

THE MEMPHIS **perspective**

October 2019 edition



**Booze & Brews**

**A CSI Memphis Chapter Family  
Friendly Networking Event**

**INSIDE:**


~ CSI Memphis Presidents Message pg. 4~ Notices pg. 5~ CSI Memphis Leadership 2018-19 pg. 6-7~

~ New Members and Anniversaries pg. 8~

~ by Hans Dietrich Faulhaber, Architect pg.9-15~

~ Region Conference Report by Tommy Smith pg.16~ Dempsie B. Morrison Scholarship Fund pg. 20-21~

**csimemphis.org**



# BOOZE and BREWS

BREWERY  
TOUR STARTS  
@ 2:30 PM  
(FIRST 10 TOURS  
ARE FREE)

**SAT 19 OCT  
1PM-4PM**

**WICKED GOOD TIME  
FAMILY-FRIENDLY  
NETWORKING  
PUMPKIN PAINTING  
MORE ACTIVITIES**

**WISEACRE BREWING CO.  
2783 BROAD AVENUE, MEMPHIS, TN 38112**



**RSVP @ <http://www.csimemphis.org/events/Booze-and-brews>**

## About CSI

Founded in 1948, the Construction Specifications Institute is a not-for-profit technical organization dedicated to the advancement of construction technology through communication, research, education and service. CSI serves the interests of architects, engineers, specifiers, interior designers, contractors, product manufacturers and others in the construction industry.

[www.csinet.org](http://www.csinet.org)

## CSI Membership

Architects, engineers, contractors, and manufacturers—14,000 members strong—are in touch with one another through their Construction Specifications Institute membership. CSI provides contacts in the construction industry as well as provides you up-to-date information to help you do your job efficiently and effectively. Yearly Institute membership fee is \$250 plus \$40 Memphis Chapter fee = \$290; Institute membership fee for an Emerging Professional is \$125 plus \$40 Memphis Chapter fee = \$165.00; and Institute membership fee for students is \$30 plus \$10 Memphis Chapter = \$40.

Contact: Jeffrey Parnell [jparnell@hbg.design](mailto:jparnell@hbg.design)

901-577-0594

At each monthly meeting, the Chapter encourages all members

## Tabletop Displays at Monthly Meetings

to provide a table display of their product and/or services for inspection and education of those attending the meeting. After the meal and prior to the program, the displayer will be given five minutes to address the group. The table display is also encouraged to be represented during the social hour and after the program for any questions by the attendees. The presentation fee for this time is \$25.00.

Table Top Info. - Mike Zielinski  
[mzielinski@lrk.com](mailto:mzielinski@lrk.com)  
901-652-5612

## The Memphis PerSPECTive Information

*The Memphis PerSPECTive* is published ten times a year by the Memphis Chapter of the Construction Specifications Institute. Appearance of products or services, name or editorial copy does not constitute an endorsement by the Memphis Chapter of CSI nor any of its members.

Circulation of *The Memphis PerSPECTive* is now limited to access on the CSI Memphis website: [csimemphis.org](http://csimemphis.org). To be included on future notifications of the uploaded magazine forward your name, mailing address, and e-mail address to the following email address:

[hansfaulhaber@hotmail.com](mailto:hansfaulhaber@hotmail.com)

### SUBMITTING ARTICLES

Readers are encouraged to submit articles of interest within the construction industry for publishing. Articles on individual projects whether currently in design, under construction, or recently completed are encouraged.

Any printed articles, photos or program inserts should be forwarded to:

The Memphis PerSPECTive  
Attn: Hans Faulhaber  
[hansfaulhaber@hotmail.com](mailto:hansfaulhaber@hotmail.com)

Articles and images should be submitted in electronic format via digital media or email. Microsoft Word documents are required for articles, minus tabs and any other formatting. All images must include a date and caption. Printed material will not be accepted

### MAGAZINE ADVERTISING

Advertising in the PerSPECTive was discontinued as of June 1, 2018. Advertising will be on the website from that date forward.



**CSI Memphis Chapter Meetings**

**Board Meetings:** 5:30pm - Monday preceding Chapter Meeting (unless noted)

**Place:** Allen + Hoshall Conference Room 1661 International Dr., Memphis, TN 38120

**Chapter Meetings:** 11:30 am -1:00pm 2nd Thursday of the month  
(except Dec., April, July)

**Place:** Holiday Inn University of Memphis Medallion Lounge  
3700 Central Ave, Memphis, TN 38111

**Cost:** \$20 for members and guests; \$12.50 for students (*sponsors may cover student costs*)

**CSI Memphis Chapter Calendar 2018-2019**

**October 2019**

**October 2019 Board Meeting**

*See above for time and place*

**October, 2019 Chapter Meeting:**

The chapter program this month is:  
**BooZE & BREWS**

CSI Memphis is hosting a family-friendly networking event on Saturday, October 19 from 1 to 4 PM at Wise Acre Brewery. This event is free to attend and we encourage attendees to bring their families. We'll have games for the kids and football on the TVs for the adults. Food trucks will be on site if you get hungry. More details will be released shortly, so stay tuned and visit our website:

***csimemphis.org***

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		



**GO TO *csimemphis.org***  
**Everything you need to know about CSI Memphis and more.**



## CSI Memphis Chapter President's Message



**JEFFREY PARNELL, CSI, AIA**  
**CSI MEMPHIS CHAPTER PRESIDENT**

Greetings CSI Memphis!

Our chapter has the rest of 2019 completely planned out. We have a ton of great events coming up and I'm really looking forward to the next few months of events. For more information on any of our chapter events, go to [www.csimemphis.org/events](http://www.csimemphis.org/events).

First, **CONSTRUCT 2019** in National Harbor, Maryland is also around the corner. **Mike Zielinski, Gary White** and **Susan Evans** will be joining me in representing the Memphis Chapter of CSI at the institute convention. If you have any topics you would like to be presented at the annual business meeting, please feel free to email [info@csimemphis.org](mailto:info@csimemphis.org). I'm excited for this year's show because this will be my first year as a presenter and not just an attendee. I will give a presentation titled, "Emerging Professionalism," with a friend and colleague, Erica Kennedy from the Charlotte Chapter of CSI. I'm also pleased to announce that the Memphis Chapter of CSI will be receiving the Outstanding Chapter Commendation yet again. After CONSTRUCT, our chapter will be doing something a little different for the month of October. In lieu of a typical chapter meeting, we will be hosting a family-friendly networking event Saturday, October 19<sup>th</sup> from 1PM to 4PM at the **Wisecre Taproom on Broad Ave**. We are calling this event **Booze & Brews** and we are partnering with the **Memphis Section of Illuminating Engineering Society** to make it happen. We'll have football on TV for the adults and crafts for the kids, including a Pumpkin Painting Station sponsored by **Sherwin Williams**. This event is free to attend but the chapter will not be covering the bar tab. We're still looking for a few small sponsors.

Our **November Chapter Meeting** will be Thursday, November 14<sup>th</sup> from 11:30 AM to 1 PM. Our featured speaker is **Chris McNally** of **Memphis Repro-**

**graphics**. He will give a CEU presentation on Document Control and Delivery with respect to the CDT and real-world experience. This will be the last chapter meeting hosted at the University of Memphis Holiday Inn. We're still looking for a new venue to host our meetings and we will disperse that information as soon as we have it.

Finally, we will end 2019 with the annual **Holiday Party** on Thursday, December 5<sup>th</sup> from 5:30 PM to 8:30 PM at **No. 2 Vance**, located at 325 Wagner. All are welcome to attend. This is a free event, drinks and heavy hors d'oeuvres will be served. For more information on this or any of our other chapter events, go to [www.csimemphis.org/events](http://www.csimemphis.org/events).

I would like to encourage our members to donate to the **Dempsey B Morrison Scholarship Fund**. Our Immediate Past-President, **Julie Fleming**, is hard at work for the 2019-2020 donation drive. Be sure to be on the lookout for donation forms, which should be mailed out shortly. Of course, you can donate now, online, by visiting [www.csimemphis.org/morrison-scholarship/](http://www.csimemphis.org/morrison-scholarship/). Our scholarship is the only scholarship that is still fully matched by the University of Memphis, which allows us to provide full tuition for two students in the Department of Architecture each year.

**Jeffrey Parnell, CSI, AIA**  
**Architect, HBG Design**  
**CSI Memphis Chapter President**



**CSI Memphis Notices**

**The Memphis *PerSPECTive* is currently searching for an Editor. If you are interested in becoming the Editor of this award winning publication please call Hans at (901) 326-9937!**

**CSI MEMPHIS MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE**

Architects, engineers, contractors, and manufacturers can be in touch with one another through their Construction Specifications Institute membership. CSI provides contacts in the construction industry as well as provides you current information to help you do your job efficiently and effectively. Annual Institute membership fee is \$250 plus \$40 Memphis Chapter fee = \$290; Institute membership fee for an Emerging Professional is \$125 plus \$40 Memphis Chapter fee = \$165.00; and Institute membership fee for students is \$30 plus \$10 Memphis Chapter = \$40.

**Contact: Jeffrey Parnell**  
**jparnell@hbg.design**  
**901 577-0594**

**CSI Memphis Announces QAQC Educational Opportunity**

Former Chapter member **Louis Medcalf, FCSI** will be the Faculty for this program on Quality Assurance and Quality Control. Louis is currently a senior specifier with Conspectus and has more than 40 years of experience in architecture and more than 25 years of experience in QAQC. If you are interested in this program further information can be found at [www.Lorman.com](http://www.Lorman.com). Here is a description of the event:

**Effective Quality Control and Quality Assurance**

The increasing complexity of regulatory and technical requirements for projects and time pressures from clients are a challenge to maintaining a high level of quality for contract documents. Successful QA/QC procedures can avoid costly waste effort as well as potential claims. Whether large or small, many firms do not have a consistent approach to managing the quality of their deliverables. Although they realize the need, firm leaders may not have a concept of how to begin. This presentation will help architects and engineers establish goals for quality management and introduces a basic strategy for planning a QA/QC program tailored to the size and practice of individual design firms.

**INVITE A FRIEND OR COLLEAGE**

**CSI Memphis Mission Statement**

**CSI Memphis Mission Statement**

**In order to enhance the process of creating and sustaining the built environment, Memphis Chapter CSI:**

**Provides opportunities for persons in the design and construction industry to receive cutting edge information regarding construction documents and practices;**

**Promotes members career advancement and enhancement of leadership and communication skills; and supports students aspiring to design and construction careers.**

*Memphis Chapter*

THE CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS INSTITUTE



**2018-2019 CSI Memphis Officers and Board of Directors**

**Officers:**

**President: Jeffrey Parnell**  
**President Elect: Gary White**  
**Vice President: Susan Evans**  
**Secretary: Melissa Pope**  
**Treasurer: Mike Zielinski**  
**Past Pres: Julie Fleming**  
**UM Student Pres: Isaac Barrantes**

**Board of Directors:**

**Pam Davidson : 2017-2020**  
**Lisa Perkowski: 2017-2020**  
**Carlie Massery: 2018-2021**  
**BJ Brillard: 2018-2021**  
**Sarah Hawkins: 2019-2022**  
**Wendy Cooper Kelly: 2019-2022**

## 2018-2019 Committee Chairs

Academic Affairs:	Sarah Hawkins
Awards:	Sara Hawkins
Banquet/Christmas:	Susan Evans
Certification:	Tommy Smith and Hans Faulhaber
Chapter Operations:	Jim Neison
Conference/Conventions:	Mike Zielinski
Education:	Mike Zielinski
Fellowship:	Wally Bostelmann
Finance:	Jim Neison
Bowling Tournament:	Carley Massery
Historian:	Pam Davidson
Magazine Editor:	Hans Dietrich Faulhaber
Membership   Database:	Pam Davidson
Nominations:	Julie Fleming and Jeffrey Parnell
Planning:	Hans Faulhaber and John Bigham
Products Display Show:	Mike Zielinski and Jeffrey Parnell
Programs   Table Top:	Jeffrey Parnell and Gary White
Publicity:	Open
Scholarship:	Julie Fleming
Table Top:	Mike Zielinski
Technical:	Hans Dietrich Faulhaber
Bylaws / Operating Guide:	John Bigham and Jim Neison
Website:	Jeffrey Parnell

***If you are interested in volunteering for service on any of these committees or if you have any ideas you would like to discuss with committee chairs— do not hesitate to call!***



## Anniversaries

*The following members have anniversaries for October*

<u>Member</u>	<u>Join Date</u>	<u>Member Years</u>
Ronnie Bonner	10/28/99	20 Years
Benjamin Evans	10/31/18	1 Year
Michael Folk	10/23/99	20 Years
Dwight LeClair	10/07/98	21 Years
Carlie Massery	10/16/17	2 Years
Ron Perkins	10/01/03	16 Years
Ron Roberts	10/01/92	27 Years
Brock Terwilleger	10/14/18	1 Year

**THANKS FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!**

*Congratulations on your anniversary and thanks for participating!!*



## Common Submittal Related Problems *by Hans Dietrich Faulhaber, Architect, CSI, CDT*

*This article is related to documents required for submission prior to and typically during construction. The requirement for Submittals is found in Division 01 General Requirements and specifically in Section 01300 or 0113 00. The individual specification sections will detail the specific submittals required.*

### **Multiple Submittals for One Specification Section**

There are essentially two issues related to this problem. The first is MPE engineers think in terms of specifying subcontracts rather than specifying products. The second is a single specification section that applies to the product submittal and installation requirements of multiple subcontractors. Both of these issues have their own special set of problems.

Engineering specifications have been traditionally known to be a sort of renegade product. That is to say they sometimes follow the CSI format and sometimes do not; more often they do not which can lead to compromising situations if specific issues are not identified before a particular product installation occurs. Because engineering professionals consider the specification “theirs” and include all aspects of that installation, a given product might be specified in multiple sections. Unfortunately the engineers desire to be comprehensive can lead to confusion, a mis-match of approved products and potentially non-compatible products submitted for installation in the work of a given project.

An example of the engineering related specification problem is Fire Stopping. Architectural specification writers will typically place this product in specification Section 07840, wherein the specifier will list a number of acceptable manufacturers. The specifier will also provide a schedule indicating where the products are to be used and under what Underwriter’s Laboratory (UL) or Factory Mutual (FM) category they fall. The architectural construction administrator would logically expect the submission of this product under one submittal covering all aspects of product submission and installation.

One way to avoid this problem is to have the engineering specification reference the architectural specification and remain silent on any other aspects of that component and its installation. To do otherwise is to invite confusion and further the notion of specifying subcontracts which is NOT what specifications are intended to accomplish. The division of labor for a given project is solely the responsibility of the bidding general contractor. The Contract Documents should in no way imply nor should the bidding contractor infer that there is an implicit division of labor or subcontract relationship in the composition of the technical specifications: there isn’t.

When multiple subcontractors install products from the same section, a similar problem with the product and installation of that product occur. For example, Joint Sealants, which apply to windows, doors, finish materials and other components will be installed on the interior and exterior of the building by a variety of different subcontractors. The problem is that if the window installer and the masonry installer do not use the exact same brand of sealant, there might be an incompatibility problem with the final installation. One sealant may not stick to the other resulting in a leaky building.

The way for architects and engineers to avoid this problem, as related to Joint Sealants, is to simply require the use of one manufacturer throughout the project. This provides sole source responsibility and should ensure a compatibility review on the part of the successful bidder/supplier. To ensure that this review is accomplished, it too should be listed as a specified requirement.

The way a contractor can eliminate this problem is to first recognize its existence (i.e. either example) and then be pro-active by asking the architect for a modification of the offending requirement(s). The reasoning being for the contractor to provide a more comprehensive and accurate product submission and installation, a “streamlining” of the particular submittal would be a benefit to the project as a whole. A prudent architect should have no issues with this sort of request and approve it immediately.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 10

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 9

### Unrequested Submittals

Unrequested submittals are just that: components submitted for review that are not contractually required for submission, review or approval. An example of this submittal is any component that is not listed in any given specification section as being required to be submitted for review and approval.

The reviewer should beware of the potential legal liability associated with the disposition of submittals of this nature. The reviewing party will inevitably take on some liability associated with submissions of this nature. The most effective means of disposing of unrequested submittals would be to simply return them to the submitter with no action taken.

The contractor should also be aware of the potential legal liability associated with the submission of components or information that are not required to be submitted. Just as the reviewing party will take on liability, the submitting party does too.

### Resubmittals

A resubmittal, as the term implies, is the resubmission of a product or group of products for review and disposition a second time. This may occur due to the submittal being incomplete, the submittal being vague and requiring clarification, or the incorrect or inferior product being submitted. Resubmission implies that the process has already been through one review cycle for the given product. Consequently, the reviewer will have notations ready to quickly review and dispose of the resubmission once it is received.

Limiting re-submittals is an almost impossible task. Very few owners would capitulate to specification language that would cause proprietary components to be integrated into their project for the simple reason that acceptance would not be cost effective and may not provide any better quality. Not all similar products are created equal. Consequently, specifications need to be clear, concise, complete and coordinated to convey what is wanted for a project. Remember that any rejection or revision required to a submittal on the part of the submitting subcontractor will inevitably lead to a resubmission for verification. That is, unless the reviewer simply noted to provide the product with whatever notations were placed on the submittal and returned the submittal to the contractor.

In practice a resubmission of a product or assembly of products that happens in a single occurrence is generally acceptable. A third occurrence calls for the contractor and reviewer to get together face to face to determine why there is division on what the requirements are for the submittal. Without actually discussing the submittal issues, the submittal process will simply ping-pong back and forth until everyone becomes frustrated and nothing productive is accomplished and the project is potentially delayed. This sort of scenario should be avoided.

Resubmittals have professional compensation issues associated with them. Architects and engineers are compensated for their time. It is simply not equitable for one party to a contract (the contractor) to cause uncompensated extra work to another party (the architect or engineer) through their actions. The innocent party becomes the Owner when they are required to compensate the architect for additional services related to multiple submittal reviews. Some AIA Owner Agreement forms have provisions for how many times a submittal review can occur without triggering additional service fees.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 11

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 10

### **Incomplete Submittals**

All specification sections have an article devoted to the requirements for the submittals under Part 1 General Requirements for the given product or assembly being specified. An incomplete submittal occurs when on or more of the listed components is omitted from the submission for review that the submittal becomes incomplete.

Incomplete submittals are product or component submissions that do not have all of the requisite submittal components attached to them as required by the specification for the given product. For example: Section 08800 Glazing typically requires small samples (12" x 12" or smaller) of the glass proposed for inclusion in the project in addition to product data on each individual glass component. Submission of the product data without the sample would be considered incomplete. The reviewer has a choice of reviewing that which was submitted and comment on it, noting that the submission of samples is required or he may reject the submittal in favor of receiving a complete submittal to review in one sitting. The contractor in this example may want to obtain approval based on the submission of the product data prior to procuring and submitting samples and in some cases this would be acceptable. However, if there is no extraordinary glazing requirement and the glass that is specified is commonly available then there is no compelling reason not to submit all of the required components at one time, the first time.

Incomplete submittals are a reality of the construction industry. In order to provide a thorough "three C" review, the submission has to be complete, clear and concise. (I like to add my 4<sup>th</sup> "C" to the process: *coordinated*. A fully coordinated set of documents will provide the contractor with the proper information in the right locations without duplication.) The easiest way to eliminate repeat submissions of incomplete submittals is to return the first incomplete submittal to the contractor with no action taken. The reviewer should note on the return transmittal the fact that the submittal is incomplete and why, thus requiring a resubmission and reactivation of the review timetable. Often this method will result in better submissions. The negative aspect of taking this action is being perceived as a non team player and one who will forever be a hindrance to the construction schedule.

### **Nonresponsive Submittals**

A non-responsive submittal can be best described as a submittal that is incomplete or where all the components have been submitted by multiple selections exist on the submittal data or cut sheet and none had been marked signifying that particular product for review. In other words, it does not *respond* to specified requirements. The reviewer has the option of marking and noting the correct or acceptable component and returning it to the contractor or simply taking no action and returning it to the contractor to make the selections and resubmit. The danger in marking the submittal with the acceptable component is that the contractor may respond that the marked component was not the priced component and there will be an up charge for what was indicated. Consequently I recommend reviewers return the submittal with no action taken thus reactivating the review time and placing the responsibility on the contractor for indicating which components he intends for review.

Informational submittals are assessed solely on the basis of whether they are responsive or non-responsive and not on correctness of content. For example, contractors are routinely required to submit construction progress schedules. The architect is required to review this submittal solely based on its requirement to be submitted and not the actual content, although comments may be forthcoming.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 12

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 11

### **Inadequate Contractor Review**

The contractor is contractually obligated to review all of the submittals it receives prior to officially submitting them to the architect for review. The contractor is required to make notations for coordination with related work and to list any items that are not in conformance with the contract documents. A product substitution may also be specified to have a listing of the features of the substitution versus the specified product so that the reviewer does not spend an inordinate amount of time determining the suitability of a given substitution. It should be noted that most specifications do not allow post-bid substitutions to be processed as ordinary submittals.

The contractor has a responsibility to verify that submissions from their subcontractors that are intended to be submitted to the architect for official review have all of the components required by the specifications. This verification process takes only minutes to perform and can potentially save hours in time. Typically inadequate contractor review will result in resubmission of the submittal which will take the subcontractor's, the contractor's and the architect's time to process. The waste of re-processing time can be avoided by simply reviewing the submissions as they come in and verify that they comply.

Simply stamping the submission and affixing initials and a date do not constitute a review of a submittal. Once the submittal is received it should be compared to the specifications for compliance and any deficiencies or omissions annotated on the submittal. If the submittal is found to be complete, it should then be forwarded to the architect for their review.

The General Conditions for AIA document A201 state the following relative to contractor submittal review state the following under Article 3.12.6: *"By submitting Shop Drawings, Product Data, Samples and similar submittals, the Contractor represents to the Owner and Architect that the Contractor has (1) reviewed and approved them, (2) determined and verified materials, field measurements and field construction criteria related thereto, or will do so and (3) checked and coordinated the information contained within such submittals with the requirement of the Work and of the Contract Documents."*

### **Contractor Refuses to Approve**

Prior to submission for an official review, the contractor is required to verify the completeness of a given submittal and approve it as complying with the contract documents. Typically this approval takes the form of a project manager or other reviewer looking over the submittal and stamping the submittal with the contractor's stamp signifying that the contractor has in fact reviewed the subcontractor's submittal and concurs that the submittal components and that the contents of the submittal comply with the contractual requirements.

In my experience it is very rare that the contractor will refuse to approve the subcontractor's submission for review by the A/E team. The architect or reviewer's action will typically be to reject the submittal based on the fact that there is no indication that the contractor has reviewed the submittal prior to submission for official review, which the contractor is contractually required to do.

Reasons for the contractor refusing to approve submittals can vary from the contractor not believing that the submittals are the purview of the architect and thus should not carry the review signification from the contractor. Another potential reason is that the contractor was provided with advice from his counsel advising him not to approve submittals as a matter of practice to avoid any liability associated with them.

Regardless of the reason, the contractor has a duty to review and dispose of submissions on the part of his subcontractors that are deemed to be official submittals. Failure to do so will result in time wasted.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 13



CONTINUED FROM PAGE 12

### **Overloading**

Overloading is a practice by contractors where they submit a large amount of submittals on a certain date expecting them to be disposed of within the contractual timeframe, typically two weeks. If the Project Manual specifies that the contractor is to produce a submittal schedule prior to the review of any submittals, the potential for overloading is mitigated to some degree. This practice does not serve the project well as there may be truly critical submissions that will enable the contractor to move quickly and meet its schedule that might not be reviewed in as timely manner as if they had been properly submitted. The problem of overloading can be compounded when the reviewing party is located in a different city from the project or the contract administrator.

Overloading can be eliminated by enforcing the contract requirements related to the submission of a Submittal Schedule. The Submittal Schedule is or should be a living (constantly updated) document typically required to be submitted within a very short period of time after execution of a construction contract. The Submittal Schedule defines the submittal process to come and is the “road map” to the submittal process orchestrated by the general contractor. If the Submittal Schedule is submitted then there should be an orderly progression of submissions once the contract has been executed.

### **Multiple Submittals Requiring Coordination**

“Multiple submittals that require coordination” is a good reason to require the contractor to provide a Submittal Schedule. This problem occurs when there are a number of specified components on the project that require close coordination with each other. An example for this would be a curtain wall system that is directly adjacent to an exterior metal panel system. While the two systems are independent of one another they intersect with each other and thus coordination between the two is necessary.

As previously stated the contractor is required to review submittals prior to official submission for review. When there are submittals that require coordination, the contractor should request these submittals concurrently from his subcontractors. The contractor should allow for sufficient time to review and provide the coordination as required for the submittals. The contractor’s review may require that the submittals be returned to the subcontractor for corrections prior to official submission to the architect for review.

The complexity of the submissions requiring coordination may be such that a meeting between the subcontractors providing and erecting each of the components is conducted with the contractor and the architect and his consultant involved. The procedure would generally eliminate the potential for resubmissions as all or many of the problems would be worked out in the meeting prior to the submission of the components.

Some of these issues will be addressed in my future article: *Submittal Schedules and Product Substitutions*. These are problems that are experienced industry wide and tend to have a negative impact on the whole construction administrative process. Enforcing all aspects of the contract documents, particularly requiring Submittal Schedules to be submitted, will enable the contractor and architect to work together to avoid these sorts of problems. Avoiding these problems will go a long way to producing a successful project that is on time and on budget and results in the level of quality prescribed in the specifications. After all, we are in business to satisfy the clients and to produce high quality products.

**Hans Dietrich Faulhaber, Architect, CSI, CDT ©2019**

CONTINUED ON PAGE 14

CERTIFICATION

**Become Certified! Take the CSI Certification Exams!**

*CDT-Construction Document Technologist*

*CCCA-Certified Construction Contract Administrator*

*CCS-Certified Construction Specifier*

*CCPR-Certified Construction Product Representative*



PROMOTE.  
INVOLVE.  
ENGAGE.  
CONNECT.

Read the  
*Construction Specifier Magazine*  
On Line at [csinet.org](http://csinet.org)  
Or get your copy by  
joining CSI

## Current Dempsey B. Morrison Scholarship Recipients



### Scholarship Fund

00 01 01 PROJECT TITLE PAGE

### **Dempsie B. Morrison Scholarship Fund**

2019 - 2020 Campaign | July 2018 - January 31, 2019

01 11 00 SUMMARY OF WORK

Dempsie B. Morrison, Jr., FCSI was a practicing architect, specifier, and teacher deeply involved in the CSI Memphis and National chapters. The CSI Memphis Chapter continues to honor his memory by awarding the Morrison Scholarship to University of Memphis Architecture students that show exemplary performance in academics as well as involvement within the CSI Student Affiliate.

Awarded each year since 1979, the Dempsie B. Morrison, Jr. Scholarship is funded in partnership with the University of Memphis. Contributions collected by the CSI Memphis chapter are matched and two students receive full tuition for the academic year. With your support, CSI Memphis will award two scholarships in May of 2019 to students who will continue to honor the spirit of Dempsie B. Morrison, Jr.

Congratulations to the 2018-2019 Scholarship recipients:



**Christen Ayoub**



**Jason Ontiveros**

01 35 00 SPECIAL PROCEDURES

Please join us in celebrating the legacy of Dempsie B. Morrison by donating to the Scholarship Fund. Thank you for your continued support; your generosity is greatly appreciated by CSI Memphis and all past, current, and future Scholarship recipients.

# DEMPSEY B. MORRISON SCHOLARSHIP FUND



## Scholarship Fund

00 01 01 PROJECT TITLE PAGE

### Dempsey B. Morrison Scholarship Fund

01 30 00 ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Please fill out the following form or donate online at <http://www.csimemphis.org/>

Levels of Participation (please select one):

- \$500+ Diamond
- \$400 Platinum
- \$300 Gold
- \$200 Silver
- \$100 Bronze

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Memorial? Please provide an address for the acknowledgement:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Please make your tax deductible donation check payable to:  
**Dempsey B. Morrison Scholarship Fund, Inc.**

Mail form and check to:  
Farrell-Calhoun Paint, Attn: Julie Fleming  
221 E. Carolina Ave,  
Memphis, TN 38126