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## I INTRODUCTION

Summer traffic and parking problems have been of concern to the local community for several years. Growth of the scientific institutions, increased traffic to the islands, and increased tourist traffic have all contributed to intensifying the local problem. Since attendance at the Aquarium during the summer season is over 200, 000 persons, it has generally been assumed that this facility generates a high proportion of the traffic and parking problem. However, until the present study was made, there were no data on which to base any opinion regarding the degree to which the Aquarium aggravates the summer congestion in Wuods Hole.

In order to obtain such data a statistical survey was conducted during the 1966 season to estimate the total number of Aquarium visitors, the total number of cars involved, the adequacy of the Bureau's parking facilities, and the relation of the Aquarium visitors to the Island visitors.

The results of this study are useful to the Bureau in clarifying its parking problem in Woods Hole and will be useful to any planning agency studying the future development of Woods Hole. II. METHODS

In order to meet the objectives of the study it was necessary to obtain reliable estimates of attendance, of the number of cars that Aquarium visitors brought into Woods Hole, of the number that used the Bureau's lots, the length of stay in the parking lots and the primary reason for coming to Woods Hole.

These data were obtained from a stratificd sampling dessi,", for attendance counts and interviews, and from car marking experiments in the Aquarium parking lot.

The season was pre-stratified into

1) Weekends and holidays (Stratum I) and
2) Weekdays (Stratum II), other than holidays. It was known that weather is a dominant factor relative to attendance, so the data were post-stratified into two domains of fair and inclement weather. Although the number occurrence of such days is a random variable, the total number through the season was recorded and the whole of the survey data could thus be treated in four strata.

Attendance Estimates. An electronic counter located in a passageway of the Aquarium has been used since the Aquarium opened in 1961 and was continued during the present study. Counts from this device are subject to some error. A group of people can pass it simultaneously resulting in a single count for the group. On the other hand, a certain number of small boys discover it and amuse themselves for a while making it click. Although the se two errors tend to compensate, spot checks in the past have indicated that the electronic counts tend to be somewhat high.

The ratio of the observed number of visitors to the counter total was estimated from 16 one-half-hour samplings per week (out of a possible 96 ), selected as follows: Each week, four days were selected at random and within each of the selected days, 4 one-halfhour time periods were selected at random. All persons entcring
the Aquarium during these periods were counted and the electronic counter readings were recorded at the start and end of each sampling period.

Interview Survey. To obtain the other required information samples of visitors were interviewed. They were asked the following questions: Did you come to Woods Hole by car? If so, how many persons are in your party and where did you park your car? Did you come to Woods Hole primarily to see the Aquarium or for other reasons. Are you on your way to the Islands?

The sampling design was as follows: Initially, two days per week were selected at random from each of the two strata and within each day three periods were chosen at random within the time available after the selection of sampling periods for the attendance survey. It was then possible for one employee to conduct both the attendance counts and interviews.

For each sampling period, ten parties were interviewed. At the beginning of the period, the first adult entering the Aquarium was questioned. During the interview, free movement of visitors was allowed into the Aquarium. The next adult entering the Aquarium after the completion of the first interview was selected as the second sample. This procedure was continued until ten parties had been interviewed. Thus, there were 30 interview samples per day and 60 for each stratum per week.

After the third week of surveying, analysis showed that confidence limits for Stratum II (weekdays) were too wide so the sampling periods were increased by selecting two periods per day on four days of the week, making a total of eight sampling periods (80 interviews) per week in Stratum II. This increased sampling started with Week 5 (July 16).

Length of stay in parking lot. The rate of turnover in the parking lot was estimated from marking experiments conducted on two different weekdays. The details of estimation are in Appendix C. III. RESULTS

Attendance. Attendance was estimated in all cases by multiplying the counter total (for each day or stratum) by the corresponding estimate of the stratum ratio. This ratio varied somewhat from stratum to stratum; the overall estimate was 0.88 (Sce Appendix A).

In 1966 the Aquarium was open from June 18 to September 11. The estimated daily attendance and state of the weather is presented in Table 1. Total attendance for the 86 -day season was 229,000 $( \pm 7,960)$. The average daily attendance was 2,663 .

The state of the weather has a marked effect on the Aquarium attendance. During days of inclement weather daily attendance is, on the average, about 1, 500 higher than on fair days. Table 2 presents a breakdown of attendance by type of day and weather.

Total attendance has increased slightly each season since the new Aquarium opened in 1961. The average daily attendance, however, has not varied much and does not show any definite trend. The seasonal totals depended on the number of days the Aquarium was open. Seasonal and average daily attendance figures are presented in Table 3.

Table 1. --Daily Aquarium Attendance, Summer 1966

| Date | Attendance | Weather |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| June 18 (Sat) | 1,826 | Fair |
| June 19 (Sun) | 3,204 | Inclement |
| June 20 (Mon) | 1,619 | Fair |
| June 21 (Tues) | 1,535 | Fair |
| June 22 (Wed) | 1,476 | Fair |
| June 23 (Thurs) | 1,899 | Fair |
| June 24 (Fri) | 972 | Frair |
| June 25 (Sat) | 3, 752 | Inclement |
| June 26 (Sun) | 3,634 | Inclement |
| June 27 (Mon) | 1,990 | Fair |
| June 28'(Tues) | 1,561 | Fair |
| June 29 (Wed) | 3,079 | Inclement |
| June 30 (Thurs) | 1,358 | Fair |
| July 1 (Fri) | 1,703 | Fair |
| July 2 (Sat) | 1,166 | Fair |
| July 3 (Sun) | 1,973 | Fair |
| July 4 (Mon) | 2, 050 | Fair |
| July 5 (Tues) | 2,296 | Fair |
| July 6 (Wed) | 3,788 | Inclement |
| July 7 (Thurs) | 4,293 | Inclement |
| July 8 (Fri) | 1,726 | Fair |
| July 9 (Sat) | 2, 259 | Fair |
| July 10 (Sun) | 3, 502 | Inclement |
| July 11 (Mon) | 2,111 | Fair |
| July 12 (Tues) | 2, 734 | Fair |
| July 13 (Wed) | 2,792 | Fair |
| July 14 (Thurs) | 3,737 | Inclement |
| July 15 (Fri) | 2, 234 | Fair |
| July 16 (Sat) | 2,393 | Fair |
| July 17 (Sun) | 2,631 | Fair |
| July 18 (Mon) | 2, 446 | Fair |
| July 19 (Tues) | 3,353 | Fair |
| July 20 (Wed) | 4, 563 | Inclement |
| July 21 (Thurs) | 2, 439 | Fair |
| July 22 (Fri) | 2,493 | Fair |
| July 23 (Sat) | 2,307 | Fair |

* Holiday

| Date | Attendance | Weather |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| July 24 (Sun) | 2,520 | Fair |
| July 25 (Mon) | 2,662 | Fair |
| July 26 (Tues) | 4,147 | Inclement |
| July 27 (Wed) | 3, 098 | Fair |
| July 28 (Thurs) | 4, 291 | Inclement |
| July 29 (Fri) | 2,892 | Inclement |
| July 30 (Sat) | 3,318 | Inclement |
| July 31 (Sun) | 3,117 | Inclement |
| August 1 (Mon) | 1,921 | Fair |
| August 2 (Tues) | 4,095 | Inclement |
| August 3 (Wed) | 2,919 | Fair |
| August 4 (Thurs) | 3,105 | Fair |
| August 5 (Fri) | 3, 949 | Inclement |
| August 6 (Sat) | 1,947 | Fair |
| August 7 (Sun) | 2,502 | Fair |
| August 8 (Mon) | 4, 209 | Inclement |
| August 9 (Tues) | 3, 701 | Inclement |
| August 10 (Wed) | 4,459 | Inclement |
| August 11 (Thurs) | 3,845 | Inclement |
| August 12 (Fri) | 3,100 | Inclement |
| August 13 (Sat) | 2,079 | Fair |
| August 14 (Sun) | 2,707 | Fair |
| August 15 (Mon) | 3,905 | Inclement |
| August 16 (Tues) | 4, 272 | Inclement |
| August 17 (Wed) | 2, 324 | Fair |
| August 18 (Thurs) | 2,559 | Fair |
| August 19 (Fri) | 2,536 | Fair |
| August 20 (Sat) | 2,369 | Fair |
| August 21 (Sun) | 2,726 | Fair |
| August 22 (Mon) | 3,676 | Inclement |
| August 23 (Tues) | 3,745 | Inclement |
| August 24 (Wed) | 2,339 | Fair |
| August 25 (Thurs) | 2,773 | Fair |
| August 26 (Fri) | 2,066 | Fair |
| August 27 (Sat) | 2,058 | Fair |
| August 28 (Sun) | 2,489 | Fair |
| August 29 (Mon) | 2, 273 | Fair |
| August 30 (Tues) | 3,323 | Inclement |
| August 31 (Wed) | 2,640 | Fair |
| September 1 (Thurs) | 2,809 | Inclement |
| September 2 (Fri) | 1,641 | Fair |
| September 3 (Sat) | 3, 514 | Inclement |


| Date |  | Weather |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| September 4 (Sun) | 3,785 | Fitendance | Inclement |
| * September 5 (Mon) | 2,073 | Fair |  |
| September 6 (Tues) | 851 | Fair |  |
| September 7 (Wed) | 908 | Fair |  |
| September 8 (Thurs) | 912 | Fair |  |
| September 9 (Fri) | 1,253 | Inclement |  |
| September 10 (Sat) | 1,108 | Fair |  |
|  |  | Fair |  |

* Holiday

Table 2. --Daily attendance in relation to type of day and weathor.

| Stratum | Attendance |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average | Min. | Max. |
| Weekdays, fair weather | 2,119 | 851 | 3,353 |
| Weekend days (+ holidays), fair weather | 2,190 | 1,108 | 2,726 |
| Weekdays, inclement weather | 3,686 | 1,253 | 4,563 |
| Weekend days (+ holidays), inclement <br> weather | 3,475 | 3,117 | 3,785 |
| Average | 2,663 |  |  |

Table 3. --Seasonal and average daily attendance for a six-year period, adjusted electronic counter readings.

| Year | No. days <br> open | Season <br> attendance | Average daily <br> attendance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1961 | 72 | 186,000 | 2,583 |
| 1962 | 78 | 199,300 | 2,555 |
| 1963 | 72 | 208,900 | 2,901 |
| 1964 | 86 | 224,900 | 2,615 |
| 1965 | 86 | 219,400 | 2,551 |
| 1966 | 86 | 229,000 | 2,663 |

Number of cars. The number of persons per car, obtained from the interviews, varied from 1 to 13 with an overall average of 4.2. It is interesting to note that the number was higher in inclement weather than on clear days (Table 4).

The number of cars per day was computed by dividing the daily attendance by the average number of persons per car. These estimates are shown for different attendance levels in Table 5. On $85 \%$ of the days, the number of cars varied between 240 and 950 (Table 5). The average numbers for the four strata are shown in Table 6. For estimators and confidence limits of the interview survey see Appendix B.

Parking spaces required. The number of parking spaces required depends upon the length of time each car is parked. An analysis of the data from the turnover rate experiments show that the average length of stay is about 30 minutes. Approximately $50 \%$ of the cars in the parking lot stayed a little less than 30 minutes, $23 \%$ stayed three-quarters of an hour and the maximum length of stay was about two hours. The Aquarium lot with its 30 parking spaces can accommodate about 260 cars per day (Appendix C). The spaces required for different attendance levels are shown in Table 5 and for the four strata in Table 6.

Table 4. --Number of persons per car.

Weekend days, fair weather 4.1
Weekend days, inclement weather 4.3
Weekdays, fair weather 4.0
Weekdays, inclement weather $\quad \underline{4.6}$
Average 4.2

Table 5.--Parking requirements for different attendance levels.

| Attendance class <br> (No. persons/day) | Frequency of <br> occurrence <br> Days (percent) | Estimated no. <br> cars/day | Estimated no. <br> parking spaces <br> required |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $500(0-1000)$ | $4(4.65 \%)$ | $120(0-239)$ | $14(0-28)$ |
| $1500(1001-2000)$ | $18(20.93 \%)$ | $359(239-478)$ | $42(29-56)$ |
| $2500(2001-3000)$ | $34(39.53 \%)$ | $598(478-717)$ | $69(57-83)$ |
| $3500(3001-4000)$ | $22(24.42 \%)$ | $837(717-956)$ | $97(84-111)$ |
| $4500(4001-5000)$ | $8(9.30 \%)$ | $1076(956-1195)$ | $125(112-138)$ |

Table 6.--Parking requirements for different types of conditions.

|  | Average |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Attendance | Cars | Spaces <br> required |
| Weekdays, fair weather | 2,119 | 527 | 61 |
| Weekend days (+ holidays), fair <br> weather | 2,190 | 537 | 62 |
| Weekdays, inclement weather | 3,686 | 803 | 93 |
| Weekend days (+ holidays), inclement <br> weather | 3,475 | 801 | 94 |
| Average | 2,663 | 637 | 74 |

Where did they park? Visitors to the Aquarium may lark their cars (1) in commercial parking lot if they are going to the Islands, (2) on the street, or (3) in Government parking lot. There are two Government parking areas: (1) the Aquarium visitor parking lot which is open to the public every day, and (2) the Laboratory staff parking area which is open to the public only on non-work days. The Aquarium lot has spaces for 30 cars; the Laboratory parking area can accommodate 50 cars. Thus, there are 30 spaces available on work days and 80 spaces on non-work days.

The bulk of the visitors interviewed said they parked their cars either in a Government lot or on the street. The average percentage using Government parking areas.varied from 36 to 58 depending upon type of day and weather (Table 7).

Adequacy of Government parking areas. As noted above, the Aquarium parking lot experiment showed that the Aquarium parking lot can handle a peak load of about 260 cars per day. Using the ratio of 8.6 cars per space derived from the study we es timate that the staff parking area can accommodate another 430 cars or a total of 690 cars per day for the two lots.

On non-work days there never was a parking problem. The staff parking lot was never completely filled. Table 7 shows that on the average inclement weekend day 801 cars were parked in Woods Hole by Aquarium visitors. This is more than the 690 cars the Government lots can handle. In actual fact, only $58 \%$ or 465 cars used the Government lots on average inclement weekend days, indicating a large surplus of Government parking space on those days. Evidently, street parking areas were not taxed to their limits on these days.

Table 7. --Average daily parking pattern (number of cars and percent).

|  | Non-work days |  | Weekdays |  | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fair weather | Inclement weather | Fair weather | Inclement weather |  |
| Government parking lot | 312 (58\%) | 465 (58\%) | 221 (42\%) | 289 (36\%) | 306 (48\%) |
| On street | $188(35 \%)$ | 280 (35\%) | 239 (45\%) | 466 (58\%) | 274 (43\%) |
| Commercial parking lot | 5 (1\%) | $8(1 \%)$ | 23 (4\%) | 8 (1\%) | 12 (2\%) |
| Other areas * | 32 (6\%) | 48 (6\%) | $44(8 \%)$ | 40 (5\%) | 45 (7\%) |
| Total | 537 (100\%) | $801(100 \%)$ | 527 (100\%) | 803 (100\%) | $637(100 \%)$ |
| * Private and motel areas |  |  |  |  |  |

On weekdays in fair weather there was again no problem, because the average use of the Aquarium lot was only 221 cars, which is less than its capacity of 260 cars. Apparently, on these days also, the street parking was not overtaxed.

On inclement weekdays a problem develops. The average attendance on these days results in 803 cars which overtaxes both the street and the Aquarium parking lot. Visitors parked 466 cars on the street on average inclement weekdays, which, assuming the Aquarium lot turnover rate, would require about 54 spaces; and on peak weekdays when the attendance ran to 4,000 , the number of cars parked on the streets ran to more than 505 requiring about 59 parking -paces.

The Aquarium as a tourist attraction. The survey questioning provided information on the extent to which the Aquarium attracted persons to Woods Erole. We were interested in knowing whether the Aquarium actually attracted large numbers of people to Woods Hole or whether it simply served those who came for other reasons. There is a heavy traffic through Woods Hole to Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket and we were interested in knowing how many of the Aquarium visitors were persons waiting for the ferry or combining a trip to Woods Hole and the Islands.

Results of the survey show that only $10 \%$ of the Aquarium visitors were on their way to the Islands (Table 8). This is important information as it means that traffic and parking problems associated with the Aquarium and the Steamship Authority are for

Table 8. --Purpose of visit to Woods Hole.

| To see Aquarium | $43 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| To visit the Islands | $10 \%$ |
| Residents | $3 \%$ |
| For other reasons | $44 \%$ |

the most part independent. Only $43 \%$ of the visitors said they came specifically to see the Aquarium. The greatest percentage of the visitors stated they came to Woods Hole for "other" reasons, such as "just drove down to see Woods Hole" or "we had always heard of Woods Hole" or "we were just driving around the Cape." Apparently, these people were part of that great body of summer tourists who choose a general area to see and then visit all the available points of interest.

## IV. CONCLUSIONS

1. Average daily attendance at the Aquarium in the summer of 1966 was 2,663. This is somewhat higher than the daily attendance in the previous year but not so high as that for 1963. There has: been no definite trend in daily attendance since the new Aquarium opened in 1961.
2. Very few Aquarium visitors are on their way to the Islands. Therefore, any traffic or parking problem generated by the Aquariura visitors is separate from those of the Steamship Authority.
3. Less than half of the Aquarium visitors came to Woods Hole specifically to see the Aquarium. Almost half came as general tourists to see the Woods Hole area and the ocean.
4. The station's parking facilities made available to Aquarium visitors on Saturday, Sunday, and holidays (80 spaces) are more than adequate to handle the Aquarium visitors' cars on those days even on the most crowded days.
5. On the average fair weather weekday the Aquarium parking lot ( 30 spaces) was not overtaxed, indicating the combined available parking on the street and in the Aquarium parking lot was adequate on such days.
6. On inclement weekdays parking is a problem. Judging from the number of cars parked on the street (239) on fair weather weekdays when the Aquarium parking lot was not utilized to capacity, we may assume there were roughly 28 parking spaces readily available on the street. The average inclement weekday requires about 93 parking spaces. With 28 available on the street and 30 in the Aquarium lot, another 35 are required. On a day of high density ( 4,000 visitors), about 50 additional parking spaces are required in order to prevent an undesirable parking pressure on the quiet residential section of Woods Hole and annoyance to the Aquarium visitors.

The estimated ratio for each stratum is

$$
\hat{R}_{h}=\bar{y}_{h} / \bar{x}_{h},
$$

where $y_{h}=$ mean of the observed counts of visitors in the $h$ stratum,
$x_{h}=$ mean of the electronic counter record during the observed counting period in the $h$ stratum.
and the combined ratio is,

$$
\hat{R}_{c}=\frac{\Sigma N_{h} \bar{y}_{h}}{\Sigma N_{h} \bar{x}_{h}}
$$

The estimate of total attendance for any stratum is computed by,

$$
\hat{Y}_{S_{h}}=\hat{R}_{h} X_{h}
$$

and total attendance is estimated by,

$$
\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{s}}=\Sigma \hat{R}_{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{h}}
$$

Variances and confidence limits of these estimates follow Cochran (1963)* and are presented in Table A-1.

The estimated confidence limits for total attendance fell within the $5 \%$ limits while those for three of the individual strata were a little greater $(7-8 \%)$. Variances of the ratios were very low.

* Cochran, William G. 1963. Sampling Techniques. John Wiley and Sons. pp. 154-170.

Table A-1. --Statistical evaluation of the attendance survey.

| Statistic * | Weekends \& Holidays |  | Weekdays |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fair weather | Inclement weather |  | Inclement weather |  |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | 280 | 112 | 504 | 308 | 1,204 |
| $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | 48 | 16 | 74 | 53 | 191 |
| $\bar{y}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | 159.667 | 251.063 | 123.514 | 292.623 |  |
| $\bar{x}_{h}$ | 187.042 | 255.000 | 150.649 | 317. 264 |  |
| $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | 51,245 | 28, 251 | 93,000 | 87,993 | 260,489 |
| $S^{2}$ | 3,124 | 8,115 | 3,779 | 9,348 |  |
| $S_{\text {Sh }}^{2}$ | 5,861 | 6,134 | 4,451 | 3,865 |  |
| $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | . 6512 | . 9199 | -. 8763 | . 5533 |  |
| $\hat{R}_{h}$ | . 854 | . 985 | . 820 | . 922 | . 885 |
| $\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | 2,539 | 1,281 | 878 | 6,494 |  |
| $v\left(\hat{Y}_{R h}\right)$ | 3,436,959 | 860,966 | 2,571,135 | 9,624,142 | 16, 493, 203 |
| $\hat{\mathrm{Y}}_{\mathrm{Rh}}$ | 43,763 | 27,827 | 76, 260 | 81,129 | 228, 980 |
| $\dot{D}\left(\hat{Y}_{R h}\right)$ | $\pm 3,111$ | $\pm 1,977$ | $\pm 3,193$ | $\pm 6,223$ | $\pm 7,960$ |
| $D / \hat{Y}_{R h}$ | . 0852 | . 0710 | . 0419 | . 0767 | . 0348 |
| $v\left(\hat{R}_{\text {sh }}\right)$ | . 0000067 | . 0000055 | . 0000015 | . 0000063 | . 0000200 |
| D(95\%) | $\pm .0164$ | $\pm .0158$ | $\pm .0078$ | $\pm .0160$ | $\pm .0088$ |
| $D / \hat{R}_{\text {sh }}$ | . 0192 | . 0160 | . 0095 | . 0173 | . 0099 |
| * Definitions of statistics |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{r}=\operatorname{corr} \\ & \mathrm{z}=\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{y}}^{2}+ \\ & \mathrm{v}(\mathrm{O}= \end{aligned}$ | relation coe $+\hat{R}^{2} S_{X}^{2}-Z \hat{R}$ <br> variance | cient $x, y$ <br> Sy Sx | $N_{h}$ $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | population nu observationa sample numb | mber of 1 periods r |
| $D=$ confidence Limits at $95 \%$ probability level |  |  |  |  |  |
| D/estimate $=$ precision of estimate |  |  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW SURVEY

The interviews provided estimates of the number of persons per car, the proportion of cars parked in various areas and the proportion of attendees who were in Woods Hole for various reasons. These data, combined with the attendance estimates provided the following estimates of interest, which are tabulated in Table B-1.

The estimated number of cars brought into Woods Hole by Aquarium visitors,

$$
\widehat{c}_{\mathrm{h}}=\hat{\mathrm{y}}_{\mathrm{sh}} / \overline{\mathrm{c}}_{\mathrm{h}}
$$

where $\overline{\mathrm{c}}_{\mathrm{h}}=$ number of persons per car in the $\underline{h}$ stratum. Fiducial limits of this estimate were calculated using Fieller's theorem with the Behrens distribution (Finney, 1964*). The density distribution of c was skewed right, but a normal distribution was used for calculating variance.

The estimated number of cars that utilized the various parking areas,

$$
\widehat{A}_{h i}=\hat{C}_{h} p_{h i}
$$

where $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{hi}}=$ proportion of cars from the interview survey using the $i$ th area
*Finney, D. J. 1964. Statistical Method in Biological Assay. Charles Griffin \& Co., pp. 24-35.

The estimated number of persons visiting Woods Hole for reasons of interest,

$$
\widehat{Y}_{h j}=\widehat{Y}_{S h} p_{h j}
$$

where $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{hi}}$ proportion of people from the interview survey who came to Woods Hole for the $j-$ th reason.
The variances of $\widehat{\mathrm{A}}_{\mathrm{hi}}$ and $\widehat{\mathrm{Y}}_{\mathrm{hj}}$ were estimated by adding the component variances, using binomial variation, $p q / n$, for the proportions.

Table B-1. Estimates, variances and confidence limits for certain items from the interview survey.

| Estimate of | Estimate | Variance | Confidence <br> Limits (95\%) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Precision } \\ (95 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of cars | 53, 800 |  | $\begin{aligned} & +2,204 \\ & -2,161 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| People per car |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 4.184 | . 0018 | $\pm .0832$ | . 0199 |
| Weekends, fair weather | 4.078 | . 0051 | $\pm .1400$ | . 0343 |
| Weekends, inclement weather | 4.340 | . 0162 | $\pm .2495$ | . 0575 |
| Weekdays, fair weather | 4.016 | . 0052 | $\pm .1413$ | . 0353 |
| Weekdays, inclement weather | 4.592 | . 0100 | $\pm .1960$ | . 0427 |
| Proportion of cars in Aquarium parking lots |  |  |  |  |
| Total | . 4822 | . 0002 | $\pm .0239$ | . 0495 |
| Weekends, fair weather | . 5749 | . 0005 | $\pm .0607$ | . 0723 |
| Weekends, inclement weather | . 5800 | . 0012 | $\pm .0678$ | . 1169 |
| Weekdays, fair weather | . 4194 | . 0005 | $\pm .0416$ | . 0991 |
| Weekdays, inclement weather | . 3564 | . 0008 | $\pm .0555$ | . 1556 |

Proportion of persons who came to Woods Hole primarily to see Aquarium

Total
Weekends, fair weather
Weekends, inclement weather
Weekdays, fair weathe
Weekdays, inclement weather
. 4265
$.4071 .00011 \pm .0206$
$.4782 .00029 \pm .0334$. 0698
$.4076 .00011 \pm .0206 .0505$
.4559
.00019
$\pm .0268$
. 0588

APPENDIX C. Length of Stay and Capacity of Aquarium Parking Lot.

Operational design of survey. To ascertain lengths of stay in the Aquarium parking lot and to determine the number of cars that the lot could accommodate per day, cars were counted and marked at 15-minute intervals over a $1-1 / 2$ hour period as follows:

1st count - At the beginning of the period to be checked the number of cars in the parking lot were recorded and each car was marked (on a rear tire) with an "I".

2nd count - Fifteen minutes from the start of the period, the lot was again checked and the number of cars remaining with an "I" mark were counted and recorded.

3rd count - Thirty minutes from tise beginning of the period the number of cars remaining in the lot with "I" marks were recorded and all cars without a mark were counted and marked with a "II".

4th count - Forty-five minutes from the period's start, the number of cars in the lot that had "I" or "II" markings were counted and separately recorded.

This process continued at 15-minute intervals, so each 1-1/2 hour sampling period contained seven counts. Because of the limited amount of time available in which to conduct each count, the counting and marking routine was carried out at every other time interval ( $1,3,5,7$ ) while counts only were conducted at the remaining intervals (2, 4, 6).

Results. Two samplings were conducted on both August 22 and August 30 , and the number of cars remaining at each interval was recorded (Table C-1). The proportion (P) of cars remaining of the original number marked at each time interval was determined. As an example: to find the proportion of cars present for $1 / 4$ hour on the morning sampling of August 22, divide 21 by 28. All proportions are given in Table C-2.

These proportions were plotted on logarithmic probability paper and the percent of cars remaining at each time interval was read directly from the plots (Figure C-1).

To determine the number of cars that could be handled by the Aquarium parking lot,

$$
L=\Sigma t_{i} p_{i} S
$$

where $t_{i}=$ total hours $/ i^{\text {th }}$ time interval

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{i}}= & \text { proportion of the cars utilizing the } \mathrm{i}^{\text {th }} \text { time } \\
& \text { interval (average of both experiments) } \\
\mathrm{S}= & 30=\text { number of parking spaces available. }
\end{aligned}
$$

We chose to make our estimate conservative by not including the first hour when attendance is usually low and by using three discrete points on the probability duration curve ( $50 \%, 75 \%, 100 \%$ at two hours) rather than integrating completely over the curve.

The results are shown in Table C-3.
To generate the number of parking spaces required per day for any attendance level,

$$
S=A /(\sim \bar{c})
$$

where $A=$ attendance level desired
$\Omega=$ the number of cars per day per parking space $\bar{c}=$ number of people per car.

For our data, $\Omega=260 / 30=8.6$

$$
c=4.2
$$

Table C-1. Number of cars remaining in Aquarium parking lot at $1 / 4$ hour intervals for four 1-1/2 hour periods.

| 1,August 22, Morning |  |  |  |  |  | 2. August 22, Afternoon |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval No. | Time | No. cars remaining at each time interval |  |  |  | Time | No, cars remaining at each time interval |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1 | II | III | IV |  | I | II | III | IV |
| 1 | 1100 | 28 |  |  |  | 1400 | 29 |  |  |  |
| 2 | 1115 | 21 |  |  |  | 1415 | 25 |  |  |  |
| 3 | 1130 | 17 | 12 |  |  | 1430 | 16 | 9 |  |  |
| 4 | 1145 | 13. | 10 |  |  | 1445 | 12 | 9 |  |  |
| 5 | 1200 | 5 | 4 | 13 |  | 1500 | 8 | 6 | 12 |  |
| 6 | 1215 | 2 | 3 | 8 |  | 1515 | 7 | 6 | 11 |  |
| 7 | 1230 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 16 | 1530 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 15 |

3. August 30, Morning
4. August 30, Afternoon


Table C-2. --Proportion of cars remaining in Aquarium parking lot for each time interval.

|  | 1. August 22, Morning |  | 2. Auguri 22, Afternoon |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Time <br> interval <br> (hr) | Proportions of cars remaining <br> in lot | Proportions of cars remaining <br> in lot |  |  |  |
| $1 / 4$ | .7500 | .8333 | .6154 | .8621 | 1.0000 |

Table C-3.--Estimate of number of cars that can be accommodated per day by the Aquarium parking lot


Fig. 4. Plots of duration of stay in Aquarium parking lot. (Open circles represent average stay for each time interval.)


