

CTA CIRCLE LINE ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS STUDY:
Screen 3 Report

Purpose and Need Goals	Alternatives				
	HRT Kimball to 87th (via Cicero)	HRT Ashland/Ogden/ North Full Circle	HRT Ashland/Ogden Full Circle	HRT Linden to Midway (via Ashland/Ogden)	HRT Linden to Ash./Archer (via Ashland/Ogden)
Regional & Local Access & Mobility					
Number of Rail Connections Outside of the Loop	7	10	10	8	8
Travel Time Savings, passenger hours saved annually (millions)	3.6	2.6	2.5	5.5	4.3
Final Rating	0	+	+	0	0
Community & Economic Development					
Access to Pre-defined Activity Centers (outside Loop), out of 4 possible	0 of 4 0%	4 of 4 100%	4 of 4 100%	3 of 4 75%	3 of 4 75%
Access to additional Activity Centers (including Loop), out of 4 possible	0 of 4 0%	4 of 4 100%	3 of 4 75%	1 of 4 25%	1 of 4 25%
Final Rating	-	+	+	0	0
Environmental Quality					
Does the alternative decrease passenger congestion around the Loop?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Projected Total Annual Ridership (number of passengers in millions)	9.1	24.4	25.1	26.3	22.4
Final Rating	-	+	+	+	+
Regional Transit System Performance					
Efficiency Compared to No-Build (5/hr saved)	\$50	\$103 - \$129	\$79 - \$100	\$27	\$33
Restricted Headways	N/A	12 minutes	12 minutes	5-6 minutes	5-6 minutes
Final Rating	-	-	-	+	-

The Screen 3 Report (of the Circle Line Alternatives Analysis) represented the final vetting process of the study’s alternatives. It resulted in the CTA’s identifying a preferred alternative which balanced costs and benefits. This was followed by the preparation of an economic analysis and a financial plan.

Like the Screen 2 Report, Screen 3 was divided into three main steps that focused on: evaluating previous alternatives; reducing the set to the best performing alternatives; and refining them for the agency’s final consideration.

VleCIDes-Schroeder Associates, Inc. (VSA) assisted in evaluating alternatives and organizing report findings. The firm also developed tables and graphics and produced final written materials.

