



**MINUTES**

GBI Consensus Body for Existing Buildings- Call #8  
 Webinar/Teleconference  
 September 20, 2022, from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. ET

**NOTE ALL TIMES ARE EASTERN TIME**

**Consensus Body for Existing Buildings Members in Attendance**

Full Name	Organization	9/20/22	11/17/21	11/15/21	10/25/21	10/14/21
Benjamin Bojda	Dominion Environmental Consultants NV, Inc	X	X (Proxy Cole)	X	X	X
Larry Clark	Sustainable Performance Solutions	X	X (Proxy Shymko)	X (Proxy Shymko)	X	Absent
Michael Cudahy	PPFA - PPEF	X (left early)	X	X	X	Absent
Lawrence (Buddy) Humphries (Chair)	Efficient Green, LLC	X	X	X	X	X
Christoph Lohr	IAPMO	Absent	Absent	X	X (Proxy Zatz)	Absent
Max Puchtel	American Institute of Steel Construction	X	Absent	X	Absent	X
Dave Ray	GRN Vision	X	Absent	Absent	Absent	X
Benjamin Reeves	Arete Design Group	X (Proxy Shymko)	X (Proxy Sullivan)	X	X (Proxy Shymko)	Absent
Jane Rohde	JSR Associates, Inc., The Vinyl Institute / Resilient Floor Covering Institute	X	X (Proxy Cudahy)	X (Proxy Cudahy)	Absent	X
Anthony Serres	Signify North America Corporation	Absent	X	X	X	Absent
Gord Shymko	G. F. Shymko & Associates Inc.	X	X	X	X	X
Frank Sullivan	Kiewit	X	X	X	X	Absent
Michael Zatz	ENERGY STAR Commercial & Industrial Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	X	X	X	X	X

**Voting Alternates in Attendance**

Full Name	Organization	9/20/22	11/17/21	11/15/21	10/25/21	10/14/20
Dan Cole	IAPMO		X			
John Mullen	IAPMO	X				

**Interested Parties in Attendance**

Full Name	Organization	9/20/22	11/17/21	11/15/21	10/25/21	10/14/20
Rob Brooks	Rob Brooks Associates			X		
Randolph Chapman	EPA's Indoor Environments Division	X				
Soph Davenberry	Independent Consultant		X	X		
Larry Eisenberg	Ovus Partners 360	X				
Josh Jacobs	WAP Sustainability		X			
Viken Koukounian	K.R. Moeller Associates Ltd.	X				
James O'Brien	Independent Environmental Consultant		X	X	X	

**Staff in Attendance**

Full Name	Organization	9/20/22	11/17/21	11/15/21	10/25/21	10/14/21
Emily Marx	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X	X	X
Joseph Granada	Staff, GBI		X	X	X	X
Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI	X		X	X	X
Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI		X	X	X	X
Aparna Varadharajan	Staff, GBI	X	X	X	X	X

**Roll Call**

Secretariat Emily Marx took roll call to establish quorum, reviewed the GBI Anti-Trust Policy, Code of Conduct policy and notified participants that the call was being recorded for the purpose of preparing minutes. No objections or concerns were raised. She asked if any guests or interested parties wanted to discuss any specific comment or topic. No interested party noted an item they wanted to discuss.

**Administrative Items**

Chair Lawrence Humphries thanked everyone for attending the meeting. He reviewed the agenda and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were no comments or concerns.

**MOTION: A Motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously to approve the Agenda as presented.**

Humphries also reviewed the minutes from meeting #7 on November 17, 2021, and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were no comments or concerns.

**MOTION: A Motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from meeting #7 on November 17, 2021, as presented.**

**Front End Public Comment Review**

The Secretariat reviewed two editorial revisions recommended for the draft standard.

## EBPoints-201-2

### Proposed Revision: TABLE III

Justifications for Use of Not Applicable Criteria

**Reason:** Should be Table III

### Discussion took place on the Editorial Revision:

- There were no objections to the editorial revision.

## EBPoints-201-3

**Proposed Revision:** • ~~65~~ Sixty-five points are earned for a standing of  $\geq 90\%$ .

**Reason:** Spell out all points in all hierarchy areas for consistency

### Discussion took place on the Editorial Revision:

- There were no objections to the editorial revision.

## ESG Public Comment Review

The ESG Task Group Chair reviewed each public comment or item of new business and the reasons why the action is recommended before a motion took place.

## EB201-2 & EB202 -1

**EB201-2 Public Comment:** Resilience “the ability to withstand and recover rapidly from adverse events ~~and to adapt to changing environmental conditions.~~”

Add a new definition for adaptation:

Adjustment in natural or human systems to a new or changing environment that exploits beneficial opportunities or moderates negative effects.

**EB201-2 Reason:** Adaptation is distinct from resilience; while there is overlap, they have different goals and require different strategies. Suggest removing “to adapt to changing environmental conditions” from the definition for resilience and adding a definition for adaptation. The National Climate Assessment defines adaptation as “Adjustment in natural or human systems to a new or changing environment that exploits beneficial opportunities or moderates negative effects.”

Christopher Flavelle in the New York Times (“Searching for Hidden Meaning in Climate Jargon,” 10/31/21) differentiates between the two this way:

“[Adaptation] is sometimes used interchangeably with resilience, but the terms have important differences. Resilience means maintaining a way of life, but with better protection; adaptation means changing a way of life that is becoming too hard to sustain. Think of protecting a beach town from hurricanes with a seawall (resilience), versus helping people move somewhere else (adaptation).”

**EB201-2 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The proposed definition expands the intent of the criteria, and the definition is not compatible with the use of the term within the draft standard.

**EB202 -1 Public Comment:** Resilience “the ability to withstand and recover rapidly from adverse events ~~and to adapt to changing environmental conditions.~~”

Add a new definition for adaptation:

Adjustment in natural or human systems to a new or changing environment that exploits beneficial opportunities or moderates negative effects.

**EB202 -1 Reason:** Adaptation is distinct from resilience; while there is overlap, they have different goals and require different strategies. Suggest removing “to adapt to changing environmental conditions” from the definition for resilience and adding a definition for adaptation. The National Climate Assessment defines adaptation as “Adjustment in natural or human systems to a new or changing environment that exploits

beneficial opportunities or moderates negative effects.”

Christopher Flavelle in the New York Times (“Searching for Hidden Meaning in Climate Jargon,” 10/31/21) differentiates between the two this way:

“[Adaptation] is sometimes used interchangeably with resilience, but the terms have important differences. Resilience means maintaining a way of life, but with better protection; adaptation means changing a way of life that is becoming too hard to sustain. Think of protecting a beach town from hurricanes with a seawall (resilience), versus helping people move somewhere else (adaptation).”

**EB202 -1 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The proposed definition expands the intent of the criteria, and the definition is not compatible with the use of the term within the draft standard.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comments and reply with the proposed responses for EB201-2 and EB202 -1.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

#### **EBESG-202**

**Proposed Revision:** resilience: the ability to withstand and recover rapidly from adverse events and ~~to~~ adapt to or cope with changing environmental conditions.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

#### **EBESG-201**

**Proposed Revision:** Maximum = 7 points

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

#### **EB202-2**

**Public Comment:** 1.1.2.2 There is reoccurring training received by facility staff members that includes updates about building operations and energy conservation measures implemented and recorded as well as the protection of historic and cultural resources.

**Reason:** There is no mention of historic preservation in this standard. Integrated Design and Management, one of the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Federal Buildings, requires federal agencies to protect all historic and cultural resources in the operation and maintenance of buildings. As this standard does not mention historic preservation at all, federal agencies would not be able to use this standard to assess whether they meet one of the federal government's building performance requirements.

**Original Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The criteria language has been modified as follows:

1.1.2.2 There is reoccurring training received by facility staff members that includes updates about building operations and energy conservation measures implemented and recorded, as well as the awareness of protection of historic and cultural resources.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed response.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was a question of whether ‘historic and cultural’ aspects were within the scope of GBI.
- It was argued that the addition is too specific.
- It was noted that ‘as well as’ should be replaced with ‘including.’
- There was discussion about various jurisdictional requirements for the resources included in the revision.

**WITHDRAWN: The motion and second to accept with modification was withdrawn.**

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and respond with the proposed response to the commenter.**

**Final Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected because compliance with federal and/or jurisdictional historical requirements is an implicit obligation for any project and citing it specifically within the draft standard is unnecessary.

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- It was noted that historical requirements are implicit with any project and citing it within specific GBI criteria is not necessary.
- The reason submitted by the commenter was reviewed and there was confusion on their intent.
- It was asked how LEED deals with historical and cultural resources within their rating system.
- It was argued that a federal agency can complete the criteria because the criteria is on facility staff training.
- A reason to the commenter was developed.
- It was noted that if it is true that this is needed to be included within the draft standard for federal agency use, then it should be included within the front pages of the standard and not within specific criteria.
- It was also asked if this is included within guiding principles and if so, then GBI has already responded to this issue.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

**EB201-3 & EB202-3**

**EB201-3 Public Comment:** 1.2.1 Risk Assessment ~~& Facility Adaptation~~

**EB201-3 Reason:** Suggest this be named just “Risk Assessment” – since adaptation is not addressed.

**EB201-3 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The term 'facility adaptation' is currently used in 1.2.1.3.

**EB202-3 Public Comment:** 1.2.1 Risk Assessment ~~& Facility Adaptation~~

**EB202-3 Reason:** Suggest this be named just “Risk Assessment” – since adaptation is not addressed.

**EB202-3 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The term 'facility adaptation' is currently used in 1.2.1.3.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comments and reply with the proposed responses for EB201-3 and EB202-3.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

**EB201-4 & EB202-4**

**EB201-4 Public Comment:** 1.2.1.1 A multi-hazard risk assessment has been completed for the building and location that includes the following current and future risks or hazards as applicable:

Suggest adding text that clarifies future risk must be assessed using climate change-informed projections (not

historical trends).

In the list of hazards to be assessed (1.2.1.1-8), suggest adding: “Changes to water table and groundwater that affect water supply and quality and/or disrupt infrastructure”

**EB201-4 Reason:** Historical trends are not a good indicator of potential future risks. e.g., see <https://www.technologyreview.com/2021/12/13/1041309/climate-change-rising-groundwater-flooding/> for an example of problems caused by rising groundwater; sinking water tables can cause land subsidence; sea level rise can make groundwater more saline

**EB201-4 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The criteria have been modified to remove all language on assessment data timeline as follows: 1.2.1.1 A multi-hazard risk assessment has been completed for the building and location that includes the following ~~current and future~~ risks or hazards as applicable:

The following addition has been made to the criteria language:

1.2.1.1.9 Changes to geology and/or groundwater conditions that affect or disrupt infrastructure and/or facility function

**EB202-4 Public Comment:** 1.2.1.1 A multi-hazard risk assessment has been completed for the building and location that includes the following current and future risks or hazards as applicable:

Suggest adding text that clarifies future risk must be assessed using climate change-informed projections (not historical trends).

In the list of hazards to be assessed (1.2.1.1-8), suggest adding: “Changes to water table and groundwater that affect water supply and quality and/or disrupt infrastructure”

**EB202-4 Reason:** Historical trends are not a good indicator of potential future risks. e.g., see <https://www.technologyreview.com/2021/12/13/1041309/climate-change-rising-groundwater-flooding/> for an example of problems caused by rising groundwater; sinking water tables can cause land subsidence; sea level rise can make groundwater more saline

**EB202-4 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The criteria has been modified to remove all language on assessment data timeline as follows: 1.2.1.1 A multi-hazard risk assessment has been completed for the building and location that includes the following ~~current and future~~ risks or hazards as applicable:

The following addition has been made to the criteria language:

1.2.1.1.9 Changes to geology and/or groundwater conditions that affect or disrupt infrastructure and/or facility function

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed responses for EB201-4 and EB202-4.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- It was argued that the revision is too specific and that other water issues should be considered as hazards besides groundwater.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

## **EB201-5 & EB202-5**

**EB201-5 Public Comment:** 1.2.1.2 A ~~risk analysis~~ vulnerability assessment has been completed for 1.2.1.1 for each climate change associated risk or hazard, current and future.

**EB201-5 Reason:** We think the term “vulnerability assessment” would be more accurate here. Also, the definitions section defines “risk assessment,” not “risk analysis” – if the risk analysis is the same thing as a risk assessment, the standard should use one consistent term; if it’s different, the standard should define “risk analysis” in the definitions.

**EB201-5 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The language was updated for consistency within the section.

1.2.1.2 A risk ~~analysis~~ assessment has been completed for 1.2.1.1 for each climate change associated risk or hazard, current and future.

**EB202-5 Public Comment:** 1.2.1.2 A ~~risk analysis~~ vulnerability assessment has been completed for 1.2.1.1 for each climate change associated risk or hazard, current and future.

**EB202-5 Reason:** We think the term “vulnerability assessment” would be more accurate here. Also, the definitions section defines “risk assessment,” not “risk analysis” – if the risk analysis is the same thing as a risk assessment, the standard should use one consistent term; if it’s different, the standard should define “risk analysis” in the definitions.

**EB202-5 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The language was updated for consistency within the section.

1.2.1.2 A risk ~~analysis~~ assessment has been completed for 1.2.1.1 for each climate change associated risk or hazard, current and future.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed responses for EB201-5 and EB202-5.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

#### **EBESG-204**

**Proposed Revision:** 1.2.1.2 A risk assessment has been completed for 1.2.1.1 for each ~~climate change~~ associated risk or hazard, current and future.

Maximum = 4 points

One point is earned for each risk assessed in 1.2.1.1 for a maximum of 4 points.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

#### **EBESG-203**

**Proposed Revision:** 1.2.1. 3 The assessment evaluates building functional requirements and prioritizes accordingly for future facility resiliency modifications ~~adaptation~~.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

#### **EB201-6 & EB202-6**

**EB201-6 Public Comment:** 1.2.2 Emergency Procedures, Response, & Facility Upgrades

This section should include points for having a plan in place to help differently abled people in emergencies (e.g., if someone in a wheelchair needs help evacuating from the building or getting to a shelter-in-place location) and making plans and automated notifications available in all necessary languages (e.g., if you have

workers who do not speak or read English well)? That seems at least as basic as having an AED. There are other considerations related to culturally appropriate communication, physical abilities, etc., that other stakeholders would be better positioned to address. We suggest the committee does greater outreach to get input from groups and people who specialize in those aspects.

**EB201-6 Reason:** N/A

**EB201-6 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: There are already jurisdictional and organizational requirements and guidelines addressing this issue.

**EB202-6 Public Comment:** 1.2.2 Emergency Procedures, Response, & Facility Upgrades

This section should include points for having a plan in place to help differently abled people in emergencies (e.g., if someone in a wheelchair needs help evacuating from the building or getting to a shelter-in-place location) and making plans and automated notifications available in all necessary languages (e.g., if you have workers who do not speak or read English well)? That seems at least as basic as having an AED. There are other considerations related to culturally appropriate communication, physical abilities, etc., that other stakeholders would be better positioned to address. We suggest the committee does greater outreach to get input from groups and people who specialize in those aspects.

**EB202-6 Reason:** N/A

**EB202-6 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: There are already jurisdictional and organizational requirements and guidelines addressing this issue.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comments and reply with the proposed responses for EB201-6 and EB202-6.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- It was argued that this should be included within the Draft Standard or at least the Technical Manual because these items are easily and quickly overlooked the moment a disaster happens.
- It was noted that this is often included in health care facilities. It was stated that a revision could be vague but would still highlight its importance.
- It was argued that this change would be too prescriptive and puts too much of an onerous task on the Assessor, as well as some liability on GBI for evaluating the policy.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Opposed: Jane Rohde

Abstain: Max Puchtel

**ESGIEQ-201-06**

**Proposed Revision:** Not applicable for residential spaces.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

**EB201-7 & EB202-7**

**EB201-7 Public Comment:** 1.2.2.7.3 Facility resilience and/or adaptation upgrades and renovation(s) have been completed that minimize the risk of hazards.

**EB201-7 Reason:** Suggest saying “facility resilience and/or adaptation” due to these being distinct interventions/approaches per previous comments.



**EB201-7 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification as follows. The reason is that adaptation is considered a subset of resilience and is so defined in the definition of resilience.

1.2.2.7.2 Schematics, and/or construction documents for facility resilience ~~adaptation~~.

1.2.2.7.3 Facility resilience ~~adaptation~~ upgrades and renovation(s) have been completed that minimize the risk of hazards.

**EB202-7 Public Comment:** 1.2.2.7.3 Facility resilience and/or adaptation upgrades and renovation(s) have been completed that minimize the risk of hazards.

**EB202-7 Reason:** Suggest saying “facility resilience and/or adaptation” due to these being distinct interventions/approaches per previous comments.

**EB202-7 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification as follows. The reason is that adaptation is considered a subset of resilience and is so defined in the definition of resilience.

1.2.2.7.2 Schematics, and/or construction documents for facility resilience ~~adaptation~~.

1.2.2.7.3 Facility resilience ~~adaptation~~ upgrades and renovation(s) have been completed that minimize the risk of hazards.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed responses for EB201-7 and EB202-7.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

## **B201-8 & EB202-8**

**EB201-8 Public Comment:** 1.3.1.1 Ownership/stakeholders have a written policy ~~in place~~ publicly available and are in compliance with such policy to support diversity, equity, and inclusion.

**EB201-8 Reason:** It is insufficient to just have a written DEI policy. The ESG section (1.3.2) has details like making materials publicly available and ensuring they align with industry standards – these actions would be appropriate for a DEI policy also.

**EB201-8 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Requiring policy to be placed in the public domain raises too many legal and regulatory issues for many public and private sector entities. Also determining compliance with such a policy would be problematic for an assessor.

**EB202-8 Public Comment:** 1.3.1.1 Ownership/stakeholders have a written policy ~~in place~~ publicly available and are in compliance with such policy to support diversity, equity, and inclusion.

**EB202-8 Reason:** It is insufficient to just have a written DEI policy. The ESG section (1.3.2) has details like making materials publicly available and ensuring they align with industry standards – these actions would be appropriate for a DEI policy also.

**EB202-8 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Requiring policy to be placed in the public domain raises too many legal and regulatory issues for many public and private sector entities. Also, determining compliance with such a policy would be problematic for an assessor.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comments EB201-8 and EB202-8 and reply with the proposed responses.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

#### **EBESG-205**

**Proposed Revision:** 1.3.1.1 Ownership/stakeholders have a written policy and/or action plan in place to support diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI).

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- It was noted that this revision fills a gap that was found by the task group.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

#### **EB201-9 & EB202-9**

**EB201-9 Public Comment:** 1.3.1.2 Ownership/stakeholders invest in the local community.

We suggest more specificity here to ensure it's getting the intended result. Perhaps adding "with meaningful engagement from community members" and/or "in environmentally beneficial ways".

**EB201-9 Reason:** Otherwise, a company could argue that widening the road in front of its building or having an ownership stake in a strip mall that paved over wetlands is "investing in the community." We assume the intent is for there to be investment in something that benefits the community and the environment.

**EB201-9 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. This change clarifies the intent of the criterion without being overly prescriptive in terms of process and outcomes.

1.3.1.2 Ownership/stakeholders invest in the local community, socially and/or environmentally.

**EB202-9 Public Comment:** 1.3.1.2 Ownership/stakeholders invest in the local community in environmentally beneficial ways with meaningful engagement from local community members.

**EB202-9 Reason:** We suggest more specificity here to ensure it's getting the intended result. Otherwise, a company could argue that widening the road in front of its building or having an ownership stake in a strip mall that paved over wetlands is "investing in the community." We assume the intent is for there to be investment in something that benefits the community and the environment.

**EB202-9 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. This change clarifies the intent of the criterion without being overly prescriptive in terms of process and outcomes.

1.3.1.2 Ownership/stakeholders invest in the local community, socially and/or environmentally.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed responses for EB201-9 and EB202-9.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- It was asked if the 'or' was needed but it was argued that you could do something environmentally but not socially.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

Mike Cudahy and Frank Sullivan left the meeting.

#### **Site Public Comment Review**

The Secretariat reviewed each public comment or item of new business and the reasons why the action is recommended before a motion took place.

#### **EB201-16, EB202-16, EBSite-204 & EBSite-208**

##### **EB201-16 Public Comment:** 2.2.2.7 Walkability

Add definitions for State of Place Index, and AARP Livability Index.

**EB201-16 Reason:** The three defined paths are Walk Score®, State of Place Index, and AARP Livability Index. Walk Score is defined in the glossary; the other two are not.

**EB201-16 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The definitions have been derived from their respective websites.

State of Place Index: a walkability and quality of place score from 0-100. It is based on 290 features of the built environment – like sidewalks, benches, street trees, and land uses – data that is collected block by block. It indicates how walkable – convenient, safe, pleasurable, and livable – a block, group of blocks, or neighborhood is. The index value for a site is determined by a proprietary algorithm maintained by State of Place, Inc. who can be contacted at <https://www.stateofplace.co/>.

AARP Livability Index (Neighborhood Category only): a measure of community livability on a scale of 0-100. The American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that empowers people to choose how they live as they age. The livability index for a site can be publicly accessed at <https://livabilityindex.aarp.org/>.

##### **EB202-16 Public Comment:** 2.2.2.7 Walkability

Add definitions for State of Place Index, and AARP Livability Index in the definitions section (section V).

**EB202-16 Reason:** The three defined paths are Walk Score®, State of Place Index, and AARP Livability Index. Walk Score is defined in the glossary; the other two are not.

**EB202-16 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The definitions have been derived from their respective websites.

State of Place Index: a walkability and quality of place score from 0-100. It is based on 290 features of the built environment – like sidewalks, benches, street trees, and land uses – data that is collected block by block. It indicates how walkable – convenient, safe, pleasurable, and livable – a block, group of blocks, or neighborhood is. The index value for a site is determined by a proprietary algorithm maintained by State of Place, Inc. who can be contacted at <https://www.stateofplace.co/>.

AARP Livability Index (Neighborhood Category only): a measure of community livability on a scale of 0-100. The American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that empowers people to choose how they live as they age. The livability index for a site can be publicly accessed at <https://livabilityindex.aarp.org/>.

**EBSite-204 Proposed Revision:** Walk Score®: measures the walkability on a scale of 0-100 of any address using a patented system. For each address, Walk Score® analyzes hundreds of walking routes to nearby amenities. Points are awarded based on the distance to amenities in each category. Walk Score® is maintained by Walk Score® Management, LLC part of Redfin Corporation. The score can be publicly accessed for a site at <https://www.walkscore.com/>.

~~Walk Score®: It is a score that is developed through Walk Score®, a public access walkability methodology that assigns a walkable score to addresses in Canada, United States, and Australia.~~

**EBSite-208 Proposed Revision:** Bike Score®: measures whether a location is good for biking on a scale of 0-100 of any address using a patented system. For each address, Bike Score® analyzes four equally weighted components: bike lanes, hills destinations and road connectivity, and bike commuting mode share. Bike

Score® is maintained by Walk Score® Management, LLC part of Redfin Corporation. The score can be publicly accessed for a site at <https://www.walkscore.com/>.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed responses for EB201-16 and EB202-16, and to accept the new definitions for EBSite-204 and EBSite-208.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

## **EBCB-202**

**Proposed Revision:** EV Electric Vehicle

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

## **EBPoints-201-4**

**Proposed Revision:** 2.2 SITE IMPROVEMENT (~~65~~60 POINTS)

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

## **EB202-10**

**Public Comment:** Add new section 2.2.1.5

2.2.1.5 "if located in a floodplain, the project minimizes additional harm to or within the floodplain."

**Reason:** There is no mention of floodplains in this standard. Sustainable Siting, one of the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Federal Buildings, requires federal agencies to ensure existing buildings minimize potential harm to or within a floodplain. As this standard does not mention floodplains at all, agencies would not be able to use this standard to assess whether they meet one of the federal government's building performance requirements.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The revision proposed includes further definition of 'harm' and thus, all floodplain impacts have been added to the requirements of comprehensive site plan requirements.

The modification is below:

2.2.1.3 A comprehensive site plan has been developed and implemented that includes all areas of site improvement, including as applicable floodplain impacts, access to walking trails, bike paths, outdoor respite, and outdoor community spaces (i.e., community gardens, farmers' markets, etc.) on or adjacent to the building or campus.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed response.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

## **EB201-10 & EB202-11**

**EB201-10 Public Comment:** 2.2.1.1 There are indications that the site has been enhanced by activities, such as an increase of indigenous species that are appropriate for current and projected climate conditions or the re-establishment of corridors to provide wildlife habitat.

**EB201-10 Reason:** Some species that are indigenous to a place will not be suited for the changing climate in that place.

**EB201-10 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: It is hard to quantify and define the revision proposed. For example, it may be difficult to identify what plant or animal species will be deemed as invasive or indigenous as it migrates through the climate change. Wholesale adoption of this approach may put pressure on rare or endangered species and cause negative impacts.

**EB202-11 Public Comment:** 2.2.1.1 There are indications that the site has been enhanced by activities, such as an increase of indigenous species that are appropriate for current and projected climate conditions or the re-establishment of corridors to provide wildlife habitat.

**EB202-11 Reason:** Some species that are indigenous to a place will not be suited for the changing climate in that place.

**EB202-11 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: It is hard to quantify and define the revision proposed. For example, it may be difficult to identify what plant or animal species will be deemed as invasive or indigenous as it migrates through the climate change. Wholesale adoption of this approach may put pressure on rare or endangered species and cause negative impacts.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comments EB201-10 and EB202-11 and reply with the proposed responses.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

## **EB201-11 & EB202-12**

**EB201-11 Public Comment:** 2.2.1.4 The following strategies are used to reduce stormwater runoff over and above municipal requirements:

We suggest that additional strategies or practices be identified regarding stormwater that can be planned or implemented to increase the resiliency of stormwater management systems to projected climate change.

**EB201-11 Reason:** Changing climate conditions necessitate the use of resilient designs and systems that can be adjusted and modified to achieve the desired performance goals of the systems.

**EB201-11 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The proposed wording provides insufficient criteria to determine compliance.

**EB202-12 Public Comment:** 2.2.1.4 The following strategies are used to reduce stormwater runoff over and above municipal requirements and are appropriate for current climate conditions while also adaptable to project climate conditions:

**EB202-12 Reason:** To take into account projected climate conditions

**EB202-12 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The proposed wording provides insufficient criteria to determine compliance.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comments EB201-11 and EB202-12,**

and reply with the proposed responses.

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

#### **EBSite-201**

**Proposed Revision:** The following strategies are used to reduce stormwater runoff ~~over and above municipal requirements:~~

Maximum = 5 points

- One point is earned for 2.2.1.4.1.
- One point is earned for 2.2.1.4.2.
- Two points are earned for 2.2.1.4.3.
- ~~Two~~ One points ~~are~~ is earned for 2.2.1.4.4.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

#### **EB201-12 & EB202-13**

**EB201-12 Public Comment:** 2.2.2.2 The distance to the closest public transit stop is within at least 1 mile (1.6 km).

Suggest revising to: “~~The~~ Walking and biking distance to the closest public transit stop is ~~within at least~~ less than 1 mile (1.6 km) along safe, accessible, well-maintained sidewalks, bike lanes, and/or paths.”

**EB201-12 Reason:** The criterion needs to be clear that the distance measured needs to be the actual distance people must travel, not as the crow flies.

**EB201-12 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The modification was necessary in order to determine compliance with the criteria.

The modification is below:

2.2.2.2 The distance along public sidewalks and bike lanes/paths to the closest public transit stop is less than ~~within at least~~ 1 mile (1.6 km) .

**EB202-13 Public Comment:** 2.2.2.2 The walking and biking distance to the closest public transit stop is within at least 1 mile (1.6 km) along safe, accessible, well-maintained sidewalks, bike lanes, and/or paths.

**EB202-13 Reason:** The criterion needs to be clear that the distance measured needs to be the actual distance people must travel, not as the crow flies.

**EB202-13 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The modification was necessary in order to determine compliance with the criteria.

The modification is below:

2.2.2.2 The distance along public sidewalks and bike lanes/paths to the closest public transit stop is less than ~~within at least~~ 1 mile (1.6 km) .

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed responses for EB201-12 and EB202-13.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

#### **EBSite-210**

**Proposed Revision:** 2.2.2.3 There is a main or secondary building entrance located accessibly to pedestrian traffic and public transit stop(s).

4-2 points

**MOTION:** The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE:** The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

### EB201-13

**Public Comment:** ~~2.2.2.4 There are public or private transit service available for building staff for commuting.~~ We suggest deleting this criterion.

**Reason:** Aside from the inclusion of private transit, how is this element different from having a public transit stop within walking distance (2.2.2.2)?

Private transit has many issues (such as using public infrastructure like bus stops without paying for their maintenance; or drawing passengers off public transit where routes are duplicated) that make it inadvisable to offer 3 points for providing it.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Both public and private transit are considered desirable.

**MOTION:** The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE:** The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

### EBSite-202

**Proposed Revision:** 2.2.2.4 There are public or private transit service within 0.5 mile (0.8 km) available for building users at reduced costs ~~staff for commuting.~~

2.2.2.3 There is a main or secondary building entrance located ~~accessibly~~ within 0.5 mile (0.8 km) to pedestrian traffic and public transit stop(s).

**MOTION:** The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revisions to 2.2.2.4 and 2.2.2.3.

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE:** The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

### EB201-14 & EB202-14

**EB201-14 Public Comment:** 2.2.2.5.2 Bike paths/lanes

The goal of this section seems to be to reduce single-occupancy vehicle commuting, so this element ought to specify “bike paths/lanes that connect the site to the surrounding community.”

**EB201-14 Reason:** To/from where? A bike path that simply goes in a circle around a site is valuable for recreation, but not for reducing emissions from commuting.

**EB201-14 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted and the changes have been implemented in the draft Standard.

**EB202-14 Public Comment:** 2.2.2.5.2 Bike paths/lanes that connect the site to the surrounding community.

**EB202-14 Reason:** The goal of this section seems to be to reduce single-occupancy vehicle commuting, so this element ought to be specific.

**EB202-14 Recommended Response:** 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 proposed responses for EB201-14 and EB202-14.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

### **EB201-15, EB202-15, EBSite-206, & EBSite-203**

**EB201-15 Public Comment:** 2.2.2.6 Other measures have been enacted to ~~reduce car dependency (e.g., car-pooling, scooters, bike paths/lanes, purchase of transit passes).~~

Suggest revising the examples to “incentives to carpool, elimination of subsidies for driving such as free parking, facilities and safety measures for micro-mobility options such as scooters, free or reduced-price transit passes, financial or other incentives to encourage commuting on foot or by non-motorized vehicles”

**EB201-15 Reason:** “bike lanes” should be removed because it’s already covered in 2.2.2.5.2; the other edits are to be clear about specific actions that would be helpful. Could also add “telework” or “remote work” to this list, although that doesn’t necessarily reduce overall car travel, just car travel for commuting.

**EB201-15 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: To not stifle creativity the good examples provided will be reviewed and may be placed in the Technical Manual.

**EB202-15 Public Comment:** 2.2.2.6 Other measures have been enacted to reduce car dependency (e.g., incentives to carpool, elimination of subsidies for driving such as free parking, free or reduced-price transit passes, financial or other incentives to encourage commuting on foot or by non-motorized vehicles. ~~car-pooling, scooters, bike paths/lanes, purchase of transit passes).~~

**EB202-15 Reason:** “bike lanes” should be removed because it’s already covered in 2.2.2.5.2; the other edits are to be clear about specific actions that would be helpful.

**EB202-15 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: To not stifle creativity the good examples provided will be reviewed and may be placed in the Technical Manual.

**EBSite-206 Proposed Revision:** 2.2.2.6 Other measures have been enacted to reduce car dependency (e.g., car-pooling, scooters, bike paths/lanes, purchase of transit passes).

↳ 2 points

**EBSite-203 Proposed Revision:** 2.2.2.6 Other measures have been enacted to reduce car dependency (~~e.g., car-pooling, scooters, bike paths/lanes, purchase of transit passes).~~

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comments EB201-15 and EB202-15 and reply with the proposed responses, and to accept revisions, EBSite-206 and EBSite-203.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- It was argued that when rejecting a comment, the response to the commenter shouldn’t also contain any revision to the criteria.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

### **EBSite-207**



**Proposed Revision:** ~~2.2.2.7 WALKABILITY~~ OCCUPANT ACCESS

Path A, B, ~~C~~, or D

~~Three~~ Four paths are available for assessing a site's ~~walkability~~ occupant access.

- 2.2.2.7A Path A: Walk Score®: Up to 5 points

OR

- 2.2.2.7B Path B: State of Place Index: Up to 5 points

OR

- 2.2.2.7C Path C: AARP Livability Index: Up to 5 points

OR

- 2.2.2.7D Path D: Bike Score®: Up to 5 points

OR

2.2.2.7D PATH D: Bike Score®

2.2.2.7D.1 The Bike Score® is at least 50.

Maximum = 5 points

- Five points are earned for a  $\geq 90$  to  $\leq 100$  Bike Score®.
- Four points are earned for an  $\geq 80$  to  $\leq 89$  Bike Score®.
- Three points are earned for a  $\geq 70$  to  $\leq 79$  Bike Score®.
- Two points are earned for a  $\geq 60$  to  $\leq 69$  Bike Score®.
- One point is earned for a  $\geq 50$  to  $\leq 59$  Bike Score®.
- No points are earned for a Bike Score®  $< 50$ .
- Not applicable if the building is unoccupied.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Max Puchtel

**EBSite-205**

**Proposed Revision:** 2.2.2.7C.1 The Neighborhood category of the AARP Livability score is at least 50.

Of the seven categories that make up the index the Neighborhood category index is used for the scoring in the criterion.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

Frank Sullivan rejoined the meeting.

**EBSite-209**

**Proposed Revision:** 2.3 Light Pollution (5 points)

2.3.1 Exterior Light Pollution

Two paths are provided for assessing exterior light pollution:

- 2.3.1A Path A: Lighting Design Performance Method: 5 points

OR

- 2.3.1B Path B: Prescriptive Lighting Requirements: 5 points

Points cannot be combined between paths. Select one of the paths below.

### 2.3.1A Path A: Lighting Design Performance Method

2.3.1A.1 An engineer or lighting professional creates a lighting design that meets all the performance requirements of the IDA - IES Model Lighting Ordinance (MLO), Tables D (Initial Lumens), AND Table E (Additional Lumen Allowances) AND Table F (Maximum Vertical Illuminance on the Property Line), 2011.

5 points or N/A

- Not applicable where there is no site lighting.

OR

### 2.3.1B Path B: Prescriptive Method Lighting Requirements

2.3.1B.1 Exterior lighting does not exceed prescribed values for the amount of light per unit of area per IDA – IES Model Lighting Ordinance (MLO), Tables A (Parking Space Method) or B Hardscape Area Method) AND Table F (Maximum Vertical Illuminance on the Property Line), 2011.

1 point or N/A

- Not applicable where there is no exterior lighting.

2.3.1B.2 Exterior lighting trespass does not exceed prescribed Backlight, Uplight and Glare (BUG) ratings as per IDA – IES Model Lighting Ordinance (MLO), Table C (C-1, C-2, and C-3), 2011 for the following:

- Backlight;
- Uplight; and
- Glare.

3 points or N/A

- Not applicable where there is no exterior lighting.

2.3.1B.3 Parking lot lighting does not emit light above 90 degrees from the vertical axis.

1 point or N/A

- Not applicable where there is no parking lot lighting.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was agreement that Path A should be called “Lighting Design Performance Method.”

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

### **Energy Public Comment Review**

The Energy Subcommittee Chair reviewed each public comment or item of new business and the reasons why the action is recommended before a motion took place.

#### **EB203-1**

**Public Comment:** ~~Renewable energy: energy derived from the sun, wind, water, or geothermal sources.~~  
Renewable energy: energy that is continuously replenished on the Earth, such as wind, solar thermal, solar electric, geothermal, hydropower, and various forms of biomass from recovered waste sources using such technologies as wind turbines, photovoltaic solar panels, transpired solar collectors, solar thermal heaters, and small-scale hydroelectric power plants.

(adapted from GBI 01-2021)

**Reason:** The consensus body should adopt the definition found in GBI 01-2021 to reduce any questions or confusion around the definition of renewable energy across the GBI standard portfolio and the committee should retain biomass consistent with the definition in GBI 01-2021.

The renewable energy definition must also not remove biomass. Biomass sources, including biomass from forests, have been recognized as beneficial for the reduction of GHGs in the atmosphere by many governments around the world, including the US Federal Government and the State of California. In California the Governor is actively promoting the use of biomass as a renewable fuel as they attempt to address the fuel loads that are contributing to the massive wildfires that have plagued the state over the last few years. The findings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) are instructive: “In the long term, a sustainable forest management strategy aimed at maintaining or increasing forest carbon stocks, while producing an annual sustained yield of timber, fiber, or energy from the forest, will generate the largest sustained mitigation benefit.” (IPCC 2007).

In wildfire prone areas biomass facilities help to promote healthier forests less likely to catastrophically burn by providing a market to help offset the expensive fuels reduction treatments while improving air quality by burning the materials in controlled facilities instead of piled and burned in the woods. Biomass facilities are also able to utilize diverted clean C&D material from landfills during construction projects.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The comment has been revised as follows:

renewable energy: energy that is continuously replenished on the Earth, such as wind, solar thermal, solar electric, geothermal, hydropower, and various forms of biomass utilized in a sustainable manner derived from the sun, wind, water, or geothermal sources.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed response.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- It was argued that including biomass is a good change.
- It was noted that this is a very common public comment topic, and the definition is continually changing and thus, must be continuously reviewed and updated within the draft standard.
- It was noted that the assessor will also review the renewable energy use and make note of whether it is biomass or not.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

## **EBEnergy-202**

**Proposed Revision:** 3. ENERGY (~~185~~ 310 POINTS)

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

## **EB201-18 & EB202-17**

**EB201-18 Public Comment:** We propose a new section or possibly an addition to 3.1.1 Energy Consumption that gives points for energy efficiency practices/building technologies that also allow the building to maintain habitable conditions for a certain period of time if external power is disrupted (aka passive survivability).

Can include additional insulation, operable windows to allow ventilation, window shading designed to allow more sun in the winter and block it in the summer, onsite energy generation and storage. Can also include water-related technologies such as cisterns to gather rainwater that can be used for non-potable uses if external water is disrupted.

**EB201-18 Reason:** These technologies will become more important as climate change causes more power outages (both from extreme weather and from planned outages to prevent wildfires).

Elements 6.4.1.8 and 6.4.1.9 address window shading and orientation in the context of lighting, but it would be good to call out the passive survivability benefits of those features as well.

**EB201-18 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Issues of resilience are already addressed in the ESG Assessment Area of the draft standard.

**EB202-17 Public Comment:** We propose a new section or possibly an addition to 3.1.1 Energy Consumption that gives points for energy efficiency practices/building technologies that also allow the building to maintain habitable conditions for a certain period of time if external power is disrupted.

Can include additional insulation, operable windows to allow ventilation, window shading designed to allow more sun in the winter and block it in the summer, onsite energy generation and storage. Can also include water-related technologies such as cisterns to gather rainwater that can be used for non-potable uses if external water is disrupted.

**EB202-17 Reason:** These technologies will become more important as climate change causes more power outages (both from extreme weather and from planned outages to prevent wildfires).

Elements 6.4.1.8 and 6.4.1.9 address window shading and orientation in the context of lighting, but it would be good to call out the passive survivability benefits of those features as well.

**EB202-17 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Issues of resilience are already addressed in the ESG Assessment Area of the draft standard.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comments and reply with the proposed responses for EB201-18 and EB202-17.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.**

Abstain: Frank Sullivan

#### **EB201-20 & EB202-19**

**EB201-20 Public Comment:** 3.4.1 Renewable energy

Suggest adding at least one point (maybe as a subset of 3.4.1.2) for having some form of energy storage to allow onsite renewable energy to operate more effectively (e.g., having battery storage to complement a photovoltaic system so it can provide energy at night and on cloudy days).

**EB201-20 Reason:** N/A

**EB201-20 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The prescriptive aspects of the renewable energy system design is not relevant. Points are awarded on the overall performance of the system.

**EB202-19 Public Comment:** 3.4.1 Renewable energy

Suggest adding at least one point (maybe as a subset of 3.4.1.2) for having some form of energy storage to allow onsite renewable energy to operate more effectively (e.g., having battery storage to complement a photovoltaic system so it can provide energy at night and on cloudy days).

**EB202-19 Reason:** N/A

**EB202-19 Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The prescriptive aspects of the renewable energy system design is not relevant. Points are awarded on the overall performance of the system.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comments and reply with the proposed responses for EB201-20 and EB202-19.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

**IEQ Public Comment Review**

The ESG/IEQ Subcommittee Chair reviewed each public comment or item of new business and the reasons why the action is recommended before a motion took place.

**EBCB-201**

**Proposed Revision :** ASTM ASTM International, formerly American Society for Testing and Materials

**Reason:** Add ASTM to the Acronym list

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

**ESGIEQ-201-17**

**Proposed Revision :** Definition

UVGI system: a system for disinfection of air, water and object surfaces that uses radiation with a wavelength in the UV-C range (100 nm to 280 nm) to kill or inactivate microorganisms and viruses

Acronym

MERV: Minimum Efficiency Reporting Values

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

**ESGIEQ-201-05**

**Proposed Revision:** 6.2 HAZARD MITIGATION (~~16~~ 18 POINTS)

6.1 MEASURES 6.1 INDOOR AIR QUALITY (IAQ) SYSTEMS & MEASURES (~~89~~ 87 POINTS)

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- It was noted that this was a change because of moving mold criteria from 6.1 to 6.2.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

**ESGIEQ-201-07**

**Proposed Revision:** Not applicable for residential spaces.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

**ESGIEQ-201-18, ESGIEQ-201-12, ESGIEQ-201-15, ESGIEQ-201-14, and ESGIEQ-201-16**

**ESGIEQ-201-18 Proposed Revision:** 6.1.2 AIR FILTRATION AND TREATMENT SYSTEM

Path A, B, or C

Three paths are available for assessing air filtration and treatment systems.

- 6.1.2A Path A: Offices, Higher Education, General Commercial Facilities: Up to ~~10~~ 16 points

OR

- 6.1.2B Path B: Multifamily: Up to ~~10~~ 16 points

OR

- 6.1.2C Path C: Healthcare: Up to ~~10~~ 16 points

Points cannot be combined between paths. Select one of the paths below.

**ESGIEQ-201-12 Proposed Revision:** 6.1.2A.1 The air filtration and treatment are as follows:

6.1.2A1.1 The type of filtration in place at the facility is Minimum Efficiency Reporting Values (MERV 13) on make-up air (MUA) and ~~distributed~~ dedicated outdoor air system (DOAS) units and MERV 8 for zone units (applicable to fan coils and fan powered boxes).

6.1.2A1.2 Upper-air (upper room) ultraviolet germicidal (UVGI) luminaires used in densely occupied spaces (25 or more people per 1,000 ft<sup>2</sup>), or HEPA filters are installed in spaces or in all AHUs and packaged units.

Maximum = ~~10~~ 16 points

- Ten points are earned for 6.1.2A.1.1 for MERV 13 on MUA and DOAS units and MERV 8 for zone units.
- Ten points are earned for 6.1.2A.1.1 for MERV 13 in central AHUs.
- Five points are earned for 6.1.2A.1.1 for MERV 8 on MUA, DOAS, and zone units.
- Six points are earned for 6.1.2A.1.2.
- Not applicable if there are no AHUs.

**ESGIEQ-201-15 Proposed Revision:** • Not applicable if there are no AHUs or packaged units.

**ESGIEQ-201-14 Proposed Revision:** Maximum = ~~10~~ 16 points

- ~~Ten~~ Sixteen points are earned for MERV 13 on MUA, DOAS, and zone units.
- Five points are earned for MERV 8 on MUA, DOAS, and zone units.
- Not applicable if there are no AHUs or packaged units.

**ESGIEQ-201-16 Proposed Revision:** ~~6.1.2.2 Ultraviolet light is used for germicidal irradiation or other technologies use ionization of particles to address potential infectious particles. Maximum = 4 points~~

- ~~• Four points are earned when HEPA filters are installed in spaces or in all AHUs.~~
- ~~• Four points are earned when UVGI is used in spaces or spaces are designed to inactivate airborne contaminants.~~
- ~~• Three points are earned when UVGI for coil cleaning is used.~~
- ~~• Three points are earned when other ionization approaches are used.~~

**MOTION:** The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revisions for 6.1.2, 6.1.2A, 6.1.2B, and 6.1.2.2 for new business items, ESGIEQ-201-18, ESGIEQ-201-12, ESGIEQ-201-15, ESGIEQ-201-14, and ESGIEQ-201-16.

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- It was stated that a task group was created to review UVGI technology and develop proposals that could revise criteria within the IEQ Assessment Area.

**VOTE:** The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

**ESGIEQ-201-13**

**Proposed Revision:** 6.1.2C.1 The filtration in place at the facility is meeting all Facility Guidelines Institute (FGI) Guidelines.

Maximum = ~~10~~ 16 points

**MOTION:** The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

**ESGIEQ-201-02**

**Proposed Revision:** 6.1.3.4 Procedures have been implemented for the identification of mold, mold source, mold remediation, and precautions to prevent mold growth during building operations, occupancy, and renovations, documented in a mold management plan.

~~The following are addressed and/or resolved, including observations or complaints, so that the facility is free of the following symptoms of mold or excess moisture:~~

~~6.1.3.4.1 Damp or musty carpets~~

~~6.1.3.4.2 Musty odors~~

~~Maximum = 2 points~~

~~• One point is earned for 6.1.3.4.1.~~

~~• One point is earned for 6.1.3.4.2.~~

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

**ESGIEQ-201-04**

**Proposed Revision:** 6.2.4 Mold Detection and Abatement

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

**ESGIEQ-201-08**

**Proposed Revision:** 6.1.3.6.1: Not applicable when there are no environmental services rooms.

6.1.3.6.4: Not applicable when there are no general storage areas.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revisions.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- There was no discussion.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

**EB202-28**

**Public Comment:** Add new section 6.2.2.2

6.2.2.2 Verify a radon policy is in place that manages the process for testing and relevant mitigation activities to adequately protect occupant health.

**Reason:** While the standard requires a building have a radon survey done within the last 2 years to ensure radon levels are below 4 pCi/L, there is no mention of a policy that ensures regular radon testing takes place. This addition to the standard would ensure radon levels within existing building projects continue to be below the EPA-established levels. This requirement (that a radon policy be in place) is contained in the Guiding Principles for Federal Sustainable Buildings, and, as currently written, federal agencies would not be able to use this standard to assess compliance with radon mitigation guiding principal.

**Recommended Response:** Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The existing language as written is adequate to protect against radon occurrence in a building.

**MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comment and reply with the proposed response.**

**Discussion took place on the Motion:**

- It was asked if surveying would include survey maps, but it was noted that it would be a physical map.

**VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.**

#### **Public Participation**

There was no discussion.

#### **New Business**

There was no discussion.

#### **Action Items**

GBI staff will send out a doodle poll for later this fall to determine the best date and time for meeting #9 of the Consensus Body for Existing Buildings.

**MOTION: The motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously to adjourn.**

**Meeting adjourned at 3:59 PM EST.**