



MINUTES

GBI Consensus Body - Call #4
 Webinar/Teleconference
 February 21, 2020 from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. ET

NOTE ALL TIMES ARE EASTERN TIME

Consensus Body Members in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	2/21/20	2/7/20	1/10/20	12/20/19
Gregg Bergmiller	The S/L/A/M Collaborative	X	X	X	X
Allan Bilka	International Code Council	Absent	X	Absent	X
Benjamin Bojda	Dominion Environmental Consultants NV, Inc	X	X	X	X
Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X	X	X	X
Karen Butler	EPA	X	X	X	X
Virgil Campaneria	Gurri Matute PA	X	Absent	Absent	X
Michael Cudahy	PPFA - PPEF	X	X	X	X
Chris Dixon	Morrison Hershfield	(proxy Bergmiller)	X	X	X
David Eldridge	Grumman/Butkus Associates	X	(proxy Shymko)	X	X
Josh Jacobs	UL	X	X	X	X
Luke Johnson	American Institute of Steel Construction	Absent	Absent	Absent	X
Gary Keclik	Keclik Associates Ltd.	X	X	Absent	Absent
Charles Kibert	University of Florida	X	Absent	X	X
Michael Lehman (Chair)	Chair	Absent	X	X	X
Tim Miller	Sidock Group Inc	X	Absent	X	X
James O'Brien	Independent Environmental Consultant	Absent	Absent	X	X
Jane Rohde	JSR Associates, Inc., The Vinyl Institute / Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X	X	Absent	X
Kirk Sander	National Waste and Recycling Association	X	X	Absent	X
Gord Shymko	G. F. Shymko & Associates Inc.	X	X	X	X
Stephen Szoke	American Concrete Institute	X	X	Absent	X
Angela Tin	American Lung Association	X	X	X	X
Doug Tucker	Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc.	X	X	X	X

Interested Parties in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	2/21/20	2/7/20	1/20/20	12/20/19
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		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	X	
Emily Lorenz	Independent Consulting Engineer		X	X	X
Cambria McLeod	Kohler Company	X	X		X
Thomas Pape	Best Management Partners		X	X	
Kimmy Seago	Yardi Energy	X			
Mike Temple	Irrigation Association				X
Kyle Thompson	IAPMO			X	

Staff in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	2/21/20	2/7/20	1/10/20	12/20/19
Vicki Worden	President & CEO, GBI	Absent	X	Absent	X
Emily Marx	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X	X
Megan Baker	Staff, GBI	Absent	X	X	X
Kate Callahan	Staff, GBI	Absent	X	X	X
Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI	Absent	X	X	X
Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI	X	X	X	X
Adam Wellen	Staff, GBI	Absent	X	X	X

Welcome

Vice Chair Charles Kibert welcomed everyone to the meeting.

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

Kibert spoke of first going through the Water public comments, followed by Materials, and Site, and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were no comments or concerns.

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

VOTE: The Motion passes with 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstained: David Eldridge

Kibert also reviewed the minutes from meeting #3 on February 7, 2020 and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were no comments or concerns.

MOTION: A Motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from meeting #3 on February 7, 2020 as presented.

VOTE: The Motion passes with 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstained: David Eldridge

Karen Butler and Jane Rohde joined the call.

WATER ASSESSMENT AREA PUBLIC COMMENT REVIEW

Chair of the Water Subcommittee, Mike Cudahy, reviewed the first 8 public comments concerning moving Recommended Documentation under specific criteria. As a Subcommittee, they voted against moving the Recommended Documentation, but that they want to follow what all the Subcommittees are doing as it is important for consistency throughout the Standard. Kibert spoke about the need for consistency means that these items need to be agreed on by the Consensus Body.

A member from the Site Subcommittee stated they had a similar discussion about Recommended Documentation. They looked at the online questionnaire and noted that a lot of the Recommended Documentation is not necessary for completing criteria (they can support and verify the criteria but are not required), which is what he always liked about Green Globes. The member asked whether the standard could list all the types of Recommended Documents within an appendix for reference, and each document type can be identified by A, B, C, etc. separated by generic/usual documents that are used in multiple areas and then also by assessment area.

A member of the Energy Subcommittee who is also a Green Globes Assessor spoke about their experience with assessments. Green Globes is a bit more specific with their criteria, including listing the Recommended Documentation directly with the criteria. Putting the Recommended Documentation at the end puts users at risk of missing that appendix entirely. Another member suggested putting Recommended Documentation at the end of the standard like a footnote to avoid it being too voluminous.

GBI staff was asked whether the online software displays Recommended Documentation for individual criteria, and staff confirmed that the software forces the documents to be separated by criterion. It was agreed that it makes sense to keep Recommended Documentation with the criteria.

Kibert asked for additional comments on Recommended Documentation, and there were none. Kibert stated that the Points Allocation Subcommittee should review the discussion had by the Consensus Body and asked the Water Subcommittee Chair to proceed to the next public comment.

1-1

Public Comment: Path C: ~~2015 IAPMO Green Plumbing & Mechanical Code Supplement~~ 2017 IAPMO WEstand Section 402: 54 points

Reason: The 2017 WEstand supersedes the 2015 GPMCS in water efficiency provisions.

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 if there were any major changes to the IAPMO standard, or if it is just a name change. The Chair for Water said that it is primarily a name change, although there are other updates. The member said that the change is to one Path and it is important that equivalence is maintained with the update.
- A member asked about flow rates listed in 2017 IAPMO WEstand and stated that it is important for them, before voting, to understand what the underlying change is that would be taking place.
- The Water Chair said that they can confirm that it is still Section 402 in the updated IAPMO Standard. The Water Chair showed the new fixture and fittings flow rates from the 2017 IAPMO WEstand (Table 402.1) on the screen.

- Another member spoke about problems occurring within Hospitals and Long-Term Care facilities, particularly related to Legionella induced by low flow fixtures. The Water Chair said part of the issue is with water age, but it is also an issue for healthcare facilities. He said IAPMO will need to look at providing an exemption for hospitals and long-term care facilities.
- A question was posed to GBI staff about how long they have to submit additional comments. Marx responded that comments can be submitted at any time as part of the continuance maintenance process timeline.
- A member spoke about how the 2019 GBI Standard is being used as the basis for the update to Green Globes for Existing Buildings (EB 2019), and any changes here would also take place in the EB 2019 update taking place in the next few months. Unlike the previous version, there will not be a separate module for healthcare, and thus any changes or exemptions for low flow fixtures need to be done for the EB 2019 update.
- A different member commented that there needs to be a review for other building types that can also be affected by Legionella.

VOTE: The Motion passes with 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.

Abstained: Jeff Bradley, David Eldridge

1-2

Public Comment: ~~9.1.3 Path C: 2015 IAPMO Green Plumbing & Mechanical Code Supplement~~ 2017 IAPMO WEstand 9.1.3.1 Plumbing fixtures and fittings comply with ~~2015 IAPMO Green Plumbing & Mechanical Code Supplement~~ 2017 IAPMO WEstand, Section 402.

Reason: The 2017 WEstand supersedes the 2015 GPMCS in water efficiency provisions.

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:

- No discussion took place.

VOTE: The Motion passes with 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.

Abstained: David Eldridge, Tim Miller

5a-1

Public Comment: Maximum = 45 points (out of 54) or N/A

Reason: Users can earn a max of 45 points for Path D under Water Efficiency, but the score would be 45/54 not 45/45

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The change is not consistent with the rest of the standard and would not provide clarity.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- No discussion took place.

VOTE: The Motion passes with 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstained: Kirk Sander

5a-3

Public Comment: ~~Not applicable where Path A, B or C is followed.~~

Reason: Criteria already specifies "New construction is not eligible for Path D," and N/A provisions are only for scoring criteria applicable to the project. This is unnecessary, potentially confusing, and redundant.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The change would not be consistent with the other pathways of 9.1.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The chair stated that that the language proposed does not appear anywhere else in the document and is redundant to what is already within the standard.

VOTE: The Motion passes with 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstained: Jane Rohde

5a-5

Public Comment: • Four points are earned where $\geq 50\%$ (equal or greater) and $< 75\%$ of annual evaporative cooling demands are replaced by non-evaporative cooling.

Reason: Should be equal or greater than 50%, since the next scoring threshold is $< 50\%$.

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:

- No discussion took place.

VOTE: The Motion passes unanimously with 17 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

5a-8

Public Comment: Not applicable where there is no on-premise/institutional laundry, are no coin- and card-operated machines.

Reason: Should say “Not applicable where there is no on-premise/institutional laundry” not “Not applicable where there are no coin- and card-operated machines.”

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:

- A member had a question about how there are references to “coin- and card-operated machines” in other areas, and whether they were going to change that as well. There are different Water Factor (WF) points listed. Criterion 9.4.3.1 also specifies “coin- or card-operated laundromat machines.” A question was posed to the full Consensus Body about whether these are the appropriate nomenclature.
- The question was asked if the correct term is “coin- and card-operated” or “on-premise/institutional laundry?”
- Another member spoke about how if they’re going to be nit-picky, there are phone-operated laundry machines that do not take coins or cards.
- It was stated that they could change the text to “pay per use.”
- It was agreed that more information is needed from the Water Subcommittee.
- There was no further discussion or comments and the Consensus Body vice chair asked the Water Subcommittee Chair to move on to the next comment until further information is gathered from the Water Subcommittee.

5a-13

Public Comment: • Not Applicable where there is no landscaping, the landscaping has no vegetation, or where no irrigation system is installed.

Reason: 9.8.1.1, 9.8.1.3, and 9.8.1.4 each have N/A provisions, and it would seem to apply here as well.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. For consistency within this section of the standard and for clarification we have modified the comment to the following: Maximum = 4 points or N/A

- Four points are earned where there is an irrigation plan

• Not Applicable where there is no landscaping, the landscaping has no vegetation, or where no irrigation system is installed.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- A member involved with the 2019 Standard said that they were trying to remember why this specific sub-criterion did not specify N/A whereas the other sub-criteria did. The Water Chair said that one of the issues is you can game the system by having a plan that never goes anywhere, and the member said that this is similar to other rating systems.
- A member said that Green Globes typically rewards project teams for having plans, although that may be more important in other areas than irrigation.

VOTE: The Motion passes with 14 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstained.

Opposed: David Eldridge, Gary Keclik

Abstained: Jeff Bradley

Moving on to the next assessment area, Materials, Kibert handed over the floor to Materials Subcommittee member, Josh Jacobs.

2-3

Public Comment: N/A

Reason: Do any manufacturers, in the United States, provide letters or documentation for this? It seems to be another example of European standards being applied to a market which is not ready for it. If we can't get this documentation, we can not assess the project and the client will lose the points.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been acknowledged and while the Consensus Body has discussed your comment no changes have been implemented in the draft Standard.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- No discussion took place.

VOTE: The Motion passes with 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstained: Jeff Bradley

4-2

Public Comment: 10.6.3.1 Products used in the construction of the building are selected from manufacturers who have minimized or diverted waste during the production/manufacturing of the products. This criterion applies gate-to-gate – ~~to~~ all material inputs and outputs to a facility (or facilities) that produce/manufacture finished products.

Reason: The word 'to' was to be removed during last round

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The sentence makes sense to keep the word 'to.'

Discussion took place on the Public Comment:

- No discussion took place on the Editorial Public Comment and Jacobs moved on to the next comment.

7-1

Public Comment: 10.4.1.1 Points are earned based on adding percentages of materials, by material cost, that carry the pre-consumer recycled content, post-consumer recycled content, biobased content or third party sustainable forestry certification content attribute:

Product Sustainable Attribute Material =

Pre-consumer recycled content %

+

Post-consumer recycled content %

+

Biobased content %

+

Third Party Sustainable Forestry Certification content

%

±

Eco-Certified Composite sustainability standard %

Use the formula ~~below~~ above to determine the percentages by cost of the products that carry the listed attributes. Only the portion of materials that has the identified attribute should be included. For example, if a product has 40% pre-consumer recycled content, only 40% of the value of that product is included.

Sustainable Attribute % = Sum for all materials: (Portion of the Material with the Attribute x materials cost)/(Total Material Value)

Products that are claimed for credit under Third Party Sustainable Forestry Certification are not also included as biobased content.

Biobased content percentage may be calculated by weight or in accordance with ASTM D6866-16 Standard Test Methods for Determining the Biobased Content of Solid, Liquid, and Gaseous Samples Using Radiocarbon Analysis.

Eco-Certified Composite (ECC) is a sustainability standard for composite wood or agrifiber-based panels, including particleboard, medium density fiberboard (MDF), hardboard, engineered wood siding, and engineered woodtrim.

The following forest certification systems are recognized:

- Forest Stewardship Council (FSC): <https://us.fsc.org/en-us> (last accessed 8/30/17)
- Sustainable Forestry Initiative, Inc. (SFI): <http://www.sfiprogram.org/> (last accessed 8/30/17)
- American Tree Farm System (ATFS): <https://www.treefarmssystem.org/> (last access 8/30/17)
- Canadian Standards Association Sustainable Forestry Management (CSA): <http://www.csasfmforests.ca/> (last accessed 8/30/17)
- Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC): <https://www.pefc.org/> (last accessed 8/30/17)
- ECC Certification information, including the ECC standard and ECC-certified company list can be found online at <http://compositepanel.org/sustainability/ecc/>

Recommended Documentation

Manufacturer's product data sheets or a statement from manufacturer(s) certifying claims or third-party certification from an organization that has the program in its ISO 17065 scope of accreditation.

Reason: This allows for the inclusion of an independent, third-party certification standard that recognizes products that meet a number of relevant sustainable attributes, such as:

- carbon footprint;
- local sourcing of wood fiber;
- use of recycled/recovered materials;
- low production waste; and
- sustainable wood sourcing.

We believe that including the ECC Standard in this section strengthens the standard by recognizing products that improve the overall sustainability profile of the commercial building. For more information on the ECC program, please go to: <https://www.compositepanel.org/sustainability/ecc/>.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The reason for modification is that the referenced standard is a more traditional multi-attribute standard which we currently used to show compliance with 10.2.1.1 and is not applicable to 10.4.1.1. We have an Informational Reference section where this standard will be included. The modification is:

10.2.1.2

Informational Reference(s):

- Multi-attribute Standards (MAS): products compared use the same MAS. Examples include the following:
- ECC Certification information, including the ECC standard and ECC-certified company list can be found online at <http://compositepanel.org/sustainability/ecc/>
- NSF/ANSI 140-2015 Sustainability Assessment for Carpet

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- Jacobs stated that the ECC Standard is new to the Subcommittee and is also referenced by other criteria. Thus, it is the Subcommittee's recommendation to Accept with Modification, and to add the new reference to the Informational References within 10.2.1.1.

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

4-8

Public Comment: • Eight points are earned where waste is less than ~~or equal to~~ 1.2 lbs./ft²

Reason: Should say "Eight points are earned where waste is less than 1.2 lbs/ft² . . ." not "less than or equal to" because the next response choice includes 1.2 lbs/ft².

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:

- No discussion took place.

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

INDOOR ENVIRONMENT ASSESSMENT AREA PUBLIC COMMENT REVIEW

Moving on to the next assessment area, Indoor Environmental, Kibert asked for Josh Jacobs, an Indoor Environment Subcommittee member to present the public comments for the Subcommittee Chair that was not present.

5b-1

Public Comment: To determine acceptability of the emission results, VOC product emission concentrations are estimated per testing procedures from ANSI/BIFMA e3-2014, 7.6.1, 7.6.2, and 7.6.3. The maximum allowable concentrations are not exceeded per each section's requirements.

Reason: Grammar, add an apostrophe and 's' within sections.

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:

- No discussion took place on the Editorial Public Comment and Jacobs moved onto the next comment.

1-3

Public Comment: 11.1.1.1 The quantity of ventilation for the building is compliant with one of the following: ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.1-2013; Ventilation for Acceptable Indoor Air Quality;

- The ICC International Mechanical Code (ICC IMC 2015);
- IAPMO UMC (~~2015~~ 2018): Uniform Mechanical Code;
- ANSI/ASHRAE/ASHE Standard 170-2013, Ventilation of Health Care Facilities; OR
- Local codes or standards (if more stringent).

Informational Reference(s):

- ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.1-2013
- ANSI/ASHRAE/ASHE Standard 170-2013
- ICC 2015 International Mechanical Code: section 605
- IAPMO ~~2015~~ 2018 Uniform Mechanical Code: Section 402

Reason: 2018 is the current IAPMO Uniform Mechanical Code.

Discussion took place on the Public Comment:

- Jacobs discussed the public comment, which is on updating the IAPMO Uniform Mechanical Code and what the correct year version is.
- There was discussion on the need to review all of the informational references for those that need to be updated with a new version.
- Kibert noted that this is a problem for the entire standard and codes and standards are referenced across assessment areas (and thus, Subcommittees). He asked that if there are no objections they will refer this issue to the Points Allocation Subcommittee. There were no objections or concerns.

ENERGY ASSESSMENT AREA PUBLIC COMMENT REVIEW

Kibert handed the floor over to the Gord Shymko, Energy Subcommittee Chair to review the Assessment Area's comments.

6b-3

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: 100% of the pilot participants did this wrong because it is very confusing. They don't like that they can't get points for prescriptive criteria if they pursue Path A or B for energy performance.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The reason for modification is to increase clarification. The modification is:

8.1.1 Assessing Energy Performance

Three paths are provided for assessing energy performance. Select one of the paths below. Points cannot be combined

between paths.

- 8.1.1.1 Path A: Performance - ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 90.1-2010, Appendix G: 180 points

OR

- 8.1.1.2 Path B: Performance - Building Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (CO₂e) Emissions: 180 points

OR

- 8.1.1.3 Path C: Prescriptive: 111 points

~~Points cannot be combined between paths. Select one of the paths below.~~

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- No discussion took place.

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

Virgil Campaneria left the call.

6b-5

Public Comment: No points are earned where the building complies only with the minimum performance based requirements of either ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 90.1-2010 or the 2012 IECC.

Reason: Reword to eliminate confusion. Is that supposed to mean that no points are earned if the building ONLY complies with the minimum and does not demonstrate an improvement over baseline?

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:

- No discussion took place.

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

Abstained: Angela Tin

Virgil Campaneria joined the call.

6b-8

Public Comment: • Four points are earned for each percent reduction in CO₂e emissions above the baseline (≥51%), to a maximum total of 180 points.

Reason: If the building must achieve more than 50% reduction, and 4 points are awarded for every 1% reduction, that should be 51% to begin scoring. Reword to ease confusion.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been modified for clarity and now states :

- Four points are earned for each percent reduction in CO₂e emissions above the ~~baseline~~ BER, to a maximum total of 180 points.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- No discussion took place.

VOTE: The Motion passes unanimously with 17 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

6b-28

Public Comment: Variable refrigerant flow ~~air-to-air~~ and applied heat pumps

Reason: One small change should be made to the description of 6.8.1-10 remove the words air-to-air as this also covers water source products.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The current language is consistent with the 90.1 2013 table.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The Chair stated that the Subcommittee recommends to reject the public comment because it is a reference to a specific ASHRAE table that uses the language currently within the Standard.

VOTE: The Motion passes unanimously with 17 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

Public Participation

A public participant had a question about ASTM standards being Recommended Documents versus Informational References, and whether there was a formal definition for Recommended Documentation and Informational References. A voting member stated that Informational References are helpful but not needed, whereas Recommended Documents tell project teams what specific criteria is being met. The participant gave an example of ASTM standards that are guides, which are more informational, but other ASTM standards that are prescriptive and should be Recommended Documentation but are currently being listed as Informational References.

A different member spoke and said that Recommended Documentation are documents that support a claim to achieving a criterion. The member then warned that the Standard is *not* a rating system, it is a standard. The rating system is an implementation of the standard and Recommended Documentation is important for the assessment and verification process.

Marx said that Recommended Documentation is described within the standard's Forward under Section 4, Assessment of Compliance:

“Items from ‘Recommended Documentation’ list at the end of each area of compliance in this Standard are typical documents that providers of the third-party assessment will use prior to, or in conjunction with, a post-construction site visit and walk-through to assess compliance, although additional documentation may be requested or substituted prior to, or during, the on-site visit.”

The participant said that this description shows that it is prescriptive documentation and asked whether this should be considered when moving Recommended Documentation. A different member said that assessors can ask project teams to provide additional documentation that may not be included as Recommended Documentation. Another member spoke and said that anything being referenced should be listed under Informational References.

There was discussion that perhaps GBI is using the wrong term and perhaps “Recommended Documentation” should be called “Recommended Compliance.” Another member said that from their perspective, compliance is based on documentation, and “Recommended Documentation,” makes sense as the things you show an assessor as part of achieving Green Globes criteria.

A different member said that their Subcommittee is looking at each of these documents as they go through and move items, and are moving items to Informational References if it makes sense. The public participant said that this information is helpful, and that Recommended Documentation are really deliverables as opposed to references for more information.

New Business

A member stated that hospitality and Multi-family are also mentioned in the same report 2017 IAPMO WEstand standard and asked whether someone could take that report back to the Water Subcommittee for further review. The Water Subcommittee Chair stated that he will review it and present it to the Subcommittee to examine whether there are other exemptions needed within the Water Subcommittee.

Another member said that Legionella is also mentioned within Indoor Environment and would be willing to sit on a Task Group to review these fixture flow rate exemptions.

Schedule

Marx reviewed the schedule and said that there may be a little break before the next Consensus Body meeting due to Subcommittees reviewing public comments. The next meeting will likely be mid-March. Marx also informed the group that she would be out on maternity leave for the next couple of months.

GBI staff will send out a doodle poll for March to determine the best date and time for meeting #5.

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

Meeting adjourned at 3:41 PM EST.