

## Appendix A: CMAP Capital Improvement Recommendations and Transit Line History for the Red, Orange and Yellow Lines

Two extension proposals were chosen as comparables to the Red Line Extension based on the following five decision criteria:

- 1) That the comparables be in the same Regional Investment Category – a project recommendation
- 2) That the comparables should be of same Project Type – a rapid transit upgrade and extension project
- 3) That the comparables have the same Funding Category – funding for construction is anticipated through discretionary grants made based on the proposals merits
- 4) That the comparables have New Starts program planning authorization – have New Starts program funding to begin Alternatives Analysis
- 5) That the comparables be the same Transit Type – CTA

**Table 1 Decision Criteria Legend**

<b>CRITERIA LEGEND</b>	
<b>Regional Investment Category</b>	
1	Management Recommendations
2	Committed Recommendations
3	System Recommendations
4	Project Recommendations
5	Corridor Recommendations
<b>Project Type</b>	
1	Chicago Transit Hub Improvements
2	Rapid Transit Upgrades and Extensions
3	Existing Commuter Rail Upgrades and Extensions
4	New transit projects
<b>Funding</b>	
1	Funding for construction is anticipated through discretionary Federal grants made based on the proposal's merits
2	Funds for construction of the project have not been identified
3	Need for new revenue sources, public-private partnership
4	Funding has been secured
5	Capital construction is substantially complete
6	Funding status unknown
<b>New Start Authorization</b>	
Y	Yes, has New Starts Funding, Alternatives Analysis Underway
N	No, does not have New Starts Funding
<b>Transit Type</b>	
1	CTA
2	Metra
3	Multi-modal

**Table 2 Decision criteria for CMAP 2030 recommended major capital projects**

<b>CMAP 2030 Major capital recommendations</b>	<b>Regional Investment Category</b>	<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Funding</b>	<b>New Start Authorization</b>	<b>Transit Type</b>
Green Line Enhancements	1	Improv	6	N	1
North Central Service Improvements	1	Improv	5	N	2
Union Pacific West Improvements	1, 3	Improv	1	Y	2
SouthWest Service Improvements and Extension	1, 3, 5	Ext	2	N	2
Circle Line	1, 4	Hub	1	N	1
Brown Line Rehabilitation	2	Rehab	4	N	1
Union Pacific North Improvements	3	Improv	6	N	2
Rock Island Improvements and Extension	3, 5	Ext	2	N	2
Metra Electric Improvements and Extension	3, 5	Ext	2	N	2
<b>Red Line Extension</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Ext</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Orange Line Extension</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Ext</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Yellow Line Enhancements and Extension</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Ext</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>1</b>
Union Pacific Northwest Improvements and Extension	4	Ext	1	Y	2
SouthEast Service	4	New	1	Y	2
STAR Line	4, 5	New	1	Y	2
BNSF Railway Extension	4, 5	Ext	1	Y	2
Milwaukee District West Extensions	5	Ext	2	Y*	2
Blue Line West Extension	5	Ext	2	N	1
Milwaukee District North Improvements and Extension	5	Ext	2	N	2
West Loop Transportation Center	5	Hub	2	N	3
Express Airport Train Service	5	Hub	3	N	1
Heritage Corridor Improvements	5	Improv	2	N	2
Mid-City Transitway	5	New	2	N	3
*Proposed extension to Rockford is included in the New Starts authorization					

## BRIEF HISTORY OF THE RED LINE & EXTENSION

- 1967 The Dan Ryan Expressway was constructed, which displaced many thriving and long-standing African-American communities along its path, and concurrently, facilitated the out-migration of mostly white, middle class residents to the suburbs.
- 1969 The Dan Ryan Line entered service on September 28 as part of the West-South Route (Lake-Dan Ryan) service. The line was constructed for the CTA by the City of Chicago's Public Works department (currently Chicago Department of Transportation), expanding rapid transit service four miles further south than it had previously gone.<sup>1</sup>
- 1973 Plans to extend the line are developed but tabled because they needed "more study." This continues for the next 30 years.
- 1993 The Dan Ryan Line was rerouted and now comprises the south end of today's Red Line.
- 1998 The 2020 *Regional Transportation Plan* included a proposal to extend the Red Line south from the present 95th Street terminal to the vicinity of 108th/Stony Island via the Bishop Ford Freeway.
- 2002 **Developing Communities Project** begins organizing the community with goal of reaching half of the 110,000 people in Greater Roseland through grassroots strategies to get support for the Red Line to extend through their community.
- 2003 RTA's Draft 2030 *Shared Path* regional transportation plan released and DCP provides public comment.
- 2003 DCP held a public meeting with CATS (May) and with NIPC (September); 200 residents attend each.
- 2003 The CTA proposed a different route for the Red Line extension. Instead of the previously proposed route along the Bishop Ford highway, the CTA proposed that the extension pass through the Roseland community via the Union Pacific right-of-way, south along Stewart Avenue and southeast to 118th and Calumet in Kensington. From there, it would follow the South Shore Line right-of-way to 130th and Doty, at the Bishop Ford highway.<sup>2</sup> Chicago Area Transportation Study (CATS) selects Red Line Extension to be a capital project of the Regional Transportation Plan (October).
- 2003 DCP launches petition drive to get an advisory referendum on the ballot to extend the Red Line; 6,000 residents sign and it is put on the November 2004 ballot.
- 2004 Referendum is supported by nearly 39,000 voters in the 9th and 34th wards—a record turnout for a referendum in Chicago.
- 2005 Feasibility study by Parsons Brinckerhoff begins for CDOT.
- 2005 Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) is passed by Congress (July) and signed into law by President Bush (August).
- 2005 *The Case for Transit Oriented Development in the Greater Roseland Area* report completed by the Nathalie P. Voorhees Center for Neighborhood and Community Development for DCP. This report demonstrates the need for the Red Line extension, as well as how it might create more impact if a route through the community is selected and if transit oriented development is integrated into the extension plans (October).
- 2006 The Chicago Transit Board approved a \$3.5 million contract for Alternatives Analysis Studies for proposed extensions of the Red, Orange, and Yellow Lines. This is the first step in pursuing Federal New Starts grant program funding for the projects.
- 2007 The CTA held Screen 1 Alternatives Analysis Study open houses. Alternative routes considered include 10 combinations of bus rapid transit and heavy rail transit along Halstead Street, Michigan Avenue, and UP Railroad right-of-way corridors, in at-grade, elevated, trench, and underground profiles. (April)

---

<sup>1</sup> From <http://www.transitchicago.com/news/motion/red/danryan/>.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.chicago-l.org/plans/2020plan.html>.

- 2008 A RTA Community Planning (RTAP) Grant was issued to DCP to perform a research and strategic planning project to identify the transit-linked opportunities for community development and assess the impact mass transit can have on housing, the economy and work force development in the Greater Roseland area. (September)
- 2008 *The Greater Roseland Red Line Extension, Equity and Transit-Linked Community Development Project* is initiated by DCP. The project works to develop a comparative analysis that assesses the impact and collateral benefits that mass transit has regionally (August)
- 2008 The CTA held Screen 2 Alternatives Analysis Study open houses. Remaining alternatives included Halstead Street at-grade bus rapid transit, Halstead Street elevated heavy rail transit, and UP Railroad right-of-way elevated heavy rail transit. (December)<sup>3</sup>
- 2009 The CTA held Screen 3 Alternatives Analysis Study open houses. The Locally Preferred Alternative is presented to be the UP Railroad right-of-way elevated heavy rail transit. This community route is supported by DCP. (June)
- 2009 The CTA Board approved the Locally Preferred Alternative as presented. CTA will begin the next stages of the Federal Transit Administration's New Starts process. They will apply for federal funding to begin preliminary engineering and environmental review, and continue public outreach. (August)<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.transitchicago.com/news\\_initiatives/planning/redextend.aspx](http://www.transitchicago.com/news_initiatives/planning/redextend.aspx).

<sup>4</sup> Chicago Tribune. (13 August 2009). *CTA OKs 3 rail-line extensions*.

## BRIEF HISTORY OF THE YELLOW LINE & EXTENSION

- 1925 The Skokie Valley Route of the Chicago, North Shore and Milwaukee Railroad was constructed as a high speed bypass of the main electric interurban railroad. Travelling from Chicago to Lake Bluff, stops included Howard and Dempster. Local service along this route was provided by the Chicago Rapid Transit Company to stations at Dodge Avenue, Asbury Avenue, and Ridge Avenue.
- 1948 The local rail service was stopped and replaced with bus service due to low usage.
- 1963 The Chicago Transit Authority reinstated rapid-transit railroad service along the Skokie Valley Route of the North Shore Line. Travelling from Howard Street in Chicago to Dempster Street in Skokie, the shuttle route served as a demonstration of how public transit could serve the suburbs. This service was fully developed, to coordinate with local bus routes and provided a parking lot, drop off area, and bus turnarounds.<sup>5</sup>
- 2000 The *Evanston Comprehensive General Plan* is adopted. Specific recommendations include participation in regional discussions of the extension of the Yellow Line and study of potential infill stations in Evanston.<sup>6</sup>
- 2003 The 2030 *RTA Regional Transportation Plan* was released, listing the extension of the Yellow Line as a “project recommendation,” having land use and transportation support from the regional plan. The proposal to construct a new station at Oakton was included in the current Transportation Improvement Program and the extension is authorized for federal evaluation. Stated benefits of the extension include increased mobility for the north suburbs, reverse-commute opportunities to a major activity center, transit-oriented infill development, and multi-modal connectivity.<sup>7</sup>
- 2003 The *Skokie Swift Station Location Feasibility Study* is completed for the Village of Skokie with funding from an RTA Regional Technical Assistance Program grant (RTAP). The study’s recommendation that the addition of infill stations be considered with an extension of the Yellow Line led to the Federal funding of design and construction of a new station at Oakton Street in downtown Skokie.<sup>8</sup>
- 2005 The extension of the Yellow Line was authorized for preliminary engineering in the Safe Accountable Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU).
- 2005 A working group led by state Senator Susan Garrett (29th district) and composed of the Transportation Management Association of Lake-Cook, employers, communities, and legislators began working to address reverse commute issues to the northern suburbs, focusing on Metra and Pace service.<sup>9</sup>
- 2006 The Chicago Transit Board approved a \$3.5 million contract for Alternatives Analysis Studies for proposed extensions of the Red, Orange, and Yellow Line extensions. This is the first step in pursuing Federal New Starts grant program funding for the projects.
- 2007 A resident survey was conducted by the City of Evanston to determine local preference for station location at Dodge, Asbury, and Ridge Avenues. Residents did not show a strong preference for one station, with many indicating that they would use each of the stations. A station at Asbury had the highest level of stated use (41 percent).<sup>10</sup>
- 2007 The *Skokie Swift North Shore Corridor Travel Market Analysis* was released by the City of Evanston and the Village of Skokie, in partnership with the Regional Transportation Authority. Three potential locations of new stations are selected for evaluation, including the former Dodge Avenue, Asbury Avenue, and Ridge Avenue stations.<sup>11</sup>
- 2008 The CTA held Screen 1 Alternatives Analysis Study open houses. Alternative routes were along the UP Railroad, Edens Expressway, Gross Point Road/Skokie Boulevard, and Skokie Boulevard. Routes

---

<sup>5</sup> Chicago-L. (2009). *Yellow Line*. Retrieved on February 5, 2009, from <http://www.chicago-l.org/operations/lines/yellow.html>

<sup>6</sup> City of Evanston, IL. (8 May 2000). *Evanston Comprehensive General Plan*. p. 108-115.

<sup>7</sup> CMAP. (9 October 2008). *2030 Regional Transportation Plan for Northeastern Illinois, October 9, 2008*. Chapter 6: Major Capital Recommendations. p.145-146.

<sup>8</sup> Parsons Brinkerhoff. (11 September 2003). *Skokie Swift Station Location Feasibility Study: Final Report*. p. 2.

<sup>9</sup> Cambridge Systematics, Inc. (July 2007). *Skokie Swift North Shore Corridor Travel Market Analysis*. P. 1-3.

<sup>10</sup> Cambridge Systematics, Inc. (July 2007). *Skokie Swift North Shore Corridor Travel Market Analysis*. p. 6-19.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. p. 6-1 – 6-2.

selected for further study include the UP Railroad (heavy rail transit or bus rapid transit) and Gross Point Road/Skokie Boulevard (bus rapid transit). (August)<sup>12</sup>

- 2009 The *City of Evanston Multi-modal Transportation Plan* was released with funding for the transit portion provided by an RTA RTAP grant. Transit recommendations include an alternatives analysis study of sites for an additional Yellow Line CTA station. (April)<sup>13</sup>
- 2009 The CTA held open houses to receive input on findings from Screen 2 of the Alternatives Analysis Study. Remaining alternatives included transit system management with bus rapid transit along Gross Point Road and Skokie Boulevard, bus rapid transit along the UP Railroad right-of-way at grade, and heavy rail transit along the UP Railroad right-of-way elevated and trenched. The locally preferred alternative was presented to be heavy rail transit along the UP railroad right-of-way. (April)<sup>14</sup>
- 2009 The CTA Board approved the Locally Preferred Alternative as presented. CTA will begin the next stages of the Federal Transit Administration's New Starts process. They will apply for federal funding to begin preliminary engineering and environmental review, and continue public outreach. (August)<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> [http://www.transitchicago.com/news\\_initiatives/planning/yellowextend.aspx](http://www.transitchicago.com/news_initiatives/planning/yellowextend.aspx).

<sup>13</sup> T. Y. Lin, International, Inc. (April 2009). *City of Evanston Multi-Modal Transportation Plan*. p. 11-30.

<sup>14</sup> [http://www.transitchicago.com/news\\_initiatives/planning/yellowextend.aspx](http://www.transitchicago.com/news_initiatives/planning/yellowextend.aspx).

<sup>15</sup> Chicago Tribune. (13 August 2009). *CTA OKs 3 rail-line extensions*.

## BRIEF HISTORY OF THE ORANGE LINE & EXTENSION

- 1940s Plans began for a subway line from the central business district to the Municipal (Midway) Airport. By the 1950s, suburban development had advanced sufficiently southwest of the city to necessitate a rail line, however funding was not available. For the next fifty years various plans were put forth, though not enacted.<sup>16</sup>
- 1964 The Stevenson Expressway (I-55) opened, along the former Illinois and Michigan Canal right-of-way, travelling southwest from the Dan Ryan Expressway. Though never used, space was left in the center of the expressway for a rapid-transit route.<sup>17</sup>
- 1980 Mayor Byrne announced plans for a new Southwest Route, but lack of federal funding stalled the plan.
- 1986 President Reagan entered into a funding agreement with Mayor Harold Washington for the Southwest Transit Project.
- 1993 The Orange Line entered service on October 31 as part of the Southwest Route service. The tracks were constructed along the rights-of-way of several freight railroads. It was the first line with a color name, all ADA-accessible stations, all stations with park-n-ride lots, and first non-shuttle service to be run by one person. Though unable to extend to the Ford City Mall due to financial restrictions, the layout and location of the Midway terminal were constructed so as to facilitate such expansion.<sup>18</sup>
- 2003 2030 RTA Regional Transportation Plan was released, listing the extension of the Orange Line as a "project recommendation," having land use and transportation support from the regional plan. Funds for right-of-way acquisition have been programmed, construction funding may be obtained through discretionary federal grants, and the extension is authorized for federal evaluation. Stated benefits of the extension include increased mobility for the southwest suburbs, reverse-commute opportunities to a major activity center, and a reduction of congestion at the Midway Orange Line station.<sup>19</sup>
- 2007 2006 The Chicago Transit Board approved a \$3.5 million contract for Alternatives Analysis Studies for proposed extensions of the Red, Orange, and Yellow Line extensions. This is the first step in pursuing Federal New Starts grant program funding for the projects.
- 2008 The CTA held Screen 1 Alternatives Analysis Study open houses. The four alternative routes were along Cicero Avenue, Pulaski Road, and a combination of the Belt Railway and either Cicero or Kostner Avenues. The corridors selected for further study were Cicero Avenue (bus rapid transit), Belt/Cicero, or Belt/Kostner (heavy rail transit). (August)<sup>20</sup>
- 2008 The FY2008 Federal Omnibus Appropriations Bill was approved. As requested by Illinois Congressman Daniel Lipinski, \$500,000 in funding is included for the extension of the Orange Line to Ford City Mall.<sup>21</sup>
- 2009 The CTA Screen 2 Alternatives Analysis Study open houses. Remaining alternatives included transit system management with bus rapid transit along Cicero Avenue, heavy rail transit along the Belt Railway right-of-way and above Cicero Avenue, and heavy rail transit along the Belt Railway right-of-way and above Kostner Avenue. The locally preferred alternative was presented to be heavy rail transit along the Belt Railway and Cicero Avenue. (April)<sup>22</sup>
- 2009 The CTA Board approved the Locally Preferred Alternative as presented. CTA will begin the next stages of the Federal Transit Administration's New Starts process. They will apply for federal funding to begin preliminary engineering and environmental review, and continue public outreach. (August)<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.chicago-l.org/operations/lines/orange.html>.

<sup>17</sup> <http://web.presby.edu/~jtbell/transit/Chicago/CTA/Orange/>.

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.chicago-l.org/operations/lines/orange.html>.

<sup>19</sup> CMAP. (9 October 2008). *2030 Regional Transportation Plan for Northeastern Illinois, October 9, 2008*. Chapter 6: Major Capital Recommendations. p.143-144.

<sup>20</sup> [http://www.transitchicago.com/news\\_initiatives/planning/orangeextend.aspx](http://www.transitchicago.com/news_initiatives/planning/orangeextend.aspx).

<sup>21</sup> [www.lipinski.house.gov/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=689](http://www.lipinski.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=689).

<sup>22</sup> [http://www.transitchicago.com/news\\_initiatives/planning/orangeextend.aspx](http://www.transitchicago.com/news_initiatives/planning/orangeextend.aspx).

<sup>23</sup> Chicago Tribune. (13 August 2009). *CTA OKs 3 rail-line extensions*.

## **Appendix B: Chicago PUMA's and their corresponding Community Areas**

---

### **PUMS Community Areas**

- 03501: Rogers Park, Edgewater, Uptown
- 03502: Lake View, Lincoln Park
- 03503: West Ridge, Lincoln Square, North Center
- 03504: Forest Glen, North Park, Albany Park, Irving Park
- 03505: Edison Park, Norwood Park, Jefferson, Dunning, O'Hare
- 03506: Portage Park, Montclare, Belmont Cragin
- 03507: Austin
- 03508: Humboldt Park, West Garfield Park, East Garfield Park, North Lawndale
- 03509: Hermosa, Avondale, Logan Square, West Town
- 03510: Near North Side, Near West Side, Loop, Near South Side
- 03511: South Lawndale, Lower West Side
- 03512: Armour Square, Archer Heights, Brighton Park, McKinley Park, Bridgeport, New City
- 03513: Garfield Ridge, West Elsdon, Gage Park, Clearing, West Lawn, Chicago Lawn
- 03514: Douglas, Oakland, Fuller Park, Grand Boulevard, Kenwood, Washington Park, Hyde Park
- 03515: Woodlawn, South Shore, Chatham, Avalon Park, Greater Grand Crossing
- 03516: West Englewood, Englewood, Auburn Gresham, Washington Heights
- 03517: Ashburn, Beverly, Mount Greenwood, Morgan Park
- 03518: Roseland, Pullman, West Pullman, Riverdale
- 03519: South Chicago, Burnside, Calumet Heights, South Deering, East Side, Hegewisch

## Appendix C: Data Tables for Indicators

### 1.1 Transit dependent is measured by population that is disabled.

PUMA	Total Population	Disabled	% Disabled	Zscore
03001	111,082	12,183	0.11	-0.39
03002	133,858	10,837	0.08	-1.14
03003	149,527	14,144	0.09	-0.78
03004	124,890	9,501	0.08	-1.27
03005	114,830	15,594	0.14	0.30
03006	179,768	16,202	0.09	-0.90
03101	131,349	16,874	0.13	0.11
03102	117,311	17,048	0.15	0.55
03103	177,411	17,646	0.10	-0.66
03104	216,622	17,064	0.08	-1.20
03201	198,789	17,941	0.09	-0.90
03202	109,383	11,769	0.11	-0.44
03203	111,123	7,843	0.07	-1.41
03204	138,129	13,581	0.10	-0.69
03205	116,593	13,051	0.11	-0.33
03206	190,289	21,284	0.11	-0.33
03301	96,533	8,966	0.09	-0.83
03302	122,440	15,491	0.13	0.05
03303	212,602	19,934	0.09	-0.80
03304	114,299	10,687	0.09	-0.81
03305	105,381	8,526	0.08	-1.14
03401	118,465	9,811	0.08	-1.09
03402	210,167	20,478	0.10	-0.71
03403	231,819	24,212	0.10	-0.52
03404	210,952	26,807	0.13	0.07
03405	221,384	25,081	0.11	-0.29
03406	114,961	16,247	0.14	0.44
03407	171,808	21,508	0.13	0.02
03408	174,329	21,268	0.12	-0.06
03409	141,506	17,527	0.12	-0.02
03410	166,564	20,275	0.12	-0.07
03411	165,284	25,689	0.16	0.81
03412	108,282	18,299	0.17	1.17
03413	171,524	26,413	0.15	0.78
03414	161,727	22,173	0.14	0.33
03501	159,031	24,997	0.16	0.86
03502	146,639	12,276	0.08	-1.07
03503	127,818	12,917	0.10	-0.61
03504	133,966	16,680	0.12	0.00
03505	126,885	17,429	0.14	0.34
03506	148,389	18,991	0.13	0.09
03507	99,242	23,955	0.24	3.07
03508	122,197	24,704	0.20	2.04
03509	207,274	29,093	0.14	0.42
03510	139,718	14,553	0.10	-0.53
03511	107,217	9,636	0.09	-0.91
03512	148,586	18,459	0.12	-0.01
03513	186,431	19,954	0.11	-0.46
03514	96,442	19,191	0.20	1.96
03515	150,421	31,783	0.21	2.28
03516	151,635	29,356	0.19	1.81
03517	97,542	11,766	0.12	-0.10
03518	88,143	16,688	0.19	1.70
03519	101,414	17,511	0.17	1.27
Mean			0.12	
SD			0.04	

Source: US Census 2005-2007 PUMS

**1.2 Transit dependent is measured by households with 0 cars.**

PUMS	Total Households	No Vehicle	% No Vehicle	Zscore
03001	42,106	1,791	0.04	-0.70
03002	47,989	1,176	0.02	-0.86
03003	53,232	2,848	0.05	-0.60
03004	45,646	1,379	0.03	-0.81
03005	40,826	3,449	0.08	-0.32
03006	65,314	1,494	0.02	-0.87
03101	50,964	1,510	0.03	-0.81
03102	43,481	3,377	0.08	-0.38
03103	60,961	1,269	0.02	-0.89
03104	72,191	1,179	0.02	-0.93
03201	74,926	1,373	0.02	-0.91
03202	42,468	1,901	0.04	-0.68
03203	44,181	1,046	0.02	-0.87
03204	56,273	1,974	0.04	-0.76
03205	47,353	2,391	0.05	-0.63
03206	70,069	2,189	0.03	-0.80
03301	32,086	1,110	0.03	-0.77
03302	43,418	3,983	0.09	-0.26
03303	78,817	1,797	0.02	-0.87
03304	42,166	1,685	0.04	-0.72
03305	37,131	785	0.02	-0.89
03401	47,604	1,729	0.04	-0.75
03402	83,179	2,981	0.04	-0.76
03403	98,322	5,553	0.06	-0.57
03404	83,091	4,649	0.06	-0.58
03405	85,964	7,553	0.09	-0.29
03406	43,835	4,697	0.11	-0.12
03407	66,089	5,656	0.09	-0.31
03408	62,624	7,619	0.12	0.01
03409	53,844	3,664	0.07	-0.47
03410	64,279	1,853	0.03	-0.82
03411	66,315	5,127	0.08	-0.38
03412	40,522	2,632	0.06	-0.50
03413	64,200	6,480	0.10	-0.17
03414	61,770	4,277	0.07	-0.46
03501	81,627	30,425	0.37	2.26
03502	82,110	25,758	0.31	1.73
03503	54,599	9,433	0.17	0.47
03504	49,142	7,380	0.15	0.27
03505	52,073	5,664	0.11	-0.10
03506	49,542	7,274	0.15	0.24
03507	34,727	11,481	0.33	1.89
03508	42,092	15,630	0.37	2.25
03509	84,056	18,958	0.23	0.94
03510	80,444	28,417	0.35	2.09
03511	28,834	6,673	0.23	1.00
03512	49,120	10,146	0.21	0.77
03513	59,877	8,968	0.15	0.27
03514	46,673	16,223	0.35	2.04
03515	67,183	23,298	0.35	2.03
03516	50,241	15,773	0.31	1.74
03517	36,328	2,717	0.07	-0.41
03518	30,539	7,560	0.25	1.14
03519	34,912	7,507	0.22	0.85
Mean			0.12	
SD			0.11	

Source: US Census 2005-2007 PUMS

### 1.3 Transit dependent is measured by population that is elderly.

PUMA	Total Aged Population	65+	% 65+	Zscore
03001	118,571	11,693	0.10	-0.31
03002	145,004	11,890	0.08	-0.87
03003	165,288	11,180	0.07	-1.35
03004	135,692	10,514	0.08	-1.02
03005	127,227	10,548	0.08	-0.84
03006	195,276	18,276	0.09	-0.48
03101	140,624	15,108	0.11	-0.01
03102	127,754	13,878	0.11	0.03
03103	190,977	17,395	0.09	-0.56
03104	240,642	10,533	0.04	-2.16
03201	215,962	14,130	0.07	-1.43
03202	117,023	13,461	0.12	0.25
03203	118,666	10,204	0.09	-0.73
03204	147,850	19,517	0.13	0.82
03205	123,990	18,430	0.15	1.38
03206	204,189	22,282	0.11	0.05
03301	103,077	12,897	0.13	0.59
03302	133,504	11,586	0.09	-0.71
03303	231,690	16,098	0.07	-1.29
03304	123,425	14,365	0.12	0.29
03305	112,406	10,085	0.09	-0.61
03401	126,777	12,409	0.10	-0.33
03402	229,706	19,590	0.09	-0.76
03403	250,683	36,455	0.15	1.27
03404	223,305	41,177	0.18	2.58
03405	236,155	36,248	0.15	1.54
03406	122,278	17,635	0.14	1.23
03407	185,365	24,853	0.13	0.89
03408	192,336	14,886	0.08	-1.02
03409	151,808	18,280	0.12	0.43
03410	176,173	26,153	0.15	1.37
03411	177,354	27,324	0.15	1.56
03412	116,041	13,826	0.12	0.38
03413	187,081	22,470	0.12	0.42
03414	172,675	21,099	0.12	0.49
03501	168,701	18,065	0.11	-0.02
03502	154,463	11,668	0.08	-1.09
03503	139,065	14,745	0.11	-0.06
03504	145,095	14,604	0.10	-0.24
03505	134,756	24,120	0.18	2.40
03506	159,860	15,088	0.09	-0.45
03507	107,974	10,368	0.10	-0.40
03508	133,654	12,027	0.09	-0.60
03509	222,996	14,616	0.07	-1.42
03510	144,725	16,985	0.12	0.32
03511	118,381	6,800	0.06	-1.70
03512	163,816	14,923	0.09	-0.56
03513	206,312	19,280	0.09	-0.48
03514	104,325	12,775	0.12	0.50
03515	163,450	20,700	0.13	0.64
03516	163,230	19,995	0.12	0.50
03517	105,832	11,426	0.11	0.01
03518	94,520	12,969	0.14	0.99
03519	109,574	13,689	0.12	0.58
Mean			0.11	
SD			0.03	

Source: US Census 2005-2007 PUMS

**1.4 Transit dependent is measured by population that is a high school student.**

PUMA	Total Enrolled in School	# Attending Grades 9-12	% Attending Grade 9-12	Zscore
03001	31,784	6,981	0.22	0.14
03002	45,917	9,312	0.20	-0.36
03003	48,731	8,980	0.18	-0.92
03004	41,954	9,821	0.23	0.57
03005	34,746	7,495	0.22	0.02
03006	53,588	11,860	0.22	0.19
03101	36,347	7,521	0.21	-0.24
03102	31,765	7,497	0.24	0.63
03103	56,436	11,339	0.20	-0.42
03104	78,355	17,027	0.22	0.07
03201	65,509	13,268	0.20	-0.37
03202	36,599	7,012	0.19	-0.70
03203	36,009	7,296	0.20	-0.37
03204	40,134	8,849	0.22	0.16
03205	34,348	7,291	0.21	-0.08
03206	52,262	11,360	0.22	0.07
03301	30,587	7,971	0.26	1.36
03302	38,994	8,659	0.22	0.21
03303	69,147	14,692	0.21	-0.08
03304	35,847	7,488	0.21	-0.18
03305	35,779	8,914	0.25	1.02
03401	36,720	7,859	0.21	-0.03
03402	58,660	12,152	0.21	-0.23
03403	60,173	11,555	0.19	-0.69
03404	56,287	12,337	0.22	0.13
03405	73,338	15,774	0.22	0.00
03406	31,458	7,904	0.25	1.08
03407	48,536	10,363	0.21	-0.04
03408	56,106	14,142	0.25	1.11
03409	42,147	9,625	0.23	0.40
03410	49,685	11,176	0.22	0.30
03411	47,931	11,040	0.23	0.46
03412	31,171	7,482	0.24	0.75
03413	59,005	13,550	0.23	0.44
03414	52,903	12,719	0.24	0.76
03501	37,953	5,474	0.14	-2.12
03502	32,991	2,814	0.09	-3.88
03503	33,696	7,225	0.21	-0.02
03504	39,631	8,245	0.21	-0.21
03505	30,169	5,741	0.19	-0.74
03506	42,782	9,292	0.22	0.07
03507	32,138	8,335	0.26	1.33
03508	42,468	10,928	0.26	1.27
03509	57,428	10,559	0.18	-0.93
03510	30,050	3,598	0.12	-2.85
03511	33,146	7,254	0.22	0.12
03512	45,303	11,043	0.24	0.86
03513	58,826	13,075	0.22	0.22
03514	35,423	5,039	0.14	-2.18
03515	45,856	11,226	0.24	0.89
03516	48,215	11,023	0.23	0.41
03517	32,068	7,554	0.24	0.62
03518	29,708	8,136	0.27	1.76
03519	31,527	7,027	0.22	0.24
Mean			0.21	
SD			0.03	

Source: US Census 2005-2007 PUMS

### 1.5 Inadequate access is measured by excessive travel time to work.

PUMA	Total Workers	Travel 60+ minutes	% With Extensive Travel Time	Zscore
03001	57,723	5,811	0.10	1.39
03002	66,776	6,140	0.09	1.10
03003	75,401	3,154	0.04	-0.56
03004	61,962	4,248	0.07	0.32
03005	57,058	1,814	0.03	-0.89
03006	95,701	7,732	0.08	0.73
03101	65,886	4,570	0.07	0.35
03102	58,870	2,800	0.05	-0.37
03103	91,190	9,111	0.10	1.36
03104	109,767	11,734	0.11	1.60
03201	103,966	7,537	0.07	0.46
03202	53,747	3,409	0.06	0.15
03203	58,279	4,104	0.07	0.39
03204	67,291	3,502	0.05	-0.22
03205	61,115	1,701	0.03	-1.03
03206	99,268	3,256	0.03	-0.86
03301	43,591	2,228	0.05	-0.25
03302	57,989	1,641	0.03	-1.01
03303	111,795	9,506	0.09	0.87
03304	57,211	3,722	0.07	0.21
03305	52,795	2,910	0.06	-0.12
03401	61,345	2,175	0.04	-0.77
03402	118,167	5,158	0.04	-0.50
03403	119,527	5,215	0.04	-0.50
03404	100,575	3,652	0.04	-0.74
03405	100,287	2,804	0.03	-1.02
03406	56,308	1,223	0.02	-1.23
03407	82,145	2,642	0.03	-0.88
03408	83,879	2,239	0.03	-1.06
03409	68,949	2,362	0.03	-0.81
03410	79,333	5,663	0.07	0.42
03411	75,680	4,258	0.06	-0.08
03412	51,288	3,718	0.07	0.46
03413	71,343	5,627	0.08	0.67
03414	70,347	6,182	0.09	0.97
03501	85,312	4,098	0.05	-0.36
03502	95,939	3,433	0.04	-0.76
03503	69,271	3,161	0.05	-0.44
03504	67,077	1,993	0.03	-0.96
03505	65,361	2,116	0.03	-0.88
03506	73,522	4,575	0.06	0.11
03507	35,786	1,685	0.05	-0.39
03508	37,138	2,299	0.06	0.10
03509	111,537	3,747	0.03	-0.83
03510	78,889	3,054	0.04	-0.66
03511	40,801	1,383	0.03	-0.82
03512	66,940	2,861	0.04	-0.53
03513	77,429	4,226	0.05	-0.14
03514	39,457	1,460	0.04	-0.72
03515	57,330	5,199	0.09	1.06
03516	46,725	7,511	0.16	3.38
03517	44,250	3,275	0.07	0.51
03518	29,744	4,912	0.17	3.53
03519	37,176	2,507	0.07	0.29
Mean			0.06	
SD			0.03	

Source: US Census 2005-2007 PUMS

**2.1 Low-income is measured by households earning under 80% Area Median Income (2007).**

<b>PUMS</b>	<b>Total Households</b>	<b>HH Below 80%</b>	<b>% Low-Income</b>	<b>Zscore</b>
3001	41,924	17,271	0.41	-0.55
3002	47,870	16,128	0.34	-1.05
3003	52,870	24,450	0.46	-0.21
3004	45,533	12,977	0.29	-1.39
3005	40,654	26,022	0.64	0.96
3006	65,235	20,956	0.32	-1.15
3101	50,745	21,315	0.42	-0.50
3102	43,166	24,809	0.57	0.53
3103	60,555	19,957	0.33	-1.10
3104	71,842	21,398	0.30	-1.31
3201	74,804	26,291	0.35	-0.95
3202	41,903	14,752	0.35	-0.95
3203	44,160	15,023	0.34	-1.03
3204	55,992	21,512	0.38	-0.73
3205	47,008	16,697	0.36	-0.93
3206	69,654	28,606	0.41	-0.56
3301	31,965	8,881	0.28	-1.44
3302	43,110	26,490	0.61	0.79
3303	78,403	29,888	0.38	-0.75
3304	42,134	13,221	0.31	-1.20
3305	37,063	8,263	0.22	-1.80
3401	47,208	16,089	0.34	-1.02
3402	82,809	34,569	0.42	-0.51
3403	97,778	43,453	0.44	-0.33
3404	82,544	34,202	0.41	-0.53
3405	85,211	32,624	0.38	-0.74
3406	43,558	24,561	0.56	0.46
3407	65,278	32,715	0.50	0.04
3408	61,950	34,787	0.56	0.44
3409	53,298	24,924	0.47	-0.18
3410	64,131	24,952	0.39	-0.70
3411	65,439	36,127	0.55	0.38
3412	40,009	20,866	0.52	0.18
3413	62,697	38,975	0.62	0.84
3414	60,660	30,377	0.50	0.04
3501	80,211	51,830	0.65	1.00
3502	81,428	33,008	0.41	-0.59
3503	54,350	28,345	0.52	0.18
3504	48,776	27,435	0.56	0.45
3505	51,465	24,578	0.48	-0.11
3506	49,055	30,189	0.62	0.80
3507	33,020	24,160	0.73	1.57
3508	40,338	32,763	0.81	2.10
3509	83,130	50,684	0.61	0.76
3510	78,011	31,794	0.41	-0.58
3511	28,155	21,453	0.76	1.77
3512	47,952	32,988	0.69	1.28
3513	59,301	38,867	0.66	1.07
3514	45,591	31,776	0.70	1.34
3515	66,062	50,626	0.77	1.80
3516	48,244	35,700	0.74	1.63
3517	35,526	16,554	0.47	-0.19
3518	29,811	21,674	0.73	1.54
3519	34,384	22,893	0.67	1.13
<b>Mean</b>			0.49	
<b>SD</b>			0.15	

Source: US Census 2005-2007 PUMS

## 2.2 Minority is measured by population of “non white” and/or Hispanic.

PUMA	Total Population	Minority	% Minority	Zscore
03001	118,571	11,249	0.09	-1.08
03002	145,004	15,677	0.11	-1.03
03003	165,288	43,593	0.26	-0.46
03004	135,692	11,430	0.08	-1.12
03005	127,227	43,535	0.34	-0.18
03006	195,276	25,064	0.13	-0.96
03101	140,624	18,267	0.13	-0.95
03102	127,754	49,529	0.39	-0.01
03103	190,977	25,662	0.13	-0.94
03104	240,642	71,061	0.30	-0.35
03201	215,962	51,657	0.24	-0.55
03202	117,023	18,344	0.16	-0.86
03203	118,666	23,100	0.19	-0.72
03204	147,850	25,493	0.17	-0.80
03205	123,990	19,995	0.16	-0.84
03206	204,189	44,333	0.22	-0.64
03301	103,077	16,501	0.16	-0.84
03302	133,504	50,904	0.38	-0.03
03303	231,690	42,871	0.19	-0.75
03304	123,425	20,757	0.17	-0.81
03305	112,406	16,880	0.15	-0.88
03401	126,777	24,634	0.19	-0.72
03402	229,706	65,737	0.29	-0.38
03403	250,683	51,794	0.21	-0.67
03404	223,305	48,574	0.22	-0.63
03405	236,155	65,822	0.28	-0.41
03406	122,278	29,940	0.24	-0.53
03407	185,365	90,791	0.49	0.36
03408	192,336	101,552	0.53	0.50
03409	151,808	23,364	0.15	-0.87
03410	176,173	17,155	0.10	-1.07
03411	177,354	44,863	0.25	-0.50
03412	116,041	46,396	0.40	0.03
03413	187,081	140,663	0.75	1.32
03414	172,675	103,189	0.60	0.76
03501	168,701	75,646	0.45	0.21
03502	154,463	26,600	0.17	-0.80
03503	139,065	52,274	0.38	-0.05
03504	145,095	74,345	0.51	0.45
03505	134,756	22,827	0.17	-0.81
03506	159,860	76,869	0.48	0.33
03507	107,974	100,709	0.93	1.98
03508	133,654	118,872	0.89	1.83
03509	222,996	120,536	0.54	0.55
03510	144,725	56,516	0.39	0.00
03511	118,381	98,797	0.83	1.62
03512	163,816	116,194	0.71	1.17
03513	206,312	139,013	0.67	1.04
03514	104,325	85,835	0.82	1.58
03515	163,450	160,994	0.98	2.17
03516	163,230	162,521	1.00	2.21
03517	105,832	56,698	0.54	0.53
03518	94,520	92,961	0.98	2.17
03519	109,574	86,733	0.79	1.47
Mean			0.39	
SD			0.27	

Source: US Census 2005-2007 PUMS

### 3.1 Economic health is measured by population unemployed.

PUMA	Total Population	Unemployed	% Unemployed	Zscore
03001	91,812	5,389	0.06	0.18
03002	106,578	4,408	0.04	-0.50
03003	118,732	4,653	0.04	-0.59
03004	98,626	2,904	0.03	-0.97
03005	92,085	6,881	0.07	0.82
03006	148,803	5,460	0.04	-0.69
03101	109,298	5,161	0.05	-0.27
03102	99,496	5,655	0.06	0.11
03103	144,774	4,607	0.03	-0.88
03104	168,341	6,449	0.04	-0.62
03201	161,600	5,957	0.04	-0.68
03202	90,348	2,813	0.03	-0.91
03203	92,757	3,338	0.04	-0.71
03204	115,089	3,286	0.03	-1.01
03205	98,672	3,054	0.03	-0.91
03206	161,050	7,655	0.05	-0.26
03301	79,666	1,602	0.02	-1.34
03302	97,909	7,215	0.07	0.78
03303	171,019	8,225	0.05	-0.24
03304	92,457	2,482	0.03	-1.08
03305	84,908	2,544	0.03	-0.95
03401	97,443	2,881	0.03	-0.97
03402	176,973	6,648	0.04	-0.65
03403	195,703	6,277	0.03	-0.87
03404	178,617	5,602	0.03	-0.90
03405	186,514	6,876	0.04	-0.68
03406	97,809	4,297	0.04	-0.40
03407	143,068	7,867	0.05	0.04
03408	140,838	8,977	0.06	0.38
03409	116,306	5,497	0.05	-0.27
03410	139,065	5,798	0.04	-0.49
03411	139,988	8,546	0.06	0.28
03412	89,764	5,444	0.06	0.26
03413	137,694	13,014	0.09	1.60
03414	130,245	8,947	0.07	0.58
03501	145,677	7,819	0.05	-0.01
03502	138,088	5,250	0.04	-0.63
03503	111,403	4,516	0.04	-0.53
03504	111,566	6,538	0.06	0.18
03505	111,697	3,870	0.03	-0.77
03506	121,492	7,030	0.06	0.15
03507	79,910	9,971	0.12	2.80
03508	94,925	7,428	0.08	0.96
03509	178,511	9,542	0.05	-0.02
03510	130,173	4,977	0.04	-0.63
03511	85,560	5,086	0.06	0.21
03512	121,170	7,489	0.06	0.31
03513	148,212	7,715	0.05	-0.08
03514	82,834	6,660	0.08	1.04
03515	126,576	13,655	0.11	2.13
03516	121,015	13,509	0.11	2.28
03517	79,472	5,366	0.07	0.53
03518	70,625	8,438	0.12	2.59
03519	80,614	9,043	0.11	2.30
Mean			0.05	
SD			0.03	

Source: US Census 2005-2007 PUMS

### 3.2 Business health is measured by extensive business vacancy.

PUMA	Total Businesses	Total Vacancy	Total Vac24+	% Vacant	Zscore
03001	4,219	365	159	0.44	0.19
03002	4,315	405	130	0.32	-0.91
03003	5,513	844	336	0.40	-0.17
03004	5,498	618	280	0.45	0.36
03005	4,470	467	236	0.51	0.86
03006	5,167	202	78	0.39	-0.29
03101	1,953	94	42	0.45	0.30
03102	4,450	378	179	0.47	0.56
03103	6,415	297	101	0.34	-0.73
03104	6,000	248	42	0.17	-2.37
03201	7,219	522	186	0.36	-0.57
03202	3,786	514	180	0.35	-0.63
03203	4,052	526	217	0.41	-0.03
03204	5,749	741	201	0.27	-1.39
03205	8,078	1,353	505	0.37	-0.41
03206	11,128	1,560	542	0.35	-0.66
03301	4,320	578	185	0.32	-0.92
03302	3,162	455	190	0.42	0.02
03303	5,931	450	160	0.36	-0.58
03304	5,661	631	238	0.38	-0.37
03305	4,162	347	119	0.34	-0.70
03401	4,074	604	226	0.37	-0.40
03402	7,635	1,356	511	0.38	-0.38
03403	11,478	1,772	770	0.43	0.18
03404	10,498	1,521	519	0.34	-0.72
03405	10,257	1,266	427	0.34	-0.76
03406	4,819	614	205	0.33	-0.79
03407	5,781	838	315	0.38	-0.39
03408	4,913	498	215	0.43	0.15
03409	5,207	460	152	0.33	-0.82
03410	5,559	504	176	0.35	-0.64
03411	5,720	593	183	0.31	-1.03
03412	3,329	448	145	0.32	-0.89
03413	5,937	842	407	0.48	0.65
03414	4,412	649	277	0.43	0.11
03501	4,321	500	270	0.54	1.20
03502	5,534	445	250	0.56	1.41
03503	4,621	524	199	0.38	-0.35
03504	4,464	527	156	0.30	-1.15
03505	4,074	454	164	0.36	-0.53
03506	3,873	400	147	0.37	-0.47
03507	2,424	343	178	0.52	0.99
03508	3,568	532	307	0.58	1.55
03509	7,601	982	416	0.42	0.07
03510	34,198	5,049	1,983	0.39	-0.22
03511	3,140	369	294	0.80	3.67
03512	4,065	419	243	0.58	1.58
03513	3,845	480	198	0.41	-0.03
03514	2,759	451	264	0.59	1.63
03515	4,177	768	400	0.52	1.01
03516	2,989	452	239	0.53	1.09
03517	2,328	254	108	0.43	0.09
03518	1,641	234	144	0.62	1.92
03519	2,025	338	167	0.49	0.75
Mean				0.42	
SD				0.10	

Source: HUD NSP 2008

### 3.3 Economic stability is measured by estimated high cost loans.

PUMA	Total 04-06 HMDA Loans	Total High Cost (Sub-Prime)	High Cost Loan Rate	Zscore
03001	19,792	4,602	0.23	-0.40
03002	27,880	5,502	0.20	-0.64
03003	26,920	7,832	0.29	0.00
03004	20,734	2,859	0.14	-1.04
03005	18,343	7,255	0.40	0.70
03006	38,848	7,570	0.19	-0.65
03101	14,717	4,552	0.31	0.12
03102	18,653	6,608	0.35	0.42
03103	33,180	7,307	0.22	-0.48
03104	54,063	14,153	0.26	-0.20
03201	36,996	7,398	0.20	-0.62
03202	14,812	2,005	0.14	-1.05
03203	16,857	2,622	0.16	-0.92
03204	20,640	2,798	0.14	-1.05
03205	16,874	2,957	0.18	-0.78
03206	31,490	7,957	0.25	-0.26
03301	11,967	1,401	0.12	-1.18
03302	13,300	5,557	0.42	0.85
03303	38,841	8,973	0.23	-0.41
03304	19,721	3,187	0.16	-0.88
03305	19,882	2,362	0.12	-1.17
03401	19,777	3,398	0.17	-0.81
03402	42,331	9,969	0.24	-0.38
03403	36,238	6,922	0.19	-0.68
03404	33,737	5,547	0.16	-0.86
03405	33,050	5,144	0.16	-0.92
03406	17,242	4,655	0.27	-0.14
03407	27,251	9,559	0.35	0.40
03408	25,733	8,418	0.33	0.24
03409	20,349	4,942	0.24	-0.33
03410	24,387	4,149	0.17	-0.82
03411	24,074	7,616	0.32	0.17
03412	17,564	7,107	0.40	0.76
03413	24,348	14,513	0.60	2.06
03414	26,295	13,126	0.50	1.40
03501	20,029	3,450	0.17	-0.81
03502	24,124	1,787	0.07	-1.47
03503	17,259	3,243	0.19	-0.70
03504	16,216	3,666	0.23	-0.44
03505	18,986	3,838	0.20	-0.60
03506	19,904	6,742	0.34	0.32
03507	12,182	6,715	0.55	1.76
03508	13,373	7,155	0.54	1.65
03509	28,936	5,989	0.21	-0.57
03510	35,390	4,377	0.12	-1.13
03511	5,568	2,272	0.41	0.79
03512	14,442	5,388	0.37	0.55
03513	27,815	11,652	0.42	0.86
03514	9,891	3,708	0.37	0.56
03515	14,581	8,265	0.57	1.86
03516	15,527	9,987	0.64	2.38
03517	16,786	6,381	0.38	0.60
03518	9,893	6,286	0.64	2.32
03519	10,303	5,440	0.53	1.60
Mean			0.29	
SD			0.15	

Source: HUD NSP 2008

**4.1 Affordability is measured by cost burdened households.**

<b>PUMA</b>	<b>Total HH Owners</b>	<b>Cost Burdened</b>	<b>% Cost Burdened</b>	<b>Zscore</b>
03001	34,047	7,988	0.23	-1.01
03002	42,924	11,727	0.27	-0.46
03003	39,508	12,305	0.31	0.09
03004	38,487	9,012	0.23	-1.01
03005	27,771	9,839	0.35	0.70
03006	56,607	13,630	0.24	-0.92
03101	41,160	9,627	0.23	-1.02
03102	29,545	7,136	0.24	-0.91
03103	54,905	14,608	0.27	-0.56
03104	66,508	20,388	0.31	0.02
03201	59,269	16,147	0.27	-0.47
03202	32,035	7,298	0.23	-1.10
03203	33,907	7,769	0.23	-1.08
03204	44,542	10,682	0.24	-0.93
03205	37,854	9,814	0.26	-0.65
03206	53,390	15,037	0.28	-0.34
03301	25,624	6,401	0.25	-0.79
03302	26,970	8,922	0.33	0.36
03303	65,010	17,128	0.26	-0.60
03304	35,838	9,325	0.26	-0.64
03305	32,529	8,734	0.27	-0.52
03401	37,156	9,627	0.26	-0.66
03402	66,055	18,400	0.28	-0.38
03403	73,849	18,834	0.26	-0.71
03404	67,895	18,635	0.27	-0.44
03405	64,891	19,586	0.30	-0.05
03406	30,325	10,849	0.36	0.75
03407	47,569	14,056	0.30	-0.14
03408	37,632	13,238	0.35	0.66
03409	41,989	11,386	0.27	-0.49
03410	56,739	11,740	0.21	-1.40
03411	49,580	12,465	0.25	-0.77
03412	31,701	9,126	0.29	-0.25
03413	43,149	12,970	0.30	-0.07
03414	49,124	13,436	0.27	-0.45
03501	28,599	8,769	0.31	0.02
03502	38,920	9,773	0.25	-0.77
03503	26,772	8,700	0.32	0.28
03504	26,341	10,273	0.39	1.20
03505	39,331	11,782	0.30	-0.08
03506	27,935	13,198	0.47	2.38
03507	14,191	5,923	0.42	1.59
03508	13,565	7,463	0.55	3.48
03509	34,224	13,696	0.40	1.35
03510	39,978	11,722	0.29	-0.17
03511	10,919	5,329	0.49	2.60
03512	23,552	8,878	0.38	1.02
03513	40,682	15,084	0.37	0.93
03514	14,407	5,053	0.35	0.65
03515	22,166	7,721	0.35	0.61
03516	24,486	9,614	0.39	1.24
03517	30,805	8,665	0.28	-0.34
03518	17,865	6,357	0.36	0.72
03519	21,464	5,851	0.27	-0.47
<b>Mean</b>			0.31	
<b>SD</b>			0.07	

Source: US Census 2005-2007 PUMS

#### 4.2 Affordability is measured by rent burdened households.

PUMA	Total HH Renters	Rent Burdened	% Rent Burdened	ZScore
03001	7,520	3,218	0.43	0.11
03002	4,482	1,674	0.37	-0.67
03003	12,964	5,078	0.39	-0.41
03004	6,716	2,461	0.37	-0.77
03005	12,171	6,075	0.50	1.12
03006	7,812	2,783	0.36	-0.91
03101	9,291	2,638	0.28	-1.95
03102	13,451	6,006	0.45	0.37
03103	5,386	2,350	0.44	0.23
03104	5,011	2,150	0.43	0.12
03201	15,289	5,529	0.36	-0.84
03202	9,594	3,470	0.36	-0.84
03203	9,849	3,302	0.34	-1.21
03204	10,991	4,300	0.39	-0.42
03205	8,769	2,976	0.34	-1.16
03206	15,862	6,401	0.40	-0.24
03301	5,909	2,373	0.40	-0.27
03302	15,786	5,689	0.36	-0.86
03303	12,666	4,612	0.36	-0.80
03304	6,009	2,612	0.43	0.20
03305	4,322	1,499	0.35	-1.05
03401	9,402	2,833	0.30	-1.70
03402	16,371	6,024	0.37	-0.75
03403	23,072	7,861	0.34	-1.14
03404	14,228	5,312	0.37	-0.67
03405	19,480	8,216	0.42	0.02
03406	12,818	5,120	0.40	-0.30
03407	17,353	6,817	0.39	-0.39
03408	23,879	9,800	0.41	-0.14
03409	10,880	4,466	0.41	-0.14
03410	6,907	3,165	0.46	0.54
03411	15,199	5,977	0.39	-0.39
03412	8,046	3,343	0.42	-0.07
03413	18,973	9,143	0.48	0.88
03414	11,145	5,343	0.48	0.84
03501	50,862	21,869	0.43	0.14
03502	41,571	13,362	0.32	-1.41
03503	27,025	10,651	0.39	-0.37
03504	21,952	9,281	0.42	0.03
03505	11,618	4,662	0.40	-0.27
03506	20,822	9,835	0.47	0.74
03507	18,584	10,401	0.56	1.99
03508	25,615	15,319	0.60	2.53
03509	47,098	20,025	0.43	0.07
03510	36,927	13,779	0.37	-0.67
03511	17,049	8,000	0.47	0.70
03512	23,337	11,338	0.49	0.93
03513	18,158	10,058	0.55	1.91
03514	30,445	13,352	0.44	0.26
03515	43,323	22,639	0.52	1.46
03516	23,296	12,918	0.55	1.91
03517	4,557	1,946	0.43	0.10
03518	11,608	6,686	0.58	2.22
03519	12,482	6,443	0.52	1.37
<b>Mean</b>			0.42	
<b>SD</b>			0.07	

Source: US Census 2005-2007 PUMS

### 4.3 Housing instability is measured by foreclosure risk.

PUMA	Estimated Number of Mortgages	Estimated Foreclosure Risk	Foreclosure Risk Rate	Zscore
03001	33,202	1,452	0.04	-0.47
03002	46,769	1,713	0.04	-0.73
03003	45,157	2,616	0.06	0.07
03004	34,781	980	0.03	-1.05
03005	30,771	2,265	0.07	0.66
03006	65,164	2,590	0.04	-0.62
03101	24,687	1,446	0.06	0.09
03102	31,289	2,190	0.07	0.53
03103	55,656	2,442	0.04	-0.46
03104	90,688	4,502	0.05	-0.24
03201	62,058	2,345	0.04	-0.69
03202	24,844	590	0.02	-1.22
03203	28,276	787	0.03	-1.07
03204	34,623	863	0.02	-1.18
03205	28,305	899	0.03	-0.92
03206	52,822	2,443	0.05	-0.37
03301	20,072	459	0.02	-1.25
03302	22,311	1,744	0.08	0.84
03303	65,154	2,875	0.04	-0.45
03304	33,081	1,058	0.03	-0.91
03305	33,351	789	0.02	-1.22
03401	33,175	1,051	0.03	-0.92
03402	71,007	3,097	0.04	-0.47
03403	60,787	1,984	0.03	-0.88
03404	56,587	1,733	0.03	-0.96
03405	55,438	1,652	0.03	-0.99
03406	28,923	1,532	0.05	-0.12
03407	45,713	3,111	0.07	0.45
03408	43,163	2,702	0.06	0.25
03409	34,133	1,668	0.05	-0.27
03410	40,906	1,388	0.03	-0.84
03411	40,382	2,466	0.06	0.19
03412	29,464	2,186	0.07	0.68
03413	40,842	4,568	0.11	2.11
03414	44,108	4,079	0.09	1.38
03501	33,597	1,347	0.04	-0.60
03502	40,469	978	0.02	-1.20
03503	28,952	1,236	0.04	-0.51
03504	27,202	1,327	0.05	-0.27
03505	31,848	1,433	0.04	-0.42
03506	33,386	2,239	0.07	0.42
03507	20,435	2,078	0.10	1.72
03508	22,438	2,225	0.10	1.63
03509	48,538	2,221	0.05	-0.39
03510	59,362	1,914	0.03	-0.90
03511	9,341	730	0.08	0.83
03512	24,226	1,762	0.07	0.63
03513	46,656	3,738	0.08	0.91
03514	16,592	1,209	0.07	0.63
03515	24,457	2,549	0.10	1.82
03516	26,046	3,033	0.12	2.28
03517	28,157	2,078	0.07	0.67
03518	16,597	1,911	0.12	2.23
03519	17,279	1,691	0.10	1.58
Mean			0.06	
SD			0.03	

Source: HUD NSP 2008

#### 4.4 Housing market condition is measured by vacancy.

PUMA	Residential Addresses	90+ days Vacant	% 90 day Vacant	Zscore
03001	45,020	762	0.02	-0.90
03002	50,316	594	0.01	-1.10
03003	55,611	2,306	0.04	0.03
03004	46,679	872	0.02	-0.83
03005	42,041	1,537	0.04	-0.15
03006	77,435	664	0.01	-1.22
03101	35,904	554	0.02	-0.96
03102	49,366	2,116	0.04	0.09
03103	68,175	766	0.01	-1.12
03104	77,845	608	0.01	-1.25
03201	77,263	1,147	0.01	-0.98
03202	32,659	787	0.02	-0.63
03203	48,017	1,094	0.02	-0.68
03204	62,056	1,581	0.03	-0.58
03205	51,901	1,740	0.03	-0.27
03206	72,867	1,893	0.03	-0.56
03301	35,040	1,536	0.04	0.12
03302	46,708	2,863	0.06	0.79
03303	86,748	1,843	0.02	-0.74
03304	47,063	1,200	0.03	-0.57
03305	40,763	572	0.01	-1.01
03401	51,027	1,658	0.03	-0.31
03402	86,732	2,434	0.03	-0.48
03403	103,797	2,636	0.03	-0.58
03404	90,297	2,807	0.03	-0.36
03405	93,014	3,350	0.04	-0.17
03406	45,652	1,325	0.03	-0.44
03407	67,673	2,930	0.04	0.10
03408	60,419	1,811	0.03	-0.40
03409	56,276	1,830	0.03	-0.31
03410	66,698	599	0.01	-1.20
03411	69,521	1,796	0.03	-0.56
03412	42,320	1,297	0.03	-0.38
03413	67,776	4,546	0.07	1.01
03414	65,300	2,755	0.04	0.06
03501	87,271	4,920	0.06	0.60
03502	94,805	3,323	0.04	-0.21
03503	58,304	3,581	0.06	0.79
03504	48,025	2,336	0.05	0.31
03505	51,097	1,071	0.02	-0.75
03506	42,924	1,610	0.04	-0.12
03507	29,815	2,133	0.07	1.18
03508	36,586	3,927	0.11	2.54
03509	68,681	3,769	0.05	0.54
03510	101,074	4,105	0.04	0.00
03511	19,411	965	0.05	0.35
03512	39,476	2,303	0.06	0.67
03513	57,579	2,483	0.04	0.10
03514	53,885	5,090	0.09	2.05
03515	70,408	7,404	0.11	2.45
03516	49,877	4,856	0.10	2.16
03517	35,564	921	0.03	-0.56
03518	33,754	3,736	0.11	2.66
03519	33,313	2,902	0.09	1.77
Mean			0.04	
SD			0.03	

Source: HUD NSP 2008

#### 4.5 Availability of affordable low-income housing as measured by Housing Choice Voucher usage.

PUMA	Households	Voucher Holders	% of Voucher Holders	ZScore
03001	37,271	575	0.02	-0.11
03002	38,259	136	0.00	-0.67
03003	46,892	597	0.01	-0.23
03004	37,548	43	0.00	-0.78
03005	37,118	4	0.00	-0.83
03006	45,014	344	0.01	-0.47
03101	30,148	78	0.00	-0.71
03102	40,338	619	0.02	-0.11
03103	46,469	124	0.00	-0.71
03104	50,587	260	0.01	-0.59
03201	66,744	462	0.01	-0.51
03202	42,496	436	0.01	-0.35
03203	43,477	315	0.01	-0.49
03204	56,543	453	0.01	-0.46
03205	47,033	315	0.01	-0.52
03206	69,308	586	0.01	-0.44
03301	33,616	214	0.01	-0.53
03302	42,784	1,563	0.04	0.89
03303	67,672	1,120	0.02	-0.05
03304	37,344	194	0.01	-0.59
03305	34,881	97	0.00	-0.70
03401	46,619	265	0.01	-0.57
03402	78,992	592	0.01	-0.48
03403	98,868	618	0.01	-0.54
03404	83,279	402	0.00	-0.61
03405	87,704	909	0.01	-0.35
03406	44,633	96	0.00	-0.73
03407	66,608	804	0.01	-0.26
03408	65,896	807	0.01	-0.26
03409	53,550	270	0.01	-0.60
03410	58,782	81	0.00	-0.77
03411	66,496	487	0.01	-0.49
03412	38,590	682	0.02	0.00
03413	64,690	2,762	0.04	1.18
03414	57,774	1,729	0.03	0.58
03501	87,043	1,165	0.01	-0.20
03502	92,736	205	0.00	-0.73
03503	58,938	613	0.01	-0.34
03504	51,432	552	0.01	-0.33
03505	51,989	132	0.00	-0.71
03506	49,717	818	0.02	-0.06
03507	35,251	2,195	0.06	2.10
03508	43,676	3,561	0.08	3.01
03509	85,174	1,499	0.02	0.00
03510	77,250	841	0.01	-0.32
03511	32,010	157	0.00	-0.60
03512	52,612	577	0.01	-0.32
03513	62,416	1,369	0.02	0.20
03514	52,368	2,760	0.05	1.65
03515	70,001	5,487	0.08	2.86
03516	53,108	4,106	0.08	2.81
03517	36,265	633	0.02	-0.01
03518	33,562	2,441	0.07	2.60
03519	36,152	1,591	0.04	1.24
Mean			0.02	
SD			0.02	

Source: HUD 50058

**5.1 Education support is measured by high school drop out rate.**

<b>PUMA</b>	<b>Avg HS Drop Out</b>	<b>Zscore</b>
03001	5.32	-0.90
03002	5.28	-0.90
03003	11.80	-0.36
03004	4.55	-0.96
03005	22.95	0.57
03006	5.04	-0.92
03101	7.24	-0.74
03102	19.10	0.25
03103	6.90	-0.77
03104	4.60	-0.96
03201	1.83	-1.19
03202	3.40	-1.06
03203	6.30	-0.82
03204	2.80	-1.11
03205	6.50	-0.80
03206	6.98	-0.76
03301	1.60	-1.21
03302	26.50	0.86
03303	5.02	-0.92
03304	4.05	-1.00
03305	3.80	-1.02
03401	5.05	-0.92
03402	10.50	-0.47
03403	5.33	-0.90
03404	4.44	-0.97
03405	5.55	-0.88
03406	9.15	-0.58
03407	13.33	-0.23
03408	19.27	0.26
03409	10.03	-0.51
03410	3.80	-1.02
03411	11.60	-0.38
03412	10.30	-0.48
03413	19.84	0.31
03414	13.78	-0.19
03501	35.60	1.62
03502	11.50	-0.38
03503	17.75	0.13
03504	25.23	0.75
03505	25.10	0.74
03506	35.00	1.57
03507	40.35	2.01
03508	31.88	1.31
03509	35.43	1.60
03510	23.92	0.65
03511	30.70	1.21
03512	36.48	1.69
03513	33.80	1.47
03514	28.83	1.05
03515	37.65	1.79
03516	31.28	1.26
03517	21.97	0.48
03518	29.44	1.10
03519	35.55	1.61
<b>Mean</b>		
<b>SD</b>		

Source: Illinois Stated Board of Education School Report Cards 2008

**5.2 Education stability is measure by school mobility.**

<b>PUMA</b>	<b>Average Mobility</b>	<b>ZScore</b>
03001	11.03	-0.95
03002	7.11	-1.57
03003	17.35	0.04
03004	11.69	-0.85
03005	18.76	0.26
03006	13.00	-0.65
03101	13.58	-0.55
03102	18.23	0.18
03103	7.63	-1.49
03104	10.06	-1.11
03201	12.79	-0.68
03202	15.47	-0.26
03203	11.76	-0.84
03204	10.51	-1.03
03205	16.18	-0.15
03206	14.55	-0.40
03301	15.71	-0.22
03302	18.19	0.17
03303	11.73	-0.84
03304	13.40	-0.58
03305	7.27	-1.54
03401	13.37	-0.59
03402	16.02	-0.17
03403	11.11	-0.94
03404	11.88	-0.82
03405	12.39	-0.74
03406	15.23	-0.30
03407	16.94	-0.03
03408	17.47	0.06
03409	14.16	-0.46
03410	9.02	-1.27
03411	17.59	0.08
03412	18.01	0.14
03413	19.72	0.41
03414	21.10	0.62
03501	24.47	1.15
03502	16.35	-0.12
03503	15.34	-0.28
03504	18.00	0.14
03505	11.62	-0.86
03506	20.41	0.52
03507	27.11	1.57
03508	26.43	1.46
03509	20.26	0.49
03510	19.28	0.34
03511	18.82	0.27
03512	24.16	1.11
03513	20.69	0.56
03514	29.73	1.98
03515	31.14	2.20
03516	33.11	2.51
03517	14.66	-0.38
03518	34.91	2.79
03519	27.62	1.65
<b>Mean</b>		
<b>SD</b>		

Source: Illinois Stated Board of Education School Report Cards 2008

**6.1 Environmental space is measured by park space per capita.**

PUMA	Total Population	Sum of Acres	Ratio	Zscore
03001	118,519	849	0.007	-1.19
03002	145,029	1,065	0.007	-1.26
03003	165,044	791	0.005	-0.26
03004	134,815	1,592	0.012	-3.00
03005	127,011	675	0.005	-0.47
03006	196,479	1,252	0.006	-0.88
03101	140,729	667	0.005	-0.24
03102	127,660	427	0.003	0.30
03103	190,785	993	0.005	-0.42
03104	240,778	1,543	0.006	-0.90
03201	215,958	1,525	0.007	-1.15
03202	117,004	658	0.006	-0.59
03203	118,966	767	0.006	-0.91
03204	147,799	946	0.006	-0.89
03205	124,094	778	0.006	-0.84
03206	204,265	1,366	0.007	-1.00
03301	102,740	600	0.006	-0.67
03302	133,429	620	0.005	-0.21
03303	231,954	1,134	0.005	-0.30
03304	123,176	1,023	0.008	-1.63
03305	112,407	1,112	0.010	-2.26
03401	126,819	772	0.006	-0.77
03402	229,736	1,411	0.006	-0.79
03403	250,671	1,291	0.005	-0.40
03404	223,349	1,078	0.005	-0.28
03405	236,090	1,049	0.004	-0.13
03406	122,294	136	0.001	1.17
03407	185,463	331	0.002	0.91
03408	192,342	195	0.001	1.21
03409	151,788	595	0.004	0.08
03410	176,653	1,035	0.006	-0.68
03411	177,430	459	0.003	0.60
03412	115,844	441	0.004	0.12
03413	187,097	611	0.003	0.33
03414	172,361	816	0.005	-0.24
03501	168,589	119	0.001	1.33
03502	154,326	193	0.001	1.12
03503	139,071	245	0.002	0.92
03504	145,109	253	0.002	0.93
03505	134,777	137	0.001	1.21
03506	159,924	155	0.001	1.23
03507	107,913	206	0.002	0.86
03508	133,726	333	0.002	0.64
03509	222,969	89	0.000	1.45
03510	144,468	473	0.003	0.33
03511	118,368	67	0.001	1.39
03512	163,813	203	0.001	1.12
03513	206,336	388	0.002	0.87
03514	104,353	593	0.006	-0.61
03515	163,468	184	0.001	1.17
03516	162,941	260	0.002	0.98
03517	105,848	218	0.002	0.80
03518	94,637	187	0.002	0.84
03519	109,588	147	0.001	1.08
Mean			0.004	
SD			0.003	

Source: CMAP Land Use dataset 2005 Classification 3100

## 6.2 Healthy housing is measured by estimated lead risk in housing.

PUMA	Total Households	Estimated Housing with Lead Risks	% of Housing with Lead Risks	Zscore
03001	22,629	7,780	0.34	-0.30
03002	16,961	5,120	0.30	-0.64
03003	31,944	12,029	0.38	-0.04
03004	19,925	6,063	0.30	-0.62
03005	34,061	13,117	0.39	0.03
03006	26,220	8,986	0.34	-0.31
03101	28,447	9,611	0.34	-0.35
03102	33,145	12,831	0.39	0.05
03103	22,003	5,854	0.27	-0.93
03104	18,169	3,251	0.18	-1.63
03201	26,422	5,964	0.23	-1.26
03202	30,145	8,774	0.29	-0.73
03203	27,672	4,948	0.18	-1.64
03204	38,399	10,266	0.27	-0.92
03205	38,217	13,000	0.34	-0.33
03206	48,963	10,480	0.21	-1.35
03301	25,660	9,820	0.38	0.01
03302	33,997	13,402	0.39	0.11
03303	33,567	10,706	0.32	-0.50
03304	20,791	5,808	0.28	-0.82
03305	14,982	2,638	0.18	-1.66
03401	31,858	6,891	0.22	-1.33
03402	47,782	7,739	0.16	-1.77
03403	74,085	16,396	0.22	-1.29
03404	69,101	20,815	0.30	-0.65
03405	81,517	37,557	0.46	0.64
03406	42,116	15,115	0.36	-0.18
03407	65,390	30,263	0.46	0.66
03408	66,417	37,825	0.57	1.52
03409	45,230	16,770	0.37	-0.08
03410	28,139	6,650	0.24	-1.17
03411	58,296	20,148	0.35	-0.29
03412	29,969	7,359	0.25	-1.10
03413	60,568	20,393	0.34	-0.36
03414	49,106	15,322	0.31	-0.56
03501	86,411	41,994	0.49	0.85
03502	73,072	34,076	0.47	0.69
03503	57,286	30,432	0.53	1.21
03504	50,301	28,542	0.57	1.51
03505	48,167	21,576	0.45	0.54
03506	51,910	28,882	0.56	1.42
03507	38,109	20,685	0.54	1.31
03508	49,077	28,552	0.58	1.62
03509	82,271	49,285	0.60	1.76
03510	56,018	21,359	0.38	0.00
03511	33,118	19,722	0.60	1.73
03512	51,051	28,432	0.56	1.42
03513	61,447	28,511	0.46	0.67
03514	50,339	22,992	0.46	0.61
03515	76,341	39,615	0.52	1.11
03516	56,265	29,550	0.53	1.16
03517	36,208	16,068	0.44	0.51
03518	35,016	16,655	0.48	0.76
03519	36,810	18,223	0.50	0.92
Mean			0.38	
SD			0.12	

Source: National Survey of Lead Final Report,

vol.1; Analysis of Lead Hazards, Westat for HUD; NIEHS, Revision 6.0 April 2001

## Appendix D: Zoning codes and definitions

---

Table 3 Cook County Zoning Codes

<b>CODE</b>	<b>Title</b>
RS -	Residential Single-Unit District (Detached)
RT -	Residential Two-Flat, Townhouse, and Multi-Unit Districts
RM -	Residential Multi-Unit District
B1 -	Neighborhood Shopping District
B2 -	Neighborhood Mixed-Use District
B3 -	Community Shopping District
C1 -	Neighborhood Commercial District
C2 -	Motor Vehicle-Related Commercial District
C3 -	Commercial, Manufacturing, and Employment District
M1 -	Limited Manufacturing/Business Park District
M2 -	Light Industry District
M3 -	Heavy Industrial District
POS -	Parks & Open Space District
PD -	Planned Development District
PMD -	Planned Manufacturing District

**Table 4 Zoning within ¼ mile of proposed stations at the Red Line and Orange Line.**

1/4 mile	103rd St	111th St	116th St	130th St	Ford City	Front Setbacks	mixed use (of res. & com.)	Residential parking (off-street)	Commercial parking (off street)	Residential density (max)	Commercial density (max)
RS -	x	x	x	x	x	avg. setback of 2 adjacent lots	No	1 to 2/unit		2,500-6,250 sf/unit at 0.5-0.9 FAR	
RT -		x				15 ft (or 12% lot depth) or avg. setback of 2 adjacent lots	No	1/unit		1,000-1,250 sf/unit at 1.2 to 1.5 FAR	same
RM -			x			15 ft (or 12% lot depth) or avg. setback of 2 adjacent lots	Yes	1/unit		135-700 sf/unit at 1.7-6.6 FAR	same
B1 -		x		x	x	none, or 50% of adjacent residential setback	Yes	1/unit	None for first 4,000 sf, then min. 1.66 spaces/1,000 sf	1,325-2,500 sf/unit at 1.2-1.5 FAR	1.2-1.5 FAR
B2 -						none, or 50% of adjacent residential setback	Yes	1/unit	None for first 4,000 sf, then min. 1.66 spaces/1,000 sf	700-1,000 sf/unit at 2.2 FAR	2.2 FAR
B3 -	x	x	x		x	none, or 50% of adjacent residential setback	Yes	1/unit	None for first 10,000 sf, then min. 1.66 spaces/1,000 sf	200-400 sf/unit at 3.0 FAR	3.0 FAR
C1 -	x	x	x			none, or 50% of adjacent residential setback	Yes	1/unit	None for first 4,000 sf, then min. 1.66 spaces/1,000 sf	1,325-2,500 sf/unit at 1.2-1.5 FAR	1.2-1.5 FAR
C2 -	x		x			none, or 50% of adjacent residential setback	Yes	1/unit	None for first 4,000 sf, then min. 1.66 spaces/1,000 sf	700-1,000 sf/unit at 2.2 FAR	2.2 FAR
C3 -						none, or 50% of adjacent residential setback	No		None for first 10,000 sf, then min. 1.66 spaces/1,000 sf	200-400 sf/unit at 3.0 FAR	3.0 FAR
M1 -	x	x	x			min 10 ft	No		gen. None for first 10,000 sf, then min. 1.66 spaces/1,000 sf		1.2 FAR
M2 -						min 10 ft	No		gen. None for first 10,000 sf, then min. 1.66 spaces/1,000 sf		2.2 FAR
M3 -				x		min 10 ft	No		gen. None for first 10,000 sf, then min. 1.66 spaces/1,000 sf		3.0 FAR
POS -	x				x	none, or 50% of adjacent residential setback	No		?		as appvd by jurisdiction
PD -	x				x	per parcel zoning prior to designation	Yes	per ordinance	per ordinance	per parcel zoning prior to designation	per parcel zoning prior to designation
PMD -						min 10 ft	No		same as M1-M3		2.2-7.0 FAR

**Table 5 Skokie zoning codes, 2009**

<b>Code</b>	<b>Title</b>
R1	Single-Family
R2	Single-Family
R3	Two-Family
R4	General
R5	Elderly and Disabled Housing
NX	Neighborhood Mixed-Use
TX	Transit Mixed-Use
CX	Core Mixed-Use
B1	Service Commercial
B2	Commercial
B3	Business
B4	Regional Shopping
B6	Downtown Science and Technology
H1	Hospital
M1	Office Assembly Industry
M2	Light Industry
M3	Industry
OR	Office Research

**Table 6 Zoning within ¼ mile of proposed stations at the Yellow Line**

1/4 mile	Dempster/ Skokie	Old Orchard	Front setbacks	Mixed use (of res. & com.)	Residential parking (off street)	Commercial parking (off street)	Residential density (max)	Commercial density (max)
R1		x	min 25 feet	No	2 spaces/unit		6,600 sf/unit at .6 FAR	
R2	x	x	min 25 feet	No	2 spaces/unit		4,800 sf/unit at .6 FAR	
R3	x	x	min 25 feet	No	2 spaces/unit		2,400- 4,800 sf/unit	
R4	x	x	min 20-25 feet	No	2 spaces/unit		2,200- 4,800 sf/unit	40% coverage
R5	x		per code and approval	No	1 space/1-3 units		per approval	
NX			none required	Yes	1-1.5 spaces/unit		1.4-2.75 FAR	1.4-2.75 FAR, max height 39 feet
TX			none required	Yes	1-1.5 spaces/unit		2.0-5.0 FAR	2.0-5.0 FAR, max height 75 feet
CX			nonrequired	Yes	1.25 spaces/unit	2 spaces/1000 sf	2.5-9.0 FAR	2.5-9.0 FAR, max height 156 feet
B1	x		none required (beyond landscaping & sidewalk - 10ft)	No		1 space/100- 400 sf		full lot coverage minus setbacks, max height 25 feet
B2	x	x	none required	No		1 space/100- 400 sf		full lot coverage minus setbacks, max height 30-40 feet
B3		x	none required	No		1 space/100- 400 sf		2.0-5.0 FAR, max height 30-60 feet
B4			none required	No		5 spaces/1,000 sf		full lot coverage minus setbacks, max height 65- 175 feet
B6			none required	No		15% less than business requirement in other areas		full lot coverage minus setbacks, height 40-180 feet
H1			50-160 feet	No		per approval		50% lot coverage, max height 91 feet
M1	x		50 feet	No		1 space/300- 1,500 sf		50% lot coverage, max height 45-120 feet

## Appendix E: U.S. Census and Local Employment Dynamics, *OnTheMap Version 3*

### Red Line Extension

Table 7 Red Line Extension Commute Shed of residents living within 1 mile radius of all proposed stations.

<u>Total All Jobs</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Total All Jobs	25,408	100.0%

<u>Job counts in Cities/Towns Where Workers are Employed</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Chicago, Illinois	15,300	60.2%
Oak Lawn, Illinois	364	1.4%
Blue Island, Illinois	221	0.9%
Aurora, Illinois	220	0.9%
Alsip, Illinois	215	0.8%
Bedford Park, Illinois	211	0.8%
Lansing, Illinois	198	0.8%
Schaumburg, Illinois	193	0.8%
Countryside, Illinois	187	0.7%
Evergreen Park, Illinois	177	0.7%
All Other Locations	8,122	32.0%

<u>Job counts in Counties Where Workers are Employed</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Cook Co., Illinois	21,857	86.0%
DuPage Co., Illinois	1,457	5.7%
Will Co., Illinois	401	1.6%
Lake Co., Illinois	399	1.6%
Kane Co., Illinois	301	1.2%
Lake Co., Indiana	215	0.8%
Kankakee Co., Illinois	74	0.3%
Winnebago Co., Illinois	69	0.3%
McHenry Co., Illinois	64	0.3%
Marion Co., Indiana	30	0.1%
All Other Locations	541	2.1%

<u>Job counts in States Where Workers are Employed</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Illinois	24,887	97.9%
Indiana	340	1.3%
Wisconsin	61	0.2%
Michigan	54	0.2%
Iowa	17	0.1%
All Other Locations	49	0.2%

Table 7, continued

<u>Total All Jobs</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Total All Jobs	25,408	100.0%

  

<u>Jobs by Worker Age</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Age 30 or younger	6,368	25.1%
Age 31 to 54	14,380	56.6%
Age 55 or older	4,660	18.3%

  

<u>Jobs by Earnings Paid</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
\$1,200 per month or less	8,479	33.4%
\$1,201 to \$3,400 per month	11,516	45.3%
More than \$3,400 per month	5,413	21.3%

  

<u>Jobs by Industry Type (2-digit NAICS)</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	18	0.1%
Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction	6	0.0%
Utilities	51	0.2%
Construction	492	1.9%
Manufacturing	1,721	6.8%
Wholesale Trade	871	3.4%
Retail Trade	2,587	10.2%
Transportation and Warehousing	1,692	6.7%
Information	551	2.2%
Finance and Insurance	1,647	6.5%
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	571	2.2%
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	1,593	6.3%
Management of Companies and Enterprises	305	1.2%
Administration & Support, Waste Management and Remediation	2,319	9.1%
Educational Services	2,501	9.8%
Health Care and Social Assistance	4,240	16.7%
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	492	1.9%
Accommodation and Food Services	2,301	9.1%
Other Services (excluding Public Administration)	976	3.8%
Public Administration	474	1.9%

Table 8 Red Line Extension Labor Shed of residents traveling to within 1 mile radius of all proposed stations for employment.

<u>Total All Jobs</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Total All Jobs	7,705	100.0%

<u>Job counts in Cities/Towns Where Workers Live</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Chicago, Illinois	3,658	47.5%
Calumet City, Illinois	182	2.4%
Lansing, Illinois	130	1.7%
Hammond, Indiana	128	1.7%
Harvey, Illinois	111	1.4%
Dolton, Illinois	111	1.4%
South Holland, Illinois	99	1.3%
Tinley Park, Illinois	92	1.2%
Riverdale, Illinois	89	1.2%
Oak Lawn, Illinois	72	0.9%
All Other Locations	3,033	39.4%

<u>Job counts in Counties Where Workers Live</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Cook Co., Illinois	6,040	78.4%
Lake Co., Indiana	438	5.7%
Will Co., Illinois	299	3.9%
DuPage Co., Illinois	188	2.4%
Lake Co., Illinois	92	1.2%
Kankakee Co., Illinois	62	0.8%
Kane Co., Illinois	52	0.7%
Porter Co., Indiana	40	0.5%
McHenry Co., Illinois	39	0.5%
Grundy Co., Illinois	35	0.5%
All Other Locations	420	5.5%

<u>Job counts in States Where Workers Live</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Illinois	7,136	92.6%
Indiana	518	6.7%
Wisconsin	13	0.2%
Michigan	10	0.1%
Kentucky	9	0.1%
All Other Locations	19	0.2%

Table 8, continued

<u>Total All Jobs</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Total All Jobs	7,705	100.0%

  

<u>Jobs by Worker Age</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Age 30 or younger	1,618	21.0%
Age 31 to 54	4,355	56.5%
Age 55 or older	1,732	22.5%

  

<u>Jobs by Earnings Paid</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
\$1,200 per month or less	2,062	26.8%
\$1,201 to \$3,400 per month	2,983	38.7%
More than \$3,400 per month	2,660	34.5%

  

<u>Jobs by Industry Type (2-digit NAICS)</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	0	0.0%
Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction	0	0.0%
Utilities	234	3.0%
Construction	144	1.9%
Manufacturing	730	9.5%
Wholesale Trade	380	4.9%
Retail Trade	837	10.9%
Transportation and Warehousing	982	12.7%
Information	266	3.5%
Finance and Insurance	68	0.9%
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	111	1.4%
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	109	1.4%
Management of Companies and Enterprises	3	0.0%
Administration & Support, Waste Management and Remediation	213	2.8%
Educational Services	1,620	21.0%
Health Care and Social Assistance	1,366	17.7%
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	5	0.1%
Accommodation and Food Services	371	4.8%
Other Services (excluding Public Administration)	266	3.5%
Public Administration	0	0.0%

Red Line Extension

**QWI Indicators - Private Sector Jobs**

**2006**

	<b>Count</b>	<b>Share</b>
<b>Number of Employers</b>	385	100.0%
<b>Employment (Beginning-of-2nd quarter)</b>	3,148	100.0%
<b>Employment, Stable Jobs</b>	2,784	100.0%
<b>Separations, Stable Jobs</b>	212	100.0%
<b>New Hires, Stable Jobs</b>	314	100.0%
<b>Firm Job Gain</b>	140	100.0%
<b>Firm Job Loss</b>	76	100.0%
<b>Employment (reference quarter)</b>	3,724	100.0%
<b>Average Monthly Earnings, Stable Jobs</b>	2,247	100.0%
<b>Average Monthly Earnings Separations from Stable Jobs</b>	1,029	100.0%
<b>Average Monthly Earnings, New Hires, Stable Jobs</b>	1,808	100.0%

*Quarterly Workforce Indicators (QWI) in OnTheMap are considered to be experimental. For the latest and most accurate QWI statistics, use the QWI Online application at <http://lehd.did.census.gov>.*

*Job counts and average earnings measures that are subject to item suppression at the block-level do not contribute to estimates for the selected area in this report. To the extent that the selected area in the QWI Report is affected by item suppression, job counts in the QWI Report will be lower than the corresponding job counts in the Shed Report.*

*Orange Line Extension*

Table 9 Orange Line Extension Commute Shed of residents living within 1 mile radius of proposed station.

<u>Total All Jobs</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Total All Jobs	4,488	100.0%

<u>Job counts in Cities/Towns Where Workers are Employed</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Chicago, Illinois	1,970	43.9%
Bedford Park, Illinois	200	4.5%
Oak Lawn, Illinois	140	3.1%
Burbank, Illinois	129	2.9%
Bridgeview, Illinois	73	1.6%
Alsip, Illinois	64	1.4%
Orland Park, Illinois	53	1.2%
Cicero, Illinois	52	1.2%
Countryside, Illinois	42	0.9%
Bolingbrook, Illinois	42	0.9%
All Other Locations	1,723	38.4%

<u>Job counts in Counties Where Workers are Employed</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Cook Co., Illinois	3,728	83.1%
DuPage Co., Illinois	380	8.5%
Will Co., Illinois	140	3.1%
Lake Co., Illinois	74	1.6%
Kane Co., Illinois	45	1.0%
Lake Co., Indiana	19	0.4%
Winnebago Co., Illinois	16	0.4%
Sangamon Co., Illinois	13	0.3%
McHenry Co., Illinois	6	0.1%
McLean Co., Illinois	5	0.1%
All Other Locations	62	1.4%

<u>Job counts in States Where Workers are Employed</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Illinois	4,438	98.9%
Indiana	31	0.7%
Wisconsin	12	0.3%
Michigan	2	0.0%
South Carolina	1	0.0%
All Other Locations	4	0.1%

Table 9, continued

<b><u>Total All Jobs</u></b>	<b>2006</b>	
	<b>Count</b>	<b>Share</b>
<b>Total All Jobs</b>	4,487	100.0%

  

<b><u>Jobs by Worker Age</u></b>	<b>2006</b>	
	<b>Count</b>	<b>Share</b>
<b>Age 30 or younger</b>	1,243	27.7%
<b>Age 31 to 54</b>	2,624	58.5%
<b>Age 55 or older</b>	620	13.8%

  

<b><u>Jobs by Earnings Paid</u></b>	<b>2006</b>	
	<b>Count</b>	<b>Share</b>
<b>\$1,200 per month or less</b>	1,214	27.1%
<b>\$1,201 to \$3,400 per month</b>	1,823	40.6%
<b>More than \$3,400 per month</b>	1,450	32.3%

  

<b><u>Jobs by Industry Type (2-digit NAICS)</u></b>	<b>2006</b>	
	<b>Count</b>	<b>Share</b>
<b>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting</b>	2	0.0%
<b>Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction</b>	4	0.1%
<b>Utilities</b>	13	0.3%
<b>Construction</b>	221	4.9%
<b>Manufacturing</b>	678	15.1%
<b>Wholesale Trade</b>	256	5.7%
<b>Retail Trade</b>	500	11.1%
<b>Transportation and Warehousing</b>	280	6.2%
<b>Information</b>	84	1.9%
<b>Finance and Insurance</b>	259	5.8%
<b>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</b>	91	2.0%
<b>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</b>	269	6.0%
<b>Management of Companies and Enterprises</b>	62	1.4%
<b>Administration &amp; Support, Waste Management and Remediation</b>	364	8.1%
<b>Educational Services</b>	309	6.9%
<b>Health Care and Social Assistance</b>	463	10.3%
<b>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</b>	71	1.6%
<b>Accommodation and Food Services</b>	322	7.2%
<b>Other Services (excluding Public Administration)</b>	156	3.5%
<b>Public Administration</b>	83	1.8%

Table 10 Orange Line Extension Labor Shed of residents traveling to within 1 mile radius of all proposed stations for employment.

<u>Total All Jobs</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Total All Jobs	11,223	100.0%

<u>Job counts in Cities/Towns Where Workers Live</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
<u>Live</u>		
Chicago, Illinois	4,387	39.1%
Burbank, Illinois	351	3.1%
Oak Lawn, Illinois	250	2.2%
Naperville, Illinois	133	1.2%
Orland Park, Illinois	127	1.1%
Cicero, Illinois	120	1.1%
Joliet, Illinois	109	1.0%
Bridgeview, Illinois	101	0.9%
Aurora, Illinois	91	0.8%
Tinley Park, Illinois	88	0.8%
All Other Locations	5,466	48.7%

<u>Job counts in Counties Where Workers Live</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Cook Co., Illinois	8,079	72.0%
DuPage Co., Illinois	677	6.0%
Will Co., Illinois	638	5.7%
Lake Co., Illinois	343	3.1%
Lake Co., Indiana	240	2.1%
Kane Co., Illinois	201	1.8%
McHenry Co., Illinois	144	1.3%
Champaign Co., Illinois	126	1.1%
Winnebago Co., Illinois	89	0.8%
Kankakee Co., Illinois	73	0.7%
All Other Locations	613	5.5%

<u>Job counts in States Where Workers Live</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Illinois	10,883	97.0%
Indiana	272	2.4%
Wisconsin	51	0.5%
Michigan	13	0.1%
Iowa	3	0.0%
All Other Locations	1	0.0%

Table 10, continued

<u>Total All Jobs</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Total All Jobs	11,223	100.0%

  

<u>Jobs by Worker Age</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Age 30 or younger	3,854	34.3%
Age 31 to 54	5,597	49.9%
Age 55 or older	1,772	15.8%

  

<u>Jobs by Earnings Paid</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
\$1,200 per month or less	3,950	35.2%
\$1,201 to \$3,400 per month	4,559	40.6%
More than \$3,400 per month	2,714	24.2%

  

<u>Jobs by Industry Type (2-digit NAICS)</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	0	0.0%
Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction	0	0.0%
Utilities	24	0.2%
Construction	268	2.4%
Manufacturing	2,646	23.6%
Wholesale Trade	568	5.1%
Retail Trade	4,606	41.0%
Transportation and Warehousing	152	1.4%
Information	147	1.3%
Finance and Insurance	109	1.0%
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	838	7.5%
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	65	0.6%
Management of Companies and Enterprises	0	0.0%
Administration & Support, Waste Management and Remediation	170	1.5%
Educational Services	680	6.1%
Health Care and Social Assistance	115	1.0%
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	10	0.1%
Accommodation and Food Services	728	6.5%
Other Services (excluding Public Administration)	96	0.9%
Public Administration	1	0.0%

Orange Line Extension

<b><u>QWI Indicators - Private Sector Jobs</u></b>	<b>2006</b>	
	<b>Count</b>	<b>Share</b>
<b>Number of Employers</b>	308	100.0%
<b>Employment (Beginning-of-2nd quarter)</b>	9,899	100.0%
<b>Employment, Stable Jobs</b>	8,595	100.0%
<b>Separations, Stable Jobs</b>	851	100.0%
<b>New Hires, Stable Jobs</b>	998	100.0%
<b>Firm Job Gain</b>	326	100.0%
<b>Firm Job Loss</b>	296	100.0%
<b>Employment (reference quarter)</b>	11,743	100.0%
<b>Average Monthly Earnings, Stable Jobs</b>	2,738	100.0%
<b>Average Monthly Earnings Separations from Stable Jobs</b>	1,056	100.0%
<b>Average Monthly Earnings, New Hires, Stable Jobs</b>	1,838	100.0%

*Quarterly Workforce Indicators (QWI) in OnTheMap are considered to be experimental. For the latest and most accurate QWI statistics, use the QWI Online application at <http://lehd.did.census.gov>.*

*Job counts and average earnings measures that are subject to item suppression at the block-level do not contribute to estimates for the selected area in this report. To the extent that the selected area in the QWI Report is affected by item suppression, job counts in the QWI Report will be lower than the corresponding job counts in the Shed Report.*

*Yellow Line Extension*

Table 11 Yellow Line Extension Commute Shed of residents living within 1 mile radius of proposed station

<u>Total All Jobs</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Total All Jobs	5,794	100.0%

<u>Job counts in Cities/Towns Where Workers are Employed</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Chicago, Illinois	1,992	34.4%
Skokie, Illinois	516	8.9%
Evanston, Illinois	453	7.8%
Wilmette, Illinois	250	4.3%
Glenview, Illinois	204	3.5%
Northbrook, Illinois	158	2.7%
Niles, Illinois	116	2.0%
Schaumburg, Illinois	102	1.8%
Lincolnwood, Illinois	86	1.5%
Des Plaines, Illinois	81	1.4%
All Other Locations	1,836	31.7%

<u>Job counts in Counties Where Workers are Employed</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Cook Co., Illinois	4,848	83.7%
Lake Co., Illinois	471	8.1%
DuPage Co., Illinois	295	5.1%
Kane Co., Illinois	42	0.7%
Will Co., Illinois	17	0.3%
McHenry Co., Illinois	16	0.3%
Winnebago Co., Illinois	12	0.2%
Peoria Co., Illinois	11	0.2%
Kankakee Co., Illinois	7	0.1%
Kendall Co., Illinois	6	0.1%
All Other Locations	69	1.2%

<u>Job counts in States Where Workers are Employed</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Illinois	5,751	99.3%
Wisconsin	19	0.3%
Indiana	16	0.3%
Iowa	3	0.1%
Michigan	2	0.0%
All Other Locations	3	0.1%

Table 11, continued

<u>Total All Jobs</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Total All Jobs	5,794	100.0%

  

<u>Jobs by Worker Age</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Age 30 or younger	1,196	20.6%
Age 31 to 54	2,969	51.2%
Age 55 or older	1,629	28.1%

  

<u>Jobs by Earnings Paid</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
\$1,200 per month or less	1,609	27.8%
\$1,201 to \$3,400 per month	1,740	30.0%
More than \$3,400 per month	2,445	42.2%

  

<u>Jobs by Industry Type (2-digit NAICS)</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	3	0.1%
Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction	2	0.0%
Utilities	7	0.1%
Construction	156	2.7%
Manufacturing	385	6.6%
Wholesale Trade	281	4.8%
Retail Trade	682	11.8%
Transportation and Warehousing	130	2.2%
Information	162	2.8%
Finance and Insurance	373	6.4%
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	124	2.1%
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	484	8.4%
Management of Companies and Enterprises	126	2.2%
Administration & Support, Waste Management and Remediation	360	6.2%
Educational Services	609	10.5%
Health Care and Social Assistance	928	16.0%
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	153	2.6%
Accommodation and Food Services	432	7.5%
Other Services (excluding Public Administration)	265	4.6%
Public Administration	132	2.3%

Table 12 Yellow Line Extension Labor Shed of residents traveling to within 1 mile radius of all proposed stations for employment.

<u>Total All Jobs</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Total All Jobs	10,166	100.0%

<u>Job counts in Cities/Towns Where Workers Live</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Chicago, Illinois	3,178	31.3%
Skokie, Illinois	1,103	10.8%
Evanston, Illinois	408	4.0%
Glenview, Illinois	305	3.0%
Morton Grove, Illinois	261	2.6%
Wilmette, Illinois	233	2.3%
Northbrook, Illinois	168	1.7%
Niles, Illinois	161	1.6%
Des Plaines, Illinois	150	1.5%
Arlington Heights, Illinois	136	1.3%
All Other Locations	4,063	40.0%

<u>Job counts in Counties Where Workers Live</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Cook Co., Illinois	8,014	78.8%
Lake Co., Illinois	947	9.3%
DuPage Co., Illinois	443	4.4%
Will Co., Illinois	189	1.9%
McHenry Co., Illinois	156	1.5%
Kane Co., Illinois	155	1.5%
Winnebago Co., Illinois	32	0.3%
Kenosha Co., Wisconsin	30	0.3%
Lake Co., Indiana	29	0.3%
Kendall Co., Illinois	16	0.2%
All Other Locations	155	1.5%

<u>Job counts in States Where Workers Live</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Illinois	10,043	98.8%
Wisconsin	59	0.6%
Indiana	45	0.4%
Michigan	13	0.1%
Kentucky	3	0.0%
All Other Locations	3	0.0%

Table 12, continued

<u>Total All Jobs</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Total All Jobs	10,166	100.0%

  

<u>Jobs by Worker Age</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Age 30 or younger	2,951	29.0%
Age 31 to 54	5,499	54.1%
Age 55 or older	1,716	16.9%

  

<u>Jobs by Earnings Paid</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
\$1,200 per month or less	2,581	25.4%
\$1,201 to \$3,400 per month	4,118	40.5%
More than \$3,400 per month	3,467	34.1%

  

<u>Jobs by Industry Type (2-digit NAICS)</u>	2006	
	Count	Share
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	0	0.0%
Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction	0	0.0%
Utilities	0	0.0%
Construction	62	0.6%
Manufacturing	226	2.2%
Wholesale Trade	188	1.8%
Retail Trade	960	9.4%
Transportation and Warehousing	2	0.0%
Information	244	2.4%
Finance and Insurance	648	6.4%
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	145	1.4%
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	995	9.8%
Management of Companies and Enterprises	71	0.7%
Administration & Support, Waste Management and Remediation	1,548	15.2%
Educational Services	660	6.5%
Health Care and Social Assistance	2,977	29.3%
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	276	2.7%
Accommodation and Food Services	649	6.4%
Other Services (excluding Public Administration)	512	5.0%
Public Administration	3	0.0%

Yellow Line Extension

<b>QWI Indicators - Private Sector Jobs</b>	<b>2006</b>	
	<b>Count</b>	<b>Share</b>
<b>Number of Employers</b>	543	100.0%
<b>Employment (Beginning-of-2nd quarter)</b>	9,037	100.0%
<b>Employment, Stable Jobs</b>	7,876	100.0%
<b>Separations, Stable Jobs</b>	713	100.0%
<b>New Hires, Stable Jobs</b>	867	100.0%
<b>Firm Job Gain</b>	495	100.0%
<b>Firm Job Loss</b>	282	100.0%
<b>Employment (reference quarter)</b>	11,052	100.0%
<b>Average Monthly Earnings, Stable Jobs</b>	3,702	100.0%
<b>Average Monthly Earnings Separations from Stable Jobs</b>	1,583	100.0%
<b>Average Monthly Earnings, New Hires, Stable Jobs</b>	2,456	100.0%

*Quarterly Workforce Indicators (QWI) in OnTheMap are considered to be experimental. For the latest and most accurate QWI statistics, use the QWI Online application at <http://lehd.did.census.gov>.*

*Job counts and average earnings measures that are subject to item suppression at the block-level do not contribute to estimates for the selected area in this report. To the extent that the selected area in the QWI Report is affected by item suppression, job counts in the QWI Report will be lower than the corresponding job counts in the Shed Report.*

## Appendix F: Tax Increment Financing (TIF) and Special Service Area (SSA)

---

### Economic Incentives: TIF and SSA

Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is a funding tool through which growth in property taxes is used to promote private investment and capital improvement. TIF districts are commercial or other development areas designated as blighted and lacking in investment. When the property tax values rise in a TIF district, additional revenues are set aside for re-investment in the community for a 23-year period. Developers or organizations may apply to use such funds for associated costs of infrastructure, public facility improvements, development subsidies for new and redevelopment projects, job training, and day care services.<sup>24</sup>

Special Service Areas (SSA) are means through which single use areas pool their levied property taxes to fund expanded services. Tax revenues from an SSA may be used for security, marketing, or capital investments not currently provided by a municipality. Special service areas may be managed by non-profit organizations, chambers of commerce, or business groups to provide cohesive services and identity to an area.<sup>25</sup>

**Table 13 Tax Increment Financing Districts and Special Service Areas, 2009.**

<b>TIF Names:</b>
T-6: 72nd/Cicero
T-26: Howard/Paulina
T-89: Midway Industrial Corridor
T-92: Greater Southwest Industrial (West)
T-98: 63rd/Pulaski
T-99: Archer/Central
T-103: Lake Calumet Industrial Corridor
T-113: Roseland/Michigan
T-114: 119th/Halstead
T-140: 79th/Cicero
<b>SSA Names:</b>
SSA-19: Howard Street
SSA-24: Clark Street-Rogers Park
SSA-40: Michigan Avenue-Roseland
SSA-41: 103rd Street-Roseland

<sup>24</sup> Neighborhood Capital Budget Group. (2005). Tax Increment Financing, Chicago TIF Overview. Retrieved on August 5, 2009, from <http://www.ncbg.org/tifs/tifs.htm>.

<sup>25</sup> Chicago Department of Community Development. (2009). Programs and Services, Special Service Area Designations. Retrieved on August 5, 2009, from <http://egov.cityofchicago.org/city/webportal>.

## Appendix G: Consumer Spending Gaps and Surpluses

Table 14 Consumer Spending Gaps, 2009 Claritas Retail Opportunity Gap – Retail Stores.

	Red Line				Orange Line	Yellow Line	
	103rd St	111th St	116th St	130th St	Ford City	Dempster	Old Orchard
TOTAL Opportunity gap/surplus	68M gap	60M gap	41 M gap	8M gap	22M surplus	77M gap	397M surplus
<b>Total Retail Sales including Eating and Drinking Places</b>	-	-	-	-	+	-	+
<b>General GAPS</b>							
Motor Vehicle & Parts Dealers	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
Furniture & Home Furnishings	-	-	-	-	+	+	+
Electronics and Appliance Stores	-	-	-	-	+	-	+
Building Material, Garden Equipment Stores	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Food and Beverage Stores	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Health and Personal Care Stores	-	-	-	+	-	-	+
Gasoline Stations	-	+	-	-	-	-	+
Clothing and Accessories Stores	-	-	+	-	+	-	+
Sporting Goods, Hobby, Book Music Stores	-	-	-	-	+	-	+
General Merchandise Stores	-	-	-	-	+	-	+
Miscellaneous Store Retailers	-	-	-	-	+	-	+
Foodservice and Drinking Places	-	-	-	-	+	+	+

**Table 15 Consumer Spending Surpluses, 2009 Claritas Retail Opportunity Gap – Retail Stores**

Consumer Spending	Red Line				Orange Line	Yellow Line	
	103rd St	111th St	116th St	130th St	Ford City	Dempster	Old Orchard
TOTAL Opportunity gap/surplus	68M gap	60M gap	41M gap	8M gap	22M surplus	77M gap	397M surplus
<b>Total Retail Sales including Eating and Drinking Places</b>	-	-	-	-	+	-	+
<b>Specific Surpluses</b>							
Other Motor Vehicle Dealers							
Furniture Stores			+			+	
Household Appliance Stores			+				
Paint and Wallpaper Stores			+				
Hardware Stores			+				
Cosmetics, Beauty Supplies, Perfume stores							
Pharmacies and Drug Stores				+			
Convenience Stores		+					
Specialty Food Stores						+	
Beer Wine and Liquor			+	+		+	
Mens Clothing			+				
Womens Clothing			+				
Other Clothing Stores			+				
Shoe Stores			+				
Hobby, Toys and Games Stores			+				
Musical Instrument and Supply Stores						+	
Books, Periodicals and Prerecorded Music/Record Stores		+					
Gift Novelty and Souvenir Stores						+	
Florists	+						
Department Stores Excl Leased Departments			+				
Used Merchandise Stores			+			+	
Gasoline Stations with Convenience Stores		+					
Full Service Restaurants							
Limited Service Eating Places						+	

## Appendix H: Case Studies of Successful TOD Sites

---

### *TOD Case Study: BART's Fruitvale Station*

#### **Introduction**

Oakland's Fruitvale community and its successful development of a mixed-use transit village offers a rich case of community mobilization that resulted in a successful community-led TOD planning and development process. This example not only demonstrates that successful TODs can be implemented in low-income areas, it shows how perseverance and effective partnerships with private and public entities can bring many benefits to a particular community and the other stakeholders involved.

#### **The Context**

Fruitvale is a predominantly low-income Latino community just south of downtown Oakland. In 1991, Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) revealed a proposal to construct a parking garage on a surface lot between the Fruitvale BART station and the neighborhood commercial center. Led by the Unity Council, a long time community development corporation in the area, the community successfully resisted the proposed project and developed an alternative plan with grants from the City of Oakland and the Federal Transportation Authority.

#### **The Process**

From 1992-2003, the Unity Council conducted planning and development activities in partnership with many other public and private entities, to make the transit village a reality. The goals of the project included neighborhood revitalization, the reduction of poverty, enhancing choices for neighborhood residents, providing high quality affordable housing, the reduction of traffic congestion and pollution, and to provide a stable source of jobs and income to Fruitvale residents, among others. In 1997, the Unity Council created the Fruitvale Development Corporation (FDC) to act as the real estate developer for the project and worked with the City Oakland and BART to acquire the land and help finance the project. Although the project encountered many obstacles in relation to land acquisition and financing, occupancy finally began in 2003.

#### **The Outcome**

Today, the project exists as a 257,000 square foot transit village, including a pedestrian street, plaza, retail shops, office space, community services, and rental housing. Of the 47 1- and 2-bedroom units, 10 are designated as affordable units for residents earning 25-80% of the area median income. In addition, 500-600 housing units are planned for future development. Community services include a health clinic, library, and senior center while the office space includes the Unity Council's headquarters. While the project has aided in the economic and community development of the neighborhood, it has also created productive land uses and put people and services close to transit. Thus, the community-led TOD benefited a wide range of stakeholders and offers an example of what TODs can do for cities, transit agencies, and local communities.

## *Case Study: Impacts of the CTA Orange Line*

### **Introduction**

In 1993, the CTA Orange Line began operating between Midway Airport and downtown Chicago, linking the airport, various neighborhoods of the Southwest Side, and downtown Chicago with heavy rail rapid transit. Two studies reveal the impacts this new rail line had on congestion in the region and the price of single-family homes within 1.5 miles of Orange Line stations. The results suggest that new transit lines in Chicago have a positive effect on housing value and they relieve traffic congestion across the Chicago region.

### **Impact on Housing**

In 2004, economists McMillen and McDonald of the University of Illinois-Chicago published report that demonstrated the effects of the Orange Line on the market for single-family homes between 1983 and 1999. By using 17,034 single-family home property transactions, the researchers employed both a repeat-sales method and the hedonic method to estimate the impact of the Orange Line on housing prices in Southwest Side neighborhoods. According to their findings, anticipated benefits of the new Orange Line transit line began to be capitalized into house prices as early as 1987, 6 years before construction of the transit line was complete. On average, homes within 1.5 miles of Orange Line stations increased in value by \$6,000 as compared with similar properties at the sample boundary.

### **Impact on Congestion**

In a 2000 FTA policy paper, researcher employed the Mogridge-Lewis Convergence Hypothesis to estimate the benefits of transit on the Midway Orange Line Transportation Corridor. By quantifying the delay saving by user category—train riders, users of the I-55 expressway-segment that parallels the Orange Line, and user of parallel highways—the researchers were able to estimate savings in time and dollar value due to the existence of the Orange Line. In terms of time, they found that transit reduced door-to-door trips by almost 5 minutes. They also found that aggregate peak delay savings (in dollars) due to transit amounted to \$47.3 million, or \$3.9 million per rail mile. Interestingly, 55% of the savings went to the users of the I-55 corridor while only 8% of the saving was the savings of the CTA Orange Line users.

### **Conclusions**

Evidence from the reviewed reports suggests that the construction of the Orange Line benefited single-family homeowners living within 1.5 miles of the new rail stations, users of the Orange Line, and downtown auto commuters. The case of the Orange line reveals that the effects of new rail lines, or rail line extensions, are not isolated in one geographic area and are not experienced by one type of person. Rather, new transit infrastructure has the potential to benefit multiple types of stakeholders that span entire transportation corridors from diverse communities.

### *TOD Case Study: The Lake-Pulaski Transit Village*

CTA transit stations can be crucial assets in economic development and community revitalization. Careful planning and dedicated promotion of transit oriented development (TOD) can attract investment and economic and social activity to areas surrounding transit stops, creating new centers for jobs, shopping, and other services. The following case study of the Pulaski CTA Green Line station illustrates how TOD has been used to bring opportunity and equity to the Chicago community of West Garfield Park.

TOD planning first began for the Pulaski Green Line station in the early 1990s after numerous community groups convinced the CTA to rehabilitate the Green Line. In 1993, the Citizen's Green Line Task Force was formed to assure public participation and oversight of the rehabilitation project. The Task Force, in collaboration with various community members and the Neighborhood Capital Budget Group (NCBG), produced asset-based TOD plans for 4 stations along the Lake Street Green Line Branch.

Many consider the implementation of the Pulaski Station Plan to be the most successful effort to come out of the activities of the early 1990s. Led by Bethel New Life, a community development corporation operating on the Westside, the area around the Pulaski station has undergone significant revitalization. Bethel New Life's efforts have resulted in what is now known as the "Lake Pulaski Transit Village." This includes affordable housing within ¼ mile of the station and a transit center that sits next to the Pulaski station. The transit center consists of a 100 child day care center, an employment center, and six new commercial storefronts. It has also created over 75 jobs.

The creation and growth of the Lake Pulaski Transit Village has not come easily, however. Bethel New Life has not only been successful because of its continued dedication to the community and to the project. Project success is also due to Bethel's ability to leverage numerous and diverse resources. In addition to community support and participation, over the years its efforts have also relied on strategic partnerships with private and public actors. The City of Chicago, Commonwealth Edison, U.S. Bank, and Argonne National Laboratory have been some of the major partners along the way. Making TOD work has been a process requiring creativity, cooperation, and dedication.

By viewing transit stations as assets for economic development and utilizing the TOD framework, local stakeholders have preserved access to transit and attracted investment to the area around Lake and Pulaski. Past and ongoing efforts in West Garfield Park and other areas of the Westside can be looked upon as a best practice guide for Greater Roseland Area stakeholders as they plan to use potential Red Line stations to leverage community reinvestment.