



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-1220260
Estimated Dollar Amount:	Up to \$10,000,000 per project for three years with one two-year renewal option
Type of Procurement:	Request for Proposals
Contract Description:	Managing General Contractor Services at Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport
Requesting Department:	Department of Aviation
All Proponents:	SOCO-Catamount JV, Swinerton + WEBMyers JV, Drake-Reams JV, Johnson-Laux-Skyline, Atlanta JOC Contractors, LLC., P2K & Lefko JV, Randolph Co-JOTS JV.
DOP Responsive Proponents:	SOCO-Catamount JV, Swinerton + WEBMyers JV, Johnson-Laux-Skyline, Atlanta JOC Contractors, LLC., P2K & Lefko JV, Randolph Co-JOTS JV.
Recommended Awardee:	SOCO-Catamount JV, Swinerton + WEBMyers JV

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. 	No findings identified.	N/A

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
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 proponent's compliance with those required documents. • Unclear or inconsistent responsiveness determinations could be a red flag of bid manipulation. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In response to Question 1 (which proponent re-labeled as Question A) on Form 2 (Contractor Disclosure and Declaration Form), a non-responsive proponent stated that it held a contract with the City of Atlanta within the last three years and provided the contract number and project name as required. However, DOP noted that the proponent did not provide the contract details. 2) A non-responsive proponent failed to provide its General Contractors License as this solicitation requires. 3) A joint venture partner of a non-responsive proponent listed itself as a sub-contractor on Forms DBE-2 and DBE-3 along with the Letter of Intent. 4) A minority partner in a joint venture provided three years of self-prepared financial statements but failed to select the type of financial statements submitted as required. 5) In response to Question 1 on Form 2 (Contractor Disclosure and Declaration Form), an awardee stated that it held a contract with the City of Atlanta within the last three years but failed to provide the project number and contract name as required. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The absence of a response to question 1 on Form 2 was listed as a minor technicality. The proponent was deemed non-responsive due to the failure to provide a JV agreement. 2) DOP did not deem the proponent non-responsive due to the General Contractor's License. The proponent was deemed non-responsive due to the failure to provide a JV agreement. 3) The proponent was deemed non-responsive due to the failure to provide a JV agreement. 4) DOP noted that the proponent failed to select the type of financial statements; however, deemed it to be a minor technicality. 5) The absence of providing the project number and contract name was deemed to be a minor technicality.
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). 	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