

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Corps Specifications Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

1. The Corps Specifications Steering Committee (CSSC) met on 28-29 June 1999 in Oxnard, California. The meeting was held in Oxnard because the national CSI conference was being held in Los Angeles the previous week and it was thought some people would attend both meetings and save on travel costs. Also, the CSSC had coordinated with the Navy office at Port Hueneme, which has responsibility for many Navy specifications, and a session of the CSSC meeting was set up to discuss mutual Corps/Navy concerns.
2. Announcements. Mike Dahlquist, CEMVP-PE-D, was present in proxy for Al Geisen. [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. Criteria Scrub. Since many criteria are getting out of date, they are being looked at to determine what ETL's, EM's, etc. are not needed. The review will be conducted 2 levels down from HQUSACE. There is a three-month time frame for this process. Specifications will be looked at after the other technical criteria. After all criteria are reviewed, updating will be prioritized based on limited funding. The goal is to reduce the current 400+ criteria documents to approximately 200. The review and prioritization will include Civil Works criteria.
- b. HQ Restructuring. Both Civil Works and Military Programs are working on restructuring at HQUSACE. Restructuring is scheduled to take effect in 2001. HQUSACE will be moving in 2000.
- c. Notice Program. Huntsville currently runs the Notice Program for Military Programs and Vicksburg District runs the Notice Program for Civil Works. Huntsville had a HQ-directed Phase I functional review of all programs, including the Notice Program. The Phase I review indicated that both HNC and MVK were capable of operating the Notice Program. Since Tom Shaw, Civil Works Notice Program Manager and CSSC committee member has left the Corps, the Committed discussed considering recommendations to combine the programs. Either Huntsville or Vicksburg can do the Notice Programs, as well as guidance update programs. This will be determined by the Phase II study. Rick Dahnke reported that

the idea was forwarded, but nothing is being done currently on Phase II. He also reported that the Military Programs Notice Program would be scrutinized in the near future. Most of the \$2.5 million programmed for the criteria update is being directed to security criteria. Charlie Baldi reported that \$2.3 million is currently programmed for the Civil Works criteria update and could be used by whoever runs the Notice Program. The money could be merged with Military Programs. Freddie Rush will have discussions with MVK to determine what they desire to do about the Notice Program

d. SPECSINTACT Fee for Services. The \$200,000 per year cost of maintaining SPECSINTACT will be billed to the districts beginning in FY 2000. The cost will possibly be prorated among the districts based on the cost of doing business for planning, engineering and design, using FY 98 data. The Cost of Doing Business report is currently the only CEFMS report that gives the same data for Civil Works and Military Programs. Joe Miller suggested using construction funding since Planning doesn't involve specifications, however, Engineering and Construction functions don't break down CG funding. Anil Nisargand suggested using 3 fixed rates, based on workload such as \$2,500, \$5000, and \$10,000. Rick Dahnke stressed the need to have a rational (objective) basis to backup the billing procedure since an exact determination is easier to defend than ranges. Administrative charges for site licenses are lumped together with other fees and are automatically billed to RM by HQ. The billing would change annually with changing workloads. Freddie Rush reminded the committee that the consolidated technical references program will reduce these costs to the districts, so the overall costs will probably go down.

e. Virtual Library. Information Management and the steering committee have surveyed districts concerning use of references and preferences for format. Based on the survey results that indicated a preference for a web based system with printing capability, only IHS can currently meet the needs. IM will probably try to negotiate with IHS, probably initially with unlimited access. The program will be funded by HQ for now, but will eventually be some type of site licenses. Existing libraries may be regionalized so savings could be used for the Virtual Library. The central purchase plan will be briefed to MP and CW Engineering Directorates, then to the executive board. Implementation will probably mid-FY 2000 or early FY 2001. The head librarian is looking at the material currently on CCB to ensure that we don't pay a lot for something we currently get free. There is a possibility that Air Force and Navy could also help support it.

f. Guide Specification Update Survey. The CSSC survey of specifications to be revised or created was discussed. There were no items that jumped out; each district reported specific wants, and there were few duplicates. Freddie Rush will prepare a list from the information received and send to the committee members. Members will then ask their districts to rank the listings. The movement to standardize controls on locks will mean that the guide specifications will have wide application. Operations will have to make a determination on need for a maintenance dredging specification. Some of the Military Programs specifications listed are already being updated.

g. Combining Military Programs and Civil Works Specifications. Combining of Environmental Protection specifications is already underway. Combining elevator specifications (14210 and 14211) has been evaluated and will be put in the FY 2000 program. Charlie Baldi suggested that they could be combined at HQ, and, unless high priority, will probably be done when updates are due. Duplicate specifications will appear in the guide specification criteria scrub. Rick Dahnke suggested that the committee recommend priorities. He also stated the proponents have to be in agreement on combining specifications. Joe Miller said that tailoring should not be used just to combine two specifications into one; the intent of tailoring should only be to address special situations. Joe Miller made a motion to recommend that the HQ proponents investigate and prioritize the 13 pairs of guide specifications that have been identified to be combined. Larry Seals seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. Tim Pope said there has been a problem getting input and responses from the field. Larry Seals suggested getting the field offices to sign for review of the combined specifications in which they have an interest.

5. CSSC Web Page.

a. The status of the CSSC web page was discussed. The page was opened by Jim Quinn and is now being maintained by Don Carmen. It can be accessed from TECHINFO under the Guide Specifications listing. A link to recommendations will be added to the first page. The recommendations will include a status report. Pictures can be added to the links if desired. The committee decided to put the web page out as it is. Committee member resumes can be added under "Resources". Jim Quinn's resume is currently on the web page and can be used as an example. It was prepared using WordPerfect resume format. Don Carmen recommended that the Resources just list Committee member pages for now. Jim Quinn suggested a virtual team concept with those who wanted to volunteer for a virtual specification team should send their resumes. Larry Seals suggested that minimal guidelines be established for resumes, including format, Chief of ED approval, who to send information to, etc. There will be some duplication with the Registry of Consultants, but the Registry of

Consultants includes only points-of-contact.

b. Registry of Consultants (ROC). The status of the Registry of Consultants was discussed in connection with discussion on resumes. The current concept of the ROC will cost approximately \$5,000 per division for setup and will probably require some maintenance funding. It will be an Oracle-based program and will include an email link. Individual users (i.e. Chief of ED) will be able to query on geographical area and technical expertise. The database will include resumes and supervisory points-of-contact. An individual will fill out information to form a District database. The Chief of the functional division will approve entering the data into the ROC database. Any changes in information will have to be reapproved by functional chief. There will be a provision to validate the database on an annual basis. There has been some concern with the Registry of Consultants concept that it may be used for emergency assignments against the person's will. People may be reluctant to enter their qualifications because they think such a listing would indicate they are available for long term TDY, when in fact, they are not interested in TDY assignment. The TriService CADD working group maintains a database of electronic design projects. The database only lists projects and relies on voluntary input from districts. The database uses CP-18 listings as a template. Since "specifications" isn't in the CP-18 program, it isn't currently listed in the ROC. There should not be a problem with CSSC resumes and the ROC. The ROC may help with developing Technical 13's in theory.

c. Additional Information for Web Page. Don Carmen asked what other resources should be on WEB page? Eventually ROC, committee button with picture, names and hotlinks to resumes could be added.

1) Resumes. Committee resumes are optional. It was suggested that the "Resource" link be changed to "Specification Engineers/SPECSINTACT". Jim Quinn will draft format, procedures for adding resumes, etc. for Freddie to send to the committee. In response to Freddie's concern about the appearance of CSSC endorsement of names on the list, Charlie recommended that resumes be sent to Division representatives for approval, and ensuring that the individual's supervisor be aware of and agreeable to submitting the resume. The resumes should be in a standard format and should include education, experience, duties in current office, and connection with CSSC.

2) Button Labels. Larry Seals noted that the previous minutes are listed under "History" and current minutes are under "Minutes". He suggested removing History and putting all minutes under one button.

3) Training. Joe Miller asked if there were any way to link to training resources other than the "Purple Book". Jim Quinn said he could copy appropriate pages from Purple Book. Charlie Baldi suggested adding CSI certification requirements as recommendations for training, SPECSINTACT training sources, and SI Helpdesk telephone number.

4) Links. Don Carmen suggested putting the CSSC link on first page of TECHINFO. Guide Specifications is a narrower subject than CSSC. Since Guide Specs is more of a library to be read, the location of the committee link is not necessarily obvious there. A recommendation was made to put the link as the first item under "Other Information" and retain it as the second link under Guide Specs. Rick Dahnke suggested also putting a link to guide specs on the CSSC page. Don Bergner suggested also putting a link to CSSC from headquarters home page. Rick Dahnke said it could probably be done, and he will work on it.

6. Specification Engineer Skills. Anil Nisargand presented the Specifications Engineer skills list that he had prepared. It was a draft of skills list prepared by Seattle District, based on what their specification engineers do. Don Carmen suggested adding involvement in the advertising process and responsibility for coordinating schedule. Larry Seals mentioned that those developing the ROC will need to define what fields must be populated in the registry. Don Carmen recommended sending the list to the districts for comment. Larry recommended determining what is needed and a proper format prior to sending it for comment. Charlie recommended cleaning it up and putting it on the web page for comment. Larry Seals also stressed the need to be sure that our skill list agrees with the ER definition. It was decided that the District Representatives on the committee would provide comments on Anil's paper.

7. Recommendation No. 14. Charlie Baldi reported that due to the current funding scenario, it would be hard to implement now. Rick Dahnke said that update of specifications is done as a matter of course; when technical guidance is updated; specification changes are recommended for implementation. In Military Programs, specifications and criteria are from same funding source. Larry Seals recommended checking the scopes of work for technical guidance updates to ensure that specifications are updated to agree. He expressed concern that we may not be getting what we think we are getting. For example, Freddie Rush mentioned that the EM on cathodic protection has been updated, but the guide specification has not been updated because it requires separate funding.

8. Organizational Guidance. Jim Quinn reported that the template for CEGS has been recently updated and that it is a standard format. The guidance document is generic. The template

is included with SI software; the guidance document is available on TECHINFO.

9. Letter of Appreciation. Freddie Rush suggested sending Tom Shaw a letter of appreciation. Freddie will draft letter and send to Charlie to send out.

10. Prospect Course Instruction. Freddie reported that he would not be available as an instructor for the next 3 years; George Norton probably won't be available. Jim Quinn said that the class could go as a classroom another year, but that the class is suited for distance learning because most materials are available on the web. TRW has been asked for a proposal on what they would do for specwriting course. Distance learning can be by means of CD, video, Internet, videoconference, etc. Specification writing is adapted to Internet application. Students can learn at their own pace, within specified time for course. Anil Nisargand noted that it is not cost effective to send people to Huntsville for Prospect course. He said that distance learning is more cost effective, particularly for design engineers who do their own specifications. Dave Barber suggested making the course shorter if possible. This has been looked at before, but the information exchange takes the full time currently used. Using distance learning would result in losing the interchange of students and instructors personal experience. Freddie emphasized that this interchange is very important. Another problem with distance learning is that the student hasn't left his environment and is subject to interruptions. Jim reported that contracting out the class has been found to be high cost, and that contract instructors don't have a feel for how the Corps does business. Committee members were asked to query for possible Corps instructors. Any candidates should be referred to Freddie Rush or Jim Quinn.

11. New issues

a. EPA Requirements. Additional EPA requirements will require changes to some guide specifications to address recycling and reused materials. Huntsville prepared a report on guide specs that would be affected, however, the report does not include Civil Works and Environmental specifications. Jim Quinn recommended that a new Environmental section be prepared to reflect the EPA requirements and that other guide specifications be revise GS to address recycled materials. The specification would include specific contract clauses and reporting requirements for contractors. The PARC letter designates clauses to be used in contracts. Jim estimated that 60 to 70 guide specifications would be affected. The background for the requirements is Executive Order's that require certain EPA designated items be made of a certain percentage of recycled or recovered materials. There are eight categories of items, including: carpet, plastics, playground equipment, and

insulation. There are some exceptions such as: economy, sole source, not available within time required, or not suitable for application. Districts must report upward on compliance with the requirements. The requirements apply to Federal acquisition, so they probably apply to Design-Build also. The Corps has to ensure that guide specs don't conflict with the EPA requirements.

Rick Dahnke reported that Military Programs has some Green Building funding to start doing something to fix GS. Some Civil specifications such as concrete will also be affected. Rick Dahnke and Charlie Baldi will investigate the amount of work required on the Civil Works side. Initial work on the EPA changes should be done in three months, with final work done within six months.

b. Submittal Requirements. Jim Quinn reported that the Submittal paragraphs will have to be updated in all guide specs to reflect new designations and new paragraph arrangement. Huntsville was tasked by SI-CCCB to revise the Army submittal requirements for compatibility of Navy and NASA specifications with Army specifications. The target was for the revisions to be done by 1 Oct 99 so that it could be included in the October CCB.

Since all agencies have not submitted sample sections to the SPECSINTACT contractor as agreed, Huntsville will advise SI-CCB that it will not be available until the next CCB update.

12. Continuing Issues

a. Amendments. Freddie reported that the proposal to use SPECSINTACT for preparing amendments sent to WES, but he has not heard anything on it yet.

b. SI-CCCB. The next SI-CCCB meeting will be in November. Tom Shaw had been attending. Freddie will check with Vicksburg District to see if they have anyone to attend.

c. Performance Specifications. Anil Nisargand said that this is no longer an issue. The Air Force had asked for a performance spec for grass instead of a prescriptive one, however the guide specification can be used either way. No feedback is needed. Tim Pope noted that as we loose expertise, we will have to go more toward performance specs.

d. Standard Procurement System. Rick Dahnke reported that there are still problems with coordination with CEFMS and PROMIS. It is currently scheduled for "fielding" this fall or early next year. Vicksburg District has begun using it recently as a Beta test site.

e. Navy Coordination. The committed discussed Navy specifications since the Navy representatives were unable to attend the CSSC meeting. Tim Pope recommended inviting them to next meeting. Some issues to be addressed include: system versus

component specification, use of tailoring options, and how the Navy uses "Specification Engineers". It was pointed out that the Navy front end more closely complies with the CSI than the Corps does. A recommendation was also made to coordinate with Navy, which guide specifications we are planning to update and ask that they coordinate their changes with us. Rick Dahnke said that there is still interest in TriService cooperation and the board meets monthly. The panel supporting the board also meets monthly. He said that he has not received any feedback yet. John Kerkowski will draft a letter to invite the Navy to a meeting to discuss mutual issues. Jim Quinn reported that NASA has also expressed interest in sharing resources. NASA will also be invited. Tim Pope suggested that it would be satisfactory for a smaller group to meet with Navy and NASA, and then report to next CSSC meeting.

13. Funding. Freddie Rush reported that the committee currently has \$60,000 available. Huntsville is owed \$10,000 for support of EIRS program, etc. The submittal update for guide specifications will be taken from Notice Program funds to be done for the January CCB release. A new submittal program is also being developed to create the submittal register in RMS. St. Paul District has been asked to prepare technical guidance to go with the guide specifications that they prepared for mechanically stabilized slopes and walls. They estimate this to cost about \$21,060. Also, Charlie Baldi said that updating EC 1110-2-311 should be funded from criteria money. Freddie Rush said that he might use \$20,000 for the Cathodic Protection EC and \$20,000 for St. Paul District.

14. Status of Guide Specs

The status of the guide specifications that had been previously approved for preparation was presented. All specification funds already distributed have been extended so they do not expire until 30 Sept

a. Levee Guide Spec - The specification has been completed. Funds have been sent to MVK for conversion to SPECSINTACT. The guide specification should be available soon.

b. Stone Protection Guide Spec - The specification has been completed and is ready to be published. MVK received the funds from HQ in the last month. The specification has tailoring options.

c. Rock and Soil Anchors Guide Spec - A draft has been completed and will be sent for review soon. The specification has tailoring option for performance/prescriptive specification.

d. Fracture Critical Members - MVK is waiting for the EM to be finished to complete the revision to the guide

specification. Tom Shaw was working it, but is no longer with the Corps. Freddie Rush will check status.

e. Concrete Restoration Guide Specification - LRP is coordinating with WES. Work should start this FY (LRP). Consideration is being given to changing the name to rehabilitation to differentiate from restoration (implying historical restoration, which has occurred in past). A revised cost proposal will be submitted.

f. Drainage Structures Guide Specification - An existing Omaha District specification will be converted to SPECSINTACT.

g. Mechanically Stabilized Slopes and Walls Guide Specifications - The guide specifications have been completed; work is continuing on the accompanying guidance documents. The Scope of Work was incomplete for required technical guidance that is required for a higher quality product. Approximately \$20,000 more will be required.

h. Gabion Study - The study of welded vs. twisted wire gabions is being conducted by Philadelphia District. No dramatic findings have been made since the last report. It appears that more settlement of stone occurred in welded than in twisted wire. This is possibly due to not being able to overfill the welded wire gabions. The twisted units also indicated differences in manufacturing and/or construction quality control problems. The second biennial report is due in September. "Land & Water" magazine had an article quoting (incorrectly) the Corps on which worked better. Terra-Aqua, the twisted wire gabion supplier, was unhappy with the article. The Corps does NOT endorse one over the other.

15. Submittal Registers. Some divisions have been reporting problems with submittal registers on A-E jobs. In general, too many submittals require Government approval. This raises the Construction Phase Services (old Title II) A-E costs. The question is who determines which submittals require approval. It is important that Specification Engineers be on QA teams for A-E work and ITR teams for in-house work so they can check registers to insure they are correct. There is a potential for large savings to districts. If Specifications Engineers are not currently on QA/ITR teams, it should be discussed with the Chief of Engineering Division. This will be a Division QA area of interest in future QA audits. It was recommended that a specifications engineer be present on QA/ITR teams. A CSSC mini-committee consisting of John Kerkowski, Larry Seals and Freddie Rush was established to rough out some recommendations. A related issue discussed was getting design approvals monitored on design-build projects.

16. ER 1110-2-1200. The committee is looking at revising ER 1110-2-1200, Plans & Specifications. MVK has submitted a proposal for updating it, but no funds are available this fiscal year. Other districts could submit proposals. There was some discussion on eliminating it and preparing one ER for plans and specifications for both Civil Works and Military Programs. CSSC members will review ER 1110-2-1200 to determine if it is needed or not (also considering new specifications ER 1110-2-8155). Comments are due to Freddie Rush by the end of July 1999.

17. Future Minutes. Future CSSC minutes will be put on TECHINFO in draft form to reduce posting time and get the information out faster.

18. Reports on CSI Meeting. Ray Duncan, a former CSSC board member, presented a report on the recent CSI Meeting in Los Angeles.

a. Awards. No awards were given for CSI Project Manuals this year.

b. Uniform Drawing System. The Uniform Drawing System (2 modules) has now been published - this will be important for the Corps. The system can be obtained from CSI. WES has worked closely with CSI in developing the system, so we should already be close.

c. "Perspective". This program appears to be a failure. It was to be an automated type Design-Build program to produce "uniformat" specs. CSI invested about \$1.5 Million; "BSD" in Atlanta did the work. Only 27 copies have been sold to date.

d. Environment. The public sector is getting big into environmental projects. California is big into recycling. Corps specifications now require updating for "green" EPA mandates and PL requirements, including upward reporting requirements.

e. Design-Build. The CEO of a large Engineering firm gave a one-hour presentation on Design-Build. Partnering is important because the builder and designer take greater risks and get greater rewards. He indicated that Design-Build project interfaces used to be with facility managers; now CEO, RM, etc represent the facility. Facility personnel do not have the input they used to; the bottom line is now the driver.

f. Automation. A lot is happening, including electronic approvals of shop drawings and other Web based tools. The Corps has not yet scratched the surface. Anil Nisargand noted that the cost of automation, as CSI sessions discussed, is high. This raises a concern that, with limits being placed on in-house designs, it will be difficult to justify the costs.

g. CSI proceedings are usually published 2-3 months after the meeting, and in the CSI magazine, Construction Specifier. The next CSI national meeting will be in Atlanta in June 2000. It was suggested that CSSC consider a joint meeting with CSI around that time. This may be difficult, since the Los Angeles CSI attendance was around 1,900. Rooms could be a problem.

19. CSI-SAME Competition. Ray Duncan presented and discussed a handout on evaluation criteria. There may be competition in this area in 2001, since it is not possible to make it for 2000. CSSC members were asked to review Ray's data and send comments to Freddie. Ray was asked for electronic copy of his write-up, so district specification points-of-contact could also provide input. As the competition will be set up, a good, standard Corps specification (or Project Book) could be submitted without changes and have a good chance for an award. SPECSINTACT software should be used with the internal QA checks run. The competition will be limited to current projects being advertised or constructed. The rules will be made available.

20. Role of Specifications Engineer. Charlie Baldi discussed a Specifications Engineer paper that he prepared up from a longer paper by Ray Duncan. Charlie says the future for Specifications Engineer future is not rosy.

21. Next Meeting. The next meeting will probably be in November or December. Freddie will notify the committee when arrangements are made.

22. Since Navy representatives could not attend, the meeting agenda was compressed into two days. There being no further discussion or business for the Committee to consider, the meeting was adjourned on 29 June.

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

2 Encls

CORPS SPECIFICATIONS STEERING COMMITTEE
Meeting Attendance
Oxnard, California
28-30 June 1999

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Rick Dahnke	CEMP-ET	(202) 761-1203
Charlie Baldi	CECW-EP	(202) 761-8894
Jim Quinn	CEHNC-ED-ES-G	(205) 895-1821
Larry Seals	CELRD-ET-EW	(513) 684-3034
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	(206) 764-3828
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-E	(415) 977-8101
Dave Barber	CESWD-ETEC-T	(214) 767-2385
John Kerkowski	CENAD-ET-E	(718) 481-8737
Timothy Pope	CESAD-ED-EG	(404) 562-1100

AGENDA

CORPS SPECIFICATIONS STEERING COMMITTEE

MONDAY, 28 JUNE 1999

1300 - 1305	Announcements	Rush
1305 - 1310	Review Agenda	Rush
1310 - 1325	HQUSACE CW Update	Baldi
1325 - 1335	Review and Approve Minutes of Previous Meeting	CSSC
1335 - 1350	CW Notice Program Manager	Rush
1350 - 1400	ER 1110-2-1200	CSSC
1400 - 1600	Status of CEGS (CW)	
	Levee GS	Baldi
	Stone Protection GS	Rush
	Rock & Soil Anchors GS	Andre
	Fracture Critical Members	Rush
	Concrete Restoration GS	Andre
	Drainage Structures GS	Rush
	Mechanically Stabilized Walls	Dahlquist
	Gabion Study	Kerkowski
1600 - 1645	New/Update CEGS	CSSC
	Results of Districts Query	
	Cathodic Protection	
1645 - 1700	FY99 & FY00 Funding	Baldi/Dahnke

TUESDAY, 29 JUNE 1999

0800 - 0815	Introductions/Announcements	
0815 - 0830	HQUSACE Comments	Baldi/Dahnke
0830 - 0845	NAVY Comments	Kersten
0845 - 0915	Submittals Update	CSSC/Navy
0915 - 0945	SI-CCB Update	CSSC/Navy
0945 - 1000	Break	
1000 - 1030	Electronic Bid Sets	CSSC/Navy
1030 - 1100	Amendments (Proposal)	CSSC/Navy
1100 - 1130	Linking SMRL	CSSC/Navy
1130 - 1145	SAME/CSI Competition	CSSC/Navy
1145 - 1245	Lunch	
1245 - 1330	Performance Specifications	CSSC/Navy
1330 - 1400	Standard Procurement System	CSSC/Navy
1400 - 1430	Recovered Materials (EPA)	CSSC/Navy
1430 - 1445	Break	
1445 - 1500	Joint Specifications Workshop	CSSC/Navy
1500 - 1630	Open Discussion	CSSC/Navy
1630 - 1700	Summary & Recap	CSSC/Navy

WEDNESDAY, 30 JUNE 1999

0800 - 0815	Status of Recommendations	CSSC
0815 - 0900	Notice Program	Quinn
0900 - 0915	CEGS (MP) Update	Quinn/Dahnke
0915 - 0945	References/Virtual Library	CSSC
0945 - 1000	Break	
1000 - 1015	Organizational Guidance	Quinn
1015 - 1035	Combining CEGS	CSSC
1035 - 1045	CSSC Web Page	Carmen/Quinn
1045 - 1100	Skills/Expertise Registry	CSSC
1100 - 1130	New Issues for Discussion	CSSC
1130	Adjourn	