Allan H. Treman Marina). The second was a parcel inside the City, southwest of Southwest Park. The third was an adjacent parcel in the Town of Ithaca, also southwest of Southwest Park.

The choice of the “Festival Lands” as substitute park land was a big error, for both practical and political reasons. As a practical matter, the City already owned the “Festival Lands,” and City-owned land was not eligible for substitution. As a political matter, some Ithacans felt the “Festival Lands” had already attained park status, because of their use as park for some fifteen years. The City was accused of identifying “new” park land that already was park land.

To rectify this, the City asked the State legislature to amend Chapter 757, so five Six Mile Creek parcels would replace the “Festival Lands” as substitute park land. In the summer of 1988, Assemblyman McNeil and Senator Seward introduced a bill intended to accomplish this. The Senate passed the bill, but the Assembly’s Cities Committee “lost” it. The bill was reintroduced by Assemblyman Luster and Senator Seward in 1989, but — since Common Council never sent a “home rule message” asking its adoption — the bill died again. No subsequent amendment attempts were made.

Which is just as well. Chapter 757 had a bigger flaw — one the amendment would not have touched.

As it turns out, the entire structure of Chapter 757 was faulty. The law amalgamated two different legal procedures which must remain distinct. Removing park status from Southwest Park requires only alienation, a State procedure. The Inlet Island land, though, involved federal Land and Water Conservation Fund money. Removing park status from such land requires both alienation, a State procedure, and conversion, a federal procedure. The federal conversion process requires a precise one-to-one linkage between the federally-funded land to lose park status and its specific substitute. The indiscriminate “pool” of substitute parcels listed in Chapter 757, therefore, rendered the law useless from the outset.

So this is a good time for fresh beginnings.

Opportunities.

The State’s 1989 selection of a specific Route 96 plan, ending forty years of uncertainty about the project’s scope, has permitted the beginning of constructive planning to solve Inlet Island’s problems. Finally, it is possible for the Island to reach its full potential, for it to become one of the City’s most beautiful and visited places.

On August 1, 1990, Common Council voted to establish the Inlet Island Land Use Committee, charging it with recommending

FIGURE 10. This is the “Design Development” drawing from the 1983 Final Report: Cayuga Inlet and Island Projects. Proposed development north of Buffalo Street and the Station Restaurant includes a hotel, condominium units, and new stores. Some marina activities and the Coast Guard Auxiliary remain in place. A public promenade with picturesque curving paths extends along the Eelod Channel north from Buffalo Street all the way to a small park at the Island’s tip. The trails also continue south of Buffalo and State Street across a rebuilt railroad bridge (next to the existing Brindley Street bridge) to a “natural park” with many looping paths. As the far left, west to Six Mile Creek and separated by water from the “natural park,” is a proposed “positive recreation” park. This is one of the substitute park land parcels suggested in Chapter VII.
"...a conceptual Inlet Island land use plan which combines public land (including some park land) and private land (including some commercial land) in a compatible and mutually-beneficial manner. The committee should consider, where it seems reasonable and appropriate, whether certain areas now designated as park land should be alienated/converted to other appropriate uses, and whether other areas now privately owned should become park land.

The committee's goal should be to foster an attractive and unifying waterfront atmosphere that will simultaneously benefit the city park system and Inlet Island commercial areas. If the committee recommends the alienation/conversion of any current Inlet Island park land, the committee should recommend a specific location for substitute park land, whether this be on Inlet Island or elsewhere in the city."
CHAPTER V:
Proposed Land Use Plan for Inlet Island.

Some general principles guided development of the Inlet Island Land Use Plan, described in this chapter. The committee sought:

- To make the complicated, simple; and the confusing, clear.
- To distribute land uses and arrange property boundaries so both reflect the true shape and "feel" of the Island.
- To encourage visitors to perceive and experience the Island as a whole, and to give the Island a unifying sense of place.
- To recognize the waterfront's special character.
- To increase the internal coherency of both green spaces and commercial areas.
- To remove existing conflicts between public green spaces and private commercial areas, so each complements and supports the other.

Map #8 illustrates the proposed Inlet Island Land Use Plan. It is conceived as a long-range plan, with some aspects to be implemented soon, and other elements to be implemented over a longer period.

A description of the plan's principal elements follows. Chapter VI will then present in detail the procedural actions required for implementation.

Expanded Brindley Park.

The plan proposes that a simple system of linked green spaces organize the west side of Inlet Island. This system would contain two small waterfront parks, one to the south and one to the north, with a greenway corridor linking them.24 The small park on the south would be called "Brindley Park," but the name would cover an area much larger than the original Brindley Park. The renamed park would contain: (1) the portion of original Brindley Park not taken for the Route 96 project; (2) part of Williams Playground; (3) some former street rights-of-way; and
(4) a portion of the 1967 Cass Park purchase. Compare the area labeled “(Expanded) Brindley Park” on Map #8 with Map #9. The reuse of the name “Brindley Park” would be in memory of the community center demolished to make way for the Flood Control Channel. The original Brindley Park’s roofed drinking fountain would be restored and featured in the renamed park.

Several considerations suggest the presence of a small park here. As part of the proposed Park-to-Corridor-to-Park system, the “expanded” Brindley Park would help lend logic and coherence to the west side of Inlet Island. Unlike much Island park land, furthermore, the original Brindley Park and Williams Playground have been parks for over half a century. It seems fitting to preserve these gifts to the City from the Williams family — especially since so much land this family donated to the old Inlet neighborhood is now under water or under highway pavement. Finally, the new park boundaries would be defined on three sides by attractive existing landmarks. To the west would be the Flood Control Channel, to the south the old drinking fountain, and to the east the Station Restaurant’s train, complete with engine, cars and cabooses.

Look-Out Point.

The north terminus of the Park-to-Corridor-to-Park sequence would be the north tip of Inlet Island, which would be opened to public access (“Look-Out Point” on Map #8). The Coast Guard Auxiliary’s long-standing access to this area would also continue.

The tip of the Island offers splendid views in several directions. To the west is Cass Park, with joggers on its lakeside trail. To the east stand the boathouses of Cornell and Ithaca College, from which shells emerge to race the Flood Control Channel. To the north, water and trees stretch far into the distance. So the relatively enclosed Brindley Park on the south would have as its pendant this visually expansive park to the north.

Dual permits from the N.Y.S. D.o.T. would allow this symbiotic use of the Island’s tip by both the City (for use as a public look-out) and the Coast Guard Auxiliary (for its traditional functions). At a January 23, 1991 meeting between D.o.T. staff members and the Inlet Island Land Use Committee, Jamie Marino of the D.o.T. Waterways Maintenance Division affirmed that dual permits are possible, provided the two applicants agree to the joint use. From the D.o.T.’s perspective, Marino added, using the tip for park purposes would be “ideal.” This use would be a “public benefit,” like the “public benefit” the Coast Guard Auxiliary provides.

To date, the Coast Guard Auxiliary has opposed the idea of dual permits. A chief concern of the auxiliary is that such dual permits could subject the auxiliary’s corporation to increased liability. This is a valid concern. In fairness, though, it should be noted that the auxiliary now uses City-owned land (a portion of the Old Taughannock Boulevard right-of-way, over which the auxiliary floating dock passes). This could subject the City to liability. It is hoped that future negotiations with the Coast Guard Auxiliary will result in a mutually-beneficial agreement that provides for dual permits and that fairly addresses both parties’ liability concerns.

Other waterfront cities have successfully combined Coast Guard activities and waterside parks. For example, the September 1989 issue of Planning magazine features a photograph and article about a newly-developed waterfront area in Wilmington, North Carolina. Here, “a U.S. Coast Guard dock forms the backdrop to a new riverfront park.”

‘Williams Walk’ Greenway Corridor.

A greenway corridor with a paved path would link these companion parks. The corridor would begin in the renamed Brindley Park, and lead all the way to Look-Out Point. The waterside path would be called the “Williams Walk,” in acknowledgement of the Williams family’s generosity. This generosity has been undeservedly forgotten, as physical evidence of it has disappeared.

A vital element of the greenway corridor would be a pedestrian underpass beneath the new Route 89 bridge, where it leaves the west side of the Island.

This pedestrian underpass would decisively link what the
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obstructive Route 89 ramp threatens to divide. Because of its linking function, the greenway corridor would be much more than a pleasant amenity — it would be an essential connection encouraging visitors to experience, and to think of, Inlet Island as a whole. As it entices visitors to explore the Island from end to end, the greenway corridor would provide delightful recreation, and simultaneously benefit Inlet Island businesses.

The preliminary design for the Route 89 bridge does not provide such a pedestrian underpass on the Inlet Island side. It does, however, provide an underpass for the bike and pedestrian trail on the west side of the channel. In response to questions from the Inlet Island Land Use Committee, D.O.T. Regional Design Engineer Richard A. Lucas wrote that "Based on a cursory review of the Route 89 bridge alignment drawings, it appears a vertical clearance of 8'4" may be available on the west shore of Inlet Island beneath the bridge."23 In other words, though he can offer no guarantee, it appears to Mr. Lucas that an Inlet Island pedestrian underpass is feasible. A final determination would not be known until final bridge design begins.

The Inlet Island greenway corridor would consist of three segments:

The first and widest segment would proceed north from renamed Brindley Park along the Flood Control Channel to a point just south of the Coast Guard Auxiliary building. This segment, colored yellow-green on Map #8, would be about sixty feet wide. This would include the forty foot (or so) band of land subject to the Flood Control Channel easement, and an additional twenty feet east of the easement line.

The D.E.C. will not allow vertical structures or plantings on land subject to the easement. On Inlet Island, the easement applies west of the easement line. So the twenty feet of greenway corridor east of the line would allow the planting of trees and the placement of benches and lighting near the Williams Walk path. It is hoped the City will provide such amenities in future years, when budgets allow.24

This first corridor segment would be preserved as green space under City ownership, but would not be designated as park land. This would make it possible — in the future — for one or more privately-developed lagoons or mooring basins, with water access to the Flood Control Channel, to be established on the interior of the Island. Since access to any such basin(s) would be through City owned land, the City would be in a position to ensure that the Williams Walk would continue around the periphery of any such basin, so as to maintain the integrity of the overall greenway corridor.

To complete this corridor segment, the City would have to purchase part of a privately-owned parcel that now extends into the easement area (and into the channel itself).

The second, and shortest segment of the greenway corridor would be south of the Coast Guard Auxiliary building. Here, the corridor would head east, extending from the channel to Old Taughannock Boulevard. The purpose of this eastward turn, away from the water, is to bypass the area used most intensively by the Coast Guard Auxiliary.

This second segment is colored green on Map #8. Its present status as a portion of the 1967 Cass Park purchase would continue. The corridor here would be about fifty-five feet wide, providing room for both the paved Williams Walk and for a possible small parking area for park users.

Note: Before the City could use this segment for the greenway corridor, it would have to remove a concrete dike within which four petroleum tanks once stood. Also, the ground here would have to be tested for contamination by petroleum products. The City, as property owner, has an obligation to deal with this issue anyway, sooner or later, no matter what it does with the land.

The third segment of the greenway corridor is a narrow twelve-foot wide path that would bring the Williams Walk all the way to the Island’s tip (Look-Out Point). It would pass over both City-owned and privately-owned land, and would not be considered park land. Where appropriate, fencing would be used to keep people using the corridor from straying onto land used by either the Coast}

---

25. From a February 28, 1991 letter to John Schroeder by Richard A. Lucas, Regional Design Engineer, Syracuse office of the N.Y.S. Department of Transportation (written on behalf of Richard Simberg, Regional Director of Transportation at the Syracuse office).

26. A design vocabulary for such improvements could be derived from old Lehigh Valley Railroad Company hardware stored behind the Station Restaurant. Relevant stored items include decorative metal bench supports.
Guard Auxiliary or the Ithaca Boating Center. The precise character of this third segment is described in Chapter VI, under the heading 'Note A' Through 'Note D.'

The entire proposed Inlet Island greenway corridor would—in its very linearity—recall the linear land and water transportation routes that have characterized one hundred and fifty years of Inlet Island history.

**Inlet Island’s ‘Entry.’**

An inviting "entry" to Inlet Island off Buffalo Street is essential for successful public and private use of the Island. The Inlet Island Land Use Plan proposes two measures here to mitigate negative impacts to drivers and pedestrians when Taughannock Boulevard is widened and Route 89 traffic begins whizzing by.

First, a long-term project is proposed to improve Inlet Island's street-side sidewalks and lighting (see below). This project would include improvements to the east side of Taughannock Boulevard, as it heads north from Buffalo Street.

Second, a twelve-foot wide City-owned "curb lawn" would be provided all along the west side of the reconstructed Route 89, from Buffalo Street to the channel. This green strip—shown in yellow-green with a green dashed line on Map #8—would feature a paved path, lawn and plantings. It would provide physical, visual and psychological "breathing space" next to the busy highway, and would augment any unpaved City and State highway land. As with a curb lawn, full driveway access would be provided as needed to private parcels on the west.

This linear buffer zone of grass and plantings would greatly improve the appearance of Taughannock Boulevard where it joins Buffalo Street. It would also provide direct pedestrian access to both the Williams Walk and the Route 89 bridge.

The recent controversy about proposed sidewalks on Elmira Road has demonstrated the wisdom of reserving an adequately broad pedestrian corridor along major highways before development close to the highway occurs. Safety requires that sidewalks along highways be set well back from on-rushing traffic. This time, the City should plan ahead.

**Sidewalk, Lighting and Street Improvements.**

In addition to planning for green space improvements, the City should adopt a long-range plan to improve sidewalks and lighting on Inlet Island. Suggested locations for improved urban street-side sidewalks with lighting are indicated by the brown dashed lines on Map #8. (Of the suggested new sidewalks, some will be provided by the State as part of the Route 96 project.)

Furthermore, the City should plan to install curbing and fresh pavement on the dead-end portion of Old Taughannock Boulevard that will remain after the new Route 89 alignment is built. The State project will not touch most of this street.

The new greenway paths and urban street-side sidewalks are intended to work together as a system, so visitors will experience Inlet Island as a pleasing and coherent whole. Pedestrians will stroll easily between the Island’s “green” and “urban” areas, each a natural complement to the other. The whole Inlet Island pedestrian system is characterized by interconnecting loops, providing visitors with a wide variety of walking experiences—even during a single visit to the Island.

**New Areas for Private Development.**

The Inlet Island Land Use Plan proposes alienation and conversion from park status of substantial portions of the 1967 Cass Park purchase.

Some of the discontinued park land (along the Island’s west edge and along the west edge of the realigned Route 89) would be reserved as City green space. But most of the former park land would be sold, leased or licensed to the private sector. Several reasons exist for allowing more private development on Inlet Island:

(1) Increased marine-oriented commercial and residential dep-
Development on the Island has been recommended repeatedly over a twenty-year span by various planning reports, including 1971's Ithaca, N.Y.: A General Plan, the 1974 Cayuga Inlet Study, the 1976 Ithaca Waterways Study, and 1982's Final Report: Cayuga Inlet and Island Project.

(2) Large stretches of Ithaca's waterfront are already publicly or institutionally owned. Little land, therefore, remains for private waterfront development. Successful urban waterfronts maintain a healthy balance between public parks, on the one hand, and privately-owned waterside restaurants, shops and housing, on the other. Ithaca has much of the former, but little of the latter.

(3) Smaller, well-coordinated Inlet Island green spaces will probably be used by more people than park land that — though larger in aggregate — has been chopped into separate, irrationally-shaped pieces by a new highway.

(4) Additional private development is needed to support Inlet Island's park land by giving it a special marine context and purpose. Cass Park already provides a large stretch of open natural park just across the Flood Control Channel, and so Inlet Island's green spaces will benefit from playing a different role — that of waterfront promenade in a more urbanized setting. The neglected, functionless appearance of some current Inlet Island park land serves no one's interests.

A comparison of Map #8 with Map #6 clarifies exactly which areas would be opened to private use.

The Inlet Island Land Use Committee envisions mixed use private development (commercial, retail, housing) that is water-enhanced or water-dependent, and that takes fullest possible advantage of Inlet Island's special waterfront location. The possibility of establishing one or more lagoons or mooring basins on the Island's interior should encourage imaginative and creative development proposals.

The City could promote private development that makes full and attractive use of the Island's potential by becoming an active pro-development ally of the private sector. Such partnerships have resulted in some of the most beautifully developed urban water-fronts in America (Baltimore's Inner Harbor being one example among many). As a major Inlet Island land owner, the City would be in an ideal position to play such a role.

To further encourage appropriate development, Common Council may wish to modify slightly the current description of the M-1 zoning district, which applies to Inlet Island. The committee suggests that "warehouse storage facilities" be removed as a permitted use in M-1, as such warehouses would waste waterfront potential. We also discussed, but reached no consensus, on whether the maximum building height in M-1 should be lowered from 70 to 50 feet for residential, hotel, motel and boating uses (the maximum for all other uses is 35 feet). We leave this issue to Common Council. For reference, the Lehigh Valley House, which appears rather tall in Inlet Island's context, rises about 35 feet.

Note: In the early 1970s, the Ithaca Garden Club beautified the banks of the new Flood Control Channel with donated flowering crabapple trees. One grove of these trees stands on Inlet Island. A boulder with plaque dedicates these trees to "the presidents and members of the Ithaca Garden Club during its first fifty years." Under the Inlet Island Land Use Plan, most of this grove (and the commemorative boulder) would remain in protected green areas. A smaller portion of the grove, though, would be on land slated for private use. Any commemorative trees to be displaced by private development should be carefully replanted elsewhere on the Island.

Recommendations to State Agencies.

In addition to taking the necessary steps to implement the Inlet Island Land Use Plan described above, Common Council should formally recommend the following actions to the N.Y.S. Department of Transportation and the N.Y.S. Department of Environmental Conservation:

* Recommendation 1:
The City should ask the N.Y.S. D.o.T. to coordinate its final
Route 96 project design with relevant aspects of the Inlet Island Land Use Plan.

Particularly relevant here will be sidewalk connections and planting plans on project rights-of-way.

- Recommendation 2:
The City should strongly express its wish that the D.o.T. provide a pedestrian underpass on the east side of the Flood Control Channel beneath the new Route 89 bridge.

The more forceful the City is about this, the more likely it is to happen.

- Recommendation 3:
The City should request the D.o.T. to provide sidewalks on both sides of both the new Buffalo Street Route 96 bridge and the new Route 89 alignment bridge. If possible, bridge lighting should also be provided to increase pedestrian and driver safety.

In a written response to questions from the Inlet Island Land Use Committee, Richard Lucas stated that sidewalks will be provided on both sides of the Route 89 bridge.\(^\text{27}\) However, since the preliminary bridge design shows only one sidewalk on the bridge's north side, the City should not take this for granted.

- Recommendation 4:
The City should ask the D.o.T. to accommodate bicyclists on both new bridges. If separate bike lanes are not possible, then widened traffic lanes should be provided for bicycle safety.

Bicyclists will use both new bridges.
But safety for bicyclists will be especially important on the new Route 89 bridge, because the new alignment will become an attractive "shortcut" for bicyclists traveling between downtown and Cass Park.

The width of the new bridges is restricted by the State's need to avoid taking more park land. However, within this constraint,

Mr. Lucas has said the State will do its best to provide extra lane width, especially on the new bridges, for bicycle safety.

- Recommendation 5:
The City should request formal input into the design process for the new bridges, to ensure that they are outwardly attractive and that they offer pleasing and unobstructed views to motorists and pedestrians passing over them.

The State appears willing to cooperate here.

- Recommendation 6:
In preliminary designs, the rebuilt Buffalo Street and Taughannock Boulevard are very close to several Inlet Island stores. The City should ask the D.o.T. to provide as much sidewalk width as possible here, to buffer stores and pedestrians from traffic.

Inlet Island's "entry" should feature thriving stores and sidewalks wide and safe enough to attract people onto the Island.

- Recommendation 7:
The City should ask the D.o.T. to ensure preservation of the Brindley Park water fountain during Route 96 construction.

The last physical remnant of the old Inlet community center complex should be preserved. Eventually, the fountain should be restored as a working drinking fountain, in accordance with the City's 1927 agreement with Augusta H. Williams.

- Recommendation 8:
The City should urge the N.Y.S. Department of Environmental Conservation to take effective measures to stabilize the Flood Control Channel's east and west banks, which have been suffering severe erosion over the past twenty years.

In places, up to eight feet of the west edge of Inlet Island has been lost to erosion since the original digging of the Flood Control Channel. This is a serious rate of loss. Heavily undercut sod hangs
all along this shore, and the earth bank reveals buried objects, proving that the process continues (Figure 20). Measures to prevent further erosion should be taken as soon as possible.

**Potential Funding Sources.**

Two New York State programs offer matching grants which could fund future design studies or green space improvements on Inlet Island:

(1) The Architecture, Planning and Design Program of the New York State Council on the Arts offers matching grants for "Urban Design and Planning" projects. Eligible projects "focus on creative design and planning for hamlets, villages and cities," and "may be part of broader analysis addressing the economic benefits of downtown revitalization or waterfront development."

(2) The N.Y.S. Department of Economic Development (in consultation with the N.Y.S. D.o.T.) offers matching grants to fund community improvement projects related to the Barge Canal system. The proposed Inlet Island greenway corridor improvements (path, lighting, benches) may be eligible for this funding.

*FIGURE 20. Erosion continues to nibble away at the west shore of Inlet Island.*

INLET ISLAND LAND USE COMMITTEE
CHAPTER VI:
Implementation Mechanics.

UNDER THE INLET ISLAND LAND USE PLAN, nine parcels would undergo a change of ownership or park status. These parcels — “Parcel 1” through “Parcel 9” — are labeled on Map #9.

Parcels Whose Status Would Change.

- PARCEL 1.

  Current Status: Part of parcel owned by Mark Zaharis.

  Proposed Status: To be acquired by City of Ithaca to provide a narrow twelve-foot wide green zone (much like a broad landscaped curb lawn with path) along Taughannock Boulevard/Route 89. This green strip would help provide an attractive vehicular and pedestrian entry point onto the Island. It would also provide a sidewalk that is buffered from on-rushing traffic. Curb cuts (as allowed by the State) would cross this area as necessary to provide access to adjacent privately-owned land.

- PARCEL 2, PARCEL 4 and PARCEL 7.

  Current Status: City of Ithaca park land (a portion of the 1967 Cass Park purchase, involving federal funding).

  Proposed Status: Remove park status through alienation and conversion process, and sell, lease or license to private sector. Replacement park land to be provided elsewhere in the City.

- PARCEL 3 and PARCEL 5.

  Current Status: City of Ithaca park land (a portion of the 1967 Cass Park purchase, involving federal funding).

  Proposed Status: Maintain City ownership to provide essential links in the proposed Inlet Island greenway corridor and pedestrian path system. (Included would be both the Williams Walk and the path along the new Route 89 alignment’s west edge.) The parcels would be preserved as green space, but their park status would be removed through the alienation and conversion process. The latter
step would allow curb cuts into “Parcel 2” from Taughannock Boulevard (as allowed by the State). It would also allow the potential for boat access into a possible privately-developed lagoon or mooring basin within “Parcel 2.” The Williams Walk would follow the periphery of any such basin. Replacement park land to be provided elsewhere within the City.

- **PARCEL 6.**

  **Current Status:** Part of parcel owned by Joseph Ciaschi. Most of the area shown is subject to the Permanent Flood Control Channel Easement. However, a twenty-foot strip is located east of the permanent easement line and is not subject to the easement restrictions.

  **Proposed Status:** To be acquired by City of Ithaca as an essential link in the Inlet Island greenway corridor, with its Williams Walk path. This parcel would be preserved as green space, but it would not be given park status, so as to allow the potential for boat access into a possible privately-developed lagoon or mooring basin to the east. The Williams Walk would follow the periphery of any such basin.

- **PARCEL 8 and PARCEL 9.**

  **Current Status:** “Parcel 8” is City of Ithaca park land (a portion of the 1967 Cass Park purchase, involving federal funding). “Parcel 9” is part of the current Taughannock Boulevard right-of-way, owned by the City of Ithaca.

  **Proposed Status:** “Parcel 8” should be alienated and converted from park status, because it is a tiny “remainder” parcel. The ultimate disposition of these two parcels should include provision for a straight section of north-south sidewalk along the east edge of the old Taughannock Boulevard right-of-way. These two parcels could be sold, leased or licensed to the private sector. Alternatively, it might be possible for the City to provide some parking in this area to replace parking possibilities lost along Taughannock Boulevard when it is realigned and widened.

**Note A** Through **Note D.**

References to “Note A” through “Note D” appear on Map #9.

- **NOTE A.**

  **Current Status:** Part of City of Ithaca Taughannock Boulevard right-of-way.

  **Proposed Status:** A twelve-foot wide strip would be dedicated to the Inlet Island greenway corridor, allowing the paved Williams Walk to pass through. For pedestrian safety, curbing would separate this corridor from the paved portion of Old Taughannock Boulevard. A curb cut would be provided to allow vehicular access to the Coast Guard Auxiliary parking area to the west.

- **NOTE B.**

  **Current Status:** Part of an abandoned section of Taughannock Boulevard that the City of Ithaca has licensed to the Ithaca Boating Center, owned by Peter DeGraff. (The original license was given to Inlet Park Marina, a predecessor of the Ithaca Boating Center.) This license is revocable by either party on thirty days’ notice.

  **Proposed Status:** A twelve-foot wide section of this parcel would be dedicated to the Inlet Island greenway corridor, allowing the paved Williams Walk to pass through. The rest of the parcel would continue to be licensed to the Ithaca Boating Center. Fencing would be provided on either side of this corridor segment. This would clearly define the corridor and prevent trespass onto areas used by the Coast Guard Auxiliary or the Ithaca Boating Center.

- **NOTE C.**

  **Current Status:** Part of parcel owned by Peter DeGraff.
**Proposed Status:** The land would continue to be owned by Mr. DeGraff, but he would graciously allow the Inlet Island greenway corridor (with the Williams Walk) to pass through a twelve-foot wide strip. Fencing would define this corridor and prevent any one from straying into areas used by the Coast Guard Auxiliary or the Ithaca Boating Center.

- **NOTE D.**

**Current Status:** Owned by the N.Y.S. Department of Transportation as part of the New York State Barge Canal system. The area is licensed to U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla 2-2.

**Proposed Status:** Dual permits would be granted for the use of this land. One permit would go to the Coast Guard Auxiliary for its traditional activities, and the other would go to the City for a public park-like look-out. See details in Chapter V.
CHAPTER VII:
Proposals for Substitute Park Land.

WHEN A MUNICIPALITY SEeks federal approval for “unparking” federally-funded park land, it must substitute new park land “of at least equal fair market value and of reasonably equivalent usefulness and location.” Chapter II presents details about the alienation and conversion process.

Under the Inlet Island Land Use Plan, approximately 180,000 square feet (about 4.13 acres) of federally-funded park land would be alienated and converted from park use. Most of this land (Parcels 2, 4, 7 and 8 on Map #9) would be used by the private sector, but some of it (Parcels 3 and 5) would be reserved by the City for green corridors.

It is difficult to predict the “fair market value” of the land proposed for alienation and conversion, for several reasons. First, while most of this land is east of the Permanent Flood Control Easement line, and hence developable, some is west of the line, and not developable. Second, current assessed values of Inlet Island land vary dramatically, from as low as $1.72 to as high as $10.02 per square foot, with more typical figures ranging between $3 and $4 per square foot. Finally, no available figures reflect the impending impact of the Route 96 project, which may increase the monetary value of certain areas and decrease that of others.

Uncertainty about the monetary value of land to be alienated and converted is matched by uncertainty about the current value of any land proposed for substitution. The committee felt it fruitless, because of these unknowns, to attempt precise delineation of substitute park land parcels. Instead, the committee ranked its top three general preferences for locating substitute land. The precise package of substitute park land must await appraisal of relevant parcels.

The committee considered seven possible substitute park land sites, all on a waterfront or along a stream. In addition to the three locations ultimately preferred (discussed in detail below), these possible sites included: a corridor providing access into the Six Mile Creek Gorge from the central business district, land near Ithaca Falls, land outside the City in the Six Mile Creek watershed, and land now occupied by the Cornell Field Station, north of the Newman Municipal Golf Course.

Two clear themes developed as these possible locations were discussed. First, some committee members strongly preferred finding substitute park land within the City. This preference
29. The bridge was designed by the Cornell Student Chapter of the American Society of Civil Engineers, working in cooperation with the City of Ithaca. This organization would be a likely candidate to design the proposed pedestrian bridge at point "F" on Figure 21.

30. The Conservation Advisory Council recommended such a path and bridge in a resolution it forwarded to Common Council. At its February 6, 1991 meeting, Council referred the proposed resolution to its Planning and Development Committee. The committee discussed the resolution once, but the idea has progressed no further.

eliminated the Six Mile Creek valley outside city limits. Second, many committee members felt the substitute park land should be located along or near the Cayuga Inlet, like the land being “unparked.” Locations meeting these criteria, therefore, were favored over the others.

Ultimately the committee chose the following as its three preferred substitute park land locations. All three would help create green spaces or green corridors with clear relationships to, and close connections with, Inlet Island.

First Preference.

First preference consists of the blue areas shown on Figure 21 (including the blue dashes, representing thin linear paths). The blue areas are part of a path system that would link the Farmers' Market, as well as the golf course and Stewart Park, to Buffalo Street and Inlet Island. This system itself is part of an even broader network of pedestrian paths that are planned — or, in places, already exist — along Ithaca's waterfront.

Figure 21 illustrates the full network of existing or proposed pedestrian paths. The paths are indicated by black dashes, blue dashes and the two narrow blue wooded areas. In places, the paths are intended for bicyclists as well as pedestrians. A description of some non-park paths shown on Figure 21 will precede a description of the blue areas suggested for park acquisition.

Path segment “B,” as labeled on Figure 21, already exists. It connects the Farmers' Market to a new pedestrian bridge (off the map, below the arrow at “A”). The bridge links the Farmers' Market with downtown neighborhoods, with the golf course and — ultimately — with Stewart Park. Path segment “C” is an existing walk through the Farmers' Market parking area.

Path segment “D,” though, does not yet exist. This waterside walk would connect the Farmers' Market to a proposed pedestrian bridge at point “F.” The path would run along a thin strip of N.Y.S. D.o.T. Barge Canal land. Path construction, therefore, would require approval by the D.o.T.'s Waterways Maintenance Division. (The cluster of buildings east of path “D” are also owned by the D.o.T., but are separately administered by its highway division.)

This brings us to the blue-colored areas which — in sum — constitute the top substitute park land preference.

The long, narrow marshy/shrubby/woody strip labeled “E” (and including point “F”) is part of the original course of the Cayuga Inlet. This old waterway — now owned by the D.o.T.'s highway division — has been largely filled in. The parcel's development potential is limited by its history as a stream bed. The new Ithaca Area Wastewater Treatment Facility was built just northeast on another part of the old Inlet stream bed, and its construction required pilings to be driven into the muddy earth for an entire summer.

Acquisition of this strip as park land would allow the City to build a new path connecting path “C” to point “F.” It would also allow the City to build a pedestrian bridge over the marshy ditch separating proposed path “D” from the point where the letter “F” appears on the map.

Also suggested for park acquisition is the thin path segment labeled “G,” which would connect point “F” to the waterfront woods labeled “H.” This path segment is indicated by blue dashes on the map. It would be thin, maybe only twelve feet wide, and would run first on the west side and then on the east side of Third Street Extension. No portion of the street itself, of course, would have park status. Full access must be maintained to the Cornell boathouse, the Ithaca College boathouse and a nearby privately-owned building.

The woods labeled “H” are also suggested for park acquisition. The railroad tracks come quite close to the Cayuga Inlet at this point. The remaining land is narrow, and a sloping bank runs through it. Both factors limit its development potential. Furthermore, the 1976 Ithaca Waterways Study suggested placing a green buffer zone here, to shield Inlet Island from the “industrial-commercial uses” east of the tracks.

The final element suggested for park status is the thin path segment labeled “I,” also indicated by blue dashes. Like segment “G,” it would be quite thin, perhaps twelve feet wide. Non-park access points would be provided to the prime development land
located between path "I" and the Inlet.
Path segment "J" would provide the final link to Buffalo Street (and, via Buffalo Street, to Inlet Island). Path segment "I" could potentially follow three different routes, pending further study. It would not have park designation, due to its proximity to private functions.

Second Preference.

Second choice for substitute land is the area colored green and labeled "O" on Figure 21. This tree-covered land is part of the lagoon-like area of water and woods south of the State Street bridge over the Cayuga Inlet. Five beautiful "fingers" of water converge

FIGURE 21. The map shows existing and proposed pedestrian paths in the Inlet Island vicinity. Some of these routes are intended for bicycles, as well. The paths "proposed" greatly outnumber those "existing." The blue areas constitute the first preference, and the green area the second choice, for new park land to substitute for park to be alienated and converted under the Inlet Island Land Use Plan.
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31. This City-owned land was part of a four parcel March 6, 1967 City purchase from the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company. One of these four parcels was the 1967 Cass Park purchase, funded in part by federal Land and Water Conservation Fund monies, according to a December 18, 1967 agreement. The question arises: Did the December 18 agreement apply this federal funding to the other three parcels bought on March 6, as well? If so, they, too, are rigidly restricted to park use by federal regulations. In a December 26, 1991 conversation with John Schroeder, Roberts Gosset (Regional Program Specialist for the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation) stated that, to the best of his knowledge, Land and Water Conservation Fund monies were not applied to the other three parcels, all of which are south of State Street. He could not state this, however, with absolute certainty.

32. See Item 18.4 in the minutes of the February 6, 1991 Common Council meeting.

**FIGURE 22.** The yellow vertically-striped area is the third preference for park land to substitute for park to be alienated and conveyed under the Inlet Island Land Use Plan. The diagonally-striped areas have already been chosen as substitute park land for the NYS D.O.T.’s Route 96 project park takings. In the midst of both striped areas is one parcel (in white) already owned by the City, and a second parcel (also white) over which the City will obtain an easement. The easement will accommodate the Cayuga Inlet Trail, and preserve a corridor for a possible future “West Hill collector road.” The letter “W” here corresponds to the same letter on Figure 21.

**Third Preference.**

Ranked third is part of a parcel owned by Reuben Weiner close to the Cayuga Inlet. The general area suggested is striped vertically and colored yellow on Figure 22. This area adjoins land, striped diagonally on Figure 22, already slated to replace Inlet Island park land that will be used for the new Route 96 project highway corridors. The two diagonally-striped areas (and an intervening parcel over which the City will hold an easement) will together provide a crucial link in the Cayuga Inlet Trail — a proposed bicycle and pedestrian path which some day will link Taughannock Falls State Park, Cass Park, Allan H. Treman State Marine Park, Buttermilk Falls State Park and Robert H.
Treman State Park.

The additional substitute park land in the yellow vertically-striped area would complement and buffer the future recreation way.

Portions of the Cayuga Inlet Trail route are illustrated on Figure 21. One trail segment already exists: the bike and foot path (labeled "P") which proceeds along the Flood Control Channel's west bank north of State Street. Segment "Q" will be a future leg, extending (as arrow "R" indicates) all the way to Taughannock Falls State Park. Another future leg ("S") will head south (as arrow "T" indicates) all the way to Buttermilk Falls and Robert H. Treman State Parks.

One can follow this last trail leg south along the Flood Control Channel from Figure 21 onto Figure 22, where the illustrated trail portion extends from the arrow at "U" to the arrow at "W." A proposed bicycle and pedestrian bridge will span the channel at location "V." The trail will pass through the two diagonally-striped areas, and pass by the yellow vertically-striped area.

After Route 96 project completion, Inlet Island will have three direct bicycle and pedestrian connections to the Cayuga Inlet Trail via the old State Street bridge and the new Route 96 and Route 89 bridges. Thus, Inlet Island will eventually have direct bike and hiking connections to all major regional state parks.

The Cherry Street Industrial Park is just north of the Weiner parcel, and both areas are zoned industrial. The Weiner parcel's northernmost portion should not become park land, since ultimately the City may wish to expand the industrial park southward.

If all the paths and connections shown on Figures 21 and 22 come into being, the City will possess one of the most comprehensive and beautiful waterfront greenway systems in the United States. Each preferred substitute park land location would help build or enhance this future greenway network. Inlet Island can become a focal point for appreciating the civic and natural beauty of the whole southern Cayuga Lake region.

**Available Funding for Substitute Park Land.**

According to Director of Planning and Development H. Matthys Van Cort, Common Council has set aside three "pots" of money which could fund substitute park land purchases:

1. A capital project for West End Development contains $78,850.00.
2. A capital project for Southwest Park Development contains $66,126.62.
3. Capital Reserve Fund No. 26 for Six Mile Creek land acquisition contains $166,000. This money could only be used, though, for substitute park land located in the Six Mile Creek valley.
Bibliography.

Previous Studies and Other Resources Relevant to Inlet Island.

Book of Aerial Photos of Ithaca

1933 A hand-made volume of annotated aerial photographs of Ithaca taken by local photographer Cervin Robinson; the book is preserved in City Hall.

Ithaca Flood Protection Project, Composite Taking Maps


Ithaca, N.Y.: A General Plan

1971 Ithaca, N.Y.: A master plan for Ithaca prepared by the City Planning Board.

Cayuga Inlet Study

1974 Ithaca, N.Y.: Inlet Island area planning strategies prepared for the City by Henk DeBakker, Charles Henkels, and other Cornell University College of Architecture, Art and Planning graduate students.

Ithaca Waterways Study

1976 Ithaca, N.Y.: A study of all City waterways and adjacent land areas — including the Cayuga Inlet and Inlet Island — prepared by the Department of Planning and Development.

Final Report: Cayuga Inlet and Island Project

1982 Ithaca, N.Y.: Analysis of existing conditions and development potential on Inlet Island and its near vicinity prepared for the City by Trowbridge-Trowbridge and Roger Trancik.
The Ithaca Journal,
"The Past Regained: A Neighborhood's Small-Scale Revival"

1986 Ithaca, N.Y.: A May 14 article discussing reaction to the West End model built by David Fogel; the model shows how the West End appeared prior to construction of the Flood Control Channel.

An Analysis and Evaluation of Octopus / Route 96 Alternative Plans


Ithaca's Neighborhoods: The Rhine, the Hill and the Goose Pasture

1988 Ithaca, N.Y.: Edited by Carol U. Sisler, Margaret Hobbs and Jane Marsh Dieckmann; published by DeWitt Historical Society of Tompkins County.

Transportation Project Report:
Design Report / Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation, Route 96 Improvement


Visual Resources Assessment, Route 96, Ithaca, N.Y.

1988 Albany, N.Y.: Prepared for the N.Y.S. Department of Transportation by Young Associates of Greene, N.Y.

Guide to the Alienation or Conversion of Municipal Parklands

Appendix A.

Permanent Flood Control Channel Easement: The Language of the Restrictions.

The Existing Perpetual Easement for Flood Control Purposes On Various Inlet Island Properties Reads as Follows:

A permanent easement for the rights to construct, reconstruct, maintain and operate thereon, (1) Levees or dikes, (2) Work Area, (3) Landscaping, and (4) Appurtenances to all structures; and including the rights to (1) Remove therefrom any or all materials excavated, cut, razed or torn down from the area described herein, or deposit any material thereon, (2) Protect the bank of improved creek and/or walls adjacent thereto, by any method deemed necessary by the owner of this easement, (3) Grade, (4) Clear and grub of trees, shrubs, brush, debris and structures, (5) Place, keep and operate machines, tools, and equipment; with the rights at all times of ingress, egress or regress by the State of New York, its assigns and/or their agents in the improvement for purposes connected with the Flood Protection Project, in and to and within the bounds of all that piece or parcel of property hereinafter designated as Parcel No. _____, situated in the City/Town of Ithaca, county of Tompkins and State of New York, as shown on the accompanying map and described as follows: ______.
Appendix B.

License for Discontinued Portion Of Old Taughannock Boulevard.

Excerpt Number One,
From Board of Public Works Proceedings, May 12, 1976:

PUBLIC HEARING -
DISCONTINUANCE OF TAUGHANNOCK BOULEVARD

Resolution to open hearing
By Comm. Schickel; seconded by Comm. Shaw
Vice Chm. Ewanicki reported as follows:

It is proposed to license Inlet Park Marina to use the discontinued portion. This license would be in exchange for the conveyance to the city by Inlet Park Marina of a portion of the bed of Cascadilla Street. The portion of Taughannock Boulevard to be discontinued is not presently used by vehicles other than those proceeding to and from Inlet Park Marina. If discontinued, the city would erect at its expense a movable barricade. No action on the discontinuance is recommended until the City Attorney indicates that he has prepared the proposed license and is ready to proceed.

No one appeared to speak at the public hearing.

Motion to close hearing
By Comm. Shaw; seconded by Comm. Schickel

RESOLVED, That the public hearing be closed. Carried

Excerpt Number Two,
From Board of Public Works Proceedings, April 27, 1977:

Discontinuance of a Portion of Taughannock Boulevard

Comm. Schickel reported that on May 12, 1976, the Board of Public Works held a hearing on the discontinuance of a portion of
Taughannock Boulevard, more particularly, the most northerly 150 feet of the Boulevard at its intersection with the Flood Control Channel. No one appeared to speak at the public hearing.

Resolution
By Comm. Schickel: Seconded by Comm. Baldini

RESOLVED, That that portion of Taughannock Boulevard, being approximately the most northerly 150 feet before its intersection with the Flood Control Channel, as more particularly shown on a map entitled ‘Portion of Taughannock Boulevard to be Discontinued[,]’ prepared by the Office of City Engineer, May 10, 1976, be discontinued.

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Mayor and City Clerk be authorized to execute a revocable license to Inlet Park Marina containing the following provisions:

1. That the City hereby grants a revocable license to the licensee to use the premises described as follows: That portion of Taughannock Boulevard northerly to the easterly permanent easement line of the flood control channel from a line which is normal to the street center line from a point of the easterly right-of-way line being a pipe set flush with the ground; said pipe being 77.1' S 16° 55' E. of a pipe set at the corner of the north property line of Inlet Park Marina and the easterly right-of-way line of Taughannock Boulevard.

2. That the city of Ithaca will erect a moveable gate at the location indicated on the attached map which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

3. That the licensee shall maintain the said premises.

4. That this license be revocable upon 30 days’ notice by either party to the other.

5. That the licensee agrees to defend and hold the City harmless from any claims arising out of the licensee’s use, occupation, or maintenance of the said premises.

Carried Unanimously
Appendix C.

Permit to Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla 2-2
For Use of D.o.T. Land at Tip of Inlet Island.

Permit No. 71-2-12

STATE OF NEW YORK
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
WATERWAYS MAINTENANCE SUBDIVISION
REVOCABLE PERMIT
Issued Pursuant to Article X of the Canal Law

Albany February 9 1971

U. S. Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla 2-2, Inc. Coast Guard Point,
WHEREAS,

hereinafter referred to as the "licensee," has made application for permission to temporarily make use of portions of Sarge Canal Parcels 6358-1, 6539 and T-21 at Cayuga Inlet Point, Ithaca, New York to beautify the area for use by the general public as shown on sketch furnished and Cayuga-Seneca Canal Residency Sheet 88.

as above on sketch furnished and Cayuga-Seneca Canal Residency Sheet 88


THEREFORE, permission is hereby granted to said licensee to temporarily make use of portions of Sarge Canal Parcels 6358-1, 6539 and T-21 at Cayuga Inlet Point, Ithaca, New York to beautify the area for use by the general public as shown on sketch furnished and Cayuga-Seneca Canal Residency Sheet 88

Inlet Island Land Use Committee

1st. This permit shall not be assigned or transferred without the written permission of the Commissioner of Transportation.

2nd. All work authorized by this permit shall be done in accordance with any maps, plans and profiles which may be on file in this office, and/or in accordance with the special and general conditions hereinafter set forth, or directions which may be given by the Commissioner of Transportation. Any
structures erected upon canal lands by right of this permit shall not be changed in any way without first receiving written permission of the Commissioner of Transportation to do so.

3d. All work authorized by this permit shall be done under the supervision of the Commissioner of Transportation or an Inspector to be appointed by him. The work shall not be commenced until such time as the officially signed copy of the permit is received by the licensee. The work shall be done at such times as the Commissioner of Transportation shall direct, so as not to interfere with the free and perfect use of the canals, or endanger the lives or property of any persons, and particularly of those engaged in requiring, operating or navigating the canal.

4b. In the event that any vessel or fixed is subjected to delay by reason of the work authorized by this permit, the licensee shall pay to the owner of such vessel or fixed so delayed, such amount as will fairly compensate each owner for the delay or loss of time occasioned to him by the operations herein authorized; and in the event that the licensee and the owner are unable to agree as to the amount of compensation to be paid for such delay the amount of such payment shall be determined by the Commissioner of Transportation. The sum fixed by him shall be binding upon and paid by the licensee to such owner. The Inspector appointed by the Commissioner of Transportation pursuant to the third paragraph of this permit, shall ascertain whether or not any boats have been delayed by the work herein authorized, and shall determine the extent of the damages suffered, and shall report such facts to the Commissioner of Transportation, for his final determination.

5th. Any and all canal banks or other structures which may be disturbed or interfered with during the progress of the work shall be restored to a perfect condition by the licensee at his own cost and expense.

6b. Except as they are specifically modified herein, the rules and regulations governing navigation and use of the New York State Barge Canal System, are hereby made a part of this permit.

SPECIAL SPECIFICATIONS AND CONDITIONS

(a) The work of beautification shall not be done without the consent of the Commissioner of Transportation or his representative, and further, such work shall be done in accordance with directions given by the Commissioner of Transportation or his representative.

(b) The use of all land shall be as the Minister and Church accept no responsibility whatever in the matter, and the City of New York, its agents and employees shall have the right to enter upon and make use of the land referred to, whenever the interests of the State may so require.

(c) Said land is to be cleared up by the licensee and during the period in which the permit may remain in force, the premises shall be maintained in a neat, clean and sanitary condition. No matter of any kind is allowed on the land or in the water.

(d) Cutting down of brush and scrub trees shall not be done except as directed by the Commissioner of Transportation or his representative, and if any planting is to be done, it shall be done as directed by the Commissioner of Transportation or his representative. Cut brush and tree limbs must be disposed of off State land and no live trees shall be removed.

(e) No Specimen shall be allowed on State land.

(f) In granting this permit, no right or title is conveyed to the licensee or any ownership or interest of any kind in the land covered by the permit.

(g) All State land and/or local regulations requiring fencing, building, pollution, littering, rubbish and sewage or garbage disposal must be observed.

(h) The granting of this permit is for the occupancy of said land by the licensee and no hunting, fishing or commercial use of same will be allowed.

(i) The licensee agrees that the State property shall be used solely for the purpose as stated in the permit.

(j) No interference shall be had with others who hold permits for the occupancy of State land adjacent to the area covered by this permit.

(k) The licensee is required to furnish this department with a Certificate of Public Liability Insurance in accordance with Form CA 20.

7b. The use of said land shall be subject at all times to the interest of the State in the making of improvements and repairs to the canal system or work in connection therewith. The Commissioner of Transportation, his agents, employees and contractors, shall at all times have the right of entry thereon, if in the judgment of the Commissioner of Transportation the State’s interest shall require.

8b. The licensee undertakes and agrees to indemnify and save harmless the State, its officers, employees, or agents, from any and all claims, demands and recoveries arising out of the use or manner of use made by the licensee of the property which is the subject matter of this permit and shall furnish upon request to the Commissioner of Transportation, evidence of required protective liability insurance.

9b. The work authorized by this permit shall be commenced promptly, and progress made to completion without delay; and in the event that such work is not so commenced and progressed to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Transportation, this permit shall be declared to be revoked, and said work shall not be resumed without a renewal of this permit in writing by the Commissioner of Transportation.

10b. The Commissioner of Transportation reserves the right at any time to revoke and annul this permit, wherever it shall become the duty of the licensee, at his own cost and expense, to remove from the property which is the subject matter of this permit, any and all works and structures erected by the same, and to vacate and surrender to the State possession thereof.

11b. Upon failure of the licensee to remove such works and structures, the Commissioner of Transportation may summarily enter upon and remove from said premises any and all encroachments and property of the licensee, at the licensee’s own cost and expense.

Notice of revocation may be given to the licensee personally or by mailing to:

12b. a notice to that effect enclosed in a prepaid wrapper addressed to

13b. at 12 No. Jughandleck Blvd., street, Ithaca, N.Y. 14850

14b. This permit shall not become effective, nor shall any work be commenced under the same, until the original thereof has been executed by the applicant, signed by the Commissioner of Transportation, the official seal of the State of New York attached hereto, and an executed copy of the permit received by the licensee.

15b. In accepting this permit the said licensee has in mind the possibility of the sale of otherwise disposed by the State of the land referred to, without notice, and in such event the permission hereby granted shall be automatically terminated.

16b. No refund will be made to the licensee or other party, of any portion of the fee paid for the use of the State property should this permit be cancelled within the specified time for which the fee has been paid.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of said office, the day and year first above written.

T. V. PARKER
Director of Waterways Maintenance

JOSEPH E. STULLATO
Commissioner of Transportation

ACCEPTANCE OF PERMIT

The undersigned hereby accepts the foregoing revocable permit and agrees faithfully to comply with all the terms and conditions thereof.
Date: Ithaca, N.Y. February 11, 1971

U. S. COAST GUARD AUXILIARY-FLOTILLA 2-2 Inc.

By: Paul R. Sandefur Flotilla Commander

(Acknowledgment, if an individual)

STATE OF NEW YORK

County of ________________

On this ________________ day of ________________, 19__, before me, the subscriber, personally appeared ________________, to me known to be the person described in, and who executed the foregoing instrument, and he duly acknowledged to me that he executed the same.

Notary Public

(Acknowledgment, if a firm or co-partnership)

STATE OF NEW YORK

County of ________________

On this ________________ day of ________________, 19__, before me, the subscriber, personally appeared ________________, to me known to be the individual who executed the foregoing instrument as a member of the co-partnership of ________________, who, being by me duly sworn, did depose and say that he resides in ________________, that he is a member of the above-named co-partnership which is composed of himself and ________________, who are all the persons interested therein, that he executed the foregoing instrument on behalf of the said co-partnership and as a member thereof, that he was authorized to execute the same, and he acknowledged to me that he executed the same on behalf of the said co-partnership for the purposes therein stated.
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Letter From 'State Parks,' Finger Lakes Region, Concerning Status of Inlet Island Park Land.

November 13, 1990

Mr. Benjamin Nichols, Mayor
City of Ithaca
100 East Green Street
Ithaca, NY 14850

Dear Mayor Nichols:

RE: 34-06653

Some time has passed since conversion issues have been raised concerning the Inlet Island portion of this project. The City's wish to formally convert Inlet Island have been under discussion since 1985, with existing conversions being known since 1985.

Since the initial discussions about existing conversions began some progress has been made towards returning the site to park use:

- The Farmer's Market relocated to Steadman Landing.
- The Ithaca Boating Center has vacated the former highway property.

There remain additional conversions on the Inlet Island site:

- Encroachment by the Station Restaurant along the southern boundary.
- Possible encroachment by businesses located along Old Taughannock Boulevard.
- The general poor condition of the site is also a conversion.

This project has been discussed at several levels. In order to immediately existing conversions and bring the project into compliance with Land and Water Conservation Fund guidelines the City is directed, by May 15, 1991, to:

- Establish the K(f) boundary of Inlet Island on the ground by survey.
- Cease all existing conversions of the site and return the site to park use.
- Remove facilities that do not comply with Land and Water Conservation Fund guidelines.

Very truly yours,

OFFICE OF PARKS, RECREATION AND
AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Andrew R. Mazzella
Regional Director

Robert F. Conner
Regional Park Specialist

RFG:ked
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