

Capital Plan Submission Requirements

- All capital projects proposed for state funding during the FY25 - 28 planning period must be submitted individually using the new Project Template, including:
 - Large Caps proposed for GO Bond construction funding in FY 26 – FY 28
 - Large Caps recommended by the BOR for design funding in FY24
 - Small Caps proposed for GO Bond funding in FY 25 – FY 28
 - Small Caps recommended by the BOR for funding in FY24
- Institutions are encouraged to provide all relevant project backup information, and to include revised and refined information for previously submitted projects.

Template Summary

- NEW/UPDATED FEATURES in the Project Template for FY 25-38 are detailed in [this TABLE](#).
- The USG Capital [Project Template](#) is an Excel workbook with data and narrative entry organized in four separate tabs (following a reference tab):
 - TAB 1 – Project ID and Primary Narrative
 - TAB 2 – Project Specifications
 - TAB 3 – Project Costs
 - TAB 4 – Project Funding Sources and Schedule
- The Template is designed to accommodate complex projects with multiple distinct “elements”:
 - Building Elements (New Construction, Renovation, Demolition)
 - Infrastructure Elements (Parking, Mechanical, Utilities, Other)
 - Acquisition Elements (Land, Building)
 - Projects do not necessarily need to contain more than one element

General Information

- Data Entry
 - GREEN cells are for data entry; patterned GREEN cells denote drop down menus.
 - GOLD cells have formulas that pull or calculate from other data and text entered in the workbook.
 - For best results, complete sections 1A and 1B of TAB 1 before proceeding sequentially to tabs 2, 3 and 4.
- Naming Individual Project Template Workbooks
 - Save each completed project template under the protocol: “InstAcronym_SCP21-24_Priority#_Version#.xlsx”
Examples: UGA_SCP25-28_LC1_V1.xlsx ABAC_SCP25-28_SC2_V1.xlsx

Tab-Specific Instructions

TAB 1 – Project ID and Primary Narrative

- **1A – Project Identification**
 - Select Institution and Campus from dropdown menus, enter Project Name, and provide contact info.
 - **GO Project type:** select Large Cap (> \$5M GO Bonds) or Small Cap (<= \$5M GO Bonds). You must ensure that the budget and funding data developed in later tabs is consistent with the selected project type. Only GO bond funded projects are required to be submitted in this round of planning. Non-GO bond projects can be submitted on a rolling basis through USO Integrated Review.

- **BOR Recommendation FY24** – select the appropriate option to indicate if your project was recommended for funding in the FY24 BOR capital budget, or if it has yet to be funded.
- **Anticipated delivery method** is selected on Tab 1. The chosen method affects how certain project costs are estimated and calculated:
 - CM at Risk: common for most Large Cap building projects
 - Design Bid Build: common for most Small Cap building projects
 - Design Build: less common, sometimes used for infrastructure projects and less complex new construction projects

Please contact USO REF staff if you have questions about the appropriate delivery method for your project
- **1B – Proposed Priority Order and Construction Funding Schedule**
 - **Institution priority** for each project is now entered in 1B. Enter the proposed institutional project priority number within the FY25-28 plan period. Projects must be ordered sequentially within each funding group type and are not duplicated (e.g., you must only identify one #1 priority Large Cap project, one #1 priority Small Cap, etc.).
 - **Proposed FY for Construction** is now selected in 1B. Enter the Fiscal Year that you propose to begin project construction. This can't be done prior to the selection of Project Type and BOR Recommendation FY24 in 1A.
 - Large Caps: The FY of the budget for approval of GO Bonds for construction (meaning it would be funded for design the previous FY) – new projects can be requested for construction funding in FY 26/27/28.
 - Small Caps: The FY of the budget for approval of GO Bonds for the project – new projects can be requested for funding in FY 25/26/27/28.
 - *Fiscal Year reference guide - the USG fiscal year is 1 July – 30 June, with the FY beginning in July of the previous calendar year (e.g., 2025 begins 1 July 2024).*
 - *Sample FY25 GO Bond cycle:*

<i>BOR approves FY 25 Capital Budget recommendation:</i>	<i>August/Sept 2023</i>
<i>Governor recommends FY25 Capital Budget:</i>	<i>January 2024</i>
<i>General Assembly approves FY25 Capital Budget:</i>	<i>~ March/April 2024</i>
<i>Governor signs final FY25 Capital Budget:</i>	<i>~ April/May 2024</i>
<i>First potential availability of FY25 GO Bonds:</i>	<i>July-August 2024</i>
 - Refer to the USG Capital Plan Summary (distributed to institutions individually by REF) and confirm the status of previously submitted capital project proposals.
- **1C – Project Scope and Cost Summary** is automatically populated from data entry in Tabs 2/3/4.
- **1D/1E – Primary Project Narrative**
 - These sections have been streamlined from the previous narrative format on former Tab 5 for consistency with OPB's current submission methodology.
 - Intended for comprehensive, project-level narrative.
 - For highly detailed and specialized narrative, use the appropriate element/component specific narrative boxes in other tabs. Project level narrative may refer to the specialized detail where appropriate.
 - Projects with clear need and solid fundamentals are the easiest to explain and justify
 - In general, focused brevity is best
 - Avoid undue repetition
- **1D – Project Description and Scope Narrative** *(former section 5B)*
 - **What is the Project itself?**
 - Describe the overall project scope with a focus on its physical characteristics (including all significant components)

- Stick to facts about the physical changes/interventions in the project scope, and save discussion of importance/outcomes/benefits for section 1E
- **1E Project Justification** – consolidates three previous Tab 5 narrative sections (5B-5D)
 - **Importance** – ***WHY do we need to do the project?***
 - What are the ***realistic*** outcomes that ***specifically and verifiably*** advance strategic institution and system objectives and critical institution needs?
 - Instructional/Academic Plan (capacity/quantity? quality? critical programs? RPG?)
 - Campus Life (RPG? Student support and well-being? Recruiting?)
 - Research (Which disciplines? What activities? Sponsored? What level (faculty, Grad, UG)? New, or expansion of existing?)
 - Major operating impacts (e.g., profound operating cost savings, major elimination of deferred maintenance, large scale safety/regulatory remediation). These elements will feature in demolition and infrastructure projects
 - Be ***objective*** – use real facts and numbers wherever you can. Specific and verifiable claims are the most compelling, but they require us to show our work.
 - Focus on explaining the ***primary, major outcomes*** of the project, and for justifying the project ***as it is proposed***.
 - In REF review, alterations to project scope, cost, timing, and other characteristics are often modeled to optimize projects and alleviate plan funding and time constraints. Detailed analysis and explanation of plan prioritization, funding schedule/sources, project scope/complexity, and cost intended primarily for internal USO review purposes can be provided in the appropriate narrative sections in Tabs 2/3/4.
 - **Urgency** – ***Why do we need to do this project NOW?***
 - Urgency is an extension of Importance - build on that to explain why the project needs to be implemented now/ASAP/on the proposed schedule.
 - You should demonstrate what makes the project more important than lower priority institution needs, or other system/state needs, ***but without specifically identifying those other needs***, unless...
 - ...you need to explain how the project is integrated in a critical path with other capital investment at your institution, or is specifically required to enable a subsequent campus project
 - **Other Impact and Benefits** – ***What OTHER good things does the project accomplish or enable?***
 - Note other secondary impacts and benefits that are less profound in scale, longer term/more speculative, more subjective/nuanced, or difficult to measure objectively
 - These should be included in a way that does not obscure the focus on the primary outcomes and objectives
 - **USG Capital Evaluation Framework** - *For guidance about issues important to USO staff and executive review, use this framework (attached at end of document text) which represents a feedback loop between proposed project characteristics, evaluation factors relating primarily to individual projects, and issues inherent to the assembly of individual institution projects and priorities into a multi-year system plan.*
- **1F – Supporting Documents** – Institutions are encouraged to submit relevant documents to support template data and narrative. Use this table to identify each submitted document (e.g.

TAB 2 – Project Specifications

- **For entry of data and information describing a project’s physical/functional scope and characteristics**
- **Most projects are likely to logically contain a single element, most commonly an existing building renovation or new building construction.**

- **Projects that optimally contain multiple elements must be carefully considered to ensure appropriate project configuration/outcome and critical path implementation/funding schedules**
 - If renovated/new space is combined with other project elements (demolition/infrastructure/acquisition) significantly exceeding the scope/cost needed to support the new/renovated space area and function, it is critical to separately identify those elements to maintain accurate and consistent cost modeling and analysis (e.g., construction cost per GSF; soft costs as % of SCL)
 - Any multiple element project must be able to logically proceed on a critical path and not delay the reasonable need for or expenditure of GO Bond funds beyond the requested funding schedule.
 - Examples of multi-element projects:
 - The renovation of all/part of 2-3 existing buildings logically combined in a single project
 - New construction and renovation of 1-3 existing building(s) logically combined in a single project
 - New construction coupled with demolition of existing obsolete building(s), such as:
 - a) A new building logically proposed on the site of an obsolete existing building
 - b) Obsolete surplus building(s) functionally replaced by the new building space program (a key justification for new space that is not warranted by utilization/portfolio analysis)
 - c) Demolition of obsolete/surplus building(s) not directly related to the new space which alleviates net-space portfolio impact, eliminates deferred maintenance liability, and reduces M&O cost (a key justification for new space not warranted by utilization/portfolio analysis)
 - A building project includes an infrastructure component that is significantly beyond the scale and cost of the scope necessary to serve the proposed space area and function, such as:
 - a) A new/upgraded district chiller plant and chilled water distribution infrastructure supporting one or more building(s) in addition to the new or renovated building(s)
 - b) A new construction project requires a significant expansion or relocation of utilities, mechanical infrastructure, parking, or “other” infrastructure (e.g., vehicular/pedestrian circulation).
 - c) An infrastructure renewal or expansion project logically combines significant scope/cost in multiple elements (mechanical/utilities/parking/ “other”).
 - Campuses considering complex multi-element projects are encouraged to contact REF staff to discuss potential issues and options.

- **2A – Building Elements**
 - New Construction
 - Scope is driven by entry of the proposed GSF of new construction.
 - Requires selection of “Primary Space Function” from the options in the drop-down menu that most appropriately represents the function provided by proposed space program.
 - Requires entry of numeric burden factor (see range based on selected primary space function) to calculate program ASF.
 - Enter the anticipated assignable space program by percentage of each FICM room use code group. Values must = 100%. Ensure that your space program entry is consistent with your selection for the building’s primary space function.
 - For projects that do not yet have detailed space programs, assignable room use percentages should be estimated based on best available information.
 - Enter any detailed narrative specific to the new construction element. Element specific narrative should be technical and oriented primarily toward informing internal USO review and should focus on issues and information specific to the relevant element. It may be referenced in the primary narrative on Tab 1 but should not be duplicated. See notes provided above the narrative boxes associated with each element.

- If a portion of your new space is an outlier from a cost/function perspective (e.g., a 60K GSF general academic building combined with 8K GSF district plant building and associated equipment), please speak with REF staff about the appropriate way to treat and distinguish the disproportionately expensive mechanical equipment and distribution infrastructure from the core building GSF
 - Renovation
 - Requires selection for up to 3 buildings for renovation by “Building Name (Regents Bldg. Code)” using the dropdown menu, which auto-populates key building data. The list of building names and codes is referenced to data in the “Spring 2022 FIDC” Tab located to the right of the workbook tab array
 - If only a portion of the building’s GSF is being renovated, the total “Renovation GSF” can be adjusted by entering a value less than 100% in “% GSF in Scope”.
 - If only a portion of a building’s GSF is being demolished, the total “Demolition GSF” can be adjusted by entering a value less than 100% in “Percentage of building to be demolished”.
 - Requires selection of “Primary Space Function” from the options in the drop-down menu that most appropriately represents the function provided by proposed space program. If the project will change the existing space use type, select the proposed future space function, and note the existing space functions in the Renovation specific narrative field.
 - Requires entry of numeric burden factor (see range based on selected primary space function) to calculate program ASF.
 - Enter the anticipated assignable space program by percentage of each FICM room use code group. Values must = 100%. Ensure that your space program entry is consistent with your selection for the building’s primary space function.
 - For projects that do not yet have detailed space programs, assignable room use percentages should be estimated based on best available information.
 - Enter any detailed narrative specific to the renovation element. Narrative at the element level should be technical and oriented primarily toward informing internal USO review, and should focus on issues and information specific to the relevant element. It may be referenced in the primary narrative on Tab 1 but should not be duplicated. See notes provided above the narrative boxes associated with each element.
 - Demolition
 - This section is only intended to specify the complete demolition of all or a portion of a building’s GSF. Scope and cost for selective interior demolition associated with renovation should be reflected within the renovation scope and cost figures.
 - Subject building(s) must be selected by “Building Name (Regents Building Code)” using the dropdown menu, which auto-populates key building data. The list of building names and codes is referenced to data in the “Spring 2022 FIDC” Tab located to the right of the workbook tab array.
 - If only a portion of a building’s GSF is being renovated, the total “Renovation GSF” can be adjusted by entering a value less than 100% in the “% Building GSF to be demolished” field.
 - Provide detailed narrative specific to the demolition element.
 - Infrastructure
 - Parking – Scope Driven by entry of # spaces (surface or deck)
 - Mechanical/Utilities/Other – scope(s) described on this tab, but entered as a total project cost by element on
 - Acquisition – Scope by Acres of land/GSF entry
 - Because infrastructure scope is difficult to characterize in a structured way, specifics about overall project scope and individual components should be documented in narrative and with detailed backup documents. A dedicated narrative section is provided for each infrastructure element.

TAB 3 – Project Cost

- Allows detailed entry of entry of component costs at an “element” level that are rolled up to a calculated overall project cost and a total project budget with an automatically rounded up to a total project budget using a calculated Regents Contingency
- **3A – New Construction/Renovation Building Construction Cost Detail**
 - Cost data entry and calculation for new construction and renovation are very similar, with 2 distinctions:
 - New construction - costs are calculated from one GSF scope and base unit cost entry, and allows the entry of a reserve for subsurface site conditions
 - Renovation - allows the potential for blended cost calculations from individual inputs for up to 3 different buildings, and allows a similarly structured reserve entry for hazmat abatement.
 - Cost calculation begins with the entry of an estimated base construction unit cost(s) per GSF, EXCLUDING subsurface/abatement reserve, building data and technology infrastructure, General Conditions/CM fees, and soft costs.
 - General Conditions and CM fees are calculated depending on the delivery method selected in 1A
 - DBB/DB delivery: General Conditions are calculated as a percentage (Cell F14/F45) of the subtotal of Bldg. Data/Tech Infrastructure (G13/G44) + Base Construction Cost (G15/G46) + Subsurface/Abatement reserve (G16/G47). The default percentage is 7% but can be adjusted within the normative range to reflect project conditions.
 - CM at Risk delivery: CM costs (for preconstruction, CM fee, and General Conditions) are entered numerically (G17-19; 48-50) with a corresponding calculation of these costs as a percentage of the resulting Stated Cost Limitation (SCL). As the project data are refined, these figures must be adjusted to ensure that each percentage is reasonable based on project characteristics and normative fee ranges based on past projects.
 - The Stated Cost Limitation (SCL) for new construction (G15) and renovation (G51) is reached by adding General Conditions/CM fees to the previous subtotals.
 - SCL is the basis for calculating soft costs by entry of a percentage (of SCL) for each of the following: Project Oversight; A&E (programming; design and construction administration services (inclusive of reimbursables; and special); FF&E (loose equipment; AV/Tech equipment); and testing/surveys
 - % of SCL is also the basis for calculating owner contingency, commissioning, and other special costs.
 - Enhanced articulation in CM fees and soft costs provides a better basis for and comparison to the BOR project budget template for projects that are funded and implemented.
 - Each total project element cost of each element is calculated by entry of estimated percentages/amounts that roll up hard, soft, and contingency costs in a methodology similar to the BOR project budget template. If any individual percentages or the overall soft cost ratio exceed the typical ranges noted, explanation is required in the cost narrative box at the bottom of the tab.
 - Typical cost ratio percentages are pre-populated in the template, but they can be edited to reflect the specific characteristics of the proposed project.
- **3B – Full Building Demolition Cost Detail**
 - Demolition costs calculations simpler than new construction and renovation, based on GSF to be demolished and unit costs for a) building demolition and waste disposal; and b) required abatement and remediation.
 - Contractor fees and soft costs are not itemized in these calculations, so these costs must be rolled into the overall unit cost figures.
 - In this version of the template, up to 3 buildings can be demolished within a single project.
- **3C – Infrastructure Cost Detail**
 - **Parking** construction cost is calculated by entering a unit cost per space specific to parking type (deck or surface). Surface parking unit costs should include related lighting and drainage work

- **Mechanical, Utility, and “Other”**
 - Base construction costs for these infrastructure elements are entered as lump sums because the variability and complexity of unit measures is too difficult to model in this context.
 - General Conditions/CM Fees have the same entry and calculation methodology as new construction and renovation, as do owner contingency and commissioning. Soft cost calculations are similar but more streamlined, with all A&E costs consolidated into a single line. Change designed to ensure budget consistency in implementation of infrastructure projects, particularly when combined with new construction or renovation.
- **3B – Acquisition Cost Detail** Land and building acquisition costs are generated by a simple calculation of area (acres for land, GSF for buildings) x unit cost. Include all anticipated costs within the unit cost, and provide any necessary information in the project cost narrative.
- **3E – Project Cost Supplemental Narrative** Narrative on costs should be technical and oriented primarily toward informing internal USO review. It should focus on issues and information specific to the unit and component costs of the project, particularly to explain and justify high/low unit costs and outlying cost components. It may be referenced in Tab 5 narrative but should not be duplicated.
- **Cost Escalation Notes** – Although the template is designed to allow construction starts over a 3-4 year period, since the year of actual project funding is unknown, institutions are generally encouraged to enter estimated unit construction costs based on an FY25 start for Small Caps or an FY26 start for Large Caps. If you have sound cost estimates for the current year or base plan year, you may roll in normative cost escalation to your baseline base unit cost figures along with an explanation of your assumptions and methods in the Project Cost Supplemental Narrative (3E).

TAB 4 – Project Funding and Schedule

- **4A – Proposed Project Funding Sources**
 - Enter proposed GO Bond funding and any proposed Non-GO funding amounts by source. If the sum of source amounts do not equal total project budget (F9.), an error message appears in G20.
 - A narrative text line is provided any necessary description or clarification of each source and amount.
 - Please be sure to accurately identify and explain any proposed non-GO sources. A “grants/other” category has been added to the Non-GO bond category for such sources that are not correctly characterized as Research ICR/F&A.
 - Ensure that your funding entry is compatible with the project type selected in Tab 1. Error messages will indicate Small Caps with > \$5M and Large Caps with <= \$5M in GO funding.
- **4B– Proposed Project Prioritization and Funding Schedule**
 - Large cap project entry now requires the selection of a GO Bond appropriation method (cell I26). The default selection is “Multi-Year”, which will be appropriate for the vast majority of projects. Single year Large Cap requests are extremely rare and will only be considered for highly unusual projects that will a) complete the design process in significantly less than a year and b) inherently have no FFE component. Institutions considering requesting this approach should contact REF staff in advance to discuss issues and options.
 - Large Cap Funding Availability and Schedule:
 - For projects with Non-GO funding, enter the anticipated availability of these funds by project phase (Design/Construction/Equipment).
 - The sum of funding by phase must equal the total for the project.

- Large Caps selected for multi-year funding are automatically split into a normative 3 year funding cycle for design, construction, and equipment. These calculations are based on the entry of cost by category and automatically adjusted by the entry of proposed Non-GO funding by project phase (cells F35-37).
- Typically, Non-GO funding is most logically proposed for the construction phase, although in some heavily leveraged projects these funds may also supplement the design and/or construction phases.
- In rare cases, the entire Equipment phase has been covered by Non-GO funds. Please contact REF staff in advance to discuss if you intend to propose this funding scenario.
- In a multi-year project, do not propose to fund 100% of design from Non-GO sources, as this creates issues with OPB guidelines and BOR project authorization.
- Do not attempt to otherwise adjust the calculated normative funding cycle by completing multiple templates for a single project or other means. If you seek an atypical GO Bond funding schedule due to project or funding characteristics, please contact USO REF staff to discuss issues and options.

Framework for System Capital Plan Evaluation

