FTA’s New Starts Process

- Concept Development
- Alternatives Analysis Study
  - Preliminary Engineering
  - Environmental Impact Statement
- Final Design
  - Construction
  - Operation
Alternative Analysis (AA) Process
Screen 1, 2 and 3

Screen 1
- Reviewed universe of alternatives
  - Eliminated alternatives that were not suitable
  - Three public involvement meetings – May 2006

Screen 2
- Detailed definition and comparative evaluation
  - Specific alignments, transit ridership and capital costs
  - Evaluate and identify the strongest alternatives
  - Three public involvement meetings – September 2006

Screen 3
- Final definition and evaluation
  - Refine strongest alternatives to best serve the Purpose and Need
  - Present recommended LPA and supporting data to the public and solicit feedback

Public Input

Screen 1
Screen 2
Screen 3
LPA

Evaluation Criteria

Alternatives Considered
Purpose and Need

• Transportation Needs
  - Growth in population and employment
  - Access to activity and employment centers
  - Changing travel patterns (non-Loop destinations)
  - Connecting among transit modes
  - Increasing transit travel options for residents
  - Congestion and lengthening travel times

• Purpose of Transit Investments
  - Increase transit access between neighborhoods
  - Improve access to major regional activity centers
  - Improve CTA and Metra transfer connections
  - Increase regional transit system efficiency
  - Leverage existing regional transit infrastructure investments
Screen 1 Findings

Screen 2 Corridor Map

Proposed Corridors
- Ashland Corridor
- Ashland Ogden Corridor
- Western Corridor
- Western 35th Corridor

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

Light Rail Transit (LRT)

Heavy Rail Transit (HRT)
- Mostly Elevated
- Limited Elevated
Screen 2 Findings

Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives Advancing to Screen 3

Heavy Rail Transit Alternatives Advancing to Screen 3
Community Participation

- More than 500 people attended Screen 1 and 2 public meetings
- Met with stakeholders and elected officials
- Approximately 550 comments submitted and answered
- Significant media coverage
Screen 3 Expanded Study Area

- Response to public request
- Seeking cost-effective solution to Purpose and Need
- Cicero Bus Rapid Transit & Heavy Rail Transit
- Modified system routes
- Expanded study area
  - Extended north to Lawrence
  - Extended south to 79th Street
  - Extended west to Cicero
Circle Line Alternatives Analysis Study

Screen 3 Alternatives Maps

New Cicero Alternatives

Bus Rapid Transit

Heavy Rail Transit

New Route Alternatives
(Utilizing Ashland/Ogden)

Heavy Rail Transit to Midway

Heavy Rail Transit to Ashland/Archer

Refined Screen 2 Alternatives
(Lower Cost Alternatives)

Bus Rapid Transit

Heavy Rail Transit

Heavy Rail Transit

Ashland/North Ave

Ashland/Ogden
## Screen 3 – Step 3 Summary Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>New Cicero Alternatives</th>
<th>New Route Alternatives (Utilizing Ashland/Ogden)</th>
<th>Refined Screen 2 Alternatives (Lower Cost Alternatives)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit</td>
<td>Heavy Rail Transit to Midway</td>
<td>Heavy Rail Transit to Ashland/Archer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of Magnitude Capital Cost (2009 $million)</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Operating Cost (2009 $million)</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>$28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Project Ridership (2030-million)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual User Benefits (million hours)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Project Cost Per Hour of User Benefits (compared to no-build)</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td>$33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTA Recommendations</th>
<th>Not Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended for Long Term Vision and premise of LPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Route Alternatives (Utilizing Ashland/Ogden)</td>
<td>Potential component of BRT network</td>
<td>Provides for future connections identified in Purpose and Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Route Alternatives (Utilizing Ashland/Ogden)</td>
<td>High cost relative to estimated ridership</td>
<td>Does not allow for future connections identified in Purpose and Need</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Long Term Vision

• Provides future connections identified in Purpose and Need
• Potential Green, Red, Brown and Purple connections
• Future connections require additional environmental impact analysis
Recommended Locally Preferred Alternative

**Proposed Circle Line**
- To Utilize Existing Underground Red Line Tracks
- To Utilize Existing Elevated Pink Line Tracks
- To Utilize Existing Orange Line Tracks
- Proposed Turn Back At Existing Ashland Station
- Potential Future Station Ashland (Metra BNSF)
- New Orange and Pink Line Connection
- Proposed Circle Line To Utilize Existing Underground Red Line Tracks
- Proposed Circle Line To Utilize Existing Elevated Pink Line Tracks
- Proposed Circle Line To Utilize Existing Orange Line Tracks
- Potential Future Station Archer (Metra R, Future SWS)
- New HRT Elevated Service
- New HRT Underground Service
- New HRT Station

**Capital Cost (inflated dollars)**: $1.1 B

**Capital Cost ($2009)**: $1.0 B

**Operating Cost ($2009)**: $22 M

**Project Ridership (Year 2030)**: 10 M

*Inflated to estimated year of expenditure
**To be revised to reflect refined service plan