ORIGINAL

Exhibit 2 **Declaration Regarding Court Action** Dated this 29th day of September, 2016. Respectfully submitted, **GUAM WATERWORKS AUTHORITY (GWA)** KELLY O. CLARK, ESQ. **GWA** General Counsel In the Appeal of IP&E Holdings, LLC, Appellant Appeal No. OPA-PA-16-013 **Submission of Agency Report**

EXHIBIT 1

In the Appeal of IP&E Holdings, LLC, Appellant Appeal No. OPA-PA-16-013

Agency Statement

The Shell Oil licensee on Guam and has continually been the fuel provider for GWA since 2007. More recently, Appellant, as the Shell licensee, has been supplying all fuel purchased by GWA under the Second Amendment to Contract for IFB no. GWA 2011-15 dated September 28, 2015 which was an extension of the original Fleet Fuel Supply Contract that expired on December 30, 2011.

In order to determine low bidder in a solicitation that was split and within pennies, GWA looked at several different formulas and approaches to the bid numbers and how each approach might lead to the bid most advantageous to GWA. One option was to use the estimated quantities and award to a single provider. Another option was to use the estimated quantities and split the contract between fuel types and have a supplier for diesel and another for gasoline. Another, which happens to be the one that GWA determined was in its best interest, was to have a single provider and to input GWA's actual usage along with the predicted trend of fuel usage going forward over the life of the contract. This formula option was based on a rational application of GWA empirical financial figures and was not in any way designed to prejudice one bidder over the other.

II. DISCUSSION

In its procurement appeal, Appellant states that GWA was "required to use the estimated quantities provided in the IFB for evaluation." In fact, there is no language in the IFB stating that the estimated quantities will be used as part of the evaluation criteria. Under paragraph 6 of the IFB, "the awarded contract will be made by GWA to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder whose bid conforms to the invitation for bids and *would be most advantageous to GWA*" and that "GWA reserves the right to award the Contract to a vendor *other than the lowest price offeror*." (emphasis added)

14

15

19

27

28 29

30 31

32

The estimated quantities were provided for two purposes: 1) to allow the bidders to bid intelligently; and 2) to allow the agency to evaluate proposals on a relatively equal basis. The two lowest bids could hardly be more equal. The bid numbers for the two lowest bidders were disparate between the two fuel types specified in the IFB. Appellant's diesel price was \$.02 lower than the successful bidder however, Appellant's regular unleaded price was \$.01 higher than the successful bidder.

Appellant's apparent position is that if the IFB contained actual usage figures as the estimated quantities, Appellant would have used a price different than offered in its bid. Using standard business practices to determine a different bid price based on a lower quantity, the new price should have been higher. Under normal circumstances with regards to fuel bids, the lower the volume, the higher the price. Further, GWA did not use actual usage as the sole determining factor in its criteria. GWA also used trends and how GWA's infrastructure changes over the next few years would impact gasoline usage over the life of the Contract.

Actual fuel usage by GWA over the past three years shows a trend down in diesel usage and GWA's gasoline consumption also dropped over the last couple of years as well. Those trends appears to have levelled off but, gasoline usage is expected to climb somewhat over the next several years due to expanded capital improvement projects coming on-line. Therefore, a lower gasoline price from a single provider is more advantageous to GWA over the life of the contract and its potential extensions. While no party to this procurement appeal has a crystal ball, GWA contends that to award the contract on the method it used is not arbitrary but, a reasonable and rational approach entirely within its discretion.

Appellant fails to show that it was prejudiced by the evaluation criteria used in determining the lowest price that was the most advantageous to GWA. Being the incumbent supplier, Appellant has known the actual gallons bought each and every day by GWA since 2011. While the successful low bidder was not privy to that information, Appellant undeniably was. One would assume the Appellant considered the information it had in its files showing actual GWA consumption and usage trends over the past five years as a part of formulating its bid pricing.

III CONCLUSION

It is GWA's position that whether it used an actual and trending usage formula or the estimated quantities formula, Appellant's numbers would have either been the same or higher in its bid. Most importantly, the award criteria set forth in the IFB states the Contract will be made to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder whose bid would be the most advantageous to GWA in terms of price and all other factors while expressly reserving the right to award the Contract to a bidder other than the lowest price offeror.

WHEREFORE, GWA respectfully requests that the appeal of IP&E be denied and that the Public Auditor grant all legal and any further equitable relief it deems appropriate.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 29th day of September, 2016.

GUAM WATERWORKS AUTHORITY (GWA)

By:

KELLY O. CLARK, ESQ.

GWA General Counsel

EXHIBIT 2

1	KELLY O. CLARK, ESQ. General Counsel		
2	Guam Waterworks Authority		
3	Gloria B. Nelson Public Service Bldg.		
4	688 Route 15 Mangilao, GU 96913		
5	Telephone: (671) 300-6853		
6	Attorney for the Guam Waterworks Authority		
7			
8	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY		
9			
10			
11	1 IN THE APPEAL OF) APP	EAL NO.: OPA-PA-16-013	
12		CLARATION REGARDING URT ACTION	
13	Appellant.	ORI ACTION	
14			
15			
16	Pursuant to 5 GCA Chapter 5, unless the court requests, expects, or otherwise expresses		
17	interest in a decision by the Public Auditor, the Office of the Public Auditor will not take action on		
18	any appeal where action concerning the protest or appeal has commenced in any court.		
20	The undersigned party does hereby confirm that to the best of his knowledge, no case or		
21	other action concerning the subject of this Appeal has been commenced in court. All parties are		
22			
23	required to and the undersigned party agrees to notify the Office of the Public Auditor within 24		
24	hours if court action commences regarding this Appeal or the underlying procurement action.		
25	Dated this 28th day of September, 2016.		
26	CHAM WATERWORKS AUTHORITY (CWA)		
27	GUAM WATERWORKS AUTHORITY (GWA)		
28			
30	By: Chan		
	THOMAS E. CRUZ, P.E.		
31	Acting General Manager		
32	2		