



## 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#	IFB-C-1220228
Estimated Dollar Amount:	\$3,300,000
Type of Procurement:	Invitation for Bids
Contract Description:	Traffic Signal and Communication Projects - Traffic Combo #1
Requesting Department:	Atlanta Department of Transportation
All Bidders:	Brooks Berry Haynie & Associates, Inc.
DOP Responsive Bidders:	Brooks Berry Hayne & Associates, Inc.
Recommended Awardee:	Brooks Berry Hayne & Associates, Inc.

### TABLE OF FINDINGS

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
<b>Evaluation Team</b>	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
<b>Solicitation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Evaluation criteria that are too vague or subjective can allow for manipulation of the scores.</li> </ul>	The user agency recommended DOP cancel the previous solicitation, IFB-C-1220024, due to not receiving any bids.	No response required
<b>Advertisement/ Addenda</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing the solicitation criteria to favor a particular proponent is a red flag of potential bid rigging (International Anti-Corruption Resource Center).</li> <li>Too many addenda could indicate unclear specifications or unclear scope of work, which could also favor a particular proponent.</li> </ul>	No findings identified	N/A

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
<b>Submittal</b>	<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"> <li>• Bidders must provide sealed bids via the ATCLCloud electronic procurement system, no later than 2:00 P.M., ET on date specified in the advertisement or addenda.</li> <li>• Bids shall be received without alteration or correction except as authorized by the CPO. (City Code Sec. 2-1188).</li> </ul>	DOP received one submittal for this solicitation.	No response required
<b>Responsive Review</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Unclear or inconsistent responsiveness determinations could be a red flag of bid manipulation.</li> </ul>	The authorized representative of the awardee signed the IIREA form (Form 1) and the Contractor's Disclosure form (Form 2) of the required submittals ten days in advance of the notary's signature. Both forms state the dates of these signatures must be the same.	This error was waived as a minor irregularity as all other notarized forms were dated properly.
<b>Conflict of Interest</b>	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
<b>Evaluation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DOP procedures require procurement staff to compile the evaluation scores, including those from risk management and contract compliance.</li> <li>• Public procurement practice states that any arithmetical errors should be corrected, and scores should be recorded in grids/matrices (NIGP).</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	No findings identified	N/A
<b>Cancellation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Transparency International states that effective record-keeping of decisions and reasons for cancellation promotes accountability and transparency.</li> </ul>	No findings identified	N/A

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
<b>Award</b>	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