



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-S-1210282
Estimated Dollar Amount:	\$15,000,000
Type of Procurement:	Request for Proposal
Contract Description:	General Engineering Services for the Atlanta Department of Transportation
Requesting Department:	Atlanta Department of Transportation
All Proponents:	AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (AECOM) and Accura Engineering and Consulting, Inc. (Accura) Arcadis - BPA JV TransportATL Barge-WRJ, JV Gresham Smith + Platinum Geomatics Joint Venture HNTB/CERM Design Collaborative (HCDC) Visioneering Partners (VP) Pond-Rohadfox, LLC Atlanta Transportation Partners RS&H/BenchMark, JV Atlanta Mobility Professional, a Joint Venture WSP/Luster Joint Venture ATSG KH/SEI
DOP Responsive Proponents:	DOP deemed all proponents responsive.
Recommended Awardee:	The user agency recommended all proponents for award.

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	N/A
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. 	The user agency previously canceled the solicitation under RFP-S-1200575. IPro found the user agency failed to include a reason for cancellation in the cancellation memo to DOP. Best practices from Transparency International suggest effective record-keeping of decisions and reasons promotes accountability and transparency.	No response required

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
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. 	No findings identified	N/A
Submittal	The city code provides that the city shall select no less than three submittals solicited from an RFP that it deems as the most responsible and responsive; provided, however, that if three or fewer offerors respond, the requirement shall not apply (City Code Sec. 2-1189).	No findings identified	N/A
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. 	<p>DOP received 14 proposals for this solicitation and found all proponents responsive. However, IPro found the following discrepancies in two responsive proponents' submittals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The minority partner of a joint venture indicated a Certified Public Accountant reviewed the financial statements; however, the Independent Accountants Compilation Report stated the accountant firm did not audit or review the submitted documents, and the firm was not independent of the proponent. 2) The minority partner of a joint venture provided financial statements for only two years; the solicitation's instructions required proponents to submit financial statements for the three most recent years. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The financial documents were deemed sufficient per DOP's responsiveness review and additionally reviewed and scored by Risk Management. 2) The financial documents were deemed sufficient per DOP's responsiveness review and additionally reviewed and scored by Risk Management
Conflict of Interest	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.	No findings identified	N/A

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
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. Not applicable for RFPs. 	No findings identified	N/A
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	N/A
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	N/A