving an important state interest.

##### B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

None.

##### C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

##### D. Other Constitutional Issues:

#### Commerce Clause

The U.S. Constitution provides that Congress shall have the power to “regulate commerce... among the states.”<sup>21</sup> The Commerce Clause acts not only as a positive grant of powers to Congress, but also as a negative constraint upon the states.<sup>22</sup> When a state or local government is acting as a “market participant” rather than a “market regulator,” it is not subject to the limitations of the Commerce Clause.<sup>23</sup> A state is considered to be a “market participant” when it is acting as an economic actor such as a purchaser of goods and services.<sup>24</sup> Since the state is acting as a “market participant” under this bill, the in-state preference provisions herein are likely to be upheld as an exception to the Commerce Clause.

#### Equal Protection Clause

The United States Constitution provides that “[n]o State shall... deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”<sup>25</sup> The expansion of the in-state preference provisions in this bill may constitute an equal protection violation. If such legislation is challenged, the court would use a rational basis test to determine the

<sup>21</sup> U.S. Const. art. I, s. 8, cl. 3.

<sup>22</sup> See *Gibbons v. Ogden*, 22 U.S. 1 (1824).

<sup>23</sup> *National Collegiate Athletic Ass’n v. Associated Press*, 18 So.3d 1201, 1211-1212 (Fla. 1st DCA 2009) (citing *Brown-Forman Distillers Corp. v. New York State Liquor Authority*, 476 U.S. 573, 578-579).

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*

<sup>25</sup> U.S. Const. amend. XIV, s. 1; see also FLA. Const. art. I, s. 2.

constitutionality of the alleged discriminatory treatment.<sup>26</sup> Under the rational basis test, a court must uphold a state statute so long as the classification bears a rational relationship to a legitimate state interest.<sup>27</sup>

## V. Fiscal Impact Statement:

### A. Tax/Fee Issues:

None.

### B. Private Sector Impact:

Florida-based businesses might obtain more public contracts.

### C. Government Sector Impact:

Indeterminate. The application of the 5% Florida preference to construction contracts theoretically could increase costs of those projects, and the offsetting secondary economic benefits of awarding more contracts to Florida-based businesses are difficult to determine in advance.

## VI. Technical Deficiencies:

None.

## VII. Related Issues:

The bill amends a current preference applicable to purchases of personal property, located in Ch. 287, F.S., to apply to purchases of construction services. Public construction contracting is regulated in Ch. 255, F.S., which also includes two existing preferences. The construction preference would be better placed in Ch. 255, F.S.

### Principal Place of Business

Current law does not provide for a definition of “principal place of business.” There are two competing tests to determine where a company’s principal place of business is located.

The first is the “substantial predominance” test, which analyzes the following criteria: the location of its employees, where sales took place, its production activities, its tangible property, its sources of income, the value of land owned and leased, and the replacement cost of assets located in a certain state.<sup>28</sup>

The second test is the “nerve center test.” Under this test, a company’s principal places of business refers to the place where the corporation’s high level officers direct, control, and

<sup>26</sup> *Nordlinger v. Hahn*, 505 U.S. 1, 33-34 (1992) (stating that a “classification rationally furthers a state interest when there is some fit between the disparate treatment and the legislative purpose.”)

<sup>27</sup> *Id.*

<sup>28</sup> *Ghaderi v. United Airlines, Inc.*, 136 F.Supp.2d 1041, 1044-46 (N.D. Cal 2001).

coordinate the corporation's activities.<sup>29</sup> The Department of Management Services has previously utilized the "nerve center" test to determine the company's principal place of business.<sup>30</sup>

**VIII. Additional Information:**

- A. **Committee Substitute – Statement of Substantial Changes:**  
(Summarizing differences between the Committee Substitute and the prior version of the bill.)

None.

- B. **Amendments:**

None.

---

This Senate Bill Analysis does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill's introducer or the Florida Senate.

---

---

<sup>29</sup> *Hertz Corp v. Friend et al.*, 130 S.Ct. 1181 (2010).

<sup>30</sup> In a 2010 memorandum to purchasing directors, the department indicated it intended to use the nerve center test when applying the Florida based business preference found in s. 49 of ch. 2010-151, L.O.F., to both state term contracts and other department issued solicitations. Memorandum to Purchasing Directors, Department of Management Services, September 2, 2010 at 3.