

Corridor Advisory Group Meeting #3 February 14, 2019

### Agenda

#### **SOUTH HALSTED** Bus Corridor Enhancement Project

- Introductions
- Recap of Meeting #2/Goals of Meeting #3
- Revised Purpose & Need Statement
- Updated Measures of Effectiveness
- Corridor Improvement Alternatives
- Station Location Concepts
- Small Group Discussion
- Next Steps



### Introductions

- Lead Agencies
  - o Chicago Transit Authority (CTA)
  - o Pace Suburban Bus
- Project Team
  - o CDM Smith
  - Metro Strategies
  - EJM Engineering







### Recap of Meeting #2

- Purpose & Need
   Statement
- Current Improvement
   Program
- Physical Improvement
   Alternatives
- Feedback on Bus Operations



### What We Heard

- Revisions to Purpose & Need Statement and Measures of Effectiveness
- Positive reception to improved transit
- Concern about the removal of parking
- Potential interest in a bus lane where it is possible with minimal impacts to parking and traffic
- Interest in economic development
- Interest in a further review of bus ridership/person throughput



### Project Status





### CAG Meeting #3 Goals



Pace and CTA buses on 95<sup>th</sup> Street

- 1. Review bus enhancement alternatives
- 2. Introduce station locations
- 3. Feedback from CAG on priorities and tradeoffs



## Revised Purpose & Need Statement



### Revised Purpose & Need Statement

Additions based on CAG discussion and feedback

Needs	Purpose
Disinvested areas	<ul> <li>Improve infrastructure, amenities, accessibility, and safety</li> <li>Improve connectivity, equity and</li> </ul>
Goals	
<ul> <li>Promote inclusive growth</li> </ul>	economic development
	<ul> <li>Integration with existing transit service – CTA, Pace, and Metra</li> </ul>



## Updated Measures of Effectiveness



### Measures of Effectiveness

- Bus Travel Time
- Reliability
- Traffic Impacts
- Parking Impacts
- Widening Impacts
- Relative Cost
- Person Throughput
- Economic Impact Potential





Pace bus on 95<sup>th</sup> Street

CTA bus on Route #8A



## Corridor Improvement Alternatives



### Alternative 1

Queue Jumps



#### Alternative 1: Sample Aerial





### Alternative 1: Sample Intersection



### Alternative 1: Measures of Effectiveness

Measure	Impact
Bus Travel Time	Average savings of approximately 4-8 seconds per intersection; Approximately 5%* for entire corridor (only available/necessary at 28 intersections) plus 3%* saving from TSP and Signal Optimization
Reliability	Increase travel time reliability
Traffic Impacts	Low traffic impacts, some minor impacts at intersections
Parking Impacts	Total of 253 spaces impacted at 28 intersections (approximately 9 spaces per intersection) plus up to 51 additional spaces to integrate far side bus stations
Median/Widening Impacts	Narrow median 1 to 4 feet at intersections (typical); widen roadway at intersections 1 to 2 feet at a few locations
Relative Cost	Low as compared to Alternatives 2 and 3
Person Throughput	<ul> <li>Modest improvements in passenger throughput with current service levels based on:</li> <li>Modest increases in persons on transit; estimated transit ridership increase of 3% (Estimated increase of 300 riders per day and 13 peak hour, peak direction riders)</li> <li>No change to persons in autos; no significant impacts on auto traffic capacity</li> <li>Potential for greater improvements in person throughput capacity with additional transit service frequencies leading to increased transit ridership without affecting road capacity</li> </ul>
Economic Impact Potential	Opportunities for development at many station areas

\* Planning level estimate based on TCRP Report 18 and VPTI Report; Subject to revision



### Alternative 2

- Queue Jumps:
  - o 79<sup>th</sup> Street
  - o 95<sup>th</sup> Street
  - Halsted between
     79<sup>th</sup> & 129<sup>th</sup> Street
- Bus Lanes
  - 129<sup>th</sup> to 154<sup>th</sup>
     Street (Peak Hour
     Only or 24 Hour)



#### Alternative 2: Sample Aerial





### Alternative 2: Sample Cross Section





### Alternative 2: Intersection Performance

In locations where reducing travel lane is proposed, intersection performance remains highs

Intersection	Existing Performance (AM Peak)	Proposed Bus Lane Performance (AM Peak)	Existing Performance (PM Peak)	Proposed Bus Lane Performance (PM Peak)
134 <sup>th</sup> St & Halsted St	A	В	А	А
138 <sup>th</sup> St & Halsted St	С	С	С	С
144 <sup>th</sup> St & Halsted St	В	В	В	В
147 <sup>th</sup> St & Halsted St	D	D	D	E
149 <sup>th</sup> St & Halsted St	D	D	D	D
149 <sup>th</sup> St & Morgan St	A	В	В	В
150 <sup>th</sup> St & Morgan St	В	В	В	В
154 <sup>th</sup> St & Park Ave	В	В	A	А



### Alternative 2: Measures of Effectiveness

Measure	Impact
Bus Travel Time	Queue jumps similar to Alternative 1; Average savings from bus lanes of approximately 1-2 minutes per mile in typical urban environment, or 8%* savings total for this alternative plus 3%* saving from TSP and Signal Optimization
Reliability	Significantly improve travel time and reliability beyond queue jumps
Traffic Impacts	Medium/Low traffic impacts, removing travel lanes but traffic in southern section is light
Parking Impacts	Total of 253 spaces impacted at 28 intersections (approximately 9 spaces per intersection) plus up to 51 additional spaces to integrate far side bus stations
Median/Widening Impacts	Narrow median 1 to 4 feet at intersections (typical); widen roadway at intersections 1 to 2 feet at a few locations
Relative Cost	Greater than Alternative 1, but no additional significant changes to roadway geometry
Person Throughput	<ul> <li>Increased improvements in passenger throughput with current service levels based on:</li> <li>Modest increases in persons on transit; estimated transit ridership increase of 4% (Estimated increase of 500 riders per day and 21 peak hour, peak direction riders)</li> <li>No change to persons in autos; no significant impacts on auto traffic capacity</li> <li>Potential for greater improvements in person throughput capacity with additional transit service frequencies leading to increased transit ridership without affecting road capacity</li> </ul>
Economic Impact Potential	Opportunities for development at many station areas; increased investment in South section of corridor

\* Planning level estimate based on TCRP Report 18 and VPTI Report; Subject to revision



### Alternative 3

- Queue Jumps
  - o 79<sup>th</sup> Street
  - o 95<sup>th</sup> Street
  - Halsted between
     79<sup>th</sup> & 98<sup>th</sup> Streets
- Bus Lanes
  - 98<sup>th</sup> to 154<sup>th</sup>
     Streets (Peak
     Hour Only or 24
     Hour)



#### Alternative 3: Sample Aerial





### Alternative 3: Sample Cross Section



Minor widening (1 to 2 ft) needed in a few locations



### Alternative 3: Off-Street Parking

Halsted between 98th and 129th:

- Primarily commercial properties
- Average On-Street Parking Utilization
  - o AM Peak: 7%
  - o Mid-Day Off-Peak: 11%
  - o PM Peak: 9%
- Max On-Street Parking Utilization: 45%
- Parcels without Off-Street Parking: 11
- Approximate Number of Off-Street Spaces: 6,700



### Alternative 3: Measures of Effectiveness

Measure	Impact
Bus Travel Time	Queue jumps similar to Alternative 1 and 2; Bus lanes similar to Alternative 2, or 10%* savings total for this alternative plus 3% saving from TSP and Signal Optimization
Reliability	Significantly improve travel time and reliability within city limits
Traffic Impacts	Same as Alternative 2; Low traffic impacts, removing travel lanes but traffic in southern section is light
Parking Impacts	Same spaces impacted as Alternative 1 and 2 between 79 <sup>th</sup> and 98 <sup>th</sup> St.; Total of 90 spaces (plus up to 7 additional if far side stations) impacted at 10 intersections (approximately 9 spaces per intersection) plus approximately 981 spaces between 98 <sup>th</sup> St. and 129 <sup>th</sup> on Halsted (approximately 32 spaces per block)
Median/Widening Impacts	Narrow median 1 to 4 feet (typical); widen roadway 1 to 2 feet in some locations
Relative Cost	Greater than Alternative 2, but no additional major changes to roadway geometry
Person Throughput	<ul> <li>Greatest improvements in passenger throughput with current service levels based on:</li> <li>Modest increases in persons on transit; estimated transit ridership increase of 5% (Estimated increase of 550 riders per day and 24 peak hour, peak direction riders)</li> <li>No change to persons in autos; no significant impacts on auto traffic capacity</li> <li>Potential for greater improvements in person throughput capacity with additional transit service frequencies leading to increased transit ridership without affecting road capacity</li> </ul>
Economic Impact Potential	Opportunities for development at many station areas; increased investment in south section of corridor and in designed TIF Districts, Special Service Areas, and Thrive Zones



### Peak vs. Off-Peak Travel

• Bus:

- 44% of trips occur during peak
- Hourly midday ridership is
   75% of peak
- Auto:
  - Peak: 24% of ADT
  - o Off Peak: 76% of ADT



(3 - 6pm)

(6 - 9am)

(9am - 3pm)

Avg. Hourly Ridership by Time of Day



Night/Owl

(10pm - 6am)

(6 - 10pm)

# Station Location Concepts



### Limited Stop Service

- Pulse service will have fewer stops
  - 1/2 mile spacing estimated to provide 22% travel time savings
  - 98% of existing riders board at a stop within ¼ mile of stations
  - Pace local service will likely have reduce frequency
- CTA local service remains in place



### Station Improvements

- Near-level boarding
- Heated shelters with seating
- Bicycle racks
- Landscaping
- Vertical marker with real time and static information
- Trash receptacles
- Customizable
   features

Pace Pulse Station

CTA Jeffery Jump Station

KONLINN F



### **Typical Station Placement**

- Thoughtful station placement to ensure safety and promote efficient bus operation
  - Far side where possible
  - Connections to existing service
- Multiple alternatives still under consideration









#### 123<sup>rd</sup> or 124<sup>th</sup> Street



#### 149<sup>th</sup> or 150<sup>th</sup> Street





## Small Group Discussion



### Small Group Discussion

- Evaluate each alternative
  - Which aspects do you like? Which do you not like?
  - Are there specific locations where bus only lanes or queue jumps are preferred? Why?
  - Is there a preference for peakhour or 24-hour lanes?
- Review station placement
  - Are the current placements appropriate? Any recommended changes?
  - Have all connections been considered?
- Report back to group



Pace Harvey Transportation Center



# Next Steps



### Next Steps

- February/March 2019
  - Confirm Preferred Alternative(s)
  - Corridor Evaluation, Recommendations, and Strategy Report





### **Contact Information**

To speak to a CTA or Pace representative, contact:

Sukmeke Watkins (CTA) Government & Community Relations Representative (312) 681-2793

Martin Sandoval (Pace: Chicago) Community Relations Representative (847) 217-9098

Jessica Rybarczyk (Pace: Suburbs) Community Relations Representative (847) 372 -2077 For general project questions, email:

SouthHalstedBus@transitchicago.com

Website:

<u>www.transitchicago.com/planning/</u> <u>SouthHalstedBus/</u>



# Thank you!

