



2101 L St. NW
Washington, DC 20037
T: 202 828-7422
F: 202 828-5110
www.usgbc.org

MINUTES

Market Advisory Committee

Meeting date: April 18, 2010
Time: 4pm ET (Conference Call)
Minutes approved: Approved 9/19/11

Member	Title	Present
Liana Berberidou-Kallivoka	Austin Energy Green Building	X
Jeffrey Cole	Konstrukt	X
Rand Ekman	Cannon Design	X
Holley Henderson	H2 Ecodesign	X
Richard Kleinman	LaSalle Investment Management	
Craig Kneeland	NYSERDA	X
Muscoe Martin (Chair)	M2 Architecture	
Lisa Mattheissen (Vice-Chair)	Buro Happold	X
Cindy Quan	Goldman Sachs & Co.	
Matt Raimi	Raimi & Associates	X
Jon Ratner	Forest City Enterprises, Inc	
Rebecca Stafford	University of California	X
Keith Winn	Catalyst Partners	X
Subject Matter Experts		
Galina Chadwick	Bank of America	
Jonathan Flaherty	Tishman Speyer	X
Yetsuh Frank	Urban Green Council	
Brad Jones	Sebasta Blomberg	X
Raphael Sperry	Simon & Associates, Inc.	X
Staff		
Chris Law	USGBC	X
Corey Enck	USGBC	X
Chrissy Macken	USGBC	X
Meghan Bogaerts	USGBC	X
Sara Cederberg	USGBC	X
Amy Boyce	USGBC	X
Batya Metalitz	USGBC	X
Lonny Blumenthal	USGBC	X

Committee Vice-Chair Lisa Mattheissen called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm with the following agenda:

1. Roll Call and Conflict of Interest Declarations
2. Approve: 3/21, 4/4 and 4/11 Minutes
3. Discuss: Task Force Review— EBOM
4. Discuss: Task Force Review— ND

A quorum was present.



2101 L St. NW
Washington, DC 20037
T: 202 828-7422
F: 202 828-5110
www.usgbc.org

MINUTES

1. **Roll Call and Conflict of Interest Declarations**
 - a. None declared

2. **Approve: 3/21, 4/4 and 4/11 Minutes**
 - a. A motion to approve the 3/21/11 meeting minutes was made by Rand Ekman and seconded by Rebecca Stafford. Motion approved by consent.
 - b. A motion to approve the 4/4/11 meeting minutes was made by Jeff Cole and seconded by Rebecca Stafford. Motion approved by consent.
 - c. A motion to approve the 4/11/11 meeting minutes was made by Jeff Cole and seconded by Holley Henderson. Motion approved by consent.

3. **Discuss: Task Force Review— EBOM**
 - a. EA Prerequisite: Minimum Energy Performance
 - i. The Committee discussed a fundamental question reflected in the public comments for this prerequisite: Should project teams be rewarded for improved building performance or for absolute performance of the building against its peers? The Committee discussed the value of rewarding energy improvement of individual buildings as an important part of market transformation, and the benefits seen by incentivizing these buildings to pursue the other strategies found in LEED. While not posing a market barrier, however, the Committee expressed discussed whether this option could entail significantly different costs for buildings pursuing the same LEED plaque. The Committee received clarification that Option 3: Demonstrate Energy Efficiency Improvement will not be weighted as heavily as other options in EA Credit: Optimize Energy Performance.
 - b. PF Prerequisite: Ongoing Occupant Experience Survey
 - i. It discussed the significant challenge for multi-tenant building owners to achieve sufficient participation from tenants, as well the ability of owners to use the survey to produce actionable improvements in individual tenant spaces. The Committee recommended that this prerequisite instead become a credit. In addition, the Committee wished to affirm the significant differences between multi-tenant and single tenant buildings in the implementation of LEED.
 - c. WE Prerequisite: Minimum Fixture and Fitting Water Use Reduction
 - i. The Committee discussed the baselines of 100% water usage from meeting UPC and IPC codes and 120% for buildings built before 1993, which it saw as overly stringent. This requirement has been changed to 120%/150% for buildings built before 1995 in the 2nd draft version of the prerequisite. This date more accurately marks the compliance date for water efficiency measures as a result of the 1992 EPA Act. The Committee determined that such a change eliminates a market barrier for existing buildings built between 1993 and 1995, but was concerned with the documentation burden that this posed for the rest of projects tracking this data, for such a small increase in performance, It was recommended that thresholds change substantially if they are to change at all.
 - ii. The Committee also weighed the possibility that this prerequisite would necessitate an overhaul of the building's plumbing system for certain projects, thereby preventing such projects from pursuing LEED. Two alternate compliance paths have been discussed by TAG



2101 L St. NW
Washington, DC 20037
T: 202 828-7422
F: 202 828-5110
www.usgbc.org

MINUTES

subcommittees, requiring future fit-outs to be replaced to code, or comparing improvements to submetered data.

- d. WE Prerequisite: Landscape Water Use Reduction
 - i. The Committee discussed and supported the 1000 sq ft minimum for project teams to comply with this prerequisite. It noted the burden that replacing existing landscapes might pose for existing buildings.

4. **Discuss: Task Force Review— ND**

- a. The Committee discussed overall findings for prerequisites in LEED for Neighborhood development. This rating system was balloted and released roughly a year ago and as a result the revisions planned are not substantial. The Committee judged prerequisites to play a significant role in the ND rating system. In general, it recommended reducing the complexity of calculations in these prerequisites such that qualifying project teams are swiftly rewarded and able to focus on other credits.
 - i. SLL Prerequisite: Smart Location
 - 1. The Committee discussed the complexity of the calculations in Option 3: and recommends that the calculation method be clarified and, if possible, simplified.
 - ii. NPD Prerequisite: Connected and Open Community
 - 1. The Committee discuss the requirement in Case 1: Projects with Internal Streets that project teams include at least one through street at every 800 ft of project boundary. The requirement can be difficult to meet on project sites in urban areas with bordering existing development parcels, roadways and other intersections. The committee recommends clarifying the language to cover more complex urban environments and potentially increasing the minimum distance and average distance between intersections.
 - iii. SLL Prerequisite: Wetland and Water Body Conservation
 - 1. The Committee discussed whether this prerequisite conflicted with NPD Prerequisite: Connected and Open Community by forcing project teams to create cul de sacs in order to avoid wetland areas. The TAG should explore this further to make sure that there are no conflicts.
 - iv. NPD Prerequisite: Compact Development
 - 1. This prerequisite is very complex and should be simplified. Project teams are required to undertake detailed calculations of transit service for different areas of the project before determining if the project meets the requirements.
 - 2. The prerequisite also requires project teams locating near transit to have higher densities than projects not near transit. This appears to be a market disincentive as it may penalize projects in good locations and requires an additional detailed calculation.

Meeting adjourned at 5:20 pm ET. Next meeting scheduled for April 25th, 2011 at 4:00 pm ET