OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC AUDITOR GOVERNMENT OF GUAM

-000-

PUBLIC HEARING

PROPOSAL RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR PROCUREMENT APPEALS

May 31, 2006

PREPARED BY: GEORGE B. CASTRO

DEPO RESOURCES

#49 Anacoco Lane, Nimitz Hill Estates

Piti, Guam 96915

Tel: (671)688-DEPO * Fax: (671)472-3094

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC AUDITOR GOVERNMENT OF GUAM

-000-

PUBLIC HEARING

PROPOSAL RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR PROCUREMENT APPEALS

May 31, 2006

Public hearing for the Proposed Amendments to Procurement Law and Procurement Regulations was taken on Tuesday, May 31, 2006 at the hour of 2:00 p.m., at the Office of the Public Auditor, Government of Guam, Suite 401 Pacific Daily News Building, 238 Archbishop Flores Street, Hagatna, Guam. That at said time and place there transpired the following:

APPEARANCES

Doris Flores Brooks

Public Auditor

Therese Terlaje, Esq.

Hearings Officer

DEPO RESOURCES

George B. Castro
COURT REPORTER

Tel.: (671)688-**DEPO** * Fax: (671)472-3094

ORAL TESTIMONIES

Anthony Camacho, Esq. Counsel, Consolidated

Commission on Utilities, Guam Power Authority, and Guam Waterworks

Authority

Lou Perez Director, Department of

Administration

Claudia Acfalle Chief Procurement

Officer, DOA, General

Services Agency

COURT REPORTER

Tel.: (671)688-**DEPO** * Fax: (671)472-3094

HAGATNA, GUAM, WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 2006: 2:00 P.M.

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BROOKS: Good afternoon everybody. My name is Doris Flores Brooks and I would like to officially call the public hearing on the proposed procurement rules and regulations under the Office of the Public Auditor.

We're here to gather testimony for the public as to the proposed rules and Ι'd like to just kind of regulations. the benefit more of the hearing, give little bit of background information οf how this came about.

Public Law 28-68, more commonly known as the FY06 Budget Act, gave the responsibility of procurement appeals to the Office of the Public Auditor. Prior to that, there was a Procurement Appeals Commission, however, the Commission did not fully have members on board and therefore it really was not in the position to act formerly and take appeal.

So, in the interest of moving forward into this very important area, the senators of the $28^{\rm th}$ Guam Legislature designated the Office

DEPO RESOURCES

the Public Auditor to be the procurement 1 With that, they provided us separate 2 appeal. This is collateral 3 appropriation. а the Office οf responsibility of the Public 4 Auditor. 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

did was And what we then hired an attorney, Ms. Therese Terlaje. She has a lot of experience. Therese came on board effective March 1st. She brings with her, not private sector experience, but more importantly, government sector experience, served for over a dozen years as having majority as well as minority legal counsel of the various Guam Legislature.

we're very pleased that Therese has joined us. And with that -- let me just say, our rules have been posted on the internet mid-May. And we here take since are to People testimony. can submit testimony in person, in writing, via email. Ιn fact, we have received some testimonies thus far. And we're here to seek additional testimony. And that, we'll open it up and I'll turn it with Therese, who is officially over now to the Procurement Hearing Officer.

DEPO RESOURCES

MS. TERLAJE: Thank you. Okay, for the record, I'd just like to make some notes here. And that is that, the notice for this hearing was published on May 21 and May 26 in both the PDN and Marianas Variety.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The notices for the hearing were also delivered to the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor and the Speaker, and all senators of the Guam Legislature, the Guam Bar Association, all agency heads of the government departments, agencies autonomous and public corporations, Office οf the Attorney General, Compiler of Laws, the Guam Contractor License Board and the Policy Office.

Notice was also posted, as Doris said, on the OPA website, www.guamopa.org, and the public had the opportunity to review the rules at the OPA Office or on the website since May 17.

Prior to this hearing, written comment Unpingco submitted Senator Tony bу and submitted via email testimony was by Isaac, Assistant AG; Sandra Cruz at Mair, Mair, Spade & Thompson; Dana Gutierrez-Reyes of Mair, Mair, Spade & Thompson; Serge Quenga the аt

DEPO RESOURCES

1	Compiler of Laws; and Vicki Renacia of UOG.
2	After today's hearing, we will continue
3	to take testimony for about seven days and then
4	we intend to transmit this to the Legislature.
5	So, after that, testimony should be transmitted
6	directly to the Legislature.
7	Those presenting oral testimony today
8	will be recorded so that we can make a
9	transcript of this hearing.
10	So, without further delay, we'll now
11	receive oral testimony from Mr. Anthony
12	Camacho. He also provided written notes. If
13	anybody would like a copy to follow along,
14	please come up here.
15	MS. BROOKS: And, Anthony, if you
16	wouldn't mind, for the record, just identify
17	cite your full name and your position and then
18	go into your testimony.
19	
20	
21	TESTIMONY FROM ANTHONY CAMACHO
22	STAFF ATTORNEY FOR CCU, GPA and GWA
23	
24	MR. CAMACHO: Yes. I'm Anthony
25	Camacho. I am a staff attorney for the CCU,

DEPO RESOURCES

the Guam Power Authority and the Guam Waterworks Authority. And I'm testifying today on behalf of those three agencies.

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

first wanted to begin by commending the Office of the Public Auditor for the great work that's been undertaken. I've been in the procurement, the practice of procurement law, now for almost 10 This is the first years. time that had the administrative we adjudication part οf procurement appeal protest. And also on the short period of time that you've had the authority to do this, the creation of these rules, it just takes us light and years propels the ahead practice οf procurement law exponentially.

And I want to thank the Office of the Public Auditor and especially the new counsel and the Procurement Hearing Officer for all the fine work done on the rules.

I've reviewed the rules from back to back, all 15 pages of them, including the exhibits and the draft document. Some notes in terms of -- some of my thoughts at least, in Section 12102(a), which essentially describes the jurisdiction of the Public Auditor.

DEPO RESOURCES

I note that this particular section closely tracks, if not identical to language to any OPA statute or enabling statute authorizing her to hear procurement appeals. However, the language, it states, "No prior determination shall be final and conclusive" as it applies to the agency.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in other There is language statutes though that states essentially that, determinations made by the procurement officers the heads οf the agency are essentially final and conclusive, unless they are clearly erroneous, arbitrary, capricious or contrary to Which means that someone protesting those specific actions will have to make a showing that they were final, conclusive and erroneous, arbitrary, or contrary to law.

We simply ask that the OPA amend this particular section to harmonize those statutes by including that standard.

And, for the record, I know Ι regurgitating numbers off books, but it's stated in the --I'm quoting 5 GCA, Section GCA, Section and also 5 5703 or, correction, 5 GCA, Section 5480(b), which talks

DEPO RESOURCES

about limited finality for administrative determination.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And this comes with statute that а essentially waives sovereign immunity in connection with the contracts. So, this essentially authorizes members of the public to procurement actions protest made bу the Government of Guam and the autonomous agencies or public corporations.

And essentially the specific decisions finality here that have that type οf decisions concerning requirement for security, whenever a procurement officer makes determination that no requirement for performance bond in a solicitation or when officer makes sole procurement а source procurement determination, or when there is determination for emergency procurement, when there is a determination of best qualified professional and competitive selection procedures for procurement.

Also when there is a determination of non-responsibility or whether the determination calls for proprietary data from a contractor not be required. Likewise, when there is a

DEPO RESOURCES

determination of a type of contractor to be used, or when there is a determination of approval of contractor's accounting system, or when there's a determination to use both of your contract.

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

In this particular statute, we simply ask that that language, that these types of determinations are final and conclusive unless they're clearly erroneous, contrary to arbitrary, capricious or contrary law, be added in there, just to harmonize all the existing statutes. I think we have those -- we have those anyway.

MS. BROOKS: Just as a point of clarification, translate -- (laughter) -- into simple language.

think, MS. TERLAJE: Ι and, yeah, Anthony can correct me if I'm overstating here. standard that, prior But, wе set а no determinations are final or conclusive. His statute, there are comment is that, by some determinations made by the agency or the procuring officer that should be final and conclusive unless erroneous, arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law.

DEPO RESOURCES

And I think we can harmonize these, as he has asked to do, by stating these exceptions and stating a different standard for these οf procurement, review οf these types determinations -- or, just recognizing them, that these exist and that we should follow the law.

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

MR. CAMACHO: Now bear with me, that's all related to a larger, legal theory of review of agency determinations. Okay? Basically, those are sovereign immunity -- certainly not to argue in the wee hours of the night, so.

MS. BROOKS: But, let me just ask this question, because I come here more as lay person, and for, let's say, an appellant who let's disagrees with, а ruling say, or determination made to a Vendor, that appellant might view the decision as erroneous capricious. And, whose burden of arbitrary or proof then is it to decide this?

Because from his lay perspective, not knowing all the details, the mere fact that he lost this, he might be of a different set that the decision made was already erroneous or was capricious because, let's say, Vendor A always

DEPO RESOURCES George B. Castro Court Reporter Tel.(671)688-DEPO * Fax(671)472-3094

gets the contract and he's trying to bid on the 1 contract and he still didn't get it. Do you 2 follow what I mean? 3 MR. CAMACHO: Yes, I do. 4 MS. BROOKS: So, how do we distinguish 5 Because to the vendor's mind that --6 that? 7 What the statute means is MS. TERLAJE: the vendors would have to claim 8 that, that's true, that it 9 was erroneous or 10 capricious. That that would have to be one of their allegations. If they just 11 said wrong, possibly that wouldn't go anywhere. 12 But they'd have to make one of these allegations. 13 determine if that's 14 And then we have to 15 correct. MS. BROOKS: Uh-huh, okay. 16 17 MS. TERLAJE: Yeah, whether it was 18 erroneous. MR. CAMACHO: Like maybe "aggrieved", 19 "by solicitation or award of a contract, 20 by the protest, or by the Appeal, and who filed 21 22 a protest or Appeal". MS. BROOKS: That's where he's 23 proposing "or" to "and"? 24 25 MS. TERLAJE: We review that again, the

DEPO RESOURCES

agency should review that during the protest. 1 MR. CAMACHO: Yeah, that's 2 very important for an agency to respond. 3 For if the protestor well, 4 example, says, it's 5 contrary to law and nothing else. So, okay, 6 well, how do I answer that? 7 MS. TERLAJE: Right. MR. CAMACHO: Do we have to go through 8 single law that applies and show how it 9 10 applies? Or, you know, if they're alleging that, you know, we violated a law somehow, they 11 should at least make a showing, violated this 12 statute. 13 MS. BROOKS: Okay. That's rather than 14 a broad brush? 15 MR. CAMACHO: Yeah. And likewise, if 16 they're saying it's arbitrary and capricious, 17 well, there are different ways to respond to 18 that as an agency. And it would help us, you 19 20 from an agency perspective if we exactly which of these, particular 21 determinations --22 Well, you say it's wrong. Why do you 23 think it's wrong? And if it's one of these, at 24 25 least that allows us to answer more

DEPO RESOURCES

specifically. And it will also make for a more 1 expedited hearing. I know we make all these 2 motions for clarifications or, 3 you know, you can't respond to it if you have no information. 4 MS. BROOKS: So what I hear you saying is, you would like the appellant or the vendor 6 7 who did not get the award to be more specific as to his alleged wrong? 8 Well, that's MR. CAMACHO: 9 correct. 10 Generally --MS. BROOKS: Other 11 than just say, didn't get it or I know it was done unfairly. 12 MR. CAMACHO: The procurement 13 that a protest has to be in a certain 14 states 15 form, when it gets to our level. MS. BROOKS: Yes, yeah 16 CAMACHO: 17 MR. What ever gets to your office. For example, they have to state the 18 grounds of their protest. 19 20 MS. BROOKS: Right. CAMACHO: And in doing 21 MR. that, they'll -- I guess by the time it gets to your 22 level, they should clearly state whether or not 23 a final determination is arbitrary, capricious, 24 contrary to law, so on and so forth. 25

DEPO RESOURCES

İ	
1	MS. BROOKS: Okay.
2	MR. CAMACHO: You talked a little bit
3	about burden of proof. I was going to get to
4	that as we go on. But for now, I'm just going
5	to continue on here.
6	I crossed out Section 12102(b), simply
7	because that was there erroneously that closely
8	tracks language of the statute. So, we have no
9	issue with that.
10	12103(b), I believe there's a
11	grammatical error; 12103(b). And that is where
12	it defines Interested Party. It would just
13	make more sense if the fourth sentence be
14	the "or". It should be "and".
15	MS. BROOKS: Right before number 2?
16	MR. CAMACHO: Yeah, right before number
17	2.
18	MS. TERLAJE: Okay. Well, that makes a
19	big difference.
20	MR. CAMACHO: Yeah, well, it does, but
21	it just makes more sense that way.
22	MS. TERLAJE: Okay.
23	MR. CAMACHO: Like maybe "aggrieved",
24	okay "by the solicitation or award of a
25	contract, by the protest, or by the Appeal, and

DEPO RESOURCES

who filed a protest or Appeal". 1 MS. BROOKS: That word "or" 2 to be "and"? 3 MS. TERLAJE: Yeah. Okay. 4 " 1 " MS. BROOKS: So, they have to do 5 "1" or "2"? and "2" 6 as opposed to 7 MR. CAMACHO: That's correct. TERLAJE: Correct, definitely. MS. 8 MR. CAMACHO: Well, here --9 10 MS. BROOKS: And by putting in "and", that making it harder for the appellant 11 opposed to easier? 12 MR. CAMACHO: Well, it makes it 13 clearly identifies --14 15 MS. BROOKS: Because you have to have two things to comply as opposed to one thing. 16 MR. CAMACHO: Well, 17 that goes to --Generally, one of the things I see with 18 the rule, I'll discuss this later in certain 19 20 section, is that, it's kind of expansive what it allows an interested party to do things like 21 file a rebuttal, present evidence. 22 The reason being is, you can then define interested party 23 broadly and you bring in people who didn't file 24 a protest. One of the defenses is, you didn't 25

DEPO RESOURCES

file your protest in accordance with the statute, you have no standing in the hearing to decide the protest. It's another story if one the parties, either the protester or the agency, subpoenas another interested party, like another bidder for example, to come forth with any testimony.

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

But, I don't believe that allowing interested party and just tell them who submits bid but the 14 davs goes back from the If they don't file a protest to have a second bite at the apple, like, oh, okay, this other guy filed a protest -- so I'm going to take advantage of his timeliness and his work and submit my rebuttal to whatever the agency's There's a fundamental fairness doing. issue Likewise, there's also a due process there. issue there. A protester is fully defined when he files an appeal. Interested party, I guess, in the -- as defined here is very broad. anyone who has an interest in the solicitation or the award of the contract.

Basically, if there's 10 bidders and only one files a protest, the way this is worded and in combination with the other

DEPO RESOURCES

sections you have here would allow all the
bidders, for example, to submit rebuttals to
the agency's response to the protest instead of
just the protestor that's the way the other
statutes read.
MS. TERLAJE: That is how it reads. I
understand. I understand your point. It's
also been made by some of the other
testimonies.
MS. BROOKS: So, let's see. Is that
good or bad? (laughter)
MR. CAMACHO: That is interesting
MS. BROOKS: But it's good for the
public, right?
MS. TERLAJE: The other, I guess, issue
that was raised is that that allows other
bidders who have not protested to gain access
possibly to negotiation
MR. CAMACHO: An administrative
MS. TERLAJE: or materials that they
weren't normally going to access.
MR. CAMACHO: That's correct too.
MS. TERLAJE: Well, we'll consider
those.
MR. CAMACHO: We'd ask that that, you

DEPO RESOURCES

know, if interested parties is going be 1 to expanded in this way that the parties 2 not be allowed to participate in the hearing 3 unless they're specifically subpoenaed by one οf 4 the 5 parties or by the OPA.

MS. BROOKS: Okay. Point well taken, thank you.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CAMACHO: And going on, in Section 12104(b)(6), which concerns contract disputes. Essentially, I noted that if the OPA -- you know, I know that the statute allows the OPA to hear the appeals of final determinations for contract disputes.

noted that there are a couple other Ι sections οf the existing administrative regulations procurement regulations or that will require amendment to harmonize the OPA's For example, in 2 GAR Division 4 power. Section 9103, Subsection (d)(2)(e), Chapter 9, please bear with me, that's just the --

MS. BROOKS: Yes, uh-huh.

MR. CAMACHO: For contract dispute, before the notice of final decision by a procurement officer must include the statement, you may obtain judicial review of this decision

DEPO RESOURCES

by -- in fact, reading it at the beginning -beginning an action in the Superior Court of
Guam. I recommend that that be amended also to
state: By beginning an action with the Office
of the Public Auditor.

MS. BROOKS: Yeah, we made note of that.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CAMACHO: then the other And is, 2 GAR our Division 4 Chapter 9, Section 9103, Subsection (g)(3)(i). Ιt requires mandatory dispute clause be in every government contract. Okay? And that clause, mandatory clause, states that the decision -for contract disputes this is now the decision οf the procurement officer, conclusive unless fraudulent or the contractor brings an action seeking judicial review of the decision of the Superior Court of Guam.

That last section should be amended to read: Seeking administrative review of the decision of the Office of the Public Auditor. Just so there's no issues there that it clearly just -- it brings these two statutes of regulations up to date.

MS. TERLAJE: These sets of regulations

DEPO RESOURCES

that you're recommending, we intend to write a 1 letter to Legislature and tell them what has 2 been pointed out to be inconsistent in other 3 regs or in the law also that need to be fixed. 4 5 Of course, we've been very limited in here --Oh, yeah. MR. CAMACHO: 6 7 MS. TERLAJE: in this public But, we'll take all hearing, so. οf these, 8 9 we'll include them when we submit it to the 10 Legislature. 11 MR. CAMACHO: Ι just know these two 12 conflicts --MS. TERLAJE: Sure. 13 CAMACHO: -do exits it's 14 MR. and 15 certainly not the OPA's fault -- other statutes and regs. 16 Well, we 17 MS. BROOKS: appreciate you pointing it out. Thank you. 18 MR. And then, 19 CAMACHO: Section 20 12104(c)(2), where it talks about the head of the purchasing agency, shall furnish copies of 21 22 the appeal documents to interested parties, bidders offerors, which are essentially 23 or bidders offerors, with instructions 24 or to

DEPO RESOURCES

further directly with

the

Public

communicate

25

Auditor. That goes to including all interested 1 parties to have a say, you know, kind of like -2 3 MS. BROOKS: Yeah. 4 MR. CAMACHO: The other problem is, 5 kind of conflicts with the existing procurement 6 7 and regulations which statutes require, guess, the agencies to identify the procurement 8 9 officer. Okay? 10 So, if it's an ongoing procurement, and 11 there is a protest and it's at the OPA level, but they have, I guess, a question generally 12 about the procurement, they should still direct 13 their inquires to the procurement officer. 14 Ιf 15 they have a question or inquiry concerning the procurement appeal, certainly that is one thing 16 the OPA should be answering. 17 MS. BROOKS: Yeah. 18 So, I ask that that be a MR. CAMACHO: 19 20 little specified, that that be specified and limited to the inquiries concerning the status 21 22 of the appeal. MS. BROOKS: Appeal. Yeah. 23 MR. CAMACHO: In a lot of cases, you're 24

DEPO RESOURCES

where

the

procurement

appeals

going

25

have

to

action is still pending, and certainly we still want the integrity to preserve οf the for procurement process those procurement actions. And this goes to the other statutes which require, for example, procurement officer log of all communications with the to keep a bidder and so on and so forth. It also helps for our record keeping as far as procurement or the procurement itself that they still are being made to communicate with the procurement officer.

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

12104(c)(3): This is essentially after the procurement appeal to the OPA. Then the head of the purchasing agency may file a Detailed Agency Report. So, I guess it's one of semantics. For most lawyers, they're used to complaint and an answer. Okay? Detailed is in essence our Agency Report answer, the agency's answer, to the appeal itself.

I ask the Detailed Agency Report should be amended to read "Answer". That's all. Because everybody knows what an answer is.

MS. BROOKS: Okay.

MR. CAMACHO: And Detailed Agency Report, like I said, it's just a matter of

DEPO RESOURCES

are

GWA,

semantics. We have a preference for answer.

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

very

complex,

And the other problem we had was the requirement that the agency respond to the appeal within five working days after receiving the notice of the appeal.

The OPA, I guess, is required to decide these impartially. Okay? Meaning to say they neither favor either party, if they want to decide it in accordance with the law and with the existing right of the parties.

This kind of makes it very difficult and very challenging for the agency to respond And the protest. reason why is, Essentially for appellant. а protest, solicitation or award of a contract has 14 days under the law to get their stuff together and actually file that complaint. That's 14 days οf work. Likewise, for debarment а The suspension proceedings. appellant would days to prepare that complaint. for breach οf contractor or contract controversy, that's another 60 days for them to prepare the complaint.

DEPO RESOURCES

least

аt

Some of those procurement actions

for

GPA

and

10

were requesting

especially when they involve construction. 1 They're not simple bids. They're not 2 Okay? simplistic contracts. And they involve 3 sometimes millions, millions of dollars. 4 For us to respond to something that the 5 other party had 14 days or 60 days to prepare 6 7 and give us only 5 days to come up with a response is very challenging and it's -- this, 8 in our opinion, it would be very difficult for 9 10 us to do that. MS. 11 BROOKS: What are you proposing 12 then? MR. CAMACHO: Ι propose that it 13 аt the period of time 14 least match that the 15 appellant has to prepare their actual claim. At a minimum, few weeks. 16 But Ι ask those 17 especially for the contract and а breach οf contract controversy, that allowed 18 we be аt 19 least 60 days to respond. 20 MS. BROOKS: I know there was a concern raised by the University in that area. 21 TERLAJE: 22 MS. Yeah, they were

DEPO RESOURCES

They

requesting 10 days.

days at least.

MS. BROOKS:

23

24

25

MS. TERLAJE: Yeah, I'll tell you, I mirrored this after other jurisdiction, because -- I guess, in my thinking, the agency that is supposed to be preparing this report is also the same agency that had already written the decision on the protest. So, I assume they should have all their things ready to go.

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

There may be other issues that, you know, are thrown into the appeal that weren't there and you'd have to answer that somehow. But, for the most part, you've got the record of the procurement, the record of the protest, and you've got -- your decision on the protest has to be based on something, so all those back up documents should be available.

CAMACHO: Well, it MR. goes bevond We're not just -- it's not like the that. Sunshine Act request where are just we providing documents. I mean, that's easy -- find them and you deliver.

Now, it's also responding to allegations. For example, if they are alleging that our action's arbitrary and capricious or contrary to law. We're going to have to hit the books, do a research, and at least, in our

DEPO RESOURCES George B. Castro

Court Reporter Tel.(671)688-**DEPO** * Fax(671)472-3094

response say, well, according to this precedent and this, this is why it's law. This is why we did what we did in that case. And that takes -3 - legal research does take some time.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So we're not just providing documents here, we're also making а legal response, making a legal answer, to the challenge to our So, we require a little longer. action. And we simply ask for more time, especially in the case for contract dispute. The reason being is, the only interested parties are the agency and the contractor. Its already been awarded the contract. And it's usually a dispute about timing -- or about, you know, particular rights that they may have or think they have or breach of contract, so.

Yeah, SO we ask, especially for contract disputes, we ask for 60 days to respond to those, just like they have 60 days -- just like the appellant would have 60 days to file his onerous response.

Superior Court Ιn the οf Guam, for example, in judicial review, you would have 60 days to respond to the complaint.

> I'm, again, just going MS. BROOKS: to

DEPO RESOURCES

interject my own thinking. When you say judicial -- you know, the whole purpose of going through here is to make the process less ornerous, less judicial. Kind of an expedited matter so that things don't have to be really as, you know, in the exact format as the way you would prepare a brief.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm just thinking out of what I kind of envision this, that this would be a simplified way of trying to decide something without all of the formality of a judicial review. wrong in how I could be envision this. that was the whole idea, so that it would be costly for both the appealing parties less well as for the government entity, as opposed to, you know, going to court where you have to do all -- and, maybe I'm just a little bit my thought process and maybe actuality might be a little bit -- you know, in conflict.

MR. CAMACHO: For GPA and GWA especially, yeah. The protest or the appeal will mostly likely be prepared by an attorney. It will be a legal document. These are big companies --

MS. BROOKS: I recognize -- yes, I --

DEPO RESOURCES

MR. CAMACHO: -- they're going to have 1 an advantage if they have 60 days. And we only 2 to five to respond this. 3 have What will probably end up with is a fairly large appeal, 4 very clearly stating their legal ground. 5 to give us five days to respond to that is not 6 very realistic in terms of GPA and GWA. 7 Maybe for some of the smaller agencies where 8 simpler type of procurement. 9 10 MS. BROOKS: Yeah. And then you have the dollar differentiate as either 11 to аt level or something that you know, because 12 - whole idea, at least envisioning 13 mу is to make it simple so that we're not 14 this, 15 using lawyers to lawyers and in each side incurring additional costs to do this. 16 I mean, that was really kind of like a layman's way of 17 filing an appeal that doesn't have to have all 18 the legal language. 19 20 MS. TERLAJE: I think, in theory, 21 right... 22 MS. BROOKS: In theory. MS. TERLAJE: ...these rules are written 23 that, and the rules before these 24 like were

DEPO RESOURCES

But in reality, nowadays,

written like that.

25

yeah, most of these contractors hire lawyers 1 and the appeal, the protest themselves 2 have become very judicial like. 3 MR. CAMACHO: Yes, it's very 4 very

complex, for GPA and GWA at least --

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. TERLAJE: Well, I expect that. And we'll consider the five days, because that's also been another point that's been brought up to us, but I'd like to get everybody's testimony on that.

MR. CAMACHO: And then going on, 12104 (c)(4) -- and this is where I kind of hinted on this before. This is kind of expansive because it allows rebuttals by interested parties. Interested parties who didn't file a protest.

MS. BROOKS: Yes, yes.

MR. CAMACHO: I've already --

MS. BROOKS: Right.

I've already stated that MR. CAMACHO: before. This is the one that really needs be -- rebuttal to the agency's report (sic) as far as the answer really should be limited to protestor not another party, although the interested, who didn't file a protest. Because they essentially, I'm making on due process or

DEPO RESOURCES

standing ground. Ιt really lacks standing 1 essentially to participate in a hearing without 2 filing a protest. 3 But if MS. BROOKS: we were to cure 4 5 your earlier one about the two requirements, and 2, then that would eliminate who could be 6 7 an interested party? Yes. Or, you could keep MR. CAMACHO: 8 that there but change this statute and --9 10 MS. BROOKS: Right. 11 MR. CAMACHO: only the say, appellant could file a rebuttal. Going 12 on, real quick. 12104(c)(8); this says that after 13 notice of appeal to the Public Auditor has been 14 15 filed by the head of the purchasing agency. I believe that this is another typo or --16 17 Essentially, it's not -- for appeal, The contractor would be the one to file 18 okay? the appeal because it's the agency that makes 19 20 the final action. And it's the contractor who appeals that action to the OPA, so I think that 21 this particular section should be revised to 22 read "contractor". 23 MS. TERLAJE: Yes. Ιf Ι 24 can just

DEPO RESOURCES

agree

with

you.

that. I totally

comment on

25

That's why I put the source here, because 1 Ι just had to mirror the statute language. 2 Ι think the statute itself is identical and it's 3 off, yeah. 4 So, I want to leave it in since that's the way the statute reads, we pointed out to 6 the Legislature that, you know, this doesn't 7 really make that much sense. And we'll 8 9 your comments in as well. Hopefully then they 10 can make the amendment to the statute. 11 MS. BROOKS: Okav. MR. CAMACHO: Yeah but these are your 12 regulations. You have the authority to --13 MS. TERLAJE: Amend. 14 -- make 15 MR. CAMACHO: it clear. Ι mean, and make them amendable? 16 Then again -- that will 17 MS. TERLAJE: be saying the opposite of what the statute said 18 or at least that's what we think it says. 19 20 MR. CAMACHO: I still submit that it's just my humble opinion. 21 MS. TERLAJE: Go ahead. 22 MR. CAMACHO: With the rule making 23 authority, you have the opportunity to correct 24 that error that exist --25

DEPO RESOURCES

MS. BROOKS: Rather than perpetuate the 1 in the rules. That's a valid point. 2 error 3 Okay. MR. CAMACHO: I leave it uр to 4 your 5 discretion. **BROOKS:** MS. Sure. 6 7 MR. CAMACHO: Pointing out though. MS. TERLAJE: Okay. That's 8 good point. 9 CAMACHO: 10 MR. And then, in 12105(b), Agency Reports, where it talks about submitting 11 or -- yeah, one of the things you're suppose to 12 one of the things the 13 submit, or agency is submit as part of its answer 14 suppose to is a 15 copy of the appellant's bid. The problem we had is that, under the 16 17 Guam Procurement Law and Guam Procurement Regulations, information, specifically 18 bids, can only be released at certain times. 19 20 For example, in а sealed bid, bidder that bid that -- the bidder's abstract, 21 for example, isn't released until after 22 award of the bid. Likewise, of all the bids, 23 only the bidder who is awarded the 24 contract, that's the only bid that's subject to public 25

DEPO RESOURCES

release. And all the other bids are not. 1 And the reason that that 2 is basically to preserve the 3 integrity οf the procurement process. So -- and I understand 4 also that, I guess, the public -- the OPA has a 5 valid interest in seeing the copy of the bid. 6 7 But in other sections here, it says that -- you know, all their stuff is provided to OPA as 8 public information. 9 10 Something should be inserted here that, if the 11 stating contract hasn't awarded or it's under law, it 12 procurement wouldn't be disclosed, 13 even (pauses; _ _ to answer cell phone). 14 about 15 MS. TERLAJE: Anthony, what Section 12106? Do you think doesn't 16 that adequately address that concern? 17 MR. CAMACHO: 18 (pauses; peruses document) 19 20 MS. TERLAJE: Required to be withheld by law or regulation. 21 You could cite that 22 MR. CAMACHO: there, but at the same time, in handling the 23 records, I'm trying to make it clear that -- in 24 our interest especially, and especially bids, 25

DEPO RESOURCES

and if it's a pending -- especially if no award 1 has been made. Okay? 2 BROOKS: But if I understand your 3 MS. let me just, again, I want to put 4 concern, it 5 for the benefit of the group here as well as myself, who is not a lawyer. 6 Okay? You're asking that, if the bid has not 7 been awarded, that the details of the bid 8 9 be opened for public scrutiny? 10 MR. CAMACHO: That's correct, yes. Or public disclosure? 11 BROOKS: MR. CAMACHO: Or, at least that it be -12 - the procurement rules and statutes state that 13 suppose to publicly disclose this 14 they're not part of the bid documents or the procurement 15 file, that they not be publicly disclosed. 16 But certainly if the OPA wants to look at them, by 17 law I believe you can. 18 Because I do believe there MS. BROOKS: 19 20 something -- we have already addressed it, where there is information that is proprietary 21 in Right? I think 22 nature. that's your concern. 23 MR. CAMACHO: Yes. 24

DEPO RESOURCES

Okay.

The proprietary

25

MS.

BROOKS:

1	nature still remains proprietary in nature.
2	And I think there is something in the rules
3	that we're proposing that the protester, right,
4	has to identify that portion that is
5	proprietary in nature, if I'm not mistaken.
6	So, the burden of proof, I guess, really
7	belongs on the bidder or the person that you
8	know, because we even have that in other areas
9	that identify this is and it's not to be
10	revealed at any time.
11	MR. CAMACHO: I think your tape
12	stopped.
13	MS. BROOKS: We'll take a moment to
14	change our (pauses).
15	MS. TERLAJE: Your concern is, is the
16	agency handling of the documents?
17	MR. CAMACHO: That's correct.
18	Essentially, if we're going to be disclosing
19	information of the previous procurement file to
20	the OPA, those portions which are not available
21	for public release clearly have to be
22	identified as
23	MS. BROOKS: Right.
24	MR. CAMACHO: made very clear that
25	they're not for public disclosure.

I	
1	MS. BROOKS: Right.
2	MR. CAMACHO: Although to decide to
3	protest, certainly I will not doubt your
4	jurisdiction to review them.
5	MS. BROOKS: Uh-huh.
6	MR. CAMACHO: Just so that
7	otherwise, if they are publicly disclosed,
8	what's bad for the agency is, that essentially
9	jeopardizes the entire procurement action. And
10	then whenever the protest is resolve one way or
11	the other, we have to go back and start it all
12	over again, because, let's say that
13	MS. BROOKS: And they already know the
14	
15	MR. CAMACHO: All information is out
16	and they can't compete. They can no longer
17	adequately compete because everybody knows what
18	everybody's bid is.
19	MS. BROOKS: Right.
20	MR. CAMACHO: Then there are a lot of
21	problems, so.
22	MS. TERLAJE: Would it be satisfactory
23	to add a provision right here in the Agency
24	Report section that says that, you the agency
25	shall mark those types of documents or

1	information and that
2	MR. CAMACHO: Yeah, we cite all
3	MS. TERLAJE: we are not allowed to
4	release that I mean, we'll have to put that
5	in all different sections here probably
6	MR. CAMACHO: Pursuant to the law.
7	MS. BROOKS: Right. So, put the burden
8	on the agency to tell us.
9	MR. CAMACHO: We could yes.
10	MS. TERLAJE: On things that they're
11	submitting
12	MR. CAMACHO: Now the protester could,
13	if they submit their documents, the agency
14	action the statute really applies to the
15	agency. The agency, you know, you will not,
16	for example, release any information, you know,
17	in a proposal, an RFP, to anybody else. And
18	only the proposal or the operator who gets
19	awarded the contract, only that proposal gets
20	publicly release. Nobody else gets released.
21	Stuff like that, you know.
22	MS. BROOKS: So, going back to what
23	Therese said. If we put the burden on the
24	agency to decide what should be
25	MR. CAMACHO: Yeah, we can

1	MS. BROOKS: citing whatever rule or
2	law that allows you to do that. And then we'll
3	take that into consideration?
4	MR. CAMACHO: Yes.
5	MS. BROOKS: Okay.
6	MR. CAMACHO: We can certainly do that
7	as part of an answer.
8	MS. BROOKS: All right; okay. Good.
9	Your comments are good so far. Thank you.
10	MR. CAMACHO: Sorry I'm taking so much
11	of your time.
12	MS. BROOKS: No. This is a long
13	process and I think, you know, that and I
14	apologize we'll give you opportunity, but I
15	think, you know we're not going to get this
16	all right the first time. And we envision that
17	over time, you know, it will improve. But,
18	where we can get a lot of the input and
19	feedback from the entity, we appreciate that.
20	And, Anthony, we appreciate you taking the time
21	to review this. So, thank you.
22	MR. CAMACHO: Okay. And then,
23	12105(d), that same thing, when we talk
24	about the bid abstract
25	MS. BROOKS: Right, yes.

1	MR. CAMACHO: to a certain extent.
2	12107(b); this particular section talks about
3	Ex Parte Communications with the OPA. Or,
4	generally, you know, communications with the
5	OPA by the party.
6	MS. BROOKS: Right.
7	MR. CAMACHO: The agency and the
8	appellant or the protester. Essentially, if
9	the OPA and the staff, when they entertain
10	questions or complaints, that we simply ask
11	that a provision be added that such questions
12	or complaints in any OPA responses should be
13	disclosed to the other parties in the appeal.
14	That's all.
15	MS. TERLAJE: Yes, that makes sense.
16	MS. BROOKS: That has relevance to this
17	case.
18	MR. CAMACHO: Yes.
19	MS. BROOKS: Not necessarily because
20	we get a lot of other issues that aren't
21	MR. CAMACHO: Oh, no. Only those
22	MS. BROOKS: Relevant to this too
23	well, okay.
24	MR. CAMACHO: And Guam's small, we
25	can't get away with, you know, blanket

provision. In Section 12108(a), where it talks about hearing officers will determine whether is necessary for resolution hearing οf the It's position that, due appeal. our process mandates that а hearing is mandatory if requested by one of the parties.

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

believe, for example, a protester or the agency, if they demand a hearing, I believe the Organic Act of Guam would require, as part of the administrative review, that that party requesting a hearing be granted a hearing any official decision before is made on the Ιt shouldn't be left the appeal. up to discretion of the hearing officer.

And that's essentially part of the due process clause of the Organic Act, that states that, you know, no or, basically the fundamental rights οf -- the fundamental the at risk by rights are some government action, government can't take action unless party's been afforded right to notice and hearing to respond to such action.

Here, as written, if the hearing officer says, well, I'm just not going to grant you a hearing, for whatever reason, I believe

DEPO RESOURCES

that would lead to due process due 1 or, process argument -- that's wrong. 2 You have a fundamental 3 it's our position that the agency and a protester 4 has 5 the fundamental right to a hearing. You know, if they requested it, it's mandatory. 6 7 MS. BROOKS: Okay. You raise a valid What are you proposing? 8 9 MR. CAMACHO: That it just, that part 10 where it says, hearing officer will determine -11 MS. BROOKS: Okay. 12 MR. CAMACHO: -- whether a hearing is 13 necessary for resolution of appeal be deleted. 14 15 MS. TERLAJE: I agree with you. I just 16 Or, unless -17 MR. CAMACHO: MS. TERLAJE: -- think it -- yeah. 18 Unless the parties -- and MR. CAMACHO: 19 20 think it's, you waive your right to hearing. 21 MS. BROOKS: 22 Okay. MS. TERLAJE: We can put that 23 language in about the waiving your right to a hearing. 24 25 And that would probably address that.

DEPO RESOURCES

MR. CAMACHO: Yeah. And I submit, you know, probably --

MS. TERLAJE: I think it would, yeah, intended that, if no one requests a hearing, no hearing is necessary. But, we'll revert to --put waiver right to a hearing. That should address your concern.

MR. CAMACHO: Yeah. And I also go on to recommend that you have a specific form for doing so. You know, it's just like --

MS. TERLAJE: Right.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CAMACHO: -- so there's no question 12108(d), Hearing Proceedings. later on. Ιn This goes to your first question when you said, what's the burden of proof. Well, it says that following the you're not evidentiarv informal guidelines. You know, these are proceedings and expedited proceedings. But, I guess, here where it just says, "The weight to attached to evidence presented in particular form will be within the discretion of the hearing officer."

That's kind of a very broad -- broad brush. Really, there's no identification of who has the burden of proof. And, I guess, if

DEPO RESOURCES

you're going to leave that language as is, ask that you follow the Supreme Court the United States decision Chevron versus NRDC. U.S. That's 487 837, where it says that, "Deference should be given to agency's an interpretation of the law if it is reasonable." That's essentially the reasonableness test.

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

if Essentially interpret the we procurement statue and regulation one way, reasonable, some deference needs be given to that, because we're the one, or are the one that have enact agency's to the statute and implement it on a day-to-day basis.

MS. BROOKS: I understand your comment, but where in (b) needs to change? Because the weight to be attached to the evidence presented is within the discretion... So, where in 12108(b) would we make the change? Because we say in here it shall be informal, the testimony shall be written, the weight, the attached --

MS. TERLAJE: I think that this is -what you're referring to in the Chevron case,
if that's going to be included, it's going to
have to go somewhere else. Not necessarily
towards how the evidence's going to be

DEPO RESOURCES

reviewed, but interpretation of the law; right? 1 MR. CAMACHO: Yeah, or you could just 2 know, deference be given 3 you to the say, if agency's interpretation οf law, it's 4 5 reasonable. That's all. Ι guess, if you're 6 really going to the Chevron case, they have 7 very specific, you know there's very specific definition of the reasonableness test. 8 9 Which is -- which is accepted on Guam and the 10 other 50 states and territories. And then in -11 MS. BROOKS: But going back (d) 12 to you're just making a statement that 13 should consider that, but you're not proposing 14 15 any change in the proposed rules? MR. CAMACHO: I'd actually request that 16 some statement --17 MS. BROOKS: Be added. 18 Yeah, hopefully tracking MR. CAMACHO: 19 20 that language. MS. BROOKS: 21 Okav. 22 MR. CAMACHO: Deference should be given agency's interpretation of law if it's 23 reasonable. 24 25 MS. BROOKS: Okay; statement be added.

DEPO RESOURCES

in

MR. CAMACHO: You could put in there, 1 either -- you know, the last sentence in the 2 paragraph, or a different section altogether. 3 MS. BROOKS: Okay. MR. CAMACHO: And then, 12108(h), 5 Once again, I already 6 Disclosure. discussed 7 you know, in terms of parts that are that, terms are not discloseable at certain times. 8 And then 12109(h)(1); when you talk 9 10 about sanctions, disobedient parties, essentially parties that are not listening to 11 the orders of the OPA. I believe that where --12 instead of the language where it 13 states, "refusing to allow disobedient party to support 14 15 or oppose designated claim to defenses, it should be basically, I think, there's 16 _ _ sanctions that talk about dismissal 17 οf the action or dismissal of their defense. That's 18 just a matter of semantics though. That's all. 19 20 The sanction of dismissal in court, for example, is very well recognized. Likewise, 21 you know, the sanction of dismissal at your 22 level will also be -- also recognized. 23

DEPO RESOURCES

essentially -- 12501(a), that implies to --

24

25

12501(a), this is my last one. This is

I'm trying to put fact, it in layman's terms When a protest is filed, the agency can here. make a determination to proceed with the award οf the contract that despite the protest, essentially, you know, there's no staying the significant interest of the territory are at stake.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that And, here, in and comes from _ _ Section 5425(g). The regulation is little expansive here, because we go to the statute. The statute says that, only the party essentially who -- only the protestor need be given notice of that type οf determination. And that ostensibly allows the protestor then to go to court or go to the OPA and file the appropriate documents to oppose that.

Here, once again, there would be interested party lines. That would allow anybody, you know, to include -- if there's 10 bidders and everyone filed a protest --

TERLAJE: I totally agree with you MS. that the typo here, because this is totally different type of party that we need in So, yes, I think I can state with this case. confidence that that one for will sure be

DEPO RESOURCES

1	amended.
2	MR. CAMACHO: Okay.
3	MS. TERLAJE: That one should only be
4	protestor.
5	MR. CAMACHO: And I'll just add I
6	ask that we closely track this stuff.
7	MS. TERALJE: Okay.
8	MR. CAMACHO: And once again, I know
9	I've taken a lot of time
10	MS. BROOKS: No, no, not at all.
11	MR. CAMACHO: I apologize, but
12	MS. BROOKS: No, we appreciate you, and
13	in fact, maybe if there's any other additional
14	comments you'd like to make, please turn them
15	in for us. We will be taking testimony up 'til
16	about 10 days, from now?
17	MS. TERLAJE: I think it's about seven
18	days.
19	MS. BROOKS: Seven days, 'til
20	MS. TERLAJE: Seven more days. Sorry,
21	I didn't calculate what that day was
22	(laughter).
23	MS. BROOKS: We'll post it on the
24	website. We'll post it on the website tomorrow
25	that we'll still be taking a couple comments up

1 'til -- okay. And I want to thank you CAMACHO: 2 MR. again for 3 a11 also your great work and certainly thank you for the notice of hearing 4 5 and the opportunity to be heard. MS. BROOKS: Thank you. 6 7 MS. TERLAJE: We want to thank you for your detailed review. You're the one that 8 9 implement it. 10 MS. BROOKS: Yeah, you're the one. So, 11 appreciate you having -- okay. MS. TERLAJE: All right. After Anthony 12 Camacho -- before that, if anyone needs copies 13 his testimony -- there aren't any of that? 14 Of the rules, and -- they made enough copies of 15 the rules? If anyone needs copies made --16 17 MS. BROOKS: There uр front, still? Okay. 18 If you need more copies, 19 MR. CAMACHO: 20 I can make some. have MS. BROOKS: Ι think we 21 enough, Does anybody want copies of his? 22 right? Okay. 23 We'll make a few more copies. Okay. A11 We'll make a few more copies. 24 right. 25 MS. TERLAJE: Does anyone else want

DEPO RESOURCES

1	copies of the testimony made right now?
2	MS. BROOKS: Now, you're going to give
3	us this? We'll make copies so that others can
4	have them available.
5	MS. TERLAJE: We'll have Lou Perez and
6	Claudia, if you can both come up. Sorry about
7	the tight order here.
8	MS. BROOKS: We realized after, but we
9	thought, when we got this place, it was big,
10	but didn't realize for a public hearing, it may
11	not be (laughter).
12	Okay. Thank you. And it's now
13	approximately 2:55 and we are hearing testimony
14	from our next citizen. If you could just state
15	for the record your name and your position and
16	then go into your testimony.
17	
18	TESTIMONY FROM LOU PEREZ
19	DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF ADMINSTRATION
20	
21	MS. PEREZ: Okay. Lou Perez, Director
22	of Department of Administration. I have with
23	me Claudia Acfalle, Chief Procurement Officer,
24	General Services Agency.
25	MS. BROOKS: Thank you very much for

coming.

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

MS. PEREZ: We just have a few. First of all, I just want to start by also commending your office for coming up with the much needed, much awaited, procurement appeals and rules and regulation.

know, the General Services You and Adminis- -- General Services Agency for the Government of Guam, does on occasion receive a protest. And, we feel for the protesters that maybe they feel they have not been fully heard and to the extent whether to allow -- the only other option is to go to court if they do not agree with the determination of the procurement officer, chief procurement officer, οf the agency, which happens to be the procuring officer for request for proposal.

So, we feel this is a very good thing. And we're happy for the opportunity to review your proposed rules and regs. And also, I believe there is some suggested language in terms of the statute that you're asking the Legislature to consider.

I'm ending, so with that, Claudia and I are happy to be here. We do have some very,

DEPO RESOURCES

just a short -- a few items that we ask that 1 you consider prior to actually forwarding rules 2 the Guam Legislature. 3 and regs over to And Claudia before goes through οf the some details, it will go very quickly, because it 5 basically echoes some of the concerns that 6 the 7 previous witness, Mr. Camacho, had stated. And I'm happy for the legal opportunity to listen 8 to the legal concerns on some others. 9 10 do encourage our Public Auditor to suggest to read the --11 MS. BROOKS: Okay. 12 MS. PEREZ: -- we already see there are 13 conflicting. And Ι 14 know you've been some 15 receiving those directly because you stated it when you opened the hearing. 16 If you other 17 MS. BROOKS: have any suggestions might 18 that you also see, please transmit that to us so that we can try 19 20 as many of those changes in as possible opportunity. 21 Legislature has an So, we feedback in 22 appreciate your those areas,

DEPO RESOURCES

That's right.

and

can

see

those

because you deal with it more that we do

MS.

MS.

PEREZ:

BROOKS:

23

24

25

inconsistencies of law. And therefore I think you testimony will have greater weight, because you're dealing with it on a day-to-day basis. So, we would appreciate getting that.

MS. PEREZ: All right.

MS. BROOKS: Thank you.

MS. PEREZ: With that, I'll go ahead and have our Chief Procurement Officer to outline some of the concerns to the proposed language.

11

12

13

10

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

CLAUDIA ACFALLE CHIEF PROCUREMENT OFFICER

GENERAL SERVICES AGENCY

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

14

MS. ACFALLE: Okay. We share the same Camacho's concerns with Tony testimony, on 12102. And what we are seeing there is -- or what I've suggested was -- where it says that Public Auditor shall have the power review and determine. And what I added there was whether there was substantial evidence to uphold the determination made by the Chief Procurement Officer, the Director Public οf Works, or the head of the purchasing agency.

DEPO RESOURCES

I'm assuming here, at this point, Therese, that we -- you know, the appellant, right, of course, the only reason why they would appeal to the OPA's office is if they were not satisfied with the decision of the Chief Procurement Officer.

MS. BROOKS: Right.

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

So in line with that, of MS. ACFALLE: course, their appeal will be on the same basis of their protest. Because then otherwise it's going to go out οf - you know, out alignment here. So, their focus should still be on the same basis of their protest if they submitted it.

MS. TERLAJE: Okay.

MS. ACFALLE: And that's why I'm saying -- I mean, I just suggested so that -- just a minor change there, whether -- to determine whether there were substantial evidence to uphold the determination made by the CPO, the Director of Public Works, or the head of the purchasing agency.

MS. BROOKS: Let me just ask you, again, just an observation, okay? And I'm coming in here, again, with no preconceived

DEPO RESOURCES

notion. You've made a determination to give it 1 to Company "A"; Company "B" protest it because 2 they feel that they should have won 3 it. And file the protest, so, they will a then and you're going to make a determination, saying, 5 you disagree with "B", it Company still 6 7 goes to Company "A". then Company So that's why "B" will 8 come to our office to protest, saying that they 9 disagree with your -- of the decision. 10 Because you made the determination and you -- you know 11 So, until -- my concern here 12 (pauses). is, whether there substantial evidence 13 was to uphold the determination. We really won't know 14 this until we look at all --15 MS. ACFALLE: We'll still provide 16 it will still be provided --17 MS. BROOKS: Yeah; okay. So that's my 18 comment here. This really won't happen until 19 20 all the evidence is submitted. MS. ACFALLE: And it will be --21 Okay; all right. Okay. 22 MS. BROOKS: MS. ACFALLE: Okay. On 12104(a), the 23 second sentence where it 24 says there, they deleted it because -- the agency cannot prevent 25

DEPO RESOURCES

1	the appellant -it says here that that
2	electronic filing may also be allowed when
3	available and approved by the agency. But we
4	can't prevent them from filing an appeal,
5	right?
6	MS. TERLAJE: Yeah, what I meant there
7	is the OPA.
8	MS. ACFALLE: The OPA, okay, I
9	understand.
10	MS. TERLAJE: That's a typo that I need
11	to change.
12	MS. ACFALLE: Okay.
13	MS. BROOKS: The intent here was
14	really, you know, as we move into electronic
15	age, rather than having paper - and that was
16	that was meant to be the OPA.
17	MS. TERLAJE: OPA.
18	MS. BROOKS: Because we're new to this
19	process, we're still in the paper stage.
20	MS. ACFALLE: Okay.
21	MS. BROOKS: So, at some point, we will
22	allow people to file electronically, you know,
23	just like the court is in the process of doing
24	some of that, so that we will eventually move
25	to that level also. So, that should have been

1 OPA. MS. ACFALLE: Okay. 12104(b), this is a 2 question I'm posing -- and again, because we 3 do -- you know, I deal with protest a lot --4 MS. BROOKS: Sure. 5 MS. ACFALLE: -- down in our office, we 6 wanted to -- if the failure to do the 7 just minimum in the form and filing of an appeal, is 8 9 ground for automatic denial of the appeal. For 10 example, labeling the envelope "Appeal". Because in the case of protest, right, and even 11 if we get it through a fax, a fax copy, and 12 then the original could be submitted later, we 13 still entertain it, because it is 14 still 15 protest. So, we just wanted to make sure that there's something in there 16 that, you know, about denying. 17 MS. TERLAJE: Well, yeah, that's a very 18 good question. I have to say the answer is not 19 20 written in here. MS. ACFALLE: Yeah. 21 Maybe if we try to put 22 TERLAJE: the answer in there, I think -- I thought about 23 -- yeah, we just want to label it so it doesn't 24 get mixed up with any other business affair. 25

DEPO RESOURCES George B. Castro

Court Reporter Tel.(671)688-DEPO * Fax(671)472-3094

1	MS. ACFALLE: Yeah.
2	MS. TERLAJE: That's the most number
3	one concern.
4	MS. ACFALLE: Because right now, it
5	looks like the only reason why you can deny it
6	is because it did not meet the filing period,
7	of requirement.
8	MS. TERLAJE: Right, that's correct.
9	In the statute that
10	MS. BROOKS: In my own dealing with
11	procurement, as we've evaluated, sometimes we
12	find that things are denied because of what I
13	call, substance over form. The form wasn't
14	submitted, but yet substantively everything was
15	there. And so, where there if they forgot
16	to check off something, to me, I don't feel
17	that that should be a denial
18	MS. TERLAJE: Yeah.
19	MS. BROOKS: if substantively the
20	whole package was complete.
21	So, we're not looking to disqualify
22	someone merely for a, you know, a technicality.
23	MS. ACFALLE: Especially if it's in the
24	best interest of the
25	MS. BROOKS: Yeah, right.

1	MS. ACFALLE: We deal with those.
2	MS. BROOKS: So that's just from my own
3	experience too, you know, that I have seen
4	that. And sometimes and we want to
5	discourage that.
6	MS ACFALLE: Yeah.
7	MS. BROOKS: But if substantively, it
8	does have an affect, you know, then
9	MS. ACFALLE: Absolute, substantively.
10	MS. BROOKS: Yeah, right.
11	MS. ACFALLE: Okay. 12104(c)(3), where
12	it says we are recommending to
13	MS. BROOKS: Oh, yeah.
14	MS. ACFALLE: yeah, to indicate the
15	Chief Procurement Officer, the Director of
16	Public Works, or the head purchasing agency
17	shall submit to the Public Auditor a complete
18	copy of the procurement file relevant to the
19	appeal within five working days of receiving
20	notice of an appeal. Okay?
21	I notice earlier, Tony stated, you
22	know, to be allowed to have more time to file
23	the record, or the document to the OPA's
24	office, which I would agree. Because, you
25	know, in their case it may vary.

DEPO RESOURCESGeorge B. Castro

Court Reporter Tel.(671)688-DEPO * Fax(671)472-3094 MS. BROOKS: How many days are you suggesting?

I guess -- the way we see -MS. PEREZ: solve it, would be either informal in that we provide the complete procurement file, there, you determine whether you think is there they have actually the accusation can be upheld and then you'll have the hearing. So, we don't really calling our attorney at this point in this process.

MS. BROOKS: Sure.

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

MS. PEREZ: We give you the files to determine if there's some regulation or rule process that we did not follow, which gives credence to the appellant's claim. If we do engage the services of the attorney general, I'm not sure whether the five working days is going to be adequate either.

MS. TERLAJE: The way it's written -the procurement file that, I think, should be
able to be made available in five days. And
that's how I originally wrote this. And then I
changed it, because I thought, we really don't
need everything in that file. What's required

DEPO RESOURCES

in the statute to be put in a procurement 1 filing, is a lot. 2 MS. ACFALLE: That's right. 3 MS. TERLAJE: And Ι′m thinking, 4 sometimes with procure -- I mean, the appeal, 5 6 might be on a, you know, lesser issue that doesn't really require all of that. 7 MS. ACFALLE: I see. 8 MS. TERLAJE: But, I thought I was a 9 short cutting there to allow you 10 bit -- you know, less to duplicate 11 all of that, you know, copying and audio, testimonies. 12 your deliberation, things like that. 13 I mean, So, those are two different things. 14 15 So, Ι think, we've allowed you to submit less than the entire working file. 16 I agree, that if submitting the document -- my 17 original thinking was five days was more than 18 But, yeah, if enough time. you're going 19 20 submit an answer, the attorney general submit an answer, I think. 21 That's right. 22 MS. ACFALLE: MS. TERLAJE: I think it's a disservice 23 to you not to have -- if the attorney on the 24

DEPO RESOURCES

other side protesting --

25

1	MS. ACFALLE: Right, our attorney -
2	then more to him.
3	MS. TERLAJE: Yeah. You're going to
4	have to work that out with him. And we'll
5	consider the five days. We're going to
6	consider that five days.
7	MS. ACFALLE: We also don't want to
8	delay it any further.
9	MS. TERLAJE: Yeah.
10	MS. BROOKS: Right.
11	MS. TERLAJE: Right.
12	MS. ACFALLE: Because some of these,
13	you know, we would like to proceed of course.
14	MS. BROOKS: Because as long as it's
15	in protest, it
16	MS. ACFALLE: It has its case.
17	MS. BROOKS: Uh-huh, okay. So, I hear
18	two comments relative to this, that giving us
19	the file within five working days is not
20	onerous to anyone. Right? You can produce the
21	file, whatever is relevant in the file, for us.
22	MS. ACFALLE: Yes.
23	MS. BROOKS: Okay. And so, that's not
24	a problem. But then if you have to file a
25	formal answer, then that's the one that

1	requires a little bit more time, may require a
2	little more time?
3	MS. ACFALLE: Yeah.
4	MS. BROOKS: Okay.
5	MS. ACFALLE: And, 12104(4), I would
6	just recommend to delete that, because again -
7	it's in line with item three, right? The 10
8	days, and then it goes to a 5-day again. That
9	could be done in view of the three.
10	MS. TERLAJE: The ten days is for the
11	comments from the other people. You can submit
12	your report in five days.
13	MS. ACFALLE: Okay.
14	MS. TERLAJE: Ten days after that
15	MS. ACFALLE: Is for the interested?
16	MS. TERLAJE: Yes.
17	MS. ACFALLE: Okay.
18	MS. TERLAJE: Or the opposing party to
19	submit, yeah. Then you get five days to rebut
20	it.
21	MS. ACFALLE: Okay.
22	MS. BROOKS: One of the things that we
23	will do, I've asked Therese to do, is to kind
24	of, maybe as an attachment, a proposed timeline
25	so these people would see, okay, the protest is

the

filed on this, this is what has to happen, 1 and It's kind of like --2 so on. MS. TERLAJE: Highlight. 3 BROOKS: MS. highlight 4 а οf 5 chronology. And, she's in the process οf preparing that. And we'll attach that as part 6 7 of this, so that way people will have a general idea of what is the timeline. So, we would not 8 9 want to delete Number 4. 10 MS. TERLAJE: No. That's for the 11 appellants response. MS. BROOKS: Right, uh-huh. Okay. 12 MS. ACFALLE: 12104(6); this says, the 13 Auditor 14 Public shall upon request make available, we recommend after decision has been 15 made. Because it doesn't indicate when, 16 аt what time, or at what point. 17 MS. BROOKS: Oh! 18 ACFALLE: Yeah, the document will MS. 19 20 be made available. And in order to avoid the other selection in having to put a decision 21 together, everybody just coming at any time to 22 for these files or documents, 23 request information, I ' m recommending that after 24

DEPO RESOURCES

been made, by the Office of

decision has

25

Public Auditor to, again, you know, whoever it becomes public wants to request, record after that. 3

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BROOKS: Thank you for pointing -intent actually is to also post the the web. decision on Okay? So, that way in addition to formally everybody has first formally notify notifying, we will parties of the decision and then after the notification, then we will post it. That way, anyone has access.

And we're in the process of preparing a whole area just for the procurement appeal, so that people will know what is being appealed, what the status is, where we are in the appeals So, we're looking at avenues process. like that and we're using the web so that, that way it's open and everybody has information.

MS. TERLAJE: Can Ι iust point something out to you and Anthony, and you guys could help me justify this, you know. Ιt doesn't have to be right now. But in 5 GCA, 5703, it says, the Public Auditor may consider testimony and evidence submitted by any competing bidder, offeror, or contractor after

DEPO RESOURCES

protesting. That's why we tried to allow them access at every point. Right? But I know that the issues of, you know, confidentiality of the bid, the proposals, things like that have to be addressed.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But, you know, otherwise I think -- you know, it has to be inclined to leave it open at almost every point. If they can't respond, they can't submit comments unless they know what the appeal is. Right? So, we'd have to allow them copies of that.

MS. ACFALLE: Well, yes, I tend to with Tony's earlier statement about the bids not, you know, formal and confidential. But there is a distinguishment between the proposal and the actual, you know -- invitation for bid and request for proposal.

Because you have request for proposal, the only documents that can be to the awarding offeror. released is That's only one. Anything else remains confidential.

But on a bidder, an invitation to bid, it still -- it's open.

MS. BROOKS: Uh-huh.

DEPO RESOURCES

1	MS. TERLAJE: All the bids are open.
2	MS. ACFALLE: Yeah, these are open
3	bids.
4	MS. BROOKS: Right.
5	MS. ACFALLE: These are open bids. So,
6	they can all come in and hear everybody else's
7	price.
8	MS. BROOKS: Right.
9	MS. ACFALLE: But on a request for
10	proposal, that's where it differs.
11	MS. BROOKS: Okay.
12	MS. ACFALLE: Because in a request for
13	proposal, the only information or the only
14	document that can be released or become public
15	record is the one that's awarded to the
16	contractor.
17	MS. TERLAJE: I appreciate your point
18	is to avoid delay.
19	MS. ACFALLE: So, we'll just have to
20	keep this all in line.
21	MS. PEREZ: Yes, we've also had
22	experience dealing with protest that have gone
23	to the courts, where some of the information we
24	allowed to the protestor was actually being
25	challenged and that we should have never had

1	disclosed it. Because then, it puts the one
2	that was
3	MS. TERLAJE: Competing bidders.
4	MS. PEREZ: That's right.
5	MS. BROOKS: Right, yes.
6	MS. PEREZ: And then it just we're
7	just continually just going to court about all
8	the
9	MS. BROOKS: Differential, like Guam
10	Mass Transit.
11	MS. PEREZ: Yeah, three years in
12	protest and still not resolved. So
13	MS. BROOKS: Uh-huh, uh-huh.
14	MS. PEREZ: In various it's hard for
15	us to try to award that contract.
16	MS. BROOKS: I thought a decision was
17	made already.
18	MS. PEREZ: It's actually awaiting -
19	there's a request for reconsideration.
20	MS. BROOKS: Just for the record, that
21	would not ever come to us now, because once
22	it's in court, it's already barred. Okay? The
23	moment someone files officially with the court,
24	this office now no longer has jurisdiction.
25	So, even any subsequent things regarding that,

it's --1 MS. PEREZ: As long it's the original 2 3 appeal. Yeah. And, thank MS. BROOKS: God. 4 5 (laughter). TERLAJE: What rule do you go by MS. 6 7 to -- do you go to by the statute what released, not be released, when you're can be 8 9 dealing with a protest and do you release? 10 PEREZ: Okay, only if an award -on an RFP, if it has been awarded and we don't 11 protest, then that is releasable 12 have а information. But only for the one that 13 been awarded. 14 15 MS. TERLAJE: But when there is protest, what do you do in those situations? 16 17 MS. PEREZ: When there is a protest, well those 18 wе now, wе have questions I know there's some of that. 19 arising. Unless they specifically put in, and they do have that 20 opportunity, because 21 it's proprietary and confidential. 22 MS. BROOKS: Right. Ιt 23 says that in our audit proposal too, that 24 you have to 25 identify it first up front what is proprietary.

DEPO RESOURCES

Because if you don't, then the whole RFP is 1 public. 2 MS. PEREZ: Yes. I'm not really sure, 3 I'm hoping that the written responses 4 5 receive from the AG maybe address this. I'm So, I haven't had the chance to 6 not so sure. I'm not 7 review his recommendation. aware οf not aware of the finding. 8 MS. BROOKS: One of the things that I'm 9 seeing though, you know, since we're talking 10 about procurement in general, one of the things 11 I'm seeing is that more and more entities are 12 using an RFP when they should not be. 13 Okav. And that, I think, was the basis of the Guam 14 15 Mass Transit. Because, you know, what constitutes professional 16 services versus services, you know --17 MS. PEREZ: By definition. 18 MS. BROOKS: Yeah. And that's where 19 I'm seeing a little bit more use of the 20 RFP maybe inappropriately. All right. 21 MS. TERLAJE: All right. Your number? 22 MS. ACFALLE: Okay. Now, 12108 --23 MS. PEREZ: 104- --24 25 MS. TERLAJE: (b)(8).

DEPO RESOURCES

1	MS. ACFALLE: 12104 (c)(8)
2	MS. TERLAJE: Yeah, (c)(8).
3	MS. ACFALLE: Okay, that one there I'm
4	not - we're recommending that maybe in your
5	transmittal you note we recommend some
6	changes.
7	MS. BROOKS: Law change.
8	MS. ACFALLE: Yeah. Yeah, because it
9	should not be the government agency to
10	MS. BROOKS: Yeah, yeah.
11	MS. ACFALLE: to file the appeal.
12	MS. BROOKS: Okay. And I think, Tony's
13	comment and yours is well taken. We know for
14	in fact the law is definitely in error, maybe
15	our rule, should be changed to be more
16	MS. PEREZ: Inclined.
17	MS. BROOKS: inclined, what I call,
18	plain English. All right.
19	MS. ACFALLE: Therese, I think, we'll -
20	- to finish on the confidentiality.
21	MS. TERLAJE: Yes.
22	MS. ACFALLE: I know the statute
23	mentions where if we are you know, we have
24	to advise, even if it's in proposal, to
25	offeror, they're getting the award. If they're

going to be awarded the contract, that document 1 becomes public record. 2 BROOKS: With the exception of 3 MS. the well, maybe I'm going to ask for 4 5 clarification. And Ι noticed specifically because when we do the RFP for audit services, 6 RFP if 7 do in the that there's say in that is determined section there 8 9 proprietary, that you must so state so. And 10 that the entity still mav have to make determination whether or not 11 they agree then if the entity disagrees with that. And 12 they notify the offeror and then 13 that, the offeror may decide to either [quote] retrieve 14 15 it. Okay? So, that is my understanding. MS. ACFALLE: Just particularly to the 16 statute, is that confidentiality. 17 MS. TERLAJE: Yeah. 18 ACFALLE: Prior MS. to an award, they 19 20 should be advised that if it's confidential their solicitation --21

MS. BROOKS: Right.

22

23

24

25

MS. ACFALLE: -- that it will have to be exposed. And if they don't want it, then they would have to --

DEPO RESOURCES

1	MS. BROOKS: Right.
2	MS. ACFALLE: Thank you.
3	MS. TERLAJE: Well, thank you very
4	much.
5	MS. BROOKS: Thank you. That was
6	short. Okay. (laughter)
7	MS. TERLAJE: Thank you very much. We
8	appreciate your testimony.
9	MS. BROOKS: Thank you very much too.
10	MS. TERLAJE: All right. Who's next?
11	Anita Cruz and Jolene Evangelista? No
12	testimony? Okay, Jolene now. All right, Jesse
13	Reyes? Testimony? Okay. Anyone else would
14	like to submit testimony? Are you sure?
15	MS. BROOKS: You are more or less
16	observers?
17	MR. PUBLIC: I have some problem. Guam
18	Public School System.
19	MS. TERLAJE: Oh! Okay. All right.
20	(unintelligible: discussion amongst
21	panel)
22	MS. TERLAJE: Any questions? Questions
23	or comments from what has been presented? And
24	you're with?
25	MS. PUBLIC: Guam Power.

MS. BROOKS: Okay; okay. GPA's well 1 (laughter) 2 supported. TERLAJE: 3 MS. If I may ask, you know, here there's a provision in when the Public 4 5 Auditor has to recuse, that it really doesn't allow 6 the statute any other 7 alternative. So, we wrote that it's going to go to court, but we would like to propose that 8 the Legislature come up with an alternative. 9 10 And I'd to solicit your comment. If anyone has any on what that alternative should be. 11 MS. PUBLIC: Right now, it's still 12 in court, right? 13 14 MS. TERLAJE: Because, yeah, there's no 15 -- uh-huh. MS. BROOKS: Yeah, we were having some 16 discussions. Ι think we 17 did answer, for in the event that Therese has 18 example, to recuse herself, we put in there that -- then I 19 20 could go and hire (pauses; peruses I could hire another 21 documents). attornev. And, I think, we'll be soliciting, of course, 22 who list of who might 23 attorneys as а be available. 24 25 So, in Therese's case, there is an

DEPO RESOURCES

opportunity that in the vent she has to recuse 1 herself, she can. What happens in my case, if 2 I have to recuse myself -- and that's a good --3 we don't know yet what should happen. 4 MS.PUBLIC: (question being asked; 5 audible but unintelligible) 6 BROOKS: 7 MS. One exactly is in our Enabling Act 1909, where we select the auditor. 8 9 Okav? And I make that determination, 10 because -- (pauses). And our court case, that was reaffirmed in Retirement 11 court case where the iudae, Judge Manibusan, said the Public 12 Auditor has to make the decision. 13 in that particular case, where I 14 So, 15 made the decision, and let's say a CPA firm protest that, because I have made the decision, 16 although -- who then will become -- (pauses). 17 MR. PUBLIC: Have the court intervene. 18 MS. Well, TERLAJE: Yeah. right 19 20 that's what it looks like. If the Legislature asks, I want to be able to say we've heard, you 21 22 know, these types of comments, these types of

DEPO RESOURCES

suggested to Therese is, where she feels that

Well, one thing I

have

BROOKS:

proposals.

MS.

23

24

25

she can make the determination herself without, you know -- that she go ahead and do it. recuse myself, she becomes the I have to court, (pauses). So it prevents it going to you know, one more time. You know, other than just going to court directly because I have to In the event where -- like in recuse myself. - that she be the final determiner. Because in practicality, Ι′m going to rely 99 nine-tenth on what she says. You know, SO (pauses).

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. TERLAJE: Yeah, there are some --

MS. PUBLIC: (question being asked; audible but unintelligible).

MS. BROOKS: That's the only one that I know for certain that, you know, where we make a determination. But then there might be other let's just say, hypothetically, instance, if we made а determination in awarding something from our own office operation. right? Then, you know, who would make that review? Not that we buy а lot οf stuff. (laughter). But still, you know, you have to, again, when you go through great pain to make

DEPO RESOURCES

sure everything is done correctly, but still there could be that, you know, feeling. And who would be the appropriate determinant for making that.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. TERLAJE: Thank you again everyone. And iust reminder that, when these are submitted to Legislature, Legislature will also hopefully have a public hearing they're going to do with it. And they have additional time to comment there. Or, you can submit anything to us in seven days; we'll pass it on to them or incorporate it, you know, it merits that. And, again, thank you very, very much.

MS. BROOKS: Just as а summary. Our target is to finalize everything and submit it to the Legislature on or before June 30th. That way they have the 90 days. And it's our hope within the 90 days, then come October 1 with the new budget act, it will be blessed. And then effective October 1, we can then be open for hearing any protest after that time. That's really the goal of what we want Okav. to do; be operational by October 1.

But again, we can't predict what the

DEPO RESOURCES

1	Legislature will do. But the deserve	the
2	opportunity also for 90 days.	
3	So, thank you so much everyone.	We
4	appreciate your taking the time. I will	now
5	officially close this public hearing as	of
6	3:25.	
7		
8	(Public Hearing concluded at 3:25 p.m.)	
9	HAGATNA, GUAM, WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 2006	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
2324		
25		

1 2 3 6 7 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 8 9 Castro, Court Reporter, 10 I, George в. do hereby certify the foregoing 79 pages to be a 11 12 and correct transcript οf the audio recording provided to me of the time and place 13 as set forth herein. 14 hereby certify that thereafter 15 Ι do the transcript was prepared 16 by mе under or mу supervision. 17 further certify that I am not a direct 18 relative, employee, attorney or counsel 19 οf 20 the parties, nor а direct relative employee of such attorney or counsel, and that 21 I am not directly or indirectly interested in 22 the matters in controversy. 23 testimony whereof, I have hereunto set 24

DEPO RESOURCES

my hand and seal of Court this 30th day of June,

25

1	2006.				
2	2000.				
3					
4					
5				George B.	. Castro
6					
7 8		CHANGI	ES TO	TRANSCRIPTION	
9 10 11	Page	Change			Initial
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
23					
25					

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	