GUAM EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES FOUNDATION, INC. ("GEFF"), an interested party and the offeror selected as the most qualified in the instant procurement, joins in DPW's list of issues to be determined by the OPA. In addition, GEFF respectfully submits the following list of issues:

LIST OF ISSUES

With regard to Core Tech's protest which is the subject of Appeal No. OPA-PA-16-007:

- 1. Whether, after GEFF's selection as the most qualified offeror, DPW's consideration of GEFF's alternative price estimates for construction of the new Simon Sanchez High School constituted permissible negotiations in accordance with the terms of the RFP, which permitted negotiations concerning fee estimates and scope of work?
- 2. Whether Core Tech's May 27, 2016 protest ground relative to DPW's consideration of GEFF's four alternative price estimates was *untimely* asserted because Core Tech knew or should have known since at least September 23, 2015 (the issuance date of Addendum 6 to the RFP) that the terms of the RFP permitted negotiations concerning a fee estimate and scope of work *after* selection of the most qualified offeror?
- 3. Whether Core Tech's protest relative to a performance and payment bond is without merit, because it is undisputed that (a) the RFP states that either the awardee *or its prime contractor* must provide a performance and payment bond, (b) GEFF's prime contractor, Hensel Phelps, is bondable up to \$1 billion, and (c) in any event, a bond is not due at this time until plans and specifications are completed in conjunction with the first Task Order under an executed IDIQ?
- 4. Whether Core Tech's attempt to inject *new* issues in this appeal that were *not* raised its Core Tech's protest or in DPW's decision denying the protest (for example, issues mentioned in Core Tech's Comments on DPW's Agency Report relative to the proposed subcontractual arrangement between GEFF and GEDP, GDOE's 4/19/16 internal memorandum, and Core Tech's cost-comparison analysis based on an exhibit it failed to submit) should be disregarded as outside the scope of the OPA's jurisdiction?