

Minutes (final)

GBI Consensus Body Meeting #6

BSR/GBI 01-201X

Webinar

Thursday, June 11, 2015 12:00 PM ET to 3:00 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	6-11-15
1	Gregg Bergmiller	S/L/A/M Collaborative	X	X	X	X	X(in listen only mode)	X	X
2	Paul Bertram	Kingspan Insulated Panels, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	Absent	X
3	Allan Bilka	International Code Council	X	X	X	Absent	X	X	X
4	Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X	X (proxy for Jane Rohde)	X (proxy for Jane Rohde)	X	X	X	X (proxy for Greg Johnson)
5	William Carroll	Occidental Chemical Corp.	X			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	Absent
7	Nicole Dovel-Moore	CTA Architects Engineers	absent	X	X	X	X	X	X
8	Amber Dzikowicz	NSF International	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
9	David Eldridge	Grumman/Butkus Assoc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10	William Freeman	Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X	X	X	X	(Jane Rohde was proxy)	X	Absent

11	Don Horn	GSA		X	X	X	X	X	X
Alt:	Lance Davis	GSA (Voting Alternate for Don Horn)	X						
12	Josh Jacobs	UL Environment	X			X	X	Absent	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 2 nd half of call)	X	
14	Leslie Kahn	Admin. Office of the U.S. Courts	X	X	X	Absent	X	Absent	Absent
15	Malee Kaolawanih	NIH (rep. self)	absent	absent	absent	Absent	X	X	Absent
16	Rachel Minnery	AIA					X		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	X
18	John Koeller	Alliance for Water Efficiency	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
19	Jennifer Kowalonek	Alfred Benesch & Company	X	absent	absent	Absent	X	X	X
20	Michael Lehman	ConTech Lighting	X	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	X
23	Bernadette Reyes	Clark Construction Group	X	absent	absent	X	Absent	Absent	Absent

24	Angela Rivera	URS Corporation (rep. self)	X	absent	absent	X	Absent	Abse nt	Absent
25	Jane Rohde	JSR Assoc. Inc., Vinyl Institute	X	absent	absent	X	X (Also served as proxy for Bill Freeman)	X	X
26	Gord Shymko	G.F. Shymko & Associates, In.							(Elected) X
27	Julie Sobelman	Independent Consultant	X	absent	absent	X	Absent	Abse nt	Absent
28	Kent Sovocool	Southern Nevada Water Authority	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
29	Steve Strawn	JELD-WEN	X	X	X	X	Absent	Abse nt	Absent
30	George Thompson	Chemical Compliance Systems, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
31	Angela Tin	American Lung Assn.	X	X	X	X			Absent
Alt	Abby Brokaw	Amrican Lung Assn. (voting Alternate for Angela Tin)					X	X	
32	Douglas Tucker	Misubishi Electric Cooling & Heating	X	X	X	X	X	X	Absent
33	Erika Winters Downey	American Institute of Steel Construction	X	X	X	Abse nt	X	X	X
TOTALS			30/32	27/31	27/31	26/31	27/31	25/31	21/32
Visitors									
	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					X	X	

		Solutions							
	Mike Cudahy	PPFA		X	X	X		X	X
	Lance Davis	GSA						X	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	X
	Susan McGlaughlin Gitlin	U.S. EPA		X	X	X	X		
	Brent Mecham	Irrigation Assn.		X	X	X			X
	Paula Melton	Building Green, Inc.					X	X	X
	Brad Miller	BIFMA				X			
	Dave Panning	BIFMA		X	X	X		X	X
	Gord Shymko	G.F. Shymko & Associates, Inc.					X	X	(Elected to Consensus Body)
	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			X
	Doug Wolf	The Weidt Group		X	X	X			
	Staff/Consultants								
	Wayne	Chair	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

	Trusty								
	Vicki Worden	Executive Director, GBI	X		X	X	X	X	X
	Emily Randolph	Secretariat Asst., GBI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Maria Woodbury	Secretariat, GBI					X	X	X

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Welcome & Roll Call

Chair, Wayne Trusty, welcomed participants. Roll call established quorum. At this meeting, there was one member voting via proxy: Jeff Bradley voted by proxy for Greg Johnson.

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

Woodbury reviewed the participation options.

Administrative Procedures and Related Matters

Trusty asked for a motion on the agenda.

MOTION: A motion was made, seconded, and carried to approve the agenda.

The membership roster was reviewed, noting that it is published online denoting interest categories and the organizations each individual is representing. Woodbury reported that Gord Shymko was elected by ballot to the Consensus Body to replace Tom Meyer who resigned last year.

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

MOTION: A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously carried to approve the minutes from the last Consensus Body Meeting on Wednesday, May 20, 2015.

Woodbury reviewed the schedule for upcoming meetings and noted that there is one more meeting currently scheduled 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 tentatively slated to begin on June 29, 2015 and will last 45 days. There will be an in-person meeting scheduled for some time between mid-September and mid-October following the public comment period and after the Secretariat has processed the comments and Subcommittees have met to craft proposed responses to each comment for presentation to the Consensus Body. The date and location for the in-person meeting has yet to be decided.

Schedule/Timeline:

- 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
- In-person CB Meeting Weeks of September 14th or 28th or Weeks of October 5th or 12th – two day meeting

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

Project Management

Emily Randolph reported that the Subcommittee has allocated points and finalized content and definitions for the Project Management section.

Site

Gregg Bergmiller reported that the Subcommittee allocated points, content, and definitions and is ready to go. One of the Subcommittee members clarified that there is still some work to be done in the Stormwater Management section but it will be completed shortly.

Energy

David Eldridge reported that the Energy section consists of a three path approach. The Subcommittee will be meeting to revise the section in the prescriptive path relating to heat recovery. There is still work to be done in reconciling the 3 paths to make sure that they are in fact equivalent. It was asked if the prescriptive path would be awarded the same points as the modeling paths. Eldridge answered that the paths are worth the same points and that the prescriptive path includes modeling. He reiterated that they're still working to ensure equivalency between paths.

Water

Kent Sovocool reported that the water section has finalized content, allocated points, and separated out prerequisites into a separate section. Water will not be awarding points for prerequisites. (See prerequisite discussion below for more dialogue on this issue.)

Materials

Charles Kibert reported that the Subcommittee includes a section on risk assessment. The Subcommittee has also finalized its definitions. Kibert reported that when allocating points the Subcommittee has assigned points in a more specific way to encourage design teams to pursue incremental improvements rather than assigning points by ranges. Materials Subcommittee is also working on an Appendix to correspond to the risk assessment section.

Indoor Environment

Michael Lehman reported that the Subcommittee has finalized content and definitions. They are working on allocating points into their criteria.

Final decisions related to preparation of document for public comment

Minimum Points for each section

The Subcommittees presented their point minimums for their sections as well as brought forward their recommendations on prerequisites to the Consensus Body.

The point minimums proposed to the Consensus Body are as follows:

- Project and Risk Management: 50% of applicable points
- Site: 36 points earned in compliance and 8 points must be earned in Stormwater Management
- Energy: 35% of applicable points
- Water Efficiency: a percentage of applicable points to be determined
- Materials and Resources: 20% of points, this is not a final number
- Indoor Environment: 35% of applicable points.

Site Chair stated that Site Subcommittee will change its minimums to a percentage prior to the next Consensus Body call.

The question was raised if this is the minimum of each level of Green Globes or are we establishing the first level of points?

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to establish a minimum number of points for 1st level of certification.

Discussion took place on this motion.

- Some commented that these minimum point levels as presented seemed inflexible and more restrictive than needed. A lower threshold was recommended.
- It was noted that the recommended percentages varied significantly from section to section and suggested that perhaps it should be 20-30% across all the sections.
- It was stated that a minimum should be equivalent to the minimum for 1 Green Globes and that it should be equivalent across the board.
- The question was asked whether there will be different minimums for each of the four Green Globes levels. It was clarified that the motion is not to determine the number of points, but rather that this would determine the minimum number of points required to achieve 1 Green Globes. The motion was restated and clarified to establish a minimum percentage of points in each category for 1st level certification.

Motion carried with 13 in favor.

3 opposed (David Eldridge, Jeff Bradley + Proxy Greg Johnson).

2 Abstained (Paul Bertram, Amber Dzikowicz).

It was noted that the point minimums need to be percentages because of non-applicable criteria. It was also noted that the entry level needs to be higher than the average of percent minimums in the assessment areas.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to lower all minimum percentages to 15% of applicable points in order to allow flexibility.

Discussion took place on the motion.

- It was suggested that Energy needed a higher minimum.
- One participant stated that they are opposed to across the board minimums and that we'd have to see how this plays out in each section prior to making a decision.
- It was suggested that it be up to the Subcommittees to allocate minimum points.
- One member said that the Indoor Environment Subcommittee looked through to see what number you need to achieve to make a green building.
- It was stated that having low minimum percentages allows teams to have more flexibility in earning points across the sections to achieve the overall minimum.
- Another member recommended getting rid of the ranges for each of the four achievement levels, instead making them hard numbers. It was pointed out that two Subcommittees have their minimums set at 35%: could Project Management look at the impact of the current 50% minimum as compared to a 35% minimum?

Motion failed with 4 in favor.

14 opposed (David Eldridge, Tien Peng, Kent Sovocool, Gord Shymko, Don Horn, Mike Lehman, Rachel Minnery, George Thompson, Paul Bertram, Gregg Bergmiller, Jane Rohde, Amber Dzikowicz, Erika Winters-Downey, Allan Bilka).

0 abstained.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded for 35% minimums across all of the sections.

Discussion took place on the motion.

- It was pointed out that 35% is the entry level for achieving 1 Green Globes and that the minimum per category should be close but less than the overall minimum to allow some flexibility for those few extra points.
- The flexibility of Green Globes was highlighted by several committee members. Many also agreed that 15% was too low and 35% was too high. The question was also raised about the implications having 35% minimums all around would have on existing buildings that have already gone through assessment.

The motion was amended to ensure consistent point percentages across all categories. The amendment was seconded.

The motion failed with 7 in favor.

8 opposed (John Koeller, Tien Peng, Kent Sovocool, Allan Bilka, Don Horn, Mike Lehman, Paul Bertram, Erika Winters-Downey).

3 abstained (Amber Dzikowicz, Jeff Bradley + Greg Johnson).

GBI volunteered to provide data to the Consensus Body on minimum points achieved in each section using data from the current Green Globes 2013 system.

Prerequisites in relation to points

Each of the Subcommittees presented their recommendations on whether or not their sections wanted to incorporate prerequisites. The Water Subcommittee was indicated it desired prerequisites. Kent Sovocool stated that they only have one path and saw no reason to give points for the items they chose as prerequisites. They also wanted to avoid double counting certain items.

Recommended Water Prerequisites were:

- Where installed in the project, the following plumbing fixtures and fitting are certified as being compliant with the requirements of the U.S. EPA's WaterSense Program where WaterSense specifications exist:
 - Toilets (Maximum effective flush volume 1.28 gallons);
 - Urinals (Maximum effective flush volume 0.5 gallons);
 - Showerheads (Maximum effective flow rate 2.0 gallons per minute);
 - Residential lavatory faucets (Maximum flow rate 1.5 gallons per minute);
 - Residential kitchen faucets (Maximum flow rate 2.2 gallons per minute); and
 - Non-residential lavatory faucets (Maximum flow rate 0.5 gallons per minute).
- Pre-rinse spray valves shall be compliant with the requirements of the U.S. EPA's WaterSense Program and consume 1.28 gal/min (4.8 L/min) or less;
- Water features re-circulate water for reuse within the system and have a leak/water loss detection system.
- Graywater treatment systems must be NSF 350 listed where present.
- Residential clothes washers are ENERGY STAR labeled and possess a maximum water factor of 5.4 gal/ft³ (720 L/m³)
- Residential dishwashers are ENERGY STAR labeled and possess a maximum water factor of 3.8 gal/ft³ (510 L/m³) per cycle

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to allow water to have prerequisites where the item is present and that there are no points for prerequisites. Not applicable where item is not present.

Discussion took place on the motion.

- It was asked whether requiring ENERGY STAR and WaterSense water factor reduces the flexibility.
- One participant recommended that there be no prerequisites and that these items be given points.

- It was asked how these would apply to major renovation where the work does not affect toilets. Would they be required to update these fixtures to achieve certification? It was recommended that we could specify “where work is done.”
- Another participant said that while they have no problem with prerequisites for water, they should be worth points.
- The question was raised whether it was possible to say that a minimum number of points must come from these particular sections? A question was raised whether that would make them a prerequisite or not and how do you ensure that these measures are met using minimum points? It was reiterated that minimum required points could be ascribed to these sections in particular.
- Other participants stated their dislike of prerequisites, citing that they don’t allow for flexibility and they exclude certain project types. One participant was in particular concerned about how these water prerequisites would apply in a healthcare setting. The response was that certain healthcare facilities are exempted in code, but the language could be made more specific in this Standard.
- Another participant hoped that the prerequisites might be alternatively complied with using a performance path.
- It was noted that a project should still be able to achieve points for doing something differently like citing a % of total water use rather than by fixture type. It was also stated that we don’t want to make things more difficult or cause problems for designers by tying their hands, though it could be good to have minimums.

Motion failed with 6 in favor.

9 opposed (Gord Shymko, Mike Lehman, Nicole Dovel-Moore, Jeff Bradley + Greg Johnson, Paul Bertram, George Thompson, Gregg Bergmiller, and Jane Rohde).

3 abstained (Tien Peng, Allan Bilka, Amber Dzikowicz).

The Water Subcommittee was asked to go back and figure out how to incorporate these requirements without making them prerequisites. They were also asked to consider some exceptions that address the Consensus Body’s concerns.

Discussion of Purpose and Scope

Purpose

The Purpose of the draft standard was taken directly from the 2010 document.

Items discussed included:

- The use of the word “commercial” was discussed. “Commercial” might be interpreted solely as office buildings rather than including all the intended projects. It was asked if “health” could be added to the Purpose so that it reads “...environmental, health, and related efficiency outcomes.”
- The use of the phrase “commonly valued” was also questioned.

It was requested that any recommendations on wording of purpose or scope be sent to the Secretariat Assistant.

Scope

The Scope of the Standard was also taken directly from the 2010 document.

Discussion included:

- It was noted that “action” could replace outcomes so that the sentence reads: “...identify solutions that earn points for actions likely to achieve levels of performance commonly valued as having desirable environmental and related efficiency outcomes.”
- One committee member asked if “or buildings that do not use energy or water” should be added to the list of buildings that the Standard does not apply to.

Future Meetings-

There will be a Consensus Body Call on June 24th 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 2:55 pm ET.

###

NOTE: After Meeting #6, Meeting #7 was rescheduled for July 7th from 12:00 noon to 3:00 pm ET. Additionally, Meeting #8 was scheduled for July 29th from 12:00 noon to 3:00 pm ET.