FEMA's Comparative Analysis

J. David Duffer Federal Emergency Management Agency

> Washington, D.C. September 26, 2001



Panel Tasking

- Q1 Does FEMA's CEF parallel the ASPE Level 3 (L3) estimating approach?
- Q2 Would CEF (at L3) provide a level of confidence that meets the ASPE L5 (± 10%) floor and ceiling thresholds selected by the panel?

Introduction

Accuracy of an estimate is governed by:

Clear definition of the scope-of-work

Level of completion of A&E effort

Estimating technique employed

Skill of estimator / team



CEF Part A

Part A – Construction Costs



CEF Parts B - E

- Part B General Requirements
- Part C Design and Construction Cost
 Contingencies
- Part D Overhead & Profit
- Part E Escalation



CEF Parts F - H

- Part F Plan Review and Permits
- Part G Owners Reserve
- Part H Management & Design Costs



When are the factors used?

CEF Part	Nature of costs used in Part A				
Α	Complete	Bid	Local	Means	
В	-	-	-	Υ	
С	-	-	-	Υ	
D	-	-	-	Y	
E	-	-	Y	Y	
F	-	Y	Y	Y	
G	-	Y	Y	Υ	
Н	Y	Y	Y	Y	



ASPE Estimating Procedures

- Level 1 Order of Magnitude Estimate
- Level 2 Schematic Design Concept
- Level 3 Design Development (25%)
- Level 4 Project Control (75%)
- Level 5 Construction Documents (90%)
- Level 6 Bid Documents



Findings - Q1

Does FEMA's CEF parallel the ASPE Level 3 (L3) estimating approach?

- Yes, the CEF process does parallel the ASPE L3 process, both in:
 - level of contingency, e.g., design phase scope contingency, and
 - type and level of design documentation

Design Phase Scope Contingency

Comparison of four estimating methods and their contingencies at different design stages:

Stage	CEF	ВСН	DOE	AACE
Preliminary Engineering Analysis	15 to 20%	10 to 15%	15 to 25%	+25 / - 15%
Working Drawing Stage	2 to 10%	2 to 7%	5 to 15%	+10 / - 5%

Type of Design Documentation Similarities...

ASPE L3 Requirements

General site description

Preliminary structural design

Site dimensions

Elevations

Roads

Impounds & fences

General arrangements

Architectural construction

CEF Guidelines

Site map or location plan

Photographs and sketches

Measurements & calculations

Applicable codes & standards

Schematic drawings, plans



Type of Design Documentation

Differences...

ASPE L3 Requirements

Applicable for all size projects

Named plans or drawings:

- Preliminary building equipment
- Soil bearing condition
- Preliminary plumbing
- > Preliminary mechanical
- Preliminary electrical

CEF Guidelines

Applicable for large projects

(>\$50,600 FY 2001)

Other data sources:

- "As-built" plans
- > 406 hazard mitigation proposals
- Force account summary sheets



Work Type versus Accuracy

Repair Work

HIGHER

- Other Discrete WorkElements
- Retrofit / Upgrade
- Hazard Mitigation
- New Construction

LOWER



Category of Projects and % Permanent Work

	Cat. C - Roads & Bridges	57%
	Cat. D - Water Control Facilities	6%
	Cat. E - Buildings & Equipment	16%
•	Cat. F - Utilities	12%
	Cat. G - Parks, Recreation & Other	9%



Findings Summary - Q1

- Does FEMA's CEF parallel the ASPE Level 3 (L3) estimating approach?
- Yes, similar requirements and only minor differences. Key points:
 - Itemized base costs (CEF Part A)
 - Confidence in Part A use of factors
 - Risk to applicant depends on type of work and availability of applicant supplied information

Findings - Q2

- Would CEF (at L3) provide a level of confidence that meets the ASPE L5 (± 10%) floor and ceiling thresholds selected by the panel?
- Under post disaster conditions, a CEF estimate will compare favorably with the other cost estimating methodologies (depicted at slide 10), and produce an estimate of approximately the same magnitude and confidence level.

Ensuring Level of Confidence

- The following actions could provide a higher level of confidence that actual project costs will fall closer to the target thresholds:
 - Clear definition of the scope-of-work
 - Increased applicant participation (team approach to estimating)
 - Refine the project qualification criteria to include all large permanent work projects

Ensuring Level of Confidence

- Actions (continued)
 - Update the CEF Instructional Guide to include lessons learned in the field
 - Expand DFTO CEF Training for Cost Estimators to include PAO, PAC's, and PO's
 - Measure the performance of CEF to the 10% floor and ceiling thresholds by all of an applicant's large permanent work projects, rather than by a single project

Questions and Comments



Engineering and Design Services (Curves A & B) Status

- 1975 ASCE originally published curves A and B in Manual 45 that is entitled, "Consulting Engineering: A Guide for the Engagement of Engineering Services"
- 1982 nationwide survey of A&E firms performed to update the curves
- > 1988 2nd edition of Manual 45 published
- > 1996 3rd edition of Manual 45 published
- 2001 ASCE Committee on Professional Practice meeting in San Antonio, TX

Questions and Comments



Recommendation Report

- Development
 - > Foreword

- > Introduction
 - curriculum vitae of each Panel member

Charter and Duties



Recommendation Report (continued)

- Development
 - Executive Summary (establish tone)
 - estimating business practices and discuss design contingencies, etc.
 - level of effort put into CEF and its germaneness to the PA Program
 - GAP background and early-CEF development during the Northridge Earthquake



Recommendation Report (continued)

- Development
 - Executive Summary (continued)
 - ASCE Independent Peer Review of CEF developed during the redesign of the PA Program



Recommendation Report (continued)

- Development
 - Recommendations
 - recommended cost estimating methodology
 - the level of technical expertise required to uniformly apply it
 - the type of training guidance to make available to users to maximize its' accuracy and national applicability
 - ± 10% floor and ceiling thresholds

Recommendation Report

- Development
 - Appendices
 - activities and accomplishments
 - charter of the Expert Panel
 - others (meeting notes and appendices, etc.)?

