

## Expert Judging Criteria



**Judging ID Number:** 02EJ-A

---

**Team Number of Entr** 0202

---

**Design Category of Entry:**

---

### **Judges' Comments:**

I would have liked to have seen a solution that incorporates LID without the use of the open canal. Maintenance for such a canal would be very expensive...and the canal would lead to some unintended consequences. For example.....what happens if water is not flowing? Smell issues, mosquitos and pest, water quality, HSW of patrons.....Canals have been tried over and over (remember downtown Tulsa?) All have failed or did not live up to expectations for one reason or another...eventually having to be been filled in. Even in cities like Chicago and San Antonio where you have rivers flowing through sections....maintenance and water quality continue to be huge issues. You did a good job separating pedestrian traffic from vehicular.... I did not see examples of how you would handle parking in back. The single lane roads will be somewhat problematic....delivery trucks...cars dropping off or picking up passengers will back up the traffic flow. Anchoring each end with a small 2 story parking structure while allowing some on street parking may be one solution. The pervious pavers/pervious concrete is a good solution...I have used both with success....again the only issue is the heavy maintenance requirement. I like the bio retention areas and the water harvesting/reuse solutions....would love to see more of that thinking industry wide. One nagging issue is ...who pays for it?? Land is cheap in Tulsa, buildings are cheap in Tulsa.....do you think the cost model will be able to compete with other locations? Maybe so.....just a thought.

- How well does this site conserve natural resources that provide natural functions associated with controlling and filtering storm water?

\_\_\_9\_\_\_ of 10 points

Total Points Accumulated: \_\_\_\_\_ out of 100

## Expert Judging Criteria

- 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?  
\_\_\_8\_\_ of 10 points
  - Minimize the use of and/or reduce the size of pipe and other centralized control and treatment infrastructure?  
\_\_\_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?  
\_\_\_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?  
\_\_\_8\_\_ 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?  
\_\_9\_\_ of 10 points
- How well does this site correctly identify current codes that prohibit the construction or implementation of your prescribed LID techniques?  
\_\_15\_\_ 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?  
\_\_9\_\_ of 10 points
- How well do the team's submitted materials address grammar, editing, appearance, and verbiage?  
\_\_\_5\_\_ 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?  
\_\_\_9\_\_ of 10 points

88 Total

Total Points Accumulated: \_\_\_\_\_ out of 100

## Expert Judging Criteria

Total Points Accumulated: \_\_\_\_\_ out of 100