

MINUTES
GBI Consensus Body for New Construction- Call #1
Webinar/Teleconference
October 13, 2022, from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. ET

NOTE ALL TIMES ARE EASTERN TIME

Consensus Body Members in Attendance

Full Name	Company	10/13/22
Senthil Arunachalam	BTU Engineers, LLC	X
Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X (arrived late)
Karen Butler	EPA, Office of Air and Radiation	X
Virgil Campaneria (Chair)	Gurri Matute PA	X
Michael Cudahy	PPFA - PPEF	X
Larry Eisenberg	Ovus Partners 360	X
Ashley Eusey	Hoefer Welker	X (arrived late, left early)
Tehmina Husain	Merrick and Company	Absent
Josh Jacobs	WAP Sustainability	X
Michael Lehman	ConTech Lighting	X
John Mullen	IAPMO	X
James O'Brien	Independent Environmental Consultant	X
Thomas Pape	BMP (representing AWE)	Absent
Max Puchtel	American Institute of Steel Construction	X
Jane Rohde	JSR Associates, Inc. (representing RFCI)	Absent
Gord Shymko	G. F. Shymko & Associates Inc.	X
Stephen Szoke	American Concrete Institute	X

Angela Tin	American Lung Association	X
------------	---------------------------	---

Interested Parties in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	10/13/22
Rob Brooks	Rob Brooks Associate	X
Steve Kooy	BIFMA	X
Matthew Lemay	NRMCA	X

Staff in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	10/13/22
Emily Marx	Secretariat, GBI	X
Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI	X

Roll Call & Welcome

Secretariat Emily Marx welcomed everyone to the meeting, 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.

Marx reviewed the Consensus Body for New Construction roster and noted the three interest categories, General Interest, Producer, and User. She stated that there is balance on the Consensus Body for New Construction.

Administrative Items

Chair Virgil Campaneria thanked everyone for participating on the consensus body and attending today's meeting. Campaneria 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.

Site Public Comment Review

The Site Subcommittee chair presented each comment or item of new business before giving a motion to approve the recommended action of the subcommittee.

NC104-3

Public Comment: Do we want to provide a Bike Score option as documentation as well?

Reason: It could be an easier form of documentation than trying to determine what is and isn't complaint [sic]. Not all areas have a bike score or an accurate bike score so having both options would make the credit more inclusive.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The Bike Score is far more robust and thus, should be considered for the convenience of the users. It was important to quantify the score that would qualify for the points.

7.2.1.4

OR

The building's Bike Score^(R) is 50 or greater.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- The credibility of Bike Score was questioned, and it was noted that it is a reputable source that is used by many realtors and maintained by the same company that created Walk Score.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

NCSite102

Proposed Revision: ~~Maximum~~ = 5 points or N/A

Reason: Not necessary

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 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

Ashely Eusey and Jeff Bradley joined the meeting.

NC102-2

Public Comment: 7.4.1.1.4 Low impact development strategies help project meet stormwater management criteria 7.4.1.1.1 - 7.4.1.1.3 or enable a project site to be mitigated to pre-development hydrology.

Reason: There is no mention of LID strategies or ensuring the site is mitigated to pre-development hydrology. The credits will certainly help, but will not get an agency to be 100% compliant with the guiding principle.

In order to comply with the Guiding Principles, agencies would need to ensure the site uses LID strategies or is mitigated to pre-development hydrology.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The existing language is adequate to guide projects on storm water issues.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- A member asked what pre-development hydrology is and whether it was about returning the site back to its natural state. There was discussion on different possible definitions.
- It was noted that the change is too prescriptive and could even cause a negative effect on the landscape for projects if completed.

Ashely Eusey and Jeff Bradley joined the meeting.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.

Abstain: Ashely Eusey, Jeff Bradley

NCSite117

Proposed Revision: Where a Wildland Urban Interface Code has been adopted OR ~~if~~ there is a determination by a fire protection engineer or certified fire marshal that the site wildland-urban interface hazard is moderate, high or extreme;

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was a question on the intention and the possible effect of this change.
- It was noted that NCSite117 and NCSite118 are related and that projects must meet the Wildland Urban Interface Code to be awarded points for each of the listed items within the criteria.
- An assessor noted that this is a good change that makes sense for the usability of the standard.
- There were questions of whether the N/A change in NCSite118 is not beneficial or even harmful to sites.
- It was argued that WUI codes are created in response to something, and this change allows the codes to be determined by the jurisdictional authority and not a third party.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstained.

Abstain: Ashley Eusey, Steve Szoke, Jeff Bradley

NCSite118

Proposed Revision:

3 points or N/A

- Not applicable where the building site is not located in ~~authority having jurisdiction or legislative body has formally declared~~ a wildland-urban interface area.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was noted that because NCSite117 was passed, then NCSite118 should pass for both revisions to make sense.
- It was argued that the change doesn't have any bounds around what is entailed with WUI.
- It was argued that if we do not change this, then other items should be changed concerning buildings codes within the standard.
- There was discussion on the amount of WUIs that exist and how many would be in a fire hazard area.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 10 in favor, 2 opposed, 2 abstained.

Opposed: Gord Shymko, Jeff Bradley

Abstain: Mike Lehman, Stephen Szoke

Water New Business Item Review

The Water Subcommittee vice chair presented each item of new business before giving a motion to approve the recommended action of the subcommittee.

NCWater105

Proposed Revision: 9.5.1.2 Provide reverse osmosis that achieves one of the following:

• Rejects less than 60% of feed-water volume for a system that produces more than 100 gal. (380 L) per day.

OR

• Rejects less than 70% of feed-water volume for a system that produces less than 100 gal. (380 L) per day;

OR

~~• Rejects less than 60% of feed-water volume for a system that produces more than 100 gal. (380 L) per day.~~

- Maximum = 2 points or N/A
- Two points are earned where reverse osmosis rejects <60% of feed-water volume.
- One point is earned where reverse osmosis rejects <70% of feed-water volume.
- Not applicable where there is no water treatment system.

Reason: Flip flop bullets to match point hierarchy.

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 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Senthil Arunachalam

NCWater106

Proposed Revision: • Not applicable ~~for~~ when end uses are not included or reclaimed water is not available.

Discussion took place on the Editorial Revision:

- There was no objection to the editorial revision.

NCWater108

Proposed Revision: • 9.9.1.3.4: Flow sensing incorporated in the control system to suspend irrigation in any zone where flows exceed expectation; ~~AND/OR~~

• 9.9.1.3.5: Landscape irrigation sprinklers and drip emitters that comply with ASABE/ICC 802-2020 Landscape Irrigation Sprinkler and Emitter Standard; ~~AND/OR~~

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 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

NCWater109, NcWater110, NcWater111, NcWater112, NcWater113

NCWater109 Proposed Revision: ~~Maximum=1~~ point or N/A

NCWater110 Proposed Revision: ~~Maximum=2~~ points or N/A

NCWater111 Proposed Revision: ~~Maximum=1~~ point or N/A

NCWater112 Proposed Revision: ~~Maximum=4~~ points or N/A

NCWater113 Proposed Revision: ~~Maximum=2~~ points or N/A

NCWater109, NcWater110, NcWater111, NcWater112, NcWater113 Reason: Not necessary

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revisions for 9.8.1 and 9.9.1.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

NCWater114

Proposed Revision: 2018 International Plumbing Code (IPC)

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 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: John Mullen

NCWater123

Proposed Revision: ~~INTERNATL~~ INTERNAL VOLUME OF VARIOUS WATER DISTRIBUTION TUBING

Discussion took place on the Editorial Revision:

- It was noted that the title should say Internal Volume of Various Water Distribution Tubing and not International.
- There was no objection to the editorial revision.

Materials Public Comment Review

The Materials Subcommittee chair presented each comment or item of new business before giving a motion to approve the recommended action of the subcommittee.

NC104-6

Public Comment: Do we need to state which software can be used for providing the Material LCA?

Reason: Keep consistency in submissions as well as verify the accuracy of what is being submitted

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been acknowledged and while the Consensus Body has discussed your comment no changes have been implemented in the draft Standard. Software is not determined by GBI but by the requirements in the ASTM standard.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was noted that not all LCA software is the same and that depending on what you use, the results may not be apples to apples.
- It was argued that by listing software, it would be too prescriptive and limiting to projects.
- It was stated that the criteria need to be in line with the ASTM reference within the criteria, and to list any LCA software could be contradictory of the ASTM standard.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Steve Szoke

NC102-8

Public Comment: The proposed final design of the building with the lower anticipated environmental impact achieves the following performance targets compared to the reference design:

- A minimum 5% reduction each, for at least three impact indicators, one of which is global warming potential; and
- No other impact indicator exceeds the reference design by more than 5%.
- To the maximum extent practicable, class I and class II substances shall be replaced by chemicals, product substitutes, or alternative manufacturing processes that reduce overall risks to human health and the environment.

Reason: The rating system requires the project team to do a life cycle assessment and choose the design that is the most environmentally friendly design - but there are 5 factors to take into consideration and the use of ODPs is only one of the 5; therefore it cannot be assumed a project would meet the GP solely based on this credit.

In order to meet the Guiding Principles, agencies must ensure they do not use ozone depleting substances.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: This section is about LCA and by adding additional parameters it increases its complexity.

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 argued that the suggestion is not in line with the intent of the criteria and may fit better in another criteria/section.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Ashley Eusey

The secretariat noted that comments, NC102-6 and NC102-7 were nearly duplicate comments submitted by the same commenter and one motion could be made to approve the action for both.

NC102-6 & NC102-7**NC102-6 Public Comment:** 10.4.1 Product Sustainable Materials Attributes

NC102-6 Reason: Should cite EPA's Comprehensive Procurement Guideline Program.

While the standard covers procurement of recycled content, it is included in combination with other factors defining a 'sustainable' product (Pre-consumer recycled content % + Post-consumer recycled content % + Biobased content % + Third Party Sustainable Forestry Certification content %) and therefore can't be assured to meet the Guiding Principles requirement.

To meet the Guiding Principles, federal agencies must purchase products that meet or exceed EPA's recycled content recommendations.

NC102-6 Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The addition is too prescriptive for the standard, but members recommend the following to go into the Technical Manual for reference: If you want to meet the Federal Guiding Principles, see the EPA's Comprehensive Procurement Guidelines Program for required percentages.

NC102-7 Public Comment: 10.4.1 Product Sustainable Materials Attributes

NC102-7 Reason: While the standard covers procurement of biobased content, it is included in combination with other factors defining a 'sustainable' product (Pre-consumer recycled content % + Post-consumer recycled content % + Biobased content % + Third Party Sustainable Forestry Certification content %) and therefore can't be assured to meet the Guiding Principles requirement.

To meet the Guiding Principles, federal agencies must purchase products that meet or exceed the USDA's biobased content recommendations.

NC102-7 Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The addition is too prescriptive for the standard, but members recommend the following to go into the Technical Manual for reference: If you want to meet the Federal Guiding Principles, see the EPA's Comprehensive Procurement Guidelines Program for required percentages.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject comments, NC102-6 and NC102-7 and reply with the proposed response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was noted that 10.4.1.1 does list certification systems, but it was argued that the EPA Comprehensive Procurement Guidelines is different and has certain requirements that are not included in the current standard.
- It was argued that if government buildings require it, it should be included within the standard. However, it was stated that GBI has its own Guiding Principles that federal buildings would use to certify with.
- An assessor noted that if some buildings require this then it should be included as one of the methods that can be used.
- It was stated that the formula that is listed within the criteria does not relate well to the EPA Comprehensive Procurement Guidelines.
- It was argued that what the commenter is asking is out of line with the intent of the criteria and that federal projects could be awarded points by using one of the other references.

- There was discussion on the feasibility of projects using Guiding Principles and EPA Comprehensive Procurement Guidelines and whether it falls in line with the requirements of this criteria.
- It was noted that there are many other types of materials evaluated when accrediting for this section, Product Sustainable Materials Attributes, and that the list of certifications is only for forest materials. It was argued that the list should be taken out of the standard and placed within the Technical Manual.
- There was agreement that the Materials Subcommittee should review the comments again.

WITHDRAWN: The Motion and second to reject comments, NC102-6 and NC102-7 was withdrawn. There was no opposition to the withdrawal.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to send public comments, NC102-6 and NC102-7 back to the Materials Subcommittee for further review.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 12 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstained.

Opposed: Steve Szoke

Abstain: Jeff Bradley

NC103-3

Public Comment: Sustainable Materials Index (%) =
100 x

(\$ value of pre-consumer recycled content

+

\$ value of post-consumer recycled content

+

\$ value of biobased content

+

\$ value of third-party sustainable forestry certification content

+

\$ value of Eco-Certified Composite)/TMV

Reason: Add the closing parenthesis

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

Discussion took place on the Editorial Revision:

- There was no objection to the editorial revision.

NC102-9

Public Comment: 10.6.1 Construction Waste

The preconstruction waste management plan will include:

- The strategies planned for construction waste reduction, salvaging, recycling, returning to supplier/manufacturer, or other methods for diverting waste from landfill;

• Policies for managing hazardous waste in accordance with RCRA subtitle C and subtitle I and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA)

- The facility, hauler, or service provider that will handle each material being diverted;
- Whether construction and demolition materials will be separated on-site or commingled;
- The name and contact information for the person(s) responsible for developing and implementing the waste management plan;
- Reporting and record keeping provisions;
- Target construction waste rate per 10.6.1.3 below; and
- Target waste diversion rate

Reason: Federal agencies are required to follow statutory requirements for managing hazardous waste. Currently the standard does not include anything related to managing hazardous waste in either a policy or during construction.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: Hazardous waste needs to meet the requirements of local and federal hazardous waste regulations.

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 noted that federal requirements should not be put into the standard because buildings need to comply with them anyway.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Senthil Arunachalam

NC102-10

Public Comment: 10.6.1.2 A final waste management summary report is completed after construction documenting the results of the implementation of the preconstruction waste management plan, including:

- The weight or volume of the total quantity of construction and demolition waste;
- The calculated construction waste per unit area for the project (see 10.6.1.3 below);
- The weight or volume of hazardous waste generated, stored, treated or disposed of, if any
- The weight or volume of the major categories of materials that were reused or recycled;
- The reuse/recycling rate for each major category of waste material;
- The overall reuse/recycling rate for the project; • A description of whether materials are managed through source separation or comingling;
- Copies of receipts and invoices used to track the progress of the waste management effort;
- A statement that describes if a waste recycling facility was used whether it was certified by a government or non-government organization;
- The organization and contact information of the author of the waste management summary report and the name and contact information of the person(s) at the off-site recycling facility (or facilities) responsible for data collection and reporting.

Reason: Federal agencies are required to follow statutory requirements for managing hazardous waste. Currently the standard does not include anything related to managing hazardous waste in either a policy or during construction.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. This level of detail is sufficient.

- The weight or volume of hazardous waste generated, if any;

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 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstained.

Abstain: Angela Tin, Ashley Eusey, Mike Cudahy

Ashley Eusey left the meeting.

NC104-8

Public Comment: Better define requirements here or perhaps provide an alternative path.

Reason: Have had project teams confused by this requirement and if there are even any manufacturers that have this. When we've reached out to GBI on this requirement they seem equally confused.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been acknowledged and while the Consensus Body has discussed your comment no changes have been implemented in the draft Standard. This is an incomplete proposal, but the Technical Manual Assessment Guidance will be reviewed in order to make improvements and better clarification.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

NC105-1

Public Comment: The following forest certification systems are recognized:

- _Forest Stewardship Council (FSC): <https://us.fsc.org/en-us> (last accessed 8/30/17)
- _Sustainable Forestry Initiative, Inc. (SFI): <http://www.sfiprogram.org/> (last accessed 8/30/17)
- _American Tree Farm System (ATFS): <https://www.treefarmssystem.org/> (last access 8/30/17)
- _Canadian Standards Association Sustainable Forestry Management (CSA): <http://www.csasfmforests.ca/> (last accessed 8/30/17)
- _Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC): <https://www.pefc.org/> (last accessed 8/30/17)
- Products categorized as Responsible or Certified Sources in accordance with ASTM D7612.

Reason: ASTM D7612 Responsible and Certified Sources are extensively recognized in green standards such as the USGBC LEED Pilot Credit, 2020 ICC-700, 2015 IgCC and the USDA BioPreferred

program. For more information, see www.responsible-source.com. ASTM D7612 recognizes all existing sustainable forestry certification programs, and this addition will not impact procurement of wood materials.

This language was accepted in the GBI Existing Buildings standard in 2021.

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 response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was noted that this would be an addition to the list of certifications listed in the criteria that was sent back to Subcommittee. It was stated that this list should be in the Technical Manual and not the standard.
- It was argued that the change could create a legal element because of the word ‘responsible.’
- An interested party reviewed the ASTM standard and the Sustainable Forestry Initiative reference and noted that the use of the word responsible is not out of line from what is referred to in the other listed references.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 5 in favor, 3 opposed, 5 abstained.

Opposed: Max Puchtel, Mike Lehman, Steve Szoke

Abstain: Senthil Arunachalam, Angela Tin, Gord Shymko, Josh Jacobs, Karen Butler

NCMaterials104

Proposed Revision: • One additional point is earned for facilities that have verified their annual average recycling rate of construction waste from an independent third-party organization.

Reason: Assessor Feedback

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 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Mike Lehman

Indoor Environment Public Comment Review

The Indoor Environment Subcommittee chair presented each comment or item of new business before giving a motion to approve the recommended action of the subcommittee.

NCIE102

Proposed Revision: • The VOC and Particulate Matter sampling and averaging times and measurement methods achieve the detection limits of the contaminant levels listed in Table 11.2.2A.1 ~~11.2.2.1.1~~ below;

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 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

NCIE103

Proposed Revision: ~~Maximum~~ = 2 points or N/A

Reason: Not necessary

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 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

NCIE104

Proposed Revision: • Five points are earned where $\geq 90\%$ of occupied floor area meets the IES Illuminance recommendations.

- Four points are earned where $\geq 70\%$ to $< 90\%$ of occupied floor area meets the IES Illuminance recommendations.

Reason: Should be greater than or equal to 90?

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 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

NC101-1

Public Comment: Assessment of transient noise shall be evaluated, after construction but prior to occupancy, using appropriate metrics as defined in one of the following:

Reason: The recommended change is advised because it provides clarity as to “when” the user should pursue (or comply with) the criterion.

The assessment of transient noise during design is very difficult, and this criterion was not intended to offer guidance for that stage of the project.

The referred sections in the listed documents in 11.5.1.1.2 (as evident in their titles) are for “measurement”. Again, the added language attempts to resolve misapplication of the criteria.

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 response.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

NC101-2

Public Comment: Design complies with minimum composite Sound Transmission Class ratings calculated to meet the noise limit criteria or 5 points less than the masking sound levels for spaces. For spaces requiring speech privacy, the minimum composite Sound Transmission Class ratings is ~~calculated~~ set to the required “Level Difference” (as in ASTM E2638) or “Level Reduction” (as in ASTM E1130) to provide the level of speech privacy in accordance with one of the following:

Reason: The recommended change is advised because it provides clarity as to “how” to minimum composite Sound Transmission ratings (i.e., the values) are “calculated.”

Specifically, all “noise” or “speech privacy” calculations are a function of a:

- (1) source,
- (2) the degree of attenuation, and
- (3) background sound level at the receiver.

For (1): there is guidance in the ASTM Standards.

For (3): there is guidance in the first sentence of this criteria’s paragraph.

(2) needs to be “determined.”

Example:

Generalized formula for Speech Privacy Class (SPC):

$SPC = \text{Level Difference} + \text{Background Sound}$

Rearranged:

$\text{Level Difference} = SPC - \text{Background Sound}$

Givens:

- Required level of Speech Privacy for SPC is “75.”
- Background sound is NC30 (or 35dBA of Masking)

$\text{Level Difference} = 75 - \text{NC30} \dots \text{or} \dots 75 - (35 \text{ dBA} - 5)**$

$\text{Level Difference} = 45$

The minimum composite STC needs to be 45.

**In the criteria, it says “or 5 points less than the masking sound levels.”

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

The text to be revised as follows: Design complies with minimum composite Sound Transmission Class ratings calculated to meet the noise limit criteria or 5 ~~dBA points~~ less than the masking sound levels for spaces. For spaces requiring speech privacy, the minimum composite Sound Transmission Class ratings is ~~calculated~~ set to the required “Level Difference” (as in ASTM E2638) or “Level Reduction”

(as in ASTM E1130) to provide the required level of speech privacy in accordance with one of the following:

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

NCIE106

Proposed Revision: 11.5.2.4B.1~~2~~ Field-testing of spaces comply with noise criteria limits in 11.5.2.1 or 5dBA less than the masking sound levels in 11.5.2.2 for spaces, measured after construction but prior to occupancy, in accordance with the following as applicable:

Reason: Correcting the number only

Discussion took place on the Editorial Revision:

- There was no objection to the editorial revision.

NCIE107

Proposed Revision: 11.5.2.4B.2 Field-testing of adjacent spaces comply with ~~noise~~ criteria limits in 11.5.2.1 or 5dBA less than the masking sound levels in 11.5.2.2 for spaces, measured after construction but prior to occupancy, in accordance with the following as applicable:

Reason: Submitted as part of resolved objection process in creating ANSI/GBI 01-2021.

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 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Jeff Bradley

NC101-3

Public Comment: Field-testing of spaces comply with ~~noise~~ criteria limits in 11.5.2.1 or 5dBA less than the masking sound levels in 11.5.2.2 for spaces, measured after construction but prior to occupancy, in accordance with the following as applicable:

Reason: To avoid any confusion, the language in this criterion should be updated.

To explain:

11.5.1 is intended for background noise and background sound

11.5.2 is intended for sound insulation and vibration isolation

11.5.3 is intended for reverberation time (“absorption”)

In 11.5.2.4, two paths are presented to test compliance of sound insulating performance in 11.5.2.1. The paths depend on whether the user referred to:

(1) Sound insulating values in the referred documents (FGI, ANSI S12.60 or igCC in 11.5.2.1)

OR

(2) Calculated the required sound insulating values to meet the noise criteria in 11.5.1.1 or 5 dBA less than the masking levels in 11.5.1.2

The current language in 11.5.2.4B.2 is problematic for these reasons:

- 1- The language states that testing of spaces need to comply with noise criteria limits or masking levels. Instead, it should be to comply with sound insulating performance values.
- 2- It refers to noise criteria in 11.5.2.1. Noise criteria are in 11.5.1.1.
- 3- It refers to masking sound levels in 11.5.2.2. Masking sound levels are in 11.5.1.2.

It should be referring to sound insulating performance criteria in 11.5.2.1. These would be the values referred to in documents or calculated to meet acoustic privacy (noise from MEP/HVAC or speech).

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. The comment has been rejected because the language has been modified as a response to another comment, NCIE107, as follows:

~~11.5.2.4B.2 Field-testing of adjacent spaces comply with noise criteria limits in 11.5.2.1 or 5 dBA less than the masking sound levels in 11.5.2.2 for spaces, measured after construction but prior to occupancy, in accordance with the following as applicable:~~

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 it was better to accept with modification the comment since the revisions the commenter is asking for are largely being accepted. The secretariat noted that although GBI does prefer that usually, she believes that in this scenario a rejection is fine.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

NC102-16

Public Comment: New section:

8.1.1C.2.7 – Workspaces comply with UL DG24480 to ensure occupants receive enough light for circadian entrainment.

Reason: Circadian entrainment of building occupants requires lighting to be of the correct amount, intensity, timing, and duration, and primarily – ensure that the light reaches to back of building occupant’s eyes to have maximum effect. Following the steps within UL’s Design Guideline for Promoting Circadian Entrainment with Light for Day-Active People (DG24480) will ensure the lighting within a workspace is optimized for circadian entrainment.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. The comment has been rejected. While circadian entrainment is important, research is underway to develop consensus recommendations based on the latest research.

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 discussion on the UL source, and it was argued that there are better sources to be used on this topic.
- It was noted that there are many non-consensus documents used in the standard and the response to the commenter should be revised.
- There was discussion on entrainment and its meaning.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.

Abstain: Jeff Bradley, Josh Jacobs

Public Participation

There was no discussion.

New Business

There was no discussion.

Review Schedule

The secretariat noted that the next meeting is tentatively being planned for mid-November.

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

Meeting adjourned at 4:01 PM EST.