

Minutes
Consensus Body Meeting #34
BSR/GBI 01-2016
Webinar
Tuesday, January 30, 2018, from 12:00 PM ET to 3:00 PM ET

Attendance:

No	Name	Organization(s)	5-17-17	5-18-17	5-19-17	1-30-18		
1	Gregg Bergmiller	S/L/A/M Collaborative	X	X	Absent	X		
2	Paul Bertram	PRB Connect	X	X (by proxy)	X (by proxy)	X (by proxy)		
3	Allan Bilka	International Code Council	X	X	X	X		
4	Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X	X	X (by proxy last 2 hours)	X		
5	William Carroll	American Chemistry Council	X	X	Absent	X		
6	John Cross	American Institute of Steel Construction	X	X	X	Absent		
7	Mike Cudahy	Plastic Pipe and Fittings, Association	X	X	X	X		
8	Chris Dixon	NBBJ (rep. self)	X	X (by Proxy)	X (by Proxy)	X		
9	Nicole Dovel-Moore	CTA Architects Engineers	X	X	X	Absent		
10	David Eldridge	Grumman/Butkus Assoc.	X	X	X	X		
11	William Freeman	Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X	X	X	X		
12	Susan Gitlin	U.S. EPA	X	X (partial proxy)	X (partial proxy)	X		
13	Don Horn	GSA	X	X	X	X		
14	Josh Jacobs	UL Environment	X	X	Absent	X		
15	Greg Johnson	Johnson Consulting Services, Greenscape Alliance	X	X	X	X		
16	Karen Joslin	Joslin Consulting	X	X	X	X		
17	Malee Kaolawanich	NIH (rep. self)	Absent	Absent	Absent			
18	Rachel Minnery	AIA	X	X (partial proxy)	X (partial proxy)	X		
19	Charles Kibert	University of Florida	X (Chair)	X	X (Chair for part of the meeting)	X		
20	Gary Keclik	Keclik Associates	X	X	X	X		

21	Thomas Pape	Alliance for Water Efficiency	X	X	Absent	X		
22	Tien Peng	National Ready Mix Concrete Assn.	X	X	X	X		
23	Jane Rohde	JSR Assoc. Inc., Vinyl Institute	X (by Proxy)	X (by Proxy)	X (by Proxy)	X		
24	Gord Shymko	G.F. Shymko & Associates, Inc.	X	X	X	X		
25	Kent Sovocool	Southern Nevada Water Authority	X	X	X	X		
26	Steve Strawn	JELD-WEN	Absent	Absent	Absent			
27	George Thompson	Chemical Compliance Systems, Inc.	X (by Proxy)	X (by Proxy)	X (by Proxy)	X (by proxy)		
28	Angela Tin	American Lung Assn.	X	X	X	Absent		
29	Douglas Tucker	Misubishi Electric Cooling & Heating	X	X	X	X		
Voting Alternates								
	Abby Brokaw	American Lung Assn. (voting Alternate for Angela Tin)						
	Paul Karrer	AIA (Alternate for Rachel Minnery)						
	Bill Hoffman	UL Environment (Voting Alternate for Josh Jacobs)						
	Lance Davis	GSA (Voting Alternate for Don Horn)						
	D'Lane Wisner	D'Lane Wisner (Voting Alternate for William Carroll)						
TOTALS			27/29	27/29	23/29			
Visitors								
	Martha VanGeem	Self (Principal Engineer)	X	X	X	X		
	Ric Doedens	Logison			X			
	Richard Willis	NAPA	X	X				
	Kyle Thompson	IAPMO	X					
	Niklas Moeller	LogiSon			X			
	Barbara Clarke	JL Architects				X		
	Dave Panning	BIFMA				X		
	Brent Mecham	Irrigation Association				X		
Staff/Consultants								
	Michael Lehman	Chair	Absent	X	X	X		
	Vicki Worden	Executive Director, GBI						

	Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI	n/a	n/a	n/a	X		
	Emily Randolph	Secretariat Asst., GBI	X	X	X	n/a		
	Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI	X	X	X	X		
	Maria Woodbury	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X	X		
	Kim Goldsworthy	Roberts-Rules Consulting	X	X	X	X		

Tuesday, January 30, 2018

Welcome & Roll Call

Secretariat, Maria Woodbury, welcomed participants and conducted roll call to establish quorum. The anti-trust statement and code of conduct were reviewed, and participants were requested to comply with both fully.

Woodbury reminded members that all are welcome to participate in the discussion provided participants raise their hands.

Additional updates included: the roster hasn't changed since last meeting. This meeting was recorded to help with the preparation of minutes. Only GBI staff and consultants will access to the recording and an opportunity was given to voice concerns about the recording. No concerns were raised. Finally, the GBI update – Emily is no longer with GBI. Sara Rademacher is a GBI staff member who will be assisting with the ANSI process going forward.

At this meeting, no members voted using voter alternates and 2 members voted using a proxy (Jane Rohde for George Thompson for part of the meeting and Chris Dixon for Paul Bertram).

Administrative Items

Chair, Michael Lehman, made his opening comments, thanking everyone for their time and expertise. Lehman provided an overview of the agenda for the day and reminded members that discussion will be led in the order hands are raised. He also asked that participants keep on topic during the discussions.

Meeting minutes from Consensus Body Meeting #33 on August 24, 2017 were approved with no discussion or objections.

Schedule Going Forward:

Woodbury gave an overview of 3rd Comment Period. Advising it's anticipated that 2-3 more Consensus Body meetings will be required to complete the process before the Standard is ready to submit to ANSI. The next steps include sending responses to public comments to the commenters, there will be a 15-day period for commenters to submit objections to the response. Staff will work to resolve objections from the second public comment period. A recirculation ballot is required, and a meeting will be held to discuss that process. Final paperwork and documentation will be submitted to ANSI for review and publication. The hope is to complete the process by midyear 2018.

Discussion:

One participant expressed concern that the 3rd Public Comment Period Comment Form instructions stated that no action would be taken on substantive comments that were submitted during this period. Participant expressed concern that this perception may have prevented additional substantive comment submittals. Participant also expressed that making substantive changes and then sending it out for public comment is at odds with the GBI procedure 8.2.

Secretariat stated that the Consensus Body will respond to every comment submitted in accordance with GBI procedures. Only the limited revisions were subject to public comment during the 3rd Public Comment Period. Per procedures there are not limits to what commenters can submit on the limited revisions and procedures will be followed to consider and address each comment.

Another participant stated that it is appropriate for the Consensus Body to have a disclaimer as to what may or may not be changed during the comment period and that the Consensus Body will respond appropriately to all submitted comments.

Lehman commented that any substantive changes made will be subject to public comment. However, it was appropriate for the Consensus Body to review a comment that was submitted as substantive and determine the comment was editorial. And then determine how the Consensus Body will address it.

One participant asked if the Standard will be published within six months. Woodbury commented that the goal is mid-year to submit the revised draft Standard to ANSI.

One participant asked if there had been any Subcommittee meetings. Woodbury responded that the Chair and Vice Chairs of the Subcommittees discussed comments pertaining to their Assessment Area and drafted the proposed responses based on previous Subcommittee discussions on the issues raised by the commenters.

Subcommittee Updates**Water Efficiency comments**

Presented by Subcommittee Chair, Kent Sovocool

5-3. Editorial. 5.1:

- **Comment:** Revise definition of “potable water” to read “water that meets the requirements of the authority having jurisdiction and is satisfactory for drinking, culinary, and domestic purposes.”
- **Reason:** Satisfactory is a subjective term; drinking water standards are defined by federal, state, or local authorities.
- **Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: the existing language is consistent with national plumbing codes.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed response to the comment.

Discussion that took place on the motion:

- A participant pointed out, to be consistent with past responses, this is an unactionable comment. The word “satisfactory” was not formatted as changed language in the Limited Revisions, so it is unavailable for comment. That should be stated as well.

AMENDMENT: An Amendment was made and seconded to reject the comment and change the response as follows: “Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected as unactionable. At this time, the text suggested for deletion is not subject to public comment.”

Objections were raised.

Discussion took place on the amendment:

- A participant speaking against the amendment expressed that it should be actionable because the definition was changed in the Standard draft.
- Another participant stated that it was their understanding that only parts of the Standard that were modified were open to public comment. Lehman confirmed this and reiterated that the Consensus Body must follow the procedures.

VOTE: The Amendment carried with 18 in favor, 3 opposed, 1 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin, Thomas Pape, Tien Peng

Abstained: Don Horn

Discussion took place on the amended motion:

- One participant pointed out the original proposed response does not match the motion that just carried. A motion was made to accept the proposed response as amended. There was clarification from another participant that the motion on the table is accepting the proposed response, as amended.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 18 in favor, 2 opposed, 2 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin, Thomas Pape,

Abstained: Don Horn, Jeff Bradley

Materials comments

Presented by Subcommittee Chair, Charles Kibert

7-1. Substantive. 5.1

Comment: pre-consumer recycled content: the portion of *recycled material* in a product diverted from the waste stream during a manufacturing process. Materials or scrap that have been reutilized (i.e., reworked, reground or ~~scrap generation in a process and capable of being~~ reclaimed) within the same process that generated it) are excluded.

Reason: It is clear that the revisions to the definition to pre-consumer recycled content were intended to clarify that materials both generated and reused in the same process should not be considered pre-consumer recycled content. However, the changes to the text are still difficult to interpret. We suggest reorganizing the sentence for further clarification

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected. The Consensus Body did not find your comment persuasive enough to warrant the modification of the existing Standard language at this stage of the current review cycle. There will be public and Stakeholder notifications of the next review cycle and you are encouraged to re-submit your comment at that time.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the motion:

- One participant expressed agreement with an earlier participant’s statement that the Consensus Body should accept substantive comments.
- A Subcommittee participant provided background that this Section of the Standard has been discussed many times over the last three years during the previous two comment periods and that the Subcommittee and Consensus Body have agreed on the current technical approach. No new information submitted as part of this comment that would merit changing the language.
- Another participant agreed with the intent of the response but suggested that it be changed from a template response to be more specific to the comment.
- A participant suggested using the same response for this comment as the next comment 7-2.

AMENDMENT: The Amendment was made and seconded to change the response to the same language as the proposed response for 7-2: “The Materials Subcommittee and Consensus Body have previously discussed and reached consensus on this language.”

Objections were raised.

Discussion that took place on the Amendment:

- Participant stated that these are just process comments. None were yellow.

VOTE: The Amendment carried with 20 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin, Jeff Bradley

Abstained: none

Discussion took place on the Amended Motion: One participant posed the question of whether the statement related to not being open to public comment should be added to the response.

VOTE: The Amended Motion carried with 18 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin, Don Horn

Abstained: Karen Joslin

7-2. Substantive. 10.6.1

Comment: Replace deleted final bullet with: For each recycling facility used, it should be noted whether the recycling operation is certified by government or a third-party independent certifier.

Reason: We strongly disagree with the removal of language in the pre-construction waste management plan requiring upfront consideration and documentation of a facility’s certification status. Using only recycling facilities that are government or third-party certified ensures regulations are followed and curbs sham recycling. Inclusion of this requirement in the pre-construction waste management plan will help teams identify available certified facilities ahead of time and set realistic waste management goals.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected. The Consensus Body did not find your comment persuasive enough to warrant the modification of the existing Standard language at this stage of the current review cycle. The Materials Subcommittee and Consensus Body have previously discussed and reached consensus on this language. There will be public and Stakeholder notifications of the next review cycle and you are encouraged to re-submit your comment at that time.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- One participant agreed that this topic had been discussed and accepted at the Subcommittee level between the first and second review drafts. A comment was addressed during the Second Comment Period after language was added that requested that the whole Section be pared down. In later discussions, the commenter was not in attendance, but hoped the discussion

would go over the possibility of merging the new comment with the old comment that has been accepted. Participant questions if this comment has been fully considered after the second comment period.

- A member speaking in favor of the comment clarified that this was discussed extensively and while that member supports the comment, the group consensus was in favor of the current language.
- Another participant agreed with the summary of discussion from the first public comment period. That comment stated that it “shall” be certified. The consensus was it should not be required, but it should be noted. The current language was a compromise from the first comment period, and now it's gone.
- It was stated that it would be appropriate to provide more rationale in the responses regarding why/how the technical decision to inform the commenter better.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 19 in favor, 2 opposed, 2 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin, Rachel Minnery

Abstained: Don Horn, Kent Sovocool

7-3. Editorial. 10.6.1.2

Comment: A description of ~~whether the processing of materials~~ are managed through source ~~separate separation or comingling by a comingled waste hauler;~~

Reason: The sentence “A description of the processing of materials through source separate or by a comingled waste hauler” is unclear.

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

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

Discussion took place on the motion:

- One participant confirmed that editorial changes can be accepted without requiring additional public comment. The Chair confirmed.

VOTE: The motion carried with 24 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

None opposed.

None abstained.

7-4. Substantive. 10.6.1.2

Comment: A statement that describes if a legitimate waste recycling facility was used whether it was certified by a government or a third-party independent certifier ~~non-government organization.~~

Reason: Waste recycling facilities are either certified by government or by third-party organizations. We suggest changing the language to reflect this convention and ensure consistency with certification language found elsewhere in this section.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected. The Consensus Body did not find your comment persuasive enough to warrant the modification of the existing Standard language at this stage of the current review cycle. The Materials Subcommittee and Consensus Body have previously discussed and reached consensus on this language. There will be public and Stakeholder notifications of the next review cycle and you are encouraged to re-submit your comment at that time.

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

VOTE: The motion carried with 20 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin

Abstained: Rachel Minnery

7-5. Editorial. 10.6.1.2

Comment: The organization and contact information of the author of the waste management summary report and the name and contact information of the person(s) at the off-site recycling facility (or facilities) responsible for ~~date~~ data collection and reporting.

Reason: Multiple off-site recycling facilities may be the recipients of waste. The standard should reflect this point. There also appears to be an error in the use of “date” as opposed to “data” collected by the facility.

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

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

VOTE: The Motion carried with 24 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

None opposed.

None abstained.

7-6. Substantive. 10.6.3.1

Comment: ~~Discarded Waste~~ materials ~~resulting from~~ generated from the recycling of an external waste stream as an incoming material should not be considered a “discarded material” and should not appear in either the denominator or numerator.

Reason: The term “waste generation” is commonly used to capture wastes generated from different activities, e.g., construction and demolition activities. For example, the full annual amount of construction and demolition waste materials is labeled as “generated” and it is subsequently managed either through landfilling or diversion from landfills. We recommend using the term “generated” instead of “discarded”. The term “generated” does not have the same regulatory weight as the term “discarded”. We understand that not all instances of the use of the term “discarded” are open for comment. However, we recommend that the term be replaced with “generated” in the text that is open for comment when it is not tied to the text that cannot be changed.

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

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

VOTE: The Motion carried with 21 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstained.

Opposed: Thomas Pape

Abstained: Kent Sovocool

Discussion took place after the motion:

- A clarifying Question was raised and answered that this comment was submitted as substantive by the commenter, but in review it was determined this is an editorial change and not a substantive change.

7-7. Substantive. 10.6.3.1

Comment: The Adjusted Diversion Rate is the Diversion Rate is multiplied by 1.5 for products that have been produced or manufactured in a facility that meets the ~~following~~ standards and certification programs: noted below. The Adjusted Diversion Rate must be noted as such.

Reason: We strongly disagree with the modification of the Diversion Rate as written in the standard. Multiplying the diversion rate by 1.5 without noting so misrepresents the actual diversion rate. We

support waste minimization along the supply chain but believe that the most appropriate way to do so is to introduce another term like an “adjusted diversion rate”.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected due to the fact that the diversion rates are noted by the certifications listed in the criterion language.

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

VOTE: The motion carried with 22 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin

Abstained: Kent Sovocool

5-4. Editorial. 10.3.1

Comment: “. . .based on the product’s intended use, concentration of each chemical constituent within the product, and ~~completion of a peer reviewed~~ use of a generally accepted exposure model in accordance with 10.3.2 . . . “

Reason: It is not clear what has to be peer reviewed – the risk assessment conducted per the criterion or the exposure model used to conduct the evaluation. Requiring peer review of the actual risk assessment would be expensive and time consuming. I do not believe that all common exposure models have been “peer reviewed” per se, but all are generally recognized as being acceptable.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected. The Consensus Body did not find your comment persuasive enough to warrant the modification of the existing Standard language at this stage of the current review cycle. The Materials Subcommittee and Consensus Body have previously discussed and reached consensus on this language. There will be public and Stakeholder notifications of the next review cycle and you are encouraged to re-submit your comment at that time.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed response to the comment.

Discussion took place on the motion:

- A participant stated they don’t agree that this is an editorial change and instead feel it is substantive because the term “peer reviewed” has a specific meaning that is not the same as “generally accepted”. Another participant agreed that the two terms can’t be used interchangeably.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 16 in favor, 4 opposed, 2 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin, Allan Bilka, Karen Joslin, Thomas Pape

Abstained: Josh Bradley, Rachel Minnery

5-5. Editorial. 10.3.1 Informational Reference

Comment: Per 5-1 – revise Informational References text to read “. . . allowed by regulatory authorities, e.g. REACH, EPA, Health Canada or other ~~authoritative~~ sources. OR keep the definition for “authoritative” in Section 5.1

Reason: The use of “authoritative” is redundant and is no longer defined.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your editorial comment. Your comment on the Informational References has been accepted and the editorial changes have been implemented in the Informational References section which is not part of the Standard criteria and can be changed editorially.

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

Discussion took place on the motion:

- A participant stated this is not an editorial comment because an argument could be made that the word “authoritative” could be considered stronger than “sources”.

- Woodbury reminded the Consensus Body that Informational References are not subject to the ANSI process. Therefore, this suggestion provided by the commenter is being handled as an editorial change.
- A participant speaking against the motion stated there is a degree of vagueness.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 17 in favor, 4 opposed, 2 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin, Kent Sovocool, Gary Keclik, Don Horn

Abstained: Allan Bilka, Karen Joslin

5-1. Editorial. 5.1

Comment: Maintain the definition of “authoritative” or delete it from Section 10.3.1.

Reason: “authoritative” is used in Section 10.3.1 – Informational References (page 75)

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected due to action taken on comment 5-5 to resolve the issue.

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

VOTE: The Motion carried with 20 in favor, 3 opposed, 1 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin, Thomas Pape, Don Horn

Abstained: Karen Joslin

Indoor Environmental Quality Comments

Presented by Subcommittee Vice Chair, Chris Dixon

1-2. Editorial. New

Comment: The measured overall level is within 0.5dBA of that specified.

Reason: Create Section 11.5.2.2 to describe performance criteria for sound masking system to be applied in all areas defined in section 11.5.2.1 as was the case in the approved draft (see attached)

ANSI/GBI 01-201X :

Green Building Assessment Protocol for Commercial

Buildings Public Comment Draft 2 - October 27, 2016

11.5.1.2 Design complies with minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) ratings of floor/ceiling assemblies, walls and doors between acoustically separated areas (e.g. learning spaces), and adjacent spaces as follows and as applicable:

Maximum = 2 points.

- **11.5.1.2.1:** STC-45 where the adjacent space is a corridor, stair, office, or conference room;
- **11.5.1.2.2:** STC-50 where the adjacent space is a quiet area, speech clinic, health clinic, classroom, or an exterior wall; or
- **11.5.1.2.3:** Floor Ceiling Assemblies: Designed to meet a minimum STC 50 rating. (Stacked non-

- Two points are earned where two or more of the listed measures is employed.
- One point is earned where one of the listed measures is employed.

H.5.2 Sound Maskine System

<p><u>11.5.2.1 The building design incorporates a sound masking system with an overall level specified to an A-weighted decibel (dBA) value within the following spaces and ranges:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.5.2.1.1: Offices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <u>Open:</u> 45-48dBA o <u>Enclosed:</u> 35-45dBA o <u>Meeting /Conference:</u> 30-45dBA o <u>Circulation:</u> 45-48dBA • 11.5.2.1.2: Healthcare <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <u>Patient room:</u> 40-48dBA o <u>Private offices and exam/treatment room:</u> 35-45dBA o <u>Waiting area:</u> 45-48dBA o <u>Corridor and Public Spaces:</u> 45-48dBA o <u>Circulation:</u> 45-48dBA • 11.5.2.1.3: Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <u>All other areas where speech privacy, concentration, or sleep/relaxation is required:</u> 35-48-dBA <p><u>Informational Reference(s):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASTM E1374-06, Open Office Guide</u> • <u>FGI Guidelines, 2014</u> • <u>Facilities Guideline Institute, "Sound & Vibration", 2010</u> • <u>GSA, Facilities Standards, PI00, 2014</u> • <u>GSA, Sound Materials, 2012</u> 	<p>13. points</p>
<p>11.5.2.2 The measured overall level is within 0.5dBA of that specified.</p>	<p>Point TBD</p>
<p>11.5.2.3 The measured spectrum conforms to the National Research Council's COPE Optimum Masking frequency range and 1/3 octave band levels, or the project acoustician's specified 1/3 octave band levels, within +/-2.0dB.</p>	<p>Point TBD</p>

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected. The Consensus Body did not find your comment persuasive enough to warrant the modification of the existing Standard language at this stage of the current review cycle. There will be public and Stakeholder notifications of the next review cycle and you are encouraged to re-submit your comment at that time.

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

Discussion took place on the motion:

- An overview of Sound Masking was provided.
- It was suggested that a number of the references have been updated and should be reviewed before the final draft is published. Clarification was provided that this will be part of the work done in continuous maintenance.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 20 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin, Thomas Pape

None abstained

1-3. Editorial. New

Comment: The measured spectrum conforms to the National Research Council's COPE Optimum Masking frequency range and 1/3 octave band levels, or the project acoustician's specified 1/3 octave band levels, with +/-2.0dB

Reason: Create Section 11.5.2.3 to describe performance criteria for sound masking system to be applied in all areas defined in section 11.5.2.1 as was the case in the approved draft (see attached)

11.5.1.2 Design complies with minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) ratings of floor/ceiling assemblies, walls and doors between acoustically separated areas (e.g. learning spaces), and adjacent spaces as follows and as applicable:

Maximum = 2 points.

- **11.5.1.2.1:** STC-45 where the adjacent space is a corridor, stair, office, or conference room;
- **11.5.1.2.2:** STC-50 where the adjacent space is a quiet area, speech clinic, health clinic, classroom, or an exterior wall; or
- **11.5.1.2.3:** Floor Ceiling Assemblies: Designed to meet a minimum STC 50 rating. (Stacked non-

- Two points are earned where two or more of the listed measures is employed.
- One point is earned where one of the listed measures is employed.

H.5.2 Sound Masking System	
<p><u>11.5.2.1 The building design incorporates a sound masking system with an overall level specified to an A-weighted decibel (dBA) value within the following SQaces and ranges:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.5.2.1.1: Offices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <u>Open:</u> 45-48dBA o <u>Enclosed:</u> 35-45dBA o <u>Meeting /Conference:</u> 30-45dBA o <u>Circulation:</u> 45-48dBA • 11.5.2.1.2: Healthcare <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <u>Patient room:</u> 40-48dBA o <u>Private offices and exam/treatment room:</u> 35-45dBA o <u>Waiting area:</u> 45-48dBA o <u>Corridor and Public SQaces:</u> 45-48dBA o <u>Circulation:</u> 45-48dBA • 11.5.2.1.3: Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <u>All other areas where speech privacy, concentration, or sleep/relaxation is required:</u> 35-48-dBA <p><u>Informational Reference(s):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ASTM E1374-06, Open Office Guide</u> • <u>FGI Guidelines, 2014</u> • <u>Facilities Guideline Institute, "Sound & Vibration", 2010</u> • <u>GSA, Facilities Standards, PI00, 2014</u> • <u>GSA, Sound Matters, 2012</u> 	13. points
11.5.2.2 The measured overall level is within 0.5dBA of that specified.	Point TBD
11.5.2.3 The measured spectrum conforms to the National Research Council's <u>COPE optimum Masking frequency range and 1/3 octave band levels, or the project acoustician's specified 1/3 octave band levels, within +/-2.0dB.</u>	Point TBD

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected. The Consensus Body did not find your comment persuasive enough to warrant the modification of the existing Standard language at this stage of the current review cycle. There will be public and Stakeholder notifications of the next review cycle and you are encouraged to re-submit your comment at that time.

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

Discussion took place on the motion:

- A participant asked why the comments had so many typographical errors in them.

- Woodbury responded that it was most likely due to Microsoft glitches from copying and pasting the text from the PDF version of the Standard to the comment form in Word.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 21 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin, Thomas Pape

None abstained.

2-1. Editorial. 11.5

Comment: ~~20~~ 23

Reason: The total points available for acoustics is 20 per the section heading. However, if you add all the points for individual sections up, the total is 23. Correct the discrepancy.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification to correct the discrepancy by adding the word "maximum" to the points column.

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

Discussion took place on the motion:

- One participant asked for clarification on where the word “maximum” is intended to be inserted. Questions around whether this is the points in the column being discussed, but it's the total points in 11.5. This does not follow the format of the rest of the Standard.
 - Woodbury clarified that the intention is to add the word “maximum” to the header of the Section.

AMENDMENT: The Amendment was made to modify the response to say “Your comment has been rejected. Any project can only earn a maximum of 20 points in whatever combination of options the project team chooses.”

Objections were raised.

Discussion took place on the Amendment:

- A participant objected to the amendment because they felt it was inappropriate.
- Discussion took place as to whether this is accepting with modification or rejecting and modifying the suggested response.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded refer to the IEQ Subcommittee to adjust the 13 subsections so the total for the Section if 20 points.

Discussion that took place on the Motion to refer to the Subcommittee:

- Woodbury clarified that procedurally this would potentially add 3-4 months to the process because a substantive change would require a public comment period.
- A participant pointed out that Subsections don't need to total up to 20 points. It is clear that a project can only earn 20 points in this Section and how those points are achieved is up to the project team.
- Another participant speaking against the motion to refer to Subcommittee reminded the group that the points in this Section is similar to how the points work in the Energy Efficiency Assessment Area.
- Clarification was given on how the design team can earn points in this Section.
- Sentiment was echoed that there is no need for this to be sent back to Subcommittee. The speaker preferred the suggested amendment of rejecting the comment and explaining that the maximum points available under 11.5 is 20 points.

VOTE: The Motion failed with 6 in favor, 17 opposed, 2 abstained.

Opposed: Bill Carroll, Gregory Bergmiller, Jane Rohde, George Thompson, Chris Dixon, Paul Bertram, Greg Johnson, Thomas Pape, Gary Keclik, Gordon Shymko, Karen Joslin, Charles Kibert, Allan Bilka, Jeff Bradley, Bill Freeman, David Eldridge, Tien Peng

Abstained: 2 Michael Cudahy, Doug Tucker

AMENDMENT: The Amendment stated prior to the motion was seconded.

Discussion that took place on the previous Amendment:

- One participant stated that the amended response doesn't clearly address the comment as the original response did.
- Discussion around whether adding the word "maximum" requires an additional public comment period.
 - Lehman confirmed that it was an editorial comment and that the change would not require another public comment period.
- Participant pointed out the word "maximum" was used fairly liberally in the Energy section, though they are uncertain if it was used in the header of a Section.

VOTE: The Amendment carried with 17 in favor, 3 opposed, 3 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin, Allan Bilka, Don Horn

Abstained: Josh Jacobs, Greg Johnson, Kent Sovocool

- Clarification was provided by the Parliamentarian that the Consensus Body still needed to vote on the motion as amended.

VOTE: The Amended Motion carried with 17 in favor, 3 opposed, 2 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin, Allan Bilka, Don Horn

Abstained: Gregory Bergmiller, Kent Sovocool

2-2. Editorial. 11.5.2.1

Comment: Informational Reference(s) - National Research Council's COPE - ASTM E1374-06, Open Office Guide - FBI Guideline, ~~2014~~ - Facilities Guideline Institute, "Sound &Vibration", ~~2010~~ - GSA, Facilities Standards, P100, ~~2014~~ - GSA, Sound Matter, ~~2012~~

Reason: The GSA P100 is revised annually. The current version is 2017 and the 2018 version will be published in early 2018. Avoid using specific dates/editions so that the standard is not outdated as these other documents get revised and updated. Omit the dates and simply refer readers to the "most current version/edition".

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected as un-actionable. The Standard can't include references to versions that are not yet published. The Consensus Body has a policy to include dates for all references and standards.

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

Discussion took place on the motion:

- One participant requested that Informational References should be checked to ensure they were updated.
- GSA Facilities Standards needs to be changed to 2017. Also, the official name of the document is the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service, which needs to be reflected.
- "FBI" guideline is a typo and should be "FGI".

VOTE: The Motion carried with 17 in favor, 6 opposed, 0 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin, Thomas Pape, Don Horn, Jane Rohde, George Thompson, Josh Jacobs

None abstained.

Discussion took place after the vote:

- A participant raised a question to clarify what informational reference document project teams use. For example, would a user use the reference stated in the Standard even if two years from now, there is a newer Standard available? It was clarified that the Standard references the versions specified.
- Participant asked, and it was clarified that editorial changes will be made prior to the submission to ANSI.
- Another participant commented that there is precedence to use the terminology that the most current version edition unless otherwise noted.
 - Woodbury clarified that is not the policy in this Standard, which is why GBI's goal is to use a Continuous Maintenance schedule moving forward so updates will be made more frequently than every five years.
 - A participant spoke in support of the current approach, so users aren't given a moving target should their project be delayed and different requirements are put in newer versions of reference materials.

The chair calls address the last two comments at the next meeting due to time.

New Business

- No new business

Announcements:

Woodbury informed the Consensus Body that these remaining comments and 3 Energy comments would be addressed on the next call. A Doodle poll will be sent out to schedule the next meeting.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting.

Motion to adjourn carried without objection at 2:58 PM ET.