| -  |  | RECEIVED OFFICE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY                     |  |
|----|--|--|--|
| 1  | GUAM DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION   | PROCUREMENT APPEALS  DATE: 9/8/202/                          |  |
| 2  | James L.G. Stake, Legal Counsel 501 Mariner Avenue   | TIME: 4:22 CIAM EPM BY: ( MY)                                |  |
| 3  | Barrigada, Guam 96913  | FILE NO OPA-PA: 21-001-21-005                                |  |
| 4  | Telephone: (671) 300-1537 E-mail: legal-admin@gdoe.net   |  |  |
| 5  | Attorney for Guam Department of Education  |  |  |
| 6  | OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC AUDITOR PROCUREMENT APPEALS   |  |  |
| 7  |  |  |  |
| 8  | In the Appeal of   | APPEAL CASE NOS.: OPA-PA-21-004 and OPA-PA-21-005            |  |
| 9  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Pacific Data Systems, Inc. (PDS),  | GDOE'S OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S                             |  |
| 11 | Appellant.   | MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND STAY OF PROCUREMENT PENDING |  |
| 12 |  | FINAL RESOLUTION OF APPEAL                                   |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |
| 16 | The Guam Department of Education (GDOE), by and through its undersigned counsel,                   |  |  |
| 17 | files this Opposition to Appellant's Motion for Injunctive Relief and Confirmation of Stay of      |  |  |
| 18 | Procurement Pending Final Resolution of Appeal, for Appeal of Case Nos. OPA-PA-21-004 and          |  |  |
| 19 | OPA-PA-21-005. Appellant's motion violates Guam law and is without merit and should be             |  |  |
| 20 | denied.  |  |  |
| 21 | I. RELEVANT BACKGROUND   |  |  |
| 22 | On April 28, 2021, GDOE issued its Invitation for Bids (IFB) 027-2021 and 028-2021 for             |  |  |
| 23 | Telecommunication Services. On June 4, 2021, GDOE made awards to GTA as the lowest, most           |  |  |
| 24 | responsible and responsive bid for the two (2) IFBs. On June 9 and June 10, 2021, Appellant        |  |  |
| 25 | filed their respective protests for the IFBs. On August 31, 2021, Appellant filed this motion with |  |  |
| 26 | numerous new allegations regarding the already issued awards for the first time before the Office  |  |  |
| 27 | ·  |  |  |
| 28 | Page 1 of 5  |  |  |
|    | In the Appeal of Pacific Data Systems, Inc.  Appeal Case Nos. OPA-PA-21-004 and OPA-PA-21-00       | 05   |  |

GDOE Opposition to Appellant's Motion for Injunctive Relief and Confirmation of Stay of Procurement Pending Final Resoulution of Appeal

of Public Accountability (OPA). GDOE now files its Opposition to Appellant's Motion for the following reasons.

II. APPELLANT'S MOTION VIOLATES GUAM PROCUREMENT LAW BECAUSE

(1) APPELLANT FAILED TO EXHAUST THEIR ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES,

(2) APPELLANT'S NEW ALLEGATIONS ARE NOT PROPERLY BEFORE THE OPA,

AND (3) APPELLANT BLATANTLY VIOLATED THE REQUIREMENT TO RAISE

THIS ISSUE IN ITS PROTEST WITHIN FOURTEEN (14) DAYS AFTER APPELLANT

KNEW OR SHOULD HAVE KNOWN ABOUT SUCH ISSUE.

Guam Procurement law states that any actual or prospective bidder, offeror, or contractor who may be aggrieved in connection with the method of source selection, solicitation or award of a contract, may protest to the Chief Procurement Officer, the Director of Public Works or the head of a purchasing agency, and the protest shall be submitted in writing within fourteen (14) days after such aggrieved person knows or should know of the facts giving rise thereto. See 5 GCA §5425(a). Appellant has violated this Guam Procurement law in numerous ways. Specifically, Appellant failed to exhaust their administrative remedies by not raising these issues in their already filed protest to the Purchasing Agency. As a result, these new issues are not properly before the OPA because Appellant failed to comply with the fourteen (14) day requirement under Guam Procurement law. It is now more than sixty (60) days after Appellant knew or should have known these issues. Id.

## 1. Appellant failed to exhaust their administrative remedies.

On June 4, 2021, GDOE made awards to GTA as the lowest, most responsible and responsive bidder for IFB 027-2021 and IFB 028-2021. *See* Notice of Award, GDOE Procurement Record of IFB 027-2021 at 515 and IFB 028-2021 at 605 (GDOE Procurement Record of IFB 027-2021 and IFB 028-2021 hereafter referred to as "IFB 027" and "IFB 028"). On June 9 and 10, 2021, Appellant filed their protests regarding the IFBs. It is clear that the

Page 2 of 5

Appellant failed to timely raise these new issues in their protests. *See* IFB 027 at 517-637 and IFB 028 at 607-795. These issues are not mentioned at all anywhere in the protest documents. Guam Procurement law specifically requires that the Appellant first exhaust their administrative remedies by protesting with the Purchasing Agency prior to an Appeal to the OPA. *See* 5 GCA §5425. Appellant failed to do what is required by law. Therefore, Appellant's motion should be denied.

## 2. Appellant's new allegations are not properly before the OPA.

Appellant's biased allegations are not properly before the OPA. *Id.* The Public Auditor shall determine whether a decision on the protest of method of selection, solicitation or award of a contract, or entitlement to costs is in accordance with the statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the solicitation. *See* 2 GAR Div. 4 §12112. As stated above, Appellant's issues regarding the award was not part of their protests. Appellant did not afford GDOE the lawful opportunity to review and provide a decision on the issue prior to Appellant filing the appeal now before the OPA. *Id.* Therefore, the OPA does not have proper jurisdiction over Appellant's brand new allegations regarding the award, and Appellant's motion should be denied. *Id.* 

## 3. Appellant blatantly violated the requirement to raise this issue in its protest within fourteen (14) days after Appellant knew or should have known about such issue.

Protests shall be submitted in writing within fourteen (14) days after such aggrieved person knows or should know of the facts giving rise thereto. See 5 GCA §5425(a). On June 4, 2021, GDOE made awards regarding the IFBs and directly addressed the award notices to the Appellant. See IFB 027 at 516 and IFB 028 at 605. On August 31, 2021, Appellant improperly raised new issues regarding the award, more than sixty (60) days after Appellant knew of the award. This is in clearly not allowed by law. Appellant fails to provide any authority that would allow the raising of new issues after the fourteen (14) days prescribed by law. See 5 GCA §5425(a). Therefore, GDOE respectfully requests that the OPA deny the motion.

## III. APPELLANT'S PROTEST DID NOT TRIGGER AN AUTOMATIC STAY BECAUSE THEIR PROTEST WAS AFTER THE AWARD, AND THE OPA DOES NOT HAVE JURISDICTION TO IMPOSE INJUNCTIVE RELIEF ON A PURCHASING AGENCY.

Guam Procurement law applies an automatic stay when a protest is filed before an award is issued. See 5 GCA §5425(g); see also 2 GAR Div. 4 §9101(e) (When a protest has been filed within 14 days and before an award has been made, the Chief Procurement Officer...shall make no award of the contract prior to final resolution of such protest...). The IFBs were awarded on June 4, 2021, Appellant received notice of award on that same day, and the protests were filed on June 9 and 10, 2021. See Notice of Award IFB 027 at 515 and IFB 028 at 605; see also Bid Protests IFB 027 at 518 and IFB 028 at 609. Therefore, because Appellant filed their protest after the awards were made the law does not require a post-award stay. See 5 GCA §5425(g); see also 2 GAR Div. 4 §9101(e).

In the Appeal of JJ Global Services, OPA-PA-19-001, the OPA held that an automatic stay is not required when a protest is filed after an award. Analogous to this case, GDOE has already made awards before Appellant filed their protest. Therefore, an automatic stay was not required by law and there was no stay to be violated.

In the Appeal of JJ Global Services, OPA-PA-19-001, the OPA held that it does not have jurisdiction to impose injunctive relief on a Purchasing Agency. OPA-PA-19-001, Decision and Order RE Appellant's Motion for Injunctive Relief and Stay of Procurement for Final Decision on Second Protest, at 2 (March 25, 2019). Similarly, Appellant improperly seeks injunctive relief from the OPA, which the OPA has already said it cannot grant.

| 1        | In conclusion for the reasons stated above, Appellant's motion should be denied in its |
|----------|--|
| 2        | entirety.  |
| 3        |  |
| 4        |  |
| 5        |  |
| 6        | Respectfully submitted this 8th day of September, 2021.                                |
| 7        |  |
| 8        | GUAM DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION   |
| 9        | 1. 4.2   |
| 10       | By: JAMES L.G. STAKE   |
| 11       | Legal Counsel  |
| 12       |  |
| 13       |  |
| 14       |  |
| 15       |  |
| 16       |  |
| 17       |  |
| 18<br>19 |  |
| 20       |  |
| 21       |  |
| 22       |  |
| 23       |  |
| 24       |  |
| 25       |  |
| 26       |  |
| 27       |  |
|          | Page 5 of 5  |