

RSM ROOFING PROCESS ANALYSIS

ADVANCE QUESTIONS FROM AUDIT COMMITTEE MEMBER MS. CONNIE POU

Observation #2 - Strategic Long-term BCPS Roofing Plan - Response needed from RSM

In addition to the required five-year District Educational Facility Plan, did RSM look at other school districts i.e., Miami-Dade and Palm Beach to see if they have long-term roofing plans? If yes, do they utilize an Asset Management Company or is it done in house.

Observation # 5 – Roofing Sub-permitting Process is Manual/Printed - Response needed from the Building Department

In response to the above observation, can management provide an update as to the progress in addressing the recommendation to automate the sub-permitting process.

Observation #6 – Lack of resources to support Roofing Sub-permitting and Observation #7 – Lack of Formalized Procedure and Resources for Inspections. Response needed from the Building Department

From management responses to the above observations it does not appear that there is a plan to address these issues. Can management provide us with alternative options to resolve or mitigate the issues.

RSM ROOFING PROCESS ANALYSIS

ADVANCE QUESTIONS FROM AUDIT COMMITTEE MEMBER DR. NATHALIE LYNC-WALSH

Observation #1: Response requested from the Office of Capital Programs and/or CBRE Heery

RFP 15-115C is part of the contractual obligations to which Heery agreed in August of 2015. While it was regrettably light on defining the importance of the building department and related processes—a weakness that was addressed in this year’s Program Manager Owner’s Representative RFQ—it did contain some language that suggests Heery should have addressed design issues at the front end of their involvement, rather than at the back end:

6.4.3.5 Design Management

As discussed in Sections 3.2 and 3.5 the OR shall provide day-to-day management of the design process from project definition through the completion of pre-construction. Of critical import is that the OR team be fully capable of developing Design Criteria Packages for all projects which are assigned to the OR. The design criteria packages shall provide a clear scope of work upon which design builders or design professionals can propose and develop projects from. As part of the budgeting process the OR shall ensure that the design professional (or other design entity) produces a design that is within the established budget for construction of the project in question. The OR shall implement the District’s robust process to control changes during the design that necessitate a change in the project budget. Furthermore, the OR shall establish a clear understanding of the cost drivers of the project prior to development of completed construction drawings. This should include understanding the risks related to the scope of work in question, and taking the appropriate steps to assess such risks, such as destructive testing and environmental sampling. Furthermore, the OR shall incorporate collaborative constructability reviews into their design review process to further mitigate the occurrence of foreseeable changes during construction.

6.4.3.6 Master Project Specifications and Guidelines.

The OR is expected to actively contribute to the District’s initiative to continuously improve the master program standards to avail itself of current industry standards and evolving best practices. The process of developing these standards is expected to be iterative and collaborative between the OR, FCM, PPO, Design Professionals and other applicable District departments for the duration of the program.

Question 1a: Given that the contractual obligation above has existed since 2015, why weren’t the issues identified in Observation #1 (p. 11) proactively addressed prior to 2018 (see mgt response p. 12)?

Question 1b: Although roofing is the only area requiring a sub permit, it is not the only discipline requiring additional drawings. Are there similar challenges, obstacles, delays, etc. due to HVAC and fire safety projects? Explain.

Observation#2: Q2a/Q2b/Q2d - Response requested from the Office of Capital Programs and/or CBRE Heery; Q2c – Response requested from the Superintendent

This observation cited the lack of a “strategic roofing plan in place for prioritizing, selecting, or scheduling roofing projects to develop a long-term plan for each of the 241 school facilities managed by

RSM ROOFING PROCESS ANALYSIS

ADVANCE QUESTIONS FROM AUDIT COMMITTEE MEMBER DR. NATHALIE LYNC-WALSH

BCPS,” and that “while the DEFP is critical to capital outlay planning, it does not contemplate the long-term plans for each BCPS school.”

Question 2a: Is the lack of the aforementioned strategic roofing plan and long-term plan overall a primary reason why we are discussing all of these roofing issues now, instead of in 2015 or 2016, or even 2017?

Question 2b: Why did the management response on page 14 fail to address the RSM recommendation that “BCPS develop and maintain a long-range plan for all facilities managed”?

Question 2c: Given that the Council of Great City Schools PPO report made the same recommendation—a recommendation similarly ignored—please explain why the district attempted a General Obligation Bond program without an underlying long-term plan to guide it, and why now--given lack of planning has led to so many unnecessary delays and costs--why the district seems so unwilling to engage in what amounts to be best business practices? Is the problem a failure to understand the difference between a five-year DEFP and long-term facilities planning?

Question 2d: What steps have been taken to ensure the asset management company will be mobilized by early 2021? Please provide a timeline and status report.

Observation #3: Response requested from the Office of Capital Programs and/or CBRE Heery

Question 3a: If you extract roofing, HVAC, and mechanical scopes, what’s left? What is the point based on what would be left--is there anything to be gained in terms of saving time and money, or was the goal to create more CSMP opportunities given the threshold recently [increased to \\$4 million](#)?

Question 3b: What is the potential impact on Procurement of extracting roofing from the projects?

Question 3c: Are there contracts and contractors that would be impacted by extracting roofing scopes?

Observations #4/#5: Response requested from the Office of Capital Programs and/or CBRE Heery (Chief Auditor Note: Building Department to also respond to 4c and 4d)

Section 6.1.2 outline the District’s objectives in retaining program managers. One of the objectives included the following: “By implementing, maintaining and upgrading management information systems appropriate for the District’s projects, the owner’s representatives will facilitate the efficient and effective use of information throughout the District’s capital projects.”

Question 4a: Given that this was a contractual obligation, and that CBRE Heery has been the District’s Program Manager - Owner’s Representative for the past five years, why wasn’t the building department’s information system (ISS) reviewed initially and upgraded to ensure “the efficient and effective use of information?” Why weren’t the Building Department’s manual tasks and outputs reviewed and automated in 2015, 2016, or 2017?

Question 4b: CBRE Heery was tasked with developing standard operating procedures. Are there SOPs associated with ISS comments and clearance?

Question 4c: When the District finally decided to replace Compass with a new asset management system, was the Building Department ever consulted as part of that process?

RSM ROOFING PROCESS ANALYSIS

ADVANCE QUESTIONS FROM AUDIT COMMITTEE MEMBER DR. NATHALIE LYNC-WALSH

Question 4d: Is Maximo (provided the right modules are purchased) a potential upgrade to ISS? Can e-Builder and Maximo replace ISS, or do neither of them offer an alternative?

Observations #6/#7: [Response requested from the Office of Capital Programs and/or CBRE Heery](#)

See also Observations #1, #4, and #5. I've attached a copy of the Building Department's 2019 Policy and Procedure Manual.

Question 6a: Given all of CBRE's contractual obligations to manage the District's capital program, why was there no plan developed in 2015, 2016, or 2017 to address human capital resources needed in the building department over the life of the program?

Question 6b: Given all of CBRE's contractual obligations to manage the District's capital program, why did Heery not review and make recommendations to streamline, automate, and improve the efficiency of the Building Department's roofing inspection process in 2015, 2016, or 2017, etc.

Observation #8: [Response requested from the Office of Capital Programs and/or CBRE Heery](#)

At the 8/20/20 special meeting of the Facilities Task Force we spent most of our time addressing unanswered questions related to this observation. The District currently has one roofing assembly consisting of one NOA. If a roofer or someone else wishes to explore the possibility of using multiple NOAs on a reroofing assembly, then it is up to that roofer or other party to make the request to the Florida Building Commission. It was made clear at our meeting that it is not the Building Department's responsibility to request a Declaratory Statement (DEC) as that would amount to them questioning themselves. Additionally, because the District's Building Officials represent the BCPS local Authority Having Jurisdiction, even if Miami Dade were to confirm its use of multiple NOAs in reroofing projects, the final word would still have to come from the State.

Question 8a: Given that the OCP was the catalyst for this roofing analysis, is the Office of Capital Programs planning to seek a DEC from the Florida Building Commission?

Question 8b: Are any roofers—particularly those interviewed during this analysis—planning on seeking a DEC from the Florida Building Commission?

Question 8c: Setting aside the question of whether multiple NOAs are even permissible under Florida Building Code, is there any evidence that using multiple NOAs on reroofing projects will save time and money?

Question 8d: Once Johns Manville officially has its NOA, what are the anticipated cost savings from having a second manufacturer in addition to Soprema?

Question 8e: At both the Roofing Workshop and Task Force meeting, it was unclear whether the exclusions listed in the system rider rendered the rider null and void, or whether maintenance and repair would maintain coverage. Has the office of Risk Management obtained clarification on the system rider, as well as the warranty coverage? Explain.

Question 8f: The District conducted a Roofing Symposium on April 10, 2015. Two of the District's current roofers—Advanced and Atlas Apex—attended (both attached). The topics covered included roofing specifications update, new warranty format, and M/WBE certification and pre-qualification. If this information was shared with the industry back in 2015, why are the same topics being discussed in 2020 as though these are new concepts? Did Heery, along with Bobadilla, fail to pick up where Derek Messier left off on this initiative?

RSM ROOFING PROCESS ANALYSIS

ADVANCE QUESTIONS FROM AUDIT COMMITTEE MEMBER DR. NATHALIE LYNC-WALSH

Observation #9: [Response requested from the Office of Capital Programs and/or CBRE Heery](#)

Question 9a: Has the district factored in the new [5% retainage limit](#) into its payment process?

Last question—Given all the issues noted in the analysis, are there plans to implement a roofing department—why or why not?