Please Register Here

Thank you for joining the Federal Highway Administration and the New York State Department of Transportation for the Final Scoping Meeting for the I-81 Viaduct Project. You will have an opportunity to provide written and oral comments on the project.

Schedule of Events

3:00 pm to 8:00 pm: Continual open house and displays
4:00 pm: Formal presentation
6:00 pm: Repeat of formal presentation

After each presentation, the public will have an opportunity to comment on the scope of the EIS. Those wishing to speak must complete a speaker card.

Comments will be received and recorded in several ways:

- Orally, in public, recorded by a stenographer. Please sign up here.
- Orally, in private, with a stenographer. Please sign up here.
- In writing, by contacting us via www.I81Opportunities.org, or by filling out the available comment forms on site or mailing them at your convenience to:

  I-81 Viaduct Project
  New York State Department of Transportation
  333 E. Washington Street
  Syracuse, NY 13202

Comments will be accepted through September 2, 2014

- Spanish/English interpreters are available. Intérpretes de español e inglés están disponibles.
- Interpretation of multiple languages available at MCIS Language Services table.
- A sign language interpreter is available.
Potential Expanded Project Limits for Street-level Alternatives
Potential Additional Analysis areas for Street-level Alternatives

Project Area
Project Overview

Purpose and Need

**PURPOSE**

To address the structural deficiencies and nonstandard highway features in the I-81 corridor while creating an improved corridor through the City of Syracuse that meets transportation needs and provides the transportation infrastructure to support long-range planning efforts (i.e., Syracuse Metropolitan Transportation Council, Long Range Transportation Plan, and Syracuse Comprehensive Plan).

**NEED**

The I-81 viaduct contains numerous nonstandard and nonconforming design features; is prone to congestion and safety hazards; and influences the livability, sustainability, and economic vitality of the City of Syracuse.
NYSDOT has developed the following goals for the I-81 Viaduct Project:

**Improve** safety and create an efficient regional and local transportation system within and through greater Syracuse.

**Provide** transportation solutions that enhance the livability, visual quality, sustainability, and economic vitality of greater Syracuse.

The I-81 Viaduct Project’s objectives are to:

- Address identified geometric and operational deficiencies in the I-81 Viaduct priority area;
- Maintain or enhance vehicle access to the interstate highway network and key destinations (i.e., central business district, hospitals, and institutions) within the I-81 Viaduct priority area;
- Address structural deficiencies and improve bridge ratings in the I-81 Viaduct priority area;
- Maintain the connections within the local street network within or adjacent to the I-81 Viaduct priority area; and
- Provide enhanced bicycle and pedestrian surface connections on streets across and along the I-81 viaduct.

The purpose, need, and objectives are the basis to evaluate or screen the range of alternatives that have been developed for the I-81 Viaduct Project.
What Is an Environmental Review?

Why do projects undergo environmental review?

- Both the federal government and New York State have established environmental review requirements to ensure that agencies consider potential environmental effects of projects that they are undertaking or approving. The federal and state legislation are known as:
  - NEPA National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
  - SEQRA [New York] State Environmental Quality Review Act

- Both processes are similar, and in the event that FHWA and NYSDOT are involved (as is the case with the I-81 Viaduct Project), one Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) can be prepared to satisfy the requirements of both.

- The environmental review process provides a valuable way for agencies to gather public input, coordinate with other public agencies, and make decisions that involve engineers, planners, ecologists, landscape architects, and others.

What are the steps in the environmental review process?

- **Notice of Intent**
  Formally announces project and initiates environmental review

- **Scoping Process**
  Establishes framework for environmental review

- **Draft Environmental Impact Statement**
  Documents potential environmental, social, and economic effects

- **Public Review**
  Minimum 45-day public review period of Draft EIS, including a public hearing

- **Final Environmental Impact Statement**
  Addresses public and agency comments on Draft EIS as well as any project refinements

- **Record of Decision**
  FHWA and NYSDOT decision document that officially identifies the preferred alternative and mitigation commitments. It ends the NEPA process and allows the project to enter design and construction.
The EIS Will Examine…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Evaluates potential effects on the movement of people and goods and looks at traffic, public transit, and pedestrian and bicycle movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Community Character</td>
<td>Looks at development patterns (e.g., residential, commercial, recreational, etc.) to determine potential effects on land use operations and the character of an area and also considers community visions for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Conditions</td>
<td>Evaluates demographic and employment characteristics and the potential impacts and/or benefits on businesses, tax bases, and other economic indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition, Displacement, and Relocation</td>
<td>Determines if the project would require acquisition of or easements on any property outside the existing highway right-of-way and whether that would result in displacement or relocation of any occupants and whether that would affect tax revenues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources and Aesthetic Conditions</td>
<td>Evaluates whether the project would affect any views to or from resources where such views are considered defining or important, and evaluates the aesthetic quality of the project itself and its potential effects on the visual character of the surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Considers potential impacts to historic and archaeological resources. Historic resources may include buildings, districts, monuments, or sites of architectural, cultural or historic significance. Archaeological resources include buried artifacts or remains that have cultural or historic significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Evaluates how a project may affect (increase or decrease) pollutants in the air we breathe, typically related to vehicle emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>Considers potential energy consumption of a project and its effect on greenhouse gases and climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Analyzes potential changes in ambient noise levels (typically from highway traffic) and potential effects on sensitive receptors (e.g., residences, schools, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>Considers potential effects on the natural environment, such as plants and wildlife (including endangered or threatened species), wetlands and other water resources, floodplains, and geologic conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The EIS Will Examine...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Wastes and Contaminated Materials</td>
<td>Identifies the potential to disturb or expose hazardous wastes and contaminated materials and the measures that would be implemented to protect public health from the removal, transport, and disposal of these materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Effects</td>
<td>Considers the short-term effects in each of the subject areas described above that could result from construction of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</td>
<td>Indirect effects consider a project’s potential to induce separate actions later in time or farther removed in distance and result in secondary impacts. Cumulative impacts consider the combined effects of a project with other independent but simultaneous or reasonably foreseeable actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td>Evaluates potential effects on minority and low-income populations to ensure these communities do not suffer disproportionately high and adverse effects from a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other NEPA and SEQRA Considerations</td>
<td>Considers more general or global aspects of a project, such as potential short-term effects that are necessary for its long-term productivity; irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources; a summary of unavoidable impacts, which cannot be partially or fully mitigated; and consistency with New York State smart growth principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f) Evaluation (Assessment of Effects on Public Parks, Wildlife Refuges, or Historic Resources)</td>
<td>An independent evaluation that is often incorporated into an EIS and evaluates compliance with Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) Act of 1966, which prohibits USDOT (including FHWA) from approving any project that “uses” or adversely effects public parks, wildlife refuges, or historic resources unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative to that use and all measures to minimize harm have been implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6(f) Evaluation (Consistency with Land and Water Conservation Act)</td>
<td>An independent evaluation that documents coordination with respect to Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1964. A Section 6(f) analysis is needed when a project would alter parklands or other sites that previously received federal money from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. There is potential that parklands near the existing alignment of I-81 have received Land and Water Conservation Funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Alternatives Considered During Scoping

No Build Alternative

Viaduct Alternatives
- V-1: Rehabilitation
- V-2: New Viaduct Fully Improved to Current Standards
- V-3: New Viaduct with Substantial Design Improvements
- V-4: New Viaduct with Considerable Design Improvements
- V-5: Stacked Viaduct

Street-level Alternatives
- SL-1: Boulevard
- SL-2: One-way Traffic on Almond Street and Other Local Street(s)
- SL-3: Two-way Traffic on Almond Street and Other Local Street(s)

Tunnel Alternatives
- T-1: Almond Street Tunnel (MLK East to Butternut Street)
- T-2: Almond Street Tunnel (MLK East to Genesee Street)
- T-3: Townsend Street Tunnel
- T-4: Tunnel on Eastern Alignment (81’ Below Syracuse)

Depressed Highway Alternatives
- DH-1: Depressed Highway (Adams Street to Butternut Street)
- DH-2: Depressed Highway (Adams Street to Genesee Street)

Other Alternatives
- O-1: Western Bypass
- O-2: West Street/Salt City Circuit
### Results of Preliminary Screening

NYSDOT and FHWA will consider your comments on these recommendations as part of the final screening of alternatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Pass (✓) or Fail (X)</th>
<th>Purpose and Need</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Constructability</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NB No Build*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-1 Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-2 New Viaduct Fully Improved to Current Standards</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-3 New Viaduct with Substantial Design Improvements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-4 New Viaduct with Considerable Design Improvements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-5 New Stacked Viaduct</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL-1 Boulevard</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL-2 One-way Traffic on Almond Street and Other Local Street(s)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL-3 Two-way Traffic on Almond Street and Other Local Street(s)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1 Almond Street Tunnel from MLK East to Butternut Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-2 Almond Street Tunnel from MLK East to Genesee Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-3 Townsend Street Tunnel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-4 Tunnel on Eastern Alignment (81' Below Syracuse)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH-1 Depressed Highway from Adams Street to Butternut Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH-2 Depressed Highway from Adams Street to Genesee Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-1 Western Bypass</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-2 West Street (Salt City Circuit)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

*The No Build Alternative does not meet the project’s purpose and need, but it passes the preliminary screening because NEPA requires an examination of the No Build Alternative in the EIS.*
**Tunnel Alternatives: Recommended to be Eliminated**

**T-1**
- **Albany Street Tunnel from NML East to Buttermilk Street**
- **Overview**
  - The tunnel would basically follow the existing Albany Street alignment and follow the existing NML 1050 under Albany Street about 700 feet.
  - The tunnel would be approximately 20 feet wide, and its total length would be about 11,120 feet.
  - The new tunnel would have two lanes in each direction with shoulders and access provided along the roadway of the existing street.
  - The new tunnel would have two lanes in each direction with shoulders and access provided along the centerline of the existing street.
  - The new tunnel would have two lanes in each direction with shoulders and no access provided along the centerline of the existing street.
  - Cost: $52.67 billion
  - Construction duration: 9 years

**Why Eliminate T-1?**
- Elimination T-1 would require that several streets be closed. Because of unfeasible alignment, construction of the new tunnels would require that Albany Street/McBride Street, East Water Street, East Genesee Street, and W. Genesee Street be closed.
- Cost and access issues would be resolved if the existing tunnels would be closed.
- Traffic would be restricted to one lane in each direction.
- tunnel access would be available.
- Construction cost and timeline would be reasonable.

**T-2**
- **Albany Street Tunnel from NML East to East Genesee Street**
- **Overview**
  - This tunnel would basically follow the existing Albany Street and following the existing NML 1050 under Albany Street about 700 feet.
  - The tunnel would be approximately 20 feet wide, and its total length would be about 11,120 feet.
  - The new tunnel would have two lanes in each direction with shoulders and no access provided along the centerline of the existing street.
  - The new tunnel would have two lanes in each direction with shoulders and no access provided along the centerline of the existing street.
  - Cost: $51.17 billion
  - Construction duration: 8 years

**Why Eliminate T-2?**
- Elimination T-2 would require that several streets be closed. Because of unfeasible alignment, construction of the new tunnels would require that Albany Street/McBride Street, East Water Street, East Genesee Street, and W. Genesee Street be closed.
- Cost and access issues would be resolved if the existing tunnels would be closed.
- Traffic would be restricted to one lane in each direction.
- tunnel access would be available.
- Construction cost and timeline would be reasonable.

**T-3**
- **Townsend Street Tunnel**
- **Overview**
  - This tunnel would basically follow the existing Townsend Street and following the existing NML 1050 under Townsend Street about 700 feet.
  - The tunnel would be approximately 20 feet wide, and its total length would be about 11,120 feet.
  - The new tunnel would have two lanes in each direction with shoulders and no access provided along the centerline of the existing street.
  - The new tunnel would have two lanes in each direction with shoulders and no access provided along the centerline of the existing street.
  - Cost: $43.4 billion
  - Construction duration: 7 years

**Why Eliminate T-3?**
- Elimination T-3 would require that several streets be closed. Because of unfeasible alignment, construction of the new tunnels would require that New York Avenue/McBride Street, East Water Street, East Genesee Street, and W. Genesee Street be closed.
- Cost and access issues would be resolved if the existing tunnels would be closed.
- Traffic would be restricted to one lane in each direction.
- tunnel access would be available.
- Construction cost and timeline would be reasonable.

**T-4**
- **Tunnel on an Eastern Alignment (81’ Below Syracuse)**
- **Overview**
  - The tunnel would basically follow the existing NML 1050 under Townsend Street about 700 feet.
  - The tunnel would be approximately 20 feet wide, and its total length would be about 11,120 feet.
  - The new tunnel would have two lanes in each direction with shoulders and no access provided along the centerline of the existing street.
  - The new tunnel would have two lanes in each direction with shoulders and no access provided along the centerline of the existing street.
  - Cost: $42.26 billion
  - Construction duration: 6 years

**Why Eliminate T-4?**
- Elimination T-4 would require that several streets be closed. Because of unfeasible alignment, construction of the new tunnels would require that New York Avenue/McBride Street, East Water Street, East Genesee Street, and W. Genesee Street be closed.
- Cost and access issues would be resolved if the existing tunnels would be closed.
- Traffic would be restricted to one lane in each direction.
- tunnel access would be available.
- Construction cost and timeline would be reasonable.

**Conclusion**
- Constructed in a manner that is sensitive to the needs of the public during construction.
- The tunnel could be shut down at 600 feet behind the center.
- This depth would allow tunnel to be constructed in a more timely manner.
- New interchange would be constructed along the existing Townsend Street tunnel between NML East and East Genesee Street.
- New tunnel would keep traffic in each direction with shoulders and reduced flat.
- New tunnel would add exit/entrance interchange to provide connections at all directions.
- New tunnel would have two lanes in each direction with shoulders and no access provided along the centerline of the existing street.
- Cost: $42.26 billion
  - Construction duration: 6 years

**The projected construction cost is reasonable.**

---

**Note:**
- The project is currently in the planning stage.
- The cost and timeline may be subject to change.
- The construction site may be affected by local traffic conditions.
- The project is expected to be completed by 2026.

---

**References:**
- Department of Transportation
- Office of Planning and Policy Development
- Office of Environmental Protection
- Office of Construction Management
Depressed Highway Alternatives: Recommended to be Eliminated

DH-1: Depressed Highway from Adams Street to Butternut Street  
DH-2: Depressed Highway from Adams Street to East Genesee Street

Overview
- Removes I-81 viaduct and replace it with a highway in an open-air trench ("depressed highway")
- Almond Street would be replaced with local service roads next to the depressed highway
- Designed to meet current federal and state highway requirements
- Full reconstruction of I-81-690 interchange
- Would maintain north-south interstate highway access to and from Downtown Syracuse
- Overpasses would allow east-west traffic to cross the depressed highway
- Construction of the open highway would need to consider the geotechnical conditions beneath Almond Street, which include a high water table, saline groundwater, and difficult soil conditions

DH-1 Depressed Highway Between Adams Street and Butternut Street

Above, this section shows a possible arrangement of lanes between Cedar and East Genesee Streets, with exit ramps on the west side and service/local streets on the east

Why Eliminate DH-1?
- Will the alternative maintain vehicle connections to, across, and along local streets in the project limits?
  - DH-1 would eliminate Almond Street. Service roads would provide north-south local access, but there would be limited room to support enhanced pedestrian or bicycle connections. Overpasses would carry east-west traffic across I-81, but it would not be feasible to provide overpasses at every street. Because of inadequate clearance for new ramps, Fairview Street, Water Street, and Washington Street would be closed to traffic between State Street and Almond Street, and Willow Street and Townsend Street would be closed to traffic between Genesee Street and Barrett Avenue. Where the depressed highway transitions to the highway section south of Adams Street, Jackson and Monroe Streets would become dead-end streets.
- Can the alternative be constructed within existing means and methods, a long duration, or an inability to maintain adequate traffic flow?
  - The subsurface conditions along Almond Street are not favorable for construction of DH-1. There is a high water table and difficult soil conditions. The water is saline, which requires special disposal methods, and all subsurface utilities would need to be relocated. The viaduct and Almond Street would need to be closed for much of the duration of construction.

DH-2 Depressed Highway between Adams Street and East Genesee Street

This section between Adams and Harrison Streets shows two lanes in each direction for I-81, as well as the service roads on either side of the Depressed Highway

Why Eliminate DH-2?
- Will the alternative maintain vehicle connections to, across, and along local streets in the project limits?
  - DH-2 would eliminate Almond Street. Service roads would provide north-south local access, but there would be limited room to support enhanced pedestrian or bicycle connections. Overpasses would carry east-west traffic across I-81, but it would not be feasible to provide overpasses at every street. Because of inadequate clearance for new ramps, Fairview Street, Water Street, and Washington Street would be closed to traffic between State Street and Almond Street, and Willow Street and Townsend Street would be closed to traffic between Genesee Street and Barrett Avenue. Where the depressed highway transitions to the highway section south of Adams Street, Jackson and Monroe Streets would become dead-end streets.
- Can the alternative be constructed within existing means and methods, a long duration, or an inability to maintain adequate traffic flow?
  - The subsurface conditions along Almond Street are not favorable for construction of DH-2. There is a high water table and difficult soil conditions. The water is saline, which requires special disposal methods, and all subsurface utilities would need to be relocated. The viaduct and Almond Street would need to be closed for much of the duration of construction.
Will the alternative maintain vehicle connections to, across, and along local streets in the project limits?

O-2 would improve connections along Almond Street, where the viaduct would be removed and a new surface street constructed. However, Alternative O-2 would create a highway along the West Street corridor, deteriorating local access in this area.

Can the alternative be built without substantial property acquisitions?

Alternative O-2 would require new right-of-way, including properties on both sides of West Street and acquisition of the New York, Susquehanna and Western railroad property. Between 70 and 90 buildings would be acquired.

Can the alternative be constructed without difficult means and methods, a long duration, or an inability to maintain adequate traffic flow?

O-2 would be very disruptive to local traffic circulation along and across West Street. I-81 could operate along most of its current alignment while construction is underway.

Overview

- Proposed during the I-81 corridor study
- New highway would be routed around the western side of Syracuse
- Existing highway through Downtown would be removed
- Cost: $2.466 billion
- Construction duration: 3-4 years

Why Eliminate O-2?

- O-2 would improve connections along Almond Street, where the viaduct would be removed and a new surface street constructed. However, Alternative O-2 would create a highway along the West Street corridor, deteriorating local access in this area.
- The construction cost of $2.46 billion is unreasonable

Other Alternatives Recommended to be Eliminated

V-1 Rehabilitation

Overview

- Rehabilitation would implement a long-term capital program to address the deterioration of I-81
- A total of 42 bridges would be repaired or replaced
- Most nonstandard and nonconforming features would remain, including narrow shoulders, insufficient distance between on- and off-ramps, and sharp curves
- Cost: $800 million
- Construction duration: 2-3 years

Why Eliminate V-1?

- V-1 would not change the geometric features of the highway, and therefore, would not correct nonstandard or nonconforming features.

O-1 Western Bypass

Overview

- Proposed during the I-81 corridor study
- New highway would be routed around the western side of Syracuse
- Existing highway through Downtown would be removed
- Cost: $2.466 billion
- Construction duration: 3-4 years

Why Eliminate O-1?

- O-1 would require acquisition of at least 72 acres of new right-of-way or could require upward of 206 acres of new right-of-way, not including the land needed for new interchanges. This would include both developed and undeveloped land. Over 100 buildings would be acquired.
- The construction cost of $2.46 billion is unreasonable

V-5 New Stacked Viaduct

Overview

- This alternative was suggested by a member of the public during scoping
- Would remove the existing viaduct and construct a new, two-level viaduct
- Northbound and southbound vehicles would travel on separate stacked decks
- New viaduct would be about 11 feet narrower and 30 feet taller than the existing I-81 viaduct
- Cost: $1.588 billion
- Construction duration: 5-6 years

Why Eliminate V-5?

- V-5 would eliminate east-west travel on Genesee Street where it crosses Almond Street. Genesee Street is an important east-west arterial roadway between Downtown and University Hill and a designated New York State Route. It carries Connective Corridor bike lanes between University Hill and Downtown and is used by Centro Routes 62 and 262.

O-5 Other Alternatives Recommended to be Eliminated

Overview

- Rehabilitation would implement a long-term capital program to address the deterioration of I-81
- A total of 42 bridges would be repaired or replaced
- Most nonstandard and nonconforming features would remain, including narrow shoulders, insufficient distance between on- and off-ramps, and sharp curves
- Cost: $800 million
- Construction duration: 2-3 years

Why Eliminate V-5?

- V-5 would eliminate east-west travel on Genesee Street where it crosses Almond Street. Genesee Street is an important east-west arterial roadway between Downtown and University Hill and a designated New York State Route. It carries Connective Corridor bike lanes between University Hill and Downtown and is used by Centro Routes 62 and 262.

O-5 Other Alternatives Recommended to be Eliminated

Overview

- Rehabilitation would implement a long-term capital program to address the deterioration of I-81
- A total of 42 bridges would be repaired or replaced
- Most nonstandard and nonconforming features would remain, including narrow shoulders, insufficient distance between on- and off-ramps, and sharp curves
- Cost: $800 million
- Construction duration: 2-3 years

Why Eliminate V-5?

- V-5 would eliminate east-west travel on Genesee Street where it crosses Almond Street. Genesee Street is an important east-west arterial roadway between Downtown and University Hill and a designated New York State Route. It carries Connective Corridor bike lanes between University Hill and Downtown and is used by Centro Routes 62 and 262.

O-5 Other Alternatives Recommended to be Eliminated

Overview

- Rehabilitation would implement a long-term capital program to address the deterioration of I-81
- A total of 42 bridges would be repaired or replaced
- Most nonstandard and nonconforming features would remain, including narrow shoulders, insufficient distance between on- and off-ramps, and sharp curves
- Cost: $800 million
- Construction duration: 2-3 years

Why Eliminate V-5?

- V-5 would eliminate east-west travel on Genesee Street where it crosses Almond Street. Genesee Street is an important east-west arterial roadway between Downtown and University Hill and a designated New York State Route. It carries Connective Corridor bike lanes between University Hill and Downtown and is used by Centro Routes 62 and 262.

O-5 Other Alternatives Recommended to be Eliminated

Overview

- Rehabilitation would implement a long-term capital program to address the deterioration of I-81
- A total of 42 bridges would be repaired or replaced
- Most nonstandard and nonconforming features would remain, including narrow shoulders, insufficient distance between on- and off-ramps, and sharp curves
- Cost: $800 million
- Construction duration: 2-3 years

Why Eliminate V-5?

- V-5 would eliminate east-west travel on Genesee Street where it crosses Almond Street. Genesee Street is an important east-west arterial roadway between Downtown and University Hill and a designated New York State Route. It carries Connective Corridor bike lanes between University Hill and Downtown and is used by Centro Routes 62 and 262.

O-5 Other Alternatives Recommended to be Eliminated

Overview

- Rehabilitation would implement a long-term capital program to address the deterioration of I-81
- A total of 42 bridges would be repaired or replaced
- Most nonstandard and nonconforming features would remain, including narrow shoulders, insufficient distance between on- and off-ramps, and sharp curves
- Cost: $800 million
- Construction duration: 2-3 years

Why Eliminate V-5?

- V-5 would eliminate east-west travel on Genesee Street where it crosses Almond Street. Genesee Street is an important east-west arterial roadway between Downtown and University Hill and a designated New York State Route. It carries Connective Corridor bike lanes between University Hill and Downtown and is used by Centro Routes 62 and 262.

O-5 Other Alternatives Recommended to be Eliminated

Overview

- Rehabilitation would implement a long-term capital program to address the deterioration of I-81
- A total of 42 bridges would be repaired or replaced
- Most nonstandard and nonconforming features would remain, including narrow shoulders, insufficient distance between on- and off-ramps, and sharp curves
- Cost: $800 million
- Construction duration: 2-3 years

Why Eliminate V-5?

- V-5 would eliminate east-west travel on Genesee Street where it crosses Almond Street. Genesee Street is an important east-west arterial roadway between Downtown and University Hill and a designated New York State Route. It carries Connective Corridor bike lanes between University Hill and Downtown and is used by Centro Routes 62 and 262.

O-5 Other Alternatives Recommended to be Eliminated

Overview

- Rehabilitation would implement a long-term capital program to address the deterioration of I-81
- A total of 42 bridges would be repaired or replaced
- Most nonstandard and nonconforming features would remain, including narrow shoulders, insufficient distance between on- and off-ramps, and sharp curves
- Cost: $800 million
- Construction duration: 2-3 years

Why Eliminate V-5?

- V-5 would eliminate east-west travel on Genesee Street where it crosses Almond Street. Genesee Street is an important east-west arterial roadway between Downtown and University Hill and a designated New York State Route. It carries Connective Corridor bike lanes between University Hill and Downtown and is used by Centro Routes 62 and 262.
Overview
- Designed to meet all current federal and state highway requirements
- Full reconstruction of 81-690 interchange
- Full reconstruction of all bridges on I-81 between MLK East and Spencer St.
- Reconnaissance and reconstruction of ramps to local streets
- Reconfiguration of Almond St. between the viaduct, with possible urban design treatments to improve its appearance
- Local street and pedestrian improvements near the viaduct
- The viaduct structure could be reconstructed at the same height or could be five to ten feet taller through Southside and University Hill
- Treatments to improve the aesthetics of the viaduct would be considered
- The new viaduct would be approximately 10-15 feet wider than the existing viaduct
- Would require acquisition of about 50-60 buildings

V-2: New Viaduct Fully Improved to Current Standards: Recommended for Further Study
Viaduct Alternatives
V-2: New Viaduct Fully Improved to Current Standards

ALMOND STREET AREA PLAN
THIS ILLUSTRATION IS ONE OF MANY POSSIBLE CONCEPTS

Potential distinctive landscape treatment at Genesee Street to strengthen the Connective Corridor
Paved area below viaduct

Large open spaces below viaduct provide an opportunity for a range of possible uses

Consistent streetscape treatments on both sides of Almond Street where alignment diverges from highway corridor

Planted tree lawn and sidewalk on west side of Almond Street

Potential stormwater treatment areas adjacent to highway viaduct and/or reduced highway ROW for future development

On-road bicycle route to provide a link between the Connective Corridor and the Erie Canalway Trail and bicycle facilities on Water Street

Enhanced landscape buffer at Pioneer Homes, and multi-use path connection to Wilson Park at Jackson Street

Pedestrian and bicycle safety enhancements (including bollards, distinctive pavement treatments, and lighting improvements) at primary east-west crossings of I-81 and Almond Street

Large open spaces below viaduct

V3 and V4 would be similar to this illustration, but the highway curves extending north from this area would vary

Legend
- OUTSIDE EDGE OF VIADUCT STRUCTURE
- PAVEMENT BELOW VIADUCT STRUCTURE
- SPECIALTY CROSSWALK AND INTERSECTION PAVEMENT
- CONNECTIVE CORRIDOR
- BICYCLE FACILITY

Forman Park
Connective Corridor
Viaduct Alternatives
V-2: New Viaduct Fully Improved to Current Standards

ALMOND STREET AREA PLAN
THIS ILLUSTRATION IS ONE OF MANY POSSIBLE CONCEPTS

Potential distinctive landscape treatment at Genesee Street to strengthen the Connective Corridor
Paved area below viaduct

Large open spaces below viaduct provide an opportunity for a range of possible uses

Consistent streetscape treatments on both sides of Almond Street where alignment diverges from highway corridor

Planted tree lawn and sidewalk on west side of Almond Street

Potential stormwater treatment areas adjacent to highway viaduct and/or reduced highway ROW for future development

On-road bicycle route to provide a link between the Connective Corridor and the Erie Canalway Trail and bicycle facilities on Water Street

Enhanced landscape buffer at Pioneer Homes, and multi-use path connection to Wilson Park at Jackson Street

Pedestrian and bicycle safety enhancements (including bollards, distinctive pavement treatments, and lighting improvements) at primary east-west crossings of I-81 and Almond Street

Large open spaces below viaduct

V3 and V4 would be similar to this illustration, but the highway curves extending north from this area would vary

Legend
- OUTSIDE EDGE OF VIADUCT STRUCTURE
- PAVEMENT BELOW VIADUCT STRUCTURE
- SPECIALTY CROSSWALK AND INTERSECTION PAVEMENT
- CONNECTIVE CORRIDOR
- BICYCLE FACILITY
V-3: New Viaduct with Substantial Design Improvements: Recommended for Further Study

Overview
- Designed to meet all current federal and state highway standards, except that some areas would be larger. At the same locations shown in purple above, traffic would need to slow down slightly to negotiate the curves. Tighter curves would reduce horizontal stopping sight distance—the minimum distance needed for a motorist, driving through a curve, to see an object and still have time to stop.
- Full reconstruction of I-81-I-690 interchange
- Full reconstruction of all bridges on I-81 between MLK East and Spencer St.
- Reconstruction and reconstruction of ramps to local streets
- Reconstruction of Almond St. before the viaduct, with possible urban design treatments to improve its appearance
- Local-street and pedestrian improvements near the viaduct
- The viaduct structure could be restructured at the same height or could be five to six feet taller through Southside and University Hill
- Treatments to improve the aesthetics of the viaduct would be considered
- The new viaduct would be approximately 16 feet wider than the existing viaduct
- Would require acquisition of about 25 percent fewer buildings than would be needed under Alternative V-2
V-4: New Viaduct with Considerable Design Improvements: Recommended for Further Study

Overview
- Designed to meet all current federal and State highway standards, except that some curves would be sharper. At the two locations shown in purple above, traffic would need to slow down slightly to navigate the curves. At the two curves shown in orange, the horizontal stopping sight distance—the minimum distance needed for a motorist, driving through a curve, to see an object and still be able to stop—would be further reduced.
- Full reconstruction of I-41 at Genesee interchange.
- Full reconstruction of all bridges on I-41 between MLK East and Spencer Street.
- Reconfiguration and reconstruction of ramps to local streets.
- Reconstruction of Almond St. below the viaduct, with possible urban design treatments to improve its appearance.
- Local street and pedestrian improvements near the viaduct.
- The viaduct structure could be reconstructed at the same height or could be five to ten feet taller through Southside and University Hill.
- Treatments to improve the aesthetics of the viaduct would be considered.
- The new viaduct would be approximately 16 feet wider than the existing viaduct.
- Would require acquisition of about 40 percent fewer buildings than would be needed under Alternative V-2.

New off-ramp connecting westbound I-690 to Downtown/University Hill—would replace existing connection on Harrison St.

Ramp from northbound I-61 to eastbound I-490 would change from a right lane to left-side exit, eliminating a weaving movement for traffic.

No access from Monroe St. to Almond St.

No access from Harrison St. to Almond St.

No access from Monroe St. to Almond St.
Viaduct Alternatives

New Viaduct Fully Improved to Current Standards (V-2)
New Viaduct with Substantial Design Improvements (V-3)
New Viaduct with Considerable Design Improvements (V-4)

Examples of what a new viaduct might look like on Almond Street:

**ALMOND STREET VIEW NORTH, CEDAR STREET TO EAST GENESEE STREET**
THIS ILLUSTRATION IS ONE OF MANY POSSIBLE CONCEPTS

[Diagram of viaduct alternatives]

**ALMOND STREET VIEW NORTH, ADAMS STREET TO HARRISON STREET**
THIS ILLUSTRATION IS ONE OF MANY POSSIBLE CONCEPTS

[Diagram of viaduct alternatives]
Examples of what a new viaduct under V-4 might look like at Almond Street:

```
Viaduct Alternatives
New Viaduct Fully Improved to Current Standards (V-2)
New Viaduct with Substantial Design Improvements (V-3)
New Viaduct with Considerable Design Improvements (V-4)
```

```
VIEW 1
BIRD’S-EYE VIEW LOOKING NORTH
THIS ILLUSTRATION IS ONE OF MANY POSSIBLE CONCEPTS

VIEW 2
AERIAL VIEW FROM HARRISON STREET LOOKING NORTH
THIS ILLUSTRATION IS ONE OF MANY POSSIBLE CONCEPTS
```
Viaduct Alternatives

Alternative V-4:
New Viaduct with Considerable Design Improvements

Examples of what a new viaduct under V-4 might look like at the I-81 / I-690 interchange:
SL-1: Boulevard: Recommended for Further Study

Overview
- Would remove I-690 viaduct
- Would designate I-481 as I-81 and redirect interstate traffic around Syracuse
- Would reconstruct Almond St. as the primary north-south route serving Downtown and University Hill between Monroe St. and I-690
- Would reconstruct I-481/I-690 interchange
- Initial traffic studies indicate six lanes would be needed to maintain efficient flows between Downtown / University Hill / Southside and other neighborhoods
- Would include urban design treatments such as landscaping and trees, wider sidewalks and park-like medians, open space, aesthetic treatments, pedestrian and bicycle enhancements on Almond St. and the other local streets
- Would require acquisition of about 5-10 buildings

Investigating two options to connect the elevated I-481/I-690 interchange to the surface roadway

Option 1: The Boulevard would extend from Monroe Street to E. Adams St. The Boulevard would continue onto McBride St. and the former I-81 via a new interchange, called a single-point urban interchange. The new interchange would have only one signalized intersection, as opposed to the traditional two signals.

Option 2: The Boulevard would extend from Monroe Street to Midtown Street. In this case, vehicles would pick up speed, heading northbound, as the road gradually transitions from a Boulevard to an interstate around Butternut Street.

New connection at either Burt St. or MLK East to I-81
See “Common Features of All Alternatives: Improving Access to I-81 from the South” display

现有 I-81 北端的 I-81 可以被重新命名为 “东西向” 或 “南北向”，以便与现有的 I-481 无缝连接。

新连接位于 Burt St. 或 MLK East 至 I-81
See “Common Features of All Alternatives: Improving Access to I-81 from the South” display

New York State Department of Transportation
Examples of what a Boulevard might look like at Almond Street:

**D** ALMOND STREET VIEW NORTH
THIS ILLUSTRATION IS ONE OF MANY POSSIBLE CONCEPTS

**E** ALMOND STREET VIEW NORTH AT PIONEER HOMES
THIS ILLUSTRATION IS ONE OF MANY POSSIBLE CONCEPTS
Potential distinctive landscape treatment at East Genesee Street to strengthen the Connective Corridor

Linear green space with potential continuous stormwater feature in broad central median and/or linear pedestrian access, sculptural features and shade tree plantings

Pedestrian and bicycle safety enhancements (including bollards, distinctive pavement treatments, and lighting improvements) at primary east-west crossings of Almond Street

Enhanced landscape buffer at Pioneer Homes, and multi-use path connection to Wilson Park at Jackson Street

On-road bicycle route to provide a link between the Connective Corridor and the Erie Canalway Trail and bicycle facilities on Water Street

Potential stormwater treatment areas and/or reduced highway ROW or future development

Vertical gateway and/or identity elements in planted median

Boulevard with on-street parking, street trees, off-road bike facility, and sidewalks
Examples of what a Boulevard might look like at Almond Street:
Examples of what a Boulevard might look like at the I-81 / I-690 interchange:

AERIAL VIEW LOOKING NORTHEAST AT THE I-81 / I-690 INTERCHANGE
THIS ILLUSTRATION IS ONE OF MANY POSSIBLE CONCEPTS

AERIAL VIEW LOOKING SOUTHEAST AT THE I-81 / I-690 INTERCHANGE
THIS ILLUSTRATION IS ONE OF MANY POSSIBLE CONCEPTS
Overview

- Would restore I-81 (Four-Leaf Clover)
- Would designate I-481 as I-61 and redirect interstate traffic around Syracuse
- Would reconstruct Almond St. as a surface street serving Downtown and University Hill between Monroe St. and I-690
- Northbound traffic would be carried on one-way Almond St. Almond would be a one-way street from Harrison St. to connection with I-690, and two-way street south of Harrison St.
- Southbound traffic would be carried on another one-way local street(s) (e.g., West, Clinton, State, Townsend, or University), which also would be enhanced
- Would reconstruct I-315 and I-690 interchange to the interchange with I-690, and two-way street south of Harrison St.

- Would introduce an overhead road along I-690, with no connection to the Boulevard
- Overhead road would be replaced with a single on-ramp at Clinton St. Access to Franklin St. would be provided
- Connections from the elevated I-315/I-690 interchange to the surface roadway would be enhanced with traditional on- and off-ramps

- Would introduce an overpass to carry Erie Blvd. over Almond St.
- This is one of many possible concepts using Almond, Townsend, and Clinton Streets; other street combinations are possible

- Southbound I-81 to westbound I-690
- New connecting ramp from northbound I-690 to westbound I-690
- Connections from the elevated I-315/I-690 interchange to the surface roadway would be enhanced with traditional on- and off-ramps

- Northbound traffic would be carried on a one-way Almond St. Almond and University Hill between Monroe St. and I-690
- Would reconstruct Almond St. as a surface street serving Downtown Syracuse
- Would designate I-481 as I-81 and redirect interstate traffic around Syracuse
- Would reconstruct Almond St. as a surface street serving Downtown and University Hill between Monroe St. and I-690

- Northbound traffic would be carried on one-way Almond St. Almond would be a one-way street from Harrison St. to connection with I-690, and two-way street south of Harrison St.
- Southbound traffic would be carried on another one-way local street(s) (e.g., West, Clinton, State, Townsend, or University), which also would be enhanced
- Would reconstruct I-315 and I-690 interchange to the interchange with I-690, and two-way street south of Harrison St.
This alternative would place northbound traffic on Almond Street and southbound traffic on Townsend Street.

Three travel lanes would generally be needed to carry traffic on a one-way Almond Street. The remainder of Almond Street could be used in numerous ways, and a few of these concepts are shown below.

Below are sketches illustrating three potential scenarios for the excess right of way. These are three concepts among many possibilities for Almond Street.

**Concept A:**
Three lanes of through traffic, separate local roads on both sides, off-road bike facility, street trees, and linear park

**Concept B:**
Three lanes of through traffic with parking lanes, off-road bike facility, and street trees with excess property utilized for potential future development.

**Concept C:**
Three lanes of through traffic with a parking lane on one side, separate local road on one side with on-road bike lane, street trees, and a linear park
Examples of what SL-2 Almond Street and Other Local Street(s) might look like at Almond Street:

**BIRD’S-EYE VIEW LOOKING NORTH**
THIS ILLUSTRATION IS ONE OF MANY POSSIBLE CONCEPTS

**AERIAL VIEW FROM HARRISON STREET LOOKING NORTH**
THIS ILLUSTRATION IS ONE OF MANY POSSIBLE CONCEPTS
Street-level Alternatives

SL-2: One-way Almond Street and Other Local Street(s)

Examples of what SL-2 Almond Street and Other Local Street(s) might look like at the I-81 / I-690 interchange area:

AERIAL VIEW LOOKING NORTHWEST AT THE ALMOND ST / I-690 INTERCHANGE
THIS ILLUSTRATION IS ONE OF MANY POSSIBLE CONCEPTS

AERIAL VIEW LOOKING SOUTHEAST AT THE I-81 / I-690 INTERCHANGE
THIS ILLUSTRATION IS ONE OF MANY POSSIBLE CONCEPTS

View Key Map

Fayette Park  Clinton Square  St. Joseph's Hospital

Crowne Plaza Hotel  Syracuse Center of Excellence

Downtown  Clinton Square  Crowne Plaza Hotel  Syracuse Center of Excellence

See the full map for additional details.
What are the Differences Between SL-2 and SL-3?

SL-2: 
**ONE-WAY** Traffic on Almond Street and Other Local Street(s)

SL-3: 
**TWO-WAY** Traffic on Almond Street and Other Local Street(s)
SL-3: Two-way Traffic on Almond Street and Other Local Street(s): Recommended for Further Study

Overview
- Would remove I-81 viaduct
- Would designate I-81 as I-81 and redirect interstate traffic around Syracuse
- Alternative SL-3 is the same as Alternative SL-2 except it would keep traffic running in both directions (two-way) on Almond and other local streets.
- Would reconstruct Almond St. as a surface street serving Downtown and University Hill between Monroe St. and I-81
- Almond St. would carry two-way traffic
- Other local streets (e.g., West, Clinton, Stale, Townsend, University), also would carry two-way traffic and would be enhanced
- Would reconstruct I-81/I-800 interchange and other highway features north of I-81
- Almond St. and the other local streets would be improved with urban design treatments such as landscaping and trees, wider sidewalks and bicycle enhancements
- Would require acquisition of about 5-10 buildings

Widening I-81 north of I-690 could be re-designated as a “spur,” or branch, of I-81 (e.g., I-801 or I-802)

Connections from the elevated I-81/800 interchange to the surface roadway would be achieved with traditional on- and off-ramps

Exploring Ways to Connect I-690 to West St.
See “Common Features of All Alternatives: Rebuilding Access to West Street” display

Other Local Street(s): All Almond St., Clinton St., Townsend St., University St.

Connections from the elevated I-81/800 interchange to the surface roadway would be achieved with traditional on- and off-ramps

Would introduce an overpass to carry Erie Blvd. over Almond St.

Almond St. would become a dead-end street at Almond St., with no connection to the windshield; motorists would need to detour to Taylor St.

Would reconstruct I-81/I-690 interchange and other highway features north of I-690

Connections from the elevated I-81/800 interchange to the surface roadway would be achieved with traditional on- and off-ramps

Would remove I-690/681 service road

Crossing I-81 north of I-690 could be re-designated as a “spur,” or branch, of I-81 (e.g., I-811 or I-812)

This board shows one possible concept using Almond, Townsend, and Clinton Streets; other street combinations are possible

New connection at either Burt St. or MLK East to I-81
See “Common Features of All Alternatives: Improving Access to I-81 from the South” display

Overview
- Would remove I-81 viaduct
- Would designate I-81 as I-81 and redirect interstate traffic around Syracuse
- Alternative SL-3 is the same as Alternative SL-2 except it would keep traffic running in both directions (two-way) on Almond and other local streets.
- Would reconstruct Almond St. as a surface street serving Downtown and University Hill between Monroe St. and I-81
- Almond St. would carry two-way traffic
- Other local streets (e.g., West, Clinton, Stale, Townsend, University), also would carry two-way traffic and would be enhanced
- Would reconstruct I-81/I-800 interchange and other highway features north of I-81
- Almond St. and the other local streets would be improved with urban design treatments such as landscaping and trees, wider sidewalks and bicycle enhancements
- Would require acquisition of about 5-10 buildings
This alternative would place northbound traffic on Almond Street and southbound traffic on Townsend Street. Examples of what this concept might look like at different locations:
Potential distinctive landscape treatment at Fayette Park to strengthen the Connective Corridor

Potential linear stormwater treatment feature integrated with street tree planters

Local road with on-road bike lane, parking, sidewalks, and street trees to provide access to properties adjacent to Almond Street

Road with on-street parking, street trees, sidewalks, and off-road bicycle facility on west side

Vertical gateway elements

Pedestrian and bicycle safety enhancements (including bollards, distinctive pavement treatments, and lighting improvements) at primary east-west crossings of Almond and Townsend Streets

Enhanced landscape buffer at Pioneer Homes with multi-use path connection to Wilson Park at Jackson Street

On-road bicycle lane provides connection to the Southside neighborhood

Potential stormwater treatment areas and/or reduced highway ROW for future highway development

Off-road bicycle route to provide a link between the Connective Corridor and the Erie Canalway Trail and bicycle facilities on Water Street

Vertical gateway elements

Potential linear stormwater treatment feature integrated with street tree planters

Local road with parking, off-road bike lane, sidewalks, street trees to provide access to adjacent properties on both sides of Almond Street

Vertical gateway elements

Potential distinctive landscape treatment at East Genesee Street to strengthen the Connective Corridor

Road with on-street parking, street trees, sidewalks, and off-road bicycle lane on west side

Potential linear stormwater treatment feature integrated with street tree planters

Local road with parking, off-road bike lane, sidewalks, street trees to provide access to adjacent properties on both sides of Almond Street

Potential distinctive landscape treatment at Fayette Park to strengthen the Connective Corridor

Road with on-street parking, street trees, sidewalks, and off-road bicycle lane on west side

Potential linear stormwater treatment feature integrated with street tree planters

Local road with parking, off-road bike lane, sidewalks, street trees to provide access to adjacent properties on both sides of Almond Street

Potential distinctive landscape treatment at East Genesee Street to strengthen the Connective Corridor

Road with on-street parking, street trees, sidewalks, and off-road bicycle facility on west side

Vertical gateway elements

Pedestrian and bicycle safety enhancements (including bollards, distinctive pavement treatments, and lighting improvements) at primary east-west crossings of Almond and Townsend Streets

Enhanced landscape buffer at Pioneer Homes with multi-use path connection to Wilson Park at Jackson Street

On-road bicycle lane provides connection to the Southside neighborhood

LEGEND
SPECIALTY CROSSWALK AND INTERSECTION PAVEMENT
CONNECTIVE CORRIDOR
BICYCLE FACILITY
How Would the Street-level Alternatives Modify I-481?

- I-481 would be designated as I-81 from end to end
- The existing I-81/I-481 interchanges (Interchange 16A and Interchange 29) would be modified to meet FHWA and NYSDOT design standards for a mainline interstate highway
- Unlikely to require any building acquisitions
- Would meet 70 MPH design standards
- Other Improvements to I-481
  - Auxiliary lanes would be added at three locations
    - Southbound I-481 between the on-ramp from Kirkville Road East to the off-ramp to westbound I-690
    - Northbound I-481 between the on-ramp from eastbound I-690 and the off-ramp to I-90
    - Southbound I-481 between the on-ramp from I-81 and the off-ramp to Northern Boulevard
  - If necessary, noise walls along the entirety of I-481 would be provided (to be determined by noise analyses in the DEIS)
  - If required, other interchanges such as I-481 / I-690 and I-481 / I-90 would be modified (need for modifications to be determined as engineering studies progress)
Common Features of All Alternatives:
Improving Access to University Hill via Teall Avenue

- Studying various routes from Teall Avenue to University Hill to determine how best to improve these local connections. Improvements would:
  - decrease commute times
  - help to reduce traffic volumes at the I-81 / I-690 interchange and at Interchange 18 (Harrison Street/Adams Street) on I-81
- Studying options to reconstruct Teall Avenue interchange with I-690

How Can We Improve the Teall Avenue / I-690 Interchange?

- The new interchange design would simplify traffic movements
- All traffic would be controlled by one signal (rather than the existing two signals)
- Entering I-690 (orange), exiting I-690 (purple), and through traffic (blue) would take turns crossing the interchange
- All traffic of the same color would move through the interchange simultaneously
- Efficient and safe way to move large volumes of vehicles and accommodate many turns in a compact space

Legend:
- Access via University Avenue and Erie Boulevard
- Access via Walnut Avenue and Erie Boulevard
- Access via Genesee Street, South Beech Street, and Erie Boulevard
Common Features of All Alternatives:
Rebuilding Access to West Street

Exploring the Best Way to Connect West Street to the Highway

Option 1: Improve Existing West Street Ramps Over I-690
- Would keep current, free-flowing interchange layout
- Would raise I-690 slightly to improve safety on the highway and the West Street ramps

Option 2: Rebuild as Signalized Intersection
- Free-flowing interchange would be replaced with a signalized, street-level intersection
- Would elevate I-690 over the West Street ramp intersection
- Consistent with the City’s initiative to calm traffic on West Street
Common Features of All Alternatives:
Improving Access to I-81 from the South

Exploring Which Option Would Work Better

Option 1: On- and Off-Ramps at MLK East

Option 2: On-Ramp at Burt Street and Off-Ramp at MLK East

- Would add new on-ramp to existing southbound I-81 (south of the railroad tracks) at MLK East under Option 1 and at Burt Street under Option 2
- Both options would add new off-ramp from existing northbound I-81 to MLK East that could serve as an alternate route to University Hill / Carrier Dome

- Congestion at Adams Street / Almond Street intersection would be reduced
- Townsend Street would carry Downtown traffic to southbound I-81
Common Features of All Alternatives:
Improving I-81 / I-690 Interchange
Common Features of All Alternatives:
Improved Safety for Pedestrians and Bicyclists

IMPROVING SAFETY OF PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE CROSSINGS

Representative concept of an intersection on Almond Street (Shown: Alt SL-2: One-Way Almond Street and Other Local Street(s)). This illustration is one of many possible concepts.

- **At street corners, the sidewalks would be extended into the roadway to narrow the crossing distance for pedestrians.**
- **Bollards and medians provide protection from vehicles at the crossing locations.**
- **Pedestrian walkways and bicycle lanes would be clearly defined with pavement markings, color, or aesthetic treatments to promote driver awareness of pedestrians and bicyclists.**
- **Special traffic signals would inform bicyclists when it is safe to cross the intersection. Pedestrians and bicyclists would cross at the same time.**
TRIPS TO SYRACUSE
- 35,000 total trips to Syracuse
- 13,000 trips originate in Syracuse
- 22,000 trips originate outside of Syracuse
- Highest number of trips come from the north

TRIPS TO UNIVERSITY HILL
- 7,600 total trips to University Hill
- 30 percent originate in Syracuse
- 70 percent originate outside of Syracuse
- Highest number of trips come from the north

TRIPS TO DOWNTOWN
- 6,500 total trips to Downtown
- 36 percent originate in Syracuse
- 64 percent originate outside of Syracuse
- Highest number of trips come from the north

TRIPS TO NORTHSIDE
- 4,200 total trips to Northside
- 30 percent originate in Syracuse
- 70 percent originate outside of Syracuse
- Highest number of trips come from the north

Source: SMTC Regional Model
How Do the Alternatives Differ in Travel Times?

Comparison of Travel Times to Downtown During 7:30 - 8:30 AM

Comparison of Travel Times to University Hill During 7:30 - 8:30 AM

Comparison of Travel Times of Through and Bypass Traffic During 7:30 - 8:30 AM

Legend

NB = No Build
V-2 = New Viaduct Fully Improved to Current Standards
V-3 = New Viaduct with Substantial Design Improvements
V-4 = New Viaduct with Considerable Design Improvements
SL-1 = Boulevard
SL-2 = One-way Traffic on Almond Street and Other Local Street(s)
SL-3 = Two-way Traffic on Almond Street and Other Local Street(s)
Public Involvement tools include:

- Public meetings/open houses at project milestones
- Stakeholders’ Committee
- Sustainability Stakeholders’ Advisory Working Group
- Community and Economic Development Stakeholders’ Advisory Working Group
- Project website: www.i81opportunities.org
- Project email: i81opportunities@dot.ny.gov
- Project hotline: 1-855-481-8255 (I-855-I81-TALK)
- Project document viewing sites throughout greater Syracuse
- Environmental justice outreach
- Outreach to populations with limited English proficiency
- Outreach Center in historic Carnegie Building

Visit the project’s outreach center at the historic Carnegie Building on 335 Montgomery Street. We are open on Tuesday through Thursday, from 11:00 AM to 2:00 PM.
Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

- Initiated when there is a federal undertaking
- Requires that federal agencies consider the effects of their actions on historic properties within the project’s Area of Potential Effect
- Comprises a public involvement component, which includes:
  - providing the public with information about the project and its effects on historic properties
  - seeking public comment and input, and
  - consultation process among project’s lead agencies, State Historic Preservation Office, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, federally recognized Native American tribes, and other consulting parties

Who are the consulting parties?

Consulting parties may include local governments and individuals and organizations with a demonstrated interest in the project who may participate due to the nature of their legal or economic relation to the undertaking or affected properties, or their concern with the undertaking’s effects on historic properties
For more information, please contact:

**I-81 Viaduct Project**

New York State Department of Transportation
333 E. Washington Street
Syracuse, NY 13202

Project Hotline:
**1-855-I81-TALK** (855-481-8255)

Visit [www.i81opportunities.org](http://www.i81opportunities.org)