# TABLE OF CONTENTS

*Executive Summary* ........................................................................................................ iii

*Introduction* .................................................................................................................... 4

*Background* ....................................................................................................................... 5

*TMP Elements* ................................................................................................................ 5

  *Carpool Incentives* ......................................................................................................... 5

  *Transit* ............................................................................................................................ 5

  - Free Regular Service .................................................................................................... 5
  - Free Park & Ride Service ................................................................................................. 5
  - Free Husky Special Service ......................................................................................... 7

  *Boats* ............................................................................................................................... 8

  - Boat Shuttles ................................................................................................................. 8
  - Boat Moorage ................................................................................................................ 8
  - Charter Boats and Buses ............................................................................................... 8

  *Bicycles* ........................................................................................................................... 8

  *Restricted Parking Zone* ............................................................................................... 8

  *Marketing* ....................................................................................................................... 8

*Data Collection* ............................................................................................................... 9

  *Survey Methodology* .................................................................................................... 9

  *Data Collection Outcomes* .......................................................................................... 11

*Results* ............................................................................................................................. 11

  *Travel Mode Choice* .................................................................................................... 11

  *Automobile Occupancy and Parking* ........................................................................... 13

  *Buses* ............................................................................................................................. 14

  *Walking* .......................................................................................................................... 16

  *Boats* ............................................................................................................................. 16

  *Bicycles* .......................................................................................................................... 17

  *Other* ................................................................................................................................ 17

*Pre-Expansion Comparison* ............................................................................................ 19

*Neighborhood Parking Impact Areas* ............................................................................. 21

*Conclusion* ....................................................................................................................... 22
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Park & Ride Lot Locations .............................................................................................................. 6
Figure 2. Park & Ride Post-game Boarding Locations .................................................................................. 6
Figure 3. Husky Special Transit Service ....................................................................................................... 7
Figure 4. Map used to indicate parking locations ......................................................................................... 10
Figure 5. Mode Choice 2009 .......................................................................................................................... 12
Figure 6. Parking Area Choice for Game Attendees Arriving by Auto .............................................................. 14
Figure 7. Historical Comparison: Bus Passengers ............................................................................................ 19
Figure 8. Historical Comparison: Arriving by Automobile ............................................................................. 20
Figure 9. Historical Comparison: Vehicles Parked on Campus ....................................................................... 20

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. 2009 Husky Football Games ........................................................................................................... 4
Table 2. Travel Mode Choice 2009 .................................................................................................................. 11
Table 3. Travel Mode Choice, 2003 - 2009 ...................................................................................................... 12
Table 4. Automobile Occupancy ..................................................................................................................... 13
Table 5. Average Occupancy of Parked Automobiles .................................................................................... 13
Table 6. Average number of King County Metro Bus Trips and Passengers .................................................... 16
Executive Summary

After twenty-two years of operation, the Husky Stadium Expansion Parking Plan and Transportation Management Program (TMP) continued to fulfill its primary goal of accommodating sellout crowds while reducing parking impacts in nearby residential areas. Transportation travel mode targets have been met and surpassed in 2009.

This report outlines the findings of the 2009 TMP monitoring efforts. In 2009, data was collected by conducting a random intercept survey of game attendees as they entered the gates at Husky Stadium on October 24th. Of the 1,298 surveys attempted, 169 were refused and 20 had data collection errors. In total 1,109 usable responses were received, representing 85.44% of attempted surveys. Reported game attendance for October 18th was 67,809. Results are estimated within a confidence interval of +/- 2.92% at a 95% confidence level.

Key findings according to usable data:

- Game attendees traveled to the stadium using these modes:
  - 45.0% carpooled (traveled in autos with more than one person) in 2009, compared to 49.5% in 2008. 3.88% drove alone, compared to 5.4% in 2008. The average auto occupancy in 2009 was 3.09 persons per car, which was higher than 2.90 persons per car in 2008.
  - 25.1% arrived by transit or charter bus, up from 21.7% in 2008.
  - 17.7% walked to the game, down from 18.4% in 2008.
  - 4.8% arrived by boat, up significantly from 2.4% in 2008.
  - 0.9% arrived by bicycle, down from 1.1% in 2008.
- 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 2009 mode shares as follows:
    - Projected auto use was 72% vs. actual auto use of 49%.
    - Projected transit and charter bus use was 16% vs. actual transit and charter bus use of 25%.
    - Projected pedestrian share was 8.1% vs. the actual 17.7%.
    - Projected boat use was 3.9% vs. actual boat use of 4.7%.
Introduction

The University of Washington hosted seven football games at Husky Stadium during the 2009 season, listed in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Opponent</th>
<th>Reported Game Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 5, 2009</td>
<td>Lousiana State University</td>
<td>69,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 12, 2009</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>58,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 19, 2009</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>61,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10, 2009</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>61,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 24, 2009</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>67,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 28, 2009</td>
<td>Washington State</td>
<td>68,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5, 2009</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>62,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season Average</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>64,356</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the 2009 season, the Husky Stadium Expansion Parking Plan and Transportation Management Program (TMP) was executed to provide transportation options to football fans and to discourage single occupant vehicle (SOV) trips to the stadium. Non-SOV modes were encouraged, including:

- Carpools
- Transit and charter buses
- Walking
- Boats
- Bicycles

The purpose of this document is to monitor the effectiveness of the TMP during the 2009 season using the following indicators:

- Mode choice
- Average automobile occupancy
- Parking location choice
- Neighborhood parking impacts

This report explains the TMP efforts in 2009, details the methodology used to collect the data related to performance indicators, and discusses the results. It illustrates mode choice in 2009 and draws comparisons to previous years. Finally, it describes the neighborhood parking impact areas and draws conclusions about the TMP in 2009.
Background

In 1987, Husky Stadium was expanded 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 periods of time. The TMP is in place to reduce the number and impact of automobiles 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 either carpool or use non-automobile transportation options, such as walking, mass transit, or bicycling. The City of Seattle is responsible for traffic management and parking enforcement in residential parking zones.

Seattle City Council Resolution 27435, relative to the TMP, requires the University and the City of Seattle to collect data during each football season. The data is then used to monitor the performance of the TMP. Data collected in 1986 is a baseline for comparing impacts after the stadium expansion in 1987. This document summarizes the data collected for the 2009 season and compares them to past seasons.

TMP Elements

Carpool Incentives

The TMP uses a pricing system to incentivize carpooling. During the 2009 season, parking on campus cost $15 for vehicles with three or more persons, $25 for vehicles with less than three persons, $50 for motor homes and campers, and $75 for buses. In addition to financial incentives, the TMP encourages carpooling through a marketing campaign. The 2009 “Get to The Game” Website highlighted the Event Ridematch feature provided by RideshareOnline. This regional ride matching service, designed by King County Metro, allows game attendees to find others with whom they might share a ride to the game.

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 to the stadium for free on King County Metro buses and Sound Transit Express route 554 by showing their game ticket to the driver.

Free Park & Ride Service

In 2009, King County Metro provided special game day bus service from eight Park & Ride lots in the region, shown in Figure 1. Fans were allowed to park at the Park & Ride lots for free, and were allowed to ride on King County Metro buses for free by showing their game tickets to bus drivers. Buses began boarding at the lots two hours prior to kickoff, with 20-minute headways. Following the games, fans boarded the buses at specified locations, as shown in Figure 2, to return to the designated lots.

On average, King County Metro provided 157 inbound and 127 outbound Park & Ride bus trips each game. An average of 9,396 and 9,592 passengers rode to and from Husky Stadium, respectively, on the Park & Ride Service on each game of the season.
Figure 1. Park & Ride Lot Locations

Figure 2. Park & Ride Post-game Boarding Locations
Free Husky Special Service

King County Metro operated five special bus routes to Husky Stadium during each game in 2009. Service was provided from downtown Seattle, Ballard, and Lake City. On average, King County Metro provided 34 inbound and 32 outbound bus trips each game on all Husky Special Service routes. This service on average brought 1,990 fans to the game and took 2,247 safely home.

![Figure 3. Husky Special Transit Service](image)
**Boats**

**Boat Shuttles**
In 2009, guests could anchor their private vessels in Union Bay and a boat shuttle service would assist them in getting to Husky Stadium. The shuttle service took fans to the Husky Stadium boat dock for free returned them to their boats after the game for a fee of $6 per person.

**Boat Moorage**
For private vessels, boat moorage was available on a season or single game basis in 2009. The price of the permit was dependent on the length of the vessel. Single game permits were available through the Tyee Office with purchase required 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 Husky Stadium during home football games.

**Bicycles**

UW Commuter Services provided bicycle parking by siting 12 additional bicycle racks near the stadium entrances during football season. Additionally, Husky Football partnered with area cycling club, Bike Works, to offer free valet bicycle parking at every home game; fans who biked to the game could leave their bikes above the Triangle Parking Garage while volunteers monitored them for the duration of the game. In order to further encourage bicycling, UW Commuter Services and Cascade Bicycle Club sponsored a “Bike Tailgate Party” on September 12th. Information regarding these efforts was promoted on the “Get to The Game” website.

**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 issued $44 citations to non-residents who parked in the restricted zones.

**Marketing**

UW Commuter Services provided extensive transportation information to Inter-Collegiate Athletics (ICA) for them to post on the official Husky Football website, [http://www.gohuskies.com/gettothegame](http://www.gohuskies.com/gettothegame). The web site 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. In addition to the website, Commuter Services produced a postcard that was mailed to season ticket holders and individuals who requested transportation options information. In 2009, more than 23,000 “Game Day” flyers were printed and distributed to season ticket holders and at point of sale ticket purchases. An additional 3,250 “Bike to the Game” postcards were printed and 3,000 mailed to season ticket holders residing near the Burke Gilman Trail.
Data Collection

Data collection consisted of a survey of game attendees conducted by UW Commuter Services at one football game in the season, bus ridership data collected by King County Metro, campus parking and charter bus data collected by UW Commuter Services, and boat passenger and game attendance data collected by UW Intercollegiate Athletics.

Survey Methodology

On October 24th, 2009, UW Commuter Services conducted a survey of football game attendees as they passed through the gates at Husky Stadium. The weather was surprisingly comfortable for the season. Although it was a bit chilly in the morning, the sun came out and the temperature was in the upper 40’s to lower 50’s during the survey. Thirty-seven surveyors in teams of two and three were distributed to the eight stadium gates, proportional to the number of game attendees estimated to enter through each gate. The teams attempted 1,298 surveys and obtained 1,109 usable responses, equating to a higher-than-expected response rate of 85.4%.

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 4.

  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?
Figure 4. Map used to indicate parking locations
**Data Collection Outcomes**

Of the 1,298 attempted surveys, 1,109 yielded usable responses, a response rate of 85.4%. With a total population of 67,809 fans (reported paid attendance for the game), the results are within a confidence interval of +/- 2.92% 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. The travel behavior of game workers is not known.

Like most surveys, this one 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 alone in order to portray themselves favorably to the surveyors. Little can be done to suppress social desirability biases; however, 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 travel behavior.

**Results**

**Travel Mode Choice**

Approximately half of all attendees traveled to the game by car, including 45.0% by carpool and 3.9% by SOV. Taking the bus and walking were the next most popular travel modes. Table 2 and Figure 5 show attendee mode share.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
<th>Share of Attendance (on surveyed day)</th>
<th>Share of Attendance (season average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>30,511</td>
<td>28,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>16,998</td>
<td>12,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>11,984</td>
<td>11,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3,241</td>
<td>3,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2,629</td>
<td>2,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>1,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67,809</td>
<td>64,356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimates based on paid attendance for the 2009 football seasons as reported by Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA)

As in previous years, game attendance was based on reported paid attendance, not actual attendance. If paid attendance exceeded actual attendance, the estimated number of people traveling by each mode would be overestimated; however, actual attendance is unknown.
Figure 5. Mode Choice 2009

Table 3 provides a historical comparison of travel mode choice over the seven years of the intercept survey. Bus ridership to Husky Stadium increased by nearly four percentage points compared to 2008, from 21.7% to 25.1%. The bus mode share in 2009 is more consistent with the previous five years than it is with 2008 data. Boating also showed substantial growth in 2009, as its share of total trips doubled from 2.4% to 4.8%. The 2007 and 2008 boat mode shares were much lower than those observed in previous years, which are more consistent with the 2009 data.

Table 3. Travel Mode Choice, 2003 - 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Automobile Occupancy and Parking

The vast majority of people who traveled to the game by car came via carpool; only 8% of those who came in an automobile drove alone. Auto occupancy is summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Automobile Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto Occupancy</th>
<th>Percent of Attendees Who Arrived in Automobiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the survey game day, approximately 33,140 people arrived in 10,711 vehicles, for an average automobile occupancy of 3.09. These vehicles parked in one of four areas:

- Campus parking lots
- Retail areas (University Way corridor 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 cars parked in each of the four areas are estimated and listed in Table 5.

Table 5. Average Occupancy of Parked Automobiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Area</th>
<th>Total Occupancy*</th>
<th>Total Automobiles*</th>
<th>Average Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>18,121</td>
<td>5,632</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>6,462</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of Area</td>
<td>2,431</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Off</td>
<td>2,134</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,140</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,711</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.09</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounded to nearest whole number

In Figure 4 on page 11, 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 area are white.

Approximately 52.6% of attendees who arrived by car parked on campus in approximately 5,632 vehicles. The mode share and number of cars estimated to have parked on campus fell sharply in 2009 compared to 2008, when 58.3% of survey respondents reported parking on campus in approximately 6,939 vehicles.
Average occupancy for cars parked on campus increased to 3.22 from 2008’s estimate of 3.05, resulting in more people parking on campus in fewer vehicles.

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

![Parking Area Choice](image)

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

Surrounding areas were impacted by parking. About 40% of cars parked off campus or in unidentified areas compared with 42% in 2008. About 2,154 cars parked within neighborhoods identified as parking impact areas, and about 909 cars parked in neighborhoods outside the impact areas. Approximately 534 parked in retail areas.

**UW Commuter Services Estimate of Vehicles Parked on Campus:**
Over the 2009 Husky football season, the average number of vehicles parked on campus on a game day, as counted by Commuter Services, was 8,059. This is inclusive of all vehicles parked on campus regardless of purpose.

**Buses**

Twenty-five percent of respondents arrived by transit or charter bus. This represents approximately 16,998 people on the survey game day and 16,132 people on a typical game day throughout the 2009 season. One explanation for the increase in bus ridership in 2009 as compared to 2008 is increased certainty regarding King County Metro’s Husky service. Due to changes in federal charter regulations, continued operation of King County Metro’s historic football service was uncertain in 2008 until shortly before the first home game. As a result, less marketing was done to make fans aware of their transit options and encourage their use. In 2009, King County Metro and ICA secured an early agreement through a private bus company that
allowed King County Metro to provide most of its service the same way it had done prior to 2008. Service to the Shoreline Park & Ride and Northgate Transit Center was initially provided by the private bus company, then shifted over to King County Metro operation starting at the October 10\textsuperscript{th} home game against Arizona. If the increase in bus ridership was associated with reliable provision of King County Metro’s Free Park & Rider Service, then a slight increase over 2009 might be expected in 2010 if the transit agency retains the ability to provide this service.

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. In 2009, Band Day was held on September 12\textsuperscript{th} during the Idaho game. Approximately 3,500 participants arrived in 60 buses and 8 support trucks.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
\textbf{UW Commuter Services and King County Metro Estimates of Bus Ridership:} \\
\textbf{Data on bus ridership to Husky football games are collected in the following ways:} \\
\begin{itemize}
\item Parking lot attendants count charter bus passengers. \\
\item King County Metro employees count Park & Ride bus passengers as they board the buses. \\
\item King County Metro counts regular transit and Husky Special riders when they leave buses at the stadium. A significant number of passengers may leave the buses before they reach the stadium and then walk several blocks to reach the ticket gates. These passengers are not counted. Passengers going to the game who take routes that stop elsewhere in the University District are also not counted.
\end{itemize}
\hline
Parking lot attendants counted charter bus passengers for all games during the 2009 football season except for the October 24\textsuperscript{th} game against Oregon. Normally all home games are counted by Commuter Services; however, in 2009 there was a communication error in obtaining all relevant information. The charter bus information reported here excludes the October 24\textsuperscript{th} game against Oregon.

During the 2009 football season, these counts yielded an average of 556 charter bus passengers and 12,204 transit bus passengers, for a total average of 12,760 people who arrived at a typical game by bus. In previous surveys, Commuter Services was able to determine transit and charter bus mode share for the survey game day based on these counting methods; however, because Commuter Services was unable to secure data from 2009’s survey game day, the estimate and mode share information is unavailable.
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
Table 6. Average number of King County Metro Bus Trips and Passengers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Game</th>
<th>Pregame</th>
<th>Postgame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>Passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Sept: LSU</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>11,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Sept: Idaho</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>10,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Sep: USC</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>11,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Oct: Arizona</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>13,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Oct: Oregon</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>13,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Nov: WSU</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>13,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Nov: Cal</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>10,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season Average</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>12,204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Survey date

Walking

Approximately 11,984 (17.7%) fans walked to the stadium, slightly down from 18.4% in 2008. Commuter Services hypothesizes that students are the most likely group to walk due to their residences being in close proximity to the stadium. Others who walk may include residents of nearby neighborhoods and people who use the Burke-Gilman Trail as their route to the stadium.

Boats

It is estimated that 3,241 people (4.8%) arrived by boat, a substantial increase from 2.4% in 2008. This increase could be due to the nice weather during the day of the survey. The increase could also be attributed to additional training provided to those who administered the survey. Furthermore, it should be noted that the boat mode share was unusually low in 2007 and 2008, and 2009 has a share comparable to those observed in surveys prior to 2007.

UW Intercollegiate Athletics Boat Passenger Estimate:

In 2009, ICA used boat shuttle ticket sales to count the number of passengers in boats anchored offshore; ICA also counted the number of charter boats bringing passengers to the game; and ICA counted the number of boats that moored at each Husky home game. In past years, charter boat companies provided ICA with passenger numbers; however, that data was not available in 2009. Similarly, ICA typically estimates the number of passengers in boats moored at the nearby docks based on boat size; however, this estimate was also unavailable in 2009.

During the 2009 season, ICA’s shuttle ticket sales yielded an average of 404 passengers arriving at Husky Stadium by shuttle boat (405 passengers on October 24th). This represents 0.6% of game attendees. In addition to shuttle boats, an average of 7 charter boats (8 boats on October 24th) brought passengers to games during 2009. Finally, during the 2009 season, an average of 104 passenger boats (106 boats on October 24th) moored at the nearby docks.
Compared to the survey, data from ICA appear to give a significantly lower estimate of the number of attendees arriving by boat, and represent a significant decline from ICA’s most recent data collection in 2007, which found that approximately 4% of game attendees arrived by boat. The 2009 survey suggests that nearly 5% of game attendees arrived by boat on October 24th. For ICA’s boat passenger estimates to yield a share consistent with the survey, the average occupancy of charter boats and boats moored at nearby docks would have to approach 30 passengers, which seems unlikely. In future surveys, steps will be taken to better understand whether the survey overestimates boat arrivals, ICA underestimates boat arrivals, or both.

**Bicycles**

It is estimated that 550 people (0.8%) arrived by bicycle. The bike share dropped from 2008’s 1.1%, despite additional efforts made by ICA and UW Commuter Services to encourage bicycling to the game. These efforts included free valet bike parking, special discount tickets to the September 12th game against Idaho ($46 compared to the regular price of $55), a tailgate party for bicyclists at that same game, a Husky Cycling fundraiser, and bike-powered blended smoothies. Unfortunately, relatively few people took advantage of the discounted ticket offer. In contrast, the valet bike parking service was extremely successful, serving an average of nearly 50 attendees per game.

During the first half of the September 19th game against Southern California, Commuter Services conducted a count of bikes parked around Husky Stadium. The count found a total of 355 bikes parked around the stadium, representing 0.5% of game attendance for that day. This share is lower than what the survey found, however the count only considered those bicycles parked near the stadium. It is likely that some fans who biked to the game parked elsewhere in the neighborhood and then walked to the stadium. Others may have joined friends who drove to the game and left their bikes with the vehicles in the parking lot. Though lower than the survey results, the bike count results from September 19th are nevertheless reasonably consistent with the survey’s bike share.

**Other**

Approximately 1,895 people (2.8%) arrived by other travel modes. These other modes may have included motorcycle, taxi, and limousine, among others. The significant increase in “other” responses (from 1.5% in 2008) may be due to confusion on the part of surveyors about how to account for those arriving in a commercially operated vehicle such as a taxi or limousine. Similarly, there may have been confusion about how to account for bicyclists, which might partially explain the decline in bicycle mode share.

In previous years, Commuter Services collected data on traffic leaving parking areas after each game; however, in 2009 this data was not available. Commuter Services is considering the value of this information and whether or not it should be included in future reports.
Pre-Expansion Comparison

Figures 7, 8, and 9 illustrate historical comparisons for bus passengers, attendees arriving by automobile, and vehicles parked on campus, respectively. The figures show comparisons between the current year, 1984 (before stadium expansion), and post-expansion projections (from the 1986 Stadium Expansion Plan TMP, based on a sellout crowd of 72,200). Data for 2009 are from the intercept survey conducted at the October 24th game. The comparisons show that the desired modal shifts surpass the expectations of the 1986 Stadium Expansion Parking Plan TMP.

![Percentage of Attendees Arriving by Bus: A Historical Comparison](image)

Figure 7. Historical Comparison: Bus Passengers
Figure 8. Historical Comparison: Arriving by Automobile

Figure 9. Historical Comparison: Vehicles Parked on Campus
Neighborhood Parking Impact Areas

Figure 4 shows the neighborhood parking impact areas (in blue) defined in City Council Resolution 27435. Portions of these parking impact areas have Special Event RPZs for football game days. On the October 24th survey day, an estimated 6,462 people parked in the neighborhood parking impact areas in 2,154 automobiles, compared to 6,234 people in 2,250 cars in 2008. Game attendees parked an additional 909 vehicles in neighborhoods outside of the parking impact areas, compared to 972 vehicles in 2008. Neighborhood parking impact areas experienced an increase in the number of people who parked in the area; however, they saw a decrease in the number of vehicles those people arrived in. In 2008 the average occupancy of vehicles parking in this area was 2.77 and in 2009 that estimate had increased to 3.0. The decrease of vehicles in neighborhood parking impact areas is likely due in part to increased carpooling, which might have been seen as more affordable than other options as the local and national economies continued to struggle.

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 Police Department (SPD) provided a summary of parking citations issued in neighborhood parking impact areas during all seven games for the 2009 season. On average, 120 citations were issued per game, which represents a decrease from 2007, when the average was 155. Due to staffing changes at UW Commuter Services, this data was not available for the 2008 season, leaving the 2007 data as the most recent information.
Conclusion

The TMP continues to successfully encourage fans to travel to games by modes other than driving alone. Over one quarter of all game attendees arrived at the stadium in transit and charter buses. Over fifteen percent 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 all other parking areas. It is estimated that approximately 2,154 automobiles parked in residential neighborhoods identified as parking impact areas as compared to 8,170 automobiles parked in 1984.