


CUMULATIVE IMPACT AND OTHER DISRUPTION CLAIMS IN CONSTRUCTION

RICHARD J. LONG, P.E.

ROD C. CARTER, CCP, PSP

HAROLD E. BUDDMEYER



LONG INTERNATIONAL

**Order Your Copy of this Book
Online Today at**

www.virtualbookworm.com

[http://www.virtualbookworm.com/bookstore/product/
cumulative_imp_and_other_disrupt_claims_construct.html](http://www.virtualbookworm.com/bookstore/product/cumulative_imp_and_other_disrupt_claims_construct.html)

BOOK PRICE: \$95.00 USD


Plus Shipping & Handling

CUMULATIVE IMPACT AND OTHER DISRUPTION CLAIMS IN CONSTRUCTION

RICHARD J. LONG, P.E.

ROD C. CARTER, CCP, PSP

HAROLD E. BUDDEMEYER



LONG INTERNATIONAL

Cumulative Impact and Other Disruption Claims in Construction

Richard J. Long, P.E.
Rod C. Carter, CCP, PSP
Harold E. Buddemeyer



Cumulative Impact and Other Disruption Claims in Construction

Published in 2014 by Virtualbookworm.com Publishing Inc., College Station, Texas 77842, United States of America.

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter. It is sold with the understanding that the author and publisher are not engaged in rendering legal services. If legal advice is required, the services of a competent lawyer should be sought.

© 2014 by Long International, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the permission in writing from Long International, Inc. Requests for permissions to reproduce content should be directed to the Corporate Office of Long International, Inc. as identified at www.long-intl.com.

ISBN 978-1-62137-527-2

Library of Congress Number on file with Publisher.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Table of Contents

Preface	ix
About The Authors.....	xiii
Acknowledgements	xvii

Chapter 1

Disruption and Cumulative Impact Defined	3
1.1 Disruption.....	3
1.1.1 Disruption as Compared to Delay	4
1.1.2 The Components of Disruption.....	5
1.2 Cumulative Impact Defined	6
1.3 Direct Disruption vs. Cumulative Impact, Foreseeability, and Hidden Costs.....	10

Chapter 2

Legal Considerations	15
2.1 Acknowledgement of Cumulative Impact.....	16
2.2 Disruption and Cumulative Impact Claim Challenges	17
2.2.1 Demonstration of Causation.....	18
2.2.2 Reservation of Rights to Make a Claim.....	23
2.2.3 Use of Proper Damages Methods	29
2.2.4 Preservation of Good Records	33
2.2.5 Overcome the Claim Premise Being Barred by Law or Contract	35
2.3 Arguments Against the Theory of Cumulative Impact.....	35
2.4 Successful Claim Recovery	36

Table of Contents

(continued)

Chapter 3

Methods for Estimating Loss of Productivity Man-Hours for Disruption and Cumulative Impact Claims41

3.1 Causes of Productivity Loss42

3.2 Contractor-Caused Problems that Contribute to Growth in Quantities, Man-Hours, and Costs.....45

3.3 Industry Recommended Practices for Calculating Productivity Loss47

3.4 Methods for Estimating Productivity Loss50

3.4.1 Estimating Loss of Productivity Man-Hours Related to Direct Disruption and Cumulative Impact 51

3.4.1.1 Measured Mile Analysis.....51

3.4.1.2 Earned Value Analysis.....60

3.4.1.3 Industry Studies on the Impact of Changes (Formulaic Approaches).....62

3.4.1.3.1 1988 Leonard Study63

3.4.1.3.2 1990 CII Study.....70

3.4.1.3.3 1995 CII Study.....71

3.4.1.3.4 2001 CII Study.....78

3.4.1.3.5 2005 Ibbs Study.....81

3.4.1.3.6 Court's General View of Formulaic Approaches87

3.4.1.3.7 Further Uncertainties in using Formulaic Approaches88

3.4.1.4 The Use of Factors 90

3.4.1.4.1 MCAA Factors90

3.4.1.4.1.1 General Considerations 90

3.4.1.4.1.2 Method..... 92

3.4.1.4.1.3 Criticisms and Court Decisions..... 97

3.4.1.4.1.4 Estimating Cumulative Impact..... 98

Table of Contents

(continued)

3.4.1.4.1.5	Impacting the Project Schedule Using the MCAA Factors	99
3.4.1.4.2	NAVSEA Guidelines.....	99
3.4.1.5	System Dynamics Modeling	101
3.4.2	Industry Studies Associated with Overtime and Overcrowding/Congestion	102
3.4.2.1	Estimating Loss of Productivity Man-hours Related to Working Overtime	103
3.4.2.1.1	U.S. Department of Labor Bulletin No. 917	103
3.4.2.1.2	Models Published by the Business Roundtable.....	104
3.4.2.1.3	NECA Overtime Study	105
3.4.2.1.4	1988 CII Study.....	106
3.4.2.1.5	1994 CII Study.....	108
3.4.2.1.6	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Study.....	109
3.4.2.2	Estimating Loss of Productivity Man-hours Related to Overcrowding/Congestion.....	111
3.4.2.2.1	Studies Based on Worker Density	111
3.4.2.2.2	Studies Comparing Planned and/or Actual Manpower	113

Chapter 4

Example Calculations for Estimating Productivity Loss..... 121

4.1	Example Calculations from Industry Studies	121
4.1.1	1998 Leonard Study.....	122
4.1.2	1995 CII Study.....	123
4.1.3	2001 CII Study.....	124
4.1.4	MCAA Factors	125
4.1.5	2005 Ibbs Study.....	126
4.2	Comparison of Results	127

Table of Contents

(continued)

Chapter 5

Choosing a Quantum/Damages Method 131

5.1 Preliminary Analyses 133

5.2 Methods of Damages Calculations..... 135

5.2.1 Total Cost Method..... 135

5.2.1.1 Elements of Proof 137

5.2.1.2 Theoretical Bases 139

5.2.1.3 Prerequisites..... 140

5.2.1.4 Owner's Failure to Provide Alternate Method..... 141

5.2.1.5 The Total Cost Cumulative Impact Claim..... 142

5.2.2 Modified Total Cost Method 143

5.2.3 Jury Verdict Method..... 149

5.2.3.1 When Can the Jury Verdict Method be Used?..... 151

5.2.3.1.1 Proof of Injury..... 151

5.2.3.1.2 No Other Reliable Method of Calculating Damages 152

5.2.3.1.3 Adequate Evidence 152

5.2.3.2 Procedure 152

5.2.3.3 Reasonableness Requirement 153

5.2.3.4 Unpredictable Nature 154

5.2.4 *Quantum Meruit*..... 154

5.2.5 "A"/"B" Estimates..... 156

5.2.6 Delta Estimate Method..... 158

5.2.7 Discrete Damages/Cost Variance Analysis Method..... 159

5.2.7.1 Nine Step Process 161

5.2.7.2 Development of Cost Analysis Databases..... 164

5.2.7.2.1 Control Budget Calculations..... 166

5.2.7.2.2 Actual Cost Calculations 168

Table of Contents

(continued)

5.2.7.2.3 Cost Variance Calculations	170
5.2.7.2.4 Allocation of Cost Variances.....	172
5.2.8 Comparison of Methods.....	173

Chapter 6

Supporting a Cumulative Impact or Disruption Claim

during the Project	177
---------------------------------	------------

6.1 Foreseeability and Reasonable Quantification of Direct Disruption and Cumulative Impact Costs during the Project.....	178
6.2 Owner-Directed Change Example	179
6.3 Options for Contemporaneously Estimating Cumulative Impact	181
6.4 Documents that a Contractor Should Maintain	183
6.5 Documenting Changes and Impacts.....	184
6.6 Tracking Productivity.....	185
6.7 Notice	186

Chapter 7

Proving the Cause-Effect Linkage	191
---	------------

7.1 Schedule Analyses	192
7.2 Tracking Impacts by Activity or Crew.....	193
7.3 Site Environment Changes	194
7.4 Tell the Factual Story with Graphics	196
7.5 The Cause-Effect Matrix.....	199

Appendix A

Court/Board Decisions Awarding the Contractor

Impact Costs	203
---------------------------	------------

Table of Contents

(continued)

Appendix B

Court/Board Decisions Rejecting the Contractor's

Impact Claims209

Appendix C

Engineering and Construction Project Documentation217

Index.....221

Case Citations227

List of Tables

Table 3-1:	Above-Ground Piping Data	54
Table 3-2:	Planned and Actual Productivity – Above-Ground Piping.....	56
Table 3-3:	“Should Have Been” Costs – Above-Ground Piping Labor	58
Table 3-4:	Claim using Earned Value Analysis for Above-Ground Piping Labor	61
Table 3-5:	Example of Forward Pricing Productivity Loss Estimations.....	93
Table 3-6:	Example of Retrospective Productivity Loss Estimations	96
Table 3-7:	Labor Overtime Productivity Data – 1994 CII Study	109
Table 4-1:	Man-Hour Data – Mechanical Project	121
Table 4-2:	Results from Industry Studies.....	127
Table 5-1:	Man-Hour/Cost Variances – Total Project	133

Table of Contents

(continued)

List of Figures

Figure 3-1: Cumulative Linear Feet Installed per Week – Above-Ground Piping.....	55
Figure 3-2: Leonard Study – Effects of Change Orders on Productivity Electrical/Mechanical Work	65
Figure 3-3: Leonard Study – Effects of Change Orders on Productivity Civil/Architectural Work	66
Figure 3-4: Engineering Change vs. Engineering Productivity 1995 CII Study – SD 108.....	73
Figure 3-5: Construction Change vs. Construction Productivity	74
Figure 3-6: Comparison of Ibbs’ 1995 and 2005 Productivity Loss Data.....	82
Figure 3-7: Ibbs’ Productivity Loss Data as a Function of the Timing of Changes.	86
Figure 3-8: U.S. Department of Labor Overtime Productivity Data.....	104
Figure 3-9: Effect of Overtime on Productivity – 50 and 60 Hour Workweeks – Business Roundtable Study.....	105
Figure 3-10: Productivity Loss Curves 1969 NECA Study.....	106
Figure 3-11: Productivity Loss Data – 1988 CII Study Large Bore Pipe Crews – 4/9s & 1/8	107
Figure 3-12: Productivity Loss Data – 1988 CII Study Small Bore Pipe Crews – 4/9s & 1/8	108
Figure 3-13: Productivity Loss Data – 1979 U.S. Corps of Engineers.....	110
Figure 3-14: Lost Efficiency Based on Worker Density	111
Figure 3-15: Lost Efficiency Due to Trade Stacking (Hanna).....	113
Figure 3-16: Effect of Crowding on Labor Efficiency.....	114
Figure 3-17: Comparison of Overmanning Curves for a Base Work Force of 600 Craftsmen	115
Figure 3-18: Lost Efficiency Due to Overmanning (Hanna).....	117
Figure 5-1: Total Cost Method	136

Table of Contents

(continued)

Figure 5-2: Modified Total Cost Method	144
Figure 5-3: Jury Verdict Method	153
Figure 5-4: “A”/“B” Estimate Method	157
Figure 5-5: Delta Estimates Method	158
Figure 5-6: Discrete Damages/Cost Variance Analysis Method.....	160
Figure 5-7: Typical Cost Account Structure	162
Figure 5-8: Cost/Damages Analysis Matrix	165
Figure 5-9: Control Budget Revisions with Time.....	167
Figure 5-10: Sample Evolution of Control Budget.....	167
Figure 5-11: Allocation of Cost Variances	173
Figure 5-12: Comparison of Damage Analysis Methods.....	174
Figure 7-1: Bar Chart Schedule and Manpower Comparisons.....	195
Figure 7-2: Example of Tracking Impacts by Activity.....	197
Figure 7-3: Multiple Impacts to Project.....	198
Figure 7-4: Simple Cause-Effect Matrices.....	199
Figure 7-5: Typical Cause-Effect Matrix for a Delay/Disruption Construction Claim	200

Preface

Construction contracts usually contain a “Changes” clause by which the owner can bilaterally or unilaterally request changes to the scope of work that is to be performed by the contractor, and these requests are typically converted into change orders. However, the owner’s actions or inactions can also result in constructive changes to the contract. Change orders to adjust the contract price and time for completion result from a wide range of owner responsible events, including but not limited to, owner-directed increases or decreases in the scope of work to be performed by the contractor, owner-directed changes in the means and methods of the contractor’s performance or the materials or equipment to be installed, owner-directed changes in the contractor’s planned sequence in which the work is to be performed, design changes, changes in the performance specifications, differing site conditions, constructability issues, late responses to the contractor’s properly prepared submittals and requests for information, delays in the delivery of owner-supplied materials and equipment, failure to secure permits in a timely manner, owner interference with the contractor’s work, owner delays resulting in changes in the weather season during which the work is to be performed, changes due to actions or inactions of other trades working on the project for which the owner is responsible, and “constructive changes.”

A directed change order or a constructive change typically entitles the contractor to a time extension if the changed work is on the then critical path, and to additional compensation not only for all direct costs, time-related costs, and costs for direct disruption that are caused by the change, but also indirect disruption costs for the unforeseen impact of the change on unchanged work.

The disruptive effect of a change is a function of the size (man-hours and cost) of the change, the nature or scope of the change, the number of changes (although the number of changes may not be a sufficient determining factor in an assessment of cumulative impact), and the impact of the change on the other work. Also critical to the magnitude of the disruptive impact of a change is the time within the engineering and construction cycle when the change is issued. The further into the construction phase of the project, the greater the disruptive impact. If the changes are significant in scope and require significant additional man-hours to perform the changed and/or impacted work, direct and indirect disruption may occur.

The cost of direct disruption that is known and foreseeable should be included in the contractor’s change order requests as they are submitted to the owner for approval. The indirect disruption is often unforeseeable and referred to as the cumulative impact of changes. If requests for additional compensation for these indirect disruption costs are not included as part of the change order process because they are not foreseeable, cumulative impact claims may be submitted by the contractor, usually

near or shortly after the completion of the project. These cumulative impact claims most often seek recovery of the contractor's additional expenditure of resources, typically labor costs.

By any measure, it is difficult for a contractor to recover claimed costs that allegedly result from the cumulative impact of changes, either during the project, through a request for equitable adjustment and claim negotiations, or through arbitration/litigation. The construction industry, courts, and arbitration panels in the United States generally agree that the theory of cumulative impact is reasonable, and that multiple change orders and other types of delays and disruption can negatively impact the contractor's performance of unchanged work such that a contractor expends additional time, man-hours, and costs in completing its "unchanged" base scope of work. Yet, as will be discussed, the standard of proof set by the courts in proving these cumulative impact claims is burdensome, and their decisions are somewhat subjective. Further, the construction industry has no definitive standard to calculate loss of productivity claims that allegedly result from the cumulative impact of changes. Finally, the concept of cumulative impact claims has not always been accepted in dispute resolution venues outside of the United States.

Cumulative impacts remain largely an ill-defined concept. A more thorough understanding of cumulative impacts as defined by the construction industry and courts and boards will aid the contractor in preparing its damages and proving causation. The information herein provides a blueprint for the contractor seeking to recover costs that result from disruption and the cumulative impact of changes. Conversely, information is also provided that can be used by the owner to identify weaknesses in the contractor's claim submittal, and to better defend against such a claim.

The term "contractor" is used throughout this book to indicate the party claiming damages for disruption and cumulative impact. Subcontractors may also be claimants. The term "owner" is used throughout this paper to indicate the party defending against a disruption and cumulative impact claim. Engineering and construction firms, prime contractors, or construction managers may also be defendants against disruption and cumulative impact claims that are submitted by subcontractors.

Chapter 1 discusses disruption and cumulative impact as defined by the construction industry, as well as by courts and boards. Legal considerations affecting disruption and cumulative impact claims, and the challenges that contractors may encounter to sustain a cumulative impact claim, are discussed in Chapter 2. Methods for estimating loss of productivity man-hours for disruption and cumulative impact claims are presented in Chapter 3, including references to commonly referenced industry studies. Chapter 4 presents examples of productivity loss and cumulative impact calculations using various industry studies and methods. A discussion of quantum/damages quantification methods associated with construction claims is presented in Chapter 5,

Preface

and these quantum/damages calculation methods are discussed in the context of preparing cumulative impact and other disruption claims. Chapter 6 provides information for preparing a cumulative impact or disruption claim during the project. Finally, a discussion of cause-effect analysis is provided in Chapter 7.

Appendix A includes 18 cases in which a court or board awarded a contractor monies pursuant to its disruption claims. In six of these cases, the theory and legal precedent associated with cumulative impact was specifically discussed. Appendix B includes 31 cases in which a court or board denied a contractor's disruption claims, along with a brief description of the reasons for rejecting the claim. In 24 of these cases, the theory and/or legal precedent associated with cumulative impact was specifically discussed. Appendix C provides a list of documentation that is typically preserved on an engineering and construction project.

This book contains information from numerous published sources, and in many cases, the claims made by the various writers of those publications are restated herein. Therefore, the views and conclusions in this book are not necessarily those of the authors.

Richard J. Long, P.E.

Rod C. Carter, CCP, PSP

Harold E. Buddemeyer

About The Authors



Richard J. Long, P.E., is Founder and CEO of Long International, Inc., one of the world's largest construction claims consulting companies, which also provides project management consulting services. Based in Colorado with offices throughout the U.S. and the Middle East, Long International focuses its practice on owners, engineering and construction firms, and contractors performing oil & gas, petroleum refining, petrochemical, chemical, power, mineral processing, manufacturing, industrial, building, and infrastructure projects worldwide. Mr. Long has over 40 years of U.S. and international engineering, construction, and management consulting experience involving construction contract disputes analysis and resolution, arbitration and litigation support and expert testimony, project management, engineering and construction management, cost and schedule control, and process engineering. As an internationally recognized expert in the analysis and resolution of complex construction disputes for over 30 years, Mr. Long has served as the lead expert on over 300 projects having claims ranging in size from US \$100,000 to over US \$2 billion. He has presented and published numerous articles and training seminars on the subjects of claims analysis, entitlement issues, CPM schedule and damages analyses, and claims prevention.

Before forming Long International, Mr. Long was Senior Vice President, Contract Administration for a major electrical and mechanical contractor. In this role, he had corporate-wide responsibility for technical management and oversight of the preparation and resolution of construction claims. In addition, he was responsible for the development, training, and implementation of project management policies and procedures to ensure that profit, cost, schedule, scope, quality, and safety objectives were achieved. For 13 years, Mr. Long managed the construction claims practices of two large consulting firms. Prior to his consulting career, Mr. Long gained 13 years of project management and process engineering experience on petroleum refining, oil shale, synfuels, mining, and power generation projects with Tosco, Fluor, and Conoco.

Mr. Long earned a B.S. in Chemical Engineering from the University of Pittsburgh in 1970 and an M.S. in Chemical and Petroleum Refining Engineering from the Colorado School of Mines in 1974. He is a Registered Professional Engineer in the State of Colorado. Mr. Long is based in Littleton, Colorado, and can be contacted at rlong@long-intl.com and (303) 972-2443.

About The Authors



Rod C. Carter, CCP, PSP, is a Principal with Long International and has over 15 years of experience in construction project controls, contract disputes and resolution, mediation/arbitration support, and litigation support for expert testimony. He has experience in entitlement, schedule, and damages analyses on over thirty construction disputes ranging in value from US \$100,000 to over US \$2 billion. His experience includes heavy civil, nuclear, environmental, chemical, power, industrial, commercial, and residential construction. He is proficient in the

use of Primavera Project Planner software, and has extensive experience in assessing the schedule impact of RFIs, change orders, and other events to engineering and construction works.

Mr. Carter specializes in loss of productivity, cumulative impact, and quantum calculations, and has held a lead role in assessing damages on more than a dozen major disputes. In addition, Mr. Carter has developed cost and schedule risk analysis models using Monte Carlo simulations to address the uncertainty of estimates and claims. He has testified as an expert in construction scheduling and damages, and has presented expert findings to an international arbitral tribunal.

Mr. Carter earned a B.S. in Civil Engineering from the University of Colorado at Boulder in 1996, with an emphasis in Structural Engineering and Construction Management. Mr. Carter is based in Littleton, Colorado, and can be contacted at rcarter@long-intl.com and (303) 463-5587.



Harold E. Buddemeyer was a Senior Principal for Long International and passed in January 2022. He had nearly 50 years of experience in all aspects of program and construction project management and construction disputes. His experience included construction and property damage/business interruption claims analysis, preparation, defense, and negotiation of settlements on projects including refineries, offshore oil and gas, petrochemical plants, heavy civil and mining projects, oil sands facilities, nuclear, coal and gas-fired power plants, and building projects.

Mr. Buddemeyer's project experience included project cost/schedule control, systems and procedures development and implementation, program planning, as well as capital and operating cost estimating and economic analysis during the design, construction, and start-up phases of a diverse cross section of projects.

Mr. Buddemeyer had over 34 years of construction contract disputes consulting experience. In this regard, he was responsible for entitlement and issue analysis; change order analysis; labor productivity analysis; cost and damages analysis; schedule delay and

About The Authors

impact analysis; claim report preparation and rebuttal; negotiation and mediation assistance; the organization, development and maintenance of document databases; assistance to counsel during discovery; and depositions and interrogatory preparation.

Mr. Buddemeyer testified in U.S. and international arbitration. He was enrolled in a professional degree program, majored in applied mathematics and operations research, and minored in Chemical and Petroleum Refining Engineering at the Colorado School of Mines from 1965 to 1970. For further information, please contact Long International's corporate office at (303) 972-2443.



Douglas J. Nutter, Long International's Manager of Graphic Services, prepared the graphical illustrations throughout this text and formatted the text for layout and indexing. He has nearly 40 years of experience in design, illustration, cartography, and graphic production for technical support, arbitration, and litigation. Mr. Nutter is skilled in developing complex technical issues and data into concise presentations for use by counsel, juries, and arbitration panels. Prior to his consulting career, Mr. Nutter gained 12 years of engineering drafting and graphics experience on petroleum refining, oil shale, synfuels, mining, and power generation projects with Tosco Corporation.

Mr. Nutter has provided graphic design, illustration, and technical support for construction claim preparation, analysis, defense, and negotiation of settlements for various parties, including owners, contractors, transit agencies, universities, sureties, financial institutions, law firms, and architectural firms. Mr. Nutter is based in Littleton, Colorado, and can be contacted at dnutter@long-intl.com and (303) 427-4368.

Index

“A”/“B” Estimate	156–57, 173
1988 CII Study.....	106–8
1990 CII Cumulative Impact Study	70–71
1994 CII Overtime Study	108–9
1995 CII Cumulative Impact Study	71–78, 81–83, 123–24, 181
2001 CII Cumulative Impact Study	78–81, 124
2005 Ibbs Study.....	81–87, 126–27, 181
Abandonment.....	155–56
Acceleration	3, 24, 42, 46, 48, 51, 57, 59, 61, 64, 67, 93, 99, 102, 122–27 131, 135, 163, 169, 184, 192, 194, 201, 204, 207, 212, 216
Accord and Satisfaction	24–29, 37, 91, 211
Actual Cost Calculations.....	168
Actual vs. Estimated Cost of Changes	29, 148
Allocation of Cost Variances	172–73
Bid Error	30, 46, 59, 95, 102, 133, 139, 143, 145, 153 159–61, 162, 166, 170–74, 205, 213, 215
Cause-Effect Analysis	
Cause-Effect Matrix	198–201
Schedule Analysis	192–93
Site Environment Changes	194–96
Tracking Impacts.....	193–94
Use of Graphics.....	196–98
Challenges to Sustaining a Cumulative Impact Claim.....	17–35, 18–23, 36–37
Barred by Law	34–35
Proving Causation	18–23, 196–201
Reservation of Rights.....	23–29, 209
Successful Claim Recovery.....	36–37
Use of Proper Damages Methodology	29–32
Change Orders	
Actual Costs	17, 29–30, 53, 58, 138, 142, 145, 148 152, 162, 166, 168, 170–71, 174, 183
Coding of Costs	34, 169
Documentation of Changes.....	9, 148
Hidden Cost of Changes	11–12, 36
Quantity of Changes	18, 20, 23, 37, 196

Index

Claim Entitlements	131
Contractor-Caused Impacts	18, 21, 45–47, 53, 58, 60, 70 101, 122, 134, 161, 172, 199
Control Budget Calculations	166
Cost Records.....	33, 54, 121, 145, 160–62, 184
Cost Variance Analysis.....	133, 161, 166, 170–72
Cost/Damage Analysis Matrix.....	164
Cumulative Impact	16–17
Arguments Against.....	35–36
Causes.....	9
Court’s Acknowledgement.....	16–17, 21, 25–26
Court’s General View of Formulaic Approaches.....	87–88
Definitions	6–11
Estimating Cumulative Impact During the Project	177–87, 177–87
Foreseeability.....	6–11, 24, 32, 41 142, 177–81, 186
Notice	9, 60, 186–87, 209
Owner-Directed Change	179–81
Total Cost Claim.....	142–43
Damages	
Adequate Evidence	17, 20, 28, 34, 132, 137–39 141, 145–51, 154, 210
Damages Analysis Methods.....	131–74
Damages Calculation Methods	168
Defective Work	47, 95
Delta Estimate Method.....	135, 158–59, 174
Demotivation of Work Force	194–95
Differing Site Conditions.....	186
Discrete Damages/Cost Variance Analysis Method.....	135, 150, 159, 174
Actual Cost Calculations	168–69
Allocation of Cost Variances	172–73
Control Budget Calculations.....	165–68
Discrete Calculation of Damages.....	139
Nine Step Process.....	161–65
Discrete/Actual Damages	149
Disruption	
Definition.....	3
FIDIC.....	5

Index

MCAA	5–6
Society of Construction Law	4
Disruption and Delay	4–5
Documentation	32–34, 45, 132, 134
Documenting Changes and Impacts	184–85
Documents and Recordkeeping.....	183–84
Engineering and Construction Project Documentation	217–19
Earned Value	16, 127, 169, 185
Extra Work	37, 45, 84, 88, 152, 156, 186
Foreseeability	3, 6–11, 7, 24, 35, 41, 94, 132, 177–81, 185–87
Global Claim.....	30–31, 178
Ibbs Studies.....	81–87, 126–27
Industry Studies Regarding Cumulative Impact	
1990 CII Cumulative Impact Study.....	70–71
1995 CII Cumulative Impact Study.....	71–78, 82–83, 123–24, 181
2001 CII Cumulative Impact Study.....	78–81, 124
2005 Ibbs Study	81–87, 126–27, 181
Leonard Study	8, 63–70, 83, 87–88, 122–23, 127, 174, 194
Jury Verdict Method.....	98, 135, 143, 151–52, 174, 203–7, 212
Adequate Evidence	152
No Other Reliable Method of Calculating Damages.....	151–52
Procedure.....	152–53
Proof of Injury.....	151
Reasonableness Requirement	153
Unpredictable Nature	154
When Can a Jury Verdict Method be Used.....	151–52
Learning Curve	48, 56, 90, 93, 194–96
Leonard Study.....	8, 63–70, 83, 87–88, 122–23, 127, 174, 194
MCAA Factors	90–99, 125–26, 135, 174, 194, 204, 206–7
Criticisms and Court Decisions.....	97–98
Estimating Cumulative Impact.....	98–99
General Considerations	90–92
Impacting the Project Schedule	99
Method.....	92–97
Measured Mile Analysis.....	16, 29–30, 33, 37, 41, 50–62, 69, 127
	135, 137, 164, 172, 174, 185, 204–7
Advantage	59
Criteria.....	53

Index

Steps to Prepare.....	53
Modified Total Cost Method.....	34, 122, 127, 135, 139, 143–48, 168, 174, 203–7
Notice	186–87
Out-of-Sequence Work.....	3, 184, 194
Overcrowding/Congestion	110–17, 159, 161
Comparison of Planned vs. Actual Manpower.....	111, 113–17
Overtime.....	41–43, 48–51, 57, 59, 61, 80, 90–92, 102–10
	125, 134–35, 159, 161, 163, 172, 179, 192
Overtime Studies	
1988 CII Overtime Study.....	106–8
1994 CII Overtime Study.....	108–9
Business Roundtable Study.....	104
NECA Overtime Study.....	105–6
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Study	109–10
U.S. Department of Labor Bulletin No. 917	103
Productivity Loss	
Causes.....	42–45
Tracking Productivity	185–86
Productivity Loss/Cumulative Impact Calculation Methods	50
1990 CII Cumulative Impact Study.....	70–71
1995 CII Cumulative Impact Study.....	71–78, 82–83, 123–24, 181
2001 CII Cumulative Impact Study.....	78–81, 124
2005 Ibbs Study	81–87, 126–27, 181
Court’s General View of Formulaic Approaches.....	87–88
Earned Value Analysis.....	60–61
Example Calculations	121–27
Industry Studies on the Impact of Changes	
(Formulaic Approaches).....	62–89
Leonard Study.....	63–70, 122–23
MCAA Factors.....	90–99, 125–26
Measured Mile Analysis.....	50–62
NAVSEA Guidelines.....	99–100
Overcrowding/Congestion	110–17
Overtime.....	103–10
System Dynamics Modeling.....	100–102
Timing of Changes	78, 84, 86
Uncertainties of Formulaic Approaches.....	88–89

Index

Proof of Damages.....	22, 29, 48, 132, 138, 147, 151, 159, 183, 204
<i>Quantum Meruit</i>	135, 154–56, 174
Quantum/Damages Methods	
“A”/“B” Estimates Method.....	156–57
Choosing a Method.....	131–74
Comparison of Methods	173–74
Delta Estimate Method	158–59
Discrete Damages/Cost Variance Analysis Method	159–73
Jury Verdict Method	151–52
Modified Total Cost Method.....	143–48
<i>Quantum Meruit</i>	154–56
Total Cost Method.....	31–34, 135–43
Reservation of Rights	23–29, 91, 209
Society of Construction Law.....	4, 52, 178
System Dynamics Modeling.....	100–102
Total Cost Method.....	31–34, 135–43
Elements of Proof.....	137–39
Owner’s Failure to Provide Alternative Method.....	141
Prerequisites	140
Theoretical Bases	139
Total Cost Claim.....	142–43
Tracking Impacts	196–97
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Study.....	109–10
Uncertainties in using Formulaic Approaches	88–89
Worker Density	111

Case Citations

Cases

<i>Acme Missiles & Constr. Corp.</i> , ASBCA Nos. 11256, 11716, 68-1 BCA ¶ 6,873 (1968).....	209
<i>Advanced Engineering & Planning Corp.</i> , ASBCA Nos. 53366, 54044, November 2004.....	99, 100, 193, 216
<i>Aetna Casualty & Surety Co. v. George Hyman Const. Co.</i> , U.S. Dist., LEXIS 22627 (E.D. Pa. 1998)	69, 88, 138, 211
<i>AMEC Civil, LLC v. DMJM Harris, Inc.</i> Civil Action No. 06-64 (FLW), US District Court, D. New Jersey (June 2009)	35, 144, 148, 213
<i>Amelco Elec. v. City of Thousand Oaks</i> , 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 159 (Cal Ct. App. 2000)	9, 139, 207
<i>Aragona Constr. Co. v. United States</i> , 163 Ct. Cl. 382 (1964).....	143, 214
<i>Atlantic Dry Dock Corp. v. United States</i> , 773 F. Supp. 335, 338-39 (M.D. Fla. 1991).....	27, 210
<i>Atlas Construction Co. Inc.</i> , 90-2 BCA ¶ 22,812, GSBCA Nos. 8593, 7903, 8143, 8653 (1990)	206
<i>Bagwell Coatings, Inc. v. Middle S. Energy, Inc.</i> , 797 F.2d 1298, 1309 (5th Cir. 1986)	138
<i>Bay Construction Co.</i> , VABCA Nos. 5594, 5625, 5626, 5628 and 5831, 2002 WL 442118 (2002)	211
<i>Beaty Electric</i> , EBCA No. 408-3-88, 90-2 BCA (CCH) ¶22,829 (1990)	28
<i>Bechtel National</i> , NASA BCA No. 1186-7, 90-1 BCA ¶ 22,549 (1989)	7, 16, 32, 203
<i>Bell BCI Co. v. United States</i> , No. 03-1613C, 81 Fed. Cl. 617, 2008 U.S. Claims LEXIS 116 (April 2008)	16, 28, 36, 196, 204
<i>Bell v. United States</i> , 404 F.2d 975, 983, 186 Ct.Cl. 189, 205 (1968).....	151
<i>C. Norman Peterson Co. v. Container Corp of Am.</i> , 218 Cal Rptr. 592 (Cal. Ct. App 1985).....	156, 205
<i>California Cannery & Growers Ass'n v. United States</i> , 9 Ct.Cl. 774, 785 (1986).....	152
<i>Centex Bateson Constr. Co.</i> , VABCA Nos. 4613, 5162, 5165, 99-1 BCA ¶ 30,153 (1998), aff'd, <i>Centex Bateson Constr.</i> <i>Co. v. West</i> , 250 F.3rd 761 (Fed Cir. 2000).....	6, 7, 9, 21, 22, 23, 41, 191, 211

Case Citations

<i>Central Mechanical Construction</i> , ASBCA No. 29434, 86-3 BCA ¶ 19,240 (1986).....	26, 210
<i>Chantilly Construction Corp.</i> , ASBCA No. 24138, 81-1 BCA ¶ 14,863 (1980)	205
<i>Charles G. Williams Constr., Inc.</i> , ASBCA No. 33766, 89-2 BCA ¶ 21,733 (1989)	192, 206
<i>City of Del Rio v. Ulen Contracting Corp.</i> , 94 F.2d 701, 704 (5th Cir. 1938). Accord, California Civil Code § 1689 (a)	155
<i>City of Portland ex rel. Donohue & Fleskes Corp. v. Hoffman Constr. Co.</i> , 236 Ore. 739, 596 P.2d 1305, 1309, 1313 Fn. 22 (1979)	156
<i>Clark Concrete Contractors, Inc. v. General Services Administration</i> , 99-1 BCA ¶ 30280, GSBCA No. 14340 (1999)	41, 98, 206
<i>Clark Construction Group, Inc.</i> , 00-1 BCA ¶ 30,870, VABCA No. 5674 (April 2000)	22, 98, 150, 207
<i>Coastal Constr. Grp., Inc. v. Stellar J. Corp.</i> , Court of Appeals of Washington, Division One, No. 66932-0-1, October 2011	148
<i>Coates Industrial Piping, Inc.</i> , VABCA No. 5412, 99-2 BCA ¶ 30,479 (1999).....	211
<i>David H. Tierney Jr.</i> , GSBCA Nos. 7107, 6198, 5585, 88-2 BCA ¶ 20,806 (1988)	8, 16, 22, 27, 203
<i>Dawco Constr., Inc. v. United States</i> , 930 F.2d 872, 880, 882 (1991).....	150, 151, 152, 184
<i>Delco Electronics Corp. v. United States</i> , 17 Ct.Cl. 302, 320-324 (1989).....	150, 151, 154
<i>Dillingham-Ray Wilson v. City of Los Angeles</i> (2010) 182 Cal. App.4 th 1396	148
<i>Drexel Dynamic Corp.</i> , 67-2 BCA ¶ 6,410, pages 29,698, 29,699 (ASBCA 1967)	147, 154
<i>Dugan & Meyers Constr. Co., Inc. v. Ohio Dept. of Adm. Servs.</i> , 113 Ohio St.3d 226, 864 N.E.2d 68 (2007).....	212
<i>Dugan & Meyers Constr. Co., Inc. v. Ohio Dept. of Adm. Servs.</i> , 2003-Ohio-3709 (2003).....	204
<i>Dyson & Co.</i> , ASBCA No. 21,673, 78-2 BCA ¶ 13,482, on reconsid., 7901 BCA (CCH) ¶ 13,661 (1979).....	26, 143, 209
<i>E. Arthur Higgins</i> , 79-2 BCA ¶ 14,050, pp. 69,052, 69,066 (AGBCA 1979).....	149
<i>E.C. Ernst, Inc. v. Koppers Co., Inc.</i> , 626 F.2d 324, 327 (3rd Cir. 1980)	147
<i>Elete, Inc. v. S.S. Mullen, Inc.</i> , 469 F.2d 1 127 (1972)	147

Case Citations

<i>F.H. McGraw and Co. v. United States</i> , 130 F.Supp. 394, 397, 398, 400 131 Ct.Cl. 501 (1955)	138, 140
<i>Fattore Co., Inc. v. Metropolitan Sewerage Comm’n</i> , 505 F.2d 1, 4 (7th Cir. 1974).....	149, 152
<i>Fire Security Systems, Inc.</i> , 91-2 BCA ¶ 23,743	98
<i>Freeman-Darling, Inc.</i> , GSBICA No. 7112, 89-2 BCA ¶ 21,882 (1989)	19, 210
<i>Fruehauf Corp.</i> , PSBCA No. 477, 74-1 BCA ¶ 10,596 (1974).....	7, 205
<i>Great Eastern Hotel Company Ltd v. John Laing Construction Ltd</i> (2005) EWHC 181 (TCC).....	33
<i>Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co. v. United States</i> , 96 F. Supp. 923 (119 Ct.Cl. 1951)	136, 143, 146
<i>Greenwood Constr. Co., Inc.</i> , 78-1 BCA ¶12,893, pp. 62,818, 62,830-1 (AGBCA 1977).	151, 152
<i>Groves-Black</i> , ENGBICA No. 4557, 85-3 BCA (CCH) ¶ 18,398 (1985)	88
<i>H.T.C. Corp. v. Olds</i> , 486 P.2d 463, 466 (Colo.App. 1971)	155
<i>Haas & Haynie Corp.</i> , GSBICA Nos. 5530, 6224, 6638, 6919-20, 84-2 BCA ¶ 17,446 (1984)	8, 10, 11, 210
<i>Haskell Corporation, et al v. ConocoPhillips Company</i> , No. A124446, Court of Appeals of California, First District, Division Four. (March 2012).....	214
<i>Hensel Phelps Construction Co.</i> , GSBICA 14744; 01-1 BCA ¶ 31,249 (2001)	204
<i>Hensel Phelps</i> , ASBCA No. 49270, 99-2 BCA ¶ 30,531	19
<i>Hoffman Const. Co. of Oregon v. U.S.</i> , 40 Fed. Cl. 184 (1998)	215
<i>Ingalls Shipbuilding Division, Litton Systems, Inc.</i> , ASBCA 17579, 78-1 BCA, ¶ 13,038 (1978)	16, 205
<i>J. A. Jones Construction Co.</i> , 00-2 BCA ¶ 31,000, ENGBICA Nos. 6390-1, 6386-7, 6348, 6388-9, 2000 WL 1014011	18, 30, 69, 192, 211
<i>Jackson Construction Co. v. United States</i> , 62 Fed.Cl. 84 (Fed. Cl. 2004)	27, 212
<i>Jacobellis v. Ohio</i> , 378 U.S. 184, 197 (1964)	23
<i>John Doyle Construction Limited v. Laing Management (Scotland) Ltd</i> [2002] BLR 393 (Outer House) and [2004] BLR 295 (Inner House).....	31
<i>John E. Green Plumbing & Heating Co., Inc. v. Turner Const. Co.</i> , 742 F.2d 965, 968 (6th Cir. 1984).....	142, 215
<i>John F. Harkins Co. v. School Dist. of Philadelphia</i> , 313 Pa. Super. 425, 460 A.2d 260, 263 (1983).....	140
<i>Kit-San-Azusa, J. V. v. United States</i> , 32 Fed Cl. 647 (1995).....	206

Case Citations

<i>Kvaerner Construction Ltd v. Egger (Barony) Ltd</i> (2000) QBD (TCC) Lawtel 8/9/2000(unreported)	33
<i>L.K. Comstock & Co., Inc. v. Becon Const. Co., Inc.</i> , 932 F. Supp. 906 (E.D. Ky. 1993)	142
<i>Lake Union Drydock Company, Inc. v. U.S.</i> , US District Court, W.D. Washington, at Seattle, No. C05-2146RSL (October 2007).....	100, 213
<i>Lamb Engineering & Construction Company</i> , EBCA 97-2 BCA ¶ 29,207	51
<i>Larry Armbruster & Sons, Inc. v. State Public School Bldg. Auth.</i> , 95 Pa. Commw. 310, 505 A.2d 313 (1986).....	139
<i>Luria Bros. & Co. v. U.S.</i> , 177 Ct. Cl. 676 369 F.2d 701 713 (1966).....	139, 191
<i>Maxwell v. Schaefer</i> , 112 A.2d 69 (1955)	132
<i>McAlpine Humberoak v. McDermott</i> (1992) 58 BLR 1.....	33
<i>McGee Landscaping, Inc.</i> , AG-BCA No. 91-172-1, 93-3 BCA (CCH) ¶ 25,946 (1993)	88
<i>McMillin Brothers Constructors, Inc.</i> , 91-1 BCA ¶ 23,351, EBCA No. 328-10-84, 1990 WL 140900 (1990)	7, 17, 210
<i>Mergentime Corp. v. WMATA</i> , 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23408.....	151
<i>Metropolitan Sewerage Comm’n v. R.W. Constr.</i> , 78 Wis.2d 451, 255 N.W.2d 293-302 (1977).....	150
<i>Modern Builders, Inc. of Tacoma v. Manke</i> , 27 Wash.App. 86, 615 P.2d 92 (1980).....	155
<i>Needles v. United States</i> , 101 Ct. Cl. 535 (1944).....	149
<i>New Pueblo Constructors, Inc. v. State</i> , 144 Ariz. 95, 696 P.2d 185, 194 (1985).....	150, 152
<i>Obert v. Ede</i> , 38 Wis.2d 240, 156 N.W.2d 422, 424 (1968).....	156
<i>Oliver-Finnie Co. v. United States</i> , 279 F.2d 498, 506, 150 Ct.Cl. 189 (1960).....	140
<i>P.J. Dick, Inc.</i> , 01-2 BCA ¶ 31,647, VABCA Nos. 5840-5850, 5951-5959, and 6017-6024 (2001)	196, 207
<i>Pennzoil Co. v. Texaco, Inc.</i> , 481 U.S. 1, 4 (1987).....	141
<i>Phillips Construction Co. v. United States</i> , 394 F.2d 834, 839, 184 Ct.Cl. 249 (1968)	154
<i>Pittman Construction Co.</i> , GSBCA Nos. 4,897, 4,923, 81-1 BCA ¶ 14,847, 1980 WL 2643	8, 11, 19, 21, 26, 32, 180, 209
<i>Propellex</i> , 342 F.3d	144
<i>Pugh v. Holmes</i> , 486 Pa. 272, 405 A.2d 897 (1979)	139

Case Citations

<i>R. J. Lampus Co. v. Neville Cement Products Corporation</i> , 378 A.2d 288 (1977)	132
<i>R-D Mounts, Inc.</i> , 75-1 BCA ¶ 11,237, Pages 53,491, 53,492 (ASBCA 1975).....	150
<i>Reflectone, Inc. v. Dalton</i> , 60 F3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	184
<i>Roanoke Hospital Association v. Doyle & Russell, Inc.</i> , 214 S.E.1d 155 (1975)	132
<i>Robert McMullan & Sons, Inc.</i> , ASBCA No. 19129, 76-2 BCA ¶ 57,947	145
<i>Rochey Bros., Inc. v. Rhoades</i> , 527 F.2d 891 (1975).....	132
<i>S. Comfort Builders</i> , 67 Fed. Cl. 124, 139 (2005).....	144
<i>S. J. Groves & Sons Co. v. Warner Co.</i> , 576 F.2d 524 (1928)	132
<i>S. Leo Harmonay Inc. v. Binks Manufacturing Company</i> , 597 F. Supp. 1014 (S. D. N.Y. 1984) aff'd. 762 F.2d. 990 (2d Cir. 1984)	147
<i>Santa Fe Eng'g, Inc.</i> , ASBCA Nos. 24578, 25838, 2838, 28687, 94-2 BCA ¶ 26,872	19
<i>Saudi Tarmac Co., Ltd and Tarmac Overseas, Ltd.</i> , ENGBCA No. 4841, 89-3 BCA ¶ 22,036 (1989)	27, 210
<i>Schwartz v. Shelby Constr. Co.</i> , 338 S.W.2d 781, 788 (Mo. 1960)	155
<i>Skanska Construction UK Ltd v. Egger (Barony) Ltd</i> (2002) EWHC 773 and (2004) EWHC 1748 (TCC).....	33
<i>Southwest Marine</i> , 94-3 BCA ¶ 27,102, DOTCAB No. 1663 (1994)	11, 20, 100, 143, 210
<i>Sovereign Construction Company, Ltd.</i> , ASBCA No. 17792, 75-1 BCA ¶ 11,251	143, 145
<i>Specialty Assembling & Packing Co. v. United States</i> , 355 F.2d 554, 572, 174 Ct.Cl. 153 (1966).....	151
<i>State Highway Comm'n of Wyoming v. Brasel & Sims Construction Co., Inc.</i> , 688 P.2d 871, 877 (Wyo. 1984)	139, 150
<i>State of California ex rel. Dept. of Transportation v. Guy F. Atkinson Co.</i> , 187 Cal. App. 3d 25 [231 Cal. Rptr. 382] (1986)	206
<i>States Roofing</i> , ASBCA No. 55505 (January 2010).....	204
<i>Strand Hunt Const., Inc. v. Lake Washington School Distr., No. 414</i> , Not Reported in PJd, 2006 WL 2536315 (Wash. App. Div. 1).....	212
<i>Stroh Corporation</i> , GSBCA No. 11029, 96-1 BCA ¶28,265	98
<i>Teledyne McCormick-Selph v. U.S.</i> , 588 F.2d 808, 810 (Ct.Cl. 1987)	146
<i>The Triax Co. v. United States</i> , 28 Fed.Cl. 733 (1993), aff'd 19 F. 3d. 1196 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	215

Case Citations

<i>Triple “A” South</i> , 94-3 BCA ¶ 27,194, ASBCA No. 46,866 (1994)	6, 100, 191, 210
<i>U.S. v. J. H. Copeland & Sons</i> , 568 F.2d 1159 (1928)	132
<i>Uble v. Tarlton Corp.</i> , 938 S.W.2d 594 (Mo. Ct. App. 1997)	27
<i>Vanlar Construction, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles</i> , 217 Cal. Rptr. 53 (Cal. App. 1985)	26
<i>Venetian Lien Litig.</i> , 2004 WL 326505 (Nev. Dist. Cr., 2004)	35, 212
<i>Walsh/Davis Joint Venture</i> , CBCA No. 1460 (March 2012)	213
<i>Watt Plumbing, A.C., and Electrical v. Tulsa Rig, Reel, and Manufacturing Co.</i> , 533 P.2d 980 (1975)	214
<i>Western Contracting Corp. v. United States</i> , 144 Ct.Cl. 318, 320, 333, 334, 369 (1958)	154
<i>WRB Corp. v. United States</i> , 183 Ct.Cl. 409, 426-427 (1968)	30, 31, 137, 151
<i>Wunderlich Contracting Co. v. U.S.</i> , 173 Ct.Cl. 180, 351 F.2d 956 (1965)	19, 20, 133, 140, 151, 214
<i>Youngdale & Sons Const. Co., Inc. v. U.S.</i> , 27 Fed. Cl. 516 (1993)	142, 144