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Building Livable Communities with Transit
Champaign-Urbana, IL – Typical Midwestern Community

- Located in the center of Illinois
- Home to the University of Illinois
- Urbanized area has approximately 130,000 residents.
- University has over 42,000 students and 12,000 faculty and staff
- UIUC geographically located in the middle of the two cities. University is split down the middle.
Community Characteristics

- Intensely urban campus
- Urbana 35% of the work trips are non-SOV
- Community as a whole: non-SOV commute to work rate is 23%
- Average commute to work time - 15 minutes
- Excellent transit system
- Quality neighborhoods adjacent to the campus many faculty/staff walk, bike, or take the bus to work
- Students/faculty/staff have universal access to the transit system
Reversing Trends

- During the 1960’s-1990’s non-auto trips declined
- New developments lacked interconnected streets, access to transit, walking, bicycling
- Planning for multi-modal community began in 2001
- CUMTD adopted Strategic Plan focused on creating mobility
MTD’s Mission... *Leading the way to greater mobility*

MTD’s Vision... *MTD goes beyond traditional boundaries to promote excellence in transportation*

Among MTD’s Goals:
- MTD will encourage the use of alternative transportation services to promote mobility in our community

Strategies included:
- MTD should lobby for transit friendly development and sustainable communities.
- Advocate bicycle/pedestrian access improvements

Convergence of Issues Impacting Transportation

- Foreign policy and foreign oil dependence
- Global warming and environmental issues
- Obesity and health epidemic related to inactivity
- Aging transportation infrastructure
- Transportation congestion and capacity inadequacies
- Aging population and mobility issues
- Lack of local government funding
Enabling Mode Shift

- Infrastructure
- Appropriate land-use and design
- Interconnect modes, land-use, and infrastructure
- Social Marketing – encouragement for behavior change
Long Range Transportation Plan 2025 (LRTP 2025) adopted in 2004 by Champaign-Urbana Urbanized Area Transportation Study (CUUATS) called for more housing and mobility choices, less sprawl.

miPLAN – Mobility Implementation Plan to implement LRTP 2025
More Community Transportation Plans

Champaign Moving Forward:
Transportation Master Plan
2008 – Update to Champaign’s Comprehensive Plan

Urbana Bicycle Plan –
Adopted plan becomes part of Comprehensive Plan

Long Range Transportation Plan
2035-
Adopted 2009
LRTP 2025 Preferred Scenario calls for:

- Express bus service between core and fringe areas of the community
- An enhanced arterial fringe road system that provides improved mobility around the community
- Transit intensive corridors
- High capacity transit system in the University District
- Mixed use, denser development and redevelopment
If implemented LRTP 2025 will:

- Create higher population density, less sprawl
- Promote alternative transportation modes
- Save money on infrastructure
- Create walkable activity centers and reduce reliance on automobiles
- Make travel safer for pedestrians and bicyclists
- Increase mobility for motorists
- Educate residents about alternative transportation modes, safety, and new transportation concepts
Mobility Implementation Plan

How do we implement the LRTP?
Champaign-Urbana Mass Transit District (CUMTD) funded the Mobility Implementation Plan (miPLAN)

Goals for miPLAN:
• Develop cost effective mobility strategies to achieve goal of 8% non-SOV trips within the CUMTD service area by 2025
• Develop cost-effective mobility strategies to achieve the CUMTD goal of 35% non-SOV work trips in the CUMTD service area by 2015
• Develop specific implementation plan to institute the mobility strategies to achieve the above
miPLAN Regional Partners

- Champaign County Regional Planning Commission
- Champaign County Farm Bureau
- City of Urbana
- City of Champaign
- University of Illinois/ Urbana-Champaign
- CUMTD
- PACE, Independent Living Center
- Illinois Department of Transportation
- Village of Savoy
- Urbana Public School District
- Champaign County Board
miPLAN Phase Diagram

Phase 1 reports:
- Stakeholder Interviews
- Neighborhood Transopoly
- Onboard Survey
- Employer E-survey
- Focus Groups
- Mobility Enhancing Development
- Boarding/Alighting Profile
- Student E-survey

Phase 2:
- Stakeholder Forum
- MED Feasibility
- Mobility Evaluate
- Mobility Existing

Phase 3:
- Stakeholder Forum
- Benefit/Cost Analysis
- Preferred Mobility Scenario
- FTA Alternatives Analysis
- Performance Analysis

Champaign Moving Forward
Big small all
Staley-Rising Corridor
UUC Multimodal Study
Do you know what mobility options are currently available?

What kinds of transportation services do we want in our community right now?

How will we want to move around in the future?
Public Input & Market Research

- Interviews – 50 community leaders
- Focus groups
- On-board transit survey
- E-survey 3,262 employees
- E-survey 3,319 U of I students
- Neighborhood Transopoly
Mobility Enhanced Development

MED is defined as a compact walkable neighborhood with a wide array of transportation choices for trips, frequent and well-connected transit, biking amenities, and car-sharing. MED also include diverse housing stock, and a concentration of small retail and service-oriented business that meet day-to-day needs of local residents.
Affordability Index Formula

Affordability Index = Housing Costs + Transportation Costs

Income
Mobility Enhanced Development Findings:

- Transportation costs in core significantly less than fringe. Average $/month spent on transportation: Core=$832 or less Fringe=$1372 or less. (2004 data)

MED Recommendations:
- Build on current density and urban form.
- Maximize options and choices in alternative forms of mobility.
- Provide tools to create mixed-use, mixed-income market-rate developments through infill and redevelopment.
- Maintain affordability through community development programs and by factoring in both household housing and transportation costs.
Got the Message?

Strong consistency found for the following top priority mobility improvements:

- Improved bicycle infrastructure and routing
- Better street lights
- Additional sidewalks
- Later evening MTD service
- Additional direct MTD routes along major arterials
1. Develop two alternative mobility scenarios
2. Green Corridors analysis for development of enhanced transit and mobility options along with increased densities and infill/redevelopment (MED Feasibility)
3. Modeling of the mobility scenarios using econometric, land-use modeling and transportation modeling (Benefit Preference Model and Mode Choice Model)
Corridor Analysis

White Street and Springfield Avenue Corridors Analysis

DRAFT

Center for Neighborhood Technology 2010
White and Springfield Corridors Analysis

- Identifies MED Opportunities
- Plan Process (public input)
- Enhancing Connection Between Transportation and Land Use

- MED Development Scenarios
- Policy and Implementation Strategies
- Recommendations for Implementation
Connecting Corridors - Goals

- Increase population w/in corridor area by 10,000 by 2025
- Infill and redevelopment structures meet LEED standards
- Attract 3,000 jobs to the corridor area by 2025
- Develop mixed-use live-work-play environments
- Increasing connectivity between the U of I and the two downtowns
- Creating development that reduces carbon emissions, energy consumption, storm water run-off by the LEED ND rating system
What might a transit intensive corridor look like?
### Intersection of Springfield and Main

#### Proposed Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Development</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Type</td>
<td>Commercial, Residential &amp; Parking</td>
<td>Commercial, Residential &amp; Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Parcel Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Information</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Area</td>
<td>58,099 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Area</td>
<td>24,870 (estimated by footprint)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN</td>
<td>92-21-17-130-014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Central Business, Central Business Expansion, R2 Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Incentives</td>
<td>Downtown TIF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>312 WEST SPRINGFIELD LLC, Strawberry Fields, Kirby Michael, Allman Carl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Existing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Commercial, Residential &amp; Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint (sq ft)</td>
<td>24,870 (3 bldgs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Stories</td>
<td>1 (ground floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial sq ft</td>
<td>26,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Demand</td>
<td>80 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential sq ft</td>
<td>79,500 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Floors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Demand</td>
<td>10 Units/Floor 800 sq ft (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 Units/Floor 1,200 sq ft (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>55 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Sharing on Site</td>
<td>0 Cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Street</td>
<td>125 (approximate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>50 (approximate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground Deck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sq ft/space)</td>
<td>32,109 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99 Spaces (residential w/ some commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value / Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>Land: $430,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building(s): $1,673,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Revenue</td>
<td>$55,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$16,991,712 projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$407,801 projected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Areas

The following policy areas contribute to sustainability in a variety of interrelated ways that are important in forming a "green corridor".

**Energy Efficiency & Conservation**
In existing buildings and new construction, power consumption is a major determinant of environmental sustainability.

**Water Efficiency & Conservation**
Reduced water consumption recognizes the finite nature of this resource. This comes through retrofits and habit changes.

**Bicycle Policy & Infrastructure**
More people choosing bikes for short trips = fewer automobile greenhouse gas emissions and decreased congestion.

**Economic Development**
Economic development on the corridors takes place through sustainable building, green jobs, and targeted development.

**Age & Income Diversity**
The most economically and socially vital places are diverse places. This means a mix of people, incomes and activities.

**Low-Impact Stormwater Management**
The flat grades of Champaign and Urbana pair with pervious surfaces to require attention paid to flood-prone areas and runoff management.

**Pedestrian-Oriented Urban Design**
Downtown Champaign and Urbana, Campustown, and Western Urbana provide examples of local pedestrian-friendly urban design.
IMPLEMENTATION – What has happened already
High frequency transit service between two downtowns and campus = service every 10-15 minutes during academic year.
Four Lanes W/O Center Turn Lanes

Center Turn Lanes, Bike Lanes, Ped Refuge Island at Bus Stop
Bike Lanes and Pedestrian Improvements

BIKE LANES – CALM TRAFFIC

PEDESTRIAN PRIORITY – PED SCRAMBLE
Complete Streets = Value added

SIDEWALK CAFÉ - BEFORE

SIDEWALK CAFÉ AFTER
Pedestrian and Transit Upgrades

UPGRADING PEDESTRIAN INFRASTRUCTURE

UPGRADING TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE
Support for Mode Shift

CAR SHARE - ZIPCAR

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

BICYCLE FRIENDLY COMMUNITY/BUSINESS

C-U SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROJECT (C-U SRTS ROJECT)  WWW.CU-SRTSPROJECT.COM
Phase III

- Benefit-Cost Analysis
- Preferred Investment Plan Development
- Upgrade MPO transportation model - add land-use component
- 5-10 Year Plan
- Final Report
Challenges and Lessons Learned

- Coordination with a large university system can be challenging
- Upgrading a 4-step transportation forecasting model is difficult (we need better tools)
- MPO staffing issues can delay upgrades to transportation model (small MPO, big ambitions)
- Integrating a land-use model with transportation model is breaking new ground
- Involving the private sector can be hard
- Implement good ideas ASAP – creates momentum
- It takes longer than you think it will
- Do not give up!
Conclusions

A seamless multimodal transportation system requires building consensus at a regional scale. We must ask: “How do we make mobility easy and as inexpensive as possible?”
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