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**Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AADT</td>
<td>Annual Average Daily Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALIS</td>
<td>Accident Location Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amtrak</td>
<td>Passenger railroad company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Automatic Passenger Counter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APU</td>
<td>Auxiliary Power Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVL</td>
<td>Automatic Vehicle Locator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMS</td>
<td>Bridge Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPCMS</td>
<td>Bridge and Pavement Condition Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTU</td>
<td>British Thermal Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAA</td>
<td>Clean Air Act Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Central Business District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CenterState CEO</td>
<td>CenterState Corporation for Economic Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro</td>
<td>Common name for CNYRTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Centralized Local Accident Surveillance System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Congestion Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNG</td>
<td>Compressed Natural Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNYRPDB</td>
<td>Central New York Regional Planning Development Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNYRTA</td>
<td>Central New York Regional Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>Carbon Dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoE-ES</td>
<td>Center of Excellence in Environmental Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMCO</td>
<td>Cayuga Oswego Madison Cortland and Onondaga Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>Context Sensitive Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSX</td>
<td>Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSXT</td>
<td>Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTPP</td>
<td>Census Transportation Planning Package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPZ</td>
<td>Duany, Plater, Zyberk &amp; Associates (A Planning Firm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVMT</td>
<td>Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>Federal Aviation Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.O.C.U.S.</td>
<td>Forging Our Community's United Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOP</td>
<td>Goal Oriented Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOV</td>
<td>High Occupancy Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPMS</td>
<td>Highway Performance Monitoring System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>Housing and Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAP</td>
<td>Industrial Access Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICG</td>
<td>Intragency Consulting Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV</td>
<td>Low Emissions Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEN</td>
<td>Information Exchange Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/M</td>
<td>Inspection Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTEA</td>
<td>Intermodal Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JARC</td>
<td>Job Access Reverse Commute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED</td>
<td>Light Emitting Diode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRTP</td>
<td>Long Range Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWRP</td>
<td>Lakefront Water Revitalization Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDA</td>
<td>Metropolitan Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMC</td>
<td>Mobility Management Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Metropolitan Statistical Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>National Highway System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Nitrous Oxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Northern Suffolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYS DEC</td>
<td>New York State Department of Environmental Conservation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NYS&W  New York, Susquehanna & Western Railway
NYSAMPO  New York State Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations
NYSDMV  New York State Department of Motor Vehicles
NYSDOT  New York State Department of Transportation
NYSP  New York State Police
NYSTA  New York State Thruway Authority
OCPB  Onondaga County Planning Board
OCDOT  Onondaga County Department of Transportation
PARP  Petroleum Addiction Rehabilitation Park
PIP  Public Involvement Plan
PMS  Pavement Management System
PSAP  Public Safety Answering Point
ReMAP  Regional Mobility Action Plan
SAC  Study Advisory Committee
SEP  State Energy Plan
SCI  Shared Cost Initiative
SEQR  State Environmental Quality Review
SIDA  Syracuse Industrial Development Agency
SIMS  Safety Information Management System
SIP  State Implementation Plan for Air Quality Redesignation Request
SMARTNET  Syracuse Metropolitan Area Regional Transportation Network
SMTC  Syracuse Metropolitan Transportation Council
SNI  Syracuse Neighborhood Initiative
SOV  Single Occupancy Vehicle
SyREN  Syracuse Regional Emergency Network
TAC  Transportation Advisory Committee
TANF  Temporary Assistance to Needy Families
TCM  Transportation Control Measure
TCSPPP  Transportation/Community Systems Preservation Pilot Program
TE  Transportation Enhancements
TEA-21  Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century
TIP  Transportation Improvement Program
TMC  Transportation Management Center
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TMODEL</td>
<td>Software program used for Transportation Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TND</td>
<td>Traditional Neighborhood Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNT</td>
<td>Tomorrow's Neighborhoods Today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransCAD</td>
<td>Software program used for Transportation Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSE</td>
<td>Truck Stop Electrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPWP</td>
<td>Unified Planning Work Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDOT</td>
<td>United States Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>Volatile Organic Compound.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SMTC Policy Resolution
RESOLUTION

SYRACUSE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
POLICY COMMITTEE

July 21, 2011

WHEREAS, the Syracuse Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) contains a complex, multimodal transportation system, which must be maintained in a good state of repair to preserve the infrastructure, increase safety, improve security, provide system connectivity, improve mobility, increase access, support economic development and growth, and protect/enhance the environment; and

WHEREAS, the Syracuse Metropolitan Transportation Council (SMTC) has been designated by the Governor of the State of New York as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) responsible, together with the New York State Department of Transportation, for the comprehensive, continuing, and cooperative transportation planning process for the Syracuse MPA, including the preparation of the Long Range Transportation Plans; and

WHEREAS, the current Federal Metropolitan Planning Regulations (23 CFR Part 450) mandate that MPOs update their Long Range Transportation Plans every four years in nonattainment and maintenance areas; and

WHEREAS, the SMTC has prepared the Long Range Transportation Plan 2011 Update to examine and consider changes in trends and conditions, and to confirm the validity of the forecasts and assumptions used in the 1995 Long Range Transportation Plan and the subsequent Updates of 1998, 2001, 2004 and 2007; and

WHEREAS, Onondaga County was designated in October 1993 as a maintenance area under the provisions of the Clean Air Act of 1990; and

WHEREAS, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation established a State Implementation Plan for Onondaga County containing motor vehicle emissions budget for transportation conformity purposes; and

WHEREAS, the transportation conformity analysis prepared for the Long Range Transportation Plan 2011 Update and the 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program meet all applicable requirements in 40 CFR Part 93 and conform to the purpose of the State Implementation Plan as approved by the Interagency Consultation Group; and

WHEREAS, the Long Range Transportation Plan 2011 Update was developed collectively by the SMTC Central Staff and the SMTC Planning Committee, including coordination and consultation with Federal, State, and Tribal land management, wildlife and regulatory agencies as appropriate; and been made available for public comment; and
Adoption of the 
Long Range Transportation Plan 2011 Update

WHEREAS, all public comments received have been evaluated, addressed as appropriate and documented as an appendix to the report; and

WHEREAS, the SMTC Policy Committee is the policy making body of the MPO having the authority to adopt the Long Range Transportation Plan 2011 Update.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SMTC Policy Committee hereby adopts the Long Range Transportation Plan 2011 Update and the conformity determination for the Long Range Transportation Plan 2011 Update and the 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program.

Kathleen A. Rapp  
Chairperson  
SMTC Policy Committee  

Date: July 21, 2011  

Carl F. Ford  
Secretary  
SMTC Policy Committee  

Date: July 21, 2011
Syracuse Metropolitan Transportation Council  
Long Range Transportation Plan 2011 Update  
Executive Summary

Chapter I: Introduction

What is the SMTC?
In 1966, the Governor of the State of New York established the SMTC to serve as the local Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Syracuse MPA. The purpose of the MPO is to carry out the continuous, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning process for the Metropolitan Planning Area’s (MPA). The MPA includes all of Onondaga County and small parts of Oswego and Madison Counties.

As Syracuse’s MPO, the SMTC also acts as a forum where long term and immediate transportation planning decisions are made for the region. These decisions are made through committees comprised of officials representing local, State, and Federal governments or agencies who utilize consensus building models to make transportation planning decisions. Many of these committees are run by SMTC staff; however, the governing committees are staffed solely by member agency representatives.

Purpose of LRTP
The LRTP is a blueprint to guide the Syracuse Metropolitan Area’s transportation development over a 20-year period. Updated every four years to reflect changing conditions and new planning principals, the LRTP is based on projections of growth and travel demand coupled with financial assumptions and public input. In addition, the LRTP establishes a vision and goals that guide projects associated with the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

The LRTP planning process engages the public and considers major urban transportation planning concerns such as environmental quality, access to transportation, alternative transportation modes (especially bicycle and pedestrian), the impact of land development on the transportation system, highway congestion, and maintenance of the existing infrastructure.

The SMTC developed its first LRTP in 1995. The 2020 Long Range Transportation Plan included descriptions of existing land use patterns, economic conditions, demographics, and an extensive inventory of transportation conditions. The plan identified goals, objectives, and actions designed to achieve concepts fundamental to a “desired plan.” That plan focused on enhancing mobility, safety, environmental sustainability, economic development, land use, and facility investments.

The SMTC produced updates to the 1995 plan in 1998, 2001, 2004, 2007, and now in 2011. These updates were not designed as independent documents, but as supplements to be used in conjunction with the 1995 plan. These updates generally reviewed:

- The goals, objectives, and actions outlined in the 1995 plan;
- Emerging transportation and demographic trends, planning concepts, and resulting transportation needs;
- Bridge, pavement, and safety conditions and resulting needs; and
- The energy and air quality impacts of resulting projects (as identified in the TIP).

The SMTC launched public involvement efforts related to each update. An advisory committee oversaw the development of each update. The original LRTP and all updates have remained policy-level plans.
During the last two decades, several changes in federal legislation have had a substantial impact on how MPOs conduct transportation planning. These include the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the Intermodal Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991, the TEA-21 of 1998, and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) legislation of 2005.

Collectively, these acts address such major urban transportation planning concerns as environmental quality (especially air quality), access to transportation (especially for those with mobility difficulties), alternative transportation modes (especially bicycle and pedestrian), the transportation-land use linkage (especially the impact of land development on the transportation system), highway traffic congestion and maintenance of the existing transportation infrastructure. The legislation directs the planning focus of agencies such as the SMTC to these new areas of concern.

**Public Involvement Process**

Engaging the public early and often in the planning process is critical to the success of any transportation plan or program, and it is required by numerous state and federal laws. This legislation calls on MPOs such as the SMTC to provide citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of transportation agencies, private providers of transportation and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on transportation plans and programs.

With the passage of the SAFETEA-LU transportation bill in 2005, MPOs were mandated to follow additional public participation requirements for their LRTPs. Currently, SAFETEA-LU has expired; however, the federal government has not passed any new legislation to date and the 2005 version of the transportation bill remains in effect through subsequent rolling extensions.

Within SAFETEA-LU, Congress introduced a new requirement for development and use of a documented participation plan for the MPO which defines and outlines a process for providing various interested parties within the MPO reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process. To that end the SMTC developed a broad umbrella Public Participation Plan (PPP) that identifies such opportunities.

For many of the SMTC’s activities, a project-specific Public Involvement Plan (PIP) is created that sets the framework for the public participation opportunities that will be available throughout the course of the project. A proactive and dynamic PIP development process ensures the continual review of public involvement objectives and concepts.

Input from stakeholder groups is important to the success of the SMTC planning projects in meeting identified needs. Stakeholder groups may vary depending on the nature of the project, but could include such groups as freight shippers, business developers, property owners, community leaders, social service agencies, fire and police representatives, and/or representatives of public transit. PIPs also pinpoint when in the project the public involvement meetings will be held that allow for the exchange of information and input.

As noted within the project-specific PIP for the LRTP 2011 Update, the SMTC created a Study Advisory Committee (SAC) to assist in management of the LRTP and provide needed input and direction to the update. In addition, the SMTC completed significant outreach for the LRTP through the development and use of a survey completed in conjunction with the Syracuse-Onondaga County Planning Agency (SOCOA) during late 2009. The intent of the Community Planning & Transportation Resident Survey was to inform the LRTP, along with SOCPA’s Sustainable Development Plan for Onondaga County (currently being developed). At various SMTC public meetings for specific SMTC studies the SMTC noted the update of
the LRTP and provided information on how to offer feedback on long range transportation planning in the MPA. This ensured a captive audience and gave the SMTC an opportunity to reach a broad segment of the population. At these meetings, the SMTC shared a few slides on the LRTP and pointed to the project website and opportunity to complete a questionnaire similar to the survey that was mailed to random households within Onondaga County. Additionally, the public was invited to complete questionnaires at the Onondaga County Traffic Safety Advisory Board’s (OCTSAB) Share the Road Expo in September 2010. The draft LRTP 2011 Update was also sent to interested parties for review and comment. The final draft LRTP 2011 Update was available for public comment for a 30-day period, during which time a public meeting was scheduled (for July 12, 2011).

Planning Process
The SMTC is mandated to develop three documents that are the ingredients to transportation planning and programming in the MPA: the LRTP, the UPWP, and the TIP. Together, these three documents represent the beginning, middle, and end to an effective transportation planning process. Descriptions of each of the three key documents are included within Chapter 1. The LRTP represents the starting point in which the transportation goals and objectives for the future are set forth in a document adopted by the SMTC Policy Committee.

LRTP Goals
The original 1995 LRTP provided the policy framework for fulfilling transportation needs within the MPO. The Goals of the LRTP are as follows:
Community Safety
• Goal: To enhance the safety of the people using the transportation system.
Community Mobility
• Goal: To improve the mobility options for people within the Syracuse Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA).
Community Environment
• Goal: To provide a clean and environmentally sound transportation system for current and future residents.
Community Economy
• Goal: To enhance the area’s economic competitiveness, thereby increasing opportunities for employment.
Community Land Use
• Goal: To promote the development of an efficient urban area and a sense of community through transportation planning.
Community Facilities
• Goal: To provide safe, clean, well maintained and efficient transportation infrastructure.

This 2011 Update emulates previous LRTP updates (2001, 2004, and 2007) by addressing and updating the implementation actions associated with the plan’s specific goals. The identification of implemented action plans involved discussions with the member agencies responsible for their respective TIP projects. The chapters within the LRTP Update are organized by goal. The implemented action plans are presented following a discussion of existing conditions and trends tied to each of the goals. The implemented action plans are summaries rather than complete descriptions. In many cases, overlap exists because a particular action plan may apply to multiple goals. For example, a highway project can fulfill both a safety and a mobility goal.
Chapter 2: Existing Conditions

Demographic Overview

The existing conditions and needs within the Syracuse Metropolitan Transportation Council (SMTC) study area have stayed relatively stable during the course of the past LRTP updates with minor exceptions. This chapter summarizes the current demographic conditions of the SMTC study area as they relate to the mission of the SMTC, and to point out the continued trend of certain demographic, economic, and land use conditions. This 2011 Update includes a basic profile of some of the most important demographic trends and changing conditions that affect transportation planning in the SMTC area. When possible, the SMTC utilized Census 2010 data to update demographic data within this chapter (the Census Bureau has yet to release all Census data). The Syracuse MPA continues to experience the following types of population change, economic transition, and land use shifts that are not uncommon to most Northeast communities:

- A declining metropolitan area population, and a shift in population away from the city core to suburban and rural areas;
- A changing economic base from manufacturing to a more diversified information and service-based economy;
- A continued land-use pattern toward suburban sprawl and decreasing density;
- A concentration of poverty in the City of Syracuse; and
- Increased commuting into Onondaga County and from the City to the suburbs.

During the past decade, Onondaga County, the City of Syracuse, and several towns and villages within the MPA have developed plans that identify growth management strategies designed to address these trends. For instance, the Onondaga County Settlement Plan (2001) and the Onondaga County 2010 Development Guide (1998) support, among other things:

- Redirecting growth towards urban centers,
- Capitalizing on infill opportunities,
- Smart Growth and New Urbanism Planning Principles, and
- Managing growth through the provision of sustainable, cost-effective infrastructure.

Onondaga County is in the process of creating a new County plan (Onondaga County Sustainable Development Plan) with a focus on settlement patterns that will foster sustainability. This new effort will replace the 1998 Development Guide, but will include many of the same principals. The County Plan will be closely linked with the County’s Climate Change Action Plan (currently being developed) and the LRTP.

The City of Syracuse also undertook extensive planning efforts during the development of its Comprehensive Plan 2025 (2005). The City’s plan complements many of the recommendations and policies established within the Settlement Plan and the 2010 Development Guide, most notably by recapturing growth and development opportunities. Through the implementation of effective enhancement strategies, the City is striving to maximize the use of its existing infrastructure that once supported a population of more than 220,000.

Future Projections

The SMTC utilizes travel demand modeling to enable the agency to more accurately predict future travel patterns and volumes. This tool is valuable in transportation planning activities to assist in determining the best solution for identified transportation problems and issues. Additionally, it can be used to examine the consequences of capital investments via the TIP. This allows the SMTC to better understand the regional impact of the project. Because of the utility of travel demand models at predicting future travel patterns
and volumes, they are also critical to the process of Air Quality and Conformity. The model allows for the agency to predict future volumes and speeds on selected roadway elements and then, by following an involved procedure and additional computer software analysis, the impact on air quality can be quantified to a degree.

Travel demand model software uses current and projected population and land use statistics to estimate impacts of proposed transportation infrastructure projects. Modeling is a useful and essential tool, helping planners to project improvements and predict typical impacts of land development actions. Additionally, it is mandated that the SMTC utilize modeling as part of its air quality conformity process.

Based on SMTC’s travel demand model outreach meetings with community representatives, projected population for the MPA area for the year 2035 is approximately 455,000. This represents an approximate decrease of 3% for the region over a 28 year period (2007 to 2035). In addition, the number of households in the region is projected to grow by nearly 4% over the same timeframe. The projected increase in households and decrease in population indicates a declining average number of people per household in the region (these population and household projections were developed prior to the release of 2010 US Census data).

Chapter 3: Facilities
Goal
To provide safe, clean, well maintained and efficient transportation infrastructures.

The Facility Chapter contains information about the surface transportation system within the MPA, including detailed discussions on roadways and functional classification, bridge and pavement conditions, transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, air/water/rail facilities and other related topics.

Roadways
The transportation system is organized by “functional classification.” Functional classification is the process by which roads are categorized into classes according to the type of service they are meant to provide.

Basic to this process is the recognition that individual roads and streets do not serve travel independently but are part of a greater network. This network “channels” traffic in a logical, safe and efficient manner and helps to define the functional classification hierarchy. A simplified hierarchy of a functional classification (from lowest class to highest) consists of local roads, major and minor collector roads, minor arterial, and principal arterials. Functional classification codes are given to all federal-aid eligible roads.

The MPA’s surface transportation system includes approximately 3,500 centerline miles of roads. The vast system of existing highways and bridges in the MPA area require a large amount of maintenance in order to ensure adequate operational characteristics. The majority (72%) of money spent on the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) from Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is used for maintaining the existing road network in the MPA.

Bridge & Pavement Conditions
Onondaga County has 492 bridges on the various State, County and local roads, as well as on or over the New York State Thruway. The New York State Department of Transportation (NYS DOT) maintains a Bridge Management System (BMS) for all of these bridges. The State only inspects bridges with spans of 20 feet or greater for Onondaga County Department of Transportation (OCDOT). OCDOT maintains 255 drainage structures that are classified as bridges. The BMS rates the bridge deck, bearings and other structural elements on a weighted scoring system. State and local bridges are rated by the NYS DOT on a scale of 1.0 to 7.0. Bridges with a condition rating of less than 5.0 are deemed as being in a deficient
condition. However, a deficient condition does not mean that the bridges are unsafe, but rather they are candidates for rehabilitation work, replacement or even perhaps closure.

The NYSDOT uses a Pavement Management System (PMS) that attempts to maximize the effectiveness of the limited dollars spent on maintaining pavements. Pavements have a varying life cycle dependent on many conditions. A PMS allows the NYSDOT and other highway departments to determine the pavement rating relative to all other pavements in a jurisdiction. It also allows year-to-year monitoring of pavements and, most importantly, it facilitates predictions of when to cost effectively overlay, rehabilitate or reconstruct a road. Knowing where a pavement is in its life cycle allows a determination of the most cost-effective treatment.

This information illustrates the necessity for infrastructure maintenance and safety concerns in the MPO area. These critical issues emphasize the need for maintenance funding to be allocated to the MPO on an annual basis.

**Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities**

Since the publication of the original 1995 LRTP, a slight but important shift has occurred creating a larger emphasis on bicycle and pedestrian facilities planning than previously existed. The increase in facilities for non-motorized travel creates a stronger multimodal orientation than was reflected in original 1995 LRTP. This section of the LRTP notes several of the bicycle and pedestrian plans and projects currently underway in the MPA area, including the Loop the Lake Trail, the extension of the Syracuse Creekwalk, the Connective Corridor, and the addition of bike lanes to City streets.

**Transit**

Centro operates the public transportation system in Onondaga, Oswego, Oneida and Cayuga Counties. Centro operates fixed-route public transit systems and demand-responsive paratransit service with a total fleet of 254 buses. CNY Centro, the Onondaga County fleet, consists of 188 buses (25 of which are paratransit). Bicycle racks can be found on the front of most Centro buses and all future bus purchases will include bike racks and will be clean fuel-technology vehicles.

The majority of Centro’s routes meet at the central point of the regional hub-and-spoke system at the intersection of Fayette and Salina Streets in the City of Syracuse. It is at this Common Center that nearly two thirds (65%) of the Syracuse metropolitan region’s bus riders transfer to other routes. Centro has undertaken a major capital investment that involves the development of a new Common Center located at the intersection of South Salina Street and Adams Street, the location of the former American Red Cross building. The new Common Center will consist of an enclosed seating area for passengers as well as a covered bus loading and unloading area where transfers may be made out of the general flow of traffic. The new Common Center project will be completed in winter 2011/2012.

**Air/Water/Rail Facilities**

Hancock International Airport is the only airport providing commercial air passenger service in the SMTC area and the four-county Syracuse Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). Hancock International Airport is owned and operated by the City of Syracuse. In June 2011, the New York State Assembly approved legislation to create a regional airport authority for the Syracuse Hancock International Airport (the Federal Aviation Administration must approve the plan for the authority). The MPA also contains four local airports: Skaneateles Aerodrome, located in Skaneateles; Michaels Field, located in Cicero; Marcellus Airport, located in Marcellus; and Camillus Airport located in Camillus. The local airports are privately owned and open to the public, except for the Marcellus Airport which is not opened to the public. The number, condition, and type of runways vary by airport.
The New York State Canal Corporation is responsible for the overall operation, maintenance and rehabilitation of the 524-mile New York State Canal System. The statewide Canal System is made up of four canals: the Erie Canal, the Champlain Canal, the Oswego Canal and the Cayuga-Seneca Canal. In the Metropolitan Planning Area, the Canal System includes Oneida Lake, the Oneida River, Onondaga Lake, the Oswego River, the Seneca River and Cross Lake.

Rail facilities within the SMTC area consist of both passenger and freight facilities. Rail passenger service in the SMTC area is provided through the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak), which provides intercity rail passenger service on three different routes (Lake Shore Limited, Empire Service, and Maple Leaf) in the Central New York region. Primarily a freight railroad, the Finger Lakes Railway has offered passenger services along the Finger Lakes Railway since 2000 in the form of special excursions sponsored by local organizations.

The William F. Walsh Regional Transportation Center (RTC) opened in 1998 by the CNYRTA provides improved interconnectivity between bus and rail transportation modes, as well as a greater presence for Amtrak in the Syracuse Metropolitan Area. The RTC has an enclosed seating area, one boarding platform, a small food court area, and is home to bus services provided by Greyhound and Trailways.

A number of initiatives being considered have the potential for improving passenger rail service in Central New York. The State of New York is currently assessing the feasibility of high-speed rail service across Upstate. If this service is implemented, changes will be required in the configuration of the William F. Walsh Regional Transportation Center to accommodate high-speed trains and the resulting increase in the number of rail passengers. The New York State Empire Corridor connects all of New York’s largest cities. The vision for the corridor is to increase speeds to 110mph and add daily round trips, with one of the largest investments being the construction of a third track between Albany and Buffalo.

Rail freight services in the Central New York region include one major (Class 1) carrier, CSX Transportation; one regional carrier, New York, Susquehanna & Western Railway; and one shortline railroad, Finger Lakes Railway.

Chapter 4: Mobility Goal
To improve the mobility options for people within the Syracuse Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA).

The Mobility Chapter examines the various modes of transportation within the MPA, including vehicular travel, bicycle and pedestrian travel, public transit, water transportation, air passenger transportation, rail passenger service and freight movement.

Vehicular Travel
By far, the most common mode of transportation in Onondaga County is the passenger motor vehicle, and the popularity of this mode of travel continues to increase over time. Between 1960 and 2000 (Census 2010 Journey to Work data has not yet been released), the percentage of the Onondaga County labor force driving to work increased from 71% to 90%. Of those using vehicles to access work in the MPA, the vast majority are driving alone. According to the 2000 census, 89% of MPA workers who drove to work did so by driving alone. Eleven percent drove in a car with more than one person. In 2000, commuting by
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driving alone was particularly prevalent in the northern suburbs and in the towns of Onondaga, Manlius, and Camillus, where over 86% of workers drove alone to work. In contrast, only 65.9% of workers from the City of Syracuse drove alone to work in 2000.

Bicycle & Pedestrian Travel
According to the Census, 4%, or 8,906, of workers over the age of 16 in the Syracuse MPA walked or bicycled to work in 2000. The region lags behind the rest of the state, where 6.2% of workers walked to work and 0.8% used other means in 2000. Of those who walked or bicycled to work in the MPA, 70.8% lived within the City of Syracuse. The next highest percentage, 4.2%, lived in Salina. Within the City of Syracuse, most pedestrians and bicycles are found in the vicinity of University Hill. The 2006 University Hill Transportation Study estimated a daily total of 89,000 pedestrian trips and 12,848 bicycle trips in this area. Most of these were the product of students and employees, and many were discretionary, or non-commute, trips.

Despite the prevalence of pedestrian and bicycle activity in some key locations in the community, Onondaga County has seen a downward trend in terms of pedestrian commuting over the last several decades. In 1960, 9.9% of the county population walked to work. By 2000, the percentage of walking commuters had decreased to 3.8%. Since the census began tracking bike commuters in 1990, the percentage of bike commuters in Onondaga County has remained stable at 0.2%.

Public Transit
According to the census, 2.5%, or 5,589, of workers over the age of 16 in the MPA used public transit to access work in 2000. Of those who used transit to access work in the MPA, 74.2% lived in the City of Syracuse. The next highest percentages (4.3%) were found in Salina and Clay.

However, considerably more people are using the transit system in the MPA for non-work reasons. Centro transported an average of 33,000 passengers per day in FY 2007-08, the last year for which data is available. The 2009 data based on farebox totals indicates that Centro’s most popular route is the James Street/Lamson Street bus, with the South Salina/Brighton Avenue route following closely behind. The Syracuse University/Downtown bus, the South Avenue bus, and the Court Street/Park Street bus also have high ridership.

Water Transportation
The New York State Canal Corporation is responsible for the overall operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of the New York State Canal System. Lock E-23 in Brewerton is historically the busiest lock in the entire New York State Canal System. Lock E-24 in Baldwinsville is generally the second or third busiest in the state. Most of the boats passing through these locks are recreational vessels. In 2010, traffic on the New York State Barge Canal increased nearly two percent over 2009 and more than five percent over 2008, when a rainy summer and the national economic downturn reduced recreational traffic.

Air Passenger Transportation
Over the past decade, enplanements at Hancock Airport have mirrored national trends, dipping in 2001 and generally increasing in the years thereafter. Air traffic forecasts show an increase in passengers. The airport’s Master Plan Update, completed in September 2006, predicts an increase of over 50% by 2022. Enplanements in Syracuse have generally been stable around 1 million annually since 2004.
Rail Passenger Service
Rail passenger service in the SMTC area is provided primarily through the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak). Syracuse rail passenger traffic on Amtrak is substantial, traditionally ranking third behind New York City and Albany in ridership.

Freight Movement (Air/Highway/Rail/Water)
Among the attractions to doing business in Onondaga County and the Central New York region is the crossroads location of the County for air, highway, rail and water transportation and the variety of freight movement services available. Air cargo service is available at Syracuse Hancock International Airport, which is directly linked to Interstate 81. U.S. Customs inspection services are also available at Hancock Field. Two interstate highways intersect at Syracuse, the New York State Thruway (Interstate 90) and Interstate 81, providing excellent truck access to the SMTC planning area. Rail freight services in Onondaga County are available from three providers. Water transportation is available on the New York State Canal System.

Chapter 5: Land Use Goal
To promote the development of an efficient urban area and a sense of community through transportation planning.

Land Use Trends
The 1995 SMTC LRTP and subsequent updates identified five general types of land use prevalent in the SMTC Study Area, including a moderately dense urban core; suburban towns, villages and hamlets; farmland; shoreline; and scattered development. These types remain indicative of present conditions, though the trend towards suburbanization and outward growth of the metropolitan area is beginning to affect the distinction between urban and rural landscapes and are creating new patterns of development in the County. Several economic development projects both planned and underway may have impacts on future development patterns as well.

Suburban Development (“Suburbanization”)
Not unlike other municipal areas across the United States and the northeast, the SMTC MPA has experienced an increase in suburban development while overall MPA population numbers remain relatively constant. Suburbanization typically occurs in rural fringe areas with development patterns often consisting of segregated, low density uses. Land use planners refer to unmanaged, low density development patterns that lack a sustainable environmental, economic, and social balance as “suburban sprawl”. The term “suburban sprawl” may consist of residential and nonresidential development patterns.

Suburban and traditional development patterns are both vital and serve important roles to help meet a community’s needs. However, it is important to maintain a balance of transportation and development patterns to ensure that the land uses can support the cost of infrastructure and that traffic patterns as well as the natural and social environment are not adversely affected. When the transportation-land use balance is not maintained traffic worsens; congestion increases; air and water pollution increases; more costly roads are built or widened; the young, the elderly, people with disabilities, and the lower income population segments often become immobilized and isolated; and opportunities for social interaction and the local economy falters.

Land Use & Transportation
A reactive trend referred to as the “transportation-land use cycle” occurs when the transportation-land use balance is not maintained. In developing communities, traffic congestion often leads people to ask for
added highway capacity, which in turn will attract more development, which in turn creates more congestion, which in turn leads people to ask for added highway capacity, and so on and so on. As such, transportation planners contest that in many cases you cannot build your way out of congestion by adding additional travel lanes. Instead, transportation planners advocate for integrating land use planning and community design principles with transportation planning principles to effectively eliminate congestion.

The NYSDOT is also continuing to recognize the important linkage between land use and transportation. Introduced by the NYSDOT in 2000, and supported by the FHWA, Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) is “a philosophy wherein safe transportation solutions are designed in harmony with the community. CSS strives to balance environmental, scenic, aesthetic, historic, cultural, natural resources, community and transportation service needs.”

Another initiative being undertaken by New York State is the Smart Growth Initiative, which has a mission to work with localities to use smart, sensible planning to create livable communities, protect our natural resources and promote economic growth. New York State recently enacted the New York State Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act. The SMTC is currently participating in various Smart Growth working groups with the NYSDOT and other NYS MPOs in an effort to assist with determining how smart growth requirements (as outlined in the new NYS law) should be addressed within MPO LRTPs, the NYSDOT Master Plan, planning studies and TIP project selection processes. As the Smart Growth law directly applies to State Infrastructure Agencies, the NYSDOT formed these working groups to address the requirements of this law.

Finally, the Land Use chapter details region-wide planning efforts, including summaries of existing Comprehensive Plans and Local Waterfront Revitalization Programs.

Chapter 6: Economy

Goal
To enhance the area’s economic competitiveness, thereby increasing opportunities for employment.

Transportation Crossroads of Central New York
Syracuse and Onondaga County benefit from their location at the center of New York State. The establishment of the Erie Canal and the subsequent development of prominent railroad corridors as well as the interstate highway system across Onondaga County ensured Central New York’s rise to prominence through continual access to major transportation routes for nearly two centuries.

Today, Onondaga County continues to benefit economically as the transportation crossroads of Central New York. Interstate 81 serves as a significant north-south corridor reaching from Canada to Tennessee. It also intersects the NYS Thruway just north of the City of Syracuse in the center of Onondaga County. The NYS Thruway runs east-west across all of New York State linking with major interstate corridors in neighboring states. NYS Route 481 also plays a role in the regional transportation network, stretching from I-81 north of the City of Syracuse to the City of Oswego (Interstate 481 runs from I-81 south of the city to I-81 north of the City). Other significant east-west corridors that span across the state include NYS Route 20 and NYS Route 5. Additionally, NYS Route 31 serves as the northern Onondaga County connector.

In addition, the MPA is served by extensive multi-modal transportation hubs, which include: the Syracuse Hancock International Airport, the deep water Port of Oswego, a CSX intermodal freight rail center, and
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5 Source: http://smartgrowthny.org/index.asp.
the Regional Transportation Center that offers Amtrak passenger rail service and commercial bus services. This network is critical in terms of carrying freight which in turn supports the economy. For example, according to the I-81 Corridor Coalition, I-81 is estimated to carry 12% of the United States Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The network is also critical in terms of providing access for commuters to Downtown Syracuse and the University Hill area, where many Central New Yorkers are employed.

**Current Economic Conditions**

As defined by the New York State Department of Labor, the Central New York Labor Market Region consists of five counties — Cayuga, Cortland, Madison, Onondaga and Oswego. While broader than the SMTC planning area, it is important to understand the regional economy and its impact on the transportation system. The CNY region covers an area of approximately 3,600 square miles and has an estimated population of approximately 782,000. The region generally forms an area of interdependent economic activity, with Onondaga County at its core.

Many of the region’s largest employers are located in Onondaga County. These companies and institutions include the State University of New York Health Science Center, Syracuse University, Wegmans Food Markets, Inc., St. Joseph’s Hospital Health Center, Crouse Hospital, Lockheed Martin, National Grid, and Loretto to name a few.

According to SMTC Travel Demand Model Outputs (2007-2035 Employment Data), the business sectors with the highest estimated number of employees in the MPA currently are education, retail/trade industries and health. The City of Syracuse is the municipality with the highest number of employees both the education and health industries at 14,376 and 20,730 respectively. Several institutions of higher learning are located in the University Hill area. In addition, most health sector jobs are located at hospitals and medical office buildings on University Hill or at St. Joseph’s Hospital. Syracuse also has the majority of retail and trade employees at 8,358, followed by Clay and DeWitt.

The next largest number of employees works in the fields of manufacturing, financial and real estate, and business and professional. The Town of DeWitt has the highest number of employees working in the manufacturing field, followed by the City of Syracuse and the Town of Salina. The City of Syracuse is the municipality with the largest number of employees in the financial and real estate and business and professional sectors.

The job sectors with the least number of employees include mining and agriculture. Only the Towns of Cicero, Clay, DeWitt, Geddes and the City of Syracuse report employees working in the mining industry. The Towns of DeWitt, Onondaga, Salina and the City of Syracuse show the most number of employees (around 66 in each municipality) working in the agriculture sector.

As calculated through the SMTC’s Travel Demand Model, the number of jobs in the MPA region is projected to grow by 12% from 252,753 in 2007 to 282,753 in 2035.

---


Chapter 7: Environment

Goal
To provide a clean and environmentally sound transportation system for current and future residents

Environmental Mitigation

Environmental mitigation is the process of consistency of transportation planning with applicable federal, state and local energy conservation programs, environmental goals, and objectives. Environmental mitigation is incorporated into the current LRTP’s goals for establishing project priorities. The SMTC member agencies are engaged in environmental mitigation activities at the planning and project level through the implementation of (a) National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) regulations and (b) Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) which ensure that projects are in harmony with the community, and that they preserve environmental, scenic, aesthetic, historic, and natural resource values of the area in which they are located. The SMTC’s LRTP is essentially a policy level document that does not specifically contain many significant projects in the out-years for which potential mitigation activities would be appropriate. Specific mitigation measures will be examined at the project phase via the SEQR/NEPA process and are therefore beyond the scope of this document. However, environmental mitigation is a major consideration in local major investment studies, planning studies, and other planning efforts.

Air Quality & Transportation Conformity

The SMTC works with various agencies in regards to air quality and conformity. Air quality, as it pertains to the operations of the SMTC and its member agencies includes the state and federal requirements for transportation conformity\(^8\), project level analysis for Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funding, and requirements for the State Energy Plan (SEP) and Greenhouse Gas analysis.

Transportation conformity (“conformity”) is a way to ensure that Federal funding and approval is applied to those transportation activities that are consistent with air quality goals. Conformity applies to transportation plans, such as the SMTC Long Range Transportation Plan, the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and projects funded or approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in areas that do not meet or previously have not met air quality standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, or nitrogen dioxide. These areas are known as “non-attainment areas” or “maintenance areas,” respectively.

Transportation projects must demonstrate conformity in order to be funded. A conformity determination demonstrates that the total emissions projected for a plan or program are within the emissions limits (“budgets”) established by the State Implementation Plan (SIP), and that transportation control measures (TCMs) are implemented in a timely fashion. TCMs are specific programs designed to reduce emissions from transportation sources by reducing vehicle use, changing traffic flow or congestion conditions.
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\(^8\) Transportation conformity (“conformity”) is a way to ensure that Federal funding and approval is applied to those transportation activities that are consistent with air quality goals. Conformity applies to transportation plans (such as the SMTC Long Range Transportation Plan [LRTP]), Transportation Improvement Programs [TIPs], and projects funded or approved by the Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] or the Federal Transit Administration [FTA] in areas that do not meet or previously have not met air quality standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, or nitrogen dioxide. These areas are known as "non-attainment areas" or "maintenance areas," respectively. Transportation projects must demonstrate conformity in order to be funded.
Examples include programs for improving public transit, developing high occupancy vehicle (HOV) facilities, and ordinances to promote non-motor vehicle travel.

The SMTC LRTP is a blueprint that guides investment in the surface transportation system in our metropolitan area, and is therefore required to be in conformity with the regional air quality plan or SIP. This is due to Onondaga County being designated a “maintenance” area for Carbon Monoxide (CO). Regarding ozone emissions, in 2010 the EPA proposed to strengthen the national air quality standard from its current 0.075 parts per million (ppm) to a range within 0.060-0.070 ppm. According to the EPA, “the proposed revisions are based on scientific evidence about ozone and its effects on people and sensitive trees and plants.” The EPA intends to issue a final decision in July 2011 as to the new standard. To date, Onondaga County is presently in conformance with all applicable standards relative to ozone. Should the federal government officially strengthen this threshold, it is probable that Onondaga County, based on prior emissions data, would eventually be reclassified as a non-attainment area. This reclassification would then require the monitoring and analysis of said emissions as per the federal transportation conformity regulations.

In examining the results of the conformity analysis for the SMTC relative to this LRTP 2011 Update, the output shows that carbon monoxide emissions between the base year of 2007 and the forecast year of 2035 will be significantly reduced. The SMTC remains in conformity with a classification of maintenance.

Chapter 8: Safety and Security

Goal
To enhance the safety of the people using the transportation system.

Safety
This goal is rooted in ensuring a safe transportation system for all users as well as instilling a sense of security for all users. Safety projects continue to be a priority in the SMTC MPA. Safety projects not only look at automobile safety, but also address pedestrian and bicyclist safety.

The SMTC completed an analysis of the ten highest accident locations in the MPA by jurisdiction from 2006-2009 as determined through the NYSDOT Accident Location Information System (ALIS), and the locations with the most bicycle and pedestrian accidents during the same time frame. The SMTC member agencies play a key role in reducing the number and severity of accidents, with much of the local effort directed at engineering improvements to the highway system itself. The presence of a high number of accidents does not always indicate a problem with a particular location. A road with a large number of accidents may actually have a relatively low accident rate due to high traffic volumes. Other locations that have a low number of accidents may have a relatively high accident rate due to low traffic volumes. The highest accident locations between June 2006 and June 2009 are Thompson Road/Carrier Parkway (New York State), Onondaga Road/Old Route 5 (Onondaga County), and West Hiawatha Boulevard/Solar Street (City of Syracuse).

The locations with the most bike and pedestrian accidents during the same three years are as follows:

Pedestrian Accidents
Location (# accidents)
South Salina/East Fayette Streets (9)
South Clinton/West Fayette Streets (5)
Lodi/Butternut Streets (4)

9 http://www.epa.gov/ghg/actions.html
Bicycle Accidents
Location (# accidents)
South Geddes/Seymour Streets (4)
Brewerton Road/Ramp I-81 to US 11 (3)
South Salina/East Fayette Streets (3)

The majority of pedestrian accidents occurred in downtown Syracuse, near Centro’s current transit hub, where numerous pedestrians wait for buses on a daily basis.

The SMTC also conducts an annual Safety Improvement Analysis (SIA) (formerly known as the Accident Surveillance Program) as part of the SMTC’s UPWP. The program, which is intended to identify and analyze priority vehicular collision locations, is offered to both the ODOT and the City of Syracuse DPW. The most recent SIA completed during the 2010-2011 UPWP program year addressed ten priority collision locations as determined by the ODOT. The objective of the SIA report is to provide the member agency with an assessment of their ten priority vehicular collision locations.

Security
SAFETEA-LU Legislation
Within the SAFETEA-LU legislation, an additional planning factor was added to address security as its own entity. Furthermore, according to the Federal Register Final rule for Metropolitan Transportation Planning, “the metropolitan transportation plan should include a safety element that incorporates... emergency relief and disaster preparedness plans and strategies and policies that support homeland security (as appropriate) and safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.”

The FHWA/FTA’s 2009 review of the SMTC called out the importance of security considerations in the SMTC Planning Process. Security issues include significant disruptions to the transportation system, either long or short term, intentional or not. Previously, the issue of security had not yet become a significant part of the MPO planning processes. However, the issue of security is now a part of the MPO planning process, notably via the SAFETEA-LU legislation through the separation of the safety and security planning factor, and the requirements for addressing security within the metropolitan transportation plan.

The SMTC’s role in addressing security concerns has been primarily supportive in nature, as most issues related to security and transportation are outside the purview of the MPO. However, the SMTC can and does act as a conduit to facilitate interagency cooperation to that end.

One of the most significant components of security in the MPO area is the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) initiative. ITS refers to the application of electronics, communications, hardware, and software that support various services and products to address transportation challenges. When deployed in an integrated fashion, ITS allows the surface transportation system to be managed as an intermodal, multi-jurisdictional entity, appearing to the public as a seamless system. Commonly used ITS components include Variable Message Signs and Dynamic Message Signs.

Chapter 9: Emerging Initiatives/Projects, Long Term Outlook & Financial Plan

Emerging Initiatives
There are several emerging initiatives and projects relating to transportation planning that currently have a direct impact on the planning activities in the MPO area. The first include concepts like Smart Growth and
Complete Streets. New York State recently enacted the New York State Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act. As such, several State agencies including NYSDOT are required to align construction of new or expanded infrastructure projects or the reconstruction of existing projects, to the extent practicable, with Smart Growth criteria. The overall approach of NYSDOT is to build upon existing programs in NYSDOT and integrate Smart Growth principles in existing federal and state mandated planning and project development processes.

Complete Streets are those designed for everyone – regardless of age and ability. “A complete street may include: sidewalks, bike lanes (or wide paved shoulders), special bus lanes, comfortable and accessible public transportation stops, frequent and safe crossing opportunities, median islands, accessible pedestrian signals, curb extensions, narrower travel lanes, roundabouts, and more.”

Recently there has been a national push for Complete Streets and the development of Complete Streets policies, which has also been gaining momentum locally. Legislation for Complete Streets at both the state and national levels is presently under consideration.

Emerging Projects

The I-81 Challenge is one of the largest planning projects undertaken in the Syracuse Metropolitan Planning Area in decades. In 2009, on behalf of the NYSDOT, the SMTC began working on the I-81 Public Participation Project. The goal of this project is to facilitate the public participation effort in conjunction with NYSDOT’s study of the I-81 Corridor. Together, the Public Participation Project, the NYSDOT’s I-81 Corridor Study and the I-81 Travel Demand Modeling Project (another project undertaken by the SMTC to assist NYSDOT in evaluating existing and future traffic conditions along I-81 in the MPA), form The I-81 Challenge.

University Hill is a thriving educational and institutional center. The Hill is home to more than 16,000 residents, three educational institutions, four major hospitals and healthcare facilities and the 50,000-seat Carrier Dome located on the Syracuse University Campus. University Hill is poised for continued development and growth. The SMTC completed the University Hill Transportation Study in 2007 to create a multi-modal transportation plan that supports the existing and future land uses and guides transportation decisions on the Hill. The goal of the study was to keep the institutions viable by identifying creative land use policies and innovative transportation alternatives, and reduce the need for more cars and parking. Collectively, more than 4 million square feet of development is forecast by the institutions over the next two decades. This growth can contribute significantly to the Central New York economy.

The Connective Corridor project – another emerging project in the University Hill area, was kicked-off by Syracuse University Chancellor Nancy Cantor who wanted to create a symbolic and functional means of linking Syracuse University to the City of Syracuse. The project involves streetscape improvements and will improve travel and access to various modes of transportation to better link its neighborhoods, institutions, and businesses. The corridor will also reflect and promote the different historical and cultural attractions to the city, to make downtown Syracuse a destination for people and business development.

Over the past 20 years, the City of Syracuse and several public and private partners have been working to redevelop a long vacant and underutilized area in the northern part of the city. Sometimes referred to as Oil City due to the large concentration of oil storage facilities and industrial businesses, the area is undergoing a continued transformation into what is now known as the Syracuse Lakefront. The project

11 Home to Syracuse University, Crouse Hospital, State University of New York (SUNY) Upstate Medical Center, SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry, the Veterans Administration Hospital and other important institutions and businesses, this area attracts a significant number of people each day for employment, learning, research and living.
involves the ongoing redevelopment of a former industrial district to include retail/entertainment and mixed-use development of the Inner Harbor, historic Franklin Square, and on additional available land within the Lakefront area. The Lakefront Planning Study and the Carousel Center Expansion/DestiNY USA projects will continue to play a big role in the development of the Syracuse Lakefront.

**Long Term Outlook**
First and foremost, as shown in the previous sections of this plan, the vast majority of financial resources relating to transportation for the Syracuse Metropolitan Transportation Council (SMTC) area are committed to maintaining the extensive, diverse, and aging infrastructure that already exists in the community. This infrastructure maintenance includes, but is not limited to the major activities that are discussed in the LRTP 2011 Update. It is expected that the majority of the resources that will be expended in the near future relate to maintenance via the activities previously discussed and other required actions. However, there are some notable exceptions, such as the potential for future projects requiring additional capacity, new transit initiatives, additions and improvements to the non-motorized system (bicycle/pedestrian system), potential new development, and ITS programs.

**Financial Plan**
The 2020 LRTP, when first published in 1995, anticipated a total of $3.050 billion in funding over the 25-year planning period. This LRTP 2011 Update anticipates a total of $5.363 billion in funding over the remaining term of the planning period. The major sources of funding include the federal government at 38.0% ($2,026 million) of the total, the State Dedicated Fund at 27% ($1,435 million), Onondaga County at 6% ($342 million) and the City of Syracuse at 1% ($76 million). The balance is comprised of other State and local sources at 20% ($1060 million) and Centro operating revenue at 8% ($433 million). It is anticipated that all traditional funding mechanisms will be exhausted with the implementation of this LRTP 2011 Update.