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I. Executive Summary

In most countries, public procurement through government contracting represents a large if not the largest share of government spending. This translates into a vast amount of money, which provides seemingly endless opportunities for corruption. The process of public procurement differs widely throughout the world, but in all countries it involves a complicated set of regulations and practices. In response to the need for a better way to monitor government procurement, Transparency International-USA helped to develop the Civil Society Procurement Monitoring (CSPM) tool. This tool was designed for civil society actors to identify possible red flags of corruption in public procurement and offer helpful advice on how to mitigate opportunities for corruption.

With this in mind, our team was tasked with two separate but complementary objectives. First, using the CSPM tool, we tracked 21 procurements in Arlington County (Virginia), Prince George’s County (Maryland), and Washington, DC and reflected on the first use of the tool in a U.S. setting. Second, our team compared the different regulatory environments, procurement practices, and relative transparency of these three jurisdictions in order to determine whether best practices were being followed, and if certain jurisdictions were outperforming others. This assessment did not uncover any clear acts of corruption, but the CSPM tool did identify several possible red flags in all jurisdictions that were worth noting. In our comparison of the regulatory environment, no jurisdiction stood out as a clear example of how best to handle public procurement, but each one possessed qualities and practices worth replicating in their counterparts. Concerns over the level of transparency in procurement offices and questionable practices involving public engagement were common concerns during this project, and are noted in our report.

II. Introduction and Objectives

The objective of this study is to use the CSPM tool to provide a comparative analysis of the public procurement systems and regulations in Washington, DC, Arlington, Virginia, and Prince George’s County, Maryland to identify the strengths and weaknesses of each system as they pertain to anti-corruption/fraud safeguards and overall transparency/ease of use of members of the general public.

I. Methodology

For the purposes of using the CSPM tool and for testing the transparency of each jurisdiction, the team conducted research through the framework of operating as a member of a civil society organization. The central question at the core of the data collection plan was “how would an interested party obtain this information through formal means?” To accomplish this goal, the team’s efforts included the following:

- Phone interviews
- Semi-structured, in-person interviews
- Freedom of Information Act requests
III. Regulatory Framework Overview

Based on our research, we found that the three jurisdictions studied had very different Public Procurement regulatory frameworks.

- In Arlington County public procurement is guided by one law common to all public bodies in Virginia. Arlington County (as well as other public bodies in this jurisdiction) has its own approach to implementing the law, and this implementation usually depends on the particular public body’s financial, political, and administrative structure. These interpretations are reflected in county vendor manuals and purchasing resolutions.

- In Prince George’s County, public procurement is guided by state law and county-level regulations. Regulations employed by a particular entity may differ from another entity in the same county. For example, the public schools system follows county and board of education regulations, while the county library follows both state and county regulations.

- In Washington DC, public procurement is mainly guided by one law, under the authority of the Chief Procurement Officer. However, we have found that this framework is not uniformly applied across DC agencies.

The sections below cover each jurisdiction’s regulatory framework in more details, and provide some historical background.

A. Public Procurement in Arlington, Virginia

Public procurement in Arlington County is guided by the Virginia Public Procurement Act (VPPA). The VPPA was enacted by the Virginia General Assembly in 1981 in order to standardize the purchase of goods and services by state agencies and local governments. The VPPA was drafted following a study by a committee made up of local and state public purchasing officials. This was meant to ensure that the act considered the needs of both local and state governments.

Over the last 30 years, amendments to the VPPA have been minor. The VPPA applies to all “public bodies” (financial, political, and administrative structures, cities, counties, and authorities). Towns with populations under 3,500 are exempt from VPAA requirements.

---

1 The Virginia Public Procurement Act, Virginia Municipal League, August 2005 <http://www.vml.org/sites/default/files/05VaPubProcurement_0.pdf>
Each public body’s approach to implementing the VPPA and to approving contracts reflects their own financial, political, and administrative structure.²

The Commonwealth of Virginia has recently established eVA, a centralized electronic procurement program at the state level, in order to centralize the advertising of public procurements across the state. The General Assembly has strongly encouraged local participation in this program through revisions to the VPPA. The Virginia Department of General Services (DGS) sponsors the eVA program, through its Division of Purchases and Supply.

As of Monday April 27, 2015, Arlington County has discontinued its use of online Sourcing for issuing competitive procurements, and has moved all future procurement advertisement to eVA.

B. Public Procurement in Prince George County, Maryland

At the state level, the Maryland Annotated Code (official codification of the statutory laws of Maryland) governs procurement law in the State of Maryland.³ In particular, Division II of the State Finance Article in the Annotated Code provides the statutory framework for government procurement. The separate Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR), title 21 outlines the state procurement regulations.⁴

State procurement law was partly the result of former governor Spiro T. Agnew receiving kickbacks and bribes from state contractors during his tenure in the late 1960s. In 1980, Maryland adopted a version of the American Bar Association's Model Procurement Code as its comprehensive procurement statute.⁵

The Board of Public Works in Maryland was originally established in 1864 to “exercise a diligent and faithful supervision of all Public Works in which the State may be interested as Stockholder or Creditor...” It informally assumed authority over public procurement until the 1980 law passed by the General Assembly that formalized its role in “controlling procurement by units”.⁶

² Ibid.
⁶ Ibid.
At the county level, the Prince George's County Charter and County Code are the source of local laws and regulations, and have been since 1990. In particular, subtitle 10A of the County Code deals with the topic of public procurement/purchasing, lays out the duties, powers, and responsibilities of procurement officers, describes proper bidding and contract award procedures, includes some anti-corruption provisions, and other relevant information. The Contracting Administration and Procurement Division procurements use the County Code regulations.

In 2013, amid calls for more transparency, effectiveness, and efficiency in an audit report by the County Council's Office of Audits and investigations, CB-15-2013 was unanimously adopted, updating the procurement regulations for the first time since 1994. Under CB-15-2013, the Prince George's County Office of Central Services is required to evaluate the need for updating the county's procurement regulations every five years, transmitting recommendations to the County Council for review. The legislation also requires Central Services to perform a cost-benefit analysis before exercising option years on contracts. The County Council must also be notified of any procurement process modifications, and receive copies of any contract modifications in excess of 25 percent of the original contract or $500,000.

The three entities housing the procurements monitored for this project followed regulations formed from very different sources. While the main county office, the Contract Administration and Procurement Division (CAPD), followed the County Code, we were informed the Public Schools System had a procurement manual based on a combination of state-level laws and Prince George's County Board of Education regulations. The Memorial Library System uses both state and local county regulations. Nonetheless, state laws and regulations still are still relevant to all procurement in Maryland.

C. Public Procurement in Washington, DC

Public Procurement in Washington, DC is covered by the Procurement Practices Reform Act (PPRA) of 2010, and the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (DCMR) Title 27, which contains the rules for contracts and procurements.

The PPRA was preceded by the DC Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, or Home Rule Act (enacted by Congress in 1973), as well as the District of Columbia Procurement Practices Act of 1985 (“PPA”), and the Procurement Reform Amendment Act of 1996.

---

8 Ibid.
The Home Rule Act of 1973 was broad and gave authority to the mayor to authorize the heads of executive departments, offices, and agencies to place orders for work.

The District of Columbia Procurement Practices Act of 1985 ("PPA") applied to all agencies and employees of the District government. It excluded the several separate government branches and independent agencies, and created the Contracts Appeals Boards for contractors to protest contract awards.

In 1997 the Procurement Reform Amendment Act of 1996 became official. It was enacted as the result of procurement studies that described the District of Columbia procurement as “in crisis”, “inconsistent” and ineffective. This act introduced a Council approval requirement for contracts exceeding $1 million and extending for multiple years. The reform also expanded the PPA’s application to include several independent agencies that were previously exempt from its application, although not all.

The Procurement Practices Reform Act of 2010, which is still in use today, was enacted as a result of calls to reform public procurement from two main reports (the Contracting and Procurement Reform Task Force’s report issued in December 2006 and the Report from Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued in January 200710), and the 2009 Parks and Recreations Procurement Controversy under Mayor Adrian Fenty.

The PPRA of 2010 attempted to simplify and modernize DC procurement law by adding several new sections to the PPA to improve transparency and governance, including:11

- The creation of an independent Office of the Procurement Ombudsman
- The creation of a “single procurement transparency website to ensure that all publicly available information regarding District procurement is easily accessible in one online location”
- A provision for specific and required “training, continuing education, and certification for District contracting personnel
- A provision for acquisition planning:
- A provision for the qualification of members of the Contract Appeals Board:

The PPRA of 2010 gives the Chief Procurement Officer of the Office of Contracting and Procurement authority over public procurement matters in Washington DC. However to date:12

---

● 74 agencies are subject to the PPRA and the Chief Procurement Officer’s authority
● 16 agencies are subject to the PPRA, but independent of the Chief Procurement Officer’s authority
● 12 agencies are exempt from both the PPRA and the Chief Procurement Officer’s authority

In the DC Government Organization Chart, the Office of Office of Contracting and Procurement, reports to the Deputy City Administrator/Deputy Mayor for Public Safety and Justice, which reports to the City Administrator. The City Administrator reports to the Mayor.13

IV. Summary Findings

This section will cover the findings our team obtained from interacting with procurement agencies in each of the three jurisdictions. This was done in order to acquire the information necessary to use the CSPM tool and make an assessment of their respective regulatory framework and comparison of each in terms of transparency and accountability.

We monitored 21 procurements in the three jurisdictions (seven in Arlington, six in Prince George’s County, and eight in Washington, DC). There were mixes of goods, works/infrastructure, and service procurements, with the third type being the most common overall. Most of the questions in the tool that could be answered with obtained information fell under the Planning and Bidding phases, and in some cases, the Evaluation phase. Unfortunately, because many procurement agencies did not give out detailed information on contracts that had not yet been awarded, we had insufficient information to accurately respond to many questions given the time constraints of our project.

A. Findings in Arlington, Virginia

The agencies we interacted with were the Arlington County Purchasing Office (ACPO) and Arlington County Public Schools (APS). Key findings at ACPO included barriers to transparency, such as a sustained reluctance to speak to the public concerning procurement projects, and a complicated vendor registration requirement for websites and online portals. In regards to public openings for bids, we observed inconsistencies between procurement employees’ statements that bids would be opened publicly, and the common practice of not having a public opening, which is required by law. We were turned away from two such public openings for automotive and leaf collector equipment parts without explanation, and in the case of a procurement for bus line inspection services, told that it was not usual practice for some lower-priced contracts to have public openings.

---

In addition to problems with public openings, potential bidders for the sole works procurement we monitored in Arlington County complained that the solicitation documents were unnecessarily vague in that they did not identify the exact location where construction would take place, nor did they give an estimated amount for each item listed on the pricing request. Vendors present at the pre-bid conference claimed that this would likely result in arbitrary bidding amounts and inefficient outcomes for both parties. In addition, the evaluation criteria included a lowest qualified bid formula that the procurement staff said would not be released before the bidding period was closed. Nevertheless, these complaints were later addressed in amendments and posted online. The APS office, on the other hand, generally had a climate of transparency and openness regarding procurement. Documents were more freely available online and on the central eVA website for all Virginia government procurement. However, due to the relatively low volume of procurements processed through APS compared to ACPO, only one procurement was monitored during this period and time constraints did not make it possible to file a FOIA request, since at the time this report was written the contract had yet to be awarded. Both offices did make bidding documents available online. If such documentation was not available through their home portals, they were available through the eVA website. Copies of bids and bid evaluation documents, on the other hand, were only accessible through FOIA requests.

- **Red flags**
  - Only raised by the CSPM tool’s questionnaire in regards to the aforementioned public opening discrepancies for two of the parts procurements at ACPO. Some agencies may in practice not conduct public openings, especially if bidders show no interest in attending.
  - The complaints made by potential bidders at the pre-bid conference for the works procurement were concerning, but were addressed by the procurement officers, added as amendments to the solicitation documents, and the deadline to submit bids was extended accordingly.

### B. Findings in Prince George’s County, Maryland

The relevant procurement entities for our project were the Contract Administration and Procurement Division (CAPD, the main county procurement office), Prince George’s County Public Schools system (PGCPS), and the Prince George’s County Memorial Library system (PGCML). As noted in the regulatory framework section, they each used a different source for their own procurement regulations. The PGCPS and PGCML offices were generally open regarding basic information; bidding documents were available online and the offices agreed to meet or speak with us regarding more detailed procurement information as needed. One apparent issue was a lack of clear or consistent information on when an MPIA (Maryland Public Information Act) request was needed to obtain certain documents. Some procurement officers decided to give us access to copies of bids without requiring a formal request to be filed, while others informed us that a formal letter mailed in to their administrative offices was required. However, this information was not available online. Notices of previously awarded contracts were posted on the solicitations page of the PGCPS website. While not necessary a red flag, several bid
closings, such as those at Glenarden Woods Elementary school, were pushed back three to five times over the course of several months. Upon inquiry, the procurement officers explained it was to allow more vendors the opportunity to see the project and bid, due to a lower number of interested bidders, or to add amendments and addenda to the bidding documents. Also, PGCML only required requests for proposals (RFPs) to be emailed in by a certain deadline, and did not conduct a public opening. At CAPD, there were a few communication difficulties: i.e. there were problems and delays in setting up an interview meeting with chief procurement staff regarding its regulatory framework, and some aspects of its website, including access to a working version of the county code, were not very user-friendly or intuitive.

- **Red flags**
  - One problem we noticed was that there were around six or seven attendees at the pre-bid conferences and only two actual bids for the Elementary School projects, though this may not be a red flag per se.
  - Finally, the most notable issue was the long duration between the bid openings and the actual awarding of contracts for some projects. As of this report's writing, we are still waiting on the contract awards for some of the elementary school procurements that closed in early March. Procurement officials recently indicated that the bid closings were actually extended until April 30th in order to get more bids and give more vendors opportunity to bid.

C. **Findings in Washington, DC**

The agencies relevant to our procurement monitoring in DC were the Department of General Services (DGS), DC Public Schools (DPS), and the District Department of Transportation (DDOT). The Office of Contracting and Procurement (OCP) was the main procurement office for the district. This jurisdiction contained some of our highest valued procurements, such as the Minnesota Avenue Revitalization and Transit Signal Priority Implementation projects. Information on DDOT’s procurements was available on their website and online portal, which required registration before accessing. Public openings were held as advertised, and we were able to speak with vendors and procurement officials. Afterward, however, there was somewhat less openness when we tried to obtain more detailed information in regards to bids, the budget, contracts, evaluation processes, and the exact status of a given procurement (regarding evaluation, some were only primarily price-based, and required only a justification); procurement officials did not divulge as much about the evaluators and the reasons for bid extensions and delay. A FOIA request through the DC portal was not able to give us these requested documents until the contract had been awarded, instead they only returned a redacted bid tabulation and other information already obtained at the pre-bid conference. Another request demonstrated problems with inter-agency coordination, as DDOT said they did not have the information for one project, TSP Implementation, which was under OCP’s records, despite being listed as a DDOT procurement. Information on the DDOT website concerning contract awards was very outdated, having not been updated for four years. However, the OCP website did contain a list of awarded, pending, and open
contracts. Further FOIA requests are still pending. At DGS, there was also a turnover of several procurement employees in the midst of our procurement monitoring, which complicated the process somewhat. At DCPS, two procurements were canceled after numerous amendments were made. For both procurements, the Chief Procurement Officer issued notices of cancellation that attributed the cause of cancellations to the “changes in the specifications and requirements of the agency, and the decision to seek other procurement methods to meet the needs of the agency.”

- **Red flags**
  - For the bidding phase, there were some red flags produced by the Tool for DCPS projects: with the Dedicated Internet Services Solicitation, technical specifications were changed after the pre-bid conference without extension of the proposal submission deadline. The Wide Area Network also involved changing specifications without deadline extension.
  - At DDOT, the main problem was the inordinate amount of time between the bid opening period (in early February for both procurements monitored) and the contract award (as of this report, they have still not been awarded). Procurement officers indicated there were some issues to deal with regarding price discrepancies between bidders and the agency, and a responsibility assessment was still ongoing. Further information was not given.
  - Another issue was the low number of bidders on major, multi-million dollar projects (two for Minnesota Avenue Revitalization and only one for TSP Implementation). The officers explained this was likely due to the specific and technical nature of these projects.

V. **Regulatory Framework Comparison**

In addition to the analysis of the procurements in each jurisdiction, it is also important to compare the public procurement regulations and frameworks in each jurisdiction to get a complete picture of the environment. Several provisions were selected and used to assess each jurisdiction in a consistent way. The relevant provisions regarding procurement regulation are expanded on below:

- **Document publication requirements**: Washington, DC requires posting solicitation documents on the OCP website, and for procurement amounts of $250,000 and higher, a notice in a

---

newspaper of generation circulation. Arlington requires online posting at least 10 days before the closing deadline. PGC does not have a regulation specifically regarding document publication.

- **Anti-corruption provisions**: All jurisdictions share similar provisions to combat corruption, including language forbidding collusion among bidders, restrictions targeting kickbacks for contracts, requirements for bidder debarment or suspension, and provisions on price fixing.

- **Conflict of interest provisions**: All jurisdictions share similar provisions requiring the declaration of conflicts of interest. Prince George’s County requires that no member of the elected governing body of the county or members of his or her immediate family, may benefit from the acts of awarding or executing the contract. Arlington County regulations state that no public employee having official responsibility for a procurement transaction shall participate in that transaction on behalf of the public body when the employee knows that they or members of their family may benefit or have an interest in the procurement. In Washington, DC each agency has its own conflict of interest rules that all fall under the general regulation that the procurement business of Washington, DC should be conducted in a manner above reproach and with complete impartiality.

- **Monetary thresholds for competitive bidding**: Washington, DC: $100,000 Arlington County: $100,000 Prince George’s County: $30,000

- **Asset/financial declaration provisions**: No provisions exist for Arlington County in purchasing manual. Nothing is specifically mentioned in Prince George’s County outside of the anti-corruption and conflict of interest provisions that state that no officer or employee of the county shall in any manner receive any benefit from any contract, job, work, or service for the county. Washington, DC does have specific asset/financial declaration provisions.

- **Complaint resolution provisions**: Similar provisions for complaints and protests exist among all jurisdictions, with varying time periods required for submission and responses to complaints. Washington, DC regulations state that resolution of the complaint will come within 120 days, Arlington County within 10 days with an appeal available within an additional 10 days following, while Prince George’s County regulations state that complaints valued under $100,000 will be resolved within 90 days after receipt, and complaints over $100,000 within 120 days.

- **Bid bond/security provisions**: Same percentage in each of the three jurisdictions (5% of bid). $100,000 threshold in Prince George’s County and Washington, DC. $500,000 for Arlington County, with $250,000 for transportation related projects.

- **Contract change/amendment provisions**: All jurisdictions have similar provisions in that formal written notification of the change must be made with the effect on the total project budget included and submitted to the responsible fiscal officer. Additionally, Prince George’s County requires contract changes over $500,000 to be entered into an official review process and Arlington County requires changes to be made within 60 days or at the time of occurrence of the work.
• **Contract audit provisions:** All jurisdictions share similar provisions enabling the auditing of a contract winner.

• **Certain types of contracts that require the approval of political officials:** This type of regulation only applies to Washington, DC and Prince George’s County. Arlington County has no such regulation. In Washington, DC, multiyear contracts or those over $1 million must be submitted to the Council for review and in Prince George’s County, sole sourcing, emergency, and special circumstance procurements and minority business opportunities must be recommended to the County Council for approval.

• **Regulations that try to insulate the civil service staff/procurement process from political interference:** This provision exists solely in Washington, DC and states that no district employee shall attempt to influence a procurement official in their duties.

### Table 1: Regulatory Framework Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Criteria</th>
<th>Washington, DC</th>
<th>PG County, MD</th>
<th>Arlington, VA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document Publication Requirements</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations that try to insulate the civil service staff/procurement process from political interference</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain types of contracts that require the approval of political officials</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Resolution Provisions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition Planning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Corruption Provisions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of Interest Provisions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Thresholds for Competitive Bidding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset/Financial Declaration Provisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Resolution Provisions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid Bond/Security Provisions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. FOIA Experience

In order to obtain documents relating to the evaluation of bids, it was often necessary to make Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests to the relevant authorities. Each jurisdiction operated under its own version of FOIA, with its own unique set of exemptions and regulations governing the process of making and approving requests. In Maryland, it is referred to as the Maryland Public Information Act (MPIA).

Table 2: FOIA Comparison by Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Comparison</th>
<th>Washington, DC</th>
<th>Prince George’s County</th>
<th>Arlington County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Law</td>
<td>The District of Columbia Freedom of Information Act</td>
<td>The Maryland Public Information Act</td>
<td>The Virginia Freedom of Information Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Can Make Requests?</td>
<td>Anyone</td>
<td>Anyone</td>
<td>Only residents of Virginia or the media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| What is Exempt?         | ● Invasion of privacy  
● Investigative materials  
● Personnel records  
● Agency memorandums  
● Employee names | ● Invasion of privacy  
● Investigative materials  
● Trade secrets  
● Public policy development memos | ● Personnel records  
● Attorney-client privilege  
● Proprietary information  
● Award negotiation |
| Response Requirement    | 15 business-days, optional 10 day extension | 30 days | 5 days, optional 7 day extension |

Each jurisdiction’s version of FOIA contained exemptions. In each case, documents relating to ongoing contract negotiations were exempt from FOIA requests until said contracts had been awarded. This was the most commonly cited reason for rejecting our requests. Virginia was unique in its requirement that requestors be citizens of the Commonwealth or members of a media organization operating within the Commonwealth. Virginia law also prohibits incarcerated felons from making FOIA requests. This presented a barrier to transparency that appeared arbitrary and counter to the purpose of sunshine laws.
Among the jurisdictions, Maryland had the longest time horizon for FOIA requests and possessed no formal, unified FOIA system. Instead of a dedicated FOIA officer (Arlington) or online FOIA request system (DC), Prince George’s County FOIA requests had to be made directly to specific individuals via email. An individual would have to know exactly whom to contact and what to ask for in advance without an online guide specifying the format of the request. Washington, DC had the second-longest time horizon for complying with FOIA requests and its formalized online FOIA portal system was much more user-friendly. Virginia had the shortest time horizon for FOIA requests as well as a dedicated FOIA officer in Arlington County.

A. Arlington, Virginia

During the monitoring period, a total of five FOIA requests were made for documents pertaining to the evaluation of bids and awarding of contracts, of which three were answered in full. The first two requests were answered within the period required by law, and were rejected due to the FOIA officer’s assessment that we were not Virginia residents. After a quick appeal of this rejection due to the Virginia residency status of one of our team members, and subsequent attempts to follow-up, the Arlington County FOIA officer finally responded three weeks later confirming that the requested material was in the mail. The requests appeared to have been fulfilled, although no evaluation rubrics were included. However, due to the small size of the contract and disqualification of two out of the three bidders, such a rubric may not have been used. No information was redacted.

The next three requests were responded to within the legal five-day response period. One was rejected due to the ongoing negotiations exemption, and two were delivered via email. However, technical difficulties with the format of the delivered documents made it impossible to view one of the two sets of bidding documents. Subsequent requests for documents in a different format were not met. The viewable bidding documents were not redacted.

B. Prince George’s County, Maryland

During the monitoring period, a total of six MPIA requests were made in Prince George’s County. Unlike Arlington County and Washington, DC, Prince George’s County did not have a streamlined way to make FOIA requests that was consistent among all agencies. Instead, requests had to be made directly to the source by email, in person request, or whichever means that particular agency preferred. Three MPIA requests were initially filed, two with Prince George’s County Public Schools (PGCPS) and one with Prince George’s County Memorial Library (PGCML). The MPIA requests were written and printed out as official letters, as requested by PCGPS and PGCML officials. The first two were delivered in person to the office at the Public Schools' administrative building while the third was mailed to the Memorial Library's CEO. When speaking to the Library procurement officer, we were told that we would have to submit a formal letter to that office in order to get anything. We also found that some counties and some
agencies had MPIA form templates as downloadable PDFs, but only for those particular counties and agencies. One of the first requests has since been met, within the 30 day period required by law, and the other two requests have only received confirmations. Three additional MPIA requests made to the County Contract Administration and Procurement Division (CAPD) have yet to receive any response, exceeding the 30 day required response period.

C. Washington, DC

During the monitoring period, a total of five FOIA requests were made through the Washington, DC online FOIA portal. Washington was the only jurisdiction that had a single unified FOIA filing system that streamlined the process of making FOIA requests. The first two FOIA requests made to the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) were responded to after 16 business-days (just shy of making it within the 15-business day response period required by law) and the official asked for an additional 10-day extension, which was within the law for them to do. Under certain circumstances, D.C. Official Code § 2-532(d)(2011) authorizes the District to extend, by ten (10) additional days, the deadline by which it must respond to a FOIA request. One of the circumstances provided by that statute is a case in which the District needs additional time to search for, collect and examine voluminous amounts of records and/or consult with an additional D.C. agency. Within the additional 10-business days, we received documents that were heavily redacted and only pertaining to one of the two FOIA requests. Trade secrets and the ongoing negotiation of the contract were cited as reasons for a lack of bids and evaluation materials. We were also referred to the DC Office of Contracting and Procurement (OCP) for additional information. A FOIA request made to OCP directly, and not through the portal, has yet to garner a response.

Three additional FOIA requests were also made through the DC FOIA portal. The first request was answered after 16-business days - also shy of the 15-business day requirement - and the other two were responded to after 13-business days. Because the contracts for these procurements had not been awarded, these requests were denied.

VII. Web Experience

Throughout this study, we dealt with nine procurement websites, and evaluated them on their availability of information online and overall user experience.

For availability of information online, we checked each site for the following criteria: availability of information without vendor registration, Information on how procurements are handled, solicitation and bidding Documents, pricing lists, amendments, contract awards (winner and contract amount), and complaints.
For overall user experience, we rated each site based on transparency (related to availability of information online), and ease of use (how easy was it to find pertinent information, how easy is the site to navigate, etc...). We used the following rating scale:

- 1 = Poor
- 2 = Fair
- 3 = Good
- 4 = Very Good
- 5 = Excellent

This section of the report is organized as follows:
- Websites we evaluated
- Jurisdiction-Specific Comparison of websites
- Cross-Jurisdictional Comparison of Main Procurement Sites

A. List of Websites We Evaluated

Below is the list of websites. For the purposes of this study, we decided to select the first site listed under each jurisdiction, as the main procurement site for the particular jurisdiction.

- In Arlington:
  - The Arlington County Purchasing Office (ACPO) -
    - Budget & Finance - Purchasing: [http://budget.arlingtonva.us/purchasing/](http://budget.arlingtonva.us/purchasing/)
    - i-Supplier site: [https://eprismr12.arlingtonva.us/OA_HTML/RF.jsp?function_id=31914&resp_id=1&resp_appl_id=-1&security_group_id=0&lang_code=US&params=rKZ5BnGiUoh-1JRzZtfZhybZpWfFs0oN64H5hkYnC.nG6E-vYjYQ2Jo7UkhUHuG&oas=RUuPMwU7EwzKKW5MfxmeiQ.](https://eprismr12.arlingtonva.us/OA_HTML/RF.jsp?function_id=31914&resp_id=1&resp_appl_id=-1&security_group_id=0&lang_code=US&params=rKZ5BnGiUoh-1JRzZtfZhybZpWfFs0oN64H5hkYnC.nG6E-vYjYQ2Jo7UkhUHuG&oas=RUuPMwU7EwzKKW5MfxmeiQ.)

- In Prince George’s County:
  - PG County Contract Administration and Procurement Division (PG CAPD): [http://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/CentralServices/Services/CAP/Pages/default.aspx](http://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/CentralServices/Services/CAP/Pages/default.aspx)
  - PG County Public Schools (PGCPS) - Purchasing: [http://www1.pgcps.org/purchasing/awardsnew.aspx](http://www1.pgcps.org/purchasing/awardsnew.aspx)
B. Jurisdiction-Specific Comparison of websites

1. **Arlington, Virginia**

*Centralization of information Online*
As mentioned under section III B, the Commonwealth of Virginia has established eVA, a centralized electronic procurement program at the state level. As of Monday April 27, 2015, the Arlington County Purchasing Office has discontinued its use of Sourcing for issuing competitive procurements, and entirely moved to the eVA. The Arlington Public Schools (APS) now uses eVA for advertising all procurement opportunities having a value of over $100,000\(^\text{15}\). There does not appear to be any other website that advertises Arlington County procurement opportunities.

*Availability of Information Online*
Information available online included solicitation and bidding documents. If relevant, pricing lists and any amendments made to the initial solicitation were also available. Any public records kept by employees related to procurement, evaluations of bids, and copies of submitted bids by bidders required a FOIA request, and were only made available after the contract award date. Once the contract is awarded, it is published on the Arlington County Purchasing Office website, but was not available on the centralized eVA website.

Both Arlington County Purchasing Office (ACPO), and eVA required users to register as vendors before accessing the solicitation and bidding documents. Arlington Public Schools (APS) made this information available to civil society at large without the vendor registration requirement.

\(^{15}\) Arlington Public Schools Solicitation Page: [http://www.arlington.k12.va.us/Page/2782](http://www.arlington.k12.va.us/Page/2782)
One commonality between each site was the unavailability of registered complaints online.

For both the Arlington County Purchasing Office (ACPO) iSupplier, and the Arlington Public Schools (APS) websites once solicitations are closed, bidding documents are removed from the open bidding opportunities pages and moved either to another location or removed from the websites completely. Unlike these two sites, on eVA, closed solicitations going back several years are still available, as are their documents.

### Table 3: Arlington Procurement Website Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/website</th>
<th>ACPO</th>
<th>eVA</th>
<th>APS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of info without vendor registration</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info on how procurements are handled</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation and bidding documents</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing lists</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract awards (winner &amp; contract amount)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement forecast</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archiving of awarded procurements</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Website contains a link to future procurements, but the link is broken.

**Overall user experience**

The **Arlington County Purchasing Office (ACPO) iSupplier** website had a number of barriers for the average person trying to access available bidding opportunities.

- First the site required the user to register as a vendor (there is no option for a non-vendor citizen).
- Once registered, it was unclear how to view solicitation documents at all. Upon calling the Purchasing office, we were told to follow a series of links and insert the symbol “%” into a search box in order to view bidding documents. We believe it is without prejudice to say that no user would be able to access solicitation documents without prior knowledge of this process or contact with the Arlington County Purchasing Office.
- Even after the user learns this process, we found that we had to clear cookies before every attempt to access the iSupplier website or else we would get an error message.

**eVA**, the **centralized website for procurement across Virginia** was more user-friendly than the Arlington County iSupplier website, but also had some issues:

- In order to access solicitation documents on eVA, the user must register as a vendor or buyer (there is no option for non-vendor/buyer citizen). This process is arguably harder than the
iSupplier process, as one must fill out every single box in the registration window in order for the system to allow you to register. For someone who is not a vendor/buyer, this requires some creativity, and frankly, lying about one’s identity in order to access documents.

- Once registration is complete, the eVA website is actually quite useful. Although award notices are not posted on eVA, the status of solicitations appear to be updated regularly.

While Arlington Public Schools (APS) had far fewer bidding opportunities than the Arlington County Purchasing office, and eVA, it hosted all of its solicitations on its own website. Access to bidding documents required no registration and was very easy to find.

Based on our overall user experience, below is our rating of each procurement site:

**User Experience Rating** Scale: 1 = Poor | 2 = Fair | 3 = Good | 4 = Very Good | 5 = Excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>ACPO</th>
<th>eVA</th>
<th>APS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Prince George’s County, MD

**Centralization of information Online**

We examined three websites listing procurement opportunities for different agencies or purchasing entities within the county: PG County Contract Administration and Procurement Division (PG CAPD), PG County Public Schools (PGCPS), and PGC Memorial Library (PGCML) website. The main county website was the CAPD, but several of our procurements were with these other entities. In addition, there were other websites not directly connected to the procuring entities, such as eMaryland Marketplace and Maryland Bids that listed the bidding opportunities as well, connecting users to the respective websites containing the bidding documents.

The CAPD and PGCPS websites were not difficult to find, although there were not direct links between the two as they operate separately as far as purchasing is concerned. The PGCML website had fewer overall procurements and was less prominent, but could still be found through an online search. Depending on what a vendor or other interested person is looking for, there may be other relevant websites listing procurements in the county, as many other entities have their own; for example, the Community College also has its own separate site. A centralized location for all solicitations in the county may be useful, but given the different regulations each entity uses, as discussed earlier, it may be difficult to implement.
**Availability of Information Online**

On the PG County Contract Administration and Procurement Division (PG CAPD) website, the list of procurement opportunities is visible, but users must first register as vendors before accessing the solicitation and bidding documents. In addition, there is no way to access information related to old procurements. The site provides a list of current contracts, which contains among other information the vendor name and the Bid number, but did not provide any information about the contract amount.

On the PG County Public Schools (PGCPS) website, the list of procurement opportunities is visible, and solicitation bidding documents and related amendments are accessible without a required vendor registration. The site also features a dedicated page listing recently awarded contracts and the prices, with a links to notices of contract awards. There is also a link to their particular procurement manual, with guidelines based on regulations from PGC Board of Education and the Maryland State government.

On the PG County Memorial Library (PGCML) the list of procurement opportunities is visible, and solicitation bidding documents and related amendments are also accessible without a required vendor registration, however contract awards are not available online.

For all three sites, any public records kept by employees related to procurement, evaluations of bids, copies of submitted bids by bidders would need to be requested by FOIA, and would only be sent after the contract award date. Contracts award notices and amounts would need to be requested via FOIA for PG CAPD and PGCML.

One commonality between each site was the unavailability of registered complaints online.

For the PG CAPD and PGCPS sites, once solicitations are closed, bidding documents are removed from the open bidding opportunities pages and moved either to another location or removed from the websites completely. The PGCML site kept the bidding documents on its procurement opportunities page until around the time the contract was awarded, despite having closed bidding earlier.

**Table 5: Prince George’s County Procurement Website Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/website</th>
<th>PG CAPD</th>
<th>PGCPS</th>
<th>PGCML</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability of info without Vendor Registration</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Info on how Procurements are handled</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solicitation and Bidding Documents</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pricing Lists</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amendments</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Awards (Winner &amp; Contract Amount)</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procurement Forecast/Plan</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archiving of Awarded Procurements</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complaints

Overall user experience

The **PG County Contract Administration and Procurement Division (PG CAPD)**'s website had a page regarding Contract Administration and Procurement with some general information.

- The website in general was not ideal for an average person wishing to explore and find out more about local procurement, and it was difficult to find information on regulations through the site itself.
- We had to contact one of the employees at the office to get a link to the county code with the regulations, found on a link called Legislative Information System, which were separate from their website, and it took a few hours for them to produce a useful response; the initial link we were given had broken links for regulation subsections). Some aspects were not very intuitive.
- The search function was not particularly useful overall either; looking for applicable budget information, such as overall amount spent on procurements in the county was difficult.
- Information on filing FOIA/MPIA requests was not available on the main website, and we had to find out about it through a separate online search.

The **PGC Public Schools (PGCPS)** website was somewhat more user-friendly, except that under purchasing opportunities, there are some old/outdated procurements and no user-friendly way to filter them out.

The **PGC Memorial Library (PGCML)** website had very limited information on its actual procurement process. The page listing the procurement opportunities had links to individual parts of a project, like the bidding document and addenda, as separate links, rather than being nested under a project page or folder. Furthermore, there was no other information on the site itself concerning procurements or how they are handled; all the information was contained in the bidding document itself, and further inquiry to the procurement officer or CEO was necessary to get more information.

Based on our overall user experience, below is our rating of each procurement site:

**User Experience Rating** Scale: 1 = Poor | 2 = Fair | 3 = Good | 4 = Very Good | 5 = Excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Prince George’s County Procurement Website Rankings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Washington, DC**
Centralization of information Online

There is no centralized place online that would link/ or be a portal to all DC procurements. While the Office of Contracting & Procurement (OCP) site could play that role, it currently lists under a page titled “Other Procurement Websites" the names of a few district agencies that it collaborates with in order to validate information from vendors. Under a page titled “Additional Opportunities”, the OCP site only lists eight links to some DC government agencies and quasi-government agencies that have contracting and procurement authority, independent of the Chief Procurement Officer and OCP: Office of Chief Financial Officer (CFO), District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS), District of Columbia General Services (DGS), Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), Information Technology Staff Augmentation (ITSA), National Association of State Procurement Officials (NASPO), Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA), Washington Airport Authority.¹⁶

At the time of this report, there are no links the websites to any of the agencies that subject to the PPRA and under the Chief Procurement Officer’s authority, nor to the websites of agencies that are subject to the PPRA, but independent of the Chief Procurement Officer’s authority.

Availability of Information Online

Like for the Arlington websites, information generally available online for Washington DC sites included solicitation and bidding documents. If relevant, pricing lists and any amendments made to the initial solicitation. The Office of Contracting & Procurement (OCP) website provides a pdf list of current contract awards, which does not include any details on contract amounts, nor links to individual contracts. The DC Department of Transportation Department (DDOT) does not provide a listing of awarded contracts. The DC Public Schools System (DCPS) website provide a list of awarded contracts, which includes details on contract amounts, but no links to individual contracts.

Only the DC Department of Transportation Department (DDOT) site required users to register as vendors before accessing the solicitation and bidding documents. Both Office of Contracting & Procurement (OCP) and DC Public Schools System (DCPS) websites made this information available to civil society at large without the vendor registration requirement.

For all three sites, any public records kept by employees related to procurement, evaluations of bids, copies of submitted bids by bidders would need to be requested by FOIA, and would only be sent after the contract award date. The same is true for actual awarded contracts.

Like in the other two jurisdictions the commonality between each site was the unavailability of registered complaints online.

For all both the Office of Contracting & Procurement (OCP), and the DC Department of Transportation Department (DDOT) websites, once solicitations are closed, bidding documents are removed from the open bidding opportunities pages and moved either to another location or removed from the websites completely. For the DC Public Schools System (DCPS) website, their extremely outdated solicitation page could be considered as an archive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/website</th>
<th>OCP</th>
<th>DDOT</th>
<th>DCPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of info without Vendor Registration</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info on how Procurements are handled</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation and Bidding Documents</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing Lists</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Awards (Winner &amp; Contract Amount)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Forecast/Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archiving of Awarded Procurements</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Solicitation page is outdated and therefore includes some documents from closed procurements

**Overall user experience**

The **Office of Contracting and Procurement (OCP) site** was easy to navigate and presented no issue to us in terms of user friendliness.

- The site had adequate information, including solicitation listings, eSourcing FAQs, and required documents for making a complete bid. Standard contract provisions were useful.
- The site linked to FOIA portal, which streamlined the FOIA request process, after the user signed up to access the portal.
- The OCP solicitation site listed DDOT procurements, which were linked to a separate portal dedicated to DDOT procurements.

The **dedicated DDOT procurement site** only worked on a version of Internet Explorer with the Silverlight add-in, and in Google Chrome. The portal required a username and password to be created in order to access the project links themselves. The portal contained links to bidding documents, specifications, and addenda for each procurement. Several of the procurement listed have not been updated since they were originally posted.

- The page listing of awarded contracts was very outdated; the most recent procurement was from 2011, and no updates had been made since then; this could be confusing for some vendors or members of the public.
The DC Public Schools (DCPS) procurement site was not well organized, not up-to-date, and very difficult to navigate.

- The pages listing existing solicitations included procurements that were closed or cancelled since last year.
- To look for an existing solicitation, the user either has to click on a list of solicitation numbers that don’t provide any description, or scroll down for an extraordinary amount of time. This makes it hard to navigate the site.
- In addition, because some of the solicitation details are pasted on the page as images, this makes it hard for the user to perform a keyword search.

Based on our overall user experience, below is our rating of each procurement site:

**User Experience Rating** Scale: 1 = Poor | 2 = Fair | 3 = Good | 4 = Very Good | 5 = Excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>OCP</th>
<th>DDOT</th>
<th>DCPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Use</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Cross-Jurisdictional Comparison of Main Procurement Sites

Based on the analysis made in the above sections, below is our summary evaluation of the main procurement sites for each jurisdiction.

**Availability of Information Online**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/website</th>
<th>eVA</th>
<th>CAPD</th>
<th>OCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Procurement Site</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of info without Vendor Registration</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info on how Procurements are handled</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation and Bidding Documents</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing Lists</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Awards (Winner &amp; Contract Amount)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Forecast/Plan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archiving of awarded procurements</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall User Experience

Based on our overall user experience, below is our rating of each main procurement site:

User Experience Rating Scale: 1 = Poor | 2 = Fair | 3 = Good | 4 = Very Good | 5 = Excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>eVA</th>
<th>CAPD</th>
<th>OCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Use</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cumulatively, our overall user experience was better on the OCP site, compared to the other 2 main procurement sites. The CAPD site was ranked the worst.

VIII. Conclusions and Recommendations

A. Arlington, Virginia

Strengths: Despite the initial difficulties posed by a registration system geared towards vendors and buyers, once the county websites were accessed (particularly eVA), documents were relatively easy to find. The dedicated FOIA officer for Arlington County and the web page describing the FOIA process were also helpful signs of transparency. In Arlington Public Schools especially, documentation was made available online without registration, as were helpful pamphlets describing the procurement process in simple, easily digestible terms.

Weaknesses: Interactions with Arlington County staff were somewhat inconsistent and resulted in contradictory answers to questions, especially those related to public openings of bids. FOIA requests were also not always received and required some nudging to receive official responses. The eVA website, which is the central procurement website for all of Virginia, is also limited in its usefulness by the somewhat complicated vendor registration process. There is no easy access for members of the public who are not vendors or potential bidders, thus hurting its usefulness as a tool of government transparency.

Recommendations: Better training for office purchasing staff on best practices will probably help limit instances of giving contradictory information to the public. While it appears that members of the public and bidders showing up to public openings (when they even occur) is rare, the procurement staff is required by state law to have public openings and advertise them in their solicitation documents.
Making the vendor registration optional for the eVA site and making award notices easily accessible on eVA would also be a tremendous improvement in terms of transparency. The Arlington Public Schools purchasing staff appeared to be much more experienced and open to the public than the Arlington County Purchasing Office staff, who repeatedly rebuffed our attempts to speak with them. The reason given for this difference was that the ACPO was undergoing turnover in management and staff and had no time to meet with us. Staff at the APS office were more experienced and did not appear to have this problem. As a result of these interactions, we believe that it would be useful for ACPO staff to reach out to the APS procurement staff to coordinate joint trainings for newer, less experienced procurement officers to gain access to useful institutional knowledge.

B. Prince George's County, MD

**Strengths:** The bidding documents were readily available on the PGCPS and PGCML websites we consulted for the procurements, and did not require registration to access. The county also has ample regulations when considering both local and state level law. Thresholds for competitive bidding are lower than the other counties. There have also been efforts to improve the procurement process in PGC through recent laws, as noted earlier in the regulatory framework section.

**Weaknesses:** The lack of uniformity for procurement regulations across the various entities we dealt with in the county was a noticeable issue. While the CAPD based their procurements on the County Code, other entities such as PGCPS and PGCML had their own set of guidelines based on other sources, including some state level regulations, and were independent from CAPD. Meeting with the CAPD would not have revealed much about these other entities, because they operated separately. Furthermore, the county regulations were difficult to find on the CAPD website (and contained broken links), and budget information was also not easily obtainable. Vendor registration was needed to access procurement information and bidding documents. Setting up an interview with CAPD was also problematic: it was difficult to reach the person responsible in the office, and while they would agree to meet at first, a definite time was not given or it was repeatedly moved back; coordination of the issue among employees was not ideal, likely because the office was busy and this was not a priority. Officials agreed to find relevant people who could speak with us, but did not follow up on this, and we were later informed there would be a wait list until the summer to meet. The responses to the MPIA requests were mixed: for some procurements monitored, they were relatively prompt, and if the requested documents themselves had not been delivered, notifications of receipts were mailed, informing us when we could expect a full response. Other requests yielded no responses, however. There were no clear guidelines on who to send MPIA requests or when they were required either.

**Recommendations:** Improvement of the CAPD website to make it more user-friendly for members of the general public, and making regulations more accessible is needed. More clarifications on each
agency/entity's website on when MPIA/FOIA requests must be filed to obtain information and documents, as well as who they must be submitted to, will be useful. Perhaps the idea of consolidating the various agencies under a common county office or standard and possibly having one website for all county procurements can be considered, but due to differences in regulations, this may not be simple.

C. Washington, DC

**Strengths:** Washington DC has a comprehensive procurement law, and the level of transparency and openness to the public can be attributed to it given the District’s history with procurement-related scandals. Furthermore the FOIA process is streamlined electronically and handled via a portal. Finally based on our experience with this jurisdiction, we have found DC Procurement Officials open to meet with civil society (we had the opportunity to discuss with the OCP’s Interim Director, and Associate Director during as part of this study).

**Weaknesses:** DC’s major weakness is the complexity of its regulatory framework. As indicated earlier in the report numerous agencies are either exempt from being under the authority of the Chief Procurement Officer, and/or exempt from abiding by the main public procurement law. Not having the procurement law uniformly applied in all DC agencies could potentially create opportunities for shadowy transactions, and corruption.

**Recommendations:** Our main recommendation would be to simplify the regulatory framework. This recommendation was also made by the report from Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued in January 2007. Moreover, DC as a jurisdiction could benefit from having a central procurement website which would link to all other procurement sites. Finally, DCPS should revamp its solicitations page, and keep it updated.

---

APPENDIX

List of Procurements Monitored
Annotated Bibliography
List of Procurements Monitored

Washington, D.C.

1. Procurement: Minnesota Avenue Revitalization Phase I DCKA-2015-B-0009
   Monitored by: Andrei
   POC Location: 55 M St, SE, Washington DC, 4th Floor
   POC: Vallarie Howard
   Type of Bid: ITB
   Type of Project: Infrastructure
   Close Date: 2/6/2015, 2:00 pm
   Description: Apparent awardee after the closing was Capitol Paving for $12,810,839.55, but actual contract has not been awarded yet. Only two bids. Price is the only factor in this procurement, and no other considerations. Estimate on when implementation will begin is April 2015. Work under this contract consists of revitalization of Minnesota Avenue from A Street, S.E. to 300 feet south of Benning Road, N.E. The work includes, but is not limited to, the following items: Removal of existing asphalt and PCC pavement, reconstruct pavement using full depth asphalt, total removal of existing sidewalks to the limits as shown on the drawings and removal of existing curbs and gutter.

2. Procurement: Transportation Signal Priority Implementation DCKA-2014-B-0076
   Monitored by: Andrei
   POC Location: 55 M St, SE, Washington DC, 4th Floor
   POC: Kirk Benson
   Type of Bid: ITB
   Type of Project: Infrastructure
   Close Date: 2/9/2015, 2:00 pm
   Description: MC Dean is apparent awardee for the contract $2,925,956.10, after a responsibility assessment is conducted. Only one bid. Installation of wayside equipment and central management system, configuration of WMATA’s Fleet Software and provision of cellular services for the implementation of functional TSP system at 103 traffic signals along various bus priority corridors

3. Procurement: Dedicated Internet Services Solicitation GAGA-2015-I-0023
   Monitored by: Larissa
   POC Location: 1200 First Street, N.E., Suite 1137, Washington, DC 20002
   POC: Gwendolyn Walters, Glorious Bazemore
Type of Bid: Sealed Bid (IFB)
Type of Project: Services
Close Date: Thursday, February 19, 2015 at 4:00 pm
Description: The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) Office of Contracts and Acquisitions (OCA) on behalf of the Division of Technology Initiatives within the Office of the Deputy Chancellor for Operations (ODCO), is soliciting bids for Dedicated Internet Services for up to 135 public school facilities. This procurement was cancelled on 2/24/15 after 10 posted amendments. Here is the notification of cancellation:

4.
Procurement: Wide Area Network (WAN) Services GAGA-2015-I-0004 (Formerly GAGA-2015-R-0021)
Monitored by: Larissa
POC Location: 1200 First Street, N.E., Suite 1137, Washington, DC 20002
POC: Gwendolyn Walters, Glorious Bazemore
Type of Bid: Sealed Bid (IFB)
Type of Project: Services
Close Date: N/A Not listed in documentation
Description: The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) Office of Contracts and Acquisitions (OCA) on behalf of the Division of Technology Initiatives within the Office of the Deputy Chancellor for Operations (ODCO), is seeking a contractor to provide Wide Area Network (WAN) services and supporting operation for the District of Columbia Public Schools system to include all schools and administrative locations. This procurement was cancelled on 2/27/15 after 10 posted amendments. Here is the notification of cancellation:

5.
Procurement: Build-Out of Digital Evidence Unit DCAM-15-CS-0082
Monitored by: Larissa
POC Location: Department of General Services Contracts & Procurement Division, 8th Floor Frank D. Reeves Center 2000 14th Street, NW Washington, DC 20009
POC: Jamar Spruill, JW Lanum
Type of Bid: Sealed Bid (IFB)
Type of Project: Services
Close Date: 2/12/16
**Description:** The Department of General Services (DGS) is seeking a contractor to provide labor, supervision, supplies, equipment and other services to modify existing space in the Digital Evidence Unit (DEU) Department of Forensic Sciences (DFS) Consolidated Forensic Laboratory (CFL), located on the 3rd floor at 401 E Street SW, Washington DC, 20009.

6. **Procurement:** Testing, Repair, and Replacement Services for Domestic Backflow Preventers [DCAM-15-NC-0090](#)  
**Monitored by:** Larissa  
**POC Location:** Department of General Services Contracts & Procurement Division, 8th Floor Frank D. Reeves Center 2000 14th Street, NW Washington, DC 20009  
**POC:** Toufique Sayed  
**Type of Bid:** Sealed Bid (IFB)  
**Type of Project:** Services  
**Close Date:** Wednesday, February 18, 2015 - 2:00pm  
**Description:** The Department of General Services ("Department" or "District") is seeking a Contractor to provide Domestic Backflow Prevention Services for various District facilities under their jurisdiction. The selected contractor shall provide all management, tools, supplies, equipment and labor necessary to perform the required services. This procurement is set aside in the Sheltered Market and only CBE's that are certified under NIGP Code 910-60-00, Plumbing Maintenance and Repairs, by the District's Department of Small and Local Business Development (DSLBD), at the time of submission are eligible to participate.

7. **Procurement:** RFP MPD 7th District Locker Room Renovations [DCAM-15-CS-0083](#)  
**Monitored by:** Larissa  
**POC Location:** Department of General Services Contracts & Procurement Division, 8th Floor Frank D. Reeves Center 2000 14th Street, NW Washington, DC 20009  
**POC:** Danyel Riley  
**Type of Bid:** RFP  
**Type of Project:** Services  
**Close Date:** Thursday, February 19, 2015 - 2:00pm  
**Description:** The District of Columbia Department of General Services (DGS), Contracts and Procurement Division, on behalf of the DC Metropolitan Police (MPD) is issuing this Request for Proposals ("RFP") to engage a Contractor to provide all labor, materials, supervision, and other services necessary for Locker Room Renovations at MPD 7th District Police Station located at 2455 Alabama Avenue, SE Washington, DC 20020.

GAGA-2015-R-0025 - Instructional and Parental Involvement Services
Monitored by: Larissa  
RFP Closing Date/Time: April 1, 2015  
Pre-Proposal/Bid Conference Date: March 16, 2015  
Description: The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS), Office of Contracts and Acquisitions on behalf of the Office of Federal Programs and Grants is soliciting proposals for Instructional and Parental Involvement services for at-risk students and families.

**Prince George’s County**

1. **Procurement:** [Prince George’s County Memorial Library System](#) Wireless Network  
   Monitored by: Andrei  
   POC Location: 6532 Adelphi Road, Hyattsville MD, 20782  
   POC: Karen Kelly  
   Type of Bid: RFP  
   Type of Project: Wireless Network Infrastructure  
   Close Date: 2/13/2015, 3:00 pm  
   Description: PGCMLS is seeking proposals from qualified vendors to replace and/or upgrade the existing wireless network and related network infrastructure. The new wireless network shall be a controller based, enterprise class wired/wireless network compatible with a Cisco network with a captive portal.

2. **Procurement:** [TPIP Services at Glenarden Woods ES](#)  
   Monitored by: Andrei  
   POC Location: 13300 Old Marlboro Pike, Room 20 Upper Marlboro, MD 20772  
   POC: Donna Parks  
   Type of Bid: IFB  
   Type of Project: Services-testing and inspection  
   Close Date: originally 2/20/2015; now extended to 3/12/2015  
   Description: The BOARD requests bids for Third Party Construction Material Testing and Inspection Services for the renovation and addition to Glenarden Woods Elementary School.

3. **Procurement:** [Third Party Hazardous Material Abatement Monitoring and Inspection Services at Glenarden Woods Elementary School](#)  
   Monitored by: Andrei  
   POC Location: 13300 Old Marlboro Pike, Room 20 Upper Marlboro, MD 20772  
   POC: Donna Parks  
   Type of Bid: IFB
Type of Project: Services- monitoring and inspection
Close Date: originally 2/26/2015; now extended to 3/2/2015
Description: The BOARD requests bids for Third Party Hazardous Material Abatement Monitoring and Inspection Services for the hazardous material abatement portion of renovation and addition to Glenarden Woods Elementary School.

4.
Procurement: Public Safety Uniforms for the Police Department
Monitored by: T.J.
POC Location: 1400 McCormick Drive, Suite 200 Largo, Maryland 20774
POC: Margaret Bean (301) 883-6400
Type of Bid: IFB
Type of Project: Goods
Close Date: 2/19/2015, 3:00 pm
Description: It is the intent of this Invitation for Bid to establish a term contract with a vendor to provide Public Safety uniforms for the Police Department(s) personnel on an as required basis.

5.
Procurement: Waste Processing and Alternative Energy Facility Public Private Partnership
Monitored by: T.J.
POC Location: 1400 McCormick Drive, Suite 200 Largo, Maryland 20774
POC: Barbara Manley bgmanley@co.pg.md.us (301) 883-6408
Type of Bid: RFQ Submissions
Type of Project: Public Works
Close Date: 3/12/2015, 3:00 PM
Description: A facility (or set of facilities) to convert non-recyclable Multiple Solid Waste (MSW)/organics/biosolids/Construction and Demolition (C&D) waste; to recover recyclable materials from the feedstocks; and to produce solid (refuse-derived), liquid, or gaseous fuel, steam, and/or power.

6.
Procurement: Bowie High School ADA Improvements
Monitored by: T.J.
POC Location: 13300 Old Marlboro Pike, Upper Marlboro, MD 20772
POC: Nekeshi Hector 301-952-6560 nekeshi.hector@pgcps.org
Type of Bid: ITB
Type of Project: Services
Close Date: 2/19/2015, 2:00 PM
Description: The construction of various ADA improvements at Bowie High School. Work includes selective demolition and new construction for providing ADA accessibility and security improvements.
1. **Procurement:** ARLINGTON - 597-15 Automotive Equipment Replacement Parts
   **Monitored by:** Dylan
   **POC Location:** Fire Logistics Office, 1740 S Hayes St, Arlington, VA 22202, USA
   **POC:** Call Main number, 703-228-3410, Guinevere Bruner (gbruner@arlingtonva.us) and Erin O’Grady (eogrady@arlingtonva.us)
   **Type of Bid:** RFQ
   **Type of Project:** Goods
   **Close Date:** 2/3/2015, 2:30 p.m. TURNED AWAY
   **Description:** Contract awarded to Western Branch Diesel on 2/10:

2. **Procurement:** ARLINGTON - 599-15 Leaf Collector Replacement Parts
   **Monitored by:** Dylan
   **POC Location:** Fire Logistics Office, 1740 S Hayes St, Arlington, VA 22202, USA
   **POC:** Call Main number, 703-228-3410, Guinevere Bruner (gbruner@arlingtonva.us) and Erin O’Grady (eogrady@arlingtonva.us)
   **Type of Bid:** RFQ
   **Type of Project:** Goods
   **Close Date:** 2/3/2015, 3:00 p.m. TURNED AWAY
   **Description:** Contract awarded to Old Dominion Brush Company on 2/4:

3. **Procurement:** Arlington Public Schools (APS) Contract for Network and Wireless Equipment
   **Monitored by:** Dylan
   **POC Location:** Arlington Public Schools Purchasing Office., 4th Floor 1426 North Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22207
   **POC:** Fran Jones, (703) 228-6126, Fran.jones@apsva.us
   **Type of Bid:** Invitation to Bid (ITB)
   **Type of Project:** Goods
   **Project Criteria:** This solicitation is issued under the “Best Value” approach as it is defined in the Arlington Public Schools Purchasing Resolution. Under this approach, in determining the lowest
responsible bidder, APS has attached a points weighting according to those criteria under this solicitation. APS will consider the following:

**Pricing** – cost of E-rate eligible equipment – 34%

Compatibility with existing network and wireless equipment – 33% Bidders Minimum Qualifications (See 12.0) – 33%

**Budget**: Not specified

**Pre-Bid Conference**: None

**Close Date**: 2/27/2015, 2:00 p.m., EXTENDED to 4/10/2015

**Description**: This solicitation is being issued to establish a contract for NETWORK AND WIRELESS EQUIPMENT for all schools and departments of Arlington Public Schools, hereinafter referred to as APS. APS has forty (40) schools and buildings connected in a large campus type of network. APS has a centrally managed Aruba wireless network in all schools and buildings.

**Contract**: Not yet awarded

4.

**Procurement**: ARLINGTON - ITB 562-14 On-call street, gutter, curb, sidewalk construction and repair

**Monitored by**: Dylan

**POC Location**: ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA OFFICE OF THE PURCHASING AGENT SUITE 500, 2100 CLARENDON BOULEVARD, ARLINGTON, VA 22201

**POC**: Igor Scherbakov, (703) 228-3410, ischerbakov@arlingtonva.us

**Type of Bid**: ITB

**Type of Project**: Construction, public works

**Budget**: <$500,000

**Pre-Bid Conference**: 2/3/2015, 3:00 p.m. ATTENDED

**Close Date**: 2/12/2015, 2:00 p.m. EXTENDED: 2/26/2015, 2:00 p.m.; EXTENDED 3/5/2015, 2:00 p.m., EXTENDED 3/10/2015

**Description**: Capital Improvement Project Work to consist generally of larger scale public works infrastructure and street improvement projects including construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of: State and County streets, curbs & gutters, sidewalks, walkways, driveway aprons, storm sewer pipes and inlets, pavement markings & signage, electrical conduits, traffic controls, streetscapes, and related site work.

At time, date and place above, bids will be publicly opened.

Bid Surety in the amount of not less than $25,000.00 (twenty five thousand dollars) must be submitted with the bid. Performance and Payment Bonds in the amount of $500,000.00 (five hundred thousand dollars) will be required of the successful bidder and must be maintained by the Contractor throughout the duration of the Contract.

**Contract**: Not yet available
5. 
**Procurement:** ARLINGTON – Bus Line Inspection Services  
**Monitored by:** Dylan  
**POC Location:** Transit Bureau, Suite 900, 2100 CLARENDON BOULEVARD, ARLINGTON, VA  22201  
**POC:** Michelle Chaney, 703-228-3790, 703-228-7249  
**Type of Bid:** RFQ  
**Type of Project:** Services  
**Budget:** Not specified  
**Pre-Bid Conference:** None  
**Close Date:** 2/13/2015, 5:00 p.m. NO PUBLIC OPENING due to how small the budget was (under $100,000)  
**Description:** The general services required of the Contractor will be to represent ART at NABI’s manufacturing plant in Anniston, Alabama and to monitor the production quality and ensure that each bus is built properly according to specifications during the manufacturing process. The Contractor shall be responsible for determining that each vehicle has been manufactured to adherence to the ART technical specifications and also for ensuring ART compliance with all aspects of 49 CFR 663 and any and all other applicable regulations at the time of manufacture prior to release of the vehicle(s) for shipment to ART. These include, but are not limited to, the following: production line inspection, quality assurance, functional inspection of each vehicle throughout all phases of production, pre-delivery inspection, telephone and written reports as well as other applicable products and post-delivery audit requirements.  
**Contract:** Not yet available

6. 
**Procurement:** ARLINGTON – ITB 615-15 MIDLIFE REBUILD OF 8 NABI BUSES  
**Monitored by:** Dylan  
**POC Location:** ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA OFFICE OF THE PURCHASING AGENT 2100 CLARENDON BOULEVARD, SUITE 500 ARLINGTON, VA  22201  
**POC:** Igor Scherbakov, (703) 228-3410, ischerbakov@arlingtonva.us  
**Type of Bid:** ITB  
**Type of Project:** Services  
**Budget:** Not specified  
**Pre-Bid Conference:** 2/4/2015, Did NOT attend. Minutes available.  
**Close Date:** 3/5/2015, 2:00 p.m., EXTENDED 3/19/2015, 2:00 p.m., EXTENDED 3/24/2015  
**Description:** FURNISHING ALL LABOR, MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT FOR THE OVERHAUL OF EIGHT (8) 35-FOOT LOW-FLOOR NABI BUSES WITH CARBON STEEL STRUCTURE AND COMPRESSED NATURAL GAS (CNG) PROPULSION.  
**Contract:** Not yet awarded
7.

**Procurement:** ARLINGTON – ITB 684-15 Arlington Farmers' Market Management and Operation

**Monitored by:** Dylan

**POC Location:** ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA OFFICE OF THE PURCHASING AGENT 2100 CLARENDON BOULEVARD, SUITE 500 ARLINGTON, VA 22201

**POC:** Krystyna Hepler, CPPB, Procurement Officer, khepler@arlingtonva.us

**Type of Bid:** ITB

**Type of Project:** Services

**Budget:** Not specified

**Pre-Bid Conference:** 2/11/2015, 11:00 a.m., 1st Floor Azalea Conference Room

**Close Date:** 2/26/2015, 2:00 p.m., EXTENDED to 3/3/2015

**Description:** ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION OF THE ARLINGTON FARMERS’ MARKET, LOCATED AT COURTHOUSE PLAZA IN ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA

**Contract:** Not yet available

---
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