

| WRITTEN RECORD OF HEARING | |
|--|---|
| February 9, 2007 – Hearing re OPA-PA-06-003 L.P. Ganacias Enterprises Inc. dba RadioCom | |
| Hearing Officer | Therese M. Terlaje |
| Hearing | L.P. Ganacias Enterprise Inc., dba RadioCom |
| OPA Hearing No. | OPA-PA-06-003 |
| Time of Hearing | 10 a.m. |
| Where | DVR Conference Room Pacific News Building 6 th Floor 238 Archbishop Flores Street Hagatna, Guam 96910 |
| Parties Present | Doris Flores Brooks, Public Auditor Therese M. Terlaje, Hearings Officer, Procurement Appeals JoAnnalynn Fullerton, AA, Procurement Appeals Kevin J. Fowler, Attorney for Appellant Maria Victoria Ganacias Borja, Vice Pres. /General Manager, RadioCom Danilo M. Ganacias, Systems Engineer, RadioCom Donald Bourgeois, Assistant Attorney General for GSA/OHS Claudia C. Acfalle, CPO, GSA |
| Identification of Documents Presented | Mr. Fowler presented 3 exhibits – Exhibit 1 – OHS Procurement Records Exhibit 2 – GSA Agency Report Exhibit 3 – Emails (6 pages of a combination of mails) -- Email dated June 18, 2006 from Joe Javellana to Mark Sayama, re Formal Request for Approval on Reprogramming of GPD Allocation; email dated June 7, 2006 from Billy Powers to Joe Javellana; email dated June 6, 2006 from Joe Javellana to Billy Powers; email dated April 18, 2006 from Billy Powers to Joe Javellana; and email dated April 17, 2006 from Joe Javellana to Billy Powers |
| Written Statements Presented at Hearing | None |
| Summary of Hearing | <i>This section has full excerpts of the opening of the Hearing, Opening Statements and Closing Statements of Mr. Fowler and Mr. Bourgeois. A listing of the witnesses is also provided. Should you wish to hear their testimonies, please go to the OPA Website www.guamopa.org and click on Procurement Appeals, go to OPA-PA-06-003 and click on audio. Thank you.</i> Ms. Terlaje: Good Morning Everyone Mr. Fowler: Good Morning Mr. Bourgeois: Good Morning |

Ms. Terlaje: This hearing. This is to call a hearing in the appeal of L.P. Ganacias Enterprise, Inc. dba RadioCom (Appellant), Docket No. OPA-PA-06-003. I am Therese Terlaje, Hearing Officer for this hearing and this is Doris Brooks, Public Auditor. If the parties could please state their appearances for the record: The following introduced themselves: Kevin Fowler, Counsel for RadioCom, Vicky Borja, Vice President and General Manager for RadioCom, Dan Ganacias, Systems Engineer for RadioCom; Claudia Acfalle, General Service Agency (GSA), Don Bourgeois, AG's office for GSA; and I will just say my name, Doris Brooks, Public Auditor.

Ms. Terlaje: All right. There are microphones here if anyone would like to use them just to project your voice. I want to make sure that we can hear up here. All right. And if there is nothing else before we begin, we are going straight into opening statements.

Mr. Fowler: I do have a procedural matter to begin with.

Ms. Terlaje: All right, Mr. Fowler.

Mr. Fowler: You know we met yesterday and we heard a number of issues that the Public Auditor would like to have addressed and in reviewing those issues yesterday to be prepared to respond to them, I question whether we do in fact have a jurisdictional issue despite the parties' stipulation that there are no jurisdictional questions. This is in relation to Ms. Brooks raising the issue of a federal grant. Now I don't know specifically why that was raised, but I looked at that and there are some statutory provisions in our procurement code that might question whether a federal grant is subject to jurisdiction under the Guam Procurement Act. Typically, jurisdiction should be dealt with as a threshold matter, it can be raised at any time in any proceeding and it is never waived by the parties. If the OPA does not have jurisdiction over this dispute, we should resolve that first. Again, I don't know how that concern arose in the mind of the Public Auditor but I don't want to go forward on a proceeding over which there may no jurisdiction and it is a question of whether this is a federal grant. In all the documents I have received from the GSA or Homeland Security I have only found one document that references federal grant now many times federal grants tie their expenditures to compliance with local laws, if this one is a grant and if it was issued under a program requiring compliance with local procurement law, we would have jurisdiction here; if this is not a federal grant, we would have jurisdiction here. I raise that for the Auditor's consideration, I do believe jurisdiction should always be taken care of as a threshold matter. And I don't ... I assume that is what you referring to yesterday Mrs. Brooks when you referred to the federal grant question.

Ms. Terlaje: Well, could we hear from Mr. Bourgeois. Do you have any -

Mr. Bourgeois: I have no comments this was brought to my attention by Mr. Fowler just 3 ½ minutes ago, and that's fine, I understand that it just occurred to him last night. So I have no comment on it at all. Other than we are prepared to proceed today. And if the matter is set over taken off the docket, this project for the people of Guam will fail, and there will be no early warning system.

Mrs. Brooks: The reason why I raised the question was because of just the nature of Homeland Security has a lot of federal grants and I wanted to determine just in my own mind whether or not it was a federal grant or a local appropriation. That was purely a question that I just wanted to know because if it is a federal grant and depending on the review let say by the auditors, it could also effect a finding situation. That is all I was coming from and it did not appear from the record whether or not that it was a federal grant but we determined that the money was paid out of a federal grant. So and that is why I ask the question about the background because federal grants require certain other information and certain other approvals to ensure that the procurement record was complete as to approval from the federal grantor as to the system and so on. So these are all of the part of the questions I was leading up to in determining from the record. Just in my own mind as an auditor these are things that normally would happen in a procurement file. So that is what I was looking at.

Mr. Bourgeois: In that regard, I believe that we will have witnesses that should be able to answer your specific questions. But I am not sure that satisfies Mr. Fowler.

Ms. Terlaje: Well, as to the jurisdiction, I agree that that should be taken care of first. However, even based on your statements, I am not so sure that the record is that clear and that there are facts that you might need to bring up. I mean I'll admit because this was not raised by the AG-the government, and I am assuming that there are no federal grant issues like that, I mean that would move jurisdiction.

Mr. Fowler: I agree they have not raised it but also the government is not allowed cannot waive sovereign immunity only the legislature can waive sovereign immunity. If a procurement act does not apply to this, it is a sovereign immunity issue.

Mrs. Brooks: Again, you know, I am not a legal person here, the whole process of us handling procurement appeals is to talk more in a layman's person. It's just been my understanding from all the audits we have done, that local law will always, first of all you have federal law and then you have local law, local law will apply so long as if local law is greater than federal law, so local law needs to be consistent with federal law as far as grant procurement. That has always been my understanding. So if local

law is (pardon the expression) weaker than federal law then federal law with respect to the grant will be the determining factor was it in compliance with the grant agreement. That has just been the general gist, I don't want to get into the legalities but that is how we look at it from an audit perspective, so that is the reason why I wanted to ask the question of on the record was this a federal grant because then there are issues with regards to sole source procurement that affects the grant.

Mr. Fowler: Well, we are prepared to go forward.

Mrs. Brooks: Thank you.

Mr. Fowler: Our case is slight and

Mrs. Brooks: If you are prepared to go forward, we are too; we would like to go forward.

Mr. Fowler: But there was one other issue raised by the AG in terms of requesting leave to continue the hearing to bring in an off island witness. I don't know if we are going to deal that now or.

Mr. Bourgeois: I was gonna bring this up in the preliminary.

Ms. Terlaje: I would like to deal with that maybe at the end of our witnesses today? And if...

Mr. Bourgeois: That is exactly. That is exactly what I was going to say, Mr. Fowler and I had a brief pre-hearing conference and I mentioned to him that this witness, Mr. Bill Flynn is the principal for SES USA, and he is the man that is kind of hunching up the project here on Guam. He would know the ins and outs and the goods and bads and the technical parts of the interoperability, the interface nature of his early warning system with the Navy's and Air Force's of which is also an SES system. Anticipating that there might be some sort of a question that would come up that you might have about the actual details of the system. We might want to put on Mr. Flynn to testify to that. Mr. Flynn is going to be on the island in about a week.

Mrs. Brooks: But Mr. Bourgeois, with all do due respect, he is the vendor, therefore, his comments are going to be biased toward what he is doing, therefore, I would without knowing the details I would already object to his presence because he is the vendor.

Mr. Bourgeois: Okay, well, that is the reason I was, well these folks are also the vendors and they are going to testify with respect to their system.

Mrs. Brooks: Their

Mr. Bourgeois: But my point is if it turns out that this not necessary.

Mrs. Brooks: Right

Mr. Bourgeois: As the Hearing Officer said, then I want to keep this simple.

Mrs. Brooks: Right.

Mr. Bourgeois: And I would say let's don't put on Mr. Flynn, because why hold it open because it also delays this and I want to keep as short and as linear as we can. So I would agree that at the end of the testimony, if we could address this again, is that possible?

Ms. Terlaje: Similar to raising the motion at the, you know, before you end your presentation, that if you, you know, want to request that it be kept -- that option to bring in that witness -- then you would at that time and then at that time present again for what purpose that witness.

Mr. Bourgeois: Yeah. And then

Ms. Terlaje: And then at a certain time, Mr. Fowler, we hold it up till that time.

Mr. Bourgeois: I also want to make a statement, I think Mr. Fowler is suffering from the same problem. Normally, when we litigate, we go to pre-hearing conference and then pre-hearing conference or the trial is a couple of weeks later gives you plenty of time to react to what happened in the pre-hearing conference. This system is so fast that 24 hrs when we exchange witness lists and we exchange documents we look at these and then we go home and say oh now we know what we are going to litigate. So that is why I reacted to in asking -- by the way on the same day that the witness list is acquired we actually provided it that day, that 's why I did it that way, if this were two weeks off we wouldn't have this problem. So but anyway that is just my statement.

Mrs. Brooks: All right.

Mr. Bourgeois: That's good.

Ms. Terlaje: Are we ready to begin then? Shall we begin?

Mr. Fowler: Yeah, I was going to begin with a brief opening statement.

Ms. Terlaje: Yes. We will try to stick as close to 5 minutes as possible. I'll just make a slight noise or --

Mr. Fowler: I don't think that that will be a problem.

Ms. Terlaje: indication. But, I will put these up. It's not that strict either. Go ahead, Mr. Fowler.

Opening Statement:

Mr. Fowler: RadioCom obviously has protested the sole source selection of the early warning system by the GSA. It objects to the sole source procurement of the warning system because it also is a vendor of a competing warning system manufactured by Federal Signal. They have in fact installed the warning system on Rota, they are bidding to install their system on the Navy base, they have designed it to work in conjunction with the existing Whelen sirens on the base. Beyond that I am not going to go in on how they do that or whether in fact it works, I don't believe that is our burden I do believe that's an issue that must be vented out at the procurement level at the administrative level. So the only testimony I will put on from RadioCom is that they have a competing system, they can make it work with Whelen, and they are bidding on a Navy project. We simply believe we should have received an invitation to bid on the project. And then it could have submitted its bid, they are a local vendor, we will show that they fit within 5 GCA §5008 governing the policy in favor of local procurement. Beyond that this case really rests on the administrative record, as all administrative appeals should. The procurement record in this case does not justify a sole source procurement. We know it doesn't justify a sole source procurement since RadioCom is in fact here. The procurement record documents illustrates that Guam does not have an early warning system, so you cannot do a sole source procurement based on the need for compatibility with existing equipment. The government has argued that they needed to go with the Whelen system because that is in place, that is the product in place on the Navy and Air Force bases on Guam and that they want these systems to be interoperable. However, there is no evidence whatsoever in the procurement record that the military is going to let Guam hook up to its system. In fact, we know that the federal government does not even put their military children in our local schools. But you gotta think about how many soldiers and troops will be jumping out of bed at 3 in the morning if their warning system went off and it wasn't triggered by the military but by somebody at Guam Civil Defense. I don't think as a logical matter that that would ever happen and there is nothing in this procurement record to illustrate that the federal government agreed to hook up their system with Guam's. There is no specification or charges for going on to military bases and hooking up to their systems. So the compatibility issue on which our protest was denied is simply false. There is

nothing in the record to show that. Because this was not a proper sole source procurement, RadioCom should have been allowed to submit a bid. Thank you.

Ms. Terlaje: Okay, Mr. Bourgeois.

Mr. Bourgeois: I'll be even briefer.

Ms. Terlaje: All right.

Mr. Bourgeois: I'm sure we will give it a chance to sum up and I am sure Mr. Fowler and I will give more detail at a later time. Just suffice to say that as far as GSA's position is concerned that all factors are in place that support a sole source procurement in this instance. The law is satisfied and we will recite the specifics of 2 GAR 3112 (b) and regarding more of what Mr. Fowler said yesterday, I guess, then today about the status and the state of the procurement record nowhere in the law that I found does it state that an alleged omission and only an alleged because we feel there is no omission in the procurement record is the basis for cancellation or rescission of a procurement that is not the penalty. There are some penalties about perjury for not keeping proper records but this isn't a criminal court, and although you can shake your finger maybe at some Ts that weren't crossed and Is that weren't dotted that does not mean you throw out an early warning system for the island of Guam. But in response to what the current concerns seems to be here today what the discussion was yesterday, I will put on evidence about all of the issues that Mr. Fowler and the panel is concerned about. And I do encourage you both to ask as we go along, stop the testimony if something occurs to you and just ask the question right there in case somehow we have skipped over something that you are concerned about. All right nothing further.

Mr. Fowler called Ms. Vicky Borja:

Ms. Borja, VP/GM, sworn and testified. (Refer to full audio)

Mr. Bourgeois called Mr. Leo Espia:

Mr. Leo Espia, OHS Planner, sworn and testified. (Refer to full audio)

Lunch Break

Mr. Bourgeois called Mr. Javellana:

Mr. Javellana, Grants Coordinator, OHS, sworn and testified twice. (Refer to full audio)

Mr. Bourgeois called Senator Frank Blas Jr.:

Senator Frank Blas Jr. (former OHS Advisor), sworn and testified.
(Refer to full audio)

Mr. Bourgeois called Ms. Claudia Acfalle:

Ms. Claudia Acfalle, CPO, GSA, sworn and testified. (Refer to full audio)

Ms. Terlaje: Back on the record. We are back now for some short closing statements. Mr. Fowler would you mind going first?

Closing Statements:

Mr. Fowler: Thank you. As I noted in my opening comments, I really believe that there is very little for RadioCom to have to show here other than they have a warning system and that it is compatible with the Whelen system that is on the military bases. Because they are a local Guam vendor and we elicited testimony from Vicky that they comply with 5008, I believe it is, on the preference for local procurement, they should have been preferred for this project over anybody off island. Particularly, since this is money that would be going through the Guam economy, and it bothers me to a great deal when our government sends money off island when it is unnecessary, and at a time when we need tax revenues. In any event, because RadioCom is a local vendor of a warning system, you cannot do a sole source procurement for this warning system. This is most particularly true because as Leo stated in his requisition form that he spent sometime showing you. It says right there Guam does not have an early warning system. So how did we get to this issue of compatibility? As Leo testified he looked over the fence up at Anderson and saw that they had Whelen sirens, that became his standard. Joe really said nothing different then that. It is a standard, we need to have a standard. Well, does that mean that if the military buys a Ford Bronco, GovGuam must buy nothing but Ford Broncos? No. This National Preparedness Goal I addressed heavily in my comments to the Agency Report. First of all it only applies to federal civilian agencies and it does not apply to the military. However, the Secretary of Defense may indicate those military assets that may be made available to civilian authorities. And, of course, there is no evidence in this record that the Secretary of Defense has made the Whelen Siren System on Anderson Air Force Base or the Navy available to Guam. So really that whole thing about the National Preparedness Goal has got nothing to do with this procurement. In any event, as Vicky testified they are compatible with Whelen, they should have had a chance to demonstrate that. Now it could be that the administrative procurement officials at the agency level fed out these bids from competitors and find that well the Federal Signal

thing doesn't work that well with Whelen and may be they lose but at least they were allowed the due process and equal protection rights to bid on a government contract. They were denied that. Nor did anybody even try to find out if there was any local vendor of a warning system. Of course, they knew because Frank Blas testified that Vicky told him they offer a warning system and though he said he would do RFP, he did not. The procurement record itself is in poor shape, it is obviously incomplete. Leo did most of the initial work. He doesn't know the Procurement Act so he probably didn't know that he had to keep a log of all communications with potential vendors or any of the other things that go into a proper procurement record. And nobody certified this record under penalty of perjury. This is without question a construction contract. That is why RadioCom is working with general contractors bidding on the Navy project. General Contractors because it is a construction of project. You gotta put up the pole, you gotta mount the sirens, you gotta fence it out. I believe even this was addressed in the materials provided by SES, where they indicated that on the Air Force Base there were just fences around these poles but that is because the Air Force Base and the Navy Base are well protected. They said because we will be placing these signals somewhere out in the remote areas of Guam to prevent against theft, we may want to harden the structures to protect and preserve the poles. That's construction. When you have construction contracts under our procurement code, you must put into those contracts all required contract clauses and that is under 5 GCA 5306. Typically, in your Invitation to Bid, the government will send out an invitation and in that invitation they check out all -- these little boxes, they check all the contract clauses that are going to be included in that contract and it always includes a payment bond, it includes a bid bond and you know there is a provision that I can't cite to you where they can waive some of the clauses but you gotta have the contract clauses it is mandatory and, of course, that's not there. In addition, to the preference for local procurement Section 5010 requires that procurements be planned in advanced enough to maximize competition because we know through competition we get our best and lowest prices. SES didn't have to worry about competition, we did not get our best price. There is no way you get the best price when there is no competition. You know the idea about having parts available, you know these aren't aircraft, the types of parts that would be required to be held on hand would easily be kept on hand by local Guam vendors, such as RadioCom and we testified and Vicky testified they have got a system in Rota and they, of course, are prepared to maintain that just as they would be prepared to maintain a system on Guam.

Going back to the procurement record and the conduct of the contract, when we got the procurement record on December 29 filed with the OPA that's got to be the procurement record what was not in that record was the June 21st, 2006 letter from SES signed by two people on the bottom that said SES is the only person that could interface or maintain these sirens. I submit that

letter was fraudulent and it was backdated. Interfacing was not a question. Leo said they weren't interfacing and Joe never said they were interfacing, all they talked about was that the Whelen system was there so that's the standard. That letter popped up in the Agency report and it has been cut off on the top and it has been cut off on the bottom. And I think that it has been doctored and I think there is enough evidence there for a finding to be made on that basis. In addition, SES said that they are the only company that can maintain this or interface and that is just a lie, they aren't the only company that vends the Whelen system and, in fact, RadioCom can interface with that system if it is necessary. Further, SES in December of 2006 for some reason sends a letter in that comes as part of the procurement record after our protest has been filed. Leo testified that he talked to them after our protest has been filed. I believed that letter was sent in by SES to further conspire to get this project unlawfully. So I believe, first of all, this procurement was run poorly it was not properly documented, it was not properly justified and the contractor is in cahoots to get this project because it is worth a lot of money. Now you wanted to hear about remedies yesterday, the remedies are when a contractor acts in bad faith you can terminate the contractor and require them to rebid it and that is what we would ask you to do. We should have local Guam contractors doing work on Guam. Thank you.

Ms. Terlaje: All right, Mr. Bourgeois

Mr. Bourgeois: Thank you, this ah, sitting here all day my one comment in closing is this falls into the nice try rule, I cannot imagine

Ms. Terlaje: The what?

Mr. Bourgeois: The nice try rule, nice try on the part of the plaintiffs in this case. When I knew, I knew that the competitor?, the plaintiffs are grasping at straws when they started talking about doctored documents, when they started talking about back dated documents, I mean if you take any event in life, the JFK assassination, if you look at it long enough, you are going to find something this looks irregular there is going to be a xerox copy with something. This is not it. Even though the witness said that we would be happy to provide the entire document, if you like. I didn't hear any request for that. Well, this happened, that happened, the procurement record is incomplete, therefore, the entire process should be thrown out. I didn't hear any citation to any part of the law that says that the penalty for an incomplete procurement record is rescission of the deal. This isn't some sort of a clubby thing where some vendor comes out and buys some people drinks and takes them out to nightclubs and gets a deal in that regard. The testimony is clear that the way SES got this contract was totally inadvertent, inadvertent in the sense that Leo went to a conference in Oregon, discovered that Oregon has SES systems, northern California has an SES

system, the State of Washington has an SES system, and here is how it works, he comes back and reports they've got this SES system and it looks pretty good! And well, guess what? The Navy and the Air Force have SES systems. Now here I disagree with this, I'll tell you this right now, if the Air Force, if the Government of Guam wanted to buy vehicles that interfaced with the vehicles on Anderson Air Force Base, and those vehicles on Anderson Air Force Base were Ford Explorers, Government of Guam would be buying Ford Explorers. So that, so that's what we are talking about interoperability. You bet they would be. Or show some way how those parts would interchange. Yeah, that is a bad example. This is all smoking mirrors, I told these people right afterwards, we went into the little room in there, I said thank you for being the witnesses you were. In my 35 years of practicing law, I have never seen better witnesses than I put on today, and it is not me it's them, they knew their files, they knew what the "H" they were talking about, and I told them when I interviewed them several times over the last 4 days. I said you don't worry me a bit. I worry when we are trying to hide something or that we're trying to squeeze something in that you know looks a little – we want a shade make the shade look better than it is. I said you know what you can say anything you want. I will ask general questions, because the panel asked us to go through a timeline and that is exactly what I did. You said what happened then? What happened then? They could have said anything. But I knew they were going to tell the truth and I knew they were going to tell the truth in such a way that is afforded this process. I didn't know anything about this process a week ago. I learned it and I learned how these people work and I learned how credible they are and I learned that they have a tough job. I mean they are a lot brighter about this system than I am about law a lot more. If you look ... If you took my file and put it under the x-ray, and put me on the stand you would probably disbar me. I mean my file is so irregular I couldn't support anything I did and sometimes lawyers have to do that. But boy talk about crossing the "ts" and dotting the "is" ah. Claudia here you couldn't ask her a question that she didn't have to refer to a single document. She knew enough from the top of her head. That is how skilled these people are. They know exactly what happened, when it happened, how it happened, and why.

Lets talk public policy, do we want this process to be any different than it is under these circumstances? This isn't some shipment of Kleenex that we are in here worried about and that somebody that some other vendor should be selling those kinds of products or boxes of nails that's a different deal. This is a very important project for this island, to all of us in this room, and I am very happy that this process went the way it did. That these people picked the provider they did and that that system is going to be set up in such a way that the Air Force and the Navy when the balloon goes up those guys are going to be there for us and we will be there for them. That's the way this thing works. And that's the only way that it can work with defense

| | |
|---------------|---|
| | <p>systems like that and in this circumstance that it just worked out perfectly for this government that SES happened to have the one that it filled in the gap between the two poles. This is a no-brainer to me. I mean I can't - I am happy when we went through this process because this just makes it easy for us to see how wonderful these people are in these agencies. I am very very impressed! If I were to ask you, based upon what you saw today, who you saw today, the testimony that they gave, and the way they gave it, under the law, by the way the law perfectly supports everybody that testified today. Claudia's procurement record, the way she set up the sole source procurement, the work that the people did in preparing the recommendation for the Senator. I mean sure I mean life isn't perfect, then there are fits and starts and this was happening and that - I will tell you what a fit and start is - it is this process holding up this project. If we had to set this over to bring in expert testimony or some other irregularity, this project could lose its federal funding, that would be nice, then we would not have anything and nobody would be setting up sirens. Okay, fortunately, we are moving ahead, that is one reason why I decided not to bring in Bill Flynn whom I spoke with. I think any questions that you folks would have about what happened, in terms of the procurement of this, Counsel could cross-examine Bill Flynn to find out exactly how this contract came to be. And I don't think that he'll find any that big a document(s) or altered language. Anyway, we have to save time, because this is moving along, this is - next month this has to be finished. Now I am going to ask this panel not only to approve what these people did, I'm gonna ask you to do it fast, because you have 30 days to do it, win lose or draw, please issue an opinion as soon as you can. So we can get on with it. That's all I have.</p> <p>Ms. Terlaje: Thank you Mr. Bourgeois. All right well then that brings this hearing to a close, thank you everyone for being here, like you said the Public Auditor has 30 days for a decision to issue.</p> <p>Hearing ended at 4:01 pm.</p> |
| Audio Copy | Available on CD and online OPA website www.guamopa.org |
| Fee(s) | \$15.00 per audio CD |
| Transcription | On request, please contact: George Castro, Depo Resources, 688-3376 |
| | <p>Per OPA request: 3 testimonies (Claudia Acfalle, Victoria Borja, and Leo Espia) transcribed. Anyone wishing to obtain copies of already transcribed testimonies will have to pay for copies of the transcripts ordered.</p> <p>Please contact: George Castro, Depo Resources, 688-3376.</p> |