

Lessons Learned Database

Home
Defense Nuclear Security Lessons Learned Center
Logout
Establish Profile
Search Database
About This Site
Submit Lesson
Change Password
Contact Us
Help
Related Links
Corporate Operating Experience Review Program
Corporate Safety Analysis

Text size: [Smaller](#) - [Normal](#) - [Larger](#) - [Largest](#)**Search Results**

UPF Site Infrastructure Services Schedule Integration

PMLL Identifier: PMLL-2018-UPF-0053 (*Source: User Submitted*)**Validator:** Richard D (Don) Peters, Jr.**Date:** 2/2/2018 **Contact:** Richard D (Don) Peters, Jr. / 865.253.4622**Statement:** Establish an efficient process for schedule integration and updates for construction projects multiple construction managers.

Discussion: The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Uranium Processing Facility (UPF) Project Office (UPO) employed the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers as their Design Agent and Construction Manager for the UPF Construction Support Building (CSB). The CSB was a primary deliverable for the UPF Site Infrastructure and Services (SIS) subproject on the Y-12 National Security Complex in Oak Ridge, TN. The Y-12 Management and Operating (MO) Contractor served as the Design Authority, and as Design Agent and Construction Manager for other UPF SIS work. The MO contractor was assigned the responsibility to maintain the integrated master SIS subproject schedule for both the CSB and their own scope of work. The SIS Federal Project Director (FPD) required weekly schedule updates via the following process: USACE updates were due to UPO each Wednesday. After checking and editing, UPO provided the USACE schedule to the MO Contractor on Thursdays. The MO contractor then incorporated the USACE schedule into the master schedule, and provided the consolidated update to UPO on Mondays. The USACE scope was firm fixed price (FFP), so USACE was not required to have a certified Earned Value Management System (EVMS). This often resulted in misunderstandings, as USACE scheduling practices were sometimes contrary to the MO contractor's EVMS system deion. Additional confusion and inefficiencies resulted from the FPD's weekly schedule update requirement, as the MO contractor typically performed monthly updates.

Analysis: 536 of the 752 SIS Schedule activities were USACE CSB activities (71%). Of those, less than 10 were interface points with CNS. It took the MO contractor approximately 2 hours each week to incorporate USACE updates, followed by a UPO review and an additional hour of adjustments. This is equivalent to ~150 job hours per year, which might not be the best return on investment.

Recommended Actions: On future UPF work with multiple construction managers, establish an efficient and timely process for schedule integration and updates that meets the subproject and Integrated Master Schedule reporting requirements.

Savings:**Authorized Derivative Classifier:** W.T. Mallison**Lessons Learned Coordinator:** Dan Crowe**Site:** Y-12 National Security Complex**Originating Organization or Contracting Company:** NNSA UPO**Project Name:** NA - Uranium Processing Facility**Title:** UPF Site Infrastructure Services Schedule Integration**References:****Subject Matter Experts:****Critical Decision(s):** CD-1, CD-2, CD-3**Facility Type(s):** Production - NonNuclear**Priority Descriptors(s):** Blue = Information**Relevancy Rating(s):** 4 = Never**Work Function(s):** Engineering Design and Construction-Non-nuclear**Technical Discipline(s):** Civil/Structural**Attachments:**[Close Lesson](#)

Last updated July 14, 2016
[Return to Home Page](#)

Technical questions? E-mail us at: AUUserSupport@hq.doe.gov
or call AU Support at 800-473-4375