From Martin MacIntyre 2/13/12:
Questions with respect to the USF Draft IMP.
If the answers are in the IMP, then please just list the page rather than giving the answer. Please understand that due to the complexity of the problems and the overlaps in the IMP, the questions also overlap and may be repeated. This also happened when trying to group questions in categories like Parking and Enrollment by moving the questions generated from different sections of the IMP.

USF asked Fehr & Peers to review and respond questions regarding traffic issues. As noted above, some questions overlap so Fehr & Peers grouped selected questions into categories (Data Collection, Results, USF On-Street Parking Percentage). Some questions are answered individually and others are answered in their respective groups. Except for our adding numbers to help cross-reference, the questions are copied verbatim.

PARKING
1. How do you reconcile the differences in the figures cited below?

(a) Pg. 228 Chart 6.1 says “Golden Gate Avenue, between Parker Avenue and Central Avenue, has the highest occupancy rate.” Chart 6.2 has the existing on-street parking occupancy.

The Chart reference in the Transportation Study will be modified in the final draft to correctly indicate that the Figure shows on-street parking occupancy for specific segments.

(b) 15% of 3,670 available parking spaces within ½ mile = 550 spaces. Yet, the on-street occupancy of 55% of 1,670 estimated USF affiliated vehicles at peak use = 918 spaces or 25% of all spaces. Even so, 20% of the 3,670 spaces are not occupied throughout the day so the 918 USF affiliated vehicles are really 31% of the occupied spaces and not 18% as the numbers suggest, although only 15% is stated.

Please refer to response entitled “USF On-Street Parking Percentage” for more information on how the on-street percentage was calculated.

(c) P. 45 Parking Conditions and On-Street Parking
710 out of 860 campus parking spaces are for regular use.

As indicated in the footnote on the page, the other 150 parking spaces are special use spaces, such as handicap spaces or carpool spaces.

(d) Results: 45% of those who drive to campus use campus lots.

The average daily occupancy of campus lots was 56% but 93% between 11 am and noon

The percentage of faculty, staff & students who drive to campus and the percentage occupancy
of the on-campus lots are two different percentages and cannot be directly compared. These two sentences show that there is available on-campus parking for additional people who choose to drive, since some of the on-campus lots are not full and not all people who drive, park on-campus.

(e) Fig. 9. On-street parking occupancy out of 3,670 spaces within ½ mile of USF center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 am</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 am</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 3</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 pm</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 pm</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 pm</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 pm</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 80%, but where are the unoccupied spaces located?

Please see response under “Results”. As shown, on-street occupancy varies throughout the study area as was shown in Figure 6.3 of the Transportation Study.

(f) P. 48. Fig. 12

The On-Street Demand & Capacity graph (Figure 9) [actually Figure 12] shows that overall, USF affiliates occupy approximately 15% of overall parking spaces, throughout the day [and 18% on average of occupied spaces, throughout the day]. Residents occupy 35% of overall spaces and 44% of occupied spaces, on average, throughout the day. Other uses occupy 30% of overall spaces and 38% of occupied spaces, on average, throughout the day. The total parking demand from USF affiliates and study area residents falls well below the parking capacity of the area.

If this is “averaging throughout the day” from 7 am to 11 pm, then it doesn’t give a realistic measure of the impact on the residential neighborhoods, especially UT which is in the center of USF. In fact, the USF affiliate use of UT (BB) spaces is closer to averaging 95% throughout the day when the school is in session, which should be highlighted in the IMP, with proposed mitigation by USF, not by UTA.

Please refer to response under “USF On-Street Parking Percentage” for more information on how the on-street percentage was calculated. As shown in the “Results” section, parking is more occupied near the Campus; however, it is not 100% occupied. The Final Draft of the IMP will include language about USF’s support of UTA’s desire to revise the residential parking permit time limits in the BB area.

It would appear that the large study area was intended to underestimate the impact on closer neighborhoods by including a large number of spaces that are not available to USF affiliates (because they are occupied by residents with permits) or because they are located where USF affiliates don’t want to park (either too far to walk, too hilly or walking would take too much time to make moving the car impractical.

Please see response under “Results” and “Data Collection” in the previous portion of this document. As shown, on-street occupancy varies throughout the study area.
There was no mention of the two-hour time limits within the one-half mile survey area.

(g) Why not, since this is a major factor in commuting students not using parking ½ mile from the center of USF and using UT parking instead?

Please see response under “Data Collection”.

2. Why were the following issues re. commuting USF affiliates not mentioned or if they were, please cite the page(s)?

Travel time
Travel cost (gas, parking citations)
Parking availability
Time taken to find parking
Time restrictions on parking
Parking citation fees
The possibility of being towed
Actually being towed

Where are these data?

Please see response under “Data Collection”.

3. How many residents have experienced retaliation (vandalism and personal confrontations) that is proximate to, and therefore likely to have been caused by, a parking citation? Did the consultant address this problem?

Is there a place where retaliation incidents are recorded? Why not?

Vandalism and other such behaviors are law enforcement issues, not transportation issues, and thus were outside of the scope of the traffic studies. Any record of such incidences is recorded in SFPD and USF Public Safety records. Occurrences must be reported to SFPD and/or USFPS for a report to be recorded.

4. Parking surveys:

   Where are the data?
   When were they collected?
   How were they collected?

Was data collected on different days to corroborate the results? For example, during vacation periods vs. peaks school time to see the difference?

Was data collected on dorm student parking? If not, why not? Dorm students aren’t commuters but they are major parking space occupiers.

Please see response under “Data Collection”.

5. (a) Were the following factors considered when analyzing the occupied and unoccupied spaces and who was occupying them?
- parking time limits.
- walking time, i.e., distance from the center of campus.
- topography (hills)
- willingness of USF affiliate drivers to walk.
- time available before a parking ticket might be issued.
- desirability of the parking location.

Where in the IMP or study reports are each one of these factors addressed?
Please see response under “Data Collection”.

(b)How reliable is the parking occupancy data used in the IMP?
Please see response under “Data Collection”.

(c) How does this transportation study differ from prior transportation studies and where is the discussion of the differences in method and results, if any?

Both the 2004 and 2012 IMP transportation studies were prepared using the requirements set forth in the San Francisco Guidelines for Transportation Impact Assessment. Thus, both analyze transportation conditions, including traffic, transit, bicycling, walking, parking, and loading, within the same study area boundary around the university.

One key difference between the two studies; however, was the development of trip generation rates for the growth in enrollment expected during the lifespan of the IMP. The 2004 study based rates on the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ trip generation rates for universities. These rates are based off a national surveys and do not necessarily reflect the conditions in San Francisco. The 2012 study based its trip generation forecasts on a much more robust data collection effort on the campus, including a comprehensive transportation survey administered to the students, staff and faculty at USF.

Since both the 2004 and 2012 transportation studies use the same parking area boundary, the results of the two studies can be compared. As noted in the Draft IMP and in the 2004 IMP, on-street parking around the university is typically over 80% occupied earlier in the morning and in the afternoon. The 2004 study did not do a daily parking survey, therefore, the previous analysis did not show the mid-day and mid-morning peak in parking occupancy that was identified in the Draft IMP. Both the 2004 IMP and the 2012 Draft IMP show on-campus parking lots to be nearly fully occupied.

Additionally, the 2012 study incorporates a more robust transportation demand management (TDM) analysis. Since the 2004 study was prepared, industry research on the effectiveness of various TDM strategies has grown, and the 2012 study forecasts the effectiveness of the proposed TDM elements more accurately. Consistent with the 2004 study, the 2012 study analyzes unmitigated transportation conditions (i.e., transportation conditions and traffic growth without a more robust TDM program), then identify the appropriate TDM strategies that USF would use to address growth in traffic near the campus. However, the 2012 study is able to suggest a likely reduction in parking demand as a result of increased TDM programs on the campus.
Finally, both the 2004 and 2012 studies conclude that their respective IMPs would not generate significant transportation impacts according to the standards defined by the City & County of San Francisco.

(d) On what basis was the ½ mile distance selected?
For example, the BB area is in the center of the USF campuses and only a few minutes walking distance from any USF destination. This allows drivers to go back to their cars and check the tires in hope of getting four or more hours of free parking or moving their cars to another BB place by driving around, or having a friend save a parking place for them. Was this considered and discussed? If so where, if not, why not?
Please see response under “Data Collection”.

6. (a) Why isn’t there an explanation for the high occupancy on the south side of Golden Gate between Parker and Masonic? Why isn’t there a history of this prime parking area, such as, why there is no time limit (at the request of USF when the L permit area was established) or the favorable street sweeping times?
Please see response under “Results”.

(b) Was separate data collected on the 500 no-time-limit USF boundary parking spaces? If not, why not?
Please see response under “Results”.

(c) Where is there a discussion of the lack of restriction on dorm students garaging their cars on the boundaries of USF where there is unrestricted parking 24/7 except for street cleaning once a week and that street cleaning times are from 6-7 am so the dorm students can move and re-park their cars before the commuting students arrive?
Please see response under “On-Street Parking Percentage”.

street unrestricted parking spaces that should be available to daily commuting students? A 500 car garage would cost millions of dollars when this coverage is already available on the street if dorm student parking were restricted simply by having a 3 or 4 hour time limit.

This question is shown verbatim, as received in the email from Mr. MacIntyre. We cannot discern its meaning.

Why is there no mention of USF’s stated support for restricting dorm student parking by telling them to not bring cars to the campus but not asking to have a time limit on USF boundary on-street parking? Why isn’t there a proposal for a time limit for on-street parking on USF boundaries which would make them available for commuting students?

USF on-campus residents are not permitted to have cars on-campus unless for extraordinary cases; however, the University cannot control students who personally choose to bring a car with them and deal with existing parking restrictions. As shown in Table 1, parking closest to the University is only 60% occupied at midnight, and there is no objective information available to determine whether these vehicles are dorm students or other San Francisco residents that park their vehicles near the campus overnight because of more limited parking in other nearby residential areas (e.g., As shown in Table 1, on-street parking in subarea 4 is over 90% occupied
during the evening hours). As mentioned previously, the City is considering parking meters in the vicinity of USF; concerns about that program must be addressed to the City.

7. Why wasn’t there a mention or discussion of the frequency, or lack thereof for enforcement of parking restrictions?
   Please see response under “Data Collection”.

8. Why is there no mention that a recent survey of UTA members that indicated 2/3rds favored a further restriction from the already restrictive 2-hr limit?
   As mentioned in the most recent UTA traffic committee meeting, the University is working with UTA and SFMTA to establish a one-hour limit in the BB residential parking permit area.
   The advantages of reducing the parking time limit for non-BB permitted vehicles on UT streets will be mentioned in the final draft of the IMP and Transportation study.

9. Chart 6.3
   (a) It is very difficult to distinguish the dark blue (95-100% occupancy) from the lighter blue (80-95% occupancy). Which category is Temescal Terrace where I live? If it is in the 80-95% category then the data collection methods is inaccurate or doesn’t represent actual conditions. Please see response under “Results”.
   (b) Where is there a distinction between areas where the residences have garages and single-family units vs. those with multiple units with insufficient garage space for residents to park? This might show the locations where residents are parking vs. where USF affiliates are parking.
   Please see response under “Results”.

10. Ref. Page 231
   (a) Does the total campus population of 11,000 include Fromm, Koret and other regular populations and irregular populations (special events) that also constitute USF affiliates?
   Please see response under “On-Street Parking Percentage”.
   (b) Were the collected data compared with prior from prior IMPs and studies and which ones were actual counts vs. estimates based on comparable data from other sources? That is, they did the consultants go around the neighborhood and identify the cars based on their license plates (for location) or how long they stayed in one location? How did they arrive at the 15% occupancy rate?
   That is, were the numbers of drivers and percent of spaces occupied only based on mathematical projections or from actual countings?
   Please see response under “On-Street Parking Percentage”.
   (c) Where is the parking occupancy data collection method discussed?
   Please see response under “Data Collection”.
It is stated at numerous points in the IMP that the “overall” on-street parking space occupancy are: 15% by USF affiliates. Why isn’t a number given for “percent of occupied spaces as it is for residents and other uses as it is for residents and “other users”?

(d) Is it true that 20% of all on-street parking spaces are unoccupied, on average throughout the day? If so, where are these unoccupied spaces located and why are they unoccupied?

Is it because there are no more USF affiliated drivers needing these spaces?

Is it because these spaces are undesirable, which is why they are unoccupied and why drivers prefer to circle around for spaces in UT rather than use the large number of unoccupied spaces?

Please see response under “Results”.

(e) What are “other uses” and how were they determined?

Please see response under “On-Street Parking Percentage”.

(f) How were USF affiliates identified vs. residents and other uses?

Please see response under “On-Street Parking Percentage”.

(g) What is the meaning or the usefulness of the phrase “on average, throughout the day” in respect to the parking problem for UT affiliates and for USF affiliates, which are opposite sides of the same parking coin?

Please see response under “Results”.

(h) What are the time parameters for “throughout the day”?

Please see response under “Results”.

If the USF consultants intended to accurately count the numbers of USF affiliate parking, then (i) Why didn’t they do a direct count of day and night parking occupancy (or even easier, unoccupied spaces) during long vacation periods (e.g., Christmas) when there are no other USF events and the students are gone, including dorm students?

Please see response under “On-Street Parking Percentage”.

By subtraction, the remaining cars would either be residents + “other uses” or USF employees (the number of which is known). It would also show where the students are parking and where the residents and other users are parking. That would give the non-USF parking space occupancy a realistic number and location, leaving all the remaining parking occupancy and location as USF affiliate usage.

Based on my visual observation during vacation periods and weekends, the parking occupancy of residents and other users vs. USF affiliates would be the reverse of what is stated in the IMP i.e., 15% non-USF affiliates vs. 75% by USF affiliates.
Any UT resident can tell you what parking space occupancy is like both day and night, especially the spaces bordering USF and especially at night time when there are no classes or activities. This suggested data collection would have clearly demonstrated that dorm students who don’t leave the campus at night are storing their cars 24/7 so they can commute to their distant homes on the weekends and especially on holidays. It is only when the data is accurate that a problem can be analyzed and an appropriate solution proposed.

In fifteen minutes by driving around on the last Sunday morning I developed the following information:

[On Sunday morning, Feb.12, 2012, at 8:30 am, I drove around almost the entire USF boundary to count the number of unoccupied on-street parking spaces out of the 500 available. The total was less than 30. The location of these few unoccupied spaces and common sense tell us who is occupying the 470 spaces?]

On the USF GG side there were three unoccupied spaces and they were between Chabot and Temescal Terrace, the furthest from any dorm. Only 15 of the 43 spaces in the time limit BB area across the street were unoccupied and those 28 cars certainly didn’t belong to UT residents. Only three of the spaces on Parker between Turk and Fulton were unoccupied, which means that people attending St. Ignatius on Sunday would have to park in the BB area or try to find one of the 3 unoccupied spaces on Parker between Turk and Lone Mountain. On Parker from Lone Mountain to Anza there were 8 unoccupied spaces, probably because USF affiliates don’t like to climb hills. On Anza between Parker and Masonic there were 5 unoccupied spaces, all of which were near to Parker, i.e., the furthest walk from the Anza dorms. On Turk, between Masonic and Parker, there were 5 unoccupied spaces, all located near to Temescal, the furthest from dorms. There weren’t any unoccupied spaces on Turk between Stanyan and Parker and I didn’t check Stanyan between McAllister and Turk but it looked full. If the traffic and parking consultants had done a simple survey like this one, they would have had to conclude, as UT residents have concluded, that the occupied spaces on the USF boundaries are cars of USF dorm students and that these prime spaces are not available to commuters coming to USF. They amount to 500 spaces that could be freed for commuters without building a parking garage and 20% of them could easily eliminated to increase traffic safety on Turk, Golden Gate and UT streets. On Sunday midnight all the spaces were filled between Chabot and Temescal which I explain as the weekend dorm students returning since there are no classes or event at that time of night on a Sunday.]

If these spaces are being occupied by dorm students who don’t commute to USF on a daily basis, then their need to have a car to go home on the weekend or holidays could be accommodated by rental cars and Zip cars parked at off-campus locations or airplanes and trains like the other dorm student use.

(j) Did the consultants interview the dorm student?

The University administered a transportation survey to students, faculty, and staff, as well as local residents. The survey received over 1,000 responses, including 151 respondents from “on-campus” residents. The survey received responses from 982 USF faculty, staff, and students.

(11) Landscaping, especially borders. What about the parking lot on the South side of Golden Gate? Where is the plan for resolving this?
We cannot discern from the question which of the five parking lots on Golden Gate Avenue is being referenced. Potential projects for the campus are listed on pages 71 – 78 of the Draft IMP.

The comments contained in the parking section of Mr. MacIntyre's letter contain the following questions:

**Data Collection**

(1b) There was no mention of the two-hour time limits within the one-half mile survey area. Why not, since this is a major factor in commuting students not using parking ½ mile from the center of USF and using UT parking instead?

(2a) Why were the following issues RE commuting USF affiliates not mentioned or if they were, please cite the page(s)? Travel time, Travel cost (gas, parking citations); Parking availability; Time taken to find parking; Time restrictions on parking; Parking citation fees; The possibility of being towed; Actually being towed. Where are these data?

(4) Parking Surveys: Where are the data? When were they collected? How were they collected? Was data collected on different days to corroborate the results? For example, during vacation periods vs peaks school time to see the difference? Was data collected on dorm parking? If not, why not?

(5a) Were the following factors considered when analyzing the occupied and unoccupied spaces and who was occupying them? 1. Parking time limits; 2. Walking time, i.e., distance from the center of campus. 3. Topography (hills). 4. Willingness of USF affiliate drivers to walk. 5. Time available before a parking ticket might be issued. 6. Desirability of the parking location. Where in the IMP or study reports are each one of these factors addressed?

(5b) How reliable is the parking occupancy data used in the IMP?

(5d) On what basis was the ½ mile distance selected? Was [parking in the BB area] considered and discussed? If so where, if not, why not?

(6b) Was separate data collected on the 500 no-time-limit USF boundary parking spaces? If not, why not?

(7a) Why wasn’t there a mention or discussion of the frequency, or lack thereof for enforcement of parking restrictions

(10c) Where is the parking occupancy data collection method discussed?

As identified on page 45 of the IMP and on the page 74 of the attached transportation impact study, parking supply and occupancy surveys were conducted on each street within an approximately ½ walking distance from the campus. The parking study area, shown on Figure 6.1 of the transportation impact study, was bound generally by Geary Boulevard to the north, Central Avenue to the east, Fell Street and Golden Gate Park to the south, and Arguello Boulevard to the west. Surveys were collected on March 24, March 31, and April 19, 2011 and are included in Appendix D of the transportation impact study. This study area is inclusive of the entire BB residential parking permit area and the entire L residential parking permit area except for one L permit block north of Geary and one L permit block west of Arguello. Except for block faces
around the USF campus and the St. Mary's Campus, parking is generally restricted to 2-hours except for those with residential parking permits.

The parking surveys were collected within a ½ mile radius to represent parking conditions in an area within reasonable walking distance to the Campus and to be consistent with the San Francisco Planning Department's parking evaluation methodology. The San Francisco Planning Department's methodology is contained in the San Francisco Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review (October, 2002), which states that parking should typically be evaluated within a two-block radius of a project site and special considerations should be made when a large parking generator, like an educational institution, is in the area. Except for Fell Street, every block in the parking study area is within two blocks of the Campus edge. Additionally, Campus transportation surveys indicate that most of those who drive to campus and park on the street find parking within three blocks of the campus.

The parking area captures drivers who might look for less-convenient, but less-restricted parking, as well as those less willing to walk, willing to spend more time looking for parking, and more willing to move their car for applicable time restrictions. Issues like the likelihood of someone receiving a parking ticket for parking longer than a posted restriction, being towed, or time spent searching for parking were not reviewed because they change overtime and can fluctuate depending on the availability of parking. These factors also depend on personal preference and cannot easily be quantified objectively. Furthermore, the ability of parking restrictions to be enforced is controlled by SFMTA and not the University.

The parking surveys were conducted in-person by counting the total parking spaces available on each roadway segment, then counting the number of parked vehicles on each roadway segment for each hour between 7:00 AM and midnight. Because the data was collected by roadway segment, the data could be aggregated by block or subarea to determine if a particular area had a more constrained (i.e., more occupied) parking supply throughout a typical day. Data was not collected between midnight at 7:00 AM because parking restrictions are typically not in effect and parking occupancy changes less frequently from one hour to the next because, typically, residents are sleeping. For example, conditions at midnight and at 7:00 AM can be used as proxy for what parking occupancy is at 3:00 AM.

The data was also collected such that it reflected typical conditions in the study area when school is in session and parking supply is most constrained. As a result, the analysis could focus on what the effect of enrollment changes on the Campus would do to parking when it is in most short supply, and the study could inform decisions regarding transportation demand management tools to reduce parking demand and improve parking strategies (e.g., restructuring on-campus permits to manage demand or building a new garage).

Results

(1a) How do you reconcile the differences in the figures cited below?

15% of 3,670 available parking spaces within ½ mile = 550 spaces. Yet, the on-street occupancy of 55% of 1,670 estimated USF affiliated vehicles at peak use = 918 spaces or 25% of all spaces. Even so, 20% of the 3,670 spaces are not occupied throughout the day so the 918 USF affiliated vehicles are really 31% of the occupied spaces and not 18% as the numbers suggest, although only 15% is stated.

15% of 3,670 = 550 spaces yet the on-street occupancy of 55% of 1,670 estimated USF affiliated vehicles at peak use = 918 spaces or 25% of all spaces. However, 20% of the 3,670 spaces are not occupied so the 918 USF affiliated vehicles are really 31% of the occupied spaces and not 18% as the numbers indicate although only 15% is stated.
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(6a) Why isn't there an explanation for the high occupancy on the south side of Golden Gate between Parker and Masonic? Why isn’t there a history of this prime parking area, such as, why there is no time limit (at the request of USF when the L permit area was established) or the favorable street sweeping times?

(9a) [What is the occupancy of] Temescal Terrace where I live?

(9b) Where is there a distinction between areas where the residences have garages and single-family units vs. those with multiple units with insufficient garage space for residents to park?

(10d) Is it true that 20% of all on-street parking spaces are unoccupied, on average throughout the day? If so, where are these unoccupied spaces located and why are they unoccupied? Is it because there are no more USF affiliated drivers needing these spaces? Is it because these spaces are undesirable, which is why they are unoccupied and why drivers prefer to circle around for spaces in UT rather than use the large number of unoccupied spaces? Is it because there are no more USF affiliated drivers needing these spaces? Is it because these spaces are undesirable, which is why they are unoccupied and why drivers prefer to circle around for spaces in UT rather than use the large number of unoccupied spaces?

(10g) What is the meaning or the usefulness of the phrase “on average, throughout the day” in respect to the parking problem for UT affiliates and for USF affiliates, which are opposite sides of the same parking coin?

(10h) What are the time parameters for “throughout the day”? Pages 45 and 48 of the Draft IMP and pages 74 through 78 of the draft transportation impact study discuss the supply and occupancy of on-campus and on-street parking within the parking study area. As discussed on page 74 and shown on Figure 6.1 of the draft transportation impact study, the University maintains 860 parking spaces on-campus, inclusive of 150 spaces reserved for required disabled, motorcycle, carpool, carshare, and reserved parking spots. As shown in Figure 6.1, the on-campus parking occupancy ranges from 50% occupancy at the School of Education parking lot to full capacity (i.e., 100% occupancy) at the other garages on the campus with one exception – the Koret parking garage.

As shown in Chart 6.1 of the draft transportation impact study, on street parking in the study area ranges from approximately 73% occupancy at 7:00 AM to 83% occupied at 10:00AM. Figure 6.3 summarizes the peak hour occupancy of each roadway segment in the study area. As shown, even when area wide parking is most constrained (i.e., most occupied), some streets, including Fulton Street, Rossi Avenue, and Ewing Terrace have available parking. In fact, many of the blocks to the west of the Campus, including Beaumont, Willard, Edward, and Arguello have parking occupancy under 80%. However, as noted, the blocks nearest to the Campus, including Golden Gate, Rosyln Terrace, and Annapolis Terrace, are 100% occupied at the peak time of day for the area.

The parking survey data contained in Appendix D of the draft transportation impact study could be aggregated to identify the peak occupancy and peak times of day for subareas and individual streets. For example, parking on Temescal Terrace is 100% occupied at 9:00 AM, 91% occupied at 10:00 AM, and 27% occupied at 11:00 PM. Table 1 summarizes parking occupancy for each subarea shown in Figure 1 throughout the day. As shown, Subarea 3’s approximately 1,076 spaces are most occupied throughout the day, ranging from about 60% occupied at midnight to about 93% occupied at 10:00 AM.
The parking occupancy data were then used to evaluate whether the availability of parking within the parking study area would be affected by enrollment changes on the USF campus on a typical day. As discussed on page 113 of the Draft IMP, enrollment growth for the 10-year plan would increase parking demand by approximately 225 parking spaces. This parking demand would be accommodated by restructuring the on-campus parking permit system and through the other transportation demand management programs described on page 96 of the Draft IMP.