



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: March 13, 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. This project has not been previously cancelled.

Solicitation#	RFP-PS-DOA-1240104
Project Name:	Planning Support Services at HJAIA
Estimated Dollar Amount:	\$5,000,000 Annually
Term:	Three years with a renewal option of two additional one-year terms
Recommended Awardee:	Jacobsen Daniels + Valancourt Joint Venture
DOP Responsive Bidders:	Jacobsen Daniels + Valancourt Joint Venture
All Bidders:	Jacobsen Daniels + Valancourt Joint Venture

Observations and Responses

Solicitation

Observation 1: This solicitation received one submittal, which could indicate limited competition.

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

Responsive Review

Observation 2: DOP noted on the Responsive Review Checklist that the recommended awardee provided a Georgia Contractor's License. IPro found no such license in the documents DOP provided.

DOP Response: The Contractor's license was not a requirement for this solicitation. The Category Specialist listed the Georgia Contractors License listed on the Responsive Review document as a requirement in error. However, the listed requirement should have been the Certificate of Good Standing, issued by the Secretary of the State of Georgia, which is referenced in the Technical Instructions to Proponents. The Certificate of Good Standing document was submitted as required.

Observation 3: The majority JV partner of the proposed awardee failed to submit a Contractor Disclosure and Declaration Form (Form 2) on its own behalf as required on the form.

DOP Response: The authorized representative of the joint venture is also the prime contractor and completed and signed the Contractor Disclosure and Declaration Form on behalf of both. The authorized representative checked on page two that they are the majority partner and authorized to sign. The Offeror is a newly formed joint venture, formed within the last three (3) years, therefore the prime is authorized to sign on behalf of the joint venture.

DOP will continue to express the importance of completing all forms during pre-conferences and will ensure that all information is vetted properly to determine responsiveness.

Observation 4: The minority JV partner of the proposed awardee submitted an incomplete Contractor Disclosure and Declaration Form (Form 2).

DOP Response: Additional review, per this observation, notes that the minority partner did complete the questionnaire; however, they did not provide the most basic information such as name, phone number, and email address. This information was validated via Form 4 – Offeror Contact Directory.

DOP will continue to express the importance of completing all forms during pre-conferences and will ensure that all information is vetted properly to determine responsiveness.

Observation 5: The proposed awardee failed to submit a Letter of Intent for two subcontractors listed on the Subcontractor/Supplier Utilization Form (Form EOB-3) as required by the Office of Contract Compliance.

DOP Response: The two “Letter of Intent” omissions for the two listed contractors did not affect the commitment contract participation (MBE/FBE -40%) and since this is the one and only proponent that was submitted to OCC for review. However, OCC has stated that they will hold the proponent accountable for the two non-certified sub-contractors listed on form EBO#3 if the contract is awarded to the proponent.

DOP will continue to express the importance of completing all forms during pre-conferences and will ensure that all information is vetted properly to determine responsiveness.

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.