

The Center for Community Studies
at Jefferson Community College
Presentation of Results:


Third Biennial



Regional Economic Tracking Survey

Jefferson-Lewis-St. Lawrence
Counties

October 2017



Mr. Joel LaLone, Research Director
Mr. Larry Danforth, Research Coordinator

Table of Contents

Contact Information	4
Section 1 – Introduction and Description of the Study	5
Section 1.1 – Background	5
Section 1.2 – Goals for this study.....	6
Section 1.3 – Methodology – How This Data Was Collected	6
Table 1 – Response Rates for the 3 rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey.....	7
Section 1.4 – Demographics of the sample – Who was Interviewed?	8
Table 2 – Demographics of the Sample for the 3 rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey	8
Table 3 – Geographic Distribution of Participants of the 3 rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey	9
Section 2 - Summary of Findings	12
Section 2.1 – Attitudes about Local Economic Development Initiatives	12
Section 2.2 – Entrepreneurship.....	13
Section 2.3 – Passenger Air Service.....	14
Section 2.4 – Healthcare Access	15
Section 2.5 – Internet Access.....	15
Section 2.6 – Employment	16
Section 2.7 – North Country Residence	16
Section 3 - Detailed Statistical Results	18
Section 3.0 – Technical Comments to Assist Interpretation of the Data	20
Table 4 – Approximate Margins of Error for Varying Sample Sizes.....	21
Table 5 – More Detailed Margins of Error for Varying Sample Sizes and Varying Sample Proportions ..	22
Section 3.1 – Attitudes about Local Economic Development Initiatives	26
Table 6 – SUMMARY – Perceived Importance of Nine Potential Economic Development Initiatives.....	26
Table 7 – Perceived Importance of “Attracting New Businesses”	28
Table 8 – Perceived Importance of “Retaining existing businesses”	31
Table 9 – Perceived Importance of “Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities”	34
Table 10 – Perceived Importance of “Revitalizing Manufacturing”	37
Table 11 – Perceived Importance of “Expanding Activities and Attractions for more Tourism”	40
Table 12 – Perceived Importance of “Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally”	44
Table 13 – Perceived Importance of “Increasing Canadian Spending in the Local Region”	48
Table 14 – Perceived Importance of “Improving the Condition of Rental Housing”	51
Table 15 – Perceived Importance of “Improving the Condition of Single-family Homes”	54
Table 16 – SUMMARY – Satisfaction with Nine Potential Economic Development Initiatives.....	57
Table 17 – Satisfaction with “Attracting New Businesses”	58
Table 18 – Satisfaction with “Retaining existing businesses”	61
Table 19 – Satisfaction with “Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities”	64
Table 20 – Satisfaction with “Revitalizing Manufacturing”	67
Table 21 – Satisfaction with “Expanding Activities and Attractions for more Tourism”	70
Table 22 – Satisfaction with “Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally” ..	74
Table 23 – Satisfaction with “Increasing Canadian Spending in the Local Region”	78

Table 24 – Satisfaction with “Improving the Condition of Rental Housing”	81
Table 25 – Satisfaction with “Improving the Condition of Single-family Homes”	84
Table 26 – How successful have recent publicly-funded economic development investments been in revitalizing local economies?	87
Table 27 – Do you feel that local governments should explore consolidation in your county if it could save taxpayers money?	90
Section 3.2 – Entrepreneurship	93
Table 28 – Do you currently own or operate a business in Jefferson, Lewis, or St. Lawrence County?	93
Table 29 – Do you own a home-based business? (among those who currently own a business)	96
Table 30 – How many employees do you have currently, including yourself and any full or part time employees?	98
Table 31 – How many employees have you added or expanded by in the past 12 months?	103
Table 32 – SUMMARY – Potential Challenges for Business Owners	108
Table 33 – Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Taxes	109
Table 34 – Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Access to Credit	112
Table 35 – Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Broadband or High-speed Internet Access	115
Table 36 – Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Utility Rates	118
Table 37 – Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Government Regulation	121
Table 38 – Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Availability of Affordable Space at a Desired Location	124
Table 39 – Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Lack of Skilled Labor	127
Table 40 – Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Labor and Benefits Costs	130
Table 41 – Would your business benefit from increased educational opportunities being provided in your county?	133
Table 42 – Has the Internet access at your business gotten better, stayed the same, or gotten worse over the past 3 years?	136
Table 43 – What portion of your annual revenue do you believe is accounted for by Canadian spending?	139
Section 3.3 – Passenger Air Service	144
Table 44 – How satisfied are you with your access to local passenger air service?	144
Table 45 – Do you more commonly fly out of local airports, or do you more commonly fly out of airports that are not in the three North Country counties?	148
Section 3.4 – Healthcare Access	152
Table 46 – How often do you travel outside of your county for healthcare services?	152
Table 47 – When you do travel for healthcare services, is it to another county outside the Jefferson, Lewis, St. Lawrence County region? (among those who travel outside their county)	157
Table 48 – What healthcare services do you travel outside the Tri-County region to access? (among those who travel outside the Tri-County region)	161
Section 3.5 – Internet Access	171
Table 49 – Has your Internet access at home gotten better, stayed the same, or gotten worse in the past three years?	171
Section 3.6 – Employment	175
Table 50 – Current Employment Situation	175
Table 51 – Are you employed in the three-county North Country region? (among those currently employed)	180
Table 52 – What industry do you work in? (among those currently employed)	184
Table 53 – Do you work for a Canadian or other foreign-owned company? (among those currently employed)	189
Table 54 – Do you believe that you have skills, experience, and/or credentials that surpass what is typically needed for the job that you now have...in other words, do you feel that you are now “under-employed”? (among those currently employed)	193
Table 55 – Have you lost your job in the last year due to downsizing or company closure? (among those currently unemployed)	197
Table 56 – Have you tried to find a job in the last 12 months? (among those currently unemployed)	199

Table 57 – Were you unable to obtain a job because you did not have the necessary skills or training? (among those unemployed looking for a job)	201
Section 3.7 – North Country Residence	203
Table 58 – How long have you lived in the North Country?	203
Table 59 – Are you a native of the North Country, and if not, what prompted your move to this region?	206
Appendix – The Survey Instrument	211

Contact Information

The Center for Community Studies:

Mr. Joel LaLone
Professor of Mathematics and Research Director for the Center for Community Studies at Jefferson Community College
1220 Coffeen Street
Watertown, New York 13601
(315)-786-2264
jlalone@sunyjefferson.edu
www.sunyjefferson.edu/community-business/center-community-studies

The Development Authority of the North Country:

Mr. James Wright
Executive Director of the Development Authority of the North Country
317 Washington Street
Watertown, New York 13601
(315)-661-3200
jwright@danc.org
www.danc.org

The Third Biennial Jefferson-Lewis-St. Lawrence Regional Economic Tracking Survey

Based on 1204 telephone and intercept interviews conducted April 11 – April 19, 2017

Section 1 – Introduction and Description of the Study

Section 1.1 – Background

The Center for Community Studies at Jefferson Community College was established in October 1999 to engage in a variety of community-building and community-based research activities and to promote the productive discussion of ideas and issues of significance to the region. In collaboration with community partners, *The Center* conducts research that will benefit the local population, and engages in activities that reflect its commitment to enhancing the quality of life of the area. The Biennial Jefferson-Lewis-St. Lawrence County Regional Economic Tracking Survey is one specific activity conducted by *The Center*. This survey is completed in collaboration with the Development Authority of the North Country, with a goal of once every two years measuring economic-related attitudes and behaviors of a representative sample of Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence County adult citizens. This Regional Economic Tracking Survey was completed for the first time in 2013 by surveying adults in Jefferson and Lewis Counties; in 2015 the survey was expanded to also include adults who reside in St. Lawrence County. Both input regarding survey questions that could be important to use in this study, and total funding to complete this study, are now provided by the Development Authority of the North Country.

Throughout the eighteen years of *The Center's* existence it has been frequently suggested by local community leaders that *The Center* undertake a consistent data collection and study process with a focus on economic indicators – attitudes and behaviors of North Country adult residents. The suggestion included that these more qualitative measurements of human attitudes and behaviors collected via interviews might enhance the many more quantitative employment and business indicators that are measured by other labor, workforce and economic development and government agencies to provide a more complete assessment of local economic issues. Over time the changes in these economic indicators measured in the current survey study will provide important and useful information to economic planners, business owners, elected officials, potential entrepreneurs, and citizens.

This document is a summary of the results of the third Biennial Jefferson-Lewis-St. Lawrence County Regional Economic Tracking Survey, a survey of 1,204 adult residents of the three counties, with all interviews completed in April 2017. Of the 1204 total interviews, 464 interviews were completed in Jefferson County, 292 were completed in Lewis County, with the remaining 448 in St. Lawrence County. This report includes a complete presentation of results for each survey question used in 2017, with county-specific results shown. When possible, trend analyses are shown for results of survey questions used in either or both of 2013 and 2015. Further, the key community demographic characteristics of Gender, Age, Education Level, Military Affiliation, and Household Income Level are investigated as potential explanatory variables that may be correlated with the measured economic-related indicators within each county. It is standard methodology with professional surveys to provide this more detailed information to the reader – information that may assist in explaining the overall findings – by reporting the results for all subgroups within these key demographic variables. Again, the results provide important current information about contemporary economic-related thinking and behaviors of citizens, and over time, will continue to provide important baseline and comparative information as well for regional leadership.

Section 1.2 – Goals for this study

This study was designed with the following two primary goals:

1. **Planning** – The first goal is to collect economic-related attitude and behavior information via surveying local adult residents to provide baseline data that will be useful to Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence County economic planners, business owners, elected officials, potential entrepreneurs, and citizens. This goal would involve using the data to ascertain the current status of these economic indicators and best make data-driven local economic decisions about planning future initiatives. These initiatives could involve, but are not limited to, possible start-up businesses, assisting in grant applications, design of marketing, promotions, and activities, identifying needed training, and advocating for economic-related changes.
2. **Evaluation** – The second goal involves measuring economic-related data via a survey of adults to allow for evaluation. Currently many economic development initiatives are underway in Northern New York. This Regional Economic Tracking Survey has a goal to collect economic-related attitude and behavior information from local adult residents with the capability of identifying statistically significant changes over time in the region, hence the title of a *tracking* survey. The analysis for trends is useful to Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence County economic planners, business owners, elected officials, potential entrepreneurs, and citizens to attempt to identify which initiatives have been most effective.

The variables recorded in this study (survey questions) were developed with a focus of accomplishing these two goals. The survey included approximately 50 survey questions relating to the seven economic-related topics. Within each of these seven survey sections, local adult residents were asked such qualitative attributes related to these economic-related factors as their opinions on perceived importance, suggestions for development, current level of satisfaction, level of interest, perceived barriers, and current behaviors; as well as their employment situation and backgrounds.

The specific seven economic-related survey sections that are studied and reported in the remainder of this document are:

1. **Attitudes about Local Economic Development Initiatives**
2. **Entrepreneurship**
3. **Passenger Air Service**
4. **Healthcare Access**
5. **Internet Access**
6. **Employment**
7. **North Country Residence**

Section 1.3 – Methodology – How This Data Was Collected

The survey instrument used in the first biennial economic tracking survey was constructed in spring 2013 by the professional staff of the Center for Community Studies with further input from faculty members of the Business Division at the College. Revisions to the survey instrument were made in both 2015 and 2017 by *The Center's* professional staff with assistance from the leadership of each of the following four Northern New York economic planning organizations: the Development Authority of the North Country; and the Industrial Development Agencies (IDA's) of each of the three represented counties. The primary goal of the Biennial Jefferson-Lewis-St. Lawrence County Regional Economic Tracking Survey is to collect data regarding economic issues of importance to local citizens and leadership. A secondary goal is to provide a very real, research-based, learning experience for undergraduate students enrolled at Jefferson. In accomplishing this second goal, students are involved in all aspects of the research, from question editing to data collection (interviewing), to data entry and cleansing, to data analysis. The students analyze the data collected in this study as assignments in statistics classes at the College. However, all final responsibility for question-phrasing, question-inclusion versus omission, final data analysis, and reporting of findings lies exclusively with the professional staff of *The Center*. The discussions that lead to the inclusion of questions at times arise from classroom discussions involving students and staff at *The Center*. The decision to include any question as a legitimate and meaningful part of this survey is made exclusively by the professional staff at *The Center*. Similarly, data analysis of the information collected through this economic tracking survey will transpire with faculty and students in the classrooms at Jefferson while any statistical analysis reported in this document has been completed by the professional staff of *The Center*. Copies of the introductory script and survey instrument are attached as an appendix.

This study included completing interviews of 1,204 Northern New York adult residents – 464 interviews from Jefferson County (total adult population size of approximately 85,000 adult residents), 292 interviews from Lewis County (total adult population size of approximately 21,000 adult residents), and 448 from St. Lawrence County (total adult population size of approximately 88,000 adult residents). Approximately 90% of the interviews were completed via telephone while the remaining portion (133 of the 1204) of the interviews are represented using intercept methodology (face-

to-face) on post at Fort Drum. The goal for the telephone interviewing portion of the hybrid design before commencing the data collection was to have approximately 40% of the interviews represented by those completed on cell phones, and the remaining 60% of the interviews represented by landline interviews. A total goal of at least 1,200 completed interviews (targets were 450 in Jefferson County, 300 in Lewis County, and 450 in St. Lawrence County) was set for the study. The result was that interviews that were completed on the cell phone of the participants represented 424 of the 1,071 (39.6%) completed phone interviews. The landline telephone numbers were obtained from an unscrubbed list, ensuring that individuals whose households are included in the “telemarketing do-not-call list” would be represented in this study. A group of 11,000 residential landline numbers were attempted for interviews ultimately resulting in 647 complete interviews representing 60.4% of the completed telephone interviews. To be eligible to complete the survey, the resident was required to be at least 18 years old. To complete the cell phone portion of the sampling, a random-digit generation process with manual dialing was utilized in which common three-digit prefixes for cell phones in use in the Jefferson-Lewis-St. Lawrence County region were identified and random sets of four-digit telephone number endings after these common prefixes were generated to be attempted. All telephone calls were made between April 11th and April 18th between 3:00 and 9:00 p.m. from a call center in Watertown, New York. The intercept interviews on Fort Drum were completed the evening of Wednesday, April 19, 2017 at the entrance of the PX and Commissary, with prior approval obtained from the Garrison Commander. The Jefferson Community College students who completed both the telephone and face-to-face interviews had completed training in both human subject research methodology and effective interviewing techniques. Professional staff from *The Center* supervised all interviewing. The participants of the intercept portion of the sampling were also asked their phone ownership. For the overall combined sample of telephone and intercept surveying the result is that 423 participants (35%) are represented by those who report to be “cell-only”.

When each of the telephone numbers in the random telephone sampling portion of the study was attempted, one of four results occurred: Completion of an interview; a Decline to be interviewed; No Answer/Busy; or an Invalid Number (including disconnected numbers, persons under the age of 18 years, and persons who lived in none of the three counties). Voluntary informed consent was obtained from each resident before the interview was completed. This sampling protocol included informing each resident that it was his or her right to decline to answer any and all individual questions within the interview. To be categorized as a completed interview, at least one-half of the questions on the survey had to be completed. A resident’s refusal to answer more than one-half of the questions was considered a decline to be interviewed. The typical length of a completed survey was approximately 10-15 minutes. Declines to be interviewed (refusals) were not called back to attempt to convince the resident to reconsider the interview. If no contact was made at a telephone number (No Answer/Busy), a maximum of three call-backs were made to the number. No voice mail messages were left for numbers where no person answered the telephone. The response rate results for the study are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 – Response Rates for the 3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey

Methodology Utilized	Number Completed	Percent of Total Sample	Number who are “Cell only”	Percent of Sample who are “Cell only”
Telephone interviews on Landline	647	53.7%		
Telephone interviews on Cell Phones	424	35.2%	317	26.3%
Intercept (face-to-face) interviews	133	11.1%	106	8.8%
Total Interviews	1204	100%	423	35.1%

Response rates for LANDLINES & CELL PHONES COMBINED attempted in this study:	Complete Interview	Decline to be Interviewed	Not Valid Telephone Number	No Answer/ Busy	TOTALS
% of Numbers Attempted	8%	17%	25%	50%	100%
% of Valid Numbers	11%	22%		67%	100%
% of Contacted Residents	33%	67%			100%

Within the fields of social science and community-based research, when using a hybrid sampling design including both landline telephone interview and cell phone interview methodology, a response rate of approximately 33% of all successful contacts where a person speaks with the caller is considered quite successful.

Section 1.4 – Demographics of the sample – Who was Interviewed?

This section of the report includes a description of the results for the demographic variables included in the survey sample. The demographic characteristics of the sampled adult residents can be used to attain three separate objectives.

1. Initially, this information adds to the knowledge and awareness about the true characteristics of the population of adult residents in the sampled county (e.g. What is the typical household size, educational profile, and income level in Jefferson, Lewis, or St. Lawrence County?).
2. Secondly, this demographic information facilitates the ability for the data to be sorted or partitioned to investigate for significant relationships – relationships between demographic characteristics of residents and their attitudes and behaviors regarding economic issues in Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties. Identification of significant relationships allows local citizens to use the data more effectively, to better understand the factors that are correlated with various economic aspects of life in the region.
3. Finally, the demographic information also serves an important purpose when compared to established facts about Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties to analyze the representative nature of the sample that was randomly selected in this study, and to determine the post-stratification weighting schematic to be applied to the data.

The results after application of post-stratification weights for Gender, Age, Education, and Phone Ownership for the demographic questions in the survey are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 – Demographics of the Sample for the 3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey

	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
	Count in Collected Sample	Percent in Collected Sample	Count in Collected Sample	Percent in Collected Sample	Count in Collected Sample	Percent in Collected Sample
Gender: (US Census for Jefferson: 52% male; Lewis: 50% male; St. Lawrence 51% male)						
Male	244	52.5%	148	50.7%	229	51.1%
Female	220	47.5%	144	49.3%	219	48.9%
Age: (US Census for Jefferson: among those age 18+ – 29% are under age 30 and 22% are age 60+; Lewis: 18% under 30 and 30% are 60+; St. Law.: 27% under 30 and 25% are 60)						
18-29	137	29.5%	53	18.1%	118	26.4%
30-39	85	18.3%	41	14.1%	61	13.6%
40-49	71	15.3%	51	17.5%	71	15.8%
50-59	70	15.1%	60	20.6%	80	17.7%
60-69	52	11.3%	43	14.9%	63	14.0%
70+	49	10.5%	43	14.8%	56	12.6%
Education: (US Census for Jefferson: among those age 25+ – 21% have at least a 4-year degree; Lewis: 15% and St. Lawrence 20%)						
High school (or less)	211	45.5%	164	56.0%	204	45.6%
Technical school (after high school)	21	4.4%	16	5.6%	23	5.2%
Some college courses, no degree	68	14.7%	42	14.2%	53	11.8%
Associate degree	80	17.3%	28	9.7%	80	18.0%
Bachelor's degree	52	11.1%	23	8.0%	54	12.1%
Graduate degree	32	7.0%	19	6.5%	33	7.4%
Household Income: (US Census for Jefferson: 23% earn < \$25,000, 28% earn \$75,000+; Lewis: 22% < \$25,000 and 30% \$75,000+; St. Law.: 28% < \$25,000 and 26% \$75,000+)						
Up to \$25,000	88	21.6%	57	22.8%	92	23.8%
\$25,001- \$50,000	130	31.9%	89	35.3%	92	23.7%
\$50,001- \$75,000	88	21.7%	67	26.6%	103	26.5%
Over \$75,000	101	24.7%	38	15.3%	101	26.0%
Military Affiliation: (Estimates provided by the Fort Drum Regional Liaison Organization: Jefferson: 25% of adults in HH w/Active Military; Lewis: 3% St. Law.: 3%)						
AM in household	116	25.6%	12	4.0%	9	2.1%
Former AM at Fort Drum and stayed	57	12.6%	21	7.4%	50	11.3%
No AM, but job related to FD	93	20.5%	35	12.3%	87	19.7%
No FD connection	187	41.3%	219	76.3%	295	66.9%

The following distribution of towns or villages of residence (self-reported) of the participating respondents resulted in the Biennial Jefferson-Lewis-St. Lawrence County Regional Economic Tracking Survey, and after application of post-stratification weights for Gender, Age, Education, Military Affiliation, and Phone Ownership, closely parallel that which is true for the distribution of all Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence County adults – the three counties were proportionally represented accurately in this study.

Table 3 – Geographic Distribution of Participants of the 3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey

Jefferson County			Lewis County			St. Lawrence County		
Town/Villages	U.S. Census Estimates	% in Collected Sample	Town/Villages	U.S. Census Estimates	% in Collected Sample	Town/Villages	U.S. Census Estimates	% in Collected Sample
Adams (town)	4%	4%	Castorland (village)	1%	2%	Brasher (Town)	2%	2%
Alexandria (town)	3%	2%	Constableville (village)	1%	1%	Canton (Village)	6%	2%
Antwerp (town)	1%	1%	Copenhagen (village)	3%	4%	Canton (Town)	3%	10%
Brownville (town)	5%	5%	Croghan (town)	9%	11%	Clare (Town)	0%	0%
Cape Vincent (town)	3%	2%	Croghan (village)	2%	3%	Clifton (Town)	1%	0%
Champion (town)	4%	2%	Denmark (town)	6%	6%	Colton (Town)	1%	2%
Clayton (town)	4%	4%	Diana (town)	4%	3%	De Kalb (Town)	2%	5%
Ellisburg (town)	3%	2%	Greig (town)	5%	4%	De Peyster (Town)	1%	0%
Henderson (town)	2%	1%	Harrisburg (town)	1%	0%	Edwards (Town)	1%	2%
Hounsfield (town)	3%	3%	Harrisville (village)	2%	0%	Fine (Town)	1%	0%
Leray (town)	19%	26%	Lewis (town)	3%	2%	Fowler (Town)	2%	2%
Lorraine (town)	1%	1%	Leyden (town)	4%	2%	Gouverneur (Village)	3%	7%
Lyme (town)	2%	2%	Lowville (village)	13%	15%	Gouverneur (Town)	3%	6%
Orleans (town)	2%	0%	Lowville (town)	3%	13%	Hammond (Village)	0%	0%
Pamelia (town)	3%	1%	Lyons Falls (village)	3%	2%	Hammond (Town)	1%	2%
Philadelphia (town)	2%	1%	Lyonsdale (town)	5%	1%	Hermon (Village)	0%	1%
Rodman (town)	1%	1%	Martinsburg (town)	5%	3%	Hermon (Town)	1%	2%
Rutland (town)	3%	3%	Montague (town)	0%	1%	Heuvelton (Village)	1%	1%
Theresa (town)	2%	1%	New Bremen (town)	10%	7%	Hopkinton (Town)	1%	0%
Watertown (town)	4%	6%	Osceola (town)	1%	0%	Lawrence (Town)	2%	0%
Watertown (city)	23%	16%	Pinckney (town)	1%	0%	Lisbon (Town)	4%	2%
Wilna (town)	6%	6%	Port Leyden (village)	3%	1%	Louisville (Town)	3%	1%
Worth (town)	0%	0%	Turin (town)	2%	1%	Macomb (Town)	1%	0%
Not sure	--	3%	Turin (village)	1%	5%	Madrid (Town)	2%	0%
			Watson (town)	8%	4%	Massena (Village)	10%	5%
			West Turin (town)	3%	2%	Massena (Town)	2%	4%
			Not Sure		0%	Morristown (Village)	0%	0%
						Morristown (Town)	1%	2%
						Norfolk (Town)	3%	5%
						Norwood (Village)	1%	3%
						Ogdensburg (City)	10%	7%
						Oswegatchie (Town)	3%	2%
						Parishville (Town)	2%	2%
						Piercefield (Town)	0%	0%
						Pierrepont (Town)	2%	1%
						Pitcairn (Town)	1%	0%
						Potsdam (Village)	8%	4%
						Potsdam (Town)	7%	7%
						Rensselaer Falls (Village)	0%	0%
						Richville (Village)	0%	0%
						Rossie (Town)	1%	0%
						Russell (Town)	2%	2%
						Stockholm (Town)	3%	2%
						Waddington (Village)	1%	3%
						Waddington (Town)	1%	2%
						Not Sure		1%
TOTAL	100%	100%	TOTAL	100%	100%	TOTAL	100%	100%

In general, Tables 2 and 3 demonstrate that after weighting the data collected in this study for Gender, Age, Education, Military Affiliation, and Phone Ownership, the responses to the demographic questions for the Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence County residents who are included in the survey (those who actually answered the telephone and completed the survey) appear to closely parallel that which is true for the entire adult populations of the counties. The targets for demographic characteristics were drawn from the most recent U.S. Census updates for the counties. Gender, Age, and Education were selected as the factors by which to weight the survey data, since the data collected in this Biennial Jefferson-Lewis-St. Lawrence County Regional Economic Tracking Survey is susceptible to the typical types of sampling error that are inherent in telephone methodology: women were more likely than men to answer the telephone and/or agree to a survey; older residents are more likely to participate in the survey than younger adult residents; and those individuals with higher formal education levels are more likely to agree to the interviews. Standard survey research methodology has shown that regardless of the subject of the survey, these are three expected sources of sampling error when participants are contacted via telephone. In addition to these standard three weight variables it has become increasingly the case that adults in our society are not accessible via landline – they are “cell-phone-only” individuals. Therefore, the current data has additionally been weighted by Phone Ownership, with targets that have been generated from repeated surveying in these counties by the Center for Community Studies. Also, the Northern New York military population has tended to be under-represented in telephone-methodology surveying, therefore weights were applied to the data in 2015 and again in 2017 to adjust for military-affiliation to more accurately reflect the size of the local military-affiliated population in the region. To compensate for this overrepresentation of females, older residents, the highly educated, the non-military-affiliated, and those interviewed on landlines in the sample collected in this study, post-stratification weights for Gender, Age, Education Level, Military Affiliation, and Phone Ownership have been applied in any further analysis of the data analyzed in this report. In summary, all subsequent statistics that will be reported in this document are weighted by Gender, Age, and Education Level toward the 2016 U.S. Census reports that describe the Gender, Age, and Educational Attainment distributions of the actual entire adult population residing in Northern New York, toward military-affiliation proportion estimates provided by the leadership of the Fort Drum Regional Liaison Organization, and toward the Phone Ownership targets that have been developed from recent repeated surveying by the Center for Community Studies. Whenever the three counties’ results are combined to generate regional estimates a further weight for county population size has been applied to accurately reflect that the Jefferson County and St. Lawrence County adult populations are each approximately four times larger than the Lewis County adult population.

Given the diligence placed on scientific sampling design and the high response rates, after application of post-stratification weights for gender, age, education level, military affiliation, and phone ownership, these random samples of Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence County adults do accurately represent the entire adult populations of the three counties. When using the sample statistics presented in this report to estimate that which would be expected for entire adult populations, the exact margin of error for this survey is question-specific. The margin of error depends upon the sample size for each specific question and the resulting sample percentage for each question. Sample sizes tend to vary for each question on the survey, since some questions are only appropriate for certain subgroups (for example, only persons who have indicated they own or operate a business would then be asked some further question about their business). Additionally, as a result of persons refusing to answer questions throughout the survey the sample sizes can vary slightly. *In general*, the results of this survey for any questions that were answered by the entire sample of 1,204 adults may be generalized to the population of all adults at least 18 years of age residing in the three-county region with a 95% confidence level to within a margin of error of approximately ± 2.3 percentage points (there is an average margin of error of $\pm 2.3\%$ with a sample size of $n=1,204$). For questions that were posed only to certain specific subgroups, or for results that are presented for subgroups (such as when only investigating Jefferson County female adult results), the resulting smaller sample sizes in these instances allow generalization to the specific subpopulation of all adults at least 18 years of age residing in the region (i.e. generalization of some specific characteristics of sampled Jefferson County adult females to all Jefferson County adult females) with a 95% confidence level to within a margin of error of larger than approximately ± 2.3 percentage points. In other words, one can be 95% confident that any sample statistic presented in the remainder of this report for the entire combined sample of $n=1,204$ adults from the three counties would/could only deviate from the true value that would be found if all of the nearly 200,000 adults in the three counties were in fact interviewed, by at most 2.3 percentage points. Note that the preceding statement regarding 95% confidence that the statistics in this study are at the most only 2.3 percentage points away from the true population values if all adults in the counties were interviewed is based upon the fundamental mathematical, probability, and sampling theory facts and theorems that are proven in a first-semester college statistics course. Often times to the non-statistician these statements could appear counter-intuitive, and one might assume that the accuracy of a survey would somehow be related to the small portion of the entire population that is actually sampled. In other words, those who have not studied the theory and practice of statistical analysis at times pose a question such as, “why would I ever believe the results from only surveying 292 adults from Lewis County, when that means that approximately 20,400 of the 20,700 Lewis County adult residents have not been interviewed?” While this observation of such a small proportional sample size is true (292 out of 20,700 is only 1.4%, about one out of every 70 residents) the suggestion that it is too small, or that the 20,400 not sampled is even relevant, is incorrect, no less incorrect than it would be to state that $2+2=5$. In summary, the size of the margin of error when sampling (surveying) is independent of the size of the population from which one is sampling (unless a very large portion of the population is sampled). The size of the margin of error is

directly a function of sample size (the 292 in Lewis County) not population size (the 20,700 in Lewis County). The question of whether $n=292$ in Lewis County is “large enough” might also raise the question of why the sample size in Lewis County was not selected to be four times smaller than the sample size in Jefferson County or St. Lawrence County. Again, the reader is reminded that the size of the sampled population rarely, if ever, is related to the size of the sample selected from that population. If the Center for Community Studies were to survey the adult residents of Jefferson County ($N \approx 85,000$ in the population), Lewis County ($N \approx 21,000$ in the population), or St. Lawrence County ($N \approx 88,000$ in the population), a sample size of approximately $n=400-500$ would be recommended/implemented. Likewise, if the Center for Community Studies were to survey the adult residents of the entirety of New York State ($N \approx 19,700,000$ in the population) a sample size of approximately $n=400-500$ would also be recommended/implemented. And, these studies, one for smaller Jefferson, Lewis, or St. Lawrence County and one of larger New York State, using the same sample sizes of $n \approx 400-500$, would have the exact same resulting margins of error of approximately ± 4 percentage points.

Throughout this report, the key community demographic characteristics of County of Residence, Gender, Age, Education Level, Military Affiliation, and Household Income Level are investigated as potential explanatory variables that may be correlated with economic indicators for the region. It is standard methodology with professional surveys to provide this further rich information to the reader – information that may assist in explaining the overall findings – by reporting the cross-tabulated results for all subgroups within key demographic variables. For more specific detail regarding the margin of error for this survey, please refer later in this report to Section 3.0 – “Technical Comments to Assist Interpretation of the Data” and/or contact the professional staff at the Center for Community Studies. All data compilation and statistical analyses within this study have been completed using *SPSS, Release 23 and Release 24*.


Section 2 - Summary of Findings

Section 2.1 – Attitudes about Local Economic Development Initiatives

(Tables 6-27)

Nine potential local economic development initiatives were studied from two different perspectives. The first of which was local residents' perception of the importance of further developing each of the initiatives to the local economy. Each of the indicators was rated on a scale of: Very important, Somewhat important, Not that important, Not at all important.

1. Three of the nine initiatives were identified as "Very important" by at least 70% of those surveyed. The results of these three initiatives are summarized in the graph below for the entire region as well as the three individual counties. The most frequently identified "very important" initiative in the region, as well as each county, was "retaining existing business" as nearly 80% of those in the region identified this initiative as of such level of importance. The second and third most commonly identified very important initiatives were also consistent among the region as a whole and each of the three counties. The second most commonly identified initiative was "attracting new businesses" while the third most common was "training and workforce skills development opportunities." (Tables 6-15)



2. Two of the nine initiatives surveyed in 2017 were also surveyed in 2013 and 2015 for their perceived importance. In both 2013 and 2015 over 90% (91% in 2013 and 93% in 2015) of residents surveyed in the region rated "expanding activities and attractions for more tourism" as either "very important or "somewhat important." In 2017, this percentage has dropped to 87%. As one looks deeper, this drop occurs in Lewis County and St. Lawrence County but not in Jefferson County (the percentage remains at 91% in 2017). The second initiative studied previously was "keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally." The percentage indicating that this initiative was at least "somewhat important" also dropped in 2017 (91%) when compared to 2013 (97%) and 2015 (96%). This drop was seen in Jefferson County and St. Lawrence County between 2015 and 2017. The drop was seen previously in Lewis County between 2013 and 2015. (Tables 11-12)

These potential local economic development initiatives were also studied by identifying local residents' satisfaction level with each initiative. Each resident was asked to indicate their current level of satisfaction using the scale: Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.

3. In the three county region, along with each of the three individual counties, the initiative identified most positively (combining satisfaction levels of "Excellent" and "Good") was "Expanding activities and attractions for more tourism." Approximately two in five (41%) of respondents in the region identified the initiative as "Excellent or Good." Regionally, the second and third most positively rated initiatives were "retaining existing businesses" and "increasing Canadian spending in the local region." These are also in the top three most positively rated initiatives for Jefferson and St. Lawrence County; however, in Lewis County only "retaining existing businesses" is in the top three. Canadian spending in the local area is not as positively viewed in Lewis County (31% "Excellent or Good" rating, sixth highest among the nine initiatives in Lewis County). Many of the nine initiatives are less positively perceived in St. Lawrence County when compared to both Jefferson and Lewis Counties. The exceptions include satisfaction with "keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally" (St. Lawrence is lower than Jefferson but not Lewis), "increasing Canadian spending in the local region" (lower in both Lewis and St. Lawrence when

compared to Jefferson), and “improving the condition of single-family homes” (no differences between the three counties). Tables (16-25)



4. In 2013, residents were asked to rate their satisfaction with “expanding activities and attractions for more tourism.” The 2017 regional ratings (41% Excellent/Good, 57% Fair/Poor) are similar to those obtained in 2013 (42% Excellent/Good, 55% Fair/Poor). The values are also consistent on a county basis. The second initiative examined previously (both in 2013 and 2015) was satisfaction with “keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally.” The 2017 results (27% Excellent/Good, 68% Fair/Poor) have changed significantly from 2013 (32% Excellent/Good, 62% Fair/Poor). Tables (21-22)
5. Residents were asked to rate the success of recent publicly funded economic development investments in revitalizing local economies. Residents in Jefferson County and Lewis County are more likely to indicate these investments have had a positive impact (52% and 47% respectively) than those in St. Lawrence County (32%), while those in St. Lawrence County are more likely to indicate their has been either no impact or a negative impact (52%) than the other counties (Jefferson-29%, Lewis-36%). In the three-county region 45% indicate these investments have had a positive impact, 28% no impact, and 10% a negative impact. (Table 26)
6. Approximately three if every four respondents (76%) feel local governments should explore consolidation in the county if it could save taxpayers money. These results are consistent in the three counties, ranging from 75% in Jefferson County to 77% in St Lawrence County. Only 13.5% of respondents do not believe local governments should explore consolidation, ranging from 12% in Jefferson County to 17% in Lewis County. (Table 27)

Section 2.2 – Entrepreneurship


(Tables 28-43)

7. Approximately one-in-nine adults in the three-county region (12%, not significantly different from the previous two studies) currently own or operate a business (12% in Jefferson, 16% in Lewis, and 9% in St. Lawrence). Among those current business owners nearly two-thirds (66%) own a home-based business. The home-based business owners vary significantly between Jefferson County (57%) and Lewis County (82%). (Tables 28-29)
8. Among these current business owners roughly two in five (42%) employ only themselves (47% in Jefferson, 33% in Lewis, and 38% in St. Lawrence). Although this is an increase from the near 33% in 2013 and 2015, the increase is not statistically significant. More than one-fifth (23%) own businesses that are large enough to employ six or more persons (28% in Jefferson, 20% in Lewis, and 17% in St. Lawrence). When asked to share the number of employees these business owners have expanded by in the past twelve months, 76% indicated that they have not expanded, with 10% having expanded by one employee, 10% expanding by two employees with another 3% expanding by more than five employees. (Tables 30-31)

Business owners were given a list of eight potential challenges they may face as entrepreneurs. They were asked to identify whether they considered each as a major challenge, minor challenge, or not at all a challenge.

9. Regionally, taxes (54%), labor and benefits costs (44%), and government regulation (42%) were identified as the top three major challenges faced by business owners. Additionally, taxes is identified as the top major concern in all three counties (Jefferson-46%, Lewis-65%, St. Lawrence-65%); labor and benefits cost was identified as a top

three major concern in all three counties while government regulation was also a top three concern in Lewis County and St. Lawrence County. (Tables 32-40)



10. When each of the potential challenges is looked at individually, a number of differences can be seen between the counties. In St. Lawrence County business owners are more likely to identify access to credit as a major concern than those in Lewis County. This is also the case when addressing utility rates; additionally, in Lewis County utility rates are more likely to be identified as a minor challenge than in St. Lawrence County. In Lewis County, business owners are more likely to identify government regulation as a major concern than those in Jefferson County. Business owners in Jefferson County are more likely to identify government regulation as not a challenge than those in St. Lawrence County. The availability of affordable space at a desired location is more likely to not be a challenge in Lewis County than in both Jefferson and St. Lawrence. (Tables 32-40)

11. Forty percent of current business owners believe their business would benefit from increased educational opportunities being provided in the county (23% “definitely yes”, 17% “probably yes”) while more than half (31% “probably not”, 23% “definitely not”) do not believe their business would benefit. Business owners in Lewis County are less likely to believe educational opportunities would benefit their business (9%) than those in Jefferson (49%) and St. Lawrence (50%) counties. Lewis County business owners are more likely to indicate educational opportunities will not be of benefit (74%) than those in Jefferson County (47%). (Table 41)

12. Nearly one in six (16%) current business owners state that the Internet access has gotten better at their business in the last three years while more than three in five (63%) shared that Internet access has stayed the same with six percent reporting that access has gotten worse. No significant differences can be seen among the business owners in the three counties. (Table 42)

13. Among current business owners more than half (57%) indicate that none of their annual revenue is accounted for by Canadian spending (51% indicated no Canadian revenue in 2015). Lewis County business owners are more likely to indicate that none of their revenue comes from Canadian spending (78%) compared to both Jefferson County (49%) and St. Lawrence County (64%). (Table 43)

Section 2.3 – Passenger Air Service

(Table 44-45)

14. As was the case in 2015, two questions were asked regarding local passenger air service. The first question asked respondents to rate their satisfaction with access to local passenger air service. Regionally, nearly one in five (19%) residents are very satisfied while another two in five (39%) are somewhat satisfied, both increases from 2015. Nine percent of residents are not satisfied with their access to local passenger air service, a decrease from 18% in 2015. There are many countywide differences in level of satisfaction; very satisfied rates in Lewis County (10%, not significantly different from 2015) are lower than both Jefferson (20%, increase from 15% in 2015) and St. Lawrence


(22%, increase 16% in 2015). Not at all satisfied rates are lower in Jefferson County (6%, decrease from 16% in 2015) than Lewis County (16%, not significantly different from 2015). Of note, St. Lawrence County dissatisfaction rates also decreased from 2015 (10% in 2017, 21% in 2015). (Table 44)

15. The second passenger air service question asked whether one flies more commonly from airports located in the three North Country counties or from airports outside the three-county region. Significant changes were seen from the 2015 results. In 2017, nearly one quarter (24%) of residents use local airports more commonly (increase from 15% in 2015) while 42% of residents use airports outside the three counties more commonly (decrease from 50% in 2015). In 2015, five percent of participants indicated they equally use local and non-local airports; this percentage increased to eight percent in 2017. As was the case with the first question pertaining to passenger air services, similarities were seen between Jefferson County and St. Lawrence County while airport usage is different for Lewis County residents. Local airport usage is more common in Jefferson and St. Lawrence Counties than in Lewis County. Both Jefferson and St. Lawrence residents use local air service more and non-local air service less in 2017 than in 2015. The use of local and non-local airports by Lewis County residents has not changed from 2015. (Table 45)

Section 2.4 – Healthcare Access

(Tables 46-48)

16. The majority of North Country residents are more likely than not to travel outside of their county for at least some healthcare service; 41% never travel outside their county, 44% travel either rarely or some of the time, and 14% travel outside their county most or all of the time (these values parallel those from 2015). Lewis County residents are more likely to travel for healthcare services ("Never"-32%) than residents in Jefferson County ("Never"-44%) and St. Lawrence County ("Never"-44%, increase from 35% in 2015). (Table 46)
17. Among those residents who do travel outside their county for healthcare services nearly three quarters (74%) indicate they travel outside of the Jefferson-Lewis-St. Lawrence Region, an increase from 63% in 2015; 34% always travel outside the three county region while 39% sometimes travel outside the region (a significant increase from 28% in 2015). Jefferson County residents are more likely to travel outside the three county region (81%, significant increase from 62% in 2015) than both Lewis (71%, 64% in 2015) and St. Lawrence (69%, 65% in 2015) residents. (Table 47)
18. The five most common healthcare services identified by North Country residents for which they travel outside the three-county region are primary care, orthopedic services including physical therapy, cardiology, in-patient surgery, and cancer treatment. Four of these five services were also identified as top five services in 2015. In 2017, 30% of residents indicated that they leave the area to seek assistance from specialists. Each of the five services identified in the region are also identified as top six services in the three counties. (Table 48)



Section 2.5 – Internet Access

(Table 49)

19. When asked whether their home Internet access had gotten better, stayed the same, or gotten worse in the past three years the majority (54%) of residents indicate that their Internet access has remained the same (a significant increase

from 48% in 2015. Significant increases were seen in Lewis (48% to 61%) and St. Lawrence (42% to 49%) Counties. The rates of both gotten better (20% in both years) and gotten worse (16% in 2017, and 17% in 2015) have not changed significantly. In 2017, only 7% of indicated they could not answer the question, a significant drop from 14% in 2015. (Table 49)

Section 2.6 – Employment

(Tables 50-57)

20. Nearly two-thirds (65%) of adult residents in the region state they are currently employed, an increase from 61% in 2015. More than seven in ten (71%) of Jefferson County residents are employed with lower rates of 59% in Lewis County and 57% in St. Lawrence County. Approximately one-fifth (22%) of adult residents report they are retired (28% in Lewis, 25% in St. Lawrence, and a significantly lower 17% in Jefferson). (Table 50)
21. Among those who are currently employed, an overwhelming majority (90%) are employed in the tri-county region, 94% of whom are entirely employed in the region. Of note, the percentage of those fully employed in the three-county region has decreased since 2015 while the percentage of those partially employed in the region has increased. Residents of Lewis County are more likely to be fully employed than residents in Jefferson and St. Lawrence County and less likely to be partially employed than those in Jefferson County. (Table 51)
22. Each person who is currently employed was asked the industry in which they currently work. Four of the top five industries identified in 2017 were also identified in 2015: retail, education, healthcare, and service. The only significant change from 2015 is the inclusion of military in 2017. Jefferson County accounts for the vast majority of the military employment as 97% of the military employment is by resident of that county. In Lewis County agriculture is one of the major industries for employment (higher than both Jefferson and St. Lawrence) while in St. Lawrence County blue collar employment is a top five industry for employment (significantly higher than in Jefferson County). (Table 52)
23. Most of those who are currently employed (84%) shared that they do not work for a Canadian or other foreign-owned company. Each of the counties present a different rate with Jefferson residents reporting 75%, Lewis 98% and St. Lawrence 91%. This percentage is a significant decline since 2015 when 97% indicated that they do not work for a foreign-owned company. Only three percent indicate that they do work for a foreign-owned company in 2017 (2% in 2015). (Table 53)
24. Currently employed residents were asked whether they feel under-employed in their current job. The specific survey question is: "Do you believe that you have skills, experience, and/or credentials that surpass what is typically needed for the job that you now have in other words, do you feel that you are now "under-employed"? The responses to this question have changed each time they have been measured since 2013. In 2013, 58% of those who were employed felt they were underemployed. This percentage decreased to 38% in 2015 and has since increased to 45% in 2017. Similar changes were seen with those who do not believe they are underemployed (2013: 40%, 2015: 60%, 2017: 50%). The 2017 results are similar among in the three counties (underemployment rates of 45% in Jefferson, 51% in Lewis, and 43% in St. Lawrence). Lewis County has experienced the same trend of those who feel they are underemployed as the region since 2013 while Jefferson dropped significantly from 2013 to 2015 but has not seen a significant change from 2015 to 2017. St. Lawrence county residents have also not seen significant change since 2015. (Table 54)
25. Among those who are unemployed nearly one-fifth (19%) indicated they lost their job within the last 12 months due to downsizing or company closure. This rate is significantly higher in Lewis County (58%) than in the other two counties (Jefferson 15%, St. Lawrence 11%). (Table 55)
26. When those who are unemployed were asked if they had tried to find a new job in the last 12 months, nearly two out of every five (37%) indicated that they had. No significant differences were seen between the three counties. Those who reported as having been looking for a job were asked if they were unable to find a job because of a lack of necessary skills or training. Approximately one-third (32%) indicated that this was the case; each of these individuals is a resident of St. Lawrence County. (Table 56-57)

Section 2.7 – North Country Residence

(Tables 58-59)

27. Nearly three-quarters (73%) of North Country residents reported to having lived in the area for twenty or more years while 14% indicated they have spent less than 5 years in the area and 10% have lived in the North Country between ten and twenty years. The majority of individuals living in the area for less than five years reside in Jefferson County; 27% of Jefferson residents have been in the area for less than five years compared to one percent in the other two

counties. Residents of Lewis County are more likely to have lived in the area for more than twenty years than those in the other two counties (Lewis-93%, St. Lawrence 79%, Jefferson-62%) (Table 58)

28. When asked, nearly two-thirds (66%) of residents indicated they are a native of the North Country, very similar to that recorded in 2015 (68%). When comparing the counties, Jefferson residents are less likely to be natives (55%) than those in both Lewis (83%) and St. Lawrence (75%) Counties, results again consistent with those from 2015. Those who are not native to the North Country were asked to share their reason for moving to the area. Regionally the most common response was military; when looking at the counties individually, in Jefferson the most common response, at 70%, is the military, in the other two counties the most common reason is family and/or parents are in the area (38% of non-natives in both Lewis County and St. Lawrence County). (Table 59)

Section 3 - Detailed Statistical Results

This section of the Final Report of Study Findings provides a detailed presentation of the results for each of the questions in the survey. There are eight separate sections of detailed statistical results to follow (Sections 3.0-3.7). The first of these sections (Section 3.0) includes technical comments and is provided to explain the details of how to best interpret the included statistics. Descriptions of the correct margin of error to use for any provided statistic and how to determine statistical significance are explained in detail within these technical comments. Following the technical comments in Section 3.0 are seven sections of detailed presentation of economic-related statistical results. Each of these sections is comprised of an analysis of a set of related economic survey questions. The survey questions included in this study and analyzed in this report have been organized into the following seven sections:

Section 3.1 – Attitudes about the Local Economic Development Initiatives (Tables 6-27)

Section 3.2 – Entrepreneurship (Tables 28-43)

Section 3.3 – Passenger Air Service (Tables 44-45)

Section 3.4 – Healthcare Access (Tables 46-48)

Section 3.5 – Internet Access (Table 49)

Section 3.6 – Employment (Tables 50-57)

Section 3.7 – North Country Residence (Tables 58-59)

The organization of the tabular presentation of statistical results in each of these seven sections is as follows. Whenever there are multiple items (survey questions) that are all posed with the same resulting scale (e.g. all asking Very-Somewhat-Not Very Important) then an overall comparison table for these comparative results is presented. Technically, four of these overall comparison tables are presented – one for combined regional results, and one each for Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence County. These multiple-item comparative summary tables are located prior to the individual tables for each of the questions contained in these tables of overall comparison.

The most detailed statistical results, however, are presented within the next seven sections of this report on an *individual-question* basis. Whenever possible, the results for *each* of the approximately 50 individual economic-related survey questions are presented in this section of the report with the following organizational structure:

- (1) The results for all sampled residents in the three-county region are combined and summarized in a frequency distribution that shows the sampled frequency and sample proportion for each possible survey response for the survey question (in these tables the results are weighted for County Population Size, Gender, Age, Education Level, Military Affiliation, and Phone Ownership). **The benefit of these tables is to provide current three-county regional prevalence estimate data.**
- (2) The 2017 results for each survey question have been cross-tabulated by County. **The benefit of these tables is to provide an opportunity to identify differences between Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties in 2017.** Readers are reminded that the method to determine which observed sample differences between the counties in 2017 are *statistically significant* differences is explained in detail in the “Technical Comments” section in this report, Section 3.0.
- (3) When possible, the 2013 and/or 2015 results for each survey question that was used in again in 2017 have been presented in both a regional and a county-specific manner. **The benefit of these tables is to provide an opportunity to identify trends in responses that may have changed in the past two or four years within the region or within one of the three counties** (recall, no sampling was completed in St. Lawrence County in 2013 so only two year comparisons are available). Readers are reminded that the method to determine which observed sample differences between years are *statistically significant* trends is explained in detail in the “Technical Comments” section in this report, Section 3.0.
- (4) Finally, the results for each survey question have been cross-tabulated *within each county's set of results* by each of the demographic factors of Gender, Age, Education Level, Military Affiliation, and Household Income Level (there is a total of over 450 cross-tabulation tables included in this report). **The benefit of these tables is to provide an opportunity to identify possible significant correlations between demographic explanatory variables and economic-related outcome variables.** Again, readers are reminded that the method to determine which observed sample differences between subgroups (e.g. comparing males to females in Jefferson County) are *statistically significant* differences is explained in detail in the “Technical Comments” section in this report, Section 3.0.

The statistics reported in the correlative tables (the cross-tabulations by County, Gender, Age, Education, Military Affiliation, and Income) are percentages within the sampled subgroups. To determine the sample size for each subgroup – to avoid over-interpretation – the reader should refer to the bottom row in each cross-tabulation table. Again, findings should be considered with sample sizes in mind. Statistical tests of significance take into consideration these varying sample sizes.

“Framing” a Statistic – Providing Perspective to Better Understand, Interpret, and Use this Survey Data

The rationale behind providing so many analyses (statistics) for every survey question included in this study is that one never fully understands the information contained in a reported statistic without “framing” that statistic. Framing involves adding a more rich perspective to the value of some reported statistic. For example, when St. Lawrence County residents in April 2017 were asked the survey question: **“How important to the local economy do you think it is to improve the condition of rental housing?”**, the result in the current study is that 54.3% of the participants responded with *very important* (reported later in Table 14). So what does this 54.3% really mean? Often-times community-based researchers will describe the process of “framing” a statistic as completing as many as possible of the six following comparisons (frames) to better understand a reported statistic from a sample:

- **Within Response Distribution**
(Is it a majority? 4:1 ratio? “Three times more likely to respond with “better” than “worse”?)
- **Relative Standing**
(How does this result compare to other questions asked using the same scale?)
- **Trend Across Time**
(Has it increased? Decreased?)
- **Compare to Target/Benchmark**
(Compare to some regional average? Compare to an agency or community’s goal or target?)
- **Ranking Among Similar Variables**
(Among many different similar locations, characteristics, options, or attributes, that all use the same response scale, is this specific item ranked first? last?)
- **Cross-tabulations by Potential Explanatory Variables**
(Different political ideological people differ in opinion or behavior? Age-dependent? Gender-dependent? Education-dependent? Income-dependent? Military-affiliation-dependent? Geography-dependent?)

The design of this final report of study findings includes all of the various types of tables that are necessary to allow community leaders to best “frame the statistics” included in this report, best understand the statistics included, and make best decisions in the future regarding how to use the statistics. As has been mentioned several times previously, if one has further questions about “framing a statistic” please contact the professional staff at the *Center for Community Studies*.

Section 3.0 – Technical Comments to Assist Interpretation of the Data

The results of this study will be disseminated to, and utilized in decision-making by, a very wide array of readers – who, no doubt, have a very wide array of statistical backgrounds. The following comments are provided to give guidance for interpretation of the presented findings so that readers with less-than-current statistical training might maximize the use of the information contained in the Second Biennial Jefferson-Lewis-St. Lawrence County Regional Economic Tracking Survey.

Margin of Error – Constructing Confidence Intervals to Estimate for an Entire Population

When data is collected, of course, it is only possible for the researcher to analyze the results of the *sample* data, the data from the group of individuals actually sampled, or in this case, actually interviewed. However, it is typically the goal of the researcher to use this *sample* data to draw a conclusion, or estimate that which they believe is true, for the entire *population* from which the sample was selected. To complete this estimation the standard statistical technique is to construct a **confidence interval** – an interval of values between which one can be 95% certain, or confident, that the true population value will fall. For example, if a researcher interviews $n=500$ randomly selected participants from some population of size $N=100,000$ individuals, and the researcher finds that $x=200$ of the 500 sampled participants indicate that they “agree” with some posed statement (200 out of 500 would be 40%), then the researcher can never be 100% certain that if all 100,000 population members were, in fact, interviewed that the result for this entire population investigated would be that 40% (that would be 40,000 out of the 100,000) would “agree.” In general, one can never guarantee with 100% certainty that a statistic for some random sample will perfectly, exactly, result the same as the population value that describes the entire population (this value is called a “parameter”). Fortunately, considering the types of variables and resulting data that typically are generated in survey research, use of the statistical tools of probability distributions and sampling distributions allows the determination of a very important distance – the distance that one would expect 95% of the samples of size n to fall either above or below the true population value. This distance is commonly referred to as the **margin of error**. Once this distance (margin of error) is measured, there is a 95% probability that the sample result (the result of the $n=500$ sampled participants in the illustration above) will fall within that distance of the true population value. Therefore, to construct the very useful and easily-interpreted statistical estimation tool known as a **confidence interval**, all one must do is calculate the margin of error and add-and-subtract it to-and-from the sample result (statistic) and the outcome is that there is a 95% chance that the resulting interval does, in fact, include the true population value within the interval.

To illustrate the above-described concepts of margin of error and confidence intervals, recall that the margin of error for this survey has been earlier stated in the Methodology section in this report as approximately ± 2.3 percentage points when a survey question is answered by all 1,204 participants. Therefore, when a percentage is observed in one of the included tables of statistics in this report, the appropriate interpretation is that we are 95% confident that if all Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence County adult residents were surveyed (rather than just the 1,204 that were actually surveyed), the percentage that would result for all residents would be within ± 2.3 percentage points of the sample percentage that we surveyed, calculated, and reported in this study. For example, in Table 23, it can be observed that 19.0% of the sample of 1,195 adults in the three-county region reported that their satisfaction level with “Increasing Canadian spending in the local region” is “Poor”. With this sample result, one could infer with 95% confidence that if all Jefferson County adults and all Lewis County adults and all St. Lawrence County adults were asked – somewhere between 16.7% and 21.3% of the combined population of the nearly 200,000 adults in Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties rate their satisfaction level with local Canadian spending as “Poor” (generated by starting with the 19.0% that was found in the sample and adding-and-subtracting the margin of error of $\pm 2.3\%$). This resulting interval (16.7%-21.3%) is known as a **95% Confidence Interval**. The consumer of this report should use this pattern when attempting to generalize any of these survey findings for survey questions *that were answered by all, or almost all, 1,204 participants in this study* to the entire adult population of Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties combined. When attempting to generalize results for survey questions which had smaller sample sizes (the result of either screening questions, or participants refusing to answer certain questions, or investigating demographic subgroups such as only females, or when simply investigating for one of the three studied counties), the resulting margin of error will be *larger* than ± 2.3 percentage points. Table 4 presented on the top on the following page provides *approximate* margin of error values that should be used with sample sizes of less than $n=1,204$.

Table 4 – Approximate Margins of Error for Varying Sample Sizes

Sample Size (n = ...)	Approximate Margin of Error
30	±14.3%
50	±11.1%
75	±9.0%
100	±7.8%
125	±7.0%
150	±6.4%
175	±5.9%
200	±5.5%
225	±5.2%
250	±5.0%
275	±4.7%
300	±4.5%
350	±4.2%
400	±3.9%
450	±3.7%
464	±3.6%
1204	±2.3%

Margin of Error – More Detail for Those Interested in Maximizing Precision and Accuracy of Estimates

The preceding introductory example used a margin of error of ±2.3%, as a result of an illustration that used all nearly all of the 1,204 participants in this study. Again, the margin of error when using the sample results in this study to construct a confidence interval to estimate a population percentage will not always be ±2.3%. There is not one universal value of a margin of error that can be precisely calculated and used for the results for every question included in this survey, or for that matter, any multiple-question survey. Calculation methods used in this study for generating the margin of error depend upon the following three factors, which include two factors in addition to the sample-size factor that has just been mentioned:

1. The **sample size** is the number of adults who validly answered the survey question. The sample size will not always be n=1,204 since individuals have a right to omit any question. Additionally, some survey questions were only posed after screening questions. In general, the smaller the sample size then the larger the margin of error, and conversely, the larger the sample size then the smaller the margin of error.
2. The **sample proportion or percentage** is the calculated percentage of the sample who responded with the answer or category of interest (e.g. responded “Agree”). This percentage can vary from 0%-100%, and, of course, will change from question to question throughout the survey. In general, the further that a sample percentage varies from 50% in either direction (approaching either 0% or 100%), the smaller the margin of error. Conversely, the closer that the actual sample percentage is to 50% then the larger is the resulting margin of error. As an example, if 948 out of 1,204 sampled residents “Agree” with some posed statement, then the sample proportion would be $948 \div 1204 = 0.787 = 78.7\%$.
3. The **confidence level** is used in generalizing the results of the sample to the population that the sample represented. In this study, the standard confidence level used in survey research, 95% confidence level, will be used for all survey questions.

In mathematical notation, the margin of error for each sample result for this study would be represented as:

$$ME = 1.96 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{p(100 - p)}{n}}$$

Where n = sample size = # valid responses to the survey question

p = sample percentage for the survey question (between 0%-100%)

1.96 = the standard normal score associated with the 95% confidence level

Since the sample size varies (in fact, is conceivably different for each question on the survey) and the sample percentage varies (also, conceivably different for each question on the survey) the following table (Table 5) has been provided for the reader to determine the correct margin of error to use whenever constructing a confidence interval using the sample data presented in this study. This table was generated using the ME formula shown above.

Table 5 – More Detailed Margins of Error for Varying Sample Sizes and Varying Sample Proportions

Varying Sample %'s	Varying Sample Sizes														
	30	50	75	100	125	150	175	200	250	300	350	400	450	464	1,204
2%	5.0%	3.9%	3.2%	2.7%	2.5%	2.2%	2.1%	1.9%	1.7%	1.6%	1.5%	1.4%	1.3%	1.3%	0.8%
4%	7.0%	5.4%	4.4%	3.8%	3.4%	3.1%	2.9%	2.7%	2.4%	2.2%	2.1%	1.9%	1.8%	1.8%	1.1%
6%	8.5%	6.6%	5.4%	4.7%	4.2%	3.8%	3.5%	3.3%	2.9%	2.7%	2.5%	2.3%	2.2%	2.2%	1.3%
8%	9.7%	7.5%	6.1%	5.3%	4.8%	4.3%	4.0%	3.8%	3.4%	3.1%	2.8%	2.7%	2.5%	2.5%	1.5%
10%	10.7%	8.3%	6.8%	5.9%	5.3%	4.8%	4.4%	4.2%	3.7%	3.4%	3.1%	2.9%	2.8%	2.7%	1.7%
12%	11.6%	9.0%	7.4%	6.4%	5.7%	5.2%	4.8%	4.5%	4.0%	3.7%	3.4%	3.2%	3.0%	3.0%	1.8%
14%	12.4%	9.6%	7.9%	6.8%	6.1%	5.6%	5.1%	4.8%	4.3%	3.9%	3.6%	3.4%	3.2%	3.2%	2.0%
16%	13.1%	10.2%	8.3%	7.2%	6.4%	5.9%	5.4%	5.1%	4.5%	4.1%	3.8%	3.6%	3.4%	3.3%	2.1%
18%	13.7%	10.6%	8.7%	7.5%	6.7%	6.1%	5.7%	5.3%	4.8%	4.3%	4.0%	3.8%	3.5%	3.5%	2.2%
20%	14.3%	11.1%	9.1%	7.8%	7.0%	6.4%	5.9%	5.5%	5.0%	4.5%	4.2%	3.9%	3.7%	3.6%	2.3%
22%	14.8%	11.5%	9.4%	8.1%	7.3%	6.6%	6.1%	5.7%	5.1%	4.7%	4.3%	4.1%	3.8%	3.8%	2.3%
24%	15.3%	11.8%	9.7%	8.4%	7.5%	6.8%	6.3%	5.9%	5.3%	4.8%	4.5%	4.2%	3.9%	3.9%	2.4%
26%	15.7%	12.2%	9.9%	8.6%	7.7%	7.0%	6.5%	6.1%	5.4%	5.0%	4.6%	4.3%	4.1%	4.0%	2.5%
28%	16.1%	12.4%	10.2%	8.8%	7.9%	7.2%	6.7%	6.2%	5.6%	5.1%	4.7%	4.4%	4.1%	4.1%	2.5%
30%	16.4%	12.7%	10.4%	9.0%	8.0%	7.3%	6.8%	6.4%	5.7%	5.2%	4.8%	4.5%	4.2%	4.2%	2.6%
32%	16.7%	12.9%	10.6%	9.1%	8.2%	7.5%	6.9%	6.5%	5.8%	5.3%	4.9%	4.6%	4.3%	4.2%	2.6%
34%	17.0%	13.1%	10.7%	9.3%	8.3%	7.6%	7.0%	6.6%	5.9%	5.4%	5.0%	4.6%	4.4%	4.3%	2.7%
36%	17.2%	13.3%	10.9%	9.4%	8.4%	7.7%	7.1%	6.7%	6.0%	5.4%	5.0%	4.7%	4.4%	4.4%	2.7%
38%	17.4%	13.5%	11.0%	9.5%	8.5%	7.8%	7.2%	6.7%	6.0%	5.5%	5.1%	4.8%	4.5%	4.4%	2.7%
40%	17.5%	13.6%	11.1%	9.6%	8.6%	7.8%	7.3%	6.8%	6.1%	5.5%	5.1%	4.8%	4.5%	4.5%	2.8%
42%	17.7%	13.7%	11.2%	9.7%	8.7%	7.9%	7.3%	6.8%	6.1%	5.6%	5.2%	4.8%	4.6%	4.5%	2.8%
44%	17.8%	13.8%	11.2%	9.7%	8.7%	7.9%	7.4%	6.9%	6.2%	5.6%	5.2%	4.9%	4.6%	4.5%	2.8%
46%	17.8%	13.8%	11.3%	9.8%	8.7%	8.0%	7.4%	6.9%	6.2%	5.6%	5.2%	4.9%	4.6%	4.5%	2.8%
48%	17.9%	13.8%	11.3%	9.8%	8.8%	8.0%	7.4%	6.9%	6.2%	5.7%	5.2%	4.9%	4.6%	4.5%	2.8%
50%	17.9%	13.9%	11.3%	9.8%	8.8%	8.0%	7.4%	6.9%	6.2%	5.7%	5.2%	4.9%	4.6%	4.5%	2.8%
52%	17.9%	13.8%	11.3%	9.8%	8.8%	8.0%	7.4%	6.9%	6.2%	5.7%	5.2%	4.9%	4.6%	4.5%	2.8%
54%	17.8%	13.8%	11.3%	9.8%	8.7%	8.0%	7.4%	6.9%	6.2%	5.6%	5.2%	4.9%	4.6%	4.5%	2.8%
56%	17.8%	13.8%	11.2%	9.7%	8.7%	7.9%	7.4%	6.9%	6.2%	5.6%	5.2%	4.9%	4.6%	4.5%	2.8%
58%	17.7%	13.7%	11.2%	9.7%	8.7%	7.9%	7.3%	6.8%	6.1%	5.6%	5.2%	4.8%	4.6%	4.5%	2.8%
60%	17.5%	13.6%	11.1%	9.6%	8.6%	7.8%	7.3%	6.8%	6.1%	5.5%	5.1%	4.8%	4.5%	4.5%	2.8%
62%	17.4%	13.5%	11.0%	9.5%	8.5%	7.8%	7.2%	6.7%	6.0%	5.5%	5.1%	4.8%	4.5%	4.4%	2.7%
64%	17.2%	13.3%	10.9%	9.4%	8.4%	7.7%	7.1%	6.7%	6.0%	5.4%	5.0%	4.7%	4.4%	4.4%	2.7%
66%	17.0%	13.1%	10.7%	9.3%	8.3%	7.6%	7.0%	6.6%	5.9%	5.4%	5.0%	4.6%	4.4%	4.3%	2.7%
68%	16.7%	12.9%	10.6%	9.1%	8.2%	7.5%	6.9%	6.5%	5.8%	5.3%	4.9%	4.6%	4.3%	4.2%	2.6%
70%	16.4%	12.7%	10.4%	9.0%	8.0%	7.3%	6.8%	6.4%	5.7%	5.2%	4.8%	4.5%	4.2%	4.2%	2.6%
72%	16.1%	12.4%	10.2%	8.8%	7.9%	7.2%	6.7%	6.2%	5.6%	5.1%	4.7%	4.4%	4.1%	4.1%	2.5%
74%	15.7%	12.2%	9.9%	8.6%	7.7%	7.0%	6.5%	6.1%	5.4%	5.0%	4.6%	4.3%	4.1%	4.0%	2.5%
76%	15.3%	11.8%	9.7%	8.4%	7.5%	6.8%	6.3%	5.9%	5.3%	4.8%	4.5%	4.2%	3.9%	3.9%	2.4%
78%	14.8%	11.5%	9.4%	8.1%	7.3%	6.6%	6.1%	5.7%	5.1%	4.7%	4.3%	4.1%	3.8%	3.8%	2.3%
80%	14.3%	11.1%	9.1%	7.8%	7.0%	6.4%	5.9%	5.5%	5.0%	4.5%	4.2%	3.9%	3.7%	3.6%	2.3%
82%	13.7%	10.6%	8.7%	7.5%	6.7%	6.1%	5.7%	5.3%	4.8%	4.3%	4.0%	3.8%	3.5%	3.5%	2.2%
84%	13.1%	10.2%	8.3%	7.2%	6.4%	5.9%	5.4%	5.1%	4.5%	4.1%	3.8%	3.6%	3.4%	3.3%	2.1%
86%	12.4%	9.6%	7.9%	6.8%	6.1%	5.6%	5.1%	4.8%	4.3%	3.9%	3.6%	3.4%	3.2%	3.2%	2.0%
88%	11.6%	9.0%	7.4%	6.4%	5.7%	5.2%	4.8%	4.5%	4.0%	3.7%	3.4%	3.2%	3.0%	3.0%	1.8%
90%	10.7%	8.3%	6.8%	5.9%	5.3%	4.8%	4.4%	4.2%	3.7%	3.4%	3.1%	2.9%	2.8%	2.7%	1.7%
92%	9.7%	7.5%	6.1%	5.3%	4.8%	4.3%	4.0%	3.8%	3.4%	3.1%	2.8%	2.7%	2.5%	2.5%	1.5%
94%	8.5%	6.6%	5.4%	4.7%	4.2%	3.8%	3.5%	3.3%	2.9%	2.7%	2.5%	2.3%	2.2%	2.2%	1.3%
96%	7.0%	5.4%	4.4%	3.8%	3.4%	3.1%	2.9%	2.7%	2.4%	2.2%	2.1%	1.9%	1.8%	1.8%	1.1%
98%	5.0%	3.9%	3.2%	2.7%	2.5%	2.2%	2.1%	1.9%	1.7%	1.6%	1.5%	1.4%	1.3%	1.3%	0.8%
Average	14.3%	11.1%	9.0%	7.8%	7.0%	6.4%	5.9%	5.5%	5.0%	4.5%	4.2%	3.9%	3.7%	3.6%	2.3%

Illustration of how to use Table 5: To estimate the percentage in the entire population of *Jefferson County* adults who rate their satisfaction with Canadian spending locally as “Poor” in 2017 one must first refer to Table 23 to determine the sample size and percentage of this sample of Jefferson County adults who respond with “Poor”. From Table 23 it is found that 9.2% of the sampled Jefferson County adults in 2017 rated local Canadian spending as “Poor”, and the sample size for Jefferson County is $n = 459$. Reference to Table 5 on the preceding page indicates that the appropriate margin of error would be $\pm 2.7\%$ (used $n=464$, the closest entry to $n=459$ in the table, and used $p=10\%$, the closest entry to $p=9.2\%$ in the table). Therefore, we can be 95% confident that if all Jefferson County adults were asked, the resulting percentage who would indicate that local Canadian spending is “Poor” among this population would be within $\pm 2.7\%$ of the 9.2% found in our sample. The interpretation of this would be that we are 95% confident that among all Jefferson County adults the percentage who rate local Canadian spending as “Poor” would be somewhere between 6.5% and 11.9%. Note that this margin of error of 2.7 percentage points is larger than the earlier-cited study margin of error of 2.3 percentage points as a result of there being only 459 Jefferson County residents who responded to this question.

It should be noted that the margin of error is a measurement of random error, error due to simply the random chance of sampling. For example, if one were to flip a fair coin $n=300$ times, the population percentage for the percentage of the time that the coin would result with a head is, of course, 50%. Use of Table 5 indicates that with a margin of error of $\pm 5.7\%$, one would determine that there is a 95% chance that a sample of $n=300$ flips would fall within $\pm 5.7\%$ of this real population value of 50%. In other words, there is a 95% chance that the sample result will be between $50\% \pm 5.7\%$, between 44.3% and 55.7%. Only 5% of the time would a sample of $n=300$ flips result with either less than 44.3% heads, or greater than 55.7% heads.

However, in survey research, it is not coins that are being flipped; it is humans who are being interviewed. When surveying humans there are other potential sources of error, sources of error in addition to random error (which is the only error encompassed by the margin of error). Response error, nonresponse error, process error, bias in sample selection, bias in question-phrasing, lack of clarity in question-phrasing, and undercoverage are common sources of other-than-random error. Methods that should be, and have been employed in this Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence County study, to minimize these other sources of error are: maximum effort to select the sample randomly, piloting and testing of utilized survey questions, extensive training of all data collectors (interviewers), and application of post-stratification algorithms. Hence, when using this study data to make estimates to the entire Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence County adult populations, as is the case in standard survey research practices, the margin of error will be the only error measurement cited and interpreted.

Significance Testing – Testing for Statistically Significant Relationships (Differences)

The technical discussion of statistical techniques above has focused on the statistical inference referred to as *estimation* – construction of confidence intervals using the margins of error described in Table 5. To take full advantage of the data collected in this study, other statistical techniques are of value. Tests for significantly correlated factors with measured economic-related variables are presented as well.

A comment or two regarding “statistical significance” could help readers of varying quantitative backgrounds most appropriately interpret the results of what has been statistically analyzed. Again, because the data for this Third Biennial Jefferson-Lewis-St. Lawrence County Regional Economic Tracking Survey is based on a *sample* of 1,204 adult residents, as opposed to obtaining information from every single adult resident in Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties, there must be a method of determining whether an observed relationship or difference in the *sample* survey data is likely to continue to hold true if every adult resident in the region were, in fact, interviewed. To make this determination, **tests of statistical significance** are standard practice in evaluating sample survey data.

For example, if the *sample* data shows that Jefferson County residents are more likely to fly out of local airports than Lewis County residents (24.8% vs. 12.8%, respectively, Table 45), the researcher would want to know if this higher rate of local airport usage among Jefferson County residents would still be present if they interviewed every Jefferson County adult rather than just the sample of 458 adults who were actually interviewed and provided this information, and likewise, if every Lewis County adult were sampled. To answer this question, the researcher uses a **test of statistical significance**. The outcome of a test of statistical significance will be that the result is either “not statistically significant” or the result is “statistically significant.”

The meaning of “not statistically significant” is that if the sample were repeated many more times (in this case that would mean many more different groups of $n=1,204$ randomly selected local adults from the approximately 200,000 adults in the three counties), then the results of these samples would not consistently show that Jefferson County residents are more likely to report using local airports than Lewis County residents. Some samples would have Jefferson County higher and some would have Lewis County higher. In this case, the researcher could not report *with high levels of confidence* that

the Jefferson County local airport usage rate is statistically significantly different from the Lewis County rate. Rather, the difference found between the two counties in the one actually-selected sample of size $n=1,204$ local residents would be interpreted as small enough that it could be due simply to the random chance of sampling – *not statistically significant*. Again, the determination of “how far apart is far enough apart to be statistically significant?” is calculated by using sampling distributions and the margins of error described earlier. These tools allow the measurement of how far apart sample subgroups must be to be interpreted as a very *unlikely* difference to occur simply by random chance (if one assumes that the population values for the subgroups are, in fact, equal).

Conversely, the meaning of “statistically significant” is that if the sample were repeated many more times, then the results of these samples would consistently show that Jefferson County adults are more likely to report flying out of local airports than Lewis County adults; and further, if every Jefferson County adult were interviewed, we are confident that the population “use local airports more commonly” rate among Jefferson County adults would be higher than the rate among Lewis County adults. One can never be 100% certain (or confident) that the result of a sample will indicate appropriately whether the population percentages are, in fact, different from one another or not. The interpretation of a “statistically significant” difference is that it is so large that there is a probability of less than 5% that this difference occurred simply due to the random chance of sampling (if one assumes that the population values for the subgroups are, in fact, equal) – instead, it is considered a “real” difference. In statistical vocabulary and notation, this would be represented as a p-value of less than 5% ($p < 0.05$).

Each of the county tables, trend tables, and demographic cross-tabulation tables in sections 3.1 – 3.7 contains the information necessary to determine statistically significant differences between either yearly results or between demographic subgroups. The county specific results from Table 45 are displayed below to illustrate how to determine whether the differences between the sample results are statistically significant.

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Local airports more commonly	24.8% _a	114	12.8% _b	37	25.5% _a	114
Airports outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties more commonly	41.0% _a	187	54.6% _b	159	34.9% _a	156
Equally locally and not locally	9.3% _a	42	2.8% _b	8	8.9% _a	40
I do not fly ever	20.8% _a	95	27.3% _a	80	26.9% _a	120
Don't Know	4.1% _a	19	2.5% _a	7	3.8% _a	17
TOTALS:	100.0%	458	100.0%	292	100.0%	446

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column proportions. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

Taking notice of the note that accompanies the table one can see that when the subscripts in the row differ it can be concluded that the difference between the sample percentages is statistically significant. Since the percentage of Jefferson residents who use local airports more commonly (24.8%) has a subscript of “a” and the percentage of Lewis County residents who use local airports more commonly (12.8%) has a subscript of “b” it can be concluded that the local airport usage is different among Jefferson County adult residents and Lewis County adult residents. It can also be seen that the differences between Jefferson and St. Lawrence Counties (24.8% and 25.5%) are not significantly different since they share the same subscript. Looking at the results for “I do not fly ever” for all three counties the subscript is the same. This indicates that these differences are not statistically significant.

This same process is used when looking for statistically significant time trends and statistically significant differences among demographic subgroups. The two sub-tables below have also been taken from Table 45 for illustration.

	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
	2015	2017	2015	2017	2015	2017
Local Airports More Commonly	17.1% _a	24.8% _b	10.6% _a	12.8% _a	14.5% _a	25.5% _b
Airports Outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties	50.2% _a	41.0% _b	52.0% _a	54.6% _a	48.9% _a	34.9% _b
Equally Locally and Not Locally	5.9% _a	9.3% _a	1.6% _a	2.8% _a	4.5% _a	8.9% _b
I do not fly ever.	23.1% _a	20.8% _a	34.4% _a	27.3% _a	29.8% _a	26.9% _a
Don't know	3.6% _a	4.1% _a	1.4% _a	2.5% _a	2.2% _a	3.8% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column proportions. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

The table above shows that in 2015, 17.1% of Jefferson County respondents indicated that they use local airports more commonly. In 2017, this percentage increased to 24.8%. The subscripts indicate that this difference is statistically significant since they differ (subscript of “a” in 2015 and “b” in 2017). In Lewis County, 10.6% of residents used local

airports more commonly in 2015 while 12.8% used local airports more commonly in 2017. The subscripts indicate this increase is not statistically significant (both percentages have a subscript of “a”). Take note that in the Country-Trend tables tests are only performed within each county. For example, a test is not performed to see if there is a difference between the percentage in Jefferson County in 2015 and the percentage in Lewis County in 2017.

The sub-table below is also taken from Table 45 and displays the cross-tabulations by age for Lewis County. There are some slight differences in this sub-table when compared to the previous tables. Firstly, notice that not all of the percentages listed in the table contain subscripts. When a sample percentage is equal to either 0.0% or 100.0% the category is not used when comparing the results for statistically significant results. In this table notice that some of the percentages list multiple subscripts (this can occur when there are three or more groups used for comparison). Again, we will look at the percentages for those who use local airports more commonly. In the 30-39 age group 28.3% use local airports more commonly (notice the subscript for the 28.3% is “a”). Any other percentages with a subscript of “a” are not statistically significantly different from the 28.3% among the 30-39 age group. In the 70+ age group 4.2% use local airports more commonly (subscript is “b”). This indicates that there is a difference between the 30-39 age group and the 70+ age group. The percentages for the remaining age groups (18-29, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69) have subscripts of “a,b”. This “dual” subscript indicates that it is not significantly different from either the 30-39 age group (“a” subscript) or the 70+ age group (“b” subscript).

	Age Groups											
	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+						
Local airports more commonly	6.3% _{a,b}	3	28.3% _a	12	18.0% _{a,b}	9	9.9% _{a,b}	6	12.5% _{a,b}	5	4.2% _b	2
Airports outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties more commonly	81.1% _a	43	32.4% _b	13	56.1% _{a,b}	28	48.8% _b	29	56.8% _{a,b}	25	46.9% _b	20
Equally locally and not locally	4.2% _a	2	1.7% _a	1	0.9% _a	0	0.9% _a	1	7.8% _a	3	1.9% _a	1
I do not fly ever	8.4% _a	4	30.6% _{a,b}	13	22.9% _{a,b}	12	38.6% _b	23	22.8% _{a,b}	10	41.2% _{b,c}	18
Don't Know	0.0% ¹	0	6.9% _a	3	2.0% _a	1	1.8% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	5.7% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column proportions. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because its column proportion is equal to zero or one.

Take note that in some tables some of the survey responses have been combined to perform the tests of significance. For example, in Tables 7-15 the response distribution included “Very important”, “Somewhat important”, “Not that important”, “Not at all important”, and “Not sure”. In these tables the responses of “Very important” and “Somewhat important” have been combined as have the responses of “Not that important” and “Not at all important”.

Finally, the preceding comments regarding statistically significant differences between subgroups are comments addressing **statistical significance** ... which, of course, is not one-and-the-same as **practical significance**. The reader should be reminded that statistical significance addresses the concept of probability, as follows – “is this difference likely to occur in a sample of size $n=1,204$ (or, even smaller, at times) if there is no difference in the entire sampled population. Could the result simply be due to chance?” However, practical significance is an interpretation that is left to the subject area expert, since practical significance addresses the concept of usefulness, as follows – “is this result useful in the real world?” A difference identified in a sample may be statistically significant without being practically significant; however, a difference identified in a sample may *not* be practically significant without being statistically significant.

Please direct any questions regarding margin of error, confidence intervals, other sources of sampling error, tests of statistical significance, and practical significance to the professional staff at the Center for Community Studies.

Section 3.1 – Attitudes about Local Economic Development Initiatives

Table 6 – SUMMARY – Perceived Importance of Nine Potential Economic Development Initiatives

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not that important	Not at all important	Not sure
Retaining existing businesses	78.6%	19.3%	1.7%	0.3%	0.1%
Attracting new businesses	74.5%	22.2%	2.9%	0.2%	0.3%
Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities	72.1%	23.7%	2.8%	0.1%	1.3%
Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally	64.3%	26.9%	6.2%	1.6%	1.0%
Revitalizing Manufacturing	56.3%	34.0%	5.9%	0.6%	3.2%
Improving the condition of single-family homes	55.6%	35.7%	5.2%	1.0%	2.4%
Improving the condition of rental housing	54.3%	33.7%	6.8%	1.4%	3.7%
Expanding activities and attractions for more tourism	47.4%	39.7%	10.2%	2.3%	0.4%
Increasing Canadian spending in the local region	38.2%	39.7%	14.5%	5.2%	2.5%

2017 County Specific Results for Each of Jefferson, Lewis, St. Lawrence County

Jefferson County Summary:

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not that important	Not at all important	Not sure
Retaining existing businesses	76.6%	20.0%	2.9%	0.6%	0.0%
Attracting new businesses	73.8%	22.8%	2.5%	0.3%	0.7%
Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities	73.0%	22.4%	3.2%	0.0%	1.3%
Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally	65.0%	24.5%	7.5%	1.6%	1.3%
Improving the condition of rental housing	60.3%	31.0%	5.6%	1.5%	1.6%
Improving the condition of single-family homes	60.0%	31.5%	5.5%	1.0%	1.9%
Revitalizing Manufacturing	57.3%	31.4%	5.3%	1.0%	5.0%
Expanding activities and attractions for more tourism	51.8%	38.8%	7.8%	1.2%	0.3%
Increasing Canadian spending in the local region	40.6%	35.6%	17.2%	4.8%	1.8%

Lewis County Summary:

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not that important	Not at all important	Not sure
Retaining existing businesses	82.3%	16.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%
Attracting new businesses	74.8%	24.1%	1.1%	0.1%	0.0%
Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities	74.7%	23.5%	1.7%	0.1%	0.0%
Revitalizing Manufacturing	56.5%	35.8%	4.7%	0.4%	2.5%
Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally	56.0%	35.5%	3.6%	4.3%	0.5%
Improving the condition of rental housing	50.7%	33.3%	10.5%	3.0%	2.6%
Improving the condition of single-family homes	48.6%	40.0%	5.9%	1.6%	3.9%
Expanding activities and attractions for more tourism	36.6%	47.8%	10.4%	4.6%	0.5%
Increasing Canadian spending in the local region	32.1%	50.0%	12.8%	2.9%	2.2%

Table 6 cont.— SUMMARY – Perceived Importance of Nine Potential Economic Development Initiatives

St. Lawrence County:

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not that important	Not at all important	Not sure
Retaining existing businesses	80.8%	18.1%	1.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Attracting new businesses	77.4%	16.7%	5.8%	0.2%	0.0%
Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities	69.8%	23.2%	2.9%	0.3%	3.7%
Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally	67.1%	25.4%	6.2%	0.4%	0.9%
Revitalizing Manufacturing	56.4%	33.4%	4.8%	0.8%	4.5%
Improving the condition of single-family homes	50.8%	41.3%	4.8%	0.7%	2.4%
Improving the condition of rental housing	47.5%	39.0%	6.8%	0.6%	6.2%
Expanding activities and attractions for more tourism	47.5%	36.0%	13.1%	2.8%	0.6%
Increasing Canadian spending in the local region	35.9%	38.8%	14.5%	6.1%	4.7%

Table 7 – Perceived Importance of “Attracting New Businesses”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Attracting new businesses	Very important	896	74.5%
	Somewhat important	266	22.2%
	Not that important	35	2.9%
	Not at all important	2	0.2%
	Not sure	3	0.3%
	TOTALS:	1203	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Very important	73.8%	342	74.8%	218	77.4%	347
Somewhat important	22.8%	106	24.1%	70	16.7%	75
"Very Imp/Important"	96.6% _{a,b}	447	98.9% _a	289	94.0% _b	421
Not that important	2.5%	11	1.1%	3	5.8%	26
Not at all important	0.3%	1	0.1%	0	0.2%	1
"Not Very/Not at all important"	2.7% _a	13	1.1% _a	3	6.0% _b	27
Not sure	0.7% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	463	100.0%	292	100.0%	448




Table 7 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Attracting New Businesses”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	70.6%	172	77.3%	170	67.8%	79	76.0%	43	73.5%	68	75.9%	142
Somewhat important	26.3%	64	19.0%	42	30.7%	36	20.4%	12	24.7%	23	19.0%	35
"Very Imp/Important"	96.9% _a	236	96.3% _a	211	98.5% _a	114	96.4% _a	54	98.1% _a	91	94.9% _a	177
Not that important	2.0%	5	3.0%	7	1.5%	2	1.4%	1	1.9%	2	3.5%	7
Not at all important	0.5%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	2.5% _a	6	3.0% _a	7	1.5% _a	2	3.6% _a	2	1.9% _a	2	3.5% _a	7
Not sure	0.6% _a	2	0.7% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.6% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	244	100.0%	219	100.0%	116	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	71.1%	97	57.4%	49	78.0%	55	86.4%	61	77.7%	40	81.4%	40
Somewhat important	28.9%	40	39.2%	33	18.6%	13	8.7%	6	14.9%	8	12.3%	6
"Very Imp/Important"	100.0% ¹	137	96.6% _a	82	96.6% _a	69	95.1% _a	67	92.5% _a	48	93.8% _a	46
Not that important	0.0%	0	3.4%	3	2.1%	2	4.9%	3	6.9%	4	0.0%	0
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.3%	1	0.0%	0	0.6%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.0% ¹	0	3.4% _a	3	3.4% _a	2	4.9% _a	3	7.5% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.2% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	137	100.0%	85	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	51	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	71.3%	151	75.7%	127	76.0%	64	60.0%	52	78.7%	102	75.8%	66	82.4%	83
Somewhat important	26.1%	55	19.5%	33	21.5%	18	39.0%	34	18.4%	24	18.8%	16	17.0%	17
"Very Imp/Important"	97.4% _a	206	95.2% _a	160	97.5% _a	82	99.1% _a	87	97.1% _a	126	94.6% _a	83	99.5% _a	100
Not that important	1.2%	2	4.2%	7	2.1%	2	0.9%	1	2.2%	3	5.0%	4	0.5%	1
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.5%	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.7%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	1.2% _a	2	4.8% _a	8	2.5% _a	2	0.9% _a	1	2.9% _a	4	5.4% _a	5	0.5% _a	1
Not sure	1.4% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	168	100.0%	84	100.0%	87	100.0%	130	100.0%	88	100.0%	101

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	73.5%	109	76.0%	109	84.8%	10	80.1%	17	81.6%	29	73.4%	161
Somewhat important	24.7%	37	23.5%	34	15.2%	2	19.9%	4	9.7%	3	26.5%	58
"Very Imp/Important"	98.2% _a	145	99.5% _a	143	100.0% ¹	12	100.0% ¹	21	91.3% _a	32	99.9% _b	219
Not that important	1.8%	3	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	8.7%	3	0.0%	0
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	1.8% _a	3	0.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	8.7% _a	3	0.1% _b	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

Table 7 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Attracting New Businesses”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	59.2%	31	62.2%	26	79.2%	41	90.7%	55	83.9%	36	69.2%	30
Somewhat important	40.8%	22	37.8%	15	14.8%	8	9.3%	6	16.1%	7	30.3%	13
"Very Imp/Important"	100.0% ¹	53	100.0% ¹	41	94.0% _a	48	100.0% ¹	60	100.0% ¹	43	99.6% _a	43
Not that important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	6.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.4%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.0% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.4% _a	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	70.5%	115	76.7%	66	87.2%	37	80.6%	46	61.2%	54	72.8%	49	92.0%	35
Somewhat important	27.9%	46	22.5%	19	12.8%	5	19.4%	11	38.3%	34	23.3%	16	8.0%	3
"Very Imp/Important"	98.4% _a	161	99.2% _a	85	100.0% ¹	42	100.0% ¹	57	99.5% _a	88	96.1% _a	64	100.0% ¹	38
Not that important	1.6%	3	0.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.5%	0	3.9%	3	0.0%	0
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	1.6% _a	3	0.8% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _a	0	3.9% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	80.3%	184	74.2%	163	77.0%	7	78.5%	39	60.9%	53	83.0%	245
Somewhat important	15.9%	36	17.5%	38	23.0%	2	21.5%	11	19.2%	17	14.0%	41
"Very Imp/Important"	96.2% _a	220	91.7% _b	201	100.0% ¹	9	100.0% ¹	50	80.1% _a	70	97.0% _b	286
Not that important	3.4%	8	8.3%	18	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	19.9%	17	2.9%	9
Not at all important	0.4%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	3.8% _a	9	8.3% _b	18	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	19.9% _a	17	3.0% _b	9
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	219	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	77.4%	92	60.4%	37	72.7%	51	86.7%	69	82.4%	51	82.6%	47
Somewhat important	8.5%	10	27.0%	16	25.6%	18	12.7%	10	17.1%	11	16.6%	9
"Very Imp/Important"	86.0% _a	102	87.4% _{a,c}	53	98.3% _{a,b}	69	99.4% _b	79	99.4% _{b,c}	62	99.2% _{a,b}	56
Not that important	14.0%	17	12.6%	8	1.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.8%	0
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.6%	0	0.6%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	14.0% _a	17	12.6% _{a,c}	8	1.7% _{a,b}	1	0.6% _b	0	0.6% _{b,c}	0	0.8% _{a,b}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	71	100.0%	80	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	78.9%	161	72.0%	113	83.2%	73	74.1%	68	68.6%	63	87.6%	90	76.9%	78
Somewhat important	14.7%	30	21.9%	34	12.0%	10	11.7%	11	22.8%	21	11.0%	11	18.8%	19
"Very Imp/Important"	93.6% _a	191	93.9% _a	147	95.2% _a	83	85.9% _a	79	91.4% _{a,b}	84	98.6% _b	102	95.7% _{a,b}	97
Not that important	6.4%	13	5.6%	9	4.8%	4	14.1%	13	8.6%	8	0.9%	1	4.0%	4
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.5%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.5%	0	0.3%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	6.4% _a	13	6.1% _a	10	4.8% _a	4	14.1% _a	13	8.6% _{a,b}	8	1.4% _b	1	4.3% _{a,b}	4
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	157	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Table 8 – Perceived Importance of “Retaining existing businesses”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Retaining existing businesses	Very important	946	78.6%
	Somewhat important	232	19.3%
	Not that important	21	1.7%
	Not at all important	3	0.3%
	Not sure	2	0.1%
	TOTALS:	1203	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Very important	76.6%	355	82.3%	240	80.8%	362
Somewhat important	20.0%	92	16.8%	49	18.1%	81
"Very Imp/Important"	96.5% _a	447	99.1% _a	289	98.9% _a	443
Not that important	2.9%	13	0.1%	0	1.0%	5
Not at all important	0.6%	3	0.1%	0	0.1%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	3.5% _a	16	0.2% _b	0	1.1% _{a,b}	5
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	463	100.0%	292	100.0%	448




Table 8 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Retaining existing businesses”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	68.6%	167	85.4%	188	73.8%	86	76.6%	44	76.6%	71	77.2%	144
Somewhat important	27.5%	67	11.6%	26	24.7%	29	16.7%	10	19.7%	18	19.4%	36
"Very Imp/Important"	96.1% _a	234	97.0% _a	213	98.5% _a	114	93.3% _a	53	96.3% _a	89	96.6% _a	180
Not that important	2.8%	7	3.0%	6	1.5%	2	6.7%	4	3.7%	3	2.1%	4
Not at all important	1.1%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.4%	3
"Not Very/Not at all important"	3.9% _a	10	3.0% _a	6	1.5% _a	2	6.7% _a	4	3.7% _a	3	3.4% _a	6
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	244	100.0%	220	100.0%	116	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	77.1%	105	66.1%	56	77.0%	55	82.5%	58	77.1%	40	83.9%	41
Somewhat important	22.9%	31	26.1%	22	20.9%	15	13.2%	9	17.0%	9	12.4%	6
"Very Imp/Important"	100.0% ¹	137	92.2% _a	78	97.9% _a	69	95.7% _a	67	94.1% _a	49	96.4% _a	47
Not that important	0.0%	0	7.8%	7	2.1%	2	4.3%	3	4.3%	2	0.0%	0
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.6%	1	3.6%	2
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.0% ¹	0	7.8% _a	7	2.1% _a	2	4.3% _a	3	5.9% _a	3	3.6% _a	2
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	137	100.0%	85	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	79.9%	169	69.8%	117	82.1%	69	72.7%	64	73.6%	96	70.8%	62	87.0%	88
Somewhat important	17.1%	36	26.0%	44	14.9%	13	27.3%	24	19.5%	25	25.5%	22	11.9%	12
"Very Imp/Important"	97.0% _a	205	95.8% _a	161	97.0% _a	81	100.0% ¹	87	93.1% _a	121	96.4% _a	85	98.9% _a	99
Not that important	1.9%	4	4.1%	7	3.0%	3	0.0%	0	6.7%	9	3.6%	3	1.1%	1
Not at all important	1.1%	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	3.0% _a	6	4.2% _a	7	3.0% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	6.9% _a	9	3.6% _a	3	1.1% _a	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	168	100.0%	84	100.0%	87	100.0%	130	100.0%	88	100.0%	101

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	78.2%	116	86.6%	125	94.0%	11	93.0%	20	83.9%	30	81.3%	178
Somewhat important	21.8%	32	11.7%	17	6.0%	1	7.0%	1	16.1%	6	17.6%	38
"Very Imp/Important"	100.0% ¹	148	98.3% _a	141	100.0% ¹	12	100.0% ¹	21	100.0% ¹	35	98.9% _a	217
Not that important	0.0%	0	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	0
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.0% ¹	0	0.3% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.2% _a	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	1.4% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

Table 8 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Retaining existing businesses”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	61.2%	32	80.4%	33	86.5%	44	93.6%	56	88.2%	38	83.1%	36
Somewhat important	38.8%	21	19.6%	8	13.5%	7	5.9%	4	11.8%	5	11.7%	5
"Very Imp/Important"	100.0% ¹	53	100.0% ¹	41	100.0% ¹	51	99.5% _a	60	100.0% ¹	43	94.8% _a	41
Not that important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.4%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.4% _a	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.7% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	77.7%	127	88.1%	76	88.4%	37	89.2%	51	71.1%	63	83.2%	56	87.9%	34
Somewhat important	21.1%	34	11.7%	10	10.9%	5	7.3%	4	28.9%	26	16.8%	11	11.4%	4
"Very Imp/Important"	98.8% _a	161	99.8% _a	86	99.3% _a	42	96.5% _a	55	100.0% ¹	89	100.0% ¹	67	99.2% _a	38
Not that important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.8%	0
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.0% ¹	0	0.2% _a	0	0.7% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.8% _a	0
Not sure	1.2% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.5% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	78.9%	181	82.8%	181	97.2%	9	69.1%	34	83.8%	73	82.5%	244
Somewhat important	19.3%	44	16.7%	37	2.8%	0	30.2%	15	15.9%	14	16.0%	47
"Very Imp/Important"	98.3% _a	225	99.6% _a	218	100.0% ¹	9	99.3% _a	49	99.7% _a	87	98.5% _a	291
Not that important	1.6%	4	0.4%	1	0.0%	0	0.7%	0	0.3%	0	1.3%	4
Not at all important	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	1.7% _a	4	0.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _a	0	0.3% _a	0	1.5% _a	4
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	219	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	90.3%	107	71.8%	44	75.0%	53	88.4%	70	76.5%	48	72.2%	41
Somewhat important	9.7%	11	28.2%	17	25.0%	18	11.3%	9	20.1%	13	23.3%	13
"Very Imp/Important"	100.0% ¹	118	100.0% ¹	61	100.0% ¹	71	99.7% _a	79	96.6% _a	60	95.4% _a	54
Not that important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.3%	0	2.8%	2	4.6%	3
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.6%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.3% _a	0	3.4% _a	2	4.6% _a	3
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	71	100.0%	80	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	81.9%	167	78.1%	122	83.3%	73	80.0%	74	74.9%	69	88.4%	91	81.0%	82
Somewhat important	16.3%	33	21.3%	33	16.4%	14	18.1%	17	23.7%	22	10.3%	11	18.4%	19
"Very Imp/Important"	98.2% _a	200	99.4% _a	156	99.7% _a	87	98.1% _a	91	98.6% _a	91	98.8% _a	102	99.4% _a	100
Not that important	1.8%	4	0.4%	1	0.3%	0	1.9%	2	1.4%	1	1.2%	1	0.3%	0
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.3%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	1.8% _a	4	0.6% _a	1	0.3% _a	0	1.9% _a	2	1.4% _a	1	1.2% _a	1	0.6% _a	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	157	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Table 9 – Perceived Importance of “Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities	Very important	867	72.1%
	Somewhat important	285	23.7%
	Not that important	34	2.8%
	Not at all important	2	0.1%
	Not sure	15	1.3%
	TOTALS:	1203	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Very important	73.0%	338	74.7%	218	69.8%	313
Somewhat important	22.4%	104	23.5%	69	23.2%	104
"Very Imp/Important"	95.5% _{a,b}	442	98.2% _a	287	93.0% _b	417
Not that important	3.2%	15	1.7%	5	2.9%	13
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.1%	0	0.3%	2
"Not Very/Not at all important"	3.2% _a	15	1.8% _a	5	3.3% _a	15
Not sure	1.3% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0	3.7% _b	17
TOTALS:	100.0%	463	100.0%	292	100.0%	448




Table 9 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	70.2%	171	76.2%	168	69.8%	81	66.7%	38	83.0%	77	71.5%	133
Somewhat important	25.9%	63	18.6%	41	26.9%	31	25.1%	14	9.2%	9	26.4%	49
"Very Imp/Important"	96.1% _a	234	94.8% _a	208	96.8% _a	112	91.9% _a	52	92.3% _a	85	97.9% _a	183
Not that important	3.3%	8	3.2%	7	3.2%	4	8.1%	5	4.5%	4	1.3%	2
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	3.3% _a	8	3.2% _a	7	3.2% _{a,b}	4	8.1% _a	5	4.5% _{a,b}	4	1.3% _b	2
Not sure	0.6% _a	2	2.0% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.2% _a	3	0.8% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	244	100.0%	220	100.0%	116	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	70.3%	96	77.6%	66	57.2%	41	82.0%	57	80.7%	42	74.7%	36
Somewhat important	27.0%	37	14.6%	12	38.5%	27	14.4%	10	16.3%	8	18.1%	9
"Very Imp/Important"	97.2% _a	133	92.2% _a	78	95.7% _a	68	96.4% _a	68	97.0% _a	50	92.8% _a	45
Not that important	2.8%	4	5.8%	5	4.3%	3	3.6%	2	0.6%	0	1.0%	0
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	2.8% _a	4	5.8% _a	5	4.3% _a	3	3.6% _a	2	0.6% _a	0	1.0% _a	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	2.0% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.4% _a	1	6.2% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	137	100.0%	85	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	77.9%	164	66.0%	111	75.0%	63	75.2%	66	69.6%	90	69.6%	61	75.5%	76
Somewhat important	17.4%	37	29.8%	50	20.4%	17	20.4%	18	25.1%	33	28.5%	25	19.4%	20
"Very Imp/Important"	95.2% _a	201	95.8% _a	161	95.4% _a	80	95.6% _a	84	94.7% _a	123	98.0% _a	86	94.9% _a	95
Not that important	2.7%	6	3.2%	5	4.6%	4	3.0%	3	4.0%	5	2.0%	2	5.1%	5
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	2.7% _a	6	3.2% _a	5	4.6% _a	4	3.0% _a	3	4.0% _a	5	2.0% _a	2	5.1% _a	5
Not sure	2.0% _a	4	1.0% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	1.5% _a	1	1.3% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	168	100.0%	84	100.0%	87	100.0%	130	100.0%	88	100.0%	101

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	68.0%	101	81.6%	117	81.8%	9	71.1%	15	79.6%	28	75.0%	164
Somewhat important	29.4%	44	17.4%	25	12.2%	1	27.1%	6	19.1%	7	24.7%	54
"Very Imp/Important"	97.5% _a	144	99.1% _a	143	94.0% _a	11	98.2% _a	21	98.7% _a	35	99.7% _a	218
Not that important	2.5%	4	0.8%	1	6.0%	1	1.8%	0	1.3%	0	0.2%	1
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	2.5% _a	4	0.9% _a	1	6.0% _a	1	1.8% _a	0	1.3% _a	0	0.3% _a	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

Table 9 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	100.0%	53	77.4%	32	61.8%	32	67.3%	41	77.1%	33	64.5%	28
Somewhat important	0.0%	0	14.0%	6	37.3%	19	31.8%	19	22.0%	10	35.1%	15
"Very Imp/Important"	100.0% ¹	53	91.4% _a	38	99.1% _a	51	99.1% _a	60	99.1% _a	43	99.6% _a	43
Not that important	0.0%	0	8.6%	4	0.9%	0	0.9%	1	0.9%	0	0.0%	0
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.4%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.0% ¹	0	8.6% _a	4	0.9% _a	0	0.9% _a	1	0.9% _a	0	0.4% _a	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	76.9%	126	73.4%	63	69.2%	29	76.0%	43	84.5%	75	62.5%	42	77.5%	30
Somewhat important	23.1%	38	20.7%	18	30.8%	13	24.0%	14	13.8%	12	33.3%	22	22.5%	9
"Very Imp/Important"	100.0% ¹	164	94.0% _a	81	100.0% ¹	42	100.0% ¹	57	98.2% _a	87	95.8% _a	64	100.0% ¹	38
Not that important	0.0%	0	5.7%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.8%	2	4.2%	3	0.0%	0
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.0% ¹	0	6.0% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.8% _a	2	4.2% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTAL LS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	70.1%	160	69.5%	152	67.1%	6	68.1%	34	68.5%	60	71.6%	212
Somewhat important	26.9%	62	19.3%	42	32.9%	3	29.5%	15	28.1%	24	20.0%	59
"Very Imp/Important"	97.0% _a	222	88.8% _b	195	100.0% ¹	9	97.6% _a	49	96.6% _a	84	91.7% _a	271
Not that important	2.7%	6	3.2%	7	0.0%	0	0.9%	0	3.4%	3	2.4%	7
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.7%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.5%	2
"Not Very/Not at all important"	2.7% _a	6	3.9% _a	8	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	0	3.4% _a	3	2.9% _a	9
Not sure	0.3% _a	1	7.3% _b	16	0.0% ¹	0	1.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	5.4% _a	16
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	219	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	79.3%	94	58.9%	36	52.9%	37	78.1%	62	72.1%	45	68.3%	38
Somewhat important	10.5%	12	35.7%	22	39.6%	28	19.0%	15	18.4%	12	27.2%	15
"Very Imp/Important"	89.8% _a	106	94.5% _a	57	92.5% _a	65	97.1% _a	77	90.5% _a	57	95.5% _a	54
Not that important	0.0%	0	5.5%	3	5.3%	4	2.9%	2	4.6%	3	1.5%	1
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.2%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.0% ¹	0	5.5% _a	3	7.5% _a	5	2.9% _a	2	4.6% _a	3	1.5% _a	1
Not sure	10.2% _a	12	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.9% _a	3	3.0% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	71	100.0%	80	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	74.6%	152	64.1%	100	68.7%	60	66.7%	62	64.4%	59	86.1%	89	67.2%	68
Somewhat important	15.5%	32	28.7%	45	31.3%	27	16.4%	15	29.4%	27	11.9%	12	28.6%	29
"Very Imp/Important"	90.1% _a	184	92.8% _a	145	100.0% ¹	87	83.1% _a	77	93.8% _{a,b}	86	98.0% _b	101	95.8% _{b,c}	97
Not that important	1.1%	2	7.0%	11	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	5.4%	5	2.0%	2	3.8%	4
Not at all important	0.8%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.7%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	1.8% _a	4	7.0% _b	11	0.0% ¹	0	1.7% _a	2	5.4% _a	5	2.0% _a	2	3.8% _a	4
Not sure	8.1% _a	16	0.2% _b	0	0.0% ¹	0	15.2% _a	14	0.8% _b	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.3% _b	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	157	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Table 10 – Perceived Importance of “Revitalizing Manufacturing”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Revitalizing Manufacturing	Very important	676	56.3%
	Somewhat important	409	34.0%
	Not that important	71	5.9%
	Not at all important	8	0.6%
	Not sure	39	3.2%
	TOTALS:	1202	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Very important	57.3%	266	56.5%	164	56.4%	253
Somewhat important	31.4%	145	35.8%	104	33.4%	150
"Very Imp/Important"	88.7% _a	411	92.3% _a	268	89.8% _a	402
Not that important	5.3%	25	4.7%	14	4.8%	22
Not at all important	1.0%	5	0.4%	1	0.8%	4
"Not Very/Not at all important"	6.3% _a	29	5.2% _a	15	5.7% _a	25
Not sure	5.0% _a	23	2.5% _a	7	4.5% _a	20
TOTALS:	100.0%	463	100.0%	291	100.0%	448




Table 10 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Revitalizing Manufacturing”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	61.5%	150	52.7%	116	55.8%	65	53.1%	30	55.2%	51	59.7%	111
Somewhat important	28.7%	70	34.3%	75	36.7%	43	32.3%	18	21.3%	20	34.0%	63
"Very Imp/Important"	90.2% _a	220	87.0% _a	191	92.5% _a	107	85.4% _{a,b}	49	76.5% _b	71	93.7% _a	175
Not that important	6.7%	16	3.9%	9	6.3%	7	12.5%	7	6.3%	6	2.1%	4
Not at all important	1.6%	4	0.3%	1	0.0%	0	0.5%	0	0.3%	0	2.1%	4
"Not Very/Not at all important"	8.3% _a	20	4.2% _a	9	6.3% _a	7	13.1% _a	7	6.6% _a	6	4.2% _a	8
Not sure	1.5% _a	4	8.9% _b	20	1.2% _a	1	1.6% _a	1	16.9% _b	16	2.1% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	244	100.0%	220	100.0%	116	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	45.6%	62	46.3%	39	56.4%	40	73.8%	52	72.8%	38	70.6%	34
Somewhat important	44.2%	61	28.7%	24	35.3%	25	24.6%	17	18.4%	10	17.6%	9
"Very Imp/Important"	89.8% _a	123	74.9% _b	64	91.7% _{a,b}	65	98.4% _a	69	91.2% _{a,b}	47	88.3% _{a,b}	43
Not that important	9.2%	13	4.3%	4	5.5%	4	0.0%	0	1.2%	1	8.1%	4
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.9%	1	1.6%	1	4.9%	3	0.6%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	9.2% _a	13	4.3% _a	4	6.4% _a	5	1.6% _a	1	6.1% _a	3	8.7% _a	4
Not sure	1.0% _a	1	20.8% _b	18	1.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	2.7% _a	1	3.1% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	137	100.0%	85	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	56.8%	120	61.3%	103	50.5%	42	44.6%	39	63.3%	82	50.0%	44	67.9%	68
Somewhat important	28.4%	60	31.0%	52	39.5%	33	30.7%	27	27.8%	36	43.8%	39	29.1%	29
"Very Imp/Important"	85.2% _a	180	92.4% _a	156	90.0% _a	76	75.3% _a	66	91.1% _b	118	93.7% _b	83	97.1% _b	98
Not that important	5.0%	11	4.4%	7	8.1%	7	8.9%	8	6.0%	8	2.9%	3	2.7%	3
Not at all important	0.9%	2	0.8%	1	1.4%	1	0.0%	0	0.9%	1	2.9%	3	0.3%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	5.9% _a	13	5.2% _a	9	9.5% _a	8	8.9% _a	8	6.9% _a	9	5.7% _a	5	2.9% _a	3
Not sure	8.9% _a	19	2.4% _b	4	0.6% _b	0	15.9% _a	14	2.0% _b	3	0.5% _b	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	168	100.0%	84	100.0%	87	100.0%	130	100.0%	88	100.0%	101

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	53.9%	79	59.2%	85	59.4%	7	69.1%	14	54.7%	19	56.3%	123
Somewhat important	37.3%	55	34.3%	49	10.1%	1	30.9%	6	41.0%	15	36.0%	79
"Very Imp/Important"	91.2% _a	134	93.5% _a	135	69.5% _a	8	100.0% ¹	20	95.7% _b	34	92.3% _b	202
Not that important	3.7%	5	5.8%	8	30.5%	4	0.0%	0	4.3%	2	3.8%	8
Not at all important	0.7%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.6%	1
"Not Very/Not at all important"	4.4% _a	6	5.9% _a	9	30.5% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	4.3% _b	2	4.4% _b	10
Not sure	4.4% _a	6	0.6% _b	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.3% _a	7
TOTALS:	100.0%	147	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	20	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

Table 10 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Revitalizing Manufacturing”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	36.8%	19	43.3%	18	64.8%	33	67.2%	39	58.5%	25	66.7%	29
Somewhat important	51.7%	27	32.5%	13	31.4%	16	30.9%	18	34.5%	15	32.8%	14
"Very Imp/Important"	88.5% _{a,b}	47	75.8% _a	31	96.2% _{a,b}	49	98.1% _b	58	93.0% _{a,b}	40	99.6% _{b,c}	43
Not that important	0.0%	0	24.2%	10	3.8%	2	1.4%	1	2.4%	1	0.0%	0
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.4%	1	0.4%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.0% ¹	0	24.2% _a	10	3.8% _b	2	1.4% _b	1	4.9% _{a,b}	2	0.4% _b	0
Not sure	11.5% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _b	0	2.1% _{a,b}	1	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	59	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	60.3%	98	60.7%	52	33.2%	14	56.1%	31	48.7%	43	70.8%	47	55.3%	21
Somewhat important	30.8%	50	31.1%	27	64.9%	27	31.0%	17	44.3%	39	26.8%	18	44.7%	17
"Very Imp/Important"	91.1% _a	148	91.8% _a	79	98.1% _a	42	87.1% _a	49	93.0% _a	82	97.6% _a	65	100.0% ¹	38
Not that important	4.2%	7	7.5%	6	1.2%	1	12.0%	7	5.3%	5	2.4%	2	0.0%	0
Not at all important	0.7%	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.2%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	4.8% _a	8	7.7% _a	7	1.2% _a	1	12.0% _a	7	6.5% _a	6	2.4% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	4.1% _a	7	0.5% _a	0	0.7% _a	0	0.9% _a	1	0.4% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	162	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	56	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	63.7%	146	48.8%	107	17.0%	2	67.3%	34	60.7%	53	55.1%	163
Somewhat important	29.3%	67	37.7%	83	71.8%	7	22.4%	11	34.0%	30	33.4%	99
"Very Imp/Important"	93.0% _a	213	86.6% _b	190	88.8% _a	8	89.7% _a	45	94.7% _a	82	88.5% _a	261
Not that important	5.7%	13	4.0%	9	0.0%	0	10.3%	5	4.0%	3	4.1%	12
Not at all important	0.2%	0	1.6%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.3%	4
"Not Very/Not at all important"	5.8% _a	13	5.5% _a	12	0.0% ¹	0	10.3% _a	5	4.0% _a	3	5.4% _a	16
Not sure	1.2% _a	3	7.9% _b	17	11.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	1.3% _a	1	6.1% _a	18
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	219	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	53.3%	63	22.4%	14	55.3%	39	76.0%	60	72.0%	45	56.2%	32
Somewhat important	30.5%	36	62.2%	38	38.5%	27	21.4%	17	21.3%	13	32.2%	18
"Very Imp/Important"	83.9% _a	99	84.6% _{a,b}	51	93.9% _{a,b}	66	97.4% _b	77	93.3% _{a,b}	58	88.4% _{a,b}	50
Not that important	3.0%	4	7.2%	4	5.0%	4	2.2%	2	6.1%	4	8.0%	5
Not at all important	2.9%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.6%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	5.9% _a	7	7.2% _a	4	5.0% _a	4	2.2% _a	2	6.7% _a	4	8.0% _a	5
Not sure	10.2% _a	12	8.2% _{a,b}	5	1.1% _{a,b}	1	0.3% _b	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.6% _{a,b}	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	71	100.0%	80	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	64.1%	131	53.2%	83	44.3%	39	60.0%	55	41.5%	38	68.9%	71	56.0%	57
Somewhat important	25.9%	53	36.9%	58	44.8%	39	18.7%	17	45.8%	42	26.2%	27	38.3%	39
"Very Imp/Important"	89.9% _a	184	90.1% _a	141	89.1% _a	78	78.7% _a	73	87.2% _{a,b}	80	95.1% _b	98	94.3% _{b,c}	95
Not that important	3.3%	7	6.2%	10	5.9%	5	4.3%	4	5.5%	5	4.0%	4	5.0%	5
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.2%	0	4.0%	3	0.0%	0	3.7%	3	0.0%	0	0.3%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	3.3% _a	7	6.5% _a	10	9.9% _a	9	4.3% _a	4	9.3% _a	9	4.0% _a	4	5.4% _a	5
Not sure	6.8% _a	14	3.4% _a	5	1.1% _a	1	17.0% _a	16	3.5% _b	3	0.9% _b	1	0.3% _b	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	157	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Table 11 – Perceived Importance of “Expanding Activities and Attractions for more Tourism”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Expanding activities and attractions for more tourism	Very important	570	47.4%
	Somewhat important	477	39.7%
	Not that important	123	10.2%
	Not at all important	28	2.3%
	Not sure	5	0.4%
	TOTALS:	1202	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	2013		2015		2017	
Very important	63.2%	431	60.5%	782	47.4%	570
Somewhat important	28.0%	191	32.3%	417	39.7%	477
"Very Imp/Important"	91.2% _a	622	92.8% _a	1198	87.0% _b	1046
Not that important	2.9%	20	3.7%	48	10.2%	123
Not at all important	3.4%	23	2.7%	34	2.3%	28
"Not Very/Not at all important"	6.3% _a	43	6.4% _a	83	12.5% _b	151
Not sure	2.5% _a	17	0.8% _b	10	0.4% _b	5
TOTALS:	100.0%	682	100.0%	1291	100.0%	1202




Table 11 cont.– Perceived Importance of “Expanding Activities and Attractions for more Tourism”

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Very important	51.8%	240	36.6%	107	47.5%	213
Somewhat important	38.8%	180	47.8%	140	36.0%	161
"Very Imp/Important"	90.7% _a	419	84.4% _b	247	83.6% _b	374
Not that important	7.8%	36	10.4%	30	13.1%	59
Not at all important	1.2%	6	4.6%	14	2.8%	12
"Not Very/Not at all important"	9.0% _a	42	15.1% _b	44	15.9% _b	71
Not sure	0.3% _a	2	0.5% _a	1	0.6% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	463	100.0%	292	100.0%	448

Trend Analysis by Region and by County:

	Jefferson			Lewis			St. Lawrence	
	2013	2015	2017	2013	2015	2017	2015	2017
Very important	60.2%	63.0%	51.8%	75.9%	59.0%	36.6%	58.4%	47.5%
Somewhat important	30.5%	31.2%	38.8%	17.1%	35.3%	47.8%	32.6%	36.0%
"Very Imp/Important"	90.8% _a	94.2% _a	90.7% _a	93.1% _a	94.3% _a	84.4% _b	91.1% _a	83.6% _b
Not that important	3.0%	3.1%	7.8%	2.7%	2.9%	10.4%	4.6%	13.1%
Not at all important	3.4%	1.6%	1.2%	3.4%	2.1%	4.6%	3.9%	2.8%
"Not Very/Not at all important"	6.3% _{a,b}	4.7% _a	9.0% _b	6.0% _a	5.0% _a	15.1% _b	8.5% _a	15.9% _b
Not sure	2.9% _a	1.1% _{a,b}	0.3% _b	0.9% _a	0.7% _a	0.5% _a	0.5% _a	0.6% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 11 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Expanding Activities and Attractions for more Tourism”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	50.7%	123	53.1%	117	52.8%	61	49.0%	28	59.9%	55	45.4%	85
Somewhat important	36.6%	89	41.2%	91	37.8%	44	42.6%	24	35.9%	33	42.2%	79
"Very Imp/Important"	87.3% _a	212	94.3% _b	207	90.6% _a	104	91.6% _a	52	95.8% _a	88	87.6% _a	163
Not that important	11.1%	27	4.1%	9	9.4%	11	5.2%	3	3.4%	3	9.9%	19
Not at all important	0.9%	2	1.5%	3	0.0%	0	3.2%	2	0.8%	1	1.7%	3
"Not Very/Not at all important"	12.1% _a	29	5.7% _b	12	9.4% _a	11	8.4% _a	5	4.2% _a	4	11.6% _a	22
Not sure	0.6% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.8% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	243	100.0%	220	100.0%	115	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	55.4%	76	55.3%	46	32.7%	23	51.6%	36	55.7%	29	60.1%	29
Somewhat important	36.5%	50	33.8%	28	57.0%	40	43.2%	30	34.2%	18	26.1%	13
"Very Imp/Important"	91.9% _a	126	89.1% _a	75	89.7% _a	64	94.8% _a	66	89.9% _a	47	86.2% _a	42
Not that important	6.7%	9	10.9%	9	8.0%	6	4.3%	3	9.0%	5	9.1%	4
Not at all important	1.5%	2	0.0%	0	2.4%	2	0.9%	1	1.2%	1	1.5%	1
"Not Very/Not at all important"	8.1% _a	11	10.9% _a	9	10.3% _a	7	5.2% _a	4	10.1% _a	5	10.6% _a	5
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.1% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	137	100.0%	84	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	58.6%	124	44.1%	74	50.2%	42	66.5%	58	53.7%	70	40.4%	36	45.5%	45
Somewhat important	32.9%	69	44.9%	76	41.6%	35	25.4%	22	38.0%	49	46.3%	41	48.5%	48
"Very Imp/Important"	91.5% _a	193	89.1% _a	150	91.8% _a	76	91.9% _a	80	91.7% _a	119	86.7% _a	76	94.0% _a	94
Not that important	6.4%	13	9.9%	17	7.2%	6	7.2%	6	6.3%	8	11.4%	10	5.4%	5
Not at all important	1.4%	3	1.1%	2	1.0%	1	0.8%	1	2.0%	3	1.9%	2	0.6%	1
"Not Very/Not at all important"	7.8% _a	16	10.9% _a	18	8.2% _a	7	8.1% _a	7	8.3% _a	11	13.3% _a	12	6.0% _a	6
Not sure	0.7% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	168	100.0%	83	100.0%	87	100.0%	130	100.0%	88	100.0%	100

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	30.9%	46	42.5%	61	0.0%	0	39.5%	8	45.6%	16	37.3%	82
Somewhat important	45.6%	68	50.1%	72	69.5%	8	51.7%	11	33.6%	12	49.4%	108
"Very Imp/Important"	76.5% _a	113	92.6% _b	133	69.5% _a	8	91.2% _a	19	79.2% _a	28	86.7% _a	190
Not that important	15.4%	23	5.4%	8	30.5%	4	0.0%	0	20.8%	7	7.3%	16
Not at all important	7.2%	11	2.0%	3	0.0%	0	1.8%	0	0.0%	0	6.0%	13
"Not Very/Not at all important"	22.5% _a	33	7.4% _b	11	30.5% _a	4	1.8% _a	0	20.8% _a	7	13.3% _a	29
Not sure	1.0% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.0% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

Table 11 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Expanding Activities and Attractions for more Tourism”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	33.5%	18	37.7%	15	43.5%	22	27.5%	17	34.8%	15	45.8%	20
Somewhat important	66.5%	35	35.8%	15	25.4%	13	57.3%	35	57.7%	25	39.7%	17
"Very Imp/Important"	100.0% ¹	53	73.5% _{a,b}	30	68.8% _a	35	84.9% _{a,b}	51	92.5% _b	40	85.5% _{a,b}	37
Not that important	0.0%	0	21.8%	9	25.1%	13	2.7%	2	2.2%	1	14.1%	6
Not at all important	0.0%	0	4.6%	2	6.1%	3	9.9%	6	5.3%	2	0.4%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.0% ¹	0	26.5% _{a,b}	11	31.2% _a	16	12.7% _{a,b}	8	7.5% _b	3	14.5% _{a,b}	6
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	35.0%	57	38.9%	34	38.3%	16	55.4%	32	29.9%	26	35.3%	24	37.9%	15
Somewhat important	49.1%	80	42.6%	37	53.7%	23	32.9%	19	58.8%	52	43.8%	29	47.2%	18
"Very Imp/Important"	84.1% _a	137	81.5% _a	70	92.0% _a	39	88.3% _a	51	88.7% _a	78	79.2% _a	53	85.1% _a	33
Not that important	8.2%	13	17.8%	15	4.1%	2	1.2%	1	10.9%	10	19.6%	13	10.8%	4
Not at all important	6.9%	11	0.7%	1	3.9%	2	7.9%	5	0.4%	0	1.3%	1	4.1%	2
"Not Very/Not at all important"	15.0% _a	25	18.5% _a	16	8.0% _a	3	9.1% _a	5	11.3% _a	10	20.8% _a	14	14.9% _a	6
Not sure	0.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	49.5%	113	45.4%	99	41.0%	4	44.1%	22	35.6%	31	51.7%	153
Somewhat important	36.2%	83	35.9%	79	11.8%	1	39.4%	20	30.7%	27	37.6%	111
"Very Imp/Important"	85.7% _a	196	81.3% _a	178	52.8% _a	5	83.5% _{a,b}	42	66.3% _a	58	89.2% _b	264
Not that important	12.7%	29	13.5%	30	47.2%	4	16.5%	8	25.6%	22	8.1%	24
Not at all important	1.3%	3	4.3%	9	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	8.1%	7	1.8%	5
"Not Very/Not at all important"	14.1% _a	32	17.8% _a	39	47.2% _a	4	16.5% _{a,b}	8	33.7% _a	29	9.9% _b	29
Not sure	0.2% _a	1	0.9% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.8% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	219	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	52.2%	62	41.7%	25	30.7%	22	54.6%	43	56.1%	35	45.2%	25
Somewhat important	31.7%	37	31.1%	19	47.7%	34	38.3%	30	33.5%	21	35.6%	20
"Very Imp/Important"	83.9% _{a,b}	99	72.9% _a	44	78.4% _{a,b}	55	92.9% _b	74	89.7% _{a,b}	56	80.8% _{a,b}	45
Not that important	16.1%	19	27.1%	16	11.3%	8	5.4%	4	7.2%	4	11.4%	6
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	10.2%	7	1.7%	1	3.2%	2	3.4%	2
"Not Very/Not at all important"	16.1% _{a,b}	19	27.1% _a	16	21.6% _{a,b}	15	7.1% _b	6	10.3% _{a,b}	6	14.8% _{a,b}	8
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.4% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	71	100.0%	80	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	52.6%	107	43.9%	69	42.1%	37	39.1%	36	51.5%	47	49.1%	51	42.4%	43
Somewhat important	32.9%	67	35.5%	56	44.3%	39	31.8%	29	36.1%	33	42.4%	44	35.9%	36
"Very Imp/Important"	85.5% _a	175	79.4% _a	124	86.4% _a	75	70.9% _a	65	87.6% _{b,c}	81	91.5% _b	94	78.3% _{a,c}	79
Not that important	10.8%	22	16.8%	26	11.9%	10	23.1%	21	12.4%	11	7.9%	8	14.8%	15
Not at all important	2.6%	5	3.6%	6	1.7%	1	5.7%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7.0%	7
"Not Very/Not at all important"	13.4% _a	27	20.4% _a	32	13.6% _a	12	28.8% _a	27	12.4% _{b,c}	11	7.9% _b	8	21.7% _{a,c}	22
Not sure	1.1% _a	2	0.2% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.3% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	157	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Table 12 – Perceived Importance of “Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally	Very important	773	64.3%
	Somewhat important	323	26.9%
	Not that important	75	6.2%
	Not at all important	19	1.6%
	Not sure	12	1.0%
	TOTALS:	1202	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	2013		Year 2015		2017	
Very important	80.3%	548	79.4%	1029	64.3%	773
Somewhat important	16.4%	112	16.1%	208	26.9%	323
"Very Imp/Important"	96.7% _a	659	95.5% _a	1237	91.2% _b	1096
Not that important	0.3%	2	3.0%	39	6.2%	75
Not at all important	0.6%	4	0.8%	11	1.6%	19
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.9% _a	6	3.8% _b	50	7.8% _c	94
Not sure	2.4% _a	16	0.7% _b	9	1.0% _{a,b}	12
TOTALS:	100.0%	682	100.0%	1295	100.0%	1202




Table 12 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally”

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Very important	65.0%	301	56.0%	164	67.1%	300
Somewhat important	24.5%	114	35.5%	104	25.4%	114
"Very Imp/Important"	89.5% _a	415	91.5% _a	267	92.5% _a	414
Not that important	7.5%	35	3.6%	10	6.2%	28
Not at all important	1.6%	8	4.3%	13	0.4%	2
"Not Very/Not at all important"	9.2% _a	42	7.9% _a	23	6.6% _a	29
Not sure	1.3% _a	6	0.5% _a	2	0.9% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	463	100.0%	292	100.0%	447

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson			Lewis			St. Lawrence	
	2013	2015	2017	2013	2015	2017	2015	2017
Very important	79.1%	80.1%	65.0%	85.6%	78.3%	56.0%	79.1%	67.1%
Somewhat important	17.2%	15.7%	24.5%	12.9%	13.7%	35.5%	17.1%	25.4%
"Very Imp/Important"	96.3% _a	95.7% _a	89.5% _b	98.4% _a	91.9% _b	91.5% _b	96.1% _a	92.5% _b
Not that important	0.3%	2.0%	7.5%	0.7%	6.6%	3.6%	3.2%	6.2%
Not at all important	0.6%	1.0%	1.6%	0.5%	1.4%	4.3%	0.5%	0.4%
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.8% _a	3.0% _a	9.2% _b	1.1% _a	8.0% _b	7.9% _b	3.7% _a	6.6% _b
Not sure	2.8% _a	1.2% _a	1.3% _a	0.4% _a	0.1% _a	0.5% _a	0.2% _a	0.9% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 12 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	59.5%	145	71.1%	156	52.3%	60	59.0%	34	79.7%	74	65.8%	123
Somewhat important	28.2%	69	20.5%	45	29.1%	34	30.5%	17	15.9%	15	25.5%	48
"Very Imp/Important"	87.6% _a	213	91.6% _a	202	81.4% _a	94	89.5% _{a,b}	51	95.6% _b	88	91.2% _{a,b}	170
Not that important	8.7%	21	6.2%	14	11.4%	13	9.9%	6	2.2%	2	7.1%	13
Not at all important	2.4%	6	0.8%	2	3.9%	4	0.0%	0	1.9%	2	0.8%	1
"Not Very/Not at all important"	11.1% _a	27	7.0% _a	15	15.3% _a	18	9.9% _a	6	4.1% _a	4	7.9% _a	15
Not sure	1.2% _a	3	1.3% _a	3	3.3% _a	4	0.5% _a	0	0.3% _a	0	0.8% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	243	100.0%	220	100.0%	116	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	59.0%	81	64.4%	55	61.9%	44	73.3%	51	65.3%	34	75.3%	36
Somewhat important	28.0%	38	19.5%	17	23.0%	16	22.5%	16	29.6%	15	23.2%	11
"Very Imp/Important"	87.0% _a	119	83.9% _a	71	85.0% _a	60	95.8% _a	67	94.9% _a	49	98.5% _a	48
Not that important	6.9%	9	14.1%	12	13.6%	10	4.2%	3	0.8%	0	1.0%	0
Not at all important	2.9%	4	2.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.7%	2	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	9.8% _a	13	16.1% _a	14	13.6% _a	10	4.2% _a	3	4.5% _a	2	1.0% _a	0
Not sure	3.2% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	1.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.6% _a	0	0.6% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	137	100.0%	85	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	48

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	72.2%	152	55.3%	93	66.4%	56	72.4%	63	62.8%	81	58.1%	51	67.1%	67
Somewhat important	21.4%	45	27.5%	46	26.5%	22	20.4%	18	23.1%	30	27.7%	24	26.2%	26
"Very Imp/Important"	93.6% _a	197	82.8% _b	139	92.9% _{a,b}	78	92.8% _a	81	85.9% _a	111	85.8% _a	76	93.3% _a	94
Not that important	5.2%	11	11.0%	19	6.4%	5	5.6%	5	9.6%	12	12.3%	11	4.9%	5
Not at all important	1.2%	3	3.0%	5	0.0%	0	1.6%	1	3.3%	4	1.6%	1	0.5%	1
"Not Very/Not at all important"	6.4% _a	14	14.0% _b	24	6.4% _{a,b}	5	7.2% _a	6	12.9% _a	17	13.9% _a	12	5.4% _a	5
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	3.2% _a	5	0.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	1.2% _a	2	0.3% _a	0	1.3% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	168	100.0%	84	100.0%	87	100.0%	129	100.0%	88	100.0%	101

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	46.5%	69	65.8%	95	52.5%	6	63.3%	13	66.5%	24	54.4%	119
Somewhat important	40.7%	60	30.2%	43	35.3%	4	34.1%	7	26.1%	9	37.7%	83
"Very Imp/Important"	87.2% _a	129	96.0% _b	138	87.8% _a	10	97.4% _a	21	92.7% _a	33	92.1% _a	202
Not that important	4.2%	6	2.9%	4	12.2%	1	0.0%	0	5.9%	2	1.9%	4
Not at all important	8.2%	12	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	5.8%	13
"Not Very/Not at all important"	12.5% _a	18	3.2% _b	5	12.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	5.9% _a	2	7.7% _a	17
Not sure	0.4% _a	1	0.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _a	1	1.5% _a	1	0.2% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

Table 12 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	30.8%	16	61.8%	25	60.2%	31	54.9%	33	65.9%	29	68.1%	29
Somewhat important	42.0%	22	26.1%	11	38.9%	20	41.5%	25	28.3%	12	31.4%	14
"Very Imp/Important"	72.8% _a	39	88.0% _{a,b}	36	99.1% _b	51	96.4% _{b,c}	58	94.2% _{a,b}	41	99.6% _{b,d}	43
Not that important	4.2%	2	12.0%	5	0.9%	0	2.3%	1	3.4%	1	0.0%	0
Not at all important	23.0%	12	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.4%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	27.2% _a	14	12.0% _{a,b}	5	0.9% _b	0	2.7% _{b,c}	2	3.4% _{b,d}	1	0.4% _{b,e}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	1	2.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	56.5%	92	51.9%	45	62.4%	26	68.8%	39	54.6%	48	49.5%	33	61.2%	23
Somewhat important	34.7%	57	36.8%	32	35.9%	15	28.3%	16	35.5%	31	42.7%	29	34.5%	13
"Very Imp/Important"	91.3% _a	149	88.7% _a	76	98.3% _a	42	97.2% _a	56	90.1% _a	80	92.2% _a	62	95.6% _a	37
Not that important	0.6%	1	10.1%	9	1.7%	1	1.9%	1	3.1%	3	5.8%	4	4.4%	2
Not at all important	7.4%	12	0.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	6.9%	6	0.4%	0	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	8.1% _a	13	10.6% _a	9	1.7% _a	1	1.9% _a	1	9.9% _a	9	6.2% _a	4	4.4% _a	2
Not sure	0.6% _a	1	0.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	1.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	65.2%	149	69.1%	151	78.3%	7	67.0%	33	68.5%	59	66.9%	198
Somewhat important	29.7%	68	21.0%	46	21.7%	2	23.9%	12	26.6%	23	24.7%	73
"Very Imp/Important"	94.9% _a	217	90.1% _a	197	100.0% ¹	9	91.0% _a	45	95.1% _a	82	91.7% _a	271
Not that important	4.3%	10	8.3%	18	0.0%	0	8.7%	4	2.9%	3	7.1%	21
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.7%	2	0.0%	0	0.3%	0	1.7%	1	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	4.3% _a	10	9.0% _b	20	0.0% ¹	0	9.0% _a	5	4.6% _a	4	7.1% _a	21
Not sure	0.8% _a	2	0.9% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.3% _a	0	1.2% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	218	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	86	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	62.3%	74	52.9%	32	54.7%	38	79.4%	63	81.0%	51	75.0%	42
Somewhat important	24.3%	29	39.8%	24	40.4%	28	18.2%	15	14.7%	9	16.0%	9
"Very Imp/Important"	86.6% _a	102	92.7% _a	56	95.2% _a	66	97.7% _a	78	95.7% _a	60	91.0% _a	51
Not that important	13.4%	16	7.3%	4	3.8%	3	2.3%	2	2.9%	2	2.2%	1
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.1%	1	0.0%	0	1.1%	1	0.3%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	13.4% _a	16	7.3% _a	4	4.8% _a	3	2.3% _a	2	4.0% _a	2	2.5% _a	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.3% _a	0	6.5% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	70	100.0%	80	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	67.9%	139	65.8%	103	67.3%	59	61.8%	57	67.6%	62	79.1%	81	68.6%	69
Somewhat important	23.6%	48	26.9%	42	27.1%	24	21.7%	20	25.7%	24	19.0%	20	23.2%	23
"Very Imp/Important"	91.5% _a	187	92.8% _a	145	94.5% _a	82	83.5% _a	77	93.3% _{a,b}	86	98.1% _b	101	91.8% _{a,b}	92
Not that important	6.4%	13	6.6%	10	5.1%	4	14.6%	13	5.4%	5	1.0%	1	8.2%	8
Not at all important	0.3%	1	0.5%	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.8%	1	0.9%	1	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	6.8% _a	14	7.1% _a	11	5.3% _a	5	14.6% _a	13	6.2% _{a,b}	6	1.9% _b	2	8.2% _{a,b}	8
Not sure	1.7% _a	3	0.2% _a	0	0.2% _a	0	1.9% _a	2	0.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	156	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	100

Table 13 – Perceived Importance of “Increasing Canadian Spending in the Local Region”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Increasing Canadian spending in the local region	Very important	458	38.2%
	Somewhat important	476	39.7%
	Not that important	174	14.5%
	Not at all important	63	5.2%
	Not sure	29	2.5%
	TOTALS:	1199	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Very important	40.6%	187	32.1%	93	35.9%	161
Somewhat important	35.6%	165	50.0%	145	38.8%	174
"Very Imp/Important"	76.2% _a	352	82.1% _a	237	74.7% _a	335
Not that important	17.2%	79	12.8%	37	14.5%	65
Not at all important	4.8%	22	2.9%	9	6.1%	28
"Not Very/Not at all important"	22.0% _a	101	15.7% _a	45	20.6% _a	92
Not sure	1.8% _a	8	2.2% _{a,b}	6	4.7% _b	21
TOTALS:	100.0%	462	100.0%	289	100.0%	448




Table 13 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Increasing Canadian Spending in the Local Region”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	44.1%	107	36.7%	80	40.7%	47	37.0%	21	30.6%	28	43.0%	80
Somewhat important	33.4%	81	38.1%	83	26.0%	30	32.9%	19	43.6%	40	40.5%	76
"Very Imp/Important"	77.5% _a	188	74.8% _a	164	66.7% _a	77	70.0% _{a,b}	40	74.2% _{a,b}	68	83.5% _b	156
Not that important	16.2%	39	18.4%	40	20.1%	23	19.2%	11	25.8%	24	11.6%	22
Not at all important	4.3%	10	5.3%	12	7.6%	9	10.8%	6	0.0%	0	3.8%	7
"Not Very/Not at all important"	20.4% _a	50	23.7% _a	52	27.7% _a	32	30.0% _a	17	25.8% _a	24	15.4% _a	29
Not sure	2.1% _a	5	1.6% _a	3	5.6% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.1% _b	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	243	100.0%	219	100.0%	115	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	39.5%	54	29.1%	25	48.8%	34	35.9%	25	39.5%	21	59.8%	29
Somewhat important	34.1%	46	33.4%	28	24.8%	17	50.0%	35	47.1%	24	26.6%	13
"Very Imp/Important"	73.6% _{a,b}	100	62.4% _a	53	73.6% _{a,b}	52	85.9% _b	60	86.6% _{b,c}	45	86.4% _{b,d}	42
Not that important	16.1%	22	32.4%	28	20.4%	14	8.3%	6	9.3%	5	10.4%	5
Not at all important	5.3%	7	5.2%	4	4.5%	3	5.8%	4	4.1%	2	2.3%	1
"Not Very/Not at all important"	21.3% _{a,b}	29	37.6% _a	32	24.9% _{a,b}	18	14.1% _b	10	13.4% _{b,c}	7	12.7% _{b,d}	6
Not sure	5.1% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	1.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	136	100.0%	85	100.0%	70	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	38.6%	82	39.3%	66	48.2%	40	41.2%	36	30.4%	40	36.1%	31	51.1%	51
Somewhat important	34.5%	73	36.0%	61	37.7%	31	19.4%	17	48.8%	63	45.6%	39	29.7%	30
"Very Imp/Important"	73.2% _a	154	75.3% _a	127	85.9% _a	71	60.6% _a	53	79.3% _b	103	81.7% _b	71	80.8% _b	81
Not that important	19.8%	42	17.4%	29	10.2%	8	31.3%	27	14.4%	19	16.9%	15	13.2%	13
Not at all important	5.6%	12	4.2%	7	3.8%	3	5.1%	4	5.1%	7	1.4%	1	5.0%	5
"Not Very/Not at all important"	25.4% _a	54	21.5% _a	36	14.1% _a	12	36.4% _a	32	19.5% _b	25	18.3% _b	16	18.2% _b	18
Not sure	1.4% _a	3	3.2% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	3.0% _a	3	1.2% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	1.0% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	168	100.0%	82	100.0%	87	100.0%	130	100.0%	87	100.0%	101

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	32.7%	47	31.5%	45	24.5%	3	30.1%	6	36.5%	13	32.0%	70
Somewhat important	47.8%	69	52.2%	75	69.5%	8	45.7%	10	29.0%	10	52.9%	116
"Very Imp/Important"	80.5% _a	117	83.6% _a	120	94.0% _{a,b}	11	75.8% _{a,b}	16	65.6% _a	23	84.9% _b	186
Not that important	15.3%	22	10.3%	15	6.0%	1	14.1%	3	28.5%	10	10.2%	22
Not at all important	2.8%	4	3.1%	4	0.0%	0	10.1%	2	0.0%	0	2.9%	6
"Not Very/Not at all important"	18.0% _a	26	13.4% _a	19	6.0% _a	1	24.2% _a	5	28.5% _a	10	13.1% _a	29
Not sure	1.5% _a	2	3.0% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.0% _a	2	2.0% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	145	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

Table 13 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Increasing Canadian Spending in the Local Region”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	17.8%	9	33.0%	13	38.0%	19	24.7%	15	36.1%	16	48.0%	21
Somewhat important	65.3%	35	47.4%	18	40.1%	21	55.9%	34	41.2%	18	45.6%	20
"Very Imp/Important"	83.1% _a	44	80.4% _a	31	78.1% _a	40	80.6% _a	49	77.3% _a	34	93.7% _a	40
Not that important	8.5%	4	17.6%	7	20.9%	11	12.1%	7	13.8%	6	4.1%	2
Not at all important	8.4%	4	2.0%	1	1.0%	1	1.4%	1	4.0%	2	0.4%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	16.9% _a	9	19.6% _a	7	21.9% _a	11	13.5% _a	8	17.8% _a	8	4.6% _a	2
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	5.9% _a	4	4.9% _a	2	1.7% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	38	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	32.9%	54	34.9%	29	23.3%	10	42.3%	24	39.9%	35	26.5%	17	28.8%	11
Somewhat important	54.6%	89	35.8%	30	60.3%	26	42.1%	24	40.4%	36	54.1%	35	49.7%	19
"Very Imp/Important"	87.5% _a	143	70.6% _b	59	83.6% _{a,b}	35	84.4% _a	48	80.3% _a	71	80.6% _a	52	78.6% _a	30
Not that important	8.7%	14	21.6%	18	11.0%	5	11.4%	7	17.6%	16	8.6%	6	19.5%	7
Not at all important	0.3%	1	6.8%	6	5.4%	2	3.0%	2	0.9%	1	9.1%	6	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	9.1% _a	15	28.5% _b	24	16.4% _{a,b}	7	14.3% _a	8	18.5% _a	16	17.7% _a	11	19.5% _a	7
Not sure	3.5% _a	6	0.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	1.3% _a	1	1.2% _a	1	1.7% _a	1	1.9% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	83	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	64	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	36.3%	83	35.5%	78	8.0%	1	41.7%	21	32.2%	28	36.3%	107
Somewhat important	36.2%	83	41.5%	91	21.7%	2	39.6%	20	28.9%	25	42.5%	126
"Very Imp/Important"	72.5% _a	166	77.0% _a	169	29.8% _a	3	81.3% _{b,c}	40	61.2% _{a,b}	53	78.8% _c	233
Not that important	16.6%	38	12.2%	27	70.2%	7	16.3%	8	16.3%	14	12.0%	36
Not at all important	3.6%	8	8.8%	19	0.0%	0	2.4%	1	21.2%	18	2.5%	7
"Not Very/Not at all important"	20.2% _a	46	21.0% _a	46	70.2% _a	7	18.7% _{b,c}	9	37.5% _{a,b}	33	14.5% _c	43
Not sure	7.3% _a	17	2.0% _b	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.3% _a	1	6.7% _a	20
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	219	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	29.5%	35	13.8%	8	27.1%	19	45.9%	36	54.9%	34	49.1%	28
Somewhat important	45.9%	54	29.4%	18	46.8%	33	41.3%	33	27.8%	17	32.7%	18
"Very Imp/Important"	75.4% _a	89	43.3% _b	26	73.9% _a	52	87.2% _a	69	82.7% _a	52	81.7% _a	46
Not that important	0.0%	0	51.7%	31	21.1%	15	9.3%	7	9.4%	6	9.3%	5
Not at all important	11.0%	13	3.2%	2	5.0%	3	2.3%	2	7.9%	5	4.0%	2
"Not Very/Not at all important"	11.0% _a	13	54.9% _b	33	26.1% _a	18	11.6% _a	9	17.3% _a	11	13.3% _a	8
Not sure	13.6% _a	16	1.8% _{a,b}	1	0.0% ¹	0	1.2% _b	1	0.0% ¹	0	4.9% _{a,b}	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	71	100.0%	80	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	38.5%	78	30.2%	47	40.3%	35	45.3%	42	33.8%	31	40.6%	42	32.6%	33
Somewhat important	34.7%	71	42.4%	66	41.8%	36	30.6%	28	47.3%	44	38.4%	40	41.0%	41
"Very Imp/Important"	73.2% _a	149	72.6% _a	114	82.1% _a	72	75.9% _a	70	81.1% _a	75	79.1% _a	81	73.5% _a	74
Not that important	9.7%	20	23.7%	37	9.1%	8	5.8%	5	18.3%	17	17.6%	18	18.8%	19
Not at all important	9.2%	19	3.0%	5	4.6%	4	17.1%	16	0.0%	0	2.8%	3	7.6%	8
"Not Very/Not at all important"	18.9% _a	39	26.7% _a	42	13.8% _a	12	22.9% _a	21	18.3% _a	17	20.4% _a	21	26.5% _a	27
Not sure	7.9% _a	16	0.7% _b	1	4.1% _{a,b}	4	1.2% _a	1	0.6% _a	1	0.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	157	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Table 14 – Perceived Importance of “Improving the Condition of Rental Housing”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Improving the condition of rental housing	Very important	653	54.3%
	Somewhat important	406	33.7%
	Not that important	82	6.8%
	Not at all important	17	1.4%
	Not sure	45	3.7%
	TOTALS:	1202	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Very important	60.3%	279	50.7%	148	47.5%	213
Somewhat important	31.0%	143	33.3%	97	39.0%	175
"Very Imp/Important"	91.2% _a	422	83.9% _b	245	86.5% _{a,b}	388
Not that important	5.6%	26	10.5%	31	6.8%	30
Not at all important	1.5%	7	3.0%	9	0.6%	2
"Not Very/Not at all important"	7.2% _a	33	13.5% _b	39	7.3% _a	33
Not sure	1.6% _a	7	2.6% _{a,b}	8	6.2% _b	28
TOTALS:	100.0%	462	100.0%	292	100.0%	448




Table 14 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Improving the Condition of Rental Housing”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	55.9%	135	65.1%	143	60.9%	70	59.4%	34	67.0%	62	54.9%	102
Somewhat important	36.4%	88	25.0%	55	35.5%	41	31.4%	18	21.4%	20	34.4%	64
"Very Imp/Important"	92.3% _a	224	90.1% _a	198	96.4% _a	111	90.8% _a	52	88.4% _a	82	89.3% _a	167
Not that important	5.7%	14	5.6%	12	2.4%	3	3.6%	2	7.2%	7	7.6%	14
Not at all important	0.8%	2	2.3%	5	0.0%	0	1.6%	1	4.4%	4	1.1%	2
"Not Very/Not at all important"	6.5% _a	16	7.9% _a	17	2.4% _a	3	5.2% _{a,b}	3	11.6% _b	11	8.7% _{a,b}	16
Not sure	1.2% _a	3	2.0% _a	4	1.2% _a	1	4.0% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	2.0% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	242	100.0%	220	100.0%	115	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	62.8%	86	58.7%	49	63.1%	45	53.2%	37	61.4%	32	60.6%	30
Somewhat important	35.6%	49	29.2%	24	29.0%	21	34.7%	24	22.9%	12	26.9%	13
"Very Imp/Important"	98.4% _a	135	87.9% _b	74	92.2% _{a,b}	65	87.9% _b	62	84.4% _b	44	87.5% _b	43
Not that important	0.6%	1	7.6%	6	7.8%	6	8.2%	6	11.1%	6	3.5%	2
Not at all important	0.0%	0	2.1%	2	0.0%	0	1.1%	1	1.8%	1	7.6%	4
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.6% _a	1	9.7% _b	8	7.8% _{a,b}	6	9.3% _b	7	12.9% _b	7	11.1% _b	5
Not sure	1.0% _a	1	2.4% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	2.8% _a	2	2.7% _a	1	1.4% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	137	100.0%	84	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	67.4%	142	55.3%	92	52.4%	44	73.5%	64	58.9%	76	54.6%	48	53.9%	54
Somewhat important	26.2%	55	35.7%	60	33.5%	28	21.4%	19	32.5%	42	35.2%	31	37.5%	38
"Very Imp/Important"	93.5% _a	197	91.0% _a	152	85.9% _a	72	94.9% _a	83	91.3% _a	117	89.8% _a	79	91.4% _a	92
Not that important	3.7%	8	4.6%	8	12.7%	11	3.4%	3	3.1%	4	7.6%	7	7.1%	7
Not at all important	1.4%	3	1.8%	3	1.3%	1	1.6%	1	3.2%	4	0.8%	1	0.9%	1
"Not Very/Not at all important"	5.1% _a	11	6.4% _{a,b}	11	13.9% _b	12	5.1% _a	4	6.2% _a	8	8.3% _a	7	8.0% _a	8
Not sure	1.4% _a	3	2.6% _a	4	0.2% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.4% _a	3	1.9% _a	2	0.6% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	167	100.0%	84	100.0%	87	100.0%	129	100.0%	88	100.0%	101

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	43.4%	64	58.2%	84	53.7%	6	55.7%	12	61.9%	22	48.7%	107
Somewhat important	35.2%	52	31.3%	45	34.1%	4	44.3%	9	30.4%	11	33.1%	73
"Very Imp/Important"	78.6% _a	116	89.5% _b	129	87.8% _a	10	100.0% ¹	21	92.3% _a	33	81.9% _a	179
Not that important	13.7%	20	7.1%	10	12.2%	1	0.0%	0	3.5%	1	11.3%	25
Not at all important	4.1%	6	1.9%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.1%	9
"Not Very/Not at all important"	17.9% _a	26	9.0% _b	13	12.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	3.5% _a	1	15.4% _a	34
Not sure	3.6% _a	5	1.5% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.2% _a	1	2.7% _a	6
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

Table 14 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Improving the Condition of Rental Housing”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	65.3%	35	61.5%	25	44.8%	23	32.5%	20	51.0%	22	54.5%	23
Somewhat important	23.2%	12	16.2%	7	36.3%	19	47.0%	28	39.6%	17	32.7%	14
"Very Imp/Important"	88.5% _a	47	77.7% _a	32	81.1% _a	42	79.5% _a	48	90.6% _a	39	87.2% _a	38
Not that important	11.5%	6	22.3%	9	16.0%	8	4.0%	2	6.1%	3	4.7%	2
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	10.4%	6	0.9%	0	5.2%	2
"Not Very/Not at all important"	11.5% _a	6	22.3% _a	9	16.0% _a	8	14.4% _a	9	7.0% _a	3	9.9% _a	4
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.9% _a	1	6.1% _a	4	2.4% _a	1	2.9% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Very important	50.6%	83	49.3%	42	53.8%	23	52.8%	30	69.2%	61	30.6%	20	53.0%
Somewhat important	33.9%	55	34.3%	30	28.8%	12	38.3%	22	23.0%	20	51.7%	35	31.7%
"Very Imp/Important"	84.5% _a	138	83.6% _a	72	82.6% _a	35	91.0% _a	52	92.2% _a	82	82.2% _a	55	84.7% _a
Not that important	9.3%	15	13.4%	12	9.1%	4	2.9%	2	5.5%	5	16.1%	11	11.2%
Not at all important	4.7%	8	1.0%	1	0.7%	0	3.5%	2	0.4%	0	0.4%	0	0.0%
"Not Very/Not at all important"	14.0% _a	23	14.4% _a	12	9.8% _a	4	6.5% _a	4	5.9% _a	5	16.5% _a	11	11.2% _a
Not sure	1.5% _a	3	2.1% _a	2	7.6% _a	3	2.5% _a	1	1.9% _a	2	1.3% _a	1	4.1% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	39.9%	91	55.5%	122	69.9%	7	63.9%	32	50.0%	44	43.1%	127
Somewhat important	46.0%	105	31.6%	69	0.0%	0	24.9%	12	31.9%	28	44.5%	132
"Very Imp/Important"	85.9% _a	197	87.1% _a	191	69.9% _a	7	88.8% _a	44	82.0% _a	71	87.7% _a	259
Not that important	4.6%	10	9.1%	20	30.1%	3	5.0%	2	11.1%	10	5.2%	15
Not at all important	0.4%	1	0.8%	2	0.0%	0	1.7%	1	0.6%	1	0.4%	1
"Not Very/Not at all important"	4.9% _a	11	9.8% _b	21	30.1% _a	3	6.7% _{a,b}	3	11.7% _{a,b}	10	5.6% _b	16
Not sure	9.2% _a	21	3.0% _b	7	0.0% ¹	0	4.5% _a	2	6.4% _a	6	6.8% _a	20
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	219	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	49.8%	59	43.8%	27	28.9%	20	58.0%	46	54.8%	34	47.3%	27
Somewhat important	42.6%	50	36.5%	22	56.5%	40	31.9%	25	29.2%	18	32.8%	18
"Very Imp/Important"	92.3% _a	109	80.3% _a	49	85.4% _a	60	89.9% _a	72	84.0% _a	53	80.1% _a	45
Not that important	4.6%	5	10.4%	6	7.6%	5	5.9%	5	8.3%	5	5.8%	3
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.6%	0	3.2%	2	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	4.6% _a	5	10.4% _a	6	7.6% _a	5	6.5% _a	5	11.5% _a	7	5.8% _a	3
Not sure	3.0% _a	4	9.3% _a	6	7.0% _a	5	3.6% _a	3	4.5% _a	3	14.1% _a	8
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	71	100.0%	80	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Very important	52.7%	107	46.8%	73	36.7%	32	70.1%	65	58.0%	53	34.9%	36	37.5%
Somewhat important	39.4%	80	38.9%	61	38.1%	33	17.3%	16	26.7%	25	55.4%	57	45.7%
"Very Imp/Important"	92.0% _a	188	85.8% _{a,b}	134	74.9% _b	65	87.4% _a	81	84.8% _a	78	90.3% _a	93	83.2% _a
Not that important	3.6%	7	8.7%	14	10.6%	9	8.6%	8	10.8%	10	1.9%	2	9.7%
Not at all important	0.0%	0	1.0%	2	1.1%	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.8%	1	0.7%
"Not Very/Not at all important"	3.6% _a	7	9.7% _{a,b}	15	11.7% _b	10	8.9% _a	8	10.8% _a	10	2.7% _a	3	10.5% _a
Not sure	4.4% _a	9	4.5% _a	7	13.4% _b	12	3.7% _a	3	4.4% _a	4	7.0% _a	7	6.4% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	157	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%

Table 15 – Perceived Importance of “Improving the Condition of Single-family Homes”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Improving the condition of single-family homes	Very important	665	55.6%
	Somewhat important	427	35.7%
	Not that important	63	5.2%
	Not at all important	12	1.0%
	Not sure	29	2.4%
	TOTALS:	1195	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Very important	60.0%	275	48.6%	141	50.8%	227
Somewhat important	31.5%	145	40.0%	116	41.3%	185
"Very Imp/Important"	91.5% _a	420	88.6% _a	256	92.1% _a	412
Not that important	5.5%	25	5.9%	17	4.8%	22
Not at all important	1.0%	5	1.6%	5	0.7%	3
"Not Very/Not at all important"	6.6% _a	30	7.5% _a	22	5.5% _a	25
Not sure	1.9% _a	9	3.9% _a	11	2.4% _a	11
TOTALS:	100.0%	459	100.0%	289	100.0%	447




Table 15 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Improving the Condition of Single-family Homes”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	59.5%	144	60.6%	131	60.2%	68	63.7%	36	63.9%	59	55.6%	103
Somewhat important	31.4%	76	31.7%	69	32.5%	37	27.0%	15	23.8%	22	37.9%	70
"Very Imp/Important"	90.9% _a	220	92.3% _a	200	92.7% _a	105	90.7% _a	51	87.8% _a	81	93.5% _a	173
Not that important	6.7%	16	4.1%	9	6.1%	7	6.6%	4	5.7%	5	4.8%	9
Not at all important	0.9%	2	1.2%	3	0.0%	0	1.1%	1	3.3%	3	0.6%	1
"Not Very/Not at all important"	7.7% _a	19	5.3% _a	12	6.1% _a	7	7.7% _a	4	9.0% _a	8	5.4% _a	10
Not sure	1.4% _a	3	2.4% _a	5	1.2% _a	1	1.6% _a	1	3.2% _a	3	1.1% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	242	100.0%	217	100.0%	113	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	185

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	62.1%	84	65.5%	55	56.3%	40	54.1%	38	52.6%	27	66.7%	31
Somewhat important	35.0%	47	21.2%	18	33.8%	24	37.5%	26	33.4%	17	25.5%	12
"Very Imp/Important"	97.1% _a	132	86.7% _b	73	90.2% _{a,b}	64	91.6% _{a,b}	64	86.0% _{a,b}	45	92.2% _{a,b}	43
Not that important	1.9%	3	11.3%	9	5.2%	4	6.5%	5	8.0%	4	2.0%	1
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.4%	2	0.9%	1	2.5%	1	1.1%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	1.9% _a	3	11.3% _b	9	8.6% _{a,b}	6	7.4% _{a,b}	5	10.4% _{a,b}	5	3.0% _{a,b}	1
Not sure	1.0% _a	1	2.1% _a	2	1.3% _a	1	1.0% _a	1	3.6% _a	2	4.7% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	136	100.0%	84	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	47

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	69.6%	146	52.9%	88	50.1%	42	71.5%	63	61.4%	78	53.7%	47	53.1%	53
Somewhat important	24.2%	51	37.7%	62	37.6%	32	22.9%	20	29.2%	37	41.4%	36	36.0%	36
"Very Imp/Important"	93.8% _a	197	90.6% _a	150	87.7% _a	74	94.4% _a	83	90.6% _a	115	95.1% _a	84	89.1% _a	88
Not that important	5.2%	11	3.9%	7	9.5%	8	4.9%	4	6.8%	9	2.2%	2	7.0%	7
Not at all important	0.3%	1	1.9%	3	1.2%	1	0.7%	1	0.0%	0	1.1%	1	2.7%	3
"Not Very/Not at all important"	5.5% _a	11	5.9% _a	10	10.6% _a	9	5.6% _a	5	6.8% _a	9	3.2% _a	3	9.7% _a	10
Not sure	0.7% _a	2	3.5% _a	6	1.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _a	3	1.6% _a	1	1.2% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	210	100.0%	165	100.0%	84	100.0%	87	100.0%	127	100.0%	88	100.0%	99

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	42.5%	62	54.8%	79	47.7%	6	56.4%	12	60.9%	20	46.6%	102
Somewhat important	44.6%	65	35.4%	51	52.3%	6	41.3%	9	26.8%	9	40.6%	89
"Very Imp/Important"	87.1% _a	127	90.1% _a	130	100.0% ¹	12	97.8% _a	21	87.7% _a	29	87.2% _a	191
Not that important	6.7%	10	5.0%	7	0.0%	0	2.2%	0	0.0%	0	7.4%	16
Not at all important	1.3%	2	1.9%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.6%	1	1.9%	4
"Not Very/Not at all important"	8.0% _a	12	6.9% _a	10	0.0% ¹	0	2.2% _a	0	1.6% _a	1	9.3% _a	20
Not sure	4.8% _a	7	2.9% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	10.7% _a	4	3.5% _a	8
TOTALS:	100.0%	146	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	33	100.0%	219

Table 15 cont.— Perceived Importance of “Improving the Condition of Single-family Homes”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	60.7%	32	59.6%	24	48.6%	24	39.6%	24	38.6%	16	45.9%	20
Somewhat important	39.3%	21	36.7%	15	36.9%	18	49.0%	30	37.4%	16	37.6%	16
"Very Imp/Important"	100.0% ¹	53	96.3% _a	40	85.5% _a	42	88.6% _a	53	75.9% _a	32	83.5% _a	36
Not that important	0.0%	0	3.7%	2	11.6%	6	4.3%	3	11.1%	5	5.6%	2
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.9%	1	1.8%	1	0.9%	0	5.2%	2
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.0% ¹	0	3.7% _a	2	13.6% _a	7	6.1% _a	4	12.0% _a	5	10.8% _a	5
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.0% _a	0	5.3% _a	3	12.1% _a	5	5.7% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	49	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	46.0%	75	54.7%	47	46.2%	19	54.2%	31	65.7%	58	31.6%	21	52.7%	19
Somewhat important	40.8%	67	39.5%	34	37.8%	15	34.9%	20	25.2%	22	56.1%	37	31.7%	12
"Very Imp/Important"	86.8% _a	142	94.2% _a	81	84.1% _a	34	89.2% _a	51	90.9% _a	80	87.7% _a	58	84.4% _a	31
Not that important	6.6%	11	2.5%	2	9.9%	4	1.3%	1	2.3%	2	11.9%	8	10.9%	4
Not at all important	1.2%	2	2.7%	2	0.7%	0	3.5%	2	0.4%	0	0.4%	0	2.6%	1
"Not Very/Not at all important"	7.9% _a	13	5.3% _a	5	10.6% _a	4	4.8% _a	3	2.8% _a	2	12.3% _a	8	13.5% _a	5
Not sure	5.3% _a	9	0.6% _a	0	5.3% _a	2	6.0% _a	3	6.3% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0	2.1% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	40	100.0%	57	100.0%	88	100.0%	67	100.0%	36

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very important	44.2%	101	57.8%	126	69.9%	7	58.2%	29	55.4%	48	48.1%	142
Somewhat important	47.2%	108	35.1%	76	30.1%	3	33.0%	16	40.4%	35	42.6%	126
"Very Imp/Important"	91.4% _a	209	92.8% _a	202	100.0% ¹	9	91.2% _a	45	95.8% _a	83	90.8% _a	267
Not that important	4.5%	10	5.2%	11	0.0%	0	4.6%	2	3.3%	3	5.6%	16
Not at all important	0.8%	2	0.5%	1	0.0%	0	1.7%	1	0.4%	0	0.6%	2
"Not Very/Not at all important"	5.3% _a	12	5.7% _a	12	0.0% ¹	0	6.3% _a	3	3.7% _a	3	6.2% _a	18
Not sure	3.3% _a	7	1.5% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	2.5% _a	1	0.5% _a	0	3.0% _a	9
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	218	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	294

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very important	64.9%	77	27.3%	17	29.0%	20	55.2%	44	53.6%	34	64.3%	36
Somewhat important	35.1%	42	56.6%	34	63.3%	44	34.8%	28	35.7%	22	25.8%	15
"Very Imp/Important"	100.0% ¹	118	83.9% _a	51	92.3% _a	64	90.0% _a	71	89.4% _a	56	90.0% _a	51
Not that important	0.0%	0	12.8%	8	1.3%	1	7.0%	6	6.0%	4	6.2%	4
Not at all important	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.6%	0	4.1%	3	0.0%	0
"Not Very/Not at all important"	0.0% ¹	0	12.8% _a	8	1.3% _a	1	7.7% _a	6	10.1% _a	6	6.2% _a	4
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	3.2% _a	2	6.4% _a	4	2.3% _a	2	0.5% _a	0	3.7% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	70	100.0%	79	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very important	52.8%	108	46.5%	72	53.9%	47	73.0%	67	51.1%	47	45.3%	47	41.9%	42
Somewhat important	43.2%	88	44.6%	69	31.0%	27	17.4%	16	41.2%	38	49.6%	51	47.1%	48
"Very Imp/Important"	96.0% _a	196	91.0% _{a,b}	142	84.9% _b	74	90.4% _a	84	92.3% _a	85	94.8% _a	98	89.0% _a	90
Not that important	3.2%	7	4.6%	7	9.1%	8	5.6%	5	7.7%	7	2.0%	2	6.8%	7
Not at all important	0.0%	0	1.5%	2	0.9%	1	1.6%	1	0.0%	0	0.5%	0	0.5%	1
"Not Very/Not at all important"	3.2% _a	7	6.0% _a	9	10.0% _a	9	7.1% _a	7	7.7% _a	7	2.5% _a	3	7.3% _a	7
Not sure	0.8% _a	2	2.9% _a	5	5.1% _a	4	2.4% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	2.7% _a	3	3.7% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	156	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Table 16 – SUMMARY – Satisfaction with Nine Potential Economic Development Initiatives

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not sure
Expanding activities and attractions for more tourism	9.0%	31.7%	31.1%	25.6%	2.6%
Retaining existing businesses	9.5%	29.7%	37.4%	21.5%	2.0%
Increasing Canadian spending in the local region	8.7%	27.9%	35.8%	19.0%	8.6%
Attracting new businesses	8.9%	27.4%	34.6%	26.4%	2.8%
Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities	10.3%	25.3%	37.4%	21.8%	5.1%
Improving the condition of single-family homes	7.2%	26.3%	33.8%	24.1%	8.6%
Improving the condition of rental housing	8.7%	20.5%	34.2%	27.8%	8.8%
Revitalizing Manufacturing	7.0%	21.5%	32.0%	35.1%	4.4%
Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally	9.7%	16.9%	31.8%	36.5%	5.1%

2017 County Specific Results for Each of Jefferson, Lewis, St. Lawrence County

Jefferson County Summary:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not sure
Expanding activities and attractions for more tourism	10.3%	34.7%	35.4%	17.4%	2.3%
Increasing Canadian spending in the local region	11.0%	32.7%	37.7%	9.2%	9.5%
Retaining existing businesses	7.9%	32.6%	43.0%	14.2%	2.2%
Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities	11.1%	29.0%	36.7%	18.7%	4.5%
Attracting new businesses	8.5%	29.8%	37.8%	20.1%	3.7%
Improving the condition of single-family homes	7.7%	25.4%	34.3%	21.9%	10.8%
Improving the condition of rental housing	9.3%	22.1%	35.0%	26.8%	6.8%
Revitalizing Manufacturing	8.4%	21.1%	35.2%	30.6%	4.8%
Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally	11.1%	16.7%	32.9%	32.3%	7.0%

Lewis County Summary:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not sure
Expanding activities and attractions for more tourism	4.8%	39.4%	31.1%	20.2%	4.5%
Retaining existing businesses	11.9%	29.9%	35.4%	21.3%	1.5%
Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities	10.6%	30.1%	32.5%	22.2%	4.6%
Attracting new businesses	9.9%	30.1%	31.4%	24.7%	3.9%
Improving the condition of single-family homes	3.6%	31.1%	37.8%	20.8%	6.7%
Increasing Canadian spending in the local region	3.2%	27.9%	28.3%	31.0%	9.6%
Improving the condition of rental housing	5.8%	24.9%	34.8%	24.2%	10.2%
Revitalizing Manufacturing	5.0%	24.5%	36.1%	28.9%	5.4%
Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally	6.2%	19.0%	36.1%	35.8%	3.0%

St. Lawrence County:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not sure
Expanding activities and attractions for more tourism	7.5%	26.7%	28.3%	36.0%	1.6%
Increasing Canadian spending in the local region	9.5%	24.2%	36.6%	24.4%	5.3%
Retaining existing businesses	8.1%	23.7%	33.5%	33.0%	1.7%
Improving the condition of single-family homes	7.6%	20.4%	33.5%	31.4%	7.1%
Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities	6.8%	18.8%	41.6%	27.0%	5.8%
Attracting new businesses	6.9%	17.1%	40.7%	34.4%	0.8%
Revitalizing Manufacturing	5.7%	15.7%	28.8%	44.5%	5.3%
Improving the condition of rental housing	6.8%	14.2%	36.1%	34.7%	8.3%
Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally	7.6%	12.1%	30.7%	46.4%	3.3%

Table 17 – Satisfaction with “Attracting New Businesses”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Attracting new businesses	Excellent	107	8.9%
	Good	329	27.4%
	Fair	417	34.6%
	Poor	317	26.4%
	Not sure	33	2.8%
	TOTALS:	1203	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

What county do you live in?						
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Excellent	8.5%	39	9.9%	29	6.9%	31
Good	29.8%	138	30.1%	88	17.1%	77
"Excellent/Good"	38.3% _a	178	40.0% _a	117	24.1% _b	108
Fair	37.8%	175	31.4%	92	40.7%	182
Poor	20.1%	93	24.7%	72	34.4%	154
"Fair/Poor"	58.0% _a	269	56.1% _a	164	75.1% _b	337
Not sure	3.7% _a	17	3.9% _a	11	0.8% _b	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	463	100.0%	292	100.0%	448




Table 17 cont.— Satisfaction with “Attracting New Businesses”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	9.2%	22	7.6%	17	5.8%	7	6.0%	3	6.4%	6	8.5%	16
Good	31.4%	76	28.1%	62	36.9%	43	17.0%	10	22.4%	21	33.9%	63
"Excellent/Good"	40.6% _a	99	35.7% _a	79	42.7% _{a,b}	50	23.0% _a	13	28.8% _{a,b}	27	42.4% _b	79
Fair	39.0%	95	36.6%	80	41.5%	48	49.5%	28	35.6%	33	35.0%	65
Poor	16.6%	41	24.0%	53	10.2%	12	26.7%	15	33.8%	31	18.8%	35
"Fair/Poor"	55.6% _a	135	60.6% _a	133	51.7% _a	60	76.1% _b	43	69.3% _{a,b}	64	53.8% _a	100
Not sure	3.8% _a	9	3.7% _a	8	5.6% _a	7	0.8% _a	0	1.8% _a	2	3.8% _a	7
TOTALS:	100.0%	244	100.0%	220	100.0%	116	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	15.1%	21	4.6%	4	4.6%	3	5.1%	4	4.9%	3	11.0%	5
Good	39.3%	54	26.1%	22	32.2%	23	25.4%	18	23.8%	12	19.0%	9
"Excellent/Good"	54.4% _a	74	30.7% _b	26	36.8% _{a,b}	26	30.4% _b	21	28.7% _b	15	29.9% _b	15
Fair	29.4%	40	42.4%	36	38.0%	27	41.6%	29	43.7%	23	41.6%	20
Poor	12.6%	17	26.8%	23	21.4%	15	23.8%	17	23.5%	12	19.0%	9
"Fair/Poor"	42.0% _a	57	69.3% _b	59	59.4% _{a,b}	42	65.4% _b	46	67.3% _b	35	60.5% _{a,b}	29
Not sure	3.6% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	3.8% _a	3	4.1% _a	3	4.0% _a	2	9.5% _a	5
TOTALS:	100.0%	137	100.0%	85	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Excellent	6.9%	15	9.5%	16	10.4%	9	3.2%	3	13.9%	18	11.3%	10	5.3%
Good	30.3%	64	32.6%	55	23.1%	19	23.1%	20	36.4%	47	28.2%	25	25.2%
"Excellent/Good"	37.2% _a	79	42.1% _a	71	33.5% _a	28	26.3% _a	23	50.2% _b	65	39.4% _{a,b}	35	30.5% _a
Fair	34.0%	72	37.5%	63	48.3%	41	35.4%	31	36.7%	48	39.9%	35	43.5%
Poor	23.9%	50	18.2%	31	14.6%	12	32.2%	28	11.7%	15	18.5%	16	23.9%
"Fair/Poor"	57.8% _a	122	55.7% _a	94	62.9% _a	53	67.5% _a	59	48.4% _b	63	58.4% _{a,b}	51	67.4% _a
Not sure	5.0% _a	10	2.2% _a	4	3.6% _a	3	6.2% _a	5	1.3% _a	2	2.1% _a	2	2.0% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	168	100.0%	84	100.0%	87	100.0%	130	100.0%	88	100.0%

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	8.1%	12	11.7%	17	0.0%	0	19.4%	4	21.4%	8	7.8%	17
Good	23.0%	34	37.4%	54	23.2%	3	39.3%	8	48.3%	17	26.6%	58
"Excellent/Good"	31.1% _a	46	49.2% _b	71	23.2% _a	3	58.7% _{a,b}	12	69.7% _b	25	34.4% _a	75
Fair	39.8%	59	22.8%	33	41.3%	5	19.8%	4	16.4%	6	33.8%	74
Poor	24.9%	37	24.5%	35	16.3%	2	19.1%	4	13.9%	5	27.9%	61
"Fair/Poor"	64.7% _a	96	47.2% _b	68	57.6% _{a,b}	7	38.8% _{a,b}	8	30.3% _a	11	61.7% _b	135
Not sure	4.2% _a	6	3.6% _a	5	19.2% _a	2	2.5% _{a,b}	1	0.0% ¹	0	4.0% _b	9
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

Table 17 cont.— Satisfaction with “Attracting New Businesses”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	0.0%	0	14.8%	6	22.2%	11	5.8%	3	5.5%	2	13.1%	6
Good	32.0%	17	21.5%	9	30.4%	16	22.8%	14	41.5%	18	34.3%	15
"Excellent/Good"	32.0% _a	17	36.2% _a	15	52.6% _a	27	28.6% _a	17	46.9% _a	20	47.4% _a	20
Fair	52.3%	28	24.6%	10	18.7%	10	29.5%	18	29.2%	13	32.1%	14
Poor	11.5%	6	25.9%	11	28.7%	15	41.9%	25	21.8%	9	13.9%	6
"Fair/Poor"	63.8% _a	34	50.5% _a	21	47.4% _a	24	71.4% _a	43	51.0% _a	22	46.0% _a	20
Not sure	4.2% _a	2	13.3% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.1% _a	1	6.6% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	10.1%	17	9.1%	8	10.7%	5	3.5%	2	12.2%	11	14.3%	10	9.0%	3
Good	20.6%	34	41.7%	36	43.1%	18	29.7%	17	29.5%	26	21.8%	15	35.8%	14
"Excellent/Good"	30.7% _a	50	50.8% _b	44	53.8% _b	23	33.2% _a	19	41.7% _a	37	36.1% _a	24	44.8% _a	17
Fair	38.1%	62	23.7%	20	21.2%	9	31.2%	18	46.1%	41	30.9%	21	21.0%	8
Poor	29.6%	48	15.8%	14	24.0%	10	22.5%	13	12.2%	11	27.1%	18	34.2%	13
"Fair/Poor"	67.7% _a	111	39.4% _b	34	45.2% _b	19	53.7% _a	31	58.3% _a	52	58.0% _a	39	55.2% _a	21
Not sure	1.6% _a	3	9.8% _b	8	1.0% _{a,b}	0	13.1% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	5.9% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	10.4%	24	3.3%	7	0.0%	0	1.5%	1	5.5%	5	8.6%	25
Good	18.6%	42	15.7%	34	38.2%	4	23.7%	12	32.6%	28	11.1%	33
"Excellent/Good"	28.9% _a	66	19.0% _b	42	38.2% _{a,b}	4	25.3% _{a,b}	13	38.1% _a	33	19.7% _b	58
Fair	35.3%	81	46.3%	101	36.4%	3	42.6%	21	31.6%	27	43.6%	129
Poor	35.6%	82	33.2%	73	25.3%	2	31.7%	16	28.7%	25	36.0%	106
"Fair/Poor"	70.9% _a	162	79.5% _b	174	61.8% _{a,b}	6	74.3% _{a,b}	37	60.3% _a	52	79.6% _b	235
Not sure	0.2% _a	0	1.5% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.4% _a	0	1.6% _a	1	0.7% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	219	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	14.2%	17	0.0%	0	6.9%	5	5.0%	4	4.5%	3	4.5%	3
Good	11.7%	14	14.5%	9	27.4%	19	23.1%	18	11.5%	7	16.4%	9
"Excellent/Good"	25.9% _a	31	14.5% _a	9	34.3% _a	24	28.1% _a	22	15.9% _a	10	20.9% _a	12
Fair	61.3%	73	55.1%	33	18.0%	13	32.1%	26	29.6%	19	34.5%	19
Poor	12.7%	15	30.4%	18	47.7%	34	37.6%	30	53.3%	33	42.4%	24
"Fair/Poor"	74.1% _a	88	85.5% _a	52	65.7% _a	46	69.7% _a	55	82.9% _a	52	76.9% _a	43
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.2% _a	2	1.2% _a	1	2.2% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	71	100.0%	80	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	11.9%	24	3.1%	5	2.0%	2	5.6%	5	5.3%	5	0.6%	1	6.2%	6
Good	13.9%	28	19.3%	30	20.8%	18	11.0%	10	22.3%	21	9.8%	10	26.3%	27
"Excellent/Good"	25.8% _a	53	22.4% _a	35	22.8% _a	20	16.5% _{a,c,d}	15	27.6% _{a,b}	25	10.4% _c	11	32.4% _{b,d}	33
Fair	33.7%	69	41.8%	66	55.0%	48	31.7%	29	52.5%	48	42.3%	44	40.7%	41
Poor	40.5%	83	33.9%	53	21.2%	18	51.5%	48	18.6%	17	47.1%	49	24.8%	25
"Fair/Poor"	74.2% _a	151	75.7% _a	119	76.2% _a	66	83.2% _{a,b}	77	71.1% _{a,c}	65	89.4% _b	92	65.5% _c	66
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	1.8% _a	3	1.0% _a	1	0.3% _a	0	1.3% _a	1	0.2% _a	0	2.1% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	157	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Table 18 – Satisfaction with “Retaining existing businesses”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Retaining existing businesses	Excellent	113	9.5%
	Good	355	29.7%
	Fair	447	37.4%
	Poor	258	21.5%
	Not sure	24	2.0%
	TOTALS:	1198	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

What county do you live in?						
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Excellent	7.9%	37	11.9%	35	8.1%	36
Good	32.6%	151	29.9%	87	23.7%	106
"Excellent/Good"	40.6% _a	187	41.9% _a	121	31.7% _b	142
Fair	43.0%	199	35.4%	102	33.5%	150
Poor	14.2%	65	21.3%	62	33.0%	148
"Fair/Poor"	57.2% _a	264	56.6% _a	164	66.5% _b	298
Not sure	2.2% _a	10	1.5% _a	4	1.7% _a	8
TOTALS:	100.0%	461	100.0%	289	100.0%	447




Table 18 cont.— Satisfaction with “Retaining existing businesses”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	12.7%	31	2.6%	6	11.1%	13	2.9%	2	4.6%	4	6.3%	12
Good	28.8%	70	37.0%	81	38.4%	45	31.2%	18	28.7%	27	31.6%	58
"Excellent/Good"	41.5% _a	101	39.6% _a	86	49.5% _a	57	34.2% _a	19	33.3% _a	31	37.9% _a	70
Fair	43.5%	106	42.5%	93	40.9%	47	43.5%	25	42.7%	39	46.8%	87
Poor	12.5%	30	16.1%	35	5.3%	6	22.3%	13	22.5%	21	14.0%	26
"Fair/Poor"	56.0% _a	136	58.5% _a	128	46.2% _a	54	65.8% _{a,b}	37	65.1% _b	60	60.8% _{a,b}	113
Not sure	2.5% _a	6	1.9% _a	4	4.3% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	1.5% _a	1	1.3% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	243	100.0%	218	100.0%	116	100.0%	56	100.0%	92	100.0%	185

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	17.8%	24	3.6%	3	3.1%	2	3.5%	2	2.5%	1	7.4%	4
Good	30.9%	42	36.9%	31	38.7%	27	32.3%	23	33.2%	17	21.2%	10
"Excellent/Good"	48.6% _a	66	40.5% _a	34	41.8% _a	29	35.8% _a	25	35.7% _a	19	28.7% _a	14
Fair	36.7%	50	50.1%	43	38.5%	27	43.2%	30	43.5%	23	54.3%	26
Poor	11.0%	15	9.4%	8	18.9%	13	21.0%	15	16.5%	9	12.1%	6
"Fair/Poor"	47.7% _a	65	59.5% _a	51	57.3% _a	40	64.2% _a	45	60.0% _a	31	66.4% _a	32
Not sure	3.7% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	4.3% _a	2	4.9% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	135	100.0%	85	100.0%	70	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Excellent	7.8%	16	9.2%	15	5.9%	5	6.3%	6	14.7%	19	5.8%	5	3.9%
Good	30.2%	64	35.7%	60	32.6%	27	15.2%	13	44.5%	57	28.1%	25	31.3%
"Excellent/Good"	38.0% _a	80	44.9% _a	75	38.5% _a	32	21.6% _a	19	59.3% _b	76	33.9% _a	30	35.2% _a
Fair	47.7%	101	36.9%	62	43.4%	36	60.5%	53	37.7%	48	49.4%	43	42.1%
Poor	11.6%	25	16.7%	28	15.6%	13	13.0%	11	3.1%	4	15.8%	14	21.8%
"Fair/Poor"	59.3% _a	125	53.6% _a	89	59.0% _a	49	73.5% _a	64	40.7% _b	52	65.2% _a	57	63.9% _a
Not sure	2.7% _a	6	1.5% _a	3	2.5% _a	2	4.9% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	1	0.9% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	167	100.0%	83	100.0%	87	100.0%	128	100.0%	88	100.0%

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	10.6%	16	13.3%	19	19.2%	2	5.7%	1	19.2%	7	11.1%	24
Good	22.5%	33	37.7%	53	16.1%	2	29.6%	6	48.9%	17	28.0%	61
"Excellent/Good"	33.2% _a	49	51.0% _b	72	35.3% _{a,b}	4	35.3% _{a,b}	7	68.2% _a	24	39.2% _b	85
Fair	37.8%	56	32.8%	46	43.3%	5	55.2%	12	24.8%	9	33.7%	73
Poor	28.0%	42	14.2%	20	21.4%	2	7.0%	1	7.1%	3	25.4%	55
"Fair/Poor"	65.9% _a	97	47.0% _b	66	64.7% _{a,b}	7	62.2% _{a,b}	13	31.8% _a	11	59.1% _b	128
Not sure	1.0% _a	1	2.0% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	2.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	1.8% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	141	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	216

Table 18 cont.— Satisfaction with “Retaining existing businesses”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	15.7%	8	18.5%	8	17.2%	9	5.4%	3	6.6%	3	9.0%	4
Good	21.4%	11	24.9%	10	19.7%	10	34.2%	20	42.7%	19	38.9%	17
"Excellent/Good"	37.1% _a	20	43.3% _a	18	36.8% _a	19	39.7% _a	23	49.3% _a	21	47.9% _a	21
Fair	39.8%	21	35.8%	15	33.9%	17	36.2%	21	34.9%	15	30.5%	13
Poor	23.1%	12	20.9%	9	29.3%	15	21.0%	12	14.6%	6	16.9%	7
"Fair/Poor"	62.9% _a	33	56.7% _a	23	63.2% _a	32	57.3% _a	33	49.5% _a	21	47.4% _a	20
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.1% _a	2	1.2% _a	1	4.7% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	57	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	13.0%	21	11.1%	10	9.8%	4	2.9%	2	11.1%	10	16.6%	11	6.3%	2
Good	27.8%	45	29.5%	25	38.8%	16	38.6%	21	23.3%	21	30.8%	21	37.1%	14
"Excellent/Good"	40.8% _a	66	40.5% _a	35	48.6% _a	21	41.5% _a	23	34.4% _a	30	47.4% _a	32	43.4% _a	17
Fair	28.0%	45	49.2%	42	35.3%	15	36.6%	20	42.9%	38	31.0%	21	36.2%	14
Poor	28.7%	46	10.3%	9	15.4%	7	18.1%	10	22.7%	20	20.8%	14	19.6%	8
"Fair/Poor"	56.7% _a	91	59.5% _a	51	50.7% _a	21	54.7% _a	30	65.6% _a	58	51.8% _a	35	55.8% _a	21
Not sure	2.5% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _a	0	3.7% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.8% _a	1	0.8% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	161	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	54	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	11.1%	25	4.9%	11	0.0%	0	5.2%	3	7.3%	6	9.2%	27
Good	18.8%	43	28.8%	63	71.9%	7	21.8%	11	33.7%	29	19.9%	59
"Excellent/Good"	29.8% _a	68	33.7% _a	74	71.9% _a	7	26.9% _{a,b}	13	41.0% _{a,b}	36	29.0% _b	86
Fair	31.1%	71	36.0%	79	19.8%	2	44.3%	22	27.9%	24	34.0%	101
Poor	37.5%	86	28.4%	62	8.3%	1	25.6%	13	30.9%	27	34.9%	103
"Fair/Poor"	68.6% _a	157	64.4% _a	141	28.1% _a	3	69.9% _a	35	58.7% _a	51	68.9% _a	204
Not sure	1.6% _a	4	1.9% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	3.2% _a	2	0.3% _a	0	2.0% _a	6
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	219	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	14.2%	17	3.8%	2	10.2%	7	3.7%	3	6.5%	4	4.8%	3
Good	27.6%	33	50.8%	31	17.3%	12	19.6%	16	11.1%	7	13.8%	8
"Excellent/Good"	41.8% _{a,b}	49	54.6% _a	33	27.6% _{b,d}	19	23.3% _{b,c,d}	19	17.6% _d	11	18.6% _{d,e}	10
Fair	41.8%	49	13.5%	8	28.0%	20	41.3%	33	33.3%	21	34.0%	19
Poor	16.5%	20	30.1%	18	44.4%	31	35.4%	28	47.9%	30	36.7%	20
"Fair/Poor"	58.2% _{a,b}	69	43.6% _a	26	72.4% _{b,d}	51	76.7% _{b,c,d}	61	81.2% _d	51	70.8% _{b,d,e}	39
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	1.8% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.2% _a	1	10.6% _a	6
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	71	100.0%	80	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	14.0%	29	3.6%	6	2.2%	2	11.1%	10	5.2%	5	0.6%	1	6.2%	6
Good	18.3%	37	32.1%	50	20.9%	18	20.0%	18	29.8%	27	10.7%	11	30.6%	31
"Excellent/Good"	32.4% _a	66	35.7% _a	56	23.1% _a	20	31.0% _a	29	35.0% _a	32	11.3% _b	12	36.8% _a	37
Fair	32.9%	67	27.0%	42	46.5%	41	38.8%	36	37.3%	34	36.1%	37	31.7%	32
Poor	32.2%	65	35.8%	56	29.9%	26	25.2%	23	26.5%	24	52.4%	54	31.3%	32
"Fair/Poor"	65.1% _a	133	62.9% _a	98	76.4% _a	67	64.0% _a	59	63.7% _a	59	88.5% _b	91	63.0% _a	64
Not sure	2.5% _a	5	1.4% _a	2	0.5% _a	0	5.0% _a	5	1.2% _a	1	0.2% _a	0	0.2% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	157	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Table 19 – Satisfaction with “Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities	Excellent	124	10.3%
	Good	304	25.3%
	Fair	450	37.4%
	Poor	262	21.8%
	Not sure	61	5.1%
	TOTALS:	1201	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

What county do you live in?						
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Excellent	11.1%	51	10.6%	31	6.8%	31
Good	29.0%	134	30.1%	88	18.8%	84
"Excellent/Good"	40.1% _a	185	40.7% _a	119	25.6% _b	115
Fair	36.7%	170	32.5%	95	41.6%	186
Poor	18.7%	87	22.2%	65	27.0%	121
"Fair/Poor"	55.4% _a	256	54.7% _a	160	68.6% _b	307
Not sure	4.5% _a	21	4.6% _a	13	5.8% _a	26
TOTALS:	100.0%	462	100.0%	292	100.0%	447




Table 19 cont.— Satisfaction with “Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	11.7%	28	10.5%	23	7.4%	8	9.8%	6	6.9%	6	12.8%	24
Good	30.6%	74	27.2%	60	37.8%	43	22.1%	13	27.1%	25	27.0%	50
"Excellent/Good"	42.2% _a	103	37.7% _a	82	45.2% _a	52	31.9% _a	18	34.1% _a	31	39.8% _a	74
Fair	38.9%	95	34.2%	75	38.5%	44	41.4%	24	30.6%	28	39.1%	73
Poor	14.6%	36	23.3%	51	6.9%	8	23.1%	13	33.7%	31	18.4%	34
"Fair/Poor"	53.5% _a	130	57.6% _a	126	45.4% _a	52	64.5% _{a,b}	37	64.4% _b	59	57.5% _{a,b}	107
Not sure	4.3% _a	10	4.7% _a	10	9.4% _a	11	3.6% _a	2	1.5% _a	1	2.7% _a	5
TOTALS:	100.0%	244	100.0%	219	100.0%	115	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	21.4%	29	3.6%	3	4.9%	4	13.6%	10	4.9%	3	7.5%	4
Good	24.8%	34	30.6%	26	36.5%	26	25.5%	18	35.6%	19	24.9%	12
"Excellent/Good"	46.2% _a	63	34.2% _a	29	41.5% _a	29	39.0% _a	27	40.5% _a	21	32.5% _a	16
Fair	37.5%	51	37.8%	32	31.9%	23	34.0%	24	39.1%	20	40.9%	20
Poor	9.9%	13	26.6%	23	22.5%	16	24.6%	17	16.2%	8	18.6%	9
"Fair/Poor"	47.4% _a	64	64.3% _a	55	54.3% _a	39	58.6% _a	41	55.3% _a	29	59.5% _a	29
Not sure	6.4% _a	9	1.5% _a	1	4.2% _a	3	2.4% _a	2	4.2% _a	2	8.1% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	136	100.0%	85	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Excellent	11.4%	24	11.3%	19	9.8%	8	9.5%	8	15.6%	20	9.4%	8	8.9%
Good	26.5%	56	30.0%	50	33.2%	28	14.7%	13	35.3%	46	28.4%	25	31.1%
"Excellent/Good"	38.0% _a	80	41.3% _a	69	43.0% _a	36	24.3% _a	21	50.9% _b	66	37.7% _{a,b}	33	40.0% _{a,b}
Fair	40.5%	85	32.3%	54	35.8%	30	44.1%	39	37.7%	49	37.7%	33	32.0%
Poor	17.3%	37	21.5%	36	16.8%	14	23.2%	20	9.6%	12	22.4%	20	22.2%
"Fair/Poor"	57.8% _a	122	53.8% _a	90	52.7% _a	44	67.3% _a	59	47.3% _b	61	60.1% _{a,b}	53	54.2% _{a,b}
Not sure	4.2% _a	9	4.9% _a	8	4.3% _a	4	8.4% _a	7	1.8% _a	2	2.2% _a	2	5.8% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	167	100.0%	84	100.0%	87	100.0%	130	100.0%	88	100.0%

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	5.5%	8	15.9%	23	19.2%	2	22.2%	5	14.4%	5	8.4%	18
Good	26.6%	39	33.6%	48	12.8%	1	35.6%	8	27.0%	10	31.3%	69
"Excellent/Good"	32.1% _a	48	49.5% _b	71	32.0% _a	4	57.8% _a	12	41.4% _a	15	39.7% _a	87
Fair	37.8%	56	26.9%	39	51.7%	6	17.6%	4	40.6%	14	30.8%	67
Poor	25.9%	38	18.4%	27	16.3%	2	22.1%	5	5.7%	2	25.6%	56
"Fair/Poor"	63.8% _a	94	45.4% _b	65	68.0% _a	8	39.7% _a	8	46.3% _a	16	56.4% _a	123
Not sure	4.1% _a	6	5.1% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	2.5% _a	1	12.3% _a	4	3.9% _a	9
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

Table 19 cont.— Satisfaction with “Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	12.6%	7	23.1%	9	12.1%	6	5.9%	4	6.3%	3	5.6%	2
Good	10.6%	6	17.0%	7	42.2%	22	33.9%	20	38.7%	17	38.1%	16
"Excellent/Good"	23.2% _a	12	40.1% _{a,b}	16	54.2% _b	28	39.8% _{a,b}	24	45.0% _{a,b}	20	43.7% _{a,b}	19
Fair	36.0%	19	45.5%	19	24.4%	13	27.5%	17	34.9%	15	29.8%	13
Poor	40.8%	22	14.4%	6	20.4%	10	24.5%	15	14.1%	6	14.0%	6
"Fair/Poor"	76.8% _a	41	59.9% _{a,b}	25	44.8% _b	23	52.0% _{a,b}	31	49.0% _{a,b}	21	43.9% _{b,c}	19
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	0	8.2% _a	5	6.1% _a	3	12.4% _a	5
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College	4+ Year Degree	Up to \$25,000	\$25,001- \$50,000	\$50,001- \$75,000	Over \$75,000							
Excellent	9.1%	15	16.1%	14	5.4%	2	8.5%	5	10.8%	10	13.5%	9	5.2%	2
Good	30.4%	50	24.0%	21	41.3%	17	23.4%	13	32.6%	29	40.2%	27	28.9%	11
"Excellent/Good"	39.4% _a	64	40.1% _a	35	46.6% _a	20	31.8% _a	18	43.4% _a	38	53.7% _a	36	34.1% _a	13
Fair	25.1%	41	41.1%	35	43.4%	18	26.7%	15	24.9%	22	29.1%	19	43.4%	17
Poor	28.4%	46	16.7%	14	9.9%	4	34.1%	19	28.9%	26	14.3%	10	18.7%	7
"Fair/Poor"	53.4% _a	87	57.8% _a	50	53.4% _a	23	60.7% _a	35	53.8% _a	48	43.4% _a	29	62.0% _a	24
Not sure	7.1% _a	12	2.1% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	7.4% _a	4	2.9% _a	3	2.9% _a	2	3.8% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	9.9%	23	3.6%	8	0.0%	0	1.8%	1	5.8%	5	8.3%	25
Good	19.3%	44	18.3%	40	17.6%	2	28.7%	14	8.6%	8	19.9%	59
"Excellent/Good"	29.2% _a	67	21.8% _a	48	17.6% _a	2	30.5% _a	15	14.5% _a	13	28.2% _a	83
Fair	37.8%	87	45.5%	99	73.4%	7	35.3%	18	44.7%	39	41.1%	121
Poor	29.5%	68	24.4%	53	9.0%	1	27.9%	14	36.7%	32	24.3%	72
"Fair/Poor"	67.3% _a	154	69.9% _a	153	82.4% _{a,b}	8	63.2% _{a,b}	31	81.3% _a	71	65.4% _b	193
Not sure	3.4% _a	8	8.2% _b	18	0.0% ¹	0	6.3% _a	3	4.2% _a	4	6.5% _a	19
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	219	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	16.0%	19	5.6%	3	2.4%	2	3.4%	3	2.0%	1	4.6%	3
Good	15.5%	18	23.9%	15	18.4%	13	20.6%	16	14.3%	9	23.2%	13
"Excellent/Good"	31.5% _a	37	29.5% _a	18	20.8% _a	15	24.0% _a	19	16.3% _a	10	27.8% _a	15
Fair	50.5%	60	56.7%	34	43.7%	31	40.3%	32	29.4%	18	18.7%	10
Poor	15.1%	18	11.9%	7	32.2%	23	28.5%	23	43.3%	27	42.1%	23
"Fair/Poor"	65.6% _a	78	68.6% _a	42	75.9% _a	54	68.8% _a	55	72.8% _a	45	60.8% _a	34
Not sure	2.9% _a	3	1.8% _a	1	3.4% _a	2	7.1% _a	6	11.0% _a	7	11.4% _a	6
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	71	100.0%	80	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College	4+ Year Degree	Up to \$25,000	\$25,001- \$50,000	\$50,001- \$75,000	Over \$75,000							
Excellent	10.6%	22	4.4%	7	2.3%	2	8.5%	8	5.9%	5	0.5%	0	3.3%	3
Good	15.7%	32	24.8%	39	15.2%	13	11.9%	11	21.7%	20	26.7%	28	20.0%	20
"Excellent/Good"	26.3% _a	54	29.3% _a	46	17.5% _a	15	20.4% _a	19	27.6% _a	25	27.2% _a	28	23.3% _a	23
Fair	35.2%	72	41.8%	66	55.8%	49	35.8%	33	44.8%	41	41.7%	43	52.7%	53
Poor	30.8%	63	25.7%	40	20.6%	18	32.8%	30	24.3%	22	27.4%	28	20.1%	20
"Fair/Poor"	66.1% _a	134	67.5% _a	106	76.4% _a	67	68.6% _a	63	69.0% _a	64	69.1% _a	71	72.8% _a	74
Not sure	7.6% _a	15	3.2% _a	5	6.1% _a	5	11.0% _a	10	3.3% _a	3	3.8% _a	4	3.9% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	157	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Table 20 – Satisfaction with “Revitalizing Manufacturing”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Revitalizing Manufacturing	Excellent	84	7.0%
	Good	258	21.5%
	Fair	384	32.0%
	Poor	421	35.1%
	Not sure	53	4.4%
	TOTALS:	1199	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

What county do you live in?						
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Excellent	8.4%	38	5.0%	15	5.7%	26
Good	21.1%	97	24.5%	72	15.7%	70
"Excellent/Good"	29.4% _a	136	29.5% _a	86	21.4% _b	96
Fair	35.2%	162	36.1%	105	28.8%	129
Poor	30.6%	141	28.9%	84	44.5%	199
"Fair/Poor"	65.8% _a	303	65.0% _a	190	73.3% _b	328
Not sure	4.8% _a	22	5.4% _a	16	5.3% _a	24
TOTALS:	100.0%	461	100.0%	292	100.0%	447




Table 20 cont.— Satisfaction with “Revitalizing Manufacturing”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	11.6%	28	4.8%	10	8.1%	9	6.2%	4	4.6%	4	8.3%	15
Good	25.2%	61	16.4%	36	29.5%	33	16.7%	10	10.6%	10	23.3%	43
"Excellent/Good"	36.7% _a	89	21.2% _b	46	37.6% _a	43	22.9% _{a,b}	13	15.3% _b	14	31.5% _a	59
Fair	32.2%	79	38.6%	84	36.0%	41	27.0%	15	48.9%	45	31.7%	59
Poor	26.8%	65	34.8%	75	17.3%	20	45.5%	26	31.2%	29	35.0%	65
"Fair/Poor"	59.1% _a	144	73.3% _b	159	53.3% _a	60	72.5% _{a,b}	41	80.1% _b	74	66.7% _{a,b}	124
Not sure	4.2% _a	10	5.5% _a	12	9.1% _a	10	4.6% _{a,b}	3	4.6% _{a,b}	4	1.8% _b	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	244	100.0%	217	100.0%	113	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	15.9%	21	2.3%	2	6.9%	5	5.7%	4	2.5%	1	10.2%	5
Good	30.5%	41	21.9%	19	17.5%	12	13.5%	9	14.3%	7	16.7%	8
"Excellent/Good"	46.4% _a	62	24.2% _b	21	24.4% _b	17	19.2% _b	13	16.8% _b	9	26.9% _{a,b}	13
Fair	26.0%	35	45.4%	39	41.2%	29	28.7%	20	44.0%	23	34.4%	17
Poor	20.1%	27	26.8%	23	29.3%	21	52.1%	37	33.9%	18	33.3%	16
"Fair/Poor"	46.0% _a	62	72.2% _b	61	70.6% _b	50	80.8% _b	57	77.9% _b	40	67.6% _{a,b}	33
Not sure	7.5% _a	10	3.6% _a	3	5.0% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	5.3% _a	3	5.4% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	134	100.0%	85	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	9.2%	19	7.7%	13	7.6%	6	5.6%	5	15.5%	20	6.4%	6	3.9%	4
Good	21.5%	45	22.0%	36	18.2%	15	26.8%	23	21.1%	27	16.1%	14	14.5%	14
"Excellent/Good"	30.7% _a	65	29.7% _a	49	25.8% _a	22	32.4% _{a,b}	28	36.5% _a	47	22.5% _{a,b}	20	18.4% _b	18
Fair	40.3%	85	30.3%	50	32.2%	27	39.9%	35	34.7%	45	41.4%	36	33.6%	33
Poor	24.6%	52	35.1%	58	36.6%	31	17.9%	16	25.2%	32	35.3%	31	43.4%	43
"Fair/Poor"	64.9% _a	137	65.4% _a	108	68.8% _a	58	57.8% _a	51	59.9% _{a,b}	77	76.7% _{b,c}	68	76.9% _c	76
Not sure	4.4% _a	9	4.9% _a	8	5.5% _a	5	9.8% _a	9	3.6% _{a,b}	5	0.8% _b	1	4.6% _{a,b}	5
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	166	100.0%	84	100.0%	87	100.0%	128	100.0%	88	100.0%	99

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	3.8%	6	6.3%	9	0.0%	0	9.1%	2	5.7%	2	4.9%	11
Good	20.0%	30	29.1%	42	25.2%	3	30.0%	6	55.1%	20	19.0%	42
"Excellent/Good"	23.8% _a	35	35.4% _b	51	25.2% _{a,b}	3	39.1% _{a,b}	8	60.9% _a	22	23.9% _b	52
Fair	41.2%	61	30.8%	44	47.7%	6	18.1%	4	26.4%	9	38.1%	83
Poor	29.8%	44	28.0%	40	27.1%	3	40.4%	9	11.3%	4	31.3%	69
"Fair/Poor"	71.1% _a	105	58.8% _b	85	74.8% _{a,b}	9	58.4% _{a,b}	12	37.6% _a	13	69.3% _b	152
Not sure	5.1% _a	8	5.8% _a	8	0.0% ¹	0	2.5% _a	1	1.5% _a	1	6.8% _a	15
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

Table 20 cont.— Satisfaction with “Revitalizing Manufacturing”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	0.0%	0	3.5%	1	12.1%	6	5.3%	3	2.2%	1	6.8%	3
Good	16.8%	9	19.2%	8	30.4%	16	21.9%	13	33.4%	15	26.5%	11
"Excellent/Good"	16.8% _a	9	22.8% _a	9	42.5% _a	22	27.2% _a	16	35.6% _a	15	33.4% _a	14
Fair	60.2%	32	44.1%	18	27.3%	14	23.8%	14	30.8%	13	31.7%	14
Poor	11.5%	6	29.4%	12	29.2%	15	46.0%	28	26.4%	11	28.1%	12
"Fair/Poor"	71.7% _a	38	73.5% _a	30	56.5% _a	29	69.8% _a	42	57.3% _a	25	59.8% _a	26
Not sure	11.5% _a	6	3.7% _a	2	1.0% _a	1	2.9% _a	2	7.1% _a	3	6.8% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	6.5%	11	3.5%	3	2.3%	1	2.2%	1	4.6%	4	9.2%	6	1.2%	0
Good	23.8%	39	28.4%	24	19.3%	8	29.5%	17	20.7%	18	25.8%	17	23.2%	9
"Excellent/Good"	30.3% _a	50	32.0% _a	28	21.6% _a	9	31.6% _a	18	25.3% _a	22	35.0% _a	23	24.4% _a	9
Fair	28.3%	46	52.2%	45	33.5%	14	27.0%	15	49.0%	43	36.6%	24	31.2%	12
Poor	33.3%	54	15.4%	13	39.4%	17	36.9%	21	23.4%	21	27.0%	18	38.3%	15
"Fair/Poor"	61.6% _a	101	67.6% _a	58	72.9% _a	31	63.9% _a	37	72.4% _a	64	63.6% _a	43	69.5% _a	27
Not sure	8.1% _a	13	0.4% _b	0	5.5% _{a,b}	2	4.5% _a	3	2.3% _a	2	1.4% _a	1	6.1% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	8.4%	19	2.9%	6	0.0%	0	4.6%	2	5.0%	4	6.4%	19
Good	15.5%	35	15.9%	35	2.8%	0	20.9%	10	12.2%	11	16.0%	47
"Excellent/Good"	23.9% _a	55	18.8% _a	41	2.8% _a	0	25.5% _a	13	17.2% _a	15	22.4% _a	66
Fair	20.7%	47	37.3%	82	33.6%	3	49.4%	25	46.5%	40	20.6%	61
Poor	53.2%	122	35.4%	77	60.7%	6	22.4%	11	34.7%	30	50.0%	148
"Fair/Poor"	73.9% _a	169	72.8% _a	159	94.3% _a	9	71.8% _a	36	81.2% _a	71	70.6% _a	209
Not sure	2.2% _a	5	8.5% _b	18	2.9% _a	0	2.8% _a	1	1.6% _a	1	7.0% _a	21
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	219	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	14.2%	17	0.0%	0	2.8%	2	2.5%	2	5.4%	3	2.5%	1
Good	15.9%	19	21.1%	13	15.0%	11	12.2%	10	10.9%	7	20.5%	11
"Excellent/Good"	30.1% _a	36	21.1% _a	13	17.8% _a	13	14.7% _a	12	16.3% _a	10	23.0% _a	13
Fair	26.8%	32	42.8%	26	30.9%	22	33.0%	26	17.4%	11	22.1%	12
Poor	29.9%	35	29.0%	18	51.3%	36	51.1%	41	65.3%	41	51.2%	29
"Fair/Poor"	56.7% _a	67	71.8% _{a,b}	44	82.2% _b	58	84.1% _{b,c}	67	82.7% _{b,d}	52	73.2% _{a,b}	41
Not sure	13.2% _a	16	7.1% _{a,b}	4	0.0% ¹	0	1.2% _b	1	1.0% _{a,b}	1	3.8% _{a,b}	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	71	100.0%	80	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	10.3%	21	2.4%	4	1.2%	1	11.4%	10	0.9%	1	0.3%	0	1.5%	2
Good	15.5%	32	20.5%	32	7.2%	6	6.3%	6	23.1%	21	17.5%	18	14.0%	14
"Excellent/Good"	25.8% _a	53	22.9% _a	36	8.3% _b	7	17.7% _a	16	24.0% _a	22	17.7% _a	18	15.5% _a	16
Fair	23.0%	47	34.4%	54	32.3%	28	29.4%	27	32.7%	30	28.7%	30	37.5%	38
Poor	44.7%	91	38.9%	61	54.0%	47	37.6%	35	39.8%	37	52.9%	55	45.6%	46
"Fair/Poor"	67.7% _a	138	73.4% _{a,b}	115	86.3% _b	75	67.0% _a	62	72.5% _a	67	81.7% _a	84	83.0% _a	84
Not sure	6.5% _a	13	3.7% _a	6	5.3% _a	5	15.3% _a	14	3.5% _b	3	0.6% _b	1	1.5% _b	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	157	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Table 21 – Satisfaction with “Expanding Activities and Attractions for more Tourism”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Expanding activities and attractions for more tourism	Excellent	107	9.0%
	Good	380	31.7%
	Fair	373	31.1%
	Poor	306	25.6%
	Not sure	31	2.6%
	TOTALS:	1197	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	Year					
	2013		2015		2017	
Excellent	9.8%	67	-	-	9.0%	107
Good	32.4%	220	-	-	31.7%	380
"Excellent/Good"	42.2% _a	287	-	-	40.7% _a	487
Fair	32.1%	218	-	-	31.1%	373
Poor	23.3%	158	-	-	25.6%	306
"Fair/Poor"	55.4% _a	376	-	-	56.7% _a	679
Not sure	2.4% _a	16	-	-	2.6% _a	31
TOTALS:	100.0%	679	-	-	100.0%	1197




Table 21 cont.— Satisfaction with “Expanding Activities and Attractions for more Tourism”

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Excellent	10.3%	47	4.8%	14	7.5%	33
Good	34.7%	160	39.4%	114	26.7%	119
"Excellent/Good"	45.0% _a	207	44.3% _a	128	34.2% _b	153
Fair	35.4%	163	31.1%	90	28.3%	126
Poor	17.4%	80	20.2%	59	36.0%	161
"Fair/Poor"	52.7% _a	243	51.3% _a	149	64.3% _b	287
Not sure	2.3% _a	11	4.5% _a	13	1.6% _a	7
TOTALS:	100.0%	461	100.0%	290	100.0%	447

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
	2013	2017	2013	2017	2013	2017
Excellent	10.3%	10.3%	8.1%	4.8%	-	7.5%
Good	31.2%	34.7%	37.4%	39.4%	-	26.7%
"Excellent/Good"	41.5% _a	45.0% _a	45.5% _a	44.3% _a	-	34.2% ¹
Fair	32.7%	35.4%	29.8%	31.1%	-	28.3%
Poor	23.6%	17.4%	22.1%	20.2%	-	36.0%
"Fair/Poor"	56.2% _a	52.7% _a	51.9% _a	51.3% _a	-	64.3% ¹
Not sure	2.3% _a	2.3% _a	2.6% _a	4.5% _a	-	1.6% ¹
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%




Table 21 cont.— Satisfaction with “Expanding Activities and Attractions for more Tourism”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	13.5%	32	6.8%	15	11.9%	13	5.2%	3	6.5%	6	10.1%	19
Good	32.3%	78	37.3%	82	31.9%	36	34.3%	20	26.3%	24	41.2%	77
"Excellent/Good"	45.8% _a	110	44.1% _a	97	43.8% _{a,b}	50	39.5% _{a,b}	22	32.8% _a	30	51.3% _b	96
Fair	30.1%	73	41.2%	91	31.5%	36	32.9%	19	50.8%	47	32.5%	61
Poor	21.4%	52	12.9%	28	20.7%	24	25.2%	14	15.6%	14	14.8%	28
"Fair/Poor"	51.5% _a	124	54.1% _a	119	52.2% _{a,b}	59	58.1% _{a,b}	33	66.4% _a	61	47.4% _b	88
Not sure	2.8% _a	7	1.8% _a	4	4.0% _a	5	2.4% _a	1	0.8% _a	1	1.4% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	241	100.0%	220	100.0%	113	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	18.3%	25	7.8%	7	7.3%	5	2.5%	2	7.2%	4	11.2%	5
Good	31.6%	42	26.9%	23	34.1%	24	42.0%	29	41.1%	21	40.4%	20
"Excellent/Good"	49.9% _a	67	34.7% _a	29	41.4% _a	29	44.5% _a	31	48.3% _a	25	51.6% _a	25
Fair	29.7%	40	46.0%	39	36.4%	26	36.5%	26	33.0%	17	31.9%	16
Poor	17.1%	23	19.2%	16	19.4%	14	18.1%	13	17.0%	9	11.1%	5
"Fair/Poor"	46.8% _a	63	65.3% _a	55	55.8% _a	40	54.7% _a	38	49.9% _a	26	43.0% _a	21
Not sure	3.4% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	2.8% _a	2	0.9% _a	1	1.7% _a	1	5.4% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	134	100.0%	85	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Excellent	12.6%	26	8.7%	15	7.5%	6	7.9%	7	17.1%	22	10.4%	9	4.3%
Good	29.4%	61	36.1%	61	45.0%	38	25.1%	22	37.4%	48	37.5%	33	35.9%
"Excellent/Good"	42.0% _a	88	44.9% _a	76	52.5% _a	44	33.1% _a	29	54.5% _b	69	47.9% _{a,b}	42	40.2% _{a,b}
Fair	39.7%	83	32.6%	55	30.2%	25	44.7%	39	25.5%	32	35.8%	32	42.4%
Poor	15.7%	33	21.5%	36	13.2%	11	17.1%	15	18.0%	23	15.7%	14	16.4%
"Fair/Poor"	55.4% _a	116	54.1% _a	91	43.4% _a	36	61.8% _a	54	43.5% _a	55	51.6% _a	45	58.8% _a
Not sure	2.6% _a	5	1.0% _a	2	4.2% _a	4	5.2% _a	5	1.9% _a	2	0.5% _a	0	1.1% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	209	100.0%	168	100.0%	84	100.0%	87	100.0%	127	100.0%	88	100.0%

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	1.7%	2	8.0%	11	0.0%	0	13.9%	3	4.8%	2	4.2%	9
Good	41.8%	61	37.1%	53	28.4%	3	44.5%	9	50.5%	17	38.5%	84
"Excellent/Good"	43.5% _a	63	45.0% _a	65	28.4% _a	3	58.4% _a	12	55.3% _a	18	42.7% _a	94
Fair	36.6%	53	25.5%	37	31.0%	4	17.6%	4	14.2%	5	34.1%	75
Poor	14.3%	21	26.2%	38	40.6%	5	21.5%	5	27.6%	9	18.0%	39
"Fair/Poor"	50.8% _a	74	51.7% _a	74	71.6% _a	8	39.2% _a	8	41.8% _a	14	52.0% _a	114
Not sure	5.7% _a	8	3.2% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	2.5% _a	1	2.9% _a	1	5.2% _a	11
TOTALS:	100.0%	146	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	33	100.0%	219

Table 21 cont.— Satisfaction with “Expanding Activities and Attractions for more Tourism”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	0.0%	0	6.5%	3	9.7%	5	3.8%	2	6.3%	3	3.5%	2
Good	35.0%	19	15.4%	6	39.2%	19	43.8%	26	55.0%	24	46.2%	20
"Excellent/Good"	35.0% _{a,b}	19	21.9% _a	9	49.0% _{a,b}	24	47.6% _{a,b}	29	61.4% _b	27	49.7% _{a,b}	21
Fair	47.3%	25	33.4%	14	26.4%	13	25.2%	15	22.8%	10	30.7%	13
Poor	17.8%	9	44.8%	18	16.5%	8	17.2%	10	14.6%	6	14.0%	6
"Fair/Poor"	65.0% _{a,b}	34	78.1% _a	32	42.8% _b	21	42.5% _{b,c}	26	37.4% _{b,d}	16	44.7% _{b,e}	19
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	8.2% _a	4	9.9% _a	6	1.2% _a	1	5.6% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	49	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	4.1%	7	4.0%	3	9.3%	4	0.9%	1	7.3%	6	1.5%	1	13.4%	5
Good	43.1%	70	29.3%	25	46.3%	19	35.8%	20	23.1%	20	54.7%	37	34.9%	13
"Excellent/Good"	47.2% _a	77	33.4% _a	29	55.6% _a	22	36.7% _{a,b}	21	30.4% _a	27	56.2% _b	38	48.2% _{a,b}	18
Fair	29.1%	48	38.4%	33	23.2%	9	34.9%	20	46.9%	42	28.6%	19	15.4%	6
Poor	17.0%	28	26.1%	23	20.5%	8	17.8%	10	22.7%	20	13.8%	9	35.6%	13
"Fair/Poor"	46.2% _a	75	64.5% _b	56	43.6% _{a,b}	18	52.7% _{a,b}	30	69.6% _a	62	42.4% _b	28	51.0% _{a,b}	19
Not sure	6.6% _a	11	2.1% _a	2	0.7% _a	0	10.6% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0	1.4% _a	1	0.8% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	40	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	36

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	11.4%	26	3.4%	7	0.0%	0	5.7%	3	6.7%	6	8.4%	25
Good	24.2%	55	29.3%	64	21.7%	2	28.9%	14	19.7%	17	28.3%	83
"Excellent/Good"	35.6% _a	81	32.7% _a	71	21.7% _a	2	34.6% _a	17	26.5% _a	23	36.7% _a	108
Fair	29.8%	68	26.7%	58	20.2%	2	40.3%	20	18.2%	16	28.8%	85
Poor	32.7%	75	39.5%	86	58.1%	5	24.7%	12	54.6%	47	32.5%	96
"Fair/Poor"	62.5% _a	143	66.2% _a	145	78.3% _a	7	65.0% _a	32	72.8% _a	63	61.2% _a	181
Not sure	1.9% _a	4	1.2% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.4% _a	0	0.7% _a	1	2.1% _a	6
TOTALS:	100.0%	228	100.0%	219	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	14.2%	17	0.0%	0	7.3%	5	4.9%	4	5.5%	3	7.3%	4
Good	33.0%	39	13.4%	8	25.0%	18	41.7%	33	14.6%	9	22.3%	12
"Excellent/Good"	47.2% _a	56	13.4% _b	8	32.3% _{a,b}	23	46.6% _a	37	20.2% _b	13	29.6% _{a,b}	16
Fair	24.3%	29	33.9%	21	27.2%	19	26.5%	21	36.9%	23	24.5%	14
Poor	28.5%	34	49.6%	30	40.5%	29	25.6%	20	41.7%	26	39.9%	22
"Fair/Poor"	52.8% _a	63	83.4% _b	51	67.7% _{a,b}	48	52.2% _a	41	78.6% _b	49	64.4% _{a,b}	36
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	3.2% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	1.2% _a	1	1.2% _a	1	6.0% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	71	100.0%	79	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	12.1%	25	4.6%	7	1.7%	1	8.0%	7	2.8%	3	4.3%	4	3.9%	4
Good	30.0%	61	22.7%	35	26.2%	23	29.1%	27	23.7%	22	32.0%	33	27.5%	28
"Excellent/Good"	42.1% _a	86	27.3% _b	43	27.9% _{a,b}	24	37.1% _a	34	26.5% _a	24	36.2% _a	37	31.4% _a	32
Fair	20.7%	42	34.1%	53	35.6%	31	11.0%	10	31.2%	29	37.0%	38	28.9%	29
Poor	35.4%	72	38.0%	59	33.9%	30	49.5%	46	41.8%	38	25.7%	27	37.5%	38
"Fair/Poor"	56.0% _a	114	72.1% _b	113	69.4% _{a,b}	61	60.5% _a	56	72.9% _a	67	62.7% _a	65	66.5% _a	67
Not sure	1.9% _a	4	0.6% _a	1	2.7% _a	2	2.4% _a	2	0.6% _a	1	1.1% _a	1	2.1% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	156	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Table 22 – Satisfaction with “Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally	Excellent	117	9.7%
	Good	202	16.9%
	Fair	382	31.8%
	Poor	438	36.5%
	Not sure	61	5.1%
	TOTALS:	1200	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	Year					
	2013		2015		2017	
Excellent	7.9%	54	7.7%	100	9.7%	117
Good	23.8%	162	18.8%	245	16.9%	202
"Excellent/Good"	31.8% _a	216	26.5% _b	345	26.6% _{a,b}	319
Fair	27.2%	185	26.1%	339	31.8%	382
Poor	35.1%	239	41.5%	540	36.5%	438
"Fair/Poor"	62.3% _a	424	67.6% _{a,b}	879	68.3% _b	820
Not sure	5.9% _a	40	5.9% _a	77	5.1% _a	61
TOTALS:	100.0%	680	100.0%	1301	100.0%	1200




Table 22 cont.— Satisfaction with “Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally”

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Excellent	11.1%	51	6.2%	18	7.6%	34
Good	16.7%	77	19.0%	55	12.1%	54
"Excellent/Good"	27.8% _a	128	25.1% _{a,b}	73	19.7% _b	88
Fair	32.9%	152	36.1%	105	30.7%	137
Poor	32.3%	149	35.8%	104	46.4%	207
"Fair/Poor"	65.2% _a	301	71.9% _{a,b}	209	77.1% _b	344
Not sure	7.0% _a	33	3.0% _{a,b}	9	3.3% _b	15
TOTALS:	100.0%	462	100.0%	291	100.0%	447

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson			Lewis			St. Lawrence	
	2013	2015	2017	2013	2015	2017	2015	2017
Excellent	7.1%	10.4%	11.1%	11.4%	8.8%	6.2%	4.7%	7.6%
Good	25.8%	22.9%	16.7%	15.4%	19.1%	19.0%	14.6%	12.1%
"Excellent/Good"	33.0% _a	33.3% _a	27.8% _a	26.8% _a	28.0% _a	25.1% _a	19.3% _a	19.7% _a
Fair	27.5%	24.5%	32.9%	26.1%	29.8%	36.1%	26.8%	30.7%
Poor	33.0%	35.9%	32.3%	44.2%	40.1%	35.8%	47.5%	46.4%
"Fair/Poor"	60.4% _a	60.4% _a	65.2% _a	70.3% _a	69.9% _a	71.9% _a	74.3% _a	77.1% _a
Not sure	6.6% _a	6.3% _a	7.0% _a	2.9% _a	2.1% _a	3.0% _a	6.4% _a	3.3% _b
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 22 cont.— Satisfaction with “Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	12.8%	31	9.2%	20	9.7%	11	7.9%	5	6.9%	6	12.4%	23
Good	17.6%	43	15.6%	34	22.3%	26	9.5%	5	8.6%	8	19.1%	36
"Excellent/Good"	30.5% _a	74	24.8% _a	54	32.0% _a	37	17.5% _{a,b}	10	15.4% _b	14	31.5% _a	59
Fair	31.7%	77	34.3%	75	33.2%	38	39.5%	22	31.3%	29	32.8%	61
Poor	29.2%	71	35.7%	78	17.8%	20	37.8%	22	48.4%	45	33.5%	63
"Fair/Poor"	60.9% _a	148	70.0% _b	153	51.0% _a	58	77.3% _b	44	79.7% _b	74	66.3% _{a,b}	124
Not sure	8.7% _a	21	5.3% _a	11	17.0% _a	19	5.3% _{a,b}	3	4.9% _b	4	2.2% _{b,c}	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	244	100.0%	219	100.0%	115	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	22.6%	31	7.5%	6	2.2%	2	8.6%	6	5.5%	3	7.9%	4
Good	19.5%	26	21.8%	18	13.0%	9	11.2%	8	13.7%	7	16.5%	8
"Excellent/Good"	42.1% _a	57	29.3% _{a,b}	25	15.2% _b	11	19.7% _{b,c}	14	19.2% _{a,b}	10	24.4% _{a,b}	12
Fair	30.0%	41	33.5%	28	32.1%	23	27.4%	19	43.8%	23	37.4%	18
Poor	18.7%	25	30.3%	26	43.1%	31	50.4%	35	33.1%	17	30.7%	15
"Fair/Poor"	48.7% _a	66	63.8% _{a,b}	54	75.2% _b	53	77.7% _{b,c}	54	76.9% _{b,d}	40	68.1% _{a,b}	33
Not sure	9.2% _a	12	6.9% _a	6	9.6% _a	7	2.5% _a	2	3.9% _a	2	7.4% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	136	100.0%	85	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	12.7%	27	11.9%	20	5.3%	4	8.6%	8	19.5%	25	4.2%	4	7.7%	8
Good	18.5%	39	13.3%	22	18.8%	16	16.2%	14	14.8%	19	25.9%	23	9.9%	10
"Excellent/Good"	31.3% _a	66	25.2% _a	42	24.1% _a	20	24.9% _{a,b}	22	34.3% _a	44	30.1% _{a,b}	27	17.6% _b	17
Fair	32.5%	69	33.7%	56	32.2%	27	29.8%	26	31.4%	41	34.1%	30	41.3%	41
Poor	29.9%	63	32.8%	55	37.2%	31	37.5%	33	25.4%	33	31.2%	27	36.6%	36
"Fair/Poor"	62.4% _a	132	66.6% _a	111	69.4% _a	58	67.3% _{a,b}	59	56.8% _a	74	65.3% _{a,b}	57	78.0% _b	77
Not sure	6.4% _a	13	8.2% _a	14	6.5% _a	5	7.9% _a	7	8.9% _a	12	4.6% _a	4	4.4% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	167	100.0%	84	100.0%	87	100.0%	130	100.0%	88	100.0%	99

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	2.6%	4	9.9%	14	0.0%	0	22.1%	5	13.0%	5	4.0%	9
Good	12.9%	19	25.3%	36	12.1%	1	18.4%	4	27.9%	10	17.6%	38
"Excellent/Good"	15.4% _a	23	35.1% _b	50	12.1% _a	1	40.5% _a	9	40.9% _a	14	21.6% _a	47
Fair	40.0%	59	32.1%	46	50.2%	6	31.9%	7	33.3%	12	35.7%	78
Poor	43.2%	64	28.1%	40	37.7%	4	22.8%	5	23.8%	8	39.5%	86
"Fair/Poor"	83.2% _a	123	60.2% _b	86	87.9% _a	10	54.8% _a	12	57.1% _a	20	75.2% _a	164
Not sure	1.4% _a	2	4.7% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	4.7% _a	1	2.1% _a	1	3.2% _a	7
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	143	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	218

Table 22 cont.— Satisfaction with “Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	4.2%	2	12.8%	5	8.5%	4	5.3%	3	5.3%	2	1.4%	1
Good	15.1%	8	16.8%	7	12.7%	6	21.2%	13	22.4%	10	26.7%	12
"Excellent/Good"	19.3% _a	10	29.6% _a	12	21.2% _a	11	26.5% _a	16	27.8% _a	12	28.1% _a	12
Fair	44.1%	23	42.3%	17	37.4%	19	29.8%	18	27.1%	12	36.8%	16
Poor	36.7%	19	28.1%	12	40.5%	21	39.4%	24	37.5%	16	29.5%	13
"Fair/Poor"	80.7% _a	43	70.4% _a	29	77.9% _a	40	69.3% _a	42	64.6% _a	28	66.3% _a	29
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	0	4.3% _a	3	7.7% _a	3	5.6% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	6.8%	11	6.0%	5	3.8%	2	4.6%	3	6.6%	6	8.4%	6	2.3%	1
Good	15.2%	25	22.8%	20	25.5%	11	20.7%	12	18.6%	16	12.3%	8	15.2%	6
"Excellent/Good"	22.1% _a	36	28.8% _a	25	29.3% _a	12	25.3% _a	14	25.2% _a	22	20.7% _a	14	17.6% _a	7
Fair	33.2%	54	41.6%	36	36.1%	15	48.0%	27	22.8%	20	45.0%	30	42.3%	16
Poor	40.6%	66	27.3%	24	34.1%	14	22.7%	13	49.4%	44	31.9%	21	38.3%	15
"Fair/Poor"	73.9% _a	120	68.9% _a	59	70.2% _a	30	70.8% _a	40	72.3% _a	64	76.9% _a	51	80.7% _a	31
Not sure	4.0% _a	7	2.3% _a	2	0.5% _a	0	3.9% _a	2	2.5% _a	2	2.4% _a	2	1.8% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	163	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	10.7%	24	4.4%	10	0.0%	0	1.5%	1	7.0%	6	9.2%	27
Good	8.1%	18	16.3%	36	21.7%	2	17.4%	9	8.5%	7	11.7%	34
"Excellent/Good"	18.7% _a	43	20.6% _a	45	21.7% _a	2	18.9% _a	9	15.5% _a	14	20.8% _a	61
Fair	32.4%	74	28.8%	63	61.2%	6	20.4%	10	36.6%	32	30.3%	89
Poor	47.6%	109	45.1%	99	17.0%	2	42.9%	21	45.6%	40	47.6%	140
"Fair/Poor"	80.1% _a	183	74.0% _a	162	78.3% _a	7	63.3% _a	32	82.2% _a	71	77.9% _a	230
Not sure	1.2% _a	3	5.4% _b	12	0.0% ¹	0	17.8% _a	9	2.3% _b	2	1.3% _b	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	228	100.0%	219	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	17.2%	20	5.3%	3	1.1%	1	4.4%	3	5.5%	3	4.7%	3
Good	13.9%	16	10.1%	6	8.2%	6	9.0%	7	16.2%	10	15.0%	8
"Excellent/Good"	31.1% _a	37	15.4% _{a,b}	9	9.3% _b	7	13.4% _{a,b}	11	21.8% _{a,b}	14	19.7% _{a,b}	11
Fair	29.0%	34	58.8%	36	30.5%	22	33.5%	27	10.9%	7	21.9%	12
Poor	34.9%	41	20.2%	12	60.2%	42	50.9%	40	65.8%	41	53.9%	30
"Fair/Poor"	63.9% _a	76	79.0% _{a,b}	48	90.7% _b	64	84.3% _{b,c}	67	76.7% _{a,b}	48	75.7% _{a,b}	42
Not sure	5.0% _a	6	5.6% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	2.3% _a	2	1.5% _a	1	4.6% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	71	100.0%	80	100.0%	63	100.0%	55

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	10.2%	21	5.9%	9	4.6%	4	6.6%	6	7.1%	7	3.6%	4	0.7%	1
Good	11.7%	24	14.8%	23	8.1%	7	9.4%	9	19.6%	18	2.6%	3	10.8%	11
"Excellent/Good"	21.9% _a	44	20.7% _a	32	12.6% _a	11	16.0% _{a,b}	15	26.7% _a	25	6.2% _b	6	11.5% _{b,c}	12
Fair	32.1%	65	29.2%	46	30.1%	26	31.0%	29	27.1%	25	43.6%	45	34.5%	35
Poor	45.2%	92	43.0%	67	55.3%	48	50.1%	46	37.4%	34	49.2%	50	53.5%	54
"Fair/Poor"	77.3% _a	157	72.2% _a	113	85.3% _a	74	81.1% _{a,b}	75	64.5% _a	59	92.8% _b	95	88.0% _{b,c}	89
Not sure	0.8% _a	2	7.1% _b	11	2.0% _{a,b}	2	2.9% _{a,b}	3	8.7% _a	8	1.0% _{a,b}	1	0.5% _b	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	203	100.0%	157	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Table 23 – Satisfaction with “Increasing Canadian Spending in the Local Region”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Increasing Canadian spending in the local region	Excellent	104	8.7%
	Good	334	27.9%
	Fair	428	35.8%
	Poor	227	19.0%
	Not sure	103	8.6%
	TOTALS:	1195	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

What county do you live in?						
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Excellent	11.0%	50	3.2%	9	9.5%	42
Good	32.7%	150	27.9%	81	24.2%	108
"Excellent/Good"	43.7% _a	201	31.1% _b	91	33.7% _b	150
Fair	37.7%	173	28.3%	83	36.6%	163
Poor	9.2%	42	31.0%	90	24.4%	109
"Fair/Poor"	46.9% _a	215	59.3% _b	173	61.0% _b	272
Not sure	9.5% _a	43	9.6% _a	28	5.3% _a	24
TOTALS:	100.0%	459	100.0%	292	100.0%	446




Table 23 cont.— Satisfaction with “Increasing Canadian Spending in the Local Region”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	12.2%	29	9.6%	21	6.7%	7	4.1%	2	7.8%	7	14.6%	27
Good	35.7%	86	29.5%	64	33.0%	37	34.7%	20	31.3%	29	33.7%	63
"Excellent/Good"	47.8% _a	115	39.1% _a	85	39.7% _a	44	38.9% _a	22	39.1% _a	36	48.3% _a	90
Fair	33.8%	81	41.9%	91	34.0%	38	33.4%	19	47.0%	43	38.4%	72
Poor	7.8%	19	10.7%	23	5.6%	6	17.7%	10	7.2%	7	9.7%	18
"Fair/Poor"	41.6% _a	100	52.6% _b	115	39.6% _a	44	51.1% _a	29	54.2% _a	50	48.1% _a	90
Not sure	10.5% _a	25	8.3% _a	18	20.7% _a	23	10.0% _{a,b}	6	6.8% _b	6	3.6% _{b,c}	7
TOTALS:	100.0%	241	100.0%	218	100.0%	112	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	18.5%	25	5.3%	4	12.5%	9	8.3%	6	3.1%	2	10.1%	5
Good	27.9%	37	35.2%	30	30.3%	22	33.9%	24	36.6%	19	39.1%	19
"Excellent/Good"	46.4% _a	62	40.5% _a	34	42.8% _a	30	42.2% _a	30	39.7% _a	20	49.2% _a	24
Fair	30.3%	40	45.7%	39	39.3%	28	39.4%	28	41.1%	21	35.3%	17
Poor	9.4%	12	7.1%	6	8.0%	6	12.1%	8	12.4%	6	6.5%	3
"Fair/Poor"	39.7% _a	53	52.8% _a	45	47.4% _a	34	51.5% _a	36	53.5% _a	28	41.8% _a	20
Not sure	13.9% _a	18	6.7% _a	6	9.9% _a	7	6.3% _a	4	6.8% _a	4	8.9% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	133	100.0%	85	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	51	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Excellent	12.3%	26	11.1%	18	7.4%	6	11.5%	10	16.7%	22	7.2%	6	5.8%
Good	30.3%	63	30.3%	51	43.3%	36	24.2%	21	29.5%	38	33.0%	29	44.1%
"Excellent/Good"	42.7% _a	89	41.4% _a	69	50.7% _a	43	35.7% _a	30	46.2% _a	60	40.3% _a	35	49.9% _a
Fair	41.1%	86	34.5%	57	35.5%	30	48.1%	41	31.4%	41	46.6%	41	33.5%
Poor	8.7%	18	11.3%	19	6.1%	5	3.7%	3	12.7%	17	9.0%	8	8.6%
"Fair/Poor"	49.8% _a	104	45.8% _a	76	41.6% _a	35	51.8% _a	44	44.1% _a	57	55.6% _a	49	42.1% _a
Not sure	7.5% _a	16	12.8% _a	21	7.7% _a	6	12.4% _a	11	9.7% _a	13	4.2% _a	4	8.0% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	209	100.0%	167	100.0%	84	100.0%	85	100.0%	130	100.0%	88	100.0%

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	0.5%	1	6.0%	9	19.2%	2	10.5%	2	3.8%	1	1.7%	4
Good	27.3%	40	28.5%	41	0.0%	0	51.9%	11	14.6%	5	29.5%	65
"Excellent/Good"	27.8% _a	41	34.5% _a	50	19.2% _{a,b}	2	62.4% _a	13	18.4% _b	7	31.2% _{b,c}	68
Fair	31.0%	46	25.6%	37	44.4%	5	20.1%	4	43.9%	16	24.6%	54
Poor	33.4%	49	28.5%	41	25.3%	3	12.6%	3	25.7%	9	34.4%	75
"Fair/Poor"	64.4% _a	95	54.1% _a	78	69.7% _{a,b}	8	32.7% _a	7	69.6% _b	25	59.1% _{a,b}	129
Not sure	7.8% _a	12	11.4% _a	16	11.1% _a	1	4.9% _a	1	12.1% _a	4	9.7% _a	21
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

Table 23 cont.— Satisfaction with “Increasing Canadian Spending in the Local Region”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	8.4%	4	3.5%	1	0.0%	0	2.1%	1	3.8%	2	1.4%	1
Good	26.3%	14	16.6%	7	13.3%	7	32.7%	20	36.4%	16	42.8%	18
"Excellent/Good"	34.7% _{a,b}	18	20.2% _{a,b}	8	13.3% _a	7	34.8% _{a,b}	21	40.3% _b	17	44.1% _{b,c}	19
Fair	15.7%	8	50.6%	21	25.7%	13	35.5%	21	23.0%	10	21.2%	9
Poor	49.6%	26	29.2%	12	47.4%	24	13.0%	8	19.0%	8	27.4%	12
"Fair/Poor"	65.3% _{a,b,c}	35	79.8% _a	33	73.1% _{a,b}	37	48.5% _{b,c}	29	42.0% _c	18	48.5% _{b,c,d}	21
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	13.6% _a	7	16.7% _a	10	17.8% _a	8	7.3% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	0.8%	1	8.3%	7	2.5%	1	0.0%	0	4.4%	4	3.3%	2	0.0%	0
Good	32.6%	53	21.8%	19	22.4%	10	41.2%	24	29.6%	26	27.7%	19	19.6%	8
"Excellent/Good"	33.3% _a	54	30.0% _a	26	24.9% _a	11	41.2% _a	24	34.1% _a	30	31.0% _a	21	19.6% _a	8
Fair	21.7%	35	39.7%	34	30.8%	13	25.5%	15	26.5%	23	27.4%	18	37.0%	14
Poor	33.8%	55	21.8%	19	38.7%	16	28.5%	16	28.0%	25	34.2%	23	32.3%	12
"Fair/Poor"	55.5% _a	91	61.5% _a	53	69.5% _a	29	54.1% _a	31	54.5% _a	48	61.6% _a	41	69.3% _a	27
Not sure	11.2% _a	18	8.5% _a	7	5.6% _a	2	4.7% _a	3	11.4% _a	10	7.4% _a	5	11.2% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	15.2%	35	3.6%	8	0.0%	0	5.6%	3	6.7%	6	11.5%	34
Good	14.5%	33	34.2%	75	16.4%	2	33.3%	17	21.7%	19	23.8%	70
"Excellent/Good"	29.8% _a	68	37.7% _a	82	16.4% _a	2	38.9% _a	19	28.4% _a	25	35.3% _a	104
Fair	40.1%	91	33.0%	72	21.7%	2	45.1%	22	30.7%	27	36.8%	108
Poor	27.1%	61	21.6%	47	59.0%	6	11.5%	6	37.4%	32	21.7%	64
"Fair/Poor"	67.2% _a	152	54.6% _b	119	80.8% _a	8	56.5% _a	28	68.1% _a	59	58.5% _a	172
Not sure	3.0% _a	7	7.7% _b	17	2.9% _a	0	4.6% _a	2	3.5% _a	3	6.2% _a	18
TOTALS:	100.0%	227	100.0%	219	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	293

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	27.8%	33	1.9%	1	1.1%	1	5.4%	4	2.8%	2	3.0%	2
Good	31.5%	37	7.4%	4	23.3%	16	32.0%	25	13.2%	8	28.6%	16
"Excellent/Good"	59.3% _a	70	9.3% _b	5	24.3% _{b,c}	17	37.3% _c	30	16.0% _{b,c}	10	31.6% _{c,d}	18
Fair	34.2%	40	41.0%	24	32.8%	23	40.7%	32	49.6%	31	21.8%	12
Poor	3.7%	4	37.9%	22	42.9%	30	17.3%	14	25.1%	16	39.9%	22
"Fair/Poor"	37.8% _a	45	78.9% _b	46	75.7% _b	53	58.0% _{a,b}	46	74.7% _b	47	61.7% _b	34
Not sure	2.9% _a	3	11.8% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	4.7% _a	4	9.3% _a	6	6.7% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	59	100.0%	71	100.0%	80	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	15.0%	31	4.4%	7	5.8%	5	6.4%	6	4.2%	4	13.9%	14	1.4%	1
Good	28.4%	58	22.6%	35	17.0%	14	37.0%	34	26.6%	24	10.5%	11	25.6%	25
"Excellent/Good"	43.4% _a	88	27.0% _b	42	22.8% _b	19	43.4% _a	40	30.8% _{a,b}	28	24.4% _b	25	27.0% _{a,b}	27
Fair	30.8%	63	34.4%	54	54.6%	47	26.3%	24	34.1%	31	43.2%	44	41.8%	41
Poor	23.3%	47	32.1%	50	12.7%	11	22.1%	20	29.6%	27	27.0%	28	26.5%	26
"Fair/Poor"	54.1% _a	110	66.5% _a	104	67.3% _a	57	48.4% _a	45	63.7% _{a,b}	59	70.2% _b	72	68.2% _{b,c}	68
Not sure	2.5% _a	5	6.5% _{a,b}	10	9.9% _b	8	8.2% _a	8	5.5% _a	5	5.4% _a	6	4.7% _a	5
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	157	100.0%	85	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	99

Table 24 – Satisfaction with “Improving the Condition of Rental Housing”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Improving the condition of rental housing	Excellent	104	8.7%
	Good	246	20.5%
	Fair	411	34.2%
	Poor	333	27.8%
	Not sure	106	8.8%
	TOTALS:	1200	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

What county do you live in?						
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Excellent	9.3%	43	5.8%	17	6.8%	30
Good	22.1%	102	24.9%	73	14.2%	63
"Excellent/Good"	31.4% _a	145	30.7% _a	90	21.0% _b	94
Fair	35.0%	162	34.8%	102	36.1%	161
Poor	26.8%	124	24.2%	71	34.7%	155
"Fair/Poor"	61.8% _a	286	59.1% _a	172	70.8% _b	316
Not sure	6.8% _a	31	10.2% _a	30	8.3% _a	37
TOTALS:	100.0%	462	100.0%	292	100.0%	447




Table 24 cont.— Satisfaction with “Improving the Condition of Rental Housing”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	13.2%	32	5.0%	11	5.7%	7	6.8%	4	8.5%	8	10.1%	19
Good	21.7%	53	22.5%	49	30.1%	34	17.4%	10	14.7%	14	22.5%	42
"Excellent/Good"	34.9% _a	85	27.5% _a	60	35.8% _a	41	24.3% _a	14	23.1% _a	21	32.6% _a	61
Fair	28.7%	70	42.0%	92	29.7%	34	40.5%	23	44.5%	41	33.4%	62
Poor	28.2%	69	25.3%	55	23.0%	26	27.0%	15	28.3%	26	29.6%	55
"Fair/Poor"	56.9% _a	139	67.3% _b	147	52.7% _a	60	67.5% _{a,b}	38	72.9% _b	67	63.0% _{a,b}	118
Not sure	8.2% _a	20	5.2% _a	11	11.5% _a	13	8.2% _a	5	4.0% _a	4	4.4% _a	8
TOTALS:	100.0%	244	100.0%	219	100.0%	115	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	18.9%	26	4.5%	4	3.6%	3	2.4%	2	3.7%	2	15.5%	8
Good	22.6%	31	26.6%	23	24.2%	17	17.4%	12	25.9%	13	12.4%	6
"Excellent/Good"	41.5% _a	56	31.1% _{a,b}	26	27.8% _{a,b}	20	19.9% _b	14	29.5% _{a,b}	15	27.9% _{a,b}	14
Fair	28.7%	39	37.3%	32	44.7%	32	36.6%	26	29.4%	15	37.8%	18
Poor	19.2%	26	25.9%	22	25.7%	18	39.2%	27	36.3%	19	23.6%	12
"Fair/Poor"	47.8% _a	65	63.2% _{a,b}	54	70.4% _b	50	75.8% _{b,c}	53	65.6% _{a,b}	34	61.4% _{a,b}	30
Not sure	10.7% _a	14	5.7% _a	5	1.8% _a	1	4.3% _a	3	4.8% _a	3	10.7% _a	5
TOTALS:	100.0%	136	100.0%	85	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Excellent	12.2%	26	7.5%	12	5.7%	5	13.3%	12	13.1%	17	3.2%	3	5.1%
Good	20.6%	43	23.7%	40	22.7%	19	12.2%	11	26.8%	35	29.2%	26	18.3%
"Excellent/Good"	32.8% _a	69	31.2% _a	52	28.4% _a	24	25.6% _a	22	39.8% _a	52	32.3% _a	28	23.4% _a
Fair	39.5%	83	27.5%	46	38.3%	32	45.1%	39	34.5%	45	25.7%	23	42.5%
Poor	19.9%	42	35.6%	60	26.9%	23	15.7%	14	20.4%	27	38.8%	34	29.5%
"Fair/Poor"	59.4% _a	125	63.1% _a	105	65.2% _a	55	60.8% _{a,b}	53	55.0% _a	71	64.5% _{a,b}	57	72.0% _b
Not sure	7.8% _a	16	5.7% _a	10	6.4% _a	5	13.7% _a	12	5.2% _a	7	3.1% _a	3	4.6% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	167	100.0%	84	100.0%	87	100.0%	130	100.0%	88	100.0%

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	3.4%	5	8.3%	12	19.2%	2	2.2%	0	9.0%	3	4.7%	10
Good	26.4%	39	23.3%	34	7.7%	1	19.3%	4	40.1%	14	24.2%	53
"Excellent/Good"	29.8% _a	44	31.7% _a	46	26.9% _a	3	21.6% _a	5	49.1% _a	17	28.9% _a	63
Fair	35.1%	52	34.6%	50	38.5%	4	42.3%	9	29.7%	11	34.0%	74
Poor	25.0%	37	23.5%	34	34.6%	4	27.0%	6	9.8%	3	26.2%	57
"Fair/Poor"	60.0% _a	89	58.1% _a	84	73.1% _a	8	69.3% _a	15	39.5% _a	14	60.1% _a	132
Not sure	10.2% _a	15	10.3% _a	15	0.0% ¹	0	9.2% _a	2	11.5% _a	4	10.9% _a	24
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

Table 24 cont.— Satisfaction with “Improving the Condition of Rental Housing”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	16.9%	9	8.2%	3	0.9%	0	3.8%	2	3.4%	1	1.2%	1
Good	11.5%	6	31.1%	13	23.6%	12	22.8%	14	29.4%	13	35.3%	15
"Excellent/Good"	28.4% _a	15	39.2% _a	16	24.5% _a	13	26.6% _a	16	32.8% _a	14	36.6% _a	16
Fair	32.9%	17	25.7%	11	33.2%	17	48.3%	29	25.8%	11	38.0%	16
Poor	27.3%	14	27.6%	11	34.5%	18	17.1%	10	20.8%	9	18.6%	8
"Fair/Poor"	60.1% _a	32	53.3% _a	22	67.8% _a	35	65.4% _a	39	46.5% _a	20	56.5% _a	24
Not sure	11.5% _a	6	7.4% _a	3	7.8% _a	4	8.0% _a	5	20.7% _a	9	6.9% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	2.7%	4	13.5%	12	2.3%	1	5.7%	3	9.7%	9	4.8%	3	1.2%	0
Good	29.7%	49	21.6%	19	12.8%	5	27.3%	16	16.4%	14	32.0%	21	15.3%	6
"Excellent/Good"	32.4% _a	53	35.1% _a	30	15.1% _a	6	33.0% _a	19	26.0% _a	23	36.9% _a	25	16.5% _a	6
Fair	30.5%	50	35.1%	30	50.9%	22	31.1%	18	27.0%	24	31.8%	21	54.9%	21
Poor	27.4%	45	25.2%	22	10.2%	4	27.3%	16	34.4%	30	25.8%	17	10.2%	4
"Fair/Poor"	57.9% _a	95	60.3% _a	52	61.1% _a	26	58.4% _a	33	61.4% _a	54	57.6% _a	39	65.1% _a	25
Not sure	9.7% _a	16	4.6% _a	4	23.8% _b	10	8.6% _a	5	12.6% _a	11	5.5% _a	4	18.4% _a	7
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	11.0%	25	2.4%	5	0.0%	0	2.6%	1	7.2%	6	7.7%	23
Good	14.8%	34	13.6%	30	20.2%	2	17.7%	9	13.6%	12	13.6%	40
"Excellent/Good"	25.7% _a	59	15.9% _b	35	20.2% _a	2	20.3% _a	10	20.8% _a	18	21.3% _a	63
Fair	37.3%	85	34.7%	76	69.0%	7	37.2%	19	36.7%	32	34.7%	103
Poor	28.7%	66	41.0%	89	10.8%	1	33.8%	17	35.0%	30	35.1%	104
"Fair/Poor"	66.1% _a	151	75.7% _b	165	79.8% _a	8	71.0% _a	35	71.7% _a	62	69.9% _a	206
Not sure	8.2% _a	19	8.3% _a	18	0.0% ¹	0	8.7% _a	4	7.5% _a	6	8.8% _a	26
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	218	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	86	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	16.0%	19	0.0%	0	6.8%	5	2.6%	2	5.5%	3	2.0%	1
Good	6.5%	8	31.3%	19	14.2%	10	13.3%	11	9.0%	6	18.9%	11
"Excellent/Good"	22.5% _a	27	31.3% _a	19	20.9% _a	15	16.0% _a	13	14.6% _a	9	20.9% _a	12
Fair	35.8%	42	42.4%	26	39.4%	28	39.1%	31	32.3%	20	25.3%	14
Poor	38.8%	46	12.8%	8	35.7%	25	37.8%	30	47.0%	29	30.4%	17
"Fair/Poor"	74.6% _a	88	55.2% _a	34	75.1% _a	52	76.9% _a	61	79.3% _a	49	55.7% _a	31
Not sure	2.9% _a	3	13.5% _{a,b}	8	4.0% _a	3	7.1% _{a,b}	6	6.1% _{a,b}	4	23.4% _b	13
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	70	100.0%	80	100.0%	62	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	11.7%	24	3.9%	6	0.3%	0	5.9%	5	4.6%	4	4.1%	4	3.2%	3
Good	13.6%	28	16.3%	25	11.8%	10	10.9%	10	15.3%	14	15.8%	16	15.4%	15
"Excellent/Good"	25.3% _a	51	20.2% _{a,b}	32	12.1% _b	11	16.8% _a	16	19.8% _a	18	20.0% _a	21	18.6% _a	19
Fair	27.9%	57	45.2%	70	38.6%	34	19.1%	18	50.0%	46	40.3%	42	38.9%	39
Poor	40.4%	82	27.5%	43	34.3%	30	56.1%	52	26.0%	24	25.3%	26	37.4%	38
"Fair/Poor"	68.3% _a	139	72.7% _a	113	73.0% _a	64	75.2% _a	69	76.0% _a	70	65.6% _a	68	76.3% _a	76
Not sure	6.4% _a	13	7.1% _a	11	14.9% _a	13	8.0% _a	7	4.1% _a	4	14.4% _a	15	5.1% _a	5
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	156	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	100

Table 25 – Satisfaction with “Improving the Condition of Single-family Homes”

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Improving the condition of single-family homes	Excellent	86	7.2%
	Good	315	26.3%
	Fair	405	33.8%
	Poor	289	24.1%
	Not sure	104	8.6%
	TOTALS:	1198	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Excellent	7.7%	35	3.6%	11	7.6%	34
Good	25.4%	117	31.1%	91	20.4%	91
"Excellent/Good"	33.0% _a	152	34.7% _a	101	28.0% _a	125
Fair	34.3%	158	37.8%	110	33.5%	150
Poor	21.9%	100	20.8%	61	31.4%	140
"Fair/Poor"	56.2% _a	258	58.6% _{a,b}	171	64.9% _b	290
Not sure	10.8% _a	50	6.7% _a	20	7.1% _a	32
TOTALS:	100.0%	459	100.0%	292	100.0%	447




Table 25 cont.— Satisfaction with “Improving the Condition of Single-family Homes”

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	11.8%	29	3.0%	7	5.1%	6	7.9%	4	4.9%	5	7.8%	14
Good	24.2%	59	26.6%	57	32.0%	37	26.2%	15	19.8%	18	24.2%	45
"Excellent/Good"	36.0% _a	88	29.7% _a	64	37.1% _a	42	34.1% _a	19	24.7% _a	23	32.0% _a	59
Fair	30.4%	74	38.7%	84	28.5%	33	35.1%	20	34.0%	31	39.0%	72
Poor	23.9%	58	19.6%	42	18.6%	21	23.9%	14	21.4%	20	24.9%	46
"Fair/Poor"	54.3% _a	132	58.3% _a	126	47.2% _a	54	59.0% _{a,b}	34	55.4% _{a,b}	51	63.8% _b	117
Not sure	9.7% _a	24	12.0% _a	26	15.8% _a	18	7.0% _{a,b}	4	19.9% _a	18	4.2% _b	8
TOTALS:	100.0%	244	100.0%	216	100.0%	115	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	184

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	15.8%	21	2.3%	2	6.3%	4	0.6%	0	1.6%	1	12.8%	6
Good	30.2%	41	25.3%	21	23.3%	16	24.8%	17	23.5%	12	17.9%	9
"Excellent/Good"	46.0% _a	62	27.5% _a	23	29.6% _a	21	25.4% _a	18	25.1% _a	13	30.7% _a	15
Fair	23.0%	31	22.7%	19	51.5%	36	48.3%	33	45.8%	24	29.4%	14
Poor	18.5%	25	26.7%	23	15.5%	11	24.7%	17	22.7%	12	27.0%	13
"Fair/Poor"	41.5% _a	56	49.4% _{a,b}	42	67.0% _{b,c}	46	73.0% _c	50	68.5% _{b,c,d}	36	56.4% _{a,b,c}	27
Not sure	12.5% _{a,b}	17	23.1% _a	20	3.4% _b	2	1.6% _{b,c}	1	6.4% _{a,b}	3	12.9% _{a,b}	6
TOTALS:	100.0%	136	100.0%	85	100.0%	69	100.0%	69	100.0%	52	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	9.3%	19	7.8%	13	3.4%	3	5.6%	5	13.4%	17	1.9%	2	3.4%	3
Good	25.9%	54	24.5%	41	25.7%	22	18.1%	16	32.2%	41	26.7%	24	22.4%	22
"Excellent/Good"	35.2% _a	73	32.3% _a	54	29.1% _a	24	23.7% _a	21	45.6% _b	58	28.6% _{a,b}	25	25.9% _a	26
Fair	31.2%	65	34.2%	57	42.4%	36	28.9%	25	33.3%	43	35.3%	31	47.0%	47
Poor	18.0%	37	28.0%	47	19.3%	16	17.9%	16	14.4%	18	31.8%	28	23.7%	24
"Fair/Poor"	49.2% _a	102	62.2% _b	104	61.7% _{a,b}	52	46.8% _a	41	47.7% _a	61	67.2% _b	59	70.7% _b	70
Not sure	15.6% _a	33	5.5% _b	9	9.3% _{a,b}	8	29.5% _a	26	6.8% _b	9	4.2% _b	4	3.5% _b	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	208	100.0%	167	100.0%	84	100.0%	87	100.0%	128	100.0%	88	100.0%	99

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	0.0%	0	7.3%	11	19.2%	2	2.2%	0	2.7%	1	3.0%	7
Good	26.7%	39	35.6%	51	22.9%	3	27.8%	6	52.7%	19	28.8%	63
"Excellent/Good"	26.7% _a	39	42.9% _b	62	42.1% _{a,b}	5	30.1% _{a,b}	6	55.4% _a	20	31.8% _b	70
Fair	41.5%	62	34.0%	49	24.2%	3	53.8%	11	26.4%	9	38.2%	84
Poor	26.2%	39	15.2%	22	33.6%	4	11.4%	2	6.7%	2	23.4%	51
"Fair/Poor"	67.8% _a	100	49.2% _b	71	57.9% _{a,b}	7	65.2% _{a,b}	14	33.1% _a	12	61.6% _b	135
Not sure	5.5% _a	8	7.9% _a	11	0.0% ¹	0	4.7% _a	1	11.5% _a	4	6.6% _a	15
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

Table 25 cont.— Satisfaction with “Improving the Condition of Single-family Homes”

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	4.2%	2	8.2%	3	0.9%	0	2.9%	2	5.1%	2	1.2%	1
Good	24.5%	13	27.9%	11	32.8%	17	30.9%	19	31.9%	14	39.4%	17
"Excellent/Good"	28.7% _a	15	36.1% _a	15	33.7% _a	17	33.8% _a	20	37.1% _a	16	40.6% _a	18
Fair	39.8%	21	35.7%	15	39.9%	20	37.0%	22	32.7%	14	41.3%	18
Poor	31.5%	17	24.5%	10	17.1%	9	22.6%	14	16.2%	7	10.7%	5
"Fair/Poor"	71.3% _a	38	60.2% _a	25	57.0% _a	29	59.6% _a	36	48.8% _a	21	52.0% _a	22
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	3.7% _a	2	9.3% _a	5	6.6% _a	4	14.1% _a	6	7.4% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	2.7%	4	6.0%	5	2.3%	1	0.9%	1	5.4%	5	5.6%	4	1.2%	0
Good	33.9%	55	25.4%	22	31.5%	13	22.0%	13	24.3%	22	38.2%	26	29.1%	11
"Excellent/Good"	36.6% _a	60	31.4% _a	27	33.8% _a	14	22.9% _a	13	29.8% _a	26	43.8% _a	29	30.4% _a	12
Fair	33.6%	55	44.7%	39	40.0%	17	45.6%	26	40.8%	36	33.0%	22	50.9%	20
Poor	24.2%	40	20.1%	17	9.0%	4	22.9%	13	26.5%	23	17.8%	12	8.2%	3
"Fair/Poor"	57.9% _a	95	64.8% _a	56	49.0% _a	21	68.5% _a	39	67.3% _a	60	50.8% _a	34	59.1% _a	23
Not sure	5.5% _a	9	3.8% _a	3	17.2% _b	7	8.6% _a	5	3.0% _a	3	5.4% _a	4	10.6% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Excellent	10.4%	24	4.6%	10	0.0%	0	1.6%	1	6.5%	6	9.3%	27
Good	20.5%	47	20.4%	45	69.0%	7	20.9%	10	16.8%	15	19.5%	58
"Excellent/Good"	30.9% _a	71	25.0% _a	55	69.0% _a	7	22.6% _b	11	23.3% _b	20	28.8% _{a,b}	85
Fair	29.9%	69	37.2%	81	20.2%	2	43.6%	22	34.7%	30	32.0%	95
Poor	31.0%	71	31.8%	69	10.8%	1	28.8%	14	38.9%	34	30.2%	89
"Fair/Poor"	61.0% _a	140	69.1% _a	151	31.0% _a	3	72.4% _{a,b}	36	73.6% _b	64	62.2% _{a,b}	184
Not sure	8.1% _a	19	5.9% _a	13	0.0% ¹	0	5.1% _a	3	3.0% _a	3	8.9% _a	26
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	218	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Excellent	14.2%	17	9.1%	6	5.7%	4	3.3%	3	5.0%	3	3.4%	2
Good	10.0%	12	43.3%	26	26.8%	19	18.0%	14	14.2%	9	20.2%	11
"Excellent/Good"	24.2% _a	29	52.4% _b	32	32.5% _{a,b}	23	21.3% _a	17	19.2% _a	12	23.7% _a	13
Fair	28.8%	34	34.1%	21	31.2%	22	41.4%	33	34.7%	22	33.0%	18
Poor	41.0%	49	4.9%	3	30.2%	21	31.0%	25	37.7%	24	35.0%	19
"Fair/Poor"	69.9% _a	83	38.9% _b	24	61.4% _{a,b}	43	72.4% _a	58	72.4% _a	45	68.0% _a	38
Not sure	5.9% _a	7	8.7% _a	5	6.1% _a	4	6.3% _a	5	8.4% _a	5	8.3% _a	5
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	70	100.0%	80	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Excellent	13.6%	28	3.8%	6	0.3%	0	8.1%	8	5.7%	5	3.6%	4	4.2%	4
Good	15.0%	31	27.8%	44	19.8%	17	12.1%	11	26.6%	24	17.4%	18	27.1%	27
"Excellent/Good"	28.7% _a	58	31.6% _a	49	20.2% _a	18	20.2% _a	19	32.3% _a	30	21.0% _a	22	31.3% _a	32
Fair	28.0%	57	37.6%	59	38.9%	34	22.0%	20	45.6%	42	36.2%	37	33.8%	34
Poor	39.7%	81	24.5%	38	24.5%	21	50.7%	47	20.0%	18	31.0%	32	25.9%	26
"Fair/Poor"	67.7% _a	138	62.1% _a	97	63.5% _a	55	72.8% _a	67	65.7% _a	60	67.2% _a	69	59.7% _a	60
Not sure	3.6% _a	7	6.4% _a	10	16.4% _b	14	7.0% _{a,b}	6	2.0% _a	2	11.8% _b	12	9.0% _{a,b}	9
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	157	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Table 26 – How successful have recent publicly-funded economic development investments been in revitalizing local economies?

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
How successful have recent publicly-funded economic development investments been in revitalizing local economies?	Very positive impact on local	50	4.2%
	Positive impact on local	486	40.5%
	No impact on local	336	28.0%
	Negative impact on local	123	10.3%
	Not sure	204	17.0%
	TOTALS:	1199	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Very positive impact on local economies	5.8%	27	3.2%	9	0.7%	3
Positive impact on local economies	46.4%	214	43.5%	127	31.7%	142
"Very Positive/Positive"	52.2% _a	241	46.6% _a	136	32.4% _b	145
No impact on local economies	22.2%	102	25.4%	74	33.7%	151
Negative impact on local economies	6.3%	29	10.3%	30	18.1%	81
"No/Negative"	28.5% _a	132	35.6% _a	104	51.8% _b	231
Not sure	19.2% _a	89	17.7% _a	52	15.8% _a	71
TOTALS:	100.0%	461	100.0%	292	100.0%	447




Table 26 cont.— How successful have recent publicly-funded economic development investments been in revitalizing local economies?

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very positive impact on local economies	7.5%	18	3.9%	9	7.2%	8	4.6%	3	4.6%	4	5.5%	10
Positive impact on local economies	42.8%	104	50.5%	110	42.4%	49	32.1%	18	47.0%	43	51.5%	96
"Very Positive/Positive"	50.3% _a	122	54.4% _a	119	49.6% _{a,b}	57	36.8% _a	21	51.6% _{a,b}	47	57.0% _b	106
No impact on local economies	20.8%	50	23.8%	52	11.5%	13	47.3%	27	32.1%	29	17.3%	32
Negative impact on local economies	7.1%	17	5.4%	12	2.3%	3	7.0%	4	7.8%	7	8.3%	15
"No/Negative"	27.9% _a	68	29.3% _a	64	13.7% _a	16	54.3% _b	31	39.9% _{b,c}	37	25.6% _{a,c}	48
Not sure	21.8% _a	53	16.4% _a	36	36.6% _a	42	8.9% _b	5	8.5% _b	8	17.3% _b	32
TOTALS:	100.0%	243	100.0%	218	100.0%	115	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very positive impact on local economies	10.1%	14	3.8%	3	6.0%	4	3.5%	2	3.5%	2	2.8%	1
Positive impact on local economies	46.1%	62	46.0%	39	55.6%	39	52.5%	37	44.4%	23	28.2%	14
"Very Positive/Positive"	56.2% _a	76	49.8% _{a,b}	42	61.6% _a	44	55.9% _{a,b}	39	47.9% _{a,b}	25	31.0% _b	15
No impact on local economies	16.1%	22	25.2%	21	24.3%	17	27.3%	19	21.3%	11	24.6%	12
Negative impact on local economies	3.1%	4	4.5%	4	5.9%	4	5.4%	4	11.0%	6	15.7%	8
"No/Negative"	19.2% _a	26	29.7% _a	25	30.2% _a	21	32.7% _a	23	32.3% _a	17	40.3% _a	20
Not sure	24.7% _{a,b}	33	20.5% _{a,b}	17	8.2% _a	6	11.4% _{a,b}	8	19.8% _{a,b}	10	28.8% _b	14
TOTALS:	100.0%	136	100.0%	84	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	51	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very positive impact on local economies	5.7%	12	5.3%	9	7.0%	6	3.9%	3	10.7%	14	4.3%	4	3.7%	4
Positive impact on local economies	47.2%	100	44.9%	75	47.4%	39	57.6%	50	44.3%	57	42.1%	37	49.6%	49
"Very Positive/Positive"	52.9% _a	112	50.2% _a	84	54.5% _a	45	61.4% _a	54	55.0% _a	71	46.4% _a	41	53.3% _a	53
No impact on local economies	20.3%	43	25.6%	43	20.3%	17	19.3%	17	16.5%	21	28.4%	25	27.7%	27
Negative impact on local economies	8.2%	17	5.5%	9	3.2%	3	0.7%	1	4.9%	6	7.8%	7	6.6%	7
"No/Negative"	28.5% _a	60	31.1% _a	52	23.6% _a	20	20.0% _a	18	21.4% _a	28	36.2% _a	32	34.3% _a	34
Not sure	18.6% _a	39	18.7% _a	31	22.0% _a	18	18.5% _a	16	23.6% _a	30	17.4% _a	15	12.3% _a	12
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	166	100.0%	83	100.0%	87	100.0%	129	100.0%	88	100.0%	99

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very positive impact on local economies	2.8%	4	3.6%	5	6.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.9%	9
Positive impact on local economies	42.7%	63	44.2%	64	70.0%	8	48.4%	10	34.4%	12	43.5%	95
"Very Positive/Positive"	45.5% _a	67	47.8% _a	69	76.0% _a	9	48.4% _a	10	34.4% _a	12	47.4% _a	104
No impact on local economies	25.2%	37	25.5%	37	24.0%	3	29.0%	6	36.1%	13	22.3%	49
Negative impact on local economies	13.3%	20	7.2%	10	0.0%	0	16.6%	4	7.9%	3	10.8%	24
"No/Negative"	38.5% _a	57	32.7% _a	47	24.0% _a	3	45.6% _a	10	44.0% _a	16	33.1% _a	72
Not sure	16.0% _a	24	19.5% _a	28	0.0% ¹	0	5.9% _a	1	21.6% _a	8	19.5% _a	43
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very positive impact on local economies	0.0%	0	8.3%	3	0.0%	0	2.6%	2	0.0%	0	10.0%	4
Positive impact on local economies	80.1%	42	31.6%	13	35.8%	18	40.5%	24	35.9%	16	30.6%	13
"Very Positive/Positive"	80.1% _a	42	39.9% _b	16	35.8% _b	18	43.1% _b	26	35.9% _b	16	40.6% _b	18
No impact on local economies	2.1%	1	39.8%	16	25.8%	13	22.6%	14	39.3%	17	29.5%	13
Negative impact on local economies	17.8%	9	4.6%	2	13.6%	7	7.5%	5	7.3%	3	9.3%	4
"No/Negative"	19.9% _a	11	44.5% _a	18	39.4% _a	20	30.1% _a	18	46.6% _a	20	38.8% _a	17
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	15.6% _a	6	24.8% _a	13	26.8% _a	16	17.6% _a	8	20.6% _a	9
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

Table 26 cont.— How successful have recent publicly-funded economic development investments been in revitalizing local economies?

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College	4+ Year Degree				Up to \$25,000	\$25,001- \$50,000	\$50,001- \$75,000	Over \$75,000				
Very positive impact on local economies	2.5%	4	5.7%	5	0.7%	0	1.8%	1	3.8%	3	7.0%	5	0.0%	0
Positive impact on local economies	39.5%	65	42.9%	37	59.9%	25	41.0%	23	45.1%	40	33.7%	23	52.2%	20
"Very Positive/Positive"	42.0% _a	69	48.6% _a	42	60.6% _a	26	42.8% _a	25	49.0% _a	43	40.7% _a	27	52.2% _a	20
No impact on local economies	22.1%	36	32.6%	28	23.3%	10	29.5%	17	22.2%	20	21.5%	14	40.4%	16
Negative impact on local economies	10.8%	18	11.5%	10	5.6%	2	10.3%	6	16.3%	14	9.9%	7	2.7%	1
"No/Negative"	32.9% _a	54	44.1% _a	38	29.0% _a	12	39.8% _a	23	38.5% _a	34	31.4% _a	21	43.1% _a	17
Not sure	25.1% _a	41	7.3% _b	6	10.4% _{a,b}	4	17.3% _{a,b}	10	12.6% _{a,b}	11	27.9% _a	19	4.7% _b	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male	Female			AM in household	Fort Drum and stayed	No AM, but job related to FD	No FD connection				
Very positive impact on local economies	0.4%	1	1.2%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.6%	0	1.0%	3
Positive impact on local economies	33.7%	77	29.6%	64	69.0%	7	38.2%	19	28.3%	25	30.7%	91
"Very Positive/Positive"	34.1% _a	78	30.7% _a	67	69.0% _a	7	38.2% _a	19	28.8% _a	25	31.7% _a	94
No impact on local economies	30.9%	71	36.7%	80	0.0%	0	31.3%	16	44.8%	39	31.9%	94
Negative impact on local economies	23.6%	54	12.3%	27	16.4%	2	6.3%	3	10.3%	9	21.7%	64
"No/Negative"	54.4% _a	125	48.9% _a	107	16.4% _a	2	37.6% _a	19	55.1% _a	48	53.7% _a	159
Not sure	11.5% _a	26	20.3% _b	44	14.7% _a	1	24.3% _a	12	16.0% _a	14	14.6% _a	43
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	218	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+						
Very positive impact on local economies	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.3%	1	1.3%	1	2.0%	1	0.3%	0
Positive impact on local economies	32.6%	39	46.5%	28	36.7%	26	24.6%	20	21.6%	13	28.7%	16
"Very Positive/Positive"	32.6% _a	39	46.5% _a	28	38.0% _a	27	25.9% _a	21	23.6% _a	15	29.0% _a	16
No impact on local economies	25.3%	30	34.0%	21	35.2%	25	37.3%	30	43.0%	27	33.9%	19
Negative impact on local economies	21.1%	25	5.5%	3	25.8%	18	19.4%	15	19.9%	12	11.6%	6
"No/Negative"	46.3% _a	55	39.5% _a	24	61.0% _a	43	56.7% _a	45	62.8% _a	39	45.5% _a	25
Not sure	21.1% _a	25	14.0% _{a,b}	9	1.1% _b	1	17.4% _a	14	13.6% _{a,b}	8	25.4% _a	14
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	71	100.0%	80	100.0%	62	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College	4+ Year Degree				Up to \$25,000	\$25,001- \$50,000	\$50,001- \$75,000	Over \$75,000				
Very positive impact on local economies	0.0%	0	0.7%	1	2.5%	2	0.4%	0	0.5%	0	0.6%	1	1.5%	2
Positive impact on local economies	23.2%	47	37.8%	59	40.7%	36	24.7%	23	39.6%	36	25.5%	26	41.0%	41
"Very Positive/Positive"	23.2% _a	47	38.5% _b	60	43.2% _b	38	25.0% _a	23	40.0% _a	37	26.1% _a	27	42.5% _a	43
No impact on local economies	34.4%	70	30.6%	48	37.5%	33	41.4%	38	32.8%	30	35.1%	36	34.0%	34
Negative impact on local economies	27.1%	55	13.0%	20	6.2%	5	11.0%	10	6.8%	6	25.7%	27	13.5%	14
"No/Negative"	61.5% _a	125	43.5% _b	68	43.7% _b	38	52.5% _{a,b}	48	39.6% _a	36	60.9% _b	63	47.6% _{a,b}	48
Not sure	15.3% _a	31	18.0% _a	28	13.1% _a	11	22.5% _a	21	20.4% _a	19	13.0% _a	13	9.9% _a	10
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	156	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Table 27 – Do you feel that local governments should explore consolidation in your county if it could save taxpayers money?

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Do you feel that local governments should explore consolidation in your county if it could save taxpayers money?	Yes	906	75.8%
	No	162	13.5%
	Not sure	128	10.7%
	TOTALS:	1195	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

What county do you live in?						
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Yes	75.2% _a	345	75.9% _a	222	76.7% _a	343
No	12.4% _a	57	17.3% _a	51	14.4% _a	64
Not sure	12.4% _a	57	6.8% _b	20	8.9% _{a,b}	40
TOTALS:	100.0%	459	100.0%	292	100.0%	447




Table 27 cont.— Do you feel that local governments should explore consolidation in your county if it could save taxpayers money?

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes	76.3% _a	183	74.1% _a	162	82.4% _a	93	65.6% _a	37	76.8% _a	71	74.9% _a	139
No	12.7% _a	30	12.0% _a	26	4.7% _a	5	17.9% _b	10	18.0% _b	17	13.4% _{a,b}	25
Not sure	11.0% _a	26	13.9% _a	30	12.9% _a	15	16.5% _a	9	5.2% _a	5	11.7% _a	22
TOTALS:	100.0%	239	100.0%	219	100.0%	113	100.0%	57	100.0%	92	100.0%	185

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	73.2% _a	98	78.8% _a	66	80.1% _a	57	70.2% _a	49	74.2% _a	38	75.8% _a	36
No	8.0% _a	11	11.4% _a	10	7.8% _a	6	19.2% _a	13	20.0% _a	10	15.2% _a	7
Not sure	18.8% _a	25	9.8% _a	8	12.1% _a	9	10.5% _a	7	5.8% _a	3	9.0% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	134	100.0%	84	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	51	100.0%	48

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes	78.6% _a	163	72.1% _a	121	72.9% _a	61	79.9% _a	69	78.2% _a	99	77.3% _a	68	70.9% _a	71
No	13.7% _a	28	12.1% _a	20	9.9% _a	8	7.2% _a	6	12.8% _a	16	11.8% _a	10	16.6% _a	17
Not sure	7.7% _a	16	15.8% _b	26	17.1% _{a,b}	14	12.9% _a	11	9.0% _a	11	10.9% _a	10	12.5% _a	13
TOTALS:	100.0%	208	100.0%	168	100.0%	83	100.0%	87	100.0%	126	100.0%	88	100.0%	101

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes	73.6% _a	109	78.3% _a	113	94.0% _a	11	88.4% _a	19	82.7% _a	29	73.5% _a	161
No	21.9% _a	32	12.6% _b	18	6.0% _a	1	4.4% _a	1	7.7% _a	3	20.9% _a	46
Not sure	4.6% _a	7	9.2% _a	13	0.0% ¹	0	7.2% _a	2	9.5% _a	3	5.6% _a	12
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	77.0% _a	41	77.6% _a	32	87.3% _a	45	70.2% _a	42	71.4% _a	31	71.7% _a	31
No	23.0% _a	12	13.8% _a	6	10.8% _a	6	15.2% _a	9	17.6% _a	8	24.0% _a	10
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	8.6% _a	4	1.9% _a	1	14.6% _a	9	11.0% _a	5	4.3% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes	73.6% _a	120	78.8% _a	68	78.9% _a	33	90.5% _a	52	65.8% _b	58	78.6% _{a,b}	53	77.7% _{a,b}	30
No	20.4% _a	33	13.3% _a	11	13.6% _a	6	4.8% _a	3	32.3% _b	29	10.7% _a	7	13.0% _{a,b}	5
Not sure	6.1% _a	10	7.9% _a	7	7.6% _a	3	4.7% _a	3	1.8% _a	2	10.7% _a	7	9.3% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

Table 27 cont.— Do you feel that local governments should explore consolidation in your county if it could save taxpayers money?

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes	75.2% _a	172	78.3% _a	171	88.8% _a	8	72.6% _a	36	84.6% _a	74	74.3% _a	219
No	16.3% _a	37	12.5% _a	27	11.2% _a	1	20.8% _a	10	6.9% _a	6	15.9% _a	47
Not sure	8.5% _a	19	9.2% _a	20	0.0% ¹	0	6.6% _a	3	8.5% _a	7	9.8% _a	29
TOTALS:	100.0%	228	100.0%	219	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	77.1% _{a,b,c}	91	67.4% _{a,c}	41	89.2% _b	63	82.8% _{a,b}	65	79.6% _{a,b,c}	50	58.2% _c	32
No	16.4% _{a,b}	19	16.0% _{a,b}	10	6.3% _a	4	11.0% _{a,b}	9	11.5% _{a,b}	7	26.9% _b	15
Not sure	6.6% _a	8	16.6% _a	10	4.5% _a	3	6.2% _a	5	8.9% _a	6	14.8% _a	8
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	71	100.0%	79	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes	76.7% _a	156	78.1% _a	122	74.0% _a	65	78.9% _a	73	77.6% _a	71	73.3% _a	75	77.5% _a	78
No	15.7% _a	32	10.5% _a	16	18.4% _a	16	15.2% _{a,b}	14	7.7% _a	7	23.6% _b	24	15.5% _{a,b}	16
Not sure	7.5% _a	15	11.4% _a	18	7.5% _a	7	5.9% _{a,b}	5	14.8% _a	14	3.1% _b	3	7.0% _{a,b}	7
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	156	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Section 3.2 – Entrepreneurship

Table 28 – Do you currently own or operate a business in Jefferson, Lewis, or St. Lawrence County?

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Do you currently own or operate a business in Jefferson, Lewis, or St. Lawrence County?	Yes	142	11.9%
	No	1052	88.1%
	TOTALS:	1195	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	2013		Year 2015		2017	
Yes	12.3% _a	84	10.6% _a	138	11.9% _a	142
No	87.7% _a	598	89.4% _a	1164	88.1% _a	1052
TOTALS:	100.0%	683	100.0%	1302	100.0%	1195





Table 28 cont.— Do you currently own or operate a business in Jefferson, Lewis, or St. Lawrence County?

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Yes	12.0% _{a,b}	55	16.2% _a	47	9.0% _b	40
No	88.0% _{a,b}	403	83.8% _a	245	91.0% _b	408
TOTALS:	100.0%	458	100.0%	292	100.0%	448

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson			Lewis			St. Lawrence	
	2013	2015	2017	2013	2015	2017	2015	2017
Yes	11.9% _a	11.0% _a	12.0% _a	14.1% _a	15.7% _a	16.2% _a	9.0% _a	9.0% _a
No	88.1% _a	89.0% _a	88.0% _a	85.9% _a	84.3% _a	83.8% _a	91.0% _a	91.0% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%



Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes	10.3% _a	25	13.9% _a	30	3.8% _a	4	11.3% _{a,b}	6	10.2% _{a,b}	9	18.2% _b	34
No	89.7% _a	216	86.1% _a	186	96.2% _a	109	88.7% _{a,b}	49	89.8% _{a,b}	83	81.8% _b	153
TOTALS:	100.0%	241	100.0%	216	100.0%	114	100.0%	55	100.0%	92	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	1.6% _a	2	17.0% _{b,c,d}	14	7.9% _{a,b}	6	25.0% _{b,c}	18	27.9% _c	14	2.2% _{a,d}	1
No	98.4% _a	132	83.0% _{b,c,d}	69	92.1% _{a,b}	65	75.0% _{b,c}	53	72.1% _c	37	97.8% _{a,d}	46
TOTALS:	100.0%	135	100.0%	83	100.0%	71	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	47

Table 28 cont.— Do you currently own or operate a business in Jefferson, Lewis, or St. Lawrence County?

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College	4+ Year Degree				Up to \$25,000	\$25,001- \$50,000	\$50,001- \$75,000	Over \$75,000				
Yes	10.1% _a	21	14.2% _a	24	12.2% _a	10	2.0% _a	2	8.7% _{a,b}	11	14.7% _b	13	19.3% _{b,c}	19
No	89.9% _a	187	85.8% _a	143	87.8% _a	73	98.0% _a	86	91.3% _{a,b}	115	85.3% _b	75	80.7% _{b,c}	81
TOTALS:	100.0%	208	100.0%	167	100.0%	83	100.0%	87	100.0%	125	100.0%	88	100.0%	101

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes	18.7% _a	28	13.6% _a	20	23.3% _a	3	8.3% _a	2	2.1% _a	1	19.1% _a	42
No	81.3% _a	120	86.4% _a	124	76.7% _a	9	91.7% _a	19	97.9% _a	35	80.9% _a	177
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	144	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	11.5% _{a,b}	6	20.3% _a	8	13.6% _{a,b}	7	25.4% _a	15	24.2% _a	10	0.5% _b	0
No	88.5% _{a,b}	47	79.7% _a	33	86.4% _{a,b}	44	74.6% _a	45	75.8% _a	33	99.5% _b	43
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College	4+ Year Degree				Up to \$25,000	\$25,001- \$50,000	\$50,001- \$75,000	Over \$75,000				
Yes	19.2% _a	31	14.7% _a	13	8.0% _a	3	18.1% _a	10	16.8% _a	15	9.5% _a	6	19.8% _a	8
No	80.8% _a	132	85.3% _a	74	92.0% _a	39	81.9% _a	47	83.2% _a	74	90.5% _a	60	80.2% _a	31
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male	Female			AM in household	Fort Drum and stayed	No AM, but job related to FD	No FD connection				
Yes	12.0% _a	27	5.8% _b	13	0.0% ¹	0	10.8% _a	5	7.6% _a	7	9.0% _a	27
No	88.0% _a	201	94.2% _b	206	100.0% ¹	9	89.2% _a	44	92.4% _a	80	91.0% _a	269
TOTALS:	100.0%	229	100.0%	219	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	3.3% _a	4	7.3% _{a,b}	4	15.4% _b	11	15.0% _{b,c}	12	12.5% _{a,b}	8	2.2% _{a,b}	1
No	96.7% _a	115	92.7% _{a,b}	56	84.6% _b	60	85.0% _{b,c}	68	87.5% _{a,b}	55	97.8% _{a,b}	55
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	71	100.0%	80	100.0%	63	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College	4+ Year Degree				Up to \$25,000	\$25,001- \$50,000	\$50,001- \$75,000	Over \$75,000				
Yes	7.2% _a	15	9.8% _a	15	11.6% _a	10	5.2% _{a,b}	5	3.4% _a	3	10.9% _{a,b}	11	16.9% _b	17
No	92.8% _a	189	90.2% _a	141	88.4% _a	77	94.8% _{a,b}	88	96.6% _a	89	89.1% _{a,b}	92	83.1% _b	84
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	157	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101


Table 29 – Do you own a home-based business? (among those who currently own a business)

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Do you own a home-based business?	Yes	97	65.6%
	No	49	33.6%
	Not sure	1	0.8%
	TOTALS:	147	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

What county do you live in?						
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Yes	56.8% _a	33	81.5% _b	39	70.1% _{a,b}	28
No	43.2% _a	25	18.5% _b	9	27.4% _{a,b}	11
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.5% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	58	100.0%	48	100.0%	40



Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

Gender					Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		Fort Drum and stayed				No AM, but job related to FD			
					AM in household							
Yes	38.3% _a	10	71.2% _b	23	32.5% _a	1	34.8% _a	3	92.9% _a	9	54.1% _a	19
No	61.7% _a	16	28.8% _b	9	67.5% _a	3	65.2% _a	5	7.1% _a	1	45.9% _a	16
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	25	100.0%	32	100.0%	4	100.0%	8	100.0%	9	100.0%	35

Age Groups												
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	0.0% ¹	0	53.1% _a	9	57.1% _a	3	58.8% _a	11	66.9% _a	10	51.1% ²	1
No	100.0% ¹	2	46.9% _a	8	42.9% _a	2	41.2% _a	7	33.1% _a	5	48.9% ²	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	2	100.0%	16	100.0%	6	100.0%	18	100.0%	15	100.0%	1

Table 29 cont.— Do you own a home-based business? (among those who currently own a business)

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College	4+ Year Degree	Up to \$25,000	\$25,001- \$50,000	\$50,001- \$75,000	Over \$75,000							
Yes	61.7% _a	14	56.3% _a	13	47.5% _a	5	100.0% ^{1,2}	2	42.9% _a	6	61.7% _a	8	51.3% _a	10
No	38.3% _a	9	43.7% _a	10	52.5% _a	6	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	57.1% _a	7	38.3% _a	5	48.7% _a	9
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	23	100.0%	24	100.0%	11	100.0%	2	100.0%	13	100.0%	14	100.0%	19

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male	Female	AM in household	Fort Drum and stayed	No AM, but job related to FD	No FD connection						
Yes	89.8% _a	25	69.7% _a	14	52.3% _a	1	100.0% ^{1,2}	2	65.6% ²	1	83.6% _a	35
No	10.2% _a	3	30.3% _a	6	47.7% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	34.4% ²	0	16.4% _a	7
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	28	100.0%	20	100.0%	3	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	42

	Age Groups											
	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+						
Yes	100.0% ¹	6	100.0% ¹	8	62.9% _a	4	64.5% _a	10	92.5% _a	10	100.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	37.1% _a	3	35.5% _a	5	7.5% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	15	100.0%	11	100.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College	4+ Year Degree	Up to \$25,000	\$25,001- \$50,000	\$50,001- \$75,000	Over \$75,000							
Yes	78.1% _a	24	95.0% _a	12	61.7% _a	2	100.0% ¹	10	100.0% ¹	15	50.1% _a	3	68.0% _a	5
No	21.9% _a	7	5.0% _a	1	38.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	49.9% _a	3	32.0% _a	3
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	31	100.0%	13	100.0%	3	100.0%	10	100.0%	15	100.0%	6	100.0%	8

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male	Female	AM in household	Fort Drum and stayed	No AM, but job related to FD	No FD connection						
Yes	67.8% _a	19	74.9% _a	10	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	93.5% _a	5	81.9% _a	5	61.9% _a	16
No	28.5% _a	8	25.1% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	6.5% _a	0	3.0% _a	0	38.1% _a	10
Not sure	3.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	15.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	27	100.0%	13	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	7	100.0%	27

	Age Groups											
	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+						
Yes	100.0% ¹	4	100.0% ¹	4	77.0% _a	8	47.6% _a	6	67.0% _a	5	43.7% ²	1
No	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	23.0% _a	3	44.0% _a	5	33.0% _a	3	56.3% ²	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	8.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	12	100.0%	8	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College	4+ Year Degree	Up to \$25,000	\$25,001- \$50,000	\$50,001- \$75,000	Over \$75,000							
Yes	59.3% _a	9	87.8% _a	13	58.9% _a	6	55.2% _a	3	67.5% _a	2	75.5% _a	8	70.0% _a	12
No	33.9% _a	5	12.2% _a	2	41.1% _a	4	44.8% _a	2	32.5% _a	1	15.6% _a	2	30.0% _a	5
Not sure	6.8% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	8.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	15	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	5	100.0%	3	100.0%	11	100.0%	17

Table 30 – How many employees do you have currently, including yourself and any full or part time employees?

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
How many employees do you have currently, including yourself and any full or part time employees?	1	59	41.6%
	2	29	20.3%
	3	4	3.1%
	4	12	8.7%
	5	4	3.1%
	6-10	18	12.8%
	11-20	7	5.1%
	21-30	5	3.6%
	More than 30	2	1.7%
	TOTALS:	142	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	2013		2015		2017	
1	32.9%	28	32.7%	44	41.6%	59
2	20.8%	17	21.0%	28	20.3%	29
3	3.1%	3	9.5%	13	3.1%	4
4	4.1%	3	5.5%	7	8.7%	12
5	4.3%	4	7.1%	10	3.1%	4
1-5	65.2% _a	55	75.7% _a	102	76.8% _a	109
6-10	22.0%	19	11.4%	15	12.8%	18
11-20	6.6%	6	10.1%	14	5.1%	7
21-30	3.0%	2	1.2%	2	3.6%	5
6-30	31.6% _a	27	22.8% _a	31	21.5% _a	30
More than 30	3.2% _a	3	1.5% _a	2	1.7% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	84	100.0%	135	100.0%	142




Table 30 cont.— How many employees do you have currently, including yourself and any full or part time employees?

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
1	46.6%	25	33.2%	16	38.2%	15
2	17.3%	9	28.4%	14	22.8%	9
3	5.7%	3	3.3%	2	0.9%	0
4	2.4%	1	11.2%	5	15.7%	6
5	0.0%	0	4.2%	2	5.7%	2
1-5	72.1% _a	39	80.4% _a	38	83.2% _a	33
6-10	10.0%	5	16.3%	8	12.6%	5
11-20	8.6%	5	2.7%	1	1.0%	0
21-30	6.7%	4	0.0%	0	1.2%	0
6-30	25.3% _a	14	19.0% _a	9	14.8% _a	6
More than 30	2.6% _a	1	0.6% _a	0	2.0% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	54	100.0%	48	100.0%	40

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson			Lewis			St. Lawrence	
	2013	2015	2017	2013	2015	2017	2015	2017
1	27.6%	35.9%	46.6%	52.3%	38.1%	33.2%	26.4%	38.2%
2	22.3%	22.0%	17.3%	15.0%	7.4%	28.4%	25.4%	22.8%
3	2.7%	10.4%	5.7%	4.6%	1.5%	3.3%	11.6%	0.9%
4	3.1%	1.6%	2.4%	7.9%	11.1%	11.2%	7.9%	15.7%
5	4.7%	4.0%	0.0%	3.1%	14.0%	4.2%	8.2%	5.7%
1-5	60.4% _a	73.9% _a	72.1% _a	82.9% _a	72.1% _a	80.4% _a	79.4% _a	83.2% _a
6-10	27.1%	9.5%	10.0%	3.3%	5.1%	16.3%	16.5%	12.6%
11-20	7.2%	13.2%	8.6%	4.6%	22.4%	2.7%	1.1%	1.0%
21-30	1.2%	1.7%	6.7%	9.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.9%	1.2%
6-30	35.5% _a	24.4% _a	25.3% _a	17.1% _a	27.9% _a	19.0% _a	18.6% _a	14.8% _a
More than 30	4.1% _a	1.7% _a	2.6% _a	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.6% _a	2.0% _a	2.0% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 30 cont.— How many employees do you have currently, including yourself and any full or part time employees?

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
1	22.1%	5	63.4%	20	0.0%	0	69.5%	5	51.5%	5	43.0%	15
2	20.5%	5	15.1%	5	0.0%	0	8.7%	1	34.3%	3	16.3%	6
3	6.1%	1	5.4%	2	23.3%	1	0.0%	0	7.1%	1	5.2%	2
4	4.0%	1	1.3%	0	31.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.3%	0
5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
1-5	52.8% _a	12	85.3% _b	28	55.0% _a	2	78.2% _a	5	92.9% _a	9	65.8% _a	23
6-10	17.0%	4	5.2%	2	45.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	12.2%	4
11-20	13.8%	3	5.1%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7.1%	1	11.7%	4
21-30	16.5%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	21.8%	2	0.0%	0	6.2%	2
6-30	47.2% _a	10	10.3% _b	3	45.0% _a	1	21.8% _a	2	7.1% _a	1	30.1% _a	10
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	4.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.1% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	22	100.0%	32	100.0%	3	100.0%	7	100.0%	9	100.0%	34

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
1	0.0%	0	53.3%	9	61.0%	3	41.5%	7	39.3%	6	51.1%	1
2	0.0%	0	9.1%	1	0.0%	0	20.0%	3	29.1%	4	34.1%	0
3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	9.8%	2	8.7%	1	14.8%	0
4	0.0%	0	5.5%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.0%	0	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
1-5	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	67.9% _a	11	61.0% _a	3	71.2% _a	12	80.1% _a	11	100.0% ^{1,2}	1
6-10	0.0%	0	20.5%	3	0.0%	0	2.4%	0	12.1%	2	0.0%	0
11-20	0.0%	0	4.8%	1	11.9%	1	16.9%	3	2.1%	0	0.0%	0
21-30	0.0%	0	6.8%	1	27.1%	2	6.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	32.1% _a	5	39.0% _a	2	25.3% _a	4	14.2% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
More than 30	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	3.5% _a	1	5.6% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	0.0%	0	100.0%	16	100.0%	6	100.0%	18	100.0%	14	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
1	54.1%	12	45.8%	10	30.3%	3	0.0%	0	68.4%	7	41.0%	5	17.5%
2	23.6%	5	15.3%	3	6.9%	1	35.8%	1	6.4%	1	22.9%	3	23.9%
3	0.0%	0	7.1%	2	16.4%	2	0.0%	0	6.2%	1	4.4%	1	9.8%
4	0.0%	0	2.0%	0	9.4%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.3%	0	4.7%
5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1-5	77.7% _a	18	70.1% _a	15	62.9% _a	6	35.8% ²	1	81.0% _a	9	71.6% _a	9	55.9% _a
6-10	8.9%	2	12.2%	3	7.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	22.6%	3	13.0%
11-20	9.9%	2	3.0%	1	18.3%	2	0.0%	0	10.6%	1	5.8%	1	14.8%
21-30	0.0%	0	11.9%	3	11.1%	1	64.2%	1	8.3%	1	0.0%	0	8.8%
6-30	18.8% _a	4	27.1% _a	6	37.1% _a	4	64.2% ²	1	19.0% _a	2	28.4% _a	4	36.7% _a
More than 30	3.5% _a	1	2.8% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.5% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	23	100.0%	22	100.0%	9	100.0%	2	100.0%	11	100.0%	13	100.0%

Table 30 cont.— How many employees do you have currently, including yourself and any full or part time employees?

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
1	23.7%	7	46.8%	9	0.0%	0	77.7%	1	65.6%	1	32.8%	14
2	27.6%	8	29.5%	6	52.3%	1	22.3%	0	0.0%	0	27.5%	12
3	3.8%	1	2.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.8%	2
4	14.5%	4	6.5%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	12.8%	5
5	5.2%	1	2.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.8%	2
1-5	74.9% _a	21	88.2% _a	17	52.3% _a	1	100.0% ^{1,2}	2	65.6% ²	1	81.6% _a	34
6-10	25.1%	7	3.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	34.4%	0	17.7%	7
11-20	0.0%	0	6.6%	1	47.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
21-30	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	25.1% _a	7	10.3% _a	2	47.7% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	34.4% ²	0	17.7% _a	7
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	1.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.7% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	28	100.0%	20	100.0%	3	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	42

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
1	0.0%	0	74.0%	6	25.4%	2	41.2%	6	13.0%	1	100.0%	0
2	0.0%	0	16.9%	1	18.6%	1	25.6%	4	64.0%	7	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	14.6%	2	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0	9.1%	1	37.5%	3	9.6%	1	4.8%	1	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	13.1%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
1-5	0.0% ¹	0	100.0% ¹	8	81.4% _a	6	89.5% _a	14	96.4% _a	10	100.0% ^{1,2}	0
6-10	100.0%	6	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	8.6%	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	0
11-20	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	18.6%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
21-30	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	100.0% ¹	6	0.0% ¹	0	18.6% _a	1	8.6% _a	1	3.6% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.9% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	15	100.0%	11	100.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
1	20.1%	6	66.9%	9	24.7%	1	52.6%	5	19.8%	3	28.9%	2	32.2%	3
2	29.6%	9	26.0%	3	27.1%	1	10.2%	1	35.5%	5	19.6%	1	20.2%	2
3	5.1%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	5.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	13.2%	1
4	14.7%	5	0.0%	0	22.3%	1	25.1%	3	0.0%	0	8.2%	1	18.4%	1
5	4.7%	1	4.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.6%	1	23.1%	1	0.0%	0
1-5	74.1% _a	23	97.0% _a	13	74.2% _a	3	93.0% _a	10	58.9% _a	9	79.8% _a	5	84.1% _a	7
6-10	21.8%	7	3.0%	0	17.3%	1	7.0%	1	41.1%	6	0.0%	0	12.2%	1
11-20	4.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	20.2%	1	0.0%	0
21-30	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	25.9% _a	8	3.0% _a	0	17.3% _a	1	7.0% _a	1	41.1% _a	6	20.2% _a	1	12.2% _a	1
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	8.6% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.6% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	31	100.0%	13	100.0%	3	100.0%	10	100.0%	15	100.0%	6	100.0%	8

Table 30 cont.— How many employees do you have currently, including yourself and any full or part time employees?

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
1	42.5%	12	28.4%	3	0.0%	0	17.9%	1	43.9%	3	41.4%	11
2	12.2%	3	46.6%	6	0.0%	0	3.8%	0	14.8%	1	30.1%	8
3	0.0%	0	2.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	5.1%	0	0.0%	0
4	22.7%	6	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	10.9%	1	21.2%	6
5	3.6%	1	10.3%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	15.1%	1	4.8%	1
1-5	81.0% _a	22	88.1% _a	11	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	21.7% _a	1	89.9% _{a,b}	6	97.5% _b	25
6-10	18.2%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	78.3%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
11-20	0.8%	0	1.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.0%	0	0.8%	0
21-30	0.0%	0	3.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7.1%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	19.0% _a	5	5.5% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	78.3% _a	4	10.1% _{a,b}	1	0.8% _b	0
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	6.4% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.7% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	27	100.0%	12	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	7	100.0%	26

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
1	0.0%	0	100.0%	4	25.8%	3	58.3%	7	9.6%	1	22.3%	0
2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	14.7%	2	25.4%	3	49.4%	4	77.7%	1
3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.4%	0	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	44.2%	5	0.0%	0	18.3%	1	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.1%	0	12.3%	1	4.4%	0	0.0%	0
1-5	0.0% ¹	0	100.0% ¹	4	88.7% _a	10	96.1% _a	11	85.9% _a	7	100.0% ^{1,2}	1
6-10	100.0%	4	0.0%	0	7.2%	1	0.0%	0	4.5%	0	0.0%	0
11-20	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	5.2%	0	0.0%	0
21-30	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	100.0% ¹	4	0.0% ¹	0	7.2% _a	1	3.9% _a	0	9.7% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.1% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.4% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	12	100.0%	8	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
1	34.0%	5	49.8%	8	26.4%	3	26.4%	1	67.5%	2	61.9%	7	29.0%	5
2	20.1%	3	25.4%	4	22.5%	2	73.6%	3	32.5%	1	15.6%	2	5.6%	1
3	0.0%	0	2.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.0%	0	0.0%	0
4	38.9%	6	4.6%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	6.4%	1	32.3%	6
5	7.0%	1	5.3%	1	4.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	8.9%	1	4.7%	1
1-5	100.0% ¹	14	87.3% _a	13	53.3% _a	5	100.0% ¹	4	100.0% ¹	3	95.8% _a	11	71.6% _a	12
6-10	0.0%	0	7.4%	1	38.3%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	24.7%	4
11-20	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.2%	0
21-30	0.0%	0	3.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.2%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	0.0% ¹	0	10.5% _a	2	42.3% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.2% _a	0	25.8% _a	4
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	2.2% _a	0	4.4% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	14	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	4	100.0%	3	100.0%	11	100.0%	17

Table 31 – How many employees have you added or expanded by in the past 12 months?

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

How many employees have you added or expanded by in the past 12 months?	Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
None, have not added	109	75.7%
1	14	9.7%
2	14	9.5%
3	2	1.3%
4	0	0.0%
5	1	0.7%
6-10	2	1.4%
11-20	3	1.8%
21-30	0	0.0%
More than 30	0	0.0%
TOTALS:	144	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	Year			
	2015		2017	
None, have not added	75.2% _a	102	75.7% _a	109
1	9.4%	13	9.7%	14
2	9.8%	13	9.5%	14
3	3.3%	4	1.3%	2
4	0.7%	1	0.0%	0
5	1.0%	1	0.7%	1
1-5	24.3% _a	33	21.2% _a	30
6-10	0.5%	1	1.4%	2
11-20	0.0%	0	1.8%	3
21-30	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	0.5% _a	1	3.2% _a	5
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	135	100.0%	144




Table 31 cont.– How many employees have you added or expanded by in the past 12 months?

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
None, have not added	72.4% _a	40	65.6% _a	31	87.2% _a	35
1	7.5%	4	19.3%	9	7.6%	3
2	9.5%	5	15.1%	7	2.0%	1
3	1.6%	1	0.0%	0	2.4%	1
4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
5	1.9%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
1-5	20.6% _{a,b}	11	34.4% _a	16	12.0% _b	5
6-10	3.7%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
11-20	3.3%	2	0.0%	0	0.9%	0
21-30	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	7.0% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	0
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	55	100.0%	47	100.0%	40

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
	2015	2017	2015	2017	2015	2017
None, have not added	76.7% _a	72.4% _a	79.3% _a	65.6% _a	71.8% _a	87.2% _a
1	4.7%	7.5%	12.4%	19.3%	13.8%	7.6%
2	13.1%	9.5%	8.3%	15.1%	6.6%	2.0%
3	4.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	2.4%
4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%
5	0.4%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%
1-5	22.2% _a	20.6% _a	20.7% _a	34.4% _a	28.2% _a	12.0% _a
6-10	1.1%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11-20	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%
21-30	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6-30	1.1% _a	7.0% _a	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.9% _a
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 31 cont.— How many employees have you added or expanded by in the past 12 months?

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
None, have not added	60.5% _a	14	81.1% _a	26	31.7% _a	1	81.0% _a	7	100.0% ¹	9	67.9% _a	23
1	11.6%	3	4.6%	1	5.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	9.2%	3
2	17.2%	4	3.9%	1	17.9%	1	11.4%	1	0.0%	0	11.3%	4
3	1.3%	0	1.9%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.7%	1
4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
5	4.5%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7.6%	1	0.0%	0	1.3%	0
1-5	34.6% _a	8	10.4% _b	3	23.3% _a	1	19.0% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	24.4% _a	8
6-10	0.0%	0	6.5%	2	45.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.4%	1
11-20	4.9%	1	2.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	5.3%	2
21-30	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	4.9% _a	1	8.5% _a	3	45.0% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.7% _b	3
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	23	100.0%	32	100.0%	3	100.0%	8	100.0%	9	100.0%	34

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
None, have not added	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	65.7% _a	11	61.2% _a	3	76.3% _a	13	76.5% _a	11	85.2% ¹	1
1	0.0%	0	9.1%	1	15.8%	1	0.0%	0	12.0%	2	14.8%	0
2	0.0%	0	17.4%	3	0.0%	0	11.3%	2	3.6%	1	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.5%	1	2.2%	0	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	11.1%	1	2.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
1-5	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	26.5% _a	4	26.9% _a	2	17.2% _a	3	17.8% _a	2	14.8% ¹	0
6-10	0.0%	0	7.8%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	5.7%	1	0.0%	0
11-20	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	11.9%	1	6.5%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
21-30	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	7.8% _a	1	11.9% _a	1	6.5% _a	1	5.7% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
More than 30	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	1	100.0%	16	100.0%	6	100.0%	18	100.0%	14	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
None	79.2% _a	18	67.7% _a	16	67.2% _a	6	100.0% ^{1,2}	2	97.3% _a	12	74.1% _{a,b}	10	47.4% _b
1	3.5%	1	13.9%	3	1.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7.9%	1	7.7%
2	8.9%	2	7.5%	2	16.4%	2	0.0%	0	2.7%	0	5.9%	1	22.2%
3	0.0%	0	2.6%	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.4%	0	3.2%
4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	11.5%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	5.6%
1-5	12.4% _a	3	24.0% _a	6	32.8% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	2.7% _a	0	16.2% _a	2	38.7% _a
6-10	3.5%	1	5.4%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	9.8%	1	4.2%
11-20	5.0%	1	2.9%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	9.6%
21-30	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
6-30	8.5% _a	2	8.3% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	9.8% _a	1	13.9% _a
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹
TOTALS:	100.0%	23	100.0%	23	100.0%	9	100.0%	2	100.0%	12	100.0%	13	100.0%

Table 31 cont.— How many employees have you added or expanded by in the past 12 months?

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
None, have not added	52.0% _a	14	84.7% _b	17	52.3% _a	1	100.0% ^{1,2}	2	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	64.1% _a	27
1	27.9%	8	7.3%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	21.9%	9
2	20.1%	6	8.0%	2	47.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	14.0%	6
3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
1-5	48.0% _a	13	15.3% _b	3	47.7% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	35.9% _a	15
6-10	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
11-20	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
21-30	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	28	100.0%	20	100.0%	3	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	42

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
None, have not added	0.0% ¹	0	91.6% _a	8	81.4% _a	6	79.9% _a	12	50.8% _a	5	100.0% ^{1,2}	0
1	100.0%	6	8.4%	1	0.0%	0	8.6%	1	10.1%	1	0.0%	0
2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	18.6%	1	11.5%	2	39.1%	4	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
1-5	100.0% ¹	6	8.4% _a	1	18.6% _a	1	20.1% _a	3	49.2% _a	5	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
6-10	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
11-20	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
21-30	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
None	53.0% _a	17	94.5% _b	12	74.2% _{a,b}	3	93.0% _a	10	26.6% _b	4	56.7% _{a,b}	4	74.5% _{a,b}	6
1	25.1%	8	5.5%	1	17.3%	1	7.0%	1	45.8%	7	0.0%	0	21.7%	2
2	21.9%	7	0.0%	0	8.6%	0	0.0%	0	27.7%	4	43.3%	3	3.8%	0
3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
1-5	47.0% _a	15	5.5% _b	1	25.8% _{a,b}	1	7.0% _a	1	73.4% _b	11	43.3% _{a,b}	3	25.5% _{a,b}	2
6-10	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
11-20	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
21-30	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	31	100.0%	13	100.0%	3	100.0%	10	100.0%	15	100.0%	6	100.0%	8

Table 31 cont.— How many employees have you added or expanded by in the past 12 months?

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
None, have not added	89.2% _a	24	82.8% _a	11	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ¹	5	60.8% _a	4	94.7% _b	25
1	7.9%	2	7.2%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	32.1%	2	3.5%	1
2	2.9%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0	7.4%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7.1%	0	1.8%	0
4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
1-5	10.8% _a	3	14.6% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	39.2% _a	3	5.3% _b	1
6-10	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
11-20	0.0%	0	2.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
21-30	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	0.0% ¹	0	2.7% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	27	100.0%	13	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	7	100.0%	26

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
None, have not added	100.0% ¹	4	100.0% ¹	4	85.6% _a	9	83.7% _a	10	78.5% _a	6	100.0% ^{1,2}	1
1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7.2%	1	8.4%	1	17.0%	1	0.0%	0
2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7.2%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7.9%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
1-5	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	14.4% _a	2	16.3% _a	2	17.0% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
6-10	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
11-20	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.6%	0	0.0%	0
21-30	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.6% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	12	100.0%	7	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
None	93.2% _a	14	76.4% _a	11	94.3% _a	10	100.0% ¹	5	75.0% _a	2	78.1% _a	8	95.2% _a	16
1	6.8%	1	9.8%	1	5.7%	1	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	17.6%	2	2.1%	0
2	0.0%	0	5.2%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
3	0.0%	0	6.3%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.3%	0	2.8%	0
4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
1-5	6.8% _a	1	21.4% _a	3	5.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	25.0% _a	1	21.9% _a	2	4.8% _a	1
6-10	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
11-20	0.0%	0	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
21-30	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
6-30	0.0% ¹	0	2.3% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
More than 30	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	15	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	5	100.0%	3	100.0%	11	100.0%	17

Table 32 – SUMMARY – Potential Challenges for Business Owners

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

	Major	Minor	Not a challenge	Not sure
Taxes	53.9%	32.5%	13.6%	0.0%
Labor and benefits costs	44.2%	22.1%	30.1%	3.6%
Government regulation	41.6%	29.7%	27.5%	1.2%
Utility rates	32.9%	35.5%	29.0%	2.6%
Lack of skilled labor	31.7%	17.7%	49.4%	1.2%
Broadband or high--speed Internet access	29.8%	21.8%	46.0%	2.4%
Access to credit	13.5%	37.1%	45.5%	3.9%
Availability of affordable space at a desired location	10.3%	25.6%	60.7%	3.3%

2017 County Specific Results for Each of Jefferson, Lewis, St. Lawrence County

Jefferson County Summary:

	Major	Minor	Not a challenge	Not sure
Taxes	45.8%	34.4%	19.8%	0.0%
Labor and benefits costs	40.8%	24.8%	34.4%	0.0%
Lack of skilled labor	34.3%	13.7%	50.6%	1.4%
Utility rates	29.5%	36.8%	33.7%	0.0%
Government regulation	27.2%	29.9%	42.9%	0.0%
Broadband or high--speed Internet access	22.3%	28.2%	48.8%	0.8%
Availability of affordable space at a desired location	12.3%	25.1%	56.9%	5.6%
Access to credit	11.6%	32.8%	55.6%	0.0%

Lewis County Summary:

	Major	Minor	Not a challenge	Not sure
Taxes	64.6%	26.4%	9.0%	0.0%
Government regulation	51.7%	15.9%	30.9%	1.5%
Labor and benefits costs	38.4%	19.1%	31.3%	11.2%
Lack of skilled labor	27.8%	14.3%	57.5%	0.4%
Broadband or high--speed Internet access	23.2%	22.5%	45.2%	9.1%
Utility rates	20.3%	49.3%	29.0%	1.4%
Access to credit	5.5%	44.8%	37.1%	12.6%
Availability of affordable space at a desired location	5.1%	11.2%	82.2%	1.4%

St. Lawrence County:

	Major	Minor	Not a challenge	Not sure
Taxes	65.2%	24.4%	10.3%	0.0%
Labor and benefits costs	51.1%	17.3%	28.8%	2.7%
Government regulation	49.9%	31.6%	16.7%	1.9%
Utility rates	49.5%	19.4%	22.0%	9.2%
Broadband or high--speed Internet access	42.5%	10.5%	46.1%	0.9%
Lack of skilled labor	28.6%	19.1%	50.7%	1.6%
Access to credit	25.0%	37.2%	34.8%	2.9%
Availability of affordable space at a desired location	8.0%	37.1%	52.3%	2.6%

Table 33 – Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Taxes

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

Taxes		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
	Major	79	53.9%
	Minor	47	32.5%
	Not a challenge	20	13.6%
	Not sure	0	0.0%
	TOTALS:	146	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Major	45.8% _a	26	64.6% _a	31	65.2% _a	26
Minor	34.4% _a	20	26.4% _a	13	24.4% _a	10
Not a challenge	19.8% _a	11	9.0% _a	4	10.3% _a	4
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	57	100.0%	47	100.0%	40




Table 33 cont.— Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Taxes

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	50.9% _a	13	41.9% _a	13	11.7% _a	1	57.0% _a	5	41.5% _a	4	47.2% _a	16
Minor	43.2% _a	11	27.5% _a	9	62.1% _a	3	43.0% _a	4	37.9% _a	4	28.8% _a	10
Not a challenge	5.8% _a	1	30.6% _b	10	26.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	20.6% _a	2	24.0% _a	8
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	25	100.0%	32	100.0%	4	100.0%	8	100.0%	9	100.0%	34

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	55.2% _{a,b}	1	9.1% _a	1	56.3% _{a,b}	3	65.2% _b	11	57.4% _{b,c}	8	51.1% ¹	1
Minor	0.0% ²	0	62.8% _a	10	27.9% _a	2	19.6% _a	3	29.6% _a	4	17.0% ¹	0
Not a challenge	44.8% _a	1	28.1% _a	5	15.8% _a	1	15.2% _a	3	13.0% _a	2	31.8% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	2	100.0%	16	100.0%	6	100.0%	18	100.0%	14	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	49.1% _a	11	48.1% _a	11	33.0% _a	3	35.8% ²	1	47.4% _a	6	44.9% _a	6	58.4% _a	11
Minor	33.7% _a	8	35.2% _a	8	34.2% _a	3	64.2% ²	1	36.7% _a	5	20.4% _a	3	27.5% _a	5
Not a challenge	17.2% _a	4	16.7% _a	4	32.8% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	15.9% _a	2	34.7% _a	4	14.0% _a	3
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	23	100.0%	24	100.0%	10	100.0%	2	100.0%	13	100.0%	13	100.0%	19

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	68.3% _a	19	59.4% _a	12	52.3% _a	1	63.9% ²	1	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	65.2% _a	27
Minor	31.7% _a	9	18.9% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	36.1% ²	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	28.3% _a	12
Not a challenge	0.0% ¹	0	21.7% _a	4	47.7% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	6.4% _b	3
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	28	100.0%	20	100.0%	3	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	42

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	0.0% ¹	0	82.5% _a	7	81.4% _a	6	61.5% _a	9	82.5% _a	9	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Minor	100.0% ¹	6	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	30.0% _a	5	15.5% _a	2	100.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not a challenge	0.0% ¹	0	17.5% _a	1	18.6% _a	1	8.5% _a	1	2.0% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	67.1% _a	21	69.5% _a	9	23.4% _a	1	93.0% _a	10	38.4% _b	6	25.7% _b	2	87.9% _{a,b}	7
Minor	28.8% _a	9	14.7% _a	2	48.1% _a	2	7.0% _a	1	49.9% _a	7	54.1% _a	3	9.4% _a	1
Not a challenge	4.1% _a	1	15.8% _a	2	28.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	11.7% _a	2	20.2% _a	1	2.7% _a	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	31	100.0%	13	100.0%	3	100.0%	10	100.0%	15	100.0%	6	100.0%	8

Table 33 cont.— Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Taxes

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	68.4% _a	19	58.4% _a	7	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	24.4% _a	1	60.1% _a	4	72.6% _a	19
Minor	19.5% _a	5	35.2% _a	4	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	75.6% _a	4	36.9% _{a,b}	2	12.5% _b	3
Not a challenge	12.1% _a	3	6.5% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.0% _a	0	14.9% _a	4
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	27	100.0%	13	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	7	100.0%	27

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	95.8% _a	10	78.3% _a	9	75.4% _a	6	43.7% ²	1
Minor	100.0% ¹	4	25.2% _a	1	4.2% _a	0	17.8% _a	2	22.1% _a	2	43.7% ²	1
Not a challenge	0.0% ¹	0	74.8% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	3.9% _b	0	2.6% _b	0	12.5% ²	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	12	100.0%	8	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Major	96.3% _a	14	56.2% _b	9	33.3% _b	3	44.8% _a	2	91.2% _a	3	58.2% _a	7	62.7% _a
Minor	3.7% _a	1	19.0% _{a,b}	3	63.2% _b	6	55.2% _a	3	8.8% _a	0	12.1% _a	1	32.5% _a
Not a challenge	0.0% ¹	0	24.8% _a	4	3.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	29.7% _a	3	4.8% _a
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹
TOTALS:	100.0%	15	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	5	100.0%	3	100.0%	11	100.0%

Table 34 – Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Access to Credit

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Access to credit	Major	20	13.5%
	Minor	54	37.1%
	Not a challenge	66	45.5%
	Not sure	6	3.9%
	TOTALS:	146	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Major	11.6% _{a,b}	7	5.5% _a	3	25.0% _b	10
Minor	32.8% _a	19	44.8% _a	21	37.2% _a	15
Not a challenge	55.6% _a	32	37.1% _a	18	34.8% _a	14
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	12.6% _a	6	2.9% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	57	100.0%	47	100.0%	40




Table 34 cont.– Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Access to Credit

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	13.8% _a	3	9.9% _a	3	3.5% _{a,b}	0	52.8% _a	4	14.6% _{a,b}	1	2.2% _b	1
Minor	46.3% _a	12	22.3% _a	7	62.1% _a	3	7.5% _a	1	14.3% _a	1	41.2% _a	14
Not a challenge	39.9% _a	10	67.8% _b	22	34.4% _a	1	39.7% _a	3	71.2% _a	7	56.6% _a	19
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	25	100.0%	32	100.0%	4	100.0%	8	100.0%	9	100.0%	34

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	55.2% _a	1	12.5% _a	2	11.1% _a	1	4.3% _a	1	11.6% _a	2	31.8% ¹	0
Minor	0.0% ²	0	41.9% _a	7	29.4% _a	2	34.1% _a	6	29.6% _a	4	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not a challenge	44.8% _a	1	45.5% _a	7	59.5% _a	3	61.6% _a	11	58.8% _a	9	68.2% ¹	1
Not sure	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	2	100.0%	16	100.0%	6	100.0%	18	100.0%	14	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	8.8% _a	2	10.9% _a	3	19.7% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	35.0% _a	5	1.2% _a	0	6.3% _a	1
Minor	28.0% _a	6	39.0% _a	9	29.2% _a	3	64.2% ²	1	18.0% _a	2	40.1% _a	5	44.5% _a	9
Not a challenge	63.2% _a	15	50.1% _a	12	51.1% _a	5	35.8% ²	1	47.0% _a	6	58.7% _a	8	49.1% _a	10
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	23	100.0%	24	100.0%	10	100.0%	2	100.0%	13	100.0%	13	100.0%	19

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	9.4% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	6.2% _a	3
Minor	54.7% _a	15	30.9% _a	6	52.3% _a	1	46.4% ²	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	45.4% _a	19
Not a challenge	16.2% _a	4	66.6% _b	13	47.7% _a	1	41.6% ²	1	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	34.7% _a	15
Not sure	19.7% _a	5	2.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	12.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	13.7% _a	6
TOTALS:	100.0%	28	100.0%	20	100.0%	3	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	42

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	37.5% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Minor	100.0% ¹	6	16.9% _a	1	18.6% _a	1	48.3% _a	7	48.2% _a	5	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not a challenge	0.0% ¹	0	17.5% _a	1	43.9% _a	3	49.8% _a	8	51.8% _a	5	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	65.6% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	1.9% _b	0	0.0% ¹	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	8.3% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	25.1% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Minor	46.0% _a	14	40.2% _a	5	50.7% _a	2	17.2% _a	2	59.5% _a	9	63.8% _a	4	68.9% _a	5
Not a challenge	45.6% _a	14	16.6% _a	2	34.6% _a	1	5.1% _a	1	40.5% _a	6	31.6% _a	2	31.1% _a	2
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	43.2% _a	5	14.7% _a	1	52.6% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	4.6% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	31	100.0%	13	100.0%	3	100.0%	10	100.0%	15	100.0%	6	100.0%	8

Table 34 cont.— Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Access to Credit

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	29.1% _a	8	16.3% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	43.9% _a	3	25.6% _a	7
Minor	41.7% _a	11	27.6% _a	4	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	93.5% _a	5	26.0% _{a,b}	2	26.1% _b	7
Not a challenge	28.5% _a	8	48.4% _a	6	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	6.5% _a	0	15.3% _a	1	47.5% _a	13
Not sure	0.8% _a	0	7.7% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	14.8% _a	1	0.8% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	27	100.0%	13	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	7	100.0%	27

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	0.0% ¹	0	100.0% ¹	4	7.2% _a	1	34.7% _a	4	8.7% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Minor	100.0% ¹	4	0.0% ¹	0	33.2% _a	4	41.2% _a	5	18.9% _a	1	87.5% ²	1
Not a challenge	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	59.6% _a	6	24.1% _a	3	57.2% _a	4	12.5% ²	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	15.2% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	12	100.0%	8	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	26.2% _a	4	38.6% _a	6	2.7% _a	0	23.4% _a	1	25.0% _a	1	38.6% _a	4	20.4% _a	3
Minor	36.3% _{a,b}	5	15.7% _a	2	71.2% _b	7	56.1% _a	3	43.7% _a	1	38.6% _a	4	31.3% _a	5
Not a challenge	37.5% _a	6	39.4% _a	6	24.0% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	31.3% _a	1	22.8% _a	3	48.4% _a	8
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	6.4% _a	1	2.0% _a	0	20.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	15	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	5	100.0%	3	100.0%	11	100.0%	17

Table 35 – Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Broadband or High-speed Internet Access

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Broadband or high-speed Internet access	Major	44	29.8%
	Minor	32	21.8%
	Not a challenge	67	46.0%
	Not sure	3	2.4%
	TOTALS:	146	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

What county do you live in?						
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Major	22.3% _a	13	23.2% _a	11	42.5% _a	17
Minor	28.2% _a	16	22.5% _a	11	10.5% _a	4
Not a challenge	48.8% _a	28	45.2% _a	21	46.1% _a	19
Not sure	0.8% _a	0	9.1% _a	4	0.9% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	57	100.0%	47	100.0%	40




Table 35 cont.— Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Broadband or High-speed Internet Access

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	29.6% _a	7	16.5% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	46.6% _a	4	14.3% _a	1	22.0% _a	7
Minor	27.5% _a	7	28.7% _a	9	44.3% _a	2	24.6% _a	2	14.6% _a	1	31.6% _a	11
Not a challenge	41.1% _a	10	54.7% _a	18	55.7% _a	2	28.8% _a	2	71.2% _a	7	45.2% _a	15
Not sure	1.7% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.3% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	25	100.0%	32	100.0%	4	100.0%	8	100.0%	9	100.0%	34

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	55.2% _a	1	4.8% _a	1	39.0% _a	2	32.9% _a	6	14.1% _a	2	68.2% ¹	1
Minor	0.0% ²	0	34.7% _a	6	29.4% _a	2	19.0% _a	3	37.8% _a	5	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not a challenge	44.8% _a	1	60.5% _a	10	31.6% _a	2	45.6% _a	8	48.1% _a	7	31.8% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	2.5% _a	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	2	100.0%	16	100.0%	6	100.0%	18	100.0%	14	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	12.5% _a	3	25.4% _a	6	36.9% _a	4	35.8% ²	1	23.9% _a	3	18.3% _a	2	27.4% _a	5
Minor	44.5% _a	10	16.3% _a	4	18.9% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	44.9% _a	6	38.7% _a	5	19.3% _a	4
Not a challenge	42.9% _a	10	58.3% _a	14	39.9% _a	4	64.2% ²	1	31.2% _a	4	43.0% _a	6	51.1% _a	10
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.2% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.2% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	23	100.0%	24	100.0%	10	100.0%	2	100.0%	13	100.0%	13	100.0%	19

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	22.5% _a	6	24.2% _a	5	47.7% _a	1	63.9% ¹	1	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	18.7% _a	8
Minor	11.9% _a	3	37.5% _b	7	0.0% ²	0	24.2% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	24.4% _a	10
Not a challenge	50.8% _a	14	37.3% _a	7	52.3% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	47.1% _a	20
Not sure	14.8% _a	4	1.1% _a	0	0.0% ²	0	12.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	9.8% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	28	100.0%	20	100.0%	3	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	42

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	0.0% ¹	0	74.0% _a	6	43.9% _{a,b}	3	6.5% _b	1	7.4% _{b,c}	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Minor	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	59.0% _a	9	15.5% _b	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not a challenge	100.0% ¹	6	26.0% _a	2	56.1% _a	4	34.5% _a	5	37.9% _a	4	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	39.1% _a	4	100.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	10.6% _a	3	60.8% _b	8	0.0% ¹	0	52.6% _a	5	15.4% _a	2	26.3% _a	2	3.5% _a	0
Minor	18.4% _a	6	22.9% _a	3	59.3% _a	2	7.0% _a	1	15.9% _a	2	54.1% _a	3	17.1% _a	1
Not a challenge	58.0% _a	18	16.4% _b	2	34.6% _{a,b}	1	40.4% _a	4	41.1% _a	6	19.6% _a	1	79.4% _a	6
Not sure	13.1% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	6.2% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	27.7% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	31	100.0%	13	100.0%	3	100.0%	10	100.0%	15	100.0%	6	100.0%	8

Table 35 cont.— Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Broadband or High-speed Internet Access

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	55.8% _a	15	13.8% _b	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	71.7% _a	4	33.1% _a	2	41.5% _a	11
Minor	6.7% _a	2	18.8% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	17.9% _a	1	15.1% _a	1	6.7% _a	2
Not a challenge	36.2% _a	10	67.4% _a	9	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	10.4% _a	1	51.8% _a	3	50.5% _a	13
Not sure	1.3% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.3% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	27	100.0%	13	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	7	100.0%	27

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	100.0% ¹	4	74.8% _a	3	58.9% _a	6	18.6% _a	2	16.1% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Minor	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	8.1% _a	1	20.5% _a	2	4.5% _a	0	43.7% ²	1
Not a challenge	0.0% ¹	0	25.2% _a	1	33.0% _a	4	60.9% _a	7	74.8% _a	6	56.3% ²	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.5% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	12	100.0%	8	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	55.1% _a	8	30.1% _a	5	43.0% _a	4	33.6% _a	2	8.8% _a	0	42.1% _a	5	61.3% _a	10
Minor	16.9% _a	3	5.5% _a	1	8.8% _a	1	11.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	21.8% _a	2	4.7% _a	1
Not a challenge	28.0% _a	4	62.1% _a	10	48.2% _a	5	55.2% _a	3	91.2% _a	3	32.9% _a	4	34.0% _a	6
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	2.3% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.1% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	15	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	5	100.0%	3	100.0%	11	100.0%	17

Table 36 – Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Utility Rates

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Utility rates	Major	48	32.9%
	Minor	52	35.5%
	Not a challenge	42	29.0%
	Not sure	4	2.6%
	TOTALS:	146	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Major	29.5% _{a,b}	17	20.3% _a	10	49.5% _b	20
Minor	36.8% _{a,b}	21	49.3% _a	23	19.4% _b	8
Not a challenge	33.7% _a	19	29.0% _a	14	22.0% _a	9
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	1.4% _a	1	9.2% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	57	100.0%	47	100.0%	40




Table 36 cont.— Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Utility Rates

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	32.1% _a	8	27.6% _a	9	0.0% ¹	0	28.1% _a	2	38.0% _a	4	32.0% _a	11
Minor	48.8% _a	12	27.5% _a	9	32.5% _a	1	33.5% _a	3	27.9% _a	3	41.6% _a	14
Not a challenge	19.1% _a	5	45.0% _b	14	67.5% _a	3	38.4% _a	3	34.1% _a	3	26.4% _a	9
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	25	100.0%	32	100.0%	4	100.0%	8	100.0%	9	100.0%	34

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	55.2% _a	1	21.7% _a	3	41.3% _a	2	36.5% _a	6	22.3% _a	3	17.0% ¹	0
Minor	0.0% ²	0	29.7% _a	5	27.1% _a	2	43.6% _a	8	44.7% _a	6	51.1% ¹	1
Not a challenge	44.8% _a	1	48.5% _a	8	31.6% _a	2	19.9% _a	3	33.0% _a	5	31.8% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	2	100.0%	16	100.0%	6	100.0%	18	100.0%	14	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	25.9% _a	6	34.1% _a	8	27.0% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	24.5% _{a,b}	3	2.4% _a	0	39.7% _b	8
Minor	37.7% _a	9	33.2% _a	8	43.1% _a	4	100.0% ^{1,2}	2	35.3% _a	5	37.4% _a	5	33.1% _a	6
Not a challenge	36.4% _a	8	32.7% _a	8	29.9% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	40.2% _a	5	60.2% _a	8	27.2% _a	5
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	23	100.0%	24	100.0%	10	100.0%	2	100.0%	13	100.0%	13	100.0%	19

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	22.8% _a	6	16.8% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	63.9% ²	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	19.6% _a	8
Minor	55.8% _a	15	40.0% _a	8	47.7% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	36.1% ²	0	52.0% _a	22
Not a challenge	21.4% _a	6	39.7% _a	8	52.3% _a	1	24.2% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	28.4% _a	12
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	3.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	12.0% ²	0	63.9% ²	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	28	100.0%	20	100.0%	3	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	42

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	56.1% _a	4	22.8% _a	3	21.3% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Minor	100.0% ¹	6	74.0% _a	6	18.6% _a	1	45.8% _a	7	26.6% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not a challenge	0.0% ¹	0	26.0% _a	2	18.6% _a	1	31.4% _a	5	52.2% _a	5	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.8% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	25.2% _a	8	11.4% _a	1	8.6% _a	0	35.3% _a	4	10.2% _a	2	17.5% _a	1	23.2% _a	2
Minor	42.3% _a	13	69.5% _a	9	38.3% _a	1	57.6% _a	6	55.4% _a	8	62.9% _a	4	30.3% _a	2
Not a challenge	32.5% _a	10	15.4% _a	2	47.0% _a	2	7.0% _a	1	31.3% _a	5	19.6% _a	1	46.5% _a	4
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	3.8% _a	0	6.2% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.2% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	31	100.0%	13	100.0%	3	100.0%	10	100.0%	15	100.0%	6	100.0%	8

Table 36 cont.— Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Utility Rates

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	61.9% _a	17	22.5% _b	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	71.7% _a	4	46.2% _a	3	44.5% _a	12
Minor	10.6% _a	3	38.3% _b	5	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	17.9% _a	1	10.1% _a	1	21.3% _a	6
Not a challenge	15.8% _a	4	35.4% _a	5	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	10.4% _a	1	43.6% _a	3	20.3% _a	5
Not sure	11.7% _a	3	3.7% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	13.9% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	27	100.0%	13	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	7	100.0%	27

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	100.0% ¹	4	74.8% _a	3	62.6% _a	7	31.3% _a	4	27.2% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Minor	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	23.0% _a	3	22.4% _a	3	26.5% _a	2	43.7% ²	1
Not a challenge	0.0% ¹	0	25.2% _a	1	14.4% _a	2	20.0% _a	2	39.3% _a	3	56.3% ²	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	26.3% _a	3	7.1% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	12	100.0%	8	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	55.9% _a	8	45.9% _a	7	45.4% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	55.0% _a	6	60.8% _a	10
Minor	21.0% _a	3	20.2% _a	3	15.6% _a	2	44.8% _a	2	15.1% _a	0	25.9% _a	3	10.7% _a	2
Not a challenge	3.7% _a	1	31.6% _a	5	34.2% _a	3	55.2% _{a,b}	3	84.9% _a	3	14.2% _{a,b}	2	10.1% _b	2
Not sure	19.4% _a	3	2.3% _a	0	4.7% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.9% _a	1	18.4% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	15	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	5	100.0%	3	100.0%	11	100.0%	17

Table 37 – Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Government Regulation

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

Government regulation		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
	Major	61	41.6%
	Minor	43	29.7%
	Not a challenge	40	27.5%
	Not sure	2	1.2%
	TOTALS:	146	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Major	27.2% _a	15	51.7% _b	24	49.9% _{a,b}	20
Minor	29.9% _a	17	15.9% _a	8	31.6% _a	13
Not a challenge	42.9% _a	24	30.9% _{a,b}	15	16.7% _b	7
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	1.5% _a	1	1.9% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	57	100.0%	47	100.0%	40




Table 37 cont.— Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Government Regulation

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	40.6% _a	10	16.7% _b	5	11.7% _a	1	21.0% _a	2	21.7% _a	2	32.8% _a	11
Minor	29.6% _a	7	30.2% _a	10	32.6% _a	1	63.9% _a	5	7.1% _a	1	28.5% _a	10
Not a challenge	29.8% _a	7	53.1% _a	17	55.7% _a	2	15.1% _a	1	71.2% _a	7	38.7% _a	13
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	25	100.0%	32	100.0%	4	100.0%	8	100.0%	9	100.0%	34

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	0.0% ¹	0	17.4% _a	3	11.9% _a	1	33.5% _a	6	39.8% _a	6	34.1% ²	0
Minor	55.2% _a	1	46.3% _a	7	16.0% _a	1	30.9% _a	5	13.2% _a	2	17.0% ²	0
Not a challenge	44.8% _a	1	36.3% _a	6	72.1% _a	4	35.6% _a	6	46.9% _a	7	48.9% ²	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	2	100.0%	16	100.0%	6	100.0%	18	100.0%	14	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	20.0% _a	5	28.9% _a	7	39.3% _a	4	35.8% ²	1	15.4% _a	2	25.1% _a	3	28.2% _a	5
Minor	42.5% _a	10	17.5% _a	4	30.5% _a	3	64.2% ²	1	56.0% _a	7	37.8% _a	5	16.2% _a	3
Not a challenge	37.5% _a	9	53.5% _a	13	30.2% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	28.7% _a	4	37.1% _a	5	55.6% _a	11
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	23	100.0%	24	100.0%	10	100.0%	2	100.0%	13	100.0%	13	100.0%	19

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	53.6% _a	15	49.0% _a	10	100.0% ¹	3	41.6% ²	1	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	47.8% _a	20
Minor	8.1% _a	2	26.8% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	22.3% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	17.0% _a	7
Not a challenge	38.3% _a	11	20.5% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	24.2% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	33.9% _a	14
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	3.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	12.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	1.3% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	28	100.0%	20	100.0%	3	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	42

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	0.0% ¹	0	90.9% _a	8	81.4% _a	6	48.4% _a	7	36.7% _a	4	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Minor	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	40.1% _a	6	13.1% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not a challenge	100.0% ¹	6	9.1% _a	1	18.6% _a	1	11.5% _a	2	45.2% _a	5	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	5.0% _a	1	100.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	43.3% _a	14	78.3% _a	10	29.7% _a	1	94.9% _a	10	16.4% _b	2	41.1% _{a,b}	3	68.2% _{a,b}	5
Minor	16.0% _a	5	13.5% _a	2	23.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	7.9% _a	1	47.5% _a	3	6.6% _a	1
Not a challenge	39.0% _a	12	8.2% _a	1	40.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	75.7% _a	11	11.4% _b	1	25.2% _{a,b}	2
Not sure	1.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	6.2% _a	0	5.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	31	100.0%	13	100.0%	3	100.0%	10	100.0%	15	100.0%	6	100.0%	8

Table 37 cont.— Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Government Regulation

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	54.0% _a	15	41.0% _a	5	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	6.5% _a	0	56.0% _a	4	55.9% _a	15
Minor	30.2% _a	8	34.7% _a	4	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	89.6% _a	5	29.2% _{a,b}	2	20.5% _b	5
Not a challenge	15.9% _a	4	18.4% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	3.8% _a	0	14.8% _a	1	20.8% _a	6
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	5.9% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.8% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	27	100.0%	13	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	7	100.0%	27

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	78.1% _a	9	57.0% _a	7	53.7% _a	4	43.7% ²	1
Minor	100.0% ¹	4	25.2% _a	1	21.9% _a	2	27.6% _a	3	26.0% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not a challenge	0.0% ¹	0	74.8% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	9.2% _b	1	20.3% _{a,b}	2	56.3% ²	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	12	100.0%	8	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Major	74.1% _a	11	47.9% _{a,b}	7	17.4% _b	2	11.3% _a	1	49.9% _a	2	27.2% _a	3	68.1% _a
Minor	22.3% _a	3	20.9% _a	3	61.5% _a	6	57.0% _a	3	41.3% _a	1	34.0% _a	4	24.2% _a
Not a challenge	3.7% _a	1	28.1% _a	4	18.4% _a	2	31.7% _a	2	8.8% _a	0	38.8% _a	4	3.3% _a
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	3.1% _a	0	2.7% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.4% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	15	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	5	100.0%	3	100.0%	11	100.0%

Table 38 – Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Availability of Affordable Space at a Desired Location

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Availability of affordable space at a desired location	Major	15	10.3%
	Minor	37	25.6%
	Not a challenge	88	60.7%
	Not sure	5	3.3%
	TOTALS:	145	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

What county do you live in?						
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Major	12.3% _a	7	5.1% _a	2	8.0% _a	3
Minor	25.1% _{a,b}	14	11.2% _a	5	37.1% _b	15
Not a challenge	56.9% _a	32	82.2% _b	39	52.3% _a	21
Not sure	5.6% _a	3	1.4% _a	1	2.6% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	55	100.0%	47	100.0%	40




Table 38 cont.— Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Availability of Affordable Space at a Desired Location

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	20.6% _a	5	5.7% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	34.1% _a	3	7.1% _a	1	10.0% _a	3
Minor	34.6% _a	9	17.5% _a	5	78.2% _a	2	7.8% _a	1	14.6% _a	1	28.1% _a	10
Not a challenge	44.8% _a	11	66.7% _a	20	21.8% _a	1	58.1% _a	5	78.3% _a	7	52.7% _a	18
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	10.2% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	9.2% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	25	100.0%	31	100.0%	3	100.0%	8	100.0%	9	100.0%	34

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	55.2% _a	1	5.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	11.6% _a	2	19.7% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Minor	44.8% _a	1	27.2% _a	4	11.1% _a	1	26.9% _a	5	23.6% _a	3	20.5% ²	0
Not a challenge	0.0% ¹	0	67.7% _a	10	88.9% _a	5	43.6% _a	8	56.7% _a	8	79.5% ²	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	17.8% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	2	100.0%	15	100.0%	6	100.0%	18	100.0%	14	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	6.2% _a	1	14.4% _a	3	21.8% _a	2	35.8% ²	1	11.7% _a	2	18.7% _a	2	8.9% _a	2
Minor	21.0% _a	5	25.4% _a	6	33.9% _a	3	64.2% ²	1	21.8% _a	3	13.5% _a	2	26.5% _a	5
Not a challenge	67.9% _a	16	51.3% _a	12	44.3% _a	4	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	66.5% _a	9	67.8% _a	8	58.6% _a	11
Not sure	4.9% _a	1	8.9% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	5.9% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	23	100.0%	22	100.0%	10	100.0%	2	100.0%	13	100.0%	12	100.0%	19

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	2.1% _a	1	9.3% _a	2	47.7% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	2.7% _b	1
Minor	13.5% _a	4	8.0% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	24.2% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	11.7% _a	5
Not a challenge	84.4% _a	23	79.2% _a	16	52.3% _a	1	63.9% ²	1	36.1% ²	0	85.6% _a	36
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	3.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	12.0% ²	0	63.9% ²	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	28	100.0%	20	100.0%	3	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	42

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	18.6% _a	1	7.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Minor	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	18.6% _a	1	11.5% _a	2	21.6% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not a challenge	100.0% ¹	6	100.0% ¹	8	56.1% _a	4	81.1% _a	12	78.4% _a	8	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.8% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	4.1% _a	1	4.3% _a	1	17.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	28.6% _a	2	7.7% _a	1
Minor	12.2% _a	4	6.2% _a	1	21.0% _a	1	10.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	33.7% _a	2	10.7% _a	1
Not a challenge	83.7% _a	26	85.8% _a	11	55.6% _a	2	89.8% _{a,b}	9	96.8% _a	14	37.7% _b	2	81.6% _{a,b}	6
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	3.8% _a	0	6.2% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.2% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	31	100.0%	13	100.0%	3	100.0%	10	100.0%	15	100.0%	6	100.0%	8

Table 38 cont.— Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Availability of Affordable Space at a Desired Location

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	11.7% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	12.1% _a	3
Minor	43.2% _a	12	23.9% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	21.7% _a	1	60.1% _a	4	34.9% _a	9
Not a challenge	43.8% _a	12	70.8% _a	9	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	71.7% _a	4	39.9% _a	3	50.5% _a	13
Not sure	1.3% _a	0	5.3% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	6.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.5% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	27	100.0%	13	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	7	100.0%	27

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	29.4% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Minor	0.0% ¹	0	74.8% _a	3	47.9% _a	5	35.1% _a	4	18.9% _a	1	56.3% ²	1
Not a challenge	100.0% ¹	4	25.2% _a	1	22.7% _a	2	62.6% _a	7	71.5% _a	6	43.7% ²	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.3% _a	0	9.6% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	12	100.0%	8	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	21.7% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	18.8% _a	3
Minor	50.3% _a	7	40.5% _a	6	12.7% _a	1	44.8% _a	2	49.9% _a	2	67.1% _a	8	21.5% _a	4
Not a challenge	28.0% _a	4	57.2% _{a,b}	9	80.6% _b	8	55.2% _a	3	34.9% _a	1	32.9% _a	4	56.5% _a	10
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	2.3% _a	0	6.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	15.1% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.2% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	15	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	5	100.0%	3	100.0%	11	100.0%	17

Table 39 – Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Lack of Skilled Labor

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Lack of skilled labor	Major	46	31.7%
	Minor	26	17.7%
	Not a challenge	72	49.4%
	Not sure	2	1.2%
	TOTALS:	146	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Major	34.3% _a	20	27.8% _a	13	28.6% _a	12
Minor	13.7% _a	8	14.3% _a	7	19.1% _a	8
Not a challenge	50.6% _a	29	57.5% _a	27	50.7% _a	20
Not sure	1.4% _a	1	0.4% _a	0	1.6% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	57	100.0%	47	100.0%	40




Table 39 cont.— Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Lack of Skilled Labor

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	52.5% _a	13	20.2% _b	6	23.6% _a	1	46.6% _a	4	7.2% _a	1	38.5% _a	13
Minor	12.7% _a	3	14.5% _a	5	72.9% _a	3	24.6% _{a,b}	2	0.0% ¹	0	7.8% _b	3
Not a challenge	31.7% _a	8	65.3% _b	21	3.5% _a	0	21.3% _a	2	92.8% _b	9	53.2% _{a,b}	18
Not sure	3.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	25	100.0%	32	100.0%	4	100.0%	8	100.0%	9	100.0%	34

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	55.2% _a	1	24.2% _a	4	54.8% _a	3	30.2% _a	5	39.4% _a	6	34.1% ¹	0
Minor	44.8% _a	1	30.6% _a	5	0.0% ²	0	3.5% _a	1	7.7% _a	1	17.0% ¹	0
Not a challenge	0.0% ²	0	45.1% _a	7	45.2% _a	3	62.8% _a	11	52.9% _a	8	31.8% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	3.5% _a	1	0.0% ²	0	17.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	2	100.0%	16	100.0%	6	100.0%	18	100.0%	14	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	24.9% _a	6	44.6% _a	11	31.6% _a	3	100.0% ^{1,2}	2	18.7% _a	2	26.0% _a	3	54.0% _a	10
Minor	12.3% _a	3	7.9% _a	2	30.4% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	25.4% _a	3	17.0% _a	2	4.6% _a	1
Not a challenge	62.8% _a	14	44.9% _a	11	36.2% _a	4	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	55.9% _a	7	57.0% _a	7	37.4% _a	7
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _a	1	1.7% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.1% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	23	100.0%	24	100.0%	10	100.0%	2	100.0%	13	100.0%	13	100.0%	19

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	42.0% _a	12	7.4% _b	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	63.9% ²	0	29.7% _a	12
Minor	11.7% _a	3	18.1% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	41.6% ²	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	14.4% _a	6
Not a challenge	46.3% _a	13	73.4% _a	14	100.0% ¹	3	46.4% ²	1	36.1% ²	0	55.9% _a	23
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	1.1% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	12.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	28	100.0%	19	100.0%	3	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	42

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	100.0% ¹	6	8.4% _a	1	44.3% _a	3	21.4% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Minor	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	18.6% _a	1	17.2% _a	3	27.3% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not a challenge	0.0% ¹	0	91.6% _a	8	37.1% _a	3	61.4% _a	9	72.7% _a	8	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	37.2% _a	12	11.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	25.1% _a	3	49.0% _a	7	24.2% _a	1	19.4% _a	1
Minor	12.1% _a	4	13.5% _a	2	39.2% _a	1	10.2% _a	1	11.2% _a	2	25.3% _a	2	15.6% _a	1
Not a challenge	50.7% _a	16	75.1% _a	9	54.0% _a	2	64.7% _a	7	39.9% _a	6	50.5% _a	3	65.0% _a	5
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.7% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	31	100.0%	13	100.0%	3	100.0%	10	100.0%	15	100.0%	6	100.0%	8

Table 39 cont.— Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Lack of Skilled Labor

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	32.7% _a	9	19.7% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	18.0% _a	1	38.8% _a	10
Minor	17.6% _a	5	22.5% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	17.9% _a	1	27.0% _a	2	16.7% _a	4
Not a challenge	48.4% _a	13	55.6% _a	7	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	75.6% _a	4	55.0% _a	4	43.4% _a	12
Not sure	1.3% _a	0	2.2% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	6.5% _a	0	0.0% ²	0	1.0% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	27	100.0%	13	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	7	100.0%	27

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	66.1% _a	7	16.2% _b	2	30.3% _{a,b}	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Minor	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	15.3% _a	2	38.2% _a	5	11.7% _a	1	43.7% ²	1
Not a challenge	100.0% ¹	4	100.0% ¹	4	18.6% _a	2	43.3% _a	5	53.5% _a	4	56.3% ²	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.3% _a	0	4.5% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	12	100.0%	8	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Major	53.2% _a	8	20.0% _{a,b}	3	5.7% _b	1	33.6% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	22.7% _a	3	30.2% _a
Minor	16.9% _a	3	16.0% _a	2	27.1% _a	3	11.3% _a	1	51.1% _a	2	32.3% _a	4	7.4% _a
Not a challenge	29.8% _a	4	61.7% _a	9	64.5% _a	7	55.2% _a	3	40.1% _a	1	45.0% _a	5	60.3% _a
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	2.3% _a	0	2.7% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	8.8% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.1% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	15	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	5	100.0%	3	100.0%	11	100.0%

Table 40 – Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Labor and Benefits Costs

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Labor and benefits costs	Major	65	44.2%
	Minor	32	22.1%
	Not a challenge	44	30.1%
	Not sure	5	3.6%
	TOTALS:	146	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Major	40.8% _a	23	38.4% _a	18	51.1% _a	21
Minor	24.8% _a	14	19.1% _a	9	17.3% _a	7
Not a challenge	34.4% _a	20	31.3% _a	15	28.8% _a	12
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	11.2% _a	5	2.7% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	57	100.0%	47	100.0%	40




Table 40 cont.— Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Labor and Benefits Costs

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	55.8% _a	14	29.2% _b	9	23.6% _a	1	46.5% _a	4	21.5% _a	2	45.5% _a	15
Minor	25.2% _a	6	24.4% _a	8	72.9% _a	3	46.0% _a	4	7.3% _a	1	19.1% _a	6
Not a challenge	19.0% _a	5	46.4% _b	15	3.5% _{a,b}	0	7.5% _a	1	71.2% _b	7	35.5% _{a,b}	12
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	25	100.0%	32	100.0%	4	100.0%	8	100.0%	9	100.0%	34

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	55.2% _a	1	38.0% _a	6	43.7% _a	2	44.8% _a	8	36.4% _a	5	34.1% ¹	0
Minor	44.8% _a	1	42.6% _a	7	11.1% _a	1	23.1% _a	4	9.8% _a	1	17.0% ¹	0
Not a challenge	0.0% ²	0	19.4% _a	3	45.2% _a	3	32.1% _a	6	53.8% _a	8	48.9% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	2	100.0%	16	100.0%	6	100.0%	18	100.0%	14	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	27.2% _a	6	47.4% _a	11	56.3% _a	6	100.0% ^{1,2}	2	32.8% _a	4	22.3% _a	3	48.3% _a	9
Minor	35.3% _a	8	12.7% _a	3	29.1% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	46.0% _a	6	44.1% _a	6	12.5% _a	2
Not a challenge	37.5% _a	9	39.9% _a	9	14.5% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	21.2% _a	3	33.6% _a	4	39.1% _a	8
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	23	100.0%	24	100.0%	10	100.0%	2	100.0%	13	100.0%	13	100.0%	19

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	49.3% _a	14	23.0% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	41.6% ²	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	41.1% _a	17
Minor	6.8% _a	2	36.5% _b	7	47.7% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	18.5% _a	8
Not a challenge	29.1% _a	8	34.3% _a	7	52.3% _a	1	46.4% ²	1	36.1% ²	0	29.4% _a	12
Not sure	14.8% _a	4	6.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	12.0% ²	0	63.9% ²	0	11.0% _a	5
TOTALS:	100.0%	28	100.0%	20	100.0%	3	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	42

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	100.0% ¹	6	8.4% _a	1	56.1% _a	4	36.2% _a	6	18.8% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Minor	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	37.1% _a	3	28.6% _a	4	19.9% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not a challenge	0.0% ¹	0	91.6% _a	8	0.0% ¹	0	35.2% _b	5	17.2% _b	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.8% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	44.1% _a	5	100.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	51.0% _a	16	10.7% _b	1	25.8% _{a,b}	1	47.4% _a	5	50.7% _a	8	29.2% _a	2	30.9% _a	2
Minor	22.9% _a	7	7.3% _a	1	27.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	6.3% _a	1	42.8% _a	3	33.6% _a	3
Not a challenge	11.3% _a	4	78.2% _b	10	40.9% _{a,b}	1	52.6% _a	5	12.2% _a	2	19.8% _a	1	35.5% _a	3
Not sure	14.8% _a	5	3.8% _a	0	6.2% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	30.8% _a	5	8.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	31	100.0%	13	100.0%	3	100.0%	10	100.0%	15	100.0%	6	100.0%	8

Table 40 cont.— Possible Challenges as a Business Owner – Labor and Benefits Costs

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Major	54.8% _a	15	43.1% _a	5	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	24.4% _a	1	33.1% _a	2	59.8% _a	16
Minor	21.6% _a	6	8.2% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	71.7% _a	4	14.9% _{a,b}	1	6.1% _b	2
Not a challenge	20.6% _a	6	46.5% _a	6	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	3.8% _a	0	52.0% _a	3	29.9% _a	8
Not sure	3.0% _a	1	2.2% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	4.1% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	27	100.0%	13	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	7	100.0%	27

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Major	0.0% ¹	0	74.8% _a	3	74.2% _a	8	41.8% _a	5	45.9% _a	4	43.7% ²	1
Minor	100.0% ¹	4	0.0% ¹	0	14.4% _a	2	6.4% _a	1	9.9% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not a challenge	0.0% ¹	0	25.2% _a	1	11.4% _a	1	42.6% _a	5	44.2% _a	3	56.3% ²	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	9.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	12	100.0%	8	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Major	70.2% _a	10	50.8% _a	8	23.7% _a	2	44.8% _a	2	32.5% _a	1	61.0% _a	7	38.5% _a	7
Minor	0.0% ¹	0	13.4% _a	2	48.7% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	33.8% _a	1	16.4% _a	2	23.8% _a	4
Not a challenge	29.8% _a	4	35.8% _a	5	16.8% _a	2	55.2% _a	3	25.0% _a	1	15.3% _a	2	37.8% _a	6
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	10.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	8.8% _a	0	7.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	15	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	5	100.0%	3	100.0%	11	100.0%	17

Table 41 – Would your business benefit from increased educational opportunities being provided in your county?

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Would your business benefit from increased educational opportunities being provided in your county?	Definitely yes	33	22.7%
	Probably yes	25	17.1%
	Probably not	45	31.1%
	Definitely not	33	22.9%
	Not sure	9	6.1%
	TOTALS:	145	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Definitely yes	26.1%	15	7.1%	3	28.4%	11
Probably yes	23.3%	13	2.4%	1	22.0%	9
"Definitely/Probably Yes"	49.4% _a	28	9.4% _b	4	50.4% _a	20
Probably not	24.4%	14	49.0%	23	26.9%	11
Definitely not	22.5%	13	24.7%	12	22.8%	9
"Definitely/Probably No"	46.9% _a	26	73.7% _b	35	49.6% _{a,b}	20
Not sure	3.8% _a	2	16.9% _b	8	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	56	100.0%	47	100.0%	40




Table 41 cont.— Would your business benefit from increased educational opportunities being provided in your county?

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Definitely yes	30.7%	8	22.5%	7	63.9%	3	33.5%	3	14.4%	1	22.8%	8
Probably yes	22.1%	5	24.2%	8	11.8%	1	39.6%	3	0.0%	0	27.2%	9
"Definitely/Probably Yes"	52.8% _a	13	46.7% _a	15	75.7% _a	3	73.1% _a	6	14.4% _a	1	50.0% _a	17
Probably not	24.5%	6	24.3%	8	24.3%	1	24.7%	2	34.1%	3	21.6%	7
Definitely not	16.7%	4	27.1%	8	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	51.6%	5	22.7%	8
"Definitely/Probably No"	41.2% _a	10	51.4% _a	16	24.3% _a	1	24.7% _a	2	85.6% _a	8	44.3% _a	15
Not sure	6.0% _a	1	2.0% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	2.1% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	5.7% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	25	100.0%	31	100.0%	4	100.0%	8	100.0%	9	100.0%	34

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Definitely yes	100.0%	2	23.7%	4	48.1%	2	21.0%	4	18.4%	3	0.0%	0
Probably yes	0.0%	0	34.0%	5	14.1%	1	28.4%	5	13.4%	2	0.0%	0
"Definitely/Probably Yes"	100.0% ¹	2	57.7% _a	9	62.3% _a	3	49.4% _a	9	31.8% _a	5	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Probably not	0.0%	0	24.9%	4	19.0%	1	21.9%	4	32.9%	5	14.8%	0
Definitely not	0.0%	0	17.4%	3	18.8%	1	18.7%	3	35.3%	5	51.1%	1
"Definitely/Probably No"	0.0% ¹	0	42.3% _a	7	37.7% _a	2	40.6% _a	7	68.2% _a	10	65.9% ²	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	10.0% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	34.1% ²	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	2	100.0%	16	100.0%	5	100.0%	18	100.0%	14	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Definitely yes	13.5%	3	39.0%	9	25.5%	3	100.0%	2	38.6%	5	16.5%	2	22.8%	4
Probably yes	30.3%	7	19.5%	4	15.9%	2	0.0%	0	15.6%	2	42.5%	5	28.5%	6
"Definitely/Probably Yes"	43.8% _a	10	58.5% _a	13	41.4% _a	4	100.0% ^{1,2}	2	54.2% _a	7	59.0% _a	8	51.3% _a	10
Probably not	36.8%	8	10.7%	2	27.0%	3	0.0%	0	31.6%	4	10.0%	1	38.5%	7
Definitely not	14.4%	3	28.1%	6	28.2%	3	0.0%	0	5.3%	1	24.9%	3	9.3%	2
"Definitely/Probably No"	51.2% _a	12	38.8% _a	9	55.2% _a	6	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	37.0% _a	5	35.0% _a	5	47.8% _a	9
Not sure	5.0% _a	1	2.7% _a	1	3.4% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	8.8% _a	1	6.1% _a	1	0.9% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	23	100.0%	23	100.0%	10	100.0%	2	100.0%	13	100.0%	13	100.0%	19

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Definitely yes	6.7%	2	7.6%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	8.0%	3
Probably yes	1.5%	0	3.6%	1	0.0%	0	24.2%	0	0.0%	0	1.7%	1
"Definitely/Probably Yes"	8.2% _a	2	11.1% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	24.2% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	9.7% _a	4
Probably not	56.0%	16	39.1%	8	52.3%	1	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	49.6%	21
Definitely not	16.0%	4	36.9%	7	0.0%	0	63.9%	1	0.0%	0	25.2%	11
"Definitely/Probably No"	72.1% _a	20	76.0% _a	15	52.3% _a	1	63.9% ²	1	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	74.8% _a	31
Not sure	19.7% _a	5	12.9% _a	3	47.7% _a	1	12.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	15.5% _a	6
TOTALS:	100.0%	28	100.0%	20	100.0%	3	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	42

Table 41 cont.— Would your business benefit from increased educational opportunities being provided in your county?

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Definitely yes	0.0%	0	9.1%	1	0.0%	0	14.4%	2	3.7%	0	0.0%	0
Probably yes	0.0%	0	8.4%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Definitely/Probably Yes"	0.0% ¹	0	17.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	14.4% _a	2	7.8% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Probably not	100.0%	6	16.9%	1	6.8%	0	55.7%	9	64.0%	7	0.0%	0
Definitely not	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	74.6%	5	23.2%	4	28.2%	3	0.0%	0
"Definitely/Probably No"	100.0% ¹	6	16.9% _a	1	81.4% _{a,b}	6	78.9% _b	12	92.2% _{b,c}	10	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	65.6% _a	5	18.6% _{a,b}	1	6.8% _b	1	0.0% ¹	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Definitely yes	7.0%	2	3.1%	0	22.3%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	17.5%	1	19.4%	1
Probably yes	0.0%	0	5.5%	1	12.4%	0	0.0%	0	4.7%	1	0.0%	0	5.6%	0
"Definitely/Probably Yes"	7.0% _a	2	8.6% _a	1	34.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	4.7% _a	1	17.5% _a	1	24.9% _a	2
Probably not	55.9%	18	30.8%	4	53.0%	2	17.2%	2	78.2%	12	62.3%	4	36.4%	3
Definitely not	32.9%	10	9.2%	1	6.2%	0	30.2%	3	10.1%	2	0.0%	0	38.7%	3
"Definitely/Probably No"	88.9% _a	28	40.0% _b	5	59.1% _{a,b}	2	47.4% _a	5	88.3% _a	13	62.3% _a	4	75.1% _a	6
Not sure	4.1% _a	1	51.4% _b	6	6.2% _{a,b}	0	52.6% _a	5	7.0% _b	1	20.2% _{a,b}	1	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	31	100.0%	13	100.0%	3	100.0%	10	100.0%	15	100.0%	6	100.0%	8

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Definitely yes	32.3%	9	19.7%	3	0.0%	0	93.5%	5	0.0%	0	22.7%	6
Probably yes	15.3%	4	36.4%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	22.2%	1	24.8%	7
"Definitely/Probably Yes"	47.7% _a	13	56.2% _a	7	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	93.5% _a	5	22.2% _b	1	47.4% _{a,b}	13
Probably not	30.1%	8	20.0%	3	0.0%	0	6.5%	0	57.7%	4	24.9%	7
Definitely not	22.3%	6	23.9%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	20.0%	1	27.6%	7
"Definitely/Probably No"	52.3% _a	14	43.8% _a	6	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	6.5% _a	0	77.8% _b	5	52.6% _{a,b}	14
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	27	100.0%	13	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	7	100.0%	27

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Definitely yes	100.0%	4	0.0%	0	36.6%	4	18.9%	2	9.6%	1	43.7%	1
Probably yes	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	26.0%	3	36.1%	4	19.9%	2	12.5%	0
"Definitely/Probably Yes"	100.0% ¹	4	0.0% ¹	0	62.6% _a	7	55.0% _a	7	29.4% _a	2	56.3% ²	1
Probably not	0.0%	0	25.2%	1	26.0%	3	32.4%	4	38.1%	3	0.0%	0
Definitely not	0.0%	0	74.8%	3	11.4%	1	12.7%	2	32.5%	3	43.7%	1
"Definitely/Probably No"	0.0% ¹	0	100.0% ¹	4	37.4% _a	4	45.0% _a	5	70.6% _a	6	43.7% ²	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	12	100.0%	8	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Definitely yes	31.9%	5	10.4%	2	50.4%	5	11.3%	1	26.1%	1	17.4%	2	45.3%	8
Probably yes	17.6%	3	24.1%	4	25.2%	3	0.0%	0	8.8%	0	34.2%	4	14.5%	2
"Definitely/Probably Yes"	49.5% _a	7	34.5% _a	5	75.6% _a	8	11.3% _a	1	34.9% _a	1	51.6% _a	6	59.8% _a	10
Probably not	46.8%	7	21.1%	3	6.4%	1	77.4%	4	25.0%	1	6.4%	1	24.7%	4
Definitely not	3.7%	1	44.4%	7	17.9%	2	11.3%	1	40.1%	1	42.0%	5	15.5%	3
"Definitely/Probably No"	50.5% _a	7	65.5% _a	10	24.4% _a	2	88.7% _a	4	65.1% _a	2	48.4% _a	5	40.2% _a	7
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	15	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	5	100.0%	3	100.0%	11	100.0%	17

Table 42 – Has the Internet access at your business gotten better, stayed the same, or gotten worse over the past 3 years?

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Has the Internet access at your business gotten better, stayed the same, or gotten worse over the past three years?	Better	22	15.5%
	Same	91	63.2%
	Worse	9	6.2%
	Not sure	7	5.1%
	Not Applicable	14	10.0%
	TOTALS:	144	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

What county do you live in?						
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Better	14.7% _a	8	21.7% _a	10	16.6% _a	7
Same	63.4% _a	35	53.8% _a	25	74.9% _a	30
Worse	9.6% _a	5	7.0% _a	3	2.9% _a	1
Not sure	2.9% _a	2	8.7% _a	4	3.7% _a	1
Not Applicable	9.4% _a	5	8.9% _a	4	1.9% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	56	100.0%	47	100.0%	39




Table 42 cont.— Has the Internet access at your business gotten better, stayed the same, or gotten worse over the past 3 years?

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Better	15.5% _a	4	14.1% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	7.4% _a	1	34.3% _a	3	12.9% _a	4
Same	57.6% _a	14	68.0% _a	21	88.2% _a	4	75.9% _a	6	58.6% _a	6	58.6% _a	20
Worse	2.7% _a	1	15.0% _a	5	11.8% _a	1	2.1% _a	0	7.1% _a	1	11.8% _a	4
Not sure	6.5% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	14.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	1.3% _a	0
Not Applicable	17.6% _a	4	2.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	15.5% _a	5
TOTALS:	100.0%	25	100.0%	31	100.0%	4	100.0%	8	100.0%	9	100.0%	34

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Better	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	13.5% _a	2	38.1% _a	6	34.1% ²	0
Same	44.8% _a	1	74.6% _a	12	46.3% _a	2	66.8% _a	12	56.3% _a	8	48.9% ²	0
Worse	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	34.9% _a	2	17.3% _a	3	3.5% _a	1	17.0% ²	0
Not sure	55.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.5% _b	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not Applicable	0.0% ¹	0	25.4% _a	4	18.8% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	2.1% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	2	100.0%	16	100.0%	5	100.0%	18	100.0%	14	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Better	22.2% _a	5	12.2% _a	3	3.4% _a	0	35.8% ²	1	5.3% _a	1	30.1% _a	4	15.7% _a	3
Same	48.0% _a	11	71.1% _a	16	81.0% _a	8	64.2% ²	1	72.6% _a	9	63.0% _a	8	54.4% _a	11
Worse	12.1% _a	3	7.6% _a	2	8.3% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	12.8% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	15.6% _a	3
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	5.2% _a	1	4.2% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	9.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	2.2% _a	0
Not Applicable	17.7% _a	4	3.9% _a	1	3.0% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.9% _a	1	12.1% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	23	100.0%	23	100.0%	10	100.0%	2	100.0%	13	100.0%	13	100.0%	19

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Better	28.8% _a	8	11.7% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	12.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	24.0% _a	10
Same	45.8% _a	13	65.0% _a	13	52.3% _a	1	63.9% ²	1	36.1% ²	0	53.5% _a	22
Worse	2.9% _a	1	12.7% _a	2	47.7% _a	1	24.2% ²	0	63.9% ²	0	2.7% _b	1
Not sure	14.8% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	9.8% _a	4
Not Applicable	7.6% _a	2	10.7% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	10.1% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	28	100.0%	20	100.0%	3	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	42

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Better	100.0% ¹	6	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	19.8% _a	3	9.0% _a	1	100.0% ^{1,2}	0
Same	0.0% ¹	0	100.0% ¹	8	74.6% _a	5	65.2% _a	10	18.8% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Worse	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	25.4% _a	2	4.8% _a	1	7.8% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	39.1% _a	4	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not Applicable	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	10.3% _a	2	25.2% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	0

Table 42 cont.— Has the Internet access at your business gotten better, stayed the same, or gotten worse over the past 3 years?

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Better	28.1% _a	9	4.3% _a	1	27.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	44.7% _a	7	26.2% _a	2	23.2% _a	2
Same	43.9% _a	14	76.4% _a	10	60.4% _a	2	84.7% _a	9	17.5% _b	3	27.6% _{a,b}	2	57.3% _{a,b}	4
Worse	6.4% _a	2	6.8% _a	1	12.4% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.2% _a	0	37.7% _a	2	5.6% _a	0
Not sure	13.1% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	27.7% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not Applicable	8.4% _a	3	12.5% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	15.3% _a	2	7.0% _a	1	8.4% _a	1	13.9% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	31	100.0%	13	100.0%	3	100.0%	10	100.0%	15	100.0%	6	100.0%	8

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Better	21.4% _a	6	6.4% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	3.8% _{a,b}	0	53.0% _a	4	8.8% _b	2
Same	75.6% _a	20	73.5% _a	9	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	96.2% _a	5	47.0% _a	3	78.6% _a	21
Worse	2.9% _a	1	2.7% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.2% _a	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	11.5% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	5.5% _a	1
Not Applicable	0.0% ¹	0	5.9% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.8% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	27	100.0%	13	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	7	100.0%	27

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Better	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.8% _a	1	30.0% _a	4	20.9% _a	2	43.7% ²	1
Same	100.0% ¹	4	100.0% ¹	4	84.5% _a	9	51.5% _a	6	74.7% _a	6	56.3% ²	1
Worse	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.8% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	4.4% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	12.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not Applicable	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	10	100.0%	12	100.0%	8	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Better	22.1% _a	3	13.6% _a	2	12.9% _a	1	11.3% _a	1	25.0% _a	1	27.0% _a	3	12.8% _a	2
Same	77.9% _a	12	65.4% _a	10	84.4% _a	9	88.7% _a	4	75.0% _a	2	66.0% _a	7	80.9% _a	14
Worse	0.0% ¹	0	7.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.0% _a	1	2.0% _a	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	10.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not Applicable	0.0% ¹	0	3.2% _a	0	2.7% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.4% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	15	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	5	100.0%	3	100.0%	11	100.0%	17

Table 43 – What portion of your annual revenue do you believe is accounted for by Canadian spending?

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
What portion of your annual revenue do you believe is accounted for by Canadian spending?	None	82	57.0%
	Less than 10%	35	23.9%
	11% - 30%	14	9.5%
	31% - 50%	7	5.0%
	51% - 75%	0	0.0%
	More than 75%	0	0.0%
	Not sure	7	4.5%
	TOTALS:	144	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	Year			
	2015		2017	
None	50.9% _a	70	57.0% _a	82
Less than 10%	26.4%	36	23.9%	35
11%-30%	9.8%	13	9.5%	14
31%-50%	2.0%	3	5.0%	7
"Less than 50%"	38.2% _a	52	38.4% _a	56
51%-75%	1.8%	3	0.0%	0
More than 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"More than 50%"	1.8% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	9.0% _a	12	4.5% _a	7
TOTALS:	100.0%	137	100.0%	144




Table 43 cont.— What portion of your annual revenue do you believe is accounted for by Canadian spending?

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
None	49.3% _a	28	78.3% _b	37	63.5% _{a,b}	25
Less than 10%	25.6%	14	21.1%	10	16.7%	7
11% - 30%	9.7%	5	0.0%	0	19.8%	8
31% - 50%	10.2%	6	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Less than 50%"	45.5% _a	25	21.1% _b	10	36.5% _{a,b}	14
51% - 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
More than 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"More than 50%"	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	5.2% _a	3	0.6% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	56	100.0%	47	100.0%	39

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
	2015	2017	2015	2017	2015	2017
None	47.9% _a	49.3% _a	54.3% _a	78.3% _b	53.2% _a	63.5% _a
Less than 10%	37.1%	25.6%	23.2%	21.1%	14.7%	16.7%
11%-30%	9.0%	9.7%	4.1%	0.0%	13.0%	19.8%
31%-50%	0.9%	10.2%	1.6%	0.0%	3.5%	0.0%
"Less than 50%"	47.0% _a	45.5% _a	28.9% _a	21.1% _a	31.2% _a	36.5% _a
51%-75%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	0.0%
More than 75%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
"More than 50%"	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	4.9% _a	0.0% ¹
Not sure	5.1% _a	5.2% _a	16.8% _a	0.6% _b	10.7% _a	0.0% ¹
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 43 cont.— What portion of your annual revenue do you believe is accounted for by Canadian spending?

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
None	36.3% _a	9	59.7% _a	19	32.5% _a	1	34.4% _a	3	79.2% _a	7	46.8% _a	16
Less than 10%	32.2%	8	20.3%	6	33.0%	1	19.0%	2	0.0%	0	33.4%	11
11% - 30%	10.1%	3	9.4%	3	11.8%	1	0.0%	0	7.3%	1	12.5%	4
31% - 50%	9.6%	2	10.6%	3	22.7%	1	24.6%	2	13.5%	1	4.2%	1
"Less than 50%"	52.0% _a	13	40.3% _a	13	67.5% _a	3	43.6% _a	4	20.8% _a	2	50.0% _a	17
51% - 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
More than 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"More than 50%"	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	11.7% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	22.0% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	3.2% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	25	100.0%	31	100.0%	4	100.0%	8	100.0%	9	100.0%	34

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
None	0.0% ¹	0	38.0% _a	6	51.9% _a	2	56.0% _a	10	60.3% _a	9	51.1% ²	1
Less than 10%	0.0%	0	42.7%	7	13.2%	1	30.2%	5	8.5%	1	31.8%	0
11% - 30%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	34.9%	2	13.8%	2	8.3%	1	17.0%	0
31% - 50%	44.8%	1	12.5%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	18.6%	3	0.0%	0
"Less than 50%"	44.8% _a	1	55.2% _a	9	48.1% _a	2	44.0% _a	8	35.5% _a	5	48.9% ²	0
51% - 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
More than 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"More than 50%"	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	55.2% _a	1	6.8% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.2% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	2	100.0%	16	100.0%	5	100.0%	18	100.0%	14	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
None	41.0% _a	9	54.2% _a	12	57.1% _a	6	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	31.6% _a	4	42.8% _a	6	66.9% _a
Less than 10%	26.2%	6	24.2%	6	27.5%	3	0.0%	0	2.5%	0	36.3%	5	27.4%
11% - 30%	15.9%	4	5.3%	1	5.9%	1	0.0%	0	33.6%	4	0.0%	0	5.7%
31% - 50%	14.3%	3	6.2%	1	9.5%	1	0.0%	0	23.1%	3	20.9%	3	0.0%
"Less than 50%"	56.3% _a	13	35.7% _a	8	42.9% _a	4	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	59.1% _a	8	57.2% _a	7	33.1% _a
51% - 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
More than 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
"More than 50%"	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹
Not sure	2.7% _a	1	10.1% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	2	9.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹
TOTALS:	100.0%	23	100.0%	23	100.0%	10	100.0%	2	100.0%	13	100.0%	13	100.0%

Table 43 cont.— What portion of your annual revenue do you believe is accounted for by Canadian spending?

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
None	69.2% _a	19	91.3% _a	18	100.0% ¹	3	75.8% ²	1	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	76.5% _a	32
Less than 10%	30.8%	9	7.3%	1	0.0%	0	24.2%	0	0.0%	0	22.8%	10
11% - 30%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
31% - 50%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Less than 50%"	30.8% _a	9	7.3% _b	1	0.0% ¹	0	24.2% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	22.8% _a	10
51% - 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
More than 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"More than 50%"	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	1.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.7% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	28	100.0%	20	100.0%	3	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	42

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
None	0.0% ¹	0	91.6% _a	8	100.0% ¹	7	89.5% _a	14	82.1% _a	9	100.0% ^{1,2}	0
Less than 10%	100.0%	6	8.4%	1	0.0%	0	8.6%	1	17.9%	2	0.0%	0
11% - 30%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
31% - 50%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Less than 50%"	100.0% ¹	6	8.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	8.6% _a	1	17.9% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
51% - 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
More than 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"More than 50%"	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.9% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
None	74.9%	23	91.4%	12	61.7%	2	82.8%	9	51.6%	8	95.4%	6	86.7%	7
"None"	74.9% _a	23	91.4% _a	12	61.7% _a	2	82.8% _a	9	51.6% _a	8	95.4% _a	6	86.7% _a	7
Less than 10%	25.1%	8	8.6%	1	29.7%	1	17.2%	2	48.4%	7	0.0%	0	13.3%	1
11% - 30%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
31% - 50%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Less than 50%"	25.1% _a	8	8.6% _a	1	29.7% _a	1	17.2% _a	2	48.4% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	13.3% _a	1
51% - 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
More than 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"More than 50%"	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	8.6% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.6% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	31	100.0%	13	100.0%	3	100.0%	10	100.0%	15	100.0%	6	100.0%	8

Table 43 cont.— What portion of your annual revenue do you believe is accounted for by Canadian spending?

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
None	54.4% _a	15	82.7% _a	11	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	17.9% _a	1	48.8% _{a,b}	3	77.1% _b	20
Less than 10%	18.4%	5	13.1%	2	0.0%	0	6.5%	0	51.2%	3	8.8%	2
11% - 30%	27.3%	7	4.2%	1	0.0%	0	75.6%	4	0.0%	0	14.1%	4
31% - 50%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Less than 50%"	45.6% _a	12	17.3% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	82.1% _a	4	51.2% _{a,b}	3	22.9% _b	6
51% - 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
More than 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"More than 50%"	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	27	100.0%	13	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	7	100.0%	27

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
None	0.0% ¹	0	100.0% ¹	4	56.1% _a	6	70.6% _a	8	73.9% _a	6	56.3% ²	1
Less than 10%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	12.1%	1	29.4%	4	23.4%	2	0.0%	0
11% - 30%	100.0%	4	0.0%	0	31.7%	3	0.0%	0	2.6%	0	43.7%	1
31% - 50%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Less than 50%"	100.0% ¹	4	0.0% ¹	0	43.9% _a	4	29.4% _a	4	26.1% _a	2	43.7% ²	1
51% - 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
More than 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"More than 50%"	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	10	100.0%	12	100.0%	8	100.0%	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
None	56.2% _a	8	83.2% _a	12	45.8% _a	5	88.7% _a	4	66.2% _a	2	73.0% _a	8	46.7% _a	8
Less than 10%	18.4%	3	16.8%	2	13.9%	1	0.0%	0	33.8%	1	27.0%	3	10.7%	2
11% - 30%	25.4%	4	0.0%	0	40.3%	4	11.3%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	42.6%	7
31% - 50%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Less than 50%"	43.8% _a	6	16.8% _a	2	54.2% _a	5	11.3% _a	1	33.8% _a	1	27.0% _a	3	53.3% _a	9
51% - 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
More than 75%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"More than 50%"	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	15	100.0%	15	100.0%	10	100.0%	5	100.0%	3	100.0%	11	100.0%	17

Section 3.3 – Passenger Air Service

Table 44 – How satisfied are you with your access to local passenger air service?

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
How satisfied are you with your access to local passenger air service?	Very satisfied	227	19.2%
	Somewhat satisfied	465	39.3%
	A little satisfied	166	14.1%
	Not satisfied at all	106	9.0%
	Not sure	219	18.5%
TOTALS:		1183	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	Year			
	2015		2017	
Very Satisfied	14.9% _a	193	19.2% _b	227
Somewhat Satisfied	35.1% _a	456	39.3% _b	465
A Little Satisfied	14.1% _a	182	14.1% _a	166
Not Satisfied At All	18.4% _a	238	9.0% _b	106
Not Sure	17.6% _a	229	18.5% _a	219
TOTALS:	100.0%	1298	100.0%	1183




Table 44 cont.— How satisfied are you with your access to local passenger air service?

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Very satisfied	20.1% _a	91	9.8% _b	29	21.6% _a	95
Somewhat satisfied	37.5% _a	170	35.8% _a	104	42.4% _a	187
A little satisfied	17.4% _a	79	19.7% _a	57	6.5% _b	29
Not satisfied at all	6.3% _a	28	15.5% _b	45	9.7% _{a,b}	43
Not sure	18.7% _a	85	19.3% _a	56	19.8% _a	88
TOTALS:	100.0%	454	100.0%	292	100.0%	442

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
	2015	2017	2015	2017	2015	2017
Very Satisfied	14.5% _a	20.1% _b	11.0% _a	9.8% _a	16.1% _a	21.6% _b
Somewhat Satisfied	40.8% _a	37.5% _a	32.2% _a	35.8% _a	30.1% _a	42.4% _b
A Little Satisfied	12.0% _a	17.4% _b	16.4% _a	19.7% _a	15.6% _a	6.5% _b
Not Satisfied At All	15.6% _a	6.3% _b	18.2% _a	15.5% _a	21.1% _a	9.7% _b
Not Sure	17.1% _a	18.7% _a	22.2% _a	19.3% _a	17.1% _a	19.8% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 44 cont.— How satisfied are you with your access to local passenger air service?

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very satisfied	19.4% _a	46	20.8% _a	45	9.9% _a	11	23.5% _{a,b}	13	26.7% _b	25	22.1% _{b,c}	41
Somewhat satisfied	38.0% _a	90	37.0% _a	80	36.0% _a	40	38.1% _a	21	41.9% _a	39	36.3% _a	67
A little satisfied	21.7% _a	51	12.8% _b	28	26.4% _a	29	14.5% _{a,b}	8	10.8% _b	10	16.8% _{a,b}	31
Not satisfied at all	5.7% _a	13	6.9% _a	15	8.1% _a	9	5.2% _a	3	8.6% _a	8	4.6% _a	9
Not sure	15.2% _a	36	22.6% _b	49	19.6% _a	22	18.6% _a	10	11.9% _a	11	20.2% _a	38
TOTALS:	100.0%	237	100.0%	217	100.0%	111	100.0%	56	100.0%	93	100.0%	185

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very satisfied	12.6% _a	17	19.3% _{a,b}	16	32.9% _b	23	15.6% _{a,b}	11	33.7% _{b,c}	18	14.7% _{a,b}	7
Somewhat satisfied	46.6% _a	62	40.8% _{a,b}	34	30.0% _{a,b}	21	43.1% _{a,b}	30	21.5% _b	11	27.2% _{a,b}	13
A little satisfied	20.9% _a	28	14.8% _a	12	18.3% _a	13	12.7% _a	9	12.6% _a	7	23.2% _a	11
Not satisfied at all	4.1% _a	5	6.1% _a	5	6.2% _a	4	6.0% _a	4	10.7% _a	6	8.1% _a	4
Not sure	15.9% _a	21	18.9% _a	16	12.5% _a	9	22.5% _a	16	21.4% _a	11	26.8% _a	13
TOTALS:	100.0%	132	100.0%	83	100.0%	70	100.0%	69	100.0%	52	100.0%	47

	Education Level					Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College	4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000	\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very satisfied	23.5% _a	49	16.9% _a	28	17.9% _a	15	9.2% _a	8	16.8% _{a,b}	21	25.1% _{b,c}	22
Somewhat satisfied	37.0% _a	76	34.3% _a	57	45.4% _a	37	48.6% _a	41	39.2% _{a,b}	50	36.7% _{a,b}	32
A little satisfied	13.3% _a	27	21.7% _a	36	19.2% _a	16	19.6% _a	16	17.7% _a	23	16.8% _a	15
Not satisfied at all	6.4% _a	13	5.7% _a	9	7.0% _a	6	8.4% _a	7	4.6% _a	6	7.3% _a	6
Not sure	19.8% _a	41	21.4% _a	35	10.5% _a	9	14.2% _a	12	21.8% _a	28	14.1% _a	12
TOTALS:	100.0%	206	100.0%	166	100.0%	82	100.0%	84	100.0%	128	100.0%	88

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very satisfied	9.1% _a	13	10.5% _a	15	0.0% ¹	0	12.0% _a	3	20.3% _a	7	8.4% _a	18
Somewhat satisfied	33.7% _a	50	37.9% _a	54	46.4% _a	5	25.8% _a	5	30.8% _a	11	37.6% _a	82
A little satisfied	21.8% _a	32	17.5% _a	25	13.9% _a	2	18.1% _a	4	13.1% _a	5	21.6% _a	47
Not satisfied at all	17.8% _a	26	13.0% _a	19	28.6% _a	3	23.8% _a	5	28.5% _a	10	12.2% _a	27
Not sure	17.6% _a	26	21.1% _a	30	11.1% _a	1	20.3% _a	4	7.3% _a	3	20.2% _a	44
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	143	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very satisfied	4.2% _a	2	12.9% _a	5	10.8% _a	6	12.3% _a	7	12.9% _a	6	5.8% _a	3
Somewhat satisfied	46.2% _a	24	20.1% _a	8	31.1% _a	16	30.5% _a	18	39.9% _a	17	46.6% _a	20
A little satisfied	34.0% _a	18	21.7% _{a,b}	9	22.3% _{a,b}	11	10.7% _b	6	14.1% _{a,b}	6	15.3% _{a,b}	7
Not satisfied at all	11.5% _a	6	19.7% _a	8	20.7% _a	11	10.9% _a	7	12.7% _a	6	19.2% _a	8
Not sure	4.2% _a	2	25.6% _b	11	15.1% _{a,b}	8	35.5% _b	21	20.4% _{a,b}	9	13.2% _{a,b}	6
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

Table 44 cont.— How satisfied are you with your access to local passenger air service?

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very satisfied	8.6% _a	14	14.3% _a	12	5.3% _a	2	11.6% _a	7	13.5% _a	12	7.2% _a	5	10.6% _a	4
Somewhat satisfied	34.2% _a	56	43.0% _a	37	27.1% _a	11	26.3% _a	15	33.0% _{a,b}	29	50.3% _b	34	23.5% _a	9
A little satisfied	18.4% _a	30	13.8% _a	12	36.5% _b	15	10.5% _a	6	27.5% _a	24	14.4% _a	10	29.4% _a	11
Not satisfied at all	17.3% _a	28	10.7% _a	9	18.0% _a	8	30.1% _a	17	14.9% _{a,b}	13	11.0% _b	7	15.8% _{a,b}	6
Not sure	21.6% _a	35	18.1% _a	15	13.1% _a	6	21.5% _a	12	11.1% _a	10	17.1% _a	11	20.7% _a	8
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Very satisfied	22.2% _a	51	20.9% _a	45	8.0% _a	1	21.0% _a	10	16.8% _a	14	23.6% _a	70
Somewhat satisfied	37.8% _a	86	47.3% _b	101	67.4% _{a,b}	6	51.0% _{a,b}	25	68.7% _a	57	33.1% _b	98
A little satisfied	5.8% _a	13	7.1% _a	15	0.0% ¹	0	7.2% _a	4	4.3% _a	4	7.1% _a	21
Not satisfied at all	10.3% _a	23	9.1% _a	19	21.7% _a	2	5.2% _a	3	5.9% _a	5	10.4% _a	31
Not sure	23.8% _a	54	15.6% _b	34	2.8% _{a,b}	0	15.6% _{a,b}	8	4.4% _a	4	25.7% _b	76
TOTALS:	100.0%	227	100.0%	214	100.0%	9	100.0%	49	100.0%	83	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Very satisfied	11.1% _a	13	15.4% _{a,b}	9	18.5% _{a,b}	13	35.6% _b	28	21.3% _{a,b}	13	34.2% _{b,c}	19
Somewhat satisfied	33.3% _a	38	69.3% _b	42	53.3% _{a,b}	37	38.3% _a	30	36.4% _a	23	31.0% _a	17
A little satisfied	7.2% _a	8	4.3% _a	3	3.1% _a	2	4.6% _a	4	12.5% _a	8	7.4% _a	4
Not satisfied at all	9.7% _a	11	1.1% _a	1	15.4% _a	11	12.3% _a	10	12.9% _a	8	4.9% _a	3
Not sure	38.7% _a	44	9.9% _b	6	9.7% _b	7	9.3% _b	7	16.9% _b	11	22.5% _{a,b}	13
TOTALS:	100.0%	115	100.0%	61	100.0%	69	100.0%	79	100.0%	62	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Very satisfied	25.5% _a	52	19.2% _a	30	16.4% _a	14	18.2% _a	17	18.4% _a	17	23.3% _a	24	22.1% _a	22
Somewhat satisfied	36.7% _a	75	54.1% _b	83	34.7% _a	29	38.4% _a	35	52.7% _a	48	42.5% _a	44	52.6% _a	51
A little satisfied	1.1% _a	2	6.8% _b	10	18.8% _c	16	5.3% _a	5	5.6% _a	5	5.2% _a	5	9.6% _a	9
Not satisfied at all	6.9% _a	14	11.3% _a	17	13.7% _a	11	6.9% _a	6	11.8% _a	11	9.4% _a	10	6.3% _a	6
Not sure	29.8% _a	61	8.6% _b	13	16.4% _{a,b}	14	31.1% _a	29	11.5% _b	11	19.7% _{a,b}	20	9.4% _b	9
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	154	100.0%	84	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	98

Table 45 – Do you more commonly fly out of local airports, or do you more commonly fly out of airports that are not in the three North Country counties?

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Do you more commonly fly out of local airports, or do you more commonly fly out of airports that are not in the three North Country counties?	Local airports more commonly	281	23.5%
	Airports outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties more commonly	503	42.1%
	Equally locally and not locally	100	8.4%
	I do not fly ever	269	22.6%
	Don't Know	41	3.4%
	TOTALS:	1193	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	Year			
	2015		2017	
Local Airports More Commonly	15.3% _a	199	23.5% _b	281
Airports Outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties	49.8% _a	647	42.1% _b	503
Equally Locally and Not Locally	4.8% _a	63	8.4% _b	100
I do not fly ever.	27.3% _a	355	22.6% _b	269
Don't know	2.8% _a	36	3.4% _a	41
TOTALS:	100.0%	1299	100.0%	1193




Table 45 cont.— Do you more commonly fly out of local airports, or do you more commonly fly out of airports that are not in the three North Country counties?

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Local airports more commonly	24.8% _a	114	12.8% _b	37	25.5% _a	114
Airports outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties more commonly	41.0% _a	187	54.6% _b	159	34.9% _a	156
Equally locally and not locally	9.3% _a	42	2.8% _b	8	8.9% _a	40
I do not fly ever	20.8% _a	95	27.3% _a	80	26.9% _a	120
Don't Know	4.1% _a	19	2.5% _a	7	3.8% _a	17
TOTALS:	100.0%	458	100.0%	292	100.0%	446

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
	2015	2017	2015	2017	2015	2017
Local Airports More Commonly	17.1% _a	24.8% _b	10.6% _a	12.8% _a	14.5% _a	25.5% _b
Airports Outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties	50.2% _a	41.0% _b	52.0% _a	54.6% _a	48.9% _a	34.9% _b
Equally Locally and Not Locally	5.9% _a	9.3% _a	1.6% _a	2.8% _a	4.5% _a	8.9% _b
I do not fly ever.	23.1% _a	20.8% _a	34.4% _a	27.3% _a	29.8% _a	26.9% _a
Don't know	3.6% _a	4.1% _a	1.4% _a	2.5% _a	2.2% _a	3.8% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 45 cont.— Do you more commonly fly out of local airports, or do you more commonly fly out of airports that are not in the three North Country counties?

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Local airports more commonly	29.6% _a	71	19.5% _b	42	34.4% _a	39	19.4% _{a,b}	11	26.9% _{a,b}	25	19.6% _b	37
Airports outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties more commonly	44.2% _a	106	37.3% _a	81	39.6% _{a,b}	45	55.2% _a	31	32.8% _b	30	43.0% _{a,b}	80
Equally locally and not locally	13.2% _a	32	5.0% _b	11	18.2% _a	20	8.0% _{a,b}	5	3.8% _b	3	7.3% _{b,c}	14
I do not fly ever	9.9% _a	24	32.9% _b	72	5.4% _a	6	15.0% _{a,b}	9	28.9% _b	27	28.9% _{b,c}	54
Don't Know	3.1% _a	7	5.3% _a	11	2.4% _{a,b}	3	2.4% _{a,b}	1	7.7% _a	7	1.1% _b	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	241	100.0%	217	100.0%	113	100.0%	57	100.0%	93	100.0%	186

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Local airports more commonly	40.4% _a	55	17.2% _b	14	26.6% _{a,b}	18	16.2% _b	11	20.0% _{a,b}	10	9.4% _b	4
Airports outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties more commonly	31.4% _a	42	49.4% _a	41	47.4% _a	33	50.5% _a	35	39.9% _a	21	31.0% _a	15
Equally locally and not locally	17.3% _a	23	5.0% _a	4	6.2% _a	4	4.6% _a	3	9.9% _a	5	4.8% _a	2
I do not fly ever	7.0% _a	9	23.3% _{b,c}	19	15.6% _{a,b}	11	27.8% _{b,c}	19	25.5% _{b,c}	13	48.1% _c	23
Don't Know	4.0% _a	5	5.2% _a	4	4.3% _a	3	0.9% _a	1	4.7% _a	2	6.8% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	135	100.0%	84	100.0%	69	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	47

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Local airports more commonly	29.0% _a	61	21.6% _a	36	20.5% _a	17	22.9% _a	20	23.3% _a	30	27.5% _a	24	23.7% _a
Airports outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties more commonly	31.8% _a	67	46.7% _b	78	52.7% _b	43	29.9% _a	26	45.9% _{a,b}	59	36.4% _{a,b}	32	51.0% _b
Equally locally and not locally	9.0% _a	19	8.4% _a	14	11.8% _a	10	15.6% _a	14	11.2% _a	14	7.2% _a	6	5.8% _a
I do not fly ever	26.0% _a	55	18.4% _{a,b}	31	12.3% _b	10	29.4% _a	26	13.7% _b	18	25.0% _{a,b}	22	14.6% _{a,b}
Don't Know	4.1% _a	9	4.9% _a	8	2.7% _a	2	2.2% _a	2	5.8% _a	7	3.8% _a	3	4.9% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	210	100.0%	167	100.0%	81	100.0%	88	100.0%	129	100.0%	88	100.0%

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Local airports more commonly	11.3% _a	17	14.4% _a	21	48.7% _a	6	14.3% _{a,b}	3	26.2% _a	9	8.8% _b	19
Airports outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties more commonly	62.8% _a	93	46.1% _b	66	34.1% _a	4	40.6% _a	9	42.0% _a	15	59.8% _a	131
Equally locally and not locally	3.7% _a	6	1.8% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	2.5% _a	1	5.7% _a	2	2.6% _a	6
I do not fly ever	18.6% _a	27	36.3% _b	52	17.2% _a	2	42.6% _a	9	23.2% _a	8	27.4% _a	60
Don't Know	3.6% _a	5	1.4% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.9% _a	1	1.4% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	143	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Local airports more commonly	6.3% _{a,b}	3	28.3% _a	12	18.0% _{a,b}	9	9.9% _{a,b}	6	12.5% _{a,b}	5	4.2% _b	2
Airports outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties more commonly	81.1% _a	43	32.4% _b	13	56.1% _{a,b}	28	48.8% _b	29	56.8% _{a,b}	25	46.9% _b	20
Equally locally and not locally	4.2% _a	2	1.7% _a	1	0.9% _a	0	0.9% _a	1	7.8% _a	3	1.9% _a	1
I do not fly ever	8.4% _a	4	30.6% _{a,b}	13	22.9% _{a,b}	12	38.6% _b	23	22.8% _{a,b}	10	41.2% _{b,c}	18
Don't Know	0.0% ¹	0	6.9% _a	3	2.0% _a	1	1.8% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	5.7% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

Table 45 cont.— Do you more commonly fly out of local airports, or do you more commonly fly out of airports that are not in the three North Country counties?

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Local airports more commonly	10.4% _{a,b}	17	21.4% _a	18	4.8% _b	2	11.9% _a	7	19.8% _a	18	10.0% _a	7	16.5% _a	6
Airports outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties more commonly	58.9% _a	96	40.4% _b	35	66.6% _a	28	36.6% _a	21	59.7% _b	53	61.2% _b	41	67.2% _b	26
Equally locally and not locally	0.3% _a	1	5.2% _b	4	7.6% _b	3	0.0% ¹	0	1.3% _a	1	8.8% _b	6	0.0% ¹	0
I do not fly ever	29.2% _a	48	28.5% _a	24	17.6% _a	7	48.0% _a	27	19.2% _b	17	13.6% _b	9	16.2% _b	6
Don't Know	1.2% _a	2	4.6% _a	4	3.5% _a	1	3.5% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	6.4% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male	Female	AM in household	Fort Drum and stayed	No AM, but job related to FD	No FD connection						
Local airports more commonly	23.0% _a	52	28.0% _a	61	63.6% _a	6	28.9% _{a,b}	14	21.4% _b	19	25.1% _{a,b}	74
Airports outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties more commonly	36.1% _a	82	33.7% _a	74	21.7% _{a,b}	2	32.7% _{a,b}	16	48.0% _a	42	31.2% _b	92
Equally locally and not locally	8.9% _a	20	9.0% _a	20	0.0% ¹	0	16.0% _a	8	13.1% _a	11	6.9% _a	20
I do not fly ever	27.1% _a	62	26.6% _a	58	11.9% _a	1	22.3% _a	11	16.9% _a	15	31.3% _a	92
Don't Know	4.9% _a	11	2.7% _a	6	2.8% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _a	0	5.5% _a	16
TOTALS:	100.0%	227	100.0%	218	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Local airports more commonly	10.8% _a	13	41.7% _b	25	24.8% _{a,b}	17	33.5% _b	27	23.5% _{a,b}	15	30.6% _b	17
Airports outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties more commonly	42.4% _a	50	20.8% _{a,b}	13	34.9% _{a,b}	24	40.1% _{a,b}	32	43.9% _a	27	17.1% _b	10
Equally locally and not locally	8.9% _a	11	12.7% _a	8	7.4% _a	5	7.5% _a	6	6.4% _a	4	11.4% _a	6
I do not fly ever	34.8% _a	41	19.3% _a	12	24.5% _a	17	17.6% _a	14	22.8% _a	14	38.9% _a	22
Don't Know	3.0% _a	4	5.5% _a	3	8.4% _a	6	1.2% _a	1	3.5% _a	2	2.0% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	69	100.0%	80	100.0%	62	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Local airports more commonly	19.3% _a	39	36.4% _b	56	20.6% _a	18	12.9% _a	12	29.9% _b	28	29.2% _b	30	37.4% _b	38
Airports outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties more commonly	31.4% _a	64	28.6% _a	44	54.5% _b	48	34.6% _a	32	32.5% _a	30	41.7% _a	43	37.6% _a	38
Equally locally and not locally	7.9% _a	16	10.4% _a	16	8.7% _a	8	10.0% _a	9	11.2% _a	10	5.4% _a	6	6.6% _a	7
I do not fly ever	39.3% _a	80	19.3% _b	30	11.2% _b	10	38.5% _a	36	21.3% _{a,b}	20	22.4% _{a,b}	23	15.3% _b	15
Don't Know	2.1% _a	4	5.4% _a	8	5.0% _a	4	4.1% _a	4	5.2% _a	5	1.3% _a	1	3.1% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	155	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Section 3.4 – Healthcare Access

Table 46 – How often do you travel outside of your county for healthcare services?

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

	Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
How often do you travel outside of your county for healthcare services?		
Never	486	40.7%
Rarely	295	24.6%
Some of the time	228	19.1%
Most of the time	124	10.4%
All of the time	47	4.0%
Don't Know	16	1.3%
TOTALS:	1195	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	Year			
	2015		2017	
Never	40.0% _a	520	40.7% _a	486
Rarely	24.1%	313	24.6%	295
Some of the time	20.1%	262	19.1%	228
"Rarely/Some of the time"	44.2% _a	575	43.7% _a	522
Most of the time	9.4%	122	10.4%	124
All of the time	5.3%	69	4.0%	47
"Most/All of the time"	14.7% _a	191	14.3% _a	171
Don't know	1.2% _a	15	1.3% _a	16
TOTALS:	100.0%	1301	100.0%	1195




Table 46 cont.— How often do you travel outside of your county for healthcare services?

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Never	44.2% _a	203	32.3% _b	94	43.5% _a	194
Rarely	27.5%	126	20.5%	60	22.7%	101
Some of the time	13.4%	62	30.7%	90	20.9%	93
"Rarely/Some of the time"	40.9% _a	188	51.2% _b	149	43.6% _{a,b}	194
Most of the time	8.7%	40	11.7%	34	8.9%	40
All of the time	4.6%	21	3.8%	11	2.5%	11
"Most/All of the time"	13.3% _a	61	15.5% _a	45	11.4% _a	51
Don't Know	1.6% _a	7	1.0% _a	3	1.5% _a	7
TOTALS:	100.0%	460	100.0%	292	100.0%	445

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
	2015	2017	2015	2017	2015	2017
Never	46.5% _a	44.2% _a	31.7% _a	32.3% _a	35.3% _a	43.5% _b
Rarely	24.4%	27.5%	20.1%	20.5%	24.6%	22.7%
Some of the time	16.8%	13.4%	25.7%	30.7%	22.2%	20.9%
"Rarely/Some of the time"	41.3% _a	40.9% _a	45.8% _a	51.2% _a	46.8% _a	43.6% _a
Most of the time	7.3%	8.7%	14.6%	11.7%	10.3%	8.9%
All of the time	2.8%	4.6%	7.9%	3.8%	7.2%	2.5%
"Most/All of the time"	10.1% _a	13.3% _a	22.5% _a	15.5% _b	17.4% _a	11.4% _b
Don't know	2.1% _a	1.6% _a	0.0% ¹	1.0% _a	0.5% _a	1.5% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 46 cont.— How often do you travel outside of your county for healthcare services?

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Never	48.5% _a	118	39.4% _b	85	54.5% _a	63	36.4% _a	21	39.5% _a	37	43.9% _a	82
Rarely	24.4%	59	30.9%	67	28.5%	33	21.5%	12	31.7%	29	26.3%	49
Some of the time	11.5%	28	15.7%	34	10.6%	12	15.1%	9	16.1%	15	13.6%	25
"Rarely/Some of the time"	35.9% _a	87	46.6% _b	101	39.1% _a	45	36.6% _a	21	47.8% _a	44	39.9% _a	74
Most of the time	8.2%	20	9.3%	20	0.0%	0	15.1%	9	10.8%	10	11.5%	21
All of the time	5.1%	12	3.9%	8	3.0%	3	12.0%	7	1.9%	2	4.7%	9
"Most/All of the time"	13.3% _a	32	13.2% _a	29	3.0% _a	3	27.1% _b	15	12.7% _b	12	16.2% _b	30
Don't Know	2.3% _a	6	0.9% _a	2	3.3% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	243	100.0%	217	100.0%	115	100.0%	57	100.0%	93	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Never	57.8% _a	79	34.9% _b	29	38.1% _{a,b}	27	39.6% _{a,b}	28	45.0% _{a,b}	24	36.6% _{a,b}	17
Rarely	21.2%	29	40.9%	34	31.9%	22	28.1%	20	20.7%	11	21.5%	10
Some of the time	9.6%	13	7.3%	6	11.7%	8	19.7%	14	19.2%	10	22.5%	11
"Rarely/Some of the time"	30.8% _a	42	48.2% _a	41	43.6% _a	31	47.8% _a	34	40.0% _a	21	44.1% _a	21
Most of the time	6.2%	8	7.1%	6	10.6%	7	7.5%	5	10.5%	6	15.8%	7
All of the time	1.2%	2	8.3%	7	6.8%	5	5.1%	4	4.5%	2	3.6%	2
"Most/All of the time"	7.4% _a	10	15.4% _a	13	17.4% _a	12	12.6% _a	9	15.0% _a	8	19.3% _a	9
Don't Know	4.1% _a	6	1.5% _a	1	0.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	136	100.0%	84	100.0%	70	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	47

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Never	47.3%	99	43.8%	74	37.0%	30	42.1%	37	54.2%	70	41.3%	36	34.2%	34
"Never"	47.3% _a	99	43.8% _a	74	37.0% _a	30	42.1% _{a,b}	37	54.2% _a	70	41.3% _{a,b}	36	34.2% _b	34
Rarely	32.5%	68	19.0%	32	32.0%	26	34.2%	30	22.9%	30	25.4%	22	30.7%	31
Some of the time	5.8%	12	20.2%	34	19.1%	16	7.4%	6	14.6%	19	19.8%	17	14.9%	15
"Rarely/Some of the time"	38.3% _a	80	39.2% _a	66	51.1% _a	42	41.6% _a	37	37.4% _a	48	45.1% _a	40	45.6% _a	46
Most of the time	7.3%	15	10.6%	18	8.3%	7	10.5%	9	4.0%	5	7.3%	6	10.7%	11
All of the time	4.4%	9	5.6%	9	2.9%	2	2.8%	3	4.3%	6	4.2%	4	6.5%	7
"Most/All of the time"	11.7% _a	25	16.2% _a	27	11.2% _a	9	13.4% _a	12	8.3% _a	11	11.4% _a	10	17.3% _a	17
Don't Know	2.6% _a	6	0.8% _a	1	0.8% _a	1	2.9% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	2.1% _a	2	2.9% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	210	100.0%	168	100.0%	82	100.0%	88	100.0%	129	100.0%	88	100.0%	101

Table 46 cont.— How often do you travel outside of your county for healthcare services?

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Never	36.3% _a	54	28.2% _a	40	55.7% _{a,c}	6	7.7% _b	2	54.2% _a	19	30.5% _{b,c}	67
Rarely	17.6%	26	23.5%	34	6.0%	1	22.3%	5	4.9%	2	24.1%	53
Some of the time	33.3%	49	28.0%	40	26.1%	3	30.9%	7	21.7%	8	32.8%	72
"Rarely/Some of the time"	50.9% _a	75	51.5% _a	74	32.1% _{a,b}	4	53.2% _{a,b}	11	26.6% _a	9	56.8% _b	125
Most of the time	7.7%	11	15.8%	23	0.0%	0	37.3%	8	16.7%	6	9.0%	20
All of the time	3.1%	5	4.6%	7	12.2%	1	1.8%	0	2.5%	1	3.6%	8
"Most/All of the time"	10.8% _a	16	20.3% _b	29	12.2% _{a,b}	1	39.1% _a	8	19.2% _{a,b}	7	12.7% _b	28
Don't Know	1.9% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	143	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Never	44.4% _{a,c}	24	50.6% _a	21	52.5% _a	27	15.9% _b	10	13.4% _b	6	18.1% _{b,c}	8
Rarely	22.1%	12	20.7%	8	9.9%	5	25.9%	16	28.3%	12	15.7%	7
Some of the time	27.2%	14	4.6%	2	21.0%	11	40.4%	24	37.2%	16	51.2%	22
"Rarely/Some of the time"	49.3% _{a,b}	26	25.3% _a	10	31.0% _a	16	66.2% _b	40	65.5% _{b,c}	28	66.9% _{b,d}	29
Most of the time	6.3%	3	12.0%	5	10.1%	5	13.8%	8	19.1%	8	9.6%	4
All of the time	0.0%	0	5.1%	2	6.5%	3	4.1%	2	2.1%	1	5.5%	2
"Most/All of the time"	6.3% _a	3	17.2% _a	7	16.5% _a	8	17.9% _a	11	21.2% _a	9	15.1% _a	6
Don't Know	0.0% ¹	0	6.9% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Never	30.0%	49	36.9%	32	31.8%	13	38.7%	22	33.6%	30	32.5%	22	22.1%	8
"Never"	30.0% _a	49	36.9% _a	32	31.8% _a	13	38.7% _a	22	33.6% _a	30	32.5% _a	22	22.1% _a	8
Rarely	19.0%	31	25.6%	22	16.1%	7	12.8%	7	22.0%	19	18.8%	13	17.9%	7
Some of the time	37.8%	62	17.3%	15	30.3%	13	36.4%	21	28.6%	25	30.2%	20	38.7%	15
"Rarely/Some of the time"	56.8% _a	93	42.9% _a	37	46.4% _a	20	49.2% _a	28	50.6% _a	45	49.0% _a	33	56.6% _a	22
Most of the time	11.7%	19	9.6%	8	15.7%	7	11.8%	7	10.1%	9	11.2%	7	14.1%	5
All of the time	1.4%	2	7.2%	6	6.1%	3	0.3%	0	5.7%	5	3.0%	2	7.2%	3
"Most/All of the time"	13.2% _a	22	16.9% _a	14	21.8% _a	9	12.1% _a	7	15.8% _a	14	14.2% _a	9	21.3% _a	8
Don't Know	0.0% ¹	0	3.3% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.2% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	86	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

Table 46 cont.— How often do you travel outside of your county for healthcare services?

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Never	37.9% _a	86	49.4% _b	108	57.1% _{a,b}	5	30.7% _a	15	56.6% _b	49	41.8% _{a,b}	123
Rarely	25.5%	58	19.8%	43	19.9%	2	37.3%	19	18.8%	16	21.7%	64
Some of the time	20.9%	48	20.9%	45	14.7%	1	18.8%	9	10.7%	9	23.7%	70
"Rarely/Some of the time"	46.4% _a	105	40.6% _a	89	34.6% _{a,b}	3	56.1% _a	28	29.5% _b	26	45.4% _{a,b}	134
Most of the time	8.9%	20	8.9%	19	0.0%	0	9.0%	4	9.9%	9	9.0%	26
All of the time	3.9%	9	1.1%	2	8.3%	1	4.2%	2	0.2%	0	2.8%	8
"Most/All of the time"	12.8% _a	29	10.0% _a	22	8.3% _a	1	13.3% _a	7	10.1% _a	9	11.7% _a	35
Don't Know	2.9% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.8% _a	3	1.1% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	227	100.0%	218	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Never	68.8% _a	81	52.8% _{a,b}	32	34.5% _{b,c}	24	21.0% _c	17	26.5% _{c,d}	16	42.0% _{b,c,e}	23
Rarely	21.1%	25	24.9%	15	20.5%	14	22.6%	18	23.5%	15	25.4%	14
Some of the time	7.2%	9	6.2%	4	26.7%	18	39.8%	32	30.3%	19	21.6%	12
"Rarely/Some of the time"	28.3% _a	34	31.1% _{a,c}	19	47.2% _{a,b}	33	62.4% _b	50	53.8% _{b,c}	33	47.0% _{a,b}	26
Most of the time	2.9%	3	5.2%	3	12.8%	9	10.5%	8	16.8%	10	9.7%	5
All of the time	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	5.5%	4	6.1%	5	2.9%	2	1.3%	1
"Most/All of the time"	2.9% _a	3	5.2% _{a,b}	3	18.4% _b	13	16.7% _{b,c}	13	19.7% _{b,d}	12	10.9% _{a,b}	6
Don't Know	0.0% ¹	0	11.0% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	69	100.0%	80	100.0%	62	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Never	46.7% _a	95	39.7% _a	61	42.8% _a	37	62.4% _a	58	41.8% _b	38	28.9% _b	30	36.1% _b
Rarely	18.6%	38	25.7%	40	26.8%	23	13.2%	12	23.9%	22	31.7%	33	28.9%
Some of the time	22.8%	47	20.1%	31	17.8%	16	12.7%	12	14.6%	13	29.3%	30	21.0%
"Rarely/Some of the time"	41.5% _a	84	45.7% _a	71	44.6% _a	39	25.8% _a	24	38.5% _{a,c}	35	61.0% _b	63	49.9% _{b,c}
Most of the time	10.0%	20	6.4%	10	10.6%	9	5.1%	5	10.6%	10	8.6%	9	12.1%
All of the time	1.8%	4	3.8%	6	2.0%	2	6.7%	6	1.8%	2	1.5%	2	1.9%
"Most/All of the time"	11.8% _a	24	10.2% _a	16	12.6% _a	11	11.8% _a	11	12.4% _a	11	10.1% _a	10	14.0% _a
Don't Know	0.0% ¹	0	4.3% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.2% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹
TOTALS:	100.0%	204	100.0%	154	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%

Table 47 – When you do travel for healthcare services, is it to another county outside the Jefferson, Lewis, St. Lawrence County region? (among those who travel outside their county)

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
When you do travel for healthcare services, is it to another county outside the Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence County region?	Yes, always	242	34.4%
	Yes, sometimes	275	39.2%
	No	178	25.3%
	Not sure	8	1.1%
	TOTALS:	703	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	Year			
	2015		2017	
Yes, always.	35.0%	268	34.4%	242
Yes, sometimes.	28.3%	217	39.2%	275
"Yes"	63.3% _a	485	73.6% _b	517
No.	36.5% _a	280	25.3% _b	178
Not sure.	0.2% _a	1	1.1% _b	8
TOTALS:	100.0%	766	100.0%	703




Table 47 cont.— When you do travel for healthcare services, is it to another county outside the Jefferson, Lewis, St. Lawrence County region? (among those who travel outside their county)

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Yes, always	34.4%	87	30.4%	59	35.4%	87
Yes, sometimes	46.9%	119	40.1%	78	33.7%	83
"Yes"	81.3% _a	206	70.5% _b	137	69.2% _b	169
No	17.0% _a	43	29.2% _b	57	29.9% _b	73
Not sure	1.7% _a	4	0.3% _a	1	0.9% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	254	100.0%	195	100.0%	245

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
	2015	2017	2015	2017	2015	2017
Yes, always.	38.4%	34.4%	36.1%	30.4%	32.0%	35.4%
Yes, sometimes.	23.3%	46.9%	27.5%	40.1%	32.5%	33.7%
"Yes"	61.7% _a	81.3% _b	63.5% _a	70.5% _a	64.5% _a	69.2% _a
No.	38.3% _a	17.0% _b	36.5% _a	29.2% _a	35.1% _a	29.9% _a
Not sure.	0.0% ¹	1.7% _a	0.0% ¹	0.3% _a	0.4% _a	0.9% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 47 cont.— When you do travel for healthcare services, is it to another county outside the Jefferson, Lewis, St. Lawrence County region? (among those who travel outside their county)

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes, always	33.3%	41	35.4%	46	17.5%	8	48.4%	19	29.1%	16	40.2%	43
Yes, sometimes	37.7%	46	55.5%	73	43.8%	21	36.8%	14	66.6%	37	42.1%	45
"Yes"	71.0% _a	87	90.9% _b	119	61.3% _a	30	85.3% _{a,b}	33	95.7% _b	54	82.3% _{b,c}	88
No	25.4% _a	31	9.1% _b	12	31.6% _a	15	14.7% _{a,b}	6	3.4% _b	2	17.7% _{a,b}	19
Not sure	3.6% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	7.1% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	123	100.0%	131	100.0%	48	100.0%	38	100.0%	56	100.0%	107

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes, always	22.8%	12	27.1%	14	41.3%	18	46.0%	20	39.3%	11	36.9%	11
Yes, sometimes	47.6%	26	49.1%	26	55.1%	24	40.7%	18	48.3%	14	37.0%	11
"Yes"	70.5% _a	38	76.1% _{a,b}	41	96.4% _b	42	86.8% _{a,b}	37	87.6% _{a,b}	25	73.9% _{a,b}	22
No	29.5% _a	16	17.4% _{a,b}	9	3.6% _b	2	13.2% _{a,b}	6	9.2% _{a,b}	3	26.1% _{a,b}	8
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	6.4% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	54	100.0%	54	100.0%	44	100.0%	43	100.0%	29	100.0%	30

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes, always	21.8%	24	47.4%	44	37.6%	19	21.4%	10	30.0%	18	40.6%	20	43.0%	28
Yes, sometimes	53.8%	59	38.7%	36	46.9%	24	58.5%	28	47.4%	28	42.6%	21	48.4%	31
"Yes"	75.7% _a	83	86.2% _a	80	84.5% _a	43	80.0% _a	39	77.4% _a	46	83.2% _a	41	91.4% _a	59
No	24.3% _a	27	10.6% _b	10	12.9% _{a,b}	7	20.0% _a	10	18.4% _a	11	16.8% _a	8	6.5% _a	4
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	3.2% _a	3	2.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	4.3% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	2.1% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	109	100.0%	93	100.0%	51	100.0%	48	100.0%	60	100.0%	50	100.0%	64

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes, always	30.1%	28	30.7%	32	57.5%	3	38.4%	7	30.4%	5	28.2%	43
Yes, sometimes	49.2%	45	31.9%	33	42.5%	2	33.1%	6	32.8%	6	41.8%	64
"Yes"	79.3% _a	73	62.7% _b	64	100.0% ¹	5	71.5% _a	14	63.2% _a	11	70.1% _a	107
No	20.1% _a	19	37.3% _b	38	0.0% ¹	0	28.5% _a	5	36.8% _a	6	29.6% _a	45
Not sure	0.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.4% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	5	100.0%	19	100.0%	17	100.0%	152

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes, always	28.2%	8	54.1%	9	49.7%	12	33.9%	17	22.3%	9	11.3%	4
Yes, sometimes	49.0%	14	37.9%	7	33.5%	8	35.9%	18	44.9%	17	39.0%	14
"Yes"	77.2% _{a,b}	23	92.0% _a	16	83.2% _{a,b}	20	69.8% _{a,b}	35	67.3% _{a,b}	26	50.3% _b	18
No	22.8% _{a,b}	7	8.0% _a	1	16.8% _{a,b}	4	29.1% _{a,b}	15	32.7% _{a,b}	12	49.7% _b	18
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	29	100.0%	17	100.0%	24	100.0%	50	100.0%	38	100.0%	35

Table 47 cont.— When you do travel for healthcare services, is it to another county outside the Jefferson, Lewis, St. Lawrence County region? (among those who travel outside their county)

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College		4+ Year Degree			Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes, always	28.9%	33	31.3%	16	35.1%	10	31.8%	11	31.8%	19	29.6%	13	39.7%	12
Yes, sometimes	42.2%	48	30.5%	15	48.7%	14	29.9%	10	40.0%	24	49.1%	21	46.3%	14
"Yes"	71.0% _a	82	61.8% _a	31	83.8% _a	24	61.7% _a	22	71.9% _a	42	78.6% _a	34	86.0% _a	26
No	29.0% _a	33	37.1% _a	19	16.2% _a	5	38.3% _a	13	28.1% _a	17	21.4% _a	9	14.0% _a	4
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	1.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	115	100.0%	51	100.0%	29	100.0%	35	100.0%	59	100.0%	43	100.0%	30

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes, always	40.6%	55	29.2%	32	40.3%	2	26.8%	9	23.4%	8	38.9%	66
Yes, sometimes	33.9%	46	33.5%	37	32.0%	1	24.3%	8	39.2%	14	34.7%	58
"Yes"	74.5% _a	100	62.7% _b	69	72.3% _a	3	51.1% _a	18	62.6% _a	22	73.6% _a	124
No	23.9% _a	32	37.3% _b	41	27.7% _{a,b}	1	48.9% _a	17	37.4% _{a,b}	13	25.1% _b	42
Not sure	1.7% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.3% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	134	100.0%	110	100.0%	4	100.0%	35	100.0%	34	100.0%	169

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes, always	0.0%	0	27.4%	6	53.4%	24	44.6%	28	41.5%	19	29.8%	10
Yes, sometimes	34.0%	13	28.5%	6	34.8%	16	32.2%	20	32.7%	15	40.1%	13
"Yes"	34.0% _a	13	55.9% _{a,c,d,e}	12	88.3% _b	40	76.8% _{b,c}	48	74.2% _{b,d}	34	69.9% _{b,e}	23
No	66.0% _a	24	44.1% _{a,c,d,e}	10	11.7% _b	5	23.2% _{b,c}	15	20.9% _{b,d}	9	30.1% _{b,e}	10
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.9% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	37	100.0%	22	100.0%	45	100.0%	63	100.0%	45	100.0%	32

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College		4+ Year Degree			Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes, always	41.1%	45	35.2%	30	23.6%	12	38.7%	13	25.1%	12	28.3%	21	42.2%	27
Yes, sometimes	29.4%	32	38.2%	33	35.4%	18	35.7%	12	41.0%	19	40.7%	30	24.1%	16
"Yes"	70.5% _a	76	73.4% _a	63	59.0% _a	29	74.3% _a	26	66.1% _a	31	69.1% _a	51	66.2% _a	43
No	27.4% _a	30	26.6% _a	23	41.0% _a	20	25.7% _a	9	29.1% _a	14	30.9% _a	23	33.8% _a	22
Not sure	2.1% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.8% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	108	100.0%	86	100.0%	50	100.0%	35	100.0%	47	100.0%	73	100.0%	65

Table 48 – What healthcare services do you travel outside the Tri-County region to access?
(among those who travel outside the Tri-County region)

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
What healthcare services do you travel outside the Tri-County region to access?	Primary Care	80	16.1%
	Orthopedic services including Physical Therapy	65	13.1%
	Cardiology	59	11.9%
	In-Patient Surgery (admitted)	53	10.7%
	Cancer Treatment	43	8.6%
	Dermatology	42	8.5%
	Outpatient Surgery	34	6.9%
	Neurology	26	5.2%
	Cardiac Surgery	24	4.9%
	Pediatric Care	23	4.7%
	Women's Health Services	18	3.7%
	Urology	18	3.6%
	Emergency Room Care	18	3.5%
	Eye/Optical/Vision Care	16	3.3%
	Endocrinology	14	2.7%
	Gastroenterology	13	2.7%
	Rheumatology	12	2.4%
	In-Patient Medical Care (admitted)	11	2.3%
	Allergist	9	1.8%
	Dental	9	1.7%
	Audiology	7	1.3%
	Mental Health Services	5	1.0%
	Ear/Nose/Throat	3	0.7%
	Respiratory	0	0.1%
	"Specialists"	145	29.3%
	Not Sure	28	5.6%

Table 48 cont.— What healthcare services do you travel outside the Tri-County region to access?
(among those who travel outside the Tri-County region)

Trend Analysis by Region:

	Year			
	2015		2017	
Primary Care	21.2% _a	96	16.1% _a	80
Orthopedic services including Physical Therapy	11.5% _a	52	13.1% _a	65
Cardiology	16.3% _a	74	11.9% _a	59
In-Patient Surgery (admitted)	10.3% _a	47	10.7% _a	53
Cancer Treatment	7.1% _a	32	8.6% _a	43
Dermatology	6.5% _a	29	8.5% _a	42
Outpatient Surgery	7.8% _a	35	6.9% _a	34
Neurology	7.2% _a	32	5.2% _a	26
Cardiac Surgery	7.6% _a	35	4.9% _a	24
Pediatric Care	2.2% _a	10	4.7% _b	23
Women's Health Services	7.7% _a	35	3.7% _b	18
Urology	0.3% _a	2	3.6% _b	18
Emergency Room Care	5.3% _a	24	3.5% _a	18
Eye/Optical/Vision Care	2.3% _a	10	3.3% _a	16
Endocrinology	3.4% _a	15	2.7% _a	14
Gastroenterology	5.6% _a	26	2.7% _b	13
Rheumatology	1.0% _a	5	2.4% _a	12
In-Patient Medical Care (admitted)	2.4% _a	11	2.3% _a	11
Allergist	0.5% _a	2	1.8% _a	9
Dental	0.0% ¹	0	1.7% _b	9
Audiology	0.1% _a	0	1.3% _b	7
Mental Health Services	0.6% _a	3	1.0% _a	5
Ear/Nose/Throat	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _a	3
Respiratory	0.0% ¹	0	0.1% _a	0
"Specialists"	5.4% _a	24	29.8% _b	145
Not Sure	8.1% _a	36	5.7% _a	28




Table 48 cont.— What healthcare services do you travel outside the Tri-County region to access?
(among those who travel outside the Tri-County region)

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Primary Care	16.2% _a	31	13.4% _a	18	12.4% _a	20
Emergency Room Care	1.2% _a	2	7.9% _b	11	3.9% _{a,b}	6
Outpatient Surgery	4.3% _a	8	9.8% _a	13	7.1% _a	12
In-Patient Surgery (admitted)	9.4% _{a,b}	18	18.2% _a	25	8.3% _b	14
In-Patient Medical Care (admitted)	2.5% _a	5	2.3% _a	3	0.9% _a	2
Women's Health Services	4.5% _a	9	5.4% _a	7	1.2% _a	2
Mental Health Services	0.9% _a	2	1.8% _a	2	0.6% _a	1
Orthopedic services including Physical Therapy	20.5% _a	39	8.6% _b	12	10.4% _b	17
Cancer Treatment	7.8% _{a,b}	15	16.0% _a	22	7.2% _b	12
Cardiology	9.5% _a	18	15.6% _a	21	14.7% _a	24
Cardiac Surgery	5.2% _a	10	6.3% _a	9	4.1% _a	7
Neurology	5.6% _a	11	4.2% _a	6	7.3% _a	12
Dermatology	10.7% _a	20	7.1% _a	10	5.7% _a	9
Gastroenterology	2.9% _a	5	4.3% _a	6	0.7% _a	1
Allergist	0.4% _a	1	6.0% _b	8	2.0% _{a,b}	3
Eye/Optical/Vision Care	2.8% _a	5	4.8% _a	7	1.9% _a	3
Rheumatology	2.7% _a	5	3.7% _a	5	1.3% _a	2
Urology	2.4% _a	5	8.3% _b	11	1.3% _a	2
Pediatric Care	3.5% _a	7	4.3% _a	6	3.4% _a	6
Endocrinology	2.1% _a	4	3.2% _a	4	2.7% _a	4
Audiology	2.4% _a	5	1.8% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0
Ear/Nose/Throat	0.5% _a	1	1.6% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0
Respiratory	0.0% ¹	0	0.1% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Dental	0.9% _a	2	1.4% _a	2	4.5% _a	7
"Specialists"	25.8% _a	49	40.0% _b	55	22.3% _a	37
Not Sure	5.9% _a	11	3.0% _a	4	7.1% _a	12

Table 48 cont.— What healthcare services do you travel outside the Tri-County region to access?
(among those who travel outside the Tri-County region)

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
	2015	2017	2015	2017	2015	2017
Primary Care	21.6% _a	16.2% _a	15.7% _a	13.4% _a	22.2% _a	12.4% _b
Orthopedic services including Physical Therapy	18.7% _a	20.5% _a	15.9% _a	8.6% _a	5.4% _a	10.4% _a
Cardiology	9.4% _a	9.5% _a	16.8% _a	15.6% _a	21.0% _a	14.7% _a
In-Patient Surgery (admitted)	8.8% _a	9.4% _a	12.2% _a	18.2% _a	10.9% _a	8.3% _a
Cancer Treatment	7.2% _a	7.8% _a	7.8% _a	16.0% _b	6.8% _a	7.2% _a
Dermatology	10.5% _a	10.7% _a	4.0% _a	7.1% _a	4.3% _a	5.7% _a
Outpatient Surgery	9.7% _a	4.3% _a	11.1% _a	9.8% _a	5.6% _a	7.1% _a
Neurology	7.8% _a	5.6% _a	11.0% _a	4.2% _b	5.7% _a	7.3% _a
Cardiac Surgery	4.2% _a	5.2% _a	7.8% _a	6.3% _a	10.0% _a	4.1% _b
Pediatric Care	3.9% _a	3.5% _a	0.6% _a	4.3% _b	1.4% _a	3.4% _a
Women's Health Services	8.7% _a	4.5% _a	14.9% _a	5.4% _b	5.2% _a	1.2% _b
Urology	0.3% _a	2.4% _a	1.4% _a	8.3% _b	0.1% _a	1.3% _a
Emergency Room Care	4.1% _a	1.2% _a	4.6% _a	7.9% _a	6.3% _a	3.9% _a
Eye/Optical/Vision Care	2.6% _a	2.8% _a	1.1% _a	4.8% _a	2.4% _a	1.9% _a
Endocrinology	3.2% _a	2.1% _a	0.9% _a	3.2% _a	4.2% _a	2.7% _a
Gastroenterology	6.8% _a	2.9% _a	9.7% _a	4.3% _a	3.8% _a	0.7% _a
Rheumatology	2.4% _a	2.7% _a	0.6% _a	3.7% _a	0.2% _a	1.3% _a
In-Patient Medical Care (admitted)	2.8% _a	2.5% _a	4.9% _a	2.3% _a	1.4% _a	0.9% _a
Allergist	0.3% _a	0.4% _a	1.3% _a	6.0% _b	0.3% _a	2.0% _a
Dental	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	1.4% _a	0.0% ¹	4.5% _a
Audiology	0.0% ¹	2.4% _a	0.6% _a	1.8% _a	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹
Mental Health Services	0.6% _a	0.9% _a	1.7% _a	1.8% _a	0.4% _a	0.6% _a
Ear/Nose/Throat	0.0% ¹	0.5% _a	0.0% ¹	1.6% _b	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹
Respiratory	0.0% ¹	2.1% _a	0.0% ¹	0.1% _a	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹
"Specialists"	1.7% _a	25.8% _b	7.3% _a	40.0% _b	7.5% _a	22.3% _b
Not Sure	8.3% _a	5.9% _a	6.0% _a	3.0% _a	8.4% _a	7.1% _a




Table 48 cont.— What healthcare services do you travel outside the Tri-County region to access?
(among those who travel outside the Tri-County region)

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Primary Care	21.3% _a	18	12.2% _a	13	15.3% _a	5	24.7% _a	7	13.7% _a	6	13.7% _a	11
Emergency Room Care	1.5% _a	1	1.1% _a	1	2.4% _a	1	3.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _a	1
Outpatient Surgery	3.9% _a	3	4.5% _a	5	2.4% _a	1	2.0% _a	1	3.7% _a	2	6.1% _a	5
In-Patient Surgery (admitted)	7.2% _a	6	11.2% _a	12	9.9% _a	3	7.9% _a	2	4.6% _a	2	11.5% _a	10
In-Patient Medical Care (admitted)	3.6% _a	3	1.6% _a	2	2.6% _a	1	3.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	3.5% _a	3
Women's Health Services	1.7% _a	1	6.6% _a	7	4.0% _a	1	1.4% _a	0	5.2% _a	2	5.5% _a	5
Mental Health Services	1.4% _a	1	0.6% _a	1	4.0% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _a	1
Orthopedic services including Physical Therapy	13.0% _a	11	26.3% _b	28	7.0% _a	2	10.0% _a	3	44.8% _b	20	16.5% _a	14
Cancer Treatment	9.3% _a	8	6.6% _a	7	4.0% _a	1	9.3% _a	3	8.3% _a	4	7.4% _a	6
Cardiology	10.2% _a	9	9.0% _a	10	1.8% _a	1	12.0% _a	4	3.8% _a	2	14.7% _a	12
Cardiac Surgery	4.0% _a	3	6.2% _a	7	4.2% _a	1	5.5% _a	2	0.9% _a	0	6.9% _a	6
Neurology	5.5% _a	5	5.8% _a	6	4.0% _a	1	10.9% _a	3	3.6% _a	2	5.5% _a	5
Dermatology	6.6% _a	5	13.8% _a	15	4.0% _a	1	14.7% _a	4	17.2% _a	8	8.3% _a	7
Gastroenterology	1.4% _a	1	4.0% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	3.6% _a	1	1.5% _a	1	4.5% _a	4
Allergist	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	1
Eye/Optical/Vision Care	3.7% _a	3	2.1% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	6.7% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	2.9% _a	2
Rheumatology	0.0% ¹	0	4.9% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	2.0% _a	1	1.6% _a	1	4.6% _a	4
Urology	2.7% _a	2	2.2% _a	2	4.0% _a	1	1.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.5% _a	3
Pediatric Care	1.6% _a	1	5.1% _a	5	1.8% _a	1	6.7% _a	2	3.8% _a	2	2.9% _a	2
Endocrinology	3.0% _a	2	1.5% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.9% _a	4	0.7% _b	1
Audiology	3.0% _a	2	2.0% _a	2	8.3% _a	2	1.4% _a	0	1.6% _a	1	1.2% _a	1
Ear/Nose/Throat	1.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	3.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Respiratory	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Dental	0.7% _a	1	1.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	2.1% _a	1	1.5% _a	1	0.6% _a	0
"Specialists"	29.9% _a	25	22.7% _a	24	45.6% _a	14	30.6% _{a,b}	9	10.8% _b	5	25.9% _{a,b}	22
Not Sure	10.2% _a	9	2.6% _b	3	21.9% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	5.8% _b	5

Table 48 cont.— What healthcare services do you travel outside the Tri-County region to access?
(among those who travel outside the Tri-County region)

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Primary Care	29.5% _a	11	11.0% _a	4	23.6% _a	8	12.7% _a	5	12.9% _a	3	2.3% _a	0
Emergency Room Care	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	4.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
Outpatient Surgery	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.0% _a	2	4.6% _a	2	15.3% _a	4	2.0% _a	0
In-Patient Surgery (admitted)	0.0% ¹	0	7.9% _a	3	9.6% _a	3	11.0% _a	4	12.1% _a	3	21.8% _a	5
In-Patient Medical Care (admitted)	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.5% _a	1	7.0% _a	3	2.4% _a	1	4.1% _a	1
Women's Health Services	0.0% ¹	0	2.9% _a	1	11.1% _a	4	4.4% _a	2	2.9% _a	1	7.0% _a	2
Mental Health Services	0.0% ¹	0	2.9% _a	1	1.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Orthopedic services including Physical Therapy	10.0% _a	4	46.9% _b	19	12.4% _a	4	14.5% _a	5	8.6% _a	2	23.8% _{a,b}	5
Cancer Treatment	0.0% ¹	0	2.9% _a	1	16.0% _a	5	8.2% _a	3	10.9% _a	3	13.6% _a	3
Cardiology	0.0% ¹	0	2.7% _a	1	12.3% _{a,b}	4	13.2% _{a,b}	5	11.2% _{a,b}	3	26.1% _b	6
Cardiac Surgery	0.0% ¹	0	3.1% _a	1	8.6% _a	3	2.6% _a	1	4.9% _a	1	17.8% _a	4
Neurology	0.0% ¹	0	6.4% _a	3	4.7% _a	2	12.6% _a	5	5.0% _a	1	3.9% _a	1
Dermatology	9.2% _a	3	14.0% _a	6	11.6% _a	4	9.1% _a	3	8.4% _a	2	10.6% _a	2
Gastroenterology	3.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.4% _a	2	4.2% _a	1	4.5% _a	1
Allergist	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Eye/Optical/Vision Care	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.8% _a	1	1.7% _a	1	10.3% _a	3	5.7% _a	1
Rheumatology	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.1% _a	2	3.4% _a	1	1.2% _a	0	6.7% _a	1
Urology	0.0% ¹	0	2.9% _a	1	1.9% _a	1	3.4% _a	1	1.3% _a	0	5.6% _a	1
Pediatric Care	0.0% ¹	0	13.7% _a	6	3.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Endocrinology	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.3% _a	1	6.9% _a	2	1.2% _a	0	1.1% _a	0
Audiology	3.6% _a	1	2.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	3.3% _a	1	2.9% _a	1	1.1% _a	0
Ear/Nose/Throat	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Respiratory	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Dental	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	2.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
"Specialists"	34.9% _a	13	21.6% _a	9	20.5% _a	7	28.8% _a	10	26.5% _a	7	21.2% _a	5
Not Sure	13.5% _a	5	8.0% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	4.8% _a	2	3.2% _a	1	3.3% _a	1

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Primary Care	15.3% _a	11	22.1% _a	18	6.5% _a	3	19.1% _a	7	22.4% _a	10	11.8% _a	5	16.6% _a	8
Emergency Room Care	0.9% _a	1	0.5% _a	0	3.2% _a	1	1.6% _a	1	1.6% _a	1	1.0% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Outpatient Surgery	2.0% _a	1	5.0% _a	4	6.4% _a	3	4.9% _a	2	3.0% _a	1	5.2% _a	2	4.3% _a	2
In-Patient Surgery (admitted)	8.5% _a	6	10.7% _a	9	8.5% _a	4	15.6% _a	6	4.9% _a	2	7.8% _a	3	8.8% _a	4
In-Patient Medical Care (admitted)	2.8% _a	2	2.8% _a	2	1.4% _a	1	3.2% _a	1	1.0% _a	0	1.0% _a	0	3.9% _a	2
Women's Health Services	0.0% ¹	0	6.0% _a	5	8.9% _a	4	6.3% _a	2	2.1% _a	1	10.0% _a	4	2.2% _a	1
Mental Health Services	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.2% _a	2	3.1% _a	1	1.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Orthopedic services including Physical Therapy	28.5% _a	20	13.5% _a	11	20.4% _a	9	41.9% _a	16	7.1% _b	3	17.1% _{a,b}	7	20.7% _{a,b}	10
Cancer Treatment	8.2% _a	6	6.9% _a	5	8.7% _a	4	8.6% _a	3	4.4% _a	2	8.2% _a	3	6.2% _a	3
Cardiology	14.4% _a	10	5.3% _a	4	9.5% _a	4	4.9% _a	2	10.8% _a	5	8.5% _a	4	13.9% _a	7
Cardiac Surgery	6.5% _a	4	5.8% _a	5	2.2% _a	1	3.3% _a	1	4.7% _a	2	5.3% _a	2	5.0% _a	2
Neurology	2.8% _a	2	8.3% _a	7	5.3% _a	2	4.3% _a	2	12.8% _a	6	3.5% _a	1	4.0% _a	2
Dermatology	11.4% _a	8	8.2% _a	6	14.0% _a	6	8.1% _a	3	14.0% _a	6	9.6% _a	4	7.8% _a	4
Gastroenterology	0.7% _a	0	4.2% _a	3	4.0% _a	2	3.1% _a	1	2.2% _a	1	3.5% _a	1	2.4% _a	1
Allergist	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.8% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.8% _a	0	0.9% _a	0
Eye/Optical/Vision Care	2.0% _a	1	4.3% _a	3	1.1% _a	0	4.8% _a	2	1.3% _a	1	2.7% _a	1	1.3% _a	1
Rheumatology	4.1% _a	3	1.8% _a	1	2.2% _a	1	3.1% _a	1	6.1% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.6% _a	0
Urology	0.7% _a	0	2.9% _a	2	4.2% _a	2	4.6% _a	2	1.9% _a	1	2.1% _a	1	0.7% _a	0
Pediatric Care	2.9% _a	2	3.5% _a	3	4.6% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	8.3% _a	4	3.4% _a	1	1.1% _a	1
Endocrinology	2.6% _a	2	1.6% _a	1	2.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	4.0% _a	2	3.3% _a	1	1.4% _a	1
Audiology	0.0% ¹	0	2.3% _a	2	6.5% _a	3	3.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	4.5% _a	2	3.3% _a	2
Ear/Nose/Throat	0.0% ¹	0	1.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.1% _a	1
Respiratory	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Dental	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	1	2.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.1% _a	0	1.3% _a	1
"Specialists"	20.2% _a	14	22.5% _{a,b}	18	41.4% _b	18	8.4% _a	3	22.9% _{a,b}	10	32.7% _b	13	32.4% _{b,c}	16
Not Sure	6.9% _a	5	7.2% _a	6	2.1% _a	1	13.8% _a	5	6.6% _a	3	2.6% _a	1	1.6% _a	1

Table 48 cont.— What healthcare services do you travel outside the Tri-County region to access?
(among those who travel outside the Tri-County region)

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Primary Care	10.1% _a	7	17.1% _a	11	41.1% _{a,b}	2	32.7% _a	5	24.0% _{a,b}	3	8.5% _b	9
Emergency Room Care	12.8% _a	9	2.3% _b	1	27.5% _a	1	10.5% _a	1	3.6% _a	0	7.1% _a	8
Outpatient Surgery	4.7% _a	3	15.5% _b	10	27.5% _a	1	24.7% _a	3	6.6% _a	1	7.3% _a	8
In-Patient Surgery (admitted)	25.1% _a	18	10.3% _b	7	27.5% _a	1	17.7% _a	2	1.8% _a	0	19.6% _a	21
In-Patient Medical Care (admitted)	2.5% _a	2	2.2% _a	1	27.5% _a	1	7.9% _{a,b}	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _b	1
Women's Health Services	2.5% _a	2	8.7% _a	6	27.5% _a	1	3.7% _a	1	2.5% _a	0	4.9% _a	5
Mental Health Services	2.5% _a	2	1.1% _a	1	27.5% _a	1	2.8% _{a,b}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _b	1
Orthopedic services including Physical Therapy	4.8% _a	4	12.8% _a	8	25.2% _a	1	16.2% _a	2	1.9% _a	0	7.5% _a	8
Cancer Treatment	22.5% _a	16	8.6% _b	6	27.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	12.6% _a	1	17.6% _a	19
Cardiology	24.5% _a	18	5.5% _b	4	48.2% _a	2	8.3% _a	1	9.7% _a	1	15.6% _a	17
Cardiac Surgery	10.3% _a	8	1.7% _b	1	27.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.6% _a	7
Neurology	3.0% _a	2	5.5% _a	4	27.5% _a	1	2.8% _{a,b}	0	8.8% _{a,b}	1	2.8% _b	3
Dermatology	11.6% _a	8	2.0% _b	1	27.5% _a	1	2.8% _a	0	3.5% _a	0	7.1% _a	8
Gastroenterology	4.5% _a	3	4.0% _a	3	27.5% _a	1	2.8% _{a,b}	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.8% _b	4
Allergist	10.3% _a	8	1.1% _b	1	27.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.4% _a	7
Eye/Optical/Vision Care	3.8% _a	3	5.9% _a	4	27.5% _a	1	2.8% _a	0	4.8% _a	1	4.0% _a	4
Rheumatology	4.5% _a	3	2.8% _a	2	31.3% _a	2	2.8% _{a,b}	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.9% _b	3
Urology	5.1% _a	4	11.9% _a	8	52.0% _a	3	16.4% _{a,b}	2	8.8% _{a,b}	1	5.1% _b	5
Pediatric Care	3.4% _a	2	5.3% _a	3	27.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.2% _b	4
Endocrinology	3.9% _a	3	2.3% _a	1	27.5% _a	1	2.8% _{a,b}	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.1% _b	2
Audiology	2.5% _a	2	1.1% _a	1	27.5% _a	1	2.8% _{a,b}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _b	1
Ear/Nose/Throat	0.0% ¹	0	3.4% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.1% _a	2
Respiratory	0.0% ¹	0	0.3% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.2% _a	0
Dental	0.6% _a	0	2.4% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.9% _a	0	1.5% _a	2
"Specialists"	42.2% _a	31	37.6% _a	24	40.5% _a	2	18.7% _a	3	33.0% _a	4	43.9% _a	47
Not Sure	3.4% _a	3	2.4% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	7.4% _a	1	4.7% _a	1	2.4% _a	3

Table 48 cont.— What healthcare services do you travel outside the Tri-County region to access?
(among those who travel outside the Tri-County region)

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Primary Care	9.8% _a	2	31.7% _a	5	24.2% _a	5	12.0% _a	4	3.5% _a	1	6.5% _a	1
Emergency Room Care	26.8% _a	6	13.2% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	5.0% _a	2	3.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
Outpatient Surgery	0.0% ¹	0	13.2% _a	2	12.8% _a	3	7.4% _a	3	12.3% _a	3	16.6% _a	3
In-Patient Surgery (admitted)	26.8% _a	6	25.0% _a	4	11.2% _a	2	23.9% _a	8	13.5% _a	4	4.4% _a	1
In-Patient Medical Care (admitted)	0.0% ¹	0	13.2% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	2.1% _a	1	1.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Women's Health Services	0.0% ¹	0	13.2% _a	2	11.6% _a	2	7.4% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	2.4% _a	0
Mental Health Services	0.0% ¹	0	13.2% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Orthopedic services including Physical Therapy	0.0% ¹	0	13.9% _a	2	6.4% _a	1	13.3% _a	5	5.8% _a	2	12.0% _a	2
Cancer Treatment	53.6% _a	12	17.9% _{a,b}	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.8% _b	0	17.5% _{a,b}	5	11.6% _{a,b}	2
Cardiology	26.8% _{a,b}	6	13.2% _{a,b}	2	4.8% _{a,b}	1	5.0% _a	2	9.7% _{a,b}	3	45.3% _b	8
Cardiac Surgery	26.8% _a	6	13.2% _{a,b}	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.5% _b	0	0.0% ¹	0
Neurology	0.0% ¹	0	13.2% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	6.0% _a	2	4.3% _a	1	2.4% _a	0
Dermatology	26.8% _a	6	13.2% _{a,b}	2	0.0% ¹	0	1.7% _b	1	3.8% _{a,b}	1	0.0% ¹	0
Gastroenterology	0.0% ¹	0	25.0% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	4.2% _{a,b}	1	1.5% _b	0	0.0% ¹	0
Allergist	26.8% _a	6	13.2% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Eye/Optical/Vision Care	0.0% ¹	0	13.2% _a	2	11.2% _a	2	0.8% _a	0	5.5% _a	1	3.0% _a	1
Rheumatology	0.0% ¹	0	13.2% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	6.3% _a	2	2.2% _a	1	1.2% _a	0
Urology	0.0% ¹	0	29.7% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	9.7% _a	3	6.7% _a	2	8.4% _a	1
Pediatric Care	0.0% ¹	0	30.0% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.1% _b	1	0.0% ¹	0
Endocrinology	0.0% ¹	0	13.2% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.8% _a	0	7.5% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0
Audiology	0.0% ¹	0	13.2% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Ear/Nose/Throat	0.0% ¹	0	8.7% _a	1	2.6% _a	1	0.8% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Respiratory	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Dental	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.4% _a	1	0.8% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.4% _a	0
"Specialists"	63.4% _a	14	41.9% _a	7	49.2% _a	10	27.3% _a	9	38.0% _a	10	26.0% _a	5
Not Sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.7% _a	2	7.2% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Primary Care	5.5% _a	5	23.8% _b	7	26.7% _b	6	9.2% _a	2	10.2% _a	4	6.8% _a	2	29.3% _a	8
Emergency Room Care	9.8% _a	8	8.8% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	6.8% _a	1	17.0% _a	7	1.5% _a	1	6.5% _a	2
Outpatient Surgery	11.2% _a	9	12.4% _a	4	1.2% _a	0	21.3% _a	5	6.5% _a	3	7.5% _a	3	13.5% _a	3
In-Patient Surgery (admitted)	20.6% _a	17	17.5% _a	5	10.5% _a	3	32.8% _a	7	23.3% _a	10	17.5% _a	6	8.0% _a	2
In-Patient Medical Care (admitted)	0.9% _a	1	8.0% _b	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _a	1	2.1% _a	1	5.5% _a	1
Women's Health Services	3.3% _a	3	8.4% _a	3	8.5% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	4.7% _a	2	2.1% _a	1	16.7% _a	4
Mental Health Services	0.0% ¹	0	8.0% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	5.5% _a	1
Orthopedic services including Physical Therapy	4.0% _a	3	12.8% _{a,b}	4	18.8% _b	5	6.8% _a	1	6.3% _a	3	9.8% _a	3	15.9% _a	4
Cancer Treatment	19.2% _a	16	10.7% _a	3	11.8% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	37.6% _a	16	9.9% _b	3	5.5% _b	1
Cardiology	17.4% _a	14	17.5% _a	5	7.0% _a	2	6.8% _a	1	19.3% _a	8	22.7% _a	8	10.3% _a	3
Cardiac Surgery	7.4% _a	6	7.4% _a	2	0.9% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	16.1% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	6.2% _a	2
Neurology	0.9% _a	1	14.7% _b	5	1.8% _{a,b}	0	2.5% _a	1	7.3% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	5.5% _a	1
Dermatology	7.4% _a	6	9.2% _a	3	3.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _a	1	0.6% _a	0	9.3% _a	2
Gastroenterology	4.1% _a	3	8.0% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.1% _a	3	5.6% _a	2	5.5% _a	1
Allergist	7.4% _a	6	6.7% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	16.1% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	5.5% _a	1
Eye/Optical/Vision Care	3.5% _a	3	11.9% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	6.8% _a	1	8.1% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	6.5% _a	2
Rheumatology	2.7% _a	2	8.6% _a	3	0.9% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.8% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	6.3% _a	2
Urology	7.0% _a	6	12.7% _a	4	6.7% _a	2	15.5% _a	3	3.6% _a	2	9.9% _a	3	7.1% _a	2
Pediatric Care	1.3% _a	1	15.4% _b	5	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	10.6% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	5.5% _a	1
Endocrinology	1.9% _a	2	8.8% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	5.1% _a	2	1.5% _a	1	5.5% _a	1
Audiology	0.0% ¹	0	8.0% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	5.5% _a	1
Ear/Nose/Throat	0.0% ¹	0	5.3% _a	2	2.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.1% _a	1	3.0% _a	1
Respiratory	0.0% ¹	0	0.6% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.6% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Dental	1.6% _a	1	0.9% _a	0	1.8% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.1% _a	2	0.8% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
"Specialists"	43.8% _a	36	48.2% _a	15	16.5% _b	4	33.9% _a	7	60.1% _a	25	38.9% _a	13	29.7% _a	8
Not Sure	1.8% _a	1	3.3% _a	1	6.5% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	2.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	11.8% _a	3

Table 48 cont.— What healthcare services do you travel outside the Tri-County region to access?
(among those who travel outside the Tri-County region)

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Primary Care	13.4% _a	13	10.9% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	17.5% _a	3	8.2% _a	2	13.1% _a	16
Emergency Room Care	3.2% _a	3	4.9% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	8.4% _a	2	3.8% _a	5
Outpatient Surgery	6.8% _a	7	7.6% _a	5	64.2% _a	2	3.5% _b	1	13.5% _{a,b}	3	5.0% _b	6
In-Patient Surgery (admitted)	6.8% _a	7	10.6% _a	7	25.9% _a	1	12.0% _a	2	9.8% _a	2	7.4% _a	9
In-Patient Medical Care (admitted)	0.6% _a	1	1.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	3.0% _a	0	0.7% _a	0	0.7% _a	1
Women's Health Services	0.0% ¹	0	3.0% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.2% _a	0	1.3% _a	2
Mental Health Services	0.7% _a	1	0.4% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.2% _a	0
Orthopedic services including Physical Therapy	7.4% _a	7	14.7% _a	10	0.0% ¹	0	6.2% _a	1	20.9% _a	5	9.7% _a	12
Cancer Treatment	6.4% _a	6	8.4% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.6% _a	0	9.5% _a	12
Cardiology	14.2% _a	14	15.3% _a	10	0.0% ¹	0	33.1% _a	5	6.4% _a	1	14.5% _a	18
Cardiac Surgery	3.5% _a	3	4.8% _a	3	29.0% _a	1	6.3% _a	1	3.2% _a	1	3.4% _a	4
Neurology	10.0% _a	10	3.5% _a	2	55.8% _a	2	4.4% _{a,b}	1	5.1% _{a,b}	1	7.1% _b	9
Dermatology	5.1% _a	5	6.5% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	2.2% _a	0	16.9% _a	4	4.4% _a	5
Gastroenterology	0.0% ¹	0	1.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	3.0% _a	0	0.9% _a	0	0.4% _a	0
Allergist	2.9% _a	3	0.6% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.1% _a	0	2.3% _a	3
Eye/Optical/Vision Care	2.5% _a	2	1.0% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.0% _a	0	2.4% _a	3
Rheumatology	1.0% _a	1	1.8% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.6% _a	1	1.0% _a	1
Urology	1.7% _a	2	0.7% _a	0	29.0% _a	1	3.0% _{a,b}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _b	1
Pediatric Care	1.3% _a	1	6.5% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.7% _a	1	3.5% _a	4
Endocrinology	3.0% _a	3	2.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.1% _a	4
Audiology	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Ear/Nose/Throat	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Respiratory	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Dental	7.0% _a	7	1.0% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.1% _a	7
"Specialists"	22.4% _a	22	22.1% _a	15	29.0% _a	1	9.0% _a	1	31.4% _a	7	21.0% _a	26
Not Sure	9.4% _a	9	3.8% _a	3	9.0% _a	0	9.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	8.1% _a	10

Table 48 cont.— What healthcare services do you travel outside the Tri-County region to access?
(among those who travel outside the Tri-County region)

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Primary Care	0.0% ¹	0	14.6% _a	2	8.9% _a	3	14.5% _a	7	18.6% _a	6	10.5% _a	2
Emergency Room Care	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.5% _a	4	8.8% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0
Outpatient Surgery	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	9.9% _{a,b}	4	1.0% _a	0	8.2% _{a,b}	3	22.3% _b	5
In-Patient Surgery (admitted)	0.0% ¹	0	9.4% _a	1	11.1% _a	4	8.1% _a	4	6.0% _a	2	11.7% _a	3
In-Patient Medical Care (admitted)	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.0% _a	0	0.6% _a	0	4.0% _a	1
Women's Health Services	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.1% _a	0	1.6% _a	1	1.7% _a	1	1.4% _a	0
Mental Health Services	0.0% ¹	0	5.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.6% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Orthopedic services including Physical Therapy	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	10.1% _a	4	18.2% _a	9	6.9% _a	2	11.1% _a	2
Cancer Treatment	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.6% _a	3	8.5% _a	4	12.6% _a	4	4.1% _a	1
Cardiology	0.0% ¹	0	9.1% _a	1	14.9% _a	6	15.3% _a	7	14.8% _a	5	24.3% _a	5
Cardiac Surgery	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.1% _a	1	7.3% _a	2	15.6% _a	3
Neurology	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	19.8% _a	8	2.2% _b	1	7.8% _{a,b}	3	3.9% _{a,b}	1
Dermatology	0.0% ¹	0	15.8% _a	2	7.9% _a	3	6.1% _a	3	4.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
Gastroenterology	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.0% _a	0	1.2% _a	0	1.2% _a	0
Allergist	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.1% _a	0	6.0% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Eye/Optical/Vision Care	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.4% _a	1	9.5% _a	2
Rheumatology	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.1% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	1.2% _a	0
Urology	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.2% _a	0	1.0% _a	0	1.1% _a	0	3.9% _a	1
Pediatric Care	0.0% ¹	0	33.2% _a	4	1.9% _b	1	0.6% _b	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _{a,b}	1
Endocrinology	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.8% _a	2	0.6% _a	0	5.2% _a	2	2.5% _a	1
Audiology	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Ear/Nose/Throat	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Respiratory	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Dental	48.5% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.0% _b	0	2.8% _b	1	0.0% ¹	0
"Specialists"	34.6% _{a,b}	4	55.4% _a	7	19.7% _{a,b}	8	14.6% _b	7	23.5% _{a,b}	8	15.8% _{a,b}	3
Not Sure	16.9% _a	2	5.5% _a	1	17.4% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	0.6% _a	0	8.8% _a	2

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Primary Care	8.2% _a	6	18.5% _a	11	10.6% _a	3	39.4% _a	10	3.7% _b	1	10.6% _b	5	6.4% _b	3
Emergency Room Care	1.3% _a	1	8.6% _a	5	1.0% _a	0	4.1% _a	1	4.4% _a	1	2.2% _a	1	7.0% _a	3
Outpatient Surgery	6.7% _a	5	10.2% _a	6	1.8% _a	1	11.0% _a	3	4.1% _a	1	3.8% _a	2	10.2% _a	4
In-Patient Surgery (admitted)	8.5% _a	6	9.7% _a	6	5.3% _a	2	11.0% _a	3	7.0% _a	2	4.1% _a	2	13.0% _a	5
In-Patient Medical Care (admitted)	0.7% _a	1	0.8% _a	0	1.8% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	1.8% _a	1	1.7% _a	1	0.4% _a	0
Women's Health Services	0.0% ¹	0	1.3% _a	1	4.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.0% _a	1	2.5% _a	1
Mental Health Services	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	3.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Orthopedic services including Physical Therapy	13.5% _a	10	7.7% _a	5	8.2% _a	2	2.7% _a	1	12.9% _a	4	10.8% _a	5	11.8% _a	5
Cancer Treatment	8.5% _a	6	4.1% _a	2	10.6% _a	3	4.1% _a	1	14.8% _a	4	2.9% _a	1	10.6% _a	4
Cardiology	19.4% _a	15	10.0% _a	6	11.8% _a	3	2.1% _a	1	14.0% _{a,b}	4	28.3% _b	14	9.9% _{a,b}	4
Cardiac Surgery	3.9% _a	3	4.7% _a	3	3.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	12.5% _a	4	3.9% _a	2	0.4% _a	0
Neurology	10.0% _a	8	5.9% _a	4	3.3% _a	1	9.2% _a	2	5.7% _a	2	9.8% _a	5	5.2% _a	2
Dermatology	2.2% _a	2	8.0% _a	5	9.9% _a	3	2.8% _a	1	1.1% _a	0	2.0% _a	1	17.4% _a	7
Gastroenterology	0.0% ¹	0	1.2% _a	1	1.4% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	0	0.4% _a	0	1.6% _a	1
Allergist	3.8% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	1.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	5.8% _a	3	1.1% _a	0
Eye/Optical/Vision Care	2.3% _a	2	1.1% _a	1	2.5% _a	1	6.7% _a	2	1.1% _a	0	1.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
Rheumatology	2.6% _a	2	0.4% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	0	2.0% _a	1	2.3% _a	1
Urology	0.0% ¹	0	2.8% _a	2	1.6% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	1.1% _a	0
Pediatric Care	3.7% _a	3	3.1% _a	2	3.3% _a	1	11.0% _a	3	0.9% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.1% _a	3
Endocrinology	1.6% _a	1	0.6% _a	0	9.6% _a	3	2.1% _a	1	5.0% _a	2	3.5% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0
Audiology	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Ear/Nose/Throat	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Respiratory	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Dental	0.9% _a	1	10.9% _b	7	0.7% _{a,b}	0	4.6% _a	1	0.7% _a	0	12.4% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0
"Specialists"	21.7% _a	17	16.8% _a	10	35.2% _a	10	26.8% _a	7	23.3% _a	7	10.1% _a	5	26.6% _a	11
Not Sure	7.0% _a	5	8.3% _a	5	4.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	9.2% _{a,h}	3	0.4% _a	0	12.5% _b	5

Section 3.5 – Internet Access

Table 49 – Has your Internet access at home gotten better, stayed the same, or gotten worse in the past three years?

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

	Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Has your Internet access at home gotten better, stayed the same, or gotten worse over the past three years?		
Better	240	20.3%
Same	638	54.0%
Worse	190	16.1%
Not sure	34	2.9%
Not Applicable	80	6.8%
TOTALS:	1183	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	Year			
	2015		2017	
Better	20.3% _a	264	20.3% _a	240
Same	47.8% _a	621	54.0% _b	638
Worse	16.5% _a	214	16.1% _a	190
Don't know	1.9% _a	25	2.9% _a	34
Not applicable	13.5% _a	176	6.8% _b	80
TOTALS:	100.0%	1300	100.0%	1183




Table 49 cont.— Has your Internet access at home gotten better, stayed the same, or gotten worse in the past three years?

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Better	18.9% _a	86	16.5% _a	48	21.9% _a	97
Same	53.9% _{a,b}	245	60.9% _a	177	49.3% _b	218
Worse	18.2% _a	83	14.1% _a	41	19.0% _a	84
Not sure	3.6% _a	16	0.8% _b	2	2.5% _{a,b}	11
Not Applicable	5.4% _a	24	7.7% _a	22	7.3% _a	32
TOTALS:	100.0%	454	100.0%	291	100.0%	441

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
	2015	2017	2015	2017	2015	2017
Better	18.5% _a	18.9% _a	12.7% _a	16.5% _a	24.0% _a	21.9% _a
Same	53.1% _a	53.9% _a	48.0% _a	60.9% _b	42.3% _a	49.3% _b
Worse	13.8% _a	18.2% _a	15.7% _a	14.1% _a	19.4% _a	19.0% _a
Don't know	1.6% _a	3.6% _a	1.1% _a	0.8% _a	2.4% _a	2.5% _a
Not applicable	13.1% _a	5.4% _b	22.5% _a	7.7% _b	11.9% _a	7.3% _b
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 49 cont.— Has your Internet access at home gotten better, stayed the same, or gotten worse in the past three years?

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Better	21.7% _a	51	15.9% _a	34	21.0% _a	24	15.4% _a	9	14.0% _a	13	20.8% _a	39
Same	50.9% _a	121	57.3% _a	124	49.2% _a	55	41.4% _a	23	61.2% _a	57	56.3% _a	105
Worse	17.0% _a	40	19.6% _a	43	21.9% _{a,b}	25	30.1% _a	17	22.3% _{a,b}	21	11.1% _b	21
Not sure	4.3% _a	10	2.8% _a	6	6.4% _a	7	3.9% _a	2	1.3% _a	1	3.0% _a	6
Not Applicable	6.2% _a	15	4.5% _a	10	1.5% _a	2	9.2% _a	5	1.1% _a	1	8.8% _a	16
TOTALS:	100.0%	238	100.0%	217	100.0%	112	100.0%	56	100.0%	93	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Better	23.5% _a	31	14.8% _a	12	15.1% _a	10	22.1% _a	15	18.9% _a	10	14.2% _a	7
Same	51.3% _a	68	63.0% _a	53	54.8% _a	38	46.3% _a	32	61.1% _a	32	47.0% _a	22
Worse	17.7% _a	23	12.6% _a	11	27.5% _a	19	21.1% _a	15	13.3% _a	7	17.4% _a	8
Not sure	5.9% _a	8	2.9% _a	2	1.0% _a	1	0.9% _a	1	0.9% _a	0	8.9% _a	4
Not Applicable	1.7% _a	2	6.7% _{a,b}	6	1.5% _{a,b}	1	9.6% _{a,b}	7	5.8% _{a,b}	3	12.5% _b	6
TOTALS:	100.0%	133	100.0%	84	100.0%	69	100.0%	69	100.0%	52	100.0%	47

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Better	19.4% _a	40	16.8% _a	28	21.9% _a	18	20.1% _a	18	19.6% _a	25	20.1% _a	18	15.7% _a	16
Same	50.2% _a	104	55.8% _a	92	59.6% _a	50	48.8% _a	43	56.3% _a	71	60.5% _a	53	51.0% _a	51
Worse	18.3% _a	38	21.0% _a	35	12.6% _a	10	14.5% _a	13	15.3% _a	19	12.8% _a	11	32.0% _b	32
Not sure	4.4% _a	9	3.0% _a	5	2.9% _a	2	11.3% _a	10	2.8% _{a,b}	3	1.8% _{a,b}	2	0.5% _b	0
Not Applicable	7.9% _a	16	3.4% _a	6	3.0% _a	2	5.3% _a	5	6.1% _a	8	4.8% _a	4	0.8% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	207	100.0%	164	100.0%	83	100.0%	88	100.0%	126	100.0%	88	100.0%	99

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Better	11.9% _a	18	21.2% _b	30	4.1% _a	0	36.4% _a	8	12.9% _a	5	16.1% _a	35
Same	68.6% _a	101	53.0% _b	76	75.6% _{a,b}	9	29.7% _a	6	68.4% _b	24	61.4% _{b,c}	134
Worse	16.0% _a	24	12.2% _a	18	11.1% _a	1	30.5% _a	6	10.1% _a	4	13.6% _a	30
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	1.6% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	2
Not Applicable	3.5% _a	5	12.0% _b	17	9.2% _a	1	3.4% _a	1	8.7% _a	3	8.0% _a	17
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	143	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Better	17.2% _a	9	19.1% _a	8	12.6% _a	6	12.2% _a	7	21.1% _a	9	19.1% _a	8
Same	82.8% _a	44	67.6% _{a,b}	28	68.2% _{a,b}	35	60.1% _{a,b,c}	36	49.2% _{b,c}	21	31.8% _c	14
Worse	0.0% ¹	0	13.3% _a	5	18.3% _a	9	22.9% _a	14	14.0% _a	6	15.5% _a	7
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _a	0	4.7% _a	2
Not Applicable	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	0	4.7% _a	3	15.2% _{a,b}	7	28.8% _b	12
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

Table 49 cont.— Has your Internet access at home gotten better, stayed the same, or gotten worse in the past three years?

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College	4+ Year Degree				Up to \$25,000	\$25,001- \$50,000	\$50,001- \$75,000	Over \$75,000				
Better	8.6% _a	14	21.4% _b	18	37.2% _b	16	5.2% _a	3	13.6% _{a,b}	12	21.9% _b	15	27.5% _{b,c}	11
Same	66.0% _a	108	56.5% _a	48	50.3% _a	21	35.8% _a	20	70.3% _b	62	70.6% _b	47	58.2% _{a,b}	22
Worse	12.9% _a	21	19.0% _a	16	9.3% _a	4	36.3% _a	21	11.0% _b	10	6.4% _b	4	11.8% _b	5
Not sure	1.2% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not Applicable	11.3% _a	18	3.2% _a	3	2.7% _a	1	22.8% _a	13	5.1% _b	5	1.1% _b	1	2.6% _b	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	85	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection			
Better	27.4% _a	62	16.2% _b	35	64.5% _a	6	24.2% _{a,b}	12	25.6% _{a,b}	22	19.0% _b	56
Same	50.7% _a	115	47.8% _a	102	8.0% _a	1	42.6% _a	21	50.4% _a	43	51.5% _a	152
Worse	12.4% _a	28	26.0% _b	56	21.7% _a	2	22.3% _a	11	21.4% _a	18	17.6% _a	52
Not sure	2.5% _a	6	2.5% _a	5	2.9% _a	0	0.4% _a	0	1.3% _a	1	3.3% _a	10
Not Applicable	7.0% _a	16	7.6% _a	16	2.8% _a	0	10.5% _a	5	1.4% _a	1	8.6% _a	25
TOTALS:	100.0%	227	100.0%	214	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	86	100.0%	295

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Better	24.3% _a	29	24.8% _a	15	18.8% _a	13	24.3% _a	19	25.4% _a	15	10.4% _a	6
Same	54.1% _a	64	48.1% _a	29	51.7% _a	35	50.1% _a	40	49.1% _a	29	36.6% _a	20
Worse	21.6% _a	26	25.3% _a	15	24.3% _a	17	14.1% _a	11	10.1% _a	6	16.2% _a	9
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.6% _a	0	3.9% _a	3	4.4% _a	3	9.2% _a	5
Not Applicable	0.0% ¹	0	1.9% _a	1	4.5% _a	3	7.6% _a	6	10.9% _{a,b}	6	27.7% _b	15
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	68	100.0%	80	100.0%	59	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College	4+ Year Degree				Up to \$25,000	\$25,001- \$50,000	\$50,001- \$75,000	Over \$75,000				
Better	25.5% _a	51	18.5% _a	28	19.7% _a	17	20.4% _a	19	18.5% _a	17	22.7% _a	23	16.5% _a	17
Same	42.5% _a	86	46.7% _a	72	69.7% _b	60	33.2% _a	31	35.6% _a	33	60.1% _b	61	70.5% _b	71
Worse	17.8% _{a,b}	36	26.9% _a	41	7.6% _b	7	19.8% _{a,b}	18	37.4% _a	34	13.5% _b	14	11.4% _{b,c}	12
Not sure	4.0% _a	8	1.4% _a	2	1.2% _a	1	6.9% _a	6	3.0% _a	3	1.1% _a	1	0.2% _a	0
Not Applicable	10.2% _a	21	6.5% _{a,b}	10	1.9% _b	2	19.6% _a	18	5.5% _b	5	2.7% _b	3	1.4% _b	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	201	100.0%	153	100.0%	87	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	102	100.0%	101

Section 3.6 – Employment

Table 50 – Current Employment Situation

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

What is your current employment situation?	Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Retired	264	22.2%
Disabled	46	3.8%
Full time employed	640	53.9%
Part time employed	135	11.4%
Unemployed (less than 1 year)	27	2.3%
Unemployed (more than 1 year)	45	3.8%
Homemaker	31	2.6%
TOTALS:	1187	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	Year					
	2013		2015		2017	
Full time employed	47.7%	326	46.9%	608	53.9%	640
Part time employed	13.9%	95	13.7%	178	11.4%	135
"Employed, Full or Part-time"	61.7% _{a,b}	421	60.6% _a	785	65.3% _b	776
Unemployed (less than 1 year)	4.4%	30	4.0%	51	2.3%	27
Unemployed (more than 1 year)	4.1%	28	5.2%	67	3.8%	45
"Unemployed"	8.4% _{a,b}	58	9.2% _a	119	6.0% _b	72
Retired	19.6% _a	134	20.6% _a	266	22.2% _a	264
Disabled	4.1% _a	28	5.5% _a	71	3.8% _a	46
Homemaker	4.5% _a	31	4.2% _a	54	2.6% _a	31
TOTALS:	100.0%	683	100.0%	1295	100.0%	1187




Table 50 cont.— Current Employment Situation

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Full time employed	61.6%	283	44.5%	129	47.0%	206
Part time employed	9.0%	41	14.6%	43	9.9%	43
"Employed, Full or Part-time"	70.5% _a	324	59.2% _b	172	56.9% _b	249
Unemployed (less than 1 year)	2.0%	9	2.5%	7	4.6%	20
Unemployed (more than 1 year)	4.3%	20	2.1%	6	6.7%	29
"Unemployed"	6.3% _a	29	4.6% _a	13	11.3% _b	50
Retired	17.4% _a	80	28.4% _b	82	25.0% _b	110
Disabled	2.9% _a	13	3.8% _a	11	5.1% _a	23
Homemaker	2.9% _a	13	4.0% _a	12	1.6% _a	7
TOTALS:	100.0%	459	100.0%	291	100.0%	439

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson			Lewis			St. Lawrence	
	2013	2015	2017	2013	2015	2017	2015	2017
Full time employed	46.8%	51.1%	61.6%	52.0%	41.2%	44.5%	44.0%	47.0%
Part time employed	15.2%	16.3%	9.0%	8.7%	17.1%	14.6%	10.3%	9.9%
"Employed, Full or Part-time"	61.9% _a	67.5% _{a,b}	70.5% _b	60.7% _a	58.3% _a	59.2% _a	54.3% _a	56.9% _a
Unemployed (less than 1 year)	5.0%	2.7%	2.0%	1.6%	4.2%	2.5%	5.2%	4.6%
Unemployed (more than 1 year)	4.4%	3.2%	4.3%	2.8%	1.5%	2.1%	8.2%	6.7%
"Unemployed"	9.4% _a	5.9% _a	6.3% _a	4.4% _a	5.8% _a	4.6% _a	13.3% _a	11.3% _a
Retired	18.6% _a	17.8% _a	17.4% _a	23.9% _a	24.2% _a	28.4% _a	22.5% _a	25.0% _a
Disabled	3.7% _a	4.2% _a	2.9% _a	6.1% _a	5.4% _a	3.8% _a	6.8% _a	5.1% _a
Homemaker	4.4% _a	4.7% _a	2.9% _a	5.0% _a	6.3% _a	4.0% _a	3.1% _a	1.6% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 50 cont.— Current Employment Situation

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Full time employed	74.0%	178	47.9%	105	85.5%	98	47.9%	27	57.1%	53	52.5%	98
Part time employed	6.0%	14	12.2%	27	6.0%	7	18.0%	10	1.5%	1	12.1%	23
"Employed, Full or Part-time"	80.0% _a	193	60.1% _b	131	91.5% _a	105	65.9% _b	38	58.6% _b	54	64.5% _b	120
Unemployed (less than 1 year)	2.0%	5	1.9%	4	3.1%	4	2.1%	1	0.0%	0	2.3%	4
Unemployed (more than 1 year)	1.1%	3	7.9%	17	0.7%	1	2.9%	2	14.9%	14	1.8%	3
"Unemployed"	3.1% _a	7	9.8% _b	21	3.8% _a	4	5.0% _{a,b}	3	14.9% _b	14	4.1% _a	8
Retired	12.8% _a	31	22.6% _b	49	0.4% _a	1	21.4% _b	12	23.5% _b	22	23.6% _b	44
Disabled	3.5% _a	8	2.2% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	2.9% _a	2	3.0% _a	3	4.8% _a	9
Homemaker	0.7% _a	2	5.3% _b	12	4.3% _a	5	4.8% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	2.9% _a	6
TOTALS:	100.0%	241	100.0%	218	100.0%	115	100.0%	57	100.0%	93	100.0%	187

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Full time employed	83.2%	112	65.9%	56	79.0%	55	60.9%	43	31.6%	16	2.7%	1
Part time employed	8.8%	12	10.6%	9	9.5%	7	10.0%	7	11.3%	6	2.0%	1
"Employed, Full or Part-time"	91.9% _a	123	76.5% _b	65	88.4% _{a,b}	61	70.9% _b	50	42.9% _c	22	4.7% _d	2
Unemployed (less than 1 year)	4.3%	6	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.5%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Unemployed (more than 1 year)	2.5%	3	16.3%	14	1.8%	1	1.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Unemployed"	6.9% _{a,b}	9	16.3% _a	14	1.8% _b	1	6.2% _{a,b}	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Retired	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.4% _a	1	9.0% _a	6	50.7% _b	26	95.3% _c	46
Disabled	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.9% _a	3	10.6% _a	7	4.9% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0
Homemaker	1.2% _a	2	7.2% _a	6	3.5% _a	2	3.2% _a	2	1.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	134	100.0%	85	100.0%	69	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	49

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Full time employed	50.5%	107	70.4%	116	72.2%	61	50.8%	45	65.7%	85	69.4%	61	66.2%	66
Part time employed	12.1%	25	7.4%	12	4.2%	4	10.2%	9	8.8%	11	9.1%	8	8.6%	9
"Employed, Full or Part-time"	62.6% _a	132	77.7% _b	128	76.5% _{a,b}	64	61.0% _a	54	74.5% _a	97	78.5% _a	69	74.8% _a	74
Unemployed (less than 1 year)	1.8%	4	1.9%	3	2.5%	2	0.0%	0	1.8%	2	1.3%	1	0.0%	0
Unemployed (more than 1 year)	7.6%	16	2.0%	3	0.6%	0	19.0%	17	0.5%	1	0.5%	0	1.2%	1
"Unemployed"	9.4% _a	20	3.9% _a	6	3.0% _a	3	19.0% _a	17	2.3% _b	3	1.8% _b	2	1.2% _b	1
Retired	21.9% _a	46	12.7% _a	21	15.6% _a	13	15.5% _a	14	15.1% _a	20	16.3% _a	14	17.1% _a	17
Disabled	3.5% _a	7	2.2% _a	4	3.0% _a	3	4.5% _a	4	3.9% _a	5	1.0% _a	1	2.5% _a	2
Homemaker	2.7% _a	6	3.5% _a	6	1.9% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	4.2% _a	5	2.4% _a	2	4.4% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	164	100.0%	84	100.0%	88	100.0%	130	100.0%	88	100.0%	99

Table 50 cont.— Current Employment Situation

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Full time employed	51.4%	76	37.4%	54	63.9%	7	24.0%	5	30.2%	11	47.2%	103
Part time employed	9.2%	14	20.2%	29	6.0%	1	9.6%	2	16.9%	6	15.4%	34
"Employed, Full or Part-time"	60.6% _a	89	57.7% _a	83	70.0% _a	8	33.6% _a	7	47.1% _a	17	62.7% _a	137
Unemployed (less than 1 year)	4.3%	6	0.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.7%	1	2.9%	6
Unemployed (more than 1 year)	3.9%	6	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.1%	0	2.6%	6
"Unemployed"	8.1% _a	12	0.9% _b	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.8% _a	1	5.5% _a	12
Retired	26.8% _a	40	30.0% _a	43	10.8% _a	1	39.4% _a	8	41.8% _a	15	26.2% _a	57
Disabled	2.7% _a	4	5.0% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	13.2% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	3.8% _b	8
Homemaker	1.8% _a	3	6.4% _b	9	19.2% _a	2	13.8% _a	3	7.4% _{a,b}	3	1.8% _b	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	148	100.0%	143	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	35	100.0%	219

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Full time employed	54.5%	29	65.8%	27	71.2%	36	46.8%	28	21.0%	9	1.2%	1
Part time employed	37.1%	20	21.6%	9	5.6%	3	7.7%	5	6.3%	3	8.9%	4
"Employed, Full or Part-time"	91.6% _a	49	87.3% _a	36	76.9% _{a,b}	39	54.5% _{b,c}	32	27.4% _{c,d}	12	10.1% _d	4
Unemployed (less than 1 year)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	12.2%	6	1.8%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Unemployed (more than 1 year)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	9.6%	6	0.9%	0	0.0%	0
"Unemployed"	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	12.2% _a	6	11.4% _a	7	0.9% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Retired	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.9% _a	2	19.7% _a	12	69.6% _b	30	89.4% _b	39
Disabled	0.0% ¹	0	4.6% _a	2	0.9% _a	0	13.1% _a	8	2.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
Homemaker	8.4% _a	4	8.0% _a	3	6.1% _a	3	1.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	51	100.0%	59	100.0%	43	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Full time employed	42.8%	70	45.6%	39	49.1%	21	24.4%	14	47.5%	42	48.7%	33	81.8%	31
Part time employed	8.7%	14	25.1%	21	16.5%	7	15.3%	9	17.7%	16	3.4%	2	7.9%	3
"Employed, Full or Part-time"	51.6% _a	84	70.6% _b	60	65.6% _{a,b}	28	39.7% _a	23	65.2% _b	58	52.2% _{a,b}	35	89.7% _c	34
Unemployed (less than 1 year)	3.2%	5	2.4%	2	0.0%	0	1.7%	1	0.0%	0	7.8%	5	0.0%	0
Unemployed (more than 1 year)	3.5%	6	0.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.6%	0	0.0%	0
"Unemployed"	6.7% _a	11	2.9% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	1.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	8.4% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0
Retired	32.7% _a	53	18.1% _b	15	32.5% _{a,b}	14	42.5% _a	24	29.7% _{a,b}	26	30.1% _{a,b}	20	9.1% _b	4
Disabled	5.9% _a	10	1.0% _a	1	1.4% _a	1	16.1% _a	9	2.1% _b	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Homemaker	3.2% _a	5	7.4% _a	6	0.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.0% _a	3	9.3% _a	6	1.2% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	85	100.0%	42	100.0%	57	100.0%	89	100.0%	67	100.0%	38

Table 50 cont.— Current Employment Situation

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Full time employed	51.0%	116	42.8%	90	57.1%	5	42.6%	21	59.4%	52	43.7%	128
Part time employed	8.1%	18	11.8%	25	11.9%	1	10.4%	5	10.5%	9	9.5%	28
"Employed, Full or Part-time"	59.1% _a	134	54.5% _a	115	69.0% _{a,b}	7	53.0% _{a,b}	26	69.9% _a	61	53.2% _b	155
Unemployed (less than 1 year)	3.1%	7	6.2%	13	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	6.9%	20
Unemployed (more than 1 year)	6.5%	15	6.9%	15	0.0%	0	3.3%	2	15.0%	13	5.0%	15
"Unemployed"	9.7% _a	22	13.1% _a	28	0.0% ¹	0	3.3% _a	2	15.0% _a	13	12.0% _a	35
Retired	23.5% _a	53	26.7% _a	56	14.7% _{a,b}	1	35.4% _a	18	13.6% _b	12	27.0% _{a,b}	79
Disabled	7.6% _a	17	2.5% _b	5	8.3% _a	1	6.4% _a	3	0.3% _a	0	6.3% _a	18
Homemaker	0.2% _a	0	3.2% _b	7	8.0% _a	1	1.9% _a	1	1.1% _a	1	1.5% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	227	100.0%	211	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	292

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Full time employed	41.9%	48	83.7%	51	65.2%	45	63.5%	50	20.2%	12	0.0%	0
Part time employed	19.2%	22	8.7%	5	5.6%	4	9.5%	8	7.5%	4	0.0%	0
"Employed, Full or Part-time"	61.1% _a	70	92.4% _b	56	70.8% _a	49	72.9% _a	58	27.7% _c	16	0.0% ¹	0
Unemployed (less than 1 year)	16.7%	19	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.2%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Unemployed (more than 1 year)	22.2%	26	1.9%	1	2.2%	2	0.6%	0	1.2%	1	0.0%	0
"Unemployed"	38.9% _a	45	1.9% _b	1	2.2% _b	2	1.8% _b	1	1.2% _b	1	0.0% ¹	0
Retired	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	10.2% _a	7	16.0% _a	13	63.6% _b	37	94.5% _c	53
Disabled	0.0% ¹	0	1.9% _a	1	15.6% _a	11	5.2% _a	4	5.8% _a	3	5.5% _a	3
Homemaker	0.0% ¹	0	3.8% _a	2	1.1% _a	1	4.0% _a	3	1.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	115	100.0%	61	100.0%	69	100.0%	80	100.0%	59	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Full time employed	32.5%	65	60.3%	93	57.7%	48	12.4%	11	49.9%	46	64.1%	66	75.4%	76
Part time employed	10.3%	21	7.5%	11	13.3%	11	12.1%	11	11.3%	10	6.8%	7	5.4%	5
"Employed, Full or Part-time"	42.8% _a	86	67.8% _b	104	70.9% _b	59	24.5% _a	22	61.2% _b	56	70.9% _{b,c}	73	80.7% _c	82
Unemployed (less than 1 year)	6.5%	13	0.0%	0	8.6%	7	17.6%	16	0.0%	0	0.9%	1	0.0%	0
Unemployed (more than 1 year)	13.8%	28	1.1%	2	0.0%	0	17.8%	16	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
"Unemployed"	20.3% _a	41	1.1% _b	2	8.6% _a	7	35.3% _a	31	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _b	1	0.0% ¹	0
Retired	28.7% _a	58	24.3% _a	37	17.4% _a	15	26.0% _a	23	33.6% _a	31	21.3% _a	22	18.2% _a	18
Disabled	6.2% _a	12	5.1% _a	8	2.7% _a	2	10.5% _a	9	3.2% _{a,b}	3	6.6% _{a,b}	7	0.3% _b	0
Homemaker	2.1% _a	4	1.7% _a	3	0.3% _a	0	3.7% _a	3	2.1% _a	2	0.3% _a	0	0.7% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	201	100.0%	154	100.0%	83	100.0%	89	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Table 51 – Are you employed in the three-county North Country region? (among those currently employed)

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Are you employed in the three-county North Country region?	Yes, entirely.	648	84.2%
	Yes, part of my employment.	42	5.4%
	No	58	7.6%
	Not sure	22	2.8%
	TOTALS:	770	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	Year			
	2015		2017	
Yes, entirely.	91.4% _a	714	84.2% _b	648
Yes, part of my employment.	1.4% _a	11	5.4% _b	42
No	6.7% _a	53	7.6% _a	58
Not sure	0.5% _a	4	2.8% _b	22
TOTALS:	100.0%	782	100.0%	770




Table 51 cont.— Are you employed in the three-county North Country region? (among those currently employed)

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Yes, entirely.	79.7% _a	256	94.9% _b	160	84.1% _a	215
Yes, part of my employment.	7.1% _a	23	1.9% _b	3	5.7% _{a,b}	14
No	9.0% _a	29	2.9% _b	5	8.4% _{a,b}	22
Not sure	4.2% _a	13	0.3% _b	0	1.8% _{a,b}	5
TOTALS:	100.0%	321	100.0%	168	100.0%	256

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
	2015	2017	2015	2017	2015	2017
Yes, entirely.	92.5% _a	79.7% _b	80.8% _a	94.9% _b	92.6% _a	84.1% _b
Yes, part of my employment.	0.7% _a	7.1% _b	2.0% _a	1.9% _a	2.0% _a	5.7% _b
No	6.7% _a	9.0% _a	17.2% _a	2.9% _b	4.0% _a	8.4% _b
Not sure	0.0% ¹	4.2% _a	0.0% ¹	0.3% _a	1.3% _a	1.8% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 51 cont.— Are you employed in the three-county North Country region? (among those currently employed)

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes, entirely.	74.7% _a	141	87.0% _b	114	72.1% _a	73	82.8% _{a,b}	31	84.1% _{a,b}	46	86.8% _b	105
Yes, part of my employment.	8.8% _a	17	4.6% _a	6	10.2% _a	10	3.0% _a	1	5.7% _a	3	6.8% _a	8
No	11.3% _a	21	5.6% _a	7	11.2% _a	11	14.2% _a	5	6.1% _a	3	5.8% _a	7
Not sure	5.2% _a	10	2.8% _a	4	6.5% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	4.2% _{a,b}	2	0.7% _b	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	189	100.0%	131	100.0%	101	100.0%	38	100.0%	54	100.0%	121

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes, entirely.	71.9% _a	87	79.1% _{a,b}	51	90.3% _{a,b}	54	92.8% _b	47	67.8% _{a,b}	15	67.4% _{a,b}	2
Yes, part of my employment.	9.6% _a	12	6.9% _a	5	4.9% _a	3	2.8% _a	1	10.3% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0
No	11.4% _a	14	7.3% _a	5	4.8% _a	3	4.3% _a	2	21.9% _a	5	15.0% _a	0
Not sure	7.2% _a	9	6.7% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	17.6% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	121	100.0%	65	100.0%	60	100.0%	50	100.0%	22	100.0%	2

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Yes, entirely.	74.7% _a	97	80.1% _a	101	89.1% _a	57	63.5% _a	32	79.8% _{a,b}	76	84.1% _{a,b}	59	93.5% _b
Yes, part of my employment.	12.4% _a	16	4.1% _b	5	2.2% _{a,b}	1	18.9% _a	10	3.9% _b	4	9.1% _{a,b}	6	0.9% _b
No	8.3% _a	11	11.9% _a	15	4.7% _a	3	10.9% _a	6	10.3% _a	10	6.9% _a	5	1.6% _a
Not sure	4.6% _a	6	3.9% _a	5	4.0% _a	3	6.7% _a	3	6.0% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0	4.0% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	130	100.0%	127	100.0%	64	100.0%	51	100.0%	95	100.0%	70	100.0%

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes, entirely.	97.0% _a	84	92.7% _a	76	91.4% _a	7	92.6% _a	7	97.0% _a	16	95.0% _a	130
Yes, part of my employment.	0.0% ¹	0	4.0% _a	3	8.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.9% _a	3
No	3.0% _a	3	2.8% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	7.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	3.2% _a	4
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.6% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.0% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	86	100.0%	82	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	16	100.0%	137

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes, entirely.	100.0% ¹	49	95.5% _a	31	93.0% _a	36	93.0% _a	30	86.2% _a	10	87.9% _a	4
Yes, part of my employment.	0.0% ¹	0	2.2% _a	1	3.3% _a	1	2.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	12.1% _a	1
No	0.0% ¹	0	2.3% _a	1	2.5% _a	1	4.8% _a	2	13.8% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.2% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	49	100.0%	32	100.0%	39	100.0%	32	100.0%	11	100.0%	4

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Yes, entirely.	94.2% _a	79	94.8% _a	53	97.3% _a	27	95.8% _a	22	94.8% _a	54	98.3% _a	31	91.8% _a
Yes, part of my employment.	3.0% _a	3	1.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.4% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹
No	2.7% _a	2	3.2% _a	2	2.7% _a	1	4.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	1.7% _a	1	8.2% _a
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.8% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.8% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹
TOTALS:	100.0%	84	100.0%	56	100.0%	28	100.0%	23	100.0%	57	100.0%	32	100.0%

Table 51 cont.— Are you employed in the three-county North Country region? (among those currently employed)

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes, entirely.	85.4% _a	116	82.6% _a	99	100.0% ¹	7	97.5% _a	26	89.4% _a	51	79.4% _a	130
Yes, part of my employment.	6.5% _a	9	4.7% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0	1.8% _a	0	3.7% _a	2	7.2% _a	12
No	8.1% _a	11	8.8% _a	11	0.0% ¹	0	0.8% _a	0	6.9% _a	4	10.6% _a	17
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	3.8% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.8% _a	5
TOTALS:	100.0%	136	100.0%	120	100.0%	7	100.0%	26	100.0%	57	100.0%	164

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes, entirely.	75.8% _a	59	80.5% _{a,b}	43	93.7% _{a,b}	47	94.5% _b	56	69.4% _a	12	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Yes, part of my employment.	6.1% _a	5	7.6% _a	4	1.5% _a	1	3.4% _a	2	17.6% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	13.7% _a	11	9.8% _a	5	4.8% _a	2	2.1% _a	1	12.9% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	4.5% _a	3	2.1% _a	1	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	77	100.0%	53	100.0%	50	100.0%	59	100.0%	17	0.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes, entirely.	90.5% _a	79	90.5% _a	92	65.7% _b	43	68.7% _a	20	76.7% _a	41	93.9% _b	69	85.6% _{a,b}	70
Yes, part of my employment.	4.3% _a	4	4.5% _a	5	9.3% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0	15.1% _a	8	2.8% _b	2	3.0% _b	2
No	5.2% _a	5	3.9% _a	4	19.7% _b	13	19.3% _a	6	6.1% _{a,b}	3	3.2% _b	2	11.3% _{a,b}	9
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	1.1% _a	1	5.2% _a	3	12.0% _a	3	2.0% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	88	100.0%	102	100.0%	66	100.0%	29	100.0%	53	100.0%	73	100.0%	82

Table 52 – What industry do you work in? (among those currently employed)

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

What industry do you work in?	Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Healthcare	98	12.7%
Government	69	8.9%
Manufacturing	32	4.2%
Agriculture	54	7.0%
Tourism	6	0.8%
Retail	77	10.0%
Education	75	9.7%
Legal	14	1.8%
Finance	13	1.7%
Service	119	15.4%
Blue Collar	52	6.7%
Military	136	17.6%
Technology/Telecommunications/Media	14	1.8%
Non-profits	8	1.1%
Not sure	5	0.6%
TOTALS:	773	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	Year			
	2015		2017	
Healthcare	12.2% _a	94	12.7% _a	98
Government	15.3% _a	118	8.9% _b	69
Manufacturing	8.0% _a	61	4.2% _b	32
Agriculture	4.3% _a	33	7.0% _b	54
Tourism	1.9% _a	15	0.8% _a	6
Retail	16.8% _a	129	10.0% _b	77
Education	12.4% _a	95	9.7% _a	75
Legal	0.4% _a	3	1.8% _b	14
Finance	4.0% _a	31	1.7% _b	13
Service	10.6% _a	81	15.4% _b	119
Blue Collar	6.9% _a	53	6.7% _a	52
Military	2.8% _a	21	17.6% _b	136
Technology/Telecommunications/Media	2.8% _a	22	1.8% _a	14
Non-profits	0.2% _a	1	1.1% _b	8
Not sure	1.3% _a	10	0.6% _a	5
TOTALS:	100.0%	767	100.0%	773




Table 52 cont.— What industry do you work in? (among those currently employed)

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Healthcare	14.4% _a	46	9.9% _a	17	12.3% _a	31
Government	9.2% _a	29	8.5% _a	14	8.9% _a	23
Manufacturing	1.1% _a	4	6.3% _b	11	7.5% _b	19
Agriculture	4.2% _a	14	22.8% _b	39	3.7% _a	9
Tourism	0.8% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	1.4% _a	4
Retail	6.7% _a	21	12.2% _{a,b}	21	14.6% _b	37
Education	11.1% _a	36	8.3% _a	14	8.7% _a	22
Legal	2.1% _a	7	1.8% _a	3	3.0% _a	8
Finance	0.8% _a	3	2.2% _a	4	2.7% _a	7
Service	12.6% _a	40	18.2% _{a,b}	31	20.0% _b	51
Blue Collar	3.0% _a	10	8.5% _b	14	11.9% _b	30
Military	30.3% _a	97	0.0% ¹	0	1.3% _b	3
Technology/Telecommunications/ Media	2.4% _a	8	0.9% _a	2	0.9% _a	2
Non-profits	1.2% _a	4	0.5% _a	1	0.4% _a	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.7% _a	7
TOTALS:	100.0%	320	100.0%	171	100.0%	254

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
	2015	2017	2015	2017	2015	2017
Healthcare	10.7% _a	14.4% _a	13.8% _a	9.9% _a	13.7% _a	12.3% _a
Government	21.7% _a	9.2% _b	6.8% _a	8.5% _a	9.2% _a	8.9% _a
Manufacturing	6.2% _a	1.1% _b	9.4% _a	6.3% _a	10.0% _a	7.5% _a
Agriculture	3.9% _a	4.2% _a	8.0% _a	22.8% _b	3.7% _a	3.7% _a
Tourism	1.5% _a	0.8% _a	0.7% _a	0.0% ¹	2.8% _a	1.4% _a
Retail	21.8% _a	6.7% _b	16.7% _a	12.2% _a	10.3% _a	14.6% _a
Education	10.4% _a	11.1% _a	15.3% _a	8.3% _b	14.2% _a	8.7% _a
Legal	0.2% _a	2.1% _b	0.0% ¹	1.8% _a	0.8% _a	3.0% _a
Finance	2.2% _a	0.8% _a	2.1% _a	2.2% _a	7.1% _a	2.7% _b
Service	8.4% _a	12.6% _a	10.9% _a	18.2% _b	13.4% _a	20.0% _a
Blue Collar	5.5% _a	3.0% _a	14.1% _a	8.5% _a	6.9% _a	11.9% _a
Military	5.4% _a	30.3% _b	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	1.3% _a
Technology/Telecommunications/ Media	1.8% _a	2.4% _a	0.9% _a	0.9% _a	4.8% _a	0.9% _b
Non-profits	0.1% _a	1.2% _a	1.0% _a	0.5% _a	0.1% _a	0.4% _a
Not sure	0.3% _a	0.0% ¹	0.2% _a	0.0% ¹	3.1% _a	2.7% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 52 cont.— What industry do you work in? (Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations)

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Healthcare	5.8% _a	11	27.5% _b	35	6.7% _a	7	11.7% _{a,b}	4	30.7% _b	16	15.1% _{a,b}	18
Government	13.2% _a	25	3.1% _b	4	14.9% _a	16	9.2% _a	3	6.0% _a	3	6.0% _a	7
Manufacturing	1.8% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.7% _a	1	1.7% _a	2
Agriculture	4.8% _a	9	3.4% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	4.0% _a	1	3.3% _a	2	8.7% _a	10
Tourism	0.4% _a	1	1.5% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	3.1% _a	1	2.7% _a	1	0.1% _a	0
Retail	3.6% _a	7	11.4% _b	15	2.0% _a	2	9.8% _{a,b}	4	1.4% _{a,b}	1	12.5% _b	15
Education	3.0% _a	6	23.4% _b	30	3.8% _a	4	11.1% _{a,b}	4	24.1% _b	13	12.5% _{a,b}	15
Legal	1.3% _a	3	3.2% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	6.7% _a	4	2.6% _a	3
Finance	1.0% _a	2	0.6% _a	1	0.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	1.9% _a	1	0.7% _a	1
Service	11.4% _a	22	14.3% _a	18	1.7% _a	2	10.9% _{a,b}	4	6.2% _a	3	26.0% _b	31
Blue Collar	4.4% _a	8	1.0% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	13.1% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	4.2% _a	5
Military	47.5% _a	92	4.3% _b	5	70.1% _a	73	20.1% _b	7	14.4% _b	8	2.2% _c	3
Technology/Telecommunications/ Media	0.6% _a	1	5.1% _b	7	0.0% ¹	0	4.4% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	5.0% _a	6
Non-profits	1.2% _a	2	1.4% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	2.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _a	3
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	193	100.0%	128	100.0%	105	100.0%	36	100.0%	53	100.0%	120

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Healthcare	9.9% _a	12	12.3% _a	8	16.2% _a	10	24.3% _a	12	20.0% _a	4	7.5% _a	0
Government	7.8% _a	10	14.6% _a	9	8.0% _a	5	9.0% _a	5	5.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
Manufacturing	0.0% ¹	0	1.2% _a	1	2.4% _a	1	1.7% _a	1	1.5% _a	0	7.5% _a	0
Agriculture	1.3% _a	2	7.0% _a	5	4.8% _a	3	5.4% _a	3	8.5% _a	2	7.5% _a	0
Tourism	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.7% _a	2	3.4% _a	1	7.5% _a	0
Retail	3.7% _a	5	10.9% _a	7	6.3% _a	4	7.4% _a	4	8.3% _a	2	24.8% _a	1
Education	3.0% _a	4	5.2% _{a,c}	3	26.6% _b	16	20.1% _{b,c}	10	12.9% _{a,b}	3	0.0% ¹	0
Legal	1.3% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	3.3% _a	2	6.1% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Finance	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.2% _a	2	1.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Service	10.5% _a	13	12.1% _a	8	11.2% _a	7	12.8% _a	6	31.3% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0
Blue Collar	0.0% ¹	0	1.7% _a	1	7.2% _a	4	5.2% _a	3	5.4% _a	1	27.5% _a	1
Military	58.3% _a	72	31.0% _b	20	7.1% _c	4	0.0% ¹	0	2.5% _{b,c}	1	17.6% _{a,b,c}	0
Technology/Telecommunications/ Non-profits	4.2% _a	5	2.9% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	1.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	1.2% _a	1	3.6% _a	2	1.7% _a	1	1.1% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	123	100.0%	65	100.0%	59	100.0%	50	100.0%	21	100.0%	2

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Healthcare	9.1% _a	12	17.2% _a	22	19.9% _a	13	5.5% _a	3	17.2% _a	17	19.5% _a	13	14.2% _a	10
Government	5.1% _a	7	14.5% _b	18	6.8% _{a,b}	4	16.6% _a	9	5.8% _a	6	6.4% _a	4	9.1% _a	7
Manufacturing	0.0% ¹	0	1.1% _a	1	3.3% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.9% _a	2	2.2% _a	2
Agriculture	4.4% _a	6	4.6% _a	6	3.1% _a	2	1.1% _a	1	1.8% _a	2	6.6% _a	4	5.5% _a	4
Tourism	0.9% _a	1	1.1% _a	1	0.3% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.9% _a	2	1.1% _a	1	0.2% _a	0
Retail	6.7% _a	9	9.0% _a	11	1.9% _a	1	3.8% _a	2	5.8% _a	6	7.1% _a	5	10.3% _a	8
Education	10.5% _a	14	5.2% _a	7	24.0% _b	15	0.0% ¹	0	7.2% _a	7	14.5% _{a,b}	10	23.6% _b	17
Legal	1.4% _a	2	3.3% _a	4	1.0% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	2.5% _a	2	1.6% _a	1	4.2% _a	3
Finance	0.0% ¹	0	1.3% _a	2	1.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.4% _a	1	2.3% _a	2
Service	17.0% _a	22	13.2% _a	17	2.3% _b	1	10.6% _a	6	16.6% _a	16	10.7% _a	7	6.5% _a	5
Blue Collar	4.5% _a	6	1.9% _a	2	2.5% _a	2	2.4% _a	1	1.6% _a	2	5.0% _a	3	3.2% _a	2
Military	39.7% _a	51	24.3% _b	31	23.2% _{a,b}	15	60.0% _a	32	37.9% _a	37	13.4% _b	9	14.4% _b	11
Technology/Telecommunications/ Non-profits	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _a	3	6.7% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	1.8% _a	2	6.6% _a	4	2.1% _a	2
Not sure	0.7% _a	1	0.7% _a	1	3.5% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.4% _a	2	2.1% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	130	100.0%	127	100.0%	64	100.0%	54	100.0%	97	100.0%	66	100.0%	74

Table 52 cont.— What industry do you work in? (Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations)

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Healthcare	1.1% _a	1	19.4% _b	16	0.0% ¹	0	10.7% _a	1	20.2% _a	3	9.4% _a	13
Government	11.3% _a	10	5.5% _a	5	40.8% _a	3	28.9% _{a,b}	2	1.8% _{a,b}	0	6.5% _b	9
Manufacturing	3.8% _a	3	8.9% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	6.7% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.5% _a	10
Agriculture	34.6% _a	31	10.2% _b	8	15.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	2.9% _a	0	27.3% _a	37
Tourism	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Retail	12.6% _a	11	11.9% _a	10	8.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	22.9% _a	4	12.1% _a	16
Education	0.7% _a	1	16.5% _b	14	0.0% ¹	0	46.4% _a	3	7.4% _{a,b}	1	7.1% _b	10
Legal	2.4% _a	2	1.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	12.7% _a	2	0.7% _b	1
Finance	0.4% _a	0	4.1% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.7% _a	4
Service	20.9% _a	19	15.2% _a	12	17.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	20.0% _a	3	17.3% _a	24
Blue Collar	11.7% _a	10	5.0% _a	4	17.4% _a	1	7.4% _a	1	12.2% _a	2	7.7% _a	11
Military	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Technology/Telecommunications/ Media	0.6% _a	1	1.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.1% _a	2
Non-profits	0.0% ¹	0	1.0% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.6% _a	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	89	100.0%	82	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	16	100.0%	136

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Healthcare	11.9% _a	6	9.9% _a	4	8.7% _a	3	9.5% _a	3	5.4% _a	1	12.1% _a	1
Government	0.0% ¹	0	7.9% _a	3	11.8% _a	5	16.5% _a	5	14.4% _a	2	4.8% _a	0
Manufacturing	0.0% ¹	0	17.0% _a	6	7.3% _a	3	0.9% _a	0	13.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
Agriculture	54.9% _a	27	0.0% ¹	0	4.5% _b	2	22.3% _b	7	26.3% _{a,b}	3	12.1% _{a,b}	1
Tourism	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Retail	24.1% _a	12	16.4% _a	6	2.4% _a	1	4.1% _a	1	4.7% _a	1	12.1% _a	1
Education	2.3% _a	1	9.5% _{a,b}	3	9.2% _{a,b}	4	8.6% _{a,b}	3	11.5% _{a,b}	1	46.8% _b	2
Legal	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	5.4% _a	2	2.3% _a	1	1.9% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Finance	0.0% ¹	0	4.2% _a	2	3.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	3.5% _a	0	12.1% _a	1
Service	6.9% _a	3	15.9% _{a,b}	6	35.6% _b	14	20.6% _{a,b}	7	14.3% _{a,b}	2	0.0% ¹	0
Blue Collar	0.0% ¹	0	19.2% _a	7	11.7% _a	5	7.8% _a	2	4.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
Military	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Technology/Telecommunications/ Non-profits	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.8% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	49	100.0%	36	100.0%	39	100.0%	32	100.0%	11	100.0%	4

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Healthcare	0.6% _a	1	14.9% _b	9	27.5% _b	8	3.1% _a	1	5.9% _a	3	13.6% _a	5	10.1% _a
Government	5.7% _a	5	9.9% _a	6	14.1% _a	4	4.6% _a	1	8.8% _a	5	9.9% _a	3	14.7% _a
Manufacturing	5.8% _a	5	5.5% _a	3	9.4% _a	3	21.0% _a	5	0.7% _b	0	0.9% _{a,b}	0	15.2% _a
Agriculture	42.1% _a	35	5.6% _b	3	0.8% _b	0	4.7% _a	1	43.8% _b	25	11.0% _a	4	3.7% _a
Tourism	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹
Retail	13.8% _a	12	14.6% _a	9	2.2% _a	1	6.3% _a	1	16.8% _a	10	7.0% _a	2	3.7% _a
Education	3.9% _a	3	9.8% _{a,b}	6	18.5% _b	5	10.2% _a	2	7.2% _a	4	10.1% _a	3	11.5% _a
Legal	0.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	8.4% _b	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	8.8% _a
Finance	2.2% _a	2	0.7% _a	0	5.6% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	2.2% _a	1	1.6% _a	1	5.6% _a
Service	17.9% _a	15	22.9% _a	14	8.7% _a	2	26.1% _{a,c,d}	6	12.4% _{a,b}	7	39.0% _{b,c}	13	9.6% _{b,d}
Blue Collar	6.3% _a	5	13.7% _a	8	3.8% _a	1	24.0% _a	5	0.5% _b	0	5.4% _{a,b}	2	16.3% _a
Military	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹
Technology/Telecommunications/ Non-profits	0.9% _a	1	1.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.8% _a
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	1	1.1% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _a	0	1.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹
TOTALS:	100.0%	84	100.0%	59	100.0%	27	100.0%	23	100.0%	58	100.0%	34	100.0%

Table 52 cont.— What industry do you work in? (St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations)

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Healthcare	6.2% _a	9	19.7% _b	23	0.0% ¹	0	29.2% _a	8	15.2% _{a,b}	9	9.0% _b	14
Government	8.0% _a	11	10.0% _a	11	31.5% _a	2	1.8% _a	0	14.0% _a	9	7.2% _a	11
Manufacturing	9.0% _a	12	5.6% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _{a,b}	1	21.7% _a	13	3.2% _b	5
Agriculture	5.2% _a	7	1.8% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.6% _a	1	5.3% _a	8
Tourism	0.9% _a	1	2.0% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	7.9% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _b	2
Retail	14.9% _a	21	14.2% _a	16	17.2% _a	1	2.7% _a	1	7.9% _a	5	19.1% _a	30
Education	4.4% _a	6	13.9% _b	16	0.0% ¹	0	7.9% _a	2	7.6% _a	5	9.7% _a	15
Legal	5.6% _a	8	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.8% _a	0	4.6% _a	7
Finance	2.7% _a	4	2.7% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	5.7% _a	3	2.1% _a	3
Service	22.0% _a	30	17.6% _a	20	0.0% ¹	0	23.8% _a	6	13.8% _a	8	22.6% _a	36
Blue Collar	14.6% _a	20	8.7% _a	10	0.0% ¹	0	22.3% _a	6	9.1% _a	6	11.3% _a	18
Military	2.4% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	51.2% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Technology/Telecommunications/ Media	1.2% _a	2	0.4% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.8% _a	0	1.3% _a	1	0.6% _a	1
Non-profits	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _a	1
Not sure	2.9% _a	4	2.4% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.2% _a	1	3.8% _a	6
TOTALS:	100.0%	139	100.0%	115	100.0%	7	100.0%	26	100.0%	61	100.0%	160

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Healthcare	0.0% ¹	0	21.1% _a	12	24.1% _a	12	10.5% _a	6	8.4% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Government	7.5% _a	5	1.2% _a	1	15.0% _a	7	10.5% _a	6	16.8% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Manufacturing	10.6% _a	8	9.1% _a	5	3.2% _a	2	6.5% _a	4	4.1% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Agriculture	0.0% ¹	0	8.9% _a	5	4.0% _a	2	4.1% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Tourism	0.0% ¹	0	2.0% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	1.7% _a	1	8.8% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Retail	28.2% _a	21	15.7% _{a,b}	9	10.2% _{a,b}	5	1.3% _b	1	9.4% _{a,b}	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Education	4.7% _a	3	3.5% _a	2	8.9% _a	4	16.0% _a	9	18.1% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Legal	0.0% ¹	0	12.1% _a	7	1.8% _b	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Finance	1.7% _a	1	2.0% _a	1	7.6% _a	4	1.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Service	29.7% _a	22	12.6% _{a,b}	7	3.1% _b	2	30.3% _a	17	16.4% _{a,b}	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Blue Collar	12.8% _a	9	5.7% _a	3	16.1% _a	8	15.5% _a	9	4.2% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Military	0.0% ¹	0	5.9% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Technology/Telecommunications/ Media	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.4% _a	2	0.8% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Non-profits	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.3% _a	1	2.0% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	4.8% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	2.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	11.8% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	74	100.0%	56	100.0%	50	100.0%	57	100.0%	17	0.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Healthcare	3.3% _a	3	20.7% _b	22	10.7% _{a,b}	7	0.0% ¹	0	9.5% _{a,b}	5	7.5% _a	5	25.2% _b	21
Government	9.1% _a	8	8.0% _a	8	9.9% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0	11.8% _a	7	10.3% _a	7	7.7% _a	6
Manufacturing	11.1% _a	10	4.7% _a	5	7.0% _a	4	21.5% _a	5	5.1% _a	3	7.9% _a	6	6.0% _a	5
Agriculture	1.1% _a	1	2.6% _a	3	9.1% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0	5.8% _a	3	3.6% _a	3	4.3% _a	4
Tourism	1.1% _a	1	2.1% _a	2	0.6% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.4% _a	2	1.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
Retail	21.0% _a	18	17.0% _a	18	1.5% _b	1	8.1% _{a,b}	2	18.0% _a	10	24.6% _a	18	0.8% _b	1
Education	6.9% _{a,b}	6	4.7% _a	5	18.0% _b	11	3.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	7.1% _a	5	17.4% _a	14
Legal	7.8% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	1.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	9.4% _a	7	1.1% _b	1
Finance	1.8% _a	2	1.5% _a	2	6.0% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	5.0% _a	3	2.2% _a	2	2.7% _a	2
Service	21.5% _a	19	19.5% _a	20	18.7% _a	12	17.1% _a	4	20.0% _a	11	21.8% _a	16	16.2% _a	13
Blue Collar	13.0% _a	11	13.1% _a	14	8.5% _a	5	27.4% _a	7	18.0% _a	10	2.5% _b	2	12.2% _{a,b}	10
Military	0.0% ¹	0	3.2% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.1% _a	3
Technology/Telecommunications/ Media	0.0% ¹	0	1.2% _a	1	1.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	1.4% _a	1	0.7% _a	0	1.1% _a	1
Non-profits	0.0% ¹	0	0.8% _a	1	0.4% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.6% _a	0
Not sure	2.3% _a	2	0.7% _a	1	6.4% _a	4	21.9% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0	1.0% _b	1	0.6% _b	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	87	100.0%	105	100.0%	63	100.0%	25	100.0%	56	100.0%	73	100.0%	82

Table 53 – Do you work for a Canadian or other foreign-owned company? (among those currently employed)

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

Do you work for a Canadian or other foreign-owned company?		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Do you work for a Canadian or other foreign-owned company?	Yes, Canadian-owned.	12	1.6%
	Yes, other foreign-owned.	13	1.7%
	No	639	83.6%
	Not sure	100	13.1%
	TOTALS:	765	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	Year			
	2015		2017	
Yes, Canadian-owned.	0.7% _a	5	1.6% _a	12
Yes, other foreign-owned.	0.9% _a	7	1.7% _a	13
No	97.4% _a	748	83.6% _b	639
Not sure	1.0% _a	8	13.1% _b	100
TOTALS:	100.0%	767	100.0%	765




Table 53 cont.— Do you work for a Canadian or other foreign owned company? (among those currently employed)

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Yes, Canadian-owned.	1.5% _a	5	0.2% _a	0	3.5% _a	9
Yes, other foreign-owned.	1.8% _a	6	0.2% _a	0	1.4% _a	4
No	74.9% _a	237	97.5% _b	162	90.7% _c	233
Not sure	21.8% _a	69	2.1% _b	4	4.3% _b	11
TOTALS:	100.0%	317	100.0%	167	100.0%	257

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
	2015	2017	2015	2017	2015	2017
Yes, Canadian-owned.	1.2% _a	1.5% _a	0.6% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ¹	3.5% _a
Yes, other foreign-owned.	0.3% _a	1.8% _a	0.2% _a	0.2% _a	1.8% _a	1.4% _a
No	98.5% _a	74.9% _b	99.0% _a	97.5% _a	95.7% _a	90.7% _b
Not sure	0.0% ¹	21.8% _a	0.2% _a	2.1% _a	2.6% _a	4.3% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 53 cont.— Do you work for a Canadian or other foreign owned company? (among those currently employed)

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes, Canadian-owned.	1.8% _a	3	1.0% _a	1	3.6% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	1
Yes, other foreign-owned.	2.0% _a	4	1.5% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	8.7% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	2.0% _a	2
No	64.1% _a	119	90.3% _b	118	38.4% _a	38	73.2% _b	27	93.5% _c	51	96.3% _c	115
Not sure	32.1% _a	60	7.2% _b	9	58.0% _a	58	18.1% _b	7	6.5% _{b,c}	4	0.8% _c	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	186	100.0%	131	100.0%	100	100.0%	38	100.0%	54	100.0%	120

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes, Canadian-owned.	1.2% _a	1	3.5% _a	2	1.7% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Yes, other foreign-owned.	0.0% ¹	0	3.1% _a	2	2.1% _a	1	3.2% _a	2	3.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
No	55.0% _a	64	75.4% _{a,b}	49	87.6% _{b,c}	54	95.6% _c	48	95.0% _{b,c,d}	21	82.4% _{a,b,c}	2
Not sure	43.9% _a	51	17.9% _b	12	8.6% _b	5	1.2% _b	1	1.3% _b	0	17.6% _{a,b}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	116	100.0%	65	100.0%	61	100.0%	50	100.0%	22	100.0%	2

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes, Canadian-owned.	0.0% ¹	0	2.8% _a	4	1.8% _a	1	2.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	1.6% _a	1	1.4% _a	1
Yes, other foreign-owned.	4.1% _a	5	0.4% _b	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.1% _a	2	1.2% _a	1	3.9% _a	3
No	70.2% _a	89	75.9% _a	95	82.5% _a	53	55.6% _a	27	67.8% _a	64	89.2% _b	63	85.4% _b	63
Not sure	25.7% _a	33	20.9% _a	26	15.7% _a	10	42.0% _a	20	30.0% _a	28	8.1% _b	6	9.3% _b	7
TOTALS:	100.0%	127	100.0%	125	100.0%	65	100.0%	49	100.0%	95	100.0%	70	100.0%	74

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes, Canadian-owned.	0.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.3% _a	0
Yes, other foreign-owned.	0.0% ¹	0	0.3% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.2% _a	0
No	96.2% _a	81	98.8% _a	82	86.8% _a	5	100.0% ¹	7	100.0% ¹	15	99.5% _b	136
Not sure	3.4% _a	3	0.8% _a	1	13.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	84	100.0%	83	100.0%	5	100.0%	7	100.0%	15	100.0%	137

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes, Canadian-owned.	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.4% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Yes, other foreign-owned.	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.8% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
No	100.0% ¹	49	89.3% _a	29	100.0% ¹	37	99.2% _a	32	96.6% _a	11	100.0% ¹	4
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	10.7% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	49	100.0%	33	100.0%	37	100.0%	32	100.0%	11	100.0%	4

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes, Canadian-owned.	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Yes, other foreign-owned.	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.8% _a	0
No	100.0% ¹	84	92.6% _a	53	100.0% ¹	26	100.0% ¹	23	99.3% _a	54	91.8% _a	32	97.0% _a	31
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	6.2% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	8.2% _a	3	2.2% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	84	100.0%	57	100.0%	26	100.0%	23	100.0%	55	100.0%	35	100.0%	32

Table 53 cont.— Do you work for a Canadian or other foreign owned company? (among those currently employed)

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes, Canadian-owned.	5.7% _a	8	1.0% _b	1	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _a	1	1.3% _a	1	4.6% _a	8
Yes, other foreign-owned.	2.2% _a	3	0.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.7% _a	2	1.3% _a	2
No	89.9% _a	124	91.6% _a	109	100.0% ¹	7	71.4% _a	19	93.8% _b	56	92.2% _b	151
Not sure	2.3% _a	3	6.7% _a	8	0.0% ¹	0	26.0% _a	7	2.2% _b	1	1.8% _b	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	139	100.0%	119	100.0%	7	100.0%	26	100.0%	60	100.0%	164

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes, Canadian-owned.	7.9% _a	6	1.2% _a	1	1.6% _a	1	2.6% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Yes, other foreign-owned.	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.3% _a	2	2.8% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	84.5% _a	65	96.8% _a	54	89.7% _a	43	92.9% _a	55	93.6% _a	16	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	7.6% _a	6	2.0% _a	1	4.4% _a	2	1.6% _a	1	6.4% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	77	100.0%	56	100.0%	48	100.0%	59	100.0%	17	0.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes, Canadian-owned.	1.1% _a	1	6.6% _a	7	1.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	1.9% _a	1	9.3% _a	7	1.5% _a	1
Yes, other foreign-owned.	1.8% _a	2	1.4% _a	1	1.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	2.8% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _a	2
No	96.0% _a	84	83.4% _b	86	95.0% _{a,b}	63	100.0% ¹	29	81.1% _a	46	89.2% _a	65	93.2% _a	75
Not sure	1.1% _a	1	8.6% _a	9	2.0% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	14.2% _a	8	1.5% _b	1	2.6% _b	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	88	100.0%	104	100.0%	66	100.0%	29	100.0%	56	100.0%	73	100.0%	81

Table 54 – Do you believe that you have skills, experience, and/or credentials that surpass what is typically needed for the job that you now have...in other words, do you feel that you are now “under-employed”? (among those currently employed)

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Do you believe that you have skills, experience, and/or credentials that SURPASS what is typically needed for the job that you now have?	Yes	349	44.7%
	No	389	49.9%
	Not sure	41	5.3%
	TOTALS:	779	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	2013		Year 2015		2017	
Yes	57.5% _a	244	38.1% _b	298	44.7% _c	349
No	39.5% _a	168	60.4% _b	473	49.9% _c	389
Not sure	3.0% _{a,b}	13	1.5% _a	12	5.3% _b	41
TOTALS:	100.0%	425	100.0%	783	100.0%	779




Table 54 cont.— Do you believe that you have skills, experience, and/or credentials that surpass what is typically needed for the job that you now have...in other words, do you feel that you are now “under-employed”? (among those currently employed)

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Yes	44.9% _a	145	51.3% _a	88	43.3% _a	112
No	48.0% _a	155	47.2% _a	81	55.0% _a	142
Not sure	7.0% _a	23	1.4% _b	2	1.7% _b	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	323	100.0%	172	100.0%	258

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson			Lewis			St. Lawrence	
	2013	2015	2017	2013	2015	2017	2015	2017
Yes	55.9% _a	38.8% _b	44.9% _b	64.2% _a	36.0% _b	51.3% _c	37.9% _a	43.3% _a
No	40.6% _a	61.0% _b	48.0% _a	34.8% _a	62.6% _b	47.2% _a	59.0% _a	55.0% _a
Not sure	3.5% _a	0.2% _b	7.0% _a	1.0% _a	1.3% _a	1.4% _a	3.1% _a	1.7% _a
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 54 cont.— Do you believe that you have skills, experience, and/or credentials that surpass what is typically needed for the job that you now have...in other words, do you feel that you are now “under-employed”? (among those currently employed)

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes	48.9% _a	94	39.0% _a	51	47.8% _a	49	32.1% _a	12	44.1% _a	24	45.3% _a	55
No	42.3% _a	81	56.5% _b	74	42.4% _a	43	64.7% _a	24	45.3% _a	25	50.5% _a	62
Not sure	8.8% _a	17	4.5% _a	6	9.7% _a	10	3.2% _a	1	10.6% _a	6	4.1% _a	5
TOTALS:	100.0%	192	100.0%	131	100.0%	102	100.0%	38	100.0%	54	100.0%	122

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	42.6% _a	52	55.0% _a	36	40.8% _a	25	41.0% _a	21	46.5% _a	10	66.7% _a	2
No	44.2% _a	54	39.3% _a	26	56.5% _a	35	57.8% _a	29	51.2% _a	11	33.3% _a	1
Not sure	13.3% _a	16	5.8% _a	4	2.7% _a	2	1.2% _a	1	2.3% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	122	100.0%	65	100.0%	61	100.0%	50	100.0%	22	100.0%	2

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Yes	38.2% _a	50	50.5% _a	65	47.2% _a	31	39.3% _a	21	47.3% _a	45	57.2% _a	40	35.6% _a
No	55.8% _a	72	39.9% _b	51	48.6% _{a,b}	32	47.2% _{a,b}	25	39.8% _a	38	41.9% _a	29	64.4% _b
Not sure	6.0% _a	8	9.6% _a	12	4.1% _a	3	13.6% _a	7	12.9% _a	12	0.9% _b	1	0.0% ¹
TOTALS:	100.0%	130	100.0%	128	100.0%	65	100.0%	54	100.0%	95	100.0%	70	100.0%

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes	57.0% _a	51	45.2% _a	37	14.5% _a	1	22.9% _a	2	27.5% _a	5	56.9% _a	78
No	41.3% _a	37	53.6% _a	44	85.5% _a	7	77.1% _a	5	68.4% _a	11	41.8% _a	57
Not sure	1.7% _a	1	1.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.2% _a	1	1.3% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	89	100.0%	83	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	17	100.0%	137

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	68.7% _a	33	53.1% _a	19	38.6% _a	15	45.8% _a	15	35.3% _a	4	41.1% _a	2
No	31.3% _a	15	44.9% _a	16	61.4% _a	24	48.9% _a	16	64.7% _a	7	58.9% _a	3
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	1.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	5.4% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	49	100.0%	36	100.0%	39	100.0%	32	100.0%	11	100.0%	4

	Education Level						Annual Income						
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000
Yes	62.4% _a	53	44.1% _{a,b}	26	33.4% _b	9	40.6% _a	9	71.3% _a	41	54.0% _a	19	45.8% _a
No	35.9% _a	30	54.3% _{a,b}	32	66.6% _b	18	59.4% _a	13	24.9% _b	14	46.0% _{a,b}	16	54.2% _a
Not sure	1.7% _a	1	1.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.8% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹
TOTALS:	100.0%	84	100.0%	60	100.0%	28	100.0%	23	100.0%	58	100.0%	35	100.0%

Table 54 cont.— Do you believe that you have skills, experience, and/or credentials that surpass what is typically needed for the job that you now have...in other words, do you feel that you are now “under-employed”? (among those currently employed)

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes	44.2% _a	61	42.3% _a	51	17.2% _{a,b}	1	69.5% _a	18	49.2% _{a,b}	30	38.1% _b	63
No	55.0% _a	76	54.9% _a	66	82.8% _{a,b}	5	30.5% _a	8	48.8% _{a,b}	30	59.9% _b	98
Not sure	0.9% _a	1	2.7% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.0% _a	1	2.0% _a	3
TOTALS:	100.0%	139	100.0%	120	100.0%	7	100.0%	26	100.0%	61	100.0%	164

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	42.6% _a	33	58.9% _a	33	37.2% _a	18	37.1% _a	22	34.2% _a	6	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	57.4% _a	44	41.1% _a	23	62.8% _a	31	59.1% _a	35	52.8% _a	9	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	3.8% _a	2	13.0% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	77	100.0%	56	100.0%	49	100.0%	59	100.0%	17	0.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes	30.4% _a	27	57.1% _b	60	38.7% _{a,b}	26	63.2% _{a,c}	18	64.0% _a	36	25.1% _b	18	38.8% _{b,c}	32
No	65.1% _a	57	42.9% _b	45	60.5% _{a,b}	40	29.9% _a	9	36.0% _a	20	73.5% _b	54	60.8% _b	50
Not sure	4.5% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _a	0	6.9% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	1.4% _a	1	0.3% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	88	100.0%	104	100.0%	66	100.0%	29	100.0%	56	100.0%	73	100.0%	82


Table 55 – Have you lost your job in the last year due to downsizing or company closure? (among those currently unemployed)

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Have you lost your job in the last year due to downsizing or company closure?	Yes	13	19.2%
	No	51	73.7%
	Not sure	5	7.1%
	TOTALS:	70	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Yes	14.5% _a	3	57.9% _b	6	10.5% _a	4
No	77.3% _{a,b}	16	42.1% _a	4	89.5% _b	35
Not sure	8.2% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	21	100.0%	10	100.0%	39



Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes	33.8% _a	2	9.3% _a	2	18.2% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	52.7% _a	2
No	66.2% _a	3	80.3% _a	13	81.8% _a	3	100.0% ¹	2	100.0% ¹	11	10.2% _b	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	10.3% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	37.0% _a	2
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	17	100.0%	4	100.0%	2	100.0%	11	100.0%	5

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	62.8% ²	1	83.7% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	72.9% _a	5	100.0% ¹	11	37.2% ²	0	16.3% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	27.1% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	7	100.0%	11	100.0%	1	100.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0

Table 55 cont.— Have you lost your job in the last year due to downsizing or company closure? (among those currently unemployed)

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes	5.8% _a	1	48.1% _b	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	49.2% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	83.1% _a	13	51.9% _a	2	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	86.8% _a	11	50.8% _a	1	100.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	1
Not sure	11.1% _a	2	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	13.2% _a	2	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	15	100.0%	4	100.0%	1	100.0%	13	100.0%	2	100.0%	0	100.0%	1

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes	56.5% _a	5	71.1% ¹	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	71.1% ¹	1	56.5% _a	5
No	43.5% _a	4	28.9% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	28.9% ¹	0	43.5% _a	4
Not sure	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	9	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	12

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	15.4% _a	1	100.0% ²	5	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	84.6% _a	4	0.0% ²	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes	52.1% _a	4	84.0% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	47.9% _a	4	16.0% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ²	4	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	8	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	100.0%	4	0.0%	0

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes	23.7% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	0.0% ¹	0	10.2% _a	3
No	76.3% _a	13	100.0% ¹	21	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ¹	10	89.8% _a	24
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	17	100.0%	21	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	10	100.0%	27

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	8.0% _a	3	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	33.6% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	92.0% _a	32	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	66.4% ¹	1	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	35	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	0.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes	0.0% ¹	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	50.0% _a	3	1.6% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	100.0% ¹	32	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	50.0% _a	3	98.4% _a	24	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	32	100.0%	1	100.0%	6	100.0%	24	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0


Table 56 – Have you tried to find a job in the last 12 months? (among those currently unemployed)

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Have you tried to find a job in the last 12 months?	Yes	26	37.2%
	No	36	52.0%
	Not sure	8	10.8%
	TOTALS:	70	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

What county do you live in?						
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Yes	21.3% _a	4	49.8% _a	5	43.0% _a	17
No	63.2% _a	13	42.1% _a	4	57.0% _a	22
Not sure	15.5% _a	3	8.1% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	21	100.0%	10	100.0%	39



Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

Gender					Military Affiliation							
Male		Female			AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes	No	Yes	No		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
54.7% _a	45.3% _a	12.3% _b	68.0% _a		40.3% _a	59.7% _a	100.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	100.0% ¹	19.3% _a	10.2% _a
2	2	2	11		1	2	2	0	0	11	1	1
Not sure		19.7% _a			0.0% ¹		0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	70.5% _a	
		3			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
TOTALS:		100.0%	100.0%		100.0%	3	100.0%	2	100.0%	11	100.0%	5

Age Groups											
18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
41.1% _a	31.8% _a	0.0% ¹	100.0% ¹	100.0% ^{1,2}	0.0% ^{1,2}	30.6% _a	16.3% _a	0.0% ^{1,2}	0.0% ^{1,2}	0.0% ^{1,2}	0.0% ^{1,2}
3	2	0	11	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Not sure		0.0% ¹		0.0% ^{1,2}		53.1% _a		0.0% ^{1,2}		0.0% ^{1,2}	
		2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS:		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	1	100.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0

Table 56 cont.— Have you tried to find a job in the last 12 months? (among those currently unemployed)

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College		4+ Year Degree			Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes	5.8% _a	1	54.9% _b	2	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	0.0% ²	0	100.0% ²	2	100.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	1
No	83.1% _a	13	10.6% _b	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	86.8% _a	11	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	11.1% _a	2	34.5% _a	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	13.2% _a	2	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	15	100.0%	4	100.0%	1	100.0%	13	100.0%	2	100.0%	0	100.0%	1

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes	47.4% _a	4	71.1% ¹	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	71.1% ¹	1	47.4% _a	4
No	43.5% _a	4	28.9% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	28.9% ¹	0	43.5% _a	4
Not sure	9.0% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	9.0% _a	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	9	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	9

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	15.4% _a	1	84.0% _b	4	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	84.6% _a	4	0.0% ²	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	16.0% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College		4+ Year Degree			Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes	52.1% _a	4	39.3% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	47.9% _a	4	16.0% _a	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ²	4	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ²	0	44.7% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	8	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	100.0%	4	0.0%	0

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes	37.8% _a	6	47.1% _a	10	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	70.4% ²	1	0.0% ¹	0	57.8% _a	16
No	62.2% _a	11	52.9% _a	11	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	29.6% ²	0	100.0% ¹	10	42.2% _a	11
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	17	100.0%	21	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	10	100.0%	27

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	42.9% _a	15	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	66.4% ¹	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	57.1% _a	20	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	33.6% ¹	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	35	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	0.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College		4+ Year Degree			Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Yes	31.9% _a	10	70.4% ¹	1	100.0% ²	6	49.7% _a	12	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	68.1% _a	22	29.6% ¹	0	0.0% ²	0	50.3% _a	12	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	32	100.0%	1	100.0%	6	100.0%	24	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0


Table 57 – Were you unable to obtain a job because you did not have the necessary skills or training? (among those unemployed looking for a job)

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Were you unable to obtain a job because you did not have the necessary skills or training?	Yes	8	32.4%
	No	17	63.5%
	Not sure	1	4.0%
	TOTALS:	26	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

What county do you live in?						
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Yes	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	78.7% _a	13
No	80.1% _a	4	100.0% ¹	5	21.3% _b	4
Not sure	19.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	5	100.0%	17



Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

Gender					Military Affiliation							
Male		Female			AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Yes	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	63.4% _a	2	100.0% ¹	2	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	100.0% ¹	2	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	36.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	1
TOTALS:	100.0%	3	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	100.0%	1

Age Groups												
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Yes	0.0% ^a	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0
No	100.0% ^a	3	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	100.0% ^{a,b}	1	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0
Not sure	0.0% ^a	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	100.0% ^{a,b}	1	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	3	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0

Table 57 cont.— Were you unable to obtain a job because you did not have the necessary skills or training? (among those unemployed looking for a job)

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College	4+ Year Degree	Up to \$25,000	\$25,001- \$50,000	\$50,001- \$75,000	Over \$75,000							
Yes	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ²	2	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	50.8% _a	1	100.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	1
Not sure	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	49.2% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	1	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	100.0%	0	100.0%	1

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male	Female	AM in household	Fort Drum and stayed	No AM, but job related to FD	No FD connection						
Yes	0.0% ^a	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^a	0
No	100.0% ^a	4	100.0% ^{a,b}	1	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	100.0% ^{a,b}	1	100.0% ^a	4
Not sure	0.0% ^a	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	4

	Age Groups											
	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+						
Yes	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0
No	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	100.0% ^{a,b}	1	100.0% ^b	4	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0
Not sure	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^b	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0
TOTALS:	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College	4+ Year Degree	Up to \$25,000	\$25,001- \$50,000	\$50,001- \$75,000	Over \$75,000							
Yes	0.0% ^a	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0
No	100.0% ^a	4	100.0% ^{a,b}	1	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0
Not sure	0.0% ^a	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0	0.0% ^{a,b}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	4	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male	Female	AM in household	Fort Drum and stayed	No AM, but job related to FD	No FD connection						
Yes	57.0% _a	4	92.6% _a	9	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	77.5% _a	12
No	43.0% _a	3	7.4% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	22.5% _a	4
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	7	100.0%	10	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	100.0%	16

	Age Groups											
	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+						
Yes	81.4% _a	12	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	18.6% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	15	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG	Some College	4+ Year Degree	Up to \$25,000	\$25,001- \$50,000	\$50,001- \$75,000	Over \$75,000							
Yes	92.6% _a	9	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	50.0% _b	3	77.1% _a	9	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
No	7.4% _a	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	50.0% _b	3	22.9% _a	3	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	100.0% ^{1,2}	1	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
Not sure	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ²	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0	0.0% ^{1,2}	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	10	100.0%	1	100.0%	6	100.0%	12	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0

Section 3.7 – North Country Residence

Table 58 – How long have you lived in the North Country?

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
How long have you lived in the North Country?	Less than 5 years	152	13.9%
	Less the 10 years	39	3.6%
	Less than 20 years	102	9.4%
	Twenty or more years	798	73.1%
	TOTALS:	1092	100.0%

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
Less than 5 years	26.5% _a	107	1.0% _b	3	1.4% _b	6
Less the 10 years	2.6% _a	11	0.5% _a	1	6.5% _b	27
Less than 20 years	8.4% _{a,b}	34	5.6% _a	16	12.9% _b	53
Twenty or more years	62.4% _a	251	92.9% _b	262	79.2% _c	329
TOTALS:	100.0%	403	100.0%	282	100.0%	415




Table 58 cont.— How long have you lived in the North Country?

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Less than 5 years	42.3% _a	89	9.2% _b	18	84.4% _a	85	18.0% _b	10	12.1% _b	9	1.3% _c	2
Less the 10 years	1.8% _a	4	3.6% _a	7	4.8% _{a,b}	5	7.7% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	1.0% _b	2
Less than 20 years	9.1% _a	19	7.6% _a	15	8.8% _a	9	8.4% _a	4	4.0% _a	3	10.3% _a	17
Twenty or more years	46.8% _a	99	79.6% _b	153	2.0% _a	2	65.9% _b	35	83.9% _{b,c}	64	87.5% _c	149
TOTALS:	100.0%	211	100.0%	192	100.0%	100	100.0%	54	100.0%	76	100.0%	170

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Less than 5 years	62.1% _a	76	29.7% _b	22	14.9% _{b,c}	8	1.0% _c	1	0.9% _{c,d}	0	1.3% _{c,e}	1
Less the 10 years	3.1% _a	4	4.6% _a	3	6.0% _a	3	0.6% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Less than 20 years	12.4% _a	15	5.1% _a	4	14.9% _a	8	8.7% _a	6	2.5% _a	1	0.6% _a	0
Twenty or more years	22.4% _a	27	60.6% _b	44	64.2% _b	34	89.6% _c	59	96.6% _c	47	98.0% _c	41
TOTALS:	100.0%	122	100.0%	73	100.0%	52	100.0%	66	100.0%	48	100.0%	41

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Less than 5 years	25.5% _a	46	29.0% _a	42	24.3% _a	19	42.9% _a	34	36.2% _a	40	13.6% _b	11	15.6% _b	13
Less the 10 years	0.7% _a	1	3.4% _{a,b}	5	5.8% _b	4	0.0% ¹	0	1.1% _a	1	3.8% _a	3	7.5% _a	6
Less than 20 years	8.0% _a	15	8.4% _a	12	9.3% _a	7	9.0% _a	7	8.7% _a	10	7.8% _a	7	8.4% _a	7
Twenty or more years	65.8% _a	119	59.2% _a	85	60.6% _a	47	48.1% _a	38	54.0% _{a,c}	59	74.9% _b	63	68.5% _{b,c}	58
TOTALS:	100.0%	181	100.0%	144	100.0%	77	100.0%	80	100.0%	110	100.0%	84	100.0%	84

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Less than 5 years	2.0% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	26.0% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Less the 10 years	0.3% _a	0	0.7% _a	1	6.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.3% _b	1
Less than 20 years	5.5% _a	8	5.7% _a	8	10.8% _a	1	14.3% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	5.5% _a	12
Twenty or more years	92.2% _a	130	93.6% _a	132	56.8% _a	6	85.7% _{a,b}	17	100.0% ¹	35	94.2% _b	204
TOTALS:	100.0%	141	100.0%	141	100.0%	11	100.0%	20	100.0%	35	100.0%	217

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Less than 5 years	0.0% ¹	0	7.6% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Less the 10 years	0.0% ¹	0	1.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _a	0	1.0% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Less than 20 years	17.8% _a	9	3.7% _{a,b}	1	7.8% _{a,b}	4	2.0% _b	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Twenty or more years	82.2% _a	44	86.9% _a	33	92.2% _a	45	97.5% _a	56	99.0% _a	42	100.0% ¹	43
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	38	100.0%	49	100.0%	58	100.0%	42	100.0%	43

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Less than 5 years	0.0% ¹	0	3.6% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.3% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Less the 10 years	0.0% ¹	0	1.2% _a	1	1.0% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _a	0	2.6% _a	1
Less than 20 years	4.5% _a	7	6.6% _a	5	8.0% _a	3	1.0% _a	1	0.8% _a	1	1.8% _a	1	10.2% _a	4
Twenty or more years	95.5% _a	156	88.5% _a	69	91.0% _a	37	99.0% _a	57	95.9% _a	83	97.6% _a	61	87.2% _a	33
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	78	100.0%	41	100.0%	57	100.0%	87	100.0%	63	100.0%	37

Table 58 cont.— How long have you lived in the North Country?

St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
Less than 5 years	0.6% _a	1	2.3% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.5% _a	1	1.7% _a	5
Less the 10 years	5.0% _a	11	8.1% _a	16	12.6% _{a,b}	1	0.0% ¹	0	20.4% _a	17	3.2% _b	9
Less than 20 years	14.5% _a	31	11.1% _a	23	37.5% _a	3	11.2% _a	5	12.9% _a	11	12.2% _a	34
Twenty or more years	79.9% _a	169	78.5% _a	160	49.9% _{a,c}	4	88.8% _b	39	65.3% _a	55	83.0% _{b,c}	231
TOTALS:	100.0%	212	100.0%	203	100.0%	9	100.0%	44	100.0%	84	100.0%	278

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
Less than 5 years	4.7% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	0
Less the 10 years	11.2% _a	13	13.6% _a	8	0.0% ¹	0	6.0% _a	4	3.1% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0
Less than 20 years	19.1% _a	22	22.7% _a	13	10.0% _a	6	6.3% _a	5	3.9% _a	2	10.5% _a	5
Twenty or more years	65.0% _a	76	63.7% _a	37	90.0% _b	55	87.7% _b	65	92.9% _b	52	88.6% _b	44
TOTALS:	100.0%	116	100.0%	57	100.0%	61	100.0%	75	100.0%	56	100.0%	50

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
Less than 5 years	2.2% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	2.0% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	1.9% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Less the 10 years	8.6% _a	17	6.4% _a	9	1.7% _a	1	19.4% _a	17	9.4% _{a,b}	8	1.1% _{b,c}	1	0.6% _c	1
Less than 20 years	11.8% _a	23	13.9% _a	19	13.6% _a	11	4.2% _a	4	11.8% _a	10	10.0% _a	10	13.6% _a	12
Twenty or more years	77.4% _a	151	79.7% _a	110	82.7% _a	68	76.5% _a	68	76.8% _a	67	88.9% _a	90	85.8% _a	78
TOTALS:	100.0%	195	100.0%	138	100.0%	83	100.0%	89	100.0%	87	100.0%	101	100.0%	91

Table 59 – Are you a native of the North Country, and if not, what prompted your move to this region?

2017 Three-County Combined Regional Results:

		Frequency (weighted)	Percentage (weighted)
Are you a native of the North Country, and if not, what prompted your move to this region?	"I am a North Country native"	774	65.8%
	Military	204	17.4%
	College	9	0.7%
	Job	47	4.0%
	Perceived quality of life	23	2.0%
	Spouse/Partner	38	3.2%
	Family/Parents here	76	6.4%
	Inexpensive land/Real estate	2	0.2%
	Not sure	4	0.4%
	TOTALS:	1177	100.0%

Trend Analysis by Region:

	Year			
	2015		2017	
"I am a North Country native"	68.2% _a	884	65.8% _a	774
Military	12.3% _a	160	17.4% _b	204
College	1.0% _a	13	0.7% _a	9
Job	4.0% _a	52	4.0% _a	47
Perceived quality of life	1.8% _a	24	2.0% _a	23
Spouse/Partner	5.2% _a	68	3.2% _b	38
Family/Parents here	4.0% _a	52	6.4% _b	76
Inexpensive land/Real estate	0.7% _a	9	0.2% _b	2
Not sure	2.7% _a	35	0.4% _b	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	1296	100.0%	1177




Table 59 cont.— Are you a native of the North Country, and if not, what prompted your move to this region?

2017 County Specific Results:

	What county do you live in?					
	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
"I am a North Country native"	55.4% _a	252	82.5% _b	236	75.2% _b	331
Military	31.2% _a	142	2.3% _b	7	3.0% _b	13
College	0.3% _a	1	0.1% _a	0	1.2% _a	5
Job	2.2% _a	10	5.0% _{a,b}	14	5.5% _b	24
Perceived quality of life	1.0% _a	5	1.3% _a	4	2.8% _a	13
Spouse/Partner	4.6% _a	21	2.0% _a	6	1.9% _a	8
Family/Parents here	4.9% _a	22	6.5% _{a,b}	19	9.4% _b	41
Inexpensive land/Real estate	0.1% _a	0	0.1% _a	0	0.2% _a	1
Not sure	0.3% _a	1	0.1% _a	0	0.8% _a	4
TOTALS:	100.0%	455	100.0%	286	100.0%	440

Trend Analysis by County:

	Jefferson		Lewis		St. Lawrence	
	2015	2017	2015	2017	2015	2017
"I am a North Country native"	57.2% _a	55.4% _a	85.4% _a	82.5% _a	75.2% _a	75.2% _a
Military	26.4% _a	31.2% _a	1.4% _a	2.3% _a	0.7% _a	3.0% _b
College	0.4% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ¹	0.1% _a	1.8% _a	1.2% _a
Job	3.2% _a	2.2% _a	2.7% _a	5.0% _a	5.1% _a	5.5% _a
Perceived quality of life	2.3% _a	1.0% _a	1.7% _a	1.3% _a	1.4% _a	2.8% _a
Spouse/Partner	2.7% _a	4.6% _a	4.2% _a	2.0% _a	8.0% _a	1.9% _b
Family/Parents here	5.4% _a	4.9% _a	3.1% _a	6.5% _b	2.8% _a	9.4% _b
Inexpensive land/Real estate	0.0% ¹	0.1% _a	0.3% _a	0.1% _a	1.5% _a	0.2% _b
Not sure	2.5% _a	0.3% _b	1.2% _a	0.1% _a	3.4% _a	0.8% _b
TOTALS:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Table 59 cont.— Are you a native of the North Country, and if not, what prompted your move to this region?

Comparison of Demographic Subgroups *Within* Each County (using only 2017 data)

Jefferson County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
"I am a North Country native"	44.1% _a	104	67.7% _b	148	8.0% _a	9	42.5% _b	24	77.5% _c	72	79.7% _c	146
Military	47.0% _a	111	14.0% _b	30	90.1% _a	105	41.1% _b	23	10.9% _c	10	1.1% _d	2
College	0.0% ¹	0	0.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.6% _a	1
Job	1.8% _a	4	2.5% _a	6	0.0% ¹	0	4.6% _a	3	3.0% _a	3	2.5% _a	5
Perceived quality of life	1.2% _a	3	0.8% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.2% _a	4
Spouse/Partner	2.8% _a	7	6.6% _b	14	1.8% _a	2	6.5% _a	4	2.2% _a	2	5.6% _a	10
Family/Parents here	2.9% _a	7	7.2% _b	16	0.1% _a	0	2.1% _{a,b}	1	6.4% _b	6	8.2% _{b,c}	15
Inexpensive land/Real estate	0.1% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	0.1% _a	0	0.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	2.0% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.1% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	237	100.0%	218	100.0%	116	100.0%	55	100.0%	93	100.0%	184

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
"I am a North Country native"	26.0% _a	35	53.0% _b	45	63.2% _{b,c}	43	75.1% _{b,c}	53	75.3% _{b,c}	39	81.0% _c	38
Military	65.7% _a	88	38.6% _b	32	18.4% _{b,c}	12	5.8% _c	4	6.1% _{c,d}	3	3.4% _{c,e}	2
College	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.7% _a	0	0.9% _a	1	0.6% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Job	0.6% _a	1	0.9% _a	1	0.9% _a	1	3.0% _a	2	4.2% _a	2	7.3% _a	3
Perceived quality of life	2.2% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.9% _a	1	0.6% _a	0	1.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0
Spouse/Partner	3.2% _a	4	4.1% _a	3	6.7% _a	5	5.6% _a	4	4.0% _a	2	5.6% _a	3
Family/Parents here	2.3% _a	3	3.3% _a	3	9.3% _a	6	7.4% _a	5	7.8% _a	4	2.3% _a	1
Inexpensive land/Real estate	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.6% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.4% _a	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	134	100.0%	84	100.0%	68	100.0%	70	100.0%	52	100.0%	46

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
"I am a North Country native"	60.3% _a	126	52.3% _a	85	49.2% _a	41	46.5% _a	41	48.0% _a	62	64.2% _a	57	60.4% _a	59
Military	26.6% _a	55	35.6% _a	58	34.1% _a	28	42.7% _a	38	40.3% _a	52	20.1% _b	18	22.3% _b	22
College	0.0% ¹	0	0.4% _a	1	0.9% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.2% _a	1	0.3% _a	0
Job	1.8% _{a,b}	4	0.5% _a	1	6.3% _b	5	1.6% _a	1	2.5% _a	3	1.6% _a	1	4.0% _a	4
Perceived quality of life	1.4% _a	3	0.3% _a	0	1.6% _a	1	3.4% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	1.5% _a	1	0.4% _a	0
Spouse/Partner	4.8% _a	10	4.5% _a	7	4.4% _a	4	0.8% _a	1	3.0% _a	4	4.6% _a	4	9.4% _a	9
Family/Parents here	4.5% _a	9	6.5% _a	11	2.9% _a	2	5.0% _a	4	5.3% _a	7	6.9% _a	6	3.2% _a	3
Inexpensive land/Real estate	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.4% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	0.5% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.2% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.0% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	208	100.0%	163	100.0%	83	100.0%	88	100.0%	130	100.0%	88	100.0%	98

Table 59 cont.— Are you a native of the North Country, and if not, what prompted your move to this region?

Lewis County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
"I am a North Country native"	84.2% _a	120	80.7% _a	116	63.5% _{a,b}	7	60.7% _a	13	84.4% _{a,b}	28	86.6% _b	188
Military	3.1% _a	4	1.6% _a	2	36.5% _a	4	9.7% _{a,b}	2	1.2% _b	0	0.0% ¹	0
College	0.3% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.3% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Job	5.3% _a	8	4.7% _a	7	0.0% ¹	0	15.3% _a	3	2.3% _{a,b}	1	3.3% _b	7
Perceived quality of life	0.4% _a	1	2.2% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.3% _a	1	1.2% _a	3
Spouse/Partner	1.0% _a	1	3.0% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	1.0% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _a	6
Family/Parents here	5.4% _a	8	7.6% _a	11	0.0% ¹	0	13.3% _a	3	7.6% _a	3	6.1% _a	13
Inexpensive land/Real estate	0.3% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.2% _a	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.1% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	143	100.0%	143	100.0%	12	100.0%	21	100.0%	33	100.0%	216

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
"I am a North Country native"	95.8% _a	51	74.8% _b	31	86.0% _{a,b}	42	78.1% _{a,b}	46	87.6% _{a,b}	38	69.7% _b	29
Military	0.0% ¹	0	10.3% _a	4	3.1% _a	2	0.9% _a	1	0.9% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
College	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.0% _a	0
Job	0.0% ¹	0	6.9% _a	3	5.2% _a	3	4.0% _a	2	4.4% _a	2	11.3% _a	5
Perceived quality of life	0.0% ¹	0	3.4% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	2.9% _a	2	0.9% _a	0	0.5% _a	0
Spouse/Partner	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	2.6% _a	1	1.5% _a	1	4.3% _a	2	4.3% _a	2
Family/Parents here	4.2% _a	2	4.6% _a	2	3.0% _a	1	12.5% _a	7	0.4% _a	0	13.2% _a	6
Inexpensive land/Real estate	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.0% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	53	100.0%	41	100.0%	49	100.0%	58	100.0%	43	100.0%	42

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
"I am a North Country native"	88.1% _a	144	81.0% _{a,b}	67	62.1% _b	25	73.0% _a	42	90.3% _b	79	81.2% _{a,b}	54	72.9% _{a,b}	26
Military	0.0% ¹	0	6.8% _a	6	2.6% _a	1	0.0% ¹	0	3.3% _a	3	0.8% _a	1	9.1% _a	3
College	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.1% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
Job	1.9% _a	3	5.3% _{a,b}	4	17.3% _b	7	3.5% _{a,b}	2	1.1% _a	1	10.3% _{a,b}	7	12.2% _b	4
Perceived quality of life	0.0% ¹	0	2.4% _a	2	4.3% _a	2	2.3% _a	1	1.6% _a	1	0.6% _a	0	1.6% _a	1
Spouse/Partner	2.4% _a	4	0.5% _a	0	3.8% _a	2	1.4% _a	1	2.3% _a	2	1.8% _a	1	0.8% _a	0
Family/Parents here	7.6% _a	12	4.1% _a	3	7.2% _a	3	19.8% _a	11	0.9% _b	1	4.6% _{a,b}	3	3.3% _{a,b}	1
Inexpensive land/Real estate	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.1% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.6% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.5% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	164	100.0%	83	100.0%	40	100.0%	57	100.0%	87	100.0%	66	100.0%	36

Table 59 cont.— Are you a native of the North Country, and if not, what prompted your move to this region?


St. Lawrence County Demographic Cross-tabulations:

	Gender				Military Affiliation							
	Male		Female		AM in household		Fort Drum and stayed		No AM, but job related to FD		No FD connection	
"I am a North Country native"	73.3% _a	165	77.2% _a	166	43.8% _a	4	62.5% _a	31	76.6% _a	66	78.0% _a	229
Military	4.1% _a	9	1.7% _a	4	47.2% _a	4	15.0% _a	7	0.3% _b	0	0.3% _b	1
College	1.4% _a	3	0.9% _a	2	0.0% ¹	0	1.3% _a	1	0.8% _a	1	1.3% _a	4
Job	4.1% _a	9	7.0% _a	15	9.0% _a	1	0.5% _a	0	5.9% _a	5	6.0% _a	18
Perceived quality of life	4.3% _a	10	1.3% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	4.7% _a	4	2.9% _a	8
Spouse/Partner	1.3% _a	3	2.5% _a	5	0.0% ¹	0	3.6% _a	2	2.4% _a	2	1.5% _a	4
Family/Parents here	9.5% _a	21	9.2% _a	20	0.0% ¹	0	17.0% _a	8	5.2% _a	5	9.6% _a	28
Inexpensive land/Real estate	0.3% _a	1	0.2% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.3% _a	0	0.3% _a	1
Not sure	1.6% _a	4	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.8% _a	3	0.1% _b	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	225	100.0%	215	100.0%	9	100.0%	50	100.0%	87	100.0%	293

	Age Groups											
	18-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-69		70+	
"I am a North Country native"	77.0% _a	91	62.0% _a	38	77.9% _a	54	79.0% _a	61	79.1% _a	46	72.8% _a	41
Military	0.0% ¹	0	14.7% _a	9	1.1% _b	1	2.3% _{a,b}	2	1.2% _{a,b}	1	1.5% _{a,b}	1
College	0.0% ¹	0	3.0% _a	2	0.7% _a	0	1.1% _a	1	3.2% _a	2	0.6% _a	0
Job	3.5% _a	4	11.9% _a	7	7.4% _a	5	2.4% _a	2	5.9% _a	3	4.6% _a	3
Perceived quality of life	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	7.9% _a	5	1.7% _a	1	0.9% _a	1	9.3% _a	5
Spouse/Partner	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	1.1% _a	1	4.2% _a	3	2.6% _a	2	5.1% _a	3
Family/Parents here	19.5% _a	23	3.0% _b	2	4.0% _b	3	9.3% _{a,b}	7	6.2% _{a,b}	4	4.9% _{a,b}	3
Inexpensive land/Real estate	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.6% _a	0	1.3% _a	1
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	5.5% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0	0.4% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	118	100.0%	61	100.0%	69	100.0%	78	100.0%	59	100.0%	56

	Education Level						Annual Income							
	HSG		Some College		4+ Year Degree		Up to \$25,000		\$25,001- \$50,000		\$50,001- \$75,000		Over \$75,000	
"I am a North Country native"	81.2% _a	164	67.9% _b	103	73.9% _{a,b}	64	89.6% _a	83	64.2% _b	59	80.0% _{a,b}	82	73.9% _b	75
Military	0.6% _a	1	7.2% _b	11	0.9% _{a,b}	1	1.3% _a	1	1.1% _a	1	2.0% _a	2	8.1% _a	8
College	0.0% ¹	0	1.7% _a	3	3.1% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	2.4% _a	2	1.3% _a	1	1.6% _a	2
Job	2.8% _a	6	8.7% _b	13	6.3% _{a,b}	5	1.9% _a	2	8.5% _a	8	2.8% _a	3	6.4% _a	6
Perceived quality of life	3.6% _a	7	2.3% _a	4	2.1% _a	2	2.4% _a	2	2.7% _a	2	6.3% _a	7	1.3% _a	1
Spouse/Partner	1.0% _a	2	2.4% _a	4	3.0% _a	3	1.2% _a	1	1.3% _a	1	3.1% _a	3	2.9% _a	3
Family/Parents here	10.7% _a	22	7.0% _a	11	10.3% _a	9	3.1% _a	3	15.9% _b	15	4.3% _a	4	5.7% _{a,b}	6
Inexpensive land/Real estate	0.0% ¹	0	0.6% _a	1	0.2% _a	0	0.5% _a	0	0.3% _a	0	0.3% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0
Not sure	0.0% ¹	0	2.2% _a	3	0.2% _a	0	0.0% ¹	0	3.6% _a	3	0.0% ¹	0	0.0% ¹	0
TOTALS:	100.0%	201	100.0%	152	100.0%	86	100.0%	92	100.0%	92	100.0%	103	100.0%	101

Appendix – The Survey Instrument



3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017

Introduction

"Hello. My name is (first name only), I am a student at Jefferson Community College, how are you doing this evening (afternoon)? Tonight (today) I am calling for the Center for Community Studies at JCC. We are not calling for a donation. We are conducting the third regional economic tracking survey in Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties. The goal is to gather information from residents like you that could be useful in creating more jobs and economic development locally in the future. We complete this survey every-other year, working together with the Development Authority of the North Country. Do you have a few minutes to do a survey for us (or, "help us out")?"

If NO . . . Is there another adult in the home who might wish to participate or is there a more convenient time to call? If still NO, try to arrange a CALL BACK time.


If THEY ARE "ON THE FENCE": "Would you like me to start with the first question, and you can stop the survey anytime you'd like?"

If YES . . . (First verify that the person is 18 years old.) Great, well, let's begin.

IMPORTANT - ESPECIALLY WITH CELL PHONES - Verify that they do live in Jefferson, Lewis, or St. Lawrence County, if they do not then just thank them for their time and wish them a good day/evening.

BE PREPARED TO EXPLAIN:

- this call is NOT a call looking for a donation
- Northern New York economic development agencies use this data in their planning and decision-making,
- the survey is paid for by JCC and the Development Authority of the North Country
- results will be available to the public for free in the fall of 2017, at www.sunyjefferson.edu
- your number has been randomly generated, we do not know who you are



3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017

Attitudes About the Local Economic Development

READ THIS:

I'm going to start by listing several potential local economic development initiatives.

For each I'd like to know HOW IMPORTANT to the local economy you think it is to be further developed.

Is it VERY important, SOMEWHAT important, NOT THAT important, or NOT AT ALL important that it be developed?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not that important	Not at all important	Not sure
Q1. Attracting new businesses	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q2. Retaining existing businesses	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q3. Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q4. Revitalizing Manufacturing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q5. Expanding activities and attractions for more tourism	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q6. Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q7. Increasing Canadian spending in the local region	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q8. Improving the condition of rental housing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q9. Improving the condition of single-family homes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

READ THIS:

I'm now going to list the same economic development initiatives and for each I'd like to know **YOUR CURRENT LEVEL OF SATISFACTION** with that initiative in your county would you rate each as **EXCELLENT, GOOD, FAIR, or POOR?**


	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not sure
Q10. Attracting new businesses	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q11. Retaining existing businesses	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q12. Training and Workforce Skills Development Opportunities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q13. Revitalizing Manufacturing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q14. Expanding activities and attractions for more tourism	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q15. Keeping Northern New York college graduates living and working locally	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q16. Increasing Canadian spending in the local region	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q17. Improving the condition of rental housing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q18. Improving the condition of single-family homes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q19.0 How successful have recent publicly-funded economic development investments been in revitalizing local economies? Do you think they have had...

- ☐ Very positive impact on local economies
- ☐ Positive impact on local economies
- ☐ No Impact on local economies
- ☐ Negative impact on local economies
- ☐ Not Sure

Q19. Do you feel that local governments should explore consolidation in your county if it could save taxpayers money?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure



3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017


Entrepreneurship - Interest & Barriers

READ THIS:

Next, we are interested in your views about locally-owned businesses.

Q20. Do you currently own or operate a business in Jefferson, Lewis, or St. Lawrence County?

☐ Yes ☐ No



3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017

If already an entrepreneur:

Q21. Do you own a home-based business

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Q22. How many employees do you have currently, including yourself and any full or part time employees?

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| ☐ 1 | ☐ 5 |
| ☐ 2 | ☐ 6-10 |
| ☐ 3 | ☐ 11-20 |
| ☐ 4 | ☐ 21-30 |

If more than 30 employees, how many?

Q23. How many employees have you added or expanded by in the past 12 months?

- ☐ None, have not added. ☐ 5
- ☐ 1 ☐ 6-10
- ☐ 2 ☐ 11-20
- ☐ 3 ☐ 21-30
- ☐ 4

If more than 30 employees, how many?

READ THIS:

I'm now going to read a list of possible challenges that you might face as a business owner. For each please tell me whether it is a **MAJOR CHALLENGE**, **MINOR CHALLENGE**, or **NO CHALLENGE** for you?

	Major	Minor	Not a challenge	Not sure
Q24. Taxes	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q25. Access to credit	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q26. Broadband or high-speed Internet access	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q27. Utility rates	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q28. Government regulation	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q29. Availability of affordable space at a desired location	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q30. Lack of skilled labor	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q31. Labor and benefits costs	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q32.1. Would your business benefit from increased educational opportunities being provided in your county? (Read first 4 choices)


- ☐ Definitely Yes ☐ Probably Yes ☐ Probably Not ☐ Definitely No ☐ Not sure

Q32.2. Has the Internet access at your business gotten better, stayed the same, or gotten worse over the past three years?

- ☐ Better ☐ Same ☐ Worse ☐ Not sure ☐ Not applicable (no Internet access, or business is new)

Q33. What portion of your annual revenue do you believe is accounted for by Canadian spending? (READ the first 6 choices)

- ☐ None ☐ Less than 10% ☐ 11%-30% ☐ 31%-50% ☐ 51%-75% ☐ More than 75% ☐ Not sure



3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017

Local Passenger Air Service

READ THIS:


Next we have two questions about local passenger air service.

Q34. How satisfied are you with your access to local passenger air service? (READ FIRST 4 CHOICES)

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Somewhat Satisfied ☐ A Little Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied At All ☐ Not Sure

Q35. Do you more commonly fly out of local airports, or do you more commonly fly out of airports that are not in the three North Country counties?

- ☐ Local Airports More Commonly
- ☐ Airports Outside Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties More Commonly
- ☐ Equally Locally and Not Locally
- ☐ I do not fly ever.
- ☐ Don't know



3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017


Healthcare Access

READ THIS:

We now are interested in some of your opinions about healthcare access locally.

Q36. How often do you travel outside of your county for healthcare services? (READ ONLY FIRST 5 CHOICES ALOUD)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Never | ☐ Most of the time |
| ☐ Rarely | ☐ All of the time |
| ☐ Some of the time | ☐ Don't know |




3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017

Among those who do travel for healthcare services:

Q37. When you do travel for healthcare services, is it to another county OUTSIDE the Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence County region?

- ☐ Yes, always. ☐ Yes, sometimes, ☐ No. ☐ Not sure.




3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017

If travel outside Tri-County Region:

Q38. What healthcare services do you travel outside of the Tri-County region to access? (if "SURGERY" or "IN-PATIENT" prompt for what type? Check all that are mentioned.)

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| ☐ Primary Care | ☐ Cancer Treatment | ☐ Rheumatology |
| ☐ Emergency Room Care | ☐ Cardiology | ☐ Urology |
| ☐ Outpatient Surgery | ☐ Cardiac Surgery | ☐ "Specialists" |
| ☐ In-Patient Surgery (admitted) | ☐ Neurology | ☐ Pediatric Care |
| ☐ In-Patient Medical Care (admitted) | ☐ Dermatology | ☐ Endocrinology |
| ☐ Women's Health Services | ☐ Gastroenterology | ☐ Audiology |
| ☐ Mental Health Services | ☐ Allergist | ☐ Not Sure |
| ☐ Orthopedic services including Physical Therapy | ☐ Eye/Optical/Vision Care | |
| ☐ Other (please specify) | | |




3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017

County of Residence

Q39. What county do you live in?

- ☐ Jefferson ☐ Lewis ☐ St. Lawrence

Other (please specify)



3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017

Demographics - Education & Training

READ THIS:

As we approach the end of this survey, we are now interested in the education levels and employment statuses of North Country adults.

*** Q45. What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?**

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ High school (or less) | ☐ Associate degree |
| ☐ Technical school (after high school) | ☐ Bachelor's degree |
| ☐ Some college courses, no degree | ☐ Graduate degree |


Q46. Has your Internet access at home gotten better, stayed the same, or gotten worse over the past three years?

- ☐ Better ☐ Same ☐ Worse ☐ Don't know ☐ Not applicable (no Internet at home)

Q47. What is your current employment situation? Are you ... (read the list of choices)

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ Retired | ☐ Unemployed (less than 1 year) |
| ☐ Disabled | ☐ Unemployed (more than 1 year) |
| ☐ Full time employed | ☐ Homemaker |
| ☐ Part time employed | |

Other (please specify)



3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017

Demographics - Among Those Currently Employed

Q48. Are you employed in the three-county North Country region?

- ☐ Yes, entirely. ☐ Yes, part of my employment. ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Q49. What industry do you work in? (READ CHOICES, SELECT PRIMARY CHOICE INDICATED)


- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ Healthcare | ☐ Finance |
| ☐ Government | ☐ Service |
| ☐ Manufacturing | ☐ Blue Collar |
| ☐ Agriculture | ☐ Military |
| ☐ Tourism | ☐ Technology/Telecommunications/Media |
| ☐ Retail | ☐ Non-profits |
| ☐ Education | ☐ Not sure |
| ☐ Legal | |
| ☐ Other (please specify) | |

Q50. Do you work for a Canadian or other foreign-owned company?

- ☐ Yes, Canadian-owned. ☐ Yes, other foreign-owned. ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Q51. Do you believe that you have skills, experience, and/or credentials that SURPASS what is typically needed for the job that you now have in other words, do you feel that you are now "under-employed"?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure



3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017


Demographics - Among Those Unemployed

Q52. Have you lost your job in the last year due to downsizing or company closure?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Q53. Have you tried to find a job in the last 12 months?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure




3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017

Demographics - Among Those Unemployed Who are Looking

Q54. Were you unable to obtain a job because you did not have the necessary skills or training?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure



3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017

Demographics - Other than Education and Employment

READ THIS:

Finally, to help us best understand and use the data collected in this study, we have a few standard demographic questions for adults in our region.

*** Q55. I'm going to read you some categories of age, please stop me when I get to the category in which your age falls.**

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| ☐ Teens | ☐ Forties | ☐ Seventies |
| ☐ Twenties | ☐ Fifties | ☐ Eighty or older |
| ☐ Thirties | ☐ Sixties | |

Q56. Which of the following best describes your household regarding affiliation with the military?
(Read first 4 choices)


- ☐ There is at least one person living in my household now who is ACTIVE military.
- ☐ I, or we, were FORMERLY in the military at Fort Drum and chose to stay in the Northern New York region to live.
- ☐ No person in our household is active or retired military, but our residence here is due to employment at, or directly RELATED TO, Fort Drum.
- ☐ I have NOT HAD ANY EMPLOYMENT CONNECTION to the military while in Northern New York.
- ☐ Other (please specify)

Q57. In what township or village do you reside?

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| ☐ JEFFERSON: | ☐ Harrisburg (town) | ☐ Hammond (Village) |
| ☐ Adams (Adams Center) | ☐ Harrisville (village) | ☐ Hammond (Town) |
| ☐ Alexandria (Alexandria Bay, Collins Landing, Plessis, Redwood, Wellesley Island) | ☐ Lewis (town) | ☐ Hermon (Village) |
| ☐ Antwerp (Oxbow) | ☐ Leyden (town) | ☐ Hermon (Town) |
| ☐ Brownville (Dexter, Glen Park) | ☐ Lowville (village) | ☐ Heuvelton (Village) |
| ☐ Cape Vincent | ☐ Lowville (town) | ☐ Hopkinton (Town) |
| ☐ Champion (Deferiet, Great Bend, West Carthage) | ☐ Lyons Falls (village) | ☐ Lawrence (Town) |
| ☐ Clayton (Depauville, Grindstone Island) | ☐ Lyonsdale (town) | ☐ Lisbon (Town) |
| ☐ Ellisburg (Belleville, Mannsville, Pierrepont Manor, Woodville) | ☐ Martinsburg (town) | ☐ Louisville (Town) |
| ☐ Henderson (Henderson Harbor) | ☐ Montague (town) | ☐ Macomb (Town) |
| ☐ Hounsfield (Sackets Harbor, Sulfur Springs, Smithville) | ☐ New Bremen (town) | ☐ Madrid (Town) |
| ☐ LeRay (Calcium, Evans Mills, Fort Drum) | ☐ Osceola (town) | ☐ Massena (Village) |
| ☐ Lorraine | ☐ Pinckney (town) | ☐ Massena (Town) |
| ☐ Lyme (Three Mile Bay, Chaumont) | ☐ Port Leyden (village) | ☐ Morristown (Village) |
| ☐ Orleans (Fineview, Fishers Landing, LaFargeville, Thousand Island Park) | ☐ Turin (town) | ☐ Morristown (Town) |
| | ☐ Turin (village) | ☐ Norfolk (Town) |
| | ☐ Watson (town) | ☐ Norwood (Village) |
| | ☐ West Turin (town) | ☐ Ogdensburg (City) |
| | ☐ ST. LAWRENCE | ☐ Oswegatchie (Town) |
| | ☐ Brasher (Town) | ☐ Parishville (Town) |

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| ☐ Pamela | ☐ Canton (Village) | ☐ Piercefield (Town) |
| ☐ Philadelphia | ☐ Canton (Town) | ☐ Pierrepont (Town) |
| ☐ Rodman | ☐ Clare (Town) | ☐ Pitcairn (Town) |
| ☐ Rutland (Black River, Felts Mills) | ☐ Clifton (Town) | ☐ Potsdam (Village) |
| ☐ Theresa (Lakes) | ☐ Colton (Town) | ☐ Potsdam (Town) |
| ☐ Town of Watertown (Burrville) | ☐ De Kalb (Town) | ☐ Rensselaer Falls (Village) |
| ☐ City of Watertown | ☐ De Peyster (Town) | ☐ Richville (Village) |
| ☐ Wilna (Carthage, Croghan, Natural Bridge) | ☐ Edwards (Village) | ☐ Rossie (Town) |
| ☐ Worth | ☐ Edwards (Town) | ☐ Russell (Town) |
| ☐ LEWIS: | ☐ Fine (Town) | ☐ Stockholm (Town) |
| ☐ Castorland (village) | ☐ Fowler (Town) | ☐ Waddington (Village) |
| ☐ Constableville (village) | ☐ Gouverneur (Village) | ☐ Waddington (Town) |
| ☐ Copenhagen (village) | ☐ Gouverneur (Town) | ☐ Not sure |
| ☐ Croghan (town) | | |
| ☐ Croghan (village) | | |
| ☐ Denmark (town) | | |
| ☐ Diana (town) | | |
| ☐ Greig (town) | | |

Other (please specify)



3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017

Final Demographics

Q58.0 How long have you lived in the North Country? (in YEARS)

Q58. Are you a native of the North Country, and if not, what prompted your move to this region?

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ "I am a North Country Native." | ☐ Spouse/Partner |
| ☐ Military | ☐ Family/Parents here |
| ☐ College | ☐ Inexpensive Land/Real Estate |
| ☐ Job | ☐ Not Sure |
| ☐ Perceived Quality of Life | |
| ☐ Other (please specify) | |

Q59. Next, I'm going to read you some categories of annual household income, please stop me when I get to the category in which the annual income of your household falls.

- | | | |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| ☐ Up to \$10,000 | ☐ \$50,001-\$75,000 | ☐ Don't know |
| ☐ \$10,000-\$25,000 | ☐ \$75,001-\$100,000 | ☐ Refused |
| ☐ \$25,001-\$50,000 | ☐ Over \$100,000 | |

*** Q60. If you don't mind me asking what is your gender?**

- ☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Transgender
- ☐ Other (please specify)

*** READ THIS:**


Finally, to help us best understand the accuracy of the sample we are selecting we have two questions for you about the phone on which you are now speaking.

Q61. Is the phone you are now on a cell phone or a landline?

- ☐ Landline ☐ Cell ☐ Intercept at Fort Drum

*** Q62. Which of the following best describes your current phone ownership? You have**


- ☐ Both a landline and a cell
- ☐ Cell only
- ☐ Landline only
- ☐ Refused



3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017

Concluding Comments and "Thank you."

Thank you very much for helping us out this evening. The results will be released to the community in the summer. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Joel LaLone, Research Director of the Center for Community Studies, 315-786-2264 or jlalone@sunyjefferson.edu. Have a great evening.



3rd Biennial Regional Economic Tracking Survey - 2017

Bookeeping

*** Phone Number Called:**

*** Interviewer name:**

Any important observations or comments about this interview that Mr. LaLone and/or Mr. Danforth should know, enter here. (Complaints? Comments? Compliments? Interesting participants? Difficulties?)