



**MINUTES**

GBI Consensus Body for Existing Buildings- Call #5  
 Webinar/Teleconference  
 October 25, 2021 from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. ET

**NOTE ALL TIMES ARE EASTERN TIME**

**Consensus Body for Existing Buildings Members in Attendance**

Full Name	Organization	10/25/21	10/14/21	10/7/21	5/7/21	4/2/21
Benjamin Bojda	Dominion Environmental Consultants NV, Inc	X	X	X	Absent	X
Larry Clark	Sustainable Performance Solutions	X	Absent	X	X	X
Michael Cudahy	PPFA - PPEF	X	Absent	Absent	Absent	X
Lawrence (Buddy) Humphries (Chair)	Efficient Green, LLC	X	X	Absent	X	X
Josh Jacobs	UL	N/A	N/A	N/A	X	X
Christoph Lohr	IAPMO	X (Proxy Zatz)	Absent	Absent	N/A	N/A
Max Puchtel	American Institute of Steel Construction	Absent	X	X	X	X
Dave Ray	GRN Vision	Absent	X	X	N/A	N/A
Benjamin Reeves	Arete Design Group	X (Proxy Shymko)	Absent	X	X	X
Jane Rohde	JSR Associates, Inc., The Vinyl Institute / Resilient Floor Covering Institute	Absent	X	X	X	X
Anthony Serres	Signify North America Corporation	X	Absent	X	X	X
Gord Shymko	G. F. Shymko & Associates Inc.	X	X	X	X	X
Frank Sullivan	Kiewit	X	Absent	X	X	X
Kyle Thompson	IAPMO (International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials)	N/A	N/A	N/A	Absent	X
Michael Zatz	ENERGY STAR Commercial & Industrial Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	X	X	X	X	X

**Interested Parties in Attendance**

Full Name	Organization	10/25/21	10/14/20	10/7/21	5/7/21	4/2/21
Rob Brooks	Rob Brooks Associates			X		
Daniel Huard	Humann Building Solutions, LLC					X
Viken Koukounian	K.R. Moeller Associates Ltd.			X		X
James O'Brien	Independent Environmental Consultant	X				
Brenda Steinhauer	W.A. Richardson Builders, LLC			X		
Ray Tonjes	Ray Tonjes Builder, Inc.				X	

Eric Truelove	Green Building Resources LLC				X	
Doug Tucker	Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc.				X	
John Yowell	EPA's Indoor Environments Division			X		

#### Staff in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	10/25/21	10/14/21	10/7/21	5/7/21	4/2/21
Emily Marx	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X	X	X
Joseph Granada	Staff, GBI	X	X	X		
Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI	X	X	X	X	X
Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI	X	X	X	X	X
Aparna Varadharajan	Staff, GBI	X	X	X		

#### Welcome

Chair Lawrence Humphries 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. She asked if any guests or interested parties wanted to discuss any particulate comment or topic. No interested party noted an item they wanted to discuss.

Marx reviewed the Consensus Body for Existing Buildings roster and noted the three interest categories, General Interest, Producer, and User. She stated that there is balance on the Consensus Body for Existing Buildings. She reminded members to inform the Secretariat if there is any change in their Interest Category.

#### Administrative Items

Humphries thanked everyone for attending the meeting. He reviewed the agenda 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.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

Humphries also reviewed the minutes from meeting #3 on October 7, 2021, and meeting minutes #4 from October 14, 2021, 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 October 7, 2021, and the minutes from meeting #4 on October 14, 2021, as presented.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

#### ESG Public Comment Review

The Chair of the ESG/IEQ Subcommittee reviewed each public comment before discussion took place.

#### P1-1201

**Public Comment:** Reduce the number of total points available for the activities described in this section.

**Reason:** All of the points available in this section are awarded for “soft” commitments. They are commitments to have plans and schedules in place, but largely don’t require that those plans or schedules meet any sort of requirement in terms of effectiveness.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The committee has determined that the documented EMS is crucial to the safe and effective operations and the comment does not provide specifics of how the section would be modified. Additionally, this section addresses the processes necessary for adequate outcomes, the outcomes themselves are addressed in other parts of the rating system.

**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 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

#### **P1-401**

**Public Comment:** ~~1.1.1.3.5~~

**Reason:** What is being asked for in 1.1.1.3.5 should be part of 1.1.1.3.6

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: IAQ is much broader in scope than addressing and setting targets of the operational status of air handling equipment or the other aspects of defined in 1.1.1.3.5. Section 1.1.1.3.5 allows for the implementation of non-applicable criteria.

**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 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

#### **EB104-2**

**Public Comment:** Delete and allocate points to other credits

**Reason:** Benefit and practicality are questionable. Seldom have metered water networks of nonuse. Large water leaks are more likely visually apparent. Small leaks are a challenge to detect via meter readings due to meter accuracy and volume of water involved.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: This criterion emphasizes the importance of detecting leaks by any reasonable method.

**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 technology is moving very fast on this topic.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

#### **EB104-3**

**Public Comment:** Delete and allocate points to other credits

**Reason:** Legacy issue. I have not seen an untreated cooling tower system in all my time as an assessor. Typically, it is contracted out to water chemistry specialist

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The committee does not consider water treatment in cooling towers to be universal.

**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 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

#### **EB104-4**

**Public Comment:** Delete and allocate points to other credits

**Reason:** How relevant is this when everything has either moved or is moving to LED

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The committee rejects this revision because cleaning policies do not necessarily relate to type of light bulb and fixture. Additionally LED technology is not common in all existing buildings.

**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 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

#### **P1-1202**

**Public Comment:** Reduce the number of total points available for the activities described in this section.

**Reason:** All of the points available in this section are awarded for “soft” commitments which are highly subjective as to whether they have been accomplished.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: These criteria outline the implementation of planned responses to the various circumstances cited.

**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 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

#### **Energy Public Comment Review**

The Chair of the Energy Subcommittee asked the Vice Chair to present each public comment because he was not at the Points Allocation Subcommittee meeting. Thus, the Vice Chair reviewed each public comment or Subcommittee proposal before discussion took place

#### **P1-1208**

**Public Comment:** Delete Path A and require all buildings that can't receive an ENERGY STAR score to use Path C.

**Reason:** “Improvement Over Baseline” is not an appropriate way to assess energy performance for the designation of a green building. If a building is a poor performer, even a significant improvement over that building's baseline may still leave the building at a low level of performance. For example, the current Path A would award approximately 50 points to a building that reduces energy use by 1/3 over a 5 year period. Using the ENERGY STAR Score as a proxy, if a building with an ENERGY STAR Score of 5 reduces energy use by 1/3, that building will almost certainly be performing worse than the national average (and perhaps significantly worse). Yet the building would awarded 50 points and may end up being designated as a green building by GBI.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Path A is designed to address engagement in the existing building market from projects that do not necessarily have the technical and economic capacity to achieve scores under Path B or Path C.

**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 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

#### **P1-1209, P1-1210, Energy Pathway-1, Energy Pathway-2, Energy Pathway-3, Energy Pathway-4, Energy Pathway-5, Energy Pathway-6**

**P1-1209 Public Comment:** Change point allocations to:

100 points for score of 90 or higher

85 points for score of 85-90

70 points for score of 80-84

55 points for score of 75-79

40 points for score of 70-74

30 points for score of 65-69

20 points for score of 60-64

**P1-1209 Reason:** The differential in points awarded changes too much with each single point on the ENERGY STAR scale. To simplify this item, and to incentivize applicants to pursue larger improvements, the same number of points should be awarded for a range of scores. In addition points should be given for an ENERGY STAR score down to a score of 60, which is still 10 points higher than the national median and a good level of performance. These points should be much lower though to incentivize buildings to move from a score of 60 to a higher score.

**P1-1209 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The existing Path B scale was designed to be consistent with a number of jurisdictional programs and requirements. However, the granularity of the scale will be addressed separately. The scale has been revised to the following:

- 100 points are earned for an ENERGY STAR® score 95 to 100 ~~≥97 to ≤100~~.

- 88 points are earned for an ENERGY STAR® score 90 to 94.
  - 68 points are earned for an ENERGY STAR® score 85 to 89.
  - 52 points are earned for an ENERGY STAR® score 80 to 84.
  - 40 points are earned for an ENERGY STAR® score 75 to 79.
  - No points are earned for an ENERGY STAR® score of 74 or below.
  - ~~96 points are earned for an ENERGY STAR® score of 96.~~
  - ~~92 points are earned for an ENERGY STAR® score of 95.~~
- etc....

**P1-1210 Public Comment:** Change point allocations to:

- 100 points for a current standing of 90 or higher
- 85 points for a current standing of 85-90
- 70 points for a current standing of 80-84
- 55 points for a current standing of 75-79
- 40 points for a current standing of 70-74
- 30 points for a current standing of 65-69
- 20 points for a current standing of 60-64

**P1-1210 Reason:** The differential in points awarded changes too much with each single point on the scale. To simplify this item, and to incentivize applicants to pursue larger improvements, the same number of points should be awarded for a range of scores. In addition, points should be given for performance down to 60, which is still 10 points higher than the median and a good level of performance. These points should be much lower though to incentivize buildings to move from a level of 60 to a higher level.

**P1-1210 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The existing Path C scale was designed to be consistent with a number of jurisdictional programs and requirements. However, the granularity of the scale will be addressed separately. The scale has been revised to the following:

- 100 points are earned when the building's current standing is 95 to 100 ~~≥97 to ≤100~~.
  - 88 points are earned when the building's current standing is 90 to 94.
  - 68 points are earned when the building's current standing is 85 to 89.
  - 52 points are earned when the building's current standing is 80 to 84.
  - 40 points are earned when the building's current standing is 75 to 79.
  - No points are earned when the building's current standing is 74 or below.
  - ~~96 points are earned when the building's current standing is 96.~~
  - ~~92 points are earned when the building's current standing is 95.~~
- etc...

**Energy Pathway-1 Proposed Revision:** Points cannot be combined between paths. Select one of the paths below. If the building is eligible for an ENERGY STAR Score, then Path A (Improvement Over Baseline) or Path B (ENERGY STAR Score) must be pursued. If the building is not eligible for an ENERGY STAR score and Path A cannot be pursued (refer to the Assessment Guidance in the Technical Manual), then Path C (Alternative Building Energy Performance) can be pursued. Please note, manufacturing/industrial plants are eligible for an ENERGY STAR Score.

**Energy Pathway-2 Proposed Revision:** 3.1.1A.1 There is at least a 15% reduction in the building's energy over a 5-year benchmarking period ~~baseline~~ or 6-to 10-year benchmarking period ~~baseline~~.

**Energy Pathway-3 Proposed Revision:**

- 100 points are earned for a >45% ≥50 to ≤100 reduction over a ~~of the~~ 5-year benchmarking period ~~baseline~~.
  - 86 points are earned for a ≥41% to ≤45% reduction over a 5-year benchmarking period.
  - 71 points are earned for a ≥36% to <41% reduction over a 5-year benchmarking period.
  - 56 points are earned for a ≥31% to <36% reduction over a 5-year benchmarking period.
  - 43 points are earned for a ≥26% to <31% reduction over a 5-year benchmarking period.
  - 28 points are earned for a ≥21% to <26% reduction over a 5-year benchmarking period.
  - 13 points are earned for a ≥15% to <21% reduction over a 5-year benchmarking period.
  - No points are earned for a <15% reduction over a 5-year benchmarking period.
  - ~~98 points are earned for a ≥49 to <50 reduction of the 5-year benchmarking baseline.~~
  - ~~95 points are earned for a ≥48 to <49 reduction of the 5-year benchmarking baseline.~~
- etc...

#### Energy Pathway-4 Proposed Revision:

- 80 points are earned for a ~~≥45%~~ ≥50 to ≤100 reduction of the 6- to 10-year benchmarking period ~~baseline.~~
  - 65 points are earned for a ≥41% to ≤45% reduction of the 6 to10-year benchmarking period.
  - 50 points are earned for a ≥36% to <41% reduction of the 6 to10-year benchmarking period.
  - 35 points are earned for a ≥31% to <36% reduction of the 6 to10-year benchmarking period.
  - 20 points are earned for a ≥26% to <31% reduction of the 6 to10-year benchmarking period.
  - 12 points are earned for a ≥21% to <26% reduction of the 6 to10-year benchmarking period.
  - 6 points are earned for a ≥15% to <21% reduction of the 6 to10-year benchmarking period.
  - No points are earned for a <15% reduction of the 6 to10-year benchmarking period.
- ~~77 points are earned for a ≥49 to <50 reduction of the 6-10-year benchmarking baseline.~~  
~~74 points are earned for a ≥48 to <49 reduction of the 6-10-year benchmarking baseline.~~  
etc...

#### Energy Pathway-5 Proposed Revision:

- 100 points are earned for an ENERGY STAR® score 95 to 100 ~~≥97 to ≤100.~~
  - 88 points are earned for an ENERGY STAR® score 90 to 94.
  - 68 points are earned for an ENERGY STAR® score 85 to 89.
  - 52 points are earned for an ENERGY STAR® score 80 to 84.
  - 40 points are earned for an ENERGY STAR® score 75 to 79.
  - No points are earned for an ENERGY STAR® score of 74 or below.
  - ~~96 points are earned for an ENERGY STAR® score of 96.~~
  - ~~92 points are earned for an ENERGY STAR® score of 95.~~
- etc....

#### Energy Pathway-6 Proposed Revision:

- 100 points are earned when the building's current standing is 95 to 100 ~~≥97 to ≤100.~~
  - 88 points are earned when the building's current standing is 90 to 94.
  - 68 points are earned when the building's current standing is 85 to 89.
  - 52 points are earned when the building's current standing is 80 to 84.
  - 40 points are earned when the building's current standing is 75 to 79.
  - No points are earned when the building's current standing is 74 or below.
  - ~~96 points are earned when the building's current standing is 96.~~
  - ~~92 points are earned when the building's current standing is 95.~~
- etc...

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comments, P1-1209, P1-1210, and reply with the proposed responses, and to accept all changes for 3.1.1, 3.1.1A.1, 3.1.1B.1, and 3.1.1C.1.**

#### Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

#### P1-1211

**Public Comment:** Divide the 20 points proportionally by square footage between the common areas and rooms/units. Or if that is too complicated, reallocate points to award up to 5 for common areas and 15 for rooms/units.

**Reason:** In a residential or hospitality building, typically the amount of lighting in rooms/units will be significantly higher than that in common areas. Yet in the standard the use of LED lighting in common areas can earn the same number of points as the use of LED lighting in the much larger rooms/units.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The combination of common and suite calculation was found to be complex and the relative impact between common and suite lighting was not considered to be an issue.

**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 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

**P1-1212**

**Public Comment:** Delete section 3.3.4.8

**Reason:** Awarding a point for receiving free money seems inappropriate as it has nothing to do with the greenness of the building, but rather with how it was paid for.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Although the reason is true, the criteria is incentivizing and encouraging owners to make use of these programs. Programs also provide technical guidance to help building owners.

**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 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

**EB104-11**

**Public Comment:** Provide these points for a "good" feasibility study including financial analysis; implementation can be handled by next (3.4.1.3)

**Reason:** Encouraging onsite use of renewable begins with decision makers seeing the feasibility of such. It begins with the studies so this needs to be encouraged.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: A feasibility study doesn't save energy, which is the intention of the criteria. The comment does not include clarity as to what language should be changed in the standard.

**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 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

**P1-1213**

**Public Comment:** Delete section 3.4.1.2 and allocate the points to section 3.4.1.3.

**Reason:** This section is redundant with section 3.4.1.3 in that a building using onsite energy sources is awarded 8 points just for having it (regardless of how much energy is generated). But since a building is then awarded additional points under section 3.4.1.3 depending on how much energy is produced and used onsite, there is no need to have this as a separate section. If left, it will award 8 points to buildings that have onsite energy sources even if they are extremely small systems.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: This criterion is intended to award the implementation of renewable energy. Subsequent criteria award the level of performance achieved by that implementation.

**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 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

**P1-1214**

**Public Comment:** Add the 8 points from section 3.4.1.2 to provide additional points for buildings with more than 25% onsite renewable energy. Add the following:

18 points are earned when 25-50% is provided.

22 points are earned when 50-100% is provided

**Reason:** Additional points should be available for buildings generating up to 100% of their energy via onsite renewable sources, as this practice directly reduces GHG emissions and air pollution from buildings.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Reasonability mainstream technology inherently limits the opportunity for onsite energy generation as indicated by the 25% cap. Additionally, extending the cap would unduly dilute incentivizing smaller scale installations.

**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 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

### Energy-1, Energy-2, Energy-3

**Energy-1 Proposed Revision:** 3.2 PRESCRIPTIVE ENERGY MEASURES (~~90~~ 94 POINTS)

**Energy-2 Proposed Revision:** 3.3 ENERGY MAINTENANCE & PROGRAM (~~86~~ 84 POINTS)

**Energy-3 Proposed Revision:** 3.4 SUSTAINABLE ENERGY (~~34~~ 32 POINTS)

**Reasons:** Text update, points add up in section to 94

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revisions for the headers of 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- The Secretariat noted that this is technically a substantive change but that it is only updating the text of the number and doesn't change any point values within the Assessment Area.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

### Water Public Comment Review

The Chair of the Water Subcommittee reviewed each public comment before discussion took place.

#### EB104-1

**Public Comment:** Consider simple formula rather than extensive table with point values (e.g. 4.1.1 A)

**Reason:** It would improve continuity and readability of survey and technical manual. Also, to facilitate move to new software.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The commenter did not provide a proposed formula.

**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 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr, Mike Cudahy

#### P1-1215

**Public Comment:** Change point allocations to:

65 points for standing of 90 or higher

60 points for standing of 85-90

55 points for standing of 80-84

50 points for standing of 75-79

40 points for standing of 70-74

25 points for standing of 65-69

10 points for standing of 60-64

**Reason:** The differential in points awarded changes too much with each single point on scale. To simplify this item, and to incentivize applicants to pursue larger improvements, the same number of points should be awarded for a range of scores. In addition points should be given for a current standing down to a value of 60. These points should be much lower though to incentivize buildings to move from a score of 60 to a higher score.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The points in the water section are important and the committee does not find justification to disincentivize points in the Water Section and reallocate to another area.

**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 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr, Mike Zatz

#### P1-1216

**Public Comment:** Change point allocations to:

65 points for score of 90 or higher

60 points for score of 85-90

55 points for score of 80-84

50 points for score of 75-79

40 points for score of 70-74



25 points for score of 65-69

10 points for score of 60-64

**Reason:** The differential in points awarded changes too much with each single point on the ENERGY STAR scale. To simplify this item, and to incentivize applicants to pursue larger improvements, the same number of points should be awarded for a range of scores. In addition, points should be given for an ENERGY STAR score down to a score of 60, which is still 10 points higher than the national median and a good level of performance. These points should be much lower though to incentivize buildings to move from a score of 60 to a higher score.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The points in the water section are important and the committee does not find justification to disincentivize points in the Water Section and reallocate to another area.

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

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- The public commenter who is also a member of the Consensus Body noted that the comment's intent was not to increase or change the point value but to make it less granular. It was noted that the Energy Pathways were voted to be less granular and that the EPA Water Score's methodology is similar to Energy Star, and it would make sense for the point granularity to match for the two pathways.
- It was noted that Energy and Water consumption is different, and it is easier to measure water use than energy use.
- It was noted that an Energy Star score is achieved by how much energy you use, whereas Water is not.
- There was discussion on the procedures of how to proceed with sending this public comment back to the Subcommittee for further review.
- It was argued that the response to the commenter does not provide clarity or directly answer the comment's intent and that it needs further review as well.

**WITHDRAWN: The Motion and second was withdrawn. There were no opposed to the withdrawal.**

#### **P1-1215**

**Public Comment:** Change point allocations to:

65 points for standing of 90 or higher

60 points for standing of 85-90

55 points for standing of 80-84

50 points for standing of 75-79

40 points for standing of 70-74

25 points for standing of 65-69

10 points for standing of 60-64

**Reason:** The differential in points awarded changes too much with each single point on scale. To simplify this item, and to incentivize applicants to pursue larger improvements, the same number of points should be awarded for a range of scores. In addition, points should be given for a current standing down to a value of 60. These points should be much lower though to incentivize buildings to move from a score of 60 to a higher score.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The points in the water section are important and the committee does not find justification to disincentivize points in the Water Section and reallocate to another area.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reconsider the previous motion to reject public comment P1-1215.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

There was discussion and agreement that the Water Subcommittee should review the public comments, P1-1215 and P1-1216, again. It was confirmed that the public commenter or a colleague will be present on the next Water Subcommittee call.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to send public comments, P1-1215 and P1-1216 back to the Water Subcommittee for further review.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

#### **EB104-12**

**Public Comment:** Confirm that points for all paths are based on generally accepted impact.

**Reason:** Points should be allocated based on impact and not just equal point distribution.

**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 and reply with the proposed response.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

#### **P1-1218**

**Public Comment:** Link the number of points to the size of the irrigated area (perhaps relative to the building size), with smaller areas receiving fewer points and larger areas receiving more points.

**Reason:** 30 Points are awarded for “no irrigation” used on landscaping regardless of the amount of landscaping present. For example, it appears that a building with a small rooftop garden area that uses no irrigation will receive 30 points, as will a hotel with extensive gardens and grounds if it uses no irrigation. The level of effort required in these situations is extremely different and warrants a different level of points.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The intention of the criterion is to not have outdoor irrigation.

**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 discussion on the need to change the N/A and the criterion’s planter statement.
- An assessor noted that linking the number of points to the size of the irrigated area could be quite challenging and time consuming.
- It was argued that irrigation is always a problem area for assessors and that how it is currently written could be easily gamed by users.
- It was noted that many green roofs are considered planters and would be affected by this criterion.
- There was discussion on the procedures of revising the N/A. The Secretariat stated that she can add this item to the list for the Water Subcommittee to review during their next meeting.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

#### **EB104-16**

**Public Comment:** Consider partial points relative to ASHRAE 189 targeted quantity

**Reason:** This calculation should be encouraged as it can be used to help make future adjustments to the existing plant palette. If the project does not make the target but is close or they provide a strategy to attain the target some credits will encourage them.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: It’s not clear how a gradual point allocation would take place and the Assessment Guidance provides clear instructions. The Committee needs strikethrough and underline suggestions to gauge what revisions should take place.

**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 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

#### **EB104-17**

**Public Comment:** Delete and allocate points to other credits

**Reason:** Hydrozoning is standard practice in new installations. For existing property, typically the irrigation drawings are not available, this is difficult to assess without the drawings.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: While the practice may be difficult to assess there are ways to complete an assessment and some buildings may have drawings available. The criterion should be included for those projects that can show that the practice is in place.

**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 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Christoph Lohr

**Water-1**

**Public Comment:** WaterSense<sup>®</sup> labeled

**Reason:** Make consistent throughout standard

**Recommended Response:**

**Discussion took place on the Editorial Revision:**

- There were no objections to the editorial revision.

**Public Participation**

There was no discussion.

**New Business**

There was no discussion.

**Action Items**

GBI staff stated that the meeting scheduled for November 1, 2021, will be canceled to allow for Subcommittees to continue to review comments. She noted that the next meeting will be on November 15, 2021 from 3:00-5:00pm ET.

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

**Meeting adjourned at 4:13 PM EST.**