

IMPROVING THE LEED CREDIT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Credit Proposal

- **PROBLEM:** No clear process or rules for how credits are proposed or developed.
- Develop and use clear process that calls for credit proposals and assigns them to TAG/WG.
- Make all credit proposals public, identifying the proponent and the technical justification for proposal on USGBC public website.

Development

- **PROBLEM:** Committees limited to USGBC members; no public notice of credit development activities; technical committees may lack relevant expertise; committees may lack balance; no clear requirement for committees to reach consensus.
- Committees opened to participation by any interested stakeholder.
- Make public call for committee members and participation and provide public notice of initiation of credit development activity.
- Any interested stakeholder participating in committee has an opportunity to speak to proposals before they are adopted.
- No blanket exemption for technical committees from balance requirement. All committees should ensure materially affected stakeholders are invited to participate.
- TAG, WG, other committees must reach at least majority vote on proposal to proceed further through the development process.
- TAG, WG, other committees are required to post timely and detailed minutes, with rationale for any actions on credit development, to the USGBC website.

Technical Review and Response to Public Comment

- **PROBLEM:** Complex technical comments often addressed by USGBC staff, not technical experts; technical review process not transparent.
- Technical proposals, input and comments must be addressed by technical experts.
- TAGs must provide substantive written response to all technical proposals and public comments, whether from a USGBC member or the general public.
- All technical proposals, public comments and TAG responses posted to USGBC public website.

Public Comment Period(s)

- **PROBLEM:** Inadequate time for public review and comment; insufficient comment times for subsequent rounds; comment process not transparent.
- Public comment periods must be sufficiently long to allow the public an opportunity for input. Wholesale changes to an entire rating system need at least 60 days. If major substantive revisions are proposed, at least 60 days should be provided again.
- Unresolved public comments will be reported to the LSC.

Appeals Process

- **PROBLEM:** Appeals process inaccessible; expensive; no right to appear before panel.
- There is a right to appear before the appeals panel.
- Filing fees are reasonable, i.e., consistent with fees of other standards organizations.
- A failure to provide technical review or committee review of comments or a negative vote, and a failure to provide an adequate substantive/technical response to a substantive/technical comment are appealable.
- Appeals on these bases require an Appeals Panel with appropriate technical expertise to evaluate the comment or vote.