

**The Center for Community Studies
at
Jefferson Community College**

Presentation of Results:

The Seventh Annual
Survey of the
Community

June 2006



**Ms. Denise K. Young, Director
Mr. Joel LaLone, Research Coordinator**

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements Page iii

Section 1 – Introduction Pages 1-6

 Background – For First-time Readers..... Page 1

 What's New – For Returning Readers Page 1

 Methodology Page 2

 Socio-demographics of the Sample Page 3

 The "Typical" Respondent in Year 2006 Page 6

Section 2 – Summary of Findings Pages 7-9

 Perceptions of Quality of Life in Jefferson County Page 7

 Profile of a Resident in Jefferson County..... Page 8

Section 3 – Detailed Results and Analysis: *The Core Survey Questions*.....Pages 10-34

 Technical Comments – For the Statistically Interested..... Page 10

 Familiarity with The Center for Community Studies..... Page 12

 Residence in Jefferson County – Longevity and Intent to Remain Page 13

 Quality of Life Issues – Better/Same/Worse 2006 Page 14

 Quality of Life Issues: Individual Indicator Tables 2000-2006..... Page 16

 Quality of Life Issues - Most Important Issues Page17

 Technology-related Items Page 27

 Fort Drum Impact..... Page 30

 Miscellaneous “Life in Jefferson County” Items Page 31

Section 4 – Detailed Results and Analysis – “*New in 2006*” Survey Questions .Page 35-44

 On-line Communication Page 35

 Involvement in the Community – With Focus on Youth Page 37

 Farming Issues in Jefferson County Page 41

 Recent Fort Drum Growth Impact..... Page 42

 Jefferson County – A Safe Place to Grow Old?..... Page 44

Section 5 – Final Comments Page 45

Table of Tables

Table 1 – Response Rates Page 3

Table 2 – Socio-demographics of the Sample Page 4

Table 3 – Age and Gender of Sample Compared to U.S. Census Page 5

Note: Tables for each sub-section and individual survey questions responses are included in the each section noted under Detailed Results and Analysis above.

Appendix – Survey Instrument

Acknowledgements

The annual survey of the community is a collaborative effort. The Center is grateful for the expertise and assistance from the following students, faculty, staff and Advisory Committee members.

Participating students included the following:

Andy Babel	Ben Gilchrist	Deanna Pfister
Kady Boynton	Alyssia Hullender	Christopher Ried
Jennifer Clark	Tracy Leonard	Brendan Rowe
John Crupi	Melanie Lloyd Lopinto	Joshua Satchwell
Darla Davis	Wanda Lopez	Terri Tubolino
Kris Dunaway	Brie Marsh	Dennis Turpin
Penny Ferdig	Joe Martusewicz	Krista Vincent
Megan Gefell	Michael Paye	Ashleigh Williams

Faculty supervisors included:

Joel LaLone	Professor of Mathematics and Research Coordinator, The Center for Community Studies
Raymond E. Petersen	Professor of Political Science
Michael K. White	Associate Professor of Mathematics
Timothy Grosse	Mathematics Instructor
Ingrid Overacker	Associate Professor of History

The Advisory Committee of the Center for Community Studies includes the following people:

Donald Alexander	Richard Halpin	Rebecca Small Kellogg
Bruce Armstrong	Joel LaLone	Kevin Smith
Paul Barton	Tracy Leonard	Lynn Sprott
David Cutter	Norah Machia	Daniel Stern
John W. Deans	Kenneth J. McAuliffe	Norman J. Wayte
Rev. Fred Garry	Lisa Porter	Joseph M. Weaver
Judith Gentner	Theresa Quintin	Denise K. Young

The costs of this study were underwritten by a grant from Community Bank, NA.

Please contact the Center for Community Studies at (315) 786-2488 for additional information.
The report is available online at www.sunyjefferson.edu/ccs/ccs.html

The Center for Community Studies
at Jefferson Community College
1220 Coffeen Street
Watertown, New York 13601
Telephone: 786-2488 or 786-2489
E-mail: commstudies@sunyjefferson.edu
Website: www.sunyjefferson.edu/ccs/ccs.html

Appendix: Survey Instrument

The Seventh Annual Survey of the Community

Based on 354 telephone interviews conducted April 3 - April 6, 2006

Section 1 - Introduction

Background – For First-time Readers of this Annual Survey

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 our area. 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 annual survey of the community is one specific activity conducted to gauge the attitudes and opinions of a representative sample of Jefferson County citizens. This activity results in a yearly updated inventory of the attitudes and opinions of citizens of the County.

This document is a summary of the results of the Seventh Annual Survey of the Community, including comparisons with the results of the surveys from the past six years. The results provide important information about contemporary thinking of citizens, and over time will continue to provide important baseline and comparative information as well.

“What’s New?” – For Returning Readers of this Annual Survey

After six years of completing this study of quality of life indicators in Jefferson County, it has become apparent that the results of this survey provide meaningful and useful information to local decision-makers. To provide analysis that is of maximum levels of accuracy and utility, the following two significant improvements have been made to the annual survey in this, the seventh year of its existence.

Improvement #1: - Weighting of the results for age and gender.

Rationale: Random telephone interviewing (such as that used in this study and described in greater detail later in this report) continues to be the industry standard methodology for sampling from an adult population located in a specified geographic region with an attitude, opinion, behavior, satisfaction, and/or preference survey. However, inherent in this telephone methodology are biases regarding the age and gender of the participants – telephone methodology typically underrepresents males and younger residents. One common mathematical procedure that adjusts to compensate for this sampling error is referred to as post-stratification weighting. The annual survey has not used weighting in its first six years. Starting in this seventh year, all results will be weighted by age and gender – providing results that are more likely to be generalizable to the adult population of Jefferson County. Again, more detail will be provided later in the description of methodology.

Improvement #2: - All key quality-of-life indicators that have been recorded in the study (close to 100 of them) will be reported after being cross-tabulated by each of the following four demographic variables: gender, age, education level, and household income level.

Rationale: Again, it is standard methodology with professional surveys to provide more rich information to the reader – information that may assist in explaining the overall findings – by reporting the results for all subgroups within key demographic variables. In this study this process would involve reporting the distributions for all of the key quality-of-life indicators for each subgroup of the overall sample. The Center has identified gender, age, education level, and household income level as the key demographic partitioning variables. A test for statistical significance has been completed for each of the cross-tabulations.

Methodology – How This Data Was Collected

The original survey instrument used in the annual survey of the community was constructed in spring 2000 by a team of Jefferson Community College faculty including the following:

Dr. Richard L. Halpin	Former Professor, Sociology; Former Director, The Center for Community Studies Executive Director, Cornell Cooperative Extension of Jefferson County
Mr. Joel LaLone	Professor, Mathematics
Dr. Ingrid Overacker	Associate Professor, History
Dr. Ronald A. Palmer	Associate Professor, History
Dr. Raymond Petersen	Professor, Political Science
Ms. Rebecca Riehm	Associate Professor, Sociology
Mr. Michael White	Professor, Mathematics
Dr. Jerome Wichelns	Former Associate Professor, Philosophy

The instrument is modified each year by The Center for Community Studies, with input from its staff, and Advisory Board, and students employed at the Center throughout the current academic year, to include new questions of relevance to local organizations and agencies. There is a core set of 40-50 questions that have been asked every year since 2000. The primary goal of The Annual Survey of the Community is to collect data regarding quality of life issues of importance to the local citizens. 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 formation to data collection (interviewing), to data entry, to data analysis. The students analyze the data collected in this study annually as assignments in statistics classes. 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 and the Advisory Board of The Center. The discussions that lead to the inclusion of questions at times arise from classroom discussions involving students and Center staff. The decision to include any question as a legitimate and meaningful part of an annual survey, however, is made exclusively by The Center. Similarly, data analysis of the information collected through the annual survey will transpire with faculty and students in the classrooms at Jefferson, however 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 354 Jefferson County adult residents. All interviews were completed via telephone. To be eligible to complete the survey, the resident was required to be at least 18 years old. Two thousand personal residence telephone numbers were randomly selected from the population of approximately 29,000 personal residence telephone numbers in Jefferson County. These numbers were obtained from *Accudata America*, a subsidiary of Primis, Inc. *Accudata America* is a firm that specializes in providing contact information for residents of the United States. The 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. After receiving the 2,000 randomly selected telephone numbers, the list was randomly sorted a second time and a group of 1,680 residential numbers were selected for attempts to interview. All telephone calls were made between 4:30 and 8:30 p.m. from a call center on the Jefferson Community College campus, in Watertown, New York, on four evenings between April 3rd and April 6th, 2006. The Jefferson Community College students who completed the interviews had completed training in human subject research methodology and effective interviewing techniques. Professional staff from The Center supervised the telephone interviewing at all times.

When each of the 1,680 telephone numbers was attempted, one of four results occurred: Completion of an interview; a Decline to be interviewed; No Answer/Busy; or an Invalid Number. 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 half of the questions on the survey had to be completed. The resident’s refusal to answer more than half of the questions was considered a decline to be interviewed. The typical length of a completed survey was approximately five to 10 minutes. Declines to be interviewed (refusals) were not called back in an attempt to convince the resident to reconsider the interview. If no contact was made at a telephone number (No Answer/Busy), call-backs were made to the number.

Telephone numbers that were not successfully contacted, and, as a result, were ultimately categorized as No Answer/Busy, were attempted a minimum of six times. No messages were left on answering machines at homes where no person answered the telephone. The response rate results for the study are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 – Response Rates for the 7 TH Annual Survey of the Community					
Result:	Complete Interview	Decline to be Interviewed	Not Valid Telephone Number	No Answer/ Busy	TOTALS
Frequency	354	543	355	428	1,680
% of Numbers Attempted	21.1%	32.3%	21.1%	25.5%	100%
% of Valid Numbers	26.7%	41.0%	---	32.3%	100%
% of Contacted Residents	39.5%	60.5%	---	---	100%

Within the fields of social science and educational research, when using telephone interview methodology, a response rate of 25%-30% of all valid phone numbers and 40%-50% of all successful contacts where a person is actually talking on the phone are both considered quite successful.

Socio-demographics of the sample – Who was Interviewed?

This section of the report includes a description of the results for the socio-demographic variables included in the survey sample. The socio-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 (i.e. What is the typical household size, educational profile, and income level in Jefferson County?).
2. Secondly, this socio-demographic information facilitates the ability for the data to be sorted or partitioned to investigate for significant relationships – relationships between socio-demographic characteristics of people and their attitudes and behaviors regarding the quality of life in Jefferson County. Identification of significant relationships allows local citizens to use the data more effectively to better understand the factors that are correlated with various aspects of life in the county.
3. Finally, the socio-demographic information also serves an important purpose when compared to established facts about Jefferson County to analyze the representativeness of the sample that was randomly selected in this study.

The results for the socio-demographic questions in the survey are summarized in Table 2. Note that the socio-demographic data presented in Table 2 is raw, or unweighted; it represents the actual characteristics of the residents who were interviewed via the previously described telephone methodology.

Table 2 – Socio-demographics of the Sample Compared to Census Estimates for Jefferson County			
Socio-demographic Characteristic:	7 th Annual Survey of the Community Sample Results		Jefferson County Population Parameters (U.S. Census 2000)
	n	%	%
GENDER			
Male	108	30.5%	51.8%
Female	246	69.5%	48.2%
AGE GROUP (US Census %'s are among those 18 years old or older)			
18-29	72	20.3%	26.5%
30-39	80	22.6%	22.0%
40-49	71	20.1%	18.6%
50-59	67	18.9%	13.1%
60-69	24	6.8%	8.5%
70+	40	11.3%	11.3%
EDUCATION LEVEL			
Did not complete HS	19	5.8%	17.1%
HS Graduate	102	30.9%	36.3%
Some College	127	38.5%	46.7%
College Graduate (4+years)	82	24.8%	
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME			
Less than \$25,000	86	28.1%	36.0%
\$25,000-\$50,000	109	35.6%	34.4%
\$50,000-\$75,000	63	20.6%	17.8%
More than \$75,000	48	15.7%	11.8%
CHILDREN LIVING IN THE HOME			
No children	166	49.6%	62.8%
1 child	88	26.3%	37.2% have at least one child in the home
2 children	53	15.8%	
3 children	23	6.9%	
4 or more children	5	1.5%	
RACE/ETHNICITY			
White	293	88.8%	88.7%
Black or African American	13	3.9%	5.8%
Hispanic or Latino	8	2.4%	4.2%
Asian, Pacific Islander	2	0.6%	0.9%
Native American	4	1.2%	0.1%
Multiracial	5	1.5%	0.5%
Other	5	1.5%	---
MARITAL STATUS			
Single	77	22.9%	55.6% Married
Married	209	62.2%	
Other	50	14.9%	

In general, the responses to the socio-demographic questions included in the survey appear to closely parallel that which is true for the entire adult populations of Jefferson County, with the exception that women were more likely than men to answer the telephone and/or agree to a survey, and older residents are more likely to be sampled as well. The 2000 U.S. Census reports for gender and age distributions of the actual adult populations that reside in Jefferson County are shown in Table 3. Additionally, the gender and age distributions of the interviewed adults for this study are shown for comparison. An analysis of the postal zip codes of the respondents paralleled that which is true for the distribution of all Jefferson County adults very closely – the entire county was proportionally represented.

Table 3 – Age and Gender of the Sample compared to U.S. Census 2000 Reported Distributions for Persons 18+ Years Old Among Jefferson County							
Age Groups:	7 th Annual Survey of the Community Sample			Age Groups:	Jefferson County US Census 2000 Statistics		
	% Male	% Female	Totals		% Male	% Female	Totals
18-29	4.8	15.5	20.3	18-29	15.6	10.9	26.5
30-39	7.6	15.0	22.6	30-39	11.8	10.2	22.0
40-49	4.5	15.5	20.0	40-49	9.5	9.1	18.6
50-59	8.2	10.7	18.9	50-59	6.6	6.5	13.1
60-69	2.3	4.5	6.8	60-69	4.1	4.4	8.5
70+	3.1	8.2	11.3	70+	4.3	7.0	11.3
Totals	30.5	69.5	100.0	Totals	51.9	48.1	100.0

Table 3 clearly illustrates a type of sampling error that is inherent in telephone methodology: females and older persons are typically overrepresented – regardless of the subject of the survey. To compensate for this overrepresentation of females and older residents in the sample collected in this study, post-stratification weightings by gender and age have been completed in any further analysis of the data analyzed in this report. All subsequent statistics that will be reported in this document are weighted by gender and age.

Given the extreme diligence placed on scientific sampling design and the high response rates, after application of post-stratification weightings by age and gender, it is felt that this random sample of Jefferson County adults does accurately represent the population of Jefferson County adults. When using the sample statistics presented in this report to estimate that which would be expected for the entire Jefferson County adult population, 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 for each question. Sample sizes tend to vary for each question on the survey, since some questions are only appropriate for certain subgroups, (i.e. only persons who rent their home are asked if their rent has increased in the past six months), and/or as a result of persons refusing to answer questions. In general, the results of this survey for any questions that were answered by the entire sample of 354 residents may be generalized to the population of all adults at least 18 years of age residing in Jefferson County with a 95% confidence level to within a margin of error of approximately ± 4 to ± 5 percentage points. For questions that were only posed to certain specific subgroups such as the rent increase question, the resulting smaller sample sizes of $n=50-100$ allow generalization to the specific subpopulation of all adults at least 18 years of age residing in that county (i.e. generalization of some specific characteristics of renters to *all Jefferson County renters*) with a 95% confidence level to within a margin of error of approximately ± 8 to ± 10 percentage points. For more specific detail regarding the margin of error for any individual questions included in this survey, please contact the staff at The Center for Community Studies.

In order to maximize comparability among the seven annual surveys that have been completed between 2000 and 2006, the procedures used to collect information and the core questions asked have remained virtually identical. All surveys were conducted in the first week in April each year, and the total number of interviews ranged from 340 to 413, depending upon the year. All interviewers have been similarly and extensively trained preceding data collection each year. The survey methodology used to complete the Seventh Annual Survey of the Community was comparable to that used in the previous five years. Furthermore, post-stratification weights for age and gender have also been applied to all results from the first six years of surveying to allow for valid comparisons for trends over the seven year period that will be illustrated later in this report. Please note that these weights that have been applied to preceding year results will at times change the statistics that are reported for those years. The results for years 200-2005 that are reported in this study should be used rather than those reported in earlier years.

All data compilation and statistical analyses within this study have been completed using *Minitab, Release 14* and *SPSS, Release 14*.

The "Typical" Respondent in Year 2006

A profile of a typical respondent is that they have lived in Jefferson County more than seven years, and intend to continue living here. They have completed a high school education and perhaps some college studies. They tend to own their home and live in a household with an annual income between \$25,000 and \$50,000. They voted in the most recent local and presidential elections and hold moderate to conservative political views. The household they live in has a computer that is connected to the Internet and used about 18 hours per week. They have made an online purchase in the past year. They have a personal cell phone and live in a household that has one-to-two cell phones. They regard the overall quality of life in the county as positive, and are feeling more positive about the overall local economy and the availability of good jobs than they have in the past seven years. They are most concerned about the high costs of energy, real estate taxes, and the availability of housing. They believe that both healthcare quality and healthcare access are improving. They volunteer in the local community, contributing an average of 10 hours per month. They continue to rely on the local daily newspaper and local television to learn about local news events, however, are increasingly likely to use the Internet to acquire this information. They believe that the location of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum positively impacts both the quality of life and the economy of the region and that the recent growth of Fort Drum has positively impacted their own personal financial health. They strongly support the development of renewable energy sources in the North Country and recognize the importance of agriculture to the local economy. They have visited the school in their district in the past year and have a high regard for youth in their communities. They feel that Jefferson County is both a safe place to live and a good place to grow old.

Section 2 – Summary of Findings

I. Perceptions of Quality of Life in Jefferson County:

1. Most Jefferson County adult residents continue to **view the quality of life in the region as positive** and it appears that their satisfaction with the quality of life in the region has **significantly improved** over the past year, **particularly in areas related to jobs and the economy.**
2. In 2006, there were dramatic decreases in the percentage of respondents indicating job and economic decline as the most important issues facing Jefferson County, while housing and energy issues moved into the top three most important issues. County residents, regardless of gender, age, income, and education level, reported **the highest rates of positives ever recorded on every single economic-related indicator except housing and cost of energy.**
3. The overall quality of life in the area was reported as getting better by 35% of the residents, a 14% increase from 2005, and **the highest rate of satisfaction reported since 2000.**

4. Economic-related Quality of Life Findings:

Availability of Good Jobs:	Residents reported the highest rate of availability of good jobs as <i>getting better</i> that has been recorded throughout the seven years of data collection (22%) For the first time, availability of good jobs did not make the top three of highest areas of dissatisfaction.
Shopping Opportunities:	Over four out of five (81%) residents believe that shopping opportunities are <i>getting better</i> ; previously this rate has never been larger than 51%.
Overall State of Local Economy:	Residents are more than twice as likely to report that the overall state of the local economy is <i>getting better</i> (35%) than they were in 2005 (15%). For the first time, a greater percentage report that the overall state of the local economy is <i>getting better</i> than report that it is <i>getting worse</i> .
Availability of Housing:	In 2006, residents are still much more likely to believe that housing availability is <i>getting worse</i> than <i>getting better</i> (57% versus 20%).
Cost of Energy:	While the cost of energy has been viewed by the majority as <i>getting worse</i> every year of this survey, in 2006 that opinion reached an all-time high of 88% of the respondents, regardless of age, education level or income.

5. Lifestyle-related (less economic) Quality of Life Findings:

Opportunities for Youth:	In 2006, residents reported the highest rate since 2000 of “opportunities for youth” <i>getting better</i> and interestingly, those most likely to report that opportunities were getting better were the younger respondents.
Healthcare Access and Healthcare Quality	2006 saw the highest rate ever reported of healthcare quality <i>getting better</i> and the highest rate since 2000 of healthcare access <i>getting better</i> , with more than one-third of respondents (35% and 33%) giving a positive response.
Cultural/Entertainment/Recreational Opportunities:	Residents are over three times as likely to report that recreational opportunities are <i>getting better</i> than <i>getting worse</i> (37% versus 11%), and they are twice as likely to report that cultural/entertainment opportunities are <i>getting better</i> than <i>getting worse</i> (28% versus 14%).

- Access to Higher Education: Residents are still more than four times as likely to report access to higher education *getting better* than *getting worse*.
- Downtown Watertown: In 2006, again, **more respondents indicated that downtown Watertown was improving than the previous year** 27% vs 22% and fewer responded it was *“getting worse.”* If the trend of the past three years continues, the future may see positive perceptions of downtown Watertown reach at least an equal footing, and perhaps surpass the negative.
- Policing and Crime Control: Residents are twice as likely in 2006 to view policing and crime control as *getting better* than *getting worse*, with residents under 30 years old and over 60 years old the most likely to perceive it as better.
- Quality of K-12 Education: **K-12 education is viewed as improving by more residents than at any time since 2001**, up 7% from 2005 (38% vs 31%).
- Availability of Elder Care: The perception of availability of care for the elderly as getting better has nearly doubled from the previous two years this question has been asked (28% vs 15%). Residents age 60 or older were the most likely to view it positively.

6. **Residents reported the most satisfaction with the following aspects** of our community:

- Shopping Opportunities
- Internet Access
- Availability of Goods and Services
- Access to Higher Education

7. **Residents reported the most dissatisfaction with the following aspects** of our community:

- Cost of Energy
- Real Estate Taxes
- Availability of Housing

8. **Residents reported the following top three issues facing youth:**

- Isolation/lack of recreational and social activities
- Employment issues/living wage jobs for their future
- Drug and alcohol abuse

II. Profile of a Resident in Jefferson County:

9. Among our respondents, 77% have lived in the county for more than seven years and, reflecting the satisfaction seen throughout this year's responses, only 18% reported that they did not expect to be living here five years from now – the lowest percentage ever recorded.
10. The majority of Jefferson County residents (77.7%) have a working computer in their home and virtually all households with computers are connected to the Internet (94.5%). Members of the typical household in 2006 use their household's computer 18 hours per week, the highest usage ever recorded. While younger residents are more likely to own a computer, almost half of those ages 60+ do have a working computer in their household.
11. Nearly four out of five Jefferson County adults (79%) use at least one form of online communication with the most common being email (73%) and the second most common being instant messenger (IM) (28.6%). More than one in every 10 (11.4%) take part in online communities such as myspace.com. Eighty-eight percent of adults with children in the household report they monitor the online communication of those children at least some of the time.
12. Cell phone use is continuing to increase; currently 71.2% of residents report having a personal cell phone.

13. The findings of this study **overwhelmingly suggest support for Fort Drum**. Over 76% of adults in Jefferson County agree that the presence of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum since 1985 has improved the overall quality of life of Jefferson County citizens. This high rate of Fort Drum support persists among all gender, age, education and income groups.
14. Clearly, Fort Drum is viewed as a large contributing factor to the overall economic improvement identified by residents in this survey, with *78.1% indicating that the recent growth at Fort Drum has had a positive impact on the overall Jefferson County economy*. Jefferson County adults are five times more likely to indicate that Fort Drum's recent growth has impacted their personal job and financial health positively, rather than negatively.
15. The **spirit of volunteerism remains strong and continues to grow** in Jefferson County. Over half the respondents (56%) reported regular volunteer time to the community. The mean number of hours volunteered grew by more than three hours per week in 2006, reaching an all-time high of 10.2 hours per citizen, equaling a community economic value of at least \$228,000,000 per year.
16. *There has been an obvious and fairly steep trend toward reduced cross-border travel over the past seven years, which has reached an all-time low in 2006*. Only 34% of residents indicated they had crossed the border to Ontario in the past year (this has been as high as 66% in the past).
17. Approximately one out of every four households (23.8%) in the survey group reside in Jefferson County because of either their or a family member's civilian or military employment at Fort Drum, with 16.7% of the survey group indicating that there is a member of the household who is active military.
18. Residents continue to report their two most common sources of information about local events are the local newspaper and local television stations, however, the number of respondents indicating their primary source of information is the Internet more than doubled to 13.6% in 2000.
19. Jefferson County residents are more likely to have voted in the last presidential election (70.3%) than the last local election (49.8%), and **most commonly report to be "middle of the road," self-identifying as neither conservative or liberal** (40.4%), but if they indicated a political belief, are significantly more likely to be conservative than liberal (38% versus 21%).
20. The majority of Jefferson County residents own their own homes (64.7%). Of the 30.5% who rent one-third reported that their rent has increased in the past six months.
21. Over one-third of residents (37%) have attended at least one community-based meeting (school, church, town, firehall etc.) in the past year and 57% of those reported seeing youth participating at the meetings at least a few times or more.
22. The majority of Jefferson County adults, over 62%, report having visited a school in their district at least once during the past year, with 31% reporting having visited the school 10 or more times. Nearly equal percentages of residents consider themselves active in their school district (44%) as consider themselves not active in their district (45%).
23. **Jefferson County residents overwhelming indicated a high regard for youth in their communities**. Regardless of gender, age, education or income level, over 83% of all Jefferson County adults agree that they would like to see more youth participation in school and community decision-making processes. Over 77% indicate there are youth in their community who they personally value and over 63% believe the youth in their community improve their own personal quality of life.
24. There is *strong evidence of support among the majority of Jefferson County residents (84.8%) for developing renewable energy sources in the North Country*, with males particularly supportive.
25. *Jefferson County residents (94%) strongly believe in the importance of agriculture and farming to the local economy*; further, the majority (62%) of residents believe that most or all farmers take good care of the environment.
26. **People in Jefferson County overwhelmingly perceive this as a safe place to live (92.9%) and a good place to grow old (81.4%)**.

Section 3- Results: *The Core Survey Questions*

This section of the Report of Findings provides a detailed presentation of the results for each of the 53 questions in the 2006 survey that has been included in the survey instrument for multiple years. These core survey questions can be grouped as questions regarding:

- Familiarity with The Center for Community Studies
- Residence in Jefferson County – Longevity and Intent to Remain
- Quality of Life Issues in Jefferson County
- Technology-related Items
- Fort Drum Impact
- Miscellaneous “Life in Jefferson County” Items

The results for each of these core survey questions (53 separate core questions) are presented in this section of the report with the following organizational structure:

- (1) The results for each year are presented in a table for an analysis of trends or changes
- (2) A six year average has been calculated (when possible) for comparison of the magnitude of the 2006 result
- (3) The 2006 results for each of these 53 questions have been cross-tabulated by each of the demographic factors of gender, age, education level, and household income level (total of over 200 cross-tabulations). Significant correlations are highlighted throughout.

Technical Comments for Interpretation of these Results

(For the Statistically Interested)

In a typical year, over 200 copies of this report are produced and disseminated for free to citizens of Northern New York by The Center for Community Studies. This wide distribution, coupled with the report being freely available as a pdf file at the Jefferson Community College website, result with 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 7th Annual Survey.

Recall that the margin of error for this survey has been stated as approximately ± 4 to ± 5 percentage points. Therefore, when a percentage is observed in one of the following tables, the appropriate interpretation is that we are 95% confident that if all Jefferson County adult residents were surveyed (rather than just the 354 that were actually surveyed), the percentage that would result for all residents would be within ± 4 to ± 5 percentage points of the sample percentage that we calculated. For example, in the first table included in this section it can be observed that 34.3% of our sample reported that they had heard of The Center before this survey. With this sample result we can infer with 95% confidence (only a 5% chance that it will not be true) that if all Jefferson County adults were asked – somewhere between 29.8% and 38.8% of the population of 82,000 adults in Jefferson County have heard of the Center (used a margin of error of $\pm 4.5\%$). This resulting interval (29.8%-38.8%) 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 to the entire adult population of Jefferson County.

As has been previously mentioned, a new addition to the 7th Annual Survey report is to investigate for significant factors that may be correlated with various quality-of-life indicators. The statistical techniques that will be applied to identify statistically significant relationships or differences will depend upon the structure of each variable (survey question) and will include Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient r , the Independent Two Sample t-Test, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), a z-test for Binomial Proportions, a Poisson Test, and the χ^2 Test for Independence. A test or correlation that results with $p < 0.05$ will be considered statistically significant.

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. Because the data for the 7th Annual Survey is based on a *sample* of 354 adult residents, as opposed to obtaining information from

every single adult resident in Jefferson County, 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 of the county 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 female residents are more likely to report that Entertainment Opportunities are getting better in Jefferson County than male residents (34.5% vs. 22.8%, respectively), the researcher would want to know if this greater satisfaction with improving entertainment opportunities rate would still be present if they interviewed every Jefferson County adult rather than just the sample of 354 adults who were actually interviewed. To answer this question, the researcher uses a test of statistical significance. The outcome of a statistical significance test 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=354 randomly selected adults from the approximately 82,000 adults in Jefferson County), then the results of these samples would not consistently show that female residents are more likely to report that Entertainment Opportunities are getting better in Jefferson County than male residents; some samples might have females higher and some have males higher. In this case, the researcher could not report *with high levels of confidence* that the female satisfaction rate is statistically significantly different than the male rate. Rather, the difference found within the one actually selected sample of size n=354 Jefferson County residents would be interpreted as small enough that it could be due simply to the random chance of sampling – *not statistically significant*.

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 female Jefferson County adults are more likely to report that Entertainment Opportunities are getting better than males, and further, if every adult were interviewed, we are confident that the population familiarity rate among females would be higher than the rate among males. One can never be 100% certain (or confident) that the result of a sample will indicate appropriately whether the population percentages are, in fact, statistically significantly different from one another or not. However, the standard confidence level is 95% (as it is with the previously described Confidence Interval) - meaning that the observed sample difference would also be found in 95 out of 100 random samples of similar size n. 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 – 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).

Note should be made between the analyses that included all 354 sampled residents versus those that involved questions that were only asked of certain subgroups (i.e. only parents asked). With only 166 persons with children under the age of 18 living in their home sampled in this study, and then partitioning by levels of some other factor such as household income level, sample sizes within specific factor/level combinations can become quite small. With these small sample sizes, extremely large sample differences must be found to be considered statistically significant (p<0.05). For this reason, as well as to condense the voluminous amount of data and statistics that are included in these tables into a manageable and useful size, most of the categorical variables have been collapsed throughout any following correlational analyses. For example, annual household income levels have been collapsed into the following three categories: Less than \$25,000, \$25,000-\$50,000, and Over \$50,000. Another caution: the statistics reported in the correlative tables (correlating with Gender, Age, etc.) are percentages of the sampled subgroups. To determine the sample size for each subgroup – to avoid over interpretation – the reader should refer to the preceding socio-demographic tables that provide counts, or sample sizes. Again, findings should be considered with sample sizes in mind. The statistical tests of significance take into consideration these varying sample sizes.

The following sample sizes were collected within each of the four key demographic variable subgroups:

By Gender	n	By Age	n	By Education	n	By Income	n
Males	108	18-29	72	No College	121	Less than \$25,000	86
Females	246	30-59	218	Some College	127	\$25,000-\$50,000	109
		60+	64	4+ Year Degree	82	More than \$50,000	111

Finally, the reader can observe highlighted results in each cross-tabulation table by noting the shaded cells – shaded in gray. The shaded cells designate statistically significant relationships. To determine which

differences and relationships are, in fact, statistically significant (recall, again that this means a difference or relationship that is large or strong enough to be 95% confident that it is not simply due to the random chance of sampling based upon the sizes of the selected sample) the 5% significance level has been used ($p < 0.05$).

We now begin with the presentation of seven years of quality of life results for Jefferson County residents.

Familiarity with The Center for Community Studies

Have you ever heard of The Center for Community Studies at JCC?

Heard of The Center for Community Studies?	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Yes					40.0%	32.5%	34.3%	36.3%
No					60.0%	67.5%	65.7%	63.8%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	38.6%
Females	29.7%

By Age	% Yes
18-29	38.2%
30-59	29.9%
60+	40.9%

By Education	% Yes
No College	28.7%
Some College	32.6%
4+ Year Degree	45.1%

By Income	% Yes
Less than \$25,000	21.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	39.6%
More than \$50,000	40.2%

Recognition of The Center among Jefferson County residents remains at about one in three (34.3%) adults having heard of the community-based research institute. Recognition is significantly related to both education and income levels, with those residents with higher education levels and from households with greater annual income most familiar with The Center.

Have you ever heard of this annual survey?

Heard of this survey?	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Yes	33.9%	27.8%	20.1%	22.2%	24.4%	23.7%	26.3%	25.4%
No	66.1%	72.2%	79.9%	77.8%	75.6%	76.3%	73.7%	74.7%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	28.2%
Females	24.3%

By Age	% Yes
18-29	23.6%
30-59	22.3%
60+	40.8%

By Education	% Yes
No College	19.5%
Some College	25.2%
4+ Year Degree	38.1%

By Income	% Yes
Less than \$25,000	20.1%
\$25,000-\$50,000	26.8%
More than \$50,000	33.6%

Familiarity with this annual survey among Jefferson County residents remains at about one in four (25.4%) adults having heard of this survey. Recognition is significantly related to both age and education, with older residents and those with higher education levels most familiar with the survey.

Residence in Jefferson County – Longevity and Intent to Remain

How long have you lived in Jefferson County?

How Long Lived Here	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
<1 Year	1.2%	3.2%	6.8%	3.2%	7.1%	4.0%	4.4%	4.3%
1-3 Years	12.9%	14.9%	11.1%	12.6%	13.7%	9.1%	10.0%	12.4%
4-6 Years	4.2%	8.4%	4.1%	6.1%	8.1%	10.0%	9.0%	6.8%
7+ Years	81.7%	73.4%	77.9%	78.1%	71.1%	77.0%	76.6%	76.5%

By Gender	7+ Years
Males	76.5%
Females	76.7%

By Age	7+ Years
18-29	67.7%
30-59	75.2%
60+	92.2%

By Education	7+ Years
No College	90.8%
Some College	68.7%
4+ Year Degree	63.2%

By Income	7+ Years
Less than \$25,000	84.9%
\$25,000-\$50,000	69.7%
More than \$50,000	71.4%

Do you expect that you will still be living in Jefferson County in 5 years?

Plan to Stay	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Yes	78.1%	65.8%	73.0%	72.7%	66.1%	72.1%	74.2%	71.3%
No	19.6%	28.8%	21.0%	22.6%	28.3%	19.4%	18.2%	23.3%
Unsure	2.3%	5.4%	6.0%	4.7%	5.6%	8.4%	7.6%	5.4%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	71.3%
Females	77.3%

By Age	% Yes
18-29	58.1%
30-59	75.3%
60+	92.7%

By Education	% Yes
No College	87.4%
Some College	69.8%
4+ Year Degree	61.1%

By Income	% Yes
Less than \$25,000	70.9%
\$25,000-\$50,000	74.0%
More than \$50,000	73.2%

If you plan to be still living in Jefferson County in 5 years, what is the primary reason for staying?

Why stay?	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 2-6 Average
Family		62.4%	70.2%	69.0%	72.3%	81.0%	70.0%	71.0%
Employment		30.6%	19.0%	19.2%	14.8%	12.8%	14.2%	19.3%
Other		7.0%	10.9%	11.8%	12.9%	6.1%	15.8%	9.7%

By Gender	% Fam.
Males	61.4%
Females	78.4%

By Age	% Fam.
18-29	58.9%
30-59	72.5%
60+	73.6%

By Education	% Fam.
No College	71.1%
Some College	65.3%
4+ Year Degree	71.2%

By Income	% Fam.
Less than \$25,000	78.8%
\$25,000-\$50,000	67.3%
More than \$50,000	65.4%

If you do not plan to be still living in Jefferson County in 5 years, what is the primary reason for leaving?

Why leave?	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 2-6 Average
Military		60.7%	62.6%	50.9%	29.7%	23.4%	32.5%	45.5%
Employment		23.6%	11.6%	27.8%	27.5%	24.6%	30.3%	23.0%
Other		15.7%	25.7%	21.3%	42.8%	52.0%	37.1%	31.5%

By Gender	% Mil.
Males	18.3%
Females	53.7%

By Age	% Mil.
18-29	24.2%
30-59	45.0%
60+	0.0%

By Education	% Mil.
No College	13.0%
Some College	37.6%
4+ Year Degree	39.7%

By Income	% Mil.
Less than \$25,000	7.7%
\$25,000-\$50,000	56.8%
More than \$50,000	34.7%

Over three-fourths (76.6%) of the Jefferson County adult population has lived in the county for more than seven years, similar to the rate that has been reported in the first six years of this study. Almost 75% of residents plan to still be living in the county five years from now - the highest rate since 2000 with the lowest rate ever recorded (18.2%) of those who indicate they do not plan to stay. However, it is worth noting that younger residents (under 30 years old) and those residents with higher education levels were more likely to respond they either do not plan to be, or are unsure if they will be, living in the county five years from now.

Quality of Life Issues in Jefferson County

The table below summarizes the responses of the 21 *Trends in Issues* questions asked in 2006.

Trends in Issues in Jefferson County – Year 2006 (table entries are %'s)

Issue or Characteristic	Getting Better	Staying the Same	Getting Worse	Don't Know
1. Opportunities for youth	29	38	18	15
2. Cultural / entertainment opportunities	28	51	14	7
3. Cost of energy	1	6	88	5
4. Health care access	33	35	25	7
5. Health care quality	35	40	19	6
6. Access to higher education	43	37	11	9
7. Internet access	58	23	6	13
8. Recreational opportunities	38	44	11	7
9. Quality of the environment	23	48	24	6
10. Local government	9	46	29	16
11. Real-estate taxes	6	20	58	16
12. The downtown of Watertown	27	29	38	7
13. Policing and crime control	36	40	18	6
14. Availability of good jobs	22	30	42	8
15. Shopping opportunities	81	11	5	2
16. Quality of K-12 education	38	29	13	20
17. The overall state of the local economy	35	28	33	4
18. The overall quality of life in the area	35	47	16	3
19. Availability of goods and services in the area	51	38	6	5
20. Availability of care for the elderly	28	32	17	23
21. Availability of housing	20	15	57	7

Those items rated most negatively in 2006 are as follows:

Issues perceived as *getting worse*

	In 2006 % Indicate Getting Worse
Cost of energy	88%
Real estate taxes	58%
Availability of housing	57%

Clearly, the cost of energy, as well as real estate taxes and housing availability, are of most concern to the residents of Jefferson County. Items rated most positively in 2006 are as follows:

Issues perceived as *getting better*

	In 2006 % Indicate Getting Better
Shopping opportunities	81%
Internet access	58%
Availability of goods and services in the area	51%
Access to higher education	43%

With the recent expansion of Fort Drum and the associated development that has transpired in the county, shopping opportunities and availability of goods and services have been rated at all time highs among Jefferson County residents. As has been true for many years, Internet access and access to higher education are also commonly perceived as improving in the Jefferson County region over the past year. Items perceived as most stable include the following:

Issues most often perceived *about the same*

	In 2006 % Indicate Staying the Same
Cultural/entertainment opportunities	51%
Quality of the environment	48%
Overall quality of life	47%
Local government	46%
Recreational opportunities	44%

The overall quality of life, the environment, recreation, entertainment, and cultural opportunities, and local government – all issues not typically associated with job and economic issues – are most commonly perceived as unchanged in the past year by Jefferson County residents.

An investigation for trends in responses regarding quality of life issues among Jefferson County residents will now be completed by comparing responses over the seven years of the survey. **The methodology in completing the survey each year has remained consistent, resulting in a rich set of sociological data describing our community – richer than that owned by any other community known by The Center.**

The following tables provide the percentage of the interviewed respondents who indicated that each of the 21 key quality of life characteristics was getting better, or was getting worse, respectively. Review of the data provided in each row of the table will provide a picture of the trend in the attitude about that particular characteristic over a seven-year span. Sample sizes varied slightly from year to year and from question to question (some people did not answer all questions). A rule of thumb for determining whether a difference in any row is “statistically significant,” however, is that **any variation by 6% or more could be considered statistically significant** (a variation that is not simply due to the chance of sampling).

The shaded pairs of adjacent cells in each of the following two tables are notable variations in responses of Jefferson County residents between April 2005 and April 2006.

Trends in Issues in Jefferson County – Years 2000-2006
% Indicating “Getting Better” Each Year

Issue or Characteristic	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1. Opportunities for youth	31	26	17	21	18	22	29
2. Cultural / entertainment opportunities	36	26	32	28	26	26	28
3. Cost of energy	3	2	7	1	2	2	1
4. Health care access	36	25	25	32	22	22	33
5. Health care quality	33	22	26	31	21	20	35
6. Access to higher education	62	45	50	48	41	34	43
7. Internet access	75	61	65	70	49	44	58
8. Recreational opportunities	44	37	35	36	27	29	37
9. Quality of the environment	30	23	19	24	22	22	23
10. Local government	17	10	12	14	13	12	9
11. Real-estate taxes	12	5	5	6	5	6	5
12. The downtown of Watertown	33	25	22	25	16	22	27
13. Policing and crime control	35	39	31	39	33	19	36
14. Availability of good jobs	17	5	7	9	8	10	22
15. Shopping opportunities	51	40	30	39	38	46	81
16. Quality of K-12 education	50	31	33	37	31	31	38
17. The overall state of the local economy	28	9	12	13	12	15	35
18. The overall quality of life in the area	41	21	23	25	16	19	35
19. Availability of goods and services in the area			28	37	28	24	51
20. Availability of care for the elderly					15	15	28
21. Availability of housing						12	20

Trends in Issues in Jefferson County – Years 2000-2006
% Indicating “Getting Worse” Each Year

Issue or Characteristic	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1. Opportunities for youth	18	32	31	27	22	16	18
2. Cultural / entertainment opportunities	13	21	13	17	9	7	14
3. Cost of energy	77	84	65	77	68	78	88
4. Health care access	19	29	21	25	19	13	25
5. Health care quality	21	25	14	19	11	9	19
6. Access to higher education	3	8	6	9	4	5	11
7. Internet access	1	14	3	3	4	5	6
8. Recreational opportunities	10	13	12	10	8	7	11
9. Quality of the environment	20	20	16	25	10	16	24
10. Local government	23	34	28	31	24	19	29
11. Real-estate taxes	41	55	51	55	47	39	58
12. The downtown of Watertown	39	45	47	38	45	42	38
13. Policing and crime control	14	14	10	11	8	18	18
14. Availability of good jobs	52	81	70	69	63	49	41
15. Shopping opportunities	13	19	22	25	10	6	5
16. Quality of K-12 education	9	15	8	15	5	7	13
17. The overall state of the local economy	31	69	58	61	49	32	33
18. The overall quality of life in the area	11	30	16	19	16	11	16
19. Availability of goods and services in the area			16	13	9	5	6
20. Availability of care for the elderly					15	16	17
21. Availability of housing						54	57

2006 appeared to be a year of change or at least more polarized opinions compared to 2005, with lower rates of “staying the same” in 20 of the 21 quality of life categories. Four categories; healthcare access, healthcare quality, access to higher education, and K-12 education, saw statistically significant increases in both the perceptions of “getting better” **and** “getting worse,” although in each case the positive increase either equaled or outweighed the negative. Eleven categories had significant positive changes, with more residents indicating they were getting better and only five of the 21 categories had significant “getting worse” only changes; cultural/entertainment opportunities, cost of energy, quality of the environment, local government and real estate taxes.

In summary, significant changes in perceptions of Jefferson County residents regarding the quality of life in the region in 2006, with significant correlations that were found, include:

Economic-related Quality of Life Findings:

In 2006, Jefferson County residents, regardless of gender, age, income, and education level, reported the highest rates of positives ever recorded on every single economic-related indicator except housing and cost of energy.

- Availability of Good Jobs: Residents reported the highest rate of availability of good jobs as *getting better* that has been recorded throughout the seven years of data collection (22% reported getting better, up from 10% in 2005, and dramatically higher from the lowest rate of 5% in 2001); simultaneously, 2006 had the lowest rate of availability of good jobs as *getting worse* that has ever been recorded in the annual survey.
- Shopping Opportunities: Over four out of five (81%) residents believe that shopping opportunities are *getting better*. This *getting better* rate has never previously been larger than 51% with a previous six year average (2000-2005) of 41%.
- Overall State of Local Economy: Residents are more than twice as likely to report that the overall state of the local economy is *getting better* than they were in 2005, increased by 20% from 15% in 2005 to 35% in 2006 and more than double the six year average of 15%. For the first time, a greater percentage report that the overall state of the local economy is *getting better* than report that it is *getting worse*.
- Availability of Housing: In 2006, residents are still much more likely to believe that housing availability is *getting worse* than *getting better* (57% versus 20%). Higher income, more highly educated residents between the ages of 30-59 are the most likely to view the availability of housing as getting worse.
- Cost of Energy: While the cost of energy has been viewed by the majority as *getting worse* every year of this survey, in 2006 that opinion reached an all-time high of 88% of the respondents, regardless of age, education level or income.

Lifestyle-related (less economic) Quality of Life Findings:

- Opportunities for Youth: In 2006, residents reported the highest rate of “opportunities for youth” *getting better* since 2000 and interestingly, those most likely to report that opportunities were getting better were the younger respondents.
- Healthcare Access and Healthcare Quality: 2006 has the highest rate ever reported of healthcare quality *getting better* and the highest rate since 2000 of healthcare access *getting better*, with more than one-third of respondents (35% and 33%) giving a positive response. However, at the same time those reporting healthcare access and quality as *getting worse* both nearly doubled (from 13% to 25% for access and from 9% to 19% for quality). While clearly more respondents view healthcare as *getting better*

than *getting worse* (more than one in three vs. less than one in four), there is a shift away from the middle seen in other years when it comes to healthcare access and quality, with fewer respondents reporting “staying the same.”

Cultural/Entertainment/ Recreational Opportunities:	Residents are over three times as likely to report that recreational opportunities are <i>getting better</i> than <i>getting worse</i> (37% versus 11%), and they are two times more likely to report that cultural/entertainment opportunities are <i>getting better</i> than <i>getting worse</i> (28% versus 14%). These rates have remained fairly stable over the seven-year period of this survey. Younger males are the least likely to report cultural and entertainment opportunities are improving, however, perceptions regarding recreational opportunities were not correlated to any demographic factors.
Access to Higher Education:	Like healthcare, perceptions regarding access to higher education have moved from middle ground in 2006, with 37% reporting “staying the same” vs. 55% in 2005. Of that shift, the majority shifted positively, with 43% indicating that access to higher education is <i>getting better</i> vs. 34% last year some, however, went the other way viewing it as <i>getting worse</i> 11% vs 5% in 2005. Residents are still more than four times as likely to report access to higher education <i>getting better</i> than <i>getting worse</i> .
Downtown Watertown:	In 2006, again, more respondents indicated that downtown Watertown was improving than the previous year, 27% vs. 22%, and fewer responded it was “ <i>getting worse</i> ”, 38% (the lowest rate ever) vs. 42 %. If the trend of the past three years continues, the future may see positive perceptions of downtown Watertown reach at least an equal footing and perhaps surpass the negative.
Policing and Crime Control:	Policing and Crime control bounced back this year, nearly doubling to 36% of respondents in 2006, indicating that policing and crime control are <i>getting better</i> from an all time low perception of “ <i>getting better</i> ” in 2005 (19%). In 2006 residents are twice as likely to view policing and crime control as <i>getting better</i> than <i>getting worse</i> , with residents under 30-years-old and over 60-years-old the most likely to perceive it as better.
Quality of K-12 Education:	K-12 education is viewed as improving by more residents than at anytime since 2001, up 7% from 2005 (38% vs 31%).
Availability of Elder Care:	The perception of availability of care for the elderly as getting better has nearly doubled from the previous two years that this question has been asked (28% vs 15%). Like the “youth opportunities” question, those most likely to be close in age to this issue were the most likely to view it positively. Older (60+), less educated and lower income residents were more likely to perceive the availability of elder care as getting better. Older residents were also the ones most likely to view healthcare quality as getting better.

Review of the information in the preceding two tables leads to the observation that over the seven-year duration of the Annual Survey, there have been variations in residents' satisfaction with the area's quality of life. One method of extracting useful information from the trends presented in these tables is to compare the percentage of the respondents who indicate that the issue is *getting better* to the percentage of the respondents who indicate that the issue is *getting worse*. If the percentage indicating *Better* is larger than the percentage that indicate *Worse*, then it is a positive statement about the satisfaction level of residents with that issue. This type of analysis has been completed and summarized for each of the seven years of the Annual Survey:

- Year 2000: 12 of the 18 issues had larger *Better* % than *Worse* %
- Year 2001: 9 of the 18 issues had larger *Better* % than *Worse* %
- Year 2002: 12 of the 19 issues had larger *Better* % than *Worse* %
(a new 19th item, “availability of goods and services,” was added in 2002)
- Year 2003: 12 of the 19 issues had larger *Better* % than *Worse* %
- Year 2004: 13 of the 20 issues had larger *Better* % than *Worse* %

- Year 2005: (a new 20th item, "availability of care for the elderly," was added in 2004)
13 of the 21 issues had larger *Better* % than *Worse* %
- Year 2006: (a new 21st item, "availability of housing," was added in 2005)
14 of the 21 issues had larger *Better* % than *Worse* %

In summary, it appears that the satisfaction of Jefferson County residents with the quality of life in the region has significantly improved over the past year and has returned to comparable levels of the highest surveyed year to date, year 2000, and has surpassed 2000 in areas related to jobs and the economy.

Following are the detailed tables and results for the 21 items discussed previously. As noted in the methodology section, a year 1-6 average appears next to each section and each of the items has been cross-tabulated by gender, age, education and income. Shading indicates that there is a significant correlation between that factor and the answer indicated. For a more complete discussion of methodology and assistance with interpretation please refer to the methodology and technical comments sections at the beginning of this report.

Opportunities for Youth:

Opportunities Youth	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	31.1%	25.9%	17.4%	21.4%	17.7%	22.4%	28.9%	22.7%
Same	41.8%	35.1%	39.2%	36.9%	43.9%	47.3%	38.1%	40.7%
Worse	18.0%	31.8%	31.1%	26.7%	22.2%	16.4%	18.1%	24.4%
Don't Know	9.1%	7.2%	12.3%	15.0%	16.3%	14.0%	14.9%	12.3%

By Gender	% Better
Males	32.1%
Females	25.6%

By Age	% Better
18-29	33.7%
30-59	31.2%
60+	16.5%

By Education	% Better
No College	30.7%
Some College	28.8%
4+ Year Degree	26.7%

By Income	% Better
Less than \$25,000	32.7%
\$25,000-\$50,000	29.8%
More than \$50,000	25.9%

Cultural/Entertainment Opportunities:

Entertainment Opportunities	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	36.2%	26.1%	32.3%	28.4%	26.2%	25.5%	28.4%	29.1%
Same	45.0%	48.3%	47.0%	48.0%	57.9%	56.9%	51.1%	50.5%
Worse	13.3%	20.6%	13.5%	16.7%	9.2%	7.4%	13.7%	13.5%
Don't Know	5.4%	5.0%	7.2%	6.9%	6.7%	10.2%	6.8%	6.9%

By Gender	% Better
Males	22.8%
Females	34.5%

By Age	% Better
18-29	21.2%
30-59	27.0%
60+	42.0%

By Education	% Better
No College	35.6%
Some College	21.0%
4+ Year Degree	28.3%

By Income	% Better
Less than \$25,000	34.1%
\$25,000-\$50,000	26.8%
More than \$50,000	25.4%

Cost of Energy:

Cost of Energy	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	2.8%	1.6%	6.9%	1.2%	1.7%	2.0%	1.5%	2.7%
Same	12.8%	7.8%	17.4%	10.0%	21.2%	12.9%	5.8%	13.7%
Worse	77.0%	83.8%	65.3%	76.7%	67.8%	78.0%	88.0%	74.8%
Don't Know	7.4%	6.8%	10.4%	12.1%	9.3%	7.1%	4.7%	8.9%

By Gender	% Worse
Males	89.5%
Females	86.3%

By Age	% Worse
18-29	80.6%
30-59	91.4%
60+	88.4%

By Education	% Worse
No College	85.4%
Some College	88.2%
4+ Year Degree	90.1%

By Income	% Worse
Less than \$25,000	78.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	88.9%
More than \$50,000	93.6%

Healthcare Access:

Healthcare Access	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	36.2%	25.2%	24.8%	31.5%	22.0%	21.7%	32.5%	26.9%
Same	39.8%	40.9%	47.5%	35.8%	45.2%	54.6%	35.2%	44.0%
Worse	18.8%	29.2%	21.4%	25.4%	19.5%	13.3%	25.0%	21.3%
Don't Know	5.3%	4.7%	6.3%	7.3%	13.3%	10.4%	7.3%	7.9%

By Gender	% Better
Males	30.8%
Females	34.4%

By Age	% Better
18-29	29.6%
30-59	30.6%
60+	41.7%

By Education	% Better
No College	32.1%
Some College	33.8%
4+ Year Degree	31.0%

By Income	% Better
Less than \$25,000	26.8%
\$25,000-\$50,000	33.0%
More than \$50,000	39.3%

Healthcare Quality:

Healthcare Quality	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	33.5%	21.9%	26.0%	31.4%	20.9%	19.8%	34.9%	25.6%
Same	37.9%	48.1%	53.8%	43.2%	56.7%	58.4%	40.0%	49.7%
Worse	21.4%	24.8%	14.1%	19.0%	10.5%	9.1%	18.8%	16.5%
Don't Know	7.2%	5.2%	6.0%	6.5%	11.9%	12.6%	6.4%	8.2%

By Gender	% Better
Males	37.6%
Females	31.9%

By Age	% Better
18-29	31.2%
30-59	31.7%
60+	48.2%

By Education	% Better
No College	40.2%
Some College	30.5%
4+ Year Degree	37.2%

By Income	% Better
Less than \$25,000	30.8%
\$25,000-\$50,000	40.9%
More than \$50,000	36.5%

Access to Higher Education:

Access to Higher Education	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	62.4%	45.1%	50.0%	47.9%	41.4%	33.7%	42.8%	46.8%
Same	27.0%	42.2%	35.5%	36.5%	47.1%	54.7%	36.7%	40.5%
Worse	3.4%	8.3%	6.3%	8.6%	4.4%	5.4%	11.5%	6.1%
Don't Know	7.2%	4.4%	8.2%	7.0%	7.1%	6.3%	9.0%	6.7%

By Gender	% Better
Males	39.6%
Females	46.2%

By Age	% Better
18-29	47.1%
30-59	37.0%
60+	52.5%

By Education	% Better
No College	50.3%
Some College	41.5%
4+ Year Degree	34.2%

By Income	% Better
Less than \$25,000	52.2%
\$25,000-\$50,000	41.3%
More than \$50,000	36.6%

Access to the Internet:

Internet Access	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	74.7%	60.9%	64.7%	69.7%	49.0%	44.2%	57.9%	60.5%
Same	8.0%	11.7%	18.6%	12.9%	31.4%	32.7%	22.9%	19.2%
Worse	1.3%	14.5%	3.5%	3.3%	3.6%	4.6%	5.7%	5.1%
Don't Know	16.1%	12.9%	13.3%	14.2%	16.0%	18.6%	13.5%	15.2%

By Gender	% Better
Males	55.6%
Females	60.5%

By Age	% Better
18-29	60.1%
30-59	65.3%
60+	35.0%

By Education	% Better
No College	47.3%
Some College	64.6%
4+ Year Degree	63.3%

By Income	% Better
Less than \$25,000	51.7%
\$25,000-\$50,000	53.5%
More than \$50,000	68.1%

Recreational Opportunities:

Recreation Opportunities	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	43.7%	36.6%	34.6%	36.5%	27.3%	29.4%	37.5%	34.7%
Same	42.8%	46.2%	47.2%	50.2%	59.6%	57.7%	44.5%	50.6%
Worse	9.6%	12.8%	12.5%	9.9%	7.9%	6.8%	11.4%	9.9%
Don't Know	3.9%	4.4%	5.7%	3.5%	5.3%	6.2%	6.6%	4.8%

By Gender	% Better
Males	36.3%
Females	38.8%

By Age	% Better
18-29	36.8%
30-59	37.0%
60+	39.8%

By Education	% Better
No College	40.3%
Some College	32.9%
4+ Year Degree	40.9%

By Income	% Better
Less than \$25,000	31.3%
\$25,000-\$50,000	38.5%
More than \$50,000	38.9%

Quality of the Environment:

Quality of Environment	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	30.4%	22.9%	19.4%	24.1%	22.5%	21.7%	22.8%	23.5%
Same	47.6%	54.2%	61.8%	45.8%	61.1%	55.5%	47.7%	54.3%
Worse	19.7%	19.8%	16.0%	24.9%	10.2%	16.0%	23.8%	17.8%
Don't Know	2.2%	3.1%	2.8%	5.2%	6.2%	6.8%	5.7%	4.4%

By Gender	% Worse
Males	21.9%
Females	25.8%

By Age	% Worse
18-29	27.0%
30-59	25.5%
60+	14.7%

By Education	% Worse
No College	21.7%
Some College	24.4%
4+ Year Degree	28.2%

By Income	% Worse
Less than \$25,000	24.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	21.0%
More than \$50,000	29.6%

Local Government:

Local Government	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	16.8%	10.4%	12.0%	13.7%	13.2%	11.8%	9.1%	13.0%
Same	48.4%	47.4%	53.8%	41.3%	48.7%	53.4%	45.9%	48.8%
Worse	22.7%	33.8%	27.8%	31.4%	23.5%	18.8%	28.6%	26.3%
Don't Know	12.1%	8.4%	6.4%	13.6%	14.7%	16.0%	16.4%	11.9%

By Gender	% Worse
Males	31.9%
Females	25.1%

By Age	% Worse
18-29	27.7%
30-59	31.5%
60+	21.9%

By Education	% Worse
No College	37.5%
Some College	24.2%
4+ Year Degree	19.2%

By Income	% Worse
Less than \$25,000	31.2%
\$25,000-\$50,000	19.9%
More than \$50,000	31.9%

Real Estate Taxes:

Real Estate Taxes	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	11.6%	5.4%	4.6%	6.1%	5.2%	6.2%	5.5%	6.5%
Same	30.5%	24.3%	22.9%	16.7%	24.7%	28.6%	20.3%	24.6%
Worse	40.6%	54.6%	51.0%	54.8%	47.4%	38.8%	58.4%	47.9%
Don't Know	17.3%	15.7%	21.6%	22.5%	22.6%	26.4%	15.8%	21.0%

By Gender	% Worse
Males	60.7%
Females	56.0%

By Age	% Worse
18-29	53.3%
30-59	64.3%
60+	49.3%

By Education	% Worse
No College	57.9%
Some College	59.0%
4+ Year Degree	58.7%

By Income	% Worse
Less than \$25,000	55.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	54.6%
More than \$50,000	60.2%

The Downtown of Watertown:

Downtown Watertown	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	33.0%	24.5%	22.1%	24.7%	15.6%	22.2%	26.7%	23.7%
Same	25.2%	26.4%	26.1%	29.9%	31.1%	29.1%	28.6%	28.0%
Worse	38.8%	45.2%	47.4%	37.9%	45.4%	41.8%	37.6%	42.8%
Don't Know	3.0%	3.9%	4.4%	7.5%	7.9%	6.9%	7.1%	5.6%

By Gender	% Better
Males	17.1%
Females	37.0%

By Age	% Better
18-29	30.6%
30-59	25.5%
60+	24.4%

By Education	% Better
No College	23.3%
Some College	28.6%
4+ Year Degree	28.2%

By Income	% Better
Less than \$25,000	24.0%
\$25,000-\$50,000	31.4%
More than \$50,000	22.3%

Policing and Crime Control:

Policing and Crime Control	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	34.8%	39.1%	31.0%	38.9%	32.7%	18.9%	36.2%	32.6%
Same	47.6%	40.6%	51.8%	42.2%	51.1%	53.9%	40.5%	47.9%
Worse	13.8%	14.4%	10.4%	11.0%	8.3%	18.1%	17.7%	12.7%
Don't Know	3.9%	5.9%	6.8%	7.8%	8.0%	9.2%	5.7%	6.9%

By Gender	% Better
Males	38.3%
Females	33.8%

By Age	% Better
18-29	44.9%
30-59	29.5%
60+	42.7%

By Education	% Better
No College	41.3%
Some College	36.3%
4+ Year Degree	29.2%

By Income	% Better
Less than \$25,000	45.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	36.7%
More than \$50,000	29.5%

Availability of Good Jobs:

Availability of Good Jobs	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	16.6%	4.5%	6.7%	9.2%	7.7%	9.9%	21.6%	9.1%
Same	27.0%	10.9%	18.2%	16.4%	23.7%	35.5%	29.5%	22.0%
Worse	52.1%	80.8%	69.6%	69.2%	62.8%	49.3%	41.1%	64.0%
Don't Know	4.3%	3.8%	5.5%	5.2%	5.8%	5.4%	7.8%	5.0%

By Gender	% Better
Males	22.2%
Females	20.9%

By Age	% Better
18-29	21.8%
30-59	20.2%
60+	24.9%

By Education	% Better
No College	22.7%
Some College	18.9%
4+ Year Degree	24.0%

By Income	% Better
Less than \$25,000	25.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	22.0%
More than \$50,000	18.2%

Shopping Opportunities:

Shopping Opportunities	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	51.0%	40.2%	30.1%	38.5%	37.6%	46.2%	80.9%	40.6%
Same	34.1%	40.2%	46.0%	36.2%	46.3%	43.7%	11.7%	41.1%
Worse	13.2%	18.6%	21.7%	24.6%	10.0%	6.1%	5.3%	15.7%
Don't Know	1.6%	0.9%	2.2%	0.7%	6.2%	4.0%	2.1%	2.6%

By Gender	% Better
Males	80.1%
Females	81.8%

By Age	% Better
18-29	77.9%
30-59	86.8%
60+	69.0%

By Education	% Better
No College	74.8%
Some College	82.5%
4+ Year Degree	86.4%

By Income	% Better
Less than \$25,000	77.1%
\$25,000-\$50,000	77.6%
More than \$50,000	86.4%

Quality of K-12 Education:

K12 Education	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	49.6%	30.8%	32.8%	36.6%	30.9%	30.7%	37.8%	35.2%
Same	25.1%	39.5%	43.8%	27.6%	40.2%	42.2%	29.0%	36.4%
Worse	9.3%	15.3%	8.5%	15.0%	5.4%	7.5%	12.7%	10.2%
Don't Know	16.1%	14.4%	15.0%	20.8%	23.5%	19.6%	20.5%	18.2%

By Gender	% Better
Males	36.5%
Females	39.3%

By Age	% Better
18-29	37.3%
30-59	37.9%
60+	38.4%

By Education	% Better
No College	46.7%
Some College	29.7%
4+ Year Degree	38.9%

By Income	% Better
Less than \$25,000	38.4%
\$25,000-\$50,000	36.0%
More than \$50,000	38.5%

Overall State of the Local Economy:

Overall Local Economy	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	27.6%	9.2%	12.0%	12.7%	12.3%	15.1%	34.7%	14.8%
Same	37.1%	18.6%	26.2%	23.4%	32.1%	45.5%	28.2%	30.5%
Worse	31.5%	69.3%	58.5%	60.6%	48.7%	32.1%	32.6%	50.1%
Don't Know	3.7%	3.0%	3.4%	3.3%	6.9%	7.3%	4.5%	4.6%

By Gender	% Better
Males	39.0%
Females	30.0%

By Age	% Better
18-29	35.0%
30-59	34.9%
60+	33.5%

By Education	% Better
No College	33.5%
Some College	31.3%
4+ Year Degree	39.5%

By Income	% Better
Less than \$25,000	26.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	42.1%
More than \$50,000	32.7%

Overall Quality of Life in the Area:

Quality of Life Locally	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Better	40.9%	20.7%	23.0%	25.5%	15.6%	18.6%	34.9%	24.1%
Same	46.9%	46.4%	57.7%	52.7%	62.6%	67.0%	46.7%	55.6%
Worse	10.8%	29.9%	16.2%	18.9%	16.5%	10.6%	15.7%	17.2%
Don't Know	1.4%	3.0%	3.1%	2.9%	5.3%	3.8%	2.6%	3.3%

By Gender	% Better
Males	33.0%
Females	37.1%

By Age	% Better
18-29	27.6%
30-59	32.7%
60+	50.8%

By Education	% Better
No College	37.4%
Some College	30.0%
4+ Year Degree	37.3%

By Income	% Better
Less than \$25,000	34.7%
\$25,000-\$50,000	38.8%
More than \$50,000	35.2%

Availability of Goods and Services in the Area:

Goods/services	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 3-6 Average
Better			27.8%	36.9%	28.4%	24.1%	51.2%	29.3%
Same			54.6%	48.8%	59.3%	67.1%	37.9%	57.5%
Worse			15.9%	12.7%	8.6%	5.2%	6.0%	10.6%
Don't Know			1.8%	1.6%	3.7%	3.7%	4.9%	2.7%

By Gender	% Better
Males	50.4%
Females	52.2%

By Age	% Better
18-29	47.8%
30-59	53.1%
60+	50.8%

By Education	% Better
No College	50.4%
Some College	49.1%
4+ Year Degree	60.7%

By Income	% Better
Less than \$25,000	46.1%
\$25,000-\$50,000	52.1%
More than \$50,000	58.5%

Availability of Care for the Elderly:

Care for Elderly	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 5-6 Average
Better					14.7%	15.2%	27.5%	15.0%
Same					37.3%	41.0%	32.4%	39.2%
Worse					14.6%	16.0%	16.9%	15.3%
Don't Know					33.4%	27.9%	23.2%	30.7%

By Gender	% Better
Males	28.4%
Females	26.6%

By Age	% Better
18-29	25.1%
30-59	21.4%
60+	47.3%

By Education	% Better
No College	45.3%
Some College	17.4%
4+ Year Degree	16.1%

By Income	% Better
Less than \$25,000	35.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	24.1%
More than \$50,000	19.9%

Availability of Housing:

Housing Availability	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Year 6 Average
Better						11.8%	20.3%	11.8%
Same						27.6%	15.2%	27.6%
Worse						54.1%	57.3%	54.1%
Don't Know						6.5%	7.2%	6.5%

By Gender	% Worse
Males	57.5%
Females	57.1%

By Age	% Worse
18-29	57.1%
30-59	63.3%
60+	41.4%

By Education	% Worse
No College	46.8%
Some College	64.2%
4+ Year Degree	68.2%

By Income	% Worse
Less than \$25,000	49.1%
\$25,000-\$50,000	63.1%
More than \$50,000	65.6%

The next core quality of life section of the survey asked respondents to identify *the most important issue facing residents of Jefferson County at the present time*. (Note: This was a completely open-ended question; no prompts were given.)

The most important issue facing residents of Jefferson County

Most Important Issue	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Employment, loss of jobs, etc.	-	48%	50%	37%	44%	30%	18%
Housing	-	-	-	-	-	8%	17%
Energy issues – cost and availability	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
Taxes	-	4%	10%	13%	14%	9%	11%
Economic decline, loss of industry, etc.	-	27%	10%	13%	10%	14%	9%
Military/civilian relations	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%
Healthcare issues	-	-	4%	5%	5%	3%	6%
Crime	-	-	-	-	-	5%	4%
Drug related problems	-	-	-	-	-	5%	3%
Education, problems with schools	-	3%	3%	8%	-	2%	3%

In 2006, there were dramatic decreases in the percentage of respondents indicating job and economic decline as the most important issues facing Jefferson County, while housing and energy issues moved into the top three most important issues.

The next section contained a set of two open-ended questions intended to elicit perceptions of the overall quality of life in the region. The 21 items in the preceding section identified the progress on issues: are things getting better or worse? However, the fact that an issue is perceived as getting better did not necessarily suggest that people are satisfied with that issue. To identify the aspects of life in Jefferson County that the residents value the most, the question was directly asked.

Best Aspects of Jefferson County - The three best aspects of living in Jefferson County reported were the small/rural communities, the people, and the environment/natural resources.

Main Drawbacks of Jefferson County - The main drawbacks of living in Jefferson County were employment issues (identified by approximately one in five) and the weather (identified by approximately one in seven). As always, job-related issues were reported as the main drawback of residence in Jefferson County; however, the rate is at the lowest rate ever recorded in The Annual Survey.

The next section contains core questions related to a variety of issues. Observations will be made providing explanation of significant relationships at appropriate breaks within the subsection and at the end of each subsection.

Technology-related Items

Do you currently have a working computer in your home?

Working Computer in Home	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Yes	62.4%	72.1%	73.8%	78.1%	74.6%	77.0%	77.7%	73.0%
No	37.6%	27.9%	26.2%	21.9%	25.4%	23.0%	22.3%	27.0%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	79.6%
Females	75.6%

By Age	% Yes
18-29	86.9%
30-59	84.5%
60+	45.8%

By Education	% Yes
No College	58.6%
Some College	86.4%
4+ Year Degree	95.6%

By Income	% Yes
Less than \$25,000	58.8%
\$25,000-\$50,000	80.4%
More than \$50,000	96.8%

If yes, how many hours per week is it usually used?

Hours/week Computer Use	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Mean	15.4	16.5	16.1	17.2	15.1	17.0	17.9	16.2
Median	11.0	14.0	10.0	14.0	10.0	10.0	14.0	
Standard Deviation	13.7	15.6	17.9	15.0	13.9	21.1	16.9	
Range	0-84	0.5-100	1-168	0-90	0-84	0-168	0-120	

By Gender	Mean
Males	18.0
Females	17.8

By Age	Mean
18-29	18.2
30-59	18.6
60+	13.7

By Education	Mean
No College	14.8
Some College	18.7
4+ Year Degree	19.7

By Income	Mean
Less than \$25,000	13.3
\$25,000-\$50,000	20.9
More than \$50,000	18.4

Do you have an Internet connection at home?

Internet at Home (among those with computer)	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Yes	89.4%	92.5%	89.8%	94.4%	91.6%	92.1%	94.5%	91.6%
No	10.6%	7.5%	10.2%	5.6%	8.4%	7.9%	5.5%	8.4%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	95.0%
Females	93.8%

By Age	% Yes
18-29	95.1%
30-59	94.2%
60+	93.9%

By Education	% Yes
No College	90.8%
Some College	93.5%
4+ Year Degree	98.4%

By Income	% Yes
Less than \$25,000	85.8%
\$25,000-\$50,000	94.7%
More than \$50,000	98.8%

If yes, what type of Internet connection do you have?

Type of Internet Connection	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 2-6 Average
Phone line (dial-up, DU)		88.2%	74.3%	66.0%	38.1%	44.4%	34.8%	62.2%
Cable		9.7%	22.3%	25.9%	38.1%	41.2%	39.4%	27.4%
DSL		0.0%	1.8%	7.4%	20.0%	11.1%	19.9%	8.1%
Satellite		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	1.3%	0.2%
Other		2.1%	1.6%	0.7%	3.8%	2.4%	4.7%	2.1%

By Gender	% DU
Males	38.7%
Females	30.1%

By Age	% DU
18-29	33.8%
30-59	32.8%
60+	47.7%

By Education	% DU
No College	50.9%
Some College	18.8%
4+ Year Degree	40.3%

By Income	% DU
Less than \$25,000	34.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	38.5%
More than \$50,000	27.2%

Do you have Internet access at work?

Internet at Work	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 2-6 Average
Yes		44.9%	49.4%	49.0%	49.4%	44.5%	41.6%	47.4%
No		35.5%	50.6%	51.0%	28.8%	28.9%	33.7%	39.0%
Don't Work		19.6%	**	**	21.8%	26.6%	24.7%	22.7%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	46.6%
Females	36.2%

By Age	% Yes
18-29	49.2%
30-59	48.7%
60+	10.8%

By Education	% Yes
No College	24.6%
Some College	39.9%
4+ Year Degree	64.7%

By Income	% Yes
Less than \$25,000	15.9%
\$25,000-\$50,000	43.7%
More than \$50,000	58.9%

Do you have Internet access at all – at home and/or at work?

Internet Home and/or Work	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 3-6 Average
Yes			72.4%	77.1%	71.1%	78.6%	81.7%	74.8%
No			27.6%	22.9%	28.9%	21.4%	18.3%	25.2%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	85.2%
Females	78.1%

By Age	% Yes
18-29	96.8%
30-59	86.7%
60+	46.1%

By Education	% Yes
No College	63.4%
Some College	89.2%
4+ Year Degree	96.6%

By Income	% Yes
Less than \$25,000	60.2%
\$25,000-\$50,000	86.7%
More than \$50,000	98.7%

Have you made an online purchase in the past year?

Online Purchase Last Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Yes	52.9%	48.8%	45.4%	58.5%	54.6%	59.3%	58.2%	53.3%
No	47.1%	51.2%	54.6%	41.5%	45.4%	40.7%	41.8%	46.8%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	61.9%
Females	54.4%

By Age	% Yes
18-29	68.6%
30-59	63.1%
60+	30.2%

By Education	% Yes
No College	28.1%
Some College	70.6%
4+ Year Degree	82.3%

By Income	% Yes
Less than \$25,000	32.4%
\$25,000-\$50,000	61.2%
More than \$50,000	81.2%

The majority of Jefferson County residents (77.7%) have a working computer in their home, with virtually all households with a computer connected to the Internet (94.5%), most commonly by either a cable (39.4%) or dial-up (34.8%) connection. The typical household in 2006 uses their computer 18 hours per week, the highest usage ever recorded. While younger residents are more likely to own a computer, almost half of those age 60+ do have a working computer in their household that is used an average of 14 hours per week. Residents who have attended at least some college are much more likely to have a computer in their home.

Jefferson County adults are highly “connected” with a combined total of 81.7% having Internet access either at home, work or both, and over half (58.2%) of all survey respondents have made an Internet purchase in the past year.

Do you personally own a cell phone?

Own Personal Cell Phone	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Year 6 Average
Yes						65.9%	71.2%	65.9%
No						34.1%	28.8%	34.1%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	70.4%
Females	72.1%

By Age	% Yes
18-29	79.1%
30-59	72.3%
60+	56.4%

By Education	% Yes
No College	54.5%
Some College	77.2%
4+ Year Degree	83.8%

By Income	% Yes
Less than \$25,000	54.1%
\$25,000-\$50,000	67.5%
More than \$50,000	89.2%

How many cell phones are used by members of your household?

# Cells in Household	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Year 6 Average
Mean						1.49	1.66	1.49
Median						1.0	2.0	
Standard Deviation						1.25	1.23	
Range						0-6	0-6	

By Gender	Mean
Males	1.72
Females	1.59

By Age	Mean
18-29	2.13
30-59	1.76
60+	0.70

By Education	Mean
No College	1.35
Some College	1.89
4+ Year Degree	1.74

By Income	Mean
Less than \$25,000	1.19
\$25,000-\$50,000	1.39
More than \$50,000	2.30

Do you know anyone in Jefferson County who has only a cell phone, no land line in their home?

Know Jefferson County Resident w/LL Only	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Yes						44.3%	52.6%	44.3%
No						55.7%	47.4%	55.7%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	55.0%
Females	50.0%

By Age	% Yes
18-29	63.9%
30-59	56.4%
60+	24.8%

By Education	% Yes
No College	43.4%
Some College	56.6%
4+ Year Degree	61.0%

By Income	% Yes
Less than \$25,000	45.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	46.9%
More than \$50,000	67.5%

Cell phone use is continuing to increase by all three recorded measures. Currently, 71.2% of residents report having a personal cell phone, with the typical resident living in a household with 1.66 cell phones in use. Over 50% of residents know someone in Jefferson County with a cell phone only and no land line. Cell phone usage appears to be gender independent (none of these measures differ significantly between males and females), however, all three measures are significantly correlated with age, education and income as follows: younger, college educated, and those living in households making more than \$50,000 annually are using cell phones the most.

Fort Drum Impact

Is your residence in Jefferson County related to either civilian or military employment at Fort Drum, either by you or a family member?

Residence related to FD?	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Yes	17.7%	24.8%	25.0%	26.3%	25.3%	21.7%	23.8%	23.5%
No	82.3%	75.2%	75.0%	73.7%	74.7%	78.3%	76.2%	76.5%

“The presence of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum since 1985 has improved the overall quality of life of Jefferson County citizens.”

FD since 1985 has (+) Quality of Life in Jeff Co	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 4-6 Average
Strongly Agree				36.6%	40.4%	35.9%	38.2%	37.6%
Agree				44.8%	42.4%	41.3%	37.9%	42.8%
Disagree				6.2%	8.3%	11.5%	12.0%	8.7%
Strongly Disagree				0.9%	0.6%	3.3%	3.9%	1.6%
No Opinion/Neutral				11.4%	8.3%	8.0%	8.1%	9.2%

By Gender	% A or SA
Males	74.1%
Females	78.3%

By Age	% A or SA
18-29	74.9%
30-59	78.6%
60+	70.1%

By Education	% A or SA
No College	72.3%
Some College	73.6%
4+ Year Degree	83.4%

By Income	% A or SA
Less than \$25,000	71.9%
\$25,000-\$50,000	76.9%
More than \$50,000	80.1%

If Fort Drum were to close, would you continue to live in Jefferson County?

If FD closed, would you stay in Jefferson Co.?	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 4-6 Average
Yes				71.6%	66.9%	69.4%	69.0%	69.3%
No				23.9%	24.3%	19.4%	25.0%	22.5%
Unsure				4.5%	8.8%	11.2%	6.0%	8.2%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	71.1%
Females	66.7%

By Age	% Yes
18-29	62.0%
30-59	69.3%
60+	78.4%

By Education	% Yes
No College	76.9%
Some College	62.3%
4+ Year Degree	69.5%

By Income	% Yes
Less than \$25,000	71.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	63.2%
More than \$50,000	72.7%

It continues to be the case that one in four adults report his or her residence in Jefferson County is related to either their own or a family member's civilian or military employment at Fort Drum and 25% of all residents report if Fort Drum were to close, they would not continue to live in Jefferson County. Over 75% of adults in Jefferson County agree that the presence of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum since 1985 has improved the overall quality of life of Jefferson County citizens, a rate that is very consistent with the preceding three years. This high rate of Fort Drum support persists among all gender, age, education and income groups.

Three additional questions regarding the recent growth of Fort Drum were added to this survey in 2006 and the results are presented in Section 4 of this report.

Miscellaneous "Life in Jefferson County" Items

How many times have you crossed the border to eastern Ontario in the past year?

Canada Visits	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
0	38.7%	33.0%	49.5%	49.3%	48.2%	56.2%	65.6%	45.8%
1-2 times	26.6%	36.2%	24.9%	23.6%	25.0%	21.7%	20.6%	26.3%
3-5 times	15.4%	11.7%	12.6%	13.1%	13.3%	9.3%	5.6%	12.6%
6+ times	19.4%	19.1%	12.9%	14.0%	13.5%	12.9%	8.2%	15.3%

By Gender	% Visit
Males	37.1%
Females	31.4%

By Age	% Visit
18-29	33.7%
30-59	35.3%
60+	32.8%

By Education	% Visit
No College	23.3%
Some College	40.1%
4+ Year Degree	43.0%

By Income	% Visit
Less than \$25,000	16.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	39.8%
More than \$50,000	44.8%

There has been an obvious and fairly steep trend toward reduced visits over the border during the previous seven years that has continued into 2006. Only 34% indicated they crossed the border to Ontario in 2006, while in 2000, more than 61% had made a trip to Ontario.

Estimate how many hours per month you volunteer for community service activities such as church, school and youth activities, charitable organizations, local government, boards, etc.

Volunteer Hours/Month	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Mean		7.1	9.4	9.4	6.8	6.6	10.2	7.9
Median		2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	
Standard Deviation		16.7	22.1	19.3	12.2	13.3	18.9	
Range		0-120	0-250	0-150	0-80	0-100	0-160	

By Gender	Mean
Males	10.7
Females	9.7

By Age	Mean
18-29	9.9
30-59	11.5
60+	6.9

By Education	Mean
No College	9.2
Some College	12.1
4+ Year Degree	9.7

By Income	Mean
Less than \$25,000	9.9
\$25,000-\$50,000	12.2
More than \$50,000	9.5

The spirit of volunteerism continues to be strong regardless of gender, age, education and income level. Over 56% of Jefferson County adults volunteer their time each month, while only 44% of adults nationwide volunteer (www.independentsector.org). Jefferson County adults give an average of 10.2 hours per person of their time every month to community service (the national rate is 6.8 hours per month per person). With 82,000 adults in Jefferson County typically volunteering 10.2 hours each per month, the result is Jefferson County adult residents give over 10 million hours per year to community service*. The Independent Sector (www.independentsector.org) estimated the dollar value of volunteer time in New York State in 2004 at \$22.77 per hour equaling a community economic value of over \$228 million.

*Note: All responses of zero hours per month are averaged in so that the number of hours reported is accurate per Jefferson County adult, including volunteers and non-volunteers.

What is your primary source of information about local events?

Source of Local Info.	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Years 1-6 Average
Watertown Daily Times (WDT)	49.4%	40.5%	46.5%	35.7%	39.9%	34.5%	34.3%	41.1%
Watertown TV	26.4%	40.0%	35.4%	35.5%	34.7%	34.3%	34.7%	34.4%
Internet	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.1%	13.6%	1.0%
Syracuse TV	1.6%	0.6%	1.7%	1.1%	0.3%	1.2%	0.5%	1.1%
Syracuse Newspaper	11.4%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	2.1%
Radio	3.1%	7.9%	5.5%	9.0%	8.8%	9.9%	7.5%	7.4%
Friends	3.7%	4.7%	3.3%	5.8%	6.4%	5.6%	5.2%	4.9%
Weekly NP	4.4%	3.3%	1.9%	9.8%	5.0%	5.2%	0.8%	4.9%
Other	0.0%	3.1%	5.2%	3.1%	4.6%	2.8%	3.4%	3.1%

Residents continue to report their two most common sources of information about local events are the *Watertown Daily Times* and local television stations, however, the number of respondents indicating their primary source of information is the Internet more than doubled to 13.6% in 2006.

Note: those citing the Internet as their primary source of information may be getting that information from websites offered by local television stations and the *Times*.

Do you rent or own your home?

Rent or own your home	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Year 6 Average
Rent						30.5%	30.5%	30.5%
Own						65.6%	64.7%	65.6%
Neither						3.9%	4.8%	3.9%

By Gender	% Own
Males	65.8%
Females	63.4%

By Age	% Own
18-29	37.7%
30-59	71.6%
60+	82.8%

By Education	% Own
No College	66.8%
Some College	54.3%
4+ Year Degree	74.8%

By Income	% Own
Less than \$25,000	41.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	64.5%
More than \$50,000	78.5%

If you rent, has your rent increased in the past six months?

If rent, has rent (+) in past 6 months?	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Year 6 Average
Yes						21.5%	33.0%	21.5%
No						78.5%	67.0%	78.5%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	36.8%
Females	29.4%

By Age	% Yes
18-29	37.7%
30-59	23.5%
60+	53.2%

By Education	% Yes
No College	27.1%
Some College	33.4%
4+ Year Degree	41.4%

By Income	% Yes
Less than \$25,000	36.8%
\$25,000-\$50,000	20.3%
More than \$50,000	41.1%

If your rent has increased in the past six months, has it forced you to move?

If rent has (+), forced a move?	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Year 6 Average
Yes						38.0%	14.9%	38.0%
No						62.0%	85.1%	62.0%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	0.0%
Females	32.0%

By Age	% Yes
18-29	8.5%
30-59	32.9%
60+	0.0%

By Education	% Yes
No College	20.7%
Some College	4.3%
4+ Year Degree	18.7%

By Income	% Yes
Less than \$25,000	17.7%
\$25,000-\$50,000	20.4%
More than \$50,000	0.0%

The majority of Jefferson County residents (65%) own their own home and 30% rent. Among the renters, one in three (33%) has had an increase in rent in the past 6 months (as opposed to only 21.5% reporting an increase in 2005). This increase in rent is not commonly reported as forcing the renters to move.

The next three core questions all deal with political beliefs and participation.

Did you vote in the last local election?

Vote Last LOCAL Election	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Year 6 Average
Yes						60.7%	49.8%	60.7%
No						39.3%	50.2%	39.3%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	49.9%
Females	49.6%

By Age	% Yes
18-29	26.3%
30-59	49.0%
60+	85.2%

By Education	% Yes
No College	44.2%
Some College	50.4%
4+ Year Degree	56.1%

By Income	% Yes
Less than \$25,000	43.8%
\$25,000-\$50,000	54.9%
More than \$50,000	52.8%

Did you vote in the last presidential election?

Vote Last PRESIDENTIAL Election	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Year 6 Average
Yes						70.3%	68.8%	70.3%
No						29.7%	31.2%	29.7%

By Gender	% Yes
Males	70.5%
Females	67.0%

By Age	% Yes
18-29	44.0%
30-59	74.7%
60+	87.6%

By Education	% Yes
No College	55.1%
Some College	67.8%
4+ Year Degree	88.9%

By Income	% Yes
Less than \$25,000	53.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	73.0%
More than \$50,000	80.0%

How would you classify your political beliefs?

Political beliefs	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Year 6 Average
Very Conservative						6.3%	8.4%	6.3%
Moderately Conservative						29.1%	29.8%	29.1%
Middle of the Road						43.2%	40.4%	43.2%
Moderately Liberal						17.8%	14.7%	17.8%
Very Liberal						3.7%	6.7%	3.7%

By Gender	Cons.
Males	41.3%
Females	34.9%

By Age	Cons.
18-29	29.7%
30-59	43.6%
60+	34.2%

By Education	Cons.
No College	38.7%
Some College	35.5%
4+ Year Degree	41.1%

By Income	Cons.
Less than \$25,000	37.0%
\$25,000-\$50,000	38.8%
More than \$50,000	39.9%

By Gender	Lib.
Males	21.7%
Females	21.0%

By Age	Lib.
18-29	29.1%
30-59	16.4%
60+	25.2%

By Education	Lib.
No College	16.5%
Some College	22.4%
4+ Year Degree	27.4%

By Income	Lib.
Less than \$25,000	27.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	23.4%
More than \$50,000	16.3%

Jefferson County adults were more likely to have voted in the last presidential election (70.3%) than the last local elections (49.8%) with older adults being the most likely to vote in both their local elections and the presidential election.

More highly educated residents and those from households with higher incomes are more likely to have voted in the last presidential election than persons with less education and lower income, however, they are **not** any more likely to have voted in the last **local** elections.

Jefferson County residents are most likely to be middle of the road in their political beliefs (40.4%). Those not middle of the road are almost twice as likely to be conservative (38%) than liberal (21%). Political beliefs are not significantly different between gender, education or income levels however they are related to age, with those 30-59 most likely to be report being conservative and least likely to report being liberal.

Section 4 – Results – *The New-in-2006 Survey Questions*

This section of the Report of Findings provides a detailed presentation of the results for each of the 20 questions in the 2006 survey that have not been included in the survey instrument for multiple years. These core survey questions can be grouped as questions regarding:

- Online Communication
- Involvement in the Community – With Focus on the Youths
- Farming Issues in Jefferson County
- Recent Fort Drum Growth Impact
- Jefferson County – A Safe Place to Grow Old?

The results for each of these core survey questions (20 separate questions) are presented in this section of the report with the following organizational structure: (1) the results for the 2006 year are presented in a table (no analysis of trends or changes, of course, can be made); and, (2) the 2006 results for each of these 20 questions have been cross-tabulated by each of the demographic factors of gender, age, education level, and household income level (total of over 75 cross-tabulations). Observations will be made following each of the five subsections, providing explanation of significant relationships.

Online Communication

Which types of online communication do you use?

Types Online Communication Used	% who use each
Email	73.3%
IM	28.6%
Chat rooms	8.3%
OL Communities	11.4%
None	20.7%
Other	2.7%

If you have children under 18 living in your household, how often do you or another adult monitor their online communications?

Frequency of Monitor Online Communication	% of total	% of those with children who use the Internet
Never	7.8%	12.1%
Rarely	8.5%	13.1%
Sometimes	2.2%	3.4%
Usually	7.3%	11.3%
Always	38.8%	60.0%
Not Applicable	35.3%	NA

By Gender	% Mon. at least some
Males	71.3%
Females	77.8%

By Age	% Mon. at least some
18-29	73.1%
30-59	75.3%
60+	100.0%

By Education	% Mon. at least some
No College	64.9%
Some College	79.3%
4+ Year Degree	74.6%

By Income	% Mon. at least some
Less than \$25,000	72.0%
\$25,000-\$50,000	80.6%
More than \$50,000	76.0%

If you do monitor the online communications of children who live with you, how do you do so (indicate all that apply)?

How Monitor Online Communication	% using each
Check Computer History	33.6%
Look Over Shoulder	64.6%
Discussion	13.1%
Password Protection	15.3%
Monitoring Software	7.5%
Other	8.1%

Nearly four out of every five Jefferson County adults (79%) use at least one form of online communication, with the most common being email (73%) and the second most common being IM (instant messenger). More than one of every 10 (11.4%) take part in online communities such as Myspace.com.

Among adults who have children who use the Internet in the household, 88% monitor the online communication of those children at least some of the time, with 60% indicating they monitor it all the time. The most common form of monitoring is “looking over the shoulder.”

Involvement in the Community – With Focus on Youth

What do you believe is the biggest issue facing the youth of Jefferson County at the present time?

Biggest Issues Facing Youth	%
Isolation – lack of recreation and social activities	22.5%
Employment issues – living wage jobs for future	21.9%
Drug and alcohol abuse	14.6%
Education issues	13.7%
Not invested/connected to community	3.5%

How many times in the past year did you go to the school in your district for any reason?

Visit School in Past Year	%
Never	37.9%
1-3 times	18.5%
4-9 times	12.6%
10+ times	31.0%

By Gender	% Visit
Males	58.8%
Females	65.7%

By Age	% Visit
18-29	57.3%
30-59	68.8%
60+	49.4%

By Education	% Visit
No College	55.8%
Some College	66.0%
4+ Year Degree	65.4%

By Income	% Visit
Less than \$25,000	48.8%
\$25,000-\$50,000	66.9%
More than \$50,000	67.9%

How active do you consider yourself in your school district?

How Active in School	%
Very Active	20.4%
Somewhat Active	23.6%
Formerly Active	11.1%
Not Active	44.9%

By Gender	% SW + Very
Males	43.8%
Females	44.3%

By Age	% SW + Very
18-29	47.9%
30-59	48.3%
60+	26.7%

By Education	% SW + Very
No College	34.9%
Some College	44.0%
4+ Year Degree	54.9%

By Income	% SW + Very
Less than \$25,000	26.3%
\$25,000-\$50,000	49.3%
More than \$50,000	49.7%

How often have you gone to a community-based meeting in the past year?

Go to community-based meetings?	%
Never	63.1%
Once	9.9%
2-5 times	13.3%
6+ times	13.7%

By Gender	% Attend
Males	40.9%
Females	32.6%

By Age	% Attend
18-29	33.9%
30-59	42.3%
60+	26.2%

By Education	% Attend
No College	29.7%
Some College	29.4%
4+ Year Degree	56.1%

By Income	% Attend
Less than \$25,000	25.6%
\$25,000-\$50,000	37.0%
More than \$50,000	43.3%

If you have attended a community-based meeting in the past year, how often did you see youth participating in the meetings?

See youth participation at community-based meetings	%
Never	42.8%
Few times	38.1%
About half the time	3.5%
Most of the time	11.4%
Always	4.3%

By Gender	% See YP
Males	60.2%
Females	53.1%

By Age	% See YP
18-29	61.1%
30-59	57.5%
60+	49.0%

By Education	% See YP
No College	62.5%
Some College	52.7%
4+ Year Degree	59.1%

By Income	% See YP
Less than \$25,000	70.3%
\$25,000-\$50,000	60.5%
More than \$50,000	49.3%

The next four questions asked the respondent's agreement with a statement about youth in their community on a scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree.

“I would like to see more youth participation in school and community decision-making processes.”

Want more youth participation	%
Strongly Agree	36.3%
Agree	47.2%
Disagree	5.8%
Strongly Disagree	3.1%
No Opinion/Neutral	7.7%

By Gender	% A or SA
Males	80.6%
Females	86.7%

By Age	% A or SA
18-29	89.3%
30-59	81.4%
60+	81.3%

By Education	% A or SA
No College	82.5%
Some College	79.4%
4+ Year Degree	90.6%

By Income	% A or SA
Less than \$25,000	83.1%
\$25,000-\$50,000	81.4%
More than \$50,000	84.5%

“There are youth in my community who I personally value and enjoy spending time with.”

Value and enjoy youth	%
Strongly Agree	32.8%
Agree	44.6%
Disagree	5.6%
Strongly Disagree	2.8%
No Opinion/Neutral	14.2%

By Gender	% A or SA
Males	76.1%
Females	78.8%

By Age	% A or SA
18-29	84.5%
30-59	77.3%
60+	67.6%

By Education	% A or SA
No College	75.8%
Some College	73.5%
4+ Year Degree	85.4%

By Income	% A or SA
Less than \$25,000	79.9%
\$25,000-\$50,000	78.9%
More than \$50,000	78.3%

“Youth in my community are often unreliable and irresponsible.”

Youth unreliable/irresponsible.	%
Strongly Agree	9.7%
Agree	28.6%
Disagree	41.5%
Strongly Disagree	9.9%
No Opinion/Neutral	10.2%

By Gender	% A or SA
Males	42.9%
Females	33.2%

By Age	% A or SA
18-29	45.7%
30-59	36.5%
60+	33.0%

By Education	% A or SA
No College	44.2%
Some College	33.5%
4+ Year Degree	37.0%

By Income	% A or SA
Less than \$25,000	57.2%
\$25,000-\$50,000	28.2%
More than \$50,000	34.2%

“Youth in my community make my personal quality of life better.”

Youths improve my Quality of Life	%
Strongly Agree	16.8%
Agree	46.7%
Disagree	12.7%
Strongly Disagree	5.2%
No Opinion/Neutral	18.5%

By Gender	% A or SA
Males	60.4%
Females	67.1%

By Age	% A or SA
18-29	63.6%
30-59	62.6%
60+	66.0%

By Education	% A or SA
No College	67.2%
Some College	56.4%
4+ Year Degree	71.3%

By Income	% A or SA
Less than \$25,000	68.3%
\$25,000-\$50,000	61.7%
More than \$50,000	65.7%

The top three “biggest issues” identified by residents as facing the youth of Jefferson County were isolation/lack of recreational and social activities, employment issues/living wage jobs for their future, and drug and alcohol abuse.

Over 62% of Jefferson County residents report having visited the school in their district at least once during the past year, with 31% reporting having visited the school 10 or more times. Nearly equal percentages of residents consider themselves active in their school district, 44% as opposed to not active 45%. Younger, more highly educated, residents with annual incomes over \$25,000 were more likely to consider themselves active with in the schools.

Thirty-seven percent of residents have attended at least one community-based meeting (school, church, town, firehall etc.) in the past year and 63 percent have not. Attendance at community meetings was strongly related to residents with 4-year degrees or higher. Of those who have attended a community based meeting, 57% reported seeing youth participating at the meetings at least a few times or more.

Jefferson County residents overwhelming indicated a high regard for youth in their communities. Regardless of gender, age, education or income level, over 83% of all Jefferson County adults agree that they would like to see more youth participation in school and community decision-making processes. Over 77% indicate there are youth in their community who they personally value and over 63% believe the youth in their community improve their own personal quality of life.

It is worth noting that while 41.5% of respondents disagreed with the statement “youth in my community are often unreliable and irresponsible,” 38.3% indicated agreement with the statement with a strong correlation between agreement and an annual income of less than \$25,000.

Farming Issues in Jefferson County

How important is maintaining Jefferson County farms and agriculture to our local economy?

Farms important to local economy	%
Very Important	79.9%
Important	14.1%
Not Very Important	4.4%
Not Important at All	1.6%

By Gender	% Very
Males	79.6%
Females	80.2%

By Age	% Very
18-29	72.5%
30-59	82.7%
60+	81.7%

By Education	% Very
No College	85.4%
Some College	76.3%
4+ Year Degree	77.1%

By Income	% Very
Less than \$25,000	86.3%
\$25,000-\$50,000	77.3%
More than \$50,000	77.2%

How many of the local farms in Jefferson County would you estimate take good care of the environment?

Local farms care for environment?	Among all residents	Among those who have an opinion
All	6.2%	7.7%
Most	43.7%	54.1%
About Half	21.6%	26.7%
Few	8.9%	11.0%
None	0.4%	0.5%
Don't Know	19.2%	

By Gender	% at least Half
Males	72.2%
Females	70.7%

By Age	% at least Half
18-29	63.6%
30-59	72.0%
60+	81.1%

By Education	% at least Half
No College	71.8%
Some College	65.5%
4+ Year Degree	78.6%

By Income	% at least Half
Less than \$25,000	65.2%
\$25,000-\$50,000	76.8%
More than \$50,000	73.1%

Jefferson County residents (94%) strongly believe in the importance of agriculture and farming to the local economy. The majority (62%) of residents believe that most or all farmers take good care of the environment.

How supportive are you of developing renewable energy sources in the North Country? (i.e. methane digesters for farms, hydro-electric, wind farms, biofuel production, etc.)

Support North Country Renewable Energy Development	%
Very Supportive	68.2%
Somewhat Supportive	16.6%
Not Supportive	5.9%
Not Sure	9.4%

By Gender	% Very
Males	73.8%
Females	62.0%

By Age	% Very
18-29	62.1%
30-59	72.0%
60+	66.2%

By Education	% Very
No College	66.6%
Some College	64.4%
4+ Year Degree	78.6%

By Income	% Very
Less than \$25,000	65.1%
\$25,000-\$50,000	76.6%
More than \$50,000	67.0%

There is strong evidence of support among the majority of Jefferson County residents (84.8%) for developing renewable energy sources in the North Country, with males particularly supportive (73.8% said very supportive).

Recent Fort Drum Growth Impact

How has the recent growth from 2003-2006 of Fort Drum impacted the overall economy and job/financial health of Jefferson County residents?

Fort Drum Recent Growth - Impact on Overall Jefferson County Economy	%
Very Positively	34.3%
Positively	43.8%
Negatively	8.2%
Very Negatively	1.9%
No Opinion/Neutral	11.8%

By Gender	% P + VP
Males	80.8%
Females	75.0%

By Age	% P + VP
18-29	73.0%
30-59	81.7%
60+	74.9%

By Education	% P + VP
No College	77.8%
Some College	73.7%
4+ Year Degree	84.4%

By Income	% P + VP
Less than \$25,000	69.9%
\$25,000-\$50,000	78.8%
More than \$50,000	83.9%

How has the recent growth from 2003-2006 of Fort Drum impacted your personal job/financial health?

Fort Drum Recent Growth - Impact on Your Personal Job/Financial Health?	%
Very Positively	20.7%
Positively	27.2%
Negatively	7.0%
Very Negatively	2.1%
No Opinion/Neutral	43.0%

By Gender	% P + VP
Males	51.4%
Females	44.1%

By Age	% P + VP
18-29	40.9%
30-59	58.3%
60+	27.2%

By Education	% P + VP
No College	37.3%
Some College	53.9%
4+ Year Degree	52.7%

By Income	% P + VP
Less than \$25,000	40.3%
\$25,000-\$50,000	50.8%
More than \$50,000	54.2%

How has the recent growth from 2003-2006 of Fort Drum impacted the overall quality of life of Jefferson County residents?

Fort Drum Recent Growth - Impact on Overall Quality of Life	%
Very Positively	25.5%
Positively	47.0%
Negatively	11.7%
Very Negatively	3.6%
No Opinion/Neutral	12.2%

By Gender	% P + VP
Males	72.9%
Females	72.0%

By Age	% P + VP
18-29	61.0%
30-59	78.9%
60+	70.1%

By Education	% P + VP
No College	68.0%
Some College	66.7%
4+ Year Degree	85.6%

By Income	% P + VP
Less than \$25,000	67.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	77.2%
More than \$50,000	76.3%

Earlier in this report we found that people in Jefferson County are the most positive they have ever been in the seven years we have surveyed about jobs and the economy. Clearly Fort Drum is viewed as a large contributing factor to this economic improvement, with 78.1% indicating that the recent growth at Fort Drum has had a positive impact on the overall Jefferson County economy. Jefferson County adults are five times more likely to indicate that Fort Drum's recent growth has impacted their personal job and financial health positively rather than negatively. Those 30-59 and those with at least some college education are most likely to have reported this positive personal financial impact.

When asked about the impact of the recent Fort Drum growth on the overall quality of life of the area, 72.5% reported that it has been positive. Those 30-59 and those with a four-year degree or above are most likely to have reported this positive regional quality of life impact.

Jefferson County – A Safe Place to Grow Old?

Do you believe that Jefferson County is a good place to grow old?

Jefferson County is a good place to grow old?	%
Very Good	43.5%
Fairly Good	37.9%
Not Very Good	10.0%
Definitely Not Good	6.8%
Don't Know	1.9%

By Gender	% Very
Males	45.8%
Females	40.8%

By Age	% Very
18-29	36.9%
30-59	38.8%
60+	66.4%

By Education	% Very
No College	46.2%
Some College	37.2%
4+ Year Degree	51.9%

By Income	% Very
Less than \$25,000	40.9%
\$25,000-\$50,000	38.1%
More than \$50,000	50.2%

Do you believe that Jefferson County is a safe place to live?

Jefferson County is a safe place to live	%
Very Safe	50.0%
Fairly Safe	42.9%
Not Very Safe	5.6%
Definitely Not Safe	1.4%

By Gender	% Very
Males	55.9%
Females	43.5%

By Age	% Very
18-29	50.0%
30-59	44.3%
60+	66.9%

By Education	% Very
No College	58.4%
Some College	45.1%
4+ Year Degree	48.4%

By Income	% Very
Less than \$25,000	50.1%
\$25,000-\$50,000	52.4%
More than \$50,000	48.0%

People in Jefferson County overwhelmingly perceive this as a safe place to live (92.9%) and a good place to grow old (81.4%), especially those 60 years of age or older.

Section 5 – Final Comments

This report is a presentation of the information collected from 354 telephone interviews conducted during the evenings of April 3-6, 2006, with comparisons to similar annual surveys completed in 2000-2005. The Center for Community Studies exists to engage in a variety of community-based research activities, and to promote the productive discussion of ideas and issues of significance to our community. As such, the results of this survey are available for use by any citizen or organization in the community. If you use information from this survey, we simply ask that you acknowledge the source.

These interviews produced a large volume of data, which can be analyzed and assessed in a number of different ways. **Please contact The Center for Community Studies for specific analyses.** Additionally, we are available to make presentations of these survey findings to community groups and organizations upon request. Please contact::

The Center for Community Studies
Room 2-013
1220 Coffeen Street
Watertown, NY 13601
Telephone: (315) 786-2488 or (315) 786-2489

Joel LaLone, Research Coordinator
Denise Young, Director

jjalone@sunyjefferson.edu
dyoung@sunyjefferson.edu

www.sunyjefferson.edu/ccs/ccs.html

The Eighth Annual Survey of the Community is tentatively scheduled for the first week of April 2007.

Community Survey 2006

Interviewer Initials: _____	M	T	W	TH
Time Started: _____	Length of Interview:			minutes

Good evening. My name is (first name) and I am a student at Jefferson Community College. Tonight I am calling for the Center for Community Studies at Jefferson Community College. We are conducting the seventh annual survey of the community and are interested in your opinions about the quality of life in Northern New York. Do you have a few minutes to do a survey for us?

If **NO** . . . *Might there be another adult in the home who might wish to participate or is there a more convenient time to call?*
 If **YES** . . . **(First verify that the person is 18 years old.)** *Great, well, let's begin.*

Have you ever heard of The Center for Comm. Studies at JCC? (circle one)	Y(1)	N(2)
Have you ever heard of this annual survey? (circle one)	Y(1)	N(2)

A. Living in Jefferson County

1. How long have you lived in Jefferson County? **(CHECK ONE.)**
 < 1 year **(1)** 1-3 years **(2)** 4-7 years **(3)** > 7 years **(4)**
2. Do you expect you will still be living in Jefferson County in 5 years? **(CHECK ONE.)**
 yes **(1)** no **(2)** not sure **(3)**
- 2a. If yes, reasons: "family, it is home, etc." **(1)** work, business related **(2)**
 other: explain **(3)** _____
- 2b. If no, reasons: military related **(1)** other employment related **(2)**
 other: explain **(3)** _____

B. Trends in Issues

*I am going to read you a list of issues facing the county and tell us whether in your opinion in the past year, the **TREND** has gotten **Better**, stayed about the **Same**, or gotten **Worse**.*

Issue	What is the TREND in past year?			
	Better	Same	Worse	Don't Know; Not Sure
1. Opportunities for youth				
2. Cultural / entertainment opportunities				
3. Cost of energy				
4. Health care access				
5. Health care quality				
6. Access to higher education				
7. Internet access				
8. Recreational opportunities				
9. Quality of the environment				
10. Local government				
11. Real estate taxes				
12. The downtown of Watertown				
13. Policing and crime control				
14. Availability of good jobs				
15. Shopping opportunities				
16. Quality of k-12 education				
17. The overall state of the local economy				
18. The overall quality of life in the area				
19. Availability of goods/services in area				
20. Availability of care for the elderly.				
21. Availability of housing				

C. Most Significant Jefferson County Issue

1. What do you think is the most important issue facing the **RESIDENTS** of Jefferson County at the present time? (Open ended question, write their answer in the space provided on the coding form. **DO NOT** read the list below, they are simply examples if the interviewee needs prompting).

Write answer on coding form

1.	Crime	10.	Lack of "community vision"
2.	Drug, alcohol problems	11.	Employment issues, loss of jobs, etc.
3.	Economic decline (loss of industry, etc.)	12.	Military/civilian relations
4.	Education, problems with schools	13.	Overall depressed economy
5.	Environmental issues	14.	Taxes
6.	Health care issues	15.	Youth related issues
7.	Inefficient, ineffective government	16.	Energy issues (cost, availability)
8.	Intolerance	17.	Other: (identify)
9.	"Isolation," lack of cultural/recreational/ shopping opportunities	18.	Housing

2. What do you think is the most important issue facing the **YOUTH** of Jefferson County at the present time (Open ended question, write their answer in the space provided on the coding form. **DO NOT** read the list below, they are simply examples if the interviewee needs prompting).

Write answer on coding form

1.	Public safety and crime	6.	Employment issues, living-wage jobs for future
2.	Drug, alcohol abuse	7.	Not invested/connected to community (feeling nothing to stay here for or come back to)
3.	Education issues	8.	Loss of spiritualism
4.	Intolerance – community places low value on youth	9.	Other: (identify)
5.	Isolation – lack of recreational and social activities		

D. Quality of life in Jefferson County (open-ended)

1. What is the **one** best aspect of living in Jefferson County?

2. What is the **one** main drawback of living in Jefferson County?

E. Technology

This next section deals with some questions related to your use of technology.

1. Do you currently have a working computer in your home? **Y(1) N(2)**
 If yes: a) how many hours a week is it usually used? _____ hours

b) Do you have an Internet connection at home? **Y(1) N(2)**

c) What type of connection do you have? (**check one**)
 ___phone line (1) ___cable(roadr)(2) ___DSL (3) ___Satellite (4) ___other/DK(5)

2. Do you have access to the Internet at work? **Y(1) N(2) Don't Work(3)**

16. How **active** do you consider yourself in your school district? (**READ THESE 4 CHOICES, CHECK 1**)
___very active (1) ___somewhat active (2) ___formerly active but not now (3) ___not active (4)
(*note: not as a student*)

17. How often have you gone to a community-based meeting in the past year? (*i.e. school board, town board, public or church committee, town hall/fire hall meeting etc.*)
___never (1) ___once (2) ___2-5 times (3) ___6 or more times (4)

(*If never, skip 17a otherwise complete 17a*)

17a. How often did you see youth **participating** in the meetings? (**Youth =10-17**)
___never (1) ___a few times (2) ___about half the time (3) ___most of the time (4) ___always (5)

18. Please indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with the following four statements about youth in Jefferson County. Youth are defined as children between 10 and 17.

a. I would like to see more youth participation in school and community decision-making processes.
___ Strongly Agree (1) ___ Agree (2) ___ Disagree (3) ___ Strongly Disagree (4) ___ Neutral/No Opinion (5)

b. There are youth in my community who I personally value and enjoy spending time with.
___ Strongly Agree (1) ___ Agree (2) ___ Disagree (3) ___ Strongly Disagree (4) ___ Neutral/No Opinion (5)

c. Youth in my community are often unreliable and irresponsible.
___ Strongly Agree (1) ___ Agree (2) ___ Disagree (3) ___ Strongly Disagree (4) ___ Neutral/No Opinion (5)

d. Youth in my community make my personal quality of life better.
___ Strongly Agree (1) ___ Agree (2) ___ Disagree (3) ___ Strongly Disagree (4) ___ Neutral/No Opinion (5)

19. How many times per week do you eat dinner with the children under 18 who live in your household?
___No children in household (1) ___less than 2 times (2) ___2-3 times (3) ___4-5 times (4) ___6 or more times (5)

20. Do you rent or own your home? Rent(1) Own(2) Neither(3)

20a. (If RENT) Has your rent increased in the past 6 months? Y(1) N(2)

20a-1. (If YES) Has this rent increase forced you to move (or WILL it)? Y(1) N(2)

21. How important is maintaining Jefferson County farms and agriculture to our local economy?
___very important (1) ___important (2) ___not very important (3) ___not important (4)

22. How many of the local farms in Jefferson County would you estimate take good care of the environment?
___all (1) ___most (2) ___about half (3) ___few (4) ___none (5) ___don't know (6)

23. Do you believe Jefferson County is a good place to grow old? (appropriate supports, elder friendly)
___very good (1) ___fairly good (2) ___not very good (3) ___definitely not good (4) ___don't know (5)

24. Do you consider Jefferson County a safe place to live?
___very safe (1) ___fairly safe (2) ___not very safe (3) ___definitely not safe (4)

G. Fort Drum

The next 5 questions deal with Fort Drum. For the first statement please indicate your agreement or disagreement

25. The presence of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum since 1985 has improved the overall quality of life of Jefferson County citizens. (Read choices.)
___ Strongly Agree (1) ___ Agree (2) ___ Disagree (3) ___ Strongly Disagree (4) ___ Neutral/No Opinion (5)

26. How has the **recent growth** from 2003-2006 of Fort Drum impacted the overall economy and job/financial health of Jefferson County citizens? **(Read choices)**
 very positively (1) positively (2) negatively (3) very negatively (4) Neutral/No Opinion (5)
27. How has the **recent growth** from 2003-2006 of Fort Drum impacted your personal job/financial health? **(Read choices)**
 very positively (1) positively (2) negatively (3) very negatively (4) Neutral/No Opinion (5)
28. How has the **recent growth** from 2003-2006 of Fort Drum impacted the overall quality of life of Jefferson County citizens?
 very positively (1) positively (2) negatively (3) very negatively (4) Neutral/No Opinion (5)
29. If Fort Drum were to close would you continue to live in Jefferson County?
 Yes (1) No (2) Unsure (3)

H. Demographic Variables.

We are almost finished. The last few demographic questions will help us get a better sense of the general nature of the people who have helped us with this project.

- a) **Age:** I am going to read some categories of age classification. Please stop me when I get to the category in which your age falls. **(CHECK ONE.)**
 teens (1) twenties (2) thirties (3) forties (4)
 fifties (5) sixties (6) seventies (7) eighties and older (8)
- b) **Education:** I am going to read some categories relating to education. Please stop me when I get to the category in which your highest level of formal education falls. **(CHECK ONE.)**
 less than high school graduate (1) associate's degree (4)
 high school graduate (2) bachelor's degree (5)
 some college, no degree (3) graduate or professional degree (6)
- c) **Household income range:** I am going to read some categories relating to income. Please stop me when I get to the category in which your yearly household income falls:
 Up to 10,000 (1) 10,000-25,000 (2) 25,000-50,000 (3)
 50,000-75,000 (4) 75,000-100,000 (5) Over 100,000 (6)
- d) Is anyone living in your household active military? Y(1) N(2)
- e) If YES, is it you? Y(1) N(2)
- f) Is your residence in Jefferson County related to either civilian or military employment at Fort Drum, by either you or a family member? (Check one.) Y(1) N(2)
- g) How would you describe yourself in regard to your race or ethnicity? **(CHECK ONE.)**
 Black (1) White (2) Hispanic (3) Asian / Pacific Islander (4)
 Native American (5) multiracial (6) other _____ (7)
- h) How would you classify your political beliefs? (Read list; **CHECK ONE.**)
 very conservative (1) moderately conservative (2) middle of the road (3)
 moderately liberal (4) very liberal (5)
- i) Marital status: are you: single (1) married (2) other (3)
- j) Apparent gender: male (1) female (2)

Just one more!

I. In which Jefferson County township do you reside? (CHECK ONE.)

1. Adams (Adams Center)
2. Alexandria (Collins Landing, Plessis, Redwood, Wellesley Island)
3. Antwerp (Oxbow)
4. Brownville (Dexter, Glen Park)
5. Cape Vincent
6. Champion (Deferiet, Great Bend, West Carthage)
7. Clayton (Depauville, Grindstone Island)
8. Ellisburg (Belleville, Mannsville, Pierrepont Manor, Woodville)
9. Henderson (Henderson Harbor)
10. Hounsfield (Sackets Harbor, Sulfur Springs, Smithville)
11. LeRay (Calcium, Evans Mills, Fort Drum)
12. Lorraine
13. Lyme (Three Mile Bay, Chaumont)
14. Orleans (Fineview, Fishers Landing, LaFargeville, Thousand Island Park)
15. Pamela
16. Philadelphia
17. Rodman
18. Rutland (Black River, Felts Mills)
19. Theresa (Lakes)
20. Town of Watertown (Burrville) ⇒
21. City of Watertown ⇒
22. Wilna (Carthage, Croghan, Natural Bridge)
23. Worth
24. not sure

<i>Be sure to specify town or city</i>
--

Thank you very much for your time and for sharing your thoughts with us. The results of this representative survey of Jefferson County residents will be reported through the media and on our website. Good evening. (website: www.sunyjefferson.edu/ccs/ccs.htm)