

## Shaw, Jeremy (CPC)

---

**From:** Costa, Peter <pcosta@nelsonnygaard.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 26, 2016 3:42 PM  
**To:** Shaw, Jeremy (CPC)  
**Subject:** FW: Comments on CCSF Ocean Campus Parking Memorandum

[Here you go.](#)

**Pete Costa**  
Principal  
t 415.281.6939  
Nelson\Nygaard

---

**From:** Costa, Peter  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 11, 2016 4:00 PM  
**To:** 'Paine, Carli' <Carli.Paine@sfmta.com>  
**Cc:** Paz, Aliza <apaz@nelsonnygaard.com>; Cenizal, Calli <cenizal@nelsonnygaard.com>  
**Subject:** Comments on CCSF Ocean Campus Parking Memorandum

Carli –

The following are my comments on the CCSF – Ocean Campus Summary of Findings of Preliminary Parking Analysis (prepared by Sandis on September 9, 2016):

- The memo included assessing parking demand by CCSF Ocean Campus lot and the analysis provided hourly and peak parking demand by lot and the entire campus. Because campus parking is delineated by employees and students, the memo appendix includes the general fluctuation in parking demand by students and employees on an hourly basis.
- The parking demand numbers support N\N observations in the field and in the Existing Conditions Report.
- The analysis findings in the memo are very summarized and only focus on peak parking demand on the campus. Although there are no substantial issue with focusing solely on peak parking demand for estimating future parking supply/demand for CCSF Ocean Campus (to be conservative and present a “worst-case scenario”), I believe the missing piece of the memo is a clear understanding and breakdown in parking utilization by user (student, employee, visitor, etc.). The reader needs to continuously refer back to the appendix to get a better sense of parking utilization by specific lot (which can correspond to user) but perhaps a table (or few tables) in the memo would be useful. Also, the focus should be on the average daily utilization as well, not just peak.
- The projected parking demand by Year 2026 was based on the existing peak parking demand rate (number of enrolled students divided by parked vehicles at peak) and then applies this peak parking rate to the increase in enrollment in student population (25%) to achieve the estimated peak parking demand for Year 2026.
- The memo does not state if there would be any increase in employment for CCSF Ocean Campus and only focuses on increase in student population; this needs to be discussed.
- The peak parking demand rate is erroneous and should only consider the peak parking demand of students and the actual total number of students that arrived/departed at the campus during the same time as the parking survey. Using the actual number of students that arrived/departed that day would provide a much more accurate demand rate as opposed to just total enrollment. This would also capture a typical conditions, as student’s travel behaviors and choices they make are not static. Using the total enrollment numbers will likely result in overestimation in parking demand. We already know that not all of CCSF students at Ocean Campus (that is, all that are enrolled) do not drive and park on a daily basis. However, because this may be difficult to determine, at minimum, the peak parking demand rate should only focus on student parking demand at peak

relative to total enrollment and then apply this rate to the projected increase in student population. The memo uses the total peak parking demand which would also account for employees and visitors, so it's not an "apples-to-apples" approach. To be more specific, the memo included the peak parking demand of 2,309 spaces and then multiplied this demand by 25% to get the projected future parking demand of 2,886. The demand of 2,309 accounts for all users: employees and students. If the purpose of the analysis is to identify an estimated parking demand solely for students based on student enrollment, then they need to only use the parking demand associated with students, not both students and employees. As shown in the appendix, the student parking demand was roughly 1,447 vehicles at peak, so this should be included in the equation as opposed to 2,309.

- **Other factors need to be considered and thus adjustments need to be explored:** potential shifts in mode choice in the future, on-site or nearby housing for students, future number of employees, changes to parking pricing for employees/students (if applicable). At this point, there needs to be some adjustment factor to reduce the estimated demand and account for TDM. Our CCSF student survey results indicated that students are interested in shifting from driving to transit and/or biking as their primary means of transport to/from the campus.
- The memo methodology and findings lead me to think **there is an overestimation in future parking demand** and if CCSF builds more parking based on these findings, the campus could be over-parked. Adjustments need to be considered and designing for the average demand is generally a more appropriate approach; not peak. As I've stated, simply taking the peak parking demand number of all users and multiplying this value by 25% does not tell an accurate story. The over-parking of the campus has other externalities, such as increased costs associated with maintaining parking areas, induced vehicle demand, and perhaps precluding on-site space from being developed for other active uses that can provide more benefits to the student body and employees.

It is my understanding that these preliminary findings are subject to further review and revision. Therefore, my above comments may no longer apply in the future.

Thank you,

-Pete

**Peter Costa**  
Principal

**Nelson\Nygaard**  
116 New Montgomery St., Suite 500, San Francisco, CA 94105  
t 415.281.6939

pcosta@nelsonnygaard.com  
nelsonnygaard.com | Twitter | Facebook

Mobility | Accessibility | Sustainability