



Phoenix Chapter of the Construction Specifications Institute

Cactus Comments

January, 2007

From the President

George Wadding
Star Roofing

Happy New Year!

I am not the first to wish this blessing on you but since Cactus Comments is usually available on the first day of the month, I should be in the early group. I am excited about 2007 and hope you are too. I am proud to be part of a dynamic industry that impacts almost everyone's lifestyle.

In the last few years, many changes have already come, but you ain't seen nothing yet. Phoenix Chapter has multiple educational opportunities and programs planned. We will be presenting some construction issues we have never dealt with before and others that are new and suggest some basic changes in the next several years in how we all operate.

50th ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

We reach a proud moment in the history of the Phoenix Chapter in this year. In March 2007, we will have reached the distinguished age of 50. If you have not noticed our chapter number is 011, the significance of which is that Phoenix was the eleventh chapter chartered by the Institute. I am, and I hope all of you are, looking forward to June 13. It will be an evening filled with good times and fond remembrances, along with a unique opportunity for those who are newer to CSI to become acquainted with the Chapter's history and accomplishments.

Do take your appointment calendar\book\software right now and mark that day boldly. You definitely do not want to miss this!

GOVERNANCE OF THE INSITUTE

A comprehensive and thoughtful review of CSI with the object to revitalize and make the governance of CSI more efficient and effective has resulted in a unanimous recommendation by the current Institute Board of Directors to streamline the governance of the Institute. This will require a change in the Bylaws and because of that all of the members of CSI will have the opportunity to vote on these critical issues.

By the time you read this all of the relevant information will be on-line and available to each of you. A great deal of time and effort has gone into this and it behooves every member to review the information and thoughtfully consider these changes. I encourage you to take time to do so. In the final analysis, you are just as important as all of the other members of CSI and this decision will affect you for some time to come.

As President of the Chapter I was briefed by our Region Directors during our bi-monthly teleconference. They participated directly in the discussions about this very important topic and supported it. I have now had the opportunity to read the proposed Bylaws and reach my own conclusions about the value of the proposed changes.

That said, I will share my personal reactions. Since becoming more involved in the current structure of the Institute, I have been of the opinion (not stated publicly heretofore) that the size of the Institute Board was cumbersome and the resultant expenses of the Board as currently constituted were excessive. These proposed changes are aimed fairly directly at dealing with those two concerns.

Another personal concern is related to issues of transparency. I first joined CSI in late 1964, although my membership record indicates a much shorter duration. The answer to that is very simple: there came a time when certain information was available to only a very small committee and, in my opinion, too much power was vested in too few individuals. Consequently, I deliberately let my membership lapse; perhaps the ultimate expression of dissatisfaction, although perhaps not the best method to deal with it. The proposed changes do not cause me any concern in that respect.

To summarize, when my personal opportunity to vote comes, I will be among those approving the changes in the Bylaws because I believe them to be in the best interests of the members of CSI. These last three paragraphs will be my only and last public responsive statement on this issue. Any further expressions will be aimed at encouraging each of you to look at the information, come to your own conclusions, and cast your vote based on your conviction.

Walter T. Marlowe, P.E., CAE Selected as New Executive Director and CEO of the Construction Specifications Institute

ALEXANDRIA, VA (December 20, 2006) –The Construction Specifications Institute (CSI) announced today that **Walter T. Marlowe, P.E., CAE**, has been selected as the new Executive Director and Chief Executive Officer of CSI. Marlowe accepted the position Tuesday, Dec. 19, 2006 at CSI's offices in Alexandria, Va. Institute President Edd Soenke, FCSI, CCS, AIA, Former Institute President Gary Betts, FCSI, CCS, AIA, and Institute Treasurer Michael Davis, FCSI, CDT were present to welcome the new director.

A Search Task Team of respected CSI members, led by Ross Spiegel, FCSI, CCS, CCCA, AIA, LEED AP, worked closely with Korn/Ferry International to develop the specifications for the kind of executive to lead CSI forward. CSI President, Edd Soenke said, "It was an inspiring process, and I know we have the right person for the job. Walt is a perfect fit and his engineering background will serve CSI well." The CSI Board of Directors made its selection during its November 2006 Board Meeting in Denver, Colorado following a nationwide search by Korn/Ferry.

Marlowe has 16 years experience and demonstrated increasing responsibility in association management. He served in a variety of staff leadership roles at the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) and National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE). His positions included Director of Professional Practice, International Activities and Technical Activities.

Prior to joining CSI, Marlowe was the Executive Director of Building Security Council (BSC). Led by the ASCE Architectural Engineering Institute, BSC focuses on improving public safety by advancing building security. BSC administers and maintains a voluntary rating system that enables building owners to evaluate and improve the security of their facilities.

Asked why he was drawn to the opportunity of helming CSI, Marlowe stated, "There is such potential for members, staff and CSI partners to build a truly collaborative, growing and innovative organization. The mission of CSI is increasingly important as the construction industry becomes more multi-disciplinary, interdependent, and technology driven."

A licensed professional engineer in New Jersey, Marlowe practiced structural engineering earlier in his career with the consulting firms DeLeuw, Cather & Co. and The RBA Group.

Marlowe is an alumnus of Stevens Institute of Technology in Hoboken, NJ where he earned a Bachelor of Engineering degree. He also holds a masters degree in Business Administration from the George Washington University in Washington, DC. He attained the Certified Association Executive (CAE) designation from the American Society of Association Executives in 2003.

Proposed Governance Recommendation Fuels Debate at CSI Leader Forum

On November 18th, CSI's officers and directors voted unanimously to propose to the membership a restructuring of the Institute Board of Directors. Among other points, the recommendation is to reduce the size of the Board of Directors from twenty-nine to twelve members to create a more efficient, streamlined governing body that will be better able to concentrate on leading the Institute. In February, all members will receive a ballot to vote on this recommendation.

The goal of this forum is to allow all CSI leaders to actively and easily participate in one of the most important decisions members will ever make. The Board of Directors unanimously supports this recommendation, and encourages all CSI leaders to use this forum to resolve their questions about the recommendation.

This forum has seen an unprecedented level of activity (nearly 3,000 views in 3 days). This level of activity, combined with being auto-subscribed, has caused a large amount of email being directed to you. Every new post to this forum causes an email notification to be sent out to all CSI Leaders to let them know a comment has been made.

To view the forum and activate your e-mail notification, go to www.csinet.org, log in, and click "Forums." The All Leaders Discussion will be your first option -- but it will not become visible to you until you have logged in. Once you have logged in, you will begin receiving email notices when a new comment is posted. If you have any difficulty, contact CSI's web team at forums@csinet.org.

Given the importance of the topic to CSI's future, please take time to read and participate in the forum. For more information, including FAQs, please visit www.csinet.org/futurecsi.

Program

Materials Testing and Approvals

We see them in the specifications we write, the building codes we comply with, and the product information distributed by manufacturers: test reports; providing evidence of compliance with minimum requirements of either voluntary or mandatory standards.

But beside the numbers and test standard identifiers, how many of you really know what process is involved in material testing? What some of the main issues and concerns are regarding testing? And, why testing is even required?

To answer these, and other questions, we'll have with us that evening Mr. Alpesh Patel, Senior Project Engineer, with the Underwriters' Laboratory Fire Protection Division in Northbrook, Illinois.

Date January 10, 2007

Place Holiday Inn, Tempe / ASU
915 E. Apache Blvd.
Tempe, Arizona

Time 5:30 p.m.
Social Hour

6:30 p.m.
Dinner

7:30 p.m.
Presentation

Tangible Evidence Of Existence

Imagine if you will, a warm sunny weekend in the Spring sometime in the future. Great day for a garage sale for sure.

A car pulls up, a young man gets out and wanders through the items displayed on the tables for sale. His attention is drawn to a wooden box. Curiosity compels him to take a closer look.

He opens the lid and inside are rows of badges in a rounded triangular shape. Each badge has a clip or pin on the back, and on the front are the letters "CSI". Each has a different name on it. He picks up one or two and examines them more closely. Finally, he turns to the person sitting on the side of the driveway and asks: "Do you know where these came from?"

The reply is: "No, we inherited them from my grandfather after he died. The only thing I can recall is that he used to talk about belonging to something called 'Madison Chapter CSI'."

"Madison Chapter CSI?" the customer asks. "I wonder what that was?"

The seller replies: "I don't know, but I think it used to be a pretty well-known local society. Grandpa used to talk about getting a newsletter and going to meetings described in it."

"Wow! A newsletter? You mean like printed, mailed out, and all that?"

"Yep!" Replies the seller. "Nowadays, we have the technology to send virtual information that we all can access anywhere, anytime. Back then, not everyone had computers and e-mail and some of those that did have them weren't connected to a high speed, broad-band system. To save money, so Grandpa said, they decided to quit printing and mailing a newsletter and instead put it on a web site, and e-mailed copies to members."

"People back then were still accustomed to reading printed news papers and magazines, and when the newsletters stopped coming, many of them 'forgot' the chapter still existed and quit joining and coming to meetings. Of course, as Grandpa said, it didn't help things much when the board decided to quit meeting in person and started holding e-mail conferences. This, Grandpa recalled, eventually led to abandoning formal meetings with sit-down dinners and conversations. Instead, the chapter leaders felt that an interactive web site with a monthly topic, continuing education credits quiz, and a chat forum were sufficient, and they saved money, too."

"Eventually, the novelty of an 'e-chapter' worn off and, faced with declining membership, revenues, and a resounding lack of interest, the Madison Chapter of CSI vanished. Grandpa kept the badges, hoping that somehow, someone would call a meeting and send notice out in a newsletter, but it never happened. These badges are the last tangible evidence of the chapter's existence."

"There never was much evidence of the chapter's existence in the first place," the seller goes on.

"There were the badges of course, a banner, a cash box, a bank account, and a few binders with copies of old newsletters someone put together, but that was about it. No one knows what happened to all that. Not much to show for an entity that lasted over fifty years. I think that when it was decided not to publish a newsletter any more - something that you could hold and read at your convenience - the chapter began losing its connection with people."

"The newsletter was tangible evidence that the chapter existed, was active, and was asking for participation in its events. Once the newsletter went to an e-format, it just wasn't the same. People forgot, and ultimately, it spelled the end of the chapter. Too bad; from the way Grandpa described it, it sounded like a fun thing to do once a month. I think I'll put the badges away; maybe some day they'll be needed again. Glad you stopped by anyway."

Thomas E. Irvin, CSI, CCS, Madison Chapter, CSI



Information provided by CSI Phoenix Chapter Technical Committee

In 2005, CSI charged the Sustainable Facilities Task Team with creating a product data guide that would track the green properties of building materials and components used during construction. After months of development work, the initial result of these efforts—**GreenFormat: A Reporting Guide for Sustainable Criteria of Products**—now available for a limited beta test.

GreenFormat will provide a standardized format for reporting information about the sustainable attributes of construction products. This information will be stored in a Web-accessible database that allows users to sort and view the data in various ways to best suit a project's needs. The database will offer an additional benefit to manufacturers: a way to present clear, consistent, and concise information on the lifecycle qualities of products to specifiers.

Read [Supporting Sustainability with GreenFormat \(PDF\)](#), an excerpt from CSI's Construction Specifier Magazine.

Go to www.csinet.org for the latest news about GreenFormat and how you might be able to join the beta test.

THE CODE CORNER

Egress Width

By Ronald L. Geren, RA, CSI, CCS, CCCA

“The inability of the exits to handle all of the occupants in the short time available for this fast growing fire contributed directly to the large loss of life.”

That is a quote from the NIST’s (National Institute of Standards and Technology) 2005 final report on The Station Nightclub fire that occurred on February 20, 2003, killing 100 people. Although the estimated 458 occupants within the building that night did not exceed the calculated maximum occupant load of 585 based on floor area per the 2003 *International Building Code* (IBC), the one of the most significant limiting factor was the lack of capacity of the egress system, and the improper distribution of exit width.

The Station Nightclub had four exits, one more than what is required by the IBC¹. However, the capacity of those exits to handle the number of occupants present was limited by the exits’ widths. The capacity of the nightclub’s exits was calculated to handle only 420 occupants, a little more than 71% of the building’s calculated occupant load, and 91% of the occupants in attendance that night. Had the exits been sized for the maximum occupant capacity of the building, the tragic result of the fire would have been significantly reduced, if not eliminated². Therefore, it is critically important to understand the egress width requirements of the building code, and apply them properly to new and existing buildings.

The best way to visualize a building’s egress system is to look at your city’s freeway system during the morning rush hour. Cars will work their way onto the freeway from their neighborhoods via side streets, and, as you move toward the city, more cars enter the freeway. And if your department of transportation put a little thought into their freeway planning, the number of lanes will increase as you make your way to the city center.

A building’s egress system is very similar, but instead of cars we have people making their way from the various spaces in a building via aisles and access doors to a corridor, that may connect to other corridors, and which will eventually lead to an exit. And along that path, as the number of people increase, the width of corridors and doors will typically get wider. But how do you know how wide to make those components? Like the department of transportation needing to know how many cars to expect on their freeway, you need to determine how many people will be exiting the building; commonly referred to as the building’s “occupant load.”

Calculating occupant load is covered in Section 1004 of the IBC³. It is based on an area per occupant according to the space’s function as provided in Table 1004.1.1. If a space is 700 square feet in area and the area per occupant is 100 square feet, the occupant load is 7. If accessory spaces egress through an adjoining space, such as a private office exiting through an open office area, then the adjoining space’s occupant load will be a combination of the occupants in the space plus the occupants exiting through the space. A new addition to the 2006 IBC is the provision that, upon approval by the building official, the actual occupant load may be used--even if it is less than the calculated occupant load.

Once the occupant load is calculated, the overall required exit width can now be determined. Section 1005 of the IBC establishes the provisions for calculating the egress width. To do so, two pieces of information will be needed: whether or not a fire sprinkler system will be installed throughout

the building and the occupancy classification. With those two pieces of information, utilize Table 1005.1 to obtain the egress width per occupant and multiply that number by the number of occupants.

For example, if a sprinklered, 4-story office building has 600 occupants per floor, the width per occupant for stairways is 0.2 inches, which calculates to be 120 inches (10 feet) of overall egress width for stairs. For all other egress components (doors, ramps, aisles, corridors, passageways, etc.) the width per occupant is 0.15 inches, or 90 inches (7'-6") overall. These dimensions seem quite large, but they'll be distributed among the number of exits required, which leads us to the next step.

Using the occupant load calculated, the number of required exits can now be determined. Per the IBC, at least two exits will be required from each room, space or floor. However, individual spaces are permitted to have a single exit in accordance with Table 1015.1. For example, spaces in business occupancies with less than 50 occupants need only have one exit. Buildings, under certain conditions, are also permitted to have only one exit in accordance with Table 1019.2. As an example, a building classified as a business occupancy can have one exit if it's a single story with no more than 49 occupants, and the travel distance from the farthest space to the exit does not exceed 75 feet.

The exit width should be as evenly distributed as possible among the required exits. At no time should the loss of one egress path diminish the egress capacity by 50%. Therefore, with buildings requiring only two exits, each exit must handle 50% or more of the occupants. For buildings requiring three exits, the egress width of any two exits must handle 50% or more of the occupants.

Let's return to our 4-story office building example. Since each floor has 600 occupants, three exits will be required per story in accordance with Table 1019.1. Therefore, we divide the required exit widths by three to determine the width of the three main exits. For each stair, the width would be 40 inches (120 inches divided by 3) and all other egress components would have a width of 30 inches. However, exit components cannot have a width less than that specified elsewhere. So, according to Section 1009.1, stairways with occupant loads of 50 or greater must have a minimum required width of 44 inches (or 48 inches if the stairway is part of an accessible means of egress); and, other components will have the following minimum widths:

- Doors: Clear width of 32 inches in accordance with Section 1008.1.1. It should be clarified that the clear width of a door is measured between the stop on the latch side and the face of the door on the hinge side when the door is open at 90 degrees. With that in mind, a standard 36-inch-wide door will have a clear width of approximately 33 inches.
- Aisles: 36 inches for B and M occupancies (Section 1014.4.1), and 23 to 48 inches in A occupancies (Section 1025.9.1) depending on number and arrangement of seating; however, aisle widths in A occupancies are not subject to the width requirements of Section 1005.
- Corridors: 44 inches in accordance with Section 1017.2 if occupant load is greater than 49; 36 inches otherwise.
- Exit Passageways: 44 inches in accordance with Section 1021.2 if occupant load is greater than 49; 36 inches otherwise.
- Egress Courts: 44 inches in accordance with Section 1024.5.1.

Therefore, our example office building will require three stairways having a minimum width of 44 inches; and the doors into and exiting from those stairways will need to be 32 inches wide. The first floor can exit directly to the exterior through three, 32-inch-wide doors. The corridors connecting these exits will need to have a width of not less than 44 inches; however, like the freeway adding lanes when the number of cars increases, if there's a point in any corridor that would handle more than 294 occupants (the capacity of a 44-inch-wide corridor), then the corridor width will need to be increased by the factors in Table 1005.1 for each occupant over the 294 maximum.

The freeway analogy also applies to stairways...even more so. There are two locations in the IBC that touch on this matter. The first location is Section 1003.6, which states, "The required capacity of a means of egress system shall not be diminished along the path of egress travel." The second location is Section 1004.4, and it states:

Where exits serve more than one floor, only the occupant load of each floor considered individually shall be used in computing the required capacity of the exits at that floor, provided that the exit capacity shall not decrease in the direction of egress travel.

The first provision is fairly self-explanatory; however, the second one may need some explaining. In older editions of the *Uniform Building Code* (1988 and earlier), the stairway widths were based on the occupant load of the floor they served plus specified percentages of the occupant loads from the two floors above. This created a rather complex calculation. Later editions of the UBC, and now the IBC, have simplified it considerably by requiring the stairway widths to be determined by the floor they're currently serving, provided it doesn't reduce the width of the stairway from the floor above.

To illustrate this, let's go back to our 4-story office building. If the third floor had an occupant load of 800 instead of 600, then each of the three stairways for that floor would need to be about 54 inches wide (800×0.2 , divided by 3 exits) and doors, leading into the stairway and exiting from the stairway at the first floor, will need to be 40 inches wide (800×0.15 , divided by 3 exits). Since the fourth floor has an occupant load of 600, the stairway can still be 44 inches wide from the fourth floor to the third floor. But once the stairway reaches the third floor, it will need to increase to 54 inches wide, and remain that way to the first floor, even though the second floor, which has 600 occupants, only requires a 44-inch-wide stairway.

Additionally, per Section 1004.5, if two floors converge at an intermediate level or floor, then the exit width will be based on the sum of the occupant loads. For instance, we'll add a basement to our 4-story office building; and because it houses mechanical and some storage spaces, the occupant load will only be 250. The exit widths for stairs and other components are 50 inches and 37.5 inches, respectively.

Since the occupant load of the basement is less than 501, there only needs to be two exits per Table 1019.1. So, we divide the widths by two to determine the required width for each exit. However, the widths will be less than the minimums previously stated, so the stairs need to be 44 inches wide, doors at 32 inches wide, and corridors at 44 inches wide. For efficiency, we'll use two of the stairs serving the other floors of the building to serve the basement.

In this example, the occupant loads of the basement and second floor will converge at the first floor. For that reason, the width of the door exiting the stair enclosure will be based on the sum of the occupant loads of those two floors for each of those stairs. Since the 600 occupants are distributed evenly among the three exits, each stair will handle 200 occupants. Therefore, each stair serving the basement will have 200 occupants from the second floor and 125 from the basement for a total of 350 occupants converging at the first floor exit discharge door from the stairway. At 350 occupants each, the doors will need to be 52.5 inches wide.

This brings us to another dilemma: a single door leaf cannot have a width greater than 48 inches. Overcoming this problem is simple...provide a double-wide door with two leaves: one having the minimum 32-inch-wide clear opening and the other making up the difference. However, if a mullion is used, then both leaves will need to provide a 32-inch-wide clear opening (See Section 1008.1.1).

And finally, it should be clearly understood that the required exit widths as determined above are not necessarily clear widths; some encroachment into these required widths is permitted. For example, doors can open into the egress path provided that the required width is not reduced by more than half at any point in the door's swing; and when fully open, the door cannot project more than 7 inches into the required width. Additionally, handrails on stairways and ramps cannot project more than 4.5 inches at or below the handrail height.

Having the capability to handle the number of occupants in a building quickly and safely is paramount in an egress system. It is even more critical in assembly occupancies where large numbers of people are gathered in a relatively small area. For that reason, the IBC provides a special egress section just for assembly occupancies. One of the key elements of that section is the "main exit." Since most people don't utilize the same assembly building on a regular basis, they aren't as familiar with the egress system as they would their work place or local grocery store. Therefore, in times of emergency, most people will exit the way they entered--through the main exit. Due to this typical human response, the building code requires that the main exit be sized to handle at least 50% of the occupant load when the occupant load is greater than 300.

The lack of a main exit complying with the requirements of the IBC was probably the single most building condition that led to the high number of deaths at the scene of The Station Nightclub fire. Forty of the victims were found at or near the main exit. Although the exterior door of the vestibule had a clear width of 68 inches and could handle 340 occupants, the interior vestibule door had only a clear width of 36 inches that could only handle 180 occupants...a little more than 39% of the people in attendance that night, and only 30% of the people it should have been designed to handle. Because of that bottle neck, the flow of panic-stricken people eventually stopped--just like that morning rush hour--and they were only inches away from safety.

There are many examples in fire history, beside The Station Nightclub, that suffered loss of life as a result of inadequate exiting. The NIST report identifies at least 13 events, going back as far as 1876, that experienced "crowd crush" at the exits. The building code requirements for minimal exit width are founded on this experience, as well as detailed research by organizations such as the NIST and the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA). It is not just enough to understand the need to provide a means of egress for building occupants, but to also understand the need to size them properly to ensure that all occupants can exit quickly and safely without overloading the exits.

¹ Per Table 1018.1, an occupant load between 501 and 1000 requires three exits.

² There were other factors in addition to occupant load and egress that contributed to the tragic loss, such as lack of fire sprinklers, improper use of finish materials, and use of pyrotechnics.

³ Although the NIST report used the 2003 IBC in its research, the published code edition at the time, this article will use the 2006 IBC, which was publicly released earlier this year. Therefore, some of the code section references will be different than those in the 2003 IBC.

To comment on this article, suggest other topics, or submit a question regarding codes, contact the author at ron@specsandcodes.com.

About the Author: Ronald L. Geren, RA, CSI, CCS, CCCA, is an ICC Certified Building Plans Examiner, and is the principal of RLG Technical Services located in Scottsdale, Arizona, which provides specification and code consulting services to architects, engineers, owners, and product manufacturers. A 1984 graduate of the University of Arizona, Ron has over 22 years of experience with military, public, and private agencies.

Member Bios

Steve Andros
GrEn A/E Consultants
480-967-0088
steve@grenspecs.com

GrEn A/E Consultants was founded in September, 2000 in response to the increasing demand in environmentally responsible commercial construction projects. GrEn A/E Consultants provide sustainable and green consulting for the sustainable building industry. Specific services offered are:

- LEED™ consulting, including specifications for LEED™ projects.
- Sustainable design/Green architecture strategies and technologies
- Materials and products research
- Green product specifications

What Steve is currently working on include: a LEED mixed used (commercial office/retail/restaurant) project under construction in Durango, CO, the Air National Guard Headquarters at Andrews Air Force Base which will be Silver LEED certified, a library in Las Vegas which will be Gold LEED certified, another mixed use project near Salt Lake City which will be registered under LEED-SC (Shell and Core), a LEED certified multi-family residential project in Phoenix, a new facility for KLVX Channel 10 (PBS) which is a joint project with the Clark County School District which will be Silver LEED certified and a new Student Center/Fine Arts Building which will be LEED certified in Farmington, New Mexico.

Steve has been involved in CSI since February 1979. He was a Project Manager for Cornoyer-Hedrick Architects (which was the first firm that Steve worked for after graduating from ASU). Each project manager had to write their own specs for their projects... so... he figured he'd better join CSI and learn how to do it!

Steve has been very active in CSI over the last few decades. Here is a list of all of his contributions:

Program Committee Chairman, Phoenix Chapter, 1979-80
Representative to CICA, 1981-84
Appointee to AAA Regional CIAC, 1982-1992
CSI Prize Jury, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1988
Institute Certification Committee, 1984-1987 (Chairman 1986-87)
Program Chairman, SW Region Conference, 1985
Program Chairman, Region Leaders Orientation, Durango, CO, 1986
Member, Program Committee, 1990 SW/SC Bi-Region Conference
Member, Institute Jury of Fellows, 1987-1990
Member, Institute Practice Subcommittee, 1990-1992
Certification Chairman, Phoenix Chapter, 1988-90
Technical Chairman, Phoenix Chapter, 1990-91
Chairman, Southwest Region Conference, 1991-93
Education Committee, 1994-??
Advisor, Explorer Post 969 sponsored by Phoenix Chapter CSI, 1999-2000
Instructor, "Spec School", AIA A201 General Condition, 2001, 2002 & 2003
Member "Green Sheet - Moisture Vapor Transmission" Committee, 2001-2002

Steve has also been on the Chapter Board, too and he was Chapter President a few times in the “olden days” he claims.

A tough question I asked Steve was what you hoped to gain or what he has gained from CSI. He says, as a specification writer, CSI has been his primary professional organization throughout his career. He cannot “measure” what he’s gained from CSI... that’s not possible; he does believe that his membership in CSI has given back more than any amount of time, effort and money that he’s put into the organization. Steve has had opportunities to learn about the construction industry that he could not get anywhere else. He honestly can say that he has met people that have changed his life for the better. CSI is the one organization where free flow of information occurs in a way that doesn’t happen in a lot of other organizations, and he also truly believes that CSI has improved construction by its existence.

Steve grew up in Crete, Illinois until his sophomore year of high school, when his family moved to the outskirts of Phoenix at Northern Avenue near the “new” Black Canyon Freeway. The family moved to a home that his father built in Carefree and Steve commuted to Cortez H.S. since there wasn’t a high school in Carefree. After high school, Steve attended ASU and graduated with a degree in Architecture.

Steve became involved in the Boy Scouts in 1991 because both of his sons are active and are now Eagle Scouts. His boys got him involved in rifle/pistol/shogun shooting and he became an NRA Certified Instructor. Steve has since become a Coach for the Arizona Game and Fish Scholastic Clay Target program and on 2 Saturdays each month he teaches 9-18 year olds to shoot trap, skeet and sporting clays. In the summers Steve gets to go to Camp Raymond near Flagstaff for 2 months where he teaches the shotgun merit badge. He also enjoys hunting (but only when he’s lucky enough to get drawn).

When asking Steve his most memorable vacation...he responds: “What is the word ‘vacation’?” Actually, his parents decided to renew their wedding vows on the beach in Kauai a couple of years ago, so he and his wife actually HAD TO go to Hawaii. They were able to spend a couple of “tourist” days in Oahu and then another 5 days tooling around “the garden isle.” It was interesting that Hawaii actually has their own version of the Grand Canyon which was just down the road from the wettest (rainiest) spot on earth! Steve’s dad is a fisherman so they did the deep sea fishing thing on a little boat and caught their dinner! They went to a couple of luaus and ate our fill of roast pig! And now, Steve actually owns (and sometimes wears) Hawaiian shirts!

The membership should be very lucky to have Steve Andros as part of the Phoenix Chapter.

Mr Wolfe Goes to Washington

An important - and amazing -decision

This past November, in one of its most important decisions in decades, CSI's Board of Directors unanimously approved a recommendation to restructure the Board. The most obvious difference would be a change in size from twenty-nine members to twelve, but related changes will be just as significant if not as visible.

I am not going to try to explain the recommendation in this article; you will have ample opportunity to read about it, ask questions, and discuss it online. Furthermore, I am not going to try to convince you that we made the right decision, except in a roundabout fashion. Instead, I want to explain to you how amazing this event is, and to impress upon you the significance of the unanimous decision.

Unanimous decisions are anything but common in CSI Board meetings. The only time they *can* happen is when an issue is clearly defined, the proposed solution is well prepared, and the recommendation is supported by overwhelming evidence.

Despite what you may have been told, we *do* have politics in CSI, and the Board definitely is *not* a rubber-stamping body. In the first half of my three-year term, we have had many spirited debates. In some cases, the executive committee was split almost evenly; other times, as one reasonably would expect, a majority supported one view. Unanimity, even within this smaller part of the entire Board, is a rarity. When the full Board discusses an issue, some directors will support an executive committee recommendation, while others will oppose it. There are no permanent alliances; directors will support one officer's view on one issue, and oppose that same officer on another. With rotation of officers and directors on a two- or three-year schedule, it is difficult to believe that anyone would be able to continually convince a majority of Board members to support a position that is contrary to the best interest of the Institute.

So what does all that mean? Simply this: a unanimous decision by the Board cannot be anything but a response to a convincing argument, one that persuades all officers and directors, regardless of where they come from, when they joined the Board, or who their friends are. The same group that has passionately argued different aspects of many issues considered this recommendation, debated it, and agreed to support it. As noted in an earlier MWGTW, directors do *not* represent regions to the Board; directors and officers alike act in what they see as the best interest of the Institute. We may have politics, but we don't have a pork barrel to influence our judgment.

I know this sounds like a "trust me" message, and in a sense it is - but please don't just accept it as that. Read the *whole* recommendation, and think about the purpose of a board of directors. Talk to your chapter, region, and Institute leaders, and post your questions on CSINet. And, whatever your conclusion, don't forget to vote on this important recommendation.

Sheldon Wolfe, RA, FCSI, CCS, CCCA

Institute Director, North Central Region, CSI