

# Wayzata Boulevard Corridor Study

## RFP Questions and Answers

Posted on March 29, 2022

**Question:** Budget/Cost: \$128,800 is identified in the 2022 budget. Will additional funds be secured in 2023 or are there any other partners contributing?

**Answer:** The City's 2022 CIP budgets \$128,800 for this project; however, a portion of that budget will also be utilized to fund work provided by the "City Architect" Van Meter Williams Pollack. That is budgeted at approximately \$43,000. City staff would also prefer to leave a modest contingency of \$5,000-10,000 for unexpected costs. This allocated approximately \$75,800 for the work associated with this RFP. At this time, the City does not anticipate that additional funding will be provided in 2023. Some zoning implementation work or immediate safety improvements that are recommended during this study could possibly be included in the CIP for 2023 or 2024.

**Question:** How will Hennepin County be involved regarding recommendations/analysis with 101?

**Answer:** This project will require consistent collaboration with Hennepin County both at this current stage of planning, in discussions about immediate safety improvements, and eventually for final design and construction of their portion of the roadway in 2030-2035. It is not the intent of this project to create final designs for a reconstructed roadway, but potential options (access management, pedestrian connections/crossings, streetscape) that can be considered, in the future, by both the City and the County in order to meet the goals of the community. It is expected that the several meetings with the County staff will occur throughout this study.

**Question:** I was in Wayzata and noticed the large TimCo development built on the south side of Wayzata Boulevard east of Central Avenue (1020 Wayzata Blvd). How has recent development along the corridor been managed, knowing that this effort is about to start? How will this process connect to new development/inquiries during its development?

**Answer:** The project under construction at 1020 Wayzata Blvd is a medical office building that met all current zoning requirements, but required formal Design Review. The most recent development has been managed mainly through the newly adopted design standards and the existing zoning standards for the properties. There are differing views in the community about this building. Some like that it is close to the street with parking in the rear yard, which is consistent with guidance in the Comprehensive Plan and promotes walkability. Others feel it's too close to the street, too tall, and is disjointed from other nearby development. Those owners/developers making new development inquiries with the City will be advised that this Corridor Study is currently underway. The results of the study may affect the specific zoning regulations for their property.

**Question:** How will the entire Council, Planning Commission and Housing & Redevelopment Authority be involved or just a subset?

**Answer:** This Corridor Study Committee will include all members of the City Council, Planning Commission, Housing & Redevelopment Authority, and City staff.

**Question:** Initially we had determined a PM that is a transportation planner to lead the effort. With the language about land use in there, I am wondering about whether or not you think it would be more appropriate for a land use planner to PM. This question is mainly driven by the language in the RFP regarding a Small Area Plan (“Create a Small Area Plan that studies the existing developments, identifies properties likely to redevelop, and creates a cohesive land use and development plan for the area guided in the 2040 Land Use Plan for Mixed-Use Commercial/Residential”). Is this still a secondary effort to support the main goals of the project related to improving safety and design of the corridor?

**Answer:** Both topics are important to this study and so the decision can be left to each proposer. The land use planner really needs to speak the language of transportation and understand importance. Once the planned land use and density is confirmed, then transportation, safety, connections will lead the remaining of the process. The transportation needs are driven by the land use intensity of the corridor, but that doesn’t make it secondary. If a land use planner leads the process, this professional should strongly understand transportation, especially multijurisdictional corridors.

**Question:** Do you have a budget for the project, and if so what is it?

**Answer:** This is addressed in the answer on page one of this document.

**Question:** We will be providing graphics addressing, perhaps, new design standards relating to changes in building massing, building height and potentially land use. Will our team be required to provide final product graphics that would fit into your adopted design guidelines or will the city’s architecture firm take our renderings and bring them into consistency with design guidelines document. In other words, we are trying to understand the level of detail needed for the renderings provided as part of our project versus what the City would like for their final design guidelines document.

**Answer:** It is anticipated that the “City Architect” will review the documents to provide comments on how consistency in the design guidelines can be achieved. It would then be the selected consultant’s responsibility to make necessary updates. The level of detail needed in renderings has not yet been discussed by staff, so staff looks to each proposer’s guidance on what level of detail is recommended for maximum effectiveness.

**Question:** Is there a budget fee range for the scope of services described under item k. page 6?

**Answer:** This is addressed in the answer on page one of this document.

**Question:** It is understood that COVID policies need to be constantly reviewed and amended to reflect the latest data and guidance from the CDC and the Minnesota Department of Health. However, in many cases, local governments are given a certain amount of leeway when determining policies. Therefore, does the City of Wayzata have a specific definition for what is "COVID-friendly" in terms of public engagement as noted under k.v. on page 7?

**Answer:** Since the statewide state of emergency was lifted in summer 2021, the City has been conducting in-person meetings at City Hall. A few ad-hoc committees and task forces have been meeting virtual; however, the Corridor Study Committee will need to meet entirely in-person to comply with the Minnesota Open Meeting Law. Any open houses should be planned in-person unless a statewide state of emergency is enacted again. The City has required the use of masks in the past, but currently does not based on the current COVID case rate. The City supports to use of online engagement tools like surveys, but expects that the primary format for community

engagement includes in-person meetings. Some staff meetings could be virtual for convenience now and for safety if the case rate rises again.

**Question:** Re:p2; the Objective of the RFP is to prepare a ..."a cohesive long-term plan for the future" ...and refers to a ..."reconsideration of the physical configuration and potential for future improvement (p3 e. Collaborative Study). So beyond demolishing everything and starting over, how has the city staff and leaders discussed this approach? The Comp Plan identifies most (if not all) of the commercial properties in the corridor (mostly east of Central) as areas for redevelopment...is this a realistic goal of the comp plan and why?

**Answer:** It is realistic that Wayzata Boulevard will experience the redevelopment highlighted in the Comprehensive Plan by 2040. The demand for urban-style living within a small lakeside town is strong. Real estate investment continues to occur at a fast pace in Wayzata. The majority of Lake Street is now redeveloped. The single family neighborhoods are stable and the priority is to preserve them, same for the big woods, and the bigger public and private institutions (Wayzata Middle School West, Churches, etc.). This leaves the community with just commercial properties that could be ripe for redevelopment because:

- Blighted buildings
- Lack of investment in some properties along the corridor
- Not pedestrian oriented
- Challenged access
- Not the right use
- Strong demand for multi-family housing in the market
- Strong commercial base to continue attracting businesses

This is where the zoning portion of this work becomes really important. Each of these commercial properties has an outsized impact on the corridor. A good zoning district will guide each property so that as they develop one-by-one, and not within our control, they continue to function within the existing corridor while also fitting in with what the corridor will look like in 10, 20, 30 years. We're asking these redevelopments to do a lot, the study will help tell us what *exactly* we need them to do.

**Question:** Under item C.a. on page 8, can you restate more clearly what the make-up of the Corridor Study Committee will be?

**Answer:** This is addressed in the answer on page one of this document.

**Question:** Re: p. 8: C. Corridor Study Committee - This group is mentioned as meeting several times during the process; so would that be a full meeting of all the bodies/boards listed? Would these meetings then also be advertised as official meetings of the City Council? So how many meetings for this group and then how many meetings are expected with the Core Project Team?

**Answer:** This is partially addressed in the answer on page one of this document. Proposers should recommend how many times the Corridor Study Committee should meet and why those milestones are important checkpoints with the Committee. They would not be advertised as official meetings of the City Council, but would be noticed as public meetings of the Corridor Study Committee. The City will be asking that two Council Members be appointed as the Committee Co-Chairs. It is very likely that the Co-Chairs will be invited to attend some Core Project Team meetings. Core Project Team meetings will likely occur on a bi-weekly basis for 30 minutes, but City staff is open to what proposers think is the correct cadence for regular check-in meetings. There could be points in the project schedule where weekly Core Project Team meetings are most appropriate.

**Question:** Under the Milestones column in the Project Timeline table on Page 9, is it assumed that the presentation of any findings and subsequent recommendations would go before the City Council prior to them going before other stakeholders?

**Answer:** City staff is open to what proposers recommend. It will not be a requirement that the City Council review the materials prior to being reviewed by other stakeholders. The exact order that this occurs in would likely be solidified during Core Project Team meetings if not already solidified in the selected proposal.

**Question:** How do you square the expected function of A-Relievers and Expanders (street classifications from the Comp Plan) with the goal of walkability and connectivity? The comp plan anticipates Wayzata Blvd and Central Ave to remain 4 lane divided and undivided facilities; does the Comp Plan guidance outweigh the results of this study?

**Answer:** That will be the challenge. These segments function as minor arterials, but need to provide safe access and connectivity to the neighborhoods and service district. The reconstruction of Bushaway Road (101 S) is a great example of context sensitive design, where transportation needs (traffic volumes) were balanced with walkability, connectivity, tree preservation, and safety. I think the objectives of walkability and connectivity can still be met while meeting traffic demands. But we need this study to help us get there.

**Question:** How does recent investments (MOB and a Caribou Coffee/restaurant) fulfill the city's goals and expectations for the corridor?

**Answer:** The purpose of the study will be to more clearly articulate the community's goals for this corridor, so it is difficult to say how these projects fulfill those goals. MOB stands for the Davis Medical Office Building located at 1020 Wayzata Blvd (also noted in a previous answer in this document) and the Caribou Coffee/restaurant proposal is currently under review at 1022 Wayzata Blvd. These projects (mostly) meet the current design standards, but the City wants to advance the walkability, safety, traffic flow, etc. of the corridor. The Planning Commission recently noted that drive-through food and beverage establishments may not be a good fit for the majority of this corridor long-term.

**Question:** At the top of page 10, it states that the proposal shall be no more than 20 pages. Does this mean a maximum of 20 faces of content? Or, is the intention to mean 20 pages, 40 faces, if the submission were to be printed with content allowable on both sides of each page?

**Answer:** Maximum of 20 faces of content.

**Question:** Can the proposal pages be 11 x 17?

**Answer:** The pages should be 8.5 x 11.

**Question:** Will front and back covers, table of contents, and tabs count towards the 20 page maximum?

**Answer:** The front and back covers will be counted toward the allowed 20 page maximum.