



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 Green Business Certification Inc. (GBCI®).

VESTA PARK PACIFICO II

Project ID 1000100108
Rating system & version LEED V4 BD+C: CS
Project registration date 06/08/2017



Certified

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

LEED V4 BD+C: CORE AND SHELL

ATTEMPTED: 46, DENIED: 11, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 41 OF 130 POINTS

INTEGRATIVE PROCESS	0 OF 1
Integrative Process	0 / 1

LOCATION AND TRANSPORTATION	10 OF 40
LEED for Neighborhood Development Location	0 / 20
Sensitive Land Protection	2 / 2
High Priority Site	0 / 3
Surrounding Density and Diverse Uses	4 / 6
Access to Quality Transit	3 / 6
Bicycle Facilities	1 / 1
Reduced Parking Footprint	0 / 1
Green Vehicles	0 / 1

SUSTAINABLE SITES	2 OF 11
Construction Activity Pollution Prevention	Y
Site Assessment	1 / 1
Site Development - Protect or Restore Habitat	0 / 2
Open Space	0 / 1
Rainwater Mgmt	0 / 3
Heat Island Reduction	0 / 2
Light Pollution Reduction	0 / 1
Tenant Design and Construction Guideline	1 / 1

WATER EFFICIENCY	4 OF 11
Outdoor Water Use Reduction	Y
Outdoor Water Use Reduction	2 / 2
Indoor Water Use Reduction	Y
Indoor Water Use Reduction	2 / 6
Building-Level Water Metering	Y
Cooling Tower Water Use	0 / 2
Water Metering	0 / 1

ENERGY AND ATMOSPHERE	12 OF 33
Fundamental Commissioning and Verification	Y
Minimum Energy Performance	Y
Optimize Energy Performance	8 / 18
Building-Level Energy Metering	Y
Fundamental Refrigerant Mgmt	Y
Enhanced Commissioning	3 / 6
Advanced Energy Metering	0 / 1
Demand Response	0 / 2
Renewable Energy Production	0 / 3
Enhanced Refrigerant Mgmt	1 / 1
Green Power and Carbon Offsets	0 / 2

MATERIALS AND RESOURCES	3 OF 14
Storage and Collection of Recyclables	Y
Construction and Demolition Waste Mgmt Planning	Y
Building Life-Cycle Impact Reduction	0 / 6
Product disclosure & optimization - Environmental Product Declarations	0 / 2
Product disclosure & optimization - Sourcing of Raw Materials	1 / 2
Product disclosure & optimization - Material Ingredients	0 / 2
Construction and Demolition Waste Mgmt	2 / 2

INDOOR ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY	5 OF 10
Minimum IAQ Performance	Y
Environmental Tobacco Smoke Control	Y
Enhanced IAQ Strategies	0 / 2
Low-Emitting Materials	2 / 3
Construction IAQ Mgmt Plan	1 / 1
Daylight	2 / 3
Quality Views	0 / 1

INNOVATION	2 OF 6
Innovation	1 / 5
LEED Accredited Professional	1 / 1

REGIONAL PRIORITY CREDITS	3 OF 4
Access to Quality Transit	1 / 1
Outdoor Water Use Reduction	1 / 1
Optimize Energy Performance	1 / 1

TOTAL 41 OF 130

CREDIT DETAILS



Project Information

Project Information

Awarded

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 01:40 PM

The additional documentation continues to demonstrate compliance.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:37 AM

The Project Information has been completed and the supporting documentation has been provided.



Integrative Process

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

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

Denied

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 01:41 PM

1. The Integrative Process Worksheet has not been provided and the REVIEW - v4_Integrative Process Worksheet_v04.pdf document does not fully address the credit requirements. For future submittals, provide the completed Integrative Process Worksheet (found under the credit's "Resources" tab in the Credit Library).

For energy-related systems ensure to provide the following:

- a. At least two potential load reduction strategies that were assessed for each aspect and were included in the simple box energy modeling analysis.
- b. How research and analysis during discovery influenced the project building program, form, geometry, and/or configuration.
- c. How the research and analysis during discovery influenced the project design and/or resulted in system downsizing. If applicable, give reasons for not addressing any aspects.
- d. How this process informed changes to the Owner's Project Requirements and Basis of Design.

For water-related systems ensure to provide the following:

- a. The baseline assumptions for each aspect included in the water budget analysis.
- b. How the research and analysis during the discovery phase influenced the project design and/or changes to the design. If applicable, give reasons for not addressing any aspects.
- c. How this process informed changes to the Owner's Project Requirements and Basis of Design.
- d. How one on-site nonpotable water supply source was analyzed to reduce municipal supply or wastewater treatment for all demand aspects.

The documentation does not demonstrate compliance.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:37 AM

1. The required worksheet has not been provided.

Provide the completed Integrative Process Worksheet (found under the credit's "Resources" tab in the Credit Library).

For energy-related systems ensure to provide the following:

- a. The baseline assumptions for each aspect included in the simple box energy modeling analysis.
- b. At least two potential load reduction strategies that were assessed for each aspect and were included in the simple box energy modeling analysis.
- c. How research and analysis during discovery influenced the project building program, form, geometry, and/or configuration.
- d. How the research and analysis during discovery influenced the project design and/or resulted in system downsizing. If applicable, give reasons for not addressing any aspects.
- e. How this process informed changes to the Owner's Project Requirements and Basis of Design.

For water-related systems ensure to provide the following:

- a. The baseline assumptions for each aspect included in the water budget analysis.
- b. How the research and analysis during the discovery phase influenced the project design and/or changes to the design. If applicable, give reasons for not addressing any aspects.
- c. How this process informed changes to the Owner's Project Requirements and Basis of Design.
- d. How one on-site nonpotable water supply source was analyzed to reduce municipal supply or wastewater treatment for all demand aspects.



Location And Transportation

LEED for Neighborhood Development Location
POSSIBLE POINTS: 20

Not Attempted

Sensitive Land Protection

POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

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

Awarded : 2

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:36 AM

Option 2: Meets Sensitive Land Criteria

Awarded.

High Priority Site

POSSIBLE POINTS: 3

Not Attempted

Surrounding Density and Diverse Uses

POSSIBLE POINTS: 6

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

Awarded : 4

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 01:41 PM

Option 1: Surrounding Density

Awarded for two points.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:35 AM

Option 1: Surrounding Density

1. The provided vicinity map does not meet the required criteria (i.e. density offset in lieu of radius) and it is not clear if the average density, reported in the LEED Form, has been determined correctly. Further, it does not appear that all buildable land has been included in the calculations.

Provide a scaled area plan or map showing the project boundary and the surrounding area one-quarter mile (400 meters) from the project boundary (density offset). Label the buildings that are included in the density calculations. Ensure that it is clear how the total buildable land value has been determined and that the entire area within the one-quarter mile surrounding area is shown. Buildable land is defined as the portion of the site where construction can occur, including land voluntarily set aside and not constructed on. When used in density calculations, buildable land excludes public rights-of-way and land excluded from development by codified law. All buildable land, both developed and not, must be included.

Option 2: Diverse Uses

Awarded for two points.

Access to Quality Transit

POSSIBLE POINTS: 6

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

Awarded : 3

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:35 AM

Awarded for three points.

Bicycle Facilities

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

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

Awarded : 1

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 01:42 PM

Awarded.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 13 Aug 2018 05:01 PM

1. The map provided does not appear to show a qualifying bicycle network. According to the documentation the off street bicycle paths or trails are not at least 8 feet (2.5 meters) wide.

Provide a revised vicinity map that shows a bicycle network to at least ten diverse uses. Ensure that the documentation demonstrates that the bicycle network is a continuous network consisting of any combination of the following: 1) off street bicycle paths or trails at least 8 feet (2.5 meters) wide for a two-way path and at least 5 feet (1.5 meters) wide for a one-way path, 2) physically designated on-street bicycle lanes at least 5 feet (1.5 meters) wide, 3) streets designed for a target speed of 25 mph (40 km/h) or less.

2. Gasmart and Llantera del Pacifico are not an eligible use type for this credit. Automobile-oriented services do not support the intent of the credit: to promote walkability and transportation efficiency and reduce vehicle distance traveled. Refer to Appendix 1: Use Types and Categories in the LEED BD+C v4 Reference Guide.

Provide revised documentation with only eligible services included.

3. The short-term and long-term bicycle storage appears to be located more than 100 feet (30 meters) from the main entry and functional entry respectively.

Provide a revised site plan highlighting the distance from the bicycle storage to the entry. Ensure that the distance is within the 100-foot (30-meter) maximum.

4. It does not appear that the long-term bicycle storage provided for the regular building occupants is covered to protect bicycles from rain and snow.

Provide documentation to demonstrate that the long-term bicycle storage is covered.

Reduced Parking Footprint

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

Withdrawn

Green Vehicles

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

Not Attempted



Sustainable Sites

Construction Activity Pollution Prevention

Awarded

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:37 AM

EPA Construction General Permit

Awarded.

Site Assessment

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

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

Awarded : 1

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:39 AM

Awarded.

Site Development - Protect or Restore Habitat

POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

Not Attempted

Open Space

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

Not Attempted

Rainwater Management

POSSIBLE POINTS: 3

Not Attempted

Heat Island Reduction

POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

Withdrawn

Light Pollution Reduction

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

Not Attempted

Tenant Design and Construction Guideline

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

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

Awarded : 1

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:39 AM

Awarded.



Water Efficiency

Outdoor Water Use Reduction

Awarded

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:29 AM

Option 1: No Irrigation Required

Awarded.

Outdoor Water Use Reduction

Awarded : 2

POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

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

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:30 AM

Option 1: No Irrigation Required

Awarded.

Indoor Water Use Reduction

Awarded

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 01:42 PM

Usage-based Calculation, 36.99%

Four issues are noted:

1. Female water closet usage has not been accounted for in the Security Booth flush fixture calculations.
2. The Bicycle Facilities percent of males expected to use restrooms with urinals was not revised to 100%.
3. The Bicycle Facilities percent of occupants using each flush fixture was not revised to 100%.
4. The calculations for the Bicycle Facilities lavatory indicate a total daily uses value (i.e. non-default) that differs from the standard calculation methodology.

When the four issues noted above are addressed and recalculated, the documentation indicates the project has reduced potable water use by 22.16%.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 13 Aug 2018 05:04 PM

Usage-based Calculation, 40.68%

1. The Fixture Groups have not been correctly accounted for in the calculations. The prerequisite is limited to the plumbing fixtures within the Core and Shell project's scope.

Revise the calculations to exclude Fixture Group Future Building Occupants. The occupants for both the Bicycle Facilities and Security Staff Fixture Groups should total 77 FTE.

2. The urinal, shower, and female water closet usage has not been included in the calculations for all Fixture Groups.

Revise the calculations to include the urinal (urinals have been provided in both the Security Booth and Shower & Changing Room Facility) and shower usage for all FTE occupants. In addition, revise the calculations to include the female water closet usage in the Security Staff Fixture Group calculations. Note the calculations require a balanced, one-to-one gender ratio unless project-specific conditions warrant an alternative ratio for the lifespan of the building. Current staffing level is not an acceptable rationale for deviating from the standard usage ratio of 50% male and 50% female.

3. The Indoor Water Use Reduction calculator indicates that less than 100% of the occupants will be using each fixture.

Provide the following:

- a. A revised calculator with the percent of occupants using each fixture type equaling 100% when summed in total for each fixture type (e.g. the male toilet, female toilet, urinal, lavatory, kitchen sink, and showerhead should each equal 100% in total).
- b. If project-specific special circumstances exist, a narrative and documentation/calculations justifying different usage rates. For example, it would be anticipated that only a small percentage of FTE occupants would use the fixtures in the bicycle facilities (e.g. 5% based on the LTC Bicycle Facilities credit requirements).
4. The lavatories have been indicated as belonging to the Private Lavatory Faucet fixture family, yet it does not appear that the private lavatory classification is appropriate for this project type. Private or private use applies to plumbing fixtures in

residences, apartments, and dormitories; private (non-public) bathrooms in transient lodging facilities (hotels and motels); and private bathrooms within hospitals and nursing facilities. All other facilities are considered to be public or public use.

Revise the calculator to ensure that the lavatories are classified as public, using the appropriate baseline for the public lavatory fixtures. Ensure the lavatory faucets to use the default daily uses per the LEED BD+C v4 Reference Guide, Further Explanation section.

Indoor Water Use Reduction

POSSIBLE POINTS: 6

ATTEMPTED: 3, DENIED: 2, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 2

Awarded : 2

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 01:42 PM

Usage-based Calculation, 42.38%

Three issues are noted:

1. Female water closet usage has not been accounted for in the Security Booth flush fixture calculations.
2. The Bicycle Facilities and Future Building Occupants percent of occupants using each flush fixture was not revised to 100%.
3. The calculations for the Bicycle Facilities lavatory indicate a total daily uses value (i.e. non-default) that differs from the standard calculation methodology.

When the four issues noted above are addressed and recalculated, the documentation indicates the project has reduced potable water use by 34.56%.

Awarded for two points.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:31 AM

Usage-based Calculation, 40.68%

1. WEp Indoor Water Use Reduction is pending clarifications.

Refer to the comments within the prerequisite and resubmit this credit.

2. The prerequisite is limited to the plumbing fixtures within the Core and Shell project's scope, while the credit must include all fixtures necessary to meet the occupants' needs, including any applicable tenant installed fixtures.

Provide the following:

- a. A clarification narrative describing the future tenant installed fixtures and confirming that any future tenant installed fixtures have been included in the calculations.
- b. A separate Indoor Water Use calculator to include all fixtures necessary to meet the needs of the project occupants, including any applicable future tenant installed fixtures. Future tenant installed fixtures must be included in the calculations as neutral (same as the baseline water consumption rates). Alternatively, submit the legally binding tenant sales or lease agreement, signed by both owner and tenant, stating the performance requirements for the future fixtures, including the maximum water flush or flow rates and the WaterSense label (or a local equivalent for projects outside the U.S.) for all newly installed fixtures eligible for labeling. Ensure that the tenant sales or lease agreement is fully executed.

Building-Level Water Metering

Awarded

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 01:43 PM

Awarded.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:31 AM

1. Based on the narrative in WEc Water Metering, the project has not provided the required water meters. This prerequisite requires the project to provide water meters to measure the total potable water use for the project building and associated grounds.

Provide documentation such as a narrative, drawings, or specifications demonstrating that the all potable water sources are metered at the project building.

Cooling Tower Water Use

POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

Not Attempted

Water Metering

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

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

Denied**DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW**

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 01:43 PM

1. Submeters for the core and shell project building have not been provided.

For future submittals, provide documentation to confirm two or more subsystems are metered in the core and shell project building, not just the ancillary buildings as currently documented. The documentation does not demonstrate compliance.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:31 AM

1. WEp Building-Level Water Metering is pending clarifications.

Refer to the comments within the prerequisite and resubmit this credit.

2. The required documentation has not been provided.

Provide a narrative describing the submeters for the core and shell project building. Include a list of submeters, their locations, and the percentage of each subsystem metered (as applicable). Ensure the documentation confirms that at least 80% of the indoor fixtures described in WEp Indoor Water Use Reduction are metered, either directly or by deducting all other measured water use from the measured total water consumption of the building and grounds.



Fundamental Commissioning and Verification

Awarded

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 08:12 AM

Awarded.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 07 Aug 2018 02:29 PM

1. The CFR and OMP table of contents does not contain all of the required information.

Update the table of contents to include a sequence of operations for the building; equipment run-time schedules; setpoints for all HVAC equipment; minimum outside air requirements; any changes in schedules or setpoints for different seasons, days of the week, and times of day; and a systems narrative describing the mechanical and electrical systems and equipment.

Minimum Energy Performance

Awarded

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 05:35 AM

Modeled energy cost savings of 17.1% have been demonstrated. The total predicted annual energy consumption for the project is 2,040,451 kWh/year of electricity per Option 1: Whole Building Energy Simulation.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 03 Aug 2018 07:23 AM

Modeled energy cost savings of 17.19% have been claimed with Option 1: Whole Building Energy Simulation. However, to demonstrate compliance, the following comments requiring a project response (marked as Mandatory) must be addressed for the Final Review.

TECHNICAL ADVICE

REVIEW COMMENTS REQUIRING A PROJECT RESPONSE (Mandatory)

1. Provide the following:

a. A narrative response to each Preliminary Review comment below.

b. A narrative describing any additional changes made to the energy models between the Preliminary and Final Review phases not addressed by the responses to the review comments. The mandatory comments are perceived to reduce the projected savings for the Proposed design. If the projected savings increase substantially in the Final submission, without implementing any optional comments that may improve performance, a narrative explanation for these results must be provided.

2. Although U-factors are provided, the Minimum Energy Performance Calculator is missing information regarding the descriptions for the Proposed Case construction assemblies of walls and roofs (e.g. steel-framed R-13, U-0.124; continuous insulation R-20, U-0.048).

Revise the Minimum Energy Performance Calculator with the requested information. Ensure the Proposed Case U-values are congruous with the construction assembly U-values reflected for various wall and roof construction assemblies listed in Appendix A. Provide updated TRACE LEED Energy Performance Summary and Room Entered Values reports verifying that the Proposed Case wall assemblies were modeled as designed.

3. It is not clear whether the Proposed Case HVAC system was modeled as designed because the supply airflow is modeled inconsistent with the mechanical schedule (Pip Project Information: HVAC FLOOR PLANS M. SCHEDULE.pdf). Additionally, the mechanical schedule does not indicate the heating capacity and fan power for system MS-01. Therefore, it is unclear if what is modeled is consistent with the design. Lastly, the cooling and heating efficiencies for the System #4s modeled in the Proposed Case are inconsistent with ASHRAE minimum requirements. Table G3.1.10 (b)(Proposed) requires that the model be consistent with the design documents.

a. The modeled Proposed Case supply airflows appear inconsistent with the mechanical design. For example, the mechanical schedule indicates that the supply airflow for system MS-01 is 400 cfm. However, the TRACE System Checksum and the Minimum Energy Performance Calculator indicate that the supply airflow for this system has been modeled at 400 cfm. Revise the supply airflows to be consistent with the mechanical design. Update the Minimum Energy Performance Calculator as necessary, and provide updated TRACE LEED Energy Performance Summary and System Checksums reports verifying that the modeled supply airflows for all systems are consistent with the design.

b. It is unclear if the modeled Proposed Case heating capacity is consistent with the mechanical design. For example, the mechanical plans do not include a heating capacity for system MS-01. However, the TRACE System Checksums and Minimum Energy Performance Calculator indicate that this system was modeled with a heating capacity of 13.5 kBTU/HR. Provide additional documentation indicating the design heating capacity for this system. Revise the heating capacity to be consistent

with the additional documentation. Update the Minimum Energy Performance Calculator as necessary and provide updated TRACE LEED Energy Performance Summary and System Checksums reports verifying that the heating capacity for all systems has been modeled as designed.

c. It is unclear if the modeled Proposed Case fan power is consistent with the mechanical design. For example, the mechanical plans do not indicate a fan power for system MS-01. However, the TRACE LEED Energy Performance Summary and Minimum Energy Performance Calculator indicate it was modeled with 1.3 kW supply fan power. Provide additional documentation indicating the design fan power for this system. Revise the fan power to be consistent with the additional documentation. Update the Minimum Energy Performance Calculator as necessary, and provide updated TRACE LEED Energy Performance Summary and System Checksums verifying that the fan power for all systems has been modeled as designed.

d. The modeled cooling and heating efficiency for the Packaged Single Zone Heat Pumps (System #4) in the Proposed Case appears inconsistent with the ASHRAE 90.1-2010 guidance. For example, the TRACE LEED Energy Performance Summary indicates that the cooling capacity for VP-Office 1 Proposed is 44,900 BTU/HR, and the TRACE LEED Energy Performance Summary indicates that this system was modeled with cooling and heating efficiencies of 11.1 EER and 3.26 COP, respectively. However, ASHRAE 90.1-2010 Table 6.8.1B indicates that a system with this cooling capacity would have cooling and heating efficiencies of 11.0 EER and 3.2 COP respectively. Revise the cooling and heating efficiency to be consistent with Table 6.8.1B. Update the Minimum Energy Performance Calculator as necessary, and provide updated TRACE LEED Energy Performance Summary and System Checksums reports verifying that the modeled cooling and heating efficiencies for all systems are consistent with the design.

Update the model so that all HVAC system parameters (e.g. fan volumes, fan powers, efficiencies, heating/cooling capacities, etc.) are consistent with the design documents, update the Minimum Energy Performance Calculator to reflect all changes made, and update the form to reflect any changes made.

4. The Minimum Energy Performance Calculator indicates that outside airflow rates have been modeled identically in the Baseline and Proposed Case buildings (as designed). The mechanical schedule does not indicate any designed outside airflow for any HVAC system. Additionally, the EQ Minimum IAQ Performance submission indicates that the guard house system (MS-01) and the future office space systems (System #4s) have a total minimum required outside airflow of 1,027 cfm. The Minimum IAQ Calculator also indicates that the designed outside airflow for these systems is equal to the minimum required outside airflow. Lastly, the Minimum Energy Performance Calculator indicates that outside airflow in the Baseline and Proposed Case was modeled at 665 cfm. Section G3.1.2.6 exception c requires that, when the minimum outdoor air intake flow in the Proposed Case is greater than the amount required by the rating authority or building official (see EQp: Minimum Indoor Air Quality Performance for ASHRAE 62.1-2010 calculations for the outdoor airflow rate required by the rating authority - GBCI), the Baseline Case must be modeled as the greater of the outdoor airflow rate required by the rating authority or the building official and will be less than the Proposed Case.

Provide clarification about the designed outside airflow to the building. Revise the outside airflow in the Baseline Case to consistent with the minimum required outside airflow, and revise the Proposed Case to be consistent with the design outside airflow. Update the Minimum Energy Performance Calculator as necessary, and provide updated TRACE LEED Energy Performance Summary and System Checksums reports verifying that the outside airflow in the Baseline and Proposed Case was modeled as required.

Optimize Energy Performance

POSSIBLE POINTS: 18

ATTEMPTED: 8, DENIED: 0, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 8

Awarded : 8

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 05:36 AM

Modeled energy cost savings of 17.1% have been demonstrated. The total predicted annual energy consumption for the project is 2,040,451 kWh/year of electricity per Option 1: Whole Building Energy Simulation.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 02 Aug 2018 04:21 AM

1. Refer to the comments within EAp Minimum Energy Performance and resubmit this credit.

Building-Level Energy Metering

Awarded

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 02 Aug 2018 10:27 AM

Awarded.

Fundamental Refrigerant Management

Awarded

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 02 Aug 2018 11:16 AM

Awarded.

Note that the mechanical schedules provided in P1p Project Information (HVAC FLOOR PLANS M. SCHEDULE.pdf) indicates that there is a mini-split heat pump with R-410A refrigerant. Since the mechanical schedules confirm there are no CFC-based refrigerants compliance is not affected. For future submittals, ensure the credit form is completed as required with each refrigerant-based HVAC system listed in the form table.

Enhanced Commissioning

POSSIBLE POINTS: 6

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

Awarded : 3

Advanced Energy Metering

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

Not Attempted

Demand Response

POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

Not Attempted

Renewable Energy Production

POSSIBLE POINTS: 3

Not Attempted

Enhanced Refrigerant Management

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

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

Awarded : 1**DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW**

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 08:52 AM

Option 1: No refrigerants or low-impact refrigerants

Awarded.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 02 Aug 2018 11:22 AM

Option 1: No refrigerants or low-impact refrigerants

1. The form narrative indicates that no refrigerants have been included in the building design. However, the mechanical schedules provided in P1p Project Information (HVAC FLOOR PLANS M. SCHEDULE.pdf) indicates on page 3 that there is a Carrier 53XPQ123B mini-split heat pump with R-410A refrigerant that serves the guardhouse. This system must be included in the refrigerant impact calculation if it contains 0.5 lbs or more of refrigerant.

Revise the LEED Form to provide Equipment Type, Units, Qunit, Refrigerant, Rc, and Life inputs consistent with the design for all HVAC&R systems.

Green Power and Carbon Offsets

POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

Withdrawn



Materials And Resources

Storage and Collection of Recyclables

Awarded

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:31 AM

Awarded.

Construction and Demolition Waste Management Planning

Awarded

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 01:43 PM

Awarded.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:32 AM

Percentage of construction waste diverted from landfill, 70.3%

1. The construction waste management plan (CWMP) does not describe how the companies or facilities that are expected to receive the recyclables will process those materials.

Provide a clarification narrative describing how all the receiving facilities will process materials.

Building Life-Cycle Impact Reduction

POSSIBLE POINTS: 6

Not Attempted

Building Product Disclosure and Optimization - Environmental Product Declarations

POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

Withdrawn

Building Product Disclosure and Optimization - Sourcing of Raw Materials

POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

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

Awarded : 1

Building Product Disclosure and Optimization - Material Ingredients

POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

Withdrawn

Construction and Demolition Waste Management

POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

ATTEMPTED: 2, DENIED: 1, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 2

Awarded : 2

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 01:45 PM

Option 1: Diversion, Path 1, 57.22%

Awarded.

Option 2: Reduction of Total Waste Material

Awarded.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:32 AM

Option 1: Diversion, Path 1, 57.75%

1. MRp Construction and Demolition Waste Management Planning is pending clarifications. Refer to the comments within MRp Construction and Demolition Waste Management and resubmit this credit.

2. Calculations showing the waste diverted from landfill have not been provided.

Provide a copy of the completed Construction and Demolition Waste Calculator (found under the credit's "Resources" tab in the Credit Library) or equivalent documentation.

Option 2: Reduction of Total Waste Material

1. MRp Construction and Demolition Waste Management Planning is pending clarifications. Refer to the comments within MRp Construction and Demolition Waste Management and resubmit this credit.

2. The gross project area is not listed consistently throughout the submittal. PI Project Information indicates the site area within the LEED project boundary as 17,812.59 square meters and this credit indicates the project building area as 17,812 square meters.

Verify the project square meter value and update the project as necessary.



Indoor Environmental Quality

Minimum Indoor Air Quality Performance

Awarded

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 05:41 AM

Option 1: ASHRAE Standard 62.1-2010

Awarded.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 02 Aug 2018 04:19 AM

Option 1: ASHRAE Standard 62.1-2010

1. It is unclear how the guard house HVAC system (MS-01) and the office area systems (Baseline System #4) receive outside air. The mechanical schedule indicates that MS-01 is a mini-split heat pump, with no designed outside airflow. Additionally, no other additional equipment is listed that would be able to supply the office space systems with outside air. However, the Ventilation Rate Procedure (VRP) calculations indicate that these systems provide 18.01 cfm and 1,009.37 cfm of outside airflow, respectively.

Provide clarification about how this system receives outside airflow. Revise the VRP calculations as necessary.

2. The VRP calculations indicate that the measured or designed outside airflow for the guard house system (MS-01) and the office area (Baseline System #4) systems are identical to the minimum required ventilation (Voz) for these systems, which is unexpected.

Revise the measured or design outside airflow to be consistent with the design outside airflow for the building.

3. There does not appear to be any exhaust fans for the bathrooms within the guard house space.

Provide clarification about the exhaust systems for the guard house restrooms. Ensure that the exhaust follows the requirements of ASHRAE 62.1-2010 Table 6-4.

Environmental Tobacco Smoke Control

Awarded

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:33 AM

Awarded.

Enhanced Indoor Air Quality Strategies

POSSIBLE POINTS: 2

Withdrawn

Low-Emitting Materials

POSSIBLE POINTS: 3

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

Awarded : 2

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 01:45 PM

Option 1. Product category calculations

Awarded for two points.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Sep 2018 08:50 AM

Option 1. Product category calculations

1. The Low-Emitting Materials Calculator has not been completed for wet-applied products. Specifically, for Interior Adhesives and Sealants (e.g. grout, drywall joint compound, etc.).

Provide a revised Calculator (VOC Content section) that includes the volume used for every wet-applied product. Alternatively, the "volume used" column may be completed for enough of the wet-applied products to determine budget compliance.

2. BEHR paint products documentation has not been provided.

Provide manufacturer or testing documentation demonstrating that the sustainable criteria are met for the BEHR paint products. Documentation may include URLs to product information, cutsheets, MSDS, etc.

3. The Tile Joint Filler products have been categorized as a flooring, but appear to be adhesives and sealants

Provide a revised Low-Emitting Materials Calculator in which the appropriate category and/or product type is selected for each product (Products tab). Provide a narrative as necessary.

4. Adequate manufacturer testing documentation has not been provided.

Provide revised general emissions evaluation reports that state the exposure scenario used to determine compliance and the measurement of TVOCs for the following products: Dunn Edwards Spartazero Semigloss, Sonolastic NP2 Joint Sealant, and USG Sheetrock Plus 3 Joint Mortar. Highlight the applicable information and revise the Calculator as necessary.

5. Several GREENGUARD certificates have been provided for the Panel Rey products. According to the Low-Emitting Materials Third Party Certification Table, which can be located at <http://www.usgbc.org/resources/low-emitting-materials-third-party-certification-table>, only GREENGUARD GOLD certification meets the requirements for CDPH Standard Method v1.1.

Provide the following:

- a. A clarification narrative confirming which products have been included in the project's scope of work.
- b. Provide GREENGUARD GOLD certificates for all Panel Rey products.
- c. Revise the calculator and form as required.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 13 Aug 2018 05:42 PM

Option 1. Product category calculations

1. The Low-Emitting Materials Calculator has not been completed for wet-applied products. Specifically, for Interior Adhesives and Sealants (e.g. grout, drywall joint compound, etc.).

Provide a revised Calculator (VOC Content section) that includes the volume used for every wet-applied product. Alternatively, the "volume used" column may be completed for enough of the wet-applied products to determine budget compliance.

2. Missing documentation.

Provide manufacturer or testing documentation demonstrating that the sustainable criteria are met for the BEHR paint products. Documentation may include URLs to product information, cutsheets, MSDS, etc.

3. The Tile Joint Filler products have been categorized as a flooring, but appear to be adhesives and sealants

Provide a revised Low-Emitting Materials Calculator in which the appropriate category and/or product type is selected for each product (Products tab). Provide a narrative as necessary.

Construction Indoor Air Quality Management Plan

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

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

Awarded : 1

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:33 AM

Awarded.

Daylight

POSSIBLE POINTS: 3

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

Awarded : 2

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:33 AM

Option 2: Simulation - Illuminance Calculations, 96.83%

Quality Views

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

Not Attempted



Innovation

POSSIBLE POINTS: 5

ATTEMPTED: 2, DENIED: 2, PENDING: 0, AWARDED: 1

Awarded : 1

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 01:47 PM

Pilot Credit 1: Pilot Credit 98: Assessment and Planning for Resilience

This credit was submitted for initial review during the Final Review. The LEED Form states that the project team has registered for Pilot Credit 98: Assessment and Planning for Resilience. The project team has documented the prerequisite: Conduct Hazard Assessment for the Project Site and has completed Option 1: Climate Resilience Planning. The following have been provided: 1) The completed Assessment and Planning for Resilience Workbook with any site-specific custom analyses developed; 2) The completed Climate Resilience Planning template documenting how the analysis was completed prior to schematic design and informed design decisions in the project's OPR and BOD.

1. It appears that the project has not registered for Pilot Credit 98: Assessment and Planning for Resilience. Note that in order to achieve any Pilot Credit, the project must register for the credit with USGBC, participate in an online Pilot Credit Forum via LEEDuser, and complete a USGBC Pilot Credit Feedback Survey. A copy of the Pilot Credit Registration Confirmation email and the USGBC Pilot Credit Survey Completion email must be provided.

For future submittals, provide documentation demonstrating that a project representative has registered for Pilot Credit 98: Assessment and Planning for Resilience USGBC and has completed the necessary process steps beyond the credit-specific documentation. Provide a copy of the Pilot Credit registration confirmation email and a copy of the Pilot Credit survey confirmation email.

For additional information, please visit the following websites:

General Pilot Credit Registration: <http://www.usgbc.org/leed/pilot/PilotLibraryProjectReg.aspx>

General Pilot Credit Feedback Survey: <http://www.usgbc.org/DisplayPage.aspx?CMSPageID=2266>

The documentation does not demonstrate compliance.

One point is denied.

Exemplary Performance 1: Sourcing of Raw Materials - Option 2 Leadership Extraction Practices

The clarifications provided for Building Product Disclosure and Optimization, Option 2: Leadership Extraction Practices demonstrate compliance. The requirement for exemplary performance is 50% and the project has documented 77%.

One point is awarded.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Sep 2018 03:44 AM

Innovation Credit 1: Low Impact Slope Reinforcement

The project team has developed and implemented a Low Impact Slope Reinforcement strategy. The project is using engineered slope reinforcement to achieve major angles to the same grounds in the natural condition. Narratives, demonstration video, product data, and specification sheets have been provided.

1. An Innovation strategy must be significantly better than standard sustainable design practices and meet two basic criteria:

- a. Includes quantitative performance improvements (comparing a baseline and design case), and
- b. Is a comprehensive strategy (more than one product or process).

Only those strategies that have significant environmental benefits, beyond standard sustainable design practices, are applicable to Innovation credits. Further, Innovation in Design credits are not awarded when the strategy aids in the achievement of an existing LEED credit (even if the credit was not pursued on this project). The project team may replace this strategy for the next review phase.

One point pending.

Exemplary Performance Credit 1: Sourcing of Raw Materials - Option 2 Leadership Extraction Practices

The project is pursuing exemplary performance for Building Product Disclosure and Optimization, Option 2: Leadership Extraction Practices. The requirement for exemplary performance is 50% and the project has documented 89%. However, the base credit has not been achieved.

1. Refer to the comments within Building Product Disclosure and Optimization, Option 2: Leadership Extraction Practices. Ensure that any issues noted there are addressed within the exemplary performance documentation when resubmitting this credit.

Alternatively, the project may pursue a different Innovation strategy for the Final Review.

One point pending

LEED Accredited Professional

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

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

Awarded : 1

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION FINAL REVIEW

Commented on 23 Jan 2019 01:48 PM

Awarded.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Commented on 01 Aug 2018 10:34 AM

1. LEED APs without specialty (legacy LEED APs) do not qualify for this credit.

Provide an updated LEED AP certificate or document this credit with another member of the project team. Ensure the specialty of the LEED AP matches the rating system family of the project (LEED BD+C).



Regional priority credits

Access to Quality Transit

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

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

Outdoor Water Use Reduction

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

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

Indoor Water Use Reduction

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

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

Cooling Tower Water Use

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

Optimize Energy Performance

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

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

Renewable Energy Production

POSSIBLE POINTS: 1

TOTAL

130

46

11

0

41

REVIEW SUMMARY

Review			POINTS:			
	SUBMITTED	RETURNED	SUBMITTED	DENIED	PENDING	AWARDED
Design and Construction Preliminary	07/18/2018	09/06/2018	49	0	36	16

Credit	STATUS	TYPE	POINTS: ATTEMPTED	DENIED	PENDING	AWARDED
Project Information	Awarded		0	0	0	0
Integrative Process	Pending	Design	1	0	1	0
Sensitive Land Protection	Awarded	Design	2	0	0	2
Surrounding Density and Diverse Uses	Pending	Design	6	0	6	2
Access to Quality Transit	Awarded	Design	4	0	0	4
Bicycle Facilities	Pending	Design	1	0	1	0
Construction Activity Pollution Prevention	Awarded	Construction	0	0	0	0
Site Assessment	Awarded	Design	1	0	0	1
Tenant Design and Construction Guideline	Awarded	Design	1	0	0	1
Outdoor Water Use Reduction	Awarded	Design	0	0	0	0
Outdoor Water Use Reduction	Awarded	Design	3	0	0	3
Indoor Water Use Reduction	Pending	Design	0	0	0	0
Indoor Water Use Reduction	Pending	Design	5	0	5	0
Building-Level Water Metering	Pending	Design	0	0	0	0
Water Metering	Pending	Design	1	0	1	0
Fundamental Commissioning and Verification	Pending	Construction	0	0	0	0
Minimum Energy Performance	Pending	Design	0	0	0	0
Optimize Energy Performance	Pending	Design	9	0	9	0
Building-Level Energy Metering	Awarded	Design	0	0	0	0
Fundamental Refrigerant Management	Awarded	Design	0	0	0	0
Enhanced Commissioning	Pending	Construction	3	0	3	0
Enhanced Refrigerant Management	Pending	Design	1	0	1	0
Storage and Collection of Recyclables	Awarded	Design	0	0	0	0
Construction and Demolition Waste Management Planning	Pending	Construction	0	0	0	0
Building Product Disclosure and Optimization - Sourcing of Raw Materials	Pending	Construction	1	0	1	0
Construction and Demolition Waste Management	Pending	Construction	2	0	3	0
Minimum Indoor Air Quality Performance	Pending	Design	0	0	0	0
Environmental Tobacco Smoke Control	Awarded	Design	0	0	0	0
Low-Emitting Materials	Pending	Construction	2	0	2	0
Construction Indoor Air Quality Management Plan	Awarded	Construction	1	0	0	1
Daylight	Awarded	Design	2	0	0	2

Innovation	Pending	Design	2	0	2	0
LEED Accredited Professional	Pending	Construction	1	0	1	0

Design and Construction Final**01/16/2019****02/25/2019****32****11****0****27**

Credit	STATUS	TYPE	POINTS: ATTEMPTED	DENIED	PENDING	AWARDED
Project Information	Awarded		0	0	0	0
Integrative Process	Denied	Design	1	1	0	0
Surrounding Density and Diverse Uses	Awarded	Design	4	4	0	4
Bicycle Facilities	Awarded	Design	1	0	0	1
Indoor Water Use Reduction	Awarded	Design	0	0	0	0
Indoor Water Use Reduction	Awarded	Design	4	2	0	2
Building-Level Water Metering	Awarded	Design	0	0	0	0
Water Metering	Denied	Design	1	1	0	0
Fundamental Commissioning and Verification	Awarded	Construction	0	0	0	0
Minimum Energy Performance	Awarded	Design	0	0	0	0
Optimize Energy Performance	Awarded	Design	9	0	0	9
Enhanced Commissioning	Awarded	Construction	3	0	0	3
Enhanced Refrigerant Management	Awarded	Design	1	0	0	1
Construction and Demolition Waste Management Planning	Awarded	Construction	0	0	0	0
Building Product Disclosure and Optimization - Sourcing of Raw Materials	Awarded	Construction	1	0	0	1
Construction and Demolition Waste Management	Awarded	Construction	2	1	0	2
Minimum Indoor Air Quality Performance	Awarded	Design	0	0	0	0
Low-Emitting Materials	Awarded	Construction	2	0	0	2
Innovation	Awarded	Design	2	2	0	1
LEED Accredited Professional	Awarded	Construction	1	0	0	1