



CITY OF ATLANTA
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
SHANNON K. MANIGAULT
INSPECTOR GENERAL

INDEPENDENT PROCUREMENT REVIEW DIVISION

Independent Procurement Review Report

TO: Atlanta City Council

DATE: January 31, 2024

The purpose of this report is to communicate the results of the following solicitation.

Background

The Department of Aviation requested a Request for Proposals for the project and scope shown below. Requests for Proposals are typically evaluated based on a variety of evaluation factors including price, understanding of scope and objectives, and expertise.

Solicitation#	RFP-DOA-2308-1240039
Project Name:	Airside On-Call Electrical Services at H-JAIA
Estimated Dollar Amount:	\$1,500,000.00 (\$500,000 annually)
Term:	Three years with one two-year renewal option.
Recommended Awardee:	Brooks Berry Haynie & Associates Inc.
DOP Responsive Bidders:	Brooks Berry Haynie & Associates Inc.
All Bidders:	Brooks Berry Haynie & Associates Inc.

Observations and Responses

Initiation

Observation 1: DOP did not submit a signed copy of the CPO memo, which lists the approved evaluators, as required.

DOP Response: The evaluator approval memo was not housed in the SharePoint folder as the previous Contract Specialist did not save it as instructed. The Category Lead downloaded the memo from DocuSign and saved it to the files and forwarded a copy in a shared folder to include in the IPro response. The only revision made to the memo was to rename and save the file for use.

Observation 2: This solicitation was previously cancelled under solicitation RFP/CON/DOA/2304-1230326, Airside Electrical On-Call after receiving two responses. The cancellation memo stated the responses were deemed non-responsive by either DOP or OCC.

IPro does not require a response from DOP for this observation.

Solicitation

Observation 3: This solicitation received one submittal, which could be an indication of limited competition.

IPro does not require a response from DOP for this observation.

Responsive Review

Observation 4: The Financial Responsibility Review Form for the proposed awardee was not signed by the Contract Specialist to indicate the responsiveness of the proponent's submittal, as required on the form.

DOP Response: The omission of signature on this form was an oversight. The assigned Category Specialist is no longer employed with COA. Risk Management vetted and approved the information. DOP will ensure that CS signatures are obtained for all future solicitations.

Observation 5: The proposed awardee submitted three references from one source who is also listed as an approved evaluator for this solicitation.

DOP Response: The referenced evaluator is the Planning Director for DOA Planning and Development, and she is consistently used as a reference for DOA projects. DOP does not consider providing references for active projects a conflict.

Evaluation

Observation 6: One evaluator not identified as an approved evaluator attended the collaborative scoring session. One approved evaluator did not attend the collaborative scoring session.

DOP Response: An Airport Engineer replaced an Airport Planning and Development Director as an evaluator. The timeframe was short due to scheduling conflicts and DOP inadvertently omitted preparing a revised evaluator approval memo for the replacement. DOP will ensure that such documentation will be prepared for future solicitations.

The review yielded no additional findings.

Methodology

The Independent Procurement Division reviews the following stages of the procurement process:

- Initiation
- Solicitation
- Responsive Review
- Evaluation
- Award

In accordance with Atlanta City Charter Article 8, Section 8-107, and Section 2-1604 of the Atlanta Code of Ordinances, 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; must review all cooperative purchase agreements and piggyback contracts with an aggregate value greater than \$1,000,000; and may conduct discretionary reviews of any value.