

**HUNTINGTON STATION: A COMMUNITY IN A REGION OF OVERALL
PROSPERITY
A STRATEGY FOR REVITALIZATON**

Prepared For

The Town of Huntington
Frank Petrone, Supervisor

September 2003

Prepared by

Martin R. Cantor, CPA, M.A.

Economic, Planning and Economic Development Consultant
28 Woodmont Road
Melville, New York 11747

Tel: (631) 491-1388
Fax: (631) 491-6744

**Huntington Station: A Community In a Region of Overall Prosperity
A Strategy for Revitalization
September 2003**

Table of Contents

I:	Introduction: The Rise and Fall of Huntington Station's Downtown.	Page 3
II:	The Impact of the Global Economy and Changing Technology, Projections for the Long Island Labor Supply, and The Relationship Between Income and Education.	Page 8
III A:	Suffolk County and Huntington Station: A Comparison of Economic and Social Indicators; Household Income, Academic Achievement, Single Parent Households, Labor Force Participation, Unemployment, and Home Ownership.	Page 16
III B:	Huntington Station Revitalization Strategy: Identified Weaknesses and Targeted Economic Development Initiatives.	Page 39
IV:	Implementing A Coordinated Vision for the Huntington Station Community.	Page 53
VI:	Conclusion.	Page 61

I:INTRODUCTION: RISE AND FALL OF HUNTINGTON STATION'S DOWNTOWN

Huntington Station, located in the Town of Huntington and the County of Suffolk, is similar to most downtown areas struggling to revitalize itself. The current economic base has evolved over the past forty years, first impacted by the unfulfilled promises of the enacted Urban Renewal Programs of the 1960's, then by economic development decisions, demographic changes and a shifting regional economic base.

Huntington Station's emergence as a population and commercial center began 136 years ago and can be directly attributed to the expansion of the Long Island Rail Road (LIRR), which established a depot in 1867 on the site of the present station. As is often the case, the railroad brought commerce and people to the communities along its right-of-way. Thus, development came to eastern Long Island, and in particular to Huntington Station, where hotels, a bank, a post office, a racetrack, and two to three story buildings on both sides of New York Avenue were built to cater to both the needs of travelers, and to the eastern migrating population. These buildings provided space for offices, and convenience retail and service establishments. Goods and services offered included: coal, lumber and feed merchants, a bicycle shop, a barber, a shoe repair store, meat and poultry purveyors, a drug store, a general and sundry store, a bakery, a grocery store, an auto repair garage, and a ready to wear clothing store.¹ Huntington Station had become an important commercial center of western Suffolk County.

From its inception, Huntington Station became a transportation hub. Initially, stagecoaches linked up with scheduled arrivals of LIRR trains as they headed east, ultimately replaced by horse-drawn trolleys, and they in turn by electric trolleys and motorized buses. By 1910 a new LIRR station and underpass were built, with the station becoming the focal point of community and commercial activity. This encouraged the next generation of business activity to flourish. Over the next 50 years new merchants arrived

¹ Alfred Sforza, *Portrait of a Small Town* (New York: Maple Hill Press, 1996) p24-35.

providing goods and services to Huntington Station residents such as; department and sundry stores; a movie theater; more banks; several pharmacies; funeral homes; florists; jewelers; haberdashers; hardware and building supply stores; deli's, restaurants, bars and grills; fruit, vegetable and grocery stores; stationary and ice-cream stores; furniture stores; and other convenience stores and family-owned businesses.²

While merchants were meeting the demand for convenience shopping by the area's increasing population, Huntington Station was becoming an important manufacturing center for Suffolk County. A 1952 Huntington Town Chamber of Commerce listing of the 80 companies in the Town of Huntington was heavily weighted towards manufacturing. Employing 2,600 persons, these businesses produced station wagon bodies; lumber and building supplies; electronics; machine shops; sand and gravel; welding and iron works; ice and fuel; aerospace components; concrete; fishing; plastics and injection molding; tool and die; and pickle production. The workforce also included 339 persons employed by the electric, telephone and municipal water utilities.³

By the end of 1960, Huntington Station's economic growth had placed it at the top of the ten Suffolk County communities having the greatest number of manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers. In 1961, Huntington Station, with over 6.6 percent of Suffolk County's 8,100 businesses, maintained that top ten ranking. According to a report compiling rankings by Dun and Bradstreet, the 532 Huntington Station businesses exceeded those in Babylon, Bay Shore, Lindenhurst, Huntington, Patchogue, Amityville, Riverhead, East Northport and Copiague

All of that growth came to a halt during the 1960s. Under the rationalization of urban renewal, the 86 businesses surrounding the railroad station, and comprising the economic center and vital core of Huntington Station, were demolished. Conceptually, the displaced

² Ibid, p35-58.

³ Huntington Township Chamber of Commerce. *Industries in Huntington Township.* (Huntington, New York 1952).

and relocated businesses were to be replaced by a modern shopping center with adequate off-street parking. Additional office space was to be provided, while industrial uses eliminated. Housing was also impacted, with the urban renewal plan calling for the displacement of over 100 households, and the construction of new single family housing and garden apartments capable of accommodating nearly 275 families.⁴

The urban renewal plan adopted by the Huntington Town Board was guided by several factors. These were, (a) that the projected LIRR rider-ship would double from 23,000 riders in 1963 to 46,000 by 1980; (b) that 10.27 acres would be required for commuter parking; (c) that relieving the congestion in the vicinity of the station was a pressing public need for the Town to act upon;⁵ and (d) that the “land proposed for commercial use represented a reduction from existing allocation, in keeping with the transformation of the Huntington Station area from a regional shopping area to one predominantly servicing the local neighborhoods.” It was believed that traffic congestion, lack of adequate and convenient parking spaces, and a lack of room for commercial expansion and modernization contributed to a decline of the commercial area. Ironically, despite Huntington Station’s commercial district being anchored by a modern regional shopping center with ample off-street parking on New York Avenue, the prevailing planning policy as discussed in items (a)-(d) above, prevented Huntington Station from becoming a shopping destination of regional scale.⁶

Unfortunately the urban renewal plan failed to deliver on its vision. Rather than centralizing the commercial activity in a new neighborhood commercial district, the process of urban renewal eliminated the economic center of Huntington Station, replacing it with hundreds of commuter parking spaces, while decentralizing business activity elsewhere. The widening of New York Avenue, by the nearly 130 feet required for the four

⁴ Office of Urban Renewal, Town of Huntington. *Facts About LIFT Project No. 1.*(Town of Huntington, 1966)

⁵ Huntington Town Board. *General Neighborhood Renewal Plan, Huntington Station Area.*(Huntington, New York Nov. 1962),p.15.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p.10.

traffic lanes under the railroad overpass, separated the communities on the east and west side of New York Avenue. The failure to install the envisioned landscaped dividing mall on New York Avenue made crossing it unsafe and pedestrian unfriendly, and geographically divided the neighborhood and eroded Huntington Station's sense of community.

The Town of Huntington Planning Board, understanding the problems caused by Urban Renewal and the widening of New York Avenue, adopted a Comprehensive Plan Update in April 1993. The Planning Board recognized that the original 1965 Comprehensive Plan "classified Huntington Station as a Secondary Retail Center. Thus, the Update recognized that urban renewal efforts had altered the character of the area to the point where it no longer functioned, and was no longer perceived as a village center in the same vein as Greenlawn or East Northport."⁷

Compounding the economic impact of the failed urban renewal policies of the 1960's and 1970's on Huntington Station was the changing world economy. Subsequently, between 1980 and 2000, Long Island experienced the deindustrialization of its manufacturing base, caused in part by the contraction of the region's defense industry. This contraction, felt especially by Long Island's many machine shops, led to workforce reductions impacting much of the region's less skilled and less educated workers. At the same time, influenced largely by the globalization of economic activity between 1970 and 1990, the demand for more skilled and more educated workers was growing in Long Island's emerging high technology industries, and in the growing financial and banking sector.⁸ This analysis discusses how Huntington Station, a culturally and ethnically diverse African-American, Hispanic and White community, fared between 1990 and 2000 as compared to the surrounding Suffolk County.

⁷ Report On The Huntington Station Moratorium Area.

⁸ See Table 2: *Long Island Average Annual Opening for Fastest and Slowest Growing Occupations 1997-2007*.

What would be the impact of this period of industrial and economic restructuring on the Huntington Station workforce and related economy? What would be the cost to the community of the loss of jobs that required a lower level of education, such as blue-collar manufacturing and clerical? Would Huntington Station's residents be able to achieve the education and skills necessary for employment in the emerging and higher paid technology jobs, such as specialized financial services, and computer and telecommunication technology and their related commercial applications? Would the global economy and changes in technology, now requiring more intellectual skills from the workforce, impact the correlation existing between education and family income as compared to past years? Would Huntington Station be similar to other primarily African-American and Hispanic communities, which tend to have inadequate support structures for families; often having families living in homes where lower property tax bases are inadequate to fund financially strapped educational systems; and with communities often lagging behind whites in educational attainment, employment, and income? The result for some contemporary American communities is that the income gap has widened between the haves and have-nots. Would Huntington Station have the same experience and lag behind Suffolk County?

This analysis will explore the above questions by comparing Huntington Station, a multi-cultural African-American, Hispanic, and White community, with the surrounding primarily white, and economically more prosperous Suffolk County. The effects of globalization and technological change on Long Island and Huntington Station will be analyzed in part by using census data.

Following sections will discuss revitalization strategies for the Huntington Station Community, and the coordination of these revitalization strategies with the economic development and planning policies of the Town of Huntington. Conclusions will then be drawn about which economic development initiatives can best be employed in the Huntington Station community.

II: IMPACT of the GLOBAL ECONOMY and CHANGING TECHNOLOGY **WORKFORCE IMPACT: GLOBALIZATION and CHANGING TECHNOLOGY**

The global economy is based on changes in technology and communications, whereby capital flows, commodity markets, information, raw materials, management and organization have become internationalized and fully interdependent.

Between 1970 and 1990, the evolution of our industrial system brought with it an economy emphasizing services and finances, and a renewed focus on major cities for specific production, services, marketing and innovation. Furthermore, the internationalization of mergers, acquisitions, and financial transactions made cities the ideal center for management and coordination, for the raising and consolidations of investment capital, and for the formation of an international property market. This demand for financial innovations and specialized financial services continued, even during the period when major developments in computer and telecommunications technology and their related commercial applications occurred. What evolved was a change in the composition and growth patterns of the economies of major cities, now weighted heavily toward finance and producer services resulting from the above-average growth of these industrial sectors during the 1980's.⁹ During this period of globalization, New York City increased its importance as a center of finance and as a center for global servicing and management. The New York City employment base lost 30 percent of its construction jobs, 22 percent of the manufacturing jobs and 20 percent of the transportation jobs. At the same time jobs in the wholesale/retail sector grew by 15 percent, by 21 percent in finance, insurance, and real estate, and respectively by 23, 42 and 62 percent in banking, and business and legal services sectors. Not only did these service sectors report an increase of jobs, but their share of the New York City employment base also increased.¹⁰ The result was that jobs that earlier workforces could fill now required a higher degree of learning.

⁹ Saskia Sassen, *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), p.87-88.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, p. 126-134.

This new structure of global economic activity has brought changes in the organization of work, resulting in a shift in the job supply, and causing a polarization of the income and occupational distribution of workers. The growth industries of the global economy show a greater incidence of jobs at the high and low paying ends of the wage scale than do the jobs in the older industries now in decline. Almost half the jobs in the producer services are lower-wage jobs, with the other half in the two highest earning classes. This is in contrast to a large share of manufacturing workers who were in the middle-wage earning jobs during the postwar era. This economic polarization was caused, in part, by the contraction of the manufacturing sector and the increase in the supply of low-wage jobs. This resulted in the decline of the labor market share of unionized shops and in the deterioration of wages, while factories with overcrowded working conditions and industrial homework proliferated. Additionally, the supply of low-wage jobs in restaurants, hotels, cleaners, luxury housing, boutiques, etc., increased as required to service the new high-wage job holders created by globalization. Important, and not to be lost, is the fact that the growth of jobs in the global economy brings not only higher wage technological jobs but also many low-paying jobs.¹¹ What prevents universal access to the higher paying jobs generated by the global economy is that in the United States only college graduates and those few with extra-specialized post-high school training have acquired the skills relevant to the demands of this highly technological marketplace. This differs from Japan and Germany, where most high school and college graduates leave school with the skills required for the global economy.¹²

Technological advances, now favoring intellectual over physical attributes of workers, have transferred skills once provided by workers to machines. Blue collar manufacturing jobs, once epitomized by the assembly line, have been replaced by computers with their

¹¹ Saskia Sassen, *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), p. 9-10.

¹² William Julius Wilson, *When Work Disappears, The World of the New Urban Poor* (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1997), p.221.

attendant technical and professional personnel. Further change is evident in what can be called the global assembly line, where production and assembly of goods originate from factories and depots throughout the world wherever labor costs and economies of scale make an international division of labor cost-effective. The globalization of production and assembly has created the need for increased centralization and complexity of management, control, and planning. The complexity of participating in world markets and foreign countries has resulted in diversification of product lines, mergers, and transnationalization of economic activities that require highly specialized skills in top-level management. This has fostered growth and development of higher levels of expertise among producer service firms such as accountants, attorneys, programmers, and financial, banking, public relations and management consultants, who are now asked to improve upon their support services such that they become crucial elements in corporate decision making. Thus, the multinational company, with its dispersed manufacturing facilities, contributes to the development of new types of planning in production and distribution required for its business.¹³ While geographically Long Island, and in particular Huntington Station, may both be considered to be on the perimeter of the centers of global activity, the proximity to New York City, considered a leading global city, has impacted the Long Island region. The growth of Long Island's finance and banking sectors, as well as the presence of many multi-national companies, has brought the impact of the global economy to the region.

At the same time that changes in technology were producing new jobs, they were also making others obsolete. The technologically revolutionized workplace was widening the gap between skilled and unskilled workers, primarily because education and training had grown to become more important than ever. An example of this disparity is that in 1987

¹³ Saskia Sassen, *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), p. 10-11.

the average unadjusted annual pay in New York City was \$28,735, as compared to \$43,964 in the finance, insurance and real estate sector.¹⁴

Because of low levels of education, unskilled workers tend to be out of work or poorly paid, with others facing the threat of job displacement. For example, jobs created to develop new computer operated machine tools also eliminated jobs for those trained only for manual assembly-line work. Similarly, advances in word processing increased the demand for those who not only can type but who also can operate specialized software, often eliminating routine typists and secretaries.¹⁵ This disappearance of work, caused by the structural changes of the global economy, subsequently impacting the distribution of jobs and the level of education required to obtain employment, resulted in the simultaneous occurrence of increasing joblessness and declining real wages for low-skilled workers. The decline of the mass production system, the decreasing availability of lower-skilled blue-collar jobs, and the growing importance of training and education in the higher-growth industries all have adversely affected the employment rates and earnings of low-skilled black workers.¹⁶ The skills still taught in the public schools in the United States were principally designed to provide low-income native and immigrant students with the basic literacy and numeracy skills required for routine work in mass production factories, service industries, or farms. The interaction between technological and international competition demanded by the global economy has eroded the basic institutions of the mass production system, which has now become reliant on productivity improvements where human capital costs have been replaced by technology and the few educated professional, technical, and managerial workers necessary for production.¹⁷

¹⁴ Ibid, p. 224.

¹⁵ William Julius Wilson, *When Work Disappears, The World of the New Urban Poor* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf,1997), p.152.

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 54.

¹⁷ Ibid, p. 151.

THE GLOBAL ECONOMY: LONG ISLAND OCCUPATIONAL FORECAST:

Impacting any labor force are the skill demands placed on it by its regional economy. The Long Island economy is not only consumer driven, but it is also influenced by its proximity to New York City, a center of global economic activity. Thus for Long Island, a large concentration of the current jobs available in the local economy, and those projected for the first half of this decade, are from service and technology sectors which require a higher degree of skill and education. Table 1 illustrates the overall projected job availability on Long Island, expressed as the total of new jobs created and the job openings necessary to fill existing positions left vacant due to retirements, deaths, relocation, etc. Table 2 illustrates that some of the fastest growing occupations in the Long Island region are related to technology, while some of the slowest are related to jobs requiring lesser skills. This supports the belief that higher paying jobs are not only currently available in the Long Island economy, but the demand for skilled and educated workers to fill these jobs will continue well into this decade.

Table 1: Long Island Occupational Outlook 1996 - 2006

<u>Employment Group</u>	<u>Annual Openings</u>	<u>Job Growth</u>	<u>Average Net Replacement Jobs</u>
Managers/Administrators	2,160	750	1,410
Professional/Technology	9,970	4,250	5,720
Marketing/Sales	5,950	1,161	4,789
Administrative Support	5,040	500	4,540
Service Occupations	7,640	2,000	5,640
Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing	390	100	290
Precision Prod/Crafts/Repair	3,060	600	2,460
Operators/Fabricators	<u>3,050</u>	<u>400</u>	<u>2,650</u>
Total	<u>37,260</u>	<u>9,761</u>	<u>27,499</u>

Source: NYS Department of Labor as appearing in Long Island Business News Market Facts, 2000.

**Table 2: Long Island Average Annual Openings for Fastest Growing Occupations
1997-2007**

<u>Employment Group</u>	<u>Annual Growth Rate 1997-2007</u>	<u>Jobs Base Year 1997</u>	<u>Jobs Projected 2007</u>	<u>Median Hourly Wage</u>
Systems Analysts	9.1 %	3,020	5,770	\$22.19
Electronic Pagation Sys. Oper	8.0 %	200	360	\$14.16
Data Processing Equip. Repair	7.9 %	610	1,090	\$20.11
Occupational Therapy Assist.	7.3%	220	380	\$11.11
Adjustment Clerks	6.5%	4,620	7,610	\$10.97
Engineering, Mathematical				
Natural Science Managers	4.4%	2,300	3,320	\$34.34
Computer Support Specialists	4.3%	2,740	3,930	\$18.36
Telephone, Cable Install/Repair	3.8%	2,930	4,050	\$17.72
Data Base Administrators	3.8%	580	800	\$21.90

**Table 2 (cont.): Long Island Average Annual Openings for the Slowest Growing
Occupations: 1997-2007**

Parking Lot Attendants	4.0%	700	980	n/a
Bill and Account Collectors	4.0%	4,580	6,400	\$11.47
Investigators, Clerical	4.0%	590	820	\$12.93
Insulation Workers	3.9%	180	250	n/a
Bicycle Repairers	3.8%	130	180	\$11.27
Manicurists	3.8%	680	940	\$ 5.78

Source: NYS Department of Labor, Occupational Outlook, Long Island Region

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AND INCOME QUINTILES

The relationship between education, training, and income distribution is complex, since education's effect on income distribution is dependent not only on the way education is planned, developed and financed, but is also contingent upon such socioeconomic factors as employment probabilities, educational composition of the labor force, wage structure, and economic base. However, education does create a more skilled labor force and results in a shift from lower paid unskilled employment to higher paid skilled employment. This shift produces higher labor incomes, a reduction in skill differentials, and an increase in the share of wages in total output. The increase in the number of more educated and skilled

people will increase the ratio of such people in the total labor force while decreasing the ratio of less educated people.¹⁸

According to the World Bank, schooling, after controlling for the rate of economic growth, contributes significantly to a more equal income distribution in developing countries. As levels of schooling of the labor force increase, the income shares of both the bottom 40 percent and middle 40 percent of the population rise. Also important is that as the labor force gets more educated, income is redistributed from the top income quintile to the bottom 80 percent of the population.¹⁹ Table 3 expresses the relationship between money income levels and educational attainment for families in the United States. Tables 1 and 2 suggest that there are higher paying jobs being created in the Long Island economy that require a higher degree of education, and by attaining that level of education a worker may be able to earn that higher paying job.

Table 3: Relationship Between 1999 Family Income Level and Educational Attainment
Income Levels (\$1,000's)

Families	Total	\$10,000		\$15,000	\$25,000	\$35,000	\$50,000	\$75,000
		Under \$10,000	to \$14,999	to \$24,999	to \$34,999	to \$49,999	to \$74,999	and Over
<u>Total</u>	<u>72,031</u>	<u>4,144</u>	<u>3,485</u>	<u>8,678</u>	<u>8,550</u>	<u>11,861</u>	<u>15,236</u>	<u>20,077</u>
<u>With Education</u>	<u>68,678</u>	<u>3,431</u>	<u>3,142</u>	<u>8,008</u>	<u>7,947</u>	<u>11,361</u>	<u>14,897</u>	<u>19,892</u>
% of Total	95%	83%	90%	92%	93%	96%	98%	99%
Below 9th Grade	6%	16%	21%	14%	10%	5%	3%	1%
9th-12th No Grad	9%	23%	19%	17%	13%	9%	6%	2%
High Sch grad	32%	34%	34%	38%	39%	38%	34%	20%
Some College	19%	14%	13%	17%	18%	22%	21%	17%
Assoc. Degree	8%	5%	6%	6%	8%	8%	10%	9%
College Grad	17%	5%	5%	6%	9%	13%	18%	30%
Post Grad Deg	9%	3%	2%	2%	3%	5%	8%	21%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of The United States:2001: Table 671. Money Income of Families-Distribution by Family Characteristics and Income level: 1999

¹⁸ Jandhyala B.G. Tilak, *Education and Its Relation to Economic Growth, Poverty, and Income Distribution* (Washington: The World Bank, May 1980), p. 29-32.

¹⁹ Ibid, p. 77.

Other research has shown that income is closely related to the level of education, as is the widening income gap. Robert Reich, in *The Works of Nations*, points out that a male with a high school diploma, but without college education, who is employed and earning \$27,733 in 1987, will find that fourteen years earlier in 1973, someone with the same education would have earned \$31,677, as expressed in 1987 dollars. Thus, with no more than a high school education, real earnings actually declined by 12 percent. That same male, if he had dropped out of high school and was working in 1987, would have earned \$16,094, as compared to the \$19,562 (expressed in 1987 dollars) he would have earned in 1973, a decline of 18 percent. For a graduate from a four-year college, the earnings comparison would be different. The 1987 earnings of \$50,115 would be comparable to the \$49,531 (expressed in 1987 dollars) earned by a four-year college graduate in 1973. While a college degree does not guarantee that one will earn more, without it the chances are very slim that one will.²⁰

The widening gap between rich and poor appears to be related to a growing divergence in how much money people receive for the work that they do, and that divergence appears to have something to do with education. As suggested by Table 3, if one graduated from college, earnings improved; if one did not, one tended to get poorer. Basic causes include deindustrialization, technology replacing what manual labor once provided, and the global economy.²¹ Supporting this contention for Long Island are Tables 1 and 2, which report a current and future demand for jobs that require a higher degree of skill and education.

²⁰ Robert B. Reich, *The Works of Nations* (New York: Vintage Books, 1992), P. 205-206

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 207.

III A: SUFFOLK COUNTY AND HUNTINGTON STATION:
A COMPARISON OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL INDICATORS:

INTRODUCTION:

The 10 years between 1990 and 2000 brought socioeconomic changes to the New York City metropolitan area, including the culturally and ethnically diverse African-American, Hispanic, and White community of Huntington Station. Huntington Station continues to have a large Black and Hispanic population, while experiencing growth in the Asian and Pacific Islander populations. Several indices point to Huntington Station's slower growth; as compared to the economic development that has characterized Suffolk County. Despite Huntington Station's single parent headed families growing at a pace 40 percent slower than Suffolk County, the concentration of single parent families in Huntington Station continued to out pace Suffolk County. In Huntington Station, single headed families increased to where they now represent 1 in 4 families, or 26.3 percent of all Huntington Station families. This is 36 percent greater than in Suffolk County, where 19.2 percent of families are headed by single persons and now represent 1 in 5 families. The educational enrollment in advanced grades is somewhat comparable to Suffolk County, with overall educational attainment levels in Huntington Station keeping pace. This, in part, explains Huntington Station's similar employment levels as compared to Suffolk County. The Huntington Station unemployment and labor participation rates were comparable to surrounding Suffolk County, with Huntington Station's workforce widely employed in jobs requiring skills similar to those in greater Suffolk County. However, fewer Huntington Station residents own their own homes, with more living in rental apartments and paying rents comparable to those charged in Suffolk County. The following comparison of a broad range of social indicators and economic data shows how Huntington Station, a community with untapped economic potential, fared nearly as well as Suffolk County.

POPULATION:

Table 4: Racial Composition

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
Total	<u>1,321,864</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>1,419,369</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>97,505</u>	<u>7.4%</u>
White	1,190,315	90.0%	1,200,755	84.6%	10,440	.9%
Black	82,910	6.3%	98,553	6.9%	15,643	18.9%
Other (a)	48,639	3.7%	120,061	8.5%	71,422	146.8%
Hispanic (of any race)	87,852	6.6%	149,411	10.5%	61,559	70.1%
<u>Huntington Station:</u>						
Total	<u>28,247</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>29,910</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>1,663</u>	<u>5.9%</u>
White	23,091	81.8%	21,401	71.5%	(1,690)	(7.3%)
Black	3,596	12.7%	3,459	11.6%	(137)	(3.8%)
Other	1,560	5.5%	5,050	16.9%	3,490	223.7%
Hispanic (of any race)	3,377	12.0%	6,802	22.7%	3,425	101.4%

Source: 1990 U.S. Census, Table DP-1., 2000 U. S. Census, Table DP-1.
Note (a): Other includes Natural Americans, Asians and Pacific Islanders.

The total Suffolk County population grew by 7.4 percent between 1990 and 2000, to a total of 1,419,369, whereas by 2000, the Huntington Station community reported growth of 5.9 percent to 29,910. While the population growth percentages were similar, the changes in their racial composition were not. In 1990, whites and blacks respectively represented 90.0 and 6.3 percent of Suffolk County's population. By 2000, the black component of Suffolk County's population had increased slightly to 6.9 percent, while whites decreased to 84.6 percent. The non-white non-black population (termed other) rose from 3.7 percent to 8.5 percent. Blacks grew at a faster pace, increasing by 18.9 percent or 15,643 persons

to 98,553, while Whites, increasing by 10,440 people, grew marginally by .9 percent. The Hispanic population showed dramatic growth between 1990 and 2000. In 1990 Hispanics represented 6.6 percent of the Suffolk County population. This grew by 70.1 percent by 2000, with the 149,411 Hispanics representing 10.5 percent of the 2000 Suffolk County population.

Between 1990 and 2000, Huntington Station's population increased. Decreases were reported in both white and black residents, with other residents accounting for all the growth. In 1990, the Huntington Station population was 81.7 percent white and 12.7 percent black. By 2000, the Huntington Station population of 29,910 grew by 5.9 percent. The white population decreased by 7.3 percent, now representing 71.5 percent of the 2000 Huntington Station population. Others, including Asian and Pacific Islanders, increased by 223.7 percent to 5,050 persons, and now represented 16.9 percent of the population. Blacks, while decreasing 3.8 percent to 3,459, were now 11.6 percent of Huntington Station's population, making the black community of Huntington Station more concentrated than the rest of Suffolk County. The Hispanic community of Huntington Station exhibited significant growth between 1990 and 2000. In 1990, the 3,377 Hispanics represented 12.0 percent of the population, growing by 101.4 percent, or 3,425 persons, to where the 6,802 Hispanics now represented 22.7 percent of the 2000 Huntington Station community. Both in numbers and percentage of the community, Hispanics have become the largest minority population in Huntington Station.

FAMILY STRUCTURE:

Table 5: Family Composition (with children under 18 years of age)

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
Total Families	<u>340,593</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>360,422</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>19,829</u>	<u>5.8%</u>
Husband/Wife	282,081	82.8%	291,098	80.8%	9,017	3.2%
Male head	14,399	4.2%	18,665	5.2%	4,266	29.6%
Female head	44,113	13.0%	50,659	14.0%	6,546	14.8%
Persons per Household	3.04		2.96		(.08)	(2.6)%
<u>Huntington Station:</u>						
Total Families	<u>7,257</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>7,190</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>(67)</u>	<u>(.9%)</u>
Husband/Wife	5,521	76.1%	5,296	73.7%	(225)	(4.1%)
Male head	414	5.7%	502	6.9%	88	21.3%
Female head	1,322	18.2 %	1,392	19.4%	70	5.3%
Persons per Household	2.93		3.06	.	.13	4.4%

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table DP-1, 2000 Census Table DP-1.

Changes in family composition between 1990 and 2000 reflected similar structural weakening of the two-parent family in both Huntington Station and surrounding Suffolk County. As shown in Table 5, despite Huntington Station single parent families growing by 26.6 percent, that growth rate was nearly 40 percent less than Suffolk County's 44.4 percent. However, an example of two communities heading in somewhat different directions is that between 1990 and 2000 two parent families with children under 18 decreased by 4.1 percent in Huntington Station, while increasing by 3.2 percent in Suffolk County as a whole. By 2000, 19.2 percent of families with children in greater Suffolk

County had single parent families, as compared to 17.2 percent one decade earlier, an 11.6 percent increase. This compares to the 23.9 percent of 1990 Huntington Station families that were headed by single persons. This group grew larger by 2000, growing by 10 percent to 26.3 percent of Huntington Station families.

In contrast to the 2000 family structure in Suffolk County, where 86.0 percent of families with children under 18 years of age had a male present, a male presence was reported in only 80.6 percent of Huntington Station families. Both represented a marginal decrease from 1990, where 87.0 percent of Suffolk County families had a male present as compared to 81.8 percent of Huntington Station families. Additionally, the average 1990 Huntington Station household size of 2.93 persons was 3.6 percent less crowded than the 3.04 persons in the average Suffolk County household. However by 2000, Huntington Station households became more crowded. Families in Huntington Station with both a husband and wife present had decreased by 4.1 percent, male headed families increased by 21.3 percent, and families headed by females increased by 5.3 percent. In Suffolk County, families with children under 18 experienced a 5.8 percent growth between 1990 and 2000, while families in Huntington Station decreased by .9 percent to 7,190. While there was growth in total Suffolk County families, the average 2000 household became smaller, decreasing by 2.6 percent from 3.04 persons in 1990 to 2.96 persons. Despite families in Huntington Station decreasing by .9 percent, they became more crowded, growing by 4.4 percent to 3.06 persons in 2000.

Table 6: Marital Status (those 14 years of age and older)

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
<u>Total Males</u>	<u>508,381</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>516,143</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>7,762</u>	<u>1.5%</u>
Single Males	205,480	40.4%	193,684	37.5%	(11,796)	(5.7)%
Married Males	302,901	59.6%	322,459	62.5%	19,558	6.5 %
<u>Total Females</u>	<u>544,293</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>589,515</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>45,222</u>	<u>8.3%</u>
Single Females	242,571	44.6%	267,056	45.3%	24,485	10.1%
Married Females	301,722	55.4%	322,459	54.7%	20,737	6.9%
<u>Huntington Station:</u>						
<u>Total Males</u>	<u>10,835</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>11,184</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>349</u>	<u>3.2%</u>
Single Males	4,922	45.4%	5,088	45.5%	166	3.4%
Married Males	5,913	54.6%	6,096	54.5%	183	3.1%
<u>Total Females</u>	<u>11,647</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>12,319</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>672</u>	<u>5.8%</u>
Single Females	5,635	48.4%	6,224	50.5%	589	10.5%
Married Females	6,012	51.6%	6,095	49.5%	83	1.4%

Source: 1990 U.S.Census of Population - NYS Data Center, 2000 U.S. Census Table DP-2.

Integral to family structure stability is marital status. In 1990, 59.6 percent of the males living in Suffolk County older than 14 years of age were married while 40.4 percent were single. Similarly, 44.6 percent of women were single with 55.4 percent married. By 2000, males had increased by 1.5 percent, with single males dropping by 5.7 percent and married males growing by 6.5 percent. Single males over 14 now represented 37.5 percent of males, with married males increasing to 62.5 percent. In contrast, by 2000, single females over 14 living in Suffolk County had grown by 10.1 percent, and now represented 45.3 percent of females. Similar to married males, married females grew at a slower 6.9 percent rate, yet decreased to 54.7 percent of Suffolk County females. Between 1990 and 2000, single and married males and females over 14 years of age living in Huntington Station followed a pattern similar to Suffolk County. While Suffolk County males increased by 1.5 percent and females grew by 8.3 percent, Huntington Station males grew by 3.2 percent

while females increased by 5.8 percent. However, there were differences in the composition of that growth. Whereas Suffolk County experienced declines in single males and growth in single females over 14, single males and females in Huntington Station both grew between 1990 and 2000. Suffolk County single males decreased by 5.7, with single females increasing 10.1 percent, while single Huntington Station males and females increased by 3.4 and 10.5 percent respectively. In contrast, Suffolk County married males grew by 6.5 percent, with Huntington Station married males increasing by less than half that rate at 3.1 percent. Married Huntington Station females increased slightly by 1.4 percent, almost five times less than the growth rate of Suffolk County married females. While there was evidence of the improvement and strengthening of the Huntington Station family structure, the incidence of marriage still lagged significantly behind that of Suffolk County. In 1990, 45.4 percent of Huntington Station males were single, with 54.6 percent married, while 48.4 percent of females were single and 51.6 percent married. By 2000, reflecting the differing rates of increase in Huntington Station married males and females, 45.5 percent of males were single and 54.5 percent were married, while 50.5 percent of females were single and 49.5 percent were married. By 2000 in Suffolk County, 62.5 percent of males and 54.7 percent of females were married, an increase for males from the 1990 level of 59.6 and a marginal decrease for females from 55.4 percent.

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT:

If a correlation exists between academic achievement and higher family income, it may therefore be reasoned that those advancing to higher education have an opportunity to work in higher paying jobs. Such a correlation emerged between 1990 and 2000, where similarities in patterns of school enrollment and educational achievement between Suffolk County and the Huntington Station community became evident.

Table 7: School Enrollment (3 years of age and older)

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
Preliminary	28,516	8.2%	31,658	8.2%	3,142	11.0%
Elementary-H.S.	218,985	63.0%	273,741	70.6%	54,756	25.0%
College	<u>100,187</u>	<u>28.8%</u>	<u>82,092</u>	<u>21.2 %</u>	<u>(18,095)</u>	<u>(18.1%)</u>
Total	<u>347,688</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>387,491</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>39,803</u>	<u>11.4%</u>
<u>Huntington Station:</u>						
Preliminary	609	8.5%	557	7.4%	(52)	(8.5%)
Elementary-H.S	4,379	61.3%	5,473	72.8%	1,094	25.0%
College	<u>2,157</u>	<u>30.2%</u>	<u>1,485</u>	<u>19.8%</u>	<u>(672)</u>	<u>(31.2%)</u>
Total	<u>7,145</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>7,515</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>370</u>	<u>5.2%</u>

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table DP-2, 2000 U.S. Census Table DP-2

In 1990, Suffolk County and Huntington Station exhibited similar patterns of school enrollment, with slight differences in the distribution of that enrollment. Of the 347,688 persons over 3 years of age enrolled in Suffolk County schools, 8.2 percent were enrolled in preliminary (pre-elementary) schools, 63 percent were in elementary through high school, and 28.8 percent were attending college. By comparison, of the 7,145 Huntington Station school enrollees, 8.5 percent attended preliminary schools, 61.3 percent were enrolled in elementary through high school, and 30.2 percent were attending college. By 2000, the similar patterns continued between those enrolled in elementary through high school, excepting those attending college. In Suffolk County, of the 387,491 persons attending school, 8.2 percent were in preliminary schools, 70.6 percent were in elementary through high school, and 21.2 percent were attending college. Of the 7,515 students in Huntington Station, 7.4 percent were in preliminary schools, 72.8 percent were enrolled in elementary through high school, and 19.8 percent were attending college. Any distinguishable enrollment distribution disparity became clear by 2000, where 78.8 percent of Suffolk County school enrollees were in elementary through high school, as compared

to 80.2 percent in Huntington Station. The result was a higher education enrollment gap, where the 21.2 percent of those in Suffolk County attending college marginally exceeded the 19.8 percent in Huntington Station. This relationship was opposite of 1990, where the 30.2 percent of Huntington Station college enrollments exceeded the 28.8 percent for Suffolk County. The educational enrollment gap had narrowly expanded, explained in part by the fact that those in Huntington Station attending college decreased by 31.2 percent between 1990 and 2000, a decline 58.0 percent greater than the 18.1 percent drop in Suffolk County. The importance of college enrollment for both Suffolk County and Huntington Station residents is that a correlation exists between higher levels of education and greater family income. That Huntington Station's growth in elementary through high school and college enrollment kept pace with Suffolk County, while still lagging behind, would indicate that increased future family incomes could be anticipated in Huntington Station, providing that students remain attached to their community

Table 8: Educational Attainment - over 25 years of age

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		Increase (Decrease)	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
8th Grade or less	50,547	5.9%	41,038	4.3%	(9,509)	(18.8%)
9-12 gr. no diploma	101,571	11.9%	89,136	9.5%	(12,435)	(12.2%)
High School Grad	281,557	32.9%	294,953	31.3%	13,396	4.8%
College 1-3 yrs.	225,073	26.3%	258,410	27.4%	33,337	14.8%
College Grad +	<u>196,295</u>	<u>23.0%</u>	<u>258,864</u>	<u>27.5%</u>	<u>62,569</u>	<u>31.9%</u>
Total	<u>855,043</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>942,401</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>87,358</u>	<u>10.2%</u>
<u>Huntington Station:</u>						
8th Grade or less	1,324	7.1%	1,579	8.0%	255	19.3%
9-12 gr. no diploma	2,592	13.8%	2,401	12.1%	(191)	(7.4%)
High School Grad.	5,393	28.8%	5,563	28.1%	170	3.0%
College 1-3 yrs.	4,767	25.4%	4,732	23.9%	(35)	(.7%)
College Grad +	<u>4,679</u>	<u>24.9%</u>	<u>5,516</u>	<u>27.9%</u>	<u>837</u>	<u>17.9%</u>
Total	<u>18,755</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>19,791</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>1,036</u>	<u>5.5%</u>

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table DP-2, 2000 U.S. Census Table DP-2.

By 1990, an educational attainment gap anomaly had developed between Suffolk County and Huntington Station. While 64.7 and 66.4 percent of the respective 1990 Suffolk County and Huntington Station populations had completed some level of schooling, 82.2 percent of those over 25 years of age in Suffolk County had graduated from high school or gone on to higher education as compared to 79.1 percent in Huntington Station. By 2000, while Huntington Station maintained previous educational attainment levels, the population education attainment gap had disappeared. Those who had attained some level of education were now 66.4 and 66.2 percent of the respective Suffolk County and Huntington Station populations. However, the higher education attainment gap for those over 25 years of age had now widened, with 86.2 percent of those in Suffolk County having graduated from high school and gone on to higher education as compared to 79.9 percent in Huntington Station. One explanation for the widening of the gap was that those in Suffolk County over 25 years of age attaining some level of education increased by 10.2 percent between 1990 and 2000, nearly twice the 5.5 percent growth rate in Huntington Station.

The importance of the over 25 years of age higher education attainment gap is that it occurred after changes in the global economy restructured Long Island's job market from jobs requiring a lesser degree of education and skills to jobs requiring a higher level. By 2000, growth in college and post college education attainment for Suffolk County had increased more than 2.7 times that of Huntington Station. A further indication of the higher education gap is that the 34.3 percent of Huntington Station residents in 2000 who attained higher education levels was slightly higher than the 33.4 percent in 1990, and lagged slightly behind the 36.4 percent in greater Suffolk County, which grew from 31.9 percent in 1990. The issue is whether the narrow higher education attainment gap would correlate with a greater proportion of the Huntington Station population having the skills required for employment in higher paying jobs and result in greater family income.

WORKFORCE EMPLOYMENT:

A correlation was found to exist between the higher levels of educational attainment achieved by Suffolk County and Huntington Station residents, and their respective higher workforce employment rates and representation in higher paying jobs. While Huntington Station’s population as a percent of educational enrollment was equivalent to that of Suffolk County, Huntington Station’s higher educational achievement levels, while less than Suffolk County, still resulted in similar employment rates and greater representation in higher paying jobs for Huntington Station residents. In 1990, the 665,182 Suffolk County persons over 16 years of age in the workforce represented 50.3 percent of the population, as compared to 51.4 percent of Huntington Station’s population of 28,247 persons. By 2000, the relationship between workforce representation had remained basically unchanged. Those employed in the Suffolk County economy had fallen to 48.1 percent of the population, as compared to 49.5 percent of Huntington Station residents. Of note is that despite overall workforce employment decreases from 1990, Huntington Station residents experienced a 16 percent growth in government employment, exceeding that of Suffolk County.

Table 9: Workforce Employment - over 16 years of age

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
Private wage and salary	505,869	76.1%	522,597	76.5%	16,728	3.3%
Government	121,969	18.3%	122,849	18.0%	880	.7%
Self-employed	<u>37,344</u>	<u>5.6%</u>	<u>37,616</u>	<u>5.5%</u>	<u>272</u>	<u>.7%</u>
Total	<u>665,182</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>683,062</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>17,880</u>	<u>2.7%</u>
<u>Huntington Station:</u>						
Private wage and salary	11,780	81.1%	11,891	80.3%	111	.9%
Government	1,938	13.3%	2,249	15.2%	311	16.0%
Self-employed	<u>815</u>	<u>5.6%</u>	<u>667</u>	<u>4.5%</u>	<u>(148)</u>	<u>(18.2%)</u>
Total	<u>14,533</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>14,807</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>274</u>	<u>1.9%</u>

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table DP-3, 2000 U.S. Census Table DP-3.

JOB SKILLS:

As presented in Table 10, employment of Suffolk County and Huntington Station workers in 1990 was comparable in most industry sectors, including jobs in the professional, managerial and administrative categories, which tend to require a higher degree of education. Similarly, clerical, service and machine operators jobs, often requiring a lower degree of education, were the other categories employing large percentages Huntington Station and Suffolk County residents.

Table 10: Employment by Industry Sector

<u>Industry Sector</u>	<u>1990</u>			
	<u>Suffolk County</u>		<u>Huntington Station</u>	
Technician	23,773	3.6%	531	3.7%
Professional	103,133	15.5%	2,394	16.5%
Manager/Administrator	89,432	13.4%	1,722	11.9%
Sales	85,593	12.9%	2,055	14.1%
Clerical	118,926	17.9%	2,222	15.3%
Crafts/Construct/Mechanic	79,624	12.0%	1,779	12.2%
Machine Operators	26,958	4.1%	724	5.0%
Transportation Operators	25,885	3.8%	490	3.4%
Laborers	20,698	3.1%	594	4.1%
Farm/Fishing	8,573	1.3%	165	1.1%
Service	61,415	9.2%	1,498	10.3%
Private Household	1,964	.3%	76	.5%
Protective Service	<u>19,208</u>	<u>2.9%</u>	<u>283</u>	<u>1.9%</u>
Total	<u>665,182</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>14,533</u>	<u>100%</u>

Source: 1990 Census, Table DP-3, Labor Force Status and Employment Characteristics.

By 2000, the differing levels of educational attainment between Suffolk County and Huntington Station residents had resulted in little recognizable differences in labor force employment. The 2000 Suffolk County labor force employment for those over 16 years old increased by 2.7 percent to 683,062 and now represented 48.1 percent of the Suffolk County population. Huntington Station's labor force, however, fared better. The 14,807

persons in 2000 working represented 49.5 percent of Huntington Station’s population, while reflecting a 1.9 percent employment increase from 1990. Additionally, as presented in Table 9, Huntington Station’s employed in private wage and salary jobs increased by .9 percent, as compared to Suffolk County’s 3.3 percent growth, while government employment increased by 16.0 percent, in contrast to the .7 percent growth in Suffolk County. Entrepreneurs, the backbone of small business and critical to economic growth of any community, differed significantly between Suffolk County and Huntington Station. In Suffolk County, those who were self-employed increased by .7 percent between 1990 and 2000, and now represented 5.5 percent of the workforce. As an example of two workforce sectors heading in different directions, Huntington Station self-employed individuals, already in short supply, decreased by 18.2 percent and represented only 4.5 percent of the workforce. Furthermore, the percent ratio between the Suffolk County and Huntington Station self-employed had increased from 1.00 to 1.00 in 1990 to 1.22 to 1.00 in 2000. The composition of the respective workforces also changed during the 10 years ending with 2000, and appears in Table 10.

Table 10 (cont.): Employment by Industry Sector

<u>Industry Sector</u>	<u>2000</u>		<u>Huntington Station</u>	
	<u>Suffolk County</u>			
Professional	70,611	10.4%	1,879	12.7%
Finance/Insur/Real Estate	53,510	7.8%	1,182	8.0%
Sales	112,235	16.4%	2,489	16.8%
Clerical/Information	27,290	4.0%	597	4.0%
Mfg/Construct/Mechanics	116,395	17.1%	2,328	15.7%
Public Administration	38,124	5.6%	505	3.4%
Whse/Transport/Utilities	40,393	5.9%	892	6.0%
Farm/Agric/Fish	2,369	.3%	16	.1%
Service	<u>222,135</u>	<u>32.5%</u>	<u>4,919</u>	<u>33.3%</u>
Total	<u>683,062</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>14,807</u>	<u>100%</u>

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, Table DP-3

Despite the fact that the increase between 1990 and 2000 of the Huntington Station workforce employment over 16 years of age was proportionately smaller than in Suffolk County, there were similarities in the distribution of jobs between the higher paying professional, managerial and administrative, crafts and construction sectors. These jobs tend to require a higher degree of education and skills, areas in which Huntington Station, while lagging behind, still had kept pace with Suffolk County. Suffolk County's professional jobs decreased by 31.5 percent; and managerial and administrative jobs (now included in Finance, Insurance and Real Estate) decreased by 40.1 percent, while manufacturing, crafts, and construction jobs increased by 46.1 percent. By comparison, Huntington Station lost 21.5 percent of its professional jobs; managerial and administrative employment decreased by 31.4 percent and manufacturing, crafts, and construction employment increased by 30.9 percent. In occupations where a lower level of education would be acceptable, such as clerical and service, Suffolk County grew by 38.3 percent, while Huntington Station, in the aggregate, reported 48.3 percent growth. In sales jobs, Suffolk County increased by 31.1 percent, while Huntington Station reported 21.1 percent growth

Table 11: Employment Status - Male and Female - 16 years of age and older

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
Males employed	369,116	55.5%	370,585	54.3%	1,469	.4%
Females employed	296,066	44.5%	312,477	45.7%	16,411	5.5%
Total	665,182	100%	683,062	100%	17,880	2.7%
<u>Huntington Station:</u>						
Males employed	8,023	55.2%	8,242	55.7%	219	2.7%
Females employed	6,510	44.8%	6,565	44.3%	55	.8%
Total	14,533	100%	14,807	100%	274	1.9%

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table DP-3, 2000 U.S. Census Tables DP-3.

In 1990, of the 665,182 persons over 16 years of age employed in Suffolk County, 55.5 percent were male and 44.5 percent females, a 1.25 to 1 ratio. For the 14,533 persons over 16 employed in Huntington Station, 55.2 percent were male and 44.8 percent female, a 1.23 to 1 ratio. By 2000, males in the Suffolk County workforce had increased by .4 percent, while falling to 54.3 percent of the employment base. Females, while increasing by 5.5 percent, also improved their labor force participation ratio, with the male to female ratio in the workforce narrowing to 1.19 to 1. In contrast, by 2000, Huntington Station reported a 2.7 percent increase in employed males and an .8 percent increase in employed females. With the labor force participation ratio widening between males and females, from 1.23 in 1990 to 1.26 in 2000, the result was that males and females employed in Huntington Station were respectively 55.7 and 44.3 percent of the labor force. As female-headed families increased regionally, more females proportionally participated in the labor force increase in Suffolk County than in Huntington Station. An important distinction is that females represented a smaller share of the increase in the Huntington Station workforce, while Suffolk County females did not. Additionally, while there was a smaller proportional labor force increase in Huntington Station than in Suffolk County, the male and female composition of the respective workforces, for the most part, remained unchanged.

Despite the fact that the 29.7 percent increase in Huntington Station's labor force increase between 1990 and 2000 was less than Suffolk County's, Huntington Station reported the same degree of unemployment, when comparing those employed to those who are not. The relationship existing between the employment and unemployment status of males and females over 16 years of age was slightly favorable to Suffolk County over Huntington Station.

Table 12: Unemployed Compared to Workforce (a)

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
Total Workforce	<u>698,716</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>711,026</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>12,310</u>	<u>1.8%</u>
Male unemployed	18,461	2.6%	14,668	2.0%	(3,793)	(20.5%)
Female unemployed	<u>15,073</u>	<u>2.2%</u>	<u>13,296</u>	<u>1.9%</u>	<u>(1,777)</u>	<u>(11.8%)</u>
Total	<u>33,534</u>	<u>4.8%</u>	<u>27,964</u>	<u>3.9%</u>	<u>(5,570)</u>	<u>(16.6%)</u>
<u>Huntington Station:</u>						
Total Workforce	<u>15,300</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>15,414</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>114</u>	<u>.7%</u>
Male unemployed	373	2.4%	285	1.8%	(88)	(23.6%)
Female unemployed	<u>394</u>	<u>2.6%</u>	<u>322</u>	<u>2.1%</u>	<u>(72)</u>	<u>(18.3%)</u>
Total	<u>767</u>	<u>5.0%</u>	<u>607</u>	<u>3.9%</u>	<u>(160)</u>	<u>(20.9%)</u>

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table DP-3, 2000 U.S. Census Table DP-3.

Note (a): Workforce defined as employed plus unemployed.

The 1990 Suffolk County unemployed represented 4.8 percent of the workforce, with unemployed males approximately 2.6 percent of their workforce force and females 2.2 percent. Huntington Station's 5.0 percent unemployment rate was nearly that of Suffolk County's, with unemployed males and females respectively representing 2.4 and 2.6 percent of Huntington Station's unemployed workforce. By 2000, the Suffolk County unemployed decreased to 3.9 percent of the workforce, a 16.6 percent decline, while Huntington Station's unemployment rate fell by a almost 21 percent to 3.9 percent. The unemployment status of Suffolk County males and females in 2000 each decreased to nearly 2 percent of their respective employment bases, with unemployed males and females decreasing respectively by 20.5 and 11.8 percent from 1990. In similar fashion, Huntington Station's male unemployed decreased by 23.6 percent, while females decreased by 18.3 percent. Significant is that between 1990 and 2000; Huntington Station's unemployment rate fell 25 percent more than Suffolk County's rate. Also important is that Huntington Station's workforce grew by less than a third of Suffolk

County's, and that the male unemployment rate by 2000 was nearly 10 percent less than Suffolk County's male unemployment rate.

A comparison between the employed and unemployed reveals how Huntington Station had fared as compared to Suffolk County. Between 1990 and 2000, the ratio of the 17,880 increased in employment in the Suffolk County economy for those 16 years of age and older, to the decrease of 5,570 in unemployed was 3.21 to 1. While improving from 1990, Huntington Station's net gain in employment of 274 resulted in a workforce where 1.71 new persons were employed for every additional one not working. This resulted in the ratio of employed to unemployed in Huntington Station improving between 1990 and 2000 to where it mirrored Suffolk County. In 1990, the Suffolk County ratio was 19.8 persons employed to every person unemployed, with an 18.9 to 1 ratio in Huntington Station. By 2000, the Suffolk County ratio improved to 24.4 to 1, with Huntington Station also increasing to 24.4 to 1. Surrounded by an economically vibrant Suffolk County, Huntington Station had improved, becoming a community with potential for greater economic activity.

FAMILY INCOME:

The socioeconomic infrastructure of Huntington Station had weakened slightly by 2000. Single parent families had increased to 26.3 percent of all Huntington Station families, and families headed by females were almost 3 times as much as families headed by men. Despite the difficulty that single family heads have in balancing their day care needs and employment responsibilities, Huntington Station residents kept pace with Suffolk County in academic attainment and job skills, resulting in a workforce that was capable of accessing the region's higher paying jobs. However, there were economic consequences of having more women heading families than men. In 2000, women

working full time had a median income of \$32,935, 24 percent lower than the \$43,349²² earned by their male counterparts. The result is that women family heads often earned less, despite having the requisite skills for higher paying jobs. With these lower wages impacting a greater proportion of single parent families, including Huntington Station families, it is reasonable to conclude that Huntington Station family income would be less than the surrounding Suffolk County. Tables 13 and 14 reflect how family income in Huntington Station, while improving between 1990 and 2000, still lagged behind family income growth for Suffolk County.

Table 13: Nominal Family Income

<u>1990</u>				
<u>Nominal Family Income</u>	<u>Suffolk County Families</u>		<u>Huntington Station</u>	
<u>Families</u>				
\$0 - \$5,000	4,730	1.4%	254	3.4%
\$5,000-\$9,999	6,407	1.9%	141	1.9%
\$10,000-\$14,999	10,536	3.1%	268	3.6%
\$15,000-\$24,999	27,903	8.1%	688	9.3%
\$25,000-\$49,999	105,383	30.6%	2,333	31.5%
\$50,000-\$99,999	147,114	42.8%	3,006	40.6%
Over \$100,000	<u>41,538</u>	<u>12.1%</u>	<u>717</u>	<u>9.7%</u>
Total	<u>343,611</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>7,407</u>	<u>100%</u>

<u>2000</u>				
<u>Nominal Family Income</u>	<u>Suffolk County Families</u>		<u>Huntington Station</u>	
<u>Families</u>				
\$0-\$9,999	8,561	2.4%	264	3.6%
\$10,000-\$14,999	6,936	1.9%	234	3.2%
\$15,000-\$24,999	19,237	5.3%	478	6.7%
\$25,000-\$49,999	71,600	19.7%	1,516	20.9%
\$50,000-\$99,999	150,808	41.6%	2,990	41.3%
Over \$100,000	<u>105,715</u>	<u>29.1%</u>	<u>1,760</u>	<u>24.3%</u>
Total	<u>362,857</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>7,242</u>	<u>100%</u>

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table DP-4, Income and Poverty Status in 1989; 2000 U.S. Census Table DP-3, Profile of Selected Economic Characteristics:2000.

²² 2000 U.S. Census Table DP-3, Profile of Selected Economic Characteristics.

In 1990, the 8.9 percent of Huntington Station families earning below \$15,000 exceeded the 6.4 percent of Suffolk County families earning \$15,000 or less. Fewer Huntington Station families also earned over \$25,000, with 85.5 percent of Suffolk County families earning in excess of \$25,000, as compared to 81.8 percent for Huntington Station families. Furthermore, 50.3 percent of Huntington Station families earned over \$50,000, as compared with 54.9 percent of Suffolk County families. By 2000, correlating with improving educational attainment, economic conditions improved to where only 4.3 percent of Suffolk County families and 6.8 percent of Huntington Station families were earning below \$15,000, and 90.4 percent of Suffolk County families earned more than \$25,000, followed by 86.5 percent of Huntington Station families. In part because more residents attended or graduated from college, Suffolk County families earning over \$50,000 improved from 54.9 percent in 1990 to 70.7 percent in 2000. Furthermore, the gap between families earning over \$100,000 annually had also narrowed. In 1990, the 12.1 percent rate of Suffolk County families earning over \$100,000 was 25 percent greater than the 9.7 percent of Huntington Station families. By 2000, Suffolk County families earning over \$100,000 more than doubled to 29.1 percent, and were now only 20 percent more than Huntington Station, a drop of 20 percent from 1990. In Huntington Station, 24.3 percent of the families now earned over \$100,000, nearly a three-fold increase from 1990. Reflecting similar percents of college attendees and graduates, Huntington Station families earning over \$50,000 per year, while improving from 50.3 percent in 1990 to 65.6 percent by 2000, not only still lagged behind Suffolk County, but the gap had widened by 10.7 percent.

Mean per capita and family median income variances also existed between Suffolk County and Huntington Station, and are presented in Table 14.

Table 14: Mean Per Capita and Median Family (Nominal and Real) Income

		<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>	
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>
		<u>Per Capita</u>	<u>Family</u>	<u>PerCapita</u>	<u>Family</u>
<u>Suffolk</u>	Nominal \$	\$18,481	\$53,247	\$26,577	\$72,112
<u>County:</u>	Real \$ (1)	\$13,392	\$38,585	\$14,603	\$39,622
<u>Huntington</u>	Nominal \$	\$17,870	\$50,184	\$23,689	\$67,115
<u>Station:</u>	Real \$	\$12,949	\$36,365	\$13,016	\$36,876

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table DP-4, 2000 U.S. Census Table DP-3.

Note (1): Adjusted for Inflation; Based on 1984 CPI as the base year, New York Area Index as of July 1990 and July 2000.

The 1990 Huntington Station mean per capita and median family income, as expressed in both nominal and real dollars, were respectively 97 and 94 percent of their Suffolk County equivalent. By 2000, however, this gap had widened. The Suffolk County nominal mean per capita and median family incomes experienced a respective 44 and 35 percent growth between 1990 and 2000, while mean per capita and median family income expressed in real dollars grew by 9.0 and 2.7 percent respectively. The growth of Huntington Station's mean per capita and median family income expressed in nominal dollars lagged behind at 33 and 34 percent, with mean per capita and median family income expressed in real dollars also lagging behind, with marginal increases of .5 and 1.4 percent respectively. The Huntington Station mean per capita and median family income expressed in both nominal and real dollars had now fallen to 89 and 93 percent of their Suffolk County equivalents. Not only had Huntington Station failed to keep pace with Suffolk County, but actually lost economic ground.

HOUSING:

As would be expected, with the additional costs of home ownership, including down payment requirements, the lower mean per capita and median family incomes in Huntington Station impacted the incidence of home ownership, as reflected in Table 15.

Table 15: Occupied Housing Units

	<u>1990</u>		<u>Increase</u> <u>2000</u>		<u>(Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
Total occupied units	<u>424,719</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>469,299</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>44,580</u>	<u>10.5%</u>
Owner occupied	<u>340,253</u>	<u>80.1%</u>	<u>374,360</u>	<u>79.8%</u>	<u>34,107</u>	<u>10.0%</u>
Renter occupied	<u>84,466</u>	<u>19.9%</u>	<u>94,939</u>	<u>20.2%</u>	<u>10,473</u>	<u>12.4%</u>
Persons/Owner Occup.	<u>3.16</u>		<u>3.07</u>		<u>(.09)</u>	<u>(2.8)%</u>
Persons/Renter Occup.	<u>2.57</u>		<u>2.55</u>		<u>(.02)</u>	<u>(.8)%</u>
<u>Huntington Station:</u>						
Total occupied units	<u>9,591</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>9,731</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>140</u>	<u>1.5%</u>
Owner occupied	<u>6,643</u>	<u>69.3%</u>	<u>6,830</u>	<u>70.2%</u>	<u>187</u>	<u>2.8%</u>
Renter occupied	<u>2,948</u>	<u>30.7%</u>	<u>2,901</u>	<u>29.8%</u>	<u>(47)</u>	<u>(1.6)%</u>
Persons/Owner Occup.	<u>3.01</u>		<u>3.00</u>		<u>(.01)</u>	<u>(.3)%</u>
Persons/Renter Occup.	<u>2.74</u>		<u>3.19</u>		<u>.45</u>	<u>16.4%</u>

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table DP-1, 2000 U.S. Census Tables DP-1.

In 1990, of the total occupied housing units in Suffolk County, 80.1 percent were owner occupied and 19.9 percent renter occupied. Of Huntington Station's total occupied housing units, 69.3 percent were owner occupied with 30.7 percent renter occupied. By 2000, total Suffolk County housing units had increased by 10.5 percent, with 77 percent of the increase owner occupied units, and 23 percent renter occupied. In Huntington Station, the total occupied housing units increased by 1.5 percent, with 133 percent of the increase owner occupied units, netted against a 33 percent decrease in renter occupied units. While Suffolk County experienced a more balanced 10.0 and 12.4 percent respective increase in owner and renter occupied housing units, Huntington Station reported owner occupied unit growth of 2.8 percent, and a renter occupied housing unit decrease of 1.6 percent. Suffolk County's growth rate in owner occupied housing units had lagged slightly behind that of

renter occupied units, while the opposite was occurring in Huntington Station, where the owner occupied housing unit growth rate increased nearly four times faster than the rate for renter occupied units.

Not only had housing unit growth in Huntington Station lagged behind Suffolk County, that housing had become more crowded. In Suffolk County, which reported 7.4 percent growth in population between 1990 and 2000, persons per owner occupied and renter occupied units decreased, primarily due to the 10.5 percent increase in total housing units. By comparison, Huntington Station's population increased by 5.9 percent, while total occupied units increased by only 1.5 percent, resulting in more crowded housing. Persons per owner occupied units remained basically unchanged, marginally decreasing by .3 percent, while persons per rental housing units increased significantly by 16.4 percent, from 2.74 persons in 1990 to 3.19 persons in 2000.

In a trend that continued between 1990 and 2000, the 1990 median gross rent in Huntington Station of \$658 was 5.5 percent less than the Suffolk County median gross rent of \$696. By 2000, the median gross rent of Huntington Station had increased 41 percent to \$927, as compared to the 36 percent increase in Suffolk County's median gross rent to \$945 (1990 U.S. Census, table DP-1, 2000 U.S. Census table DP-4). Despite lower family incomes, renters in Huntington Station not only continued to pay almost as much rent as Suffolk County as a whole, but that gross rent was now only 1.9 percent lower than the median gross rent of Suffolk County, significantly narrowing the gap from 1990.

SUMMARY:

Of all the socioeconomic indicators discussed above, family structure and academic attainment, workforce participation, job distribution, household income, and home ownership, Huntington Station started in 1990 from a slightly less favorable position as

compared to Suffolk County as a whole. During the 10 year period covered by this research, in comparison to the surrounding Suffolk County, Huntington Station:

(1) Despite having a population growth rate slightly below that of Suffolk County, Huntington Station's black community decreased, with Hispanics and others growing at a rate disproportionate to the Suffolk County Hispanic and Asian growth rate;

(2) Experienced a decrease in families with a male and female present, and had more families headed by women than men;

(3) Had a weakening of traditional family structure, where single males and females grew at a faster rate than married males and females;

(4) Had greater negative growth in college enrollments than Suffolk County, with equivalent student enrollment growth in elementary and high school;

(5) Had significantly slower growth in post-secondary education attainment;

(6) Had a significant decrease in self-employed entrepreneurs, a marginal increase in private sector employment, and a significant increase government employment;

(7) Had comparable distribution in higher paying professional, craft, construction, and machine operator jobs, and similar increases in lower paying service, clerical, and sales jobs;

(8) Experienced slight growth in workforce employment, with steeper decreases in both male and female unemployment;

(9) Had growth comparable to Suffolk County in both nominal median family and nominal mean per capita income, with nearly half of Huntington Station families earning nominal median income above \$67,115, as compared to Suffolk County where a just less than half of the families earned below the nominal median income of \$72,112;

(10) Had real mean per capita and real median real family income growing at a slower rate than Suffolk County's, with a marginal increase in Huntington Station's real mean per capita income.

(11) Had a slight increase in owner occupied housing units and a marginal decrease in renter occupied units, while Suffolk County reported significant growth for both;

Overall, despite experiencing growth in the socio-economic indicators between 1990 and 2000, Huntington Station, while keeping pace with surrounding Suffolk County, continued to lag behind.

The remaining sections of this study discusses Huntington Station business district and community revitalization strategies and how they relate to the economic development and planning visions of the Town of Huntington.

III B: HUNTINGTON STATION REVITALIZATION STRATEGY:

A: IDENTIFIED WEAKNESSES:

Economic development is incremental and depends heavily on people. Bricks and mortar can rebuild a business district and community, but it is the talent of people that makes that development lasting. The presented socio-economic profile of Huntington Station, while slightly weaker than Suffolk County, provides instances where opportunities for economic growth are possible. The foundation is there, since Huntington Station was once a vibrant part of Suffolk County's economic base. Unfortunately urban renewal obliterated Huntington Station's economic center, leaving a parking lot where the new economic center was to be. Urban renewal was also responsible for the redirecting and widening of New York Avenue, thus physically bifurcating the community.

With this in mind, any economic development plan for the Huntington Station community and business district must be designed to take advantage of the competitive advantages of the community. The strategy must seek to address the identified weaknesses in the Huntington Station workforce and to physically reunite the Huntington Station community. Those identified socio-economic workforce weaknesses are:

(1) **An untapped entrepreneurial class** that decreased by 18.2 percent between 1990 and 2000. By 2000, the percentage of Huntington Station entrepreneurs, as part of the Huntington Station workforce, had now fallen to 81.8% of the percentage of Suffolk County's entrepreneurs to the Suffolk County workforce; a significant decrease from 1990, when the percentage of entrepreneurs in the Huntington Station workforce equaled that of Suffolk County. This would indicate that there is growth potential in Huntington Station's entrepreneurial class, as every community often has untapped entrepreneurs, each representing a potential business. Experience indicates that many entrepreneurs begin by operating out of a home, garage, or a single building, dispersed, uncentered, disconnected and unrooted. Providing incentives that not only encourage cultivation of Huntington Station's entrepreneurs, but also concentrate their economic activity in the Huntington Station business district, will provide an important economic spark that can contribute to revitalizing any new contemplated downtown. By attracting entrepreneurs to Huntington Station's central business district, storefronts will become occupied, vacant land built upon, and dilapidated buildings rehabilitated. Customer and pedestrian traffic increases, and new economic activity is generated. As a critical mass of economic activity evolves, the downtown eventually becomes stronger than it's individual parts.

(2) **A local workforce with improved earnings potential.** Huntington Station's workforce is burdened with a family structure where single males or females head 26.3 percent of all Huntington Station families with children under 18. Furthermore, single-family heads are a greater percentage of total Huntington Station families than their Suffolk County counterparts. Huntington Station's weaker family structure is the result of a decade where families with both a male and female present decreased, resulting in more families headed by women than men. This is important because single-family heads not only have income earning responsibilities, but have child-care concerns as well. Providing

daycare support will allow single family heads to either seek higher paying jobs, or become employed, thereby increasing Huntington Station's combined workforce employment rate and household income.

(3) **The lower median family income** and mean per capita income in Huntington Station, as compared to Suffolk County, continues a decade long erosion in Huntington Station's mean per capita income. The loss of economic ground, while not steep, was caused by the slower adaptation of Huntington Station's workforce to Long Island's changing job market, caused in part by the globalization of the world's economy and the impact of that change on the Long Island economy. Contributing to the lower median family income are the combination of more female family heads who traditionally earn lower salaries than their male counterparts, and the Huntington Station workforce's comparatively lower educational attainment levels, which often make it more difficult to access the region's higher paying jobs currently created by the global marketplace. This situation can be improved with a coordinated policy that addresses aspects of entrepreneurial development, job training and workforce support.

(4) **The Urban Renewal Program of the 1960's, the Elimination of Huntington Station's Commercial Center** and the widening of New York Avenue to a four-lane road. This left a commercial void in Huntington Station's economy, while also physically bisecting the community. For any revitalization process to succeed, the impact of these policies must be addressed. The untapped consumer and economic activity available in the community should give consideration to establishing a new Huntington Station commercial center. Policies and initiatives to address this effort will be discussed in the remaining sections of this report.

B: TARGETED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES:

Objectives of this study were to identify the socio-economic challenges confronting Huntington Station, and within that context, suggest policies that the Town of Huntington can initiate and focus its efforts on in support of Huntington Station's revitalization efforts, including development of vacant, dilapidated, and underutilized properties. Such initiatives can inject new economic vitality into Huntington Station's business district by: increasing Huntington Station's workforce; returning underutilized parcels to property tax rolls; attracting more pedestrians and consumers to Huntington Station's business district; and attracting young people to Huntington Station.

1:A CONNECTED AND WALKABLE HUNTINGTON STATION COMMUNITY:

A tremendous assist towards this goal would be to create traffic mitigating alternatives that make the intersections on New York Avenue pedestrian friendly. Intersections that encourage pedestrians will encourage the linkage between the Huntington Station center and the communities east and west of the Long Island Railroad Station, North of Broadway and Railroad Street, and East and West of New York Avenue up to Olive Street. Creating safe and walkable intersections at the five corners of Pulaski and Depot Roads, a possible Huntington Station economic center; at Olive Street and New York Avenue; and at Broadway and New York Avenue will allow for pedestrian traffic to flow south towards the Huntington Station center, while also serving to connect the east and west sides of Pulaski Road, thus creating a larger sense of community.

(a) **Create a Walkable, Mixed Retail and Office Plaza South of the LIRR Station.** Traffic calming intersections won't automatically generate new pedestrian activity unless there is something that attracts them. Prior to the 1960's urban renewal, a center of commercial economic activity was situated north of the railroad station, on sites east and west of New York Avenue, and south of the railroad station by 2nd Street. Now, for the most part, these properties are parking lots.

A proposed plaza would begin at New York Avenue and 2nd Street. It would entail relocating approximately 100 parking spaces to other suitable sites in the area. The properties on the corner of New York Avenue and 2nd Street are still capable of supporting the higher economic purpose that a plaza would be capable of generating. A further benefit is that the plaza creates a walkable connection between the communities on the east and west side of Broadway at New York Avenue for residents north and south of the LIRR station. This creates a pedestrian corridor capable of attracting economic activity to the five-corner neighborhood center by way of the retail plaza. Artists and professionals are a market for second story business cooperatives above the street level retail that is contemplated for these mixed use structures. Since the plaza is located next to the LIRR, transportation related funding should be available to support this project. Since the plaza would be intermodal, that is it connects mass transit, commuters, and walkable communities, the project should be eligible for funding from federal government transportation programs.

(b) **Create A Walkable Huntington Station Neighborhood Center** at the five-corner intersection at Depot and Pulaski Roads. Properly designed, this can transform the area into a pedestrian destination point, something that it currently is not. Facilitating this effort would allow for two story mixed use development on Depot Road and on Pulaski Road, between the five corners and New York Avenue. Such projects could include buildings with retail on the street level and limited residential or office space on the second floor. Additionally, because of Pulaski Road's proximity to the Depot Road commercial district south of the five corners, second floor uses could include office space. Possible economic activity that could be attracted to these properties include artists, professionals, entrepreneurs, and emerging businesses and technology companies.

(c) **Beautifying Olive Street and the West Side of New York Avenue** would create a natural border for the revitalization area. Moving the hurricane fencing surrounding the

sump behind the tree line and planting more trees surrounding the sump to hide it would create a park-like setting.

2:HUNTINGTON STATION AS AN URBAN RENEWAL AREA; A ROLE FOR A TOWN OF HUNTINGTON INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY:

The fact that the previously enacted Huntington Station Urban Renewal Plans failed to achieve their economic development potential does not diminish the benefits that such designations can provide in assisting current revitalization strategies. Amendments to the previously enacted plans, or enactment of new proposals, can provide a framework within which an Industrial Development Agency can direct its economic development incentives.

Unlike the other Long Island towns of Riverhead, Brookhaven, Islip, Babylon, Hempstead, and Glen Cove, the Town of Huntington does not have its own Industrial Development Agency. The creation of a Town of Huntington Industrial Development Agency should be explored, since it is the most efficient way to encourage and implement town economic and industrial development initiatives. However, until that agency is formed, the Suffolk County Industrial Development Agency is available to provide economic development incentives to assist with Huntington Station's revitalization effort.

The broadness of any objectives enacted by revised Urban Renewal Plans presents new opportunities for the use of Industrial Revenue Bonds and straight lease transactions. Bonds and leases can, if approved by the Suffolk County Industrial Development Agency (SCIDA), be issued to support those objectives, which can include retail and mixed use development projects. While Urban Renewal Plans do not necessarily expand the SCIDA's powers, a project within an Urban Renewal Area covered by an Urban Renewal Plan, as adopted by the Town of Huntington, often is eligible for SCIDA inducement. An important threshold for inducement is that the projects or facilities detailed in the Urban Renewal Plan must be of the scope, nature, and type that the SCIDA is seeking to support. As such,

the Urban Renewal Plan is one of the important circumstances and factors that the SCIDA can look to in making a determination as to whether any project under consideration meets inducement criteria.

3:CREATE A LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION:

Despite the prosperity of the past 20 years, many neighborhoods and communities in the United States, such as Huntington Station, continue to lag economically behind their respective surrounding regions. To revive these neighborhoods, civic and government leaders have adopted programs and institutions known collectively as the community development system. Unlike the policy of urban renewal, such as the policy of the 1960's that adversely impacted Huntington Station's central business district, community development is a decentralized system that relies on private citizen groups as much as it does on government.²³

The primary agents of the community development system are community development corporations (CDCs). CDCs, such as the recently created Town of Huntington Economic Development Corporation, are independent organizations that operate in neighborhoods with a range of demographic and economic characteristics, and strive to improve adverse physical, social, and economic conditions in which people live. A CDC is an incorporated nonprofit entity, usually authorized as a 501(c)(3) organization by the Internal Revenue Service, with a board of directors, an executive director and staff members.²⁴

CDC's offer certain advantages over previous efforts at urban renewal. Because CDCs are often located in the neighborhoods that they are trying to improve, and because the history and conditions of a CDC's neighborhood influences its community development strategies, the CDC's directors can tailor programs to local conditions and residents'

²³ Fuel Lines for the Urban Revival Engine.

²⁴ Ibid.

desires more readily than can government officials located in either Hauppague, Albany, or Washington, D.C. As small, autonomous organizations, CDCs operate more easily than large bureaucratic organizations such as government agencies. When CDCs effectively fulfill local aspirations, they can become important local institutions, directing resources at often-underserved communities.²⁵

Because of their size, CDCs face obstacles in their mission to revive neighborhoods. As small locally based organizations, they must develop programs to deal with diverse local conditions, often lack sufficient money to run their operations, and often pursue projects that governments and commercial companies have chosen not to attempt because of the cost and the risk. To obtain funds, CDCs typically must apply to several sources, a complicated and time-consuming process. To assist CDCs in their efforts to survive, while tackling the socio-economic problems impacting their target communities, a network of national and local institutions are available. These are primarily government agencies and private foundations, which can provide financial and technical support to assist and expand the scale and scope of community development activities.²⁶

One caveat important to the CDC's success is the political environment of the town or region in which it operates. Having local political and governmental support for the CDC determines the success not only of the CDC, but also of the other components of the local community development system. The CDCs local intermediaries, such as philanthropic corporations and foundations, are all aided or constrained by the prevailing political and governmental attitudes toward community development and nonprofit organizations.²⁷

One example of such government support is the Carlisle, Pennsylvania downtown revitalization effort. Here, the Cumberland County Redevelopment Authority (CCRA), understanding that a nightlife is critical to a downtown's resurgence, renovated and

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid.

reopened an abandoned art deco movie house as a performing arts center. The CCRA formed a nonprofit organization, which then raised \$500,000 to purchase the theater. This investment was supported by a marketing survey, which had shown that theater patrons are relatively affluent and often use downtown restaurants before attending performances.²⁸

The bulk of the renovations involved constructing a thrust stage for live performances. The nonprofit organization programs about half of the theater's 100 annual events, which include musical performances, comedies, a children's theater and an art cinema. The facility is rented out for the other half. A local college also leases office and rehearsal space in the building. Rental income, plus a \$200,000 grant from the state Department of Community and Economic Development, paid for further renovations. The theater, as expected, has spawned plans for new downtown projects including incentives for owner-occupied housing and a new hotel.²⁹

Another example is the Anacostia Economic Development Corporation (AEDC) which acquired Good Hope Marketplace, a shopping center development, from the Safeway supermarket chain in 1997. AEDC created two for-profit subsidiaries for the purchase. One was the managing partner, the other an investment corporation. AEDC plans to make 10 percent of the project's equity available to residents through shares held by the investment subsidiary. The intent of AEDC, which must put a percentage of revenues into a maintenance and security reserve, is to sell stock to residents and is based on the premise that ownership will give residents a personal stake in maintaining and supporting the Good Hope Marketplace. It will also help residents to obtain tangible economic benefits from neighborhood revitalization efforts. AEDC expects to use its investment subsidiary as the mechanism to sell stock to the community for future development projects in which the investment subsidiary is itself an investor.³⁰

²⁸ Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

Properly and creatively used, a CDC, and in particular the Town of Huntington Economic Development Corporation, can be the impetus for the revitalization of Huntington Station.

4: SMALL BUSINESS INCUBATOR

As the presented data indicates, entrepreneurs in Huntington Station, as a percent of the labor force, are 81.8 percent below that of their Suffolk County counterparts. Nurturing the development of Huntington Station entrepreneurs, as well as making available post high school certification for technology job training, will provide Huntington Station residents with the skills to access the higher paying jobs being created in the Suffolk County economy. The success of both initiatives can introduce more disposable income into the Huntington Station community.

For example, technology, bio-technology, and business incubation has proven to be a successful economic development strategy that can be leveraged to facilitate academic, government and business collaborations at the community and regional levels.

One example of a successful business incubator is Esperanza Unida, Inc. a business incubator in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. A presence for over 27 years, Esperanza Unida has continuously upgraded and expanded its services to help people linked by poverty and unemployment.³¹

Milwaukee is a city with a smaller population than Suffolk County. Yet, like Suffolk County, it has felt the economic effects of industrial restructuring from globalization and setbacks to significant industry. For Suffolk County and Huntington Station, it was the shrinkage of the defense industry; for Milwaukee, it was the contraction of beer-brewing and industrial machinery. Those most impacted were minority workers, with those unemployed having severely limited work-ready skills further hampered by a language barrier. With a grant from the Economic Development Administration, Esperanza Unida

³¹ Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations.

was able to acquire a building and prepare it for rehabilitation. A business that it had nurtured, an asbestos removal training business, removed the asbestos and trained 15 people in the process. Some of those 15 people now operate a business of their own. Furthermore, when Esperanza Unida entered into a contract with a construction firm to renovate the building, one of the stipulations was that the construction crew hire people from the community to work with them. This particular part of the project focused on youth skills, with several young people from the area able to join the construction crew and train to reach union apprenticeship.³²

Esperanza Unida's training business infrastructure enables the City of Milwaukee to address a problem similar to that which exists in Huntington Station; that is, to connect employers with skilled workers from economically lagging communities. This targeted approach to developing training businesses and workers allows Esperanza Unida to focus on quality jobs, which offer graduates living wages, benefits, and the potential for advancement.³³

While any incubator in Huntington Station must conform to zoning regulations, Esperanza Unida's business incubator has almost five floors occupied. A variety of services are offered, including a local bank's bilingual home mortgage office, a copy shop (which is also part of the incubator's Graphic Arts Training program), a restaurant operated by community residents, and office space. Other occupants are training programs and government agencies.³⁴ An important dividend of the incubator's training program is that it has spawned successful businesses, which are integral to the incubator's curriculum. While the size of the facility is important, it is not as important as the tenants occupying the space. Incubator tenants should be synergistic with the higher paying jobs being created in the regional economy. In Long Island's case, this is presented in Tables 1 and 2.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid.

Another business incubator initiative is that of Rural Enterprises of Oklahoma, Inc. (REI), a private not-for-profit organization that provides financial services and technical assistance to businesses in Oklahoma communities, with the ultimate result of job creation. REI was designated as the State's first One-Stop-Capital Shop, and as a Certified Development Company by the U.S. Small Business Administration, a designation that is available to the Town of Huntington Economic Development Corporation. REI received a grant to construct a business incubator and Foreign Trade Zone facility. The 21,000 plus square foot multi-tenant facility includes space for both manufacturing assembly and start-up, and for expanding small businesses. REI manages 11 of Oklahoma's 16 incubators and has a 70 percent occupancy rate.³⁵

REI is relevant because the city sought as tenants for the incubator businesses whose primary activities were compatible with the FTZ needs. Thus, incubator tenants became an efficient source of assembly and manufacturing services. The role of matching tenant businesses to companies needing their services is similar to the work of Esperanza Unida, which also played a role in identifying revenue sources for its business incubator tenants. The Huntington Economic Development Corporation could also function in this capacity.

REI also focuses on entrepreneurial development, where on-site technical support services are available to tenants. Such assistance includes management, marketing, financing, exports, engineering and plant layout. Also available to provide additional individual assistance is the State Department of Commerce, a broker/agent of the Oklahoma Alliance for Manufacturing Excellence, and a member of the Governor's International Economic Development Team, all of who are headquartered in the incubator. An initial incubator tenant was Telecommunications Systems, which specializes in telecommunications.³⁶ The success of any incubator is dependent on not only providing

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid.

reasonable rents and business opportunities for tenants, but also on providing access to technical assistance and entrepreneurial development mentoring, elements that can be replicated in Huntington Station.

Successful Long Island incubators have been affiliated with either government or academic institutions. This is necessary because the resources critical to an incubator's success are beyond the ability of a community to absorb. An example of such a relationship was the 6,000 square foot light-manufacturing incubator at SUNY, Farmingdale. Of the 6,000 square feet in the SUNY Farmingdale incubator, 4,200 square feet was allocated for 7 companies, with the remaining 1,800 square feet consisting of common space including conference rooms. This incubator, operated by the Long Island Forum for Technology (LIFT), recently moved its operations to Main Street in Bay Shore where it now occupies a 10,000 square foot building. This new space was designed for six companies, each occupying 1,000 square feet, with common area of 4,000 square feet. Another incubator located at Briarcliff College in Bethpage, and operated by LISTnet, houses 17 companies each occupying approximately 500 square feet of space. The total usable space is approximately 8,500 square feet, with nearly 4,000 square feet of common area. Such a facility, providing 250-500 square feet of space for emerging companies, with expansion potential to 1,000 square feet, could be accommodated in Huntington Station. Another example is the State University at Stony Brook, which operates the 48,000 square foot Long Island High Technology Incubator, and the 20,000 square foot Software Incubator which contains 2,000 square feet of common area and 18,000 square feet for individual companies. Stony Brook is also about to begin construction of the 20,000 square foot Calverton Incubator, which will have 18,000 square feet available for companies with 2,000 square feet of common area.³⁷

³⁷ Carl Hanes Personal Interview.

5: WORKFORCE SUPPORT INITIATIVES

Economic development is incremental and dependent upon people. As the presented data suggests, Huntington Station's 1.5 percent growth rate in occupied housing units was 7 times slower than the rate of growth in surrounding Suffolk County. This presents an opportunity for home ownership, since between 1990 and 2000 rental occupied units marginally decreased and owner occupied units modestly increased, while rental units become more crowded and owner occupied units became marginally less crowded. Also suggested is that the Huntington Station workforce may have disproportionately greater child-care responsibilities. Single parent headed families are 36 percent of those jointly headed by both males and females, as compared to Suffolk County single household heads which represent 24 percent of Suffolk County jointly headed households. One conclusion is that the Huntington Station economy has potential for expansion by: identifying higher paying job opportunities for residents who have the requisite skills for employment; creating housing opportunities for young workers who wish to come back to their community; and providing access to daycare for members of Huntington Station's workforce who require it.

Housing can be an important tool in revitalizing a neighborhood. It provides a 24-hour presence from tenants who come and go with their daily routines, as well as maintaining the stability of a local economy. Housing also creates a market for goods and services sold in the business district by attracting new consumers.

One such housing initiative, already allowable under existing Town of Huntington Zoning Codes, would allow on a restricted and limited basis, and insuring code standards adherence, residential units for occupancy that are above ground floor retail space. Opportunities exist for entrepreneurs to own a building where they can live above their ground floor commercial space. The Town of Riverhead recently approved such an initiative for artists who wish to live and work in the downtown-shopping district. The

Town of Huntington should encourage similar arts related uses, and can act similarly, with housing elements strictly controlled.

The cost and availability of daycare is one of the most stubborn impediments to escaping poverty. In addition to the working poor, two wage earner households also find accessing quality daycare as difficult as it is affordable. Many who use daycare prefer it near where they work, rather than near their home. This is in case an emergency need arises where they have to pick up their child. With many of Huntington Station's households headed by single parents, the need for daycare is apparent. One example of the contribution that daycare can make is illustrated by the revitalization efforts of North Amityville, and the integral part played by the acquisition of a 12,000 square foot building on Albany Avenue and Great Neck Road. The Town of Babylon leveraged its Community Development Block Grant monies into a 20-year, Section 108 loan, which financed the project. The project, which was included in the Town of Babylon's enacted Urban Renewal Plan, included properties located in the center of the targeted revitalization area. A daycare center, owned by a community resident, occupies 10,500 square feet of the building, providing jobs for residents and care for the children of part of North Amityville's workforce.

IV: IMPLEMENTING A COORDINATED VISION FOR HUNTINGTON STATION:

With the support of the Town of Huntington, residents of Huntington Station have spent the past several years developing a vision for their community. To implement that vision requires an operating entity whose mission it is not only to revitalize the Huntington Station community, but to also raise the funds necessary for that effort. The following discussion identifies those entities, and links them with the Huntington Town Planning Department strategies for the Huntington Station revitalization effort.

A: TOWN OF HUNTINGTON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Because political and governmental support is critical to a CDC's success, the fact that the Huntington Town Board has created the Town of Huntington Economic Development Corporation (HEDC) greatly enhances its chances for success.

As a separate organization, the HEDC's objectives and purposes, as expressed in its By-Laws, are broad enough to encompass whatever projects are undertaken in Huntington Station. The powers of HEDC are to be used exclusively for the charitable or public purpose of; relieving and reducing adult unemployment; promoting, facilitating and providing for additional and maximum adult job opportunities; instructing or training individuals to improve or develop their capabilities for such jobs; and enhancing economic development and business opportunities. Activities could include; supporting artistic, charitable, cultural and recreational events and facilities; finance, construct, acquire, rehabilitate, improve, develop, operate, and maintain commercial, recreational, industrial, manufacturing, municipal, and transportation facilities; disseminate information and furnish advice, technical assistance; and liaison with federal, state, and local authorities. The HEDC can also borrow money and issue negotiable bonds, debentured, notes, and obligations to finance the previously discussed activities.

Furthermore, among the most important private institutions that support CDCs are nonprofit philanthropic and banking organizations known as financial intermediaries. These include the Long Island Fund for Sustainable Development (LIFSD), the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), SEEDCO, The Enterprise Foundation, and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation (NRC). Many of these organizations, usually operating through local branches, collect and distribute large sums of private, local and federal funds for CDC projects, while also providing training and advice to CDC staff. National philanthropies include the Pew Charitable Trusts, the Rockefeller Foundation, the James D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Lilly Endowment and the W.K.

Kellogg Foundation. Quasi-public enterprises, such as Freddie Mac, Fannie Mae, and the Fannie Mae Foundation also contribute to community development programs. Between 1995 and 1998, almost half of the CDC's that received large amounts of financing obtained funds from foundations.³⁸

Depending on the projects and activities selected by its board of directors, the HEDC may find these organizations as valuable partners in Huntington Station's revitalization efforts.

B:INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY INCENTIVES:

Real Property Tax Exemptions

Local incentives are where the contemplated Town of Huntington Industrial Development Agency, or the existing the Suffolk County Industrial Development Agency (SCIDA) can be most effective. These agencies can provide exemptions from property, and state and local sales taxes, usually only available through the issuance of Industrial Revenue Bonds or straight lease transactions. Under Section 485(e) of the New York State Real Property Tax Law, companies locating in Huntington Station, and owning their own properties, may receive a ten year property tax exemption comprised of a 50 percent exemption phasing out over ten years. SCIDA guidelines further allow, on a case by case basis, the enhancement of the 485(b) benefits to a 100 percent real property tax exemption, with these enhanced benefits phasing out over ten years, as the SCIDA may deem appropriate.

Supporting projects contained in Urban Renewal Plans, the SCIDA may issue bonds or enter into straight leases to finance relocating companies, including retail, and may also provide a preference, both in terms of inducement and incentives available to those companies.

³⁸ Fuel Lines for the Urban Revival Engine.

Low Interest Rate Financing

Through issuance of Industrial Revenue Bonds for projects located within or outside of an Urban Renewal Area, the SCIDA can be a factor in lowering the interest rates on financing the acquisition, construction, or equipping of manufacturing and civic facilities. This is critical, since lower interest rates often are a significant factor in determining the financial viability of a project. With two of the suggested economic development initiatives for Huntington Station's business district revitalization being a small business incubator and daycare facility, and with ventures such as these usually struggling to achieve profitability, interest rate reductions can often be the difference between financial survival or not. Since both of these projects tend to apply for not-for-profit status, they are eligible for Civic Facility Revenue Bond financing, and the lower interest rates available through the issuance of Civic Facility Bonds.

Whereas Industrial Development Agencies can issue both taxable and tax exempt industrial revenue bonds to finance projects, it is the tax exempt financing that lowers interest rates. Tax exempt industrial revenue bonds are regulated by federal tax law which makes interest income on these bonds exempt from federal and state income tax. Federal tax law allows that tax exempt financing be used only for manufacturing, while the New York State Legislature expanded the use of tax exempt financing to Civic Facilities.

A civic facility is defined as any facility owned or operated by a not-for-profit corporation organized and existing under the laws of New York State or authorized to conduct activities in New York State. Tax-exempt Civic Facility bonds allow a not-for-profit corporation to finance their projects at a lower cost than they would through conventional mortgage financing. A not-for-profit corporation, with a strong credit history and financial statements, can obtain an interest rate nearly 200 basis points lower than a taxable bond. The interest rate reduction for a not-for-profit organization with weak financial statements will be less. However, it can also obtain a lower interest rate if a letter

of credit from a top rated bank secures the outstanding bond issue balance, effectively guaranteeing the outstanding bonds. Thus, the bank guarantee serves to lower interest rates further.

The New York State Legislature recently adopted July 1, 2005 as the sunset date for the latest extension of Industrial Development Agency authorization to issue Civic Facility Bonds.

C: THE TOWN OF HUNTINGTON:

The Town of Huntington; The Huntington Town Community Development Agency

The Town of Huntington, through its Community Development Agency (CDA), can make available important resources for significant projects. An example of the CDA's success and effectiveness is the community of Highview, made possible through the involvement of the CDA. This agency can also apply for **Federal Community Development Block Grant** funds, the allocation of which can either be used as direct grants, or leveraged against creating low interest loans repayable over a period as long as twenty years.

The Town of Huntington may also consider a **linked deposit program**, which links a banks becoming a repository for the Town's cash deposit accounts to that bank's lending policies in underserved neighborhoods, such a Huntington Station. All too often these communities have found it more difficult to access commercial lending at reasonable interest rates. Banks seeking **Community Reinvestment Act (CRA)** credits would find lending in the Huntington Station Community a perfect opportunity in which to participate, and could be encouraged to participate in a consortium of banks that would finance commercial and residential development. With some regional commercial banks now purchasing civic facility bonds issued by Industrial Development Agencies, a new source of capital could become available for Huntington Town economic development initiatives.

The process of linked deposits begins with the Town of Huntington, its Community Development Agency, and other town agencies such as the Town of Huntington Economic Development Corporation using their bank accounts as compensating cash balances to underwrite bank-lending activities. These deposits are made with the understanding that the bank will make loans in support of identified community projects. Some municipalities and agencies have even foregone interest on some of these deposits so that the bank can make loans at below market lending rates. A linked deposit requires a constant level of cash to be deposited at the cooperating bank. Many localities use their CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) funds by using the lump sum drawdown technique.

The nature of linked deposit program agreements varies greatly on the credit worthiness of the applying businesses, and the aggressiveness of the cooperating bank in making the loans. An example of a successful program is the Montana Economic Development Board (MEDB), which placed a long term linked deposit with their bank. The linked deposit agreement stipulated that primarily small businesses engaged in basic industries, as well as retail and wholesale distribution of Montana made products would be eligible. Interest rates earned by the MEDB deposits were set at 105 percent of the U.S. Treasury bond interest rate. The maximum lending rate a participating bank could earn from borrowers under the linked deposit program was 3 percent above the MEDB rate. In Kalamazoo, Michigan, the city deposited its CDBG funds at several local financial institutions earning 0 percent interest. The resulting lending interest rate to eligible borrowers who measured up to normal credit and review criteria was reduced by 3 to 4 percent.³⁹

The Proposed Huntington Station Overlay District

In recent years incentive zoning has been utilized in downtowns seeking to improve the retail flow. Many downtowns have a discontinuous retail flow with ground floor space

³⁹ National Council for Urban Economic Development.

either vacant or undeveloped, or devoted to office, blank walls and other uses which fragment the pedestrian flow and hurt the physical ambiance.

To address these development issues, the Town of Huntington Planning Department proposed the Huntington Station Overlay District (HSOD). The HSOD intended to encourage commercial investment, preserve industrial uses that increase the tax base, and targeted only commercial and industrial zoned and utilized properties. The HSOD provided suggested land uses that would “limit and separate incompatible uses (i.e. auto repair, and fast food from residential, professional, and office), strengthen the area as a destination, and encourage investment by increasing its market potential to both local residents and commuters.”⁴⁰

The land use goals and objectives presented in the HSOD, some of which are discussed below, are compatible with the findings of this study. These uses are also eligible for financial support by local and regional economic development agencies. However, such support is not limited to these tracts alone, which are provided as an example of the types of projects that would support the economic revitalization of Huntington Station.

1-Southeast Corner of New York Avenue and Broadway is owned by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) and is used primarily for parking. Proposed uses would allow for a plaza with benches and landscaping, and with MTA approval, commuter-oriented commercial development, such as a coffee shop.⁴¹

2-East Side of New York Avenue From May Street to Nassau Road is zoned for a variety of commercial and residential uses. Proposed zoning changes allowing for an office-residence district would permit dwellings and commercial uses such as studios, galleries and antique stores. Precluded, due primarily to the lack of parking,⁴² would be certain uses such as laundromats or supermarkets.

3-West Side of New York Avenue From Church Street to Railroad Street provides commuter parking for approximately 200 vehicles, a use not intended in the original 1966 Urban Renewal Plan. Recommended land uses for the northern

⁴⁰ Report on the Huntington Station Moratorium Area

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid.

portion of the parking area are those not requiring a parking permit, such as for general business, professional offices, with live-in artisans on the second floor. Parking would be behind or next to the buildings. Any eliminated parking spaces for both commuters and non-commuters would be provided further to the south⁴³

4-*West Side of New York Avenue From the Railroad Tracks to West 4th Street* is currently used as a commuter parking lot with a capacity for 303 cars, vacant commercial establishments, an office building and a 20 foot right-of-way connecting to a two-acre vacant parcel. Possible uses for the vacant parcel include a parking area to replace the parking capacity displaced by reuse of the currently designated parking spots noted in (3) above, and for other commercial uses.⁴⁴

5-*Southwest Corner of New York Avenue and West 4th Street* is currently zoned general business, and contains a two-story mixed use building (office with residential above). Recommendations include that the newly formed Business Improvement District identify and acquire vacant or under utilized properties along New York Avenue for municipal parking. A partner in this venture could be the Town of Huntington Economic Development Corporation. Other uses include a commercial plaza that would service commuters.⁴⁵

6-*East Side of New York Avenue From Pulaski Road to Depot Road, and Depot Road From New York Avenue to Pulaski Road* is primarily zoned for commercial uses, with some having second floor residential apartments. While Pulaski Road is zoned residential, other properties in this area contain a mix of commercial, day workers site, and residential dwellings. The location where Depot and Pulaski Roads converge creates a physical uniqueness that could be developed as a core for a “Secondary Village Business District.”⁴⁶ This area could serve as a replacement for the Huntington Station central business district eliminated by the Urban Renewal Plan of 1966.⁴⁷

7-*Depot Road From East Pulaski Road South to East 9th Street* is currently zoned general business to a depth of 150 feet, with residential behind, and contains a mixture of residential dwellings and commercial uses. It is natural for these properties to be included in a larger extended Village Business District as discussed in (6) above.⁴⁸

⁴³ Ibid.
⁴⁴ Ibid.
⁴⁵ Ibid.
⁴⁶ Ibid.
⁴⁷ Ibid.
⁴⁸ Ibid.

8-*The New York Avenue, East 2nd Street, Fairground Avenue “triangle”* area is zoned for general business and residential, and contains mostly commuter parking, with limited residential. The possible uses preclude auto related, industrial and fast food establishments, but do include a community cultural/recreational center, and outdoor uses such as a plaza. Since pedestrian traffic is critical to the success of the proposed land uses, sidewalks should be provided.⁴⁹

The Town of Huntington Economic Development Corporation can be an important catalyst in the revitalization of Huntington Station. The proposed uses discussed above would not dramatically alter Huntington Station, but would encourage the gradual emergence of a village center, allow for residents to interact with their neighbors, bring new economic activity to the business district, and heighten the sense of Huntington Station residents as being part of a greater community. The HSOD would create a unified district, originally bifurcated by the Urban Renewal Plans of the 1960’s, and reestablish an enhanced economic base from which the community can grow and prosper, as it once had.

V: CONCLUSION

Globalization and technology have altered both Suffolk County’s and Huntington Station’s job structure. As the data presented in Section III A indicated, the Huntington Station Community, while keeping pace with Suffolk County, still lagged behind Suffolk County in economic growth. However, despite the lagging economic growth, the Huntington Station mean and median household income growth appears sufficient to sustain the economic development initiatives contemplated in the Town of Huntington Planning Department’s proposed Huntington Station Overlay District.

To support these initiatives, incentives and resources are available from the Town of Huntington, the Town of Huntington Economic Development Corporation, the Suffolk County Industrial Development Agency, and national and local financial intermediaries. The incentives, including grants, low interest loans, and sales, and mortgage recording and

⁴⁹ Ibid.

property tax abatements are often the difference in a project's financial viability. This is especially critical to projects capable of supporting Huntington Station's Business District revitalization strategies. These strategies include:

(1) **Business Incubator:** Increasing Huntington Station's entrepreneurial class by way of a business and technology incubator, to where entrepreneurs will approximate the same percent of Huntington Station's workforce as Suffolk County entrepreneurs are represented in the county workforce.

(2) **Day Care Facilities:** Providing workforce support to those single and two wage earner household heads seeking to improve their earnings and family income, by providing daycare facilities that allows them to either access higher paying jobs generated by the regional economy, or to obtain the necessary skills required of those jobs.

(3) **Owner Occupied Workforce Housing:** Providing, on a limited basis, owner occupied workforce housing in Huntington Station for young workers wishing to come back and live in the community. Such need is supported by data indicating that Huntington Station owner occupied housing lags behind that of Suffolk County.

(4) **Support of Town of Huntington Economic Development Corporation and Huntington Station Overlay District:** Focusing resources of all levels of government on the goals and objectives contained in the By-laws of the Town of Huntington Economic Development Corporation, and the planning strategies enumerated in the proposed Huntington Station Overlay District. These initiatives provide a planning and economic development framework within which the revitalization efforts can begin. To that extent, it will take a coordinated governmental effort to achieve a level of success in revitalizing the Huntington Station Business District.

(5) **Linkage of Available Resources to Vision for Huntington Station Business District:** Insure that the shared vision of the Town of Huntington and the Huntington Station community is equaled by the use of the limited resources available. These include

the use of Community Development Block Grants; a program that links the depositing of Town of Huntington funds in banks that will finance the activities of the Town of Huntington Economic Development Corporation; and funding from financial intermediaries.

(6) **Recreate a Huntington Station Business Center:** Use the Town of Huntington Economic Development Corporation to recreate a Huntington Station business center to effectively replace the commercial center eliminated by the Urban Renewal program of the 1960's. This can be accomplished by installing traffic calming intersections allowing for safe pedestrian traffic to flow south toward the new commercial center, and by developing the properties within the Huntington Station Overlay District, which are also within the boundaries of the various Urban Renewal Plans enacted since 1965. Some of these properties appear to have sufficient square footage to accommodate a business incubator, a daycare facility, community center, office, retail and limited owner-occupied housing. Other parcels, while smaller, can accommodate projects such as office, retail and limited second floor housing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations. *Technology Business Incubators and Business Development/Business Incubators*. Online. Internet, 18 December 1999. Available, http://www.narc.org/Ed/art_reprt/bus_dev.html.
- Hanes, Carl. President and Treasure of the Long Island High Technology Incubator. *Personal Interview* 13 November 2002.
- Howley, Patricia. Executive Director of the Long Island Forum for Technology. *Personal Interview*. 13 November 2002.
- Huntington Township Chamber of Commerce. *Industries in Huntington Township*. Huntington, New York. 1952.
- Huntington Town Board. *General Neighborhood Renewal Plan, Huntington Station Area*. Huntington, New York. November, 1962.
- Fannie Mae Foundation. *Fuel Lines for the Urban Revival Engine*. Washington, D.C. December, 2001.
- The Long Islander. *Station Leads County In Number of Businesses*. Huntington, New York. January 18, 1962.
- National Council for Urban Economic Development. *Downtown Retail Revitalization: Strategies to Maximize Your Market*. Information Service Report #58. Washington, D.C. 1985.
- New York State Data Center, Department of Economic Development. *1990 Census of Population and Housing - Summary Tape File 3 - Selected Characteristics*. April, 1992.
- New York State Department of Labor. *Occupational Outlook, Long Island Region. Long Island Labor Market Information*. Online. Internet, 11 June 2001. Available, <http://www.wdsny.org/longisle/top.htm>.
- Office of Urban Renewal, Town of Huntington. *Facts About LIFT Project No. 1*. Huntington, New York, 1966.
- Policy Link. *Sharing the Wealth: Resident Ownership Mechanisms*. Oakland, California. 2001.

- Reich, Robert B. *The Works of Nations*. New York: Vintage Books, 1992.
- Sassen, Saskia. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Sforza, Alfred V. *Portrait of A Small Town*. New York: Maple Hill Press, 1996.
- The Town of Huntington Planning Department. *Report on The Huntington Station Moratorium Area*. Huntington, New York. 5 August 2003.
- Tilak, Jandhyala G.G. *Education and Its Relation to Economic Growth, Poverty, and Income Distribution*. Washington: The World Bank, May 1990.
- United States. Bureau of the Census. *1990 Census, Population of Housing Summary Tape File 1 and 3* (STF 1 and 3). Online. Internet, 15 June 2003.
Available, <http://Factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes>.
- Table DP-1: General Population and Housing Characteristics: 1990.
 - Table DP-2: Social Characteristics: 1990.
 - Table DP-3: Labor Force Status and Employment Characteristics: 1990
 - Table DP-4: Income and Poverty Status in 1989: 1990.
- United States. Bureau of the Census. *Census 2000 Summary File 1* (SF-1). Online. Internet, 15 June 2003. Available, <http://Factfinder.census.gov/bf>.
- Table DP-1: Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000.
 - Table DP-2: Profile of Selected Social Characteristics: 2000.
 - Table DP-3: Profile of Selected Economic Characteristics: 2000.
- Wilson, William Julius. *When Work Disappears, The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997.

