

## MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Corps Specifications Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

1. The Corps Specifications Steering Committee (CSSC) met on 3 March 2000 in San Antonio, Texas.

2. Announcements. Mike Dahlquist, CEMVP-ED-D, was present in proxy for Al Geisen; Stephen Goodin was present for Tim Pope; Tats Hirata was present replacing Wayne Hashiro who is now Chief of Design at Norfolk; Anil Nisargand and Rick Dahnke were absent. Douglas Crum, CEMVP-ED-D was present as a visitor. [Enclosure 1](#) is the list of attendees.

3. Specifications Workshop. The principle purpose of the meeting was to discuss the workshop and plan for the June CSSC meeting.

3.1 Administrative Matters. John Kerkowski will put together a list of attendees and presenters and send to those who attended. Freddie Rush will send a letter of appreciation to Rosemarie Johnston, CENAD for her work with the registration and other matters in relation to the workshop. Charlie Baldi suggested also sending a letter to Tom Henshaw's supervisor at NASA since he gave up another trip to attend the workshop. Letters will also be sent to Pat Roberston and Tom Adams who gave presentations at the workshop.

3.2 Issues from Workshop:

a. Corps SPECSINTACT Users Group. A suggestion was made at the workshop that the Corps establish a users group for those who use SPECSINTACT daily to discuss issues and present concerns to the oversight committee. Tom Adams from InDyne said that NASA has something similar. There is a possibility that Indyne may be willing to participate in such a group. As a result of discussions, it was decided that the users group would be made up of 8-12 district users, with at least one representative from each division. The group would meet one or two times a year. Since the group is not budgeted, members would have to pay their own way. Division representatives will provide Freddie with a recommendations on who to invite. Freddie will check with Tom Adams to see how NASA is doing it and put together a list of candidates. Several potential candidates were presented at the meeting.

b. CSSC/SICCB relationship. Steve Goodin asked what the

relationship is between the CSSC and the SPECSINTACT oversight committee. Charlie Baldi explained that the SPECSINTACT committee receives funding from the Corps, NASA, Navy, and each agency participates on the SICCB board. Jim Quinn and Rick Dahnke are on the board; Charlie Baldi attends the meetings. Minutes of the meetings are posted on their web page. It takes a 2/3 majority to approve any proposals. Jim Quinn explained that software recommendations are submitted on a NASA Form 1620 that the board approves and prioritizes. Last year, the 32-bit version was highest priority. Larry Seals asked how much of the \$600,000 for Indyne goes toward software development. Jim said that they currently have 1 programmer and 3 on the help desk, and that most of the money goes toward the help desk. Steve suggested that the interactive tool, including being more user-friendly and having more links, was more important. Jim reported that the 32-bit version should include a lot of the improvements recommended on previous NASA Form 1620's. A public Beta test version should be available this summer, and the actual release may be in October. Don Bergner questioned the tracking of NASA Form 1620's. Joe Miller said that they are on the NWD website.

c. Other SPECSINTACT Issues.

(1) Hot Links. Tom Henshaw (NASA) had mentioned at the workshop that it might be possible to have hot links in specifications to the references. This could be possible with .pdf format.

(2) Corp-Wide Purchase of Standards. Doug Crum stated that field offices really need access to the Corps wide standards purchase database. The Corps-wide system will have base standards and the number of users, however, Districts will also be able to sign up for additional standards not in base. Charlie Baldi reported that Rick Dahnke is working with IM on it. He will provide an update to be put in minutes. Districts that are currently using IHS will get a refund for unused use after Corps-wide system goes into effect.

(3) SPECSINTACT Training. Larry Seals reported that he has given some people in LRD information on SPECSINTACT training. He suggested that the CSSC web page be updated to include a listing of Corps people who provide training. Freddie Rush said that he will send out a memo about training to Districts and Divisions. Jim Quinn said that he will update the web page to include training information.

(4) RMS. Currently the only link between SPECSINTACT and RMS is the submittal register. In the future, RMS may also include testing, property information.

(5) Technical News Group. Joe Miller asked if a new

technical news group should be set up for SPECSINTACT users. Freddie suggested talking to some users to get their opinion. Charlie Baldi noted that Engineering and Construction News (E&C News) is put out monthly. Having a SPECSINTACT news group would require someone to set up (Portland District) and maintain it. Techinfo has some information, but news groups are more interactive. He suggested linking Techinfo to E&C News. It was reported that E&C News is hard to find on the web. The Techinfo link should help. Charlie will look into making the E&C News more accessible. Dave Barber suggested sending that Division members send the E&C News to district specification POC's.

(6) SPECSINTACT Graphics. Doug Crum questioned SPECSINTACT's ability to include charting, tables, etc. Freddie said that Tom Adams (Indyne) had indicated that after the 32-bit comes out, more emphasis will be put into editor revisions.

#### d. Design-Build

Omaha District has started to develop a process. Joe Miller said that he thought Rick Dahnke was going to set up a group in Design and Construction to identify mandated criteria in guide specs that would be used in Design-Build contract requirements. Jim Quinn has been in meetings about Design-Build and reported that Ray Navidi is trying to come with a template for Design-Build, which could then have criteria (performance requirements, etc.) filled in. He is still attempting to get a group to develop templates and performance requirements. Headquarters has been busy on job descriptions, etc. and has not been as actively working on the Design-Build issues. Steve Goodin reported that the committee was looking at PerSpective (a CSI-developed program).

John Kerkowski said that discussions he has had indicated that PerSpective doesn't work for everything, and that some districts may try PerSpective so we will have some lessons learned. As Design-Build is used more, a decision tree may be developed on when to use Design-Build versus the conventional IFB, extent of preliminary design required, etc. Don Bergner reported that Air Force customers want Design-Build and that it is happening in Military. He reported some districts have done Design-Build at 95% design completion. The Air Force likes to use it for awarding contracts quickly. Don Carmen reported that some guidance has been developed for SPECSINTACT, and that the Prospect course information should be used to develop a SPECSINTACT module for Design Build. Indyne is currently looking at SPECSINTACT use for Design-Build. The available information will be put out on an FTP site to make it available to others. Jim Quinn said that specifications will put out for Sections 00700 and 00800 clauses on Techinfo in March. Districts that are currently working on Design-Build will get together and develop a

unified approach to make the information available to others.

John Kerkowski suggested that the committee determine who is where in developing the Design-Build process and make recommendation on where to go. Larry Seals suggested having Ray Navidi attend next meeting to update the committed. Steve Goodin stated that there is a need to determine whether to use SPECSINTACT, the current system, or PerSpective. He said that Savannah District would try PerSpective. John Kerkowski suggested that with those who said they are going to try PerSpective to see how it works should be contacted before going full scale and that an objective evaluation is needed. Jim Quinn reported that South Division of the Navy has used PerSpective. They used PerSpective, printed data out, imported the information into Word, and developed their own performance requirements, however, they could not get the information back into PerSpective. They only used the PerSpective format. Jim Quinn and Joe Miller said that PerSpective has good format. Jim said that the Navy only needed shop drawings as deliverables, not technical specifications. He expressed concerned about the future of CEGS, particularly if funds get squeezed.

Charlie Baldi will check with Ray Navidi and Mark Grammer on attending next meeting, Larry Seals suggested including an update in next E&C News on status of Design-Build. The update will include information on the FTP site for available information. Steve Goodin said that Mark Grammer will have someone develop website for Design-Build, which may include the beginnings of a template.

e. Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (DAWIA) Training for Specification Engineers. The question of DAWIA training was raised at the workshop. One issue was whether we should provide our own training or try to get specification engineers into existing training. Don Carmen questioned the need for training since contracting procedures and processes are currently limited to Contracting Officers and Construction Division. Engineering Division personnel are not permitted to attend the training. Contracting Division says Engineering Division doesn't need to know FAR policy, etc.

The need for specification engineers to be familiar with contracting processes was discussed. Charlie and Freddie suggested determining what training is currently available, Mike Dahlquist reported that some Engineering Division have had DAWIA training because of A-E contracting. He suggested seeing what training is available and determine if having more sessions would make it available. John Kerkowski said it might be necessary to determine if current DAWIA training is appropriate, or if something more tailored would be better than complete contracting training. He questioned whether there was alternative training

available, or if something could be put together to meet our needs?

Don Carmen said that questions came up a couple of years ago about Engineering Division personnel putting together contracting information without training. An exception was given for those with 10 years experience. Don Bergner said he didn't know how many would need the training. Steve Goodin suggested one person per specification section and several throughout Engineering Division. He also said there is a question on Contracting Division taking over A-E contracting. Don Carmen said that Engineering Division needs to work as a team with Contracting Division. Engineering Division needs to get the training to maintain jobs and keep these functions in Engineering Division.

Freddie Rush said that more information is needed. There may be some aspects of the training that specification engineers would need. He suggested the possibility of letting the PARC set up and conduct training as agreed on. Dave Bergner said that he would get with John Bergets (who has 60 years experience with the Corps of Engineers) to discuss training needs. He also suggested that there may be some information on DAWIA on the Internet.

#### f. Submittals

Mike Dahlquist suggested adding a discussion of submittals to the agenda for the next meeting. He suggested that there could possibly be a subcommittee including field people to get recommendations to address submittals issue. Joe Miller and Larry Seals said the Headquarters guidance is that submittals should be required only for extensions of design. Freddie Rush said that the ER states that only "GA" designations are submittals, and there are some ideas that "FIO" submittals should be deliverables in O&M manuals, etc. Construction representatives have different views on what are considered "submittals". Freddie said that Headquarters is looking at the quantity of submittals. Jim Quinn said that the designer is responsible for determining if submittal is required or not. Mike Dahlquist suggested determining what issues are and having discussion on subject. Freddie suggested that the committee could make a recommended policy based on the research, such as status of "FIO" submittals and defining submittals and deliverables. Don Carmen said that he helps with Quality Assurance. He said some information is needed to verify compliance with contract requirements.

Clear guidance on preconstruction submittals such as quality control plans and safety plans - are they submittals, should they be on submittal register. Freddie stated that Construction Division is responsible for contract compliance, so their input into submittals required is needed. Construction people should

also be consulted on how this should go. Eliminating "FIO" submittals would be a culture change. He stressed that CSSC needs to be involved in the process. The committee needs to get Construction Division feedback on the status of accident prevention plans, environmental plans, quality control plans, etc. as submittals. Both Engineering and Construction Division input is need since Engineering Division determines submittal requirements and Construction Division administers the contract.

Larry Seals said that we need to get back to process - submittals are for information purposes. Mike Dahlquist will put together an information paper on submittals. CSSC members should get district/division information to Mike by 1 May. Construction Division's position on submittals, including their awareness of discussion on reducing submittals; eliminating "FIO" submittals; accident prevention, environmental, and quality controls plans; and the current process should be determined, as well as what they would favor.

4. Future Conference. Discussion of a future specification conference resulted in a plan to aim for 2003. It will also be a specifications training workshop.

5. Dredging Guide Spec. It was reported that George Norton is submitting an ENG 3078 requesting a new dredging guide specification.

6. Tri Service Specifications. Jim Quinn reported that a previous plan for combining Navy, Corps, and Air Force specifications had been accepted but never acted on. Currently work is being done on manuals and other criteria. The emphasis is on replacing TI's, EI', and TM's; then the concentration will probably change to Guide Specifications.

7. Standardization of Sections 00700 and 00700 and Davison 1. Freddie Rush and Jim Quinn said this would probably require working with PARC. They suggested that there also might be some PARC funding because of regulated FAR clauses, etc. It was suggested that work should be started on a partnership with PARC on DAWIA training and discussion of other issues (00800, etc.) Jim Quinn said the he had previously made a proposal to incorporate some existing Division 1 sections as new guide specs, but the proposal was never funded.

8. Workshop Evaluation.

A suggestion was made to invite evaluation and recommendations concerning the workshop from those attending. This will be included with attendance list. The information will also mention 2003 workshop. Steve Goodin said that he had a copy of a conference evaluation form, but that the Huntsville form may be

more effective. The evaluation should address the content of workshop, not the hotel, etc.

9. Resumes for New Members. Division representatives should query districts for resumes for new members. Input is needed 30 days prior to the June meeting. Headquarters funds travel and salary for District representatives. Freddie reported that one resume had been received, and one other candidate is known. He noted that former members can come back after being off committee. The resume should indicate training and experience in specifications, SPECSINTACT, membership in professional organizations, etc. Nominations will be accepted until 1 May.

10. Hammer Award Application. Charlie hasn't heard anything - he has been busy with reorganization. It is still being worked on it, but he is not sure what status of award currently is.

11. Funds. \$124,000 is currently available, not including SPECSINTACT committee money.

12. Concrete Guide Specifications.

a. Roller Compacted Concrete. M. K. Lee wants to update the guide specification. NWD has some volunteers. Joe Miller will get an estimate on costs and schedules. Freddie will check with M. K. Lee and Seattle District.

b. Concrete Guide Specifications. M. K. Lee wants to form a task force to determine how to incorporate tolerances into the concrete guide specifications. This is expected to cost about \$15,000. Larry Seals suggested that this is a criteria issue. Freddie said the email indicated that it was a guide specification update issue. He will check on it again. The problem is that tolerances tend to vary so the guide specifications are out of date. Mike Dahlquist suggested that efforts to consolidate Military Programs and Civil Works concrete specifications be coordinated with this. Freddie said that he would recommend to M. K. that the task force include "Military Programs" people on task force and address both issues.

13. Combining ER's for Plans and Specifications. Joe Miller raised the issue of previous discussion on combining ER's for Military Programs and Civil Works. Freddie stated that we have a current policy on specifications but that ER 1110-2-1200 is old on Civil Works plans. ER 1110-345-700 is current on Military Programs plans. He suggested that Civil Works policy could probably be incorporated into ER 1110-345-700. Joe Miller suggested some Civil Works input would be needed and that automatically combining may not be good. The Civil Works requirements would need to be investigated. This would also eliminate an ER. The Committee will also look into combining

Design Analysis that is an appendix to ER 1110-345-700. Design Analysis may be more difficult to incorporate into a joint regulation. As required by ER 1110-2-1150 (Civil Works Engineering and Design, 31 Aug 99) a Design Documentation Report is an informal Design Manual, and is not like Design Analysis for Military Programs. The basis of design should be similar scope for both programs. Freddie Rush said that there is also some major difference on design process due to cost sharing, etc. Freddie will put together a Scope of Work for committee review. This will then be sent to Vicksburg District for cost and schedule estimates.

14. Updating Guide Specifications. Charlie Baldi reported that how many guide specifications would be updated depending on funding. Where possible, Civil Works and Military Programs specifications will be merged when updated. He said that the elevator specifications are not currently in the plans. Money will have to be available from both sources at the same time to accomplish merging the specifications. There was discussion at the last meeting on prioritizing combining. This could help Military Programs schedule their money. Charlie Baldi suggested that we split who funds which guide specs, rather than split funding for each. He will check on it.

15. Status of New Guide Specifications.

a. Soil and Rock Anchor. Tom Andre reported that the specification is close to being ready for final review.

b. Mechanically Stabilized Walls and Slopes. The guide specifications are out and St. Paul District has money to finish guidance. Final submittal of the guidance may be the end of March or shortly after.

c. Articulated Concrete Block Revetment. Doug Crum had proposed a new guide specification. Freddie will forward his email to determine if there is interest and need for it Corps-Wide. Preparing a new guide specification will require responses and committee decision.

d. Deleting Guide Specifications. Steve Goodin questioned if there were a need for alerting when guide specs are being deleted. The guide specification he was particularly interested in was that for systems furniture. Freddie said that he could provide information on results of queries on need for updating guide specs, etc. Joe Miller said that he didn't remember getting rid of the guide specification for systems furniture. Severo Lopez had said that the guide specification was related to a design standard, which was deleted, consequently it was deleted. It was mentioned that some systems furniture is not related to the standard. A query is currently in place on

folding partitions. Freddie said that he will include systems furniture with the query on articulated concrete blocks.

Jim Quinn reminded the committee that Techinfo includes a listing of new, deleted and updated guide specs. Joe Miller asked who makes decision on deleting specs. Jim said that some replaced by another number and sometimes Headquarters directs deleting specs. He said that Huntsville doesn't delete guide specifications unless directed to do so.

16. June Meeting. The CSI convention and trade show is June 22 to 24. CSI has offered to give CSSC members complimentary passes to show and educational program, provide a meeting room, and hotel registration, however, we will need to check the room rate. Larry Seals said that the Lodging Success program is in effect in some areas, but not downtown. Freddy will check with CSI on getting Government rate. Freddy said that the CSSC could meet with CSI if desired. He will also invite Navy and NASA. The meeting will be on Tuesday and Wednesday. Monday will be for travel, Thursday and Friday will be available for the convention. Don Smith (CSI) will provide information on educational programs for those interested.

17. Specifications Web Sites. Doug Crum asked if the use of specifications web sites should be encouraged, and how many know about them. Freddie said we could encourage using them, but shouldn't say that they must be done. CSSC could consider including links on CSSC web pages to some of them. The committee doesn't want to give unofficial endorsements. This could be included in the query on new specifications. Spectext is available on CCB, with access fee.

18. Privatization of Maintenance of Specifications. A previously reported proposal concerning the guide specifications has developed some legal issues, and Military Programs has dropped the concept. Charlie Baldi said that he would look into it. The National Institute for Building Sciences (NIBS) a quasi-governmental, non-profit organization offered to maintain them at their cost, the Corps would be responsible for content and updating. This would require contractors getting specifications only from NIBS.

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

3 Encls

CORPS SPECIFICATIONS STEERING COMMITTEE  
Meeting Attendance  
San Antonio, Texas  
3 March 2000

| <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 |
| Freddie S. Rush | CEMVD-ET-ET         | (601) 634-5936 |
| Mike Dahlquist  | CEMVP-PE-D          | (651) 290-5571 |
| Thomas Andre    | CELRP-ED-DT         | (412) 395-7306 |
| Joseph Miller   | CENWD-MR-ET-E       | (402) 697-2649 |
| Tats Hirata     | CEPOD-ET-T          | (808) 438-6950 |
| Don Bergner     | CESPD-ET            | (415) 977-8103 |
| Dave Barber     | CESWD-ETEC-T        | (214) 767-2385 |
| John Kerkowski  | CENAD-ET-E          | (718) 481-8737 |
| Scott Stewart   | CEMVK-ED-D          | (601) 631-5567 |
| Steve Goodin    | CESAD-ET-EA         | (404) 562-5115 |
| Don Carmen      | CESAW-TS-EE         | (910) 251-4656 |
| Doug Crum       | CEMVP-ED-D          | (651) 290-5645 |