

**Minutes (Final)**

GBI Consensus Body Meeting #5

BSR/GBI 018201X

Webinar

Wednesday, May 20, 2015 11:00 AM 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	5/20/15
1	Greg Bergmiller	S/L/A/M Collaborative	X	X	X	X	X(in listen only mode)	X
2	Paul Bertram	Kingspan Insulated Panels, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	Absent
3	Allan Bilka	International Code Council	X	X	X	Abse nt	X	X
4	Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X	X (proxy for Jane Rohde)	X (proxy for Jane Rohde )	X	X	X
5	William Carroll	Occidental Chemical Corp.	X			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	X
7	Nicole Dovel8 Moore	CTA Architects Engineers	absen t	X	X	X	X	X
8	Amber Dzikowicz	NSF International	X	X	X	X	X	X
9	David Eldridge	Grumman/Butkus Assoc.	X	X	X	X	X	X
10	William Freeman	Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X	X	X	X	(Jane Rohde was proxy)	X

11	Don Horn	GSA		X	X	X	X	X
Alt:	Lance Davis	GSA (Voting Alternate for Don Horn)	X					
12	Josh Jacobs	UL Environment	X			X	X	Absent
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 y 2 <sup>nd</sup> half of call)	X
14	Leslie Kahn	Admin. Office of the U.S. Courts	X	X	X	Absent	X	Absent
15	Malee Kaolawanich	NIH (rep. self)	absent	absent	absent	Absent	X	X
16	Rachel Minnery	AIA					X	
Alt	Paul Karrer	AIA (Alternate for Rachel Minnery)	X	X	X	X		X
17	Charles Kibert	University of Florida	X	X	X	X	X	X
18	John Koeller	Alliance for Water Efficiency	X	X	X	X	X	X
19	Jennifer Kowalonek	Alfred Benesch & Company	X	absent	absent	Absent	X	X
20	Michael Lehman	ConTech Lighting	X	X	X	X	X	X
21	Tom Meyer	NEBB	X	resigned				
22	Tien Peng	National Ready Mix Concrete Assn.	X	X	X	X	X	X
23	Bernadette Reyes	Clark Construction Group	X	absent	absent	X	Absent	Absent
24	Angela	URS Corporation	X	absent	absent	X	Absent	Absent

	Rivera	(rep. self)					t	
25	Jane Rohde	JSR Assoc. Inc., Vinyl Institute	X	absent	absent	X	X (Also served as proxy for Bill Freeman)	X
26	Julie Sobelman	Independent Consultant	X	absent	absent	X	Absent	Absent
27	Kent Sovocool	Southern Nevada Water Authority	X	X	X	X	X	X
28	Steve Strawn	JELD&WEN	X	X	X	X	Absent	Absent
29	George Thompson	Chemical Compliance Systems, Inc.	X	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	X
31	Douglas Tucker	Misubishi Electric Cooling & Heating	X	X	X	X	X	X
32	Erika Winters Downey	American Institute of Steel Construction	X	X	X	Abse nt	X	X
TOTALS			30/32	27/31	27/31	26/31	27/31	25/31
<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	X
	Mike Cudahy	PPFA		X	X	X		X

	Lance Davis	GSA						X
	Michelle DiPenti	HDR					X	
	Nathan Elliot	eA Architecture & Design, Inc.						X
	Jonathon Humble	American Iron & Steel Institute	X					
	Michael Jouaneh	Lutron Electronics		X	X	X		
	Emily Lorenz	Independent Consultant				X	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	X
	Brad Miller	BIFMA				X		
	Dave Panning	BIFMA		X	X	X		X
	Gord Shymko	G.F. Shymko & Associates, Inc.					X	X
	Jiri Skopek	JLL					X	X
	Melanie Stanton	Turfgrass Producers International			X			
	Christine Subasic	The Masonry Society					X	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	X
	Vicki Worden	Executive Director, GBI	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Emily Randolph	Secretariat Asst., Worden	X	X	X	X	X	X

		Associates, Inc.						
	Maria Woodbury	Secretariat, Worden Associates, Inc.					X	X

**Wednesday, May 20, 2015**

**Welcome & Roll Call**

Chair, Wayne Trusty, welcomed participants. Roll call established quorum. At this meeting, there were two voting alternates (Abby Brokaw for Angela Tin and Paul Karrer for Rachel Minnery) and no members voting via proxy.

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

Woodbury introduced herself as the new Secretariat from Worden Associates and reviewed the participation options.

Trusty asked for a motion on the minutes from the previous meeting.

**MOTION: A motion was then made, seconded to approve the minutes.** Greg Johnson suggested changes to the previous meeting minutes, specifically asking that a typo in his company name be corrected, to include language specifying beelawns under the Site report, and replacing wetlands with wildland8urban interface fire prevention. Johnson also noticed that ‘excepted’ had been used instead of ‘accepted’ and asked that the correct word be used.**The motion was then amended, seconder approved the amendment, and the motion carried to approve the minutes with the changes noted from the April 16, 2015 meeting.**

**Administrative Procedures and Related Matters**

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

The membership roster was reviewed, noting that it is published online denoting interest categories and the organizations each individual is representing. There are no changes to the roster since last meeting. However, Woodbury noted that a ballot went out requesting a vote on adding Gord Shymko to the Consensus Body to replace Tom Meyer, an energy engineer, who resigned from the CB last year.

Woodbury reviewed the schedule for upcoming meetings and noted that there are two more meetings prior to the projected 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 for either mid8September or mid8October following the public comment period after the Secretariat has processed the public comments and Subcommittees have met to craft proposed responses. The location for the in8person meeting has yet to be decided.

#### Schedule/Timeline:

- CB Call/Meeting #6 – June 11 – 12:00 Noon to 3:00 pm ET
- CB Call/Meeting #7 – June 24 – 12:00 Noon to 3:00 pm ET
- Public Comment Period (projected) – start June 29
- Approx. Aug 19 – Public Comments in
- In8person CB Meeting Weeks of September 14<sup>th</sup> or 28<sup>th</sup> or Weeks of October 5<sup>th</sup> or 12<sup>th</sup> – two day meeting

### **Review Working Draft BSR/GBI01/201X**

#### **Subcommittee Reports**

##### **Materials**

Charles Kibert reported that the Subcommittee is finalizing the Risk Assessment section and is working on compiling the definitions section. Kibert specifically mentioned that the Subcommittee is developing definitions for biobased content, modular, prefabricated, preassembled, and total materials value. Kibert also stated that the Subcommittee has begun looking at points allocations and has completed several surveys to determine the weighting of each subsection within the materials section, a discussion that will be continued on subsequent Subcommittee calls.

##### **Energy**

David Eldridge reported that the Energy section still consists of the same three pathways and that the Subcommittee still has a lot of work ahead to determine how equal those three paths are. The Subcommittee is still working on definitions and does not expect significant changes in the section between now and public comment.

##### **Water**

Kent Sovocool reported that the water section is close to being finished. They are still working on definitions, specifically those dealing with technical content.

##### **Indoor Environment**

Michael Lehman reported that the Subcommittee has reviewed the document and cleaned up a couple of sections. They've been working on ensuring that the definitions are updated.

##### **Project Management**

Emily Randolph reported that the Commissioning section has been revised and that there is work being done to incorporate Design8Build language into the section.

A question was raised about the Moisture Control section of this document, specifically if there is anything in Energy or IEQ on Air Barriers David Eldridge, the chair of the Energy Subcommittee, said that there's nothing currently in Energy, but it should be. It was pointed out that 90.1 addresses Air Barriers in its current version, although other versions may not. The question was raised as to whether or not Green Globes will be requiring compliance to 90.18 2013. The answer is no. The question was then raised if requiring such compliance would satisfy the Air Barrier requirements. The answer is yes, but that might supersede other requirements. The point was then made that we could reserve compliance to 90.18 2013 strictly for Air Barriers. A comment was made that air barriers could be addressed in Commissioning and a question was raised about what air leakage is allowed. It was suggested that the document could cite either ASHRAE 90.18 2013 or ASTM for Whole Building Commissioning. It was stressed that Moisture and Air are two different issues. It was decided that further discussion was required between the chairs of Project Management and Energy.

### **Site**

Gregg Bergmiller reported that the Subcommittee has finalized their content. They are now checking definitions. Bergmiller stated that in their next meeting they will look at points. They are trying to understand consensus on whether the points column should say "Maximum =" or if they should just state how many points are available.

### **Review of Survey on Points, Minimums, and Prerequisites**

David Eldridge reviewed the results of the survey that was sent out following the April 16<sup>th</sup> Consensus Body call, stating that there were 18 respondents to three questions. The first question asked the respondents to enter their proposed percentage of total points for each section. The second question asked whether or not each category should have a minimum score required. The third question asked whether or not each category should have mandatory requirements.

### **Points Percentages**

Trusty presented the Consensus Body with the survey results rounded to the nearest 5% so that the points were allotted as follows:

- Project Management: 10%
- Site: 15%
- Water Efficiency: 20%
- Energy: 25%
- Materials: 15%
- Indoor Environment: 15%

Prior to the motion, a concern was raised about rounding to the nearest 5% rather than rounding mathematically, specifically in the case of Water Efficiency and Energy. It was suggested that Water Efficiency be rounded to 19% and Energy to 26%.

Significant discussion took place on the proposed rounding with several voicing support for and several against the proposal. Ultimately, agreement was expressed to amend the rounding bring it as close as possible to the results of the survey.

**MOTION: A Motion was made, seconded, and carried to accept recommended point allocations as they stood following the new rounding of Water and Energy.**

Following the vote points for each section stand as follows:

- Project Management: 100
- Site: 150
- Water: 190
- Energy: 260
- Materials: 150
- Indoor Environment: 150

### **Minimum Points**

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve setting minimum points for all assessment areas in the standard.** Discussion included arguments for and against minimum points with some questioning if the vote should be deferred until Subcommittees have allotted points within their sections. **A vote was called and the motion carried.**

### **Prerequisites**

**MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to send the question of prerequisites back to Subcommittees for discussion and submission of their recommendations to the Consensus Body.**

It was stated that the issue of prerequisites needs to be clarified and a question was raised whether prerequisites should be worth 0 points or if they should be items already included for points? A suggestion was made to allow the Subcommittees to decide whether prerequisites earn points or not.

One observing member of the public emailed during the call to state that in the past Green Globes' lack of prerequisites has been one of the standard's strengths over other standards. This observer hopes that the discussion about having prerequisites doesn't cloud the advantages to using Green Globes and limit the number of projects that are able to achieve certification..

A suggestion was made that maybe the solution could be unique from section to section.

The question was raised about whether prerequisites had already been voted on in the Consensus Body. Randolph clarified that during an Executive Session there was discussion



between Subcommittee Chairs and Vice Chairs where there was a vote to include prerequisites in the Water and Energy sections of the document. The Executive Session is used simply to bring forward recommendations to the Consensus Body.

**MOTION: The prior Motion was then amended and seconded to request that the Subcommittees propose specific prerequisites for the Consensus Body's review. The Motion carried as amended.**

### **Further Discussion**

A question was raised about how the final document will be formatted. Randolph replied that at this point Staff is planning to use the formatting from the 2010 standard. A request was made for staff to provide an example of the overall document formatting. Trusty asked if staff could create a template working with the Subcommittee Chairs to finalize recommendations. Agreement was expressed stating that the Subcommittee Chairs should go through and find inconsistencies in the document and make improvements over what was done in the previous version of the standard.

A statement made that there also needs to be a discussion regarding the nonapplicables.

One participant raised a concern about returning to the 2010 format and stated that they like the idea of further discussion. Trusty asked if the person with the concern could highlight the areas they feel are problematic. A statement was made that the points column should be modified for clarity once it's updated by Staff.

It was requested for Staff to create a place where documents could be placed to ensure consistency between sections. Woodbury will check the document control procedures and determine an acceptable solution.

The question was raised regarding how many comments the document will receive in Public Comments. Trusty answered that there's no real way of knowing at this point and guessed that it will be 100 or more comments, but likely less than 1000. Trusty also said that once the comments are processed they will be reviewed by Subcommittees. Subcommittees will then submit suggested responses to the Consensus Body to be voted on during the two-day in-person meeting.

### **Future Meetings/**

There will be a Consensus Body Call on June 11<sup>th</sup> from 12:00 noon to 3:00 pm ET and another Consensus Body Call on June 24<sup>th</sup> from 12:00 noon to 3:00 pm ET. The in-person meeting will be scheduled once all Public Comments are in and have been processed.

### **Adjournment**

***Motion: A motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 1:36 pm ET.***