

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes



Date: May 1 - 2, 2012
Time: 9:00 am – 5:00 pm
Location: National Institute of Building Sciences
Washington, DC
Author: Cheryl Fitz-Simon

ATTENDEES:

Invited	Attended	Name	Organization / Location
✓	✗	Steve Rider	NASA (Washington)
✓	✓	Frank Der	NASA (KSC)
✓	✓	Sherri McMillion, Chairman	NAVFAC (Norfolk)
✓	✓	Zenovia Wilcox	USACE (Washington)
✓	✓	Steven Freitas	USACE (Sacramento)
✓	✓	Sheron Belcher	USACE (Huntsville)
✓	✓	Robert Iseli	USACE
✓	✓	Dan Evans	Abacus Technology (KSC)
✓	✓	Jim Whitehead	Abacus Technology (KSC)
✓	✗	Mark MacKenzie	Abacus Technology (KSC)
✓	✓	Cheryl Fitz-Simon	Abacus Technology (KSC)
✓	✗	Maggie Muller	Abacus Technology (KSC)
✓	✗	Michelle Pizzuto	Abacus Technology (KSC)
✓	✗	Rick Hatcher	URS (KSC)
✓	✓	Richard Hungate	URS (KSC)
✓	✓	Dan Smith	URS (KSC)
✓	✓	Alynn Skrabalak	NIBS (Washington)

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

- 1) [Introduction](#)
- 2) [Past Action Items](#)
- 3) [Review of November 2011 Minutes](#)
- 4) [DoD LEED™ Certifications](#)
- 5) [Submittal Requirements for LEED™](#)
- 6) [Resident Management System \(RMS\)](#)
- 7) [Submittal Paragraph General Note](#)
- 8) [Submittal Classification and Reviewer](#)
- 9) [UFGS Update](#)
- 10) [UFC 1-300-02 Status](#)
- 11) [Enterprise Database Tools](#)
- 12) [ASTM Reference Update/Migration](#)

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

- 13) [Military vs. Industry Standards](#)
- 14) [International Code Council \(ICC\) Publications](#)
- 15) [UFGS Tailoring Option Definition Review](#)
- 16) [Submitting/Requesting New UFGS Sections](#)
- 17) [Calk vs. Caulk](#)
- 18) [Section 01 33 16 Design After Award](#)
- 19) [Status of Army CoN for SpecsIntact](#)
- 20) [Commissioning Section Update](#)
- 21) [CMS/CCR System Review Process](#)
- 22) [UFGS Change/Revision Policy Update](#)
- 23) [Tri-Agency New and outstanding CCRs](#)
- 24) [FY13 and FY14 Criteria Plan Development and Finalization](#)
- 25) [April 2012 Health of Document Report](#)
- 26) [FY13 Workload Planning Report](#)
- 27) [Construct 2012 Attendance](#)
- 28) [New Action Items](#)

DISCUSSION SUMMARY:

Subject 1: Introduction **Audio Recording Day 1 - 001**

- 1) Sherri McMillion, NAVFAC and Board Chairman, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone.

Subject 2: Past Action Items **Audio Recording Day 1 - 002 and 003**

- 1) Cheryl Fitz-Simon followed-up with review of the Open Action Items.
- 2) The UFGS Working Group recommended and approved the removal of all ongoing Action Items.

Subject 3: Review of November 2011 Minutes **Day 1 - Audio Recording Day 1 - 001**

- 1) Due to the complexity and possible discrepancies of the November 2011 Meeting Minutes, the UFGS Working Group agreed to review and update the minutes collectively in order to finalize and post on the SpecsIntact Website.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

Subject 4: DoD and LEED™ Certification **Day 1 - Audio Recording Day 1 - 004**

- 1) Frank Der noted that in late March an article was distributed that stated that Army was abandoning LEED™ certification.
- 2) Zenovia Wilcox stated that the article was a misprint. The Army is fully on onboard with using LEED™ Certifications and stated, “Internally we’re opening up the possibility of using other third-party certifications.”

Subject 5: Submittal Requirements for LEED™ **Audio Recording Day 1 - 005**

- 1) This is a Sustainable Working Group effort and is a high priority. Once the UFC is completed then this will be visited around June 2012.
- 2) Appendix A was distributed by Dennis Talton and sent to the Sustainable Working Group.
- 3) This effort must be worked along with Section 01 33 29 and UFC updates.
- 4) Since it will become a more generic Section, the Title will change to “Sustainable Requirements” and include Green Globe guidelines.
- 5) If adopted, the contract will need to be modified as it is adopted.
- 6) Zenovia Wilcox asked if anyone had compared LEED™ and Green Globe guidelines? Sherri McMillion stated that there are approximately 180 rating systems. At this time, there are three third-party rating systems that are acceptable by GSA that haven’t been published yet. Once this is done then GSA will approve.
- 7) Item (4) - A list of commonly used Sections that have “LEED™” submittals were sent to Sherri McMillion. The A/E Firm contracted to lead this effort will make further recommendations and will be sent to the DWGs for possible incorporation.
- 8) Item (6) – Is also discussed under Item (5). Sherri McMillion stated that Appendix A had been distributed to the Sustainable Working Group and they are in agreement with using “S” Classification for LEED™ Submittals under SD-11 Closeout Submittals. The Sustainable Working Group will also help write the language for Section 01 33 29.
- 9) By Accepting Appendix A, the “S” Classification for LEED Submittals has been adopted throughout the UFGS. LEED™ Submittals can be duplicated under SD-03 and SD-10, but would use either a “G” Classification or none.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

- 10) Item (7) - There is common language that's repeated throughout the specifications that describes Local/Regional material with the same language. The contractor has been tasked to see if the definitions could be incorporated into 01 33 29 rather than being repeated and then reference those Sections back to Section 01 33 29.
- 11) Sherri McMillion will update the UFGS Working Group when Item (7) has taken place.
- 12) Richard Hungate had a question on Item (8) regarding the proposed milestones. NASA is restricted to a 7-day review period. Frank Der stated that URS would adhere to the 7-day review period whereas DoD will have a 30-day review period as stated in MIL-STD-3007F.

Subject 6: Resident Management System (RMS) and LEED™ Audio Recording Day 1 – 005

- 1) At the present time, RMS will ignore the "S" Classification for LEED™ Submittals. Once approved, Paul Parsono will direct the RMS development team to modify the application to accept the "S" classification. During this discussion, it was mentioned that Haskell Barker has retired. Zenovia Wilcox will find out who his replacement is and will notify UFGS Working Group.
- 2) Jim Whitehead stated that contractor's working for the Corps did not have access to QMS and QCS. RMS is the government module that can directly import the navy4288.txt file whereas QCS is for the contractor and cannot directly import this file. Since the Contracting Officer is the only one able to import the data at this time, it has resulted in the contractors having to reinvent the data which has cost them several weeks of work.
- 3) This applies to all Submittals including but not limited to LEED™.
- 4) They have the capability to allow the contractors to incorporate Submittals, but we're not sure if this had occurred. RMS assumption was that only the Contracting Officer would be the only one who would input this information, but have since discovered this is not the case.
- 5) Steve Freitas stated that it was a miscommunication with the Army's RMS group. To date, we have not received notice on whether this change has been incorporated.
- 6) Jim Whitehead had discussed this issue with Haskell Barker. Providing the input that the capabilities need to be in both the RMS and QCS system. The understanding was that it would be incorporated in the next QCS update. Jim Whitehead will send Zenovia Wilcox his communication regarding this issue.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

Subject 7: Submittal Paragraph General Note Audio Recording Day 1 - 008

- 1) The UFC 1-300-02 is for the UFGS spec writers and the DWGs.
- 2) In the proposed change, remove the first two added text in the 2nd paragraph and leave the redlined text redlined.
- 3) Accepted changes to a) and b).
- 4) Last paragraph leave the first sentence redlined. Remove the first sentence in the added text "Generally, other submittal...." begin with "Only add a "G"
- 5) Delete "Note: In paragraph below and for each G...." in its entirety.

Subject 8: Submittal Classification and Reviewer Audio Recording Day 1 - 006 and 007

- 1) Opening up the discussion on changing the standard submittal format for the classification and reviewer it was stated that users take the "G" as being optional for critical submittals and have been deleting them because brackets indicate "optional."
- 2) The proposed format was suggested in order to simplify and clarify what are critical submittals.
- 3) The Current format is [; _G][; _{G, [____]}]
- 4) The Proposed format as discussed at the November 2011 Meeting is _{G[, [____]]}
- 5) After a lengthy discussion, The UFGS Working Group agreed to accept the critical Submittal Formatting as:
 - a) ; _{G<TAI OPT=Army>[, [____]]</TAI>}
- 6) During the discussion, Jim Whitehead tested the new markup including the TAI OPT to verify the markup would not interfere or require a software change. He determined there was no adverse effect by implementing the proposed markup.
- 7) It was noted that users should be provided with instructions to make their Tailoring Option selections prior to printing and marking up their Sections.
- 8) The DWGs will be notified of the changes. At this point, all submittals using the current format will now utilize the critical format.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

- 9) The Database Managers will adopt the critical format and update the UFGS in conjunction with the UFC 1-300-02 posting.
- 10) Steve Freitas will also update UFC 1-300-02 2-2.9.3 to list the Critical format first, and the FIO format second.

Subject 9: UFGS Update Audio Recording Day 1 - 009

Richard Hungate presented the UFGS Update 2012:

- 1) Status of NASA FY-12 Tasking:
 - a) NASA Tri-Annual Database Maintenance (3-Year Cycle) is 64% Complete
 - b) UFC/CSI Section Formatting is 64% Complete
 - c) Submittal Paragraph Cleanup is 64% Complete
 - d) Updating Tables, and all Metric/English Conversions is 64% Complete
 - e) Integration of CSI MasterFormat 2011 into NASA Preparing Activity (PA) Sections is still in progress
- 2) CMS/CCR New Sections Status:
 - a) 01 91 00.00 40 COMMISSIONING
 - b) Richard Hungate will need to review the Mechanical DWGs 01 91 00 Section and use the CMS system to make comments.
 - c) Frank Der will forward the 40 version of this Section to Rudy Perky for his review.
- 3) Section 09 90 00 PAINTING AND COATINGS
 - a) Richard indicated there have been complaints about the length of this Section.
 - b) The Section is not titled properly as Paints and Coatings it should be Painting and Coatings.
 - c) In order to simplify the Section, suggestions were made to add Tailoring Options to the tables throughout this Section.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

- (1) Since the Paints and Coatings Section is currently in the process of disassembly, this would be a temporary solution by adding Tailoring Options around the tables. Sherri McMillion made sure to clarify this was only a temporary solution and Richard Hungate agreed.
 - (2) This will significantly reduce the time it takes to edit such a large section.
 - d) Sherri McMillion stated that Richard Hungate should contact the Architectural Working Group in order to discuss adding the Tailoring Options to this Section in order to come up with a workable solution.
 - e) Sherri McMillion stated that she didn't feel this should be submitted as a CCR.
- 4) DoD Sustainability.
- a) Richard Hungate should contact the Technical Proponent for each of the Sections to discuss recommendations.
 - b) NAVY is in the process of updating 01 33 29 Sustainability Requirements
 - c) The Dennis Telton, Navy is on the Sustainability Working Group.
 - d) The Guiding Principles submittals are being addressed in the update of 01 33 29 along with LEED and Federal Regulations.
 - e) After which time, the related Sections will then require updating.
- 5) UFGS Master Text Unification Process
- a) NASA unified Sections should be submitted as a CMS Project.
 - b) The CP is notified that NASA has opened a project and then the CP can go to the direct DWG.
- 6) Status of DoD Unification Process
- a) Richard Hungate asked, "What is the simplest way to handle this workload under the new process in order to not lose the work that has already been accomplished?"
 - (1) Send an email to the DWG obtain approval to add new projects for these Sections and then follow-up with an email.
 - (2) The DWG have been in contact with Tom Hinshaw.
 - (3) Sheron stated that she thought work was being done on FY12-21. Richard Hungate stated that he had been contacted about the work being performed.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

b) CSI MasterFormat 2012

- (1) Introduced 72 New Sections
- (2) Sheron Belcher stated that the Section Titles have been released.

c) The Engineering Essentials Company (TEEC)

- (1) You can purchase a \$14,000/per user license or a scaled down version for \$6,000 and an even lower version for \$500.
- (2) Attributes that are available in these applications reference the MasterFormat, but it has no database so it interfaces with ARCOM.
- (3) Steve Freitas stated that it was his understanding the attributes available in the modules lists MasterFormat and Unifomat numbers, as well as the OmniClass.
- (4) Walter Heimbaugh from the Kansas City District sent Steve a couple of spreadsheets that shows the extracted values.
- (5) Steve Freitas stated there is always hope that one day SpecsIntact will be able to utilize these attributes.
- (6) Jim Whitehead stated that this approach results in massive edits by integrating the attributes throughout the UFGS. In order to move forward with BIM there are obstacles. One has to do with adding the attributes to the Guide Specifications. The other would be maintaining those attributes.
- (7) At this stage, it almost becomes impossible to integrate with other or even multiple applications.
- (8) Steve stated that they are at the very basic level of getting the numbers into the modules and making them available.
- (9) Jim feels this is a great direction to move towards, but there are some major obstacles getting there.

Subject 10: UFC 1-300-02 Status
Audio Recording Day 2 – 001 and Day 2 - 012

- 1) Steve Freitas presented the updates and comments to the UFC 1-300-02.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

2) Added Section 2-2.2 Section Numbering

- a) The sentence “Remove the 5th level UFGS designator from the Sections in the project specifications before the final submittal in accordance with CSI best practice”, caused controversy with Navy for a number of reasons.
- b) Steve stated that this is CSI Best Practice and if we’re following the industry standards then we should follow them.
- c) Sherri McMillion said this statement should be in located in the Design procedures for each agency, not the UFC.
- d) The UFGS Working Group agreed to remove this last sentence as stated above.

3) Section 2-2.2 Section, Part, and Subpart Numbering

- a) Remove last sentence.
- b) Add reference to Appendix A
- c) Use of List and Items remain documented. Recommended revisiting this issue at the next UFGS Working Group.
- d) Jim Whitehead proposed removing the list and items, make them subparts, eliminate the requirement for titles in subparts below a certain level, and provide an additional automatic numbering option that would be a hybrid of numeric. At the fourth level, it would switch to the item and list format in which we use today. Essentially, you get rid of ITM and LST tags almost entirely with the exception of historical documents. Put them into subparts then you can take advantage of the automatic numbering. He feels this approach is a very straightforward approach and easy to accomplish.
- e) Sheron Belcher and Alynne Skrabalak stated this would be a large undertaking and could potentially be an issue if they had to be done in one single release. If you have a list of items you probably wouldn’t want them listed a separate subparts.
- f) With that said, Jim Whitehead stated that maybe we should scrap that idea, but Cheryl Fitz-Simon felt as though it wouldn’t be necessary to scrap the concept totally but rather expand by keeping it uniform by utilizing the approved CRs for multi-level lists. The board would decide on the scenarios what type of list is required. Develop around it so that when you select a multi-level tag, you’d get the proper list that would automatically number correctly in those instances.
- g) Due to the complexity of this discussion, the UFGS Working Group felt as though it would be a good idea for the SpecsIntact Team to review the open CRs that deal with this vary topic, come up with an approach and discuss at the next SI-CCCB Meeting.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

4) 2-2.4 Units of Measure

- a) Soft metric is referred to in this edit.
 - (1) Since Army Districts use soft metric, Zenovia Wilcox will research and email recommendations to the UFGS Working Group by May 15, 2015 in order to finalize edits to the UFC 1-300-02.
- b) MIL-STD-3007F states “Do not use dual units on the drawings.” And UFC 1-300-01 Section 00 31 10 Metric Measurements should be updated to reflect the way it is now done throughout the UFGS.
- c) Remove “Metric units can be hard or soft” from the first sentence.
- d) Remove the last sentence.
- e) 2nd sentence remove “hard”.
- f) Continue this discussion for tomorrow.

Subject 11: Enterprise Database Tools **Audio Recording Day 2 – 002**

- 1) Sheron Belcher opened the discussion regarding the status of the Enterprise Database Tools developed by Sandy Wood, Army Corps of Engineers.
- 2) A conference call between Sandy Wood and Abacus took place. At that time, Sandy Wood was going to provide the database to the SpecsIntact team in order for the developers to evaluate and provide feedback to the UFGS Working Group. To date, they have not received the database.
- 3) Sheron Belcher received a proposal from the GIS Group. They would complete the work then pass it off to NIBS for hosting/maintaining. This proposal suggested using Cloud for hosting, but the preferred method would be to have NIBS house this database tool since there’s a yearly cost as well as security issues associated with using Cloud.
- 4) There is still a possibility that other resources are available in Huntsville.
- 5) The current spreadsheet continues to grow and is cumbersome to maintain. The database is designed to simplify and streamline the maintenance.
- 6) The SpecsIntact still needs the files from Sandy Wood in order to complete the review and provide a proposal. Frank Der stated that more than likely outside of the SpecsIntact Scope of Work.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

- 7) In order for the SpecsIntact Team to take develop, maintain, and host this database an ITAR would have to be generated and approved.
- 8) Sherri McMillion suggested that DoD fund/contract NIBS to complete and possibly coincide with CMS.
- 9) Sheron Belcher opened the database from their Huntsville server in order to demonstrate this tool for the UFGS Working Group.
- 10) Sherry McMillion and Sheron Belcher to explore the feasibility of incorporating the Enterprise Database Tool into the current CMS contract with NIBS and will provide status at the next UFGS Working Group Meeting.

Subject 12: ASTM Reference Update / Migration **Audio Recording Day 2 – 003**

- 1) Sheron Belcher stated that the migration/update of the ASTM References throughout the UFGS was completed, and they were able to complete the task earlier than anticipated.

Subject 13: Military vs. Industry Standards **Audio Recording Day 2 – 004**

- 1) Richard Hungate opened the discussion on Military and Industry Standard updates throughout the UFGS in order to clarify the process since the UFGS Working Group agreed to replace Military Standards with Industry Standards whenever possible.
- 2) Sherri McMillion indicated that DoD is required by law to move industry standards whenever possible. Originally, there were no industry standards available to follow. She stated that if Military Standards are being used instead of the Industry Standard, create a CCR addressing the issue or contact the DWG directly.
- 3) The UFGS Working Group agreed that Military Standards should be replaced with Industry Standards.
- 4) Frank Der question on whether or not the DWGs were aware of this change? Sherri McMillion stated that they were aware.
- 5) Sheron Belcher wanted the Board to be aware that there are several MIL Standards referenced throughout the UFGS that have been canceled without replacements that need to be resolved.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

- 6) Sheron Belcher will send Sherri McMillion a report of the canceled/obsolete MIL Standards in order to research.

Subject 14: International Code Council (ICC) Publications Audio Recording Day 2 – 005

- 1) UFC 1-200-01, is the over-arching UFC for the guide specifications for DoD. This UFC states which International Code Council that DoD is currently using. Sherri McMillion mentioned that some of the International Codes they have not conformed to the design criteria. Once the UFC 1-200-01 has been analyzed to determine what impacts are going to be made to the design guide specifications we cannot automatically update the references.
- 2) At this time, DoD still uses the 2009 IBC. Before DoD implements the latest IBC, a thorough review and analysis must be completed.
- 3) Sherri McMillion stated that when the 2012 IBC was released, the Coordinating Panel initiated a contract to update the UFC 1-200-01 which references other UFC's. The owners of those UFC's (Mechanical, Electrical, Structural, Fire Protection, etc.) are involved in the update of UFC 1-200-02. Until then, the current adopted code is 2009. This review can take up to one year until review and implementation can occur.
- 4) The IBC is not automatically adopted in its entirety since some of their requirements are more stringent.
- 5) Steve Freitas felt we should be timelier about analyzing and incorporating International Building Code (IBC) updates.
- 6) The DoD Request for Proposals (RFP) references UFC 1-200-01 which references all of their legal requirements.
- 7) Frank Der said the way NASA does their designs, the RFP states to use the year of the standards that are applicable when the contract is awarded.
- 8) Sheron stated that someone would need to inform her when she should update the ICC Code within the UMRL.
- 9) The Safety Manual still refers to old industry standards that are no longer available. The complaint was that the UFGS is not up-to-date with the manual. The UFGS does not comply with the criteria because they are not current. He explained that the reason we have the change in the UFGS is because those are the ones that are available. Whereas the ones in the manual are no longer available, but they didn't feel that was acceptable and wanted the UFGS changed back to reference the ones cited in the Safety Manual.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

10) NASA has no issues with using and/or updating to the latest ICC standards.

Subject 15: UFGS Tailoring Option Definition Review Audio Recording Day 2 – 006

- 1) Sheron Belcher provided an update to the Tailoring Options definitions list but also stated that it will be a moving target as sections are updated and new Tailoring Options are incorporated.
- 2) The UFGS Working Group would like to see the spreadsheet sorted by the Tailoring Options so you can see the variance of the Tailoring Options.
- 3) Sheron Belcher mentioned that at some point the spreadsheet would need to be reviewed for accuracy.
- 4) The goal of this exercise was to add clarity and uniformity of Tailoring Options for everyone.
- 5) Sheron stated that anything we could do to facilitate the use of Tailoring would be highly beneficial.
- 6) A discussion took place on modifying the SI Editor's Tailoring Option dialog so that users could choose a Tailoring Option and see the Tailoring Option description. When adding Tailoring Options, also have the ability to add the definition. Jim Whitehead believed this would definitely be possible.
- 7) The software would need to use the tailor.tag file used by the UFGS to incorporate the Tailoring Option Definitions.
- 8) Jim Whitehead will submit a CR to expand Tailoring Option Capabilities to do the following:
 - a) Show all tailoring options in a Job/Master
 - b) Show all Tailoring Option definitions within a Job/Master
 - c) When adding Tailoring Options, provide the capability to:
 - (1) Add a new Tailoring Option and Definition
 - (2) Choose from the UFGS Tailoring Options List
- 9) As an Interim solution, the SpecsIntact team will compile a full Tailoring Option List and the UFGS Database Coordinator will distribute along with the UFGS Master. This will be available in the next UFGS Release scheduled for August 2012.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

Subject 16: Submitting/Requesting New UFGS Sections Audio Recording Day 2 – 007

- 1) When a new Criteria Change Request (CCR) is submitted a notification/update is sent to the Technical Proponents (TP), Technical Representatives (TR) and the Design Working Groups (DWG's) are copied.
- 2) Frank Der requested clarification on how a project was created within the Criteria Management System (CMS), whether by the Technical Proponent, or Technical Representative? Sherri McMillion answered stating when a project is required the requestor should initiate communication via e-mail to the Technical Proponent for the specification. If the Technical Proponent and Technical Representative agree, they will assign a lead and the lead will create a CMS project. Once the project is entered, it's then forwarded to the Coordinating Panel (CP) for approval. The Coordinating Panel meets once a month.
- 3) Before initiating a "New Project", concurrence from the Section(s) Technical Proponent must first be obtained.
- 4) For the NASA specific sections resulting in the Tri-Annual Maintenance, a project would need to be initiated once concurrence has been obtained by the Technical Proponent.
- 5) Zenovia Wilcox said Army plans to submit their sections as CCRs so that everyone in the group would be notified for review.
- 6) There seems to be an ongoing issue on allowing the public to submit new Sections:
 - a) Sherri McMillion stated that they do not want to open up the capability to add New Sections because it opens the door for manufacturers to submit Sections based on their products.
 - b) Steve Freitas said there is still the ongoing issue and confusion on how to create a New UFGS Section. He is still receiving requests and questions on how to accomplish this. They want to know how to add Sections that need to be in the UFGS but are not. Today, they have to look at the entire UFGS database and guess what Section would be the closest fit.
 - c) The UFGS Working Group agreed to clarify the statement by modifying the statement on the UFGS Page for submitting new Section(s).

Subject 17: Calk vs. Caulk

- 1) The UFGS Working Group agreed that the UFGS would use "caulk."
- 2) Database Managers will implement this change with the August 2012 UFGS release.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

Subject 18: Section 01 33 16 Design After Award Audio Recording Day 2 – 008

- 1) Section 01 33 00 SUBMITTAL PROCEDURE references Section 01 33 16 DESIGN AFTER AWARD in Army Tailoring Options. The Section currently does not have an <SRF> tag surrounding it but the SpecsIntact Technical Support desk has received numerous calls about this Section.
- 2) The Section is currently a part of the RFP Wizard, and currently this is the only place which it can be obtained.
- 3) Sheron Belcher stated that a draft UFGS Section 01 33 16 was submitted to Headquarters for approval.
- 4) Sheron stated that when using the RFP wizard then references to Section 01 33 16 Design After Award (design submittal procedures) should be removed from Section 01 33 00 Submittal Procedures (Construction submittals).
- 5) Steve Freitas stated that the Bid Schedule and List of Drawings are causing issues with the Army Corps of Engineers. They are getting messed up because our project people rather use PDsquared.
- 6) Sheron will incorporate a note into Section 01 33 00 clarifying where users can obtain Section 01 33 16 and forward to NASA for incorporation.
- 7) Zenovia Wilcox stated she would talk to Joe Hoffman to see what can be done to resolve this issue. The consensus amongst the Board was to add Section 01 33 16 to the UFGS.

Subject 19: Status of Army Certificate of Noteworthiness (CoN) for SpecsIntact Audio Recording Day 3 – 004

- 1) Zenovia Wilcox and Jim Whitehead discussed the effort to make SpecsIntact v4.5.0 available on Army networks by obtaining the Army's Certificate of Noteworthiness (CoN).
- 2) SpecsIntact v4.3.0 was the first SpecsIntact version that required an Army CoN.
- 3) The requirements for obtaining an Army CoN have progressively increased.
 - a) In part because of the increased and changing requirements, applying for and obtaining a CoN may now take up to six months or more.
 - b) In the past, new SpecsIntact revisions releases (e.g., 4.4.0, 4.4.1, 4.4.2) were incorporated into the CoN obtained for 4.4.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

- 4) Zenovia Wilcox stated that she would try to obtain a timeline in which SpecsIntact v4.5.0 would be certified.
- 5) The Certification process deems SpecsIntact as Government Off-The-Shelf (GOTS) software, not Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) software.

Subject 20: Commissioning Section Update Audio Recording Day 2 – 009

- 1) Sherri McMillion provided status to the UFGS Working Group on the Commissioning Section due to the SpecsIntact Technical Support desk receiving numerous calls looking for this Section.
- 2) A project has been created in CMS to create a new Section 01 91 00 Building Commissioning. This section will be the overarching Commissioning Specification. At this time, the work for this Section is at approximately 35%.
- 3) Technical Support can inform customers this Section is in the process of being worked. Once completed, it will be made available in the UFGS.
- 4) For NASA the board suggested to incorporate a note into the NASA commissioning Sections stating that this Section is only used for NASA projects and cannot be used for Army, Navy, or Air Force Projects. NASA stated that once Section 01 91 00 completed, NASA would remove theirs from the database and use the unified Commissioning Section.
- 5) Section update will be completed by March 2013.

Subject 21: CMS/CCR System and Review Process Audio Recording Day 2 – 010

- 1) Sherri McMillion added the User Guide for the CCR Review Process, but was unable to upload it during the meeting. She will contact Bob Payn to resolve.
- 2) Was incorporated into the discussion with Subject 16, entitled “Submitting/Requesting New UFGS Sections.”

Subject 22: UFGS Change/Revision Policy Update Audio Recording Day 2 – 011

- 1) After the last meeting, Sheron stated the Coordinating Panel approved the policy.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

- 2) The plan is to implement the policy for the August 2012 release so the UFGS Working Group could review it one last time so everyone understands the new criteria.
- 3) Maggie Muller had some concerns regarding clerical repairs. Sheron stated, “we envisioned that we would not note clerical repairs on the Change or Revision Policy.”
- 4) Sheron Belcher addressed all the concerns and provided responses to those concerns.
- 5) At this time, only revisions will be added to the “Cumulative Change List” not the “Revisions.”
- 6) The intent of having a UFGS Change/Revision policy is to keep the UFGS and UFCs in alignment with one another.

Subject 23: Tri-Agency New and Outstanding CCRs **Audio Recording Day 2 – 012**

- 1) Sheron Belcher opened the discussion with presenting the UFGS CCR Aging Report was provided for information. It addresses sections that have been submitted but not reviewed.
- 2) The Summary Report:
 - a) 8 - Awaiting Review
 - b) 15 - In Review
 - c) 0 - Approved Change Now
 - d) 2 - Approved for Next Revision
 - e) 23 - Disapproved
 - f) 41 - Completed/Incorporated
 - g) 89 – Total
- 3) The UFGS Working Group reviewed the Open CCR Report and stated that each Agency should be responsible for their own specifications.
- 4) During this meeting, Sherri McMillion opened the CMS to incorporate the UFGS Working Groups comments/recommendations and provide status updates.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

Subject 24: FY13 and FY14 Criteria Plan Development and Finalization Audio Recording Day 2 – 013

- 1) Sherri McMillion began by reviewing the Health by Document Report with the UFGS Working Group in order to look at the age of the documents and determine which ones need to be refreshed.
 - a) 8 – Unaddressed (has since been addressed)
 - b) 15 – In Review
 - c) 43 – Waiting
- 2) The FY13 Criteria Plan Development has to be finalized by July 2013 and we must have a plan for FY14. We will be on a cycle from this point forward.
- 3) At this time, we are not doing badly because we are still changing the dates for minor changes.
- 4) Steve Freitas mentioned the focus should be updating the specification Section(s) since they are not being maintained, as they should.
- 5) During this discussion, Sherri McMillion stated that is why the metrics have been assigned. The metrics for the UFGS and UFCs is the Health Index which shows how healthy the documents are. The CP is using the report to track the workload for the next fiscal year to determine cost and resources required to complete maintain the database.

Subject 25: April 2012 Health of Document Report Audio Recording Day 2 – 013

- 1) Discussion was incorporated into Subject 24, entitled “FY13 and FY14 Criteria Plan Development and Finalization.”

Subject 26: FY13 Workload Planning Report Audio Recording Day 1 - 010 and Day 2 – 013

- 1) On the first day, Sherri McMillion distributed a “Workload Planning FY13 and FY14” chart for the UFGS Working Group to review for the second day’s meeting.
- 2) The UFGS Working Group agreed to focus on the following factors for ranking:
 - a) First by Unified Sections (excluding Sections with the fifth level designation)
 - b) Second by sections with a Factor 5 rating

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

- 3) Sheron Belcher suggested resetting full revisions to zero and the UFGS Working Group agreed. Sherri McMillion will follow-up and have the correction incorporated.
- 4) The UFGS Working Group reviewed and assigned priorities. Updates were recorded in the FY12Ratingrev1.xls file during this meeting.

Subject 27: Construct 2012 Attendance Audio Recording Day 3 - 007

- 1) Frank Der questioned the UFGS Working Group Members on attendance as well as whether we would hold a session.
- 2) Steve Freitas stated that he had not submitted paperwork to conduct a session at the Construct2012 Conference. The session that Steve, ISC and the SpecsIntact Team hosted at the Construct2011 Conference was incorrectly perceived as a marketing session for SpecsIntact, rather than an educational session for government projects.
- 3) The consensus of the session was the attendees preferred to learn more about the process of performing projects for NASA, NAVFAC and USACE.
- 4) At this point, SpecsIntact has not changed enough to justify another educational session.
- 5) Frank would still like to conduct the separate Agency and Joint UFGS Working Group Meetings if funding permits.
- 6) Due to funding constraints for all three agencies, the UFGS Working Group decided to forego CSI Construct2012 attendance.

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

Subject 28: New Action Items **Audio Recording Day 2 - 002, 003, and 011**

#	Action Items	Person	Assign Date	Due Date	Item Status
1	Incorporate Link to the Tailoring Options Help in the Scope Note for RCB&EA	Richard Hungate	03/31/09	8/30/12	Pending
	Comment : Discuss with the Tailoring Option Definition Topic later in this meeting.				
2	Provide link to Database Managers for Tailoring Options	Cheryl Fitz-Simon	03/31/09	06/16/09	Pending
3	Provide draft of the Concrete Sections to the UFGS Working Group	Sheron Belcher	03/31/09	12/01/09	In Progress
	Comment: The Army portion is complete and will be released with an Army 10 extension. The next phase will require unified Section (PRA: NAVFAC) Sections to be merged into those Sections. Attempting to get a Structural Engineer. 11/1/11 – Partially Done. 5/1/12 – Recommend removing this action. UFGS Working Group Agreed.				
4	Draft a Submittal Paragraph General Note detailing the classification codes used by SpecsIntact and RMS	Steve Freitas	11/03/09	10/31/12	Pending
	Comment: Steve will reassess and update. 5/1/11 – Still pending LEED paragraph changes, and RFP due to continual changes. Also, include 6, 7, 8, and 9				
5	Email draft Submittal Paragraph General Note to Sheron Belcher and Richard Hungate for review/concurrence	Steve Freitas	11/03/09	01/31/09	Pending
6	Once Submittal Paragraph General Note has been finalized forward to the UFGS Working Group for approval	Steve Freitas	11/03/09	01/31/09	Pending
7	Implement Submittal Paragraph General Note throughout the UFGS	Database Managers	11/03/09	05/2010	Complete 02/2012
8	Modify Help to define the use of Tailoring Options	Cheryl Fitz-Simon	11/03/09	TBD	Pending
9	Add capability to perform a keyword search on Section Titles in the new Internet Based Database for Tracking the UFGS	Sherri McMillion Sheron Belcher	11/04/09	TBD	Ongoing
10	Add capability to the Document List to “Filter by Status: ALL and AGENCY” in the new Internet Based Database for Tracking the UFGS	Sherri McMillion Sheron Belcher	11/04/09	TBD	Ongoing

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

#	Action Items	Person	Assign Date	Due Date	Item Status
11	Create Administrative Rights for User Groups for the different Document Types-	Sherri McMillion Sheron Belcher	11/04/09	TBD	Ongoing
	Comment: Anticipate completion in mid-May 2011. Reports still need to be worked. Sheron will request Sandy Wood transfer the database to the SpecsIntact Team for evaluation and consideration for development and maintenance. The UFGS Working Group Board Members approved for the SI Team to move forward. Frank Der will look into the contract obligations.				
12	Provide a standard list of NAVFAC Regions to the Database Managers and the SpecsIntact Team in order to update the Tailoring Options throughout the UFGS.	Sherri McMillion	10/26/10	12/15/10	Complete 11/2011
13	Provide a Tailoring Options Definitions List that will be available on the SI Web Site and linked within the UFGS.	Sheron Belcher	07/31/12	TBD	Ongoing
14	Send a draft Tailoring Options Definitions List to the UFGS Working Group for final approval.	Sheron Belcher	10/26/10	TBD	Ongoing
	Comment: Added CR 11-004. 11/1/2011 - Further discussion will need to commence on this topic.				
15	List the Word Publishing issue and solution on the Technical Excellence Network (TEN) Site.	Steve Freitas	10/26/10	10/31/12	Pending
	Comment: Not completed yet. 11/1/2011 – Add General note to contact the SpecsIntact Technical Support Desk.				
16	Forward FedGreen and RCBEA spreadsheets to the DWG for approval	Zenovia Wilcox Sherri McMillion	10/26/10	11/15/10	OBE
	Comment: This topic will be discussed in more depth further into the meeting. 11/1/2011 – The RCBEA throughout Navy Sections is redundant information. Sherri stated that it does not fit the UFGS Template as far as they are concerned. Frank and Richard will review the NAVY and Army Sections to see what is being considered as duplicated information. Richard will forward this list to Zenovia Wilcox.				
17	Provide Bob Payn an updated list changing the CCR status in CMS from Other to NASA	Sherri McMillion	04/18/11	10/31/12	Pending
18	Provide a Proposal to the UFGS Working Group addressing LEED™ Submittal Requirements (and tagging)	Sherri McMillion	04/18/11	11/2012	Pending
19	Obtain the Sustainability Criteria Update scope from Rudy then distribute to the UFGS Working Group for review and clarify whether this includes	Sherri McMillion	04/19/11	05/06/11	Complete 05/01/2012

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

#	Action Items	Person	Assign Date	Due Date	Item Status
	commissioning.				
20	Follow-up with Pete Rossbach on RCBEA Issues with Structural DWG	Richard Hungate	04/19/11	04/29/11	OBE
21	Send the 95% NASA BIM Guidelines for Design-Build and Design-Bid-Build to the UFGS Working Group	Frank Der	04/18/11	05/31/12	Ongoing
22	Send note to the DWG proponents to identify Critical Standard updates within the UMRL	Sherri McMillion	11/1/11	11/18/11	Complete 01/2012
23	Send note to the NS-CCCB on updating/adopting Critical updates (ICC).	Frank Der	11/1/11	06/2012	Complete 05/07/2012
24	Update the Submittal Note by the February 2012 release	Database Mgr.	11/1/11	02/2011	Complete 02/2012
25	Make the changes to the UFGS Change Revision Policy then forward to Sherri McMillion	Sheron Belcher	11/1/11	11/2011	Complete 05/01/2012
26	Forward the updated UFGS Change Revision Policy to the Coordinating Panel for review	Sherri McMillion	11/1/11	11/16/11	Complete 11/17/2011
27	Check MIL-STD-3007F for the UFGS Database Manager role and responsibilities	Dan Evans	11/1/11	11/16/11	Complete 11/2011
	Comment: Statement is generalized and no change required.				
28	Develop Matrix for Sustainable Specifications and identify the impact to Division 02 – 49	Richard Hungate	11/1/11	12/10/11	OBE
29	Send Richard Hungate contact information for Paula Shaw, Air Force	Sherri McMillion	11/2/11	11/16/11	Complete 01/2012
30	Incorporate the UFGS Level Modification Classification and Associated Documentation Change/Revision Table into the MIL-STD-3007G	Sherri McMillion	11/2/11	01/2013	Pending
31	Incorporate SectionFormat as documented in UFC 1-300-02 into the SI Section Template	Maggie Muller	11/2/11	10/31/12	Complete 01/17/2013
32	Incorporate Minor changes to UFC 1-300-02	Steve Freitas	11/2/11	11/18/11	Complete 04/16/2012

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

#	Action Items	Person	Assign Date	Due Date	Item Status
33	UFC 1-300-02 Review Comments received from DWG	Steve Freitas	11/2/11	12/13/11	Complete 04/01/2012
34	Review and incorporate comments Send Final UFC 1-300-02 to the CP	Steve Freitas	11/2/11	06/2012	Pending
35	Contact Bob Payn to see whether it is possible to add files to the CCR System.	Sherri McMillion	11/2/11	12/15/12	Complete 05/01/2012
	Comment: 5/1/2012 - Disapproved				
36	Request approval for Navy participation at the CSI Construct2012 Conference, Phoenix AZ	Sherri McMillion	11/2/11	01/31/12	Complete 05/01/2012
	Comment: 5/1/2012 - Disapproved				
37	Approval to use the "S" classification for sustainable submittals (tied to #20) – See about merging actions.	Sherri McMillion	11/2/11	02/2012	Complete 5/01/2012
38	Verify CSI 4 th Level Definition/Designation for System	Richard Hungate	05/01/12	05/31/12	
39	Validate the SI Web Site Support Page POCs. http://si.ksc.nasa.gov/Support/Support.shtml	Sherri McMillion Zenovia Wilcox Frank Der Steve Freitas	05/01/12	10/31/12	
40	Forward Email to Jim Lovo RMS Communications	Jim Whitehead	05/01/12	6/1/12	
41	Notify the UFGS Working Group of Haskell Barker's replacement	Zenovia Wilcox	05/01/12	5/1/12	
42	With the November 2012 UFGS Release, change the current Submittal Classification and Reviewer format throughout the UFGS to the new Critical Format. NOTE: Changes must coincide with UFC 1-300-02 release and posting. ;_{G<TAI OPT=Army>[, [____]]</TAI>}	Database Mgrs.	05/01/12	10/31/12	
43	With the November 2012 UFGS Release incorporate the approved Submittal Note. NOTE: Changes must coincide with UFC 1-300-02 release and posting.	Database Mgrs.	05/01/12	10/31/12	

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

#	Action Items	Person	Assign Date	Due Date	Item Status
44	Contact the Architectural DWG to discuss Tailoring Option implementation for Section 09 90 00	Richard Hungate	05/01/12	05/31/12	
45	Add CCR to change the Section Title for 09 90 00 in order to align with CSI	Richard Hungate	05/01/12	05/31/12	
46	Draft a paragraph to clarify Subject 15, Item 11 in the November 2011 Minutes.	Richard Hungate	05/01/12	05/1/12	
47	Research FAR Clause for Submittal Items requiring Government Approval	Sherri McMillion	05/01/12	05/2/12	
48	Email soft metric Army's recommendations for the use of soft metric and incorporation in UFC 1-300-02	Zenovia Wilcox	05/02/12	05/12/12	
49	Explore the feasibility of incorporating the Enterprise Database Tool currently residing on the Huntsville server into the current CMS contract with NIBS	Sherri McMillion Sheron Belcher	05/02/12	06/30/12	
50	Coordinate release of Section 01 33 29 with implementing the "S" Designation for LEED Submittals and adding "S" to RMS	Zenovia Wilcox	05/02/12	TBD	
51	Incorporate note into Section 01 33 00 to clarify where users can obtain the Section 01 33 16	Sheron Belcher	05/02/12	TBD	
52	Forward the note for Section 01 33 00 to NASA for incorporation	Sheron Belcher	05/02/12	TBD	
53	Add Status of Enterprise Database Tools to the UFGS Working Group Agenda for the next meeting.	Michelle Pizzuto	05/01/12	10/2012	
54	Review Action #15 for user impact and possible recommendation of OBE	Michelle Pizzuto	05/01/12	10/2012	
55	Submit new CR to expand Tailoring Option Capabilities (Subject #14)	Jim Whitehead	05/01/12	10/2012	
56	Provide a full Tailoring Option List for UFGS for the August 2012 release	Jim Whitehead	05/02/12	08/2012	
57	Distribute Tailoring Options Definitions List for DWGs to review for accuracy	Sherri McMillion	05/02/12	7/31/12	

UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

#	Action Items	Person	Assign Date	Due Date	Item Status
58	Modify statement for CCRs to incorporate/clarify information for submitting New Sections	Sherri McMillion	05/02/12	07/01/12	
59	Resolve issue referencing Section 01 33 16 Design After Award from Section 01 33 00 Submittal Procedures	Zenovia Wilcox	05/02/12	07/01/12	
60	Modify/write note for Section 01 33 00 which clarifies where users can obtain the Section 01 33 16, then send to NASA for incorporation	Sheron Belcher	05/02/12	07/15/12	
61	Talk to Rudy Perky to see if it's okay for NASA to add their NASA specific Commissioning specification for NASA ONLY until the unified spec is released	Sherri McMillion	05/02/12	07/15/12	
62	Add NASA Commissioning Section to CMS as a New UFGS for incorporation in the August Release pending concurrence	Richard Hungate	05/02/12	07/15/12	
63	Clarify and respond to CCR 1088	Steve Freitas	05/02/12	07/31/12	
64	Review and Update the UFGS MOU	Board Members	05/02/12	10/2012	
65	Update the CCRs for the specific agencies	UFGS WG	05/02/12	08/2012	
66	Forward changes to the Submittal Note and "G" Submittal Formatting to the database managers	Cheryl Fitz-Simon	05/02/12	06/09/12	
67	Update the UFGS Working Group when Item (7) of Appendix A LEED™ Documentation has taken place	Sherri McMillion	05/01/12		
68	Send list of canceled/obsolete MIL Standards to Sherri McMillion for research	Sheron Belcher	05/01/12		