

Jerrick Hernandez < jhernandez@guamopa.com>

OPA-PA-19-011 & 20-003: Proposed Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

Sandra Miller <smiller@oagguam.org>

Fri, Oct 16, 2020 at 1:51 PM

To: Jerrick Hernandez jhernandez@guamopa.com, admin@guamopa.com Cc: Robert Kono <robert.kono@gsa.guam.gov>

Hafa adai Jerrick,

Attached on behalf of GSA is the proposed findings of fact & conclusions of law. Because this document already discusses and incorporates the identical remedies that would be requested for in a remedies brief, I am not submitting a separate brief.

Thank you, Sandra Miller



GSA_Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.docx

IN THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY PROCUREMENT APPEAL

IN THE APPEAL OF)	Docket No.	OPA-PA-19-011
)		OPA-PA-20-003
BASIL FOOD INDUSTRIAL)		
SERVICE CORPORATION,)		
)	FINDINGS	OF FACT AND
)	CONCLUSI	ONS OF LAW
Appellant.)		
)		

This consolidated appeal came before the Public Auditor on October 5, 2020. Protestant Basil Food Industrial Service Corporation. In accordance with Guam Rule of Civil Procedure 52(a) and having reviewed the parties' pre- and post-trial submissions as well as the entire record, the Public Auditor now makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law.

I. FINDINGS OF FACT.

- A. OPA-PA-19-011 (Elderly Congregate and Home Delivered Meals).
- 1. Starting on or about March 15, 2019, Purchasing Agency General Services Agency initiated a thirty-day emergency procurement on behalf of the Department of Public Health & Social Services (DPHSS) for the month of April 2019

by sending out a Request for Quotations (RFQ) for the federally funded *Elderly*

Nutrition Program: Congregate and Home Delivered Meals. 1

2. In response to the RFQ, Appellant Basil Food submitted a bid,² as did

Appellee SH Enterprises.³ On March 28, 2019, GSA awarded Purchase Order No.

P19E-003-4 for the emergency procurement to SH Enterprises.⁴

3. On April 3, 2019, DPHSS conducted an inspection of SH's food

establishment. The inspection found thirty eight demerits, which under 10 GCA §

23106(c), warranted a letter grade of "C" plus a Letter of Warning.⁵

4. On April 5, 2019, Basil sent a letter to the Chief Procurement Officer

(CPO) of GSA notifying the agency that Basil had learned of the C rating given to SH

and demanding that GSA take action.6

Also on April 5, 2019, SH Enterprises advised GSA that it was 5.

withdrawing from the purchase order because it lacked enough drivers to ensure

delivery of the program's home meals.⁷

1 GSA Exhibits A to D.

2 GSA Exhibit B.

3 GSA Exhibit C.

4 GSA Exhibit E; Basil Food Exhibit 1; Basil Food Notice of Appeal Exhibit C.

5 Basil Food Exhibit 3; Basil Food Notice of Appeal Exhibit E.

6 Basil Food Exhibit 5; Testimony of Michael Zhou.

7 GSA Exhibit F.

Page 2 of 10

6. The CPO received the withdrawal of SH before seeing Basil's letter and

before learning of the C rating. The CPO accepted SH's withdrawal and awarded the

purchase order to Basil Food.8

7. Basil Food was also awarded emergency purchase orders for the

subsequent months of May through November 2019.9

8. On or about September 25, 2019, GSA published in the Guam Daily Post,

an Invitation for Bid (IFB) No. GSA-056-19 seeking "Nutrition Services for the

comprehensive Management, Operations, and Maintenance of the Elderly Nutrition

Program, Congregate Meals, and Home-Delivered Meals Component." The services

sought by the IFB were similar to that of the emergency procurement, but for a term

of three years (instead of thirty days) with an option to renew for two additional one-

year terms (total five years).

9. Section 2.4/2.5(f) of the IFB required that if a bidder had been awarded

a government contract in the past, then the bidder must list any citations received

that were related to that previous contract.¹⁰

10. The IFB additionally required each bidder to sign and submit a written

certification (aka the B-4 Certification) warranting that the bidder had not been

"debarred, suspended, or declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded" to be a

8 Testimony of CPO Claudia Acfalle.

9 Testimony of Michael Zhou.

10 Procurement Record at Tab 4, p. 56.

Page 3 of 10

contractor during the previous three-year period. 11 Three bidders responded to the

IFB: Basil Food, SH Enterprises, and Sunleader Guam, Co. Ltd.¹²

11. SH's bid response contained no indication of the C-rating it received in

April 2019.

12. Basil Foods' bid response contained no indication of multiple C and D-

ratings it had received that were related to previous government contracts, including

a D-rating and suspension received in 2016 which was the subject of a pending 2018

appeal to the Guam Supreme Court. Final resolution of the appeal was not had until

December 31, 2019, when the Supreme Court issued an opinion in 2019 Guam 29

which ruled against Basil.¹³

13. A public bid opening for the IFB was held on October 24, 2019, and

representatives of all three bidders (Basil, SH Enterprises and Sunleader) were

physically present.14

14. After the bids were opened, SH Enterprises was found to have been the

lowest responsive and responsible bidder. 15

11 Procurement Record at Tab 4, p. 38.

12 GSA Exhibit G (Basil Food bid submittal); GSA Exhibit H and Basil Food Exhibit 7 (SH

bid submittal).

13 Testimony of Michael Zhou.

14 Testimony of Michael Zhou.

15 Procurement Record at Tab 9 (GSA Bid Analysis dated October 25, 2019).

Page 4 of 10

15. On November 8, 2019, GSA issued a Bid Status Report recommending

award of the contract in GSA-056-19 to SH Enterprises. 16 That same day, GSA also

notified SH of its intention to award it the contract.¹⁷ Finally, also on November 8,

2019, GSA awarded Purchase Order No. P206A00841 to SH Enterprises. 18

16. Fourteen days later on November 22, 2019, Basil Food filed a

procurement protest with GSA over the award of the contract to SH Enterprises.¹⁹

GSA denied the protest on November 30, 2019.20 This appeal followed on December

16, 2019.

B. OPA-PA-20-003 (Hakubotan Building).

17. In January 2020, the Office of the Governor contacted Mrs. Hui Sook

Min at SH Enterprises to inquire if there was vacant space available on the first floor

of the Hakubotan building in Tamuning. The building is owned by SH Enterprises.

Mrs. Min replied that the space was available, but it had no utilities.²¹

18. Subsequently, the Governor's Chief of Staff, Mr. Jon Calvo, and the

Deputy Director of DPW, Mr. Jesse Garcia, toured the Hakubotan Building and asked

16 Basil Food Exhibit 8.

17 GSA Exhibit I.

18 Basil Food Exhibits 9 and 11.

19 GSA Exhibit J; Basil Food Notice of Appeal Exhibit I.

20 GSA Exhibit L; Basil Food Exhibit 13; Basil Food Notice of Appeal Exhibit G.

21 Testimony of Mrs. Min.

Page 5 of 10

if SH Enterprises would allow for the space to be temporarily used for two weeks

without charge in order to host the Guam war claims processing center. SH

Enterprises agreed. 22

19. On or about January 24, 2020, Guam war claims processing center

opened in the Hakubotan building.²³

20. The Hakubotan building's use as the Guam war claims processing center

was entirely procured by the Office of the Governor without any involvement, action,

or knowledge on the part of GSA. ²⁴

21. On February 7, 2020, Basil Food a second protest appeal alleging that

the donation of the Hakubotan building by SH Enterprises for use as the war claims

processing center violated the ethical prohibitions against giving gratuities and

kickbacks to the Government of Guam.

II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

A. OPA-PA-19-011. Timeliness.

22. Under Guam law, a protestant must bring a protest within fourteen

days after he knows or should known of the facts giving rise thereto. 5 GCA §5425(a).

22 Testimony of Mrs. Min.

23 Exhibit C, Basil Food's *Notice of Procurement Appeal*, OPA -PA-20-003.

24 Testimony of CPO Claudia Acfalle.

Page 6 of 10

23. The Guam Supreme Court has clarified that section 5425(a) means that

the 14-day window begins to run when the protester knew or should have known the

facts establishing the essential elements of the protest claim. DFS Guam L.P. v. The

A.B. Won Pat International Airport Authority, Guam, 2020 Guam 14, ¶ 88.

24. Where knowledge of the essential elements of the protest claim is known

before an award, then a sufficient legal basis exists to support a protest against the

qualifications of a competitor so that the protester may obtain relief prior to the

issuance of an award. 2020 Guam 14 ¶¶ 96, 133.

25. The 14-day clock begins to run when knowledge of the purported

misconduct is received, and not necessarily when an award is made. "There may be

situations in which the announcement of an award reveals new facts forming the

basis of a protest or where the award is a key fact itself that forms the basis of a

protest. . . as a general proposition, when alleged misconduct forms the basis of a

procurement protest, the time runs from the date on which the protesting party first

learned of the purported misconduct." 2020 Guam 14 ¶ 89.

26. Michael Zhou from Basil Foods testified that at the bid opening of

October 24, 2019, he and SH representatives were both present and that he heard

the announcement that SH was the low bidder. At the time, Mr. Zhou also had actual

knowledge of the C-rating received by SH in April 2019.

Page 7 of 10

27. An award of the IFB was made to SH on November 8, 2019. However,

as of October 24, 2019, and prior to award, Basil Foods had actual knowledge of the

fact establishing the essential elements of its protest claim questioning the

qualifications and responsiveness of SH. Basil therefore had a legal obligation to

bring its protest within 14 days after October 24, or by November 7, 2019, and to

thereby triggering the automatic stay of award provided for by 5 GCA § 5245(g).

28. Because Basil failed to file its protest by the deadline of November 7,

2019, and instead waited until November 22, 2019, its protest is untimely.

29. GSA properly denied Basil's untimely protest.

B. OPA-PA-20-003 (Method of Source Selection, Solicitation, or Award).

30. Under 5 GCA § 5425m the remedy of a procurement protest is limited

to resolving grievances over "the method of source selection, solicitation or award of

a contract."

31. In order to maintain a cause of action against GSA for the Hakubotan

Building procurement, Basil Foods must allege facts, which if proved, show that the

GSA wrongfully executed its duties over the method of source selection, solicitation

or award of a contract for the building.

32. GSA Chief Procurement Officer Claudia testified that the procurement

of the Hakubotan building was handled exclusively by the Office of the Governor, that

GSA had no procurement duties at all with respect to the building, and that GSA only

learned of the building's use as the Guam war claims center through media reports.

Page 8 of 10

33. Because GSA is not the agency involved in the "method of source

selection, solicitation or award" with respect to the Governor's use of the Hakubotan

building, not action can be maintained against GSA and Basil's protest must be

dismissed.

C. Debarment and Suspension.

34. Pursuant to 5 GCA § 5426, authority to debar or suspend is vested in

the Chief Procurement Officer of GSA, the Director of Public Works, or the head of a

purchasing agency. Debarment authority can only be exercised after consultation

with the using agency and the Attorney General.

35. Pursuant to 5 GCA § 5705, the Public Auditor's may review an appeal

of a decision to debar or suspend, but the Public Auditor does not have original

jurisdiction or authority to sua sponte initiate debarment or suspension proceedings.

36. Because SH Enterprises has not been administratively debarred or

suspended, nor have proceedings for such action been initiated by the Chief

Procurement Office after consultation with the using agency and the Attorney

General under 5 GCA § 5426, and there is no appeal of a debarment or suspension

decision before the Public Auditor, Basil Food's request for the Public Auditor to

debar or suspend SH Enterprises is denied.

Page 9 of 10

III. CONCLUSION.

In light of the findings of fact and conclusions of law, the Public Auditor ORDERS that this consolidated appeal be dismissed with prejudice in its entirety. Each party shall bear their own attorneys' fees and costs.

SO ORDERED this _____ day of October, 2020.

BENJAMIN J.F. CRUZ Public Auditor of Guam