CITY OF ATLANTA
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
LADAWN BLACKETT
INTERIM INSPECTOR GENERAL

INDEPENDENT PROCUREMENT REVIEW DIVISION

Independent Procurement Review Report

TO: Atlanta City Council

DATE: September 23, 2025

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

Background

The Department of Watershed Management requested an Invitation for Bids for the project and scope shown below. Invitations for Bids are to be awarded to the lowest responsive or responsible bidder. This project was not previously cancelled.

Solicitation#	IFB/CON/DWM/2502-1250143
Project Name:	Valley of the Hawks Constructed Wetlands
Estimated Dollar Amount:	$11,853,000
Term:	548 days for substantial completion, 548 days for final completion
Recommended Awardee:	Rockdale Pipeline Inc./Integral Municipal Services Inc., JV
DOP Responsive Bidders:	Rockdale Pipeline Inc./ Integral Municipal Services Inc., JV Ruby Collins/SE Consortium Joint Venture
All Bidders:	Rockdale Pipeline Inc./ Integral Municipal Services Inc., JV Ruby Collins/SE Consortium Joint Venture BRTU Construction Inc. Precision 2000 Inc. Southeastern Site Development, Inc.

Observations and Responses

Solicitation

Observation 1: The Department of Procurement (DOP) issued three addenda for this solicitation. The addenda were issued to update the Construction Plans, change the site tour date, the question and proposal due dates, revise various project attachments, revise the Statement of Bidder Qualifications, revise the Required Submittals Checklist, upload the attendance sheet from the site visit, extend due dates, and respond to thirty-seven (37) questions. Too many addenda could indicate unclear specifications or scope of work, which could favor a particular proponent.

> DOP Response: Each addendum served a value-added purpose by providing suppliers with updated and necessary information to ensure transparency, provide detailed clarification and eliminate ambiguity. The addenda addressed items such as Construction Plans, revisions to project attachments, and a revised Statement of Bidder Qualifications. Addenda are designed to ensure all offerors receive information to prepare a responsive and responsible submission.

Evaluation

Observation 2: A bid spread is the difference between the lowest and highest bids as a percentage of the lowest bid. The bid spread between the lowest and highest bids is 56.10%. The lowest bidder was deemed non-responsive.

The bid spread between the proposed awardee and the lowest bid, which was non-responsive per DOP, is 44.34%. Bids more than 20% apart could be an indication of collusive bidding.

> DOP Response: Pursuant to Code Section 2-1188(k), the award of a contract must be made to the most responsible and responsive offeror, as determined under evaluation criteria 1 through 11. In this case, the lowest proponent was deemed non-responsive and, therefore, excluded from further consideration. Accordingly, when considering only responsible and responsive proponents, the actual bid spread is 8.15% between the highest and lowest ranking responsive offerors. This reflects a competitive range and does not support an indication of collusive bidding.

Award

Observation 3: Invitations for Bids (IFBs) are considered "an appropriate procurement method when price and responsibility are the primary means for award," per DOP's 2024 SOP Section 2.23. This section states, "cost is evaluated based on the best value to the City."

The User Agency did not award the lowest bidder and cited it failing to meet the requirements outlined in the Statement of Offeror's Qualification by not highlighting the company's project experience to include scope for excavation and installation of large-scale infrastructure (72" or greater). The letter cites the Bid Evaluation Team was concerned that the award of the contract

could potentially result in multiple Change Orders and from previous experience with the bidder they felt the bidder did not have familiarity with the work scoped on past projects.

> DOP Response: Pursuant to Code Section 2-1188(k), the award of a contract must be made to the most responsible and responsive offeror. The Department of Watershed Management's evaluation concluded that the selected bidder provided a comprehensive work history covering both stream restoration and complex pipe work, which are critical components of this project. The lowest bidder emphasized only stream restoration, the least technical portion of the scope; therefore, DWM found the recommended awardee to be the most responsive and responsible, best serving the interest of the City.

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.