



**MINUTES**

GBI Consensus Body for Existing Buildings- Call #7  
 Webinar/Teleconference  
 November 17, 2021 from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. ET

**NOTE ALL TIMES ARE EASTERN TIME**

**Consensus Body for Existing Buildings Members in Attendance**

Full Name	Organization	11/17/21	11/15/21	10/25/21	10/14/21	10/7/21
Benjamin Bojda	Dominion Environmental Consultants NV, Inc	X (Proxy Cole)	X	X	X	X
Larry Clark	Sustainable Performance Solutions	X (Proxy Shymko)	X (Proxy Shymko)	X	Absent	X
Michael Cudahy	PPFA - PPEF	X	X	X	Absent	Absent
Lawrence (Buddy) Humphries (Chair)	Efficient Green, LLC	X	X	X	X	Absent
Christoph Lohr	IAPMO	Absent	X	X (Proxy Zatz)	Absent	Absent
Max Puchtel	American Institute of Steel Construction	Absent	X	Absent	X	X
Dave Ray	GRN Vision	Absent	Absent	Absent	X	X
Benjamin Reeves	Arete Design Group	X (Proxy Sullivan)	X	X (Proxy Shymko)	Absent	X
Jane Rohde	JSR Associates, Inc., The Vinyl Institute / Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X (Proxy Cudahy)	X (Proxy Cudahy)	Absent	X	X
Anthony Serres	Signify North America Corporation	X	X	X	Absent	X
Gord Shymko	G. F. Shymko & Associates Inc.	X	X	X	X	X
Frank Sullivan	Kiewit	X	X	X	Absent	X
Michael Zatz	ENERGY STAR Commercial & Industrial Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	X	X	X	X	X

**Voting Alternates in Attendance**

Full Name	Organization	11/17/21	11/15/21	10/25/21	10/14/20	10/7/21
Dan Cole	IAPMO	X				

**Interested Parties in Attendance**

Full Name	Organization	11/17/21	11/15/21	10/25/21	10/14/20	10/7/21
Rob Brooks	Rob Brooks Associates		X			X
Soph Davenberry	Independent Consultant	X	X			
Josh Jacobs	WAP Sustainability	X				
Viken Koukounian	K.R. Moeller Associates Ltd.					X
James O'Brien	Independent Environmental Consultant	X	X	X		

Brenda Steinhauer	W.A. Richardson Builders, LLC					X
John Yowell	EPA's Indoor Environments Division					X

**Staff in Attendance**

Full Name	Organization	11/17/21	11/15/21	10/25/21	10/14/21	10/7/21
Emily Marx	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X	X	X
Joseph Granada	Staff, GBI	X	X	X	X	X
Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI		X	X	X	X
Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI	X	X	X	X	X
Aparna Varadharajan	Staff, GBI	X	X	X	X	X

**Welcome**

Chair Lawrence Humphries 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**

Humphries thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Humphries 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.**

Humphries also reviewed the minutes from meeting #6 on November 15, 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 #6 on November 15, 2021, as presented.**

**Front End Public Comment Review**

The Secretariat reviewed each item of new business and public comment.

**P1-301**

**Public Comment:** N/A

**Reason:** We should also include ADA, ASTM, ANSI,

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. ANSI is the only one not currently included and still within the draft standard.

**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, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Jane Rohde

**Proposed Revision:** Indoor Environmental Quality

- IEQ Systems & Measures
- Hazard Mitigation ~~IE Management~~
- Hazard Prevention
- Lighting
- Thermal Comfort,
- ~~Thermal-Acoustical Privacy & Comfort~~
- Occupant Health, & Wellness

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed revision in red.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- The Secretariat noted that the text in red is rectifying a previous mistake in updating the sections if the IEQ Assessment Area in the beginning summary pages of the draft standard..

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Jane Rohde

**Site Public Comment Review**

The Consensus Body for Existing Buildings Chair reviewed each item of new business and public comment before asking for a motion to approve the action approved by the Subcommittee.

**Site-3**

**Proposed Revision:** 2.2.1.2 The site has achieved sustainability certification from a nationally or regionally recognized site certification program within the last four years.

**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, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Jane Rohde

**Site-4**

**Proposed Revision:** 2.2.1.3 A comprehensive site plan has been developed and implemented that includes all areas of site improvement, including access to walking trails, bike paths, outdoor respite, and outdoor community spaces (i.e., community gardens, farmers' markets, etc.) on or adjacent to the building or campus.

Maximum = 5 points

- Two points are earned for developing a plan.
- Three points are earned for implementing or dedicating funding for the plan.

**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, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Jane Rohde

**Site-5**

**Proposed Revision:** 2.2.1.4 The following strategies are used to reduce stormwater runoff over and above municipal requirements:

2.2.1.4.1 Permeable strategies are used to reduce water run-off from roofs, and hardscaping

2.2.1.4.2 Permeable strategies are used to reduce water run-off from hardscaping.

2.2.1.4.3 Filtration of water runoff is accomplished through a comprehensive hydrology plan.

2.2.1.4.4 .Roof drains are disconnected from sanitary or combined sewers.

Maximum = 5 points

- One point is earned for 2.2.1.4.1.
- One point is earned for 2.2.1.4.2.
- Two points are earned for 2.2.1.4.3.
- Two points are earned for 2.2.1.4.4.
- ~~Not applicable if the building covers >80% of the site.~~

**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, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Jane Rohde

#### **P1-802**

**Public Comment:** N/A

**Reason:** Define what is the Walk Score®

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted and the changes have been implemented in the draft Standard. The definition to be added to the standard is as follows:

**Walk Score(R):** It is a score that is developed through Walk Score®, a public access walkability methodology that assigns a walkable score to addresses in Canada, United States, and Australia.

**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, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Jane Rohde

#### **Site-1**

**Proposed Revision:** 2.2.2.5 The following are incorporated ~~included~~ in the project ~~based upon an annual occupant commute survey:~~

**2.2.2.5.1** Secure Bike shelters  ~~racks~~ for minimum 10 ~~5~~ % of occupants

**2.2.2.5.2** Bike paths/lanes

~~Bike shelters~~

**2.2.2.5.3** Changing facilities with lockers and/or showers

~~Lockers~~

~~Showers~~

Maximum = ~~5~~ 6 points

Two points are earned for 2.2.2.5.1.

Two points are earned for 2.2.2.5.2.

Two points are earned for 2.2.2.5.3.

- ~~• Five points are earned if 100% are incorporated.~~
- ~~• Three points are earned if ≥50 to <100% are incorporated.~~
- ~~• One point is earned if <50% are incorporated.~~
- No points are earned if none are incorporated, ~~or a survey was not completed.~~
- Not applicable if the building is unoccupied.

2.2.2.1 A transportation assessment has been completed.

~~5~~ 4 points

**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, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Jane Rohde

#### **Site-7**

**Proposed Revision:** 2.2.2.6 Other measures have been enacted to reduce car dependency (e.g., car-pooling, scooters, bike paths/lanes, purchase of transit passes).

**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, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Jane Rohde

The Water Subcommittee Chair reviewed each item of new business and public comment before placing a motion to approve the action approved by the Subcommittee.

#### **EB104-1**

**Public Comment:** Consider simple formula rather than extensive table with point values (e.g. 4.1.1 A)

**Reason:** It would improve continuity and readability of survey and technical manual. Also, to facilitate move to new software.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The commenter did not provide a proposed formula.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to rescind the motion from October 25, 2021 to reject the comment.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Jane Rohde

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

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The reason for modification is that slight text updates were made to align with other aspects of the draft standard. We have not created a formula but have simplified the point structure to improve understanding and better reflect the performance of the building.

The modification is below:

4.1.1A.1 The building's current standing as compared to average water performance for the building type is at least ~~75~~ 65%.

Maximum = 65 points

- 65 points are earned for a standing of  $\geq 90\%$ .
- 60 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 85$  to  $<90\%$ .
- 55 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 80$  to  $<85\%$ .
- 50 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 75$  to  $<80\%$ .
- 40 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 70$  to  $<75\%$ .
- 25 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 65$  to  $<70\%$ .
- 10 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 60$  to  $<65\%$ .
- ~~Beginning at 75%, twenty one points will be earned with two points being earned for every 1% improvement up to 97% for a maximum of sixty five points.~~
- ~~No points are earned for  $<75\%$ .~~

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Jane Rohde

There was agreement to make one joint motion for the New Business Item Water-9 and Public Comment P1-1215 because they are on the same criteria.

#### **Water-9 and P1-1215**

**Water-9 Proposed Revision:** 4.1.1A.1 The building's current standing as compared to average performance for the building type is at least ~~75~~ 65%.

Maximum = 65 points

- 65 points are earned for a standing of  $\geq 90\%$ .
- 60 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 85$  to  $<90\%$ .
- 55 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 80$  to  $<85\%$ .
- 50 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 75$  to  $<80\%$ .
- 40 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 70$  to  $<75\%$ .
- 25 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 65$  to  $<70\%$ .
- 10 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 60$  to  $<65\%$ .
- ~~Beginning at 75%, twenty one points will be earned with two points being earned for every 1% improvement up to 97% for a maximum of sixty five points.~~
- ~~No points are earned for  $<75\%$ .~~

**P1-1215 Public Comment:** Change point allocations to:

- 65 points for standing of 90 or higher
- 60 points for standing of 85-90
- 55 points for standing of 80-84
- 50 points for standing of 75-79
- 40 points for standing of 70-74
- 25 points for standing of 65-69
- 10 points for standing of 60-64

**P1-1215 Reason:** The differential in points awarded changes too much with each single point on scale. To simplify this item, and to incentivize applicants to pursue larger improvements, the same number of points should be awarded for a range of scores. In addition points should be given for a current standing down to a value of 60. These points should be much lower though to incentivize buildings to move from a score of 60 to a higher score.

**P1-1215 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The reason for modification is that slight text updates were made to align with other aspects of the draft standard. The modification is below:

4.1.1A.1 The building's current standing as compared to average water performance for the building type is at least ~~75~~ 65%.

Maximum = 65 points

- 65 points are earned for a standing of  $\geq 90\%$ .
- 60 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 85$  to  $<90\%$ .
- 55 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 80$  to  $<85\%$ .
- 50 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 75$  to  $<80\%$ .
- 40 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 70$  to  $<75\%$ .
- 25 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 65$  to  $<70\%$ .
- 10 points are earned for a standing  $\geq 60$  to  $<65\%$ .
- ~~Beginning at 75%, twenty one points will be earned with two points being earned for every 1% improvement up to 97% for a maximum of sixty five points.~~
- ~~No points are earned for  $<75\%$ .~~

**MOTION:** The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision, Water-9 and accept with modification the proposed response for public comment P1-1215.

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE:** The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Jane Rohde

There was agreement to make one joint motion for the New Business Item Water-10 and Public Comment P1-1216 because they are on the same criteria.

#### **Water-10 and P1-1216**

**Water-10 Proposed Revision:** 4.1.1B.1 The EPA Water Score of the facility is at least 60 ~~75~~.

Maximum = 65 points

- 65 points are earned for a Water Score<sup>®</sup> of 90 or higher.
- 60 points are earned for a Water Score<sup>®</sup> of 85-89.
- 55 points are earned for a Water Score<sup>®</sup> of 80-84.
- 50 points are earned for a Water Score<sup>®</sup> of 75-79.
- 40 points are earned for a Water Score<sup>®</sup> of 70-74.
- 25 points are earned for a Water Score<sup>®</sup> of 65-69.
- 10 points are earned for a Water Score<sup>®</sup> of 60-64.
- ~~Beginning at a score of 75, twenty one points will be earned with two points being earned for every 1 point improvement up to 97 for a maximum of sixty five points.~~
- ~~No points are earned for a score of  $<75$ .~~

**P1-1216 Public Comment:** Change point allocations to:

- 65 points for score of 90 or higher
- 60 points for score of 85-90

55 points for score of 80-84  
50 points for score of 75-79  
40 points for score of 70-74  
25 points for score of 65-69  
10 points for score of 60-64

**P1-1216 Reason:** The differential in points awarded changes too much with each single point on the ENERGY STAR scale. To simplify this item, and to incentivize applicants to pursue larger improvements, the same number of points should be awarded for a range of scores. In addition, points should be given for an ENERGY STAR score down to a score of 60, which is still 10 points higher than the national median and a good level of performance. These points should be much lower though to incentivize buildings to move from a score of 60 to a higher score.

**P1-1216 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The reason for modification is that slight text updates were made to align with other aspects of the draft standard. The modification is below:

4.1.1B.1 The EPA Water Score<sup>®</sup> of the facility is at least 60 ~~75~~.

Maximum = 65 points

- 65 points are earned for a Water Score<sup>®</sup> of 90 or higher.
- 60 points are earned for a Water Score<sup>®</sup> of 85-89.
- 55 points are earned for a Water Score<sup>®</sup> of 80-84.
- 50 points are earned for a Water Score<sup>®</sup> of 75-79.
- 40 points are earned for a Water Score<sup>®</sup> of 70-74.
- 25 points are earned for a Water Score<sup>®</sup> of 65-69.
- 10 points are earned for a Water Score<sup>®</sup> of 60-64.
- ~~Beginning at a score of 75, twenty-one points will be earned with two points being earned for every 1 point improvement up to 97 for a maximum of sixty-five points.~~
- ~~No points are earned for a score of <75.~~

**MOTION:** The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision, Water-10 and accept with modification the proposed response for public comment P1-1216.

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE:** The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Jane Rohde

#### **EB104-13**

**Public Comment:** Expand considerations to include kitchen faucet, clothes washer and dishwasher.

**Reason:** Restricting the MF prescriptive considerations to just these fixtures do not appear adequate

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. This comment is addressed by updating paths A-H of 4.2.1.

The modification is as follows:

- 4.2.1A Path A: WaterSense<sup>®</sup> Labeling: 40 points  
OR
- 4.2.1B Path B: Multifamily: 36 points  
OR
- 4.2.1C Path C: Office: 36 points  
OR
- 4.2.1D Path D: Healthcare: 36 points or N/A  
OR
- 4.2.1E Path E: Hotel/Hospitality: 36 points or N/A  
OR
- 4.2.1F Path F: Resort/Casino: 36 points or N/A  
OR
- 4.2.1G Path G: Restaurant: 36 points  
OR
- 4.2.1H Path H: Other Building Types: 36 points or N/A

4.2.1A PATH A: WATERSENSE<sup>®</sup> LABELING

4.2.1A.1 All water fixtures ~~meet the are~~ WaterSense<sup>®</sup> and/or ENERGY STAR labeled where a specification exists.

#### 4.2.1B PATH B: MULTIFAMILY

4.2.1B.1 There are the following water-conserving fixtures:

4.2.1B.1a WaterSense® labeled aerators on lavatory faucets and lavatory faucet accessories fixtures (not including main kitchen sink)

4.2.1B.1b WaterSense® labeled showerheads

4.2.1B.1c WaterSense Non-water urinals or WaterSense® labeled urinals, WaterSense® labeled tank-type toilets, or WaterSense® Flushometer-Valve water closets

#### 4.2.1C PATH C: OFFICE

4.2.1C.1 There are the following water-conserving fixtures:

4.2.1C.1a WaterSense® labeled aerators on lavatory faucets and lavatory faucet accessories fixtures (not including main kitchen sink)

4.2.1C.1b WaterSense Non-water urinals or WaterSense® labeled urinals

4.2.1C.1c WaterSense® labeled tank-type toilets, or WaterSense® Flushometer-Valve water closets

#### 4.2.1D PATH D: HEALTHCARE

4.2.1D.1 There are the following water-conserving fixtures:

4.2.1D.1a WaterSense® labeled aerators on lavatory faucets and lavatory faucet accessories fixtures (not including main kitchen sink)

4.2.1D.1b WaterSense® labeled showerheads

4.2.1D.1c WaterSense® labeled tank-type toilets, or WaterSense® Flushometer-Valve water closets

4.2.1D.1d WaterSense Non-water urinals or WaterSense® labeled urinals

4.2.1D.1e Low flow pre-rinse and No residential dishwashers or provisions are installed. Where commercial equipment is installed, they are ENERGY STAR dishwashers

- Six points are earned for 4.2.1D.1e projects that have no residential dishwashers or provisions or for commercial ENERGY STAR dishwashers.

- 2 points are earned for ENERGY STAR residential dishwashers.

o Not applicable where low-flow water fixtures would pose a possible health hazard due to the building type, user, and/or space use.

#### 4.2.1E PATH E: HOTEL/HOSPITALITY

4.2.1E.1 There are the following water-conserving fixtures:

4.2.1E.1a WaterSense® labeled aerators on lavatory faucets and lavatory faucet accessories fixtures (not including main kitchen sink)

4.2.1E.1b WaterSense® labeled showerheads

4.2.1E.1c WaterSense Non-water urinals or WaterSense® labeled urinals, WaterSense® labeled tank-type toilets, or WaterSense® Flushometer-Valve water closets

4.2.1E.1d Low flow pre-rinse and No residential dishwashers or provisions are installed. Where commercial equipment is installed, they are ENERGY STAR dishwashers

- Six points are earned for 4.2.1E.1d for projects that have no residential dishwashers or provisions or for commercial ENERGY STAR dishwashers..

- 2 points are earned for ENERGY STAR residential dishwashers.

o Not applicable where low-flow water fixtures would pose a possible health hazard due to the building type, user, and/or space use.

#### 4.2.1F PATH F: RESORT/CASINO

4.2.1F.1 There are the following water-conserving fixtures:

4.2.1F.1a WaterSense® labeled aerators on residential lavatory faucets and lavatory faucet accessories fixtures (not including main kitchen sink)

4.2.1F.1b WaterSense® labeled aerators on non-residential lavatory faucets and lavatory faucet accessories fixtures (not including main kitchen sink)

4.2.1F.1c WaterSense® labeled showerheads

4.2.1F.1d WaterSense® labeled tank-type toilets, or WaterSense® Flushometer-Valve water closets

4.2.1F.1e WaterSense Non-water urinals or WaterSense® labeled urinals



4.2.1F.1f Low-flow pre-rinse and No residential dishwashers or provisions are installed. Where commercial equipment is installed, they are ENERGY STAR dishwashers

- Six points are earned for 4.2.1F.1f. projects that have no residential dishwashers or provisions or for commercial ENERGY STAR dishwashers.

- 2 points are earned for ENERGY STAR residential dishwashers.

o Not applicable where low-flow water fixtures would pose a possible health hazard due to the building type, user, and/or space use.

#### 4.2.1G PATH G: RESTAURANT

4.2.1G.1 There are the following water-conserving fixtures:

4.2.1G.1a WaterSense® labeled aerators on lavatory faucets and lavatory faucet accessories fixtures (not including main kitchen sink)

4.2.1G.1b WaterSense® labeled tank-type toilets, or WaterSense® Flushometer-Valve water closets

4.2.1G.1c WaterSense Non-water urinals or WaterSense® labeled urinals

4.2.1G.1d Low-flow pre-rinse

4.2.1G.1e No residential dishwashers or provisions are installed. Where commercial equipment is installed, they are ENERGY STAR dishwashers

- ~~Six~~ Eight points are earned for 4.2.1G.1a.

- ~~Six~~ Eight points are earned for 4.2.1G.1b.

- ~~Six~~ Eight points are earned for 4.2.1G.1c.

- ~~Six~~ points are earned for 4.2.1G.1d.

- Twelve points are earned for 4.2.1G.1e. projects that have no residential dishwashers or provisions or for commercial ENERGY STAR dishwashers.

- 2 points are earned for ENERGY STAR residential dishwashers.

#### 4.2.1H PATH H: OTHER BUILDING TYPES

4.2.1H.1 There are the following water-conserving fixtures:

4.2.1H.1a WaterSense® labeled aerators on lavatory faucets and lavatory faucet accessories fixtures (not including main kitchen sink)

4.2.1H.1b WaterSense® labeled tank-type toilets, or WaterSense® Flushometer-Valve water closets

4.2.1H.1c WaterSense Non-water urinals or WaterSense® labeled urinals

4.2.1H.1d Low-flow pre-rinse

4.2.1H.1e No residential dishwashers or provisions are installed. Where commercial equipment is installed, they are ENERGY STAR dishwashers

4.2.1H.1f e Other water-saving features

- ~~Six~~ Eight points are earned for 4.2.1H.1a.

o Not applicable for fixtures, pending the building type and space use(s).

- ~~Six~~ Eight points are earned for 4.2.1H.1b.

o Not applicable for fixtures, pending the building type and space use(s).

- ~~Six~~ Eight points are earned for 4.2.1H.1c.

o Not applicable for fixtures, pending the building type and space use(s).

- ~~Six~~ points are earned for 4.2.1H.1d.

o Not applicable for fixtures, pending the building type and space use(s).

- Six points are earned for 4.2.1H.1e. projects that have no residential dishwashers or provisions or for commercial ENERGY STAR dishwashers.

- 2 points are earned for ENERGY STAR residential dishwashers.

o Not applicable for fixtures, pending the building type and space use(s).

- Six points are earned for 4.2.1H.1f e.

o Not applicable for fixtures, pending the building type and space use(s).

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

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- Marx displayed the changes in a word document on the screen.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Jane Rohde

## Materials Public Comment Review

The Consensus Body for Existing Buildings Chair reviewed each public comment before asking for a motion to approve the action approved by the Subcommittee.

### P1-402

**Public Comment:** Completely rewrite language around comparison of product certification levels and EPDs to ensure that there is an apple to apple comparison.

**Reason:** This language is much too simplified for the suggested pathway. Comparison of EPDs requires significant parameters be detailed to ensure there is no gaming of the system.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The rewrite was completed to address comparison of product from a continuous improvement process perspective. The requirements are laid out to avoid gaming of the system.

The revision is below:

5.1.1.2 Product standards for cycle renovations have been developed that require the following:

5.1.1.2.1 Products that include:

- Third-party verified multiple attribute standard certifications
- Industry Average or Product Specific Environmental Product Declarations (EPDs)
- Being listed on NIST's (National Institute of Standards and Technology) BEES (Building for Environmental and Economic Sustainability) database

5.1.1.2.2 Product selections that include sustainable comparison and/or improvements utilizing:

- Higher level of certification based upon third party verified multiple attribute standard certifications for the same product type.
- Product that is included in an Industry Average EPD and have subsequently produced a Product Specific EPD for the same product.
- Products that include a baseline Product Specific EPD, and over time produces an updated Product Specific EPD that demonstrates continual improvement from the baseline of a specific product. LCA method (TRACI, CML, etc.) and Product Category Rules (PCR) are required to be the same for comparability.
- Comparison of similar building products utilizing NIST's BEES database, online analysis tool utilizing the, and same impact indicators for comparison.

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

5.1.1.2.4 Products that include:

- Pre-consumer and Post-consumer Recycled content
- Biobased content (other than sustainable wood)

5.1.1.2.5 Products that include reused, refurbished and/or salvaged materials from off-site in place of new materials (including furnishings).

- ~~Five~~ Four points are earned for 5.1.1.2.1.
- ~~Five~~ Four points are earned for 5.1.1.2.2.
- One point is earned for 5.1.1.2.3.
- Two points are earned for 5.1.1.2.4.
- ~~Two~~ Four points are earned for 5.1.1.2.5.

**Discussion took place before the Motion:**

- The public commenter stated that the current criteria in the draft standard was lacking, and it needed to be improved upon. He noted that the GBI New Construction (NC) standard is detailed and more specific and that the EB draft standard needs to be more like the NC standard. He asked for public commenters to be more involved in the process because this is the first time he is seeing the proposed revision. He stated that he would vote against the change of how the proposal is currently written. He noted problems with the NIST reference and the Industry Average text.
- The Secretariat noted that the only changes tied to this comment are for 5.1.1.2.1 and 5.1.1.2.2. and the other changes included in the revision were approved with other comments but on the same criteria. She stated that the revision included to the commenter will include all approved changes by the Consensus Body for the criteria.

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

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- A member asked if this was a step in the right direction and the commenter stated that it would increase confusion for users.
- It was argued that the changes should be moved on to the next review phase so that more public input can be gathered and then reviewed during the next cycle.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 5 in favor, 1 opposed, 4 abstained.**

Opposed: Anthony Serres

Abstain: Dan Cole, Benjamin Bojda, Mike Zatz, Jane Rohde

There was discussion on whether the action taken for P1-404 and P1-405 is correct. It was noted the action is correct and that the criteria were voted to be altered as part of a different public comment.

#### **P1-404**

**Public Comment:** ~~5.1.1.3.1~~

**Reason:** A safety data sheet and an HPD are not similar in many many ways. These are also required by law for many products so giving credit for them seems rather outside the scope of a high-performance building certification.

**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, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Jane Rohde

#### **P1-405**

**Public Comment:** 5.1.1.3 needs to be completely rewritten to incentivize the transparency of products' chemical makeup and selection of materials that have taken potentially harmful chemicals out.

**Reason:** If I am reading this correctly we want to give points for products that HAVE carcinogenic, mutagenic, or reproductive toxins? I think what you are trying to get at is that products have something like a Product Lens, HPD, Declare verification that helps identify IF those are in products.

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

**Discussion took place before the Motion:**

- After some discussion on the changes that were voted through as part of a different public comment, there was agreement to change the action from Reject to Accept.

**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, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Jane Rohde

#### **IEQ Public Comment Review**

The ESG/IEQ Subcommittee Chair reviewed each public comment before placing a motion to approve the action approved by the Subcommittee.

#### **EB101-3**

**Public Comment:** 6.2.1.3 There are procedures and policies for maintaining 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

6.2.1.3.6 UVGI operations and maintenance

Maximum = ~~10~~12 points

- Two points are earned for 6.2.1.3.1.
- Two points are earned for 6.2.1.3.2.
- Two points are earned for 6.2.1.3.3.
- Two points are earned for 6.2.1.3.4.
- Two points are earned for 6.2.1.3.5.
- Two points are earned for 6.2.1.3.6

We recommend that UVGI systems be included as an additional way to maintain good IAQ.

**Reason:** Disinfecting rooms with ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI) systems is an efficient way to prevent contagious sicknesses from spreading and this maintains good IAQ.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The reason for modification is we are not increasing the total points awarded but we are adding another category to reach the maximum points total to include UVGI and other technologies that address infectious particles.

The standard now reads:

~~6.2.1.1.4.3~~ There is a policy and procedure ~~are procedures and policies~~ for maintaining the air quality that include the following components: good IAQ that include:

~~6.2.1.1.4.3.1~~ HVAC operations

~~6.2.1.1.4.3.2~~ Housekeeping procedures

~~6.2.1.1.4.3.3~~ Preventive maintenance

~~6.2.1.1.4.3.4~~ Procedures for unscheduled maintenance

6.1.4.3.5 Operations and maintenance of UVGI or other technologies including ionization of particles to address potential infectious particles

~~6.2.1.1.4.3.6~~ 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.}

Maximum = 10 points

- Two points are earned for ~~6.2.1.1.4.3.1~~.
- Two points are earned for ~~6.2.1.1.4.3.2~~.
- Two points are earned for ~~6.2.1.1.4.3.3~~.
- Two points are earned for ~~6.2.1.1.4.3.4~~.
- Two points are earned for ~~6.2.1.1.4.3.5~~.
- Two points are earned for 6.1.4.3.5.

**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, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Jane Rohde

#### **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:

~~6.2.1.1.4.3~~ There is a policy and procedure ~~are procedures and policies~~ for maintaining the air quality that include the following components: good IAQ that include:

~~6.2.1.1.4.3.1~~ HVAC operations

~~6.2.1.1.4.3.2~~ Housekeeping procedures

~~6.2.1.1.4.3.3~~ Preventive maintenance

~~6.2.1.1.4.3.4~~ Procedures for unscheduled maintenance

6.1.4.3.5 Operations and maintenance of UVGI or other technologies including ionization of particles to address potential infectious particles

~~6.2.1.1.4.3.6~~ 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.}

Maximum = 10 points

- ~~Two points are earned for 6.2.1.1.4.3.1.~~
- ~~Two points are earned for 6.2.1.1.4.3.2.~~
- ~~Two points are earned for 6.2.1.1.4.3.3.~~
- ~~Two points are earned for 6.2.1.1.4.3.4.~~
- ~~Two points are earned for 6.2.1.1.4.3.5.~~
- Two points are earned for 6.1.4.3.5.

**Discussion took place on the Public Comment**

- The Secretariat stated that no motion is needed because only the revision in the response has changed and no other part. She stated that the action and reason was already approved by the Consensus Body for EB during a prior meeting. There was no objection to updating the revision of the commenter's response.

**P1-408**

**Public Comment:** Please define what this means.

**Reason:** "Poor air quality event" is not defined.

**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:

~~6.2.3.3 If a poor air quality event has occurred in the building or in the community, the following techniques to rapidly improve air quality can take place pending longer term and/or permanent resolution of the problem:~~

~~6.2.3.3.1 Increasing air changes (where feasible)~~

~~6.2.3.3.2 After hour air flushes~~

The building utilizes no-touch mechanisms and controls that minimize the need to use hand contact on multi-person high touch surfaces such as but not limited to the following:

- Elevator controls
- Lighting and access control
- Restroom door hardware
- Restroom toilet controls
- Restroom faucet controls
- Building entry and exit door controls
- Interior door hardware leading to spaces regularly occupied by multiple persons
- Other

Maximum = 2 points

- ~~One Two points are is earned for 6.2.3.3.1 four or more no-touch features.~~
  - o Not applicable for unoccupied buildings and buildings with no regular working occupants.
- ~~One point is earned for 6.2.3.3.2 two or three no-touch feature.~~
  - o Not applicable for unoccupied buildings and buildings with no regular working occupants.
- ~~No points are earned for one or less no-touch features.~~
  - o Not applicable for unoccupied buildings and buildings with no regular working occupants.

**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, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Jane Rohde

**Public Participation**

There was no discussion.

**New Business**

There was no discussion.

**Review Schedule**

Marx stated that all comments have been reviewed by the Consensus Body for Existing Buildings and that public comments and Consensus Body members that submitted comments during the ballot process will receive information on the Consensus Body's action on November 18, 2021. She stated that the next public comment period will begin in early December and end in mid-January, and that subcommittees will begin meeting again in mid to late January.

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

**Meeting adjourned at 4:01 PM EST.**