



MINUTES

GBI Consensus Body - Call #5
 Webinar/Teleconference
 June 19, 2020 from 12:00 to 2:00 p.m. ET

NOTE ALL TIMES ARE EASTERN TIME

Consensus Body Members in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	6/19/20	2/21/20	2/7/20	1/10/20	12/20/19
Gregg Bergmiller	The S/L/A/M Collaborative	X	X	X	X	X
Benjamin Bojda	Dominion Environmental Consultants NV, Inc	X	X	X	X	X
Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X	X	X	X	X
Karen Butler	EPA	X	X	X	X	X
Virgil Campaneria	Gurri Matute PA	X	X	Absent	Absent	X
Michael Cudahy	PPFA - PPEF	X	X	X	X	X
Chris Dixon	Morrison Hershfield	X	(proxy Bergmiller)	X	X	X
David Eldridge	Grumman/Butkus Associates	(Proxy Shymko)	X	(proxy Shymko)	X	X
Josh Jacobs	UL	X	X	X	X	X
Gary Keclik	Keclik Associates Ltd.	X	X	X	Absent	Absent
Charles Kibert	University of Florida	X	X	Absent	X	X
Michael Lehman (Chair)	Chair	X	Absent	X	X	X
Tim Miller	Sidock Group Inc	X	X	Absent	X	X
James O'Brien	Independent Environmental Consultant	X	Absent	Absent	X	X
Jane Rohde	JSR Associates, Inc., The Vinyl Institute / Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X	X	X	Absent	X
Kirk Sander	National Waste and Recycling Association	X	X	X	Absent	X
Gord Shymko	G. F. Shymko & Associates Inc.	X	X	X	X	X
Stephen Szoke	American Concrete Institute	X	X	X	Absent	X
Angela Tin	American Lung Association	X	X	X	X	X
Doug Tucker	Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X

Interested Parties in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	6/19/20	2/21/20	2/7/20	1/20/20	12/20/19
Tara Brooks	American Lung Association	X				
Glen Clapper	National Roofing Contractors Association				X	
Larry Clark	Sustainable Performance Solutions			X		
John Cross	American Institute of Steel Construction	X				
Domenic DeCaria	The Vinyl Institute				X	

Robyn Dowsey	Eco Build Strategies	X				
Larry Eisenberg	Ovus Partners 360	X	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		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	X	
Emily Lorenz	Independent Consulting Engineer	X		X	X	X
Cambria McLeod	Kohler Company	X	X	X		X
Thomas Pape	Best Management Partners			X	X	
Kimmy Seago	Yardi Energy		X			
Mike Temple	Irrigation Association					X
Kyle Thompson	IAPMO	X			X	
Martha VanGeem		X				

Staff in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	6/19/20	2/21/20	2/7/20	1/10/20	12/20/19
Vicki Worden	President & CEO, GBI	Absent	Absent	X	Absent	X
Emily Marx	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X	X	X
Megan Baker	Staff, GBI	Absent	Absent	X	X	X
Kate Callahan	Staff, GBI	X	Absent	X	X	X
Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI	X	Absent	X	X	X
Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI	Absent	X	X	X	X
Adam Wellen	Staff, GBI	Absent	Absent	X	X	X

Welcome

Chair Michael Lehman 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

Lehman reviewed the agenda and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were no comments made on the agenda

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

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

Abstain: Jeff Bradley

Lehman also reviewed the minutes from meeting #4 on February 21, 2020 and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were no comments made on the minutes.

MOTION: A Motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from meeting #4 on February 21, 2020 as presented.

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

Abstain: Josh Jacobs, Mike Cudahy

Stephen Szoke joined the call.

Universal Changes

Staff discussed why the numbering of certain criteria needs to be updated throughout the standard to have consistency. Marx displayed water editorial comments on the screen as an example. She stated that because this is an Editorial Comment it does not need a motion and formal approval.

All Editorial Numbering System Public Comments

Public Comment: N/A

Reason: N/A

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 Comments:

- There were no objections to the numbering updates throughout the standard.

Staff stated that there has been discussion on removing all recommended documentation sections from the standard and placing them in the Technical Manual.

6a-2, 6a-9, 6a-15, 8-6, 8-9, 8-14, 8-17, 8-18, 8-20, 6b-6, 6b-9, 6b-14, 6b-36, 6b-39, 6b-58, 6b-62, 5a-4, 5a-6, 5a-7, 5a-9, 5a-10, 5a-11, 5a-12, 5a-14, 4-6, 4-7, 4-9, 4-10, 5b-2, 5b-8, 5b-10, 5b-14,

Public Comment: N/A

Reason: To maintain consistency throughout the standard and to minimize confusion (as reported by pilot participants), it's proposed that Recommended Documentation be broken up and placed within the points where the documents are applicable.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to remove all Recommended Documentation from the standard and place it within the Technical Manual.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was discussion on how best to vote and resolve the numerous comments in each Assessment Area. There was agreement that the recommended documents will be part of the Technical Manual. It was noted that this motion does not include the Informational References, which could be brought up as new business.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 14 in favor, 3 opposed, 1 abstained.

Opposed: James O'Brien, Josh Jacobs, Mike Cudahy

Abstain: Jeff Bradley

Gary Keclik joined the call.

Materials

Marx asked if Materials could be reviewed first as a person on the call wants to speak on a certain item but needs to leave early. The first public comment up for discussion was on reducing the points minimum requirement. A member stated it was pre-mature to review this comment when the topic is discussed more thoroughly by the Points Allocation Subcommittee concerning a different public comment labeled under Front/Back End. The chair asked for the comments labeled under Front/Back End to be displayed.

Front/Back End

Marx displayed public comment 1-4 of moving the Achievement Table from the standard. There was discussion from Subcommittee chairs on removing the points minimum from the standard and Marx displayed New Business, Points-1.

Points -1

Proposed Revision:

3. ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS, MINIMUMS, NOT APPLICABLES AND THIRD PARTY ASSESSMENTS

3.1 Achievement Levels

~~Levels of Achievement 1, 2, 3, and 4 are specified in Table 1 below.~~

~~TABLE 1~~

3.2 Minimum Achievement Requirements

~~To achieve compliance in any of the four Levels, buildings must:~~

- ~~1. attain a minimum of 35% of applicable points out of the 1000 possible points available; and~~
- ~~2. attain a minimum percentage of points in each environmental assessment area as denoted in Table 2.~~

~~Where calculations are used to determine points achieved, round to the nearest whole number.~~

3.3 Not Applicable Criteria

Each environmental assessment area contains certain criteria that a design and delivery team may deem to be "Not Applicable" to the building. Selecting "Not Applicable" may be appropriate in the following circumstances as denoted in Table 3:

TABLE 3

Questions without a Not Applicable option should be answered as appropriate for the building.

4. ASSESSMENT OF COMPLIANCE

~~Assessment of compliance with a specific Level of Achievement (Table 1) can be established through a third-party review of appropriate written plans, working drawings, specifications, site plans, energy modeling, life cycle assessment results, commissioning reports, construction documents and/or other data or documents that demonstrate conformance.~~

Discussion on the Proposed Revision

A member from the Points Subcommittee reviewed the reasons why the points minimum for each Assessment Area and the entire standard should be removed: points should be the purview of GBI and not the Consensus Body and removing points will allow more time for the Consensus Body to focus on the criteria and not the rating system. A Points Allocation Subcommittee member stated that they concluded that the Consensus Body is responsible for establishing the content of the standard and GBI is responsible for determining if a building achieves certification. He argued that this allows GBI to evolve with changing markets and remain nimble. It was noted that removing the points minimum will allow GBI to differentiate Green Globes from any competitor. The point was made that the standard is the intellectual property of GBI. Staff will prepare a presentation for the next call on the need to alter the minimum points requirement.

1-4

Public Comment: 12. REFERENCES AND GUIDELINES

International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials (IAPMO)

~~IAPMO 2015 Green Plumbing & Mechanical Code Supplement~~ 2017 IAPMO WEstand

~~IAPMO 2015-2018~~ Uniform Mechanical Code

Reason: The 2017 WEstand supersedes the 2015 GPMCS in water efficiency provisions, and the 2018 is the current IAPMO Uniform Mechanical Code.

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 on the motion.

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

Project Management

The PM/Energy Subcommittee Chair reviewed the editorial updates to the Informational References within the Assessment Area. He asked if any member opposed the updates. There were no comments or concerns.

PM-E-1, PM-E-2 PM-E-3, PM-E-4 PM-E-5, PM-E-6

Proposed Revision: N/A

No discussion took place on the Editorial updates by the PM/Energy Subcommittee.

PM-E-7

Proposed Revision: Commissioning and building operator training is conducted in accordance with ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 202–~~2013~~2018, Commissioning Process for Buildings and Systems, and ASHRAE Guideline 0-2013, NIBS (Building Envelope), and The Commissioning Process, for the following building systems:

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- No discussion took place on the motion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 18 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Charles Kibert

PM-E-8

Proposed Revision: 6.5.1.1

Commissioning and building operator training is conducted in accordance with ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 202–2013, Commissioning Process for Buildings and Systems, and ASHRAE Guideline 0-~~2013~~2019, The Commissioning Process, for the following building systems:

6.5.2.1 Produce a systems manual in accordance with ASHRAE Guideline 0-~~2013~~2019, The Commissioning Process, Informative Annex O – Systems Manual, Sections 4 to 10, inclusive.

6.5.2.2 Conduct systems training in accordance with ASHRAE Guideline 0-~~2013~~2019, The Commissioning Process, Informative Annex P – Training Manual and Training Needs.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- No discussion took place on the motion.

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

Site

The Site Subcommittee chair reviewed each public comment before a motion was made on each one.

8-4

Public Comment:

7.1.1.1 The building is being constructed on a previously developed site that has been served by existing utility and transportation infrastructure for at least a full year prior to construction. ~~14~~13 points

7.1.2.1 The building is being constructed on a brownfield or remediated Superfund site. ~~14~~ 13 points

7.2.1.6.2: At least 50% of the sheltered bicycle parking is located inside the building or within storage lockers or another area that provides security of a locked room or cage secured by a keyed, cipher, or electronic lock and the ability to lock the bicycle to a rack within that space.

- ~~Two~~One points where the sheltered bicycle parking is secure. (Only applicable where the above two points are achieved.)

7.4.1.2 Hardscapes and structures, excluding pervious walkways 48 in. (121.9 cm) or less in width, are located 100 ft. (30.5 m) or more from a natural body of water or natural waterway on or adjacent to the site. Document such distance

on the site plan.

~~4~~ 3 points or N/A

Reason: Site area has 154 points not 150. This is because criterion was omitted from the subcommittee's scoring spreadsheet. Total points in Site is 154, not 150. 4 points from 7.4.1.2 was omitted. To reduce the total points for this section 4 points were removed from different criteria.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. We would like to promote bicycling which occurs more often than the one-time impact of brownfields and site development. The modification is as follows:

7.1.1.1 The building is being constructed on a previously developed site that has been served by existing utility and transportation infrastructure for at least a full year prior to construction. ~~4~~12 points

7.1.2.1 The building is being constructed on a brownfield or remediated Superfund site. ~~4~~ 12 points

7.2.1.6.2: At least 50% of the sheltered bicycle parking is located inside the building or within storage lockers or another area that provides security of a locked room or cage secured by a keyed, cipher, or electronic lock and the ability to lock the bicycle to a rack within that space.

- Two points where the sheltered bicycle parking is secure. (Only applicable where the above two points are achieved.)

7.4.1.2 Hardscapes and structures, excluding pervious walkways 48 in. (121.9 cm) or less in width, are located 100 ft. (30.5 m) or more from a natural body of water or natural waterway on or adjacent to the site. Document such distance on the site plan.

4 points or N/A

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The chair reviewed the need to reduce points in this Assessment Area and why the points were removed just from 7.1.1 and 7.1.2.1

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

8-5

Public Comment: 7.1 Development Area (~~38~~ 41 points)

Reason: Points in this section add up to 41, not 38 (Includes above changes to 7.1.1.1 and 7.1.2.1)

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. To be in balance with comment 8-4 the below modification is as follows:

7.1 Development Area (~~38~~ 35 points)

Discussion took place on the Public Comment:

- The chair reviewed the need to update the header accurately and stated that it needed to be updated further to make up for the point change of the criteria on Bird Strikes.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was noted that discussion of 8-21 on Bird Strikes should occur before discussion on header changes.

The Motion was withdrawn.

8-21

Public Comment: 7.3.5 Bird Strikes

- No construction or site disturbance takes place in bird migration or flyaway zones

OR

- Techniques/materials are used throughout 50% of the building exterior to mitigate bird strikes.

Informational Reference(s):

- Cornell Lab of Ornithology: <https://mailchi.mp/cornell/release-study-lists-top-cities-where-lights-endanger-migratory-birds>
- San Francisco Planning, Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings: <https://sfplanning.org/standards-bird-safe-buildings>, and Bird-Safe Building Checklist: [http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/bird_safe_bldgs/Standards for Bird Safe](http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/bird_safe_bldgs/Standards%20for%20Bird%20Safe)

Buildings - 11-30-11.pdf

• Chicago, Bird Friendly Building Ordinance (proposed): <https://birdfriendlychicago.org/ordinance>

Reason: Add criteria on bird strikes

Resources:

• Cornell Lab of Ornithology: <https://mailchi.mp/cornell/release-study-lists-top-cities-where-lights-endanger-migratory-birds>

• San Francisco Planning, Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings: <https://sfplanning.org/standards-bird-safe-buildings>, and Bird-Safe Building Checklist: [http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/bird_safe_bldgs/Standards for Bird Safe Buildings - 11-30-11.pdf](http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/bird_safe_bldgs/Standards%20for%20Bird%20Safe%20Buildings%20-%2011-30-11.pdf)

• Chicago, Bird Friendly Building Ordinance (proposed): <https://birdfriendlychicago.org/ordinance>

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification because of the need to provide more clarity and more information. The modification is the following: 7.3.5 Bird Strikes

7.3.5.1 Measures to address bird strikes include, but are not limited to the following:

Glass and Façade Treatments:

• Fritted and Frosted Glass

• Angled Glass

• Ultra-Violet Glass

• Film and Art Treatment of Glass

• External Screens

• Architectural Features

• Netting

Other Considerations:

• Wind generators

• Lighting Treatments

Location-Related Hazard:

• Buildings located inside of, or within a clear flight path of less than 300 feet from an Urban Bird Refuge (defined below) require treatment when:

o New buildings are constructed

o Additions are made to existing buildings (Note: only the new construction will require treatment)

o Existing buildings replace 50% or more of the glazing within the “bird collision zone” on the façade(s) facing the Urban Bird Refuge

Bird Collision Zone:

The portion of buildings most likely to sustain bird strikes. This area begins at grade and extends upwards for 60 feet. This zone also applies to glass façades directly adjacent to large landscaped roofs (two acres or larger) and extending upward 60 feet from the level of the subject roof.

Informational Reference(s):

• San Francisco Planning, Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings

(https://sfplanning.org/sites/default/files/documents/reports/bird_safe_bldgs/Standards%20for%20Bird%20Safe%20Buildings%20-%2011-30-11.pdf)

• Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings, San Francisco Planning Department (July 14, 2011),

(<https://sfplanning.org/standards-bird-safe-buildings>)

• American Bird Conservancy Bird-Friendly Building Design (<http://collisions.abcbirds.org/>)

• Cornell Lab of Ornithology Study Names Top Cities Emitting Light that Endangers Migratory Birds

(<https://mailchi.mp/cornell/release-study-lists-top-cities-where-lights-endanger-migratory-birds>)

• Chicago Bird Collision Monitors (CBCM) (www.birdmonitors.net)

• Architectural and Landscape Risk Factors Associated with Bird-Glass Collisions in an Urban Environment (Klem, et al., 2009), (<https://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/pdf/management/klemandsanger2009architecturalrisk.pdf>)

• Chicago Bird Friendly Building Ordinance (<https://birdfriendlychicago.org/ordinance>)

Maximum = 4 points

• 3 points are awarded for implementing measures identified in 7.3.5.1.

• 1 point is awarded for assessing and reporting on the design analysis for bird safety.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The chair reviewed the Bird Strike criteria.
- A member stated that the language should be updated to include some of the original language that was submitted with the public comment, such as how to decrease bird strikes with actual methods. There was discussion that the criteria is better if it focuses on credit to mitigate collisions versus those on flyaway zones. The original member noted that he did not oppose the criteria in general but stated that the language should be revised before going out for public comment.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 17 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstained.

Opposed: Jeff Bradley

Abstain: Doug Tucker

8-5

Public Comment: 7.1 Development Area (~~38~~ 41 points)

Reason: Points in this section add up to 41, not 38 (Includes above changes to 7.1.1.1 and 7.1.2.1)

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. To be in balance with comment 8-4 the below modification is as follows:

7.1 Development Area (~~38~~ 35 points)

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- No discussion took place on the motion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 18 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Jeff Bradley

8-7

Public Comment: 7.2 Transportation (~~34~~ 30 points)

Reason: Points in this section add up to 31, not 34. (Includes above changes to 7.2.1.6)

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. To be in balance with comment 8-4 the below modification is as follows:

7.2 Transportation (~~34~~ 31 points)

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 17 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.

Abstain: Jeff Bradley, Kirk Sander

8-10

Public Comment: 7.3 Construction Impacts (~~29~~ 30 points)

Reason: Points in this section add up to 30, not 29.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. To be in balance with comment 8-4 the below modification is as follows:

7.3 Construction Impacts (~~29~~ 34 points)

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The chair stated that because of the new Bird Strike criteria this header was also updated to reflect the new total.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 18 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Jeff Bradley

8-15

Public Comment: 7.4 Stormwater Management (~~21~~ 20 points)

Reason: Be decreasing the points of 7.4.1.2, this section adds up to 20, not 21.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Point re-allocation was not required due to changes made for comment 8-4. The header is below:

7.4 Stormwater Management (21 points)

Discussion took place on the Public Comment:

- The chair stated that because the Subcommittee took points from other areas to reduce the Assessment Area to 150, this header did not need to be updated.

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 on the motion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 18 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Tim Miller

8-19

Public Comment: 7.6 Exterior Light Pollution (~~7~~5 points)

- Path A: Lighting Design Performance: ~~7~~5 points

OR

- Path B: Prescriptive Lighting Requirements: ~~7~~5 points

Reason: Exterior Light Pollution has 2 paths. Standard said Path A was worth 7 points and Path B was worth 5 points. Subcommittee voted to make both paths 5 points, but the Standard was not updated correctly.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted and the changes have been implemented in the Standard. The correction is below:

7.6 Exterior Light Pollution (~~7~~5 points)

- Path A: Lighting Design Performance: ~~7~~5 points

OR

- Path B: Prescriptive Lighting Requirements: ~~7~~5 points

Discussion took place on the Public Comment:

- The chair stated that the update from 7 to 5 is more of a typo since it was not updated correctly during the last round of updates. He confirmed that the change of number does not change any point totals within the Assessment Area.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

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

Energy

The PM/Energy Subcommittee chair reviewed each comment.

6b-11

Public Comment: N/A

Reason: Path C for Energy has only 111 possible points instead of 180, but full points for this path would be 111/180 not 111/111

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been acknowledged for the following reason: the maximum points for Path C is 111 points, whereas the maximum for Path A and Path B is 180 points.

Discussion took place on the Public Comment:

- The chair explained that this comment was made out of confusion, so the subcommittee acknowledged it and created an item as New Business to clarify the path language.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 16 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstained.

Opposed: Tim Miller

Abstain: Jeff Bradley, Mike Cudahy

PM-E-9

Proposed Revision: 8. ENERGY (260 points)

Three paths are provided for assessing energy performance. Path A and Path B provide a maximum of 180 points out of 180, and Path C provides a maximum of 111 points out of 180.

- Path A: Performance - ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 90.1-2010, Appendix G: 180 points
OR
- Path B: Performance - Building Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (CO₂e) Emissions: 180 points
OR
- Path C: Prescriptive: 111 points

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

Reason for Proposed Revision: Related to comment 6b-11, Subcommittee voted during New Business to send recommended edits to the Consensus Body for approval. Intended to clarify points for Path C, which are a maximum of 111 out of 180 possible points for the Energy Performance pathways.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 18 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Jeff Bradley

6b-51

Public Comment: Maximum = 5 points or N/A

- One point is earned for each 20% increment of the building's site energy that is metered through any combination of building-level energy meters up to a maximum of 5 points.
- Not applicable only where specified for each criterion.
- 100% = 5/5 points
- 80% - 99% = 4/5 points
- 60% - 79% = 3/5 points
- 40% - 59% = 2/5 points
- 20% - 39% = 1/5 points
- 0% - 19% = 0/5 points

Reason: Scoring is already based on any combination of meter types for energy use in the building - why specify N/A provisions for Steam and Other? N/A removes from total denominator but how would that be done here, particularly since scoring is based on increments of total energy usage being metered? Recommend removing N/A provisions as it unnecessarily complicates scoring. Keep scoring based on total energy usage that is metered, in increments of 20%.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The reason for modification is to delete unnecessary N/As. Changes will be made as follows:

[From left column]: Install Metering or ensure a mandatory design requirement exists for metering (at the building level) for the following:

- Electricity (~~N/A where metering does not exist for electricity~~);
- Heating fuels (~~N/A where metering does not exist for heating fuels~~);
- Steam (~~N/A where metering does not exist for Steam~~); and
- Other (e.g., chilled or hot water for campus/district systems) (~~N/A where metering does not exist for any other systems~~).

[From right column]: Maximum = 5 points ~~or N/A~~

- One point is earned for each 20% increment of the building's site energy that is metered through any combination of building-level energy meters up to a maximum of 5 points.
- ~~• Not applicable only where specified for each criterion.~~

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 18 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstained.

Opposed: Jeff Bradley

6b-54

Public Comment: 8.5.2.1 Maximum = ~~2~~ 3 points

8.5.2.2 Maximum = ~~3~~ 2 points

• ~~Two~~ One points ~~are~~ is earned where there is definition of a process for implementing improvements in energy usage to reach the stated goals, based upon review and analysis of the gathered documentation for two or more of the listed systems.

Reason: There's three criterion that can get one point each, should the max points for this section be 3? If so it raises the energy section to 261 points. Alternatively, is the intent for there to be three ways to get to a total of 2 points, but no more than 2 points?

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The intent is for a maximum of 2 points, with three possible ways to gain points.

Discussion took place on the Public Comment:

- Chair explained that this comment may have been made out of confusion but it is accurate as currently written in the standard that a project can achieve 2 points 3 ways.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

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

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

New Business

Chris Dixon noted that removing informational references could make updates to them easier and faster. A question was asked about how they would be updated in the future and if one were added to the standard, how it would be done. The Secretariat noted that the informational references would be moved to the Technical Document and when they needed to be updated staff would confirm the update with experts and update them in a timely manner. It was noted that because Informational References were not substantive changes, they should be moved to the Technical Manual.

Consensus Body-1

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to remove all Informational References and place them in the Technical Manual to be updated accordingly by staff with the advice of experts.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 16 in favor, 3 opposed, 0 abstained.

Opposed: Jane Rohde, Jeff Bradley, Josh Jacobs

A member stated that this motion would affect previously approved public comments where the Consensus Body approved revisions to Informational References (i.e. Bird Strike, 8-21). Marx stated that she will review all public comments and will present them to the Consensus Body at the next meeting so the responses to the commenters' can be updated.

Action Items

GBI staff reminded those on the call that the next Consensus Body call will be next Friday, June 26, 2020, from 12:00-2:00pm EST. Staff stated that they will develop a short presentation on removing the points minimum from the standard.

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

Meeting adjourned at 1:58 PM EST.