



MINUTES

GBI Consensus Body - Call #11

Webinar/Teleconference

February 5, 2021 from 3:00 to 4:30 p.m. ET

NOTE ALL TIMES ARE EASTERN TIME

Consensus Body Members in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	2/5/21	9/3/20	8/13/2020	8/6/2020	7/17/2020
Gregg Bergmiller	The S/L/A/M Collaborative	X	X (Arrived Late)	Absent	X	Absent
Benjamin Bojda	Dominion Environmental Consultants NV, Inc	X	X	X	X	Absent
Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	Absent	X	X	X	X
Karen Butler	EPA	X	X	X	X	X
Virgil Campaneria	Gurri Matute PA	X	X (Arrived Late)	X	X (Proxy Shymko)	X
John Cross	American Institute of Steel Construction	X	X	X	Absent	N/A
Michael Cudahy	PPFA - PPEF	X	X	X	X	X
Chris Dixon	Morrison Hershfield	X	X	X	X	X
David Eldridge	Grumman/Butkus Associates	X	X (Arrived Late)	X	X	
Josh Jacobs	UL	X	X	X (Left Early)	Absent	X
Gary Keclik	Keclik Associates Ltd.	X	X	X	X (Proxy Rohde)	X
Charles Kibert	University of Florida	N/A	X	X	X	X (Acting as Chair)
Michael Lehman (Chair)	Chair	X	X	Absent	Absent	Absent
Tim Miller	Sidock Group Inc	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	X
Amlan Mukherjee	Michigan Technological University	X				
James O'Brien	Independent Environmental Consultant	X	X	X	X	X
Jane Rohde	JSR Associates, Inc., The Vinyl Institute / Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X	X (Arrived Late)	X (Arrived Late)	X	X
Kirk Sander	National Waste and Recycling Association	X	Absent	X (Left Early)	X (Left Early)	Absent
Gord Shymko	G. F. Shymko & Associates Inc.	X	X	X	X	X
Stephen Szoke	American Concrete Institute	X	X (Arrived Late)	X	X	X

Kyle Thompson	IAPMO	X	X	X	Absent	N/A
Angela Tin	American Lung Association	X	X	X	X	X
Doug Tucker	Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc.	X	Absent	X	X	X

Voting Alternate in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	2/5/21	9/3/20	8/13/20	8/6/2020	7/17/2020
Dan Cole	IAPMO	N/A	N/A	N/A	X	N/A
Matt Hunter	American Wood Council	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Interested Parties in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	2/5/21	9/3/20	8/13/20	8/6/2020	7/17/2020
Tara Brooks	American Lung Association		X			
John Cross	American Institute of Steel Construction					X
Domenic DeCaria	The Vinyl Institute				X	X
Larry Eisenberg	Ovus Partners 360		X			X
Sara Greenwood	The Greenwood Consulting Group, LLC		X			
Jonathan Humble	American Institute of Steel Construction				X	X
Alison Kinn Bennett	EPA	X		X		
Viken Koukounian	K.R. Moeller Associates Ltd.	X	X	X	X	X
Emily Lorenz	Independent Consulting Engineer		X	X		X
Kyle Thompson	IAPMO	N/A	N/A	N/A		X
Martha VanGeem	Independent Consulting Engineer			X	X	

Staff in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	2/5/21	9/3/20	8/13/20	8/6/2020	7/17/2020
Emily Marx	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X	X	X
Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI	X	X	X	X	Absent
Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI	X	X	X	X	Absent

Welcome

Chair Michael Lehman welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked everyone for their continued time and effort. Lehman recognized the recent passing of former Vice Chair, Charles Kibert and acknowledged his dedication to GBI and his work developing GBI's standards. A member asked if there was a way to honor Kibert with his work on the standard and staff stated they will research different options that are available.

Roll Call

Secretariat Emily Marx took roll call to establish quorum, reviewed the GBI Anti-Trust Policy, Code of Conduct policy and notified participants that the call was being recorded for the purpose of preparing minutes. No objections or concerns were raised.

Marx reminded participants that all voting members fall within an interest category of General Interest, Producer, or User and asked if any member had any change in interest category. There were none noted on the call and Marx asked members to contact her if they had any questions or concerns about their interest category.

Administrative Items

Lehman reviewed the agenda and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There was no discussion or objections.

MOTION: A Motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously to approve the Agenda as presented.

Lehman also reviewed the minutes from meeting #10 on September 3, 2020 and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There was no discussion or objections.

MOTION: A Motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from meeting #10 on September 3, 2020 as presented.

Meeting Procedures Reminders

Marx noted that the Roberts Rules of Order Cheat Sheet was sent out before the call and reminded all members to use Roberts Rules during meeting. Marx also presented the Code of Conduct Enforcement Policy and noted that all participants are required to complete the policy. She stated that if anyone had any comments or questions on Roberts Rules or the Code of Conduct Policy they can contact her.

COVID-19 Task Group Update

The Task Group Chair stated that the group met in December to review recent data and advancements with the COVID-19 pandemic. He informed the Consensus Body that the Task Group decided to wait until spring before re-evaluating the standard again to see if any changes are necessary to recognize pandemics or other health/environmental disruption events.

Project Management Public Comment Review

205-1

Public Comment: Proposed Revision or Comment

(Use strikethrough and underline for all proposed revisions)

6.5.1.1.1 Commissioning and building operator training is conducted in accordance with ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 202–2018, Commissioning Process for Buildings and Systems, and ASHRAE Guideline 0-2019, The Commissioning Process for the following building systems as applicable.

Alternatively, and ASTM E2813-18 Standard Practice for Building Enclosure Commissioning and ASTM E2947-16a Standard Guide for Building Enclosure Commissioning for the following building systems meet this requirement for the building envelope. as applicable:

Reason: This is the first of three possible resolutions.

- 1.) This charging paragraph is confusing because ASTM E2813 and E2947 only apply to the building envelope.
- 2.) ASTM E2813 and E2947 include much more than the criteria in this document. Commissioning should be in relation to the criteria chosen.
- 3.) Based on the ASTM E6.55 meetings on E2813 and E2947 in October 2020 (last week) and ballots, there is a lot of confusion within the ASTM subcommittee E6.55 in charge of these documents as to what testing is required and not required. If the subcommittee cannot understand its own document, we should not make it a requirement for the building envelope. Rather, citing it here as an alternative will enhance its use when users choose to interpret to comply with the standard. This is in line with the goal in the foreword of this public comment draft that the standard should be comprehensive but not rigid.

4.) When E2813 was brought before another organization for adoption as a requirement, the proponents indicated that compliance can cost 10% of the project budget. So 10% must be added to the project budget to meet E2813. It is important that this is considered.

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 Public Comment:

- The PM/Energy Char reviewed the comment and noted that commissioning is a complicated topic and that the subcommittee reviewed changes to the criteria extensively this winter, as well as last summer.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The question was asked if a project could choose to complete commissioning from the different references included in the criteria. It was noted that projects need to complete the first part of the criteria to be able to complete the second.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 18 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.

Abstain: David Eldridge, Matt Hunter

205-2

Public Comment: 6.5.1.1.1 Commissioning and building operator training is conducted in accordance with ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard

202–20132018, Commissioning Process for Buildings and

Systems, and ASHRAE Guideline 0-20132019, The Commissioning Process, and ASTM E2813-18 Standard Practice for Building Enclosure Commissioning and ASTM

E2947-16a Standard Guide for Building Enclosure Commissioning for the following building systems as applicable, taking into account for the building basis of design, owner's project requirements, and budget when determining what testing cited by ASTM E2813 is to be performed:

Secretariat Note: Text in orange was struck through on released redline version.

Reason: This is the second of three possible resolutions.

- 1.) This change allows for one interpretation of E2813. Based on the ASTM E6.55 meetings on E2813 and E2947 in October 2020 (last week) and ballots, there is a lot of confusion within the ASTM subcommittee E6.55 in charge of these documents as to what testing is required and not required. If the subcommittee cannot understand its own document, we should not make it a requirement for the building envelope.
- 2.) When E2813 was brought before another organization for adoption as a requirement, the proponents indicated that compliance can cost 10% of the project budget. So 10% must be added to the project budget to meet E2813. It is important that this is considered.
- 3.) Funds may be better spent on other features than requiring all of the tests in E2813 especially when building envelope commissioning can be done, and is currently frequently done, by inspection by a third party during the construction process, without testing.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: It is felt that the inclusion of ASTM Standards and Guidelines should be at the discretion of the project and commissioning team.

Discussion took place on the Public Comment:

- The chair noted that this was submitted as an alternative to the first public comment that was just reviewed. There was debate amongst the subcommittee members on the different guidelines to include, and thus which to approve of the three public comments that were submitted from the commenter on this topic.
- It was noted that it was decided to put commissioning on the project team to decide what is best for the project.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was asked of whether the subcommittee considered a minimum amount of inspection or requirements.
- It was stated that the items required in the ASHRAE reference is onerous. It was argued that it is a problem, and that the revision is an imperfect solution but that what was previously approved is the best option.
- It was noted that it is impractical to include a list of options.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 17 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstained.

Abstain: David Eldridge, Matt Hunter, Kirk Sander

205-3

Public Comment: Delete the new test methods as follows:

6.5.1.1.1 Commissioning and building operator training is conducted in accordance with ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 202–2018, Commissioning Process for Buildings and Systems, and ASHRAE Guideline 0-2019, The Commissioning Process, and ~~ASTM E2813–18 Standard Practice for Building Enclosure Commissioning and ASTM E2947–16a Standard Guide for Building Enclosure~~

~~Commissioning~~ for the following building systems as applicable:

Reason: This is the third of three possible resolutions. This change deletes the ASTM standard and guide.

- 1.) The charging paragraph is confusing because it requires all of the tests without indicating that E2813 and E2947 are only for the building envelope.
- 2.) Adding specific testing requirements for the building envelope and not adding testing requirements for the other aspects of the building results in an inequality in the number of points assigned to the building envelope.
- 3.) Based on the ASTM E6.55 meetings on E2813 and E2947 in October 2020 (last week) and ballots, there is a lot of confusion within the ASTM subcommittee E6.55 in charge of these documents as to what testing is required and not required. If the subcommittee cannot understand its own document, we should not make it a requirement for the building envelope.
- 4.) When E2813 was brought before another organization for adoption as a requirement, the proponents indicated that compliance can cost 10% of the project budget. So 10% must be added to the project budget to meet E2813. It is important that this is considered in the point distribution, and it is not. None of the other items cost 10% of the cost of the building.
- 5.) Funds may be better spent on other features than requiring all of the tests in E2813 especially when building envelope commissioning can be done, and is currently frequently done, by inspection by a third party during the construction process, without testing.
- 6.) E2813 and E2947 can be added to the other informative references.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The

Discussion took place on the Public Comment:

- The Chair noted that the public commenter participated in the discussion of the three comments and was happy with the outcome of which comment was accepted. He stated that this proposal was too onerous compared to the other two options that were submitted.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 18 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.

Abstain: David Eldridge, Matt Hunter

PM-E-1

Proposed Revision: Maximum = 29 points or as adjusted by N/A items--

Reason: Remove period for consistency and un-capitalize Items

Discussion took place on the Editorial Revision:

- There was no discussion or objection to change in punctuation.

Site Public Comment Review

206-10

Public Comment: Add reference to WaterSense Water-Smart Landscapes guide in informational references.

Informational Reference(s):

- WaterSense® Water-Smart Landscapes guide: <https://www.epa.gov/watersense/landscaping-tips>

Reason: Suggest adding WaterSense® Water-Smart Landscapes guide as informational reference in standard or technical manual, as this provides a good summary of landscaping practices to use along with selection of drought tolerant and native species.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected because Informational References have been moved to the Technical Manual. The proposed modification will be recommended for inclusion in the Technical Manual.

Discussion took place on the Public Comment:

- The chair noted that this was an addition to the references but that all references were voted to be removed from the standard during the last revision cycle.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

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

Site-1

Proposed Revision: ~~7~~ 5 points or N/A

Reason: There was no official comment or discussion to update this line.

Discussion took place on the Proposed Revision:

- Marx displayed the change on the screen and noted that it is a substantive change but was caused by an error of not updating the standard correctly in all relevant parts.

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 20 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

Site-3, Site-4, Site-6

Site-3 Proposed Revision: ~~exterior vegetated space~~

Site-4 Proposed Revision: ~~impervious hardscape area~~

Site-6 Proposed Revision: ~~Tree Protection Zone (TPZ)~~

Site-3, Site-4, Site-6 Reason: Remove definition, no longer appears in standard

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision and remove all three definitions from the standard.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

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

Site-5

Proposed Revision: ~~permeable pavement surface(s)~~

Reason: Update definition to "permeable surfaces"

Recommended Response:

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision and update the definition in the standard.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 19 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Stephen Szoke

Energy Public Comment Review

203-2

Public Comment: Current text indicates a Maximum = 1 point and no points earned where there is electric resistance heat. Recommend *ANSI/GBI 01-2019* include a point valuation for both electric heat resistance water heaters and heat pump water heaters.

Reason: **8.3.3.4 Domestic Hot Water Heaters** indicates a Maximum = 1 point and no points earned where there is electric resistance heat. Local jurisdictions and states exploring Green House Gas reductions and energy efficiency, are rapidly adopting requirements for decarbonization and electrification. To offer no points for water heat electric resistance precludes all electric resistance water heaters regardless of efficiency, and advanced technology, such as electric heat pump water heaters (HPWH). In cases where the local building codes require all-electric, *ANSI/GBI 01-2019 Green Globes Assessment Protocol for Commercial Buildings* provides 0 points for electric resistance water heaters in sections **8.3.3.3. Heating Equipment** and **8.3.3.4 Domestic Hot Water Heaters**. We recommend *ANSI/GBI 01-2019* include a point valuation for both electric heat resistance water heaters and heat pump water heaters. The point valuation would reflect the energy efficiency and advanced technology of both electric heat resistance water heaters and heat pump water heaters, contributing to the sustainability of the Green Building Initiative.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. This section is primarily concerned with efficiency of fossil fueled water heaters but language has been added to acknowledge that electric resistance water heaters are eligible for a point provided that the electricity is 100% onsite renewable. The modification is below.

8.1.1.3.3.4.1

- One point is earned where performance is 10% better than the requirements of ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 90.1-2013.
- No points are earned where there is electric resistance heat unless the source of electricity was documented as 100% onsite renewable electricity [1 point].

Discussion took place on the Public Comment:

- The PM/Energy Chair noted the commenter is saying that the energy source defined comment is good and should be awarded special credit, however, all energy is not created equal and some is not as harmful to the environment as others. However, there is a modification to include 100% of onsite renewable electricity.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was asked why it is 100% and not another number. It was noted that renewable electricity is referenced in another section. It was noted that the standard is not awarding double points and that it is only worth one point.
- It was argued that a building often does not know where their energy is coming from because it is coming from the grid.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 18 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstained.

Opposed: John Cross

Abstain: Chris Dixon

Chris Dixon left the meeting.

PM-E-2

Proposed Revision: C-factor (thermal conductance): the amount, in British Thermal Units (Btu), that flows each hour through 1 ft² of the surface area of material when there is a 1° temperature difference between the inside and outside air Btu/hr-ft²-F.

Reason: Remove underline

Discussion took place on the Editorial Proposed Revision.

- There was no discussion or objection to removing the underlined text.

PM-E-3, PM-E-4, PM-E-5, PM-E-6

PM-E-3 Proposed Revision: ~~primary [regularly] occupied space~~

PM-E-3 Reason: Primary is never used

PM-E-4 Proposed Revision: ~~sidelit daylighted area~~

PM-E-4 Reason: Remove definition, no longer appears in standard, but does within another definition

PM-E-5 Proposed Revision: ~~toplit daylighted area~~

PM-E-6 Proposed Revision: ~~variable air volume (VAV) system~~

PM-E-5, PM-E-6 Reason: Remove definition, no longer appears in standard

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to remove the definitions for sidelit daylighted area, toplit daylighted area, variable air volume (VAV) system, and to remove the bracket and the word 'primary' from the definition of "primary [regularly] occupied space".

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 19 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

PM-E-7

Proposed Revision: The CO₂e emission factor for each fuel in the proposed building's annual energy fuel mix can be found in Table 8.2.1—A.8.1.1.2 of this document.

Reason: Change to 8.1.1.2 for table reference.

Discussion took place on the Editorial Proposed Revision:

- It was noted that this was missed during the numbering hierarchy update that took place throughout the standard during the last update. There was no discussion or objection to updating the reference number.

Water Public Comment Review

206-29

Public Comment: 9.8.1.3.6: Spray sprinkler bodies are WaterSense labeled.

Reason: Add a new requirement for spray sprinkler bodies and require that they be WaterSense labeled. WaterSense labeled spray sprinkler bodies meet performance requirements related to pressure regulation, ensuring a consistent flow at the sprinkler nozzle, given higher upstream pressure. This helps reduce water waste from misting and overspray by optimizing the flow of water through the sprinkler body and nozzle. More information can be found at: <https://www.epa.gov/watersense/spray-sprinkler-bodies>

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 19 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

206-30

Public Comment: 9.8.1.4: Sprinkler system is inspected for proper installation of all components specified on the irrigation plan and to assure that there is no runoff or overspray onto impervious surfaces.

Informational reference(s):

- ANSI/ASABE Standard S626 Landscape Irrigation Uniformity and Application Rate Testing.
- EPA WaterSense. Irrigation with a Pro. <https://www.epa.gov/watersense/irrigation-pro>
- Irrigation Association. Irrigation Audit Guidelines. <https://www.irrigation.org/ia/Resources/Audit-Guidelines.aspx>

Reason: EPA WaterSense maintains a directory of certified irrigation professionals with expertise in auditing irrigation systems. Suggest inclusion as an informational reference in standard or in technical manual.

Similarly, the Irrigation Association has guidelines for inspecting irrigation systems (and landscapes) that is a useful tool and ASABE has a standard on irrigation uniformity and application rate, both of which could be utilized as part of irrigation system auditing. Suggest inclusion as informational references in standard or in technical manual.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected because Informational References have been moved to the Technical Manual. The proposed modification will be recommended for inclusion in the Technical Manual.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was noted that the Consensus Body does not have authority to update the Technical Manual but that staff will review the public comments and recommendations made by the Consensus Body to update the manual.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 19 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

203-3

Public Comment: Boiler systems with over ~~50 BHP~~ 1,673,768 Btu/hr have condensate return systems; Two points are earned where boiler systems with over ~~50 BHP~~ 1,673,768 Btu/hr have condensate return systems. Not applicable where there will be no steam boilers or where steam boilers are less than ~~200 BHP~~ 6,695,072 Btu/hr.

Reason: Recommend the amount of energy, Boiler Horsepower (BHP) be changed to the more commonly utilized British Thermal Units per hour (Btu/hr).

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification because it is best to use conversions so they reflect international and conventional units. The modification is below:

Boiler systems with over 50 BHP or 1.67MBtu/hr have condensate return systems; Two points are earned where boiler systems with over 50 BHP or 1.67MBtu/hr have condensate return systems. Not applicable where there will be no steam boilers or where steam boilers are less than 200 BHP or 6.69 MBtu/hr.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was noted that the revision is to include an additional conversion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 19 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

Gary Keclik left the call.

205-4

Public Comment: Delete Section 9.1.1.1 in its entirety:

~~9.1.1.1 Path A: ANSI/ASHRAE/USGBC/IES Standard 189.1-2017 9.1.1.1.1 Plumbing fixtures and fittings comply with ANSI/ASHRAE/USGBC/IES Standard 189.1-2017, Section 6.3.2.1.~~

~~52 points or N/A~~

~~• For points to be earned fifty percent of fixtures must comply.~~

~~• Points earned = percentage of compliant fixtures x 52 (fractional points are rounded upward.)~~

~~• Not applicable where no fixtures or fittings exist.~~

~~• Not applicable where Path B, C or D is followed.~~

Reason: Section 9.1.1.1 and 9.1.1.2 are identical. The 2018 IgCC is equivalent and is the same as 189.1-2017. Standard 189.1 is now the content of IgCC.

Section 6.3.2.1 of 189.1 is Section 601.3.2.1 in the IgCC, as indicated by the section number in parentheses in the IgCC. The table 601.3.2.1 is a summary of the requirements.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Someone may have copies of one standard and should be allowed to use that standard without having to purchase an additional standard.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was noted that the IgCC standard name needs to be corrected, however the public commenter is asking to delete the entire section.
- There was agreement that the section should not be deleted.
- It was noted that the standard is used in North America and the name could be updated further to increase clarification.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 18 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstained.

Abstain: Josh Jacobs, Kirk Sander, Doug Tucker

206-11

Public Comment: With Path A, replace ~~ANSI/ASHRAE/USGBC/IES Standard 189.1-2014~~ with ANSI/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Standard 189.1-2017 throughout.

Reason: ASHRAE 189.1-2017 is more up-to-date than the 2014 version in terms of water efficiency criteria related to plumbing fixtures and fittings.

Note that the redline version incorrectly references this standard and excludes ICC from listing. It should read: ANSI/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Standard 189.1-2017 throughout.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification because the year of the standard was updated in summer 2020 by the GBI Consensus Body for New Construction. Prior modifications updated everything besides the addition of ICC.

- Path A: ANSI/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Standard 189.1-2017, Section 6.3.2.1: 52 points

9.1.1.1 Path A: ANSI/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Standard 189.1-2017

9.1.1.1.1 Plumbing fixtures and fittings comply with ANSI/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Standard 189.1-2017, Section 6.3.2.1.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was argued that this is an Editorial change. However, because there was already a motion on the floor it was decided to proceed with the vote.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 18 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

206-12

Public Comment: Remove: ~~Pre-rinse spray valves (Maximum flow rate 1.28 gal. (4.8 L) per minute)~~

Reason: Effective as of January 2019, the Department of Energy requires all pre-rinse spray valves to have a maximum flow rate of 1.28 gallons per minute (or less, depending on the product's spray valve). In response, WaterSense sunset its specification and no longer labels this product category. See <https://www.epa.gov/watersense/pre-rinse-spray-valves> for more information. Suggest removal, since points should not be awarded for installing products that do not achieve efficiency beyond what is already federally required. These products are also separately covered under Section 9.4.2.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The GBI standard could be used outside of the United States and this requirement could still apply.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 18 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

206-20

Public Comment: 9.4.2.2 Specify Dry vacuum systems for all laboratory/medical/dental purposes.

1 point or N/A

- Not applicable where there are no laboratory/medical/dental systems.

Reason: Vacuum systems are also prevalent in a laboratory environment. Dry vacuum systems should be specified.

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 18 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

Public Participation

There was no discussion.

New Business

There was no discussion.

Action Items

GBI staff reminded those on the call that the next meeting will be on February 11, 2021 from 3:00-4:30pm ET.

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

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM EST.