



**Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee  
Zoom Hybrid Meeting  
Meeting Minutes  
February 11, 2026  
Approved: February 25, 2026**

**Committee Members Present:** Chair Ann DiPetta, Elizabeth Weatherby, Roxanne Marino, Karl Klankowski, Kim Moore, Katelin Olson

**Committee Members Present on Zoom:** Alison Weaver, Karen Meador

**Committee Members Absent:** Diane Cohen, Tai Basilius, Mo Klein

**Quorum Present**

**Comp Plan Consultant Present:** Matt Horn, Jessica Geary

**Town Staff Present:** Lori Asperschlager, Niels Tygesen

**Members of the Public Present:** Kurt Jordan, Rich Goldman, Neil Klohmann, Evan Romer, George Breuhaus, Beth Warner-Breuhaus, Linda Liddle, Scott Sutcliffe, Brock Buffon, Sarah Adams, Rebecca Schneider, Steven Morreale, Carl Mazzocone, Kristy Licari, Nancy Zahler, Sara Abernethy, Caitlin Matthenson

**Members of the Public Present on Zoom:** Shirley, Moore, Krys Cail

**Proceedings**

Chair Ann DiPetta called the meeting to order at 5:33 pm at the Town Hall.

**Approval of Agenda**

Marino suggested extending the public hearing portion of the agenda. Committee agreed to extend it to 45 minutes and give those who haven't spoken at previous CPSC meeting the first chance to speak.

**Motion:** Weatherby motioned to approve the agenda; Klankowski seconded. **Passed unanimously.**

**APPROVAL OF PAST MINUTES (December 10, 2025, January 14, 2026, and January 28, 2026)**

December 10, 2025 minutes

**Motion:** Olson approved the past minutes; Klankowski seconded. **Passed unanimously.**

January 14, 2026 minutes

**Motion:** Klankowski approved the past minutes; Olson seconded. **Passed unanimously.**

January 28, 2026 minutes

**Motion:** Olson motioned to table to next meeting to give committee members a chance to review.

**PUBLIC HEARING (Continued Hearing of the Draft 2025-2045 Comp Plan)**

Scott Sutcliffe (Waterburg resident) property is in conservation easement and is not residential and cannot be developed.

Steven Morreale (Waterburg resident) would like to help the committee with a GIS map with spatial layers to understand the landscape better. Had a concern as a BZA committee member, that if individual land owners can request to change their zoning that would be an issue for the BZA.

Shirley Brown (Waterburg resident) read a statement (attached) from Dr. Sherene Baugher, President of the New York State Archaeological Association and Professor Emeritus Department of Anthropology and Department of Landscape Architecture Cornell University.

Kurt Jordan spoke in a joint statement with Steve Hawkin and Michelle Seneca residents on Pease Street about Indian Fort Road and provided a written statement (attached).

Rebecca Schneider (Waterburg resident) requests careful thought of the local waterfront revitalization that supports eco-tourism in the area. Concerned about rural residential and medium density residential in the plan, and about development on Waterburg Rd along Taughannock Creek. Will send the remaining comments in writing.

Kristy Licari (Waterburg resident) spoke about the protected lands included in the proposal and requests more environmental review. Believes the current draft has veered away from the 2009 comprehensive plan regarding the Waterburg Hamlet.

Helen McLallen (Route 227 resident) would like to see her property as agricultural character area as it is not strictly residential.

Carl Mazzocone (Inn at Taughannock owner) concerned that in the latest draft of the plan his property is now in the lakeshore protection area and worries that might cause issues down the road. His business is on the west side of 89, not on the water.

Nancy Zahler (Jacksonville resident and president of Jacksonville Community Association) spoke on behalf of the JCA after they met earlier in the week. Shared written comments (attached).

Sarah Adams would like to see agricultural have its own chapter in the plan. Also would like the town to identify where it makes the most sense to have a higher density of housing.

Krys Cail supports review of the map alongside GIS. Development is going to stop where there is no public water.

Rich Goldman read a statement from Kelley Berliner, Eastern Regional Director of The Archaeological Conservancy (attached).

Evan Romer spoke about neighborhood mixed-used and does not support the Waterburg area and Taughannock Creek having that character area.

Linda Liddle spoke about rural residential parcels and would like clarification about the intention of that area. Also spoke about a portion of Dubois Rd that is active agriculture but has been put into the conservation character area on the future land use map and thinks it should match the current zoning map indication.

George Breuhaus, member of the yacht club, would like an update to the description of the waterfront protection zone to allow for a range of allowed uses.

**Motion:** Klankowski tabled the public hearing until next meeting; Olson seconded. **Passed unanimously.**

#### **FUTURE LAND USE MAP AMENDMENTS, Continued Discussion**

Klankowski recommended that the Lakeshore Protection and Conservation & Environmental Protection Character areas on FLUM match the 2019 zoning map exactly, including the businesses in those areas.

Weatherby and Moore recommended commercial mixed use for businesses in that area. Consensus reached by the committee to make this change.

The committee would like MRB to add language to the plan to provide protection for the types of businesses that are currently in business and encourage certain types of future uses that support hospitality and eco-tourism that have water dependent to the plan.

Marino spoke about maps she has of natural landscapes.

Olson recommend the use of Development Districts on the FLUM. This helps to recognize long-standing commercial businesses. After discussion a consensus from the committee was reached – Create a Legacy Business Development District. MRB will select a new color for the character area and create language around the area for the plan. This will include anything already in a Development District plus P&S Excavating and the Trumansburg Golf Course.

It was thought that since historically Waterburg as a hamlet existed with both residential and business properties it could be possible to have that again if the FLUM supported medium-density residential, however if the residents only want residential properties the committee will support that. After a discussion about Waterburg hamlet a consensus from the committee was reached – Waterburg hamlet will go to low-density residential because of community feedback and no public water in that area.

A short discussion about Indian Fort Road and a consensus from the committee was reached - the west side of Indian Fort Road (last two parcels) will go back to agriculture character area on the FLUM. This area is already designated as a Unique Natural Area. Marino asked that the whole of Indian Fort Road change back to agriculture based on the comments of several members of the public.

A note about the Land Trust areas – no matter the FLUM designation or zoning (agriculture or otherwise), the state and a SEQR review would never allow development.

Olson suggests all areas on the FLUM that are currently medium density residential and has public water stays as medium density residential. Also suggests that Waterburg Road toward Curry Road be switched from medium density residential to low density residential.

#### **LATEST COMP PLAN DRAFT**

Latest plan is online as of February 2. MRB did not open this round of the draft for comments from the public. The committee can share comments with Tygesen and will be passed along to MRB.

Next meeting is scheduled on Wednesday, February 25 at 5:30pm. Tygesen will do a quorum call on February 23 to make sure there will be a quorum.

**Motion:** Olson motioned to adjourn; Weatherby seconded. **Passed unanimously.**

**Meeting adjourned at 7:40 PM.**

Respectfully submitted by Lori Asperschlager, Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee Secretary  
February 25, 2026

**From:** [Carissa Parlato](#)  
**To:** [Lori Asperschlager](#); [Niels Tygesen](#); [Elizabeth Weatherby](#); [Ann DiPetta](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Comprehensive Plan  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 11, 2026 3:29:16 PM

---

---

**From:** Scott Andrew Sutcliffe [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 11, 2026 3:24 PM  
**To:** Parlato, Carissa [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Comprehensive Plan

Hi Carissa:

I am able to attend the meeting this evening but only for a few minutes.

When I attended the last meeting, I was completely unimpressed with the consultants' comments, their responses to my questions, and their clumsy techniques for obtaining info. I commented about errors regarding land use designations and was told I was incorrect. The person brushed me off and I left disappointed. A case in point is my acreage on Waterburg (about 100 acres) which was and still is designated as residential on the maps presented at the last meeting and on the new maps.

It was obvious the consultants had not done their homework. Most of my property is protected in perpetuity with a conservation easement thru the FL Land Trust and I'm soon to designate an additional 23 acres. My neighbor is doing the same. It doesn't speak well for the consultants. So, I have little faith in their plan, their current land use maps, or their means of identifying current land use.

I can't stay long for the meeting this evening but will share my thoughts in detail in a longer message. In the meantime, please feel free to share this message with others on the committee.

Thanks a lot for your consideration.

-Scott

Scott Sutcliffe  
Trumansburg, NY t

COMMENTS FROM THE JACKSONVILLE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION on 2-2-26 DRAFT COMP PLAN Submitted by Nancy Zahler, JCA on 2/11/26

Members of the Jacksonville Community gathered on Feb 9<sup>th</sup> to review the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan and I'd like to share some of our comments:

- 1) First, we want to thank the hardworking members of the Steering Committee who are striving to balance the competing goals we have for our Town.
- 2) The Jacksonville community members who have reviewed the plan were generally supportive of the plan, especially the sections that highlight the need for future community planning and transportation in the hamlet of Jacksonville. We are grateful for the Steering Committee's continued recognition of the importance of our hamlet and the Jacksonville Community Park.
- 3) The Neighborhood Mixed Use area for the hamlet in effect now remains the same and already reflects denser development with some local businesses. We have ideas about how the built environment can enhance the connectedness within the hamlet.
- 4) We are open to more reasonable scale housing that is affordable in the form of duplexes or townhouses. We continue to have public water to sustain development; however, the challenge is finding sufficient land and financial support for developers. We would very much like to be involved if the Town is considering any future housing developments in the hamlet.
- 5) We do not view the hamlet as an appropriate location for big box franchises and encourage the Town to support local businesses by limiting the square footage of new big box-style developments.
- 6) If Water District 3 can be extended, it would allow for more development and contribute to better water quality. We did not discuss specific recommendations at this meeting.
- 7) We agree with the need to add welcoming signage or structures and traffic calming measures— especially for those who view Jacksonville as merely a 40 mph zone on the way from Ithaca to Trumansburg. The historical and special features of our community deserve to be highlighted and appreciated.
- 8) We are concerned about the safe and limited operation of the gas station in the hamlet center and want to be sure it is not expanded to prevent any future gasoline leaks.
- 9) While there has been some revitalization of the hamlet, there are still blighted properties that need attention, including the Special Development District that has become an unauthorized junk yard on Rt 96. If that property were cleaned up, it could be developed into a useful business or housing site.

**There are more comments in the written material but I'll close by saying**

- 10) We look forward to partnering with the Town and local funders to develop the community development, tourism, and transportation plans called for in the draft.

I know Cameron Neuhoff from the JCA is here and he or others from Jacksonville may want to comment. Thank you.

- 11) While we are very supportive of expanded sidewalks and lighting and informal walkways to link the center of the hamlet near the gas station with the Community Park, we are wary of any sidewalk mandates that would require property owners to bear the full cost of providing and maintaining sidewalks.
- 12) We'd like to collaborate with the Town and any future Economic Development Committee to encourage local businesses to locate in the hamlet to offer amenities for local residents and tourists.
- 13) Some of our Jacksonville neighbors raised concern about designation of most of Agard Road as moderate density, which seems to be at odds with the Steering Committee's interest in preserving active farmland and open space. Especially since it seems unlikely that public water will reach Agard Rd in the next 10-20 years. Similarly, the land along Rt 96 from Agard Rd to Taughannock Creek is currently open fields and forests and we'd recommend that area remain designated as Ag/Natural resources, rather than for moderate density development.
- 14) While the JCA is happy to discuss the current and future features of the Community Park, its utility for playing fields would be limited to informal pickup games since the majority of the 10 acre park is forested with hiking trails, which the Plan and our community members support. However, now that there is a restroom open during mild weather, it could be included in tourist promotions for hikers and bikers.
- 15) You may want to update the plan to reflect that there is now a Massage School operating out of the southern half of the Ulysses Square complex.
- 16) We encourage you to include the demographics gleaned from the Jacksonville Census Tract recently added for the 2020 census. We found this link which may provide more details about the 539 residents recorded as hamlet residents in 2020 census.  
<https://www.point2homes.com/US/Neighborhood/NY/Jacksonville-Demographics.html#:~:text=Demographics%20in%20Jacksonville,YoY%20change>

**From:** Kurt Anders Jordan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 11, 2026 7:09 PM  
**To:** Comp Plan Steering Committee  
**Cc:** Sherene Barbara Baugher; Kelley Berliner  
**Subject:** Submission of comments on Indian Fort Road site  
**Attachments:** Baugher Revised Statement for the planning board.docx; Berliner Archaeological Conservancy letter re Town of Ulysses rezoning Indian Fort Road.docx; Jordan statement Ulysses Draft Comprehensive Plan 2-11-2026.docx

Dear Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee members,

Thank you for the opportunity to hear about our concerns today. I have attached the three sets of comments that were presented at the public portion of the meeting.

I also wanted to address the comments made by the final public speaker, an architect who basically argued that archaeological sites are protected by the State Historic Preservation Office and the SEQR process. I can state from my own experience that sites definitely *are not* protected. The state's records only cover a small portion of the sites within its boundaries, and SHPO officials cannot act unless there is documentation in their system; the SEQR process is deployed with incredible variability and many local administrations have sought to dodge its requirements. I have been brought into several projects where SEQR has gone bad; these instances are not infrequent. The Gayogohó:nò<sup>2</sup> people in the room certainly could also attest to the difficulties involved relying on New York State in general.

We were advocating for a different type of preservation: instead of treating an Indigenous site like Indian Fort Road as just another piece of property and relying on an inconstant bureaucracy to recognize the site's existence and preserve it, we seek to build local knowledge and understanding that this site is one of the crown jewels of our township. We will rely not on distant officials but on local residents to know that they should absolutely not touch the site. Its listing on the National Register of Historic Places and its status as a prime location of Gayogohó:nò<sup>2</sup> people reconnecting to the history of their homelands demand nothing less.

Sincerely,

---Kurt Jordan

\*\*\*

**Kurt A. Jordan, Ph.D.**

he/him/his

Professor, Anthropology / American Indian and Indigenous Studies

120 Mary Ann Wood Drive, Room 221

**Cornell University**

Ithaca NY 14853-4601

<http://anthropology.cornell.edu/kurt-jordan>

***Land Acknowledgment***

**Comment submitted during Town of Ulysses Comprehensive Plan Steering  
Committee Meeting & Public Hearing  
Ulysses Town Hall, 10 Elm Street, Trumansburg NY  
February 11, 2026**

My name is Kurt Jordan. I am a practically life-long resident of the Town of Ulysses and also Professor of Anthropology and American Indian and Indigenous Studies at Cornell. I am an archaeologist by training, with specialization in the archaeology of Hodiñhsó:nih, or more commonly but improperly known as Iroquois, communities.

I come to this meeting with a suggestion that enacts two of the stated goals of the draft Comprehensive Plan: improving knowledge of the Town's historic resources, and consultation with the Gayogohó:nq' Learning Project. I am here today with several of the Learning Project's leaders and board members, including Gayogohó:nq' (or Cayuga) individuals, and we jointly make this statement.

We note that the draft Comprehensive Plan makes no mention of the extremely significant archaeological site known as Indian Fort Road, near the western edge of the Township. The draft plan in fact has reclassified some of this town site and surrounding areas as "medium density residential."

The site was the location of a large, nucleated longhouse village that was at least partly enclosed with a wooden defensive fortification. Radiocarbon dates indicate that the town was occupied in the 1520s through 1550s. The residential portion of the site is approximately 6 acres in size, an area that could have housed as many as 1800 residents.

Cornell-based researchers excavated at the site in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, finding dense clusters of the preserved bases of hearths, pits, and post molds below plowed soil. Additionally, the site is one of the earliest in the region where European materials are present, specifically sheet brass that was modified into Indigenous bead forms. I note that the Cornell excavations impacted only a minute portion of this very large site; there are extensive preserved deposits remaining at the site. The site has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places since 1983. This site is particularly

valued by Gayogohó:nq' people since many of their other ancestral communities in this region have been partly or even completely destroyed by development. Indian Fort Road is known to the community, and still preserves the look and feel of the site as it would have been experienced by Gayogohó:nq' ancestors.

It appears that the board did not consider archaeological sites in its examination of the historic resources in the Town; we note that this was true of the 2009 Comprehensive Plan and likely all the other plans before it, so this does not sit solely on the shoulders of the current committee.

However, this is a serious oversight for reasons both of historic preservation and the priorities of Gayogohó:nq' people. The site spans across at least three properties, one of which is held by the Archaeological Conservancy, a non-profit dedicated to the preservation of North American archaeological sites. This property only includes a small portion of the site – I would estimate one-sixth of it. The remainder of the site is on privately-owned land, and the largest part of the site is in what is currently a farm field which would be rezoned as “Medium Density Residential” in the current plan. This could result in development and destruction of the site in the future.

We urge the Committee to reconsider the zoning designation of the site itself and the areas surrounding it to protect this historic site, one that is particularly meaningful to Gayogohó:nq' people. A zoning classification that prevents further development should be applied. This could include continuing the "Agriculture & Natural Resource Lands" zoning from the 2009 plan, or ideally, designation of the site and its surroundings as a “Critical Environmental Area.” The definition of Critical Environmental Areas in the draft plan includes consideration of spaces of “exceptional or unique social, historic, archaeological, recreational, or educational value,” and we believe that Indian Fort Road meets this criterion exactly.

Thank you.

To: Town Board Members

Re: Town of Ulysses Comprehensive Plan

~~From: Dr. Sherene Baugher~~

President of the New York State Archaeological Association  
Professor Emeritus,  
Dept of Anthropology and Dept. of Landscape Architecture, Cornell University

It is commendable for the town to develop a plan for affordable housing, however there are flaws in the current proposed Town of Ulysses Comprehensive Plan. I was shocked to see the lack of concern for the Native American archaeological sites in the Town. On page 5 of the plan, it recognizes the land acknowledgement to the Gayogohó:nq' and yet the land slated for development includes one of the most important and largest Gayogohó:nq' village sites on the west side of Cayuga Lake, the Indian Fort Road site. I was one of the Cornell University Professors who excavated a portion of the 16th-century Indian Fort Road Site. The site still has the potential to provide additional important artifacts and critical information about the lifestyle and history of the Gayogohó:nq' people. Unlike other Haudensaunee (Iroquois) nations, such as the Seneca and Mohawk Nations, where numerous archaeological and historical studies have been undertaken, the Gayogohó:nq' have received minimal research. That is why the loss of their sites is devastating. The importance of the Indian Fort Road Site was recognized by the Federal Government over 40 years ago when it was listed as a National Register Historic Places Site on September 30, 1983 (Register number 83001810). This site should be taken off the area proposed for development. I understand that the Agricultural Priority Area and Environmental Protection Area classifications were applied to the Indian Fort area in the Town's 2009 comprehensive plan. I would hope that the Town could apply them again to the Indian Fort Road Site to protect it.

As the President of the NYS Archaeological Association, I know that your town has other archaeological sites that also deserve to be protected. On page 242, it states the goal of creating an inventory of historic resources. I hope that it will include archaeological resources, including other Gayogohó:nq' sites.

February 11, 2026

Dear Town of Ulysses Board, Staff, and Comprehensive Steering Committee,

My name is Kelley Berliner, and I am the Eastern Regional Director of The Archaeological Conservancy (TAC), the only national nonprofit organization dedicated to preserving this country's most important archaeological sites. It has been brought to my attention that the Town of Ulysses has drafted a new comprehensive plan, and it is proposing to rezone culturally and archaeologically sensitive land as "Medium Density Residential." TAC owns and preserves land within this area, and there are additional archaeological resources present beyond our boundaries, which makes this proposed change very concerning.

TAC preserves archaeological sites by acquiring the land where they are located through donation or purchase. As the fee simple owners, we manage the properties as permanent open-space preserves that are open for access by descendent communities and limited research. The property we own in Ulysses (Parcel 22.-4-29, containing 34.82 acres) contains a portion of the Indian Fort Road site. You may be familiar with this site as it is marked with a New York State Historic Marker. It contains the remains of a 16<sup>th</sup> Century Gayogohó:nq? /Cayuga Nation village site and is unique in that some of the earthen features that defined the village remain on the landscape to this day. The site is registered with the state and was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1983. The archaeological deposits present extend beyond the boundaries of our parcel, and while we continue to work with adjoining property owners to try and expand the area we own and protect, the proposed rezoning proposes a very real threat to this important place.

Seeing as the land owned by TAC can never be developed per our mission and management guidelines, it would be inappropriate for it to be rezoned as "Medium Density Residential," and this change to the surrounding landscape would be extremely detrimental to the portions of the site beyond our boundaries, as well as the general character of the landscape. It is most concerning that the Indian Fort Road site was overlooked during the planning process, and I strongly encourage officials to **not** change the current zoning on or around the site to residential, helping to keep this significant place protected. It is critical to realize that this site is not only important to the Gayogohó:nq? people as well as the archaeological community, but that it is very likely that there are burials of ancestors surrounding

the site, as was typical for villages of this time period. Changing the zoning designation risks these resting places being disturbed.

Archaeological sites across this country that are located on private property are given few protections, and as a result are frequently destroyed, primarily due to development. TAC formed in 1980 to try and protect these important places, as the archaeological record present at these sites provides a critical link for understanding the past lives of people in this country. Archaeological sites are nonrenewable—once destroyed they cannot be put back, and any information we could have learned through their study is irrevocably lost.

While I can speak for the site's archaeological importance, I also strongly encourage working with the Gayogoḥó:nq? people, who can more fully emphasize the importance of this place. The land acknowledgment in the draft comprehensive plan makes a nod to their historic and ongoing presence on the landscape but falls short of meaningful consultation.

At a minimum, I would encourage the Town to classify this acreage as Agricultural and Natural Resource Lands or Conservation and Environmental Protection, but suggest this would be a perfect opportunity to create a "Critical Environmental Area" as the Indian Fort Road site is of "An exceptional or unique social, historic, archaeological, recreational, or educational value;" a criteria defined on page 183 of the proposed Comprehensive Plan.

I would be happy to answer any questions about the Conservancy's efforts or further discuss the proposed zoning changes. Please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you for your time,

Kelley Berliner

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]