

- Following completion of the GBCS Review Report, GSA convened six Interagency Ad-Hoc Discussion Groups and two public listening sessions.
- A *Federal Register* notice is pending, with draft findings on the Federal government's use of green building certification systems to evaluate and measure building performance in relation to market standards and federal building performance requirements. Once the *Federal Register* notice is published, a document will be made available on GSA's GBCS website (<http://www.gsa.gov/gbc/certificationreview>) covering the main discussion topics and summarizing the Ad Hoc Discussion Group meetings.
- The GBCS review process included supplemental analyses of ASHRAE Standard 189.1, the Green Building Initiative's Guiding Principles Compliance Assessment tool and GSA's Sustainable Operations and Maintenance Program. These evaluations and supplemental information will also be released after the *Federal Register* notice is posted.
- The *Federal Register* notice provides the public with a 60 day comment period on the findings from the Ad Hoc Discussion Group; comments will be analyzed and will be used to inform the final recommendation(s) from the GSA Administrator to the Secretary of Energy.
- The GBCS review process has generated significant public and congressional interest.
- OFHPGB is increasing engagement with green building certification system owners as they improve and develop new systems.

Green Building Certification System Review – Committee Comments

- Committee members commended GSA on the thoroughness of the GBCS review process.

Brian Gilligan presented on the Federal Buildings Personnel Training Act (FBPTA) and Facilities Management Institute (FMI):

- Facility managers must demonstrate compliance with FBPTA by June 2013 by showing they have the core competencies for operating high performance buildings.
- GSA has created a new website, FMI.gov, with a Core Competency Web Tool to help federal employees and their supervisors track compliance with FBPTA.
- While targeted at key job functions (e.g. building managers, facility engineers, energy managers), the tool is designed to cover all employees and contractors involved in facility management.
- In developing FMI.gov, GSA faced challenges including no dedicated funding for program development or training costs and no authority or tools to enforce FBPTA. Cost savings resulting from improved facility management are an incentive for agencies to comply.

Federal Buildings Personnel Training Act – Committee Comments

- Increase incentives to use the tool:
 - Find ways to link FMI.gov with overall professional development and performance systems and ensure management is engaged and informed of compliance and staff development.
 - Look at the Khan Academy website as an example of how to reward frequent users of its training modules.
- Expand the capabilities of the tool:
 - Design the tool to prioritize required trainings.
 - Ensure the tool promotes and tracks hands-on experience and on-the-job training, which are often more effective than academic courses.
 - Include manufacturers' trainings on specialized equipment as appropriate.
 - Incorporate resources for managing specialized and older buildings.
 - Identify ways to incorporate core competencies in facilities contracts to help agencies identify competent O&M contractors.
 - Consider how this tool can help ensure that facility manager training actually leads to higher-performing buildings.

Michael Bloom presented on the **Knowledge Network (KNet)**

- The Knowledge Network delivers actionable, evidence-based practices to people who can improve building performance. It enables them to understand and adopt integrated solutions to achieve continuous high performance in buildings.
- The overall KNet process for the creation of practical, digestible knowledge is to identify, deconstruct, target, translate, contextualize, motivate, identify partners, deliver, and validate effectiveness.
- KNet has brought in multiple focus groups to help identify research topics of interest and for which rich content is not already widespread, within the initial issue areas of energy, water, integrated design, and operations & maintenance.
- Initial target audiences are facility managers, financial decision makers, procurement professionals, and technical experts.
- KNet intends to use existing channels through which it can provide content free of charge to target audiences, such as associations, newsletters, academia, online communities, social networks, and GSA resources such as SFTool and FMI.gov.
- An initial topic is the dual flush toilet water use reduction project that GSA conducted at an EPA Regional office in Denver. Additionally, KNet has completed two Submetering documents including a Submetering Business Case and a Portable Meters Comparison, to round out a diverse package of informational products created to target key audiences.
- We are requesting input from the committee and external stakeholders on issues of research development, education and outreach, content development, delivery channel identification, and impact assessment, to further advance this tool.

Knowledge Network – Committee Comments

- Identify opportunities to combine Knowledge Network products in a single presentation for an organization like The American Institute of Architects (AIA), for which professionals could receive continuing educational credits.
- Providing good information often is insufficient to influence building occupant and facility manager behavior. Key is how to motivate people, for example, through competition, inspiring stories or a focus on what matters to them – e.g., their health. Also help facility managers to understand the importance of changing default conditions to promote the most sustainable results.
- This committee can help identify potential priority topics for the KNet and useful research on these topics, as well as review and comment on KNet materials.
- Maintain a repository for these documents (e.g., on one website) in addition to dispersing them throughout other established external channels.
- Give the stakeholders the ability to request research/resources. This will help identify topic areas of greatest interest.

Public Comment Period

The following commenters spoke at the meeting. Written comments submitted to GSA will be available upon request.

- Jeff Bradley, American Wood Council
- Justin Koscher, Center for Environmental Innovation and Roofing
- Bill Hall, The Resilient Floor Covering Institute and The American High Performance Building Coalition
- Chris Pyke, U.S. Green Building Council
- Erin Schaeffer, Green Building Initiative
- Josh Jacobsen, UL

Kevin Kampschroer presented on the Business Case/Value Proposition for Federal Green Building

- GSA's Administrator has requested that OFHPGB develop a Business Case for Federal Green Building. The draft paper is organized around four proposed value streams which demonstrate that a high-performance green building can create long term cost savings and add value at competitive first cost levels.
- The business case is an internal narrative, targeted at Federal decision-makers, especially budgetary decision-makers.
- The business case is for both owned and leased assets. GSA has 80% leased assets, by square footage. The rest of the government is dominated by owned assets.
- The Federal government monitors asset value and replacement value of buildings, but does not track these values as closely as the private market.
- Focus is not on major new investment, but on directing the investments we must make, as even in a highly-constrained budget environment, we're not going to spend zero money on buildings.

Business Case – Committee Comments

- Frame the business case:
 - Compare benefits and risks of maintaining the status quo vs. those of investing in green buildings, especially existing buildings. Quantify the value of continuous improvement. The cost of doing nothing makes the case for doing something.
 - Articulate the baseline to which a building should be compared, so as to make the added value of green building as clear as possible.
 - Focus on integrating the value streams.
 - Decision-makers should not simply be led to conclude that cost savings can translate into workforce reductions – emphasize added value.
 - Figure out how to make evidence of proven, significant paybacks from green buildings credible to overcome the usual reaction of skepticism.
- Target health, productivity and organizational effectiveness:
 - Focus on occupant health and productivity – 80% of the costs of tenant building expenses are for the people inside.
 - Although health and productivity are hard to quantify and monetize, value can be demonstrated in terms of how green buildings increase mission readiness and positively impact operations.
 - Consider comparing health care utilization rates in similar buildings in dollars per person. Alternatively, identify examples where the same group of people move from a lower-performing to a higher-performing building and survey occupants on any changes in health and productivity.
 - Look at HHS and EPA examples of health and environmental impact assessments.
 - Examine correlations between occupant satisfaction and building value.
- Additional comments:
 - Building location (ease of access, commute, etc.) also impacts productivity and effectiveness. Factor in data on commuting patterns. Determine how to apply Federal siting guidelines to building disinvestment, not just new investment.
 - In the federal budgeting system, initial price and life-cycle cost are paid from different checkbooks (e.g. personnel, health, O&M). Need to get decision makers to look across these checkbooks to make worthwhile investment decisions.
 - Consider marking buildings to the market, to capture externalities and translate them into dollars per square foot.

GBAC Members' Closing Comments

- Discussion of climate change seems to be increasing, which is helpful for making progress in this field.
- Climate adaptation is a big issue after Hurricane Sandy and should be discussed at a future committee meeting. Resiliency is an essential component of a high-performance building, particularly from a safety and security perspective.

- Need to get health professionals more involved in these discussions.
- The environment, not just the business case, should be the driver of management decisions.
- Moving forward, the federal government has to think about what measureable performance metrics it is really after. What separates a good green building from a bad green building?
- GSA is a great place to bring together all of the best practices and lessons learned from federal green buildings, and access to that data is very important.
- For future meetings, consider fielding public comments and questions ahead of time so that they can be part of the discussion.
- We know how to achieve high performance green buildings, but we need to make the connections and identify our knowledge gaps. Over the next year, this committee should work to accelerate our ability to scale and adopt these practices, while identifying the market impediments.

Bob Fox thanked everyone for a great discussion, and adjourned the meeting.