Attachment B Scope of Services

Project Understanding

The need to study and recommend approaches to address parking and transportation issues in Stadium Village and its influence area is an outgrowth of the City's, County's, and University's efforts to jointly develop the Central Corridor LRT (CCLRT) Stadium Village Station Area Plan. In the course of developing the station area plan, parking issues were raised by the University and businesses and residents in and around the station area. While the CCLRT Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) addressed traffic and parking impacts, it is limited in terms of geographic scope and level of detail, particularly regarding the parking issues. Thus, a study focused on parking (and associated traffic circulation and access) is needed to inform station area planning efforts.

Factors contributing to the area's parking and associated transportation issues are many and complex. Even without introducing LRT, which will result in a 90 percent reduction in the supply of on-street parking and the elimination of some left-turn movements, the area faces parking and traffic circulation challenges under existing conditions. First, the two major streets serving the study area, Washington and University Avenues, either directly or indirectly provide access to some of the region's largest trip generators. Beyond providing access to jobs, educational services, businesses, and residences, these two streets have regional significance by virtue of their geographic locations and functional classifications. Washington Avenue (CSAH 122) is one of the bridges over the Mississippi River, and University Avenue(County Road 36) is in the vicinity of Stadium Village. Both streets are "A" Minor Arterial relievers in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Highway Plan, and, therefore, carry significant through traffic volumes.

Exacerbating this condition is the degree to which the area has been developed. The immediate station area and its wider influence area are within a compact and densely developed, mixed use section of the city. Uses within this area include the University of Minnesota, businesses with both regional and local (walkable) markets, and student- and non-student-oriented housing. Because regional markets are attracted to the area, daily and peak hour trip and parking generation are high and concentrated.

The area is characterized by high levels of pedestrian circulation and bicycle usage. It is also highly served by transit and enjoys a 60 percent to 70 percent transit mode share. LRT will further contribute to non-automobile travel, but, nevertheless, analysis conducted in the CCLRT FEIS showed that daily and peak hour traffic (and resultant parking demand) within and through the area will still be significant.

Project Purposes

The Stadium Village/University Avenue Parking and Transportation Study will need to address three purposes. The first is to look at the short-term to address existing parking issues in order to maximize the efficiency of existing supplies of public and private parking in the area. The measures of efficiency defined in the RFP are *layout* and *utilization*.

The second purpose is to address parking in the future, under a long-term scenario where LRT implementation will result in the almost total elimination of on-street parking on University and Washington Avenues and reduced left-turn opportunities. This purpose includes development of approaches to both: a) ensure/increase utilization of LRT and other non-auto modes of travel and b) reconfigure parking facilities so that those who must drive/park can do so efficiently.

The third purpose applies to both the existing and future conditions but is mostly focused on the long-term. This purpose is to provide guidance on infrastructure and traffic circulation improvements that will facilitate:

1. safe and efficient accessibility to/from parking supplies
2. safety and efficiency of the overall transportation system serving the area

Proposed Approach ***(Research and Field Work, Science, Art and Collaboration)***

Biko Associates proposes to approach this study as though it were a fast turn-around, research assignment where a team of experienced professionals (supported by formally educated, intelligent and energetic newcomers and student interns) fully immerses itself in solving a problem. Cornerstones of this approach are:

1. **Develop a thorough familiarity with the study area.** Our team consists of individuals who attended and currently attend the University of Minnesota and have worked on land use and transportation planning and design projects in the study area. Our team will augment its present knowledge of the study area through background research and field work assignments where: a) the transportation system will be inventoried and mapped, b) parking lots will be inventoried and parking occupancies will be counted (as necessary), c) and parking and traffic operations will be observed.

2. **Develop a spatial GIS model.** Our team will use GIS to develop a spatial model of parking lots, their supplies, and their utilization. Other tools will be used as well to provide a scientific, technical basis for decision making. Our team includes individuals who have conducted parking studies for the cities in the metropolitan area, business districts within Minneapolis and Saint Paul, Hennepin County, the Capitol Area Architectural and Planning Board, and communities in Dane County, Wisconsin. These studies have included analyses of existing conditions (supply/utilization), parking demand forecasting, parking operations and pricing, and parking facility design.

3. **Encourage "what if" thinking.** With almost 80 years combined experience in the areas of land use and transportation planning and LRT operations and traffic impact analysis; parking facilities planning, engineering, and operations/management; and parking facility design, our team's three principal researchers (William Smith, AICP, Michael Sachi, PE, and Harold Skjelbostad, RLA/ASLA) are not afraid to put down the "green book," think outside the box, and use professional judgment in the application of standards. This level of experience will enable our team to couple technical/scientific thinking with innovative/creative thinking.

4. **Work with others.** Our team proposes to work closely with and collaboratively with the technical advisors and Steering Committee. It is a given that meetings with TAC will be working meetings. Beyond these, it is our expectation that meetings with the Steering Committee will also be working meetings where the consultant team presents background information and analysis findings, optional courses of action, and pros and cons associated with each option. Provided with this information, Steering Committee members will be in a position to ask questions and provide guidance, based on their first-hand knowledge of the study area, policies and practices affecting parking, and political acceptability.

Proposed Work Program

The proposed work program is divided into five phases of work. Each phase of work is further divided into work tasks, which are discrete, measurable activities that can be associated with a work product or deliverable.

The description of Phase 1, which includes straight forward, field work and reconnaissance activities, is detailed. Experience conducting parking studies guided the development of work tasks under this phase. Phase 1, as described below, is concluded with a "definition of the area's existing and future parking challenges."

Because work tasks under additional phases of the study (Phases 2 through 4) are partly dependent on the "definition of parking challenges," it is not possible, at this point, to be as detailed in the description of the work tasks. These phases have been developed to respond to the "defined parking challenges" by: a) preparing a tool box of potential solutions, b) developing and evaluating short- and long-term parking alternatives, and selecting favored alternatives for further refinement and final evaluation.

Phase 5, the final phase of work, is where the study comes together and is concluded. The first task under Phase 5 will be the refinement of favored alternatives from Phases 3 and 4 to maximize the potential that favored, long-term alternatives can logically be built upon favored, short-term alternatives. The sequential coupling of short- and long-term alternatives will lead to the development of alternative scenarios.

Next, the alternative scenarios will be evaluated and preferred scenarios will be selected for inclusion in the Stadium Village Station Area Plan. A key consideration in the selection of preferred scenarios will be assurance that implementing a particular short-term alternative will not preclude (or make more difficult or expensive) the future implementation of a long-term alternative.

Phase 1: Get Started and Define Parking Challenges

Task 1-1: Confirm project administration protocols and procedures with client.

Task 1-2: Confirm project management protocols and procedures with consultant team.

Task 1-3: Confirm work program and project schedule/timeframe with client.

Task 1-4; Develop base mapping for the study area.

Task 1-5: Conduct one-on-one and focus group interviews with Steering Committee members and other key stakeholders to assist in the development/refinement of the "definition of parking challenges" and project goals, which will serve as criteria for measuring the effectiveness and impacts of alternatives in Phases 2 and 3.

Task 1-6: Coordinate with technical advisors to assist in the development/refinement of the "definition of parking challenges" and project goals:

- City of Minneapolis Public Works Transportation Division
- Hennepin County Public Works/Transportation
- University of Minnesota Parking and Transportation Services
- Metropolitan Council Central Corridor LRT project office.

Task 1-7: Collect and review previous plans and studies that have been prepared for the study area. Collect and review information on planned and programmed improvements to the transportation system so they can be included on the base mapping.

Task 1-8: Conduct field scoping and inventory activities to:

- build on and complete the Central Corridor project office's and University of Minnesota's already developed inventory of parking lots in the study area (size, type, cost, and utilization)
- gather information on on-street parking conditions (metered, restricted, free, etc.)
- gather information on traffic circulation and accessibility to/from parking lots
- gather information on bicycle routes and sidewalks
- take note of land uses that are significant parking generators

Task 1-9: Develop GIS spatial model to describe/illustrate parking lot locations, supplies, and utilization. Conduct analysis to identify issues and develop short- and long-term Problem Statements that "define parking challenges" for the existing condition and a future condition with LRT.

Task 1-10: Attend community meeting to present Phase 1 findings and receive input on parking issues as they are perceived by community members.

Task 1-11: Document findings and observations in a technical memorandum for distribution to the TAC and Steering Committee

Phase 2: Develop Parking Solutions Tool Box

Task 2-1: With an understanding of "defined parking challenges," the team will develop a tool box of potential parking solutions that responds to parking inefficiencies and supply deficits. Among other factors, the tool box will attempt to address:

- physical configuration of parking stalls;
- security and safety within and along bicycle and pedestrian routes to and from the parking lot;
- accessibility between parking facilities and adjacent streets;
- operations, management and pricing (low cost - e.g. manual pay box, moderate cost - e.g. automated pay stations, or high cost - e.g. barrier gates, card access, pay machines);
- location relative to key destinations; and
- provision of transportation services and facilities (sidewalks, bike paths, transit and shuttles, etc.) between remote parking facilities and key destinations.
- shared parking agreements and other arrangements that increase the efficiency of how parking is utilized

Task 2-2: Develop an indication/contra-indication matrix to guide the application of solutions in the tool box. Indications and contra-indications will help determine where a particular solution is appropriate and, alternatively, where it would not be appropriate. It is likely that the study area will need to be divided into land use-specific segments in order to develop the matrix. This will enable the team to determine, for example, which solutions would be appropriate in areas that predominantly consist of a particular land use (e.g., commercial, institutional, residential, etc.).

Task 2-3: Review the tool box with the TAC to test its validity and feasibility. Review the tool box with the Steering Committee to test the feasibility and acceptability of tool box elements.

Include analysis of how proposed strategies and approaches can work together as an overall system to meet the parking needs of an area.

Task 2-4: Document Phase 2 activities and findings in a technical memorandum.

Phase 3: Develop and Evaluate Short-Term Alternatives to Improve Existing Parking Issues

Task 3-1: With the tool box reviewed and modified based on input from the TAC and Steering Committee, a universe of short-term parking alternatives will be developed.

Task 3-2: Develop a list of short-term evaluation criteria, based on short-term parking goals developed in Phase 1.

Task 3-3: Evaluate the universe of alternatives, identifying pros and cons of each alternative.

Task 3-4: Review findings from Tasks 3-1 through 3-3 with the TAC. Review findings from Tasks 3-1 through 3-3 with the Steering Committee to identify a set of favored, short-term parking alternatives that will be carried into Phase 5.

Task 3-5: Document Phase 3 work activities and findings in a technical memorandum.

Phase 4: Develop and Evaluate Long-Term Alternatives to Address Future Parking Issues

Task 4-1: Coordinate with CPED and University staff to gain understanding of future land use developments within the study area and identify potential opportunity sites that might be developed as parking facilities.

Task 4-2: Forecast future parking demand based on future land use projections, relying on City Parking Code, ITE, ULI, and other resources. Consider the benefits of LRT, improved transit services, and bicycle use/pedestrian circulation in the forecasting algorithms.

Task 4-3 Develop a universe of long-term parking alternatives to respond to forecast parking demand.

Task 4-4: Develop a list of long-term evaluation criteria, based on short-term parking goals developed in Phase 1.

Task 4-5: Evaluate the universe of alternatives, identifying pros and cons of each alternative.

Task 4-6: Review findings from Tasks 4-1 through 4-5 with the TAC. Review findings from Tasks 4-1 through 4-5 with the Steering Committee to identify a set of favored, long-term parking alternatives that will be carried into Phase 5.

Task 4-7: Document Phase 4 work activities and findings in a technical memorandum.

Phase 5: Select Preferred Alternatives and Document Study Conclusions

Task 5-1: Refine favored short-term and long-term alternatives to develop alternative scenarios where:

- long-term alternatives can logically be built on short-term alternatives and
- short-term alternatives will not preclude implementation of long-term alternatives.

Task 5-2: Review/confirm the list of evaluation criteria.

Task 5-3: Conduct evaluation of alternative scenarios and select preferred scenarios.

Task 5-4: Review findings from evaluation and selection with the TAC and Steering Committee.

Task 5-5: Conduct final refinement of preferred alternatives to consider:

- study area traffic and circulation patterns in view of changes to the transportation network that will accompany LRT implementation
- the multi-modal nature of the study area, efficiency of movement, and safety.

Task 5-5: Prepare draft recommendations and document in a draft report for distribution to the TAC and Steering Committee. Recommendations will include any suggested traffic, circulation or infrastructure improvements to the transportation network that were observed as needed to improvement overall system efficiency and safety. Receive comments on the draft report from the TAC and Steering Committee.

Task 5-6: Attend community meeting to present the draft report and receive comments from the community.

Task 5-6: Prepare final report based on comments and input from the TAC, Steering Committee, and, as appropriate, the community.