

Minutes

GBI Consensus Body Meeting #23

BSR/GBI 01-2016

Webinar

Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 11:00 AM ET to 3:00 PM ET

Attendance:

No	Name	Organization(s)	8-31-2016	9-14-16			
1	Gregg Bergmiller	S/L/A/M Collaborative	X				
2	Paul Bertram	Kingspan Insulated Panels, Inc.	X				
3	Allan Bilka	International Code Council	X				
4	Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X (by Proxy)				
5	William Carroll	American Chemistry Council	X (by Proxy)				
6	Chris Dixon	NBBJ (rep. self)	X				
7	Nicole Dovel-Moore	CTA Architects Engineers	Absent				
8	Amber Dzikowicz	NSF International	Absent				
9	David Eldridge	Grumman/Butkus Assoc.	X (by Proxy)				
10	William Freeman	Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X				
11	Susan Gitlin	U.S. EPA	X				
12	Don Horn	GSA	X				
13	Josh Jacobs	UL Environment	X				
14	Greg Johnson	Johnson Consulting Services, Greenscape Alliance	X				
15	Karen Joslin		X				
16	Malee Kaolawanich	NIH (rep. self)	Absent				
17	Rachel Minnery	AIA	Absent				
18	Charles Kibert	University of Florida	X				
19	Gary Keclik	Keclik Associates	X				
	Jennifer Kowalonek	Alfred Benesch & Company	resigned				
20	Thomas Pape	Alliance for Water	X				

		Efficiency					
21	Tien Peng	National Ready Mix Concrete Assn.	X				
22	Jane Rohde	JSR Assoc. Inc., Vinyl Institute	X				
23	Gord Shymko	G.F. Shymko & Associates, Inc.	X				
24	Kent Sovocool	Southern Nevada Water Authority	X (by Proxy)				
25	Steve Strawn	JELD-WEN	Absent				
26	George Thompson	Chemical Compliance Systems, Inc.	X				
27	Angela Tin	American Lung Assn.	X				
28	Douglas Tucker	Misubishi Electric Cooling & Heating	X				
29	Erika Winters Downey	American Institute of Steel Construction	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)					
	Mark Thimons	(Voting alternate for Erika Winters-Downey)					
	John Cross	American Institute of Steel Construction (Voting Alternate for Erika Winters-Downey)					

TOTALS							
Visitors							
Mike Cudahy	PPFA	X					
Staff							
Michael Lehman	Chair	X					
Vicki Worden	Executive Director, GBI						
Emily Randolph	Secretariat Asst., GBI	X					
Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI						
Maria Woodbury	Secretariat, GBI	X					
Chelsea Amaio	Staff, GBI						
Kim Goldsworthy	Roberts-Rules Consulting	X					
Charles Kibert	Stand-in Chair for Mike Lehman						

Wednesday, August 31st, 2016

Welcome & Roll Call

Secretariat, Maria Woodbury welcomed participants and conducted roll call 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.

Woodbury reviewed the membership roster, stating that Jennifer Kaowlanek has resigned from the Consensus Body.

At this meeting, no members voted using a voting alternate. There were four members voting via proxy (Greg Johnson for Jeff Bradley, Gord Shymko for David Eldridge, Tien Peng for Kent Sovocool, and Jane Rohde for William Carroll).

Administrative Procedures and Related Matters

Chair Mike Lehman welcomed participants and thanked them for their time. Lehman stated that there should only be a couple more calls before the document is ready to go out to Public Comment again.

Woodbury reviewed the agenda, stating that the discussion of Water comments would be postponed until a later call when Water Chair Kent Sovocool could be present.

MOTION: A motion was made, and seconded to approve the minutes from the previous Consensus Body Meeting #22 on August 16th and 17th, 2016

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The question was raised if the question could be divided between the two days of the meetings, given that not all members were present on both days. The parliamentarian clarified that members are under no obligation to abstain from approving minutes from a meeting at which they were not present and that it was unnecessary to divide to the question.

VOTE: The motion carried with 22 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstained.

None Opposed

Abstained: Greg Johnson, Gregg Bergmiller

Discussion of Public Comments

Project Management

(Presented by Karen Joslin, Chair of the Project Management Subcommittee.

- **34 – 5. Substantive. 6.1.2**
 - **Comment:** Delete this section and move points to another major section of GG
 - **Reason:** Meaningful evaluation of this process is unrealistic. Also it denotes a single work flow path for which many contracts may not lend themselves. Further, this penalizes a strong early, central management of the process.
 - **Proposed Response:** Reject. We feel this is an area we want to emphasize.
 - **Subcommittee Vote:** 4 in favor, none opposed, none abstained

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- Concern was raised that “We feel” is not appropriate phraseology. “The Consensus Body believes” was offered as an alternative.

AMENDMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to strike “We feel” from the response.

There were no Objections to the amendment.

VOTE: The amended motion carried with 23 in favor, 1 opposed, and none abstained.

Opposed: Allan Bilka

None Abstained

- **7 – 6. Substantive. 6.1.2**
 - **Comment: 6.1.2 Integrated Design Process** ~~Maximum = 10 points~~ **“Minimum = 25 points”**
 - **Reason:** The optimization of the design of a project through an integrated or collaborative design process can yield a much greater reduction of environmental and energy impacts than any other item in the standard – in fact the improvement may be greater than all other aspects of this standard combined. Real world examples from structural steel projects indicate that a collaborative design process using BIM tools has reduced the both the amount material and the fabrication intensity for that material by as much as 25% (St Vincent Hospital, Toledo, OH). Similar savings are achievable for all building systems individually and collectively. The points within this section and possibly the standard should be adjusted to prioritize this credit. 10 points out of a possible 1000 point standard is not adequate to incentivize efforts to incorporate the expertise of the entire project team (architects, engineers, general contractors and specialty contractors) into design teams.
 - **Proposed Response:** Accept with Modification. We are hoping to reward teams that bring more stakeholders to the table by providing extra points.
 - **Summary of changes:** 1.) Eliminated the final three milestones. 2.) combined the conceptual and design phases. 3.) Created a phase to review final budget/GMP with the

goal of evaluating any changes made based on their green impact. 4.) created two levels for earning points: one for 6 job functions present and one for 10 job functions present. 5.) upped the total points to 18. We will determine where these extra points are coming from by working with the points task group to determine total PM points.

- **Subcommittee Vote:** 3 in favor, none opposed, none abstained.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The question was raised whether a project could earn points in both areas. If that is the case, the speaker felt that there needs to be an explanatory note.
- It was stated that integrated design proposals are micromanaging and aren't cost effective in small to medium projects. The speaker felt that IDPs are overloaded with oversight and spoke against the motion.
- Concern was raised that this method rewards the process and not the end result.
- One speaker in favor of the motion stated that IDPs are not yet the status quo in current constructions, but are important in ensuring project success. It was stated that other rating systems do this too.
- The opinion was raised that there are misconceptions about why the Standard should reward the process. It was stated that it is important for educating project teams who will move forward to other projects utilizing this process.
- Concern was raised that this credit favors traditional project delivery methods but does not consider design-build.
- Concern was raised about the redistribution of points and the Points Task Group

VOTE: The motion carried with 17 in favor, 6 opposed, and none abstained.

Opposed: Thomas Pape, Josh Jacobs, Allan Bilka, Don Horn, Greg Johnson, Jeff Bradley
None Abstained

Site:

(Presented by Gregg Bergmiller, Chair of the Site Subcommittee)

- **43 – 16. Substantive. 7.4.1.2**
 - **Comment:** Modify as follows: ~~Hardscapes and~~ Structures are located...
 - **Reason:** Walkways and other paths may be necessary for transit on a site and damage to them due to flooding is not as expensive to repair as structures.
 - **Proposed Response:** Accept as modified. To accommodate low impact pedestrian travel a clause was added to the charging language that reads "excluding pervious walkways 48 in. or less in width"
 - **Subcommittee Vote:** 9 in favor, none opposed, none abstained.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the Subcommittee's proposed response.

VOTE: The motion carried with 22 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.

None Opposed

Abstained: Chris Dixon

- **34 – 16. Substantive. 7.4.1.1.2**
 - **Comment:** ...of listed requirements are met ~~appear~~ in the . . .
 - **Reason:** To clarify the need to meet and not address the standard.
 - **Proposed Response:** Accept as modified. We deleted all the words after "appear," as well. This more clearly requires performance versus specification.

- **Subcommittee Vote:** 9 in favor, none opposed, none abstained.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was clarified that everything from “appear” to the end of the sentence would be deleted.
- The question was raised as to how to validate that risk requirements are met. It was clarified that the requirements are addressed in the left hand column of the standard. The speaker was in favor of the motion.

VOTE: The motion carried with 24 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed

None Abstained

- **14 – 1. Substantive. 5.1**

- **Comment: climate zone:** see ASHRAE Standard 169-2013, Normative Appendix B of ANSI/ASHRAE/IESNA Standard 90.1-2013, or Section 301 of the 2015 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC).
- **Reason:** Standard 169-2013 includes updated weather data and the addition of Climate Zone 0 with humid (0A) and dry (0B) to better account for extremely hot locations. The inclusion of Standard 169 makes the rating system more applicable to international locations, especially for locations in extremely hot climates.
- **Proposed Response:** Reject. It is advantageous to use one set of climate zones for the standard. The newer climate zone reference recommended in the comment will be incorporated into ASHRAE 90.1-2016 (due out Oct 2016) and hopefully the new version of the IECC, due out early 2017. At that time it would worthwhile to update the GBI standard to ASHRAE 90.1-2016 which references ASHRAE 169-2013. At this time it is better to use the current definition to be consistent with current versions of 90.1 and the IECC so that the user is not confused by modifications to the climate zones that occur in 169-2013. The climate zone definition should be consistent with the standards and codes that use them in GBI.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** 6 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstained

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the subcommittee’s recommendation.

VOTE: The motion carried with 23 in favor, 1 opposed, and 4 abstained.

Opposed: Josh Jacobs

None Abstained

- **49 – 12. Substantive. 7.1.3**

- **Comment:** ~~Manufacturer’s specifications, zoning maps, cut sheet and performance documentation~~
- **Reason:** Not appropriate documentation for Development Area
- **Proposed Response:** Accept.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** 9 in favor, none opposed, none abstained

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the subcommittee’s recommendation.

VOTE: The motion carried with 24 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed

None Abstained

- **24 – 10. Substantive. 7.1.3**

- **Comment:** Community Resilience Plan

- **Reason:** A Community Resilience Plan (CRP) is important and could be applicable toward other applications in this standard; however, in the context of the overall site criteria affecting floodplains it is significant overkill. Based on the information requested, the floodplain maps are sufficient and more telling than a CRP.
- **Proposed Response:** Reject. The committee changed the last bullet to read “Community resilience, climate action, or similar mitigation plan.” We feel the CRP is important and we have a task group working on integrating resiliency into the Standard. This is recommended documentation, not required, and it will be up to the design team to decide whether or not they want to provide the CRP.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** 8 in favor, 1 opposed, none abstained.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the subcommittee’s recommendation.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The question was raised if the language change needs to be voted on prior to approving the response. It was determined that it was not needed.

Second was withdrawn. The seconder spoke in opposition to the modification the Subcommittee made to the language.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to split the motion: Reject. We feel the CRP is important and we have a task group working on integrating resilience into the Standard. This is recommended documentation, not required, and it will be up to the design team to decide whether or not they want to provide the CRP.

AMENDMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to change “we feel” to “the Consensus Body believes”.

There were no objections to the Amendment.

VOTE: The amended motion carried with 23 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstained.

Opposed: Don Horn

None Abstained

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the changed language.

Discussion took place on the motion:

- It was clarified that any one of the items in the bulleted list is adequate documentation. It was stated that Climate Action Plan or a similar plan needs to be added in since it’s labeled/called different things in different parts of the construction world.
- There is opposition to the word “similar” on the grounds that this is confusing and opens up the possibility for debate.
- It was clarified that there is no argument over documentation, which is what this is being talked about.

VOTE: The motion carried with 22 in favor, 1 opposed, none abstained.

Opposed: Thomas Pape

None Abstained

- **52 – 6. Substantive. 7.1.1.1**

- **Comment:** Delete the criterion and the definition “commercial zone”.
- **Reason:** The benefits of this criterion are not clear and could encourage, rather than discourage, urban sprawl. Under the criterion as written and the current definition of “commercial zone,” a building could be located a half mile from a commercial zone and still require new infrastructure and contribute to leapfrog development. To avoid urban

sprawl, it is essential that the project be located next to or within an area of existing infrastructure, not a half mile away from it.

Moreover, this criterion does not seem to serve any additional purpose beyond that which is addressed by 7.2.1.6. That criterion provides better measures for ensuring that a building is actually in close proximity to existing infrastructure. Moreover, the “commercial zone” referenced in 7.1.1.1 and defined in 5.1 is largely redundant with the definition for “neighborhood assets.” (If the term “commercial zone” must be kept, we recommend that it be based on the definition of “neighborhood assets.”)

We recommend that 7.1.1.1 be deleted and its points transferred to 7.2.1.6.

- **Proposed Response:** Accept. Point redistribution to be discussed.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** 9 in favor, none opposed, none abstained.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the subcommittee’s recommendation.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There were sentiments that whole-heartedly supported this recommendation

VOTE: The motion carried with 24 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed

None Abstained

- **28 – 5. Substantive. NEW**

- **Comment: 7.5.2 Landscaping in the Wildland- Urban Interface**

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

and,

The site is designed to comply with wildland-urban interface principles.

and

Vegetation management plans and specifications are prepared; including classifications of fuel loading, fuel model light, medium, or heavy, and substantiating data to verify classification of fire resistive vegetation. Informational Reference(s):

- International Wildland-Urban Interface Code 2015
- Safer From the Start, A Guide to Firewise- Friendly Development. National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)
- National Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy

Points column:

Maximum = 3 points or N/A

- Three Points are earned for an Extreme Hazard Site.
- Two points are earned for a High Hazard Site.
- One point is earned for a Moderate Hazard Site.

Not applicable where the legislative body has declared a wildland-urban interface area.

- **Reason:** This proposal was originally part of a pair of complimentary changes proposed to reduce the environmental impacts of fire spread through the wildland-urban interface. It was sharply debated by the Sites subcommittee before being rejected by a 3-2 margin. New section 7.1.2.3, which was accepted by the subcommittee, creates an incentive to not locate the building project within or adjacent to a wildland-urban interface area where such an area has been formally recognized by the government with jurisdiction. This is an incentive to not build by land that is still in a natural condition. Requiring government declaration of such an area before awarding points for not building there prevents this provision from being ‘free points’ for all.

The half of the proposal now being offered recognizes that sometimes buildings will be constructed in the wildland- urban interface. When that happens conformance with the vegetative design and management provisions of the impacts of fire spread between buildings and wildlands.

This proposal is consistent with the National Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy promulgated by USDA, Department of the Interior, and Homeland Security. It is also consistent with section VII O. of the Guidance for Federal Agencies on Sustainable Practices for Designed Landscapes and GSA's adoption of the International family of codes as referenced in the 2015 Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service.

This proposal is similarly consistent with the position of the International Association of Fire Chiefs Fire & Life Safety Section (see attached letter) as well as credits 4.1 and 8.1 of the Sustainable Sites Initiatives 2012 SITES v2 Rating System.

Since this proposal addresses locations where government has not formally declared a wildland-urban interface area, a fire protection engineer or certified fire marshal would have to establish the applicability of these requirements to the specific site. This allows the technical details of this subject matter to be addressed by proven experts in the application of the principles of the IWUIC.

Requiring subject matter experts to determine wildland- urban interface hazard also keeps this provision from being 'free points' for building in any location regardless of wildland adjacency or vegetative fuel loads. Similarly, if government has established a wildland-urban interface area points will not be awarded for building in a known hazard area (consistent with Sec. 7.1.2.3). The IWUIC is structured to categorize hazarded sites as Extreme, High, and Moderate, with other sites not qualifying as hazarded.

It is proposed that points be allocated according to the degree of hazard; with the highest hazard – Extreme – receiving the most points at 3, High hazard receiving 2, and Moderate hazard receiving 1. It is appropriate to give the greatest incentive to mitigating the worst hazard.

Note that this is fewer points than are being proposed for not building in a wildland urban interface area (4 points) as per Sec. 7.1.2.3.

Also note that other sections (Urban infill, Greenfields, Transportation) award approximately 30 points for developing in the urban environment or away from wildland conditions. It is not realistic to believe that awarding 3 points for wildland fire mitigation will drive site selection; however it will hopefully drive site protection where necessary.

- **Proposed Response:** Accept as modified. [No reason drafted by Subcommittee]
- **Reason Submitted by Greg Johnson:** Preventing fire from spreading between structures and wildlands has important environmental benefits. The proposal was modified to limit some of the potentially negative impacts of developing a qualifying site.
- **Subcommittee Vote:** 6 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstained

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the subcommittee's recommendation.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The question was posed if the "Firewise" program was looked at as an alternate. It was stated that it was considered, but this was a better way to structure the proposal. Firewise focuses on residential and it was felt to be inappropriate for commercial building. It was stated that some language was drawn from the appendices in the Firewise document.
- Concern was raised about the first sentence of the response.

AMENDMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to strike out the first sentence.

Objections were raised to the Amendment.

Discussion took place on the Amendment:

- It was stated that if a building burns down, it's resource intensive to rebuild. The atmospheric impacts of burning the materials are significant and can be mitigated through appropriate site design. There are important environmental reasons.
- Objection was raised over the amendment. The speaker felt that the first sentence needs to remain to keep the intent of the section.
- Concern was raised about encouraging urban sprawl. It was clarified that this concern did not relate directly to the amendment.
- Staff clarified that the response relayed back to the commenter will be published, but will not be part of the Standard.
- It was stated that the first sentence adds nothing but further debate.
- Concern was raised about the word "important". The speaker stated that there is no specification on what the benefits are and that the sentence is emotionally charged.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT: The amendment carried with 10 in favor, 6 opposed, and 8 abstained.

Opposed: Chris Dixon, George Thompson, Bill Freeman, Greg Johnson, Jeff Bradley, Gary Keclik

Abstained: Allan Bilka, Jane Rohde, Bill Carroll, Doug Tucker, Erika Winters-Downey, Gord Shymko, David Eldridge, Josh Jacobs

Discussion took place on the Amended Motion:

- There was a question about whether "determination" is the correct choice of words.
- The question was raised about how many states have adopted this. It was clarified that States don't typically adopt this code; Individual jurisdictions do.
- Concern was raised about awarding points for New Construction in a wildland-urban interface. Setting criteria for already-existing infrastructure is a different thing.
- It was clarified that wildland-urban interface isn't always pristine undeveloped land. It's often on outlying edges of property development.

VOTE ON MOTION: The amended motion carried with 18 in favor, 3 opposed, and 3 abstained.

Opposed: Don Horn, Erika Winters-Downey, Charles Kibert

Abstained: Chris Dixon, Jane Rohde, Bill Carroll

Whole Document:

(Presented by Mike Lehman, Chair of the Consensus Body)

- **24 – 30. Editorial. 12**
 - **Comment:** In the ASTM section, ASTM E1374 is written twice. Remove one instance.
 - **Reason:** Comment is self-explanatory.
 - **Proposed Response:** Accept

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

VOTE: The motion carried with 24 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed

None Abstained

- **50 – 15. Substantive. 12.**
 - **Comment:** Not all of the ASHRAE versions that are currently referenced throughout the document are listed here.

- **Reason:** As noted above, there are multiple version years noted. Based on resolution of those comments, fix the references.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept. Staff will verify that all references are listed appropriately.

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

VOTE: The motion carried with 24 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed

None Abstained

--End of Public Comments--

New Business:

- There was discussion around how the Points Task Group is going to be formed and how it will function. It was stated that Subcommittees should provide a recommendation to the Points task group.
- The question was raised whether there is a possibility for a recommendation to be made to the Point Task Group. It was clarified that the Task Group is made up of experts representing each Subcommittee.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to have each individual Subcommittee recommend to the Points Task Group an allocation within their Subcommittee's domain so that the Points Task Group has a starting point that comes from the area's expertise to allocate points.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was clarified that the Points Task group was formed to look at points from the macro level. The Subcommittees will need to be adequately represented but can't get caught up in the nitty-gritty of two point here, two points there.
- It was stated that the previous statement needs to be in writing.
- Concern was raised that having the Subcommittees submit recommendations in the beginning is putting the cart before the horse and is based on the assumption that the Point Task Group will come back with the same model that is currently being used, which isn't necessarily the case. Subcommittee has already made some decision for value of points based on how they're allocated now.
- The question was raised if there will still be 1000 points, and the Points Task Group will determine how they will be allocated. It was clarified that the Points Task Group may ultimately decide 1000 points is not the best. They will also determine what the biggest points values are— not just energy savings as it was when these ranking systems were first being developed a decade ago.
- There were sentiments echoing the need to put the scope and purpose of the Task Group in writing.

SUBSTITUTION: The motion was made and seconded to substitute the following for the original motion: that each Subcommittee have the opportunity to review the allocation of points within their assessment area and make a recommendation to the Consensus Body.

VOTE: The motion carried with 21 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.

None Opposed

Abstained: Bill Freeman

Review of Schedule/Status Update:

- Next Meeting September 14st: 12pm-3pm EDT

- Woodbury reminded participants that the Code of Conduct is due back by COB September 30th.
- Randolph reported that the Consensus Body reviewed 11 comments today and is 96% done with all comments. Subcommittees are continuing to work on comments where it is still needed.

MOTION: The motion was made, seconded, and carried to adjourn CB Meeting #23.

--Meeting adjourned: 1:25PM ET—