



Established 1915

**BROWARD**  
County Public Schools

---

# Internal Audit of Program Management FY19 Q3

June 12, 2019



---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Transmittal Letter .....	1
Executive Summary .....	2
Detailed Observations.....	4
Objectives and Approach.....	13
Appendicies.....	14



## TRANSMITTAL LETTER

June 12, 2019

Joris Jabouin, Chief Auditor  
Broward County Public Schools  
600 SE 3rd Avenue, 8th Floor  
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301

Pursuant to the approved internal audit scoping letter submitted January 22, 2019, we hereby submit our FY19 Q3 internal audit report of the Program Management function. We will be presenting this report to the Audit Committee at the next scheduled meeting on June 20, 2019.

Our report is organized in the following sections:

<b>Executive Summary</b>	This section provides a brief background and a summary of the observations related to our internal audit of the Contract Administration function.
<b>Detailed Observations</b>	This section presents descriptions of the items noted during our internal audit and recommended actions as well as summarized responses from Atkins and CBRE Heery, and estimated completion dates.
<b>Objectives and Approach</b>	The internal audit objectives and focus are expanded upon in this section as well as a review of our approach.
<b>Appendices</b>	This section provides full Atkins and CBRE Heery's responses to RSM's recommendations.

We would like to thank all those involved in assisting the Internal Auditors in connection with the FY19 Q3 internal audit of the Program Management function at Broward County Public Schools.

Respectfully Submitted,

[RSM US LLP]



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Background, Objectives and Scope

RSM has provided various operational and construction auditing services through agreement with District's Office of the Chief Auditor ("OCA") since 2013. In March of 2017, RSM began providing quarterly evaluation reports of the District's Program Management team directly to the District's Office of Facilities and Construction ("OFC"). During our engagement we worked closely with OFC and members of the ATKINS and CBRE-HEERY Program Management team to improve the District's design and construction control environment, and encourage transparency and accuracy in reporting. In November 2018, RSM was notified that the District intended to shift the contractual oversight and management of our work from OFC, back to the OCA. In January 2019, RSM worked with OCA to define an audit plan for the calendar year 2019, and began conducting fieldwork shortly thereafter.

The objective of our current engagement is to verify that the District's Program Management Consultant ("PM" - Atkins) and Owner's Representative ("OR" - CBRE-HEERY) are providing deliverables and services in conformance with the terms and conditions of their respective agreements / RFP. Our procedures included testing of PM/OR compliance with District standard operating procedures and industry leading practices. Our scope included activities performed during the period January – March 2019.

### Observations

The observations identified during our assessment are summarized on the following page, and include management action plans with estimated completion dates.

During our work we noted that with the exception of RFI aging reports, the PM team is in compliance with the reporting requirements of their agreement, but the OR team's agreement will need to be modified to reflect current reporting practice.

Further, we noted e-Builder work flows for invoice and RFI reviews were recently implemented (February 2019), but have not been mandated for use by OFC. Lastly, we identified instances of non-compliance with the standard operating procedure for Design; these include departure from the standard design review schedule, as well as missed or combined design review phases.

### Approach

Our audit approach consisted of the following:

#### Program Manager (Atkins)

- Obtained and reviewed deliverables submitted in accordance with PM monthly reporting requirements derived from RFP Article 6.4.2.6.
- Reviewed Atkins monthly invoicing for contractual compliance, proper supporting documentation, and mathematical accuracy
- Followed up on prior findings, including e-Builder utilization and workflow rollout

#### Owner's Representative (CBRE-Heery)

- Obtained and reviewed deliverables submitted in accordance with PM monthly reporting requirements derived from RFP Article 6.4.3.10.
- Selected a sample of project(s) for control assessment and testing
- Tested the sample projects for compliance with District Standard Operating Procedure and best practices. In-Scope processes for this period included:
  - Design procurement
  - Design schedule management
- Review CBRE-HEERY monthly invoicing for contractual compliance, proper supporting documentation, and mathematical accuracy

#### Reporting

At the conclusion of our procedures, we summarized our findings related to the Contract Administration process. We have reviewed the results of our testing with OCA, OFC, the PM/OR team, and incorporated management's response into our report.



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - CONTINUED

### Summary of Observations

Following is a summary of observations that were identified. Further details of each item are included within the Detailed Observations section of this report.

#### Observations

##### 1. PM/OR Compliance with Reporting Requirements

During our testing of reporting packages provided by the PM/OR team for the in-scope period, we noted that in some instances reports were provided for the first time in the January 2019 package, and that some reports have still not been provided by the PM/OR team.

##### 2. Delay in Execution of the Authorization to Proceed

Through our detailed testing related to the Design Procurement Standard Operating Procedure (“SOP”), we noted non-compliance with the SOP for 5 of 5 projects sampled, with significant delays in the execution of the consultant’s Authorization to Proceed (“ATP”) after Board approval of the Professional Service Agreements (“PSA”) for 4 out of 5 projects sampled.

##### 3. PM/OR Adherence to Design Phase Timeline

Through our detailed testing related to the Design Phase Standard Operating Procedure (“SOP”), we noted instances of non-compliance with the SOP in effect at the time of our testing.

##### 4. e-Builder Workflow Implementation & Document Retention

Although the Request for Information (“RFI”) / Architect Supplemental Instruction, Consultant’s Invoicing, and GC Invoicing e-Builder workflows relevant to capital projects were listed as “live” in monthly reporting, we noted that workflows are not yet widely utilized. The PM/OR team noted that although the workflows were live and training was provided, a directive was not issued to Project Managers, instructing them to utilize e-Builder workflows for all invoicing and RFIs.

Through our detailed SOP testing, we also noted that several supporting documents were not uploaded to e-Builder, including copies of the advertisement for design procurement, and design review logs.



## DETAILED OBSERVATIONS

### INTERNAL AUDIT – PROGRAM MANAGEMENT FY19 Q3

#### OBSERVATION

#### 1. PM/OR Compliance with Reporting Requirements

#### DETAIL

In August 2018 RSM conducted a facilitated session with representatives from Broward OFC, CBRE-Heery, and Atkins to discuss PM/OR compliance with deliverable requirements as outlined in each vendor's contract documents. This facilitated session was intended to establish a baseline for reports to be provided by the PM/OR team going forward. In this meeting, we collectively identified reporting previously provided to OFC, reporting available from the PM/OR team, and reporting to be provided to OFC for future periods. We then reconciled the current/future reporting to the requirements outlined in each vendor's contract documents to verify that reporting in future periods would align specified requirements. As a result of this reconciliation, we noted that Atkins' planned future reporting conformed with requirements, but that CBRE-Heery's RFP requirements would require amendment to align with planned future deliverables. For reporting to sufficiently meet OFC's needs, the contract may require modification as the planned reporting varied from that specified in the CBRE-Heery contract.

The reports listed in the table below were identified as the agreed-upon package to be provided for the periods ending September 2018 and beyond. The table summarizes the results of our testing:

Monthly Report	Responsible Vendor	Provided Jan 2019?	Provided Feb 2019?
Project schedule updates	CBRE-Heery	Yes	Yes
Milestone Baseline Schedule	CBRE-Heery	Yes	Yes
Monthly report of schedule delays / slippage at both program and project level	Atkins	Yes	Yes
Monthly cash flow report – actual vs projected	Atkins	Yes	Yes
Monthly RFI aging and reporting by project	Atkins	No	Yes
Monthly change order reporting – project & program level	Atkins	Yes	Yes
Vendor performance monitoring reports	Atkins	Yes	Yes
Post project completion reporting	Atkins	No*	No*
Project quality reporting – design process revise & resubmits, inspection results	Atkins	Yes	Yes

\*Through review of the Milestone Baseline Schedule, we noted that only one project is listed as complete (Manatee Bay ES P.001759; complete December 18, 2018).



## DETAILED OBSERVATIONS

### INTERNAL AUDIT – PROGRAM MANAGEMENT FY19 Q3

OBSERVATION	1. PM/OR Compliance with Reporting Requirements (continued)
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	<p>As identified in the August 2018 facilitated session, to comply with section 6.4.2.6 of the Program Manager RFP, we recommend the Program Manager report on post project stakeholder satisfaction. If stakeholder satisfaction assessments are not currently solicited, we recommend OFC and Atkins co-develop a survey for distribution to stakeholders as part of the project closeout process.</p> <p>In addition, we recommend OFC issue an addendum, memorandum of understanding, or similar to the CBRE-Heery contract specifying that reporting requirements have been modified to include project specific schedule reporting, as a replacement to the program level reporting specified in section 6.4.3.10 of the Owner's Representative RFP.</p>
<b>MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE</b>  <i>(REFER TO APPENDIX A FOR FULL TEXT)</i>	<p><b>Response:</b> The post project completion report has been drafted by [Capital and Program Controls Management] CPCM for review by OFC and the ORPM. Upon approval the report will be submitted in the CPCM monthly reporting. The January 2019 RFI report has since been provided to OFC and the office of the Chief Auditor.</p> <p><b>Estimated Completion Date:</b> July 2019</p>



## DETAILED OBSERVATIONS – CONTINUED

### INTERNAL AUDIT – PROGRAM MANAGEMENT FY19 Q3

#### OBSERVATION 2. Delay in Execution of the Authorization to Proceed

**DETAIL**

Through our detailed testing related to the Design Procurement Standard Operating Procedure (“SOP”), we noted non-compliance with the SOP for 5 of 5 projects sampled, with significant delays in the execution of the consultant’s Authorization to Proceed (“ATP”) after Board approval of the Professional Service Agreements (“PSA”) for 4 out of 5 projects sampled. SOP 10.20, as effective during the design and design procurement phases of our sampled projects, states that the Project Manager shall prepare the ATP 1 week prior to the SBBC meeting, and that the Architect must return the ATP by the day of the Board meeting.

In further discussions, the OR noted that Project Managers are often not assigned to projects until after Board approval of the PSA. As such, the ATP is not completed until after the PSA is executed, and then must route through the various OR and OFC approvals prior to execution.

Refer to the table below, which summarizes the timeline between Board approval of the PSA and execution of the ATP for each of our sampled projects:

Project	Board Approval of PSA	ATP Document Date	Days Elapsed	OFC Approval of ATP	OFC Approval Days Elapsed	ATP Delivery to Designer*	ATP Delivery Days Elapsed	Total Days Elapsed After Board Approval
Cooper City HS (P.002133)	05/08/2018	07/05/2018	-58	07/11/2018	-6	7/24/2018	-13	-77
Sanders Park ES (P.002132)	04/24/2018	06/14/2018	-51	07/02/2018	-18	7/12/2018	-10	-79
Mary M. Bethune ES (P.002125)	05/08/2018	07/20/2018	-73	07/30/2018	-10	8/10/2018	-11	-94
Westglades MS (P.002131)	06/12/2018	06/17/2018	-5	07/02/2018	-15	7/12/2018	-10	-30
Sawgrass ES (P.002127)	05/08/2018	07/23/2018	-76	07/30/2018	-7	8/10/2018	-11	-94

\*includes review, approval, and assignment of project number by Capital Payments, receipt by OR, distribution to Design Professional

Note that an SOP has since been created for the ATP process, as SOP 10.25 (effective 03/05/2019). The timeline related to the preparation of the ATP remained the same as noted in the prior SOP 10.20.

**RECOMMENDATION**

We recommend the OFC and PM/OR team review the SOP to determine whether the timeline established for execution of the ATP is practical and reasonable. If the analysis reveals that the timeline should be modified, we recommend the SOP be updated to reflect an attainable schedule. If the timeline is reasonable as currently written, we recommend the OR assign project managers prior to the Board meeting date for approval of the PSA, and work to complete ATPs in accordance with the timeline specified in the SOP.





## DETAILED OBSERVATIONS – CONTINUED

### INTERNAL AUDIT – PROGRAM MANAGEMENT FY19 Q3

OBSERVATION	2. Delay in Execution of the Authorization to Proceed (continued)
<p><b>MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE</b></p> <p><i>(REFER TO APPENDIX A FOR FULL TEXT)</i></p>	<p><b>Response:</b> Based upon the SMART Project assignment of A/Es being nearly complete, the future issuance of ATPs is limited to eleven (11) projects. It is the OR-PM and CPCM recommendation not to change the SOP 10.25 since that practice is sound. In addition, the assignment of PMs to the projects have also now been completed. Going forward assignment of PMs prior to A/E selection continues to be best practice. As a practical application, PMs were not always assigned ahead of time due to the manner in which PM staffing was increased during the course of the project. Until this year, PMs were not always in place prior to the inception of RFQ process.</p> <p>There were eight (8) year (5) projects where designers had been selected and given approved PSAs. At that time, a conscious effort was made to smooth out the number of projects in the work flow, (design-bid-build). In the case of the three (3) designers involved in these eight (8) projects, all had an existing work load with prior year projects.</p> <p>This purposeful delay was aimed at effecting the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce a log jam of design and design review</li> <li>• Focus on Year 1-2-3 projects</li> <li>• Recognize that year 4 and year 5 projects are being managed on schedule and with the new milestone schedule this delay smooths out the curve from design through cash flow. (The designers included in this group are Laura M. Perez and Assoc., DLFC Architectural, CES Consultants.)</li> </ul> <p><b>Estimated Completion Date:</b> N/A</p>



## DETAILED OBSERVATIONS – CONTINUED

### INTERNAL AUDIT – PROGRAM MANAGEMENT FY19 Q3

#### OBSERVATION

#### 3. PM/OR Adherence to Design Phase Timeline

#### DETAIL

Through our detailed testing related to the Design Phase Standard Operating Procedure (“SOP”), we noted instances of non-compliance with the SOP in effect at the time of our testing. SOP 3.3 details the procedures for completing design reviews at each major design milestone (Scope Validation, 30%, 50%, 90% and 100%), and established the following timeline of procedures to be performed prior to each milestone’s design review meetings:

- Designer submits required documentation 2 weeks prior to design review meeting
- Design reviewers submit Design Comment Sheets to Design Coordinator 5-10 days prior to design review meeting (depending on complexity of project)
- Designer submits responses 2 days prior to design review meeting
- In general, the design review process should be completed within a 3-week period

The timeline noted above was originally developed to provide structure and efficiency to the design review process. Through discussions with the OR team, we noted that they did not track or maintain evidence of compliance with the timeline detailed in the SOP. We reviewed supporting documentation to validate completion of the various Design reviews noted in the SOP, and identified the following:

- The OR noted that design schedules are developed on a project by project basis, and listed in the designer’s Authorization to Proceed. Zero (0) of 5 projects sampled included reviews at all design milestones noted in the SOP (SV, 30%, 50%, 90% and 100%).
- In one instance, a Scope Validation design review was not performed, although the review was noted in the ATP.
- The architect did not submit responses prior to the design meeting as required in the SOP for 21 of 24 milestones reviewed.

Through further discussions with the PM/OR team, we noted that SOP 3.3 was recently updated (effective 02/21/2019) to remove reference to the timeline described in prior versions of the SOP, and to clarify that review timelines are dependent on those listed in the executed PSA. Refer to the table below that summarizes dates of key design milestone reviews and total time between each milestone noted for each of our sampled projects:

OR Reviews Completed (Atlanta team)													
Project	ATP	Scope Validation		SD		DD		50%		90%		100%	
		Complete	Days	Complete	Days	Complete	Days	Complete	Days	Complete	Days	Complete	Days
Nov a HS (P.001817)	2/28/17	X	X	6/26/17	118	9/28/17	94	1/3/18	97	■	■	4/7/18	94
Hollywood Hills HS (P.001806)	3/7/17	■	■	6/20/17	105	10/8/17	110	1/8/18	92	3/14/18**	65	7/5/18	113
Swgrass Spgs MS (P.001841)	4/26/17	6/6/17	41	8/23/17	78	11/1/17	70	2/9/18	100	■	■	3/23/18	42
Forest Glen MS (P.001865)	5/31/17	6/29/17	29	8/22/17	54	12/18/17*	118	12/18/17*	0	■	■	5/23/18	156
Gulfstream Acd. (P.001822)	5/24/17	7/14/17	51	9/13/17	61	11/17/17	65	1/8/18	52	■	■	5/7/18	119

■ According to the Authorization to Proceed, this portion of the design review was not required based on the design schedule  
 \* Phases completed at same time, instead of separate as specified in ATP

X Validation was not performed by the Design Review Team  
 \*\* Not specified in ATP, but was performed



## DETAILED OBSERVATIONS – CONTINUED

### INTERNAL AUDIT – PROGRAM MANAGEMENT FY19 Q3

#### OBSERVATION 3. PM/OR Adherence to Design Phase Timeline (continued)

##### DETAIL - CONTINUED

The table below summarizes the variance in days from the original schedule noted in each project's ATP:

Project	Scope Validation			SD			DD			50%			100%		
	ATP Day	Actual Day	Variance	ATP Day	Actual Day	Variance	ATP Day	Actual Day	Variance	ATP Day	Actual Day	Variance	ATP Day	Actual Day	Var.
Nov a HS (P.001817)	14	X	X	84	118	-34	154	212	-58	231	309	-78	293	403	-110
Holly wood Hills HS (P.001806)	■	■	■	84	105	-21	154	215	-61	231	307	-76	293	485	-192
Swgrass Spgs MS (P.001841)	66	41	25	124	119	5	189	189	0	268	289	-21	347	331	16
Forest Glen MS (P.001865)	36	29	7	92	83	9	148	201	-53	231	201	30	315	357	-42
Gulf stream Acd. (P.001822)	42	51	-9	105	112	-7	161	177	-16	224	229	-5	275	348	-73

■ According to the Authorization to Proceed, this portion of the design review was not required based on the design schedule

X Validation was not performed by the Design Review Team

\* Phases completed at same time, instead of separate as specified in ATP

In addition to the reviews performed by the OR team, the District's Building Department also conducts a review of each project at 50% and 100% documents. As noted in our recommendation below, in the next quarter RSM will meet with the Building Department to understand their process, and conduct further analysis of the review timeline.

##### RECOMMENDATIONS & NEXT STEPS

Given the design delays identified for the 5 projects we sampled, we recommend the PM/OR develop an approach to identifying and addressing design phase schedule delays as they arise.

In addition, we noted that for 5 of 5 projects sampled, the PSA contained an option for the District to pursue damages for unexcused delay caused by the design consultant. As such, we further recommend the OFC analyze each project within the program to determine whether (1) damages for delay were included in each PSA, and (2) whether delays from the established design schedule existed. For variances noted between the timeline established in the PSA and/or accompanying NTP, the District should perform an analysis to identify the cause(s) of delay, and whether pursuit of damages is warranted.

Considering the Building Department's review of 100% documents occurs after the OR Atlanta Team's review, RSM intends to interview the Building Department during our next quarter's audit procedures in an effort to identify the full review timeline, and more clearly define the root cause(s) of noted delays.



## DETAILED OBSERVATIONS – CONTINUED

### INTERNAL AUDIT – PROGRAM MANAGEMENT FY19 Q3

OBSERVATION	3. PM/OR Adherence to Design Phase Timeline (continued)
<p><b>MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE</b></p> <p><i>(REFER TO APPENDIX A FOR FULL TEXT)</i></p>	<p><b>Response:</b> Regarding the monitoring of deliverables, every design phase project is managed by the PM per deliverable. We will now be utilizing the language of the PSA to assess delay charges at \$100/day. Notice was given to the consultants initially in December 2018.</p> <p>In addition, the PSA language allows for assessment of damages on plan reviews past (2) cycles. This will be enacted and these charges will go back to January 1, 2019 and be assessed going forward.</p> <p>We have reports that are used to track the status of Revise/Re-submit cycles which the PM will use to initiate notice of assessment.</p> <p>Regarding analysis of delay causes, there is on-going review of delay cause action. There has been a significant learning curve for all parties. The OR-PM team is working closely with the OFC and the Building Department to continually identify issues and determine subsequent improvements.</p> <p>As an example, a study of common issues that were surfacing during design reviews resulted in a document that was shared with all designers in December 2018 in order to pre-empt repetitive mistakes.</p> <p><b>Estimated Completion Date:</b> N/A</p>



## DETAILED OBSERVATIONS – CONTINUED

### INTERNAL AUDIT – PROGRAM MANAGEMENT FY19 Q3

OBSERVATION	4. e-Builder Workflow Implementation & Document Retention
<p><b>DETAIL</b></p>	<p>Although the Request for Information (“RFI”) / Architect Supplemental Instruction, Consultant’s Invoicing, and GC Invoicing e-Builder workflows relevant to capital projects were listed as “live” in monthly reporting, we noted that workflows are not yet widely utilized. An e-Builder Summit was hosted by Atkins in January 2019 to discuss the scope and timeline of the e-Builder workflow implementation. Representatives from Atkins, CBRE-Heery, and OFC were present for the discussion, and deadlines for “go-live” dates were agreed upon. The PM/OR team noted that although the workflows were live and training was provided, a directive was not issued to Project Managers, instructing them to utilize e-Builder workflows for all invoicing and RFIs.</p> <p>Through our detailed SOP testing, we also noted that several supporting documents were not uploaded to e-Builder. To conduct our testing of SOP compliance, we first reviewed documents available on e-Builder, and followed up with PM/OR and District personnel to obtain those documents which were not originally uploaded. All documentation requested was provided, and uploaded to the appropriate location in e-Builder after our request; however, the following documents were consistently missing from e-Builder:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A copy of the advertisement for Design Procurement</li> <li>• All Design Review logs</li> </ul> <p>As e-Builder is the District’s central repository of information related to projects, all relevant project and program documents should be uploaded in a timely manner.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b></p>	<p>We recommend the OR team begin utilizing the established workflows for all invoicing and RFIs going forward. Vendors should also be informed that invoicing submitted outside of e-Builder will not be processed unless a corresponding invoice issued through the workflow has also been generated.</p> <p>We further recommend the PM/OR team establish a process to verify that all documents are uploaded to e-Builder in accordance with the established SOP.</p>
<p><b>MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE</b></p> <p><i>(REFER TO APPENDIX A FOR FULL TEXT)</i></p>	<p><b>Response:</b> A letter has been prepared for District approval instructing external vendors to utilize electronic workflows as of a certain cut off date. With regards to the timeline for issuance of the e-Builder utilization letter, as there are still some contracts to amend with e-Builder language, the issuance of the letter has been postponed to the end of June.</p> <p>With respect to a tool that is to be used to ensure that all pertinent project documents are archived in e-Builder, a template has been created by project. This template will be used once fully vetted to track and record documentation to be loaded and placed into eBuilder. By virtue of this tool, project by project monitoring will be able to be accomplished through the OR-PM Document Control staff.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(continued on following page)</p>



## DETAILED OBSERVATIONS – CONTINUED

### INTERNAL AUDIT – PROGRAM MANAGEMENT FY19 Q3

#### OBSERVATION

#### 4. e-Builder Workflow Implementation & Document Retention (continued)

#### MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

*(REFER TO APPENDIX A FOR FULL TEXT)*

The archival template is already being used by Document Control. The first phase is to retro-actively review and ensure that closed-out, projects have all archives of project records in e-Builder. The Template is being vetted and will be finalized for full roll-out by mid-June 2019. Internal training of PM's/APM's/Admins will occur (by July 1st) relative to use of the Template. The next level of review once completed projects have been reconciled, will begin in July with the oldest projects in construction being the first area of focus.

Regarding the Design Review Logs, the Atlanta Design Review team has now completed loading all past reviews to e-Builder. They will be responsible for this task throughout all remaining design phases.

Added Staff: A Coordinator is to be hired by July 1st whose job will include daily monitoring of progress of archival in e-Builder according to the template. The next major checkpoint should be September 2019 to determine the gap in records in e-Builder and an action plan to reconcile the same.

**Estimated Completion Date:** September 2019



## OBJECTIVES AND APPROACH

### Objectives

The objective of our work was to verify that the District's Program Management Consultant ("PM" - Atkins) and Owner's Representative ("OR" - CBRE-HEERY) are providing deliverables and services in conformance with the terms and conditions of their respective agreements / RFP. Further, our procedures included testing of PMOR compliance with District standard operating procedures and industry leading practices.

### Approach

Our audit approach consisted of the following:

#### Program Manager (Atkins)

- Obtained and reviewed deliverables submitted in accordance with PM monthly reporting requirements derived from RFP Article 6.4.2.6 including:
  - Monthly schedule delays / slippage at both program and project level
  - Cash flow – actual vs projected
  - RFI aging and reporting by project
  - Change order reporting – project & program level
  - Vendor performance monitoring
  - Post project completion reporting
  - Project quality – design process revise & resubmits, inspection results
- Reviewed Atkins monthly invoicing for contractual compliance, proper supporting documentation, and mathematical accuracy
- Followed up on prior findings, including eBuilder utilization and workflow rollout

#### Owner's Representative (CBRE-Heery)

- Obtained and reviewed deliverables submitted in accordance with PM monthly reporting requirements derived from RFP Article 6.4.3.10 including:
  - Updated project schedules – all projects
  - 6 phases report
- Selected a sample of project(s) for control assessment and testing
- Tested the sample projects for compliance with District Standard Operating Procedure and best practices. In-Scope processes for this period included:
  - Design procurement
  - Design schedule management
- Review CBRE-HEERY monthly invoicing for contractual compliance, proper supporting documentation, and mathematical accuracy

#### Reporting

At the conclusion of our procedures, we summarized our findings related to the Contract Administration process. We have reviewed the results of our testing with Internal Audit, OFC, the PM/OR team, and incorporated management's response into our report.



## APPENDIX A

### Observation 1 Response

Observation: PM/OR Compliance with Reporting Requirements. #1 Post Project Stakeholders satisfaction assessment.

The OR-PM agrees with the concept and utilization of Post-occupancy assessments. The challenge to implementing such a process in the SMART Program is the nature of the vast majority of work are renovations including roofing, building envelope, HVAC and Life Safety systems. As such, in order to develop the assessment surveys, it is suggested that the following be jointly defined by District, OR-PM, and CPCM staff:

1. Stakeholders - determine the survey audience. Is it the same for every project?

Additions maybe different from renovation.

- School Based Staff
- District Level Staff

2. Focus of Survey

- Additions Only?
- Renovations – if yes - sampling or all?
- Media Centers, STEM Labs, Music, Art Projects as separate survey?

3. Assessment focus on all or part of listed groups below

- OR-PM and OR-PC
- Professional Consultants
- CM or CMAR Project
- Contractors

4. Who will receive the results and how will they be reported?

#### **Outcome**

As OR-PM we suggest that the most significant benefit of a Post-Occupancy assessment is to be utilized to identify opportunities for improvement in the efficacy of future capital projects as well as to confirm practices and procedures that should be continued.

#### **Summary**

The results of post-occupancy assessments will be reviewed as they are received for improvement opportunities. As more data is collected, analysis can identify trends and commonalities which indicate the greatest opportunity for improvement. The post project completion report has been drafted by CPCM for review by OFC and the ORPM. Upon approval the report will be submitted in the CPCM monthly reporting. **(Appendix B)**

#### **Recommendation**

To include modification to reporting requirements (project in next contract renewal amendment) (anticipated July 2019)

#### **Post Project Completion Financial Report**

Regarding reporting of project completion, please see attached example of report.





## APPENDIX A - CONTINUED

### Observation 2 Response

Delay in Execution of the Authorization to Proceed (ATP)

The OR-PM has used an ATP Log (**Appendix C**) to track the time it takes to deliver the fully executed ATP to the designer. This log, has been used since 2016 to track, monitor and adjust processes where and if needed. The earliest ATP's issued starting in mid-year 2016 ranged from 35 to 69 days in cycle time. In 2017, cycle times were reduced dramatically and ranged from 9 to 62 days. The outliers that were in excess of 30 days were almost all CMAR delivery and the CM's ATP.

ATP cycle times began to shift again in 2018. These were driven by the assignment of the new baseline schedule and sequencing the work such that as designs are commenced the flow through the permitting and bidding processes are systematic and set-up to prevent pinch points/bottlenecks in the work flow.

Finally in the past six months, there has been strategic direction wherein projects in late 2018 and early 2019 are being held as consideration is given to modifying delivery methods.

With respect to the reference to SO P's 10.20 and 10.25 we still would maintain the target of issuing an ATP to the consultant prior to the action taken by the SBBC Board is a sound practice. The decision on when to issue the fully executed ATP is being made on a project by project basis as noted above.

The projects sampled in this report are all year 4 or 5 projects and as such the issuance of ATPs were varied based upon the new schedule and the flow of obtaining LORs which determines the flow of bidding.

### **Summary**

Based upon the SMART Project assignment of A/Es being nearly complete, the future issuance of ATPs is limited to eleven (11) projects. It is the OR-PM and CPCM recommendation not to change the SOP 10.25 since that practice is sound. In addition, the assignment of PMs to the projects have also now been completed. Going forward assignment of PMs prior to A/E selection continues to be best practice. As a practical application, PMs were not always assigned ahead of time due to the manner in which PM staffing was increased during the course of the project. Until this year, PMs were not always in place prior to the inception of RFQ process.



## APPENDIX A – CONTINUED

### Observation 3 Response

PM/OR Adherence to Design Phase Timeline.

The design phase schedule has always been dictated by what is included in the SBBC Board approved Professional Service Agreement (PSA). This is true whether or not the Delivery Method is an Invitation to Bid (Hard Bid) or a Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) project. The PSA determines the reviews and the deliverables that are required as well as the duration provided for the designer and the owner. (Attached is a copy of the PSA Schedule) (**Appendix D**)\*\*

The SOP as correctly noted has been modified to match actual practice. Original schedules were not based upon actual working processes, but estimates of the same. The new milestone baseline schedule was built using experience from the first 2-3 years of the program.

Currently, the deliverable schedules are tracked against and as part of the milestone schedule. All of the Design Review Team comments for each phase of their review are now in e-Builder.

Regarding the monitoring of deliverables, every design phase project is managed by the PM per deliverable. We will now be utilizing the language of the PSA to assess delay charges at \$100/day. Notice was given to the consultant initially in December 2018. (Attached is a copy the December letter, letter of Notice and Cost Tracking table) (**Appendix D**)

In addition, the PSA language allows for assessment of damages on plan reviews past (2) cycles. This will be enacted and these charges will go back to January 1, 2019 and be assessed going forward. (Attached is a copy of the letter and Cost Tracking table)

We have reports that are used to track the status of Revise/Re-submit cycles which the PM will use to initiate notice of assessment.

Regarding analysis of delay causes, there is on-going review of delay cause action. There has been a significant learning curve for all parties. The OR-PM team is working closely with the OFC and the Building Department to continually identify issues and determine subsequent improvements.

As an example, a study of common issues that were surfacing during design reviews resulted in a document that was shared with all designers in December 2018 in order to pre-empt repetitive mistakes.



## APPENDIX A – CONTINUED

### Observation 4 Response

The need to ensure that e-Builder is the authoritative archival source for all project related documentation is clear and the OR-PM in conjunction with CPCM are working diligently to this end result.

With respect to a tool that is to be used to ensure that all pertinent project documents are archived in e-Builder, a template has been created by project. This template (**Appendix E**) will be used once fully vetted to track and record documentation to be loaded and placed into eBuilder. By virtue of this tool, project by project monitoring will be able to be accomplished through the OR-PM Document Control staff.

Regarding the Design Review Logs, the Atlanta Design Review team has now completed loading all past reviews to e-Builder. They will be responsible for this task throughout all remaining design phases. Regarding the advertisement for Design Procurement, after the initial tranche of projects went to design, there was a process change whereby the Board allowed advertisement for design without Board approval. Therefore, any subsequent project will not have Board item for approval to advertise design.

As far as utilization of the e-Builder workflows, we are providing the following data since the go- line date of February 15th for your reference:

A/E Invoicing: 102 total invoices with 17 different vendors

G/C Invoicing: 38 total invoices with 13 different vendors

RFIs: 133 total records (13 G/Cs and 10 A/E)

A letter has been prepared for District approval instructing external vendors to utilize electronic workflows as of a certain cut off date.

## APPENDIX B



# Broward County Public Schools

## MARCH 31, 2019 -Post Project Completion Financial Report

Project Name	Project Number	Original Budget	Current Budget	Current Commitments	Actuals Paid	SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION (PH: 6) Finish	END OF CONSTRUCTION (FINAL) (PH: 7) Finish	Warranty Phase (Forecast Date)	Actual/Current Budget %	Amount Returned To Smart Reserves
<b>Boyd Anderson HS - Media Ctr Remodeling</b> Boyd Anderson HS - Media Ctr Remodeling	P.001360	2,018,340.00	2,018,340.00	1,477,026.34	1,471,863.57	03.06.2017	08.16.2017	03.06.2018	73	Pending
<b>Indian Ridge MS - GOB Renovations</b> Indian Ridge MS - GOB Renovations	P.001748	5,115,000.00	6,060,102.00	5,284,051.01	5,233,757.01	01.10.2019	02.22.2019	01.10.2020	86	Pending
<b>Manatee Bay ES - SMART Program Renovations</b> Manatee Bay ES - SMART Program Renovations	P.001759	1,759,000.00	2,384,661.00	2,252,779.36	2,239,095.19	11.02.2018	11.02.2018	11.02.2019	94	Pending

## APPENDIX C

**Heery ATP LOG RFQ  
(Request For Qualification)**

As of 04/16/19

District #	Location #	Project #	School	PM	Consultants	Board Award Date	ATP to Consultant	Days	ATP From Consultant	Days	ATP to OFC	Days	ATP to Cap.	Days	ATP From Procure.	Days	ATP From CAP.	Fully Executed ATP to Consultant	Days	Purchase Order No./ Work Order #	Time to Execute	Average Time
7	2221	P.000415	Atlantic Technical College	Spiros	M.C. Harry and Associates, Inc.	6/21/16	8/24/16	(64)	9/1/16	(8)	9/2/16	(1)	9/7/16	(5)	9/16/2016		9/16/2016	9/23/16 2:48 PM	(8)	PO.8517000058	95	Average Time from Board Approval to when hard copy got to consultant ( D to P)
4	0811	P.001638	BroadView Elenentary	Fadi	M.C. Harry and Associates, Inc.	6/21/16	6/29/16	(8)	7/18/16	(19)	7/19/16	(1)	7/26/16	(7)	8/9/2016	8/9/2016	8/9/2016	0	PO.8517000012	49		
7	1421	P.001413	Coconut Creek Elementary	Spiros	Jorge A. Gutierrez Architect LLC	6/21/16	7/28/16	(37)	8/4/16	(7)	8/4/16	0	8/11/16	(7)	8/25/2016	8/25/2016	8/25/2016	0	PO.8517000030	65		
3	1781	P.001412	Cypress Elementary	Spiros	Jorge A. Gutierrez Architect LLC	6/21/16	7/28/16	(37)	8/4/16	(7)	8/9/16	(5)	8/11/16	(2)	8/31/2016	8/31/2016	8/31/2016	0	PO.8517000046	71		
7	1711	P.001694	Deerfield Beach High	Gustavo	Wolfberg Alvarez	6/21/16	7/7/16	(16)	7/18/16	(11)	7/20/16	(2)	7/26/16	(6)	8/9/2016	8/9/2016	10/19/16 12:00 AM	(71)	PO.8517000011	120		
5	1701	P.001637	Lauderdale Lakes Middle	Fadi	Jorge A. Gutierrez Architect LLC	6/21/16	6/29/16	(8)	7/6/16	(7)	7/7/16	(1)	7/18/16	(11)	8/3/2016	8/3/2016	8/3/2016	0	PO.8517000007	43		
4	2741	P.001639	Maplewood Elementary	Trevor	M.C. Harry and Associates, Inc.	6/21/16	6/29/16	(8)	7/18/16	(19)	7/19/16	(1)	7/26/16	(7)	8/3/2016	8/3/2016	8/3/2016	0	PO.8517000008	43	69	
7	1681	P.001753	Coconut Creek High	Spiros	M.C. Harry and Associates, Inc.	7/26/16	8/25/16	(30)	9/1/16	(7)	9/2/16	(1)	9/7/16	(5)	9/19/2016	9/19/2016	9/23/16 2:48 PM	(5)	PO.8517000059	60		
4	1151	P.001765	Coral Springs High	Ron	M.C. Harry and Associates, Inc.	7/26/16	8/29/16	(34)	9/6/16	(8)	9/7/16	(1)	9/9/16	(2)	9/19/2016	9/19/2016	9/23/16 2:48 PM	(5)	PO.8517000062	60		
6	3461	P.001746	Eagle Point Elementary	Spiros	Williamson Dacar Associates	7/26/16	8/24/16	(29)	9/1/16	(7)	9/1/16	(1)	9/9/16	(5)	9/14/2016	9/14/2016	9/26/16 9:59 AM	(12)	PO.8517000053	62		
6	2851	P.001745	Griffin Elementary	Spiros	Jorge A. Gutierrez Architect LLC	7/26/16	8/29/16	(34)	9/2/16	(4)	9/6/16	(4)	9/9/16	(3)	9/16/2016	9/16/2016	9/23/16 9:14 AM	(7)	PO.8517000057	59		
6	3471	P.001748	Indian Ridge Middle	Ron	Jorge A. Gutierrez Architect LLC	7/26/16	8/31/16	(36)	9/2/16	(2)	9/6/16	(4)	9/9/16	(3)	9/16/2016	9/16/2016	9/23/16 9:14 AM	(7)	PO.8517000056	59		
6	3841	P.001759	Manatee Bay Elementary	Ron	Jorge A. Gutierrez Architect LLC	7/26/16	8/31/16	(36)	9/2/16	(2)	9/6/16	(4)	9/9/16	(3)	9/16/2016	9/16/2016	9/23/16 9:14 AM	(7)	PO.8517000055	59		
7	1161	P.001647	Margate Elementary	Matt	Song & Associates, Inc.	7/26/16	9/9/16	(45)	9/12/16	(3)	9/13/16	(1)	9/15/16	(2)	9/21/2016	9/21/2016	9/23/16 10:04 AM	(2)	PO.8517000064	59		
5	1901	P.001744	Piper High	Fadi	Wolfberg Alvarez	7/26/16	7/28/16	(2)	8/2/2016	(5)	8/4/16	(2)	8/9/16	(5)	8/25/2016	8/25/2016	8/29/16 11:39 AM	(4)	PO.8517000029	34		
1	1811	P.001636	Sheridan Hills Elementary	Spiros	Williamson Dacar Associates	7/26/16	8/24/16	(29)	9/1/16	(7)	9/1/16	(1)	9/6/16	(5)	9/14/2016	9/14/2016	9/26/16 9:59 AM	(12)	PO.8517000054	62	57	
7	0361	P.001646	Blanche Ely High (CMAR Design)	Matt	Wolfberg Alvarez	8/16/16	9/2/16	(17)	9/13/16	(11)	9/16/16	(3)	9/19/16	(3)	10/11/2016	10/11/2016	11/2/16 11:45 AM	(22)	PO.8517000077	78		
3	2121	P.001743	James Rickards Middle	Fadi	Williamson Dacar Associates	8/16/16	8/18/16	(2)	8/23/16	(5)	8/24/16	(1)	8/26/16	(2)	9/8/2016	9/8/2016	9/14/16 4:30 PM	(7)	PO.8517000050	30		
3	1241	P.001684	Northeast High (CMAR Design)	Herve	ACAI Associates, Inc.	8/16/16	9/13/16	(28)	9/15/16	(1)	9/15/16	(1)	9/16/16	(1)	10/18/2016	10/18/2016	10/19/16 1:46 PM	(2)	PO.8517000075	65		
7	3121	P.001754	Quiet Waters Elementary	Fadi	Williamson Dacar Associates	8/16/16	8/18/16	(2)	8/23/16	(5)	8/24/16	(1)	8/26/16	(2)	9/8/2016	9/8/2016	9/13/16 4:30 PM	(6)	PO.8517000049	29		
2	3331	P.001406	Silver Trail Middle	Gustavo	Nyarko Arch Group	8/16/16	9/8/16	(23)	9/8/16	0	9/9/16	(1)	9/12/16	(3)	9/19/2016	9/19/2016	10/26/16 12:27 PM	(38)	PO.8517000061	72		
3	0211	P.001683	Stranahan High (CMAR Design)	Ron	Wolfberg Alvarez	8/16/16	9/12/16	(27)	9/20/16	(7)	9/22/16	(2)	10/18/2016	(2)	10/18/2016	10/19/16 10:04 AM	(1)	PO.8517000083	64	56		
5	0991	P.001741	Wingate Oaks Center	Ron	Sol-ARCH, Inc.	9/7/16	10/11/16	(34)	10/13/16	0	10/13/16	(2)	10/14/16	(1)	10/20/2016	10/20/2016	10/21/16 1:12 PM	(2)	PO.8517000088	45	45	
4	2721	P.001725	Ramblewood Elementary	Fadi	Nyarko Arch Group	9/20/16	9/29/16	(9)	10/4/16	(5)	10/5/16	(1)	10/14/16	(9)	10/20/2016	10/20/2016	10/25/16 11:36 AM	(5)	PO.8517000087	35	35	
5	0371	P.001726	Dillard 6-12 School	Ron	Sol-ARCH, Inc.	10/18/16	11/8/16	(21)	11/15/16	(1)	11/15/16	(13)	12/8/2016	(6)	12/8/2016	12/13/16 12:21 PM	(6)	PO.851700012	57			
4	3441	P.001722	Eagle Ridge Elementary	Trevor	Tamara Peacock	10/18/16	10/19/16	(1)	10/25/16	(6)	10/27/16	(2)	11/14/16	(18)	11/14/2016	11/14/2016	11/16/16 2:26 PM	(3)	PO.8517000105	30		
1	0531	P.001727	Miramar Elementary	Matt	Tamara Peacock	10/18/16	10/25/16	(7)	10/25/16	(21)	11/18/16	(13)	12/8/2016	(6)	12/8/2016	12/13/16 12:30 PM	(6)	PO.8517000110	57			
7	0751	P.001713	Pompano Beach Elementary	Fadi	Williamson Dacar Associates	10/18/16	10/19/16	(1)	10/24/16	(5)	11/3/2016	(8)	11/3/16	(2)	11/8/2016	11/8/2016	11/10/16 10:46 AM	(2)	PO.8517000102	23		
7	0021	P.001721	Pompano Beach Middle	Fadi	Nyarko Arch Group	10/18/16	10/19/16	(1)	10/26/16	(7)	11/3/2016	(6)	11/4/16	(3)	11/14/2016	11/14/2016	11/16/16 10:43 AM	(2)	PO.8517000104	29		
2	2871	P.001632	Sea Castle Elementary	Ron	Crain Atlantis	10/18/16	11/10/16	(23)	11/16/16	(6)	11/16/16	(12)	12/8/2016	(5)	12/8/2016	12/13/16 11:46 AM	(5)	PO.8517000113	56			
4	2621	P.001724	Tamarac Elementary	Trevor	Crain Atlantis	10/18/16	10/19/16	(1)	10/21/16	(2)	10/25/16	(4)	10/28/16	(3)	11/8/2016	11/8/2016	11/10/16 12:45 PM	(3)	PO.8517000101	24	39	
1	1631	P.001728	Annebel Perry Elementary	Matt	Jorge A. Gutierrez Architect LLC	11/1/16	12/8/16	(37)	12/8/16	0	12/9/16	(1)	12/12/16	(3)	12/14/2016	(2)	12/16/2016	12/20/16 11:56 AM	(4)	PO.8517000114	43	
7	0361	P.001646	Blanche Ely High (CMAR)	Matt	Morganti Group, Inc.	11/1/16	11/15/16	(14)	11/16/16	(1)	11/30/16	(14)	12/2/16	(2)	12/23/2016	(21)	1/20/2017	1/23/17 9:57 AM	(3)	PO.8517000117	52	Average Time from Board Approval to when Procurement sends out ( D to M)
3	1241	P.001684	Northeast High (CMAR)	Herve	Gilbane Building Company	11/1/16	12/6/16	(35)	12/7/16	(1)	12/8/16	(1)	12/16/16	(2)	1/13/2017	(28)	1/17/2017	1/23/17 9:16 AM	(6)	PO.8517000120	73	
1	0461	P.001712	Oakridge Elementary	Fadi	Nyarko Arch Group	11/1/16	11/3/16	(2)	11/4/16	(1)	11/4/16	0	11/10/16	(6)	11/17/2016	(7)	11/29/2016	11/29/2016	0	PO.8517000106	16	
3	0211	P.001683	Stranahan High (CMAR)	Ron	Gilbane Building Company	11/1/16	12/2/16	(31)	12/6/16	(4)	12/7/16	(4)	12/7/16	(2)	12/13/16	(2)	12/13/16	0	PO.8517000119	73	51	
6	2641	P.001757	Central Park Elementary	Gustavo	CSA Central Inc	12/6/16	12/14/16	(8)	12/13/16	0	12/14/16	(1)	12/16/16	(2)	1/13/2017	(28)	1/17/2017	1/23/17 9:16 AM	(6)	PO.8517000121	38	
1	1761	1788	Hollywood Park Elementary	Trevor	CSA Central Inc	12/6/16	12/12/16	(6)	12/16/16	(4)	12/16/16	0	1/9/17	(24)	1/13/2017	(4)	1/17/2017	1/19/17 11:20 AM	(2)	PO.8517000122	38	
5	0431	P.001635	Lauderdale Manors	Rodney	CSA Central Inc	12/6/16	1/19/17	(44)	1/23/17	(4)	1/23/17	0	1/24/17	(1)	1/30/2017	(6)	2/2/2017	2/6/17 10:52 AM	(4)	PO.8517000129	55	44
2	1641	P.001785	Fairway Elementary	Ron	Nyarko Arch Group	12/20/16	1/23/17	(34)	1/31/17	(8)	2/1/17	(1)	2/6/2017	(4)	2/6/2017	(4)	2/6/2017	2/8/17 12:28 PM	(3)	PO.8517000137	48	
2	3131	P.001784	Hawkes Bluff Elementary	Ron	Sol-ARCH, Inc.	12/20/16	1/23/17	(34)	1/24/17	(1)	1/24/17	0	1/31/17	(7)	2/6/2017	(6)	2/6/2017	2/7/17 1:39 PM	(2)	PO.8517000136	48	
3	0881	P.001710	New River Middle	Gustavo	Crain Atlantis	12/20/16	12/21/16	(1)	12/22/16	(1)	12/22/16	0	1/13/17	(22)	1/18/2017	(5)	1/20/2017	1/23/17 12:27 PM	(4)	PO.8517000126	29	
5	0701	P.001807	Parkway Middle	Spiros	Crain Atlantis	12/20/16	1/4/17	(15)	1/9/17	(2)	1/9/17	(3)	1/13/17	(4)	1/18/2017	(5)	1/20/2017	1/23/17 12:27 PM	(4)	PO.8517000125	29	39
7	2511	P.001796	Atlantic West Elementary	Spiros	FICE Design, Inc.	1/18/17	1/18/17	0	1/19/17	(1)	1/19/17	0	1/25/17	(6)	1/30/2017	(5)	2/2/2017	2/7/17 4:12 PM	(6)	PO.8517000130	12	
1	2071	P.001634	Pasadena Lakes Elementary	Gustavo	FICE Design, Inc.	1/18/17	1/6/17	12 AOT	1/13/17	(7)	1/19/17	(6)	1/25/17	(6)	1/30/2017	(5)	2/2/2017	2/7/17 4:12 PM	(6)	PO.8517000132	12	
5	0551	P.001729	Plantation Middle	Ron	Sol-ARCH, Inc.	1/18/17	1/19/17	(1)	1/24/17	(5)	1/24/17	0	1/27/17	(3)	2/1/2017	(5)	2/6/2017	2/7/17 1:39 PM	(3)	PO.8517000135	14	
1	0161	P.001794	West Hollywood Elementary	Trevor	Crain Atlantis	1/18/17	1/12/17	6 AOT	1/18/17	(6)	1/19/17	(1)	1/25/17	(6)	1/30/2017	(5)	2/2/2017	2/6/17 9:39 AM	(4)	PO.8517000131	12	13
6	3623	P.001774	Cypress Bay High (CMAR Design)	Gustavo	Zyscovich Architects	2/7/17	1/11/17	27 AOT	1/12/17	(1)	2/8/17	(27)	2/10/17	(2)	2/22/17	(12)	2/28/17	3/1/17 12:32 PM	(2)	PO.8517000147	15	
1	1661	P.001806	Hollywood Hills High (CMAR Design)	Spiros	ACAI Associates, Inc.	2/7/17	1/19/17	19 AOT	2/27/17	(39)	2/27/2017	0	3/1/2017	(2)	3/3/2017	(2)	3/7/2017	3/8/17 12:23 PM	(2)	PO.8517000152	24	

4	2711	P.001867	Ramblewood Middle	Gary	CES Engineering Services, LLC	5/16/17	4/12/17	34 AOT	4/13/17	(1)	5/18/17	(35)	5/22/17	(4)	5/25/2017	(9)	5/26/2017	6/1/17 11:48 AM	(6)	PO.8517000201	9	19
1	1661	P.001806	Hollywood Hills High (CMAR)	Spiros	James B. Pirtle Construction	6/13/17	7/14/17	(31)	7/18/17	(4)	8/15/17	(28)	8/17/17	(2)	8/28/2017	(11)	8/30/2017	9/5/17 2:30 PM	(7)	PO.8518000036	76	
6	1281	P.001817	Nova High (CMAR)	Rodney	James B. Pirtle Construction	6/13/17	6/16/17	(3)	7/14/17	(28)	7/17/17	(3)	7/18/17	(1)	7/31/2017	(13)	8/2/2017	8/7/17 11:44 AM	(5)	PO.8518000009	48	62
6	2801	P.001899	Davie Elementary	Nkenge	Wolfberg Alvarez	8/8/17	8/15/17	(7)	8/16/17	(1)	8/21/17	(5)	8/23/17	(2)	8/28/2017	(5)	8/30/2017	9/1/17 1:34 PM	(3)	PO.8518000037	20	
6	3191	P.001897	Embassy Creek Elementary	Nkenge	Wolfberg Alvarez	8/8/17	8/15/17	(7)	8/16/17	(1)	8/21/17	(5)	8/23/17	(2)	8/28/2017	(5)	8/30/2017	9/1/17 1:34 PM	(3)	PO.8518000038	20	
6	1311	P.001898	Nova Middle	Nkenge	Wolfberg Alvarez	8/8/17	8/15/17	(7)	8/16/17	(1)	8/21/17	(5)	8/23/17	(2)	8/28/2017	(5)	8/30/2017	9/1/17 1:34 PM	(3)	PO.8518000039	20	
P.	0031	P.001895	Oakland Park Elementary	Blake	Jorge A. Gutierrez Architect LLC	8/8/17	8/16/17	(8)	8/17/17	(1)	8/22/17	(5)	08/25/17	(3)	8/30/2017	(5)	8/31/2017	9/5/17 11:39 AM	(5)	PO.8518000045	22	
5	1851	P.001896	Royal Palm Elementary	Blake	Jorge A. Gutierrez Architect LLC	8/8/17	8/16/17	(8)	8/17/17	(1)	8/22/17	(5)	08/25/17	(3)	8/30/2017	(5)	8/31/2017	9/5/17 11:39 AM	(5)	PO.8518000043	22	
5	1071	P.001900	William Dandy Middle	Blake	Jorge A. Gutierrez Architect LLC	8/8/17	8/16/17	(8)	8/17/17	(1)	8/22/17	(5)	08/25/17	(3)	8/30/2017	(5)	8/31/2017	9/5/17 11:39 AM	(5)	PO.8518000044	22	21
6	3622	P.001902	Falcon Cove Middle (CMAR)	Gustavo	OHL Building, Inc.	9/26/17	11/27/17	(62)	12/4/17	(7)	12/20/17	(16)	1/8/18	(19)	1/17/2018	(9)	1/19/2018	1/23/18 1:01 PM	(5)	PO.8518000177	113	
2	3391	P.001847	Fianagan, Charles High (CMAR)	Ron	Core Construction Services	9/26/17	10/9/17	(13)	10/12/17	(3)	10/13/17	(1)	10/18/17	(5)	11/2/2017	(15)	11/29/2017	12/4/17 10:10 AM	(5)	PO.8518000112	37	
4	2751	P.001942	J.P. Taravella High (CMAR)	Jamie	Morganti Group, Inc.	9/26/17	9/5/17	21	9/19/17	(14)	10/3/17	(14)	10/5/17	(2)	10/13/2017	(8)	10/17/2017	10/23/17 1:12 PM	(7)	PO.8518000075	17	
4	2751	P.001942	J.P. Taravella High (CMAR Design)	Jamie	Song & Associates, Inc.	9/26/17	9/5/17	21	9/18/17	(13)	10/3/17	(15)	10/5/17	(2)	10/12/2017	(7)	10/17/2017	10/18/17 9:49 AM	(1)	PO.8518000071	16	
1	0471	P.001955	Olsen Middle	Nkenge	Song & Associates, Inc.	9/26/17	10/5/17	(9)	10/9/17	(4)	10/10/17	(1)	10/12/17	(2)	10/20/2017	(8)	10/25/2017	10/26/17 1:29 PM	(2)	PO.8518000088	24	
5	1451	P.001916	Plantation High (CMAR)	Chris S.	Thornton Construction	9/26/17	10/17/17	(21)	10/27/17	(10)	11/3/17	(6)	11/3/17	(1)	11/28/2017	(12)	11/28/2017	11/29/17 12:11 PM	(2)	PO.8518000120	50	
5	1451	P.001916	Plantation High (CMAR Design)	Chris S.	Song & Associates, Inc.	9/26/17	10/5/17	(9)	10/9/17	(4)	10/10/17	(1)	10/12/17	(2)	10/16/2017	(4)	10/23/2017	10/31/17 12:16 PM	(9)	PO.8518000076	20	
7	1671	P.001920	Markham C. Robert ES (CMAR)	Blake	The Weitz Company	9/26/17	12/4/17	(69)	12/11/17	(7)	12/12/17	(1)	12/15/17	(3)	12/22/2017	(7)	1/9/2018	1/11/18 1:22 PM	(3)	PO.8518000169	87	
7	1671	P.001920	Markham C. Robert ES (CMAR Design)	Blake	Carty Architecture	9/26/17	11/2/17	(37)	11/6/17	(4)	11/7/17	(1)	11/9/17	(2)	11/15/2017	(6)	11/27/2017	11/29/17 1:06PM	(2)	PO.8518000121	50	
6	2831	P.001967	Western High	Herve	LIMCO Engineering Inc.	9/26/17	9/29/17	(3)	10/4/17	(5)	10/10/17	(6)	10/12/17	(2)	10/20/2017	(8)	10/25/2017	10/27/17 1:55 PM	(3)	PO.8518000087	24	
3	0191	P.001917	Wilton Manors Elementary	Blake	LIMCO Engineering Inc.	9/26/17	11/2/17	(37)	11/7/17	(5)	11/9/17	(2)	11/14/17	(5)	11/20/2017	(6)	11/29/2017	11/29/17 12:16 PM	(3)	PO.8518000133	55	45
6	2981	P.002002	Country Isles Elementary	Jean-Marc	Nyarko Arch Group	11/7/17	11/21/17	(14)	11/28/17	(7)	12/15/17	(17)	1/8/18	(24)	1/12/2018	(4)	1/18/2018	1/23/18 11:32 AM	(5)	PO.8518000173	66	
7	3697	P.001972	Dave Thomas Edu Cnt East	Jorge	Tamara Peacock	11/7/17	11/8/17	(1)	11/8/17	0	11/9/17	(1)	11/15/17	(6)	11/20/2017	(5)	11/27/2017	11/29/17 11:43 AM	(2)	PO.8518000134	13	
2	3731	P.001985	Everglades High	Rodney	Tamara Peacock	11/7/17	11/2/17	5 AOT	11/3/17	(1)	11/9/17	(6)	11/17/17	(8)	12/4/2017	(17)	12/6/2017	12/8/17 12:33 PM	(3)	PO.8518000145	27	
3	0851	P.002001	Floranada Elementary	Jean-Marc	Nyarko Arch Group	11/7/17	11/21/17	(14)	11/28/17	(7)	12/1/17	(3)	12/11/17	(10)	12/22/2017	(11)	1/9/2018	1/11/18 12:07 PM	(3)	PO.8518000168	45	
6	3531	P.001973	Fox Trail Elementary	Jorge	Via Design Studio, LLC	11/7/17	11/8/17	(1)	11/9/17	(1)	11/13/17	(4)	11/14/17	(1)	11/17/2017	(3)	11/27/2017	11/30/17 1:47 PM	(4)	PO.8518000125	10	
2	2021	P.001968	Glades Middle	Jorge	Via Design Studio, LLC	11/7/17	11/8/17	(1)	11/9/17	(1)	11/13/17	(4)	11/14/17	(1)	11/17/2017	(3)	11/27/2017	11/30/17 1:47 PM	(4)	PO.8518000126	10	
1	1011	P.001986	Henry D. Perry Edu Cnt	John S.	Laura M. Perez and Associates	11/7/17	11/21/17	(14)	11/27/17	(6)	11/28/17	(1)	12/1/17	(3)	12/7/2017	(6)	12/11/2017	12/14/17 1:20 PM	(4)	PO.8518000151	30	
1	0121	P.001983	Hollywood Central Elementary	Jamie	Tamara Peacock	11/7/17	11/2/17	5 AOT	11/3/17	(1)	11/9/17	(6)	11/17/17	(8)	12/4/2017	(17)	12/6/2017	12/8/17 12:33 PM	(3)	PO.8518000143	27	
1	0241	P.001954	McArthur High (CMAR Design)	Jorge	Rodriguez Architects	11/7/17	11/8/17	(1)	11/9/17	(1)	11/13/17	(4)	11/14/17	(1)	11/17/2017	(3)	11/27/2017	11/29/17 10:52 AM	(2)	PO.8518000128	10	
2	1751	P.002003	Miramar High (CMAR Design)	Nkenge	M.C. Harry and Associates, Inc.	11/7/17	11/16/17	(9)	12/6/17	(20)	12/12/17	(6)	12/19/17	(7)	1/8/2018	(20)	1/10/2018	1/11/18 2:48 PM	(2)	PO.8518000170	62	
7	0561	P.001969	Norcrest Elementary	Jorge	Tamara Peacock	11/7/17	11/8/17	(1)	11/8/17	0	11/9/17	(1)	11/15/17	(6)	11/17/2017	(2)	11/28/2017	11/29/17 11:43 AM	(1)	PO.8518000132	10	
5	1831	P.001970	Oriole Elementary	Jorge	Via Design Studio, LLC	11/7/17	11/8/17	(1)	11/9/17	(1)	11/13/17	(4)	11/14/17	(1)	11/17/2017	(3)	11/27/2017	11/30/17 1:47 PM	(4)	PO.8518000127	10	
2	2861	P.002004	Pines Lakes Elementary	Blake	Laura M. Perez and Associates	11/7/17	11/21/17	(14)	11/27/17	(6)	11/28/17	(1)	12/1/17	(3)	12/7/2017	(6)	12/11/2017	12/14/17 1:20 PM	(4)	PO.8518000152	30	
3	0151	P.001987	Riverland Elementary	Blake	Laura M. Perez and Associates	11/7/17	11/21/17	(14)	11/27/17	(6)	11/28/17	(1)	12/1/17	(3)	12/7/2017	(6)	12/11/2017	12/14/17 1:20 PM	(4)	PO.8518000154	30	
6	3081	P.001984	Silver Ridge Elementary	Jamie	Tamara Peacock	11/7/17	11/2/17	5 AOT	11/3/17	(1)	11/9/17	(6)	11/17/17	(8)	12/4/2017	(17)	12/6/2017	12/8/17 12:33 PM	(3)	PO.8518000144	27	
2	3661	P.001971	Sunset Lakes Elementary	Jorge	Tamara Peacock	11/7/17	11/8/17	(1)	11/8/17	0	11/9/17	(1)	11/15/17	(6)	11/20/2017	(5)	11/27/2017	11/29/17 11:43 AM	(2)	PO.8518000136	13	
3	3321	P.002000	Virginia Shuman Young Elemen.	Jean-Marc	Nyarko Arch Group	11/7/17	11/21/17	(14)	11/28/17	(7)	12/1/17	(3)	12/4/17	(3)	12/7/2017	(3)	12/11/2017	12/14/17 12:20 PM	(4)	PO.8518000153	30	
2	3001	P.002010	Walter C Young MS (CMAR Design)	Fadi	Laura M. Perez and Associates	11/7/17	10/26/17	12 AOT	11/3/17	(8)	11/9/17	(6)	11/15/17	(6)	11/20/2017	(5)	11/27/2017	11/29/17 12:06 PM	(3)	PO.8518000135	13	26
7	0391	P.002036	Deerfield Park Elementary	Jamie	Rodriguez Architects	12/5/17	12/6/17	(1)	12/11/17	(5)	12/14/17	(3)	12/18/17	(4)	1/8/2018	(21)	1/10/2018	1/11/18 1:49 PM	(2)	PO.8518000171	34	
5	0271	P.001915	Dillard Elementary	Trevor	Song & Associates, Inc.	12/5/17	11/27/17	8 AOT	12/6/17	(9)	12/7/17	(1)	12/11/17	(4)	12/19/2017	(8)	12/20/2017	12/22/17 2:23 PM	(3)	PO.8518000163	14	
7	3821	P.001999	Liberty Elementary	Trevor	Song & Associates, Inc.	12/5/17	11/27/17	8 AOT	12/6/17	(9)	12/7/17	(1)	12/11/17	(4)	12/19/2017	(8)	12/20/2017	12/22/17 2:23 PM	(3)	PO.8518000161	14	
4	2741	P.001998	Maplewood Elementary	Trevor	Song & Associates, Inc.	12/5/17	11/27/17	8 AOT	12/6/17	(9)	12/7/17	(1)	12/11/17	(4)	12/19/2017	(8)	12/20/2017	12/22/17 2:23 PM	(3)	PO.8518000160	14	
5	3761	P.001988	Park Lakes Elementary	Trevor	Song & Associates, Inc.	12/5/17	11/27/17	8 AOT	12/6/17	(9)	12/7/17	(1)	12/11/17	(4)	12/19/2017	(8)	12/20/2017	12/22/17 2:23 PM	(3)	PO.8518000162	14	18
4	2561	P.001979	Coral Springs Middle (CMAR)	Chris S.	MCM	12/19/17	2/5/18	(48)	2/14/18	(9)	2/15/18	(1)	2/21/18	(6)	2/26/2018	(5)	3/2/2018	4/12/18 11:43 AM	(41)	PO.8518000213	69	
4	2561	P.001979	Coral Springs Middle (CMAR Design)	Chris S.	Rodriguez Architects	12/19/17	1/11/18	(23)	1/17/18	(6)	1/24/18	(7)	1/25/18	(1)	1/30/2018	(5)	2/1/2018	2/5/18 3:51 PM	(5)	PO.8518000186	42	
	3931	P.002055	Gulfstream Middle	John S.	Silva Architects LLC	12/19/17	1/4/18	(16)	1/8/18	(4)	1/9/18	0	1/10/18	(1)	1/17/2018	(7)	1/19/2018	1/23/18 12:11 PM	(5)	PO.8518000176	29	
1	0241	P.001954	McArthur High (CMAR)	Jorge	Gilbane Building Company	12/19/17	12/20/17	(1)	12/22/17	(2)	12/22/17	0	1/10/18	(19)	1/22/2018	(12)	1/23/2018	1/25/18 9:52 AM	(2)	PO.8518000179	34	
2	1751	P.002003	Miramar High (CMAR)	Nkenge	Thornton Construction	12/19/17	1/5/18	(17)	1/10/18	(5)	1/16/18	(6)	1/19/18	(3)	1/30/2018	(11)	1/29/2018	1/31/18 11:23 AM	(2)	PO.8518000180	42	
2	3001	P.002010	Walter C Young MS (CMAR)	Fadi	Core Construction Services	12/19/17	12/26/17	(7)	1/3/18	(8)	1/5/18	(2)	1/10/18	(5)	1/22/2018	(12)	1/23/2018	1/25/18 11:20 AM	(2)	PO.8518000178	34	42
4	3771	P.002040	Challenger Elementary	Blake	Song & Associates, Inc.	1/17/18	1/12/18	5 AOT	1/26/18	(14)	1/29/18	(3)	1/31/18	(2)	2/6/2018	(6)	2/8/2018	2/14/18 11:11 AM	(6)	PO.8518000190	20	
4	3041	P.002045	Coral Park Elementary	Blake	Song & Associates, Inc.	1/17/18	1/12/18	5 AOT	1/26/18	(14)	1/29/18	(3)	1/31/18	(2)	2/6/2018	(6)	2/8/2018	2/14/18 11:11 AM	(6)	PO.8518000191	20	
6	3181	P.001980	Indian Trace Elementary	Herve	LIMCO Engineering Inc.	1/17/18	1/29/18	(12)	2/2/18	(4)	2/5/18	(3)	2/7/18	(2)	2/12/2018	(5)	2/14/2018	2/16/18 1:33 PM	(3)	PO.8518000194	26	
4	4772	P.002046	Millennium 6-12 Collegiate Academy	Blake	Song & Associates, Inc.	1/17/18	1/12/18	5 AOT	1/26/18	(14)	1/29/18	(3)	1/31/18	(2)	2/6/2018	(6)	2/8/2018	2/14/18 11:11 AM	(6)	PO.8518000189	20	
4	30																					



2	3741	P.002088	Coconut Palm Elementary (CMAR Design)	Jorge	RGD & Associates,Inc	3/6/18	3/9/18	(3)	3/13/18	(4)	3/14/18	(1)	3/16/18	(2)	3/22/2018	(6)	3/26/2018	3/28/18 11:39 AM	(2)	PO.8518000246	16	
1	0101	P.002061	Dania Elementary	Gary	RGD & Associates,Inc	3/6/18	4/17/18	(42)	4/20/18	(3)	4/27/18	(7)	4/30/18	(3)	5/4/2018	(4)	5/8/2018	5/10/18 1:08 PM	(3)	PO.8518000287	59	
1	0721	P.002064	Driftwood Elementary	Gary	RGD & Associates,Inc	3/6/18	4/17/18	(42)	4/20/18	(3)	4/23/18	(3)	4/25/18	(2)	5/3/2018	(8)	5/8/2018	5/10/18 1:08 PM	(3)	PO.8518000285	58	
1	0131	P.002072	Gulfstream Academy of Hallendale Beach K-8 (CMAR Design)	John S.	RGD & Associates,Inc	3/6/18	4/5/18	(30)	4/6/18	(1)	4/11/18	(5)	4/13/18	(2)	4/18/2018	(5)	4/20/2018	4/24/18 1:49 PM	(5)	PO.8518000262	43	
3	0491	P.002068	Harbordale Elementary (CMAR Design)	Jorge	RGD & Associates,Inc	3/6/18	3/9/18	(3)	3/13/18	(4)	3/14/18	(1)	3/16/18	(2)	3/22/2018	(6)	3/26/2018	3/28/18 11:39 AM	(2)	PO.8518000247	16	
4	1971	P.002059	James Hunt Elementary	Gary	RGD & Associates,Inc	3/6/18	4/17/18	(42)	4/20/18	(3)	4/24/18	(4)	4/25/18	(1)	5/3/2018	(8)	5/8/2018	5/10/18 1:08 PM		PO.8518000284	58	
3	0761	P.002083	Meadowbrook Elementary (CMAR Design)	Jorge	RGD & Associates,Inc	3/6/18	3/9/18	(3)	3/13/18	(4)	3/14/18	(1)	3/16/18	(2)	3/26/2018	(10)	3/26/2018	3/28/18 11:39 AM	(2)	PO.8518000243	20	
7	1131	P.002084	Palmview Elementary	Gary	RGD & Associates,Inc	3/6/18	4/17/18	(42)	4/20/18	(3)	4/26/18	(6)	4/30/18	(4)	5/3/2018	(3)	5/8/2018	5/10/18 1:08 PM	(3)	PO.8518000282	58	
4	3631	P.002082	Parkside Elementary (CMAR Design)	Jorge	RGD & Associates,Inc	3/6/18	3/9/18	(3)	3/13/18	(4)	3/14/18	(1)	3/16/18	(2)	3/26/2018	(10)	3/26/2018	3/28/18 11:39 AM	(2)	PO.8518000245	20	
5	0931	P.002041	Peters Elementary	Rodney	Delta G-Consulting	3/6/18	4/10/18	(35)	4/16/18	(6)	4/18/18	(2)	4/19/18	(1)	4/25/2018	(6)	4/26/2018	4/30/18 2:12 PM	(5)	PO.8518000267	50	
6	1891	P.002047	Seminole Middle	Rodney	Delta G-Consulting	3/6/18	4/10/18	(35)	4/16/18	(6)	4/18/18	(2)	4/19/18	(1)	4/24/2018	(5)	4/26/2018	4/30/18 2:12 PM	(5)	PO.8518000264	49	
1	1051	P.002060	Sheridan Technical Colloge (CMAR)	Jim	D. Stephenson Construction	3/6/18	3/30/18	(24)	4/2/18	(3)	4/4/18	(2)	4/5/18	(1)	4/12/2018	(7)	4/16/2018	4/20/18 11:05 AM	(4)	PO.8518000224	37	
6	2351	P.002090	South Plantation High	Gary	RGD & Associates,Inc	3/6/18	4/17/18	(42)	4/20/18	(3)	4/23/18	(3)	4/25/18	(2)	5/3/2018	(8)	5/8/2018	5/10/18 1:08 PM	(3)	PO.8518000281	58	
1	0511	P.002074	Watkins Elementary (CMAR Design)	Nkenge	RGD & Associates,Inc	3/6/18	4/10/18	(35)	4/17/18	(7)	4/23/18	(6)	4/25/18	(2)	5/3/2018	(8)	5/8/2018	5/10/18 1:08 PM	(3)	PO.8518000280	58	
2	1752	P.002089	Whispering Pines Education Center (CMAR Design)	Jorge	RGD & Associates,Inc	3/6/18	3/9/18	(3)	3/13/18	(4)	3/14/18	(1)	3/16/18	(2)	3/26/2018	(10)	3/26/2018	3/28/18 11:39 AM	(2)	PO.8518000244	20	41
7	0201	P.002085	Bennett Elementary (CMAR Design)	Gary	DLFC Architects	3/20/18	4/18/18	(29)	4/18/18	0	4/23/18	(5)	4/25/18	(2)	5/3/2018	(8)	5/8/2018	5/10/18 2:13 PM	(3)	PO.8518000277	44	
3	0221	P.002092	Castle Hill Annex (CMAR Design)	Gary	DLFC Architects	3/20/18	4/18/18	(29)	4/18/18	0	4/23/18	(5)	4/25/18	(2)	5/3/2018	(8)	5/8/2018	5/10/18 2:13 PM	(3)	PO.8518000276	44	
4	3861	P.002080	Coral Glades High	Rodney	DLFC Architects	3/20/18	3/20/18	0	3/21/18	(1)	3/21/18	0	3/23/18	(2)	3/28/2018	(5)	3/29/2018	4/3/18 3:18 PM	(6)	PO.8518000249	8	
3	0221	P.002086	Croissant Park Elementary	Rodney	DLFC Architects	3/20/18	3/20/18	0	3/21/18	(1)	3/21/18	0	3/23/18	(2)	3/28/2018	(5)	3/29/2018	4/3/18 3:18 PM	(6)	PO.8518000250	8	
2	3222	P.002081	Cross Creek school (CMAR Design)	Gary	DLFC Architects	3/20/18	4/18/18	(29)	4/18/18	0	4/23/18	(5)	4/25/18	(2)	5/3/2018	(8)	5/8/2018	5/10/18 2:13 PM	(3)	PO.8518000283	44	
7	1382	P.002091	Pompano Beach High	Rodney	DLFC Architects	3/20/18	3/20/18	0	3/21/18	(1)	3/21/18	0	3/23/18	(2)	3/28/2018	(5)	3/29/2018	4/3/18 3:18 PM	(6)	PO.8518000248	8	
7	1171	P.002079	Sunshine Elementary (CMAR Design)	Gary	DLFC Architects	3/20/18	4/18/18	(29)	4/18/18	0	4/23/18	(5)	4/25/18	(2)	5/4/2018	(9)	5/9/2018	5/14/18 3:20 PM	(6)	PO.8518000286	45	29
1	1791	P.002110	Apollo Middle	Gary	RGD & Associates,Inc	4/10/18	4/17/18	(7)	4/20/18	(3)	4/23/18	(3)	4/25/18	(2)	5/2/2018	(7)	5/8/2018	5/10/18 1:08 PM	(3)	PO.8518000274	22	
5	3301	P.002111	Endeavour Primary Learning Center (CMAR Design)	Rodney	Tamara Peacock	4/10/18	3/2/18	39 AOT	3/26/18	(24)	4/10/18	(15)	4/13/18	(3)	4/18/2018	(5)	4/20/2018	4/24/18 11:22 AM	(4)	PO.8518000259	8	
4	2671	P.002112	Nob Hill Elementary (CMAR Design)	Jamie	Tamara Peacock	4/10/18	3/2/18	39 AOT	3/26/18	(24)	4/10/18	(15)	4/13/18	(3)	4/18/2018	(5)	4/20/2018	4/24/18 11:22 AM	(4)	PO.8518000261	8	
6	3011	P.000817	Stoneman Douglas High (CMAR Design)	Alfonso	Song & Associates, Inc.	4/10/18	4/11/18	(1)	4/17/18	(6)	4/25/18	(8)	4/27/18	(2)	5/2/2018	(5)	5/9/2018	5/14/18 1:46 PM	(6)	PO.8518000273	22	
5	3291	P.001674	Thurgood Marshall Elementary (CMAR Design)	Jamie	Tamara Peacock	4/10/18	3/2/18	39 AOT	3/26/18	(24)	4/10/18	(15)	4/13/18	(3)	4/18/2018	(5)	4/20/2018	4/24/18 11:22 AM	(4)	PO.8518000260	8	
5	2881	P.002114	Welleby Elementary	Gary	RGD & Associates,Inc	4/10/18	4/17/18	(7)	4/20/18	(3)	4/23/18	(3)	4/25/18	(2)	5/2/2018	(7)	5/8/2018	5/10/18 1:08 PM	(3)	PO.8518000275	22	15
1	0403	P.002115	Hallandale Magnet High	Nkenge	Song & Associates, Inc.	4/24/18	5/7/18	(13)	5/8/18	(1)	5/9/18	(1)	5/10/18	(1)	5/15/2018	(5)	5/18/2018	5/21/2018	(3)	PO.8518000294	21	
4	3781	P.002116	Park Trails Elementary	Alfonso	Song & Associates, Inc.	4/24/18	4/27/18	(3)	5/1/18	(4)	5/3/18	(2)	5/7/18	(4)	5/10/2018	(3)	5/16/2018	5/21/2018	(5)	PO.8518000288	16	
7	0891	P.002132	Sanders Park Elementary	Chris S.	DLFC Architects	4/24/18	6/20/18	(57)	6/21/18	(1)	6/26/18	(5)	7/3/18	(7)	7/10/2018	(7)	7/12/2018	7/13/18 1:13 PM	(2)	PO.8519000007	77	
6	3011	P.000817	Stoneman Douglas High (CMAR)	Alfonso	D. Stephenson Construction	4/24/18	5/29/18	(35)	6/1/18	(3)	6/6/18	(5)	6/8/18	(2)	6/20/2018	(12)	6/20/2018	6/25/18 11:00 AM	(5)	PO.8518000456	57	43
6	1931	P.002133	Cooper City High (CMAR Design)	Chris S.	Song & Associates, Inc.	5/8/18	7/3/18	(56)	7/10/18	(7)	7/11/18	(1)	7/17/2018	(5)	7/23/2018	(5)	7/23/2018	7/24/18 11:36 AM	(1)	PO.8519000012	70	
1	0341	P.002125	Mary Bethune Elementary	Chris S.	RGD & Associates,Inc	5/8/18	7/20/18	(73)	7/25/18	(5)	7/26/18	(1)	7/31/18	(5)	8/8/2018	(8)	8/9/2018	8/15/18 10:44 AM	(6)	PO.8519000036	92	
6	3401	P.002127	Sawgrass Elementary	Chris S.	RGD & Associates,Inc	5/8/18	7/24/18	(77)	7/25/18	(1)	7/26/18	(1)	7/31/18	(5)	8/8/2018	(8)	8/9/2018	8/15/18 10:44 AM	(6)	PO.8519000035	92	
4	2551	P.001982	Coral Springs Pre K-8	Blake	RGD & Associates,Inc	6/12/18	6/15/18	(3)	6/25/18	(10)	6/26/18	(1)	7/3/18	(7)	7/9/2018	(6)	7/12/2018	7/17/18 10:08 AM	(5)	PO.8519000006	27	
7	1871	P.000816	Crystal Lake Middle (CMAR Design)	Alfonso	Rodriguez Architects	6/12/18	7/30/18	(48)	8/1/18	(2)	8/6/18	(5)	8/10/18	(4)	8/20/2018	(10)	8/21/2018	8/24/18 12:29 PM	(4)	PO.8519000049	69	
2	1881	P.002130	Pines Middle (CMAR Design)	Alfonso	Rodriguez Architects	6/12/18	7/30/18	(48)	8/1/18	(2)	8/6/18	(5)	8/10/18	(4)	8/20/2018	(10)	8/21/2018	8/24/18 12:29 PM	(4)	PO.8519000050	69	
6	1251	P.002136	Plantation Park Elementary (CMAR Design)	Alfonso	Rodriguez Architects	6/12/18	7/30/18	(48)	8/1/18	(2)	8/6/18	(5)	8/10/18	(4)	8/20/2018	(10)	8/21/2018	8/24/18 12:29 PM	(4)	PO.8519000047	69	
7	3481	P.002129	Tradewinds Elementary (CMAR Design)	Alfonso	Rodriguez Architects	6/12/18	7/30/18	(48)	8/1/18	(2)	8/6/18	(5)	8/10/18	(4)	8/20/2018	(10)	8/21/2018	8/24/18 12:29 PM	(4)	PO.8519000051	69	
4	3871	P.002131	Westglades Middle	Alfonso	RGD & Associates,Inc	6/12/18	6/17/18	(5)	6/25/18	(8)	6/26/18	(1)	7/3/18	(7)	7/10/2018	(7)	7/12/2018	7/17/18 10:08 AM	(5)	PO.8519000009	28	55
6	1211	P.002150	Cooper City Elementary (CMAR Design)	Chris S.	RGD & Associates,Inc	6/26/18	7/26/18	(30)	7/27/18	(1)	7/31/18	(4)	8/1/18	(1)	8/7/2018	(6)	8/8/2018	8/14/18 1:56 PM	(7)	PO.8519000033	42	
6	1931	P.002133	Cooper City High (CMAR)	Chris S.	D. Stephenson Construction	6/26/18	7/25/18	(29)	7/30/18	(5)	7/31/18	(1)	8/1/18	(1)	8/20/2018	(19)	8/21/2018	8/23/18 10:02 AM		PO.8519000048	55	
4	3961	P.002147	Heron Heights Elementary (CMAR Design)	Alfonso	RGD & Associates,Inc	6/26/18	7/26/18	(30)	7/27/18	(1)	7/31/18	(4)	8/1/18	(1)	8/7/2018	(6)	8/8/2018	8/14/18 1:56 PM	(7)	PO.8519000032	42	
6	1282	P.002149	Nova Blanche Forman Elementary (CMAR Design)	Rodney	RGD & Associates,Inc	6/26/18	7/16/18	(20)	7/19/18	(3)	7/24/18	(5)	7/25/18	(1)	8/2/2018	(8)	8/8/2018	8/14/18 1:56 PM	(7)	PO.8519000028	37	
6	1271	P.002145	Nova Dwight Eisenhower Elementary (CMAR Design)	Rodney	RGD & Associates,Inc	6/26/18	7/16/18	(20)	7/19/18	(3)	7/24/18	(5)	7/25/18	(1)	8/1/2018	(7)	8/8/2018	8/14/18 1:56 PM	(7)	PO.8519000026	36	
2	3491	P.002146	Silver Palms Elementary (CMAR Design)	Herve	RGD & Associates,Inc	6/26/18	7/16/18	(20)	7/19/18	(3)	7/19/18	0	7/19/18	0	8/1/2018	(13)	8/8/2018	8/14/18 1:56 PM	(7)	PO.8519000025	36	41
3	0211	P.002163	Stranahan High - Cafeteria (CMAR Design)	Ron	LIVS Associates	7/24/18	7/25/18	(1)	7/27/18	(2)	7/31/18	(4)	8/2/18	(2)	8/13/2018	(11)	8/14/2018	8/22/18 9:35 AM	(8)	PO.8519000039	20	
4	3011	P.002185	Stoneman Douglas High - New Addition (CMAR Design)	Alfonso	Zyscovich Architects	7/24/18	7/26/18	(2)	7/30/18	(4)	7/30/18	0	8/2/18	(3)	Never seen Email go out		8/14/2018	8/16/18 12:01 PM	(3)	PO.7519003381		
7	1711	P.002134	Deerfield Beach High	Gustavo	Laura M. Perez and Associates	10/2/18																
3	1051	P.002128	Sheridan Technical High	Gustavo	Laura M. Perez and Associates	10/2/18																
4	3011	P.002185	Stoneman Douglas High - New Addition (CMAR)	Alfonso	James B. Pirtle Construction	10/16/18	10/12/18	4 AOT	11/8/18	(27)	11/9/18	(1)	11/14/18	(5)	Never seen Email go out		11/28/2018	12/11/18 11:35 AM	(13)	PO.7519005750		
3	0211	P.002163	Stranahan High - Cafeteria Additions (CMAR)	Ron	Thornton Construction	11/7/18	11/5/18	2 AOT	11/7/18	(2)	11/8/18	(1)	11/8/18	0	Never seen Email go out		11/28/2018	12/3/18 9:27 AM	(5)	PO.7519005605		
7	0911	P.002142	Deerfield Beach Middle	Alfonso	DLFC Architects	11/7/18	3/13/19	(126)	3/13/19	0	3/25/19	(12)	3/27/19	(2)	4/8/2019	(12)						
7	3101	P.002141	Lyons Creek Middle	Alfonso	DLFC Architects	11/7/18	3/13/19	(126)	3/13/19	0	3/25/19	(12)										

7	0901	P.001676	Cresthaven Elementary	Nkenge	CES Consultants, Inc	11/7/18	3/19/19	(132)			4/2/19		4/3/19								
4	2971	P.002144	Silver Lakes Middle	Nkenge	CES Consultants, Inc	11/7/18	3/19/19	(132)			4/2/19		4/3/19								
2	3911	P.002143	New Renaissance Middle	Nkenge	CES Consultants, Inc	11/7/18	3/19/19	(132)			3/29/19		4/3/19								
3	1241	P.002301	Northeast High - New Addition (CMAR Design)	Herve	Zyscovich Architects	12/18/18	12/19/18	(1)	12/20/18	(1)	1/4/19	-15	1/21/19	(17)	1/24/2019	(3)	2/4/2019	2/8/19 10:23 AM	(4)	PO.85190000167	37
3	1241	P.002301	Northeast High - New Addition (CMAR)	Herve	James B. Pirtle Construction	3/19/19	3/26/19	(7)													

Legend

## APPENDIX D



November 13, 2018

«First\_Name» «Last\_Name»  
«Company\_Name»  
«Contact\_Address», «Suite»  
«Contact\_City», «Contact\_State» «Contact\_Zip»

- RE: SMART Program Renovations – Professional Services
1. Proper Submittal of Invoices
  2. Basic Service Fee Impact due to Non-Conforming Design Documents
  3. Basic Service Fee Impact due to delay in Performance of Deliverables

Dear First Name,

This letter is intended to provide clarification and notice with respect to the three (3) topics listed above.

**Item 1:**

Submittal of invoices enhances the ability for pay requests to be processed in a timely fashion. It has come to our attention that invoices received by Broward County Public Schools (BCPS) for payment to consultants for services rendered have not always included all required documents such as updated project schedules. This requirement is specifically identified in Article 2.2.6.5 of the Professional Service Agreement (PSA) (Note: similar language is found in the PSA's for CMAR delivery). Article 6.1.7 specifies that no payment shall be due unless and until all material, forms and documents required by the PSA have been provided by the Project Consultant and its sub-consultants.

With respect to the above, effective December \_\_, 2018, invoices will be rejected and returned if the appropriate documents are not attached. Also, for immediate action, consultant must include a copy of this memo when submitting their invoice as acknowledgement of their understanding of these requirements.

**Item 2:**

Deduction of Basic Fee for costs due to Non-Conforming Design Documents. As of this memorandum, the District (BCPS) will be applying the effects of Article 2.1.7.2. (Note: This language is in all PSA's except the 2015 versions).

2.1.7.2 (Excerpt)

Penalty for Non-Conforming Design Document. The cost, as solely determined by the Owner, of all subsequent reviews after the second review for that phase shall be borne by the Project Consultant and the Owner will deduct such costs from the Project Consultants Basic Fee.

**Item 3:**

Deduction of Basic Fee for Performance Delay. As of the memorandum, the District (BCPS) will be applying the effective Article 10.1.3.

10.1.3 (Excerpt)

The consultant agrees that the Owner is entitled to recover no less than \$100 per consecutive calendar day of unexcused delay caused by the Consultants failure to comply with the times set forth in the fully executed ATP. Owner shall have the right to deduct such amount from payments due and owing to the Consultant.

Regarding items 2 and 3, a notice will be sent to the Consultant from the Project Manager detailing the event that has occurred, and the amount of the deduction. The subsequent pay application shall reflect the deductions as specified in the notice.

The application and consequences of these items will be enforced from this point. It is not the intent to apply any actions to previously incurred conditions that may have fallen under any of these three PSA driven terms.

For questions regarding matters presented herein, please contact Mike Bobby at Michael.Bobby@CBRE.com.

Sincerely,



Daniel Jardine  
Project Manager  
CBRE | Heery

Acknowledge By:

Firm Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Representative Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



[Month Day, 201 ]

[Mr./Ms. First and Last Name]

[Firm Name]

[Firm Address]

[City, State Zip Code]

**RE: SMART Program Renovations – Non-Conforming Design Documents and Delay of Deliverables**

Dear [Mr./Ms. Last Name]:

This letter serves to provide notice and clarification regarding the enforcement of specific terms of the Professional Service Agreement (“PSA”) addressing the above-referenced topics.

You will recall a letter dated November 30, 2018 and a meeting for all designers on December 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2018 at which time the letter was distributed to all in attendance. In addition for those firms not in attendance, the letter was sent out as a follow-up to the meeting.

This letter and meeting of December 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2018 was to provide notice of three actions that will be required going forward.

1. Invoicing – These instructions relative to proper submittals of invoices went in to effect December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018. A follow-up letter was sent specific to these invoicing requirements (see attached).

The next two items for action were first, application of charges for Non-Conforming Design Documents and second, application of charges for Delay in Performance of Contractually obligated deliverables.

This letter further serves to notify that action on Non-Conforming Documents (these requiring more than two (2) submittals and/or Delays on Deliverables will be in effect as stated in items I and II below.

## **I. NON-CONFORMING DESIGN DOCUMENTS**

If the Building Department, Design Services Department, Peer Plan Review Consultant (and/or other plan review authority) deem the submittal of any drawings, plans, specifications or other documents or materials (“Deliverable”) to be unacceptable as defined by the terms “Revise and Resubmit,” *all costs -- as solely determined by the SBBC -- for reviews* after the second review of the applicable Phase Deliverable will be deducted from the Project Consultant’s Basic Services Fee. See Art. 2.1.7.2.

**Example:** A 100% Construction Design Document Deliverable is submitted, reviewed (the **First Review**) and returned to the Project Consultant as “Revise and Resubmit.” The Project Consultant revises and re-submits the Phase I Deliverable which is reviewed (the **Second Review**) and again returned to the Project Consultant as “Revise and Resubmit.” The Project Consultant revises and re-submits the Phase I Deliverable which is reviewed (the **Third Review**)

and returned to the Project Consultant as “Approved with Comments” (or similar). In this example, all costs associated with the Third Review will be deducted from the Project Consultant’s Basic Services Fee.

**NOTE:** Effective January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019, the District shall enforce the terms of Article 2.1.7.2 of the PSA. The assigned Project Manager shall provide notice detailing the event that has occurred and the amount of the deduction. The applicable invoice shall reflect the deductions as specified in the notice. **[Note: This language is in all PSA’s except the 2015 versions]**

The costs to be incurred are illustrated on the attached Non-Confirming Design Documents Table of Charges.

**II. DELAY:**

If the Project Consultant fails to comply with the schedule set forth in the fully-executed ATP, the SBBC shall deduct and withhold \$100, for each calendar day of unexcused delay, from payments due and owing to the Project Consultant. See Art. 10.1.3.

Example: A Phase I Deliverable is due on December 4, 2018. Project Consultant submits its Phase I Deliverable on January 5, 2018. The Phase I Deliverable is considered to be thirty two (32) days late. The delay clock stops at the delivery date. The submittal is then reviewed. It may be returned to the Project Consultant as “Approved and the delay charges will be calculated on (32) days. If returned and not accepted the delay clock continues until acceptance.”

**NOTE:** Effective April 15<sup>th</sup>, 2019 the District shall enforce the terms of Article 2.1.7.2 of the PSA. The assigned Project Manager shall provide notice detailing the event that has occurred and the amount of the deduction. The applicable invoice shall reflect the deductions as specified in the notice.

For questions regarding matters presented herein, please contact Mike Bobby at [Michael.Bobby@CBRE.com](mailto:Michael.Bobby@CBRE.com).

Sincerely,

Daniel Jardine  
Program Director  
CBRE | Heery

DJ:mq

Receipt and Content Acknowledge By:

Firm Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Representative Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



**REVISE AND RE-SUBMIT FEE DEDUCTIONS  
 BASIC SERVICE FEE – DEDUCTION TABLE**

**Project Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Purchase Order #:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project #:** \_\_\_\_\_

RR #:		Original Basic Service Fee:	\$
Date #:		Deduction:	\$
Phase:			
Description:			
RR #:		Original Basic Service Fee:	\$
Date #:		Deduction:	\$
Phase:			
Description:			
RR #:		Original Basic Service Fee:	\$
Date #:		Deduction:	\$
RR #:		Original Basic Service Fee:	\$
Date #:		Deduction:	\$

**Adjusted Basic Service Fee: \$** \_\_\_\_\_



**BASIC SERVICE FEE - DEDUCTION TABLE**

**Project Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Purchase Order #:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project #:** \_\_\_\_\_

RR #:		Original Basic Service Fee:	\$
Date:		Deduction:	\$
Description:			
RR #:		Original Basic Service Fee:	\$
Date:		Deduction:	\$
Description:			
RR #:		Original Basic Service Fee:	\$
Date:		Deduction:	\$
Description:			
RR #:		Original Basic Service Fee:	\$
Date:		Deduction:	\$
Description:			

**Adjusted Basic Service Fee:** \$ \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX E

**PROJECT DOCUMENTS LOG**

**Construction Phase**  
**NAME OF SCHOOL,**  
**SMART Program Renovations**  
**Project No. P.00**

**CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS:**

<b>Document Type:</b>	<b>e-Builder File Location:</b>	<b>Date Uploaded:</b>
<b>Pre-Con Meeting Minutes</b>		
<b>Progress Meeting Minutes</b>		
<b>Schedules</b>		
<b>Field Progress Report</b>		
<b>Submittal Logs</b>		
<b>RFI Logs</b>		
<b>ASI Logs</b>		
<b>Inspections</b>		
<b>Testing Reports</b>		
<b>Surveys</b>		
<b>Change Order Log</b>		

4.1.12 **e-Builder.** The Project Consultant shall be required to use Owner's Project Management Software, e-Builder. One (1) license will be distributed to Design Professional, at cost to Owner, which will allow access into e-Builder for one of multiple projects as awarded by Owner. Usage of this license will be provided throughout the duration of the project(s). Based on availability, additional licenses may be provided as needed.

In order to further delineate how e-Builder will be utilized to manage your project(s) we are providing the following:

1. **e-Builder.** The Project Consultant shall use the Owner's Project Management software, e-Builder, as a conduit for all project management tasks, including, but not limited to: communications to, from and between Owner, Project Consultant and CM; pay applications/invoicing; request for change orders and change orders; materials, equipment and systems submittals; requests for information; Architect's Supplemental Instructions; SMWBE Monthly Utilization Reporting; Weekly Progress Reports and meeting minutes

Licenses shall be provided to Project Consultant to permit access and use of e-Builder for all projects awarded by Owner. Such license(s) shall be valid throughout the duration of the project(s). See Item 1.5 below for license request instructions.

- 1.1. **Forms Module.** The e-Builder Forms Module shall be used as the exclusive method to create Action Items that require a response from another Project Construction Team member. The required use of the Forms Module includes ALL e-mailed communications.
- 1.2. **Work Flows.** Any and all responses or required response to an open Action Item or to an initiated Work Flow process shall be input and managed through e-Builder. Work Flow processes that will be executed through e-Builder include but are not limited to those processes identified in Item # 1 above.
- 1.3. **Calendar Module.** The identification of Project events and required deliverables shall be input and maintained in the Calendar Module. At a minimum, such events include bi-weekly design meetings (while in design), weekly construction meetings, public meetings for the project (ex. Project Charter Meetings, Big Three Monthly Updates, etc.) and other design and/or construction milestones and deadlines.
- 1.4. **Meetings.** Information to be input into e-Agenda related to any meeting includes, but is not limited to an agenda, a reminder of the meeting (which must occur a minimum of two (2) days prior to the meeting), meeting minutes (using the approved meeting minutes template) and confirmation of actual meeting attendees.
- 1.5. **Access to e-Builder and Licensing.** Vendor shall designate and identify the employee(s) that shall personally access e-Builder, the projects to which the employee(s) is assigned, and the employee(s)'s duties and responsibilities as it relates to e-Builder.

This information together with a request for licensing shall be sent to Colette Jones, Program Controls Support, telephone number (754) 321-1537, colette.jones@browardschools.com. Upon receipt, review and acceptance of the request, access information and logins shall be provided to Vendor.

Training shall be coordinated, scheduled and provided to those provided access and licenses by Colette Jones. Additional training may be provided based on availability.

Please notice that licenses are now unlimited and as such the Project Consultant may request the number of licenses deemed necessary to meet your commitment herein under your current PSA's.

If you have any questions please contact Mike Bobby, (754) 321-4865, Michael.Bobby@cbre.com


Please sign your receipt of this notice. Scan and email it Colette Jones.

Firm Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Representative Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



RSM US LLP  
100 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Suite 300  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301  
954.462.6351  
[www.rsmus.com](http://www.rsmus.com)

RSM US LLP is a limited liability partnership and the U.S. member firm of RSM International, a global network of independent audit, tax and consulting firms. The member firms of RSM International collaborate to provide services to global clients, but are separate and distinct legal entities that cannot obligate each other. Each member firm is responsible only for its own acts and omissions, and not those of any other party.

For more information, visit [rsmus.com/aboutus](http://rsmus.com/aboutus) for more information regarding RSM US LLP and RSM International.

© 2019 RSM US LLP. All Rights Reserved.