

# CASE STUDY: SCOPE-COST-TIME INTEGRATED MODEL WITH WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE

By

Forest Peterson, Renate Fruchter & Martin Fischer

CIFE Working Paper #WP115 April 2009 – revised November 2014

**STANFORD UNIVERSITY** 

# **COPYRIGHT © 2009 BY** Center for Integrated Facility Engineering

If you would like to contact the authors, please write to:

c/o CIFE, Civil and Environmental Engineering Dept., Stanford University The Jerry Yang & Akiko Yamazaki Environment & Energy Building 473 Via Ortega, Room 292, Mail Code: 4020 Stanford, CA 94305-4020

# CASE STUDY: SCOPE-TIME-COST INTEGRATED MODEL WITH WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE

#### Forest Peterson, Renate Fruchter, Martin Fischer

Dept. of Civil and Env. Eng. Center for Integrated Facility Engineering Stanford University, granite@stanford.edu, fruchter@stanford.edu, fischer@stanford.edu

#### Abstract

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate the feasibility of integrating scope cost and time for construction project planning. This study is important because it will demonstrate the use of a work breakdown structure as a classifying code to facilitate creating an integrated system. This will add to the science of project management in that the literature covering this topic does not specify how to correlate specific item's scope-cost-time information across the three models. This project matters because the solution is adaptable to work breakdown formats readily available to any construction professional.

This case study relied on project management software tools common on construction projects. The case example is an academic building constructed from concrete. The analyses of the study results are qualitative.

The results demonstrate that integrated model systems are possible using older software tools. The work breakdown classification method produced by this study is applicable in non-computer applications as well as integrated systems.

The studies purpose has been achieved. The question of how integrating scope-cost-time across software tools is accomplished has proved to be a work breakdown structure. This was not the answer expected. In preliminary informal discussions with both researchers and practitioners it was anticipated that such a system was not probable. This study was limited by the scope of the test model and by time limitations.

The practical implication is construction project planners are being advised to begin this method. Any projects implementing an integrated system should consider deriving a similar system prior to the scopecost-time planning process. Further research is needed to determine if this method applies to more advanced BIM systems and what project types.

#### Keywords

Integrated system, Building Information Model, BIM, Product Information Model, Scope-cost-schedule, Project Planning, estimate, schedule, take-off

#### Introduction

The automated steam engine is said to have been invented by a young child. In the early days of steam power steam engines were used to simply push a piston connected to a rocking beam. Due to the simplicity of these machines it was necessary to manually open a valve at the end of each stroke to release the pressure on the piston. Young children were employed to open and close this valve, an occupation called the *plug man* (Deakins 2008). As the story goes, one who wanted to play stickball outside with some other children devised a mechanism from scrap steel to do his job. He connected one end of a rod to the rocking beam and the other end to the lever for the valve. As the beam rocked back and forth it opened and closed the valve. Field engineers too have the need to devise a more efficient method of completing project planning. An early integration paper (Fischer and Kunz 1993) proposes an integrated system to update project information with any change in one system component.

In this case study a work breakdown structure (WBS) is employed to allow the same data to be used repeatedly from the product model, to the cost model, then to the process model and last a 4D model. An early reference to the need for such a hierarchy is a CIFE technical report that introduces a four level work breakdown structure called a *PMAP hierarchy* to represent product model components within CAD (Ito et. al 1989). A second article expands the use of the WBS as an activity naming method using an action, object and resource (Darwiche et. al 1989). Recently this has been expanded to include an action, object, resource and work space (Mourgues et al. 2007).

The most important concept that is essential is if objectan component is not in the product model then it is not going to be built unless some form of recipe formula is written calculate to its value by reference. It will not be in the estimate, it will not be scheduled and it will have no corresponding tracking component and no billing



element. Obviously there is commercial software that completes the same task of take-off and passing data through to the cost model and process model, though the process used here highlighted some details that are not always evident, specifically the importance of WBS classification. The method given here was the most effective available until recent advances in software tools (Ito et al. 1989).

#### **CIFE Work Breakdown Structure**

- Work Level 1: Project
- Work Level 2: Location
- Work Level 3: Sub-Location
- Work Level 4: Building Units / Disciplines
- Work Level 5: Master Schedule Activities
- Work Level 6: Objects
- Work Level 7: Operations

Table 2 Basic Work Breakdown Structure containing elements needed to classify an activity. This WBS can be expanded to include additional information as needed.

### Work Breakdown Structure

The first step in integrating the product model cost model and process model is a product model with layers codified using a WBS. The AIA is currently

🔛 Layer Properties Manager						<u>?</u> ×
38 % × V	Current layer: 1.4.7.9	3.63				
	me	On Freeze	Lock	Color	Linetune	
	1247	011110020	LOCK	20101	Санбриана	
	1.4.26	X 🞽	2	Cyan 40	Continuous	_
	19.20	X 🞽	2	- 20	Continuous	
	1.0.20	XX	2	0 30	Continuous	_
	4 2 21	X	2	204	Continuous	Ξ.
	4.3.31	XX	2	ieu	Continuous	
	4.3.47	X	2	Cyan 0 40	Continuous	
	4.4.20	X	2	<b>0</b> 40	Continuous	
	4963	XX	8	254	Continuous	
	7 2 21	X	2	204	Continuous	
	7.3.31	XX	2		Continuous	
	7.4.25	X	2	a do	Continuous	
	7.4.20	XX	2		Continuous	
	1 2 21	X	2	2:04	Continuous	
	1 2 47	XX	2	e leu	Continuous	
	1.4.25	X	2	Cyan 40	Continuous	
	1.9.20	XX	2		Continuous	
- 12	1.0.00	X	2	0.00	Continuous	
→ 1.2 → 1.2	4 3 31	X 🞽	2	254	Continuous	
- 12	4.3.31	X 🞽	2	160	Continuous	
- 12	4.3.47	X	2	cyan	Continuous	
- 1.2	4.4.20	X 🞽	2	40	Continuous	- 1
- 12	4.3.23	X 😫	2	30	Continuous	
→ 1.2 → 1.2	4.3.63	X 👱	2	204	Continuous	- 1
- 1.2	.7.3.31	X 👱	0	red	Continuous	
	7.3.47	X 👱	2	cyan	Continuous	
→ 1.2 →	.7.4.25	¥ 💆	10	40	Continuous	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	.7.9.63	V 👱	0	254	Lontinuous	
1.3	1.3.31	V 💭	10	red	Continuous	
- 1.3 - 1.3	1.3.47	V 👱	2	cyan	Continuous	
■ 1.3	.1.4.25	8 💆	1	40	Continuous	
- 1.3	1.9.29	V 💭	70	30	Continuous	
→ 1.3	1.9.63	S 🧕	2	254	Continuous	- 1
- 1.3	.4.3.31	9 Q	1	red	Continuous	
- 1.3 - 1.3	.4.3.47	V 🛄	70	cyan	Continuous	_
- 1.3	.4.4.25	8 💆	70	40	Continuous	-
- 1.3 - 1.3	4.9.29	V 👱	2	30	Continuous	-
↓ 1.3	4.9.63	8 👱	2	254	Continuous	-
- 1.3	.7.3.31	V 🛄	70	red	Continuous	-
→ 1.3	.7.3.47	S 🧕	2	📘 cyan	Continuous	-
- 1.3	7.4.25	9 🛄	7	40	Continuous	-
- 1.3	7.9.63	V 💭	70	254	Continuous	-
- 1.4	.1.3.47	S 🦲	7	📘 cyan	Continuous	-
- 1.4	.1.9.63	V 💭	70	254	Continuous	-
→ 1.4	4.3.47	V 🧿	70	📘 cyan	Continuous	-
1.4	.4.9.63	V 🖸	7	254	Continuous	-
<u> </u>	7.3.47	S 🧿	7	📘 cyan	Continuous	
Search for la	30.00		_		<u> </u>	▶
All: 72 layers displayed of 72 tota	layers					
□ Invert filter □ Indicat	e layers in <u>u</u> se					
Apply to layers toolbar	OK	Cancel	1		<u>H</u> e	dp.

Figure 1: Within the CAD software there is the ability to export to a text file a list of all layers used in the model. With deliberate naming of layers this export can function to identify objects within the model. proposing a standardized naming convention utilizing abbreviation dependent codes. "The Layer Guidelines published by the AIA (American Institute of Architects), suggest layer names that look like this (www.autodeskpress.com/resources/olcs/acad2000/jan01/comman d\_january01.html):

# È-LGHT-EMER-NEWW

#### E-LGHT-SWCH-DEMO".

A number based system relying on integers sequenced to give context information on objects allows easier conversion to other software applications. The disparity between architect descriptions and construction coding is something that can be solved by the involvement of the constructor in creation of the product model. Working closely with the product modelers to determine what needs to be modeled for this purpose and what the work breakdown structure (WBS) is for each layer. In AutoDesk the layers can be named as created or imported as a predefined set. The import tool gives the modeler the option of defining what the project must contain then importing the set of codes and using these to draft the model. This is accomplished in AutoDesk by opening layers then open layers manager and select add. Assign a name to the layers set that will be created. Select ok then deselect all data; all we want is the layer codes. Select export and save the file to a folder containing other project data. We have now created a list of all the objects in the project..

#### Import List to Spreadsheet

After exporting the layer list from the product model then open a prepared spreadsheet. Starting with the first tab on the left, named AutoDesk model, there are column heading for the eight WBS levels. This example uses a simplified WBS than the AROW form recently proposed by Mourgues. To import the product model list of layers open data/import external data/import data then open the saved file. The file is a text file and the search needs to be expanded to include all files. The layer codes are saved as dot delineated so in the import tool check the option other and place a (.) in the box. Select finish and a list of the object/layer codes is imported into excel with each WBS level in a separate column. Once imported the data is not in a usable format yet and requires more manipulation before use. Importing the data in different columns allows use of the different components of the WBS to identify what object is represented by the code.

In this application the WBS was shortened to fit the time constraints on the project. In an actual application or for a more comprehensive project, the full WBS sequence of sets needs to be created in the CAD model. [graphic CAD  $\rightarrow$  text  $\rightarrow$  excel]



Figure 2: We need the codified layers in a format we can import to excel. The *layer states manager* provides the function to create a new *layer state name* to which the current product model layers can be saved as a text file.

	Space	Description	<u>N</u> ew
ress	Model		Delete
			I <u>m</u> port
			Export
er settings to restore			
0n / Off		🔲 Cojor	Select All
Erozen / Thawed		🗌 Linetype	
Loc <u>k</u> ed / Unlocked		Lineweight	
Plot / No Plot		Plot style	
			/ The sure of
Locked / Unlocked	harma d	Lineweight Plot style	Clear <u>A</u>

Figure 3: We do not want all the information associated with a layer, we only need the layer name itself since this is codified with information. With the *layer states manager* select the layer settings to export, for our purposes we only need the layer names



Figure 4: Once the layers are exported to a text file, the list can then be imported into excel using the excel import function. This function provides the ability to define delineation for columns.

Text Import Wizard - Step 2 of 3	? ×
This screen lets you set the delimiters your data contains. You can see how your text is affected in the preview below.	one
□ Space □ Other: .	<u> </u>
Data preview	
0 LAYERSTATEDICTIONARY	Ē
0	
	-1
Correct Rock Next S	Finich

Figure 5: We want the breakdown codes delineated in different columns so we can then use a lookup function to identify the code components. Select the delineation between breakdown codes; in this case dots are used. Tab, semicolon, comma and space are other options.

An issue that arose while creating a more automated version of the model is the conversion from columns to dot delineation. Using text files it is possible to go from dot delineation to spreadsheet but going from spreadsheet to dot delineation is not possible. This causes some difficulty in moving classifications around the spreadsheet and appears to be one of the limitations of spreadsheets.

# **Sorting List**

Once the product model object/layer list is in the spreadsheet then the list need to be manipulated to obtain a list of codes. Using the sort function, data/sort, sort by some column of the WBS other than the first. The codes will be listed sequentially and

any extra data will be after the codes. Delete the unneeded extra data. Next import a second set of codes from the same AutoDesk export file. The second set of codes is not delineated by column and is kept as a dot delineated. This second set of codes is used in place of the ability to restore the dot delineation from columns delineation of the codes. The list needs to be sorted so that both the column delineated data and the dot delineated data corresponds with each other in there respective rows. To achieve this use the data sort function and highlight the column delineated codes and sort by WBS 2, WBS 3 and WBS 4. The two sets of codes should now be in the same sequence.

WL1	_2	_3	4	WL5	WL6	WL7	WL8	Line Number
0	Γ							
LAYERSTATEDICTIONARY								
0								
LAYERSTATE								
1								
express								
91								
495								
301								
290								
0								
302								
1	4	7	9	63				
8								
1	1	1	9	29				
90								
8								
62								
30								
370								
-3								
6								
Continuous								
2								
Color_30								
8								
1	1	4	9	29				
90								

Figure 6: Once the layer list text file is imported to excel we must cleanup additional layer information not needed in this applications. Material type or other identifying information could be useful in a different setup, for this case delete this information.

WL1	WL2	WL3	WL4	WL5	WL6	WL7	WL8	Line Number
1	0	0	3	30				1.0.0.3.30
1	0	0	3	- 30				1.0.0.3.30
1	0	0	3	- 30				1.0.0.3.30
1	0	0	3	- 30				1.0.0.3.30
1	0	0	3	31				1.0.0.3.31
1	1	1	3	31				1.1.1.3.31
1	1	1	3	47				1.1.1.3.47
1	1	1	4	25				1.1.1.4.25
1	1	1	9	- 29				1.1.1.9.29
1	1	1	9	63				1.1.1.9.63
1	1	4	3	31				1.1.4.3.31
1	1	4	3	47				1.1.4.3.47
1	1	4	4	25				1.1.4.4.25
1	1	4	9	- 29				1.1.4.9.29
1	1	4	9	63				1.1.4.9.63
1	1	7	3	31				1.1.7.3.31
1	1	7	3	47				1.1.7.3.47
1	1	7	4	25				1.1.7.4.25
1	1	7	9	63				1.1.7.9.63
1	2	1	3	31				1.2.1.3.31
1	2	1	3	47				1.2.1.3.47
1	2	1	4	25				1.2.1.4.25
1	2	1	9	29				1.2.1.9.29
1	2	1	9	63				1.2.1.9.63
1	2	4	3	31				1.2.4.3.31
1	2	4	3	47				1.2.4.3.47
1	2	4	4	25				1.2.4.4.25
1	2	4	9	- 29				1.2.4.9.29
1	2	4	9	63				1.2.4.9.63
1	2	7	3	31				1.2.7.3.31
1	2	7	3	47				1.2.7.3.47
1	2	7	4	25				1.2.7.4.25
1	2	7	9	63				1.2.7.9.63
1	3	1	3	31				1.3.1.3.31
1	3	1	3	47				1.3.1.3.47
1	3	1	4	25				1.3.1.4.25
1	3	1	9	29				1.3.1.9.29
1	3	1	9	63				1.3.1.9.63
1	3	4	3	31				1.3.4.3.31
1	3	4	3	47				1.3.4.3.47
1	3	4	4	25			-	1.3.4.4.25
1	3	4	9	29				1.3.4.9.29
1	3	4	9	63				1.3.4.9.63
1	3	- 7	3	31				1.3.7.3.31
1	3	- /	3	4/				1.3.7.3.47
1	3	- /	4	25				1.3.7.4.25
1	3		9	63				1.3.7.9.63
1	4	1	3	4/				1.4.1.3.47
1	4	1	9	63				1.4.1.9.63
1	4	4	3	4/				1.4.4.3.47
	i∖3p	Auto	lesk.	Esti	mate	/ wB	s Nami	ing / Schedule

Figure 7: With the extra layer parameters deleted the list can now be sorted to create a column separated list of object-components contained within the product model. In this list each Work Breakdown Level (WL) code contains specific identifying information, cumulatively providing an exact identification.

# **Cost Model Estimate**

With the two sets of codes in the dot delineated and column delineated formats, the codes are now ready to be copied to the next tab. The next tab is the estimating tab. To copy, highlight all eight columns of the WBS and the one column of the dot delineated set. Open the estimating tab and paste in the corresponding columns. The spreadsheet is formatted so the codes can be directly copied and pasted. The codes can now be sorted by the WBS columns into the estimate break down desired.

Once the WBS codes are pasted into the estimate tab then the entire estimate is basically complete. All of the corresponding costs and production rates are automatically looked up and appear in the estimate. There is a database located on the production RS Means tab that contains a partial database of RS Means production rates copied from the RSMeans website for free [web address].

# **Take-off Scope**

The takeoff quantity for each item can now be entered into the spread sheet. The takeoff quantities are possible to be exported from a Building Information Model (BIM) and would facilitate their automated import. The number of crews that are placed on each activity can be adjusted to obtain the desired durations. This may take several iterations to have the resources leveled properly. Another option is to import to the process model, level the resources then export back to excel.

In this instance once the WBS codes are copied to the estimate tab and the crews were assigned for the correct durations, the project estimate is complete.

# Historical Library

The production rates in the RS Means database are compiled from empirical measurements, the basic format or concept can be retained but actual data should be project region specific, wage rate specific, and modified for project climate conditions. The production rates should also be scaled on a variable range to account for learning curve, and repetitiveness of work. In the current RS Means library codes are not dot delineated between sets. For the data needed for this project I had to manually add dots.

			WL3	WL6	WL7	WL8	WL9														Unit Cos	sts				
ML1 V	VL2	WL3	wL4	WL5	WL6	WL7	wee	Line Number	Description	OD (down)	Takeoff Quantity	Crews	Unit	Crew	Daily Output	Labor Hours	Bare Material	Material O&P	Bare Labor	Labor O&P	Bare Equipment	Equipment O&P	Material	Material	Bare Total	Total
1 4		1	9	63							1	1														
1 0			9	29	10	300390		9.29.10.300390	With compound sk	1.5	3,571	3	S.F.	2 Carp	775.00	0.02	0.40	0.44	0.76	1.18	0.00	0.00	0.40	0.44	1.16	1.16
1 0		0	9	42							1	1														
1 0		1	9	23							1	1														
1 0		1	9	51	23	100300		9.51.23.100300	Fiberglass boards, film fa	3.3	6,100	3	S.F.	1 Carp	625.00	0.01	0.59	0.65	0.47	0.73	0.00	0.00	0.59	0.65	1.06	1.06
1 0		1	9	68							1	1														
1 0		1	9	91	23	202000		9.91.23.202000	Paint, oil base, brushw	3.2	4,167	2	S.F.	1 Pord	650.00	0.01	0.07	0.07	0.40	0.61	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.47	0.47
1 0		4	9	23							1	1														
		4	9	51	23	100300		9.51.23.100300	Fiberglass boards, film fa	3.3	6,100	3	S.F.	1 Carp	625.00	0.01	0.59	0.65	0.47	0.73	0.00	0.00	0.59	0.65	1.06	1.06
1 0		4	9	68							1	1														
1 0		4	9	91	23	202000		9.91.23.202000	Paint, oil base, brushw	3.2	4,167	2	S.F.	1 Pord	650.00	0.01	0.07	0.07	0.40	0.61	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.47	0.47
1 0		7	9	23							1	1														
1 0		7	9	51	23	100300		9.51.23.100300	Fiberglass boards, film fa	3.3	6,100	3	S.F.	1 Carp	625.00	0.01	0.59	0.65	0.47	0.73	0.00	0.00	0.59	0.65	1.06	1.06
1 0		7	9	68							1	1														
1 0		7	9	91	23	202000		9.91.23.202000	Paint, oil base, brushw	3.2	4,167	2	S.F.	1 Pord	650.00	0.01	0.07	0.07	0.40	0.61	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.47	0.47
1		1	9	23							1	1														
1 1		1	9	29	10	300390		9.29.10.300390	With compound sk	1.5	3,571	3	S.F.	2 Carp	775.00	0.02	0.40	0.44	0.76	1.18	0.00	0.00	0.40	0.44	1.16	1.16
1 1		1	9	51	23	100300		9.51.23.100300	Fiberglass boards, film fa	3.3	6,100	3	S.F.	1 Carp	625.00	0.01	0.59	0.65	0.47	0.73	0.00	0.00	0.59	0.65	1.06	1.06
1 1		1	9	63							1	1														
1 1		1	9	68							1	1														
1 1		1	9	91	23	202000		9.91.23.202000	Paint, oil base, brushw	3.2	4,167	2	S.F.	1 Pord	650.00	0.01	0.07	0.07	0.40	0.61	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.47	0.47
1 1		4	9	23							1	1														
1 1		4	9	29	10	300390		9.29.10.300390	With compound sk	1.5	3,571	3	S.F.	2 Carp	775.00	0.02	0.40	0.44	0.76	1.18	0.00	0.00	0.40	0.44	1.16	1.16
1 1		4	9	51	23	100300		9.51.23.100300	Fiberglass boards, film fa	3.3	6,100	3	S.F.	1 Carp	625.00	0.01	0.59	0.65	0.47	0.73	0.00	0.00	0.59	0.65	1.06	1.00
1 1		4	9	63							1	1	L													
1 1		4	9	68							1	1														
1 4		ы	10	104	ino.	1000000		0.04.02.000000	Det sil haas heushuu		4467	2	C E	4 Devel	ezo no	0.04	0.07	0.07	0.40	0.64	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.47	0.47

1	ACT	TITLE	OD	ES	EF		VBS
2							
4							
ł	1.0.0.11.21	Connect Equipment	3.0	30-May-16	01–Jun–16		
	1.0.0.11.33	Install Elevator Rails and Equipment	15.0	16-Mar-16	05-Apr-16	1.0.0.11.21	
1	1.0.0.11.5	Install Elevator Cab and Finishes	2.0	20-Jun-16	21-Jun-16	1.0.0.11.33	
	1.0.0.2.42	Crush & Recycle Concrete	13.0	30-Sep-15	16-Oct-15	1.0.0.11.5	
	1.0.0.23.21	Install geothermal heatpump	5.0	16-Oct-15	22-Oct-15	1.0.0.2.42	
	1.0.0.23.5	Startup and Test HVAC	1.0	02-Jun-16	02-Jun-16	1.0.0.23.21	
1	1.0.0.23.57	Set Heat Pump	5.0	16-May-16	20-May-16	1.0.0.23.5	
1	1.0.0.23.6	Test and Balance HVAC Equip.	1.0	18-Aug-16	18-Aug-16	1.0.0.23.57	
I	1.0.0.26.24	Set Mechanical and Electrical Equip.	15.0	05-Feb-16	25-Feb-16	1.0.0.23.6	
	1.0.0.3.30	F/P/S foundation concrete	29.0			1.0.0.26.24	
1	1.0.0.3.31	F/P/S foundation columns	3.0			1.0.0.3.30	
	1.0.0.3.47	F/P/S foundation beams	3.0			1.0.0.3.31	
I	1.0.0.5.51	Install basement stairs	7.5			1.0.0.3.47	
ł	1.0.0.5.52	Install basement railing	5.0			1.0.0.5.51	
ł	1.0.0.9.29	F/P/S basement interior walls	2.5			1.0.0.5.52	
I	1.0.0.9.42	Instructional labs complete	0.0		25-Apr-16	1.0.0.9.29	
1	1.0.1.12.32	Finish Carpentry and Millwork basement E	0.5	10-Aug-16	16-Aug-16	1.0.0.9.42	
	1.0.1.22.11	Rough-In Plumbing/Piping basement E	1.5	03-Mar-16	23-Mar-16	1.0.1.12.32	
Ŧ	1.0.1.22.42	Install Plumbing Fixtures bacoment F	0.5	10-Aug-16	11-Aug-16	1.0.1.22.11	
1	1.0.1.23.31	Install HVAC Ducts basement H 🕺 Cut	1.0	26-Feb-16	10-Mar-16	1.0.1.22.42	
				00 T.1 1C	20 7.1 17	1 0 1 22 21	

Figure 8: The correlation between cost model cost code and process model activity code is shown here. This correlation creates a one-to-one match for each estimate item or group of estimate items, resulting in improved integration between the tools.

RS Means provided access to their data base for free for a limited time. They gave me permission to copy as much data as I needed. Due to the setup of their website it is time consuming to copy the data and then manipulate to a usable state.

#### Classification

The CSI MasterFormat used by RS Means is also reused for this model. The construction specification institute (CSI) 16 division master format has been expanded by CSI to a 31 division format and now more recently to 50 divisions [website]. Some of the 31 divisions are not used so the actual number of divisions is less. The WBS structure used for this project is a compilation of the work breakdown structure (WBS), cost breakdown structure (CBS) and project breakdown structure (PBS). This combination of breakdown structures results in one work breakdown for all three breakdown structures.

I		31113200500	1	WL1	WL2	WL3	WL4	WL5	WL6	WL7	WL8							
		1.0.0.3.11.13.200500.1		1	0	- (	) 3	11	13	200500	1							
Т		WL1	E	Ехрг	ess													
Т		WL2			Base	emen	t											
Т		WL3				Bas	ement											
1		WL4					3 Co	oncret	e									
Т		WL5						0311	Con	crete For	ming							
1		WL6							0311	13 Struc	tural C	ast-In	-Place	e Concre	te Formi	ng		
1		WL7								Exteri	ior spa	ndrel	l, job-l	uilt plyv	vood, 12"	wide, 1 u	se	
T		WL8									Labo	r						
1	exp.	1.0.0.3.11.13.50015.1	in	istall	031	113 S	tructu	ral Ca	st-In-	Place Co	ncrete	Form	ning					
Т			1	WL1	WL2	WL3	WL4	WL5	WL6	WL7	WL8	W	VL1	WL2	WL3	WL4	WL5	WL6 V
Г				1	0	(	) 3	11	13	200500	1	E)	xpress	Basement	Basement	3 Concrete	0311 Concrete Forming	031119 Insulating Concrete Forming
Т	1	WL1: Construction project		1	2	;	7 3	31			1	E)	xpress	2nd floor	center	3 Concrete	0311 Concrete Forming	031113 Structural Cast-In-Place Concrete Forming
Т	1	Express		1	2	1	7 3	31			1	E)	xpress	2nd floor	center	3 Concrete	0311 Concrete Forming	031113 Structural Cast-In-Place Concrete Forming
Т				1	2	:	7 3	47			1	E)	xpress	2nd floor	center	3 Concrete	0311 Concrete Forming	031113 Structural Cast-In-Place Concrete Forming
1	1	WL2: Construction areas		1	2		7 4	25			1	E	xpress	2nd floor	center	4 Masonry	0311 Concrete Forming	031113 Structural Cast-In-Place Concrete Forming
1	0 1	Basement		1	2		7 9	63			1	E:	xpress	2nd floor	center	9 Finishes	0311 Concrete Forming	031113 Structural Cast-In-Place Concrete Forming
1	1	1st floor		1	3		1 3	31			1	E:	xpress	3rd floor	Module E	3 Concrete	0311 Concrete Forming	031113 Structural Cast-In-Place Concrete Forming
T	2 :	2nd floor		1	3		1 3	47			1	E:	xpress	3rd floor	Module E	3 Concrete	0311 Concrete Forming	031113 Structural Cast-In-Place Concrete Forming
ſ	3 :	3rd floor		1	3		1 4	25			1	E>	xpress	3rd floor	Module E	4 Masonry	0311 Concrete Forming	031113 Structural Cast-In-Place Concrete Forming
1	4 1	Roof		1	3		1 9	29			1	E)	xpress	3rd floor	Module E	9 Finishes	0311 Concrete Forming	031113 Structural Cast-In-Place Concrete Forming
1	5 :	Sitework																

Figure 9: This view of the classification code provides a breakdown of several codes by work level. From WL 1 through WL 8, each level provides some additional information reducing the possible objects this classifies. Using this form of work Breakdown Structure (WBS) provides a simple and repeatable method to create and derive classifications.

1		1	WL3	WL6	WL7	WL8	WL3				1										L
								Line Number				Daily	Labor	Bare	Material	Bare	Labor	Bare	Equipment		
WI	1 ¥L2	WL3	WL4	I WL5	WL6	WL7	WL8	Enternoor	Description	Unit	Crew	Output	Hours	Material	O8P	Labor	O&P	Equipment	O8P	Material	
1			3	11	13	50015		31113050015	Aluminum, smooth face, 3' x 8', buy	SFCA				12.80	14.10					12.80	L
1			3	11	13	50020		31113050020	2' × 8'	SFCA				15.95	17.55					15.95	L
1			3	11	13	50050		31113050050	12"×8"	SFCA				22.00	24.50					22.00	
			3	11	13	50100		31113050100	6" × 8'	SFCA				21.50	23.50					21.50	
i –			3	11	13	50150		31113050150	3' × 4'	SFCA				16.00	17.60					16.00	
i –			3	11	13	50200		31113050200	2' × 4'	SFCA				17.90	19.70					17.90	
1			3	11	13	50250		31113050250	12" × 4'	SFCA				24.00	26.00					24.00	
1			3	11	13	50300		31113050300	6" × 4'	SFCA				27.50	30.50					27.50	
1			3	11	13	50500		31113050500	Textured brick face, 3' × 8', buy	SFCA				14.50	15.95					14.50	Γ
1			3	11	13	50550		31113050550	2' × 8'	SFCA				19.20	21.00					19.20	Γ
			3	11	13	50600		31113050600	12" × 8'	SFCA				25.50	28.00					25.50	Γ
1			3	11	13	50650		31113050650	6" × 8'	SFCA				35.50	39.00					35.50	Γ
1			3	11	13	50700		31113050700	3' × 4'	SFCA				16.75	18.45					16.75	Γ
			3	11	13	50750		31113050750	2' × 4'	SFCA				21.00	23.00					21.00	Г
i			3	11	13	50800		31113050800	12" × 4'	SFCA				28.50	31.50					28.50	Г
i i			3	11	13	50850		31113050850	6" × 4'	SFCA				46.00	50.50					46.00	Г
1			3	11	13	51000		31113051000	Average cost incl. accessories but not incl. ties	SFCA				21.50	23.50					21.50	Г
1			3	11	13	51100		31113051100	Rent per month	SFCA				2.15	2.37					2.15	Г
1			3	11	13	52000		31113052000	Metal framed plywood 2' x 8' buy	SFCA				7.20	7.95					7.20	T
1			3	11	13	52050		31113052050	2' × 3'	SFCA				7.95	8.75					7.95	T
			3	11	13	52100		31113052100	1' × 3'	SFCA				10.80	11.90					10.80	T
1			3	11	13	52200		31113052200	Average for corners & specials	SFCA				14.40	15.85					14.40	T
1			3	11	13	52300		31113052300	Rent per month	SFCA				0.97	1.07					0.97	
			3	11	13	53000		31113053000	Plywood modular prefabricated 2' x 8' buy	SFCA				2.01	2.21					2.01	
i			3	11	13	53050		31113053050	Average cost for corners, fillers & specials	SFCA				2.61	2.87					2.61	
i i			3	11	13	53200		31113053200	Average cost incl. accessories but not incl. ties	SFCA				2.71	2.98					2.71	
1			3	11	13	53500		31113053500	Steel 2' × 4' buy	SFCA				7.95	8.75					7.95	T
1			3	11	13	53550		31113053550	2" × 4'	SFCA				14.40	15.85					14.40	T
1			-								1										

Figure 10: This view of the cost model shows copying the product model layer codes and pasting them to the estimate tab results in an automatic estimate of each object. The only additional information needed is the takeoff quantities provided by either a BIM takeoff or manual takeoff. The simplicity in the system is the classification codes correlating with the cost models classification system, resulting in an automated takeoff. The additional upfront time spent defining layer names is regained in iterations of estimates.

#### Time, Process Model or Schedule

Once the data in the estimate has been audited for project specific corrections then the classification, description and durations are ready to be imported into the schedule. The P3 schedule tab is formatted for importing into Primavera P3 process model software. Copy the code column, description and duration columns, then paste into the schedule tab. For the schedule to be imported into primavera the schedule tab needs to be copied into a new worksheet and saved. Then with the primavera application open, open the tools/project utilities/import. Link the import tool to the file location of the excel schedule tab. Once the file is imported then all of the activity codes, descriptions and durations will be listed. The sequencing and logic of the schedule must be manually completed. It could be possible to create an excel listing of standard logic sequences for various activity codes. The most common sequences would remove the need to define these in every schedule. Once the logic is complete press F9 and update the schedule. After review, if any changes to the schedule durations are necessary, export the schedule back into the excel file. In the excel spreadsheet copy the data from the schedule tab back into the estimate tab. Adjust the durations by reassigning the number of crews to the activities. Once the durations



Figure 11: One of the more difficult tasks with Primavera P3 has been made easier with version P5 and subsequent versions, exporting and importing data. This is the true secret to professional scheduling. What one scheduler could spend a week doing another will have completed in less than several hours. are as desired then import the data back into primavera and update again. In the P3 version of Primavera schedule the WBS is manually created.

### 4D Model

Once the schedule is completed then create the 4D model. Import the CAD .dwg file and schedule into CommonPoint, and then map the product model objects to process model operations. If the classification codes in the product model match the classification codes in the process model then the mapping task is simplified. The integrating spreadsheet created for this worked well and allowed for a much shorter turnaround time in design iterations. The final product of an integrated 3D model, estimate, schedule and 4D model is rudimentary but establishes that it is possible. The model can use more work and macros could automate

Perform     Edx     Were     Treat     Fear     Perform     Perform </th <th>29JUN16 OCT NOV</th> <th>UEC J</th>	29JUN16 OCT NOV	UEC J
Image: Construction of the second sector conduit     Image: Construction of the second sector co	29JUN16 OCT NOV	Wed
Image: Second	29JUN16 OCT HOV	Wed
Activity     Activity     Origi     Early     2015     Jan     2015     2015       ID     Bescription     Dur     SL     OCI     Nov     DEC     JAN     FBB     MAR     APR     MAY     JUN     JUL     AUG     SEP       10.0.2.42     Crush & Recycle Concrete     13 (090C115     270C115     MOMERATION Recycle Concrete     JUL     AUG     SEP       15.02.55     [Install Underground Electric Conduit     15 (02FEB16     SEPEDIE     SEPEDIE <t< th=""><th>OCT   NOV</th><th></th></t<>	OCT   NOV	
ID     Description     Dur     Start     Finish     S     VLI     RVV     UCC     JRIN     TES     MAX     JRIN     JUL     JUL     JUL     AUG     Start       1     0.02.42     Crush & Recycle Concrete     13     030C/15     270C/15     HEMBLY Crush & Recycle Concrete     1		
Internal		
Bectrical       15.0.26.5     Install Underground Electric Conduit     18 [02FEB16		
1.5.0.26.5 Install Underground Electric Conduit 18 02FEB16 25FEB16		
Earthwork	1 1	
1.5.8.31.2 Install Temporary Fence 2 30SEP15 01OCT15 Install Temporary Fence		
1.5.8.31.4 Install Soil Retention System 20 280CT15 24NOV15		
1.5.0.31.2 Excavate Basement 49 25NOV15 01FEB16 Big Basement		
Basement		
Basement		
Equipment		
1.0.0.11.7 Install construction elevator 2 02FEB16 03FEB16 ginstall construction elevator		
1.0.0.11.3 Install Elevator Rails and Equipment 15 27JUN16 15JUL16	Equipment	
1.0.0.11.5 Install Elevator Cab and Finishes 2 18JUL16 19JUL16 Install Elevator Cab and Ele	Finishes	(
1.0.0.11.6 Install Atrium Mech Syst. 20 01AUG16 26AUG16	m Mech Syst.	
1.0.0.11.2 Connect Equipment 10 29AUG16 09SEP16	t Equipment	
HVAC		
1.0.0.23.2 Install geothermal heatpump 5 27JUN16 01JUL16	)	
1.0.23.5 Set Heat Pump 5 04JUL16 08JUL16		
1.0.23.6 Test and Balance HVAC Equip. 5 125EP16 165EP16	and Balance HVA	C Equip.
Electrical		
1.0.0.26.2 Set Mechanical and Electrical Equip. 15 11JUL16 29JUL16	Electrical Equip.	
Concrete		
1.0.0.3.30 F/P/S foundation concrete 29 28MAR16 05MAY16		
1.0.0.3.31 FIP/S foundation columns 3 06MAY16 10MAY16		
1.0.0.3.47 F/P/S foundation beams 3 11MAY16 13MAY16		
Metals		
1.0.0.5.51 Install basement stairs 7 16MAY16 24MAY16		
1.0.0.5.52 Install basement railing 5 [25MAY16 31MAY16 B] B] Install basement railing		
Finishes		
1.009.29 Frame basement interior wais 2 18/04/16 19/04/16 Brance basement interior wais		
10113 Elicith Comparison and Millwork basement E 5 30MAV16 03 UN16	opt E	
1 0.1 221 Rough-In Plumbing Pioing basement F 15 20MAY16 [03.II.1016	vt F	
1.0.1.22.4 Install Plumbing Fixtures basement E 2 10JUN16 13JUN16	nt F	
HVAC		
10.1.23.3 Install AC Grills and Registers basement E 5 30MAY16 03JUN16	ent E	
1.0.1.23.7 Insulate Ducts basement E 5 10JUN16 16JUN16		
Electrical		
1.0.1.26.5 Install Lighting Fixtures basement E 8 25MAY16 03JUN16		
Concrete Concrete		
1.0.1.3.21 Install Rebar Cages basement E 21 26FEB16 25MAR16		
Finishes		
1.0.1.9.23 Drywall in Offices basement E 1 23MAY16 23MAY16		
1.0.1.9.91 Paint building interior basement E 1 24MAY16 24MAY16 EPAINT building interior basement E		:   <b>_</b>
III1.0.1.9.51 IInstall Ceiling Grid basement E 1 1/25MAY16 /25MAY16	1	

Figure 12: The completed process model. Following the process given here results in durations based on estimated production rates, classifications that correlate to other project management tools and the ability to update with changes in design. The entire process from product model through cost model and to process model is completed in less than half an hour, in what was once a several day task. Details of estimating and scheduling are still relevant and can not be replicated in this system, requiring someone with experience to review and add any missing information.

many of the manual operations that must be done.

#### Conclusion

The results are a success. This case study of integrating four common software tools highlights the importance of common classification and macro tools. Many steps were repetitive and with a few simple macros have been automated. The classification work breakdown structure appears to be the key to identifying the same operation across multiple software tools. Updating these same tools later during project progress would be much simpler with a common classifying system. As stated previous there are commercial applications that complete these tasks. That a system can be patched together in this way shows it is possible. All of the software used here is of 1990's vintage and the method outlined requires no special knowledge beyond those expected of any graduate or undergraduate construction engineer.

The work breakdown structure is a useful project management tool that is ignored by many

field engineers. Through the use of the Construction Specification Institute (CSI) MasterFormat or derivations, operations are possible to track across applications. This allows easier updating of project planning and control tools with less ambiguity of line item descriptions. These tools will continue to progress as integration becomes more complete and robust. Understanding the underlying importance of a common classification system provides an understanding of underlying topics and issues.

#### Acknowledgements

The work presented in this paper was developed, tested, and validated by expert panel review using the Project Based Learning Laboratory (p<sup>5</sup>bl lab) http://pbl.stanford.edu/ at Stanford University as a testbed. This experiment existed within a larger team project, the full project is located at http://pbl.stanford.edu/AEC% 20projects/Year% 2020 06-2007/Express-SpringPresentation-Version1-ForCyberGuests.ppt I am grateful to the expert panelists for their montoring during savaral and

panelists for their mentoring during several early round reviews and for their time during review of the final prototype.

# References

Darwiche, A., Levitt, R., Hayes-Roth, B. (1989) "OARPLAN: Generating Project Plans by Reasoning about Objects, Actions and resources" Stanford University CIFE technical report # 002

Deakins, S. (2008) "The Primitive Steam Engines" University of Notre Dame, AME34104 Engineering Analysis, www.nd.edu/~sdeakins/engan/Project3\_Report.pdf

Fischer, M. and Kunz, J. (1993) "Circle Integration" Stanford University, CIFE working paper number 20

Ito, K., Ueno, Y., Levitt, R., Darwiche, A. (1989) "Linking Knowledge-Based Systems to CAD Design Data with an Object-Oriented Building Product Model" Stanford University CIFE technical report # 017

"Newcomen steam engine." Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopaedia. 5 Jul 2008, 22:42 UTC. Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. 17 Jul 2008 en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Newcomen steam engine&oldid=223810661

Mourgues, C., Fischer, M., Hudgens, D. (2007) "Using 3D and 4D Models to Improve Jobsite Communication – Virtual Huddles Case Study" W78 2007 p91 - 96