

Comments from Jean McGinn, HQ, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, (202)761-1052

1. Page 2, first paragraph under, “Future Technologies,” last sentence: Need to rewrite. “Proficiency, communication, expense, delivery time, and quality,” are used as modifiers of, “a building’s life cycle.” The following definitions are from Webster’s:

Proficiency -- advancement in Knowledge or skill, the quality or state of being proficient.  
Proficient -- Well advanced in an art, occupation or branch of knowledge, adept, skilled skillful

A building's life cycle cannot be proficient, communicate, or have a delivery time. The personnel who design, construct, and manage a building during it’s life cycle can be proficient, and the delivery time for various elements within the life cycle can be improved. Additionally, communication can occur between people and software used during the life cycle.

**Response:** Concur. This sentence will be rewritten to "IFCs would improve the quality of a building's life cycle from construction through maintenance and ultimately to demolition. These improvements would result from reductions in expense and delivery time, enhanced communications, and an increase in discipline proficiency."

2. Page 10, first paragraph left column, last sentence: change, “develope,” to, “develop”.

**Response:** Concur, will fix.

3. Page 14-21: screen captures from MicroStation are still illegible, both on the printed copy and the screen. Need to fix.

**Response:** Concur, we will evaluate all figures and improve legibility of certain ones.

4. Page 20, Note under Figure 32: “discipline,” is spelled wrong.

**Response:** Concur, will fix.

5. Page 21: “forth,” should be “fourth”.

**Response:** Concur, will fix.

6. Page 28:

a. Second column, paragraph after Example 2: Paragraph indicates that the tables in Appendix A, “references the page number in Appendix B for each drawing type code’s level/layer assignment tables.” Though there is a column for Page # on most of the pages in appendix A (there is none on pages A-3 & A-4), there are no page numbers in the columns. Also, in the tables there is no indication of what the purpose of the page #'s is.

**Response:** The Tri-Service Center was going to wait and add these page numbers after the initial review. This way, if a model file table was thrown out, we wouldn't have to go back and renumber the pages in these tables. We will provide an explanation of the page number's purpose.

b. Figure 43: Title should be “Tri-Service Optional Sheet File Naming Convention”

**Response:** Concur, will fix.

c. To me it would be more logical to follow the Standard format in using numbers for sheet type code in the sheet file naming option (a single digit) rather than using the double letter designation. This would leave 2 user defined spaces at the end.

**Response:** We are still debating this. As you mentioned, changing this character to a single digit would make us comply with the AIA document. This would also further differentiate the difference in model file naming and sheet file naming. Will definitely explore this further.

- d. Where is the “File Use Indicator” defined? I do not know what the “M” used in the example and the figure represents.

**Response:** We are still deciding whether to keep this character or not. The "M" designates that the file is a model file. Because the Tri-Service Optional Model and Sheet File Naming schema are so similar, a person could locate model files within a directory by searching for the "M" character in the fourth position of the file names. However, since we didn't use a similar character ("S") for sheet files, this character may be discarded and another character added to the User Defined group.

7. Page 34, Figure 48: Title should be, “[MicroStation](#) design file.....”

**Response:** The title on the dialog box is correct. The caption will be corrected to reflect the fact that these are the dialog boxes for creating MicroStation design files and selecting seed files.

8. Page 35, first column: Indicates that the Level/Layer Matrix is found in Appendix B -- should be Appendix C.

**Response:** Concur, this should be Appendix C.

9. Page A1: This is Model File Naming Convention (Industry Standard) table. I assume that this represents the AIA CAD Layering Guidelines. Under Structural and Architectural, “Enlarged Plan,” is shown as, “EN”; there is no “Enlarged Plan,” under Structural and the designation is, “EP,” under Architectural in the AIA Guidelines.

**Response:** Concur, with changing back to "EP" to comply with AIA. We will rename "Environmental Plan", under the Civil Site discipline, to "EN". However, we felt that the "Enlarged Plan" Drawing Type Code would apply to all disciplines, not just the Architectural discipline, since all disciplines could potentially develop enlarged plans. We also recommend that "EP" be added to the AIA's list of "Drawing Type Codes that Apply to All Disciplines" on page 11 of their *CAD Layer Guidelines* document and that Environmental Plan under Civil be renamed to "EN".

10. Page A2: Under Fire Protection/Suppression, “Sprinkler Plan,” is shown as, “SK”. In the AIA Guidelines it is “KP”.

**Response:** Concur, will change to "KP" to comply with AIA.

11. In Appendix C: I suggest that you remove all rows where there is not reference or active file. This appendix is too voluminous, and it becomes tedious to go through it all before locating an applicable layer -- i.e. from the second half of page C-30 to the last 1/4 of page C-33 there are no layers referenced. All of pages C-36, C-37, C-50 to C-55, and C-57 & C-58 have no references. You need to remove all this superfluous data from this appendix.

**Response:** We are still debating on whether this appendix is helpful or not. A lot of engineers and architects feel that this appendix is confusing and that the referencing of appropriate files to create sheet files is intuitive enough. Also, the decision over which levels/layers in reference files are "turned on" is also dependent on the project and its complexity. We may just eliminate

this section.