

City of La Quinta

MEMORANDUM

TO:	Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
FROM:	Timothy R. Jonasson, P.E., Public Works Director/City Engineer
DATE:	September 16, 2014
SUBJECT:	CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATING FOR CIP PROJECTS

In an effort toward continuous improvement of the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP), staff has reviewed 40 pre-bid construction cost estimates (or engineer's estimates) over the past five fiscal years to gauge their accuracy and how they relate to the overall budget for the project (Attachment 1). While reviewing these projects, it is important to realize that the goal of estimating construction costs at the various stages of a CIP project is to keep the project costs within the adopted project budget. While important for determining probable costs when a project is advertised for bids, the engineer's estimate is only one of several construction cost estimates that are made during the life of a CIP project.

# Life of a CIP Project

The delivery of capital projects consists of four major components, which include:

- 1) Developing the project budget
- 2) Designing the project
- 3) Awarding the project
- 4) Accepting the project

# Capital Improvement Program Budgeting

The project budget begins with development of a scope of work. This scope of work is often defined by either client departments or outside consultants who may have performed a study for the City. When developing the scope of work, staff considers such things as the need for additional right-of-way, the level and type of environmental work required, impacts to existing utilities, and the funding being used (e.g., local, federal, state).

Soft costs for design and administration of the project are applied once the scope of work is developed and the cost of construction is estimated for the first time. Soft costs are typically based on historic averages and include: engineering/design

(10% of the estimated construction cost); project management costs (7.75% of the estimated construction cost); right-of-way costs, including utility relocations (best estimate based on type of project and complexity); inspection, testing and survey (9.75% of the estimated construction cost); City administration (5% of the estimated construction cost); and contingency (typically 10% of the total of all budget items).

## Design Phase

The design phase is initiated with the development of a Request for Proposals for engineering, architectural or other design services. The scope of work is refined during this step and the project plans, construction details, and project specifications are prepared along with an estimate of probable construction costs or engineer's estimate. The engineer's estimate is revised at the 65%, 85%, and 100% plan completion submittals. Public Works staff and NAI (the City's CIP project management consultant) review these estimates for accuracy based on similar CIP projects and industry averages. Due to anti-collusion laws, staff and City consultants are not normally allowed to contact potential bidders to verify prices directly for publicly bid projects. If the City has not recently constructed a similar project, the consultant's estimate may be difficult to verify in which case a higher contingency is often used. Once the plans, specifications and engineer's estimate are complete, the project is advertised for construction bids.

# Project Award

Once bids are received and the lowest bidder is identified, staff reviews the low bid to ensure the contractor meets the minimum required qualifications for the project, including the appropriate contractor's license and adequate experience on similar projects. A bid comparison summary is prepared to evaluate the bids against the engineer's estimate checking for errors, pricing irregularities, and compliance with the bid instructions.

Contractor bids may or may not align with the unit prices in the engineer's estimate since contractor prices are often affected by economic factors such as the price of oil, cement, lumber, etc. While these factors are taken into account by the design engineer, there is normally at least 60 days between when the estimate is prepared and when bids are opened during which prices can be affected. The number of bids received for a project may also affect price, as greater competition enhances chances for a lower project price. Up to this point, the cost of construction is a theoretical estimate based on the engineer's knowledge of the project as well as the bidding climate. However, once the project is awarded, the cost of construction is known since a contractor is now obligated to construct the project for the bid amount.

#### Project Acceptance

A project close-out report is prepared after a project is determined to be substantially complete. The close-out report considers any contract change orders issued for unanticipated additional work not included in the plans and specifications and/or for adjustments necessary to reconcile bid quantities from what was actually installed by the contractor. Since the engineer must estimate quantities of work (such as square feet of asphalt, cubic yards of backfill, etc.) before the project is bid, it is unlikely that the exact same amounts will be used in the field. End-of-project quantity adjustments reconcile this difference before the final project cost is determined and the project is recommended for acceptance to the City Council.

## How Close Have the Engineer's Estimates Been?

Based on staff's five-year analysis, the engineer's estimates made at the time projects were bid have been within 10% of the low bid 88% of the time with the average lowest bid being 13% below the engineer's estimate. Generally, the engineer is providing an estimate that is somewhat conservative without unnecessarily tying up more of the City's capital for projects than is necessary. The better measure of the overall CIP budgeting process is that 82% of the projects did not require an appropriation. The ones that did were usually due to unanticipated utility costs, changes in the project scope, or disqualification of the low bid where there wasn't enough time to rebid the project. Some of these items should have been identified by the engineer during design and some could not. The City has been able to recoup a portion of these appropriations in cases where the designer was at fault.

## How Could the Process Be Improved?

Despite the best of planning, unforeseen circumstances will arise that may cause a project to go over budget. To help ensure this occurs less frequently in the future, staff offers the following suggestions:

- 1) Institute a 20% overall contingency (instead of 10%) at the Capital Improvement Program scoping/budgeting stage given all of the unknowns at that stage of the project.
- Begin the CIP scoping process earlier in the budget preparation cycle in order to allow engineering staff sufficient time to better examine project proposals from departments.
- Institute minimum amounts for project design (\$25,000) and contingency (\$10,000) since small projects (less than \$100,000) tend to have higher than normal soft costs than larger projects do on a percentage basis.
- Institute a 20% construction contingency (instead of 10%) for specialty projects such as heating ventilation and air conditioner projects, and projects on school properties.
- 5) Include a specific line item for utilities in all cost estimates rather than lump the cost in with construction where it tends to get overlooked.

Attachment: 1. Pre-Bid Construction Cost Estimates Analysis

Project No.	Project Description		ngineer's timate (EE)	Р	Lowest Bid Including repurchased Equipment	% Difference	Higher or Lower than EE	<10% above EE	Additional Funds Required at Award	No. Of Bids	Addition Funds Required at Acceptance	Notes	
1997-02/03	Jefferson Street Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$	16,533		10,703	-35.26%	Lower	Yes	\$0	4	\$0		
2009-03	Highway 111 Median Landscape	\$	952,339	\$	667,748	-29.88%	Lower	Yes	\$0	5	\$0		
2009-05	Seasons Park Dog Park	\$	142,455	\$	143,205	0.53%	Higher	No	\$0	5	\$15,935		
2009-09	Pioneer Park Improvements	\$	409,344	\$	217,951	-46.76%	Lower	Yes	\$0	9	\$0		
2009-10	A Street Extension	\$	1,323,645	\$	1,155,686	-12.69%	Lower	Yes	\$171,234	2	\$53,000	Appropriation required for Coral Mountain Utilities	
2009-14	Highway 111 Utility Undergrounding	\$	92,700	\$	40,480	-56.33%	Lower	Yes	\$0	7	\$0		
2009-15	Drainage Improvements (Washington at Simon)	\$	199,050	\$	61,946	-68.88%	Lower	Yes	\$0	9	\$0		
2009-16	Jefferson Street Landscape	\$	575,090		299,133	-47.99%	Lower	Yes	\$0	9	\$0		
2009-16A	Jefferson Street Landscape	\$	516,020	\$	377,103	-26.92%	Lower	Yes	\$0	8	\$0	Awarded to Second Lowest Bidder (amount listed)	
2009-17	Lions Gate Sidewalk and Landscape	\$	46,097	\$	45,791	-0.66%	Lower	No	\$0	7	\$0		
2009-18	Turf Reduction Green Projects	\$	274,919	\$	268,557	-2.31%	Lower	No	\$0	5	\$0		
2009-19	Village Sidewalk In-Fill	\$	146,998	\$	107,992	-26.54%	Lower	Yes	\$0	12	\$0		
2009-21	Monroe Street Pavement Rehabilition	\$	185,630	\$	128,330	-30.87%	Lower	Yes	\$0	7	\$0		
2009-22	Eisenhower Signal Interconnect	\$	309,945	\$	235,656	-23.97%	Lower	Yes	\$0	7	\$0		
2009-24	Adams Street, Miles Avenue, and Dune Palms Signal Interconnect	\$	353,480	\$	261,256	-26.09%	Lower	Yes	\$0	5	\$0		
2010-01	Ahmanson Drainage	\$	99,115	\$	87,794	-11.42%	Lower	Yes	\$0	7	\$0		
2010-02	SilverRock Club House Drainage	\$	46,358	\$	112,600	142.89%	Higher	Yes	\$0	7	\$0		
2010-04	Avenue 48 at Jefferson Drainage & Landscape	\$	237,350	\$	264,170	11.30%	Higher	Yes	\$0	4	\$0		
2010-05	Colonel Paige Middle School Restroom (installation only)	\$	47,320	\$	40,607	-14.19%	Lower	Yes	\$15,000	6	\$29,000	City Prepurchased Restroom for \$95,000	
2010-06	Washington Street Improvement at Avenue 48	\$	418,983	\$	429,559	2.52%	Higher	No	\$0	4	\$0		
2010-08	Washington Street Drainage Improvements Phase II	\$	368,955	\$	252,486	-31.57%	Lower	Yes	\$0	3	\$0		
2010-09	Washington Street Improvement at Eisenhower & Calle Tampico	\$	349,945	\$	294,000	-15.99%	Lower	No	\$0	5	\$0		
2010-11	New Traffic Signal - Sinaloa at Eisenhower	\$	522,631	\$	504,401	-3.49%	Lower	Yes	\$464,019	4	\$70,444	Project scope changed mid-design	
2010-13	Miles Avenue Median Island Landscape	\$	187,894	\$	115,811	-38.36%	Lower	Yes	\$0	5	\$0		
2010-14	Avneue 50 Widening	\$	233,100	\$	146,025	-37.36%	Lower	Yes	\$0	6	\$0		
2010-15	Slurry Seal Project	\$	1,187,280	\$	869,460	-26.77%	Lower	No	\$0	8	\$0		
2011-01	Highway 111 at Washington Street Intersection Improvements	Ś	566,375	Ś	730,136	28.91%	Higher	No	\$65,838	2	\$0	Only two bids received w/higher mobilization & unit costs	
2011-04	Fred Waring Drive Median Island Landscape Improvements	\$	527,190		578,279	9.69%	Higher	Yes	\$0	2	\$0		
2011-11	Avenue 50 Pavement Reconstruction	Ś	146,263		103,925	-28.95%	Lower	Yes	\$0	6	\$0		
2012-02	Sports Complex Lighting Rehabilitation Expansion Improvements	\$	304,640		339,900	11.57%	Higher	No	\$0	5	N/A		
2012-03/04/05	Miscellaneous Public Facility ADA Improvements (Civil Improvements)	\$	161,481	-	150,166	-7.01%	Lower	Yes	\$0	2	N/A		
2012-03/04/05	Miscellaneous Public Facility ADA Improvements (General Construction)	\$	145,600		146,013	0.28%	Same	Yes	\$0	2	\$0		
2012-07	Pavement Management Plan Street Improvements (Re-Bid)	\$	1,613,903		1,544,673	-4.29%	Lower	Yes	\$0	2	N/A		
2012-08	Calle Sinaloa & Avenue 52 Sidewalk Infill Improvements	\$	179,753		138,127	-23.16%	Lower	Yes	\$0	3	\$0		
2012-09	SilverRock Resort Parking Lot ADA Improvements	\$	48,906	\$	45,912	-6.12%	Lower	Yes	\$0	3	\$0		
2013-06	SilverRock Irrigation Relocation Improvements	\$	409,500		387,884	-5.28%	Lower	Yes	\$0	1	\$36,666	As-builts did not show all facilities that required modification	
2013-11	Community Center Expansion	\$	3,308,725	\$	2,888,309	-12.71%	Lower	Yes	\$0	10	N/A		
2013-13A	Citywide Preventative Maintenance Improvements (HVAC 3)	\$	44,200	\$	28,258	-36.07%	Lower	Yes	\$0	1	\$0		
2013-13B	Citywide Preventative Maintenance Imp. (HVAC 1-2) (Re-bid)	\$	139,000	\$	171,789	23.59%	Higher	No	\$63,350	2	\$0	Could not reduce scope or increase EE due to funding restrictions	
2013-14	City Hall Lighting Conversion	\$	121,346		125,000	3.01%	Higher	Yes	\$0	3	\$0		
L					\$14,516,819	-12.59%		•	\$779,441		\$205,045		

88% Of the time no more than 10% above the Engineer's Estimate

75% Of the time the Engineer's Estimate was equal to or higher than Low Bid

23% Of the time the Engineer's Estimate was lower than Low Bid

**13%** On average the lowest bid is lower than the Engineer's Estimate for all bids

# ATTACHMENT 1

\$205,045