

Minutes (final)

GBI Consensus Body Meeting #9

BSR/GBI 01---201X

Webinar

Wednesday, December 16, 2015 1:00 PM ET to 4:00 PM ET

Attendance:

No	Name	Organization(s)	12-16-15	1-13-16					
1	Gregg Bergmiller	S/L/A/M Collaborative	X						
2	Paul Bertram	Kingspan Insulated Panels, Inc.	X (Left Early)						
3	Allan Bilka	International Code Council	X						
4	Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X						
5	William Carroll	Occidental Chemical Corp.	X						
6	Chris Dixon	NBBJ (rep. self)	X						
7	Nicole Dovel--- Moore	CTA Architects Engineers	Absent						
8	Amber Dzikowicz	NSF International	Absent						
9	David Eldridge	Grumman/Butkus Assoc.	X						
10	William Freeman	Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X						
11	Don Horn	GSA	Alternate						
12	Josh Jacobs	UL Environment	X						
13	Greg Johnson	Johnson Consulting Services, Greenscape Alliance	X						
14	Leslie Kahn	Admin. Office of the U.S. Courts	Resigned						
15	Malee Kaolawanich	NIH (rep. self)	X						
16	Rachel Minnery	AIA	X						
17	Charles Kibert	University of Florida	X						
18	John Koeller	Alliance for Water Efficiency	X						
19	Jennifer	Alfred Benesch &	Absent						

	Kowalonek	Company							
20	Michael Lehman	ConTech Lighting	Absent						
21	Tien Peng	National Ready Mix Concrete Assn.	X						
22	Bernadette Reyes	Clark Construction Group	Resigned						
23	Angela Rivera	URS Corporation (rep. self)	Absent						
24	Jane Rohde	JSR Assoc. Inc., Vinyl Institute	X						
25	Gord Shymko	G.F. Shymko & Associates, In.	X						
26	Julie Sobelman	Independent Consultant	Resigned						
27	Kent Sovocool	Southern Nevada Water Authority	X						
28	Steve Strawn	JELD-WEN	X (Proxy for Paul Bertram)						
29	George Thompson	Chemical Compliance Systems, Inc.	X						
30	Angela Tin	American Lung Assn.	Alternate						
31	Douglas Tucker	Misubishi Electric Cooling & Heating	Absent						
32	Erika Winters Downey	American Institute of Steel Construction	Alternate						
Voting Alternates									
	Abby Brokaw	American Lung Assn. (voting Alternate for Angela Tin)	X						
	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)							
	John Cross	American Institute of Steel Construction (Voting Alternate for Erika Winters---Downey)	X						
TOTALS			23/29						
Visitors									
	Ed Deomano	Composite Panel Association	X						
	Christian Taber	Big Ass Solutions	X						
	Brent Mecham	Irrigation Association	X						
	Jiri Skopek	JLL	X						
	Martha VanGeem	Self (Principal Engineer)	X						
	Chris Hsieh	Trane	X						
	Allen Blakey	Allen Blakey & Associates	X						
	Susan McGlaughlin Gitlin	U.S. EPA	X						
	Kyle Thompson	IAPMO	X						
Staff/Consultants									
	Wayne Trusty	Chair	X						
	Vicki Worden	Executive Director, GBI	X						
	Emily Randolph	Secretariat Asst., GBI	X						
	Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI							
	Maria Woodbury	Secretariat, GBI	X						

Wednesday, December 16, 2015

Welcome & Roll Call

Chair, Wayne Trusty, welcomed participants. Roll call established quorum. At this meeting, there was one member voting via proxy (Steve Strawn for Paul Bertram) and three members using voting alternates (Lance Davis for Don Horn, John Cross for Erika Winters---Downey, and Abby Brokaw for Angela Tin).

Secretariat, Maria Woodbury informed participants that the call was being recorded and no objection was raised.

The antitrust statement was reviewed and participants were requested to comply with it fully.

Woodbury reviewed the participation options, stating that while observers are welcome to participate in the discussion, only Consensus Body Members are able to vote.

Administrative Procedures and Related Matters

The agenda was reviewed and no changes were requested by the Consensus Body.

The membership roster was reviewed, noting that it is published online denoting interest categories and the organizations each individual is representing. Woodbury reported three resignations from the Consensus Body (Bernadette Reyes (User), Julie Sobelman (User), and Leslie Kahn (Government)), bringing the current roster to 29 voting members with a quorum of 15. Woodbury reported that the Executive Session met to review the Consensus Body queue and make their recommendations and that a letter ballot will be sent out to elect new members to the Consensus Body.

Woodbury informed the Consensus Body that Staff is working to update GBI's procedures to ensure that the process is in compliance with ANSI's Anti-Trust policy. Language has also been added to the procedures regarding the use of technology and webinars to run meetings. In addition, the procedures have been changed to include holding an Executive Session to review the queue prior to filling vacancies on the Consensus Body.

Trusty asked for a motion on the minutes from the meeting on July 29.

MOTION: A motion was made, seconded, and carried to approve the minutes from the last Consensus Body Meeting on Wednesday, July 29, 2015.

None opposed.

Abstained: John Cross

Overview of procedures for processing public comments

Over 600 comments were received from nearly 60 commenters. Once all of the agreed changes have been made they will be entered into the draft standard in strikethrough/underline format. The Consensus Body will then vote to approve the changes by letter ballot.

This call will focus on reviewing the Subcommittees' recommended responses to General and Editorial public comments, followed by the Substantive comments that have been reviewed thus far.

Secretariat, Emily Randolph reviewed options for reviewing comments:

- Accept
- Accept with Modification: reason for modification
- Reject: reason for rejection

Discussion of public comments: Editorial and General

Subcommittee Reports

Project Management

The Chair and Vice Chair were not on the call so Project Management Subcommittee member Gregg Bergmiller gave a summary of the comments received on the Project Management assessment Area:

- 47 Comments
 - 23 Substantive
 - 15 Editorial
 - 9 General
- No defined trends in comments:
 - Inserted Words
 - Point Re-allotment
 - Requirement for minimal commissioning

11 – 6. Editorial. 6.2.1

- **Comment:** Consider replacing “Environmental Management System” with “Environmental, Health and Safety Management System”
- **Reason:** The scope of the requirements of this section extends beyond an EMS to include employee health and safety requirements.
- **Proposed Response:** Reject due to the fact that EMS is commonly accepted terminology.
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimous

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept proposed subcommittee response. The motion carried with 17 in favor, none opposed, and one abstained.

None opposed.

Abstained: John Cross

36 – 4. Editorial. 6.3.2.1.3

- **Comment:** ~~6.3.2.1.3~~ **6.3.2.1.3**
- **Reason:** Should bold the number for consistency.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimous

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept proposed subcommittee response. The motion carried with 18 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

28 – 9. Editorial. 6.4.1.1

- **Comment:** ~~A Moisture Control Design Analysis~~ moisture control design analysis in buildings using ASHRAE 160-2009 is performed in accordance with ASHRAE 160-2009 for the purpose of predicting, mitigating, or reducing moisture damage to the building envelope, materials, components, systems, and furnishings.
- **Reason:** Grammatically corrected capitalization is recommended.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimous

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept proposed subcommittee response. The motion carried with 21 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed.
None Abstained.

24 – 25. Editorial. 6.5.1.1, 6.5.2.1, 6.5.2.2

- **Comment:** “ASHRAE Guideline ~~0-2013-0-2-13~~”
- **Reason:** Code Standard is mislabeled though the year of issuance is accurate.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimous

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept proposed subcommittee response. The motion carried with 19 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None opposed.
None Abstained.

The question was raised if it was possible to have the chair review all of the editorial comments and then ask for a single motion to be made including all of the editorial comments for the assessment area. If someone would like further discussion on a specific comment it can be dealt with separately. Staff stated that this would be acceptable. A concern was raised that the comments the Subcommittees recommended to reject should be dealt with individually. Staff agreed.

Site

Gregg Bergmiller gave a summary of the comments received on the Site assessment area:

- 111 Comments
 - 81 Substantive
 - 28 Editorial
 - 2 General
- Trends in comments:
 - Transportation
 - High SRI Roofing
 - Stormwater Management
 - Drought Tolerant Plants
 - Definition of terms and clarifying terms such as “general vicinity”

40 – 2. Editorial. 5.1

- **Comment: low---sloped roof:** a roofing assembly applied to a roof deck having a slope less than or equal to ~~7.6 cm/m (3 in/ft)~~ 3 in/ft. (7.6 cm/m).
- **Reason:** This change would specify the imperial units first and the metric units second for the purposes of consistency with other definitions within Section 5.1 where units are indicated.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** 9 in favor, 1 Abstained

52 – 5. Editorial. 5.1

- **Comment:** Capitalize “Superfund.”
- **Reason:** EPA identifies Superfund as a proper noun; consistency with the rest of the document.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimous

9 – 8. Editorial. 5.1

- **Comment:** Definitions: Tree Protection Zone Include Metric Conversions
- **Reason:** Include Metric Conversions
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimous

11 – 9. Editorial. 7.1.1.2

- **Comment:** “*previously developed site that has been*” Consider removing italics from the words “that has been” because “previously developed site” has an associated definition.
- **Reason:** None given
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimous

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the Subcommittees’ responses to all editorial Site comments. The motion carried with 20 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

Energy

David Eldridge gave a summary of the comments received for the Energy assessment area:

- 52 Comments
 - 33 Substantive
 - 10 Editorial
 - 9 General
- Trends in Comments
 - Version of ASHRAE 90.1 and 189.1
 - Point distribution

A member stated that they would like to consider comment 34 – 25 separately from the rest of the Energy editorial comments.

24 – 4. Editorial. 8.3.2.1.1

- **Comment:** “...Calculations for LPD are based on either the whole-building method, or ~~spacey~~by-space method.”
- **Reason:** typographical error
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** Unanimous

50 – 9. Editorial. 8.5.2.1

- **Comment:** Spelling correction of acronym: “~~(IPMVP)~~” change to “(IPVMP)”
- **Reason:** None given
- **Proposed Response:** Reject comment but amend text in the right column “International performance ~~Verification~~Measurement & Verification ~~Measurement~~ Protocol”
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** Unanimous

50 – 10. Editorial. 8.5.3

- **Comment:** Spelling correction of acronym: “~~(IPMVP)~~” change to “(IPVMP)”
- **Reason:**
- **Proposed Response:** Reject comment but amend text in the right column “International performance ~~Verification~~Measurement & Verification”

- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** Unanimous

11 – 3. Editorial. 5.1

- **Comment:** Renewable Energy Credits (def): Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) : One REC is issued for each megawatt-hour (MWh) unit of renewable electricity produced. The Electricity that ~~was~~ is split from the REC is no longer considered "renewable" and is cannot be counted as renewable or zero-emissions by ~~whoever buys it~~ the purchaser.
- **Reason:**
- **Proposed Response:** Accept with the amendment to also delete "is" from ... "and is cannot be..."
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** Unanimous

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to adopt the comments as specified in the packet: accept 24 – 4, pass 34 – 25, 50 – 9 and 50 – 10 will be rejected while incorporating a change for consistency, and 11 – 3 is accepted.

Discussion took place on the motion:

- One member was uncomfortable with the proposed response for comment 50 – 10. Would be okay with spelling it out in more detail.
- It was asked that 50 – 10 be withdrawn from consideration at this time so that it can be verified.
- Members present on the Energy Subcommittee call stated that the proposed response for 50 – 10 was incorrectly written and should have been the same response as 50 – 9.
- The point was made that on the subcommittee calls the responses should be written out for each comment prior to taking the vote to avoid confusion and mistakes.

The Motion carried with 14 in favor, 3 opposed, and 2 abstained.

Opposed: Allan Bilka, Greg Johnson, John Cross

Abstained: Rachel Minnery, Kent Sovocool

34 – 25. Editorial.8.3.3.6

- **Comment:** Clarify whether this is air or water or both
- **Reason:** Section 6.5.6 addresses both air and water is this air only?
- **Proposed Response:** Reject on the basis that specifying 6.5.6 implicitly includes all subsections
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** 7 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstained

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to reject comment 34 – 25 on the basis that specifying ANSI/ASHRAE/IES 90.1--2010 section 6.5.6 implicitly includes all subsections and therefore provides adequate clarity.

Discussion took place on the motion:

- The question was raised as to whether this was in fact an Editorial comment, but rather a Substantive comment. The argument was raised that it was Editorial, asking for clarification not for a change in the intent of the criteria.

The motion carried with 19 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

Water

Kent Sovocool gave a summary of the comments received on the Water Efficiency assessment area:

- 56 Comments
 - 29 Substantive

- 15 Editorial
- 12 General
- Trends in Comments
 - 9.1 Indoor Domestic Plumbing

Requests were made that 33 – 6 and 29 – 8 be voted on separately from the rest of the editorial comments.

45 – 3. Editorial. 9.2.1.1

- **Comment:** Four points are earned when either (i.) 6 cycles are achieved where the tower target performance metric is defined in 9.2.1.1 as 5 or (ii.) where 4.5 cycles are achieved where the target performance metric is defined in 9.2.1.1 as 3.5 and where the tower exceeds the respective thresholds by one cycle (that is 6 or 4.5 cycles is achieved respectively) while these cycles of concentration are sustained while maintaining the defined threshold water quality parameters in 9.2.1.1.
- **Reason:** The proposed language is designed to remove any ambiguity from the existing points explanation.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** Unanimous

24 – 5. Editorial. 9.2.1.1

- **Comment:** "...with more than 200 ppm (200 mg/L) total **hardness** as calcium carbonate"
- **Reason:** Typographical error
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** Unanimous

22 – 3. General. 9.2.1.5

- **Comment:** Bleed-Cooling tower blowdown water is reclaimed, recycled, and/or used for another purpose.
- **Reason:** Be consistent with language in section 9.2.2 this same water is referred to as blowdown water, which is more common when referring to cooling towers.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** Unanimous

50 – 11. General. 9.3.2.1

- **Comment:** Replace screen shot with a clearer image, or delete completely and maybe provide web link
- **Reason:** None given
- **Proposed Response:** Accept and have Secretariat draft a legible table
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** Unanimous

34 – 32. 34 – 33. 34 – 34. Editorial: 9.4.1, 9.4.2, 9.4.3

- **Comment:** Simplify section rather than just carry it over from previous standard
- **Reason:** why are some of these items still in the standard in such detail rather than in one small group
- **Proposed Response:** Reject since there was no proposed change and other comments more clearly address the issue.
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** 5 in favor, 1 abstained

33 – 4. Editorial. 9.4.3.3

- **Comment:** Statement: "...have a maximum WF of 8.0. water consumption of 8.0 gal/ft³ or less."

- **Reason:** Consistency with other provisions that cite a Water Factor (WF).
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** Unanimous

33 – 7. Editorial. 9.7.1.1

- **Comment:** Statement: "...commercial kitchens, commercial laundries, laboratories, pools, spas, etc."
- **Reason:** Parallel sentence structure.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** Unanimous

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the responses to all editorial Water comments with the exception of 29 – 8 and 33 – 6. The motion carried with 20 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.

None Opposed.

Abstained: Jeff Bradley

29 – 8. Editorial. 9.1.1.1

- **Comment:** ASHRAE Standard 189.1 SS
- **Reason:** None given
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** Unanimous

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the comment for use throughout the document with full title in reference section.

Discussion took place on the motion:

- The question was raised whether to include ASHRAE in the title, since the standard is listed in short-form as "Standard 189.1" on the website. It was noted that it would be better to specify "ASHRAE" so that users know where the standard is from.
- The point was also raised that the year of publication should be included in the reference section as well as added to the shortened form.

The Motion was amended and the amendment was seconded to accept the comment for use throughout the document with full title in reference to include year in both references and criteria.

The motion carried with 20 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

33 – 6. Editorial. 9.6.4

- **Comment:** Statement: "Plumbing ~~engineer's~~ ~~designer's~~ drawings and specifications"
- **Reason:** Using the term 'designer' doesn't reflect the nature of the design nor the qualifications of the professional doing the design.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept with Modification: "Plumbing ~~designer's~~ drawings..."
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** Unanimous

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to reject the comment.

Discussion took place on the motion:

- The point was made that plumbing designers could be any number of types of plumbing professionals, including master plumbers who can legally do design work, and that it is better for the standard to use generic terminology rather than to specify a plumbing engineer.
- An issue was also raised using the word "plumbing" and that it should be made more generic for use throughout the entire standard.

- It was proposed that perhaps this comment be removed from consideration and sent back to the Subcommittee for a Substantive change to be made and then brought back to the Consensus Body.
- There was an argument made that there can be plumbing items that don't appear in plumbing drawings.

MOTION Withdrawn

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded that the language read “contract drawings and specification”.

Discussion took place on the motion

- It was noted that construction documents encompass drawings and that the bullet could be removed entirely. The counter argument was made that the Recommended Documentation sub--sections are meant as guidance and serve to help the user.

The Motion was amended and the amendment was seconded to remove the fourth bullet entirely.

Discussion took place on the amendment:

- Some members stated their opposition to this motion, feeling that the subcommittee had made the correct decision. The construction documents are not necessarily complete.

The Motion carried with 12 in favor, 6 opposed, and 3 abstained.

Opposed: Allan Bilka, William Freeman, George Thompson, John Cross, Josh Jacobs, and Kent Sovocool.

Abstained: Steve Strawn, Paul Bertram, and Jane Rohde

Materials

Charles Kibert gave a summary of the comments received on the Materials assessment area:

- 112 Comments
 - 79 Substantive
 - 15 Editorial
 - 18 General
- Trends in Comments
 - 10.3 Risk Assessment and Appendix
 - Biobased and Third Party Sustainable Forestry Certification
 - Construction Waste

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept proposed subcommittee responses.

Discussion took place on the motion:

- The question was raised as to whether “Noted” is a valid response. An alternative of “accept as a supportive comment” was offered.
- The question was also raised that if commenters haven't proposed any changes or modifications to the language what is there to accept or reject.
- It was noted that no change is being made here and that this is simply a way of responding to the commenter by saying their comment has been noted.
- It was stated that the term “as noted” is frequently used and is essentially the same as saying thank you.

The Motion was withdrawn.

25 – 2. General. 10

- **Comment:** We support the inclusion of product risk assessment, rather than just a chemical hazard assessment, specifically including ASTM E60.01 document on Product Transparency Declarations.
- **Reason:** In keeping with adoption by reference to prominent standards, this could be a validation and general improvement.

25 – 3. General. 10

- **Comment:** We support use of the NSF/GCI/ANSI---355 consensus standard ecological, health, and safety chemical characteristics
- **Reason:** In keeping with adoption by reference to prominent standards, this could be a significant validation and generally preferred policy. We understand that the Materials section represents the first time the science of risk assessment has been included in a national standard of this type and represents a significant improvement.

25 – 4. General. 10

- **Comment:** We support incorporation of exposure scenario factors and referencing specific exposure modeling tools.
- **Reason:** In keeping with adoption by reference to prominent standards, this could be a significant validation and generally preferred policy. We understand that the Materials section represents the first time the science of risk assessment has been included in a national standard of this type and represents a significant improvement.

25 – 5. General. 10

- **Comment:** We support the naming of specific product risk assessment tools in the standard.
- **Reason:** In keeping with adoption by reference to prominent standards, this could be a significant validation and generally preferred policy. We understand that the Materials section represents the first time the science of risk assessment has been included in a national standard of this type and represents a significant improvement.

25 – 6. General. 10

- **Comment:** We support the idea of awarding 67 percent of points if only health and safety or 33 percent of points if only ecological characteristics are evaluated.
- **Reason:** In keeping with adoption by reference to prominent standards, this could be a significant validation and generally preferred policy. We understand that the Materials section represents the first time the science of risk assessment has been included in a national standard of this type and represents a significant improvement.

25 – 7. General. 10

- **Comment:** The wide range of points earned based on number of product evaluated seems a bit tedious.
- **Reason:** In keeping with adoption by reference to prominent standards, this could be a significant validation and generally preferred policy. We understand that the Materials section represents the first time the science of risk assessment has been included in a national standard of this type and represents a significant improvement.
- **Proposed Response for 25 – 2 through 25 – 7:** Mark these general comments as noted since there's no other response
 - **Subcommittee Vote Results:** 9 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstained

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded for proposed response to read “accept as a supportive comment”.

Discussion took place on the motion:

- The question was raised whether the Consensus Body should be moving to accept a pat on the back for a comment that offers no proposed change.
- It was proposed that the comment could be accepted as a general comment.
- The question was raised as to whether or not there was a specific ANSI recommendation for dealing with comments that propose no change to the document. Staff clarified that commenters must receive a response for all comments.

Motion Withdrawn

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept 25 – 2, 25 – 3, 25 – 4, 25 – 5, 25 – 6, 25 – 7 as noted.

Discussion took place on the motion:

- The point was made that letters should be drafted thanking the commenters for their supportive comments and that should be the end of it.
- It was stated that to accept or reject these comments could be problematic and the Consensus Body should respond “as noted”.

The Motion carried with 13 in favor, 7 opposed, and 1 abstained.

Opposed: Allan Bilka, Bill Carroll, Charles Kibert, Chris Dixon, Gord Shymko, John Koeller, and Lance Davis.

Abstained: Tien Peng

11 – 4. General. 5.2

- **Comment:** add: EPD - - - Environmental Product Declaration, TPC - - - Third Party Certifier
- **Reason:** None Given
- **Proposed Response:** Reject EPD (never used alone.) send TPC to IEQ
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** 10 in favor, 1 opposed

25 – 1. General. 10

- **Comment:** The ANSI/TIA Standard 4994 could be referenced in the GBI Standard to cover the ‘smart’ ICT infrastructure space within a green building.
- **Reason:** In keeping with adoption by reference to prominent standards, this could be a validation and general improvement.
- **Proposed Response:** Reject on the grounds that there’s no direction from commenter about where to put this. Would like the commenter to specify where they’d like this standard to be referenced.
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** 10 in favor, 1 abstained

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept subcommittee recommendations for 11 – 4 and 25 – 1.

Discussion took place on the motion:

- Staff clarified that once the Consensus Body has responded on each of the comments, the commenters will have a chance to respond if they feel their comments have not been adequately resolved.

The motion carried with 19 in favor, none opposed and none abstained.

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

Indoor Environment

The Indoor Environment Subcommittee Meeting occurred following the creation of the packet for this Consensus Body call and thus no comments regarding this section were discussion. Consensus Body

meeting #10 will begin with the review of editorial comments from the Indoor Environment Assessment Area.

Future Meetings

Woodbury reviewed the schedule moving forward.

- The next meeting is scheduled for January 13, from 12:00 Noon to 3:00 PM ET.
- A letter ballot will be going out to the CB. The letter ballot period is 15 days.
- Doodle Poll will be going out to schedule a CB meeting via teleconference in February.
- Doodle Poll will be going out to schedule a 2.5 day in-person meeting in March/April.

Adjournment

MOTION: A motion was made, seconded and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 3:42 pm ET.