

Expert Judging Criteria: Judge 02EJ-B; Team No. 02-01



Judging ID Number: 02EJ-B

Team Number of Entry: 02-01

Design Category of Entry: Green Street – 6th Street

Judges' Comments: The project solution is a high quality conceptual plan for a low impact development (LID) street and drainage improvement based on the 6th Street Infill Plan in the Pearl District in midtown Tulsa. The creative solution would benefit from inclusion of an overall plan more specifically based on existing conditions of parcels size and depth, streets, alleys and city blocks to provide a better, more precise understanding of practical design urban design solutions. Cost information for the improvements was excellent. Potential costs for relocation of area utilities were not mentioned and were not addressed. Design guidelines presented well graphically. The inclusion of possible promotional efforts for the District was good. Implementation strategies for specific obstacles to the solutions maintenance of specific improvements was not addressed which will likely include maintenance costs of streetscape, landscape, hardscape, park site, debris removal from channel and preserving long-term infiltration of permeable surfaces. The solution did not address the pedestrian connection along Rockford Avenue from 6th Street to the planned storm water detention facility "D" in the Redevelopment Subarea in the Pearl District plan.

Expert Judging Criteria: Judge 02EJ-B; Team No. 02-01

How well does this site conserve natural resources that provide natural functions associated with controlling and filtering storm water? **Given that the project area is fully urbanized, conservation of natural resources was not a primary consideration. However, the introduction of natural features into LID solutions was quite good.**

9 of 10 points

- How well does this site use decentralized, small-scale landscape features and LID Integrated Management Practices (IMP) working as a system to:
 - Reduce the amount of runoff by mimicking the natural hydrologic function of the site and matching pre-development hydrology?

9 of 10 points

- Minimize the use of and/or reduce the size of pipe and other centralized control and treatment infrastructure? **The primary storm water conveyance included two 10'x10' boxes was not reduced, however localized flooding was reduced.**

8 of 10 points

- How well does this site minimize and disconnect impervious surfaces, lengthen time of concentration and promote bio-filtration of runoff to improve the quality of storm water leaving the site? **Appears quite good.**

8 of 10 points

- How well does this site minimize or eliminate the use of potable water resources needed for irrigation and where practical provide for the reuse of rainwater? **Appears quite good.**

9 of 10 points

- How well does this site use enhanced quality of life values and reduced maintenance costs inherent in LID practices to increase marketability of the development and long-term property values? **The curvilinear street and drainage channel alignment tie in well with site design of the Central Park storm water facility, however, it does “fit well” with the preferred grid street system encouraged by the Pear District plan and does not provide an equal, enhanced pedestrian environment and development access on both sides of the street. Practical obstacle of maintenance of improvements was not adequately addressed.**

7 of 10 points

- How well does this site correctly identify current codes that prohibit the construction or implementation of your prescribed LID techniques? **Not very well.**

2 of 15 points

- How well does this site address the aspects of your area of expertise in architecture, landscape architecture, hydrology/hydraulics/civil engineering, storm water quality, or planning/development/consulting? **The curvilinear street and drainage channel alignment tie in well with site design of the Central Park storm water facility, however, it does “fit well” with the preferred grid street system encouraged by the Pear**

Expert Judging Criteria: Judge 02EJ-B; Team No. 02-01

District plan and does not provide an equal, enhanced pedestrian environment and development access on both sides of the street.

6 of 10 points

- How well do the team's submitted materials address grammar, editing, appearance, and verbiage? **It provides a fairly good approach. The presentation boards do not depict the overall proposed solution which is covered more thoroughly in the PowerPoint presentation and additional report.**

3 of 5 points

- Does the team's design adequately compare the costs of LID versus conventional design? Is their design a better investment, in your opinion, than the conventional design? **Yes and yes.**

8 of 10 points

Total Points Accumulated: 69 out of 100