

**From:** Bacchus, Jamy [<mailto:jbacchus@nrdc.org>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 06, 2011 7:43 PM

**To:** Shawn Huff

**Cc:** Dave Walls; [CBSC@dgs.ca.gov](mailto:CBSC@dgs.ca.gov)

**Subject:** FW: Invitation to Work Group Meeting on May 17, 2011 (Recycled Content/Renewable Materials; Carbon Monoxide Alarms; Electric Vehicle Charging)

Shawn,

Attached are Ed Osann's water-related comments to the proposed CALGreen changes dated April 22<sup>nd</sup>. **My comments are provided below and highlighted to separate them for existing proposals.** If you need these in the same format, please let me know and I can reformat them.

Thanks,  
Jamy

**10. HCD proposes to amend Sections 4.408.1, 4.408.2 and 4.408.2.1, adopt Sections 4.408.3 and 4.408.4, and repeal Section 4.408.2.2 as follows:**

**SECTION 4.408  
CONSTRUCTION WASTE REDUCTION,  
DISPOSAL AND RECYCLING**

**4.408.1 Construction waste reduction of at least 50 percent management.** Recycle and/or salvage for reuse a minimum of 50 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition debris, waste in accordance with either Section 4.408.2, 4.408.3 or 4.408.4, or meet a more stringent local construction and demolition waste management ordinance, whichever is more stringent.

**Exceptions:**

1. Excavated soil and land-clearing debris.
2. Alternate waste reduction methods developed by working with local agencies if diversion or recycle facilities capable of compliance with this item do not exist or are not located reasonably close **within in a distance** to the jobsite **where the energy offset by recycling the materials does not exceed the energy used to deliver them to the sorting facility to recycle the materials.**
3. ~~The enforcing agency may make exceptions to the requirements of this section when isolated jobsites are located in areas beyond the haul boundaries of the diversion facility.~~

**4.408.3 Waste management company.** Utilize a waste management company, **approved by the enforcing agency,** which can provide verifiable documentation that the percentage of construction and demolition waste material diverted from the landfill complies with Section 4.408.1.

**Reasons:** Reasonably close and isolated are too vague for compliance and enforcement. If the local AHJ can provide a variance to the code requirements then there seems to be little value or need to explicitly state the exception 3# above. Under notes item 2, it refers to CalRecycle, but CalRecycle does not approve facilities in this way.

**15. HCD proposes to amend Section 4.504.4 as follows:**

**4.504.4 Resilient flooring systems.** Where resilient flooring is installed, at least 50 percent of floor area receiving resilient flooring shall comply with one or more of the following:

1. ~~the~~ VOC emission limits defined in the Collaborative for High Performance Schools (CHPS) ~~Low-emitting Materials List~~ High Performance Products Database.
2. Products compliant with CHPS criteria certified under the Greenguard Children & Schools program.
3. ~~or certified~~ Certification under the Resilient Floor Covering Institute (RFCI) FloorScore program.
4. Meet the California Department of Public Health, "Standard Method for the Testing and Evaluation of Volatile Organic Chemical Emissions from Indoor Sources Using Environmental Chambers", Version 1.1, February 2010 (also known as Specification 01350.)

**NOTE:** Authority cited: Health and Safety Code Sections 17921, 17922 and 19990. Reference: Health and Safety Code Sections 17000 through 17060, 17910 through 17990 and 19960 through 19997

**Reasons:** Emissions limits need to apply to everything in the space to maintain indoor environmental quality. 50% seems arbitrary to permit half of what is installed to be "anything goes" while the remainder would have to comply with strict VOC limits. If this product were to be included in an LCA, then we can capture several aspects of toxicity and embodied energy which would be more thorough than only reviewing one metric.

**26. HCD proposes to amend Section A4.203 of Appendix A4 as follows:**

**SECTION A4.203  
PERFORMANCE APPROACH**

**A4.203.1 Energy performance.** Using an Alternative Calculation Method (ACM) approved by the California Energy Commission, calculate the annual Time Dependent Valuation (TDV) energy for each proposed building's energy and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, and compare it to the TDV energy budget (standard or "budget" building) to achieve the following:

**Tier 1.** Exceed the 2010 *California Energy Code* ~~based on the 2008 energy standards~~ requirements by 15 percent.

**Tier 2.** Exceed the 2010 *California Energy Code* ~~based on the 2008 energy standards~~ requirements by 30 percent.

Field verify and document the measures and calculations used to reach the desired level of efficiency following the requirements specified in the Title 24 Reference Appendices.

**NOTE:** Authority cited: Health and Safety Code Sections 17921, 17922 and 19990. Reference: Health and Safety Code Sections 17000 through 17060, 17910 through 17990 and 19960 through 19997.

**Reasons:** Most codes don't reference a code year but typically refer to the currently enforced version. Is there a reason to list it here? Proposal number 35 also does this. Is it necessary to reference the year here? Is it possible for jurisdictions to adopt a Tier based on older T24 codes? If not then wouldn't the most current always be used?

Jamy Bacchus, PE  
Staff Engineer, Energy Program  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
111 Sutter Street, 20th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Phone: 415-875-6149  
[jbacchus@nrdc.org](mailto:jbacchus@nrdc.org)