

SWLED-MM

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY LRDOM 1110-1-4
Little Rock District, Corps of Engineers 22 Mar 86
P.O. Box 867
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-0867

Office Memorandum
No. 1110-1-4

Engineering and Design
PROCEDURE FOR REVIEWING MILITARY DESIGNS

1. Purpose. This office memorandum outlines basic procedures for reviewing military designs.
2. Applicability. This office memorandum applies to all elements of the Little Rock District.
3. Reference. SWDED-TM/T letter, Subject: Procedural Steps for Handling Military Review Comments, dated 30 Jan 86.
4. General.
 - a. The Project Manager for design of a military construction project is responsible for coordinating the review process outlined by this office memorandum.
 - b. Appendix A lists basic guidelines for review of both in-house and A-E design of military construction projects. It refers to design by A-E contract, but the same basic procedures apply to review of designs by in-house forces.
 - c. Suggested changes will be forwarded to Chief, Project Management Section, Military-Civil Program Branch.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

1 Appendix
APP A - Procedure for
Reviewing Military Designs
Comments


JEROME B. SIDIO
Major, Corps of Engineers
Deputy Commander

DISTRIBUTION A

APPENDIX A
Procedure for Reviewing Military Designs

1. Receipt of submittal. The Project Manager (PM) should first check to see that the material has been submitted in the required quantities. Although the material submitted will vary depending on the program (MCA, MCAF, etc.), it will generally consist of plans, specifications, design analysis, cost estimates, narrative reports, and annotated material and comment replies from previous efforts. The transmittal letter should certify that all documents have been checked and coordinated prior to submittal, and the letter should be signed by a principal in the A-E firm.

2. Distribution for comments. Generally, distribution requirements will be established at the pre-design meeting with the user. Distribution depends on the program involved. The different program requirements are summarized in the following subparagraphs.

a. MCA. The PM receives the submittal from the A-E and is responsible for distribution. Normally distribution will be made to the appropriate District elements, SWD, the installation FE/DEH, and the major command involved (TRADOC, AMCCOM, etc.). The number of copies required by each should be established by prior coordination.

b. MCAF. The Air Force insists that the A-E distribute the design to all review agents. Therefore, the PM must furnish the distribution list to the A-E prior to negotiation of the design fee. In addition to District and Division design elements, this list will normally include the using service (SAC, etc.), the base civil engineer, the communications commander, and AFRCE.

c. MCAR. Distribution will generally include OCE, OCAR, FORSCOM, Fifth Army, the DEH of the Support Installation (Fort Sill in the case of USAR facilities in Arkansas), the ARCOM/GOCOM that will control the facility, the using unit, and District/Division elements.

d. Installation Support Projects. Distribution requirements will depend on the review requirements established by the installation. If the Corps is requested to review the design, then normal in-house distribution will be made. Other distribution includes the installation FE/DEH/BCE, the using service, and others specified by the installation.

3. Review periods. The time required for review should be established during the pre-design phase in coordination with the user. It will often be dictated by the overall design schedule; however, unrealistically short review periods will not be established. Typically, the Air Force will require 5 weeks for review.

4. Review conferences. In the case of complex projects, a review conference may be necessary. The PM should make this determination in coordination with the user and the A-E and schedule the review conference in the correspondence distributing the design material. It should be emphasized that review comments must be completed prior to the conference. On-board review conferences can also be useful when the design schedule dictates a short review period. The cost of an on-board review conference should not be omitted from the overall design cost, especially since it may involve travel to the installation. It may be beneficial to have the review conference as a pre-negotiated option in the A-E contract.

5. Consolidation of comments. It is the responsibility of the PM to consolidate all comments from the various reviewers, resolve any inconsistencies, and furnish them to the A-E.

6. Changes to design/project. Comments which could change the scope of the contract should be discussed with the reviewer to insure that the change is required. If so, then steps should be taken to modify the A-E contract. It is the responsibility of the PM to formally obtain the approval of the Corporate Group for any changes adversely affecting the scope, schedule, or CWE for MCA projects.

7. Annotation of comments. The A-E contract should establish the time allotted for the A-E to annotate comments furnished by the PM. The A-E must furnish written explanations of any rebuttals. All annotated comments and rebuttals must be distributed by the PM to all reviewers. Normally, SWD must approve all rebutted comments. Insure that the distribution of annotated comments includes the entire set of original comments--not just written annotations.