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Executive Summary

After seventeen 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 2004 TMP monitoring efforts. In 2004, data were collected by conducting a random intercept survey of game attendees as they entered the gates at Husky Stadium on November 6th. 767 surveys were attempted, with 99 refusals and 668 usable responses. Reported game attendance was 60,567 on the survey date. Results are estimated within a confidence interval of +/- 3.7% at 95% confidence.

Key findings of this report are presented below:

- Game attendees traveled to the stadium using these modes:
  - 52.1% carpooled in 2004 compared to 45.4% in 2003. 3.9% drove alone, compared 1.8% in 2003. The average auto occupancy in 2004 was 2.7 persons per car, down from 3.2 in 2003.
  - 29.9% arrived by transit or charter bus, compared to 31.7% in 2003.
  - 8.2% walked to the game, down from 13.2% in 2003.
  - 4.0% arrived by boat vs. 5.2% in 2003.
  - 0.7% arrived by bicycle, compared to 1.6% in 2003.

- The change in mode split following the implementation of the TMP is greater than was anticipated in the 1986 TMP plan. Projected mode shares compare to actual 2004 mode shares as follows:
  - Projected auto use was 72% vs. actual auto use of 56%.
  - Projected transit and charter bus use was 16% vs. actual transit and charter bus use of 29.9%.
  - Projected use of walking was 8.1% vs. actual use of walking of 8.2%.
  - Projected boat use was 3.9% vs. actual boat use of 4.0%.

- It was estimated that roughly 3,900 autos parked in surrounding neighborhood parking impact areas, an increase from 2003 levels.
Introduction

The University of Washington hosted six football games at Husky Stadium during the 2004 season, listed in Table 1:

Table 1. 2004 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>September 5th</td>
<td>2:30 pm</td>
<td>Fresno State</td>
<td>65,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18th</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>65,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 9th</td>
<td>12:30 pm</td>
<td>San Jose State</td>
<td>65,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16th</td>
<td>12:30 pm</td>
<td>Oregon State</td>
<td>65,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 6th</td>
<td>12:30 pm</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>60,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 13th</td>
<td>12:30 pm</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>65,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Season Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>64,629</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the 2004 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
- boats
- bicycles

The purpose of this document is to monitor the effectiveness of the TMP during the 2004 season. To monitor TMP effectiveness, the University uses several indicators:

- transportation mode choice
- average auto occupancy
- neighborhood parking impacts
- patron origin
- duration of exiting traffic

This report explains the TMP efforts in 2004. It details the methodology used to collect the data related to performance indicators and discusses the results. It illustrates travel mode choice in 2004 and draws comparisons to previous years. Finally, it describes the neighborhood parking impact areas and draws conclusions about the success of the TMP in 2004.
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 volumes 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.

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 2004 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 2004 season, parking on campus cost $10.00 for vehicles with three or more persons, $20.00 for vehicles with less than three persons, and $30.00 for motor homes and buses. In addition to financial incentives to carpool, the TMP uses marketing information to encourage carpooling. The 2004 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 whom they might share a ride. During the 2004 season the Transportation Office partnered with King County Metro to provide a $5 gas voucher, available to everyone who logged on to Event Ridematch at www.RideshareOnline.com.

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 their bus driver. Sound Transit Express route 550 is also free 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 2004 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 186 inbound and 135 outbound Park and Ride bus trips each game. An average of 9,529 passengers rode to Husky Stadium on the Park & Ride Service. The average number of return passengers for the 2004 football season was 9,497.

Free Husky Special Service
King County Metro operated five special bus routes to Husky Stadium during each game in 2004. Service was provided from downtown Seattle, Ballard, and Lake City. Over the course of the 2004 season, Husky Special Service carried 14,010 passengers to Husky Stadium in 282 trips. Figure 3 illustrates these special routes.
Figure 3. Husky Special Transit Service
Boat Shuttles

In 2004, 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 $4 per person.

Boat Moorage

For private vessels, boat moorage was available on a season or single game basis in 2004. 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 2004, the University of Washington Transportation Office continued its program to provide bike lock-up space by placing bicycle racks near stadium entrances during the 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) limit 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 2004, more than 21,000 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, 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 (www.washington.edu/upass/news_and_reports/notices/football.html).
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 November 6th, 2004 the UW Transportation Office conducted a survey of football game attendees as they passed through the gates at Husky Stadium. The weather was cold and slightly rainy. Twenty-five 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 surveyed every 80th patron who entered the gate and attempted 767 random surveys. In 2004, surveyors asked about patrons’ home zip code. This was done in an attempt to gain an understanding of where patrons were coming from to attend the game.

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 form is displayed in Figure 4 and the survey map is shown in Figure 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFUSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Drive / ride to the game today?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including in RV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Or mode:

| BIKE | BUS | WALK | BOAT | OTHER |

2. Inc self, # of people in the car?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

3. Parking Area:

| X | Dropped off, not parked |
| A | (on campus, yellow) |
| B | (retail area, orange) |
| C | (neighborhood, blue) |
| D | (out of survey area, white) |
| E | (patron doesn’t know) |

HOME ZIP:___________

Figure 4. Survey Form

Figure 5. Survey Map
Implementation of 2003 Survey Recommendations

Several suggestions were made at the conclusion of the 2003 survey about possible improvements to the survey methodology. Following is a list of the suggestions and how they were addressed in 2004.

Conduct the survey until the stadium is substantially full. The survey in 2004 was conducted until 2:00pm, when the flow of patrons passing through the gates had essentially ceased. Not all survey teams stayed to the end of the survey. At gates with multiple teams, teams were dismissed one at a time as the flow of patrons decreased. Decreasing the number of surveyors in proportion to the number of arriving patrons struck a good balance between inclusion of late arrivals and labor costs.

Better coordinate the process of dismissing survey teams at gates with multiple teams. The 2004 survey teams were dismissed according to a schedule set during training. Two-person teams that would be leaving before 2:00pm were decided on during training, and the transportation planner confirmed dismissal times with designated teams approximately thirty minutes prior to their dismissal.

Ensure the number of survey teams stationed at each stadium gate is proportional to the number of fans passing through each gate: In 2004, survey teams were stationed at each gate according to the number of surveys attempted at each gate in 2003.

Have a centralized location at the stadium for temporary storage of survey materials. In 2004, the transportation planner arranged to have a small, secure area available to place survey materials from surveyors who were dismissed before 2:00pm. This was done so that the planner would not be stuck carrying copious amounts of survey materials in the latter stages of the survey process.

Data Collection Outcomes

767 surveys were attempted, with 668 responses. Consistent with 2003, there was a high response rate (87%). Only 99 fans refused the survey. While the number of responses is below the survey goal, there was a sufficient amount to produce an acceptable confidence interval. Football game attendance was unusually low for 2004, especially during the latter half of the season.

With a total population of 60,567 fans (reported paid attendance), the results are within a confidence interval of +/- 3.7% at 95% confidence.

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. This non-response error seems to have been lower in 2004. In contrast to 2003, the non-response rates were approximately equal at data collection locations, even though the responses varied by location.
Results

Travel Mode Choice
Approximately half of all attendees traveled to the game by auto, including 52.1% in a carpool and 3.9% in a single-occupant vehicle (SOV). Taking the bus and walking were the next most popular travel modes. Mode choices are listed in Table 2 and illustrated in Figure 6.

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>348</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>31,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>18,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>4,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* estimates based on average paid attendance for the 2004 football season as reported by Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA)

Figure 6: Mode Choice

Like previous years, game attendance is based on reported paid attendance, not actual attendance. To the extent that paid attendance exceeds actual attendance, the estimated number of people traveling by each mode is overestimated.
**Auto Occupancy and Parking**

Most people (93%) who traveled to the game by auto came in a carpool. Only 7% arrived in a SOV. Auto occupancy is summarized in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto Occupancy</th>
<th>Percent of Attendees Who Arrived in Autos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average auto occupancy was 2.7 people. While it is estimated that 33,900 people arrived by auto to each game in the 2004 football season, the total number of autos driven to each game was estimated at 12,500. These autos 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
- neighborhoods outside the TMP parking impact area

Based on average occupancies by parking area, the numbers of autos parked in each of the four areas were estimated and listed in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Area</th>
<th>Total Occupancy* (rounded to nearest tenth)</th>
<th>Average Occupancy</th>
<th>Autos* (rounded to nearest tenth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - campus</td>
<td>18130</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>6150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - retail</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - neighborhood</td>
<td>9340</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>3880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - out of area</td>
<td>2540</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - didn't know</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X – dropped off</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,920</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,480</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* estimates based on average paid attendance for the 2004 football season as reported by ICA

In Figure 5 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 53.5% of attendees who arrived in autos parked on campus. This is similar to 2003, when 54.4% parked on campus. Autos parked on campus had a higher average occupancy than those parked in any other area.

Game day parking location choices are illustrated in Figure 7.

![Parking Area Choice](image)

**Figure 7. Parking Area Choice for Game Attendees Arriving by Auto**

Surrounding areas were impacted by parking. Over 45% of autos were parked off campus or in unidentified areas. Approximately four percent of attendees who arrived by auto were dropped off. It is estimated that 3,900 autos were parked within the neighborhoods identified as parking impact areas, and over 1,000 autos were parked in neighborhoods outside the impact areas. Almost 700 autos were parked in retail areas.

**UW Parking Services Estimate of Vehicles Parked on Campus:**

Over the 2004 Husky football season the average number of vehicles parked on campus on game days, as counted by Parking Services, was 8,900. This count included autos carrying people not attending the football game. To assess how many of those vehicles might be associated with people who had come to campus for non-game related reasons, a count was done on a Saturday in October, 2003 with no home football game. Counts were conducted in the largest, most highly used lots, which collectively comprise two thirds of the total campus-wide parking capacity. This count yielded just over 4,300 vehicles. If 4,300 autos came to campus on game days for non-game related purposes, approximately 4,600 of the 8,900 vehicles counted by Parking Services would have come to campus for the football game. This estimate is lower than the survey’s estimate of 6,100 autos parked on campus by game attendees.
Buses
Nearly one-third of respondents (29.9%) arrived by transit or charter bus. This represents about 18,100 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 October 9th during the San Jose State game. Approximately 2,380 participants arrived in 68 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 2004 football season, these counting methods yielded an average of 900 people on charter buses and 11,000 people on transit buses, for an average of 11,900 people who arrived at each game by bus (10,600 arrived by bus on November 6th).

Using the Metro Transit and Parking Services estimates of bus ridership, and ICA’s estimates of total average attendance, approximately 19% of game attendees alighted at Husky Stadium from a Metro Transit or Charter bus on an average game day during the 2004 season. This compares to 30% of survey respondents, or an estimated 18,100 people per game.

Table 5. Average number of Metro Bus Trips and Passengers (Metro Estimates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>5-Sep</th>
<th>18-Sep</th>
<th>9-Oct</th>
<th>16-Oct</th>
<th>6-Nov</th>
<th>13-Nov</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Pregame Trips</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Postgame Trips</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregame Passengers</td>
<td>12072</td>
<td>12756</td>
<td>9853</td>
<td>11516</td>
<td>9765</td>
<td>10082</td>
<td>11007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgame Passengers</td>
<td>12643</td>
<td>12916</td>
<td>10163</td>
<td>11648</td>
<td>10190</td>
<td>10246</td>
<td>11301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Walking
It was estimated that 5,000 people (8.2%) walked to the stadium. Poor weather likely contributed to the lower rate of walking to the game.
**Boats**

It was estimated that 2,500 people (4%) arrived 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 2004 season, these estimation methods yielded an average of approximately 4,300 people on 300 boats. 6,920 people arrived by boat on November 6th (season high).

Using ICA’s estimate of the average number of boat passengers, and ICA’s estimates of average attendance, approximately 6.6% of game attendees arrived by boat. This compares to 4.0% of survey respondents, or 2,500 people.

---

**Bicycles**

It was estimated that 400 people (0.6%) arrived by bicycle. Poor weather likely contributed to the lower rate of biking to the game.

---

**Other**

Approximately 700 people (1.2%) arrived by other travel modes. These other modes could include motorcycle, taxi, and limousine.
**Patron Origin**

In 2004, a question regarding home zip code was included in the survey for the first time. This was done in an attempt to gain an understanding of patron origin and for garnering a general gauge of patron density throughout the region.

King County was the origin for 51.1% of patrons, Pierce County for 8.2%, Snohomish County for 12.6%, and 28.1% of patrons came from outside of the three counties. Figure 8 depicts patron distributions in King County by zip code.

![Figure 8. Patron Origin by Zip Code in King County](image)

The highest concentrations of patrons occurred in the greater-university district, followed by the Bellevue region. In general, patron concentrations decreased as distance from the university increased.
Figure 9 shows the distributions in King County of patrons who arrived by automobile.

The highest concentrations of patrons who arrived via automobile occurred in North Seattle and in the South and East Bellevue regions.
Figure 10 depicts the distributions in King County of patrons who arrived by bus.

![Map showing bus patron origin in King County](image)

**Figure 10. Bus Patron Origin by Zip Code in King County**

The highest concentrations of patrons who arrived by bus occurred in Bellevue and the Wallingford / Ballard neighborhoods.

**Out-Traffic Management System**

Parking Services collects data on traffic leaving parking areas for each game. The data gives an indicator of the conclusion of out traffic management system, which includes Seattle Police operations. Table 6 details the time elapsed in minutes between game completion and when the E1 and E12 parking lots were significantly clear of vehicles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sept 5th</th>
<th>Sept 18th</th>
<th>Oct 9th</th>
<th>Oct 16th</th>
<th>Nov 6th</th>
<th>Nov 13th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E12 Vehicles Cleared</td>
<td>75 min</td>
<td>78 min</td>
<td>38 min</td>
<td>65 min</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>50 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Vehicles Cleared</td>
<td>70 min</td>
<td>18 min</td>
<td>42 min</td>
<td>55 min</td>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>50 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre-Expansion Comparison

Historical comparisons are difficult because mode choice categories have changed over time. However, historical comparisons are possible for three categories: bus passengers, attendees arriving by auto, and the number of vehicles parked on campus. Figures 11, 12, and 13 illustrate and compare bus passengers, attendees arriving by automobile, and vehicles parked on campus, respectively. The data compared are the percentage in 1984 before the stadium was expanded, the percentage projected to be reached after the stadium expansion (at full capacity), the percentage estimated by the intercept survey in 2004, and, in the case of the vehicles parked on campus, data from Parking Services. Data for 2004 are for November 6th. Post expansion projections are derived from a set percentage based upon a sellout crowd of 72,000. In the case of lower game attendance, these projections decrease proportionally to the amount of attendance under 72,000. The comparisons show that the desired modal shifts have surpassed the expectations of the 1986 Stadium Expansion Parking Plan TMP.

Figure 11. Historical Comparison: Bus Passengers
Figure 13. Historical Comparison: Arriving by Automobile

Figure 13. Historical Comparison: Vehicles Parked on Campus

* The 2004 Survey only estimated the number of vehicles parked on campus by people going to the football game. The 1984 and Post Expansion Projection numbers included all vehicles parked on campus. In 2004, a count conducted by Parking Services on the date of the survey estimated 9,000 vehicles parked on campus, compared to approximately 4,400 vehicles parked on campus during a typical non-game Saturday; suggesting that approximately 4,400 vehicles parked on campus on game days are not associated with the game.
Neighborhood Parking

Impact Areas

Figure 5 on page 8 shows the neighborhood parking impact areas (in blue) that are defined in City Council Resolution 27435. Some of these neighborhoods have Special Event RPZs for football game days. On average during the 2004 football season, an estimated 9,300 people parked in the neighborhood parking impact areas in 3,900 autos on each game day. An additional 1,000 autos were parked by game attendees in neighborhoods outside of the Residential Parking Zones.

The causes for the increase in autos parked in neighborhood parking impact areas, from 2,100 in 2003 to 3,900 in 2004, is not fully understood. There are several factors that could have led to the rise in these numbers, including measurement error, lack of RPZ enforcement, or the increase in on-campus parking fees. An increased differential between the actual attendance and the paid (and reported) attendance may also have inflated the estimate of cars parked off campus (as it would inflate other numerical estimates). In addition, the poor weather on survey day might have caused people who would usually walk or bike to drive and park in the neighborhood impact areas. The 2003 to 2004 rate drop of bicyclists (from 1.6% to 0.7%) and walkers (from 13.2% to 8.2%) would lend some credence to this theory.

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. In 2003 and 2004, the City of Seattle failed to conduct a survey of parking violations in the residential parking zones surrounding Husky Stadium. Levels of enforcement in these areas have previously been tracked since 1986, but are unknown for the last two years. It is unknown whether enforcement levels in these areas over the past two years are contributing to the higher rate of autos parked in residential areas.
Conclusions

The TMP successfully encouraged fans to travel to the game by alternative modes. Almost one-third of all game attendees arrived at the stadium in transit and charter buses. Another 8% 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. The decrease in overall average auto occupancy, from 3.2 in 2003 to 2.7 in 2004, was probably due to the lack of enthusiasm of large groups to attend games because of the extremely poor performance of the Husky football team (the worst in the University’s 115 years of football).

It was estimated that approximately 3,900 autos parked in residential neighborhoods identified as parking impact areas. Average auto occupancy was lowest in these areas.