



# SW 87 Ave Bridge Project No 20220010

Aug 8, 2024

# Cost

- ▶ Original Estimate - \$3,100,000

- ▶ Joseph Miorelli, PE 3/10/2021 - “The cost estimate of \$3.1M appears *very under-estimated* when compared with recent, comparable bridge + required infrastructure projects.”

- ▶ Bids Received

Condotte America, LLC	General Building Contractor	\$5,517,500.00
Ebsary Foundation Company	Structural	\$4,866,304.51
Jones Benitez Corporation	General Building Contractor	\$6,866,462.45
MCM	General Building Contractor	\$4,499,077.10

- ▶ 2023-2024 Budget

- ▶ Construction      \$5,639,000
  - ▶ Design              \$ 845,000
  - ▶ Total                \$6,484,000

# Timeline

- Advertise – 5/26/2022
- Open Bids – 7/6/2022
- Due Diligence review 8/2022 – 2/2024
- Process delayed due to permit issues
- Negotiation Meeting (Publicly Advertised) – 10/26/2022
- **Award – 2/20/2024**
- 1st Negotiation meeting for cost escalation 2/26/2024
- 2nd Negotiation Meeting for cost escalation 3/18/2024
- **SBD Notified for Disparity Justification Required 3/19/2024**
- **Disparity Justification 4/22/2024 (Katherine Fernandez) -----**
- **AWARD Department notice for SBD approval sent 4/23/2024**
- Pre-Construction Meeting - 3/19/2024
- Notice to Proceed - 5/28/2024
- Onsite meeting – 5/28/2024
- **Change Order No. 1 Requested 7/12/2024**

***“DTPW does not consider 53% overage unreasonable due to working conditions”***

# Change Order #1

- **Change Order No. 1 Requested 7/12/2024**

“As per our conversation on the phone, you advised that the change order increases the contract amount to \$5 million dollars. Surpassing the MCC threshold. Can you please provide us with an option on how we can proceed with this change order without going to the BCC.”

Thank you in advance  
Daniel Viaud, Administrative Officer 2  
Capital Improvements Division  
Department of Transportation and Public Works

# NTSB Report

- Design Flaws: While the design was primarily the responsibility of FIGG Bridge Engineers, MCM, as the construction manager, had a duty to ensure the design's feasibility and safety during construction.
- Construction Errors: The NTSB report indicated that MCM failed to recognize and take appropriate action when significant structural cracks appeared before the collapse.
- Communication Failures: There were breakdowns in communication between MCM, the design firm, and FIU, which contributed to the tragedy.
- Inadequate Safety Measures: The decision to keep the road open beneath the bridge during a critical stress test, despite observed cracking, raises serious questions about MCM's commitment to public safety.

# Recommendations

- The County must seriously reconsider whether the MCC program is the right vehicle for this bridge project. Perhaps a more specialized procurement process would better serve our needs.
- Given the concerns about the bidding process, a truly competitive process could yield better terms for our community and ensure we're partnering with the most qualified contractor.
- If the County does proceed with MCM, we need a comprehensive safety plan that goes above and beyond standard requirements. We should also implement increased oversight measures, possibly including third-party inspections throughout the construction process.
- The proposed change order requires the County to perform a more detailed review. We recommend bringing in independent engineering and cost estimation experts to review changes orders from all contractors.



District(s) Served: 8

REVENUE SCHEDULE:		PRIOR	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	FUTURE	TOTAL
Road Impact Fees		6,459	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,459
TOTAL REVENUES:		6,459	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,459
EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE:		PRIOR	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	FUTURE	TOTAL
Construction		2,805	2,809	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,614
Permitting		44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Planning and Design		787	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	801
TOTAL EXPENDITURES:		3,636	2,823	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,459