Expert Judging Criteria



| Judging ID Number: | 01EJ-G |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| | |
| Team Number of Entry | Team 01-02 |
| | |
| | |
| Design Category of Entry | : Mixed Use |
| | |
| Judges' Comments: | |
| Judges Comments: | |
| | |

Team No. 2:

Very attractive graphics and good attention to editing (I only saw one typographic error)

No estimates of cost for this particular development, comparative cost information was about other developments Good discussion of planning and conceptual elements of LID and of the walkability/connectivity concepts; good discussion of amenities. While the marketability was not explicitly mentioned, this discussion suggested greater marketability as compared to conventional subdivisions.

Hydrologic results were given, but the methodology was not named. (I assume Rational Method since the comparison table gave C-factors)

Discussion of water quality benefits was qualitative, no quantitative estimate of water quality improvement was provided

Expert Judging Criteria

| • | How well does this site conserve natural resources that provide natural functions associated with controlling and filtering storm water? |
|---|--|
| | 7 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? |
| | 9 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? |
| | 9 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? |
| | 4 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? |
| | 6 of 10 points |
| • | How well does this site correctly identify current codes that prohibit the construction or implementation of your prescribed LID techniques? |
| | 10 of 15 points |
| • | How well does this site address the aspects of your area of expertise in architecture, landscape architecture, hydrology/hydraulics/civil engineering, stormwater quality, or planning/development/consulting? |
| | 4 of 10 points |
| • | How well do the team's submitted materials address grammar, editing, appearance, and verbiage? |
| | 4 of 5 points |
| • | Does the team's design adequately compare the costs of LID versus conventinal design? Is their design a better investment, in your opinion, than the conventional design? |
| | _3 of 10 points |
| | Total Points Accumulated: _65 out of 100 |