LEED Project 10001623
Final LEED v2 Review
LEED ™ Certification
2/5/2007

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 Wesleyan University Fauver Field Residence 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 29 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.

Denied 3 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.

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		
6		1	Sustainable Sites	Possible Points 14

0			Erosion & Sedimentation Control	Prerequisite 1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template states that the EPA BMPs have been followed. Measures include silt fencing, storm drain inlet protection, check dams on all natural swale areas, permanent seeding and planting on all non-paved areas, mulching, sediment traps, drainage swales, soil retaining measures and the use of geotextiles. Supporting documentation includes a copy of the project's Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan drawing and details.

1			Site Selection	Credit 1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template declares that the site does not meet any of the prohibited criteria. Site maps were provided to illustrate that the criteria has been met. Additionally, a letter response from the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection indicates that an endangered species (Barn Owl) has been recorded in the vicinity of the project area, but that the site activities would not affect the species.

Not Attempting			Urban Redevelopment	Credit 2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

Not Attempting			Brownfield Redevelopment	Credit 3-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

1			Alternative Transportation, Public Transportation Access	Credit 4.1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template states that there are 2 campus bus lines within 1/4 mile of the project site. A scaled site map has been provided, showing the location of the campus Red and Blue bus line stops located within ¼ mile of the site, thereby demonstrating compliance. Additional documentation includes a map depicting municipal bus lines, but bus stop locations are not indicated.

1			Alternative Transportation, Bicycle Storage & Changing Rooms	Credit 4.2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template declares that 42 covered bicycle storage slots for securing bicycles are provided for 275 residential building occupants within 200 yards of the building. Submitted floor plan drawings indicate the locations of bike storage rooms in both buildings. Bicycle rack cut sheets also are provided.

Not Attempting			Alternative Transportation, Alternative Fuel Refueling Stations	Credit 4.3-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A	D	
1		Alternative Transportation, Parking Capacity — Credit 4.4-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template declares that the parking capacity for the project does not exceed minimum zoning requirements, and that seven preferred carpool parking spaces are provided for 5.09% of building occupants. A submitted narrative states that no new parking has been added to the campus for this project and describes the University's carpooling program. Additionally, this narrative explains that a dedicated parking space on the adjacent road is reserved for drop-off and pick-up of carpool riders and that the project is within ½ mile of numerous basic services and amenities. Accordingly, the project team has demonstrated compliance with the intent of the credit, given the circumstance of a residential project on a University campus and the inclusion of rider boards located at the buildings' main entrances with a dedicated carpooling pick-up/drop-off space, as described by SSc4.4 CIR Ruling dated 2/7/2005. This CIR clarifies that "given the nature and siting of this project, it is clear that all of the residents are within a short walk of their 'workplace' (i.e. the academic core)" and "in close proximity (within a mile) to basic amenities (for goods and services useful to students such as convenience grocery or supermarket, pharmacy, bank, post office, etc.)", thereby obviating the need for multiple carpooling spaces.

Not Attempting			Reduced Site Disturbance, Protect or Restore Open Space — Credit 5.1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

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

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template declares that there are no local zoning requirements for open space, so an area of open space has been allocated adjacent to the building which is equal in size to the building footprint. A letter from the building owner as well as calculations substantiate this claim.

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 signed LEED Letter Template declares that a minimum of 30% of non-roof impervious surfaces areas will be shaded within five years, and/or constructed with light-colored/high albedo materials. Supporting documentation includes a paving plan (with shaded areas), and calculations indicating that 34% of non-roof impervious surfaces are shaded or constructed with light-colored/high albedo materials. A landscaping plan also is included elsewhere in the submission, demonstrating compliance.

Not Attempting			Landscape & Exterior Design to Reduce Heat Islands, Roof Surfaces — Credit 7.2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A		D
		1

Light Pollution Reduction

Credit 8-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template declares that the project's exterior lighting has been designed according to the IESNA RP-33 requirements of the credit. Supporting documentation includes four partial photometric plans. The submitted narrative explains that, based on the use of Environmental Zone E3 (medium ambient brightness), and SSc8 CIR Ruling dated 6/15/2004, calculations for light trespass do not appear to exceed 0.2 fc by utilizing the line-of-site illuminance calculations described on pages 75-76 of the LEED-NC V2.1 Reference Guide. However, the plans do not clearly indicate the site boundaries on all photometric plans, and therefore compliance with the credit's light trespass requirements could not be verified.

TECHNICAL ADVICE: Please submit an exterior lighting and photometric site plan(s) with the project's LEED site boundary area clearly defined. The site boundary must be consistent with the site area defined for all other credits (SSc5.2 in this case). This photometric site plan should indicate point-by-point illuminance levels (calculated and indicated on a 10' grid, similar to those already submitted) that extend 10 feet beyond the marked boundary lines. Where horizontal fc values exceed zero at the site boundary or property line, please provide "line of sight illuminance" calculations, demonstrating that these "line of site illuminance" values comply with the limits indicated in Table 1 on page 70 of the LEED-NC V2.1 Reference Guide. It should be noted that the site boundary should not extend to "the opposite sides of the streets where residences occur" (as explained in the submitted narrative), since this road was not newly constructed and since such a boundary is inconsistent with the LEED site area documented for SSc5.2. Lastly, please provide cut sheets for all exterior lighting fixtures, with lamp lumen data and cut off information highlighted, keyed to their location on their locations on the exterior lighting and photometric site plan(s).

Requirements Meet or provide lower light levels and uniformity ratios than those recommended by the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA) Recommended Practice Manual: Lighting for Exterior Environments (RP-33-99). Design exterior lighting such that all exterior luminaires with more than 1000 initial lamp lumens are shielded and all luminaires with more than 3500 initial lamp lumens meet the Full Cutoff IESNA Classification. The maximum candela value of all interior lighting shall fall within the building (not out through windows) and the maximum candela value of all exterior lighting shall fall within the property. Any luminaire within a distance of 2.5 times its mounting height from the property boundary shall have shielding such that no light from that luminaire crosses the property boundary.

Submittals Provide the LEED Letter Template, signed by an appropriate party, declaring that the credit requirements have been met.

Final Review The project team has withdrawn their pursuit of this credit.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A		D		
4			Water Efficiency	Possible Points 5
1			Water Efficient Landscaping, Reduce by 50%	Credit 1.1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template states that the project's landscape design uses native plantings which do not require a permanent irrigation system. A narrative describing the plant species and the watering protocol for their establishment period has been provided.

1			Water Efficient Landscaping, No Potable Use or No Irrigation	Credit 1.2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: See WEc1.1.

Not Attempting			Innovative Wastewater Technologies	Credit 2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

1			Water Use Reduction, 20% Reduction	Credit 3.1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The submitted signed LEED Letter Template and calculations indicate that water use has been reduced by 30.36% through the use of low-flow lavatories, low flow shower heads, and low-flow kitchen sink faucets. It is unclear why an additional 40 male uses for urinals is included in the calculations, and it should be noted that typically the male LEED defaults for “Daily Uses” should be two for water closets (WCs) and one for urinals; however, it could not be determined from the floor plans provided elsewhere in the submission whether or not either or both buildings include urinals. Nevertheless, in the worst case (no urinals in either building), if daily uses for only 137 males were revised to three for WCs and none for urinals, the project still achieves a 30.60% water use reduction.

1			Water Use Reduction, 30% Reduction	Credit 3.2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: See WEc3.1.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A		D		
2			Energy & Atmosphere	**Possible Points 17**

0			Fundamental Building Systems Commissioning	Prerequisite 1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template declares that the required commissioning (Cx) activities have been completed or are under contract.

0			Minimum Energy Performance	Prerequisite 2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template declares that the project complies with ASHRAE 90.1-1999.

			CFC Reduction in HVAC&R Equipment	Prerequisite 3-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

1			Optimize Energy Performance, 20% New /10% Existing	Credit 1.1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template, summary tables, and energy modeling output declare a 17.43% savings between the design case and the budget case based on ASHRAE 90.1-1999. Energy efficiency measures include improved thermal envelope, lower lighting power, occupancy sensors, premium efficiency motors, and energy recovery. One issue should be addressed for the final review.

TECHNICAL ADVICE:

1. The energy consumption for the “office equipment” on the ECB Table should be identical. These non-regulated components must be modeled with the same inputs for both models and are not eligible for savings under EAc1. Please revise the proposed building model.

2. In addition, please provide the BEPS, BEPU and ES-D reports for both the design case and budget case models.

Final Review Revised energy modeling results claim a 17.14% savings relative to an ASHRAE 90.1-1999 budget building. The plug load energy consumption in the budget matches the proposed building. One issue remains with the modeling results: There is a conflict with the values on the ECB Compliance Report and those contained on the BEPU reports. Each building model (the two buildings were modeled separately) must be within 50 hours of unmet loads according to ASHRAE 90.1-1999, Section 11.4.3j. The FR Dorm is within the requirement; however, the UC Dorm is approximately 88 hours of unmet load hours based on the BEPU report. Nevertheless, it is clear that if the hours of unmet loads are brought into compliance, the project still would achieve at least a 12.5% energy cost savings to achieve one point.

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.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A		D		
	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.

	Not Attempting		Additional Commissioning	Credit 3-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

1			Ozone Protection	Credit 4-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template declares that the project's HVAC&R systems do not contain HCFCs or Halons. Supporting documentation includes a narrative explaining that two of the existing campus central plant chillers contain HFC-134a refrigerant and that the third existing central plant chiller will be replaced with HFC coolant before June 2007. Additionally, this narrative clarifies that the small on-site units contain compliant HFC refrigerants as well.

	Not Attempting		Measurement & Verification	Credit 5-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

	Not Attempting		Green Power	Credit 6-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A		D		
7			Materials & Resources	Possible Points 13
0			Storage & Collection of Recyclables	Prerequisite 1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template indicates that appropriate facilities for recycling have been provided. Recycling areas are indicated on submitted floor plans, along with calculations of recycling storage areas and a flyer explaining the University's recycling program.

Not Attempting			Building Reuse, Maintain 75% of Existing Shell	Credit 1.1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

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 signed LEED Letter Template declares that 75.57% of project construction waste was diverted from the landfill. A list of materials and where they were diverted has been included in the Letter Template, along with a copy of the project's Construction Waste Management Plan.

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

Preliminary Review: See 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 signed LEED Letter Template and supporting calculations declare that the project has achieved a combined recycled content value of 11.07% of the total materials by cost.

Final Review A revised signed LEED Letter Template, along with supporting calculations, declares that the project has achieved a combined recycled content value of 10.78% of the total materials by cost.

1			Recycled Content, Specify 10%	Credit 4.2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: See MRc4.1.

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

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template and supporting calculations declare that 44.22% of the total project's materials by cost were manufactured within 500 miles of the project site.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A	D	
1		Local/Regional Materials, 50% Extracted Regionally — Credit 5.2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: THIS CREDIT HAS BEEN SELECTED FOR AUDIT. The signed LEED Letter Template and supporting calculations declare that 30.66% of the total project's materials by cost were manufactured using raw materials harvested within 500 miles of the project site.

TECHNICAL ADVICE: To support the calculations in the LEED Letter Template, please provide a product cut sheet, product literature, or letter from the manufacturer verifying the cost/value, location of manufacture, and the location of extraction, harvesting, or recovery for each raw material contained in each of the products listed as compliant.

Final Review: The revised signed LEED Letter Template and supporting calculations declare that 26.66% of the total project's materials by cost were manufactured using raw materials harvested within 500 miles of the project site. Supporting documentation includes letters and calculations from manufacturers verifying the cost, location of manufacture, and the extraction, harvesting, or recovery location for each raw material contained in most of the products listed as compliant. However, this documentation does not indicate the extraction/harvesting location for each of the raw materials in the listed batt insulation, CMU, and cast stone; although likely compliant, the raw material extraction locations for these products could not be verified. Nevertheless, even if the cost of these products is excluded from the calculations, a regionally extracted value of 21.47%, relative to total materials cost, is still achieved.

Not Attempting			Rapidly Renewable Materials — Credit 6-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

1			Certified Wood — Credit 7-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template declares that 75.10% of wood based materials are certified in accordance with FSC Principles and Criteria. Wood products constitute 5.07% of the total value of all materials for the project.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A		D	
7			Indoor Environmental Quality — Possible Points 15

0			Minimum IAQ Performance	Prerequisite 1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template has been provided declaring that the requirements of ASHRAE 62-1999 have been met. A submitted narrative explains the project's compliance relative to the requirements for dormitory rooms or apartments for this residential project.

0			Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS) Control	Prerequisite 2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template has been provided declaring that no smoking is allowed in the building and outdoor smoking areas are located away from operable windows and entryways. Supporting documentation includes a copy of the University's "Residential Smoking Policy".

Not Attempting			Carbon Dioxide (CO2) Monitoring	Credit 1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

Not Attempting			Increase Ventilation Effectiveness	Credit 2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

1			Construction IAQ Management Plan, During Construction	Credit 3.1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template declares that a construction IAQ plan was followed and implemented, that filters with a MERV 8 rating were installed during construction, and that filters with a MERV 13 rating were installed after construction. Photographs and a description of the SMACNA approaches followed are included.

Not Attempting			Construction IAQ Management Plan, Before Occupancy	Credit 3.2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

1			Low-Emitting Materials, Adhesives & Sealants	Credit 4.1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template declares the use of compliant adhesives and sealants. A list with associated VOC levels has been provided. One of these listed regulated products, PVC Cement, exceeds the required VOC limit, but the project team is pursuing this credit utilizing the VOC budget method. However, the VOC budget for adhesives and sealants must be calculated separately from the VOC budget for paints and coatings, and only interior field-applied adhesives and sealants should be included in the calculations. Nevertheless, it is clear that if the VOC budget is calculated accordingly, the project complies with credit requirements for adhesives and sealants. Please note that the VOC limit for PVC Welding applications is 510 g/L, not the 750 g/L indicated in the submitted spreadsheet list.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A	D		
1			Low-Emitting Materials, Paints — Credit 4.2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template declares that all paints, including topcoats and primers, meet the VOC requirements of Green Seal. A list with associated VOC levels has been provided. One of these listed regulated products, "Speedhide 6-610 Flat Latex", exceeds the required VOC limit, but the project team is pursuing this credit utilizing the VOC budget method. However, the VOC budget for paints and coatings must be calculated separately from the VOC budget for adhesives and sealants, and only interior field-applied paints and coatings should be included in the calculations. Also, this list does not clarify whether the "17-21 Seal Grip Primer" is flat or non-flat; accordingly, compliance could not be verified.

TECHNICAL ADVICE: Please provide cut sheets, MSDSs, or letters from product manufacturers highlighting the VOC levels and for each listed product, along with documentation verifying whether these products qualify as flat or non-flat paints. Include a summary table comparing credit requirements and actual VOC levels for each product. Also, please re-calculate the VOC budget for paints and coatings only, and include only interior field-applied paints and coatings in the calculations. Please note that anti-corrosive paints are exempt from credit requirements in LEED-NC V2.1, and therefore should be excluded from the calculations as well.

Final Review: A revised summary table comparing credit requirements and actual VOC levels for each product, along with revised VOC budget calculations, demonstrates compliance. Supplemental documentation includes manufacturers' product data verifying the VOC content for five of the seven listed products. VOC documentation was not provided for the 6-500 Latex Semi-Gloss and 6-610 Flat Latex products, but the listed VOC content for these products was verified via research on PPG's web site.

A	D		
1			Low-Emitting Materials, Carpet — Credit 4.3-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template declares that the project uses carpeting that complies with the CRI Green Label Program. A list of all carpet systems used in the project has been provided, along with manufacturer's IAQ testing results, demonstrating compliance.

A	D		
Not Attempting			Low-Emitting Materials, Composite Wood — Credit 4.4-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

A	D		
1			Indoor Chemical and Pollutant Source Control — Credit 5-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template declares that the requirements of the credit have been met. Supporting documentation includes floor plans indicating recessed floor mat systems at all high volume building entrances, along with cut sheets of the grating/floor mat system utilized, a narrative describing sealed deck-to-deck partitions, and detail drawings of applicable partition types.

A	D		
Not Attempting			Controllability of Systems, Perimeter — Credit 6.1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

A	D		
Not Attempting			Controllability of Systems, Non-perimeter — Credit 6.2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

A	D		
Not Attempting			Thermal Comfort, Compliance with ASHRAE 55-1992 — Credit 7.1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A		D	
Not	Attempting		Thermal Comfort, Permanent Monitoring System — Credit 7.2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: No Comments.

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

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template, drawings, and calculations documented in the LEED Calculator spreadsheet demonstrate that 84.7% of critical visual task areas have a daylight factor of at least 2%. Supporting documentation includes highlighted floor plans, indicating compliant and non-compliant applicable spaces.

1			Daylight and Views, Views for 90% of Spaces — Credit 8.2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template, drawings, and calculations documented in the LEED Calculator spreadsheet demonstrate that 98.2% of critical visual task areas have direct access to views of the outdoors. Supporting documentation includes highlighted floor plans, indicating compliant and non-compliant applicable spaces.

A - Achieved
D - Denied

A		D	Innovation & Design Process	Possible Points 5
3		2		

1			Exemplary Performance for MRc5.1	Credit 1.1-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template and supporting calculations submitted for MRc5.1 indicate that the project has achieved 44.22% regionally manufactured materials, which exceeds the 40% (or double the credit threshold), performance threshold established for exemplary performance.

1			Exemplary Performance for MRc5.2	Credit 1.2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: THIS CREDIT HAS BEEN SELECTED FOR AUDIT. See MRc5.2.

TECHNICAL ADVICE: See MRc5.2.

Final Review The signed LEED Letter Template and supporting calculations submitted for MRc5.2 indicate that at least 21.47% of the project's total materials, by cost, were manufactured and utilized raw materials harvested within 500 miles of the project site, which demonstrates that more than double the credit threshold of 10% was achieved.

		1	Exemplary Performance for MRc7	Credit 1.3-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The project team seeks an innovation credit for exemplary performance relative to MRc7. The signed LEED Letter Template and supporting calculations submitted for MRc7 indicate that the project has not achieved 95% certified wood by cost, which has been established as the performance threshold for exemplary performance.

Requirements Same as Credit 1.1.

Submittals Provide the proposal(s) within the LEED Letter Template (including intent, requirement, submittals and possible strategies) and relevant evidence of performance achieved.

		1	Site-Wide Low VOC	Credit 1.4-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The project team seeks an innovation credit for exemplary performance relative to EQc4 by utilizing site-wide low VOC products. Although a laudable pursuit, an innovation credit is not warranted in this case. As clarified by IDc1.1 CIR Rulings dated 9/20/2004 and 11/4/2002, "Generally, the low-emitting materials credits are considered as a body of credits that together represent a goal to reduce VOCs. To achieve an innovation in this category, it would be necessary to demonstrate that the project had addressed VOC control as a whole. Since there are already four points available in this category, additional innovations would require substantial effort, and clear documentation of achievement above and beyond existing credit requirements." Since the project has not achieved EQc4.4, pertaining to urea-formaldehyde, not all of the baseline EQc4 credit requirements have been satisfied, therefore obviating the ability to achieve exemplary performance "above and beyond existing credit requirements".

Requirements Same as Credit 1.1.

Submittals Provide the proposal(s) within the LEED Letter Template (including intent, requirement, submittals and possible strategies) and relevant evidence of performance achieved.

1			LEED™ Accredited Professional	Credit 2-Version 2.1

Preliminary Review: The signed LEED Letter Template declares that the project's Environmental Adviser, John Amatruda, served as the project's LEED Accredited Professional and as a principal participant of the project team. A copy of his LEED Accredited Professional Certificate has been provided.