MINUTES
GBI Consensus Body for Existing Buildings - Call #2
Webinar/Teleconference
April 7, 2025, from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. ET

NOTE ALL TIMES ARE EASTERN TIME

Consensus Body Members in Attendance

Full Name	Company	4/7/25	3/31/25
Michael Cudahy	PPFA	X	X
Larry Eisenberg	Ovus Partners 360	X	X
Janis Fedorowick	Wavefront Planning and Design Incorporated	X	Absent
Buddy Humphries (Chair)	Efficient Green, LLC	X	X
Joe Menchefski	Advanced Glazings Ltd.	X (Proxy Cudahy)	Absent
John Mullen	IAPMO	Absent	X
James O'Brien	Independent Environmental Consultant	X	X
Sarah Puls	American Wood Council	X	X
David Ray	SRAAG	X	Absent
Jane Rohde	JSR Associates, Inc.	X	X
Jiri Skopek	JIri Skopek Architect	X	Absent
Frank X Sullivan	Kiewit	X (Proxy Fedorowick)	X
Kerry Sutton	American Concrete Institute (ACI)	X	Absent

Interested Parties in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	4/7/25	3/31/25
Viken Koukounian	Parklane		X

Staff in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	4/7/25	3/31/25
Emily Marx	Secretariat, GBI	X	X

Katy Johnson	Staff, GBI	X	
Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI		X

Roll Call & Welcome

Secretariat Emily Marx welcomed everyone to the meeting, 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.

Administrative Items

Chair Buddy Humphries thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Marx reviewed the agenda and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were no comments or concerns.

MOTION: A Motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda as presented.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Joe Menchefski

Jane Rohde, Janis Fedorowick, and Jiri Skopek joined the meeting.

ESG Revision Review

The Secretariat reviewed the revision before asking for a motion.

ESG-105

Proposed Revision: 1.3.1.1 Ownership/stakeholders have a written policy and/or action plan in place to support an organizational ~~corporate~~ culture of fairness and belonging ~~diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI)~~.

1 point

Discussion took place on the Proposed Revision:

- There was agreement that the revision should be updated to replace the word "corporate" with "organizational".

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 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Joe Menchefski

Site Revision Review

The Secretariat reviewed each revision before asking for a motion.

Site-103
Proposed Revision: Parking areas have Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure
that are either AC Level 2 minimum (240V in single-phase or 208V in three-phase projects) or Direct
Current Fast Charging (DCFC).

~~Parking areas have EV charging spaces and the electric infrastructure to support expansion of current~~
~~EV charging stations (EV ready).~~
For example, EV ready includes conduits in place to support installation of charging stations.

Maximum = 8 points
•Four points are earned for buildings when ≥5% of onsite parking spaces are equipped with electric
charging stations.
• Two additional points are earned for buildings when ≥10% of onsite parking spaces are equipped
with electric charging stations.
•Two points are earned for buildings when ≥30~~5~~% of onsite parking spaces are EV ready.
• Not applicable if the building is regularly unoccupied or does not have onsite parking.
Reason: SME Email
Change this to 30% or more. We had a long discussion of this. We should probably go back and
reconsider the EB language. The wording you have with 5% also begs the question of whether EV
ready includes EV equipped. If you agree with this then we don't need to take back to subcommittee
as it is just a wording clarification.

The EB standard should also be changed to specify Level 2 or DCFC.
Discussion took place on the Proposed Revision:
• It was stated that there shouldn't be any problem with adding the word minimum because Level 2
   are the stations currently being installed.
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 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.
Abstain: Joe Menchefski

There was discussion on the use of the word minimum and whether it's current location in the
revision made the most sense. There was agreement that the word placement in the revision was
correct and offered the best clarification for clients.

Site-108, Site-109, & Site-110

Site-108 Proposed Revision: 2.2.2.5 The following are incorporated in the project:

2.2.2.5.1 Secure bike shelters for minimum 10% of occupants

2.2.2.5.2 Bike or shared use [multi-use] paths/lanes that connect the site to the surrounding community

2.2.2.5.3 Changing facilities with lockers and/or showers

Site-108 Reason: SME: Do I understand that multi-user paths (e.g. sidewalks) are no longer acceptable? I think "multi-user" should be added for clarity and consistency.

Site-109 Proposed Revision: 2.2.1.3 A comprehensive site plan has been developed and implemented that includes all areas of site improvement, including as applicable floodplain impacts, access to walking trails, bike or shared use [multi-use] paths, outdoor respite, and outdoor community spaces (i.e., community gardens, farmers' markets, etc.) on or adjacent to the building or campus.

Site-109 Reason: SME: Do I understand that multi-user paths (e.g. sidewalks) are no longer acceptable? I think "multi-user" should be added for clarity and consistency.

Site-110 Proposed Revision: shared use [multi-use] path: a form of infrastructure that supports multiple transportation opportunities, such as walking, bicycling and inline skating. A multi-use path is physically separated from motor vehicular traffic.

Discussion took place on the Proposed Revision:

- There was agreement to keep "bike" and add "or multi-user".
- The New Construction Standard definition for "shared use [multi-use] path" was reviewed. There was discussion on the definition of 'multi-user' path. Different options to add better clarification to the definition were discussed. There was agreement to add the definition into the Existing Buildings Standard.
- It was argued that different parts of the country separate paths differently and that the criteria should not be too limiting.
- A member stated how campuses would be able to achieve this criterion opposed to other project ty pes.
- There was discussion on the barrier requirement and whether a yellow line would be considered a barrier. It was argued that it is considered a barrier.
- It was asked if it should be "multi-user" or "multi-use" and there was agreement that the revision should be "multi-use."

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revisions, Site-108, Site-109, & Site-110.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 7 in favor, 3 opposed, 1 abstained.

Opposed: James O'Brien, Janis Fedorowick, Frank Sullivan

Abstain: Joe Menchefski

Energy Revision Review

The Secretariat reviewed each revision before asking for a motion.

Energy-115

Proposed Revision: 3.1.1 ENERGY ~~CONSUMPTION~~PERFORMANCE

Path A, B, C, D, or E

Five paths are available for assessing energy ~~consumption~~ 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 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Joe Menchefski

Energy-116

Proposed Revision: Maximum = 4 points or N/A

• Four points are earned when 100% of equipment is energy efficient.

• Three points are earned when ≥75 to <100% of equipment is energy efficient.

• Two points are earned when ≥50 to <75% of equipment is energy efficient.

• One point is earned when ≥25 to <50% of equipment is energy efficient.

• No points are earned when <25% systems are energy efficient.

• Not applicable if there are no water heaters.

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 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Joe Menchefski

Materials Revision Review

A member of the Site/Materials Subcommittee reviewed each public comment or revision before making a motion.

EB103-1

Public Comment: Select at least ~~one~~ four formulated product~~s~~ that include a third-party verified transparency documentation that addresses any chemical constituents that are carcinogenic, mutagenic, or reprotoxic (CMR) to reproduction or human development and related exposure *risk.* ~~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~~ Points are earned for discrete products ~~with different functional uses~~ that have an Occupant Exposure Screening Report (OESR), Safety Data Sheet

(SDS), <u>Health Product Declaration (HPD)</u>, <u>third-party verified multiple attribute standard certifications that include ingredient transparency reporting</u> or equivalent labeling, ~~/~~<u>certification</u>, <u>or declaration</u> that includes transparency and ingredient listing for specified products.

<u>Move the ASTM Standard reference to the Technical Manual:</u>
<u>ASTM E3182-20 - Standard Practice for Preparing an Occupant Exposure Screening Report (OESR) for Substances in Installed Building Products</u>

<u>Update the Technical Manual:</u>
<u>Add the multiple attribute standards and certifications to this section that are also included in Section 5.1.1.2.1.</u>
Reason: When the Materials language was developed, the OESR standard was relatively new and was created to provide a methodology and process for evaluating ingredients in products by including risk and exposure as part of the evaluation. This avoids utilizing a "red list" approach that does not include evaluation of risk, exposure, and performance requirements of a product for a specific application. At the time the current language was provided, it was anticipated that manufacturers would utilize this methodology and a database of products would be developed through various program operators. Unfortunately, that did not occur and created difficulty for those wanting to comply with the criteria. The language was updated to include SDSs and HPDs to provide ingredient transparency documentation, however being that an OESR database has yet to occur, providing a general requirement for ingredient transparency reporting would be more appropriate versus the standard requirement highlighted. In addition, as more manufacturers have been completing Health Product Declarations, increasing the requirement from 1 to 4 products is reasonable as currently more declarations are available for various types of products. To provide more flexibility for the specifier "different functional uses" was removed, as having an HPD for various flooring products, wallcovering products, furniture products, etc. would be discrete and different products, but could have same functional use and provide a framework for selecting more products with transparency ingredient reporting to support the increased number of products required. Third-party verified multiple attribute standard certifications were added as a means of compliance, because most of the multiple attribute standard certifications have been updated to include transparency ingredient reporting. Similar to the inclusion and requirement of EPDs in multiple attribute standards and certifications, most require ingredient reporting.

For the Technical Manual, it is recommended to move the ASTM Standard reference to the Technical Manual and add the multiple attribute standards and certifications that are also included in Section 5.1.1.2.1. Note that the Technical Manual and related questions for Green Globes would need to be reviewed and updated with these recommendations. It would be recommended to simplify the "Levels" provided in the manual and in the Green Globes questions to allow this credit to be more achievable by the users.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The language was updated to add clarification on transparency versus related exposure and risk as HPDs and SDS are used as transparency documentation. We accepted that one point is awarded for four products.

5.1.1.3 Select at least ~~one~~ four ~~formulated~~ installed building product~~s~~ that includes ~~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 ~~addresses~~ identifies any chemical constituents that are carcinogenic, mutagenic, or reprotoxic (CMR) to reproduction or human development~~,~~ ~~and related exposure risk~~. 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, Safety Data Sheet (SDS), Health Product Declaration (HPD), third-party verified multiple attribute standard certifications that include ingredient transparency reporting or equivalent labeling, /certification, or declaration that includes transparency and ingredient listing for specified products

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~~.

Maximum = 4 points

Points are earned where products include third-party verified ingredient transparency reporting: ~~undergo a screening-level product risk assessment:~~
• Four points are earned for ~~4~~ 16 or more products.
• Three points are earned for ~~3~~ 12 products.
• Two points are earned for ~~2~~ 8 products.
• One point is earned for ~~1~~ 4 products.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was discussion on the number of products increasing from one to four.
- The use of the phrase "formulated products" versus "building products" was discussed. The criteria in 5.1.1.2 was also reviewed and it was argued that the criteria should be consistent.
- The number of carcinogenic products in a building and whether it should be zero was discussed. It was argued that the criteria is only on the aspect of reporting products.
- It was noted that the database that is part of ASTM E3182-20 did not get a lot of support from the industry like everyone hoped, and the revision is to make this topic more achievable for clients.
- It was argued that the criteria and the references included are not about comparing products but about being transparent on what is installed.

- The criteria and the intention were discussed and whether certain aspects of this topic are built into existing code.
- There was discussion on the point hierarchy in the proposal and it was added into the response to the commenter.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstained.

Abstain: Joe Menchefski, Jiri Skopek, Kerry Sutton

EB103-3

Public Comment: 5.1.2.2 There is a list of environmentally preferred products used in housekeeping and building maintenance based ~~upon~~ on the building type application.

Add the following resources in the Technical Manual.
Products that support the compliance of 5.1.2.2 criteria can be found on the following databases:
1. Design for the Environment (DfE) -Certified Disinfectants are available at
https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-labels/dfe-certified-disinfectants.
2. Safer Choice-Certified Products, an EPA Pollution Prevention (P2) Program:
https://www.epa.gov/saferchoice
3. For healthcare and related settings, EPA provides lists of Registered Disinfectants that are utilized based on pathogens: https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/selected-epa-registered-disinfectants and Emerging Viral Pathogens are specifically found in List Q:
https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/disinfectants-emerging-viral-pathogens-evps-list-q.
These lists can be cross referenced with DfE and Safer Choice chemicals and it is recommended to review with the Infection Control and/or Quality Assurance personnel when completing the Green Globes survey.
4. Certified products are available in the ecomedes database: https://products.ecomedes.com/
Reason: The criteria recommendation is editorial; however, the Technical Reference information is Substantive. Currently technical information does not provide resources for understanding and finding chemicals and related information that would be considered environmentally preferrable. These are typically found in the various EPA lists and certified product databases and in the ecomedes product database. This is particularly important for healthcare projects utilizing the GBI/ANSI Standard and related Green Globes survey. Discussing the information with the environmental services team – contract or in-house is important for all projects as cleaning, sanitizing, and disinfecting chemicals can reduce impacts to staff and building users.
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 on the Editorial Public Comment:

- There were no comments or concerns on the editorial revision.

EB103-4

Public Comment: For ~~fluorescent and high-intensity discharge~~ lamps and ballasts the following are available:

5.2.1.3.1 A designated, secured storage area for replacement lamps and ballasts.

5.2.1.3.2 A designated, secured recycling/disposal area <u>for lamps and/or ballasts</u>.

Reason: With the utilization of LEDs and replacing other types of lamps with LEDs – all types of lamping need to be considered for recycling. In evaluation of different types of lamping there are facilities and big box stores that will recycle not only fluorescent and HID lamps, but also LED and incandescent. The proposal is to generalize the lamp types so that all would require a place for storage and recycled disposal. No recommendations to point changes are provided.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. We shoudl recycle all types of bulbs but only need secured storage for fluorescent and high-intensity discharge lamps and ballasts.

For ~~fluorescent and high-intensity discharge~~ lamps and ballasts the following are available:

5.2.1.3.1 A designated, secured storage area for replacement <u>fluorescent and high-intensity discharge</u> lamps and ballasts.

5.2.1.3.2 A designated, secured recycling/disposal area <u>for lamps and/or ballasts</u>.

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, 2 abstained.

Abstain: Joe Menchefski, Jiri Skopek

EB103-2

Public Comment: The following is the recommended update for point allocations for 5.1.1.3 based on Comment: EB103-1:

Maximum = 4 points

Points are earned where products <u>include third-party verified ingredient transparency reporting:</u> ~~undergo a screening-level product risk assessment:~~

• Four points are earned for ~~4~~ <u>16</u> or more products.

• Three points are earned for ~~3~~ <u>12</u> products.

• Two points are earned for ~~2~~ <u>8</u> products.

• One point is earned for ~~1~~ <u>4</u> product<u>s</u>.

Reason: This proposal aligns with proposal EB103-1 as a recommendation for the description and re-allocation of points based on the number of products included in proposal EB103-1 for section 5.1.1.3. The language and description for compliance is updated to align with the change in the requirements and the points do not change from the total, only the number of products that are required to receive points.

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, 2 abstained.

Abstain: Joe Menchefski, Jiri Skopek

IEQ Revision Review

The Secretariat reviewed each revision before asking for a motion.

IEQ-117

Proposed Revision: 6.6.1 ACOUSTICAL ~~PROGRAM~~ PERFORMANCE 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 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Joe Menchefski

IEQ-116

Proposed Revision: The potable water has been tested onsite within the last three years ~~at least annually~~ and if the water quality report indicates needs for improvement there is a remediation policy.

Reason: SME: I am disappointed that annual testing would now be required. From my perspective every 3 to 5 years would be more than adequate since infrastructure (water treatment) changes and services to the building are slow to change. From my experience there is not much uptake on this criteria as it is, but I would like to see more uptake in the EB program. To me this is added expense and effort with no real value added especially when looking across all the nation-wide properties.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reconsider the previous motion made on March 31, 2025, and accept the updated proposed revision.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was argued that the language should be kept at the original proposal to test the potable water annually. It was noted that it is not expensive to get a water test and there are many factors that could happen within three years for a building that may change the water quality.
- It was noted that the water quality report comes the water utility and that it would be best practice for the building to test the potable water that is coming in.

VOTE: The Motion fails with 2 in favor, 8 opposed, 1 abstained.

Opposed: Dave Ray, Jane Rohde, Janis Fedorowick, Frank Sullivan, Kerry Sutton, Larry Eisenberg, Mike Cudahy, Sarah Puls

Abstain: Joe Menchefski

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the latest proposal for IEQ-116.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was discussion on where the client would get the water quality report.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstained.

Opposed: James O'Brien

Abstain: Joe Menchefski, Jiri Skopek

Public Participation

There was no discussion.

New Business

There was no discussion.

Review Schedule

Marx stated that the next Public Comment Period will begin later this month, and the next Consdensus Body and/or subcommittee meetings will occur in early summer to discuss any comments received.

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

Meeting adjourned at 3:28 PM EST.