



Comptroller General
of the United States

Washington, D.C. 20548

100700

1:12

Decision

Matter of: Radiological Physics Associates, Inc.--
Reconsideration

File: B-252835.5

Date: January 25, 1994

DECISION

Radiological Physics Associates, Inc. (RPA) requests reconsideration of our decision denying its protest of the determination by the Department of the Air Force to amend request for proposals (RFP) No. F22600-92-R-0133, to reopen discussions, and to request best and final offers from the offerors. Relief Servs., Inc.; Radiological Physics Assocs., Inc., B-252835.3; B-252835.4, Aug. 24, 1993, 93-2 CPD ¶ 116. We denied the protest because we found that the agency had properly determined that 9 of the 10 job classifications listed in the RFP did not call for professional employees and that it was therefore appropriate for the agency to amend the RFP to insert clauses relevant to nonprofessional employees.

We deny the request for reconsideration because it provides no basis for reconsidering our prior decision.

RPA in essence repeats arguments it made previously and expresses disagreement with our decision. Under our Bid Protest Regulations, to obtain reconsideration the requesting party must show that our prior decision may contain either errors of fact or law or present information not previously considered that warrants reversal or modification of our decision. 4 C.F.R. § 21.12(a) (1993). The repetition of arguments made during our consideration of the original protest and mere disagreement with our decision do not meet this standard. R.E. Scherrer, Inc.--Recon., B-231101.3, Sept. 21, 1988, 88-2 CPD ¶ 274.

While our decision did not directly address every allegation within each protest ground raised by the protesters, we did consider every such allegation. For the reasons explained in our decision, we concluded that the agency's amendment of the RFP was reasonable. Thus, our decision explained why the protester's argument that two of the employees at issue (rather than only one) would be professionals was legally erroneous. The request for reconsideration in this regard merely repeats the arguments already raised, and which we

rejected in our consideration of the initial protest. In addition, we properly rejected as incongruous RPA's initial protest argument, which it reiterates in its request for reconsideration, that the one professional employee covered by the RFP constituted "meaningful numbers of professional employees," as that term is used in Federal Acquisition Regulation § 52.222-46, and that the Air Force abused its discretion in concluding that, for purposes of this procurement, a single employee did not constitute "meaningful numbers" of employees.

The request for reconsideration is denied.

Robert P. Murphy
Robert P. Murphy
Acting General Counsel