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Executive Summary

After nineteen years of operation, the Husky Stadium Expansion Parking Plan and Transportation Management Program (TMP) continued to fulfill its primary goal of "accommodating a sellout crowd of 72,200 with less reliance on parking in the residential areas near campus." The mode split targets set in the TMP have been surpassed.

This report outlines the findings of the 2006 TMP monitoring efforts. In 2006, data were collected by conducting a random intercept survey of game attendees as they entered the gates at Husky Stadium on October 14th. 1592 surveys were attempted, with 1371 responses, a response rate of 86%. Reported game attendance was 62,656 on the survey date. Results are estimated within a confidence interval of +/- 2.6% at a 95% confidence level.

Key findings of this report are presented below:

- Game attendees traveled to the stadium using these modes:
  - 47.6% carpooled in 2006, compared to 46.3% in 2005. 4.2% drove alone, compared 4.3% in 2005. The average auto occupancy in 2006 was 2.91 persons per car, remarkably similar to the 2.98 persons per car in 2005.
  - 23% arrived by transit or charter bus, compared to 27.8% in 2005.
  - 18% walked to the game, up from 13.5% in 2005.
  - 4.4% arrived by boat vs. 6.1% in 2005.
  - 1% arrived by bicycle, up from 0.7% in 2005.

- The change in mode split following the implementation of the TMP is greater than anticipated in the 1986 TMP plan. Projected mode shares compare to actual 2006 mode shares as follows:
  - Projected auto use was 72% vs. actual auto use of 51.8%.
  - Projected transit and charter bus use was 16% vs. actual transit and charter bus use of 23%.
  - Projected pedestrian share was 8.1% vs. the actual 18%.
  - Projected boat use was 3.9% vs. actual boat use of 4.4%.

- Roughly 2,000 vehicles parked in surrounding neighborhood parking impact areas in 2006, down from 2,900 vehicles in 2005. Fewer than 120 parking citations were issued in these areas on average.
Introduction

The University of Washington hosted six football games at Husky Stadium during the 2006 season, listed in Table 1:

Table 1. 2005 Husky Football Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Kickoff Time</th>
<th>Opponent</th>
<th>Reported Game Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/2/2006</td>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>San Jose State</td>
<td>52,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/2006</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>Fresno State</td>
<td>57,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/23/2006</td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>58,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2006</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>Oregon State</td>
<td>62,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2006</td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>Arizona State</td>
<td>58,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Season Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,483</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Highlighted row indicates day of 2006 survey

During the 2006 season, the Husky Stadium Expansion Parking Plan and Transportation Management Program (TMP) was executed to provide transportation options and to discourage guests from driving alone. Alternative modes of transportation were fostered and encouraged, including:

- carpool
- transit & charter buses
- walking
- boats
- bicycles

The purpose of this document is to monitor the effectiveness of the TMP during the 2006 season. To monitor TMP effectiveness, the University uses several indicators:

- travel mode choice
- average auto occupancy
- parking location choice
- duration of exiting traffic
- neighborhood parking impacts

This report explains the TMP efforts in 2006. It details the methodology used to collect the data related to performance indicators and discusses the results. It illustrates travel mode choice in 2006 and draws comparisons to previous years. Finally, it describes the neighborhood parking impact areas and draws conclusions about the success of the TMP in 2006.
Background

In 1987, Husky Stadium was enlarged to accommodate 72,200 spectators. The TMP was first implemented in 1987 to mitigate the additional impacts of traffic on the surrounding community. Due to the nature of football games, large numbers of people travel to and from Husky Stadium over short time periods. The TMP is in place to reduce the number and impact of vehicles in the area before and after football games and to reduce parking impacts on surrounding neighborhoods. The University of Washington is responsible for encouraging football attendees to not drive or to drive together, and the City of Seattle is responsible for traffic management and parking enforcement in residential parking zones.

The Seattle City Council Resolution 27435, relative to the TMP, requires the University and City of Seattle to collect data during each football season. The data are used to monitor the performance of the TMP. The 1986 data collection is a baseline for comparing impacts after the stadium expansion in 1987. This document summarizes the data collected for the 2006 season and compares them to the past data.

TMP Elements

Carpool Incentives

The TMP uses a pricing system to provide incentives for carpooling. During the 2006 season, parking on campus cost $10.00 for vehicles with three or more persons, $20.00 for vehicles with less than three persons, $30.00 for buses and $40.00 for motor homes and campers. In addition to financial incentives to carpool, the TMP uses marketing information to encourage carpooling. The 2006 Husky Football Transportation Guide highlighted the Event Ridematch feature provided by RideshareOnline. The regional ridematching service designed by King County Metro allows game attendees to find others going to the game with who they might share a ride.

Transit

Free Regular Service

One of the goals of the TMP is to encourage football game attendees to ride public transit to the stadium. All ticket-holders may ride King County Metro buses free to the stadium by showing their game ticket to the driver. Sound Transit Express route 550 is also free to ticket-holders between Bellevue and downtown Seattle, where passengers can transfer to buses headed to the stadium.
Free Park & Ride Service
King County Metro provided special game day bus service in 2006 from eight Park & Ride lots in the region, shown in Figure 1. To use the Park & Ride service, fans park for free at the Park & Ride lots and show their game tickets to ride free on Metro buses to Husky Stadium. Buses begin boarding at the lots two hours before the kickoff, and leave every 20 minutes. Following the games, fans board the buses at special locations, as shown in Figure 2, to return to the designated lots.

On average, Metro provided 175 inbound and 133 outbound Park and Ride bus trips each game. An average of 9,323 passengers rode to Husky Stadium on the Park & Ride Service. The average number of return passengers for the 2006 football season was 9,254.

Free Husky Special Service
King County Metro operated five special bus routes to Husky Stadium during each game in 2006. Service was provided from downtown Seattle, Ballard, and Lake City. Over the course of the 2006 season, Husky Special Service carried 7,452 passengers to Husky Stadium in 192 trips, averaging 39 passengers per trip. Figure 3 illustrates these special routes.
Figure 3. Husky Special Transit Service
**Boat Shuttles**

In 2006, passengers in boats anchored offshore could flag down a boat shuttle service. The shuttle took the fans to the Husky Stadium boat dock for free. After the game, the shuttle returned the fans to their boats for a cost of $5 per person.

**Boat Moorage**

For private vessels, boat moorage was available on a season or single game basis in 2006. The price of the permit was dependent on the length of the vessel. Single game permits were available through the Tyee Office by the Thursday before each home game.

**Charter Boats and Buses**

Several Seattle restaurants, hotels, and clubs featured activities that included a chartered bus or boat ride to a Husky football game. A list of organizations that sponsored charter buses was provided on the U-PASS website.

**Bicycles**

In 2006, the University of Washington Transportation Office continued its program to provide bicycle parking space by placing 12 additional bicycle racks near the stadium entrances during football season. Bicycling was also promoted in the Husky Football Transportation Guide.

**Restricted Parking Zone**

In some surrounding neighborhoods, Special Event Restricted Parking Zones (RPZ) limited game day parking to neighborhood residents. Seattle’s parking enforcement officers give $44 citations to non-residents who park in the restricted zones.

**Marketing**

The Transportation Office produces and distributes a Husky Football Transportation Guide every year. In 2006, more than 16,000 brochures were printed and mailed to season ticket holders and individuals who requested the information. The guide focused on providing information to help game attendees use one of the modes encouraged in the TMP (walking, biking, carpooling, and taking the bus). Contact information was provided, as well as information about parking and post-game traffic routing. Individuals who purchased their tickets on-line received a link to the electronic version of the guide. The information was available on-line at the University’s U-PASS web site:

http://www.washington.edu/commuterservices/get_to_uw/football/
**Data Collection**

Data collection consisted of a survey of game attendees conducted by the UW Transportation Office at one football game in the season, as well as bus ridership data collected by Metro Transit, campus parking and charter bus data collected by the UW Parking Services, and boat passengers and game attendance data collected by the UW Intercollegiate Athletics.

**Survey Process**

On October 14th, 2006 the UW Transportation Office conducted a survey of football game attendees as they passed through the gates at Husky Stadium. The weather was typical for the season, cloudy and cool but free of rain. Twenty-six surveyors in teams of two were distributed to the seven stadium gates, proportional to the number of game attendees estimated to enter through each gate. The teams attempted 1592 surveys and obtained 1371 responses, equating to a higher-than-expected response rate of 86%.

Surveyors were instructed to ask the following questions, in this order:

**Q1**  Did you drive or ride in a car driven to the game today?

If respondent answered ‘yes’ to Q1:

**Q1-a**  How many passengers, including you, came to the game in that vehicle?

**Q1-b**  Please point to your approximate parking location on this map. [Respondent was shown a map of the area, with campus, retail areas, and the neighborhoods in the Special Event Parking Zone each identified by a different color background, see Figure 5].

If respondent answered ‘no’ to Q1:

**Q2**  By which transportation mode did you come to the game today?

Regardless of response to Q1:

**Q3**  What is your home zip code?

The survey map is shown in Figure 4.
Figure 4. Map used to indicate parking location

Legend
- Neighborhood
- On Campus
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- Out of Area
Implementation of Previous Year’s Survey Recommendations

Several suggestions were made at the conclusion of previous surveys about possible improvements to the survey methodology. Following is a list of some of the suggestions and how they were addressed in 2006.

Continue to coordinate with City of Seattle regarding RPZs. The Transportation Office discussed data collection needs with Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) prior to the 2005 season. SDOT agreed to provide data on the number of tickets issued by parking enforcement officers assigned to the neighborhood impact areas. SDOT also conducted a pre-season check for signage in RPZ areas. This agreement continued in 2006.

Change wording on Survey. On the survey sheet, change the wording for Q#2 to “Including yourself, # people in car?” This recommendation was intended to ensure that the surveyor includes the “including yourself” phrase in the question. The wording on the survey sheet was changed accordingly in 2005 and continued to be used in 2006.

Do survey earlier in season. If possible, conduct the survey earlier than November. This year, the survey was conducted on October 14th.

Data Collection Outcomes

1592 surveys were attempted, with 1371 responses, a response rate of 86%. With a total population of 62,656 fans (reported paid attendance), the results are within a confidence interval of +/- 2.6% at 95% confidence, which is considered an acceptable confidence level.

The population was defined as game attendees who pass through the gates, and the sample was taken from only this population. This population did not include game workers who did not pass through the gates, although these workers account for approximately 800 trips to the game. It is not known which proportion of game workers travel by which mode.

Like most surveys, this survey was subject to a non-response error as a result of people who refused to take the survey. Transportation surveys also suffer from social desirability bias. For example, respondents can have a tendency to say that they carpooled when in fact they drove solo in order to portray themselves favorably to the surveyors. While not much can be done to suppress social desirability biases, it is expected that the proportion of this bias remains constant over time and therefore the data still gives accurate information about relative changes in traveler behavior.
Results

Travel Mode Choice
Approximately half of all attendees traveled to the game by auto, including 47.6% in a carpool and 4.2% in a single-occupant vehicle (SOV). Taking the bus and walking were the next most popular travel modes. Mode choices are listed in Tables 2, 3 and 4 and illustrated in Figure 5.

Table 3 provides a historical comparison of travel mode choice over the three years of the intercept survey. Bus mode share declined by approximately two percent per year until 2006, when it dropped by almost 5%. The carpool mode share in 2006 was 1.3% higher than 2005. The SOV mode share increased steadily since 2003, but seems to have leveled off at just over 4%.

Table 2. Travel Mode Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
<th>Share of Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>27,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>13,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>10,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>57,460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* estimates based on average paid attendance for the 2006 football season as reported by Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA)
Table 3. Travel Mode Choice, 2003-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimates based on average paid attendance for the 2003-2006 football seasons as reported by Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA)

Figure 5: Mode Choice

As in previous years, game attendance is based on reported paid attendance, not actual attendance. If paid attendance exceeds actual attendance, the estimated number of people traveling by each mode would be overestimated. Actual attendance is unknown.
Auto Occupancy and Parking

Most people (92%) who traveled to the game by auto came in a carpool. Only 8% of those who came in an automobile drove alone. Auto occupancy is summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Auto Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto Occupancy</th>
<th>Percent of Attendees Who Arrived in Autos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average auto occupancy was 2.91 people. Therefore, on an average game, roughly 29,800 people arrived in 10,200 vehicles. These vehicles were parked in one of four areas:

- campus parking lots
- retail areas (University Way area and University Village)
- neighborhoods within the TMP parking impact area
- areas outside the TMP parking impact area

Based on average occupancies by parking area, the number of autos parked in each of the four areas were estimated and listed in Table 5.

Table 5. Average Occupancy of Parked Autos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Area</th>
<th>Total Occupancy*</th>
<th>Average Occupancy</th>
<th>Autos*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - campus</td>
<td>17,925</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>5,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - retail</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - neighborhood</td>
<td>5,598</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - out of area</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - didn't know</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X – dropped off</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,776</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.91</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,233</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* estimates based on average paid attendance for the 2006 football season as reported by ICA

In Figure 4 on page 8, TMP neighborhood parking impact areas are illustrated in blue, campus is shown in yellow, retail areas are indicated by orange, and neighborhoods outside of the TMP parking impact areas are white.
Approximately 60.2% of attendees who arrived in autos parked on campus in approximately 5,900 vehicles. While the total number of cars parking on campus is 100 fewer than in 2005, the proportion of campus parking is greater than 2005’s 56.3%. Average occupancy for autos parked on campus remained at approximately three people per vehicle.

Game day parking location choices are illustrated in Figure 6 below.

Figure 6. Parking Area Choice for Game Attendees Arriving by Auto

Surrounding areas were impacted by parking. About 40% of autos parked off campus or in unidentified areas. Over 2,000 autos parked within the neighborhoods identified as parking impact areas, and over 400 autos parked in neighborhoods outside the impact areas. Approximately 950 autos parked in retail areas.
### UW Parking Services Estimate of Vehicles Parked on Campus:

Over the 2006 Husky football season the average number of vehicles parked on campus on game days, as counted by Parking Services, was 7,885. This count included autos carrying people not attending the football game. To assess how many of those vehicles might be associated with people who came to campus for non-game related reasons, counts were conducted on the three Saturdays in October, 2006 with no home football game. Counts were conducted in the same lots included in the game day counts. These counts yielded, on average, just under 2,450 vehicles. If 2,450 autos came to campus on game days for non-game related purposes, approximately 5,435 of the 7,885 vehicles counted by Parking Services would have come to campus for the football game. This estimate is lower than the survey’s estimate of 5,894 autos parked on campus by game attendees. For comparison, 9,338 autos were counted in 2005. The decline is most likely due to decreased attendance.

### Buses

Just under a quarter of respondents (23%) arrived by transit or charter bus. This represents about 13,200 people who arrived by bus on a typical game day.

Bus ridership varies for “Band Day”, when marching bands from area high schools perform during one game each season. The bands travel to the stadium on charter buses. Band Day was held on September 16th during the Fresno State game. Approximately 2,270 participants arrived in 62 buses.

### UW Parking Services and Metro Transit Estimates of Bus Ridership:

Data on bus ridership to Husky football games are collected in the following ways:

- Parking lot attendants count charter bus passengers.
- Metro transit workers count Park & Ride bus passengers as they board the buses.
- Metro counts regular transit and Husky Special riders when they alight buses at the stadium. However, a significant number of passengers may alight the buses before they reach the stadium and then walk several blocks to the stadium. These passengers are not counted. Passengers going to the game who take routes that stop elsewhere in the University District are also not counted.

During the 2006 football season, these counting methods yielded an average of 500 people on charter buses and 11,000 people on transit buses, for an average of 11,500 people who arrived at each game by bus (12,223 arrived by transit bus on October 14th).

Using the Metro Transit and Parking Services estimates of bus ridership, and ICA’s estimates of total average attendance, approximately 20% of game attendees alighted at Husky Stadium from a Metro Transit or Charter bus on an average game day during the 2006 season. This compares to 23% of survey respondents, or an estimated 13,200 people per game.
Table 6. Average number of Metro Bus Trips and Passengers (Metro Estimates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2-Sep</th>
<th>16-Sep</th>
<th>23-Sep</th>
<th>14-Oct</th>
<th>28-Oct</th>
<th>11-Nov</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Pregame Trips</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Postgame Trips</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregame Passengers</td>
<td>10,676</td>
<td>10,614</td>
<td>11,857</td>
<td>12,223</td>
<td>10,769</td>
<td>10,107</td>
<td>11,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgame Passengers</td>
<td>10,806</td>
<td>10,734</td>
<td>12,428</td>
<td>12,355</td>
<td>10,568</td>
<td>9,787</td>
<td>11,113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Highlighted column indicates day of 2006 survey

Walking

Approximately 10,350 (18%) walked to the stadium, up from 13.5% in 2005. A reasonable explanation for this increase may be attributed to the overall decline in attendance in 2006. The Transportation Office hypothesizes that the number of students who attend games remains constant, and that students are the most likely to walk due to their residences being in close proximity to the stadium. Hence, while the total attendance decreased from previous years, if the total number of students remained the same, there would indeed be an increase in the percentage of fans that walked to the game.

Boats

It is estimated that 2,530 people (4.4%) arrived by boat, a decline of 1.7% from 2005. ICA substantiated the assumption that poor weather in 2006 had an adverse affect on conditions on Lake Washington, which in turn reduced the number of people willing to cross the lake by boat.

UW Intercollegiate Athletics Boat Passenger Estimate:

ICA counts the number of boats and estimates the number of passengers based on boat size at each Husky football game. Charter boat companies provide ICA with actual passenger counts from the charter boats. ICA uses boat shuttle ticket sales to count the number of passengers in boats anchored off shore.

In the 2006 season, these estimation methods yielded an average of approximately 2,324 people in 171 boats. 2,836 people arrived by boat on October 14th.

Using ICA’s estimates of the average number of boat passengers and average attendance, approximately 4% of game attendees arrived by boat. This compares to 4.4% of survey respondents, or 2,530 people.

Bicycles

It is estimated that 575 people (1%) arrived by bicycle. Thanks in part to increased numbers of bike racks at all stadium gates, the proportion of bicyclists actually increased from 2005’s 0.7%.
Other
Approximately 1030 people (1.8%) arrived by other travel modes. These other modes could include motorcycle, taxi, and limousine.

Out-Traffic Management System
Parking Services collects data on traffic leaving parking areas for each game. The data gives a performance indicator for the traffic management system, which includes Seattle Police operations. Table 7 details the time elapsed in minutes between when vehicles began exiting the E1 and E11/12 parking lots and when the lots were significantly clear of vehicles. While the data is limited, generally the out-traffic durations improved in 2006 compared to 2005. This is most likely attributed to the overall decline in game attendance.

Table 7. Out Traffic Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sept 2</th>
<th>Sept 16</th>
<th>Sept 23</th>
<th>Oct 14</th>
<th>Oct 28</th>
<th>Nov 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1 Vehicles Cleared</td>
<td>47 min</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>65 min</td>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>45 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11/12 Vehicles Cleared</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>85 min</td>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>85 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A: Not Available. Data were not collected on these dates.
Pre-Expansion Comparison

Figures 10, 11, and 12 illustrate Historical comparisons for bus passengers, attendees arriving by automobile, and vehicles parked on campus, respectively. The figures show comparisons between the current year and 1984 (before stadium expansion and to post-expansion projections (from the 1986 Stadium Expansion Plan TMP, based on a sellout crowd of 72,200). Data for 2006 are from the intercept survey conducted at the October 14th game.

The comparisons show that the desired modal shifts surpass the expectations of the 1986 Stadium Expansion Parking Plan TMP.

Figure 10. Historical Comparison: Bus Passengers
Figure 11. Historical Comparison: Arriving by Automobile

Figure 12. Historical Comparison: Vehicles Parked on Campus
* In all instances, data represent the total number of vehicles parked on campus (on a game day, vehicles parked by game patrons, as well as UW employees and other visitors to campus). In 2006, counts conducted by Parking Services estimated an average of 7,885 vehicles parked on game days, compared to approximately 2,450 vehicles parked on campus during typical non-game Saturdays.
Neighborhood Parking

Impact Areas

Figure 4 on page 8 shows the neighborhood parking impact areas (in blue) that are defined in City Council Resolution 27435. Portions of these parking impact areas have Special Event RPZs for football game days. On average during the 2006 football season, an estimated 5,600 people parked in the neighborhood parking impact areas in 2,000 autos on each game day, compared to 8,000 people in 2,900 vehicles in 2005. Game attendees parked an additional 400 vehicles in neighborhoods outside of the parking impact areas, compared to 700 vehicles in 2005.

The 1986 Stadium Expansion Parking Plan and Transportation Management Program cites the need for the City of Seattle to increase enforcement and monitoring in neighborhood parking impact areas during Husky games. The Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) provided a summary of parking citations issued in neighborhood parking impact areas during the two home games during the 2006 season. On average, 118 citations were issued per game, which is down from an average of 196 citations in 2005. While it is not known if the same amount of time was devoted to issuing citations in 2006, it appears as though citations are discouraging parking in the neighborhood impact areas.
Conclusions

The TMP continues to successfully encourage fans to travel to games by alternative modes. Almost one quarter of all game attendees arrived at the stadium in transit and charter buses. Almost one fifth of fans walked to the stadium. Also, carpool parking price incentives appear to be successful, resulting in higher average auto occupancy in campus parking lots compared to other parking areas. It is estimated that approximately 2,000 autos parked in residential neighborhoods identified as parking impact areas.