Federal Transit Administration’s
New Starts Process

Circle Line
Alternatives Analysis Study

September, 2006
Tonight’s Speakers

• Darud Akbar – Moderator
  – Chicago Transit Authority

• Jeffrey Sriver – Project Manager
  – Chicago Transit Authority

• Jim Czarnecky – Project Manager
  – DMJM+HARRIS/CTE
Schedule for Tonight’s Meeting

• Structure of the Meeting

• Questions and Answers Process
  – Submit Your Comments in Writing on Comment Cards
  – Similar Comments Submitted Tonight will be Answered in Groups To Maximize Questions Answered in Time Allowed
  – All Comments will be Addressed and Posted on CTA’s Web Site

• Signer and Translators are Available
  – Levante la Mano si Usted Requiere Traducción en Español
  – 備有手語與翻譯人員
Outline of the Presentation

• Status of the Alternatives Analysis Study
  – New Starts Overview
  – Screen 1 Findings

• Screen 2 Preliminary Findings
  – Completing the Alternatives Analysis Study

• Public Involvement Process
Status of the Study
FTA’s Required New Starts Process

Typically 10 to 15 Years

- Concept Development
- Alternatives Analysis Study
- Preliminary Engineering
- Environmental Impact Statement
- Final Design
- Construction
- Operation
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Alternatives Analysis (AA) Studies

- Requirement for Federal Funding for Transit Expansion (FTA New Starts Grant Program)
- Identifies Transit Opportunities and Ensures All Practical Solutions are Considered
- Ensures Planning is Consistent Among All New Starts Projects
- Opportunity to Provide Information and Receive Public Input
- Identify Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)
FTA Evaluation Process

Progressively fewer alternatives are studied with additional evaluation criteria until a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) is identified.
Evaluation Process - Detail

• Screen 1 – Reviewed Universe of Alternatives
  – Eliminated Alternatives that Were Not Suitable

• Screen 2 – Detailed Definition and Comparative Evaluation
  – Specific Alignments, Transit Ridership, Capital Costs and Neighborhood Resources
  – Evaluate and Identify the Strongest Alternatives

• Screen 3 – Final Definition and Evaluation
  – Refine Strongest Alternatives to Maximize FTA New Starts Rating
  – Assess Economic Impacts and Develop Financial Plan
  – Present LPA and Supporting Data to FTA to Compete for Federal Funding
Purpose and Need

- Riders Must Now Travel Through Loop to Get to Most Destinations
  - Access to Neighborhoods
  - Regional Job Centers
  - Civic and Educational Institutions
  - Transit Between Suburbs and City

- Connect Existing CTA and Metra Systems
Screen 1 Preliminary Findings

Technologies*

- Bus Rapid Transit
- Light Rail Transit
- Heavy Rail Transit

&

Corridors

- Ashland
- Ashland-Ogden
- Western

&

Profiles

- At-Grade
- Elevated
- Underground

= Universe

14 Combinations
Including No-Build and Baseline

*Not all Technologies Can be Applied to Each Profile
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Screen 1 Public Involvement Process

• Three Public Meetings
  – Mexican Fine Arts Museum
    • South Study Area – May 2, 2006
  – Lincoln Park High School
    • North Study Area – May 3, 2006
  – University of Illinois-Chicago
    • Mid Study Area – May 4, 2006
Screen 1 Public Involvement Process

- More than 185 People Attended Public Meetings
- Met with Stakeholders and Elected Officials
- Over 300 Comments Submitted and Answered
- Significant Media Coverage
Response to Public Comments

- Responded to More than 300 Comments
  - Responses Distributed Via Web, E-mail and U.S. Post

- Based Upon Public Input…
  - Extended Comment Period to Four Weeks
  - Evaluated 35th Street Alternative
  - Scheduled Screen 2 Public Meeting Locations

- Developed List of More than 250 Individuals and Groups for Ongoing Communications and Updates
Screen 2
Analysis
Screen 2 – Evaluation Process

• Step 1
  – Defining the Alternatives

• Step 2
  – Preliminary Evaluation

• Step 3
  – Detailed Evaluation
Step 1 – Defining the Alternatives

Integrated the Most Suitable Technologies, Alignments and Potential Station Locations

- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Light Rail Transit (LRT)
- Heavy Rail Transit (HRT) Mostly Elevated
- Heavy Rail Transit (HRT) Limited Elevated
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Screen 2

Step 2 - Preliminary Evaluation

• Screening Criteria
  – Social Factors
    • Land Use, Demographics, Public Input
  – Economic Factors
    • Physical Constraints, Cost Issues
  – Environmental Factors
    • Noise, Visual, Cultural Resources
  – Transportation Factors
    • Travel Time, Transit Connectivity, Traffic
## Step 2 – Evaluation of Medium Capacity Alternatives

### Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Ashland - Ogden</th>
<th>Western - 35th</th>
<th>Ashland</th>
<th>Ashland - Ogden</th>
<th>Western</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Do Not Advance</td>
<td>Do Not Advance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Light Rail Transit Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Ashland - Ogden</th>
<th>Western - 35th</th>
<th>Ashland</th>
<th>Ashland - Ogden</th>
<th>Western</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Do Not Advance</td>
<td>Do Not Advance</td>
<td>Do Not Advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results determined by comparison of the alternatives shown

Indicates a Cause for Elimination by Comparison

+ = Positive Rating by Comparison
0 = Neutral Rating by Comparison
- = Negative Rating by Comparison
## Step 2 – Evaluation of High Capacity Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Ashland</th>
<th>Ashland - Ogden</th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>Ashland</th>
<th>Ashland - Ogden</th>
<th>Western</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3 Route Miles 27 Stations</td>
<td>12 Route Miles 21 Stations</td>
<td>15.4 Route Miles 27 Stations</td>
<td>13.3 Route Miles 24 Stations</td>
<td>12.1 Route Miles 21 Stations</td>
<td>14.9 Route Miles 26 Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Do Not Advance</td>
<td>Do Not Advance</td>
<td>Do Not Advance</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Advance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results determined by comparison of the alternatives shown.

Indicates a Cause for Elimination by Comparison

+ = Positive Rating by Comparison
0 = Neutral Rating by Comparison
- = Negative Rating by Comparison

* All HRT alternatives have elevated and underground components in order to effectively integrate existing infrastructure.
Step 3 - Detailed Alternatives Evaluation

• Screening Criteria
  – Project Costs and FTA Criteria
    • Capital Cost Comparison
    • Operating and Maintenance (O&M) Cost Comparison
    • Annual Ridership Comparison
    • Annualized Cost per Boarding Comparison (Effectiveness)
Screen 2

Step 3 - Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives

BRT Ashland Alignment
BRT Ashland-Ogden Alignment
BRT Western Alignment
BRT Western-35th Alignment
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## Step 3 - Bus Rapid Transit Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Ashland</th>
<th>Ashland - Ogden</th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>Western - 35th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost – Percent Difference from Average</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost – Percent Difference from Average</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridership – Percent Difference from Average</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Boarding – Percent Difference from Average</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Do Not Advance</td>
<td>Do Not Advance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages based on deviation from average of BRT alternatives shown

- Indicates a Notable Strength by Comparison
- Indicates a Cause for Elimination by Comparison
Screen 2

Step 3 - Heavy Rail Transit Alternatives

HRT Ashland Alignment

HRT Ashland-Ogden Alignment

HRT Western Alignment
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## Step 3 - Heavy Rail Transit Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Ashland</th>
<th>Ashland-Ogden</th>
<th>Western</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost – Percent Difference from Average</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost – Percent Difference from Average</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridership – Percent Difference from Average</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Boarding – Percent Difference from Average</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result</strong></td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Do Not Advance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages based on deviation from average of HRT alternatives shown

- Indicates a Notable Strength by Comparison
- Indicates a Cause for Elimination by Comparison
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Screen 2 Preliminary Findings

- Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives Advancing to Screen 3

Bus Rapid Transit Ashland

See presentation boards for additional information.

Bus Rapid Transit Ashland-Ogden
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Screen 2 Preliminary Findings

- Heavy Rail Transit Alternatives Advancing to Screen 3

See presentation boards for additional information.
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Completing the Alternatives Analysis Study

• Screen 2
  – Confirm Findings
    • Incorporate Comments from Public Meetings

• Screen 3
  – Detailed FTA Review
    • Baseline, Ridership Forecasting, User Benefits and Cost Effectiveness Index
  – Detailed Refinement of Alternatives
    • Alignment, Profile and Station Locations
  – Continued Public Involvement
  – Identify Locally Preferred Alternative
Screen 2
Next Steps
Next Steps

• Signer and Translators are Available
  – Levante la Mano si Usted Requiere Traducción en Español
  – 備有手語與翻譯人員

• Questions and Answers Process
  – Submit Your Comments in Writing on Comment Cards
  – Similar Comments Submitted Tonight will be Answered in Groups To Maximize Questions Answered in Time Allowed
  – All Comments will be Addressed and Posted on CTA’s Web Site

• Continue Public Involvement
  – Add to Circle Line Contact List for Future Notices and Updates
  – CTA Car Cards, Customer Alerts, Local Media and Contact List
  – Project Updates on CTA Web Site - www.transitchicago.com
Questions and Comments

• CTA Representatives are Available to Answer Additional Questions

• Written Comments and Questions for Screen 2 Will be Accepted Through October 27, 2006:

  Mr. Darud Akbar
  Chicago Transit Authority
  Government and Community Relations
  P.O. Box 7567
  Chicago, IL  60680-7567
  dakbar@transitchicago.com
Federal Transit Administration’s New Starts Process
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