

DRAFT MINUTES
GBI Consensus Body for New Construction- Call #9
Webinar/Teleconference
April 22, 2024, from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. ET

NOTE ALL TIMES ARE EASTERN TIME

Consensus Body Members in Attendance

Full Name	Company	4/22/24	4/5/24	4/3/24	3/27/24	3/6/24	3/4/24
Jeff Bradley	American Wood Council	X	X	X (arrived late)	X	X	X (left early)
Karen Butler	EPA, Office of Air and Radiation	X	X	X	X	X	X
Virgil Campaneria (Chair)	Gurri Matute PA	X	Absent	X	Absent	X	X
Michael Cudahy	PPFA - PPEF	X	X	X	X	X	Absent
Larry Eisenberg	Ovus Partners 360	X (left early)	X	X	X	X	X
Tehmina Husain	Merrick and Company	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Absent	Absent
Josh Jacobs	WAP Sustainability	Absent	Absent	Absent	X	X	X
Ashley Langenfeld	Hoefer Welker	Absent	X (Proxy Eisenberg)	X (left early)	X	X	X
Michael Lehman	ConTech Lighting	X (arrived late)	X (acting Chair)	X	Absent	Absent	X
John Mullen	IAPMO	X	Absent	X (Proxy Butler)	X (Proxy Tin)	X	X
James O'Brien	Independent Environmental Consultant	X	X	Absent	X (Acting Chair)	X	X
Max Puchtel	American Institute of Steel Construction	Absent	Absent	X	X	X	X
Jane Rohde	JSR Associates, Inc.	X	X (Proxy Cudahy)	X (Proxy Cudahy)	X	Absent	X

Stephen Szoke	American Concrete Institute	X	Absent	X	X (Proxy Puchtel)	X	X
Sumayyah Theron	Cyclone Energy Group	X (Proxy Eisenberg)	X	X (left early)	X	X	X (left early)
Angela Tin	American Lung Association	X	X	Absent	X	X	X

Voting Alternates in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	4/22/24	4/5/24	4/3/24	3/27/24	3/6/24	3/4/24
John Cross	American Institute of Steel Construction	X					

Interested Parties in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	4/22/24	4/5/24	4/3/24	3/27/24	3/6/24	3/4/24
Viken Koukounian	Parklane Mechanical Acoustics	X		X	X (arrived late)		
Niklas Moeller	LogiSon Acoustic Network	X					X

Staff in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	4/22/24	4/5/24	4/3/24	3/27/24	3/6/24	3/4/24
Emily Marx	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI	X	X	X	X		X
Micah Thomas	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. She asked if any guests or interested parties wanted to discuss any comment or topic. No interested party noted an item they wanted to discuss.

Administrative Items

Chair Virgil Campaneria thanked everyone for joining the meeting. Campaneria reviewed the agenda and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were no concerns or comments.

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

Campaneria reviewed the #7 from April 3, 2024, and #8 minutes from April 5, 2024, and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were no concerns or comments.

MOTION: A Motion was made and seconded to approve the #7 from April 3, 2024, and #8 minutes from April 5, 2024, as presented.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstained.

Abstain: Sumayyah Theron, John Cross, Steve Szoke

Water Public Comment Review

The Secretariat reviewed each public comment before a motion was made.

NCWater-223

Proposed Revision: • 9.4.1.1.2: The project does not include water-fed food waste ~~disposers~~ disposal appliance.

food waste disposal appliance ~~disposer~~: a device used to shred food and other organic kitchen wastes ~~prior to disposal~~.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was discussion about how the definition could be improved. Improvements to the definition were suggested, and the criteria was updated to reflect the new definition.
- It was argued that 'disposer' is the term used in many codes and other documents, but that in others it is 'disposal.'

VOTE: The Motion carries with 6 in favor, 3 opposed, 2 abstained.

Opposed: James O'Brien, Mike Cudahy, John Mullen

Abstain: Sumayyah Theron, Steve Szoke

NCWater-224

Proposed Revision: No irrigation system, or a temporary system that is dismantled after ~~one~~ two years, is installed.

Reason: SME Feedback: I am ok with this change, as 2 – 3 seasons of adequate water in my experience would be required for establishment of the specimen, before removal of the installed irrigation system.

I would imagine, this would affect the landscape drainage amongst other things that are worth considering, once the permaculture is matured.

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: Sumayyah Theron

Materials Public Comment Review

The Materials Subcommittee Chair reviewed each public comment or item of new business before a motion was made.

203-31

Public Comment: The following forest certification systems and non-forestry related standards are recognized:

Add:

Concrete Sustainability Council (CSC)

Reason: The CSC is the global certification system for responsibly sourced ready-mixed and precast concrete. CSC certification is BREEAM DGNB USGBC assessment programs and follows a holistic approach which requires compliance with five fundamental prerequisites and a wide range of social and environmental performance indicators, There are currently more than 900 Certified Projects in 21 countries.

<https://csc.eco/>

In addition, I feel we could still add most of the material-specific credits accepted in LEED.

Here are others for consideration:

- Aluminum Stewardship Initiative Chain of Custody Standard
- BRE:BES 6001 Responsible Sourcing of Construction Products Standard (v3.1)
- BRE: BES 6002 Ethical Labour Sourcing Standard (v1) – Level One (likely out of scope)
- Concrete Sustainability Council Certification

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The Standard seems to be more on the operation of the manufacturing facility and the Consensus Body is unsure if this is the right section. We invite the commenter to provide additional information and re-submit in the future.

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 intent of the Concrete Sustainability Council (CSC) and it was noted that it is less on the sourcing of material and more on the operations of the manufacturing facility.
- It was noted that responsible sourcing of the product coming into the plant is included in CSC. However, it was argued that SMI is more on the final product that is used in buildings and a client could not complete the formula in the criteria using CSC.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstained.

Abstain: John Cross, Steve Szoke, Sumayyah Theron

203-26

Public Comment: Project may not achieve points in more than one option.

Reason: NRMCA is supportive of Whole Building LCA. However, there is some confusion on point achievements. For instance, if the project team chooses 10.1.1.3 WBLCA for comparison of all the life cycle impact indicators (16 points for highest achievement), does that mean they can simply use that for 10.1.1.2 (7 points) for considering only GWP? And since they are doing a WBLCA they can get the 10.1.1.1 (3 points) as well? Or was this the intention?

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: It was the Consensus Body's intent to have these be cumulative criteria.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- A reason for the commenter was developed.

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

Abstain: Sumayyah Theron

203-27 & 203-28

203-27 Public Comment: Product Manufacturers provide one or more of the following for a minimum of fifteen products that evaluate the *cradle-to-gate product life cycle* environmental impacts:

203-28 Public Comment: A minimum of five products include one or more of the following verifications that evaluate the products' environmental impacts through end of life (cradle-to-grave product life cycle):

203-27 & 203-28 Reason: NRMCA is supportive of maintaining the use of EPDs for evaluating product life cycle environmental impacts.

203-27 & 203-28 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 comments, 203-27 and 203-28.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 8 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstained.

Opposed: Jane Rohde, Jeff Bradley

Abstain: Sumayyah Theron

203-29

Public Comment: In 10.2.1.1 and 10.2.1.2, it reads "Third-party verified Type III EPD according to ISO 21930: 2017 or ISO 14025: 2006, either product specific or industry wide."

Reason: I believe this should be “and” or “and/or”. ISO 21930 doesn’t stand alone, and heavily references ISO 14025 as the standard for EPDs generally. I struggle to find a scenario where an EPD could be produced which meets ISO 21930 but not 14025. The reverse (meets 14025 but not 21930) is obviously normal for non-construction products. Maybe I’m missing a scenario here, but as a reader it seems confusing, as if I have a menu of options, where in reality I’d produce an EPD that meets both 14025 (or it wouldn’t be an EPD) and 21930 (because it’s a construction product).

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 discussion on the difference between product specific and industry wide and it was noted that the criteria is correct for how it is stated.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.

Abstain: Jeff Bradley, Sumayyah Theron

203-30

Public Comment: Points are earned for discrete products with different functional uses that have an OESR, SDS, HPD, Industry-wide HPD, or equivalent labeling/certification that includes transparency and ingredient listing for specified products

Reason: NRMCA is supportive of maintaining the use of third-party verified transparency documentation for occupant exposure screening.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The Consensus Body does not feel like the inclusion of industry wide HPDs is appropriate. At this time industry wide HPDs is not recognized by the HPDC.

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- A response to the comment was developed.

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

Abstain: Sumayyah Theron

NCMaterials-222

Proposed Revision: The Diversion Rate is multiplied by 1.5 for products that have been produced or manufactured in a facility that meets the following standards and certification programs:

- Business or facilities that have achieved Zero Waste certification from the US Zero Waste Business Council; or
- ~~Have followed and certified to~~ Facilities validated Demonstrate compliance with to the UL 2799 Environmental Claim Validation for Zero Waste to Landfill ~~2017~~

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was agreement to change ‘to’ to ‘with.’

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

Abstain: Sumayyah Theron

Indoor Environment Public Comment Review

The Secretariat reviewed each public comment or new business item before a motion was made.

NCIE225 & NCIE240

NCIE225 Proposed Revision: 11.5 ACOUSTICAL PRIVACY AND COMFORT (26 ~~18-23~~ POINTS)

NCIE225 Reason: Updated section total

NCIE240 Proposed Revision: 6. INDOOR ENVIRONMENT (~~150~~ 155 points)

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revisions, NCIE225 and NCIE240.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

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

Opposed: Larry Eisenberg

Abstain: Sumayyah Theron

NCIE241

Proposed Revision: 11.5.1.2 Design incorporates a sound masking system to provide the specified minimum A-weighted Overall Sound Level (dBA) for all occupiable spaces where a sound masking system is to achieve the acoustical goals of the identified space, each type of space, selected from within the following ranges:

• **Offices:**

o Open: 45-48dBA

o Enclosed: 35-45dBA

o Meeting/Conference: 30-45dBA

o Circulation: 45-48dBA

• **Healthcare:**

o Patient room: 40-48dBA

o Private offices and exam/treatment room: 35-45dBA

o Waiting area: 45-48dBA

o Corridor and public spaces: 45-48dBA

o Circulation: 45-48dBA

• **Other:**

o All other areas where speech privacy, concentration, or sleep/relaxation is required: 35-48 dBA

11.5.1.2.1 The installed sound masking system is measured in accordance with ASTM E1573-18 Standard Test Method for Measurement and Reporting of Masking Sound Levels Using A-Weighted

and One-Third-Octave-Band Sound Pressure Levels to determine compliance with specified performance requirements, as follows:

- The measured overall level is within +/-0.5dBA of that specified.
- The measured spectrum conforms to the National Research Council's SPMSOFT Optimum Masking frequency range and 1/3 octave band levels, or the project acoustician's specified 1/3 octave band levels, within +/-2.0dB.

Maximum = ~~6~~ 4 points

- ~~• Four points are earned for $\geq 80\%$ to $\leq 100\%$ of floor area of listed room types using sound masking.~~
- ~~• Three points are earned for $\geq 50\%$ to $< 80\%$ of floor area of listed room types using sound masking.~~
- Two points are earned for $\geq 7025\%$ to $< 50\%$ of floor area of listed room types the identified space using sound masking.
- One point is earned for $\geq 5010\%$ to $< 7025\%$ of floor area of listed room types the identified space using sound masking
- No points are earned if $< 5010\%$ of floor area of listed room types the identified space use sound masking.

- Two points are earned for 11.5.1.2.1.

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: Sumayyah Theron

Larry Eisenberg left the meeting.

202-1 & 202-2

202-1 Public Comment: 11.5.1.2 There is a sound masking system, and a report in accordance with ASTM E1573-~~18~~ 22 Standard Test Method for Measurement and Reporting of Masking Sound Levels Using A-Weighted and One-Third-Octave-Band Sound Pressure Levels, showing its operation to be in compliance within tolerances of the specified overall masking sound level and spectrum for all occupiable spaces, as defined in the acoustical program where a sound masking system is not contrary to the acoustical goals of the space.

2 points or N/A

Not applicable for residential units.

~~Design incorporates a sound masking system to provide the specified minimum A-weighted Overall Sound Level (dBA) for each type of space, selected from within the following ranges:~~

~~Offices:~~

~~Open: 45-48dBA~~

~~Enclosed: 35-45dBA~~

~~Meeting/Conference: 30-45dBA~~

~~Circulation: 45-48dBA~~

~~Healthcare:~~

~~Patient room: 40-48dBA~~

~~Private offices and exam/treatment room: 35-45dBA~~

~~Waiting area: 45-48dBA~~

~~Corridor and public spaces: 45-48dBA~~

~~Circulation: 45-48dBA~~

~~Other:~~

~~All other areas where speech privacy, concentration, or sleep/relaxation is required: 35-48-dBA~~

~~11.5.1.2.1 The installed sound masking system is measured in accordance with ASTM E1573-18 Standard Test Method for Measurement and Reporting of Masking Sound Levels Using A-Weighted and One-Third-Octave-Band Sound Pressure Levels to determine compliance with specified performance requirements, as follows:~~

~~The measured overall level is within +/- 0.5dBA of that specified.~~

~~The measured spectrum conforms to the National Research Council's SPMSoft Optimum Masking frequency range and 1/3 octave band levels, or the project acoustician's specified 1/3 octave band levels, within +/- 2.0dB.~~

~~Maximum = 6 points~~

~~Four points are earned for ≥80% to ≤100% of floor area of listed room types using sound masking.~~

~~Three points are earned for ≥50% to <80% of floor area of listed room types using sound masking.~~

~~Two points are earned for ≥25% to <50% of floor area of listed room types using sound masking.~~

~~One point is earned for ≥10% to <25% of floor area of listed room types using sound masking.~~

~~No points are earned if <10% of floor area of listed room types use sound masking.~~

~~Two points are earned for 11.5.1.2.1.~~

202-1 Reason: Strike the entirety of these two sections and replace with the credit language from Green Globes Existing Buildings (as updated for 2024).

The complete text of these two sections omitted here for brevity in the form.

The approach to earning points differs for the sound masking credits in NC versus EB. There is no justifiable reason for this difference and the two should be aligned. The credit language in EB is advantageous.

In EB, there are three points available. These are awarded only upon providing a masking system in areas in accordance with an acoustical design plan ('program') and also providing legitimately tested reporting of compliance with specifications.

In NC, there are six points available, however these are awarded differently - and illogically. In 6.5.1.2, up to four points are awarded based on the percentage of a space covered by the masking system.

This is illogical, as the amount of space with a masking system should be driven by the space type and acoustical program. Further, these coverage points are awarded regardless of any tested performance of the system. A system could be both improperly engineered and adjusted, but still earn up to 67% of the available points based solely on physical presence in the space.

In 6.5.1.2.1, just two points are awarded for acceptable demonstration of performance to

specifications. It is only upon testing that it can be verified that the masking system contributes to the acoustical performance of the space as specified. Note that the requirements for conformity in the current version of NC are identical to EB.

The credit language in NC should be duplicated from EB to better align the application of sound masking to project needs and to award credits only upon demonstration of performance.

The suggested modification also results in shorter credit language.

202-1 Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The reason for modification is that the criteria was updated to be constructive.

The revision is below:

11.5.1.2 Design incorporates a sound masking system to provide the specified minimum A-weighted Overall Sound Level (dBA) for all occupiable spaces where a sound masking system is to achieve the acoustical goals of the identified space. ~~each type of space, selected from within the following ranges:~~

• ~~Offices:~~

○ ~~Open: 45-48dBA~~

○ ~~Enclosed: 35-45dBA~~

○ ~~Meeting/Conference: 30-45dBA~~

○ ~~Circulation: 45-48dBA~~

• ~~Healthcare:~~

○ ~~Patient room: 40-48dBA~~

○ ~~Private offices and exam/treatment room: 35-45dBA~~

○ ~~Waiting area: 45-48dBA~~

○ ~~Corridor and public spaces: 45-48dBA~~

○ ~~Circulation: 45-48dBA~~

• ~~Other:~~

○ ~~All other areas where speech privacy, concentration, or sleep/relaxation is required: 35-48-dBA~~

11.5.1.2.1 The installed sound masking system is measured in accordance with ASTM E1573-18 Standard Test Method for Measurement and Reporting of Masking Sound Levels Using A-Weighted and One-Third-Octave-Band Sound Pressure Levels to determine compliance with specified performance requirements, as follows:

- The measured overall level is within +/-0.5dBA of that specified.
- The measured spectrum conforms to the National Research Council's SPMSOFT Optimum Masking frequency range and 1/3 octave band levels, or the project acoustician's specified 1/3 octave band levels, within +/-2.0dB.

Maximum = ~~6~~ 4 points

• ~~Four points are earned for ≥80% to ≤100% of floor area of listed room types using sound masking.~~

• ~~Three points are earned for ≥50% to <80% of floor area of listed room types using sound masking.~~

• Two points are earned for ≥7025% to <50% of floor area of listed room types the identified space using sound masking.

• One point is earned for ≥5010% to <7025% of floor area of listed room types the identified space using sound masking

• No points are earned if <5010% of floor area of listed room types the identified space use sound

masking.

- Two points are earned for 11.5.1.2.1.

202-2 Public Comment: Modify text duplicated from EB Section 6.6.3.1 to say “...showing its operation to be in compliance within tolerances of the specified overall masking sound level and spectrum for all occupiable spaces, ~~as defined in the acoustical program~~ where a sound masking system is not contrary to the acoustical goals of the space.”

202-2 Reason: The overall acoustical section in EB is structured differently than in NC. EB includes a section defining an ‘acoustical program’. As this is absent in the NC section (and unlikely to be added), reference to the acoustical program must be removed. In its place, another requirement pertaining to the extent of system coverage is required.

We note that the current NC credit language seeks to motivate projects towards full coverage (perhaps even in spaces where masking may not be necessary), by awarding points based on a percentage of the space covered. It also awards projects points for systems covering an insufficient area. Neither of these is desirable.

In lieu of referencing coverage in line with an acoustical plan (which is not defined in NC), and in keeping with the existing NC credit’s motivation towards ‘full’ coverage, the proposed wording here indicates that a project would earn points only for including sound masking in all occupied areas where such a system is not detrimental to the acoustical goals of the space. This motivates project teams to include masking in areas where it will contribute to the acoustical performance of the space and only awards points if they do so.

202-2 Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been accepted with modification. The reason for modification is that the criteria was updated to be constructive. The revision is below:

11.5.1.2 Design incorporates a sound masking system to provide the specified minimum A-weighted Overall Sound Level (dBA) for all occupiable spaces where a sound masking system is to achieve the acoustical goals of the identified space. ~~each type of space, selected from within the following ranges:~~

▲ ~~Offices:~~

○ ~~Open: 45-48dBA~~

○ ~~Enclosed: 35-45dBA~~

○ ~~Meeting/Conference: 30-45dBA~~

○ ~~Circulation: 45-48dBA~~

▲ ~~Healthcare:~~

○ ~~Patient room: 40-48dBA~~

○ ~~Private offices and exam/treatment room: 35-45dBA~~

○ ~~Waiting area: 45-48dBA~~

○ ~~Corridor and public spaces: 45-48dBA~~

○ ~~Circulation: 45-48dBA~~

▲ ~~Other:~~

○ ~~All other areas where speech privacy, concentration, or sleep/relaxation is required: 35-48 dBA~~

11.5.1.2.1 The installed sound masking system is measured in accordance with ASTM E1573-18 Standard Test Method for Measurement and Reporting of Masking Sound Levels Using A-Weighted

and One-Third-Octave-Band Sound Pressure Levels to determine compliance with specified performance requirements, as follows:

- The measured overall level is within +/-0.5dBA of that specified.
- The measured spectrum conforms to the National Research Council's SPMSoft Optimum Masking frequency range and 1/3 octave band levels, or the project acoustician's specified 1/3 octave band levels, within +/-2.0dB.

Maximum = ~~6~~ 4 points

- ~~• Four points are earned for $\geq 80\%$ to $\leq 100\%$ of floor area of listed room types using sound masking.~~
- ~~• Three points are earned for $\geq 50\%$ to $< 80\%$ of floor area of listed room types using sound masking.~~
- Two points are earned for $\geq 25\%$ to $< 50\%$ of floor area of listed room types the identified space using sound masking.
- One point is earned for $\geq 10\%$ to $< 25\%$ of floor area of listed room types the identified space using sound masking
- No points are earned if $< 10\%$ of floor area of listed room types the identified space use sound masking.
- Two points are earned for 11.5.1.2.1.

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept with modification the proposed responses for comments, 202-1 and 202-2.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

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

Abstain: Sumayyah Theron

NCIE230

Proposed Revision: 11.5.3.1 Design of spaces complies with the maximum reverberation time (T60) criteria from Sections 801.3.3 Acoustical Control and 801.3.3.4 Interior Sound Reverberation in the 2018 International Green Construction Code (IgCC).

For specialized spaces not included in the above references the design team shall submit evidence of compliance. Spaces may include but are not limited to the following: community centers, theatres, music halls, studios, sensory rooms, supportive accessibility spaces.

~~Maximum = 4~~ 3 points or N/A

- ~~• Four points are earned for $\geq 80\%$ to $\leq 100\%$ of listed spaces.~~
- Three points are earned for $\geq 50\%$ to $< 80\%$ of listed spaces.
- Two points are earned for $\geq 25\%$ to $< 50\%$ of listed spaces.
- No points are earned for $< 25\%$.
- Not applicable for Multi-Unit Residential Buildings (MURBs).

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, 2 abstained.

Abstain: Jeff Bradley, Sumayyah Theron

Mike Lehman joined the meeting.

Energy Public Comment Review

The Secretariat noted that five points were voted to be removed from the Energy Assessment Area, and they were moved to the Acoustic Comfort Section under Indoor Environment.

Energy-224, Energy-225, Energy-226

Energy-224 Proposed Revision: 3. ENERGY (~~260~~ 255 points)

Energy-225 Proposed Revision: 3.3 METERING, MONITORING, AND MEASUREMENT (~~25~~ 20 POINTS)

Energy-226 Proposed Revision: ENERGY (~~260~~ 255 points)

INDOOR ENVIRONMENT (~~150~~ 155 points)

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revisions, Energy-224, Energy-225, and Energy-226.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

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

Abstain: Sumayyah Theron

Public Participation

There was no discussion.

New Business

Marx noted that all comments and items of new business have been reviewed and a third open public comment will begin on May 3. She asked volunteers to consider applying for the Consensus Body or Subcommittees to update the Existing Buildings standard. Lastly, she noted that she will be going out on leave soon until mid-August and all correspondence will be sent from her colleagues, Katy Johnson or Sara Rademacher.

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

Meeting adjourned at 2:01 PM EST.