



LEED - NC

Version 2

How to Interpret this Report

Purpose The Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Rating System was designed by the US Green Building Council to encourage and facilitate the development of more sustainable buildings. The Van Wormer Administration Bldg Rehabilitation project was evaluated according to this system and the Final Rating is totaled below.

Environmental Categories The report is organized into five environmental categories as defined by LEED including: Sustainable Sites, Water Efficiency, Energy and Atmosphere, Materials and Resources and Indoor Environmental Quality. The category of Innovation and Design Process is also included.

LEED Prerequisites Prerequisites must be achieved. Non-compliant prerequisites must be resolved before a certification can be awarded.

LEED Credits The environmental categories are subdivided into the established LEED credits, which are based on desired performance goals within each category. An assessment of whether the credit is earned, pending, or rejected is made and a narrative describes the basis for the assessment.

Achieved The applicant has provided the mandatory documentation which supports the achievement of the credit requirements, achieving the associated points. Currently the project has scored the adjacent points in this category.

28

Denied The applicant has applied for a point in a particular credit, but has misinterpreted the credit intent or cannot substantiate meeting the requirements. Currently the project has the adjacent points in this category.

3

Rating Final Rating is Certified

Official LEED v2 Scores: Certified: 26-32 Silver Rating: 33-38 Gold Rating: 39-51 Platinum Rating: 52 +

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A	D		Possible Points
7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	14
Sustainable Sites			
0	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Prerequisite 1-Version 2.1
Erosion & Sedimentation Control			
Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the project has followed an erosion and sedimentation control plan that complies with the referenced EPA standard. Additionally the project team has provided a list of the measures implemented on-site.			
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Credit 1-Version 2.1
Site Selection			
Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the project site does not meet any of the prohibited criteria.			
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Credit 2-Version 2.1
Urban Redevelopment			
Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the average site development density for the project and surrounding areas is 61,968 s.f. per acre. A calculation spreadsheet and scaled site area plan have been provided to support achievement of this credit.			
Not Attempting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Credit 3-Version 2.1
Brownfield Redevelopment			
Preliminary Review: No Comments.			
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Credit 4.1-Version 2.1
Alternative Transportation, Public Transportation Access			
Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the project is served by 4 bus lines within 0.25 miles of the project site. A scaled drawing showing the location of the bus stops has been provided.			
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Credit 4.2-Version 2.1
Alternative Transportation, Bicycle Storage & Changing Rooms			
Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the project has provided bicycle storage and shower facilities for a minimum of 5% of the FTE building occupants.			
Not Attempting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Credit 4.3-Version 2.1
Alternative Transportation, Alternative Fuel Refueling Stations			
Preliminary Review: No Comments.			
Not Attempting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Credit 4.4-Version 2.1
Alternative Transportation, Parking Capacity			
Preliminary Review: No Comments.			
Not Attempting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Credit 5.1-Version 2.1
Reduced Site Disturbance, Protect or Restore Open Space			
Preliminary Review: No Comments.			

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A D

1 **Reduced Site Disturbance, Development Footprint** Credit 5.2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the project has been developed in an area with no minimum code requirements for open space. The Template further states that the dedicated open space, equal in size to the building footprint, has been provided adjacent to the building; however, the provided calculations illustrating the development footprint and open space area appear to indicate that a large portion of the open space is non-vegetated. Per the requirements for this credit, the dedicated open space must be vegetated to comply.

TECHNICAL ADVICE: Please provide a narrative describing the provided open space. Additionally, please confirm the open space calculations and highlight the vegetated open space provided to comply with the credit requirements.

Final Review The project team has provided a narrative and revised site plan, including calculations, to clarify the claim of this credit. Per the submitted documentation, the project building footprint area is 7,148 s.f. and the provided vegetated open space is 16,048 s.f. This area is 45% larger than the building footprint area.

Not Attempting **Stormwater Management, Rate and Quantity** Credit 6.1-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: No Comments.

Not Attempting **Stormwater Management, Treatment** Credit 6.2-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: No Comments.

1 **Landscape & Exterior Design to Reduce Heat Islands, Non-Roof Surfaces** Credit 7.1-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that a minimum of 30% of the non-roof impervious surfaces on-site will be shaded within 5 years. Calculations provided in the submittal claim that of the 2,246 s.f. of total non-roof impervious surfaces, 683.7 s.f. (30.4%) will be shaded within 5 years. A site plan showing the extents of the shaded areas, has been provided.

1 **Landscape & Exterior Design to Reduce Heat Islands, Roof Surfaces** Credit 7.2-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that 4,860.5 s.f. of the reported 5,828 s.f. total roof area (83.4%) is covered by an Energy Star rated roofing product that has an emissivity of at least 0.9.

Not Attempting **Light Pollution Reduction** Credit 8-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: No Comments.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A		D			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Water Efficiency	Possible Points 5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Attempting			Water Efficient Landscaping, Reduce by 50% Preliminary Review: No Comments.	Credit 1.1-Version 2.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Attempting			Water Efficient Landscaping, No Potable Use or No Irrigation Preliminary Review: No Comments.	Credit 1.2-Version 2.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Attempting			Innovative Wastewater Technologies Preliminary Review: No Comments.	Credit 2-Version 2.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Attempting			Water Use Reduction, 20% Reduction Preliminary Review: No Comments.	Credit 3.1-Version 2.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Attempting			Water Use Reduction, 30% Reduction Preliminary Review: No Comments.	Credit 3.2-Version 2.1

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A		D			Possible Points 17
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	Energy & Atmosphere	
0	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fundamental Building Systems Commissioning	Prerequisite 1-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the fundamental commissioning requirements have been completed or are under contract.					
0	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Minimum Energy Performance	Prerequisite 2-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the project complies with the minimum energy performance requirements of ASHRAE 90.1-1999.					
0	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CFC Reduction in HVAC&R Equipment	Prerequisite 3-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that base building HVAC&R systems use no CFC-based refrigerants.					

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A	D
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Optimize Energy Performance, 20% New /10% Existing

Credit 1.1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template and supporting documentation have been submitted claiming that the project performs 11.1% better than ASHRAE 90.1-1999 requirements using the LEED ECB method. Energy efficiency measures reported for the project include variable speed pumps, demand controlled ventilation, and premium efficiency motors. However, further documentation is required to confirm the projected level of savings:

TECHNICAL ADVICE:

- Insufficient information was provided regarding building energy inputs. Please provide the following information for both the budget and design case: [a] wall, roof, and floor assemblies including framing type, assembly R-values, assembly U-values, and roof reflectivity; [b] fenestration window-to-gross wall ratio, assembly U-values (including the impact of the frame on the assembly in accordance with ASHRAE 90.1-1999 Table A-17) and SHGCs; [c] fan volume, power, and controls; [d] description of service water heating system type(s), efficiency, and storage tank size(s) [e] lighting power densities [f] process or equipment loads modeled for the building. [g] Building operating schedule summary.
- For LEED v2.1, the demand control ventilation measure should be modeled using the exceptional calculation methodology as described in ASHRAE 90.1-1999 Section 11.5. A narrative should be provided documenting the assumptions made, and providing justification for the base case and proposed case inputs. The savings for this measure should also be reported as a separate line item on the Energy Cost Budget table, similar to Site Generated Renewable Energy.
- It is unclear whether proposed case lighting is modeled as installed, and baseline case lighting is modeled per ASHRAE 90.1-1999 whole building or space-by-space method. Please verify that the proposed case lighting reflects the actual installed (or designed) lighting power for all building spaces, and that the baseline case reflects ASHRAE 90.1 lighting power allowances.
- It is unclear whether the hot water and chilled water loops were modeled with variable primary flow, as required in the Notes for Table 11.4.3A. Please verify that these loops were modeled with variable primary flow (i.e. two-way valves for each air handler) as required.
- The energy savings reported for pumps do not appear to be substantiated based on the energy inputs reported in the input comparison table. Please review the Baseline and Proposed inputs for the model to confirm that they conform with ASHRAE 90.1 Energy Cost Budget method modeling protocol, and provide sufficient information regarding the energy inputs to justify the reported energy savings [Note: you may also submit an accompanying narrative if this would more easily facilitate the confirmation of energy savings].

Requirements Reduce design energy cost compared to the energy cost budget for energy systems regulated by ASHRAE/IESNA Standard 90.1-1999 (without amendments), as demonstrated by a whole building simulation using the Energy Cost Budget Method described in Section 11 of the Standard.

New Bldgs.	Existing Bldgs.	Points
15%	5%	1
20%	10%	2
25%	15%	3
30%	20%	4
35%	25%	5
40%	30%	6
45%	35%	7
50%	40%	8
55%	45%	9
60%	50%	10

Regulated energy systems include HVAC (heating, cooling, fans and pumps), service hot water and interior lighting. Non-regulated systems include plug loads, exterior lighting, garage ventilation and elevators (vertical transportation). Two methods may be used to separate energy consumption for regulated systems. The energy consumption for each fuel may be prorated according to the fraction of

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A **D**

energy used by regulated and non-regulated energy.

Alternatively, separate meters (accounting) may be created in the energy simulation program for regulated and non-regulated energy uses. If an analysis has been made comparing the proposed design to local energy standards and a defensible equivalency (at minimum) to ASHRAE/IESNA Standard 90.1-1999 has been established, then the comparison against the local code may be used in lieu of the ASHRAE Standard. Project teams are encouraged to apply for innovation credits if the energy consumption of non-regulated systems is also reduced.

Submittals Complete the LEED Letter Template incorporating a quantitative summary table showing the energy saving strategies incorporated in the building design. Demonstrate via summary printout from energy simulation software that the design energy cost is less than the energy cost budget as defined in ASHRAE/IESNA 90.1-1999, Section 11.

Final Review No additional documentation has been provided by the project team. Credit has been withdrawn.

Not Attempting	Optimize Energy Performance, 30% New /20% Existing	Credit 1.2-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: No Comments.		
Not Attempting	Optimize Energy Performance, 40% New /30% Existing	Credit 1.3-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: No Comments.		
Not Attempting	Optimize Energy Performance, 50% New /40% Existing	Credit 1.4-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: No Comments.		
Not Attempting	Optimize Energy Performance, 60% New /50% Existing	Credit 1.5-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: No Comments.		
Not Attempting	Renewable Energy, 5% Contribution	Credit 2.1-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: No Comments.		
Not Attempting	Renewable Energy, 10% Contribution	Credit 2.2-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: No Comments.		
Not Attempting	Renewable Energy, 20% Contribution	Credit 2.3-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: No Comments.		
1	Additional Commissioning	Credit 3-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the required additional commissioning elements have been completed or are under contract to be completed.		
Not Attempting	Ozone Protection	Credit 4-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: No Comments.		
Not Attempting	Measurement & Verification	Credit 5-Version 2.1
Preliminary Review: No Comments.		

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A **D**
 Not Attempting

Green Power

Credit 6-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A	D		Possible Points
7	1	Materials & Resources	13

0		Storage & Collection of Recyclables	Prerequisite 1-Version 2.1
---	--	--	----------------------------

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the project has provided appropriately sized dedicated areas for the collection and storage of recycling materials, including cardboard, paper, plastic, glass, and metals. Plans have been provided highlighting the location of recycling collection areas within the project.

1		Building Reuse, Maintain 75% of Existing Shell	Credit 1.1-Version 2.1
---	--	---	------------------------

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that 75.33% of the existing structural and shell elements have been reused. However, highlighted building drawings showing the retained areas/elements have not been provided to support this claim.

TECHNICAL ADVICE: Please provide highlighted building drawings to support the project's claim that 75.33% of the existing structural and shell elements have been reused.

Final Review The project team has provided the required drawings to confirm the areas of building reuse. Additionally, the project team has submitted a revised Submittal Template indicating that 86.25% of the existing structural and shell elements have been retained and reused.

Not Attempting		Building Reuse, Maintain 100% of Shell	Credit 1.2-Version 2.1
----------------	--	---	------------------------

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

Not Attempting		Building Reuse, Maintain 100% Shell and 50% Non-Shell	Credit 1.3-Version 2.1
----------------	--	--	------------------------

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

1		Construction Waste Management, Divert 50%	Credit 2.1-Version 2.1
---	--	--	------------------------

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the project has diverted 1338 cu. yards (78.25%) of on-site generated construction waste from landfill. Calculations have been provided to document the waste types and receiving agencies for recycled materials.

1		Construction Waste Management, Divert 75%	Credit 2.2-Version 2.1
---	--	--	------------------------

Preliminary Review: See comments under MRc2.1.

Not Attempting		Resource Reuse, Specify 5%	Credit 3.1-Version 2.1
----------------	--	-----------------------------------	------------------------

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

Not Attempting		Resource Reuse, Specify 10%	Credit 3.2-Version 2.1
----------------	--	------------------------------------	------------------------

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

1		Recycled Content, Specify 5%	Credit 4.1-Version 2.1
---	--	-------------------------------------	------------------------

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template and calculations have been provided declaring that 9.87% of the total building materials content, by value, have been manufactured using recycled materials.

Not Attempting		Recycled Content, Specify 10%	Credit 4.2-Version 2.1
----------------	--	--------------------------------------	------------------------

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A **D**
 1 **Local/Regional Materials, 20% Manufactured Regionally** **Credit 5.1-Version 2.1**

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template and calculation have been provided declaring that 70.21% of the total building materials by value have been manufactured within 500 miles of the project site.

Please note that the project team may elect to submit for and ID point exemplary performance under this credit. To achieve exemplary performance, projects must document a minimum of 40% regionally manufactured materials.

1 **Local/Regional Materials, 50% Extracted Regionally** **Credit 5.2-Version 2.1**

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template and calculation have been provided declaring that 70.21% of the total building materials value (100% of the locally manufactured materials) have been manufactured using raw materials that were harvested, extracted, or recovered within 500 miles of the project site.

Please note that the project team may elect to submit for and ID point exemplary performance under this credit. To achieve exemplary performance, projects must document a minimum of 20% regionally manufactured and harvested (based on total materials value.)

1 **Rapidly Renewable Materials** **Credit 6-Version 2.1**

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that 5.84% of the total materials used on the project were from rapidly renewable sources. However, no documentation was provided indicating that the building materials and products included in this calculation are in fact made from plants that are typically harvested within a ten-year cycle or shorter. Additionally, the project team has included \$15,000 for planting as a rapidly renewable material. The credit requirements state, "Use rapidly renewable building materials and products (made from plants that are typically harvested within a ten-year cycle or shorter)..." As plant materials used for landscaping are not put through a manufacturing process they cannot be included in the calculations for this credit.

TECHNICAL ADVICE: Please provide supporting documentation to demonstrate that the building materials and products used on the project are made from rapidly renewable materials. Additionally, please remove the "planting" line item from the materials calculation.

Requirements Use rapidly renewable building materials and products (made from plants that are typically harvested within a ten-year cycle or shorter) for 5% of the total value of all building materials and products used in the project.

Submittals Provide the LEED Letter Template, signed by the architect or responsible party, declaring that the credit requirements have been met. Include calculations demonstrating that the project incorporates the required percentage of rapidly renewable products. Show their cost and percentage of rapidly renewable components, and the total cost of all materials for the project.

Final Review The project team has submitted a revised Submittal Template that excludes the plant materials as requested. The revised Template calculations indicate that 5.16% of the total materials used on the project were from rapidly renewable sources. Manufacturer's documentation for all tracked materials has been provided. The literature for the linoleum and wall base materials clearly indicates the rapidly renewable materials percentage. The documentation for the finish carpentry, casework and doors, however, indicates that the materials are FSC Certified, which would apply for MRc7; there is no information to confirm that these materials are from rapidly renewable resources, as required for compliance with this credit.

As the required 5% threshold cannot be met by the linoleum and wall base values alone, the credit cannot be awarded.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A	D
1	

Certified Wood

Credit 7-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that 52.63% of the total wood based building materials are harvested from FSC certified forests. The template calculation has been provided listing the certified wood products and chain of custody numbers.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A	D		Possible Points 15
10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Indoor Environmental Quality
0	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Minimum IAQ Performance Prerequisite 1-Version 2.1</p> <p>Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the project complies with the minimum IAQ performance requirements of ASHRAE 62-1999 and all approved Addenda. A supplemental narrative has been provided to document the project's compliance with the Ventilation Rate Procedure methods.</p>
0	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS) Control Prerequisite 2-Version 2.1</p> <p>Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that smoking is prohibited inside buildings within the project and that designated smoking areas have been located away from building openings and air intakes.</p>
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Carbon Dioxide (CO2) Monitoring Credit 1-Version 2.1</p> <p>Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the project has installed a CO2 monitoring system in accordance with the requirements of the credit. Additionally, a design narrative has been provided that describes the installed sensors, operational parameters, and design conditions.</p>
Not Attempting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Increase Ventilation Effectiveness Credit 2-Version 2.1</p> <p>Preliminary Review: No Comments.</p>
Not Attempting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Construction IAQ Management Plan, During Construction Credit 3.1-Version 2.1</p> <p>Preliminary Review: No Comments.</p>
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Construction IAQ Management Plan, Before Occupancy Credit 3.2-Version 2.1</p> <p>Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been submitted declaring that the project conducted a two-week flushout prior to occupancy. The flush-out was conducted between 1/16/2006 and 1/30/2006. The Submittal Template further states that new MERV 13 filtration media was installed prior to the flushout.</p>
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Low-Emitting Materials, Adhesives & Sealants Credit 4.1-Version 2.1</p> <p>Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that all adhesive and sealant products comply with the VOC limits of the referenced standards for this credit. A summary of all interior adhesive and sealant products has been provided along with VOC data for each product confirming that they comply with the referenced VOC limits.</p>
Not Attempting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Low-Emitting Materials, Paints Credit 4.2-Version 2.1</p> <p>Preliminary Review: No Comments.</p>
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Low-Emitting Materials, Carpet Credit 4.3-Version 2.1</p> <p>Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that installed carpet systems comply with the VOC limits of the CRI Green Label Testing Program.</p>

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A D

1 **Low-Emitting Materials, Composite Wood** Credit 4.4-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that all indoor composite wood materials used on the project contain no urea-formaldehyde. Per the submitted list, the project has installed plywood, OSB, MDF and particleboard. There is no specific information provided to confirm that the listed materials contain no added urea-formaldehyde.

TECHNICAL ADVICE: Please provide additional supporting information for each of the tracked composite wood materials to confirm that they contain no added urea-formaldehyde.

Final Review The project team has provided a listing of all composite wood materials used on the project along with manufacturer's product data for each item. Per the submitted documentation, all indoor composite wood materials used on the project contain no added urea-formaldehyde.

Not Attempting **Indoor Chemical and Pollutant Source Control** Credit 5-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

1 **Controllability of Systems, Perimeter** Credit 6.1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that, for perimeter spaces, a minimum of one operable window and one lighting control zone has been provided for all regularly occupied areas within 15 feet of the perimeter wall. Calculations, a narrative, and highlighted floor plans have been provided to support this declaration.

Not Attempting **Controllability of Systems, Non-perimeter** Credit 6.2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

1 **Thermal Comfort, Compliance with ASHRAE 55-1992** Credit 7.1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the project has been designed to maintain indoor comfort within the ranges established by ASHRAE Standard 55-1992, Addenda 1995. A table listing the control ranges and installed control methods has also been provided.

1 **Thermal Comfort, Permanent Monitoring System** Credit 7.2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the project has installed a permanent temperature and humidity monitoring system that will provide control of the building zones within the thermal comfort ranges defined in ASHRAE 55-1992, Addenda 1995. These controls have been commissioned under the scope for Eap1, Fundamental Systems Commissioning.

1 **Daylight and Views, Daylight 75% of Spaces** Credit 8.1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the project has achieved a minimum 2% daylight factor in 75% of all space occupied for critical visual tasks. Calculations and highlighted drawings to support this claim have also been provided.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A D

1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------

Daylight and Views, Views for 90% of Spaces

Credit 8.2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that the project has provided direct line of sight views from a minimum of 90% of all space occupied for critical visual tasks. Floor plans and sections highlighting the direct line of sight and supporting calculations have also been provided.

From the provided section drawing, it appears that the project is including views through glazing that is located in the upper part of the rotunda structure. Per guidance on page 306 of the NCv2.1 Reference Guide indicates, "Windows below 2'6" and windows above 7'6" (including daylight glazing, skylights and roof monitors) do not qualify for the credit."

TECHNICAL ADVICE: Please provide a narrative describing the calculation methodology used in determining the access to views for the project. If windows, skylights, and other daylight glazing that is located above 7'6" from the floor of the occupied space has been used to calculate access to views, please revise the calculations to exclude this glazing. Please provide a revised calculation spreadsheet to confirm compliance with the credit requirements.

Final Review The project team has provided a narrative and revised drawings confirming that all views were calculated using vision glazing located between 2'-6" and 7'-6" above the finished floor, as required. Per the calculations, the project has achieved direct line of sight views from 91.96% of the spaces occupied for critical visual tasks.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A	D		Innovation & Design Process	Possible Points 5
---	---	--	--	--------------------------

3			Innovation & Design Process	Possible Points 5
---	--	--	--	--------------------------

1			Exemplary Performance EQc8.1	Credit 1.1-Version 2.1
---	--	--	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------

Preliminary Review: The project team has provided a proposal for an ID point based on enhanced daylighting through the incorporation of a partially glazed rotunda dome and open atrium.

While the project's daylighting design is highly commendable (daylight in 88% of spaces), the project has achieved credit for daylighting of more than 75% of the regularly occupied areas under EQc8.1. Precedent and guidance in the NCv2.2 Reference Guide has set the threshold for exemplary performance for EQc8.1 at 95% or more of occupied spaces. As such the additional ID point cannot be awarded.

Please note, the project team may substitute an alternative ID point proposal for review in the final submittal.

Final Review The project team has provided a revised calculation spreadsheet, narrative, and building section indicating that the project has achieved a minimum 2% daylight factor in 98.27% of the regularly occupied areas under EQc8.1. As the project has exceeded the 95% threshold recognized for exemplary performance, an ID point is awarded.

1			Educational Program	Credit 1.2-Version 2.1
---	--	--	----------------------------	-------------------------------

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that an education program has been developed to present the project's sustainable design practices to occupants and visitors to the facility. The submitted documentation provides information of only one educational component; the submittal lists a published informational pamphlet as the educational element. Per an IDc1.1 CIR ruling, posted 9/24/01, "To take advantage of the educational value of the green building features of a project and to earn a LEED point, any approach should be ACTIVELY instructional. Two of the following three elements must be included in the educational program:

- 1) A comprehensive signage program built into the building's spaces to educate the occupants and visitors of the benefits of green buildings. This program may include windows to view energy-saving mechanical equipment or signs to call attention to water-conserving landscape features.
- 2) The development of a manual, guideline or case study to inform the design of other buildings based on the successes of this project. This manual will be made available to the USGBC for sharing with other projects.
- 3) An educational outreach program or guided tour could be developed to focus on sustainable living, using the project as an example."

TECHNICAL ADVICE: Please provide a detailed narrative describing the components of the implemented educational program. A minimum of two distinct components (one in addition to the submitted pamphlet) must be documented. Additionally, please provide examples of the individual elements (i.e. photos/drawings of installed signage, published case study, website screen shots, etc.)

Final Review The project team has provided a detailed narrative listing the educational elements of the noted program. In addition to the published pamphlet, the campus provides guided tours of this and other LEED facilities that highlight the sustainable elements of each building. The campus also has a portion of their website dedicated to describing the LEED system and the campus' commitment to sustainability and LEED.

Not Attempting			Innovation in Design	Credit 1.3-Version 2.1
----------------	--	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------------

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

Not Attempting			Innovation in Design	Credit 1.4-Version 2.1
----------------	--	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------------

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A **D**

1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------

LEED™ Accredited Professional

Credit 2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The LEED Submittal Template has been provided declaring that a LEED AP has been a participant on the project development team. A copy of the LEED AP award certification for Richard Schoeff has been included as required.