

**Minutes** (tentative as of April 29<sup>th</sup>, 2016

GBI Consensus Body Meeting #14

BSR/GBI 01-201X

Webinar

Thursday, April 28<sup>th</sup>, 2016 12:00 PM ET to 3:00 PM ET

And

Friday, April 29<sup>th</sup>, 2016 12:00 PM ET to 3:00 PM ET

**Attendance:**

No	Name	Organization(s)	3-21-16	3-22-16	3-23-16	4-28-16	4-29-16
1	Gregg Bergmiller	S/L/A/M Collaborative	X	X	X	X	X
2	Paul Bertram	Kingspan Insulated Panels, Inc.	X	X	X	X	Absent
3	Allan Bilka	International Code Council	X	X	X	Absent	Absent
4	Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X	X	X	X(By Proxy)	X
5	William Carroll	American Chemistry Council	X (By proxy)	X (By proxy)	X(By proxy)	Absent	X
6	Chris Dixon	NBBJ (rep. self)	X	X	X	X	X
7	Nicole Dovel-Moore	CTA Architects Engineers	X	X	X	X	X
8	Amber Dzikowicz	NSF International	absent	absent	absent	X	Absent
9	David Eldridge	Grumman/Butkus Assoc.	X (By proxy for part of the day)	X	X	X (By proxy)	X (By proxy)
10	William Freeman	Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X (By proxy)	X (By proxy)	X (By proxy)	X	X
11	Susan Gitlin	U.S. EPA	X	X	X	X	X
12	Don Horn	GSA	X	X	X	X	X
13	Josh Jacobs	UL Environment	X	X	Absent	Absent	Absent
14	Greg Johnson	Johnson Consulting Services, Greenscape Alliance	X	X	X	X	X
15	Karen Joslin		absent	absent	X	X	X
	Leslie Kahn	Admin. Office of the U.S. Courts	Resigned				
16	Malee Kaolawanich	NIH (rep. self)	absent	absent	absent	Absent	Absent
17	Rachel Minnery	AIA	X	X	X	X	X

18	Charles Kibert	University of Florida	X	X	X	X	X
19	Gary Keclik	Keclik Associates	X	X	X (By proxy)	X	X
20	John Koeller	Alliance for Water Efficiency	X	absent	absent	X	X
21	Jennifer Kowalonek	Alfred Benesch & Company	absent	absent	absent	Absent	Absent
22	Michael Lehman	ConTech Lighting	X	X	X	X	X
23	Tien Peng	National Ready Mix Concrete Assn.	X	X	X	X	X
	Bernadette Reyes	Clark Construction Group	Resigned				
	Angela Rivera	URS Corporation (rep. self)	Absent	Absent	Resigned		
24	Jane Rohde	JSR Assoc. Inc., Vinyl Institute	X	X	X	X (By Proxy)	X
25	Gord Shymko	G.F. Shymko & Associates, In.	X	X	X	X	X
	Julie Sobelman	Independent Consultant	Resigned				
26	Kent Sovocool	Southern Nevada Water Authority	X	X	X	X	X
27	Steve Strawn	JELD-WEN	absent	absent	absent	Absent	Absent
28	George Thompson	Chemical Compliance Systems, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X
29	Angela Tin	American Lung Assn.	X	X	X	Absent	Absent
30	Douglas Tucker	Misubishi Electric Cooling & Heating	X	absent	absent	X	X
31	Erika Winters Downey	American Institute of Steel Construction	X (by alternate )	X (by alternate e)	X (by alternate )	X	X

**Voting Alternates**

	Abby Brokaw	American Lung Assn. (voting Alternate for Angela Tin)					
	Paul Karrer	AIA (Alternate for Rachel Minnery)					
	Bill Hoffman	UL Environment (Voting Alternate for Josh Jacobs)					

	Lance Davis	GSA (Voting Alternate for Don Horn)					
	D'Lane Wisner	D'Lane Wisner (Voting Alternate for William Carroll)					
	John Cross	American Institute of Steel Construction (Voting Alternate for Erika Winters-Downey)	X	X	X		
TOTALS			26/31	23/31	23/31	23/31	23/31
<b>Visitors</b>							
	Martha VanGeem	Self (Principal Engineer)	X	X	X	X	X
	Kyle Thompson	IAPMO	X	X		X	X
	Kelly Scanlon	U.S. EPA		X			X
	Kallie Sinkus	American Lung Association	X	X	X		
	Heather Dylla	National Asphalt Pavement Assn.	X	X	X	X	
	J. Richard Willis	Auburn University		X			
<b>Staff/Consultants</b>							
	Wayne Trusty	Chair	X	X	X	Resigned	Resigned
	Vicki Worden	Executive Director, GBI	X	X	X		
	Emily Randolph	Secretariat Asst., GBI	X	X	X	X	
	Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI					
	Maria Woodbury	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X	X	
	Chelsea Amaio	Staff, GBI				X	X

**Thursday, April 28, 2016**

**Welcome & Roll Call**

Secretariat, Maria Woodbury welcomed participants and conducted roll call by self-introductions to establish quorum. The anti-trust statement was reviewed and participants were requested to comply with it fully.

Woodbury reviewed the participation options, stating that while observers are welcome to participate in the discussion, only Consensus Body Members are able to vote. Participants were reminded to raise hands should they desire to add something new to the discussion and staff would then call on them in order.

On the first day of this meeting, no members voted using a voting alternate. There were three members voting via proxy (Bill Freeman for Jane Rohde, Greg Johnson for Jeff Bradley, and Gord Shymko for David Eldridge).

Woodbury informed participants that the call was being recorded for the purpose of minute taking and no objection was raised.

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

The agenda was reviewed and no changes were requested by the Consensus Body. It was noted that the order of the comments in the packet had been changed to coincide with the order of the comments on the agenda.

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from the last meeting.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- It was discussed that language needs to be more clear around what content is subject to review in the second public comment period.  
Questioned if language should be changed to further clarify that “any new, revised, or removed text will be sent out for public review.”  
“only language changed after the first Public Comment period would be open for comment.”  
Concern was raised that this change reduces the language too much.  
There was a suggestion to add “We are not looking for changes in provisions that were not previously questioned.”
- The issue was raised that in comment ###? The number of opposed members did not match the number of members listed in opposition. Staff stated the error would be resolved for review and approval during Part II of the meeting.

**Charles motions to postpone vote until tomorrow**

**Moved and Seconded, none opposed**

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to affirm appointment of Mike Lehman to Chair.**

**VOTE: the motion carried with 19 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstained.**

None Opposed.

Abstained: Don Horn

Mike Lehman thanked everyone for their time and urged everyone to use their expertise to create the best possible Standard to help people and the planet.

### **Discussion of public comments**

#### **Subcommittee Reports**

## Water

Water Chair Kent Sovocool provided background on the discussion of prerequisites in water, particularly in regards to 9.1. Sovocool then presented the Subcommittee's proposed responses to the water comments:

### Plan A:

#### 9.1 Indoor Domestic Plumbing (Pre-requisite – 0 points)

9.1. Indoor Domestic Plumbing	
<p><b>9.1.1</b> All plumbing fixtures and fixture fitting installed in the project shall meet the following requirements for maximum water consumption and are certified as being compliant with the requirements of the U.S. EPA's Water Sense Program where WaterSense specifications exist.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>9.1.1.1:</b> Toilets (Maximum effective flush volume 1.28 gallons per flush);</li><li>• <b>9.1.1.2:</b> Urinals (Maximum effective flush volume 0.5 gallons per flush);</li><li>• <b>9.1.1.3:</b> Showerheads (Maximum effective flow rate 2.0 gallons per minute);</li><li>• <b>9.1.1.4:</b> Residential lavatory faucets (Maximum flow rate 1.5 gallons per minute);</li><li>• <b>9.1.1.5:</b> Residential kitchen faucets (Maximum flow rate 2.2 gallons per minute); and</li><li>• <b>9.1.1.6:</b> Non--residential lavatory faucets (Maximum flow rate 0.5 gallons per minute).</li><li>• <b>9.1.1.7:</b> Pre--rinse spray valves (Maximum flow rate 1.28 gallons per minute)</li></ul> <p>Where local legal requirements require higher volumes of water for purposes of health or safety for any individual fixture or fixture fitting, the above do not apply.</p>	

#### The motion was made and seconded to accept Plan A as a prerequisite

#### Discussion took place on the motion:

- It was explained that Plan B would have negative points if efficient plumbing fixture minimums were not used.
- It was explained that Guiding Principles for Sustainable Federal Buildings guidelines were available only three weeks before the previous meeting discussing this issue. The previous version was 2008. Federal agencies are required to incorporate these policies

into building initiatives. It was stated that not aligning with these requirements is not in favor with GBI.

- It was stated we should reevaluate 9.1. to determine prerequisites in Plan A.
- The question was raised why the Subcommittee is bringing this to the Consensus Body. There was clarification that the Subcommittee voted unanimously in favor of Plan A.
- It was stated that Guiding Principles has become the baseline standard for not just federal buildings but other code requirements. To not follow this and the Survey Compliance document would be detrimental to GBI’s commercial building standard.
- The point was made that the Consensus Body completed a survey and voted against including prerequisites in the Standard.
- A suggestion to the Subcommittee was made to build ASHRAE 90.1 or WaterSense into the point reward system as a baseline with performance above baseline being rewarded as other Sections have done and not make it a prerequisite.
- Frustration and disappointment with the Subcommittee were expressed due to the same issue being repeatedly brought to the table. The member stated they would like to see a different solution than prerequisites in response to the Guiding Principles in our Standard.
- There was clarification from the chair that the reason for the current discussion is to revisit this proposed solution in light of new information.

**VOTE: the motion carried with 9 in favor, 7 opposed, and 5 abstained.**

Opposed: Chris Dixon, Karen Joslin, Gary Keclik, Gord Shymko, David Eldridge, George Thompson, and Erika Winters-Downey

Abstained: Greg Johnson, Jeff Bradley, Amber Dzikowicz, Doug Tucker, and Rachel Minnerly

**The motion was made and seconded to send the issue of prerequisites to a full letter ballot vote from the CB. The second was withdrawn and the motion was seconded by different member.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- It was stated that while the Consensus Body has voted on the issue of prerequisites in the past every member did not participate in those votes.
- Would like to see a different solution than reverting back to pre-requisites in response to the guiding principles and how the GBI standard is being developed.
- It was stated that we can’t ignore the Guiding Principles nor can we start over completely on this document. The member stated they were speaking against the motion to ballot on pre-requisites.
- The point was made that this has been an issue since 2008 so it’s not really new since the most recent version Guiding Principles. Federal leases would also follow it.

**VOTE: the motion failed with 7 in favor, 11 opposed, and 3 abstained.**

Opposed: Chris Dixon, Paul Bertam, Gregg Bergmiller, Gary Keclik, Amber Dzikowicz, Susan Gitlin, Gord Shymko, David Eldridge, Kent Sovocool, Charles Kibert, Erika Winters-Downey

Abstained: Bill Freeman, Jane Rohde, John Koeller

• **Plan B:**

<b>9.1 Plumbing Fixtures and Fittings</b>	
<b>9.1.1</b> Where installed in the project and as permitted by local codes, plumbing fixtures and	Maximum = 30 points or N/A Minimum = -60 (penalty points)

fittings are certified and listed with U.S. EPA’s WaterSense® Program wherever WaterSense® specifications exist.

As applicable, EPA WaterSense® plumbing fixtures and fittings have the potential to reduce the overall consumption of water by the building occupants. Points are allotted for the percentage of WaterSense® labeled fixtures that are used to replace otherwise applicable local code compliant plumbing fixtures and fittings.

Informational Reference(s):

- Tank Type Toilet: “WaterSense® Specification for Tank–Type Toilet”:  
[https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/partners/toilets\\_final.html](https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/partners/toilets_final.html)
- Lavatory Faucets: “High-Efficiency Lavatory Faucet Specification”:  
[https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/partners/faucets\\_final.html](https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/partners/faucets_final.html)
- Flushing Urinals: “WaterSense® Specification for Flushing Urinals Flushing Urinals”:  
[https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/partners/urinals\\_final.html](https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/partners/urinals_final.html)
- Flushometer-Valve Toilets: “WaterSense® Specification for Flushometer-Valve Water Closets”:  
[https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/partners/flushometer\\_valve\\_toilets\\_final.html](https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/partners/flushometer_valve_toilets_final.html)
- Showerheads: “WaterSense® Specification for Showerheads”  
[https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/partners/showerhead\\_spec.html](https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/partners/showerhead_spec.html)
- Commercial Pre–Rinse Spray Valves: “WaterSense® Specification for Commercial Pre-Rinse Spray Valves”  
[https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/partners/controller\\_final.html](https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/partners/controller_final.html)
- [https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/partners/prsv\\_final.html](https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/partners/prsv_final.html)
- [https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/excel/Ws\\_technical\\_clarifications-121715.xlsx](https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/excel/Ws_technical_clarifications-121715.xlsx)

Refer to the table below to determine how many points are earned.

<i>Percentage of fixtures WaterSense-compliant (labeled)</i>	<i>Points earned</i>	<i>Points deducted</i>
>90 percent	30	0
>80 to 90 percent	0	16
>60 to 80 percent	0	32
>40 to 60 percent	0	48
0 to 40 percent	0	60

- Not applicable where in jurisdictions where the installation of EPA WaterSense® compliant plumbing fixtures and fittings is a code requirement or the same flow rates are already law and such requirements for code compliance would preclude a minimum number of fixture or fitting replacements necessary to be a candidate for credit (e.g., Denver or California). No penalty points are earned.
- Not applicable where the authority having jurisdiction deems a need for exclusion. No penalty points are earned.

**At 1:25 PM ET Mike Lehman stated he needed to step away from the call and handed the chair to Charles Kibert.**

## Energy

Presented by vice chair, Paul Bertram, and Gord Shymko.

- **57 – 4. General. 9.3.2: (Note: The Water Subcommittee sent this comment to the Energy Subcommittee for their review)**
  - **Comment:** Zurn Pex supports rational design of hot water delivery systems in buildings that minimize volume and wait times. This section encourages that practice, which involves effort on part of the designer, and improves the water and energy footprint for the life of the building. Hot water is energy intensive – shouldn't the section also include an energy point or two?
  - **Reason:** None Given
- **42 – 4. General. 9.3.2**
  - **Comment:** PPFA supports rational design of hot water delivery systems in buildings that minimize volume and wait times. This section encourages that practice, which involves effort on part of the designer, and improves the water and energy footprint for the life of the building. Hot water is energy intensive – should the section also include an energy point or two?
  - **Reason:** None Given
  - **Proposed Response:** Reject. This is sufficiently covered in Water and the committee wants to avoid overlap between rating system categories.
  - **Subcommittee Vote:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to reject the comment using the proposed response.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- 57-4 Clarification that the Subcommittee wants to avoid overlap and this is already covered in the Water Section.

**VOTE: the motion carried with 19 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstained.**

None Opposed.

Abstained: Chris Dixon, John Koeller.

- **52 – 33. Substantive. 9.5.1.4 (New) (Note: also sent from Water)**
  - **Comment:** The wastewater treatment system recovers significant energy or nutrients from the wastewater stream.
  - **Reason:** State of the art systems at large facilities are being designed to recover constituents such as heat and phosphorous. Award a high number of points to reflect the considerable investment that such systems require to construct and maintain.
  - **Proposed Response:** Reject. This is implicitly covered in the performance Paths A and B and developing a requirement in the prescriptive path would complicate the point structure in the prescriptive path for a strategy that is seldom employed.
  - **Subcommittee Vote:** Unanimously in favor.

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to reject the comment using the proposed response**

**VOTE: the motion carries with 17 in favor, 2 opposed, and 1 abstained.**

Opposed: Susan Gitlin.

Abstained: Kent Sovocool, Rachel Minnery.

- **1 – 1. Substantive. 5.1**



- **Comment:** Carbon dioxide equivalent: The following GWP values are used based on a 100-year time horizon: 1 for CO<sub>2</sub>, ~~23~~28 for methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) and ~~294~~265 for nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O).
- **Reason:** The GWP values referenced are outdated. Suggest removing values entirely and referencing source data for current globally accepted values. Have updated text to match IPCC AR5. Specific values in definition of ozone depletion potential should reference the source and be current.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept as modified. The last sentence of the definition will be deleted. The technicalities expressed in the second sentence are not relevant to the rating system.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to move to accept the comment as modified using the proposed response.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- Clarification on the motion whether this is actually rejecting the comment. It was stated accept as modified is the correct response. The commenter provided a suggestion to remove current values.
- The point was made that the definition is what is the CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent is, not a list of acceptable values.
- Clarification was made that the motion is on deleting last sentence and not on editing the values.

**VOTE: the motion carried with 20 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.**

None Opposed.

Abstained: John Koeller.

• **50 – 8. Editorial. 8.1**

- **Comment:** Moved the criteria concerning HVAC equipment and energy usage to be an alternative to energy performance.
- **Reason:** More points were earned based on energy performance than on energy modeling using ASHRAE 90.1. If the points are set up appropriately, there should be a similar number of points earned under option C as if using the model. For points that would be earned in option C that are not part of the ASHRAE 90.1 model, then they should be eligible for all projects and not just specified in option C.
- **Proposed Response:** Reject as non-persuasive. There is already a non-modeled energy section attached to the performance paths. Additional review will be taken to ensure that all prescriptive options can be modeled, if not they will be included in the non-modeled section.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to reject the comment using the proposed response.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- It was stated that a prescriptive path can't be all encompassing. Commenter is proposing double dipping points.

**AMENDEMENT: Amend was made and seconded striking "as non-persuasive" from the reason. There were no objections to the amendment.**

**VOTE: the motion carried with 20 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.**

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

- **24 – 14. Substantive. 8.3.2.1.1:**

- **Comment:** Column 2 point values should not reference two separate versions of the same standards ASHRAE 90.1-2010 vs 2013 and 2012 vs 2015 IECC
- **Reason:** As noted in Comment 013, referencing multiple versions of the same document is not user-friendly.
- **Proposed Response:** Reject. The LPD values are generally lower in 90.1-2013 vs. 90.1-2010 thus each version of the 90.1 standard must be listed separately and more points are awarded for compliance with the more stringent one.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** 5 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstained

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to reject the comment using the proposed response.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- Language clarification: in three bullets, instead of “LPD [equals] ASHRAE” use “complies with”.
  - This is a separate issue and needs to be handled separately.

**VOTE: the motion carried with 18 in favor, 0 opposed, and 3 abstained.**

None Opposed.

Abstained: Susan Gitlin, Don Horn, John Koeller.

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to replace “equals” with “complies with” in first two bullets of 8.3.2.1.1.**

**VOTE: The motion carried with 19 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.**

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

- **40 – 5. General. 8.3.2.4.2:**

- **Comment:** Points are awarded in Section 8.3.2.4.2 for skylight use without regard to skylight unit performance
- **Reason:** Skylight units should be required to meet the requirements of the International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) or ASHRAE 90.1. IECC and ASHRAE 90.1 are commonly adopted energy codes/standards and both contain minimum energy performance requirements for skylight units.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept. Suggested changes will be made so that the projects can meet the requirement in 90.1 regarding skylights.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the comment.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- Clarification took place on the motion that there is no language and “accepted in principle” with language to be crafted at a later date.
- The question was raised why isn’t IECC standards included.

**AMENDEMENT: The motion was amended and seconded to include IECC in addition to ASHRAE 90.1.**

**There were no objections to amendment**

**VOTE: the motion carried with 17 in favor, none opposed, and 3 abstained.**

None Opposed.

Abstained: Karen Joslin, Rachel Minnery, Erika Winters-Downey.

- **24 – 15. Substantive. 8.3.3.2.1**
  - **Comment:** Cooling base efficiency is relative to ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 90.1-2013 but heat rejection equipment is per ASHRAE 90.1-2010. Why can't this all be under the more current adopted version?
  - **Reason:** Same reasons discussed in Comments 013 and 014.
  - **Proposed Response:** Accept the change to 2013. The table referenced will be Table 6.8.1 – 7.
  - **Subcommittee Vote:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept proposed response**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- Inquiry about how 013 and 014 were responded to and whether we need to change language.
- Do we need to bring up IECC standard?
  - 90.1 and IECC essentially address the same items. Need to make sure one standard in favor put in favor of the other. It was discussed that an \* with a note could be used or use equivalent IECC tables
  - 2010 and 2013 are different tables. It's a proposal to correct the text.
- This is technical and granular. Comparing the two codes can be daunting, but it will be taken back to subcommittee.

**AMENDMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to clarify the reason "accept to change to 2013 for heat rejection equipment." There were no objections to the amendment.**

**Discussion that took place on Amendment:**

- Clarification that heat rejection is specifically cooling towers, which is 2013. The other part is 2010.

**VOTE: the motion carried with 17 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.**

None Opposed.

Abstained: Erika Winters-Downey.

- **35 – 1. Substantive. 8.3.3.4:**
  - **Comment:** section and point opportunity for compliance with ASHRAE 90.1-2010
  - **Reason:** Other sections allow compliance with ASHRAE standards below 2013
  - **Proposed Response:** Reject. Points are given for exceeding 2013 and not meeting it. It was a conscious decision to not give points for meeting 2010.
  - **Subcommittee Vote:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to reject comment using the proposed response.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- Added explanation to proposed response: In other sections, points followed this format. The 2013 version is baseline for this credit.

**VOTE: the motion carried with 19 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.**

None Opposed.

Abstained: Don Horn.

## Site

Presented by the Site Subcommittee chair, Gregg Bergmiller

• **52 – 7. Substantive. 7.1.2.4**

- **Comment:** ~~7.1.2.4 All habitable space is located higher than the 100-year flood plain. All critical infrastructure is located above the 500-year flood plain.~~ No construction nor site disturbance takes place in the 100-year floodplain. (Not applicable where no areas in the local jurisdiction fall within the 100-year floodplain.)

Facilities critical to the health and safety of the community and buildings intended to house infirm, disabled, or elderly occupants are built outside the 500-year floodplain. (Not applicable where no areas in the local jurisdiction fall within the 500-year floodplain.)

- **Reason:** Floodplains provide functions that are essential to ecosystems and human safety. As written, this criterion does not protect floodplains' ability to provide those functions. Construction in floodplains reduces the ability of the soils and plants in that floodplain to provide essential filtration functions and other ecosystem services, and can also raise flood levels and expand the risk of flooding to new areas, including houses not previously located in the floodplain. If construction occurs in a floodplain, the criterion as written may serve to protect that building and its occupants, but as important as that is, it is inconsistent with the focus of this particular section. This section lacks an important element found in other green building standards: protect the natural functions of the floodplain. To do this, the criterion should be revised to reward a building for building outside the floodplain. Currently it does the opposite.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept as modified.

No construction nor site disturbance takes place in the 100-year floodplain. (Not applicable where no areas in the local jurisdiction fall within the 100-year floodplain.) Points only awarded when the facility also achieves points for 7.2.1.1 or 7.2.1.6 or is within ¼ mile walking distance of developed residential land of at least 8 dwelling units per acre. and

Buildings and structures assigned a risk category of III or IV in Table 1604.5 of the International Building Code shall not be located within a 500-year floodplain. ~~Facilities critical to the health and safety of the community and buildings intended to house infirm, disabled, or elderly occupants are built outside the 500-year floodplain.~~ (Not required if the entire jurisdiction is located within the 100-year floodplain. If the entire jurisdiction is located within the 500-year floodplain, then the facility is built outside the 100-year floodplain. Not applicable where no areas in the local jurisdiction fall within the 500-year floodplain.)

Alternatively:

Buildings and additions in the floodplain are elevated three feet above the 100-year floodplain or are built to allow water to flow through or under the lowest floor.

Point levels TBD: Most for not building in the floodplain, fewer for building in the floodplain with protective measures.

- **Subcommittee Vote:** 4 in favor, 2 abstained

**MOTION:** The motion was made and seconded to accept modifications using the proposed response.

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- It was stated that it could be very confusing in terms of clearly defining whether a site falls into floodplain or not.
- Important to recognize if there are incentives to prevent sprawl and development on green spaces
- There are Materials impact in addition to environmental impact when considering rebuilding

### **Further background**

Many communities are built in floodplains. If going to build there, build well, but earn more points where you're not building in flood plains. Modified: don't build in flood plain AND if you're a high structure, build outside of 500 year food plain

- Is this becoming overly complicated? How does it relate to climate change compared to a river running through the community. Does this create barriers for people in floodplains already? (i.e. Florida)
- Response: If you will build there (it's possible) but if you do, build it following these protocols. Incentives vs. Penalties
- Clarification: Are we voting on language or the point structure?
- CB should vote on language and concepts and tiered approach, knowing the points still need to be evaluated.
- In Midwest, the land is much cheaper and this policy would incentivize people in the correct direction
- Overall, incentivizing or limiting?

**VOTE: the motion carried with 10 in favor, 2 opposed, and 4 abstained.**

Opposed: Rachel Minnery, Charles Kibert

Abstained: Paul Bertram, Bill Freeman, Jane Rohde, John Koeller

- **36 – 6. Substantive. 7.1.2.4**
  - **Comment:** Use a flood risk evaluation method that incorporates climate change impacts.
  - **Reason:** Federal agencies are required to consider such impacts in design and it would be helpful to mainstream this practice by inclusion in this standard.
  - **Proposed Response:** Accept. The credit language has been revised.
  - **Subcommittee Vote:** 4 in favor, 2 abstained

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept with proposed response.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- No Discussion

**VOTE: the motion carried with 11 in favor, none opposed, and 4 abstained.**

None Opposed.

Abstained: Bill Freeman, Jane Rohde, John Koeller, Erika Winters-Downey

**Motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The motion carried unanimously at 2:56pm**

**Friday, April 29, 2016**

### **Welcome & Roll Call**

Secretariat Assistant, Emily Randolph welcomed participants and conducted roll call by self-introductions to establish quorum. The anti-trust statement was reviewed and participants were requested to comply with it fully.

Randolph reviewed the participation options, stating that while observers are welcome to participate in the discussion, only Consensus Body Members are able to vote. Participants were reminded to raise hands should they desire to add something new to the discussion and staff would then call on them in order.

On the second day of this meeting, no members voted using a voting alternate. There was one member voting via proxy (Gord Shymko for David Eldridge).

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

Lehman thanked everyone for their diligence and participation. He acknowledges the emails sent after the Meeting 14, part 1 meeting and the committee will work to address them.

**MOTION: A motion was made, seconded, and carried to approve the minutes from the previous Consensus Body Meeting on April 29<sup>st</sup> 2016.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

It was noted the list of people opposed did not match the number opposed. That has since been amended.

**VOTE: the motion carried with 16 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.**

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

## **Materials**

Materials Chair Charles Kibert presented the Public Comments and Responses relating to his section.

- **7 – 12. Substantive. 10.1.1 (Note: There is still a motion on the table from a previous call)**
  - **Comment:** Maximum = 30 points  
Points are earned where the following there is a percentage reduction is demonstrated for at least three impact indicators:
    - Thirty points are earned for a 205% or greater reduction.
    - ~~Twenty-eight points are earned for a 24% reduction.~~
    - ~~Twenty-six points are earned for a 23% reduction.~~
    - ~~Twenty-four points are earned for a 22% reduction.~~
    - ~~Twenty-two points are earned for a 21% reduction.~~
    - Twenty points are earned for a 210% reduction.
    - Eighteen points are earned for a 19% reduction.
    - ~~Sixteen points are earned for an 18% reduction.~~
    - ~~Fourteen points are earned for a 17% reduction.~~
    - ~~Twelve points are earned for a 16% reduction.~~
    - Ten points are earned for a 15% reduction.
  - **Reason:** Proposed point scheme allowed for trade-offs across all impact categories. Also, in LCA, a 1% difference across multiple indicators is not significant and will not show actual improvement.
  - **NEW Proposed Response:** Accept as modified. The clarification in the charging sentences answers the CBs concerns.

**First Modification:** “Points are earned where the following percentage reduction is demonstrated by adding there is a percentage reduction for at least three impact indicators.”

- **Subcommittee Vote:** Unanimously in favor

**Second Modification:** The points will be adjusted so that “Thirty points are earned for a total 25% reduction. Twenty points are earned for a total 20% reduction. Ten points are earned for a total 15% reduction.”

- **Subcommittee Vote:** 8 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstained.

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to withdraw the motion made at meeting 11.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- There was clarification that the motion was not officially voted upon in Materials Subcommittee, but was “strongly in favor”. Concern was raised about the need for this to be a sliding scale.
- There is question around the process as to whether sliding scale or current method is best ranking method—whether there should be reward for achievements, not arbitrary benchmarks.
- One person speaking in favor of rejecting the motion to withdraw and voting on the motion stated that the same model can be used to get the same granularity and clarified that we do start with a 15% reduction.
- Clarification on the motion-if the motion to withdraw the previous motion fails, then the Consensus Body will vote on the previous motion.

**VOTE: the motion to withdraw the previous motion carried with 12 in favor, 4 opposed, and 3 abstained.**

Opposed: Chris Dixon, Jeff Bradley, Gary Keclik, Don Horn.

Abstained: Bill Carroll, Kent Sovocool, Doug Tucker.

**Motion: The motion was made and seconded to accept proposed response from Subcommittee.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- It was stated there needs to be a more granular approach.
- Editorial changes are needed in the new proposed changes.

**AMENDEMENT: Amendment was made and seconded “at least 15% reduction, at least 20% reduction and at least 25% reduction or greater**

1 objection to the amendment.

**Discussion took place on the amended motion:**

- The point was made that these are two issues: one is the additive aspect that addresses this as totals, and then the granularity of the points. Opposition was raised to voting on both in one motion.
- Clarification was provided that voting against this motion would allow another motion to be made to separate the two issues.

**AMENDMENT: The motion was amended to strike the edit around granularity, to accept the comment as modifies. No second on the motion.**

**Discussion took place:**

- Decision was discussed to vote on the existing motion and then make a motion to get the result suggested.

**MOTION: The motion was made to strike the edit around granularity and to accept the comment as modified. There was no second on the motion.**

**Discussion took place:**

- There was debate around how many point increments there should be for the credit.

**VOTE: the amendment carried with 13 in favor, 3 opposed, and 2 abstained.**

Opposed: Erika Winters-Downey, Gary Keclik, Susan Gitlin

Abstained: Jane Rohde, Kent Sovocool

**Point of Order: Motion can be divided**

**Vote to accept the proposed response as amended:**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- Discussion as to whether this should be two separate issues.

**VOTE: the motion failed with 8 in favor, 9 opposed, and 2 abstained.**

Opposed: Chris Dixon, Charles Kibert, Jeff Bradley, Gary Keclik, Tien Peng, Gord Shymko, David Eldridge, Karen Joslin, Greg Johnson

Abstained: Bill Carroll, Kent Sovocool.

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to send back to Subcommittee to reconsider the granularity of the points**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- There was clarification that this does not alter the charging language of the points.
- There is disagreement on the language style.
- An amendment was attempted to include acceptance of the first half of the proposal "points are earned where..." is included as approved in this motion.

**AMENDEMENT: The amendment was moved and seconded to amend to accept the charging language of the points spectrum.**

One Objection.

**Discussion on Amended Motion:**

- Clarification on the amendment was requested. It was stated the language is generally not accepted language. "A way to game the system." There should be some reduction in 3 impact categories.
- Clarification that there is already a minimum of 5% for at least 3.
- Adding vs. Total was discussed at the Subcommittee level and was intentionally included in the proposed language.

**VOTE: the amendment carried with 11 in favor, 7 opposed, and none abstained.**

Opposed: Karen Joslin, Bill Freeman, Susan Gitlin, Erika Winters-Downey, Jeff Bradley, Kent Sovocool, Don Horn

Abstained: none

**Discussion took place on the motion as amended to send back to Subcommittee to reconsider the granularity of the points:**

- If it gets sent back to Subcommittee, the results returned may not be satisfactory. The Subcommittee needs guidance on what needs to be done.
- Second Modification was discussed at length in the Subcommittee.
- There is so much uncertainty in LCA that this granularity can be problematic. It was stated that there needs to be less granularity and greater tiers.
- This is a matter of incentivizing reasonable benchmarks. Does 1% difference across multiple factors warrant incentive benchmarks.
- The last subcommittee that voted on this had 9 members and normally there are 19.

**AMENDEMENT: Moved to amend motion to consider 3 points increments.**



Two Objections

**VOTE: the amended motion failed with 8 in favor, 10 opposed, and 2 abstained.**

Opposed: Jane Rohde, Bill Freeman, Chris Dixon, Greg Johnson, Gord Shymko, David Eldridge, Jeff Bradley, Gary Keclik, Tien Peng, Doug Tucker

Abstained: Gregg Bergmiller, Kent Sovocool

**Motion to request the subcommittee reconsider the granularity of the points**

**VOTE: the motion failed with 6 in favor, 11 opposed, and 2 abstained.**

**Opposed:** Bill Freeman, Doug Tucker, Chris Dixon, Charles, Kibert, Greg Johnson, Gord Shymko, David Eldridge, Jeff Bradley, Gary Keclik, Don Horn, Tien Peng

**Abstained:** Gregg Bergmiller, John Koeller

**Motion: The motion was made and seconded to accept this comment as modified and use the language from opening paragraph as the reason. This would not include modified points language.**

**Would add total to each increment.**

**VOTE: The motion carried with 13 in favor, 5 opposed, and 3 abstained.**

Opposed: Karen Joslin, Jane Rohde, Bill Freeman, George Thompson, Erika winters-Downey

Abstained: Gregg Bergmiller, John Koeller

## Site

Presented by the chair of the Site Subcommittee, Gregg Bergmiller.

### Discussion of public comments

#### Subcommittee Reports

- **34 – 9. Substantive. 7.1.2.4**

- **Comment:** Remove this section and add points to section 7.4
- **Reason:** Few permitted projects have habitable elevations below the 100 yr. Additionally, given buried utilities and transportation limitations, it seems unlikely critical infrastructure will be "located" above the 500 yr. The FEMA reference does not appear consistent with this line item. This may be an attempt to address climate change induced raising flood limits however there are other ways to do such.
- **Proposed Response:** Reject. The committee finds that building resiliency is an important element of responding to climate change. The committee is also making revisions to the credit to protect the functions of the floodplain.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** 4 in favor, 2 abstained

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed rejection.**

**VOTE: the motion carried with 17 in favor, none opposed, and 3 abstained.**

Opposed: none

Abstained: Chris Dixon, Don Horn, John Koeller

- **50 – 5. Editorial. 7.1.2.4**

- **Comment:** 1. Define "critical infrastructure".  
2. Consider adding reference for ASCE 24-14 "Flood Resistant Design and Construction."
- **Reason:** 1. It is important to include industry-standards and their definitions.  
2. ASCE 24 requirement: 100 year floodplain takes wave action into account. 500 year floodplain does not. It is possible for 100 to be higher than 500.

- **Proposed Response:** Reject. The credit has been rewritten to avoid use of the term “critical infrastructure.” ASCE 24 is a basic requirement in building codes.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** 4 in favor, 2 abstained

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed rejection**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- There was concern that there is an assumption of basic requirements. Relying on building codes is a false sense of security. (PoV from Midwest). Jurisdictions need to enforce building codes and townships don't. It's agreed upon that ASCE 24 code is in place, but a question as to whether a permitting process is in place to ensure it's being practiced.
- The point was made that if there is a lapse in regulatory framework, there won't be compliance due to a rating system.

**AMENDEMENT: The motion was amended and seconded to accept as modified. The credit has been rewritten to avoid use of the term “critical infrastructure”. ASCE 24 will be added as an informational reference.**

No Objections

**VOTE: The motion carried with 16 in favor, none opposed, and 3 abstained.**

None Opposed.

Abstained: Chris Dixon, Jeff Bradley, Jon Koeller

• **9 – 9. Substantive. 7.2.1.4&7.2.1.5:**

- **Comment:** Specific language changes:  
7.2.1.4 This site is located within .25 mi (.4 km) of a public bicycle path, multi-user path, ~~or~~ on a road with an existing dedicated bicycle lane, or a bike share program station.  
Points – 1 point.
- 7.2.1.5 ~~Sheltered Bicycle Infrastructure parking and is:~~  
• Sheltered bicycle parking is provided for at least 10% of building occupants, where the building occupant load is established in accordance with the International Building Code AND provides shower and changing facilities within the building project;  
Or  
• Sheltered bicycle parking is provided for at least 50% of units in a multi-family residential building;
- Secure Storage: Sheltered bicycle parking is secure.  
~~Or~~  
~~Available through a bike share program.~~  
Points – 4 points for Bicycle Infrastructure  
Points – 1 point for secure storage
- **Reason:** These sections do not do enough to encourage buildings projects to provide the necessary facilities for bicycle commuters. Without shower and changing facilities, bicycle commuters are limited in their ability to bike to work. As shower and locker room facilities are significant investments for projects, additional points should be provided for those projects that provide those facilities. A bike share program should be considered part of the infrastructure surrounding the building project and moved to 7.2.1.4.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept as modified. The committee prefers to maintain the bike share program in 7.2.1.5, as the existence of a bike share station does not guarantee that bicycle paths or lanes will be available.

- **Subcommittee Vote:** 4 in favor, 2 abstained

**MOTION:** The motion was made and seconded to accept proposed response

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- There is consensus that there will be reliance on designers to provide adequate facilities

**VOTE:** the motion carried with 17 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstained.

Opposed: John Koeller

Abstained: Kent Sovocool

- **52 – 10. Substantive. 7.2.1.5**

- **Comment:** Replace the existing language with the following:

7.2.1.5 The building

--provides sheltered bicycle parking for at least 10% its building occupants, where the building occupant load is established in accordance with the International Building Code; or

-- provides sheltered bicycle parking for at least 50% of units in a multi-family residential building; or

-- is located within .25 mi walking distance of a bike share facility.

- **Reason:** We think the last bullet may have been a misstatement, as bike share programs do not typically supply sheltered bicycle parking. Rather, we think you meant to say that, in lieu of providing sheltered parking, a builder may locate close to a bike share program.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept as modified.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** 4 in favor, 2 abstained

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

**VOTE:** the motion carried with 18 in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstained.

Opposed: John Koeller

None Abstained.

- **36 – 10. Editorial. 7.2.1.5**

- **Comment:** Need to clarify “Available through bike share program”
- **Reason:** Does that mean the bike share program should provide shelters, or that the shared bike parking should be covered?
- **Proposed Response:** Accept as modified. The committee has clarified the language in response to comments 9 – 9. and 52 – 10.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** 4 in favor, 2 abstained

**MOTION:** The motion was made and seconded to accept proposed response

**VOTE:** The motion carried with 15 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstained.

Opposed: John Koeller

Abstained: Chris Dixon

- **40 – 1. Substantive. 5.1:**

- **Comment:** **steep-sloped roof:** a roofing assembly applied to a roof deck having a slope greater than ~~or equal to~~ 3 in/ft/ (7.6 cm/m).
- **Reason:** This change would resolve a conflict with the definition for "low-sloped roof". Without making this change, a roof with a slope of 3 in/ft. would be considered both steep-and low-sloped roof.

- **Proposed Response:** Accept in principle. The Consensus Body has acted to incorporate specific criteria for roof slopes and deleted the definitions for sloped roofs.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept proposed response**

**VOTE: the motion carried with 18 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.**

None Opposed.

Abstained: John Koeller

- **52 – 20. Substantive. 7.4.1.2:**

- **Comment:** Revise as follows: ~~–Isolated wetlands~~ Wetlands Add the following to the list of water bodies and waterways:
  - Springs and seeps
- **Reason:** The ecosystem benefits of all wetlands, not just isolated wetlands, are protected by a buffer between them and hardscaped areas. Springs and seeps should also be protected because of their habitat value.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept as Modified. The language was changed for clarification and to define seeps. “Springs, seeps, or other place where water from the ground comes to the surface.”
- **Subcommittee Vote:** 9 in favor, 2 abstained

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept proposed response**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- It was questioned if the source of water should be specified. Difference between natural water vs. groundwater. If ground water, it needs to be more clear. Seeps are clearly defined in the dictionary. Springs are surface water, Not sure if new phrasing adds anything.

**AMENDEMENT: The motion was amended and seconded changing the response to Springs or Seeps**

No Objections

**VOTE: the amended motion carried with 17 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstained.**

None Opposed.

Abstained: John Koeller, Doug Tucker

- **31 – 1. Substantive 7.5**

- **Comment: 7.5.1.3** The vegetation palette includes the following:
  - **7.5.1.3.1:** ~~Minimum of 50% of~~ The vegetated area uses drought tolerant plants; and/or
  - **7.5.1.3.2:** ~~Minimum of 50% of~~ The vegetated area is covered with plants (new or salvaged plantings) that are native and non-invasive.
    - Informational Reference(s):
      - Federal and state noxious weed lists: <http://plants.usda.gov/java/noxComposite>
      - State and local university or college landscape reference guide
      - State or local agency landscaping reference guide.
    - Maximum = ~~10~~ 7 points or N/A
    - Four points are earned if greater than 75% of plants are native and non-invasive, or two points are earned if between 50 and 74% of plants are native and non-invasive, one point is earned if 33-49% of the plants are native and non-invasive.
    - Three points are earned if greater than 75% of the plants are drought tolerant, or two points are earned if between 50 and 74% of the plants are drought tolerant, one point is earned if 33-49% of the plants are drought tolerant.

- Zero points are earned if less than ~~33%~~ 50% of the plants are drought tolerant.
- Zero points are earned if less than ~~33%~~50% of the plants are native and non-invasive.
- Not applicable where there is no room for landscaping.
- **Reason:** Points allocation does not make sense. There is a maximum of 4 points if 75% of the plants are native and non-invasive and you could claim 3 additional points if the plants are drought tolerant making a maximum of 7 points are available not 10. Because no points are available if less than 50% of the vegetation is not drought tolerant or native but those types of plants could be utilized then the requirement in 7.5.1.3.1 and 7.5.1.3.2 which states "Minimum of 50%..." is inconsistent with the points allocation. Additionally, it seems that using something less than 50% native or drought tolerant should be encouraged so I am proposing that a minimum of 33% to earn one point in both 7.5.1.3.1 and 7.5.1.3.2.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept as Modified. The committee believes that more levels of incentive as appropriate. Four points are earned if greater than 75% of plants are native and non-invasive, three ~~or two~~ points are earned if between 50 and 74% of plants are native and non-invasive, two points are one point is earned if 33-49% of the plants are native and non-invasive; one point is earned if 20-32% are native and non-invasive.
  - Three points are earned if greater than 75% of the plants are drought tolerant, ~~or~~ two points are earned if between 50 and 74% of the plants are drought tolerant, one point is earned if ~~33-49~~20-32% of the plants are drought tolerant.

Note:Allowable point total is 7 (not 10)

- **Subcommittee Vote:** 10 in favor, 1 abstained

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept proposed response**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- Editorial change: Need to include two place decimal increments so no value is left out.
- Clarification that the subcommittee intended to strike "minimum" as shown.

**AMENDEMENT: Motion to amend and seconded to adjust increments so no value is being left out.**

No objections

**VOTE: the motion carried with [18] in favor, none opposed, and [1] abstained.**

None Opposed.

Abstained: Erika Winters-Downey

- **34 – 18. Substantive. 7.5.1.2**

- **Comment:** Delete section
- **Reason:** Since light, sun zenith and shading conditions are seasonal dependent; does anyone do this. Plan should be based on BPs by APLD.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept as modified. The committee prefers to retain the language addressing structural conditions because they are not seasonally dependent.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** 5 in favor, 1 opposed

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept proposed response**

**VOTE: the motion carried with 18 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.**

None Opposed.

Abstained: John Koeller

- **43- 17. Substantive. 7.5.1.3**

- **Comment:** Modify as follows:...noninvasive drought tolerant plants that are native or adaptive
- **Reason:** Should be specific that allowed planting are non-invasive and either native or adaptive.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept proposed response**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- Clarification that this is not changing percentages, just changing language.

**VOTE: the motion carried with 17 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstained.**

Opposed: none

Abstained: Karen Joslin, John Koeller

- **36 – 10. Substantive. 7.5.1.3:**

- **Comment:** Review point allocation. 7 or 10?
- **Reason:** Standard indicates max points = 10 but responses only allocate up to 7 points.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept. Changed the credit to 7 points.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept proposed response**

**VOTE: the motion carried with 18 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.**

None Opposed

- None Abstained **52 – 24. Substantive. 7.5.1.3**

- **Comment:** Revise as follows: 7.5.1.3 The vegetation palette includes the following:

--7.5.1.3.1: Minimum of 50% of the vegetated area uses non-invasive, drought tolerant plants; and/or

--7.5.1.3.2 Minimum of 50% of vegetated area is covered with plants (new, retained, or salvaged plantings) that are native ~~and non-invasive~~. Informational Reference(s):

--Federal and state noxious weed lists: <http://plants.usda.gov/java/noxComposite>

--*The Invasive Plant Atlas of the United States*: <http://www.invasiveplantatlas.org/>

--State and local university or college landscape reference guide

--State or local agency landscaping reference guide

Maximum = 10 points or N/A

--Four points are earned if greater than 75% of plants are native ~~and non-invasive~~, or two points are earned if between 50 and 74% of plants are native and ~~non-invasive~~.

--Three points are earned if greater than 75% of the plants are drought tolerant and non-invasive, or two points are earned if between 50 and 74% of the plants are drought tolerant and non-invasive. --Zero points are earned if less than 50% of the plants are drought tolerant and non-invasive.

--Zero points are earned if less than 50% of plants are native ~~and non-invasive~~.

--Not applicable where there is no room for landscaping.

- **Reason:** Sustainable landscaping guidelines and other green building standards generally separate out credits and requirements related to native plants and invasive plants, as the environmental impacts of these categories of plants are quite different. Native plants generally are promoted because they offer higher value to native insects, birds, and other animals and often are well-suited to the site's growing conditions. Invasive plants, on the other hand, are plants shown to cause environmental harm. So

native plants are encouraged, while invasive plants are discouraged. In fact, the environmental damage from invasive plants is sufficiently severe that sustainability-focused landscaping guidance and standards may disallow them from the site entirely.

Accordingly, it is important to emphasize that plants not be invasive, whether or not they are native.

Moreover, as invasive plants are always non-native to the particular ecosystem, the phrase "native and non-invasive" is redundant.

The reference to Federal and state noxious weed lists is unnecessary, as those lists consist of plants that are illegal to plant and generally unavailable in the trade; as this standard is intended to go beyond what is required by law, there is no point in including that reference. Rather, to encourage sustainable landscaping, a more appropriate informational reference would be *The Invasive Plant Atlas of the United States* at <http://www.invasiveplantatlas.org/>.

- **Proposed Response:** Accept as modified. The committee believe that additional informational references will benefit the user.
- 7.5.1.3.1: Minimum of 50% of the vegetated area uses non-invasive, drought tolerant plants; and/or
  - 7.5.1.3.2 Minimum of 50% of vegetated area is covered with plants (new, retained, or salvaged plantings) that are native ~~and non-invasive~~. Informational Reference(s):
    - Federal and state noxious weed lists: <http://plants.usda.gov/java/noxComposite>
    - --State or local university, college or agency landscape reference guide
    - 
    - --USDA National Invasive Species Information Center: <http://www.invasivespeciesinfo.gov/plants/main.shtml>
    - 
    - The Invasive Plant Atlas of the United States*: <http://www.invasiveplantatlas.org/>
    - State and local university or college landscape reference guide
    - State or local agency landscaping reference guide
  - --*Invasive Species Compendium*, [www.cabi.org/isc](http://www.cabi.org/isc)

Maximum = 10 points or N/A

--Four points are earned if greater than 75% of plants are native ~~and non-invasive~~, or two points are earned if between 50 and 74% of plants are native ~~and non-invasive~~.

--Three points are earned if greater than 75% of the plants are drought tolerant and non-invasive, or two points are earned if between 50 and 74% of the plants are drought tolerant and non-invasive. --Zero points are earned if less than 50% of the plants are drought tolerant and non-invasive.

--Zero points are earned if less than 50% of plants are native ~~and non-invasive~~.

--Not applicable where there is no room for landscaping.

- --Only applicable when determination of plant invasiveness is guided by a list or lists that a) cover the appropriate geographical region and b) are not limited to noxious weeds.
  - **Subcommittee Vote:** 7 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstained

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept proposed response**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

**Call for amendment**

**AMENDEMENT: The motion was amended and seconded to strike the reference to the invasive plant atlas and restore reference to noxious weed list.**

**Discussion on amended motion:**

- The point was made that there is confusion in the marketplace between noxious weeds and invasive. Noxious weeds are a subset of invasive plants with a focus on agriculture/cross-border trade. Concern that putting it in the definition, there could be over-reliance on it.
- it was suggested that we not remove the Invasive Plant Atlas. It's a repository of information from invasive plant councils around the country. The current underlying language of this document suggests using it as a guide.
- There was debate as to whether Invasive Plant Atlas is very broad and not too constructive if a developer was going in to look at it to choose certain plants. Not appropriate to use for this rating system.

**VOTE: the amendment carried with 7 in favor, 6 opposed, and 6 abstained.**

Opposed: Karen Joslin, Susan Gitlin, Kent Sovocool, Gary Keclik, Don Horn, Tien Peng

Abstained: Bill Carroll, Doug Tucker, Erika Winters-Downey, Gord Shymko, David Eldridge, John Koeller

**Discussion on Amended Motion:**

- There were thoughts around whether the standard should be oriented based on the local authority.

**VOTE: the amended Motion carried with 10 in favor, 6 opposed, and 3 abstained.**

Opposed: Susan Gitlin, Kent Sovocool, Don Hor, John Koeller, Karen Joslin Tien Peng

Abstained: Gord Shymko, David Eldridge, Erika Winters-Downey

**Review Schedule**

- Monday, May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM ET
- Tuesday, May 24<sup>th</sup>, 2016 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM ET

Randolph reported that the Consensus Body is over 65% complete responding the Public Comments

Woodbury report that the first meeting of Resilience task group took place. The group is working to schedule a call with a public commenter, as well as working to draft language that could be used to address climate change. The Resilience task group is also working to create an assessment to show steps to mitigate risks.

If anyone would like to join this group, contact Maria at [Maria@thegbi.org](mailto:Maria@thegbi.org) .

**Motion to adjourn. The motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 3:03 PM ET.**