

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



TRANSMITTAL

To:	Ms. Paula Blas Director Government of Guam Retirement Fund 424 Route 8 Maite, Guam 96910 Phone: (671) 475-8900/01 Fax: (671) 475-8922 Email: pmblas@ite.net	From:	Benjamin J.F. Cruz Public Auditor Office of Public Accountability
	Ms. Joanne L. Grimes, Esq., and Ms. Arsima A. Muller, Esq. Attorneys for GGRF Carlsmith Ball LLP 1001 Bishop Street, Suite 2100 Honolulu, HI 96813 Phone: 808-523-2500 Fax: 808-523-0842 Email: jgrimes@carlsmith.com ; amuller@carlsmith.com		
	Mr. Vincent C. Camacho, Esq. Attorney for GGRF Camacho Calvo Law Group LLC 356 E. Marine Corps. Drive, Suite 201 Hagatna, Guam 96910 Phone: 671-472-6813 Fax: 671-477-4375 Email: vcamacho@camachocalvo.law		Pages: 11 (including cover page)
CC:	Mr. William B. Brennan, Esq. Attorney for Appellant ASC Trust, LLC Arriola Law Firm 259, Martyr Street, Suite 201 Hagåtña, Guam 96910 Phone: (671) 477-9730/33 Fax: (671) 477-9734 Email: attorneys@arriolafirm.com ; wbrennan@arriolafirm.com	Date:	November 26, 2025
		Phone: Fax:	(671) 475-0390 x. 204 (671) 472-7951

Re: OPA-PA-25-007 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



BEFORE THE PUBLIC AUDITOR PROCUREMENT APPEALS TERRITORY OF GUAM

In the Appeal of) **Appeal No: OPA-PA-25-007**
ASC Trust, LLC,)
Appellant.) **DECISION**

I. INTRODUCTION

This is the Decision of the Public Auditor, pursuant to 2 G.A.R. § 12110, for Appeal No. OPA-PA-25-007. ASC Trust, LLC (“ASC”) filed its appeal on April 30, 2025, for review of the Government of Guam Retirement Fund (“GGRF”) actions related to Request for Proposal No. GGRF-002-25, Plan Administration Services related to the Defined Contribution Retirement System 457(b) Deferred Compensation Plan and Welfare Benefit Plan (the “RFP”). The Appeal was heard on September 29, 2025, before Public Auditor Benjamin J. F. Cruz. William B. Brennan, Esq. appeared on behalf of Appellant ASC, and Vincent C. Camacho, Esq. appeared for Respondent GGRF. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law were filed by ASC and GGRF on October 28, 2025.

II. JURISDICTION: STANDARD REVIEW

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

1

III. FINDINGS OF FACT

2

3 The Public Auditor shall have the power to review and determine *de novo* any matter
4 properly submitted. 5 G.C.A. § 5703 (a), and in reaching this Decision, has considered and
5 incorporates herein the procurement record and all documents submitted by the parties, and has
6 considered the testimony and arguments made during the hearing held on September 29, 2025.
7 Based on the aforementioned record in this matter, the Public Auditor makes the following findings
8 of fact:

- 9
- 10 1. On March 17, 2025, GGRF issued a request for proposal, seeking a provider of Plan
11 Administration Services related to the Defined Contribution Retirement System 457(b)
12 Deferred Compensation Plan and Welfare Benefit Plan, GGRF-002-25.
 - 13 2. On March 31, 2025, ASC timely submitted the following question to GGRF: “Will
14 Guam-based offerors receive any preference in evaluation scoring?” Notice of Appeal,
15 Ex. A at p. 1 (April 30, 2025).
 - 16 3. GGRF responded on April 10, 2025: “[t]he evaluation criteria do not include any
17 geographic preference or scoring advantage based on the offeror’s location.” Notice of
18 Appeal, Ex. A at p. 1-2 (April 30, 2025).
 - 19 4. On April 16, 2025, ASC filed a protest alleging *inter alia* that Guam law requires that
20 GGRF give preference to local businesses that meet certain requirements pursuant to 5
21 G.C.A. § 5008(d). Notice of Appeal, Ex. A. at p. 3 (April 30, 2025).¹
- 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

¹ ASC included a second basis of protest, that certain transition-related-criteria that would be used in GGRF’s ranking of offerors, gave the incumbent an unfair advantage over other offerors. GGRF accepted this separate basis of ASC’s protest in its April 23, 2025 decision, and did not assert this separate basis of protest was untimely.

- 1 5. GGRF denied ASC's protest on April 23, 2025 concerning 5 G.C.A. § 5008(d). GGRF
2 posited it would not apply the local preference in this procurement for professional
3 services. See Notice of Appeal, Ex. B at p. 1-2 ("Reading § 5008(d) to require awarding
4 a contract to a lower ranked firm based solely on price would directly conflict with the
5 structured process mandated under Section 5216. . . As such Section 5216 and 2 GAR §
6 3114 must control the selection process for professional services."). GGRF did not assert
7 that ASC's local preference related protest was untimely in its April 23, 2025 decision
8 on ASC's protest.
- 9 10. ASC subsequently appealed GGRF's denial of its protest to the Public Auditor on April
11 30, 2025 in this appeal.
- 12 13. GGRF responded to ASC's Appeal, asserting *inter alia* and for the first time, that ASC's
13 protest concerning GGRF's failure to apply the local preference to the RFP, was
14 untimely. GGRF Agency Statement at p. 6 (May 15, 2025).
- 15 16. On June 24, 2025, GGRF moved the Public Auditor to dismiss this appeal on the
16 timeliness issue.
- 17 17. After briefing and argument, before the hearing on September 29, 2025, the Public
18 Auditor orally denied GGRF's motion to dismiss.
- 19 20. At the hearing, the Parties' Counsel examined GGRF Director Paula Blas and made
20 arguments on the merits of this appeal. The relevant portions of Director Blas' testimony
21 are as follows:
- 22 22. a. GGRF is a quasi-autonomous agency, with its own procurement authority under
23 the Guam Procurement Law as well as a delegation from the Chief Procurement
24 Officer for the Government of Guam.

- b. Director Blas, in her position, is the head of the purchasing agency for GGRF, as contemplated by the procurement law.
 - c. ASC and GGRF litigated a separate issue for an earlier version of this procurement in 2023, in OPA-PA-23-006 and OPA-PA-23-005, which were consolidated and settled by the Parties before reaching the merits of ASC's claims in those appeals.
 - d. GGRF has offered different arguments concerning the local preference at different stages in these proceedings. First, at the protest stage, GGRF posited that the local preference does not apply to professional services procurement. Then, in response to the appeal, GGRF contended that the local preference is discretionary and not mandatory. At the hearing, GGRF, through Director Blas, offered that the local preference is discretionary and only applies to a business license and local office requirement, at the time of award.
 - e. After clarifying GGRF's different positions from the protest to appeal stage of these proceedings, Director Blas testified that her interpretation of Section 5008 as of the hearing date only requires that an ultimate awardee have a Guam business license and Guam office at the time of award. She further testified that GGRF RFPs do not calculate a points basis during the evaluation phase of an RFP and therefore GGRF would apply the local preference after evaluations, but pre-award in its discretion. Director Blas offered that GGRF would apply the business license and office in Guam requirement pre-award, but would not apply Section 5008 and specifically subsection (d) any further.

- 1 f. On questioning from the Public Auditor, Director Blas conceded that GGRF's
2 ultimate decision not to apply Section 5008(d) was due in part because it is not
3 clear what "substantial portion of its business on Guam." Instead, she said, GGRF
4 would only apply the first sentence of Section 5008, by requiring a Guam
5 business license and office in Guam at the time of award. She acknowledged that
6 the application she articulated ignores part of the statute at subsection (d).
- 7 g. Director Blas finally admitted that GGRF had never publicized its position on
8 Section 5008(d) and its application to professional services procurements before
9 responding to ASC's March 31, 2025 question. She conceded that local
10 preference was not something that normally was included in GGRF RFPs.
- 11 h. Director Blas further admitted that ASC could not have known GGRF's position
12 concerning Section 5008(d) prior to GGRF responding to ASC's March 31, 2025
13 question, because GGRF had never faced this issue before, and now that they
14 had, it is something they had to refer to counsel.

17 **IV. ANALYSIS**

18 **A. GUAM LAW REQUIRES A LOCAL PREFERENCE IN PROCUREMENTS FOR
19 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES.**

20 5 G.C.A. § 5008(d) in relevant part states:

21 "All procurement of supplies *and services* shall be made from among
22 businesses licensed to do business on Guam and that maintain an office
23 or other facility on Guam, wherever a business that is willing to be a
contractor is: . . .

24 (d) A *service business* actually in business, doing a substantial portion
25 of its business on Guam, and hiring at least 95% U. S. Citizens,
26 lawfully admitted permanent residents or nationals of the United
States, or persons who are lawfully admitted to the United States to
work, based on their citizenship in any of the nations previously
27 comprising the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

Procurement of supplies and services from off Guam may be made if no business for such supplies or services may be found on Guam or if the total cost F.O.B. job site, unloaded, of procurement from off island is no greater than eighty-five percent (85%) of the total cost F.O.B. job site, unloaded, of the same supplies or services when procured from a business licensed to do business on Guam that maintains an office or other facility on Guam and that is one of the above-designated businesses entitled to preference.”

5 G.C.A. § 5008 (emphasis added). The procurement law makes clear that “services” is an all-encompassing term, and includes, as an example, those professional services provided by consultants and attorneys which would fall under Sections 5216 and 5121. See 5 G.C.A. § 5030, Cmt 3.

Thus, based on the foregoing plain language of the Procurement Law, in the RFP context, if one or more local² offeror(s): (1) is a service business actually in business, (2) doing a substantial portion of its business on Guam, (3) hiring at least 95% [specifically listed persons], and (4) (a) if that offeror offers the services sought or (b) no off island vendor offers the services at less than 85% of the local offeror(s), then the local offeror(s) is entitled to a preference in the procurement. Section 5008 can therefore be harmonized with the qualifications process under Sections 5216 and 5121 for procurement of professional services. An offeror who is qualified and who is entitled to local preference must be preferred over those offerors who are not entitled to local preference for services under Section 5008(d). GGRF's arguments to the contrary that price is the only basis to apply the local preference is contrary to the plain language of Section 5008(d) and is also an unreasonable limitation on Section 5008(d) that the Legislature did not intend.

² Meaning they are licensed in Guam and maintain an office in Guam as required by 5 G.C.A. Section 5008.

1 GGRF's flip flopping throughout these proceedings is also a compelling reason to decide
2 this appeal in ASC's favor, and order GGRF to state clearly if and how Section 5008(d) is to be
3 applied to the RFP.
4

5 OPA precedent confirms that the local procurement preference is applicable in the RFP
6 context. See OPA-PA-07-002, In re Emission Technologies, Inc., Decision (August 1, 2007)
7 (hereinafter "Emission Technologies"). In Emission Technologies, the Guam Power Authority
8 ("GPA") issued an RFP for professional services, seeking "Annual Emission Testing for GPA
9 Power Generating Units". After hearing, the Public Auditor determined that Emission
10 Technologies qualified for local preference at the time of proposal, and "[a]ward to an off-island
11 vendor without a comparison to the price *or availability* of local vendors is inconsistent with 5
12 G.C.A. § 5008. OPA-PA-07-002, Emission Technologies, Decision at p. 12. (August 1, 2007).³
13 Emission Technologies makes clear: (1) the local preference applies to the procurement of
14 professional services under 5 G.C.A. Sections 5216 and 5121, and (2) Government agencies are
15 required to conduct the local preference analysis during the procurement process. Emission
16 Technologies, Decision at p. 12 ("Award to an off-island vendor without a comparison to the
17 price *or availability* of local vendors is inconsistent with 5 G.C.A. § 5008. . . ." (emphasis
18 added)).⁴
19
20

21
22 ³ Overruled on jurisdictional grounds in SP0160-07, TRC Environmental Corporation v.
23 Office of the Public Auditor (Nov. 24, 2008).
24

25 ⁴ See also, OPA-PA-06-003, In re Appeal of L.P. Ganacias Enterprise, Inc., dba
26 Radiocom, Findings and Recommendations of Hearing Officer at pp. 16-17 (Mar. 12, 2007)
27 ("There is no evidence in the record that any attempt was made prior to the procurement to
determine if a local business for this particular supply or service existed, except for the assurance
of the awardee that it is the only one. The record does not indicate that any price comparison
28

(Footnote continues on following page.)

1 This interpretation of 5 G.C.A. § 5008 is supported by the Legislature's clear intent to
2 apply the local preference to all procurements for supplies and services, when viewing the
3 Legislature's creation of the other procurement preferences in the Guam Procurement Law. See
4 5 G.C.A. § 5011 (recognizing procurement policy in favor of awarding procurements to service-
5 disabled veteran owned businesses “*except for professional services*” (emphasis added)); see
6 also, 5 G.C.A. § 5013 (recognizing procurement policy in favor of awarding procurements to
7 women-owned businesses for “any supply or service”).

8 The Committee Report on Bill 71-36,⁵ later Public Law 36-26, which adopted the women-
9 owned business preference, demonstrates the Legislature made a clear choice. In adopting the
10 women-owned business preference, which initially omitted professional services similar to the
11 service-disabled veteran owned business preference, the original Bill included the language
12 “*except for professional services*”. Id. After some discussion at the Public Hearing, the final bill
13 deleted the language exempting professional services from the women-owned business
14 preference. Id. The Legislature clearly intended that the local procurement preference, like the
15 woman-owned business preference, applies to professional services procurements. Thus,
16 GGRF's denial of ASC's protest was not in accordance with Guam laws. Further, GGRF's
17 failure to apply 5 G.C.A § 5008 (d) renders its RFP in violation of Guam law.
18

19 20
21 22 was done in the course of this procurement between the awardee's product and the product of
23 any local business. The Hearing Officer agrees with the CPO that some needs of the government
24 must be procured from off-island. However, these must be justified by a significantly lower price
25 or by a determination that no business for such supplies or services may be found on Guam.”).
26

27 28
29 30 31 32
33 34 35 36
37 38 39 40
41 42 43 44
45 46 47 48
49 50 51 52
53 54 55 56
57 58 59 60
61 62 63 64
65 66 67 68
69 70 71 72
73 74 75 76
77 78 79 80
81 82 83 84
85 86 87 88
89 90 91 92
93 94 95 96
97 98 99 100
101 102 103 104
105 106 107 108
109 110 111 112
113 114 115 116
117 118 119 120
121 122 123 124
125 126 127 128
129 130 131 132
133 134 135 136
137 138 139 140
141 142 143 144
145 146 147 148
149 150 151 152
153 154 155 156
157 158 159 160
161 162 163 164
165 166 167 168
169 170 171 172
173 174 175 176
177 178 179 180
181 182 183 184
185 186 187 188
189 190 191 192
193 194 195 196
197 198 199 200
201 202 203 204
205 206 207 208
209 210 211 212
213 214 215 216
217 218 219 220
221 222 223 224
225 226 227 228
229 230 231 232
233 234 235 236
237 238 239 240
241 242 243 244
245 246 247 248
249 250 251 252
253 254 255 256
257 258 259 260
261 262 263 264
265 266 267 268
269 270 271 272
273 274 275 276
277 278 279 280
281 282 283 284
285 286 287 288
289 290 291 292
293 294 295 296
297 298 299 300
299 300

V. CONCLUSION

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

- A. This is a pre-award matter, as ASC timely⁶ filed its protest before GGRF made an award related to the procurement at issue, within 14 days of when ASC knew or should have known of the facts giving rise to its protest.
 - B. ASC's protest is sustained and GGRF's decision denying the protest concerning the local procurement preference is reversed and vacated, and this matter is remanded to GGRF.
 - C. Guam law requires GGRF to apply the local preference at 5 G.C.A. § 5008 to the RFP.
 - D. GGRF is ordered pursuant to 5 G.C.A. § 5451 to cancel the RFP, or revise it to comply with the law.
 - E. The parties shall bear their respective costs and attorney's fees.

This is a Final Administrative Decision for Appeal No. OPA-PA-25-007. The Parties are hereby informed of their right to appeal the Public Auditor's Decision to the Superior Court of Guam in accordance with Part D of Article 9 of 5 G.C.A. §5481(a) within fourteen (14) days after receipt of a Final Administrative Decision. A copy of this Decision shall be provided to the Parties and their

⁶ In finding ASC's protest was timely and further that this appeal was within the Public Auditor's jurisdiction, the Public Auditor orally announced a decision on the Motion to Dismiss on September 29, 2025 beginning at minute mark 1:20-6:20 of the hearing recording. The Public Auditor emphasized that the date ASC knew or should have known of its basis for protest concerning the local preference, was April 10, 2025, when GGRF responded to ASC's written questions concerning the RFP.

1 respective attorneys, in accordance with 5 G.C.A. §5702, and shall be made available for review on
2 the OPA website at www.opaguam.org.
3
4

5 **DATED this 26th day of November 2025.**

6 
7
8

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

BENJAMIN J.F. CRUZ
Public Auditor of Guam



Jerrick Hernandez <jhernandez@guamopa.com>

OPA-PA-25-007 Decision

Jerrick Hernandez <jhernandez@guamopa.com>

Wed, Nov 26, 2025 at 4:49 PM

To: William Brennan <wbrennan@arriolafirm.com>, Vince Camacho <vcamacho@camachocalvo.law>, "Arsima A. Muller" <amuller@carlsmith.com>, "Joanne L. Grimes" <jgrimes@carlsmith.com>

Cc: Arriola Law Firm General Information <attorneys@arriolafirm.com>, Paula Blas <pmblas@ite.net>, Maryann Manglona <mmanglona@guamopa.com>, Trevor-Jon Ada Ybarra <tybarra@camachocalvo.law>

Hafa Adai,

Please see attached Decision for OPA-PA-25-007. 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, CIA, CGFM, CFE, CICA, CGAP
Accountability Auditor

Office of Public Accountability
+1 671 475 0390 (ext. 204)
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.

 **25-007 Decision (final for transmittal).pdf**
184K