

Table 2 I-11 Build Corridor Alternatives INVEST Scoring and Appropriate Implementation Phasing

Notes:

- This table compares the three Build Corridor Alternatives considered in the ADOT I-11 Corridor Tier 1 EIS. As the same process was deployed to analyze potential impacts and opportunities among the alternatives, the INVEST scoring is identical among the alternatives.
- Gray criteria boxes denote criteria subgroups, dependent on the question above.
- Several criteria reference additional decision-making information available in the PD Module web tool or self-evaluation guidebook; these items are not listed in this table.
- “Phase to Implement” column provides context on the appropriate project development phase to consider and complete sustainability criteria; as a Tier 1 planning study, the I-11 Corridor Tier 1 EIS is not advanced enough to meet most design and construction criteria, however these columns provide guidance for future project phases.

ID	Criteria	Available Points (Y)	INVEST Scoring			Phase to Implement Criteria			
			Purple Build Corridor Alternative	Green Build Corridor Alternative	Orange Build Corridor Alternative	Planning/Environmental		Design	Construction
						Tier 1	Tier 2		
TOTAL		155	14	14	14				
PD-01	Economic Analyses	5	0	0	0				
PD-01.1a	Was a benefit-cost analysis (BCA) for the project completed using minimum acceptable industry practices?	2	0	0	0		✓		
PD-01.1b	Was an Economic Impact Analysis (EIA) completed that meets all the listed requirements?	3	0	0	0		✓		
PD-02	Lifecycle Cost Analyses	3	0	0	0				
PD-02.1a	Was a Lifecycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) performed for all pavement structure alternatives in accordance with the method described in the FHWA's Technical Bulletin for Life-Cycle Cost Analysis?	1	0	0	0		✓		
PD-02.1b	Was an LCCA performed for all stormwater infrastructure alternatives considered?	1	0	0	0		✓		
PD-02.1c	Was an LCCA performed for the project's major feature (bridges, tunnels, retaining walls, or other items not listed in the preceding options) for each of the alternatives considered?	1	0	0	0		✓		
PD-03	Context Sensitive Project Development	10	6	6	6				
PD-03.1	Did the project development process generally follow the six-step Context-Sensitive Solutions (CSS) framework described in the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) report 480 and NCHRP report 642, or an equivalent process?	2	2	2	2	✓	✓		
PD-03.2	Did the project development process feature a "cradle-to-grave" project team that included planners, traffic engineers, public involvement specialists, design engineers, environmental experts, safety specialists, landscape architects, right-of-way staff, freight experts, construction engineers, and others to work on projects who worked together to achieve the desired CSS-based vision for the project?	1	1	1	1	✓	✓		
PD-03.3	Because of CSS-influenced project development process, were external "champions" for the project created in the affected community who were engaged and proactive in supporting it?	1	1	1	1	✓	✓		
PD-03.4	Was acceptance achieved among project stakeholders on the problems, opportunities, and needs that the project should address and the resulting vision or goals for addressing them?	1	1	1	1	✓	✓		
PD-03.5	Do project features consider the appropriate scale of the project?	1	1	1	1	✓	✓		
PD-03.6	Did the project remove objectionable or distracting views? (during construction only – 1 pt; permanently – 2 pts)	2	0	0	0				✓
PD-03.7	Did the project integrate context sensitive aesthetic treatments?	1	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-03.8	Were aesthetics for structural items incorporated into the design of the project?	1	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-04	Highway and Traffic Safety	10	4	4	4				
PD-04.1	Were human factors considerations incorporated? If yes:	--	0	0	0	✓	✓		
	The project relied solely on published design and operational performance standards during	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

ID	Criteria	Available Points (Y)	INVEST Scoring			Phase to Implement Criteria			
			Purple Build Corridor Alternative	Green Build Corridor Alternative	Orange Build Corridor Alternative	Planning/Environmental		Design	Construction
						Tier 1	Tier 2		
	the project development process.								
	Interactions between road users and the roadway using fundamentals captured in Chapter 2 of the Highway Safety Manual and the Human Factors Guideline for Road Systems (NCHRP Report 600 series) were evaluated, documented, and incorporated.	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-04.2	Was awareness built among the public regarding contributing factors to crashes?	1	0	0	0	✓	✓		
PD-04.3	Does the agency conduct explicit consideration of safety using quantitative, scientifically proven methods? If yes:	--	--	--	--	✓	✓		
PD-04.3a	Was the project type established during scoping of project alternatives through a quantitative and statistically reliable process?	1	1	1	1	--	--	--	--
PD-04.3b	Were project design and/or operational alternatives developed and evaluated using explicit consideration of substantive safety through quantitative, statistically reliable methods?	2	2	2	2	--	--	--	--
PD-04.3c	Were quantitative and statistically reliable methods and knowledge used to assess substantive safety performance in the development of preliminary and final design details?	3	0	0	0	--	--	--	--
PD-04.4	Was a statistically reliable, science-based method used to evaluate the safety effectiveness of the implemented project?	1	1	1	1	✓	✓		
PD-05	Educational Outreach	2	2	2	2				
PD-05.1	Did this project incorporate public educational outreach that promotes and educates the public about sustainability by installing or performing a minimum of two different elements from Table PD-05.1.A?	2	2	2	2	✓	✓	✓	✓
PD-06	Tracking Environmental Commitments	5	0	0	0				
PD-06.1a	Was a comprehensive environmental compliance tracking system used for the project and related facilities?	2	0	0	0		✓	✓	✓
PD-06.1b	If yes, does the environmental tracking system have a formal mechanism to communicate commitments from transportation planning through design, construction and maintenance?	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-06.2	Has the principal project constructor assigned an independent environmental compliance monitor who will provide quality assurance services and report directly to and make recommendations to the regulatory and Lead Agencies?	2	0	0	0		✓	✓	✓
PD-07	Habitat Restoration	7	0	0	0				
PD-07.1	Was project-specific mitigation or mitigation banking used on this project? Use Table PD-07.1.A to determine the points earned.	3	0	0	0		✓		
PD-07.2	Were high quality aquatic resources (HQAR) avoided or were the impacts minimized on this project? Use Table PD-07.2.A to determine the points earned.	2	0	0	0		✓		
PD-07.3	Were high quality environmental resources avoided or were the impacts minimized on this project? Use Table PD-07.3.A to determine the points earned.	2	0	0	0		✓		
PD-08	Stormwater Quality and Flow Control	6	0	0	0				
PD-08.1	Did the project treat at least 80 percent of the total runoff volume? Use Tables PD-08.1.A and PD-08.1.B to determine points.	3	0	0	0			✓	
PD-08.2	Did the project manage the flow from at least 80 percent of the total runoff volume, and is flow control based on controlling peak flows or durations from the project site? Use Tables PD-08.2.A and PD-08.1.B to determine points.	3	0	0	0			✓	
PD-09	Ecological Connectivity	4	0	0	0				
PD-09.1P	Was a site-specific ecological assessment of the roadway project using GIS data or regional expertise conducted? If yes:	--	0	0	0		✓		
PD-09.1	Were methods used to minimize impacts to ecological connectivity? Use Table PD-09.1.A to determine points.	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-09.2	Did the project team engage natural resource and regulatory agencies throughout the	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

ID	Criteria	Available Points (Y)	INVEST Scoring			Phase to Implement Criteria			
			Purple Build Corridor Alternative	Green Build Corridor Alternative	Orange Build Corridor Alternative	Planning/Environmental		Design	Construction
						Tier 1	Tier 2		
	planning process and ensure consistency with broader planning goals and objectives?								
PD-13	Freight Mobility	7 (max)	0	0	0				
PD-13.1	Were freight facilities installed on this project consistent with the need, purpose, and appropriateness for freight mobility within the project footprint? Use Table PD-13.1.A to determine points.	Up to 7	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-14	ITS for System Operations	5	0	0	0				
PD-14.1	Were one or more allowable Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) applications installed? Use Table PD-14.1.A to determine points.	--	0	0	0			✓	✓
	At least 1 application in any category	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	At least 1 application in 2 separate categories	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	At least 1 application in 3 separate categories	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	At least 1 application in 4 separate categories	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	At least 1 application in 5 separate categories	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-15	Historic, Archaeological, and Cultural Preservation	3 (max)	2	2	2				
PD-15.1P	Is any part of the project or resource listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or been determined eligible for the NHRP by a State, Local, or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer? If yes:	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-15.1	Has effort been made to minimize impacts, avoid impacts, or enhance features? If yes:	--	--	--	--	✓	✓		
PD-15.1a	An effort has been made to minimize the "adverse effects" to the features from PD-15.1P.	1	0	0	0	--	--	--	--
PD-15.1b	Measures have been taken to specifically avoid impacts to the features from PD-15.1P.	2	2	2	2	--	--	--	--
PD-15.1c	Actions have been taken to enhance features through the protection, preservation, and/or enhancement of historic, archaeological, or cultural resources.	3	0	0	0	--	--	--	--
PD-15.2P	OR Is a portion of the project along one of Americas Byways, a State Scenic Byway, an Indian Tribe Scenic Byway, or other route designated or officially recognized as significantly historical, cultural, or archaeological? If yes:	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-15.1	Has effort been made to minimize impacts, avoid impacts, or enhance features? If yes:	--	--	--	--	✓	✓		
PD-15.1a	An effort has been made to minimize the "adverse effects" to the features from PD-15.1P.	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-15.1b	Measures have been taken to specifically avoid impacts to the features from PD-15.1P.	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-15.1c	Actions have been taken to enhance features through the protection, preservation, and/or enhancement of historic, archaeological, or cultural resources.	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-15.3P	OR Is any part of the project or resource recognized by the community as having historic, cultural, and/or archeological significance to the community? If yes:	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-15.1d	Were measures taken to specifically avoid impacts to these features?	1	--	--	--	✓	✓		
PD-16	Scenic, Natural, or Recreational Qualities	3 (max)	0	0	0				
PD-16.1P	Is any portion of the project along one of America's Byways®, a State Scenic Byway, an Indian Tribe Scenic Byway, or other route that was designated or officially recognized as such? If yes:	--	0	0	0	✓	✓		
PD-16.2P	Was existing access to scenic, natural, or recreational qualities not removed (i.e., maintained) as a part of this project unless it was specifically removed to protect the scenic, natural, and/or recreational qualities themselves? If yes:	--	--	--	--	✓	✓		
PD-16.1	Were efforts made to avoid or minimize impacts, or enhance features, of the scenic, natural, and/or recreational qualities? If yes:	--	--	--	--	✓	✓		
PD-16.1a	An effort has been made to minimize "adverse effects" to the scenic, natural, or recreational qualities to the features from PD-16.1P.	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-16.1b	At least one access was provided from the project to a designated area for vehicles to exit traffic and experience the scenic, natural, or recreational quality.	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

ID	Criteria	Available Points (Y)	INVEST Scoring			Phase to Implement Criteria			
			Purple Build Corridor Alternative	Green Build Corridor Alternative	Orange Build Corridor Alternative	Planning/Environmental		Design	Construction
						Tier 1	Tier 2		
PD-16.1c	Measures were taken to specifically avoid impacts to the scenic, natural, or recreational qualities to the features from PD-16.1P.	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-16.1d	Efforts were made to protect, preserve, or enhance scenic, natural, or recreational qualities along the roadway.	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-17	Energy Efficiency	8	0	0	0				
PD-17.1	Were energy needs evaluated for the project? If yes:	--	0	0	0			✓	
PD-17.1	Were alternatives implemented to reduce power consumption while still meeting lighting and safety standards?	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-17.2	Was the energy consumption on the project reduced through the installation of energy efficient lighting and signal fixtures and through the installation of autonomous, on-site, renewable power sources? If yes:	--	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-17.2	Points are awarded based on the percentage of reduced power use. Based on Table PD-17.2.A, how many points did the project earn? (may earn 1-6 points)	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-17.3	Was a plan established for auditing energy use after project completion as part of operations and maintenance?	1	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-18	Site Vegetation, Maintenance and Irrigation	6	0	0	0				
PD-18.1P	Does all site vegetation use non-invasive species only, use non-noxious species only, use seeding that does not require consistent mowing for a viable stand of grass, and minimize disturbance of native species?	--	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-18.1	Based on Table PD-18.1.A, how many points did the project earn? Points for features are additive, however this criterion shall not exceed a total of 3 points.	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-18.2	Based on Table PD-18.2.A, how many points did the project earn for vegetative maintenance? Points for features are cumulative, however this scoring requirement shall not exceed a total of 3 points.	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-19	Reduce, Reuse and Repurpose Materials	12 (max)	0	0	0				
PD-19	<i>Points for different methods are cumulative; however, this criterion shall not exceed a total of twelve points. Points exceeding twelve will not contribute to overall score.</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-19.1	Was remaining service life increased through pavement preservation activities? Points are awarded per Table PD-19.1.A.	4	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-19.2	Was the amount of new pavement materials needed reduced? Points are awarded per Table PD-19.2.A.	3	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-19.3	Was remaining service life increased through bridge preservation activities? Points are awarded per Table PD-19.3.A.	4	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-19.4	Was remaining service life increased through retrofitting existing bridge structures? Points are awarded per Table PD-19.3.A.	3	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-19.5	Were existing pavements, structures, or structural elements reused for a new use? Points are awarded per Table PD-19.5.A.	3	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-19.6a	Were foundry sand or other industrial by-products used in pipe bedding and backfill?	1	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-19.6b	If yes , were industrial by-products reused in pavement materials, ancillary structures, and other roadway elements?	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-19.7	Was a project-specific plan for the recycling and reuse plan developed as described?	1	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-20	Recycle Materials	10 (max)	0	0	0				
PD-20	<i>Points for different methods are cumulative; however, this criterion shall not exceed a total of</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

ID	Criteria	Available Points (Y)	INVEST Scoring			Phase to Implement Criteria			
			Purple Build Corridor Alternative	Green Build Corridor Alternative	Orange Build Corridor Alternative	Planning/Environmental		Design	Construction
						Tier 1	Tier 2		
	<i>ten points. Points exceeding ten will not contribute to overall score.</i>								
PD-20.1	Was reclaimed asphalt pavement (RAP) or recycled concrete aggregate (RCA) used in new pavement lifts, granular base course, or embankments? Points are awarded per Tables PD-20.1.A or PD-20.1.B.	5	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-20.2	Were pavement materials recycled in place using cold-in-place recycling, hot-in-place recycling, and full depth reclamation methods? Points are awarded per Table PD-20.2.A.	6	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-20.3	Did the project reuse subbase granular material as subgrade embankment or as part of the new subbase? Points are awarded per Table PD-20.3.A.	2	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-20.4	Did the project relocate and reuse at least 90 percent of the minor structural elements, including existing luminaires, signal poles, and sign structures that are required to be removed and/or relocated onsite?	1	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-20.5	Did the project salvage or relocate existing buildings?	2	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-21	Earthwork Balance	5	0	0	0				
PD-21.1a	Are the design cut and fill volumes or the actual construction cut and fill volumes balanced to within 10 percent?	3	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-21.2	If yes , has an earthwork management plan been established, implemented and actively managed on this project?	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-21.1b	Are the design cut and fill volumes or the actual construction cut and fill volumes balanced to within 10 percent if construction banking is used?	1	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-21.3	Has topsoil been preserved or reused on this project?	1	0	0	0				✓
PD-22	Long-Life Pavement	7 (max)	0	0	0				
<i>PD-22</i>	<i>Points for different methods are cumulative; however, this criterion shall not exceed a total of seven points. Points exceeding seven will not contribute to overall score.</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-22.1	Which of the following describes how long-life pavement was used on this project?	--	--	--	--			✓	✓
	No long-life pavement was used or it was and did not meet the minimum requirements of the options below.	0	0	0	0	--	--	--	--
	Long-life pavement was used for at least 95 percent of the surface area of bus pullouts.	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Long-life pavement was used for at least 75 percent of the surface area of dedicated or primary bus lanes.	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Long-life pavement was used for at least 75 percent of the surface area of regularly trafficked lanes.	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-22.2	Was the asphalt density of 100 percent of the total new or reconstructed pavement increased to a minimum of 94 percent?	5	--	--	--			✓	✓
PD-22.3	Was a performance-based pay incentive for pavement smoothness used on this project?	2	--	--	--			✓	✓
PD-23	Reduced Energy and Emissions in Pavement Materials	3 (max)	0	0	0				
<i>PD-23</i>	<i>Points for different methods are cumulative; however, this criterion shall not exceed a total of three points. Points exceeding three will not contribute to overall score.</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-23.1	Was at least 50 percent of the total project pavement material (by weight) a low-energy material from asphalt production? If yes:	--	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-23.1a	Yes, it was warm mix asphalt. Was the warm mix asphalt mixing temperature reduced by one of the following:	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Less than 30 degrees from that recommended by the binder supplier.	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	A minimum of 30 degrees from that recommended by the binder supplier.	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

ID	Criteria	Available Points (Y)	INVEST Scoring			Phase to Implement Criteria			
			Purple Build Corridor Alternative	Green Build Corridor Alternative	Orange Build Corridor Alternative	Planning/Environmental		Design	Construction
						Tier 1	Tier 2		
	A minimum of 40 degrees from that recommended by the binder supplier.	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	A minimum of 50 degrees from that recommended by the binder supplier.	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-23.1b	Yes, it was asphalt from a plant utilizing the energy and fuel savings described.	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-23.2	Was at least 50 percent of the total project pavement material (by weight) a low-energy material from cement production?	--	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-23.2a	Yes, cement production using an ENERGY STAR® certified plant was used.	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-23.2b	Yes, cement production using fuel saving technologies was used.	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-23.2c	Yes, cement production using a minimum 3 percent limestone additive was used.	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	No, or it did not meet the minimum requirements in the options above.	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-23.3	Was at least 50 percent of the total project pavement material (by weight) a low-energy material from concrete production?	--	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-23.3a	Yes, concrete production in a plant with demonstrated reduction in energy and carbon footprint was used.	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-23.3b	Yes, concrete production occurred in a National Ready Mixed Concrete Association (NRMCA) Sustainable concrete plant.	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	No, or it did not meet the minimum requirements in the options above.	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-24	Permeable Pavement	2	0	0	0				
PD-24.1 & 2P	Does the project include a maintenance plan for permeable pavements and are permeable pavements placed in areas where no sand will be used for snow and ice control or pavement sealing? If yes:	--	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-24.1	Is permeable pavement used on the project?	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Yes, for at least 50 percent of the secondary pavement areas on the project.	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Yes, for at least 75 percent of the secondary pavement areas on the project.	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	No, or it did not meet the minimum requirements in the options above.	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-25	Construction Environmental Training	1	0	0	0				
PD-25.1	Did the owner require the Contractor to plan and implement a formal environmental awareness training program during construction to ensure the project stay in compliance with environmental laws, regulations, and policies?	1	0	0	0				✓
PD-26	Construction Equipment Emission Reduction	2 (max)	0	0	0				
PD-26.1	Were one or more methods implemented to reduce non-road emissions? Points are awarded per Table PD-26.1.A.	2	0	0	0				✓
PD-27	Construction Noise Mitigation	2	0	0	0				
PD-27.1	Is the contractor required to establish, implement, and maintain a formal Noise Mitigation Plan (NMP) during roadway construction?	1	0	0	0				✓
PD-27.2	Has the contractor monitored noise and the effectiveness of mitigation measures at the receptors throughout construction to ensure compliance with the NMP?	1	0	0	0				✓
PD-28	Construction Quality Control Plan	5	0	0	0				
PD-28.1	Is the Contractor required to plan and implement quality control measures throughout construction with care and for materials above and beyond what is typically required by specifications and regulations?	3	0	0	0				✓
PD-28.2	Does the contract leverage the use of Quality Price Adjustment Clauses to link payment and performance of the constructed products?	2	0	0	0				✓

ID	Criteria	Available Points (Y)	INVEST Scoring			Phase to Implement Criteria			
			Purple Build Corridor Alternative	Green Build Corridor Alternative	Orange Build Corridor Alternative	Planning/Environmental		Design	Construction
						Tier 1	Tier 2		
PD-29	Construction Waste Management	4	0	0	0				
PD-29.1	Is the contractor required to establish, implement, and maintain a formal Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan (CWMP) during roadway construction, or its functional equivalent?	1	0	0	0				✓
PD-29.2	Can the owner demonstrate that a percentage of the construction waste has been diverted from landfills?	--	0	0	0				✓
	No, or diverted less than 50 percent of the construction waste from landfills	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Diverted at least 50 percent of the construction waste from landfills	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Diverted at least 75 percent of the construction waste from landfills	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-29.3	Were excess materials hauled directly to other project sites for recycling on those projects?	1	0	0	0				✓
PD-30	Low Impact Development	3	0	0	0				
PD-30.1	Did the project use effective best management practices (BMPs) or stormwater management techniques that mimic natural hydrology to treat pollutants? Use Tables PD-30.1.A and PD-30.1.B and PD-30.1.C to determine points.	3	0	0	0				✓
PD-31	Infrastructure Resiliency Planning and Design	12	0	0	0				
PD-31.1	Did the project incorporate consideration of climate change at a project-specific level in project development and environmental reviews?	2	0	0	0		✓		
PD-31.2	Did the project incorporate future consideration of climate change effects in the design process?	--	0	0	0		✓	✓	
PD-31.2a	Yes, in the design process. Which of the following options applies? Choose quantitatively if both apply.	--	--	--	--			✓	
	Climate change effects are qualitatively considered.	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Climate change effects are quantitatively considered.	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-31.2b	Yes, in the design of the project. Which of the following options applies?	--	--	--	--			✓	
	Design changes are incorporated in only one design discipline.	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Design changes are incorporated in two or more design disciplines.	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PD-31.3	Did the project mitigate the effects of GHG emissions through design efforts above and beyond requirements and regulations?	4	0	0	0			✓	
PD-32	Light Pollution	3	0	0	0				
PD-32.1	Were the uplighting ratings met on this project per Table PD-32.1.A?	1	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-32.2	Were the backlighting ratings met on this project per Table PD-32.2.A?	1	0	0	0			✓	✓
PD-32.3	Were the glare ratings met on this project per Table PD-32.3.A?	1	0	0	0			✓	✓