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Executive Summary

This report presents the results of our review of Change Order Number 7 (Change Order) to the Odebrecht-CFE Joint Venture (OCJV) Contract at the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport (Bid No. Z0995302C1) (OCJV Contract). The purpose of the Change Order was to transfer a portion of the work from OCJV to another airport contractor, Tutor Perini\(^1\), in order to avoid a six-month delay in completing the new South Runway. The transferred work included multiple lines of charges and credits and resulted in a net additional cost of $9.2 million to the County. One of the charges included an additional $24.5 million paid to OCJV for compacted embankment material (material) consisting of a unit price increase from an original bid price of $12.00 per cubic yard (CY) to $24.11/CY for 2,020,000 CY of material. The objective of our review was to determine and evaluate the underlying factors driving the unit price increase for material.

We found the unit price increase was primarily driven by the requirement to compensate OCJV for additional costs incurred in obtaining material. The original bid price contemplated obtaining material from on-site sources including the re-use of surcharge material\(^2\); however, as a result of the transfer of responsibility to Tutor Perini, these sources were no longer available to OCJV. Therefore, OCJV had to purchase and transport material from off-site commercial sources at an additional cost.

While we ultimately were able to determine the basis for the additional cost to the County, our review was unnecessarily hampered and delayed because Broward County Aviation Department (BCAD) consultants responsible for a significant role in negotiating the change order (AECOM Technology Corporation (AECOM) and Parsons Transportation Group, Inc. (Parsons), respectively) (Consultants) provided incomplete documentation and conflicting explanations as to the basis and necessity of the additional costs. BCAD staff were of little assistance in justifying the change order costs as they did not participate in negotiations and therefore were not familiar with the elements of the change order. Only after meeting directly with OCJV did we obtain accurate explanations of the Change Order. We then met again with the Consultants to discuss questioned items; however, the Consultants continued to provide incomplete documentation and conflicting explanations. For example, when questioned about additional mark-ups within the negotiated amounts, the Consultants stated that they had not included the additional mark-ups and provided a table supporting their position. Following several months of additional inquiry and review, the Consultants acknowledged that the table was inaccurate, that negotiated amounts did include the additional mark-ups, and ultimately explained why the additional mark-ups were necessary.

\(^1\) Tutor Perini Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood Venture, LLP (Tutor) is another major contractor on the runway expansion project.
\(^2\) Surcharge is additional embankment material placed on tip of existing embankment material to act as a compression agent and subsequently removed.
were necessary. We concluded the final explanations appeared plausible; however, neither these explanations nor negotiated costs were adequately documented or maintained by the Consultants within the record of negotiation. This resulted unnecessary delay and additional cost to complete this review. We recommend the Board direct:

1) The County Administrator to require:
   a. Consultants to document and retain the supporting documentation of their review(s) of future Change Orders,
   b. BCAD to provide adequate oversight over the Consultants to include their review of change order documentation, and
   c. BCAD to attend all significant negotiations.

2) The County Attorney’s Office to evaluate the potential for recovery from AECOM and Parsons of costs associated with the review including:
   a. Fees paid to the Consultants for hours billed in relation to this review, and
   b. Reimbursement of costs incurred by the County in conducting this review.
   c. Any losses to the County which may result from disallowance of cost reimbursement by the federal government. Notwithstanding our conclusion, an audit or review by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) or other federal agency may deny cost reimbursement based on a lack of adequate documentation.

Purpose and Scope

The purpose of our review was to determine and evaluate the underlying factors driving the unit price increase from $12.00/CY to $24.11/CY for 2,020,000 CY of material in OCJV Change Order Number 7 resulting in an additional cost to the County of $24.5 million.

Methodology

To accomplish our objective, we:

- Reviewed
  o The OCJV bid documents,
  o The contract between OCJV and the County executed April 30, 2012,
  o OCJV Change Order Number 7 approved by the Board of County Commissioners on May 14, 2013,
  o OCJV Change Order Number 7 negotiation records and e-mail correspondence,
  o Tutor Perini Change Order Number 6,
o BCAD Consultants’ “breakdown of embankment cost” spreadsheet and supporting documentation,
  o OCJV’s breakdown of the revised embankment unit price of $24.11/CY with supporting documentation,
  o Agreements between OCJV and suppliers of embankment material,
  o Agreements between OCJV and transporters of embankment material,
  o Supplier invoices to OCJV,
  o Transporter invoices to OCJV,
  o Laboratory test results of embankment soil samples to calculate the conversion factor for different embankment materials, and
  o Federal Aviation Administration Technical Specifications Item P-152 related to Excavation and Embankment.

- Interviewed
  - BCAD staff,
  - OCJV staff,
  - AECOM staff, and
  - Parsons staff.

- Consulted with the County Attorney’s Office.

**Background**

**Contract**

On April 30, 2012, the Board of County Commissioners (Board) awarded the contract for Site Preparation and Navigational Aids Infrastructure to Odebrecht - CFE Joint Venture (OCJV) in the amount of $225,914,661. The purpose of this contract was to provide construction of the embankment and major utility infrastructure for the new South Runway at the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport. The project provided for the placement of approximately 8,000,000 cubic yards (CY) of embankment, construction of a mechanically stabilized earth wall system; installation of storm drainage structures; pavement demolition; dynamic compaction; removal of water, sewer, natural gas, and jet fuel pipelines; and the installation of airfield electrical duct banks and conduits associated with the development of future navigational aids in support of the overall South Runway Expansion program.

**Change Order Number 7**

On May 14, 2013, the Board approved OCJV Change Order (CO) Number 7 and a related CO Number 6 to the Tutor Perini (Tutor) contract. The primary purpose of the COs was to transfer a portion of the work originally to be performed OCJV to Tutor. According to BCAD management, failure to take action would have created a six-month delay in completing the new South Runway resulting in significant loss of revenues to BCAD. As summarized in Table 1, the COs totaled
a negotiated net additional contract cost of **$9.2 million** for the work transferred from OCJV to Tutor and **$4.1 million** for settlements of potential claims related to the OCJV and Tutor contracts.

### Table 1 – Summary of OCJV CO #7 and Tutor CO #6 Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>OCJV CO</th>
<th>Tutor CO</th>
<th>Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments to Work Scope(^a)</td>
<td>$(28,564,520)</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$(13,564,520)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resequencing</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauling Allowance</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Material Quantity(^b)</td>
<td>$(6,646,764)</td>
<td>$ (6,646,764)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Material Price(^b)</td>
<td>$24,462,200</td>
<td>$24,462,200</td>
<td>$48,924,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$(7,849,084)</td>
<td>$17,000,000</td>
<td>$9,150,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlements</td>
<td>$3,073,765</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$4,073,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$(4,775,319)</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>$13,224,681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Office of County Auditor analysis of change orders. For presentation purposes:

\(^a\) This item is a summation of three items from the OCJV CO and one item from the Tutor CO.  
\(^b\) These items are regrouped and summarized from the OCJV CO which lists a $30,886,764 decrease to “Embankment in Place” (reflecting a deletion of 2,573,897 CY of material at a unit cost of $12.00/CY) and a $48,702,200 increase to “Other – Cost Adjustment” (reflecting an addition of 2,020,000 CY of material at a unit cost of $24.11/CY).

Adjustments to work scope, resequencing, hauling allowances, and changes in price and quantity to embankment in place reflect **$9.2 million** in net costs associated with transferring the work from OCJV to Tutor.

**Adjustments to Work Scope** of $13.6 million reductions reflect $28.5 million in credits from OCJV at the original contracted quantities and unit prices for deleted scope of work offset by $15 million additional scope of services from Tutor to perform additional work.

**Resequencing costs** total $3.4 million in additional costs associated with resolving scheduling issues pertaining to transferring the work and establishment of new contract milestone dates.

**Hauling Allowance** reflects $1.5 million in additional potential hauling cost increases for OCJV. According to BCAD, this allowance was ultimately not utilized and did not result in an actual cost.

**Change in Material Quantity** includes a $6.6 million decrease reflecting a reduction in estimated material quantity from 2,573,897 CY to 2,020,000 CY at the contracted unit price of $12.00/CY.

**Change in Material Price** of $24.5 million reflects a unit price increase from an original bid price of $12.00/CY to $24.11/CY for 2,020,000 CY of material.
Finding and Recommendations

BCAD Consultants provided incomplete documentation and conflicting explanations to support the change order costs

BCAD Consultants provided incomplete and conflicting explanations.

OCJV Change Order #7 (Change Order) was originally placed on the May 7th, 2013 Board agenda for approval. Following our initial inquiries, staff withdrew the item for further review until the May 14, 2013 Board agenda. During this time, we continued to meet with BCAD staff and their program and construction project management consultants (AECOM Technology Corporation (AECOM) and Parsons Transportation Group, Inc. (Parsons), respectively) (Consultants) in order to develop an understanding of the item. Although the Consultants were contractually responsible for a significant role in negotiating the Change Order and maintaining the record of negotiations\(^3\), they provided incomplete and conflicting explanations to our inquiries. Further, BCAD staff were of little assistance to the review as they did not participate in negotiations as procedurally required\(^4\) and therefore were not familiar with the elements of the Change Order. However, according to BCAD management, failure to take action would have created a six-month delay in completing the new South Runway resulting in significant loss of revenues to BCAD. Therefore, we declined pulling the item for further review recognizing the impact of potential project delays and required period of review. The item was submitted and approved by the Board on May 14, 2013.

We met directly with OCJV to obtain accurate explanations.

We issued a formal Notice of Review to BCAD on January 15, 2014. The purpose of the review was to determine and evaluate the underlying factors driving the unit price increase from $12.00/CY to $24.11/CY for 2,020,000 CY of material in the Change Order resulting in an additional cost to the County of $24.5 million. Given the previous incomplete and conflicting explanations from the Consultants, we met directly with OCJV representatives to develop an understanding of the Change Order and elements driving the unit price increase.

We found that the unit price increase was primarily driven by the requirement to compensate OCJV for additional costs incurred in obtaining material. The original bid price contemplated obtaining material from on-site sources including the re-use of surcharge material; however, as a result of the transfer of work to Tutor, these sources were no longer available to OCJV. Therefore, OCJV had to

\(^3\) Section 3.9.10 and Exhibit A Section 3.1.2 of Parsons Contract and Airport Expansion Program (AEP) Program Management Plan (PMP) Procedure No. 2.20 Rev 2, dated September 18, 2012

\(^4\) AEP PMP Procedure No. 2.20 Rev 2, dated September 18, 2012 requires BCAD participation in contractor negotiations.
purchase and transport material from commercial sources at an additional cost. This is further described in Appendix A.

We also questioned $1.6 million in additional cost mark-ups (additional mark-ups) within the price increase which appeared to exceed the limitations on markups.\(^5\) See Appendix A. We prepared a draft report identifying the additional mark-ups and met with BCAD staff and Consultants on January 29, 2015 to discuss.

**BCAD Consultants continued to provide conflicting explanations.**

The Consultants suggested that the OCJV records we reviewed may have reflected additional mark-ups in determining the $24.11/CY unit price but their records did not. They referred us to their schedule titled “Breakdown of Embankment Cost” (Table) which did not reflect the additional mark-ups and suggested we review that information. In subsequent correspondence, the Consultants further represented that the Table they provided to us was used as a basis for their negotiations.\(^6\)

We reviewed the Table and found that it was not adequately supported, contained mathematical errors, and did not support the $24.11/CY unit price in the Change Order.

We met with BCAD staff and Consultants on June 18, 2015 to discuss the issues. The Consultants acknowledged the errors in the Table, stated that it was not used as a basis for negotiation but was developed subsequent to the change order to aid our review, and advised that they had negotiated the additional mark-ups. They referred us to a document within the record of negotiation showing that the price increase did include the additional markup.

We reviewed the new document and found that it was not adequately supported. The record of negotiation did not provide a basis for the additional mark-up listed within the document.

**BCAD Consultants claim the additional markups were contractually allowable and compensated OCJV for additional risk; however, these subsequent explanations were not properly documented within the record of negotiation.**

We subsequently met with the Consultants on August 20, 2015 to discuss their written response dated May 8, 2015 claiming that the contract did not limit markup for the Material at issue. The response stated that “in lieu of adjusting existing

---

\(^5\) Section 39.4 of the contract specifies that allowable mark-ups of change order cost incurred should not exceed either 10% for labor, material, and equipment or 7.5% for subcontracted work. As shown in Appendix A, the price increase included a 17.5% markup resulting in approximately $1.6 million in additional costs to the County.

\(^6\) We received a Consultant email on February 5, 2015 stating “As requested, attached are the ‘source documents’, received from OCJV, upon which we build our cost model entitled ‘Breakdown Embankment Cost’. We used this model as a basis for our negotiations.”
unit prices” they established a new unit price “negotiated based upon Contract Section 01260, Paragraph 1.06.B.2” which “addresses how a new unit price is to be established”, “clearly states the parties are to develop and mutually agree to a new unit price”, and “does not establish any specific percentages for mark-ups, nor does it limit the allowable mark-up”.

The response also described additional risks assumed by OCJV and stated “The new unit price negotiated, in part, compensated the contractor for these added risks”. The Consultants explained that the added risks were addressed within the additional markup. Specifically, the change order includes deletion of a line item titled “Embankment Due to Settlement” originally intended to compensate OCJV for certain risks.

We found no evidence of these explanations or support for the additional markup within the Change Order record of negotiation. Nonetheless, the explanations of the necessity to compensate OCJV for additional financial risks incurred appear plausible. Based on these explanations, the delegated authority granted to the Consultants, and after consultation with the County Attorney’s Office, we have not made a recommendation for the recovery of the $1.6 million from the Consultants.

However, because the Consultant’s changing explanations and lack of clear and consistent documentation resulted in unnecessary delay and additional cost to complete this review, we recommend the Board direct:

1) The County Administrator to require:
   a. Consultants to document and retain the supporting documentation of their review(s) of future Change Orders,
   b. BCAD to provide adequate oversight over the Consultants to include their review of change order documentation, and
   c. BCAD to attend all significant negotiations.

2) The County Attorney’s Office to evaluate the potential for recovery from AECOM and Parsons of costs associated with the review including:
   a. Fees paid to the Consultants for hours billed in relation to this review, and
   b. Reimbursement of costs incurred by the County in conducting this review.
   c. Any losses to the County which may result from disallowance of cost reimbursement by the federal government. Notwithstanding our conclusion, an audit or review by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) or other federal agency may deny cost reimbursement based on a lack of adequate documentation.
Appendix I

The unit price increase from $12.00/CY to $24.11/CY for 2,020,000 CY of material, which resulted in an additional cost to the County of $24.5 million, was primarily driven by the requirement to compensate OCJV for additional costs, plus mark-ups, incurred in obtaining material. The original bid price contemplated obtaining material from on-site sources; however, as a result of the transfer of work from OCJV to Tutor, these sources were no longer available to OCJV. Therefore, OCJV had to purchase and transport material from commercial sources at an additional cost. Table 2 below shows the additional costs and mark-ups of $24.5 million for 2,020,000 CY of material.

Table 2 – Additional Cost of $24.5 Million for 2,020,000 CY of Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity (cy)</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Additional Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Purchased Material Originally to be Obtained On-Site</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Price</td>
<td>918,454</td>
<td>$ 20.16</td>
<td>$ 18,518,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Markup (10%)*</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1,851,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Markup (7.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1,388,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>918,454</td>
<td>23.69</td>
<td>21,759,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit for not hauling surcharge</td>
<td></td>
<td>(513,204)</td>
<td>(513,204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2a. Purchased Material from a Higher Cost Supplier</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost increase from lower cost to higher cost supplier</td>
<td>288,462</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>2,228,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Markup (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>222,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Markup (7.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>167,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between OCJV detail and OCJV Summary</td>
<td>288,462</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>2,618,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(935)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,618,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2b. Additional Handling and Stockpiling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Handling and Stockpiling</td>
<td>230,769</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>461,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Markup (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>46,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Markup (19.25%)**</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>88,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. No change</strong></td>
<td>582,315</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Additional Cost per OCJV Summary</strong></td>
<td>2,020,000</td>
<td>$ 12.11</td>
<td>$ 24,462,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Difference between OCJV Summary and Change Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Additional Cost per Change Order</strong></td>
<td>2,020,000</td>
<td>$ 12.11</td>
<td>$ 24,462,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of County Auditor analysis of OCJV’s breakdown of based on review of OCJV supporting documentation.

* Purchased material costs includes hauling cost which may be determined to be subcontracted work. Section 39.4 of the contract limits mark-up for subcontracted work to 7.5%.

** The work was first marked up 10% and followed by a 17.5% mark-up (29.25% total mark-up), resulting in a 19.25% additional mark-up.
As shown in Table 2, the total additional mark-ups are $1,644,891.

1) **Materials Originally to be Obtained On-Site** ($21,246,154 Additional Cost for 918,454 cy of Material)

OCJV originally planned on utilizing 918,454 CY of surcharge\(^7\) material leftover from the east side of the project area to use as embankment material on the west side at no cost; however, because of the changes, this material became unavailable for OCJV’s use. As a result, OCJV incurred an additional $21.2 million to purchase 918,454 CY of material from a supplier.

The Change Order also provided the County a credit totaling $513,204 by removing OCJV’s cost for not hauling surcharge material from the east to the west side as included in the original contract price.

2) **Materials Originally to be Purchased from a Low Cost Supplier**

OCJV originally planned on obtaining and directly placing on the west side approximately 1,101,546 CY of material from a low cost supplier with limited daily production capabilities; however, due to project acceleration, the supplier was unable to meet required time lines for 519,231 CY of the material. As a result, OCJV incurred the following additional costs:

   a. **Purchased Material from a Higher Cost Supplier** ($2,618,004 Additional Cost for 288,462 CY of Material)

      OCJV purchased 288,462 CY of material from a higher cost supplier that could meet daily production requirements.

   b. **Additional Handling and Stockpiling** ($596,430 Additional Cost for 230,769 CY of Material)

      OCJV purchased 230,769 CY from the original cost supplier and stored it on-site in advance of final placement. This resulted in additional handling and stockpiling costs.

3) **No Additional Costs** ($0 Additional Cost for 582,315 CY of Material)

OCJV purchased and directly placed 582,315 CY of material from the lower cost supplier as originally planned.

\(^7\) Surcharge is additional embankment material placed on tip of existing embankment material to act as a compression agent and subsequently removed.

ACTION: (T-10:40 AM) Approved.

VOTE: 8-0. Commission District 3 is open.

Attachments

- Exhibit 1 - Aviation Department Review of Embankment Material Costs for Change Order Number 7 to the Odebrecht-CFE Joint Venture Contract at the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport (Report No. 15-5)
- Exhibit 2 - Management’s response
- Exhibit 3 - Consultants’ response
Broward County Commission Regular Meeting

Meeting Date: 08/16/2016
Director’s Name: Evan A. Lukic
Department: County Auditor

Information

Requested Action

ACTION: (T-10:40 AM) Approved.

VOTE: 8-0. Commission District 3 is open.

B. MOTION TO ADOPT County Auditor’s Recommendations.

ACTION: (T-10:40 AM) Approved.

VOTE: 8-0. Commission District 3 is open.

What Action Accomplishes

Is this Action Goal Related

Previous Action Taken

Summary Explanation/Background
This report presents the results of our review of Change Order Number 7 (Change Order) to the Odebrecht-CFE Joint Venture (OCJV) Contract at the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport (Bid No. Z0995302C1) (OCJV Contract). The purpose of the Change Order was to transfer a portion of the work from OCJV to another airport contractor, Tutor Perini, in order to avoid a six-month delay in completing the new South Runway. The transferred work included multiple lines of charges and credits and resulted in a net additional cost of $9.2 million to the County. One of the charges included an additional $24.5 million paid to OCJV for compacted embankment material (material) consisting of a unit price increase from an original bid price of $12 per cubic yard (CY) to $24.11/CY for 2,020,000 CY of material. The objective of our review was to determine and evaluate the underlying factors driving the unit price increase for material.

We found the unit price increase was primarily driven by the requirement to compensate OCJV for additional...
costs incurred in obtaining material. The original bid price contemplated obtaining material from on-site sources including the re-use of surcharge material; however, as a result of the transfer of responsibility to Tutor Perini, these sources were no longer available to OCJV. Therefore, OCJV had to purchase and transport material from off-site commercial sources at an additional cost.

While we ultimately were able to determine the basis for the additional cost to the County, our review was unnecessarily hampered and delayed because Broward County Aviation Department (BCAD) consultants responsible for a significant role in negotiating the change order (AECOM Technology Corporation (AECOM) and Parsons Transportation Group, Inc. (Parsons), respectively) (Consultants) provided incomplete documentation and conflicting explanations as to the basis and necessity of the additional costs. BCAD staff were of little assistance in justifying the change order costs as they did not participate in negotiations and therefore were not familiar with the elements of the change order. Only after meeting directly with OCJV did we obtain accurate explanations of the Change Order. We then met again with the Consultants to discuss questioned items; however, the Consultants continued to provide incomplete documentation and conflicting explanations. For example, when questioned about additional mark-ups within the negotiated amounts, the Consultants stated that they had not included the additional mark-ups and provided a table supporting their position. Following several months of additional inquiry and review, the Consultants acknowledged that the table was inaccurate, that negotiated amounts did include the additional mark-ups, and ultimately explained why the additional mark-ups were necessary. We concluded the final explanations appeared plausible; however, neither these explanations nor negotiated costs were adequately documented or maintained by the Consultants within the record of negotiation. This resulted unnecessary delay and additional cost to complete this review. We recommend the Board direct:

1. The County Administrator to require:
   a. Consultants to document and retain the supporting documentation of their review(s) of future Change Orders,  
   b. BCAD to provide adequate oversight over the Consultants to include their review of change order documentation, and  
   c. BCAD to attend all significant negotiations.

2. The County Attorney's Office to evaluate the potential for recovery from AECOM and Parsons of costs associated with the review including:
   a. Fees paid to the Consultants for hours billed in relation to this review, and  
   b. Reimbursement of costs incurred by the County in conducting this review.  
   c. Any losses to the County which may result from disallowance of cost reimbursement by the federal government. Notwithstanding our conclusion, an audit or review by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) or other federal agency may deny cost reimbursement based on a lack of adequate documentation.

Source of Additional Information

Fiscal Impact

Fiscal Impact/Cost Summary:  
No fiscal impact.

Attachments

Exhibit 1 - Aviation Department Review of Embankment Material Costs for Change Order Number 7 to the Odebrecht–CFE Joint Venture Contract at the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport (Report No. 15-5)  
Exhibit 2 - Management's response  
Exhibit 3 - Consultants' response