

Appendices

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix A:

Benchmark analysis of local land use regulations

	Bristol	Canadice	Canandaigua	East Bloomfield	Farmington	Geneva	Gorham	Hopewell	Manchester	Naples	Phelps	Richmond	Seneca	South Bristol	Victor	West Bloomfield
Has the town adopted a local Right to Farm Law?	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Are the following terms defined in the zoning ordinance?																
<i>Agriculture [in a manner consistent with AML §301]</i>	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
<i>Agri-business</i>	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
<i>Farm operation</i>	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
<i>Agritourism</i>	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
<i>Farm</i>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
<i>Farmstand or roadside stand</i>	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
<i>Home business occupation</i>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Does the definition of "junkyard" exclude on-farm scrap piles?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Does the town have an Ag-related zoning district?	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
<i>Is agriculture identified as a "preferred use", per the Purpose statement?</i>	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Are the following agricultural uses permitted within the Ag district?																
<i>Agri-business</i>	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
<i>Agriculture</i>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<i>Commercial horse boarding</i>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
<i>Farmstand or roadside stand</i>	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
<i>Farm worker housing</i>	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
<i>Veterinary office/hospital</i>	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
<i>Home business occupation</i>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
<i>Brewery or distillery</i>	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
<i>Winery</i>	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N

	Bristol	Canadice	Canandaigua	East Bloomfield	Farmington	Geneva	Gorham	Hopewell	Manchester	Naples	Phelps	Richmond	Seneca	South Bristol	Victor	West Bloomfield
Are the following competing uses permitted within the Ag district?																
<i>Single-family residential uses with lot sizes < 1 acre</i>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
<i>Multi-family housing or mobile home parks</i>	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
<i>Office buildings</i>	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
<i>Commercial</i>	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
<i>Hospitals, nursing homes, or other institutional uses</i>	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Does the zoning ordinance require a Special Use Permit for certain agricultural uses (in potential contravention of the AML)?	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N		N	Y	Y	N	Y
Does the town's subdivision ordinance allow for:																
<i>Minimum lot size of 2 acres or smaller</i>	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
<i>Fixed ratio lot size of 1:10 or greater</i>	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
<i>Cluster subdivision</i>	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Does the subdivision ordinance contain any protection mechanisms for agricultural infrastructure?	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix B:

Focus Group summary

1. Each group helped put shape to “local” agricultural markets

A number of questions tried to put some geographic bounds on the nature of “local” agriculture. Participants were asked what portion of their suppliers and customers are located within the county/region/state, and what they consider to be the local markets for their goods.

- Dairy representatives noted that their local market is determined by the reach of their cooperatives. In Ontario County, most product is shipped to plants in Rochester, Batavia, and Buffalo through Upstate. DFA producers also ship to Kraft and Sorrento/Lactalis (Buffalo). Organic milk products from Ontario County are typically also sold under a national brand, and are generally sold within the Northeast.
- Produce operations have closer local outlets, but also consider anything within the northeast to be local (as do their customers, many of whom are wholesalers in Boston, NYC, etc.). Large local outlets for produce include Seneca Foods (Geneva) and LiDestri (Rochester & Fairport).
- The local market for niche operations depends greatly on the type of product. Niche produce operations noted a small local radius (50-75 miles). High-volume/processed niche products tend to go toward specific markets in large population centers (e.g. NYC, D.C.); low-volume/fresh niche products may have a smaller regional market (e.g. Finger Lakes, Rochester-area restaurants).
- Livestock and field crop operations described the widest range of market locations – from within the county to foreign exports. The diversity and limited number of perspectives from that group limited any conclusions to be drawn.

2. Participants are identifying important resources that are both present and absent within the region

Several questions asked participants about the “upstream” suppliers and “downstream” markets and distribution resources that they depend on. Participants were very clear that market access is of greater concern than access to suppliers, but there were still some interesting takeaways from both sides of this discussion.

- Some participants noted that nearly all of their supplies and inputs are sourced outside of the county. While markets may be of greater concern, the absence of suppliers and the distance that operators must travel to access them create some inefficiencies that reduce profitability (e.g., no local suppliers of organic sweet corn transplants).
- Input regarding critical marketing and distribution resources varied according to operation size. For example: some small operators feel as though the distribution resources available in Geneva service medium-sized operations but not small operations; some medium-sized operations feel the opposite.
- Participants also had a mixed view of transportation resources. Transportation of supplies appears adequate, but transportation of goods to market(s) presents some obstacles. Multiple participants noted the difficulty of dealing with local regulation of over-the-road, and vigilant enforcement by the County Sherriff’s office. Rail infrastructure was discussed more in terms of its potential than its actual use, although it was noted that rail transport is common for supplies/inputs.

3. Municipal barriers to viability appear to be few in number, but complicated

Participants were asked specifically about local regulations that hinder the growth or efficiency of their operations. When asked about nuisance/junk laws, transportation restrictions (e.g. route restrictions), parking requirements, facility permitting, waste disposal, licensing, etc., most participants noted that they did not feel that these posed a substantial barrier. Zoning and subdivision, however, continues to be problematic in some areas of the county.

- To some degree, many acknowledged that these issues can be self-inflicted; in the past, large landowners have wanted to protect their holdings from development pressure until development became a profitable option for those exiting the sector.
- Participants noted a lack of knowledge on behalf of local boards in reviewing site plans for their impact on agriculture. Even in cases where the applicant is the farm owner, site plans that alter drainage, field shape, and equipment access can still have negative impacts on adjacent operations. There should be some effort to develop more consensus around the principles of site planning and subdivision that maintain agricultural infrastructure and field efficiency.
- The political reality of ag-friendly zoning and subdivision ordinances (e.g. Gorham, Seneca) is not lost on agricultural landowners; it is much more difficult to draft, adopt, and implement those types of ordinances near population centers such as Geneva or Canandaigua. There was little discussion regarding the types of zoning tools inside those population centers that might relieve pressure at the fringe.

- Water and sewer were noted as either similarly important or much more important – “As long as you don’t run water and sewer, the land will be more valuable for agriculture than for housing.” However, there are impediments to efficiency even for adjacent units without water and sewer, particularly with regard to the location of wellheads.

4. There are very strong concerns regarding the negative feedback loop between agricultural literacy and agricultural viability

This was the most consistent message across the four groups. This is not a concern about the future – it is having real and significant impacts on operations now.

- Young people are not exposed to agricultural careers, and farms have great difficulty sourcing local labor. Labor shortages are felt among both skilled and unskilled positions.
- Beyond labor, the lack of agricultural literacy also impacts relationships with neighboring landowners, and contributes to land use conflicts.
- It also impacts the marketplace more broadly, because consumers respond to changes in agriculture without a full understanding of the policies or practical utility that drives them.
- However, there is an emerging group of “hobby” farmers, “back-to-the-land” types, and new, small operators that suggest that the capacity for agricultural literacy still exists, and that efforts to educate the public can have positive impacts, even if the impacts are not immediately felt.
- Many participants acknowledged the outreach efforts of CCE, Ontario County, etc. in educating the public about agriculture. No specific concerns were raised about existing programs; the sense was more that there has to be more direct exposure within schools, more support of BOCES/FLCC programs, etc.

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix C: Additional Ag Census data

Figure C-1. Agricultural land use in Ontario County

Farm operations	1997*	2002	2007	2012
Total land (acres)	412,205	412,205	412,205	412,205
Land in farms (acres)	203,242	194,742	198,937	192,616
Proportion of land in farms	49.3%	47.2%	48.3%	46.7%
Number of farms	850	896	859	853
Average size of farms (acres)	219 [^]	217	232	226
Median (acres)	118 ^{^^}	75	78	72

Sources: Total land area: US Census Bureau; all others: USDA Agricultural Census databases as provided by the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS)

*Note: Some discrepancies existing between 1997 Agricultural Census data as originally estimated by the USDA and that which USDA currently features in their NASS databases. These discrepancies may be the result of revised definitions, revisions to sampling methods, etc. Unless otherwise noted, current (2015) NASS figures for each Agricultural Census are cited throughout this report.

[^]Calculated to reflect adjusted number of 1997 farms per current NASS estimates. Original 1997 estimate: 269 acres (based on original estimate of 692 farms, which has since been adjusted to 850, see above).

^{^^}As originally noted in 1997 estimate (cannot calculate revised estimate from aggregated data).

Figure C-2. Operation size by total acreage

Area operated (ac)	1997	2002	2007	2012	% change
1.0 to 9.9	287	448	271	336	17.1%
10.0 to 49.9	6,020	6,810	7,510	7,340	21.9%
50.0 to 69.9	3,961	3,422	3,821	3,837	-3.1%
70.0 to 99.9	6,487	6,314	6,125	7,642	17.8%
100 to 139	9,714	10,161	10,377	8,805	-9.4%
140 to 179	8,602	7,454	7,444	8,043	-6.5%
180 to 219	11,010	8,282	11,261	8,291	-24.7%
220 to 259	4,797	6,445	4,988	6,406	33.5%
260 to 499	33,421	27,490	26,016	22,151	-33.7%
500 to 999	51,524	38,333	32,272	33,200	-35.6%
1,000 to 1,999	55,329	59,337	47,500	41,659	-24.7%
>2,000	12,090	20,246	41,352	44,906	271.4%

Figure C-3. Organization types

	1997	2002	2007	2012
Non-family corporations	6	2	7	8
Acres operated	1,698	0	1,298	2,377
Family corporations	42	29	50	47
Acres operated	16,946	14,450	21,377	21,863
Family & individually owned (non-corporate)	713	796	703	731
Acres operated	140,932	0	116,778	116,397
Institutional, research, reservation, and other	6	4	11	3
Acres operated	1736	0	560	249
Partnership	83	65	88	64
Acres operated	41,930	41,128	58,924	51,730
Limited liability company	n/a	n/a	n/a	42
Acres operated	n/a	n/a	n/a	40,858

Figure C-4. Operations by gender and race

	1997 [^]	2002	2007	2012
Farm Operations	850	896	859	853
Total Operators		1,307	1,343	1,380
All Operators by Gender				
Male		904	909	933
Female	n/a	403	434	447
Principal Operator by Gender	140,932	0	116,778	116,397
Male*	759	596	573	543
Female	91	300	286	310
Acres Operated				
Operations with a female operator	n/a	103,350	64,290	59,769
Operations with a female principal operator	5,010	14,418	26,840	24,748
Principal Operators by Primary Occupation	n/a	n/a	n/a	40,858
Farming	459	555	461	495
Other	391	341	398	358
All Operators by Race				
American Indian or Alaska Native	n/a	9	4	2
Asian	n/a	6	11	7
Black or African American	n/a	1	2	0
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	n/a	0	0	0
White	n/a	1,268	1,312	1,328
More than one race	n/a	6	1	5
All Operators of Spanish, Hispanic or Latino Identity	n/a	2	2	2

[^]1997 Agricultural Census did not collect thorough data regarding operator characteristics.

*Number of male principal operators is calculated based on the total number of operations minus the USDA-estimated number of female principal operators.

Figure C-5. Total value of animal and crop sales

		1997	2002	2007	2012
Animal operations	Operations with sales	368	334	354	381
	Sales	\$41,365,000	\$49,417,000	\$104,350,000	\$103,091,000
Crop operations	Operations with sales	572	507	517	556
	Sales	\$39,834,000	\$37,659,000	\$49,498,000	\$77,235,000

Figure C-6. Value of animal and animal product sales

Sales, measured in \$	1997 [^]	2002	2007	2012
Aquaculture totals		90,000	70,000	0
Cattle, incl calves	4,231,000	6,164,000	10,398,000	14,335,000
Equine [^]		282,000	533,000	506,000
Goats, meat & other ^{^^}				6,000
Goats, milk				4,000
Hogs	1,124,000	0	0	0
Milk*	33,367,000	40,520,000	89,266,000	85,893,000
Poultry totals, incl eggs	0	0	0	227,000
Rabbits, live				2,000
Sheep, incl lambs ^{^^}				698,000
Specialty animal totals, incl products (excl equine)		29,000	455,000	32,000
Wool				22,000
<i>Animal totals, incl products</i>	<i>41,365,000</i>	<i>49,417,000</i>	<i>104,350,000</i>	<i>103,091,000</i>
<i>Animal totals, products only, organic</i>			<i>114,000</i>	

[^]Includes horses and ponies (owned), and mules, burros, and donkeys (any)

^{^^} The 2002 and 2007 Agricultural Census indicated an aggregated total of \$146,000 and \$112,000, respectively, for "Sheep & goats totals, incl. products". These figures cannot be disaggregated to distinguish between goat and sheep sales, which are noted separately in the 2012 Agricultural Census.

*Note: Prior to 2012, the Agricultural Census measurement was entitled "Milk, including other dairy products"

Figure C-7. Value of crop sales (includes fruit, vegetable, and field crops)

Sales, measured in \$	1997 [^]	2002	2007	2012
Aquatic plants			0	
Barley			2,000	0
Bedding plant totals			1,403,245	1,727,221
Berry totals				228,000
Corn			13,411,000	30,652,000
Cut Christmas trees & short term woody crops		212,000	36,000	65,000

Sales, measured in \$	1997 [^]	2002	2007	2012
Cut flowers & cut cultivated greens			0	0
Field crops, other, incl hay		3,622,000	3,693,000	7,398,000
Floriculture totals			1,427,553	1,797,700
Flowering plants, potted, indoor use			0	0
Foliage plants, indoor use				42,000
Fruit & tree nut totals	3,568,000	2,340,000	8,384,000	3,608,000
Fruit & tree nut totals, (excl berries)				3,381,000
Grain		10,463,000	23,515,000	51,232,000
Grain, other			1,044,000	1,596,000
Honey				30,000
Horticulture totals, (excl cut trees & vegetable seeds & transplants)		3,971,000	2,947,000	3,675,000
Maple syrup				206,000
Mushrooms				0
Nursery totals			0	1,412,524
Propagative material				181,600
Sorghum				0
Soybeans			6,252,000	15,159,000
Tomatoes, under protection			0	213,890
Transplants, commercial, vegetable & strawberry			0	0
Vegetable seeds				0
Wheat			2,806,000	3,731,000
Vegetable totals, incl fresh cut herbs, (excl tomatoes), under protection			0	50,301
Vegetable totals, incl seeds & transplants, in the open		17,050,000	10,921,000	11,257,000
<i>Crop totals</i>	<i>39,834,000</i>	<i>37,659,000</i>	<i>49,498,000</i>	<i>77,235,000</i>
<i>Crop totals, organic</i>			<i>731,000</i>	

Figure C-8. Asset values

	1997	2002	2007	2012
Total asset value (\$)	\$310,677,000	\$317,031,000	\$438,422,000	\$620,536,000
Total asset value (\$/ac)	\$1,474/ac	\$1,679/ac	\$2,204/ac	\$3,222/ac
Total asset value (\$/op)	\$365,933/op	\$355,018/op	\$510,387/op	\$727,475/op

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix D: Implementation progress report

This page intentionally left blank

Agricultural Enhancement Plan

Implementation Progress Report

The intent of this Progress Report is to provide a template for the consistent evaluation of the goals described in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan update. It is expected that the boards or committees tasked with implementation objectives will provide a thorough review of progress toward their respective responsibilities. The intent of these reports is to guide long-term implementation of the plan by reviewing progress and evolving contexts at regular intervals throughout the life of the plan.

Date of review:	
AEP Goal:	
Priority action(s) for this goal, as described in the AEP:	
Have these priorities changed? If yes, please describe how this priority should be adjusted.	
Has the board/committee made progress toward this goal? If so, please describe.	
Identify the tasks necessary to advance this goal in the coming year.	
Describe the resources necessary to complete these tasks (e.g., funding, partnerships, etc.).	

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix E:

Resolution of Plan Adoption

This page intentionally left blank

Ontario County

Board of Supervisors

Canandaigua, New York 14424

Supervisor Singer offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

RESOLUTION NO. 204-2018
APPROVAL OF THE AGRICULTURAL ENHANCEMENT PLAN
FOR ONTARIO COUNTY

WHEREAS, The Ontario County Board of Supervisors authorized the preparation of an update of the 2000 Agricultural Enhancement Plan with the financial assistance of the New York Dept. of Agriculture and Markets pursuant to Resolution No. 789-2012; and

WHEREAS, The draft Agricultural Enhancement Plan (Plan) for Ontario County has been completed and is on file with the Clerk of this Board; and

WHEREAS, The Ontario County Agricultural Enhancement Board has reviewed the Plan and recommends, by resolution, that the Board of Supervisors approve said Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Planning and Environmental Quality Committee has reviewed the draft Plan and recommends approval by the Board of Supervisors; and

WHEREAS, The Ontario County Board of Supervisors, has considered the written and verbal comments presented at a public hearing held in front of this Board at 6:30 pm on March 8, 2018; and

WHEREAS, This Board has determined pursuant to passage of Resolution No. 203-2018 that the proposed action will not have significant adverse environmental impacts pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Ontario County Board of Supervisors, after review of said Plan and verbal and written comments presented at said public hearing and such other documents as this Board felt it necessary or appropriate to examine to adequately review said Plan, hereby approves the Agricultural Enhancement Plan for Ontario County; and further

RESOLVED, That the Clerk of this Board send certified copies of this resolution and said Plan to the Commissioner of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, the Commissioner of the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets, and the Ontario County Planning Department.



STATE OF NEW YORK }
 County of Ontario }

I do hereby certify that I have compared the preceding with the original thereof, on file in the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors at Canandaigua, New York, and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole of said original; and that said original was duly adopted at a meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Ontario County held at Canandaigua, New York, on March 29, 2018.

Given under my hand and official seal March 30, 2018.

Kristin A. Mueller
 Kristin A. Mueller, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Ontario County, NY