

**Minutes (Final)**

GBI Consensus Body Meeting #4

BSR/GBI 01-201X

Webinar

Thursday, April 16, 2015 12:00 Noon ET to 2:00 PM ET

**Attendance:**

No.	Name	Organization(s)	9-5-14	11-13-14	11-14-14	1-7-14	4-16-15
1	Greg Bergmiller	S/L/A/M Collaborative	X	X	X	X	X(in listen only mode)
2	Paul Bertram	Kingspan Insulated Panels, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X
3	Allan Bilka	International Code Council	X	X	X	Absent	X
4	Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X	X (proxy for Jane Rohde)	X (proxy for Jane Rohde)	X	X
5	William Carroll	Occidental Chemical Corp.	X			X	X
Alt	D'Lane Wisner	D'Lane Wisner (Voting Alternate for William Carroll)		X	X		
6	Chris Dixon	NBBJ (rep. self)	X	X	X	X	X
7	Nicole Dovel-Moore	CTA Architects Engineers	absent	X	X	X	X
8	Amber Dzikowicz	NSF International	X	X	X	X	X
9	David Eldridge	Grumman/Butkus Assoc.	X	X	X	X	X
10	William Freeman	Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X	X	X	X	(Jane Rohde was proxy)
11	Don Horn	GSA		X	X	X	X
Alt:	Lance Davis	GSA (Voting Alternate for Don	X				

		Horn)					
12	Josh Jacobs	UL Environment	X			X	X
Alt:	Bill Hoffman	UL Environment (Voting Alternate for Josh Jacobs)		X	X		
13	Greg Johnson	Johnson Consulting Services, Greenscape Alliance,	X	X	X	X	X (proxy for Jeff Bradley 2 <sup>nd</sup> half of call)
14	Leslie Kahn	Admin. Office of the U.S. Courts	X	X	X	Absent	X
15	Malee Kaolawanich	NIH (rep. self)	absent	absent	absent	Absent	X
16	Rachel Minnery	AIA					X
Alt	Paul Karrer	AIA (Alternate for Rachel Minnery)	X	X	X	X	
17	Charles Kibert	University of Florida	X	X	X	X	X
18	John Koeller	Alliance for Water Efficiency	X	X	X	X	X
19	Jennifer Kowalonek	Alfred Benesch & Company	X	absent	absent	Absent	X
20	Michael Lehman	ConTech Lighting	X	X	X	X	X
21	Tom Meyer	NEBB	X	resigned			
22	Tien Peng	National Ready Mix Concrete Assn.	X	X	X	X	X
23	Bernadette Reyes	Clark Construction Group	X	absent	absent	X	Absent
24	Angela Rivera	URS Corporation (rep. self)	X	absent	absent	X	Absent
25	Jane Rohde	JSR Assoc. Inc., Vinyl Institute	X	absent	absent	X	X (Also served as proxy for Bill Freeman)
26	Julie Sobelman	Independent Consultant	X	absent	absent	X	Absent
27	Kent Sovocool	Southern Nevada Water Authority	X	X	X	X	X

GREG JOHNSON 5/20/2015 9:40 AM

**Deleted:** Greenspace

GREG JOHNSON 5/20/2015 9:41 AM

**Comment [1]:** I corrected the name of the coalition that I represent. I also suggest that the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute (not Assn.) be deleted rather than called out individually. Funding is routed through OPEI, but I represent the GA.

I thought this was clear in my application materials.

GREG JOHNSON 5/20/2015 9:41 AM

**Deleted:** Outdoor Power Equipment Assn.

28	Steve Strawn	JELD-WEN	X	X	X	X	Absent
29	George Thompson	Chemical Compliance Systems, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X
30	Angela Tin	American Lung Assn.	X	X	X	X	
alt	Abby Brokaw	Amrican Lung Assn. (voting Alternate for Angela Tin)					X
31	Douglas Tucker	Misubishi Electric Cooling & Heating	X	X	X	X	X
32	Erika Winters Downey	American Institute of Steel Construction	X	X	X	Absent	X
TOTALS			30/32	27/31	27/31	26/31	27/31
<b>Visitors</b>							
	Kathleen Almand	National Fire Protection Assn.	X				
	Anne Bevan	Green Circle Certified	X				
	Abby Brokaw	American Lung Assn.	X	X	X	X	X
	Lawrence (Larry) Clark	Sustainable Performance Solutions					X
	Mike Cudahy	PPFA		X	X	X	
	Michelle DiPenti	HDR					X
	Jonathon Humble	American Iron & Steel Institute	X				
	Michael Jouaneh	Lutron Electronics		X	X	X	
	Emily Lorenz	Independent Consultant				X	X
	Susan McGlaughlin Gitlin	U.S. EPA		X	X	X	X
	Brent Mecham	Irrigation Assn.		X	X	X	
	Paula Melton	Building Green, Inc.					X
	Brad Miller	BIFMA				X	

	Dave Panning	BIFMA		X	X	X	
	Gord Shymko	G.F. Shymko & Associates, Inc.					X
	Jiri Skopek	JLL					X
	Melanie Stanton	Turfgrass Producers International			X		
	Christine Subasic	The Masonry Society					X
	Kyle Thompson	IAPMO					X
	Martha Van Geem	Self	X	X	X	X	
	Doug Wolf	The Weidt Group		X	X	X	
<b>Staff/Consultants</b>							
	Wayne Trusty	Chair	X	X	X	X	X
	Vicki Worden	GBI Secretariat, Worden Associates, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X
	Ron Jarnagin	Consultant	X				
	Jerry Yudelson	GBI President	X				
	Tom White	GBI Staff	X	X			
	Micah Thomas	GBI Staff	X				
	Emily Randolph	Secretariat Asst., Worden Associates, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X
	Maria Woodbury	Secretariat in training, Worden Associates, Inc.					X

**Thursday, April 16, 2015**

**Welcome & Roll Call**

Chair, Wayne Trusty, welcomed participants. Roll call established quorum. The antitrust statement was reviewed and participants were requested to comply with it fully. Worden introduced the Secretariat staff. She noted she Maria Woodbury will be filling the Secretariat role working collaboratively with Emily Randolph, Secretariat Assistant.

**Motion: A motion was made, seconded and carried to approve the minutes from the January 7, 2015 meeting.**

#### **Administrative Procedures and Related Matters**

The agenda was reviewed and it was noted that the schedule update would occur earlier in the agenda.

The membership roster was reviewed, noting that it is published online denoting interest categories and the organizations each individual is representing. There are no changes to the roster since last meeting.

- At this meeting, there was one voting alternate (Abby Brokaw for Angela Tin) and three members voting via proxy (Jane Rohde for Bill Freeman, Leslie Kahn for Bernadette Reyes, and Greg Johnson for Jeff Bradley for the second half of the meeting).

Randolph noted that the Secretariat staff is working to schedule three more meetings prior to the public comment period. The last meeting prior to the public comment period will include a vote to move the document into public comment. This period is projected to begin on June 29, 2015 and will last 45 days. There will be an in person meeting scheduled following the public comment period after the Secretariat has processed the public comments and Subcommittees have met to craft proposed responses. The in-person meeting will likely take place between September and November in a location to be decided.

Randolph and Worden reviewed the timeline for the Standard development:

- May 1-17 – Definitions, Appendices, Point Allocations
- May 8 – Finalize Section Content
- CB Call/Meeting #5 Week of May 18 (TBD) – three hours
- CB Call/Meeting #6 Week of June 10 or 11 (TBD) – three hours
- CB Call/Meeting #7 Week of June 24 or 25 (TBD) – three hours
- Public Comment Period (projected) – start June 29

#### **Review Working Draft BSR/GBI 01-201X Subcommittee Reports**

##### **Materials**

Charles Kibert explained the status of Materials section as it currently stands with seven sections. The most debated topics were LCA whole building vs. product, impact categories, sustainable materials attributes (with concern around double counting wood as both bio-based

and sustainable forestry), regional transportation, and risk assessment. He noted the committee had voted to not include local and regional materials. Supply chain waste minimization is now included. Section 10.3 Risk Assessment is not resolved yet. Tien Peng had questions about sustainable materials certifications for materials other than forestry and incorporating hazard evaluation. It was decided that Peng and Kibert would further discuss over email.

### **Indoor Environment**

Mike Lehman outlined updates to this section. Language based on new research in VOCs is included and references have been updated. Air quality section has been updated to reflect new information since the 2010 document. A new section for sustainability has been added. Acoustic Comfort, section 12.5, has been updated and expanded significantly based on new research. Lehman states there is great consensus among this Subcommittee with no outstanding controversial issues at this time.

### **Site**

Greg Johnson reviewed the progress of the Site Subcommittee as the Subcommittee's vice Chair. (Note: Gregg Bergmiller, Site Chair, was in listen only mode and on the call.) He stated his Subcommittee had controversy around issues of [flowers in turf or bee lawns](#), and [wildland-urban interface fire prevention](#). He stated the Subcommittee is anticipating more work around exterior light pollution and some other issues. They have accomplished significant work in the transportation and ecological impact sections. A concern was voiced that the items noted as controversial were not represented accurately. Trusty stated the concern could be addressed after the call.

GREG JOHNSON 5/20/2015 9:46 AM

Deleted: wetlands

### **Water**

Kent Sovocool explained the Subcommittee's progress and current status. They looked at prerequisites and minimums. For example low flow toilets would be a prerequisite, however the prerequisite would only apply if that fixture exists in the building. Irrigation has more variability nationally and there are no irrigation prerequisites at this time. Questions relating to irrigation need to be resolved but there are no controversial issues remaining in this section at this time.

### **Energy**

David Eldridge outlined the Energy section. There was discussion around prescriptive vs. point based approaches and it was noted it would be discussed later in the agenda.

### **Project Management**

Vicki Worden reviewed the progress of the Project Management section as Chair Bernadette Reyes was not on the call and Vice Chair Leslie Kahn was experiencing technical difficulties. They have made significant progress. There is a new section on moisture control analysis. Building service life has evolved since the previous document. This Subcommittee is looking for new members in government with expertise in design build and design bid build. Commissioning section is written so participants can develop a systems manual or do various

levels of commissioning for points. Looking for more feedback from CB and the Administrative Comment form will go out soon. Tien Peng had questions that resilience section had moved from Site to Project Management, Worden responded that language was added and there was discussion around codes addressing these issues. This will need to be reviewed further if specific recommended language is provided.

### **Next Steps in the Process**

Worden clarified that the internal administrative comment period was meant to provide cross-pollination of ideas. It was not intended that there would be a response to every comment as there will be during the public comment period. However during public comment we will have the opportunity to review every single public comment and proposed responses would be voted on by the full Consensus Body. The Subcommittees will review public comments on their sections and recommend a response to the Consensus Body. This last round of Subcommittee calls is the opportunity to work on final issues before the document moves forward to public comment.

Concern was raised by Allan Bilka that our process doesn't allow enough time for the Consensus Body to work on proposed removal of sections or credits and other major changes before the document goes out for public comment. Worden responded that we do have time and flexibility to add another step in our process if needed. She requested that Subcommittees provide feedback if this would be necessary.

Don Horn raised issue of putting together the new document as a whole and requested discussion on the scope and purpose of the Standard. Worden stated that the beginning sections of the Standard (Sections 1-5) address Scope, Purpose and minimum compliance issues. She noted these were the next sections to be worked on by the Consensus Body and Subcommittees.

Allan Bilka raised questions around the processing of comments submitted during the Administrative Comment process. It was decided that the Administrative Comment form would be recirculated to the Consensus Body for comments to be considered during the next round of Subcommittee calls. Any comments that are not **accepted** can be resubmitted during letter ballots and public comment periods.

### **Overall Point Allocations**

Trusty reviewed the 2010 point allocations, survey results, and post-meeting recommendations for updated point allocations in the 2015 document. It was recommended that the Emissions section be removed and points from that section allocated to other sections. An additional 10 points were re-allocated to Water as a recommendation from the Subcommittee Chairs' recent meeting. The Subcommittee Chairs recommended that points be allocated as follows:

- Project Management: 110
- Site: 150
- Water Efficiency: 170
- Energy: 270

GREG JOHNSON 5/20/2015 9:50 AM

**Comment [2]:** Very different meetings

GREG JOHNSON 5/20/2015 9:49 AM

**Deleted:** excepted

- Materials: 150
- Indoor Environment: 150
- Emissions: 0

**Motion to accept recommended point allocations was made and seconded.**

**Discussion on the motion**

A question was raised about whether there are too many points allocated in Energy and Water. Should we emphasize Materials? It was suggested to allocate closer to 200 points in Materials.

Another commenter was opposed to the motion and the suggestion to move points to Materials. Energy should have most points due to impact in use phase. Decision on site has largest impact on all other sections including Water, transportation, and what materials are used. He believes Site section should receive more points.

A commenter stated Project Management and Materials points could be cut in half. The Standard serves building owners and users not producers and manufacturers. Our goal is not to give opportunity to producers to label their products green. Generally in small or mid-sized projects the management of the project does not impact the overall sustainability of the project. No points should be allocated to Project Management because it doesn't impact the outcome.

A commenter stated it is good that energy is closer to other sections than in the 2010 document. He raised concern about water usage, particularly relating to the current drought in CA. He also referenced the large mass of plastic waste floating in the Pacific. Materials and Water are more important issues now and our Standard should reflect this by allocating more points in these sections.

A commenter agreed with the earlier statement on the need to examine the Standard's scope and how it hopes to address health and safety issues or issues of resources. He would like more points allocated for Water. He stated support for this motion.

Another commenter stated the current recommendation for point allocation recognizes increasingly critical issues regarding water. We expect green buildings to have a lower environmental footprint compared to other buildings. He supports this motion.

A commenter stated we need to remember this is a rating system for commercial buildings. This system cannot resolve CA's water issues because commercial buildings are not the most significant impact on water. We should focus on areas we can significantly impact. A commenter stated energy performance is already rewarded in the market and in codes. If this Standard wants to encourage a holistic approach other areas should be emphasized more and we should incentivize Energy less. She agrees that points should be moved from Energy to other sections, particularly Site. She does not want to reduce Materials.



It was noted that we are not just working on commercial buildings, many mixed-use and multi-unit residential buildings will use this Standard. We should trust the Subcommittee Chairs in their recommendation for point allocations.

A commenter stated the 2010 point allocations were indoor-centric. We are introducing vastly improved irrigation section that will impact commercial buildings so Water is significant in its impact in the 2015 document.

A commenter stated that Materials are important but when buildings are powered by coal, this outweighs the materials used in the building. We cannot assume that codes will provide all of the incentive for buildings to be energy efficient, we should incentivize energy efficiency too. As an architect it's not easy to quantify efficiency and our Standard should be a useful tool in this regard. Additionally he stated we don't want to give some type of credit to every manufacturer. Multi-attribute Standards are not evolved enough yet.

It was noted that the Materials section now includes whole life cycle and has been significantly updated since the 2010 version.

A commenter stated we need prerequisites. Prescriptive vs. performance is still a question in the Project Management section. He states it is possible to earn points in that section and not have a green building overall.

A commenter stated we need to treat green buildings more holistically. We want to create incentives and signal what is important. Each of our sections is important.

A commenter suggested Project Management be allocated 65 points and Materials 90 points so other sections could receive more points.

**The Motion was withdrawn and withdrawal seconded with concern expressed by John Koeller that we should trust the Subcommittee Chairs as we move forward on this issue.**

A survey will be sent out to the Consensus Body members regarding what they deem appropriate point allocation.

#### **Prerequisites and Minimum points**

Wayne Trusty explained that the Subcommittee Chairs were making a recommendation that Energy and Water should have prerequisites in addition to or instead of minimum points. Other sections have minimum points

It was suggested that potentially each category could require 20% of points be earned to receive certification. A question was posed to ask for clarification whether the prerequisites have point values as the document is currently written. One commenter stated that prerequisites should not earn points.

One commenter explained that there are both performance path and prescriptive paths in the Energy section so the Energy section would need prerequisites to be addressed by minimum points. Minimum points would be required for each section on the performance path. If a project chose a prescriptive path they would need to receive points for the required measures.

One commenter noted that the Water Subcommittee doesn't want an alternative performance path. He advocated the Standard include different mechanisms for different sections.

It was noted that water prerequisites are mandated by law in the major states. We shouldn't allocate points for things already required.

A commenter stated that Energy had some requirements and minimum points in practice that weren't outlined yet. Other sections should have the flexibility to do this too. We should give points to prerequisites because green building systems are evaluated by how many points you earn for various items. He stated Subcommittees should determine how points are allocated within each section.

**Future Meetings-** A Doodle poll is out and CB members were asked to complete it to determine schedule for the next meetings.

#### **Adjournment**

***Motion: A motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 2:00 pm ET.***