

# Green Building Standards



- ◆ First and still best known
  - Front-runner's edge
- ◆ Accumulate "points" which lead to classification level
- ◆ Problems
  - Time/expense of certification
  - "As built" analysis only
  - Only FSC wood (1 point)
    - » Proposed revised wood credit also, effectively, FSC only



- ◆ Up and comer with its strongest market share in commercial remodel
  - Making inroads with new construction
- ◆ Competitive Edge
  - ANSI-certified
  - Quicker and easier to use
  - Greater emphasis on energy use and better use of LCA
  - Neutral to all legitimate wood certification systems

# Current Status



- ◆ States that are LEED/GG neutral:
  - a) Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, Wisconsin
- ◆ Increasingly, federal agencies are using GG
  - a) DOE just published certification-neutral regs for all federal construction

# Analysis of FSC's Forestry Standards



- ◆ Positives –
  - a) International focus, getting certification on the map in the parts of the world where forestry standards are poor
  - b) If the goal is the utmost in eco-forestry, then FSC's Pacific Northwest standard meets the mark
- ◆ Concerns –
  - a) Multiple standards -- 13 within N.A. and dozens internationally
    - » Wide variation in many substantive areas including clear cut size, land set asides and stream protection, among others
    - » Yet all get a single "FSC" designation
  - b) Auditors allow FSC certification of North American timberlands, even if FSC criteria are not met

# SFI's Forestry Standards



- ◆ Recognizes that North America is already more heavily regulated than other parts of the world, so many areas addressed in FSC's standards aren't really necessary
- ◆ Independent evaluators see significant overlap between the two standards, with a few notable differences
  - a) SFI offers greater flexibility on pesticide use
    - » "As applied," FSC offers the same flexibility in North America
  - b) FSC unilaterally prohibits GMO use
    - » SFI does not address, since it's not yet an issue in forestry

# What Makes Wood “Green?”



- ◆ Reforestation & sustainable rates of harvest?
- ◆ Managing the size and timing of harvest?
- ◆ Stream protection?
- ◆ Threatened and endangered species protection/wildlife habitat?
- ◆ Conservation zones/protected areas?
- ◆ Controlling oil spills, chemical use?
- ◆ Carbon footprint, including transporting products?
- ◆ Worker safety?
- ◆ Scientific research?



# Comparing the Standards

	FSC-certified beech or birch from Russia or Eastern Europe	SFI-certified alder from Washington or Oregon
Reforestation & sustainable rates of harvest		✓
Size and timing of harvest areas		✓
Stream protection		✓
Threatened and endangered species / wildlife habitat		✓
Conservation zones / protected areas		✓
Controlling oil spills, chemical use		✓
Carbon footprint, including transporting products		✓
Worker safety		✓
Scientific research		✓

# CFFC's Concerns with USGBC/SFI



- ◆ Consumer Protection/Unfair Trade Practices – State and Federal
  - a) With multiple FSC standards how does a consumer know what he/she is buying?
    - » Is it eco-wood under the Pacific NW standard or wood from Russia harvested in a massive clearcut with no set asides?
  - b) Is FSC misrepresenting itself by lumping so many distinct standards under one label?
    - » What's the impact of auditing standards that give “passes” from some FSC principles?

# Concerns Cont.



- ◆ Antitrust – State and federal
  - a) USGBC and FSC were and remain tied together, creating a standard that excludes other legitimately certified wood to FSC's commercial advantage
- ◆ (Separate issues with FSC Chain of Custody standards, which are beyond this presentation)