



Minutes
ANSI-GBI Standards Development Committee
Via Teleconference
July 14, 2009



Meeting Attendance

Committee Members	July 14
Bergmiller, Gregory	✓
Bergtold, Greg	
Birkbeck, Peter	✓
Bland, Kenneth	✓
Bryan, Harvey	✓
Carmody, John	✓
Coad, William	
Collins, David	
Crawford, Gregory	✓
Dixon, Chris	✓
Freeman, William	✓
Gardner, Michael	✓
Hubert, Steven	✓
Koeller, John	✓
Lupinacci, Jean	
Martin, Shawn	✓
Meadows, Dru	
Rogers, Robin	✓
Schenck, Paula	
Shymko, Gordon	✓
Smith, Carl	✓
Sordyl, Douglas	✓
Subasic, Christine	✓
Sundersingh, David	✓
Taylor, Thomas	✓
Thompson, Mike	✓
Tin, Angela	✓
Viola, Dave	
Trusty, Wayne	✓
White, Ron	✓

Staff	
Rademacher, Sara (Secretariat, GBI)	✓
Worden, Vicki (Committee Liaison, GBI)	✓

Tuesday, July 14, 2009

1. Welcome

Discussion: Chairman of the Committee, Wayne Trusty, opened the meeting with a general welcome to Committee Members, staff and guests. He introduced the Secretariat, Sara Rademacher. The Secretariat took a roll call of the Committee members and asked members of the public to identify themselves. With 24 Committee Members present plus the Chair, the meeting reached a quorum. Next the chair reviewed the meeting agenda. The chair also reminded the participants that the next Committee Meeting Teleconference is scheduled for August 5, 2009.

Action Required: None.



Minutes
ANSI-GBI Standards Development Committee
Via Teleconference
July 14, 2009



2. Minutes from June 2009 Committee Meeting

Discussion: Wayne reviewed minutes from June 2009 meeting. Secretariat explained that one Committee Member was in attendance during the meeting but not logged correctly and asked that the minutes be approved with that change.

Approved by Affirmation (No-0, Abstain-0)

Motion made by Harvey Bryan and seconded by David Sundersingh.

3. Appeals Process Update

Discussion: Vicki Worden explained that one of the purposes for the meeting was to review the appeals received as a result of the 2nd Round of Public Comment. She also explained that first she would give an update of the technical and procedural objections. Vicki then went over information from each appellant and current status.

Martha VanGeem - CTL

There were 7 technical objections, most of which were addressed and voted on during the February 2009 meeting.

There were two procedural objections, one of which is being addressed informally and the other was handled by an appeals panel.

There were three action items resulting:

- 1) Working Group on an alternative performance path needs to be re-established, and John Carmody has done this via email. Anyone on the call, who would like to join the working group, was invited to contact Vicki or Sara.
- 2) All 4 LCA Credit Calculator spreadsheets need to be posted during the 4th Public Comment Period.
- 3) Need to make an editorial clarification in the LCA credit calculator to explain the reason for assemblies in red text without corresponding impact results.

Thomas Culp – Birch Point Consulting, LLC

There was one technical objection which was informally resolved. Essentially the objection was based on a misunderstanding which was resolved by an explanation of the data underlying the LCA credit calculator.

Rob Marshall – Cedaridge Services

There were two technical objections regarding 10.7.6.1. One was about technical information that the appellant thought should be available. The second objection was that the appellant wanted to add Canadian Building Codes to the standard. For the first objection, the suggested resolution is to add an informational reference in the standard. The second objection was addressed at the February 2009 Committee meeting and no further action was needed. Motion made to add the suggested informational reference.

Approved by Affirmation (No-0, Abstain-0)

Motion made by Carl Smith and seconded by Doug Sordyl.

Andrew Smith –Irrigation Association

There were two technical objections. The Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) have agreed on some changes that address the concerns raised in the objections. The first objection centered on the use of “predominantly wet climate zones” wording in section 7.4.1.8 and its definition in Section 5. The SMEs agreed to delete the language and definition from the standard and a motion was made to reflect this.

Approved by Affirmation (No-0, Abstain-0)

Motion made by Thomas Taylor and seconded by Christine Subasic.

The second objection contains a suggested language change for section 7.4.1.7.1. The SMEs agreed that the following language should be added: "...or certified irrigation professional." Motion was made, seconded and passed.

Approved by Affirmation (No-0, Abstain-0)
Motion made by David Sundersingh and seconded by Peter Birkbeck.

Frank Morrison and Phillip Hollander – Baltimore Aircoil Co.

Vicki explained that where possible we have tried to combine the discussion to work through the objections. She also explained that there was discussion about wet cooling towers, water conservation and energy conservation. Several SMEs have worked with commenter and come up with some proposed changes in 12.2.5.1.

The chair clarified that the suggested changes might make the standard clearer but not necessarily resolve the objection. Vicki went on to explain that the criteria in the standard were not clear and that was the reason there was some confusion. Essentially the SMEs decided to change negatives into positives when appropriate. In addition, instead of using side air louvers or open basin it is being suggested that the language be changed to drift eliminator and inlet air louvers. Also another bullet was added and the points were adjusted slightly based on the changes.

Then Committee Member Harvey Bryan explained the changes further. He said that the appellants wanted to look at the three places that reference cooling towers within the standard. He believes we have come close to resolving this but that the appellant hopes to also see changes in the energy section.

A question was raised about why there are 0 points listed in this section when we don't list 0 in others. The point of the concern was to ensure consistency with points within the standard. As a result, an amendment to the original motion was made to eliminate the 3rd bullet point and delete reference to 0 points.

An inquiry was made about why the standard has "n/a" in this section and whether or not it makes sense. It was explained that if the user has air cooling towers or no wet cooling towers then they would get 4 points. If the user only has wet cooling towers then it would be addressed with this section. The user is given points for having a cooling tower. One Committee Member suggested a potential fix for the opening sentence by changing the wording to "if wet cooling towers were used they were equipped" and then make N/A if no cooling system was installed. The Committee agreed that this was an editorial change to the wording.

Proposed Change to 12.2.5.1

12.2.5 Wet Cooling Towers

12.2.5.1 One of the following measures was implemented:

- No wet cooling towers were installed.
- OR
- Wet cooling towers were installed with drift eliminators and inlet air louvers
- OR
- ~~Wet cooling towers were installed without drift eliminators and inlet air louvers~~

Maximum = 4 points or n/a

4 points = no wet cooling towers were installed

2 points = wet cooling towers were installed with drift eliminators and inlet air louvers

n/a if no cooling system

Approved by Affirmation (No-0, Abstain-0)
Original motion made by Greg Bergmiller and seconded by Gord Shymko. Both members agreed to the change in the motion.

The next issue was the series of credits in the standard that tie back to how we address wet cooling. When asked about section 9.3.1.3, the SMEs did not necessarily agree with commenter, but the SMEs determined that there was no reason for the last part of the 4th bullet. The language was displayed for the participants to view.

9.3.1.3 One of the following strategies was used for cooling:

- 20% of the annual heat rejected was dissipated with sensible (dry) cooling.
- 21% to 50% of the annual heat rejected was dissipated with sensible (dry) cooling
- 51% to 75% of the annual heat rejected was dissipated with sensible (dry) cooling
- No wet cooling was used ~~where any given compressor unit in a building exceeded 350 kW (100 tons) of total cooling capacity.~~

Maximum = 4 points or n/a

20% heat rejected = 1 point or n/a

21% -50% heat rejected = 2 points or n/a

51% -75% heat rejected = 3 points or n/a

no wet cooling = 4 points or n/a

It was explained that this was intended to avoid an easy point for smaller systems of less than 100 tons. A motion was made to delete a section of the 4th bullet.

Approved by Affirmation (No-0, Abstain-0)

Motion made by Doug Sordyl and seconded by Harvey Bryan.

The next section discussed was 9.3.1. The suggestion is to change the technical criteria within the first two buildings and add a bullet in order to further clarify the intent of the criteria. The language was put on the screen and explained to the Committee.

9.3.1 Cooling Towers

9.3.1.1 Cooling towers for air conditioning systems achieved one of the following:

- A minimum of 5 cycles of concentration for makeup waters having less than 200 mg/L (200 ppm) total hardness as calcium carbonate or 3.5 cycles for makeup waters with more than 200 mg/L (200 ppm) total hardness as calcium carbonate.
OR
- A minimum discharge conductivity of 1500 micromhos/cm, or maximum of 150 mg/L (150 ppm) of silica measured as silicon dioxide.
OR
- Exceeded the minimum water quality criteria as expressed above by 20% or more (e.g. achieved 6 cycles, etc.)

Maximum = 6 points

Exceeded the minimum water quality criteria by 20% or more = 6 points

Achieved the minimum water quality criteria = 4 points

n/a if no cooling towers

A motion was made to accept the changes as written. No further discussion took place.

Approved by Affirmation (No-0, Abstain-0)

Motion made by David Sundersingh and seconded by Mike Thompson.

The next section discussed was section 8.6.1. Harvey Bryan the Energy Section Subcommittee Chair was asked to explain this section. Language was displayed on screen for participants to view.

8.6.1

8.6.1 Cooling Equipment

8.6.1.1 The seasonal energy efficiency ratio (SEER), energy efficiency ratio (EER), integrated part-load value (IPLV), coefficient of performance (COP) or kilowatt per ton (kW/ton) of the cooling equipment exceeded ANSI/ASHRAE/IESNA Standard 90.1 - 2007 or 2009 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) requirements at least by 5-15%.

If ANSI/ASHRAE/IESNA Standard 90.1-2007 or 2009 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) requires more than one efficiency rating, the more efficient one was used.

The percentage improvement for multiple pieces of equipment shall be the weighted average improvement based on equipment capacity.

Maximum = 12 points or n/a

http://www.engineeringtoolbox.com/cop-eer-d_409.html

Ref. for unit conversion

90.1 Value for Base Equipment/System			Points Awarded based on % Improvement					
EER or SEER	COP or IPLV	kW/ton	5-6%	7-8%	9-10%	11-12%	13-14%	15%+
8	2.34	1.50	0	0	0	1	2	3
9	2.64	1.33	0	0	0	2	3	4
10	2.93	1.20	0	0	2	3	5	6
11	3.22	1.09	0	0	2	4	6	8
12	3.52	1.00	0	2	3	5	8	9
13	3.81	0.92	0	2	5	7	9	10
14	4.10	0.86	2	4	6	8	10	12
15	4.40	0.80	3	5	7	9	12	
16	4.69	0.75	4	6	8	11	12	
17	4.98	0.71	5	7	9	12		
18	5.28	0.67	6	8	10	12		
19	5.57	0.63	7	9	12			
20	5.86	0.60	8	10	12			
21	6.15	0.57	9	12				
22	6.45	0.55	12					

Harvey explained that someone using the standard as written might be able to boost their points in a way not intended by the Committee. Harvey then suggested this item be tabled because the subcommittee hadn't had time to review it yet and then the subcommittee could be ready to present during the August 5 meeting.

The appellant stated that as long as the general sense is there he was not tied to the particular numbers in the table. A motion was made to table this item. No further discussion took place.

Approved by Affirmation (No-0, Abstain-0)
 Motion made by Harvey Bryan and seconded by Gord Shymko.

Randy Carter – Steelcase, Inc.

The focus of the both technical and procedural appeals related to the reference to Greenguard in several places in the standard. The procedural objections were addressed by the appeals panel so no further action is required by the Committee. There have been ongoing discussions to try and resolve the technical objections with the interested parties. The issue before the Committee was - should there be only one testing method referenced or should there be more than one testing method referenced in the standard. The Committee was reminded that information summarizing the previous discussions had been previously sent out for their review.

Discussion was then turned over to Committee Member Bill Freeman. He proposed discussion items and language for the committee. These were projected.

Discussion items:

1. The Greenguard Test Method reference in Section 12.2 of the GBI Standard be removed.
2. Table 12.2.1-C Floors and Interior Fit-Outs be modified to state: Interior Fit-Out Products (including insulation and wall coverings but excluding built-in cabinetry and shelving).
3. Section 12.2.1.1 be modified to remove the word “all” from the Greenguard and Indoor Advantage certification program lines to make it clear that only certified products and materials identified in the scope of Section 12 are included.
4. Require specific, named and dated references for all of the referenced certification programs.—withdraw this motion – discuss in subgroup

Chair asked Bill Freeman to make a motion. He moved that in section 12.2 the Greenguard Test Method be removed. The motion was seconded. A lengthy discussion took place regarding various aspects of the issue, including the proprietary nature of the Greenguard testing protocol, the fact that Greenguard made changes during GBI’s public comment period, and the status of the California standard. Members of the public, including the objector, participated in the discussion. The vote was done by roll call.

Rejected (Yes-4, No-10, Abstain-3) (**Yes:** Peter Birkbeck, William Freeman, Douglas Sordyl, and David Sundersingh. **No:** Kenneth Bland, Harvey Bryan, John Carmody, Gregory Crawford, Chris Dixon, Steven Hubert, Robin Rogers, Gordon Shymko, Thomas Taylor, and Mike Thompson. **Abstain:** John Koeller, Carl Smith and Angela Tin.)

Motion made by Bill Freeman and seconded by David Sundersingh.

Next the Committee discussed the second bullet on the list. The concern was that this section wasn’t specific enough especially for built in cabinets. It was pointed out that California does not include modeling or loading for cabinetry and that Greenguard doesn’t contain enough information to know how they certify them. Committee agreed that the current language in the draft isn’t specific enough. A suggestion was made that the subcommittee should discuss this further. An initial motion by Bill Freeman to change wording as stated in #2, seconded by David Sundersingh, was withdrawn after the discussion and this item was tabled for discussion at a working group level.

The Committee moved on to #3 and a motion was made to change the language as suggested. Briefly it was explained what the original intent was and that it was no longer necessary. No further discussion by the Committee.

Approved by Affirmation(No-0, Abstain-1, Robin Rogers)

Motion made by Bill Freeman and seconded by Carl Smith.

The Committee moved on to #4. The discussion centered on whether specific dates should be used and, if so, how to determine which ones. It was explained that the assumption was that if a specific date was not given then the



Minutes
ANSI-GBI Standards Development Committee
Via Teleconference
July 14, 2009



most recent version would be used. Discussion focused on what is currently done and it was determined that there isn't a consistent answer. The Chair suggested that a working group be formed to look at this further and report back during the August 5 meeting. An initial motion by Bill Freeman, seconded by Peter Birkbeck, was withdrawn pending further research. This item was tabled until August 5.

4. Tabled Comments from June 30, 2009 Meeting

Committee discussion moved to comments from the 3rd Letter Ballot and Public Comment period that were tabled during the June Committee Meeting.

#32 Comment suggested a clarification for section 12.2.1. The commenter wanted the wording changed to indicate where the specific test methods to be used in the section were listed. Motion made to accept as written.

Approved by Affirmation (No-0, Abstain-0)
Motion made by Carl Smith and seconded by Robin Rogers.

#33 Comment suggested a change in wording regarding the ventilation rates used in section 12.2.1-C. The Secretariat suggested that this item be tabled so the working group could address it further and present during the August 5 meeting. Item was tabled.

#9 Comment suggests changing language back to what was in a previous version of the standard. It suggests that in Section 8 the wording "whichever is more stringent" should be added. The Committee decided to reject this comment. Harvey Bryan explained the response as written. One editorial change was suggested.

Approved by Affirmation (No-0, Abstain-0)
Motion to accept as written, with editorial changes, made by Gord Shymko and seconded by Peter Birkbeck.

#7 Comment suggested a change to the language in 12.3.2.1 which addresses radon. Brief explanation was given of the working group results since the June meeting. It was explained that there are still some concerns about this section and the working group will be reconvened before the next meeting. Item remained tabled.

#52 Comment suggests moving language in section 7.4.1.7 to the beginning of the clause. A brief explanation of the change was given to the Committee. The Committee agreed to the change as written. The original comment was rejected.

Approved by Affirmation (No-0, Abstain-0)
Motion to accept made by Peter Birkbeck and seconded by Harvey Bryan.

Chair advised that was the end of outstanding business and asked if anyone had any additional items. The Committee was reminded about the August 5 Committee Meeting and the public was invited to participate.

Motion to adjourn.
Approved by Affirmation (No-0, Abstain-0)
Motion to accept made by Carl Smith and seconded by Peter Birkbeck.

Addendum:

The following is a list of participants from the public. The list gives the names of the public to the best of our ability. This list may not be complete due to participants joining and leaving the conference call sporadically. Randy Carter, Josh Jacobs, Kelly Wedell, Michael Cudahy, Stan Wolfersberger, Herb Ganz, Reinhard Oppl, Stowe Hartridge-Beam, Al Hodgson, Al Addy, Andrew Smith, Simone Skopek, Amy Costello, Robert Meyer, Jiri Skopek, Larry Kouma, Martha VanGeem, Phillip Hollander and Toni Stein.