



November 10, 2008
Conference Call

MINUTES

1800 Massachusetts Ave,
NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036
T: 202 828-7422
F: 202 828-5110
www.usgbc.org

LEED Steering Committee (LSC)

Title	LSC Member	Attendance	Proxy	Voting	Attendance
Chair	Scot Horst*	X	n/a	Yes	
Vice Chair	Joel Ann Todd*	X	n/a	Yes	
LEED-NC	Muscoe Martin	X	Craig Kneeland	Yes	
LEED-EB	Stu Carron		Sheila Sheridan	Yes	
LEED-CI	Holley Henderson*	X	Denise Van Valkenburg	Yes	
LEED-CS	Christine Magar	X	Jerry Lea	Yes	
LEED-H	Kristin Shewfelt		Steven Winter	Yes	
LEED-ND	Jessica Millman	X	Burt Gregory/Susan Mud	Yes	X (Both)
SS TAG	Bryna Dunn		Stewart Comstock	Yes	
WE TAG	Neal Billetdeaux	X	John Koeller	Yes	
EA TAG	Greg Kats	X	Marcus Sheffer	Yes	X
MR TAG	Mark Webster	X	Steve Baers	Yes	X
IEQ TAG	Bob Thompson		Steve Taylor (Jude Anders)	Yes	X
TSAC	Malcolm Lewis*	X	Joel Ann Todd	Yes	
Curriculum	John Boecker*		Lynn Simon	Yes	X
Chapters	Sara O'Mara	X	Charlie Tomlinson	Yes	
USGBC CEO	Rick Fedrizzi *		n/a	No	
Board Liaison	Lauren Yarmuth	X	n/a	No	
Canada Liaisons	Alex Zimmerman	X	Ian Theaker	No	X
Other LSC Meeting Attendees				Voting	Attendance
USGBC Staff	Deon Glaser Brendan Owens Chris Marshall Miranda Gardiner Dara Zycherman Sophie Lambert Justin Doak Doug Gatlin Meghan Bogaerts Tom Hicks		X	No	
Guest Attendees	Susan Kaplan Brenda Morawa Lisa Matthiessen Nina Tallering Ted Bardacke Eliot Allen		X	No	

* LEED Management Sub Committee
Quorum met at 2:08 pm EST.

1. Declarations of Conflict

- a. HH, CM, LY, LS, MM work on Retail pilot projects in NC & CI
- b. HH, BM, CM LY, LS, SO, MM work on CS projects

2. General Straw Poll

- a. SH asked the LSC to raise any specific concerns the LSC might have that would cause them to vote against any of the rating systems being discussed today. No concerns were raised and the group agreed to move forward with the discussion.



MINUTES

1800 Massachusetts Ave,
NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036
T: 202 828-7422
F: 202 828-5110
www.usgbc.org

3. Minutes Review

- a. 10/27 – NB raised an editorial change needed in the pilot library process notes. Approved by general consent.

4. DISCUSSION/ACTION: LEED for Neighborhood Development for 1st Public Comment

- a. JM introduced the LEED for Neighborhood Development document for 1st public comment and the changes that occurred including the reweighting of credits based on the LEED 2009 weightings tool. Graphics were also added and intents revised to reflect the health benefits of the credits and a new LEED certified building prerequisite was also added.
- b. Staff reviewed the rating system through an internal process and the TAGs also reviewed and approved the rating system. Language was aligned with LEED 2009 where appropriate in preparation for LSC review.
- c. A comment was raised about how regionalization is going to be integrated into LEED for Neighborhood Development and that the work needs to begin soon to make the timeline for the rating system.
- d. A question was asked about how outdoor air quality is considered in ND since the EQ TAG was not involved in the initial review as ND does not have an EQ section in the rating system. It was relayed that because the approval today is for public comment there will be opportunity for this type of issue to be discussed and considered before going to ballot.
- e. A question was asked about the weightings categories and their relevance to ND as the impact categories may not directly meet the needs of the rating system. It was relayed that the weighting was done based on the LEED 2009 weightings tool but the possibilities of revising those categories for ND will be discussed as part of the next development cycle.
- f. MOTION: MM: Be it resolved that the LEED Steering Committee hereby approves LEED for Neighborhood Development for 1st public comment.
- g. SECOND:GK
- h. VOTE: 13 ayes, 0 nays, 0 abstentions. MOTION PASSES.

5. DISCUSSION/ACTION: LEED for Retail-CI for 2nd Public Comment & LEED for Retail-NC for 3rd Public Comment

- a. Staff introduced both Retail rating systems and the changes that occurred to the rating systems. Most of the changes occurred as a result of alignment with LEED 2009 and some slight clarifications from the previous public comment periods.
- b. As a result of weightings, one point was moved from EA to SS to incentivize projects to address issues surrounding transportation and parking issues that are more of a problem with retail facilities.
- c. A member asked whether the small number of public comments received in previous periods was an indication of the size of the retail market. Staff relayed that there has been much activity through the pilot phases and retail companies directly and that there is a huge market demand for these rating systems.
- d. MOTION: CM: Be it resolved that the LEED Steering Committee hereby approves LEED for Retail Commercial Interiors for 2nd and LEED for Retail New Construction for 3rd public comment.
- e. SECOND: ML
- f. VOTE: 13 ayes, 0 nays, 0 abstentions. MOTION PASSES.



MINUTES

1800 Massachusetts Ave,
NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036
T: 202 828-7422
F: 202 828-5110
www.usgbc.org

6. DISCUSSION/ACTION: Core and Shell Energy Modeling

- a. LSC continued the discussion regarding energy modeling requirements in LEED for Core and Shell. Between the balloted rating system and the pilot rating system, the EAc1 requirements were changed because ASHRAE 90.1 was updated. It was assumed by the Core and Shell committee that the requirements remained the same for the ballot version, however in the update to ASHRAE 1999 to 2004 there was a provision in the pilot version approved that was not approved in the ballot version. The difference between these documents was that in the pilot version the developers were not responsible for tenant loads, but in CSv2.0 the developers have to take into account tenant loads when doing calculations. It was relayed that in a typical core and shell buildings a developer may only control 50% of the load but must use 100% of the load when doing calculations. This has become a major roadblock for some core and shell projects.
- b. The committee discussed the pros and cons of three options: 1. Do nothing and close the speculative development market from pursuing LEED, 2. Revise the requirements to permit use of methodology that existed in the pilot and let projects leave out tenant loads in calculations, and 3. Reduce the thresholds associated with EAc1 recognizing speculative market can't control what the tenants do.
- c. It was agreed that whatever the decision a ballot process will need to occur.
- d. The group discussed changing the plaque to better display that CS certification is only part of a whole building and that CI needs to occur to have a true LEED building. The committee agreed this will be discussed in more detail at a later date.
- e. The group discussed that not all core and shell projects have the same scope and the standards may be lowered across the board for issues that only apply to specific projects which could weaken the requirements for projects that are able to gain credit under the current credit. The working group did consider tying thresholds to the percent of energy they have control over but the process developed was too complex to be effective. Ultimately the EA TAG recommended reducing the thresholds associated with EAc1 with the understanding that it is not the optimal solution but can quickly provide relief for projects currently experiencing difficulty with the achievement of the credit.
- f. MOTION: ML: To approve the EA TAG's recommendations for CS Energy Modeling to be put up for 1st public comment.
- g. SECOND: MS
- h. VOTE: 7 ayes, 2 nays, 4 abstentions (SM, NB, SO, HH). MOTION PASSES
- i. DISCUSSION: It was noted that a clarification in the comment period will state how this issue may be retroactive with ASHRAE 2004 & 2007.

7. DISCUSSION/ACTION: CaGBC LEED for Existing Buildings: O&M and Homes for Public Comment

- a. The Canadian Green Building Council introduced the revised rating systems for LSC consideration.
- b. There are two main differences from USGBC's LEED and the Canadian version: revision for Canadian standards equivalence and threshold changes for market perception and acceptance
- c. The group discussed EQp2 and the revisions from LEED 2009, which loosened the requirements for blower door testing for multi-unit residential



MINUTES

1800 Massachusetts Ave,
NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036
T: 202 828-7422
F: 202 828-5110
www.usgbc.org

buildings (MURBs). The TAG has not seen the CaGBC documents, but staff requested input from the LSC whether TAG review was needed. A TAG representative requested this issue be reviewed by the EQ TAG prior to going to ballot.

- d. MOTION: ML: Be it resolved that the LEED Steering Committee hereby approves CaGBC LEED for Existing Buildings: O&M and Homes 2009 to go to first public comment.
- e. SECOND: LS
- f. VOTE: 12 ayes, 1 nay, 0 abstentions. MOTION PASSES.

Meeting Adjourned. The next LSC call is scheduled for Monday, December 8th at 2 pm ET.