

NASA SpecsIntact Configuration, Control and Coordinating Board Meeting (NS-CCCB)

June 16-17, 2004
Washington, DC

Attendees:

Bill Brodt, NASA Headquarters
Ray Schuler, NASA/Ames
Tom Hinshaw, NASA/GRC
Bela Gutman, NASA/JPL
Ron Williams, NASA/JSC
Frank Der, NASA/KSC
Lee Lillard, NASA/LaRC
Tim Stubbs, NASA/LaRC
Robert Mathis, NASA/MSFC
Ed Gobert, NASA/Stennis
Don Lilly, NASA/Wallops
Richard Hatcher, SGS
Richard Hungate, SGS
Pat Robinson, InDyne

Center Reports:

Ames Ray Schuler

- N 266 Facility to be constructed in FY06 will be Ames first LEED project.
- All projects have been prepared in Metric, but are now both English & Metric.

Glenn Tom Hinshaw

- All C of F projects are using SpecsIntact
- Bulk of the work is Maintenance (Mechanical / Electrical)
- Final Specifications are produced as a PDF file.
- Specifications are redlined by A/E and edited by the clerical staff.
- Printing costs have been drastically reduced by issuing review sets electronically.
- Some Short Form specifications are produced for maintenance
 - Painting
 - Doors & Windows
- All projects are in Metric
 - Designed in English and then converted to Metric.
- There are currently no LEED projects, and none foreseen in the future.
- Need to verify Submittals comply with UFGS requirements.

JPL**Bela Gutman**

- All C of F projects are using SpecsIntact
- Specifications are created for all projects of \$100k value or greater.
 - Specifications are on the drawings for lesser projects.
- Outside Contractor's are developing specifications for projects in the \$100k - \$500k range.
- Currently there is no feedback system with SI procedures.
- New A/E firms are not able to properly edit issues due to Government/NASA language.
- We are creating "Short" and "Brief" specification sections for local conditions.
- All projects are done in Metric (Converted).
- All items not on the drawings, such as calculations, are done in Imperial (English).
- No LEED projects currently, FY06 mandated to achieve Silver Rating.
- Concerns with LEED discussion:
 - Validation & Certification of Commissioning Agents
 - Commissioning Costs
 - Availability of Specifications for LEED
 - Financial Support
 - Incorporating into project schedule (LEED slows C of F)
 - Existing Structures

JSC**Ron Williams**

- All C of F projects use SpecsIntact, in-house specifications are used for projects less than \$200k.
- No metric projects have been done since 1997.
- Astronaut Quarantine Facility will be a FY04 LEED project.
- No feed back process currently for specification changes
- Creating a local web page for local specifications and projects.

KSC**Frank Der**

- All C of F projects use SpecsIntact
- Local specifications have increased from 5 sections up to 36 sections.
- Most projects are being waived for Metric use.
 - The Chief of Design sends a letter to HQ stating that Metric is not being used for each project
- 11% of our projects are done in Metric
- Recommend the removal of the Waiver Process, no value added.
- ETDC will be first LEED project in FY07
- We are considering LEED for new projects.
- UFGS discussion regarding the wholesale dropping of suffixes
 - There is an attempt to intensify the effort towards unification

- The updated RCB Document is scheduled to be completed by the end of July (04) and submitted for approval. Estimate availability in September

LaRC Tim Stubbs

- Previously all projects used SpecsIntact. We have a new contract with James Sverdrup allowing them to use alternative specifications.
- NASA masters are not being used due to legal constraints without line by line editing.
- We have 17 local sections
- We have no Metric projects
- We currently have no LEED projects; however future projects will be heading in that direction
- “New Town” project (\$125-\$150M) C of F will be LEED project, and probably Metric.

MSFC Robert Mathis

- We use “MasterSpec” and local “Short” sections.
- We concur with previous issues relating to the use of the Metric system.
- 3 registered LEED projects
 - New office building used LEED as a guideline
 - Design fees did not increase due to A/E using it as a learning project.

Stennis Ed Gobert

- All projects use SpecsIntact
- We have 24 local sections
- 5% of our projects use Metric
- All new projects use Metric.
- We have one project currently in the design stage that is a LEED project.

Wallops Don Lilly

- All projects use SpecsIntact except small projects
- Local specification sections are outdated and being updated.
- We have no Metric projects.
- 2 LEED projects are currently in the design stage.

Dr. Checks - Bill Brodt / Bill East (Updates & Suggestions)

- Providing “ Outgoing “ files for review
 - Add link to SpecsIntact Web Site
 - Add file to the ProjNet server
 - Currently sent to administration for download

- In Oct/Nov Project Managers will be able to download files
- Criteria Management System
 - Bill east provided an online NetEx meeting tour of abilities
- Criteria Change Request (CCR)
 - Each section will be assigned a Technical Proponent (NASA) and a Technical Representative (SGS) in order to approve and execute changes to NASA/UFGS sections.

SGS Presentation - Rick Hatcher

- Updated Comparative Analysis NASA/UFGS
- SpecsIntact Gap Analysis and Editing Procedures

CSI MasterFormat 2004 interface with SpecsIntact – Rick Hatcher

New Section identification/numbering handed out at meeting

SpecsIntact - Software Updates – Pat Robinson

Whole Building Design Guide and Product Data Services - Bill Brodt

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Bill Brodt: Schedule VITS in September or October time frame for the Board regarding Master Format 2004, and a subsequent VITS regarding “OmniClass”, date and time to be determined.
2. Pat Robinson: Adjust Web based files for review. Do not use Zip files.
3. Rick Hatcher: Assist Tim Stubbs with getting online with Dr. Checks.
4. Review Federal Specification Product Standards to verify accuracy and validity of the standards relative to NASA sections.
5. Rick Hatcher: Prepare proposal addressing the unification, editing, and maintenance of UFGS sections with IDI/SGS.
6. Frank Der: Provide a list of NASA personnel, who are to be designated as the “Technical Proponent” and “Technical Representative”, to Rick Hatcher.

7. Rick Hatcher: Send link or file to Bill East for the Spec sections to be downloaded to the Projnet Server.
8. During the review cycle of the UFGS gap analysis board members, reply with concur in Dr. Checks if they do not have comments.
9. SGS: Submit all completed Unified Facilities Guide Specifications (UFGS) gap analysis in the Criteria Change Request (CCR) System for the Technical Proponents' review and implementation.
10. SGS: Conduct an impact assessment of converting the unique NASA Master Text Specifications (48) to the new CSI Master Format 2004.
11. Frank Der: Send out an email to the other board members not present for assignment of the Technical Proponents for Division 11, 12, 13, 14, and 16.
12. Board Members: Send the assigned names of the Technical Proponents to Frank Der.
13. Frank Der: Compile a list of Technical Proponents and Technical Representatives and submit it to Bill Brodt.
14. Bill Brodt: Submit the list of names for both the Technical Proponents and Technical Representatives to Bill East to update the Criteria Management System (CMS).

WORKING SESSION

Gap Analysis Results – Working Session

- When SGS distributes the specifications to the board members for review Frank Der requested they concur in Dr. Checks if they do not have comments.
- Frank Der stated that the Board needs to decide how to proceed with implementing the NASA requirements into the UFGS database.
 - Board members requested SGS to submit all completed Unified Facilities Guide Specifications (UFGS) gap analysis in the Criteria Change Request (CCR) System.

(CSI) New Master Format 2004 – Working Session

- Discussed when the NASA Master Text Database should be converted to the new 49 Divisions.
 - Frank Der stated that DoD has taken a “wait and see” attitude to see how industry reacts.

- Frank Der stated that RS Means will be accommodating the CSI Master Format 2004 very soon.
 - The conversion will be after the changes are implemented in the software.
- The NASA Master Text conversion will be coordinated with the UFGS conversion to the new CSI Master Format 2004.
- Board members requested SGS to conduct an impact assessment of converting the NASA Master Text to the new CSI Master Format 2004.
 - Note: Impacts to take into account that these are “ major maintenance ” and that NASA’s spec sections will reduced from 220 to around “40-ish”.
- The board members would like to review the SGS impact assessment at the July ViTS meeting.
- Pat Robinson stated the NASA Centers will need to schedule and coordinate converting their Local Master Text when NASA converts to the new format.

UFGS Representation – Working Session

- The board needs to determine who will be the UFGS Working Group Representatives.
 - Army has one representative (Jim Quinn)
 - Navy has two representatives (Carl Kersten and Ed Gallaher)
- Recommended that NASA assign two people to be representatives on UFGS Working Group Committee.
- Frank Der was appointed to be the NASA Representative.
- Tom Hinshaw was appointed to be the NASA Representative.
 - Mr. Hinshaw will try to participate in the July meeting at HQ.
- Discussed who should be the UFGS Technical Proponents and Technical Representative.
- Discussed who should be the UFGS Technical Proponents and Technical Representative.
- Discussed should the representatives be NASA or Contractor.
- Decided that NASA would be both representatives.
- Discussed a method would need to be developed to include SGS in this review in order for the changes to be implemented into the NASA Master Text.
- Decided the Technical Proponents (Coordinating Responsibility) would be the following individuals:
 - Frank Der/KSC – Division 02
 - Ed Gobert/SSC – Division 07, Division 08, and Division 10
 - Bella Gutman/JPL - Division 04 and Division 06
 - Tom Hinshaw/GRC – Division 09
 - Tim Stubbs/LaRC – Division 01

- Ray Schuler/ARC – Division 05
 - Ron Williams/JSC – Division 15
- Frank Der will send out an email to the other board members not present to determine the remaining divisions who do not have Technical Proponents assigned.
- Discussed who would be the Technical Representative (Subject Matter Expert).
- NASA SpecsIntact Managers will assign the Technical Representatives.
- Bill Brodt requested the list of names for both the Technical Proponents and Technical Representatives.

Future Direction

- Complete gap analysis.
- Start rewriting NASA unique specifications.

Future Meetings

- ViTS is scheduled for July 14, 2004 at 2:00 eastern time.
- Ames will host the next meeting on November 16-17, 2004.