



Facilities Reduction Program  
**Best Practices Toolbox**



**UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS**  
**FACILITIES REDUCTION PROGRAM**

**Best Practices Toolbox**

*(Library Document)*

**FRP Lessons Learned**

Last Update: October 19, 2006

## **INTRODUCTION**

This document represents a compilation of Lessons Learned that are the result of Facility Reduction Program (FRP) efforts. A lesson learned is documentation of a success or failure that generally results from execution of a project. When a lesson learned is determined to be, or results in a practice that is innovative or otherwise beneficial, the lesson learned may become implemented as a recommended best practice. For additional information on topics related to FRP Best Practices, refer to the following resources:

[FRP Guide to Best Practices](#)

[FRP Summary of Best Practices](#)

## **FRP LESSONS LEARNED**

### **LESSON LEARNED: PRELIMINARY HAZMAT SURVEY**

Whenever possible, hazardous material surveys should be completed prior to the demolition bid phase of the project. This precludes later change orders which are not subject to inherent bidding controls, garners more accurate bids (the scope is more complete, and the bidder assumes less risk), and demolition time schedules are more accurate. The potential for inadvertent contamination from missed hazardous materials is reduced.

*For additional information, visit the following links:*

[FRP Guide to Best Practices \(Sections 1.6 and 2.2\)](#)

### **LESSON LEARNED: ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEY MUST BE UP TO DATE**

Frequently, outdated or incomplete existing environmental data is relied on for demolition purposes. Surveys or sampling events that were performed for maintenance or regulatory purposes are often inadequate for demolition purposes. Environmental data should be reviewed by an experienced inspector for completeness.

*For additional information, visit the following links:*

[FRP Guide to Best Practices \(Section 2.2\)](#)

### **LESSON LEARNED: SOW INVOLVING ACM ABATEMENT ACTIVITIES**

The manner in which an abatement scope is written can have a significant financial impact on a project. Abatement associated with demolition projects, as opposed to renovation projects, requires less containment preparation, does not frequently require

re-establishment of objects and systems, and protection of objects and surfaces (walls, floors, etc.) is also usually not an issue.

The direction given to the contractor in the scope can have unanticipated financial burden as well. For example, consider a project with damaged/deteriorated ACM pipe insulation in an 8,000 square foot dirt floor crawlspace. If the SOW requires the contractor to "...remove approximately 8,000 sf of asbestos-contaminated soil from the crawlspace," this may cost much more than specifying "...remove all visible asbestos-containing debris and associated contaminated soil" or otherwise specify removal of soil in the proximity of the pipeline  $\pm$  a few feet on each side of the pipe.

#### **LESSON LEARNED: BID SOLICITATION METHODOLOGY**

Contractors should be solicited with an open, competitive bid process, or new contractors should be occasionally solicited for bids in order to stifle the potential for collusion or "price creep" sometimes observed among a group of traditionally used contractors. Inquiries related to use of particular contractors are often answered with "because that is who we have always used." This is not to say that it is not feasible to use the same contractor for extended periods of time. However, experience has shown on several occasions that such arrangements have no method of checks-and-balances which may lead to disproportionate pricing. ID/IQ contract holders or other contractors that are providing bids under existing contracts usually provide a cost savings (they save the cost of the bid/contracting process) as long as there is a CO or COTR overseeing the bids who is familiar with area pricing.

#### **LESSON LEARNED: PROJECT VESTING**

A lack of project vesting can sometimes be identified as an issue. An individual with a vested interest in the project and the project funding should be acting as the PM, CO, or COTR; without this, cost discrepancies, overruns, or more blatant abuses of the program might be missed and propagated through the system.

#### **LESSON LEARNED: LEAD-BASED PAINT (LBP) ABATEMENT**

In most projects associated with FRP, LBP abatement is not required. Several projects have been identified where a line-item was included in a contractor bid for abatement of LBP. Such discrepancies can severely inflate the removal cost of a facility.

*For additional information, visit the following links:*

[IMA Policy for Removal of Facilities that Contain Lead-based Paint](#)  
[ACSIM interactive version of AR 420-70](#)