



**SUMMARY OF MEETING  
STEERING COMMITTEE**

**Owasco River Multi-Modal Trail Corridor Plan**

**DATE:** October 19, 2011

**CHA FILE:** 23452

**PLACE:** City of Auburn

**TIME:** 12:30 pm

**ATTENDEES:**

Tim Faulkner (TF)	CHA
Mary Burgoon (MB)	CHA
Geoff Milz (GM)	CCDPED
Mike Talbot (MT)	City of Auburn DPW
Stephen Selvek (SK)	City of Auburn OPED
Christine Selvek (CS)	City of Auburn OPED
Bill Lupien (BL)	City of Auburn Engineering
Mark Odrzywolski (MO)	City of Auburn Engineering
Michael Quill (MQ)	Mayor, City of Auburn
Gary Duckett (GD)	Cayuga County Parks
Jeff Dygert (JD)	City of Auburn Fire Dept.
Doug Selby (DS)	City Manager, City of Auburn
Jenny Haines (JH)	City of Auburn OPED

**PURPOSE:**

The purpose of the meeting was to kick off the project and to obtain input from the Steering Committee on initial thoughts of trail locations regarding potential users, safety, connections to neighborhoods, maintenance, redevelopment opportunities, and potential property issues.

**MINUTES:**

1. CS kicked off the meeting and provided a brief history and overview of the project. She also provided a summary of the proposed scope of work, schedule and meeting schedule. The Steering Committee will meet every third Wednesday of the month except when other public informational meetings are scheduled. CS provided a brief overview of the public participation process (general public informational meetings and targeted meetings to specific groups).
2. MB gave an overview of the project and what has been done to date. She gave a description of the trail and who the potential users may be. MT stated that the trail should be for bikes and pedestrians, easily manicured in the winter and no motorized traffic. GD agreed that the trail should be for non-motorized traffic. BL stated that the trail should be for all users – strollers, bikes and handicap users. Trail should have varied surfaces depending on location and some sections should be kept in natural state. MQ agreed that the trail should be for non-motorized users as noise will be an issue. MO questioned whether the State Dam can be eliminated to allow boats further up river. GD stated there is a lot of property along the river that is either owned by the County or City.
3. MB and TF then started on individual discussions of each section of trail.

4. TF described Section 1 which extends from Emerson Park to the northern edge of the Auburn High School property. TF stated that there already was an established trail along the west side of the river from Whitebridge Road to the southern edge of the Auburn High School property and logically this trail could be continued along the river through the high school property. This would also provide an opportunity to engage the school district in a learning environment.
5. GD said that there should be consideration to an exercise trail on the portion that is on the high school property.
6. SS said that there should also be consideration to improvements to Emerson Park as it is difficult to access the west side of the park from the existing trail.
7. BL said that we need to provide all alternatives when there are initial discussions with public and we should include discussion using Owasco Road and Lake Avenue also.
8. GD stated that the existing trail is owned by the county and is 10-12 feet wide. He also stated that there needs to be better accommodation of bikes and pedestrians from Owasco Road into the park.
9. BL stated that the City has an easement along the west side of the river from Emerson Park to the water filtration plant.
10. GD stated that there are users of the river all year long and that the boat slips in the park are pretty much full but there is some opportunity to add additional dockage.
11. TF gave an overview of the second section which extends from the northern edge of the high school property to the State Dam. TF stated that there initial thoughts were to use Pulsifer Drive as it would be very difficult to get near river because of property issues.
12. MB stated that there could be significant property issues on both sides of the river and that grades start to become a problem closer to the State Dam.
13. BL stated that there is a waterline easement along the east side of the river to where the waterline crosses the river. He also stated that the City is about to renovate the State Dam and this may provide an opportunity to provide a pedestrian crossing across the dam.
14. MO stated that the ROW along Pulsifer Drive is approximately 60 feet so that could provide ample room for pedestrian and/or bicycle amenities.
15. BL stated that we need to provide as many crossings of the river as possible so that different length loops can be provided.
16. GD stated that we will likely get a lot of friction from the residents that live along Pulsifer Drive along the river.
17. BL stated that the City use to own property from where the cross streets along Pulsifer Drive extend down to the riverfront. Over the years, the City has sold off some of that property but still does own some even though it may currently be used by the riverfront residents.

18. TF gave an overview of the third section which extends from the State Dam to the Mill Street Dam. TF stated that there are a number of opportunities in this section as the trail can be either off road on road and can be either on the east side or west side of the river. TF stated that there should be consideration of using the State Dam or the water line crossing as a means to cross the river.
19. BL stated that there is an existing access road from Owasco Road down to the river in the area of the water line crossing.
20. BL stated that there is a sewer easement along the west side of the river.
21. CS stated that the City has a project along Osborne Street from Loop Road to Lake Street and possibly could incorporate some elements of the trail in the project.
22. SS stated that there is redevelopment potential in regards to redevelopment of the riverfront housing stock.
23. TF gave an overview of the fourth section which extends from the Mill Street Dam to State Street. This is where trail starts moving from rural environment to a more urban environment.
24. SS stated that there may be a potential to have two types of trails in this section; one that is higher up at street level and one that is at the river level.
25. BL stated that this is the section of the river where there was consideration for a kayak park. BL stated that the state owns disjointed portions of property in the area near State Street from when the Arterial was constructed. The challenge is to get to see the river as not many people know its there because it sits depressed from the existing street level.
26. A discussion ensued about the proposed hotel and how it could interface with the river. The hotel is interested in having a trail behind it however the hotel has not been designed with that in mind.
27. CS stated that there needs to be a strong visual connection to the river.
28. MT stated that the trail needs historical signing to direct users to historical locations within the City.
29. All agreed that it is very difficult for pedestrians to get across the Arterial and that connections across the Arterial need to be considered as part of the study. BL stated that there should be consideration for providing elevated walkways across the river and also at river level below the bridges.
30. MB stated that there also needs to be a consideration for parking and how to get users from the parking locations to the trail.
31. TF gave an overview of the fifth sections which extends from State Street to Division Street.
32. BL stated that there should be consideration of a railroad museum along the railroad siding east of State Street across from the prison.
33. SS stated that the study should explore sharing the use of the railroad ROW. The City also owns property on the south side of the river.

34. MO stated that the NYSEG sub-station may be relocating but there would need to be some clean up of the property. He also stated that the river in this section varies from slow moving to fast moving.
35. TF gave an overview of the sixth section of the trail which extends from Division Street to Wadsworth Park.
36. BL stated that there is an easement along the north side of the river for the Owasco Interceptor.
37. MO stated that a retaining wall would be needed along Wadsworth Street because the bank is failing and that it may be possible to get two-way traffic on this road.
38. BL stated that Wadsworth Park is hard to get to because of the existing street layout and that consideration should be given to accessing the park from the Canoga Street Bridge but property may need to be obtained.
39. JD stated that there is a lot of kayaking on this portion of the river in the spring and fishing goes on all year.
40. GD stated the county owns property along the river from the dump all the way to Port Byron.
41. MB provided a wrap up of the meeting.
42. BL stated that when this is presented to the public we need to make sure that all options are presented and nothing has been pre-determined. The river is very under-utilized.
43. SS stated that this is a multi-modal trail and where possible we need to combine bikes and pedestrians on a single trail and if that is not possible, we need to provide separate trails for bikes and pedestrians.
44. MB stated that we also need to be able to tie in Centro.
45. CS discussed the next steps – meet with the targeted groups the week of November 7 and then have first public informational meetings shortly after that.
46. The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:00 pm

#### **Action Items**

- CHA to develop maps for the public meetings.
- City of Auburn to coordinate meeting locations and send out notices.
- City of Auburn to meet with School District regarding use of their property for the trail.

Please report any additions or corrections in writing within ten calendar days to the undersigned at Clough Harbour & Associates LLP.

---

Timothy, R. Faulkner  
Project Manager