

Minutes

GBI Consensus Body Meeting #28

BSR/GBI 01-2016

Webinar

Monday, February 13th from 1:00 PM EST to 3:00 PM EST

Attendance:

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

21	Jane Rohde	JSR Assoc. Inc., Vinyl Institute	X (by Proxy)	Absent	X (by Proxy)		
22	Gord Shymko	G.F. Shymko & Associates, Inc.	X	X	Absent		
23	Kent Sovocool	Southern Nevada Water Authority	X	X	X		
24	Steve Strawn	JELD-WEN	Absent	Absent	Absent		
25	George Thompson	Chemical Compliance Systems, Inc.	X	X	X		
26	Angela Tin	American Lung Assn.	Absent	X	X		
27	Douglas Tucker	Misubishi Electric Cooling & Heating	Absent	Absent	X		
Visitors							
	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)		X			
	D'Lane Wisner	D'Lane Wisner (Voting Alternate for William Carroll)					
TOTALS			19/29	18/27	19/27		
Visitors							
	Martha VanGeem	Self (Principal Engineer)	X	X			
	Dave Panning	BIFMA	X	X			
	Mike Cudahy	Plastic Pipe and Fittings, Association	X				
	Candy McNamee	NCI Group		X			
	Ric Doedens	Logison		X	X		
	Lauren Graham	Lawbc			X		
	Jiri Skopek	JLL			X		
Staff/Consultants							
	Michael	Chair	X	X	X		

	Lehman						
	Vicki Worden	Executive Director, GBI					
	Emily Randolph	Secretariat Asst., GBI	X	X	X		
	Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI		X	X		
	Maria Woodbury	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X		
	Kim Goldsworthy	Roberts-Rules Consulting	X	X	X		

Monday, February 13, 2017

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 both fully.

Woodbury reminded members that all are welcome to participate in the discussion provided participants raise their hands. Hands will be called on first come-first serve.

At this meeting no members voted using voting alternates and one member voted using a proxy (George Thompson for Jane Rohde).

Administrative Items

Chair Michael Lehman made his opening comments stating that the meeting would include a discussion of Objections made to First Round Comment Responses as well as some of the Second Round Public Comments Review by Subcommittee Chairs and Vice Chairs.

Lehman asked if there were any objections to approving the minutes from Meeting #27 on February 2nd, 2017..

An editorial change was requested that the date in the minutes be changed from October 13th, 2016 to February 2nd, 2017 to reflect the correct meeting date. Staff made a note to make the change.

There were no objections. The Minutes were approved.

Objections to Consensus Body responses to First Round Comments

The resolved Objections and their resolutions were circulated to the Consensus Body prior to the meeting in compliance with the GBI’s ANSI approved procedures. No further action is necessary to resolve these Objections.

One participant expressed concern that commenters may not have responded with objections due to the possibility they did not receive the email responses from GBI. There was discussion about finding alternative options to verifying the receipt of emails including calling the commenters on the phone or

having alternative emails. Confirmation of receipt of emails is optional for the email recipient and is not a reliable way of determining whether an email was received. Concern was expressed about the amount of time Staff would have to dedicate to such an endeavor as every commenter must be treated equally. Woodbury stated Staff would look into options for the future. Further clarification was provided that only one of the four commenters with objections did not respond to the email. Commenters were contacted using the email address they provided on the comment resolution form.

Objections Currently Unresolved

- **52 - 65. Substantive. 13.**
 - **Comment:** Remove Appendix A
 - **Reason:** Green Globes (and the GBI) is a green building management tool and is not responsible for nor in the position to be experts in risk assessment and associated risk assessment sciences. The tool rewards risk assessment and, as such, is an obvious supporter and advocate for the scientific process of risk assessment. Adding an Appendix dedicated to providing background information on risk assessment is not necessary for the GBI nor the users of Green Globes. Users can achieve points without Appendix A information. There are ample resources (courses, books, professionals) that can provide information on risk assessment methods, data, and sciences to users should they need such assistance. The draft Appendix detracts from the overall aim of the document. In addition, the Appendix contains examples that appear to be reactionary, may be controversial, and are inaccurate statements about risk assessment. The draft contains generalizations and colloquialisms that skew the Appendix toward opinion piece instead of informed, science-based background information.

Examples of specific concerns:

Using an “X” between the terms hazard and exposure implies that risk is a mathematical (multiplicative) relationship; this is not accurate.

We do not know what Paracelsus said or thought about risk assessment. References assigning attribution, such as “According to Paracelsus, the risk from a chemical or product...” and other similar phrases are misleading.

Risk is a probability that depends on the severity of a hazard and the likelihood of exposure to that hazard. This does not seem to be captured in the Appendix.

Examples of acceptable risk and risk minimization that include pregnant women, vaccines, DDT, and food are potentially controversial and detract from the overall point.

Many statements are heavy with generalizations and colloquial language that shows bias. For example, from page 106/112, Chemicals in consumer products (what about other types of products) can be used at minimal risk (to whom? What is minimal? Does it vary depending on population?) through proper engineering controls (what is proper? Who decides?) during manufacture (what about at other product life cycle stages) and by minimizing exposures during use (how), thereby reducing the risk to acceptable levels (what acceptable levels? And to whom?)

Using bold and capital letters to make the point is unprofessional and unnecessary in this document.

- **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted and changes have been implemented in the draft Standard. The Appendix will be removed from the Standard and will be available on the GBI Website and referenced as an informational reference in the Standard. The white Paper will be revised and approved by the Risk Assessment Working Group and Materials Subcommittee.
- **Nature of Objection:** The response only partially responds to the comment and the proposed action may not allow for the use of peer-review and ANSI procedures that are important to scientific documents.
- **Action or Inaction at Issue:** The response notes the following: “The Appendix will be removed from the Standard and will be available on the GBI Website and referenced as an informational reference in the Standard. The white Paper will be revised and approved by the Risk Assessment Working Group and Materials Subcommittee”. While EPA appreciates the removal of Appendix A, our concerns about the content of the white paper remain. We have not yet had a chance to see a revised white paper and therefore it is unclear the degree to which our comments have been addressed. If the document is to be posted on the GBI website and referenced in the standard, then it should be subject to public review. Thus far, as we noted in our comments, it is not clear why GBI would need to, nor that the CB and subcommittees have the necessary expertise to, create a document on the scientific process of risk assessment. Moreover, the posting of the document on the GBI website would signal endorsement of the document by GBI. This legitimizes a document regarding scientific procedures that has not been subject to a peer review.
- **Remedial Action that Would Satisfy:** If the content of Appendix A is to be revised and issued as a separate document, then submit that document to scientific journals for peer review. Once complete, post it on a site other than GBI’s.

Discussion took place before the Motion:

- The question was raised if the removal of Appendix A will have an adverse effect on the Resilience Section. It was clarified that Appendix A was previously stricken from the Standard in response to other public comments. The Objection in question raises a concern about posting the language from Appendix A on the GBI website.
- It was stated in response to a previous concern that Appendix A was intended for use by people not familiar with chemical risk assessments and does not relate to the Resilience Section.
- The concern was reiterated that the content of Appendix A has not been peer-reviewed, further, posting Appendix A as a white paper on the GBI website could be taken as an endorsement of the document.
- It was further clarified that as of now, Appendix A no longer appears, nor is it referenced, in the draft Standard.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to strike the informational reference (Appendix A) and reference to it from the Standard, including informational references and change the response to the commenter by clarifying that adding the white paper to the GBI website is not within the jurisdiction of the Consensus Body.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 17 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.

None Opposed

Abstained: Susan Gitlin

- **Pape. Letter Ballot Negative Reason**

- **Reason or Comment:** there was no explanation as to how conflicting actions by the Consensus Board were resolved in creating the latest draft. There were several instances where the CB took one action on a comment, then later took another conflicting action on a subsequent comment. For example: the CB accepted a section to be deleted, then later accepted a modification to the section previously deleted by CB action. When this occurred, I questioned how this would be resolved when creating the new draft; I was told both actions would be represented in the draft. I disagreed with that policy in that it would add confusion in subsequent reviews and comments to the second draft. Despite my objection, I was assured both actions would be in the draft as an “either or option” in later process. I do not see any such representation of these options. I asked the GBI staff explain how they selected the conflicting actions to be included in this draft. I have not heard a response; therefore vote negative due to insufficient disclosure of staff’s selection process for conflicting CB actions.
- **Revision Requested:** [Left Blank]
- **Action Taken:** Staff has examined the document for these inconsistencies and will present them to the Consensus Body for resolution.

Discussion took place before the Motion:

- The statement was made that there is no mechanism in place to identify these inconsistencies unless it’s brought up in a comment.
- It was stated that the last action taken should stand, as this is how other standards developers handle similar issues.
- The view was expressed that it shouldn’t be the last action taken, but there was no clear approach laid out.
- The suggestion was made that the instances where language is both modified and deleted should be sent back to the appropriate Subcommittee to review individually and determine the next course of action for each instance.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to have the instances of this sent back to the respective Subcommittee for them to decided appropriate course of action.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 18 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.

None Opposed

Abstained: Jeff Bradley

Second Public Comment Period

Water Efficiency

Presented by Subcommittee Chair, Kent Sovocool

- **8 – 4. Editorial. 5.1:**

- **Comment: drip irrigation:** any non-spray, low volume irrigation system utilizing emission devices with a flow rate measured in gallons per hour (gal/hr.) or liters per hour (L/hr.). Low volume irrigation systems are specifically designed to apply small volumes of water slowly at or near the root zone of plants.
- **Reason:** The syntax of the sentence as presented is awkward insofar as the gallons per hour would only be abbreviated gal/hr.; devoid of the L/hr. abbreviation since liters per

hour is not explicitly mentioned. Since there is an international component to this Standard it seems prudent to balance imperial and metric units with equal deference.

- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted and the changes have been implemented in the draft Standard.
- **8 – 8. Editorial. 5.1:**
 - **Comment: potable water:** water that is satisfactory for drinking, culinary, and domestic purposes ~~and~~ that meets the requirements of the authority having jurisdiction.
 - **Reason:** The second *and* in the sentence is unnecessary grammatically.
 - **Recommended Response (From Subcommittee Chair and Vice Chair):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The Consensus Body changed the language to read, “water that meets the requirement of the authority having jurisdiction and that is satisfactory for drinking, culinary, and domestic purposes ~~and that meets the requirements of the authority having jurisdiction~~. This modification was made to provide further clarity to the language.
- **8 – 22. Editorial. 9.1:**
 - **Comment:** ...Points cannot be combined between paths. Select one of the four ~~three~~ pathways below...
 - **Reason:** This clause needs to be updated to reflect the new fourth pathway.
 - **Kent Sovocool. Affirmative. 9.1:**
 - **Comment:** Select one of the ~~three~~ four pathways below. Path D cannot be used for new construction.
 - **Reason:** Substantive. Logical error. The instructions say to select one of three options when there are four.
 - **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted and the changes have been implemented in the draft Standard.
- **14 – 14. Editorial. 9.8.1.1:**
 - **Comment:** *The EPA WaterSense® Water Budget Tool*
 - **Reason:** We suggest this revision to provide consistency with the program name included in the Informational references for the section.
 - **Recommended Response (From Subcommittee Chair and Vice Chair):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. In addition to the proposed change the Consensus Body also changed the language to read, “*The EPA WaterSense Landscape Water Budget Tool.*” This change will be implemented in the criterion, the informational reference, and in the points column to ensure that the complete name of the tool is used. https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/water_budget/

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response for 8-4. 8-8. 8-22. 14-14. Editorial.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was noted in regards to comment 14 – 14 that despite the wording the appears on the EPA website, the word “landscape” is not part of the title.

MOTION TO SEPARATE: The motion was made and seconded to separate comment 14 – 14 from the Motion.

There was no opposition to the Amendment.

VOTE: The Amended Motion carried with 19 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to revise the response to 14 – 14 to accept the comment.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was clarified that the correct EPA title does not appear on the website, however the website is being updated. The correct title does not include “Landscape”.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 18 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

Project Management

Presented by Subcommittee Chair, Karen Joslin

- **14 – 2. Editorial. 5.1:**
 - **Comment: [Integrated design process (IDP):]** a holistic approach to project design and planning where ~~project team members from multiple disciplines work~~ a multidisciplinary team works together throughout the project design and delivery process. It emphasizes goal setting, clear and ongoing communication, attention to detail, and active collaboration among team members with the objective of achieving holistic solutions.
 - **Reason:** The streamlined sentence is easier to read and comprehend.
 - **Recommended Response (From Karen):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The Consensus Body prefers to retain the current level of detail to avoid misinterpretation.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 18 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

None Opposed.

None Abstained.

- **22-20. Substantive. 6.1.2.1:**
 - **Comment:** An integrated design process (~~IDP~~) is employed . . . Job functions involved in the ~~IDP~~ integrated design process include but . . .
 - **Reason:** Delete IDP. IDP is confusing because it means different things in the design and construction industry.
 - **Recommended Response (From Karen):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Integrated design process is written out in the sentence directly preceding to specify the meaning. Using (IDP) signals what it refers to going forward in this document. The abbreviation is also defined in 5.2 Abbreviations on page 21 of the draft Standard.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was stated, in opposition to the motion, that the capitalized IDP should be removed. It was clarified, in favor of the motion, that the definitions used here are consistent with those used industry-wide. IDP is preferred for use in the Standard.
- It was stated that this adds clarity and IDP should be spelled out each of the two times it appears in the Standard.

AMENDMENT: The Amendment was made and seconded to include capitalizing Integrated Design Process.

There was no opposition to the Amendment.

Discussion took place on the Amendment:

- It was clarified that the official definition of Integrated Design Process is included in Section 5.1 of the Standard and the definition of the abbreviation IDP appears in Section 5.2 of the Standard.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 11 in favor, 9 opposed, and 1 abstained.

Opposed: Bill Carol, Chris Dixon, Charles Kibert, Don Horn, Gary Keclik, Greg Johnson, Kent Sovocool, Thomas Pape, Susan Gitlin

Abstained: Allan Bilka

○ **22-23. Editorial. 6.1.2.1:**

- **Comment:** Spell out GMP.
- **Reason:** GMP is not defined.
- **Recommended Response (From Karen):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted and the changes have been made in the draft Standard as follows: “guaranteed maximum price (GMP).” **MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response amended to capitalize Guaranteed Maximum Price.**

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was stated, in opposition to the motion, that it is not essential to capitalize everything and capitalization is inappropriate in this case.
- It was stated that the term should be spelled out without an acronym to limit the number of acronyms used in the Standard.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 16 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstained.

Opposed: Susan Gitlin

Abstained: Thomas Pape

○ **8-16. Substantive. 6.1.2:**

- **Comment:** The math represented in the table in the right hand column wherein points are assigned based on the number of team members involved in each milestone is incorrect.
- **Reason:** The maximum points for this credit was raised to 14 however if an IDP successfully received the maximum number of credits for each milestone as shown in the table, said Team would total 15 (6+3+3+3). Either 1) the maximum number of credits needs to be raised; 2) one of the credit totals in the *Points for 10 Job Functions* needs to be reduced by 1; or 3) a clarifying statement needs to be added whereby the credit is capped at 14 regardless of whether the IDP actually meets the requirements for a higher number.
- **Recommended Response (From Karen):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The points were modified to 5, 3, 3, 3, instead of 6, 3, 3, 3 to maintain the allotted maximum 14 points.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 17 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.

None Opposed.

Abstained: Greg Johnson

○ **21-1. General. 6.1.3.2:**

- **Comment:** How can Building Function Assessment expand on Wind and Seismic Importance and Occupancy Category Factors (IBC , ASCE 7-10, for example).
- **Reason:** Importance categories has embedded in it the rapid recovery or continuity of function of buildings. The section should address this because these factors are required for wind and seismic. What more must be required in the Building Function Assessment?
- **Recommended Response (From Karen):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been considered and while the Consensus Body agrees with the comment in principle, ultimately no changes have been implemented in the draft Standard. Your comment is un-actionable at this time. The Consensus Body encourages you to submit specific proposed revisions during the next review cycle.
- **Note:** It is our intention to invite the commenter to the Resilience meeting.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- Concern was raised about the phrasing of the response.
- It was clarified that, procedurally, no action can be taken on this comment.

AMENDMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to strike the second sentence from the recommended response.

There was opposition to the Amendment:

- Concern was raised that since this is a brand new section, it wasn't available to Public Comment during the first round. The opinion was stated that there should be a different standard for comments addressing entirely new language.

The Amendment was withdrawn with no opposition.

AMENMENT: The amendment was made and seconded to change the recommended response to "Thank you for your comment. Your comment is un-actionable at this time without specific proposed revision. The Consensus Body encourages you to submit during the next review cycle."

There was no opposition to the amendment.

Discussion took place on the Amended Motion:

- The concern was raised that commenters may not realize they need to be so specific in the wording of their comments and that they should have more of an opportunity to work with the Consensus Body.
- Concern was raised that this response is contradictory to historical actions wherein the Consensus Body has responded to comments that did not provide specific language. It was stated that the comment form had been revised to require strikethrough/underline language for proposed revisions.
- It was clarified that this is a general comment and not a substantive comment. General comments don't require specific proposed language.
- It was suggested that this issue could be brought up as New Business

VOTE: The Amended Motion carried with 11 in favor, 4 opposed, and 1 abstained.

Opposed: Allan Bilka, Kent Sovocool, Susan Gitlin, Thomas Pape

Abstained: Tien Peng

It was noted that the maker of the amendment was not opposed to the theory discussed.

- **13 – 4. Substantive. 6.1.4:**

- **Comment: (place within 6.1.2) (move to follow 6.1.2)**
- 6.1.4 Recommended Documentation**
 - Facility performance evaluation;
 - List of written performance and green design goals;
 - Progress meeting agendas, attendance rosters showing function of each attendee, and meeting minutes;
 - Post-occupancy study.
- **Reason:** This section is not in the correct place. It is not related to the section above it, 6.1.3 on resilience. It is related to the section above that, 6.1.2 on integrated design process. Tie this section to 6.1.2 by putting it within 6.1.2.
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The Standard is formatted as follows: Assessment Area, Section, Subsection, Sub-subsection, criteria with the Recommended Documentation appearing as a Subsection at the end of each Section. The Recommended Documentation under most Sections contains documents pertaining to *all* preceding Subsections. While, in this instance, the Recommended Documentation Subsection does not apply to the Subsection (6.1.3) that immediately precedes it, altering its location would make Section 6.1 of the Standard inconsistent with the formatting of the rest of the Standard.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 13 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstained.

None Opposed.

Abstained: Allan Bilka, Kent Sovocool

- **22-25. Substantive. 6.2.1.1.2:**
 - **Comment:** Left column, 3rd bullet: Includes policies and practices ~~that include for~~ continuous reporting mechanism ~~to be reviewed by the assessor.~~
 - **Reason:** Awkward wording. Everything is available for review by the assessor.
 - **Recommended Response (From Karen):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification as follows: “3rd bullet: ~~includes policies and practices that include continuous reporting mechanism to be reviewed by the assessor.~~ including continuous reporting mechanism” This does not apply to the Manager in 6.2.1.1.2. The comment does apply to the Plan in 6.2.1.1.1 and the language has been revised as shown. The modification was made because the comment did not apply to the subcriterion.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- Concern was raised that the revised language proposed in the response does not read properly.

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

There was no opposition to the Amendment.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 13 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstained.

None Opposed.

Abstained: Susan Gitlin, Allan Bilka

○ **22 – 24. Substantive. 6.2.1.1.1:**

- **Comment:** Right column: Two points are earned for documenting the ~~items~~ Environmental Policy listed in 6.2.1.1.1
- **Reason:** There is only one item.
- **Recommended Response (From Karen):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected to maintain consistency listing points awarded in the Section.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was stated that the wording could be changed to clarify the response.
- Clarification was provided on what the wording and two points encompass.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 13 in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstained.

Opposed: Don Horn

Abstained: Jeff Bradley, Kent Sovocool, Thomas Pape

Energy Subcommittee

Presented by Subcommittee Chair David Eldridge

○ **17 – 9. Editorial. 8.3.2.1.1:**

- **Comment:** The control factors from Table 9.6.3 in 90.1-2013 or Table 9.6.2 in 90.1-2010 ~~may be~~ shall be permitted to be used to achieve or exceed LDP targets.
- **Reason:** Permissive language.
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The draft Standard is a voluntary rating system where points are earned, not a code and thus does not incorporate the term “shall” for legal reasons.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended response.

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

Opposed: Thomas Pape

Abstained: Allan Bilka

○ **8 – 21. Editorial. 8.3.2.2.1:**

- **Comment:** ...Lighting control zones consist of up to 25,000 ft. ² (2,322.65 m²) on a single floor.
- **Reason:** This is a rounding issue. When converted to metric units, 25,000 square feet equals 2,322.576 square meters therefore the number should round up.
- **Recommended Response (From Staff):** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted and the changes have been implemented in the draft Standard.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the comment using the recommended response.

VOTE: The Motion carried with 15 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.

None Opposed.

Abstained: Don Horn

New Business:

Woodbury stated that there is no New Business prescheduled on the Agenda.

It was stated that some of the un-actionable comments on the Energy Assessment Area raised good points. Procedurally, these comments can't be acted on since the language they refer to was not subject to public comment. However items that need to be addressed before publication of the Standard may be brought to the Consensus Body as New Business at a future meeting.

- It was requested that when Staff sends out updated documents and materials packets for the meetings that the names be updated, to eliminate version confusion. It was also requested that dates be added to the file names. Woodbury and Randolph stated that they would endeavor to do so in future.

There was no New Business brought forward.

Review Schedule:

Woodbury reviewed the schedule moving forward:

- The letter ballot to elect new Consensus Body members will go out soon. The balloting period is 15 days.
- A doodle poll will go out to schedule a March meeting
- Doodle polls will go out for Subcommittees and Task Groups meetings.
- Staff estimates 24 hours of Consensus Body Meetings and 31 hours of Subcommittee Meetings until the draft can go out to the next Public Comment Period.
- Additionally, GBI staff are preparing for ANSI audits.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded and carried to adjourn the meeting with none opposed and none abstained.

--Meeting adjourned: 2:58 PM ET--