



LEED Certification Review Report

This report contains the results of the technical review of an application for LEED® certification submitted for the specified project. LEED certification is an official recognition that a project complies with the requirements prescribed within the LEED rating systems as created and maintained by the U.S. Green Building Council® (USGBC®). The LEED certification program is administered by the Green Business Certification Inc. (GBCI®).

Former Civic Arena Site Redevelopment

Project ID 1000053179
Rating system & version LEED-ND v2009 Stage 2
Project registration date 12/18/2014



Pre-Certified Plan (Gold)

CERTIFIED: 40-49, SILVER: 50-59, GOLD: 60-79, PLATINUM: 80+

LEED-ND V2009 STAGE 2

ATTEMPTED: 81, DENIED: 8, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 70 OF 109 POINTS

SMART LOCATION AND LINKAGE		22 OF 27
SLLp1 Smart Location	Y	
SLLp2 Imperiled Species and Ecological Communities Conservation	Y	
SLLp3 Wetland and Water Body Conservation	Y	
SLLp4 Agricultural Land Conservation	Y	
SLLp5 Floodplain Avoidance	Y	
SLLc1 Preferred Locations	10 / 10	
SLLc2 Brownfields Redevelopment	0 / 2	
SLLc3 Reduced Automobile Dependence	7 / 7	
SLLc4 Bicycle Network and Storage	1 / 1	
SLLc5 Housing and Jobs Proximity	3 / 3	
SLLc6 Steep Slope Protection	0 / 1	
SLLc7 Site Design for Habitat or Wetland and Water Body Conservati	1 / 1	
SLLc8 Restoration of Habitat or Wetlands and Water Bodies	0 / 1	
SLLc9 Long-Term Conservation Mgmt of Habitat or Wetlands and	0 / 1	

NEIGHBORHOOD PATTERN AND DESIGN		32 OF 44
NPDp1 Walkable Streets	Y	
NPDp2 Compact Development	Y	
NPDp3 Connected and Open Community	Y	
NPDc1 Walkable Streets	12 / 12	
NPDc2 Compact Development	6 / 6	
NPDc3 Mixed-Use Neighborhood Centers	4 / 4	
NPDc4 Mixed-Income Diverse Communities	3 / 7	
NPDc5 Reduced Parking Footprint	0 / 1	
NPDc6 Street Network	0 / 2	
NPDc7 Transit Facilities	1 / 1	
NPDc8 Transportation Demand Mgmt	0 / 2	
NPDc9 Access to Civic and Public Space	1 / 1	
NPDc10 Access to Recreation Facilities	0 / 1	
NPDc11 Visitability and Universal Design	0 / 1	
NPDc12 Community Outreach and Involvement	2 / 2	
NPDc13 Local Food Production	0 / 1	
NPDc14 Tree-Lined and Shaded Streets	2 / 2	
NPDc15 Neighborhood Schools	1 / 1	

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND BUILDINGS		9 OF 29
GIBp1 Certified Green Building	Y	
GIBp2 Minimum Building Energy Efficiency	Y	
GIBp3 Minimum Building Water Efficiency	Y	
GIBp4 Construction Activity Pollution Prevention	Y	
GIBc1 Certified Green Buildings	0 / 5	
GIBc2 Building Energy Efficiency	1 / 2	
GIBc3 Building Water Efficiency	0 / 1	
GIBc4 Water-Efficient Landscaping	1 / 1	
GIBc5 Existing Building Reuse	0 / 1	
GIBc6 Historic Resource Preservation and Adaptive Use	0 / 1	
GIBc7 Minimized Site Disturbance in Design and Construction	0 / 1	
GIBc8 Stormwater Mgmt	4 / 4	
GIBc9 Heat Island Reduction	1 / 1	
GIBc10 Solar Orientation	0 / 1	
GIBc11 On-Site Renewable Energy Sources	0 / 3	
GIBc12 District Heating and Cooling	0 / 2	
GIBc13 Infrastructure Energy Efficiency	1 / 1	
GIBc14 Wastewater Mgmt	0 / 2	
GIBc15 Recycled Content in Infrastructure	1 / 1	
GIBc16 Solid Waste Mgmt Infrastructure	0 / 1	
GIBc17 Light Pollution Reduction	0 / 1	

INNOVATION AND DESIGN PROCESS		4 OF 6
IDPc1.1 Innovation and Exemplary Performance-Green Building Outreach	1 / 1	
IDPc1.2 Innovation and Exemplary Performance-Bike Sharing Program	0 / 1	
IDPc1.3 Innovation and Exemplary Performance-NPDc1: Walkable Streets	0 / 1	
IDPc1.4 Exemplary Performance-NPDc1 Walkable Streets	1 / 1	
IDPc1.5 Innovation and Exemplary Performance-SLLc3	1 / 1	
IDPc2 LEED Accredited Professional	1 / 1	

REGIONAL PRIORITY CREDITS		3 OF 3
NPDc4 Mixed-Income Diverse Communities	1 / 1	
GIBc8 Stormwater Mgmt	1 / 1	
GIBc9 Heat Island Reduction	1 / 1	

TOTAL 70 OF 109

CREDIT DETAILS



Project Information Forms

Pf1: Development Program and Site Type **Approved**

06/23/2017 **STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW**

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance.

It is noted that some, but not all, credit-specific requirements listed within the Vertical Developer Guidelines have been confirmed to be legally-binding for future developers. Due to project-specific circumstances, a one-time exception has been offered by GBCI, and the Guideline requirements will be considered sufficiently binding for the purposes of this Stage 2 certification. For future projects pursuing compliance using comprehensive design guidelines, ensure that documentation is provided to confirm that all future development will be legally bound to achieving credit-specific requirements for each credit attempted via this pathway.

Additionally, the following two issues are noted.

1. The development footprint listed (17.19 acres) appears to be incorrect. Based on the document titled CAR ND Pf1 Clarif_SDC, it appears as though the project team has included the total permeable and impermeable buildable land area (17.19 acres) and excluded all impermeable non-buildable rights of way areas (7.13 acres) whereas the development footprint must be determined based on the total land area of a project site covered by buildings, streets, parking areas, and other typically impermeable surfaces constructed as part of the project. When conservatively recalculated to include areas of impervious rights of way and all buildable land area (as the exact building and hardscape areas are unknown), the development footprint is 25.04 acres.

2. The area of open space has not been reported consistently throughout the submittal. Information must be reported consistently.

In this instance, it has been determined that these issues do not affect compliance.

10/19/2015 **STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW**

The LEED Project Information Form has been provided, including the following information:

DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM: The project site includes a total of 29.93 acres, a development footprint of 29.93 acres, 17.91 acres of buildable land, and 12.02 acres of non-buildable land. A site base map with non-buildable land labeled by type and size has been provided. However, the following issues exist:

1. Table Pf1-1 reports 7.8 acres of public right-of-way, but this amount cannot be confirmed in Upload Pf1-1, which is not scaled or dimensioned. The Upload map also includes a portion of Interstate 579 right-of-way that is not labeled or categorized as right-of-way.
2. Upload Pf1-1 includes a parcel west of I-579 that is not designated buildable or non-buildable.
3. Table Pf1-1 reports 4.22 acres of required park space, which must be supported by a codified law imposing the requirement. Also, Upload Pf1-1 shows required park space in Block C that is labeled as an easement throughout the submission, e.g. Upload NPDp1-3. If an easement is used to convey required park space it must include perpetual public access for such a use.
4. PI Form 1 reports that the total project site and development footprint are both 29.93 acres, whereas the impermeable development footprint must be smaller than the project site because of the presence of permeable park acreage on the Upload Pf1-1 site plan.

BUILDING INFORMATION/FINAL DENSITIES: The project contains a total residential building floor area of 1,211,681 square feet, a residential density of 100.34 dwelling units per acre, a total nonresidential building floor area of 980,663 square feet, and a nonresidential density of 3.71 FAR. However, the following issues exist:

1. Table Pf1-6 reports new floor areas by block rather than by building, as required. Yet, building-level information is provided elsewhere throughout the submission, e.g. Upload Pf3-L4, SLLc4 documentation, Upload NPDp1-3, NPDc1 credit form.
2. Table Pf1-8 reports the project's total 1,188 dwelling units are located exclusively in mixed-use buildings. Yet, Upload Pf3-L4 shows at least 18 dwelling units in residential townhouse-style buildings.
3. Table Pf1-9 has not been completed.

TRIP GENERATOR INFORMATION: A total trip generator value of 1,188 has been provided. However, new full-time equivalent employees is reported as zero, whereas the project contains 980,663 sq. ft. of nonresidential building floor area, and 3,049 employees are reported in SLLc4 documentation.

INFILL SITE DETERMINATION (c): A vicinity base map of previously developed land, excluding rights-of-ways, within one-half mile of project boundary has been provided. The PI Form and documentation confirm that 100% of the land area, exclusive of rights-of-way, within a one-half mile distance from the project boundary is previously developed.

PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED SITE DETERMINATION: A site base map with project boundary and previously developed areas

has been provided, confirming that 100% of the project site is previously developed. A description of the duration and type of previous development has been provided.

Technical Advice:

DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM:

1. Revise the Upload P1f1-1 map to include a scale, dimensioned features, and designation of all rights-of-way and land within the project boundary as either buildable or non-buildable.
2. Provide a copy of the codified law that requires 4.22 acres of park space. Note that the law must apply jurisdiction-wide, and a site-specific development agreement or zoning does not satisfy the requirement. Also, clarify the ownership status of the park space required in Block C that is labeled as an "easement" throughout the submission, e.g. Upload NPDp1-1. If an easement is used to convey the Block C park space, confirm that it provides perpetual public access for that purpose.
3. Recalculate the development footprint to include only impermeable surfaces to be constructed as part of the project.

FINAL BUILDABLE LAND & DENSITIES:

1. Please complete Table P1f1-6 with building-level data that corresponds with building-level information provided elsewhere in the submission.
2. Revise Table P1f1-8 to report dwelling units by building type consistent with residential building information provided elsewhere in the submission, e.g. townhouses shown on Block C in the Upload P1f3 L-4 map.
3. Complete Table P1f1-9 consistent with residential building information provided elsewhere in the submission.

TRIP GENERATOR INFORMATION: Please provide the number of new full-time equivalent employees in the project, and recalculate total trip generators to include new employees.

P1f2: Project Timeline

Approved

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Project Information Form has been provided, depicting the project timeline. The project entitled 100% of the total building floor area as of February 2015. Relevant project occupancy dates have been provided.

P1f3: Project Location and Base Mapping

Approved

06/16/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance and states that the project contains or is within one-half mile of public transportation that includes weekend service. Only existing service has been included within the calculations yet it was noted that the project will also be served by planned bus rapid transit service.

10/19/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Project Information Form has been provided, including the project location in Pittsburgh PA and base mapping with the project boundary, and natural and built features. Confirmation has also been provided that the project does contain, or is within one-half mile of, transit service. However, to demonstrate compliance, the following technical advice must be addressed.

Technical Advice:

It is noted in PI Form 3 that no other transit-related credits, except for NPDp2: Option 1, will be pursued, yet several transit-related credits have been pursued. Per comments in SLLc3, please provide P1f3 transit service tables, or revise Upload SLLc3-1 to provide bus stop route identifiers that correspond to local transit schedules included in the upload, and a table summarizing weekday and weekend trips by stop.



Smart Location and Linkage

SLLp1: Smart Location

Awarded

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Prerequisite Form has been provided, confirming the project is currently served by publicly-owned water and wastewater systems. A map delineating the site base, project boundary, and water and wastewater infrastructure currently serving the site has been provided. The site has been determined to be infill based on documentation provided in Plf1: Development Program and Site Type.

SLLp2: Imperiled Species and Ecological Communities Conservation

Awarded

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Prerequisite Form has been provided, providing evidence that the state Natural Heritage Program agency and the state wildlife agency were consulted for the presence of species listed as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act, the state's endangered species act, or species or ecological communities classified by NatureServe as GH, G1 or G2 on the project site. Documentation has been provided that conclusively demonstrates the presence of such species and communities is highly unlikely due to the project site conditions.

SLLp3: Wetland and Water Body Conservation

Awarded

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Prerequisite Form has been provided, stating that the project complies with all local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to wetland and water body conservation, and that the site does not include wetlands and land within 50 feet of wetlands, or water bodies or land within 100 feet of water bodies. A pre-construction base site map showing the LEED project boundary and natural and built features has been provided.

SLLp4: Agricultural Land Conservation

Awarded

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Prerequisite Form has been provided, stating that the project is not located in a state or locally designated agricultural preservation district. Confirmation that the project is an infill site has been provided in PI1: Development Program and Site Type.

SLLp5: Floodplain Avoidance

Awarded

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Prerequisite Form has been provided, stating that the site does not contain any land within a 100-year floodplain, as documented in the project Environmental Document and online Federal Emergency Management Agency RISK mapping.

SLLc1: Preferred Locations

POSSIBLE POINTS: 10

ATTEMPTED: 10, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 10

**Awarded:
10**

06/16/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance.

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, confirming the following:

1. Per Plf1: Development Program and Site Type, the project site has been determined to be an infill site that is also a previously developed site.
2. The project is located in an area that has existing connectivity within one-half mile of the project boundary of 268 intersections per square mile. A map has been provided with the vicinity base, project boundary, any excluded land area, and intersections within one-half mile of the project boundary. Any intersections within the project boundary

that were constructed or funded by the developer within the past 10 years have been excluded.

3. The project has earned at least 2 points under NPDC4: Mixed-Income Diverse Communities Option 2, and is located in the following high-priority area: HUD Qualified Census Tract. A map of the priority area boundary in relation to the project boundary has been provided. However, awarding of NPDC4 points is pending resolution of technical advice for that credit.

Technical Advice:

Please resolve the NPDC4 technical advice.

SLLc2: Brownfields Redevelopment
POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

**Not
Attempted**

SLLc3: Reduced Automobile Dependence **Awarded: 7**

POSSIBLE POINTS: 7

ATTEMPTED: 7, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 7

06/16/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance and states that 100% of dwelling units and nonresidential building entrances are within one-quarter mile walk distance of bus or streetcar stops. Existing transit service at these stops in aggregate is 659 weekday trips and 489 weekend trips.

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, confirming that the project is less than 125 acres, that 50% of dwelling units and nonresidential building entrances are within one-quarter mile walk distance of existing bus stops, and that service at these stops in aggregate meets the credit minimums. Although building entrances, and walking routes from those entrances to bus stops, do not appear on Upload SLLc3-1 maps, it is apparent from Figure 8.8 in the uploaded development plan excerpt that 100% of entrances on the site are within a ¼-mi. walk of a bus stop. However, the number of claimed weekday and weekend trips cannot be confirmed because transit tables were not uploaded with P1f3 as indicated on the credit form, and the Upload SLLc3-1 map of bus stops does not contain route identifiers that correspond to local transit schedules included in the credit upload.

Technical Advice:

Please provide P1f3 transit service tables, or revise Upload SLLc3-1 to provide bus stop route identifiers that correspond to local transit schedules included in the upload, and a table summarizing weekday and weekend trips by stop.

SLLc4: Bicycle Network and Storage

Awarded: 1

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 1

06/19/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance.

10/19/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating that an existing bicycle network is within one-quarter mile bicycling distance of the project boundary, and connects to 11 diverse uses within a three-mile bicycling distance from the boundary. A map has been provided, depicting the boundary, a bicycle route from the boundary to the existing bicycle network, routes to 11 diverse uses, and the identification of those uses. Each segment of bicycle network has been labeled according to the bicycle network definition.

Additionally, the project has the following components per use type:

MULTI-UNIT RESIDENTIAL: A planned multi-unit residential occupancy of 1,187 with 1,187 multi-unit residential units; 1,187 secure, enclosed bicycle storage spaces; and 122 visitor bicycle racks.

RETAIL: A planned retail worker occupancy of 453 persons with a total retail square footage of 247,801 square feet, 7 businesses, 48 secure, enclosed bicycle storage spaces, 52 visitor bicycle racks, and 9 on-site showers.

NONRESIDENTIAL OTHER-THAN-RETAIL: A planned nonresidential other-than-retail planned occupancy of 2,596 persons with a total building square footage of 731,862 square feet, 4 buildings, 262 secure, enclosed bicycle storage spaces, 74 visitor bicycle racks, and 21 on-site showers.

However, an Upload SLLc4-4 map has not been provided showing the project boundary, nonresidential buildings and entrances, bicycle parking locations by user type with dimensioned distances to building entrances, and on-site shower locations.

Technical Advice:

Please provide an Upload SLLc4-4 site map showing nonresidential buildings and entrances, bicycle parking locations by user type, dimensioned distances to building entrances, and on-site shower locations.

Note that there are several inconsistencies with the dwelling unit count, dwelling type count, and nonresidential floor area in this credit, as compared to what is listed in PI Forms 1 and 3. For future projects, please insure that project descriptors are used consistently and accurately throughout the submission. In this case, credit compliance is not affected for these issues.

SLLc5: Housing and Jobs Proximity

Awarded: 3

POSSIBLE POINTS: 3

ATTEMPTED: 3, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 3

06/16/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance.

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating that the project has earned 2 points under Option 2 of NPDc4: Mixed-Income Diverse Communities, has a residential component of 55% of the total building floor area (excluding parking structures), and has a geographic center within a one-half mile walk distance of existing full-time equivalent jobs whose number is equal to or greater than the number of project dwelling units. A map has been provided, showing the vicinity base, project boundary, a job location at UPMC with 2,684 positions, and a walk route from that location to the northern corner of the project site. However, awarding of NPDc4 points is pending resolution of technical advice for that credit.

Technical Advice:

Please resolve the NPDc4 technical advice.

SLLc6: Steep Slope Protection

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

Not Attempted

SLLc7: Site Design for Habitat or Wetland and Water Body Conservation

Awarded: 1

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 1

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating that the project does not have significant habitat or land within 100 feet of such habitat and fulfills the requirements of Option 1 in SLLp3: Wetland and Water Body Conservation. A site base map has been provided, confirming the absence of significant habitat, land within 100 feet of such habitat, and wetlands and water bodies and their SLLp3 buffers.

SLLc8: Restoration of Habitat or Wetlands and Water Bodies

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

Not Attempted

SLLc9: Long-Term Conservation Management of Habitat or Wetlands and WaterBodies

Denied

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 1, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 0

06/20/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

Additional documentation has been provided but does not demonstrate credit compliance. A commitment from the owner to engage appropriate professionals and establish a long term conservation management plan at a later time is not sufficient. It remains unclear whether the project will include any qualifying conservation areas as necessary to pursue this credit (in this instance, new 100% native habitat on site). Note that habitat conservation should address factors that may affect the health of the habitat, such as limiting human intrusion in these areas, and that pedestrian open spaces with areas of native vegetation are not necessarily equivalent to areas of native habitat for the purposes of LEED ND. Additionally, while a commitment to create a management plan has been provided, a commitment to implement the management plan for at least ten years, as required, has not been provided.

10/19/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating that the project will implement a 10-year management plan for

native plants, supported by a commitment letter to meet credit requirements. A special circumstance limiting the project's ability to provide required submittals is noted on the credit form as the project's early design status. However, LEED ND Stage 2 is intended for projects that have prepared a conservation management plan meeting the credit requirements.

Technical Advice:

Please provide a summary of a conservation management plan that meets the credit requirements, including a map delineating the native habitat management areas, the name and organization of a professional assisting with the preparation and implementation of the plan, and estimated implementation costs and funding sources.



Neighborhood Pattern and Design

NPDp1: Walkable Streets

Awarded

06/19/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance.

It is noted that for building-height-to-street-width-ratio, the form indicates 100% compliance whereas the supporting documentation provided indicates that Block H is non-compliant. Information listed within LEED forms must accurately reflect the project conditions. In this instance, documentation provided within NPDc1: Walkable Streets confirms that 96% will achieve the minimum ratio and compliance is not affected.

10/19/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Prerequisite Form and accompanying uploads have been provided, stating the following:

1. The project is not in a designated historic district.
2. A principal functional entry is located on 90% of the public space-facing façades of new buildings, and is connected to qualifying walking facilities. Public spaces that are squares, parks, or plazas are at least 50 feet deep when measured at a point perpendicular to each entry. However, Upload NPDp1-3 is not scaled or sufficiently labeled and dimensioned to confirm that the requirement has been achieved. The number of compliant and non-compliant façades is not documented, and several buildings have off-street entries from spaces whose public status is unclear. The map also uses a project boundary that differs from that used elsewhere in the submission by excluding in the area labeled Cap Open Space.
3. 100% of motorized and non-motorized street frontage within and bordering the project has a minimum building-height-to-street-width ratio of 1:3. However, Upload NPDp1-3 is not scaled or sufficiently dimensioned to confirm that the requirement has been achieved. Building heights and façade widths, and street widths and frontages are not dimensioned.
4. Continuous sidewalks or equivalent provisions for walking are provided along both sides of 100% of streets or frontage within the project. All new sidewalks are at least 8 feet wide on retail or mixed-use blocks and at least 4 feet wide on all other blocks. However, Upload NPDp1-3 is not scaled or sufficiently dimensioned to confirm that sidewalks meet minimum width requirements.
5. Garage and service bay openings account for 1% of the street frontages within the project. However, garage and service bay openings in Upload NPDp1-3 are not scaled or sufficiently labeled and dimensioned to confirm that the requirement has been achieved. Also, only two of eight blocks with buildings indicate the presence of garage openings.

Technical Advice:

Please revise Upload NPDp1-3 to include the following:

1. A scale, a project boundary consistent with the boundary used throughout the submission, identification of public space-facing building façades with and without principal functional entries, identification of public spaces other-than-streets faced by principal entries, and dimensions of the perpendicular depth of such spaces from the entries. Also, confirm that other-than-street public spaces are dedicated or deeded in perpetuity to public access.
2. Dimensions of building heights and façade widths, and street widths and frontage lengths on the project site drawing.
3. Dimensions of sidewalk widths on the project site drawing.
4. Dimensions of garage and service bay openings on the project site drawing. Also, confirm that garage openings for all buildings on all blocks are shown and included in the calculation.

NPDp2: Compact Development

Awarded

10/19/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Prerequisite Form has been provided, stating that the density of the project at five years after the date of first building occupancy will be at least equal to the density of the project at full build-out. The project is mixed use and has a build-out density of 100.34 dwelling units per acre and 3.71 FAR. The form indicates 979,663 sq. ft. of nonresidential building floor area, in comparison to 980,663 sq. ft. reported in PI Form 1. In this case, prerequisite achievement is not affected by the discrepancy, but in future projects please ensure that consistent values are used throughout the submission.

NPDp3: Connected and Open Community

Awarded

06/19/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance.

10/19/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Prerequisite Form has been provided, confirming the project has an internal connectivity of 340 intersections per square mile, that all streets and sidewalks counted toward the connectivity score are available for general public use and are not gated, and that a through-street or non-motorized right-of-way intersects or terminates at the project boundary at least every 800 feet. However, the following issues exist:

1. Upload NPDp3-1 shows four hand-drawn rights-of-way in Blocks A and C that are not shown in the Upload Plf1-1 right-of-way map, nor in Figure 4 of Appendix I of the Environmental Document uploaded for SLLp2 showing proposed roadway infrastructure. The inclusion and perpetual public access status of these rights-of-way is unclear, and therefore their eligibility as qualifying access points on the project boundary. This is also true of the Block C park space labeled "easement," which is the subject of a PI Form 1 technical advice. Confirmation of dedicated or deeded perpetual public access for these routes is required before through-street compliance can be determined for Blocks A and C.
2. For internal connectivity, Upload NPDp3-1 counts intersections at, and leading to, the "easement" and hand-drawn rights-of-way referenced above. Confirmation of dedicated or deeded perpetual public access for these routes is required before intersection eligibility and density can be confirmed.

Technical Advice:

1. Please resolve the PI Form 1 technical advice regarding dedicated or deeded perpetual public access to the Block C park space labeled "easement" in Upload NPDp3-1.
2. Please revise Upload NPDp3-1 mapping to clearly depict and label all motorized and non-motorized rights-of-way being used to meet the prerequisite requirements, and confirm that the rights-of-way are dedicated or deeded in perpetuity to public access. Use centerline to centerline dimensioned intervals between qualified boundary access points.

Note that documentation for this prerequisite reports the following inconsistencies: a project site of 0.05 sq. mi., or 32 acres, whereas PI Form 1 indicates a project site of 29.93 acres; a project site with 18.1 acres of developable land versus PI Form 1 indicating 17.91 acres of developable land. In this case, prerequisite achievement is not affected by these discrepancies, but in future projects please ensure that consistent values are used throughout the submission.

NPDc1: Walkable Streets

POSSIBLE POINTS: 12

ATTEMPTED: 11, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 12

Awarded:
12

06/23/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance for twelve points via the achievement of the following 15 items: a., b., c., d., f., g., h., i., j., k., l., m., n., o., and p..

Special circumstances have been noted for item n., stating that all residential streets within the project have posted speed limits of 25 miles per hour (mph), which exceeds the maximum allowed target speed of 20 mph for item n. Evidence of the local jurisdiction's policy for 25 mph speed limits in residential districts has been provided, in addition to evidence that the proposed streets will meet the intended target speed of 20mph via design and engineering criteria, as required to demonstrate compliance when a local jurisdiction's speed limits do not meet credit requirements. Item n. was not formally pursued but has been awarded as documentation is sufficient to demonstrate compliance.

10/19/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form and accompanying uploads have been provided, indicating the following:

FACADES AND ENTRIES:

- (a) At least 80 percent of the total 8,058 ft. of street-facing building facades in the project is no more than 25 feet from the property line.
- (b) At least 50 percent of the total 8,058 ft. of street-facing building facades in the project is no more than 18 feet from the property line.
- (c) At least 50 percent of the total 4,339 ft. of mixed-use and nonresidential street-facing building facades in the project is within one foot of a sidewalk or equivalent provision for walking.
- (d) Forty-five functional entries to nonresidential and mixed-use buildings occur at an average of 75 ft. along a total of 3,375 ft. of nonresidential and mixed-use building façades. However, the total nonresidential and mixed-use façade length is reported as 4,339 ft. in item (c) above.

GROUND-LEVEL USE AND PARKING:

(f) All ground-level retail, service, and trade uses that face a public space have clear glass on at least 60% of their facades between 3 and 8 feet above grade. However, Upload NPDC1-2 does not contain typical building elevations showing how requirements are met.

(g) No more than 40% of its length, or 50 feet, whichever is less, is blank for facades that extend along a sidewalk.

(h) Any ground-level retail, service, or trade windows must be kept visible at nights. A signed commitment on letterhead to provide CC&Rs that meet the requirements has been provided.

(j) Continuous sidewalks or equivalent provisions for walking are available along both sides of all streets within and bordering the project. All sidewalks are at least 10 feet wide on retail or mixed-use blocks and at least 5 feet wide on all other blocks. However, NPDp1 upload documentation indicates 4 ft. widths in some cases for all other blocks.

(k) The project has ground-floor dwelling units, and the principal floor of at least 50% of those units have a finished floor no less than 24 inches above the sidewalk grade. However, the form indicates a total of one ground-floor dwelling unit in the project, and 0.5 dwelling units with a ground floor 24 inches above grade, whereas multiple townhouse-style dwellings of this type are documented on Block C in NPDp2 and elsewhere in the submission. Also, the accompanying documentation provided for this requirement is an advisory recommendation rather than a mandatory design specification.

(l) At least 60% of street-level facades are activated by ground-floor retail on 50% or more of the total number of office buildings; and 100% of mixed-use buildings include ground-floor retail, live-work spaces, and/or ground-floor dwelling units along at least 60% of street-level facades. All businesses and/or other community services on ground floors are accessible directly from sidewalks along a public space. However, Upload NPDC1-6 with illustrative drawings of these features was not provided.

(m) 83% of a total 8,405 ft. of street frontage within the project has a minimum building-height to street-width ratio of 1:3. However, as noted under NPDp1, project building height-to-street width ratios cannot be confirmed using the documentation provided in the submission. Also, items (a) and (b) above indicate the total project street frontage or façade length is 8,058 ft.

DESIGN SPEEDS FOR SAFE PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE TRAVEL

(o) At least 70% of new nonresidential and/or mixed-use streets within the project are designed for a target speed of no more than 25 mph.

SIDEWALK INTRUSIONS

(p) At-grade crossings with driveways account for 7% of the total 9,908.5 ft. length of sidewalks within the project. However, accompanying upload maps do not provide scaled or dimensioned confirmation of requirement compliance.

A special circumstance limiting the project's ability to provide required building elevations and plans is noted on the credit form as due to the project's early design stage. However, LEED ND Stage 2 is intended for projects that have completed the preparation of walkable street submittals, and a commitment to do so is not sufficient for Stage 2 projects to earn credit items.

Technical Advice:

Please provide the following:

1. Clarifications of the total length of nonresidential and mixed-use building façades in the project, and use a single value consistently throughout the submission, including items (c) and (d) above.
2. Illustrative building elevation drawings showing how item (f) requirements are being met.
3. A scaled and dimensioned drawing of the project sidewalk network, including segments of minimum width and driveway intrusions, to confirm achievement of items (j) and (p), respectively.
4. Revised credit form entries for item (k) to correctly represent the total number of ground-floor dwelling units in the project, and the number of those that will comply with a mandatory design specification requiring at least 24 inches of ground-floor elevation above grade.
5. Upload NPDC1-6 demonstrating how the requirements of item (l) for ground floor spaces will be achieved.
6. Also, resolve the NPDp1 technical advice regarding building height-to-street width ratio; resolve the inconsistency in total project street frontage length between items (a), (b) and (m); and revise credit documentation accordingly.

NPDC2: Compact Development

POSSIBLE POINTS: 6

ATTEMPTED: 6, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 6

Awarded: 6

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating that the project is mixed use and that the project density will be 100.34 dwelling units per acre and 3.71 FAR within five years of first building occupancy. A description of the expected timeline for project construction and the densities that will be achieved within 5 years of first building occupancy has been provided.

NPDC3: Mixed-Use Neighborhood Centers **Awarded: 4**

POSSIBLE POINTS: 4

ATTEMPTED: 4, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 4

06/23/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance.

It is noted that it appears that the two medical offices highlighted within the same block (23. Erin McKenna, 24. Mitchell A. Wentz) may reflect two medical professionals working within the same facility and therefore would not qualify as distinct uses. Additionally, walking routes to these uses have not been identified. In this instance, when recalculated to conservatively exclude these two uses, the issue does not impact credit compliance.

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, indicating the project has dwelling units, that 100% of the units are within a one-quarter mile walk distance of 15 planned diverse uses within the project, and the uses will be in place by the time 20% of the total project square footage is occupied. However, Uploads NPDC3-1 and 3-2 were not provided, and credit achievement cannot be confirmed.

Technical Advice:

Please provide Uploads NPDC3-1 and 3-2.

NPDC4: Mixed-Income Diverse Communities**Awarded: 3**

POSSIBLE POINTS: 7

ATTEMPTED: 7, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 3

06/16/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance for one point under Option 1 and two points under Option 2 and states that the project has achieved a Simpson Diversity Index score of 0.54, that 2.5 percent of rental units will be priced up to 60% of AMI, and that 17.5 percent of rental units will be priced up to 80% of AMI.

10/19/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating the project has achieved a Simpson Diversity Index score of 0.54, that 2.5 percent of rental units will be priced up to 60% of AMI, and that 17.5 percent of rental units will be priced up to 80% of AMI. A signed and dated commitment on letterhead to provide a copy of a regulatory and operating agreement, deed restriction, or other recorded documents evidencing that the rental units will be maintained at the specified affordable levels for a minimum of fifteen years has been provided. However, the commitment letter itemization of the percentages of dwelling units to be offered at specified income levels does not match the values in Table NPDC4-2, and the letter qualifies achievement of the credit requirement as occurring at project build-out.

Technical Advice:

Please revise Table NPDC4-2 or the commitment letter to use consistent income level commitments, and in the commitment letter clarify the schedule for implementing required credit measures.

Note that the number of dwelling units reported in Table NPDC4-1 by category does not match the number of units itemized in the accompanying diversity calculation sheet, and the former has a diversity score of 0.54, while the latter has a score of 0.529. For future projects, please ensure that consistent values are used throughout the submission. In this case, credit compliance is not affected by these issues.

NPDC5: Reduced Parking Footprint

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

Not Attempted**NPDC6: Street Network**

POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

Not Attempted**NPDC7: Transit Facilities**

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 1

Awarded: 1**06/19/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW**

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance.

10/19/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating that the project team has begun discussions with the transit agency and that a plan of action has not been completed. A narrative describing collaboration with the Port Authority of Allegheny County to meet the rating system requirements has been provided, along with a commitment letter to meet the requirements in their entirety. The estimated date of construction of 50% of project square footage is October 2020. Confirmation has also been provided that kiosks, bulletin boards, and/or signs will be installed to display transit schedules and route information at each public transit stop within and bordering the project, and that new stops warranted within two years of project completion have been identified and space has been reserved for shelters. However, the commitment letter qualifies achievement of the credit requirements as occurring at project build-out (October 2022) rather than at completion of 50% of the project square footage (October 2020).

Technical Advice:

Please revise the commitment letter to clarify the schedule for implementing the measures required for credit achievement.

NPDC8: Transportation Demand Management

POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

ATTEMPTED: 2, DENIED: 2, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 0

Denied

06/23/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

Additional documentation has been provided but does not demonstrate compliance as only Option 4 has been achieved and at least two options must be met. Option 1 has not been achieved due to the following issues:

1. The transportation study provided specifies the anticipated vehicular trips for the project development, but does not provide calculations to demonstrate a 20% weekday peak hour motor vehicle trip reduction exclusive of the proposed vehicle sharing program, as required.
2. The transportation study provided communicates recommendations for vehicular trip reductions; however, while recommendations from a transit study/analysis may be helpful for developing a transportation demand management (TDM) program, it is unclear which recommendations and/or strategies from this study will be implemented via a comprehensive TDM program. This study report is not equivalent to a comprehensive TDM program.
3. A plan for funding a transportation demand management program for at least three years, or a commitment to do so, has not been provided by the owner, as required.

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating that the project has provided the following for Options 1 and 4:

1. A comprehensive transportation demand management (TDM) program that reduces weekday peak-period motor vehicle trips by at least 20% compared with a baseline case (exclusive of other attempted option reductions), and funding of the program from its inception through at least three years following project build-out. A summary of the TDM program has been provided as Upload NPDC8-9. However, the summary does not include a calculation prepared by a qualified professional demonstrating a weekday peak-period motor vehicle trip reduction of at least 20% compared with a baseline, and does not confirm program funding from inception through at least three years following project build-out.
4. Confirmation that at least 50% of dwelling units and nonresidential building entrances are within a one-quarter mile walk distance of vehicles in a vehicle-sharing program. However, Uploads NPDC8-5, 8-6, and 8-12 have not been provided that describe: shared vehicle locations, walking routes and distances to vehicle locations from dwellings and nonresidential building entrances, a shared vehicle program operator commitment to start service no later than 20% of occupancy for at least two years, and how the program will be publicized project occupants, respectively.

Technical Advice:

1. Please provide a calculation prepared by a qualified professional of the percentage of weekday peak-period motor vehicle trips to be reduced by the TDM program, using itemized measures exclusive of vehicle sharing, compared to a project baseline. Provide the program start date and confirm its operation and funding from inception through at least three years following project build-out.
2. Please provide Uploads NPDC8-5, 8-6, and 8-12 describing shared vehicle locations, walking routes and distances to vehicle locations from dwellings and nonresidential building entrances, a shared vehicle program operator commitment to start service no later than 20% of occupancy for at least two years, and how the program will be publicized project occupants, respectively.

NPDC9: Access to Civic and Public Space **Awarded: 1**

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 1

06/20/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance.

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating that the project has a civic or public space at least one-sixth acre in area that lies within a one-quarter mile walk distance of at least 90% of planned dwelling units and nonresidential building entrances. The median size of all such spaces is indicated as 1.1 acres. Three maps have been provided that describe walk distances along three sides of the project boundary. Upload NPDC9-1 does not contain building entrances and walk distances to public spaces, but given the walk distance information in the project development plan excerpts uploaded for other credits, it is apparent that at least 90% of the entrances are within a ¼-mi. walk of any location on the project site. However, Upload NPDC9-1 does not contain a map and dimensions of the claimed civic and public spaces.

Technical Advice:

Please revise Upload NPDC9-1 to provide a map and dimensions of civic and public spaces used to satisfy the credit.

NPDC10: Access to Recreation Facilities
POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

Not Attempted

NPDC11: Visitability and Universal Design
POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

Not Attempted

NPDC12: Community Outreach and Involvement
POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

Awarded: 2

ATTEMPTED: 2, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 2

06/20/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance.

10/19/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating that the project has provided the following:

1. A pre-design meeting date, participant list, and meeting summary. However, of the several meetings documented in the accompanying materials, it is unclear which meeting is being claimed as the required pre-design meeting between adjacent property owners, residents, business owners, workers, and local planning and development officials. Note that the meeting must have occurred prior to commencement of any conceptual design work.
2. A copy of open community meeting advertising (not a public hearing) to solicit public input at the beginning of the design process. However, an advertisement for such a meeting was not included in the accompanying materials.
3. The date and a summary of an advertised open community meeting (not a public hearing) at the beginning of the design process. However, it is unclear which meeting in the accompanying materials is being claimed for this purpose, including its date and a summary of public input made at the meeting.
4. A description of project design changes made from public input, or if modifications were not made, an explanation of why the input did not generate changes. The accompanying materials describe a reduction in the height of four buildings, but it is unclear what additional public suggestions were made, and if so, why such input did not generate more changes.
5. A description of ongoing means of communication between developer and community throughout the design and construction phases, and during the post construction phase (if the developer maintains control).
6. A charrette description, including duration, dates, a summary of plans or drawings prepared by participants, and a participant list. However, the accompanying materials do not include such charrette information.

Technical Advice:

Please provide the following:

1. The date, participant list, and summary of a community involvement meeting that occurred prior to the commencement of project design.
2. A copy of an advertisement for an open community meeting (other than a public hearing) to solicit public input at the beginning of the project design process.
3. The date and a summary of an advertised open community meeting at the beginning of the project design process (other than a public hearing), including the public input offered at the meeting.
4. Clarification of the full scope of public suggestions for project modifications, describe those that were accepted, and for any not accepted, explain why the input did not result in a project change.
5. A description of the project charrette, including date and duration, participants, and a summary of plans prepared

by participants at the charrette.

NPDC13: Local Food Production

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 1, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 0

Denied

06/19/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

Additional documentation has been provided but does not demonstrate compliance. The commitment letter provided states that a farmers market that will achieve credit requirements has been discussed and is being considered for feasibility, whereas to contribute, farmer's markets must be planned with firm commitments from farmers and vendors that the market will meet all requirements. The commitment letter does not confirm achievement at project build-out.

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating that the project geographic center is located within one-half mile walk distance of a planned farmers' market that will operate at least once weekly for at least five months annually. A signed and dated commitment letter provided, stating that the farmers' market will meet the requirements for the market's schedule of operation and maximum growing distance at 50% occupancy of the project's total square footage. A map showing the location of the planned farmers' market in relation to the project has also been provided. However, the commitment letter does not commit to providing CC&Rs, development agreements, deed restrictions, or other binding documents that stipulate that the growing of produce is not prohibited in project areas as specified in the credit requirements. Also, the commitment letter qualifies achievement of the credit requirements as occurring at project build-out, but states that the farmers' market will be operating at 50% occupancy of total project floor area.

Technical Advice:

Please revise the commitment letter to commit to providing CC&Rs or equivalent binding documents that stipulate the growing of produce is not prohibited in project areas, including greenhouses, residential yards, balconies, patios, or rooftops; and clarify the commitment letter reference to credit achievement at project build-out versus the schedule for implementing the farmers' market.

NPDC14: Tree-Lined and Shaded Streets

POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

ATTEMPTED: 2, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 2

Awarded: 2

06/23/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance. The following two issues are noted.

1. The referenced Vertical Developer Guidelines indicate that developers may work within the framework or an illustrative master plan if provided by the owner. However, a copy of an illustrative master plan has not been provided to confirm that it reflects compliance with credit requirements if this pathway is applied. Additionally, the Guidelines appear to only require that Vertical Developers meet Option 1 and 2 compliance along a specified percentage of peripheral streets whereas compliance for both options is based on the length of sidewalks along all streets, not peripheral streets exclusively.
2. The streetscape palette (Section 7.5) included within the PLDP indicates low-maintenance and tolerant species shall be used but does not confirm that species within this palette are noninvasive, as required. It is noted that the plant palette (Section 7.4) includes a section on Native Plants and the use of native plants is required for all residential softscape areas (Section 2.7.4) but these sections are distinct from the Streetscape Palette section. Additionally, it appears as though vertical developers will be responsible for developing planting details, and there are no specific requirements for developers to use noninvasive species for street tree plantings.

In this instance, the PLDP and project site maps provided throughout the submittal consistently reflect plans to include compliant street tree locations, dimensioned intervals and shade requirements and it has been determined that documentation provided throughout this submittal is sufficient to confirm that the requirements for both credit options will be achieved. These issues do not affect credit compliance.

10/19/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating:

1. The project will have street trees on both sides of 85% of new and existing streets within and bordering the project, at intervals averaging 40 feet. Upload NPDC14-2 contains illustrative tree drawings; however, it does not contain a project site map showing street tree locations, and dimensioned intervals between the trees.
2. The project will have street trees that provide shade over 50% of total sidewalk length within or contiguous to the project. Confirmation that the required shade will be provided in 10 years has been given on the credit form. However, an Upload NPDC14-3 map has not been provided showing shade tree locations with crown diameters, and sidewalks with shading lengths noted.

Also, the credit form checkbox indicating use of tree plantings to comply with the credit requirements is unchecked; and a registered landscape architect statement has not been provided, certifying that planting details and tree species are appropriate based on the rating system requirements.

A special circumstance limiting the project's ability to provide required submittals is noted on the credit form as due to the project's early design stage. However, LEED ND Stage 2 is intended for projects that have completed required tree plans, and a commitment to do so is insufficient for Stage 2 projects to earn the credit.

Technical Advice:

Please provide the following:

1. An Upload NPDc14-2 project site map showing street tree locations, and dimensioned intervals between street trees.
2. An Upload NPDc14-3 map showing shade tree locations with crown diameters, and sidewalks with sidewalk shading lengths noted.
3. A revised credit form to note that tree plantings will be used to comply with credit requirements, and a registered landscape architect statement certifying that planting details and tree species are appropriate based on the rating system requirements.

NPDc15: Neighborhood Schools

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 1

Awarded: 1

06/19/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance.

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating that the project has a residential component of 55% of total building floor area, and that 100% of dwelling units are within a one-mile walk distance of the Urban Pathway Charter School, which is categorized in Table NPDc15-1 as an existing high school. Confirmation has been provided that walking routes have sidewalks on both sides of streets, and bicycle lanes, traffic calming measures, and controlled crosswalks have been provided along the route. However, the Upload NPDc15-1 map does not contain project dwelling unit locations, school entrance locations, school campus boundaries, and walking routes and distances from dwelling units to schools. Also, Table NPDc15-1 lists Urban Pathway as a high school, whereas the school website describes it as a K-12 school. It is also unclear from the Upload NPDc15-1 map whether the walking route to the Urban Pathway School utilizes a continuous network of qualified walking facilities in dedicated rights-of-way.

Technical Advice:

Please revise the Upload NPDc15-1 map to identify dwelling unit locations, school entrance locations, school campus boundaries, and walking routes and distances from dwelling units to schools. Also, ensure that claimed schools are categorized correctly by type and required walking distance; and confirm that walking routes to schools utilize a continuous network of qualified walking facilities located in dedicated rights-of-way.



Green Infrastructure and Buildings

GIBp1: Certified Green Building

Awarded

06/19/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance.

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Prerequisite Form has been provided, stating that the project will register at least one whole building under LEED for New Construction, and including a commitment letter to that effect. A special circumstance limiting the project's ability to provide required submittals is noted on the credit form as the early design status of the project's first building. However, LEED ND Stage 2 is intended for projects that have registered or certified at least one green building at the time of submission, and a commitment to do so is not sufficient for achieving the prerequisite.

Technical Advice:

Please provide confirmation that at least one whole building has been registered under a LEED or other eligible green building program.

GIBp2: Minimum Building Energy Efficiency

Awarded

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Prerequisite Form has been provided, stating that not all building designs are complete, and LEED compliant energy models/prescriptive measures have not been completed for the buildings. It also states that at least 90% of the building floor area (rounded up to the next whole building) of all Category 1 buildings (nonresidential buildings, mixed-use buildings, and multi-unit residential buildings four stories or more) will meet the prerequisite requirements for energy savings. In addition, it confirms that at least 90% of Category 2 buildings (single-family residential and new multi-unit residential buildings three stories or less) will meet the prerequisite requirements for energy use savings. A signed and dated commitment letter has been provided that describes the strategy to be used to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the prerequisite.

GIBp3: Minimum Building Water Efficiency

Awarded

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Prerequisite Form has been provided, stating that the project has not selected plumbing fixtures, and that at least 90% of the building floor area (rounded up to the next whole building) of all Category 1 buildings (nonresidential buildings, mixed-use buildings, and multi-unit residential buildings four stories or more) will meet the prerequisite requirements for water savings. In addition, it confirms that at least 90% of Category 2 buildings (single-family residential and new multi-unit residential buildings three stories or less) will meet the prerequisite requirements for water use savings. A signed and dated commitment letter and water consumption analysis have been provided indicating that the project will meet the requirements for Category 1 and 2 buildings, as applicable.

GIBp4: Construction Activity Pollution Prevention

Awarded

06/19/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance.

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Prerequisite Form has been provided, stating that the best management practices (BMP) to be used in the project erosion and sedimentation control (ESC) plan have been selected from the Washington State Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington. However, neither the ESC plan nor a summary have been provided as Uploads GIBp4-4 and 4-5. A special circumstance limiting the project's ability to provide required submittals is noted on the credit form as the project's early design status. However, LEED ND Stage 2 is intended for projects that have prepared an ESC, and the submitted commitment letter to do so is not sufficient for Stage 2 projects to earn the credit.

Technical Advice:

Please provide a summary and full copy of an ESC plan that uses Washington State best management practices and meets the credit requirements, including measures for water and air pollution prevention.

GIBc1: Certified Green Buildings
POSSIBLE POINTS: 5

**Not
Attempted**

GIBc2: Building Energy Efficiency

Awarded: 1

POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 1

10/14/2015 **STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW**

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating that 90% of the building floor area (rounded up to the next whole building) of all Category 1 buildings (nonresidential buildings, mixed-use buildings, and multi-unit residential buildings four stories or more) will achieve an 18% energy cost savings. In addition, it confirms that 90% of Category 2 buildings (single-family residential and new multi-unit residential buildings) will meet the credit requirements for energy savings. The accompanying letter states that Category 1 building savings will be 10% rather than 18%, which is assumed to be a typographical error; for future projects, please insure that values are consistent across forms and support documents. Also, note that a commitment letter is not requested from Stage 2 projects for this credit.

GIBc3: Building Water Efficiency

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

**Not
Attempted**

GIBc4: Water-Efficient Landscaping

Awarded: 1

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 1

06/23/2017 **STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW**

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance.

It is noted that the documentation provided is sufficient to demonstrate compliance for the base credit but does not demonstrate compliance for exemplary performance due to the following issues:

1. A note within the Developer Guidelines indicating "Credit is Pursuing Exemplary Performance @ 75% reduction is not equivalent to a commitment for a 75% reduction. The signed letter from the owner provided for this credit indicates a commitment to meet the criteria of the base credit (50% irrigation water use reduction) and Vertical Developer Guidelines provided indicate developers are "to ensure 50% reduction in potable water for irrigation." It is noted that all sections of the PLDP document was evaluated in an effort to confirm the 75% reduction commitment, but only goals, not requirements, for irrigation water reductions were listed, and no specific percentage reductions have been highlighted within the document.
2. It is unclear whether the project team has established strategies that will result in an anticipated 75% irrigation water use reduction from a calculated baseline. The RainBird controller highlighted as a sample/equivalent for controller efficiency indicates 10% water savings (CE = 0.9), and for the purposes of this credit CE values may only range from 0.7 to 1.0, whereas it appears as though the project team has incorrectly applied a CE value of 0.45 when determining the target percent landscape irrigation water reduction, resulting in inaccurate water reduction expectations.

10/19/2015 **STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW**

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating that the project will reduce water consumption for outdoor landscape irrigation by 75% from a calculated mid-summer baseline case. However, Upload GIBc4-1 has not been provided with a site plan clearly indicating areas of planned outdoor landscape irrigation; Tables GIBc4-1 and 4-2 have not been completed with planned landscape types; and Upload GIBc4-3 has not been provided with manufacturer documentation of planned controller efficiency values. The upload titled "Water LQB Nitsch Presentation" includes a project site plan that differs from the plan used elsewhere in the submission. A commitment letter has been provided to meet credit requirements, and a special circumstance limiting the project's ability to provide required submittals is noted on the credit form as the project's early design status. However, LEED ND Stage 2 is intended for projects that have prepared landscape and irrigation plans at the time of submission, and a commitment to do so is not sufficient for Stage 2 projects to meet the credit.

The special circumstance narrative in the credit form also notes that the project is seeking an exemplary performance point for this credit, but was unable to submit an IDPc1 form to that effect due to technical difficulties with the form. An exemplary performance point for this credit cannot be awarded until the GIBc4 technical advice is resolved.

Technical Advice:

Please provide a site plan that is consistent with the site plan used elsewhere in the submission, and clearly indicate areas of planned outdoor landscape irrigation; provide type of landscape information in Tables GIBc4-1 and 4-2; and provide manufacturer documentation of planned controller efficiency values.

GIBc5: Existing Building Reuse

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

**Not
Attempted****GIBc6: Historic Resource Preservation
and Adaptive Use**

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

**Not
Attempted****GIBc7: Minimized Site Disturbance in
Design and Construction**

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 1, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 0

Denied**06/20/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW**

Additional documentation has been provided but does not demonstrate compliance due to the following issues.

1. Based on the tree locations documented within the exhibit for NPDC14-2_14-3 (and throughout the PLDP), it does not appear as though the minimum number of trees that require protection will be protected. Specifically, the champion tree (Tree ID 40) identified within the Bartlett study is located within the development footprint of Block B/Street 3. Similarly, more than 25% of existing trees identified as having dbh greater than 18 inches appear to be within the proposed development footprints of project blocks B, C and E (Tree ID 36, 41, 42, 86, 88, 89).
2. The referenced Vertical Developer Guidelines indicate that parcel developers are to comply with owner's directive to protect any trees identified as required to be preserved in perpetuity, per the Inventory and Management Plan report prepared for the site; however, the Tree Inventory and Management Plan identifies applicable trees on site but does not indicate that any trees are required to be preserved or protected.

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating that the entire development footprint and construction impact zone are located on areas that are previously developed. In addition, 75% of all non-invasive trees over 18 inches DBH and 25% percent of all non-invasive trees over 12 inches DBH if deciduous, and 6 inches DBH if conifer, have been preserved by CC&R. Upload GIBc7-4 has been provided that includes: 1) an ISA-approved assessment of existing trees prepared by an ISA-certified arborist that describes the four tree types specified in the credit requirement, and identifies trees to be preserved; and 2) a plan for maintaining tree health, including protection from construction disturbance, and if applicable, invasive vegetation reduction. However, it is unclear how the preserved trees have been integrated into the project site plan presented elsewhere in the submission, e.g. Pf3 L-4 map, Upload NPDp2-1 map, and NPDC14 uploads. Also, Upload GIBc7-5 containing a copy of CC&Rs protecting preserved trees in perpetuity has not been provided.

Technical Advice:

Please confirm that preserved trees are reflected in the project site plan presented elsewhere in the submission, and provide Upload GIBc7-5 containing a copy of CC&Rs that protect preserved trees in perpetuity.

GIBc8: Stormwater Management

POSSIBLE POINTS: 4

ATTEMPTED: 4, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 4

Awarded: 4**10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW**

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating that the project will implement a comprehensive stormwater management plan that retains the 95th percentile storm event, or 1.2 inches of rainfall, on-site through infiltration, evapotranspiration, and/or reuse. The project will retain the 95th percentile event because it is a minimum municipal code requirement in Pittsburgh. A summary of stormwater plan measures to comply with the municipal code and meet credit requirements has been provided.

GIBc9: Heat Island Reduction

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 1

Awarded: 1**06/20/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW**

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance.

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating that the project is pursuing Option 3 and including a commitment letter to meet credit requirements. A special circumstance limiting the project's ability to provide required submittals is noted on the credit form as the project's early design stage, and Tables GIBc9-1, 9-5, and 9-6 have been completed with placeholder values. However, LEED ND Stage 2 is intended for projects that have completed heat

island reductions planning, and a commitment to do so is insufficient for Stage 2 projects to earn the credit.

Technical Advice:

Please complete Tables GIBc9-1, 9-5, and 9-6 with valid project information, and provide Uploads GIBc9-3 and 9-4 containing the reduction measure information that is itemized in the credit form for each upload.

GIBc10: Solar Orientation
POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

Not Attempted

GIBc11: On-Site Renewable Energy Sources
POSSIBLE POINTS: 3

Not Attempted

GIBc12: District Heating and Cooling
POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

Not Attempted

GIBc13: Infrastructure Energy Efficiency **Awarded: 1**

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 1

06/20/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

Additional documentation has been provided. It is noted that Table GIBc13-1 has not been completed with valid project information, as required, to confirm that strategies outlined will achieve the target percent reduction. In this instance, the PLDP includes supplemental details sufficient to confirm compliance with the intent of this credit and the issue does not impact credit compliance.

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, stating the target percent reduction is 15% below a baseline case, along with a commitment letter to meet the credit requirements. However, the letter does not include a description of strategies to be used to achieve the 15% reduction. Additionally, a special circumstance limiting the project's ability to provide required submittals is noted on the credit form as the project's early design stage, and Table GIBc13-1 has been completed with placeholder values. However, LEED ND Stage 2 is intended for projects that have selected infrastructure items that will meet the target, and a commitment to do so is insufficient to earn the credit.

Technical Advice:

Please complete Table GIBc13-1 with valid project information, and revise the commitment letter to include a description of strategies the project team expects to use to achieve the target reduction.

GIBc14: Wastewater Management
POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

Not Attempted

GIBc15: Recycled Content in Infrastructure

Awarded: 1

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 1

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, with a signed and dated commitment letter to meet the credit requirements for recycled content in infrastructure, including a description of the anticipated types of infrastructure to be built and how recycled content material will be incorporated.

GIBc16: Solid Waste Management Infrastructure

Denied

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 1, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 0

06/20/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

Additional documentation has been provided but does not demonstrate compliance due to the following issues.

1. The commitment letter provided does not clarify when services and facilities will be available to project occupants, by path, as requested within Preliminary Review comments.
2. Maps identifying the location of solid waste management features have not been provided, as required. A narrative indicates that the project is too early in design to determine locations for the features; however, the timeline is not

sufficient reason to exclude this documentation, as this requirement is also applicable to Stage 1 projects that have yet to be entitled. For instance, it is unclear how a commitment to providing a hazardous waste drop-off point can be reasonably made without first identifying a potential location for this feature. Deferring until 100% design completion may complicate the feasibility of providing and/or implementing these solid waste management measures.

It is noted that the PLDP and Vertical Developer Guidelines include sufficient information to confirm compliance with the criteria for Recycling Containers and Construction Waste Management but at least four paths must be achieved to demonstrate compliance.

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, indicating that the project will pursue all five solid waste management paths, along with an Upload GIBc16-2 commitment letter to publicize the availability and benefits of selected paths. However, the commitment letter states that only four paths will be pursued, but does not identify which four paths; it also states that credit requirements will not be satisfied until project build-out. Additionally, an Upload GIBc16-1 map of solid waste management features has not been provided. A special circumstance limiting the project's ability to provide required submittals is noted on the credit form as due to the project's early design stage. However, LEED ND Stage 2 is intended for projects that have completed solid waste management planning, and a commitment to do so is insufficient for Stage 2 projects to earn the credit.

Technical Advice:

Please clarify in the credit form and commitment letter which solid waste management paths are being attempted; revise the commitment letter to clarify when services and facilities will be available to project occupants, by path; and provide an Upload GIBc16-1 project site map showing the location of solid waste management features consistent with path selection. Insure that the map shows information for each path upload as itemized in the credit form.

GIBc17: Light Pollution Reduction
POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

**Not
Attempted**



Innovation and Design Process

IDPc1.1: Innovation and Exemplary Performance-Green Building Outreach

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 1

Awarded: 1

06/20/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The additional documentation demonstrates compliance.

10/19/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form and accompanying commitment letter have been provided stating that the project will develop and implement two of four possible public education and outreach programs. However, the commitment letter does not specify which two programs, and the credit form narrative only contains the minimum requirements for such programs as published by USGBC, rather than a description of the proposed program and how it meets the requirements.

Technical Advice:

Please specify which two of four possible programs are being proposed, provide descriptions of the two programs, and how they fulfill the requirements of an innovation credit devoted to education and outreach.

IDPc1.2: Innovation and Exemplary Performance-Bike Sharing Program

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 1, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 0

Denied

06/20/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

Additional documentation has been provided but does not demonstrate compliance due to the following issues.

1. Rationale for sizing station capacities has been provided; however, it remains unclear whether the project team has coordinated with the bike sharing provider (Pittsburgh Bike Share) to determine this rationale, as required.
2. Documentation states that hourly fees will be charged for bike share passes whereas bike share passes valid for at least one year, subsidized to 100% of regular price, must be available to each resident and employee locating within the project during at least the first three years of project occupancy to demonstrate compliance.

10/19/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided stating that the project team will develop a bike share program. However, the credit form and accompanying commitment letter only contain the minimum requirements for such a program as published by USGBC, rather than a description of the proposed program and how it meets the requirements.

Technical Advice:

To achieve recognition of a bike sharing program, the following must be provided:

1. Confirmation that at least 50% of all building entrances are within a 1/2 mile (400 meter) walk distance of professionally managed stations.
2. The basis or rationale for sizing station capacities, and evidence of collaboration with the bike sharing provider to determine this rationale.
3. Confirmation that bike share passes valid for at least one year, subsidized to 100% of regular price, will be available to each resident and employee locating within the project during at least the first three years of project occupancy.
4. Confirmation that the availability of subsidized bike share passes will be publicized to project occupants.
5. A schedule for service startup.

Alternatively, the project team can submit for another IDP credit, and/or submit for the bike sharing credit in a Stage 3 application.

IDPc1.3: Innovation and Exemplary Performance-NPDC1

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 1, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 0

Denied

06/20/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

Additional documentation has been provided within GIBc4: Water Efficient Landscaping but does not demonstrate compliance with requirements for exemplary performance. Refer to comments within GIBc4 for additional details.

10/19/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided, proposing an exemplary performance point for NPDc1 Walkable Streets. However, the GIBc4 form narrative indicates that the exemplary performance request is actually for GIBc4 and that a technical problem with the IDPc1 form prevented submittal of the GIBc4 exemplary performance request. An exemplary performance point for GIBc4 cannot be awarded until the technical advice for that credit is resolved.

Technical Advice:

Please resolve the GIBc4 technical advice, and resubmit for this IDP credit. If the IDPc1.3 form problem persists, contact USGBC for technical assistance.

IDPc1.4: Exemplary Performance-NPDc1 Walkable Streets **Awarded: 1**

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 1

06/20/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The LEED Form has been provided stating that the project achieves exemplary performance for NPDc1: Walkable Streets as specified in the LEED Reference Guide for Green Neighborhood Development. The project team has provided documentation demonstrating that at least seven points have been achieved within the base credit, that a 100% threshold has been met for item o., and special circumstances have been noted for item n.

All residential streets within the project have posted speed limits of 25 miles per hour (mph), which exceeds the maximum allowed target speed of 20 mph for item n. Evidence of the local jurisdiction's policy for 25 mph speed limits in residential districts has been provided, in addition to evidence that the proposed streets will meet the intended target speed of 20mph via design and engineering criteria, as required to demonstrate compliance when a local jurisdiction's speed limits do not meet credit requirements.

IDPc1.5: Innovation and Exemplary Performance-SLLc3 **Awarded: 1**

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 1

06/20/2017 STAGE 2 FINAL REVIEW

The LEED Form has been provided stating that the project achieves exemplary performance for SLLc3 as specified in the LEED Reference Guide for Green Neighborhood Development. The project team has provided documentation demonstrating at least 640 weekday trips and 400 weekend trips, which meets the exemplary performance requirement.

IDPc2: LEED Accredited Professional **Awarded: 1**

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 1

10/14/2015 STAGE 2 PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The LEED Credit Form has been provided stating that a LEED AP has been a participant on the project development team, and a copy of the LEED AP certificate for Avneet Gujral has been included.



Regional priority

NPDc4: Mixed-Income Diverse Communities

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: , PENDING: , AWARDED: 1

GIBc8: Stormwater Management

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: , PENDING: , AWARDED: 1

GIBc9: Heat Island Reduction

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

ATTEMPTED: 1, DENIED: , PENDING: , AWARDED: 1

TOTAL

109

81

8

0

70

REVIEW SUMMARY

Review			POINTS:			
	SUBMITTED	RETURNED	SUBMITTED	DENIED	PENDING	AWARDED
Stage 2 Preliminary	09/11/2015	10/19/2015	86	1	55	26

Credit	STATUS	TYPE	POINTS: ATTEMPTED	DENIED	PENDING	AWARDED
PIf1: Development Program and Site Type	Not Approved		0	0	0	0
PIf2: Project Timeline	Approved		0	0	0	0
PIf3: Project Location and Base Mapping	Not Approved		0	0	0	0
SLLp1: Smart Location	Awarded	Stage 2	0	0	0	0
SLLp2: Imperiled Species and Ecological Communities Conservation	Awarded	Stage 2	0	0	0	0
SLLp3: Wetland and Water Body Conservation	Awarded	Stage 2	0	0	0	0
SLLp4: Agricultural Land Conservation	Awarded	Stage 2	0	0	0	0
SLLp5: Floodplain Avoidance	Awarded	Stage 2	0	0	0	0
SLLc1: Preferred Locations	Pending	Stage 2	10	0	3	7
SLLc3: Reduced Automobile Dependence	Pending	Stage 2	7	0	7	0
SLLc4: Bicycle Network and Storage	Pending	Stage 2	1	0	1	0
SLLc5: Housing and Jobs Proximity	Pending	Stage 2	3	0	3	0
SLLc7: Site Design for Habitat or Wetland and Water Body Conservation	Awarded	Stage 2	1	0	0	1
SLLc9: Long-Term Conservation Management of Habitat or Wetlands and Water Bodies	Pending	Stage 2	1	0	1	0
NPDp1: Walkable Streets	Pending	Stage 2	0	0	0	0
NPDp2: Compact Development	Awarded	Stage 2	0	0	0	0
NPDp3: Connected and Open Community	Pending	Stage 2	0	0	0	0
NPDc1: Walkable Streets	Pending	Stage 2	10	0	8	2
NPDc2: Compact Development	Awarded	Stage 2	6	0	0	6
NPDc3: Mixed-Use Neighborhood Centers	Pending	Stage 2	3	0	3	0
NPDc4: Mixed-Income Diverse Communities	Pending	Stage 2	8	0	2	2
NPDc7: Transit Facilities	Pending	Stage 2	1	0	1	0
NPDc8: Transportation Demand Management	Pending	Stage 2	2	0	2	0
NPDc9: Access to Civic and Public Space	Pending	Stage 2	1	0	1	0
NPDc12: Community Outreach and Involvement	Pending	Stage 2	2	0	2	0
NPDc13: Local Food Production	Pending	Stage 2	1	0	1	0
NPDc14: Tree-Lined and Shaded Streets	Pending	Stage 2	2	0	2	0
NPDc15: Neighborhood Schools	Pending	Stage 2	1	0	1	0
GIBp1: Certified Green Building	Pending	Stage 2	0	0	0	0
GIBp2: Minimum Building Energy Efficiency	Awarded	Stage 2	0	0	0	0
GIBp3: Minimum Building Water Efficiency	Awarded	Stage 2	0	0	0	0

GIBp4: Construction Activity Pollution Prevention	Pending	Stage 2	0	0	0	0
GIBc2: Building Energy Efficiency	Awarded	Stage 2	1	0	0	1
GIBc4: Water-Efficient Landscaping	Pending	Stage 2	1	0	1	0
GIBc7: Minimized Site Disturbance in Design and Construction	Pending	Stage 2	1	0	1	0
GIBc8: Stormwater Management	Awarded	Stage 2	5	0	0	5
GIBc9: Heat Island Reduction	Pending	Stage 2	2	0	2	0
GIBc13: Infrastructure Energy Efficiency	Pending	Stage 2	1	0	1	0
GIBc15: Recycled Content in Infrastructure	Awarded	Stage 2	1	0	0	1
GIBc16: Solid Waste Management Infrastructure	Pending	Stage 2	1	0	1	0
IDPc1.1: Innovation and Exemplary Performance-Green Building Outreach	Pending	Stage 2	1	0	1	0
IDPc1.2: Innovation and Exemplary Performance-Bike Sharing Program	Pending	Stage 2	1	0	1	0
IDPc1.3: Innovation and Exemplary Performance-NPDC1: Walkable Streets	Pending	Stage 2	1	0	1	0
IDPc2: LEED Accredited Professional	Awarded	Stage 2	1	0	0	1

Stage 2 Final

04/07/201706/23/2017

66

8

0

55

Credit	STATUS	TYPE	POINTS: ATTEMPTED	DENIED	PENDING	AWARDED
Pf1: Development Program and Site Type	Approved		0	0	0	0
Pf3: Project Location and Base Mapping	Approved		0	0	0	0
SLLc1: Preferred Locations	Awarded	Stage 2	10	0	0	10
SLLc3: Reduced Automobile Dependence	Awarded	Stage 2	7	0	0	7
SLLc4: Bicycle Network and Storage	Awarded	Stage 2	1	0	0	1
SLLc5: Housing and Jobs Proximity	Awarded	Stage 2	3	0	0	3
SLLc9: Long-Term Conservation Management of Habitat or Wetlands and WaterBodies	Denied	Stage 2	1	1	0	0
NPDp1: Walkable Streets	Awarded	Stage 2	0	0	0	0
NPDp3: Connected and Open Community	Awarded	Stage 2	0	0	0	0
NPDc1: Walkable Streets	Awarded	Stage 2	11	0	0	12
NPDc3: Mixed-Use Neighborhood Centers	Awarded	Stage 2	4	0	0	4
NPDc4: Mixed-Income Diverse Communities	Awarded	Stage 2	8	0	0	4
NPDc7: Transit Facilities	Awarded	Stage 2	1	0	0	1
NPDc8: Transportation Demand Management	Denied	Stage 2	2	2	0	0
NPDc9: Access to Civic and Public Space	Awarded	Stage 2	1	0	0	1
NPDc12: Community Outreach and Involvement	Awarded	Stage 2	2	0	0	2
NPDc13: Local Food Production	Denied	Stage 2	1	1	0	0
NPDc14: Tree-Lined and Shaded Streets	Awarded	Stage 2	2	0	0	2
NPDc15: Neighborhood Schools	Awarded	Stage 2	1	0	0	1
GIBp1: Certified Green Building	Awarded	Stage 2	0	0	0	0
GIBp4: Construction Activity Pollution Prevention	Awarded	Stage 2	0	0	0	0
GIBc4: Water-Efficient Landscaping	Awarded	Stage 2	1	0	0	1
GIBc7: Minimized Site Disturbance in Design and Construction	Denied	Stage 2	1	1	0	0
GIBc9: Heat Island Reduction	Awarded	Stage 2	2	0	0	2
GIBc13: Infrastructure Energy Efficiency	Awarded	Stage 2	1	0	0	1
GIBc16: Solid Waste Management Infrastructure	Denied	Stage 2	1	1	0	0
IDPc1.1: Innovation and Exemplary Performance-Green Building Outreach	Awarded	Stage 2	1	0	0	1
IDPc1.2: Innovation and Exemplary Performance-Bike Sharing Program	Denied	Stage 2	1	1	0	0
IDPc1.3: Innovation and Exemplary Performance-NPDc1: Walkable Streets	Denied	Stage 2	1	1	0	0
IDPc1.4: Exemplary Performance-NPDc1 Walkable Streets	Awarded	Stage 2	1	0	0	1
IDPc1.5: Innovation and Exemplary Performance-SLLc3	Awarded	Stage 2	1	0	0	1