

**Joint Committee on Dimensional Stone  
Draft Meeting Summary  
Teleconference  
May 23, 2011**

This document is part of the NSF International standard development process. This document is not a NSF International standard and is subject to change. Committee members agree not to reproduce, or circulate or quote, in whole or in part, the draft document outside of the NSF Committee or to submit a document to any other organization or standards bodies (whether national, international, or other), except with approval of the Chairman of the Committee having jurisdiction and the written authorization of NSF International.

Meeting Attendees			
Company	Name	Interest Category	Role
RATIO Architects, Inc.	Bill Browne	User	Member
NSF International	Mindy Costello	Other	Secretariat
Marble Institute of America	Garen Distelhorst	Academia / NGO	Member
NSF International	Kianda Franklin	User	Member
The CleftStone Works	Peter Galgano	Industry	Observer
Tile Council of North America, Inc.	Bill Griese, LEED AP	General Interest	Observer
---	Grubb, J		Guest
Holland Marble Company	Peter Holland	Industry	Member
Artistic Tile	Joshua Levinson	Distributor	Member
Bridgewater Marble and Granite	Porter Little	Distributor	Member
Marazita and Associates	Vince Marazita	User	Member
Cold Spring Granite Company	John Mattke	Industry	Member
Stone Interiors LLC	Gasper Naquin	Distributor	Member
Indiana Limestone Institute	Jim Owens	Industry	Observer
Stony Creek Quarry Corporation	Darrell Petit	Academia / NGO	Member
Quantis	Amanda Pike	User	Member
University of Denver	Mark Rodgers	Academia / NGO	Joint Committee Chair
Indiana Limestone Institute	Todd Schnatzmeyer	Industry	Observer
NSF International	Maureen Sertich		Observer
NSF International	Jessica Slomka		Observer
Cold Spring Granite Company	Kathy Spanier	General Interest	Observer
Walker and Zanger, Inc	Jonathan Zanger	Industry	Observer

**Joint Committee on Dimensional Stone  
Draft Meeting Summary  
Teleconference  
May 23, 2011**

This document is part of the NSF International standard development process. This document is not a NSF International standard and is subject to change. Committee members agree not to reproduce, or circulate or quote, in whole or in part, the draft document outside of the NSF Committee or to submit a document to any other organization or standards bodies (whether national, international, or other), except with approval of the Chairman of the Committee having jurisdiction and the written authorization of NSF International.

Mindy Costello took attendance and the antitrust statement. Brett Skilbred agreed to co-chair with Amanda on the quarry task group. Kathy and Josh are co-chairs for processing.

Processing Task Group:

Josh provided the feedback from the processing task group. The processing task group went back to determine where the boundary was for primary and secondary processing. The group had proposed this was including all steps in processing; not including the transportation after processing (dock ready).

There were no objections to the definition proposal. Josh proposed that whoever is making the sale takes responsibility for their processing steps and apply for their own certification. Those that sub out processing stages were a question and how that works with certification. Garen stated that each person or facility that handled the material needed to be certified to continue being certified down the chain. The example was that a quarried stone was certified at the quarry and then other stages of processing may not have certification. The companies that handle that step in the processing have to meet the requirements of the standard. Sub contractors should meet the standard as well for the processor to claim their certification. Kathy added that all processing facilities would have to be certified for a stone piece to maintain their certification.

Stone that is quarried and is marked certified for the quarry operations; but not the processing steps would be marked differently. For a stone that is certified all through its chain up to "dock ready" could have a special or different mark. There was a suggestion to code the certifications as 1, 2 and 3 for each type: quarry, processing or both. The architects may only choose stone that meets all parts of processing and quarry; there was concern that architects may not be aware of the options of the certification. The marketing direction will need to explain the differences of certification. There may be issues with using bronze, silver and gold. This could be different than the way LEED uses those levels of achievement.

Education will be important to the architects and specifiers on what levels or marks are used. LEED system does only use full points where it could be expanded to stone use in buildings. There was discussion on stone that is not available in a certified way. Maybe there could be a stone that could be processed sustainably but not quarried, should it be awarded for that (achievement level) or is that a disclosure? Wood is the only material recognized in LEED by USGBC. USGBC is overwhelmed by the material companies that want to have same recognition as wood. Material recognition may be a separate program from LEED.

Peter Holland added that FSC has criteria and principles and does not seem to award points to a lumber mill or processing of the wood. He liked the level idea of 1, 2 and 3 addressing what has achieved certification. Mark went through the various pieces to LEED and how this standard could fit into LEED. He supported levels or achievement levels to acknowledge stone as greater sustainability of that product. How stone is compared to other building materials is also of concern and can be shown as

**Joint Committee on Dimensional Stone  
Draft Meeting Summary  
Teleconference  
May 23, 2011**

This document is part of the NSF International standard development process. This document is not a NSF International standard and is subject to change. Committee members agree not to reproduce, or circulate or quote, in whole or in part, the draft document outside of the NSF Committee or to submit a document to any other organization or standards bodies (whether national, international, or other), except with approval of the Chairman of the Committee having jurisdiction and the written authorization of NSF International.

more sustainable. LEED may be working on EPP having certified products achieve points. The issue is that the LEED is a moving target and cannot be considered at this time. The details of certification can be worked out once we have the standard criteria written for sustainability.

International Green Building Code is coming online next year too and should be considered. Peter Galgano had a comment on the stone industry does not have a sustainability statement on air quality or other environmental attribute. Sustainable path for processing and quarry operations can be a statement by the company. This is different than the LEED rating and how can stone achieve points; for example, 500 miles from the site it can contribute to the points for transportation. Stone does not add points to LEED by itself.

There was a question about wood planks purchased that are processed from sustainable wood; in stone the processing goes up to "dock ready". FSC wood has stringent processing requirements; therefore some claims are made on specific traits instead of the whole manufacturing process. The cost for certification of processing of wood through FSC can be high. A local processing shop should look for a certified quarried stone; processing can still be sustainably done. The standard will gain traction through the specifiers on larger projects that drives a slower track down to processors until the standard becomes mainstream. There was support this standard does not limit the smaller processors from becoming certified now if they choose.

China has many quarry operations that are hand labor; extreme differences in labor practices. The standard is North American based; it can be used by other countries keeping in mind N. American baselines for labor and other issues. Some standards can be used by other countries as they have found ways to accommodate other countries. Ultimately the value judgment comes back to the specifier. The differences between non-certified, non-sustainable products will be driven at some point to certify. The standard will evolve to accommodate international markets as well.

Josh reported that the smaller task groups will review their section for specific criteria language. Kathy agreed.

Quarry report:

Mindy provided this for the group. Updated definition of "quarry operations" based on Processing group recommendations. This will include trimming that occurs at the quarry. Thoughts from the Joint Committee? No objections. If trimming occurs at a different location, that would be under processing.

- Reviewed & revised the general topic areas for criteria
  - A prerequisite of achieving all applicable federal, state, and local laws is included under the general terms of the standard, so specific regulation will not be addressed within the criteria (US/Canada regulatory environment is being used as the frame of context to determine what goes above and beyond the law)

**Joint Committee on Dimensional Stone  
Draft Meeting Summary  
Teleconference  
May 23, 2011**

This document is part of the NSF International standard development process. This document is not a NSF International standard and is subject to change. Committee members agree not to reproduce, or circulate or quote, in whole or in part, the draft document outside of the NSF Committee or to submit a document to any other organization or standards bodies (whether national, international, or other), except with approval of the Chairman of the Committee having jurisdiction and the written authorization of NSF International.

- Assigned topics to individuals who will propose items to include (i.e., develop criteria around) under each area
  - Energy, Water, Site management (storm water & erosion), Corporate governance, Health & Safety, Land reclamation & reuse, ... (I feel like there's something missing here)
  - Goal was to identify topics that regulations don't currently address well enough for the industry (i.e., where the industry could go above and beyond)
  - Any major topics we've forgotten?

Meeting all regulations but not limited to these by means within the standard. An innovation section could be added to the standard at a future time. There were no concerns with the criteria for quarry operations. The parking lot has those areas that are more regulated and may be revisited for what can be achieved above and beyond the regulations. Todd added that these are brainstorming high level criteria for consideration by the JC. Vince asked for feedback on the land reclamation from quarry operators. This topic is tough to get consensus; but options can be listed for reporting. Some quarries are reclaimed and some are reused and others are not reclaimed but not considered a hazard.

As quarries have proved they have moved through their land management plan, they will get credit. Signs of responsibility and follow through of the ideas and improvement methods along the way are three things to consider with the development of criteria. Vince was considering old quarries, new quarries and US based versus other nations. FSC principles 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7 may be considered for land reclamation ideas. China standards are different for land reclamation; they do restore land in great ways for agriculture and avert land gradation if possible. The issue was to make this general enough to consider these differences.

Vince asked if processors could self certify. The intent will be that processors are using third party certification. Certification is a separate issue outside this process of standard development.

**The next meeting is June 20th from 2:00 to 3:30 pm EDT.**