

# Golden Valley Road Parking Management Strategies Assessment

*METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT)  
Phase 1: Station Area Planning*

**Prepared for:  
Hennepin County, Bottineau LRT Community Works**



February 4, 2015

SRF No. 8416

# Golden Valley Road Parking Management Strategies Assessment: Table of Contents

---

**Parking Management Assessment..... 1**

Purpose ..... 1

Context ..... 1

Conclusion..... 4

Attachment A: Existing On-Street Parking Supply Analysis

Attachment B: Policy References

## Parking Management Assessment

---

### Purpose

The purpose of the Parking Management Strategy Assessment is to synthesize parking discussions during the Metro Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT) Phase I Station Area Planning process and provide a tool for City of Golden Valley staff and policy-makers to engage in education and discussion regarding parking strategies at the Golden Valley Road Station on the Metro Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT) line.

### Context

While parking is an important consideration for this station, access to the Golden Valley Road Station will also be provided for riders arriving by bus, on-foot, and by bicycle, with the intention of encouraging use of these modes in favor of driving to the LRT station. Priority of access for bus, pedestrians, and bicyclists may be offered in the following ways:

- Increasing frequency of service on nearby bus lines
- Providing optimal locations for bus pick-up and drop-off points relative to the LRT station
- Providing safe, comfortable and convenient pedestrian and bicycle connections to the LRT station
- Providing optimal locations for secure bicycle parking (both short term and long term) relative to the LRT station
- Providing a pedestrian vertical circulation option such as an elevator, escalator, or stairs to reach the LRT platform
- Providing a “kiss and ride” drop-off area

Prioritizing access by bus, bicycle, or on foot enables valuable land near the station to be used for new development or preservation of existing uses. Also, parking lots and structures often act as deterrents to pedestrians, as they are visually uninteresting and can be intimidating at night. Lastly, providing parking is the most expensive way of bringing riders to a station. A single parking stall in a typical above ground structured parking ramp can cost \$15,000 – \$20,000 and a single surface parking stall cost approximately \$2,500 to \$5,000.<sup>1</sup> Both types of parking facilities require regular investments in maintenance.

---

<sup>1</sup> NCHRP 08-36, Task 109. *Guidebook for Estimating the Cost of Non-Rail Infrastructure Upgrades due to Passenger Rail Implementation*. September 2012.

## Parking Management Options

The following eight parking management options were considered for this analysis:

1. Structured parking on MPRB land east of the station platform
2. Structured parking as part of new development
3. Surface parking lot on the fire station site
4. Agreement with St. Margaret Mary for use of their lot for park and ride

Shared parking structure at Courage Center These options were raised by Bottineau LRT Phase 1 Station Area Planning TAC members and Community Working Group members, or are ideas documented during previous planning efforts such as the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board *Bottineau Transitway Design Forum* that were further considered during Station Area Planning. The pros and cons of each strategy are listed below.

### Strategy 1: Structured parking on MPRB land east of station platform

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Park and ride structure would be completely hidden in the view from the east</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost of underground parking is the highest of any option (underground, structure, or surface)</li> <li>• Structure would require ongoing maintenance</li> <li>• Access to the parking structure is likely to be complex</li> <li>• View from the park (west) could include the park and ride structure</li> <li>• Structure would be on park property; would require MPRB approval, Met Council approval</li> <li>• MPRB and Metropolitan Council policy does not permit transit uses, including parking, on regional park property; would require policy change by both agencies               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Development of this option would present additional risk to the LRT project: Policy changes needed to implement the park and ride would add time and complexity to the local project approval process</li> <li>○ The park and ride would add additional costs to the project</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Could induce demand for driving to the station from people who would have walked, bicycled, or taken transit</li> <li>• Addition of park and ride at the station could affect New Starts ratings for the project in the economic development and land use categories which award high ratings for:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concentration of development around regional transit</li> <li>○ Plans and policies to enhance transit-friendly character of station-area development</li> <li>○ Increased density and reduced parking in station areas</li> <li>○ Development proposals in transit station areas</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Note: At their October meeting, the TAC agreed not to pursue this option further

**Phase 1: Station Area Planning**

**Strategy 2: Structured parking as part of new development**

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shared arrangement could result in sharing of costs for Metro Transit and the developer</li> <li>• Shared arrangement could be the most efficient use of parking built for the development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost of underground parking is still the highest of any option</li> <li>• Low demand for parking at this station likely would result in a low benefit cost ratio</li> <li>• Structure would require ongoing maintenance</li> <li>• Structure would be part of private development, so development of parking and timeline for park and ride is uncertain, as it would depend on initiation of development by an outside party; park and ride may not be available on opening day of LRT service</li> <li>• Park and ride could be difficult for users to locate</li> <li>• Ingress and egress is likely to be complex</li> <li>• Potentially creates a competition for parking spaces between transit users and development residents/visitors</li> <li>• Could induce demand for driving to the station from people who would have walked, bicycled, or taken transit</li> </ul>

**Strategy 3: Surface parking lot on fire station site**

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land is in public ownership</li> <li>• A surface park and ride would be consistent with regional guidelines</li> <li>• Holding the land in public ownership could facilitate eventual redevelopment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lost opportunity to return the property to a taxable use</li> <li>• Cost of developing and maintaining a surface lot</li> <li>• Adjacent flood plain would not benefit from any new impervious surface</li> <li>• Park and riders would need to cross Golden Valley Road at-grade unless vertical circulation is provided on north side of GVR</li> <li>• Could induce demand for driving to the station from people who would have walked, bicycled, or taken transit</li> <li>• Addition of park and ride at the station could affect New Starts ratings for the project in the economic development and land use categories which award high ratings for:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concentration of development around regional transit</li> <li>○ Plans and policies to enhance transit-friendly character of station-area development</li> <li>○ Increased density and reduced parking in station areas</li> <li>○ Development proposals in transit station areas</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Phase 1: Station Area Planning**

**Strategy 4: Agreement with St. Margaret Mary for use of their lot for park and ride**

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimal new infrastructure required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires consent of church</li> <li>• Cost of leasing space from church</li> <li>• Monitoring of parking lot for parking compliance (St. Mary parking vs park and ride)</li> <li>• Potentially creates a competition for parking spaces between church users and transit riders – especially when the church has day time events such as funerals</li> <li>• Could induce demand for driving to the station from people who would have walked, bicycled, or taken transit</li> </ul>

Note: This option has not been discussed with St. Margaret Mary Church

**Strategy 5: Shared Parking at Courage Center**

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shared arrangement could result in sharing of costs for Metro Transit and Courage Center</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Courage Center is an approximate 0.3 mile walk from the station</li> <li>• LRT and Courage Center users would demand parking at similar times of day</li> <li>• Metro Transit could incur capital costs of building the park and ride, or leasing costs</li> <li>• Potentially creates a competition for parking spaces between Courage Center users and transit riders</li> <li>• Could induce demand for driving to the station from people who would have walked, bicycled, or taken transit</li> </ul>

Note: This option has not been discussed with Courage Center

**Conclusion**

Recommendations regarding next steps are as follows:

- Strategy 1 should be immediately dismissed because it lacks policy support, is the most expensive option, and presents implementation challenges.
- Strategies 2, 3, 4 and 5 each present their own challenges and costs and do not support regional goals of increasing walking, biking, and taking transit to stations. These strategies require further research to determine their viability.
- Approximately 561 on-street spaces are legally available for parking near the station<sup>2</sup>. As parking demand at each station and provision of park and ride facilities is revisited during the LRT line’s Preliminary Engineering process, it may be appropriate to retain this option for further exploration.

<sup>2</sup> Please see Attachment A for details on the calculation of available on-street parking spaces near the station.

## ATTACHMENT A: Existing On-Street Parking Supply Analysis

---

Data regarding availability of on-street parking was collected by Hennepin County staff in fall 2014. Data was collected on the street segments highlighted in Figure 1. Given existing pedestrian networks and one planned connection, these locations were considered convenient to the station for parking purposes.

Data collected on each street included:

- Approximate length of each street segment
- Approximate width of each street
- Existing parking restrictions: signed restrictions, driveways, curb cuts, and hydrants
- Land uses along each street

### Assumptions

- Calculation of available spaces assumed that existing parking restrictions remain in effect.
- Narrow roadways assumed new parking restrictions limiting parking to one side of the street.
- It was assumed that each on street parking space would require 25 feet of curb space.
- Golden Valley City Code Section 9.02 specifies that it is unlawful for any person to stop, stand, or park a vehicle except when necessary to avoid conflict with other traffic in compliance with the specific directions of a policy officer or traffic control device within ten (10) feet of the point of the curb nearest the fire hydrant. For purposes of this analysis, 10 feet on either side of a hydrant (20 feet total) was assumed as unavailable for parking
- Number of spaces available was always rounded down to the nearest whole number.

### Findings

As shown in Figure 1, this data collection effort found that in total 561 on-street parking spots currently exist within a convenient walk of approximately ¼ mile of the Golden Valley Road Station.

METRO Blue Line extension (Bottineau LRT)  
 Phase 1: Station Area Planning

Figure 1: On Street Parking Supply



## ATTACHMENT B: Policy References

---

### **Regional Guidance on Park & Ride Siting and Sizing**

**Transportation Policy Plan** (Page 128): Future facilities should be surface lots rather than structured ramps where feasible, given the higher cost of structured parking. However, structured ramps are appropriate where land is expensive, or where a joint-use venture or transit-oriented development is possible.

**Regional Transitway Guideline 4.4** (Chapter 4 page 30): Where parking is identified as a need per Guideline 3.3, park-and-ride lots may be surface lots or multi-level structures. Surface lots are generally preferred for cost reasons, but the type, size, and footprint of the parking facility should be evaluated to achieve the best balance between available space, cost, and funding. As discussed in Guideline 3.3, the Metropolitan Council's Park-and-Ride Plan provides design guidance for park-and-ride lots; parking areas should be sized based on the market analysis methodology provided in Chapter 5 of the plan. In general, the amount of parking provided at stations is inverse to the density of surrounding land uses; i.e., less parking is provided at stations with higher surrounding population and employment densities.

**Regional Transitway Guideline 3.3** (Chapter 3 page 16): Park-and-ride demand for a station should be analyzed. According to Guideline 10.7., Transitway Travel Demand Forecasting, the regional travel demand forecast model is the preferred method for developing transitway travel demand forecasts; however, the methodology outlined in Section 5.3 of the Park-and-Ride Plan may be appropriate, especially for estimating park-and-ride demand at Highway BRT express or Commuter Rail stations.

**2030 Park-and-Ride Plan** (Chapter 5 page 83): Each site should have the following characteristics, though a deficiency on one criteria may not necessarily be a fatal flaw for continued project development:

- *Serving Lower-Density Areas with Less than Full Transit Service Coverage* Park-and-ride facilities are typically located in lower density developing areas, as designated in the Regional Development Framework. However, facilities may be implemented in more urbanized areas if they support or bolster (and do not undermine) existing walk-up express transit services. Park-and-rides are discouraged in center cities, except in rare or atypical circumstances.
- *Located on a Major Travel Corridor to a Major Regional Activity Center* Facilities should be located in areas with high levels of travel demand at major activity center(s). Currently, park-and-ride demand focuses on downtown Minneapolis, with additional demand to downtown St. Paul and the University of Minnesota.
- *Convenient Access to Regional Highway System* Facilities should be located within ½ mile of the nearest interchange (or intersection) accessing the regional highway system (usually principal arterial).
- *Convenient Vehicle Access* Facilities should be located to optimize vehicle travel (transit and personal) into and out of the facility. In addition, connections to external bicycle and pedestrian networks should be included as design elements to provide equivalent access.

## Phase 1: Station Area Planning

- *Minimum Capacity/ Anticipated Demand* Facilities should be sized to accommodate a minimum of three exclusive, peak-period, express bus trips. This translates to a need for at least 150 spaces, though specific sizes may depend on site factors and corridor service design. A small facility should not be located near a large facility, as increased service at the large facility will likely outcompete the smaller facility for nearby users.
- *Local Area Factors* There are three groups of local area factors that need to be acknowledged, considered and satisfied for local consent of a potential park-and-ride site: community or land use compatibility, environmental constraints and economic implications.

### **Draft 2040 Hennepin County Bicycle Transportation Plan** (page 46):

- Strategy 2.5: Work with transit partners early in the planning phase of corridor and station area planning to incorporate bicycle supportive facilities at key transit locations.
- Strategy 2.6 Work with major transit providers and local communities to provide direct bicycle connections to transit stops and stations, and increase secure bicycle parking and storage to meet demand.

### **Draft 2040 Hennepin County Bicycle Transportation Plan: Attachment F Bicycle Parking Standards** (page 8):

- Bike lockers are NOT recommended for urban or suburban settings. They may be appropriate in rural or exurban settings where demand for long term bike parking is limited to less than six spots.