



MINUTES

GBI Consensus Body - Call #9
 Webinar/Teleconference
 August 13, 2020 from 12:00 to 2:00 p.m. ET

NOTE ALL TIMES ARE EASTERN TIME

Consensus Body Members in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	8/13/2020	8/6/2020	7/17/2020	6/26/2020	6/19/2020	2/21/2020
Gregg Bergmiller	The S/L/A/M Collaborative	Absent	X	Absent	X	X	X
Benjamin Bojda	Dominion Environmental Consultants NV, Inc	X	X	Absent	X	X	X
Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X	X	X	X	X	X
Karen Butler	EPA	X	X	X	X	X	X
Virgil Campaneria	Gurri Matute PA	X	X (Proxy Shymko)	X	X	X	X
John Cross	American Institute of Steel Construction	X	Absent	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Michael Cudahy	PPFA - PPEF	X	X	X	X	X	X
Chris Dixon	Morrison Hershfield	X	X	X	X	X	(proxy Bergmiller)
David Eldridge	Grumman/Butkus Associates	X	X		Absent	(Proxy Shymko)	X
Josh Jacobs	UL	X (Left Early)	Absent	X	Absent	X	X
Gary Keclik	Keclik Associates Ltd.	X	X (Proxy Rohde)	X	X	X	X
Charles Kibert	University of Florida	X	X	X (Acting as Chair)	X	X	X
Michael Lehman (Chair)	Chair	Absent	Absent	Absent	X	X	Absent
Tim Miller	Sidock Group Inc	Absent	Absent	X	Absent	X	X
James O'Brien	Independent Environmental Consultant	X	X	X	X	X	Absent
Jane Rohde	JSR Associates, Inc., The Vinyl Institute / Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X (Arrived Late)	X	X	X	X	X
Kirk Sander	National Waste and Recycling Association	X (Left Early)	X (Left Early)	Absent	Absent	X	X
Gord Shymko	G. F. Shymko & Associates Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X
Stephen Szoke	American Concrete Institute	X	X	X	X	X	X
Kyle Thompson	IAPMO	X	Absent	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Kate Callahan	Staff, GBI	Absent	Absent	X	X	X	Absent
Elizabeth Fjerstad	Staff, GBI	Absent	Absent	X	Absent	Absent	Absent
Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI	X	X	Absent	X	X	Absent
Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI	X	X	Absent	Absent	Absent	X
Adam Wellen	Staff, GBI	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent

Welcome

Vice Chair Charles Kibert welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Roll Call

Secretariat Emily Marx took roll call to establish quorum, reviewed the GBI Anti-Trust Policy, Code of Conduct policy and notified participants that the call was being recorded for the purpose of preparing minutes. No objections or concerns were raised.

Administrative Items

Kibert reviewed the agenda and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were no objections or concerns.

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

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

Abstain: David Eldridge, Gary Keclik

Jane Rohde joined the call.

Marx stated that there was some confusion on the minutes from August 6, 2020 concerning a proxy. However, everything was reviewed and confirmed to be correct in the minutes presented to the Consensus Body. Kibert reviewed the minutes from meeting #8 on August 6, 2020 and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were no objections or concerns.

MOTION: A Motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from meeting #8 on August 6, 2020 as presented.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 4 abstained.

Abstain: John Cross, David Eldridge, Gary Keclik, Jeff Bradley

Indoor Environment

The Indoor Environment Subcommittee chair presented each public comment or item of new business.

IE-10

Proposed Revision:

11.2.1.4 Furniture, casework, cabinets, workstations, and seating all comply with prescribed limits of VOC emissions AND/OR are certified.

Note: certified means compliance with any of the certifications listed per Table 11.2.1.4: Furniture and Furnishings VOC Emissions.

Table 11.2.1.4: Furniture and Furnishings VOC Emissions
 [Table - Remove all text from right side of table]

VOC Emissions Criteria

VOC emissions are determined by a third-party laboratory that is accredited to ISO/IEC 17025:~~2005~~ 2017 with the

specified test method listed in the scope of its accreditation. VOC emissions results are determined by ANSI/BIFMA M7.1-2011(R2016) Standard Test Method for Determining VOC Emissions From Office Furniture Systems, Components and Seating. Alternatively, VOC emission results may be determined by UL 2821 "GREENGUARD Certification Program Method for Measuring and Evaluating Chemical Emissions from Building Materials, Finishes and Furnishings," 2013 Table 2 Office Model and Section 34.1 Allowable Limits for GREENGUARD Gold Certification. To determine acceptability of the emission results, VOC product emission concentrations are estimated per testing procedures from ANSI/BIFMA e3-2019, 7.6.1, 7.6.2, and 7.6.3.

Assessment Guidance:

~~Provide documentation indicating compliance with the VOC emission requirements or a certification by a third party testing organization including, but not limited to, one of the following:~~

- ~~• GREENGUARD Gold – UL Environment – 7.6.1, 7.6.2, and 7.6.3~~
- ~~• UL 2818, GREENGUARD Certification Program for Chemical Emissions for Building Materials, Finishes and Furnishings, 2013.~~
- ~~• MAS Certified Green Furniture per ANSI/BIFMA M7.1-2011(R2016)~~
- ~~• SCS Indoor Advantage per ANSI/BIFMA M7.1-2011(R2016)~~

Discussion took place on the Proposed Revision:

- Marx stated that the revision in red was not initially noted the first time the revision was voted on by the Consensus Body. Another member stated that the revision should take place because it is a newer version of the ISO standard.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

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

Abstain: David Eldridge

5b-3

Public Comment: 11.2 Source Control and Measurement of Indoor Pollutants (~~35~~34 points)

Reason: Points in this section add up to 34, not 35.

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 on the motion.

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

Abstain: David Eldridge

5b-7

Public Comment: 11.3 Lighting Design and Systems (~~35~~32 points)

Reason: Points in this section add up to 32, not 35.

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 on the motion.

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

5b-9

Public Comment: 11.4 Thermal Comfort (~~25~~23 points)

Reason: Points in this section add up to 23, not 25

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 on the motion.

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

Abstain: David Eldridge

5b-11

Public Comment: 11.5 Acoustic Comfort (~~23~~ 20 points)

Reason: In the Standard, 11.5 Acoustic Comfort adds up to 23 points but says it's worth only 20. However, per the comment below, it might be worth 26 points.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The totals have been calculated and the header will be updated to 26 points.

11.5 Acoustic Comfort (~~23~~ 20 points)

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The question was asked of whether the points should add up to 23 and not 26. The chair noted that because of point changes within the Assessment Area, the points now add up to 26.

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

Abstain: David Eldridge

IE-12

Proposed Revision: For Long Term Care, Hospitals, and Outpatient Facilities, reference: *Guidelines for Design and Construction of Hospitals (2018)*, ~~and *Guidelines for Design and Construction of Outpatient Facilities (2018)*, (2014)~~: Chapter 1.2-5.1 Acoustic Design and Tables 1.2-3 through 1.2-8 ~~including Errata posted on <https://www.fgiguidelines.org/> (last access 6/30/17)~~ and *Guidelines for Design and Construction of Residential Health, Care, and Support Facilities, (2018)* ~~(2014)~~: Chapter 2.5-8 Acoustic Design Systems and Tables 2.5-3 through 2.5-8 ~~including Errata posted on <https://www.fgiguidelines.org/> (last accessed 6/30/17)~~

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was discussion on whether to include errata and links within the standard. It was argued that links may date the standard and that in past updates, it was attempted to keep links out of the standard. It was stated that other SDOs use links and links provide a greater resource for projects and assessors. It was noted that errata are distinct from amendments or addenda. It was agreed to be consistent with the rest of the standard, to remove links and errata from the original proposal.

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

Abstain: Kirk Sander

Front End & Back End

Kibert reviewed revisions to the front of the standard that are being proposed.

CB-3

Proposed Revision: 4. ASSESSMENT OF COMPLIANCE

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

~~Items from the "Recommended Documentation" list at the end of each area of compliance in this Standard are typical documents that providers of the third party assessment will use prior to, or in conjunction with, a post construction site visit and walk through to assess compliance, although additional documentation may be requested or substituted prior to, or during, the on-site visit.~~

Informational Reference(s):

- ~~The Green Building Initiative's Third Party Rating/Certification for Green Globes~~

Discussion took place on the proposed revision:

- It was noted that because the Recommended Documentation and Informational References are to be moved solely to the Technical Manual, information on them should be removed from section 4.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

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

CB-4

Proposed Revision: 3.3~~1~~ Not Applicable Criteria

Discussion took place on the proposed revision:

- Marx stated that this is a numbering issue and no motions need to be made unless there is a clear objection. There was no objection to updating the numbering for section 3.

Project Management

The Project Management Subcommittee chair presented each public comment or item of new business.

PM-E-7

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

Discussion took place on the proposed revision:

- It was noted that the next item of new business adds clarity to the criteria and “NIBS (Building Envelope)” should be removed from 6.5.1.1.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to rescind the revision to add “NIBS (Building Envelope)” to the standard under 6.5.1.1.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

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

Kirk Sander left the call.

PM-E-9

Proposed Revision: 6.5.1.1 Commissioning and building operator training is conducted in accordance with ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 202–2013, *Commissioning Process for Buildings and Systems*, and ASHRAE Guideline 0-2013, *The Commissioning Process*, and ASTM E2813-18 Standard Practice for Building Enclosure Commissioning and ASTM E2947-16a Standard Guide for Building Enclosure Commissioning for the following building systems as applicable:

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was noted that the “and” between “Commissioning Process’ and “ASTM E2813” should be removed and was done so on the screen shown to participants.
- It was asked of whether *ASTM E2947-16a Standard Guide for Building Enclosure Commissioning* was written in mandatory language and if it should be included in the criteria. It was noted that there are items that are not mandatory and it should still be added to the criteria.
- It was argued that the standards’ addition is out of sync with the others that are included in the criteria and it should not be added.
- It was noted that this was a difficult update for the subcommittee, and it did have some opposition. It was argued that the criteria’s requirements should be clear and as it is currently written it is confusing. It was stated that the “as applicable” does not add enough guidance.

- It was argued that assessors are left with deciding which standard should be used and how it is written does lead to confusion.
- There was discussion of adding an “and/or” before it was agreed to add the “and” back into the text between “Commissioning Process?” and “ASTM E2813.”

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

Abstain: Stephen Szoke, Josh Jacobs, Jeff Bradley, David Eldridge

6a-11

Proposed Revision: 6.5.1 Commissioning or Systems Manual & Training: Path A or B

Two paths are available for assessing Commissioning or Systems Manual & Training.

Discussion took place on the proposed revision:

- Marx stated that when public comment was first presented to the Consensus Body, it was not noted that “Path A or B” was new next. She stated that because it is linked to a numbering issue, no motions is needed unless there is a clear objection. There was no objection to updating the numbering for 6.5.

Site

The Site Subcommittee chair was not present and no member of the subcommittee volunteered to review each item. Thus, the secretariat presented each public comment or item of new business.

Site-1

Proposed Revision: 7.3.4.2.1 Solar Reflectance Index: Hardscape surfaces with a solar reflectance index (SRI) value of at least 0.28 are used. New concrete and concrete masonry without additional colored pigment are deemed to comply without additional testing.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was discussion on whether Solar Reflectance was the correct term and whether Index should be added.
- It was noted that Solar Reflectance Index is between 0 and 100 and the difference between SRI and SR is that SRI takes into account the emissivity of the material.

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

Abstain: David Eldridge

Site-2 and Site-4

Proposed Revision:

Site-2

7.3.4.2.1 Solar Reflectance: Hardscape surfaces with a solar reflectance (SR) value of at least ~~0.28~~ are used. New concrete and concrete masonry without additional colored pigment are deemed to comply without additional testing.

Site-4

7.3.4.2.1 Solar Reflectance: Hardscape surfaces with a solar reflectance (SR) ~~value of at least 0.28~~ of 29 or greater are used. New concrete and concrete masonry without additional colored pigment are deemed to comply without additional testing.

Discussion took place on the Proposed Revision:

- Marx noted that the language passed in Site -2 is also included in the language for Site-4 and thus, Site-2 can be rejected because it is repeated information.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the proposed revision for Site-2 and accept the proposed revision for Site-4.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was discussion on the terms SR and SRI and it was confirmed that the language would be updated from SR to SRI in all areas for consistency.

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

Abstain: David Eldridge, Jeff Bradley, Jane Rohde

Site-3

Proposed Revision: 7.3.4.3 Walls: At least 75% of opaque wall surfaces (by area) on the east, west, and south have an solar reflectance index (SRI) of 29 or greater, are covered by or are designed to be covered by, non-invasive vegetation AND/OR a vegetative wall during the summer months. New concrete or concrete masonry without additional colored pigment is deemed to comply without additional testing.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

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

Abstain: David Eldridge, Jeff Bradley

Site-5

Proposed Revision: 7.6.1.1 An engineer or lighting professional creates a lighting design that meets all the performance requirements of the IDA - IES Model Lighting Ordinance (MLO), Tables A and B, 2011.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

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

Abstain: David Eldridge, Chris Dixon

Site-6

Proposed Revision: 7.6.2.1 Exterior lighting does not exceed prescribed values for the amount of light per unit of area per IDA – IES Model Lighting Ordinance (MLO), Tables A and B, 2011.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

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

Abstain: David Eldridge, Chris Dixon, Stephen Szoke

Site-7 and Site-8

Proposed Revision:

Site-7

7.6.2.2 Exterior lighting trespass does not exceed prescribed Backlight, Uplight and Glare (BUG) ratings as per IDA – IES Model Lighting Ordinance (MLO), Table C, C1, C2, 2011 for the following:

Site-8

7.6.2.2 Exterior lighting trespass does not exceed prescribed Backlight, Uplight and Glare (BUG) ratings as per IDA – IES Model Lighting Ordinance (MLO), Table C, C1, C2, C3, 2011 for the following:

Discussion took place on the Proposed Revision:

- Marx noted that the language passed in Site -7 is also included in the language for Site-8 and thus, Site-7 can be rejected because it is repeated information.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the proposed revision for Site-7 and accept the proposed revision for Site-8.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

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

Abstain: David Eldridge, Chris Dixon, Stephen Szoke, Jeff Bradley

Site-9

Proposed Revision: 7.7.1.1 There is a determination by a fire protection engineer or certified fire marshal that the site wildland-urban interface hazard is moderate, high or extreme;

AND

The project achieves points for 7.2.1.1 or 7.2.1.7 or is within 0.25 mi (0.4 km) walking distance of developed residential land of at least 8 dwelling units per acre;

AND

The site is designed to comply with the most recent International Wildland-Urban Interface Code ([2015](#));

AND

Excluding athletic fields and agriculture, greater than 50% of the vegetation on site achieves points for Section 7.5.1.2 for drought tolerant plants, and greater than 50% of the vegetation on site achieves points for Section 7.5.1.3 for native plants.

AND

A fire protection engineer or certified fire marshal has inspected the completed site within 90 days prior to project certification or re-certification and found it compliant with the International Wildland-Urban Interface Code ([2015](#)).

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was noted that there is a 2018 version of the reference and a question was raised as of why the year listed isn't 2018. Marx stated that it may not have been known by the subcommittee.
- Kibert asked Marx for this to be reviewed by the Site Subcommittee during their next meeting in late Fall.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 3 opposed, 6 abstained.

Opposed: Jane Rohde, John Cross, Stephen Szoke

Abstain: David Eldridge, Chris Dixon, Doug Tucker, Gord Shymko, Josh Jacobs, Jeff Bradley

8-21

Public Comment: [7.3.5 Bird Strikes](#)

- [No construction or site disturbance takes place in bird migration or flyaway zones](#)

OR

- [Techniques/materials are used throughout 50% of the building exterior to mitigate bird strikes.](#)

Informational Reference(s):

- [Cornell Lab of Ornithology: https://mailchi.mp/cornell/release-study-lists-top-cities-where-lights-endanger-migratory-birds](https://mailchi.mp/cornell/release-study-lists-top-cities-where-lights-endanger-migratory-birds)

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

- [Chicago, Bird Friendly Building Ordinance \(proposed\): https://birdfriendlychicago.org/ordinance](https://birdfriendlychicago.org/ordinance)

Reason: Add criteria on bird strikes

Resources:

- [Cornell Lab of Ornithology: https://mailchi.mp/cornell/release-study-lists-top-cities-where-lights-endanger-migratory-birds](https://mailchi.mp/cornell/release-study-lists-top-cities-where-lights-endanger-migratory-birds)
- [San Francisco Planning, Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings: https://sfplanning.org/standards-bird-safe-buildings](https://sfplanning.org/standards-bird-safe-buildings), and [Bird-Safe Building Checklist: http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/bird_safe_bldgs/Standards for Bird Safe Buildings - 11-30-11.pdf](http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/bird_safe_bldgs/Standards%20for%20Bird%20Safe%20Buildings%20-%2011-30-11.pdf)
- [Chicago, Bird Friendly Building Ordinance \(proposed\): https://birdfriendlychicago.org/ordinance](https://birdfriendlychicago.org/ordinance)

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

[7.3.5.1 Measures to address bird strikes include, but are not limited to the following:](#)

Glass and Façade Treatments:

- [Fritted and Frosted Glass](#)
- [Angled Glass](#)
- [Ultra-Violet Glass](#)
- [Film and Art Treatment of Glass](#)
- [External Screens](#)
- [Architectural Features](#)
- [Netting](#)

Other Considerations:

- Wind generators
- Lighting Treatments

Location-Related Hazard:

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

o New buildings are constructed

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

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

Bird Collision Zone:

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

Maximum = 4 points

- 3 points are awarded for implementing measures identified in 7.3.5.1.
- 1 point is awarded for assessing and reporting on the design analysis for bird safety.

Discussion took place on the Public Comment:

- Marx stated that the Consensus Body’s approval included Informational References which has since been voted to be taken out of the Standard.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to remove the Informational References from the criteria and accept with modification the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

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

Abstain: David Eldridge, Mike Cudahy

8-4

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

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

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

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

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

4 ~~3~~ points or N/A

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

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

7.1.1.1 The building is being constructed on a previously developed site that has been served by existing utility and transportation infrastructure for at least a full year prior to construction. ~~14~~10 points

7.1.2.1 The building is being constructed on a brownfield or remediated Superfund site. ~~14~~ 10 points

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

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

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

4 points or N/A

Discussion took place on the Public Comment:

- Marx stated that the Consensus Body approved the reduction of 7.1.1.1 and 7.1.2.1 from 14 points to 12 points each during the June 19, 2020 meeting. However, the Subcommittee had further reduced each criterion to 10 points each to give points to the Bird Strike criteria.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reduce 7.1.1.1 and 7.1.2.1 to 10 points each and accept with modification the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 14 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstained.

Opposed: Jeff Bradley

Abstain: David Eldridge, James O'Brien

CV-1

Proposed Revision: 6.1.1.1 Performance and green design goals (qualitative AND/OR quantitative) are established in collaboration with the owner in writing and are regularly assessed from pre-design through to completion of construction and occupancy for the following listed items:

- Site design;
- Environmentally responsible construction activities;
- Water conservation, efficiency, alternate water sources, and reuse;
- Building envelope and moisture control;
- Energy efficiency;
- Materials including:
 - o Efficiency;
 - o Environmentally preferable products; and
 - o Storage of hazardous materials;
- Indoor environment including:
 - o Infection exposure control and management;
 - o Acoustic comfort;
 - o Thermal comfort;
 - o Lighting;
 - o Air quality; and
- Building resilience.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was suggested to remove the word "infection" because it could be a liability to building owners if a future outbreak takes place. It was argued that this is not a requirement to have, but this listing are topics that should be discussed. The words "pandemic" or "pathogen" were mentioned but argued that it was too limiting.
- There was discussion on removing the slash between "infection/exposure."
- It was argued that this change feels rushed, and it needs to be reviewed further by the COVID-19 Task Group.

MOTION: The Motion and second were withdrawn.

Public Participation

Interested parties had no items to discuss.

New Business

There was no items of new business discussed.

Because there was still time left during the meeting, the Vice Chair asked to review more public comments and items of new business.

CB-2

Proposed Revision: Complete 8.2, 8.3, and 8.4, ~~8.5, and 8.6~~ regardless of Path chosen above.

Discussion took place on the proposed revision:

- There was no objection to updating the numbering in the sentence.

Mike Cudahy left the call.

Water-22

Proposed Revision:

9.8 Leak Detection (10 points)

Leak detection devices shall comply with IGC 349 and not interfere with fire protection systems.

Water Leak Detection Device: A plumbing appurtenance that monitors a water supply and distribution system in order to detect and report unusual conditions that may cause water waste.

Adaptive Plumbing System Monitoring and Control Device: A type of water leak detection device that utilizes sensor inputs to continuously monitor the hydraulic conditions and intelligently adapts to remotely report expected normal vs abnormal plumbing system states.

9.8.1 Leak Detection

9.8.1.1 Install *water leak detection* device for all water-intensive applications such as commercial kitchens, commercial laundries, laboratories, pools, spas, etc.

Maximum 1 point or N/A

- One point is earned for adaptive plumbing system leak detection devices.
- Not applicable where there are no water intensive applications.

9.8.1.2 Install *water leak detection* device for water that is used for pressurized irrigation.

Maximum 2 points or N/A

- Two points are earned for adaptive plumbing system leak detection devices.
- Not applicable where there is no irrigation.

9.8.1.3 Link all water leak detection devices to internet or a central Data Management System to store monitor and report data.

1 point

9.8.1.4 Equip chilled or hot water loops or cooling tower make up water supply pipes with *water leak detection* devices..

Maximum 1 point or N/A

- One point is earned for adaptive plumbing system leak detection devices.
- Not applicable where there are no chilled or hot water loops.

9.8.1.5. Use tenant water leak detection devices in multi-unit developments. Percentages are based on units with water supply.

Maximum = 5 points or N/A

- Five points are earned when at least 90% of the units in the development include adaptive plumbing system water leak

detection.

- Four points are earned when at least 80% of the units in the development include adaptive plumbing system water leak detection.
- Two points are earned when at least 40% of the units in the development include adaptive plumbing system water leak detection.
- One point is earned when at least 20% of the units in the development include adaptive plumbing system water leak detection.
- Not applicable where there is no multi-unit development.

Discussion took place on the proposed revision:

- Marx stated that when this revision was first passed by the Consensus Body, the Recommended Documentation was included. However, since Recommended Documentation has been voted to be removed from the Standard, this should also be removed for consistency.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept remove the Recommended Documentation from the proposed revision.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

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

2-1 and Points-2

2-1 Public Comment 2-1: N/A

2-1 Reason: Many users are trying to claim partial credit for the Water Efficiency paths so that they do not lose 75 points. It seems this is against the intention of the subcommittee. Re-examine for clarity on scoring.

2-1 Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. -75 has been removed from the credit language and the calculation methodology has been revised. The new criteria is as follows:

Maximum = 45 points or N/A

- For points to be earned fifty percent of fixtures must comply.
 - o Points earned = percentage of compliant fixtures x 45 (fractional points are rounded upward.)
- ~~One point is earned where at least 80% of each fixture type meets credit requirements; and~~
- ~~Four points are earned where 90% of each fixture type meets credit requirements; and~~
- ~~Forty-five points are earned where at least 98% of each fixture type meets credit requirements.~~
- ~~Seventy-five total points are deducted if less than 80% of each fixture and fitting type meets credit requirements as listed in Path D. (Note: Points are deducted from the Water Assessment Area)~~
- Not applicable where no fixtures or fittings exist.
- Not applicable where Path A, B or C is followed.

Points-2 Proposed Revision:

9.1.1.1.1

~~54~~52 points or N/A

- For points to be earned fifty percent of fixtures must comply.
 - o Points earned = percentage of compliant fixtures x 52 (fractional points are rounded upward.)
- Not applicable where no fixtures or fittings exist.
- Not applicable where Path B, C or D is followed.

9.1.1.2.1

~~54~~52 points or N/A

- For points to be earned fifty percent of fixtures must comply.
 - o Points earned = percentage of compliant fixtures x 52 (fractional points are rounded upward.)
- Not applicable where no fixtures or fittings exist.
- Not applicable where Path A, C or D is followed.

9.1.1.3.1

~~54~~52 points or N/A

- For points to be earned fifty percent of fixtures must comply.
 - o Points earned = percentage of compliant fixtures x 52 (fractional points are rounded upward.)
- Not applicable where no fixtures or fittings exist.

- Not applicable where Path A, B or D is followed.

9.1.1.4.1

Maximum = 45 points or N/A

- For points to be earned fifty percent of fixtures must comply.

o Points earned = percentage of compliant fixtures x 45 (fractional points are rounded upward.)

- ~~One point is earned where at least 80% of each fixture type meets credit requirements; and~~
- ~~Four points are earned where 90% of each fixture type meets credit requirements; and~~
- ~~Forty five points are earned where at least 98% of each fixture type meets credit requirements.~~
- ~~Seventy five total points are deducted if less than 80% of each fixture and fitting type meets credit requirements as listed in Path D. (Note: Points are deducted from the Water Assessment Area)~~
- Not applicable where no fixtures or fittings exist.
- Not applicable where Path A, B or C is followed.

Discussion took place on the public comment and proposed revision:

- Marx stated that to be consistent with the rest of the standard “awarded” should be changed to “earned” in both of the items.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to change “awarded” to “earned” in 2-1 and Points-2.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion on the motion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.

Abstain: David Eldridge, Kyle Thompson

CB-3

Proposed Revision: Update numbering for Irrigation section from 9.8 to 9.9 and for all subsequent criteria.

Discussion took place on the proposed revision:

- There was no objection to updating the numbering in the Irrigation section.

CB-5

Proposed Revision: Update numbering to 9.1.2 and the resulting criteria.

Discussion took place on the proposed revision:

- There was no objection to updating the numbering for the subsection.

Josh Jacobs left the call.

Materials Task Group-6

Proposed Revision: Maximum = ~~5~~ 7 points

Points are earned where a percentage of the total amount of construction waste is diverted from landfill:

- ~~Four~~ Six points are earned for 75% or greater.
- ~~Three~~ Four points are earned for ≥50% and <75%.
- Two points are earned for ≥25% and <50%

PLUS

• One additional point is earned for facilities that have verified their annual average recycling rate from an independent third party organization.

- No points are earned for less than 25%.

Discussion took place on the proposed revision:

- Marx stated that the word “PLUS” was not indicated to be new text during the prior approval of this proposed revision.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the addition of “PLUS” in the proposed revision.

Discussion took place on the motion:

- There was discussion of whether the word “plus” was accurate and whether it increased confusion.
- It was argued that the total number of points that can be earned for the criteria is 7 points and that the additional point can be earned regardless of how the other points are earned.

- A member argued that this should be its own criterion and should be moved to increase clarity.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 4 opposed, 2 abstained.

Opposed: James O'Brien, Jane Rohde. Jeff Bradley, John Cross

Abstain: David Eldridge, Doug Tucker

Action Items

Marx stated that there were a few revisions that need to be discussed and thus, she will send out a doodle poll for late August to determine the best date and time for meeting #10.

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

Meeting adjourned at 2:05 PM EST.