

DATA DEVELOPMENT FOR IMPROVEMENT OF MAINTENANCE PERFORMANCE

C. O. Leigh
Assistant Maint. Engineer
Virginia Dept. of Highways

Mr. Roy Jorgensen pointed out some types of data that are useful in a maintenance management system and I want to show the source of this data we are developing through a pilot study in Virginia.

At the beginning of the study, as Mr. Jorgensen pointed out, it was felt necessary to measure the amount of maintenance work performed. Our approach to this was to have our field forces report the amount of work performed using various work units. This reporting is done in terms of county, route section, kind of road and activity. Our first step was to designate appropriate work units for as many of the maintenance activities as possible. Work units were selected for as many activities that we felt could easily be reported by the field organization. (Fig. 1)

ORDINARY MAINTENANCE

CODE	ACTIVITY	WORK UNIT
111	Skin Patching	Tons of Aggregate
131	Machine Gravel Surface	Miles Bladed
134	Apply Dust Palliative	CWT. Chemical
221	Tractor Mowing	Acres
233	Paint Guard Rail	Feet of Guard Rail

Fig. 1

These are some typical examples of work units that we did select for the field reporting. These are shown to demonstrate the wide range of work units that can be used. Actually we found that the best work unit is expressed in material because this is the most easily reported by our field units. They seem to have difficulty reporting work units expressed in area. Information on productivity, labor, equipment and materials is submitted by the field forces using three reports, the time sheet, equipment rental sheet, and the stock issue and accomplishment report in this pilot study. Since the reporting of work is the major deviation from our current practice, I will discuss the first. (Fig. 2)

This report is made out by the men in the field on a daily basis.

In the upper right hand corner, "Organization," designates Richmond District, South Hill Residency - first column, Maintenance Area 2. This designation gives

303.0 tons of stone placed. Total labor hours 1494.0 - Total cost \$3,878.82 - Productivity rate 4.93 man hours per ton - Unit cost \$12.80 per ton in place.

We accumulated this type of information previously on a daily basis and in analyzing all of these production figures, we arrived through the use of time studies and this data, at what appears to be an attainable production rate and also a good method. Planned quantities are not shown here because planning procedures have not been fully developed at the present time. In a previous part of the study the actual quantities were analyzed on a daily basis in relation to type of roads, and planned quantities were derived for the various classes of roads.

The specific uses of this type of data was covered by Mr. Jorgensen. I would like to say that the data itself does not solve your problems. Information such as this, showing comparisons of productivity, comparisons of quantity of work performed are only indicative of problems. As a Maintenance Engineer, you still have to go out and find what the cause is, but it does give you a place to look. A man can be performing excellent as far as expenditures are concerned and still not be doing the job.

CLASS	ACT UNITS PLACED	QUANTITY		LABOR HOURS		TOTAL COST		DATE	UNIT COST	PRODUCTIVITY
		PLAN	ACTUAL	PLAN	ACTUAL	PLAN	ACTUAL			
CA11E	131 23		303.0		1494.0		3,878.82		4.93	12.80
CA11G	112 23		.7		78.0		35.44		50.00	11.20
CA11H	115 23		119.0		128.0		327.64		1.11	2.87
CA11D	121 13		3.0		36.0		70.24		23.33	6.41
CA11F	123				24.0		67.20			1.98
CA11D	131 23		493.6		64.0		126.66		.09	.13
DA1G0	132 32		294.5		313.0		1,223.67		1.22	4.90
DA1G0	133 32		351.1		1044.0		2,656.68		2.97	7.26
DA1H0	134 21		108.0		26.0		65.04		.24	.60
DA1H0	142 23		15.0		12.0		21.48		.40	1.94
DA1H0	143				48.0		81.36			1.69
DA1H0	149				112.0		168.32			1.50
CA11C	151 32		36.7		91.0		323.53		2.45	6.15
CA11C	152 23		43.5		96.0		184.32		2.20	4.73
CA11C	153 23		10.0		48.0		125.76		4.30	12.57
CA11C	159				738.0		1,344.34			1.82
CA11D	161 32		74.0		2210.5		5,926.44		79.87	0.11
CA11C	162 32		129.8		332.0		956.12		7.55	7.31
CA11C	163 31		51374.5		2589.0		3,701.91		.15	.07
CA11E	164				340.0		626.60			1.85
CA11E	169				16.0		20.80			1.3
CA11E	211				137.0		209.21			1.50
CA11E	212 32		97.5		1319.0		2,116.30		13.52	11.70
CA11E	213				289.5		816.31			2.82
CA11C	215				364.0		669.54			1.8
CA11C	216				32.0		64.16			2.0
CA11E	221 48		48.0		90.0		261.46		1.43	1.4
CA11E	222 41		94.2		269.0		710.05		2.95	2.9

Fig. 5

In closing I would like to say that we have found our field forces are very capable of reporting this type of information and with the desired accuracy.

In Virginia we feel that developing data on work performance through a regular reporting system will be a major step in promoting maintenance economy.