

Minutes
 GBI Consensus Body Meeting #35
 BSR/GBI 01-201X
 Webinar

Attendance:

No	Name	Organization(s)	5-17-17	5-18-17	5-19-17	1-30-18	4/27/18	5/10/18
1	Gregg Bergmiller	S/L/A/M Collaborative	X	X	Absent	X	X	X (by proxy)
2	Paul Bertram	PRB Connect	X	X (by proxy)	X (by proxy)	X (by proxy)	X	X
3	Allan Bilka	International Code Council	X	X	X	X	X	X
4	Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X	X	X (by proxy last 2 hours)	X	X	X
5	William Carroll	American Chemistry Council	X	X	Absent	X	Absent	X (by proxy)
6	John Cross	American Institute of Steel Construction	X	X	X	Absent	X	X
7	Mike Cudahy	Plastic Pipe and Fittings, Association	X	X	X	X	X	X
8	Chris Dixon	NBBJ (rep. self)	X	X (by Proxy)	X (by Proxy)	X	X	X
9	Nicole Dovel-Moore	CTA Architects Engineers	X	X	X	Absent	X	(by alternate)
10	David Eldridge	Grumman/Butkus Assoc.	X	X	X	X	Absent	X (by proxy)
11	William Freeman	Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X	X	X	X	X	X (by proxy)
12	Susan Gitlin	U.S. EPA	X	X (partial proxy)	X (partial proxy)	X	X	Absent
13	Don Horn	GSA	X	X	X	X	X	X
14	Josh Jacobs	UL Environment	X	X	Absent	X	X	X
15	Greg Johnson	Johnson Consulting Services,	X	X	X	X	X	X

		Greenscape Alliance						
16	Karen Joslin	Joslin Consulting	X	X	X	X	X	No longer CB
18	Rachel Minnery	AIA	X	X (partial proxy)	X (partial proxy)	X	absent	absent
19	Charles Kibert	University of Florida	X (Chair)	X	X (Chair for part of the meeting)	X	X	X (Serving as chair so a nonvoting member)
20	Gary Keclik	Keclik Associates	X	X	X	X	absent	Absent
21	Thomas Pape	Alliance for Water Efficiency	X	X	Absent	X	X	X
22	Tien Peng	National Ready Mix Concrete Assn.	X	X	X	X	X	X
23	Jane Rohde	JSR Assoc. Inc., Vinyl Institute	X (by Proxy)	X (by Proxy)	X (by Proxy)	X	X (by proxy)	X
24	Gord Shymko	G.F. Shymko & Associates, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X
25	Kent Sovocool	Southern Nevada Water Authority	X	X	X	X	Absent	X
26	Steve Strawn	JELD-WEN	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
27	George Thompson	Chemical Compliance Systems, Inc.	X (by Proxy)	X (by Proxy)	X (by Proxy)	X (by proxy)	X	X
28	Angela Tin	American Lung Assn.	X	X	X	Absent	X	X
29	Douglas Tucker	Misubishi Electric Cooling & Heating	X	X	X	X	X	Absent
Voting Alternates								
	Abby Brokaw	American Lung Assn. (voting Alternate for Angela Tin)						

	Ashleigh Powell	CTA Architects Engineers						X
	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		22/28	20/27
Visitors								
	Martha VanGeem	Self (Principal Engineer)	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Ric Doedens	Logison			X		X	
	Richard Willis	NAPA	X	X				
	Kyle Thompson	IAPMO	X					
	Michael Jouaneh	Lutron Electronics Co., Inc.						X
	Barbara Clarke	JL Architects				X		
	Brent Mecham	Irrigation Association				X		
	Dave Panning	BIFMA				X	X	X
	Niklas Moeller	LogiSon			X			
Staff/Consultants								
	Michael Lehman	Chair	Absent	X	X	X	X	Absent
	Vicki Worden	Executive Director, GBI						
	Emily Randolph	Secretariat Asst., GBI	X	X	X	n/a		
	Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI	X	X	X	X	X	X

	Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI				X	X	X
	Maria Woodbury	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Kim Goldsworthy	Roberts-Rules Consulting	X	X	X	X	X	X

Friday, April 27, 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. There were no changes to the membership roster since the last meeting. The meeting was recorded for purpose of recording minutes. No objects or concerns were raised.

Woodbury reminded members that all are welcome to participate in the discussion. Only Consensus Body members can make motions or vote on motions.

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 lead in the order. He recommended that participants focus on the content at hand. The chair provided an overview of the agenda for the meeting.

Meeting minutes from Consensus Body Meeting #34 on January 30, 2018 were approved with no discussion or objections.

IEQ Committee presented by Subcommittee Vice Chair Chris Dixon.

1-1. Editorial. 11.5.2.1

- **Comment:** The Last two bullets under "Other" are meant to be separate sections: the measured overall level is within 0.5dBA of that specified. -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.
- **Reason:** In the previous draft, these were contained in separate sections to define the performance requirements of the sound masking regardless of where it was located. Where currently placed, they may be misinterpreted to apply exclusively to areas defined as "other".
- **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.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- Participant reviewed what was being separated out from the bulleted list and questioned the order of the bullets.
 - Presenter confirmed that the order was correct.
- Clarification was provided that these would apply to all building types.
- Suggestion by Member that the Committee should address 11.5.2 before 11.5.2.1 since if it got approved, this comment would be irrelevant.

- Request was made for a Vote on the motion on the table.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 20 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

4-1. Substantive. 11.5.2

- **Comment:** Delete all of section 11.5.2 on sound masking as follows:

~~11.5.2 Sound Masking System~~

~~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:~~

~~•• Offices: o Open: 45-48dBA~~

~~• o Enclosed: 35-45dBA~~

~~• o Meeting/Conference: 30-45dBA~~

~~• o Circulation: 45-48dBA~~

~~•~~

~~•• Healthcare: o Patient room: 40-48dBA~~

~~• o Private offices and exam/treatment room: 35-45dBA~~

~~• o Waiting area: 45-48dBA~~

~~• o Corridor and public spaces: 45-48dBA~~

~~• o Circulation: 45-48dBA~~

~~•~~

~~•• Other: o All other areas where speech privacy, concentration, or sleep/relaxation is required: 35-48-dBA~~

~~• o The measured overall level is within 0.5dBA of that specified.~~

~~• o 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.~~

~~•~~

~~Informational Refence(s)~~

~~•• National Research Council's COPE~~

~~•• ASTM E1374-06, Open Office Guide~~

~~•• FGI Guidelines, 2014~~

~~•• Facilities Guideline Institute, "Sound & Vibration", 2010~~

~~•• GSA, Facilities Standards, P100, 2014~~

~~•• GSA, Sound Matters, 2012~~

- **Reason:** This section on awarding credit for sound masking should be deleted. Sound masking systems lower the quality of hearing for those who have hearing loss or who wear hearing aids. The working population and population in general are getting older, and therefore having more hearing loss. Approximately 17% of US adults have hearing loss (US Department of Health and Human Services Fact Sheet on Hearing Aids). The following quotes substantiate the problems associated with hearing aids and sound masking systems:

a.) "Persons with hearing impairments require low background noise levels for proper functioning of hearing aids, and thus sound masking is not suitable for the spaces which they occupy." (Greg Clunis. Sound Masking Systems: A Guideline. Canadian Acoustics.)

b.) "Be sure to consider the consequences of background masking on the usability of open plans by hearing-impaired persons. For example, when background noise levels exceed 30 dBA,

hearing-impaired persons (even when using hearing aids) have far more difficulty understanding speech than do normal-hearing persons.” http://www.acoustics.com/ra_masking.asp

In addition, “The US Access Board does not have any information on masking sound and how it affect access

for the disabled both the hard of hearing and blind,” per the GSA Sound Matters document cited in the credit.

And finally from BuildingGreen, ” ‘As an architect and acoustician I never want to intentionally bring in extra noise to the space.’ He argues that while people may feel they have more privacy with sound masking, the additional noise will make them less productive and more tired, whether or not they are immediately aware of it.” (BuildingGreen Report, 2017 October)

- **Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected. The current Standard language has been discussed and consensus was to include this language. 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.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- One participant speaking against the motion commented that they did extensive research on sound masking impacting hearing impaired people negatively and feels the Consensus Body did not take this into consideration.
- In response to the first comment during discussion, one member asked to get a recap on the discussion that took place at the Subcommittee level.
 - Discussion in preparing the response to this comment took place between the Subcommittee chair and vice chair, based on the outcome of previous consensus on this issue it was ultimately decided that the benefits outweighed potential risks.
 - Speaking against rejecting the comment, a concern was raised around the fact that the full Subcommittee didn’t meet to discuss this comment from the third round. This needs a robust discussion to determine how to answer this.
- This has been an issue in office design for a long time. A question was raised what source was used for guidance in how at the decibel levels were determined for the Standard.
- Point of Order: This discussion should be focused on the comment and response at hand
- One Member speaking against the motion commented that this is appropriate to code, but as a Green Building protocol, this is not necessary.
- Question that if this language was struck from the Standard right now, would it have to go to public comment? Alternatively, if the Standard switches into continuous maintenance schedule, this could be taken up during the next review cycle.
 - This process was confirmed accurate by the Secretariat, if the language is struck that change would be subject to public comment during this review period. The language, and all of the language in the Standard will be subject to public comment during the first review cycle during continuous maintenance.
- The decibel level discussed in this comment is a level that is only heard in conference rooms where great efforts are taken to make quiet. The level of sounds suggested for sound masking are not different than what people hear every day. It was also mentioned that hearing aids are available with built-in sound masking. This is a technology that has been in used since the 1970’s.

- It was stated that there is not enough information available to know how many people would be negatively impacted versus how many people with hearing aids would experience an improvement.
- Member asked why there are points given if this is an old technology. This doesn't sound innovative, in addition to the potential issues other members have brought up.
- It was commented that sound masking does not cancel all background noise, and it does emphasize heating and cooling ventilation.
- The purpose of this credit is to acknowledge the organizations that endorse sound masking, and if employed in a building correctly, it is a great alternative to the methods that have been and still are being installed today.
- These systems have been around but are not common practice.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 12 in favor, 6 opposed, and 3 abstained

Opposed: Nicole Dovel-Moore, Susan Gitlin, John Cross, Thomas Pape, Don Horn, Tien Peng

Abstained: Josh Jacobs, Gregg Bergmiller, Allan Bilka

Energy comments presented by Subcommittee vice chair Paul Bertram

3-1. Substantive. 5.1

- **Comment:** renewable energy: energy that is continuously replenished on the Earth, such as wind, solar thermal, solar electric, geothermal, hydropower, and various forms of biomass ~~from recovered waste sources.~~
- **Reason:** Biomass sources, including purpose grown biomass sources are considered by states and the Federal government to be renewable energy. The greenhouse gas (GHG) benefits of energy from biomass harvested from sustainably managed forests has been recognized repeatedly by an abundance of studies, agencies, institutions, legislation and rules around the world, including guidance from the United Nations (UN) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the reporting protocols of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. Green Globes should not modify this well used definition of renewable energy as proposed in this draft standard.
- **Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected. The Consensus Body has reviewed this information previously and did not find your comment persuasive to make the change based on previous discussions and consensus votes. There will be public and Stakeholder notifications of the next review cycle and you are encouraged to re-submit you comment at that time.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- A participant speaking against the proposed response stated this was not discussed extensively by the Subcommittee. The Federal Government, State of California, and other official sources recognize biomass as a renewable form of energy.
- Clarification that the issues wasn't "biomass" but the language "from recovered waste sources" because it isn't always considered a safer or more clean energy. Biomass in general is considered a renewable energy.
- A question was raised around why removing those words would have an impact on using biomass from a recovered waste source or not. By including those words, where biomass can come from is limited.
 - Clarification was provided that the words being targeted were added due to a public comment. This is being voted on to remove the four words.
- For biomass to be considered renewable, there has to be a re-sequestered cycle.

- A participant speaking in favor of the motion stated this was added in to become consistent with onsite renewable energy definition.
- One speaker wanted to call attention to the fact that the Consensus Body was discussing a definition on “renewable”. The question is whether or not purposefully grown energy crops are renewable. So far, discussion has not indicated that they are *not*.
- Confirmation that there is no definition in the Standard on “Biomass”.
- NREL website does not restrict definition of biomass to recovered resources. Restricting the use of biomass does not seem consistent with the potential of developing biomass materials.
- New IPCC report shows that forests sequester 11 percent of all emissions (not just CO2) in the US. In order to keep forests healthy, treatments need to be done which can be used for biomass. The Standard doesn’t define Solar. The same outlook should be had for Biomass. By putting this detail on, the Consensus Body is overstepping the Standard’s focus.
- A participant speaking in favor of striking the language stated the renewable energy community at large should be working at this.
- A question posed by a member whether oil rich algae and yeast strain extractions of oil would be excluded if the four words addressed in this comment would be included?

AMENDMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to change definition to state: “renewable biomass” striking “from recovered waste sources”.

Objection raised.

Discussion that took place on the Amendment:

- It was stated that this opens up taking the good trees out of the forest and using them; not the scrub brush.
 - The point was made that there are not opportunities for this if we have a Standard that doesn’t allow or causes confusion on what is allowed for a Community Energy Project.
- A participant speaking against the amendment stated that using the word “renewable” and “renewable biomass” is confusing unless those terms are defined.
- Question posed around why the Standard does not have a definition for biomass.

Amendment withdrawn.

Discussion that took place on the Original Motion:

- Member read the definition from NREL website and suggested this be used as the Standard’s definition.
- Member states support of NREL definition.
- Speaking in favor of keeping “from recovered waste sources” due to the fact that biomass can be partially converted to charcoal which would be rewarded in this Standard without these words.
- This is a result of a compromise. ACLCA and other groups agree that if biomass is limited to waste, it’s much better off.
- Those four words are not good enough. Perhaps there is a better way to address wood in this definition without kicking the possibility of other options out.

VOTE: The Motion failed with 9 in favor, 11 opposed, and 1 abstained

Opposed: George Thompson, Jane Rodhe, Jeff Bradley, Nicole Dovel-Moore, Charles Kibert, Bill Freeman, Chris Dixon, Greg Johnson, Gregg Bergmiller, Mike Cudahy, Paul Bertram

Abstained: Josh Jacobs

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

Discussion that took place on the Motion:

- Discussion posed around what is not being allowed by saying it has to be a waste product of biomass?

AMENDMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to add the NREL biomass definition.

Objections Raised.

Discussion that took place on the Amendment:

- It was suggested that this should be New Business because this was not suggested by the commenter. This will also require another public comment period.
 - Secretariat clarified that the motion to accept the comment would lead to another comment period, adding three months to the process. If a new definition was added, that would fall into new business and would require a two-thirds majority vote to carry a New Business Motion since it is not currently on the agenda.

AMENDMENT withdrawn

Discussion that took place on the Original Motion:

- A participant explained that most technologies are not commercially viable at this time so they could be addressed in the future. Further, as an assessor, it is recommended to take a conservative approach to this.
- If this stays in the Standard, it should be considered a priority in continuous maintenance.
- Secretariat clarified that accepting a substantive comment requires a public comment period.
- Member stated that there is a need for a definition and enough knowledge in this group.
 - It was countered that it cannot be created in a response to this comment. It would need to be New Business.
- It was suggested that all comments answered in a way to prevent another public comment period should be reviewed again if this is accepted and there will be another comment period.
- A participant stated they still had not heard a concrete example that is NOT from a recovered waste source. If it does come up, this can be an exception, but currently, this is not an issue.

Point of Order: Is the commenter (who was on the call) allowed to withdraw this comment to prevent a new public comment period, with the assurance this will be a priority issue during the continuous maintenance period?

- This is not a Robert's Rules question. The Secretariat clarified that this has not occurred in a Consensus Body meeting but this has occurred at the Subcommittee level, that a commenter decided to withdraw their comment(s). The commenter would need to follow up in writing to confirm their intent to withdraw

Comment withdrawn from consideration. Commenter will send a verification in writing to the Secretariat after the call.

6-1. Substantive. 5.1

- **Comment:** renewable energy: energy that is continuously replenished on the Earth, such as wind, solar thermal, solar electric, geothermal, hydropower, and ~~various forms of biomass from recovered waste sources.~~
- **Reason:** Established in 1920, the National Association of State Foresters (NASF) is a non-profit organization comprised of the directors of forestry agencies in the states, territories and the District of Columbia of the United States. State Foresters manage and protect state and private forests, which encompass two-thirds of the nation's forests. State forestry agencies in cooperation with federal agencies are the primary delivery system for forestry activities. NASF views forests as a strategic national resource of vital importance to meeting the nation's economic, environmental, and energy needs. Biomass from the nation's public and private forests can and must be part of any solution to meeting the nation's renewable energy goals, particularly in regions where solar, wind, and other renewable resources are less prevalent.

Biomass sources, including biomass from publicly and private owned managed forests sources are considered by states and the Federal government to be renewable energy. Biomass harvested from sustainably managed forests has been recognized as beneficial for greenhouse gas (GHS) by many organizations and governments throughout the world. It is also critical for forest landowners to have markets for their wood fiber to ensure forests can be managed and retained as forests. Green Globes should not restrict the definition of renewable energy as proposed in this draft standard to only recovered waste sources.

Biomass should be broadly defined to include (but not limited to) logging residues, residues from forest or manufacturing operations, byproducts of fuels reduction and forest health and restoration treatments, clean construction debris, urban wood waste, byproducts of land clearing (e.g., for utility right-of-ways, roads) and debris from landscaping firms.

- **Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected. The Consensus Body has reviewed this information previously and did not find your comment persuasive to make the change based on previous discussions and consensus votes. 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:

- A participant speaking in favor of the response pointed out this is not the same as the previous comment because it eliminates biomass altogether.
- The response reason statement could be improved.

AMENDMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to strike “previous discussion and”

Objections Raised.

Discussion took place on the Amendment:

- The discussion during the previous comment is in contradiction to this response. The discussion is ongoing.
- The sentiment was echoed that there should be admittance to discussions, even if the comment does not classify the type of discussion
- It was pointed out that this response was based on discussions, but not on Subcommittee votes.

VOTE: The Amendment failed with 9 in favor, 10 opposed, and 1 abstained

Opposed: Nicole Dovel-Moore, Susan Gitlin, Bill Freeman, Karen Joslin, Allan Bilka, Chris Dixon, John Cross, Don Horn, Paul Bertram, Gord Shymko

Abstained: Josh Jacobs

Discussion that took place on Original Motion:

- A member speaking in favor of the original motion stated they were in agreement that “Biomass should be broadly defined” but at this point there needs to be a limit and the reasoning in the comment is not persuasive.
- Clarification was provided that if the Consensus Body rejects the comment, there will be opportunity to go back and define biomass as it evolves in the marketplace.
 - Clarified further by Secretariat: During the continuous maintenance process, comments on this issue will be addressed along with the other comments received during each review cycle. The goal is to move into a continuous maintenance schedule immediately after this Standard is published and to begin following procedures under Continuous Maintenance. Overall, this process is much quicker than the five year periodic maintenance alternative. The 2010 Standard is still under revision in 2018. It could still be 1-2 years after publication of this version until the Standard is changed under continuous maintenance.

- The longer we delay publication of this version of the Standard the more out of date it becomes.
- The Chair called for a Vote. The Consensus Body's responsibility is to get this version of the Standard published. It is beyond the scope of the Consensus Body to put a timeframe on the next review cycle.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 18 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

OBJECTIONS TO RESPONSES FROM THE SECOND COMMENT PERIOD: Presented by Consensus Body Chair, Mike Lehman

13-2 Substantive 5.1 (Presented by Maria Woodbury because the Subcommittee Chair who worked on this objection was not on the line)

- **Comment: risk (in Chapter 10 only):** the probability that a *product formulation, article or constituent chemical* will cause an unacceptable hazardous or toxic human health or safety, or ecological effect under the intended exposure and use conditions.
- **Reason:** The word risk is used throughout the standard but this definition is only applicable to Chapter 10.
- **Objection:** Here is the committee response to my comment: Your comment has been rejected as un-actionable per item four on the Public Comment Form. Your substantive comment provided no proposed language. My Objection: My comment did indeed show recommended changes in strike out and underline: risk (in Chapter 10 only):" I wanted "in chapter 10 only" to be added after "risk" so that the definition here in Chapter 5 would not be confused with other uses of risk in the standard. Risk is used throughout the standard but this definition seems only to pertain to chapter 10.
- **Action or Inaction at Issue:** The committee did not consider my comment.
- **Status:** Resolved
- **Recommended Re-drafted Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The Consensus Body did not incorporate your suggested language "(in Chapter 10 only)". Instead, the Consensus Body changed all instances of risk that are not covered under this definition so that they no longer appear in italics and thus are no longer subject to the confines of the definition.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was stated that overall, the goal was to further define as needed in Chapter 10 (speaking in favor)
- Commenter states that they didn't think it needed to be voted on because the commenter did not respond within the requested 15 days to say the objection was unresolved.
 - This is being voted on because procedurally there was in error in how the Consensus Body was responded. The commenter is correct that the objection is resolved regardless of the outcome of the vote.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 17 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained

Opposed: None

Abstained: Chris Dixon

14-8 Substantive 7.3.4.2

- **Comment:** Create definitions for, or otherwise clarify the difference between, “permeable,” “pervious,” and “porous.”
- **Reason:** To the layman, or even to some experts in site materials, these terms may seem interchangeable. The fact that different terms are used implies distinct meanings which may have significance for users of the standard. (We would have offered up draft definitions, but it is clear that the authors of this section had specific meanings and nuances in mind – and those nuances are not clear to us.)
- **Objection:** The CB appears to ignore part of our comment. As noted in our comment, we realized -- typically -- proposed language is expected. We specifically noted that we did not do so because the authors seemed to distinguish between the terms in a way that we did not understand. Yet, that become the foundation for the CB’s rejection. If a user of the standard were to write to request interpretation regarding the three terms, would you tell them to make up whatever definition they wanted? Effectively, that is what the CB has done in this case. You are telling EPA that in the future it can suggest definitions. That ignores our statement that we did not understand the nuances of these words as they were used in the document. If we do not understand their intended use, we will not be any more inclined to write definitions for the next round of comments than we were this time. Is it not the job of the CB – as opposed to the user – to ensure that the standard’s language is clear? The CB is opting to leave these terms undefined and unclear to users.
- **Action or Inaction at Issue:** The Consensus Body did not address the comment.
- **Status:** Unresolved
- **Recommended Re-drafted Response:** Thank you for your comment. ~~Your comment has been rejected as un-actionable per item four on the Public Review Comment Form. Your substantive comment provided no proposed language. You will be informed when the Standard enters its next review cycle and are invited to resubmit this comment in the required formatting for consideration at that time.~~ Based on other action taken by the Consensus Body the terms "permeable," "pervious," and "porous" appear in Section 5, Definitions as follows: **“permeable pavement(s):** infiltrate, treat, and/or store rainwater where it falls. They can be made of pervious concrete, porous asphalt, or permeable interlocking pavers.
pervious concrete: allows some or all water to penetrate the concrete assembly.
porous asphalt pavement(s): allows some or all water to penetrate the asphalt assembly.”

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The commenter remarked that if the first few sentences were removed, the objection would be resolved. In the comment, the need to provide specific proposed changes was addressed when the commenter stated they cannot interpret the definitions due to how the terms are used interchangeably.
- A member responded that Consensus Body responded to this comment in the same manner it responded to other comments.

AMENDMENT: The Amendment was made and seconded to strike “Your comment has been rejected.....no proposed language” from the response.

Objections Raised.

Discussion took place on the Amendment:

- Restated that making any changes to this is not needed as our response is technically accurate.
- There is nothing precluding a commenter from providing suggestions to a definition, even if there is ambiguity or interchangeability in the original sentence being commented on.

- Putting the burden on the commenter to come up with a definition when they don't know what is meant is too much responsibility on the commenter.
- Question as to whether GBI has a formal process on interpretation procedure. On other ANSI committees the Consensus Body member has been on, there is a separate role for interpretation questions. It was clarified that there are interpretations procedures.
- Referring a commenter to the interpretation process doesn't address the larger issue of bringing this attention to the Consensus Body.

VOTE: The Amendment carried with 10 in favor, 7 opposed, and 2 abstained

Opposed: George Thompson, Jane Rodhe, Jeff Bradley, Bill Freeman, Chris Dixon, Greg Johnson, Allan Bilka

Abstained: Karen Joslin, Angela Tin

Discussion took place on the Amended Motion:

- A member pointed out that the response says they are invited to resubmit the comment in the required formatting, but that was just removed with the amendment. Question posed as to what the basis of the rejection is at this point.
- Editorial error was fixed on screen to strike through the full amount of text intended by the Amendment maker as follows: Thank you for your comment. ~~Your comment has been rejected as un-actionable per item four on the Public Review Comment Form. Your substantive comment provided no proposed language. You will be informed when the Standard enters its next review cycle and are invited to resubmit this comment in the required formatting for consideration at that time.~~ Based on other action taken by the Consensus Body the terms "permeable," "pervious," and "porous" appear in Section 5, Definitions as follows: "**permeable pavement(s):** infiltrate, treat, and/or store rainwater where it falls. They can be made of pervious concrete, porous asphalt, or permeable interlocking pavers. **pervious concrete:** allows some or all water to penetrate the concrete assembly. **porous asphalt pavement(s):** allows some or all water to penetrate the asphalt assembly."

AMENDMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to say "your comment has been accepted with modification".

Objections Raised.

Discussion that took place on the Amended Motion:

- Clarification that the initial issues raised in the first amendment resolved this.
- It is still unclear what the difference between the three definitions are.
- It was explained that each industry has defined the characteristic of a permeable system differently, and have named it differently, which is why the definitions were included.
- Definitions were supplied for another comment so this is already accepted. This is not accept with modification.
- It was explained that the way these terms came to be was a conversation in the Site Subcommittee previously approved by the Consensus Body.

VOTE: The Amendment failed with 6 in favor, 10 opposed, and 1 abstained

Opposed: Jeff Bradley, Susan Gitlin, Allan Bilka, Chris Dixon, Greg Johnson, John Cross, Don Horn, Paul Bertram, Tien Peng, Angela Tin

Abstained: Mike Cudahy

VOTE: The Amended Motion carries with 14 in favor, none opposed, and 3 abstained

Opposed: None opposed.

Abstained: Bill Freeman, Greg Johnson, Mike Cudahy

Schedule update:

Responses will be sent to all 3rd public comment period commenters. Commenters will have 15 days to object to the responses.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to adjourn. There were no objections.

---Meeting adjourned 2:04pmET---

GBI Consensus Body Meeting #35 Part 2

May 10, 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. Change in roster since first part of CB Meeting #35 Karen Joslin has a change in employment so she has resigned from the Consensus Body to pursue a new opportunity. Meeting will be recorded for purpose of recording minutes. No objects or concerns were raised.

Woodbury reminded members that all are welcome to participate in the discussion provided participants raise their hands. Hands will be called on first come-first serve. In-person participants were asked to restate their name before speaking each time to make it easier for remote participants to follow along.

Administrative Items

Vice Chair Charles Kibert made his opening comments, thanking everyone for their time and expertise.

Energy Committee presented by Subcommittee Vice Chair Paul Bertram**5-2. Editorial. 5.1**

Comment: Revise definition of “grid displaced electricity” to read” a comprisal of all electricity generated. . .”

Reason: Current definition uses uncommon language, and may be confusing.

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.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 22 in favor, none opposed, none abstained

Opposed: none

Abstained: none

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to adjourn. There were no objections.

---Meeting adjourned 2:16 pm ET---

After the meeting adjourned there was a short discussion:

-The secretariat summarized next steps which included:

- Sending out 3rd Round of Public Comment Responses and attempting to resolve any objections submitted.
- We will follow procedures to address both 2nd and 3rd Round of Public Comment objections.
- The recirculation ballot will be sent as soon as possible at which time each Consensus Body member will have the opportunity to change their vote. If a member doesn't want to change their vote their first letter ballot vote will stand, it is not necessary to return a recirculation ballot.
- Secretariat also advised work is being done in preparation for the ANSI audit
- More specific timeline – Responses sent out and any objections received and attempts to resolve them could take about 1 month. Recirculation ballot out late June or early July then soon after that final submission to ANSI will be made.

A Consensus Body member asked about the ANSI pilot status. A GBI staff member explained that the pilot has some projects already but continuing to look for new projects to participate. And that it is based on the latest third public comment draft of the Standard.