TJKM
Transportation Consultants

Vision That Moves Your Community

July 8, 2009

Megan E. Fisher
City of Menlo Park
701 Laurel Street
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Subject: 1300 El Camino Real Parking Study: Results and Findings

Dear Megan:

TJKM Transportation Consultants is pleased to provide results and findings for the above referenced study. The purpose of this study is to determine an appropriate parking supply that is expected to adequately serve the parking demand for the proposed 1300 El Camino Real Project located in Menlo Park, California.

The proposed project consists of a grocery store/market and non-medical offices. The study evaluates the potential parking demand of the proposed project and three alternatives. The alternatives are:

1. Proposed Project: 51,365 square feet (sq. ft.) of a grocery store/market or retail and 58,700 sq. ft. of non-medical offices. The proposal includes approximately 422 parking spaces.
2. Option I: includes a smaller market at 15,000 sq. ft., 5,865 sq. ft. restaurant space, 5,500 sq. ft. retail and a 25,000 sq. ft. health and fitness complex.
3. Option II: the health and fitness complex would be retained (25,000 sq. ft.) while the retail/restaurant space would be enlarged (26,365 sq. ft.) and absorb the grocery/market use.
4. EIR Alternative: 14,000 sq. ft. restaurant space, 8,895 sq. ft. retail, 58,700 sq. ft. office building and 36 two-bedroom units. It would include approximately 415 parking stalls.

This is summarized in Table I.

Table I: Land Use Alternatives for the Proposed Project

	Grocery Store	*Non-Medical Office*	*Restaurant*	*Retail*	*Health/ Fitness*	*Housing Units*	*Total Square Feet*
Proposed Project	51,365	58,700					110,065
Option I	15,000	58,700	5,865	5,500	25,000		110,065
Option II		58,700	16,365	10,000	25,000		110,065
EIR Alternative		58,700	14,000	8,895		36	122,040

Note: An alternate land use for the Proposed Project is retail instead of grocery store.

Pleasanton
3875 Hopyard Road
Suite 200
Pleasanton, CA
94588-8526
925.463.0611
925.463.3690 fax

Fresno
516 W. Shaw Avenue
Suite 200
Fresno, CA
93704-2515
559.325.7530
559.221.4940 fax

Sacramento
980 Ninth Street
16th Floor
Sacramento, CA
95814-2736
916.449.9095

Santa Rosa
1400 N. Dutton Avenue
Suite 21
Santa Rosa, CA
95401-4643
707.575.5800
707.575.5888 fax

tjkm@tjkm.com
www.tjkm.com

Parking Analysis
The study evaluates the parking needs of the site for the four land use alternatives using the following approaches:

- Pre-existing zoning district parking requirements
- Menlo Park use-based guidelines for parking
- ITE parking standards
- Parking requirements of nearby cities
- Local land use parking utilization surveys

Menlo Park has parking requirements for the underlying zoning at the rate of 6 stalls per thousand square feet. The 6 stalls per thousand square feet of development standard yields a total requirement of 661 stalls for the primary project.

Comparison of Parking Demand Estimates
TJKM evaluated the parking demand of the four land use alternatives using the administrative guidelines, ITE parking rates and parking rates of nearby cities. Menlo Park has parking policy guidelines for individual land uses described in the City Council approved May 10, 2005 administrative parking review report.

Parking Generation, a 2003 publication of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) provides peak parking demand measured for various land uses. This report tends to be more up to date than the parking ordinances of many cities and is the best available reference to estimate the parking demand that will be created by future uses. TJKM utilized the recommendations of this document in developing the parking supply required to satisfy the four alternative land use arrangements being tested.

TJKM also compared the parking requirements with those of five nearby cities: Redwood City, Palo Alto, Mountain View, Cupertino and Burlingame. The parking demand estimated for the five cities showed a range of parking rates.

The parking rates for the six cities are shown in Table II and the ITE rates are shown in Table III. As indicated in the ITE Parking Generation report, in general it is important to consider the ranges of data presented in the report. The report presented 33rd and 85th percentile as well as average values for each land use in order to frame the variation in parking ratios and for determining appropriate parking ratios from the data set. An ITE committee as well as Shared Parking report has recommended that for the most part the 85th percentile is an appropriate design standard.

Table IV showed the median of the parking demand based on the parking demand rates of the five cities.

Table II: Parking Rates at Six Cities

	Grocery Store	*Non-Medical Office*	*Restaurant*	*Retail*	*Health / Fitness*	*Residential*
Menlo Park	5	3.3	6.0	5	5	2
Burlingame	2.5	3.3	5	2.5	5	2 per 2 bedroom unit
Cupertino	4	3.5	1/3 seats or 1/250 sq. ft. whichever is more (d)	4	8.3 (b)	2 DU (multi-family)
Mountain View	4	3.3	10 (see note A)	5.6	5	2 spaces per unit, 1 space shall be covered
Palo Alto	2.9	4	1 space for each 60 gross sq. ft. of public service area, plus 1 space for each 200 gross sq. ft. for all other areas .	5	1 per 4 persons (b)	2 per 2 bedroom unit
Redwood City	5	4	One (1) space for each three (3) seats.	4	8.3 (b)	2 spaces per unit

Notes: Units: 1 space per 1,000 square feet as shown or as stated
Note A: 1space for each 2.5 seats or 1 space for each 100 sq. ft. of gross floor area, whichever is greater
(b) Based on ITE; used for Palo Alto since person data not available.
(c) Menlo Park rates based on City Council Policy for Administrative Review of Parking Reduction, May 10, 2005
(d) Assumed 20 square feet per patron seating area.

Table III: ITE Parking Rates

	Grocery Store	*Non-Medical Office*	*Restaurant*	*Retail*	*Health/Fitness*	*Residential*
ITE Parking Code	(850)	(701)	(932)	(820)	(492)	(230)
ITE (per 1,000 sq. ft.)	4.36	2.97	6.37	4.36	7.62	1.68 (du)
- per 100's sq. ft. [A]	229	337	157	229	131	

Notes: [A]1 space required per square feet as shown

Using the rates as shown in Table II and III, the results of the parking analysis are summarized in Table IV. Since the ITE rates for grocery store and retail are similar, the potential parking demand will be similar as well.

Table IV: Comparison of Estimated Parking Required

Land Use Alternatives	*Menlo Park Use Based Parking Rates*	*Menlo Park Zoning Based Parking Rates*	*ITE Parking Rates*	*Nearby Cities (Median)*
Proposed Project	452	661	398	401
Option I	458	661	492	518
Option II	469	661	513	540
EIR Alternative	396	732	363	457

It could be concluded that Option II has the highest level of parking demand based on the three rates due to the most restaurant and fitness land use.

The results of the detailed parking analysis for each of the land use alternative are contained in Appendix A.

Shared Parking

Another important document is *Shared Parking, Second Edition,* a publication of the Urban Land Institute (ULI). This document describes techniques for determining how parking demands for various land uses fluctuate over time, creating opportunities for sharing of stalls within a common parking area. Under the ULI methodology, the percentage of parking that each land use requires at any given hour of the day is applied to the maximum demand for that land use. For example, office uses, which have peak parking demands during the day, is a good parking facility to partner with housing, which tends to have peak parking demands during the evening. The fit is not perfect, however, since there are some residential parking demands during the day and also during the times when office workers are arriving and departing their work places.

The use of shared parking concepts enables a determination of total requirements by examining the parking demands of each use on an hour-by-hour basis. Using the shared parking analysis model, the estimated peak hour parking demand were determined for each alternative and shown in Table V to VIII.

Table V: Shared Parking Analysis with ITE Rates (Proposed Project)

		Grocery Store 51,365 sq. ft.		**Non-Medical Office** 58,700 sq. ft.		
		Spaces Required = 224		Spaces Required = 174		**Total**
Time of Day		**ULI Factors**	**Parking Required**	**ULI Factors**	**Parking Required**	**387**
6:00	a.m.	1%	2	3%	5	7
7:00	a.m.	5%	11	30%	52	63
8:00	a.m.	15%	34	75%	131	164
9:00	a.m.	35%	78	95%	166	244
10:00	a.m.	65%	146	100%	174	320
11:00	a.m.	85%	190	100%	174	365
12:00	p.m.	95%	213	90%	157	370
1:00	p.m.	100%	224	90%	157	381
2:00	p.m.	95%	213	100%	174	387
3:00	p.m.	90%	202	100%	174	376
4:00	p.m.	90%	202	90%	157	358
5:00	p.m.	95%	213	50%	87	300
6:00	p.m.	95%	213	25%	44	256
7:00	p.m.	95%	213	10%	17	230
8:00	p.m.	80%	179	7%	12	191
9:00	p.m.	50%	112	3%	5	117
10:00	p.m.	30%	67	1%	2	69
11:00	p.m.	10%	22	0%	-	22
12:00	a.m.	0%	-	0%	-	-

Table VI: Shared Parking Analysis with ITE Rates (Option I)

		Grocery Store 15,000 sq. ft.		Non-Medical Office 58,700 sq. ft.		Restaurant (Family) 5,865 sq. ft.		Retail 5,500 sq. ft.		Health/Fitness 25,000 sq. ft.		
		Spaces Required = 42		Spaces Required = 174		Spaces Required = 37		Spaces Required = 24		Spaces Required = 191		Total
Time of Day		***ULI Factors***	***Parking Required***	***ULI Factors***	***Parking Required***	***ULI Factors***	***Parking Required***	***ULI Factors***	***Parking Required***	***ULI Factors***	***Parking Required***	***417***
6:00	a.m.	1%	0	3%	5	25%	9	1%	0	70%	133	149
7:00	a.m.	5%	2	30%	52	50%	19	5%	1	40%	76	151
8:00	a.m.	15%	6	75%	131	60%	22	15%	4	40%	76	239
9:00	a.m.	35%	15	95%	166	75%	28	35%	8	70%	133	350
10:00	a.m.	65%	28	100%	174	85%	32	65%	16	70%	133	383
11:00	a.m.	85%	36	100%	174	90%	34	85%	20	80%	152	417
12:00	p.m.	95%	40	90%	157	100%	37	95%	23	60%	114	372
1:00	p.m.	100%	42	90%	157	90%	34	100%	24	70%	133	390
2:00	p.m.	95%	40	100%	174	50%	19	95%	23	70%	133	389
3:00	p.m.	90%	38	100%	174	45%	17	90%	22	70%	133	384
4:00	p.m.	90%	38	90%	157	45%	17	90%	22	80%	152	386
5:00	p.m.	95%	40	50%	87	75%	28	95%	23	90%	171	350
6:00	p.m.	95%	40	25%	44	80%	30	95%	23	100%	191	327
7:00	p.m.	95%	40	10%	17	80%	30	95%	23	90%	171	282
8:00	p.m.	80%	34	7%	12	80%	30	80%	19	80%	152	248
9:00	p.m.	50%	21	3%	5	60%	22	50%	12	70%	133	194
10:00	p.m.	30%	13	1%	2	55%	21	30%	7	35%	67	109
11:00	p.m.	10%	4	0%	-	50%	19	10%	2	10%	19	44
12:00	a.m.	0%	-	0%	-	25%	9	0%	-	0%	-	9

Table VII: Shared Parking Analysis with ITE Rates (Option II)

		Non-Medical Office 58,700 sq. ft.		**Restaurant (Fine/Casual)** 8,183 sq. ft.		**Restaurant (Family)** 8,183 sq. ft.		**Retail** 10,000 sq. ft.		**Health/Fitness** 25,000 sq. ft.		
		Spaces Required = 174		Spaces Required = 52		Spaces Required = 52		Spaces Required = 44		Spaces Required = 191		**Total**
Time of Day		***ULI Factors***	***Parking Required***	***ULI Factors***	***Parking Required***	***ULI Factors***	***Parking Required***	***ULI Factors***	***Parking Required***	***ULI Factors***	***Parking Required***	**432**
6:00	a.m.	3%	5	0%	-	25%	13	1%	0	70%	133	152
7:00	a.m.	30%	52	0%	-	50%	26	5%	2	40%	76	157
8:00	a.m.	75%	131	0%	-	60%	31	15%	7	40%	76	245
9:00	a.m.	95%	166	0%	-	75%	39	35%	15	70%	133	353
10:00	a.m.	100%	174	15%	8	85%	44	65%	28	70%	133	388
11:00	a.m.	100%	174	40%	21	90%	47	85%	37	80%	152	432
12:00	p.m.	90%	157	75%	39	100%	52	95%	41	60%	114	404
1:00	p.m.	90%	157	75%	39	90%	47	100%	44	70%	133	420
2:00	p.m.	100%	174	65%	34	50%	26	95%	41	70%	133	409
3:00	p.m.	100%	174	40%	21	45%	23	90%	39	70%	133	391
4:00	p.m.	90%	157	50%	26	45%	23	90%	39	80%	152	398
5:00	p.m.	50%	87	75%	39	75%	39	95%	41	90%	171	378
6:00	p.m.	25%	44	95%	50	80%	42	95%	41	100%	191	367
7:00	p.m.	10%	17	100%	52	80%	42	95%	41	90%	171	324
8:00	p.m.	7%	12	100%	52	80%	42	80%	35	80%	152	293
9:00	p.m.	3%	5	100%	52	60%	31	50%	22	70%	133	244
10:00	p.m.	1%	2	95%	50	55%	29	30%	13	35%	67	160
11:00	p.m.	0%	-	75%	39	50%	26	10%	4	10%	19	89
12:00	a.m.	0%	-	25%	13	25%	13	0%	-	0%	-	26

Table VIII: Shared Parking Analysis with ITE Rates (EIR Alternative)

		Non-Medical Office 58,700 sq. ft.		Restaurant (Fine/Casual) 7,000 sq. ft.		Restaurant (Family) 7,000 sq. ft.		Retail 8,895 sq. ft.		Housing Units 36		
		Spaces Required = 174		Spaces Required = 45		Spaces Required = 45		Spaces Required = 39		Spaces Required = 69		Total
Time of Day		***ULI Factors***	***Parking Required***	***ULI Factors***	***Parking Required***	***ULI Factors***	***Parking Required***	***ULI Factors***	***Parking Required***	***ULI Factors***	***Parking Required***	***341***
6:00	a.m.	3%	5	0%	-	25%	11	1%	0	100%	69	86
7:00	a.m.	30%	52	0%	-	50%	22	5%	2	100%	69	146
8:00	a.m.	75%	131	0%	-	60%	27	15%	6	100%	69	232
9:00	a.m.	95%	166	0%	-	75%	33	35%	14	100%	69	282
10:00	a.m.	100%	174	15%	7	85%	38	65%	25	100%	69	313
11:00	a.m.	100%	174	40%	18	90%	40	85%	33	100%	69	334
12:00	p.m.	90%	157	75%	33	100%	45	95%	37	100%	69	341
1:00	p.m.	90%	157	75%	33	90%	40	100%	39	100%	69	338
2:00	p.m.	100%	174	65%	29	50%	22	95%	37	100%	69	331
3:00	p.m.	100%	174	40%	18	45%	20	90%	35	100%	69	316
4:00	p.m.	90%	157	50%	22	45%	20	90%	35	100%	69	303
5:00	p.m.	50%	87	75%	33	75%	33	95%	37	100%	69	260
6:00	p.m.	25%	44	95%	42	80%	36	95%	37	100%	69	227
7:00	p.m.	10%	17	100%	45	80%	36	95%	37	100%	69	204
8:00	p.m.	7%	12	100%	45	80%	36	80%	31	100%	69	192
9:00	p.m.	3%	5	100%	45	60%	27	50%	19	100%	69	165
10:00	p.m.	1%	2	95%	42	55%	25	30%	12	100%	69	149
11:00	p.m.	0%	-	75%	33	50%	22	10%	4	100%	69	129
12:00	a.m.	0%	-	25%	11	25%	11	0%	-	100%	69	91

Table IX: Shared Parking Demand Rates

Land Use Alternatives	***Shared Parking Estimate***
Proposed Project	387
Option I	417
Option II	432
EIR Alternative	341

Note: In the EIR Alternative, due to gating all 69 parking stalls are assumed to be fully occupied.

Results of Parking Survey

TJKM conducted parking studies of local land uses in or near Menlo Park. Hourly occupancy studies of various uses were conducted to determine the peak parking demand and the hourly variations throughout the day. The studies were made both on a weekday and a Saturday.

As recommended by City staff, TJKM conducted a parking space inventory for various sites as shown in Table X.

Table X: Parking Demand Survey Sites

Land Use	*Survey Site and Use*	*Address*
1. Fitness	Equinox Fitness Center, Palo Alto	440 Portage Ave, Palo Alto
2. Grocery Store	Whole Foods, Los Altos	4800 El Camino Real , Los Altos
3. Retail/Office	Menlo Center, Menlo Park (2 restaurants, Kepler's bookstore, and office)	1010 El Camino Real , Menlo Park
4. Restaurant	Menlo Square, Menlo Park (restaurant *)	1155 Merrill St., Menlo Park
5. Shared parking site	Bay Meadows I, San Mateo (mixed use)	Park Place, San Mateo
6. Office site	Office Complex, Menlo Park	2500 Sand Hill Road, Menlo Park

Note: * only restaurant rate utilized from parking survey.

The results of the survey and the estimated parking rates for each of the land use are shown in Appendix B. Table XI is a summary of the survey parking rates for the various sites.

Table XI: Survey Parking Demand Rates

	Estimated Survey Parking Rate (1 stall per sq. ft. as shown)	*Per 1,000 sq. ft.*	*Ranges of Parking Rates in Surveyed Cities Ordinances*	
Equinox Fitness Center	145	4.6/6.9 (b)	121 to 200	Health Club
Whole Foods, Los Altos	205	4.9	200 to 400	Grocery
Menlo Center	244	4.1	200 to 400	Shopping Center (Restaurants, retail, office) (c)
Menlo Square	207	4.8	100 to 200	Restaurant
Bay Meadows Total (a)	382	2.6	-	(Grocery, Health Club, Office, Restaurant, Retail, Day Care)
Non-Medical office, Menlo Park	445	2.2	250 to 300	Office

Note: (a) Bay Meadows land use include grocery, retail, health club, office, restaurants and residential land uses totaling approximately 287 ksf and 746 dwelling units.
(b) Equinox Fitness Center rate is 4.6 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. before 6 p.m. and 6.9 after 6 p.m.
(c) Note Menlo Center mix of land use is similar to shopping center use in ITE resulting in similar parking rates.

The results showed that generally most of the surveyed rates fall within the land use parking ordinance of the various surveyed cities, except the Sand Hill Road office site. The parking rate of the Sand Hill Road office site is slightly lower than the ranges of the surveyed cities. Generally survey rates are comparable to the ITE rates and situated within the mid-ranges of city parking rates.

The Bay Meadows I site is a mixed use site. The site includes approximately 287 ksf non-residential land use and 746 homes. Nearly 65 percent of the non-residential are office and 24 percent retail, grocery and restaurants. Using the resulting survey rate of 2.6 parking spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. will yield approximately 300 to 320 spaces for the proposed alternatives which will be approximately 25 to 30 percent lower than the shared parking estimates. The site is a good example of potential shared parking that is available for a very large mixed use site. In addition it is also likely due to the much higher level of office land use contained in the Bay Meadows I site which has a lower parking demand rate than retail, grocery or restaurant uses.

The estimated parking spaces for each land use alternative are shown in Table XII. Details are shown in Appendix B.

Table XII: Estimated Parking Spaces Required Based on Survey Parking Demand Rates

Land Use Alternatives	*Parking Spaces Estimate Based on Parking Surveys*
Proposed Project	382
Option I	428
Option II	424
EIR Alternative	305

Note: In the EIR Alternative, due to gating all 69 parking stalls are assumed to be fully occupied.

Table XIII: Summary of Parking Spaces Required

Land Use Alternatives	*Parking Spaces Required Based on*				
	Menlo Park Use	*ITE Parking Rates*	*Nearby Cities (Median)*	*Shared Parking*	*Parking Surveys*
Proposed Project	452	398	401	387	382
Option I	458	492	518	417	428
Option II	469	513	540	432	424
EIR Alternative	396	363	457	341	305

Note: Proposed Project includes 422 parking spaces & 416 spaces for the EIR Alternative.

Conclusion

TJKM recommended that the parking supply be based on the shared parking results. Generally, the shared parking results are consistent or more conservative than the parking surveys which reflect the local parking demands and conditions. The recommended required parking supply for each of the alternatives is shown in Table XIII.

If you have any questions about our study, please call me at (925) 463-0611. Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to conduct this interesting parking study in the City of Menlo Park.

Sincerely,

Christopher Thnay, P.E., AICP
Senior Associate

Appendix A: Parking Analysis

- Menlo Park use-based guidelines for parking
- ITE parking standards
- Parking requirements of nearby cities

Appendix B: Results of Parking Survey

- Local land use parking utilization surveys

Appendix A: Parking Analysis

- Menlo Park use-based guidelines for parking
- ITE parking standards
- Parking requirements of nearby cities

1300 El Camino Real Project Parking Study

	Grocery Store	Non-Medical Office	Restaurants	Retail	Health/Fitness	Housing Units	Total Square Feet	Parking Provided
Proposed Project	51,365	58,700					110,065	422
Option I	15,000	58,700	5,865	5,500	25,000		110,065	
Option II		58,700	16,365	10,000	25,000		110,065	
EIR Alternative		58,700	14,000	8,895		36	122,040	416

I. Proposed Project

	Grocery Store (sf)	Non-Medical Office (sf)	Restaurant (sf)	Retail (sf)	Health/Fitness (sf)	Residential Units	Total Square Feet	
Proposed Project	51,365	58,700					110,065	
i. Menlo ParkUse Based Rates (per 100 sf)								
	200	300	167	200	200	2		
							Total Parking Required	
Parking Required	257	196	0	0	0	0	452	
ii. ITE based Rates (per 100 sf)								
	229	337	157	229	131	1.68		
							Total Parking Required	
Parking Required	224	174	0	0	0	0	398	
iii. Based on Nearby Cities Rates (per 100 sf)								
Burlingame	400	300	200	400	200	2		
Cupertino	250	285	250	250	121	2.8		
Mountain View	250	300	100	180	200	2		
Palo Alto	350	250	1 sp 60 gsf. of pub serv area, + 1 sp 200 gsf for all other areas	200	1 per 4 persons	2		
Redwood City	200	250	1/3 seats	250	121	2		
							Total Parking Required	
Parking Required								
Burlingame	128	196	0	0	0		324	
Cupertino	205	206	0	0	0		411	
Mountain View	205	196	0	0	0		401	
Palo Alto	147	235	0	0	0		382	
Redwood City	257	235	0	0	0		492	
Median							401	MV
75th Percentile							411	Cup

Note:

Palo Alto Health Club rate based on ITE

II. Option I Project

	Grocery Store (sf)	Non-Medical Office (sf)	Restaurant (sf)	Retail (sf)	Health/Fitness (sf)	Residential Units	Total Square Feet	
Option I Project	15,000	58,700	5,865	5,500	25,000		110,065	
i. Menlo ParkUse Based Rates (per 100 sf)								
	200	300	167	200	200	2		
							Total Parking Required	
Parking Required	75	196	35	28	125	0	458	
ii. ITE based Rates (per 100 sf)								
	229	337	157	229	131	1.68		
							Total Parking Required	
Parking Required	65	174	37	24	191	0	492	
iii. Based on Nearby Cities Rates (per 100 sf)								
Burlingame	400	300	200	400	200	2		
Cupertino	250	285	250	250	121	2.8		
Mountain View	250	300	100	180	200	2		
Palo Alto	350	250	1 sp 60 gsf. of pub serv area, + 1 sp 200 gsf for all other areas	200	1 per 4 persons	2		
Redwood City	200	250	1/3 seats	250	121	2		
Parking Required							Total Parking Required	
Burlingame	38	196	29	14	125		401	
Cupertino	60	206	23	22	207		518	
Mountain View	60	196	59	31	125		470	
Palo Alto	43	235	70	28	207		582	
Redwood City	75	235	59	22	207		597	
Median							518	Cup
75th Percentile							582	PA

Note:

For Cupertino rates, assumed 14sf for fastfood per person.

Conversion from SF to Seats: based on J.H. Carr & Sons, Inc. square feet per person assumptions - 20 sf per person.

Palo Alto Health/Fitness based on ITE rates

III. Option II Project

	Grocery Store (sf)	Non-Medical Office (sf)	Restaurant (sf)	Retail (sf)	Health/Fitness (sf)	Residential Units	Total Square Feet	
Option II Project	0	58,700	16,365	10,000	25,000		110,065	
i. Menlo ParkUse Based Rates (per 100 sf)								
	200	300	167	200	200	2		
							Total Parking Required	
Parking Required	0	196	98	50	125	0	469	
ii. ITE based Rates (per 100 sf)								
	229	337	157	229	131	1.68		
							Total Parking Required	
Parking Required	0	174	104	44	191	0	513	
iii. Based on Nearby Cities Rates (per 100 sf)								
Burlingame	400	300	200	400	200	2		
Cupertino	250	285	250	250	121	2.8		
Mountain View	250	300	100	180	200	2		
Palo Alto	350	250	1 sp 60 gsf. of pub serv area, + 1 sp 200 gsf for all other areas	200	1 per 4 persons	2		
Redwood City	200	250	1/3 seats	250	121	2		
Parking Required							Total Parking Required	
Burlingame	0	196	82	25	125		427	
Cupertino	0	206	65	40	207		518	
Mountain View	0	196	164	56	125		540	
Palo Alto	0	235	196	50	207		688	
Redwood City	0	235	164	40	207		645	
Median							540	MV
75th Percentile							645	RWC

IV. EIR Alternative

	Grocery Store (sf)	Non-Medical Office (sf)	Restaurant (sf)	Retail (sf)	Health/Fitness (sf)	Residential Units	Total Square Feet	
EIR Alternative		58,700	14,000	8,895		36	122,041	
i. Menlo ParkUse Based Rates (per 100 sf)								
	200	300	167	200	200	2		
							Total Parking Required	
Parking Required	0	196	84	44	0	72	396	
ii. ITE based Rates (per 100 sf)								
	229	337	157	229	131	1.68		
							Total Parking Required	
Parking Required	0	174	89	39	0	60	363	
iii. Based on Nearby Cities Rates (per 100 sf)								
Burlingame	400	300	200	400	200	2		
Cupertino	250	285	250	250	121	2.8		
Mountain View	250	300	100	180	200	2		
Palo Alto	350	250	1 sp 60 gsf. of pub serv area, + 1 sp 200 gsf for all other areas	200	1 per 4 persons	2		
Redwood City	200	250	1/3 seats	250	121	2		
Parking Required							Total Parking Required	
Burlingame	0	196	70	22	0	72	360	
Cupertino	0	206	56	36	0	101	398	
Mountain View	0	196	140	49	0	72	457	
Palo Alto	0	235	168	44	0	72	519	
Redwood City	0	235	140	36	0	72	482	
Median							457	MV
75th Percentile							482	RWC

Parking Ordinance of Select Cities and ITE

	Grocery Store	Non-Medical Office	Restaurant	Retail	Health/Fitness	Residential	Notes
Menlo Park	5	3.3	6.0	5	5	2	Council Amended Policy, May 10, '05
Burlingame	2.5	3.3	5	2.5	5	2 per 2 bedroom unit	
Cupertino	4	3.5	1/3 seats or 1/250 sq. ft. whichever is more (d)	4	8.3 (b)	2 DU (multi-family)	
Mountain View	4	3.3	10 (see note A)	5.6	5	2 spaces per unit, 1 space shall be covered	
Palo Alto	2.9	4	1 space for each 60 gross sq . ft. of public service area, plus 1 space for each 200 gross sq . ft. for all other areas .	5	1 per 4 persons (b)	2 per 2 bedroom unit	
Redwood City	5	4	One (1) space for each three (3) seats.	4	8.3 (b)	2 spaces per unit	

Mountain View: Restaurant : 1 space for each 2.5 seats or 1 space for each 100 sq. ft. of gross floor area, whichever is greater.

Notes:
Rewood City staff indicated 1/200 sf for grocery stores. For health/fitness store, the city will research ITE, International Parking or nearby city parking codes.

Units: space per 1,000 sf as shown or as stated

Note A: 1 space for each 2.5 seats or 10 space for each 1,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area, whichever is greater

(b): based on ITE

(c): Menlo Park rates based on City Council Policy for Administrative Review of Parking Reduction, May 10, 2005

(d): Assumed 20 square feet per patron seating area.

Units: 1 space per square feet as shown or as stated
Note A: 1 space for each 2.5 seats or 1 space for each 100 sq. ft. of gross floor area, whichever is greater
'(b): based on ITE
(c): Menlo Park rates based on City Council Policy for Administrative Review of Parking Reduction, May 10, 2005

ITE 85th Percentile Rates

	Grocery Store	Non-Medical Office	Restaurant	Retail	Health/Fitness	Residential	
ITE Parking Code	(850)	(701)	(932)	(820)	(492)	(230)	
ITE (per 1,000 sf)	4.36	2.97	6.37	4.36	7.62	1.68 (du)	Retail (Dec Sat)
- per 100's sf	229	337	157	229	131		

Note: Based on the available data and to be conservative the analysis in the report was based on the 85th rate or as indicated. Grocery Store based on average rate.

Av + 1 Std Dev

ITE Average rates

	Grocery Store	Non-Medical Office	Restaurant	Retail	Health/Fitness	Residential
ITE Parking Code	(850)	(701)	(932)	(820)	(492)	(230)
ITE (per 1,000 sf)	4.36	2.4	5.55	3.01	5.19	1.68 (du)
- per 100's sf	229	417	180	332	193	

Note: rate shown for comparison purposes.

Appendix B: Results of Parking Survey

- Local land use parking utilization surveys

1300 ECR Parking Study Survey Results

Hourly Parking Demand at Each Surveyed Site

Time:	Equinox Fitness Center Location 1	Whole Foods, Los Altos Location 2	Menlo Center Location 3	Menlo Square Location 4	Bay Meadows Total Location 5	Non-Medical office, Menlo Park Location 6
5am	7	*				
6am	32	*				
7am	88	250		17	165	15
8am	105	219		27	301	19
9am	114	210		32	482	60
10am	98	118	179	35	618	67
11am	98	157	208	35	650	75
12pm	83	135	245	34	710	70
1pm	72	124	248	33	749	69
2pm	57	153	249	31	751	69
3pm	70	168	233	29	706	73
4pm	69	152	229	31	705	65
5pm	96	131	223	25	641	58
6pm	170	120	198	31	659	36
7pm	159	137	229	35		
8pm	83	170	211	32		
9pm	70	180	203	24		
10pm			205	15		
Total Spaces Available at Site	199	277	275	90	1,053	143

* No access to the underground garage from 5-7am

** At Equinox Fitness Center, 128 parking spaces available before 6 pm. All parking available after 6 pm.

Estimated Demand rates (sf per space)

Estimated Size	24,670	51,305	60,863	7,250 (Restaurant only)	286,963	36,374
5am	3,524					
6am	771					
7am	280	205		439	1,739	2,225
8am	235	234		269	953	1,757
9am	216	244		227	595	556
10am	252	435	340	207	464	498
11am	252	327	293	207	441	445
12pm	297	380	248	213	404	477
1pm	343	414	245	220	383	484
2pm	433	335	244	234	382	484
3pm	352	305	261	250	406	457
4pm	358	338	266	234	407	513
5pm	257	392	273	287	448	575
6pm	145	428	307	236	435	927
7pm	155	374	266	210		
8pm	297	302	288	230		
9pm	352	285	300	305		
10pm			297	483		
Peak Demand	145	205	244	207	382	445
(per 1,000's)	6.9	4.9	4.1	4.8	2.6	2.2

Note: Equinox Fitness Center rate is 4.6 spaces per 1,000 s.f. before 6 p.m. and 6.9 after 6 p.m.

Land uses	Health Club	Whole Foods	Shopping Center (2 restaurants, kepler's bookstore, and office)	Menlo Park (restaurants)	Grocery, retails, office, restaurants, health club	Office
Parking Ordinance Comparison	121-200	200-400	200-400	100-200		250-300

Note:

(a) 2500 Sand Hill Rd has 3,000 sf vacancy per conversation with Jeffrey Morris at 650-854-1123, February 16, 2009.

Parking Demand Survey Summary

	Estimated Survey Parking Rate (1 stall per sq. ft. as shown)	*Ranges of Parking Rates in City Ordinance*		*Per 1,000*
Equinox Fitness Center	145	121 to 200	Health Club	6.9
Whole Foods, Los Altos	205	200 to 400	Grocery	4.9
Menlo Center	244	200 to 400	Retail	4.1
Menlo Square	207	100 to 200	Restaurant	4.8
Bay Meadows Total	382	-	(Grocery, Health Club, Office, Restaurant, Retail, Day Care)	2.6
Non-Medical office, Menlo Park	445	250 to 300	Office	2.2

Proposed Land Use

	Grocery Store	*Non-Medical Office*	*Restaurants*	*Retail*	*Health/Fitness*	*Housing Units*	*Total Square Feet*	*Parking Provided*
Proposed Project	51,365	58,700					110,065	422
Option I	15,000	58,700	5,865	5,500	25,000		110,065	
Option II		58,700	16,365	10,000	25,000		110,065	
EIR Alternative		58,700	14,000	8,895		36	122,041	416

Parking Demand Analysis

Land Use Alternatives	*Parking Spaces Estimate Based on Parking Surveys*
Proposed Project	382
Option I	428
Option II	424
EIR Alternative	305