

Minutes (final)

GBI Consensus Body Meeting #7

BSR/GBI 01---201X

Webinar

Tuesday, July 7, 2015 12:00 PM ET to 3:00 PM ET

Attendance:

No	Name	Organization(s)	7-7-15						
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						
5	William Carroll	Occidental Chemical Corp.	X						
Alt	D'Lane Wisner	D'Lane Wisner (Voting Alternate for William Carroll)							
6	Chris Dixon	NBBJ (rep. self)	X						
7	Nicole Dovel--- Moore	CTA Architects Engineers	X						
8	Amber Dzikowicz	NSF International	X						
9	David Eldridge	Grumman/Butkus Assoc.	X						
10	William Freeman	Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X						
11	Don Horn	GSA	X						
Alt:	Lance Davis	GSA (Voting Alternate for Don Horn)							
12	Josh Jacobs	UL Environment	X						
Alt:	Bill Hoffman	UL Environment (Voting Alternate for Josh Jacobs)							
13	Greg Johnson	Johnson Consulting Services, Greenscape Alliance	X						
14	Leslie Kahn	Admin. Office of	Absent						

		the U.S. Courts							
15	Malee Kaolawanich	NIH (rep. self)	X						
16	Rachel Minnery	AIA	Absent						
Alt	Paul Karrer	AIA (Alternate for Rachel Minnery)							
17	Charles Kibert	University of Florida	X						
18	John Koeller	Alliance for Water Efficiency	X						
19	Jennifer Kowalonek	Alfred Benesch & Company	X						
20	Michael Lehman	ConTech Lighting	X						
21	Tien Peng	National Ready Mix Concrete Assn.	X						
22	Bernadette Reyes	Clark Construction Group	Absent						
23	Angela Rivera	URS Corporation (rep. self)	Absent						
24	Jane Rohde	JSR Assoc. Inc., Vinyl Institute	X						
25	Gord Shymko	G.F. Shymko & Associates, In.	X						
26	Julie Sobelman	Independent Consultant	Absent						
27	Kent Sovocool	Southern Nevada Water Authority	X						
28	Steve Strawn	JELD-WEN	X						
29	George Thompson	Chemical Compliance Systems, Inc.	X						
30	Angela Tin	American Lung Assn.	Absent						
Alt	Abby Brokaw	American Lung Assn. (voting Alternate for Angela Tin)							
31	Douglas Tucker	Misubishi Electric Cooling & Heating	X						
32	Erika Winters Downey	American Institute of Steel Construction	X						
TOTALS			26/32						
Visitors									

	Lawrence (Larry) Clark	Sustainable Performance Solutions	X						
	Emily Lorenz	Independent Consultant	X						
	Susan McGlaughlin Gitlin	U.S. EPA	X						
	Kyle Thompson	IAPMO	X						
	Karen Joslin	Joslin Construction Group	X						
	Ric Doedens	K.R. Moeller Associates Ltd.	X						
Staff/Consultants									
	Wayne Trusty	Chair	X						
	Vicki Worden	Executive Director, GBI	X						
	Emily Randolph	Secretariat Asst., GBI	X						
	Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI	X						
	Maria Woodbury	Secretariat, GBI	X						

Tuesday, July 7, 2015

Welcome & Roll Call

Chair, Wayne Trusty, welcomed participants. Roll call established quorum. At this meeting, there were no members voting via proxy or using voting alternates.

The antitrust 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.

Administrative Procedures and Related Matters

The agenda was reviewed and no changes were requested by the Consensus Body.

Trusty asked for a motion on the agenda.

MOTION: A motion was made, seconded and unanimously carried to approve the agenda.

The membership roster was reviewed, noting that it is published online denoting interest categories and the organizations each individual is representing. Woodbury reported no changes to the membership roster.

Trusty asked for a motion on the minutes from the previous meeting.

MOTION: A motion was made, seconded, and carried to approve the minutes from the last Consensus Body Meeting on Thursday, June 11, 2015.

None opposed.

Abstained: Greg Johnson, Josh Jacobs, Steve Strawn

Review Working Draft BSR/GBI 01--201X Subcommittee Reports

Project Management

Because the chair and vice chair were not on the call, Emily Randolph provided a report stating that this section has not changed since the last Consensus Body meeting and that the section is ready for Public Comment.

Site

Gregg Bergmiller reported that the Subcommittee set a minimum percentage of points for the section and has been making small changes in the Stormwater Management criteria. They have been debating between new language and the language that they currently have in the Standard. The Subcommittee changed their minimum points to a percentage from a set point value. This Subcommittee is almost ready for Public Comment.

Energy

David Eldridge reported that the Energy Subcommittee is working on allocating points. They are doing additional work on heat recovery/simultaneous heating and cooling language. They are continuing to review the equivalency of the sections. Eldridge stated that while the Subcommittee has some strong contributors, they could stand to gain additional participation. Eldridge also stated that while the content will be ready for Public Comment, the balancing of the three paths will not be completed until after the Standard goes out for Public Comment.

Water

Kent Sovocool reported that the water section brought points back into 9.1 and restructured 9.1 with three pathways. The Subcommittee set its minimum percentage at 25% and specified that 8 points must come from 9.1. Sovocool stated that they may or may not be ready to go for Public Comment depending on the results of the Consensus Body vote during this meeting.

Materials

Charles Kibert reported that the Materials section is complete except for 10.3 on Risk Assessment. They also recognize that they will need to sort out some issues with 10.3 during the Public Comment period.

Indoor Environment

Michael Lehman reported that the Subcommittee is ready to go out for Public Comment. It was noted that both Indoor Environment and the Water section deal with cooling towers. The Water section deals

with the water used in cooling towers and the Indoor Environment section deals with potential health issues that could be caused by the cooling towers

Review of front end of the document

Section 2. Scope

It was noted that the Scope as currently drafted is not detailed enough. Charles Kibert volunteered to redraft the Scope and circulate to Staff prior to the next meeting.

Section 3. Achievement levels, minimums, non-applicables and third party assessments

The question was raised as to the purpose of setting the threshold for one Green Globes as low as 35%. It was noted that most projects aim for Level 2 or higher. The Standard's threshold of 35% creates incentives for teams to consider all building types and how to make them more sustainable. It was also noted that there is a requirement that you achieve a minimum amount of points in every assessment area and that the Standard doesn't want to eliminate teams that can't go too high in one area, but might encourage them to aim higher on their next project.

One participant noted that 35% is in the middle as some Standards start as high as 40% or as low as 25%.

A question was raised about non-applicables. It was stressed that we don't want to strand points in the non-applicables and that Subcommittees should try to word things to ensure that as many points as possible can be applied to projects.

It was noted that the descriptions of the levels need to be rewritten, specifically removing the word "reserved" from the description of Level 4. Don Horn agreed to redraft and forward suggestions to the Chair.

Minimum Points Per Each Assessment Area

The Chair asked Vicki Worden from GBI to report on the Staff's findings regarding its review of 87 buildings that have achieved Green Globes 2013 certification or have made significant progress toward achieving certification. Worden noted that the Green Globes 2013 rating system incorporates much of the 2010 Standard, in addition to other updates that occurred in the market between 2010 and 2013. It was noted that because the 2013 version and the draft revisions to ANSI/GBI 01 vary substantially, GBI's research/findings may or may not be relevant. They were provided at the request of the ANSI Consensus Body during its last meeting.

Observations shared:

- 20% or under minimums per section may eliminate seven percent (7%) of buildings pursuing Green Globes certification
- 25% or under minimums per section may eliminate thirteen percent (13%) of buildings pursuing Green Globes certification
- 30% or under minimums per section may eliminate twenty-five (25%) of buildings pursuing Green Globes certification

- Overall minimum of 35% of total applicable points to achieve certification would eliminate zero (0) buildings pursuing Green Globescertification

In 2005, many buildings were dual certified to Green Globes and LEED and studies published showed that the four levels of Green Globes equated to the four levels of LEED. Worden stated that since Green Globes 2013 has been updated, several dual certifications have occurred and show they are still comparable but Green Globes thresholds may now be more stringent than LEED 2009 because buildings that achieved LEED Platinum have only achieved Three Green Globes. Worden noted that there have not yet been any Four Green Globes buildings certified through the 2013 version of the rating system.

Worden reviewed the average applicable points achieved in each assessment area under the 2013 rating system. She then reviewed the average percentage of applicable points achieved for One, Two, and Three Green Globes achievements:

- One Green Globes buildings – achieved average 44.8% of applicable points
- Two Green Globes buildings – achieved average of 59.8% of applicable points
- Three Green Globes buildings – achieved average of 73.3% of applicable points
- Four Green Globes – no buildings have yet achieved Four Green Globes under 2013 Green Globes rating system

Worden also reviewed the statistics on WaterSense plumbing fixtures and what types of buildings indicated they were not pursuing those points. The Water Subcommittee representatives on the call deemed those statistics not relevant to the discussion today.

It was noted that GBI should consider researching what are the performance achievements of each category of building (e.g., One Green Globes vs. Two Green Globes vs. Three Green Globes) and that it would be of interest to learn what Three Green Globes buildings have in common on key performance indicators.

Worden noted in a final comment that GBI is interested in developing a pilot based on the revised GBI 01 Standard that could feed applied information into the review process for the benefit of the Consensus Body in their deliberations.

Before taking motions on the minimum points per assessment area, the Chair returned the attention of the Consensus Body to the issue of the overall minimum percentage of points required for compliance with the Standard.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the ranges for all four levels as they appear (i.e., with 35% as the lowest threshold for achieving Level 1 compliance) in Table 1 of Section 3.1 Achievement Levels. Motion carried with 21 in favor, 3 opposed, and 1 abstain.

Opposed: John Koeller, Don Horn, Jane Rohde

Abstained: Amber Dzikowicz

The Consensus Body then discussed minimum percentages as suggested by the Subcommittees.

Minimum percentages as presented by the Subcommittees:

- Project Management: 50% of applicable points
- Site: 25% of applicable points

- Energy: 35% of applicable points
- Water Efficiency: 25% of applicable points
- Materials and Resources: 20% of applicable points
- Indoor Environment: 35% of applicable points

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept point minimums as presented by the Subcommittees.

Discussion took place on the motion:

- It was stated that the minimum percentages need to be simplified and that there should be 1 number across all the assessment areas. It was noted that when creating minimums it's important to ask if it's feasible for every building to comply with that minimum and the answer is different for every section. The question was asked about the reasoning for having a minimum of 50% in Project Management. It was stated that Project Management has the least amount of points and that the Subcommittee wanted to incentivize the things that weren't easy to get such as commissioning. It was noted that the section is quite small and there aren't a lot of parts to it. The thought was to strengthen the content by setting a higher minimum.
- Some members stated that they were comfortable with having different minimums for each section.
- It was stated that some projects begin the rating process later and are unable to meet some of the Integrated Design Process requirements in the Project Management section but have excellent sustainability features. It was stressed that the Standard should be about outcome, not process.
- Some members stated that they trusted the Subcommittees to have come up with appropriate minimums and that perhaps those who weren't involved in the discussions would have difficulty commenting on the validity of these minimums.
- Concern was raised about setting the minimum for Materials at 20%, stating that this is too low and not in keeping with a holistic approach. It was stated that 20% was chosen for materials because of the innovations in the section.
- One member stated that they are opposed to having minimums at all as they limit innovation.
- It was asked if the motion could be modified to set aside a decision on the Project Management minimum percentage pending further investigation and analysis.

Motion was amended to modify the minimum for Project Management from 50% to 25%, leaving the other sections as present. The original seconder withdrew second. Another member seconded the amendment.

Motion failed with 5 in favor and 20 opposed.

Opposed: Charles Kibert, Tien Peng, Steve Strawn, John Koeller, Doug Tucker, Gord Shymko, Josh Jacobs, Jeff Bradley, Mike Lehman, Greg Johnson, Paul Bertram, Bill Freeman, Amber Dzikowicz, Nicole Dovel--- Moore, Don Horn, Bill Carrol, George Thompson, Jennifer Kowalonek, Allan Bilka, Jane Rohde.

No abstentions.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the minimum percentages as presented.

Discussion on the motion took place:

- It was noted that the minimum for Project Management had carried over from the 2010 Standard and that it was not necessarily a statistically developed number.

Motion failed with 10 in favor and 15 opposed.

Opposed: Charles Kibert, Gord Shymko, Jeff Bradley, Erika Winters---Downey, David Eldridge, Mike Lehman, Greg Johnson, Paul Bertram, Bill Freeman, Nicole Dovel---Moore, Bill Carrol, Chris Dixon, George Thompson, Jennifer Kowalonek, Jane Rohde.

No abstentions.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to set point minimums at 20% for all sections.

Discussion took place on the motion:

- It was stated that this seems like a reasonable compromise. One member noted that it was politically correct but not realistic, pointing out that following 1 path in the Energy section earns 35% of the points in Energy. The thought was proposed that perhaps there should be a motion to strike point minimums from the Standard if this motion fails.
- The Secretariat Assistant reminded the Consensus Body that in a previous meeting a motion had successfully carried to include point minimums in the Standard and that motions to set the minimums for all sections at 35% and 15% both failed.

Motion carried with 15 in favor, 6 opposed, and 3 abstained.

Opposed: Tien Peng, Steve Strawn, Paul Bertram, Nicole Dovel---Moore, Jennifer Kowalonek, Jane Rohde
Abstained: Gord Shymko, Josh Jacobs, Doug Tucker.

Subsection Minimums

Proposed Subsection Minimums were then discussed as:

- Site: 8 points must be earned in 7.4 Stormwater Management
- Water: 8 points must be earned in 9.1 Indoor Domestic Plumbing

Some members expressed that they are uncomfortable with having subsection minimums as only two sections, Site and Water, defined subsection minimums, which lacks consistency.

It was reiterated that having subsection minimums is dangerously close to having prerequisites and that either all sections should have subsection minimums or there shouldn't be any subsection minimums at all.

It was suggested that as there were only fifteen minutes remaining for the meeting and that this subject should be tabled until the next meeting.

Future Meetings-

Woodbury reviewed the schedule for upcoming meetings and noted that there is one more meeting currently scheduled prior to the projected public comment period. The last meeting prior to the public comment period will include a vote to move the document into public comment. This period is tentatively slated to begin on August 12, 2015 and will last 45 days. There will be an in---person meeting scheduled for some time late October or November following the public comment period and after the Secretariat has processed the comments and Subcommittees have met to craft proposed responses to each comment for presentation to the Consensus Body. The date and location for the in---person meeting has yet to be decided.

Schedule/Timeline:

- CB Call/Meeting #8 – July 29 – 12:00 Noon to 3:00 pm ET

- Public Comment Period (projected) – start August 12th
- Approx. Sept 30 – Public Comments returned
- Week of Nov 9th or 16th – in-person meeting (It was noted that these weeks could conflict with other events. Staff will poll for a wider time period.)

Adjournment

MOTION: A motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 2:48 pm ET.