



MINUTES

GBI Consensus Body for Existing Buildings- Call #3
 Webinar/Teleconference
 October 7, 2021 from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. ET

NOTE ALL TIMES ARE EASTERN TIME

Consensus Body for Existing Buildings Members in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	10/7/21	5/7/21	4/2/21
Benjamin Bojda	Dominion Environmental Consultants NV, Inc	X	Absent	X
Larry Clark	Sustainable Performance Solutions	X	X	X
Michael Cudahy	PPFA - PPEF	Absent	Absent	X
Lawrence (Buddy) Humphries (Chair)	Efficient Green, LLC	Absent	X	X
Josh Jacobs	UL	N/A	X	X
Christoph Lohr	IAPMO	Absent	N/A	N/A
Max Puchtel	American Institute of Steel Construction	X	X	X
Dave Ray	GRN Vision	X	N/A	N/A
Benjamin Reeves	Arete Design Group	X	X	X
Jane Rohde	JSR Associates, Inc., The Vinyl Institute / Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X	X	X
Anthony Serres	Signify North America Corporation	X	X	X
Gord Shymko	G. F. Shymko & Associates Inc.	X	X	X
Frank Sullivan	Kiewit	X	X	X
Kyle Thompson	IAPMO (International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials)	N/A	Absent	X
Michael Zatz	ENERGY STAR Commercial & Industrial Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	X	X	X

Interested Parties in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	10/7/21	5/7/21	4/2/21
Rob Brooks	Rob Brooks Associates	X		
Daniel Huard	Humann Building Solutions, LLC			X
Viken Koukounian	K.R. Moeller Associates Ltd.	X		X
Brenda Steinhauer	W.A. Richardson Builders, LLC	X		
Ray Tonjes	Ray Tonjes Builder, Inc.		X	
Eric Truelove	Green Building Resources LLC		X	

Doug Tucker	Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc.		X	
John Yowell	EPA's Indoor Environments Division	X		

Staff in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	10/7/21	5/7/21	4/2/21
Emily Marx	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X
Joseph Granada	Staff, GBI	X		
Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI	X	X	X
Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI	X	X	X
Aparna Varadharajan	Staff, GBI	X		

Welcome

Chair Lawrence Humphries was unable to attend the meeting and asked Gord Shymko to fill in as temporary chair via email the morning before the meeting. Shymko welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Roll Call

Secretariat Emily Marx took roll call to establish quorum, reviewed the GBI Anti-Trust Policy, Code of Conduct policy and notified participants that the call was being recorded for the purpose of preparing minutes. No objections or concerns were raised. She asked if any guests or interested parties wanted to discuss any particular comment or topic. No interested party noted an item they wanted to discuss.

Marx reviewed the Consensus Body for Existing Buildings roster and noted the three interest categories, General Interest, Producer, and User. She stated that there is balance on the Consensus Body for Existing Buildings.

Administrative Items

Shymko reviewed the agenda and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were no comments or concerns.

MOTION: A Motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously to approve the Agenda as presented.

Shymko also reviewed the minutes from meeting #3 on May 7, 2021, and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were no comments or concerns.

MOTION: A Motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from meeting #3 on May 7, 2021, as presented.

Frank Sullivan joined the call.

ESG Public Comment Review

The ESG Task Group chair reviewed each comment and discussed the reasons the action was taken.

Benjamin Reeves joined the meeting.

P1-1001

Public Comment: N/A

Reason: Comment - need clarification of "building mission" in definitions

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been acknowledged and while there will be no additions to the definitions, the criteria has been revised to the following:

1.2.2.4 There is a plan in place for continuation of building mission function and operation based on identified risks.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to acknowledge the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Frank Sullivan

ESG-1

Proposed Revision: 1.2.2.4 There is a plan in place for continuation of building ~~mission~~ function and operation based on identified risks.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

ESG-2

Proposed Revision: 1.1.1.6 There are regular procedures for ~~checking~~ detecting and fixing water leaks.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

ESG-3

Proposed Revision: Not applicable if there are no cooling towers.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

ESG-4

Proposed Revision: 1.2.1. 3 The assessment evaluates ~~critical mission~~ and building functional requirements and prioritizes accordingly for future facility adaptation.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

Site Public Comment Review

The Site/Materials Subcommittee chair reviewed the one comment in the area and discussed the reasons for the revision.

P1-502

Public Comment: There are indications that the site has been enhanced, such as an increase of indigenous species, the reestablishment of native vegetation corridors ~~including to provide~~ wildlife habitat, or filtration or reduction of stormwater runoff.

Reason: Increased vegetation will have very little affect on increasing the habitat value unless it includes plant species *native* to that region.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. We acknowledge the concept in this comment but think it needs to be more specific and have thus, made the following modification:

There are indications that the site has been enhanced by activities, such as an increase of indigenous species, the reestablishment of ~~vegetation corridors including to provide~~ wildlife habitat, or filtration or reduction of stormwater runoff volume.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

Energy Public Comment Review

The Energy Subcommittee chair reviewed each comment and discussed the reasons each action was taken.

P1-1206

Public Comment: Establish a pre-requisite for energy consumption, specifying minimum levels of performance for each of the paths. These should be set at levels that are at least equal to the national median for each building type to ensure that all buildings designated as Green Globes are at least better than average.

Reason: The lack of a prerequisite for energy consumption could easily result in a building that is highly inefficient earning the Green Globes designation. This would be highly detrimental to the Green Globes brand to have “energy hogs” being touted as green buildings.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The comment does not provide quantitative suggestions for a pre-requisite. Additionally, the implementation for a pre-requisite for Path A presents significant policy challenges to the intent of the standard.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

P1-1207

Public Comment: Modify the language in the introduction to section 3.1.1. to read:

If the building is eligible for an ENERGY STAR Score, then ~~Path A (Improvement Over Baseline)~~ or Path B (ENERGY STAR Score) must be pursued.

Reason: The ENERGY STAR Score is a measure of the performance of a building against its peers nationwide and is based on actual measured energy data. For buildings which can receive an ENERGY STAR score, they should be required to use the score, not have a choice to use an improvement over baseline. Allowing the use of improvement over a baseline would allow buildings with low ENERGY STAR scores to still qualify for Green Globes recognition even though they are poor energy performers.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Path A is designed to address engagement in the existing building market from projects that do not necessarily have the technical and economic compacity to achieve scores under Path B.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Anthony Serres

EB104-8

Public Comment: Is this a strict adherence to the ES standards?

Reason: Due to unavailability of whole building energy data for multifamily projects in some areas, are alternate paths (i.e. energy models) going to be acceptable?

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: There is a lack of clarity in what the commenter is attempting to achieve.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

EB104-9

Public Comment: Consider smart thermostats (NEST, Verdant, Dwelo, etc) rather than NA for residential

Reason: There is new smart instrumentation for multifamily projects that include occupancy sensing and custom scheduling. These should be encouraged provided they are properly implemented and not just left to the tenant.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The energy savings from smart thermostats is yet to be proven and the controlling of tenant space in residential by central location is questionable to tenant satisfaction.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was argued that the last line of the reason should be removed because it is not on topic of the commenter's reason.

AMENDMENT: The Motion was made and seconded to remove the line "Lastly, there is currently a shortage to make the chips at this time" from the reason to the commenter.

Discussion took place on the Amendment:

- There was no discussion.

AMENDMENT VOTE: The Amendment carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

Discussion took place on the Amended Motion:

- There was no discussion.

MOTION VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Max Puchtel

EB104-10

Public Comment: Is "green electricity" continually purchased and allocated to the property?

Reason: Need to verify that green energy is allocated to property. Claims can be made that percentage of provider's energy generation is from renewable. This however does not mean it is allocated as such. It may require a separate agreement with the provider. (e.g. Nevada Power 22% PV& hydro; TVA large % hydro)

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The criterion requires continual purchase, however, allocation of green energy to the property is not possible in this category. The commenter did not use strikeout and underline language to explain specific changes they were proposing.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

P1-801

Public Comment: N/A

Reason: In the definition of ozone depleting potential, the terms 'GWP' and 'CAS numbers' are used without definition. These terms should be defined.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. GWP and CAS will be added to the acronym list in the standard.

CAS Chemical Abstracts Service

GWP Global Warming Potential

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

P1-501

Public Comment: Renewable onsite energy: energy derived from sun, wind, water, and the Earth's core, ~~and various forms of biomass from recovered waste sources~~ that is captured, stored and used on the building site, using such technologies as wind turbines, photovoltaic solar panels, transpired solar collectors, solar thermal heaters, and small-scale hydroelectric power plants.

Reason: "Renewable onsite energy" should not include "biomass" among the listed examples. Although some forms of biomass are renewable, they are not carbon free, nor should systems used to burn them be included among a list of examples that generate electricity in a carbon-free manner.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The reason for modification is that the definition has been revised as follows.

Renewable onsite energy: energy derived from the sun, wind, water, or geothermal sources, ~~the Earth's core,~~ and various forms of biomass from recovered waste sources that is captured, stored and used on the building site, using such technologies as wind turbines, photovoltaic solar panels, transpired solar collectors, solar thermal heaters, and small-scale hydroelectric power plants.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- A member of the task group that developed the definition stated that a a lot of time and discussion went into developing the definition to be more concise.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

Renewable-1, Renewable-2, Renewable-3, Renewable-4

Renewable-1 Proposed Revision: 3.4.1 RENEWABLE & ALTERNATIVE ENERGY

Renewable-2 Proposed Revision: 3.4.1.1 25% or more of remotely produced renewable energy "green electricity" is continually purchased.

Renewable-3 Proposed Revision: 3.4.1.2 Renewable onsite, or renewable directly delivered from offsite, energy sources are being used.

Renewable-4 Proposed Revision: 3.4.1.3 1% or more of the building's total energy is provided by renewable onsite, or renewable directly delivered from offsite, energy sources.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revisions for 3.4.1, 3.4.1.1, 3.4.1.2, and 3.4.1.3.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was noted that the revisions to the section cleans up any unknowns while also adding more clarity.
- There was a question about the meaning of 'directly delivered from offsite' and it was noted that a direct power line to the building from an offsite renewable source would fulfill the criteria.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

The secretariat noted that the response to the commenter for EB104-10 may need to be altered since the passing of Renewable-2 has resulted in a change of text to 3.4.1.1.

EB104-10

Public Comment: Is "green electricity" continually purchased and allocated to the property?

Reason: Need to verify that green energy is allocated to property. Claims can be made that percentage of provider's energy generation is from renewable. This however does not mean it is allocated as such. It may require a separate agreement with the provider. (e.g. Nevada Power 22% PV& hydro; TVA large % hydro)

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: "Green electricity" is no longer applicable because the language has been removed from 3.4.1.1.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to revise the reply for EHB104-10.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The prior reason was reviewed, and a new reason was developed.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

Water Public Comment Review

The Chair of the Water Subcommittee was not on the call and thus, a member from the Water Subcommittee reviewed each comment and discussed the reasons each action was taken.

P1-302

Public Comment: 4.1.1A.1 The building's current standing as compared to average water performance for the building type is at least 75%.

Reason: Include "water" somewhere.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted and the changes have been implemented in the draft Standard.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

EB104-14

Public Comment: Adjust "Assessment Guidance" to be less strict.

Reason: Collecting in a cistern is not the only way to harvest rainwater (e.g. rain gardens, efficient surface flow, mulch (deep topsoil))

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The assessment guidance is not a part of the standard. GBI staff will review the comment for incorporation into the assessment guidance.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

EB104-15

Public Comment: Does the landscaping minimize the need for using potable water for irrigation by planting specific species that require little watering as calculated per ASHRAE 189.1 6.5.1?

Reason: This is needed however getting the calculation for an existing building will likely be a challenge. Stating the requirement clearly will emphasize the expectations.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The assessment guidance is not a part of the standard. GBI staff will review the comment for incorporation into the assessment guidance.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

P1-1219

Public Comment: Change the language to read "The irrigation system is controlled by a WaterSense irrigation controller or similar qualifying controller that uses . . ."

Reason: WaterSense labels irrigation controllers so the recognition could be referenced here.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The revision gives more clarification of what controllers meet this requirement. The revision is below:

4.2.2B.1e The irrigation system is controlled by a ~~qualifying smart controller~~ WaterSense-labeled irrigation controller that uses evapotranspiration and weather data to adjust irrigation schedules.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

Water-1

Proposed Revision: WaterSense™ labeled

Reason: Make consistent throughout standard

Discussion took place on the Editorial Revision:

- A member stated that it may be a registered trademark and thus the ™ should be changed to ®. He stated that he can confirm it with colleagues and will let staff know the official terminology. It was agreed to review the proposal during the next meeting after it has been confirmed.

Materials Public Comment Review

The Materials Subcommittee chair reviewed each comment and discussed the reasons each action was taken.

EB102-1

Public Comment: Products that include third-party sustainable forestry certification, categorized as Responsible or Certified Sources in accordance with ASTM D7612.

Reason: ASTM D7612 Responsible and Certified Sources are extensively recognized in green standards such as the USGBC LEED Pilot Credit, 2020 ICC-700, 2015 IgCC and the USDA BioPreferred program. For more information, see www.responsible-source.com. ASTM D7612 recognizes all existing sustainable forestry certification programs and this addition will not impact procurement of wood materials.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The Committee would like to maintain consistency with the New Construction standard.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was noted that a member of the Site/Materials Subcommittee felt very strongly that this revision should take place and the ASTM standard should be included in the draft standard.
- The public commenter asked to present some information on the comment. He explained that he was involved in developing the ASTM standard and that it is recognized in competitor rating systems and standards. He stated it certifies sustainable forestry programs and defines responsible sources at the jurisdictional level. He gave a few examples of how the standard has worked and has had a positive impact.
- It was argued that there should be consistency with the GBI Existing Buildings (EB) and New Construction (NC) standards. However, it was noted that there are many inconsistencies among the two.
- It was noted that the NC standard should be revised to be more like what the revisions in the EB draft standard should be.

WITHDRAWN: The Motion and second to reject the comment was withdrawn.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was argued that if accepted the language would expand the number of definitions that are deemed sustainable forestry certification and would include those that are responsible but not certified.
- It was argued that the ASTM standard will expand and enforce states that have mandatory rules on forestry certification.
- It was argued this is a big and broad decision of whether it accept, reject, or modify the criteria, and the change should be reviewed more by the Site/Materials Subcommittee.

WITHDRAWN: The Motion and second to accept the comment was withdrawn.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to send the comment, EB102-1 back to the Site/Materials Subcommittee for further review.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

P1-403

Public Comment: 3rd party verified Pre-consumer and....

Reason: At the moment there is a great deal of distrust in recycled content claims due to the partial shutting down of a good portion of the global recycling market. Therefore to continue to trust these types of claims for recycled content they should be 3rd party verified.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Adding third party verification would add a requirement and the ISO 14021 and the US FTC green guides both regulate the claims around recycled content.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was argued that the reason should not reference another GBI standard and that "that is not present within the New Construction Standard" should be removed from the response to the commenter.

AMENDMENT: The Motion was made and seconded to remove the line "that is not present within the New Construction Standard" from the response to the commenter.

Discussion took place on the Amendment:

- There was no discussion.

AMENDMENT VOTE: The amendment carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

Discussion took place on the Amended Motion:

- There was no discussion.

MOTION VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

P1-1221

Public Comment: Modify the language to read "The purchasing policy includes the requirement for purchasing energy and water saving equipment."

Secretariat Note: Underline added to new text of comment.

Reason: The purchasing policy should also specify water saving equipment.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted and the changes have been implemented in the draft Standard.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

IEQ Public Comment Review

The ESG/IEQ Subcommittee chair reviewed each comment and discussed the reasons each action was taken. He noted that because he is acting as Consensus Body chair, he cannot make any motion or vote but will just summarize the comment.

P1-1002

Public Comment: N/A

Reason: Comment - for consideration - adding Positive pressured hallways

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: No actual revision is provided for the committee to evaluate and consider and there are concerns in general about the use of positive pressured hallways.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

P1-1003

Public Comment: N/A

Reason: Comment - for consideration - noise in IEQ...Renovation of space during Pandemic, noise became a real issue.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The Acoustics and Noise is not addressed under 6.1, IEQ Systems and Measures.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

EB101-1

Public Comment: In densely occupied rooms (25 or more people per 1,000 ft² (92.9 m²)) with variable occupancy (e.g., meeting rooms, assembly areas) there are CO₂ sensing, ventilation control equipment, and UVGI upper air disinfection equipment.

We recommend that UVGI systems be required in densely occupied rooms to eliminate pathogens.

Reason: A densely occupied room is more likely to have individuals who may be sick and therefore should have upper air disinfection.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: This credit is to monitor CO₂ and deliver more fresh air based on CO₂. The UVGI is part of an already existing credit.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstained.

Opposed: Anthony Serres

EB101-2

Public Comment: Occupants have personal control over the ventilation rates in the area in which they work, either through hybrid system (operable windows), or personalized HVAC controls, and equivalent air changes per hour (eACH) through UVGI equipment.

We recommend that equivalent air changes per hour (eACH) delivered through the use of UVGI systems be included.

Reason: An Equivalent Air Change (eAC) means that an alternate technology like UVGI has inactivated 63% of infectious

organisms in a Room. It can be delivered via upper air room disinfection systems and is an alternative to increasing the ACH of the existing ventilation system.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: This credit addresses personal ventilation control. UVGI doesn't fall within this scope.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstained.

Opposed: Anthony Serres

EB104-22

Public Comment: Provide NA as a response

Reason: This criterion is NA for distributed HVAC system (such as multi-family garden style)

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: All mechanical ventilation systems should have a filter by design.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

EB104-23

Public Comment: Consider a different approach such as certification from design professional rather than enumeration of specific area types.

Reason: Ventilation issues are typically professional design matters that are beyond the capability of superficial assessment

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The criterion is qualitative and not quantitative and within the capabilities of an assessor. Accordingly, the revision should not take place in it's entirety but the text has been revised to the following:

6.1.3.5 There is separate ventilation that provides ~~effective~~ local exhaust for the following spaces:

6.1.3.5.1 Dining venues

6.1.3.5.2 Kitchens

6.1.3.5.3 Chemical storage areas

6.1.3.5.4 Areas that use or process chemicals

6.1.3.5.5 Bathrooms

6.1.3.5.6 Printer or copier rooms

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

P1-406

Public Comment: See VOC Emission section of GBI 01-2019

Reason: There is no definition of what 'conforming' or 'low' is in this section. Suggest using language from the New Construction ANSI standard to help define this.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification for the following reason: The language has been modified to be in accordance with CDPH and EHLB. The modification is below:

6.2.1.3 There ~~is a policy and procedure~~ are procedures and policies for maintaining the air quality that include the following components: ~~good IAQ that include:~~

6.2.1.3.1 HVAC operations

6.2.1.3.2 Housekeeping procedures

6.2.1.3.3 Preventive maintenance

6.2.1.3.4 Procedures for unscheduled maintenance

6.2.1.3.5 Utilizing low-emitting products and materials that have conforming VOC content limits and low VOC emissions for maintenance and cycle renovations

Products shall meet testing requirements found in and be in compliance with California Department of Public Health (CDPH) Standard Method v1.2, Standard Method for the Testing and Evaluation of Volatile Organic Chemical Emissions from Indoor Sources using Environmental Chambers, using private office scenario.

Adhesives and sealants shall meet CDPH/EHLB Standard Method V1.2, private office scenario and SCAQMD Rule 1168, Adhesive and Sealant Applications, as analyzed by the methods specified in Rule 1168.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

P1-407

Public Comment: The contract with the cleaning contractors ~~specifically~~ states that they are to use ~~environmentally preferable cleaning materials. EcoLogo or GreenSeal certified cleaning products.~~ =

Reason: There is no definition of what 'environmentally preferable cleaning materials' are.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification for the following reason: The criteria has been revised as follows:

6.2.3.1 ~~The c~~ Contracts with the cleaning contractors specifically states that they are to use environmentally preferable cleaning materials and disinfection agents that are listed by the USEPA as either Safer Choice Certified products or Design for Environment Certified registered products. If cleaning and disinfection is provided directly by building management employees, then written policies and procedures specifically state that only the same products listed above be used.

2 points

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

P1-101

Public Comment: If there is asbestos has the building been certified that all asbestos has been ~~remediated~~ abated or encapsulated has a management plan?

Assessment Guidance

The presence of asbestos-containing materials does not, in itself, constitute a health hazard, provided the asbestos is in tact. Friable asbestos can crumble. Encapsulating it avoids the health hazards, which can occur when asbestos fibers become airborne. If the building was complete before 1981, the building would require an assessment and certified that asbestos had been remediated or encapsulated. This is N/A if there is no asbestos in the building .

Reason: To clarify existing regulations and industry best practices

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The management plan concept has been addressed in 6.3.1.2.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

P1-102

Public Comment: Is there a documented asbestos management plan that includes identification of asbestos-containing materials, management of asbestos within the building, and precautions to be taken during repairs and cycle renovations?

Assessment Guidance

If the building was complete after 1981 mark N/A.

Reason: To clarify existing regulations and industry best practices

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The reason for modification is to clarify what should be included in the management plan. The N/A has been revised for buildings with no asbestos.

The modification is below:

6.3.1.2 There is a documented asbestos management plan that includes identification of asbestos-containing materials, management of asbestos within the building, and precautions to be taken during repairs and cycle renovations.

2 points

- Not applicable if there is no asbestos in the building. the building was completed after 1981.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

The ESG/IEQ Subcommittee chair noted that comment P1-104 is concerning points and should not be reviewed by the Consensus Body until the Points Allocation Subcommittee has reviewed it first. The Secretariat agreed and asked the chair to move on to the next comment.

P1-105

Public Comment: Is there a documented lead management plan that includes precautions to be taken during repairs and cycle renovations?

Assessment Guidance

During renovation of any type that includes lead, verification and ~~either encapsulation or proper licensed removal~~ elimination of any lead hazards isto be executed based upon an environmental assessment. If there is no lead in the building, mark N/A.

Reason: To clarify existing regulations and industry best practices

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The Assessment Guidance is outside of the draft standard and staff will determine if the change should take place with the assistance of subject matter experts.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

P1-106

Public Comment: Has the lead levels in the potable water been tested and certified safe?

Assessment Guidance

Provide water testing data from local authority or jurisdiction and from fixtures within the building, proving potable water to the building occupants meets the criteria set in the EPA Safe Drinking Water Act.

Reason: To clarify existing regulations and industry best practices

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The Assessment Guidance is outside of the draft standard and staff will determine if the change should take place with the assistance of subject matter experts.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

EB104-24

Public Comment: Provide guidance for how this is to be assessed

Reason: Objective quantification of this criteria requires study/measurement beyond the capacity of a typical site assessment. A subjective evaluation could lead to inconsistent results among assessors.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The reason for modification is that the Assessment Guidance is provided in the Technical Manual with a formula for calculation. The modification is below:

6.4.1.6 The floor plan of the building achieves a minimum daylight factor (DF) of at least 2% in all regularly occupied spaces (excluding all direct sunlight penetration).

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

EB101-7

Public Comment: ~~6.4.2.4~~ 6.4.2.3 The artificial lighting system is capable of adjusting the correlated color temperature (CCT) to reflect the time of day to align with circadian entrainment.

Reason: CRI is a derived property of the light source and/or lighting system. "Color tuning" or "spectral tuning" refers to the tuning or changing of the correlated color temperature (CCT) of the light and is the correct term for this statement.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The standard language has been revised as follows:

~~6.4.2.4~~ 6.4.2.3 The artificial lighting system is capable of adjusting the color rendering index (CRI) and/or a combination of both correlated color temperature (CCT) to reflect the time of day to align with circadian entrainment.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstained.

Opposed: Anthony Serres

ESG/IEQ-1

Proposed Revision: 6.1.2.3 Manometers are fitted to indicate when filters should be changed.

3 points

Not applicable if there are no AHUs.

Reason: Replicate for all below criteria:

6.1.2.1A.1

6.1.2.1B.1

6.1.2.3

6.1.2.4

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revisions for 6.1.2.1A.1, 6.1.2.1B.1, 6.1.2.3, and 6.1.2.4.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

ESG/IEQ-2

Proposed Revision: 6.2.3.2 There is a protocol or plan in place for to effectively maintain air quality inside the building using treatment or filtration technologies or flushing the building in whole or part with outside air contingent upon acceptable ambient air quality air to rapidly and regularly improve air quality.

2 points

Not applicable for unoccupied buildings and buildings with no regular working occupants.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

ESG/IEQ-3

Proposed Revision: 6.4.2.2 In regularly occupied spaces, replacement or existing lamping includes a Correlated Color Temperature (CCT) between 2700°K and 4500°K and ~~one CCT~~ to be consistent ~~is used consistently~~ throughout occupied spaces.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstained.

Opposed: Anthony Serres

Public Participation

There was no discussion.

New Business

There was no discussion.

Action Items

GBI staff reminded members that meeting #4 of the Consensus Body for Existing Buildings is on Thursday, October 14, 2021, from 1:00-3:00pm ET.

MOTION: The motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 2:41PM EST.