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Executive Summary

In 2011 the Husky Stadium Expansion Parking Plan and Transportation Management Program (TMP) continued to meet its primary goal of accommodating sellout crowds while reducing parking impacts in nearby residential areas. Transportation mode targets were met and surpassed in 2011.

This report outlines the findings of the 2011 TMP monitoring efforts. In 2011, data was collected through an intercept survey of game attendees as they entered the gates at Husky Stadium on October 15th, 2011. Of the 1304 surveys attempted, 295 were refused and 10 contained data collection errors. In total 999 usable responses were received, representing 76.6% of attempted surveys. Paid game attendance on October 15th was 62,147; actual game attendance on October 15th was 58,664. Results are estimated within a confidence interval of +/- 3.08% at a 95% confidence level.

Key findings according to usable data:

- Game attendees traveled to the stadium using these modes:
  - 43.1% carpooled (traveled in automobiles with more than one person), compared to 48.9% in 2011. Just 2.3% drove alone, compared to 2.9% in 2010. Average automobile occupancy was 2.93 persons per car, which was lower than the 3.04 persons per car in 2010.
  - 32.2% arrived by transit or charter bus, up from 30.2% in 2010.
  - 14.5% walked to the game, up from 12.5% in 2010.
  - 4.5% arrived by boat, down slightly from 5.0% in 2010.
  - 0.5% arrived by bicycle, up slightly from 0.0% in 2010.

- The change in mode split following TMP implementation exceeds projections in the 1986 TMP. Projected mode shares compare to actual 2011 mode shares as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Projected Share (%)</th>
<th>Actual Share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The number of vehicles parked in the impact areas in 2011 was 2,015, an increase from 1,897 vehicles in 2010.

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 monitor and reduce the

---

1 In 2010 Intercollegiate Athletics began monitoring actual game attendance in addition to paid game attendance (based on sales). The latter now serves as the baseline for future TMP monitoring, so only actual game attendance numbers are reported in the 2011 Report.
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 requires the University and the City of Seattle to collect data during each football season, which is then used to monitor the performance of the TMP. Data collected in 1986 serves as a baseline for comparing impacts after the stadium expansion in 1987. This document summarizes the data collected for the 2011 season and compares them to past seasons.
Introduction

The University of Washington hosted six football games at Husky Stadium during the 2011 season, listed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Opponent</th>
<th>Actual Attendance</th>
<th>Kickoff Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/03/11</td>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>53,221</td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/11</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>58,104</td>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/11</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>56,727</td>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/11</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>58,664</td>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/11</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>55,944</td>
<td>7:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/11</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>66,323</td>
<td>7:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>58,164</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = Survey Date

Table 1: Husky Football Games, 2011

During the 2011 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, including carpooling, transit and charter buses, walking, boating, and bicycling, were encouraged.

The purpose of this document is to monitor the effectiveness of the TMP during the 2011 season using the following indicators:

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

This report explains the TMP efforts in 2011, details the methodology used to collect the data related to performance indicators, and discusses the results. It illustrates mode choice in 2011 and draws comparisons to previous years. Finally, it describes impacts on neighborhood parking areas and draws conclusions about the TMP’s effectiveness in 2011.
TMP Elements

Carpool Incentives
The TMP uses a pricing system to incentivize carpooling. During the 2011 season, game day parking on campus cost $25 for vehicles with three or more persons, $30 for vehicles with less than three persons, and $100 for motor homes, vehicles with trailers, and charter buses. Game day parking in the UW Tower and 4545 Parking Garages was also available for $15 per vehicle.

Transit

Free Regular Service
One of the goals of the TMP is to encourage football game attendees to ride public transit to the stadium. During the 2011 season, all ticket-holders were allowed to ride to and from the stadium for free on King County Metro buses by showing their game ticket to the driver.

Free Park & Ride Service
In 2011, King County Metro provided special Saturday game day bus service from eight regional Park & Ride lots, shown in Figure 1. Fans were allowed to park at the Park & Ride lots for free, and could 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 to return to the designated lots, as shown in Figure 2.

On average, King County Metro provided 203 inbound and 173 outbound Park & Ride bus trips each Saturday game. Metro reported an average of 12,352 and 12,665 passengers riding to and from Husky Stadium, respectively, on the Park & Ride Service on each Saturday game of the season. This represents a 10% and 7% increase in inbound and outbound Park & Ride passengers, respectively, over the 11,247 and 11,813 recorded in 2010.
Figure 1: Park & Ride Lot Locations, 2011

Figure 2: Park & Ride Post-Game Boarding Locations, 2011
Free Husky Special Service
King County Metro operated five special bus routes to Husky Stadium during each Saturday game in 2011. Service was provided from downtown Seattle, Ballard, and Lake City. On average, King County Metro reported providing 30 inbound and 41 outbound bus trips each Saturday game on all Husky Special Service routes, bringing an average of 1,608 passengers to the Husky Stadium and taking 2,438 safely home. This represents a 4% decrease in inbound and a 9% increase in outbound passengers over the 1,682 and 2,241, respectively, observed in 2010.

Figure 3: Husky Special Transit Service, 2011
Boats

Boat Shuttles
In 2011, 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 and returned them to their boats after the game for a fee of $8 per person (children under 12 ride free).

Boat Moorage
For private vessels, boat moorage was available on a season or single game basis in 2011. Table 2 outlines the 2011 moorage rates. The deadline for purchasing full season permits was July 8, 2011; single game permits were available through the Tyee Office with purchase required one week prior to each home game.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length (ft)</th>
<th>Season Rate ($)</th>
<th>Per Game Rate ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-100+</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Boat Moorage Rates, 2011

Charter Boats and Buses
Several Seattle restaurants, hotels, and clubs featured activities that included a chartered bus or boat ride to Husky Stadium during a home football game.

Bicycles
UW Commuter Services provided bicycle parking assistance by placing 5 additional bicycle racks with capacity for 65 bicycles at the Montlake Triangle during football season. Signage along popular bicycle routes directed bicyclists to overflow parking on the Triangle, and bicycling was also 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 $48 and $53 citations to non-residents who park in the restricted zones.2

Marketing
UW Commuter Services provided extensive transportation information to Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) to post on the official Husky Football website, www.gohuskies.com/gettothegame. The website focused on providing information to assist game attendees in using one of the modes encouraged in the TMP. The website provided contact information as well as information about busing, boating, walking, biking, and parking.

2 Beginning in October, the citation amount increased to $53.
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 IPM, parking citations data collected by the Seattle Police Department, and boat passenger and game attendance data collected by UW Intercollegiate Athletics.

Survey Methodology

On Saturday, October 15th, 2011, UW Commuter Services conducted a survey of football game attendees as they passed through the gates at Husky Stadium. The kickoff time was 12:30 PM and surveys began at 10:30 AM. The weather on the survey day was cool and cloudy with highs in the low fifties and lows in the high forties. Thirty-nine surveyors in teams of two (one volunteer counted bicycles) were distributed to the eight stadium gates, proportional to the number of game attendees estimated to enter through each gate. The teams attempted 1,304 surveys and obtained 999 usable responses, equating to a higher-than-expected response rate of 76.6%.

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
Of the 1,304 attempted surveys, 999 yielded usable responses, for a response rate of 76.6%. With attendance at 58,664, the results are within a confidence interval of +/- 3.08% 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 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 traveler behavior.

**Survey Results**

**Mode Choice**

Less than half of all attendees traveled to the game by car, including 43.1% by carpool and 2.3% by SOV. Taking the bus and walking were the next most popular travel modes. Table 3 and Figure 5 show attendee mode share.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th># Responses</th>
<th>% Responses</th>
<th>Survey Day</th>
<th>Season Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>25,274</td>
<td>25,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>18,909</td>
<td>18,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>8,515</td>
<td>8,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2,643</td>
<td>2,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1,327</td>
<td>1,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1,703</td>
<td>1,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>999</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,664</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,164</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Survey Response and Projected Mode Share, 2011
Table 4 provides a historical comparison of travel mode choice over the nine years of the intercept survey. Bus ridership to Husky Stadium increased two percentage points compared to 2010, from 30.2% to 32.2%. Unlike bus use, carpooling showed a substantial decrease in 2011, decreasing nearly six percentage points compared to 2010, from 48.9% to 43.1%. Walking and bicycling increased from 2010, likely due to the fair weather on the survey day. Drive alone trips also declined, from 2.9% in 2010 to 2.3% in 2011.

<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>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</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>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>43.1</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>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>32.2</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>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14.5</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>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</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>2.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.3</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>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</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>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Travel Mode Choice, 2003 - 2011
Automobile Occupancy and Parking

The vast majority of people who traveled to the game by car came via carpool; only 5.0% of those who came in an automobile drove alone. Automobile occupancy is summarized in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Automobile Occupancy</th>
<th>Share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Automobile Occupancy and Share, 2011

On the survey game day, approximately 26,601 people arrived in 8,780 vehicles, for an average automobile occupancy of 3.03. 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 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Area</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>Automobiles</th>
<th>Average Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>16,187</td>
<td>5,005</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>5,369</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of Area</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Off</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,601</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,696</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.03</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Average Occupancy of Parked Automobiles, October 15th, 2011

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 60.8% of attendees who arrived by car (16,187 attendees) parked on campus in approximately 5,005 automobiles. The share of attendees arriving by automobile and number of cars estimated to have parked on campus decreased compared to 2010, when 64.4% of attendees who arrived by car reported parking on campus in approximately 5,480 vehicles (60.9% of total cars); average occupancy for cars parked on campus remained flat in 2011.
Game day parking location choices are illustrated in Figure 6.

Surrounding areas were impacted by parking. Approximately 38.9% of cars parked off campus or in unidentified areas, and approximately 4.1% of cars dropped off 1,332 passengers. About 1,978 cars parked within neighborhoods identified as parking impact areas, and about 444 cars parked in neighborhoods outside the impact areas. Approximately 888 parked in retail areas.

UW Commuter Services Estimate of Vehicles Parked on Campus:
Over the 2011 Husky football season, Commuter Services counted an average of 4,970 vehicles parked on campus west of Montlake Blvd during game days. Vehicle counts for UW parking lots east of Montlake Blvd had an average of 456, for a campus total of 5,426.

Buses
32.2% of respondents arrived by charter or transit bus. This represents approximately 20,031 people on the survey game day and 20,046 people on a typical game day throughout the 2011 season (18,909 and 18,748 people, respectively). Possible explanations for the increase in bus ridership in 2011 as compared to 2010 (17,506 season average) include greater certainty regarding King County Metro’s Husky service, the increased cost of parking on game days, inclement weather, and construction at the Sound Transit U-Link Station adjacent to Husky Stadium.
Bus ridership varies for “Band Day,” when marching bands from area high schools perform during one game each season, traveling to the stadium on charter buses. In 2011, Band Day was held on September 9th during the Hawaii game. Approximately 2,400 participants arrived in 68 buses.

UW Commuter Services and King County Metro Bus Ridership Estimates:

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

- Parking lot attendants count charter bus passengers;
- King County Metro employees count Park & Ride bus passengers as they board the buses;
- King County Metro employees count 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.

During the 2011 football season, these counting methods yielded an average of 376 people on charter buses and 12,482 transit bus passengers, for a season average of 12,858 bus passengers and a 22.1% mode share. The lots east of Montlake Blvd had an average of four charter buses per game, but the passengers were not counted. However, the passenger average of all recorded charter buses in 2011 was 34 passengers. Adjusting for these additional 136 passengers per game brings the total to 12,994 bus passengers per game and a 22.3% mode share. On the survey day, 13,449 transit bus passengers and 279 charter bus passengers were counted, plus an additional 136 east lot charter bus passengers, for a total bus ridership of 13,864, representing a 23.6% mode share. Table 7 shows King County Metro bus trips and passengers for games throughout the 2011 season.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Game</th>
<th>PreGame</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>PostGame</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>Passengers</td>
<td>Passengers per Trip</td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>Passengers</td>
<td>Passengers per Trip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/11</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>11,212</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>12,396</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/11</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>10,881</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/11</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>11,945</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>11,858</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/11</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>13,449</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>13,423</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/11</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>12,005</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>12,303</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/5/11</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>15,398</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>14,269</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>12,482</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>12,708</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Survey date

Table 7: King County Metro Bus Trips and Passengers, 2011
Walking
Approximately 14.5% of fans (8,515 attendees) walked to the stadium on game day, up from 12.5% in 2010. The increase in pedestrian mode share is likely due to the fair weather on the survey date, and may partially explain the large decrease in carpool use.

Boats
Based on game day survey data, 4.5% of people arrived by boat on the survey game day (2,643 attendees), a slight decrease from 5.0% in 2010. This is consistent with previously observed boat mode shares.

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.

During the 2011 season, ICA’s counts and estimation methods yielded an average of approximately 2,463 people arriving at Husky Stadium, representing 4.2% of game attendees. This is consistent with past ICA estimates.

Compared to the survey estimate, ICA’s numbers yield a slightly lower boat mode share. In 2011, ICA conducted a detailed inventory and accounting of boats and passengers, so it’s likely that their estimates are accurate; however, it is possible that ICA’s boat occupancy factors for moored boats (3, 4, 6, 8, and 10 passengers for 0-20’, 21-30’, 31-40’, 41-60’, and 61-100’ boats, respectively) underestimate actual occupancy.

Bicycles
In 2011, approximately 0.5% of attendees (294 attendees) arrived by bicycle, up significantly from 0.0% in 2010. In addition to survey responses, Commuter Services also conducted a count of bikes parked around Husky Stadium on the survey game day. The count found a total of 348 bicycles parked around the stadium, representing 0.6% of total game attendance. The 2010 bicycle mode share and counts were the lowest in the TMP’s history, which is likely a reflection of inclement weather on the survey day. Other active transportation modes experienced similar declines. The weather on the survey day in 2011 was dry with mild temperatures, which likely encouraged active transportation modes.

Other
In 2011, approximately 2.9% of attendees (1,703 attendees) arrived by ‘Other’ travel modes, up significantly from 0.5% in 2010. These ‘Other’ modes may include motorcycle, taxi, and limousine.
Pre-Expansion Comparison

Figure 7 compares actual 2011 bus and automobile mode shares and vehicles parked on campus with a 1984 baseline and post-expansion projections (from the 1986 Stadium Expansion Plan TMP, based on a sellout crowd of 72,200) using survey game day data. The actuals exceed the expectations of the 1986 Stadium Expansion Parking Plan TMP in all categories.
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Figure 7: Comparison of Baseline, Actual, and Projected Travel Behavior
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 (Residential Parking Zone) for football game days. On the October 15th survey day, an estimated 5,369 people parked in the neighborhood parking impact areas in 1,978 automobiles, compared to 4,969 people in 1,897 automobiles in 2010. This represents an increase of 400 people and 81 cars. 1,110 game attendees parked 444 automobiles in neighborhoods outside of the parking impact areas, compared to 1,415 people in 512 automobiles in 2010. This represents a decline of 305 people and 68 cars. It isn’t clear what factors may have influenced the apparent parking shift from neighborhoods outside of impact areas to neighborhoods within the parking impact areas, but this behavior will be monitored further in subsequent seasons.

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 provided a summary of parking citations issued in neighborhood parking impact areas during all seven games for the 2011 season. On average, 141 citations were issued per game, an increase from 126 average citations per game in 2010. While there was an overall increase in citations in 2011, citations for automobiles parking in RPZs (as opposed to “Other” citations) actually declined substantially, from an average of 96 per game in 2010 to 85 in 2011.
Conclusions

The TMP continues to successfully encourage fans to travel to games by modes other than driving alone. Nearly one third of game attendees arrived at the stadium in transit and charter buses and over 14% of attendees walked to the game. Only 2% of attendees drove alone and 43% carpooled to the game. Carpool parking price incentives appear to be successful, resulting in higher average auto occupancy in campus parking lots compared to most other parking areas. Approximately 1,978 automobiles parked in residential neighborhoods identified as parking impact areas, compared to 8,170 in 1984.