

**Luther Burbank Dock and Waterfront  
Concept Design and Alternatives Analysis**

Criteria	Priority	Alternatives			Concept Design	Primary Considerations
		1	2	3		
<b>REQUIRED CRITERIA</b>						
<b>ADA Compliance</b>	High	2	3	5	4	
<i>Dock access</i>	High	2	3	5	5	finger docks +
<i>Shoreline access</i>	Med	3	4	5	4	beach ramp
<b>Environmental Impact - Permitting</b>	High	5	4	4	4	
<i>Aquatic environment - JARPA</i>	High	3	2	2	2	overwater coverage
<i>Impact on the neighborhood - SEPA</i>	High	5	5	4	5	destination elm'ts
<i>Increase in impervious surface- CAO/SMP</i>	Med	4	4	4	4	all have minor add.
<i>Impact on tree canopy - Land Use</i>	High	5	3	4	4	# trees lost
<b>Funding Feasibility</b>	High	4	4	3	4	
<i>Alignment with RCO Grant Criteria</i>	High	5	4	3	4	size of phase 2
<i>Potential for Levy Funding</i>	High	4	3	2	4	public support
<b>Consistency with Luther Burbank Park Master Plan objectives</b>	High	4	4	5	5	
<i>Restore north pier, convert south pier to floating docks for small powerboats and paddlecraft</i>	High	5	5	5	5	aligns with scope of work
<i>Provide facilities for non-motorized boating programs and rentals</i>	High	3	4	5	5	non-motorized capacity
<i>Improve access to the shoreline with an aggregate beach for boat launching</i>	Med	2	2	4	4	wider beach allows peak season launching
<i>Upgrade existing restrooms</i>	Med	not determined				
<b>NON-REQUIRED CRITERIA</b>						
<b>Improved safety &amp; security</b>	Med	4	4	4	4	
<i>Lighting of the plaza area</i>	Med	2	3	5	3	extent of lighting
<i>Breakwater performance (Meet wave height criteria)</i>	High	3	4	4	5	segmented breakwater
<i>Social Distancing Protocols</i>	Low	5	2	4	5	seating spacing
<b>Fits Park Character</b>	High	4	4	2	4	
<i>Compatible with fishing, sunbathing and other existing passive uses</i>	High	4	4	3	4	area of fixed pier and breakwater
<i>Impact on existing park areas &amp; activities</i>	High	5	5	4	5	destination elm'ts
<i>Noise &amp; Traffic</i>	High	5	3	2	4	dock capacity
<i>Parking</i>	Med	3	3	2	3	destination elm'ts
<i>Intensity of use</i>	High	4	3	2	3	dock capacity
<b>Local Benefits</b>	Med	2	3	5	5	
<i>Educational, youth oriented</i>	High	2	3	5	5	program spaces
<i>Power boat access</i>	Med	3	4	5	4	dock capacity
<i>Non-power boat access</i>	High	2	4	5	5	dock capacity
<b>Revenue Generation (rentals, programs, moorage fees)</b>	Med	1	2	3	3	
<i>Food Concession</i>	Low	1	1	1	1	
<b>Seasonality, benefits/impacts of extending</b>	Low	1	2	3	3	program spaces
<b>Allocation of moorage capacity</b>	Med	3	2	4	4	non-motorized capacity

Group rating reflects both the rating of subordinant criteria and other relevant design aspects