Department of General Services Division of Engineering & Buildings

The Capital Outlay Process in Virginia



January 24, 2008

Commonwealth of Virginia's agencies and institutions design and construct facilities which are:

- LARGE
 COMPLEX
 EXPENSIVE

 Examples:

 Laboratories
 Hospitals

- Prisons
- Technology-intensive classrooms
 Stadiums and arenas

 These projects are constructed under the "capital outlay process"

 On major projects, this process can span over several years



 The process begins when an agency submits a Capital Budget Request to DPB and ends when the building is occupied for its intended use

<u> The Process Begins</u>

 Agencies submit their Six Year Plan to the Department of Planning and Budget (Dept of Planning and Budget is the Agency who is primarily responsible for the overall planning and programming for the Capital Outlay Process).

Many different participants are engaged in the process:



The Budget Development Phase





The Design Phase BUDGET DESIGN PROCURE CONSTRUCT **OCCUPY Preliminary** Working Select **Schematic** Architect / Design Design **Drawings** Engineer (15%) (35%) (100%)



The Procurement Phase



The Construction Phase





 Capital projects are complex, both from the technical & administrative perspectives

 Without experienced personnel, adequate systems, and sufficient oversight, projects can be delayed, and poorly managed, — all of which result in increased costs to the Commonwealth

 Many small agencies do not have the expertise on staff to manage projects

- Agencies and their Project Management professionals must understand, select, and manage the most appropriate methods of procurement for their projects
- Methods include:
 - Traditional (Design-Bid-Build)
 - Design-Build
 - Construction Management (CM @ Risk)
 - Construction Management Agency

Traditional (Design-Bid-Build)



<u>PROS</u>

Well-defined scope puts all bidders on an even playing field
Owner has full control over quality of systems
Single set of plans and specifications expedites Building Official review process
Potential lowest cost

<u>CONS</u>

•Delays start of construction until all design is complete

•Award based on low price, although "prequalification" option can help assure suitable pool of bidders

•Contractor has no input into design of systems

- •Multiple points of project liability
- •SWAM participation suffers

Design-Build



<u>PROS</u>

•May allow earlier award of construction contract

- •A single source of project responsibility/liability
- •RFP process allows consideration of factors other than price
- •Allows Contractor to use "initiative" in selecting systems
- •Has been used successfully for prototypical or simple bldgs
- •Total project time decreases

<u>CONS</u>

•Owner loses control over quality of systems & details of construction

•Change Orders can negate cost or schedule savings

Incorrectly defined scope & criteria can result in higher costs

- Initial cost to contractors high
- •Partial/uncoordinated submittals to the Bldg Official can extend time to review & issue a permit

Construction Management (CM @ Risk)



<u>PROS</u>

May allow earlier award of construction contract
RFP process allows consideration of factors other than price

•Contractor has input into design of systems

Contractor has input to control costsBetter opportunities for SWAM subcontractors

<u>CONS</u>

The RFP process can make for an uneven playing field between proposers
Partial/uncoordinated submittals to the Bldg Official can extend review time
A/E's fee for services will be higher
Requires more Owner time for project management and oversight

Construction Management

(Agency CM)



<u>PROS</u>

May allow earlier award of construction contract
RFP process allows consideration of factors other than price

Contractor has input into design of systems
Contractor has input to control costs
SWAM business opportunities
CONS

•No risk for CM

Owner must administer multiple contracts
The RFP process and sketchy or ill-defined scope
& criteria can make for an uneven playing field
between proposers
Partial/uncoordinated submittals to the Bldg

Official can extend review time
A/E's fee for services will be higher
Requires more Owner time for project

management and oversight

Cost Containment

- Owners, including Commonwealth of Virginia agencies have seen inflation impact projects budgets
- Recent historical and forecast construction coat inflation rates as reported by industry sources who perform work in both public and private projects:

• 2003	2 - 3%		3 - 5%
• 2004	12 - 15%	10 - 15%	12 - 15%
• 2005	10 - 13%	8 - 10%	10 -14%
• 2006	8 - 10%	10%	8 - 9%
• 2007	7 - 9%	5%	5 - 6%
• 2008	6 - 8%	3 - 4%	
•2009		3 - 4%	

Cost Containment

Nongovernmental Building Costs: Office Buildings Higher Ed Teaching Wet Labs Health Care, Hospitals Parking Garages \$13,500 - \$17,000/space

Local Federal Courthouse Costs: (representative of high quality government buildings) Newport News \$402.50/sf

• Richmond \$432.50/sf

The Bureau of Capital Outlay Management (BCOM) currently provides the following key services:

- Building Code and ADA compliance reviews
- Other project review services (e.g., adherence to procurement policies, ADA compliance, etc.)
- Project inspections
- Issuance of Building Permits & Certificates of Occupancy
- Development and maintenance of the Commonwealth's <u>Construction and Professional Services Manual</u> (CPSM)
- CPSM training
- Virginia Construction Contracting Officer (VCCO) training, testing, and certification
- Technical assistance to agencies
- Coordination of capital outlay forms, the Semi-Annual Progress Report, and Annual Value Engineering (VE) Report
- Assistance to DPB and Legislature's money committees

Functions no longer performed by BCOM

Due to budget cuts, the following functions are no longer a function of BCOM:

The Asbestos Section was disbanded

The Maintenance Section was disbanded

The Energy Section was disbanded.

The Central Boiler Plant expertise was lost due to attrition.

Functions that BCOM lost support to enforce:

Space Utilization in design.

Facilities that exceed state guidelines and buildings efficiency criteria are now

recommendations and not actively enforced.

State owned building "Best Practices" in chapter 9 of the CPSM are typically identified for agency resolution but are not enforced nor do they hold up project approval.

Decentralization:

Has led to multiple manuals for design guidelines.

May fracture consistency within State procurement practices.

Internal Service Fund:

Requiring Agencies to pay for services causes BCOM to not be as involved providing answers to technical questions or for interim inspections.