



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#	SP-C-1230164
Estimated Dollar Amount:	\$2,904,455.03, one year term with two one-year renewal options
Type of Procurement:	Special Procurement
Contract Description:	Traffic Signal and Communication Project - Traffic Combo # 4
Requesting Department:	Atlanta Department of Transportation
All Proponents:	Brooks Berry Haynie & Associates, Inc.,
DOP Responsive Proponents:	Brooks Berry Haynie & Associates, Inc.,
Recommended Awardee:	Brooks Berry Haynie & Associates, Inc.,

TABLE OF FINDINGS

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
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
Award	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) Special Procurements require the following documentation, according to City Code Section 2-1214, DOP SOP Sec 4.8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement request form from user agency Department memo to CPO detailing the unusual and/or unique situation CPO's written determination/approval for special procurement Original IRREA form Statement of work and corresponding competitive quotes (at a minimum three (3) quotes shall be reflected or justification otherwise) Insurance (if applicable) Approved requisition Conflict of interest form SAM verification Authority to Transact Business in Georgia (DOP SOP Sec. 4.8) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The selected awardee submitted two bid tabulation forms for this project. The forms show conflicting dollar amounts that do not equal the amount established for this solicitation. An ADOT consultant cited calculation errors when reviewing the cost proposals. The final cost proposal amount remains unclear. The procurement file lacked an approved requisition identifying the source of funding. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Per ATL-DOT, BBH's SOV document was redlined during the evaluation process because of one minor arithmetic error for a sub-total of location and two missing sub-totals, but that didn't affect the bid because the total bid price of \$2,904,455.03 was correct, matching the total amount of our bid comparison document. DOP provided an email to IPro on 3/23/23 which included a document title Budget Change. This document shows evidence that funding for this action is available. ATL-DOT finance personnel noted that the approved requisition will be included in the legislative package.

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
		<p>3) The procurement file also lacked a Certificate of Authority to Transact Business in Georgia for the recommended awardee.</p> <p>4) The Special Designation Justification Memo states ADOT reached out to several contractors to solicit bids, however, it failed to provide documents supporting this.</p> <p>The ADOT consultant stated the documents submitted by competing bidders are now lost and no longer available.</p>	<p>3) DOP attached the document to its response.</p> <p>4) The ADOT consultant stated that they had issues with their email account and that the original email was not retrievable. DOP provided an email wherein ADOT reached out to AIM and was provided confirming information that the quotes were sent to various vendors.</p>