

Minutes Final
GBI Consensus Body Meeting #29
BSR/GBI 01-201X
Webinar

Thursday, March 23rd from 12:00 PM EST to 3:00 PM EST

Attendance:

No	Name	Organization(s)	10-14-16	2-2-17	2-13-17	3-23-17	
1	Gregg Bergmiller	S/L/A/M Collaborative	X	X	Absent	X	
2	Paul Bertram	PRB Connect	X	X	X	X	
3	Allan Bilka	International Code Council	Absent	X	X	X	
4	Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X	X	X	X	
5	William Carroll	American Chemistry Council	X (by Proxy)	X	X	X	
6	John Cross	American Institute of Steel Construction	N/A	N/A	N/A	Absent	
7	Mike Cudahy	Plastic Pipe and Fittings, Association	N/A	N/A	N/A	X	
8	Chris Dixon	NBBJ (rep. self)	X	X	X	X	
9	Nicole Dovel- Moore	CTA Architects Engineers	X	X	X	X	
10	David	Grumman/Butkus	X (by	X	X	X	

	Eldridge	Assoc.	Proxy)				
11	William Freeman	Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X	Absent	Absent	Absent	
12	Susan Gitlin	U.S. EPA	X	Absent	X	X	
13	Don Horn	GSA	X	X (by Alternat e)	X	X	
14	Josh Jacobs	UL Environment	Absent	Absent	Absent	X	
15	Greg Johnson	Johnson Consulting Services, Greenscape Alliance	X	X	X	X	
16	Karen Joslin	Joslin Consulting	X	X	X	X	
17	Malee Kaolawanich	NIH (rep. self)	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	
18	Rachel Minnery	AIA	Absent	X	Absent	X	
19	Charles Kibert	University of Florida	X	X	X	X (Chair)	
20	Gary Keclik	Keclik Associates	X	Absent	X	X	
21	Thomas Pape	Alliance for Water Efficiency	X	Absent	X	X	

22	Tien Peng	National Ready Mix Concrete Assn.	Absent	X	X	X	
23	Jane Rohde	JSR Assoc. Inc., Vinyl Institute	X (by Proxy)	Absent	X (by Proxy)	X	
24	Gord Shymko	G.F. Shymko & Associates, Inc.	X	X	Absent	X	
25	Kent Sovocool	Southern Nevada Water Authority	X	X	X	Absent	
26	Steve Strawn	JELD-WEN	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	
27	George Thompson	Chemical Compliance Systems, Inc.	X	X	X	X	
28	Angela Tin	American Lung Assn.	Absent	X	X	X	
29	Douglas Tucker	Misubishi Electric Cooling & Heating	Absent	Absent	X	X	
Voting Alternates							
	Abby Brokaw	American Lung Assn. (voting Alternate for Angela Tin)					
	Paul Karrer	AIA (Alternate for					

		Rachel Minnery)					
	Bill Hoffman	UL Environment (Voting Alternate for Josh Jacobs)					
	Lance Davis	GSA (Voting Alternate for Don Horn)		X			
	D'Lane Wisner	D'Lane Wisner (Voting Alternate for William Carroll)					
TOTALS			19/29	18/27	19/27	23/29	
Visitors							
	Martha VanGeem	Self (Principal Engineer)	X	X		X	
	Dave Panning	BIFMA	X	X			
	Candy McNamee	NCI Group		X			
	Ric Doedens	Logison		X	X		
	Lauren Graham	Lawbc			X		
	Jiri Skopek	JLL			X		
Staff/Consultants							

Michael Lehman	Chair	X	X	X	Absent	
Vicki Worden	Executive Director, GBI					
Emily Randolph	Secretariat Asst., GBI	X	X	X	X	
Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI		X	X	X	
Maria Woodbury	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X	X	
Kim Goldsworthy	Roberts-Rules Consulting	X	X	X	X	

Thursday, March 23, 2017

Welcome & Roll Call

Secretariat, Maria Woodbury welcomed participants and conducted roll call to establish quorum. The anti-trust statement and code of conduct were reviewed and participants were requested to comply with both fully.

Woodbury reminded members that all are welcome to participate in the discussion provided participants raise their hands. Hands will be called on first in order.

At this meeting no members voted using voting alternates and one member voted using a proxy, Tien Peng for Rachel Minnery during part of the call. Consensus Body Chair, Mike Lehman, had a scheduling change and was unable to attend the meeting. The Vice Chair, Charles Kibert, chaired the meeting.

Administrative Items

Vice Chair Charles Kibert made his opening comments stating we are starting with the Environmental Quality, Site and Materials sections. Kibert reiterated Woodbury's announcement of the change that editorial comments could be singled out and dealt with separately. The Chair of each subcommittee can group such comments together and vote on them collectively.

Kibert asked if there were any objections to approving the minutes from Meeting #28 on February 13nd, 2017.

There were no objections. The Minutes were approved.

Update on Letter Ballot:

Twenty-one Consensus Body members voted in the ballot, and three candidates were elected to the Consensus Body. Paul Bertram changed interest category from Producer to User. Mike Cudahy and John Cross were elected to the Consensus Body in the General interest category. The Consensus Body now numbers 29 members with a quorum of 15.

Second Public Comment Period

Indoor Environmental Quality

Presented by Subcommittee Vice Chair, Chris Dixon

8 – 12. Editorial. 5.1:

- **Comment: sidelit daylight area:** the perpendicular area from the glazing into the space, that is determined by either:
 1. a distance of 15 ft. (4.6 m) 4.6 m (15 ft.), or
 2. the perpendicular distance from the glazing to the nearest partition that is 5 ft. (1.5 m) or highermultiplied by the smaller of either;...
- **Reason:** The units provided in Subsection 1 are given in feet (meters) and again in subsection 2(a) therefore it is inconsistent to represent Subsection 2 using units in inches (meters). This convention is already represented in the definition for toplit daylighted area.
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted and the changes have been implemented in the draft Standard.

13 – 19. Editorial. 11.2.6.1:

- **Comment:** Change e-cigarettes to electronic cigarettes for consistency.
- **Reason:** The sentence above uses electronic cigarettes. Change e-cigarettes to electronic cigarettes for consistency.
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted and the changes have been implemented in the draft Standard.

13 – 20. Editorial. 11.5.3.1:

- **Comment:** 1. If the average ceiling height exceeds 12 ft. (3.7 m), the reverberation time compliance path is used; the NRC compliance path is not permitted.
- **Reason:** Change comma to semicolon or change it to a period and a new sentence.
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted and the changes have been implemented in the draft Standard.

14 – 5. Editorial. 5.2:

- **Comment:** Add RELS: Reference Exposure Levels. Alternatively, spell out the term when it is used in Table 11.2.2.1.1.
- **Reason:** “RELS” is used in Table 11.2.2.1.1, but not defined.
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted and the changes have been implemented in the draft Standard by adding RELs to Section 5.2.

17 – 5. Editorial. 11.2.6.1:

- **Comment:** 11.2.6.1 An occupancy policy prohibits smoking. “No Smoking” Signage ~~will~~shall be posted at every building entrance prohibiting smoking and the use of electronic cigarettes within 25 ft. (7.6 m) of the building.

Smoking is defined as the inhalation of smoke of burning tobacco, use of e- cigarettes or other substances encased in items such as (but not limited to) cigarettes, pipes, and cigars for recreational or medical use.

- **Reason:** *Shall* is better language than *will*, “one day”...
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. For legal reasons, the word “shall” is not used in the draft Standard. The language was instead changed to read as follows: “signage is ~~will be~~ posted...”

52 – 62. Editorial. Table 11.1.2.1:

- **Comment:** Page 80. There should be delineation in the table to show that notes 1 through 5 apply to the entire table.
- **Reason:** It currently appears that the notes only apply to the last row in the table.
- **Recommended Response (From Chair and Vice Chair):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted and the changes have been implemented in the draft Standard. This was corrected by inserting the bottom border of the previous cell and extending the cell with the notes all the way to the right of the table.

1 – 1. Editorial. 11.2.1.4 and Table 11.2.1.4:

- **Comment:** ANSI/BIFMA M7.1-2011(R2016)
- **Reason:** The standard was reaffirmed. No change from 2011, however, best to reference the most recent edition.
- **Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Standards that are referenced are current Standards. No reaffirmations are indicated.

1 – 2. Editorial. 12:

- **Comment:** ANSI/BIFMA M7.1-2011(R2016)
- **Reason:** The standard was reaffirmed. No change from 2011, however, best to reference the most recent edition.
- **Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Standards that are referenced are current Standards. No reaffirmations are indicated.

5 – 5. Editorial. 11.2.2.1.1 Table:

- **Comment:** ²ASHRAE Standard 189.1 2014 Table 10.3.1.4
- **Reason:** There is no footnote/superscript 2 in the entire table, so either add one or remove. Additionally, having this list tied to ASHRAE 189.1 will mean that it is inaccurate if that standard, which is under continuous maintenance changes.
- **Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: 189.1 is used as a reference for formaldehyde. References will be updated during our continuous maintenance.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended responses for 8-12, 13-19, 13-20, 14-5, 17-5, 52-62, 1-1, 1-2, 5-5. Editorial.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- Opposition was raised for accepting all because the recommended responses aren't all written clearly. The speaker felt 1 – 2, 1 – 1, and 5 – 5 had unclear responses that needed to be remedied.

MOTION TO DIVIDE THE QUESTION: The Motion was made and seconded to divide 1-1, 1-2, 5-5.

An Objection was raised.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The sentiment was expressed that separation is not needed, just clarification.

- It was clarified that the Chair can recommend unanimous consent for whichever motion is likely to have unanimous agreement.
- The Objection was removed and no further objections were raised.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 23 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

1 – 1. Editorial. 11.2.1.4 and Table 11.2.1.4:

Discussion took place before Motion:

- Confusion was expressed about the definition of “current.”
- It was stated that 2011 is the most recent version of the Standard in question, but the reaffirmation date is 2016. Concern was expressed that if we adopted this reaffirmation we would have to go through all references and include reaffirmation dates.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to change the response to: “your comment has been accepted as modified. The Standard reference is current as per the reaffirmation in 2016 and R2016 will be added to the title of the Standard for 1-1.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- Concern was raised that this is a substantive action and no longer editorial. It was stated that the change is not substantive as nothing being referenced is changing.
- The question was raised about whether a reason is needed to accept a comment. There was debate about whether this action was to accept or accept as modified.

Second withdrawn. No new second.

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

VOTE: The Motion carried with 19 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstained

Opposed: Don Horn

Abstained: Gregg Bergmiller

1 – 2. Editorial. 12:

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept 1-2. Editorial.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was clarified that this is the same issue that was voted on in the previous comment, only for a different section.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 19 in favor, 1 opposed and none abstained

Opposed: Don Horn

None abstained

5 – 5. Editorial. 11.2.2.1.1 Table:

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response to reject for 5-5. Editorial.

AMENDMENT: The Amendment was made and seconded to add a sentence to the proposed response saying “The reference will remain specific to ASHRAE Standard 189.1 2014”

There was opposition to the Amendment.

Discussion that took place on the Amendment:

- It was stated that it is unclear why the amendment was made. The Standard was mentioned in the footnote and therefore clarification isn’t needed.

- It was clarified that the issue isn't about referencing the standard. It was stated that the continuous maintenance process won't change because you're referencing the Standard without addenda.

SUBSTITUTION to the AMENDMENT: The Motion was made and seconded to substitute the Amendment by adding the following sentence to the recommended response: "189.1 2014 without addenda will remain the reference regardless of continuous maintenance."

There was opposition to the Substitution.

Discussion took place on the Substitution:

- It was stated that it's unclear why this is "regardless" of continuous maintenance when other sections in this Standard don't do this.

AMENDMENT to the SUBSTITUTION: The Motion was made and seconded to amend the substitution by adding "maintenance of 189.1".

Discussion took place on the Amendment to the Substitution:

- It was stated that "addenda" is not needed. Concern was raised that this is getting deep in the weeds. It was clarified that addenda is the term used when applying changes during continuous maintenance
- A member spoke against the question, stating that it is unknown that 189.1 2011 will remain the reference. It could be completely different following out continuous maintenance.
- The additional concern was raised that this comment is inaccurate so there is no need to spend so much time responding to it.

The parliamentarian clarified that the Chair can make a motion to clear out all motions and amendments, and clean the slate back to the original motion.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to clear the slate and return to the original Motion. There were no Objections.

AMENDMENT: The Amendment was made and seconded to add "until and if the BSR/GBI 01-201X is revised during continuous maintenance" and remove "specific to" from original motion. There was no opposition to the Amendment.

Discussion took place on the Amendment:

- The question was asked why formaldehyde was being referred to in the response when it doesn't appear in the comment. It was clarified that the comment asked why that Standard was being referred to as a footnote when it didn't relate to anything. The response clarifies that the footnote refers to formaldehyde.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 18 in favor, 2 opposed and 2 abstained

Opposed: Greg Johnson, Don Horn

None: Josh Jacobs, Mike Cudahy

Site

Presented by Subcommittee Chair, Gregg Bergmiller

It was clarified that "un-actionable items" were included in the meeting materials packets.

22 – 38. Editorial. 7.5.1.5:

- **Comment:** The building project supports on-site ~~and~~ agriculture . . .

- **Reason:** Left blank by commenter
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted. Editorial changes will be implemented and presented in the next draft Standard.

22 – 32. Editorial. 7.1.2.3:

- **Comment:** Misspelling – Untied States
- **Reason:** Left blank by commenter
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted. Editorial changes will be implemented and presented in the next draft Standard.

17 – 6. Editorial. 7.3.3.1

- **Comment:** An area covered by overlapping layers of plants ~~may~~ shall not be counted multiple times, i.e., the maximum canopy coverage for any site is 100%.
- **Reason:** Shall is intended here, not “may”.
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. For legal reasons, the word “shall” is not used in the draft Standard. The language was instead changed to read as follows: “layers of plants are ~~may~~ not be counted...”

17 – 7. Editorial. 7.3.4.1:

- **Comment:** Where used to comply, shading trees ~~may~~ shall be existing plants that are retained on site or newly planted trees that will provide shade with 15 years.
- **Reason:** Shall is intended here, not “may”.
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. For legal reasons, the word “shall” is not used in the draft Standard. The language was instead changed to read as follows: “shading trees are to be ~~may~~ be existing plants...”

17 – 8. Editorial. 7.4.1.1.3:

- **Comment:** Note: Infiltration ~~may~~ shall not be used as a treatment method if the site is located within 0.25 mi (0.4 km) of a lake or wetland.
- **Reason:** Shall is intended here, not “may”.
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. For legal reasons, the word “shall” is not used in the draft Standard. The language was instead changed to read as follows: “Infiltration ~~may~~ are not to be used as a...”

14 – 9. Editorial. 7.5.1.3:

- **Comment:** Capitalize “three” in the second bullet in the right-hand column.
- **Reason:** Left blank by commenter
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted. Editorial changes will be implemented and presented in the next draft Standard.

8 – 17. Editorial. 7.2.1.3:

- **Comment:** Alternative re-fueling facilities or electric charging stations are located on site or ~~in the~~ within 0.25 mi (0.4 Km) of the site.
- **Reason:** The two words that should be deleted were grammatically correct with the previously accepted language however with the new changes they make the sentence awkward.

- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted. Editorial changes will be implemented and presented in the next draft Standard.

8 – 19. Editorial. 7.5.1.1:

- **Comment:** "...the plan shows the natural light conditions of the site;..."
- **Reason:** This singular provision lacks punctuation at the end of the sentence (either a semi-colon or a period).
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted. Editorial changes will be implemented and presented in the next draft Standard.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to move the responses to the editorial comments in the Site section.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 22 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

13 – 12. Substantive. 7.7.1.1:

- **Comment:** The project achieves points for 7.2.1.1 or 7.2.1.67 or is within 0.25 mi (0.4 km) walking distance of developed residential land of at least 8 dwelling units per acre;
- **Reason:** Verify that the reference to section 7.2.1.6. It might mean the old 7.2.1.6 which is now 7.2.1.7 on walkscore. This would make more sense.
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted. Editorial changes will be implemented and presented in the next draft Standard.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response for 13.12. Substantive.

AMENDMENT: The Amendment was made and seconded to strike the last sentence in the recommended response.

There was no opposition to the Amendment

Discussion took place on the Amendment:

- The commenter was present on the call and clarified there were errors in the renumbering.

VOTE: The Amended Motion carried with 22 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

13 – 13. Substantive. 7.7.1.1:

- **Comment:** Excluding athletic fields and agriculture, greater than 50% of the vegetation on site achieves points for Section 7.5.1.32 for *drought tolerant* plants and greater than 50% of the vegetation on site achieves points for Section 7.5.1.43 for native plants.
- **Reason:** Correct section number for native plants to 7.5.1.3. Correct section number for drought tolerant plants to 7.5.1.2.
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted. Editorial changes will be implemented and presented in the next draft Standard.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response for 13-13. Substantive.

AMENDMENT: The Amendment was made and seconded to strike the last sentence in the recommended response.

There were no opposition to the Amendment.

VOTE: The Amended Motion carried with 18 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

13 – 5. Substantive. 7.1.2.4:

- **Comment:** Points are only awarded when the facility also achieves points for 7.2.1.1 or 7.2.1.6~~7~~ or is within 0.25 mi (0.4 km) walking distance of developed residential land of at least 8 dwelling units per acre.
- **Reason:** Verify that the reference is to section 7.2.1.6. It might mean the old 7.2.1.6 which is now 7.2.1.7 on walkscore. This would make more sense.
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted. Editorial changes will be implemented and presented in the next draft Standard.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response, modifying it by striking the last sentence for comment 13-5. Substantive.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 21 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

Materials

Presented by Subcommittee Vice Chair, Josh Jacobs

4 – 2. General. 10.2.1.2:

- **Comment:** If specific dates of standards are included in the credit language, has it been considered to add in a statement that would also include newer versions of the standards?
- **Reason:** Many ANSI standards are on continued maintenance mode and the version listed in 10.2.1.2 may become outdated without a clause to accept more recent versions.
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Your question has been previously considered by the Consensus Body. The Consensus Body prefers to avoid the chance of users of the Standard using different versions of referenced standards to achieve the same level of certification through Green Globes. As newer versions of referenced Standards become available they will be reviewed for potential inclusion in future versions of the GBI Standard through our own continued maintenance process.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response for comment 4-2.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 21 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

8 – 3. General. 5.1:

- **Comment:** Since definitions are provided for cradle-to-gate and cradle-to-grave product lifecycle, should an additional definition for cradle-to-cradle design be added?

- **Reason:** Self-explanatory based on proposed revision; the logical next definition in the series, however it may exceed the needs of the Standard insofar as no clauses appear to assign additional credit values relative to this condition.
- **Recommended Response (From Chair and Vice Chair):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The term cradle-to-cradle does not appear in the draft Standard

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response for comment 8-3.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 22 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

8 – 6. General. 5.1:

- **Comment:** The **modular construction** definition effectively replaces the **modular building unit** definition however it uses the latter with said definition. Does that necessitate the preservation of the original definition?
- **Reason:** If the new definition is based in part on a complete understanding of the original definition, is it responsible to remove that original definition from the Standard?
- **Recommended Response (From Chair and Vice Chair):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Section 10.7 of the Standard refers to the bigger concept of modular construction which is why the definition was replaced. The term modular building unit is no longer used in the Standard and thus does not require a definition.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response for comment 8-6. General.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- A typo was pointed out and was corrected changing “replace” to “replaced”.
- The question was raised whether the term “rejection” is appropriate, since the commenter asked a question. It was stated that the commenter is asking to bring back the old stated definition that is no longer in the Standard. One speaker disagreed on whether the commenter proposed any changes in the comment.
- One member voiced their support for the response, calling it instructive.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 20 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.

None Opposed.

Abstained: Chris Dixon

13 – 1. Substantive. 5.1:

- **Comment: prefabrication** ...This does not include M-manufactured, multi-material components such as windows, doors, and gypsum sheathing, cannot contribute to this credit unless they are incorporated into a prefabricated building element.
- **Reason:** Do not give criteria in a definition. Credit language has been removed.
- **Recommended Response (From Chair and Vice Chair):** 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 recommended response for comment 13-1. Substantive.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 21 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

8 – 9. General. 5.1:

- **Comment:** In the definition for **prefabrication**, the last sentence provides clarifying language regarding what does not constitute a prefabricated building element in the context of a specific credit contribution. Is this language appropriate as part of the baseline definition or should this be relocated to the Section of the Standard directly related to said credit?
- **Reason:** This clarifying language is largely unseen within other definitions provided in this section. It seems disjointed to reference a specific credit contribution here, especially since no numerical cross-reference is provided to where in the Standard this issue is pertinent.
- **Recommended Response (From Chair and Vice Chair):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The definition of prefabrication was modified in response to 13 – 1 to remove the credit language.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response for comment 8-9. General.

Discussion that took place on the Motion:

- Opposition was raised to this motion stating the comment shouldn't be rejected when the Body is in agreement. It was clarified that the comment wasn't to remove parts of the language, but instead to move it into the credit, which was not done. Therefore, it is appropriate to reject the comment.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 20 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.

None Opposed.

Abstained: Chris Dixon

14 – 3. Substantive. 5.1:

- **Comment: post-consumer recycled content: in a product, the content that stemmed from materials ~~the portion of recycled material in a product~~** generated by households or by commercial, industrial and institutional facilities in their role as end-users of the product which can no longer be used for its intended purpose. This includes returns of materials from the distribution chain.
- **Reason:** The revisions to this definition had good intentions, but they create confusion. It is now not clear whether the clause "generated by households..." refers to "the portion," to "recycled material" or to "the product." Moreover, term "product" is now used in the first half and second half of that sentence, once to refer to a building product to be used in the current building project and once to refer to an upstream product that was disposed. We believe that with this definition you are trying to point to the content of a building product that was manufactured from materials that were thrown out by households or facilities. Alas, the revisions created more confusion than clarity. We therefore offer a rewording of the definition.
- **Recommended Response (From Chair and Vice Chair):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. There is confusion in the language. To eliminate that confusion commas have been inserted as followed "the portion of recycled material, in a product, generated by..."

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response for comment 14-3. Substantive.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was stated that the proposed approach doesn't sufficiently address the comment.
- The question was raised whether the body of the Standard refers to "body", "volume", or "mass." These definitions only talk about "portion" and "content". It was clarified that the Standard uses percent by cost. It was stated that should be reflected in the definition.

**AMENDMENT: The Amendment was made and seconded to change the response to change the language by inserting “product, derived from materials”
There was opposition to the Amendment.**

Discussion took place on the Amendment:

- It was stated that the language is redundant and the insertion makes it more confusing, not less.
- It was stated the comment needs the amended clarification
- The opinion was raised that the comment was clear before the addition was added regarding “derived from materials”
- It was suggested that the definition for pre-consumer and post-consumer recycled content should use parallel structure. Pre-consumer recycled content does not have “derived from materials”
- It was suggested to change the prepositions: “from” as opposed to “in” a product.

VOTE: The amendment failed with 5 in favor, 11 opposed, and 6 abstained.

Opposed: Chris Dixon, George Thompson, Gary Keclik, Jeff Bradley, Greg Johnson, Josh Jacobs, Bill Carroll, Allan Bilka, Jane Rohde, Don Horn, Doug Tucker

Abstained: Susan Gitlin, Gregg Bergmiller, Thomas Pape, AngelaTin, Gord Shymko, Mike Cudahy, Paul Bertram

**AMENDMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to change the language to “in of a product’s”. No commas, add apostrophe.
There was opposition to the Amendment.**

Discussion took place on the Amendment:

- It was stated that the commenter doesn’t agree with the overall definitions, but if we change this one, then the definition to pre-consumer recycled content needs to be changed.
- Concern was raised that this amendment is confusing. It was stated that “a portion of recycled material” is standard language, not “a portion of a product’s”. The speaker was against the Amendment.
- Concern was raised that changing the definition of “pre-consumer recycled content” is un-actionable. It was clarified that the change to the definition could be presented as New Business.

VOTE: The Amendment failed with 6 in favor, 9 opposed, and 6 abstained.

Opposed: Chris Dixon, George Thompson, Greg Johnson, Josh Jacobs, Angela Tin, Allan Bilka, Jane Rohde, Don Horn, Jeff Bradley

Abstained: David Eldridge, Gord Shymko, Paul Bertram, Doug Tucker

Discussion took place on the original Motion:

- A reminder was made that there is still the issue of parallel construction to look at.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 11 in favor, 3 opposed, and 6 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin, Thomas Pape, Karen Joslin

Abstained: Josh Jacobs, Jeff Bradley, David Eldridge, Gord Shymko, Paul Bertram

22 – 17. Substantive. 5.1:

- **Comment: salvaged materials:** discarded or unused construction materials or products removed in whole form from a structure . . .

- **Reason:** Revise salvaged materials definition. It is important to include this phrase in order to distinguish salvaged materials from recycled materials. The latter can be down-cycled or reprocessed into new materials. Salvaged materials are reused in the form in which they were discarded or removed. It may be a different use but the salvaged material retains the same form.
- **Recommended Response (From Chair and Vice Chair):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The language was struck because it was too restrictive and did not address the reality of salvaging materials.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment based on the proposed response for comment 22-7. Substantive.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- One speaker spoke in opposition to the motion stating that because material is taken from another project, it needs to be used in the same form to be included as salvaged for this credit.
- It was stated that the definition for salvaged material is clear and it shouldn't be confused with recycled. E.g. ceiling beams could be cut to be used for flooring.
- The sentiment was expressed that the phrase needs to be changed to differentiate between products that are constructed and pulled out and reused, vs. being sent offsite to be processed into a new recycled material.
- There was discussion around whether it needs to be in "whole form" or not. There was also discussion about what "whole form" means.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 16 in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstained.

Opposed Don Horn

Abstained: Jane Rohde, David Eldridge, Mike Cudahy

11 – 1. Substantive. 10.1.1:

- **Comment:** Points are earned where the following percentage reduction is demonstrated by ~~adding~~ at least three impact indicators:
 - Thirty points are earned for a ~~total~~ 215% or greater reduction.
 - Twenty-eight points are earned for a ~~total~~ 214% reduction.
 - Twenty-six points are earned for a ~~total~~ 213% reduction.
 - Twenty-four points are earned for a ~~total~~ 212% reduction.
 - Twenty-two points are earned for a ~~total~~ 211% reduction.
 - Twenty points are earned for a ~~total~~ 210% reduction.
 - Eighteen points are earned for a ~~total~~ 19% reduction.
 - Sixteen points are earned for a ~~total~~ 18% reduction.
 - Fourteen points are earned for a ~~total~~ 17% reduction.
 - Twelve points are earned for a ~~total~~ 16% reduction.

- Ten points are earned for a total 15% reduction.

- **Reason:** LCIA indicator results represent entirely different impact pathways and are expressed in different units. Percentage improvements should not be summed across multiple categories. As written, a large reduction in one impact category could be summed with small increases in two other categories and points could still be earned. Furthermore, increments of 1% improvement are within the range of uncertainty in LCA and do not represent a meaningful improvement.
- **Recommended Response (From Subcommittee):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The current point methodology allows for more flexibility for users of the Standard.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** 8 in favor, 1 opposed, 3 abstained

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment using the proposed reason for comment 11-1.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- One participant spoke in favor of the motion, stating that in the point structure, it says at least 3 impact categorizes, but in the requirement it says all three impact categories. This could be the commenter's concern.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 18 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstained.

None Opposed.

Abstained: David Eldridge, Allan Bilka

8 – 28. Substantive. 10.2.1.1

- **Comment:** Do the adjusted credit value assignments in the right column seem balanced? 19 points for 30 products but only 14 points for 29 products seems unfair.
- **Reason:** If the previously accepted 15 points are now tantamount to 19 points, why not raise the point values throughout this Section?
- **Recommended Response (From Chair and Vice Chair):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The points were set at 19 for 30 products and 14 for 29 products to incentivize teams to put in the extra work.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment using the proposed response for comment 8-28. Substantive.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was clarified that the project gets 5 extra points if it achieves the highest level instead of just 1 incremental point. We are trying to incentivize the one extra product.
- The question was raised about why the is increment from 29 to 30 such a significant value?

VOTE: The Motion carried with 18 in favor, 1 opposed, and none abstained.

Opposed: Karen Joslin

None Abstained

New Business:

- Woodbury stated that there is no New Business prescheduled on the Agenda.
- The Points Task Group was urged to read materials and submit feedback prior to the next meeting of the Points Task Group.
- There was no New Business brought forward.

Review Schedule:

Woodbury reviewed the schedule moving forward:

- Meeting #30: a two-day meeting scheduled for Monday April 10th from 1 to 4 PM ET and Tuesday April 11th from 12 noon to 3 PM ET.
- Staff estimates 19 hours of Consensus Body Meetings and 15 hours of Subcommittee Meetings until the draft can go out to the next Public Comment Period.
- Additionally, GBI staff are preparing for ANSI audits.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded and carried to adjourn the meeting with none opposed and none abstained.

--Meeting adjourned: 2:55 PM ET--