

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



# TRANSMITTAL

<b>To:</b>	<b>Mr. John M. Benavente, P.E.</b> <b>General Manager</b> Guam Power Authority P.O. Box 2977 Hagåtña, Guam 96932 Fax: (671) 648-3165 Email: <a href="mailto:jbenavente@gpagwa.com">jbenavente@gpagwa.com</a>	<b>From:</b>	<b>Benjamin J.F. Cruz</b> <b>Guam Public Auditor</b> Office of Public Accountability
	<b>Ms. Marianne Woloschuk Esq</b> <b>General Counsel</b> Guam Power Authority 688 Route 15, Suite 302 Mangilao, Guam, 96913 Phone: (671) 648-3203/3227 Fax: (671) 648-3290 Email: <a href="mailto:mwoloschuk@gpagwa.com">mwoloschuk@gpagwa.com</a>	<b>Pages:</b>	9 (including cover page)
<b>CC:</b>	<b>Mr. Joshua D. Walsh, Esq.</b> <b>Attorney for Appellant Graphic Center, Inc.</b> Razano Walsh & Torres, P.C. 139 Murrery Blvd. Hagåtña, Guam 96910 Phone: (671) 989-3009 Email: <a href="mailto:jdwalsh@rwtguam.com">jdwalsh@rwtguam.com</a>	<b>Date:</b>	August 6, 2025
		<b>Phone:</b> <b>Fax:</b>	(671) 475-0390 Jos x. 204 (671) 472-7951
	<b>Ms. Roxana Weil, Esq.</b> <b>Executive VP &amp; Counsel</b> Interested Party InfoSend, Inc. 4240 E La Palma Avenue Anheim, California 92807 Phone: (714) 993-2690 Fax (714) 993-1306 Email: <a href="mailto:Roxana.w@infosend.com">Roxana.w@infosend.com</a>		

**Re:** OPA-PA-21-012 Decision

☐ For Review

☐ Please Comment

☒ Please Reply

☐ Please Recycle

**Comments:**

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

Thank you,

Jerrick Hernandez, Auditor

[jhernandez@guamopa.com](mailto:jhernandez@guamopa.com)

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



**BEFORE THE PUBLIC AUDITOR  
PROCUREMENT APPEALS  
TERRITORY OF GUAM**

In the Appeal of	)	<b>Appeal No: OPA-PA-21-012</b>
	)	
Graphic Center, Inc.,	)	<b>DECISION</b>
	)	
Appellant.	)	
_____	)	

**I. INTRODUCTION**

This is the Decision of the Public Auditor, pursuant to 2 G.A.R. § 12110, for Appeal No. OPA-PA-21-012. This matter came before the Public Auditor on June 6, 2025, for an evidentiary hearing following remand from the Superior Court of Guam in *Graphic Center v. GPA*, Case No. CV0207-22. Joshua Walsh, Esq. appeared on behalf of Appellant Graphic Center, Inc., GPA legal counsel Marianne Woloschuk, Esq. appeared on behalf of Respondent Guam Power Authority, and Roxana Weil, Esq. appeared on behalf of Interested Party InfoSend Inc.

**II. FINDINGS OF FACT**

Based on the testimony and arguments made during the hearing on June 6, 2025, as well as the procurement record and all documents submitted by the parties, the Public Auditor makes the following findings of fact:

1. Graphic Center appealed to the OPA the denial of its protest of GPA's decision to proceed with InfoSend in Solicitation GPA-RFP-21-002 for the procurement of professional printing, mailing and processing of customer bills, arguing for the first time that GPA had

1 improperly accepted InfoSend's bid proposal, which was allegedly incomplete for missing  
2 Exhibit A.

3  
4 2. Exhibit A is an inclusion of Amendment 1 to the RFP that tracks the scope of work  
5 in the RFP and is listed as a required form in section 2.12 of the RFP; it contains questions with  
6 boxes for yes/no answers and very small boxes for comments.

7 3. The OPA held an evidentiary hearing on February 4, 2022, following which the  
8 Public Auditor issued a decision denying Graphic Center's appeal because its claim was untimely  
9 and the OPA therefore lacked jurisdiction.

10 4. Graphic Center sought judicial review of the OPA's decision in the Superior Court,  
11 alleging in its complaint, without the support of a transcript, that GPA employee Dawn Fejeran had  
12 testified before the OPA that GPA had granted InfoSend an exemption from submitting Exhibit A,  
13 thereby preventing InfoSend's disqualification for failure to submit a required document.

14 5. Graphic Center also argued that GPA, by disqualifying bidder Moonlight BPO for  
15 failing to submit a required document (shareholder affidavit), treated similarly situated bidders  
16 differently.

17 6. The Superior Court affirmed the OPA's conclusion that Graphic Center was untimely  
18 in its claim that InfoSend submitted an incomplete proposal:

19  
20  
21 In this case, the OPA correctly asserted that because Graphic Center had not brought  
22 up the issue of the missing documentation on Infosend's part in a formal written  
23 protest to GPA, OPA could not hear the appeal on this issue. Graphic Center's  
24 original protest to GPA did not identify any missing documentation, and instead  
25 focused its protest mainly on the fact that Infosend is based [i]n California and not  
26 on Guam. Even if Graphic Center was not aware of the information missing from  
27 Infosend's application at the time of its original protest, it should have filed an  
28 additional written protest with GPA within 14 days of becoming aware, rather than  
including the issue only in its appeal to OPA. Because the OPA's determination on  
this legal issue was not contrary to law, this decision is affirmed.

*Graphic Center v. GPA*, Case No. CV0207-22, Decision & Order at 4 (Oct. 29, 2024).

1           7.       The Superior Court however denied as arbitrary, capricious or clearly erroneous the  
2 Public Auditor's conclusion that there was no issue of an incomplete procurement record:  
3

4           [I]t is clear that Infosend did not include all of the required information in their initial  
5 response to the RFP. Graphic Center has argued that there is evidence from a GPA  
6 employee that Infosend was granted an exemption by GPA which prevented its  
7 disqualification. . . . [T]he procurement record contains no explanation as to why  
8 Infosend's offer was allowed to continue while missing key documents, but  
9 Moonlight's offer was rejected for that reason. . . . [I]t remains to be seen whether  
10 Graphic Center sufficiently showed to OPA that missing elements of the  
procurement record were "material" or thwarted judicial review . . . . Because the  
OPA did not fully engage with the procurement record issues in its decision, . . . the  
Court remands this matter to the OPA for further agency investigation and record  
development to determine the materiality of the information missing from the  
procurement record.

11 *Graphic Center*, Case No. CV0207-22 at 6-7.

12           8.       On remand, the OPA set a hearing for June 6, 2025, for which Graphic Center  
13 subpoenaed four witnesses from GPA: (1) James Borja, (2) John Kim, (3) Dawn Fejeran, and  
14 (4) Jamie Pangelinan.  
15

16           9.       Before the hearing, GPA obtained and submitted to the OPA and served on opposing  
17 counsel transcripts of the testimony of all witnesses at the original hearing on February 4, 2022,  
18 which showed that no witness testified that InfoSend was granted an exemption from submitting  
19 Exhibit A.

20           10.      GPA moved to quash the subpoena to Jamie Pangelinan because she had been made  
21 available to testify at the original hearing on February 4, 2022, yet Graphic Center did not call her  
22 then.  
23

24           11.      The Public Auditor issued the subpoena to Ms. Pangelinan, thereby denying GPA's  
25 motion to quash, and later stated that he was doing so in order to give Graphic Center every  
26 opportunity to make a record as required by the Superior Court.  
27  
28

1           12.     At the hearing, Graphic Center called only two GPA witnesses, Dawn Fejeran and  
2 John Kim, and did not call the two other GPA witnesses it had subpoenaed, James Borja and Jamie  
3 Pangelinan.  
4

5           13.     Dawn Fejeran, a Buyer in GPA's Procurement Division, testified that InfoSend was  
6 not given an exemption from submitting Exhibit A.

7           14.     Ms. Fejeran also testified that Moonlight was disqualified because it did not submit  
8 a completed shareholder affidavit, which was a required form listed in section 2.12 of the RFP.

9           15.     John Kim, GPA's CFO, testified that he was the one who drafted the scope of work  
10 and Exhibit A for the RFP for the purpose of obtaining information about the capabilities and  
11 functions of the bid proponents.  
12

13          16.     According to Mr. Kim, who was also a member of the evaluation committee for the  
14 RFP in this case, InfoSend answered the questions asked in Exhibit A when it addressed the scope  
15 of work.

16          17.     Mr. Kim testified that the narrative in the scope of work was more helpful, like the  
17 comments to the yes/no questions in Exhibit A.  
18

19          18.     According to Mr. Kim, the space for comments (after answering yes/no) in Exhibit A  
20 was very small.

21          19.     He said it was more important to provide the content asked for in the form than the  
22 form itself.

23          20.     He said InfoSend's answers in the scope of work were about the same as Exhibit A  
24 and were not missing; in fact, InfoSend's submittal included its complete disaster recovery plan.  
25  
26  
27  
28

21. He said Graphic Center, on the other hand, did not submit information about its disaster recovery plan or answer yes/no in Exhibit A, which made it difficult to evaluate this important criterion.

21. John Kim also testified that InfoSend was not given an exemption from submitting

Exhibit A.

### III. ANALYSIS

**A. By failing to raise it in a timely manner before the proper forum, Graphic Center has waived its claim about Exhibit A.**

When Graphic Center appealed the denial of its bid protest to the OPA, it raised the issue of InfoSend’s allegedly incomplete proposal missing allegedly Exhibit A there for the first time. Issues raised for the first time on appeal are deemed waived. *Duenas v. Kallingal*, 2012 Guam 4 ¶ 35 (“As a matter of general practice, this court will not address an argument raised for the first time on appeal.”) (internal citation and quotation marks omitted). The OPA properly found that it lacked jurisdiction over Graphic Center’s untimely claim and the Superior Court properly affirmed the OPA’s ruling.

Graphic Center then argued on judicial review to the Superior Court that GPA had granted InfoSend an exemption from submitting Exhibit A. This issue had no basis in the evidence and was also raised for the first time in an appellate proceeding. The non-existent exemption duped the Superior Court into believing that GPA had somehow treated InfoSend and Moonlight differently. The court believed that GPA permitted InfoSend to continue its bid without a key document whilst rejecting Moonlight for the same reason. The court would not have remanded this matter had it known that the alleged exemption does not exist and is therefore not missing from the procurement record.

1 Having already found that the OPA properly declined to decide the matter of allegedly  
2 missing Exhibit A for lack of jurisdiction, the Superior Court should have dismissed the issue of the  
3 “missing” record of the exemption. Instead, the Superior Court chose to entertain the exemption  
4 issue and remanded the matter to the OPA for further fact finding. When transcripts of the February  
5 2022 hearing before the OPA showed no evidence to support allegations of an exemption, Graphic  
6 Center once again shifted its argument, this time claiming that the procurement record did not  
7 contain anything to show that a narrative would be accepted in lieu of the yes/no questions in Exhibit  
8 A.  
9

10 A litigant is not permitted to invent issues or to serially alter its position and argument  
11 depending on the forum. This is because “his opponent is entitled to rely upon the position he takes,  
12 and should be able to prepare for trial with the assurance that this position will not be suddenly  
13 changed without notice.” *Berry v. Klinger*, 300 S.E.2d 792, 795 (Va. 1983) (holding that “a litigant  
14 will not be permitted to assume, successively, inconsistent and mutually contradictory positions”).  
15 In this case, Graphic Center has done just that. For that reason alone, its appeal of this issue should  
16 be denied.  
17

18 **B. Graphic Center must not be permitted to elevate substance over form.**  
19

20 The hallmarks of government procurement are to ensure fair treatment and competition. *See*  
21 5 GCA § 5001(b)(4) & (6). Material deviations are generally not permitted. However, the Guam  
22 procurement regulations will allow for a minor irregularity that does not affect material elements  
23 such as price, quantity, quality, or delivery. *See, e.g.*, 2 GAR, Div. 4 § 3109(m)(4)(B).  
24

25 In contrast to its earlier arguments, Graphic Center now claims that the procurement record  
26 is missing a permission slip for InfoSend to answer the questions in Exhibit A in narrative form,  
27 rather than on the form itself. This argument seeks to elevate substance over form. As long as the  
28

1 bidders can meet the material elements of a solicitation, their proposals should be reviewed and  
2 evaluated and judged on their merits.

3  
4 Here, the testimony of John Kim shows that the members of the evaluation committee  
5 considered narrative answers to be the same as yes/no answers on Exhibit A. The evaluators were  
6 looking for information which they could use to judge the capabilities of the proponents, so the form  
7 in which that information was presented did not matter as much as the information itself. As long  
8 as the bidder answered the questions, the members of the evaluation committee had the means to  
9 evaluate a bidder's proposal. When a bidder omitted an answer, whether on Exhibit A or in a  
10 narrative, that's when the evaluators could not make a judgment.

11  
12 Under the procurement law, the test is whether accepting narrative answers in lieu of yes/no  
13 answers on Exhibit A would give a bidder an unfair advantage. In this case, InfoSend did not enjoy  
14 an unfair advantage. The information provided in InfoSend's narrative tracked the questions asked  
15 in Exhibit A. Both InfoSend and Graphic Center answered the questions, albeit in different forms.  
16 Graphic Center lost points by failing to answer questions about its disaster recovery plan, an  
17 important consideration in a Guam procurement.

18  
19 Because this solicitation adhered to the principles and policies underlying the Guam  
20 Procurement Law, Graphic Center's appeal should be denied.

## 21 **V. CONCLUSION**

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

23 A. Appellant Graphic Center's request for relief is DENIED.

24 B. The parties shall bear their respective costs and attorney's fees.

25  
26 This is a Final Administrative Decision for Appeal No. OPA-PA-21-012 Remand. The  
27 Parties are hereby informed of their right to appeal the Public Auditor's Decision to the Superior  
28



1 Court of Guam in accordance with Part D of Article 9 of 5 G.C.A. §5481(a) within fourteen (14)  
2 days after receipt of a Final Administrative Decision. A copy of this Decision shall be provided to  
3 the Parties and their respective attorneys, in accordance with 5 G.C.A. §5702, and shall be made  
4 available for review on the OPA website at [www.opaguam.org](http://www.opaguam.org).  
5

6  
7 **DATED this 6<sup>th</sup> day of August 2025.**  
8

9  
10 

11 **BENJAMIN J.F. CRUZ**  
12 **Public Auditor of Guam**  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



Jerrick Hernandez &lt;jhernandez@guamopa.com&gt;

---

## OPA-PA-21-012 Decision

---

**Jerrick Hernandez** <jhernandez@guamopa.com>

Wed, Aug 6, 2025 at 8:30 AM

To: "Joshua D. Walsh" &lt;jdwalsh@rwtguam.com&gt;, Marianne Woloschuk &lt;mwoloschuk@gpagwa.com&gt;, Roxana Weil &lt;roxana.w@infosend.com&gt;

Cc: Thyrza Bagana &lt;tbagana@guamopa.com&gt;, Kelly Law &lt;kelly.l@infosend.com&gt;

Hafa Adai,

Please see attached Decision for OPA-PA-21-012. This email will serve as an official notice in lieu of a transmittal via Fax.

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

--

Best Regards,



Jerrick J.J.G. Hernandez, MA, CGFM, CFE, CICA, CGAP  
*Accountability Auditor*

**Office of Public Accountability**

+1 671 475 0390 (ext. 204)

[jhernandez@guamopa.com](mailto:jhernandez@guamopa.com)<https://www.opaguam.org/>

This email and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipients and contain information that may be confidential or legally privileged. If you received this email in error, please notify the sender by reply email and delete the message. Any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of this communication by someone other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

**21-012 Decision.pdf**

169K