

AN A.S. PRATT PUBLICATION

JUNE 2017

VOL. 3 • NO. 6

PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT



EDITOR'S NOTE: RIDDLE ME THIS

Steven A. Meyerowitz

THE LATEST CLUE TO SOLVING THE MAROPAKIS RIDDLE: THE AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE OF OFFSET

Justin M. Ganderson and Kevin T. Barnett

HOW A CLINTON-ERA LAW HELPED THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION REDUCE REGULATIONS ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS

Justin A. Chiarodo and Philip E. Beshara

THE BUY AMERICAN-HIRE AMERICAN EXECUTIVE ORDER: THERE WILL BE DEVILS IN THE DETAILS WHEN BUYING AMERICAN

Alexander W. Major and Lillian M. Mezynski

HOW IS YOUR DOMESTIC PREFERENCE COMPLIANCE? PRESIDENT TRUMP SIGNALS MORE SCRUTINY OF "BUY AMERICAN, HIRE AMERICAN" PRACTICES

Justin A. Chiarodo, Stephanie M. Harden, and Philip E. Beshara

FOURTH CIRCUIT LEAVES UNDISTURBED A DISTRICT COURT DECISION AGAINST THE USE OF STATISTICAL SAMPLING, AND HOLDS THAT THE UNITED STATES HAS THE UNFETTERED POWER TO VETO FCA SETTLEMENTS

Jesse A. Witten and Jenna M. Poligo

FIFTH CIRCUIT AFFIRMS TIMELINESS OF AKA CLAIMS ADDED TO GOVERNMENT'S FCA COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION

Patrick M. Hagan and Michelle Tupper Butler

CIRCUIT COURTS LIMIT REACH OF FEDERAL FALSE CLAIMS ACT IN TWO DEFENSE CONTRACTOR CASES

Jesse A. Witten, Barry Gross, and Elizabeth L. Coyne

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN SECTION 1603 GRANT LITIGATION

Timothy L. Jacobs, Laura Ellen Jones, David S. Lowman, Jr., and Hilary B. Lefko

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS BEWARE: FAILING TO PROVIDE NOTICE TO YOUR INSURER BEFORE SETTLING MAY DOOM YOUR CHANCE OF RECOVERY

Jocelyn Knoll, Katie Pfeifer, and Kathryn Johnson

This article presents the views of the authors, which do not necessarily reflect those of Hunton & Williams or its clients. The information presented is for general information and education purposes. No legal advice is intended to be conveyed; readers should consult with legal counsel with respect to any legal advice they require related to the subject matter of the article.

PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT

VOLUME 3

NUMBER 6

JUNE 2017

Editor's Note: Riddle Me This

Steven A. Meyerowitz

195

The Latest Clue to Solving the *Maropakis* Riddle: The Affirmative Defense of Offset

Justin M. Ganderson and Kevin T. Barnett

198

How a Clinton-Era Law Helped the Trump Administration Reduce Regulations on Government Contractors

Justin A. Chiarodo and Philip E. Beshara

202

The Buy American-Hire American Executive Order: There Will Be Devils in the Details When Buying American

Alexander W. Major and Lillian M. Mezynski

205

How Is Your Domestic Preference Compliance? President Trump Signals More Scrutiny of "Buy American, Hire American" Practices

Justin A. Chiarodo, Stephanie M. Harden, and Philip E. Beshara

210

Fourth Circuit Leaves Undisturbed a District Court Decision Against the Use of Statistical Sampling, and Holds that the United States Has the Unfettered Power to Veto FCA Settlements

Jesse A. Witten and Jenna M. Poligo

214

Fifth Circuit Affirms Timeliness of AKA Claims Added to Government's FCA Complaint in Intervention

Patrick M. Hagan and Michelle Tupper Butler

217

Circuit Courts Limit Reach of Federal False Claims Act in Two Defense Contractor Cases

Jesse A. Witten, Barry Gross, and Elizabeth L. Coyne

220

Recent Developments in Section 1603 Grant Litigation

Timothy L. Jacobs, Laura Ellen Jones, David S. Lowman, Jr., and Hilary B. Lefko

224

Government Contractors Beware: Failing to Provide Notice to Your Insurer Before Settling May Doom Your Chance of Recovery

Jocelyn Knoll, Katie Pfeifer, and Kathryn Johnson

230

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Heidi A. Litman at 516-771-2169
Email: heidi.a.litman@lexisnexus.com
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385
Fax Number (800) 828-8341
Customer Service Website <http://www.lexisnexus.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or (800) 223-1940
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (937) 247-0293

Library of Congress Card Number:

ISBN: 978-1-6328-2705-0 (print)

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [article title], [vol. no.] PRATT’S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT [page number] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Michelle E. Litteken, GAO Holds NASA Exceeded Its Discretion in Protest of FSS Task Order, 1 PRATT’S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT 30 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Because the section you are citing may be revised in a later release, you may wish to photocopy or print out the section for convenient future reference.

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. A.S. Pratt is a registered trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2017 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

An A.S. Pratt® Publication

Editorial Office
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862
www.lexisnexus.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

MARY BETH BOSCO

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

DARWIN A. HINDMAN III

Shareholder, Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC

J. ANDREW HOWARD

Partner, Alston & Bird LLP

KYLE R. JEFCOAT

Counsel, Latham & Watkins LLP

JOHN E. JENSEN

Partner, Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP

DISMAS LOCARIA

Partner, Venable LLP

MARCIA G. MADSEN

Partner, Mayer Brown LLP

KEVIN P. MULLEN

Partner, Morrison & Foerster LLP

VINCENT J. NAPOLEON

Partner, Nixon Peabody LLP

STUART W. TURNER

Counsel, Arnold & Porter LLP

WALTER A.I. WILSON

Senior Partner, Polsinelli PC

PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT is published twelve times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright 2017 Reed Elsevier Properties SA., used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For permission to photocopy or use material electronically from *Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report*, please access www.copyright.com or contact the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. (CCC), 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400. CCC is a not-for-profit organization that provides licenses and registration for a variety of users. For subscription information and customer service, call 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 718.224.2258. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to government contractors, attorneys and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, and senior business executives. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 630 Central Avenue, New Providence, NJ 07974.

Recent Developments in Section 1603 Grant Litigation

*By Timothy L. Jacobs, Laura Ellen Jones, David S. Lowman, Jr.,
and Hilary B. Lefko**

This article discusses recent developments in Section 1603 grant litigation.

The purpose of the 1603 Department of the Treasury Program, Payments for Specified Energy Property in Lieu of Tax Credits, is to reimburse eligible applicants for a portion of the cost of installing specified energy property used in a trade or business or for the production of income. A 1603 payment is made after the energy property is placed in service; a 1603 payment is not made prior to or during construction of the energy property.

This article discusses recent developments in Section 1603 grant litigation.

FILED/DECIDED CASES

About 25 cases involving the 1603 grant have been filed in the U.S. Court of Federal Claims. A number of cases have been decided and a number of opinions have been issued on discovery and procedural issues. While the 1603 program resulted and is still resulting in considerable reductions, applicants have held back filing their claims.

A word of caution. Although claims are subject to a generous six-year statute of limitations in the Court of Federal Claims, applicants need to consider carefully when this statute of limitations begins and make sure that they do not inadvertently allow it to lapse. Given the positive direction many of the 1603 decisions have taken, and the potential for key institutional knowledge and personnel to be lost or diminished, applicants should give serious thought to filing their claims as soon as possible.

PURCHASE PRICE CHALLENGES

The government lost a number of its key positions with respect to 1603 awards in *Alta Wind I Owner-Lessor C et al. v. United States*.¹ In *Alta Wind*, the government argued that the purchase price paid for wind facilities could not be used as the cost basis for calculating the 1603 grant—asserting that basis must

* Timothy L. Jacobs, Laura Ellen Jones, and David S. Lowman, Jr., are partners in the tax practice at Hunton & Williams LLP. Hilary B. Lefko is an associate in the firm's tax practice. The authors may be reached at tjacobs@hunton.com, ljones@hunton.com, dlowman@hunton.com, and hlefkko@hunton.com, respectively.

¹ Nos. 13-402T et al.

be allocated to non-qualifying intangible assets such as the power purchase agreement, favorable location premiums, goodwill, and going concern value.

The Court of Federal Claims rejected the government's arguments (i) that the residual accounting method prescribed by IRC § 1060 applied to a newly-constructed wind farm, and (ii) that sale-leaseback transactions represented "peculiar circumstances," *per se*, permitting the court to look behind an arm's length purchase price negotiated by sophisticated and self-interested parties.

The court rejected the government's argument that costs must be allocated to a power purchase agreement ("PPA") as a separate and nonqualifying intangible asset.

The government noticed its appeal of the *Alta Wind* decision on December 22, 2016. The appeal is currently pending. The first brief was scheduled to be filed on April 13, 2017. Argument is expected later this year with a decision expected sometime thereafter.²

RESIDENTIAL SOLAR

One case involving residential solar systems, *Sequoia Pacific Solar I, LLC, et al. v. United States*, has been ongoing since early 2013.³ In June 2016, the government filed a motion to schedule a conference with the court to discuss a matter that had arisen from the *Alta Wind* case. In the *Alta Wind* trial, the court disqualified the government's valuation expert—the same expert that the government is using in the *Sequoia* litigation—after the court determined the expert had failed to disclose and was untruthful about certain articles he had written. Expert discovery is closed. A similar disqualification in the *Sequoia* case may sink the government's case, and the expert's credibility may be colored in any event. The trial has been rescheduled several times. The trial schedule was vacated recently because of ongoing settlement discussions.

In *LCM Energy Solutions v. United States*,⁴ the Court of Federal Claims rejected the applicant's claims for alleged shortfalls in its grant awards but also rejected the government's attempts to reclaim Treasury's grant awards and apply false claims treble damages and penalties with respect to residential solar system installations. The court determined that the cost basis which Treasury used for its awards—the installation costs for each system plus a 20 percent profit—was the "more reasonable approach" in that case. In rejecting the government's false claims assertions, the court pointed to the lack of sophistication by the

² No. 17-1410.

³ No. 13-139C.

⁴ No. 12-321C.

applicant's principals, their reasonable efforts to understand the grant requirements, a prior award made by Treasury at a level consistent with the applied-for amounts, and Treasury's representations to the applicants.

FUEL CELL FACILITIES

In March 2015, in *RP1 Fuel Cell, LLC et al. v. United States*, the Court of Federal Claims decided in favor of applicants with respect to two fuel cell facilities using biogas from a wastewater treatment plant.⁵ The question involved whether gas conditioning equipment used to treat the biogas was qualified as part of a qualified fuel cell facility which the court concluded it was qualified. In the alternative, the court also held that the equipment could qualify as part of a trash facility. After the government appealed, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit affirmed *per curiam* the Court of Federal Claims decision in April 2016.

BIOMASS FACILITIES

In January 2015, in *W.E. Partners II, LLC v. United States*, the Court of Federal Claims granted the government's motion for summary judgment with respect to an open loop biomass facility producing electrical power and also supplying steam to adjacent chicken rendering processes.⁶ The court agreed that the facility was a qualified facility and took a more expansive view of qualified property as all property "actually involved in making electricity, and without which the electrical production would be reduced."

However, in according deference to Treasury's guidance, the court held that a reasonable allocation of the facility's cost basis must be made between what it characterized as the qualifying electric activity and the nonqualifying steam activity. The court upheld Treasury's award which allowed the cost basis of only one of the three boilers and the steam turbine generator in the facility. In February 2016, the Federal Circuit affirmed *per curiam* the Court of Federal Claims decision.

The same judge of the Court of Federal Claims has issued two recent opinions on the same steam use issue in *Nippon Paper Industries USA Co., Ltd. v. United States*⁷ and in *GUSC Energy, Inc. v. United States*.⁸ Another case, *WestRock Virginia Corp. v. United States*,⁹ is pending before a different judge.

⁵ No. 13-552C.

⁶ No. 13-54.

⁷ No. 15-1535C.

⁸ No. 14-1228C.

⁹ No. 15-355C.

According to recent filings, summary judgment motions are expected to be filed in *Nippon* and *WestRock*.

DISCOVERY OF TREASURY

The Court of Federal Claims has sent mixed signals on discovery of Treasury records and personnel. In *W.E. Partners* and other cases, the Court of Federal Claims has held that 1603 claims are reviewed *de novo* similar to tax refund cases. As a result, the government has argued that Treasury's review process and decision-making are not relevant and not discoverable.

In *California Ridge Energy LLC v. United States*,¹⁰ the court denied an applicant's motion to compel discovery of information relating to data collected by Treasury with respect to other wind energy facilities and the size of development fees paid by other wind facilities.

On the other hand, an order issued in the SolarCity (*Sequoia*) litigation allowed limited discovery of Treasury's review process with respect to its use of certain "benchmarks" and reference of other applicants' information in the context of a valuation issue for residential solar systems. In *Nippon Paper Industries USA Co., Ltd. v. United States*,¹¹ the Court of Federal Claims concluded that Treasury's treatment of other biomass applicants was relevant and discoverable for evaluating the level of deference to give Treasury's guidance.

In *Alta Wind*, the court denied the government's motion in limine attempting to exclude certain Treasury and NREL witnesses from testifying at trial—the plaintiffs in that case had identified those witnesses on the plaintiffs' witness list.

COUNTERCLAIMS

The government has filed counterclaims in a number of the 1603 cases. The Court of Federal Claims has been receptive to allowing the government to amend its pleadings to raise a counterclaim. For example, in *Alta Wind*, the court allowed the government to amend its pleadings after the government's expert filed his report. The court stated in that case: "Here, in these *de novo* proceedings, Plaintiffs are faced with the rather obvious proposition that the Court's ultimate resolution of the cost basis issues could be greater than or less than the amount paid by the Treasury. If 30 percent of the cost basis is less than the Treasury's original determination, then Plaintiffs would be required to refund the amount of the overpayment." Although the court has allowed

¹⁰ No. 14-250C.

¹¹ No. 15-1535C.

counterclaims to be filed, the government generally has been unsuccessful in its counterclaims. The government lost its counterclaims in *Alta Wind* and *LCM*, as noted above. The government also lost in its attempt to recapture a grant award in *GUSC Energy* because of the temporary idling of a biomass facility.

SETTLEMENT

Three cases now have been settled (on undisclosed terms).¹²

JURISDICTION

In January 2011, in *ARRA Energy Co., I v. United States*,¹³ the Court of Federal Claims held that it had jurisdiction over 1603 cases under the Tucker Act. The Court of Federal Claims and the government have accepted the *ARRA Energy* decision in subsequent cases. In *Desert Sunlight 250, LLC, et al. v. Lew*,¹⁴ the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, granted the government's motion to dismiss and held that the Court of Federal Claims has exclusive jurisdiction over 1603 claims. The plaintiffs there had filed suit and filed a motion for summary judgment and seeking injunctive and mandamus relief to compel Treasury to pay the grant within the 60 day period prescribed by 1603.

CASES TO WATCH

- *Alta Wind*: The government has noticed its appeal to the Federal Circuit. Briefing was scheduled to begin in April 2017 with a decision expected later this year.
- *Sequoia*: The most recent trial schedule has been vacated pending what appear to be serious settlement discussions. A decision on residential solar transactions may have to wait for another case to be filed.
- *California Ridge & Bishop Hill Energy LLC*:¹⁵ Cases involve reductions to the grant awards of wind energy facilities based on Treasury's challenges to reported cost basis—specifically, the application of the notion of the basis being in excess of “open market expectations” and the level of permissible developer fees. Trial has not been scheduled in these cases. The government has indicated its intention to file a motion for summary judgment.

¹² See *Windpower Partners 1993, LLC v. United States*, No. 13-696C (cost basis and valuation issues); *Vasco Winds, LLC v. United States*, No. 13-697C (cost basis and valuation issues); *Fire Island Wind, LLC v. United States*, No. 14403T (costs of navigational aid facility required by FAA).

¹³ 97 Fed. Cl. 12 (2011).

¹⁴ 169 F. Supp. 3d 91 (2016).

¹⁵ No. 14-251C.

- *Genesis Solar, LLC v. United States*:¹⁶ *Genesis Solar* is the first 1603 case in the Court of Federal Claims involving a utility-scale solar farm. The issues in the case are similar to issues raised by Treasury with respect to other commercial solar facilities—issues with respect to whether certain items represent qualified property (e.g., heat transfer fluid (HTF) systems, wind fencing, water wells) and whether certain costs (e.g., land mitigation costs, permitting costs) may be capitalized to eligible basis. The case has been stayed pending settlement discussions.
- *Ampersand Chowchilla Biomass, LLC, et al. v. United States*:¹⁷ Trial was scheduled for June 12, 2017 through June 23, 2017. The issues in *Ampersand* involve whether two biomass facilities were placed into service prior to the 2009 effective date of 1603, as determined by Treasury, or within the timeframes prescribed by 1603, as alleged by the applicants in that case. The applicants have filed a motion for partial summary judgment.

¹⁶ No. 15-268C.

¹⁷ No. 14-841C.