



**MINUTES**

GBI Consensus Body for Existing Buildings- Call #9

Webinar/Teleconference

March 9, 2023 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	3/9/23	9/20/22	11/17/21	11/15/21	10/25/21
Benjamin Bojda	Dominion Environmental Consultants NV, Inc	X	X	X (Proxy Cole)	X	X
Larry Clark	Sustainable Performance Solutions	X	X	X (Proxy Shymko)	X (Proxy Shymko)	X
Michael Cudahy	PPFA - PPEF	X	X (left early)	X	X	X
Chris Fournier	Signify	Absent	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lawrence (Buddy) Humphries (Chair)	Efficient Green, LLC	X	X	X	X	X
Christoph Lohr	IAPMO	N/A	Absent	Absent	X	X (Proxy Zatz)
John Mullen	IAPMO	X				
Max Puchtel	American Institute of Steel Construction	X	X	Absent	X	Absent
Dave Ray	GRN Vision	Absent	X	Absent	Absent	Absent
Benjamin Reeves	Arete Design Group	X (Proxy Shymko)	X (Proxy Shymko)	X (Proxy Sullivan)	X	X (Proxy Shymko)
Jane Rohde	JSR Associates, Inc., The Vinyl Institute / Resilient Floor Covering Institute	Absent	X	X (Proxy Cudahy)	X (Proxy Cudahy)	Absent
Anthony Serres	Signify North America Corporation	N/A	Absent	X	X	X
Gord Shymko	G. F. Shymko & Associates Inc.	X	X	X	X	X
Frank Sullivan	Kiewit	Absent	X	X	X	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	3/9/23	9/20/22	11/17/21	11/15/21	10/25/21
Dan Cole	IAPMO			X		
John Mullen	IAPMO		X			

### Interested Parties in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	3/9/23	9/20/22	11/17/21	11/15/21	10/25/21
Rob Brooks	Rob Brooks Associates				X	
Randolph Chapman	EPA's Indoor Environments Division		X			
Soph Davenberry	Independent Consultant			X	X	
Larry Eisenberg	Ovus Partners 360	X	X			
Josh Jacobs	WAP Sustainability			X		
Viken Koukounian	K.R. Moeller Associates Ltd.	X	X			
James O'Brien	Independent Environmental Consultant			X	X	X

### Staff in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	3/9/23	9/20/22	11/17/21	11/15/21	10/25/21
Emily Marx	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X	X	X
Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI	X	X		X	X
Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI			X	X	X

### 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 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

Chair Lawrence Humphries welcomed everyone to 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 #8 on September 20, 2022, 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 #8 on September 20, 2022, as presented.**

### **ESG Public Comment Review**

The ESG/IEQ Subcommittee Chair reviewed each proposed revision before placing a motion.

#### **ESGIEQ-201-06**

**Proposed Revision:** Not applicable for residential 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, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

#### **EBESG-207**

**Proposed Revision:** 1.1.1.4 There are action plans based on measurement and performance data, operational controls and monitoring, thermal comfort reporting, and incident records to improve the environmental and energy performance of the building.

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

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- It was argued that this addition is vague. The section was reviewed, and it was noted that it goes within the theme of the section, as well as the general aspect of ESG.

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

#### **EBESG-208**

**Proposed Revision:** 1.1.1.5.3 There is a detailed cleaning schedule in place to ensure that high dusting, cleaning of ventilation vents and detail cleaning of kitchen appliances including microwaves, water dispensers, stoves, ovens, and refrigerators, if applicable.

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

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- It was asked if this was concerning mold issues, but it was argued that it could be beneficial for a wide array of concerns with water dispensers.
- There was discussion on whether 'potable' should be added, but assessors on the call noted how the proposed criteria could be assessed, and there was agreement that it could be a catch all for all water systems.

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

### **Energy Public Comment Review**

The Secretariat noted that two public commenters submitted nearly duplicate forms and when two lines on the excel are in orange or gray one motion could be placed to resolve both comments. The Energy Subcommittee Vice Chair reviewed each proposed revision or public comment before placing a motion.

#### **EB201-19, EB202-18**

**EB201-19 Public Comment:** 3.2.2 Lighting

Outdoor lighting is not addressed here. Suggest adding at least one point for having outdoor lighting that is energy efficient (i.e., LED) and complies with dark sky best practices

(<https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting/>).

**EB201-19 Reason:** Elements 6.4.1.11 and 6.4.1.12 discuss outdoor lighting but have no requirement that they be energy efficient or comply with dark sky best practices.

**EB201-19 Recommended Response:** Your comment has been accepted with modification. The reason for modification is as follows: Criteria has been added to incentivize energy efficient lighting as well as controlled performance of the lighting system that has been installed.

**EB202-18 Public Comment:** 3.2.2 Lighting

Outdoor lighting is not addressed here. Suggest adding at least one point for having outdoor lighting that is energy efficient (i.e., LED) and complies with dark sky best practices (<https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting/>).

**EB202-18 Reason:** Elements 6.4.1.11 and 6.4.1.12 discuss outdoor lighting but have no requirement that they be energy efficient or comply with dark sky best practices.

**EB202-18 Recommended Response:** Your comment has been accepted with modification. The reason for modification is as follows: Criteria has been added to incentivize energy efficient lighting as well as controlled performance of the lighting system that has been installed.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed responses for EB201-19, EB202-18.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

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

### **EBEnergy-203**

**Proposed Revision:** 3.2.2A.1 At least 10% of the building interior is installed with LED and/or OLED fluorescent lighting (quantified by floor area).

Maximum = 20 points

- Twenty points are earned when the building interior is 100% LED and/or OLED.
- Eighteen points are earned when the building interior is  $\geq 90\%$  to  $< 100\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 10\%$  fluorescent.
- Sixteen points are earned when the building interior is  $\geq 80\%$  to  $< 90\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 20\%$  to  $> 10\%$  fluorescent.
- Fourteen points are earned when the building interior is  $\geq 70\%$  to  $< 80\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 30\%$  to  $> 20\%$  fluorescent.
- Twelve points are earned when the building interior is  $\geq 60\%$  to  $< 70\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 40\%$  to  $> 30\%$  fluorescent.
- Ten points are earned when the building interior is  $\geq 50\%$  to  $< 60\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 50\%$  to  $> 40\%$  fluorescent.
- Eight points are earned when the building interior is  $\geq 40\%$  to  $< 50\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 60\%$  to  $> 50\%$  fluorescent.
- Six points are earned when the building interior is  $\geq 30\%$  to  $< 40\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 70\%$  to  $> 60\%$  fluorescent.
- Four points are earned when the building interior is  $\geq 20\%$  to  $< 30\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 80\%$  to  $> 70\%$  fluorescent.
- Two points are earned when the building interior is  $\geq 10\%$  to  $< 20\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 90\%$  to  $> 80\%$  fluorescent.
- No points are earned when the building interior is  $< 10\%$  LED and/or OLED  $> 90\%$  fluorescent.

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

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was a question on how difficult it would be to achieve this criterion and the percentages for the point breakdown. Various assessors on the call discussed what they have seen in projects and noted current lighting aspects in the industry.

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

#### **EBEnergy-204**

**Proposed Revision:** 3.2.2B.1 At least 10% of the common and amenity areas are installed with LED and/or OLED fluorescent lighting (quantified by floor area).

Maximum = 10 points

- Ten points are earned when common and/or amenity areas are 100% LED and/or OLED.
- Nine points are earned when common and/or amenity areas are  $\geq 90\%$  to  $< 100\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 10\%$  fluorescent.
- Eight points are earned when common and/or amenity areas are  $\geq 80\%$  to  $< 90\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 20\%$  to  $> 10\%$  fluorescent.
- Seven points are earned when common and/or amenity areas are  $\geq 70\%$  to  $< 80\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 30\%$  to  $> 20\%$  fluorescent.
- Six points are earned when common and/or amenity areas are  $\geq 60\%$  to  $< 70\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 40\%$  to  $> 30\%$  fluorescent.
- Five points are earned when common and/or amenity areas are  $\geq 50\%$  to  $< 60\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 50\%$  to  $> 40\%$  fluorescent.
- Four points are earned when common and/or amenity areas are  $\geq 40\%$  to  $< 50\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 60\%$  to  $> 50\%$  fluorescent.
- Three points are earned when common and/or amenity areas are  $\geq 30\%$  to  $< 40\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 70\%$  to  $> 60\%$  fluorescent.
- Two points are earned when common and/or amenity areas are  $\geq 20\%$  to  $< 30\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 80\%$  to  $> 70\%$  fluorescent.
- One point is earned when common and/or amenity areas are  $\geq 10\%$  to  $< 20\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 90\%$  to  $> 80\%$  fluorescent.
- No points are earned when common and/or amenity areas are  $< 10\%$  LED and/or OLED  $> 90\%$  fluorescent.

**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, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

#### **EBEnergy-205**

**Proposed Revision:** 3.2.2B.2 At least 10% of the residential unit or hotel rooms is installed with LED and/or OLED fluorescent lighting (quantified by floor area).

Maximum = 10 points

- Ten points are earned when residential unit or hotel rooms are 100% LED and/or OLED.
- Nine points are earned when residential unit or hotel rooms are  $\geq 90\%$  to  $< 100\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 10\%$  fluorescent.
- Eight points are earned when residential unit or hotel rooms are  $\geq 80\%$  to  $< 90\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 20\%$  to  $> 10\%$  fluorescent.
- Seven points are earned when residential unit or hotel rooms are  $\geq 70\%$  to  $< 80\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 30\%$  to  $> 20\%$  fluorescent.
- Six points are earned when residential unit or hotel rooms are  $\geq 60\%$  to  $< 70\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 40\%$  to  $> 30\%$  fluorescent.
- Five points are earned when residential unit or hotel rooms are  $\geq 50\%$  to  $< 60\%$  LED and/or OLED  $\leq 50\%$  to  $> 40\%$  fluorescent.

- Four points are earned when residential unit or hotel rooms are ≥40% to <50% LED and/or OLED≤60% to >50% fluorescent.
- Three points are earned when residential unit or hotel rooms are ≥30% to <40% LED and/or OLED≤70% to >60% fluorescent.
- Two points are earned when residential unit or hotel rooms are ≥20% to <30% LED and/or OLED≤80% to >70% fluorescent.
- One point is earned when residential unit or hotel rooms are ≥10% to <20% LED and/or OLED≤90% to >80% fluorescent.
- No points are earned when residential unit or hotel rooms are <10% LED and/or OLED>90% fluorescent.

**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, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

#### **EBEnergy-220**

**Proposed Revision:** 3.2.5.4 The furnace heating systems modulate.

2 points

Not applicable if there are no furnaces.

**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, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

#### **EBEnergy-224**

**Proposed Revision:** 3.2.8.3 The HVAC systems uses supply air temperature reset.

1 point

Not applicable for distributed or compartmentalized HVAC systems.

**Reason:**

**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, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

#### **EBEnergy-211**

**Proposed Revision:** 3.4.1B RENEWABLE ONSITE AND OFFSITE ENERGY

**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, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

#### **EBEnergy-212**

**Proposed Revision:** 3.4.1B.3 1% or more of the building's total energy is provided by renewable onsite, or renewable directly delivered from offsite, energy sources, either on a direct or net-metered basis.

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

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was discussion on what could be expected for the project's energy costs if they complete this criterion.

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

## **EB202-29 & EB201-27**

**EB202-29 Public Comment:** 6.4.1.11 Exterior pathways and parking areas are lit to provide safe access from parking areas to building entries. Lighting should be ENERGY STAR rated and comply with the Dark Sky Initiative's best practices.

6.4.1.12 All building entrances regularly used by building occupants are lit to provide safe access to the building. Lighting should be ENERGY STAR rated and comply with the Dark Sky Initiative's best practices.

**EB202-29 Reason:** Edits intended to make this criterion impactful and verifiable.

**EB202-29 Recommended Response:** Your comment has been accepted with modification. The reason for modification is as follows: Criteria have been added to the Site as well as the Energy Assessment Areas to address these issues.

**EB201-27 Public Comment:** 6.4.1.11 Exterior pathways and parking areas are lit to provide safe access from parking areas to building entries.

6.4.1.12 All building entrances regularly used by building occupants are lit to provide safe access to the building.

For these two elements, suggest specifying that the lighting should be energy efficient and compliant with Dark Sky best practices.

**EB201-27 Reason:** See previous justification for these edits. (Edits intended to make this criterion impactful and verifiable. It seems that this is a standard procedure versus a leadership approach.)

**EB201-27 Recommended Response:** Your comment has been accepted with modification. The reason for modification is as follows: Criteria have been added to the Site as well as the Energy Assessment Areas to address these issues.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed responses for public comments EB202-29 and EB201-27.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

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

## **Water Public Comment Review**

The Water Subcommittee Chair reviewed each proposed revision or public comment before placing a motion.

### **EB202-20**

**Public Comment:** rename "Water Consumption" to "Indoor Water Consumption"

**Reason:** While section 4.2.2 contains requirements for conserving outdoor water consumption, there is no specific mention of indoor water consumption. To mitigate confusion for federal agencies, and other users, in determining whether they can use the standard to assess compliance with the indoor water use reduction guiding principle, we suggest renaming 4.1.1 to Indoor Water Consumption.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Section 4.1.1 is to be applied to both indoor and outdoor water use.

**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, 0 abstained.**

### **EBWater-208**

**Proposed Revision:** 4.1.1 TOTAL WATER CONSUMPTION

Three paths are available for assessing total water performance.

**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, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

### **EBWater-204, EBWater-201, EBWater-202**

**EBWater-204 Proposed Revision:** 4.1.1A.1 The building's current standing as compared to average water performance for the building type is at least ~~65~~60%.

**EBWater-201 Proposed Revision:** • No points are earned for an improvement of <60%.

**EBWater-202 Proposed Revision:** • No points are earned for a Water Score® of less than 60.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revisions (EBWater-204, EBWater 201, EBWater-202).**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was discussion of whether additional words should be added to the criteria of Path A, such as "The building's water performance ~~current standing~~ as compared..."
- The Technical Manual was referenced and there was discussion on the intention of Path A and the differences between Path A and Path C.
- There was agreement that Path A's criteria needs to be reviewed again by the Water Subcommittee.

**WITHDRAWN: The motion and second to accept the proposed revisions (EBWater-204, EBWater 201, EBWater-202) was withdrawn.**

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to send the proposals, EBWater-204 and EBWater 201, back to the Water Subcommittee for further review.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

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

### **EBWater-202**

**Proposed Revision:** • No points are earned for a Water Score® of less than 60.

**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, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

### **EBWater-209**

**Proposed Revision:** 4.1.1C PATH C: Improvement from Baseline ~~Prescriptive Water Performance~~: 50 points

4.1.1C PATH C: IMPROVEMENT FROM BASELINE PRESCRIPTIVE WATER PERFORMANCE

**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, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**



### **EBWater-207**

**Proposed Revision:** 4.2.1 INDOOR WATER CONSERVING FIXTURES CONSUMPTION

Eight paths are available for assessing indoor water consumption conserving fixtures.

**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, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

### **EBWater-203**

**Proposed Revision:** WaterSense® labeled Flushometer-Valve water closets

**Reason:** Also to take place on

4.2.1C.1.C

4.2.1D.1.C

4.2.1E.1.C

4.2.1F.1.C

4.2.1G.1.C

4.2.1H.1.C

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

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

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

### **EB202-21**

**Public Comment:** Add new section 4.2.2B.2

4.2.2B.2 Where installed, demonstrate that the permanent irrigation system uses 50 percent or less of the amount of potable water used in conventional practices, assuming typical annual baseline water use.

**Reason:** Currently there is no requirement to measure actual outdoor water use reduction. Outdoor Water Use, one of the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Federal Buildings, requires agencies to show at least a 50% reduction in outdoor water use by using several strategies. This standard would be greatly strengthened if a requirement were added to ensure projects, with outdoor irrigation, measure and reduce actual outdoor water consumption by at least 50%. Otherwise, federal agencies would not be able to use this standard to assess compliance with the Outdoor Water Use guiding principle.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The standard already includes a pathway (Pathway 4.1.1C) to earn points for reductions in total water use up to 50%, as well as points for prescriptive measures, which would lead to a reduction in water use. Thus, this would be redundant.

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

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- A member noted that a crosswalk should be created for the NC23 Irrigation section and EB23 irrigation section. Staff stated that they will review both sections but noted that NC23 will more align with EB23 after recent approved changes.
- It was argued that this is a vital issue, and the criteria is easy for projects to be awarded points.

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

### **EBWater-205**

**Proposed Revision:** 4.2.3.5 The building water systems conforms with *ASHRAE 188-2018, Legionellosis: Risk Management for Building Water Systems* or equivalent or more stringent risk management building water

system standards, per the following:

~~4.2.3.5.1 There is a program team tasked with managing Legionella in the building, and the team has described and diagrammed building water systems.~~

~~4.2.3.5.2 Building water systems are analyzed for hazardous conditions and consider the vulnerability of building occupants.~~

~~4.2.3.5.3 Control measures are being implemented and monitored for corrective action.~~

~~4.2.3.5.4 The program team verifies and validates the legionellosis management program on an ongoing basis.~~

~~4.2.3.5.5 The legionellosis management program is documented, and activities are communicated by the program team.~~

Maximum = 8 points

~~• One point is earned for 4.2.3.5.1.~~

~~• One point is earned for 4.2.3.5.2.~~

~~• Four points are earned for 4.2.3.5.3.~~

~~• One point is earned for 4.2.3.5.4.~~

~~• One point is earned for 4.2.3.5.5.~~

**Reason:** Secretariat Note: 4.2.3.5 The building water systems conforms with ASHRAE 188-2018, Legionellosis: Risk Management for Building Water Systems or equivalent ~~or more~~ stringent risk management building water system standards. ,

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

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- A member noted that the Assessment Guidance in the Technical Manual needs to be robust so assessors know how to award for this criterion.
- There was discussion on how to certify 'or equivalent or more stringent.' There was discussion on removing the text.
- Different aspects of legionella and its importance was discussed. Members reviewed 188-2018 and alternate requirements to avoid legionella.
- Assessors on the call discussed how this could be assessed or other requirements that they would review to award for this criterion.
- A revision to add 'as applicable' was discussed.
- There was agreement that the criteria should be reviewed again by the Water Subcommittee.

**WITHDRAWN: The motion and second to accept was withdrawn.**

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to send the revision back to the Water Subcommittee for further review.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

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

There was agreement to not discuss proposal, EBPoints-201-1, until after the Water Subcommittee finishes their review of proposal, EBWater-205, and if it is accepted, for more information to be added on centralized water system.

### **Materials Public Comment Review**

The Secretariat reviewed each proposed revision or public comment before a motion was placed by a Consensus Body member.

## EBMaterials-205

**Proposed Revision:** Reusable goods: goods that can be used more than once without modification or refurbishment ~~before being discarded.~~

**MOTION:** The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed revision and to remove “before being discarded.”

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was discussion on the use of ‘reusable goods’ in the standard and different aspects of how to achieve this criterion.

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

Mike Cudahy left the meeting.

## EB201-1

**Public Comment:** I strongly encourage the committee to align the entire standard with applicable Executive Order 14057 provisions and associated direction in the Federal Sustainability Plan and Memo to Federal Agencies – December 8, 2021.

Due to the timing of this public comment opportunity, I did not have sufficient time to provide detailed edits to better align with new federal green building and material approaches; however, I would be happy to work with the committee on such improvements, which would also make the Green Globes criteria more impactful and verifiable for all users. For example, the Materials section needs more specificity and could rely on federal definitions of sustainable products and approaches to environmentally preferable purchasing. I offer some initial suggestions herein.

**Reason:** So that GreenGlobes EB could be considered a more useful tool for federal agencies in meeting federal sustainability goals and mandates. In addition, such changes would make criteria more impactful, measurable, and verifiable in line with consensus terminology and proven approaches.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been acknowledged and while the Consensus Body has discussed your comment no changes have been implemented in the draft Standard. The comment addresses principles but no specific language that the Consensus Body can react to.

**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 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

## EB201-21 & EB202-22

**EB201-21 Public Comment:** 5.1.1.2.1 X number of Products that ~~include:~~

- Are Third-party ~~verified~~ certified as meeting multiple attribute sustainability standards certifications recommended by EPA at <https://www.epa.gov/greenerproducts/recommendations-specifications-standards-and-ecolabels-federal-purchasing>

Make the following a separate credit regarding Transparency not environmental preferability and consider giving product/facility specific data more points than industry average.

5.1.1.2.1b X number of products that:

- have published an Industry Average or Product Specific Environmental Product Declarations (EPDs)
- Being are listed on NIST's (National Institute of Standards and Technology) BEES (Building for Environmental and Economic Sustainability) database

**EB201-21 Reason:** The three approaches should not be given equal weight. Depending on the certification, only the first approach – multi-attribute certification - confirms a product’s environmental preferability. EPDs

and BEES are important transparency tools, but do not indicate a product has a reduced impact on the environment.

A certain number of conformant products – or specific product categories – should be established for qualifying for this criterion. Proposed edits clarify that the EPD be published.

EPA has developed a transparent, consistent approach to assessing and recommending standards and ecolabels for federal purchasing via a multistakeholder process based on international protocols. The EPA Recommendations of Specifications, Standards, and Ecolabels for Federal Purchasing provides a broad range of options. It is a resource for manufacturers and building owners outside the federal government, as well, to sort through the hundreds of standards and ecolabels in the marketplace.

**EB201-21 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Both EPDs and BEES can be used to reduce the impact on the environment. Further, the intention of the existing buildings credits is intended for inclusion in an operational policy for cycle renovations. Therefore, it is intended to provide a framework for sustainable products selection versus setting a specific number of products to comply. It is too limited of a scope for the framework to only include the EPA references.

**EB202-22 Public Comment:** 5.1.1.2.1 X number of Products that ~~include:~~

- ~~Are~~ Third-party ~~verified~~ ~~certified~~ as meeting multiple attribute sustainability standards ~~certifications~~ recommended by EPA at <https://www.epa.gov/greenerproducts/recommendations-specifications-standards-and-ecolabels-federal-purchasing>

Make the following a separate credit regarding Transparency not environmental preferability.

5.1.1.2.1b X number of products that:

- have published an Industry Average or Product Specific Environmental Product Declarations (EPDs)
- Being are listed on NIST's (National Institute of Standards and Technology) BEES (Building for Environmental and Economic Sustainability) database

**EB202-22 Reason:** The three approaches should not be given equal weight and treated as addressing the same issues. Depending on the certification, only the first approach – multi-attribute certification - confirms a product's environmental preferability. EPDs and BEES are important transparency tools, but do not indicate a product has a reduced impact on the environment.

A certain number of conformant products – or specific product categories – should be indicated for qualifying for this criterion.

EPA has developed a transparent, consistent approach to assessing and recommending standards and ecolabels for federal purchasing via a multistakeholder process based on international protocols. This could be a resource for manufacturers and building owners outside the federal government, as well, to sort through the hundreds of standards and ecolabels in the marketplace.

**EB202-22 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Both EPDs and BEES can be used to reduce the impact on the environment. Further, the intention of the existing buildings credits is for inclusion in an operational policy for cycle renovations. Therefore, it is intended to provide a framework for sustainable products selection versus setting a specific number of products to comply. It is too limited of a scope for the framework to only include the EPA references.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comments and reply with the proposed responses for EB201-21 and EB202-22.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

## **EB201-22 & EB202-23**

**EB201-22 Public Comment:** 5.1.1.2.4 Products that include:

- ~~Pre-consumer and Post-consumer~~ Recycled content per the US EPA Comprehensive Procurement Guidelines <https://www.epa.gov/smm/comprehensive-procurement-guideline-cpg-program#products>
- Biobased content (other than sustainable wood) per the USDA BioPreferred® program as indicated by the "FP" symbol. <https://www.biopreferred.gov/BioPreferred/faces/pages/ProductCategories.xhtml>

**EB201-22 Reason:** Without establishing some specific thresholds per product category, these are not effective or verifiable criteria. E.g., does 1% recycled content qualify? The federal government has done significant research via these programs that could be the basis for more effective criteria consistent with market readiness.

**EB201-22 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: It is too limited of a scope for the framework to only include two government references. We find this more specific for a new construction project versus cycle renovations in an existing buildings project.

**EB202-23 Public Comment:** 5.1.1.2.4 Products that include:

- ~~Pre-consumer and Post-consumer~~ Recycled content per the US EPA Comprehensive Procurement Guidelines <https://www.epa.gov/smm/comprehensive-procurement-guideline-cpg-program#products>
- Biobased content (other than sustainable wood) per the USDA BioPreferred® program as indicated by the "FP" symbol. <https://www.biopreferred.gov/BioPreferred/faces/pages/ProductCategories.xhtml>

**EB202-23 Reason:** Without establishing some specific thresholds per product category, these are not effective or verifiable criteria. The federal government has done significant research via these programs that could be the basis for more effective criteria consistent with market readiness.

**EB202-23 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: It is too limited of a scope for the framework to only include two government references. We find this more specific for a new construction project versus cycle renovations in an existing buildings project.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed responses for EB201-22 and EB202-23.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

## **EBMaterials-201**

**Proposed Revision:** 5.1.1.2 Policy that includes ~~P~~product selection standards for cycle renovations has have been developed that include ~~require~~ the following:

5.1.1.2.1 Products selection criteria that include:

- Third-party verified multiple attribute standard certifications
- Industry ~~Average or~~ Wide Environmental Product Declarations (EPDs)
- 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 criteria that include sustainable comparison and/or improvements as follows utilizing:

- If policy standardized product selection is compliant to 5.1.1.2.1 third-party verified multiple attribute standard certifications, the policy includes requirements for a higher level of certification based upon third party verified multiple attribute standard certifications for the same product type.
- If policy standardized product selection is compliant to 5.1.1.2.1 Industry Wide EPD and Product Specific EPD for the same product, the policy includes requirements for comparing products that demonstrate any impact reduction using the same PCR, functional unit, and LCA method. Product that is included in an Industry Average EPD and have subsequently produced a Product Specific EPD for the same product.
- If policy standardized product selection is compliant to 5.1.1.2.1 Product Specific EPD, the policy in requirements for products that includes 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), and functional unit are required to be the same for comparability.
- If policy standardized product selection is compliant to 5.1.1.2.1 product found in BEES database, does the policy require comparison of products within the same similar building products category utilizing NIST's BEES database, online analysis tool utilizing the 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 Recycled content
- 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).

Maximum = 5 points

Points can be combined between criteria that are included within the policy for product selection standards each listed option, but maximum points awarded will not exceed 5 points total for 5.1.1.2.

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

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

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- It was argued that it is clear that a lot of consideration and time went into developing the criteria by the Materials Subcommittee.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

Max Puchtel left the meeting.

### **EBMaterials-213**

**Proposed Revision:** 5.1.1.3 Select at least one formulated product that has a completed Occupant Exposure Screening Report (OESR) prepared in accordance with ASTM E3182-20 - Standard Practice for Preparing an Occupant Exposure Screening Report (OESR) for Substances in Installed Building Products or other third party

verified transparency documentation that ~~includes addresses~~ any chemical constituents that are carcinogenic, mutagenic, or reprotoxic (CMR) to reproduction or human development and related exposure risk.

Points are earned for discrete products with different functional uses that have an OESR, SDS, HPD, or equivalent labeling/certification that includes transparency and ingredient listing for specified products.

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

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was agreement that the word 'includes' should be 'addresses'.
- There was a question asked on what labeling is required or what the intent is.
- There was agreement that further discussion on the criteria should wait until the next meeting when more materials experts can be present at the meeting and answer questions.

**WITHDRAWN: The motion and second to accept was withdrawn.**

### **EBMaterials-203**

**Proposed Revision:** Not applicable when ~~there is no available existing~~ furniture ~~is not provided~~.

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

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- The exact wording of the N/A was discussed and agreed upon.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

The Secretariat stated that there was a loss of quorum before the previous vote for EBMaterials-203. She stated that with the loss, discussion will begin again on the previous proposal, EBMaterials-203 at the next meeting.

### **Public Participation**

There was no discussion.

### **New Business**

There was no discussion.

### **Action Items**

GBI staff stated that the next meeting is scheduled for March 23, 2023.

**The meeting ended at 2:22 PM EST.**