



DRAFT MINUTES

GBI Consensus Body for Existing Buildings- Call #11

Webinar/Teleconference

April 17, 2023 from 3:00 to 4:00 p.m. ET

NOTE ALL TIMES ARE EASTERN TIME

Consensus Body for Existing Buildings Members in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	4/17/23	3/23/23	3/9/23	9/20/22	11/17/21
Benjamin Bojda	Dominion Environmental Consultants NV, Inc	X (Proxy Mullen)	X	X	X	X (Proxy Cole)
Larry Clark	Sustainable Performance Solutions	X	X	X	X	X (Proxy Shymko)
Michael Cudahy	PPFA - PPEF	X	X	X	X (left early)	X
Chris Fournier	Signify	X	X	Absent	N/A	N/A
Lawrence (Buddy) Humphries (Chair)	Efficient Green, LLC	X	X	X	X	X
Christoph Lohr	IAPMO	N/A	N/A	N/A	Absent	Absent
John Mullen	IAPMO	X	X	X		
Max Puchtel	American Institute of Steel Construction	X	X (left early)	X	X	Absent
Dave Ray	Independent Contractor	X	X	Absent	X	Absent
Benjamin Reeves	Arete Design Group	X	X	X (Proxy Shymko)	X (Proxy Shymko)	X (Proxy Sullivan)
Jane Rohde	JSR Associates, Inc., The Vinyl Institute / Resilient Floor Covering Institute	Absent	X (arrived late)	Absent	X	X (Proxy Cudahy)
Anthony Serres	Signify North America Corporation	N/A	N/A	N/A	Absent	X
Gord Shymko	G. F. Shymko & Associates Inc.	X	X	X	X	X
Frank Sullivan	Kiewit	X (Proxy Reeves)	Absent	Absent	X	X
Michael Zatz	ENERGY STAR Commercial & Industrial Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	X	X	X	X	X

Voting Alternates in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	4/17/23	3/23/23	3/9/23	9/20/22	11/17/21
Dan Cole	IAPMO					X
John Mullen	IAPMO				X	

Interested Parties in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	4/17/23	3/23/23	3/9/23	9/20/22	11/17/21
Rob Brooks	Rob Brooks Associates					
Randolph Chapman	EPA's Indoor Environments Division				X	
Soph Davenberry	Independent Consultant					X
Larry Eisenberg	Ovus Partners 360		X	X	X	
Josh Jacobs	WAP Sustainability					X
Viken Koukounian	K.R. Moeller Associates Ltd.		X	X	X	
Julian Mills-Beale	NRMCA	X				
James O'Brien	Independent Environmental Consultant					X

Staff in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	4/17/23	3/23/23	3/9/23	9/20/22	11/17/21
Emily Marx	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X	X	X
Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI		X	X	X	
Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI	X				X

Welcome and Roll Call

Secretariat Emily Marx welcomed everyone to the meeting, 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 noted that there were no interested parties on the call at this time.

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

Administrative Items

Chair Buddy Humphries thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Humphries 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 meetings #9 on March 9, 2023, and #10 on March 23, 2023, 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 meetings #9 on March 9, 2023, and #10 on March 23, 2023, as presented.

Water Public Comment Review

The Water Subcommittee chair reviewed each proposal for change before making a motion for approval.

EBWater-204

Proposed Revision: ~~4.1.1A.1 The building's current standing as compared to average water performance for the building type is at least 65%.~~

The building's water performance per square foot is at least 10% reduced compared to the median of the performance for the building type.

Maximum = 65 points

- Sixty-five points are earned for a building with consumption $\geq 40\%$ lower than the median.
- Sixty points are earned for a building with consumption $\geq 35\%$ to $< 40\%$ lower than the median.
- Fifty-five points are earned for a building with consumption $\geq 30\%$ to $< 35\%$ lower than the median.
- Fifty points are earned for a building with consumption $\geq 25\%$ to $< 30\%$ lower than the median.
- Forty points are earned for a building with consumption $\geq 20\%$ to $< 25\%$ lower than the median.
- Twenty-five points are earned for a building with consumption $\geq 15\%$ to $< 20\%$ lower than the median.
- Ten points are earned for a building with consumption $\geq 10\%$ to $< 15\%$ lower than the median.
- No points are earned for a building with consumption $< 10\%$ lower than the median.

- ~~65 points are earned for a standing of $\geq 90\%$.~~
- ~~60 points are earned for a standing $\geq 85\%$ to $< 90\%$.~~
- ~~55 points are earned for a standing $\geq 80\%$ to $< 85\%$.~~
- ~~50 points are earned for a standing $\geq 75\%$ to $< 80\%$.~~
- ~~40 points are earned for a standing $\geq 70\%$ to $< 75\%$.~~
- ~~25 points are earned for a standing $\geq 65\%$ to $< 70\%$.~~
- ~~10 points are earned for a standing $\geq 60\%$ to $< 65\%$.~~

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.

EBWater-210

Proposed Revision: • 4.1.1A Path A: ~~Peer Benchmarking~~Alternative Building Water Performance Metric: 65 points

4.1.1A PATH A: ~~PEER BENCHMARKING~~ALTERNATIVE BUILDING WATER PERFORMANCE METRIC

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.

EBWater-205

Proposed Revision: 4.2.3.5 The building water systems conforms with *ASHRAE 188-2018, Legionellosis: Risk Management for Building Water Systems* or equivalent or more stringent risk management building water system standards as applicable. ~~per the following;~~

~~4.2.3.5.1 There is a program team tasked with managing Legionella in the building, and the team has described and diagrammed building water systems.~~

~~4.2.3.5.2 Building water systems are analyzed for hazardous conditions and consider the vulnerability of building occupants.~~

~~4.2.3.5.3 Control measures are being implemented and monitored for corrective action.~~

~~4.2.3.5.4 The program team verifies and validates the legionellosis management program on an ongoing basis.~~

~~4.2.3.5.5 The legionellosis management program is documented, and activities are communicated by the program team.~~

~~Maximum = 8 points~~

~~• One point is earned for 4.2.3.5.1.~~

~~• One point is earned for 4.2.3.5.2.~~

~~• Four points are earned for 4.2.3.5.3.~~

~~• One point is earned for 4.2.3.5.4.~~

~~• One point is earned for 4.2.3.5.5.~~

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.

EBPoints-201-2

Proposed Revision: ~~Maximum = 8 points~~ or N/A

~~• One point is earned for 4.2.3.5.1.~~

~~• One point is earned for 4.2.3.5.2.~~

~~• Four points are earned for 4.2.3.5.3.~~

~~• One point is earned for 4.2.3.5.4.~~

~~• One point is earned for 4.2.3.5.5.~~

Not applicable if there is no definitive risk of legionellosis centralized water system.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was discussion on what a centralized water system is. An assessor stated how he would assess this criterion and the not applicable. It was argued that the N/A should be revised.

AMENDMENT: The Motion was made and seconded to revise the text to “Not applicable if there is no definitive risk of legionellosis centralized water system.”

Discussion took place on the Amendment:

- There was agreement that there should be a list of examples and elaboration of the N/A in the Technical Manual.
- It was argued that the original text was sufficient because a centralized water system would be the only place where legionella risk could exist. There was agreement that it would be rare, but this revision would allow for more alternatives.
- Different aspects of pathogens found in water systems were discussed.

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

Opposed: Larry Clark

Discussion took place on the Original Motion:

- There was no discussion.

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

Miscellaneous Public Comment Review

The Secretariat gave a review of inconsistencies found within the approved revisions to the draft standard or public comment responses. She stated that all new proposed text changes in already approved revisions are in red.

EBCB-205

Proposed Revision: 3.4.1B PATH A: RENEWABLE ONSITE AND OFFSITE ENERGY

Reason: Add "PATH X" for consistency; 3.4.1, 3.1.1,

Discussion took place on the Editorial Revision:

- There were no concerns or comments about the editorial revision.

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' has been revised to facility resiliency modifications.

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' has been revised to facility resiliency modifications.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to change the action to accept with modification and reply with the new proposed responses for EB201-3 and EB202-3.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was discussion on the subcommittee's decision to remove the word adaption from the criteria.

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

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 further revise 1.2.1.2 by striking out ‘current and future’ and 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 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.

Abstain: John Mullen, Benjamin Bojda

Public Comments, EB201-8 and EB202, were reviewed and it was noted that the action and response to the commenter approved at the September 20, 2022, meeting is not consistent with public comments EB201-23 and EB202-24 and the revisions approved on March 23, 2023. There was agreement to not make any changes to public Comments, EB201-8 and EB202, but to make changes to the action and responses for public comments EB201-23 and EB202-24.

EB201-23 and EB202-24

EB201-23 Public Comment: 5.1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PURCHASING

5.1.2.1 Building management has a ~~written~~ publicly available environmental purchasing policy that identifies priority spend categories and goals. 5 2 points

EB201-23 Reason: Having a policy is a first step and the committee should consider providing additional guidance here as to what needs to be included in that policy for the points to be awarded.

EB201-23 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 commercial and proprietary issues.

EB202-24 Public Comment: 5.1.2.1 Building management has a ~~written~~ publicly available environmental purchasing policy that identifies key spend categories and goals. 5 2 points

EB202-24 Reason: Having a policy is a first step and the committee should consider providing additional guidance here as to what needs to be included in that policy for the points to be awarded.

EB202-24 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 commercial and proprietary issues.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to rescind the previous motion to accept with modification public comments EB201-23 and EB202-24, and to reject the comments and response to the commenters with the proposed responses, and to revise the criteria to the following: 5.1.2.1 Building management has a written environmental impact purchasing policy that identifies sustainable and wellness purchasing goals. 5 3 points

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- Different aspects of proprietary issues that could arise because of the proposed revisions were discussed.
- There was agreement on the need to be consistent throughout the standard.
- A response to the commenter was developed.

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

Abstain: Max Puchtel

EB201-24 & EB202-25

EB201-24 Public Comment: ~~5.1.2.2 There is a list of~~ Contracts have been updated to include environmentally preferred products used in housekeeping and building maintenance based upon the building type application products that have been certified to meet standards and ecolabels managed by or recommended by EPA. See <https://www.epa.gov/greenerproducts/recommendations-specifications-standards-and-ecolabels-federal-purchasing> 5 3 points

EB201-24 Reason: Edits intended to make this criterion impactful and verifiable.

EB201-24 Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The revision proposed is already covered in its entirety in 6.3.1.1. The reference noted will be reviewed for future potential inclusion in the Technical Manual.

EB202-25 Public Comment: ~~5.1.2.2 There is a list of~~ Contracts have been updated to include environmentally preferred products used in housekeeping and building maintenance based upon the building type application products that have been certified to meet standards and ecolabels managed by or recommended by EPA. See <https://www.epa.gov/greenerproducts/recommendations-specifications-standards-and-ecolabels-federal-purchasing> 5 3 points

EB202-25 Reason: Edits intended to make this criterion impactful and verifiable.

EB202-25 Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The revision proposed is already covered in its entirety in 6.3.1.1. The reference noted will be reviewed for future potential inclusion in the Technical Manual.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to reject the comments and reply with updated responses for public comments, EB201-24 and EB202-25.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was agreement to reorder the statements in the response to the commenter.

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

The Secretariat noted that she reached out to an SME and Consensus Body for Existing Buildings member not present on the call about whether the response to the commenter for Public Comment, EB203-2, was accurate. The Secretariat shared that the SME recommended no change in action or response because it is accurate. Members at the meeting agreed not to take any further action on public comment, EB203-2.

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 **Method** 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:

- It was noted Dark Sky no longer uses MLO and the criteria may need to be revised in a future version of the standard.

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

EBMaterials-201

Proposed Revision: 5.1.1.2 Policy that includes Product selection standards for cycle renovations ~~has~~ have been developed that ~~include~~ require the following:

5.1.1.2.1 Products selection criteria that include:

- Third-party verified multiple attribute standard certifications
- Industry ~~Average or~~ Wide Environmental Product Declarations (EPDs)
- Product Specific Environmental Product Declarations (EPDs)
- ~~Being listed on NIST's (National Institute of Standards and Technology) BEES (Building for Environmental and Economic Sustainability) database~~

5.1.1.2.2 Product selections criteria that include sustainable comparison and/or improvements ~~as follows~~ utilizing:

- If policy standardized product selection is compliant to 5.1.1.2.1 third-party verified multiple attribute standard certifications, the policy includes requirements for a ~~H~~higher level of certification based upon third party verified multiple attribute standard certifications for the same product type.
- If policy standardized product selection is compliant to 5.1.1.2.1 Industry Wide EPD and Product Specific EPD for the same product, the policy includes requirements for comparing products that demonstrate any impact reduction using the same PCR, functional unit, and LCA method. ~~Product that is included in an Industry Average EPD and have subsequently produced a Product Specific EPD for the same product.~~
- If policy standardized product selection is compliant to 5.1.1.2.1 Product Specific EPD, the policy in requirements for ~~P~~products ~~that~~ includes a baseline Product Specific EPD, and over time produces an updated Product Specific EPD that demonstrates continual improvement from the baseline of a specific product. LCA method (TRACI, CML, etc.), ~~and~~ Product Category Rules (PCR), and functional unit are required to be the same

for comparability.

~~• If policy standardized product selection is compliant to 5.1.1.2.1 product found in BEES database, the policy requires Comparison of products within the same similar building products category utilizing NIST's BEES database, online analysis tool utilizing the same impact indicators for comparison.~~

5.1.1.2.3 Products that include third-party sustainable forestry certification, categorized as Responsible or Certified Sources in accordance with ASTM D7612.

5.1.1.2.4 Products that include:

- Pre-consumer ~~and~~ Recycled content
- Post-consumer Recycled content
- Biobased content (other than sustainable wood)

5.1.1.2.5 Products that include reused, refurbished and/or salvaged materials from off-site in place of new materials (including furnishings).

Maximum = 5 points

Points can be combined between criteria that are included within the policy for product selection standards each listed option, but maximum points awarded will not exceed 5 points total for 5.1.1.2.

- ~~Four~~ Three points are earned for 5.1.1.2.1.
- ~~Four~~ Three points are earned for 5.1.1.2.2.
- One point is earned for 5.1.1.2.3.
- ~~Two~~ Three points are earned for 5.1.1.2.4.
- ~~Four~~ One points ~~are~~ is earned for 5.1.1.2.5.

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.

EBEnergy-217

Proposed Revision: Complete regardless of the path chosen above.

3.2.2.2 Exterior LPDs comply with or improve upon ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 90.1-2013 Section ~~9.4.3~~ 9.4.2 for exterior lighting power density.

Additional control requirements to earn LPD credit include:

- Deactivating lighting when sufficient daylight is available; and
- Shutting off façade and landscape lighting between midnight and business opening, or other similar hours approved by the AHJ.

Maximum = 2 points or N/A

- Two points are earned where LPDs are 20% below ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 90.1-2013.
- One point is earned where ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 90.1-2013 is met.
- Not applicable where there are no exterior luminaries.

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.

Public Participation

There was no discussion.

New Business

There was no discussion.

Schedule

The Secretariat noted that all public comments or new proposals for change following the second public comment period have been reviewed. She stated that a third public comment period will begin in late April and run through mid-June. She noted that it is the intention of GBI to publish the standard in 2023.

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

Meeting adjourned at 3:50 PM EST.