

UP-NW Alternatives Analysis Study Area



Project Purpose

- Address growing demand for traditional commute into Central Chicago
- Address growing demand for suburb-to-suburb and reverse-commute service
- Improve access from Northeast McHenry County and Northwest Lake County
- Improve travel time
- Improve operational efficiency with modernized facilities

Three Feasible Alternatives:

- No-Build
- Commuter Rail
- Commuter Bus

No-Build Alternative

- Base against which other alternatives compared
- Includes all existing facilities and services
- Also includes planned and committed transportation projects in Transportation Improvement Program and Regional Transportation Plan
 - Open-road tolling on I-90
 - Rand Road Traffic Signal Priority (TSP)
 - Golf Road Bus Rapid Transit (TSP)
 - Parking expansion at Pingree Road
 - Several park-and-ride lots

Commuter Rail Alternative

- Consolidate existing yards to two new yards: northwest of Woodstock and north of McHenry
- Three new stations: Johnsburg, Prairie Grove, and Ridgefield
- Implement additional express service
- Add reverse-commute trains including express
- Shuttles from stations to major employers
- Other infrastructure changes to allow improved travel times

Commuter Bus Alternative to Northwest Cook County

- Boarding locations in the southern tier of McHenry County
- Buses would travel in mixed traffic
- Potential destinations include Schaumburg, Rolling Meadows, O'Hare, and Rosemont
 - 7% increase in transit capacity
 - Scheduled travel times would be approximately 47 minutes

Final Screening Summary

Evaluation Criteria	No-Build	Commuter Rail	Commuter Bus
Increase Transit Capacity	O	+	+
Increase Transit Ridership	O	+	O
Minimize or Avoid Negative Impacts to the Environment	O	+	-
Decrease Travel Time	O	+	-
Provide Compatibility with Transit Supportive Development	-	+	-
Improve Operating Efficiency	O	+	-

+ Comparatively Better - Comparatively Worse O Neither Better nor Worse

Key Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Commuter Rail Alternative	Commuter Bus Alternative
Increase in Regional Transit Ridership (weekday)	4,100	100
Transportation System User Benefits (hours per weekday)	8,600	40
Capital Costs (millions)	\$352	\$57
Cost Effectiveness Index	Medium	Low

All results reflect changes relative to the No-Build Alternative. **ALL RIDERSHIP & COST ESTIMATES ARE PRELIMINARY AND SUBJECT TO FURTHER REVISION.**

Recommended Locally Preferred Alternative: Commuter Rail Alternative

- Thank you for your interest in this project! Your participation and comments have been and are important to the success of this project.
- Visit our project website at www.metroconnects.metrotransit.com