

Suite 401 DNA Building
 238 Archbishop Flores St.
 Hagåtña, Guam 96910



FAX

| | | | |
|------------|---|------------------------------|---|
| To: | Ms. Claudia S. Acfalle Chief Procurement Officer General Services Agency Department of Administration 148 Route 1 Marine Drive Piti, Guam 96915 Phone: (671) 475-1707 Fax: (671) 475-1727 Email: Claudia.Acfalle@gsadoa.guam.gov | From: | Benjamin J.F. Cruz Public Auditor Office of Public Accountability |
| | Ms. Marlyn T. Aguilar Assistant Attorney General Office of Attorney General 590 S. Marine Corps Drive ITC Bldg., Ste. 802 Tamuning, Guam, 96913 Phone: (671) 475-2709 Fax: (671) 472-2493 Email: maguilar@oagguam.org | Pages: | 10 (including cover page) |
| CC: | Mr. Joshua D. Walsh, Esq. Mr. Edwin J. Torres, Esq. Attorney for Appellant Guahan Ventures Inc. dba Turfco Razano Walsh & Torres, P.C. 139 Murrery Blvd. Hagåtña, Guam 96910 Phone: (671) 989-3009 Email: jdwalsh@rwtguam.com ; etorres@rwtguam.com | Date: | February 10, 2022 |
| | | Phone: Fax: | (671) 475-0390 x. 204 (671) 472-7951 |

Re: OPA-PA-21-003 Decision

- For Review
 Please Comment
 Please Reply
 Please Recycle

Comments:

Please acknowledge receipt of this transmittal by re-sending this cover page along with your firm or agency's receipt stamp, date, and initials of receiver.

Thank you,
 Jerrick Hernandez, Auditor
jhernandez@guamopa.com

This facsimile transmission and accompanying documents may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient of this fax transmission, please call our office and notify us immediately. Do not distribute or disclose the contents to anyone. Thank you.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

II. JURISDICTION: STANDARD REVIEW

The decision of the Public Auditor under appeal is authorized by 5 G.C.A. § 5703. The determination of an issue, the findings of fact, and the decision of the Public Auditor are as stated in 5 G.C.A. § 5704.

III. FINDINGS OF FACT

The Public Auditor shall have the power to review and determine *de novo* any matter properly submitted. 5 G.C.A. § 5703 (a), and in reaching this Decision, has considered and incorporates herein the procurement record and all documents submitted by the parties, and has considered the testimony and arguments made during the hearing held on December 16, 2021. Based on the aforementioned record in this matter, the Public Auditor makes the following findings of fact:

1. On June 11, 2021, GHS/OCD submitted Emergency Requisition Q210280170 for Item 1: Golf Cart-A827 Series 4 Seater (quantity of 2) and Item 2: Golf Cart-A827 Series 6 Seater (quantity of 4). The requisition was based on a June 1, 2021 quote from “suggested vendor” Auto Spot that indicated \$21,990 total price for Item 1 and \$51,980 total price for Item 2.
2. On June 12, 2021, GHS/OCD submitted a Memo to GSA providing Justification of Emergency Procurement. The Memo specifically indicated the following justification “1. Request approval to produce six gold carts to support transportation for individual with disabilities, mobility challenges (i.e. senior citizens), and additional mobility support in the event of inclement weather at ongoing mass vaccination sites, public health outreach sites, and rapid engagement sites. 2. Reference Executive Order 2021-12: Relative to Extending the Public Health Emergency Declared to Respond to Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19). 3. Justification fulfills prior DLAN ticket requests from the Department of Public Health and Social Services and other support agencies.

- 1 3. On June 14, 2021, at 1:22 PM, GSA issued (via e-mail) RFQ 21002179 for Requisition No.
2 Q210280170, seeking golf carts. Specifically, the RFQ indicated Item 1: Golf Cart-A827
3 Series 4 Seater (quantity of 2) and Item 2: Golf Cart-A827 Series 6 Seater (quantity of 4).
4 There was no delivery date indicated, but the RFQ email indicated “Please respond with a
5 Quote or a No Quote as soon as possible but no later than Thursday, 06/17/2021 before close
6 of business at 5 PM. Your soonest response is greatly appreciated!”
7
- 8 4. On June 14, 2021, at 3:42 PM, Turfco emailed GSA asking to “speak with someone
9 regarding the specifications because it was too vague to provide an accurate quotation.”
10
- 11 5. On June 14, 2021, at 4:12 PM, GSA emailed Turfco in response to their email regarding
12 clarification on specifications indicating “Attached is the brochure that the end-user
13 provided. You may provide us with your quote equivalent or better. Also, preferred ETA is
14 30 days from the date of purchase order award. Please ensure to include delivery date of this
15 item.”
16
- 17 6. On June 16, 2021, at 5:43 PM, GSA emailed all potential bidders an amended RFQ that
18 indicated “this is an “Emergency Procurement” and Delivery Requirement is
19 “IMMEDIATE”. The deadline for quotes remained at “no later than 6/17/2021”.
20
- 21 7. Quotes were received from three bidders:
 - 22 a. Guam Auto Spot submitted a quote on 6/14/2021 indicating \$21,990 total price for
23 Item 1 and \$51,980 total price for Item 2 with immediate delivery.
 - 24 b. Royal Pacific Motors (Yamaha) submitted a quote on 6/16/2021 indicating \$20,996
25 total price for Item 1 and \$49,996 total price for Item 2 with a 45-60 days delivery.
 - 26 c. Turfco submitted two quotes on 6/15/2021 indicating: (1) \$16,750 total price for Item
27 1 and \$36,400 total price for Item 2 with a 30-75 days from the date of firm order
28

1 delivery; and (2) \$16,200 total price for Item 1 and \$35,160 total price for Item 2
2 with a 30-75 days from the date of firm order delivery.
3

4 8. On June 19, 2021, a purchase order was awarded to Guam Auto Spot indicating \$21,990
5 total for Item 1 and \$51,980 total for Item 2 with a total amount of \$73,970.

6 9. On June 24, 2021, Turfco emailed their protest of the award to Guam Auto Spot, “As it
7 appears on the surface that the vendor was not awarded on the lowest cost to the government,
8 but based on “immediate delivery”. Immediate delivery was not listed as a requirement on
9 the original RFQ received from GSA on Mon, Jun 14, at 1:24 PM..”

10 10. On June 25, 2021, GSA denied Turfco’s protest.
11

12 11. On July 9, 2021, Turfco filed a procurement appeal with the Office of Public Accountability
13 (OPA).

14 12. In the appeal, Turfco raised the following issues: GSA’s substantive change to the request
15 for quotation a day before the bid quotation, and after all quotes had been submitted, violates
16 Guam Procurement Law, and GSA’s change to “immediate delivery” amounts to Sole
17 Source Procurement in Violation of Guam law.
18

19 20 IV. ANALYSIS

21 This appeal concerns two main issues in that Turfco contends (1) GSA use of emergency
22 procurement was not valid, and (2) GSA violated Guam Procurement Law by notifying bidders
23 about a substantial change in the RFQ after working hours just the day before the deadline.

24 A. Testimony from GHS/OCD and DPHSS supplemented the missing Determination of 25 Need in Procurement Record and justification for Emergency Procurement. 26 27 28

1 GSA determined that it is an emergency procurement based on the Emergency Requisition
2 requested by GHS/OCD on June 11, 2021. However, “no emergency procurement shall be solicited
3 or awarded without a Determination of Need for Emergency Procurement” 5 GCA § 5215 (c)¹ In
4 the review of the procurement record, there was no Determination of Need for Emergency
5 Procurement to justify the urgent need to purchase golf carts in June 2021 when testing and
6 vaccination started months prior in 2020, which was acknowledged by GSA Buyer Supervisor Anita
7 Cruz who could not find it during testimony.
8

9 The only document that comes close to a “Determination of Need” is the June 12, 2021
10 memo from GHS/OCD to GSA Justifying Emergency Procurement, which indicated “1. Request
11 approval to procure six golf carts to support transportation for individual with disabilities, mobility
12 challenges (i.e. senior citizens), and additional mobility support in the event of inclement weather
13 at ongoing mass vaccination sites, public health outreach sites, and rapid engagement sites.” GSA
14 is of the understanding that the June 12, 2021 Memo along with the Executive Order 2020-03
15 Relative to Declaring a State of Emergency to Respond to Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) issued
16 in March 2020, which was extended in subsequent Executive Orders supports the use of Emergency
17
18
19
20

21 ¹ 5 GCA § 5215 (c) Determination of Need for Emergency Procurement. No emergency procurement shall be
22 solicited or awarded without a Determination of Need for Emergency Procurement, which shall: (1) state the date of
23 its execution, and be signed under penalty of perjury by the Chief Procurement Officer, the Director of Public Works,
24 the head of a purchasing agency, or a designee of either officer, conducting the emergency procurement of supplies,
25 services, or emergency construction works; (2) describe with factual particularity, the nature and apparent cause of the
26 condition posing an imminent threat to public health, welfare, or safety, or the health and safety of the environment,
27 which could not have been foreseen through the use of reasonable and prudent management procedures, and which
28 cannot be addressed by other procurement methods of source selection (3) state that the threat is imminent, and that
the emergency procurement authorized by this Section is necessary, without delay, to protect the public health,
welfare, or safety, or the health and safety of the environment; (4) affirm solemnly that the emergency procurement of
supplies, services, or emergency construction works, in the face of the emergency described, is not being used and
will not be used, directly or indirectly, to avoid other methods of source selection or the purposes and policies of this
Chapter; (5) be copied and appended to its respective Declaration of Emergency or Certificate of Emergency, as
described in Subsection (b) of this Section, and further attached to and made a part of any contract, or Notice of
Award made or given; and (6) be a material part of the procurement record required in this Chapter.

1 Procurement. However, this does not explain the urgency of needing to purchase Golf carts in June
2 2021, when vaccination started six months prior in December 2020.

3
4 Patrick T. Leon Guerrero who was Acting Administrator for GHS/OCD in June 2021,
5 testified that when vaccination started up in December 2020, DPHSS did request from GHS/OCD
6 for golf carts to use. However, he noted there was no need to purchase golf carts at that time because
7 GHS/OCD was able to get assistance from other Government of Guam agencies and local businesses
8 to loan them golf carts. It was not until after the agencies and local businesses asked that their golf
9 carts be returned that DPHSS requested to purchase golf carts because they still were needed with
10 the vaccination clinics.

11
12 Chima Mbakwem, DPHSS Chief Public Health Officer, testified that at the height of the
13 pandemic most of the island was shut down, and therefore DPHSS had access to various resources
14 the other agencies were not using. When the vaccinations started and positive cases were low, a lot
15 of the resources DPHSS once had were being pulled back that was initially provided from other
16 agencies when most places were on lockdown. There then increased the need for DPHSS to quickly
17 procure things initially borrowed to maintain operations responding to the pandemic.

18
19 Terry Aguon, DPHSS Deputy Director, testified that from May to June of 2021, DPHSS was
20 still actively responding to the pandemic with the various testing and vaccination sites. The golf
21 carts were instrumental in transporting people and supplies at the various sites. Back in December
22 2020, when the vaccination clinics started, DPHSS was borrowing golf carts and therefore they did
23 not need to really purchase until the initially borrowed golf carts were asked to be returned.

24
25 The Public Auditor finds that although the Determination of Need that fully explained the
26 urgent need for purchasing golf carts in June 2021 was missing from the procurement record, the
27
28

1 testimony from GHS/OCD and DPHSS representatives supplemented this deficiency, and provided
2 justification for use of emergency procurement.
3

4 **B. GSA’s untimely notification to potential bidders about the substantial change**
5 **in delivery is unacceptable, but not against the law.**

6 GSA acknowledged that emergency procurement and the immediate delivery date were not
7 indicated in the initial RFQ sent to potential bidders on June 14, 2021. In addition, when Turfco
8 asked for clarification on the specifications also on June 14, 2021, GSA responded by saying
9 “preferred ETA is 30 days from the date of purchase order award. Please ensure to include delivery
10 date of this item.” GSA noted this was an oversight, but bidders were aware it was an emergency
11 because the RFQ email subject line indicated “Quote Request RFQ21002179 to C0098153 – Golf
12 Cart (**Emergency**)” (Emphasis added), which GSA believed was sufficient to let potential bidders
13 know that it was an emergency and emergency procurement means “right away”.
14

15 As soon as they noticed the oversight, GSA immediately notified all potential bidders
16 through email, albeit on June 16, 2021, at 5:43 PM (after working hours) and one day before the
17 RFQ deadline of 5:00 pm, June 17, 2021, it was an “Emergency Procurement” with immediate
18 delivery. The change to put immediate delivery also happened to come two days after GSA had
19 received a quote from Guam Auto Spot on June 14, 2021, that indicated immediate delivery. GSA
20 is of the understanding that this is not a change in specifications because it was just an oversight
21 that the initial delivery did not indicate that it was for immediate delivery, but it was always an
22 emergency procurement.
23

24 The Public Auditor finds that GSA’s error in not giving notification it was an Emergency
25 Procurement and that the delivery requirement would be immediate in the initial June 14, 2021
26 RFQ and providing the notification correcting the error on June 16, 2021, at approximately 24
27
28

1 hours before the RFQ deadline is unacceptable, but not against the law. GSA is admonished for
2 this error and should be more prudent in providing potential bidders the accurate information timely
3 so they can submit their best bid as possible.
4

5 Turfco's Juan-Carlo Pangelinan testified that he didn't see the email from GSA on June 16,
6 2021 because it was after hours and he was having family time. However, he also testified that on
7 most days, he adjusts his work time to be able to respond to the last two hours of Philippine time,
8 where he also does business at. If Guam is two hours ahead of the Philippines, then this would
9 mean Mr. Pangilinan is still working till 7:00 pm Guam time. Mr. Pangelinan noted he wasn't
10 checking his Guam email at the time and only focused on his Philippines email, which is also why
11 he did not see the GSA email on June 16, 2021. The Public Auditor finds Mr. Pangelinan's
12 explanation that he did not see the email notifying bidders that it was an Emergency Procurement
13 with "immediate delivery" on June 16, 2021 as not persuasive.
14

15 Mr. Pangelinan also testified that after he received the RFQ on June 14, 2021, he was able
16 to draft a bid dated June 15, 2021, which is within 24 hours. He noted that although he had the bid
17 prepared, he did not submit it because it was before the June 17, 2021 deadline, and it is his practice
18 not to submit bids before the deadline because he does not trust his bid information would not be
19 shared to other potential bidders who could bid below him. Mr. Pangelinan testified that had GSA
20 extended the deadline, Turfco would have been able to adjust their bid to be able to meet the
21 "immediate delivery" term. He also testified that it would take more than just a day to adjust his
22 bid. However, the Public Auditor finds this argument also as not persuasive because Mr. Pangelinan
23 was able to draft his initial bid within 24 hours after he received the RFQ on June 14, 2021.
24

25 As it has been determined to be an emergency procurement and the golf carts were urgently
26 needed, the Public Auditor finds that GSA awarded the procurement "to the firm with the best
27
28

1 offer, as determining by evaluating cost and delivery time.” in accordance with 2 GAR §3113,
2 which was Guam Auto Spot because they offered “immediate delivery”. It was not a Sole Source
3 Procurement.
4

5 V. CONCLUSION

6 Based on the foregoing, the Public Auditor makes the following determinations:

- 7 A. The additional testimony from GHS and DPHSS representatives supplemented the
8 lack of Determination of Need in the procurement to justify the emergency
9 procurement.
10
11 B. GSA’s untimely notification to potential bidders about the substantial change in
12 delivery is unacceptable, but not against the law.
13
14 C. Turfco’s appeal is hereby DENIED.
15
16 D. The parties shall bear their respective costs and attorney’s fees.

17 This is a Final Administrative Decision for Procurement Appeal No. OPA-PA-21-003. The
18 Parties are hereby informed of their right to appeal the Public Auditor’s Decision to the Superior
19 Court of Guam in accordance with Part D of Article 9 of 5 G.C.A. §5481(a) within fourteen (14)
20 days after receipt of a Final Administrative Decision. A copy of this Decision shall be provided to
21 the Parties and their respective attorneys, in accordance with 5 G.C.A. §5702, and shall be made
22 available for review on the OPA website at www.opaguam.org.

23 DATED this 10th day of February 2022.

24
25 

26 **Benjamin J.F. Cruz**
27 **Public Auditor of Guam**
28



Jerrick Hernandez <jhernandez@guamopa.com>

OPA-PA-21-003 Decision

Jerrick Hernandez <jhernandez@guamopa.com>

Thu, Feb 10, 2022 at 10:53 AM

To: "Joshua D. Walsh" <jdwalsh@rwtguam.com>, "Edwin J. Torres" <etorres@rwtguam.com>, Marlyn Aguilar <maguilar@oagguam.org>, Claudia Acfalle <Claudia.Acfalle@gsadoa.guam.gov>, robert.kona@gsa.guam.gov

Hafa Adai,

Please see attached Decision for OPA-PA-21-003. This email will serve as an official notice in lieu of a transmittal via Fax.

Please confirm receipt of this email and the attached document. Thank you.

--

Regards,

Jerrick J.J.G. Hernandez, MA, CGAP, CICA
Auditor
Office of Public Accountability – Guam
www.opaguam.org
Tel. (671) 475-0390 ext. 204
Fax (671) 472-7951

This e-mail transmission and accompanying attachment(s) may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, please inform the sender and delete it and any other electronic or hard copies immediately. Please do not distribute or disclose the contents to anyone. Thank you.

 **21-003 Decision.pdf**
189K