August 3, 2009
Conference Call

MINUTES

2101 L St., NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20037
T: 202 828-7422
F: 202 828-5110
www.usgbc.org

LEED Steering Committee (LSC)

Title	LSC Member	Attendance	Proxy	Voting	Attendance
Chair	Joel Ann Todd	X	N/A	No	
Vice Chair	TBD		N/A	Yes	
Market Advisory Committee	Muscoe Martin	X	Lisa Matthiessen	Yes	X
Technical Committee	Malcolm Lewis	X	Susan Kaplan	Yes	X
Implementation Committee	David Sheridan	X	Brenda Morawa	Yes	X
			Dan Ackerstein		
Education Steering Committee	Lynn Simon	X	Barry Giles	Yes	
Chapter Steering Committee	Sara O'Mara	X	Elaine Hsieh	Yes	
At-large Member (TBD)	N/A			N/A	
At-large Member (TBD)	N/A			N/A	
At-large Member (TBD)	N/A			N/A	
SVP, LEED	Scot Horst		N/A	No	
VP LEED Technical Development	Brendan Owens	X	N/A	No	
VP LEED Implementation	Mike Opitz		N/A	No	
VP Market Development	Doug Gatlin	X	N/A	No	
VP International Activities	Tim McEnery		N/A	No	
GBCI Representative	TBD		N/A	No	
Other LSC Meeting Attendees				**Voting**	**Attendance**
USGBC Staff	Deon Glaser Chrissy Ungaro Lauren Riggs			No	
Guest Attendees	Chris Marshall Miranda Gardiner			No	

* LEED Management Sub Committee

Quorum met at 2:05 pm EST.

1. **Declarations of Conflict**

2. **Review of Minutes 7/20/09**
   a. The minutes will be corrected to show that the LSC chair position is nonvoting.
   b. Approved by general consent

3. **UPDATE: Wood Certification Material Distribution for Review & Interim Call**
   a. Staff relayed that the LSC will be asked to approve the proposed wood certification benchmarks for 2nd public comment on an upcoming call. A preparatory call will be set up for background and discussion purposes so that

2101 L St., NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20037
T: 202 828-7422
F: 202 828-5110
www.usgbc.org

LSC members feel comfortable with the materials in order to vote on the official LSC call.

4. DISCUSSION/ACTION: CIR Appeal

a. Staff introduced the CIR appeal brought by a project team pursuing a point under IDc1. The project proposed a professional two stage system that it claims delivers drinking water that is qualitatively superior to bottled and does it in an environmentally responsible manner due to 1) the primary stage filter being entirely self-cleaning in a water efficient manner with no replaceable media and 2) the longevity of the recyclable secondary stage filter. The initial draft ruling denied the request and WE TAG agreed based on the determination that this was not an innovative proposal. It was included in the ruling that a point might be earned if the project included calculations demonstrating the quantities of waste and/or pollution averted because of the filtration system, and provided a description of programs or policies to encourage facility users to take advantage of the filtered water rather than purchasing bottled water.
b. The project team resubmitted the CIR with new information but received the same ruling back after both the WE & MR TAGs reviewed it once again. It appeared that the TAGs did not take the new content into consideration when responding to the 2nd CIR.
c. The project team has requested a response as to why the credit was rejected a second time given they provided more details as requested in the original ruling.
d. DS & MM declared that they are involved in projects with similar situations related to the CIR agenda discussion. It was determined that this is not a conflict and therefore the LSC members can fully participate in the discussion.
e. The LSC agreed that the MR TAG should review the 2nd CIR and respond specifically to waste reduction documentation
f. <u>MOTION:</u> DS: To send the 2nd CIR back to the MR TAG and request their review and comment on the waste reduction proposal provided by the team that was not previously addressed in the MR TAG review, and for the MR TAG to send their recommendation back to the LSC before it is sent to the project team.
g. SECOND: LS
h. DISCUSSION: The LSC agreed that the project team should get more than a short, vague response that includes a clear explanation for the MR TAG's final reasoning for granting or not granting the CIR.
i. VOTE: 5 ayes, 0 nays, 0 abstentions. <u>MOTION PASSES.</u>

5. DISCUSSION/ACTION: Core and Shell EAc1 (continued)

a. Staff introduced the issue surrounding EAc1 in LEED for Core and Shell v2 and the need to provide a solution for projects registered between April 25, 2008 and April 26, 2009. The ASHRAE standard CS EAc1 was updated from the pilot

2101 L St., NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20037
T: 202 828-7422
F: 202 828-5110
www.usgbc.org

to the balloted version of rating system (ASHRAE 90.1 -1999 to ASHRAE 90.1-2004) which changed in the disposition of tenant load in core and shell building. The CSv2 version requires tenant loads to be included in the calculation of EAc1 which was not required under the pilot.

b. Staff has worked with the EA TAG and various affected parties to work on a recommendation that will allow projects to achieve certification.
c. For this group of projects, a proposal was made that establishes a sliding scale for project teams to allow them to dictate what their degree of control of tenant v. core spaces is. Based on their degree of control, their load responsibilities change which incentivizes developers to interact with as much of the tenant load as possible. The calculations were displayed in a supplemental spreadsheet provided to the LSC. This is seen as a reasonable compromise; however there are some concerns with the methodology that will need to be resolved in a comprehensive manner.
d. MOTION: ML: To approve the proposed solution for projects registered between April 25, 2008 and April 26, 2009.
e. SECOND: MM
f. VOTE: 5 ayes, 0 nays, 0 abstentions. MOTION PASSES.

6. UPDATE: Implementation Committee Members

a. Staff provided an update that the Executive Committee has approved Dave Sheridan as chair & Brenda Morawa as vice chair of the Implementation Advisory Committee.

7. DISCUSSION/ACTION: Market Advisory Committee Charge

a. Doug Gatlin
b. Revising charter into charge
c. Note: are we calling these sub-committees or committees…keeps changing throughout
d. Changes made in real time via WebEx/Lauren
e. Will appointments have to be approved by ExCom after LSC?
f. MOTION: MM: Be it resolved that the LEED Steering Committee hereby approves the proposed LEED Market Advisory Committee charge as drafted
g. SECOND: ML
h. VOTE: 5 ayes, 0 nays, 0 abstentions. MOTION PASSES.

Meeting Adjourned. The next LSC call is scheduled for Monday, August 17th at 2 pm ET.