



S & M SAKAMOTO, INC.

GENERAL CONTRACTORS

March 16, 2023

TO: HONORABLE SCOT MATAYOSHI, CHAIR, HONORABLE ANDREW TAKUYA GARRETT, VICE CHAIR, AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

SUBJECT: **SUPPORT FOR S.B. 1135, RELATING TO PROCUREMENT.** Requires cash or protest bonds to be returned to the initiating parties, minus administrative costs, except in cases where the appeal was frivolous or made in bad faith.

HEARING

DATE: March 16, 2023
TIME: 9:30 a.m.
PLACE: Conference Room 309

Dear Chair Matayoshi, Vice Chair Garrett and Members of the Committee,

S & M Sakamoto, Inc., General Contractor

S & M Sakamoto, Inc. supports S.B. 1135 Relating to Procurement, which requires the cash or protest bonds to be returned to the initiating parties, minus administrative costs, except in cases where the appeal was frivolous or made in bad faith.

S & M Sakamoto, Inc. supports this measure because it promotes fair and ethical procurement by adopting safeguard language that prevents the chilling effect of deterring legitimate appeals of agency decisions regarding bid protests. In fact, every other state that requires a cash or protest bond to appeal an agency's bid protest decision has adopted some form of this concept.

The primary purpose of the Procurement Code is to ensure fair and ethical procurement while maximizing the use of public funds.

Two years ago, the Legislature passed legislation that requires a party protesting an agency decision to put up a 1% cash or protest bond without a cap. The purpose of the cash or protest bond is to prevent the filing of frivolous appeals.

However, we believe that the Legislature inadvertently left out safeguard language that the other states who require cash or protest bonds without a cap use for appeals to also prevent the chilling effect of deterring legitimate protests on large projects. The safeguard language that the other states use allows for the return of the bond, minus the administrative costs associated with hearing the appeal, unless the appeal is found to be frivolous or in bad faith. This provision ensures a balance that deters frivolous appeals without the unintended consequence of also deterring legitimate appeals on large projects.

Essentially, the effect of the removal of a bond cap provision without adopting this safeguard language is that it prevents bidders from appealing an agency's bid protest decision on large projects because it raises the cost of the appeal so high that it becomes unaffordable and no longer fiscally prudent. This altered the landscape of the

procurement code by reducing one of its checks and balances. This provision removed any realistic oversight of decisions on large projects and allows agencies to go unchecked.

The impact of this legislation has already drawn the attention of several media outlets. Public trust and confidence in government should not be further eroded.¹ Every state that requires a bond to appeal an agency decision implements safeguards to ensure that the protest is fair and affordable.

Allowing for the return of the cash or protest bond, minus administrative costs, unless the appeal is found to be frivolous or in bad faith will promote fair and ethical procurement for the following reasons:

1. **REQUIRING A BID PROTEST BOND IS OUT OF STEP WITH THE MAJORITY OF STATES AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT:**

In the entire country, only seven (7) states impose a bond requirement to submit a bid protest or seek an appeal of a bid protest decision. This includes Hawaii. Other than these seven (7) states, every other state does not impose such a requirement, and the federal government does not either. This is because most states recognize “the value of having workable procedures for bidders and contractors to file bid protests, appeals, complaints and contract claims, noting that “[a] procurement system that is truly open isn’t afraid to be challenged on its contract award and management decisions.” Current bid protest practices among the states suggest that incorporating a fair mechanism to evaluate bid protests helps to ensure a level playing field for all vendors. The approach recommended in the NASPO Practical Guide is to have procedures established by law providing the opportunity for a bid protestor or contractor to appeal decisions on bid protests and contract claims, a fair hearing on the issues and prompt resolution. See NASPO Research Brief on State Bid Protests dated April 2013, https://www.naspo.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/FINAL_NASPO_BidProtests_Research_Brief_042413.pdf.

2. **AMONG THE FEW STATES THAT REQUIRE A BOND, HAWAII IS THE SOLE OUTLIER -- THE ONLY STATE -- THAT REQUIRES IMMEDIATE FORFEITURE OF BOND FUNDS**

According to the 2013 NASPO study, it found only seven (7) out of fifty states, which require a protest bond of some sort. This includes Hawaii. Of these seven states, **Hawaii is the ONLY state that imposes immediate forfeiture of the bond to the State’s general fund if a protestor loses an appeal.** Every one of the other six states that impose a bond requirement, only require either partial forfeiture to pay for costs, or forfeiture under certain conditions, most often a frivolous or bad faith protest:

¹ https://www.civilbeat.org/?p=1443162&mc_cid=4772bbfeef&mc_eid=7e39375e0a
<https://www.bizjournals.com/pacific/news/2021/05/26/hawaii-bill-drive-up-cost-appeal-bid-protest-rule.html>
<https://www.hawaiiconstructionlaw.com/blog/2021/05/a-bill-awaiting-governors-signature-will-be-bad-for-procurement.html>

NO STATUTORY BOND REQUIRED	BOND REQUIRED, BUT CLAIMS AGAINST THE BOND ARE LIMITED AND/OR NO INSTANT FORFEITURE UPON FAILURE TO PREVAIL ON BID PROTEST OR APPEAL	BOND REQUIRED, IMMEDIATE FORFEITURE UPON LOSING APPEAL OF BID PROTEST DECISION
Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming	CALIFORNIA - Bond may be required, may be subjected to forfeiture if found in bad faith/frivolous.	Hawaii
	FLORIDA - Bond only limited to Department of Transportation projects, bond recovery limited to costs and charges incurred during the protest, and forfeiture only if administrative judge finds the protest was frivolous or improper.	
	NEVADA - Protest bond is only required when the chief procurement officers require it. Bond is lesser of 25% of the bid or \$250,000. If protest if rejected a claim can be brought against the protestor for the expenses incurred by the public	

	body. Remainder returned to bidder.	
	South Carolina - Bond possible but not required, state can only recover costs and charges associated with the protest from the bond. Remaining bond funds are returned to the protestor.	
	TENNESSEE - Bond is 5%, small business owners can apply for an exemption, and bond amount is to be used for costs and subject to forfeiture only upon a finding of bad faith or frivolous action.	
	UTAH - Protest bond depends upon the contract price, bond forfeiture upon losing appeal is only if the government finds that the protest was frivolous or filed only to delay.	

3. THE BOND AMOUNT HURTS COMPETITION AND THE PERCEPTION OF HAWAII AS A STATE THAT SUPPORTS OPEN AND FAIR PROCUREMENT.

Hawaii is already the sole outlier punishing bidders who seek independent review of State agency actions, by imposing a bond requirement plus immediate forfeiture, on unsuccessful bid protest appellants. By making the amount of the bond so high, the State is effectively eliminating appeals except for those companies large enough to bear the risk of such punishment. Enabling justice only for those who can afford it, is exactly at odds with the purpose of the procurement code.

4. THE BOND AMOUNT IS AN INEFFECTIVE REVENUE GENERATOR.

If the idea of increasing the bond amount is to generate revenue for the State, this is short sighted, because half of the bid protests and appeals are made by **low** bidders whose bids have been rejected for reasons the bidder disputes. For example, in the Maui Kuponu bid protest, they were the low bidder by \$700,000.00. Their bid was rejected. If they had been required to post a bond for \$250,000 on that \$25 million dollar job, they would not have pursued it. The State and its taxpayers would have had to pay \$700,000 more for the work. Moreover, the issue in that case was subcontractor listing, and whether non-construction contractor entities like truckers and other service providers, needed

to be listed in bids. The prospect of having to list unlicensed noncontractor entities as subcontractors in a bid would have totally changed and disrupted procurement, bogged down jobs in protests, and cost the State millions and millions of dollars. The substantive merits of the case would not have been addressed without a bid protest and appeal, yet that is what would have happened if the current bond requirement had been in place. (see decision, https://cca.hawaii.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/PDH-2021-003-MAUI-KUPONO-BUILDERS-v-DEPT-OF-TRANSPORTATION_with-Final-Judgment.pdf)

5. **BOND FORFEITURE OF AN UNCAPPED AMOUNT IN EVERY INSTANCE IN WHICH A BIDDER FAILS TO PREVAIL WILL ELIMINATE OVERSIGHT AND OPEN GOVERNMENT – THE PURPOSE OF BID PROTESTS.** It should be noted that the filing fee for an action in Circuit Court is \$315.00. The previous cap on a request for administrative review of bid protest decisions was \$10,000.00, nearly 32 times the cost of a civil action. In the Maui Kuponono case, the crucial public scrutiny, and findings, would have been impossible without the filing of an appeal and a request to review such actions.

Public procurement cannot be beyond the public's review, yet imposing an uncapped bond requirement as a condition of review, that subjects a bidder to immediate punitive loss in the event its legitimate concerns do not result in a reversal of the agency's actions, would accomplish the same thing.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify in support of this measure.

Very truly yours,
S & M Sakamoto, Inc.



Francis Sakamoto, Jr.



RALPH S. INOUE CO LTD
GENERAL CONTRACTOR

500 Alakawa St., #220E
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

T: 808.839.9002
F: 808.833.5971

License No. ABC-457
Founded in 1962

March 14, 2023

TO: HONORABLE SCOT MATAYOSHI, CHAIR, HONORABLE ANDREW TAKUYA GARRETT, VICE CHAIR, AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

SUBJECT: **SUPPORT FOR S.B. 1135, RELATING TO PROCUREMENT.** Requires cash or protest bonds to be returned to the initiating parties, minus administrative costs, except in cases where the appeal was frivolous or made in bad faith.

HEARING

DATE: March 16, 2023
TIME: 9:30 a.m.
PLACE: Conference Room 309

Dear Chair Matayoshi, Vice Chair Garrett and Members of the Committee,

Ralph S Inouye Co, Ltd (RSI), a Hawaii general contractor for over 60 years, **supports S.B. 1135 Relating to Procurement**, which requires the cash or protest bonds to be returned to the initiating parties, minus administrative costs, except in cases where the appeal was frivolous or made in bad faith.

RSI supports this measure because it promotes fair and ethical procurement by adopting safeguard language that prevents the chilling effect of deterring legitimate appeals of agency decisions regarding bid protests. In fact, every other state that requires a cash or protest bond to appeal an agency's bid protest decision has adopted some form of this concept.

The primary purpose of the Procurement Code to is ensure fair and ethical procurement while maximining the use of public funds.

Two years ago, the Legislature passed legislation that requires a party protesting an agency decision to put up a 1% cash or protest bond without a cap. The purpose of the cash or protest bond is to prevent the filing of frivolous appeals.

However, we believe that the Legislature inadvertently left out safeguard language that the other states who require cash or protest bonds without a cap use for appeals to also prevent the chilling effect of deterring legitimate protests on large projects. The safeguard language that the other states use allows for the return of the bond, minus the administrative costs associated with hearing the appeal, unless the appeal is found to be frivolous or in bad faith. This provision ensures a balance that deters frivolous appeals without the unintended consequence of also deterring legitimate appeals on large projects.

Essentially, the effect of the removal of a bond cap provision without adopting this safeguard language is that it prevents bidders from appealing an agency's bid protest decision on large projects because it raises the cost of the appeal so high that it becomes unaffordable and no longer fiscally prudent. This altered the landscape of the

procurement code by reducing one of its checks and balances. This provision removed any realistic oversight of decisions on large projects and allows agencies to go unchecked.

The impact of this legislation has already drawn the attention of several media outlets. Public trust and confidence in government should not be further eroded.¹ Every state that requires a bond to appeal an agency decision implements safeguards to ensure that the protest is fair and affordable.

Allowing for the return of the cash or protest bond, minus administrative costs, unless the appeal is found to be frivolous or in bad faith will promote fair and ethical procurement for the following reasons:

1. **REQUIRING A BID PROTEST BOND IS OUT OF STEP WITH THE MAJORITY OF STATES AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT:**

In the entire country, only seven (7) states impose a bond requirement to submit a bid protest or seek an appeal of a bid protest decision. This includes Hawaii. Other than these seven (7) states, every other state does not impose such a requirement, and the federal government does not either. This is because most states recognize “the value of having workable procedures for bidders and contractors to file bid protests, appeals, complaints and contract claims, noting that “[a] procurement system that is truly open isn’t afraid to be challenged on its contract award and management decisions.” Current bid protest practices among the states suggest that incorporating a fair mechanism to evaluate bid protests helps to ensure a level playing field for all vendors. The approach recommended in the NASPO Practical Guide is to have procedures established by law providing the opportunity for a bid protestor or contractor to appeal decisions on bid protests and contract claims, a fair hearing on the issues and prompt resolution. See NASPO Research Brief on State Bid Protests dated April 2013, https://www.naspo.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/FINAL_NASPO_BidProtests_Research_Brief_042413.pdf .

2. **AMONG THE FEW STATES THAT REQUIRE A BOND, HAWAII IS THE SOLE OUTLIER -- THE ONLY STATE -- THAT REQUIRES IMMEDIATE FORFEITURE OF BOND FUNDS**

According to the 2013 NASPO study, it found only seven (7) out of fifty states, which require a protest bond of some sort. This includes Hawaii. Of these seven states, **Hawaii is the ONLY state that imposes immediate forfeiture of the bond to the State’s general fund if a protestor loses an appeal.** Every one of the other six states that impose a bond requirement, only require either partial forfeiture to pay for costs, or forfeiture under certain conditions, most often a frivolous or bad faith protest:

¹ https://www.civilbeat.org/?p=1443162&mc_cid=4772bbfeef&mc_eid=7e39375e0a
<https://www.bizjournals.com/pacific/news/2021/05/26/hawaii-bill-drive-up-cost-appeal-bid-protest-rule.html>
<https://www.hawaiiconstructionlaw.com/blog/2021/05/a-bill-awaiting-governors-signature-will-be-bad-for-procurement.html>

NO STATUTORY BOND REQUIRED	BOND REQUIRED, BUT CLAIMS AGAINST THE BOND ARE LIMITED AND/OR NO INSTANT FORFEITURE UPON FAILURE TO PREVAIL ON BID PROTEST OR APPEAL	BOND REQUIRED, IMMEDIATE FORFEITURE UPON LOSING APPEAL OF BID PROTEST DECISION
Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming	CALIFORNIA - Bond may be required, may be subjected to forfeiture if found in bad faith/frivolous.	Hawaii
	FLORIDA - Bond only limited to Department of Transportation projects, bond recovery limited to costs and charges incurred during the protest, and forfeiture only if administrative judge finds the protest was frivolous or improper.	
	NEVADA - Protest bond is only required when the chief procurement officers require it. Bond is lesser of 25% of the bid or \$250,000. If protest is rejected a claim can be brought against the protestor for the expenses incurred by the public	

	body. Remainder returned to bidder.	
	South Carolina - Bond possible but not required, state can only recover costs and charges associated with the protest from the bond. Remaining bond funds are returned to the protestor.	
	TENNESSEE - Bond is 5%, small business owners can apply for an exemption, and bond amount is to be used for costs and subject to forfeiture only upon a finding of bad faith or frivolous action.	
	UTAH - Protest bond depends upon the contract price, bond forfeiture upon losing appeal is only if the government finds that the protest was frivolous or filed only to delay.	

3. THE BOND AMOUNT HURTS COMPETITION AND THE PERCEPTION OF HAWAII AS A STATE THAT SUPPORTS OPEN AND FAIR PROCUREMENT.

Hawaii is already the sole outlier punishing bidders who seek independent review of State agency actions, by imposing a bond requirement plus immediate forfeiture, on unsuccessful bid protest appellants. By making the amount of the bond so high, the State is effectively eliminating appeals except for those companies large enough to bear the risk of such punishment. Enabling justice only for those who can afford it, is exactly at odds with the purpose of the procurement code.

- 4. THE BOND AMOUNT IS AN INEFFECTIVE REVENUE GENERATOR.** If the idea of increasing the bond amount is to generate revenue for the State, this is short sighted, because half of the bid protests and appeals are made by **low** bidders whose bids have been rejected for reasons the bidder disputes. For example, in the Maui Kuponu bid protest, they were the low bidder by \$700,000.00. Their bid was rejected. If they had been required to post a bond for \$250,000 on that \$25 million dollar job, they would not have pursued it. The State and its taxpayers would have had to pay \$700,000 more for the work. Moreover, the issue in that case was subcontractor listing, and whether non-construction contractor entities like truckers and other service providers, needed


to be listed in bids. The prospect of having to list unlicensed noncontractor entities as subcontractors in a bid would have totally changed and disrupted procurement, bogged down jobs in protests, and cost the State millions and millions of dollars. The substantive merits of the case would not have been addressed without a bid protest and appeal, yet that is what would have happened if the current bond requirement had been in place. (see decision, https://cca.hawaii.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/PDH-2021-003-MAUI-KUPONO-BUILDERS-v-DEPT-OF-TRANSPORTATION_with-Final-Judgment.pdf)

5. **BOND FORFEITURE OF AN UNCAPPED AMOUNT IN EVERY INSTANCE IN WHICH A BIDDER FAILS TO PREVAIL WILL ELIMINATE OVERSIGHT AND OPEN GOVERNMENT – THE PURPOSE OF BID PROTESTS.** It should be noted that the filing fee for an action in Circuit Court is \$315.00. The previous cap on a request for administrative review of bid protest decisions was \$10,000.00, nearly 32 times the cost of a civil action. In the Maui Kupono case, the crucial public scrutiny, and findings, would have been impossible without the filing of an appeal and a request to review such actions.

Public procurement cannot be beyond the public's review, yet imposing an uncapped bond requirement as a condition of review, that subjects a bidder to immediate punitive loss in the event its legitimate concerns do not result in a reversal of the agency's actions, would accomplish the same thing.

6. **TRANSPARENT AND FAIR GOVERNMENT IS CURRENTLY UNDER SERIOUS QUESTION.** It is especially important now to ensure the procurement process is transparent and fair. Suppressing bid protests questioning perceived unfair procurement awards conveys the wrong message to the public during these times of questionable practices by government officials in the news.
7. **FEAR OF LAPSING FUNDS.** Some may fear that projects may be lost due to lapsing funds because of protest delays. A review of HRS Section 103D-701(f) provides the opportunity, however strict, to have the chief procurement officer proceed with an award if necessary to protect the substantial interest of the state. Of course, there must be a well-reasoned written determination of the substantial interest being protected. Nevertheless, this determination may be made pending an appeal to the department of commerce and consumer affairs under HRS Section 103D-709, wherein the protest bond requirements apply. Hence, loss of a project due to lapse of funds may be within the hands of the procuring entity before the issue of chilling bond requirements come into play.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify in support of this measure.



March 16, 2023

TO: HONORABLE SCOT MATAYOSHI, CHAIR, HONORABLE ANDREW TAKUYA GARRETT, VICE CHAIR, AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

SUBJECT: **SUPPORT FOR S.B. 1135, RELATING TO PROCUREMENT.** Requires cash or protest bonds to be returned to the initiating parties, minus administrative costs, except in cases where the appeal was frivolous or made in bad faith.

HEARING

DATE: March 16, 2023
TIME: 9:30 a.m.
PLACE: Conference Room 309

Dear Chair Matayoshi, Vice Chair Garrett and Members of the Committee,

Healy Tibbitts Builders, Inc. (HTBI) is a general contractor in the State of Hawaii and has been actively engaged in construction work in Hawaii since the early 1960's. In addition to being a general contractor, HTBI also performs work as a subcontractor for foundation work.

HTBI supports S.B. 1135 Relating to Procurement, which requires the cash or protest bonds to be returned to the initiating parties, minus administrative costs, except in cases where the appeal was frivolous or made in bad faith.

HTBI supports this measure because it promotes fair and ethical procurement by adopting safeguard language that prevents the chilling effect of deterring legitimate appeals of agency decisions regarding bid protests. In fact, every other state that requires a cash or protest bond to appeal an agency's bid protest decision has adopted some form of this concept.

The primary purpose of the Procurement Code is to ensure fair and ethical procurement while maximizing the use of public funds.

Two years ago, the Legislature passed legislation that requires a party protesting an agency decision to put up a 1% cash or protest bond without a cap. The purpose of the cash or protest bond is to prevent the filing of frivolous appeals.

However, we believe that the Legislature inadvertently left out safeguard language that the other states who require cash or protest bonds without a cap use for appeals to also prevent the chilling effect of deterring legitimate protests on large projects. The safeguard language that the other states use allows for the return of the bond, minus the administrative costs associated with hearing the appeal, unless the appeal is found to be frivolous or in bad faith. This provision ensures a balance that deters frivolous appeals without the unintended consequence of also deterring legitimate appeals on large projects.

Essentially, the effect of the removal of a bond cap provision without adopting this safeguard language is that it prevents bidders from appealing an agency's bid protest decision on large projects because it raises the cost of the appeal so high that it becomes unaffordable and no longer fiscally prudent. This altered the landscape of the procurement

code by reducing one of its checks and balances. This provision removed any realistic oversight of decisions on large projects and allows agencies to go unchecked.

The impact of this legislation has already drawn the attention of several media outlets. Public trust and confidence in government should not be further eroded.¹ Every state that requires a bond to appeal an agency decision implements safeguards to ensure that the protest is fair and affordable.

Allowing for the return of the cash or protest bond, minus administrative costs, unless the appeal is found to be frivolous or in bad faith will promote fair and ethical procurement for the following reasons:

1. **REQUIRING A BID PROTEST BOND IS OUT OF STEP WITH THE MAJORITY OF STATES AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT:**

In the entire country, only seven (7) states impose a bond requirement to submit a bid protest or seek an appeal of a bid protest decision. This includes Hawaii. Other than these seven (7) states, every other state does not impose such a requirement, and the federal government does not either. This is because most states recognize “the value of having workable procedures for bidders and contractors to file bid protests, appeals, complaints and contract claims, noting that “[a] procurement system that is truly open isn’t afraid to be challenged on its contract award and management decisions.” Current bid protest practices among the states suggest that incorporating a fair mechanism to evaluate bid protests helps to ensure a level playing field for all vendors. The approach recommended in the NASPO Practical Guide is to have procedures established by law providing the opportunity for a bid protestor or contractor to appeal decisions on bid protests and contract claims, a fair hearing on the issues and prompt resolution. See NASPO Research Brief on State Bid Protests dated April 2013, https://www.naspo.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/FINAL_NASPO_BidProtests_Research_Brief_042413.pdf.

2. **AMONG THE FEW STATES THAT REQUIRE A BOND, HAWAII IS THE SOLE OUTLIER -- THE ONLY STATE -- THAT REQUIRES IMMEDIATE FORFEITURE OF BOND FUNDS**

According to the 2013 NASPO study, it found only seven (7) out of fifty states, which require a protest bond of some sort. This includes Hawaii. Of these seven states, **Hawaii is the ONLY state that imposes immediate forfeiture of the bond to the State’s general fund if a protestor loses an appeal.** Every one of the other six states that impose a bond requirement, only require either partial forfeiture to pay for costs, or forfeiture under certain conditions, most often a frivolous or bad faith protest:

¹ https://www.civilbeat.org/?p=1443162&mc_cid=4772bbfeef&mc_eid=7e39375e0a
<https://www.bizjournals.com/pacific/news/2021/05/26/hawaii-bill-drive-up-cost-appeal-bid-protest-rule.html>
<https://www.hawaiiconstructionlaw.com/blog/2021/05/a-bill-awaiting-governors-signature-will-be-bad-for-procurement.html>

NO STATUTORY BOND REQUIRED	BOND REQUIRED, BUT CLAIMS AGAINST THE BOND ARE LIMITED AND/OR NO INSTANT FORFEITURE UPON FAILURE TO PREVAIL ON BID PROTEST OR APPEAL	BOND REQUIRED, IMMEDIATE FORFEITURE UPON LOSING APPEAL OF BID PROTEST DECISION
Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming	CALIFORNIA - Bond may be required, may be subjected to forfeiture if found in bad faith/frivolous.	Hawaii
	FLORIDA - Bond only limited to Department of Transportation projects, bond recovery limited to costs and charges incurred during the protest, and forfeiture only if administrative judge finds the protest was frivolous or improper.	
	NEVADA - Protest bond is only required when the chief procurement officers require it. Bond is lesser of 25% of the bid or \$250,000. If protest is rejected a claim can be brought against the protestor for the expenses incurred by the public body. Remainder returned to bidder.	
	South Carolina - Bond possible but not required, state can only recover costs	

	and charges associated with the protest from the bond. Remaining bond funds are returned to the protestor.	
	TENNESSEE - Bond is 5%, small business owners can apply for an exemption, and bond amount is to be used for costs and subject to forfeiture only upon a finding of bad faith or frivolous action.	
	UTAH - Protest bond depends upon the contract price, bond forfeiture upon losing appeal is only if the government finds that the protest was frivolous or filed only to delay.	

3. THE BOND AMOUNT HURTS COMPETITION AND THE PERCEPTION OF HAWAII AS A STATE THAT SUPPORTS OPEN AND FAIR PROCUREMENT.

Hawaii is already the sole outlier punishing bidders who seek independent review of State agency actions, by imposing a bond requirement plus immediate forfeiture, on unsuccessful bid protest appellants. By making the amount of the bond so high, the State is effectively eliminating appeals except for those companies large enough to bear the risk of such punishment. Enabling justice only for those who can afford it, is exactly at odds with the purpose of the procurement code.


- 4. THE BOND AMOUNT IS AN INEFFECTIVE REVENUE GENERATOR.** If the idea of increasing the bond amount is to generate revenue for the State, this is short sighted, because half of the bid protests and appeals are made by **low** bidders whose bids have been rejected for reasons the bidder disputes. For example, in the Maui Kupono bid protest, they were the low bidder by \$700,000.00. Their bid was rejected. If they had been required to post a bond for \$250,000 on that \$25 million dollar job, they would not have pursued it. The State and its taxpayers would have had to pay \$700,000 more for the work. Moreover, the issue in that case was subcontractor listing, and whether non-construction contractor entities like truckers and other service providers, needed to be listed in bids. The prospect of having to list unlicensed noncontractor entities as subcontractors in a bid would have totally changed and disrupted procurement, bogged down jobs in protests, and cost the State millions and millions of dollars. The substantive merits of the case would not have been addressed without a bid protest and appeal, yet that is what would have happened if the current bond requirement had been in place. (see decision, https://cca.hawaii.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/PDH-2021-003-MAUI-KUPONO-BUILDERS-v-DEPT-OF-TRANSPORTATION_with-Final-Judgment.pdf)

5. **BOND FORFEITURE OF AN UNCAPPED AMOUNT IN EVERY INSTANCE IN WHICH A BIDDER FAILS TO PREVAIL WILL ELIMINATE OVERSIGHT AND OPEN GOVERNMENT – THE PURPOSE OF BID PROTESTS.** It should be noted that the filing fee for an action in Circuit Court is \$315.00. The previous cap on a request for administrative review of bid protest decisions was \$10,000.00, nearly 32 times the cost of a civil action. In the Maui Kupono case, the crucial public scrutiny, and findings, would have been impossible without the filing of an appeal and a request to review such actions.

Public procurement cannot be beyond the public's review, yet imposing an uncapped bond requirement as a condition of review, that subjects a bidder to immediate punitive loss in the event its legitimate concerns do not result in a reversal of the agency's actions, would accomplish the same thing.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify in support of this measure.

Very truly yours,
Healy Tibbitts Builders, Inc.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard A. Heltzel". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Richard A. Heltzel
President



March 16, 2023

TO: HONORABLE SCOT MATAYOSHI, CHAIR, HONORABLE ANDREW TAKUYA GARRETT, VICE CHAIR, AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

SUBJECT: **SUPOORT OF OF S.B. 1135, RELATING TO PROCUREMENT.** Requires cash or protest bonds to be returned to the initiating parties, minus administrative costs, except in cases where the appeal was frivolous or made in bad faith.

HEARING

DATE: Thursday, March 16, 2023
TIME: 9:30 a.m.
PLACE: Capitol Room 309

Dear Chair Matayoshi, Vice Chair Garrett and Members of the Committee,

The General Contractors Association of Hawaii (GCA) is an organization comprised of approximately five hundred (500) general contractors, subcontractors, and construction related firms. The GCA was established in 1932 and is the largest construction association in the State of Hawaii. Our mission is to elevate Hawaii's construction industry and strengthen the foundation of our community.

GCA **supports** S.B. 1135, which requires the cash or protest bonds be returned to the initiating parties, minus administrative costs, except in cases where the appeal was frivolous or made in bad faith.

The primary purpose of the Procurement Code to is ensure fair and ethical procurement while maximining the use of public funds.

Two years ago, the Legislature passed legislation that requires a party protesting an agency decision to put up a 1% cash or protest bond without a cap. The purpose of the cash or protest bond is to prevent the filing of frivolous appeals.

However, we believe that the Legislature inadvertently left out safeguard language that the other states who require cash or protest bonds without a cap use for appeals to also prevent the chilling effect of deterring legitimate protests on large projects. The safeguard language that the other states use allows for the return of the bond, minus the administrative costs associated with hearing the appeal, unless the appeal is found to be frivolous or in bad faith. This provision ensures a balance that deters frivolous appeals without the unintended consequence of also deterring legitimate appeals on large projects.

Essentially, the effect of the removal of a bond cap provision without adopting this safeguard language is that it prevents bidders from appealing an agency's bid protest decision on large

projects because it raises the cost of the appeal so high that it becomes unaffordable and no longer fiscally prudent. This altered the landscape of the procurement code by reducing one of its checks and balances. This provision removed any realistic oversight of decisions on large projects and allows agencies to go unchecked.

The impact of this legislation has already drawn the attention of several media outlets. Public trust and confidence in government should not be further eroded.¹ Every state that requires a bond to appeal an agency decision implements safeguards to ensure that the protest is fair and affordable.

Allowing for the return of the cash or protest bond, minus administrative costs, unless the appeal is found to be frivolous or in bad faith will promote fair and ethical procurement for the following reasons:

1. **REQUIRING A BID PROTEST BOND IS OUT OF STEP WITH THE MAJORITY OF STATES AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT:**

In the entire country, only seven (7) states impose a bond requirement to submit a bid protest or seek an appeal of a bid protest decision. This includes Hawaii. Other than these seven (7) states, every other state does not impose such a requirement, and the federal government does not either. This is because most states recognize “the value of having workable procedures for bidders and contractors to file bid protests, appeals, complaints and contract claims, noting that “[a] procurement system that is truly open isn’t afraid to be challenged on its contract award and management decisions.” Current bid protest practices among the states suggest that incorporating a fair mechanism to evaluate bid protests helps to ensure a level playing field for all vendors. The approach recommended in the NASPO Practical Guide is to have procedures established by law providing the opportunity for a bid protestor or contractor to appeal decisions on bid protests and contract claims, a fair hearing on the issues and prompt resolution. *See* NASPO Research Brief on State Bid Protests dated April 2013, https://www.naspo.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/FINAL_NASPO_BidProtests_Research_Brief_042413.pdf.

2. **AMONG THE FEW STATES THAT REQUIRE A BOND, HAWAII IS THE SOLE OUTLIER -- THE ONLY STATE -- THAT REQUIRES IMMEDIATE FORFEITURE OF BOND FUNDS**

According to the 2013 NASPO study, it found only seven (7) out of fifty states, which require a protest bond of some sort. This includes Hawaii. Of these seven states, **Hawaii is the ONLY state that imposes immediate forfeiture of the bond to the State’s general fund if a**

¹ https://www.civilbeat.org/?p=1443162&mc_cid=4772bbfeef&mc_eid=7e39375e0a
<https://www.bizjournals.com/pacific/news/2021/05/26/hawaii-bill-drive-up-cost-appeal-bid-protest-rule.html>
<https://www.hawaiiconstructionlaw.com/blog/2021/05/a-bill-awaiting-governors-signature-will-be-bad-for-procurement.html>



GENERAL
CONTRACTORS
ASSOCIATION
OF HAWAII

protestor loses an appeal. Every one of the other six states that impose a bond requirement, only require either partial forfeiture to pay for costs, or forfeiture under certain conditions, most often a frivolous or bad faith protest:

QUALITY PEOPLE. QUALITY PROJECTS



GENERAL CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION OF HAWAII

NO STATUTORY BOND REQUIRED

BOND REQUIRED, BUT CLAIMS AGAINST THE BOND ARE LIMITED AND/OR NO INSTANT FORFEITURE UPON FAILURE TO PREVAIL ON BID PROTEST OR APPEAL

BOND REQUIRED, IMMEDIATE FORFEITURE UPON LOSING APPEAL OF BID PROTEST DECISION

QUALITY PEOPLE. QUALITY PROJECTS

<p>Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming</p>	<p>CALIFORNIA - Bond may be required, may be subjected to forfeiture if found in bad faith/frivolous.</p>	<p>Hawaii</p>
	<p>FLORIDA - Bond only limited to Department of Transportation projects, bond recovery limited to costs and charges incurred during the protest, and forfeiture only if administrative judge finds the protest was frivolous or improper.</p>	
	<p>NEVADA - Protest bond is only required when the chief procurement officers require it. Bond is lesser of 25% of the bid or \$250,000. If protest is rejected a claim can be brought against the protestor for the expenses incurred by the public body. Remainder returned to bidder.</p>	
	<p>South Carolina - Bond possible but not required, state can only recover costs and charges associated with the protest from the bond. Remaining bond funds are returned to the protestor.</p>	
	<p>TENNESSEE - Bond is 5%, small business owners can apply for an exemption, and bond</p>	

	amount is to be used for costs and subject to forfeiture only upon a finding of bad faith or frivolous action.	
	UTAH - Protest bond depends upon the contract price, bond forfeiture upon losing appeal is only if the government finds that the protest was frivolous or filed only to delay.	

3. THE BOND AMOUNT HURTS COMPETITION AND THE PERCEPTION OF HAWAII AS A STATE THAT SUPPORTS OPEN AND FAIR PROCUREMENT.

Hawaii is already the sole outlier punishing bidders who seek independent review of State agency actions, by imposing a bond requirement plus immediate forfeiture, on unsuccessful bid protest appellants. By making the amount of the bond so high, the State is effectively eliminating appeals except for those companies large enough to bear the risk of such punishment. Enabling justice only for those who can afford it, is exactly at odds with the purpose of the procurement code.

4. THE BOND AMOUNT IS AN INEFFECTIVE REVENUE GENERATOR. If the idea of increasing the bond amount is to generate revenue for the State, this is short sighted, because half of the bid protests and appeals are made by **low** bidders whose bids have been rejected for reasons the bidder disputes. For example, in the Maui Kupono bid protest, they were the low bidder by \$700,000.00. Their bid was rejected. If they had been required to post a bond for \$250,000 on that \$25 million dollar job, they would not have pursued it. The State and its taxpayers would have had to pay \$700,000 more for the work. Moreover, the issue in that case was subcontractor listing, and whether non-construction contractor entities like truckers and other service providers, needed to be listed in bids. The prospect of having to list unlicensed noncontractor entities as subcontractors in a bid would have totally changed and disrupted procurement, bogged down jobs in protests, and cost the State millions and millions of dollars. The substantive merits of the case would not have been addressed without a bid protest and appeal, yet that is what would have happened if the current bond requirement had been in place. (see decision, https://cca.hawaii.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/PDH-2021-003-MAUI-KUPONO-BUILDERS-v-DEPT-OF-TRANSPORTATION_with-Final-Judgment.pdf)

5. BOND FORFEITURE OF AN UNCAPPED AMOUNT IN EVERY INSTANCE IN WHICH A BIDDER FAILS TO PREVAIL WILL ELIMINATE OVERSIGHT AND OPEN GOVERNMENT – THE PURPOSE OF BID PROTESTS.

It should be noted that the filing fee for an action in Circuit Court is \$315.00. The previous cap on a request for administrative review of bid protest decisions was \$10,000.00, nearly 32 times the cost of a civil action. In the Maui Kupono case, the crucial public scrutiny, and findings, would have been impossible without the filing of an appeal and a request to review such actions.




**GENERAL
CONTRACTORS
ASSOCIATION
OF HAWAII**

Public procurement cannot be beyond the public's review, yet imposing an uncapped bond requirement as a condition of review, that subjects a bidder to immediate punitive loss in the event its legitimate concerns do not result in a reversal of the agency's actions, would accomplish the same thing.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify in support of this measure.

QUALITY PEOPLE. QUALITY PROJECTS

RICK BLANGIARDI
MAYOR



ANDREW T. KAWANO
DIRECTOR

CARRIE CASTLE
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

TESTIMONY OF ANDREW T. KAWANO
DIRECTOR OF BUDGET AND FISCAL SERVICES
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU
BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
March 16, 2023, 9:30 AM, Conference Room 309 and Videoconference

TO: The Honorable Scot Z. Matayoshi, Chair
The Honorable Andrew Takuya Garrett, Vice Chair
and Members of the House Committee on Labor and Government Operations

RE: OPPOSITION OF SENATE BILL 1135, RELATING TO PROCUREMENT

The Department of Budget and Fiscal Services, City and County of Honolulu (City), **opposes** Senate Bill (SB) 1135, Relating to Procurement.

The City wishes to retain the current provision of Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS) §103D-709(e):

“The party initiating a proceeding falling within subsection (d) shall pay to the department of commerce and consumer affairs a cash or protest bond in the amount of one per cent of the estimated value of the contract. If the initiating party prevails in the administrative proceeding, the cash or protest bond shall be returned to that party. If the initiating party does not prevail in the administrative proceeding, the cash or protest bond shall be deposited into the general fund.”

The required cash or protest bond should protect more than an appeal that was frivolous or made in bad faith. The party initiating the proceeding shall have the burden of proof, including the burden of producing evidence as well as the burden of persuasion and make a determination if an administrative hearing is the appropriate step after it was already subjected to a determination of the chief procurement officer, head of a purchasing agency, or a designee of either officer.

For the reasons stated above, the City respectfully opposes Senate Bill 1135.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify on this bill. Should you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact the Department of Budget & Fiscal Services' Division of Purchasing at 808-768-5535 or bfspurchasing@honolulu.gov.



Hawaii Operating Engineers Industry
Stabilization Fund PAC
2181 Lauwiliwili Street
Kapolei, HI 96707
Phone: (808) 845-6221
Website: www.hoeisf.com

March 15, 2023

House Committee on Labor & Government Operations
Representative Scot Matayoshi, Chair
Representative Andrew Garrett, Vice Chair

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT
Senate Bill 1135, Relating to Procurement


Aloha Chair Matayoshi, Vice Chair Garrett, and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony on behalf of the Hawaii Operating Engineers Industry Stabilization Fund Political Action Committee (HOEISF PAC). The HOEISF PAC is a non-profit labor management organization whose core mission is to represent the interests of the Operating Engineers Local Union No. 3 and Hawaii's leading contractors and ensure that the industry is thriving and sustainable for the future.

We are writing in **support of SB1135**, which requires cash or protest bonds to be returned to the initiating parties, minus administrative costs, except in cases where the appeal was frivolous or made in bad faith.

We support this bill because it seeks to discourage frivolous appeals while at the same time not potentially deterring legitimate appeals. Hawaii is one of only seven states in the country that impose a bond requirement to submit a bid protest or seek an appeal of a bid protest decision. In addition, the federal government also does not impose this requirement. By passing this bill, the legislature would align our state with the vast majority of the country.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our testimony in support and we urge you to pass this measure.



Alan Shintani Inc.
GENERAL CONTRACTOR ABC 13068

March 16, 2023

TO: HONORABLE SCOT MATAYOSHI, CHAIR, HONORABLE ANDREW TAKUYA GARRETT, VICE CHAIR, AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

SUBJECT: **SUPPORT FOR S.B. 1135, RELATING TO PROCUREMENT.** Requires cash or protest bonds to be returned to the initiating parties, minus administrative costs, except in cases where the appeal was frivolous or made in bad faith.

HEARING

DATE: March 16, 2023

TIME: 9:30 a.m.

PLACE: Conference Room 309

Dear Chair Matayoshi, Vice Chair Garrett and Members of the Committee,

Alan Shintani, Inc. has been providing quality general contracting services and construction management for homes, commercial building, and government projects in a cost-effective and timely manner since 1984. ASI has earned a solid reputation in Hawaii by continuously striving to succeed in all its construction endeavors through innovation and reliable means of construction services.

Alan Shintani, Inc. supports S.B. 1135 Relating to Procurement, which requires the cash or protest bonds to be returned to the initiating parties, minus administrative costs, except in cases where the appeal was frivolous or made in bad faith.

Alan Shintani, Inc. supports this measure because it promotes fair and ethical procurement by adopting safeguard language that prevents the chilling effect of deterring legitimate appeals of agency decisions regarding bid protests. In fact, every other state that requires a cash or protest bond to appeal an agency's bid protest decision has adopted some form of this concept.

The primary purpose of the Procurement Code to is ensure fair and ethical procurement while maximizing the use of public funds.

Two years ago, the Legislature passed legislation that requires a party protesting an agency decision to put up a 1% cash or protest bond without a cap. The purpose of the cash or protest bond is to prevent the filing of frivolous appeals.

However, we believe that the Legislature inadvertently left out safeguard language that the other states who require cash or protest bonds without a cap use for appeals to also prevent the chilling effect of deterring legitimate protests on large projects. The safeguard language that the other states use allows for the return of the bond, minus the administrative costs associated with hearing the appeal, unless the appeal is found to be frivolous or in bad faith. This provision ensures a balance that deters frivolous appeals without the unintended consequence of also deterring legitimate appeals on large projects.

<p>NO STATUTORY BOND REQUIRED</p>	<p>BOND REQUIRED, BUT CLAIMS AGAINST THE BOND ARE LIMITED AND/OR NO INSTANT FORFEITURE UPON FAILURE TO PREVAIL ON BID PROTEST OR APPEAL</p>	<p>BOND REQUIRED, IMMEDIATE FORFEITURE UPON LOSING APPEAL OF BID PROTEST DECISION</p>
<p>Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming</p>	<p>CALIFORNIA - Bond may be required, may be subjected to forfeiture if found in bad faith/frivolous.</p>	<p>Hawaii</p>
	<p>FLORIDA - Bond only limited to Department of Transportation projects, bond recovery limited to costs and charges incurred during the protest, and forfeiture only if administrative judge finds the protest was frivolous or improper.</p>	
	<p>NEVADA - Protest bond is only required when the chief procurement officers require it. Bond is lesser of 25% of the bid or \$250,000. If protest is rejected a claim can be brought against the protestor for the expenses incurred by the public body. Remainder returned to bidder.</p>	
	<p>South Carolina - Bond possible but not required, state can only recover costs and charges associated with the protest from the bond. Remaining bond funds are returned to the protestor.</p>	

	TENNESSEE - Bond is 5%, small business owners can apply for an exemption, and bond amount is to be used for costs and subject to forfeiture only upon a finding of bad faith or frivolous action.	
	UTAH - Protest bond depends upon the contract price, bond forfeiture upon losing appeal is only if the government finds that the protest was frivolous or filed only to delay.	

3. THE BOND AMOUNT HURTS COMPETITION AND THE PERCEPTION OF HAWAII AS A STATE THAT SUPPORTS OPEN AND FAIR PROCUREMENT.

Hawaii is already the sole outlier punishing bidders who seek independent review of State agency actions, by imposing a bond requirement plus immediate forfeiture, on unsuccessful bid protest appellants. By making the amount of the bond so high, the State is effectively eliminating appeals except for those companies large enough to bear the risk of such punishment. Enabling justice only for those who can afford it, is exactly at odds with the purpose of the procurement code.


4. THE BOND AMOUNT IS AN INEFFECTIVE REVENUE GENERATOR. If the idea of increasing the bond amount is to generate revenue for the State, this is short sighted, because half of the bid protests and appeals are made by **low** bidders whose bids have been rejected for reasons the bidder disputes. For example, in the Maui Kupono bid protest, they were the low bidder by \$700,000.00. Their bid was rejected. If they had been required to post a bond for \$250,000 on that \$25 million dollar job, they would not have pursued it. The State and its taxpayers would have had to pay \$700,000 more for the work. Moreover, the issue in that case was subcontractor listing, and whether non-construction contractor entities like truckers and other service providers, needed to be listed in bids. The prospect of having to list unlicensed noncontractor entities as subcontractors in a bid would have totally changed and disrupted procurement, bogged down jobs in protests, and cost the State millions and millions of dollars. The substantive merits of the case would not have been addressed without a bid protest and appeal, yet that is what would have happened if the current bond requirement had been in place. (see decision, [https://cca.hawaii.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/PDH-2021-003-MAUI-KUPONO-BUILDERS-v-DEPT-OF-TRANSPORTATION with-Final-Judgment.pdf](https://cca.hawaii.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/PDH-2021-003-MAUI-KUPONO-BUILDERS-v-DEPT-OF-TRANSPORTATION-with-Final-Judgment.pdf))

5. BOND FORFEITURE OF AN UNCAPPED AMOUNT IN EVERY INSTANCE IN WHICH A BIDDER FAILS TO PREVAIL WILL ELIMINATE OVERSIGHT AND OPEN GOVERNMENT – THE PURPOSE OF BID PROTESTS. It should be noted that the filing fee for an action in Circuit Court is \$315.00. The previous

cap on a request for administrative review of bid protest decisions was \$10,000.00, nearly 32 times the cost of a civil action. In the Maui Kuponono case, the crucial public scrutiny, and findings, would have been impossible without the filing of an appeal and a request to review such actions.

Public procurement cannot be beyond the public's review, yet imposing an uncapped bond requirement as a condition of review, that subjects a bidder to immediate punitive loss in the event its legitimate concerns do not result in a reversal of the agency's actions, would accomplish the same thing.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify in support of this measure.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Fred Kim', is positioned above the typed name.

Fred Kim
President
Alan Shintani, Inc.