

Capital Budget

2005

Name of Project: **Moultrie Courthouse – C Street Expansion**

Agency: District of Columbia Courts

Account Title: Federal Payment to the District of Columbia Courts

Account Identification Code: 95-1712

Program Activity: Capital Improvements

New Project Ongoing Project

Was the Project Reviewed by the Executive Review Committee or Investment Review Board?

Yes No

Is this project Information Technology? Yes No

Part I: Summary of Spending for Project Stages (in millions)

	2003 and earlier	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009 and beyond	Project Total
Planning								
Budget Authority	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Outlays	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Full Acquisition¹								
Budget Authority	0.00	0.00	6.00	57.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	63.30
Outlays	0.00	0.00	6.00	57.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	63.30
Total, sum of stages (excludes maintenance)								
Budget Authority	0.00	0.00	6.00	57.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	63.30
Outlays	0.00	0.00	6.00	57.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	63.30
Maintenance								
Budget authority								
Outlays								

Name of Project: **Moultrie Courthouse – C Street Expansion**

Part II: Justification and Other Information

A. Project Description and Justification

(1) How does this investment support the Courts' mission and strategic goals?

The Family Court Act of 2001 required that the District of Columbia immediately begin establishing an operating Family Court physically distinct from the Superior Court. The D.C. Courts have prepared for implementation of this consolidation in their Strategic Plan, Facilities Master Plan, and the Judiciary Square Master Plan. As an immediate response to Congressional legislation, the D.C. Courts developed the "Interim John Marshall Level Renovation Project" which makes substantial progress towards full consolidation. To complete the full consolidation required, the D.C. Courts propose expansion of the Moultrie Courthouse. In May 2003, the D.C. Courts, with GSA management, completed the "Feasibility Study for the Expansion of the H. Carl Moultrie I Courthouse". This expansion proposes an addition to the courthouse on the south side, facing C Street. This addition will fully consolidate the Family Court and build upon the work completed as part of the John Marshall Level Interim Renovation. This approach is also dependent on independent projects including the restoration and expansion of the Old D.C. Courthouse, acquisition of Building C and existing building renovations. This approach also includes a series of renovations and re-organization projects within the Moultrie Courthouse to be completed as a series of phased departmental moves. This project is fully coordinated with the long-range recommendations of the D.C. Courts Facilities Master Plan.

(2) How does this investment support a core or priority function of the Courts? This investment supports the vision and mission of the Courts' Strategic Plan. A goal of the Courts is to improve court facilities and technology by providing personnel and court participants with a safe, secure, functional and habitable physical environment.

The Family Court Act and the reorganization of the Family Division into the Family Court underscores the critical nature of judicial matters related to families as a core and priority function of the D.C. Courts. The Moultrie Courthouse – C Street Expansion is a long-term plan that supports consolidated, consistent, and efficient operations for the Family Court.

Name of Project: **Moultrie Courthouse – C Street Expansion**

Are there any alternative sources, in the public or private sectors, that could perform this function? If so, explain why the Courts did not select one of these alternatives? This project is related to the core mission of the Courts. There are no alternative entities in the public or private sectors that could perform this function.

- (3) *How will this investment reduce costs or improve efficiencies?* The Moultrie Courthouse – C Street Expansion is an investment that uses the existing infrastructure of the Moultrie Courthouse to its greatest potential. The expansion and renovation involved in this project will minimize costs typically associated with constructing specialized court facilities by renovating existing space and utilizing existing infrastructure to support the addition. These include existing elevators, escalators, and support functions, among others.
- (4) *For acquisition of buildings, what is the cost per square foot estimates for comparable Federal and private sector facilities?* This project does not involve the acquisition of new buildings.

B. Program Management

- (1) *Have you assigned a project manager and contracting officer to this project? If so, what are their names?* The D.C. Courts anticipate using the General Services Administration resources to administer this project. The D.C. Courts Contracting Officer is Mr. Joseph E. Sanchez, Jr. The GSA project manager is to be determined.
- (2) *How do you plan to use the Integrated Project Team to manage this project?* The Court will designate a Project Director to act as a liaison with the GSA management team. The Project Director shall report to the Courts Integrated Project Team which shall include the Administrative Officer, Chief Capital Projects Manager, the Chief Building Engineer, the Building Operations Manager, and the Facility Supervisor. Scheduled progress meetings with the GSA and contractor shall be conducted to ensure that the project is completed on schedule and within budget.

C. Acquisition Strategy

- (1) *Will you use a single contract or several contracts to accomplish this project? If multiple contracts are planned, explain how they are related to each other, and how each supports the project performance goals?* The project is to be awarded as a single contract.

Name of Project: **Moultrie Courthouse – C Street Expansion**

(2) *For each planned contract, describe:*

- a. *What type of contract will you use? (e.g. cost reimbursement, fixed price, etc.)* The Courts will use a fixed price contract with the selected contractor.
- b. *The financial incentives you plan to use to motivate contractor performance. (e.g. incentive fee, award fee, etc.)* The contractor shall be required to meet the terms of the contract without any additional financial incentives.
- c. *The measurable contract performance objectives.* Measurable contract performance objectives will be developed on a task basis. The contractors will be required to submit a proposed construction timeline, which the GSA and Courts team will use to track progress and ensure the timely completion of all construction objectives.
- d. *How will you use competition to select suppliers?* The Courts will procure services through GSA contracts or schedules, which are competitively solicited.
- e. *The results of your market research.* The D.C. Courts will take advantage of GSA procurement procedures that incorporate market research.
- f. *Whether you will use off-the-shelf or custom designed projects.* The Moultrie Courthouse – C Street Expansion will require a custom-designed solution.

D. Alternative Analysis and Risk Management

(1) *Did you perform a life cycle cost analysis for this investment? If so, what were the results?*

The D.C. Courts completed an analysis of the life cycle cost benefits associated with a number of alternatives in support of the Family Court Act in the D.C. Courts Facilities Master Plan. Alternatives included (a) consolidating the Family Court within the Moultrie Courthouse, (b) consolidating the Family Court in other Court Buildings, and (c) consolidating the Family Court in new space. Four expansion options and six alternatives were studied in the Facilities Master Plan. For each option evaluation criteria pertaining to architectural, engineering, constructability and cost were addressed. The results determined that the greatest cost/benefit was gained through consolidating the Family Court in the Moultrie Courthouse. The project is in keeping with the mandate of the Family Court legislation and through evaluation was proven to provide the greatest system efficiencies for the Family Court and the entire court system.

(2) *Describe what alternatives you considered and the underlying assumptions of each. Did you perform a benefits/costs analysis or return on investment analysis for each alternative considered? What were the results for each? (Describe any tangible returns that will benefit the Courts, even if they are difficult to quantify.)* The Moultrie Courthouse – C Street Expansion provides for consolidation of the Family Court. The following summarizes the alternatives considered and benefits and costs considered by the D.C. Courts in the Facilities Master Plan.

Name of Project: **Moultrie Courthouse – C Street Expansion**

a) Consolidating the Family Court within the Moultrie Courthouse – The D.C. Courts are proceeding with this alternative because it has the greatest quantitative as well as qualitative return on investment. An underlying assumption of this alternative includes the use of existing courtrooms and circulation systems within the Moultrie Courthouse. Using and augmenting existing resources has a major cost benefit, made even greater by the high cost of constructing new specialized Court facilities. The consolidation of secure holding facilities within the Moultrie Courthouse for use by the Family Court and the Superior Court is also a benefit of this alternative because it eliminates the duplication of physical space for adult and juvenile detainees that would be needed in two separate facilities and has major operational cost benefits associated with the transport of prisoners. In addition, consolidating the Family Court within the Moultrie Courthouse locates this Court in a highly visible, easily accessible, and well-known building. Furthermore locating the Family Court within the Moultrie Courthouse allows the Superior Court and the Family Court to offer shared public services and amenities, such as the public cafeteria, interpretive services, and the childcare center, etc.

(b) Consolidating the Family Court in other Court Buildings – Court Buildings A and B were considered for the consolidation of the Family Court. This alternative was not chosen for a number of reasons. Neither building is large enough to house the full Family Court and would require the physical split of functions between the two buildings. Judiciary Square is an historic open space, and the National Law Enforcement Memorial occupies the major public space between the two buildings. Above ground linkages are not possible given this context. Below grade, the Metro's red line runs between the two buildings creating a major obstacle to below grade connections. In addition, these buildings were designed during an era when security was not central to courthouse design and thus they are not up to contemporary standards. Transport of inmates would be highly problematic.

(c) Consolidating the Family Court in new space - Investigation has indicated that there are not significant blocks of space immediately available for purchase within close proximity of Judiciary Square, capable of accommodating the new Family Court in its entirety. Leasing of space for the Family Court would be costly and would require a major infrastructure and security investment by the Courts as well. This alternative did not have long term cost benefits to the Courts.

- (3) *Describe your risk assessment and mitigation plan for this project.* Possible risks include delays in the construction schedule due to unforeseen field conditions associated with existing construction. The D.C. Courts is partnering with GSA on this project to minimize schedule delays and try to prevent cost overruns.

Name of Project: **Moultrie Courthouse – C Street Expansion**

Part III: Cost, Schedule, and Performance Goals

A. Description of performance-based management system (PBMS):

(1) Describe the performance based management system that you will use to monitor contract or project performance. The Courts performance based management system will provide a tracking system with project milestones that permit early and ongoing warnings to ensure that projects do not exceed either their budgeted costs and/or time projections.

B. Original baseline (OMB approved at project outset):

(1) What are the cost and schedule goals for this segment or phase of the project? The cost and schedule goals for this phase of the project are as follows:

- Development of architectural and engineering documents for the project.

(2) What are the measurable performance benefits or goals for this segment or phase of this project? Performance goals of the project are as follows:

- Obtain regulatory approval for the renovation from the D.C. Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs.
- Finalize architectural and engineering construction documents for the project.

C. Current baseline (applicable only if OMB approves the changes):

(1) What are the cost and schedule goals for this segment or phase of the project? Not applicable.

(2) What are the measurable performance benefits or goals for this segment or phase of this project? Not applicable.

D. Actual Performance and Variance from OMB approved baseline (Original or Current): Not Applicable

E. Corrective Actions: Not Applicable