OBO Industry Advisory Panel Value Engineering Gregory S. Knoop & John O. Woods Jr. December 13, 2007

Positive Improvements

- OBO has a well managed program
 High level of support from the OBO leadership
- Multiple and diverse teams under contract with the ability to get expert consulting
 Maturation of the VE program
 Effective changes in the SED program
 Future possibilities

Positive Improvements

Moving the VE studies earlier in the process to feasibility studies and pre-bid Improved Leverage over value improvements Less conflicts with bidders OBO realizes more of the value improvements OBO project team positive involvement Interactive Creative input

Increasing focus on nonconstruction issues

Long-range planning
Operations and Maintenance
LEED

Positive Changes to the SED

Regular suggestions implemented into subsequent SED

- Changes to the Atrium
- Changes to the Shops and Warehouses
- General Requirements
- Feasibility/ Bridging documents
 - Breaking away from template
 - Creative solutions for applying the SED program customized to various posts.

Improved value for US Diplomatic facilities

Assessment Trips

Confirmation of implementation Contractor Input Project management input Assessment of effectiveness of various VE ideas Allow for the growth of the effectiveness of the VE program Improve the service to US Embassy projects

VE Teams

Staffed with experienced professionals in the design of diplomatic missions
Rapid moving sequestered process
Interaction with the government team
Interaction with the design team

VE Presentations

Strong dialog with OBO team
Participation of design team
Quality measurement
Validation of design

Future changes

Pre workshop planning meeting
Establish mission for the VE team
Customize the study
Recruit the consulting team
Improve quality of data delivered to VE team
Improve quality of VE team members

Future Focus: Broaden Life-Cycle Cost Considerations

- Applies to all Federal Construction VE, not just OBO
- Traditionally VE may consider building O & M costs, such as energy, maintenance, and replacement.
- broadened to consider all LCC costs, such as tenant salaries, which can be ten times initial costs or more.
- Focusing on staff and operations functions and costs opens the door for proposals that reduce them.
- To implement VE teams need Total Life cycle Cost models, including staffing costs.

Total Life Cycle Costs

Design

.1x

Initial Facility Cost

X

Total Life Cycle Costs

10x

Future uses of VE

Create subject specific studies

- BIM
- FEBR Windows
- Evaluation of emerging technologies
- Maintenance and Operation/ GSO
- Flow of transaction areas/Consular functions
- Sensitive areas
- General Conditions and Bidding
- Insurance

Building Data Base

Program Maturation
Assessment trips
Recordation
Data base

Other programs looking at

Savings/cost avoidance Program coverage Projected savings Qualitative improvements Design excellence Return on investment Reporting

Conclusions for OBO VE Program

- Successful and Mature Program
 Many cutting edge initiatives
 VE creating has been a positive tool facilitating continued improvements in the SED program
- Compares well with other VE programs
 Strong future developments

