



20	John Koeller	Alliance for Water Efficiency	X	X					
21	Jennifer Kowalonek	Alfred Benesch & Company	Absent	X					
22	Michael Lehman	ConTech Lighting	Absent	X					
23	Tien Peng	National Ready Mix Concrete Assn.	X	X					
	Bernadette Reyes	Clark Construction Group	Resigned						
24	Angela Rivera	URS Corporation (rep. self)	Absent	Absent					
25	Jane Rohde	JSR Assoc. Inc., Vinyl Institute	X	X					
26	Gord Shymko	G.F. Shymko & Associates, In.	X	X					
	Julie Sobelman	Independent Consultant	Resigned						
27	Kent Sovocool	Southern Nevada Water Authority	X	X					
28	Steve Strawn	JELD-WEN	X (Proxy for Paul Bertram)	Absent					
29	George Thompson	Chemical Compliance Systems, Inc.	X	X					
30	Angela Tin	American Lung Assn.	Alternate	Absent					
31	Douglas Tucker	Mitsubishi Electric Cooling & Heating	Absent	Absent					
32	Erika Winters Downey	American Institute of Steel Construction	Alternate	X					
<b>Voting Alternates</b>									
	Abby Brokaw	American Lung Assn. (voting Alternate for Angela Tin)	X						
	Paul Karrer	AIA (Alternate for Rachel Minnery)							
	Bill Hoffman	UL Environment (Voting Alternate for Josh Jacobs)							
	Lance Davis	GSA (Voting Alternate for Don Horn)	X						

	D'Lane Wisner	D'Lane Wisner (Voting Alternate for William Carroll)							
	John Cross	American Institute of Steel Construction (Voting Alternate for Erika Winters-Downey)	X						
TOTALS			23/29	25/32					
<b>Visitors</b>									
	Ed Deomano	Composite Panel Association	X						
	Christian Taber	Big Ass Solutions	X						
	Brent Mecham	Irrigation Association	X						
	Jiri Skopek	JLL	X	X					
	Martha VanGeem	Self (Principal Engineer)	X	X					
	Chris Hsieh	Trane	X						
	Allen Blakey	Allen Blakey & Associates	X						
	Kyle Thompson	IAPMO	X						
	Jake Vandevort	?		X					
	Sydney Lindquist	Hexion Inc.		X					
	Ric Doedens	K.R. Moeller Associates, Ltd.		X					
	David Sundersingh	Self		X					
	Mike Cudahy	Plastic Pipe and Fittings Association		X					
	Alfred Hodgson	Berkeley Analytical		X					
	Kevin McKenny	?		X					
	James Kirby	Center for Environmental Innovation in Roofing (CEIR)		X					
<b>Staff/Consultants</b>									
	Wayne	Chair	X	X					

	Trusty								
	Vicki Worden	Executive Director, GBI	X						
	Emily Randolph	Secretariat Asst., GBI	X	X					
	Micah Thomas	Staff, GBI							
	Maria Woodbury	Secretariat, GBI	X	X					

**Wednesday, January 13, 2016**

**Welcome & Roll Call**

Chair, Wayne Trusty, welcomed participants. Roll call established quorum. At this meeting, no members voted via proxy or using alternates.

Secretariat Assistant, Emily Randolph informed participants that the call was being recorded and no objection was raised.

The antitrust statement was reviewed and participants were requested to comply with it fully.

Woodbury reviewed the participation options, stating that while observers are welcome to participate in the discussion, only Consensus Body Members are able to vote.

**Administrative Procedures and Related Matters**

The agenda was reviewed and no changes were requested by the Consensus Body.

The membership roster was reviewed, noting that it is published online denoting interest categories and the organizations each individual is representing. Woodbury reported three new members had been elected to the Consensus Body via a letter ballot: Susan Gitlin (Government), Karen Joslin (User), and Gary Keclik (User). Woodbury also reported that William Carroll had changed interest categories from Producer to General.

Trusty asked for a motion on the minutes from the meeting on December 16th.

**MOTION: A motion was made, seconded, and carried to approve the minutes from the last Consensus Body Meeting on Wednesday, December 16, 2015.**

None opposed. None Abstained.

**Discussion of public comments: Editorial and General Subcommittee Reports**

**Indoor Environment**

Mike Lehman, Chair of the Indoor Environment Subcommittee, gave a summary of the comments received on the Indoor Environment assessment area:

**52 – 60. Editorial. 11.**

- **Comment:** We suggest reformatting the tables to better describe the source of the data cited within the tables.
- **Reason:** General good practice to always provide clear references to the sources of data.
- **Proposed Response:** Reject as non-persuasive due to not enough specifications. Other comments more clearly address the issue at hand.
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimous

**23 – 1. General. Table 11.1.2.1**

- **Comment:** Table 11.1.2.1 *Air Distribution Effectiveness* prescribes values based on configuration and other factors including temperature differentials. Is the intent to measure or model the temperature differentials to obtain the  $E_z$  value?
- **Reason:** Changes to the contents in the space may change the  $E_z$  value and reduce the air distribution effectiveness. [p. 79]
- **Proposed Response:** Reject as non-persuasive subject to the correction of the missing demarcation line. The comment goes beyond the intended implementation methodology of the credit.
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** 8 in favor, 2 abstained

**50 – 13. General. 11.2.1.1**

- **Comment:** This section is the only one in the entire standard that references Green Globes Reference Manual.
- **Reason:** Consider an industry standard if possible.
- **Proposed Response:** to accept the comment by removing the Green Globes Reference Manual as a reference.
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** 8 in favor, 2 abstained

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed responses to comments 52 – 60, 23 – 1, and 50 – 13.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- The point was raised that it is important for there to be clarity in response to the comment. It was felt that the language, “due to not enough specification” was unclear. It was explained that without further specificity in the comment it is very difficult for the subcommittee to identify and address the problem.
- It was clarified that the commenter does not have to provide a solution to the problem identified.

**The motion was amended to change the reason for response of 52 – 60 to “due to not enough specificity describing the problem.” The amendment was seconded. The motion carried with 21 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.**

None opposed.

None Abstained.

**13 – 6. 13 – 16. 13 – 20. 13 – 28. Editorial. 11.2.1.1, 11.2.1.2, 11.2.1.3, 11.2.1.4**

- **Comment:** Provide documentation indicating compliance with the VOC ~~content~~ emission requirements or a certification...
- **Reason:** Correct Editorial error
- **Proposed Response:** accept all comments pertaining to this error.
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimously in favor

**13 – 7. 13 – 17. 13 – 21. Editorial. 11.2.1.1, 11.2.1.2, 11.2.1.3**

- **Comment:** ~~Scientific Certification Systems~~ SCS Global Services
- **Reason:** Company name has been changed
- **Proposed Response:** accept any comment relation to SCS name change
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to Accept the proposed responses for the above comments. The motion carried with 20 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.**

None opposed.

None abstained.

**52 – 62. Editorial. 11.2.4.1**

- **Comment:** Replace the citations of ASHRAE Guideline 12-2000 with “ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 188-2015, Legionellosis: Risk Management for Building Water Systems”
- **Reason:** This is the newest standard from ASHRAE on the topic.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept with the correction to the section reference (comment referenced incorrect section) provided by the commenter.
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** 9 in favor, 1 abstained

**53 – 8. General. 11.2.4**

- **Comment:** ASHRAE has a new standard out for Legionella control
- **Reason:** None given
- **Proposed Response:** accept based on action taken in 52 – 62.
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded the accept the responses to 52 – 62 and 53 – 8. The motion carried with 22 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.**

None opposed.

None abstained.

**34 – 39. Editorial. 11.2.2**

- **Comment:** Confirm Path A and Path B have same max points
- **Reason:** Otherwise seems this will throw off 1000 point total
- **Proposed Response:** reject based on the fact that the comment is non-persuasive and will not impact total points. There is precedent in other areas of the standard for having unequal points between paths. Some paths are intended to carry more points than others.
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to reject the comment using the response proposed by the subcommittee.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- The question was raised as to whether or not this stays within the thousand points as currently written. It was noted that the points had been carefully reconciled for this section, although there is one extra point in the IEQ section that is being addressed on the subcommittee level.

**The motion carried with 22 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.**

None opposed.

Abstained: Susan Gitlin

**9 – 15. Editorial. 11.2.5**

- **Comment:** “Mullions and ledges are less than 1 in (2.5 cm) deep to discourage bird roosting roosting.”

**51 – 3. Editorial 11.2.5, bullet 4**

- **Comment:** “roosting”
- **Reason:** Typo in Pest Control
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the recommendations for these comments.**

**The motion carried with 24 in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.**

None opposed.

None abstained.

**24 – 21. General. 11.2.5.1**

- **Comment:** Does failure to comply with all bulleted point negate a user’s ability to earn these points?
- **Reason:** This criterion only earns one point and the manner in which it is written suggests that a building must have all four of these conditions met. The first 3 conditions seem reasonable for almost any project however the 4th condition (especially with older existing buildings) seems excessive and potentially unachievable.
- **Proposed Response:** reject as non-persuasive, note that this standard applies to new construction and major renovations not existing buildings. To earn the one point you must comply with all four parts of the criterion.
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** 8 in favor, 1 abstained

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the recommend response to the comment.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- One member clarified that major renovations have to occur within an existing building. It was clarified the response was meant to discern major renovations from minor renovations.
- One member pointed out that this criterion discriminates against historic buildings. The suggestion was made to clarify that the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet applies to new construction only. One member stated that the fourth bullet should not apply to historic building. The question was raised whether historical buildings could be incentivized with an exception for registered buildings or historic districts.
- It was noted that there are pros and cons to choosing to renovate an existing building and that it could be argued that one of the cons is accepting the performance compromising inherent in the existing envelope.
- The suggestion was made to accept the intent of the comment and to come up with an innovative solution to the problem.
- The question was raised whether in the case of a major renovation the assessor would evaluate the entire building or only the new external parts. An assessor on the call responded that they evaluate the entire building and that it must respond to all aspects of the criteria. It was suggested that the language be changed to read, “for existing buildings this applies only to new components.”
- One member noted that not every project can earn every point available and that the standard cannot always be fair.
- The point was made that the committee has spent an inordinate amount of time debating the answer to a question where no actual change was proposed and no suggested change was offered by the subcommittee. It was agreed that this is an important point, but that the discussion should not take place on a Consensus Body call.

**Motion Withdrawn. Further discussion to take place at the in-person meeting.**

**28 – 6. Editorial. 11.3**

- **Comment:** 11.3 Indoor Lighting Design and Systems
- **Reason:** The title of the section should be changed distinguish it from outdoor lighting provisions in Sec. 7.
- **Proposed Response:** reject on the basis that we do not need to add the word indoor since it's in the indoor section.
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** 9 in favor, 2 abstained

**20 – 2. Editorial. 11.3.3.2**

- **Comment:** 2700°K and ~~4000°K~~ 4500°K
- **Reason:** There are light output and human health benefits of Color Temperatures up to 4500K, this number should be revised to 4500K from 4000K.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** 10 in favor, 1 abstained

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the recommended responses to 28 – 6 and 20 – 2.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- The question was raised regarding the impact of 20 – 2 on Energy. Is the Energy section going to be negatively impacted? The response was that the color temperature has no impact on Energy consumption.

**The motion carried with 20 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.**

None opposed.

Abstained: Allan Bilka

**21 – 12. Editorial. 11.4.1.1.4**

- **Comment:** “N/A where there are no open-air mercantile and assembly occupancies/areas.”
- **Reason:** Spelling error
- **Proposed Response:** accept with amendment so that it reads “open-area”
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** 11 in favor, 1 abstained

**49 – 29. Editorial. 11.5.9.2**

- **Comment:** “Nosie” should be “Noise”
- **Reason:**
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed responses to 21 – 12 and 49 – 29. The motion carried with 21 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.**

None opposed.

Abstained: John Koeller

**56 – 16. General. 11.1 & 11.4**

- **Comment:** The codes referenced within these criteria for BSR/GBI 01-201X are more stringent than the Guiding Principles for New Construction requirement for Ventilation and Thermal Comfort.
- **Reason:**
- **Proposed Response:** reject as non-persuasive since what is in the standard is more stringent than what is in the comment.
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** 10 in favor, 2 abstained



**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the response to 56 – 16.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- One member stated that they did not understand the response proposed.
- It was clarified that the commenter was pointing out the draft standard is more stringent than the Guiding Principles.

**The motion was amended to change the reason for proposed response to “higher stringency of BSR/GBI 01-201X as opposed to the Guiding Principles was intentional. The amendment was seconded. The motion carried with 21 in favor, none opposed and 1 abstained.**

None opposed.

Abstained: Chris Dixon

## Site

Gregg Bergmiller, Chair of the Site Subcommittee gave a summary of the comments reviewed in the Site Subcommittee:

### **36 – 12. Editorial. 7.3.2.1**

- **Comment:** Not applicable where there is no ~~woody shrubs~~ undergrowth existing on site, or adaptive or native to the site.
- **Reason:** Current wording seems to indicate that the only applicable undergrowth is woody shrubs.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept with modification: Change undergrowth to woody shrubs to clarify that woody shrubs are the only applicable undergrowth. Agree with the spirit of the comment but the clarification was to reinforce that woody shrubs are the issue and not undergrowth.
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** 7 in favor, 2 abstained

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response to 36 – 12. The motion carried with 22 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstained.**

None opposed.

Abstained: John Koeller, Allan Bilka

### **11 – 10. Editorial. 7.3.2.1**

- **Comment:** In the right column, in the undergrowth comments, a minor grammatical change is suggested: “Not applicable where there ~~is~~ are no woody shrubs existing on site....”
- **Reason:** None Given
- **Proposed Response:** accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response to 11 – 10. The motion carried with 23 in favor, none opposed and none abstained.**

None opposed.

None abstained.

### **9 – 11. Editorial. 7.3.4.1**

- **Comment:** Low Slope Roof definition and numbers included in 7.3.4.1 are not the same.
- **Reason:** Clarify which number is correct.
- **Proposed Response:** accept with modification to change language in first bullet to say “for a ~~low sloped~~ roof slope ...” second bullet: “for a ~~steep sloped~~ roof slope.” And remove parenthesis.

- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the response to 9 – 11.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- It was noted that in a separate vote, the subcommittee voted to remove the definitions for low-sloped and steep-sloped roofs in the definitions section.
- It was noted that there are discrepancies between various standards about the definition of low- and steep-sloped roofs. By eliminating the terms and leaving the actual slopes the issue is clarified.

**The motion carried with 23 in favor, none opposed and 1 abstained.**

None opposed.

Abstained: Jeff Bradley

**11 – 11. Editorial. 7.4.1.1**

- **Comment:** In the comments column, minor grammatical change suggested: “Not applicable where a *renovation* ~~that~~ does not change the building footprint.”

**21 – 9. Editorial. 7.4.1.1**

- **Comment:** “Not applicable where a renovation ~~that~~ does not change the building footprint.”
- **Reason:** Grammatical error
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimously in favor

**29 – 5. Editorial. 7.4.1.2**

- **Comment:** “...structures are located more than 100 feet from...” as opposed to current wording “~~not less than 100 feet~~”
- **Reason:** Streamline
- **Proposed Response:** accept with modification: “ ~~not less than~~ 100 ft. (30.5 m) or more...” modified the proposed language to include 100 ft.
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed responses to 11 – 11, 21 – 9, and 29 – 5. The motion carried with 23 in favor, none opposed, none abstained.**

None opposed.

None abstained.

**Discussion of public comments: Substantive**

**Project Management**

Erika Winters-Downey reviewed the responses for the Substantive comments on the Project Management assessment area:

**42 – 2. Substantive. 6.1.1.1**

- **Comment:** 6.1.1. 1 Performance and green design goals (qualitative and/or quantitative) are established in collaboration with the owner in writing and are regularly assessed from pre-design through to completion of construction and occupancy for the following listed items:
  - Water conservation, efficiency, alternate sources, and reuse;

- **Reason:** The standard deals with conservation, efficiency, use of alternate sources and reuse.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimous

**57 – 2. Substantive. 6.1.1.1**

- **Comment:** 6.1.1. 1 Performance and green design goals (qualitative and/or quantitative) are established in collaboration with the owner in writing and are regularly assessed from pre-design through to completion of construction and occupancy for the following listed items:

- Water conservation, efficiency, alternate sources, and reuse;

- **Reason:** The standard deals with conservation, efficiency, use of alternate sources and reuse.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimous

**Discussion took place prior to the motion:**

- The question was raised as to what alternative sources of water means? It was stated that alternative sources could refer to reclaimed water.
- One member felt that including alternate sources was redundant since the water chapter in the standard already covers alternate sources of water.
- The question was raised about inconsistencies between sections.
- It was noted that Alternate sources of water is defined in definitions. Alternate is the other side of the coin from non-potable water. It refers to the supply source as opposed to the substance itself.

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed responses with a modification on 57 – 2 to change to “Water conservation, efficiency, and alternate source ~~and reuse~~.”**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- The question was raised as to why reuse was being struck from the language.

**The motion was amended and seconded to accept the responses as proposed by the subcommittee.**

**The motion carried with 16 in favor, 3 opposed, and 5 abstained.**

Opposed: Josh Jacobs, David Eldridge, John Koeller

Abstained: Paul Bertram Allan Bilka, Gord Shymko, Amber Dzikowicz, Tien Peng

**34 – 8. Substantive. 6.4.1**

- **Comment:** Delete this section from the Project Management Area and move it (along with points) to section 11.2 Source Control
- **Reason:** Moisture control (generation or intrusion) represents the majority of construction defect claims and is very much a matter of professional practice, primarily for architects and ME's. An ASHRAE is emphasized used for an architectural item is surprising. Seems this would be more appropriately moved to
- **Proposed Response:** Reject on grounds of trying to keep a consistent document with envelope commissioning being in this section and the interior partitions separation. Overall moisture management.
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimous

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to reject comment 34 – 8.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- The concern was raised that the grounds for rejection are not valid and a new grounds for rejection was presented as seen in the amendment.

**The motion was amended and seconded to change the reason for rejection to “Moisture intrusion and infiltration potentially affects more than just potential indoor environmental quality issues including but not limited to structural integrity and material failure. The amendment was seconded. The motion carried with 21 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained.**

None opposed.

Abstained: Allan Bilka

## Site

### 24 – 9. Substantive. 7.1.2.2

- **Comment:** “The project is not located on ~~or adjacent to~~ sensitive natural sites...”
- **Reason:** The language “adjacent to” could be construed as ambiguous or misleading. A project with a large parcel of land could technically be adjacent to a protected area however the area of development could easily be well removed therefrom. If the language remains, its intent should be clarified.
- **Proposed Response:** Reject on the basis that dictionary definition of adjacent is clear.
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** 8 in favor. 1 Abstained.

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to reject comment 24 – 9. The motion carried with 20 in favor, 3 opposed, and none abstained.**

Opposed: John Koeller, David Eldridge, Gord Shymko

None abstained.

### 52 – 20. Substantive. 7.4.1.2

- **Comment:** Revise as follows: ~~-Isolated wetlands~~ Wetlands Add the following to the list of water bodies and waterways: - Springs and seeps.
- **Reason:** The ecosystem benefits of all wetlands, not just isolated wetlands, are protected by a buffer between them and hardscaped areas. Springs and seeps should also be protected because of their habitat value.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Results:** Unanimously in favor

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept comment 52 – 20.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- A member of the Site Subcommittee recalled that the Subcommittee had decided to say “naturally occurring springs and seeps. Other Site Subcommittee members concurred.

**The motion was amended and the amendment was seconded so that the language would read, “Naturally occurring springs and seeps.” The additional language was added for clarification.**

**Discussion took place on the amendment:**

- A member cautioned that the Consensus Body should be careful when adding terms that could be misused in criteria with very prescriptive requirements.
- It was noted that the term “seep” could be overly broad.
- One member raised the fact that these are points opportunities and not regulatory. Many of these items are fairly vague/flexible. It was stated that this is a pseudo-regulatory document.
- The concern was raised that project teams could interpret or misinterpret these issues in numerous ways and that it’s important to have a fallback such as a legal definition. The doubt was raised that there is a legal definition for “seep”. It is important not to include ambiguous language in the standard.

- The point was raised that we're talking about a naturally occurring body of water, specifically wetlands and seeps, that appears more than 100 ft from the structure and we're not going to see very many sites like that relative to the number of sites near oceans/lakes. We should address what a seep is in the definitions section of the standard.
- The question was raised as to whether or not this criterion refers solely to surface water or if it also deals with shallow, below grade water sources. Obvious surface water features are well documented and mapped where below grade water is very difficult to document or even identify.

**The motion was further amended and seconded so that the language would read, “from a natural surface body of water...natural surface waterway.”**

**Discussion took place on the amendment:**

- It was noted that it seems that this item needs to be discussed more thoroughly by the subcommittee.
- It was noted that there will be government entities offering incentives for buildings achieving a green globes rating and we must be able to legally defend what appears in the standard.
- A member noted that they disliked including lists in rating systems because it leaves a lot of room for things to be left out, for example gullies.

**Second Withdrawn**

**Motion Withdrawn**

52 – 20 will be sent back to the subcommittee for further discussion and will be brought before the Consensus Body at the next in-person meeting.

## Energy

David Eldridge, Chair of the Energy Subcommittee presented the following proposed responses to comments received on the Energy Section:

### **43 – 2. Substantive. 5.1: Definitions**

- **Comment:** Delete definition of **alternative energy** and change its only use in section 8.6.3 to renewable energy. ~~alternate energy: energy not from fossil fuel.~~
- **Reason:** This definition is not needed because renewable energy has been defined where it is used in section 8.6.2. It is only used in documentation, section 8.6.3. It is also incorrect. If it is used it should be the same as renewable energy. Nuclear, fossil, and hydro are traditional sources of energy in the electric grid. The intent here was for non-fossil, non-hydro, and non-nuclear. It is better to use the definition of renewable energy instead.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept. Subcommittee agrees with deletion of definition and replacing “alternate” with “renewable”
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** Unanimous

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response to 43 – 2. The motion carried with 18 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstained.**

None opposed.

Abstained: Josh Jacobs, Susan Gitlin

### **7 – 1. Substantive. 5.1: Definitions**

- **Comment:** ~~alternate energy: energy not from fossil~~ **carbon-based** fuel.
- **Reason:** The inclusion of non-fossil, carbon-based fuels as sources of alternative energy does not accomplish the goal of reducing greenhouse gasses and other combustion based emissions. Carbon-based fuel sources must be evaluated on an objective,

analytical basis by which a particular type of carbon-based fuel can demonstrate its advantages over other fuel sources rather than being given an arbitrary pass because it is characterized by a single attribute such as being bio-based. Alternatively, as the term “alternate energy” only appears once in the document, the definition could be struck with appropriate language replacing it in the standard.

- **Proposed Response:** Reject based on the action taken on 43 – 2 which deleted the definition for alternate energy.
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** Unanimous

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed response to 7 – 1. The motion carried with 20 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstained.**

None opposed.

Abstained: Josh Jacobs, Susan Gitlin

#### **7 – 7. Substantive. 8.1.1.1**

- **Comment:** ~~8.1.1.1 The building does not use energy,~~ complies with minimum performance based requirements of ASHRAE 90.1-2010 or the 2012 IECC. AND The building demonstrates an improvement over an ASHRAE 90.1-2010 baseline using Appendix G through the use of a whole-building energy modeling simulation program showing energy cost savings.8.1.1.1 The building does not use energy, complies with minimum performance based requirements of ASHRAE 90.1-2010 or the 2012 IECC. AND The building demonstrates an improvement over an ASHRAE 90.1-2010 baseline using Appendix G through the use of a whole-building energy modeling simulation program showing energy cost savings.
  - Energy cost calculations may include price components based on time of day and demand if these are available. Credit for demand saving measures, cogeneration, and energy storage may be claimed by utilizing rate schedules that reflect the billing rates in effect for the local utility, rather than using EIA state average utility rates.
- **Reason:** The proposed draft text clearly is missing something in the first sentence of 8.1.1.1. It is not clear if a building has to use no energy “and” meet the ASHRAE 90.1 or IECC requirements (which is not possible), or if the sentence was trying to address two different situations.

Our modification clarifies that a building must meet the base code or standard as a minimum and can obtain points by exceeding the base. It does not appear to make sense to include a building that uses no energy since it would not be possible to use less than zero energy and earn points under this section.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** 4 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstained

#### **28 – 13. Substantive. 8.1.1.1**

- **Comment:** ~~The building does not use energy,~~ complies with minimum performance based requirements of ASHRAE 90.1-2010 or the 2012 IECC.
- **Reason:** The performance based requirements of either document do not work for a building that does not use energy.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** 4 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstained

#### **43 – 18. Substantive. 8.1.1.1**

- **Comment:** Delete "does not use energy". The building ~~does not use energy,~~ complies with minimum performance based requirements of ASHRAE 90.1-2010 or the 2012 IECC.

- **Reason:** This phrase will allow for gaming: “building does not use energy”. Does this mean that it generates more energy than it uses? If so, this doesn’t necessarily mean that it should be exempt. Buildings with very low energy use are already covered in 90.1 and the IECC. They do not have building envelope requirements. If they have lighting, they have to meet the lighting requirements. If they have an HVAC system, they need to meet the mechanical requirements. They can be modeled in the performance path. ASHRAE 90.1 and the IECC are clear enough on how to handle all types of buildings. It is also confusing to lead off with this phrase.
- **Proposed Response:** Accept
- **Subcommittee Vote Result:** 4 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstained

**MOTION: The motion was made and seconded to accept comments 7 – 7, 28 – 13, and 43 – 18.**

**Discussion took place on the motion:**

- The question raised regarding how buildings that do not use energy are addressed in the standard. It was confirmed that such buildings are covered in the referenced standard. This section of the standard is more concerned with whether or not the building type would normally use energy. The assessor would have to make this non-applicable for building types that do not normally use energy rather than giving credit for not doing something that wouldn’t have been done regardless. Both the IECC and 90.1 have provisions for buildings that do not use energy.
- It was stated that we want to avoid awarding buildings based on features inherent in their geographical locations or circumstances. To do so would essentially state that we should only be building in temperate climates.

**The motion carried with 19 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstained.**

Opposed: Allan Bilka

Abstained: Amber Dzikowicz, Greg Johnson

### **Future Meetings**

Woodbury reviewed the schedule moving forward.

- The next meeting is scheduled for February 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>.
- There is an in-person meeting scheduled for March 21<sup>st</sup> through 23<sup>rd</sup> in Chicago.

### **New Business**

A comment on the Water assessment area raised the question of whether or not we should be drafting a new section addressing water quality. The question is if this is the time to be considering a new section in any area of the standard given the limitations on the schedule because the drafting of a new section could add as many as two months to the schedule. It was noted that once this version of the draft standard is approved it will switch to continuous maintenance and that the addition of new sections would be appropriate to the continuous maintenance process.

The question was raised regarding which comment this discussion was referring to. The commenter was on the line and clarified that they had submitted a comment regarding water treatment and nutrients found in the water. It is a water quality issue. The comment was suggested to modify a specific section and the subcommittee replied that it did not fit in the water conservation assessment area. The question was raised as to whether we could create a new assessment area to address this or if we could expand the scope of water conservation to include water quality.

It was suggested that the water subcommittee should continue to discuss this issue and return to the Consensus Body with a proposal. One member requested clarification as to whether this was referring to internal or external water use.

It was stressed that we don't want to bog down the entire process while waiting on one single issue to be worked out does not serve the betterment of the standard.

### **Adjournment**

**MOTION: A motion was made, seconded and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 3:08 pm ET.**