

Appendix B: Corridor Advisory Group Meeting #2
Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 16, 2018

11:00 AM – 1:00 PM

West Pullman Library

The second Corridor Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting for the South Halsted Bus Corridor Enhancement Project took place on Tuesday, October 16, 2018, at 11 AM at West Pullman Library, 30 W 119th St, Chicago, IL 60643. Eighteen CAG members, including representatives from three ward offices, three municipalities and two state districts, were in attendance. All CAG members and project team members in attendance can be found on page 4. CAG members were provided a fact sheet and a copy of the PowerPoint presentation upon entering the meeting.

The meeting began with Sukmeke Watkins, CTA Government and Community Relations, providing an overview of the project and reviewing the meeting agenda. Jeff Sangillo, CDM Smith, continued with a recap of CAG Meeting #1, project status, and goals for this CAG meeting. Mr. Sangillo then presented a high-level overview of the contents of the Purpose and Need Statement and received input from the CAG. He added that the document would be provided to the CAG for review and additional input within the next few weeks.

Next, Mr. Sangillo discussed the current improvement program (Transit Signal Priority and Optimization) before providing an in-depth review of the physical improvement alternatives and the associated measures of effectiveness. He also discussed potential station improvements and limited stop service.

Following discussion on the improvement alternatives, Steve Goodreau, CDM Smith, presented the preliminary alternative analysis and decision matrix. He introduced the small group discussion activity, in which feedback was requested on the measures of effectiveness, potential additional measures, and a prioritization of these measures. Each group received an alternatives handout, blank matrix, and a matrix comment form to aid in providing feedback on the measures of effectiveness.

Small group discussion occurred for approximately twenty minutes, prior to reconvening and reporting out on the discussions. Emily Drexler, CTA Project Manager, then reviewed stop spacing and bus operations to elicit additional feedback from the CAG. Prior to concluding the CAG meeting, Mr. Goodreau provided a brief review of next steps, which includes reviewing CAG comments and drafting recommended improvements.

These recommended improvements will be shared with the CAG at the final meeting in December¹, prior to providing a final report in January 2019².

A comments summary and action items are included on the next page. Raw comments are included at the end of this document.

Summary

Lively discussion occurred throughout the meeting. A few themes arose, including the following:

- Positive reception to improved transit reliability, travel times, and conditions of bus stops
- Concern about the removal of parking in the corridor, specifically near busy commercial areas and in residential areas where garages may not be present (Interest in seeing current parking plans, including locations of paid parking)
- Potential interest in a bus lane in locations where parking spots are underutilized throughout the day, or where businesses open after AM peak hour travel
- Mixed reactions as to whether bike lanes are used along the corridor and if expansion would be advisable
- Interest in economic development opportunities in the area and understanding how this would be affected by the alternatives
- Recommendation for removal of grant opportunities from the decision matrix and the potential for other grants besides Federal Small Starts to be pursued
- Interest in a further review of bus ridership/person throughput and business hours in the corridor where CTA bus service ends at 8:30pm

Action Items

- Send Purpose and Need Statement
- Provide list of the 22 intersections where queue jumps could potentially be located
- Review roadway configuration to confirm typical sections
- Provide areas with paid parking in corridor to CDOT
- Provide parking inventory to CAG members
- Review potential for stop near 134th Street because of connection to Major Taylor Trail
- Take into consideration the "[Thrive Zone](#)" from 111th to 117th, both in planning and messaging of project

¹ It was determined that the CAG meeting would be held in January 2019

² Final report is anticipated in February 2019

- Potentially create a table including intersections impacted by queue jumps, parking spaces (and type of parking) that would be impacted, and in which ward or community the spaces are located
- Potential outreach to local entities (ie: Equiticity) for more input on the potential improvements and bike lanes



CAG Member in Attendance	Organization
Representative Justin Slaughter	House District 27
Quentin Scott	House District 34
Sharron McCoy	Ward 17
James Ramos	Ward 21
Domini Gamble	Ward 21
Chester Wilson	Ward 34
Ronald E. Smith	Consultant to: City of Harvey, Village of Dixmoor, Village of Calumet Park
Nick Haddad	IDOT
Tomo Music	Cook County Dept. of Transportation and Highways
Brenda McGruder	CDOT
Peter Fahrenwald	RTA
Allison Buchwach	Metra
Leslie Phemister	South Suburban Mayors & Managers Association
Dorian Johnson	Far South CDC
Kindy Kruller	Cook County Forest Preserve
Martin Menninger	Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
Audrey Wennick	Metropolitan Planning Council
Julia Gerasimenko	Active Transportation Alliance

Project Team Member in Attendance	Organization
Emily Drexler	CTA
Jennifer Henry	CTA
Sukmeke Watkins	CTA
Paris Tyler	CTA
Charlotte O'Donnell Obodzinski	Pace
Jessica Rybarczyk	Pace
Erik Llewellyn	Pace
Ryan Ruehle	Pace
Ezekial Guza	Pace
Steve Goodreau	CDM Smith
Jeff Sangillo	CDM Smith
Lissa Domoracki	Metro Strategies
Other: Sara Hage	HNTB/ Pace PMO
Other: Steve Brown	HNTB/Pace PMO

A. Raw Comments Presentation

Purpose and Need Statement

- Safety should be the first goal and included in the Purpose and Need document.

Measures of Effectiveness

- When you refer to widening impacts, are you talking about widening streets?
 - Mainly curb lines and medians
- You should take into consideration emissions reductions (transit ridership increase), economic development (number of sites, opportunities for development) and which communities are being impacted (socio-economic status of communities).
- Person throughput would be a valuable metric. Instead of segregating by mode, you should review throughput on the entire corridor.
- Is there a minimal travel time increase needed to make this feasible?
 - There is no firm threshold. As traffic moves well in this area already, this provides an opportunity to potentially incorporate a transit lane without a negative impact to traffic
- In addition to bus travel time, are you analyzing motor vehicle travel time? (Yes.)

Concept 1: Queue Jumps

- It is only necessary at 22 intersections out of how many? It would be helpful to have a list of all the affected intersections.
 - There are 36 intersections with traffic signals. Queue jumps are being considered at a maximum of 22 intersections. Widening may not be necessary for all intersections.
- Is the time savings of 4-8 seconds/intersection normal for a queue jump?
 - Yes, this is estimated based on guidance from a TCRP (Transit Cooperative Research Program) Report.
- Do queue jumps impact where the bus stop would be located? (Yes.)
- With this project, you anticipate receiving 4-8 seconds time savings from 22 intersections?
 - Yes, and this time savings would only be from queue jumps.
- If there is a space in a commercial corridor where deliveries need to take place on Halsted, would that be accounted for?
 - Yes, in the next stage of design, we would discuss this with businesses and other affected parties in the corridor.

Concept 2: Bus Lanes

(North)

- Would you need extra space to place bollards between bikes and buses?
 - They are not included in this design (slide 21 – Bus and Bike Lane) but could be a potential option.
- I did not realize there were bike lanes in the northern end.
- Bike counts in these areas would be helpful to see how many people are using these lanes.
- How would bike lanes interact with buses?
 - There are a number of ways, such as the bike lanes becoming a dashed line to denote a shared lane. There are other methods to clearly denote a shared lane.
- Do Pace Pulse stations fit on a 12' wide sidewalk and allow for pedestrians?
 - Yes, this includes space for a shelter and meeting ADA standards for passing the shelter.
- It would be beneficial to hear opinions from cyclists.

(Middle)

- Do we want to add bike lanes here?
- (CAG Member Response) No. We do not want bike lanes. Halsted is too busy.
- If you narrow the lanes, this is also a traffic calming measure and people tend to drive slower.
- Is there paid parking in the corridor?
 - There is a small area of paid parking on 79th and another on Halsted, around 80th Street.
- Is parking removed or reduced?
 - It is removed in this example, but it could be changed to parking allowable in limited hours (slide 24).
- Do you have parking counts? (Yes.)
- So residents will need to park in a garage or on side streets? Many residents do not have garages.
 - Yes, we want your feedback on whether this is a viable option.
- I would rather see trees and landscaping along Halsted.

(South)

- From Chicago to Riverdale along Halsted, there is no median (slide 25).
 - We will investigate the configuration in this area.

Bus Lane Characteristics

- If there is metered parking on 79th Street, we (CDOT), need to know the count if this is planning to be removed.
- Regarding funding opportunities, I don't think the 50% bus lanes applies to Small Starts. You should be eligible without 50%.
- These travel time savings exclude the signal improvements? (Yes.)
- Can you provide the locations of the parking spaces in the southern end? (Yes.)
- I think everyone should be able to see where the parking spaces are. This will affect businesses and have a big impact near residential units.
- It has been shown that protected bike lanes do improve business access.
- (CAG Member Response) We do not have bikers.
- Queue jumps are much easier to accommodate than bus lanes and removing parking. From 103rd to 105th, there are so many businesses that would be affected – KFC, beauty shops.
- Another way to think about it is that we are planning for the future. In the future, people may take transit over cars.
- Do either of these options have an impact on the number or type of station? (Yes.)

Station Improvements and Limited Stop Service

- What's the average cost for a station?
 - For Pulse, it is approx. \$250,000/station.
- I'm concerned that there is no stop near 134th. There are trails that will be connecting at this location and a stop nearby is needed.

Preliminary Alternative Analysis/Decision Matrix

- There are other sources of funding than just the FTA Capital Investment Grants (CIG) program. You should include economic development in the table, even though it is hard to quantify.
- Should grants even be in the table? Funding always comes into play, but with a set purpose and goals, maybe you should not emphasize funding.
- Some of these measures are inputs for funding, so you could remove grants from the table and still look at what is available.

Stop Spacing and Bus Operations

- Would it be possible to have a survey to pass out to bus riders?
- As the CTA bus service ends at 8:30pm, are there people left behind? Has ridership decreased in the last few years? I think these should be considered. (For Pace, there has been a small decrease in the last few years, but this corridor still contains the route with highest ridership.)

- It may be helpful to look at business hours along the corridor to understand the hours that workers need to travel. If people are making connections in the morning, can they get home the same way in the evening?
- I think that if you improve the bus service, more people will ride it.

B. Breakout Group Report Out

(Edits to and ranking within Decision Matrix)

Group 1

- Added person throughput as a measure of effectiveness
- Added economic impact potential
- Added pedestrian benefits, which would include the extent to which people can walk to the bus or other pedestrian amenities
- Removed grant opportunities
- Removed widening impacts; did not see this as relevant
- Voted on our favorite criteria; which included person throughput and economic impact potential; reliability and bus travel time were in second place

Group 2

- Concerned about traffic and parking impacts
- Worried about the space needed for dedicated transit lanes, while recognizing the transit benefits

Group 3

- Removed grant opportunities
- Added land use (i.e., may be opportunities to encourage infill and economic development in areas with excess parking)
- Added traffic safety
- The most favored criteria were bus travel time and reliability