

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Corps Specifications Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

1. The Corps Specifications Steering Committee (CSSC) met on 23-24 September 1998 in Arlington, Texas.
2. Announcements. Charles Baldi opened the meeting because of Freddie Rush's late arrival. Mike Dahlquist, CEMVP-PE-D, was present in proxy for Al Geisen. John Kerkowski was absent without proxy. [Enclosure 1](#) is the list of attendees.
3. New Members. Larry Seals introduced new committee member Tom Andre, CELRP-ED-DT. Joe Miller introduced new committee member Anil Nisargand, CENWS-ED-DB-EM.
4. Mr. Baldi reviewed the proposed agenda ([Enclosure 2](#)). Review of minutes of the 16-17 June 1998 Committee Meeting was postponed until 24 September 1998 to allow everyone an opportunity to review them. He also reminded the members that HQUSACE will not fund MSC travel and per diem for future meetings, but District representatives salary, travel and per diem will continue to be funded.
5. The minutes of the [16-17 June 1998 Committee Meeting](#) in Arlington, Texas, were reviewed on 24 September 1998 and some corrections were noted. The motion to approve the minutes as corrected was passed by unanimous vote.
6. HQUSACE Comments and Update.
 - a. SPECSINTACT. Charles Baldi reported that MG Genetti considers SPECSINTACT software to be a District tool and requested Information Management investigate the applicability of the districts paying the \$200,000 annual cost through a site license. This could be accomplished by setting up site licenses for the districts, probably as a straight cut per district. If this is done, the \$50,000 annual cost of the CSSC could possibly be added. This would give a total Corps-wide cost of \$250,000 per year. Mike Dahlquist suggested that consideration be given to per-user fee like MCACES has. Mr. Baldi emphasized that nothing has been done yet on this issue.
 - b. Lessons Learned. Mr. Baldi gave an update on the Lessons

Learned program. The Dr. Checks program developed by CERL looks favorable. He briefed the Board of Directors on 6 May. There is currently no money available for implementation. He has asked for \$55,000 for testing the program in 3 districts, but has not received anything yet. Those wanting to try Dr. Checks can contact Bill East at CERL for access. The home page for the Dr. Checks system is at <http://www-2.cecer.army.mil/drchecks/index.html>. *[I tried this and was told that the site has been moved, or I have been denied access. I also tried to get into Dr.Checks through the Design Tools Steering Committee homepage, but a connection with the server could not be made.]*

c. Military Programs. Rick Dahnke reported that Military Programs is now part of the CSSC team.

d. CEGS 01780 Closeout Submittals - This is a proposed guide spec available for review on TECHINFO. It addresses transfer of warranties, as-builts, and O&M manuals. Rick Dahnke asked that any comments be furnished to him by 30 October 1998. It was also noted that a new electronic version of "Recommended Changes to Engineering Documents" with the same information and format as ENG 3078 is available on the TECHINFO homepage. Past CSSC meeting minutes and attachments are also available on TECHINFO by clicking on Guide Specs for Construction, then Additional Specs Info. CSSC will also have a page under TECHINFO. Actual layout has yet to be determined.

e. Standard Procurement System (SPS). Rick Dahnke reported that SPS is currently stalled while problems with interface with PROMIS, CEFMS, and RMS are worked on. There will be a meeting to discuss the system on 7 October. Deployment may be in the second quarter of FY 99.

f. Guide Specifications. The Civil Works and Military Construction specifications have now been combined into one database. The guide specifications are now identified as Guide Specs for Construction. The TECHINFO specifications database is now updated the 15th of each month instead of weekly as in the past.

g. Charlie stated that one of the Military Programs objections to joining CSSC was poor multidisciplinary representation. He stressed that CSSC represents all disciplines and reminded members to be sure that contact is made with all disciplines on spec issues. The CSSC is a business process, not a stove pipe. The committee now includes 3 electrical engineers, 1 geotech engineer, 2 structural engineers, 1 mechanical engineer, 1 architect, 5 civil engineers, and 1

civil/environmental engineer.

h. Joe Miller asked Rick Dahnke about the possibility of the Corps of Engineers becoming more involved in O&M work for DPW's. This will possibly involve use of tailored guide specifications. Rock Island District is doing DPW work for Rock Island Arsenal on a trial basis. There may also be more privatization of this work. The Military Programs home page has reorganization guidance. There may also be more design-build work.

7. SI-CCCB/SI Update.

a. Steve Freitas, a past CSSC district representative, attended the EG&G Design Meeting on the proposed new 32 bit SPECSINTACT (SI) operating system. The new program is more intuitive, user friendly, and backward compatible. The program has WYSIWYG screen, faster support graphics, and is more SGML compliant. It may be possible to implement Wordspec add-in directly without leaving SI. It will combine the Editor, Job and Master modules in one. A Beta version will probably be available early in 1999. The latest version of SPECSINTACT is v2.6.3, released on the WEB 21 September 1998. (A copy of Steve's report is attached as Enclosure 3.)

b. WordSpec. There was also discussion on the future of SPECSINTACT vs. WordSpec. Tom Shaw explained that SI is the main program; WordSpec is a tool. Full SGML compliance will be compatible with any SGML platform, but some of the SI Quality Control (QC) features would be lost in other platforms. SI is now more user-friendly and has full QC capabilities, including built-in error checking. Jim Quinn distributed a CD prepared by EG&G which demonstrates SI and WordSpec. Charlie Baldi has additional copies available.

c. Some problems have been reported with WordSpec conversions on Windows NT. Freddie said that A-E's would still get free SI if site licenses are instituted for Corps districts. SI is also available on the internet. The cost of SI support is split evenly between Army, Navy and NASA.

8. Joint ER 1110-1-85.

A length discussion was held on the draft ER 1110-1-85, "Specifications". In general, the revised draft makes the specification engineer a recommendation, relaxes restrictions on deviation from the Corps of Engineers Guide Specifications (CEGS), and permits each office to determine their organization. The principle issues discussed and incorporated into the ER

were:

a. Specification Engineer. Responsibility includes coordination, input to front end, and assembly of technical portions. The Specification Engineer is the final QC for the construction documents. Even with downsizing, some Specification Engineer expertise must be maintained.

b. Use of Guide Specifications. Guide specifications are recommended, not required. Since the CEGS reflect the writer's expertise, the district is responsible for including key parts in project specifications, even if the whole CEGS is not used.

c. Local/Regional Masters. Considerable discussion was held on the issue of local and regional masters. It was agreed that all districts have developed local masters and need them. One problem discussed was revising CEGS for repetitive local uses but retaining the CEGS designation. It was determined that local masters would not be addressed in the ER to avoid giving any official sanction. They may be addressed in some separate document. Districts should use available CEGS where possible. When local specifications are created by modifying CEGS, they should not be identified as CEGS. With funding reductions, use of local specs may diminish in favor of CEGS due to cost effectiveness and efficiency. There was some discussion of using the CSSC as a clearing house for local masters, without official sanctions. Jim Quinn stated that all specification POC's are listed on TECHINFO. These could be contacted for information on specific specs. There was also discussion of sending locally developed specifications upward.

d. Locally Developed Specifications. When a locally developed specification is developed which may have Corps-wide application, it should be sent to the CSSC. Locally developed specifications should be prepared in accordance with the document "Guidance for Preparation of CEGS". One problem with locally developed specifications is similar to reuse of old project specifications - they are not always updated to current criteria and standards.

9. Joint ER 15-1-41.

Several editorial changes were made to draft ER 15-1-41, "Corps of Engineers Specifications Steering Committee (CSSC)". Freddie Rush stated that there will also be a Standard Operating Procedure for CSSC procedures. It will be based on the draft charter that he wrote.

10. Notice Program.

Jim Quinn provided a handout for the Notice Program (Enclosure 3). Discussion was postponed to 24 September. Since the guide specifications have been combined into one system, discussion was held on combining the two existing notice programs into one program.

11. Specifications Conference. A proposal for a specifications conference in 2000 has been tentatively agreed to by HQUSACE. A district or MSC needs to volunteer to host it. It is expected that 70 to 100 will attend.

12. Environmental Guide Specification.

There is a need to consolidate the Military Programs and Civil Works environmental protections specifications. Both specifications have strong and weak points. The HTRW MCX has evaluated the requirement and furnished a proposal of \$15,000 to merge the documents. The cost includes field review and incorporating comments, but does not include review and publishing costs. The Military Programs portion of the funding will come from the Green Building program. HTRW MCX will perform the work and will probably use CEGS 01130 as a base. Joe Miller recommended that AGC review the specification. Tom Shaw recommended that the MCX address CSI format for the specification during preparation. A revised proposal will be obtained. The MCX recommended that the cost of revising the spec be split equally between CW, MP and Environmental. ENV has funds available; MP can get funds, and CW will prioritize to make funds available. It was noted that there are 5 or 6 other MP/CW duplicate specs which should be addressed. Tom Shaw and Jim Quinn will prioritize them.

13. SPS Update

As discussed by Rick Dahnke in the earlier USACE Comments and Update, the SPS is currently bogged down in interface problems between PROMIS, CEFMS, and RMS. Freddie Rush mentioned that the SPS is moving toward the CSI process, but some things won't change.

14. Certification

The issue of specification engineer certification was discussed at some length. The recent certification survey results were reported. Joe Miller said some had suggested CSI certification. Wayne Hashiro said some say that there are too many

certifications now. Larry Seals reported 1 response to the survey which was not in favor. It was questioned what value the certification added. Tom Shaw said that the CSI Construction Document Technology Program requires a 5 hour test. Don Carmen questioned the applicability of the CSI certification to our work, particularly with its emphasis on the front end of the specifications. Freddie Rush mentioned that the SPS is moving toward the CSI process, however, some things won't change. In-house certification for the Corps of Engineers is a lot of work for HQ. The outcome of the discussion was to encourage CSI certification.

15. CSI Competition

Additional information was presented on the proposed CSI/SAME annual competition. Since Federal specifications involve a different process than the general construction industry, CSI has endorsed adding a Federal category. SAME is now being approached to cosponsor the competition. A request has been submitted through MVD for referral to LTG Ballard for endorsement to the national SAME.

16. Skills and Expertise Inventory

Tim Pope reported on the status of the Skills and Expertise Inventory effort. The intent is for data to be entered from the bottom up. The individual creates the inventory with name, phone number, and qualifications. Each category has pulldown menus for experience, etc. The Skills Inventory is on the web at <http://YODA.NWD.USACE.ARMY.MIL/SAD>. The existing YODA server is slow but works for engineering registrants. There is an initiative to open up the registry for all Corps employees, but this will require moving it to an Oracle server for realistic access. This move will probably occur in about a year. Any current registration data will be moved to the new server, so registrations should continue to be processed.

The new ER, championed by Ray Navidi, CEMP, will have regional experts listed at the MSC level and national experts recognized at the HQ level. Districts will propose experts to the MSC, where a 2- or 3- person committee of District personnel will select experts for the inventory. There is a need to define elements for Specifications, e.g. SPECSINTACT. Don Carmen and Anil Nisargand will address this as a subcommittee. Any specifications skills that members think should be added to the database should be sent to Don or Anil, who will coordinate with Tim Pope. There will be a meeting in Portland on October 14 to write a scope of work for revisions to the inventory and

transport to Oracle server.

17. New Issues

a. Y2K. The Y2K problem has been addressed by the PARC's office. A Special Contract Requirement clause has been added to address Y2K compliance in contracts. Military Programs has put out an ETL to address inventorying existing contracts for compliance.

b. Technical References. Concern has been expressed by Construction Division on number of references in specifications. Incorporating the references into the specifications would result in very large specifications. Jim Quinn noted that the QC section now requires that references required at the construction site be maintained by the contractor. This was in accordance with a request from Alaska District. The guidance for preparation of CEGS is to evaluate references closely, and not use references for off-the-shelf items. Certificates, etc. establish compliance with manufacturer's standards.

There are currently approximately 2000 references for Military Programs CEGS from approximately 200 organizations on the CCB. Rick Dahnke noted that DoD is currently working on putting ANSI and ASTM standards on CCB.

Vicksburg District uses IHS system for maintaining referenced standards at a cost of \$40,000 to \$50,000 per year. Rock Island District uses an internet source with licenses for a number of users at a cost of \$45,000 to \$50,000 per year. Generally these services include standards, vendor catalogs, product information, etc. The Corps currently spends approximately \$1.7 million on standards.

Rick Dahnke reported that IM at HQ is looking into Corps-wide buy of IHS service as a central purchase. It was suggested that some competition be obtained with IHS, ILI and other services. Jim Quinn mentioned that IHS also has rights to distribute Construction Criteria Base (CCB) and that the National Institute of Building Sciences want to get out of putting the references on CCB. Tom Shaw recommended that the service also include the vendor catalogs and products.

Joe Miller moved, and Tom Shaw seconded a motion that CSSC recommend the Corps-wide purchase of standards be given highest priority and to consider proposals from different vendors, include vendor and product information, and require instant web access. The motion passed. Rick Dahnke will be the committee

POC for this. Jim Quinn suggested that HQ pay for the service by hit and count so you only pay for what you use.

Tom Shaw asked if IM could brief us on the status of the purchase. Charlie Baldi will check on this. The Army representative for IHS will possibly address the next CSSC meeting to explain what they offer. Don Carmen also said that he would e-mail the ILI Point of Contact to CSSC members.

Don Carmen also suggested looking at Mobile District's home page which was revised June 1998. It has good information on new publications, design guidance, and new design guides. It addresses QA/AC, ITR's, etc.

c. CSSC Web Page

The CSSC new CSSC Web Page was discussed. It was recommended that the web page be put on the TECHINFO home page. The CSSC web page will eventually include minutes of CSSC meetings, new issues, committee members, and feedback. Tom Shaw suggested that it also point to the change form for suggestions to CSSC. Don Carmen will maintain the web page.

d. Good News

The EIRS Bulletins and CSSC web page are available for publication of good news concerning specification work. Jim Quinn will add something about CSSC to the next EIRS Bulletin.

18. Status of Guide Specifications

a. Levee Guide Spec

Charlie Baldi said the Jim Chang/Allen Herlocher version was sent out 9/21 for comments. This version involved mainly format changes to Ron Burkhart's version. Tom Shaw said the guide specs have to be in proper format and SI. This guide spec is currently in WordPerfect format. Larry Seals questioned whether it was necessary for all Districts to review it again. Freddie suggested asking Districts which version they prefer and sending this on as a recommendation. Don Bergner suggested that this was ultimately an HQ decision. Wayne Hashiro suggested looking at the latest version which was sent to Geotech and determining how drastic the change is. Tom Shaw expressed concern that, if we don't use specs that we get proposals on, the parties involved may not submit another proposal. Freddie said that he will send out both versions for comparison and ask the districts which version they prefer.

b. Drainage Structures Through Levees

Ron Burkhardt will probably adapt an Omaha guide spec for the new CEGS.

c. Stone Protection

The spec is still being worked on, and more funds may be required to complete. The new guide spec will have three tailoring options. Since CSSC doesn't have additional funds available, it was decided to set a deadline for completion.

d. Dredging

As many responses said that it needed to be updated as said that it wasn't needed. George Norton was going to submit a 3078.

e. Rock and Soil Anchors

The money was sent to Pittsburgh District for preparation of the guide spec.

f. Mechanically Stabilized Walls

The money was sent to St. Paul District. A proposed schedule was distributed by Joe Miller. The District is not waiting for the ETL to be published before preparing the spec.

g. Fracture Critical Members

Tom Shaw said that the money had been given to Vicksburg. The guide spec preparation is being delayed until the EM is finished. The guide spec will need to address the HQ requirement that each district have a hydraulic steel structure qualified person, and Materials, Welding, and Records. The EM is expected to be done early in FY 99. The Appendix to the EM has a lot of AASHTO requirements. The consensus was to wait on changes until the EM is finished.

h. Concrete Restoration

MK Lee (CECW-EG) indicated to Charlie Baldi that WES could do the guide spec and start in FY 99 and complete in FY 2000 at a cost of \$100,000. The funds may be held for budget resolution. Charlie Baldi said that he would talk to WES about it. Larry Seals reminded that Pittsburgh District had also submitted a proposal for it.

19. Organizational Guidance

Nothing has changed since the last meeting, and there are no known problems. Tom Shaw and Jim Quinn will look at details and inform CSSC members of their findings.

20. Specifications Conference.

As previously mentioned the specifications conference is tentatively scheduled for FY 2000. Funding is in the program. The conference could be a workshop. The last conference required submittal of papers on various spec related subjects.

21. Election of Officers

Current CSSC officers Freddie Rush, Chairman and John Kerkowski, Vice Chairman were reelected for 2-year terms. Tom Andre had earlier been selected as Secretary and was confirmed for a 2-year term.

22. Next Meeting. Freddie will notify the committee when arrangements are made.

23. There being no further discussion or business for the Committee to consider, we adjourned the meeting.

Thomas E. Andre, P.E.
Secretary, CSSC

3 Encls

CORPS SPECIFICATIONS STEERING COMMITTEE
Meeting Attendance
Arlington, Texas
23-24 September 1998

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Charlie Baldi	CECW-EP	(202) 761-8894
Jim Quinn	CEHNC-ED-ES-G	(205) 895-1821
Larry Seals	CELRD-ET-EW	(513) 684-3034
Thomas R. Shaw	CEMVK-ED-DE	(601) 631-5579
Freddie S. Rush	CEMVD-ET-ET	(601) 634-5936
Mike Dahlquist	CEMVP-PE-D	(612) 290-5571
Tom Andre	CELRP-ED-DT	(412) 395-7306
Anil L. Nisargand	CENWS-ED-DB-SP	() -
Joe Miller	CENWD-MR-ET-E	(402) 697-2649
Wayne M. Hashiro	CEPOD-ET-T	(808) 438-6950
Don Carmen	CESAW-EP-EE	(910) 251-4656
Donald L. Bergner	CESPD-ET-ET	(415) 977-8101
David W. Barber	CESWD-ETE-T	(214) 767-2385

AGENDA

CORPS SPECIFICATIONS STEERING COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 1998

0800 - 0805	Announcements	Baldi
0805 - 0810	Introduce New Members	Seals/Miller
0810 - 0815	Appoint Secretary	Baldi
& Review Agenda		
0815 - 0830	HQUSACE Comments & Update	Baldi/Dahnke
0830 - 0845	Review and Approve Minutes	Committee
0845 - 0900	SI-CCCB/SI Update	Shaw/Quinn/Dahnke
0900 - 0930	Discussion on Joint ER	Committee
0930 - 0945	Break	
0945 - 1100	Discussion on Joint ER	Committee
1100 - 1145	Discussion on CSSC ER	Committee
1145 - 1245	Lunch	
1245 - 1330	Notice Program	Quinn/Shaw
1330 - 1345	Renumbering CEGS Update	Quinn/Shaw
1345 - 1400	SPS Update	Dahnke
1400 - 1430	Organizational Guidance	Committee
1430 - 1500	Environmental Guide Spec	Committee
1500 - 1515	Break	
1515 - 1545	Election of New Officers	Committee
1545 - 1645	New Issues for Discussion (Tech Ref, Certification, Y2K, Skills Inv., Home Page, etc.)	Committee
1645 - 1700	Summary	

THURSDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 1998

0800 - 0845	New Issues (continued)	Committee
0845 - 0900	Funding	Baldi/Dahnke
0900 - 0915	CSI/SAME Competition	Freddie Rush
0915 - 0930	Specifications Conference	Baldi
0930 - 0945	Break	
0945 - 1000	Good News/Publicize CSSC	Committee
1000 - 1145	Status of Guide Specs	
	Levee GS	Baldi
	Stone Protection GS	Rush
	Rock & Soil Anchors GS	Seals/Andre
	Fracture Critical Members	Shaw
	Concrete Restoration GS	Seals/Andre
	Drainage Structures GS	Rush
	Mechanically Stabilized Walls	Geisen
	Dredging	Baldi/Rush
1145 - 1200	Summary	Committee

(I have to add a copy of Steve Freitas report on the new version of SPECSINTACT mentioned in paragraph 7.)