

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



Judging ID Number: 02EJ-B

Team Number of Entry: 02-02

Design Category of Entry: Green Street – 6th Street

Judges' Comments: The project solution is a very 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 proposed 3-stage thematic solution is particularly intriguing and creative, and the information-education component is excellent. Each street section provides excellent pedestrian access and design elements on both sides of the street/block face. Cost information for the specific improvements was not provided, however the case studies did note the potential savings which might be expected. Potential costs for relocation of area utilities were not mentioned and were not addressed. Design guidelines were presented well graphically. The hydrologic and hydraulic information was well noted and understandable for lay persons. The proposed park on private property is a nice concept but out of the public realm and land acquisition is not a part of funded improvements for 6th Street improvements. Obstacles to implementation were addressed, however 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-

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

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.

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.**

10 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 and explained quite well.**

10 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.**

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? **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 street and drainage channel alignment tie in well with preferred solutions enumerated in the Pearl District Plan. The 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? **Fairly well.**

9 of 15 points

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

- 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? **Each street section provides excellent pedestrian access and design elements on both sides of the street/block face. Design guidelines were presented well graphically. Each thematic design solution connected well with the other connecting sections and the pedestrian environment was very good in each section. The new park is a nice concept but would be more appropriately located one block to the east where a parking lot is currently located. In either instance, it is not in the current funding package.**

9 of 10 points

- How well does the team's submitted materials address grammar, editing, appearance, and verbiage? **It provides an excellent approach. The presentation boards depict the overall proposed solution which is covered again in the PowerPoint presentation and report materials.**

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? **Yes and yes.**

9 of 10 points

Total Points Accumulated: 86 out of 100