UFGS Working Group Meeting Minutes

Date: November 1 - 2, 2011
Time: 9:00 am – 5:00 pm
Location: KSC Conference Center
Kennedy Space Center, FL
Author: Cheryl Fitz-Simon

ATTENDEES:

Invited	Attended	Name	Organization / Location
✓	✓	Steve Rider	NASA (Washington)
✓	✓	Frank Der, Chairman	NASA (KSC)
✓	✓	Sherri McMillion	NAVFAC (Norfolk)
✓	×	Gardy Cruz	NAVFAC (Washington)
✓	×	Richard Sheffler	NAVFAC (Jacksonville)
✓	✓	Pete Rossbach	USACE (Washington)
✓	✓	Zenovia Wilcox	USACE (Washington)
✓	✓	Steven Freitas	USACE (Sacramento)
✓	✓	Sheron Belcher	USACE (Huntsville)
✓	✓	Robert Iseli	USACE
✓	×	Chris Kruzel	AFCESA
✓	✓	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)
✓	✓	Brett Huether	URS (KSC)
✓	✓	Dan Smith	URS (KSC)
✓	×	Alynne Skrabalak	NIBS (Washington)

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

1) Introduction and Transfer of Chairmanship
2) ASTM Reference Updates / Migration
3) Adding UFC 1-200-01 to Reference Paragraph Note
4) International Code Council
5) CFRs within UMRL
6) Submittal Paragraph Note
7) Tri-Agency Outstanding CCRs within CMS

8) Building Information Modeling (BIM)
9) CMS Health Documents
10) CMSS Workload Reports
11) UFGS Change Revision Policy
12) UFGS Coordinator Roles
13) UFC Template
14) UFGS Update
15) LEED™ Documentation
16) Submittal Requirements for LEED
17) UFC 1-300-02 Update and Release
18) Disassembly Guidance and Direction
19) CSI Construct2012 Conference
20) New CCRs Assigned to the UFGS Working Group
21) Division 00
22) Action Items

DISCUSSION SUMMARY:

Subject 1: Introduction

1) Frank Der, NASA and Board Chairman, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone.

2) Frank also announced Pete Rossbach's retirement as the Army Board member and introduced his replacement, Zenovia Wilcox.

3) Beginning January 2012, Sherri McMillion will become the UFGS Working Group Chairman. The term runs from January 2012 until January 2014.

Subject 2: ASTM Reference Updates / Migration

1) Sheron Belcher presented the schedule in which the ASTM References have changed by removing the space between A, B, C, D, E, F and G and the number. The schedule below indicates when the updates will be made to the UMRL as well as the UFGS.

   a) Schedule is as follows:
      (1) ASTM A - Completed in May 2011 Release
      (2) ASTM B - Completed in August 2011 Release
      (3) ASTM C - November 2011
      (4) ASTM D - February 2012
      (5) ASTM E - May 2012
      (6) ASTM F and G – August 2012

   b) D and E will be done in February 2012

c) F and G will be done in May 2012

Subject 3: Adding UFC 1-200-01 to the Reference Paragraph Note

1) Sherri McMillion proposed adding the following text to the Reference Paragraph note:

```
**************************************************************************
          NOTE:  This paragraph is used to list the
          publications cited in the text of the guide
          specification. The publications are referred to in
          the text by basic designation only and listed in
          this paragraph by organization, designation, date,
          and title.

          Use the Reference Wizard's Check Reference feature
          when you add a RID outside of the Section's
          Reference Article to automatically place the
          reference in the Reference Article.  Also use the
          Reference Wizard's Check Reference feature to update
          the issue dates.

          References not used in the text will automatically
          be deleted from this section of the project
          specification when you choose to reconcile
          references in the publish print process.

          Reference dates are typically updated automatically.
          Coordinate the dates of the references below with
          the version of the codes used in the project
          design.  UFC 1-200-01 GENERAL BUILDING REQUIREMENTS
          lists codes and criteria to be used on current DoD
          projects.
**************************************************************************
```

2) After a lengthy discussion, the UFGS Working Group decided not to incorporate this text into the Reference Paragraph note.

Subject 4: International Code Council

1) Sheron Belcher stated that she had an issue arose in regards to the ICC Code date since it went from 2009 to 2012 where the customer wanted to know why the UFGS did not reflect the 2012 version.

2) Frank Der stated that the UFGS should be updated to use the current version and would address the issue with the NS-CCCB.

3) Pete Rossbach said that the agencies should reevaluate the refresh rate on our specifications.

4) Sherri McMillion stated that the 2012 ICC has not been evaluated at this time therefore until that occurs we must continue to use the 2009 code.

5) As of the November release, the ICC Reference will be the 2009 version.

6) Steve Rider stated that the codes are minimum standards and if we choose to go to a higher standard and it would be okay to do this, as long as the contractor understands we're no longer following the minimum standards. He also stated that it was prudent to use whatever the local authorities use.

7) Code dates need to match whatever is called out in the UFC 1-200-01, GENERAL BUILDING REQUIREMENTS.

8) Sherri McMillion will send a notice to the DWG proponents and the Coordinating Panel to identify Critical Standard updates within the UMRL.

9) When the codes need to be changed, Sherri McMillion will inform the database managers.

10) Updating this Reference will be re-evaluated for the February 2012 release.

11) Upon the update of certain codes, Sheron Belcher will open new CCRs in order to inform the Technical Proponents of this change.

Subject 5: CFRs within UMRL

1) Sheron Belcher raised the question on whether the UFGS Working Group wanted to reverted to the basic CFR Reference, such as 29 CFR 1910 rather than breaking them down into every level such as 29 CFR 1910.1000, etc

2) The UFGS Working Group agreed to continue to break out the CFR References.

Subject 6: Submittal Paragraph Note

1) Sherri McMillion proposed to change the standard Submittal Paragraph Note, as follows:

```
*************************************************************************
          NOTE:  Review Submittal Description (SD) definitions
          in Section 01 33 00 SUBMITTAL PROCEDURES and edit
          the following list to reflect only the submittals
          required for the project.  Submittals should be kept
          to the minimum required for adequate quality control.

          A "G" following a submittal item indicates that the
          submittal requires Government approval.  The Guide
          Specification technical editors have designated
          those items that require Government approval, due to
          their complexity or criticality, with a "G."
          Generally, other submittal items can be reviewed by
          the Contractor's Quality Control System.Some
          submittals are already marked with a "G".  Only
          delete an existing "G" if the submittal item is not
          complex and can be reviewed through the Contractor's
          Quality Control system.  Only add a "G" to an item,
          if the submittal is sufficiently important or
          complex in context of the project.

          For submittals requiring Government approval on Army
          projects, a code of up to three characters within
          the submittal tags may be used following the "G"
          designation to indicate the approving authority.
          Codes for Army projects using the Resident
          Management System (RMS) are:  "AE" for
          Architect-Engineer; "DO" for District Office
          (Engineering Division or other organization in the
          District Office); "AO" for Area Office; "RO" for
          Resident Office; and "PO" for Project Office.  Codes
          following the "G" typically are not used for Navy,
          Air Force, and NASA projects.

          Choose the first bracketed item for Navy, Air Force
          and NASA projects, or choose the second bracketed
          item for Army projects.
*************************************************************************
```

2) The consensus from the board regarding the change to the Submittal Note is that this is an educational issue with the A/E not a specification issue.

3) The UFGS Working Group agreed to adopt the proposed change to the Submittal note as indicated.

4) During this discussion, Steve Freitas suggested removing the brackets from the Submittal classification.

5) When brackets are placed around the classification then it indicates that it is a choice rather than a requirement.

   a) For critical submittals the markup should be as follows: _{G[, [_____]]} rather than currently used format [; _G][; _{G, [_____]}]

6) The Discipline Working Groups would be responsible for deciding what submittals are critical and use the proposed markup Steve Freitas recommended.

7) DoD has been getting criticized for having too many submittals.

8) Once a decision is made by the UFGS Working Group, notify the DWGs of the change.

9) Due to the complexity of changing the classification and reviewer markup for critical submittals, the UFGS Working Group decided to continue this discussion at the next UFGS Working Group Meeting.

Subject 7: Tri-Agency Outstanding Criteria Change Requests (CCRs) within the Criteria Management System (CMS)

1) Sheron Belcher presented the Outstanding CCRs to the UFGS Working Group as previously requested (90 days and older).

2) Currently the UFGS has 284 outstanding CCRs.

Subject 8: Building Information Modeling (BIM)

1) Jim Whitehead presented updates regarding the integration of BIM to the UFGS Working Group.

   a) Possible SpecsIntact/UFGS BIM Goals:

      (1) Pull specifications and check specification list based on the BIM Model

      (2) Edit/Tailor specifications based on the BIM Model

      (3) Update BIM Model on changes to specifications

   b) Benefits of BIM requires sharing information across:

      (1) Organizations and departments

      (2) IT Systems

      (3) Applications

2) This becomes a data exchange between SpecsIntact and other applications.

3) Sheron Belcher and Steve Freitas stated that in order for SpecsIntact to remain relevant and current we need to make a collaborative effort in cleaning up the UFGS Section Numbers and Titles and get them aligned with CSI.

4) Open CCRs to update Section Numbers and Titles.

5) Frank suggested that Jim Whitehad and Steve Freitas meet to discuss the methodology.

6) Steve Rider stated that NASA Headquarters is no longer supporting COBie and SPie.

7) The final consensus amongst the UFGS Working Group was that BIM is still not mature enough and will not be for some time to come, therefore would continue to monitor its progress. Once it reaches maturity, then begin we'll begin integration with SpecsIntact.

Subject 9: CMS Health Documents

1) Sherri McMillion stated there was a new report available in the CMS for the "Health of Documents".

2) When the Health number is 1 or greater, it is ready for update. If it is a 2 or greater, it's overdue x2.

3) The Safety Specification CCR questions are being addressed by NAVFACs Doug Tusing. While addressing the issues, he is going to update the specification.

4) The UFGS Working Group will review the Health Index and number of CCRs by the next meeting, then determine what projects will be worked for FY 2013.

5) The Coordinating Panel will pull their projects from CMS August 2012 in order to set project schedules.

6) The Coordinating Panel wasn't pleased with the fact that Mechanical and Electrical Guide Specifications are not yet unified. At one time, the Sections referred to were unified but due to recent changes in direction, they were demoted to NASA unique sections until some type of agreement can be made towards unification.

Subject 10: CMS Workload Reports

1) Sherri McMillion mentioned that the schedules within the CMS have been unlocked so that the technical proponents can now update their projects.

2) Currently there are only two projects assigned to the UFGS Working Group, Section 01 78 24.00 20 and 01 33 29.

3) 01 33 29 LEED™ Documentation Section will be reassigned to the Sustainable Working Group for updating/maintaining.

4) The Safety specification currently has nine open CCRs which apply. NAVFAC headquarters has filled the safety position which provides the resources to perform this work. This individual has been answering the CCRs, and would like to update this specification. Since NASA addresses safety in the contract clauses, they have no objections. The UFGS Working Group agreed that NAVFAC could lead this effort while coordinating with Army and Air Force.

5) Status of the UFC 1-300-02 will be discussed later in the meeting when Steve Freitas provides updates.

6) The Health by Document Report shows a high percentage of Mechanical and Electrical Sections ending with 10, 20, 30 or 40, which cannot count as "unified", which has raised questions and concerns amongst the Coordinating Panel in why these Sections are not yet unified.

7) The issue appears to be a philosophical issue regarding component versus system specifications.

8) Sherri McMillion stated the focus of the UFGS Working Group should be on unification.

Subject 11: UFGS Change Revision Policy

1) Sheron Belcher presented the outcome from the last meeting regarding the Change Revision Policy.

2) For New Documents, NASA was concerned about the requirement for CP Approval. Frank Der would prefer CP notification.

3) The board agreed to change "New Document – DWG concurrence & CP Approval" to "New Document – DWG concurrence & CP Notification"

4) It was agreed the current Change List would be separated into two lists, one for Changes and one for Revisions.

Subject 12: UFGS Coordinator Roles

1) The database managers proposed that Maggie Muller, maintain the role as the UFGS Coordinator which consolidates the agencies databases and performs quality control.

2) Sheron Belcher will continue to maintain the UMRL, while Alynne Skrabalak will continue to manage the WBDG UFGS web page.

3) The UFGS Coordinator would also be responsible for merging the agency changes into the Change and Revision Lists.

4) Steve Freitas stated that the MIL-STD-3007F states that the UFGS Coordinator Role is rotated every two years therefore, would require updating.

5) Sheron Belcher and Alynne Skrabalak will be act as backup to the UFGS Coordinator.

6) Maggie Muller will assume the UFGS Coordinator role beginning January 2012.

Subject 13: UFC Template

1) Sheron Belcher would like to suggest the creation and unification of a UFC Template.

2) A Working Group will be initiated in order to come up with the UFC Template. Richard Cofer will lead the working group.

3) This Working Group members will consist of Sheron Belcher, Alynne Skrabalak, Will Rinaman and Steve Freitas.

4) During the discussion, Steve Freitas suggested the new document accept electronic signatures since the tools are in place to do so.

Subject 14: UFGS Update

1) Due to questions arising in regards as to what changes URS was performing during the Unification process, administrative and non-technical. The Checklist provides the variables they adhere to when reviewing a Section for unification.

2) While presenting the UFGS Update, Richard Hungate presented the flow of the unification process as follows:

    a) Selection of non-Unified Sections.

b) Secure DWG / UFGS Working Group approval, post review notice to CMS.

c) Review Technical content – perform gap analysis.

d) Send to Technical Proponents, post CCR on CMS.

(1) Post the document under Project review for comment and follow-up with an email so there's documentation to support coordination efforts.

e) Edit, run Checklist, verify all reports.

f) Select, dominant section, merge/disassemble as required.

g) Address comments, return for final review.

h) Submit database manager for final QA and posting.

3) DoD Unification Process – Listing of Proposed FY11 DoD Merger Groups

a) Richard Hungate was looking for a "Notice to Proceed" on Sections that had been previously approved to work by the UFGS Working Group.

b) Can we resend these Sections in their current draft state to the Technical Proponents and the DWGs in order to expedite so the work isn't lost?

c) The UFGS Working group took note that the Sections that are "on hold" are from the same DWGs that have received low unification score on the Health by Documents Report.

d) Richard Hungate stated, this also is an effort is to update these Sections, (UFC/CSI SectionFormat, Submittal Article clean-up) so they become current, not to focus on disassembly.

e) The attempt is to get the DWGs to sign off so these sections so that work can proceed, since URS was assigned and funded for this work.

f) During the past five years of the unification process, there were no issues with the work being performed until work reached the Electrical and Mechanical groups.

g) The Health report points out two major issues with Fire Protection and Electrical groups.

h) Army is not exactly sure why the DWGs have not already unified these Sections.

i) Sherri McMillion will provide feedback from the Design Working Groups to Richard Hungate regarding the carryovers by December 2012.

4) DoD Unification Process – Listing of Proposed FY12 Proposed List

   a) Richard Hungate is asking for Notice to Proceed and this list as well.

   b) After sections have been unified, Section numbers and titles have been updated, the fifth level designation is removed.

   c) Army is content with URS continuing the work on the Concrete specifications.

Subject 15: LEED™ Documentation

1) Sherri McMillion provided copies of the two LEED™ Sections and the Review Comments for discussion amongst the UFGS Working Group whereas Richard Hungate also provided their response back to those comments.

2) Review Comments were as follows:

UFC Document Review & Comment Form					DATE: 26 OCT 2011
FROM (Agency or Command): NAVFAC					
CODE:					
DOCUMENT: NASA FEDGREEN SPECS					VERSION: Initial Draft
PREPARED BY: Sherri McMillion				E-MAIL ADDRESS: sherri.mcmillion@navy.mil	
REVIEWER: Sherri McMillioin				E-MAIL ADDRESS:	
COMM PHONE NUMBER: 757-322-4303			DSN PHONE NUMBER:		FAX NUMBER:
NO	PAGE	PARA	Section	COMMENT	RESOLUTION OF COMMENT (& REASONS WHERE SIGNIFICANT)
1			General	Design information and policy should not be in the construction UFGS sections. Delete any policy. For instance, in 01 11 00.00 40, SUMMARY OF WORK, para 1.7 references an executive order and memo. Policies should be interpreted, and implementation provided in design guidance or UFGS as applicable; not referenced.	Accept. Will move policy references to notes for the designer's information.
2		1.7	01 11 00.00 40	The goals do not belong in a guide spec. These need to be interpreted into design and construction requirements and provided in the appropriate design guide or spec. Same reasoning as policy comment above.	Accept intent. Much of this will be moved to notes for the designer's information.
3		General	01 11 00.00 40	Changes to direct language in other parts of the spec sections should not have been done at this time. Changing to direct in some cases confuses the meaning of the sentence. I think that commenting on these changes and the FedGreen at the same time is too much. Requests for specific changes to direct language should be done through the normal CCR process.	Reject. This was part of the scope of work we were directed.
4			General	Technical information needs to remain in the technical sections. Breaking it out and bringing it up front to one section adds confusion and potential for coordination mistakes.	Accept intent.
5			General	Provide an outline of spec sections affected and proposed changes.	Concur with intent.
6		1.7.1.1	01 11 00.00 40	LEED level is duplicate of and provided in section 01 33 29.00 40.	Concur with intent. Will cross reference with 01 33 29.00 40
7		1.3.2 NOTE	01 20 00.00 20	Wording that is added in note is not related to our Construction categories.	Accept intent. Will revise note.
8		SCOPE NOTE	01 50 00	The scope should remain as is. Fed Green guidelines are just a piece of this section, not the scope of it.	Accept. Will revise note.

9		1.1	01 50 00	**Provide documentation? Is there a submittal item required? Is this just commentary?**	Accept intent. Submittals would be part of other sections. Will edit or delete.
10		1.6	01 50 00	**What exactly needs to be coordinated with in these sections? Delete.**	Reject. Will bracket paragraph
11		1.1	03 05 81.13	**We have deleted references in general to other sections that apply to spec sections, in the past. I think this was a good practice, and we should not reference spec sections that this applies to. I would rather that the other spec sections reference this one if applicable. Having the choice of all of these will only lead to errors.**	Accept intent. Will edit paragraph
12			03 05 81.13	**This section appears to mostly contain technical requirements. Technical requirements should be in the technical spec section. Any LEED, renewable, recycle, etc. requirements can be provided in a Div 01 section, and referenced. This section is not needed.**	Reject
13			14 05 81.13 40	**Technical requirements need to be in the technical section. This section is not needed. See above comment.**	Reject
14			01 62 35.00 40	**Notes in this section are informational/teaching, more than how to edit a paragraph below. Delete.**	Accept - will edit section
15			General	**Titles of many sections are "Design Requirements." DoD design requirements are provided in our UFC's. These UFGS are construction documents.**	Accept intent.
16			General	**The sustainable requirements should be incorporated into standard building practice in the appropriate technical spec section; don't need a separate section for sustainable.**	Reject.
17			01 33 29.00 40	**LEED Documentation section needs to be updated and revised for new LEED requirements. Did not see any updates incorporated LEED 2009 requirements in this section.**	Accept Intent. Updates for section will be incorporated.

3) Frank Der expressed his concern with taking this approach as it is directly affected by the document health cycle. NASA adheres to a three year maintenance cycle whereas the DoD adheres to a 3, 5 and 7 year cycle.

4) Steve Freitas mentioned that once all of the technical information is removed from the lead in Sections for some of the Divisions there wouldn't be much information left.

5) Richard Hungate will develop a matrix to capture the FedGreen and LEED™ information as well as their origin (Army, Navy or NASA specifications). The matrix could then be forwarded to each of the Discipline Design Working Groups and then email correspondence would commence in order to coordinate and implement.

6) The UFGS Working Group decided that rather than entering CCRs, developing a matrix and spreadsheet method would be the best approach.

7) Steve Freitas mentioned that he could still see where it would be beneficial to incorporate a LEED™ lead in Section for Division 3.

8) Sherri McMillion also mentioned that once the other Divisions are reviewed, we might find that the approach of having any lead in specifications for LEED™ would not be required.

9) Steve Freitas commented that the primary philosophy for Guide Specifications is to say it once and say it right.

10) In order to move forward, Frank Der stated that rather than continuing with the approach of using FEDGreen lead- in sections for LEED™, we will look for the content to be placed in the relevant sections.

11) The final decision directed by the UFGS Working Group was that URS would forward the draft sections to the Sustainability Discipline Working Group for review and potential use. The philosophy of using lead-in Sections for each Division was declined..

Subject 16: Submittal Requirements for LEED™

1) The Submittal Requirements for LEED™ was discussed at the April 2011 meeting. At that time, the UFGS Working Group decided to use "D" for the Designer of Record.

2) Steve Freitas said RMS already uses "D". It's based on position. "D" followed by a comma means it is a "Designer of Record" issue. If followed by any other letter would indicate the position of who would actually review it. LEED™ Submittals are not an issue of approval or acceptance, but one of documentation.

3) Sheron Belcher stated although "D" would not be used for "LEED™" requirements, it is still required for Army but only in Division 01 specifications.

4) Steve Freitas mentioned that RMS would have to be modified in order to accommodate this change and submitted to RMS for incorporation.

5) SpecsIntact users should be told that the Tri-Agency is working on an adequate solution for this issue. In the meantime, list LEED™ submittals under SD-01 through SD-10 with a "G" classification. Duplicate the submittal item under SD-11 with as "(LEED)".

6) The UFGS Working Group decided that LEED™ Submittal Items located under SD 01 through SD 10 would be listed with a "G" classification, whereas SD 11 Closeout Submittals would use the "S" classification for LEED Submittals.

7) Sherri McMillion will modify 01 33 00 Submittals in order to incorporate "S" for LEED™ and the standard Submittal Note paragraph and present changes at the next UFGS Working Group Meeting.

Subject 17: UFC 1-300-02 Update and Release

1) Remove reference to IHS and replace it with "as stated in the UMRL".

2) Paragraph 2.2-5: The RID shall consist of the organization acronym and publication number. The reference title shall consist of the year of publication in parenthesis followed by the title.

3) Paragraph 2-2.9.3: Incorporate the approved Submittal Note

4) Paragraph 2-2.9.5: Incorporate the use of "S" for Sustainability "LEED"

5) Paragraph 2-2.9.6: Keep paragraph as is.

6) Paragraph 2-4: Keep paragraph as is.

7) Paragraph 2-5.1: Remove 40%

8) Fix Numbering beginning at 2-5.1

9) Paragraph 2-6: Discipline technical representatives assigned must review each UFGS.

10) Appendix A:

    a) Delete last sentence of the first paragraph "The terms "article," "paragraph," and "subparagraph" have meanings within CSI.

    b) Move "Do Not Use ITEM…. Below the second column of the illustrated table above.

11) Paragraph 1.3 Definitions:

12) Change 1.6.1 Extra Materials to 1.6.1 Spare Parts in order to be consistent with CSI.

13) 1.5.1 change title to: Submittal Item Format Shown with Tags.

    a) Remove the example of Definitions "Include manufacturer's….

14) Note: Cheryl use the section order for the "Section Template"

15) UFC 1-300-02 needs to be for reviewed through CMS. The UFGS Working Group decided to allow two weeks for comments, incorporate the changes then send to the CP for approval.

16) Once the minor revisions are done, resubmit to CMS for review.

Subject 18: Disassembly Guidance and Direction

1) Sherri McMillion opened the discussion on disassembly since DoD has stated that it is up to the DWGs on whether they want to disassemble their system specs.

2) The Mechanical and Electrical DWGs have informed the CP that they do not want to disassemble their specifications.

3) There appears to be a misconception that they must disassemble their specifications from system to component specifications.

4) NASA does not have a directive to disassemble from system to component, but is moving this direction in order to be in alignment with the industry and CSIs direction.

5) Richard Hungate stated that it's not a fixed, fast rule. It depends on the content of the Section and what the objective is while under review.

6) The 09 90 00 Paints and Coating Section needs to be disassembled according to "MPI" and "NACE Standards" because it's being driven by the industry.

7) NASA stated that they are not in agreement with the direction the DoD has recommended.

8) Sherri McMillion stated that they are going to implement the changes according to a presentation that was provided at the Joint UFGS Working Group Meeting, but if they need to change direction, they will.

9) Sherri McMillion also stated that at this time, the Mechanical DWG appears to be the biggest issue because of the Sections that were unified, without the 40 designation, since they didn't agree to it. Now, NASA has demoted the Sections by reapplying the 40 designation.

10) The Mechanical group is now attempting to update and unify those specifications, is NASA going to cooperate with them if they decide to go with system specifications? They have other specifications that have the information that includes the same information that are in the previously unified Sections.

11) Richard Hungate responded that these Sections were taken apart, merged and unified two years prior. What they appeared to be upset about was that ISC-URS took the same sections and updated dated the Section Format and the Submittal paragraph. Prior to that update, they had not gotten to them due to the DWGs workload.

12) Sherri McMillion stated these Sections need to remain as NASA (40) Sections for the time being. Rather than unifying, let's update the content.

13) Sherri McMillion asked whether NASA want to be involved in their discussions? Frank Der answered that we do and from a NASA standpoint, we're trying to follow the industry trend but we see some disconnect but we will work with the DoDs groups to see if there are some reasonable accommodations.

14) These DWGs are complaining to the Coordinating Panel and its getting to the point now that if the specifications are coming together, the CPs are going to ask about NASA and whether the memorandum is still viable or do we need to cut off our memorandum and NASA have their own database and DoD have their own.

15) Frank Der stated that we are going to disagree on some basic philosophies but obviously there are some specifications that we cannot unify. At this point, the only two DWGs that are not having success with agreeing with things are the Mechanical and Electrical.

16) The biggest hurdle is "component vs. system".

17) Sheron Belcher suggested that we should use CSIs fourth level designation so that they can exist in the same database.

18) They had a dispute resolution procedure that if you have two members that agree then the majority rules, but that doesn't include NASA. The CPs stated in order to not waste resources, if NASA doesn't want to play, then have them maintain their own database for these Mechanical and Electrical sections.

19) Richard Hungate stated that this has been misstated and there is a lot of history with these sections. These Sections were reviewed, approved and posted three or four years ago by the Mechanical DWG and the Technical Proponents. We then updated the Section Format and the Submittal paragraph and that's when this became an issue. They did not eliminate their old Sections. Somewhere there is miscommunication where these Sections are concerned because we do have historical correspondence that supports this.

20) Robert Iseli suggested that maybe the solution would be to separate the content of the system specification by removing the components from that specification, and have it reference the component specification in order to avoid duplicity.

21) The DWG has considered that but they do not want to go that direction.

22) When these sections were demoted to 40s, it was done as a placeholder in order to not lose the information, not to identify it as a separate specification.

23) What is the downside of agreeing to disagree? Since there are agency specific specifications in the database that the A/E's are pulling both specifications. But this goes back to educating the A/E's because from the beginning of the unification process it was well documented that they should only pull the specifications that apply to the agency with whom they are contracted.

24) The fourth level CSI number is there to identify detailed titles, specific components or material/composition properties and that is what should be used.

25) Frank Der stated that from that stand point, we foresee DoD still maintaining the system specification, and NASA is still maintaining the component so in reality we're in the same position as before.

26) It comes down to education and resources. It is apparent this is not a database issue rather than a perception issue from the users.

Subject 19: CSI Construct2012

1) Steve Freitas stated that we as the presenters were rated high, but comments indicated that people didn't understand the intent of the presentation.

2) The audience appeared to be more interested in the Military job process from start to finish, not in knowing how to use SpecsIntact. The breakout sessions didn't appear to be the correct forum for covering SpecsIntact's features and enhancements.

3) The Exhibit Hall is the proper place for presenting SpecsIntact, but funding isn't available for doing so at this time.

4) The UFGS Working Group agreed that Army and Navy should represent the UFGS at the CSI Construct2012 held in Phoenix, AZ, September 2012.

5) Sherri McMillion will request funding for Navy representation.

Subject 20: New CCRs Assigned to the UFGS Working Group

1) Sheron Belcher presented the CCR Status Report for the UFGS Working Groups review.

2) Reviewed the following New CCRs:

   a) CCR 1094 – UFGS 01 32 01.00.10: Project Schedule

      (1) Close due to the submitter resubmitting the same information under CCR #1252

   b) CCR 1123 - UFGS 01 32 01.00.10: Project Schedule

      (1) The Construction Management group should be the correct reviewer for this request.

   c) CCR 1252 - UFGS 01 32 01.00.10: Project Schedule

      (1) Same as #1094

3) Commenter's can only submit a problem and solution, they cannot add files. Bob Payn would have to modify in order to allow the commenter's to submit files.

Subject 21: Division 00

1) At the Joint UFGS Working Group meeting we discussed the conversion of the old 1995 templates in the standard procurement system, the testing would initially occur in October.

2) They've done their testing and it worked great.

3) They had a couple of spreadsheets attached that described the templates and all the documents that would be in Division 00.

4) They didn't realize that in addition to having the templates updated they needed to map all of the construction clauses to the new template sections. As an example, Section 00800 is now 00 73 00.

5) That took some time and unfortunately if you take the templates and share them with another organization or district, they would then need to map the contract clauses in each location at each site.

6) It can be done, but not everyone at each location knows how to do it.

7) If the desk officers for each agency authorize the program support people for the SPS System to incorporate the templates into the next release, then they would do the mapping for everyone. When the next release is issued, they would be ready to use it. There are two elements that must be considered, the desk officers for Army, Air Force, Navy and Marines which are the desk officers for the SPS office, would have to give this to them, they would have to accept, then have their contractor incorporate it, then it would go out in the next release.

8) The element that impacts the UFGS is when the references to all the Division 00 Sections within our database. We would have to go through our Sections to update them when this is approved.

9) Right now, this is FYI but we will need to update the UFGS database when this does happen.

10) This change is scheduled to occur in approximately one year.

11) The database managers will need to know when to make the changes and have a comprehensive list of the changes that need to be incorporated.

Subject 22: Action Items

#	Action Items	Person	Assign Date	Due Date	Item Status
1	Provide direction to IHS to use the exact publication titles as they are used on the IHS web site	Sherri McMillion	05/02/07	01/2008	Ongoing
2	Discuss modifying the WBDG UFGS Page with Bob Payne	Sherri McMillion	06/03/08	05/2011	Ongoing
	Comment: There will not be an option to add a New Section through the CCR/CMS System. Add a CCR next to the Section a new Section would most likely resemble. This would begin the dialog on whether this Section was applicable.				
3	Incorporate Link to the Tailoring Options Help in the Scope Note for RCB&EA	Database Mgrs.	03/31/09	O6/16/09	Pending
4	Provide link to Database Managers for Tailoring Options	Cheryl Fitz-Simon	03/31/09	O6/16/09	Pending
5	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.				
6	Draft a Submittal Paragraph General Note detailing the classification codes used by SpecsIntact and RMS	Steve Freitas	11/03/09	01/31/09	Pending
	Comment: Steve will reassess and update.				
7	Email draft Submittal Paragraph General Note to Sheron Belcher and Richard Hungate for review/concurrence	Steve Freitas	11/03/09	01/31/09	Pending
8	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
9	Implement Submittal Paragraph General Note throughout the UFGS	Database Managers	11/03/09	05/2010	Pending
10	Define and streamline Navy Tailoring Options	Sherri McMillion	11/03/09		Completed 11/2011
11	Modify Help to define the use of Tailoring Options	Cheryl Fitz-Simon	11/03/09		Pending
12	Incorporate nested Tailoring Options for Navy Regional options	Alynne Skrabalak	11/03/09		Completed 11/2011
13	Send MIL-STD-3007F to Sherri McMillion for publishing	Steve Freitas	11/03/09	11/31/09	Completed 11/2011
	Comment: Obvious Regional's have been incorporated, but Alynne has no list, so this needs to be revisited. Sherri and Alynne will meet and discuss.				
14	Add capability to perform a keyword search on Section Titles in the new Internet Based Database for Tracking the UFGS	Sandy Wood	11/04/09	TBD	Ongoing
15	Add capability to the Document List to "Filter by Status: ALL and AGENCY" in the new Internet Based Database for Tracking the UFGS	Sandy Wood	11/04/09	TBD	Ongoing
16	Create Administrative Rights for User Groups for the different Document Types	Sandy Wood	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.				
17	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 and validate the SI Web Site Support Page POCs.	Sherri McMillion	10/26/10	12/15/10	Partially Complete
18	Provide a Tailoring Options Definitions List that will be available on the SI Web Site and linked within the UFGS.	Sheron Belcher	10/26/10	TBD	Ongoing

#	Action Items	Person	Assign Date	Due Date	Item Status
19	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.				
20	List the Word Publishing issue and solution on the Technical Excellence Network (TEN) Site.	Steve Freitas	10/26/10	12/06/10	Pending
	Comment: Not completed yet. 11/1/2011 – Add General note to contact the SpecsIntact Technical Support Desk.				
21	Forward FedGreen and RCBEA spreadsheets to the DWG for approval	Pete Rossbach / Zenovia Wilcox Sherri McMillion	10/26/10	11/15/10	Ongoing
	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.				
22	Provide Bob Payn an updated list changing the CCR status in CMS from Other to NASA	Richard Hungate	04/18/11	04/29/11	Ongoing
23	Send Painting and Coating presentation to Calvin Crofford	Richard Hungate	04/18/11	04/29/11	Complete 04/2011
	Sheron stated that she has been updating as she sees them in the CMS System. MOVE COMMENT UNDER #22.				
24	Provide FEDGreen prototype and examples to Sherri for commenting and determine whether they need to be incorporated into CMS Comment: Under Review.	Richard Hungate	04/18/11	04/29/11	Complete
25	Provide a Proposal to the UFGS Working Group addressing LEED Submittal Requirements (and tagging)	Sherri McMillion	04/18/11	11/01/11	Ongoing
26	Obtain the Sustainability Criteria Update scope from Rudy then distribute to the UFGS Working Group for review and clarify whether this includes commissioning.	Sherri McMillion	04/19/11	05/06/11	Ongoing
27	Follow-up with Pete Rossback on RCBEA Issues with Structural DWG	Richard Hungate	04/19/11	04/29/11	Ongoing
28	Contact Bela Gutman to discuss the Cost of Submittal Items	Frank Der	04/19/11	04/29/11	Complete 05/2011
29	Incorporate UFC 1-300-02 Paragraph 2.1.2 into UFC 1-300-02	Steve Freitas	04/19/11	05/07/11	Completed 10/2011
30	Go back to Ed Gallaher regarding the use of Article vs. Paragaph	Sherri McMillion	04/19/11	05/20/11	Complete 06/01/2011
31	Meet with Alynne and Maggie to determine the format for Changes and definitions for the UFGS Section	Sheron Belcher	04/19/11	06/30/11	Complete 06/30/2011
32	Send the 95% NASA BIM Guidelines for Design-Build and Design-Bid-Build	Frank Der	04/18/11	04/29/11	Ongoing
33	Talk to Bob Payn regarding printing the preparing activity on the CCR	Sherri McMillion	04/18/11	05/06/11	Complete
34	Send note to the DWG proponents to identify Critical Standard updates within the UMRL	Sherri McMillion	11/1/11	11/18/11	
35	Send note to the NS-CCCB on updating/adopting Critical updates (ICC).	Frank Der	11/1/11	11/18/11	
36	Update the Submittal Note by the February release	Database Mgr.	11/1/11	02/2011	Complete 02/2012
37	Make the changes to the UFGS Change Revision Policy then forward to Sherri McMillion	Sheron Belcher	11/1/11	11/2011	
38	Forward the updated UFGS Change Revision Policy to the Coordinating Panel for review	Sherri McMillion	11/1/11	11/16/11	Completed 11/17/2011
39	Check MIL-STD-3007F for the UFGS Coordinator role and responsibilities	Dan Evans	11/1/11	11/16/11	

#	Action Items	Person	Assign Date	Due Date	Item Status
40	Develop Matrix for Sustainable Specifications and identify the impact to Division 02 – 49	Richard Hungate	11/1/11	12/10/11	
41	Send Richard Hungate contact information for Paula Shaw, Air Force	Sherri McMillion	11/2/11	11/16/11	
42	Incorporate the UFGS Level Modification Classification and Associated Documentation Change/Revision Table into the MIL-STD-3007G	Sherri McMillion	11/2/11	08/10/12	
43	Incorporate SectionFormat as documented in UFC 1-300-02 into the SI Section Template	Cheryl Fitz-Simon	11/2/11	02/2012	
44	Incorporate Minor changes to UFC 1-300-02	Steve Freitas	11/2/11	11/18/11	
45	UFC 1-300-02 Review Comments received from DWG	Steve Freitas	11/2/11	12/13/11	
46	Review and incorporate comments Send Final UFC 1-300-02 to the CP for review and approval	Steve Freitas	11/2/11	1/12/12	
47	Post Final UFC 1-300-02	Sheron Belcher	11/2/11	2/28/12	
48	Contact Bob Payn to see whether it is possible to add files to the CCR.	Sherri McMillion	11/2/11	12/15/12	
49	Request approval for Navy participation at the CSI Construct2012 Conference, Phoenix AZ	Sherri McMillion	11/2/11	1/31/12	
50	Approval classification for sustainable submittals	Sherri McMillion	11/2/11	2/2012	

Next UFGS Working Group Meeting
Scheduled for
May 1 - 3, 2012
At the
National Institute of Building Sciences
Washington, DC