



Construction Industry Institute®

Productivity Research Program – Phase I

Paul M. Goodrum, Ph.D.

Dong Zhai

Yongwei Shan

William Hinkle

Chandra Foley

University of Kentucky

Carl T. Haas, Ph.D.

Chris Gouett

Mahdi Safa

Di Zhang

University of Waterloo

Carlos H. Caldas, Ph.D.

Jie Gong

The University of Texas at Austin

Construction Industry Institute

Abbott
Air Products and Chemicals
Ameren Corporation
American Transmission Company
Anheuser-Busch InBev
Aramco Services Company
Archer Daniels Midland Company
Architect of the Capitol
BP America
Barrick Gold Corporation
Bristol-Myers Squibb Company
CITGO Petroleum Corporation
Cameco Corporation
Cargill
Chevron
ConocoPhillips
DTE Energy
The Dow Chemical Company
DuPont
Eastman Chemical Company
Ecopetrol
Eskom Holdings
ExxonMobil Corporation
General Electric Company
General Motors Corporation
GlaxoSmithKline
Hovensa
International Paper
Irving Oil Limited
Kaiser Permanente
Kinross Gold Corporation
Koch Industries
Eli Lilly and Company
LyondellBasell
Marathon Oil Corporation
National Aeronautics & Space Administration
NOVA Chemicals Corporation
Occidental Petroleum Corporation
Ontario Power Generation
Petroleo Brasileiro S/A - Petrobras
Praxair
The Procter & Gamble Company
SABIC - Saudi Basic Industries Corporation
Sasol Technology
Shell Global Solutions US
Smithsonian Institution
Southern Company
Statoil ASA
Teck Resources Limited
Tennessee Valley Authority
TransCanada Corporation
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Department of Commerce/NIST/
Engineering Laboratory
U.S. Department of Energy
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
U.S. Department of State
U.S. General Services Administration
AMEC
AZCO
Alstom Power
Apex Engineering
Aveng Group
BIS Frucon Industrial Services
Baker Concrete Construction
Bateman Engineering
Bechtel Group
Bentley Systems
Black & Veatch
Burns & McDonnell
CB&I
CCC Group
CDI Engineering Solutions
CH2M HILL
CSA Group
Coreworx
Day & Zimmermann
Dresser-Rand Company
eProject Management, LLC
Emerson Process Management
Faithful+Gould
Flad & Associates
Flint Energy Services
Fluor Corporation
Foster Wheeler USA Corporation
GS Engineering & Construction Corporation
Gross Mechanical Contractors
Hargrove Engineers + Constructors
Hilti Corporation
Industrial Contractors
Innovative Design Engineering Associates
JMJ Associates
JV Driver Projects
Jacobs
KBR
Kvaerner North American Construction
Lauren Engineers & Constructors
Matrix Service Company
McDermott International
Midwest Steel
M. A. Mortenson Company
Mustang
Oracle USA
Parsons
Pathfinder
Quality Execution
S&B Engineers and Constructors
SNC-Lavalin
SOG – Óleo e Gás S/A – SETAL
The Shaw Group
Siemens Energy
Technip
URS Corporation
Victaulic Company
Walbridge
Wanzek Construction
WorleyParsons
Yates Construction
Zachry Holdings
Zurich

CRAFT PRODUCTIVITY RESEARCH PROGRAM – PHASE I

by

Paul M. Goodrum, Ph.D.
Dong Zhai
Yongwei Shan
William Hinkle
Chandra Foley
University of Kentucky

Carl T. Haas, Ph.D.
Chris Gouett
Mahdi Safa
Di Zhang
University of Waterloo

Carlos H. Caldas, Ph.D.
Jie Gong
The University of Texas at Austin

A Report to
Construction Industry Institute
The University of Texas at Austin

Under the Guidance of
CII Research Team 252
Craft Productivity Research Program

CII Research Report 252-11
December 2011

© 2011 Construction Industry Institute®

The University of Texas at Austin.

CII members may reproduce and distribute this work internally in any medium at no cost to internal recipients. CII members are permitted to revise and adapt this work for their internal use provided an informational copy is furnished to CII.

Available to non-members by purchase; however, no copies may be made or distributed and no modifications made without prior written permission from CII. Contact CII at <http://construction-institute.org/catalog.htm> to purchase copies. Volume discounts may be available.

All CII members, current students, and faculty at a college or university are eligible to purchase CII products at member prices. Faculty and students at a college or university may reproduce and distribute this work without modification for educational use.

Printed in the United States of America.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Achieving a 50% improvement in construction craft productivity in six years would break a century-old tradition of stagnation that has been interrupted by periodic improvement. The first phase of a six-year research program tasked with trying to do just that is reported here.

Direct work typically amounts to no more than 35-45% of a craftsman's time on the job. To improve craft productivity, direct work time must be improved. To increase direct work time, the availability of materials, information and tools at the workplace must be improved. There will be no "magic bullet" that will make this happen, but rather a series of innovations that together produce change. They will include a combination of broad improvements in practice and focused improvements in technology and process.

To achieve these improvements, Research Team 252's (RT 252's) rolling, five-phase program injects innovations annually via a sequence of innovation workshops, field trials, analysis, and implementation tool delivery. Each phase of the program involves: 1) analyses of the CII BM&M data to identify best practices that appear to have an impact on productivity, 2) exploring opportunities for productivity improvement through craft information, technology support for labor, work packaging/organization, and human behavior, and 3) soliciting innovation input from structured workshops and team members' expertise.

Analysis of BM&M data in the first phase was focused on investigating the relationship between particular field practices and productivity of the mechanical trades. Significant relationships were found between improved productivity and best practices in materials

management, safety, team building, front end planning, and automation and integration. These practices, however, are not additive; they are highly correlated and interdependent. Projects that were advanced implementers of these practices experienced as much as a 50% average productivity advantage over projects that were weak implementers. Clearly, implementing these best productivity practices can make all the difference between a weak and a strong performer. But, it is natural to ask whether CII's BM&M database includes all the best practices or primarily those for which CII has produced products, and whether relatively conventional best practices exist with similar impact.

Thus, RT 252's efforts in the first research phase also focused on a thorough search and definition of best productivity practices. When these practices have become rigorously weighted and properly structured, they will become part of a Best Productivity Practices Implementation Index (BPPII). The BPPII will be thoroughly validated in Phases 2 and 3, and will be delivered as an implementation tool in the final phase of the program. No existing CII tool addresses productivity as directly as the BPPII will. Until it is fully developed, however, exciting innovations will continue to emerge and this research program will continue to track them.

For this phase of the program, emerging productivity improvement innovations for the mechanical trades were identified by the team and prioritized. Thorough analyses, including field data analysis, were conducted on each innovation in a structure that includes: 1) the problem addressed; 2) definition of the innovation in terms of technology, process, and organizational change; 3) analysis of field data and risks associated with implementing the innovation, and; 4) guidelines for implementation. Six significant innovations are delivered, including: 1) weldless

and modularized pipe supports, 2) laser scanning, 3) quick connect structural steel pipe supports, 4) cut-length elimination on modules, 5) innovative scaffolding systems, and 6) weldless pipe joining. While these innovations are focused primarily on the mechanical trades, innovations in Phase II are expected to be more cross-cutting, including craft training and work planning innovations.

Implementing the best productivity practices identified in this first phase, as well as the innovations listed above, is expected to result in significant productivity improvement on your project. More is yet to come in subsequent project phases. This report includes five chapters. Chapter 1 provides an overview of the Craft Productivity Program. Chapter 2 identifies field practices which relate to construction productivity improvement. Chapter 3 introduces six significant innovations used in mechanical trades as well as their impact on construction productivity. Chapter 4 introduces the Best Productivity Practices Implementation Index (BPPPII). Chapter 5 is the conclusions of this report.

CRAFT PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAM TEAM

Warren Adamson, S&B Engineers and Constructors, Ltd.

William R. Boyd, Southern Company

Carlos Caldas, The University of Texas at Austin

Daniel D. Christian, Victaulic Company

Chandra Foley, University of Kentucky

Michael J. Freeman, CB&I

Laerte Galhardo, Petrobras

Paul M. Goodrum, University of Kentucky

Jie Gong, The University of Texas at Austin

Robin Granger, Ontario Power Generation

Carl T. Haas, University of Waterloo

William Hinkle, University of Kentucky

Shannon D. Hopkins, Eastman Chemical Company

Thomas M. James, Zachry Construction Company

James Matteson, URS Washington Division

Paul Murray, SNC-Lavalin Inc.

Jake Priest, Aker Construction, Inc.

Yongwei Shan, University of Kentucky

Michael R. Smith, J. Ray McDermott, Inc.

Mark Stofega, Fluor Corporation

Randy Tomlinson, The Dow Chemical Company

Steve Toon, Bechtel Group, Inc.

Dong Zhai, University of Kentucky

Di Zhang, University of Waterloo

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Problem Statement.....	2
1.3 Objectives	3
1.4 Research Methodology	4
1.5 Definition of Construction Productivity	12
CHAPTER 2 : ANALYSES OF PROJECT PRACTICES AND PRODUCTIVITY	13
2.1 Automation and Integration of Information Systems	15
2.2 Materials Management.....	20
2.3 Safety	21
2.4 Team Building	24
2.5 Front-end Planning	26
2.6 Summary	28
CHAPTER 3 : MECHANICAL CONSTRUCTION PRODUCTIVITY INNOVATIONS	31
3.1 Weldless and Modularized Pipe Supports System.....	33
3.1.1 Problem.....	33
3.1.2 Description of Innovation	33
3.1.3 Analysis	38
3.1.4 Implementation.....	43
3.2 Laser Scanning.....	45
3.2.1 Problem.....	45
3.2.2 Description of Innovation.....	45
3.2.3 Analysis	55
3.2.4 Implementation.....	57
3.3 Weldless Pipe Tree Installation	59
3.3.1 Problem.....	59
3.3.2 Description of Innovation.....	60
3.3.3 Analysis	67
3.3.4 Implementation.....	70
3.4 Eliminating Cut-lengths for Prefabricated Pipe Installation	71
3.4.1 Problem.....	71
3.4.2 Description of Innovation.....	72

3.4.3 Analysis	78
3.4.4 Implementation	79
3.5 Innovative Scaffolding.....	80
3.5.1 Problem.....	80
3.5.2 Description of Innovation.....	80
3.5.3 Analysis	84
3.5.4 Implementation.....	87
3.6 Weldless Pipe Joining.....	89
3.6.1 Problem.....	89
3.6.2 Weldless Innovations.....	89
3.6.3 Grooved Systems.....	91
3.6.4 Press to Connect Systems	96
3.6.5 Push to Connect System	99
3.6.6 Final Analysis	102
3.6.7 Implementation.....	105
3.7 Estimated Impact of Innovations on the CII Model Plant.....	107
3.7.1 Introduction to the CII Model Plant Project	107
3.7.2 Methodology.....	111
3.7.3 Weldless and Modularized Pipe Supports System	112
3.7.4 Laser Scanning	116
3.7.5 Weldless Pipe Tree Installation	122
3.7.6 Eliminating Cut-lengths for Prefabricated Pipe Installation.....	126
3.7.7 Innovative Scaffolding.....	132
3.7.8 The Innovations' Overall Impact on CII Model Plant.....	134
3.8 Summary.....	137
CHAPTER 4 : BEST PRODUCTIVITY PRACTICES IMPLEMENTATION INDEX	139
4.1 Introduction.....	139
4.2 The Review of Other Construction Practice Indices.....	140
4.2.1 Project Definition Rating Index.....	141
4.2.2 Project Health Indicator.....	146
4.2.3 Decision Tool for Prefabrication, Preassembly, Modularization, and Off-site Prefabrication.....	152
4.2.4 International Project Risk Assessment	156
4.2.5 Alignment Thermometer	159

4.2.6 Communications Project Assessment Tool	161
4.2.7 Disputes Potential Index	166
4.2.8 Voice of the Worker Index	170
4.3 Overview of Best Productivity Practices Implementation Index	174
4.3.1 How the BPPII fits with the Construction Practice Indices	174
4.3.2 Development of the BPPII	177
4.4 Content of Best Productivity Practices Implementation Index	187
4.4.1 Category I – Materials Management	187
4.4.2 Category II – Equipment Logistics	198
4.4.3 Category III – Craft Information Systems	206
4.4.4 Category IV – Human Resource Management	219
4.4.5 Category V – Construction Methods	231
4.4.6 Category VI – Environment, Safety, and Health	248
4.5 The Next Steps	261
4.6 Summary	264
CHAPTER 5 : CONCLUSIONS	265
REFERENCES.....	268
APPENDIX: LABOR-HOUR ESTIMATES OF THE CII MODEL PLANT	272

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1: Implementation of CII Automation & Integration Work Functions and Mechanical Craft Productivity.....	16
Table 2-2: Percentage Improvement in Raw Labor Productivity Measurements, Considering Automation and Integration	16
Table 2-3: Implementation of CII Materials Management Work Functions and Mechanical Craft Productivity.....	20
Table 2-4: Percentage Improvement in Raw Labor Productivity Measurements, Considering Material Management	21
Table 2-5: Implementation of CII Safety Work Functions and Mechanical Craft Productivity	22
Table 2-6: Percentage Improvement in Raw Labor Productivity Measurements.....	23
Table 2-7: Implementation of CII Team Building Work Functions and Mechanical Craft Productivity.....	25
Table 2-8: Percentage Improvement in Raw Labor Productivity Measurements, Considering Team Building	25
Table 2-9: Implementation of Front End Planning Work Functions and Mechanical Craft Productivity.....	27
Table 2-10: Percentage Improvement in Raw Labor Productivity Measurements, Considering Front End Planning	27
Table 3-1: Sample Project Summary (Provided by Dow Chemical).....	39
Table 3-2: Pipe Support Cost Comparison Between Welded and HALFEN Powerclick	41
Table 3-3: Total Cost Savings From HALFEN Powerclick System	42
Table 3-4: Root Cause Evaluation and Validation	53
Table 3-5: Benefit from Laser Scanning Application in FARM Area.....	56
Table 3-6: Additional Benefits from Laser Scanning.....	56
Table 3-7: Site Drilling or Welding Costs vs. Lindapter Cost.....	69
Table 3-8: Labor-hour Comparison	85
Table 3-10: Cost Comparison of Tube & Clamp Scaffold to System Scaffold Over Five Years	87
Table 3-11: Typical Pipe Diameters and Materials	104
Table 3-12: Weldless Pipe Joining Vendors.....	105

Table 3-13: CII Model Plant Components and Costs	110
Table 3-14: Construction Cost Index (CCI) for 1986 to 2008.....	111
Table 3-15: CII Model Plant Hanger and Support Labor Hours	113
Table 3-16: Hanger and Support Labor Hours Using HALFEN Powerclick	113
Table 3-17: Laser Scanning Cost.....	118
Table 3-18: Construction Cost Index for 2007 to 2008 (CCI).....	118
Table 3-19: Rework Labor-cost Savings by Category.....	120
Table 3-20: Outside Overhead Piping.....	123
Table 3-21: Service Piping in Module	126
Table 3-22: Interpolation of Labor Hours for Cutting, Beveling, and Welding for Pipe Sizes 10” to 18”	129
Table 3-23: Interpolation of Labor Hours for Cutting, Beveling, and Welding for Pipe Sizes 20” to 30”	129
Table 3-24: Total Labor Hours Saved by Eliminating Cut-length	130
Table 3-25: Total Labor Hours for Service Piping 10” – 30”.....	130
Table 3-26: CII Model Plant Scaffolding Labor Hours	132
Table 3-27: CII Model Plant Labor Hours Applying Innovations.....	134
Table 3-28: CII Model Plant Labor Cost Applying Innovations	134
Table 3-29: CII Model Plant Labor Hours.....	137
Table 3-30: CII Model Plant Cost.....	137
Table 3-31: Summary of Mechanical Construction Productivity Innovations ... Error! Bookmark not defined.	
Table 4-1: Example Table of a Section of a Weighted Project Score Sheet for the PDRI (Gibson, 2008)	143
Table 4-2: Summary of Cost, Schedule, and Change Order Mean Performance vs. Authorization Estimate for PDRI Validation Projects (Dumont et. al., 1997)	144
Table 4-3: Example Section of a Completed PDRI Form (Gibson, 2008)	145
Table 4-4: Summary of IPRA Workshops (Walewski et. al., 2003)	157
Table 4-5: Sample Table of the IPRA Tool (Dinneen, et al., 2003)	158
Table 4-6: Example Alignment Survey (Gibson, 2005)	161
Table 4-7: Compass Communication Score Matrix (Kelly & Tucker, 1996).....	166

Table 4-8: DPI Score and Project Performance Assessment of DPI Validation Process (Diekmann et. al. 1994)	168
Table 4-9: Normalized Severity Scores for Productivity Categories.....	172
Table 4-10: Top 10 Most Significant Productivity Factors (Dai et. al., 2009)	172
Table 4-11: Section of the VOW Craft Worker Survey (Dai & Goodrum, 2007).....	174
Table 4-12: Most Significant Practices for all Projects (Dai & Goodrum, 2007)	200
Table 4-13: Significant Construction Cost Savings Impacts of Constructability Reviews (O'Connor, 1985)	217
Table 4-14: Benefits of Craft Training (Glover et. al., 2007).....	222
Table 4-15: Change in Equipment and Material Technology vs. Changes in Labor Productivity (Caldas et. al. 2008)	240

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: Craft Productivity Research Program	5
Figure 2-1: The BM&M Program’s Average Level of Automation Implementation across Work Functions.....	17
Figure 2-2: The BM&M Program’s Average Level of Integration Implementation across Work Functions.....	19
Figure 2-3: BM&M Program's Average Level of Materials Management Work Functions	21
Figure 2-4: BM&M Program's Average Level of Safety Work Functions.....	24
Figure 2-5: BM&M Program's Average Level of Team Building Work Functions.....	26
Figure 2-6: BM&M Program’s Average Level of Front End Planning Work Functions	28
Figure 3-1: HALFEN Powerclick System	35
Figure 3-2: Basic Components of HALFEN Powerclick System.....	36
Figure 3-3: Pipe Support Work Processes Comparison.....	37
Figure 3-4: Working Principle of Laser Scanning	46
Figure 3-5: Typical Laser Point Clouds.....	47
Figure 3-6: Overall Laser Scanning Work Flow.....	48
Figure 3-7: Laser Scanning Applications in Dow Chemical	49
Figure 3-8: Work Process Flow for Locating Tie Points.....	52
Figure 3-9: Time Utilization of Identified Factors	53
Figure 3-10: Connection Types (Vendor: Lindapter)	61
Figure 3-11: Pictures of Weldless Technology Used at Eastman Chemical	64
Figure 3-12: Structural Steel Connection Work Processes Comparison	67
Figure 3-13: Large Pipe Module.....	73
Figure 3-15: Comparison of Operation Environment.....	74
Figure 3-16: Piping Work Process Comparison	75
Figure 3-17: Designed Model with Gridline and Fiducial Points.....	76
Figure 3-18: Components with the Information of Dimension and.....	77
Figure 3-19: Setting Out and Checking Components and Modules by Total Station Continuously.....	77
Figure 3-20: Tube & Clamp Scaffold	81

Figure 3-21: Surelock Independent Scaffold	81
Figure 3-22: Frame Independent Scaffold	82
Figure 3-23: System Scaffold	83
Figure 3-24: Scaffolding Process Flow.....	83
Figure 3-25: Pipe Installation Work Progress Comparison	91
Figure 3-26: Grooved Couplings and Pipe	92
Figure 3-27: Components of the Grooved System	93
Figure 3-28: Total Installation Cost of Grooved Carbon Steel Compared to Welded Carbon Steel.....	94
Figure 3-29: Total Installation Cost of Grooved Stainless Steel Compared to Welded Stainless Steel.....	95
Figure 3-30: Labor-hours-per-foot for Grooved Carbon Steel Compared to Welded Carbon Steel.....	96
Figure 3-31: Press- or Crimp-to-connect Components.....	97
Figure 3-32: Press- or Crimp-to-connect Tool.....	97
Figure 3-34: Push-to-connect Fitting	99
Figure 3-35: Push-to-connect Piping and Fittings Configurations	100
Figure 3-36: Work-hours-per-foot Comparison between Push-to-connect and Traditional Means (Courtesy of Victaulic)	101
Figure 3-37 Cost-per-foot Comparison between Push-to-connect and Traditional Means (Courtesy of Victaulic)	102
Figure 3-38: Site Plot Plan.....	108
Figure 3-39: Model Plant Components.....	109
Figure 3-40: Process Diagram for Research Method.....	112
Figure 3-41: Labor-hour Reduction for Hangers & Supports.....	114
Figure 3-42: Labor-cost Reduction Using Weldless and Modularized Pipe Supports	116
Figure 3-43: Percentage of Rework by Category	119
Figure 3-44: Rework-labor-hour Reduction Using Laser Scanning	121
Figure 3-45: Labor-cost Reduction Using 3D Laser Scanning.....	121
Figure 3-46: Labor-hour Reduction Using Quick Connect Structural Steel Pipe Supports	124
Figure 3-47: Labor-cost Reduction Using Quick Connect Structural Steel Pipe Supports	125

Figure 3-48: Module Location in the Pipe Bridge of the CII Model Plant.....	127
Figure 3-49: Labor-hour Reduction by Eliminating Cut-length.....	131
Figure 3-50: Labor-cost Reduction by Eliminating Cut-length.....	131
Figure 3-51: Comparison of Labor Hours Using Tube and Clamp vs. System Scaffolding	133
Figure 3-52: Labor-cost Reduction Using System Scaffolding.....	133
Figure 3-53: Labor-cost Savings by Innovation	136
Figure 4-1: Correlation between Cost Health Scores and Project Cost Performance Outcomes (Choi, 2007).....	148
Figure 4-2: Correlation between Project Schedule Health Score and Project Schedule Performance Outcome (Choi, 2007).....	149
Figure 4-3: Example of a Leading Indicator (Anderson et. al. 2006).....	151
Figure 4-4: Roadmap for PPMOF Decisions (Haas et. al., 2002)	153
Figure 4-5: Strategic Level I of PPMOF (Haas et. al., 2002)	155
Figure 4-6: Compass Tool Research Process (Kelly & Tucker, 1996).....	162
Figure 4-7: Aggregated Group Regression Summary (Thomas et. al., 1999).....	164
Figure 4-8: Communications Score Regression Summary (Thomas et. al. 1999).....	165
Figure 4-9: DPI Evaluation Questions (Bramble, 1995)	169
Figure 4-10: Process of Implementing the VOW Tool on a Project (Dai & Goodrum, 2007)...	173
Figure 4-11: Construction Project Cost Influence Curve (Kelly & Tucker, 1996)	176
Figure 4-12: Timeline for the use of Construction Practice Indices.....	176
Figure 4-13: Categories with Sections of the BPPII.....	178
Figure 4-14: Organizational Structure of the BPPII	180
Figure 4-15: BPPII Master Form	181
Figure 4-16: An Example of a Section Audit Form.....	182
Figure 4-17: Section of PDRI Form Highlighting the Element Weights.....	186
Figure 4-18: Organizational Structure of Category I: Materials Management.....	188
Figure 4-19: Organizational Structure of Category I: Section A.....	190
Figure 4-20: Organizational Structure of Category I: Section B	196
Figure 4-21: Organizational Structure of Category II: Equipment Logistics	199
Figure 4-22: Organizational Structure of Category II: Section A.....	201
Figure 4-23: Organizational Structure of Category II: Section B.....	205

Figure 4-24: Organizational Structure of Category III: Craft Information Systems	207
Figure 4-25: Organizational Structure of Category III: Section A	208
Figure 4-26: Organizational Structure of Category III: Section B	210
Figure 4-27: Organizational Structure of Category III: Section C	216
Figure 4-28: Organizational Structure of Category IV: Human Resource Management	220
Figure 4-29: Organizational Structure of Category IV: Section A.....	221
Figure 4-30: Organizational Structure of Category IV: Section B	224
Figure 4-31: Improved RIR due to More Frequent Reward of Safety Incentives	225
Figure 4-32: Organizational Structure of Category IV: Section C	228
Figure 4-33: Organizational Structure of Category IV: Section D.....	230
Figure 4-34 Organizational Structure of Category V: Construction Methods.....	232
Figure 4-35: Organizational Structure of Category V: Section A	233
Figure 4-36: Organizational Structure of Category V: Section B.....	236
Figure 4-37: Organizational Structure of Category V: Section C.....	239
Figure 4-38: Organizational Structure of Category V: Section D	243
Figure 4-39: Organizational Structure of Category VI: Environment, Safety, and Health	248
Figure 4-40: Organizational Structure of Category VI: Section A.....	251
Figure 4-41: Organizational Structure of Category VI: Section B	255
Figure 4-42: Organizational Structure of Category VI: Section C	257
Figure 4-43: Improvement in RIR when all Workers Receive Safety Orientation to a Jobsite (Hinze, 2003)	258
Figure 4-44: Improvement in RIR when the Orientation is Formal (Hinze, 2003)	259
Figure 4-45: RIR Improves with the frequency of Toolbox Safety Meetings (Hinze, 2003).....	259
Figure 4-46: Tentative Structure of the Workshop.....	262

CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Despite a century of sporadic advances in equipment, tools, materials, and prefabrication strategies, direct work still typically amounts to no more than 35-45% of a craft worker's time on the job. Increasing direct work time would offer an opportunity for achieving a breakthrough in craft productivity in construction. To enable such a breakthrough is beyond the scope of a typical CII research team. For any substantial chance of this kind of success, a research program would be required. And, such a program would have to have a clearly defined first phase, one that initiates a sustained effort at achieving a breakthrough.

As a whole, the United States has enjoyed almost continuous productivity growth for the last several decades, with especially strong growth in this past decade. Recent research by the Brookings Institute has determined that much of the nation's productivity growth could be attributable to improved production and use of information technology, increased competition due to globalization, and changes in workplace practices and firm organizations. However, the research also points out that construction bucked this trend by experiencing negative productivity growth within the timeframe of their analysis, 1995 to 2001.

Other studies have produced contradictory data. For example, research conducted through the Sloan Center for Construction Industry Studies at the University of Texas at Austin, examined labor and partial factor productivity trends using microeconomic data for