Project Capital Intelligence:
Why Scope, Schedule, and Cost Are No Longer Enough[1]

Brent Hooks, MBA, PMP, PMI-SCP

Vice President, Cornerstone Engineering
Memphis, TN, USA

A major safety-net hospital system in the southeastern United States is undertaking one of the largest healthcare campus redevelopments in its region. The program involves multiple delivery packages, regulatory approvals, and a phased design process that will unfold over several years. The project team is exceptional: nationally recognized architecture and engineering firms, experienced program management, and a governance structure built around Target Value Delivery principles. By every traditional measure of project management readiness, this program is set up to succeed.

And yet, as the design phases progress, a familiar pattern is emerging—one that no Gantt chart, risk register, or earned value analysis will capture. The capital decisions shaping the project's financial viability and the delivery decisions shaping its execution often operate in parallel, guided by separate teams and separate frameworks. The community whose health outcomes depend on the project's success is engaged through a communication plan, not a governance structure. The project's funding sources—public appropriations, philanthropic commitments, institutional reserves—each carry different constraints, timelines, and stakeholder expectations. But the project management framework treats the budget as a single number. This is not unique to this project, nor is it a critique of any team. It is a pattern that emerges repeatedly across complex, publicly funded infrastructure—a reflection of how far project complexity has outpaced the frameworks designed to manage it.

This is not a failure of competence. It is a failure of lens.

For more than fifty years, the project management profession has organized itself around three variables: scope, schedule, and cost. These remain essential. But in the era of complex, publicly funded, multi-stakeholder infrastructure—where a single project might

[1] How to cite this work: Hooks, B. (2026). Project Capital Intelligence: Why Scope, Schedule, and Cost Are No Longer Enough, *PM World Journal*, Vol. XV, Issue VI, June.

involve tax increment financing, new market tax credits, philanthropic capital, municipal bonds, and federal grants—they are no longer sufficient. The projects that fail most consequentially in our industry do not fail because someone missed a milestone. They fail because no one on the delivery team understood the financial architecture underneath the project well enough to see the risk before it materialized.

Project Capital Intelligence is a response to that gap.

The Limitation of Traditional Project Management

The iron triangle—scope, schedule, cost—has served the profession well as an organizing principle. It gives project managers a shared language, a performance framework, and a basis for accountability. But it was designed for a simpler era of project delivery, when a single owner funded a project from internal reserves, hired a contractor, and measured success by whether the building opened on time and on budget.

Today's capital projects—particularly in healthcare, urban redevelopment, and public infrastructure—operate in a fundamentally different environment. A hospital redevelopment might be funded through a combination of county appropriations, state grants, federal matching funds, philanthropic pledges, and institutional reserves, each with different disbursement schedules, compliance requirements, and political sensitivities. A downtown hotel repositioning financed through bond issuance carries assumptions about revenue performance, debt service coverage, and completion timelines that interact with construction phasing in ways that a traditional project budget does not reveal.

In this environment, the most consequential project decisions are not delivery decisions. They are capital decisions—made months or years before a project manager is engaged, often by people who have never read the PMBOK. Site selection, program mix, phasing strategy, funding source sequencing, incentive structuring—these choices determine eighty percent of a project's outcome before a single line is drawn. Yet our profession's frameworks treat them as inputs to be inherited, not variables to be managed.

The result is a systemic gap—not a failure of any individual team, but a structural limitation in how the profession has traditionally scoped its role. Project teams optimize delivery within constraints they inherited but may not have full visibility into. When a capital structure is sensitive to timing—when bond debt service coverage depends on a completion date the delivery team did not set, when a philanthropic pledge is conditional

on milestones the delivery team was not consulted on, when a cost escalation threatens financing covenants—the consequences surface as schedule delays, scope reductions, or stakeholder crises. The root cause is not incompetence. It is a framework that was not designed for the financial complexity these projects now carry.

This is not a gap that can be solved with better cost estimation. It calls for an evolution in how the profession approaches capital-intensive projects.

Introducing Project Capital Intelligence

Project Capital Intelligence (PCI) is the continuous integration of financial structure, capital strategy, and incentive architecture into project decision-making across the full lifecycle. It introduces a lens that sits above traditional project management—not replacing scope, schedule, and cost, but contextualizing them within the financial reality that governs whether a project creates lasting value or merely gets completed.

The core premise is simple: projects are not delivery exercises. They are capital deployment strategies. Every delivery decision has a financial consequence, and every financial decision has a delivery implication. A profession that manages one without continuous intelligence on the other is operating with partial vision.

PCI does not require project managers to become accountants or developers. It requires them to understand the capital architecture of the projects they manage well enough to anticipate where financial risks will manifest as delivery problems—and to structure their governance, communication, and decision-making accordingly.

The framework is built on five pillars:

Pillar	Definition	Key Question
1. Capital Structure Alignment	Understanding the debt, equity, public funding, and incentive layers that finance a project—and how each constrains or enables delivery decisions.	*Is this project structured to survive financially, not just be built?*
2. Incentive Optimization	Identifying and protecting tax credits, public subsidies, abatements, and other incentive	*Are we leaving money on the table before we even start?*

	structures that are often misunderstood or left uncaptured by delivery teams.	
3. Pre-Development Decision Architecture	Recognizing that site selection, program mix, and phasing strategy—decisions made before a PM is engaged—determine the majority of project outcomes.	*What decisions today will determine eighty percent of the outcome?*
4. Execution Intelligence	Connecting real-time delivery decisions to financial impact—evaluating change orders by yield impact, not just cost impact.	*How does this decision affect value, not just budget?*
5. Lifecycle Value Realization	Measuring project success by long-term asset performance, operating economics, and community return—not just substantial completion.	*Did we build something valuable—or just complete something?*

Where PCI Is Emerging: A Safety-Net Hospital Redevelopment

The concept of Project Capital Intelligence did not emerge from theory. It is emerging from practice—specifically, from the experience of serving on the integrated project team for a major safety-net hospital campus redevelopment in the southeastern United States.

The hospital serves as the primary trauma center and safety-net healthcare provider for a major metropolitan area. Its campus redevelopment represents one of the most complex civic infrastructure programs in the region: a multi-phase expansion involving new clinical facilities, campus infrastructure, and community-facing amenities, delivered under a Target Value Delivery framework with a team that includes nationally ranked architecture, structural engineering, and construction management firms. The program is currently in its design phases, with the most capital-intensive delivery decisions still ahead.

My role on the project team centers on community and stakeholder engagement and philanthropy—functions that, in a traditional PM framework, would be classified as

communications management. But what has become clear is that on a project of this complexity, stakeholder engagement is deeply intertwined with capital questions. Philanthropic commitments carry milestone conditions that intersect with design timelines. Public funding sources operate on political cycles that may not align with construction schedules. Community expectations for workforce participation and local economic impact are not yet standard features of project KPIs. On project after project, I have observed the same pattern: the distance between the capital architecture and the delivery architecture represents an untapped opportunity to manage risk more effectively—and to deliver outcomes that serve both the project and the community.

In a PCI framework, a project like this would be governed with an additional layer of intelligence from the outset. The capital structure—public appropriations, philanthropic pledges, institutional reserves—would be mapped not just as a budget but as a system of constraints and opportunities, each with its own timeline, risk profile, and stakeholder. Decision checkpoints would be designed to align capital deployment with delivery milestones, rather than treating the budget as a static input. Community engagement would be structured as a governance function connected to capital decisions, not a communication function running in parallel. This is not a critique of any individual project or team. It is an observation about what our profession's frameworks do not yet ask us to do—and what the scale and complexity of modern public infrastructure now requires.

This project is where I am seeing the gap most clearly. It is where the question that became PCI first formed: Why does our profession manage projects as if the money is simple?

Where PCI Was Validated: A Hotel Repositioning

If the hospital redevelopment is revealing the need for PCI, a second project—a major downtown hotel repositioning—confirmed its analytical framework.

The project—a large-scale hotel property in a major downtown core—represents a complex hospitality repositioning involving brand transition, physical renovation, and direct interdependence with adjacent convention infrastructure. The project is bond-financed, with a pro forma built on assumptions about revenue performance, construction timing, debt service coverage, and market positioning that are deeply interdependent.

Reviewing the project from a combined CPA and development perspective—rather than a pure project management lens—revealed vulnerabilities that a traditional risk register would not surface. Construction delay risk was not just a schedule problem; it was a debt service coverage problem, because the bond structure was sensitive to completion timelines and the revenue assumptions that depended on them. Cost escalation was not just a budget problem; it had the potential to affect coverage ratios and bondholder confidence. Revenue assumptions relied on convention center booking activity and market positioning that, if softer than projected, would compress the financial margin the entire capital structure was built on. These are not delivery risks. They are capital risks that manifest through delivery—and a traditional PM framework does not surface them.

This is PCI in practice. Not replacing the project manager's work, but adding a layer of financial intelligence that makes the delivery team's decisions more informed and the project's risk profile more transparent. The question was not "Are we on schedule?" but "Does this schedule protect the capital structure?" Not "Are we on budget?" but "Does this budget reflect the true cost of the financial commitments attached to it?"

What the Profession Must Change

Project Capital Intelligence is not a call for project managers to become financial analysts. It is a call for the profession to acknowledge that the boundary between project delivery and capital strategy is artificial—and that our frameworks, training, and governance structures need to reflect that reality.

Three shifts are required:

First, we must expand our definition of project success. A project that is delivered on time and on budget but destroys value through misaligned capital structure, missed incentives, or disconnected stakeholder outcomes is not a successful project. PCI asks us to measure success by whether the project created lasting value—financial, institutional, and communal—not just whether it reached substantial completion.

Second, we must move upstream. The most important project decisions happen before a project manager is typically engaged. PCI argues that the profession must extend its scope of influence into the pre-development phase, where capital structure, incentive strategy, and stakeholder alignment are being established. If we only enter the picture after these decisions are made, we are managing consequences, not creating value.

Third, we must integrate capital literacy into PM competency. PMI's Talent Triangle recognizes technical project management, leadership, and strategic and business management as the three domains of professional development. PCI suggests that within the strategic and business management domain, capital literacy—understanding how projects are financed, how incentives work, how capital structure creates or constrains delivery options—deserves explicit attention. Not as an elective skill, but as a core competency for practitioners managing complex, publicly funded infrastructure.

From Cost Management to Capital Intelligence

We are living through the largest sustained period of infrastructure investment in a generation. Federal funding, state programs, municipal bonds, and private capital are converging on healthcare, transportation, housing, and civic infrastructure at a scale the project management profession has never been asked to govern before.

The question is whether our frameworks are ready for that moment.

Project Capital Intelligence is not a finished product. It is a practitioner's contribution—developed in the field, not in a laboratory—to a conversation the profession needs to have. PCI is not proprietary. It is offered as a framework for the profession to test, challenge, refine, and build upon. The projects I have been privileged to work on have shown me that the distance between how we manage delivery and how capital actually works is not a minor inefficiency. It is an opportunity for our profession to evolve—and to better serve the communities, institutions, and investors who depend on the projects we lead.

Most projects are managed around cost. The profession must learn to manage them around capital.

That is the shift Project Capital Intelligence proposes. And it starts with a single question every project team should be asking from day one: Do we understand the financial architecture of this project well enough to see the risks that our traditional tools will not show us?

If the answer is no, we are not managing the project. We are just executing it.

About the Author

Brent Hooks

Memphis, Tennessee, USA

Brent Hooks, MBA, PMP, PMI-SCP is Vice President of Cornerstone Engineering, where he leads business development and strategic positioning across multiple southeastern U.S. markets. He holds an MBA from Vanderbilt University, is an active CPA candidate, and serves on integrated project teams for complex healthcare and hospitality capital projects. Hooks chairs the ACE Mentor Program of Memphis, serves on the Downtown Memphis Commission board, and is a panelist on economic justice and infrastructure at the National Civil Rights Museum. His work bridges project management, development finance, and community engagement—advocating for delivery models that recognize capital intelligence as a core project management competency. He can be reached at brent@brenthooks.com