MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting Date: Wednesday, January 27, 2016
Location: I-81 Viaduct Project Outreach Center, 335 Montgomery Street, Syracuse
Event: Community and Economic Development Stakeholders’ Advisory Working Group (SAWG) Meeting
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</tr>
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<td>Peter Liebowitz, AKRF</td>
<td>Owen Kerney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Smith, AKRF</td>
<td>Barry Lentz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Obernesser, EDR</td>
<td>Anthony Mangano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Peet, TWMLA</td>
<td>Mary Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Paccone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Sarver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rob Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dirk Sonneborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merike Treier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Vavalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meghan Vitale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ben Walsh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Mark Frechette, NYS DOT’s I-81 Viaduct Project Director, started the meeting with introductions.

Peter Liebowitz and Matt Smith from AKRF provided an overview of economic development considerations and a framework for how socioeconomic analyses will be incorporated into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), including identifying the key areas of socioeconomic analyses, Environmental Justice (EJ), and the identification and assessment of potential property takings. Each of these subjects will be analyzed for all alternatives allowing for a comparison of potential effects in the DEIS. Peter Liebowitz and Matt Smith also noted that a lot of the information gathered is timely and appropriate for the local and regional discussion of economic development that can be anticipated to result from the transportation investment and how that fits into current and future trends of development and economic activity in the city and region.

About halfway through the presentation, Peter and Matt called for a break of 15 minutes that also served as an opportunity for SAWG participants to help complete an overview assessment of key trends and
recent development activities, including an interactive mapping exercise where participants highlighted areas that have a) seen recent activity and investment, b) seen disinvestment, and c) have the potential to see future investments. Summary observations of the group:

Areas of current economic activity and investment:
- Thruway corridor including hotel developments and other projects north of and east of Carrier Circle; at and around Buckley Road/Route 11 interchange; and to the north and west around Baldwinsville
- Along Route 5 to the west of the City at Fairmount/Westvale and farther west to Camillus
- Destiny
- Franklin Square
- Downtown (Salina/Clinton/Armory)

Areas of disinvestment and concern:
- West Street corridor from I-690 to Onondaga Street
- South/central downtown along Adams Street from I-81 to Salina Street

Areas of future growth potential
- Inner Harbor
- South Avenue around Valley Street (especially with BRT)

Questions (Q), Answers (A), and Comments (C) included:
Q: A big project like this ripples through the local economy. Is that a part of the EIS analyses?
A: The EIS socioeconomic analyses will include an econometric modeling of the construction investment in terms of the direct, indirect, and induced effects from the project on employment demand and total economic value. The indirect and induced effects are often referred to as a “ripple” effect as the direct expenditure results in additional economic activity, for example, wages paid to workers that then result in additional purchases of goods and services. These effects will be modeled on a regional and state basis using the IMPLAN model, which uses U.S. Department of Commerce data as a basis for the multiplier effect.
C: The ripple effect is very real; our agency (Syracuse Housing Authority) has calculated a doubling of economic value for each dollar spent in the local economy.

Q: Does the model take the residency of workers into effect?
A: Yes, the model is basically built on County datasets so it reflects when and how labor or goods and services are obtained outside of the County. In a large and economically diverse region such as Syracuse, a lot of the economic activity is local and based on the available labor force and access to goods and services.

Q: Does the analysis specifically include the construction period?
A: Yes, that is the primary focus of the economic analysis for a major capital project.

C: The Near West Side could be impacted as West Street will be a major part of the new traffic/route patterns. This neighborhood should be included in the EJ analysis. It is one of the poorest areas of the city.
A: Comment noted.

Q: Will the EJ analysis also look to identify and incorporate specific benefits that may accrue to an EJ community as a result of the project, not just the negative impacts? This is how our agency has been approaching EJ analyses – whether people in the census tracts would benefit from the project (i.e., improved travel times and accessibility).
A: This can be considered in addition to the core concern of EJ analyses to identify potential disproportionate impacts on EJ communities.

Q: At what point would impacts and mitigating measures be identified?
A: The DEIS will identify potential impacts for all the alternatives as well as potential measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts.

Q: There are two plans emerging parallel to I-81 – the Smart BRT Study and the City’s Zoning Reconfiguration. Will these be addressed in the EIS?
A: Yes, the EIS will examine the I-81 project’s consistency with public policy and with other large-scale planning initiatives such as these two studies.

Q: How many years of household income data were examined for the information provided in the slide show?
A: 2000 to 2014. The change from 2012 to 2014 is the noticeable new trends described for the Downtown area (e.g. increasing population and households, higher incomes).

Q: Is the student body of Syracuse University included in the demographic profiles of who lives in Syracuse? The influx of international students, for example, is driving demand for new luxury housing development in and around the University Hill area.
A: A qualified “yes” in that students are typically counted in census data, but it is a gray area. For example, student populations can be under-reported, and even when counted, students are a group that often under-reports on key economic traits like income (as noted in some of the data presented). For things like housing and even more generally for retail expenditures generated by students, market demand and expenditure potential of students requires a more nuanced assessment. The data has pointed to trends that are affecting student housing and where their spending might occur, such as the loss of population closest to campus with new growth to the east, even past Westcott Street.

Q: For properties that would be greatly affected by the Community Grid Alternative – say areas that are taxed as parking lots now along Almond Street – how do you measure when they become valuable land?
C: Urban3, a private consulting firm specializing in land value economics and property and retail tax analysis, prepared a land productivity baseline that was integrated into today’s presentation with information provided to the I-81 team.

C: There is already increasing development pressure on available sites in Downtown. In addition, SAWG members are a very good resource to understand likely development opportunities in the University Hill area.
A: The DEIS will have to make informed assumptions about the creation of development parcels in each of the alternatives and what the basic development program could be expected for each. The development programs have trip-making consequences that need to be included in the EIS traffic studies, but basic economic valuation of the development programs can help assess the socioeconomic impact studies as well. It is anticipated that the likely development scenarios for reconfigured land parcels would be done in coordination with the city and stakeholders to ensure that the scenarios reflect likely zoning changes and market expectations.
C: Yes, the City is pursuing an increase in density in the urban core.

Q: How far regionally will you take the analysis, or is it limited to the viaduct area? With the Community Grid Alternative, travel patterns could change. Would you disclose potential impacts of this change?
A: Yes, the DEIS will examine potential effects on the larger region, particularly at any of the key highway interchanges where a change in travel patterns might affect underlying socioeconomic conditions.

Q: In considering the forecasting of future population and jobs, will you use objective data from other places (i.e., case studies) in the EIS? How do you balance and blend quantitative and qualitative threads?
A: Many factors will be considered when creating the future development frameworks that can be expected in the viaduct area based on the reconfiguration of potential development parcels that can evolve
from the highway or street-grid alignments. There will be a need to correlate with the existing long-range
projections already developed by SMTC and a way to assess a higher or lower growth in any specific area.
Since there is not necessarily a local precedent for some of the changes that could occur with the project, it
is reasonable to assume that there will be a need to apply case study data as a basis for future
development assumptions. This is part of establishing the future year (Estimated Time of Completion + 30
years) build conditions studied in the EIS.

Q: What are the next milestones on the DEIS?
A: The DEIS must first establish a robust baseline condition for the socioeconomic analyses, which then
can be used to project and compare future conditions for each of the DEIS alternatives. There are also
many other pieces of the DEIS that have baseline condition assessment milestones; economic conditions is
just one of many.

C: HOPE, an anti-poverty group, is having five or six discussion panels aimed at addressing our predicament
of being named the city with the highest concentrated poverty by race/ethnicity in the nation. The
motivating factor for us is to not make the same mistakes.
C: USDOT Commissioner Foxx’s comments about Syracuse called on us to “re-knit” our community.
C: It’s very good to hear this kind of dialogue coming from transportation leadership in Washington.

Q: How do the more subjective comments factor in? For example, companies are increasingly choosing to
locate in urban locations and many people want to live in downtowns for the amenities and to be closer to
jobs. How is that captured in data and analyses?
A: This is where we can incorporate a broader spectrum of trends using empirical data and research
regarding locational decision-making by employers and people’s housing choices. These can be used to
bolster assumptions used to estimate changes in localized development patterns that can be used in the
EIS studies.

Q: Construction phase impacts and required traffic re-routing will have an effect on business. How will that
be analyzed in the DEIS? Do you have a list of businesses that are dependent on access to traffic?
A: Traffic patterns and diversions will be modeled so that areas of increased and reduced volumes on
streets can be identified. The DEIS studies will carefully inventory businesses (all businesses are important,
though retailers are a primary concern since they need access to their customers) and assess potential
impacts (positive and negative) of these traffic flow changes during the construction period.

Q: What is the relationship of looking at negative impacts relative to positive impacts? We have concerns
about how the DEIS will work out that balance. The DEIS needs to disclose the negative impacts of
construction-related impacts.
C: There are going to be positive and negative economic impacts with each alternative and you should be
able to predict the traffic patterns during construction and afterward.
A: The DEIS is primarily a way to identify, disclose, and mitigate adverse or negative impacts of a proposed
project. While explaining both the positive and negative outcomes of the project is important in presenting
a balanced assessment and supporting the project’s overall purpose and need, the DEIS needs to be careful
about too much focus on positive or beneficial effects. The creation of new developable parcels that could
come from an alternative alignment is a positive effect that does need to be included in the DEIS since it
has an effect on future development patterns that need to be understood from a traffic generation and
new flow pattern. This will be iterative and it can test the different alternatives and growth scenarios.

Q: What is the geographic area that will be covered in the regional economic impact analysis?
A: The economic impact analysis will identify potential impacts in the immediate locations where changes may occur (i.e., the viaduct corridor and outer interchanges along I-481) as well as broader travel pattern changes that could affect regional economic conditions.

Q: Can we generate data on the folks coming to and from the university and other major destinations like Destiny?
Q: Are you willing to share that base data from the model so we can understand and address one of the fears of the community – can the Community Grid Alternative handle the increased traffic flows?
C: SMTC indicated that the unique generators of trips as discussed by the SAWG are accounted for in the SMTC model so that it is not just a work trip model. It takes a lot of time to get the data inputted and calibrated.
A: The regional transportation demand model is currently being refined and calibrated. It will be able to provide a lot of information for project planning and impact assessment.

C: The team should review the “Visit Syracuse Today” Study (a tourism master plan), released this past August, which has a lot of good data.