



**MINUTES**

GBI Consensus Body - Call #3  
 Webinar/Teleconference  
 February 7, 2020 from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. ET

**NOTE ALL TIMES ARE EASTERN TIME**

**Consensus Body Members in Attendance**

Full Name	Organization	2/7/20	1/10/2020	12/20/2019
Gregg Bergmiller	The S/L/A/M Collaborative	X	X	X
Allan Bilka	International Code Council	X	Absent	X
Benjamin Bojda	Dominion Environmental Consultants NV, Inc	X	X	X
Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X	X	X
Karen Butler	EPA	X	X	X
Virgil Campaneria	Gurri Matute PA	Absent	Absent	X
Michael Cudahy	PPFA - PPEF	X	X	X
Chris Dixon	Morrison Hershfield	X	X	X
David Eldridge	Grumman/Butkus Associates	(proxy Shymko)	X	X
Josh Jacobs	UL	X	X	X
Luke Johnson	American Institute of Steel Construction	Absent	Absent	X
Gary Keclik	Keclik Associates Ltd.	X	Absent	Absent
Charles Kibert	University of Florida	Absent	X	X
Michael Lehman (Chair)	Chair	X	X	X
Tim Miller	Sidock Group Inc	Absent	X	X
James O'Brien	Independent Environmental Consultant	Absent	X	X
Jane Rohde	JSR Associates, Inc., The Vinyl Institute / Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X	Absent	X
Kirk Sander	National Waste and Recycling Association	X	Absent	X
Gord Shymko	G. F. Shymko & Associates Inc.	X	X	X
Stephen Szoke	American Concrete Institute	X	Absent	X
Angela Tin	American Lung Association	X	X	X
Doug Tucker	Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc.	X	X	X

**Interested Parties in Attendance**

Full Name	Organization	2/7/20	1/20/2020	12/20/2019
Glen Clapper	National Roofing Contractors Association		X	
Larry Clark	Sustainable Performance Solutions	X		
Domenic DeCaria	The Vinyl Institute		X	
Larry Eisenberg	Ovus Partners 360	X		X
Nathan Elliott	EA Architecture & Design, Inc.		X	X

Julia Farber	Legrand, North and Central America			X
Michael Gardner	M Gardner Services, LLC	X		X
Stan Graveline	US Sika		X	
Greg Hekman	Cornerstone Building Brands	X		
Gary Heroux	Composite Panel Association		X	
Alison Kinn Bennett	EPA		X	
Viken Koukounian	K.R. Moeller Associates Ltd.	X	X	
Emily Lorenz	Independent Consulting Engineer	X	X	X
Cambria McLeod	Kohler Company	X		X
Thomas Pape	Best Management Partners	X	X	
Mike Temple	Irrigation Association			X
Kyle Thompson	IAPMO		X	

#### Chair/Staff in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	2/7/20	1/10/2020	12/20/2019
Vicki Worden	President & CEO, GBI	X	Absent	X
Emily Marx	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X
Megan Baker	Staff, GBI	X	X	X
Kate Callahan	Staff, GBI	X	X	X
Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI	X	X	X
Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI	X	X	X
Adam Wellen	Staff, GBI	X	X	X

#### Welcome

Chair Michael Lehman welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked everyone for their work the past few weeks to resolve comments.

#### 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.

#### Administrative Items

Lehman spoke of reviewing the different public comments and reviewed the agenda and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. No concerns or comments were raised.

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

**VOTE: The Motion passes with 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstained: Jeff Bradley

Lehman also reviewed the minutes from meeting #2 on January 10, 2020 and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. No concerns or comments were raised.

**MOTION: A Motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from meeting #2 on January 10, 2020 as presented.**

**VOTE: The Motion passes with 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.**

Abstained: Jeff Bradley, Stephen Szoke

#### PROJECT MANAGEMENT COMMENTS

### 6a-2, 6a-9, 6a-15

**Public Comment:** Recommended Documentation Public Comments

**Reason:** Recommend moving all Recommended Documentation, as appropriate and applicable, to the criteria itself underneath Informational References (if any) throughout the standard. This would minimize questions and some confusion.

**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:**

- A member asked of Project Management and Energy to be in separate Subcommittees in the future. Although the Recommended Documentation change should be rather straightforward, these are very different areas and should be discussed separately.

**VOTE: The Motion passes with 15 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstained.**

Opposed: Mike Cudahy

### 6a-3

**Public Comment:** Maximum = 29 points ~~or N/A~~

**Reason:** Four sub-criteria allow for non-applicable designations, but not for all sub-criteria to be non-applicable as specified by the Maximum points line.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The modification improves the clarity relative to the intent of the criteria. The modification is: Maximum = 29 points or as adjusted by N/A Items.

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

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- An interested party asked for clarification on if someone is applying for an item to be not applicable, how does the arithmetic work, as it appears that removing points from the overall denominator is better than scoring points. A member spoke to how the N/A math may not be perfect, but it's still better than penalizing projects for items that simply do not exist. This has been how N/A has worked from Day 1, although the GBI Consensus Body does acknowledge that with a lot of N/A's, there may be some distortion in the point math.

**VOTE: The Motion passes with 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

### SITE COMMENTS

The Site Subcommittee Chair reviewed the three Editorial Public Comments (8-1, 8-2, and 8-3). There were no objections to the revisions for the Editorial Comments.

### 8-8

**Public Comment:** 7.2.1.7 The building's Walkscore® is:

- 90 or greater;

OR

- 75-89; 75 or greater;

OR

- A building entrance is within 0.5 mi (0.8 km) walking distance of a grocery store and a minimum of three other neighborhood assets. ~~These four neighborhood assets are open to the general public, in operation, and as a group have NAICS codes that start with a minimum of three different numbers;~~

OR

- A building entrance is within 0.5 mi (0.8 km) walking distance of a minimum of six neighborhood assets. ~~The six neighborhood assets are open to the public, in operation, and as a group have NAICS codes that start with a minimum of three different numbers;~~

OR

- ~~The building's Walkscore is 90 or greater.~~

Neighborhood assets are open to the public, in operation, and as a group have NAICS codes that start with a minimum of three different numbers.

**Reason:** 7.2.1.7 should be rewritten to descend environmental impact/point value. The criteria should also be reworded to simplify.

**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 on the proposed revision and/or motion.

**VOTE: The Motion passes with 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

### 8-11

**Public Comment:** Select the path applicable or most applicable to the project. Points cannot be combined between paths. ~~Select one of the paths below.~~

**Reason:** Some paths have N/A designations for the entire path. Pilot users are trying to take advantage of this to get out of completing any path. There is nothing saying that if one path applies and one doesn't then you must choose the path that applies instead of taking an N/A.

**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 on the proposed revision and/or motion.

**VOTE: The Motion passes with 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

### 8-12

**Public Comment:** o Three points are earned where  $\geq 70\%$  of the roof has a high initial SRI, and three points are earned where  $\geq 70\%$  of the roof has a high three-year-aged SRI.

**Reason:** The next lesser point option is  $\leq 70\%$  so this has to be greater  $> 70\%$

**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 on the proposed revision and/or motion.

**VOTE: The Motion passes with 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstained: Doug Tucker

### 8-13

**Public Comment:** • Four points are earned where  $> 50\%$   $\geq 56\%$  and  $\leq 70\%$  percent of the roof complies.

o Two points are earned where 56%-70% of the roof has a high initial SRI and two points are earned where  $> 50\%$   $\geq 56\%$  and  $\leq 70\%$  of the roof has a high three-year-aged SRI.

**Reason:** The next lesser point option is "40%-55% of the roof has a high three-year-aged SRI" so this has to be 56%.

**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 on the proposed revision and/or motion.

**VOTE: The Motion passes with 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstained: Josh Jacobs

### 8-16

**Public Comment:**

o Nitrate + nitrite reduction of 40%

AND/OR

o pH below 6.5

AND/OR

o Alkalinity below 10 mg CaCO<sub>3</sub>/L.

**Reason:** This should say "AND/OR" not "OR" if the user can get one point for each item for a max of 3 points.

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

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

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion on the proposed revision and/or motion.

**VOTE: The Motion passes with 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstained: Josh Jacobs

## ENERGY COMMENTS

**6b-6, 6b-9, 6b-14, 6b-24, 6b-36, 6b-39, 6b-44, 6b-58, 6b-62**

**Public Comment:** Moving Recommended Documentation

**Reason:** To maintain consistency throughout the standard and to minimize confusion, Required Documentation must be removed as its own subsection and moved to the criteria itself (as applicable). Required Documentation would be listed underneath Informational References (if any).

**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 with modification the proposed response.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- A member asked the Chair about coming back with a proposed change that specifies where the Recommended Documentation goes. They want to make sure that the process will include circling back and placing these items within their respective criteria. The Chair asked Marx about the process for Subcommittees and/or Task Groups. Marx responded that this resolution is simply to remove the Recommended Documentation unless the CB also motions to go back and move the documents to under the specific criteria.
- A different member asked if a successful vote would push those items back to the Subcommittee for further discussion and voting. Marx responded that she will bring the conclusion of this vote to the Chair with suggestions on appropriate next steps.
- The Water Subcommittee Chair stated that his subcommittee preferred to keep Recommended Documentation where it is, which would make the standard inconsistent if other Subcommittees vote to remove the documents.
- It was noted that the second part of satisfying the comment would be to place the Recommended Documentation to specific items.
- A member who also performs Green Globes Assessments spoke about how this comment is about making it consistent with keeping all documentation and references within the same sub-section.
- Discussion went back and forth for some time with members asking questions about what can be subject to Public Comment, what can be changed by the CB and/or Subcommittees, and placement of Recommended Documentation relative to Informational References within individual criteria. Ultimately, the ANSI Standard's Forward simply notes that "The Forward, Informational References and Recommended Documentation are informative only and do not contain mandatory requirements necessary for conformance to this Standard. As such, they *may contain* material that has not been subjected to public review or a consensus process." This does not mean that those items cannot be subject to public review or a consensus process.

**AMENDMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to replace the language "have been" to "will be" which aligns to what the Consensus Body discussed.**

**No Objections.**

**Discussion that took place on the Amendment:**

- There was discussion on whether it was efficient to vote on the comments if the CB will need to do it again once the Subcommittee has determined which documents need to go under each criterion.
- Because the documents need to be split up per each criterion, there was discussion on how best to respond to the commenter that the work was only partly completed.

**VOTE: The Amendment passed with 13 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Opposed: Jane Rohde, Jeff Bradley

Abstained: Kirk Sander

**AMENDMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to change the response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted and Recommended Documentation will be listed under Informational References.**

**Discussion that took place on the Amendment:**

- There was discussion on how exactly the information will be placed within the standard and where.
- Marx displayed an example of the Materials Assessment Area to illustrate where the Recommended Documents would be listed under each criterion.

**VOTE: The amendment failed with 4 in favor, 10 opposed, 2 abstained.**

Opposed: Angela Tin, Ben Bojda, Chris Dixon, Gary Keclik, Gordon Shymko, Gregg Bergmiller, Jane Rohde, Josh Jacobs, Kirk Sander, David Eldridge (by proxy)

Abstained: Karen Butler, Allan Bilka

**AMENDMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to change the response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been modified. There is no Required Documentation within the standard. We will move Recommended Documentation to each criteria section.**

**Discussion that took place on the Amendment:**

- No discussion took place on the amendment.

**VOTE: The Amendment carries with 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.**

Abstain: Allan Bilka, Kirk Sander

**VOTE: The Amended Motion carries with 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstained.**

Abstain: Allan Bilka, Kirk Sander, Jeff Bradley

## **PROJECT MANAGEMENT COMMENTS**

### **6a-2, 6a-9, 6a-15**

**Public Comment:** Recommended Documentation Public Comments

**Reason:** Recommend moving all Recommended Documentation, as appropriate and applicable, to the criteria itself underneath Informational References (if any) throughout the standard. This would minimize questions and some confusion.

**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 reconsider the motion to accept comments 6a-2, 6a-9, and 6a-15.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion on the motion.

**VOTE: The Motion passes with 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

### **6a-2, 6a-9, 6a-15**

**Public Comment:** Recommended Documentation Public Comments

**Reason:** Recommend moving all Recommended Documentation, as appropriate and applicable, to the criteria itself underneath Informational References (if any) throughout the standard. This would minimize questions and some confusion.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been modified. There is no Required Documentation within the standard. We will move Recommended Documentation to each criteria section.

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

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was discussion on the Public Comments' Reason and how it does not say the documentation is required like it does in the Energy Section.

**AMENDMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to change the response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been modified. We will move Recommended Documentation to each criteria section.**

**Discussion that took place on the Amendment:**

- No discussion took place on the amendment.

**VOTE: The Amendment carries with 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.**

Abstain: Allan Bilka, Doug Tucker,

**VOTE: The Amended Motion carries with 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.**

Abstain: Allan Bilka, Jeff Bradley

### **Public Participation**

No interested parties made a comment and no discussion occurred.

### **New Business**

The Water Subcommittee Chair discussed how he would like to potentially create criteria on leak protection. Marx stated she that will work with the Chair to set up a Subcommittee meeting.

### **Action Items**

Marx reminded members on the call that the next Consensus Body meeting will be on February 21, 2020 from 2:00-4:00pm EST.

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

**Meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM EST.**