



MINUTES

GBI Consensus Body - Call #14
 Webinar/Teleconference
 June 10, 2021 from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. ET

NOTE ALL TIMES ARE EASTERN TIME

Consensus Body Members in Attendance

| Full Name | Organization | 6/10/21 | 3/12/21 | 2/11/21 | 2/5/21 | 9/3/20 |
|------------------------|--|---------|------------------|---------|--------|------------------|
| Gregg Bergmiller | The S/L/A/M Collaborative | X | Absent | X | X | X (Arrived Late) |
| Benjamin Bojda | Dominion Environmental Consultants NV, Inc | X | X | X | X | X |
| Jeff Bradley | American Wood Council | X | X | Absent | Absent | X |
| Karen Butler | EPA | Absent | X | X | X | X |
| Virgil Campaneria | Gurri Matute PA | Absent | X | X | X | X (Arrived Late) |
| John Cross | American Institute of Steel Construction | X | X | X | X | X |
| Michael Cudahy | PPFA - PPEF | X | Absent | X | X | X |
| Chris Dixon | Morrison Hershfield | X | X | X | X | X |
| David Eldridge | Grumman/Butkus Associates | X | X | X | X | X (Arrived Late) |
| Josh Jacobs | UL | X | X | X | X | X |
| Gary Keclik | Keclik Associates Ltd. | X | Absent | X | X | X |
| Charles Kibert | University of Florida | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | X |
| Michael Lehman (Chair) | ConTech Lighting | X | X | X | X | X |
| Tim Miller | Sidock Group Inc | Absent | Absent | Absent | Absent | Absent |
| Amlan Mukherjee | Michigan Technological University | X | Absent | X | X | N/A |
| James O'Brien | Independent Environmental Consultant | X | X | X | X | X |
| Jane Rohde | JSR Associates, Inc., The Vinyl Institute / Resilient Floor Covering Institute | X | X | Absent | X | X (Arrived Late) |
| Kirk Sander | National Waste and Recycling Association | X | X | X | X | Absent |
| Gord Shymko | G. F. Shymko & Associates Inc. | X | X | X | X | X |
| Stephen Szoke | American Concrete Institute | X | X | X | X | X (Arrived Late) |
| Kyle Thompson | IAPMO | X | X (Arrived Late) | X | X | X |
| Angela Tin | American Lung Association | X | X | X | X | X |
| Doug Tucker | Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc. | X | X | X | X | Absent |

Voting Alternate in Attendance

| Full Name | Organization | 6/10/21 | 3/12/21 | 2/11/21 | 2/5/21 | 9/3/20 |
|-------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|
| Dan Cole | IAPMO | | X | | | |
| Matt Hunter | American Wood Council | | | X | X | |

Interested Parties in Attendance

| Full Name | Organization | 6/10/21 | 3/12/21 | 2/11/21 | 2/5/21 | 9/3/20 |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|
| Tara Brooks | American Lung Association | | | | | X |
| Larry Eisenberg | Ovus Partners 360 | | | X | | X |
| Sara Greenwood | The Greenwood Consulting Group, LLC | | | | | X |
| Greg Hekman | Sustainability, Commercial Solutions | | | X | | |
| Lawrence Humphries | Efficient Green | X | X | | | |
| Aaron Johnson | Indoor Environments Division / US EPA | | | X | | |
| Alison Kinn Bennett | EPA | | | | X | |
| Viken Koukounian | K.R. Moeller Associates Ltd. | X | X | X | X | X |
| Emily Lorenz | Independent Consulting Engineer | | | | | X |
| Eric Truelove | Green Building Resources LLC | X | | | | |
| Martha VanGeem | Independent Consulting Engineer | X | | | | |

Staff in Attendance

| Full Name | Organization | 6/10/21 | 3/12/21 | 2/11/21 | 2/5/21 | 9/3/20 |
|-----------------|------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|
| Emily Marx | Secretariat, GBI | X | X | X | X | X |
| Sara Rademacher | Staff, GBI | X | X | X | X | X |
| Micah Thomas | Staff, GBI | X | X | X | X | X |

Welcome and 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.

Marx reviewed the Consensus Body for New Construction roster and noted the three interest categories, General Interest, Producer, and User. She noted that there is balance on the Consensus Body for New Construction.

Administrative Items

Lehman thanked everyone for their participation and dedication to GBI's standard development. Lehman reviewed the agenda and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were no comments or objections.

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

Lehman also reviewed the minutes from meeting #13 on March 12, 2021 and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were no comments or objections.

MOTION: A Motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from meeting #13 on March 12, 2021, as presented.

Water Public Comment Review

The Water Subcommittee Chair gave an overview of each public comment and proposed revision.

302-1

Public Comment: 9.1.1C Path C: ~~2017~~ 2020 IAPMO WEstand Section 402: 52 points

Reason: The 2020 edition of WEstand will be published. This comment is to update the reference to the current edition of the document.

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

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

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

Abstain: Gregg Bergmiller

302-2

Public Comment: **9.1.1C.1** Plumbing fixtures and fittings comply with ~~2017~~ 2020 IAPMO WEstand, Section 402.

Reason: The 2020 edition of WEstand will be published. This comment is to update the reference to the current edition of the document.

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

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

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

Kirk Sander joined the meeting.

302-3

Public Comment: *9.8 Leak Detection (10 points) Leak detection devices shall comply with ~~IGC-349~~ IAPMO Z1349 and not interfere with fire protection systems.*

Reason: The standard IAPMO IGC 349 was updated through the ANSI process, the new designation of this standard is ANSI/CAN/IAPMO Z1349. This comment is to update the reference to the current edition of the document.

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

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

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

304-1

Public Comment: landscape irrigation sprinkler(s): hydraulically operated mechanical device consisting of a *sprinkler body* and one or more orifices that discharges pressurized water into the air through a nozzle(s) as a spray or stream of water.

Reason: The March 31, 2021 redline version of the standard adopts a new definition for "sprinkler bodies", along with requirements for sprinkler bodies to be WaterSense labeled to earn the point under Section 9.9.1.3. Suggest updating the definition of "landscape irrigation sprinkler" to make clear that the sprinkler body is a component of the irrigation sprinkler.

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

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

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

304-2

Public Comment: 9.2.1.1 Cooling towers are equipped with conductivity controllers and minimize the amount of make-up water required by achieving one of the following:

- A minimum of 5 cycles of concentration for make-up water having less than or equal to 200 ppm (200 mg/L) total hardness as calcium carbonate or 3.5 cycles for makeup water with more than 200 ppm (200 mg/L) total hardness as

calcium carbonate; OR

- A minimum discharge conductivity of 1500 micromhos/cm or a maximum of 150 ppm (150 mg/L) of silica measured as silicon dioxide.

Four points are earned where a conductivity controller is installed and cooling towers achieve the respective threshold cycles of concentration.

Reason: A conductivity controller is used to ensure the efficient use of water within the cooling tower by permitting blowdown only when a conductivity threshold is achieved. A conductivity controller is the most effective strategy for buildings to continually and properly manage cooling tower blowdown such that the requisite cycles of concentration from the credit are achieved on an ongoing basis. Conductivity controllers are required for cooling towers within ASHRAE 189.1, the IAPMO's Water Efficiency and Sanitation Standard for the Built Environment (WE-Stand), California Title 24, and other green codes, as well as some local codes such as in Austin and San Antonio, Texas and New York City.

Per discussion with members from the Water Efficiency subcommittee, it was raised that the way this credit is currently awarded is through the expectation of spot measurements from the cooling tower treatment vendor every month or quarter (depending on frequency of treatment vendor visits). This periodic check is an ineffective way of managing water treatment and ensuring water efficiency, as a manual reading taken on one particular day may show adherence to the requirement but does not ensure it will be met in the interim ahead of the vendor's next visit. Further, per information provided from a member of the subcommittee, most cooling tower manufacturers will not issue a warranty if the cooling tower is not equipped with a conductivity controller. This speaks to the importance of these devices in maintaining an optimized system. Beyond water efficiency, these controllers help prevent the build-up of minerals in the recirculating water which can lead to corrosion, scale, or fouling. It also automates blowdown, reducing/eliminating manual operation of this process and the potential for operator error.

It is likely that a conductivity controller is included with any new cooling towers, and therefore this is unlikely to result in an additional cost for property owners. However, the suggested language for this credit will guarantee one will be installed and allow for efficient water use within cooling towers on an ongoing basis.

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

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

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

Abstain: Jeff Bradley

Kyle Thompson joined the meeting.

304-3

Public Comment: 9.2.1.4 Equip Cooling tower(s) with the following features:

• 9.2.1.4.1: an overflow alarm to prevent overflow of the sump in case of makeup water valve failure. Overflow alarm shall send an audible signal or provide an alert to the tower operator via the building automation system (BAS);

AND/OR

• 9.2.1.4.2: drift eliminators that achieve an efficiency of 0.001% or less for counterflow systems; OR 0.002% or less for crossflow systems.

2 points or N/A

• One point is earned where each listed feature meets the specified requirements up to a maximum of 2 points. Two points are earned where drift eliminators achieve the specified efficiency for either counterflow or crossflow systems:

- Not applicable where there are no wet-cooling towers.

Reason: Installation of an overflow alarm within a cooling tower is considered best practice to prevent unintentional overflow from a stuck make-up valve or other malfunction that would cause excessive make-up water being supplied to the cooling tower basin. All new cooling towers are equipped with an overflow drain. An overflow alarm is an add-on sensor that is activated when it identifies water within the overflow drain. These types of alarms can contribute to water efficiency through faster identification of overflow events by notifying facility staff. Leaks can otherwise go undetected until they're identified on periodic rounds (which may happen infrequently) or are noticed due to excessive water bills. Because make-up valves typically have high water flow, a large amount of water can be wasted in a short amount of time. One facility where we heard this occur at had two separate leaks, about 4 years apart. They resulted in approximately 130,000 gallons and 200,000 gallons of water waste, respectively. Further, overflow alarms can protect against damage and flooding that could result from overflowing cooling tower basin. These alarms are

required within ASHRAE 189.1, IAPMO's WE•Stand, and California Title 24.

The suggested language is not intended to be prescriptive regarding the type of alarm signal. It can either be audible or can connect to a BAS, which could in turn notify the building manager or other operator of a malfunction via text message or email. This provides flexibility in how a project would choose to implement it.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The modification clarifies the requirement of the overflow alarm and aligns the point distribution text with the rest of the standard. The modification is below:

9.2.1.4 Equip Cooling tower(s) with the following features:

- 9.2.1.4.1: an overflow alarm to detect overflow of water from the basin caused by makeup water valve failure. Overflow alarm shall send an audible signal or provide an alert to the tower operator via the building automation system (BAS); AND/OR
- 9.2.1.4.2: drift eliminators that achieve an efficiency of 0.001% or less for counterflow systems; OR 0.002% or less for crossflow systems.

Maximum = 2 points or N/A

• One point is earned where an overflow alarm with an audible signal or alert is installed.

• One point is earned where a drift eliminator is installed ~~Two points are earned where drift eliminators achieve the specified efficiency for either counterflow or crossflow systems.~~

• Not applicable where there are no wet-cooling towers.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- A question was asked about the change in point distribution. Marx stated that the current criterion awards two points for drift eliminators but now it will award one point for an alarm and one point for a drift eliminator.
- It was stated that the alarm criterion goes above current codes and is an extra safety feature that should be on all cooling towers.

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

304-4

Public Comment: 9.9.1.3.5: Landscape irrigation sprinklers and drip emitters that comply with ASABE/ICC 802-2014~~2020~~ Landscape Irrigation Sprinkler and Emitter Standard.

Reason: ASABE/ICC 802 was revised in November 2020. Suggest referencing the most up-to-date version of this standard.

Per discussion with GBI, it was stated that, as general practice, GBI does not reference standards until they have been published for a few years.

The impetus for the 2020 revision to the ASABE/ICC 802 standard was to incorporate the testing protocols for spray sprinkler bodies included in the WaterSense Specification for Spray Sprinkler Bodies. The WaterSense specification is now referenced in Section 9.9.1.3.6 of the latest redline version of ANSI-GBI 01. In addition, WaterSense labeled spray sprinkler bodies are required in 7 states.

Beyond the adoption of the WaterSense test method (which is in Appendix A of the ASABE/ICC 802-2020 standard), the 2020 version of the standard does not include any substantive change from the ASABE/ICC 802-2014 version currently reference in ANSI-GBI 01. The requirements for sprinkler heads and drip emitters, which are referenced in ANSI-GBI 01, are the same as the 2014 version. Therefore, EPA feels that adoption of the latest standard will not cause undo confusion in the marketplace or result in a lack of available products certified to this standard.

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

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

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

Water-1

Proposed Revision: clothes washer, tunnel: an industrial laundry machine designed specifically to accommodate heavy wash loads; also called a continuous batch washer. In operation, laundry progresses through the washer in one direction, while water and washing chemicals move through in the opposite direction on a continuous basis.

Reason: Grammatical update

Discussion took place on the Editorial Revision:

- There were no comments or objections on the editorial revision.

Water-2

Proposed Revision: Maximum = 1 point or N/A

Reason: Remove Maximum

Discussion took place on the Editorial Revision:

- There were no comments or objections on the editorial revision.

Water-3

Proposed Revision: • 9.4.1.2.3: Boilerless/connectionless food steamers comply with ENERGY STAR 1.2 requirements and consume 2 gal/hr./compartment (7.5 L/hr.) or less.

Reason: Update with Energy Star Reference number

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

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

Water-4

Proposed Revision: Points are earned based on the percentage of indoor water demands met with non-potable water:

- Ten points are earned for >75%.
- Eight points are earned for >50 to ≤75%.
- Six points are earned for ~~≥~~ ≥25% to ≤50%.
- Three points are earned for ≥15% to ~~≤25%~~ 24%.
- No points are earned for <15%.

Not applicable where the authority having jurisdiction prohibits the use of alternate water sources for indoor applications.

Reason: Third Bullet: Should be Greater than 25

Fourth Bullet: Should be Less than or equal to 25.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was discussion on the need to underline new text which may be confusing with the “greater/lesser than or equal to” sign. Marx stated that the reason listed is correct.

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

EC-8

Proposed Revision: 9.1.1 Plumbing Fixture and Fitting Standards

Where installed in the project and as permitted by local codes, plumbing fixtures and fittings are certified and listed as being compliant with the requirements of the U.S. EPA’s WaterSense Program where WaterSense specifications exist.

Four paths are provided for assessing Indoor Domestic Plumbing. ~~If no path is achieved 75 total points are deducted from total earned points in the Water Efficiency Assessment Area:~~

Reason:

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The Water Subcommittee Chair stated that the -75 points was voted to be removed from the standard in summer 2020 but that this text was missed in the initial revision.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 17 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Doug Tucker

Indoor Environment Public Comment Review

The Indoor Environment (IE) Subcommittee Chair gave an overview of each public comment and proposed revision.

301-1

Public Comment: Concrete, concrete masonry, clay brick, stone, ceramic tile, glass and glass block masonry used in floors and wall systems without additional coating/sealers are deemed to comply without testing.

Reason: Ceramic tile is inherently inorganic (fired above 2000 deg. F during manufacturing) and should also be deemed to comply without testing. VOC testing on ceramic tile is not required by any of the other green building rating systems, standards, or codes, nor should it be here. I believe it was inadvertently left out of the footnote and should be added.

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

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- A member noted that the comments on the excel sheet say approved by the Executive Committee and asked why they weren't reviewed by the IE Subcommittee like the Water comments were reviewed by the Water Subcommittee. The secretariat stated that staff reviewed all comments and that the IE comment proposed changes were thought to be more minor than the Water comments. To be as efficient as possible with everyone's time, the Consensus Body for New Construction Executive Committee, a committee of all subcommittee chairs and vice chairs, met to review all Indoor Environment comments and proposed revisions. The member stated that although he agrees with the comment, he will be fundamentally opposing all items in the IE Assessment Area because they were not reviewed by the subcommittee that was formed of subject matter experts (SMEs). He argued that skipping that part of the process, is not doing the standard justice. He stated that he does appreciate that his time was thought of but does not agree with changing the process of how public comments were reviewed.

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

Opposed: Josh Jacobs

Abstain: Jeff Bradley, John Cross, Kirk Sander

302-4

Public Comment: *IAPMO UMC ~~(2018)~~(2021): Uniform Mechanical Code;*

Reason: The 2021 edition of IAPMO UMC has been published. This comment is to update the reference to the current edition of the document.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Your comment has been deferred to the revision cycle beginning in 2022 to allow the full Indoor Environment Subcommittee the opportunity to review the 2021 Uniform Mechanical Code thoroughly and against all criteria in the GBI Standard.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The IE chair noted that this is a large change and needs more time for review by the IE Subcommittee.
- Staff noted that they reviewed the response created by the Executive Committee and suggested an edit to the response to provide more information to the public commenter.
- A member stated that the proposed edition of the reference has many large substantial changes that could affect other sections of the standard and thus, needs to be further reviewed before it takes place in the standard.
- The member that noted concern of the IE Subcommittee not reviewing the comments stated that there are competing ideas in that staff said that the changes are minimal but that others say the comment needs further review.
- The secretariat discussed the continuous maintenance schedule. She noted that a 4th public comment cycle will take place because the Consensus Body has already voted to make substantive changes. She explained that because of the continuous maintenance cycle and schedule, the Consensus Body may need to decide at a certain point to defer some comments to the next revision cycle. She said that if we want to publish a standard at the end of 2021, we need to try to follow the schedule as close as possible.
- It was argued that the comment is a huge change and would probably not have resulted in anything different if the IE Subcommittee had one meeting to discuss it. The member noted that the reference in the public comment is brand new as it was approved in 2021 and should also be considered as 'too new' to be included in the GBI standard. A member noted that it may be best to use the next oldest reference, which we are currently doing with the 2018 reference. He stated that there are so many implications to updating this reference and could result in an overhaul of other criteria.
- A member argued that the comment should be tabled and sent back to the Indoor Environment Subcommittee.
- It was noted that staff said the public comments went to the Executive Committee because they were minimal but that the response given to the public commenter says it is too major to approve at this time.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 1 opposed, 7 abstained.

Opposed: Josh Jacobs

Abstain: Benjamin Bojda, David Eldridge, Gregg Bergmiller, Jeff Bradley, John Cross, Kirk Sander, Kyle Thompson

303-1

Public Comment: Criteria: One point is earned for establishing noise limit criteria for all listed spaces.

Reason: This addition provides needed clarity. Specifically, noise limit criteria are established for all spaces in the design of a new construction which are defined within the cited documents.

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

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was asked if the standard defines "listed spaces." It was noted that it does not, but that it is included in the text of the point distribution language that is below it.
- A member asked if this was an editorial change or a substantive change in that it requires all listed spaces to meet the requirements of the standards/codes listed in the criteria. An interested party that noted that he submitted the comment stated that "for all listed places" is consistent with the references that are listed in the criteria.
- There was discussion with adding "for all listed relevant places." The commenter agreed that it would not add clarity because the client would find all their spaces in the criteria's references and note which they have in their project.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 4 opposed, 5 abstained.

Opposed: Chris Dixon, Jeff Bradley, John Cross, Josh Jacobs

Abstain: Benjamin Bojda, Doug Tucker, Gary B. Keclik, Kirk Sander, Stephen Szoke

303-2

Public Comment: Verification of building-related systems', services' and utilities' noise levels comply with noise limit criteria in 11.5.1.1, measured after construction but prior to occupancy, ~~through measurement~~ using a Type I or Type II sound level meter ~~after construction but prior to occupancy~~.

Reason: Reworded for consistency with other criteria in section.

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

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstained.

Abstain: Benjamin Bojda, John Cross, Josh Jacobs

Doug Tucker left the meeting.

303-3

Public Comment: Assessment of transient noise shall be evaluated, after construction but prior to occupancy, using appropriate metrics as defined in one of the following:

Reason: This addition provides the consistency that is afforded to other sections of the acoustical section. It also provides clarity as to "when" and "how" to satisfy (or comply) with this criterion.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Consistency does not apply with a non-testing requirement. This is an assessment during design.

Discussion took place on the Public Comment:

- The Subcommittee chair stated that the commenter may have misunderstood the differences between this and the 303-2 public comment in that this is an assessment and not a measurement. The measurement in the criteria for public comment 303-2 needs to be done after construction but prior to occupancy, but the assessment in this public comment needs to be completed during design.

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 14 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstained.

Opposed: Josh Jacobs

Abstain: Benjamin Bojda, John Cross

303-4

Public Comment: · "...Part 1: Permanent Schools

o Section 5.2.2. ..."

Reason: The bullet is missing.

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

Discussion took place on the Editorial Public Comment:

- There were no comments or objections on the editorial revision.

303-5

Public Comment: Design complies with minimum composite Sound Transmission Class ratings calculated to meet the noise limit criteria or 5 points dBA less than the masking sound levels for spaces. ...

Reason: It is my understanding that this clarification was approved in the Indoor Environment subcommittee but missed during approval with the Points committee.

The change clarifies that the minimum STC needs to be calculated to meet the noise limit criteria (which are dBA values) or the level of masking sound minus 5 dBA which would be defined in the 11.5.1.2 section.

Note: This change reflects the language that is part of 11.5.2.4B.2.

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

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 4 abstained.

Abstain: Gregg Bergmiller, Jeff Bradley, John Cross, Josh Jacobs

303-6

Public Comment: "Design of floor-ceiling assemblies complies with *Table 801.3.3.3...*"

Reason: The "assemblies" should not be italicized. The "T" with "Table" should also be italicized.

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

Discussion took place on the Editorial Public Comment:

- There were no comments or objections to the editorial revision.

303-7

Public Comment: Field-testing of adjacent spaces comply with ~~noise criteria limits in 11.5.2.1 or 5dBA less than the masking sound levels in 11.5.2.2 for spaces~~, measured after construction but prior to occupancy, in accordance with the following as applicable:

- For adjacencies of mechanical, electrical and plumbing (MEP) and heating, ventilation and air-conditioning (HVAC) rooms:
 - ASTM E336-20 Standard Test Method for Measurement of Airborne Sound Attenuation between Rooms in Buildings
- For spaces where speech privacy is required:
 - ASTM E2638-10(2017) Standard Test Method for Objective

Reason: The wording in this section seems to be in error. 11.5.2.1 is the "acoustical insulation and vibration isolation" section (correctly), but the reference is incorrect. With the same rationale, the reference to masking sound is incorrect. I believe the intent was to refer to the objectives identified in 11.5.2.1 in calculating cSTC.

The proposed language changes clarify this: Specifically, testing of the acoustic insulation properties of spaces (with respect to the considerations of 11.5.2.1).

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The rationale behind the proposed change is not clear. Accordingly, the Exec Committee does not feel that there is sufficient evidence to change the editorial or substantive criteria.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- An interested party stated that he submitted the public comment and would like the group to reconsider the rejection. He noted that the criteria that is referenced within 11.5.2.4B.2 is incorrect, and the change would help clarify the criteria. He stated that the change is the most minimal change possible to ensure that it is correct.
- There was some agreement that the change is correct and should take place. It was noted that this wording should be reviewed by the IE Subcommittee more thoroughly.
- A member stated that the discussion had on this comment strengthens why all the comments should have went forth to the Indoor Environment Subcommittee. The IE Chair said that he will be voting against the proposed change so that it can be reviewed more in depth.

- A member voiced a motion to table discussion and have the comment be discussed by the IE Subcommittee. It was noted that there was already a motion on the floor.

VOTE: The Motion is tied with 6 in favor, 6 opposed, 5 abstained.

Opposed: Benjamin Bojda, David Eldridge, Jane Rohde, John Cross, Kirk Sander, Kyle Thompson

Abstain: Angela Tin, James O'Brien, Jeff Bradley, Josh Jacobs, Stephen Szoke

TIEBREAKER: The Consensus Body New Construction Chair voted in favor of the motion.

303-8

Public Comment: Design of spaces complies with the maximum reverberation time (T60) criteria from Sections 801.3.3 Acoustical Control and 801.3.3.4 Interior Sound Reverberation in the 2018 International Green Construction Code (IgCC).

For specialized spaces not included in the above references the design team shall submit evidence of compliance. Spaces may include but are not limited to the following: community centers, theatres, music halls, studios, sensory rooms, ~~supporting~~ supportive accessibility spaces.

Reason: The item in the list is a type of space. I believe it should be "supportive" accessibility spaces.

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

Discussion took place on the Editorial Public Comment:

- There were no comments or objections on the editorial revision.

The Indoor Environment Subcommittee Chair noted that any Consensus Body member could make a motion to send all IE comments to the IE Subcommittee after the comments have all been reviewed.

EC-1

Proposed Revision: Maximum = 8 points or as adjusted by N/A items

Reason: Maximum = or Maximum: - Make consistent throughout standard.

Discussion took place on the Editorial Revision:

- There were no comments or objections on the editorial revision.

EC-2

Proposed Revision: 3. NOT APPLICABLES AND THIRD-PARTY ASSESSMENTS

Reason: Section no longer contains information on Third Party Assessments

Discussion took place on the Editorial Revision:

- There were no comments or objections on the editorial revision.

EC-3

Proposed Revision: • One point is earned for evidence of each design stage review and assessment of goals prior to:

- o Conceptual design
- o Design development
- o Construction documents:

Reason: Remove period.

Discussion took place on the Editorial Revision:

- There were no comments or objections on the editorial revision.

EC-4

Proposed Revision: 8.1.1C.2.3

- Three points are earned where $\geq 90\%$ of light fixtures have continuously dimmable light reduction controls.

Two points are earned where $\geq 90\%$ of the of light fixtures have light reduction controls based multi-level lighting;

8.1.1C.2.3.2

- Three points are earned where $\geq 90\%$ of light fixtures have continuously dimmable personal lighting control.

- Two points are earned where $\geq 90\%$ of the of light fixtures have multi-level light lighting.

Reason: Should be $\geq 90\%$

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The Chair of the PM/Energy Subcommittee commented that the points should be awarded for any project that is 90% or greater in compliance.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstained.

Abstain: Amlan Mukherjee, Chris Dixon, Josh Jacobs

EC-5

Proposed Revision: • Two points are earned where $\geq 60\%$ to $< 90\%$ of occupied space has clear views.

Reason: Missing 0

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

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

Abstain: Amlan Mukherjee, Gregg Bergmiller

EC-6

Proposed Revision: Two Points are earned if $\geq 40\%$ to $\leq 55\%$ ~~$< 56\%$~~ percent of the roof complies.

o One point is earned where $\geq 40\%$ to $\leq 55\%$ ~~$< 56\%$~~ of the roof has a high initial SRI, and one point is earned where $\geq 40\%$ to $\leq 55\%$ ~~$< 56\%$~~ of the roof has a high three-year-aged SRI.

Reason: Should be less than 56%.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The secretariat noted that currently there could be confusion if anyone falls greater than 55% or less than 56%. She noted that the correction would eliminate any gray area. Marx pulled up the standard to illustrate the other percentage breakdowns within the criteria.

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

Abstain: Josh Jacobs, Kyle Thompson

Public Participation

An interested party stated that the IE comments should have gone to the IE Subcommittee. She believes there were much better solutions to many comments and subcommittees may have been better at resolving them.

A member asked how he could make a motion to send the IE comments back to the Subcommittee. Marx gave him the steps and potential words to use.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to send all public comments in the Indoor Environment Assessment Area to the Indoor Environment Subcommittee for further review.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- A member stated that he did not look at GBI's Procedures but that with his organization the Consensus Body makes all final decisions, which are binding. He noted that their technical committees are intended to assist the Consensus Body and that procedurally, nothing was done wrong by not sending them to the IE Subcommittee.
- Marx displayed the procedures and said that procedurally all comments must be presented to the Consensus Body, but not the subcommittees. She brought up the Covid-19 Task Group as an example. The Task Group reviews content and would send suggested changes to the Consensus Body for review and possible approval and not to subcommittees.
- A member asked what would happen if the Consensus Body sent some of the comments back to the subcommittee. Marx stated that if this occurred it would result in the standard not being published until late winter or spring 2022.
- A member stated that the Consensus Body has done a lot of work the past few years and it would be a shame to get this far and delay the process. Another member agreed that it would be a step backwards to send all comments back to the subcommittee.
- A different member said that the GBI standard is new, and it would not be that big of a step backwards to delay the process by sending the IE comments back to the subcommittee.
- It was argued that even sending one comment back to the IE Subcommittee would cause a significant delay in the process.
- A member voiced frustration in that members are voting to reject comments because they are massive changes, but staff said that the IE comments did not go to IE Subcommittee because they were thought to be minor.

- A member argued that if a comment could make major changes to the standard, it needs a lot of review. Because we are in continuous maintenance, we can continually make changes during the next cycle, and that some of the suggested changes need a lot more review before they are incorporated.
- A member argued that he disagrees with the GBI continuous maintenance cycle process and noted that other SDOs publish standards that include major updates but then continues with the resulting discussion.

VOTE: The Motion fails with 2 in favor, 12 opposed, 3 abstained.

Opposed: Amlan Mukherjee, Angela Tin, Benjamin Bojda, Chris Dixon, David Eldridge, Gary B. Keclik, Gord Shymko, James O'Brien, Jane Rohde, Kirk Sander, Michael Cudahy, Stephen Szoke

Abstain: Gregg Bergmiller, Jeff Bradley, Kyle Thompson

New Business

There was no other discussion.

Action Items

Staff stated that because substantive changes were passed by the Consensus Body, there will be a fourth public comment period that will last 30 days, which is expected to begin on June 25, 2021. After the fourth public comment period the Consensus Body for New Construction will be presented with all comments and will decide what changes should take place and what changes should be deferred for the next continuous maintenance cycle. She noted that the standard is still on track to be published by ANSI at the end of 2021 or early 2022.

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

Meeting adjourned at 2:38 PM EST.