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MS. NELSON: Welcome everybody, thank you all for coming out here tonight. On behalf of Joan McDonald, the Commissioner of the New York State Department of Transportation and Jonathan McDade the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, New York Division, I welcome you to this initial scoping meeting.

My name is Debera Nelson and I am the project director of the I-81 Viaduct Project. With me tonight I have two project team leads, Lisa Weiss and Joe Flint. I also would like to recognize Robert Davies the District Engineer from the Federal Highway Administration.

Lisa, Joe and I, together we form the leadership team for New York State DOT for the I-81 Project that oversees this project here tonight. Collectively we have more than 86 years of experience with the New York State Department of Transportation bringing to the project expertise in environmental process,
Nelson

engineering and urban design.

This is the first of two Scoping meetings for the Environmental Impact Statement or EIS, that will be prepared for the I-81 Viaduct Project in Syracuse, New York. This initial scoping meeting is sponsored by the two agencies that are serving as the lead agencies for the EIS. The New York State Department of Transportation as the state lead agency, and the Federal Highway Administration as the federal lead agency.

This initial Scoping meeting is being conducted to obtain comments on the scope of the project's Environmental Impact Statement. The meeting provides the public an opportunity to make formal statements of position before any project decisions are made. To assist interested parties in formulating the comments associated with the initial Scoping meeting. A Scoping Initiation Packet is available here tonight. You
Nelson can pick one up at the welcome table. The packet is also available on the project's website, which is found at www.i81opportunities.org. And at document viewing locations throughout Greater Syracuse.

The Scoping Initiation Packet provides an overview of the project presents the project purpose and needs as well as its goals and objectives, presents preliminary alternatives under consideration and outlines the steps of the environmental review process. And it describes the public involvement opportunity.

At this time I would like to have Mr. Brody Smith, tonight's moderator to explain the format and structure of tonight's meeting. Following that project team lead, Joseph Flint, will present an overview of the I-81 Viaduct Project. Then Mr. Smith will moderate the comment session. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Hello, my name is
Smith

Brody Smith, I am serving as the moderator for this evening's public hearing. It's important that everyone sign in so that we can make a record of all those who participated in this meeting. We ask that everyone sign at the registration table located just outside the doors and to your right in the foyer. There is a stenographer (court reporter) immediately in front of me. The stenographer (court reporter) will record the proceedings of this meeting verbatim and a written transcript will be prepared from his notes.

This meeting is being held pursuant to several regulations. The Environmental Impact Statement for the I-81 Viaduct Project is being prepared in accordance with the following laws and regulations: The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, NEPA, as amended and implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations 40 CFR Parts 1500 through
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1508, the Federal Highway Administration
Environmental Impact Regulations at
23 CFR Part 771, the New York State
Environmental Quality Review Act or
S.E.Q.R.A. requirements, in particular
the New York State Department of
Transportation's Implementing
Regulations at 17 NYCRR Part 15. And a
number of other federal and state
regulations and requirements, among them
are Presidential Executive Order 12898,
Environmental Justice, Section 106 of
the National Historic Preservation Act,
and Section 4F of the New York State
Department of Transportation Act.

After these opening remarks and
subsequent presentation you will have an
opportunity to provide a written and/or
oral comments. If you wish to make an
oral statement you must fill out one of
the speaker cards at the registration
desk outside those doors if you have not
already done so. Persons who wish to
make oral comments tonight may do so in
Smith
one of two ways. If you want to make a
comment in this room in front of all the
attendees I will call your name and I'll
ask you to come to this microphone right
here at the appropriate time and provide
your comments. I'll also be asking the
person speaking next to go and wait
there to keep the meeting moving since
as you can see there is a lot of people
and we want to make sure everybody who
wants to has an opportunity to speak.

Secondly, if you prefer not to make
your comments here in the opening
meeting there is through those doors and
to the left a stenographer (court
reporter) available, and you may give
your comments there in private at any
time tonight.

Oral comments will all be limited to
two minutes. I'll be providing you with
some guidance as to when your time will
elapse. When you have a minute, and 30
seconds left I'll say so and hold up a
sign letting you know how much time you
Smith

have left.

You may also submit a written
statement. Written statements may be
submitted in any of three ways. At this
meeting where you fill out and submit a
comment form, Number 1. And Number 2,
on the project website as Ms. Nelson
also stated before, that's
www.i81opportunities.org where there
will be an online comment form you will
be able to fill out. Or via US mail to
the following address: NYS DOT, I-81
Viaduct Project, 333 East Washington
Street, Syracuse, New York, 13202.
Information on how to submit written
comments is also provided at the welcome
table in the foyer.

You can elect to submit comments
both orally and in writing if you choose
to do so. Written statements will be
given the same weight. Let me emphasize
that, written statements will be given
the same weight as oral comments in
consideration and it will be given the
The official public comment period associated with this initial scoping meeting will be open through the end of Friday, January 17th, 2014. New York State DOT and Federal Highway Administration will accept written comments up through that time. To be part of the public record all written comments must be either submitted through the website no later than Friday, January 17th, 2014 or postmarked no later than January 17th, 2014.

The agencies will review and consider public comments submitted during the Scoping period and a future Scoping comment period. Responses to the comments will be included in a final Scoping report, which will include the final Scoping phase of the project.

So that everyone who desires to speak may be heard and their statements made part of the official record we will not take any questions from the floor in
this room at this meeting. Project staff are available in the exhibit area immediately to the right in the room adjacent to this room. So if you leave these doors, and the next doors on the right. They're available there to answer any questions you might have. Those conversations will not be made part of the formal record.

Before I call on speakers from the floor I will call Mr. Joseph Flint of the New York State Department of Transportation to give a brief presentation on the project. After he speaks I will give the instructions on how we plan to take oral comments and we'll begin. Mr. Flint?

MR. FLINT: Thank you. And welcome everyone to this meeting of the Initial Scoping Meeting for the I-81 Viaduct Project. We all know the importance of I-81 not only locally here in Syracuse but also beyond our city. I-81 is a major north south national, regional and
Flint local transportation route. It runs for approximately 855 miles from Canada to Tennessee, connecting New York State from its border with Pennsylvania all the way to Canada at the Thousand Islands bridge. It also directly connects with east-west Thruway. Locally I-81 accesses to downtown Syracuse as well as University Hill, the region's major employment and cultural center.

The Department in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration and the Syracuse Metropolitan Transportation Council concluded the I-81 Corridor Study this summer. Nearly 3,000 people provided feedback on that study.

The study identified critical issues related to the I-81 corridor, which are guidance and development of the I-81 project. It prioritized projects and concluded there is a need for a near term reconstruction or replacement of I-81 through downtown Syracuse.

The I-81 Corridor Study identified
many needs. Interestingly there was a concentration of needs in the I-81 viaduct priority area. Some of those needs relate to the structural condition of the bridges, safety issues related to accident rates being three to five times the state-wide average at some locations; geometric deficiencies such as shoulder width and the distance between ramps, which are no longer consistent with current day design standards; capacity issues related to severe congestion at some locations in the a.m. and p.m. peak travel periods.

Back in the late 1960s when construction of I-81 was completed highway standards were different. Today I-81 carries between 50 and a hundred thousand vehicles per day depending on where you are on the viaduct. And the majority of this traffic is traveling to or from or through downtown Syracuse. The area identified as the priority area is 3.5 miles long and crosses 18 streets.
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with 183 bridge spans. It extends from Dr. Martin Luther King east on the south to Hiawatha Boulevard on the north. The viaduct itself, the elevated portion of the highway is one and-a-half miles long.

What the Federal Highway Administration as federal lead agency, and the New York State Department of Transportation as state lead agency, we are now entering the NEPA phase of the project. NEPA stands for the National Environmental Policy Act. And the NEPA process is intended to help public officials make decisions based on an understanding of environmental consequences and take actions that protect, restore and enhance the environment.

A Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement was published in the Federal Register on August 26th of this year initiating project review under NEPA. This phase
of the project is focusing on developing reasonable and feasible alternatives for the I-81 Viaduct, including opportunities to improve local street connectivity, pedestrian and bicycle access and potential land use and economic benefits.

During the early review phase we will be focusing on the following:

First, we'll be establishing the project's purpose and need. We'll identify the project's goals and objectives. We'll examine and develop alternatives for further study. We'll have developed an environmental analysis framework and engage agency, stakeholder and public participation in the process.

The purpose of the project will be to create an approved corridor that meets transportation needs and supports long range planning efforts, and moves people and goods safely and efficiently. Additionally, the project purpose will consider how transportation
Flint infrastructure can enhance economic growth in the Greater Syracuse area while addressing structural deficiencies and non-standard highway features.

The project is guided by two overarching goals supported by a number of objectives to achieve those goals. These goals were informed by the corridor goals identified by community members who participated in the Corridor Planning Study. The first of two major goals of the I-81 Viaduct Project is to improve safety and to create an efficient regional and local transportation system within and through Greater Syracuse. Objectives for this first goal are to eliminate structural deficiencies and improve bridge ratings. The second is to address identified geometric and operational deficiencies.

The second goal of the project is to provide transportation solutions that enhance the liveability, sustainability and economic vitality of Greater
Flint

Syracuse. The objectives of the second goal are to first, create transportation infrastructure that is consistent with the long range plans of the Syracuse Metropolitan Planning Area; to improve bicycle and pedestrian surface connections that border Interstate 81; to improve the visual and aesthetic character of transportation infrastructure to minimize the perceived barrier between downtown and adjoining neighborhoods; and also to maintain and enhance vehicle access through the regional highway network and key destinations such as downtown and University Hill.

As you can see from this graphic we are currently in the Scoping phase of the environmental review process. A key part of the environmental review process is public involvement. As indicated in this graphic public participation will be ongoing throughout the process.

During the environmental review we
Flint will be looking at alternative solutions to I-81 issues and investigating the potential benefits and impacts, the pros and their cons of these approaches. These studies will be documented in a comprehensive document called the Environmental Impact Statement or EIS, which will be prepared according to federal and state guidance.

The EIS will look at how the project alternatives would affect the environment. How does each alternative affect air quality, community character, land use and noise, for example? What are the transportation, economic, quality of life, and environmental benefits and detriments of each alternative? The answers of these questions will begin the Environmental Impact statement.

We are now in the Scoping stage of the project. During Scoping the public has an opportunity to comment on what is studied in the Environmental Impact Statement. To help you, the public, and
Flint agencies understand the project we have prepared a Scoping Initiation Packet. This informational document produces the I-81, I'm sorry introduces the I-81 Viaduct Project, describes the purpose and needs, and the steps in the environmental review and gives an overview of the preliminary alternatives and public involvement opportunities.

During Scoping we will identify alternatives to be evaluated in the Environmental Impact Statement. This Initial Scoping Meeting marks the beginning of the initial formal Scoping comment period which will run through January 17th, 2014. Formal comments including those submitted at this meeting will be responded to and in a Final Scoping Report which will mark the end of Scoping. This meeting is the first of two Scoping meetings.

At this Initial Meeting we will present an overview of the NEPA process. When and how the public can be involved,
how the I-81 Corridor Study informs the current project, the purpose and need of the project as well as the goals and objectives, and a preliminary list of alternatives. Just bear with us, it's our first run through of this in public.

As a starting point we are looking at alternatives identified during the Corridor Study: The above grade and reconstruction alternatives, the at-grade and surface alternative, the below-grade and depressed highway alternative, and the below grade tunnel alternative.

In addition to the alternatives that came from the Corridor Study other alternatives may be suggested during this Scoping phase. You can learn more about how we will study the alternatives by reviewing our boards displayed in the open house section of this meeting in the next room over. Although not illustrated on the boards, it is important to know that the Draft
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Environmental Impact Statement will also include a No Build alternative, which serves as a benchmark against which to compare the build alternatives.

During Scoping, alternatives will be identified and explored further. We will develop multiple options for each alternative, engineer these options, meaning we will begin to work out engineering details, plans and profiles and determine the feasibility of these alternatives. We will take many considerations into account.

For example, among these key considerations are issues related to highway design, such as how many lanes should the highway have, how wide should they be, how wide will the median be, what about shoulder width, curves and elevations? How can we make the highway operate more efficiently and effectively? To determine this we look at data such as traffic volumes, determine the best location for ramps.
Flint

For example, how far apart should they be? And ways to optimize roadway safety. We consider issues such as snow and ice removal and maintenance costs of the highway. We will also take into account community impacts, such as effect on local street networks, pedestrian and bicycle safety, property requirements, visual quality, traffic noise and any potential impacts on historic resources.

We will also take into account quality of life impacts and explore sustainable design elements such as stormwater management. We will explore designs that enhance pedestrian and bicycle experiences. Urban design improvements such as lighting and cross-walks. And opportunities to enhance economic development.

The refined alternatives will then be presented for public review and the future Scoping meeting which will also present our initial evaluation results.
Flint

We'll present the Environmental Impact Statement Study Area as well as the methodologies used to study and analyze environmental issues.

As the project moves forward we will continue to engage the public and provide opportunities for input. We will develop and refine project alternatives, hold a second Scoping meeting in the future, then prepare the Final Scoping Report. This report will identify alternatives to carry forward to the Environmental Impact Statement and include responses to comments submitted during the comment period. As explained earlier, we will be accepting written comments through January 17th and accepting oral comments at this meeting.

Again, if you'd like to speak, please fill in a speaker card at the welcome table. The speaking portion of this meeting will begin directly after this presentation. For more information
please visit us at the project website www.i81opportunities.org. The website will be continually updated throughout the entire project. Thank you for coming to today's meeting and thank you for your interest in the I-81 Viaduct Project.

MODERATOR SMITH: Okay, we are now ready to hear from those of you who wish to make oral statements. I remind you that anyone who wishes to speak at this meeting must fill out a speaker's card located at the registration desk outside these doors in the foyer.

In accordance with agency policy elected and appointed officials will be given the first opportunity to speak. Others will be called to make their statements in the order in which they were registered.

Now I'd like to recognize representatives from several elected officials offices who let us know that they would be attending today. From US
Smith

Senator Charles Schumer's office Karen Schillinger. From New York State Senator John DeFrancisco's office, Alex Walsh. Jessica DeCerce from Senator Valesky's office. From Assemblyman Bill Magnarelli, Christine Slocum. From Assemblyman Stirpe's office, Ms. Bardor. From Assemblyman Gary Finch's office, Pamela Kirkwood. From Assemblyman Roberts office, Alex Grant. There are also numerous representatives from the Onondaga County Legislature and from County Executive Mahoney's office, from the Syracuse Common Council and from Mayor Miner's office and from the surrounding towns and villages. We appreciate all of your interest and participation in this meeting.

In order to allow as many people as possible to be heard it is necessary that we restrict individual comments do two minutes. As I said before, I'll be holding up signals to let you know when you have a minute left, when you have 30
seconds left and when your time is up. Also try to tactfully make verbal reminders so that people don't go too long. The reason for this is we want to hear from all of you and it's important that we stick to those times so that everyone gets to a chance to speak. If your comments are in writing you can simply hand them to a project team representative at the registration desk in the entrance lobby.

If you have already submitted comments specifically in response to the Department's publication of the Notice of Intent you do not have to resubmit them because they are already part of the record. Again, to remind you written comments will be accepted by the Department through Friday January 17th, 2014.

I'd liked to call up our first two speakers and I'm going to call them up two at a time so there is always somebody ready to jump in after the next
Mark Nicotra from the Town of Salina and the next speaker will be Van Robinson of the Syracuse Common Council. So I'd ask Mr. Robinson to line up there behind Mr. Nicotra and then we'll keep it moving. Mr. Nicotra you can begin when you're ready.

MARK NICOTRA: Thank you very much.

Good afternoon, my name is Mark Nicotra, I am the Supervisor of the Town of Salina and represent nearly 34,000 residents and hundreds of business owners that call Salina their home. The Town of Salina is located at the crossroads of New York where Interstate 81 and 90 come together. And the proximity to the interstate system is Salina's greatest asset in attracting and retaining business, and also making Salina a convenient place to live.

In the 1950s, the area of 7th North Street and Buckley Road in Liverpool was dominated by farmland and open spaces.
Nicotra

Fast forward to today and that same area is now dominated by hotels, restaurants and a host of other businesses. The reason is simple. Interstate 81.

Thousands of jobs, which in turn buys gas, eat meals, get prescriptions and have a drink after work. The effects of less access to Salina will domino across all walks of life and all industries.

When Interstate 81 was being built in the 1960s there is no doubt that it isolated a poor part of a Syracuse neighborhood. Let's not repeat history by tearing down Interstate 81 and cutting off the northern suburbs.

Replacing I-81 with a boulevard and rerouting that traffic will rob businesses along the highway of a vital revenue source, putting jobs in the local economy at risk. City streets will be flooded with more cars and congestion, meaning longer commutes and increased response time for first
responders during emergencies, more idling of traffic lights will lead to more vehicle emissions and air pollution and towns outside Syracuse could be faced with more heavy traffic barreling down their roads.

I urge you to abandon the boulevard idea and instead focus on alternatives that will keep I-81 flowing through Syracuse and better serving the communities needs. The Interstate 81 project is a once in a generation opportunity to impact the future of our region. Let's make sure it's the right impact to drive Central New York into the future.

VAN ROBINSON: Good afternoon, I'm Van Robinson, President of the Syracuse Common Council.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Robinson. And Mr. Jerry Smith will be the next speaker. I apologize. You may proceed.

VAN ROBINSON: I want to say welcome
Robinson
to Syracuse and I'm happy to see the
turnout here today. We're talking about
an item that's going to last for another
50, 75 years, and we must be careful not
to repeat the same mistakes that were
made 50 years ago, where we tore down an
entire neighborhood, which was comprised
primarily of African Americans and Jews.
This we do not need to see a repeat of.
We would like to see a boulevard. A
boulevard which would accommodate the
traffic. Now we hear the figure 88,000
cars tossed about. However, those 88,000
cars are primarily in the morning from
6 to 8 or 9 and from 4 to 6 in the
afternoon. That comprises most of your
88,000 cars. Many of the people who
take 81 or 690 take it just to hop from
one exit to another exit.
A boulevard would in all intents
give us an environmental clarity that we
have not had. It is no secret that
studies have been made that show those
people who live in close proximity to 81
Robinson have higher incidences of upper respiratory infections and it has caused asthma. We have the highest rate of asthma among children than anywhere in this state or in this county.

Removal of 81 and dispersing most of the traffic throughout the streets, which are under-utilized. However with the boulevard we would attempt to see realignments, reconfiguration of all streets and also updated traffic signals. We also would like to see pedestrian crossings as well as bicycles. This you cannot allow, this you cannot do if you rebuild the highway as is.

That concludes my statement.

However, a poll taken of the members of the Syracuse Common Council show that 81 has to go. The Berlin wall has to be torn down.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Mr. Smith next speaker will be Barry Lentz.

JERRY SMITH: My name is Jerry
Smith

Smith, former owner of the Addis Company, a Syracuse business since the early 1900s. My comments to the gentleman from Salina and to Mr. Robinson, Mr. Robinson is correct about the incidents of asthma, unfortunately tearing down the highway and making a boulevard is going to increase that, not decrease it.

We are a community, we are not a city surrounded by the suburbs, we are a community. It goes all the way to the north in North Syracuse, to Fayetteville, over on the west to the Westhill district, West Genesee and in the south all the way to Tully. And it's time we started thinking that way as a community.

81 moves us quickly in and out of the city. The problem with 81, and I agree with Mr. Robinson, it is a Berlin wall. But it's a Berlin wall for the same reason that everything, every project that we built in this city since the 1960s has been what Gene Jacobs
Lentz calls a soulless monolith; no glass, no windows, no eyes on the street.

We should construct, reconstruct the highway the way it is, perhaps build it even higher and imagine that the highway is a roof, a ceiling, not a highway. And then underneath it we construct parks or farmers market or whatever. You want an example of it? Toronto is doing it right now. Portland has done it. Seattle Washington has done it. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Mr. Lentz, Rob Simpson will be our next speaker.

BARRY LENTZ: Good afternoon, my name is Barry Lentz, and I'm here to speak first to an alternative that I believe when liveability, sustainability and economic development are taken into consideration stands out from all the other alternatives. After that I also want to speak to what I consider to be critical social justice concerns that need to be addressed regardless of the
With respect to the preferred alternative, I believe that the best course is to reroute 12 percent of the I-81 traffic that is thru traffic around Syracuse using 481 and to make the necessary improvements and to lessen the impact that this additional traffic would cause. I believe that the I-81 Viaduct should be deconstructed and should be replaced by an at-grade roadway.

When I say at-grade roadway I want to emphasize that I do not mean a boulevard, I mean at-grade roadway that serves the local businesses and residents and that provides robust connections to what the third and fourth criteria would be, a well developed build-out of a regional mass rapid transit system that includes connections to park-and-ride portals around the suburban areas.

The fourth component of this is a
redevelopment of the I-81 corridor in the city of Syracuse that includes a revitalization of the neighborhoods that were damaged by the original construction of I-81.

These last two items are social justice concerns that should be addressed in any other alternative, regardless of what that is. In addition to these two social justice concerns I also want to mention the importance of including a community benefit agreement in any alternative rebuild that would be negotiated with an organization like the Urban Justice -- Urban Jobs Task Force or some other entity which is collaborative which represents all of the economic interest of the residents of Syracuse. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Mr. Simpson, Tom Kinslow will be recognized.

ROB SIMPSON: Good evening, thank you all for hosting the session tonight.

I'm Rob Simpson, president of Center
Simpson

State CEO. It's a regional business and economic development organization across a broad geography of Central New York.

First off I want to thank the DOT for --

MODERATOR SMITH: I should point out you have to get real close to the microphone.

ROB SIMPSON: Sorry, it was a little low for me. As I said, I'm Rob Simpson the president of Center State CEO, a regional business and economic development organization here in the region. And first of all I want to thank the DOT for engaging on this issue. I think many of us are really depending on all of you to provide the community with the objective data that we need to make an informed decision on this issue that is really critical for the community.

We're talking about spending anywhere between 750 million to a billion and-a-half dollars on the infrastructure in this region, a volume
we haven't seen in years. It's critical
that we get this right. And this is a
region that's lost jobs over the last 50
years, lost people. Nothing short of a
transformative transportation system, is
that we should not settle for anything
short of that as we make this decision.

We know that the highway as it is,
as Van mentioned hasn't necessarily
served the community well. It isn't
safe first and foremost. It has
depressed real estate values from the
city, there is no denying that. And it
itself is a source of traffic congestion
with the exits at Harrison and Adams
on-ramps and off-ramps.

I followed this debate intimately
over the course of the last five years
as the process is moving forward, and I
personally do not feel that this
community has the information we need to
make an informed decision about these
alternatives. We submitted a list of 37
questions to the DOT that we're
resubmitting tonight for the record. We need and want that information so that we can be better partners.

But as we wait for that information I would encourage you to please help this community find some common ground. I think there are lots of things, when I hear a friend in the northern suburbs and the city talking about this, that are the same. We want to improve our economy and our liveability. I don't hear anyone arguing we shouldn't be recapturing and reactivating the property under the right-of-way and adjacent to it.

We want to be minimizing the destruction of businesses and the relocation of businesses and residences, and we want to embrace the highest level of urban designs. Please know that you have many partners in this community to work with you on those goals.

MORERATOR SMITH: After Mr. Kinslow, William Simmons will be recognized.
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TOM KINSLOW: Thank you, I'm with the Central New York American Institute of Architects Chapter. Part of the Task Force is looking into the I-81 Viaduct qualitative design issues. You edited me down to two minutes so I'll chop this in half.

We have had a series of questions about the process at hand. Given that the I-81 Viaduct occupies and directly impacts the city of Syracuse and Onondaga County and our taxes pay for the highway who would be the client in this venture? Shouldn't there be significant representation from the architectural community at the top of the decision-making apparatus that represents the city and the county to work with the state planners on this.

Secondly. Are there qualified urban planners involved currently? And if so are they from the city or the county? Remember when the viaduct was constructed it was done so without local
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representation or approval. The DOT says that this is no longer the way they bring these projects to practice. Can we improve the situation by including some of the many professional groups like those working in the Syracuse University toward a more sustainable urban design?

With Boston reporting the Big Dig project to bury their elevated highway came at a staggering 2 million per mile of construction. Shouldn't the tunnel option be considered as possibly too expensive to construct here? Or for example, of other cities taking down their elevated highways are said to be non-applicable to our situation as these were spur or feeder highways rather than bypass highways, such as Route 81.

The DOT traffic study shows that 88 percent of the vehicles on I-81 are destined for the city. And in that capacity Route 81 is actually a feeder rather than primarily as a bypass. And
the I-81 Viaduct drops the commuters on two ramps within the city basically creating congestive conditions on the ground. There's a limited access, the most efficient way to feed all this traffic into and out of the city street grid system.

The Department of Transportation has estimated the project schedule from demolition to reconstruction about 2 to 3 years. In that time what becomes of the traffic? Is it possible to interrupt highway traffic for that period of time? If it is possible --

MODERATOR SMITH: Time.

TOM KINSLOW: -- to have alternative permanent solutions that are viable? Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Is Mr. Simmons here?

VAN ROBINSON: Mr. Simmons had to leave for another engagement.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, sir. After Mr. Simmons we have Jim Bright,
and following Mr. Bright, I'm sorry if I pronounce this incorrectly, Merika Treier.

JIM BRIGHT: Good afternoon. My name is Jim Bright, I'm president of the Dunk & Bright Furniture, a retail furniture store in Syracuse. I appreciate this opportunity to share my views about the proposed changes to Route 81. In particular my concern about the boulevard or otherwise known as the at-grade option, which would eliminate high speed convenient access to the center of Syracuse, thus negatively impacting Dunk and Bright business.

Dunk and Bright currently employs 85 people, the majority of whom work at our showroom at the corner of South Salina Street and West Brighton Avenue, which is very close, less than 200 yards to Route 81 south at Exit 17. We enjoy a stable workforce and appreciate the convenience of easy access to our
Bright business.

Rather than having multiple stores in the suburbs our strategy has been to expand our showroom selection in one central location. Centralized and convenient access for our customers has been very important to our growth. Over the decades Dunk and Bright has acquired and improved many vacant commercial and residential properties and now maintain nearly 2,000 feet along South Salina, West Brighton, McClure and Warner Avenues.

We draw customers from a wide radius. Cortland to Binghamton, Elmira, New Hartford, Rome, Utica, Central Square, Pulaski, Watertown, Plattsburgh Massena, west to Camillus, Baldwinsville, Auburn, Fulton, Oswego, the Finger Lakes.

A vitally important factor to our success in drawing customers from this large radius and giving easy access to our showroom because of Route 81 and Exit 17. Eliminating Route 81 as a high
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speed interstate highway through the center of Syracuse would result in losing the quick access to Dunk and Bright via Exit 17, and longer drives for our customers and more traffic lights and frustrating traffic congestion.

We feel that this would negatively impact our business and likely cause Dunk and Bright to move our showroom from its current location. Thank you very much for allowing me to submit my comments.

MODERATOR SMITH: Peter Sarver will be the next speaker.

MERIKE TREIER: Good afternoon, my name is Merika Treier. You did not massacre it too badly. I am the Executive Director of the Downtown Committee of Syracuse. There is an economic interdependency of the region and the city and suburbs are inextricably linked. Hence the quality of life of the core, the understanding
that change is needed will benefit all residents. The current configuration of the 81 Viaduct is a physical barrier in the neighborhoods and it isn't working. Our city has changed dramatically over the last 50 years and we need a transportation system that reflects these changes. Our major employment base is located downtown and at the University Hill. We need to facilitate the growth of these employers by allowing ease of access for vibrant communities that employees deserve and residents.

Eliminating this barrier to reunite the city's core with an inviting, safe and efficient alternative will give this community one of its greatest opportunities for future growth. We need to restore connections to our neighborhoods and not look to solutions that accept the status quo that would lead to more destruction of our city. The interstate should enhance the city,
not define our community. Syracuse is not any city USA, and we want a transportation solution that will reflect our community's soul.

That said we need to create transportation alternatives to ensure that this will not be a one road solution. We need to improve the street grid for enhanced transportation flow. We need to allow for more access and egress opportunities to roadways to eliminate congestion points that we currently experience on Route 81.

We need to look forward and plan for efficient mass alternative transportation opportunities. We have significant opportunity to generate new tax revenues for our community. The current path of 81 has the potential to be a vibrant new neighborhood, and we need to allow for uses that will promote this. Although the city accounts for only 3 percent of the county taxable land area we generate 29 percent of the
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county property tax revenue. There is
significant potential to generate under-
utilized areas. We ask that you
acknowledge that the current design of
81 is not acceptable. We ask that you
rely on the experience of a
multi-disciplinary planning team to
propose transportation alternatives for
our community so as not to repeat the
mistakes of the past. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Mr. Sarver
the next speaker would be Ann Marie
Taliercio.

PETER SARVER: Thank you for this
opportunity to speak, I'm Peter Sarver,
President of the Alliance of Communities
to Transform Syracuse, known more
popularly by our acronym as ACTS. And
we are an interfaith network of
congregations and social advocacy
organizations working on social justice
concerns. We have taken this
opportunity up as one in which we want
to embrace a number of social justice
Sarver concerns. And they're couched in the context of making the best use of the space that we know as the center city.

We believe the revitalization of Syracuse is critical. And particularly we represent the concerns of disadvantaged and low income people who are in the city who were grievously displaced and otherwise had their interests overlooked during the initial construction of the I-81 Interstate.

Two concerns that we'd like to bring to your attention. One is transportation. While the automobile culture of the suburbs is fine for the suburbs we're concerned about revitalization in terms of higher density, which means that we need to have more multiple opportunities of transportation, particularly public transportation.

And the second issue that I'd like to call to your attention is the need for local jobs. Many of the people particularly in the city have not had
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sufficient opportunities for training.

We see this as a time when the community
benefits agreement would in fact enhance
the ability of many people who are
unemployed or under-employed to receive
some of the jobs that would be involved
with this infrastructure development.

Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Ms. Ann
Marie Taliercio the next speaker will be
Gary Toth.

ANN MARIE TALIERCIO: First like to
thank you for having these hearings and
opening the conversation to allow more
voices to be heard. As president, my
name is Ann Marie Taliercio, and I'm
President of the Central New York area
Labor Federation AFL-CIO. I'm here to
speak on behalf of thousands of my
members within our region. These
workers and thousands of others like
them throughout this area have come to
rely on 81 every day for a quick commute
amidst their busy schedule to get to
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work on time. Some even have purchased homes or chosen where they work because of the highway proximity in mind.

A boulevard would add more time, miles, frustration to their commutes every day while damaging businesses and putting their jobs at-risk. The added miles of course would also add gas to their cost of getting to work, gas is high, it's probably going to stay high. And we can't afford to put workers at-risk to not even be able to get to their jobs.

A large group of the workers I represent are in the hotel, hospitality and the health care industry. Many of these properties including the County Convention Center and the SUNY Health Science complex. I'm here tonight, I'll just submit my full comments, but in October the Central New York Federation as well as the Central and Northern New York Building Trade passed resolutions strongly opposing this misguided
boulevard plan. Today I'm here urging state officials to thoroughly examine the numerous other options for I-81 which include the tunnel, decompressed roadway or a new bridge. Please, thank you for considering anything but the boulevard. Thank you.

MODOERATOR SMITH: After Mr. Toth the next speaker is Kenneth Hoogs.

GARY TOTH: My name is Gary Toth. Forgive my voice, I've got a bad cold. Career transportation engineer for 40 years in the business, 34 years at the New Jersey Department of Transportation doing work much like Joe Flint did. I've gone for the large part of that career, I believe a lot of us believed that building big roads was good for America and it is good for America. But as time went on we began to study things and learned that adding capacity wasn't really solving the mobility problems in this country.

Studies done in 120 metropolitan
areas throughout the country show that building high speed freeways alone, in each of those 120 communities congestion has gotten worse, much worse. In the communities in New York State like Rochester and Albany, the traffic congestion and delay, five times worse than it was in 1982.

So we have learned that the best way to do, in the last 10 years we've learned as an industry the best way to approach this is to develop complete systems, address the whole system. And I can see from the information package that New York State DOT put out that they have obviously learned that too. And so the approach that they're showing here to look at the whole system, but more importantly to base it on studies. Not on the beliefs that we embraced for 40 or 50 years that simply building new roads will improve mobility and when they get congested to widen them. Not automatically to assume that but base
their studies on data and modeling.

So I applaud New York State DOT for what they're doing here and for engaging the stakeholders to do it. And whatever alternative emerges out of this, as somebody said before, a billion dollars of New York State money is going into this process, and I hope that to support New York State in making sure that the right decision is made based on data.

So thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Mr. Hoogs the next speaker will be Dave Mankiewicz.

KENNETH HOOGS: Hello, I'm Dr. Kenneth Hoogs, I've been a doctor in town here for 43 years. I did medical school in North Carolina. When I was coming up to the exit in New York I interviewed in Rochester and I was also going to check here in Syracuse. Well the roads in Rochester are a maze. And it was very confusing, it was tough to get around. And then I came to Syracuse and I said, oh my golly, this 81 cuts
right through the middle of town, you can get anywhere you want, we've got all these nice roads around here. By golly you can be out in the suburbs or wherever. So I ended up here in Syracuse for the last 43 years. And it's because of Route 81.

I've lived in three different locations around the area here, and all the time I can get around so easily because of the nice roads here. So thank you for having Route 81 and I hope we can keep it going.

MODERATOR SMITH: The next speaker will be Marilyn Higgins.

DAVE MANKIEWICZ: Good afternoon, my name is Dave Mankiewicz, I'm the President of the University Hill Corporation, it's a not-for-profit organization whose members include the medical and educational institutions of the organizations and the religious institutions on the Hill. I also serve as a member of the SMTC Study Advisory
Mankiewicz Committee on 81.

From the standpoint of my members there are several things that we would like to see this project accomplish. First of all one thing that has to come or when it's done is that the highway, the barrier that is currently created by the highway between University Hill and downtown must be eliminated. The current configuration is dark, ugly, foreboding, it's not a place for pedestrians who want to walk. And the economic condition of the city will be greatly improved by connecting those two places.

Second thing I'd like to consider because of the current configuration of the highway and the fact that all the University Hill traffic is generally driven towards the Harrison/Adams onramp and off-ramps is that it concentrates the traffic and it forces traffic over the stretch of the viaduct that really doesn't need to be there. If you have a
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location on the northern portion of the Hill you don't really need to make that trip and then go back, and that you have to make the same useless movement basically to go home again. So that's something that's important to us. We want to find alternative access points to the Hill. SMTC has suggested the possibilities of I-690 and also getting direct access from Interstate 481.

The other thing we'd like to see happen is that we'd like to see an increase in transit on the Hill. That's an important alternative that our employers and employees need. It is also important to our members that local roads are not severed. That was suggested in the study of either a tunnel or if a depressed highway was built, major streets, including Erie Boulevard, Fayette Street, Almond Street North would have to be closed. That is not acceptable. That is going to lose a great economic development opportunity.
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Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Ms. Higgins

Anthony Mangano will be the next speaker.

MARILYN HIGGINS: Hello, I'm Marilyn 
Higgins, I'm here today as a resident, 
and most of my comments will be directed 
from that point of view, but I'm also 
going to add some comments related to my 
position with the Near West Side 
Initiative.

As a member of CES for cities and in 
my current job as vice-president of 
economic development for SU, and in my 
previous job as vice-president of 
economic development for National Grid 
I learned that the devil is not in the 
details. The devil is in the goals and 
objectives of a project. And I think 
that's what we're here to talk about 
today.

So I want to suggest that you 
radically depart from the traditional 
process and make your first paramount 
objective under Goal One to reduce the
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amount of local traffic. The number of
short hops taken by local drivers on
this viaduct by a significant percent.
I suggest this because whether we like
it or not the highway, interstate
highway goes through our city. And if
we don't repair the damage that was done
to the street grid when it was built
you're going to end up building
something bigger and more difficult in
the future.

If you select an alternative that
enables local traffic to continue using
the viaduct the way they are today your
work will be harder, the process will be
more divisive and it will eventually
lead to problems for our physically
challenged city.

So I ask that your consultants look
at the street grid first. If the street
grid can be made to work in Manhattan
and move traffic well, quickly and
efficiently it can be made to work in
Syracuse.
Last, I'd like to say that along with this objective please don't consider West Street the easy option for moving traffic around town. That eight lines of fury is notorious for being dangerous for people. And we ask you to not consider that an easy solution.

Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Mr. Mangano, Stephanie White will be the next speaker.

ANTHONY MANGANO: Thank you to everyone on the panel for your time and attention today. I sincerely appreciate your efforts to help us find the best solutions for I-81. Thank you to all that have given your input today and throughout the past few months on this very important issue.

My name is Tony Mangano, my family own four hotels located at the crossroads of New York State, Interstate 81 and the New York State Thruway. Over the years my family has invested $40
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million in these and other businesses in
Syracuse, and we employ more than 250
members of our community. The future of
Interstate 81 is absolutely critical to
my business.

Our hotels were all built and
financed on the premise that our
customers, predominantly people from out
of town must have quick and easy access
to our front doors. More than 90 percent
of our customers come to us in their own
vehicle, and a vast majority of them
arrive via 81. During some periods of
the year almost 30 percent arrive
without reservation. Even in today's
high tech world of GPS units right in
our phones no one wants to poke their
way around in a strange city sometimes
in the dark or even in a snow storm to
find a safe and comfortable place to
stay.

Interstate 81 is my main street. In
removing or diverting any part of it
will hurt my business as well as dozens
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of others that have set up shop near the interstate, will also jeopardize hundreds of tourism industry jobs.

Interstate 81 is not only for those of us who live and work in Onondaga County, we are the crossroads of New York State and a unique and important feature only Syracuse can claim. Our city and county have thrived because of that. Easy access to key destinations such as OnCenter, Armory Square, Destiny USA, the zoo, the airport, the Regional Transportation Center are just as important as easy access to a downtown office, apartment or local hospital.

A major part of this community's future is in tourism, and we need to ensure our visitors can easily access and navigate our area. Adding miles is congestion and confusing to a visitor's trip, it will make them think twice about coming back to Syracuse. There is no question that 81 needs immediate attention and substantial investment.
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However, erasing 50 years and millions of dollars of previous investment and progress built upon the present highway is not our only option. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Stephen White the next speaker will be Minch Lewis.

STEPHEN WHITE: Thank you for the Stephen, I'm not Stephanie. Preserve the character.

MODERATOR SMITH: Penmanship, not appearance.

STEPHEN WHITE: I'm Steve White and I represent Citizens to Preserve the Character of Skaneateles, the Village and Town of Skaneateles and the merchants and businesses housed on Route 20 in the Village and Town of Skaneateles.

Both the Town and Village have passed resolutions requesting you to abandon any plan to create a boulevard. And for good reason. First the amount of garbage haulers going through our Town on Route 20 had a severely negative
impact on customer volume, pollution, smell, noise, dirt, vibration, and therefore sales.

Our second concern, impacting us and all the citizens of Syracuse is hazardous waste traveling on both sides of Skaneateles Lake - the source of free and clean water for our Village and Syracuse. You should be able to quantify the probability of accidents per truck mile driven on Routes 41, 41A, 38 and 38A. I personally responded to two spills of toxic materials near the Lake as a first responder from Boradino Fire Department.

Syracuse currently has a Federal Filtration Avoidance Certificate with no expiration date. Any serious spills of noxious substances could void that certificate and force Syracuse to build and maintain an expensive filtration plant to treat that tainted water. Owasco and Auburn face a similar problem.
Rerouting those trucks around 481 to 690 on their way to Seneca Meadows Landfill would be disastrous for Skaneateles and could be for Syracuse as well. You know those haulers won't accept those extra miles travel time and would find that their way back through our Town.

Also consider the effect of lowering the present source of I-81 traffic pollution to street level in downtown. The noise would be magnified by echoing from building to building. The exhaust smell and toxicity would be concentrated around nearby residences instead of a partial dissipation by wind to settle in diluted amounts in a far greater area.

Your published data identifies 2,500 vehicles passing through. Imagine a great proportion of the other 80,000 sitting at the boulevard lights in morning and evening traffic times.

Also, where would --

MODERATOR SMITH: Time.
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STEPHEN WHITE: -- approximately

1,000 people displaced by building
demolition or alteration relocate? In
human decency terms that may be the most
devastating consequence of creating a
boulevard.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Mr. Lewis
the next speaker is Jerry Prosonic.

MINCH LEWIS: My name is Minch Lewis,
I served as elected city auditor from
1995 to 2003. During that time I gained
a firsthand knowledge, understanding of
the finances of city government. The
economic vitality of this region and the
city government is dependent on the
resources that flow into the community.
Those resources come in many ways, but
one of the most important ways is on our
roadway system.

I believe that the social and
economic issues should be given very
serious consideration in the environmental
impact process.

There are two impacts. The first is
the traffic that brings resources from outside this community. In particular Destiny USA, Dunk and Bright, the educational and medical facilities serve to bring resources that support our local economy.

The second impact is on local commerce. Traffic studies show that 21,000 vehicles come to those facilities per day. Those counts do not include the vehicles that travel to those facilities on city streets. Even though many of the facilities themselves are tax exempt the thousands of employees who work there pay property taxes that impact the region as a whole.

Another socioeconomic impact would relate to the decommissioning of the viaduct portion of the I-81. The full burden for providing access to the economic institutions for thousands of vehicles would fall on city, county and state government. The economic impact would divert resources from other areas
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Finally, this decision is an opportunity to plan for the future. Prospects for the Hotel Syracuse and Convention Center could be improved. Alternatives that limit access could have a serious negative impact. A risk analysis considering both positive and negative impacts should be part of the environmental review. Thank you for your consideration.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Mr. Prosonic, Karaline Rothwell.

JERRY PROSONIC: My name is Jerry Prosonic, speaking from a very practical viewpoint. It seems to me that replacing elevated 81 with any other option is in dollars and cents as costly or more costly than modernizing and repairing it.

I flipped houses for years and it was always cheaper to repair and remodel than to replace. Mitigating factors now are the terms EIS, non-standard and
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non-conforming. That's the relativity now.

We know what we have with elevated 81. Do we know that any replacement will be as good let alone better? What if we tear down that elevated portion and then discover that in practical operation versus the planned outcome the replacement alternative does not live up to our expectations or needs? I don't see 81 as a Berlin wall, but the roadway beneath is a shame and needs to be revisited.

Think of the city infrastructure, constant road building and utilities working can be very unexpectedly resulting in rerouting, major closures and repairs. Elevated 81 provides the redundancy to city maintenance and repairs. It also provides the extra relief at event times. Using 81 and 690 as bypasses when crisscrossing the city is a real time saver for me by as much as a hundred percent. That saves fuel
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and frustration. Time is our most valued commodity.

Back in the 1960s when 81 was being built I worked for Tom Popp whose family owned one of the premier hotels at the time. We had Hotel Syracuse, Onondaga Hotel and the Yates Hotel. They were at the Yates Hotel. And I remember Tom saying very pointedly, geez I keep trying to get the state to give us more exits. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Ms. Rothwell the next speaker will be John Balloni.

KARALINE ROTHWELL: My name is Karaline Rothwell, and I am a resident of the city. I love city living, love it. I live on the west side. So I'm also a voice to the residents on the west side, residents in the city, I help also and I'm a member of the Westside Residents Coalition.

I'd like to specifically talk about the walkability factor associated with highways and the residents that are on
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the west side that do not have cars. These people need to be kept in mind. It is very difficult for my fellow residents to leave their homes and have to walk downtown, trying to get to services that they need for, to better their life. Specifically concerning West Street it is a very busy street to cross. And I correct you Marilyn it's nine lanes in some portions.

So I do, I also work at SUNY ESF and I enjoy in the summertime when it's nicer whether to be able to walk to work. When I try to cross West Street, which sometimes I'm pushing my son's stroller, it is scary. And so I encourage the traffic to be considered to not make West Street busy as we work on 81. But then sometimes, well all the time when I walk under 81 it is gray and it is scary. And I certainly encourage as we go forward to build up this area. Maybe we not consider driving into the city as quick as we can and leaving as
John Balloni, I'm the chief deputy with the Onondaga County Sheriff's Office. I don't have a preferred way to do this. I have concerns. On behalf of public safety I'm very concerned with how we redo this highway in that it is the main north-south route for moving emergency vehicles from one, from the northern to the southern or vice versa, wherever we have the problem. That's one of our major concerns.

Another major concern is this is a major route, north-south route to a Level 1 Trauma Center, not just for
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Syracuse but for the entire region. So that public safety aspects of this are very important. The last speaker talks about not rushing traffic, and I'm talking about rushing in and rushing out. But we have the golden hour to get somebody safely to treat at the Regional Level 1 Trauma Center. That's a big deal.

And the other concern I have is I've been in law enforcement since 1977 or public safety since that period of time. And almost all of the accidents I investigate are at intersections. If you create intersections, interchanges you create accidents. Again, public safety is my career, that's my biggest concern here. I think we just have to take these things into consideration when we're considering what to do with this highway. Our access to the hospitals, our north-south route and the level of accidents we see. I can understand that's already a concern. So
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I appreciate your time and good luck because this is a tough one.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Louer. The next speaker will be Tom Pelis.

TIM LOUER: Hi, my name is Tim Louer, I've been a citizen of Syracuse for about 22 years and I'm here with a different alternative for what some people I guess have been calling the beltway option, it's entitled the Salt City Circuit. The Salt City Circuit is a community proposal to the New York State DOT and the city of Syracuse to tear down a 1.4 mile section of viaduct and replace it with a boulevard and reroute Interstate 81 to the southern and western edges of downtown to create a micro-beltway or transportation circuit.

The Salt City Circuit concept is composed of two major components. The first of which is to tear down the existing viaduct and replace it with a boulevard. The second component is to
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eroute Interstate 81 within the city
limits instead of around the city
limits. Interstate 81 would be mostly
ererouted along vacant lands and parking
lots located on the southern edge of an
inner city railway line. Then it would
cross over an area of four city blocks
and connect to the West Street Arterial.
There the new highway would run for one
mile and connect to its original route
at Interstate 690 at Franklin Square.
Rerouting 81 this way would not only
solve the 81 dilemma, but would provide
a whole new efficient circulation
pattern for the city of Syracuse. The
new 81 and Interstate 690 and the
boulevard would act as a unified circuit
of travel around the city to move people
efficiently in the Salt City.
Several pros of this option include
keeping the interstate inside city
limits and does not force traffic away
from Syracuse. It is more cost
effective than a multi-mile long tunnel
or depressed roadway in the short term and long term maintenance pictures. It creates a formal transportation loop, additional elements such as elevated pedestrian and bicycle paths could be a possibility and would run along the circumference of the downtown area. And it eliminates any detour concerns during construction phases.

You know, no project or no proposal is perfect there are two, you know, a few cons. These are the main ones: Displacement of the private property is minimal but not absent from this concept. And the project costs exceeds that of the solo boulevard option or the viaduct replacement option. And I do not believe this would inhibit the progress. Thank you for your time.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Mr. Pelis will be Stephen Buechner.

THOMAS PELIS: My name is Tom Pelis, I'm here representing SUNY Upstate Medical University today. We have a
kind of unique situation at two levels.

One is because of what we do and the
other is because of our proximity and
presence immediately adjacent to both
the east and west side of 81 on the
elevated portion. So we're not going to
tell you the answer, we just want to
bring up four issues that we would like
addressed throughout the next phase of
the project.

The first is we really are concerned
about noise and especially vibration,
both during construction and after
construction, because it dramatically
affects patient services and diagnostic
testing. We live that. Building a
cancer center and many other things
around the hospital, so this is no
different.

Secondly, we want to address a
viable transportation plan during
construction to move emergency vehicles
and private vehicles. And we suggest
that since we're sure you're going to
look at a comprehensive plan that's not just about the road, that you implement the mass transit solution before you start the construction of 81 so that it's in place when 81 starts, whatever it is you do.

Thirdly, address the safe pedestrian crossing along the footprint of 81, the elevated portion, it's a nightmare right now. We have hundreds, and in a few years we'll have thousands of people just from Upstate crossing back and forth.

And lastly, whatever you do, don't do the status quo. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity. Think big and think comprehensively. Thank you.
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Syracuse. I've been practicing since 1964 with the Reimann & Buechner Partnership. The concept I developed was prepared to get the planners to think outside of the box.

In my opinion the boulevard and the viaduct are not going to solve the traffic problem. And equally as important because of people it's not going to help to revitalize the city. This concept that I put together, and it's basically an unsolicited concept, was basically a focus on the area between Adams Street and Erie Boulevard.

Now this is not the Big Dig, folks, this is to basically lower the road one level. This will be basically a structure built below grade as you can see and then we will tie into the east-west streets to make it more convenient for people to get into the city. We have some wonderful facilities in the city. Right now when you're coming from the south you only have one opportunity
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to get off. And when you're coming from
the north you only have one opportunity
to get off.

Basically the park itself will be
active and passive recreation facilities
and it will tie the downtown with the
University Hill. The through-traffic,
that percent that we've been talking
about, will get off out at Nedrow and
will either come back into the city via
690 or tie back into 81 up by the
Northern Mall, etc. So the lower level
road can also be two levels high and the
through-traffic can go through that
area. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: The next speaker
will be Mr. Cass.

TODD BUCHKO: Good evening, my name
is Todd Buchko and I'm a Syracuse
resident and general manager of Wonder
Works at Destiny USA off of Interstate
81. First I would just like to take a
moment to thank the Department of
Transportation for hosting this meeting
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and allowing residents to make our voices heard on such an important issue for our community.

As a general manager of a business at Destiny USA I can tell you that we have a lot of visitors from outside the region who use I-81 to quickly and conveniently reach us. That's because I-81 serves as a major arterial for visitors to Syracuse and Central New York connecting them with destinations such as the OnCenter, Syracuse University and the Carrier Dome. In fact tourism plays an important role in our region's economy. And I-81 brings many of these visitors to our community.

We heard the options that have been discussed for dealing with the aging portions of the highway here in downtown Syracuse for rebuilding the elevated highway to tunnel or boulevard. I do have serious concerns about how the boulevard plan will affect tourism in our region. Replacing I-81 with a
boulevard could impede visitors access to the key tourist destinations in our area as well as hotels, restaurants and many other businesses. And diverting I-81 around Syracuse will only add miles to visitors trips and cause unnecessary headaches and confusion.

For example think about the traffic and congestion following a Syracuse basketball or football game at the Carrier Dome. A boulevard will only add time and frustration to our visitors trying to get home after the game. Many visitors to our region are stop-over visitors who stop at businesses along highways for gas, restaurants and lodging. Diverting this traffic could damage these kinds of businesses located along our highway. As the DOT and other officials move forward with the I-81 project I urge them to give thoughtful consideration to these concerns which are shared by many in the community.

Thank you for your time.
MARK CASS: Good afternoon, my name is Mark Cass, Director of Alliance of Communities Transforming Syracuse, and a resident of the city. Initially what attracted me to this is the history of the devastation of a neighborhood. But that said, it's past tense. This neighborhood still has many many low income residents who had decades of noise, congestion, low air quality. So our concern really is that people count in this, you know, as well. And that our social justice concerns and criteria affect the decision-making process.

So applaud your willingness to be looking at a number of alternatives and to consider those things. Displacing that into another neighborhood or the near west side for instance is also an unacceptable solution. We can't continue to make these same mistakes.

See broad economic viability of
Syracuse, Syracuse is the center of a county, we are one community, but we can't continue on the path we've been on. Any future use of the footprint of the viaduct should include mixed income housing and other opportunities for people in the broad community as a city as well.

Encourage you to take a holistic approach to the traffic. We have funneled all of that to one area, some of which is by needs, some of which has really been caused by the highway. Also just have one question. There has been many reference to bicycle and pedestrian access. I'm assuming but hope that it considers people with disabilities as well as part of being able to move safely and comfortably in that area.

Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Reverend Thompson, Patti Monday.

REVEREND THOMPSON: Good evening to the New York State Department of
Rev. Thompson

Transportation, thank you very much for coming here this evening and giving the city residents of Syracuse the opportunity to voice our comments and our concerns. I live in the south side/near west side neighborhoods of Syracuse, and I'm also a Reverend at the Fountain of Life Church, 700 South Ave. And the voices of the people are going to be expressed through me who live in those particular areas.

And our concerns are that the residents of that neighborhood, for us a boulevard is not an option. You don't have to go far to understand why that is necessary for us not to have the boulevard. Just look at West Street. And West Street itself is a nightmare in a lot of situations. And it's also a divider. We do not wish for the city of Syracuse to be divided any further than it already is divided with the highway coming straight down the center of it. We know that the highways do unite
traffic, we know that it unites cars and people coming into the neighborhoods. But it divides the people who live in the neighborhood.

Also our concerns are for the elderly, the children and the disabled who may not have friendly accessibility to crossing of the streets in the city that this highway would represent. You have to go no further back than 1968, for which the adverse conditions of the building of Interstate 81 had on the communities from the displacement of residents to having to move, to health issues that was related to the I-81 building.

And lastly as an option though we would like to ask that you consider a resident friendly mass transportation included in your plan. Also we're concerned as the members of the clergy the removal of local churches that may occur with the oncoming encroachment of lands that would have to be taken due to
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eminent domain. And this is a concern for us because churches act not only as a community of centers but it also acts as a place of worship and daycare and helps unite to bring the community together. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

PATTI MONDAY: Deb Nelson, I owe you an apology, I thought that 81 viaduct stuff was yours, and when I read the master plan I thought it was about Hitler and, you know, so I apologize. I do apologize. Can I start now?

MODERATOR SMITH: You may.

PATTI MONDAY: I hear a lot about aesthetics, and I think that means beautify. Well, I live where your aesthetics are. Doesn't matter to me about aesthetics, what matters to me going to my door and getting up every morning and going out my door. There is a hospital right three blocks up the street that I can get to. The University has dorms right behind my
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building. Upstate has bought up all the buildings that used to be medical centers and other things, and Upstate is buying up all the buildings around my area. Syracuse University is buying up all the other buildings. You want your money? You want your infrastructure, put taxes on Syracuse University. Let them pay their taxes. Have Destiny USA pay taxes. Have Upstate University Hospital pay their taxes, okay?

Building neighborhoods. You're not building these neighborhoods, you're tearing them down. Where I live you're going to tear all of our buildings down when you tear that bridge down because you're not going to have any place to put that boulevard or tunnel except where our homes are. Leave us in peace, leave the neighborhoods in peace, protect the children, give them something to look forward to 50 years down the road. That's all we want. I don't need 30 more seconds thanks.
MODERATOR SMITH: The next speaker will be Bob Doucette. After Bob Doucette will be Phil Jakes-Johnson.

BOB DOUCETTE: Thank you very much. My name is Bob Doucette, I'm a resident of the city of Syracuse. The Route 81 viaduct was constructed in the City of Syracuse against the will of the people and the elected representatives at the time. Look it, this is a barrier, it's dirty, it's noisy and it's ugly and it needs to come down. And you know, everything I've heard today is basically not that people can't get to a certain place beyond the city it's just how long it's going to take them to get there. That's put against what it means to the people of Syracuse who have to live with this thing in the area.

Find a way, reroute the traffic, disperse the traffic, create a system of traffic which will allow the easy transportation of cars but will allow for people to live in the city, walk in
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the city and bike in the city. Take
down the viaduct, please.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Mr. Jakes-Johnson, Alan Jurison.

PHIL JAKES-JOHNSON: My name is Phil Jakes-Johnson, I'm a business owner with
two properties, one in downtown Syracuse
a manufacturing plant and it is united
with my distribution and manufacturing
plant in Salina. And I really want to
see us maintain Interstate 81 as a
designated interstate. And one of the
things I want to think about 81 is I
really consider it a uniter. I feel
that it unites the northern part of our
county, it unites the southern part of
our county, both economically and
socially. If I want to get downtown and
get to places, you know, on the 1700
block of Salina Street for my location
it's very easy to do that with an
interstate.

Technology has always brought us
together, because a hundred years ago we
were a lot more isolated as people in the community. With the internet today I consider it the interstate highway system from the '50s and '60s, is a real uniter. So I don't look at it as a scar on the community. I look at it as a concrete ribbon that draws us together.

So, you know some of the suggestions we have, the improvements that can be made to 81 such as maybe raising it up to the level of a skyway and what can be done with the public space underneath. But I really want to support and we maintain it as a designated interstate highway.

ALAN JURISON: Hi, I'm Alan Jurison, I'm a local city resident and I've lived in the metro area for over 22 years. I wanted to say that I'm for quick easy access either an elevated or recessed solution, no tunnel, no boulevard. But one of the things we need to look at that a lot of people are missing are perspective, looking at it from a national perspective. I do a lot of
travel all across the country, I've seen a lot of different solutions to transportation concerns. And what's happening is that all these success stories we've heard of people tearing down the interstates and things likes that in cities, they're not always the case. Also sometimes it's a farce.

And let's look at some of the most renowned examples is this highway they tore down in San Francisco. San Francisco is not a model of a metropolitan area for people who need to commute. It's great for the people that can spend, you know, millions of dollars on a house and can stay there, but for the people that actually have to work, the working class that work outside of the city and commute it's a disaster what they did. There is a hundred thousand cars that traverse that US 101 area over the Golden Gate Bridge and US 101 area. Very similar to the 81 corridor as far as number of cars.
That's one of the largest cities in our country, fourth largest metro. When companies, automotive companies are looking for traffic data, that's one of the things I do for my day job, they look where the disasters are. That's one of the places they focus on. They want to go look at that area, because the traffic is really bad there. And yet we want to make that our model. So anyway, it's the politicians and the elite that are imposing impractical and ideal decisions that don't really measure with reality. And where are all the people saying why don't we tear interstate 690, because that's a divider for the city too. But Armory Square, Hanover Square and Franklin Square seem to be doing just fine.

MODERATOR SMITH: The next speaker will be Mr. Pelligra followed by Mr. Penn. Mr. Penn?

WILLIAM PENN: My name is Bill Penn, and I'm an adjunct professor in the
engineering school at SU and a G.E. retiree. For many many years I endured the traffic jams during rush hour, especially southbound at Pearl Street. In those days everybody had to get off at Pearl Street. And the traffic would back up all the way to Park Street. So for years and years I endured that.

Finally the day came after many rather minor steps they opened the entire highway. And I thought I was in a Star Trek scenario and I was beamed from Liverpool to Cortland County. It was just wonderful. So I am pleading with all of the officials to not lose that character of our community, that we can get around so easily and so quickly.

Now as far as the Berlin wall separating the city is concerned, I think that the viaduct has the potential of not dividing the city but to integrate the city. Because if you do some creative work with the traffic grid underneath and get the lights
synchronized properly and get the people off the off ramps quickly and give high priority to the Adams Street off-ramp, the left turn onto Adams and so forth, that you can have a city which is integrated better than if you destroy that viaduct. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: The next speaker Debra Gallagher, followed by Bob Haley, followed by Phil Schuls.

DEBRA GALLAGHER: My name is Debra Gallagher, I'm the Executive Director of the North Area Volunteer Ambulance Corps known as NAVAC. We provide EMS services to the northern suburbs of Onondaga County specifically the towns of Cicero, the village of North Syracuse and portions of the Town of Clay and Salina as well as Hancock International Airport.

NAVAC handles approximately 6,000 calls that originate annually from the 911 Center, and 82 percent of those require transport to one of our hospitals.
Specifically the last year 38 percent went to St. Joe's, 46 percent went to the trauma center at SUNY Upstate and 14 percent to Crouse and then a little less than 2 percent to the VA. We rely on the 81 corridor for transport to these facilities. We are concerned about any option, particularly the boulevard concept with traffic controls that would delay our ability to quick access to these hospitals.

We deal with life and death situations, all right? Time is of the essence. The quicker you can get to a hospital the better the outcome. And it's not just our poor that is concerned about this, we have excellent facilities here, hospital facilities in Syracuse. And many of our neighbors to the north and south of us utilize us. And they utilize it via ambulance services. Anything that is going to sit there and delay our ability and access to these hospitals is not acceptable. We really
hope that you take this into consideration when you're coming up with other alternatives. And I thank you very much for your time.

MODERATOR SMITH: Bob Haley followed by Phil Schuls.

BOB HALEY: Thank you designers, thank you team. My name is Bob Haley, I'm an architect and a planner. And I grew up in the suburbs, grew up in the Fayetteville Manlius district, spent my early life there and been a resident of the city 45 years now.

I'd like to just thank you for the time and to think about things in a different way. It's great having these meetings because we listen to each others experiences, they're vast and they're wide. As planners and designers we have to get outside the personal and look at systems and volumes and impacts.

I'd like to look at simply the picture up on your wall, the picture here showing that highway going right
Haley through the middle of the city. It's analogous to how roadways were built through the small towns and villages all around here. They were slow pace wagon type and walking. They came to the city centers and houses developed around them and banks and post offices and neighborhoods. And over the years the highway volumes gotten so high they separated these.

Manlius for years has dealt with the issue of traffic from Cazenovia coming through the area. Widened the city centers and village center, it has gotten more difficult and more unfriendly. Same thing in Liverpool. Highway coming straight into the village. It's a battle between mitigation of traffic for pedestrian safety and quality of life versus flow of the cars.

This highway is a perfect example. 50 years ago it was put in here. Look at the impact on the city. Isn't it
interesting that it took out, how many residents did it take out of the city in its building process? Probably 25,000, probably. Look at the footprint.

Secondly, that was the time that all the people were leaving the city. The decision that makes people leave the city. The long term impact was you don't want to now build next to this highway.

With all this being said and the negative impact it's your opportunity now to look at this for the next 50 years and use the design skills to look at it differently than traffic. Look at the urban issue on the quality of place and look at how we can use the design tools. And the number one thing is to first, if you have an option that shows the new highway standards, we haven't seen it, for two and-a-half to three years we've been asking for it. We need to see that as an option.

MODERATOR SMITH: Time.
BOB HALEY: The only other thing I can say is that -- I thank you for your time.

MODERATOR SMITH: Phil Schuls.

PHIL SCHULS: My name is Phil Schuls and I'm not here to actually favor any alternative that's been discussed today. Actually I find that the alternatives that have been given so far are very generic. In fact the whole study in the other room I find just generic. That in many cases it could be applied to any project like this fella a little while ago talked about and Van.

What I'm interested in is seeing specific solutions. In other words, when I hear about the possible alternatives being reconstruction or a boulevard or a tunnel or a depressed highway, I don't really know what these mean, because there is many different ways that they can be achieved. So what I'm interested in is seeing the details. In other words, how the solutions will
look, not just what I call words.

So here's the questions I have. I found that everything about the Scoping study is again to use the word, generic. I'm looking for like details. And the questions are, like when will you have the detailed alternatives according to schedule? When do you plan to have the detailed alternatives? When will we see the pros and cons and the lifetime costs of those alternatives? And what is the overall schedule of this whole process? I never saw a schedule like the overall schedule. And when and how will the final decision be made? Thank you for your consideration.

MODERATOR SMITH: We have six speakers left and we need to begin the 6 o'clock meeting. Those speakers wish to speak, still wish to speak you may speak at the 6 o'clock meeting or you may give your statements at the booth in the lobby or you may provide them in writing. I'm sorry we didn't get to the
last six but we need to, you can tell
people are filing in for the next
meeting, and you'll be allowed to speak
there if you wish. Thank you for your
participation and thank you for your
interest.

(10 minute recess then 6:00 hearing commenced).
MS. NELSON: Welcome everyone, if those of you in the back of the room could move closer up you'll find you'll see the projector better, see the screen better. So I encourage you to take a minute and move up. Welcome everyone. Thank you all for coming out here tonight for this meeting. On behalf of Joan McDonald, the Commissioner of the New York State Department of Transportation and Jonathan McDade the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, New York Division, I welcome you to this Initial Scoping Meeting.

My name is Debera Nelson and I'm the project director of the I-81 Viaduct Project. With me tonight I have two project leads, Lisa Weiss and Joseph Flint. I also would like to recognize Robert Davies from our Federal Highway Administration, he's the district engineer.

Lisa, Joe and I together, we form
the leadership team for this project and we oversee the I-81 Viaduct Project. Collectively we have more than 86 years of experience with the New York State Department of Transportation, bringing to the project expertise in the environmental process, engineering and urban design.

This is the first of two Scoping meetings for the Environmental Impact Statement or EIS that will be prepared for the I-81 Viaduct Project in Syracuse, New York. This Initial Scoping Meeting is sponsored by the two agencies that are serving as lead agencies for this EIS. The New York State Department of Transportation is the state lead agency and the Federal Highway Administration is the federal lead agency.

The Initial Scoping meeting is being conducted to obtain comments on the scope of the project's Environmental Impact Statement. The meeting provides
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the public an opportunity to make formal statements of positions before any project decisions are made. To assist interested parties in formulating their comments associated with the Initial Scoping meeting, the Scoping Initiation Packet is available here tonight. You can pick one up at the Welcome Table or you can access our project website at www.i81opportunities.org, and the packet is available there as well. They're also available at document viewing locations throughout Greater Syracuse.

The Scoping Initiation Packet provides an overview of the project, presents the project's purpose and need as well as its goals and objectives, presents preliminary alternatives under consideration and outlines the steps in the environmental review process. It also describes public involvement opportunities.

At this time I would like to have Mr. Brody Smith, tonight's moderator,
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explain to you the format and structure
of tonight's meeting. Following that
project team lead Joseph Flint will
present an overview of the I-81 Viaduct
Project. Then Mr. Smith will moderate
the comment session. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Hello, my name is
Brody Smith, I will be the moderator for
this evening's meeting. So that we can
make a record of all those who
participated it's important that in the
room behind those doors there you take
the time to sign in at the registration
table. There will be a stenographer
(court reporter) recording these
proceedings, the stenographer (court
reporter) is seated in front of me. A
transcript of the verbatim comments will
be produced based on the stenographer's
notes. If you do end up coming up
speaking and you speak from a prepared
written statement and you are willing to
part with it, it would make the
stenographer's job much easier if you
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were to provide a copy of that.

This meeting is being held pursuant to several regulations. The Environmental Impact Statement for the I-81 Viaduct Project is being prepared in accordance with the following laws and regulations: The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, NEPA, as amended and implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations, 40 CFR Parts 1500 through 1508; the Federal Highway Administration Environmental Impact Regulations, 23 CFR Part 771; the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act, SEQRA requirements, in particular the New York State Department of Transportation's implementing regulations at 17 NYCRR Part 15, and a number of other federal and state regulations and requirements. Among them are Presidential Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Section 4F of U.S.
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Department of Transportation Act.

After these opening remarks and subsequent presentation you will have an opportunity to provide written and/or oral comments. If you wish to make an oral statement you must fill out one of the speaker cards at the registration desk in the foyer behind those doors if you have not already done so. Persons may make oral comments tonight in one of two ways.

First, you can come forward to this microphone here and make a comment in front of all the attendees in the meeting. I'll call your name and I'll ask you to come up to the microphone at the appropriate time. I'll also ask the person speaking after you to be behind them to keep the meeting moving so we're not waiting long periods of time in between speakers.

Secondly if you don't want to do that, if you go through these doors and to the left there is a booth set up with
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another stenographer (court reporter).
You may make your comment in private
with that stenographer (court reporter)
and it will be recorded on the record
and it will be reviewed by the project's
decision makers. All oral comments will
be limited to two minutes.

You may also submit a written
statement. Written statements may be
submitted in any one of three ways.
First, at this meeting you may fill out
and submit a comment form. Comment
forms are available at the desk in the
foyer. Second, you may access the
comment form on the project website.
Again as Ms. Nelson stated that website
is www.i81opportunities.org. There is
an online comment form there that you
may fill out.

Third, you may mail written comments
to New York State DOT I-81 Viaduct
Project, 333 East Washington Street,
Syracuse, New York, 13202. Information
on how to submit written comments is
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also provided at the welcome table in
the foyer. You can elect to submit
comments both orally or in writing if
you choose to do so. Written statements
will be given the same weight. Let me
emphasize that, written statements will
be given the same weight and
consideration as oral statements made at
this meeting.

The official public comment period
associated with this Initial Scoping
meeting will be open through the end of
Friday, January 17th, 2014. New York
State DOT and Federal Highway
Administration will accept written
comments through that time. To be part
of the public record all written
comments must be either submitted
through the website no later than Friday
January 17th, 2014 or postmarked no
later than January 17th, 2014.

The agencies will review and
consider public comments submitted
during the Scoping period and at a
future Scoping comment period. Responses to the comments will be included in a Final Scoping Report, which will conclude the Scoping phase of the project.

So that everyone who desires to speak has the opportunity to do so and be made part of the official record we will not entertain any questions from the floor in this meeting room at this time. However, there are project staff available next door in the room immediately adjacent to us. So if you leave those doors and turn to your right, in the exhibit area they are available to answer any questions that you may have. Those conversations however will not be part of the formal record.

Before I call on you the speakers from the floor I will call on Mr. Joseph Flint of the New York State Department of Transportation to give a brief presentation on the project. After he
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speaks I'll give you instructions and
some ground rules on giving comments and
then we'll proceed to your comments.

Thank you.

MR. FLINT: Good evening everyone.

Thank you for coming to this Initial
Scoping meeting for the I-81 Viaduct
Project. We all know the importance of
Interstate 81, not only locally here in
Syracuse but also beyond our city. I-81
is a major north south national,
regional and local transportation route.
It runs for approximately 855 miles from
Canada to Tennessee, connecting New York
state from its border with Pennsylvania
all the way to Canada at the Thousand
Island bridge, but also directly
connects with the east-west Thruway.
Locally I-81 provides access to downtown
Syracuse as well as University Hill, the
region's major employment and cultural
center.

The Department in cooperation with
the Federal Highway Administration and
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Syracuse Metropolitan Transportation Council concluded the I-81 Corridor Study this summer. Nearly 3,000 people provided feedback on this study. The study identified critical issues related to the I-81 corridor, which are guiding development of the I-81 Viaduct Project. It prioritized projects and concluded that there is a need for the near term reconstruction or replacement of I-81 through downtown Syracuse.

The I-81 Corridor Study identified many needs. Interestingly there was a concentration of needs in the viaduct priority area. Some of those needs are related to the structural condition of the bridges, safety issues, particularly with accident rates being three to five times the state-wide average at some locations, geometric deficiencies such as shoulder width and the distance between ramps, which are no longer consistent with current day design standards, capacity issues such as
severe congestion at some locations in the a.m. and p.m. peak travel periods. Back in the late 1960s when construction of I-81 was completed highway standards were different. Today I-81 carries 50,000 to a hundred thousand vehicles per day depending upon where you are on the interstate, and the majority of this traffic is traveling to or from or through downtown Syracuse.

The area identified as the viaduct priority area is 3.5 miles long and crosses 18 streets with 103 bridge spans. It extends from Dr. Martin Luther King east on the south to Hiawatha boulevard on the north. The viaduct itself, the elevated portion of the highway is a mile and-a-half long.

With the Federal Highway Administration as the federal lead agency and the New York State Department of Transportation as the state lead agency we are now entering the NEPA phase of the project. NEPA stands for
the National Environmental Policy Act. And the NEPA process is intended to help public officials make decisions based on an understanding of environmental consequences and take actions that protect, restore and enhance the environment.

A Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement was published in the federal register on August 26th of this year, initiating project review under NEPA. This phase of the project is focusing on developing reasonable and feasible alternatives for the I-81 Viaduct including opportunities to improve local street connectivity, pedestrian and bicycle access and potential land use and economic benefits.

During the early review phase we will focus on the following.

Establishing the project's goals and objectives as well as the project goals -- I'm sorry, the purpose and need as
Flint well as the project's goals and objectives. Examine and develop alternatives for further study. Develop an environmental analysis framework and engage agency stakeholders and public participation in the process.

The purpose of the project will be to create an improved corridor that meets transportation needs, supports long range planning efforts and moves people and goods safely and efficiently. Additionally the project's purpose will consider how transportation infrastructure can enhance economic growth in the Greater Syracuse area while addressing structural deficiencies and non-standard highway features.

The project is guided by two overarching goals supported by a number of objectives to help achieve those goals. These goals were informed by the corridor goals identified by the community members who participated in the Corridor Planning Study.
The first of two major goals of the I-81 Viaduct Project is to improve the safety and create an efficient regional and local transportation system within and through Greater Syracuse. Objectives for this first goal are to eliminate structural deficiencies and improve bridge ratings. Secondly, to address identified geometric and operational deficiencies.

The second goal of the project is to provide transportation solutions that enhance the liveability, sustainability and economic vitality of Greater Syracuse. The objectives of the second goal are to first, create transportation infrastructure that is consistent with the long range plans of the Syracuse metropolitan planning area. Secondly, to improve bicycle and pedestrian surface connections along Interstate 81. To improve the visual and aesthetic character of transportation infrastructure to
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minimize the perceived barrier between downtown and adjacent neighborhoods.
Lastly, to maintain or enhance vehicle access to the regional highway network and key destinations.

As you can see from this graphic we are currently in the Scoping phase of the environmental review process. A key part of the environmental review process is public involvement. As indicated on this graphic, public participation will be ongoing throughout the process.

During the environmental review we will be looking at alternative solutions to I-81 issues and investigating the potential benefits and impacts, the pros and their cons of these approaches.

These studies will be documented in a comprehensive document called an Environmental Impact Statement or EIS, which will be prepared according to federal and state guidance. The EIS will look at how the project alternatives would affect the environment.
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How does each alternative affect air quality, community character, land uses and noise, for example? What are the transportation, economic, quality of life and environmental benefits and detriments of each alternative? The answers to these questions will be in the Environmental Impact Statement.

We are now in the Scoping stage of the project. During scoping the public has an opportunity to comment on what is studied in the Environmental Impact Statement. To help you the public and agencies understand the project we have prepared a Scoping Initiation Package. This informational document introduces the I-81 Viaduct Project, describes the purpose and need and the steps in the environmental review and gives an overview of the preliminary alternatives and public involvement opportunities.

During Scoping we will identify alternatives to be evaluated in the Environmental Impact Statement. This
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Initial Scoping meeting marks the beginning of the initial formal Scoping comment period which will run through January 17th, 2014. Formal comments including those submitted at this meeting will be responded to in a Final Scoping report which will mark the end of Scoping. This meeting is the first of two Scoping meetings. At this initial meeting we will present an overview of the NEPA process, when and how the public can be involved, how the I-81 Corridor Study informs the current project, the purpose and need of the project, its goals and objectives and preliminary list of alternatives.

As the starting point we are looking at alternatives identified during the Corridor Study. The above grade or reconstruction alternative; the at-grade or surface alternative; the below grade or depressed highway alternative, and the below grade tunnel alternative.

In addition to the alternatives that
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came from the Corridor Study other
alternatives may be suggested during
this Scoping phase. You can learn more
about how we will study the alternatives
by reviewing our boards displayed in the
open house section of this meeting next
door. Although not illustrated on the
boards it is important to know that the
Draft Environmental Impact Statement
will also include a no build alternative,
which serves as a benchmark against
which to compare the build alternatives.

During Scoping alternatives will be
identified and explored further. We
will develop multiple options for each
alternative. Engineer these options,
meaning we will begin to work out
engineering details, plans and profiles
and determine the feasibility of these
alternatives. We will take many
considerations into account.

For example, among these
considerations are issues related to
highway design, such as how many lanes
Flint

should the highway have? How wide will they need to be? How wide would a median need to be? What about shoulder width, curvature and elevation? How can we make the highway operate most efficiently and effectively?

To determine this we look at data such as traffic volumes, determine the best location for ramps, how far apart should the ramps be, and ways to optimize roadway safety. We are considering issues such as snow and ice removal and maintenance costs of the highway. We will also take into account community impacts such as effects on local street systems, pedestrian and bicycle safety, property requirements, visual quality, traffic noise and any potential impacts on historic resources. We will take into account quality of life impacts and explore sustainable design elements, such as stormwater management. We will explore designs that enhance pedestrian and bicyclist
Flint experiences, urban design improvements, such as lighting and cross walks, and opportunities to enhance economic development.

The refined alternatives will then be presented for public review at the future Scoping meeting which will also present our initial evaluation results. We will present the Environmental Impact Statement study area as well as the methodology used to study and analyze environmental issues. As the project moves forward we will continue to engage the public and provide opportunities for input. We will develop and refine project alternatives, hold a second Scoping meeting in the future, then prepare the Final Scoping report. This report will identify alternatives to carry forward into the Environmental Impact Statement and include responses to comments submitted during the comment periods.

As explained earlier, we will be
accepting written comments through January 17th and accepting oral comments at this meeting. Again, if you would like to speak please fill in a speaker card at the welcome table. The speaking portion of this meeting will begin directly after this presentation. For more information please visit us at the project website i81opportunities.org, the website will be continually updated throughout the entire project. Thank you for coming to this evening's meeting and for participating in the I-81 Viaduct Project.

MODERATOR SMITH: Okay, before we begin I just want to go over a couple ground rules for our speeches to keep things moving. We're ready to hear from all of you who wish to provide oral comments. I remind anyone who wishes to speak at this meeting must fill out a speaker's card in the back. We've already received some speaker cards, but not too late if you wish to fill one out
Moderator

and you can be put on the list.

In accordance with agency policy
elected and appointed officials will be
given the first opportunity to speak.

Though not all of these people or very
few of them will actually speak, we
appreciate that many local
representatives have expressed an
interest in this process and have sent
representatives.

Namely US Senator Charles Schumer
sent Angelo Roefaro. New York State
Senator John DeFrancisco sent out Alex
Walsh. Senator Valesky's office sent
Jessica DeCerce. Assemblyman Bill
Magnarelli, Christine Slocum.
Assemblyman Al Stirpe, Ms. Bardor.
Assemblyman Gary Finch, Pamela Kirkwood.
Assemblyman Roberts, Alex Grant. And
there are also numerous representatives
from County Executive Mahoney's office
as well as the County Legislature, the
Syracuse Common Council and as well as
Mayor Miner's office and representatives
from several towns and villages. That includes both this meeting and the meeting that we just wrapped up at 6, began at 4.

In order to allow as many people as possible to be heard it is necessary that we restrict individual comments to two minutes. I will do this as I'll give you a visual aid to let you know how much time you have at 1 minute, 30 seconds, when your time is up. And also if you've got your nose in a piece of paper and you're reading I'll say something in case you don't look up.

If your comments are in writing you can simply hand them to the project team representative at the registration desk in the entrance lobby. If you've already submitted comments specifically in response to the Department's publication Notice of Intent you don't have to resubmit them because they've already been made part of the record.

Again to remind you, written comments will
be accepted by the Department through Friday January 17th, 2014.

As a preliminary matter we did, as I mentioned before, we did have a meeting immediately prior to this and there are a few people left over that I think are, many of them are still here and they'll be our first speakers. And then the speakers will be taken in the order that you submitted your speaker request card.

So the first speaker will be Greg Boyer. The second speaker Earl Baptiste. So Mr. Baptiste, if you're still here come on up in line and that way we'll keep it moving.

GREG BOYER: Thank you. As mentioned I'm Greg Boyer, I'm a 30 year resident of the city of Syracuse. I'm also someone who walks and bikes and uses public transportation to go to work every day. That includes successfully transiting underneath 81 today as I walked down here to speak tonight. As such I would like to give you a little
Boyer

bit of a perspective of someone who
spends a lot of time on foot in this
city. And it may surprise you I'm
actually strongly against the boulevard
option.

I-81 serves a very valuable service
for this city as you heard from, all
those previous speakers from the earlier
session, it brings people in and out, it
supports our businesses and allows our
emergency crews to cross the city
rapidly and allows people to access our
hospitals. This high volume high
traffic corridor is simply incompatible
with pedestrians and bikes. So in
essence the safest place to have this
type of transit is to keep it on a
viaduct where people can successfully
walk underneath and transit underneath
the system.

If you want to see how it doesn't
work well, I would suggest trying riding
your bike on Erie Boulevard, which is
listed as one of our city bike routes.
It's crazy. But when you talk about separation of neighborhoods, the issue is really not the viaduct, the issue is really Almond Street and the streets that are underneath the viaduct. We need to make the space underneath the viaduct accessible to people and bikes. So if it's ugly make it pretty, if it's dark make it, you know, light, make it a place where people want to have street fares and have bike paths and access that space.

And I would suggest Portland, Oregon and Seattle and even Elmira, New York have successfully done that and they are examples to look at. Thank you very much.

MODERATOR SMITH: I don't think Mr. Baptiste is still here so the next speaker Josef Lorenz followed by Sehl Burns.

JOSEF LORENZ: Hi, Josef Lorenz, six year resident of downtown Syracuse. I've lived next to the overpass several years now, hard to look at the negative
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consequences it had on my neighborhood.

Consequences of civic life, community pride, personal health, pedestrian mobility. The highway incurs a negative burden on the city for the last past century including encouraging costly suburban sprawl, stagnant real estate values, dangerous crosswalks which are not lit properly, very loud to live next to. It allocates a lot of space towards surface parking, embankments, concrete, cars. Stuff that's not economically valuable or civically valuable or publicly valuable to the city or surrounding streets.

Rebuilding the elevated highway within the same confines of the city only recreates the same visual, physical, social, economic barrier that existed there through the middle of the city for the last half century and it's not encouraging smart growth of the city. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Burns, you're
recognized and then the next person Tom
Law, if you're still here you can line
up behind Mr. Burns.

SEHL BURNS: Thank you very much.

Sehl Burns, I live in the Outer Comstock
neighborhood, resided where I was born
in the University neighborhood. And I
can still remember walking down to
Central high school and noticing when
they were constructing the viaduct and
tearing down neighborhoods. And it made
me sad at the young age of 14 I think it
was, and wondering what in the heck they
were doing.

I live on Arnold Avenue in Outer
Comstock. And after thinking things
over I just thought I'd come down and
put my two cents worth in. That is that
I favor the tunnel and the boulevard.
You know Syracuse is changing, it's real
upscale with downtown turning around and
I think it's about time we had a
beautiful boulevard. And the tunnel,
send the 81 traffic underneath and out.
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And I think it makes the most sense and keeps looking forward to the future. I appreciate the time you let me spend here.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Burns. Mr. Law is recognized and following Mr. Law will be Mr. Yusuf Abdul Qadir.

TOM LAW: Tom law here. Three main areas I'm going to cover in two minutes. The method, the technique that we're using cars, new possibilities and even fleeing from other areas I guess.

So the first thing our goal here seems to be would be to foreshadow the transit future of Syracuse public/private transit hybrid. I don't really know how hard we're looking at the future. I think we are essentially stuck in the habit of using cars. And let's call it the I-81 habit. I drive a car. The I-81 habit is an auto habit.

Now catch this, this is a little rule of caution here, habits do not
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focus on newness or on improvements.

Okay? So I'm saying I have habits, you have habits, but they don't necessarily appeal to the future, a better future that is. I use about 35 gallons of gasohol per month driving about 925 miles. I weigh 200 pounds, my car weighs 4,500 pounds. About 22 to 1 ratio. It's a Toyota Camry 2011.

That's our method. The habit, the car. That's our method and technique. And the highway is the technique that is going under the wheels of the car, that's all. Just covers the land. It's not too hard to imagine.

As far as the science, we could do better with our habits. We could think of them as habits and nothing new. And on the human vein I wish you a full life in the future, a full mind and an active mind, a healthy focus and attentive use of your faculties. So to your own acts and your potential to act, mother nature must bow.
YUSUF ABDUL QADIR: Good evening, my name is Yusuf Abdul Qadir. I wear many hats. Today the hat I'm going to be wearing is of a concerned citizen. Nine years ago I came to Syracuse as a student. I love this city. I love the city so much that I brought my mother here, she's the most prized possession, the most valuable person to me in my life. My sister is here, she brought her two children here.

This viaduct is not healthy for the future of this city. The viaduct is not healthy for the people who live in that area. As I said I wear many hats, one of the hats is I'm on the board of the Lung Society of Central New York. In that neighborhood in the south side of Syracuse there are many people who are definitely proportionately affected by the viaduct.

One of the other hats that I wear besides the one on my head is a board member of the New York Civil Liberties
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Union. This viaduct certainly invalidates everything, jeopardizes people's civil liabilities.

As an environmentalist and person who owns an environmental consulting company this is not good for smart growth of the city. As a person who spent many years working on an economic development project on the city, this is not good for economic development of the city. Money is driving through and past the city. They're driving over the city. And in ways that are not bringing in economic prosperity for the people who live in the city.

I am a resident of the city. A proud resident of the city of Syracuse. And though I'm from the Bronx, New York I have no problem taking public transportation. In fact I am one of those people who gave up my car and take a bike every day or bus every day or walk every day. And I live in Strathmore, and I get lots of interesting looks from
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my neighbors but I have no problem doing it because it's for the health and safety of the city.

This project we're talking about is far more than the people in this room, this is about the people who come after us, this is about my children, my grandchildren, my great grandchildren and their ability to live in the city that's going to be economically thriving in a city that is going to be healthy in a city that is on rebound. I won't take anymore time but thank you for your attention.

MODERATOR SMITH: That concludes the speakers who stayed from the previous meeting, and we very much appreciate you doing that and giving your comments.

Now with the batch of speaker request cards we got for this meeting the first will be, begin with our elected's, Jean Kessner, Syracuse Common Council. After Ms. Kessner will be Ed Michalenko, Dewitt supervisor.
JEAN KESSNER: Hello, I'm Jean Kessner, I'm a Syracuse Common Councilor-At-Large. Last month the Syracuse Common Council passed unanimously a resolution asking state and federal elected and the Department of Transportation to give the city of Syracuse a seat at the decision-making table. You sitting up there are the ones who will decide what will happen to us who live here. That is wrong. We deserve to be one of the decision-makers. And that's what our resolution asks for.

I hope other legislation will be coming. But I hope that you understand this city is our home, it's our future. We can't have a vision when someone takes away our main opportunity to remake ourselves or to envision ourselves. We need to be at the decision-making table. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you,
ED MICHALENKO: On behalf of the Town Board and residents of Dewitt I would like to express some concern about this project. Again, we support smart growth policies, we support the city's initiative to improve connectivity and enhance its neighborhoods. However, we do not approve of this coming at the expense of the residents of Dewitt by rerouting 81 to Route 481. You'll just be transferring the problem and not solving it.

What we believe is a more comprehensive approach, and again our concern rests with you're only addressing a couple miles of Route 81 as it's elevated through the city. We think a comprehensive plan was needed prior to this process. One to ensure that smart choices and more environmental and social and economic...
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benefits could be provided to all of Central New York and not one very small concise geographic location. We support that comprehensive approach that leads to alternative mass transit options, one that can reach out into the suburban communities as well, because we are all in dire need of a traffic diet.

We are concerned about the impact of Route 81 transferring to 481 for our own neighborhoods and for our quality of life. We suffer the disconnects in and the same problems that the south side residents in the inner city neighborhoods suffer as well. We suffer those impacts along Route 173, Route 5, Route 290, Route 298, Route 90, Route 690 and Route 481, which would only be exacerbated.

The increased wear and tear on our local roads and infrastructure are already evident and underfunded. So again, we'll be submitting our writings and our comments in more detail by the deadline. And again, we sorely advocate
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for that more comprehensive approach.
Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Is Mr. King present? Peter King. And the next speaker will be Mr. Lorenz. Mr. Lorenz, you can come to the front and line up.

PETER KING: Good evening, my name is Peter King, I'm a resident of the Outer Comstock neighborhood for 10 years. And throughout this process I've been submitting comments on my Version 6.

My first point is I think that you should prioritize including the communities and people living in the city of Syracuse more than other stakeholders because they must live with the consequences of what your design choice is, and they have had to live with this, those consequences for 40 years.

I think that you must include a complete health analysis, health impact assessment on whatever build choice you have; for example on asthma rates. But
there are other concerns. But I think that, I agree with the people coming before me who have said in so many words, one of the main if not the main method you must employ is perhaps reduce the overall traffic moving through the city.

A lot of the talk has focused on specific design builds and what you do with the steel and concrete, but there are the people to consider. And at this time there are three main opportunities that I can see, but the main one being look at the public transit.

Now the NEPA process is a wonderful legislation, which unfortunately it must include public transit in the design considerations. But unfortunately I don't think it provides for the transit funding. And so the city of Syracuse must look at the transit funding. There are all kinds of other planning tools and instruments you can use. Transit oriented development. There are many
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ecological things that we are already
doing in the city that make a lot of
sense. But I think number one you must
reduce the traffic somehow. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Mr. Lorenz

the next speaker will be John Chistolini.

DAVID LORENZ: I know the Planning
Study of the western bypass is not
feasible. I ask you to take a second
look. I'm offering a plan to move the
present footprint of the connective
corridor, which is between East Fayette
Street and East Adams Street. This
footprint would be relocated up West
Street. It would be a boulevard
connecting the present 81 and Route 690
to West Street.

West Street is presently a divided
street with three lanes on each side.
In addition it has a service road on
each side of the street to allow for
local traffic off of the boulevard. The
present street is in the old industrial
area of the city and has few if any
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homeowners. The boulevard would travel
directly south and connect with Adams
Street, and travel east up Adams Street
and connect with the present 81 south of
Adams Street.

We need to reduce the number of
elevated highways in Central New York
due to extreme weather conditions.
Elevated highways tend to freeze over
and are also difficult to remove snow.
Need to remind you of a fatal accident
happened on a portion by a driver hit a
snowbank and catapulted over to his
death.

Elevated highways are very expensive
to construct, require extra maintenance
and need to be replaced. The boulevard
would be much less to modify, maintain
and will not be necessary to replace.
The real beauty, is the plan would allow
the construction and rerouting while the
present 81 remains open. Upon
completion would open immediately
without any delays or temporary detours.
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It's imperative the connective corridor is designed to eliminate any vehicle traffic that joins east to west. I don't know why they call it the connective corridor because it's not connected. It's blocked by an interstate highway. A boulevard in the same footprint would create the same situation and not allow for pedestrian or bicycle traffic.

The connective corridor would join Syracuse University with downtown Syracuse. This was the former chancellor Nancy Cantor's dream. It would also improve the neighborhood. It would be similar to downtown in Ithaca called the Commons. It would be fully open to pedestrians which covers the shops and restaurants similar to Armory Square. The proposal would not affect Destiny USA, it's a new route south of that location. West Street is close to downtown which in the future could encourage travelers to visit downtown
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and later connect Armory Square and that
direction. I want to thank the highway
administration and DOT for allowing us
to speak. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: After

Mr. Chistolini the next speaker will be
Matthew Vincent.

JOHN CHISTOLINI: Good evening, my
name is John Chistolini, I live in the
Town of Dewitt. I also agree with the
sentiments of the town supervisor
Mr. Michalenko. My question is, no
matter what you do you're still going to
eroute traffic around 481, even if you
do reconstruction on the bridge and
decide to keep it. My question is would
you consider a noise abatement wall for
the development that I live in, which is
the Jonathan Craig (phonetic) tract that
runs along Bridge Street in East
Syracuse down along Towpath Road, which
goes along into Kinne Road and into
Maple Drive.

You've already exceeded your
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decibels of 75 points. It exceeds the standards by the federal highway system. We were just wondering if you would consider putting up a noise abatement wall and changing the quality of life that is right now unbearable. When we first moved there it wasn't that bad. Once the truck traffic realized it could go around the city of Syracuse, I have friends that drive tractor trailers, they told me why do I want to drive on those ramps and that bridge when I can go around 481. And it has exceeded its limit. So if you would again please consider a noise abatement wall. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Mr. Vincent the next speaker Douglas Martin.

MATTHEW VINCENT: Hello, thank you for allowing me this opportunity tonight to speak. A previous speaker had mentioned Erie Boulevard. And I think that is why a lot of people are hesitant about a boulevard option. Because we're
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going to have a terrible boulevard and
then a magnificent boulevard? Everyone
who drives in this city knows that the
condition of surface streets are
abysmal. You can't drive Erie Boulevard
all the way to the west side of town.
Most of that traffic now takes Fayette
Street, which is a tank trail. I don't
think that in these discussions about
what's happening with the highway we're
going to end up with any additional
funding for surface streets. So if we
have a highway, you drive on 81 it's
basically in good condition. I can't
say that for Erie Boulevard or Fayette
Street. That's my comments, thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Mr. Martin
the next speaker will be, I'm sorry,
Oldfield, looks like Julianne.

DOUGLAS MARTIN: When the
environmental impact liveability,
sustainability and economic vitality are
given more weight than the means of
special interest groups the Green Party
Martin and myself believe that one build alternative clearly stands out among all other proposed solutions. The four components of that solution are, Number 1: Reroute 12 percent of the I-81 traffic. That is thru traffic around Syracuse via 481, improving the condition of 481 to handle the additional thru traffic, eliminating any negative impacts this will have on communities along 481. It will be far cheaper and less destructive than upgrading the I-81 corridor through Syracuse to meet federal standards. Number 2: Deconstruct the 1.4 mile I-81 viaduct near downtown Syracuse and replace it with an at-grade roadway that services the local residents and businesses. This should include reconstruction of the pre-I-81 street grid to move the traffic around downtown Syracuse. Also include a pedestrian friendly reconstruction of West Street for traffic and reconnect the near west
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side with the downtown area. I hasten
to add that an at-grade roadway is not
equivalent to a boulevard. I-81
challenge process did a real disservice
to the public discord by pushing the
idea of a boulevard to near total
exclusion of all other discussion of
at-grade alternatives.

I won't get to 3 and 4 but I will
say as a resident of Syracuse for over
40 years and having lived in the shadow
of Interstate 81 and Central Village,
better known as Brick City, I'm also a
former firefighter for the city. I've
seen the impact now personally, dealt
with the impacts both from the
standpoint of responding to accidents on
I-81 in treacherous conditions and then
observing family members and friends who
have health issues and concerns as a
result of it. Thank you for my time.

MODERATOR SMITH: Following
Mrs. Oldfield, Mark Braiman.

JULIET OLDFIELD: I'm Juliet Oldfield,
a resident of Syracuse I live in the
University area. I would really welcome
not having to use the car so much.
Maybe I should just get out and walk.
But I love all these ideas you have and
I think it's really exciting. This
whole project is really exciting but I
have my reason for wanting to speak is a
concern that it doesn't just gentrify
the south side or this area that you're
talking about in these plans. Such as
the way Armory Square has happened, it's
like really not feasible for a gradient
income. I would like to see housing
that is affordable to all incomes, and I
really welcome especially the liveability
part of your plan. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: After Mr. Braiman
the next speaker will be Peter Zorabozo.

MARK BRAIMAN: I've been a faculty
member at Syracuse University since
1998. And I have been an avid bicycle
commuter since the early 1980s, first as
a graduate student at Berkley, California
then working in Boston, and subsequently working for ten years at the University of Virginia. I have continued to commute on bicycles even after having moved in 2001 to Cazenovia. Even though I'm 57 now I've traveled on bicycles at least 10 times this year.

But I also recognize the importance of alternatives to bicycles. And I use my car during the winter. I don't think we can expect people who are older and during the winter to be committed only to using non-automobile options.

The other thing that I feel is important is in this discussion is to focus also not on just what's happening below the highway but what possibilities are there for things happening above it. Even retaining the current elevation of the highway. I think it's important for the state to consider the possibility of putting things above the highway, including buildings, a covering that would protect the highway from excessive
snow. And also even the possibility of putting bicycle fly-over, bicycle and pedestrian fly-over, that certainly has been done on 690 West near the State Fair Grounds with great effect between the parking lots.

But it's important to remember that what we define as grade in this city depends very heavily on where you're looking at. Even just 400 yards roughly to the east of the current grade level highway there is another grade at Irving Street which is a good 40 or 50 feet above the current grade of the highway.

And putting a bicycle ramp over the highway would indicate the relative importance to planners of that mode of transportation.

PETER ZORABOZO: I recently moved here from Connecticut. I've lived here about three months. I feel that I-81 is an eyesore for the city of Syracuse, it no longer serves it's designated purpose. It was built over 60 years ago
and I feel that it's time to come up with a new creative idea that can better serve the city and the surrounding community.

I feel that the tunnel option is a bit too expensive to implement but would be a wonderful idea. Perhaps the boulevard or depressed highway would be better suited. Also with fly-overs as the gentleman before me mentioned, accommodating to pedestrians and bicyclists would greatly benefit the community but also may help reduce traffic in the downtown area and on the Interstate, hence reducing traffic accidents and general congestion.

I think most citizens fear the idea of a boulevard because when the idea of a boulevard is mentioned they think of Erie Boulevard. And Erie Boulevard in my opinion is not very successful. It's highway congested and it's not a practical way to move about the city.

If a boulevard can be constructed in a
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smart and clever fashion I think it would be a wonderful idea. But above all I do believe that I-81 should come down. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: We've reached the end of the people who have submitted cards to speak. Is there anyone else who would like to speak? Sir, please state your name for the record and approach the mic.

MITCH BRICKMAN: I'm Mitch Brickman. The thing that I would like to say real quickly, I just retired from a company that's downtown, and I had a traveling job. And I'd go down to Binghamton, Corning, Elmira to Rochester and all over the place. And the thing that hits me the most about what we have now is that in the morning to go downtown is extremely difficult. But the people who live south of town and are coming up to try to get off that freeway and to go to the hospitals and to go to the city, sometimes I saw those lines up to a mile
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long. And they sit there for probably
half an hour trying to go through the
traffic patterns.

And then when you come down 81 and
you want to go into the city it's
insanity, because the traffic is going
all over the place. People are bottle-
necking. There is on-ramps going up 81
that is so dangerous. There was just a
big accident I think it was last week.
But if you want to go to 690 one way or
the other way or 81, it's just crazy.

And when you plan, whatever you guys
do you have to figure out a way to get
the traffic patterns much more logical.
And the density of the hospitals, which
keeps on getting larger and larger is
making this whole process extremely
difficult. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Sir, state your
name for the record and we'd ask
Mr. Brickman and also you sir, on your
way out to fill out a card for us.

DARRELL MARCY: Darrell Marcy,
Marcy
Syracuse, New York.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Marcy, if you want you can remove it (the mic). I don't want you to have to speak doubled over.

DARRELL MARCY: I had a vision for the I-81 viaduct corridor and I have never heard anyone else talk about it. And so it's kind of unique but I think it's worth a consideration by people. I thought of removing 81 at Adams Street all the way to Erie Boulevard where it hooks into 690, but then having that corridor be a park, like Central Park in New York City. Would be like a Syracuse park, huge, just as big as Central Park in New York City. And not just as big, couldn't be that big, but it would be big relative for our city. And I think that would be a great enhancement for people walking around and bicycling and enjoying the city instead of just looking at it as a, you know, like just a place to drive through. Thank you.
MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you. So if there are no other speakers, if you would like to speak line up and we'll have someone there to help you fill out the card.

KENNETH HOOGS: This is double duty. I spoke at the first session, and then on my way out I ran into an architect who came up with an interesting --

MODERATOR SMITH: Sir, I'm sorry, did you speak at the last meeting?

KENNETH HOOGS: Hoogs.

MODERATOR SMITH: Yes, we have your comments.

KENNETH HOOGS: You would be very interested to hear what I have to say.

MODERATOR SMITH: Is it different?

KENNETH HOOGS: It's different.

MODERATOR SMITH: I would encourage you if there are additional ideas you would like to submit you can do it in writing but we, just because we set the ground rules at the beginning, in the sense of fairness I can't let you speak
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twice because there are people the last
time that didn't get to speak at all.
So I need to ask you --

KENNETH HOOGS: But I just happened
to meet with this architect and changed
my mind the opposite way.

MODERATOR SMITH: I don't mean to be
impolite but I can't let you speak
twice.

KENNETH HOOGS: Funny rules.

MODERATOR SMITH: Sorry for that.
The next speaker we have signed up is
Mr. Packard.

THOMAS PACKARD: Hello, I'm Thomas
Packard, been a resident of Onondaga
Hill for about 40 years, more than 40
years. And in the opening presentation
there was a comment about maintenance.
And there is also a flip side to that,
it has to do with durability or
downtime, that sort of thing.

Those that have lived in the city
for a number of years are very familiar
with the orange barrels. And so I guess
what I'm saying is the use of materials that are durable, that hold up with the expected salt, whatever format that the viaduct takes, that that would be useful. And then eventually when there is a real need for major repairs that the system is built so that it can be managed in a way that really keeps the traffic moving.

MODERATOR SMITH: The next speaker is Mr. Ott.

EDWARD OTT: Good evening. I'm a resident of the city since 1972 and I have a unique perspective in the sense that this young man here kind of describes, kind of goes with the job I do. I drive a wheelchair van for a living. And to put it this way, doing a tunnel is too expensive, just ask the people from Boston about that, they still didn't get it right after $1.3 billion spent on that project.

Boulevard? Why can't we look to some of the other streets that was mentioned, Erie Boulevard East, West
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Street, dangerous as heck. Just ask my wife, she takes the bus, goes over to Huntington Family Center once every week, it's a dangerous area. As far as the, those particular alternatives, it also would impact critical services, ambulance, fire, police, especially as far as getting into those areas, the hospitals from there.

And as far as the economic impact on certain areas like the south side, blaming the viaduct for their problems, then explain the same economic problems occurring over on the East Fayette Street section over by Westcott Street. Anyway, my particular thing is that I believe it should be rebuilt but conform to the standards and to make it more common sensible as far as traffic coming in and out of the hospitals. Especially around rush hour.

It's absolutely ridiculous at times when I have to pick somebody up at the University Hospital and having to get on
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the highway to get to other areas, the traffic is absolutely ridiculous, and hopefully the I-81 project will address those particular situations. Thank you very much.

MODERATOR SMITH: The next speaker is Joyce Packard.

JOYCE PACKARD: Hi, I live on Onondaga Hill, and I drive all over the city all the time. I love Syracuse because you can get anywhere you want to go in 15, 20 minutes, except for rush hour. And I'd like to see 81 stay up where it is. Maybe if it's possible to make it a little wider so you can have a shoulder if there is accidents. And make it look a little more pretty. And the other thing is I haven't heard anybody ask about what are you going to do with the Dome traffic? Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you ma'am. Go ahead and speak now and fill it out later.

CINDY GILLETTE: Cindy Gillette, I
Gillette
live in Cicero, New York. Before I that
I lived up on Onondaga Hill. Before
that Watertown. Over 21 years ago my
son was born. Brought me by ambulance
to Syracuse, he was born under 2 pounds.
It was critical for him. He spent a
year in the hospital. Back and forth
from Watertown every weekend and then
once during the week to see him. I
depended on I-81. That was for me to
get there and see my son and be with
him. All the years after that, lot of
surgeries, back and forth again, all of
the specialists in Syracuse. Eventually
I moved here.

To me it's really important to have
that access to be able to get close when
you've got a medical need or whatever.
And I like where it is right now. I
really don't want it moved too far away.
I also work downtown now in the court
house, and it's very good for me to be
able to get off at the Adams Street exit.
The problems that people are having with
Jones
the accidents, I can tell you it's the drivers. They're not watching what they're doing. It's not because of 81 or the fact that you go from three lanes to two lanes. These drivers are crazy coming in. I don't know what they can do about that. But I've had people going around me 85 and 90 miles per hour going past the Hiawatha Boulevard exit in the city.

I just think it's really important to keep 81 essentially where it is. Yes, it has to be changed, it has to be modified, improved, conform to the standards that need to be done, but we need it. That's all.

MS. JONES: Thank you, hello everybody, good to see that you came to visit us here in Syracuse DOT. I'm Ms. Jones. I would like to tell you please take into consideration what everyone has said today and know that there are serious health concerns because this is a community real close.
Jones

Because most of the viaduct, I did my research in Seattle or Boston they're over water, here you're over land where people live, so consider that.

Also we have architects who are educated here and we're a good community and we pull together. So consider pulling us to the table and maybe we can come to a happy medium. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: I think everyone who is interested has spoken. Okay, I appreciate, we very much appreciate everyone's comments and participation in this process. And thank you for coming.

[Conclusion of Initial Scoping Meeting].

* * * * *
Jones
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PUBLIC COMMENTS
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MR. DAVID LORENZ, 1 Marion Drive, Fulton, NY 13069:

(WHEREUPON Mr. Lorenz submitted the document marked Exhibit-1 as his comments.)

MR. JIM BRIGHT, 2648 South Salina Street, Syracuse, New York 13205:

(WHEREUPON Mr. Bright submitted the document marked Exhibit-2 as his comments.)

MR. CHARLES PIERCE-EL, 104 Elk Street, Syracuse, NY 13205: I will start with my name first. Good afternoon. My name is Charlie Pierce-El and I have come to put on the record the concerns that I have with the Viaduct, I-81 Viaduct coming down from a particular area, in the event that it does come down. The replacement for economic improvement for the poverty stricken families that are over there, I would like to suggest that you be able to use the railroad to go back and forth for traveling and in doing that, the proposal that I'm asking to be considered is the people that are really
poverty stricken, below the poverty level, even there are some that are is my basic concern, that they have some type of transportation to and from the Carousel or the Farmer's Market where they can get fresh vegetation and shop and do things. And my suggestion is they should be given four tokens a month for railroad, the use of the railroad, the ones that are under the poverty stricken level. The ones that are above it, then by the railroad being there they should be able to pay their own fare. So, that's my issue and that's my suggestion to this committee, and I wish that you'd consider it. I don't know if improperly putting it, dotting my i's and crossing my t's, but at least I'd appreciate it if you give it some type of consideration and go into great thought and detail because once the viaduct come down, all those people that that cannot be able to get their transportation, busses, cars, mobile transportation, at least this would give them an opportunity to spend their money within the County and the City of
Syracuse.

Thank you for your time and I appreciate letting me put this on the record.

MR. JERRY SMITH, Fayetteville, New York:

My name is Jerry Smith, formerly a business owner in downtown Syracuse with the Addis Company.

My first comment I'd like to make is this: That it really doesn't matter what we do -- take it down, dig a tunnel, dig a trench, leave it up -- unless there is a follow-up plan for the maintenance and management of the operation, it's still going to look like a garbage dump. So, we have to do a follow-up budget when we do the initial budget.

My second thought is that this community has not built a major complex in the downtown core since the 1940s that has what Ms. Jane Jacobs called a soul, or eyes on the street. We have built these huge concrete monoliths that are usually removed from the street by parking spaces, or they
are concrete edifices with no eyes, no glass, no windows, no life in them. And so as this conducts to Route 81, I was thinking the other night what if we were to think of Route 81 as a roof, not as a roadway that disrupts a connection between east and west, but as the roof of an indoor/outdoor pavilion, so that perhaps if in reconstructing 81 it was actually raised so that the interior height would be at least 15 feet, the size of the MOST, or of the Farmer's Market; that we actually could put a farmer's market or some kind of edifice or playground. And I came across this site, as I Googled "life under expressways" and I came across a site that cited nine cool ideas for use under expressways.

Toronto has put a park with basketball courts and skateboards and the rest. Portland has a skateboard park. Seattle, Washington has a mountain bike ramp park. Another city has, in New Zealand has a fair, complete with LED lighting and colorful paintings and outdoor seating areas
and areas to eat and drink, drink wine, have
wine tastings. And I thought in light of
this, when we close off Onondaga Street every
June for the Arts Fair what if that was done
underneath I-81. And I-81 was to look like
Faneuil Hall in Boston, and we were to think
of the I-81 as a warehouse, not as a road
map, but as a warehouse that we'd make it
into a building, but an outdoor building, an
indoor/outdoor building. Those are my
thoughts.

MR. WILLIAM SIMMONS, Executive
Director, Syracuse Housing Authority, 516 Burt
Street, Syracuse, New York 13202: My
name is William Simmons, Executive Director
for the Syracuse Housing Authority, and I
want to read a statement that was adopted by
the commissioners, Board of Directors for the
Syracuse Housing Authority.

The Syracuse Housing Authority, Board
of Commissioners, is aware of the planning
and public outreach for comments by the New
York State Department of Transportation
concerning the future of the elevated viaduct
of Interstate I-81 through the City of Syracuse. The Syracuse Housing Authority is perhaps the largest stakeholder concerning the elevated portion of the viaduct as it owns all of the property on both sides of the southern edge of Adams Street, with the exception of one block, which Syracuse University controls. As such, and with nearly over 900 households, housing over 2,600 residents within its corridors, the Syracuse Housing Authority has grave concerns over the final solution and the imminent construction process. Therefore, it is the position of the Syracuse Housing Authority, Board of Commissioners, that any action is made with the understanding that individual housing and daily lives will be impacted and that the existence and strength of this residential community needs to be impacted in the least disruptive manner. It is our opinion that the solution to the elevated viaduct issue be one which enhances the residential community, provides greater pedestrian access through the neighborhood and
affords the opportunity for further housing and economic development for those who live there.

MR. EDWARD STRONSKI, 7300 Cedarpost Road, Liverpool, NY 13088: It's my opinion that the Boulevard option is a no go from square one. Going back to the history of the area around Adams and Harrison, back in 1993, the EPA thought carbon monoxide levels were too high. That resulted in the pool oxygenation that moves all of that. So now we are talking about putting a boulevard with six lanes there and it's been stated over and over how 12% of the traffic goes through; that means 88% is going to be there in an enclosed system which hasn't been modeled in detail yet. So, a micro model has not been performed yet. I find it inexplicable that a boulevard could be considered, given the amount of emissions you would have from that, and how that could possibly be in compliance with EPA regs, state regs, whatever regs, just common sense. So, until told otherwise, I haven't seen
anything that negates that supposition.

MR. WAYNE S. AMATO, Town of Otisco,
Town Supervisor, 1928 Barker Street, Tully,
New York: My name is Wayne S. Amato. I'm
the Supervisor of the Town of Otisco, and
recently our Town Board, upon a motion I
suggested, voted unanimously to voice their
opinion at I-81 in its reconstruction, should
be built exactly as it is now, and we are
closed to any boulevard that goes through the
site, because it would be counterproductive
to traffic patterns and to the speed at
which commercial operations need to proceed.
The Town, even thought it is not directly in
the path of Route 81, it would have
influence on secondary roads if there is
changes in the traffic patterns which are
promoted by the boulevard mentality. Other
than that, the Town Board feels minimal
disruption should always be the objective in
order to produce high commercial activity.
Thank you.

MR. ROBERT ROMEO, 314 East Fayette
Street, Syracuse, New York 13202: So, my
name is Robert Romeo and I am a lifelong resident of the City of Syracuse and I have a business in the downtown corridor and I currently work as the attorney for the Syracuse Housing Authority, which has a great deal of contiguous property to the 81 overpass in the new project.

I'd like to state that I believe that this is potentially the biggest transformative and dynamic project in the history of the City of Syracuse since we decided, in error I will add, to put our Syracuse ball park on the north side. And I think it can make a great deal of difference to the community in the future of how this turns out.

So, I would suggest that we work strongly with urban designers to really reflect on the impacts of the neighborhoods and the community at large for the ultimate determination. The other aspect of it, from my personal point of view, is that I believe that if you look at a map of the State of New York and you put a pin in the center of
the State of New York, you hit Syracuse, New York and if you drill down into that Syracuse, New York location and put a pin in the middle of Syracuse, New York you'd probably find right around this interstate overpass 81. So, it is an opportunity to create a sense of place, in that this is the center of the entire state, this exact location. I personally believe that a very new and exciting and iconic bridge would be the way to transform the skyline of the City of Syracuse and give visitors and residents alike the opportunity to understand where they are in the state and to understand, and to view the beauty of the City of Syracuse skyline and the surrounding hills and so forth as you drive over that overpass. So, I think that our money should be well spent with architects and urban designers to design a very attractive and sustainable bridge in that location, and why not call it the Central State Bridge.

MS. BRENDA SILVERMAN, 300 Roe Avenue, Syracuse, New York 13210: For the past 20
years I have been a resident of the Outer Comstock neighborhood, which is south of Manley Field House, and I have been on the Board of the neighborhood association much of that time, and I use City streets, I use 81, I use 690. I have also been part of a group called University Neighborhood Program. I think it no longer exists. But it represented the Westcott and east University neighborhoods as well as Outer Comstock, to talk about common issues and transportation was one of them, including, this was a couple of years ago, the possibility because of the age of 81 and what might happen, and there was a wonderful presentation by at least two engineers, and they may have been with the State Department of Transportation, I'm not sure. A remodel of the current version of the highway where the highway is not torn down, there is no boulevard which would be totally absurd given the volume of traffic, the University, the medical complexes who are the largest employers in the entire County, and to not have a highway would be
just kind of crazy, at best. But they had a presentation of how you could take the current road and modernize the highway, do something about the 690 East ramp, the turn to 690 East from 81 North, and also make Almond Street look like a beautiful street, with planting trees, having road surface modern and fixed up, not full of potholes and broken cement, where you put stores so that the new parking garage Upstate put in would have had stores on its base floor and trees surrounding it, instead of just parking cars, that you could make beautiful park land and seating areas and make it safe underneath the highway. And I don't subscribe at all to the notion that the highway separates the City from some other part of the City, because you have underneath the bridges the fact that it looks like it does because it's been totally neglected. So, as a member of the Outer Comstock area I am very frightened that if the highway were torn down, any other way of rebuilding it, that Ainsley Drive would become a very heavily used street
with trucks. It would destroy the Outer Comstock neighborhood. It's already a very overused street to get to the University and the same for Thurber Avenue, which is only a two lane street and contains trucks and other things that should even be there at all. That probably is my two minutes. So, I think that's the gist of it, as I think that the highway needs to be rebuilt and modernized so that the turns to 690 are safe and modern.

MR. MARK WATKINS, 300 Roe Avenue, Syracuse, New York 13210: I'm Mark Watkins. I live in the Outer Comstock neighborhood, about three blocks south of Colvin Street. I strongly oppose the notion of a boulevard and the elimination of I-81 through the City. One of the great advantages of Syracuse over cities of our size and larger is the ability to get anywheres quickly. From my house I can be at the airport, right through the City within 15 minutes. I can be in Baldwinsville via I-690 West in 20 minutes. I go there once
a week. I can be out in East Syracuse in ten minutes. The idea of a boulevard as ending some kind of separation of the City is a fantasy. It would be a barrier just like I-81 supposedly is, but less porous. The whole City is already cut up by Erie Boulevard, by I-690, by the railroads, by Oakwood Cemetery. So, the notion of reconstituting some old neighborhood with nostalgic connections is a myth. You can't put Humpty Dumpty back together again.

Now, I grant that the intersection of I-81 North with 690 needs to be redone. It's dangerous and the crossover, if you are going to get on 690, either east or west, and going north on 81 is difficult and by luck I have survived it many, many times. One claims that the I-81 is not attractive. I grant that. It can be beautified by putting in trees and gardens and maybe stores underneath, maybe buildings underneath, but we absolutely need I-81 to get from point A to point B in this City. This is not a matter of City versus suburbs. I live in the City.
I retired recently from the University and am very much a City dweller and I am all for I-81 continuing through the City.

MR. JOHN ADAMS, 1207 Almond Street, Apartment #1008, Syracuse, New York 13210: John Adams, and I think they should just rebuild it, rebuild the I-81, and I think that when they do rebuild it to have the community have some jobs in the rebuilding process, and that's my comment.

MR. MICHAEL STREISSGUTH, 223 Twin Hills Drive, Syracuse, New York 13207: My name is Michael Streissguth. I'm a resident of the City of Syracuse, employed by LeMoyne College. I believe that the viaduct should come down and that it be replaced for the benefit of people needing to come into town for work by public transportation systems, such as light rail, from the northern suburbs and other population concentrations outside of the City. So, public transportation. Nor do I support a boulevard, which I think would also separate the City just as the viaduct has, just as the I-81 has.
MR. EDWARD WAGNER, 57 Willowbrook Drive, Auburn, New York 13021: My name is Ed Wagner, Town Supervisor for the Town of Owasco.

I wanted to express my gratitude to Deborah Nelson for attending an Owasco Town Hall meeting on July 23rd, 2013 to listen to the local residents' concerns as they related to trash hauling truck traffic. And my letter that I am presenting gives you a summary of that meeting.

(WHEREUPON Mr. Lorenz submitted the document marked Exhibit-3 as his comments.)

MR. PHIL JAKES JOHNSON, 1405 Brewerton Road, Syracuse, New York 13209: Phil Jakes Johnson. I think Interstate 81 should be thought of as a rivet that ties the north and the south together as opposed to a scar that cuts the community in two. Whenever you have efficiency on moving people and goods it brings them together. In days of old, transportation and communication were hard. We were very isolated from each other. Today we're brought together by the
advances of technology. Interstate 81 is one of those advances.

MS. ANN STEVENS, 125 Ambergate Drive, Dewitt, New York 13214: I live not far from 481 in Dewitt and am very much impacted by the noise that the highway generates. It bothers me a great deal that the people who have I-81 going right outside their windows are impacted by pollution as well as incredible noise that I can't even imagine. I think that we need to think about the people in years to come and do something to get rid of the highway running over the streets of Syracuse and for those reasons I would like to see an expensive tunnel dug. That's pretty much it.

MR. DOUGLAS MAYER, 3251 Far Reach, Baldwinsville, New York 13027: My concern is comparing the plans to the no-build alternative. I believe the no-build alternative has to be clearly laid out what that is, what that implies. This is a different type of project. There is no, really no-build alternative because something's
there. If nothing is done there is still
going to be environmental impacts. So, the
comparison of alternatives to a no-build has
to be clearly understood. So, my request is
to be specific in defining what the no-build
alternative is. Thank you.

MR. KENNETH BOBIS, Syracuse, New
York: Well, I'm a resident of the City of
Syracuse and I have a vested interest. I
have four kids that grew up here and I'm
concerned that the group Save 81 is primarily
people from outside of the City of Syracuse
and the fact that I pay taxes in the City
of Syracuse and they do not, I resent the
fact that they might have some power over
the decision-making. The City is hurting for
revenue. Almost half the properties are not
taxable because they are non-profit or
government agencies and the people who
utilize City services but live outside the
City to have much of a say in what happens
with Route 81 I feel is unfair. Until they
start paying City taxes then maybe they can
have as much say as residents of the City.
MR. MARK NORMAN, 350 West Fayette Street, Syracuse, New York 13202: Marc Norman. I'm the Director of Upstate, which is Syracuse University School of Architecture, Center for Research, Real Estate and Design. And what I wanted to say was that there have been many studies of boulevard takedowns. One of the best was commissioned by Seattle in reference to their Alaskaway Project, and what that study did was it looked at 20 different highway removal projects and looked at them in depth in terms of economic development, crime, vehicle miles traveled and connectivity. And then it summarized all of them into some basic best practices for the conversion of highways to boulevard. And so I would encourage the DOT to reference that study and to look at its findings in looking at the I-81 viaduct.

MR. G. CLARK, Fayetteville, New York: All I want to say is that I'm hearing very little about noise abatement. People need to live in downtown 24/7 during the summers and the springs and even the winters to know
that the highways generate a high decibel of noise 24 hours 7. There is no way to get around it unless you drive five to ten miles out of the City. So, it's not even on I-81 towards 690. So, noise, they have got to still think of noise. That's all I've got.

MR. THOMAS LAW, 135 Pulaski Street, Syracuse, New York 13204: This is Tom Law. I want to emphasize that it seems ridiculous to keep the car as a model of transportation for the majority, say, in 95% of the local adults because I weigh 200 pounds and my car weighs approximately 4,500 pounds. Yet, the energy used is only needed to move the 200 pounds. So, the ratio is 20 to 1. Very commonly, 20 to 1. Cars are about 25% efficient in using the energy. Most of it goes out the tail pipe and there is some internal losses where the electrical system is used and the heating system and the radio and the battery and friction, other things. My point is: Developing a future transportation requires a better ratio for using energy than one person and 20 parts of
the person's weight, four thousand pounds to get from place to place. That's it. It's a very bad ratio.

MS. DEBBIE THORNE, 636 Cumberland Avenue, Syracuse, New York: My concern is with this 481 loop idea, it is one of the proposals. You know, a lot of people have spoken to the cutting off of the hospitals. But, not only that, we're cutting off the airport, the Regional Transportation Center. That's the trains and the buses, and we'd be cutting off our major source of revenue for the City and the County, which is Carousel Mall. I think it should stay where it is, preferably leave it like it is, but make it comply with codes.

MR. HOWIE HAWKINS, Syracuse, New York: Okay. My name is Howie Hawkins. I live on the south side and I'm presenting a Petition for Transportation Justice that we circulated in the neighborhoods closest to the I-81 viaduct, public housing, retirement homes, Toomey-Abbott Towers, primarily also some students at SU and some other residents
in nearby south side neighborhoods. And the basic thing we want to say is that those of us living around the I-81 viaduct have as much right to mobility as the people that use private cars or trucks to move people and goods into the City from the suburbs and outer regions. And the whole discussion seems to have been about how to accommodate people with private cars or who need to bring goods into the City and not how people in these neighborhoods, which we know from the census less than half have private cars. They rely on public transportation. They get to work on their feet. That's over half, according to the U. S. Census. So, this Petition basically says we want more mass transit to reduce the traffic footprint of cars and vehicles in the I-81 corridor where the viaduct is. We want more affordable housing. We don't want public housing reduced, but actually if mass transit opens up the old 15th Ward to redevelopment it should be mixed income. There should be room for affordable low income and moderate
income as well as upper income. Reducing
the traffic footprint and the traffic there
from vehicles is important because it would
clean the air and we have high rates of
asthma and other lung disease in that
neighborhood, highest in the City. In fact,
I know the area. The reason Onondaga County
has some particular requirements for fuel and
additives in the winter is because of the
monitors there under the I-81 viaduct by
Pioneer Homes. And finally, we want more
good jobs. We have high unemployment,
particularly in those neighborhoods, and it's
not just about the jobs that may be created
in rebuilding the viaduct or a neighborhood
where the viaduct was, but also our access
to jobs in the suburbs where a lot of jobs
are, and if we don't have good public
transportation we are excluded from those
jobs. So, those are the concerns in this
Petition. It's signed by 102 people
collected over the last couple weeks and
explains in more careful language than my
oral presentation what our concerns are. So,
I'm going to submit these and thank you for the opportunity to present them.

(Whereupon, the PUBLIC COMMENTS were concluded.)
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MR. FRECHETTE: Okay, if we can get started, find your seat, would appreciate that. On behalf of Joe McDonald the Commissioner of the New York State Department of Transportation and Jonathan McDade, the Administrator for the Federal Highway Administration, New York Division, I want to welcome you to this Scoping Meeting. My name is Mark Frechette, and I am the Project Director for the I-81 Viaduct Project.

This is the second of two scoping meetings for the Environmental Impact Statement or EIS, that will be prepared for the I-81 Project in Syracuse, New York. The meeting is sponsored by the two agencies that are serving as the lead agency's for the EIS; the New York State Department of Transportation is the state lead agency, and the Federal Highway Administration, the federal lead agency.

This scoping meeting is being conducted to obtain comments on the
scope of the project's Environmental Impact Statement. The meeting provides the public an opportunity to make formal statements of positions before any project decisions are made. To assist interested parties in formulating their comments, a Draft Scoping Report is available for review here tonight.

And the Report is also available on the project's website at www.i81opportunities.org, and at libraries and other public facilities throughout Greater Syracuse. The Draft Scoping Report provides an overview of the project, presents the project's purpose, needs and objectives, describes the initial alternatives under consideration and explains our recommendations that some advance for further study and others that fail. It outlines the steps to the Environmental Review process and describes coordination with other agencies and public involvement opportunities.
Moderator

At this time I would like to have Mr. Brody Smith, tonight's moderator, explain to you the format and the structure of tonight's meeting. Following that I will give a presentation on the I-81 viaduct project. Then Mr. Smith will moderate the comment session.

MODERATOR SMITH: My name is Brody Smith, I'll be serving as the moderator for the meeting tonight. So that we can make a record of all those who participated in this meeting we ask that everyone sign in at the registration table. All statements made at this meeting shall be reported by the stenographer (court reporter) you see in front of me here, and a verbatim written transcript will be produced at the end.

The Environmental Impact Statement for the I-81 Viaduct Project is being prepared in accordance with the following laws and regulations:

First, the National Environmental
Policy Act of 1969, NEPA, as amended and implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality; their regulations at 40 CFR Parts 1500 through 1508; the Federal Highway Administration Environmental Act Regulations at 23 CFR Part 771; the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act requirements, in particular the New York State Department of Transportation's implementing regulations at 17 NYCRR Part 15; and a number of other federal and state regulations and requirements. Among them are Presidential Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice, Section 106 of the National Historical Preservation Act and Section 4F of the US Department of Transportation.

After the opening remarks and the subsequent presentation you will have an opportunity to provide written and/or verbal comments. If you wish to provide a verbal comment you must fill out when the speaker cards at the registration
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desk if you have not done so already.
You may provide a verbal comment tonight in one of two ways. First, if you wish to present your comment publicly in this room, I will call your name and ask you to come forward to the microphone you see to my right. I will also ask the next speaker to stand in line behind you in order to keep the meeting running so we always have the next speaker ready to go.

If you prefer, you can make a comment in private at any time. If you exit those doors behind you and look to your left there is a screen where there is a stenographer (court reporter) if you're not comfortable making your comment here in this room, you can make your comment directly with the stenographer, it will also be made part of the record. All verbal comments will be limited to two minutes, so that everyone gets a chance to speak.

You may also provide a written
Moderator

Written comments may be provided in any one of the following three ways. First, at this meeting you fill out and submit a comment form. Next, you may visit the project website that's www.i81opportunities.org, where there will be an online comment form that you may fill out. Or finally, you may mail in a comment to the following address: NYS DOT, I-81 Viaduct Project, 333 East Washington Street, Syracuse, New York, 13202. Information on how to submit written comments is also provided at the registration table at the foyer.

You may submit comments both verbally and in writing if you wish. Written comments will be given the same weight and consideration as verbal comments.

The official public comment period associated with this Scoping Meeting will be opened through Tuesday, September 2, 2014. The New York State DOT and the Federal Highway
Administrator will accept written comments through that date. To be part of the written record all written comments must be either submitted to the website no later than that day, Tuesday, September 2, 2014, or postmarked no later than that date, Tuesday, September 2, 2014.

The agencies will review and consider public comments submitted during the scoping phase of the project. Responses to the comments will be included in the Final Scoping Report, which is anticipated to be published some time this fall.

So that everyone who desires to speak may be heard and their statements made part of the official record we will not entertain any questions from the floor at this meeting in this room. Project staff members are next door in the room immediately adjacent to this one, the exit doors go to the right. And they're available in the exhibit
areas to explain the exhibits and also
to answer any questions that you may
have. Those conversations that you have
in that room will not be part of the
formal record that's being produced by
the stenographer (court reporter) here
though.

Before I call on the speakers from
the floor, Mr. Mark Frechette, who you
heard from before, he's the New York
State DOT Project Director for this
project, will give a brief presentation
on the project. After he speaks I'll go
over a few ground rules, and the public
comment portion of this meeting will
begin.

MR. FRECHETTE: Thank you, Brody.
I'm going to start by welcoming you here
to the Final Scoping Meeting and
introducing the people up here at the
head table. As mentioned, I am Mark
Frechette, I work for the New York State
Department of Transportation. To my
left is Joe Flint, he also works for
Frechette DOT, and he is the Project Manager for this project. Also with us tonight is our partner in this process, and sitting at the end of the table is Patricia Millington from the Federal Highway Administration.

The purpose of tonight is to provide an update of the work that's been completed over the last few months. And then to discuss where we're going to go from here. Since November of 2013, when we held the Initial Scoping Meeting, we have been reviewing the public comments as we have received them.

We are refining the project alternatives and we are analyzing the advantages and disadvantages of each of those alternatives. Tonight we're going to recommend which alternatives we believe should be studied further.

Before I get into that I want to recap some background information. I want to go over the project area that we have. I want to tell you why we need to
do this project. I want to go over the purpose and the objectives. And then I will go through each of the alternatives and discuss the advantages and disadvantages. And finally I'll tell you the next steps.

I-81 is a very important corridor, both regionally and locally to the transportation network. It runs north-south from Canada to Tennessee, and is approximately 855 miles long, and makes major connections to the east coast, with cities like New York City and Washington, D.C. But locally I-81 serves thousands of daily commuters every day in the Greater Syracuse, and provides those connections to Interstates 690 and I-90 at the Thruway. I-81 is a primary local access to the downtown, to the University Hill, to major economic and activity centers in Syracuse.

The bridge was built 50 years ago and since then the highway standards
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have changed dramatically. Engineering has improved and the travel means have evolved in the Syracuse area. The transportation infrastructure is deteriorated because of its age, being 50 years of age. But it's also deteriorated because of its wear and tear. It does not meet today's standards. The highway and bridges undergo inspections every year, and maintenance, to keep these bridges safe to the traveling public.

On most days I-81 carries a hundred thousand cars of traffic. And it creates major traffic to or from or through downtown Syracuse. The priority area established for this project is three and-a-half miles long on I-81, crosses 18 local streets, and it is over 183 bridge spans long.

The priority area stems from a three year planning study called the I-81 Corridor Study. The top transportation priority area from that study was a
three and-a-half mile I-81 and a two
and-a-half mile distance on Interstate
690. In these areas we have a high
collection of bridge deficiencies,
geometric deficiencies, and we
experience frequent traffic congestion
and high accident rates.

The needs that have been identified
for this project include fixing the
non-standard, non-conforming features,
where we have over a hundred
non-conforming features in this
interchange. There is bridge
deficiencies and safety concerns. At
the interchange of I-81 and 690 we have
an accident rate that is four times the
state-wide average of similar
Interstates. We have vehicular,
pedestrian, bicyclist mobility problems.
And we need to incorporate community
vision expressed in Local Long Range
Plans.

So to address these needs, the
purpose of the project is really to fix
these bridge deficiencies and non-standard highway features in the project area while creating an improved transportation corridor through Syracuse that meets the transportation needs and provides infrastructure to support long range planning efforts such as SMTC Long Range Transportation Plan and Syracuse's Comprehensive Plan.

To meet the project's purpose five objectives have been developed. These objectives are measures against, that we use against all of the project alternatives you will see here tonight. These have been evaluated to determine which should advance to the next phase of the project. Consistent with our project purpose, the objective, objectives aim to address structural deficiencies, fix non-standard geometrics, address local travel needs, provide pedestrian, bicycle connectivity, address regional travel needs and provide access to key destinations.
The Environmental Review phase of the I-81 Viaduct Project is being conducted pursuant to federal and state environmental regulations. With both federal and state funding the project is subject to NEPA and New York State SEQR Act. The federal and state review requirements will be coordinated, such that one EIS will be prepared to satisfy requirements of both NEPA and SEQR.

The environmental process includes several distinct stages. It was initiated August 26, 2013, when DOT published the Notice of Intent to prepare the EIS. The DOT currently is in the scoping phase that is shown in red. We're developing and analyzing alternatives, we're meeting with the public like we are tonight, we're identifying some of those environmental considerations to be studied in the EIS.

We've held neighborhood meetings in the fall and the Initial Scoping meeting last November. Recently DOT held a
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public update presentation where we showed all of our alternatives. Today we present the recommendations further to study.

The next move. Next we'll move into the EIS phase where public participation will continue to play a key role as the project moves forward. The Environmental Review concludes with what's called a Record Of Decision which will identify any potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures. From there we'll have a preferred alternative that will head towards construction.

During the Scoping you have an opportunity to comment on the purpose and need, the project alternatives, the environmental framework that will be conducted in the EIS phase. We published a Draft Scoping Report that provides further details. You can access that on our website at the i81opportunities.org, at local
Frechette libraries, at the Carnegie building, and copies will be available today if you would like to take a look at that. We encourage you to review and speak with our team members at the Open House next door. We welcome for you to provide oral comments here today or to provide written comments. We will accept all comments through September 2, 2014. And every comment that we receive will be included in our Final Scoping Report, a response to that.

The project alternatives fall into six categories. First one being the No Build where the project does not move forward. We have five viaduct alternatives, one rehabilitation, and four rebuild alternatives. We have three street level alternatives that would remove the viaduct and utilize surface streets. We would improve surface streets to put traffic on the street level. We have had four tunnel alternatives, the viaduct would be
removed and the tunnel put underground. We had two depressed highway, where I-81 would be located in an open cut trench. And then the last two, Others, one was a Western Bypass and the other was a Salt City Circuit called the Salt City Circuit. And I will go over each of those.

We have conducted a preliminary evaluation of all the alternatives to determine whether or not those alternatives would meet our project's purpose and needs based on the objectives we discussed earlier. We've looked at whether or not there is substantial building acquisition impacts as a result of the alternatives. We've looked at the constructability of each of the alternatives to see if they are unreasonable or very difficult for us. And then we've tried to identify whether or not the cost would be reasonable compared to some of the other alternatives.

The Draft Report evaluates all of
the advantages and disadvantages and determines them as either a Pass to go forward or a Fail. And I will explain why we recommend alternatives that Fail, therefore we would stop studying them after this phase. I will also explain why others Pass the evaluation, and we recommend those go forward for further study.

There is still a lot of work that needs to be done and we need to look closer at potential property impacts. We need to consider traffic analysis, we need to take into account environmental consideration that we learned. And also the public comments, the reason we're here today is to take into account your feedback on this also.

So I'm going to run through the different alternatives. The first one was called the No Build alternative. And the NEPA process requires investigation of the No Build, to assess the future conditions if the project
Frechette does not get implemented. This really provides a baseline for us against all the other build alternatives. Although this alternative, the No Build does not meet any of our objectives or meet the purpose and need of the project. Since it is required by the Federal Environmental Laws it will be evaluated in the EIS, and we Pass that to the next stage.

I'll go through the five Viaduct Alternatives. One would be, the first one is to Rehabilitate. The next four would reconstruct the I-81 viaduct and implement other transportation improvements within the project limits.

The Rehab alternative called V-1 is a long term program of capital investments to keep I-81 in a state of good repair. This approach would keep the bridge structurally safe. But it would not add shoulders, it would not enlarge medians, it would not improve the weaving lanes that we currently have
problems with, and it would not implement other safety or operational improvements. As a result the rehabilitation would maintain many of the non-standard and non-conforming features at a construction cost estimated to be $800 million. Because the rehab does not meet our purpose and need it Failed our evaluation and we do not recommend this alternative to go forward.

V-2 was rebuild a new viaduct fully improved to current standards. This would reconstruct I-81 from Martin Luther King east to Spencer Street with potential improvements to the highway system as far as Hiawatha Boulevard. It would also include rebuilding of Interstate 690 between West Street interchange and the Teall Avenue interchange. This alternative would include two lanes in each direction, two lanes northbound, two lanes southbound. It would operate at 55 miles per
Frechette hour. It would meet all of our standards today, shoulders, medians, weaving lanes, ramps would all be improved. The new viaduct would be 82 feet wide along Almond Street versus the current width which is 66 feet, which you can see in the picture in red is the current. The wider viaduct is expected to acquire 30 to 40 buildings. The viaduct height could be up to the same elevation or it could be 5 to 10 feet higher. The cost of this alternative is estimated at $1.438 billion.

This alternative would improve the structural and geometric features, it would allow for enhanced vehicle pedestrian, bicycle connectivity on the surface streets to, adjacent and under the bridge. It could be constructed with typical engineering practices and would be a reasonable cost in line with the other alternatives. So we recommend that this alternative be studied further in the EIS phase.
V-3, which was new viaduct with substantial design improvements was very similar to the V-2, except at seven locations. At these seven locations shown in purple we tighten the curves to reduce the real estate impacts as part of this alternative. By making these sharper curves we were able to reduce the real estate impacts from V-2 by 25 percent. V-3 would still travel at 55 miles per hour, it would create 10 foot right shoulders, four foot left shoulders, accidents or stranded motorists, emergency vehicles would be able to get to the scene still.

The cost of this alternative is estimated at $1.423 billion. And like V-2 we recommend V-3 Pass because it improves the structural and geometric features, it allows the conductivity on the surface street. We believe it's reasonably constructible. And it's reasonably cost compared to the other alternatives.
V-4, is the viaduct with considerable design improvements, is really similar to the last two alternatives. Except it would tighten five curves further to reduce the footprint of the new viaduct. By doing this we would be able to reduce the real estate impact over V-2, this alternative, by 40 percent. The cost of this alternative was $1.419. Traffic would still be able to travel at 55 miles per hour. V-4 meets our purpose and needs and with all the objectives similar to V-2 and V-3. So we recommend that this one Pass forward to the next phase also.

V-5 was the stack viaduct. It was developed as a result of a suggestion from the public. Northbound traffic would be on top and southbound would be in the middle with Almond Street traffic still being able to be carried underneath the viaduct.

This requires a narrower right-of-way, 55 feet versus the 66 that
Frechette is existing, it would be 11 foot less. The difference with this alternative is that the bridge would be quite a bit higher. It would be about 50 foot tall, which is about 30 feet taller than the existing structure. The cost of this alternative was $1.588 billion. V-5, the stack viaduct, could be designed to current standards, in some of the areas it could enhance the vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle connectivity.

But one of the major disadvantages to this alternative is to allow a ramp connection at Harrison we would need to sever the access to the Genesee Street across Almond Street. And since Genesee street is our connective corridor and a major east-west between the University Hill and downtown we Failed this alternative because it doesn't meet the project objective to maintain connections to, across and along local streets. DOT does not recommend this alternative go forward.
There are three Street Level alternatives that all would make improvements to Interstate 481 and would redesignate I-81 to Interstate 481. It would demolish the existing viaduct within Syracuse and decommission the Interstate through Syracuse. All Street Level alternatives would meet today's standards.

Street Level 1 would replace the viaduct with a boulevard along Almond Street. Street Level 2 and 3 would use Almond as a one-way or a two-way with a combination of other local streets to carry traffic. Street Level 2 and 3 would have a system-wide approach to maximize the use of the available capacity of the existing bridge system.

Street Level 1 Boulevard, our initial traffic studies indicate that six lanes are necessary to maintain efficient flow between the downtown, University Hill, the south side and other neighborhoods. There are many
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ways to lay out a new boulevard along
Almond Street, which has nearly 200 foot
of available right-of-way space
currently, to accommodate vehicles,
pedestrians, bicyclists, wide park-like
medians. We estimate the boulevard cost
to be $1.047 billion.

Since the Street Level 1, the
boulevard, meets all of the evaluation
parameters, we recommend that it goes
further in study in the EIS process.

Evaluating. We are currently
evaluating two ways to connect Almond
Street Boulevard to Interstate 690.

Under Option 1, which is shown on the
screen, we would establish the boulevard
from Monroe Street to Erie Boulevard.
Erie Boulevard would, the boulevard
would be able to connect to Interstate
690 through what's called a single point
urban interchange. This would reduce
several signals to one under Interstate
690. We would need to build a bridge on
Erie Boulevard as seen in the picture
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over Almond Street. And there is an
opportunity to convert Water Street to
potentially an Erie Canalway trail.

The Second Option to connect the
boulevard to Interstate 690 would once
again, from Monroe Street start the
boulevard to McBride Street. Vehicles
would be able to pick up speed heading
northbound as the road transitions from
a boulevard back to a higher speed
highway, like an Interstate around
Butternut Street.

Street Level 2 and Street Level 3,
both street level alternatives would
make improvements to Almond Street and a
combination of other streets. They
differ, where one envisions Almond and
other local streets as one way streets,
and the other roads make them two way
streets. Almond would carry fewer than
six lanes like the boulevard alternative
was shown, and would have shorter cross-
walks and be much easier to cross under
these alternatives.
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Street Level 2, the one way, would have Almond be one way northbound from Harrison to Interstate 690, and south of Harrison Street it would be a two way street. Southbound traffic, we've looked at Townsend Street, we've looked at Clinton Street, and we've looked at other local streets for southbound traffic.

The cost of Street Level 2 and Street Level 3 is $1.067 billion. Both Street Level 2 and Street Level 3 meet all of our evaluation parameters and is recommended for further study in the EIS.

Recognizing the significant amount of traffic accessing University Hill we are exploring different ways to improve the Teal Avenue interchange also. By reconstructing Teall and I-690 we could simplify traffic movements, controlled by one signal rather than the two that are there today. These improvements would decrease commute times and help
reduce traffic volumes at the I-81/I-690 interchange and also at Exit 18 where the Harrison/Adams join Interstate 81. This would be an efficient and safe way to move large volume of vehicles in a compact space.

As mentioned earlier, all the Street Levels would route I-81 traffic to Interstate 481; would require improvements to I-481, which would be redesignated as a new I-81. We would add auxiliary lanes at three stretches of the highway. And we would reconstruct both of the interchanges between I-81 and 481 at the northern end and the southern end. We don't anticipate that there will be any acquisition needed, any building acquisition needed along the existing Interstate 481 as part of this, those improvements.

Moving on to the Tunnel Alternatives. We looked at four tunnel concepts. Two below Almond along I-81 footprint. One
to the west of the viaduct on Townsend Street and one to the east of the viaduct. All of the tunnels would be able to meet today's current standards.

The first two called T-1 and T-2. T-1 would be, would start at Martin Luther King east all the way to Butternut Street. It would be about a distance of two miles and would have a portal near the Genesee Street. The cost of this alternative is anticipated to be $2.651 billion.

T-2 would also start at Martin Luther King east and proceed to East Genesee Street and be about a mile long. This tunnel alternative is anticipated to cost $1.761 billion. And for each of these, a surface street would be on top of the tunnel to serve local traffic.

There are two main disadvantages to these tunnel alternatives. First, the ramp connections between the tunnel and I-690 would require a number of local streets be removed or dead-ended. This
Frechette would diminish access between the downtown and the north side. The second disadvantage involves difficult construction practices related to the condition under Almond Street. There is a high water table that currently exists, with salient in the water which would require special disposal methods.

In addition the tunnel, the highway has many subsurface utilities underneath it; water, sewer, telephone, cable, storm sewer, gas. That would all need to be relocated as a result of the project of these tunnels. We would have to use cut and cover construction to build these, to build these tunnels, which would result in very lengthy time frames to relocate utilities, estimated to take seven to eight years to build these two tunnel alternatives. So for these reasons we Failed the tunnel alternative and do not consider them reasonable.
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T-3 was the Townsend Street tunnel. This would be the tunnel under Townsend Street. We had hoped to avoid some of the issues that we found under the Almond Street alternatives. We're hoping to avoid some of the soil issues. And be able to keep I-81 active during the construction phase. The cost of this alternative was $2.643 billion. We believe that cut and cover construction would still be required. And although the existing I-81 would be kept open for construction the Townsend tunnel required substantial building acquisitions due to the right-of-way being much more narrow than the Almond Street corridor.

For these reasons the Townsend Street tunnel we Failed those, feeling that we do not believe they were considered reasonable and do not recommend this alternative to go forward.

T-4, the tunnel on the Eastern Alignment was suggested from a member of
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the public. I-81 in a tunnel approximately one mile east of the existing Interstate. The tunnel would be 81 feet below the surface, and be bored through the bedrock that exists today. Its interchanges would be at the I-481, the southern end, it would pop-up at Interstate 690 shown on the picture, and then at the Bear Street I-81 interchange would surface again.

The viaduct would be able to remain in place during construction and there would be opportunity to enhance Almond Street. The disadvantages would include many property acquisitions, and the Teal Avenue interchange that is just to the east of where this comes up would need to be eliminated.

The tunnel cost was, for this alternative was the most expensive we looked at, and it was $3.298 billion, which was more than a billion dollars more than most of the other alternatives. We Failed this, this alternative on
Frechette

Eastern Alignment because we didn’t consider this reasonable.

We also looked at two Depressed Highways. One, East Adams to Butternut Street, that was a mile and a quarter long. The other one was East Adams Street to East Genesee Street, which was approximately a half mile long. The Depressed Highway 1 and 2 would create a sunken highway about 25 feet below the surface and we would build several overpasses at key locations over this depressed highway. Otherwise it would be open to the skies. It could meet today’s standards.

The Depressed Highway 1, is anticipated to cost $1.751 billion. And the Depressed Highway 2 is anticipated to cost $1.503 billion.

Two major disadvantages. Once again, the ramp connections to Interstate 690 would sever several streets where they currently could not cross Almond. And then subsurface conditions are also not
favorable, similar to the tunnel alternatives. We failed both of these as not being reasonable.

The last two alternatives, the Western Bypass was an idea that came out during the I-81 Corridor Study. And the bypass would consist of a new highway around the west side of Syracuse. It was estimated to cost $2.446 billion and would require substantial amounts of land estimated to be in the neighborhood of 70 to 200 acres, dependent upon the location of the highway. It also would acquire a number of homes estimated to be over a hundred. We do not believe the Western Bypass was a feasible alternative.

The second other alternative was a new highway along West Street. This alternative was estimated to cost $1.326 billion. It was raised by a member of the public during our scoping phase and was called the Salt City Circuit. The concept would include I-81 along the New
York and Susquehanna Railroad property, and it would approach West Street and then go up West Street to I-690. The existing 81 between the railroad and I-690 could be replaced with a boulevard.

The disadvantage to this alternative was the property impacts were anticipated to be about 70 to 90 properties along West Street. And it would really diminish local access to the West Street area. For that reason we Failed this alternative also.

An item that is common to all of the alternatives, with the exception of the Rehabilitation, the viaduct rehabilitation, was we have a desire to provide the two missing links that currently exist between I-81 and I-690.

The I-690 eastbound traffic currently cannot make that movement in yellow to I-81 northbound. And they also cannot make the I-81 southbound to the I-690 westbound. So the Department would want to move forward with these
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We're also exploring two options to connect West Street to Interstate 690 highway. The first would improve West Street, the ramps at I-690. This option would keep the current free flowing interchange layout in place now, but would raise I-690 to improve safety on the highway and West Street -- and improve the West Street ramps. That's Option 1.

Option 2, would be to rebuild as a signalized intersection under the Interstate. This would replace the current stacked interchange with a signalized street intersection. It would elevate I-690 at West Street and improve the ramp connections. This option is consistent with the city's common traffic on West Street initiative.

In summary, DOT is recommending that these six alternatives plus the No Build alternative be studied further in the EIS. We continue to investigate these
alternatives as well as the potential
effects on the social, environmental and
economic vitality of the area. But we
want to hear from you and get your input
on these recommendations, and those
recommendations that we are proposing to
eliminate.

The Scoping Report will incorporate
all comments that we receive. The EIS,
will be a comprehensive study of the
potential environmental impacts of each
of the alternative studies going forward.
There is lots of information on the
boards in the Open House and I encourage
you to speak to the team members next
door.

We are also starting the project
work related to the historic resources.
We're reaching out to experts on
historic preservation, archaeology and
the Native American tribes.

Written comments will be accepted
through September 2nd. And we're
accepting any oral comments here tonight.
If you would like to speak, I ask you to please fill in a speaker card at the welcome table. The speaking portion of this meeting will begin after this presentation.

For more information DOT has been doing a lot with their website, we ask you to visit our project website for this project at i81opportunities.org. The website will continually be updated throughout the entire project. And I want to thank you for coming and thank you for your interests in this I-81 viaduct project. So at this time I will call out Mr. Brody Smith and we'll start the public comment period.

MODERATOR SMITH: We are now ready to open the floor to those of you who wish to provide verbal comments. I remind you that anyone who wishes to speak at this meeting must fill out one of these cards. The cards can be found at the registration table in the foyer. It's not too late to you change your
mind if you would like to speak. In order to allow as many people as possible to speak we will restrict the individual comments to two minutes. I will give you a visual cue when you have one minute left and 30 seconds left and when your time has expired. I won't verbally interrupt you.

You may also dictate your comments privately, just to remind you if you prefer, to the stenographer in the foyer. If your comments are in writing, you can simply hand those into the project team representative at the table in the lobby. If you have already submitted comments in response to the Department's publication to the Notice of Intent you don't need to resubmit those, they are already part of the record.

Again, all written comments must be accepted -- will be accepted but they must be to the Department by Tuesday, September 2, 2014 or postmarked that day.
So to begin, we'll begin with James Laspino can step up to this microphone here, and I would ask that John Cooper line up behind him and he will speak second.

JAMES LASPINO: I want to thank all those who participated, all the committees, I think you're doing a phenomenal job. I'm very excited how much communication between each other and the community and I was afraid at first this would be ramrodded through. So I'm very happy that it seems like no matter what happens that it will be well thought out.

With that in mind I prefer a viaduct. And I think one thing to consider about the boulevard alternative is SU game traffic, especially at the Almond/Harrison and Adams Street interchanges.

Two, truck traffic coming from the south would have to go 481 to 90 and then 690 and it will be likely more traffic, increasing more gas to be used.
It's a less green alternative in my mind. And also communities that have historically been bypassed tend to lose. It creates an economic impact. For instance in Auburn when the Bypass went through their downtown died.

And finally the one thing that would make me more comfortable about a boulevard would be bike bridges or pedestrian bridges over Almond, which would increase the connectivity. I would seek -- maybe I missed it, but that would be a much better and safer way than trying to dodge across traffic.

Finally, right now the viaduct seems like it cuts the city in half, but it's only perception. An actual boulevard does cut the city in half. Clinton Street on S-2, if you use that, that would have a great impact on the Clinton Square activities. I hope that they choose not to use any kind of lanes going south near the Clinton Street corridor. Thank you.
MODOERATOR SMITH: John Cooper is the next speaker. Mr. Cooper, and then after Mr. Cooper is Mr. James Darlington.

JOHN COOPER: About got ready to take a nap. Anyway, I traveled a long way across the interstates of this country, through the west and through the south and with various organizations. What I've got here I'll give you a copy of this, if you look around you will notice the traffic in the Syracuse area has doubled in the last 56 years. I remember when there was very little traffic on Route 81 when they opened it and started using it, the people didn't know what it was for.

Now people see how important 81 really is. Try this, close off all the on-ramps to 81 in the Syracuse area to reach Brighton Avenue or Carousel Center for a week, see how traffic gets along without 81 through the city. If you want to go to street level you're looking for trouble. We need two
Cooper

streets to get people one place to
another in a hurry.

This would be the only through
passage from north to south and south to
north. To build a viaduct above the one
you've got now on 81 would make it a two
street, only traffic from the south
going through to the north and no
on-ramps, none of that good stuff. And
then the one that's there now would be
dedicated to local traffic with the
off- and on-ramps. And it would get a
lot of traffic moving a lot faster.

And as far as look at the mess when
the 690 bridge was closed for five days,
people didn't know how to find an
alternate route to get to work or
anyplace else. They go that way and
they run into a barricade like a herd of
cattle. And you watch them they have to
turn left or right get off and find your
way around it; it isn't easy.

My last statement here when we were
in Paris on a tour in '96 we found that
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Paris they have 5 railroad stations located easily around the city. And 70 percent of their workers go to work by train, bus or taxi, there are no tunnels under the Seine River. Why? The ground is to soft. They tried to dig a tunnel and kept caving in. We'd get to see the Seine River it would be out of luck. But anyway, I got my two cents in here. What's the red light, does that mean I'm done? Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Yes, sir. James Darlington. After Mr. Darlington Peter Saryer to speak.

JAMES DARLINGTON: I want to thank you for giving us the opportunity to speak today. I would like to speak as one of the approximately 175,000 individuals who live in the northwest quadrant of Onondaga County. This includes the towns of Camillus, Clay, Elbridge, Geddes, Lysander, Salina and Van Buren and the villages that are contained therein. More specifically I
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am, would would like to think of myself as a representative of those who travel regularly to destinations south of the city of Syracuse and use Route 81 to get there. My comments also hold for those individuals residing south of the city who use I-81 on a regular basis to commute to the same northwest quadrant for work, business or family obligations.

I want to speak against the boulevard options for several reasons. Beginning with cost of the project. Travel time I should say. It is a reasonable assumption based on current highway design and traffic flow engineering standards that the elimination of the I-81 link through the city will on average increase travel time by 10 minutes each time that route is taken. That's 20 minutes each day for commuters, a hundred minutes each week, 5,000 minutes or over eighty hours every year. That's more than three days of a person's life. A month over 10
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years.

My second point concerns additional fuel and consumption costs -- fuel consumption and cost. I haven't done the math but the cost would be substantial, especially in regards to trucks. For an 18 wheeler the route around the city that is I-81/I-481 and I-690 around the city would consume two or more gallons of fuel, additional gallons of fuel, assuming they're getting 5.5 miles per gallon, which is a reasonable estimate.

My third point is redundancy. The elimination -- redundancy in moderation is good, and the elimination of I-81 will eliminate redundancy of having two Interstate routes leading south from the city and its inner suburbs.

In closing, there is universal agreement that the selection of the present route of I-81 through the city of Syracuse was an outrageous injustice to the residents of the near east side
of the city. Regrettably, that area cannot be undone. New York State DOT and please don't commit a similar type of injustice to the non-city residents of this county. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Saryer is the next speaker. After Mr. Saryer, Barry Lentz to speak.

PETER SARYER: I am Peter Saryer of the Conveners for the Moving People Transportation Coalition, and I would like to make a specific comment. In January the DOT and Centro received a consultant's report from the Syracuse System Transit Analysis. This focused on the enhancement and the expansion of the mass transit options including base build, bus rapid transit and light rail.

Your Draft Scoping document does make reference to the fact that you've promised to coordinate activities more closely with Centro. But we believe that a more active joint planning process is necessary, that the
revitalization of our city is dependent on growth and use of mass transit options that aren't currently available.

Tuesday night at a stakeholders meeting a Centro spokesperson indicated that such as concept as park and ride option concurrent with the schedule for the I-81 replacement weren't feasible.

This was a Centro spokesperson. We really find that not acceptable, because these two activities need to go on in such a way that the whole picture is taken under consideration. Particularly we are asking that the Centro process be accelerated so that when the deconstruction process of the existing elevated highway begins that we have greater opportunities for our citizens to begin to adapt necessarily their behavior. Commission McDonald earlier promised us this closer coordination would occur and we certainly hope to see the results of that. Thank you, very much.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, sir.
The next speaker is Barry Lentz. Then following Mr. Lentz is Van Robinson Common Councilor of the city of Syracuse.

BARRY LENTZ: Good afternoon, my name is Barry Lentz, I'm a member of the Urban Jobs Task Force, the Moving People Transportation Coalition and the Community of Economic Development Working Advisory Group for the viaduct project.

I will begin by expressing my appreciation for the work that has gone into the Draft Scoping Report and state that I generally agree with the analysis and recommendations presented in the 16 Alternatives Screening tables of Appendix A. I believe the Draft Scoping Report, along with other support materials provided forms an adequate basis for public response to DOT's recommendation, the screening phase, at this particular point in the process. Specifically today I will address what I want to address is the statement of 5
objectives that express the Purpose and Need as utilized I think the Alternative Screening Table. The two stated goals of the project are:

1. Improve safety and create efficient regional and local transportation system within and through the Greater Syracuse area.

And 2, provide transportation solutions that enhance the liveability, visual quality, sustainability and economic vitality of Greater Syracuse.

Unfortunately, when these goals are rearticulated into the five objectives that are used as statements of Purpose and Need in the Alternative Screening Tables, the only aspect of Goal 2 represented are related to connections with local streets and enhanced bicycle and pedestrian connections. This is a serious flaw that I trust will be corrected during the EIS phase.

Examples of a few critical items that will be added to the decision-
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making matrix in the apparent Assessment

Tables are objectives related to land

use value economics, generation of new

economic alternatives including jobs for

local residents, urban design

principles, transit oriented
development, and health impacts.

I believe that these Goal 2

objectives are going to lead to greater
differentiation between the build

alternatives carried into the EIS

process than Goal 1 issues related to

safety and efficiency of automobile

movement.

There has been a lot of talk

throughout this process about who makes
decisions. I believe that a well

constructed decision-making matrix with

a robust representation of objectives

that are developed with full public

input and a clear method for evaluating

objectives is the surest path to a

strong public consensus. If that occurs

I believe the question of who decides
Robinson

will be rendered moot. Thank you and I look forward to continuing to work with the DOT on this matter.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Van Robinson will be the next to speaker. Mr. Lentz, would you mind sharing a copy?

BARRY LENTZ: Yes, I will.

MODERATOR SMITH: Following Common Councilor Van Robinson's comments, Bill Simmons will be recognized. Mr. Simmons, come to the front of the room, please.

VAN ROBINSON: Good evening. I want to look back and say 16 years ago when I stood up by the Adams Street intersection with I-81 and I told the reporter, tear this wall down, I-81, I thought then and I see it today as a barrier, a separation between the city. One side of the city there is the fluency, on the other side there leaves a lot to be desired. Removing the barrier will knit the city back together again. And in its stead we'll see economic development take place, we can see a reunited
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Syracuse.

Once you come down to street level, and if you do it properly and mend the streets, the grids that were closed off, shortcut it, short circuit it, reroute it, and reknit our grid. There is absolutely no reason why anyone can't get around the city in the 10 minutes that we now pridely hold our city the 10 minute city. Any other options will only bring more disaster. And when we think about I-81 we have to think not just for tomorrow, the week or the month after, the year after, we must think 50, 75, 100 years from now.

And our great, great, great grandchildren will look back and say either one of two things. They did it right by God. Or what kind of fools were they? We made a mistake 50 years ago, we cannot make that same mistake again. It would only point out that we do not know what we are doing.

There are a number of alternatives
on the plate right now. The only one that I can see that will serve the population of Central New York well, and that is the street level with mitigation. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you very much, Mr. Robinson. The next speaker is Mr. Simmons, Bill Simmons. The following speaker will be William Penn.

WILLIAM SIMMONS: Good afternoon, my name is Bill Simmons, Executive Director of Syracuse Housing Authority. I want to say on behalf of the 300 residents who live at Toomey Abbot Towers and the 600 families who live at Pioneer Homes that they're looking forward to participating in the environmental justice portion of this process whereby they would have some input in terms of talking about any mitigation and future enhancement in that community going forward.

Secondly, also want to make a comment that as we look at the three
street alternatives, I noticed that there hasn't been much detail yet in terms of the entrance ramps and the exit ramps south of East Adams Street. And so I would just suggest that although the street level alternatives, the overheads come down, the ramps could create a wall, depending upon the scope of those ramps, that would not fully realize the vision of the community for street level option. So if you could consider starting with the entrance ramps a little further south and then maybe coming under the rail station as an option, I would like to get some feedback on that option as well.

But I do want to say on behalf of the 1,000 residents who live adjacent to I-81, they're looking forward to being a full partner in this partnership going forward. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Simmons. The next speaker is William Penn.
next speaker will be Nick Kochan.

WILLIAM PENN: Referring to the last 50 years, I've lived here just about that long, and I've endured a half century of construction blockages and detours and traffic jams and much, much worse than anything we see today. And so I think that the idea of having a boulevard is a bad one because this is what we had before. I see the boulevard option as a regression back to a day when this was a much, much worse traffic situation.

So, I like the idea of closing the viaduct for a month to see how everybody likes it. I think you would have quite a bit of minds changing. So I fervently hold that V-2 or V-3 or V-4 will be a winner.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Penn. The next speaker will be Nick Kochan. Following Mr. Kochan will be Stephen White.

NICK KOCHAN: First of all, thank you
Kochan

very much to the DOT for hosting this process. In the way of background I am a 20 plus year member of the Liverpool Planning Board and for the last six years I've been Deputy Mayor of the Village of Liverpool. And I also participated in the 1990 Thruway Task Force when we were undergoing a major renovation of the State 57 interchange in Liverpool. And the notion and purpose was to look at the value and the importance that the New York State Thruway plays to local traffic in Onondaga County.

I was glad to see in this morning's paper that you expanded a review of the process for the 81 changes to include the I-690 interchanges to this process as well. Because we all understand that Syracuse really doesn't have a huge traffic problem, they really have a rush hour problem, that's really what we're talking about.

So the notion is that when you're
talking about the relieving traffic in Syracuse you're really looking at peak traffic. When you're looking at peak traffic you should be looking at all assets. And what I would like to suggest is that we have one major underutilized asset here and that's the New York State Thruway. It's currently cut through Onondaga County and has six exits in Onondaga County.

And I would just like to in the way of the role that the New York State Thruway has played in other communities in Upstate New York, from its inception Buffalo has always had 3 tolls in the New York State Thruway and the Albany area twenty years ago the Thruway Authority rebuilt the I-90 bypass around the Albany area and then turned over to the New York State highway, the New York State DOT, the old Thruway section to facilitate transportation in Albany.

In addition, toward the end of the Cuomo administration, the Thruway
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Authority bought the I-84 interchange in Westchester County and enhanced that interchange, and they currently still own it as far as I know.

So my point is the Thruway Authority has been very helpful in solving local traffic problems. To that end I would really like to see this process include the Thruway, and also look at the possibility of the offsetting capital costs associated with operational expenses that are underwritten by the Thruway tolls.

Back in that Thruway study that we did in with the Task Force in 1990, the current -- the County Executive was willing to pay to offset the costs, because began to realize the commuter traffic improvements for enhancement based in northern Onondaga County were actually relieved by the use of the Thruway, and was willing to pay that money if they have could have done it. That predated the E-Z Pass and weren't
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able to do that. So for that reason I would like to see if you could expand the integration of the entire network to include a view of the Thruway. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Kochan. The next speaker is Stephen White. Following Mr. White Elliot Reitz.

STEPHEN WHITE: Thanks for giving us the opportunity. I come to promote the viaduct rebuild in one form or another. You will have the same advantages that it provides now without the disadvantages that absolutely will come if you make a boulevard. Your access to commuter time as shown in the new plans that you put out so far will be enhanced and not slowed down by rebuilding the viaduct.

You will not increase pollution, you absolutely will, no question about it, if you have a boulevard. Because you're going to have people driving all the way around, doubling the amount of time they have to drive from the bottom of 481
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exit all the way around to either way up on 81 or across 690 and the new thing that Bob just said there to promote. And he's a good guy I like Bob. But that's going to double the pollution for those drivers. And the pollution for the people who drive down and go slower through lights and so forth on the boulevard will be way increased.

You will be having a good deal less traffic time for, or crossing time for the people who want to get from the University and the hospital area across the downtown. That seems if you want to, things that people think will be better. Well, if you put a boulevard it's going to take more time. If you have a viaduct that's a little bit higher and you mentioned it might be 10 feet higher. If it was 10 feet higher you could hang crosswalks going across in a couple spots and get much less time for people and much safer to go across. The same beautification that you would
have by having a boulevard could be done
underneath and make it very palatable.
You could have an iconic looking viaduct
and rather make a statement to do that.

The other thing is, and Joe will
back me up on this because he heard the
screaming when we went to question the
community, if you want to see what
happens when a boulevard goes through
just take a look at what happened to the
neighbors of West Street. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, sir.
The next speaker is Mr. Elliott Reitz.
Following Mr. Reitz will be Jason Sperry.

ELLIOTT REITZ: My name is Elliott
Reitz, I have a 25 year background in
systems engineering and I kind of want
to compliment part of what you've done
so far, which is engagement with the
public, identification of options and
trade space, as a systems engineer, all
right. However, you're using technology
that's five years old to do something
that's supposed to last 50 years into
that future. And some of your assumptions made to date have short circuited some of your opportunities to cause improvements, as Mr. Berry Lentz wrote in his document. I applaud Barry for that effort.

What I would like to suggest is part of my contacts are with Syracuse University through the Center of Excellence and Systems Engineering Case Center and the Air Force Research Labs, I have an account on the super computer. And we can do things like modeling. I saw a recent model in the presentation room where the cars were moving on the road representing the current state.

But as you know, regular computers like to have an in-house struggle to do that well. Doing that on a thousand separate processors on a super computer all at once, guess what, now you create dozens of scenarios and play the scenario, take a video as it runs and see what it does. Then you can put
those videos up on YouTube and allow the public to have dialogue on each video and further explore things like you're talking about, bicycle traffic and the height of the viaduct was one option. Well, under that extra height you could put a bicycle ramp where the bicycle could ride over the ramp and never stop for traffic; where the walkers could go over a stairway and not have to wait for the little green lights or the red Walk Lights and so on.

So systems engineering, the model is to do more modeling analysis and simulation in the front end of the program, can save billions of dollars down the road. And the money that you're talking about in the billions doesn't count the $5 per passenger going around the 481 on a truck or time sitting in a red light. This is going to cost everyone a lot of money. And the cost equation and the optimization modeling should be done much better with
our tax monies hard at work. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, sir. The next speaker is Mr. Sperry. And following Mr. Sperry would be, I have trouble reading it, Silverman. Brenda Silverman.

JASON SPERRY: I'm Jason Sperry, I'm the originator of the T-4 option, which is otherwise known as A-1 through Syracuse. About eight months ago I met with the DOT and their consultants to discuss this option. And within that discussion, you know, right away it was recognized that it would probably be a pretty expensive option. So the question was raised, are there strategies that economize this option? So we discussed that in detail with several specific suggestions to shorten the alignment a little bit, which would economize the option by 20 to 40 percent. Unfortunately the conceptual plan that was presented to you was just taken as that, and never developed beyond that
conceptual plan. Now the suggestions to economize that plan were evaluated. So I'm going to have to question the due diligence and sincerity that you took in valuing that option.

Second point I would like to make, one of the key proponents of the T-4 option it that it allows I-81 to remain open during the construction of the new 81. I do recognize that that is a pretty valuable benefit. However, that benefit hasn't been evaluated. So there is an economic benefit evaluation associated with that. And that, that number, that monetary figure should be added to all the other options that doesn't -- that takes down 81 during a 5 to 7 year construction period.

When you look at all the factors in play to the ways to economize that option and also take advantage of the value of keeping 81 open during construction, the T-4 option is on par economically with all the other options.
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And I think it was prematurely taken out of the EIS process. And I would encourage you to relook at it and put it back into the process. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Sperry. The next speaker is Ms. Silverman. Following Ms. Silverman will be Mark Watkins.

BRENDA SILVERMAN: I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to talk and also with the woman in the newspaper, in the sweater from the last Scoping meeting. And I guess I'm speaking on the side of maintaining the viaduct.

I live in the Outer Comstock neighborhood, 15 minute walk to Manley Field House. And we get to live with the fact that the south side of the city does not have any four-lane road. If the viaduct is taken down as has been suggested as in the past, although not discussed today, the traffic would somehow find itself going to other
streets that flow in the area. Well, there are no other streets. They are either essentially, if you look at the map and the south side of the city, southeast quadrant there are two lane roads like Comstock which is residential.

There is Brighton which is partly residential and has 300 apartments in the area mostly filled with Syracuse University students. There is the Dome and Dome events. And you have Colvin which is, you go down there now with some of the potholes filled up between Comstock and the 81 entrance it is an accordion. It's not safe.

So if the Thruway (sic) is taken down and we go to a boulevard and it's a pretty picture with trees, you can put a lot of green trees under a viaduct, you can do a lot of things. If you leave it up to who's going to pay for the repairs on Almond Street? Almond Street right now is hardly drivable. If we take the
viaduct down who's responsible for this new six lane boulevard, who is going to pay the cost of snow removal, potholes, resurfacing, and how often would we need it done, etc.?

So as much as it looks real pretty and the talk about the city, the Outer Comstock neighborhood would be eliminated because there are no through streets currently big enough to handle Syracuse University and the medical complex traffic. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, Ms. Silverman. The next speaker will be Mark Watkins. Following Mr. Watkins is Mr. Peter Black.

MARK WATKINS: Thank you very much, I really appreciate the excellent presentation and the diagrams of the traffic, it was really clear. Makes it clear that we, since I also live in the Outer Comstock area, that we in the southern part of the city including Outer Comstock, the Valley, the
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Southwest part, access to I-81 either via Colvin Street going north or Exit 18 and returning home via Exit 18. If the viaduct is eliminated and a boulevard is inserted, the southern part of the city is truncated from the city.

There is a connection of 81 from the north to 690 east-west, but not from the south in the boulevard presentation. From the southern part of the city we want to access Destiny, not just downtown, Destiny, the ball park, the Regional Market, the Transportation Center, the Airport, I-690 east and west, west to Camillus or Baldwinsville.

For any one of these it be would be essential to go through the gauntlet of a boulevard with it's traffic lights and stopping and wasting gasoline and adding fumes to the air, especially to Pioneer Village, which is right near there.

I also want to mention that at the Outer Comstock neighborhood is surrounded by parking for the Dome.
Parking for the Dome is chiefly on the top of Skytop Hill or in the lots around Manley Field House. At the end of the Dome event there is traffic that pours westward on Colvin Street onto 81 headed north.

If there are traffic lights, and a gauntlet of traffic lights just a mile up the road imagine the back-up that you would have following every Dome event.

Thank you, very much.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, sir. The next speaker will be Mr. Black, following Mr. Black, Cynthia Fleury.

PETER BLACK: My hearing isn't too good, did you say Peter Black?

MODERATOR SMITH: Yes, sir.

PETER BLACK: I appreciate the opportunity to speak here. I misjudged I think a little bit about the extent of the comment that I was concerned about, particularly development along the west side of Comstock Road above the city's central portions resulting in excessive
runoff. One direction down into the center of town, which I think has been dealt with quite a bit. But the other direction down to Meadowbrook, and I have concern over that. Because of the potential increase in runoff.

I feel this water and land resources, retired from the College of Forestry I lived in the city since 1963, '64, something like that. At any rate I've tried on occasion to get into and see some of the changes that have taken place, and the ability of the soil in that area to take in water and take it out of the area that are going to contribute to runoff in the city and also in Meadowbrook, and obviously you have commented on. Those are my comments and thank you, very much.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, sir. The next speaker will be Cynthia Fleury. Following Ms. Fleury will be Richard Riccelli. Cynthia Fleury? I'll move on to Mr. Riccelli, and if Ms. Fleury
stepped out for a moment then she can speak again. Following Mr. Riccelli is Mark Braiman.

RICHARD RICCELLI: Thank you, Richard Riccelli, president of Riccelli Enterprises. It appears in conversations with most business and community leaders there is only one reasonable option that reaches consensus with everybody in this room. The Sperry tunnel, 81 foot below, I believe is T-4. It meets everybody's expectations in the room and goes beyond. It doesn't cost the taxpayers anymore money. And it doesn't increase the tax rate. It actually will increase the state coffers. It creates the most jobs. It allows 5 to 10 years to redevelop the downtown area that's lost where 81 currently stands. It allows us to work 24 hours per day in the tunnel construction without any disruption of the current traffic flow. When complete we have the safest, least costly
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maintained highway in the area.

Every other option seems to have flaws which makes them not reasonable. So I would love to talk more on this but please add this Sperry option back in. We've got Parsons, the best engineers in the country, I'm sure they can figure out a way to finance the tunnel, bring more jobs to the area and create a safe easily flowable 81. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Riccelli. The next speaker is Mark Braiman. Following Mr. Braiman Mr. Jeremy Bossert.

MARK BRAIMAN: I would like to comment on two aspects of the Scoping Project. First as an avid bicyclist I would like to reiterate how important it is for you to make great effort to protect bicyclists. You may not be aware but less than 4 hours ago and less than six blocks from here a bicyclist was killed by a truck, just a little bit north of here in the center of the city.
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I bicycle when I commute to Syracuse University across the East Genesee Street/481 interchange. That cloverleaf interchange is one of the most dangerous in the area, and there are very few people willing to even attempt it.

The increase in traffic on 481 that has been proposed is likely to increase the risk of that, especially the ramps leading to westbound East Genesee. Because there will be sections of East Genesee Street that will be more accessible from the current 481 once there are no interchanges in the center of the city.

The second aspect that I would like to comment on is about transparency, which has been mostly excellent. The one area of concern that I have is the lack of information about which properties will need to be taken. I know that the Syracuse Post Standard requested this information more than two months ago because they reported it.
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And they reported that information was not available. To me this is one of the most important things that this community needs to help determine which options are most viable. I'm particularly concerned as an avid customer. I have no other connection, and as a customer of Smith Restaurant Supply about the value of that particular business to our community and as far as I can tell of the options only the No Build or rebuild the existing placing is going to allow that business to remain.

Also the Brennan Buildings, which have been discussed and the possible area for redevelopment, an interesting historical site, it's looks like they will be taken, almost all the options. It's very important for this community to realize which options for use of those buildings will be foreclosed.

Thank you, very much.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, sir.
The next speaker is Jim Bossert.

Following Mr. Bossert is Bob Haley.

JIM BOSSERT: Hi, I have actually no affiliation with any special interest group, just a mechanical engineering student interested in the subject matter. If you're willing to actually change up the format a tad I would like to ask a couple questions.

First off, if the pass of these proposals had only small variations basically in the radii for them to turn, in that floor plan from what I remember requires 40 percent less business acquisition than the other V plan, why were the other proposals passed in the first place? Were there any undiscussed advantages or disadvantages that exist that weren't V-1 through V-3 to still be recommended along with the V-4? So, you know, why not just simplify the subsequent process for evaluation and just focus on the V-4.

The second was, this may have been
Bossert answered if I did my homework, which I regret I probably should have, but for the businesses that are planned to be acquired what kinds of compensation for those businesses will be provided as in, you know, for possibly buying out or you know, assistance to relocate? If you're willing to answer those questions at this time.

M. SMITH: All your questions are on the record. Did you have any other questions?

J. BOSSERT: No, that was it, if it's the correct place to ask.

M. SMITH: Actually that's a good question. There are people in the room next door who are available to discuss the specifics of the proposals and answer questions. And also as part of this process comments will be responded to.

J. BOSSERT: Thank you.

M. SMITH: Mr. Haley is next, and if Ms. Fleury has returned she will
be the last speaker.

MR. HALEY: My name is Bob Haley and I'm with Rethink 81, an organization that is trying to get more information, and has been working with the process for at least six months now throughout this process.

I would like to speak to one point today. And here we are in the Final Scoping phase which is to take the public input, yet we're getting new proposals that come in in this past week, or proposals that are asked to be reconsidered. It's very logical to do that throughout this process so that we don't miss the right answer.

As part of that process I would like today to speak to one primary issue, and that's not about the details of traffic, speed, curves, radiuses, percentages or how deep or how wide and so on. I would like to speak to the criteria of long term economic value and growth to the city of Syracuse, and therefore for our
region.

It seems like each of these schemes we need to judge also on how much land they take or are in the potential taking area. And secondly, how many of the building structures would have to come down? I only mentioned land and buildings, I haven't mentioned jobs and homes.

I was here when the first highway was built. My father's business was closed on North Salina to build 81. He had to relocate. And it's interesting in retrospect that I see that families were moved then and businesses were moved then, in a vast amount of area. And then over the next 50 years we said that the city has deteriorated, when in fact the economic value from that land was taken away from the city growth then.

So today we don't want that to happen again for the next 50 years. The rationale is we would like the land back in the viaduct area. We would like the
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viaduct down. It has to be taken down but it does not have to be rebuilt. Therefore, the comparisons of the alternatives should include economic impact by cost of land taken away from the city's value and tax base, and land that could be added.

My last comment is the grave solution which I, we support, has three options. We would like to see those studied further. Because what they do is return 7 to 9 acres of land to the city for development in the most critical sensitive strategic development area in the city between the ed and the meds and downtown. Those criteria will long term benefit our city for the next 50 years. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, sir. Has Ms. Fleury returned to the room? I believe that is all of our speakers. Thank you all very much for coming. Again, the hall will remain open following the meeting. Anyone like to
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take a look. And thank you for your comments.

(First hearing recessed at 5:40 p.m.)

(Second hearing commenced at 6:00 p.m. next page).
MR. FRECHETTE: Good evening. On behalf of Joe McDonald, Commissioner of the New York State Department of Transportation, and Jonathan McDade, the Administrator for the Federal Highway Administration, New York Division, I want to welcome you to this Scoping Meeting. My name is Mark Frechette, and I am the Project Director for the I-81 Viaduct Project.

This is the second of two Scoping Meetings for the Environmental Impact Statement or EIS that will be prepared for the I-81 Viaduct Project in Syracuse, New York. The meeting is sponsored by the two agencies that are serving as the lead agencies for the EIS. The New York State Department of Transportation, the state lead agency, and the Federal Highway Administration, the federal lead agency.

This scoping meeting is being conducted to obtain comments on the scope of the project's Environmental
Impact Statement. The meeting provides the public an opportunity to make formal statements of positions before any project decisions are made. To assist interested parties in formulating their comments a Draft Scoping Report is available for review here tonight. The report is also available on the project website at www.i81opportunities.org and at libraries and other public facilities throughout Greater Syracuse.

The Draft Scoping Report provides an overview of the Project, presents the project's purpose, needs and objectives, describes the initial alternatives under consideration and explains our recommendations, that some advance for further study and others be eliminated. It outlines the steps in the Environmental Review process and describes coordination with other agencies and public involvement opportunities.

At this time I would like to have
Mr. Brody Smith, tonight's moderator, explain to you the format and structure of tonight's meeting. Following that I will give a presentation on the I-81 viaduct project. Then Mr. Smith will moderate the comment session.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you. I am Mr. Brody Smith, I'll serve as the moderate for the Scoping Meeting tonight. So that we can make a record of all those who have spoken it's important that people fill out the cards that you have at the registration table out front in the foyer if you would like to speak. There is a stenographer (court reporter) in front of me. All statements made during the meeting will be recorded by the stenographer (court reporter) and a verbatim written transcript be produced following the meeting.

The Environmental Impact Statement for the I-81 Viaduct Project is being prepared in accordance with the following laws and regulations: The
National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, NEPA as amended and implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations, 40 CFR Parts 1500 through 1508, the Federal Highway Administration Environmental Impact Regulations found at 23 CFR Part 771, the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act which I'll refer to as SEQRA, in particular New York State Department of Transportation implementing regulations at 17 NYCRR Part 15. And a number of other federal and state regulations and requirements, among them Presidential Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Section 4F of the US Department of Transportation Act.

After these opening remarks and the subsequent presentation you will have an opportunity to provide written and/or verbal comments. If you wish to provide verbal comment you must fill out one of
the speaker cards that I referred to before, and those will be gotten at the rest registration desk.

You may provide verbal comment tonight in one of two ways. First, if you wish to help to share your comment publically in this room I'll ask you to come up to the microphone to speak. I'll also ask the following speaker to come to the front of the room at that time so that we can keep the meeting going.

If you prefer to make your comment in private, at any time you can exit those doors and if you look to your left there is a screen, and behind that screen there is a stenographer (court reporter) and you can provide your comments to the stenographer (court reporter) in private. They'll be recorded and made part of the record.

All verbal comments at this meeting will be limited to two minutes. You may also provide written comments. Written
comments may be provided in three
different ways. At this meeting you can
fill out a comment form. Comment forms
can be found at the back of the room or
in the foyer. You can visit the project
website which is
www.i81opportunities.org, where there
will be an online comment form that you
can fill out. Or you can send your
comments in by mail. The address is NYS
DOT I-81 Viaduct Project, 333 East
Washington Street, Syracuse, New York,
13202.

Information on how to submit written
comments is also provided at the
registration table. You can submit
comments both verbally and in writing if
you wish. Written comments will be
given the same weight and consideration
as verbal comments at this meeting. The
official public comment period
associated with this Scoping Meeting
will be open to Tuesday September 2nd,
2014. The New York State DOT and the
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Federal Highway Administration will accept written comments through that date.

In terms of due dates, you have to visit the website by September 2nd, send your comments to meet the deadline, or you can mail comments as long as they're postmarked by September 2, 2014.

The agencies will review, consider public comments submitted during the scoping phase of the project. Responses to the comments will be included in the Final Scoping Report, which is anticipated to be published at some time this fall.

So that everyone who desires to speak may be heard and their statements may be made part of the official record we do not entertain any questions from the floor at this meeting in this room. But there are project staff members in the room next door. If you leave the doors and look to your right in the exhibit hall where you might have looked
at some of the exhibits before you came in here today, there are project staff available there to answer your questions. But those conversations won't be part of the record, won't be reported by a stenographer (court reporter).

Before I call on the speakers to the floor, Mr. Mark Frechette, who is the New York State DOT Project Director, will give a brief presentation on the project. After he speaks I will give you a few additional instructions and then the floor will be opened to comments. Thank you.

MR. FRECHETTE: Thank you. I want to welcome you to our Final Scoping Meeting for the I-81 Viaduct Project. As I mentioned, my name is Mark Frechette, I work for the New York State Department of Transportation as the Project Director. With me today is Joe Flint, who is the Project Manager for DOT for this project. And also our
The purpose of tonight is to provide some update information as to the work that we've completed over the last few months. And then to discuss where we will go from here. Since November of 2013 when we held the Initial Scoping Meeting we've been reviewing the public comments, we've been refining our project alternatives, and we've been analyzing the advantages and disadvantages of each of the alternatives.

Tonight we will recommend which alternatives we believe should be studied further. But before I go into that I want to recap some background information. I'll go over the project area, and tell you why we need to do the project. I'll go over the purpose and the objective, go through each alternative and discuss the advantages and disadvantages. And then I will tell
I-81 is an important corridor both regionally and locally to the transportation network. It runs north-south from Tennessee to Canada and is approximately 855 miles long. It makes major connections to east coast cities like New York City and Washington, D.C. Locally I-81 serves thousands of daily commuters in Greater Syracuse and provides connections to Interstate 690 and I-90 at the Thruway.

It also, I-81 is also a primary local access to the downtown, University Hill, major economic and activities centers in Syracuse. The viaduct was built 50 years ago, and since then highway standards have changed dramatically. The engineering that we have at our disposal today has improved. And travel needs in the Syracuse area has evolved. The transportation infrastructure is deteriorated because of its age, but it's also deteriorated
because of it's wear and tear. It does not meet today's standards for highway systems. The highway and the bridges though undergo inspections annually and maintenance to keep that -- to keep the highway safe for the traveling public. On most days I-81 carries a hundred thousand vehicles a day. It's the major traffic to or from or through downtown Syracuse.

We have established a priority area of three and-a-half miles long along I-81, which crosses over 18 streets, and the bridge carries over 183 bridge spans.

The priority area stems from a three year planning study called the I-81 Corridor Study. This area was the top transportation priority in that study and it included three and-a-half miles along I-81 and two and-a-half miles along I-690. We have a high concentration of structural deficiencies and geometric deficiencies in this area.
And there is frequent traffic congestion and high accident rates. The need to identify include the non-standard and non-conforming features of these Interstates, which there are over a hundred non-conforming features that exist today. There are many bridge deficiencies and there are safety concerns associated with this, these Interstates.

At the interchange of I-81 and I-690 we have an accident rate that is four times the state-wide average of similar interstates. Vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle mobility problems also exist. And we need to incorporate the community vision expressed in Local Long Range Plans. So to address these needs the project's purpose is really to fix the bridge deficiencies and non-standard highway features in the project area while creating and improving the transportation corridor through Syracuse that will meet the transportation needs
and provide infrastructure to support the long range planning efforts from SMTC'S long range transportation plan and Syracuse Comprehensive Plan.

To meet the project purpose five objectives have been developed. These objectives are the measures against which all the project's alternatives are evaluated to determine which should advance to the next phase, the Environmental Impact Statement.

It's consistent with our project's purpose, the objective aims to address structural deficiencies, fix non-standard geometrics, address local travel needs, provide pedestrian bicycle connectivity, address the regional travel needs and provide access to key destinations.

The Environmental Review phase of the I-81 Viaduct Project is being conducted pursuant to state and federal environmental regulations. With both state and federal funding the project is
subject to NEPA and New York State SEQR Act. The federal and state requirements will be coordinated such that one EIS will be prepared to satisfy the requirements of both NEPA and SEQRA.

The environmental process includes several distinct stages. It was initiated back in August 26, 2013 when DOT published the Notice of Intent to prepare the EIS. DOT is currently in the Scoping phase as shown in red. We're developing and analyzing alternatives, we're meeting with the public like we are tonight. We're identifying those environmental considerations that need to be studied in the EIS phase. We've held neighborhood meetings in the fall, Initial Scoping Meeting last November.

Recently DOT held a project update presentation where we share all the alternatives that were being analyzed. Today we want to present our recommendations of those alternatives
that we believe should go forward for further study. We will next move into the Environmental Impact Statement phase and public participation will continue to play a key role in identifying how the project moves forward. The Environmental Review will conclude with what's called the Record Of Decision shown at the bottom of the page, which will identify any potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures. And from there it will have a preferred alternative that we will work on towards the construction phases.

During scoping you have the opportunity to comment on the purpose and needs of the project, the project alternatives, the environmental framework that will be conducted in the EIS. We published a Draft Scoping Report that provides further details, and you can review that on DOT's website for this project at i81opportunities.org, or at local libraries or at the Carnegie
building, we will place copies there. And if you want to we have copies here tonight if you want to take a look at that. We encourage you to review the Report and speak with our key members next door at the Open House.

Tonight we welcome any oral comments that you want to give us. You can provide us written comments with the sheets on the back, and we'll accept all comments through the September 2, 2014 time frame. And all comments that get received will be responded to in our Final Scoping Report.

Project alternatives follow the six categories. The first, the No Build, is the project does not move forward. The Viaduct, we have five viaduct alternatives, first one being a rehabilitation, and the next four to be rebuilding. We have three Street Levels, which would remove the viaduct and improve the surface streets to move traffic onto. We have four Tunnel
alternatives, that would also remove the viaduct and build four tunnels. Four different type alternatives. We have two Depressed Highways, located in open cut trenches. Then we have two other alternatives, one a Western Bypass and the other one called a Salt City Circuit.

We have conducted a preliminary evaluation of all the alternatives to determine whether they meet our purpose and need. Whether it will result in substantial building acquisitions, and whether or not we can construct it with the engineering practices of today. We've also looked at the reasonable costs for each of these alternatives. The Draft Report evaluates all the advantages and disadvantages to determine whether we believe it should Pass and go forward or it should Fail and stop the study at this point in time.

As I go through each of the
alternatives I will explain why we recommend alternatives to Fail and therefore not be studied further. And I will also go over the ones that will Pass the evaluation that we recommend do go forward for further study. We need to look closer at many details associated with these alternatives. Things like potential property impacts. We need to consider traffic analysis. We need to consider the environmental considerations. And we also need to take into account the public comments that we learn tonight in between now and September 2nd.

The first alternative that I'll talk about is the No Build alternative. NEPA requires us, requires investigation of the No Build to assess the future conditions, if the project does not move forward. It provides a baseline against all the other build alternatives that we have. The No Build does not meet any of our objectives, it does not meet our
purpose and needs of the project, but since it is required by federal environmental laws it will pass and it will be evaluated in the EIS process.

Next I will talk about the five viaduct alternatives. One will be to rehabilitate. The others would be to reconstruct I-81 viaduct and implement other transportation improvements within the project limits.

V-1, the rehabilitation alternative would be a long term program of capital investments to keep Interstate 81 in what we call a state of good repair. This approach would keep the bridge structurally safe. But it would not add shoulders, it would not enlarge medians, it would not improve the weaving lanes, and it would not implement other safety or operational improvements.

As a result the rehab would maintain many of the non-standard features that currently exist today, at a construction cost estimated to be $800 million.
Because the rehabilitation alternative does not meet our purpose and need we Failed this alternative as part of our evaluation.

V-2, the new viaduct fully improved current standards would reconstruct I-81 from Martin Luther King to Spencer Street with potential improvements on I-81 all the way to Hiawatha. And it would also include I-690 work between the West Street interchange and the Teal Avenue interchange. The highway would include two lanes of traffic in each direction. It would operate at 55 miles per hour.

This alternative would meet all the standards, it would improve all the shoulders, the medians, the weaving lanes would be enlarged. This alternative, the new viaduct would have a width along Almond Street of about 82 feet. The current width of the viaduct bridge is 66 feet, and you can see it in red on the screen. The wider viaduct is
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expected to acquire between 30 to 40 buildings. The viaduct height could be at the same elevation it is today, or it could be 5 to 10 feet higher. The cost of this alternative is estimated to be $1.438 billion.

This alternative improves the structural and geometric features, and it allows for enhanced vehicular pedestrian connectivity on the surface streets adjacent and under the bridge. It could be constructed with typical engineering practices, and we believe it it's a reasonable cost in line with the many other alternatives. So we are recommending that this alternative Pass and be studied further in the EIS.

V-3 called new viaduct with substantial design improvements is very similar to the V-2 alternative except for the seven locations shown in purple on the screen. By tightening the curves shown in purple we were able to reduce the real estate impacts to the adjacent
Frechette properties by 25 percent over what I just stated under the V-2 alternative. The V-3 alternative would still travel, would still have speeds at 55 miles per hour, would still create the shoulders, the 10 foot shoulders on the right side, four foot shoulders on the left side, where accidents or stranded vehicles motorists could get emergency vehicles to the scene to help. The cost of this alternative is estimated to be $1.423 billion.

Like V-2, V-3 would improve the structural and geometric features, it allows the connectivity on the surface streets and has reasonable constructability and reasonable costs compared to the other alternatives. So we are recommending that this one Pass also.

Alternative V-4 was a new viaduct with considerable design improvements, similar to the last two alternatives just discussed, except it would look to
tighten five more of the curves further, to reduce the footprint of the viaduct even further. By doing this we anticipate that we could reduce the real estate impact by 40 percent over what I talked about in the V-2 alternative. We would still be able to maintain traffic speed at 55 miles per hour, and the cost, it is anticipated to cost $1.419 billion. V-4 meets the purpose and need and all the objectives similar to V-2 and V-3, so we recommend that this alternative Pass forward to the EIS also.

V-5 was the stacked viaduct. This alternative was developed as a result of suggestion from the public. And under this alternative the northbound traffic would be carried on the top, the southbound traffic would be carried in the middle, and Almond Street traffic could still be maintained on the bottom. This would require a narrower bridge, estimated to be about 55 feet versus the existing which is 66 shown in red there.
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This bridge would be significantly taller than the existing bridge we have today. We estimated it would be about 50 feet tall compared to our existing structure which is around 30 feet. Well, it would be 30 feet taller than the existing structure. The cost of this alternative is anticipated to be $1.528 billion.

V-5, the stacked viaduct could be designed to our current standards, it could enhance some vehicular, pedestrians and bicycles in some areas. The disadvantage to this alternative is to allow a ramp connection at Harrison Street we would need to sever access of the Genesee Street across from Almond to get the ramp from the top deck down to the grade. Genesee Street also known as our connective corridor is our major east-west between University Hill and downtown. So since it failed to meet the project objective to maintain connections to, across and along local
streets it Failed, and DOT does not recommend this alternative go forward.

The Street Level alternatives would make improvements to Interstate 481, it would redesignate the current I-81, the existing I-481 as I-81. It would demolish the existing viaduct through the city of Syracuse. It would decommission the Interstate through Syracuse. All the street level alternatives would meet today's standards.

Street Level 1 would replace the viaduct with a boulevard along Almond Street. Street Level 2 and 3 would use Almond as a one way or a two way with a combination of the other local streets to carry traffic. Street Level 2 and Street Level 3 is a system wide approach to maximize the use of the available capacity of the existing grid system.

Street Level 1, the boulevard, initial traffic studies indicate that six lanes are necessary to maintain
efficient flow, and that would be three lanes going northbound, three lanes going southbound. Efficient flow between downtown, University Hill, the south side and other neighborhoods. There are many ways to lay out a new boulevard along Almond Street, which has nearly 200 feet of available right-of-way to accommodate vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, in wide park-like medians.

The boulevard cost is estimated at $1.047 billion. Street Level 1 meets all of the evaluation parameters and is recommended for further study in EIS.

We've been evaluating two ways to connect Almond Boulevard to I-690. The first option would establish the boulevard starting at Monroe Street all the way to Erie Boulevard, which you can see on the screen. The boulevard would connect to Interstate 690 through what we call a single point urban interchange. This would reduce several signals to one
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under Interstate 690. You can see from
the photo we would need to build an Erie
Boulevard bridge over Almond Street.
And we have looked at the opportunity to
potentially convert Water Street to an
Erie Canalway trail.

The second option for the boulevard
to connect with 690 would be to also
start from Monroe Street to McBride
Street. Vehicles would be able to pick
up speed heading northbound as they, as
the road would transition from a
boulevard to a higher speed highway
system around Butternut Street.

Street Level 2 and Street Level 3
are alternatives which would make
improvements to Almond and a combination
of other streets. They differ where one
envisions Almond and other local streets
as one way streets. And the other make
them two way streets. Almond would be
able to carry fewer than six lanes, like
I showed on the boulevard alternative,
which would shorten crosswalks and make
it a lot easier to cross.

Street Level 2, the one way Almond one way northbound, would be one way northbound from Harrison Street to I-690. South of Harrison it would remain a two way street. Southbound traffic could be carried on streets like Townsend, Clinton, where other local streets are being evaluated. The cost of both Street Level 2 and Street Level 3 is estimated to be $1.067 billion. Both SL-2 and SL-3 meet all of our evaluation parameters and is recommended for further study in the EIS.

Recognizing the significant amount of traffic that is accessing University Hill we are exploring some ways to improve the Teal Avenue interchange also. By reconstructing Teal Avenue or Teall and I-690 Interchange we can simplify traffic movements controlled by one signal rather than the two that are there today. These improvements would decrease commute times and help reduce
traffic volumes at the I-81/I-690 interchange and also at Exit 18 where the Harrison and Adams join I-81. This would be an efficient and safe way to move large volumes of vehicles into a compact space.

All the Street Levels would route I-81 traffic to I-481. It would require improvements to Interstate, the old Interstate -- I'm sorry, would require improvements to the old I-481, which would be designated as the new I-81. We would add auxiliary lanes at the three stretches shown by the yellow arrows. We would also reconstruct the two interchanges, the I-81, I-481 at the north and at the south. No building acquisition is anticipated along the existing I-481 corridor as we believe we have enough right of way in those areas.

We looked at four tunnel concepts. Two below Almond along I-81 footprint, one to the west of the viaduct on Townsend Street, and then one to the
east of the viaduct. All the tunnels would meet today's current standards. The first two called T-1 and T-2 would start at Martin Luther King east and go to Butternut Street. That would be T-1. It's about a distance of two miles. The cost of this alternative is anticipated to be $2.651 billion. And would have a portal at the Genesee Street exit also.

T-2 would go from Martin Luther King east to East Genesee Street and be about one mile long. The estimated cost for this alternative is $1.761 billion. We would be able to maintain surface streets on top of the tunnels to serve local traffic.

There are two main disadvantages to the tunnels on Almond. The first is the ramp connections between the tunnel and Interstate 690. As the tunnel comes out of the highway and approaches the elevated I-690 it would require a number of the local streets be either removed or dead-ended. This would diminish
access between downtown and the north side.

The second disadvantage involves the
difficultness of the construction
practices related to the conditions
under Almond. Currently there is a high
water table, it's about two feet below
the surface of the highway. And the
water is contaminated with saline, which
would require special disposal methods.
There is also many subsurface utility
underground. There is water lines,
there is sewer lines, there is telephone
lines, there is cable lines, there is
storm sewers. And all those would need
to be relocated to implement the tunnel
alternatives.

We would have to use what's called
cut and cover construction to implement
these two tunnel alternatives, resulting
in lengthy time frames estimated to take
seven to eight years to build these
alternatives. For these reasons this
alternative, these two alternatives
failed our recommendations.

T-3, which was the Townsend Street tunnel, we had hoped to avoid some of the soil characteristics that we had under Almond. We would be able to keep I-81 opened during the construction phase as we built the tunnels under Townsend Street. The cost of this alternative was estimated to be $2.643 billion. We believe that cut and cover construction would be required, and although the existing I-81 would be able to be kept open for construction the Townsend Street tunnel required substantial building acquisitions due to the fact that the Townsend right-of-way is much more narrow than what we have on Almond Street. For these reasons the tunnel alternative is not being considered reasonable and we recommend that it fail to advance further.

T-4, the tunnel on Eastern Alignment was suggested from a member of the public. I-81 in a tunnel approximately
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one mile east of the existing highway. This tunnel would be 81 foot below the surface and be bored through the bedrock that exists there today. Its interchanges would be on the southern end at I-481. It would pop up at I-690 as shown on the picture. And it would also come out of the ground again at the Bear Street I-81 interchange.

The viaduct remains in place during construction and there would be opportunities to enhance Almond Street under these alternatives. The disadvantages for this alternative is that it requires many property acquisitions. And it would include the elimination of Teal Avenue, which is right to the east of where this tunnel comes up. The tunnel cost for this alternative was $3.298 billion, which was close to a billion dollars more than any other alternative study. For these reasons the tunnel on Eastern Alignment was not considered reasonable and we
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failed that.

We looked at Depressed Highways. One would begin at East Adams Street and go to Butternut, which would be about a mile and-a-quarter long. The other would be East Adams Street to East Genesee Street, approximately a half mile long. For both DH-1 and DH-2 it would create a sunken highway about 25 feet deep below the surface. We'd build several overpasses built at key locations, otherwise it would be open to the elements.

This alternative meets today's standards and we estimate that the Depressed Highway for Alternative 1 would cost $1.751 billion. The Depressed Highway for the Second One is estimated to cost $1.503 billion.

There are two major disadvantages to these alternatives. Once again, the ramp connections to Interstate 690 would sever several streets where they currently cross Almond as it comes out
of the ground and connects to 690. Also
the subsurface conditions are not
favorable, similar to the tunnel
alternatives. We Failed the Depressed
Highways as not being reasonable
alternatives.

The last two alternatives. The first
one was the Western Bypass. This was an
idea that came up during the I-81
Corridor Study. And the bypass would
consist of a new highway around the
western side of Syracuse. We estimate
that the construction cost would be
$2.446 billion. And it would require a
substantial amount of land to build
this. We estimate 70 to 200 acres of
land, dependent upon where the highway
would go. And it would require the
acquisition of over a hundred homes. So
we, based on this, felt that it was not
feasible to carry forward.

The second Other alternative was a
new highway along West Street. This
alternative we estimated to cost $1.326
billion. It was raised by a member of the public during the scoping phase and is being called, was called the Salt City Circuit. This would push I-81 traffic along the New York and Susquehanna Railroad property to West Street and then up West Street to Interstate 690. The existing I-81 between the railroad and I-690 would be replaced with a boulevard.

Disadvantages to this alternative is the properties impacted along the West Street corridor is estimated to be between 70 to 90 buildings. This would also diminish the local access to West Street. And for that reason we Failed this alternative also.

There are a couple common features to all of the alternatives that we would like to recommend, with the exception of the rehabilitation alternative. This would provide the two missing links that currently exist between I-81 and I-690. Those who travel I-690 eastbound cannot
Frechette currently make, cannot go northbound on I-81. And likewise if you're heading on I-81 southbound you cannot make the movement to 690 westbound. We're also exploring two options to connect West Street to Interstate 690.

Option 1 would improve the existing West Street ramps at I-690. This option would keep the current free flowing interchange layout in place now. It would raise I-690 to improve the safety of the highway and also improve the access from the West Street ramps.

Option 2 would rebuild as a signalized intersection underneath the Interstate. It would replace the current stacked interchange with a signalized street level intersection. It would elevate I-690 over the West Street and it would improve the ramp connections. This option is consistent with the city's initiative regarding traffic on West Street.

So in summary DOT is recommending
these six alternatives plus the No Build alternative be studied further in the Environmental Impact Statement. We continue to investigate these alternatives as well as potential effects on social, environmental and economic vitality of the area. We want to hear your input on these recommendations and those that we recommended for elimination. The scoping report will incorporate all comments that we receive.

The EIS will be a comprehensive study of the potential environmental impacts of each of the alternatives that move forward. There is lots of information on the boards in the Open House next door, and I encourage you to go speak to team members about some of the issues that interest you.

We're starting project work related to the historic resources and we're reaching out to experts in this historic preservation, archaeology and the Native
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Written comments through September, we will take written comments through September 2nd, and we're accepting any oral comments here tonight. If you would like to speak, I'd ask you to please fill out a speaker card at the welcome table. The speaking portion of this meeting will begin after this presentation. For more information about the project I ask you to please visit our website at i81opportunities.org.

We have put a lot of effort into updating this information and we are going to continually do that as the project moves forward into the different phases. I want to thank you for coming tonight and want to thank you for your interest in this I-81 viaduct project.

And so at this time I'm going to call on Mr. Brody Smith and we'll do the public comment period.

MODERATOR SMITH: We are now ready to begin your comments. Bear in mind
that anyone who wishes to speak must fill out one of these cards. You can find them out in the lobby. In order to allow as many people as possible to be heard we will restrict comments to two minutes. I will inform you when you have one minute left, 30 seconds and even when your time is expired. I use visual aids to do that, so I won't verbally interrupt you.

You may also take your comment to the stenographer in the lobby if you choose to do so. If your comments are in writing simply hand them in to a project team representative. If you have already submitted written comments in response to the Department's publication of its Notice of Intent you don't have to resubmit those, they're already part of the record. Again written comments will be accepted through September 2nd.

We will begin with Ernestine Patterson, and then the second speaker
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will be James Lespino. Ms. Patterson.

ERNESTINE PATTERSON: My issue with
have you actually looked at the people
who are going to be displaced while all
this construction is going on? And how
then that is going to impact them? I
haven't heard anything about people.
All I've heard about is, well, we're
going to do this and we're going to do
that. But there is a lot of people who
are also involved in all this and I
haven't heard anything about what are we
going to do about this? Or what are we
going to do about them?

Because this old 81 viaduct has
adversely affected all of the 50 years
it's been there and no one has done
anything about that in all this time.
And these people still live in the same
neighborhood. And all of this
construction will be going on and all
this thing and the children can get run
over because we have the highways all
around them. And I don't see anything
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about that and we haven't done anything
about bringing in mass transit. I don't
see anything about that. All I hear
about is, well, we're going to tear down
this and we're going to tear down that.
But there are lots of people out there
that we need to consider. And where is
that consideration? I don't see that.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, ma'am.
The next speaker will be James Lespino.
And then the next speaker after that
will be Mr. Madden.

JAMES LESPINO: I appreciate all the
committee has done, a lot of hard work,
this has been very exciting to hear and
I hope the best to you. Whatever
happens I'm convinced will be a good
product that you can take as much into
consideration and everybody will be
happy with. I think it's going to be a
very good product that you put forward.

First to consider, I'm not really
for the boulevard but some things could
be answered. I think more traffic
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studies need to be done at Almond and Harrison and Adams; both game day and non-game day. If you fail to include the game day traffic it could be a very detrimental.

Two, there is only three alternatives going east to west, Erie to Genesee and Fayette. Erie is bisected by Clinton Square. West Genesee by Hanover Square. And my concerns would be what would the boulevard do at Almond and East Genesee, Almond and East Fayette, would that further bisect the city?

Three, possible consideration of a northbound off-ramp at Colvin Street in or near Elk, McKinley, something like that. That would allow people going to Center Campus to get off closer to that. It would also give better access to the south side, Colvin, instead of going all the way to Brighton either way. It would also allow students and faculty to prevent them going through Harrison and
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And also, I don't know how viable this would be, but a missing link farther north towards the mall going across all that vacant property in or around Bear Street that would connect 690 and 81; there is a lot of vacant property up there. And it seems like there might be some, you wouldn't help people in the center of the city but it would take a lot of people off Hiawatha and it would be minimum impact. And again, thank you for your hard work and allowing me to speak and letting me speak twice.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Madden is the next speaker. Following Mr. Madden will be Lauren Wetterhahn.

KYLE MADDEN: Kyle Madden, I live at 133 Gertrude Street in the near north side. Thank for holding this meeting, it's very productive. I've been to every single one of them, I hope to be at every single one that follows. The concerns I still have is I haven't seen
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enough data on this project. I think one of the most important pieces of the puzzle is understanding where traffic goes. And we haven't seen that answer yet. Does this traffic go through Syracuse on Route 81 or dead-ends in Syracuse on 81? We don't know that answer. I think I want to support the boulevard concept but until I see data to suggest the traffic dead-ends in Syracuse I don't know if that's the most viable option.

Until we see that data I don't know that we, as a community, can get behind any of these concepts. Data, data, data, it drives me into indecision. And I really would love to see more from you guys on that. I think that's absolutely important to developing a transportation plan for the entire region.

Syracuse is the hub for Central New York. 81 is the hub for Central New York. We have an opportunity here. I really want to take advantage of it.
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I haven't seen enough about life trail,
I haven't seen enough about bike trail,
I haven't seen enough about dedicated
bus lines. We need to move people, not
cars. We can throw, if traffic dead-ends
in Syracuse, let's throw parking garages
at the end of 81 on either side and move
people to using public transit. They
would use it if you build it. We need
more information and I don't know that
we have seen that yet.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, sir,
Ms. Lauren Wetterhahn is next and
following her will be Karen Douglas.

LAUREN WETERHAHN: The comment that
I wanted to make regards what I think
something the Environmental Impact
Statement might be missing because it's
being conducted to the requirements of
the two lead agencies. And I think that
some things aren't looked at because
it's not required as part of the study.

My background is in public health,
and so I'm aware of the fact that there
are some health aspects that are looked at in the Environmental Impact Statement, but I don't think it's comprehensive enough. I think there might be some other things that we should be looking at. More of a, I don't want to use the term comprehensive health impact statement because that gives people hives, but something along those lines. We would be able to see a bigger picture impact on the way it would impact people who live around it the way it would impact people in the county in terms of traffic accidents.

And then also I think the environmental health parts of it could also stand to be looked at a little bit. I don't know if that's an issue that you could look at, but that's my comment.
Wetterhahn/Douglas

I've got to thank you for taking the time and having all of these meetings that we're included in this time in it. My main concern is because of what happened the first time is that you limit the number of properties that are affected, it's my goal. I was told before to keep 81. There is just too much traffic than there was 50 years ago. And I found that I live in the Valley and 81 South is closed because of storms. If people don't let me out there is no way I can get out, there is just too much traffic.

Last week when 690 was closed it took me over 20 minutes just to go from the point that the 690 was closed, and that was at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. I can't imagine what it would be at a heavy traffic time.

And I'm concerned about diverting, making 481 81, because then anybody traveling you're losing to the economy, because people wouldn't be coming into
the city and using our resources.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, ma'am.
The next speaker is Arleen Fordock.
Following Ms. Fordock will be Anita Cottrell.

ARLEEN FORDOCK: Well, I have spoken many times, I'm trying to do some new topics this time. The solar lights throughout the highway, we want to update everything for the next 50 years is what I've been hearing. You also need to road patrol over the highway for safety and emergency use. That's the latest thing, it's going to be around for 50 years if not more.

Then you need reduced speeds in certain areas, which would retain the existing highway with the improvements is what I'm in favor of. I don't want to knock down people's houses and buildings and make people displaced and businesses moved out of the area.

One thing I do not like about the boulevard is that the trucks will be
coming through. That's a dangerous situation. We have pedestrians that have been knocked around by cars just in a normal business day. We don't need trucks coming through downtown, that is one of the severe things to think about.

Then there is a thing about the lingo that you use on these presentations. I can't tell whether you're saying million with an M or B for billion. It would be nice if the money amounts would be added to your screen so I can either have a heart attack or accept it. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, ma'am. The next speaker is Anita Cottrell. Following Ms. Cottrell, Peter King. Ms. Cottrell stepped away. Mr. King, are you ready? If Ms. Cottrell comes back in the room we'll put her at the end.

PETER KING: Good evening, thank you for your presentation tonight. I have read and reviewed DOT's six basic alternatives today passing the initial
King

analysis. For whatever the build concern, I think strong consideration should be placed on social justice for those neighborhoods most closely affected by any build scenario. And the current build scenario. And extending that also to peripheral, what we might consider peripheral would be like housing and jobs what would be the impact?

I would emphasize increase in adjustment in the transit available for urban residents and for suburban residents. And I would experiment with the transit during the construction phase of whatever you put in to show people what transit is like, what it could be like. Sell it, sell transit. I don't think you need to be bashful about that, you might find some takers.

I think the public participation is very important in all phases of this. We have existing people with lots of great ideas. I hear them all the time, that might help you with your project.
King

I totally recommend a health impact analysis of whatever build of the current build and whatever build is chosen. Syracuse has never had an adequate health analysis of the air quality in the city. I've reviewed, I haven't seen any asthma studies, there is plenty of asthma data going back and so on, but no study.

Air quality analysis should include monitors placed in the city. EPA monitors are actually located outside the city currently. So you don't have data now. There is some local air flow studies through ESF that are currently available or when published.

And lastly I would emphasize street level alternatives should be really considered, including bicycle and pedestrian and multi-mobile accessibility. We need it for the whole city basically. Thank you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, sir.

The next speaker is Tom Law. Following
Mr. Law, final speaker Ms. Cottrell.

TOM LAW: Thanks for this opportunity. Just two comments really off the cuff a bit, but funding. I am kind of a numbers guy through the last 40 years, and have gone through federal, state, county, city budgets including the school districts with some pencil in my hand. And I'm just going to throw out that given what I see of the budgets and debt level and the economy I think we're in a numbers chaos in a way. And the highway funding for a big project like this, a billion dollars or whatever, to me throws it into a bit of budgetary chaos in terms of when it's going to get built and who's going to pay for it and when the funds are going to be available and when the design has to be ready and what the phases are.

So essentially I'm going to throw the last word in that little numbers question as far as dedicated funds, the question remains is dedicated funds for
highway spending. And I think that's an ongoing problem that's been discussed a lot through the last three decades, and I don't think it's been adequately satisfied.

Second, it seems to me the outliers might be in terms of what is going to be used for the pavement, the concrete, the bridge. You've got trucks, you've got buses, you've got other vehicles, ambulances. But to me one of the main drivers that's really a big unknown is what's the car going to look like in 15 years?

And if you segregate it into heavy weight vehicles and lightweight vehicles you would have some sense of the importance of that issue in the terms of the design. Doesn't have to be over-designed if it's lightweight vehicle lanes, with heavy penalties or reducing partitions to separate traffic. I mean you could save a lot of money if you had three lanes and only one of them
Smith

was for heavy vehicles. There would be a plowing problem I think at some sense. That might be the biggest one around here. But what I'm getting at is, the biggest unknown to me is what a car is going to look like in 15 years, and 20 years and 25 years. If you're designing for an unknown car 25 years from now, so what I'm suggesting in this is the best possible answer would probably be get as damn close as you can to what a car is going to look like in 10 years and design it, a lot of it around that.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, sir.

Anita Cottrell? No. Those are all the cards that we have. Would like to thank everyone for your comments, appreciate your input. There are still staff next door in the exhibit room if you have any additional questions. Have a good evening.

[Conclusion of Public Hearing at 7:20 p.m.]

*   *   *   *
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DANIEL JAY SMITH, SR.

WILLIAM H. LEE

ROBERT CRYSLER
MR. BRIGHT: My name is Jim Bright and I'm here representing Dunk & Bright Furniture which is located at the corner of South Salina Street and West Brighten Avenue in Syracuse about 200 yards off of Exit-17 on Route-81 South, and I have submitted -- I'm going to say these comments. I submitted these in an earlier scope in the evening, but I would like to add that should the viaduct be replaced with another high speed route through the city and that's continued to serve the destination now known as Route-81 Exit-17, we would hope that the staging and the timing of the construction would be such that there would not be an extended period of time without high speed access to Exit-17.

If there were years of construction delays, that would make it inconvenient to our customers and employees to get to Dunk & Bright Furniture. That can be just as devastating as the complete elimination of
MEETING

the high speed access to our business. Dunk & Bright Furniture is a retail furniture store, and I do appreciate this opportunity to share my views about the proposed changes to Route-81. In particular, my concern about the boulevard option which would eliminate convenient access through the center of Syracuse thus negatively impacting Dunk & Bright's business.

Dunk & Bright currently employees 85 people, the majority whom work at our showroom at the corner of South Salina Street and West Brighten Avenue, which is very close, less than 200 yards with no turns to Route 81 South Exit-17. We enjoy stable work force that appreciates the convenience of easy access to our business rather than having multiple stores in the growth suburbs. Our strategy is to expand our showroom and selection of one central location and centralize convenient access to our customers which has been very important to our growth.

Over the decades, Dunk & Bright has acquired and improved many vacant commercial
and residential properties and now comprises of merely 2,000 feet along South Salina and West Brighten, South State, McClure, Webster and Warner Avenue. We draw customers from a very wide radius. South Ithaca, Binghamton, Elmira, occasionally Pennsylvania, East from Utica, New Hartford, Rome, occasionally down state, north from Watertown, Plattsburgh, Massena, occasionally from Canada. We draw customers from the west, Camillus, Baldwinsville, Auburn, Oswego and the Finger Lakes.

A very important factor to our success is drawing customers from this large radius is the convenient access to our showroom because of Route-81 and Exit-17. My concern is by eliminating Route-81 as a highway through the center of Syracuse and converting traffic to 481, it will be less convenient for our customers and we'll likely have to move from our current location. Thank you very much for allowing me to submit my comments.

MR. TAUB: I'm in favor of keeping
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the viaduct out there. It seemed to work pretty well over the years there. Being a farmer and small business owner for 30 years, it provided a fast, easy transportation to and from work and helped expedite my working schedule.

Talking to some of the people here, the engineers, there doesn't seem to be a contingency plan for 481 if that becomes the main thoroughfare that goes to the viaduct. There doesn't seem to be a contingency plan if we had bridge failures or had to close down that what would be 81 or where that traffic would be routed, what the contingency plan would be, and also having two routes 81 plus 481 gives you that extra option if something does happen to one of the interstates if they had to close it. Again, I'm strongly in favor of keeping the viaduct.

MR. SMITH: My name is Daniel Smith. I live at 409 Cayuga Street, Syracuse, New York. I deliver for Upstate Hospital on a daily basis. I would like to give my aspect on this I81. I only see the viaduct working...
street level would cause for accidents than it's worth. The only ones that would benefit is Upstate Hospital from patient counts. That's not a bad thing for me, but delivery wise, it will be bad.

Other than that, street level, I know the ones behind the street level bringing up is Upstate Hospital, too. I don't think they thought about it. They see it in their plans. I don't see ambulances getting to the hospital, game time, graduation. I just don't see it happening. Also, any town or city that's lost their highways and redirect traffic around has always become a ghost town.

You look before I81 was built, Salina Street used to be the main drag which was Route-11. Once 81 was built, Route-11 became a ghost town. You look through the Midwest, it's happened all over. I guess I'll wrap it up.

MR. LEE: I'm here for the final scoping meeting and to try to make a final decision on the I81 bridge whether it should
be taken down or not. I have been doing quite a bit of thinking of that over the last three years and while I think putting the bridge up was not a good idea in the first place for practical reasons, I feel that the bridge should be rebuilt and remain up with probably so that it can last longer, and my hope is that even though it's up, they can come up with ways to make it easier for pedestrians to cross underneath the bridge.

However, I'm going to look at the other options and I can always change my mind if I consider again there might be a better way for the bridge, but right now for practical purposes, the bridge should remain up and just be rebuilt to last longer and again, just the main concern is just to find ways to make it easier for pedestrians crossing underneath the bridge. That's all I have to say.

MR. CRYSLER: I'd like to suggest a less of an emphasis on cost and more of an emphasis on return on investment and the
MEETING

distinction that this is an infrastructure investment project, it is not a consumption project and that both tangible and intangible return on investment factors should be taken into consideration with all of the alternatives as they move forward.

Secondly, I'd like to suggest that what I think this project lacks is some real vision that shows a collective imagination of community and recognition of what this community has actually had happened to it in its history, but particularly in its history since this viaduct project was built and that this project was a large factor of what disseminated and wiped out the 15th ward in Syracuse, and I think Syracuse now has with most metropolitan areas in the country, has a very bad racial problem and one of the reasons why it has a racial problem is because of the decisions and constructions that resulted from the decisions in the red lighting era of the fifties and sixties.

This project has an opportunity to help us re-imagine possibly what a new 15th
ward could become and some real community and collective vision for the opportunity that's in front of us.

(Whereupon, the meeting concluded at 7:30 p.m.)
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