



Memorandum

CITY OF MERCER ISLAND, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

9611 S.E. 36th St. • Mercer Island, WA 98040-3732

(206) 275-7608 • FAX: (206) 275-7814

www.mercerisland.gov

To: Commissioners, Parks and Recreation Commission

Date: December 9, 2020

From: Paul West, CIP Project Manager

Re: Luther Burbank Docks Alternative Concept Evaluation Criteria

As requested at the December meeting, I am providing a revised criteria sheet with space for you to provide feedback. The Chair and Vice Chair along with Ryan and myself sorted through the criteria together. We reduced redundancy and ambiguity as much as possible. We sorted them into required and non-required criteria.

The Chair and Vice Chair request that you consider the community holistically and your role as a commissioner when filling out this sheet. Please mark on the sheet your answers to the following questions for each criterion, both headings and subheadings:

1. Should we consider this criterion?
2. How important (high, medium, low) is this criterion for evaluating the alternative choices for the various design elements?

The second question is not intended to express your support for a particular outcome. It is about how important you think consideration of that criterion is to the success of the project. The compiled results will help us prepare information and allocate meeting time for our upcoming discussions of the project elements. A criterion that gets a higher rating will be given more attention. You can use the information from the design charrette and the open house survey to inform your decision, as well as your knowledge of the community and its needs in general.

We realize that these criteria are not well-defined. Please do your best to make a choice as a starting point for discussion. If you are uncertain about meaning, make an assumption and write it in the notes column. Please return the sheet to me by December 20. Scan or hardcopy work. At the January meeting, we will discuss the compiled results and make adjustments as needed.

LBDR Evaluation Criteria REVISED 12/8/2020							
Criteria	Include?		Priority			Notes	
	Yes	No	High	Med	Low		
REQUIRED CRITERIA							
ADA Compliance							
<i>Dock access</i>							
<i>Shoreline access</i>							
Environmental Impact - Permitting							
<i>Aquatic environment - JARPA</i>							
<i>Impact on the neighborhood - SEPA</i>							
<i>Increase in impervious surface- CAO/SMP</i>							
<i>Impact on tree canopy - Land Use</i>							
Funding Feasibility							
<i>Alignment with RCO Grant Criteria</i>							
<i>Potential for Levy Funding (Would the project win community support?)</i>							
Consistency with LBP Master Plan objectives (or justify a divergence)							
<i>Restore north pier, convert south pier to floating docks for small powerboats and paddlecraft</i>							
<i>Provide facilities for non-motorized boating programs and rentals</i>							
<i>Improve access to the shoreline with an aggregate beach for boat launching</i>							
<i>Upgrade existing restrooms</i>							
NON-REQUIRED CRITERIA							
Improved safety & security							
<i>Lighting of the plaza area</i>							
<i>Breakwater performance (Meet wave height criteria)</i>							
<i>Social Distancing Protocols</i>							
Fits Park Character							
<i>Compatible with fishing, sunbathing and other existing passive uses</i>							
<i>Impact on existing park areas & activities</i>							
<i>Noise & Traffic</i>							
<i>Parking</i>							
<i>Intensity of use</i>							
Local Benefits							
<i>Educational, youth oriented</i>							
<i>Power boat access</i>							
<i>Non-power boat access</i>							
Revenue Generation (rentals, programs, moorage fees)							
<i>Food Concession</i>							
Seasonality, benefits/impacts of extending							
Allocation of moorage capacity							