Minutes

GBI Consensus Body Meeting #25

BSR/GBI 01-2016

Webinar

Wednesday, September 28th, 2016 12:00 PM ET to 3:00 PM ET

Attendance:

No	Name	Organization(s)	9-28-16				
1	Gregg Bergmiller	S/L/A/M Collaborative	X (by Proxy)				
2	Paul Bertram	Kingspan Insulated Panels, Inc.	X (by Proxy)				
3	Allan Bilka	International Code Council	X				
4	Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X				
5	William Carroll	American Chemistry Council	X				
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.	Absent				
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	Absent				
14	Greg Johnson	Johnson Consulting Services, Greenscape Alliance	X				
15	Karen Joslin		X				
16	Malee Kaolawanich	NIH (rep. self)	X				
17	Rachel Minnery	AIA	X				
18	Charles Kibert	University of Florida	X				
19	Gary Keclik	Keclik Associates	X				
20	Thomas Pape	Alliance for Water Efficiency	X				
21	Tien Peng	National Ready	X				

		Mix Concrete Assn.					
22	Jane Rohde	JSR Assoc. Inc., Vinyl Institute	X				
23	Gord Shymko	G.F. Shymko & Associates, Inc.	X (by Proxy)				
24	Kent Sovocool	Southern Nevada Water Authority	Absent				
25	Steve Strawn	JELD-WEN	Absent				
26	George Thompson	Chemical Compliance Systems, Inc.	X (by Proxy)				
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)	**X**				
	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			23/29				
	Visitors						

	Martha VanGeem	Self (Principal Engineer)	X				
	Mike Cudahy	Plastic Pipe and Fittings Association	X				
	Ed Deomano	Composite Panel Association	X				
	Staff/Consultants						
	Michael Lehman	Chair	X				
	Vicki Worden	Executive Director, GBI					
	Emily Randolph	Secretariat Asst., GBI					
	Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI	X				
	Maria Woodbury	Secretariat, GBI	X				
	Chelsea Amaio	Staff, GBI					
	Kim Goldsworthy	Roberts-Rules Consulting	X				

Wednesday, September 28th, 2016

Welcome & Roll Call

Secretariat, Maria Woodbury welcomed participants and conducted roll call to establish quorum. The anti-trust statement and code of conduct were reviewed and participants were requested to comply with it fully.

Administrative Items

Woodbury confirmed that there was no change to the membership roster.

At this meeting no members voted using voting alternates and four voted using proxies (Doug Tucker for Paul Bertram, Jane Rohde for George Thompson, Gary Keclik for Gord Shymko, and Chris Dixon for Gregg Bergmiller).

Chair's Opening Comments

Chair Michael Lehman reminded participants to raise hands should they desire to add something new to the discussion and Staff would then call on them in order.

Lehman asked if there were any objections to the minutes from Consensus Body Meeting #24 on September 14th. There were none. Minutes were approved.

Discussion of Public Comments

Water Efficiency:

Presented by subcommittee Vice Chair Mike Cudahy

- **42 – 3. General. 9.1**
  - **Comment:** PPFA supports choice in green building systems, and allowing for multiple pathways for domestic plumbing is beneficial. These programs are being updated and in the case of IgCC and ASHRAE 189.1, combined. Future versions of this GBI standard may which to incorporate some of the materials in the document to maintain options.
  - **Reason:** None Given
  - **Proposed Response:** Accept in principle. The Water Subcommittee drafted new language to address the comment.
  - **Subcommittee Vote:** 4 in favor, none opposed, 1 abstained.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response.
Discussion took place on the motion:

- There was clarification on what the new language is and a question around whether the language currently presented is the most up-to-date version.
- Sentiment was expressed that this should be "reject comment" but accept in principle and this idea has been incorporated elsewhere in the document.
- There was a question around whether the points had changed, or Pathways. It was confirmed that the points changed.
- It was explained that the comments are outdated since changes have been made in responding to other public comments, despite this still being round 1 public comments.
  - Clarification was requested and provided that this motion is not voting on any of the points or language.

VOTE: The motion carried with 20 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstained.
None Opposed
Abstained: Susan Gitlin, Thomas Pape

- **22 – 1. General. 9**
  - **Comment:** Denver Water was asked by the Alliance for Water Efficiency. The stated that building can be certified as compliant under your standard without implementing the most commonly accepted water efficiency measures provided in other green standard. However, I believe that these standards they are referring to are covered in section 9.1.1 or 9.1.2 or 9.1.3
  - **Reason:** Please spell out types of toilets, urinals, faucet aerators, and showerheads etc. that are recommended to get points. I believe that this has been covered it is just currently under the veil of other standards that we do not have access to.
  - **Proposed Response with Path D:** Reject. The Water Subcommittee recommends that because the CB rejects prerequisites that reference to these Standards is necessary to support Water Sense and the credibility of the GBI Standard.
  - **Subcommittee Vote:** 5 in favor, none opposed, none abstained.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response.
VOTE: The motion carried with 19 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstained.
None Opposed
Abstained: Susan Gitlin, Erika Winters-Downey

- **56-11. General. 9.2.**

- **Comment:** EPA WaterSense is the basis for all three BSR/GBI 01-201X paths for Indoor Domestic Plumbing, meeting the Indoor Water requirement of the Guiding Principles for New Construction
- **Reason:** None provided
- **Propose Response**: Reject. The committee prefers the path taken by previous action.
- **Subcommittee Vote**: 4 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response.
VOTE: The motion carried with 22 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.
None Opposed
Abstained: Susan Gitlin

Project Management Subcommittee:
Presented by Subcommittee Chair, Karen Joslin

- **18 – 10. General. 6.2.1.1.1**
  - **Comment:** 6.2.1.1.1: GC/CM Environmental Policy:
    • Includes policies and practices that support the health of humans and site-environment during construction;
    • includes a statement to adhere to applicable regulatory/legal requirements.
  - **Reason:** Typical EMS/EHS standard requirements must include commitment to adherence to legal and other requirements, and forms a basis for objectives and targets.
  - **Proposed Response:** Reject, Adherence to applicable legal requirements is standard practice and does not merit earning points.
  - **Subcommittee Consensus:** 4 in favor, none opposed, none abstained

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response.
VOTE: The motion carried with 22 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.
None Opposed
Abstained: Allan Bilka

- **18 – 11. General. 6.2.1.1.2**
  - **Comment:** Consider adding a clause or bulleted item to clause 6.2.1.1.2 which requires setting appropraite degree of self-auditing ot ensure policies and practices are being met.
  - **Reason:** None Given
  - **Proposed Response:** Reject. This issue was addressed with response to Comment # 11 – 8.
  - **Subcommittee Consensus:** 4 in favor, none opposed, none abstained

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response.
VOTE: The motion carried with 23 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.
None Opposed
None Abstained

Indoor Environmental Quality
Presented by Subcommittee Vice Chair Chris Dixon

- **3 – 1. Substantive. 11.5.4**
  - **Comment:** ~~**11.5.4.1** Reverberation Time (RT) in quiet areas and all other areas where speech intelligibility is important does not exceed the following values as applicable:~~
    ~~• Offices: 0.6 to 0.8 seconds;~~
    ~~• School classrooms: 0.4 to 0.6 seconds;~~

~~• Presentation spaces (conference rooms, training rooms, etc.): 0.4 to 0.6 seconds; and~~
~~• All other spaces: 1.5 seconds.~~

11.5.4 Reverberation Time or Ceiling Noise Reduction Coefficient (NRC)[1]

11.5.4.1 Either the reverberation time of the room (RT) or the Noise Reduction Coefficient1 (NRC) rating of the ceiling complies with the following values.

• Offices (enclosed): RT 0.6 seconds or NRC 0.75
• Offices (open): RT 0.4 seconds or NRC 0.90
• School classrooms: RT 0.6 seconds or NRC 0.80
• Presentation and meeting spaces: RT 0.5 seconds or NRC 0.80
• Healthcare:
• Patient/resident care areas: 0.5 seconds or NRC 0.90
• Medication safety zones: 0.5 seconds or NRC 0.90
• Exam/treatment rooms: 0.5 seconds or NRC 0.90
• Activity/waiting areas: 1.5 seconds or NRC 0.75
• Music Rooms:
• Performance: 1.8 seconds
• Rehearsal (large group): 1.5 seconds
• Practice (individual or small group): 1.0 second
• All other spaces where speech intelligibility, concentration, privacy or sleep/relaxation is required: RT 1.0 seconds or NRC 0.80.

[1.] A prerequisite of using the ceiling Noise Reduction Coefficient criterion instead of the reverberation time criterion is that the average ceiling height in the room or space is not greater than 12 feet above the finish floor. If the average ceiling height exceeds 12 feet, the reverberation

- **Reason:** The proposed changes are based on the following:
  1. Healthcare specific spaces are not listed. A reverberation time of 1.5 seconds (as currently indicated) implies that there is not enough sound absorption in the room to provide patients and elder- residents auditory privacy, to reduce noise for undisturbed sleep, relaxation and healing and to safely and accurately work with medications. *Therefore we have added healthcare specific spaces to the list.*

  2. The section description says "not to exceed value", yet a range of values is given. This contradiction could confuse users of the protocol, making them think that there is a range within which the actual value must fall in order to comply with the protocol. *Therefore we have provided a single, not-to exceed, value by striking out the lower part of the current range.*

  3. In many spaces such as corridors, open office areas, nurses' stations, etc. that do not have boundary walls and the proportions to setup a reverberant field, the use of reverberation time as a metric is not advisable. In other simple, enclosed rooms such as classrooms, gymnasiums, etc. reverberation time is a good metric to use. In many rooms, areas and spaces, especially in healthcare facilities, the primary sound absorption is provided by the ceiling. Wall and floor absorption is not used as frequently because of maintenance concerns the potential relationship between porous materials and the transmission of infectious pathogens. The ceiling(s) being the only sound- absorptive surface is

common in other types of facilities too, especially in sustainable designs where carpeting is used less frequently.

It is extremely time consuming and laborious to calculate or measure reverberation time in every room of a facility to check compliance with the protocol. We dare to suggest that in many cases people are not able to do all these calculations and measurements. A more efficient metric to use in many cases is the ceiling Noise Reduction Coefficient (NRC) rating. *We propose adding ceiling Noise Reduction Coefficient as an alternate means of showing compliance when the average ceiling height is less than 12 feet above the finish floor.* Yet, we do not propose this alternate method for all room types. In some cases, reverberation time should be the only available metric for compliance with the protocol.

Implementing this proposed revision will mean that both the designer and the assessor can very efficiently check compliance for many (not all) rooms simply by reviewing the finish schedule and specifications for the ceiling Noise Reduction Coefficient. For other more critical rooms, they will still need to calculate reverberation time.

The ceiling Noise Reduction Coefficients proposed are based on various sources. For offices, they are based on the GSA P100 Standard for Federal Office Buildings (2010). For schools, they are based on ANSI/ASA S12.60. For healthcare, they are based on Evidence Based Design from The Center for Health Design. Applicable excerpts have been attached.

Note: Please note that the basic concept of using both reverberation time and ceiling NRC is already in place in other standards and guidelines. Refer to AS-NZS 2107 as an example.

- **Proposed Response:** Accept as Modified. Music Rooms and related subparagraphs were omitted. Acoustic performance of these types of spaces varies greatly depending on the type of music being played, and room size and configuration. It is not uncommon for these types of spaces to have the ability to change the acoustic characteristics depending on the need. We also included Healthcare spaces.

  11.5.4.1 Either the maximum reverberation time of the room (RT) or the minimum Noise Reduction Coefficient (NRC) rating of the ceiling complies with the following values:

  Offices:
  • Offices (enclosed): RT 0.6 seconds or NRC 0.75
  • Offices (open): RT 0.4 seconds or NRC 0.90

  Schools:
  • School classrooms: RT 0.6 seconds or NRC 0.80
  • Presentation and meeting spaces: RT 0.5 seconds or NRC 0.80

  Healthcare:
  • Patient/resident care areas: RT 0.5 seconds or NRC 0.90

• Medication safety zones: RT 0.5 seconds or NRC 0.90
• Exam/treatment rooms: RT 0.5 seconds or NRC 0.90
• Activity/waiting areas: RT 1.5 seconds or NRC 0.75

Other:
All other spaces where speech intelligibility, concentration, privacy or sleep/relaxation is required: RT 1.0 seconds or NRC 0.80.

- [1.] If the average ceiling height exceeds 12 feet, the reverberation time compliance path must be used, the NRC compliance path is not permitted. If wall or floor absorption is present, the reverberation time compliance path may permit ceilings with lower NRC values.

- **Subcommittee Vote:** 8 in favor, none opposed, none abstained.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response.
Discussion took place on the motion:

- The question was raised whether the Standard is going to start referencing the "Well Building Standard". This might be a dangerous precedent.
  - That should be spelled WELL

AMENDMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to remove the language in parenthesis in the second bullet under "offices" and the first bullet under "healthcare". No Objections were raised to the amendment.

Discussion took place on the Amended Motion:

- A question was raised regarding the Standard listing specific reverberation times, because in order to earn these points, teams may be required to hire an acoustic expert or would it be typical for architects to do these tests.
  - One architect on the line stated that typically in their experience, they hire an acoustical consultant. There is an option in the Standard to do the calculations themselves or offer a prescriptive option of carpets.

VOTE: The amended motion carried with 20 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.
None Opposed
Abstained: Jeff Bradley

- **24 – 17. Substantive. 10.2.1.2 & 11.2.1.3 & 11.2.1.4**
  - **Comment:** ANSI / BIFMA e3-2014
  - **Reason:** At no point in this standard does it indicate what version of the Furniture Sustainability Standard is intended.
  - **Proposed Response:** Accept.
  - **Subcommittee Vote:** 8 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 years are included in References Section 12, not where it's used in the body of the Standard. The proper response is to acknowledge it will be added to Section 12.
- A suggestion was made to accept the year and make an editorial change later for document consistency than to table the vote on a response to the commenter.
- Clarification was provided that E3 doesn't change, just the year changes.
- Sentiments echoed that version is the year and change the location.

AMENDMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to change the response to "Accept. We will include the document date in Chapter 12. No objections were raised to the amendment.

VOTE: The amended motion carried with 22 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.
None Opposed
None Abstained

- **No Comment #. This change was proposed by the Subcommittee**
  - **Subcommittee Proposal:** Allocate 2 open points from struck credit to the four credits that currently have half points so that each credit is worth 1 whole point.
  - **Subcommittee Vote:** 9 in favor, none opposed, 1 abstained

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the Subcommittee's recommendation.
Discussion took place on the motion:

- A participant speaking in favor of the motion provided background information stating it was discussed on a recent call that the points added in this credit came from the Sound-masking credit. On the last Subcommittee call there was discussion about allocating the points to half points to make those credits have whole number points values vs. allocating one additional point to the Non-smoking credit, as discussed at the Chicago meeting. Another speaker agreed with the above sentiment stating they were opposed to this motion and in favor of allocating the point to the Non-smoking credit as previously discussed.

VOTE: The motion carried with 15 in favor, 5 opposed and 1 abstained.

Opposed: Allan Bilka, Angela Tin, Don Horn, Karen Joslin, Thomas Pape
Abstained: Jeff Bradley, Malee Kaolawanich

- **52 – 61. Substantive. 11.1.1.2**
  - **Comment:** Second bullet item, revise the ASHRAE Standard to the most current edition: ANSI/ASHRAE Standard-2013
  - **Reason:** For consistency with preceding section 11.1.1.1.
  - **Proposed Response:** Accept.
  - **Note:** Overlooked Comment, caught at last minute, worked by Subcommittee Chair.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response.
Discussion took place on the motion:

- A question was raised whether the text in the body should be moved to Section 12.
- It was stated staff will be able to address location of references on an editorial basis.

VOTE: The motion carried with 20 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstained.
None Opposed
Abstained: Don Horn and Thomas Pape

NOTE: Clarification was requested that the Consensus Body can assume GBI staff will move all the dates within the Standard to Section 12 so the Consensus Body no longer needs to discuss this topic. This was verified to be correct.

Energy Subcommittee:
Presented by Subcommittee member, Gary Keclik.

- **36 – 16. Editorial. 8.6.1.1**
  - **Comment:** Define "areas of the project".

- **Reason:** Requirement is unclear.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept with modification. Making the credit worth 5 points and adding the following language to the credit: "The Study must consider an on-site renewable energy system that provides at least 2% of the total building annual energy usage." This Eliminates ambiguity and simplifies the credit.

Updated proposed response from Gary Keclik: Accept with modification, making the credit 5 points adding the following language: "The Study must consider an on-site renewable energy system that provides at least 2% of the total building annual energy cost." 5 points Reason: Eliminate ambiguity and simply the credit.

- **Subcommittee Vote: PENDING**

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

Discussion took place on the motion:

- Clarification was provided about where the area language was crossed out in the Standard and that this was done to reduce ambiguity.
- Clarification was provided that the intention of the vote is to clean up the credit to clearly give guidelines needed to earn the credit.

VOTE: The motion carried with 19 in favor, 2 opposed, and 1 abstained.

Opposed: Rachel Minnery, Thomas Pape

Abstained: Malee Kaolawanich

Repeat Comments Section Presented by Chair, Mike Lehman

- **18 – 15. Substantive. 11.2.1**
  - **Comment:** Consider adding requirements for composite wood panels (i.e. particleboard, MDF/HDF): Provide documenation indicating compliance with California Air Resources Board (CARB) Airborne Toxic Control Measures (ATCM) 93120
    Accepted third party cerfiers are listed on this CARB website link:
    http://www.arb.ca.gov/toxics/compwood/listofpcs.htm
    List of certified mills are also listed on the CARB website link:
    http://www.arv.ca.gov/toxics/compwood/tpc/listofmills.htm
    List of NAF/ULEF mills are listed on this CARB website link:
    http://www.arb.ca.gov/toxics/compwood/naf_ulef.htm
  - **Reason:** Adding this clause would clarify requirements for scenarios where composite panels are used on their own, and not as part of an article or finished product which would require other specific testing per the standard.
  - **Response on Similar Comment (11 – 14):** Accept with Modification. the language was not appropriately worded for the standard. Table 11.2.1.3: Interior Product VOC Emissions
    [Suggestion for modification of Column 2 in Table 11.2.1.3 to additionally require compliance with CARB/ATCM for products contributing to credits for floors/floor coverings, ceiling systems and wall systems]
    VOC Emissions Criteria
    To determine acceptability of the emission results, VOC building concentrations are estimated for the Standard Private Office Scenario in CDPH Standard Method V1.1 Tables 4.4 and 4.5 and are compared to the maximum allowable concentrations in CDPH Standard Method V1.1, Table 4.1. ~~does~~ Modeled concentrations shall not exceed the maximum allowable concentrations. Additionally, floors/floor coverings, ceiling systems and wall systems categories made with nonstructural composite wood and composite wood cores (particleboard, MDF, and hardwood plywood) shall be compliant with the

California Air Resources Board Airborne Toxic Control Measure (CARB/ATCM) to control formaldehyde emissions from composite wood (Sections 93120-93120.12, Title 17, California Code of Regulations).

[Documentation requirement for CARB/ATCM – Place as last sentence in Section 11.2.1.3]
For products containing composite wood, provide copies of product labels, chain-of-custody records, or documentation demonstrating compliance with the CARB/ATCM formaldehyde regulation.

- **18 – 6. Editorial. 5.1**
  - **Comment:** Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs): One REC is issued for each wegawatt-hour (MWh) unit of renewable electricity produced. ~~The~~ Electricity that ~~was~~ is split from the REC is no longer considered "Renewable" and ~~is~~ cannot be counted as renewable or zero-emissions by ~~whoever buys it~~ the purchaser.
  - **Reason:** None Given
  - **Response on Similar Comment (11 – 3):** Accept.
- **18 – 7. General. 5.2**
  - **Comment:** add: EPD - Environmental Product Declaration, TPC - Third Party Certifier
  - **Reason:** None Given
  - **Response on Similar Comment (11 – 4):** Reject. EPD is never used alone and TPC is not used anywhere in the document including in additions made based on other comments.
- **18 – 8. Substantive. 6.1.2.1**
  - **Comment:** Consider adding the following to the list of job functions/groups recognized for involvement in the integrated design process:
    • Certified Green Globes Professional (GGP)
    • Guiding Principles Compliance Professional (GPCP), where applicable.
  - **Reason:** The addition of GBI certified professionals encourages and promotes engagement of the rating system and adds value to the certification process.
  - **Response on Similar Comment (11 – 5):** Accept with Modification. The committee added “Sustainability Consultant” to the list. The committee doesn’t want to limit who can count as a sustainability consultant.
- **18 – 9. General. 6.2.1**
  - **Comment:** Replace ~~"Environmental Management System (EMS)"~~ with "Environmental, Health and Safety Management System"
  - **Reason:** The scope of the requirements of this section extend beyond an EMS to include employee health and safety requirements.
  - **Response on Similar Comment (11 – 6):** Reject. EMS is commonly accepted terminology.
- **42 – 6. Substantive. 9.6.1**
  - **Comment:** 9.6.1.1 Maximum = ~~10~~ 20 points
    Points are earned where a percentage of water for nonpotable uses will be harvested on-site or reclaimed:
    - ~~Ten~~ Twenty points are earned for greater than 75%.
    - ~~Eight~~ Sixteen points are earned for 51-75%.
    - ~~Six~~ Twelve points are earned for 25%-50%.
    - ~~Three~~ Six points are earned for 15%-24%.
    - No points are earned for less than 15%.

9.6.1.2

~~2~~ 4 points

- **Reason:** Use or pre-piping of alternate sources of water for indoor non-potable water would seem to have a significant impact of potable water use than the current point scaling. Use of alternate water, especially harvested rainwater for flushing fixtures, laundry, or other non-potable applications could conserve significant amounts and we recommend doubling the section points to be more in line with the benefit.
- **Response on Similar Comment (57 – 6):** Accept. Noting that points are in flux at this time.

- **57 – 3. General. 9.1**
  - **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
  - **Response: on Similar Comment (42 – 4):** Reject. This is sufficiently covered in the Water Assessment Area and the Consensus Body wants to avoid overlap between rating system Assessment Areas.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed responses to all of the repeat comments.

Discussion took place on the motion:

- Clarification was provided that the person who submitted one of these comments identical to another comment will receive the response generated for the corresponding commenter.
- All comments will be published on the website and commenters will be able to see the similar comments and responses.

VOTE: The motion carried with 19 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstained.

Opposed: Thomas Pape

Abstained: Allan Bilka

-15 minute break from 1:29 PM to 1:46 PM ET-

Whole Documents Section
Presented by Chair Mike Lehman.

- **11 – 15. Substantive. 12.**
  - **Comment:** Add under ISO International Organization of Standards: ISO 14021 — Environmental labels and declarations — Self-declared environmental claims (Type II environmental labeling
  - **Reason:** Referencing ISO 14021 in which "recycle" terms and definitions are consistent with avoids potential confusion with other standards which also provides definitions for these materials (i.e., FSC STD 40-007, Sourcing Reclaimed Materials). The "recycle" definition being used by BSR/GBI 01-201X is consistent with that of ISO 14021.
- **18 – 16. General. 12**
  - **Comment:** Add under International Organization for Standardization (ISO): ISO 14021 Environmental labels and declarations - Self-declared environmental claims (Type II environmental labeling

- **Reason:** Referencing ISO 14021 in which "recycle" terms and definitions are consistent with avoids potential confusion with other standards which also provides definitions for these materials (i.e., FSC STD 40-007, Sourcing Reclaimed Materials). The "recycle" terms and definitions being used by BSR/GBI 01-201X is consistent with that of ISO 14021
- **Proposed Response:** Accept

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response.
Discussion took place on the motion:

- Clarification was requested on why the specific ISO 14021 would be included in Section 12 if it's not referenced.
- Confusion among Consensus Body members on what the commenter is asking to add. Unclear why we are trying to add to the current language.
    - One participant confirmed ISO 14021 is not in Section 12.

SUBSTITUTION: The motion was made and seconded to Substitute the motion as follows: "Reject. The ISO 14021 Standard and all references to it do not appear in the current draft Standard.
Discussion took place on the Substitution:

- Editorial change to change "have been removed from" to "do not appear in".

VOTE: The motion carried with 21 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.
None Opposed
None Abstained

- **18 – 1. General. All**
    - **Comment:** Use of a numbering system is more efficient and provides an "ease of use" for BSR/GBI01-201X which some other green building rating systems have abandoned in recent iterations.
    - **Reason:** None Given
    - **Proposed Response:** Accept as Noted. Thank you for your comment.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response.
Discussion took place on the motion:

- The question was raised if the commenter is saying that the Standard doesn't have a numbering system.
- The use of the numbering system that does not include the date might be the intention of this comment.
- Accept as Noted does not mean the Consensus Body will take action on the comment.

VOTE: The motion carried with 17 in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstained.
Opposed: Thomas Pape
Abstained: Susan GItlin, Don Horn, Malee Kaolawanich.

- **24 – 27. Substantive. 12**
    - **Comment:** "ASA / INC / NCAC Interim Sound and Vibration Design Guidelines for Hospital and Healthcare Facilities, year"
    - **Reason:** Provide the missing year for the guidelines.
    - **Proposed Response:** Accept

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response.
Discussion took place on the motion:

- One participant stated this was discussed during the last meeting, and expressed the belief that this was struck in response to another comment.
    - Staff need to verify if this was struck or if this two separate comments.

SUBSTITION: The motion was made and seconded to Substitute the response as follows: "Reject the comment based on the current reference having been deleted and replaced by Facility Guidelines Healthcare Guidelines."
VOTE: The motion carried with 19 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.
None Opposed
Abstained: Susan Gitlin

- **41 – 1. General. Forward**
    - **Comment:** Specify ~~materials~~ chemical products that have been evaluated by product manufacturers in accordance with NSF/GCI/ANSI 355
    - **Reason:** NSF/GCI/ANSI 355 is intended to evaluate a single chemical product. It is not (to my understanding) intended for the certification of multi-chemical materials. Recommendation, change "material" to "chemical product". How can partially completed 355 assessments be acceptable if they are not allowed for the 355 standard itself? Could the 355 report be self-declared or must it be independtly verified? You may want to eliminate language which implies certification to NSF 355 if you intend only the use of a subset of data report elements. Alternatively, if you prefer the term certification, you may wish to work with the 355 JC, to update the standard to allow for certification only to certain sections of the standard.
    - **Proposed Response: PENDING**
    - **Note from Staff:** The following is a direct quote from the Standard, *"Note that the information contained in this Foreword is not part of this Standard. It does not contain requirements necessary for conformance to the Standard. The Foreword is not subject to public review."*

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to respond "Thank you for your comment. We appreciate the feedback, however the Forward was not subject to Public Comments.".
VOTE: The motion carried with 18 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.
None Opposed
Abstained: Allan Bilka

- **43 – 1. Substantive. 1**
    - **Comment:** Change "sustainable buildings" to "green buildings".
    - **Reason:** Buildings meeting this standard and other green standards are generally not sustainable but are what we call green. Even the title of this standard uses the word green.
    - **Proposed Response: PENDING**

Discussion took place before the motion:
- One speaker made the point that sustainable means it doesn't impact the environment at all.
- Another stated the definition for "sustainable" is up for debate. It doesn't necessarily mean no environmental impact and "green" is not a better word to use.
- A participant speaking in favor of using the term "green" stated "Sustainable Buildings" is only used once in the Section. It is also used in the Sustainable Material Attributes section. The point was made these should be dealt with separately.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to Accept as modified. Change "sustainable" in the purpose to "high performance green".
Discussion took place on the motion:

- One person speaking against the motion stated if you disagree with "sustainable", you would not agree with "high performance".
- The point was made that we can't build indefinitely into the future with buildings that would have the maximum Standards, so they're not sustainable.
    - There is nothing in this Standard that definitely proposes a High Performance Building either.
- One participant speaking against the motion stated that while everything can't be sustainable, the term green is too relatable to "greenwashing".

SUBSTITUTION: The motion was made to insert the term "more" in front of "sustainable buildings". No second.

Discussion continued on the original Motion:

- The commenter was at the meeting and speaking in favor of the original motion stated the intent of the comment was to have the language align with the Standard's title.
- A participant suggested the language: "Best Practices related to Sustainable Building Principles. Additionally, these are not all High Performing Green Buildings, but the highest "High Performance Green Building" allows for an assessment of all buildings.

VOTE on original motion: The motion carried with 16 in favor, 2 opposed, and none abstained.
Opposed: 2 Bill Freeman, Karen Joslin
Abstained: none
Reason for Comment Response: The Committee added "high-performance" to further clarify the Purpose.
No Objection was raised to the reason.

- **47 – 1. General. 12.**
    - **Comment:** Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA) ANSI/TIA-4994 Standard for Sustainable Information Communications Technology
    - **Reason:** TIA asks for the inclustion of ANSI/TIA-4994 Standard for Sustainable Information Communciations Technology as an Informational Reference (Section 12. REFERENCES AND GUIDELINES) in the GBI Green Building Assessment Protocol for Commercial Buildings standard. The ANSI/TIA-4994 fully supports the Purpose of BSR/GBI 01-201X in the assessment of commercial buildings relative to best practices for sustainable buildigns because ANSI/TIA-4994 focuses on the information communications technology (ICT) systems that operate within a sustainable buildign and describes and five-phase approach to planning, implementing and measuring the sustainability impact of an ICT project.
    - **Proposed Response: PENDING**
    - **Note from Staff:** This Standard does not appear to be provided as an informational reference in any part of the draft Standard

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response.
Discussion took place on the motion:

- This is asking to include the Standard. This is Reject.

SUBSTITUTION: The motion was made and seconded to Substitute the response to "Reject the comment. The reference is not being added to the Standard at this time."

VOTE: The motion carried with 18 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.
None Opposed
Abstained: Susan Gitlin

- **49 – 32. Editorial. 12.**
  - **Comment:** Why is the Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) Section 438 listed under U.S. Department of Energy? EPA has written guidance on this topic and this reference should be placed underneath the U.S. EPA heading.
  - **Reason:** None Given
  - **Proposed Response:** Accept. Reference shall be moved to the appropriate heading.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response.
Discussion took place on the motion:

- Concern was raised this shouldn't be listed under either agency. It's a law from Congress and should be listed under that. But regardless, EISA shouldn't be referenced. There is a specific EPA document that could be referenced, but EISA itself is not EPA.
- There was a suggestion to offer both EISA under Congress reference and EPA specific document.
- It was stated that discussion feedback will be taken into account, but this needs to stay pertinent to responding to the comment.
- There was clarification on what the motion is and it was determined it should be changed from "accept" to "accept as modified".

SUBSTITUTION: The motion was made and seconded to Substitute the motion as follows: "Accept with modification. Change the reference from EISA Section 438, to Technical Guidance on Implementing the Storm Water Runoff Requirements for Federal Projects 2009 under the EPA Section in the Standard. Located in Stormwater Section (7.4.1.1) under references and in Section 12. This technical guidance provides more useful information to the Standard for users. "

No Objections were raised to the substitution.

VOTE: The motion carried with 18 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.
None Opposed
None Abstained

Updates:
Point Task Committee:

- A proposal is being developed and a task group meeting will be scheduled as soon as possible. A report and/or proposal will be brought to the Consensus Body once the task group has approved something to report.
- Clarification was provided that Gord Shymko is the Chair of the Points task group.
- Sentiment was expressed that Subcommittees should look at the points within Sections to make sure they are currently where the Subcommittee is satisfied for them to be. This was a motion at the last Consensus Body meeting.
- It was stated that there will be measures in place to ensure the points do add up within Sections.
- Suggestion was made that any more discussion or directing Subcommittees on points should not occur until the Consensus Body hears back from the Points task group.

    - It was stated the Subcommittees know best how to align the points within the Sections.
    - It was explained that the Points task group process is happening in tandem, not consecutively with work by the Subcommittees to prepare the Standard for the second public comment period.
- Clarification was provided on the previous motion at Meeting #23 vs. the intent. A question was raised whether Subcommittees need to wait to get guidance from the Consensus Body pertaining to the recommendation of the Points task group. It was clarified that this is not the case. Subject matter experts in each Subcommittee have worked to weigh points for each Section and can propose their recommendations to the Consensus Body while the Points task group continues to work on a proposal.

Schedule/Timeline:

- Next Points Task Group: TBD
- Next CB Meeting: Friday, October 14th, 2016 12pm ET-3pm ET
- Signed Code of Conduct due by close of business September 30th, 2016 to Maria Woodbury.

Woodbury confirmed that there were no comments remaining for review!

The motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. There were no objections.

--Meeting adjourned: 2:53pm ET--