Gary Boyd, NAVFACENGCOM, Southern Division, (843) 820-7303

Chapter 2

1. Page 8 - The standard proportional text font should be the Arial (TTF) typestyle: this typestyle is much more readily available in Windows applications than the Swiss typestyle (they are very similar). It is very easy to include the typestyle in the MicroStation font resource file, and AutoCAD font type resources, and it is supplied with the Windows OS's. The main reason is to allow easier import/export, embedding, and linkages to non-CAD/GIS Windows applications. Examples would be in the areas of schedules and tables on drawing sheets which are spreadsheet files or database reports.
Response: The Center is looking into including a column providing examples of Windows fonts that could be used instead of the available MicroStation and AutoCAD fonts. However, the Center will not provide instructions on how to load these fonts into drawings or resource files.

2. I think the majority of the dimensioning discussion should be reworked or eliminated. Why?
a. The dimensioning style presented uses arrowhead terminators instead of "slashes" or "dots" (most A/E's use slashes).
b. There is no mention of the approach to dimensioning views of models after the sheet has been composed. Using this approach, which also defers annotation of the views until after they have been composited on sheets, all text height and parameters for dimension geometry can be preset and forgotten. There is no need to "scale" the text height or arrow size, etc. This procedure most closely follows the way "drawings" have traditionally been produced. Annotation and dimensioning are always done last. And the other BIG plus is that when you plot the sheet, the scale is always 1:1 for a full size sheet, and 2:1 for a half-size sheet. I think you still need the standard to identify the line weights and colors for the dimensions and text. As to the font please see above.
c. We are still doing "inch-pound" projects, and a lot of them (they are called retrofits, renovations, or adaptive re-use of existing facilities), and all the dimensioning stuff relates to metric.
Response: The Center received a lot of response on this section. Most people felt that setting up the appearance of dimensions was intuitive and that the Center did not have to go into detail on how to set dimensions up. Also users felt that the selection on whether terminators should be arrowheads, slashes, or dots should be left up to the site as a personal preference. This section will be removed from the document (with the exception of the page on metric dimension appearance), but will be made available via the Internet for those people who are not that familiar with setting up dimensions.

Chapter 3

1. Page 24 - In the "Note:" section, what would be an "unacceptable dimensioning error" and is this from dimensioning the MODEL before placing the view on a sheet? I thought the whole idea of the other MU:SU:PU ratios was to ease the transition to metric?
Response: This paragraph is in error and will be rewritten.

2. Page 27-29 - Please do NOT include the "TriService optional file naming" discussion. This does NOT conform to the UDS. This was discussed numerous times during the UDS file naming development sessions. This is not in the true spirit of using the industry standards.

Response: The Tri-Service Optional method was included to address the needs of tri-service personnel who felt that CSI's file naming convention did not contain the information that they required. At the CSI National Convention meeting at the beginning of June 1998, the issue of file naming was raised regarding CSI's UDS document and the NIBS CADD Council standards. Several attendees asked for an option to the file naming convention where characters for the Project ID would be added. Mark Hall, Chair of UDS Subcommittee, agreed to review this issue. Until this is resolved, the Center will continue to include the Tri-Service optional method to meet the needs of field personnel.

Chapter 4

1. There is no discussion of Level Number assignments to the Level/Layer Name for the MicroStation users. Way back when - an assignment of names (using the AIA names as closely as possible) to numbers was made by task groups composed of Navy, COE, and AF representatives - why not use those?

Response: Since a lot of new levels/layers were added to this draft, the Center wanted to wait until those levels/layers were accepted before going through the process of assigning level numbers. The level numbers assigned will closely follow those from Release 1.4, with some "shuffling" being performed to fit new levels into certain categories. The level # column will be filled in when Release 1.7 is released.