



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-1220157
Estimated Dollar Amount:	\$1,488,000
Type of Procurement:	Request for Proposals
Contract Description:	Design Build Services for Standby Generators at Remote Pumping Stations
Requesting Department:	Department of Watershed Management
All Proponents:	Lakeshore Engineering, LLC
DOP Responsive Proponents:	Lakeshore Engineering, LLC
Recommended Awardee:	Lakeshore Engineering, 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	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. 	No findings identified	N/A
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 three addenda for this solicitation to answer proponents' questions, add drawings, revise the site visit schedule, and revise the due date for proposals. Two of the three addenda were labeled "Addendum Number 1."	No response required
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).	There were fewer than three submittals for this solicitation.	No response required

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
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 proponent's compliance with those required documents. • Unclear or inconsistent responsiveness determinations could be a red flag of bid manipulation. 	The sole vendor and its notary failed to date the Contractor's Financial Disclosure (Form 3).	The Department of Procurement (DOP) waived the failure to date the financial disclosure form as a minor technicality or informality in accordance with O.C.G.A. 36-91-20 as it was determined to be in the best interest of the City, due to a lack of competition with bid responses.
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.	The sole vendor answered "no" to Question 3 on the Contractor's Financial Disclosure Form (Form 3), failing to disclose an unresolved state tax lien that occurred within the last five years.	The Department of Procurement is only able to consider information provided by the supplier with their 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). 	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