

Favor: Alt 2

Presentation of L. Childs
concerning the Thruway Exit 24 plans
March 15, 1983

~~Single interchange, not split~~

- a) I-90 Exit 2 at WA, not Fuller.
- b) Single interchange, not split.

9) Why WAE, not Fuller?

i) Fuller chews up SUNX land, compared to WA
 married student housing? parking lot
 ASRC? Kanner blue colony
 unfeasible

ii) Fuller gives very poor access from I-87 N, I-90 W to SUNX
 compared to WA

iii) WA fixes up a dangerous \cap , the worst SUNX entrance
 at Fuller \cap WA

iv) No reason to believe Fuller will give better LOS ~~than WA~~ than

WA + XG-type improvements at Fuller \cap WA. No data available.

v) Fuller is likely to worsen traffic on Fuller \cap 20, etc, and Fuller
 cannot be widened because of constraints. No analysis available.

vi) WA is cheaper to maintain, costs \$8.7 million less to build, ~~etc~~
 even with an extra \$1 m. for WAE \cap Fuller, it is vastly cheaper than Fuller. ~~etc~~
 The savings far more than covers any savings in user costs.

~~Fuller is unfeasible.~~ One disadvantage to ~~Fuller~~ WA:

Note: with WAE, this proposal offers no improvement to Fuller \cap WAE. ~~It would be just as bad~~

~~Fuller~~ Fuller \cap WAE was a critical \cap , ~~etc~~ for X6, + with X6, the LOS at the peak period
 is far beyond capacity. But the DOT road of damage: p19 X6.

This ~~does not mean that~~ just because DOT has got X6 off the books, ~~etc~~ the public
 should spend an extra \$8.7 m. on an alt. which ~~is not a~~ otherwise has so little merit.

~~Handwritten scribbles and crossed-out text at the top of the page.~~

While on the subject of X6 and this project, may I ~~refer~~ comment on
the letters between Moss & Depprey in Final Project Development Report:

X6 ~~is~~ ~~at~~ Dry A, King Rd, Dry E. = Access

b) single Δ , not split

~~The main reasons why I favor the single interchange concept is because of the~~
Why:

i) the split interchange will cost \$3.7 million more, ^{than the single interchange.} ~~to build.~~

Balancing costs and benefits, we find that maintenance costs will be \$26,000/yr less for the split interchange, toll plaza operating costs will be \$250,000 more for the split interchange, and highway user costs are \$1,000,000 less/yr with the split Δ .

Of those figures, the user costs is the least solid figure. It is based on \$0.22¢/mile. ~~But~~ I don't know ~~where~~ where that figure comes from, but ~~the~~ the difference in user costs should be based on the marginal ~~cost~~ cost of operating a car an extra mile or so per year, that is, based on the actual operating costs: gas, oil, maintenance, repairs, and not depreciation and insurance, which will be ^{essentially} the same for a car under either alternative.

With current gas prices, and assuming an increase of the mpg of the fleet to 20 mpg. A reasonable marginal ~~highway~~ user cost/mile might be as low as 11¢/mile, not 22¢, cutting the user benefits of the split interchange by half.

The cost ^{benefit} analysis correctly ignored travel time differences, for the difference in travel time per trip ^{would be} so slight that the user would place no value on it.

In short, if actual marginal operating costs are taken into account, the user benefits of the split interchange appear to roughly balance the lower car traction and toll plaza operating costs of the single interchange.

ii) There are notable local impacts associated with the split interchange concept.

a) air ~~pollution~~ pollution at Exe. Pk, already high, would be increased right up to the federal legal limit, according to the Env. Ass..

b) Adding four lanes of overpass on Weston Ave. will indeed add a "visual effect on the area". The Thruway already acts as a moat separating McKinnville from the rest of Guilderland; ^{eg. Mck. Meth. Church, fire district} ~~the project is~~ the split Δ would add a substantial vertical barrier to further cut off McKinnville, physically and psychologically, from the rest of the town.

c) The most serious impact, in my view is the added noise. I simply do not believe the noise analysis of Table 13 which indicates only a 1 dBA increase in ~~LEQ~~ LEQ noise for the split interchange in 2005 over the proposed alternative for '52 Providence, and no increase at Exe. Pk. ~~And~~ And in any case the LER analysis, while ~~the analysis~~ ^{provides} satisfying federal requirements, does not take into account the character of the noise.
I consider two cases.

1. The toll booths are operating.

In that case, it is plausible that the noise analysis is correct, for the main impact ~~of~~ of the split interchange is to move the ~~the~~ northbound FRA ramp closer to the noise receptors on Escalpe + 52 Fuller Rd, and the southbound FRA ramp further away. ~~The~~ ~~noise~~ ~~will~~ ~~be~~ ~~50%~~ of the Thruway traffic ~~will~~ ~~be~~ ~~moved~~ much closer to the receptors, but will be moving very slowly.

But the noise analysis then ignores the particularly obnoxious and ^{engine gear} ^{inherent} sounds of heavy trucks accelerating away from the toll booths ~~at~~ especially late at night. It seems to me that the annoyance ^{would be} ~~is~~ ~~due~~ ~~to~~ the relatively constant drone of ~~the~~ ~~relative~~ noise of a 55 mph vehicle ~~is~~ ~~less~~ ~~obnoxious~~ ^{hyper} than the irregular ~~noise~~ ~~of~~ ~~accelerating~~ trucks.

But in 1996 the Thruway is supposed to be one toll free. In that ~~event~~ ^{event} in 2005 there will be no toll booths. In that case, I don't believe the noise analysis. For then, half a more of the traffic which would be

~~For~~ ~~the~~ ~~switch~~ ~~of~~ ~~Thruway~~ ~~traffic~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~Northway~~ ~~-FRA~~ ~~appears~~ ~~likely~~ ~~to~~ ~~increase~~ ~~its~~ ~~noise~~ ~~effect~~ ~~on~~ ~~Escalpe~~ ~~by~~ ~~5~~ ~~or~~ ~~6~~ ~~dBa~~ on the Thruway with the single Ω , will be on the Northway-FRA with the split Ω , and will be proceeding at full speed.

The effect of moving all this Thruway traffic onto the Northway/FRA would appear to increase the ~~effect~~ the noise effect of that traffic on the Essex Park receptor by 5-6 dBA, and on 52 Providence St. by 8 or 9 dBA. The only way this could not significantly increase noise inputs on those receptors is if the Thruway noise is presently insignificant relative to the FRA noise. And that I don't believe.

In short, the noise analysis appears to have been done assuming the full booth effect, ~~which is Δ inappropriate~~ ~~is inappropriate~~. If so, the noise analysis is particularly inappropriate, for the benefits of the split Δ are ~~most strong~~ most strong assuming ~~at toll-free conditions~~ toll-free conditions; the ^{noise} inputs should also be analyzed under the same conditions.

In short, from the point of view of minimizing local inputs of noise, air pollution and ~~and~~ ~~and~~ aesthetic/social impact, the single Δ ^{Alt 2} is preferable to the split Δ . Alt 4.

A final comment. In the event the split Δ is chosen, the plans call for a reconstruction of the SHR bridge over the Thruway. ~~the~~ Please be sure that bridge includes space for pedestrians.

The ~~prob~~ prob X6 state of 20 will be so inappropriate for
bicycles that the STAR bridge ^{may} be the only ~~structure~~
reasonable route for bicycles between Met & Westmead, of
the work. School. It would be very desirable for the STAR bridge
to be designed so that bicycles might use that bridge ⁱⁿ safety.

Thank you.