



REVISED PROBLEM STATEMENT

1) The North Lake Shore Drive study area is a corridor that contains roadway, public transit, and lakefront trail facilities situated entirely within parkland along Chicago’s lakefront. **2)** The majority of the parkland is located within Lincoln Park, which extends from the Ohio Street beach to N. Ardmore Ave. and is listed on the *National Register of Historic Places*. **3)** The corridor study limits extend from Grand Avenue to Hollywood Avenue and include bordering parkland areas.

4) The North Lake Shore Drive study area is more than a heavily used transportation corridor that facilitates movement of thousands of people each day by multiple modes of travel. **5)** The corridor also provides critical connections to the park and lakefront for recreational use and circulation. **6)** These connections, however, are constrained and inadequate for today’s user demands which vary widely by time of day, day of the week and the schedule of special events on the lakefront. **7)** Overall, the North Lake Shore Drive infrastructure lacks sustainable design features and requires burdensome maintenance efforts.

8) The pedestrian and lakefront trail issues include safety, capacity, conflicts between user types, connectivity, access, American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance, lack of wayfinding, and suitability of facilities. **9)** Public transit issues include capacity to meet existing and future demands, speed, reliability, inadequate infrastructure, and lack of service to the lakefront. **10)** Roadway related issues include vehicular safety, congestion on North Lake Shore Drive, junction intersections and adjacent neighborhood streets, lack of driver information signing, excessive speeds and infrastructure condition and functionality.

TASK FORCE MEETINGS #2
PROBLEM STATEMENT FEEDBACK & RESPONSE

In small group breakout sessions with a facilitator and a note-taker, task force members were invited to provide input on the draft Problem Statement. The recorded comments and corresponding Problem Statement adjustments are summarized in the following table.

COMMENT	EXPLANATION
<u>CORRIDOR PLANNING COMMITTEE</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add Terminus (North/South, East/West) Junctions 	Added: Line 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lincoln Park/ Interconnected parks 	Clarified in the Problem Statement: Line 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobility within the Park 	Added: Line 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barrier leads to deterioration of the Park 	Included in Purpose & Need
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability 	Added: Line 7
<u>TRANSPORTATION TASK FORCE</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Order of elements i.e.: barrier has a negative connotation, instead should focus on flow on three issues points 	Order of Problem Statement was revised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ends of the drive/terminus –lacking in the statement 	Added: Line 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move up roadway in the statement especially since the infrastructure is crumbling 	Infrastructure crumbling is addressed in the Purpose & Need. Most participants asked that the order of the Problem Statement reflect Chicago’s Complete Streets modal hierarchy. The Problem Statement reflects that.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion is not mentioned- movement of people North/South and East/West 	Congestion is included in Line 10. Movement of People is added to the Problem Statement – line 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non motorized issues need to be developed more especially accessibility 	Addressed: Line 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of wayfinding and signage 	Added: Line 8
<u>PARK USER AND ENVIRONMENT TASK FORCE</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved maintenance and sustainability 	Added: Line 7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lincoln Park should be mentioned more prominently, and all the interconnected parks 	Added: Line 1 & 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All issues on equal footing, put it all together 	Revised order and issue grouping in the Problem Statement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Word “congestion” vs. “conflicts.” 	Congestion: Line 8, 9 & 10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion should not be thought of as a success because people are using it. There are design issues and flaws 	Congestion: Line 8, 9 & 10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion on trail as well as roadway 	Congestion: Line 8, 9 & 10

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add recreation, not just transportation to and from park, recreation activities within the park and the lakefront 	Added: Line 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be recognized as a park system and an asset for the City of Chicago and a Boulevard 	Park issues are more predominately featured in the revised Problem Statement: Line 1 & 2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link of transportation connections from Northern terminus to Downtown Chicago 	Connectivity addressed: Line 5 & 6.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not just a “barrier” 	Barrier language removed. Connectivity addressed: Line 5 & 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add environment as a current issue highlighting water quality, air quality, construction, materials and landscaping, 	Sustainability is added to the Problem Statement: Line 7. Environmental issues are addressed throughout the NEPA process. It is integrated into the entire Phase I process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasize that there is a variety of users, not just use the word multimodal 	Revised: Line 1 & 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connectivity North – South and East-West 	Addressed: Line 6
<u>BUSINESS AND INSTITUTIONS TASK FORCE</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Lincoln Park” Interconnected parks, train and north river need better access 	Park language added: Line 1 & 2. Access: Lines 5, 8, 9 & 10.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement should include the historical issues 	Historical issues will be addressed through the NEPA Section 106 process and is recognized in Line 2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement should include congestion on arterial, corridor, neighborhood streets and connectivity on foot 	Congestion: Line 8, 9 & 10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the statement more overarching, don’t need the modes to be spelled out as far as motorized and non motorized 	Denoted all users: Line 8, 9 & 10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List should have more order or alphabetized 	The order has been revised to reflect the City of Chicago’s Complete Streets modal hierarchy.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future growth planning without having negative effects 	“Sustainability” and “impacts to surrounding areas” added: Line 7.
<u>SOUTH RESIDENTIAL TASK FORCE</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lincoln Park should be mentioned in the statement especially focusing on the interconnected parks and parks system 	Added: Line 1 & 2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define Study area 	Added: Line 3.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define user types-all users should be included 	Denoted all users: Line 8, 9 & 10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wave action and flooding should be in the Problem Statement 	This issue is addressed in “infrastructure condition” on both the roadway and trail: Line 7, 9 & 10. It will be addressed further in the Purpose & Need.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Streamlining and simplifying governance of the study area infrastructure (CTA, CDOT, IDOT & Park District) 	The governance of the infrastructure is outside the scope of the project study. Coordination of all Project Study Group members will occur in the course of the Phase I Study.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reorganize third paragraph to make it the second paragraph 	The Problem Statement has been reorganized to reflect the City of Chicago’s Complete Streets modal hierarchy.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include priorities such as maintenance and sustainability 	Added: Line 7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasize and maintain facilities that serve non motorized users 	The Problem Statement has been reorganized to reflect the City of Chicago’s Complete Streets modal hierarchy.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Balance and prioritize the various types of users, including bike and pedestrian 	The Problem Statement has been reorganized to reflect the City of Chicago’s Complete Streets modal hierarchy.
<u>CENTRAL RESIDENTIAL TASK FORCE</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Omit multi modal 	Revised: Line 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drive is a Barrier, the statement doesn’t emphasize why 	Revised: Line 5 & 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement doesn’t mention wetlands or protected park lands 	Environmental issues are addressed throughout the NEPA process. It is integrated into the entire Phase I process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add value of every type of user and environmental asset 	The Problem Statement has been reorganized to reflect the City of Chicago’s Complete Streets modal hierarchy.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solutions to transportation problem should enhance park portion of the scope 	Paragraph two states that the study area is more than a transportation corridor, and provides critical connections to the park and lakefront for recreational access and circulation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sensitivity to protection of park front and land 	Addressed in Purpose & Need and through NEPA Section 106 process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In paragraph one, it should state something about registered and subject to parkland protection 	Addressed in Purpose & Need and through NEPA Section 106 process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In paragraph two should add while 	Sustainability added: Line 7. Environmental issues

decreasing harm to wildlife, natural flora/fauna and human usage	are addressed throughout the NEPA process . It is integrated into the entire Phase I process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mention of pedestrians/people. Entire statement should be more recreational oriented 	Revised: Line 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add that traffic demand exceeds Lake Shore Drive's capacity 	Demand/Capacity noted: Line 8, 9 & 10
<u>NORTH RESIDENTIAL TASK FORCE</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In paragraph three, the term non motorized is not clear and should be more descriptive. 	Revised: Line 4 & 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement should include water quality concerns, especially with salt water runoff and ground water 	This issue is addressed in "infrastructure condition" on both the roadway and trail: Line 7, 9 & 10. It will be addressed further in the Purpose & Need.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access and Egress of the emergency responders should be included 	This issue is included in the "suitability of facilities" in Line 8 and will be addressed further in the Purpose & Need.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Drive is more of a dividing line, not a barrier, the word barrier has negative connotations 	Omitted from Problem Statement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fencing should be addressed, so should environmental issues 	Sustainability added: Line 7. Environmental issues are addressed throughout the NEPA process . It is integrated into the entire Phase I process. Specific solutions will be reviewed in the next phase of the project: Range of Alternatives.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sidewalk sand is a problem at Foster 	Condition of the trail is noted in the Problem Statement: Line 8. Impediments to trail movement will be addressed in the Purpose & Need.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What defines Lincoln Park? That needs to be much more clear in the statement 	Revised: Line 1 & 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recreation is not mentioned and should be 	Added: Line 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Omit the word "network" 	Revised in Problem Statement
<u>EMAILED POST MEETING</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think the idea of aesthetics should be added. There is a general guideline like not expanding the roadway; there should also be a guideline that the amount of 	Urban design and landscape design will be an integral part of the development of alternatives process and will consider the aesthetic experience.

<p>park land should not be diminished.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I suggest the following additions to the North Lake Shore Drive Problem Statement: In its present configuration, North Lake Shore Drive carries too many cars and not enough people, inducing traffic congestion both downtown and in lakefront neighborhoods that undermines our quality of life and limits our economic growth and competitiveness. It does not offer a sufficiently attractive alternative to driving and parking to accommodate a growing city. The Drive does not allow sufficient access to the lakefront by public transportation, and does not link its attractions and institutions together by public transportation. 	<p>Movement of people added: Line 4 Accessibility & Connections added: Line 5, 6 & 9</p>