

REPORT BY THE

505902(R)

# Comptroller General

OF THE UNITED STATES

10,780

120215

## Renovation Of House Office Building Annex No. 2 By The Architect Of The Capitol

At the request of the Chairman, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, House Committee on Appropriations, GAO reviewed the renovation of House Office Building Annex No. 2 to

- determine the reasons for increases in the project's estimated cost and delays in completion and
- evaluate the reasonableness of the Architect of the Capitol's current estimates for project costs and completion dates.

The Architect estimates that the project will be completed by January 1981 at a cost of \$26.5 million. GAO doubts that the Architect will be able to meet the estimates.





COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-145899

The Honorable Adam Benjamin, Jr.  
Chairman, Subcommittee on  
Legislative Branch  
Committee on Appropriations  
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In accordance with your March 15, 1979, request and subsequent agreements reached with your office, we have reviewed the status of the renovation of House Office Building Annex No. 2 by the Architect of the Capitol.

Pursuant to your request, we are making no further distribution of this report pending completion of the Subcommittee's hearings on the Architect's request for additional funds for the project.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Thomas B. Staab".

Comptroller General  
of the United States

D I G E S T

PROJECT COSTS

The Architect of the Capitol currently estimates that the cost to renovate House Office Building Annex No. 2 will be about \$26.5 million--an increase of about \$12 million over the initial estimate made in January 1975. (See p. 3.) Some of this increase is attributable to inflation and the need to perform the work in phases. Other major factors are:

- The initial cost estimate was understated.
- Unrelated costs were charged to the project for operation and maintenance, outfitting the building for partial occupancy, and tenant alterations to unrenovated space.
- The current estimate includes facilities which were not in the original plan. (See pp. 3 to 6.)

The Architect has avoided even greater cost increases by reducing the scope of the project. Most of the scope reductions involve refurbishing or remodeling, rather than replacing, existing equipment or systems, including:

- Not replacing the roof.
- Refurbishing, rather than replacing, the elevators.
- Combining the smoke evacuation system with the heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning system.

GAO could not determine the overall effect of these scope reductions on project costs, but it is substantial. GAO believes these scope changes may reduce the quality of the renovation effort and cause higher building

operation and maintenance costs. (See pp. 9 to 11.)

GAO's analysis of the costs incurred to date and the Architect's current estimate to complete the project indicates that \$26.5 million will not be enough to finish the project. (See pp. 6 and 7.) Because of the funding limitations, certain portions of the ground and first floors will not be completely renovated. (See pp. 11 and 12.)

### SCHEDULE DELAYS

Under the 2-phase plan developed in the fall of 1975, the renovation project was scheduled for completion in May 1978. The Architect currently estimates completion in January 1981. The major impediment to the timely completion of the project has been the higher than expected occupancy level in the building during renovation. Because of this, the Architect is performing the work in four phases, rather than two. Other factors contributing to delays are discussed in chapter 3. (See pp. 8 and 9.)

GAO found that some renovation work on phase 3 is already behind schedule because tenants did not vacate the work areas on schedule. Also, work on phases 3 and 4 could be complicated if certain changes requested by the tenants are carried out. The Architect believes the January 1981 completion date allows sufficient time to compensate for the potential problems. However, the history of the project indicates a high probability of additional delays. (See p. 9.)

The Architect agrees that GAO's report accurately describes his efforts to renovate House Office Building Annex No. 2. (See p. 13.)

## C o n t e n t s

	<u>Page</u>
DIGEST	i
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Renovation of the building	1
Scope of review	2
2 ESTIMATED AND ACTUAL COSTS OF RENOVATION	3
Understatement of renovation cost estimate	3
Unrelated costs and additional items	4
Current estimate of project cost	6
3 DELAYED COMPLETION AND REDUCTIONS IN SCOPE	8
Delays in completion	8
Completion of project	9
Reductions in the project's scope	9
Other efforts to limit renovation costs	11
Total costs	12
Comments of the AOC	13
APPENDIX	
I Estimated costs to renovate Annex No. 2	14
II Partial occupancy of Annex No. 2 during renovation	15

### ABBREVIATIONS

A/E	architect/engineer
AOC	Architect of the Capitol
GAO	General Accounting Office
GSA	General Services Administration

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

By a motion dated December 12, 1974, the House Office Building Commission authorized and directed the Architect of the Capitol (AOC) to request the Administrator of General Services to transfer, as soon as practical after January 1, 1975, the building now known as House Office Building Annex No. 2. <sup>1/</sup> The building, which was used previously by the Federal Bureau of Investigation primarily for storage, was to be renovated by the General Services Administration (GSA) for use as Federal office space by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The building was officially transferred to the jurisdiction of the AOC on April 7, 1975. At the time of the transfer, GSA had already hired an architect/engineer (A/E) firm to design the renovation of the building. The AOC stated that since GSA's proposed alterations to the building were similar to what he had envisioned, he decided to adopt GSA's plans for the project, including retaining the A/E firm.

### RENOVATION OF THE BUILDING

Annex No. 2, a 7-story building bounded by Second Street, Third Street, D Street, and Virginia Avenue, S.W., has a total of about 582,000 gross square feet of area. When the renovation of the building is completed, about 2,000 people will occupy about 295,000 net square feet of usable space, including a 340-seat cafeteria on the first floor. As discussed in chapter 3, the AOC, because of funding considerations, decided not to completely renovate all of the building's usable space.

On the basis that the building would be partially occupied from the start, the AOC decided to renovate the building in two phases--occupy half the building, renovate the other half of the building, move the people into the renovated half, then renovate the remaining half of the building. However, according to the AOC, the occupancy of the building had increased at such a rate that, in May 1976, he decided to do the renovation in three phases. In November 1977, the AOC, again citing the building's increased occupancy level, decided

---

<sup>1/</sup>The Commission acted pursuant to Public Law 84-24 (Additional House Office Building Act of 1955), April 22, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 193a).

to do the renovation in four phases. Assignment of personnel to the building is the responsibility of the Chairman, House Office Building Commission.

The AOC is currently in phase 3 of his renovation plan, with an estimated completion date of January 1980. Phase 4 is to start that same month, with completion of the project scheduled for January 1981.

#### SCOPE OF REVIEW

Our review was made at the offices of the AOC, the A/E firm originally commissioned to design the project (associate architect), and GSA. We reviewed project records, spoke with appropriate officials, and examined the AOC's contracting techniques. Our review was primarily concerned with the (1) increases in the project's estimated cost, (2) delays in completion, and (3) reasonableness of the AOC's current estimates for total project costs and completion dates.

## CHAPTER 2

### ESTIMATED AND ACTUAL COSTS OF RENOVATION

The estimated cost to renovate Annex No. 2 has increased from the original \$14.5 million estimate in January 1975 to the AOC's current request to raise the spending limit for the project to \$26.5 million. We found, however, that the AOC's need for increased funds for the project is unrelated to any corresponding increases in the cost to actually renovate the building. Rather, the need for increased funds can be traced to three major factors:

- Understatement of the estimated cost of renovation at the time of the initial authorization.
- Costs unrelated to the renovation being charged against the project's authorizations.
- Additional items not in the original renovation plan.

With respect to the direct costs to renovate Annex No. 2, we found that the actual increases have been less than would be expected for a project of this nature. We believe, as discussed in chapter 3, that the AOC has avoided more significant increases in the actual cost of direct renovation by reducing the scope of the project.

#### UNDERSTATEMENT OF RENOVATION COST ESTIMATE

Public Law 94-6, February 28, 1975 (40 U.S.C. 175), authorized \$15 million for the Annex No. 2 project, \$14.5 million for renovation, and \$500,000 for operation and maintenance costs for the last 4 months of fiscal year 1975. If the latest AOC request for additional funds (\$3.661 million) is approved, a total of \$26.5 million will have been authorized for the project. (Appendix I shows the AOC's estimated costs for the project, by major categories, at various times during the project's evolution.) The initial authorization for the project was based on the AOC's estimate that about \$11 million would be needed for direct renovation costs, \$2.3 million for contingencies, and about \$1.2 million for A/E fees, supervision, and other related expenses.

The proposal developed for GSA by the A/E, dated March 15, 1975, estimated direct renovation costs of \$16,161,023, exclusive of inflation, contingencies, and Government administration and supervision expenses. The A/E's estimate was based on complete renovation while the building was unoccupied. In the fall of 1975 the AOC's staff, using a revised



A/E design that slightly reduced the scope of the renovation, estimated that doing the renovation in two phases, with a completion date of July 1978, would entail about \$21 million in direct renovation costs. Both estimates were based on the assumption that private contractors would do the work.

Although at the time of the initial authorization or shortly thereafter, the AOC was aware that the estimated costs of renovating the building in accordance with GSA's plans exceeded the \$14.5 million authorized, it was not until January 1977 that he sought a \$9 million increase in the project's total authorization--\$4.5 million for fiscal year 1978 and \$4.5 million for fiscal year 1979. The fiscal year 1978 request was for the operation and maintenance costs incurred through fiscal year 1976 and for temporary tenant alterations.

For fiscal year 1979, the AOC increased his request from \$4.5 million to \$5 million. These funds, which raised the project's authorizations to \$24.5 million, were to cover the costs of inflation and changes to the original GSA plans resulting from the special needs of the House of Representatives.

Of the \$3.661 million being requested by the AOC for fiscal year 1980, \$1.661 million is for restoration of funds withheld from the 1979 authorization pursuant to section 311 of Public Law 95-391 (Legislative Branch Appropriation Act of 1979), September 30, 1978 (92 Stat. 790). The \$2 million is to meet the costs of modifications not originally anticipated. AOC personnel stated that the need for the \$2 million is directly related to the increased costs resulting from doing the renovation in four phases.

#### UNRELATED COSTS AND ADDITIONAL ITEMS

Our analysis of the current total project estimate of \$26.5 million showed that about \$6,600,000 was for costs unrelated to the direct renovation of Annex No. 2.

#### Costs Unrelated To Renovation

Operation and maintenance (4/75 thru 9/76)	\$2,629,000
Outfitting building for partial occupancy and tenant alterations to unrenovated space	3,362,000
Additional alterations to renovated space	<u>586,000</u>
Total	<u>\$6,577,000</u>

At the time of the project's initial authorization, the AOC requested \$608,500 to cover the estimated operation and maintenance costs for the remainder of fiscal year 1975, and \$1,180,000 to partially cover the estimated fiscal year 1976 operation and maintenance costs (estimated at \$1,788,000). In designating \$500,000 of the initial \$15 million authorization for the fiscal year 1975 operation and maintenance costs, the House Appropriations Committee was informed that the AOC would submit a request the following year for fiscal year 1976 operation and maintenance funds.

The AOC never requested operation and maintenance funds for fiscal year 1976. Instead, the operation and maintenance costs for the remainder of fiscal year 1975 and for all of fiscal year 1976 (a total of \$2,629,000) were charged against the project's authorizations. For fiscal year 1977 and subsequent fiscal years, separate operation and maintenance funds were appropriated for the building.

To accommodate partial occupancy of the building while it was being renovated, the AOC had to outfit the unrenovated space for use. Additionally, the AOC made numerous alterations to the unrenovated space, pursuant to the requests of the temporary tenants, while the space was occupied. Through April 30, 1979, the AOC had charged these costs (a total of about \$3,362,000) to the authorizations for the renovation project. Also, about \$586,000 in alterations were made to the renovated space, in response to tenant requests after the space had been renovated, that were charged against the project's authorizations.

Eliminating the unrelated charges (about \$6.6 million) from the AOC's current estimated project cost (\$26.5 million), leaves about \$19.9 million in actual and estimated costs that can be directly associated with the renovation of Annex No. 2. However, the \$19.9 million includes two items-- a cafeteria (\$800,000) and computer facilities (\$87,000)<sup>1</sup>-- which were added to the project subsequent to the AOC's adoption of the GSA renovation plan.

Elimination of the additional items from the \$19.9 million reduces the AOC's current estimate of direct renovation costs to about \$19 million. This is less than both the A/E's March 1975 estimate (\$16.1 million), if inflation is

---

<sup>1</sup>/The original GSA proposal provided for a snack bar and a computer facility. However, both items were eliminated from the design when the AOC took control of the project.

allowed, and the AOC's fall 1975 estimate (\$21 million), which only includes inflation through fiscal year 1978. As discussed in chapter 3, the AOC has avoided more significant increases in the actual cost of direct renovation by reducing the scope of the project.

#### CURRENT ESTIMATE OF PROJECT COST

Based on his latest request for additional funds, the AOC is estimating total project costs at \$26.5 million. Our analysis of the costs incurred to date and the AOC's estimates to complete the project indicates that this amount will not be enough to finish the project as planned by the AOC.

A May 15, 1979, analysis by the AOC's staff shows a total estimated project cost of \$26,767,034, over \$267,000 more than the total authorization being sought by the AOC. Our review of the AOC's calculations showed that they were based on an outdated estimate of total renovation costs. If the renovation estimate were updated to reflect the most recent information, the analysis would show an estimated project cost of \$26,910,500, about \$410,000 above the official \$26.5 million estimate. (See app. I.) Further, as discussed in chapter 3, the latest AOC estimate does not provide for renovating the entire building as planned. Because of funding limitations, certain portions of the ground and first floors will not be completely renovated.

There are several other factors which we feel could add further increases to the project's total cost. The AOC's May 15, 1979, estimate is based on a January 1981 completion date. As discussed in chapter 3, it does not appear that the renovation will be completed by that date. Any delays in meeting that date will probably result in increased costs due to inflation beyond that already calculated into the AOC's estimate.

The AOC's staff is concerned that once phase 3 is completed, the phase 4 work will be hampered by access problems to the work area and lack of storage space. Completion of phase 3 will result in about 80 percent of the building being renovated. Access to the phase 4 work area will have to be restricted to avoid disrupting the employees occupying renovated space, especially with respect to movements of materials and equipment to and from the work area. Further, as more of the building is renovated, less area will be available to store the equipment and materials needed to complete the project. It appears that some materials and equipment needed for the phase 4 work will have to be stored offsite. Both these factors could add increased costs through

additional workload requirements and further delays in completing the project.

Another factor that has potential for increasing project costs involves tenants requesting changes to the phase 3 renovation plans. Some of the tenants that will occupy the renovated phase 3 area have already expressed a desire to have the space renovated differently from that planned by the AOC. For example, the AOC's staff estimates that the requested changes of one tenant agency that will occupy part of the phase 3 area will cost over \$130,000 if implemented.

## CHAPTER 3

### DELAYED COMPLETION AND

### REDUCTIONS IN SCOPE

Appendix II details the partial occupancy of the building, by square footage and number of people, since the AOC took control in April 1975. Complete renovation of the building while it was unoccupied would have been the most economical and quickest method to effect the renovation. Partial occupancy and the phasing of the renovation work have been the primary factors contributing to the delays in completing the project. The impact of these two factors on direct renovation costs has been substantially offset by reductions in the scope of the renovation effort.

### DELAYS IN COMPLETION

Under the 2-phase renovation plan developed in the fall of 1975 by the A/E and the AOC's staff, completion of the project was scheduled for May 1978. The current AOC estimate shows a completion date of January 1981. Numerous factors have contributed to the delays in completing the project, including:

- Delays by the associate architect in providing necessary drawings related to material procurements.
- Delays by the Clerk of the House in installing carpeting and venetian blinds and by the telephone company in installing telephones in renovated space.
- Failure of certain tenant agencies to promptly vacate unrenovated space.
- Use of construction personnel to effect tenant changes unrelated to the renovation project.

The major impediments to the timely completion of the project, however, have been partial occupancy and phased renovation. Both have been constant and integral factors in the project since its inception, and have affected all aspects of the AOC's renovation effort. Under the AOC's original concept, the building would have been 50 percent or less occupied during renovation. However, as shown in appendix II, the occupancy level of the building exceeded 50 percent before the renovation work began in July 1976.

The end result of the escalating occupancy rate has been an increase in the work phases from 2 to 3 to 4. Each

1

increase in the number of work phases further complicates problems relating to reworking design documents and shop drawings, using work forces, ordering materials and supplies, access to work areas, and availability of storage space.

#### COMPLETION OF PROJECT

The latest AOC estimate shows the renovation of Annex No. 2 as being completed by January 1981. The estimate is predicated on phase 3 being completed by January 1980, and phase 4 starting that same month.

Our analysis shows that renovation work on certain portions of the phase 3 work area is already behind schedule because the tenants occupying some of this area did not vacate the space on schedule. Although the AOC's staff maintains that they will be able to make up the lost time, the history of the project raises doubts about the feasibility of this happening. Also, as discussed previously, the renovation work in phases 3 and 4 could be further complicated if the AOC has to change his renovation plans to incorporate changes requested by tenants.

Another potential hinderance to completion of the building by January 1981 is the access to work areas and storage problems involving phase 4. The AOC's staff believes that the January 1981 estimate contains sufficient time to compensate for these problems. Once again, however, the history of the project indicates a high probability of additional delays.

#### REDUCTIONS IN THE PROJECT'S SCOPE

Since the inception of the project, the AOC has consistently reduced the scope of the renovation effort in order to reduce the direct renovation costs. This has enabled the AOC to offset, to a large degree, cost escalation related to workload increases and time delays resulting from partial occupancy and phased renovation. We believe the AOC's actions could have a detrimental effect on the quality of the renovation effort.

When the building was transferred to his control in January 1975, the AOC stated that he would renovate Annex No. 2 in accordance with the GSA plan. In being authorized

\$14.5 million 1/ to effect the renovation, the AOC estimated that about \$11 million would be needed for the direct construction costs of renovation. In March 1975, the A/E estimated that it would cost about \$16.1 million to renovate the building pursuant to GSA's proposal. In June 1975, the AOC hired the A/E firm to continue its work on the renovation design for Annex No. 2.

From the start, the AOC emphasized to the A/E that the GSA proposal was too elaborate and, due to limited funds, would have to be reduced in scope. Since then, the AOC's efforts to limit the direct renovation costs by reducing the scope have become the focal point of the renovation project.

Most of the scope reductions involved refurbishing or remodeling existing equipment and/or systems, as opposed to installing new equipment or systems. For example, although the original A/E proposal provided for replacing the roof, the AOC decided to repair the roof as needed. Other major reductions in scope included:

- Refurbishing the existing elevators rather than replacing them with new ones.
- Reglazing the existing windows as opposed to replacing them.
- Revising the design concept to allow for less complicated installations of electrical/transformer equipment.
- Combining the smoke evacuation system with the heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning system.

Numerous other scope reductions, some of a highly technical nature, have involved changing the building's electrical, mechanical, plumbing, and air circulation systems. Because the (1) original A/E proposal did not estimate costs for specific items, (2) AOC's records do not contain any cost data related to the scope reduction decisions, and (3) renovation is still in process, it is not feasible to determine the actual individual or overall savings resulting from the scope reductions. However, our analysis of the available information and discussions with the AOC and his staff and

---

1/Did not include the \$500,000 authorized for operation and maintenance expenses for the last 4 months of fiscal year 1975.

the A/E indicates that the overall savings in direct renovation costs resulting from the scope reductions have been substantial.

In our opinion, the AOC's scope reductions could negatively affect the quality of the renovation effort. By reducing the initial capital investment (direct renovation costs) in the project, the AOC is probably increasing the building's operation and maintenance costs. Generally, operation and maintenance costs would be minimized by maximizing the use of new and efficient equipment and systems. The AOC stated that the potential impact on operation and maintenance costs was not a major consideration in the scope reductions.

At the time the AOC took control of the building, it was anticipated that it would only be a temporary situation, pending construction of a fourth House Office Building. Supposedly, Annex No. 2 would be returned to GSA in about 5 to 6 years. Based on the available information, it appears that the decisions to refurbish existing equipment and systems, rather than replacing them, were influenced by the belief that the building would only temporarily be under the AOC's control. The AOC has acknowledged the possibility that the scope reductions could have been affected by considerations of temporary ownership.

The AOC's efforts to reduce the project's scope were facilitated by the use of his own people to do the renovation work. This enabled the AOC and his staff to alter the A/E's design (the A/E was terminated in August 1977) without concerns about change orders or claims from a private contractor. This is by far the largest project ever done in-house by the AOC. As a basis for comparison, the total amount of in-house renovation work done by the AOC's staff in fiscal year 1975, exclusive of Annex No. 2, was about \$2.3 million.

#### OTHER EFFORTS TO LIMIT RENOVATION COSTS

The AOC has employed several other means to limit renovation costs. The original A/E design included carpeting and venetian blinds. Under the AOC's renovation plan, the funds for these items are being provided by the Clerk of the House.

The AOC also eliminated certain items from the original A/E proposal, including a roof garden, skylights, snack bar, and computer facilities. Subsequently, a cafeteria and computer facilities were added, along with a projected increase in the project's costs, to the AOC's renovation plan.



As stated previously, we do not believe that the requested \$26.5 million in total authorizations will be sufficient to complete the project as planned. It appears that the AOC, in the absence of additional appropriations, will not be able to completely renovate the ground and first floors. Although these two floors will contain the basic fire safety, air-circulation, plumbing and mechanical systems, large amounts of space on these floors will not be finished in accordance with the AOC's renovation plan. As a result, rather than being used for office or other specific purposes, the space will either be unoccupied, used for storage, or be used by the AOC's construction personnel.

The apparent philosophy of the AOC is to use the available funds to renovate floors 2 through 6 (the primary floors to be used for office space) and the cafeteria. The renovation of the ground and first floors will be dependent upon the availability of funds. The AOC and his staff feel that the sections of these two floors not completely renovated at this time can be completed in the future, either through specific authorizations or through the AOC's regular operation and maintenance activities.

Based on the AOC's calculations, as much as 75,000 square feet of occupiable space could be affected in this manner. This has reduced the AOC's estimate of net usable space in the building from 370,000 square feet to 295,000 square feet.

#### TOTAL COSTS

The AOC's estimate of \$26.5 million for the project does not include certain indirect costs associated with the renovation of Annex No. 2. For example, the Clerk of the House estimates it will cost about \$4.2 million--\$2 million spent to date and an additional \$2.2 million--to provide furniture and furnishings (including carpeting and venetian blinds) for the renovated building. In addition, \$1.5 million was spent to purchase new furniture for the Longworth Building, with the old furniture being transferred to Annex No. 2.

Other indirect costs associated with the project, but not part of the AOC's \$26.5 million estimate, include

--overhead costs of the AOC's management and support staff involved with, but not specifically assigned to, the renovation project;

--relocation of employees to the new structure; and

--initial installation and subsequent relocation of telephones.

COMMENTS OF THE AOC

In commenting on the draft of this report, the AOC stated that it accurately depicted the circumstances surrounding his efforts to renovate House Office Building Annex No. 2.

## ESTIMATED COSTS TO RENOVATE ANNEX NO. 2

Category of cost	AOC estimates					Analyses	
	Jan. 1975	May 1976	Sept. 1976	May 1978	Dec. 1978	AOC's May 15, 1979	GAO's
Construction:							
Phase 1	-	\$ 5,145,400	\$ 5,211,000	\$ 3,800,000	\$ 5,795,592	\$ 5,795,591	\$ 5,790,290
Phase 2	-	2,762,500	2,802,000	1,900,000	3,127,531	3,127,531	3,630,137
Phase 3	-	8,060,000	8,930,000	3,587,626	5,049,580	5,049,580	5,049,580
Phase 4	-	N/A	N/A	1,312,374	1,866,205	1,866,205	1,866,205
Total	\$13,591,000	15,967,900	16,943,000	10,600,000	15,838,908	15,838,907	a/ 15,933,131
Contingencies	2,647,750	-	-	1,105,634	600,000	-	-
Overhead, administration, and A/E fees	1,323,875	1,277,432	1,355,440	1,348,086	2,813,293	2,813,293	2,862,535
Additional work	-	-	350,000	1,450,000	937,000	1,537,000	1,537,000
Total renovation estimate	14,562,625	17,245,332	18,648,440	20,503,720	20,189,201	20,189,200	20,332,666
Operation and maintenance	b/ 608,500	2,487,140	2,647,189	2,647,189	2,629,044	2,629,049	2,629,049
Tenant alterations	-	1,971,000	2,830,000	3,331,889	3,712,474	3,948,785	3,948,785
Total project	15,171,125	21,703,472	24,125,629	26,482,798	26,530,719	26,767,034	26,910,500
Less: Authorized and/or requested	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	c/ 24,500,000	c/ 24,500,000	d/ 24,500,000	d/ 26,500,000
Difference between estimated and authorized and/or requested	\$ 171,125	(\$ 6,703,472)	(\$ 9,125,629)	(\$ 1,982,798)	(\$ 2,030,719)	(\$ 267,034)	(\$ 410,500)

a/Total is \$403,081 less than the sum of the four phases because phases 1 and 2 contain costs for additional work and tenant alterations already included in the estimates for those line items. These amounts could not be readily separated from the phase 1 and 2 estimates.

b/Estimated fiscal year 1975 cost.

c/Includes fiscal year 1979 appropriation request.

d/Includes fiscal year 1980 request for \$2 million.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

PARTIAL OCCUPANCY OF ANNEX NO. 2 DURING RENOVATION

	<u>Dec.</u> 1975 (note a)	<u>June</u> 1976 (note a)	<u>Feb.</u> 1977 (note a)	<u>June</u> 1977 (note a)	<u>Jan.</u> 1978 (note b)	<u>June</u> 1978 (note b)	<u>Mar.</u> 1979 (note a)
Population	1,322	1,021	1,135	1,374	1,473	1,356	1,234
Area assigned (net square feet)	244,905	246,039	253,006	272,330	301,372	275,074	256,781
Percent of net usable area assigned (note c)	66	66	68.5	73	81	74	69

a/Data per AOC status reports.

b/Data per AOC sequence reports.

c/Net usable building area is 371,085 square feet.