

DECISION**THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES**
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20548

20992

FILE: B-210285.2

DATE: August 15, 1983

MATTER OF: Pacific Coast Utilities Service, Inc.--
Reconsideration**DIGEST:**

GAO decision is affirmed where reconsideration request merely reflects protester's disagreement with decision and does not provide evidence that the decision was based on any errors of law or fact.

Pacific Coast Utilities Service, Inc. requests reconsideration of our decision, Pacific Coast Utilities Service, Inc., B-210285, June 29, 1983, 83-2 CPD, denying its protest of the Navy's award of a contract to Able Building Maintenance Co., under invitation for bids (IFB) No. N62474-82-B-3726, for maintenance services at the Naval Post Graduate School, Monterey, California. In that decision, we denied Pacific's protest that Able's bid was ambiguous and therefore nonresponsive because it included a separately priced bid item not provided for in the solicitation's bid schedule.'

We affirm our prior decision.

Pacific argues that Able's addition of a bid item price for utility services on a schedule which required only a single lump-sum price for various maintenance services required created an ambiguity regarding Able's understanding of the IFB. In our prior decision, we considered this argument and concluded that under any reasonable interpretation of Able's bid, that firm was obligated to perform all of the required services. The only question which remained was whether the \$5,100 price set out in the schedule was to be included in Able's total price or added to it. Since Able was low in any case, it was and still is our view that the protester was not prejudiced by the agency's action in asking Able to explain its bid after opening.

026404

Our Bid Protest Procedures require that a request for reconsideration specify any error of law made or information not previously considered in the protest. 4 C.F.R. § 21.9(a) (1983). Here, Pacific has merely indicated that it finds our treatment of the issues it raised cursory and simplistic. However, Pacific has not provided any new arguments or facts. Mere disagreement with our prior decision does not provide a basis to reverse the decision. Space Age Engineering, Inc.--Reconsideration, B-205594.3, September 24, 1982, 82-2 CPD 269.

Accordingly, we affirm our prior decision. Tom Shaw, Inc.--Reconsideration, B-209018.2, March 22, 1983, 83-1 CPD 285.

for 
Comptroller General
of the United States