



DRAFT MINUTES
GBI Consensus Body for Existing Buildings - Call #3
Webinar/Teleconference
June 10, 2025, from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. ET

NOTE ALL TIMES ARE EASTERN TIME

Consensus Body Members in Attendance

Full Name	Company	6/10/25	4/7/25	3/31/25
Michael Cudahy	PPFA	X	X	X
Larry Eisenberg	Ovus Partners 360	X	X	X
Janis Fedorowick	Wavefront Planning and Design Incorporated	X	X	Absent
Buddy Humphries (Chair)	Efficient Green, LLC	X	X	X
Joe Menchefski	Advanced Glazings Ltd.	X	X (Proxy Cudahy)	Absent
John Mullen	IAPMO	X	Absent	X
James O'Brien	Independent Environmental Consultant	X	X	X
Sarah Puls	American Wood Council	X	X	X
David Ray	SRAAG	X	X	Absent
Jane Rohde	JSR Associates, Inc.	X	X	X
Jiri Skopek	Jiri Skopek Architect	Absent	X	Absent
Frank X Sullivan	Kiewit	X (Proxy Fedorowick)	X (Proxy Fedorowick)	X
Kerry Sutton	American Concrete Institute (ACI)	X (arrived late)	X	Absent

Interested Parties in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	6/10/25	4/7/25	3/31/25
Viken Koukounian	Parklane			X

Staff in Attendance

Full Name	Organization	6/10/25	4/7/25	3/31/25
Emily Marx	Secretariat, GBI	X	X	X
Katy Johnson	Staff, GBI	X	X	





Sara Rademacher	Staff, GBI	X		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 displayed the Consensus Body for Existing Buildings roster and noted the balance between interest categories.

Administrative Items

Chair Buddy Humphries thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Marx 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.

Marx reviewed the #1 minutes from March 31, 2025, 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 #1 minutes from March 31, 2025, as presented.

Marx reviewed the #2 minutes from April 7, 2025, and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were no comments or concerns.

MOTION: A Motion was made and seconded to approve #2 minutes from April 7, 2025, as presented.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

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

Abstain: Mike Cudahy

Proposed Revision Review

CB201

Proposed Revision: 1. ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL, & GOVERNANCE (ESG) RESPONSIBLE BUSINESS MANAGEMENT (107 POINTS)

Reason: And to update in all relevant areas, including the Acronym list (also change on pages 4, 5, 6, 9, and remove from the acronym list on page 15)

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revision and to update it in all relevant areas.

Discussion took place on the Motion:





- The motioner noted the different parts of the standard that would need to be updated if the Assessment Area title was changed. The Secretariat noted that all relevant parts would be updated with the revised title.
- There was discussion on whether the title should remain the same since it is a more recognized term. It was noted that the change would depoliticize the standard, which is the intention of the proposal.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstained.

Abstain: Janis Fedorowick, Frank Sullivan, Sarah Puls

CB202, CB203, CB204

CB202 Proposed Revision: 1.3 ~~SOCIAL MANAGEMENT~~ RESPONSIBLE BUSINESS PRACTICES (6 POINTS)

CB203 Proposed Revision: 1.3.1 ~~EQUITY & INCLUSIVENESS~~ RESPONSIBLE BUSINESS CULTURE

CB203 Reason: For clarity on updated section

CB204 Proposed Revision: 1.3.2 ~~SOCIAL & GOVERNANCE~~ RESPONSIBLE BUSINESS PRACTICES

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revisions for CB202, CB203, and CB204.

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstained.

Abstain: Janis Fedorowick, Frank Sullivan, Sarah Puls

CB205 & CB206

CB205 Proposed Revision: 1.3.2.2 The organization issues a ~~CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) or ESG (Environmental, Social, Governance)~~ report demonstrating responsible business practices on an annual or regular basis.

1 point

CB205 Reason: Develop Assessment Guidance in TM.

CB206 Proposed Revision: 1.3.2.3 The ~~CSR or ESG~~ report indicated in 1.3.2.2 is publicly available.

1 point

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

Discussion took place on the Motion:

- It was noted that the type of report should be described in 1.3.2.3. There was agreement to add “indicated in 1.3.2.2” within the criteria of 1.3.2.3.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstained.

Abstain: Janis Fedorowick, Frank Sullivan, Sarah Puls

CB207



Proposed Revision: 2.1.1A PATH A: ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT (ESA)

Reason: To match official title name

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, 1 abstained.

Abstain: Sarah Puls

CB208

Proposed Revision: 3.1.1E.1 The project has achieved GBI's ~~Green Globes~~ Journey to Net Zero certification/recognition, or equivalent from a nationally or regionally recognized certification program within the last three years.

Reason: Update in GBI Branding/nomenclature

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.

CB209

Proposed Revision: 3.2.1.5 The building has ~~undergone a roof replacement of a roof~~ material with a high Solar Reflectance Index (SRI) as prescribed based on the slope of the roof, as specified in Section 2.3.4.1 of ANSI/GBI-01 2024.

Reason: Reword for clarity

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.

CB210, CB211, CB212

CB210 Proposed Revision: 3.2.2.1A.1 At least 80% of the building interior lighting is installed with LED and/or OLED (quantified by floor area).

CB211 Proposed Revision: 3.2.2.1B.1 At least 80% of the common and amenity areas' lighting are installed with LED and/or OLED (quantified by floor area).

CB212 Proposed Revision: 3.2.2.1B.2 At least 80% of the residential units or hotel rooms' lighting are installed with LED and/or OLED (quantified by floor area).

MOTION: The Motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed revisions, CB210, CB211, and CB212.



Discussion took place on the Motion:

- There was no discussion.

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

Abstain: Joe Menchefski

201-1

Public Comment: Comment - Thank you for keeping acoustics in this green building standard, and remaining the same value at 14 points.

Reason: I support keeping acoustics in sustainability standards. It is key to human performance and wellbeing in built environments.

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.

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 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

201-2

Public Comment: ~~Designated spaces~~ all occupied rooms

Reason: Acoustics criteria isn't only for concert halls and specialty "quiet" rooms. Acoustics and noise control is important everywhere people exist. "Occupied rooms" are defined on page 13.

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The Technical Manual includes the information below which will also be included in the next version:

An acoustical plan or program is a framework that allows prioritization of the occupant's acoustical needs by considering the architectural features of the built environment that can affect their perception of sound in space. An acoustical program is best developed by a qualified professional in acoustics. They can vary in complexity and sophistication. An acoustical program may identify spaces available for private conversations (e.g., in person, telephone, virtual), focused or collaborative work, relaxation areas, etc. An acoustical program may define objective criteria for the architecture (e.g., reverberation time, sound insulation, vibration isolation, background noise, background sound) to achieve acoustical goals (e.g., acoustical privacy, speech privacy, acoustical comfort, speech intelligibility) that are conducive to the needs of the space and occupants.

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

MOTION FAILS: The Motion was not seconded.

Discussion took place on the Public Comment:

- There was discussion that the change should not take place because it would be difficult to police in case a room that is not occupied during certain times of the day.
- The criteria was reviewed in the current draft standard, as well as the Technical Manual. It was argued that the Technical Manual includes a great definition on what would be included as “designated spaces.”

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 revising the criteria to “habitable rooms” or rooms where people congregate.
- It was argued that there needs to be better acoustic criteria on what is acceptable in all areas where people might be. It was noted that the building should be comfortable for all, which includes sound protection for anyone using the spaces.
- There was discussion on revising the criteria to all rooms but list exceptions. It was noted that it would be difficult to list all exceptions within all the project types that are certified.
- The definition for “occupied rooms” was reviewed.
- It was argued that the room list and the sound requirements included in the acoustical plan should be determined by the project.

VOTE: The Motion carries with 5 in favor, 3 opposed, 2 abstained.

Opposed: Larry Eisenberg, Janis Federowick, Frank Sullivan

Abstain: John Mullen, Jane Rohde

201-3

Public Comment: ... List the room type, qualitative acoustic description, quantitative acoustical criteria, and justification via reference standard or acoustics professional.

Reason: How do we know what criteria design teams will include in the Acoustical Performance Plan? Does it require an acoustical consultant? Talking to client/ end users? Who sets the criteria and what standard is it based on?

Recommended Response: Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been rejected for the following reason: The Technical Manual includes additional information on this topic to aid users.

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 agreement on the response to the commenter.

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

New Business

There were no comments.

Review Schedule



Marx reviewed next steps in the standard process and stated that following the next open public comment period in July there may be a meeting depending on the comments that are submitted.

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

Meeting adjourned at 2:25 PM EST.

Kerry Sutton arrived shortly after the meeting ended early at 2:25 PM EST.