

Expert Judging Criteria



Judging ID Number: 02EJ-C _____

Team Number of Entry 02-02 _____

Design Category of Entry: Green Streets _____

Judges' Comments: The site design was aesthetically pleasing with distinct landscape zones between blocks but the design didn't provide as much information regarding the technical aspects of the LID features and functionality as the other entry. The presentation has a very well crafted message regarding community engagement and revitalization with quotes from local residents and business owners and the inclusion of several plazas for public events, with LID features in the landscaping. A particularly good idea was the phased implementation approach to plan the expansion of LID over time, adding programs and elements with each phase moving towards more private investment, creating stakeholders. This phasing idea was very creative with specific LID elements, and shows a steady path forward that engages private citizens and businesses and maintains responsible fiscal planning. Citizen quotes note importance of seeing the proof that a community is invested, and fee credit for individuals managing stormwater onsite, as suggested in the proposed phasing plan.

Total Points Accumulated: 72 out of 100

Expert Judging Criteria

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

The site design makes use of vegetation but could have provided more details regarding additional benefits provided by vegetation (i.e. filtering pollutants). Plant species were not recommended – such as if native species could be used. The use of many tree pits was a highlight but the use of expanded root zones was not discussed so it was not clear if enough soil/media volume would be in the tree pits to provide water storage.

__8__ 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?

The hydrologic model results demonstrate that the site plan does reduce runoff for the LID site design comparative to the existing conditions. The integration of the LID elements into the landscape is unclear.

_8____ of 10 points

- Minimize the use of and/or reduce the size of pipe and other centralized control and treatment infrastructure?

There was no direct discussion on the minimization of pipe. However, with the concept of directing runoff to planters and tree pits, the result would be less to manage in a centralized conveyance or treatment system

_7____ 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?

This site design subtly disconnects impervious areas by encouraging sheet flow over curbless streets into stormwater planters. It is unclear how well this design will function depending on the topography of the street. The design did provide a useful metric of identifying the ratio of percentage landscape to impervious areas.

__6__ 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?

There was no specific discussion of irrigation or the potential for reuse, but routing to stormwater and tree pits will reduce the need for irrigation. The concept plan highlighted the idea of using stormwater as a resource, with phased implementation of more intensive water harvesting and even grey water use. The phased approach creates financial incentives for private properties to capture and use rainwater, beyond the streetscape design, as called for by one the community members quoted. There was no mention of where the canal water was coming from; assumed it is untreated rainwater.

_7____ of 10 points

Total Points Accumulated: 72 out of 100

Expert Judging Criteria

- 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?

Maintenance was creatively addressed by a proposal to share the landscape maintenance responsibility with the adjacent property owner. This could significantly reduce maintenance costs and help ensure successful plant growth and reduce replacement costs. Directing runoff will reduce irrigation needs when it rains, but during droughts extra care may be needed, and engaged stakeholders might not mind the task for landscaping sake.

The site design helped to improve marketing by creating a showcase placemaking example by identifying shared spaces, activities, and vistas which could occur in different areas. For outreach, it was creative to have quotes from local community members included, and the design indicates that the community members were heard.

__8__ of 10 points

- How well does this site correctly identify current codes that prohibit the construction or implementation of your prescribed LID techniques?

Neither proposal addressed specific city code issues. However, this proposal included a table of common barriers and strategies that could be used as the preliminary starting point for identification challenges in moving forward. The table included excellent ideas and strategies for facilitating the adoption of LID and changing the stormwater management paradigm for the design community and the public. The Americans with Disability Act was specifically addressed.

__9__ 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?

_6__ 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?

Average costs were presented for the identified LID features but were not scaled up to the project level to be able to effectively compare the costs between the conventional and LID design plans.

The concept of breaking the space into three sections with different character, nature themes, and social functions was very attractive. The result was a unique sense of place, nestled within adjacent, sibling linear parks. The thoughtfulness of future planning and cost sharing was a bonus to this design. This design is a better design than the conventional design.

__8__ of 10 points

Total Points Accumulated: __72__ out of 100