

NORTH RED AND PURPLE MODERNIZATION PROJECT SCOPING REPORT



CHICAGO TRANSIT AUTHORITY
567 WEST LAKE STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60661

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION
200 WEST ADAMS STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60606





North Red and Purple Modernization Project Scoping Report

August 2011

Prepared for:
Chicago Transit Authority
567 West Lake Street
Chicago, IL 60661

Federal Transit Administration
200 West Adams Street
Suite 320
Chicago, IL 60606

Prepared by:


125 South Wacker Drive
Suite 600
Chicago, IL 60606

Table of Contents

Section 1 Introduction.....	1-1
1.1 Overview	1-1
1.2 Purpose of this Report	1-1
1.3 Background	1-1
1.4 Project Area	1-2
1.5 Alternatives	1-3
1.5.1 No Action Alternative	1-3
1.5.2 Basic Rehabilitation Alternative.....	1-3
1.5.3 Basic Rehabilitation with Transfer Stations Alternative	1-4
1.5.4 Modernization 4-Track Alternative	1-4
1.5.5 Modernization 3-Track Alternative	1-5
1.5.6 Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative.....	1-6
1.6 Summary of Purpose and Need	1-7
1.7 Project Participants.....	1-7
Section 2 Scoping Process.....	2-1
2.1 Early Scoping Activities	2-1
2.2 Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Scoping Activities	2-1
2.2.1 Public Participation Plan	2-2
2.2.2 Coordination Plan	2-2
2.3 Agency Scoping	2-2
2.3.1 Participating Agencies	2-2
2.3.2 Cooperating Agencies.....	2-3
2.3.3 Agency Scoping Meeting.....	2-4
2.3.3.1 Agency Scoping Meeting Comments	2-5
2.4 Public Scoping.....	2-5
2.4.1 Notification Database	2-6
2.4.2 Public Notification Activities.....	2-6
2.4.2.1 Direct Mail Notice	2-6
2.4.2.2 CTA Alert Cards.....	2-7
2.4.2.3 E-mail Notification.....	2-7
2.4.2.4 Newspaper Advertisements.....	2-7
2.4.2.5 Project Web Site.....	2-8
2.4.2.6 Additional Outreach During Public Scoping	
Period.....	2-8
2.4.2.7 Limited English Proficiency Analysis	2-9
2.4.3 Elected Official and Stakeholder Briefings	2-10
2.4.4 Public Scoping Meetings	2-11
2.4.4.1 Public Scoping Meeting Format.....	2-12
2.4.4.2 Public Meeting Materials	2-13

2.5	Comments Received.....	2-14
Section 3 Summary of Scoping Comments.....		3-1
3.1	Introduction.....	3-1
3.2	Summary of Substantive Comments	3-1
3.3	Comments Related to Purpose and Need.....	3-2
3.4	Comments Related to Alternatives	3-2
3.4.1	No Action Alternative	3-3
3.4.2	Basic Rehabilitation Alternative	3-3
3.4.3	Basic Rehabilitation with Transfer Stations Alternative	3-4
3.4.4	Modernization 4-Track Alternative	3-4
3.4.5	Modernization 3-Track Alternative	3-5
3.4.6	Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative.....	3-6
3.4.7	Transfer Stations.....	3-8
3.4.8	Transit Stop Consolidation	3-8
3.4.9	Operations & Service	3-10
3.4.10	Stations/Systems Improvements.....	3-11
3.4.11	ADA Improvements.....	3-13
3.4.12	Costs and Funding	3-13
3.5	Comments Related to Potential Impacts.....	3-15
3.5.1	Transportation, Multi-Modal, and Accessibility Impacts.....	3-15
3.5.2	Land Use, Economic Development, Business and Community Impacts	3-16
3.5.3	Safety and Security Impacts.....	3-16
3.5.4	Neighborhood Compatibility	3-17
3.5.5	Environmental Justice Impacts.....	3-18
3.5.6	Visual and Aesthetic Impacts	3-19
3.5.7	Natural Resources Impacts	3-19
3.5.8	Cultural and Historic Resources	3-20
3.5.9	Noise and Vibration.....	3-20
3.5.10	Land Acquisitions, Displacement, and Relocations	3-20
3.5.11	Construction Impacts.....	3-21
3.5.12	Energy Use	3-21
3.5.13	Wildlife and Ecosystems	3-22
3.5.14	Parks and Recreational Facilities.....	3-22
3.6	Comments Submitted by Federal, State, and Other Agencies	3-22
3.6.1	Comments Submitted by State Agencies	3-22
3.6.2	Comments Submitted by Other Agencies	3-23
Section 4 Next Steps: Responding to Comments.....		4-1
4.1	Introduction.....	4-1

4.2 Comments Related to Purpose and Need..... 4-1
 4.3 Comments Related to Alternatives 4-1
 4.4 Comments Related to Potential Impacts 4-2

Appendices

Appendix A Public Participation Plan
Appendix B Notice of Intent
Appendix C Participating Agencies
Appendix D Participating Agency Invitation Letters
Appendix E Agency Scoping Meeting
Appendix F Agencies and Organizations Notified of Scoping
Appendix G Notification Materials
Appendix H Scoping Meeting Materials
Appendix I Meeting Exhibit Boards
Appendix J Public Scoping Meeting Transcripts
Appendix K Public Scoping Written Comments
Appendix L Agency Scoping Comments

Tables

Table 2-1. Newspaper Display Advertisements 2-7
 Table 2-2. Comments Received at Public Scoping Meetings 2-14
 Table 3-1. Comment Summary 3-2

Acronyms

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CMAP	Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
CTA	Chicago Transit Authority
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
HUD	US Department of Housing and Urban Development
IL	Illinois
LEP	Limited English Proficiency
MWRD	Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NOI	Notice of Intent
PCB	Polychlorinated biphenyl
RPM	North Red and Purple Modernization Project
RTA	Regional Transportation Authority
SAFETEA-LU	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act - A Legacy for Users
US EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency

Section 1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

The Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) is proposing to make improvements, subject to the availability of funding, to the North Red and Purple Lines as part of the North Red and Purple Modernization Project (RPM). The improvements are proposed to bring the existing transit stations, track systems and structures into a state of good repair from the track structure immediately north of Belmont station to the Linden terminal (9.5 miles) in accordance with the project's purpose and need, as discussed in Section 1.6. This project is one part of CTA's effort to extend and enhance the entire Red Line. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and CTA will be preparing a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that will evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. FTA is the federal lead agency and CTA is the local lead agency.

1.2 Purpose of this Report

The following report summarizes the public participation process for, and the public comments resulting from, the RPM public scoping meetings and comment period. "Scoping" is the process of determining the scope, focus, and content of an EIS. Scoping meetings are a useful opportunity to obtain information from the public and governmental agencies. In particular, the scoping process asks agencies and interested parties to provide input on the proposed alternatives, the purpose and need for the project, the proposed topics of evaluation, and potential impacts and mitigation measures to be considered.

1.3 Background

After nearly 100 years of reliable service, the infrastructure of the North Red and Purple Lines is significantly past its useful life. Substantially constructed between 1900 and 1922, these two lines provide a backbone of service to neighborhoods along the North Lake Shore. Together, the North Red and Purple Lines carry over 128,000 rail trips on an average weekday. This heavily relied upon transit service carries over 19 percent of all CTA rail trips on weekdays and 23 percent of all CTA rail trips on the weekend. Rail trips refer to all rides that at some point use the corridor. This includes all rides that begin at stations in the corridor and rides that begin outside the corridor but end at stations in the corridor.

The Tier 1 EIS will build upon the North Red and Purple Lines vision study that occurred from fall 2009 to fall 2010. That study identified a range of options that could address the project's purpose and need to varying degrees and in various ways. The vision study process narrowed a preliminary array of over 20 options to six alternatives that were carried forward into scoping.

Subsequent to the completion of the vision study process, FTA and CTA initiated public and agency NEPA scoping to obtain input on the scope of the EIS. The Notice of Intent

(NOI), published on January 3, 2011 and included as Appendix B, identified the six alternatives presented during scoping. This report summarizes the results of the NEPA scoping process.

The Tier 1 Draft EIS will build upon the vision study and scoping process and form the basis for preparation of a subsequent Tier 1 Final EIS. One of the primary purposes of scoping is to identify possible environmental impacts of the project. Transit improvements along the North Red and Purple Lines corridor could be financed with a mix of local, state, and federal funds. Accordingly, the project will be executed in compliance with current FTA guidelines, and all environmental documents will satisfy the requirements of NEPA and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU).

1.4 Project Area

The proposed project area is approximately 4 miles north of the Chicago Central Area (commonly referred to as the “Loop”) and extends approximately 9.5 miles, from north of Belmont Station to Linden Terminal. There are currently 21 stations within the project area and 23 station entrances; 13 of the stations are on the North Red Line and 8 stations are on the Purple Line. The project area generally follows the project corridor, described below, and will be further articulated in the DEIS in order to incorporate all potential impact areas as part of the Tier 1 EIS analysis. Travel patterns and analyses beyond the project area are integral components to the project and will be evaluated in the Draft EIS.

The project corridor includes the existing Red and Purple Lines between the track structure immediately north of Belmont Station on the south and Linden Terminal on the North. The North Red Line section is a four-track corridor from north of Belmont Station to the Howard Station, consisting of 1.9 miles of steel elevated structure and 3.8 miles on elevated embankment fill; the Purple Line portion is a two-track corridor from the Howard Station to the Linden Terminal consisting of 3.8 miles on elevated embankment, and is discussed throughout this document as the Evanston Branch. The Purple Line travels through the North Red Line section during weekday peak hours when Purple Line trains operate non-stop between Howard Station and Belmont Station.

The project corridor interfaces with two other CTA rail lines, the Yellow and the Brown Lines, therefore modernization of the North Red and Purple Lines could affect their service. The Yellow Line connects the Village of Skokie to the Red and Purple Lines at the Howard Station and the Brown Line service intersects the project area at Clark Junction, just north of Belmont Station. In addition, the project area includes two rail yards; Howard Yard, which has a capacity of 274 cars and Linden Yard, which has a capacity of 80 cars. Howard Yard is located in the City of Chicago near the intersection of Howard St. and Chicago Ave. Linden Yard is located in the Village of Wilmette near the intersection of Linden Ave. and 4th Street.

The project corridor travels through a number of neighborhoods in the northeastern section of the City of Chicago as well as the City of Evanston and the Village of Wilmette. Neighborhoods in the City of Chicago that may be affected by improvements

to the corridor include Lakeview, Uptown, Edgewater, and Rogers Park. In addition the surrounding neighborhoods in Chicago and the villages of Skokie, Winnetka, Lincolnwood, and Kenilworth may also be interested stakeholders. The project area encompasses a diversity of residential, industrial, institutional, recreational, educational, transportation, and commercial developments.

1.5 Alternatives

The North Red and Purple Modernization EIS will include an evaluation of the six alternatives: a No Action Alternative, a Basic Rehabilitation Alternative, a Basic Rehabilitation with Transfer Stations Alternative, a Modernization 4-Track Alternative, a Modernization 3-Track Alternative, and a Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative. These alternatives are briefly described below.

1.5.1 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would maintain the status quo. This alternative would include the absolute minimum repairs required to keep the North Red and Purple Lines functional. Travel patterns would remain the same. Travel times would likely continue to increase and service reliability would continue to degrade due to the need to safely operate on systems not considered in a state of good repair. Additional ADA access would not be provided. Minor repairs and upgrades would be made using current capital funding levels. The number of stations and station entrances would remain at 21 and 23, respectively. No stations would be renovated. The No Action Alternative is used as a basis for comparison for the other alternatives.

1.5.2 Basic Rehabilitation Alternative

This alternative includes a strategic mix of repairs, rehabilitation, and replacement to bring the Evanston Branch (between Linden Terminal and Howard Station) and the North Red Line (between Belmont Station and Howard Station) into a minimal state of good repair. It would provide adequate service for the next 20 years. The stations, viaducts, and other structural elements would not be brought up to modern standards and would only meet minimal ADA requirements. Upgrades would be made to signals and communication systems. The number of stations and station entrances would remain at 21 and 23, respectively.

Evanston Branch

The Evanston Branch, between Linden Terminal and Howard Station, is the northern section of the project area and is approximately 3.8 miles long. This segment currently has 2 operating tracks with 8 stations (not including Howard). Only one station would be renovated to accommodate 8 car trains; two stations which are already accessible would receive minor repairs; the other six stations would be renovated to meet minimal ADA requirements. This alternative consists of upgrades to existing structures primarily within the existing CTA right-of-way and maintenance of the existing overall track alignment, structure, and station configurations. The current sloped embankment structure would be maintained with repairs and viaduct replacement as required.

North Red Line

The North Red Line, between Belmont Station and Howard Station, is the southern section of the project area and is approximately 5.8 miles long. This segment currently has 4 operating tracks with 13 stations. Eight stations would be renovated to meet minimal ADA requirements; one station would be reconstructed; the remaining four stations are already accessible and would receive minor repairs. This alternative consists of upgrades to existing structures primarily within the existing CTA right-of-way and maintaining the existing overall track alignment, structure, and station configurations. Current embankment structures would be maintained and upgraded. Express service with no stops between Howard and Belmont would continue to be provided in both directions during peak periods.

1.5.3 Basic Rehabilitation with Transfer Stations Alternative

This alternative includes all of the elements of the Basic Rehabilitation Alternative plus new transfer stations at Wilson and Loyola. The number of stations would remain at 21 and the total number of station entrances would increase to 25 from 23.

Evanston Branch

Same as Basic Rehabilitation Alternative in this segment for this alternative.

North Red Line

In addition to including all of the elements of the Basic Rehabilitation Alternative, this alternative adds new transfer stations at Wilson and Loyola in this segment. The existing embankment structure would be replaced with a modern concrete aerial structure along the one mile of associated structures at the new transfer stations. Current embankment structures would be maintained and upgraded in all other areas. The new transfer stations and one mile of associated structures would have a useful life of 60-80 years; the rest of the improvements would have a useful life of 20 years. Additional access to express service would be possible at the two new transfer stations. This alternative would allow for potential expanded hours of express service. Seven stations would be renovated to meet minimal ADA requirements; three stations would be reconstructed (two as transfer stations); the remaining three stations are already accessible and would receive minor repairs.

1.5.4 Modernization 4-Track Alternative

This alternative would provide modern amenities at stations, extend the useful life of the system for the next 60-80 years, increase speed and reliability, and address safety and accessibility concerns. This alternative would require significant right-of-way acquisitions. The number of stations would decrease to 17 from 21 and the total number of station entrances would increase to 31 from 23.

Evanston Branch

All stations would be reconstructed or renovated to meet modern standards for accessibility and safety including modern platform widths and clear lines of sight, in addition to being expanded to accommodate 8 car trains. Four stations would be reconstructed; the remaining two previously-modernized stations would receive minor repairs. Reconstruction of elevated structures and viaducts would bring them up to modern standards including clearances for cross streets underneath viaducts. The current sloped embankment structure would be reconstructed and viaducts would be replaced as required. Minimal acquisition would be required to straighten curves that currently slow service. The potential exists to consolidate stops while providing additional access points; examples of this could include: adding a Washington entrance to Main station and removing South Boulevard station; and adding a Gaffield entrance to Noyes station and a Church entrance to Davis station and removing Foster station.

North Red Line

All stations would be reconstructed or renovated to meet modern standards for accessibility and safety including modern platform widths and clear lines of sight. Nine stations would be reconstructed (two as transfer stations); the remaining previously modernized station would receive minor repairs. This alternative would provide express and local service in both directions by maintaining 4-tracks and would replace the existing structures and embankment with modern concrete aerial structure. This alternative would allow for potential expanded hours of express service. Substantial additional right-of-way would be required to increase platform widths and provide clear lines of sight, as well as to straighten curves that slow service. The potential exists to consolidate stops, while providing additional access points; examples of this could include: adding an Ainslie entrance to Argyle station and removing Lawrence station; adding a Glenlake entrance to Granville station and a Hollywood entrance to Bryn Mawr station and removing Thorndale station; and providing additional access to Howard station at Rogers Avenue and removing Jarvis station.

1.5.5 Modernization 3-Track Alternative

This alternative would provide modern amenities at stations, extend the useful life of the system for the next 60-80 years, increase speed and reliability, and address safety and accessibility concerns. This alternative would remove one of the four tracks in the North Red Line corridor. The number of stations would decrease to 17 from 21 and the total number of station entrances would increase to 31 from 23. The number of stations to be reconstructed and repaired would be the same as the Modernization 4-Track Alternative above.

Evanston Branch

Same as Modernization 4-Track Alternative in this segment for this alternative.

North Red Line

All stations would be reconstructed or renovated to meet modern standards for accessibility and safety including modern platform widths and clear lines of sight. This alternative would generally stay within the existing right-of-way, would eliminate one of the four existing tracks between Belmont and Howard to accommodate wider platforms, and would replace the existing structures and embankment with modern concrete aerial structure. Local service would be offered in both directions at all times and express service would be offered inbound in the morning and outbound in the evening; no reverse commute express service would be provided. Some right-of-way acquisition would be required to straighten curves that currently slow service. The potential exists to consolidate stops, while providing additional access points; possibilities would be the same as for the Modernization 4-Track Alternative above.

1.5.6 Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative

This alternative would provide modern amenities at stations, extend the useful life of the system for the next 60-80 years, increase speed and reliability, and address safety and accessibility concerns. This alternative would operate underground in a new 2-track alignment in place of the current 4-track alignment in the North Red Line segment. The number of stations would decrease to 16 from 21 and the total number of station entrances would increase to 29 from 23.

Evanston Branch

Same as Modernization 4-Track Alternative in this segment for this alternative.

North Red Line

This alternative would replace a significant portion of the existing 4-track elevated rail structure and embankment with a below-grade 2-track alignment. This alternative would provide a single, more frequent, local service in both directions between Linden and Belmont in this corridor; no express overlay service would be provided. The alternative alignment would begin north of Belmont and transition below ground, proceeding underneath the northbound Brown Line tracks. The alignment would continue northward generally following Sheffield/Sheridan to the intersection of Sheridan and Broadway, and then proceed north, underneath Broadway, until it transitions back to the elevated alignment just north of Loyola. Subway stations would be constructed at Addison, Irving Park, Wilson, Foster, Bryn Mawr, Glenlake, and Devon/Loyola. In total, seven modern stations would be constructed underground; one station would be reconstructed above ground; one previously-modernized station would receive minor repairs. The current 4-track earthen embankment between Loyola and Howard would be replaced with a 2-track modern concrete aerial structure. This alternative would require right-of-way acquisition outside of the existing Red Line alignment for station entrances and auxiliary structures. Curves would be straightened and new subway stops would be located to maximize train speed. The potential exists in the remaining elevated alignment to provide additional access to Howard station at Rogers Avenue and remove Jarvis station.

1.6 Summary of Purpose and Need

The purpose of the North Red and Purple Modernization project is to:

- Bring the existing crucial transit asset into a state of good repair
- Reduce travel times
- Improve access to job markets and other destinations
- Respond to past shifts in travel demand
- Better use existing transit infrastructure
- Provide access to persons with disabilities
- Support the area's economic development initiatives and current transit supportive development patterns

The need for the project is based on the following considerations:

- The infrastructure is significantly past its useful life – most of it was constructed between 1900 and 1922
- Much of the infrastructure is dilapidated and continued degradation could increase the cost of maintenance and compromise service in the future
- The community relies on these facilities for all trip types including work access and reverse commutes
- Improvements are needed to make stations ADA accessible – only 6 of the 21 stations are currently ADA accessible
- Transit trip times are delayed and unreliable due to antiquated infrastructure
- The volume of passengers – over 128,000 on an average weekday representing over 19 percent of all CTA rail trips on weekdays and 23 percent of all rail trips on weekends – cannot be accommodated on the currently congested road network or through bus transportation alternatives
- The project area population is growing and is highly transit-reliant and diverse

1.7 Project Participants

The project participants include FTA, CTA, and CTA's consultants. CTA's consultants include the CWC Transit Group and CWC's subconsultants. There are no cooperating agencies identified at this time, as discussed in Section 2.3.2. Other project participants include federal, state, and local participating agencies identified in accordance with the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users

(SAFETEA-LU) 6002. Participating agencies have been identified as discussed in Section 2.3.1, and are listed in Appendix C.



Section 2 Scoping Process

2.1 Early Scoping Activities

CTA conducted the North Red and Purple Lines vision study between Fall 2009 and Fall 2010 to identify a range of options that address the project's purpose and need to varying degrees and in various ways. The vision study provided many opportunities for the public to be involved, including four public meetings, a webpage, a comment period, and a direct mail survey. More than 300 people attended the open houses and over 1,100 comments were received from the meetings. Most comments received related to improving travel times by removing slow zones (replacing infrastructure) and moving at higher speeds. The CTA also collected public input by conducting a mail survey of residents in zip codes surrounding the North Red segment of the project area. A total of 11,475 surveys were mailed out to the area and data collection occurred from January 6, 2010 to February 12, 2010 and resulted in a response rate of over 30%. This early public participation in the project helped shape over 20 preliminary options, which were evaluated based on predicted ridership, constructability and cost, among other attributes. Four of these options were evaluated at a somewhat more detailed level in the vision study as representative options of varying approaches. Those four alternatives and two others were carried forward into scoping and are proposed for study in the EIS.

2.2 Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Scoping Activities

In accordance with NEPA, FTA and CTA have initiated the environmental review process for the RPM project. A Tier 1 EIS will be prepared to identify planning level and cumulative impacts related to project construction and operation. This Tier 1 EIS is proposed to identify and analyze the plan for all potential corridor-wide improvements that could be implemented as part of the RPM project. Subsequent more specific project level NEPA analyses may be prepared, if required, prior to final design and construction of discrete projects within the corridor. The subsequent analyses would reference and build upon this Tier 1 EIS. This approach allows CTA, along with the community, to consider cumulative effects within the entire project corridor, prioritize project components, and plan for efficient construction phasing. Completion of the NEPA process also allows CTA to be prepared for any future federal funding opportunities.

As part of the initial phase of the environmental process, an agency scoping meeting was held on January 24, 2011, and public scoping meetings were hosted on January 24, 25, 26 and 27, 2011, to receive public comments on the alternatives and issues that should be examined as part of the environmental analysis. The public meetings are also a requirement of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), which requires project proponents to provide opportunities for public participation in transportation decision-making. The process of determining the scope, focus, and content of an EIS is known as "scoping." Scoping meetings are a useful opportunity to obtain information from the public and

governmental agencies. In particular, the scoping process asks agencies and interested parties to provide input on the proposed alternatives, the purpose and need for the project, the proposed topics of evaluation, and potential impacts and mitigation measures to be considered.

FTA published the NOI in the Federal Register on January 3, 2011. The publication of the NOI is the official federal notification of the agency's intent to prepare a Tier 1 Draft EIS. The NOI included notification of the dates and locations of the agency and public scoping meetings, the public comment period, as well as a description of the project purpose and need and the alternatives. The NOI initiates the NEPA scoping process. Comments were accepted by CTA from the date of publication of the NOI in the Federal Register (January 3, 2011) through February 18, 2011. This schedule provided a public comment period of 47 days. A copy of the NOI is in Appendix B.

2.2.1 Public Participation Plan

NEPA and SAFETEA-LU require project proponents to provide opportunities for public participation in transportation decision-making. In order to meet the requirements of these two Acts, a Public Participation Plan was developed to guide CTA through a comprehensive public participation process for the RPM project scoping phase. The plan includes public participation goals, strategies to engage the public, key audiences to be addressed, and the plan for notification and outreach for the scoping phase of the project. The Public Participation Plan, which is included in Appendix A, was developed specifically for the scoping process and will be updated in the future to address outreach needs for the release of the Tier 1 Draft EIS.

2.2.2 Coordination Plan

Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) established an environmental review process for transit projects that has now been included in Section 139 of Title 23 of the U.S. Code. Section 139 directs agencies to prepare a plan for coordinating public and agency participation in and comments on the environmental review process for a project. The coordination plan describes how the lead agencies will provide opportunities for input from both the public and other agencies. The Coordination Plan includes the Public Participation Plan described above in Section 2.2.1.

2.3 Agency Scoping

2.3.1 Participating Agencies

Participating agencies can be federal, state, tribal, regional, and local government agencies that may have an interest in the project. In accordance with SAFETEA-LU Section 6002 requirements, CTA, in coordination with the FTA, prepared and mailed 116 participating agency invitation letters to 82 agencies with a potential interest in the project in December 2010. The identification of potential participating agencies built on the list of agencies identified through the vision study process.

The responsibilities of these agencies include, but are not limited, to:

- Participating in the NEPA process starting at the earliest possible time, especially with regards to the development of the purpose and need statement, range of alternatives, methodologies, and the level of detail for the analysis of alternatives.
- Identify, as early as practicable, any issues of concern regarding potential environmental or socioeconomic impacts of the project.
- Participate in the issue resolution process, described in the Coordination Plan.
- Provide meaningful and timely input on unresolved issues.
- Participate in the scoping process.

Accepting the designation as a participating agency does not indicate project support and does not provide the agency with increased oversight or approval authority beyond its statutory limits.

Participating agencies for the project are listed in Appendix C and include federal, state and local agencies with an interest in the project because of an overlap in their area of jurisdiction or some specialized knowledge of potential project effects. Invited federal agencies automatically become a participating agency unless they decline the invitation in writing, while local and state agencies must accept the invitation. The final list of participating agencies then includes federal agencies that either accepted or did not decline as well as state and local agencies that accepted the invitations.

Agencies were given 30 days from the date of the letter to respond. Agencies may request to be added at any time during the NEPA process. Appendix D contains two sample invitation letters; one that was sent to federal agencies and tribes and one that was sent to state, regional, and local agencies.

2.3.2 Cooperating Agencies

Cooperating agencies are, by definition in 40 CFR 1508.5, federal agencies with jurisdiction, by law or special expertise, with respect to any environmental impact involved in the proposed project. A state or local agency of similar qualifications may, by agreement with the lead agency, also become a cooperating agency. The cooperating agencies are by definition participating agencies as well, and while the roles and responsibilities of both are similar, the cooperating agencies have a slightly greater degree of authority, responsibility, and involvement in the environmental review process. There are no cooperating agencies identified for the RPM project at this time.

2.3.3 Agency Scoping Meeting

One Agency Scoping meeting was held as follows:

Time: Monday, January 24, 2011, 10:30 A.M.

Location: CTA Headquarters, Conference Room 2A
567 W. Lake Street
Chicago, IL 60661

Attendees: 25, representing the following 19 agencies and jurisdictions (sign-in sheet included in Appendix E)

- Chicago Department of Buildings
- Chicago Department of Environment
- Chicago Housing and Economic Development
- Chicago Mayor's Office
- Chicago Park District
- City of Evanston
- Chicago Department of Business Affairs and Consumer Protection
- Federal Highway Administration
- Federal Transit Administration
- Forest Preserve District of Cook County
- Illinois Commerce Commission
- Illinois Department of Transportation
- Illinois Housing Development Authority
- Illinois State Toll Highway Authority
- Metra
- Metropolitan Water Reclamation District
- Pace Suburban Bus Service
- Regional Transportation Authority
- US Environmental Protection Agency

CTA hosted the meeting and both CTA and FTA staff made presentations. A power point presentation was shown that provided an overview of the tiered NEPA process, addressed participating agency responsibilities, and described the alternatives. A long break was provided for attendees to view the exhibit boards and ask clarifying questions in an informal setting. The exhibit boards available were the same ones that were presented at the public scoping meetings and that were available on the website. Afterwards, the group reconvened for a more formal question and answer session.

2.3.3.1 Agency Scoping Meeting Comments

The topics addressed in the question and answer session included:

- Maintenance of service during construction
- Reuse or recycling of demolished materials
- Ridership calculation methods and the potential for shifts to other modes including bus, automobile, and commuter rail
- Coordination with bus services
- Reverse commutes and travel demand analyses
- Potential right-of-way acquisitions
- Potential costs
- Transit stop consolidation issues including potential effects on walking times, coordination with other providers to maintain ADA accessibility, criteria used to identify potential for consolidation, effects on businesses around existing stations
- Accessibility of secondary station entrances
- Potential to include high energy efficiency designs in renovated stations
- Types of projects that might be included in Tier 2 analyses

The agency scoping meeting notes are included in Appendix E.

2.4 Public Scoping

Public scoping is an important element in the process of determining the focus and content of an EIS. Scoping helps to identify the range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, and mitigation measures to be analyzed in depth, and helps eliminate from detailed study those issues that are not pertinent to the final decision on the proposed project. Scoping is an effective way to bring together and address the concerns of the public, agencies, and other interested parties.

Notification of the public scoping meetings was completed via several forms of media as described further in this section. This outreach was in addition to the official notice published in the Federal Register. Four public scoping meetings were held as described in Section 2.5.4.

2.4.1 Notification Database

CTA maintained and updated the stakeholder database developed during the vision study to track interested individuals and groups. To the extent possible, CTA includes mailing addresses as well as e-mail contact information in the database. The database includes those who participated in the vision study by attending a meeting or providing a comment during the process.

In addition to those identified through the vision study process, the notification database was expanded to include residents and businesses adjacent to the proposed alternatives. Addresses for businesses and residences on parcels either immediately adjacent to the proposed project area or separated from the project area by a street, park, vacant parcel, the Metra line, or one residence, were also added to the notification database.

At the time of the scoping meetings, 7,989 entries were listed on the RPM project database. A list of all public agencies included in the RPM project database is provided in Appendix F.

2.4.2 Public Notification Activities

In order to engage the public to participate in the environmental review process and attend a scoping meeting, some basic strategies were used including: 1) make it easy to participate, 2) provide easy-to-understand information that helps people provide informed scoping comments, 3) provide multiple ways to obtain information and provide comment, and 4) ensure stakeholders are aware of the planning process and are shown how public input will be used.

Invitations were mailed directly to people on the project mailing list and e-blast invitations were sent to the e-mail distribution list, which included almost 500 emails. Newspaper display ads were placed in a total of 15 regional and local papers, a legal notice was placed in the Chicago Tribune, transit cards were placed on CTA vehicles and in transit stations, approximately 4,200 flyers were distributed to businesses and other key locations along the project corridor by City Year interns, and notices were posted in libraries and village halls. Three meetings were held with elected officials from along the corridor so they could notify their constituents through their networks. Additionally, a project web page was developed to provide all of the project information and pertinent scoping information.

2.4.2.1 Direct Mail Notice

Scoping meeting invitations were mailed on January 5, 2011 to a list of 7,989 entries that included elected officials, government agencies, tribes, interested persons, businesses, organizations, neighborhood associations, schools and universities in the project

vicinity, and property owners adjacent to both sides of the proposed build alternatives. The notice provided information on scoping, the alternatives, how to provide a comment, and the public scoping meeting information. The mailed invitation included information in English and Spanish (Appendix G).

2.4.2.2 CTA Alert Cards

In order to reach a large audience of transit riders, “alert cards” with the public scoping meeting information were placed in various buses, trains, and stations in the project area. Approximately 1,495 transit cards (Appendix G) were distributed on January 7 and 10, 2011, for posting at all Red, Purple, and Yellow line train stations and on bus routes originating from the Chicago, Forest Glen, Kedzie and North Park garages.

2.4.2.3 E-mail Notification

An invitation e-mail (Appendix G) was created that included information on the public scoping meetings and how to provide comments. The e-mail was sent on January 7, 2011 to approximately 475 addresses to people who had previously demonstrated an interest in the RPM project. A follow-up “email blast” was sent out on February 11, 2011, to approximately 778 email addresses as reminder that there was one more week left in the comment period.

2.4.2.4 Newspaper Advertisements

To invite the public to the scoping meetings and notify individuals about the comment period, display advertisements were placed in 15 regional and local newspapers within the project area. Newspapers were selected based on their geographic focus, audited circulation numbers, and the project’s language needs. Display ads ran during the week of January 3, 2011 through the week of January 17, 2011. Ads were placed in different papers on different days of the week throughout the notification period. A summary of ads placed is presented in Table 2-1. Ads were placed in both the Chicago Tribune City Edition and Chicago Tribune North Shore Edition twice, running two consecutive weeks. In addition, a legal notice was placed in the Chicago Tribune on January 10, 2011. The display ads and legal notice are included in Appendix G.

Table 2-1. Newspaper Display Advertisements

Newspaper	Ad Size	Geographic Coverage	Language	First Ad Date	Second Ad Date
Our Village	1/4 page	Chicago-NW	English	Fri, 1/07/11	---
La Raza	1/4 page	Chicago	Spanish	Sun, 1/09/11	---
Chicago Sun Times	1/4 page	Chicago	English	Mon, 1/10/11	---
Hoy	1/4 page	Chicago	Spanish	Mon, 1/10/11	---
Red Eye	1/4 page	Chicago	English	Mon, 1/10/11	---
Tribune-City	1/4 page	Chicago	English	Mon, 1/10/11	Mon, 1/17/11
Tribune-North Shore zones	1/4 page	Chicago, North Suburbs	English	Mon, 1/10/11	Mon, 1/17/11
Gay Chicago Magazine	1/4 page	Chicago	English	Tues, 1/11/11	---
Windy City Times	1/4 page	Chicago	English	Wed, 1/12/11	---

Newspaper	Ad Size	Geographic Coverage	Language	First Ad Date	Second Ad Date
Chicago Reader	1/4 page	Chicago	English	Wed, 1/12/11	---
Pioneer Press-Central	1/4 page	Suburban Chicago-North	English	Thu, 1/13/11	---
Pioneer Press-N. Shore	1/4 page	Suburban Chicago-North	English	Thu, 1/13/11	---
Chicago Jewish News	1/4 page	Region	English	Fri, 1/14/11	---
Chicago Crusader	1/4 page	Chicago	English	Sat, 1/15/11	---
Evanston Roundtable	1/4 page	Suburban Chicago-North	English	Wed, 1/19/11	---

Source: CWC Transit Group

2.4.2.5 Project Web Site

A project web site, www.transitchicago.com/rpmproject, was developed for the RPM project EIS. The site includes information about the project, the environmental review process, and the scoping information. The site also included information about how to submit scoping comments and who to contact for additional information. The web site prominently featured the dates and times of the public scoping meetings, as well as links to directions using public transit to access the meeting locations. Website content included the scoping booklets, display boards used at the public scoping meetings, and other information of interest to the public. The website will continue to be updated at key milestones. Some materials posted to the website were translated into Spanish.

2.4.2.6 Additional Outreach During Public Scoping Period

In order to maximize the coverage of the outreach effort for the scoping meetings, a media release (Appendix G) was sent to local media outlets, scoping information was posted on local on-line community calendars, and approximately 4,200 flyers and leaflets (Appendix G) were distributed to businesses and other key locations around the area by City Year interns.

City Year interns, grouped in nine teams of two or three interns each, distributed flyers and leaflets to businesses within approximately two blocks of each station within the project area as well as to transit riders. The interns distributed the flyers on January 15, 2011. They provided interested businesses with full page flyers for posting in the business and with half page leaflets with the same information that the businesses could make available as “take aways” for customers. Approximately 4,200 flyers were distributed.

The flyer was also distributed to the following village/city hall and library locations:

Village/City Hall Posting Locations:

- City of Chicago
- City of Evanston

- City of Park Ridge
- Evanston Township
- Lincolnwood Village
- New Trier Township
- Village of Glenview
- Village of Kenilworth
- Village of Morton Grove
- Village of Niles
- Village of Skokie
- Village of Wilmette
- Village of Winnetka

Library Posting Locations

- Evanston Public Library - Main
- Evanston Public Library - North
- Evanston Public Library - South
- Glenview Public Library
- Lincolnwood Public Library
- Morton Grove Public Library
- Niles Public Library
- Park Ridge Public Library
- Winnetka Public Library
- Skokie Public Library
- Wilmette Public Library

2.4.2.7 Limited English Proficiency Analysis

A fundamental requirement of NEPA is communication with local citizens who could be affected by a project. This means that informational materials should effectively

communicate with everyone in a project area. The North Lake Shore area has historically supported a very diverse population. It was important at the start of this project, prior to developing notification materials, to determine whether there was a significant population with limited English proficiency within the project area.

An analysis of languages spoken and English proficiency within the study area was conducted based on data collected from the U.S. Census and supplemental sources of information. The supplemental sources of information included a study prepared for CTA about LEP communities' experiences with its transit services and local institutions and organizations that are regularly in contact with the communities in the study area. Local institutions were contacted to assess languages that they use to communicate with these populations. These supplemental sources were used to confirm and refine the results of the census data analysis.

The RPM project area crosses 57 census tracts. The majority of the population in those tracts speaks English (68.4%). The five languages spoken by the most adults in the study area are English, Spanish, Chinese, Russian, and African languages. Spanish is the most prevalent non-English language spoken in the study area. Chinese, Russian, Korean, Serbo-Croatian, Urdu, and Vietnamese are widely spoken in specific sections of the corridor. But throughout the entire study area, Chinese (Cantonese) and Russian are somewhat more common than the others although the percentage of the population that speaks these languages is small.

Based on this analysis, scoping materials were provided in Spanish and a Spanish translator was available at the public scoping meeting. Scoping notices also included a line offering additional translation services with advance notice. This offer was printed in Russian and Chinese. No requests for additional translation services were received prior to the public scoping meeting.

2.4.3 Elected Official and Stakeholder Briefings

There were four meetings with elected officials or stakeholders held on the RPM project and other proposed Red Line Improvements. Generally, briefings covered a description of the project and the scoping process. The briefings included the following:

- January 18, 2011 – elected officials and/or their representatives including:
 - Rep. Harry Osterman, Illinois 14th District
 - Ald. Carrie Austin, Chicago 34th Ward
 - Chester Wilson, Ald. Austin's Office, Chicago 34th Ward
 - Ald. James Balcer, Chicago 11th Ward
 - Ald. Freddrenna Lyle, Chicago 6th Ward
 - Ald. Helen Shiller, Chicago 46th Ward
 - Doug Frasier, Chicago 48th Ward Ald. Mary Ann Smith's Office

- January 19, 2011 – elected officials and/or their representatives including:
 - Sen. Heather Steans, Illinois 7th District
 - Leslie Combs, Congresswoman Jan Schakowsky’s Office, 9th District
 - Ald. Pat Dowell, Chicago 3rd Ward
 - Ald. Joe Moore, Chicago 49th Ward
 - Mike Land, Ald. Moore’s Office, Chicago 49th Ward
 - Ald. Latasha Thomas, Chicago 17th Ward
 - Ald. Tom Tunney, Chicago 44th Ward
 - Conrad Kiebles, Village of Calumet Park
 - Mike Braiman, Village of Wilmette
- January 20, 2011 – elected officials and/or their representatives including:
 - Michael Daly, U.S. Sen. Richard Durbin’s Office
 - Robert Becker, U.S. Rep. Mike Quigley’s Office, 5th District
 - Janis McReynolds, Sen. Mattie Hunter’s Office, Illinois 3rd District
 - Jennifer Dole, Ald. Patrick O’Connor’s Office, Chicago 40th Ward
 - Ald. Melissa Wynne, Evanston 3rd Ward
 - Paul Schneider, Evanston Department of Transportation
 - Mayor Donald Peloquin, Blue Island
- February 16, 2011 –
 - Edgewater Community Council Board of Directors
 - 67 residents and stakeholders of the Edgewater Community

2.4.4 Public Scoping Meetings

CTA hosted four public scoping meetings to inform the public about the project and gather input on the scope of the environmental studies, draft purpose and need, and alternatives to be evaluated. Meetings were conducted in compliance with NEPA guidelines, and locations were selected to reflect equitable geographic coverage, proximity to public transportation, and to minimize overlap with other meetings scheduled in the project area. The locations were within the project area, accessible by public transit, and ADA compliant. The scoping meetings were held approximately four weeks in advance of the end of the public comment period.

For the convenience of all attendees, train and bus lines to and from the meeting sites were publicized on some notices and on the website. In order to provide the greatest opportunity for community participation, meetings were scheduled in the early evening on weekdays.

A total of 522 people signed in at the four public meetings. There may have been a few additional attendees at each meeting who did not sign in. Approximately 257 people provided verbal and/or written comments at the meetings. An additional 1,257 comments were received via letters, e-mail, and mailed comment cards throughout the public scoping period.

Meeting 1: Uptown

Monday, January 24, 2011

6:00 to 8:30 p.m.

St. Augustine College

1345 W. Argyle St.

Chicago, IL 60640

Attendees: 77 people signed in

Comments: 6 using the court reporters; 19 written

Meeting 2: Edgewater

Tuesday, January 25, 2011

6:00 to 8:30 p.m.

Nicholas Senn High School

5900 N. Glenwood Avenue

Chicago, IL 60660

Attendees: 62 people signed in

Comments: 8 using the court reporters; 16 written

Meeting 3: Rogers Park

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

6:00 to 8:30 p.m.

New Field Primary School

1707 W. Morse Avenue

Chicago, IL 60626

Attendees: 228 people signed in

Comments: 35 using the court reporters; 102 written

Meeting 4: Evanston

Thursday, January 27, 2011

6:00 to 8:30 p.m.

Fleetwood-Jourdain Community Center

1655 Foster St.

Evanston, IL 60201

Attendees: 155 people signed in

Comments: 17 using the court reporters; 54 written

2.4.4.1 Public Scoping Meeting Format

Public meetings were held in accordance with FTA guidelines. An open house meeting format was used for the public meetings. Each meeting was held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. During the open house session, project team members were present at project display boards to answer questions related to the technical aspects of the project. The

open house provided attendees with an opportunity to review the project information and clarify their understanding of the project and environmental process. Two court reporters were available to take verbal public comments and input at each open house. Verbal comments were recorded in formal transcripts. Written comments were also accepted on comment sheets provided at the meetings. Written comments were collected at each meeting and accepted by mail, fax, and e-mail after the meetings until the close of the comment period on February 18, 2011. Spanish and sign language interpreters were available at all four meetings. Emphasis was placed on the importance of the community providing comments before the comment deadline, at the public meetings, or via e-mail, fax, or postal mail.

2.4.4.2 Public Meeting Materials

Each meeting attendee was offered the following materials: an EIS scoping information booklet (in English or Spanish), a comment sheet, a speaker card, and five technical handouts (Appendix H). The scoping information booklet provided a project overview and includes the following sections: purpose of the EIS and scoping, environmental issues to be considered in the EIS, project overview, project alternatives, an alternative comparison chart, project purpose and need, public participation, how to participate in the decision-making process, and next steps. All of these materials were posted on the project web site.

The comment sheet allowed attendees to submit written comments during the meeting or to mail them in after the meeting. The comment sheet (Appendix H) was designed as a self-mailer so that individuals could easily mail comments to CTA if they needed more time to develop them after the public scoping meeting. The speaker card (Appendix H) was provided for attendees to fill out and turn in to the court reporter before providing a verbal comment.

Five technical handouts (Appendix H) were offered to meeting attendees to provide additional information about specific topics. The technical handout topics were: ADA access, Infrastructure Descriptions, Transit Stop Consolidation and Secondary Entrances, Transit Projects and Your Property, and Viaduct Work.

Project exhibit boards were developed and used during the public open house. The boards included: Welcome to the Meeting, Previous Outreach, Federal Environmental Review Process, Issues Potentially Considered in Environmental Impact Statement, Targeted Project Timeline, Purpose and Need, No Action Alternative, Basic Rehabilitation Alternative, Basic Rehabilitation with Transfer Stations Alternative, Modernization 4-Track Alternative, Modernization 3-Track Alternative, Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative, Alternative Summary, What are Transfer Stations, What are the Platform Options, Viaduct Improvements, Track Structure Options, Stop Consolidation and Secondary Entrances, How to give a Spoken Comment, How to Comment, and Stay Involved (Appendix I). Exhibit boards were also posted on the website.

2.5 Comments Received

The public scoping period was from January 3, 2011 to February 18, 2011 which was greater than the 45 calendar days required by FTA rules. All interested people were provided opportunities to submit written or spoken comments at the four public scoping meetings as well as the opportunity to submit comments in writing via e-mail, fax, or postal letter. The comment cards distributed at the public meetings were designed to facilitate return of written comments both at the public meeting and via postal mail later during the public comment period. E-mail comments could be sent to a project specific e-mail address found on the project website and included in all notice materials distributed. In total, approximately 1,514 comments were received by the close of the public comment period, including 1,257 written comments. All comments received are included in Appendices K, L, and M.

Table 2-2. Comments Received at Public Scoping Meetings

Meeting Date	# Signed In	# Court Reporter Comments	# Written Comments Collected at Meeting
January 24	77	6	19
January 25	62	8	16
January 26	228	35	102
January 27	155	17	54
Total	522	66	191

Section 3

Summary of Scoping Comments

3.1 Introduction

CTA accepted comments on the North Red and Purple Modernization (RPM) Project throughout the entire scoping period, from January 3, 2011 until February 18, 2011. Agencies, community groups, members of the public, elected officials, and other interested parties submitted 1,514 letters, e-mails, comment cards, and individuals' oral testimony during this period. The summary table (Table 3-1) provides a tally of the topics discussed in the comments.

It should be noted that the combined numbers of comments listed in the following subsections and the summary table will be greater than the total number of comment submissions because some people discussed multiple topics in their submission. Topics covered in the comments included the purpose and need, the alternatives to be analyzed in the Draft EIS, potential impacts and mitigation measures, and other substantive issues. This section contains a summary of comments received during the scoping period. The actual comments may be found in Appendices K, L and M.

3.2 Summary of Substantive Comments

All comments were reviewed and categorized in an electronic database. The database contains information documenting the name of the commenter, the agency or organization the commenter represents, the method by which the comment was received, and the topic categories addressed in the comment. The full text of each comment is included in Appendices K, L, and M.

The comments were largely fit into three topic categories. The major categories of comments included the project purpose and need (approximately six comments), the alternatives to be studied in the Draft EIS (including alternative options, transfer stations, and transit stop consolidation; approximately 1,753 comments), and environmental impacts and mitigation measures (approximately 2,030 comments). Many comments related to several topics and may have been counted under more than one category in order to fully characterize the feedback for each topic. The following sections contain summaries of the comments from each major category.

Table 3-1 provides a summary of the comments received during the scoping period. Transcripts of the spoken comments submitted at the public scoping meetings and full text of all written public comments are provided in Appendices K and L. Agency comments are provided in Appendix M.

Table 3-1. Summary of Comments received

Purpose and Need	<p>“Respond to changing travel demand” rather than “respond to past shifts in travel demand” Eliminating express service and closing stations would contradict stated purpose and need</p>		
Proposed Alternatives	<p><u>No Action (8)</u> Support (3) Do Not Support (5)</p>	<p><u>Basic Rehab w/ Transfer Stations (50)</u> Support (46) Do Not Support (4)</p>	<p><u>3-Track Modernization (56)</u> Support (33) Do Not Support (23)</p>
Potential Impacts	<p><u>Basic Rehab (41)</u> Support (32) Do Not Support (9)</p>	<p><u>4-Track Modernization (115)</u> Support (108) Do Not Support (7)</p>	<p><u>2-Track Modernization (104)</u> Support (70) Do Not Support (34)</p>
Potential Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transportation/Multi-Modal/Accessibility (863) ▪ Land Use/Econ Development/Business & Community Impacts (574) ▪ Safety and Security (300) ▪ Neighborhood Compatibility (66) ▪ Environmental Justice (53) ▪ Visual and Aesthetic Impacts (39) ▪ Natural Resources (31) ▪ Cultural & Historic Resources (27) ▪ Noise and Vibration (23) ▪ Land Acquisitions, Displacement and Relocations (20) ▪ Construction Impacts (19) ▪ Energy Use (8) ▪ Wildlife & Ecosystems (4) ▪ Parks & Recreational Facilities (3) 		

Note: Tallies are approximate

3.3 Comments Related to Purpose and Need

In general, comments regarding the purpose and need for the project discussed how some of the proposed changes to the North Red and Purple Lines would appear to contradict the stated purpose and need. In total, approximately six comments related to purpose and need were received. Comments received pertaining to the Purpose and Need included:

- Suggestion to change purpose to “respond to changes in travel demand” rather than “respond to past shifts in travel demand.”
- Comment that potentially eliminating express service and closing stations (i.e. transit stop consolidation) would appear to contradict the stated purpose and need because it could increase travel time and could limit access to job markets.

3.4 Comments Related to Alternatives

Most people commented on specific aspects of one or more alternatives with transit stop consolidation generating the most input on the alternatives. Approximately 374 comments expressed a preference for a specific alternative. The Modernization 4-Track Alternative appeared to gather the most support with approximately 108 commenters expressing a preference for this alternative.

Many comments expressed concern over alternatives that include transit stop consolidation. Over 1,300 of the comments received were related to transit stop consolidation, with over 1,153 comments expressing dislike of transit stop consolidation concepts. Seventy seven comments approved of transit stop consolidation.

Several commenters suggested the A/B skip stop service as an alternative to closing stations. A/B skip stop service refers to an operating plan last used on the CTA rail system in 1995. In A/B skip stop service, successive trains are alternately designated as “A” trains and “B” trains. Lower ridership stations on the route are designated alternately from the end of a route as “A” stations or as “B” stations. Higher ridership stations are designated as “all-stop” stations. “A” stations are served by “A” trains, “B” stations are served by “B” trains and “all-stop” stations are served by both “A” and “B” trains. The “A” trains skip one group of stops while the “B” trains skip an alternate group. In this operating plan, all trains are expresses, with “A” trains skipping “B” stations and “B” trains skipping “A” stations; there are no local trains.

3.4.1 No Action Alternative

Three comments were received expressing a preference for the No Action Alternative. Two of the three comments on this alternative included approval of this alternative due to funding concerns and general opposition to transit stop consolidation. Five comments were opposed to this alternative indicating that this is not a good option for the long-term and not in the best interest of the community.

3.4.2 Basic Rehabilitation Alternative

Thirty-two comments were received supporting the Basic Rehabilitation Alternative. This option was chosen by several commenters primarily because of their disapproval of transit stop consolidation. Comments related to the Basic Rehabilitation Alternative included:

- Positive comments:
 - No transit stop consolidation
 - ADA accessibility improvements
 - Low cost compared to Modernization alternatives
 - Maintains express service
 - Maintains neighborhoods and business districts
 - Maintains reverse commute
 - Fewer construction disruptions compared to Modernization alternatives
- Negative comments:
 - Not in the best interest of the community
 - Potentially negative impact on property values

- Concern about the short lifespan of the improvements
- Too expensive

Some commenters expressed a preference for improvements equivalent to the Basic Rehabilitation Alternative for the Evanston Branch only while supporting other alternative levels of improvement for the North Red Line.

3.4.3 Basic Rehabilitation with Transfer Stations Alternative

Forty-six comments were received supporting the Basic Rehabilitation with Transfer Stations Alternative. As with the Basic Rehabilitation Alternative, this option was chosen by several commenters because of their disapproval of transit stop consolidation concepts. Comments related to the Basic Rehabilitation with Transfer Stations Alternative included:

- Positive comments:
 - No transit stop consolidation
 - Improves access to Purple Line from Wilson and Loyola (transfer stations)
 - Station improvements including ADA accessibility
 - Maintains neighborhoods and business districts
 - Low cost compared to Modernization alternatives
 - Maintains express service
 - Maintains the elevated tracks which are part of Chicago's character
 - Fewer construction disruptions compared to Modernization alternatives
- Negative comments:
 - Potentially negative impact on property values
 - Concern about the short lifespan of the improvements
 - Too expensive
 - Transfer stations aren't needed to meet the project's purpose and need

3.4.4 Modernization 4-Track Alternative

Approximately 108 comments were received supporting the Modernization 4-Track Alternative. Many commenters wrote that they like the Modernization 4-Track Alternative with the exception of the transit stop consolidation concepts. Comments related to the Modernization 4-Track Alternative included:

- Positive comments:
 - Improvements to stations (widened platforms, ADA improvements, accommodate 8 car trains)

- Faster travel time
 - Longevity of improvements
 - Replaces aging tracks/system
 - Maintains express service in both directions
 - Maintains elevated tracks which are part of Chicago's character
 - Straightens curves
 - Redesign of support structure could potentially deflect noise
 - Open space under elevated tracks
 - Improved station access
 - Reduces slow zones
 - Increases service
 - Accommodates future growth
 - Maximizes service and convenience
 - Increased reliability
- Negative comments:
 - Transit stop consolidation
 - Construction costs
 - Unknown operating cost to run express service all the time
 - Duration of construction
 - Potential disruption to neighborhoods
 - Property acquisitions including historic buildings
 - Potentially increased noise due to replacing earthen embankments

3.4.5 Modernization 3-Track Alternative

Approximately 33 comments were received supporting the Modernization 3-Track Alternative. Several commenters indicated that they liked this alternative overall, but they disliked the transit stop consolidation concepts. Comments related to the Modernization 3-Track Alternative included:

- Positive comments:
 - Maintains express service during rush hour
 - Improves station access
 - Longevity of improvements
 - Improvements to stations (widened platforms, ADA improvements)

- Viaduct improvements
- Transfer stations with access to Purple Line at Wilson and Loyola
- Requires less land acquisition than Modernization 4-Track Alternative
- Cost savings over Modernization 4-Track Alternative
- Faster travel times
- Negative comments:
 - No reverse express commute option
 - Construction costs
 - Duration of construction and service disruptions during construction
 - Potential disruption to neighborhoods
 - Potentially limited ADA access due to closed stations
 - Potentially increased travel times
 - Limits future growth

3.4.6 Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative

Approximately 70 comments were received supporting the Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative. Several commenters expressed the idea that elevated trains are a part of the character of the city and that conversion to an underground alignment would alter that element. Comments related to the Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative included:

- Positive comments:
 - No property acquisition
 - Less noise
 - No viaducts
 - Weather protection
 - Longevity of improvements
 - Faster travel times
 - Energy savings
 - ADA improvements
 - No train transfer between Chicago and Evanston (continuous service to Linden)
 - Existing elevated right of way could be used for other development (parking, community beautification projects, parks, playgrounds, parking), or could be sold to offset construction costs

- Potential to reduce crime between Wilson and Loyola
- Maximizes service and convenience
- Increases capacity
- Station expandability
- Less disruptive to community
- Lowest operating/maintenance cost
- No need for snow removal
- Existing system can operate during construction
- Increase property values
- Easy access for seniors
- Eliminate conflicts with Brown line
- More frequent service during off-peak and late night hours
- Potential to improve community cohesion
- Increases frequency
- Increases ridership
- Negative comments
 - Construction costs could be much higher given the uncertainties of building underground
 - Duration of construction
 - Maintaining traffic flow during construction could be difficult
 - Potentially negative impacts to the businesses and community along the existing corridor
 - Potential disruption to residents along new alignment
 - Stations would be too far apart
 - No express option
 - Potential for increased travel times
 - Poor lighting and poor air circulation in the subway
- Suggestion to build the subway to service Clark Street (from Howard to Division) and Western Ave (Howard/Clark to green line or further south)

3.4.7 Transfer Stations

Approximately 46 comments were received supporting proposed transfer stations at Loyola and Wilson. Alternate transfer station locations were suggested including: Thorndale, Leland, Foster (in Chicago), Lawrence, Sheridan, Addison, Granville, and Bryn Mawr. Comments on transfer stations included:

- Positive comments:
 - Improves access for Loyola and Truman College employees and students
 - Improves safety, particularly at Wilson
 - Faster travel time
 - Potential benefits to community and local businesses
- Negative comments:
 - Transfer stations are not needed to accomplish the project's purpose and need
 - Loyola and Wilson stations are too close to Howard and Belmont

3.4.8 Transit Stop Consolidation

Many of the comments received related to transit stop consolidation. Over 1,150 comments were opposed to transit stop consolidation and 77 approved of transit stop consolidation. In order to mitigate effects caused by transit stop consolidation, many comments suggested that bus service should be modified in order to meet the needs of residents who live near the closed stations. The comments related to transit stop consolidation included:

- Positive comments:
 - Faster travel times
 - Potentially could make Jarvis more safe
 - Less financial burden on CTA and riders
 - Ample service nearby
 - Additional entrances near consolidated stops
- Negative comments
 - Potentially eliminating express service and closing stations would appear to contradict the stated purpose and need because it would increase travel time and would limit access to job markets
 - Transit stop consolidation could encourage riders to drive or take the Metra, particularly riders at South Boulevard and Jarvis stations

- Convenient local service (frequent, close-together stops) should be a priority for upgrades
 - Potential negative economic impact on local businesses because consolidation could limit pedestrian traffic
 - Potential negative impact to property values because consolidation could result in longer commutes to station
 - Potentially reduces access to local businesses, community, and cultural amenities
 - Potential environmental injustice - could be unfair to lower income residents
 - Potentially result in longer walk to adjacent stations and safety concerns because of the distance
 - Concern about safety at secondary entrances
 - Potentially limits ADA access due to longer walk to adjacent stations
 - Potentially longer commute times due to longer walk to adjacent stations
 - Potential for Jarvis neighborhood to be “destabilized” if the station were to be closed
 - Potential for neighborhoods near closed stations to be alienated or isolated, and the “small town feeling” surrounding stations would be lost
 - Potential detrimental effect on existing neighborhood and business development trends, potential impact to neighborhood revitalization
 - Potential to negatively impact aesthetics at closed stations
 - Consolidating transit stops would not make the City of Chicago and City of Evanston more sustainable
 - Transit stop consolidation would appear to penalize those that use transit in order to be green
 - Transit stop consolidation would potentially limit the use of the U-Pass program, which is designed to encourage young people to choose transit
- Station-specific comments related to transit stop consolidation included the following:
- Lawrence has a thriving theater and entertainment district
 - Thorndale is used by Senn High School students
 - Jarvis has an arts district
 - South Boulevard is the closest station to St. Francis Hospital
 - Foster is one of the primary stations used by Northwestern University students

- Suggestions to expand Wilson north with a second entrance at Leland and expand Argyle south for second entrance at Ainslie

3.4.9 Operations & Service

Approximately 312 comments were received regarding operations and service.

Comments included:

- Transfer Stations and Express Service
 - Support for alternatives that maintain express service
 - Suggestion for full-time Purple Line Express service from Howard to Belmont
 - Additional express service segments suggestions: Bryn Mawr to Belmont, Montrose to downtown
 - Suggestion to skip Foster between 10am and 4pm rather than closing it
 - Suggestion for hourly or half-hour schedule for express service during the mid-day hours
 - Suggestion for better timing between Red, Purple, and Yellow lines at Howard for transfers
 - Additional transfer station location suggestions: Thorndale, Leland, Foster (in Chicago), Lawrence, Sheridan, Addison, Granville, Bryn Mawr
 - Concern that a reduction in express service would potentially have negative impacts on the community and local businesses
 - Concern that reduction in express service would limit Evanston as a desirable place to live in or visit
- Service
 - Comment that improvements should reduce travel times
 - Suggestion to return to A/B Skip-Stop Service to reduce travel time along the Red Line
 - Suggestion to extend the Red Line to Linden during non-express periods since many riders during that time period travel from downtown to Evanston and the wait to switch trains is often long
 - Suggestion for increased Red Line frequency between 9 and 10 pm due to crowded conditions.
 - Suggestion for more frequent Purple Line service between Howard and Linden
 - Suggestion to increase frequency of trains

- Preference for reduced service (morning/evening rush, evening train) over transit stop consolidation
- Suggestion that bus service should be modified in order to meet the needs of residents who live near the closed stations as part of transit stop consolidation
- Suggestion for bus turnaround on Sheridan north of Foster
- Suggestion to divert continuing trains onto second track in order to bypass stalled trains and improve through service
- Suggestion to consider conservation measures in order to reduce long-term operational costs
- Suggestion to leave consolidated stations as auxiliary entrances (without an attendant and not ADA compliant), and connecting the entrances with the neighboring station via an elevated walkway (such as the eliminated 4th track in the Modernization 3-Track Alternative). This would maintain a public transit presence in neighborhoods, but allow for faster travel times.

3.4.10 Stations/Systems Improvements

Approximately 284 comments were received regarding stations and system improvements. Comments included:

- Stations:
 - Previously modernized Belmont and Fullerton stations should be used as examples for improving stations
 - Suggestions for better seating, shelters, heaters, security cameras, and lighting to increase customer comfort and fully utilize available space along the platform
 - Support for ADA improvements at all stations
 - Suggestion to omit aesthetic/luxury station improvements in order to save money (service improvement is priority, not aesthetics)
 - Suggestion to install a tornado shelter at stations (see FEMA 320)
 - Suggestion for train tracker displays on the platform at every station
 - Suggestion for wider turnstiles to accommodate riders traveling with luggage
 - Suggestion for additional fare card machines and to update fare card machines
 - Support for proposal to widen platforms
 - Suggestion that platform widening is not necessary; 14' platforms are wide enough

- Suggestion for signage on street level displaying arrival time for next train
- Suggestion for signage on street level when the secondary entrance at Lunt is not open
- Suggestion to leave Purple Line stations as is to accommodate 6-car trains in order to save money
- Suggestion to expand Purple Line stations to accommodate 8-car trains
- Suggestion to expand Red Line stations to accommodate 10-car trains to account for future expansion
- Suggestion for magnetic CTA card readers at all station entrances
- Suggestion to include a police booth at every station to increase safety
- Wilson station suggestions to improve safety include: remove station lobby; move turnstiles to ground level, install security cameras
- Suggestion that tar not be used on platforms because of safety concerns when it is wet and sticky when hot
- Add an entrance to South Boulevard at the intersection of Oakton Street and Callan Avenue in order to reduce pedestrian crossings at South Boulevard and Callan Avenue intersection via a walkway under the Metra tracks
- Suggestion for improved safety in the Howard parking garage by having the guard walk around the garage
- Concern that project should result in improved station access
- Suggestion to involve CTA employees with maintenance of the stations
- Suggestion for additional wayfinding signs
- Suggestion for regular cleaning at stations, particularly Jarvis and Wilson
- Systems/Trains:
 - Suggestion for quieter trains
 - Lower speaker volumes on trains (both inside and outside)
 - The seats on the new 5000-series train cars are too narrow
 - Suggestion for visible location indicator on trains
 - Quiet cars for riders without electronic devices
 - Signs on trains listing CTA reroutes and problems for the day
 - Suggestion to provide wi-fi on trains
- Tracks

- Support for straightening curves in order to increase speed and for a smoother ride
- Steel and concrete structures in North Red Line need to be replaced to provide uninterrupted service
- Concern about 8-car trains and their impact on the wait time of cars at at-grade crossings at Maple and Isabella in Evanston
- Suggestion for flyover bridge at Clark Junction to reduce travel delays and improve travel time
- For Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative, suggestion to include siding tracks at every station to allow service to continue if trains are disabled or for express service
- Suggestion to consider automatic train controls
- Suggestion to provide second track to allow continuing trains to divert around stalled trains

3.4.11 ADA Improvements

Approximately 107 comments were received about ADA improvements. These comments strongly supported making all stations ADA accessible. Comments included:

- Transit stop consolidation would be detrimental to handicapped persons who would need to walk further to reach a station and/or hospitals (such as St. Francis Hospital near South Boulevard)
- Due to funding concerns, ADA improvements should be made only at the busiest stations
- ADA improvements should be made specifically at Morse due to connecting transit at the station
- Several commenters would like the EIS to address whether or not secondary entrances would be ADA accessible
- Suggestion to keep all stations open rather than making ADA improvements
- Central Street station should be ADA accessible due to its proximity to Evanston Hospital

3.4.12 Costs and Funding

Approximately 127 comments were related to costs and funding for the RPM project. Comments related to the cost differences between the alternatives included questions about how the alternatives would affect ridership. Several comments noted the uncertainty of construction costs of the Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative. Many comments stated that spending additional money to extend the life of the system from 20 to 80 years was a responsible choice given the long-term benefits.

Multiple suggestions included potential sources of funding for the project or potential system-wide cost savings that could be used to support modernization efforts. These suggestions included:

- Selling the right-of-way (if the Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative is chosen)
- Raising fares
- Leasing retail space at stations
- Corporate sponsorships
- An automobile fuel tax
- Implementing zone fares
- Implementing an express service surcharge
- Removing free rides for seniors
- Utilizing the Evanston Labor Program
- Spending cuts, such as forgoing the CTA-branded trash bags
- Removing the fare booth attendants
- Enclosing the heating stations on the platforms to better retain heat which would use less energy
- Asking for help from the community
- Posting local area maps with business advertisements at each station
- Instituting energy conservation measures
- Seeking out federal funds for beautification and sustainability
- Reducing aldermen's salary to pay for improvements
- Seeking out subway and TIF financing
- Joining in partnerships with Keep Evanston Beautiful and Northwestern University to maintain stations
- Performing a fiscal efficiency evaluation at CTA
- Creating joint ventures between CTA, the community, and Aldermen

Several comments indicated that some riders would rather have less frequent service or increased fares instead of closing stations.

3.5 Comments Related to Potential Impacts

Over 2,000 comments received pertained to specific potential impacts of the project. Commenters discussed a wide range of potential impacts, though the majority touched upon multi-modal design and accessibility, business and community impacts, and safety and security issues. The comments on each type of impact are summarized in the following subsections.

3.5.1 Transportation, Multi-Modal, and Accessibility Impacts

Approximately 863 comments touched on potential transportation impacts including potential impacts to traffic circulation, parking, and access to stations by bikes, buses, and pedestrians. ADA accessibility is summarized in Section 3.4.11. Comments included:

- Convenient, local stations are important
- Additional bus service to areas potentially affected by transit stop consolidation could mitigate impacts
- Station improvements, particularly ADA improvements, would be beneficial for the handicapped and the elderly
- Under the Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative, the existing train tracks could be turned into a bike path or parking
- The Modernization 4-Track Alternative would create a higher level of service and would generate more foot traffic
- Suggestion for better coordination between Red, Purple, and Yellow lines in order to shorten transfer times
- Suggestion to encourage intermodal ridership by placing stations on 2-way streets
- Suggestion to expand service hours for bikes on trains and have more bike racks at stations
- Suggestion for more parking at or near stations
- Transit stop consolidation could limit the handicapped or the elderly from being able to access the train
- Several commenters stated that if the South Boulevard or Jarvis station were to close, they would take the Metra for their daily commute

- Raised track, as compared to embankment, would create better traffic flow
- Potential impacts to some neighborhoods related to increased foot traffic
- Concern about 8-car trains and their potential impact on the wait time of cars at at-grade crossings at Maple and Isabella in Evanston
- Concern about transit stop consolidation due to lack of parking in affected areas
- Concern that Gaffield entrance at Foster is unnecessary due to limited pedestrian connectivity in area

3.5.2 Land Use, Economic Development, Business and Community Impacts

Approximately 574 comments about land use, economic development, business and community impacts were received. Comments included:

- Each of the alternatives would impact local businesses, communities, and property values
- Some communities, such as the one near Jarvis, have been experiencing a revival, and residents feel that closing the Jarvis station would halt the progress that has occurred in recent years
- Closing the Lawrence station could limit access to nearby entertainment venues
- Transit stop consolidation could negatively impact local businesses as well as the neighborhoods near the closed stations including property values
- The Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative could allow the space along the existing corridor to be put towards other uses, such as recreational facilities or parking lots
- The Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative could help reduce crime at stations which may help increase business
- Improvements to stations could contribute to neighborhood and environmental improvements, in particular, improvements to the Wilson station could create a better community in that area
- Support for Transit Oriented Development

3.5.3 Safety and Security Impacts

Approximately 300 comments about safety and security were received. Comments focused on making stations safer and concerns about longer, potentially unsafe walks to neighboring stations due to transit stop consolidation. A significant number of comments related specifically to existing unsafe conditions in the Morse/Jarvis/Howard

neighborhood as well as the area surrounding the Wilson station. Comments received included the following:

- Unsafe conditions at specific stations:
 - Berwyn which has poor lighting, needs repainting, water collects on station floor, stairs steep and slippery and dangerous for users
 - Wilson where vacant buildings under the station are vandalized and create a place for vagrancy and harassment of transit users; removing entry lobby and addressing crime activities at NE corner of Wilson near parking lot/hardware store could address safety concerns
 - Howard which is in a high crime area; riders from South Boulevard and Jarvis may not want to walk to Howard, particularly at night
 - Thorndale where gang activity is common. Comment noted that Thorndale gang activity would likely relocate to another station if Thorndale was closed
- Subway may help reduce crime between Wilson and Loyola which are prime areas for gang activities
- Improvements may deter crime and vagrancy and increase personal safety
- Potential terrorist threats at new, modern stations
- Request to increase security at stations, including adding security cameras and better lighting in viaducts and at stations
- Improved stations may increase ridership because riders are currently concerned for personal safety at some stations
- Request for police substations at every station
- Concern about safety at secondary entrances

3.5.4 Neighborhood Compatibility

Approximately 66 comments about neighborhood compatibility and potential community impacts were received. Comments included the following:

- Stations have symbiotic relationship with local businesses and residents; closures could affect neighborhood businesses
- Station improvements should match historic character of neighborhood
- Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative would be less disruptive to the surrounding community and would improve community cohesion
- Negative comments:

- Transit stop consolidation could have a potential detrimental effect on concert venues near Lawrence and the arts district near Jarvis
- Potential detrimental effect on neighborhoods because of transit stop consolidation; neighborhoods are built around the stations
- Potential detrimental effect on existing neighborhood and business development trends, including neighborhood revitalization because of transit stop consolidation
- Potential for Jarvis neighborhood to be “destabilized” if the station were to be closed
- Potential for neighborhoods near closed stations to be alienated or isolated, and the “small town feeling” surrounding those stations would be lost
- Concern that secondary entrance for Noyes (at Gaffield) would greatly increase foot traffic through an entirely residential neighborhood without commercial businesses that would support or benefit from that foot traffic

3.5.5 Environmental Justice Impacts

Approximately 53 comments were received that focused on the potential effects of the proposed project to transit disadvantaged communities (communities underserved proportionally by transit investment). Comments included the following:

- Transit stop consolidation would have a negative impact on lower income residents who use transit
- Transit stop consolidation would limit access to affordable housing and those with limited access to cars
- Station closure at Lawrence would negatively affect the Family Institute which serves low income patients as well as the Christopher House facilities
- Station closure at Jarvis would have a negative impact on the immigrant and refugee populations from Burma, Bhutan, and Sudan who live in Rogers Park
- Station closure at South Boulevard could isolate a diverse community with a history of discrimination
- Station closure at South Boulevard would limit access for the low-income populations to St. Francis Hospital
- Modernization plans with transit stop consolidation could limit transit access to disadvantaged/underserved communities
- Concern that transit stop consolidation would create longer walks to stations for seniors

- Concern that poorer communities would be asked to sacrifice stations while other communities that could sacrifice would not be asked to do so

3.5.6 Visual and Aesthetic Impacts

Approximately 39 comments about potential visual and aesthetic impacts were received. These comments included the following:

- Existing infrastructure (stations and viaducts) is in need of renovation
- Suggestion for better lighting and repainting under tracks at entrances
- Suggestion that stations should be safe and welcoming
- Specific upgrade requests for: Wilson station, Jarvis station, Dempster viaduct
- Suggestion to landscape earthen embankments with grass
- Concern that closing stations would negatively impact aesthetics
- Support for station/platform improvements with emphasis on function above comfort
- Service improvements should be the priority, not aesthetics
- Stations should be the gem of the community
- Appreciative of view from elevated trains (represents a lack of support for underground alternatives)

3.5.7 Natural Resources Impacts

Approximately 31 comments received concerned potential impacts to natural resources which include air quality, water resources, and actions that could result in more sustainable use of natural resources. These comments included the following:

- Suggestion to landscape earthen embankments with grass
- Interest in “green living”
- Increasing ridership would improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gasses
- Consolidating stops would not make the City of Chicago and City of Evanston more sustainable
- Federal funds should be investigated for beautification and sustainability
- Suggestion that sustainable practices should be implemented for station improvements

- Concern that transit stop consolidations would penalize those who use transit in order to be green
- Green building practices should be used with attention to green space

3.5.8 Cultural and Historic Resources

Approximately 27 comments about cultural and historic resources were received. Comments included the following:

- Historic stations and their architecture should be preserved, including Wilson, Loyola, Morse, Jarvis, South Boulevard, and Central
- Potential impact to historic properties due to property acquisitions
- The historic elevated train system is culturally significant
- Closing the Lawrence Station would limit access to the theater district located there; specific concerns about impacts of modernization on the historic Uptown Theater near the intersection of Broadway and Lawrence
- Preservation organizations may be able to help fund restoration of historic facades

3.5.9 Noise and Vibration

Approximately 23 comments about potential noise and vibration were received. Comments included the following:

- Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative would be less noisy
- Support structure should be designed to deflect noise
- Suggestion to make trains quieter internally and reduce sound system volume at stations
- Suggestion to provide noise barrier walls for non-subway options
- Concern about noise implications due to changes to earthen embankments

3.5.10 Land Acquisitions, Displacement, and Relocations

Twenty comments about potential land acquisition, displacement, and relocations were received. The issues addressed in these comments include concerns about potential impacts to houses and properties along the corridor. Comments included the following:

- Potential for property loss due to construction of the stations and modernization of the system

- CTA could meet with aldermen to discuss zoning opportunities to facilitate investment and land use changes
- Modernization options may result in oddly shaped parcels of land that may not be feasible to redevelop without active participation of CTA, City of Chicago, City of Evanston, and Village of Wilmette
- Property acquisitions would potentially alter communities
- Potential to impact historic properties which could alter the character of the communities
- Residents may be reluctant to relocate

3.5.11 Construction Impacts

Nineteen comments about potential construction effects were received. Comments included the following concerns:

- Construction duration
- Potential impacts of construction noise
- Potential service disruptions during construction
- Construction phasing
- Potential disruption of neighborhood traffic patterns and parking
- Tunneling issues/unknowns for Modernization 2-Track Underground Alternative
- Use of carcinogenic wood sealants (asphalt/tar/ash)

3.5.12 Energy Use

Eight comments about potential energy use were received. Comments included the following:

- Transit systems are more energy efficient than if all riders drove cars
- There would be energy savings by using a subway
- Reduced access to consolidated stops could cause more people to drive
- Energy-efficient, sensor-controlled escalators should be installed
- Suggestion that energy conservation measures could reduce long-term operational costs

- Station improvements should focus on sustainable practices

3.5.13 Wildlife and Ecosystems

Four comments regarding impacts to wildlife and ecosystems were received. Comments included the following:

- Pigeon roosts at stations should be removed and prevented
- Concern for bats and animals that live in the roof of the Foster Station

3.5.14 Parks and Recreational Facilities

Three comments about parks and recreational facilities were received. Comments included the following:

- The space under elevated trains could be used as parkland
- The existing system area that would no longer be needed for transit if the 2-Track Underground Alternative were selected could be used as parkland
- Consolidating the Thorndale station would hurt Park District sports leagues that are hosted by the Broadway Armory Park (at Broadway and Thorndale) by limiting the ability of athletes to get there

3.6 Comments Submitted by Federal, State, and Other Agencies

Eight agencies submitted comments during the scoping period. Most of the topics mentioned were also covered in the comments discussed in the previous sections. However, some of the agency comments presented new issues, including requests to ensure compliance with government-mandated policies and regulations, and coordination among transit providers. The agency comments are summarized in the following sections, and the full text of agency comments is provided in Appendix M. The concerns of all the agencies will be addressed both through the Draft EIS analyses and through on-going coordination with CTA.

There were no comments from federal agencies. Comment letters were received from two state agencies, two regional transit providers, two City of Chicago agencies, and the City of Evanston.

3.6.1 Comments Submitted by State Agencies

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources suggested that the project be submitted to their Ecological Compliance Assessment Tool (EcoCAT) in order to determine if protected species or natural areas are in the project corridor. The Illinois Historic Preservation Agency would require a cultural resources survey be completed in the project corridor, in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

3.6.2 Comments Submitted by Other Agencies

The Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago (MWRD), City of Evanston, the Pace Suburban Bus Service, Chicago Department of Environment, Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), and Metra submitted comments covering some of the topics mentioned in previous sections, as well as the following:

- Potential project impacts on MWRD facilities and property, in particular the property that CTA leases from the MWRD in Evanston.
- Closing South Boulevard station could impact the City of Evanston's \$18.5 million in funding through the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)'s Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP2). A key rating factor in the award of this funding was convenient access to transit. Also near South Boulevard, a new planned development is proposed to be built in 2011 which would add 214 residential units which will bring new riders to the station.
- Two residential facilities serving elderly populations are located near Foster station. Closing Foster station would limit access for the elderly, care workers, employees, and visitors to the facilities.
- Eliminating the reverse express commute would limit access to major regional destinations in adjacent suburbs. From Davis, these include: Oakton Community College, Lutheran General Hospital, downtown Des Plaines, and O'Hare Airport. From Linden, these include: Edens Plaza, Glenview, and Northbrook Court.
- The reverse travel market should be a consideration in the review of the alternatives.
- Planning, development, and design of any proposed station facilities improvements served by both fixed route and Regional ADA Paratransit services, including Linden, Davis Street, and Howard, should be coordinated with other bus service providers.
- Consider recycling or reusing at least 50% of the recyclable construction and demolition debris generated, according to the City's applicable ordinance. Concerns related to disposal of construction and demolition debris, proper handling of hazardous materials (including lead-based paint, asbestos-containing materials, PCB-containing materials, and contaminated soils).
- Consider the impact of transit stop consolidation on ADA accessibility requirements.
- Consider the impact of service interruptions during construction, and how to minimize the impact of those interruptions to commuters and local traffic.
- Consider the effect of the project on air quality given new CTA ridership.
- Evaluate the following in the EIS analyses and design:

- Recycling opportunities at stations and parking areas
- Alternative energy options including solar, solar thermal, wind, and more to provide electricity, heating, and cooling where needed
- Opportunities to install solar arrays (on rooftops, large expanses, etc.) to return energy to the grid
- Reduction of light pollution through the use of downward-facing lighting
- Compliance with the City's stormwater ordinance, including using bio-swales, rain barrels, and other methods to reduce the first flush of water into the sewer system
- Native landscapes requiring little to no irrigation
- Green roofs on any facilities
- Bicycle access and parking
- Permeable paving for any Park-N-Ride areas
- Charging stations for electric vehicles
- Support for alternatives that include full replacement of new infrastructure.
- Support for alternatives that extend the useful life of the system the longest.
- Support for alternatives that would reduce long term operating and maintenance costs.
- Examine issues raised during scoping and gain understanding of uncertainties to reduce project risks.
- Evaluate potential effects on Metra ridership and other transit services, both during and after construction.
- Evaluate potential impacts to adjacent commuter rail operations in Evanston.
- Maintain pedestrian access to the Metra stations in the project area as well as access to commuter parking during construction and in the completed project.

Section 4

Next Steps: Responding to Comments

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of scoping is to provide an opportunity for agencies and the public to comment on the purpose and need, the range of alternatives proposed for analysis, and to help the project proponent identify issues that should be evaluated in the Tier 1 Draft EIS analysis. Therefore, all comments that fall within the scope of the NEPA process will be addressed in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. CTA will also continue to work closely with agencies and stakeholder groups to address issues identified through scoping.

4.2 Comments Related to Purpose and Need

There was one comment directly related to the stated purpose of the project. The comment suggested that the purpose be changed to “respond to changes in travel demand” rather than “respond to past shifts in travel demand.” A number of comments stated that consolidating stations would contradict the stated purpose and need by limiting access to the transit system and hindering economic development initiatives. The Draft EIS will expand and clarify the purpose and need statement in response to these comments.

4.3 Comments Related to Alternatives

Many commenters expressed a preference for the Modernization 4-Track Alternative because of improvements to stations, faster travel times, maintenance of express service in both directions, and the longevity of the improvements. Comments that included reasons for a stated preference also provide insight into potential impacts or benefits of all of the alternatives. These insights into potential impacts are helpful in guiding the impact analyses of the Draft EIS. Comments that provide this insight were also counted as a comment on a particular resource discipline and will be included in the analyses of potential impacts.

Some comments expressed a preference for specific alternatives because they did not include transit stop consolidation. Most comments expressed opposition to transit stop consolidation. Based on these comments, the Draft EIS will specifically address the impacts of transit stop consolidation.

A few comments expressed a preference for an alternative that is not currently proposed for consideration in the Draft EIS. The Draft EIS will summarize alternatives previously considered and eliminated and the process used to do so. New or revised alternatives may be developed based on scoping comments received. Alternatives that do not meet the project purpose and need would not be evaluated further.

4.4 Comments Related to Potential Impacts

Potential impacts or benefits of alternatives identified by commenters will be analyzed in the Draft EIS. Insights into how a particular alternative may affect traffic, neighborhoods and communities, safety, or accessibility in the project area and the region are a valuable result of the scoping process. Many comments reflected an awareness of the transit dependency of the communities in the project area and hope for potential benefits to disadvantaged populations that may result from the project. Specific comments on each potential impact will be used to guide the analysis of the alternatives.

Specific comments on potential impacts were related to multi-modal transportation, community and economic development, community impacts, safety, neighborhood compatibility, visual and aesthetic concerns, natural resources concerns, cultural and historic resources, noise and vibration, property acquisitions, and construction activities.