



Independent Procurement Review Report

Why We Did This Review

In accordance with Atlanta City Charter Article 8, Section 8-107, the Independent Procurement Review Division of the Office of the Inspector General must review all solicitations with an aggregate value of \$1,000,000 or greater, seeking approval by the Atlanta City Council, for file completeness, conflicts of interest, and other areas of perceived deficiency.

Solicitation	RFP-C-1220116
Estimated Dollar Amount	\$7,090,000
Type of Procurement	Request for Proposal
Contract Description	Annual Contract for Major Mechanical Repairs and Services
Requesting Department	Department of Watershed Management
All Bidders	Ruby-Collins/SE Consortium JV, LLC. Lakeshore Engineering/Contessa Construction JV, LLC.
DOP Responsive Bidders	Ruby-Collins/SE Consortium JV, LLC. Lakeshore Engineering/Contessa Construction JV, LLC.
Recommended Awardee	Ruby-Collins/SE Consortium JV, LLC. Lakeshore Engineering/Contessa Construction JV, LLC.

TABLE OF FINDINGS

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
Evaluation Team	DOP procedures require evaluators to possess the necessary and appropriate experience needed to evaluate the proposals or offerors submitted to the city.	No findings identified	No response needed
Solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bids shall only be evaluated on requirements and evaluation criteria outlined in the formal solicitation (DOP SOP 4.3.6.(E)(3)). Having selection criteria established in the solicitation can help prevent bid manipulation. Evaluation criteria that are too vague or subjective can allow for manipulation of the scores. 	No findings identified	No response needed
Advertisement/ Addenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changing the solicitation criteria to favor a particular proponent is a red flag of potential bid rigging (International Anti-Corruption Resource Center). Too many addenda could indicate unclear specifications or unclear scope of work, which could also favor a particular proponent. 	DOP issued two addenda, which: revised the Contents of Proposal, Statement of Bidder qualifications, Cost Proposal, and Scope of Services, Technical Specifications; extended the due date; added the Work Plan and Safety Record; and answered 35 questions.	No response needed

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
Submittal	<p>The city code and DOP policy and procedures provide guidance for the receipt of competitive sealed bids.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidders must provide sealed bids via the ATLCLOUD electronic procurement system, no later than 2:00 P.M., ET on date specified in the advertisement or addenda. • Bids shall be received without alteration or correction except as authorized by the CPO. (City Code Sec. 2-1188). 	The solicitation received fewer than three proposals.	No response needed
Responsive Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOP procedures require findings to be recorded on a responsive checklist which identifies specific submittal requirements for the project and identifies a bidder's compliance with those required documents. • Unclear or inconsistent responsiveness determinations could be a red flag of bid manipulation. 	No findings identified	No response needed
Conflict of Interest	<p>The city's standards of conduct prohibit employees from having financial conflicts of interests. Contracts must be awarded and administered free from improper influence or the appearance of impropriety.</p>	<p>DOP rules require that evaluators follow the city's Standard of Ethical Conduct for Procurement and complete the evaluator ethics form.</p> <p>One evaluator failed to initial the City's Standards of Ethical Conduct related to discovering and addressing conflicts of interest and another failed to sign the City's Standards of Ethical Conduct.</p>	No response needed
Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOP procedures require procurement staff to compile the evaluation scores, including those from risk management and contract compliance. • Public procurement practice states that any arithmetical errors should be corrected, and scores should be recorded in grids/matrices (NIGP). • According to the International Anti-Corruption Resource Center, bids that are too close together (less than 1%) or too far apart (more than 20%) could be indicators of collusive bidding. 	No findings identified	No response needed

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
Cancellation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government Accountability Office states that the use of standard language such as “in the best interest of the city” without a specific justification for cancellation could be a fraud indicator. • Transparency International states that effective record-keeping of decisions and reasons for cancellation promotes accountability and transparency. 	No findings identified	No response needed
Award	A contract file should include all project items, to confirm that each phase of the procurement was facilitated appropriately and audit-ready (DOP SOP Sec. 3.18)	No findings identified	No response needed