

Subject 100

June 15, 2012

SUMMARY OF TOPICS

The following is being recirculated:

1. The First Edition of the Standard for Sustainability for Gypsum Boards and Panels, UL 100

COMMENTS DUE: JULY 16, 2012

For your convenience in review, proposed additions to the previously proposed requirements dated 2012-03-9 are shown underlined and proposed deletions are shown ~~lined-out~~.

1. The First Edition of the Standard for Sustainability for Gypsum Boards and Panels, UL 100

BACKGROUND

A task group was formed to consider comments received regarding the March 9, 2012 UL 100 proposal. This document provides the task group's recommended changes to the March 9, 2012 proposal.

RATIONALE

Proposal Submitted By: Bill Hoffman, UL, on behalf of the UL 100 Comment Resolution Task Group

Responses to comments have been posted within the UL 100 Proposal Review Work Area dated March 9, 2012. After reviewing the comments received on that proposal the task group recommends several changes to the draft standard.

The following references to "CSDS Comment Reference Number x" indicate the number of the comment in the CSDS Comment Matrix. The comments, and resulting proposed revisions, have been arranged in the order which they apply to the draft standard.

Proposed Revision 1

CSDS Comment Reference Number 2 stated that the definition of "ACCEPTABLE HAZARD PROFILE" in 5.2 was too broad. The comment resolution task group agreed with this comment and recommends a modified definition in 5.2.

Proposed Revision 2

CSDS Comment Reference Number 3 stated that the definition of "DIVERSION RATIO" in 5.9 did not have value as it was presented. The comment submitter provided recommended changes to 5.9. The comment resolution task group agreed with this comment and recommends that 5.9 be modified in accordance with the comment submitter's suggested revisions.

Proposed Revision 3

**FOR UL INTERNAL REFERENCE OR CSDS USE ONLY –
NOT FOR OUTSIDE DISTRIBUTION**



Documents

Document Sharing Hub

CSDS Comment Reference Number 4 stated that the complete ingredient disclosure down to 0.1% in 8.1 is unnecessary and potentially negatively impacts competitiveness and intellectual property protections. The comment resolution task group agreed in part with this comment. While the Task Group does not recommend removal of ingredient disclosure it does recommend including a statement that the product composition inventory is not intended to be released publicly.

Proposed Revision 4

CSDS Comment Reference Number 7 stated that explanatory information appeared in Remediation of Mines, Section 15. The comment resolution task group agreed with this comment and recommends that the explanatory information in Section 15 be moved to Informative Appendix D.

Proposed Revision 5

CSDS Comment Reference Number 8 suggested that "including pending action" be removed from 20.1.1(a) as regulations that are pending have not been finalized and may not be enforceable. The comment resolution task group agreed with this comment and supports the recommended change to 20.1.1(a).

Proposed Revision 6

CSDS Comment Reference Number 9 noted that the title of Section 20.2, Reduction of toxics in materials, did not accurately reflect the requirements in the Section. The comment resolution task group agreed in principle with the comment and suggests that the title of Section 20.2 be changed to "Restricted materials".

Proposed Revision 7

CSDS Comment Reference Number 10 stated that some of the requirements in 25.1 were vague. The comment resolution task group agreed with this comment and supported the recommended change that the comment submitter provided.

CSDS Comment Reference Number 11 noted that the dated reference to ASTM C1396 in Section 25 was not the same reference as contained 2012 IBC and 2012 IRC. The comment resolution task group recommends that dates be removed from all references in the standard. This is consistent with UL's standard practice and is in accordance with Section 4 of the proposal which states that an undated reference indicates that the most recent version of the referenced standard or code is to be used. In addition to 25.1, the date is also removed from some references in Appendix C, which are shown as part of Proposed Revision 11. Also, the date of references in 21.1.1 (previous paragraph 21.1) and 21.2.1 (previous paragraph 25.2) are shown in revisions related to Proposed Revision 8.

Proposed Revision 8

CSDS Comment Reference Number 6 noted that 25.2, which addresses mold-resistant property claims, would more appropriately be located in Section 21, Indoor Environmental Quality (IEQ). The comment resolution task group agreed with this comment. Please note that Section 21 has been restructured to accommodate the addition of previous 25.2 (now 21.2.1). Previous paragraphs 21.1 and 21.2 are relocated as 21.1.1 and 21.1.2, respectively. Also, please note that the date associated with references in 21.1.1 and 21.2.1 have been removed in accordance with the Rationale for Proposed Revision 7, above.

Proposed Revision 9

**FOR UL INTERNAL REFERENCE OR CSDS USE ONLY –
NOT FOR OUTSIDE DISTRIBUTION**



Documents
Document Sharing Hub

CSDS Comment Reference Number 5 indicated that "company support" in 26.1 was vague and not defined. The comment submitter recommended that this term be deleted from 26.1. The comment resolution task group supports this suggestion.

Proposed Revision 10

CSDS Comment Reference Number 12 stated that 27.1 and 27.2 in Section 27, Innovation, were vague and would allow for too much subjectivity in assessing innovation credit. The comment submitter recommended revisions to 27.1 and the deletion of 27.2. The comment resolution task group recommends adoption of these suggestions.

Proposed Revision 11

CSDS Comment Reference Number 13 noted that there were several references in Appendix C, External References, which do not appear in the body of the standard. The comment resolution task group recommends that these references be deleted from Appendix C. Also, please note that the date associated with some references in Appendix C have been removed in accordance with the rationale for CSDS Comment Reference Numbers 10 and 11.

Proposed Revision 12

CSDS Comment Reference Number 1 noted that incorrect terminology regarding "S_g" was used in the 4th paragraph of the "Statement Regarding Problem Imported Drywall" in the Informative Appendix, Appendix D. The comment submitter recommended changes accordingly. The comment resolution task group supports the recommended changes to the paragraph.

PROPOSAL

Proposed Revision 1

5.2 ACCEPTABLE HAZARD PROFILE – A product that does not contain ingredients that pose hazards which are immediate and/or have lasting, irreversible impacts, or result in unavoidable prolonged exposure. ~~This term is further described as defined~~ in the Procedure for the Preparation of a Toxicological Assessment, ULE P 113.

Proposed Revision 2

5.9 DIVERSION RATIO – The remainder of one (1) minus the quotient of the mass of material sent to a landfill or incinerated without energy recovery divided by ~~the total mass~~ the total waste of dry finished goods produced in a one-year time period.

Proposed Revision 3

8.1 A manufacturer shall provide a product composition inventory down to 0.1% by mass that characterizes the materials in the following manner: Material/Ingredient, Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS) number, Supplier, Unit of Measure, Quantity, Percentage Composition, Identification of Alternative Resource Percentage, and Hazard Classifications (Hazardous Material Identification System (HMIS) or similar rating). Data shall be provided according to the format provided in the table in Appendix B. Only one of HMIS, NFPA or the EU hazard classification scheme is needed for each chemical. This information is for the use of assessment to the criteria in this standard and is not to be released publicly. [Note – See Appendix D for additional information]

Proposed Revision 4

FOR UL INTERNAL REFERENCE OR CSDS USE ONLY –
NOT FOR OUTSIDE DISTRIBUTION



Documents
Document Sharing Hub