



Independent Procurement Review Report

Why We Did This Review

In accordance with Atlanta City Charter Chapter 6, Section 2.603, our office is authorized to 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.

FC#	1190004
Estimated Dollar Amount:	
Type of Procurement:	Invitation for Bid
Contract Description:	Chattahoochee River Intake Pump Station
Requesting Department:	Department of Watershed Management
All Proponents:	1. Archer Western/Lewis Contracting JV 2. Clark/Atkinson/Technique - Chattahoochee River, a Joint Venture 3. Oscar Renda I EA Barnett Group, JV 4. PC-Russell Joint Venture II 5. Western Summit/Anatek Construction Joint Venture
DOP Responsive Proponents:	
Recommended Awardee:	N/A- Cancelled

TABLE OF FINDINGS

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	Resolved/ Remaining
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 published more than two addenda during this solicitation.	No response needed.

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	Resolved/ Remaining
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).	Minority partner submitted as a subcontractor on another joint venture submittal	No response needed.
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 deemed two of five bidders responsive but IPRO noted deficiencies in each of the bids:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One bidder's submission had missing or incomplete documents including no joint venture agreement and an incomplete safety record form. The other bidder's joint venture agreement was not notarized as required. 	No response needed.
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
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. 	N/A	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. 	The user department cancelled the solicitation during the current period because the bids exceeded the project budget.	No response needed.
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)	N/A	N/A