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Executive Summary

Dream Big – BOA can help make brownfield redevelopment happen.¹

Overview

In 2012, the City of Geneva, New York initiated a planning process for the City’s North End neighborhoods. The City secured funding from the New York Department of State Brownfield Opportunity Area (BOA) program to complete a Nomination, an analysis that gives the community a basic assessment and understanding of existing conditions, brownfield site status and the area’s potential for revitalization. The Nomination is the second step of the BOA process; it will help to guide and coordinate future neighborhood revitalization initiatives in the North End neighborhoods, with particular emphasis on the area’s brownfield properties. The City’s Office of Neighborhood Initiatives is leading the North End BOA process with support from an advisory committee and a consultant team (Skeo Solutions, Investment Consulting Associates, Sustainable Strategies 2050).

Goals

The purpose of the North End BOA process is to develop a vision and action plan for the North End neighborhoods that:

- Identifies catalyst zones and properties.
- Identifies infrastructure improvements.
- Addresses challenges and builds on local assets.
- Outlines strategies in a unified concept plan.
- Builds community capacity for implementation.

Study Area

The Study Area for the North End BOA includes portions of four Geneva neighborhoods: East Lakeview, Upper North, Historic North and City Central. The 430-acre Study Area extends from the City’s northern boundary to the Seneca Lake shoreline and generally from Genesee Street to the City’s eastern boundary. Built around manufacturing and industrial uses, the North End neighborhoods face challenges of vacancy and disinvestment. The potential for neighborhood identity is fragmented by rail lines, perceptions of crime and diverse cultural groups.

Approach

The North End BOA process utilizes a neighborhood or area-wide planning approach to ensure that targeted revitalization, development concepts and investments take into account the needs of neighborhood residents along with market considerations and physical conditions.

Revitalization Strategies

The area-wide approach focuses on high-impact strategies (see map) across the following revitalization themes: Economic Development, Neighborhood Quality of Life, and Open Space and Connectivity.

Figure 1: North End Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies

Recommendations

The Nomination framework offers a roadmap for implementation of short- and long-term actions for capital improvements, neighborhood initiatives, recreational programming and site-specific redevelopment efforts. The project’s advisory committee and community members have prioritized potential strategies and identified the near-term actions listed below to help inform funding and implementation strategies to advance the City’s BOA application and ultimately advance economic development, improve neighborhood quality of life, and enhance open space and transportation connections in the North End neighborhoods.

Economic Development

- Advocate for efficient regulatory closure of Market Basket site and prepare property for marketing and reuse.
- Amend zoning map and code in North End neighborhoods to increase certainty in development process.
- Promote Manufacturing and Innovation Hub at Gates Avenue and Lehigh Street.
**Neighborhood Quality of Life**

- Improve streetscape and pedestrian amenities on strategic residential blocks to build sense of pride.
- Develop neighborhood commercial center at intersection of North and Exchange streets.
- Develop plan for demolition, maintenance and reuse of selective properties.

**Open Space and Connectivity**

- Evaluate long-term options for safe pedestrian and bike crossing at U.S. Route 5 & 20.
- Develop recreational reuse framework and concept plan for Foundry site.
- Enhance recreation programming at Nieder Park and Gulvin Park.

![Figure 2: Images of the BOA Study Area (L to R: residential street, Marsh Creek, The Foundry)](image-url)
Introduction

Background
Through the Brownfield Opportunity Area (BOA) program, the New York State Department of State (NYSDOS) provides grants to local governments to create revitalization strategies for neighborhoods affected by brownfields. In 2012, the City of Geneva initiated Step One in the BOA process to develop a Nomination for the North End neighborhoods in Geneva. The Nomination is an analysis that gives the community a basic assessment and understanding of existing conditions, brownfield site status and the area’s potential for revitalization. This report summarizes the City of Geneva’s initial investigation and analysis of the North End BOA Study Area. This step sets the stage for more detailed work in the future. Next steps of the BOA Program may provide more in-depth planning and implementation funds, which would allow Geneva to carry out its revitalization goals.

Context
Geneva, New York, sits at the northern tip of Seneca Lake in the Finger Lakes region of New York State. Geneva lies at the eastern border of Ontario County. The City of Geneva, which spans 4.2 square miles, is home to 13,261 people (2010 Census). The BOA Study Area occupies 430 acres in the northeastern portion of the City and has a population of 2,200 people.

Goals
The purpose of the North End BOA process is to develop a vision and action plan for the North End neighborhoods that:

- Identifies catalyst zones and properties.
- Identifies infrastructure improvements.
- Addresses challenges and builds on local assets.
- Outlines strategies in a unified concept plan.
- Builds community capacity for implementation.

Figure 3: Regional Context Map
Vision Statement

The North End BOA project utilizes a neighborhood or area-wide planning approach to ensure that targeted revitalization, development concepts and investments take into account the needs of neighborhood residents along with market considerations and physical conditions. While Geneva’s North End neighborhoods face a range of social, economic and land use challenges, the community has an opportunity to build upon the residents’ pride in the neighborhood, strong culture and valuable assets. The community envisions a future for the City’s North End Neighborhoods in which:

- **Economic development efforts are supported** through investments in a manufacturing and innovation hub and a neighborhood commercial center;

- **Quality of life is improved** by better access to neighborhood services and amenities, stable residential pockets that build pride and investment, higher quality housing throughout the neighborhood and successful efforts to transition vacant property into infill development and functional open space;

- **Neighborhood connectivity is enhanced** through an expanded open space network that links the neighborhood to Marsh Creek, Seneca Lake, Downtown Geneva and regional trails.

The subsequent sections of this report describe the analysis and process that developed this vision and accompanying revitalization themes. This first phase of the North End BOA project evaluates existing conditions in the Study Area; analyzes the land use and market considerations; and presents strategies and recommendations that the City of Geneva and community stakeholders can use to envision and implement these revitalization themes.

THE PROCESS

- **Assessment** (October 2-3, 2012): An initial advisory committee meeting and series of stakeholder conversations identified project goals, neighborhood assets and challenges. During this site visit, the consultant team also conducted targeted interviews with knowledgeable City staff, neighborhood residents and business owners.

- **Stakeholder Interviews** (November – December 2012): The consultant team conducted a series of resident conversations, joined a neighborhood tour with Councilman John Greco and ground-truthed the findings of the existing conditions analysis thus far.

- **Vision and Strategy Development** (January 29, 2013): The consultant team and Geneva ONI convened a working session with the advisory group, stakeholder focus group discussions and a community meeting. These meetings, offered at various times of the day in order to accommodate disparate stakeholder schedules, provided an overview of existing conditions and small group discussions for citizens to help develop and refine a vision and set of revitalization strategies for the North End neighborhoods.

- **Priority Actions** (April 18, 2013): During a strategic planning workshop, the advisory committee prioritized recommendations for future BOA activities, economic development goals and neighborhood revitalization initiatives. For each of the recommendations considered to be a high priority, the advisory committee discussion identified near-term actions that would generate momentum and potential funding sources (both BOA and non-BOA) that the City, neighborhood associations or other entities could seek out. An evening community meeting offered neighborhood residents, councilpersons, business owners and other stakeholders an opportunity to share their thoughts and preferences for prioritizing recommendations and near-term actions.
Planning Process
The City’s Office of Neighborhood Initiatives (Geneva ONI) is leading the North End BOA process with input from an advisory committee and support from a consultant team (Skeo Solutions, Investment Consulting Associates, Sustainable Strategies 2050).

During the fall of 2012, the consultant team conducted initial interviews and analyzed existing conditions throughout the North End neighborhoods, including land use, demographics, brownfield site status and market dynamics in the BOA Study Area.

In January 2013, the Geneva ONI and the consultant team convened stakeholder discussions and a community meeting to share findings, gather community feedback on the existing conditions, and develop a vision and set of revitalization strategies for the North End neighborhoods.

Building on analysis of existing conditions and community input, the consultant team developed a draft area-wide revitalization framework that outlines a set of strategies to support economic development, neighborhood quality of life, and open space and connectivity.

In April 2013, Geneva ONI and the consultant team reconvened the advisory committee and hosted a public community meeting to gather input on the draft framework and identify priorities, partnership opportunities and near-term actions for revitalization.

Related City Initiatives
The City has undertaken a range of planning efforts focused on the revitalization of the City’s waterfront and downtown areas that provide a solid foundation for the North End revitalization effort.

- The 1997 City Master Plan and Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan (LWRP) established the groundwork for subsequent visioning sessions and targeted revitalization efforts.
- The 2012 Waterfront Infrastructure Feasibility Study outlines concrete actions to improve the waterfront and strengthen connections to downtown. The North End BOA process recognizes the need to build on the waterfront revitalization recommendations and enhance connections between the waterfront and the North End neighborhoods.

Priority Brownfield Sites
The North End neighborhoods are home to multiple brownfield sites that were once thriving industries. The City of Geneva is focusing its attention on the North End’s brownfield sites, the neighborhoods in which they sit, and the potential they hold for revitalizing Geneva’s North End neighborhoods. The City of Geneva prioritized three brownfield sites for consideration and assessment due to their history, location and potential: The Foundry, Market Basket and North Street Service Station. Based on area-wide strategies developed throughout the process, the City identified four additional potential catalyst sites: the Northeast Corner of Exchange and North streets, Middle Street Vacant properties cluster, New York State-owned flood zone property and an inactive elevated rail line.
Using the best information available to date about the sites, the consultant team has created site snapshots that describe the sites’ history, status, potential future land uses and steps to facilitate reuse in Section 4 of this report.

**Community Engagement**

The North End BOA project is a community-driven process. Geneva ONI is leading the charge, in partnership with other City staff, the Geneva Neighborhood Resource Center, local businesses, residents, neighborhood associations, religious organizations and nearby educational institutions. This diverse group of stakeholders developed the recommendations in this report, with assistance and guidance from the consulting team. The momentum generated by this Step Two BOA process depends on continued interest and enthusiasm from all of these people and more.

Community engagement for this project included an advisory committee and broader public outreach through a series of venues. The advisory committee included City staff, neighborhood residents and community partners, who serve as key sources of feedback throughout the project; their intimate knowledge of the City helps to ensure that the consultant team’s findings are well grounded. The advisory committee members include:

- Collette Barnard, Office of Neighborhood Initiatives.
- Rick Bley, Geneva Industrial Development Authority (IDA).
- Paul Cosentino, Geneva Department of Public Works.
- Marty Davis, Geneva Neighborhood Resource Center (GNRC).
- Sage Gerling, Office of Neighborhood Initiatives.
- Lt. Eric Heieck, Geneva Police Department.
- Matt Horn, City Manager.
- Dave Linger, Geneva Local Development Corporation (LDC).
- Brandon Phillips, Cracker Factory.

The consultant team worked with Geneva ONI to design a community engagement process that would successfully solicit input, perspective and feedback from those who live and work in the North End neighborhoods. Though the advisory committee provides a solid foundation for community engagement, the outreach efforts for a project of this scope and scale need to reach as many Geneva residents, business owners and City officials as possible. To this end, the consultant team and Geneva ONI engaged in many different types of outreach and held meetings in various formats and approaches proved useful at different points in the process:

- One-on-one conversations.
- Resident interest groups.
- Business interest groups.
- Business interviews.
- Presentation at public meeting.
- Open house-style public meeting.
- Group prioritization exercise at public meeting.
- Advisory Committee meetings.
- Neighborhood tours led by City staff.
- Neighborhood tour led by a councilperson representing the Study Area.
- Follow-up phone calls.
- Email announcements and updates.
- Flyer distribution at local churches.
at multiple times of the day. During these conversations, interviews, meetings and interactions, a number of initial considerations emerged.

1. The North End of Geneva has long been called the “Butt End.” Community perception is that Geneva’s North End is a tough, undesirable area with few opportunities. Despite the area’s harsh nickname, long-time residents of the area are proud of the neighborhoods’ heritage. Ideally, the process would begin to address the negative perception of the area, build on the existing sense of community pride and create a cohesive neighborhood identity.

2. To address the concern that the North End neighborhoods traditionally “don’t turn out” to public meetings, regardless of the topic, an explicit goal of the process was to develop an outreach process that would engage as many stakeholders as possible. The process emphasized listening to stakeholders and valuing their input and feedback. Small focus groups and individual conversations helped to build trust and support for the project.

3. The North End has historically been one of the City’s most racially and ethnically diverse areas, defined by three distinct cultural groups: white Italian, African-American and Latino. As such, culture, race and ethnicity were expected to play a significant role in the outreach and engagement process. Discussions with stakeholders highlighted a cultural divide between these three groups that could hinder attempts to discuss collective community revitalization in a public forum. Addressing barriers to this perceived cross-cultural divide has been and will continue to be critical to building community cohesion.

4. The reputation of the North End is largely based on the community’s perception that the area is unsafe and overrun with criminal activity. From the outset, it was clear that the analysis of existing conditions needed to attempt to understand the difference between actual and perceived crime in the neighborhood relative to other areas of the City. Police department participation on the advisory committee and preliminary analysis of available police data for the Study Area are the first steps toward understanding and addressing neighborhood safety concerns.

Many of the City’s existing efforts to build neighborhood pride and resident engagement are housed in Geneva ONI’s Geneva Neighborhood Resource Center (GNRC) in downtown Geneva, a few blocks away from City Hall. Geneva ONI, in partnership with NeighborWorks Rochester, contracts a neighborhood association organizer who engages residents in all of Geneva’s neighborhoods and works with them to strengthen their neighborhood associations and build neighborhood pride. GNRC’s neighborhood association organizer was able to leverage the BOA outreach and public meetings in order to cultivate interest in neighborhood revitalization efforts in the Study Area neighborhoods.

All community meetings were advertised in both English and Spanish via email announcements, in-person conversations, phone invitations to targeted individuals, and paper flyers distributed at public gatherings and neighborhood churches. In addition to meeting at the Faith Community Church and receiving support and hospitality from Reverend Mark and Mrs. Ammerman, several other religious congregations were supportive of the project and distributed invitations to community meetings in order to inform their congregants and neighborhood residents. The other religious congregations and leaders included: Our Lady of Peace Parish; Pastor Stevie Brown of Divine Destiny Ministries; Pastor Juan and Mrs. Colon of Hispanic Church of Geneva on Kirkwood Ave.; Bishop and Mrs. Dixon of St. Paul’s Full Gospel Baptist Church on East North St.; Bishop and Mrs. Dunmore and Senior Minister Donald Golden of Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church on Clark St.; Bishop Harry Gramling of First Love Church of
Border City on East North St.; and Pastor Raoul Fuentes of Hispanic Church on Genesee Park, which associates with Bishop Gramling and First Love Church. Also, the same information was distributed to clients and program participants at the Salvation Army on North St., and distributed to leadership and members of the African American Men’s Association, NAACP of Geneva, Martin Luther King Scholarship Association and the Sons of Italy. A translator from the community was available at both public meetings to translate presentations, questions and conversation into Spanish as needed.

At the outset of the project, advisory committee members shared their hopes that the planning process would engage community members in a way that increases capacity and community understanding, identifying teachable moments along the way. They want people to feel happy and satisfied in their own neighborhoods. One advisory committee member hoped that, at the end of a successful project, the neighbors would be “humming in the streets.” At the conclusion of this first step of the North End BOA, the advisory committee’s hopes for capacity building are coming to fruition.

As a preliminary result of the BOA project, the East Lakeview Neighborhood Association is now organized and meeting on a monthly basis with a manageable roster of neighborhood beautification and improvement projects. Initial beautification and improvement projects are underway in Gulvin Park, a large, showcase park right in the middle of the neighborhood. This new association is well led by Edith Wormley, a long-time neighborhood resident. Several other residents have stepped up to participate fully and provide leadership on various projects and to further develop reach and connection across the neighborhood and community: James Richmond, Wanda White, Deb DeRosa, Princess White, Jean Paradise, Phyllis Cuddebeck, Bobby Hart and the Sixth Ward Councilor, John Greco. Additional support and guidance is being provided by Councilor-at-Large, Tony DiConstando, Master Gardener, Virginia Tourrella, and several other neighbors and City residents of East Lakeview Neighborhood Association. East Lakeview and Historic North neighborhood associations will be represented on the Geneva team attending NeighborWorks America’s Community Leadership Institute in Sacramento, California, in October 2013.
Land Use Analysis

History
The North End neighborhoods have historically functioned as a mixture of one- and two-family homes, small businesses and manufacturing facilities. The area’s access to rail lines and proximity to the Erie Canalway once supported a thriving network of small manufacturing businesses. Economic shifts in central and western New York have seen the decline of small businesses and a reduction in the viability of traditional manufacturing. Today, the North End neighborhoods encompass a wide range of uses and are home to diverse ethnic groups with strong cultural heritage.

Figure 4: Location Map
Figure 5: Study Area Context Map
The Study Area

The Study Area for the North End BOA extends from the City’s northern boundary to the Seneca Lake shoreline and from Genesee Street to the City’s eastern boundary. Encompassing 430-acres, the Study Area includes portions of four Geneva neighborhoods: East Lakeview, Upper North, Historic North and City Central.

The Study Area was delineated based on neighborhood and municipal boundaries (City of Geneva), neighborhood factors, natural features (Marsh Creek and Seneca Lake) and major transportation corridors (Genesee Street, Lake Street and an inactive rail line).

Land Use

The analysis of land uses in the Study Area evaluates circulation and access, existing land use patterns, current zoning designations, land ownership, as well as open space and natural resource considerations to help inform area-wide revitalization strategies.
Figure 7: Circulation Map

Circulation

The area’s circulation network includes arterial roads (Exchange Street, North Street, Genesee Street and U.S. Route 5 & 20), collector (primarily residential) streets and active and inactive rail lines.

Arterial Roads

Exchange Street functions as the primary gateway to the City of Geneva from Interstate 90. Recent streetscape improvements on Exchange Street, including new lighting, curbs and sidewalks, extend from the intersection with State Street south into downtown. These improvements have given the southern section of the Exchange Street corridor a cleaner, more cared-for appearance, which creates a more welcoming gateway to the City.

Rail Lines

Active rail lines in the Study Area, owned by the Finger Lakes Rail Road, run north to south and east to west with at-grade crossings at North Street and Exchange Street. An inactive, elevated rail line (formerly the Lehigh Valley Railroad) traverses the Study Area from east to west.

The area’s transportation corridors and Marsh Creek create circulation patterns that divide the Study Area into small, isolated pockets (see the gray “circulation barriers” in the circulation map above). The rail lines and Marsh Creek limit pedestrian and bicycle crossings from one pocket to another; the arterial streets (Exchange Street and North Street), due to their heavy traffic load and minimal pedestrian...
amenities, further subdivide the Study Area. The isolated pockets do not easily connect to each other, to
the Lakefront or to other areas of the City.

General Land Use Patterns

Configuration of residential, commercial, industrial and community service uses results in a patchwork of
isolated residential areas, scattered commercial uses and vacant property. Table 1 shows the acreage and
percentage of the Study Area occupied by general land use type.

Table 1: Study Area Land Use Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>% of Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North End BOA Study Area</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space/Parks</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residential uses are primarily single-family, two-family and three-family structures. Stable residential areas are located in the northwest and northeast sections of the Study Area. Pockets of single-family homes converted to multiple unit rental housing, highlighted with an orange outline, include many poorly maintained structures.

Fifteen percent of the Study Area’s land use is commercial. The mixed land use pattern has potential to provide neighborhood amenities; however, a breakdown of the types of commercial land uses (below) shows that the actual commercial uses are quite varied and not necessarily aligned with residents’ priorities.

Active manufacturing uses located in the northwestern portion of the Study Area, outlined in the upper left section of the map above, are functioning well. There may be opportunities to better support existing manufacturing through vacant property reuse and access improvements.

Many commercial uses in the Study Area function as low cost storage or warehouse space. Neighborhood amenities and basic services are limited to primarily convenience stores and auto-related commercial uses.
Zoning

The City of Geneva administers zoning regulations for the Study Area. The Study Area includes portions of the following zoning districts:

- Two-family residential.
- Multi-family residential.
- Commercial.
- Commercial (central business district).
- Industrial.
- Industrial park.
- Traditional Urban Design (overlay district).
- Lakefront residential (planned unit development district).

In general, industrial districts are oriented along rail lines and in the City’s industrial park. Commercial districts follow the Exchange Street corridor. The consulting team conducted a preliminary zoning audit during the existing conditions analysis phase of the project; the conclusions of this audit are summarized here.

Geneva’s zoning ordinance dates to 1968 with many amendments and updates over the following 45 years. The zoning ordinance has some sections that employ outdated concepts (such as strict separation of residential and commercial uses or strict limitations on nonconforming uses) and other sections that seem...
“bolted on,” both of which contribute to a zoning ordinance that can be confusing and hard to use. Best modern zoning practices make it easy to understand what can and cannot be built on a given parcel (by means of its zoning district) and at the same time help businesses, developers and investors identify where particular uses or structures are desired. A zoning ordinance should, at its best, not only say what cannot be built, but should give indication of what would be preferred. In line with best practices, Geneva’s zoning ordinance does provide a table of permitted uses and table of dimensional standards by zoning district. However, the zoning ordinance includes numerous exceptions in the text that are not easily found or interpreted. The ordinance also does not make use of diagrams to illustrate the concepts and regulations described.

A zoning ordinance must also balance predictability and flexibility to be effective. Homeowners want to know what can be built next door because the neighboring land use will affect their quality of life and their property value. Businesses want to know if they can operate at a particular site. On the other hand, many citizens want flexible reviews to ensure that new development provides appropriate public benefits and developers look for flexibility in the requirements so that they can adapt to changes in the market. Geneva’s zoning ordinance makes significant use of variances to modify zoning requirements that no longer reflect community preferences or market realities. The variance is intended to provide relief for unique sites from general zoning provisions. Variances must meet a high standard of hardship and are frequently overturned on appeal; therefore, variances significantly increase uncertainty. Where variances are not based in the specific characteristics of the land, the City should consider revising the regulations to reflect evolving community preferences. Where there is a desire for flexibility to negotiate or review specific uses, creating a special permit process with clear standards is preferable to the variance.

The preliminary zoning audit for this project also examined specific provisions of the zoning ordinance for how they create barriers to economic development and opportunities for improvement. Many sections of Geneva’s zoning ordinance, including parking requirements and sign standards, are relatively reasonable. Some potential improvements to these regulations include distinguishing requirements by zoning district to reflect the urban fabric and architectural character of different areas of the City. Other improvements would include revising the standards to reflect commonly granted variances and permitting waivers or modifications of the requirements by a special permit or other, non-variance discretionary review.

Schedule II of the zoning ordinance lays out a number of specific prohibited uses in the Industrial Zones (F and F1, shown in light and dark purple in the map above). These prohibited uses include a number of uses that could be desirable in the appropriate context and scale, such as brewing, distilling, fish smoking and curing, animal slaughtering, and pickle making. The prohibition of these and other uses from the City creates a barrier to developing a cluster of value-added food businesses. The zoning ordinance similarly limits the range of permitted home occupations to individual instruction, professional services and dressmaking, while excluding all other businesses and the “purchase and sale of economic goods.” Today, perhaps unlike when the ordinance was originally written, many businesses start in garages, basements and home offices. While it is important to preserve the character of residential neighborhoods, home occupation regulations can achieve this by limiting the specific impacts – number of visitors, frequency and size of deliveries, etc. – rather than specific uses. In addition, while performance standards are required for industrial uses, clear and specific thresholds or criteria are not given for residential uses (e.g.,
the noise standard allows no perceptible noise over the lot line but does not answer the question of perceptible by whom. This is a standard that many single-family houses could not meet).

The zoning audit indicates that the “backbone” of the ordinance has been lost during 45 years of updates and amendments along with the practice of granting variances in response to evolving land uses. On the ground, the use of variances has resulted in a land use distribution in the Study Area that is quite different from the zoning districts.

Property Ownership

The majority of the land in the Study Area is privately owned. However, the City of Geneva and State of New York together own approximately 104 acres or 24 percent of the land in the Study Area. Publicly owned properties generally include vacant properties, parks, and open space areas located along Marsh Creek, the inactive rail line and the waterfront.

Figure 11: Property Ownership Map
Natural Features

Marsh Creek and Seneca Lake are the most significant natural features in the Study Area. Marsh Creek flows south through the Study Area, paralleling Exchange Street and then bending southeast after flowing under East North Street. A Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)-delineated 100-year flood zone along Marsh Creek extends from Wadsworth Street to the west and to Crystal and Munson Streets to the east. The majority of land located within the flood zone is owned by the State of New York and the City of Geneva.

Based on National Wetlands Inventory data, a single isolated wetland area is located within City-owned waterfront property in the southeast portion of the Study Area.

Ground water resources in the Study Area were evaluated as part of the Environmental Data Resources Report conducted to identify potential brownfield sites. Based on the EDR findings, ground water flow in the study area flows east-southeast toward Seneca Lake. The Study Area is served by the City’s public water supply drawn from Seneca Lake’s Class A surface water resource. Minor ground water contamination has been identified in a confined upper aquifer at the Market Basket site on Gates Avenue.

Figure 12: Natural Features Map

2 Flood zone based on FEMA National Flood Insurance Rate Map for City of Geneva, Seneca and Ontario Counties, Community Panel #360599 0001B. Effective date April 1982.
(see Market Basket Site descriptive profile on page 66). No other ground water issues were identified.

Parks, Open Space and Trails

The Study Area’s open space network includes City and state parkland, publicly owned open space and existing and planned trails. The City of Geneva owns and maintains two neighborhood parks and one community park in the Study Area. The New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation operates Seneca Lake State Park, which is located primarily east of the City boundary. The westernmost edge of the State Park is located within the Study Area and is accessible from Lakefront Park. The table below provides details about Geneva’s parks.

Table 2: Park Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gulvin Park</td>
<td>Middle Street</td>
<td>3.3 acres</td>
<td>Basketball court, baseball field, open space, Marsh Creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieder Park</td>
<td>Avenue B</td>
<td>4.2 acres</td>
<td>Playground and open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakefront Park</td>
<td>Lake Street/Waterfront</td>
<td>Approximately 60 acres</td>
<td>Parking, multi-use trails, marina slips, piers, a gazebo, picnic tables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca Lake State Park</td>
<td>Lake Street (adjoining Lakefront Park to the east)</td>
<td>140 acres</td>
<td>Multi-use trails and picnic areas are located within the Study Area; a large marina, playground, sprayground and pavilions are located farther east at the confluence of the Canalway and Lake Seneca.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13: Parks and Open Space Map
The Cayuga-Seneca Canal Trail extends along the Seneca Lake shoreline from Downtown, through Lakefront Park and connecting to Seneca Lake State Park. Stakeholder discussions and land use analysis highlighted trail opportunities along the elevated inactive rail line and public land along Marsh Creek. Developing these trail segments in the Study Area and in the City as a whole could connect Geneva to the robust regional trail system, with the abandoned rail line in the North End neighborhoods playing a key role in that connection.

Regional trails include the 23-mile Ontario Pathways rails-to-trails project in Ontario County, Finger Lakes Trail at the south end of Seneca Lake, existing and proposed trails in the Town of Geneva adjacent to the BOA Study Area, and the Erie Canalway network that spans 300 miles of upstate New York and connects Utica, Syracuse and Rochester. Potential community-wide and North End neighborhood trail connections are highlighted on the Community Parks, Open Space and Trails Map.

![Figure 14: Community Parks, Open Space and Trails Map](image)

**Infrastructure**

**Electric and Natural Gas**

NYSEG (New York State Electric and Gas) provides electric and natural gas service to homes and businesses throughout the Study Area. Two electric substations serve the area: 1) NYSEG substation located on Border City Road approximately 0.5 miles east of the Study Area, and 2) Substation located at Zotos International manufacturing plant in the Geneva Industrial Park. Conversations with economic
development representatives highlighted ongoing capacity issues at the NYSEG substation that may present a barrier to expansion of manufacturing in the Industrial Park and North End neighborhoods.

Water and Sewer

The City of Geneva provides water and sewer service throughout the Study Area. The City’s water treatment and sewage plants are located on Doran Street north of the Study Area. A second-stage sewage treatment plant (Marsh Creek Sewage Treatment Plant) is located within the Study Area, on the south side of Middle Street adjacent to Marsh Creek. Geneva’s water quality and treatment facilities provide a key asset to industrial users with high water demands and food production or processing industries.

Telecommunications

Verizon serves the City of Geneva with land-based broadband telecommunications infrastructure. Downtown areas are also served by wireless broadband operated by Integrated Systems. The City is also served by Axcess Ontario, a public-private partnership that provides “open access” dark fiber to areas of the City and offers opportunities for any telecommunications provider to deliver services to customers along fiber corridors.

Key Land Use Considerations

Land Use Challenges

Stakeholder discussions and analysis of existing conditions identified the following neighborhood challenges:

- The Marsh Creek and rail lines cut off circulation, resulting in isolated neighborhood pockets.
- Scattered industrial uses, utilities and vacant parcels fragment the neighborhoods.
- Commercial uses are dispersed and many function as storage or warehouse space.
- The North End lacks a neighborhood center of activity and services.
- Poorly regulated multi-family conversions compromise housing quality and neighborhood pride.

Land Use Assets

Revitalization efforts can build on the following neighborhood assets:

- Strong cultural heritage.
- Stable residential pockets.
- Exchange Street entrance corridor.
- Active manufacturing core.
- Significant public land and open space.
- Proximity to waterfront.

Demographics and Social Conditions

Demographic Summary

The 2010 population of the Study Area was approximately 2,200, compared to a citywide population of 13,261. Additional selected demographic characteristics for the Study Area are listed in Table 2. Study Area population estimates and the demographic characteristics highlighted in the table above were
determined based on block level 2010 U.S. Census and 2011 American Community Survey Data. The North End neighborhood Census tracts and blocks are highlighted on the map below.

**Table 3: Study Area Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>City of Geneva</th>
<th>North End BOA Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>13,261</td>
<td>2,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change since 2000</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing units</td>
<td>5,486</td>
<td>2,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% housing units vacant</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income</td>
<td>$39,269</td>
<td>$30,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American alone</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino origin</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 U.S. Census Detailed Tables (P-001, QT-P6, P-4, P-13, H-1, H-11 City of Geneva, Census Blocks selected within North End BOA Study Area); Median household income data derived from U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2011 American Community Survey (Ontario County Census Tracts 517 and 518).
Police response

Stakeholder discussions highlighted a strong perception that the North End neighborhoods are more dangerous and prone to crime than the rest of the City. Geneva Police Department data were evaluated to better understand the rate of crime in the North End neighborhoods. The Geneva Police Department tracks police response data on a monthly basis using the number of “calls for service” as a measure of demand for police services. A call for service is defined by the Geneva Police Department as a response in which an officer is dispatched to a location for an event or to take action.

During the three-year period from 2010-2012, the study area generated 1.7 calls for police service per capita.\(^3\) Aggregating calls for service by street segment helps to identify the areas with the highest demand for police services. Blue dashed lines in the map below indicate street segments with greater than 40 calls for service.

![Map of Police Response and Housing Code Enforcement Overlay](image)

Figure 16: Police Response and Housing Code Enforcement Overlay Map

Police Response and Housing Code Enforcement

Stakeholder discussions highlighted the dual challenges of law enforcement and housing code enforcement in the North End neighborhoods. The overlay map below is intended to help City staff

\(^3\) Police response data provided by Geneva Police Department (April 2013). Calls for service per capita are calculated based on police data and 2010 population estimate for the North End Neighborhoods Study Area.
understand patterns of demand for these inter-departmental city services. The red lines indicate calls for service by street; the dashed blue lines encompass areas prone to housing code enforcement challenges. Information used to delineate the housing code enforcement issues was based on anecdotal discussions and confirmed by City staff review.

The overlay highlights the areas listed below where police demand and housing code enforcement challenges overlap:
- Genesee/State/Clinton streets.
- Wadsworth/Hebert/Middle streets.
- Andes Avenue.

**Education and School Performance**

2010 Census data were used to identify the educational characteristics of the Study Area residents. Educational enrollment and attainment data from Geneva census Tracts 517 and 518 were aggregated to represent the Study Area. Both Tract 517 and 518 include areas outside of the Study Area, as shown on the map below. Accordingly, the data presented below is representative of a larger area of the City than the Study Area.

In comparison to the City of Geneva as a whole, North End neighborhoods, as represented by Census Tracts 517 and 518, have a higher percentage of students enrolled in K-8 and high school, a lower percentage of college enrollments and a lower overall level of educational attainment.

**Table 4: Education Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Characteristics</th>
<th>City of Geneva</th>
<th>North End BOA Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population Enrolled (Pre-K through College)</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% preschool</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% K-8</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% high school (9-12)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% college or higher</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Attainment (Population over 25)</td>
<td>7,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% less than 9th grade</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 9-12, no diploma</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% high school degree</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% college or graduate degree</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2005-2009 American Community Survey. Table DP-02: Selected Social Characteristics (City of Geneva and Ontario County Census Tracts 517 and 518)
across the City are enrolled in each of Geneva’s schools; there are no neighborhood schools. Given the structure of the Geneva CSD system, it is not possible to identify school performance considerations for students from the North End neighborhoods alone.

*Table 5: Geneva CSD Enrollment Characteristics (2007-2008)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Characteristics</th>
<th>All Geneva Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total District Enrollment</td>
<td>2,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2011-2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Black or African American</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch Rate</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Rate</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Key Social and Demographic Considerations**

Analysis of demographic, education and police data for the North End neighborhoods indicates that the area faces the following social and economic disadvantages when compared to the City of Geneva as a whole.

- Lower median household incomes.
- Higher rates of vacant housing.
- Perception of higher crime rates.
- Lower levels of educational attainment.
Market Analysis

Examination of the Economic Base

Location Quotient

Location Quotients are a method of identifying basic (domestic) and exported (non-domestic) employment in a region – basic industries are those exporting from the region and bringing wealth from outside; non-basic (or service) industries support basic industries.

Location Quotients can be used to examine:

1. A community’s particular employment strengths.
2. How a community’s economic base is changing over time.

The table below lists those industry groups for which Ontario County (in which Geneva is the largest municipality) has a Location Quotient above 1.0 and therefore has an existing export advantage or nexus of activity. Also shown are the 2011 employment figures in each of these groups and the overall change in Location Quotient from 2001-2011.

Table 6: Location Quotient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAICS Code</th>
<th>Industry Description</th>
<th>Location Quotient</th>
<th>Change in LQ 2001-2011</th>
<th>Total Employment 2011</th>
<th>Change in Employment 2001-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 11</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 111</td>
<td>Crop production</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 112</td>
<td>Animal production and aquaculture</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 23</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 236</td>
<td>Construction of buildings</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 238</td>
<td>Specialty trade contractors</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>-305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 31-33</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 312</td>
<td>Beverage and tobacco product mfg</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 326</td>
<td>Plastics and rubber products mfg</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>-455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 327</td>
<td>Nonmetallic mineral product mfg</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 332</td>
<td>Fabricated metal product mfg</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 334</td>
<td>Computer and electronic product mfg</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 337</td>
<td>Furniture and related product mfg</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 339</td>
<td>Miscellaneous mfg</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 44-45</td>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS 441</td>
<td>Motor vehicle and parts dealers</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In total, these industry groupings represent roughly 66 percent of the total County employment. The County is reasonably diversified and has export advantages (high location quotient) in:

- Some areas of agriculture.
- Construction.
- Various forms of manufacturing, especially beverages, nonmetallic minerals, plastics and rubber, and computer/electronics.
- Retail, especially clothing and furniture.
- Information, particularly data processing and hosting.
- Hospitals and healthcare.
Performing arts.

Overall, the County lost 2,514 jobs between 2001 and 2011, a net loss of 6 percent. The greatest area of loss was manufacturing (1,083 positions).

The County gained significantly in Professional and Business Services, Education and Health Services, and Leisure and Hospitality accounting for over 1,000 new jobs in each of the three sectors. While each is significant in its own right, the addition of 1,225 positions in professional and business services is remarkable as it corresponds to a 36 percent increase from 2001.

Shift Share Analysis

The Location Quotient certainly shows concentration, but it does not show how a region’s competitiveness changes over time. Shift-share analysis allows for a review of how much of an industry’s growth (or loss) is due to the region’s strengths relative to the nation (and the metropolitan statistical area (MSA)).

An examination of both methods allows for the identification of industries where the region has a strong existing share, has a national advantage, and where these advantages are either increasing or are at risk.

The shift share analysis uses national, state and local employment statistics to examine how much growth or decline in employment in a particular sector is due to:

- The Study Area’s share of national (or regional) growth.
- The mix change in activities.
- The shift change of activities toward the Study Area.

While each point provides useful information, the shift change provides specific insights into a region’s opportunities and risks for particular industry clusters.

The shift share analysis shows that Ontario County is either growing or retaining employment in the following sectors better than the Rochester MSA or the United States as a whole:

- Professional and Business Services.
- Manufacturing.
- Trade Transportation and Utilities.
- Leisure and Hospitality.

In each of the sectors above, Ontario County has attracted or retained at least 1,000 more jobs than might have been predicted by examining national or state trends.

However, even while – as noted above – employment growth has occurred in education and health care, national trends would have predicted job growth of at least an additional 700 positions.
### Table 7: Shift Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Share Change</th>
<th>Mix Change</th>
<th>Shift Change</th>
<th>Total Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Industry: Total, all industries</td>
<td>(4,377)</td>
<td>(402)</td>
<td>(13,542)</td>
<td>(17,919)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and business services Manufacturing</td>
<td>(668)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, transportation and utilities Leisure and hospitality</td>
<td>(887)</td>
<td>(111)</td>
<td>(240)</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>(378)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>(137)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(211)</td>
<td>(162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(138)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>(189)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(563)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources and mining</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial activities</td>
<td>(218)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(510)</td>
<td>(233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and health services</td>
<td>(827)</td>
<td>(68)</td>
<td>23,563</td>
<td>17,778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regional Competitiveness**

Companies making expansion and relocation decisions typically go through a process similar to that shown in Figure 17. The process begins with the company identifying their business opportunities, constraints and needs for the new facility, and then progresses through an evaluation of location options. The evaluation process continues to narrow the list of options until the company is prepared to negotiate with the last (and best-fit) handful of communities and sites.

Importantly, this process usually starts with a regional, national or even international long list of location options. Metropolitan areas are the units of geography being evaluated at this point, not towns or sites. Accordingly, our Reverse Site Selection Screening Model compares Geneva and the Rochester MSA with
other northeastern MSAs with similar attributes that are likely to be considered when making a location decision.

Local economic development agencies are typically contacted at the completion of the first screening rounds of collected data. This gives them the opportunity to present specific sites and communities within the broader region.

Geneva Database Competitive Set

The Geneva database is a little different from the Reverse Site Selection Screening Model that the consulting team produces at the MSA level. Geneva is well outside and miles away from the closest MSA so the consulting team decided to use the City’s geography as the base for the model. Comparison candidates were chosen based on similar size, public familiarity and business/industry makeup. This can be difficult with small geographies but our choice of candidates came from the simple question “If I were looking to locate in Geneva, New York, where else might I look to locate?”

Certain statistics that we use to measure the community are not available at the city or town level. For this reason, some statistics are taken from the closest MSA. While these numbers may not be wholly representative of the community, this represents a point of comparison. Below in our list of candidates you will see the community followed by the MSA. The following cities and towns are included in the Geneva Database and shown in Figure 18 below:

- Geneva, NY – Rochester, NY MSA.
- Ithaca, NY – Ithaca, NY MSA.
- Batavia, NY – Rochester, NY MSA.
- Seneca Falls, NY – Rochester, NY MSA.
- Jamestown, NY – Buffalo-Niagara, NY MSA.
- Utica, NY – Utica-Rome, NY MSA.
- Schenectady, NY – Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY MSA.
- Saratoga Springs, NY – Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY MSA.
- Binghamton, NY MSA – Birmingham, NY MSA.
- Glens Falls, NY – Glens Falls, NY MSA.
- Mechanicville, NY - Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY MSA.

Figure 18: Location of Cities and Towns in Geneva Database

Overall Findings

Tables 8 and 9 below provide a summary of the reverse screening comparison. The values highlighted in dark green in each row represent the most favorable community for that parameter; the dark orange values represent the least favorable community for that parameter. Depending on the parameter, the most desirable value could be the highest or the lowest value. For example, the most desirable violent crime rate would be a low number, while the most desirable number of physicians per capita would be a high number.

Geneva has a small population which has historically been declining, but with a healthy working age population trend. The future is projected to hold only slightly negative population growth, but less favorable working age population growth. Unemployment rates have been remarkably favorable and education rates are on par with upstate New York once the college centers are removed from the comparison. Geneva has a high percentage of owner occupied houses and a low vacancy rate, which generally indicates a positive and involved community. As with many upstate New York locations, market access is reasonable by car but more challenging by air. Industry specific occupation rates do not
stand out; however, Rochester MSA (representing Geneva) has a heavy emphasis on production and transportation and materials moving. While salary costs are very reasonable, this is balanced by a high utility cost index for the state of New York.

The cost of living is below the national average, specifically when it comes to cost of housing. Access to medical care is better than expected in a rural community since Geneva has its own hospital. Violent crime and property rates are on par with upstate New York. One concern about locating a business in upstate New York inclusive of the transportation network is how the climate interacts with this network. The analysis showed a red flag for amount of annual snowfall. Upstate New York is equipped to deal with snowfall; however, this could cause a concern for a business that relies on timely transportation of goods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Represented</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>Ithaca</th>
<th>Batavia</th>
<th>Seneca Falls</th>
<th>Jamestown</th>
<th>Utica</th>
<th>Schenectady</th>
<th>Saratoga Springs</th>
<th>Binghamton</th>
<th>Glens Falls</th>
<th>Mechanicville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-2010 Population Change</td>
<td>-2.58%</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
<td>-4.87%</td>
<td>-2.69%</td>
<td>-1.84%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td>3.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2010 Working Age Population Change</td>
<td>4.61%</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
<td>-2.94%</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>7.24%</td>
<td>8.92%</td>
<td>14.26%</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>5.89%</td>
<td>8.63%</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 % Working Age Population</td>
<td>69.63%</td>
<td>87.34%</td>
<td>63.41%</td>
<td>66.80%</td>
<td>64.72%</td>
<td>64.54%</td>
<td>68.27%</td>
<td>70.35%</td>
<td>67.99%</td>
<td>69.80%</td>
<td>64.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 MSA Unemployment rate</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 At Least High School Graduate</td>
<td>85.70%</td>
<td>89.50%</td>
<td>89.00%</td>
<td>85.30%</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>81.10%</td>
<td>83.70%</td>
<td>93.60%</td>
<td>83.70%</td>
<td>89.40%</td>
<td>86.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 College Degree</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>62.30%</td>
<td>29.90%</td>
<td>32.50%</td>
<td>26.00%</td>
<td>23.10%</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td>30.30%</td>
<td>26.60%</td>
<td>23.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Percentage Owner Occupied Hus</td>
<td>47.05%</td>
<td>25.13%</td>
<td>48.14%</td>
<td>58.77%</td>
<td>43.76%</td>
<td>42.04%</td>
<td>38.79%</td>
<td>49.71%</td>
<td>37.69%</td>
<td>45.56%</td>
<td>34.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Percentage OOHUs Mortgage</td>
<td>29.84%</td>
<td>16.58%</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>37.14%</td>
<td>26.40%</td>
<td>24.48%</td>
<td>27.11%</td>
<td>34.72%</td>
<td>22.44%</td>
<td>33.16%</td>
<td>22.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Percentage Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>10.03%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>7.97%</td>
<td>6.96%</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
<td>11.58%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>12.55%</td>
<td>11.29%</td>
<td>7.93%</td>
<td>7.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles to Major Airport</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Highways</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Good | Bad
Table 9: Reverse Screening Comparison Overview by MSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Represented</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>Ithaca</th>
<th>Batavia</th>
<th>Seneca Falls</th>
<th>Jamestown</th>
<th>Utica</th>
<th>Schenectady</th>
<th>Saratoga Springs</th>
<th>Binghamton</th>
<th>Geneva Falls</th>
<th>Albany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSA Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Living Index</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>109.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Index</td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td>116.1</td>
<td>107.4</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>108.1</td>
<td>116.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Index</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Index</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>133.2</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>139.9</td>
<td>149.4</td>
<td>149.4</td>
<td>125.2</td>
<td>141.8</td>
<td>149.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Index</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>108.6</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>111.1</td>
<td>111.1</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>111.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Index</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td>136.7</td>
<td>136.7</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>136.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians per capita</td>
<td>320.3</td>
<td>208.1</td>
<td>320.3</td>
<td>320.3</td>
<td>297.2</td>
<td>183.6</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>236.8</td>
<td>187.5</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital beds per capita</td>
<td>478.8</td>
<td>218.1</td>
<td>478.8</td>
<td>478.8</td>
<td>677.3</td>
<td>468.2</td>
<td>367.7</td>
<td>367.7</td>
<td>406.8</td>
<td>448.9</td>
<td>367.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>288.2</td>
<td>115.9</td>
<td>288.2</td>
<td>288.2</td>
<td>515.7</td>
<td>256.6</td>
<td>365.7</td>
<td>365.7</td>
<td>173.1</td>
<td>247.3</td>
<td>365.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime</td>
<td>3018.5</td>
<td>3018.5</td>
<td>3018.5</td>
<td>3018.5</td>
<td>3013.1</td>
<td>2243.6</td>
<td>2662.1</td>
<td>2662.1</td>
<td>2500.1</td>
<td>2298</td>
<td>2662.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Total in Labor Force MSA Level</td>
<td>488,300</td>
<td>48,700</td>
<td>488,300</td>
<td>488,300</td>
<td>529,570</td>
<td>123,490</td>
<td>423,530</td>
<td>423,530</td>
<td>105,290</td>
<td>52,070</td>
<td>423,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Mean Annual Wage MSA Level</td>
<td>$43,820</td>
<td>$46,290</td>
<td>$43,820</td>
<td>$43,820</td>
<td>$42,520</td>
<td>$39,630</td>
<td>$47,280</td>
<td>$47,280</td>
<td>$41,590</td>
<td>$39,490</td>
<td>$47,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Population and Demographics Comparison

Population dynamics give an overall indication of a community’s “health,” or whether it is growing at a sustainable pace. Negative growth can indicate a failing economy or an obsolete community. Explosive growth can be a warning sign for strain on infrastructure or on community finances. This analysis, which typically examines growth of working age population over a specified time period, typically favors young or newer communities.

Geneva experienced negative population growth of -2.65 percent between 2000 and 2010. Batavia, and Seneca Falls had even lower growth percentages while Schenectady, Mechanicville and Glens Falls had significant positive growth rates. Geneva experienced a decline for 2000-2010 in general population, but a growth in the working age population during the same time period of 4.61 percent. All candidates experienced positive working age population growth except Batavia. Schenectady and Mechanicville both experienced the highest positive working age growth rate with both locations being over 10 percent. Future growth predictions between 2012 and 2017 show Geneva as having a -0.65 percent population growth rate and -2.85 percent for working age population. Mechanicville is predicted to be hardest hit for

---

4 Population and Demographic Sources: ESRI Business Analyst Online (BAO) by MSA.
future population and working age growth rates. Table 10 shows the results of the population and demographics analysis.

Table 10: Population (New York State Comparison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-2010 Population Change</td>
<td>-2.58%</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
<td>-4.87%</td>
<td>-2.69%</td>
<td>-1.84%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td>3.53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2010 Working Age Population Change</td>
<td>4.61%</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
<td>-2.94%</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>7.24%</td>
<td>8.92%</td>
<td>14.26%</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>5.89%</td>
<td>8.63%</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Population</td>
<td>13,134</td>
<td>30,204</td>
<td>15,624</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>31,008</td>
<td>62,929</td>
<td>66,916</td>
<td>26,880</td>
<td>46,989</td>
<td>14,751</td>
<td>5,059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2017 Population Change</td>
<td>-0.65%</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>-0.39%</td>
<td>-0.92%</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>-1.74%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>-3.18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2017 Working Age Population Change</td>
<td>-2.85%</td>
<td>-0.08%</td>
<td>-2.28%</td>
<td>-3.35%</td>
<td>-3.38%</td>
<td>-1.33%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>-0.73%</td>
<td>-4.30%</td>
<td>-1.93%</td>
<td>-5.56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 11, Geneva comes in significantly lower than the New York, Northeast and U.S. averages for 2000-2010 population change with a negative growth rate. Interestingly, the working age population between 2000-2010 comes in just under the New York average, although it is still significantly under Northeast and U.S. averages. Geneva comes in significantly lower than the U.S. and Northeast averages for projected 2012-2017 population and working age population growth rates.

Table 11: Population (Regional and National Comparison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2.58%</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td>11.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.61%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
<td>11.32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.65%</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>3.47%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.85%</td>
<td>-0.074%</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>-1.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Household Statistics

Household statistics indicate community involvement, residential health, income information as well as disposable income. Communities with a high number of owner occupied units are more likely to have involved and supportive residents and families. Those with low owner occupied units are more likely to house an apathetic population. Those with low vacancy rates indicate a healthy community, while those with large vacancy rates indicate that the community is struggling. Household growth shows trending for the area over the last 10 years. Median home value, median household income and median disposable income all indicate the affordability of the area and touch on quality of life.
Table 12: Household Statistics (New York State Comparison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Represented</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>Ithaca</th>
<th>Batavia</th>
<th>Seneca Falls</th>
<th>Jamestown</th>
<th>Utica</th>
<th>Schenectady</th>
<th>Saratoga Springs</th>
<th>Binghamton</th>
<th>Glen Falls</th>
<th>Mechanicville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 Owner Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>47.05%</td>
<td>25.13%</td>
<td>48.14%</td>
<td>58.77%</td>
<td>43.76%</td>
<td>42.04%</td>
<td>38.79%</td>
<td>49.71%</td>
<td>37.69%</td>
<td>45.56%</td>
<td>34.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Renter Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>42.93%</td>
<td>69.92%</td>
<td>43.90%</td>
<td>34.27%</td>
<td>45.28%</td>
<td>46.38%</td>
<td>49.71%</td>
<td>37.73%</td>
<td>51.02%</td>
<td>46.50%</td>
<td>58.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>10.03%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>7.97%</td>
<td>6.96%</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
<td>11.58%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>12.55%</td>
<td>11.29%</td>
<td>7.93%</td>
<td>7.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2010 Total Housing Units Growth</td>
<td>-1.37%</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>4.26%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>-1.92%</td>
<td>-3.64%</td>
<td>-0.59%</td>
<td>11.67%</td>
<td>-0.53%</td>
<td>4.38%</td>
<td>6.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Median Home Value</td>
<td>$80,768</td>
<td>$185,556</td>
<td>$82,523</td>
<td>$77,555</td>
<td>$70,491</td>
<td>$78,027</td>
<td>$103,305</td>
<td>$276,230</td>
<td>$98,335</td>
<td>$122,780</td>
<td>$133,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Median Household Income</td>
<td>$38,278</td>
<td>$37,987</td>
<td>$37,194</td>
<td>$39,929</td>
<td>$26,805</td>
<td>$30,350</td>
<td>$35,321</td>
<td>$60,491</td>
<td>$31,719</td>
<td>$36,920</td>
<td>$42,626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geneva has a favorable ratio of owner occupied to renter occupied housing. Geneva’s vacant housing rate is in the middle of the candidates. Geneva experienced negative housing unit growth between 2000 and 2010, which is a concern but not uncommon in upstate New York communities. This trend should be monitored going forward. The 2012 median home value is low. While this makes housing in the area more affordable, it also speaks to the quality and desirability of the houses in the community. Surprisingly, Geneva’s median household income and median disposable incomes are not terribly different from most of the candidates, even with the lower home values.

Table 13: Household Statistics (Regional and National Comparison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 Owner Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>47.05%</td>
<td>48.07%</td>
<td>55.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Renter Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>42.93%</td>
<td>42.18%</td>
<td>33.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2010 Total Housing Units Growth</td>
<td>10.03%</td>
<td>20.28%</td>
<td>10.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Median Home Value</td>
<td>$80,768</td>
<td>$247,147</td>
<td>$226,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Median Household Income</td>
<td>$38,278</td>
<td>$53,826</td>
<td>$55,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Median Disposable Income</td>
<td>$30,747</td>
<td>$41,451</td>
<td>$43,757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 13, Geneva comes in one percent under the New York average for owner occupied housing although both are significantly lower than the Northeast and U.S. averages. Geneva has a higher percentage of renter occupied units when compared to the regional values, although it is only slightly higher than the New York average. Possibly the best comparison for the Geneva region is the vacant housing units. Geneva has the lowest vacant housing rate, especially when compared to the New York
average. However, this is balanced with the lowest housing unit growth rate, which was negative. Geneva has significantly lower median home values than New York, the Northeast or the U.S. averages. Geneva also has the lowest household income and disposable income when compared to New York, Northeast and the U.S.

**Labor Force and Availability**

Given as a measure of Civilian Labor Force growth and an area’s unemployment dynamics, this section measures the very general strength of the workforce as a whole, without regard to specific skills. Areas with moderate unemployment and stable labor force growth perform well.

Labor force and unemployment rates were not available at the City level for all locations included in the database. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) only presents labor force and unemployment rates for geographies with populations greater than 25,000. Geneva has a 2012 population of 13,134 and is far too small to be considered for these statistics. Instead, this analysis shows a comparison at the MSA level and for unemployment only. Please refer to the Population and Demographics section for a review of working age population change as a substitute for labor force.

**Table 14: Unemployment Rate (New York State Comparison)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Represented</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>Ithaca</th>
<th>Batavia</th>
<th>Seneca Falls</th>
<th>Jamestown</th>
<th>Utica</th>
<th>Schenectady</th>
<th>Saratoga Springs</th>
<th>Binghamton</th>
<th>Geneva Falls</th>
<th>Mechanicville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSA Data</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>Ithaca</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>Utica</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Saratoga Springs</td>
<td>Binghamton</td>
<td>Geneva Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate 2006</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate 2011</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Unemployment</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geneva is represented by the Rochester MSA, which is geographically the closest MSA. As shown in Table 14, Rochester’s unemployment rate for both 2006 and 2011 are very good, but may not be a positive indicator for Geneva. All of the MSA candidates compare favorably for unemployment rates across upstate New York.

As shown in Table 15, Rochester MSA (representing Geneva) has the same unemployment rate for 2006 as the state of New York. The 2006 unemployment is slightly higher than the Northeast and U.S.

---

5 Labor Force and Availability Sources: [http://data.bls.gov/cgi-bin/dsrv?la](http://data.bls.gov/cgi-bin/dsrv?la) by MSA
averages. Rochester’s 2011 unemployment rate was lower than the state average, Northeast and U.S. averages. As a result, Rochester has the most favorable change in unemployment.

Table 15: Unemployment Rate (Regional and National Comparison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Represented</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rochester MSA Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate 2006</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate 2011</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>7.93%</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Unemployment</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>4.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Industry-Specific Employment

This section contains information on the availability of workers within selected industries. Employment in Utilities, Construction, Manufacturing, Finance, Services, and Professional/Technical/Scientific functions are analyzed as a percentage of overall employment, identifying critical masses of industry partners and workforce. These industries are selected as they provide an indicator of the presence of basic skills and networks that may be useful across a broad array of new industry and use types Geneva may target.

Table 16: Industry-Specific Employment (New York State Comparison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Represented</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>Ithaca</th>
<th>Batavia</th>
<th>Seneca Falls</th>
<th>Jamestown</th>
<th>Utica</th>
<th>Schenectady</th>
<th>Saratoga Springs</th>
<th>Binghamton</th>
<th>Geneva Falls</th>
<th>Mechanicville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing as a % of Total Employment</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade as a % of Total Employment</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade as a % of Total Employment</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information as a % of Total Employment</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/ Insurance/ Real Estate as a % of Total Employment</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Industries as a % of Total Employment</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 shows industry-specific employment and reveals that Geneva does not stand out in any one area. This analysis evaluated all industries including the ones not shown in Table 16 above and found Geneva to come in the middle of the candidates for each industry.

---

6 Industry Specific Employment Sources: ESRI Business Analyst Online (BAO) by MSA.
In the regional and national comparison (Table 17), Geneva had the highest employment in manufacturing as compared to New York, Northeast and U.S. averages. Geneva comes in slightly ahead of New York for retail trade but still behind the Northeast and U.S. averages. Geneva had the lowest employment in wholesale trade, information and finance/insurance/real estate. Geneva came in ahead of both New York and U.S. averages for services industries but below the Northeast average.

**Table 17: Industry-Specific Employment (Regional and National Comparison)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing as a % of Total Employment</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade as a % of Total Employment</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade as a % of Total Employment</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information as a % of Total Employment</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Insurance/Real Estate as a % of Total Employment</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Industries as a % of Total Employment</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occupation-Specific Employment**

In addition to understanding industry trends, the modern economy still requires workers with specific talents regardless of the company employing them. This category examines the availability of some in-demand skills, such as Business and Financial Operations, Computer and Mathematical, Healthcare Support Functions and Production skills. As with the statements for industry employment, the availability of these broad occupation types is indicative of the strength of the local skills base for a variety of uses.

**Table 18: Occupation-Specific Employment (New York State Comparison) – employment per 1,000 employed in the labor force**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Represented</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>Ithaca</th>
<th>Batavia</th>
<th>Seneca Falls</th>
<th>Jamestown</th>
<th>Utica</th>
<th>Schenectady</th>
<th>Saratoga Springs</th>
<th>Binghamton</th>
<th>Glenn Falls</th>
<th>Mechanicville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>41,048</td>
<td>21,368</td>
<td>41,048</td>
<td>41,048</td>
<td>44,615</td>
<td>34,944</td>
<td>59,401</td>
<td>59,401</td>
<td>22,877</td>
<td>59,401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca</td>
<td>29,331</td>
<td>18,249</td>
<td>29,331</td>
<td>29,331</td>
<td>23,483</td>
<td>15,596</td>
<td>34,322</td>
<td>34,322</td>
<td>20,309</td>
<td>34,322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>36,657</td>
<td>60,376</td>
<td>36,657</td>
<td>36,657</td>
<td>32,963</td>
<td>45,714</td>
<td>31,027</td>
<td>31,027</td>
<td>37,822</td>
<td>34,582</td>
<td>31,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton</td>
<td>165,998</td>
<td>148,43</td>
<td>165,998</td>
<td>165,998</td>
<td>190,888</td>
<td>185,628</td>
<td>182,748</td>
<td>182,748</td>
<td>177,114</td>
<td>164,754</td>
<td>182,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Falls</td>
<td>73,48</td>
<td>43,108</td>
<td>73,48</td>
<td>73,48</td>
<td>64,959</td>
<td>62,285</td>
<td>39,454</td>
<td>39,454</td>
<td>61,176</td>
<td>82,438</td>
<td>39,454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Occupation Specific Employment Sources: [http://stats.bls.gov/oes/current/oessrcma.htm](http://stats.bls.gov/oes/current/oessrcma.htm) by MSA.*
Occupation specific employment is only available at the MSA geography. The employment numbers in Tables 18 and 19 represent employment per 1,000 employed in the labor force. These numbers are not measures of how Geneva is doing in terms of employment in these areas, but instead are indications of the concentrations of occupational skills. Table 18 shows Rochester MSA representing Geneva with heavy emphasis on production, but lower than expected concentration in transportation and material moving.

Table 19: Occupation-Specific Employment (Regional and National Comparison) – employment per 1,000 employed in the labor force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSA Data</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business and Financial Operations</td>
<td>41.048</td>
<td>52.469</td>
<td>48.403</td>
<td>48.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Support Functions</td>
<td>36.657</td>
<td>37.774</td>
<td>34.324</td>
<td>30.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and Administrative Production</td>
<td>165.998</td>
<td>181.732</td>
<td>167.809</td>
<td>166.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Material Moving</td>
<td>51.624</td>
<td>52.216</td>
<td>57.508</td>
<td>67.322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 19, Rochester MSA had lower employment rates for business and financial operations, office and administrative, and transportation and material moving when compared to New York, Northeast, and U.S. averages. Rochester has greater than New York, Northeast and U.S. averages for computer and mathematical and production. Rochester comes in ahead of the Northeast and U.S. average for healthcare and support functions but not ahead of the national average.

Occupation-Specific Salaries (Annual)8

Salaries and benefits often make up companies’ largest or second largest cost category overall. Hence, costs for specific occupations in each community show the relative cost of doing business for the assembled entity.

Table 20: Occupation-Specific Salaries (New York State Comparison)

---

8 Occupation-Specific Salaries (Annual) Sources: [http://stats.bls.gov/oes/current/oessrcma.htm](http://stats.bls.gov/oes/current/oessrcma.htm) by MSA.
Rochester MSA was used in place of Geneva for data availability reasons. Rochester has the highest annual salary for business and financial operations but the lowest for healthcare support functions (Table 20). In general, salaries further east in the state (Albany area) are the highest, while those further west are somewhat lower. Also, the larger the MSA, the population and the demand for workers, the higher the average salary.

*Table 21: Occupation-Specific Salaries (Regional and National Comparison)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Represented</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSA Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Annual Wage - all occupations</td>
<td>$43,820</td>
<td>$52,810</td>
<td>$47,986</td>
<td>$45,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Financial Operations</td>
<td>$66,230</td>
<td>$83,390</td>
<td>$70,217</td>
<td>$68,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer &amp; Mathematical</td>
<td>$68,390</td>
<td>$82,300</td>
<td>$77,728</td>
<td>$78,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Support Functions</td>
<td>$27,900</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$29,678</td>
<td>$30,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and Administrative</td>
<td>$33,620</td>
<td>$35,220</td>
<td>$35,722</td>
<td>$34,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>$34,560</td>
<td>$35,220</td>
<td>$35,722</td>
<td>$34,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Material Moving</td>
<td>$30,280</td>
<td>$38,090</td>
<td>$33,670</td>
<td>$33,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rochester MSA has considerably lower annual salaries than New York State and the Northeast for the categories examined in the database. The U.S. average is a closer comparison with Rochester having minimally higher average salary salaries for healthcare support functions and production occupations.

**Education**

The education levels of a community’s population (from high school to professional school graduates) indicates both the capabilities of the workforce and can also be an indication of the regional school system as a quality of life measurement. An educated workforce can also help attract talented people to relocate to the region.

---

9 Education Sources: ESRI Business Analyst Online (BAO) by MSA.
Table 22: Education Levels (New York State Comparison)\textsuperscript{10}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Represented</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>Ithaca</th>
<th>Batavia</th>
<th>Seneca Falls</th>
<th>Jamestown</th>
<th>Utica</th>
<th>Schenectady</th>
<th>Saratoga Springs</th>
<th>Binghamton</th>
<th>Glens Falls</th>
<th>Mechanicville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th Grade</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th - 12th Grade, No Diploma</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>37.10%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>22.90%</td>
<td>32.90%</td>
<td>36.50%</td>
<td>41.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College, No Degree</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>14.20%</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>19.40%</td>
<td>21.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>10.30%</td>
<td>12.30%</td>
<td>11.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>26.30%</td>
<td>12.10%</td>
<td>13.00%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/Professional Degree</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>22.00%</td>
<td>11.40%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Least High School Degree</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Least College Degree</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to changes in available data, the education statistics provided are an average of the years 2005 through 2009. The Census forms (including the 2010 Census) no longer include questions about educational achievement. The American Community Survey is the only source for the data; however, the sample size is smaller than for the census long form. As a result, the data at smaller geographies such as county level and city level can suffer from accuracy concerns.

As seen in Table 22, Geneva has a reasonably good high school graduation rate given its more rural location. Saratoga Springs, Glens Falls and Ithaca have the best high school graduation rates, which is not surprising given the environment within those communities. Ithaca in particular has a very high college degree rate (specifically graduate/professional degree rate) due to all the higher education institutions within the City. Saratoga Springs is a fairly close second but with a more even spread between bachelor and graduate/professional degrees. Excluding those two candidates (they are known even outside New York State as college communities), Geneva holds its own for college degree rates.

Table 23: Education Levels (Regional and National Comparison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Levels</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th Grade</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th - 12th Grade, No Diploma</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>31.10%</td>
<td>29.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College, No Degree</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>15.60%</td>
<td>16.10%</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>8.10%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>18.20%</td>
<td>18.80%</td>
<td>17.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/Professional Degree</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>13.60%</td>
<td>12.80%</td>
<td>12.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Least High School Degree</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Least College Degree</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the regional and national comparison, Geneva has a slightly lower high school graduation rate than the Northeast and U.S., but a slightly higher rate than New York State (Table 23). Geneva falls short of the State, Northeast and U.S. averages for at least college degree.

Transportation and Market Access

Transport and infrastructure measures the availability of air and road capability and its capacity of that capability. It acts both as a measure of traffic within the community (and therefore workforce attraction) as well as the ability to move goods and personnel into and out of the community.

Table 24: Transportation and Market Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Represented</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>Ithaca</th>
<th>Batavia</th>
<th>Seneca Falls</th>
<th>Jamestown</th>
<th>Utica</th>
<th>Schenectady</th>
<th>Saratoga Springs</th>
<th>Binghamton</th>
<th>Glens Falls</th>
<th>Mechanicville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miles to Major Airport</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Type (M = Medium, L = Large)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Highways</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24 shows the transportation and market access for the candidate communities. With the exception of the candidates in the Albany area, none of the cities or towns is located close to a major airport. Geneva would not be as good a fit for a business depending on air travel or air freight. Geneva only has one major nearby highway.

The center of Geneva is located around 50 miles and about an hour driving time on highways from Rochester International Airport. Rochester has many car rental agencies available, many local hotels close by, a business center and free Wi-Fi. While the airport does have two terminals and air cargo facilities, it is not considered a hub for any of the major airlines. Rochester does not currently fly any transcontinental...

---

11 Transportation and Market Access Sources: ESRI Business Analyst Online (BAO) by MSA; Google Maps for distance to Airport; Investment Consulting Associates’ determination of airport type based on number and length of runways and commercial flight status; Google Maps for Interstate Highways.
flights and the only commercial international flight is to Toronto, Canada. Rochester’s proximity to the Great Lakes and lake effect snow make winter operation more challenging and flight cancellation more likely.

Geneva is also 55 miles and just over an hour driving distance from Syracuse Hancock International Airport. Syracuse also has a number of car rental agencies available, nearby hotels and free Wi-Fi, but appears to lack a business center. Syracuse also has two terminals, air cargo facilities and is also not considered a hub airport. Airlines fly from Syracuse to a similar set of airports as Rochester and its only commercial international destination is Toronto. Syracuse may experience more delays and cancellations due to snow, since snowfall in the Syracuse MSA is significantly higher than in the Rochester area.

Syracuse only has one interstate highway connection but it is important to note that it is Interstate 90 that runs just north of the City. Interstate 90 connects Boston, Massachusetts, to Seattle, Washington, with many junctions in between. It is about a 5.5-hour drive and 360 miles east to reach Boston and about 10 hours and 640 miles west to reach Chicago. Interstate 90 is also the primary east-west New York state connector. While Interstate 90 is a good connector, it is a toll road in New York state.

Climate and Natural Hazards

Climate is both a quality of life indicator and can also be a measure of business interruption risk. Similarly, no location is without some form of natural hazard risk. Businesses will typically look to establish locations in such a way as to minimize their exposure to any one risk.

Table 25: Precipitation (New York State Comparison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Represented</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>Ithaca</th>
<th>Batavia</th>
<th>Seneca Falls</th>
<th>Jamestown</th>
<th>Utica</th>
<th>Schenectady</th>
<th>Saratoga Springs</th>
<th>Albany</th>
<th>Binghamton</th>
<th>Glens Falls</th>
<th>Mechanicville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSA Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Precipitation</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Precipitation (inches)</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Snowfall (inches)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Climate and natural hazards data are presented by MSA geography only. For this set of variables only, Geneva is an average of Rochester MSA, Syracuse MSA and Ithaca MSA based on its location near the center of these three locations (See Table 25). The goal in averaging these numbers was specifically to get the most accurate snowfall amount since it varies widely between Rochester and Syracuse. The

12 Climate and Natural Hazards Source: Cities Ranked and Rated by MSA - 2007 Edition
candidates lining Lake Ontario get much more snow than the other candidates. Geneva came in with an average of 101 inches of snow, which is on par with its neighbors close to the lake. One thing worth noting is that upstate New York prides itself on snow removal capabilities. The Geneva area tends to have a higher number of days with precipitation, which is true for most candidates outside the Albany area. All the candidates receive precipitation in and around the low- to mid- 30 inches.

Climate averages are not available for New York or the Northeast (see Table 26). As discussed above, Geneva receives considerably more snow than the U.S. does on average. Geneva also has a significantly higher number of days with precipitation. Annual precipitation is a little lower than the U.S. average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Precipitation</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Annual Precipitation (inches) | 35.2 | 37.7 |
| Annual Snowfall (inches)      | 101  | 7    |

Crime and Quality of Life

Crime is a good indicator of how safe a community feels, and businesses use this information to help judge the safety of their personal and real property within a community. Quality of life is a subjective measure, and individuals may use different criteria to measure the concept. However, such subjects as cost of living, crime and health care system capacity carry universal appeal and can have direct business impact. The following analysis of crime and quality of life considers how a business would consider these factors in its location decision making, whereas the analysis in the land use section of this report evaluated the intersection of study area-specific crime (or police response) and land use characteristics.

**Table 27: Crime and Quality of Life (New York State Comparison)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Represented</th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>Ithaca</th>
<th>Batavia</th>
<th>Seneca Falls</th>
<th>Jamestown</th>
<th>Utica</th>
<th>Schenectady</th>
<th>Saratoga Springs</th>
<th>Binghamton</th>
<th>Glovers Falls</th>
<th>Mechanicville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSA Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>228.2</td>
<td>115.9</td>
<td>228.2</td>
<td>515.7</td>
<td>256.6</td>
<td>365.7</td>
<td>365.7</td>
<td>173.1</td>
<td>247.3</td>
<td>365.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime</td>
<td>3018.5</td>
<td>2145.3</td>
<td>3018.5</td>
<td>3013.1</td>
<td>2243.6</td>
<td>2662.1</td>
<td>2662.1</td>
<td>2500.1</td>
<td>2298.0</td>
<td>2662.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Living Index</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Index</td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td>116.1</td>
<td>107.4</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>108.1</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Index</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Index</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>133.2</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>139.9</td>
<td>149.4</td>
<td>149.4</td>
<td>125.2</td>
<td>141.8</td>
<td>149.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For most statistics in Table 27, Rochester MSA is a reasonable comparison point. However, statistics such as crime rates and physician/hospital bed rates are more unique to the community.

The crime and quality of life statistics are only available at the MSA level, so this analysis uses Rochester MSA to represent Geneva. Rochester is the third lowest of the candidates for violent crime rate with only Ithaca and Binghamton having lower rates. However, Rochester also has the highest property crime rate.

The Rochester MSA rates for physicians per capita and hospital beds per capita are also less relevant to downtown Geneva. While we do not have specific statistics for the Geneva General Hospital, it is important to note its location as a regional and emergency health care provider. Finger Lakes Health administers this hospital and several others through upstate New York.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Geneva</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>228.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>465.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime</td>
<td>3018.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3517.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Living Index</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Index</td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Index</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Index</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Index</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Index</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians per capita</td>
<td>320.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>244.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital beds per capita</td>
<td>478.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics for crime and quality of life are not available for state and Northeast geographies. Rochester MSA (representing Geneva) comes in significantly under the U.S. violent crime rate though is closer to the U.S. average for property crime. Rochester comes in favorably for cost of living index and housing index. Rochester is higher than the U.S. average for food index, utility index, transportation index and healthcare index. Rochester averages better than the National average for physicians per capita and hospital beds per capita.
Local and Regional Interviews

In order to gain an understanding of the existing conditions regarding economic and business development, the consulting team conducted interviews with several local business owners and organizations throughout the City of Geneva, within the project area, and also with institutions whose activities have a bearing upon the economic development future of the region. Interviewees included:

- James Haswell – Stomping Grounds.
- Dick Conoyer – CCN International.
- John Eades – Vere Sandals.
- Karen Springmeier – Finger Lakes Workforce Investment Board.
- Matthew Parrott – Coldwell Banker.
- Claudia Burcke – Greater Rochester Enterprise.
- Patty D’Amico – Ontario County Youth Bureau.
- Jerome Kohrs – Tarr Dairy.
- Susan Noble – Ag Tech Park.

While the interviews uncovered both opportunities and issues, the interviewees’ attitudes towards the City were positive. These people were willing and excited to give insight about the place where they live and work. They were hopeful that their input and this project could raise the City to its full potential. These interviews yielded the following information:

Overview

The strongest theme of the interviews was the view that the City’s workforce and resources are underutilized. Many of the interviewees indicated that the City was not realizing the full potential of some opportunities. They recognized positive aspects about Geneva, such as the City’s proximity to water, educational facilities and transportation, but expressed a disappointment that these attributes were being underutilized.

The interviewees mentioned economic opportunities that were being underutilized. Many of the business owners mentioned that business attraction (what this project seeks to improve) was an area where the City was not taking full advantage of the possibilities. One business owner said he felt the City has not tried to improve on a business attraction basis.

Other topics included utilities and aesthetics. One local business owner and homeowner mentioned that the City had redone some roads recently, but did not choose to bury the utility lines. He felt the City did not take full advantage of the opportunity to make infrastructure improvements. Several interviewees also felt that while the appearance and vibrancy of the downtown area was improving, there was still a need for further progress. They did positively comment on the downtown revitalization situation by saying that people generally admit that there is a need for further change.

Proximity to the Lake Seneca was cited as another opportunity that the City has yet to take full advantage of. Road access to the water is currently inadequate, particularly from the north. Residents and visitors alike are not able to take full advantage of being so close to the waterfront.
Many of the people who live and work in Geneva pointed out real estate is underdeveloped in general and that there are significant opportunities for reuse. People stated that property values are low and there is limited opportunity for ownership. Property values in the City are low, generally indicating a depressed community, school system and economy. People specifically mentioned property values being affected by vacancies and absent owners, citing physical neglect on the buildings. Peeling paint and yards full of garbage can result in lower neighborhood property values. The issue of absentee ownership likely deserves further investigation as this can often result in less effort being made to upkeep properties as well as other, broader aesthetic issues and even perceptions of personal safety.

It was mentioned that there are limited opportunities to buy property in the City. Interviewees said there were no multi-family ownership properties or condos, leaving people to buy single-family houses or rent property. These rentals limit the sense of pride and increase vacancies, resulting in properties that can become disheveled.

**Workforce**

Several interviewees mentioned issues surrounding the existing workforce, noting drawbacks and assets. The existing major industries in Geneva and the nearby areas are manufacturing, food and beverage, hospitality-related businesses and healthcare. Even so, underemployment was noted as one of the biggest issues facing the City’s workforce and economic climate. One person interviewed noted employable people are either over or under educated; they lack the basic skills needed to perform at many worksites in Geneva, like manufacturing. Drug use is also an issue in underemployment. New hires cannot pass the drug-screening test, resulting in decreased opportunities and beginning a downward socio-economic spiral. Another factor of under-employment is the City’s aging workforce. The average age of a machinist is 57 and filling those positions as older machinists retire has proven to be difficult.

Skilled manufacturing is both an opportunity and a risk for the community and its workforce. This element is increasingly difficult to staff and is also continuously threatened by the introduction of complex technology. While there is a local and regional legacy of machining and manufacturing, skilled manufacturing positions are difficult to staff because applicants lack middle skills sets. Applicants tend to be either under or over educated. Interviewees noted that local companies often have to search for talent outside of Geneva to fill these skilled positions. This is complicated by the fact that there are still challenges in convincing young professionals to move to Geneva.

Despite the problems Geneva faces with labor, the City does have many wonderful resources that can be used to solve this underemployment issue. The region has many educational institutions that can provide both general and specialized training. People interviewed repeatedly mentioned community colleges, agencies and organizations that provide effective training and retraining programs for the workforce. Regional agencies also work with people and businesses to best match people seeking employment with businesses with positions to fill. These organizations also help to find funding for training programs as needed.

**City Mentality**

General city mentality, perception and culture appear to be at a crossroads, complicating the picture of Geneva’s opportunities. Interviews with local business owners revealed a view that the City was not
progressive, although people admitted there was a need for change. Business owners felt that dealing with the City could be a hassle, although it was unclear if this idea was based on experience or perception.

Interviewees presented differing pictures on the issue of working with the City. Business owners mentioned difficulties with the City regarding financial support and business finance programs. Several people said while the City was helpful, the loan process available through the City was confusing. Other business owners expressed that City officials were not welcoming, personal or supportive. They said a more open line of communication would be appreciated. Others noted that this may have been the case in the past, but that the situation has improved.

The interviews also highlighted the fact that most business owners and their employees were from the City or the surrounding regions. Among other points, this underlines the limited exposure Geneva has outside the region as a possible destination for inward investment.

Regional Location

The regional location was brought up as one of the strongest assets the City can offer. Geneva is in an excellent location to prosper economically with prominent access to trucking routes. According to the business interviewees, almost all of their business shipping and shipping in the region is done by truck. Major highways and roads make this method possible and give businesses reach to the entire east coast and Northeast region. Half the population of North America is within a ten-hour drive of Geneva. Geneva is also home to a UPS hub, making shipping by truck very convenient. The City also has access to major rail lines but the preferred method of shipping is still via roadway.

People also mentioned a specific regional opportunity that has gone heretofore unrealized. The Finger Lakes region has a strong wine industry, and Geneva lies almost at the geographic center. The wine trail also traverses the City. Perhaps there are further opportunities for either more wine activity or an associated food cluster.

Summary and Recommendations

The interviews yielded interesting and useful results. Four major themes surround Geneva’s current situation: underutilization, workforce, city mentality and regional location. Geneva has many economic and general opportunities that are not being taken advantage of. The City has a workforce that has the potential to be prosperous but needs assistance from local agencies. City mentality needs to change and become more positive regarding new ideas and opportunities. Geneva is in a prime location in the region that allows the City to prosper economically. Geneva’s economic strengths provide a foundation for the general potential market strategies outlined below.

- **Intensify efforts to attract and retain new businesses** – Geneva already has a legacy of entrepreneurship. An effective economic development strategy will begin with a better understanding of what already works, while nurturing the businesses already in place and then continuing to expand on the value chains in place. The first step in this process is to create an ongoing dialogue between the City and the business community.
- **Collaborate with Greater Rochester Enterprise** – Greater Rochester Enterprise has both the capacity and responsibility to promote business attraction to the entire region. The City should leverage this relationship to ensure that the community’s strengths are broadcast to a national audience.
- **Encourage local businesses to find and attract new partners** – Local networks are in place to some degree, but there is an opportunity for better knowledge and supply chain sharing in the region. The City can and should make efforts to link associated businesses.

- **Encourage and foster small local manufacturing and production activities** – Some such activity is already in place in the region in clothing, food, and fabrication. Global economic trends are once again encouraging the formation of regional production, and Geneva is well situated to capture some of this. The Study Area already has clusters of small manufacturing businesses and could accommodate more, particularly in the northwest portion of the Study Area; these clusters can provide a jumping off point for future expansion of manufacturing-type uses.

- **Enhance job training outcomes with strong ties to business demand** – A better, more direct linkage between job training and current businesses will create a better foundation for success for both company and employee.

- **Leverage and improve connection with Wine Trail and local food cluster** – Food production has increasingly regionalized due to interests in local sourcing, regional tastes, and even food safety. Central New York state already has a strong food and wine culture, and Geneva is well positioned to play a major role in this area.

The above are only initial suggestions and should be investigated further during future planning and economic development efforts associated with the Study Area.
Strategy for the North End Neighborhoods

While Geneva’s North End neighborhoods face a range of social, economic and land use-related challenges, the community has an opportunity to build on the residents’ pride in the neighborhood, strong culture and valuable assets. This set of revitalization strategies integrates key themes, strategic opportunities and priorities outlined in the Vision Statement for the North End neighborhoods and refined through advisory committee, stakeholder and community discussions. The sections below provide more detailed strategies and recommendations for the following revitalization themes: Economic Development, Neighborhood Quality of Life and Open Space and Connectivity.

Figure 19: Proposed Revitalization Strategies Map

Support Economic Development

From 2001 to 2011, Ontario County lost 1,083 manufacturing jobs. However, the County gained significantly in professional and business services, education and health services, and leisure and hospitality, accounting for over 1,000 new jobs in each of the three sectors. While each is significant, employment associated with professional and business services has increased 36 percent from 2001. Ontario County has attracted or retained significantly more jobs in the following sectors than might have been predicted by examining national or state trends:
- Professional and Business Services.
- Manufacturing.
- Trade Transportation and Utilities.
- Leisure and Hospitality.

Geneva’s existing economic strengths provide a solid foundation for the following potential market strategies:

- Intensify efforts to attract and retain new businesses.
- Collaborate with Greater Rochester Enterprise.
- Encourage local businesses to find and attract new partners.
- Encourage and foster small local manufacturing and production activities.
- Enhance job training outcomes with strong ties to business demand.
- Consider rezoning options to increase certainty in development review process.
- Leverage and improve connection to Wine Trail and local food cluster.

In an effort to focus these broad market strategies, this study offers three targeted recommendations for gaining and achieving economic development momentum in the BOA, particularly in the northwest portion in the vicinity of the Market Basket site: 1) Promote manufacturing and innovation hub; 2) Create a new road alignment; and 3) Re-position Market Basket site.

1) Promote Manufacturing and Innovation Hub

A manufacturing and innovation hub in the vicinity of the Market Basket site would focus efforts to attract and retain a cluster of small scale, light industrial manufacturing businesses and supporting uses in the northwest portion of the Study Area. The Cracker Factory is already an excellent example of small-scale, entrepreneurial manufacturing in the area. Leveraging the Geneva Enterprise Development Center can help to expand entrepreneurship and business incubation. The manufacturing and innovation hub, and perhaps the vacant Market Basket site in particular, could be a location for those small businesses that are “graduating” from the Geneva Enterprise Development Center to grow in size and invest in a permanent location in the City. In order to encourage the creation and/or relocation of like-minded businesses who will populate the manufacturing and innovation hub, the City, LDC, IDA and other entities, should engage local businesses and educational institutions in workforce development, job training and capacity building. Greater Rochester Enterprise would be a good partner in regional collaboration to promote the Manufacturing and Innovation Hub.

2) Create New Road Alignment

The northwestern portion of the BOA Study Area suffers from a number of circulation challenges. Because the Gates Avenue rail overpass is not high enough for trucks to pass, truck traffic is currently routed through narrow residential streets. Establishing a new east-west circulation route to connect Lehigh and Exchange streets could alleviate the problems caused by this circulation pattern. A new road alignment with an at-grade rail crossing could traverse vacant City-owned property north of the Market Basket site and privately owned vacant property east of the rail line. Coordinating infrastructure improvements and road alignment considerations with CNN International’s facility expansion plans could be an efficient way to improve circulation in the general area.
3) Re-Position Market Basket

The Market Basket site is cleaned up but needs to be prepared for reuse. This would involve: completion of a closeout report by NYSDEC, removing the fence around the site, re-grading and formally indicating that the site is ready for reuse. These actions could help to change the community’s perception of the site as a historically contaminated property that is inaccessible and unusable. Evaluating potential uses could help interested parties to understand what the site’s possibilities might be. Potential uses to delve into might include: expansion of adjacent manufacturing operations; partial use of the property for new road alignment to enhance circulation; and redevelopment as commercial, manufacturing or business incubation space. During and after this repositioning process, Greater Rochester Enterprise may be an effective partner in marketing the site for future users.
**Improve Neighborhood Quality of Life**

Stakeholders came up with a number of opportunities and principles that they felt would help to improve quality of life for themselves and their neighbors.

- Pursue housing revitalization strategies to improve quality of housing in areas prone to poorly managed rental properties.
- Create a network of local neighborhood associations to help build pride and ensure minimum standards for property maintenance.
- Transition underutilized commercial space and vacant property to infill live/work residential.
- Provide structured activities for teenagers.
- Establish centrally located commercial services that provide groceries and basic amenities for residents.
- Improve streetscape infrastructure to improve pedestrian safety and access and build neighborhood pride.

In order to carry out these opportunities, three strategies stand out as productive actions to facilitate neighborhood reinvestment: 1) Improve Quality of Housing; 2) Transition to Infill Live/Work; and 3) Expand Access to Services.

![Figure 21: Neighborhood Quality of Life Strategies Map](image-url)
1) Improve Quality of Housing

Participant discussions and previous housing studies identify specific actions to improve the quality of housing in the North End neighborhoods. Neighborhood action is showing success in other parts of Geneva, and the concept is beginning to take hold in the North End neighborhoods. Recommendations from the City’s 2008 housing study are key to implementing this strategy. If residents join forces to create neighborhood associations, the members can work together to establish minimum property maintenance standards, promote neighborhood awareness and build neighborhood pride. Beginning at the block level, residents can form core groups of active, interested neighbors. “Block captains” assigned to different streets can establish the organizational structure for the neighborhood associations.

There are small, well-functioning residential pockets scattered amongst the neighborhoods in the Study Area that could be leveraged to support the nearby areas that are not functioning as well. Methods of achieving this could include building neighborhood pride and ensuring sustained investment by holding more frequent neighborhood gatherings and using those gatherings as a chance to promote the neighborhoods’ cultural heritage. Community-driven marketing is another method of building and maintaining a sense of community, whereby residents help to market for-sale homes to friends and relatives and to employees at the nearby employment centers (colleges, downtown and hospital).

Housing stock on the Genesee Street corridor has great potential. Leveraging Genesee Park’s historic district designation could help to improve housing by providing homeowners with access to historic preservation funding.

Chronic mismanagement of rental properties on Genesee, Clinton, Wadsworth and Andes streets continues to be a problem. Targeting code enforcement activities, led by the Problem Properties Task Force, on these areas could lead to a systematic means of enforcing code violations and noticeable improvement in the neighborhoods. Code enforcement activities should be followed by targeted acquisition and demolition of strategic properties. Developing a plan for maintaining and repositioning the resulting vacant lots can ensure that the demolition sites do not themselves become another source of blight.

While some streetscape improvement efforts have occurred recently and have made a significant difference to the residents, many streets are still in need. On streets where substantial improvement work has not recently occurred, working with residents to invest in sidewalk and curb improvements will create a sense of pride and ownership. Working with the Department of Public Works for additional street lighting will promote walkability year-round and increase residents’ perception of safety. In areas targeted for code enforcement, the combination of blight removal and streetscape work has great potential to inspire neighborhood investment.

2) Transition to Infill Live/Work

Participants noted that views of the lake from East Lake View are a valuable asset for the neighborhood. Clusters of certain vacant and underutilized properties on Middle Street may offer opportunities for market rate live/work-type housing. Currently, zoning on Middle Street is misaligned with a live/work goal; the area’s industrial zoning is not conducive to mixed-use development and would need to be revised. A plan to activate the live/work strategy would need to identify clusters of properties with potential to accommodate infill live/work housing and then determine potential steps to facilitate reuse.
(such as ownership transfer options, market potential, developer interest, etc.). The approximately 3.5 acre Middle Street vacant property cluster identified on page 75 encompasses four adjacent parcels may have the potential to support mixed-use live/work type housing. This cluster represents a potential catalyst site that could help spur revitalization of other vacant and underutilized properties on Middle Street. Initiating a redevelopment process for the Middle Street vacant properties cluster would need to engage stakeholders such as local businesses, property owners and real estate professionals; these players would identify vacant land and structures on Middle Street with potential for redevelopment. Evaluating environmental conditions at priority properties would be an important step.

3) Expand Access to Services

Participant discussions highlighted a lack of basic services and teen-oriented activities in the North End neighborhoods. The intersection of Exchange and North streets seemed to participants to be an obvious opportunity for a much-improved “gateway” into the City. Redeveloping strategic vacant properties near this intersection and marketing the area as a neighborhood commercial center could help to bring basic services and amenities back to the area, such as a grocery, a pharmacy and a general store. The gateway concept could include celebrating North End neighborhood culture and pride through investments in streetscape infrastructure and public art.

Activities and opportunities to serve teens in the evening hours (6:00-9:00 PM) is a growing priority for residents. If safe transportation were available from North End neighborhoods to youth centers on Pre-Emption and at Geneva’s Community Center, existing teen programs at these centers could help to fill the gap. If the Boys and Girls Club Goodman Street facility offered evening hours for teens, and if transportation were available from the North End neighborhoods, the Boys and Girls Club’s existing teen programs could provide the needed teen-oriented activities. Another option could be to establish a new Boys and Girls Club program at a new site in the North End neighborhoods. Coordinating with other youth organizations to create new opportunities would also help to keep teens engaged in productive evening activities.

The North End neighborhoods do not currently have a neighborhood grocery. Establishing a mobile food market at the intersection of North and Exchange Streets would be a test market for a grocery store. After determining demand, stakeholders could then evaluate options to reuse vacant properties for a neighborhood market, potentially at the new “gateway” at Exchange and North streets.

Increase Open Space and Connectivity

Geneva as a whole (particularly the lakefront) and the surrounding area are outdoor recreation destinations. Participants in the BOA meetings identified a number of opportunities for the North End neighborhoods to increase and make use of its open space and parkland, and to reconnect to the notable outdoor recreation amenities in and around Geneva. Opportunities and principles that the stakeholders discussed include:

- Increase programming at existing parks.
- Utilize Marsh Creek and abandoned rail line to create a network of greenway trails.
- Connect North End neighborhoods to planned trails.
- Increase access to waterfront.
Develop a park at the former Foundry site.

Establish safe pedestrian crossings at busy intersections and rail lines.

The opportunities that generated the most enthusiasm and considered by participants to have the most potential are: 1) New Programming at Parks; 2) Multi-Use Park at The Foundry; 3) North End Greenways Expansion; 4) Rail Infrastructure Modifications.

1) New Programming at Parks

Participants noted that the existing parks in the North End neighborhood are underutilized due to lack of interest in programming and mismatch between offerings and timing. Nieder Park in particular would be a good target for improvements, particularly to redefine the space and the park features (which are currently either inadequate or undesirable), increase connections to adjacent neighborhoods, and address stormwater drainage issues. Gulvin Park, too, is thought to be worthy of additional attention. Physical or programmatic improvements at Gulvin Park could incorporate watershed education elements, taking advantage of the park’s proximity to Marsh Creek. The new East Lakeview neighborhood association is looking into opportunities and funding sources to pursue these improvements.

Figure 22: Open Space Strategies Map

2) Multi-Use Park at The Foundry

A local artist and entrepreneur has proposed an innovative multi-use park concept for the Foundry site on Jackson Street that would integrate sculpture, open space and skateboarding features. Participants
identified a number of considerations to help refine a recreational reuse concept for the Foundry site. Including skateboarding in the design would offer a popular recreation alternative for young people. Additional amenities such as walking trails, lighting, seating, pavilion and a grilling area would make the park attractive to all residents. In order to access the park from the non-Exchange Street side, participants suggested a formal pedestrian connection between Jackson Street and Genesee Street. This would use a rail crossing and pathway to form an integrated open space system that addresses safety concerns and responds to pedestrian route preferences. Access to Genesee Street traverses private property and would require an easement. The multi-use park idea is particularly attractive to residents around the Foundry who feel crowded by the commercial properties on Jackson and Exchange Streets.

3) North End Greenways Expansion

A network of greenways utilizing Marsh Creek and abandoned rail lines could reconnect the North End neighborhoods with the City and waterfront. Participants identified a number of strategies to create these greenways in the North End neighborhoods. Existing trails and bikeways, such as the Ontario Pathways system to the west and Canalway trails to the east, are an already robust network; Geneva could link to these trails and bikeways using pedestrian and bicycle connections. The proposed Town Trail could be extended from the Geneva Community Center to Lehigh Valley Station and eastward along the abandoned elevated rail line. Marsh Creek is flanked with publicly-owned land on which a greenway trail could be established.

An interconnected greenway system would require various infrastructure improvements (constructing new bridges along the elevated rail line; evaluating potential trail routing, flood plain and green infrastructure considerations along Marsh Creek). Evaluating the feasibility of these improvements is a necessary first step.

All lakefront access routes would require crossing U.S. Route 5 & 20, which participants recognized to be a challenge. Though the prospect would be long term (10-15 years), identifying potential pedestrian connections from the North End neighborhoods across U.S. Route 5 & 20 and the rail line to the waterfront is a high priority for many stakeholders.

4) Rail Infrastructure Modifications

Participants in the BOA meetings identified long-term opportunities to address significant access barriers in and around the North End neighborhoods. It is possible that long-term plans for abandoning sections along the Finger Lakes Railroad line could envision rerouting rail traffic away from residential areas and the waterfront. Rail infrastructure changes like this, coupled with safe pedestrian and bicycle access across U.S. Route 5 & 20, could enhance pedestrian and auto access to downtown and the waterfront from the North End neighborhoods.
Brownfield Sites, Abandoned and Vacant Properties

Methodology

NYSDOS defines brownfields as “dormant properties where contamination or perceived contamination has impeded investment and redevelopment, making them an economic and environmental drain on localities.” Brownfields are, by nature, liabilities to communities due to a complicated mixture of environmental, economic, historic and cultural conditions, all of which can be obstacles to redevelopment. Environmental conditions are sometimes, but not often, the most intractable obstacle. In order to clear up confusion surrounding environmental conditions in the Study Area, this section of the North End BOA Nomination study attempts to gather, collate and interpret as much site-related data as possible.

In the case of Geneva’s brownfield sites, much of the available site information comes from institutional memory in the City and from New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) project managers. The consulting team conducted interviews with City and NYSDEC staff who have historically been involved at the brownfield sites in the North End neighborhoods. At the request of the consulting team, Environmental Data Resources Inc. (EDR) searched available environmental records for information pertinent to the Study Area. The Executive Summary of the EDR report is included in Appendix X. Due to its length, the complete EDR report has been provided to the City separately. The environmental records researched identified the distribution of sites within the BOA Study Area under the various federal, state/tribal and local programs as detailed in Table 29 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Federal/State/Local</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information System</td>
<td>CERCLIS</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act</td>
<td>RCRA</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA Generators</td>
<td>RCRA</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response Notification System</td>
<td>ERNS</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Tribal Equivalent CERCLIS</td>
<td>State/Tribe</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaking storage tanks list</td>
<td>State/Tribe</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered storage tanks list</td>
<td>State/Tribe</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Cleanup Sites</td>
<td>State/Tribe</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield Sites</td>
<td>State/Tribe</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered storage tanks list</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lien information from Oil Spill Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Release Records (spills reported to NYSDEC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Gas Plants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA non-generating sites</td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic Chemical Release Inventory System</td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The extensive results in the EDR report provide information about environmental conditions at a large number of sites in the Study Area. To support the City and community partners in aligning revitalization goals with reuse opportunities at potential brownfields, vacant and underutilized sites in the future, the consultant team has also developed a Brownfields Supplement, which includes an overlay of EDR search results and the revitalization strategies for the Study Area (see Appendix C). As the City and the community carry out revitalization strategies and develop detailed reuse strategies for brownfield sites in, the EDR results and the summaries here will allow the City to gauge the potential environmental obstacles associated with potential revitalization opportunities and catalyst properties. Through analysis and discussion, the City identified the seven catalyst properties within the Study Area. These brownfield sites, vacant and underutilized properties are highlighted on the map below and described in the following descriptive profiles.

Figure 23: Brownfield Sites and Catalyst Properties Map
1. Market Basket Site – Gates Avenue

Site Summary

The 2.5-acre Market Basket Site is currently vacant but formerly included two large warehouse buildings. The surrounding parcels include a combination of commercial, industrial, and residential uses. The buildings were previously used for the manufacture of straight edge razors and glass bottles during the early part of the century. The Market Basket Corporation occupied the site and operated a warehousing facility until 1956. Later uses included a tool rental company and an auto body repair business.

The City demolished the buildings as part of an NYSDEC ERP project in 2002. The site investigation identified limited soil and groundwater contamination near the former underground storage tanks (USTs) and a former boiler room at the facility. Known site contaminants include petroleum compounds, chlorinated solvents and metals.

A Record of Decision (ROD) was issued in March 2002 and called for building demolition, additional inspection beneath former buildings, removal of contaminated soil, long-term operation and maintenance, and institutional controls. Remedial design investigation was completed during the summer of 2004 and identified a source area of chlorobenzenes at the site. A remedial work plan for removing contaminated soils as called for in the ROD was approved in

14 Site summary information is based on search provided by EDR, last updated on 10/27/11.
2008. Remediation fieldwork began in August 2008 and included the excavation and removal of contaminated soils in three areas of the site. Additional surface soil excavation work in the eastern portion of the southern parcel was completed in 2009.

The primary contaminants of concern at the site include petroleum hydrocarbons, chlorinated solvent compounds (trichloroethene (TCE), dichloroethene (DCE) and vinyl chloride), chlorobenzenes and metals (chromium, copper, mercury, nickel and zinc). Exceedances of standards, criteria and guidance values (SCGs) include petroleum compounds, metals and chlorobenzenes in soil and petroleum compounds, chlorinated solvent compounds and chlorobenzenes in groundwater. Offsite migration of the contamination via groundwater is minimal and no downgradient receptors of groundwater have been identified. To prevent exposure to contaminated groundwater at the site, the remedy includes a minimum five year groundwater monitoring program and environmental easements in place to prohibit use of groundwater.

Spills

Documented spills at the Market Basket site are listed in Table 31.

Table 30: Market Basket Site Spills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spill Date</th>
<th>Material Spilled</th>
<th>Amount Spilled</th>
<th>Resource Affected</th>
<th>Closure Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/15/98</td>
<td>Gasoline, #6 Fuel Oil</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>9/20/06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Information Gathered

On January 7, 2013, NYSDEC Project Manager Greg MacLean indicated that he anticipates that the site will be closed out in several months. The future use will be restricted to commercial and industrial. A Site Management Plan and a Final Engineering Report were completed in 2010. Eight to ten on-site wells need to be maintained and monitored. Any soil removal activities that are performed on site must follow a Health and Safety Plan. The City has requested a state assistance contract extension to complete final soil cover and seeding.

Known Site Documents:

2. Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions.
5. Memo from AECOM to City of Geneva regarding the deed restriction preparation and approval.
7. Final engineering report.

Reuse Considerations

Surrounding uses include commercial and light manufacturing operations; properties are currently zoned for industrial use. Potential uses under consideration include: expansion of adjacent manufacturing operations; partial use of the property for new road alignment to enhance circulation; and as commercial, manufacturing or business incubation space (additional reuse considerations are highlighted in Section 6.)
Site Summary
This site is a former foundry on 2.5 acres in a mixed residential/commercial neighborhood. The City completed an on-site investigation under New York State’s Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) in 2000. Site investigation showed little impact to site groundwater, but certain sub-slab areas (e.g., a large sump) were proposed for sampling once demolition of the dilapidated and unsafe buildings was complete. An interim action of asbestos abatement and building demolition was completed in late 2005 and sub-slab investigation revealed minor soil contamination, mainly polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and phenols. Ground water showed little or no impact; exposures via drinking water are not expected as the area is served by a municipal water supply. A city consultant is preparing a final supplemental Remedial Investigation/Alternatives Analysis Report and demolition report. Off site, three phases of residential yard sampling revealed widespread lead contamination (30 homes showed lead levels above 400 parts per million (ppm)), apparently from historic air emissions from the foundry facility.

---

15 Site summary information is based on search provided by EDR, last updated on 11/26/12.
Spills

Documented spills at the Foundry site are listed in Table 30.

Table 31: Foundry Site Spills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spill Date</th>
<th>Material Spilled</th>
<th>Amount Spilled</th>
<th>Resource Affected</th>
<th>Closure Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/24/83</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>40 gallons</td>
<td>Ground water</td>
<td>8/28/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21/86</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>3/31/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/1900(^{16})</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>6/1/86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Information Gathered

On January 15, 2013, NYSDEC Project Manager Jim Craft indicated that the Remedial Investigation was completed and that lead contamination had been identified at off-site locations. DEC has $50,000 available to further investigate the off-site locations, which he expected to accomplish in spring 2013. At the time of this writing, the anticipated date for the off-site sampling is fall 2013. Mr. Craft confirmed that on-site structures have been demolished and that there are slabs still remaining. There is minimal on-site contamination except for some localized semi-volatile organics.

On January 29, 2013, the consultant team also met with Gordon Eddington, the former Director of Public Works for the City. Mr. Eddington has recently retired but holds most of the institutional knowledge about the Foundry and other brownfield sites in the City. He indicated that concrete slabs at the site need to be removed and the area re-graded.

Known Site Documents

3. Laboratory results of soil and groundwater samples collected in January 2006.
4. Geneva Foundry Residential Soil Survey and Sampling Results. Figure 1 and various tables. Prepared by O’Brien and Gere, October 2007.

Reuse Considerations

Due to its location on a residential street and proximity to downtown Geneva, community stakeholders would like to see the site used for recreational purposes. Potential recreational uses identified to date include: trails, light structures and a skateboard and sculpture park. Further site analysis is warranted to evaluate compatibility for recreational uses with the Foundry site’s physical features (existing concrete and asphalt slabs), and the anticipated use restrictions to be placed on the property as part of the cleanup.

\(^{16}\) This spill date is incorrectly identified in the DEC database.
3. Former Auto Parts Store - North Street and Exchange Street

Site Summary

This property occupies the northeast corner of North and Exchange Streets and has been the location of an auto parts store and a car dealership. The Geneva Local Development Corporation (LDC) and Industrial Development Agency (IDA) acquired the property and vacant two-story building in August 2013.

Spills

Documented spills at 2 North Exchange Street are listed in Table 33.

Table 32: Former Auto Parts Store Spills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spill Date</th>
<th>Material Spilled</th>
<th>Amount Spilled</th>
<th>Resource Affected</th>
<th>Closure Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2/07</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>Soil, groundwater</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Information Gathered
Two USTs were discovered during utility work conducted prior to a road construction project in February 2007. NYSDEC conducted a site visit on February 2, 2007. Former City of Geneva Department of Public Works staff confirmed that the tanks have been removed.

**Reuse Considerations**

The intersection of North and Exchange Streets functions as a strategic gateway to the City from the north. Adjacent land uses include: a service station, an automotive shop, a convenience store and small-scale professional offices. City representatives and community members see an opportunity to transition this area to a neighborhood commercial center. The City demolished the vacant structure at 2 North Exchange Street in July 2014 and by Fall 2014 will have acquired several surrounding properties. The City is under contract to acquire two adjacent residential properties, and plans are in place to demolish remaining structures and market the northeast corner of North and Exchange streets as a neighborhood commercial center.

![Figure 24: Northeast Corner of North and Exchange Streets Map](image)
4. North Street Service Station – East North Street

Site Summary

The 0.5-acre vacant, former gas station and convenience store known as Joe’s Service Station includes a small commercial building and gravel parking area located adjacent to Marsh Creek on East North Street.

Spills

Documented spills at the North Street Service Station site are listed in Table 32 on the following page.

Additional Information Gathered

In January 2013, NYSDEC Project Manager Joe Marchitell provided information on the spill that has not been closed (listed in Table 32). The tanks were removed and the soil excavated in August and September 2011. Approximately 3,800 tons of soil was disposed of at an off-site landfill. Soil samples taken during the tank and soil excavation indicated that petroleum contaminated soils remain in place along the building foundation. In July 2014, the City demolished and removed the approximately 4,000 square-foot building. NYSDEC will complete removal of any remaining on-site contaminated beneath the former building in Fall 2014. The site will be eligible for closeout after NYSDEC has completed the remaining soil removal.

Known site documents:

1. Analytical Soil Sampling Reports, prepared for NYSDEC.
   b. September 6, 2011.
   c. September 22, 2011.
   d. September 22, 2011.
Table 33: North Street Service Station Spills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spill Date</th>
<th>Material Spilled</th>
<th>Amount Spilled</th>
<th>Resource Affected</th>
<th>Closure Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/11/92</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>6/15/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/94</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>5 gallons</td>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>10/1/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/20/08</td>
<td>Waste oil/used oil</td>
<td>30 gallons</td>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>3/7/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/5/11</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>Soil, groundwater</td>
<td>Not closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reuse Considerations

Surrounding uses include residential, small-scale commercial and state-owned land within the Marsh Creek flood plain. The vacant former service station has been identified as a possible location for recreation-related commerce and a commercial grocery store, or as public green space. Conversations among the City and property owner regarding potential future use plans and a possible ownership transfer are ongoing.
Vacant Property Cluster – Middle Street

Site Summary

The south side of Middle Street is an area in transition. A cluster of poorly maintained and tax delinquent residential properties and scattered vacant lots are located among commercial, light industrial and warehousing uses in an area zoned for industrial use. The cluster of strategically positioned private and public vacant properties described below represents a potential redevelopment opportunity.

- 58 Middle Street (parcel ID #: 104.8-3-14), a vacant residential property acquired by the City via tax foreclosure.
- 60 Middle Street (parcel ID #: 104.8-3-15.100), a vacant privately-owned 0.5-acre lot.
- 143 Wadsworth Street (parcel ID #: 104.8-3-53.200), the eastern portion of a 1.6-acre privately owned parcel remains vacant and includes a narrow “panhandle” extending north to Middle Street.
- Ontario County IDA property (parcel ID #: 104.8-3-53.100) located on Railroad Place north of Route 5/20 and the Finger Lakes Railroad.

Descriptive Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Map Information:</th>
<th>Parcel #s 104.8-3-14; 104.8-3-15.100; 104.8-3-53.100; 104.8-3-53.200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Ranking of Importance:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Middle Street Vacant Property Cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner:</td>
<td>Public and private owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>58-60 Middle Street; 143 S. Wadsworth; Railroad Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality:</td>
<td>Geneva, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly owned:</td>
<td>Yes (58 Middle St.; Ontario County IDA parcel on Railroad Place)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreclosure list:</td>
<td>Yes (58 Middle St.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>3.5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings:</td>
<td>Vacant residential structure at 58 Middle St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning:</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities:</td>
<td>☑ Municipal Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Electrical Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Municipal Sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Telecom Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Natural Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Road:</td>
<td>E. North St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closest Highway:</td>
<td>NY Route 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles to Highway:</td>
<td>0.1 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closest Interstate:</td>
<td>I-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles to Interchange:</td>
<td>6 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail service:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closest Airport:</td>
<td>Finger Lakes Regional (14 mi.); Rochester International (52 mi.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spills
The EDR Search did not identify any known spills associated with the properties listed above.

Reuse Considerations
Located in close proximity to downtown and a short distance from Lakefront Park, the Middle Street vacant property cluster comprises approximately 3.5 acres across four parcels. Stakeholders have discussed the potential value of underutilized properties along Middle Street and have identified an opportunity for live/work infill development that leverages the potential views of Seneca Lake. Further discussion with property owners (two of the four parcels are privately-owned) and evaluation of parcel assembly options is needed.

Figure 25: Middle Street Vacant Property Cluster Map
Site Summary

The 2.2-acre site is entirely located within the Marsh Creek flood plain located off of East North Street. Marsh Creek bisects the property with armored stream banks and green space on either side. Surrounding land uses include: an inactive elevated rail line to the north; single-family residential uses to the east; the North Street Service Station brownfield site to the south; and residential uses to the west.

Spills

The EDR Search did not identify any known spills associated with this property. Known spills have occurred at the adjacent North Street Service Station property.

Additional Information Gathered

The property was part of a Marsh Creek flood control project constructed in 1958 and is entirely owned by the State of New York. The property is regulated under the NYSDEC Code of Regulations, Chapter V, Part 501: Use of Flood Control Lands.

Known site documents:


Reuse Considerations

The property is part of several publicly owned parcels dedicated to open space along Marsh Creek that offer an opportunity to develop and expand open space networks and connect isolated residential areas across the East Lakeview neighborhood.
Figure 26: Marsh Creek Flood Zone Property Map
**Inactive Rail Line – Genesee St. to East North Street**

**Site Summary**

An approximately 4,600-foot section of the inactive former Lehigh Valley Railroad traverses the Study Area between Genesee and East North streets. The entire segment is elevated 10-20 feet above the surrounding grade. The rail bed and embankments are largely overgrown.

The section of the former rail line within the Study Area traverses one private property, owned by Lehigh Station Inc. and three City-owned parcels, totaling 13.3 acres.

Former rail bridges along this section of the elevated rail line have been removed from crossings at Genesee, North Exchange, East North streets; Doran Avenue and the Finger Lakes Railroad.

**Spills**

The EDR Search did not identify any known spills.

**Reuse Considerations**

The elevated rail line functions as a linear green space traversing the Study Area and presents an opportunity to create a rail trail that connects existing regional trail systems, including the Ontario Pathways Rail Trail to the west and the Cayuga-Seneca Canalway Trail to the east. A rail trail along the inactive rail line could connect to public land surrounding Geneva Middle School and High School through the former Lehigh Valley Depot property west of Genesee Street. On the east side of the Study Area, a rail trail could connect the inactive line to Lakefront Park and Seneca Lake State Park utilizing public rights of way on East North and Evans streets. Evans Street public right of way extends across the Finger Lakes Railroad and US Route 5/20, creating a strategic link between the East Lakeview neighborhood and Lakefront Park.

---

**Descriptive Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Map Information</td>
<td>Parcel #s 90.19-1-90.100; 90.20-1-45; 90.20-3-30; 91.17-1-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Ranking of Importance</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Elevated Rail Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Lehigh Station Inc.; City of Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly owned</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreclosure list</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>13.3 acres; 4,600 linear feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Industrial (F, F1); Commercial (B1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Road</td>
<td>Genesee and East North Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closest Highway</td>
<td>NY Route 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles to Highway</td>
<td>0 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closest Interstate</td>
<td>I-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles to Interchange</td>
<td>6 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail service</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closest Airport</td>
<td>Finger Lakes Regional (14 mi.); Rochester International (52 mi.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential access points to the elevated rail line include the following locations along public rights of way or publicly owned properties, including: North Genesee Street, the intersection of North Wadsworth and Dove streets, Kirkwood Avenue, the Geneva IDA property on Doran Avenue, and East North Street.

Figure 27: Inactive Rail Line Map
Priority Strategies

In keeping with this BOA project as a community-driven process, the April 2013 advisory committee and community meeting focused prioritizing potential strategies for each revitalization theme. To assist the City and community stakeholders in identifying ways to advance elements of the revitalization strategy, the consultant team provided an overview of the key framework recommendations and then facilitated discussions to prioritize strategies.

Working from a master list of strategies spanning the three revitalization themes, participants completed a dot prioritization exercise to identify the strategies that they feel are most needed in the community. Each participant placed four dots (at least one dot had to be placed under each of the three themes). The tables below demonstrate the results of the exercise in each stakeholder meeting. Draft revitalization strategies are listed in the left-hand column; the dots in the middle and right-hand columns correspond to advisory committee and community stakeholder rankings, respectively.

Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Advisory Committee Ranking</th>
<th>Community Meeting Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for efficient closure of Market Basket site; Prepare Market Basket site for marketing and reuse (soil stockpile and fence removal).</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Manufacturing and Innovation Hub.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand business incubation, entrepreneurship and workforce training.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend zoning map and code in North End neighborhoods to increase certainty in development process.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with Greater Rochester Enterprise to support Manufacturing and Innovation Hub.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve signage for designated truck routes.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop plan for new road alignment and at-grade rail crossing between Lehigh and Exchange Streets.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Neighborhood Quality of Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Advisory Committee Ranking</th>
<th>Community Meeting Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve streetscape and pedestrian amenities on strategic residential</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blocks to build sense of pride.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop neighborhood commercial center at North and Exchange.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop plan for selective demolition, property maintenance and reuse.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue targeted code enforcement on Genesee, Clinton, Andes and Wadsworth.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form neighborhood associations to improve housing quality and foster</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighborhood pride.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate redevelopment opportunities for infill live/work housing at</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant Middle Street properties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to youth services.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to grocery stores, neighborhood amenities and services.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase number and frequency of festivals to celebrate North End</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighborhoods’ culture and pride.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help residents market for-sale homes to friends, relatives and</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at employment centers (hospital, colleges, downtown).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a mobile food stop at the intersection of North and Exchange.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss reuse alternatives with owner of vacant North Street Service</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open Space and Connectivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Advisory Committee Ranking</th>
<th>Community Meeting Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate long-term options for safe pedestrian and bike crossing at 5/20.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance programming at Nieder Park and Gulvin Park.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop recreational reuse framework and concept plan for Foundry site.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Marsh Creek greenway concept plan and feasibility study.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate current barriers to reuse at the Foundry site.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct rails-to-trails feasibility study for inactive rail line between Lehigh Valley depot and East North Street.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

After completing the dot exercise, participants discussed potential partnerships and funding sources for the highest priority strategies under each revitalization theme. Using the participant rankings, strategies that received a high ranking are listed below as near-term priorities. The summary below outlines potential partnerships, funding sources and near-term actions to advance priority strategies based on community input and discussion during steering committee and community meetings, and further analysis by City staff and the consultant team. A detailed Action Plan for advancing revitalization strategies throughout the Study Area is included in the Action Plan Supplement (see Appendix B).

Economic Development

Advocate for efficient closure of Market Basket site; Prepare Market Basket site for marketing and reuse.

Partnerships:
- NYSDEC.
- Geneva Department of Public Works (DPW).
- Geneva City Council.
- Geneva Industrial Development Authority.
- City Attorney.

Funding Sources:
- City staff time.
- City of Geneva for soil and fence removal.
- Empire State Development through New York State Consolidated Funding Application (CFA) process.
- Possible NYSDEC funding.

Near-term Actions:
- Coordinate with NYSDEC to advocate for closure.
- Remove fence and soil stockpile.
• Pursue active marketing in tandem with Manufacturing and Innovation Hub initiative.

Amend zoning map and code in North End neighborhoods to increase certainty in development process.

Partnerships:
- Geneva Office of Neighborhood Initiatives (ONI).
- Neighborhood residents.
- Geneva Planning Commission.
- Geneva City Council.

Funding Sources:
- Genesee Finger Lakes Regional Planning Council.
- City of Geneva.
- NYSDOS BOA.
- Possible CFA funding.

Near-term Actions:
- Apply or request funding for revised comprehensive plan.
- Conduct zoning audit.
- Develop draft re-zoning concept.

Promote Manufacturing and Innovation Hub.

Partnerships:
- Existing businesses: Cracker Factory, CCN, etc.
- Geneva Enterprise Development Center.
- Greater Rochester Enterprise.
- High-Tech Rochester (manufacturing extension service).
- Geneva Industrial Development Authority.
- New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA).

Funding Sources:
- NYSDOS BOA.
- Empire State Development through CFA process.

Near-term Actions:
- Develop marketing strategy for Manufacturing and Innovation Hub in tandem with Market Basket site closure and preparation activities.

Neighborhood Quality of Life

Improve streetscape and pedestrian amenities on strategic residential blocks to build sense of pride.

Partnerships:
- Residents.
- Geneva DPW.
- Geneva ONI.
- Shade tree committee.

Funding Sources:
- City of Geneva.
- NYS Urban Forestry Council.

Near-term Actions:
- Develop improvement strategy.
  - Update site conditions survey.
  - Design upgrades.
  - Pursue grants or request City of Geneva funding.
  - Engage residents for hands-on improvement projects.

**Develop neighborhood commercial center at North and Exchange.**

**Partnerships:**
- Property owners.
- Realtors.
- Geneva ONI.
- Geneva Development Services.
- Geneva DPW.

**Funding Sources:**
- Community Development Block Grant or Empire State Development through CFA process.
- City of Geneva Revolving Loan Fund.
- NYSDOS BOA.

**Near-term Actions:**
- Conversations with property owners.
- Implement low-cost aesthetic improvements to create an attractive gateway.
- Prioritize parcels for marketing and reuse.
- Evaluate options for the City to market gateway properties.
- Create development strategy and adaptive reuse plan.

**Develop plan for selective demolition, property maintenance and reuse.**

**Partnerships:**
- Geneva Department of Development Services/Code Enforcement.
- Geneva ONI.
- Problem Properties Task Force.
- Property owners.
- East Lakeview Neighborhood Association.
- Genesee Park/Historic North neighborhood residents.

**Funding Sources:**
- City of Geneva.
- Property owners.

**Near-term Actions:**
- Identify properties with chronic code enforcement challenges.
- Develop action plans with the City of Geneva, property owners and neighborhood associations.
- If appropriate, develop demolition, maintenance and reuse plans for targeted properties.

**Open Space and Connectivity**

**Evaluate long-term options for safe pedestrian and bike crossing at U.S. Route 5 & 20.**

**Partnerships:**
- NYS Department of Transportation (NYSDOT).
- Finger Lakes Railroad.
Geneva ONI.
Geneva DPW.

**Funding Sources:**
- NYSDOT.
- City of Geneva.
- NYSDOS BOA.

**Near-term Actions:**
- Continue discussions with NYSDOT.
- Continue discussions with Finger Lakes Railroad.
- Review current feasibility study and make recommendation for crossings in study area.

**Develop recreational reuse framework and concept plan for Foundry site.**

**Partnerships:**
- NYSDEC.
- Geneva DPW.
- Geneva ONI.
- Residents.
- Outdoor recreation user groups (e.g., skateboarders, BMXers, gardeners).
- Geneva Recreation Department.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
- NYS Department of Health.

**Funding Sources:**
- EPA.
- NYSDEC.
- NYS Parks, Recreation, & Historic Preservation through CFA process.
- NYSDOS BOA.
- Donations
- Nonprofits/Foundations.

**Near-term Actions:**
- Coordinate with NYSDEC to complete closure requirements.
- Hold planning charrette.
- Develop concept plan.
- Conduct feasibility study.
- Create a friends of park committee.

**Enhance programming at Nieder Park and Gulvin Park.**

**Partnerships:**
- East Lakeview and Upper North Neighborhood Associations.
- Geneva ONI.
- Geneva Parks Department.
- Geneva Police Department.
- Outdoor recreation users groups

**Funding Sources:**
- City of Geneva.
Near-term Actions:

- East Lakeview Neighborhood Association (ELNA) has identified several priorities for Gulvin Park improvements, including: horseshoes, bocce court, heavy tables for chess or checkers, and potential walking trail connections to public land along Marsh Creek.
- ELNA has offered to organize volunteers to assist with park improvements.
- Coordination among ELNA, Geneva ONI and Geneva Police Department is needed to clarify a policing strategy to ensure safety of park and prevent vandalism.
- Coordinate with Upper North neighborhood residents to identify potential park improvements that may be needed at Nieder Park.

The results of the prioritization exercise and funding discussion described above will help to guide the City, the neighborhood associations and other interested stakeholders as they pursue funding to carry out the near-term actions.
Next Steps

The City of Geneva intends to build on the North End Neighborhoods BOA Nomination by submitting an Application for Nomination in the BOA program. In the future, the City could utilize BOA program resources for completing detailed revitalization plans, implementation and marketing strategies for brownfield sites and catalyst properties in the Study Area.

In addition to further BOA funding, there may be opportunities to advance recommendations and align specific strategies with Consolidated Funding Application (CFA) resources through the Finger Lakes Regional Economic Development Council. Other state and federal grants offer additional resources to carry out specific action items. The Action Plan Supplement, included in Appendix B, provides a comprehensive road map of potential partnerships, funding sources and action items for each revitalization strategy.

Conclusion

The City of Geneva and community partners are well-positioned to build on the outcomes of the Nomination and advance a community vision for the future of the City’s North End neighborhoods, in which:

- **Economic development efforts are supported** through investments in a manufacturing and innovation hub and a neighborhood commercial center;

- **Quality of life is improved** by better access to neighborhood services and amenities, stable residential pockets that build pride and investment, higher quality housing throughout the

NOMINATION SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

The following supplemental materials and tools to support the City of Geneva in carrying out the Nomination recommendations are included in the Appendices:

**Appendix A – North End Neighborhoods Revitalization Framework** provides a concise summary of the revitalization strategies and recommended near-term actions.

**Appendix B – Action Plan Supplement** includes a detailed matrix that identifies potential partnerships, funding sources and action items for each of the revitalization strategies.

**Appendix C – Brownfields Supplement** offers a tool to help the City effectively leverage the EDR search results to prioritize additional brownfield sites for future research, site investigation and cleanup in coordination with revitalization efforts in the North End neighborhoods.

**Appendix D – Progress Memos** includes summary documents from Advisory Committee meetings, public forums and focus group meetings held throughout the North End BOA Nomination process.

**Appendix E – Environmental Data Resources Executive Summary Report, Data and Map** includes the findings of the EDR search for the Study Area.
neighborhood and successful efforts to transition vacant property into infill development and functional open space;

- **Neighborhood connectivity is enhanced** through an expanded open space network that links the neighborhood to Marsh Creek, Seneca Lake, Downtown Geneva and regional trails.