

Note: Italicized page numbers indicate tables or figures. An italicized *a* following a page number indicates it is contained in the appendix. An italicized *p* following a page number indicates a Perspective article.

- acoustics, in green buildings, 52, 56
- affordable housing, 131, 200–201*a*
- affordable housing, green, 41–42, 44, 44–45
- affordable-housing industry, 40–41
- air pollutant reductions, and walkability index, 114
- air quality. *See* indoor air quality; indoor environmental quality (IEQ)
- Albanese Organization, 80–81
- Aldo Leopold Center, 15, 28–29
- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), 107–8
- American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, 67, 68
- American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers, 216–17*a*, 219*a*
- Apollo Alliance, 68
- assumptions, global, 224–25*a*
- asthma, 42–43
- Atlanta, Georgia, 112–13, 117–20, 129
- Avanyu, Utah, 8
  
- Bank of America Tower at One Bryant Park, 32*p*
- Banner Bank Building, 38
- baselines for cost and performance, 5
- BAU scenario. *See* Building Green (Green) vs. Business-as-Usual (BAU) scenarios
- benefit modeling, 4–6
- benefits, direct and indirect, 6
- biophilia, 32*p*
- Black & Veatch, 67, 68
- Boston, Massachusetts, 129
- breathe-easy homes, 42–43
- Bronx Zoo Lion House, 28
- brownfield investments, 79–80*p*
- building construction, Class A, 81
- building design, in green communities vs. conventional sprawl, 94
- building green
  - benefits of, xvii–xix, 65, 165
  - in China, 142*p*
  - as corporate social responsibility, 72*p*
  - cost premiums of early adopters, 11
  - costs of, xv, 8–9, 213–14*a*
  - energy use and CO<sub>2</sub> reductions, 14
  - estimating employment impacts of, 68–70
  - faith-based communities and, 149, 155, 169
  - financial benefits, 173
  - industry knowledge in, 214*a*
  - moral dimension to, 151
  - water and wastewater savings, 33, 36–39
  - See also* green buildings
- Building Green (Green) vs. Business-as-Usual (BAU) scenarios
  - benefits, net present value of, 187
  - building green, growth in, 177
  - CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, 172, 183
  - comparison of, xviii–xix
  - construction, net present value of, 173
  - energy consumption projections, 180
  - energy efficiency projections, 180
  - energy savings, direct, 187
  - floor area by type, cumulative, 178–79
  - forecasts for BAU, 175–77
  - forecasts for Green, 177–79
  - modeling for, 186
  - renewable electricity use, 181
  - renewable energy, cumulative installed capacity in, 182
  - renewable energy, growth in demand for in, 182
  - retrofits of existing buildings in, 179–80
- Building Investment Decision Support (BIDS) tool, 48
- building space per person, 141
- Business-as-Usual (BAU) scenario. *See* Building Green (Green) vs. Business-as-Usual (BAU) scenarios
  
- Calthorpe, Peter, 101
- Calvin College, Grand Rapids, 163–64
- car accidents, 107–8, 109, 148
- carbon caps, 24
- carbon dioxide. *See* CO<sub>2</sub> *entries*
- Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP), 80
- carbon impact of buildings, 26
- carbon market, European, 22
- carbon neutrality, 26, 32, 72*p*
- car-dominated neighborhoods, 90, 118–20
- caring for the planet, 149–50, 160, 163–64
- Catholic Campaign on Climate Change, 152
- Catholic Children's Health and Environment Campaign, 153
- Catholic Relief Services (CRS), 162–63, 165–66

- CB Richard Ellis (CBRE), 72*p*
- cement production, and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, 22, 233 n.41
- Center for American Progress, 68
- Center for Building Performance Diagnostics, 48
- Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT), 121–23
- Center for the Built Environment (CBE), 51–52
- Center on Wisconsin Strategy, 67
- Centers for Disease Control (CDC), 119–20
- Cherokee Investment Partners, 79–80*p*
- Chicago, 129
- China, 142*p*, 146
- churches, 158–59
- city planning, resident and community needs in, 131
- Civano, Tucson, 133
- Class A building construction, 81
- clean energy, xvii, xix, 20, 185
- climate change, xix, 24
- CO<sub>2</sub> emissions
  - from affordable housing vs. green affordable housing, 44
  - building sector, 141, 184
  - cap-and-trade program, 186
  - cap-and-trade programs, 189–90, 233 n.50
  - cement manufacture and, 22, 233 n.41
  - financial and societal costs of, 174
  - generation of, in Chicago Metro Region, 114
  - in Green vs. BAU scenarios, 172, 183
- CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reductions
  - green buildings and, xix, 14
  - green design strategies and, 89, 113–16
  - national strategy for, 22
  - Obama's commitment to, xviii
  - in renovated buildings, 13
  - valuing, 22–23
  - voluntary, 80
- coastal development alternatives, 105
- Colorado, 99
- Comcast building, 75
- common good principle, 163
- communities, pre-World War II, 90, 94
- community design, green
  - and affordable housing, 131
  - benefits and risks of, for developers, 147
  - and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction, 114
  - commercial sprawl vs., 94
  - cost of, 9
  - costs, illustrative, of conventional development vs., 95
  - costs and benefits of, overview, 89–92
  - defined, 89
  - design of, xviii, 79*p*
  - development approaches to, 96
  - development options matrix, 93
  - health benefits of, 92, 119–20
  - and transportation emissions, 183
  - types of, 95*p*
  - value of, 189–90
  - and vehicle-use reduction, 111–13
  - See also green communities, benefits of
- community life, impact of green building on
  - See also faith-based communities
- community-scale projects, implementation of
  - green standards in, 133
- commuting patterns, 110
  - See also vehicle-miles traveled (VMT)
- Congrès Internationale d'Architecture Moderne, 99–100
- Congress for New Urbanism, 96, 99–100
- conservation developments
  - benefits of, 140
  - and CO<sub>2</sub> reductions, 188
  - design layouts for, 136
  - ecological, 95*p*, 134–35
  - first-cost savings, 34, 104–5, 135–37
  - open space in, 126
  - property values, 125–26
  - residence times, 131
  - restoration in, 139
  - single-development comparison, 137–39
  - strategies for, 39, 96
- construction, new, 142*p*, 175
- construction and demolition waste, 70–72
- construction downturn, xv
- construction materials, conventional vs. green, 173
- consumer demand for green homes, 83*p*
- conventional developments
  - building design in green communities vs, 94
  - car-dominated, 90
  - construction materials for, 173
  - costs of, 9
  - costs of green community design vs., 95
  - design layouts for, 136
  - road design and accident frequency, 107–8

- correctional facilities, 200–201a
- cost and benefit estimates, 210–12a
- CoStar, 76–77, 80
- cost comparison for coastal development alternatives, 105
- cost differentials of data set buildings, 10
- cost-effectiveness of green buildings, 83, 86–88, 168
- cost-effectiveness of green technologies, 31–32
- "Cost Savings in Ecologically Designed Conservation Developments," 103
  
- Darden, Tom, 79–80p
- data-collection sheet, 192a, 193–94a
- data-set buildings
  - assembly of, 191–92a
  - construction and demolition waste diversion, 71
  - cost differentials of, 10
  - criteria for inclusion, 3–4
  - energy savings, advanced, 28
  - energy-use reductions, 15, 26–27, 232 n.22
  - green premiums for, 9–10, 12
  - LEED level of, 211a
  - LEED-New Construction buildings compared to, 210–11a
  - limitations of, 6–7
  - by type, 200–209a
  - types, 4
  - by year of completion, 5
- daylighting, and productivity, 51
- Death and Life of Great American Cities, The* (Jacobs), 131
- Deer Park Buddhist Center, 162
- Dell Children's Medical Center of Central Texas, 64
- density, in community design, 112, 117
- Denver metropolitan area, 128
- design layouts for conventional and conservation developments, 136
- Detroit region, 128
- Dettling, Marty, 80–81
- developers, 135, 147
- development costs, horizontal vs. vertical, 103
- Dorfman, Julie, 161, 168
- downtown area redevelopments, 131–32
- Duany, Andrés, 101
  
- East Little Havana, Miami, 132–33
- ecological conservation design, 95p, 139
- ecological crisis as moral issue, 151
  
- economic benefits from energy-efficiency measures, 66
- economic benefits of green neighborhood design, 43
- economic equity, environmental sustainability and, 152–53
- economic impact of energy efficiency investments, 70
- economic impact of investment in green building improvements, 69
- economic recovery, 146p
- efficiency-driven reductions, 21
- EIA (Energy Information Agency), 175, 180
- electrical loads, flattened, green buildings and, 183–84
- electrical supply, conventional, decarbonization of, 186
- electricity, average price of, 19
- electricity use, and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, 141
- electrochromic glazing, 30
- emissions, impact of policy measures on, 185
- emissions reductions, xviii, 24–25, 171
  - See also CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reductions
- employment impacts of building green, xvii, 66–72, 236 n.124
- energy, clean, xvii, xix, 20
  - See also renewable energy
- energy consumption, primary, 245 n.15
- energy consumption by buildings, 141, 180
- energy efficiency
  - cost of, 21, 215a
  - economic benefits from, 66
  - employment impacts of, xvii, 66–67, 70, 236 n.124
  - and energy-use reductions, 32p
  - green buildings compared to, xix
  - in health care sector, 63
  - and property value of green buildings, 81
  - standards for new construction in China, 142p
  - voluntary vs. mandatory approach, 141
- Energy Information Agency (EIA), 175, 180
- energy performance, 121p, 218–19a
- Energy Policy Act (1992), 34
- energy prices, 19–20, 232 n.32
- energy savings
  - for acute care hospitals, 63
  - advanced, for data-set buildings, 28
  - in buildings with advanced energy-use reductions, 31
  - by building type, 17–19

- energy savings (*continued*)
  - direct, 15–20, 53p
  - embodied, 22, 71
  - for green affordable housing, 42, 44, 45
  - in green buildings, 14, 26
  - in green schools and offices, 84–86
  - indirect, 20–21
  - OHSU Center for Health and Healing, 64
  - potential, for electrochromic glass used with daylighting controls, 30
  - ranges of, per square foot, 17
  - water-related savings and, 38
- Energy Star buildings, 76, 77
- energy use, 53p, 142p, 176, 216–17a, 219a
- energy-use reductions
  - and CO<sub>2</sub> reductions, 14
  - for data-set buildings, 15, 26–27, 210a, 232 n.22
  - energy efficiency and, 32p
  - in health care facilities, 64
  - in LEED for New Construction buildings, 210a
  - by LEED level, 16
  - secondary impact of, 20–21
- energy users, industrial, 22
- environmental policy in U.S., 98
- Environmental Resource Guide* (AIA), 101
- environmental responsibility, 153
- environmental sustainability, and social and economic equity, 152–53
- Envision Utah process, 101
- equity value, in green affordable housing, 44
- ethical and religious values, 190
- European carbon market, 22
- European Union, and zero net energy homes, 144
- Evaluation Standard for Green Building, China, 142p
- faith-based communities
  - benefits and potential of, 165
  - and building green, 149, 155, 156–59, 169
  - interview instrument for, 154
  - responses to environmental conditions, 152
  - and stewardship of the planet, 160, 163
- Faubourg Boisbriand, 79p
- Felician Sisters, 160–61, 165, 167
- financial benefits of green design, 173, 188
- financial costs of CO<sub>2</sub>, 174
- financial crisis, as opportunity, 146p
- financial impacts of greening, 80
- financial institutions, and affordable-housing industry, 40–41
- financial payback of building green, xvii
- financial stewardship, and green initiatives, 168
- financial value, estimating, of storm-water reduction, 107
- first-cost green premiums in health care, 59, 60–61, 62–63
- first costs, 11, 103–5, 135–37
- first-cost savings, xvi, 34, 41, 104–5, 135–37
- Fisk, William, 57–58
- Forest Stewardship Council-certified wood, 54p
- form-based zoning, 101
- Franciscans, 160
- Francis of Assisi, Saint, 160
- Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL), 162, 166–67
- Furman University, 166
- future development, the shape of, 129–30
- future energy prices, 232 n.32
- gas-fired turbines, 32p
- gasoline costs in least and most walkable neighborhoods, 119
- gas use and car ownership in walkable neighborhoods, 118–19
- gentrification, 131–32
- geothermal heat pumps, 29
- GHG (greenhouse gas) emissions, xviii, 72p, 113, 171
- Glendening, Parris, 99
- global assumptions, 224–25a
- global financial crisis as opportunity, 146p
- Global Green Building Trends*, 8
- global warming, xix, 24
- green affordable developments, costs and benefits of, 41
- green affordable housing. *See* affordable housing, green
- "Green Book" (AASHTO), 108
- Green Branch banks, 53–54p
- green building data set. *See* data-set buildings
- green buildings
  - acoustics in, 52, 56
  - and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reductions, 14
  - common features of, xvii
  - construction of, and job creation, 69
  - cost-effectiveness of, 11–13, 83, 168
  - costs, perceived vs. actual, xv

- green buildings (*continued*)
  - in data set, 3–4
  - and electrical loads, flattened, 183–84
  - energy efficiency compared to, xix
  - energy savings in, 26
  - health benefits of, 56–58, 119–20
  - international, 144–45
  - lighting in, 52
  - productivity benefits of, 51–56, 56–58
  - and property values, 74–76, 78–79, 81
  - sales of, 77–78
  - simple payback for, 86–88
  - standards for, 133, 142*p*, 143 (*See also* LEED entries)
  - surveys on costs of, 8–9
  - surveys on value of, 73
  - value of, 189–90
  - See also* building green
- green building survey instrument, 223*a*
- green communities, benefits of
  - community-wide, 106
  - for developers and municipalities, 147–48
  - health improvements, 43
  - transportation, value of, 118–19
  - when compared to conventional sprawl, 94
- Green Communities Criteria (GCC), 40
- green design
  - as branding strategy, 145
  - goals of, 94
  - impacts of, 165, 167
  - rapid transition to, 189–90
  - risks of not investing in, 80*p*
- green factors, as priorities in home choice, 83*p*
- green goals, early integration of, and cost-effectiveness, 10
- Green Guide for Health Care, 61
- greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, xviii, 72*p*, 113, 171
- green housing, demand for, 78
- greenness, dimensions of, 93
- Green New Deal, 146*p*
- Green Outlook 2009* (McGraw-Hill), 78
- green power. *See* clean energy
- green premiums
  - for data-set buildings, 10, 12, 28
  - defined, 9–10
  - for faith-based projects, 155
  - for green affordable housing, 45
  - for green renovations, 13
  - limitations of, as concept, 213–14*a*
- green renovations, 13, 167–68
- green roofs, 38–39
- Green Sanctuary status, 165
- Green scenario. *See* Building Green (Green) vs. Business-as-Usual (BAU) scenarios
- ground source heat pumps (GSHPs), 29
- health benefits
  - access to public transit and, 132
  - estimating the value of, in green buildings, 56–58
  - of green communities, 43, 92, 117–20
  - IEQ and, 32, 46–51
  - of walkable neighborhoods, 43, 119–20
- health care, 65
- health care costs, 119–20, 148
- health care facilities, 59, 60–61, 64, 200–201*a*
- health care projects, green, defined, 61–62
- health care sector, 59, 61–65
- heating and cooling systems, conventional, 29
- heat pump technologies, 29
- heavy metals, 24–25
- Heifer International Headquarters, 38
- higher education buildings, 200–201*a*
- High Point HOPE VI development, Seattle, 42–43, 100, 107
- homebuyer preferences, 78, 124–25
- homeowner attitudes toward green residential products, 83*p*
- home weatherization, 44
- HOPE VI program, 42–43, 100, 107
- hospitals, 35, 51, 61, 63
- houses of worship, 158–59
- housing, 43, 78, 100, 125, 200–201*a*
  - See also* affordable housing; affordable housing, green
- IEQ. *See* indoor environmental quality
- incentive programs, market-based, in China, 142*p*
- incentives for PV installations, 30
- incentives to support green features, 231 n.14
- inclusionary zoning, 132
- India, 146
- indoor air quality, 49, 52, 57
  - See also* indoor environmental quality (IEQ)
- Indoor Air Quality Scientific Findings Resource Bank, 21, 48
- indoor environmental quality (IEQ)
  - in China, 142*p*
  - at Felician Sisters convent and school, 165

- indoor environmental quality (IEQ) (*continued*)
  - in green affordable housing, 42
  - health and productivity improvements, 32, 46–51
  - and workplace satisfaction, 75
- industrial efficiency investments, 21
- industrial energy users, 22
- industry surveys and analysis, 76
- infill development, 106
- infrastructure, 36, 104–6, 148, 238 n.7
- input-output model, 68
- integrated design, 102
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 24
- international green buildings, 144–45
- irrigation water use, 35
- Islamic values, 167
  
- Jackson, Henry (Scoop), 98
- Jacobs, Jane, 131
- Jampa, Ani, 162
- Jesuits, 166
- Jewish Reconstructionist Congregation, 161, 168
- jobs. *See* reemployment impacts
- John Paul II (pope), 151
- Judaism, 151, 161, 168
- Judson University, 166
  
- K-12 schools, 202–5a
- Kentlands, Maryland, 132
- King County, Washington, 115–16
  
- laboratories, 204–5a
- Land Use, Transportation, Air Quality, and Health (LUTAQH) study, Seattle area, 112, 113
- Land Use, Transportation, and Air Quality study, Portland, 113
- land use mix, 112, 115, 117
- land use policies, and GHG emissions, 113
- land use—travel relationship, 240 n.57
- Laurel Springs, Bainbridge, Ohio, 126
- Lawrence Berkley National Laboratory, 21, 48
- LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design), 47, 102, 143, 231 n.3, 231 n.6
- LEED Accredited Professionals, 214a
- LEED-certified buildings, 5, 16, 56, 73, 76, 77
- LEED for Commercial Interiors, 79p
- LEED for Existing Buildings, 13
- LEED for Homes, Platinum projects, 79p
- LEED for Neighborhood Development, pilot program, 79p, 82, 96–97, 102
- LEED for New Construction, 73–74, 96, 211a
- LEED Platinum buildings, 75–76, 79p, 121–23p
- LEED registrations, 61–62, 82, 82, 238 n.170
- Lewis and Clark State Office Building, 38
- Liberty Property Trust, 75
- life-cycle benefits, 4
- lighting, in green buildings, 52
- logging practices, unsustainable, 142p
- Louisa, The, Portland, Oregon, 76
- low-density suburban development, 90–91
- low-e windows, 29–30
- low-flow toilets, 38
- low-income communities, structural disadvantages of, 133
- low-income housing, 43
  - See also* affordable housing; affordable housing, green
- low-income populations, and walkable communities, 132
  
- market-transformation strategies, 40
- Maryland, 99
- Mazzarino, John, 79–80p
- McGraw-Hill, 73, 77–78
- medical building types, 60
- methodology, 3–7
- mixed-use developments, 95p, 100–101, 104, 126, 131–32
- modeled energy use, 219a
- models
  - net-present-value (NPV), 4
- moral dimension to building green, 151, 160
- Morken Center for Learning and Technology, 166
- multifamily affordable housing, 200–201a
- multifamily housing, 125
- multifamily/mixed-use buildings, 208–9a
- municipalities, costs and benefits of green community design for, 147
- municipal regulations. *See* zoning codes
- Muslim Khatri Association, 167
  
- National Council of Churches of Christ, 153
- National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), 98
- National Household Transportation Survey, 132
- National Land Use Policy Act, 98
- National Mainstream GreenHome, 79–80p
- National Religious Partnership for the Environment, 152–53
- natural gas, 19, 21
- nature preserve, Calvin College, 163

- neighborhood design, 94, 111, 131
- neighborhoods, green, 43, 110
- neighborhood walkability, 117–18
  - See also walkability index
- New Buildings Institute, 56
- New Jersey, 99
- new urbanism, 96, 100–101, 127
- New York City, 38, 128
- nitrogen oxides (NOx), 24–25
- NOx (nitrogen oxide) emissions, 24–25
  
- Obama, Barack, xviii, 171
- obesity rates, 117–18
- occupant comfort and satisfaction, 51–52, 53–54p, 55, 63–64, 121p
- office buildings, 38, 73–74, 77, 84–86, 129, 204–7a, 236 n.115
- off-site energy sources, 181–82, 246 n.16
- OHSU. See Oregon Health Sciences University (OHSU)
- One Crescent Drive, 75
- on-site renewable energy, xviii, 32p, 66–68, 181, 245 n.13
- on-site wastewater treatment, 35p
- open space, 118, 126
- Orchard Village, Maryland, 132
- Oregon Health Sciences University (OHSU)
  - Center for Health and Healing, 35p, 64
- Orenco Station, Portland, 132
- Our Lady of the Sacred Heart School, 160–61
- outdoor views, and patient recovery time, 51
- outpatient facilities, 61
  
- Pacific Lutheran University, 166
- particulate matter, 24–25
- Passivhaus principles, 143
- pedestrian safety, 107–9
- perceived risk of TNDs, 104
- performance space, 206–7a
- Phoenix, 129
- photovoltaic installations, 29–30
- physical activity, impact of green communities on, 117–18
- Piraino, Dave, 163, 166
- planning and zoning regulations. See zoning codes
- Playa Viva development, Mexico, 145
- PNC Bank, 53–54p, 55
- Portland, Oregon, 35p, 76, 113, 132
- post-occupancy evaluations, 55–56, 64, 218–19a
  
- productivity benefits in green buildings, 32, 46–51, 51–58
- property values
  - compared, 125–26
  - energy efficiency and, 81
  - for green buildings, 74–76, 78–79
  - storm-water flow and, 107
  - in walkable urban places, 129
- public buildings, other, 206–7a
- public housing revitalization, 100
- public sector costs, TNDs and, 106
- public transit, health benefits of access to, 132
- PV installations, 29–30
  
- "Real Estate Market Outlook 2007" (Ernst & Young), 73, 81
- ReBuilder's Source, 71–72
- REBusiness Online, 130
- recession, global, xv
- recreational facilities, 118
- recycled materials, in LEED, 22
- recycling of C&D waste, 70–71
- Redevco, 145–46
- reform movements, 98
- Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), 162
- Remlick Hall Farm, 107
- renewable electricity use
  - in Green vs. BAU scenarios, 181
- renewable energy
  - cost of energy-efficiency and, 215a
  - cumulative installed capacity in BAU vs. Green scenario, 182
  - development of new, 185–86
  - growth in demand in Green scenario, 182
  - off-site generation, 246 n.16
  - on-site generation, xviii, 32p, 66–68, 181, 245 n.13
- renewable-energy certificates, 181
- Renewable Energy Credits, 182, 185–86
- renewable-energy measures, 215a
- renewable-energy programs, 68
- research and case studies, 132–33
- residential buildings, 208–9a
- residential density
  - and storm-water runoff, 106
  - and transport-related CO<sub>2</sub> per person, 116
- residential energy efficiency, funding for, 190
- restoration, in conservation developments, 139
- retail buildings, 208–9a

- retrofits of existing buildings, 175, 179–80, 190, 245 n.9, 245 n.11
- reuse vs. demolition of existing buildings, 13
- Rio Earth Summit, 101, 102
- risk, green development and, 80–83, 80*p*, 104, 147
- Robert Charles Lesser & Company (RCLCO), 83*p*, 124–25
- Saulson, Gary Jay, 53–54*p*
- schools and academic buildings, faith-based, 156–59
- schools and academic buildings, green, 11, 51, 84–86, 85, 202–5*a*
- Seattle, Washington, 42–43, 100, 107, 112, 113
- sick-building syndrome, 57
- Sidwell Friends Middle School, 164
- single-family detached homes, 125
- site design, and VMT, 113
- Smart Code, 101
- smart growth, 95*p*, 96, 98–99
- Smart Growth and Neighborhood Conservation Program, 99
- SMARTRAQ (Strategies for Metropolitan Atlanta's Regional Transportation and Air Quality), 112–13, 117–18, 120
- SO<sub>2</sub> (sulfur dioxide) emissions, 24–25
- social cohesion, green community design and, 132–33
- social equity, environmental sustainability and, 152–53
- societal costs of CO<sub>2</sub>, 24, 174
- solar photovoltaics (PV), 29–30
- source list, 195–98*a*
- sprawl, 90–91, 94, 111, 117
- statewide land use planning, 98–99
- stewardship, financial, and green initiatives, 168
- stewardship of the planet, 149–50, 160, 163–64
- storm-water flow, 106–7
- storm-water infrastructure, 39
- storm-water management, in Token Creek designs, 138
- storm-water reduction, estimating value of, 107
- storm-water reduction strategies, 33, 38–39
- storm-water treatment train (STT), 138
- street connectivity, and transport-related CO<sub>2</sub>, 116
- study data set. *See* data-set buildings
- study participants, solicitation of, 191*a*
- suburban neighborhoods, standard, 124–25
- sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), 24–25
- survey instrument, green building, 223*a*
- survey instrument for faith groups, 154
- sustainable urbanism, 95*p*, 97
- technologies, green, 28–30, 31–32
- TNDs. *See* traditional neighborhood developments (TNDs)
- Token Creek Conservancy Estates, 136–39
- town planning, traditional, 100
- traditional neighborhood developments (TNDs)
- consumer preference for, 124–25
  - development costs, 103
  - infrastructure savings, 104–5
  - and new urbanism, 96
  - perception of higher costs for, 104
  - property values in, 125
  - public sector costs, 106
  - residence times in, 131
  - and storm-water flow, reduced, 106–7
  - streets and roadways in, 108
  - and sustainable urbanism, 95*p*
- transit-oriented development (TOD), 95*p*
- transit-oriented villages, 100–101
- transit service, 113, 117
- transportation, and green community design, 92, 118–19, 131, 148, 183
- See also* SMARTRAQ
- transportation energy intensity, CNT and, 122–23*p*
- transport-related CO<sub>2</sub> per person, King County, Washington, 115–16
- Unitarian Universalist Church, 165
- University of California, Berkeley, 51–52
- University of Montreal, 55–56
- University of Scranton, 166
- urban growth boundaries, 99
- Urban Land Institute (ULI), 100, 130
- urban-rural transect, 101
- U.S., potential impacts of green design in, 102, 171–74
- U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), 152, 162–63
- U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), 16, 78, 101–2
- vehicle-miles traveled (VMT)
- community design and, 112–13
  - fatalities per 100,000 million, 108–9
  - green community design and, 110
  - home-based, in Atlanta Region, 112

- vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) (*continued*)
  - sprawl and, 111
  - transit service and, 113
  - walkable neighborhoods and, 112
- venture-capital investment in clean energy, xvii
- Vincent and Helen Bunker Interpretive Center, 163–64
- vintage building energy consumption, 175
- VMT. See vehicle-miles traveled (VMT)
  
- walkability index, and air pollutant reductions, 114
- walkable communities, 96, 132
- walkable mixed-use developments, 131–32
- walkable neighborhoods
  - consumer preference for, 124–25
  - gas use and car ownership in, 118–19
  - health benefits of, 43
  - health benefits of green buildings in, 119–20
  - health care costs in, 120
  - physical activity and obesity in, 117–18
  - and VMT, 112
  - zoning codes as barriers to, 130
- walkable urbanism, 95*p*, 127–30
- Washington, D. C., metro area, 128–29
- wastewater savings, benefits of, 36–39
- wastewater treatment rates, Portland, 35*p*
- water conservation programs, 37–38
- water infrastructure, 36
- water rate increases, 36, 220–21*a*
  
- water-related savings
  - assumptions for calculations of, 220–21*a*
  - benefits of, 36–39
  - by building type, 34
  - cost of, in data-set buildings, 222*a*
  - costs and benefits of, for green schools and offices, 84–86
  - and energy savings, 38
  - in health care sector, 64
  - indirect, 37–38
  - by LEED level, 34
  - OHSU Center for Health and Healing, 35*p*
  - strategies for, 33–35
  - value of, by building type, 36
- water-saving features in data-set buildings, 222*a*
- water sources, new, cost of, 37–38
- water use in buildings, 53*p*, 142*p*, 221*a*
- weatherization of homes, 44
- Western Reserve Conservation & Development Council, 126
- Work Environments Research Group, 55–56
- World Business Council for Sustainable Development, 8–9
- World Council of Churches, 151
- World Green Building Council, 143
- World Vision, 152
  
- zero-energy buildings, xviii, 32
- zoning codes, 39, 100–101, 104, 129–30, 132, 190