

Minutes

GBI Consensus Body Meeting #26

BSR/GBI 01-2016

Webinar

Friday, October 14th, 2016 12:00 PM ET to 3:00 PM ET

Attendance:

No	Name	Organization(s)	10-14-16				
1	Gregg Bergmiller	S/L/A/M Collaborative	X				
2	Paul Bertram	Kingspan Insulated Panels, Inc.	X				
3	Allan Bilka	International Code Council	Absent				
4	Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X				
5	William Carroll	American Chemistry Council	X (by Proxy)				
6	Chris Dixon	NBBJ (rep. self)	X				
7	Nicole Dovel-Moore	CTA Architects Engineers	X				
8	Amber Dzikowicz	NSF International	Resigned				
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	Absent				
14	Greg Johnson	Johnson Consulting Services, Greenscape Alliance	X				
15	Karen Joslin	Joslin Consulting	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				
20	Thomas Pape	Alliance for Water Efficiency	X				
21	Tien Peng	National Ready	Absent				

		Mix Concrete Assn.					
22	Jane Rohde	JSR Assoc. Inc., Vinyl Institute	X (by Proxy)				
23	Gord Shymko	G.F. Shymko & Associates, Inc.	X				
24	Kent Sovocool	Southern Nevada Water Authority	X				
25	Steve Strawn	JELD-WEN	Absent				
26	George Thompson	Chemical Compliance Systems, Inc.	X				
27	Angela Tin	American Lung Assn.	Absent				
28	Douglas Tucker	Misubishi Electric Cooling & Heating	Absent				
39	Erika Winters Downey	American Institute of Steel Construction	Absent				
	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			19/29				
Visitors							

	Martha VanGeem	Self (Principal Engineer)	X				
	Dave Panning	BIFMA	X				
	Mike Cudahy	Plastic Pipe and Fittings, Association	X				
Staff/Consultants							
	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				

Friday, October 14th, 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 both fully.

Administrative Items

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

At this meeting no members voted using voting alternates and three voted using proxies (Gord Shymko for David Eldridge, William Freeman for Jane Rohde, and George Thompson for William Carroll)

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 #26. There were none. The Minutes were approved.

Discussion of Public Comments

- **7.4.Substantive. 5.1 Definitions**

- **Comment: salvaged materials:** discarded or unused construction materials or products removed ~~in whole form~~ from a structure or site that have value and can be directly substituted for new materials or products with minimal reprocessing.
- **Reason:** Removal of “whole form” – in some scenarios, products may be removed and trimmed or cut down in order to facilitate removal and/or reprocessing. A 40’ beam would ideally be removed whole but could possibly be trimmed for removal or cut down into a smaller beam.

The addition of “a” in relation to site is to clarify the fact that the salvaged materials may come from either an existing building that was torn down on the current project site or another site. As the definition reads, this is not clear.

- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **NOTE:** Staff discovered that this comment had been matched with the response for 7 – 14 and thus was overlooked when we were checking for comments missing responses. Staff sent this comment to Materials Chair Charles Kibert who drafted the proposed response above. There was not time to consult the Materials Subcommittee on this response.

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

Discussion took place on the motion:

- Concern was raised that the definition of salvaged material was being opened up too broadly and that the intent would be specific to each project team.
 - One speaker stated their opposition with the concern that anything taken from the building would then fit the definition.
 - It was clarified that “can be directly substituted” protects against the previous concerns.
 - Another speaker in opposition to the motion stated 189.1 was worked on extensively and this is not the direction that this comment should go.
 - The suggestion was made to add “or reusable form” to “in whole form” which may address the concerns discussed.

VOTE: The motion carried with 9 in favor, 3 opposed, and 2 abstained.

Opposed: Thomas Pape, Greg Johnson, Don Horn

Abstained: Gord Shymko, David Eldridge, William Freeman, Jane Rohde.

--End of Public Comments--

Subcommittee Reports:

Site Committee:

Chair Gregg Bergmiller reported that the Site Assessment Area is ready for Public Comment.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed point reallocation and send to Second Public Comment.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was concern raised over the point allocation in relation to long term effects vs. short term actions and the weight of points. It was clarified that the Point Task Group is working to address the former concern.
- Concern was voiced about the lack of points for exterior lighting and the long-term impacts there-in.
- It was stated that the Transportation Section is pushing the envelope and should be incentivized.

VOTE: The motion carried with 13 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstained.

Opposed: Nicole Dovel-Moore, Thomas Pape

Abstained: Paul Bertram, Kent Sovocool

Project Management Subcommittee:

Subcommittee Chair Karen Joslin reported that the Subcommittee hopes that, following the inclusion of the new Resilience Section, the Project Management Assessment Area might get more points to allocate. Joslin looks forward to receiving feedback on the new section through the Public Comment Period.

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

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

None Opposed

Abstained: Kent Sovocool

Energy Subcommittee:

Subcommittee Vice Chair Paul Bertram reported that no changes were made to the Energy Points.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the points as shown.

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

None Opposed

Abstained: Kent Sovocool, Susan Gitlin

Water Subcommittee:

Subcommittee Chair Kent Sovocool presented the point reallocation for the Water Assessment Area.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- One member asked for an overarching summary of how the points were reallocated. The Chair presented the changes in more detail.

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

None Opposed

None Abstained

Materials Subcommittee:

Subcommittee Chair Charles Kibert gave a report on the proposed point reallocation for the Materials Assessment Area.

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

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

None Opposed

None Abstained

Indoor Environmental Quality Subcommittee:

Consensus Body Chair and IEQ Subcommittee Chair Mike Lehman relinquished the Consensus Body Chair to Vice Chair of the Consensus Body Charles Kibert, then presented the changes to the IEQ points, stating that the Subcommittee removed all half points.

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

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

None Opposed

None Abstained

Public Comments Responses

Woodbury and Secretariat Assistant Emily Randolph presented the responses to all previously voted public comments as edited for uniformity and consistency.

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to approve the responses.

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

None Opposed

None Abstained

MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to send the Standard out to Second Public Comment.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- Staff clarified that their goal was to have the Standard ready to go out to Public Comment on November 1st, 2016.

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

None Opposed

None Abstained

New Business:

- It was clarified that if the draft Standard does get sent out for Public Comment on the 1st of November, then the Subcommittees will reconvene in the beginning of January, although that is subject to change depending on the number of comments received and how much processing they'll require.
- Concern was raised that starting in early January might not be ideal and that late January would be better. It was clarified that there is no obligatory turnaround time.
- Concern was raised about the public's ability to participate in the Comment Period if it coincided with the holidays.

Schedule/Timeline:

- Woodbury reminded participant to submit their signed Code of Conduct if they haven't done so already.
- The next Consensus Body meeting will be scheduled once an agenda becomes clear.
- Staff stated they have a few more days of work left on the Master Comment Table to anonymize everything and edit approved comments. The comment responses will be sent out to commenters next week. Commenters will have 15 days to respond from release date.
- The Public Comment Period will last 45 days from the date of publication in ANSI Standards Action.
- A letter ballot will be sent to Consensus Body members to gauge where the Consensus Body members stand with the Standard outside of the public comment responding process.

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

--Meeting adjourned: 1:04 PMET--