

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Corps Specifications Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

1. The Corps Specifications Steering Committee (CSSC) met on 17-18 February 1999 in Arlington, Texas.
2. Announcements. Mike Dahlquist, CEMVP-PE-D, was present in proxy for Al Geisen. Stacey Anastos, CENAD was present in proxy for John Kerkowski. Jim Adkinson, CEWSO, was present in proxy for David Barber. [Enclosure 1](#) is the list of attendees.
3. Mr. Rush reviewed the proposed agenda ([Enclosure 2](#)).
4. HQUSACE Comments and Update.

Rick Dahnke gave the following update and comments from HQUSACE:

a. Funding: USACE funding for SPECSINTACT for FY 2000 in the amount of \$230,000 will be funded by site licenses to Districts. \$200,000 will be for SPECSINTACT support and \$30,000 will be for Committee. The site licenses charges to districts will probably be based on district size.

b. Publications:

(1) The second draft of CEGS 01780 CLOSEOUT SUBMITTAL second draft is out for review on the internet at Techinfo/weblook/01780.pdf. The report, [01780rpt.pdf](#), for the new guide spec is at the same location. Comments are due to Rick Dahnke by February 26.

(2) A draft of ER 415-345-38 TRANSFER OF WARRANTY is being developed by a PAT Team. Jeff Kroll is the POC.

(3) Combining CEGS 01354 and CEGS 01410 into one ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION guide specification has been funded at \$24,000 by a mix of Environmental, Civil Works, and Military Programs funds. HTRW-TCX is doing the work. Karen Gentry, Huntsville is POC. If any Districts have good material which they think should be included in the revision, they should send the information to Ed Bave, CENWO-HX-T.

c. Reference Publications: IM is now handling this. They are looking at a virtual library concept with a centralized

purchase. The system will probably have internet access with a charge per use. John T. (Tim) Ruckle is the POC. The purchase will be by competitive bid. IM would like to have a base line of reference publications for the whole Corps, not just Engineering. CSSC Division representatives will query their districts for info, including: a list of standards and costs in use, which standards are necessary to have available at the desk to do the job, what format is preferred - web access, hard copy, or CD. Freddie will draft a letter for Rick's review, then will send to Division Representatives.

Joe Miller reminded the committee that some web and CD standards are read-only. Jim Quinn stated that IHS is currently maintaining the Standard Master Reference List (SMRL) for \$5,000 per year. The SMRL currently includes 200 organizations and 2,000 standards, 90% of which are used by the Corps. Tom Shaw stated that IHS doesn't currently have download capability for standards.

Rick Dahnke said that the SPECSINTACT (SI) Board has agreed to use one SMRL for all agencies, and that there may be a shift in maintenance of the SMRL from Huntsville to the SI Board.

Freddie Rush asked if AE's will have access to our system. Rick said that they probably would not because of question of how to charge for it.

Tom Shaw suggested the possibility of central funding for most standards and a per-use charge for less frequently used standards, possibly with one access point per district. Jim Quinn reminded the committee that the Quality Control guide spec now requires the contractor to maintain all references needed at job site.

Rick Dahnke said the information collected from the survey will also be used for NIBS-CCB.

Joe Miller asked if there is there difference in usage between Civil Works, Military Programs and HTRW use of standards. If there is, this should be considered in determining cost assignment.

Don Carmen said that due to current costs, this issue should be actively pursued; we have been discussing this for about a year, Larry Seals said that HQUSACE involvement will be needed to keep IM moving on it.

d. Unified Design Guidance Tri-Service Criteria: Work is continuing on Military Programs side. An SES board composed of representatives from HQUSACE, Air Force, NAVFAC and OSD, is

shaping guidance for funding, has identified eight discipline groups, including Mechanical, Electrical, Structural, Architectural, Force Protection, Anti-Terrorism, specifications, and format. The groups will work on merging. An attempt is being made to authorize the board to issue Tri-Service criteria.

The intent is to produce a single document for all three services which is easy to update. Discipline groups will look at all aspects - criteria and specs. The Mechanical group will address system specs versus component specs. A subcommittee is currently working on 5-year plan of action. The Format group is working on DoD Instructions which are due March 23.

e. On-Line Specifications. Rick Dahnke reported a Sweets-type specification system is available free on the web. It is Specs-online.com, but he doesn't know who the owner is. He said this may be the type of component to be included in an OSD initiative for a whole building design guide based on sustainable design. This will be a CCB based web site entry into the design process.

f. Freddie and the committee expressed appreciation to Rick Dahnke for his work in getting the two new Engineer Regulations, ER 415-1-51 and ER 1110-2-8155, published.

5. Minutes: The minutes of the 23-24 September 1998 Committee Meeting in Arlington, Texas, were reviewed and some minor corrections were noted. The motion by Tom Shaw and seconded by Tim Pope to approve the minutes as corrected was passed by unanimous vote. In the future, draft minutes will be sent to the committee for comment, the comments will be incorporated, and the minutes will be put on the web page as draft. After the minutes are approved, the final minutes will replace the draft. Joe Miller suggested a virtual approval process so the minutes could be put out as final.

6. SI-CCCB/SI Update

a. Submittals: Jim Quinn reported on the SI Board meeting in November 98. The SI meeting was preceded by a meeting on submittals. A report on the meeting was sent out to CSSC members giving an overview of the outcome. A copy is included as [Enclosure 3](#). SI is still working on implementing the changes.

Rick Dahnke said that the Construction Division representative did not totally agree with the proposed revisions. The vote carried, but there may be a possibility to revisit it. Jim Quinn said that we don't need 2 data's and 2 reports, O&M data may be in closeout submittals. The intent was to conform to CSI. ENG 4288 doesn't currently permit 11 submittal types, but a schedule for 11 types has been drafted by the SI contractor. The effect

on RMS system is being looked into.

FIO is not used, but schedule will mark FIO on schedule if G is not used.

b. SpecsIntact

The 32-bit SI is moving along and should be released this fall. It is based on Microsoft Visualbasic 6. There will be a meeting of power users in May at Kennedy Space Center to troubleshoot it. Steve Freitas will attend, Tom Shaw will try to. Beta version will be out in June, contact Maggie Mueller or Pat Robinson (EG&G) to be setup for Beta testing. Implementation may not be until at least Fall 99.

The .pdf function in SI 2.7.1 is a great tool. It is also helpful for maintaining CEGS. The tool requires that Acrobat PDFWriter be installed. Tom Shaw explained that the spell checker in SI is an off-the-shelf product and was not modified for SI. The default setting is to ignore ALL CAPS. Since the program does not save changes and returns to default settings each time it is used, changes are effective only while the program is active.

EG&G has been replaced by Information Dynamics, Inc. a subcontractor to Space Gateway Support. Some of the people from EG&G are still there.

Change Requests - Unless there are some pressing issues, all change requests submitted for SI will be made to the 32-bit version. There will be a section template in 32-bit version.

A NASA rep will compare Army, Navy and NASA architectural specs to see what differences there are. NASA is interested in participating in Army spec consolidation program.

Joe Miller asked if TECHINFO has a link to the SI-CCCB board minutes. The answer was that there is no direct link, but the minutes are on the SI home page which is linked. Tom Shaw said that anyone with proposed links for TECHINFO should let Jim know. Freddie said it may be possible to add text to SI link to describe what is there. Jim Quinn said that he will look into it. Latest SI-CCCB minutes are dated Nov 98, and should be reviewed to find out what is going on.

c. EBS/Amendments

Freddie Rush asked about amendments. Currently amendments are being issued in a variety of ways. He reported that the Lower Mississippi AGC doesn't like the current amendment

inconsistencies. Each District prepares amendments differently. The Tri Service CADD center is currently working on standardizing the EBS process, but they aren't to the point of standardizing amendments yet.

(1) One problem discussed was getting everyone to use the same process. Tri Service CADD center developed a standardized web page in response to a HQ USACE initiative, however, it has been difficult to get the Districts to use it.

(2) A second problem is determining what an amendment should look like. Although it would be difficult to develop a standard that covers all cases, it would be useful to have something that covered a majority of cases. There are actually two problems involved, preparing the amendment and issuing the amendment.

(a) Preparing Amendments

Jim Quinn said that it is possible to standardize the amendment preparation in SPECSINTACT. Sacramento District has developed a menu-driven process which Steve Freitas has officially submitted to the SPECSINTACT Board for implementation, but the issue has been tabled until the 32-bit version is released. If adopted, it could take 6 months after release of SI-32 to incorporate the amendment process.

Freddie Rush reported that the Tri Service CADD center is soliciting proposals for FY 2000. The committee discussed submitting a proposal to address amendment preparation. The proposal should insure that the resulting system is compatible with SPECSINTACT so that amendments could be prepared in SPECSINTACT. The proposal could state that the Sacramento procedure is available. Rick Dahnke expressed concern that not giving some direction, such as the Sacramento process would result in excessive study and time spent on the issue. Wayne noted that most of the Tri Service CADD people are CADD oriented and aren't familiar with the specifications issues involved. Tom Shaw suggested getting a CCB-SI representative to work with Tri Service CADD.

(b) Issuing Amendments

There are several methods available to issue amendments to EBS solicitations. The current guidance is to use

diskettes for amendments requiring up to 3 diskettes and reissuing the CD if more than 3 diskettes are required. Freddie noted that many districts are putting presolicitation notices and planholder lists on their web page. The web could also be used for small amendments, with larger amendments issued on CD. It was also noted that the format of EBS may change to DVD. Some Districts are currently putting multiple solicitations on a single CD to save money. There is also a possibility that the internet may replace CD's by using ftp sites. Technology developing and being implemented over time may determine the method of distribution.

Freddie stated that the intent is not to direct how to do amendments, but to insure that the process used is compatible with SPECSINTACT, and that submitting a proposal is means to get it done. Tom Shaw stated that we may need 3 options for different types of amendments, but there should be a standardized format for each option. A motion was made by Freddie Rush and seconded by Tom Shaw to submit a proposal to Tri Service CADD and talk to people to get specifications involvement in the process. The proposal will recommend that SPECSINTACT be utilized to generate amendments and identify the Sacramento process as an example. The proposal will be entered via internet.

7. CSSC Operating Procedures

The CSSC Operating Procedures which Freddie Rush had prepared and emailed to members was discussed. Some minor changes were made to better address the various types of recommendations (information presented to committee, issues to be voted on, and CSSC formal recommendations to HQUSACE) and to better define membership.

The "Recommendations" paragraph was for the use of committee members. Issues to be addressed by the CSSC must be submitted in writing. After some discussion, it was determined that the proper procedure for submitting issues from the field would be for field personnel to submit issues and suggestions to the CSSC through the Division representatives, who would make the presentation to the committee. Architect-Engineers should submit such issues through the District. Freddie said he would add a paragraph in the Operation Procedures to address this. Tim Pope made a motion to formalize the policy, which was seconded by Don Carmen and passed unanimously.

A discussion on the issue of replacement for members who left the committed resulted in a decision to leave the policy as it is and not take an official position. The CSSC does not want to set precedence or establish a policy for replacement of elected members.

The Information Paper Format and CSSC Operating Procedures will be added to the CSSC Web Page. It was also suggested that recommendations that have been made but not acted on be added to web page, along with disposition or status.

The Operating procedure will be sent to the HQUSACE proponents for signature.

8. CSSC Web Page

Don Carmen reported that a draft has been put together. The draft web page is not on a Government site, so it is not currently linked to Techinfo. The intent of the committee is that nothing be placed on the web page without CSSC approval. After some discussion, it was decided that Don would maintain the web page on his District server. Current links on the CSSC web page include minutes of last meeting, archives, ER 1110-2-8155, ER 15-1-41 and a comment page. The ER's are on an IM server, the minutes are on Techinfo. The minutes and amendment information links can be moved to CSSC. Other specs links will also be moved to CSSC. Current plans are for the CSSC web page to be the third link down on Techinfo, under Guide Specs. The Committee recommended that the link be moved to the first page of Techinfo. An e-mail link will be added for users to contact the Committee. Don will forward any e-mails to Freddie Rush.

9. Skills/Expertise Registry

Tim Pope reported that the Skills/Expertise Registry is basically dead because it is not being supported at Headquarters, however, divisions can continue to work on it with their own funds and without official recognition. The original concept started out with engineering, but was expanding in scope. Tim reported that it will cost approximately \$100,000 to convert the system to the Oracle server. The actual requirements of continuing the existing system, which is made up from several components, and moving it to a new server will be researched by Tim. Don Carmen pointed out that, with the movement toward the business center concept, such a registry would be important for developing design teams, ITR teams, etc. Anil Nisargand and Don Carmen will develop a definition for specifications expertise for the next CSSC meeting.

Anil asked about maintaining a Spec writer expertise database in

CSSC which could be done in same format as engineer database. Mike Dahlquist suggested that, if it is in general use, it should be centralized. The database will be developed for divisions first, the consideration will be given to moving on with it. Larry Seals will be the repository for resumes but will not evaluate the people on the list. It will be an honor system.

10. SAME/CSI Competition.

a. Ray Duncan, a former CSSC member gave a presentation on the CSI competition. He noted that there seems to be a decline in quality of specifications as demonstrated by the fact that there are no awards in the CSI competition this year. He said that it seems that in most cases specifications are prepared by clerical staff. He pointed out that the AIA contracting procedures handle most problems during construction, but that Government contracts don't work that way. Ray expressed his opinion that specification engineers should be registered engineers or architects, and that oversight is needed over preparation of the entire specification package, even if the actual specifications are prepared by the designers.

b. The SAME/CSI agreement has been completed. SAME will establish an implementation committee to work with CSI. The competition will be implemented in 2001, and there will be a special category for Federal Projects. SAME should have a member on board at CSI in October 1999 to transition to the 2001 competition. The competition is sponsored by SAME and will involve uniformed services only. The award will be worded differently from the current CSI award which identifies the principal contributor and the firm. There may be requirement for CSI or SAME membership, and the award may be issued to the project, however the details have not been worked out yet. The CSSC will support the competition through the web page and working through the HQ SAME contact.

The purpose of Federal competition is to remove the front end from judging. The parameters for award will be the same as in the CSI brochure, with exceptions such as formats unique to SpecsIntact prepared specifications, adherence to FAR instead of CSI Manual of Practice and other items unique to Government procurement. The competition involves the "Project Manual" only, not drawings.

There will probably be a brochure out this summer. Submissions must be in by October 2000 for 2001 Competition. Submissions will be evaluated by teams in November 2000 to January 2001. Final judging will be done by a committee in February 2001.

11. Specifications Workshop

As reported at the September 1998 meeting, a proposal for a specifications conference in 2000 has been tentatively agreed to by HQUSACE. Freddie said that he would contact Charlie Baldi, who was unable to attend, and get an update on its status.

12. Notice Program

Jim Quinn reported that Huntsville has reorganized its operation. This quarter will they will revise references to reflect the new ER and update the Mil Spec references. About a dozen Mil Spec references have been sent to USACE for waiver or approval, including four waivers. Section number references haven't been fully reconciled in Military Program guide specifications, but they are being worked on. All CEGS section numbers should agree with CSI numbering in the next quarter.

13. CEGS Update

Discussion of the ongoing guide specifications updates was postponed until later in the meeting. Joe Miller noted that the two new ER's mandate the use of SpecsIntact for producing project specifications, and which as written would make it mandatory for design-build projects. Some discussion was held concerning the use of SI for design-build projects. Freddie said that SPECSINTACT is only mandatory when producing specs from CEGS and maintaining CEGS guide specs, the intent is not to require it for design-build. For design-build, the contractor can use CEGS, commercial specifications, or whatever specifications he wants.

The ER's on specifications also apply only to construction specifications, not to design-build contracts. Jim Quinn said that we could require CEGS level specifications for Corps level quality. The Committee agreed that no further action would be necessary at this time on this issue.

14. SPS Update

Rick Dahnke reported that the status was the same as the last meeting. 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.

15 Organizational Guidance

The committee looked at organization guidance at the last meeting. Tom Shaw and Jim Quinn are still looking into it and are aware of some necessary updating and revision.

16. Environmental Spec - CEGS 01355

A copy of status of the specification was distributed. Joe Miller asked that anyone with suggestions should send them to Ed Bave within the next 30 days. There is a holdup on TERC requirements, green building, etc., but Joe suggested proceeding with the normal Civil Works and Military Programs requirements. Combining of the specifications is fully funded at \$24,000.

Tom Shaw suggested that the new specification include Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans. Joe Miller will send an electronic file of the specification to all CSSC members and verify when comments are due.

17. Closeout Submittals - CEGS 01780

Rick Dahnke reported that the second draft is available for review, with comments due by 2/26. He also reported that the HQUSACE policy on closeout submittals, transfer of warranty, and as-built drawings was issued in July 1998.

The problem being addressed by the HQUSACE policy is customer concern for turnaround time on as-builts. It is mandatory for the contractor to prepare the closeout submittals for Military Programs and it is recommended for Civil Works. The policy implies that the Contractor should make changes as job progresses with little Government involvement. There are provisions for progress payments to be dependent on maintaining as-builts. The Contractor then furnishes the final electronic files in the format required.

Freddie asked for experience of Committee members with as-builts. Joe Miller said that the contractor maintains as-builts during the contract, then gives the marked up prints to the district CADD to make the final changes. Anil Nisargand said there is some concern with giving design files to the contractor because of clean-up of files, format, and other issues. For example, most Corps districts use microstation, however, the Air Force uses Autocad. Southwestern Division has received a waiver for the Corps to prepare as-builts.

Freddie said the problem with timely completion of as-builts is the result of lack of resources, funding not being programmed, etc. Preparation of as-builts must be addressed in the Project Management Plan, cost estimate, and schedule. Mississippi Valley Division has prepared some guidance for as-builts.

18. ER 1110-2-1200

Freddie reported that Charlie Baldi is asking for proposals to update ER on Plans and Specifications for Civil Works. Anyone

who is interested should let Freddie know. Since specs are covered in ER 1110-2-8155, it was suggested that ER 1110-2-1200 be changed to address only plans, and/or combine it with the Military Programs regulation since there is a Military Programs regulation for plans. It was decided to first determine if ER 1110-2-1200 is needed before pursuing updating.

20. New Issues for Discussion

a. Incorporating Site Specific Requirements into Specifications. Joe Miller raised the issue of the Kansas City District's Lessons Learned Program. The program has database set up for specific installations and includes project installation requirements, etc. which could be pulled into automatically when a guide specification was pulled. This worked using WordPerfect, but does not work with SpecsIntact. No funds are available from HQUSACE to develop a SpecsIntact equivalent. The source code for SpecsIntact is owned by NASA, which probably won't release it for others to work on. The Committee recommended using local masters and tailoring options to work around this issue.

b. Contractor Maintained Reference Standards. Joe Miller asked what the phrase "standards required to be on site" in CEGS 01450 meant. Does it mean materials or only installation? Tom Shaw said that the requirement only applies to direct references, not to secondary references. Joe asked if on site means that the references need to be physically present, or is immediate access acceptable? Since no one had a copy of the CEGS available, the subject was not discussed further.

The discussion of new issues continued on 18 February 1999.

c. Cost of CSSC Meetings. Freddie Rush noted that the cost of the meeting room has gone from being complimentary with the reservations to \$75, then to \$125. He will check on costs for CSSC to meet in other hotels in the area.

d. Site Licenses for SpecsIntact. Rick Dahnke stated that the site licenses are currently planned only for districts and centers because divisions use it very little. The amount will be based on size or usage, and could be based on construction dollars.

e. Prospect Course: Jim Quinn had sent out an e-mail asking for instructors for the Construction Specifications Course. The idea to sole-source contract to Ray Duncan and John Horner had hit some contracting snags and the RFP's exceeded the funds available. In the past, John Horner, Ray Duncan, Freddie Rush and Don Carmen had been instructors. Freddie and Don found that their schedules would permit them to be instructors this

year. George Norton, a previous CSSC member volunteered and will be a backup/trainee. The course will use existing material, but will be updated to include policy changes as needed.

21. Funding

The Civil Works side of the Corps is now looking at billback to the districts for funding Civil Works criteria development and updating. If this is implemented, it is expected that Military Programs will follow. Civil Works proponents need to know from the Divisions and districts which specifications and criteria need to be updated. Military Programs also needs the same information. CSSC will poll the districts on specifications that should be updated, then ask them for a ranking after the list is generated.

Civil Works criteria update funds have been frozen. Tom Shaw said the funding is needed for the Notice Program and that Civil Works currently owes the Military Programs Notice Program (Jim Quinn) \$13,500. Freddie Rush said he would give the Civil Works proponent a number for the amount of funds needed for the Committee; he will also need to give guidance on where the money should go for guide specs. He also noted that there is \$30,000 left from last year's MIPR's through the end of the year.

Rick Dahnke asked if Charlie Baldi had asked about the cost of specification preparation being billed back. Freddie said that there is some Civil Works criteria money available, which has been used in the past for specifications and Charlie got some money directly for Civil Works specifications this year. Charlie plans to get separate money in future. As previously discussed, there will possibly be a need some funding for updating ER 1110-2-1200.

22. Status of Guide Specs

a. Levee Guide Spec - Freddie Rush reported that MVD had prepared a guide specification and Headquarters personnel had updated it. MVD personnel have met with Headquarters personnel to discuss the specification. It appears that the new guide spec is close to being published, but he did not know for sure. Both versions have been reviewed through 4 or 5 drafts. Freddie asked if there were any immediate need for the levee guide specification. No current urgent need was indicated.

b. Stone Protection Guide Spec - Freddie Rush reported that the final review has been completed and the guide specification should come out in March as prefinal. Mike Dahlquist asked if the Committee is comfortable with the way it is going. He said that it appears that it will be necessary to

develop local masters from it. Tom Shaw pointed out that making local masters would be difficult since the guide specification includes 3 basic tailoring options with 2 sets below. It was originally developed for coastal and shoreline protection and riverbank protection was added. Tom Shaw said this may be a good test for using CSSC for problems and concerns with guide specifications. There should be some feedback unless no one uses it.

c. Rock and Soil Anchors Guide Spec - Tom Andre reported that the funding looks to be sufficient for now and that most of the work should be completed by the end of June.

d. Fracture Critical Members - Tom Shaw and Larry Seals reported that the new EM on design of hydraulic structures, 1110-2-2105, was to be completed by the end of FY99 and the criteria from the EM was to be an appendix. The guide specification can't be completed until the EM requirements are finalized. Money has been set aside for completing the guide specification. Tom Shaw recommended freeing the money since it probably wouldn't be spent this fiscal year. The EM probably won't be done until late in FY 99.

As a related issue, Larry Seals suggested that those preparing new documents prepare a companion page with necessary changes on related guide specifications and other documents which would be needed to implement new guidance. He suggested adding this to the scope of work for new criteria updates. Stacey Anastos suggested adding a commentary like ACI does to document changes. He said this would be helpful for designers. David W. Barber suggested making Larry's suggestion a committee recommendation. Don Carmen made a motion to adopt a Recommendation that the scope of work for criteria development also include a provision to require the developer to provide a list of specification and other engineering document changes necessary to implement the new criteria. The motion passed unanimously. It will be Recommendation 14.

e. Concrete Restoration Guide Specification - Tom Andre reported that Pittsburgh District is currently looking into WES involvement in the development and defining WES's role. He suggested changing the title to Rehabilitation and Repair to distinguish it from historic structure restoration. Freddie reported that Charlie Baldi wants to proceed with the guide specification when money is available.

f. Drainage Structures Guide Specification - Omaha District has a local specification which can be converted to SPECSINTACT. This will need concurrence from HQUSACE, but there shouldn't be any cost involved.

g. Mechanically Stabilized Walls Guide Specification - Mike Dahlquist reported that St. Paul District is working on two guide specifications for Mechanically Stabilized Earth Walls and Mechanically Stabilized Slopes. They are also working on guidance documents to go with them. The specifications should be out for 90% review now. Approximately \$12,000 of the \$32,000 available has been spent, with the slope spec costing approximately \$6,000 - \$8,000. The team preparing the new guide specifications includes Jim Chang, HQUSACE and Ron Burkhardt, MVD. It was recommended that separate design guidance be prepared, a comparison of NCMA vs. FHWA procedures be included, and an explanation be given why the procedure included was chosen. The guidance will also include seismic analysis and address construction issues. The spec preparation team recommends either using existing funds for wall work and request additional funds for the slope, or completing both specifications now and completing the guidance later. If no additional funds are available, they could complete the guide specs with current scope of work, although this is not what they would recommend. The project is currently funded for guide specifications and low level design documents. The team hasn't developed a specific estimate, but estimates that approximately \$20,000 in additional funds would be needed. The team's intent is still to finish this fiscal year. Mike noted that the original scope ends 30 June, and the added scope would extend to the end of the fiscal year. He said that the team thinks it is more advantageous to prepare the design guidance with the specifications and recommends this approach.

Don Bergner asked if CSSC normally funds design guidance. Freddie said that the initial intent was to produce an ETL or similar criteria. Mike said that the team hasn't received detailed direction from HQUSACE on what is wanted. Charlie Baldi had told Freddie that he would work out funding at HQUSACE to prepare both. Freddie suggested that the team send an e-mail with recommendations to Freddie, Charlie and the Committee and include the time and money needed and options. Joe Miler suggested that funding for design criteria should come from Criteria (policy) not specs funds.

h. Gabion Study - Stacey Anastos reported on the gabion study prepared by Philadelphia District to compare welded wire/twisted wire gabions. The report, which was e-mailed to Committee members, is the result of one year of monitoring. Both methods utilized galvanized wire with PVC coating. The conclusion of the report is that in the short term results are comparable, but it is too soon to tell over the long term. The report includes some recommendations including: Use of different color tie wire and sizing fastener clips for the number of wires

involved. The report also proposes some changes to the guide specification including: simplifying the lacing requirements, clarifying stone size, and providing PVC material for repair. It also suggests that the use of fasteners should be subject to approval of a test section. Philadelphia District will continue studying the installations and will require funding for FY 99. Freddie Rush asked if the funds needed included updating the guide specification. Stacey said he didn't think so. Freddie suggested including updating the guide specification in funding for the work. Comments on the report were due in 15 days and should be submitted to Philadelphia District, NAD, Tom Shaw and Charlie Baldi. Tom Shaw said he would prepare an estimate for revising the guide specification and asked what the schedule would be. Freddie suggested completing it in a few months and said the this years funds are available to September.

i. Future Updates - Anil asked how do the committee gets the list of specs to be created or updated. Freddie said that the committee initially queried districts on what specs needed to be updated or created and what priorities were desired. A list was then created and prioritized for funding. Joe Miller stressed that this has only been Civil Works, and that Military Programs has their own procedure. Charlie Baldi had asked CSSC to do this work. Anil then asked if it were near time to do it again.

Larry suggested using money not being used in other areas to clean up duplicate Military Programs/Civil Works guide specs. It was determined that the HQUSACE proponents would determine if combining of individual guide specs should be done. Jim Quinn and Tom Shaw will identify areas to be looked at.

Tim Pope suggested that a cover letter which includes the status of current efforts be sent to districts for new query. The letter will include the status of current Civil Works and Military Programs specs being worked on. Joe Miller suggested getting the districts ranking of completed lists of proposed specs/revisions.

23. Workshop

Freddie Rush said the proposed workshop may need impetus from someone willing to host it. Mike Dahlquist said that he thought HQUSACE was going to send out request for someone willing to host the workshop. Don Carmen said that he will look into costs, etc. for hosting it at Wilmington. The workshop can be charged to training if a percentage of the workshop is exchange of information. Charlie Baldi has requested approval, but it probably won't be received until 6 months prior to the workshop.

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

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

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

3 Encls

AGENDA

CORPS SPECIFICATIONS STEERING COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 17 FEBRUARY 1999

0800 - 0805	Announcements	Rush
0805 - 0810	Review Agenda	Rush
0810 - 0825	HQUSACE Comments & Update	Baldi/Dahnke
0825 - 0835	Review and Approve Minutes of Previous Meeting	Committee
0835 - 0855	SI-CCCB/SI Update	Shaw/Quinn/Dahnke
0855 - 0915	CSSC Operating Procedures	Committee
0915 - 0930	CSSC Web Page	Norton/Quinn
0930 - 0945	Break	
0945 - 1015	Tri-Agency Submittals	Committee
1015 - 1045	Skills/Expertise Registry	Committee
1045 - 1100	SAME/CSI Competition	Committee
1100 - 1115	Recommendation No. 13	Committee
1115 - 1130	Specifications Workshop	Committee
1130 - 1245	Lunch	
1245 - 1315	Notice Program	Quinn/Shaw
1315 - 1330	CEGS Update	Quinn/Shaw
1330 - 1345	SPS Update	Dahnke
1345 - 1400	Organizational Guidance	Committee
1400 - 1415	Environmental Spec - 01355	Committee
1415 - 1435	Closeout Submittals - 01780	Committee
1435 - 1500	ER 1110-2-1200	Committee
1500 - 1515	Break	
1515 - 1645	New Issues for Discussion	Committee
1645 - 1700	Summary	

THURSDAY, 18 FEBRUARY 1999

0800 - 0845	New Issues (continued)	Committee
0845 - 0900	Funding	Baldi/Dahnke
0900 - 1145	Status of Guide Specs*	
	Levee GS	Baldi
	Stone Protection GS	Rush
	Rock & Soil Anchors GS	Andre
	Fracture Critical Members	Shaw
	Concrete Restoration GS	Andre
	Drainage Structures GS	Rush

AGENDA

CORPS SPECIFICATIONS STEERING COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 17 FEBRUARY 1999

0800 - 0805	Announcements	Rush
0805 - 0810	Review Agenda	Rush
0810 - 0825	HQUSACE Comments & Update	Baldi/Dahnke
0825 - 0835	Review and Approve Minutes of Previous Meeting	Committee
0835 - 0855	SI-CCCB/SI Update	Shaw/Quinn/Dahnke
0855 - 0915	CSSC Operating Procedures	Committee
0915 - 0930	CSSC Web Page	Norton/Quinn
0930 - 0945	Break	
0945 - 1015	Tri-Agency Submittals	Committee
1015 - 1045	Skills/Expertise Registry	Committee
1045 - 1100	SAME/CSI Competition	Committee
1100 - 1115	Recommendation No. 13	Committee
1115 - 1130	Specifications Workshop	Committee
1130 - 1245	Lunch	
1245 - 1315	Notice Program	Quinn/Shaw
1315 - 1330	CEGS Update	Quinn/Shaw
1330 - 1345	SPS Update	Dahnke
1345 - 1400	Organizational Guidance	Committee
1400 - 1415	Environmental Spec - 01355	Committee
1415 - 1435	Closeout Submittals - 01780	Committee
1435 - 1500	ER 1110-2-1200	Committee
1500 - 1515	Break	
1515 - 1645	New Issues for Discussion	Committee
1645 - 1700	Summary	

THURSDAY, 18 FEBRUARY 1999

0800 - 0845	New Issues (continued)	Committee
0845 - 0900	Funding	Baldi/Dahnke
0900 - 1145	Status of Guide Specs*	
	Levee GS	Baldi
	Stone Protection GS	Rush
	Rock & Soil Anchors GS	Andre
	Fracture Critical Members	Shaw
	Concrete Restoration GS	Andre
	Drainage Structures GS	Rush
	Mechanically Stabilized Walls	Dahlquist
	Gabion Study	Kerkowski
1145 - 1200	Summary	Committee

* Committee will take a 15-minute break around 1000.

Enclosure 2

SUBMITTAL MEETING

NOVEMBER 16, 1998

The main objective for the Submittal Meeting is to standardize specification format which benefits all three agencies and their A/E firms. Having a standard application for all three agencies allows sharing guide specifications among the agencies when preparing a project specification.

ATTENDEES

Rick Dahnke, USACE
Ed Gallagher, NAVFAC
Thomas Hinshaw, NASA
Carl Kersten, NAVFAC
Maggie Muller, I.D.I
Pat Robinson, I.D.I.
Jim Quinn, USACE
Terry Wilford, USACE

SD NUMBERS AND THEIR NAMES

Currently, there are nineteen (19) Submittal Types. Army and NASA utilize ten (10) standard submittals (SD's), Navy utilize seventeen (17).

Recommendation: Utilize the same Submittal Types (SD's) for all three agencies

Course of Action: All three agencies agreed to standardize the SD Numbers and Names according to the CSI (Construction Specification Institute) found in the Manual of Practice. They are as follows:

SD-01 Preconstruction Submittals
SD-02 Shop Drawings
SD-03 Product Data
SD-04 Samples
SD-05 Design Data
SD-06 Test Reports
SD-07 Certificates
SD-08 Manufacturer's Instructions
SD-09 Manufacturer's Field Reports
SD-10 Operation and Maintenance Data
SD-11 Closeout Submittals

Action Item: It was suggested that the SD numbers be removed from the Submittal Type. Pat Robinson said, before removing the SD numbers Pat will need to check with the programmers to see what it may affect. If the SD numbers are remove, it will not be before the release of our new 32 bit software.

SUBMITTAL DEFINITIONS

Recommendation: The Submittal Definitions, listed below the SD Number in Submittal Section 01330 be consistent for all three agencies.

Course of Action: It was decided that the definitions of the Submittal Types, listed below the SD Numbers in Submittal Section 01330, for all three agencies, will remain as is. They do not have to be identical because it does not cause a problem when interchanging guide specifications.

SUBMITTAL SECTION 01330

Recommendation: The “Title” for the Submittal Section 01330, for all three agencies, should be consistent.

Course of Action: NASA agreed to change their Submittal Section 01330 from “Submittals” to “Submittal Procedures” to be consistent with Army and Navy.

SECTION FORMAT

Recommendation: The format of the Submittal Article within Part 1, should be consistent for all three agencies.

Course of Action: Navy agreed to change their format to be consistent with NASA and Army with respect to structure of the Submittal Article within Part 1.

Example: With tags showing.

<SPT =1.3><TTL> 1.3 SUBMITTALS</TTLL>

<TXT>Insert the **Standard Paragraph** for any of the three agencies.</TXT>

<LST>SD-02 Shop Drawings</LST>

<ITM>_{Mix Design Data}shall be submitted in accordance with the paragraph entitled, “_{Ready Mix Concrete},” of this section.

_{Reinforcement}
_{Pre-Fabricated Forms}
_{Accessories}</ITM>

Example: Hiding tags

1.3 SUBMITTALS

Insert the Standard Paragraph for all three agencies.

SD-04 Shop Drawings

Mix Design Data shall be submitted in accordance with the page entitled, “Ready Mix Concrete,” of this section.

Reinforcement
Pre-Fabricated Forms
Accessories

SUBMITTAL ITEMS

Recommendation: Reference **all** submittal items (which are listed below the SD numbers within the Submittal Article, Part 1) in **one** principal subpart within the technical section.

Course of Action: Army and NASA agreed to tag submittal items (which are listed below the SD numbers), either as an Article, Paragraph, Subparagraph or within the Text, to be consistent with Navy.

PUNCTUATION

Recommendation: Insert a semi-colon (;), following the submittal item (before the Classification/Reviewer) for all three agencies.

Course of Action: NASA and Navy both agreed to insert a semi-colon (;), before the Classification/Reviewer, to be consistent with the Army.

CLASSIFICATION

Recommendation: Utilize the same Submittal Classification for all three agencies, via G, GA (Government Approved), and FIO (For Information Only).

Course of Action: Army agreed to use “G” (Government Approved) to be consistent with NASA and Navy.

Army agreed to omit the “FIO” (For Information Only) from USACE text, under one condition. If the submittal item is not followed by a “G” then the system will be defaulted to output an “x” under “Column (p)” (For Information Only) in the Army Submittal Register (***Contingent on software compatibility with RMS**).

Action Item: *This item to be investigated by Terry Wilford, USACE.

REVIEWER

Recommendation: In conjunction with the Classification, allow up to any five (5) characters in lieu of three (3) as the “Reviewer” for all three agencies.

Course of Action: Since inserting five (5) characters as a “Reviewer” would cause a problem in the Army Submittal Register, NASA and Navy agreed to use only three (3) characters to be consistent with Army.

SUMMARY

TRANSITION PLAN: Maggie will create standard procedures to send to Army, NASA, Navy so that they can create a sample section consisting of all the changes they agreed upon.

After creating the sample sections each agency will send them to Maggie for review (around the second week in January).

Maggie will review and test the sample sections. This should be completed by the end of January.

After testing the sample sections, and everything is approved, Army, NASA and Navy will continue and revise all their guide specifications.

IMPLEMENTAT DATE

The Implement Date is set for July, 1999, if everything goes as planned, otherwise it will be moved up to the October release.

NOTE: By agreeing to above recommendations, there will be no requirement to change any of the "Unique Submittal Register Forms" used by the three agencies.