CTA Blue Line Forest Park Branch
Feasibility/Vision Study
Overview of the Blue Line Feasibility / Vision Study

**PURPOSE**
- Determine long-term vision
- Coordinate transit & highway improvements

**PROCESS**
- Evaluate existing infrastructure & market conditions
- Conduct early outreach to project stakeholders
- Identify short & long term service strategies for the CTA Blue Line
- Analyze funding options
HISTORY OF THE CTA BLUE LINE / I-290 SYSTEM
- Blue Line / I-290 infrastructure is 55 years old
- First integrated transit / highway facility in the U.S.

PROJECT STUDY AREA
- EXISTING CTA BLUE LINE: From Clinton Station to Forest Park Station
- IDOT EXPANSION ALTERNATIVE: Forest Park Station to Mannheim Road
Project Schedule

2013

- Data Collection & Existing Conditions Assessment
- Transit Market Analysis

Spring 2013

- Development of Station Prototypes

Summer 2013

- Development of Conceptual Service Patterns
- Public and Agency Outreach Meeting

Fall 2013

- Travel Demand Modeling
- Refine Selected Conceptual Service Patterns
- Public and Agency Outreach Meeting

Winter 2013/2014

- Evaluation of Existing Corridor Alternatives
- Funding Options Analysis

Study Completion in Early 2014
Existing Conditions Assessment

- REVIEW AND UPDATE TRANSIT DATA
- ASSESS AND DOCUMENT EXISTING CONDITIONS
  - Rail transit deficiencies and needs
  - Platform design and access
  - Station access and entry
  - Remaining useful life
- STATUS
  - INFRASTRUCTURE CONDITION ASSESSMENT: Technical Memorandum is nearing completion
  - Final document anticipated in July 2013
ELEMENTS EVALUATED: Results

- TRACK: Contaminated ballast, deteriorated ties, poor drainage, worn rail
- SIGNALS: Recently upgraded
- STATIONS: Over 50 years old, need modern enhancements
- STRUCTURES: Nearing end of life expectancy
- TRACTION POWER: Elements require upgrading
- COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM: Need technological improvements

RECOMMENDATION

- Complete Reconstruction and Modernization
Transit Market Analysis

- ASSEMBLE & ANALYZE EXISTING DATA
  - Transit market and ridership statistics
  - Commuter surveys
  - Local land use and transportation plans
  - Transit and highway studies
  - Access and mobility assessments

- STATUS
  - TRANSIT MARKET ANALYSIS: Technical Memorandum is nearing completion
  - Final document anticipated in July 2013
Station Area Demographics – ½ mile Walkshed

- Forest Park
- Harlem
- Oak Park
- Austin
- Cicero
- Kostner (closed)
- Kedzie - Homan
- California (closed)
- Western
- UIC - Halsted
- Clinton

Bar chart showing demographics for each station, including total households, low income households, total population, and minority population.
Study Area Employment
Transit Access is Essential to Study Area

**STUDY AREA 2012 ESTIMATED POPULATION – 113,000**
- 11% of households have no access to a car
- 70% Minority population
- 19% Low income population

**STUDY AREA 2011 ESTIMATED EMPLOYMENT – 174,000**
- 97% of jobs in study area filled by outside workers
- 33% of residents leave study area for employment
- 5% live and work in the study area
Station Area - within ½ mile walkshed area

**STATION AREA POPULATION**
- NO ACCESS TO CAR: IMD 51% and Pulaski 44%
- HIGH MINORITY POPULATION: IMD 81%, Western 82%, Kedzie-Homan 98%, Cicero 99% and Austin 64%
- LOW INCOME: IMD 74%, Western 62%, Kedzie-Homan 61% and Cicero 56%

**STATION AREA EMPLOYMENT**
- FILLED BY OUTSIDE WORKERS: Clinton 10%, UIC-Halsted 11% and IMD 10%
- LEAVE FOR EMPLOYMENT: Austin 9% and Oak Park 9%
- LIVE AND WORK: UIC-Halsted 1.3% and IMD 1.4%
Station Areas by 3 Segments

- **CLINTON TO IMD**
  - More jobs than population – 3 to 1
  - Most commuters come into area for work – 55,000
  - Lowest residents who work outside of area – 6,000

- **WESTERN TO AUSTIN**
  - Kedzie-Homan highest population – 7,600
  - Highest no access to car population – 4,000
  - Most employment outside study area – 14,000
  - Low amount of local jobs - 7,000

- **OAK PARK TO FOREST PARK**
  - Oak Park 2nd highest population – 7,400
  - Lowest no access to car population & some jobs – 600 and 3,800
  - Forest Park is a major transfer station for 9 Pace bus routes
DEVELOP CONCEPTUAL DESIGNS FOR STATION MODERNIZATION

- Station redesign options
- Station access alternatives
- Roadway network improvements
- Deficiency resolution
- Local plan and study integration

STATUS

- STATION ACCESS & DESIGN:
  Technical Memorandum is 25% complete
- Vetting concepts with stakeholders
Elements Considered

- ADA Compliance
- Pedestrian
- Bicycle
- Bus Connectivity
- Park and Ride
- Kiss and Ride
- Adjacent Roadway
- Current CTA Design Standards
## Station Prototype Goal and Assumptions

### Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible / ADA Compliant</td>
<td>Elevators, ramps and stairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Compliant Egress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable, safe, and convenient for passengers</td>
<td>Platforms to meet CTA guidelines 24' center / 14' side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wind, rain, and sound protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to secure and operate</td>
<td>Clear lines of sight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to maintain</td>
<td>Durable materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Neighborhood

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy to find</td>
<td>Highly visible, clearly identifiable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamlessly and safely connected to streets and transit</td>
<td>Short distance between trains and streets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Station Types

**STATION TYPES:**

1. SUBWAY STATION
2. TRIPLE ENTRY STATION / RAMPS + STAIRS
3. DOUBLE ENDED STATION / RAMPS + STAIRS
4. SINGLE ENDED STATION / RAMP
5. TERMINAL STATION

- ○ CLOSED STATION
- ★ STATION HOUSE ENTRY / EXIT CLOSED

**Station Location**

- FOREST PARK
- HARLEM
- OAK PARK
- AUSTIN
- CENTRAL
- CICERO
- KOSTNER
- PULASKI
- KEDZIE - HOMAN
- CALIFORNIA
- WESTERN
- ILLINOIS MEDICAL DISTRICT
- RACINE
- UIC - HALSTED
- CLINTON

**Station Type**

- 5
- 3
- 3
- 3
- 4
- 3★
- 4
- 3★
- 3
- 4
- 4
- 2
- 3
- 2
- 1

**ADA Compliance**

- [ ]

**Approx. Existing Platform Width**

- 28’
- 13’
- 13’
- 13’
- 13’
- 12’
- 12’
- 12’
- 12’
- 13’
- 13’
- 15’
- 15’
- 15’
- 15’
- 20’
CONCEPTUAL OPTION B: WIDER PLATFORM

- Added station house at mid platform
- Pedestrian bridge
- Improve existing station houses
- Widen platform – relocate 1 track
- Improved access + bus connection
- New canopy + platform elements
- New station houses at bridge
- Wider center platform
- Improved access + bus connection
- New canopy + platform elements
CONCEPTUAL OPTION D: SIDE PLATFORMS

- New station houses and ramps
- New platforms – relocate 1 track
- Potential noise mitigation

- Improved access + bus connection
- Wind and weather protection
CONCEPTUAL OPTION E: STAGGERED BERTHING

- New station houses and vertical circulation
- Extend platform – same width
- No track relocation
- Potential noise mitigation
- Improved access + bus connection
- Wind and weather protection
- Added station house at mid platform
- Pedestrian bridge
Conclusions

- Based on existing conditions, full modernization is recommended.
- Based on corridor demographics, transit access is essential to study area.
- Station access should be evaluated and improved:
  - within the station,
  - from neighborhood via bike and ped,
  - from roadway for PNR and potentially KNR.
- Large employment generators from Clinton to IMD suggest that turn back track for O’Hare branch should be west of IMD (currently between UIC and Racine).
Next Steps

- COMPLETE STUDY AREA CONDITIONS ASSESSMENT REPORT
- COMPLETE STUDY AREA MARKET ANALYSIS REPORT
- DEVELOP CONCEPTUAL SERVICE PATTERNS
  - Service variations (near-term and long-term)
  - Support facilities
- EVALUATE ALTERNATIVES
  - Physical features
  - Travel time, ridership, & capacity estimates
  - Capital, operating & maintenance costs
  - Operational impacts & compatibility