









24th Annual North Country Survey of the Community

Many opinions and behaviors continue to be very consistent, and many have dramatically changed.

Table of Contents

Section 1 – Introduction	4
Section 1.1 – Methodology – How These Data Were Collected Table 1 – Participation Rates for the 24 th Annual North Country Survey of the Community	4
Section 1.2 – Demographics of the Sample – Who was Interviewed? Table 2 – Demographics of the October 2023 North Country Sample – <i>The Nature of this Sample</i> Table 3 – Margins of Error for Varying Sample Sizes Table 4 – County-specific Sample Sizes for Each Year of the North Country Annual Surveys of the Community	7
Section 2 – Topline Summary of Findings	11
The Most Notable Study Findings in 2023	11
Section 3 – Detailed Statistical Results	15
Section 3.1 – Community Quality-of-Life Indicators	15
Section 3.1.1 – Relative Standing of Community Quality-of-Life Indicators in 2023 Table 5 – SUMMARY of "Relative Standing" – Year 2023 – All 21 Quality-of-life Indicators Compared Across C Rate of Responding "Excellent or Good" Table 6 – SUMMARY of "Relative Standing" – Year 2023 – All 21 Quality-of-life Indicators Compared Across C Rate of Responding "Poor".	15 Counties –
Section 3.1.2 – Trends for Community Quality-of-Life Indicators Table 7 – SUMMARY of "Trends" in Jefferson County – Years 2000-2023 – All 21 Quality-of-life Indicators Cor Across Time and to the Long-term Average – Rate of Responding "Excellent or Good" Table 8 – SUMMARY of "Trends" in Lewis County – Years 2007-2023 – All 20 Quality-of-life Indicators Compa	npared 17
Time and to the Long-term Average – Rate of Responding "Excellent or Good" Table 9 – SUMMARY of "Trends" in St. Lawrence County – Years 2015-2023 – All 20 Quality-of-life Indicators Across Time and to the Long-term Average – Rate of Responding "Excellent or Good" Section 3.1.3 – A Long Term Perspective of 2023 Results – Compared to Long Tern	17 Compared 18 N
Averages – <i>the Delta's</i>	
Section 3.1.4 – 2023 Detailed Results for Community Quality-of-life Indicators	19
"Framing" a Statistic – Providing Perspective to Better Understand, Interpret, and Use this Survey Data	20
Table 10 – Cultural and entertainment opportunities	22
Table 12 – Healthcare access	
Table 13 – Healthcare quality	
Table 14 – Access to higher education	26
Table 15 – Public outdoor recreational opportunities	
Table 16 – Quality of the environment	
Table 17 – County government.	
Table 10 – City, Village, Of Town Government	
Table 20 – Policing and crime control	
Table 21 – Availability of good jobs	
Table 22 – Shopping opportunities	
Table 23 – Quality of K-12 education	35
Table 24 – Overall State of the Local Economy	36
Table 25 – Availability of care for the elderly	
Table 26 – Availability of housing	
Table 27 – Availability of childcare	
I able 28 – Availability of benavioral health services	
Table 30 – Overall Quality of Life in the Area	
Section 3.2 – Additional Tracked Resident Opinions and Characteristics –	How
have residents changed over time?	43
Table 31 – Generally speaking, would you say things in this country are heading in the right or wrong direction	?43
Table 32 - Generally speaking, would you say things in New York State are heading in the right or wrong direct	tion? 44
Table 33 – Generally speaking, would you say things in your county are heading in the right or wrong direction	?45

 Table 34 – When considering your family's personal financial situation- has it gotten better, stayed about the same, or gotten worse in the past 12 months? Table 35 – Do you believe that your county is a good place to grow old? (appropriate supports, elder friendly) Table 36 – "The presence of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum since 1985 has improved the overall quality of life of North Country citizens."	46 47 48 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57
Table 46 – Political Beliefs Table 47 – Largest Issue Facing Residents of the North Country	58 59
Section 4 – Final Comments	59
Appendix I –Detailed County-specific Trends in Tabular Format.Appendix II –Detailed Demographic Cross-tabulations in Tabular Format.	60 80
Appendix III – Technical Comments – Assistance in Interpretation of the Statistical Results 1	22
Margin of Error – Constructing Confidence Intervals to Estimate for an Entire Population Margin of Error – More Detail for Those Interested in Maximizing Precision and Accuracy of Estimates Table 48 – More Detailed Margins of Error for Varying Sample Sizes and Varying Sample Proportions Significance Testing – Testing for Statistically Significant Trends, Differences, and Relationships Correlated Explanatory Variables – How does one decide if there is a "statistically significant" correlation? Regional Comparisons – How does one decide if a county is "statistically significantly" different from other counties?. Trend Analysis – How does one decide if a county has "statistically significantly" changed over time?	122 122 124 125 126 127 127 127
Appendix IV – The 2023 Survey Instrument	30

Acknowledgements

Sponsors of the North Country Annual Surveys of the Community

The Center for Community Studies would like to thank the following four local organizations for their generous financial support of this study.







Faculty Supervisors for this Study:

Mr. Joel LaLone	Director of the Center for Community Studies
Mr. Larry Danforth	Assistant Professor of Mathematics and
5	Research Director of the Center for Community Studies
Mr. Andrew Draper	Assistant Professor of Mathematics and
·	Research Coordinator at the Center for Community Studies

The Advisory Board of the Center for Community Studies:

- Nance ArquiettDaniel DupeeMary CorriveauJerilyn FairmanLarry DanforthRichard HalpinJohn DeansNatalie HurleyAndy DraperJoel LaLoneSonja DraughtJoseph Lawrence
- <u>Dies:</u> Tracy Leonard Katie Malinowski Carl McLaughlin John O'Driscoll Ryan Piche Scott Shaeffer
- Megan Stadler Steve Todd Eric Virkler Henricus Wagenaar Doug Welch David Zembiec

Student Research Associates:

The following 65 students at SUNY Jefferson participated in this study by completing the interviews of North Country residents and/or compiling and cleansing data

Katelyn	Adams	Danielle	Colwell	Megan	Long	Ryan	Rogers
Mo	Anagam	Keely	Cooney	Yvette	Lopez	Samantha	Russell-Jeffers
Nicolas	Arthur	Jaci	Creasman	Heather	Magliocca	Mariella	Sauer
Brittany	Beach	Morgan	Daly	Gretta	Maitag	Taylor	Scoville
Dana	Bernard	Lauren	Davi	Maryssa	McDonald	Zachary	Smith
Tarryn	Biggs	Abigail	Davis	Kary	Melendez-Aristaud	Cadence	Stephenson
Emily	Bombard	Ali	Davis	Reese	Mono	Julia	Strough
Harper	Brown	Tatiyana	Francis	Maddy	Moore	Sidney	Tabor
Alexia	Broyles	Jacqueline	Gallegos	Natalia	Moore	Braeden	Terrillion
Olivia	Buckley	Carrie	Getman	Landen	Moshier	Julia	Valvo
Kenneth	Burd	Amanda	Glazier	Camryn	O'Donnell	Annika	VanWormer
Katelyn	Burnham	Lily	Gray	Matthew	Olney	Bridget	Watson
Jared	Butler	Riley	Hanrahan	Kate	O'Neil	Chloe	Wilson
Justin	Childers	Chris	Henning	Alexis	Parent	Rylie	Wilson
Aaron	Cole	Veda	Howell	Johanna	Probst	Kayla	Winnemore
Deliah	Collins	Lily	Jiang	Kaylum	Rivera	Jasmine	Wright
Taja	Collins	Demetrius	Kemp				

Contact Information for the Center for Community Studies

For more information, please contact

The Center for Community Studies at Jefferson Community College Office 2-100A 1220 Coffeen Street Watertown, New York 13601 E-mail: jlalone@sunyjefferson.edu Website: www.sunyjefferson.edu/community/community-studies/

Phone: (315)-786-2264

This full final report of study findings is available for free by contacting Joel LaLone at <u>jlalone@sunyjefferson.edu</u> The study findings and full report are available free online at <u>www.sunyjefferson.edu/community/community-studies/</u>

Page 3 of 59

The Twenty-fourth Annual North Country Survey of the Community

Based on 1,171 interviews of adult residents conducted October 23 - November 1, 2023

Section 1 - Introduction

The Center for Community Studies at Jefferson Community College in Watertown, New York 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 Northern New York State region. In collaboration with community partners, the *Center* conducts research that will benefit the local population, and engages in activities that reflect its commitment to enhancing the quality of life of the area.

The annual Survey of the Community is one specific activity conducted each year by the *Center* to gauge the attitudes and opinions of a representative sample of adult citizens. This activity results in a yearly updated inventory of the attitudes and opinions of adult citizens of the region. The first year of this community survey was 2000, when the survey was completed exclusively in Jefferson County in April. For the following six years this Jefferson County community survey continued to be completed each year in April (2001-2006). Due to community support and interest for this type of community survey that extended beyond Jefferson County, the Advisory Board of the *Center* and Administration of the College determined in 2007 that it would be meaningful service to the region if the survey was also completed using a similar survey instrument annually in neighboring Lewis County. Hence, starting in October 2007 a survey in Lewis County has been completed annually, as well. Similarly, starting in 2015 a survey in St. Lawrence County has been completed in each year since 2015, with a total of 24 years of surveying Jefferson County adults (each of the years 2007-2023), and a total of 9 years of surveying St. Lawrence County adults (each of the years 2015-2023).

This document is a summary of the results of the 2023 North Country Annual Survey of the Community in all of Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties, including trend analysis comparisons with the results of community surveys from the past twenty-three years when possible. The result is that this document is a summary of 50 separate county-specific community surveys completed in Northern New York since 2000. In addition, the key community demographic characteristics of Gender, Age, Education Level, Household Income Level, Military Affiliation, Race/Ethnicity, and Political Ideology are investigated as potential explanatory variables that may be associated with or linked to quality-of-life indicators for the region, using the current 2023 survey results. It is standard methodology with professional surveys to provide this more detailed information to the reader – information that may assist in explaining the overall findings – by reporting the results for all subgroups within these key demographic variables. Finally, results in each of the neighboring counties of Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence are presented, when possible, to allow county comparisons.

The results of this annual study provide important information about contemporary thinking of citizens; and, over time, will continue to provide important baseline and comparative information as well.

<u>Section 1.1 – Methodology – How These Data Were Collected</u>

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. There have been slight modifications to the survey instrument throughout the 23 subsequent years since its first version in 2000, however, the goal of this annual survey is to longitudinally track community indicators, and as a result, every effort has been made to maintain consistency in the survey instrument. The instrument includes 21 tracked community quality-of-life indicators, as well as approximately 10 other tracked community and adult resident characteristics. At times, the instrument is modified to accomplish objectives that are not longitudinally tracked in nature. The total survey length each year is approximately 30-40 questions, with an additional set of approximately 10 demographic questions.

The primary goal of the North Country 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 Community College. In accomplishing this second goal, students are involved in all aspects of the research, from question formation to data collection (interviewing), to data entry and cleansing, to data analysis. The students analyze the data collected in this study annually as assignments and projects in statistics classes. However, all final responsibility for question-phrasing, question-inclusion versus omission, final data analysis, and

final reporting of findings (this document) lies exclusively with the professional staff of the Center. The decision to include any question as a legitimate and meaningful part of an annual survey 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 Community College; 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 used in this study are attached as Appendix IV.

In accordance with the American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) Transparency Initiative pledge, the following details and disclosure for the telephone-interviewing, intercept-interviewing, and online surveying employed in this study, including the following characteristics and facts should be considered by any reader:

- 1. **(T)** Dates of Data Collection: October 23 November 1, 2023.
- 2. (R)

2.	(K) Recruitment:	
	Telephone:	All telephone participants were recruited to participate via random selection from a list of all available valid active residential and cellular telephone lines in Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties, New York, USA.
	Intercept:	All face-to-face participants were recruited as they entered or exited the PX and the Commissary
	Online:	All online participants were recruited to participate via an email invitation with a link to the survey embedded.
3.	(A) Population Under	r Study: All adult residents of Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties, New York, USA. There are approximately 250,000 residents in the region. Approximately 190,000 of the 250,000 residents are adults, it is these adults who are the population of interest in this study.
4.	(N) List Source: Tel- Inte Onl	ephone:Electronic Voice Services, Inc., www.voice-boards.comercept:No list utilizedline:Bulk Email Superstore, and DataAxle.
5.	(S) Sampling Design	
	Telephone:	The entire phone list described in #2 was randomized, and approximately 10,000 valid residential and cellular phone numbers were selected to contact to invite to participate in the survey.
	Intercept:	Every adult who attended either the PX or Commissary the afternoons and evenings of October 24.25 and November 1, 2023 was invited to participate
	Online:	The entire email address list described in #4 was randomized, and approximately 30,000 email addresses of residents of Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties, NY were selected to contact to invite to participate in the survey.
6.	(P) Population Samp	ling Frame:
	Telephone:	As described in #2, the sampling frame includes all available residential listed phone numbers, for adults in Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties, NY, both landlines and cellular phones included.
	Intercept:	All military-affiliated adult residents of Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties, New York,
	Online:	As described in #5, the sampling frame includes all available email addresses of residents of Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties, NY.
7.	(A) Administration:	
	Telephone:	Survey administered via telephone from a virtual remote call center, only in English, using
	Intercept:	Survey administered face-to-face on post at Fort Drum, Jefferson County, New York, USA, only in English No incentives or rewards were offered to participants.
	Online:	Survey administered online via an email invitation, only in English, using Momentive. No incentives or rewards were offered to participants.
8.	(R) Researchers: Th Co Ca Co Ne	the study is an annual survey completed by the <i>Center for Community Studies at Jefferson community College</i> , with funding provided by the College and four community sponsors: arFreshner, Corp., the Board of Legislature of Lewis County, New York; the Northern New York community Foundation, Inc.; and the Development Authority of the North Country, Inc., Watertown, ew York, USA
9.	(E) Exact Wording of	Survey: The survey instrument is attached as an appendix.
10.	(N) Sample Sizes: As	is discussed in much greater detail for this study later in this report: n=1,171 overall for the study,
	wi Co ma St	th an overall average margin of error of $\pm 3.2\%$, including the design effect due to weighting. bunty-specific sample sizes and margins of error are: in Jefferson County n=433 and the average argin of error is $\pm 5.3\%$; in Lewis County n=349 and the average margin of error is $\pm 5.9\%$; and in . Lawrence County n=389 and the average margin of error is $\pm 5.6\%$

11. (C) Calculation of Weights: As is discussed in much greater detail for this study later in this report: results are weighted by gender, age, educational attainment, military affiliation, and race/ethnicity, and calibrated for sampling modality (the design effect in this study is approximately 2.0). At times a small set of political polling and election forecasting survey items are included in this study, and as a result, additional weighting and calibration for political party affiliation and differential partisan nonresponse bias were applied. Target weighting parameters for demographic characteristics are obtained from the U.S. Census for gender, age, race/ethnicity, and educational attainment, and the Fort Drum Regional Liaison Organization for military affiliation. County Election Boards were consulted for party affiliation weight targets for election forecasting that has been included, and past polling analyses have been used for development of differential partisan nonresponse bias weight targets.

12. **(Y)** Contact Information: Mr. Joel LaLone, Director, *Center for Community Studies*, contact information on page 3.

Further details of study methodology and sampling include that a total of 1,171 interviews of Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence County adult residents were completed. A mixed-mode sampling methodology was employed in this study with three blended samples: 561 interviews/surveys completed using live telephone-interview methodology, 78 intercept interviews (face-to-face) completed at Fort Drum, New York, and finally, 532 additional surveys completed via a nonprobability online survey after email invitation mode. To be eligible to complete the survey, the resident was required to be at least 18 years old. All telephone calls were made between 4:00 and 9:00 p.m. on the evenings of October 23 – October 30, 2023 using both a physical call center, and a virtual remote call center that was supervised synchronously online, each from Watertown, New York. The intercept interviews on Fort Drum were completed on October 24-25, 2023 at the entrance of the PX and Commissary, with prior approval obtained from the Office of the Garrison Commander. The Jefferson Community College students who completed both the telephone and face-to-face interviews had completed training in both human subject research methodology and effective interviewing techniques. Professional staff from the *Center*, with two reminder follow-up emails sent to any non-responders over the ten-day sampling time spanning October 23 – November 1, 2023. No rewards, neither pre-incentives nor post-incentives, were used in any of the three sampling modalities to encourage participation.

When each of the telephone numbers in the random telephone sampling portion of this study was attempted, one of four results occurred: Completion of an interview; a Decline to be interviewed; No Answer/Busy; or an Invalid Number (including both disconnected numbers, as well as numbers for individuals who do not currently reside in any of the three sampled counties). Voluntary informed consent was obtained from each resident before the interview was completed, during all three sampling modalities. This sampling protocol included informing each resident that it was his or her right to decline to answer any and all individual questions within the interview. To be categorized as a completed interview at least one-half of the questions on the survey had to be completed. A resident's refusal to answer more than one-half of the questions was considered a decline to be interviewed. The typical length of a completed survey was approximately 10 minutes. Telephone 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), a maximum of four call-backs were made to the number. Telephone numbers that were not successfully contacted were ultimately categorized as No Answer/Busy. No messages were left on answering machines at homes where no person answered the telephone. The introductory script of the online version of the survey acquired consent and validation of adult age and within-region residence. The completion rate results for the study are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 – Participation Rates for the 24th Annual North Country Survey of the Community

Methodology Utilized	Number of Surveys Completed (unweighted contribution to the sample)	Number of Surveys Completed (weighted contribution to the sample)	% of Total Sample (weighted contribution to the sample)
Live Telephone interviews on Landlines	211	136	12%
Live Telephone interviews on Cell Phones	350	348	30%
Online surveys (nonprobability panel, via email)	532	582	50%
Intercept surveys – face-to-face at Fort Drum	78	105	9%
Totals	1,171	1,171	100%

The response rates for the different sampling modalities in this study are approximately: 8% of all valid phone numbers attempted via live-interviewer telephone modality; 3% of all valid email invitations sent to a nonprobability opt-in panel to complete the online modality; and over 90% of all individuals approached at Fort Drum via the intercept modality.

Within the fields of social science and public opinion research, all three of these response rates are considered very successful. The methodology employed in this annual survey continues to meet public opinion research industry standards. Section 1.2 – Demographics of the Sample – Who was Interviewed?

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

- 1. Initially, this information adds to the knowledge and awareness about the true characteristics of the population of adult residents in a sampled county (e.g. What is the typical household composition, educational profile, and household income level in a county?).
- 2. Secondly, this demographic information facilitates the ability for the data to be sorted or partitioned to investigate for significant relationships relationships between demographic characteristics of residents and their attitudes and behaviors regarding the quality of life in the North Country. 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 demographic information also serves an important purpose when compared to established facts about the county adult populations to analyze the representativeness of the sample that was randomly selected in this study, and to determine the post-stratification weighting schematic to be applied to the data.

The results for the demographic questions in the survey are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 – Demographics of the October 2023 North Country Sample – The Nature of this Sample (%'s weighted by Gender, Age, Education Level, Race/Ethnicity, Military Affiliation, and Sampling Modality)

Demographic Characteristics:	Weighted % - Contribution to the Jefferson Sample (raw sample size)	Weighted % - Contribution to the <i>Lewis</i> Sample <u></u> (raw sample size)	Weighted % - Contribution to the St. Lawrence Sample {raw sample size)
	Gender		
Male	52%	47%	49%
Female	47%	53%	51%
Non-binary	1%	0%	0%
	Age		
18-39 years of age	46%	26%	34%
40-59 years of age	28%	36%	33%
60-69 years of age	13%	20%	16%
70 years of age or older	12%	18%	17%
	Education Level		
High school graduate (including GED) or less	44%	49%	42%
Some college, no 4+ year degree	35%	32%	37%
Bachelor's degree or higher	20%	19%	21%
Annu	al Household Income		
Less than \$50,000	43%	31%	35%
\$50,001-\$100,000	35%	50%	42%
More than \$100,000	22%	19%	23%
	Occupation		
Retired	22%	30%	29%
Military employed	20%	2%	0%
Employed, non-military, but not self-employed	37%	47%	57%
Self-employed	7%	10%	4%
Disabled	7%	2%	4%
Homemaker	5%	3%	2%
Student	1%	6%	1%
Unemployed	1%	0%	3%
N	Ailitary Affiliation		
Active military reside in the household	25%	3%	4%
No active military in household	70%	93%	91%
Not sure	5%	4%	5%
Reside in North Country Due	e to Employment Asso	ociated with Fort Dru	ım
Yes	28%	10%	2%
No	72%	90%	98%
County Sample Sizes	n=433	n=349	n=389

Table 2 – Continued – Demographics of the October 2023 North Country Sample – The Nature of this Sample

(%'s weighted by Gender, Age, Education Level, Race/Ethnicity, Military Affiliation, and Sampling Modality)

Demographic Characteristics:	Weighted % - Contribution to the <i>Jefferson</i> Sample (raw sample size)	Weighted % - Contribution to the Lewis Sample = (raw sample size)	Weighted % - Contribution to the St. Lawrence Sample (raw sample size)
E	ace/Ethnicity		
Black/African American	4%	1%	1%
White/Caucasian	83%	94%	91%
Hispanic	7%	2%	2%
Asian/Pacific Islander	3%	0%	0%
Native American	0%	1%	3%
Multiracial	3%	2%	3%
Household Composition – /	Any children under a	ge 18 in the home?	
Yes	28%	30%	31%
No	72%	70%	69%
Po	litical Ideology		
Very Conservative	7%	7%	9%
Conservative	24%	33%	24%
Middle of the Road	46%	37%	32%
Liberal	7%	12%	14%
Very Liberal	3%	3%	5%
Not Sure	14%	8%	16%
County Sample Sizes	n=433	n=349	n=389

The distributions of cities, villages, or towns of residence of the participating respondents in the Twenty-fourth Annual North Country Survey of the Community after application of post-stratification weights for Gender, Age, Education, Military Affiliation, Race/Ethnicity, and Sampling Modality closely parallel that which is true for the distribution of all North Country adults – the entire counties were proportionally represented very accurately in this study.

In general, Table 2 demonstrates that after weighting the data collected in this study for Gender, Age, Education, Military Affiliation, Race/Ethnicity, and Sampling Modality, the responses to the demographic questions for the residents who are included in the survey (those who actually answered the telephone and completed the survey, those who completed intercept surveys at Fort Drum, and those who completed the survey online) appear to closely parallel that which is true for the entire adult populations of the counties. The targets for demographic characteristics were drawn from the U.S. Census updates for the counties. The targets for military affiliation were generated with the assistance of the Fort Drum Regional Liaison Organization. Gender, Age, Education, Military Affiliation, and Race/Ethnicity were selected as the factors by which to weight the survey data, since the data collected in this Annual North Country Survey of the Community is susceptible to the typical types of sampling error that are inherent in survey research methodology: women were more likely than men to agree to a survey; older residents are more likely to participate in the survey than younger adult residents; those individuals with higher formal education levels are more likely to agree to the interviews; and minorities are less likely to participate than those who self-identify as white. Standard survey research methodology has shown that regardless of the subject of the survey, these are expected sources of sampling error. To compensate for this overrepresentation of females, older residents, white residents, those who are not affiliated with the military, and the highly educated in the sample collected in this study, post-stratification weights for Gender, Age, Education Level, Military Affiliation, Race/Ethnicity, and Sampling Modality have been applied in any further analysis of the data analyzed in this report.

When using the sample statistics presented in this report to estimate that which would be expected for the entire North Country 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, the resulting sample percentage for each question, the confidence level utilized, and the sampling design effect. Sample sizes tend to vary for each question on the survey, since some questions are only appropriate for certain subgroups, 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 1,171 North Country adult residents may be generalized to the population of *all* adults at least 18 years of age residing in the North Country with a 95% confidence level to within a margin of error of approximately ± 3.2 percentage points. For questions that were posed only to certain specific subgroups the resulting smaller sample sizes allow generalization to the specific subpopulation of all adults at least 18 years of age in that subgroup (e.g. generalization of some specific characteristics of *sampled* Lewis County males to *all* males in Lewis County) with a 95% confidence level to within a margin of error to use when analyzing subgroups of the entire group of 1,171 interviewed adults. Note that the approximate margins of error provided in Table 3 are *average* margins of error, averaging across all possible sample proportions that might result between 0% and 100%, and please note that all are using a 95% confidence level, and all include the design effect of 2.0 for this study. For more specific detail regarding the margin of error

for this survey, please refer to Appendix III of this report and/or contact the professional staff at the Center for Community Studies.

Sample Size (n=…)	Approximate Margin of Error
30	±20.2%
50	±15.7%
100	±11.1%
150	±9.0%
200	±7.8%
250	±7.0%
300	±6.4%
349	±5.9%
389	±5.6%
400	±5.5%
433	±5.3%
500	±5.0%
600	±4.5%
700	±4.2%
800	±3.9%
900	±3.7%
1,000	±3.5%
1,100	±3.3%
1,171	±3.2%

Table 3 – Margins of Error for Varying Sample Sizes

Finally, the margin of error is a measurement of random error, error due to simply the random chance of sampling such as when randomly flipping fair coins. However, in survey research, it is not coins that are being flipped; it is humans who are being interviewed. When surveying humans there are other potential sources of error, sources of error in addition to random error (which is the only error encompassed by the margin of error). Response error, nonresponse error, process error, bias in sample selection, bias in question-phrasing, lack of clarity in question-phrasing, social desirability bias, acquiescence bias, satisficing, and undercoverage are common sources of other-than-random error. Methods that should be, and have been in this North Country study, employed to minimize these other sources of error are: maximum effort to select the sample randomly, piloting and testing of utilized survey questions, extensive training of all data collectors (interviewers), thorough cleansing of data, calibration of data, and application of post-stratification algorithms to the resulting sampled data. Hence, when using this study data to make estimates to the entire North Country adult populations, as is the case in standard survey research practices, the margin of error will be the only error measurement cited and interpreted.

In order to maximize comparability among the twenty-four years of annual surveys (50 studies) that have been completed in North Country by the *Center for Community Studies* between 2000 and 2023, the procedures used to collect information and the *core* questions asked have remained virtually identical. The total number of interviews completed in any one county in a year has ranged from 328 to 832. All interviewers have been similarly and extensively trained preceding data collection each year. Data management, cleansing, and transformation techniques used have remained similar throughout. The survey methodology used to complete the Twenty-fourth Annual North Country Survey of the Community is comparable to that used in the previous twenty-three years. Furthermore, post-stratification weights for gender, age, and education level have also been applied to all results from the first thirteen years of surveying, with phone ownership (landline only vs. cell only vs. both) added as an additional weighting factor in 2013, and military affiliation and race/ethnicity added as additional weighting factors in 2015 as parts of the continuous improvement methods applied at the *Center* in an attempt to maximize the representativeness of the collected sample of adults. Finally, online surveying was blended into the overall sample for the first time in 2019. This maintenance of consistent methodology from year to year allows for valid comparisons for trends over the twenty-four-year period that will be illustrated later in this report.

When comparing results across time, the sample sizes collected each year should be considered. The sample sizes for each of the years of this Annual Survey of the Community are summarized in the following Table 4.

Table 4	Table 4 – County-specific Sample Sizes for Each Year of the North Country Annual Surveys of the Community																							
County	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Jefferson Lewis St. Lawrence	340	342	413	341	348	355	354	382 409	421 393	382 404	414 400	406 409	380 421	400 381	422 328	400 396 442	416 398 354	441 447 374	575 426 466	581 539 832	587 474 435	503 550 476	563 465 430	433 349 389

Finally, throughout this report, key community demographic characteristics of Gender, Age, Education Level, Political Ideology, Military Affiliation, Race/Ethnicity, and Household Income Level are investigated as potential explanatory variables that may be associated with quality-of-life indicators and other community behavior and opinion variables for the region. It is standard methodology with professional surveys to provide this further rich information to the reader –

information that may assist in explaining the overall findings – by reporting the cross-tabulated results for all subgroups within key demographic variables. The results provide important information about contemporary thinking of citizens and over time will continue to provide important baseline and comparative information as well. Again, for more specific details regarding tests of statistical significance completed within this study, please refer to the appendices of this report and/or contact the professional staff at the *Center for Community Studies*.

All data compilation and statistical analyses within this study have been completed using SPSS, Release 28.

Section 2 – Topline Summary of Findings The Most Notable Study Findings in 2023 –

Summary – what is changing, or most surprising, among the annual 21 community indicators studied:

1. Which indicators in 2023 differ most from their Long-term Average results?

An effective method to assess which community characteristics, or indicators, are showing the most change in the current data relative to typical results is to compare the 2023 result to the long-term average (LTA) result for each indicator. This graph illustrates these comparisons of rates of responding "Excellent or Good" (the "delta's") for each indicator, separated by county. The most noteworthy observations from this visualization are that in 2023 satisfaction with availability of good jobs is well higher than average, while the results for each of the following indicators are well below long-term averages:

- Availability of behavioral health services (2%+ below LTA in each county)
- Quality of K-12 education (4%+ below LTA in each county)
- Health care access (4%+ below LTA in each county)
- The overall quality of life in the area (6%+ below LTA in each county)
- Policing and crime control (8%+ below LTA in each county)
- Healthcare quality (below LTA 7%+ in each county)
- Availability of childcare (11%+ below LTA in each county)
- Availability of care for the elderly (9%+ below LTA in each county)
- Availability of housing (13%+ below LTA in each county)

In summary, by these metrics, availability of housing is the community characteristic that currently shows the greatest decrease in satisfaction among North Country residents among the studied indicators, closely followed by availability of care for the elderly, and availability of childcare. (Tables 7-9)



2. Perceived Quality of Life in One's Community - Comparison of the three North Country

Counties – Twenty community characteristics are studied each year in the three North Country counties (with a 21st included in only Jefferson County, Downtown of Watertown). These characteristics, or indicators, have been developed over the past two-plus decades and are intended to represent all components of what comprise a community – jobs, government, education, healthcare,

housing, recreation, etc. It is difficult not to recognize that in 2023 there are stark differences present when comparing the three represented counties. In summary, quite unanimously, Lewis County residents show the most satisfaction with the characteristics of their communities, followed by Jefferson County residents, and in comparison, residents of St. Lawrence County express by far the most dissatisfaction with the characteristics of their county. To illustrate, Lewis County residents reported the highest rates of "Excellent or Good" for 16 of the 20 studied community indicators. The only exceptions were that in Jefferson County the highest rates of "Excellent or Good" were found for each of *shopping opportunities* and *cost of energy*, and in St. Lawrence County the highest rates of "Excellent or Good" were found for each of *real estate taxes* and *access to higher education*. Furthermore, St. Lawrence County residents reported the highest rates of "Poor" for 17 of the 20 studied community indicators. (Tables 5 and 6)

Highlights for individual community characteristics – among these items that are tracked each year, which are showing most notable change?

- 3. Pocketbook Issues Concern with Inflation and the Cost of Living North Country residents in 2023 continued to express that inflation is problematic. When asked the open-ended question, "What do you think is the single largest issue that is facing residents of the North Country right now?", inflation was by far the most common free response, provided by 28% of participants. Concern with inflation is significantly higher among Lewis County residents when compared to the other two studied counties, and among those North Country residents who describe themselves as conservative in their political beliefs. (Table 47)
- 4. Personal Financial Situation Some Recovery Evident Between 2022 and 2023 Compared to results found in 2017-2018, there is strong evidence that North Country residents do not currently feel positive about their personal financial situations. In 2018, only 13% of participants reported that their financial situation had "gotten worse" in the preceding twelve months. In 2023 this "gotten worse" rate in the region is triple that which was found in 2018, the 2023 rate is 39%. However, this 39% "gotten worse" in 2023 among North Country adults is a significant decrease from the all-time high of over 51% that was found one year ago in 2022. The question that will be interesting to address next year in 2024 is whether or not this 2023 short-term improvement in personal financial situations will continue trending in that direction. While only one-in-nine North Country participants in 2023 (11%) indicate that their personal financial situation has "gotten better", this rate more than doubles to 23% among those who are from households with annual income of \$100,000 or more. (Table 34)
- 5. Good Job Availability Locally Continues to be Perceived More Positively than Ever Availability of good jobs has been studied continuously for 24 years and for the past three years (2021-2023) the rate of assessing as "Excellent or Good" has been the highest ever found, with one exception St. Lawrence County. In each of Jefferson and Lewis Counties, participants in 2023 continue to rate job availability very positively (32% and 35%, respectively), but not in St. Lawrence County. The "Excellent or Good" rate in St. Lawrence County plummeted from 27% in 2022 to only 16% in 2023. Interestingly, females and those from high income households in the North Country are least likely to feel that the availability of good jobs locally is "Excellent or Good". (Table 21)
- 6. Quality of K-12 Education, Residents are Returning to Pre-pandemic Levels of Satisfaction Every year that this education-related question has been included in the study, the Lewis County residents have responded with the most positive assessments of the quality of their K-12 schools when compared to the other two studied counties, and without question, Lewis County adults are very proud of their schools (in 2023, 76% rate as "Excellent or Good"). In each of the three studied counties the rates of assessing local K-12 schools as "Excellent or Good" decreased continuously between 2017-2022 (Jefferson from 67% to 52%, Lewis from 80% to 65%, and St. Lawrence from 72% to a lowest 49%). However, between 2022-2023 the rates in each of Lewis and St, Lawrence have increased, returning to pre-pandemic levels (Lewis between 2022-2023 increased from 65% back up to 76%, and St. Lawrence increased from 49% back up to 57%) while Jefferson remained quite stable. Along with the previously noted very positive result in Lewis County, other studied subgroups that have particularly positive assessments of their K-12 schools include: those from households with \$100,000 annual income or more (64% rate as "Excellent or Good"), those age 60-69 (64%), and those with at least a 4-year degree level of educational attainment (62%). (Table 23)
- 7. Policing and Crime Control Satisfaction is Low Compared to Long-term Averages Satisfaction with policing and crime control has decreased significantly in all three studied counties between 2020 and 2023, with rates of "Excellent or Good" in each of the counties well below the long-term averages for this community indicator. The Jefferson County 2023 rate is 46%, while the long-term 2000-2023 average has been 62%. The Lewis County 2023 rate is 62%, while the long-term 2007-2023 average in the county has been 69%. The St. Lawrence County 2023 rate is 44%, while the long-term 2015-2023 average in the county has been 69%. The St. Lawrence County 2023 rate is 44%, while the long-term 2015-2023 average in the county has been 56%. Note that in 2023 Lewis County residents remain, as has been the case in every year of study, more positive regarding policing and crime control than residents of the two neighboring counties. Older residents, the highly educated, and those with conservative political ideologies are the subgroups that report the greatest satisfaction with policing and crime control in the region. (Table 20)
- 8. Availability of Housing Satisfaction with the availability of housing in the North Country has decreased significantly in all three studied counties between 2015 (when 55%-65% rated as "Excellent or Good") and the most recent two years of study (2022-23, when satisfaction rates have halved to approximately 30%). In this past year there is slight improvement in Lewis County (from 25% to 36%), however, a continued downward trend of more dissatisfaction with availability of housing has been found in both Jefferson and St. Lawrence Counties between 2022 and 2023. The more highly educated, and those from higher income households are most satisfied with the availability of housing, along with those who self-report as BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, People of Color, or non-White). (Table 26)
- 9. Availability of Childcare Satisfaction with the availability of childcare in the North Country has been at an all-time low for the past two years (2022-2023), however, in this past year there is slight improvement in each of Jefferson and Lewis Counties, with

a continued downward trend of more dissatisfaction found in St. Lawrence County. Only about one-in-seven North Country residents (15%) currently rate the availability of childcare as "Excellent or Good". When first studied in 2015-2016 the satisfaction rates were approximately 40% in the counties, which is almost triple the current rate. Interestingly, it is those adults of the age most likely to need childcare services (age 18-39) who are most satisfied with the availability (although their "Excellent or Good" rate is still a not-that-impressive, but relatively high, 20%). Most notably, the subgroup who by far reports the highest level of satisfaction with availability of childcare is those individuals who live in a household that includes active military stationed at Fort Drum (36% of participants who have active military stationed at Fort Drum in the household rate availability of childcare as "Excellent or Good". (Table 27)

- 10. What direction are things heading In our nation? North Country residents in 2023 have expressed clear and increasing concern that, in general, things in the United States are heading in the wrong direction. In 2023 only 14% of participants believe that things in the country are headed in the right direction, while 73% believe that things in the country are headed in the wrong direction (was 68% in 2022), with residents of Lewis County clearly the most likely to feel that things are headed in the wrong direction (over 80% in Lewis County express this sentiment in 2023). Attitude regarding the direction that things are going in our country is very strongly correlated with political ideology only 7% of self-described conservatives indicate that they believe that things are going in the right direction, while 86% of conservatives respond with wrong direction (over a 12:1 ratio of wrong-to-right). (Table 31)
- 11. What direction are things heading In New York State? North Country residents in 2023 have expressed large concern that, in general, things in New York State are heading in the wrong direction. In 2023 only 18% of participants believe that things in our state are headed in the right direction, while 67% believe that things in our state are headed in the wrong direction, with residents of Lewis County clearly the most likely to feel that things are headed in the wrong direction (almost 80% in Lewis County express this sentiment). Attitude regarding the direction that things are going in our state is very strongly correlated with political ideology only 4% of self-described conservatives indicate that they believe that things are going in the right direction, while 86% of conservatives respond with wrong direction (over a 20:1 ratio of wrong-to-right). (Table 32)
- 12. What direction are things heading In the North Country? North Country residents are more optimistic, although not tremendously positive, with how things are going *locally* as 34% of participants in 2023 believe that things in their *county* are headed in the right direction (was 33% in 2022), while 40% in 2023 believe that things in their *county* are headed in the right direction (was 33% in 2022), while 40% in 2023 believe that things in their *county* are headed in the right direction. Residents of Lewis County are the most likely to feel that things are headed in the right direction in their county (37% in Lewis County express this sentiment). Results have remained relatively stable over the past four years of surveying (rates of "right direction" by county in 2020 were: 50% in Lewis, 42% in Jefferson, and 35% in St. Lawrence, and in 2023 respectively the rates are 37%, 34%, and 33%). Attitude regarding the direction that things are going in our *local counties* is <u>not</u> as strongly correlated with political ideology in 2023, 34% of self-described conservatives in the region indicate that they believe that things are going in the right direction in their county, while 44% of liberals respond with right direction (nowhere near the differences that emerged when these two groups evaluated the state or country). (Table 33)
- 13. Political Ideology Residents continue to be most likely to report that they are moderate or middle-of-the-road, not as Liberal or as Conservative In all three counties it has consistently been the case over the past 24 years of North Country public opinion polling that when asked one's political beliefs or ideology, "middle-of-the-road" is the most common response. Regardless of the overwhelming notion in our current society of political polarization, it remains in 2023 that North Country adult residents self-report as: 39% middle-of-the-road; 33% conservative; 14% liberal; and 14% not sure. (2022 results were: 44% middle-of-the-road; 32% conservative; 14% liberal; and 10% not sure). (Table 46)

Revisiting several North Country resident attitudes and behaviors measured in the past, but not recently measured:

14. Severity of Community Health and Safety Issues – Crime, Poverty, Mental Health, Alcohol Abuse, Opiates Abuse, Prescriptive Drugs Abuse – Between 2016 and 2018 the Center for Community Studies included a series of survey questions regarding six separate community issues. The goal of these questions was to measure the perceived severity of each issue within North Country communities (rather than the frequency/prevalence, suggested solutions, quality of community response, or any number of other attributes that could be studied regarding these six community issues). In 2023, perceived severity questions for these six community issues were reintroduced into the annual survey study. Below is a table that includes a summary of the changes over time that have been found for each issue, and at times, a county-comparison of results. The table below is sorted from top to bottom, from largest to smallest perceived severity of issue as a "major issue" on a region-wide basis in 2023.

Community Issue	Region % rate as a "Major Issue" in 2016-2018	Region % rate as a "Major Issue" in 2023	Jefferson Results % rate as a "Major Issue" 2023	Lewis Results % rate as a "Major Issue" 2023	St. Lawrence Results % rate as a "Major Issue" 2023
Heroin, or Other Opiate, Abuse (earlier year=2017)	73%	54%	56%	35%	57%
Poverty (earlier year=2017)	52%	41%	37%	30%	47%
Mental Health (earlier year=2016)	24%	38%	36%	29%	42%
Prescriptive Drug Abuse (earlier year=2018)	52%	37%	40%	24%	37%
Alcohol Abuse (earlier year=2017)	48%	33%	36%	25%	32%
Crime (earlier year=2017)	35%	21%	19%	7%	27%

To summarize, for every community issue the adults in Lewis County in 2023 far less commonly perceive the issue as a "major" community issue than residents of either Jefferson or St. Lawrence Counties, and for each of poverty and crime St. Lawrence County residents rate the severity of these problems as "major" much more commonly than those who reside in Jefferson County. Although Heroin, or Other Opiate, Abuse remains the most commonly perceived issue as "major" in the North Country (54% in 2023), a clear trend found over the past six years in the North Country is a significant decrease in evaluating Heroin, or Other Opiate, Abuse as a "major" community issue (from 73% in 2017 to the current 54%). Similar decreases in the perceived severity of poverty, crime, prescriptive drug abuse, and alcohol abuse were found between 2017/2018 and 2023. However, the clear exception in perception of community issues found in this study is that the reverse trend has transpired in the North Country between 2016 and 2023 when assessing mental health – only 24% of participants in 2016 rated Mental Health as a "major" issue, while that rate has *increased* to 38% in 2023. To identify significant correlations between participant demographic characteristics and their perceived severities for each of the six community issues, readers are directed to the graphs located with Tables 38-43 in Section 3.1.4 of this report, and Tables 38-43 in Appendix II. (Tables 38-43)

- 15. Women's Reproductive Rights There is overwhelming evidence that a large majority of adult residents in the North Country support women's reproductive rights. Participants were provided the following two statements, and asked which of the two choices they most agree with: Statement A: "Choosing abortion is a woman's right, and society should protect that right", and Statement B: "Abortion is morally wrong, and society should prohibit it". By more than a three-to-one ratio, residents are more likely to agree with Statement A rather than Statement B. More than three-fourths (76%) of North Country residents agree with the prochoice Statement A, while less than one-fourth (24%) agree with the pro-life Statement B. This sentiment resonates in each of the three individual counties studied in 2023 (the A vs. B rates of agreement by county in 2023 are: Jefferson: 78% vs. 22%; Lewis: 66% vs. 34%; and 76% vs. 24%). Moreover, the most recent-past inclusion of this survey question in this annual study was in 2020, before the 2023 overturn of the Row v. Wade decision by the United States Supreme Court. The 2023 results have shown an increase in support for Statement A (pro-choice) in each of the three counties since 2020 – Jefferson from 65% to 78%, Lewis from 59% to 66%, and St. Lawrence from 72% to 76%. Finally, throughout the North Country support for women's reproductive rights is quite ubiquitous. Among the many subgroups studied - by county, by age, by gender, by education, by military affiliation, by race/ethnicity, and by political ideology - every subgroup has a large majority within their participants who believe that choosing abortion is a woman's right, with 66% or more agreeing with Statement A in every studied subgroup, except one subgroup. The group of conservatives show less support for women's reproductive rights, however, even among this conservative subgroup a majority (56%) agree with Statement A. (Table 44)
- **16.** *Cross-border Travel* For the first 13 years that this annual study was completed in Jefferson County (2000-2012), the question "How many times have you crossed the border to eastern Ontario during the past year?" was tracked. In 2000-2001 twoin-three (60%-70%) of Jefferson County residents crossed the border at least once per year to eastern Ontario. This rate post-9/11 continuously decreased between 2001-2012 from 67% down to only 21% in 2012. Over a decade later, in 2023, the rate of crossing the border remains similar with 25% of Jefferson County residents crossing the border at least once (and similarly, 29% in St. Lawrence County, with only 9% in Lewis County). Education level and annual household income are the two factors that are most strongly associated with cross-border travel – among those with at least a 4-year degree 42% have crossed the border at least once in the past year, and the rate increases to 45% among those from households with annual incomes of at least \$100,000. (Table 37)
- **17.A Good Place to Grow Old** In 2010 and 2011, the question "Do you believe that your county is a good place to grow old?" was included in this annual study in each of Jefferson and Lewis Counties, and at that time approximately 40% of participants responded with "very good". The question has been reintroduced into this 2023 study and a tremendous change has been observed in that the "very good" rate has decreased from 40% to only 16% in the North Country. Not surprisingly, the subgroup that is most likely to respond that their county is a very good place to grow old is those who are already 70 years of age or older. Notably, Lewis County residents, and lower education level residents, are groups with more positive assessments of their county being a very good place to grow old. (Table 35)
- **18.** Fort Drum Support In 2003, in Jefferson County, for the first time, a survey question about the perception that the presence of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum since 1985 has improved the overall quality of life of North Country citizens was included in this annual study. Between 2003-2017 in Jefferson County the typical result was that approximately 75% of participants agreed with this perceived positive quality-of-life impact. Similarly, between 2007-2017 in Lewis County the typical result was that approximately 70% of participants agreed with this perceived positive quality-of-life impact. In 2023 this question was reintroduced and employed in all three counties and results remain very positive with 74% agreeing in Lewis County, 71% in Jefferson County, and 60% in St. Lawrence County. Note that the primary reason for this lower agreement rate in St. Lawrence County is due to a larger "no opinion" response rate, which is likely associated with the further distance from the military installation. Notably, the subgroup with the highest rate of agreement is the older residents (79% among those age 70+), and Fort Drum impact opinion is independent of political ideology (71% of conservatives agree, while similarly, 68% of liberals agree). (Table 36)

REMINDER: Cross-tabulations – the statistical tool to probe deeper and better understand

survey data – Readers are reminded that later in this report every survey question is cross-tabbed (partitioned) by levels of many demographic variables including, but not limited to: County, Gender, Age, Education Level, Annual Income, and Political Ideology. Statistics are reported for every subgroup within each of these demographic factors, both on a regional and county-specific basis. As a result, the report includes hundreds of cross-tabulation tables (in Appendix II) that report thousands of sample statistics. It is these cross-tabulation tables that readers may best use to attempt to identify significant explanatory variables that may be correlated with survey outcomes.

Section 3 - Detailed Statistical Results

Section 3.1 – Community Quality-of-Life Indicators

Section 3.1.1 – Relative Standing of Community Quality-of-Life Indicators in 2023

The following two tables (Tables 5 and 6) highlight all twenty-one studied quality-of-life indicators in 2023, providing the ability for one to observe the most positively and most negatively perceived community aspects – to take a current snapshot of opinions/satisfactions. The community indicators are sorted from top to bottom of Table 5, from the most to the least positively perceived by residents of the tri-county region in 2023. The brown-shaded number in each row is the *largest* result found for each survey question, providing an easy method to determine in which of the three studied counties each quality-of-life indicator is most commonly perceived currently as **excellent or good**. For quick reference, considering the sample sizes collected each county in the 2023 North Country Annual Survey of the Community, a difference of 5% or larger between any two counties (between any two numbers located in the same row) may be considered a statistically significant difference. (For more detail regarding statistical significance, please refer to Appendix III of this report: "Technical Comments – Assistance in Interpretation of the Statistical Results.")

Table 5 – SUMMARY of "Relative Standing" – Year 2023 – All 21 Quality-of-life Indicators Compared Across Counties – Rate of Responding "Excellent or Good"

Community Indicator:	Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	Three-county Region Combined
Quality of the environment	65%	84%	63%	66%
Access to higher education	57%	54%	70%	62%
Public outdoor recreational opportunities	60%	77%	54%	60%
Quality of K-12 education	50%	76%	57%	56%
The overall quality of life in the area	49%	68%	42%	48%
Policing and crime control	46%	62%	44%	47%
Health care access	44%	47%	36%	41%
Health care quality	42%	52%	33%	39%
City, town, and village government	31%	45%	39%	36%
County government	32%	35%	35%	34%
The downtown of Watertown	34%	-	-	34%
Cultural and entertainment opportunities	36%	36%	27%	32%
Shopping opportunities	46%	39%	17%	32%
Availability of behavioral health services	30%	31%	23%	27%
Availability of housing	26%	36%	24%	26%
Availability of good jobs	32%	35%	16%	25%
Availability of care for the elderly	23%	33%	23%	24%
Cost of Energy	23%	19%	22%	22%
The overall state of the local economy	20%	29%	18%	20%
Availability of childcare	16%	19%	13%	15%
Real estate taxes	15%	13%	16%	15%

The 2023 community indicators are sorted from top to bottom of Table 6, from the least to the most positively perceived by residents. The brown-shaded number in each row is the *largest* result found for each survey question, providing an easy method to determine in which of the three studied counties each quality-of-life indicator is most commonly perceived currently as **poor**. For quick reference, considering the sample sizes collected each county in the 2023 North Country Annual Survey of the Community, a difference of 5% or larger between any two counties (between any two numbers located in the same row) may be considered a statistically significant difference. (For more detail regarding statistical significance, please refer to Appendix III of this report: "Technical Comments – Assistance in Interpretation of the Statistical Results.")

Table 6 – SUMMARY of "Relative Standing" – Year 2023 – All 21 Quality-of-life Indicators Compared Across Counties – Rate of Responding "Poor"

Community Indicator:	Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	Three-county Region Combined
Real estate taxes	37%	42%	45%	41%
Cost of Energy	39%	42%	40%	40%
The overall state of the local economy	30%	28%	47%	38%
Availability of good jobs	27%	27%	46%	36%
Availability of care for the elderly	27%	22%	41%	33%
Availability of housing	30%	27%	35%	32%
Shopping opportunities	16%	22%	50%	32%
Availability of childcare	29%	27%	35%	31%
Availability of behavioral health services	24%	25%	29%	27%
Cultural and entertainment opportunities	19%	24%	31%	25%
Health care access	22%	9%	31%	25%
Health care quality	21%	12%	24%	21%
City, town, and village government	21%	12%	21%	20%
The downtown of Watertown	19%	-	-	19%
County government	19%	19%	18%	19%
Policing and crime control	11%	10%	23%	16%
The overall quality of life in the area	12%	5%	19%	14%
Public outdoor recreational opportunities	12%	8%	14%	12%
Quality of K-12 education	7%	7%	13%	10%
Access to higher education	9%	16%	7%	9%
Quality of the environment	8%	2%	11%	9%

Section 3.1.2 – Trends for Community Quality-of-Life Indicators

Next, each of these studied indicators is presented as a *motion picture* – showing how attitudes have changed over time in the North Country. The gray-shaded cell in each row of Tables 7-9 is the largest percentage responding "Excellent or Good" found throughout the studied years for each survey question. For quick reference, considering the sample sizes collected each year in the North Country Annual Survey of the Community, a difference of 5% or larger between any two years (between any two numbers located in the same row) may be considered a statistically significant trend, or change over time. (For more detail regarding statistical significance, please refer to Appendix III of this report: "Technical Comments – Assistance in Interpretation of the Statistical Results.")

Table 7 – SUMMARY of "Trends" in Jefferson County – Years 2000-2023 – All21 Quality-of-life Indicators Compared Across Time and to the Long-
term Average – Rate of Responding "Excellent or Good"

Indicator	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2008	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2018	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Avg.
Access to higher education	68	63	64	63	63	61	60	63	65	61	63	59	61	60	65	58	67	71	75	67	-	69	60	57	64
Public outdoor recreational opportunities	65	61	61	63	61	62	62	63	64	61	56	60	62	60	64	69	64	68	68	-	-	59	60	60	62
Policing and crime control	66	66	64	65	64	58	64	61	65	64	63	61	64	59	63	61	72	59	67	-	69	-	49	46	62
The overall quality of life in the area	64	50	56	56	53	57	60	65	62	54	58	55	58	60	54	63	66	67	66	62	66	60	50	49	59
Shopping opportunities	56	51	46	48	52	57	69	71	71	57	59	62	64	64	63	67	64	62	62	-	-	50	45	46	58
Quality of K-12 education	63	58	61	55	58	58	56	59	63	60	57	55	54	52	55	49	66	67	65	61	59	-	52	50	58
Quality of the environment	53	52	53	50	56	53	50	50	49	49	51	48	53	52	51	52	73	68	67	65	71	-	65	65	56
Availability of housing	-	-	-	-	-	37	39	46	50	55	57	51	48	56	64	63	66	58	58	51	-	-	27	26	50
Healthcare quality	49	45	51	49	50	50	51	50	51	44	47	47	48	49	46	47	52	56	59	52	58	-	43	42	49
Health care access	51	44	47	47	45	47	48	49	49	41	43	43	46	47	44	49	54	56	59	-	-	67	44	44	48
City, village, or Town government	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	48	46	45	-	-	-	34	31	41
Culturallentertainment opportunities	40	36	40	38	39	39	38	43	44	38	39	38	43	40	41	47	32	50	49	35	-	-	34	36	40
County government	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	45	41	41	35	-	36	30	32	37
Availability of care for the elderly	-	-	-	-	34	36	41	36	38	32	31	36	43	46	45	42	43	39	39	-	-	33	22	23	37
Availability of behavioral health services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38	42	35	-	-	33	24	30	34
The Downtown of Watertown	30	26	24	27	23	26	27	26	28	43	43	42	40	35	39	47	25	36	40	35	-	-	34	34	33
Availability of childcare	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	41	39	-	-	27	15	16	30
The overall state of the local economy	28	16	18	18	20	24	29	31	24	15	19	19	23	23	23	32	23	36	36	32	35	28	24	20	25
Availability of good jobs	17	7	9	10	11	15	20	25	20	9	14	11	15	15	13	18	17	23	28	25	32	30	32	32	19
Cost of energy	8	7	9	7	9	8	7	8	8	9	9	8	9	12	7	21	27	35	30	-	-	-	11	23	13
Real estate taxes	15	11	10	9	11	12	10	8	10	10	10	12	11	12	9	11	11	20	23	17	-	20	15	15	13

Table 8 – SUMMARY of "Trends" in *Lewis* County – Years 2007-2023 – All 20 Quality-of-life Indicators Compared Across Time and to the Longterm Average – Rate of Responding "Excellent or Good"

Indicator	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Avg
Quality of the environment	83	89	90	90	86	91	84	86	90	83	85	88	-	86	79	78	84	86
Quality of K-12 education	82	84	85	84	80	87	75	73	83	85	80	79	-	78	76	65	76	80
Public outdoor recreational opportunities	78	80	78	70	74	83	73	75	72	72	74	-	70	-	66	69	77	74
The overall quality of life in the area	74	82	73	78	73	77	71	75	77	81	77	79	74	78	66	54	68	74
Policing and crime control	70	77	69	78	74	75	68	73	66	72	64	-	74	76	62	56	62	70
Healthcare quality	74	75	71	70	64	79	68	71	69	63	70	61	-	65	55	51	52	66
Health care access	63	64	63	66	61	72	58	55	66	61	72	-	68	-	53	43	47	61
Availability of care for the elderly	55	64	62	65	61	70	54	65	57	57	54	-	46	-	39	26	33	54
Availability of housing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63	60	61	54	-	-	42	25	36	49
City, village, or Town government	48	53	45	44	51	52	42	43	45	54	49	-	55	-	39	42	45	47
Access to higher education	-	-	38	42	36	46	41	37	45	49	47	46	56	-	42	53	54	45
County government	43	46	33	32	41	39	35	40	45	44	45	44	-	-	39	38	35	40
Shopping opportunities	35	40	35	33	28	38	31	36	34	36	39	-	34	-	28	28	39	34
Availability of behavioral health services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	37	41	-	35	-	27	25	31	33
Cultural/entertainment opportunities	27	34	26	29	31	35	29	30	27	29	41	31	-	-	27	26	36	31
Availability of childcare	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43	42	42	-	27	-	21	18	19	30
The overall state of the local economy	35	21	21	23	19	30	19	24	31	30	36	45	35	37	29	20	29	28
Cost of energy	22	22	26	22	31	30	30	26	31	38	43	-	35	-	21	14	19	27
Real estate taxes	25	22	18	19	20	27	22	16	21	21	28	24	-	-	18	17	13	21
Availability of good jobs	17	13	11	13	10	13	16	16	15	16	24	26	25	25	36	36	35	20

Table 9 – SUMMARY of "Trends" in St. Lawrence County – Years 2015-2023 –
All 20 Quality-of-life Indicators Compared Across Time and to the
Long-term Average – Rate of Responding "Excellent or Good"

Indicator	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Avg.
Access to higher education	77	72	71	75	80	-	71	75	70	74
Quality of the environment	73	67	70	71	76	71	-	73	63	71
Quality of K-12 education	65	67	72	69	72	60	-	49	57	64
Public outdoor recreational opportunities	66	60	67	66	-	-	58	59	54	61
The overall quality of life in the area	61	59	60	64	69	55	55	51	42	57
Policing and crime control	66	54	64	65	-	60	-	45	44	57
Healthcare quality	59	57	49	50	54	44	-	42	33	49
Health care access	53	52	50	50	-	-	56	42	36	48
Availability of housing	55	48	47	44	51	-	-	30	24	43
City, village, or Town government	-	39	38	39	-	-	-	38	39	39
Availability of care for the elderly	45	38	41	36	-	-	21	20	23	32
County government	35	26	30	32	34	-	34	29	35	32
Culturallentertainment opportunities	27	31	35	36	36	-	-	27	27	31
Availability of behavioral health services	34	30	36	37	-	-	27	24	23	30
Availability of childcare	35	34	40	31	-	-	21	16	13	27
Cost of energy	34	32	30	28	-	-	30	12	22	27
Shopping opportunities	21	20	18	12	-	-	28	21	17	20
The overall state of the local economy	18	19	21	16	22	16	25	10	18	18
Real estate taxes	22	18	19	19	15	-	12	13	16	17
Availability of good jobs	10	12	15	15	16	13	25	28	16	17

<u>Section 3.1.3 – A Long Term Perspective of 2023 Results – Compare to</u> <u>Long Term Averages – *the Delta's*</u>

The following graph illustrates the current 2023 results for "Excellent or Good" for each of the 21 quality-of-life indicators compared to the average rate found over preceding years. This allows the reader to gain a wide perspective of which indicators are rated more positively or negatively than the typical rate.



Page 18 of 59

Section 3.1.4 – 2023 Detailed Results for Community Quality-of-Life Indicators

This section of the study provides a detailed presentation of the results for each of the questions in the survey. Tables 10-30, shown on the following pages, provide the greatest level of detail in results in 2023 for the twenty-one investigated quality-of-life indicators. In these twenty-one tables (pages), the result for each of the quality-of-life indicators is shown both by county and regionally, including all possible responses to each survey question in 2023. A trend analysis is also completed for each of the quality-of-life indicators, comparing to results from earlier years of study in each county. Finally, cross-tabulations by the key demographic factors (Gender, Age, Education, Political Ideology, Military Affiliation, Race/Ethnicity, and Annual Household Income) have been completed using the 2023 combined regional data for each survey question. Inspection of the results after cross-tabbing by any of these demographic factors allows the reader to better understand factors that may be significantly associated with perceptions of quality-of-life characteristics of the region. A similar reporting design, or approach, will be utilized throughout the remainder of this report for every individual survey question included in the survey instrument. The results for each survey question are presented in this section of the report with the following organizational structure:

- (1) The current 2023 North Country Regional result, as well as county-specific results for each of Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence County results for all sampled residents are combined and summarized in a frequency distribution *table* that shows the weighted sample proportion for each possible survey response and unweighted sample size collected for the survey question (recall, the weighted results are weighted for Gender, Age, Education Level, Race/Ethnicity, Military Affiliation, and Sampling Modality). *Statistically significant* differences between counties may be identified by using the descriptions and examples shown in Appendix III of this report.
- (2) A current 2023 Northern New York county-level regional comparison analysis is completed and shown in a *bar graph* for each survey question that was measured in more than one of the three counties of Jefferson, Lewis, and/or St. Lawrence in the year 2023. Countyspecific and regional aggregate results are illustrated graphically with this bar graph. *Statistically significant* differences between counties may be identified by using the descriptions and examples shown in Appendix III of this report.
- (3) A trend analysis is completed and shown in a county-separated *line graph* for each survey question that was measured in at least two of the twenty-four years 2000-2023. The data that underlies these trend line graphs is included in a more detailed tabular format for every survey question, within each county, in Appendix I. *Statistically significant* trends may be identified by using the descriptions and examples shown in Appendix III of this report.
- (4) Finally, the 2023 North Country combined three-county regional results for each survey question have been cross-tabulated by each of the demographic factors of County, Gender, Age, Education Level, Political Ideology, Race/Ethnicity, Military Affiliation, and Household Income Level and illustrated in *stacked bar graphs* (there are a total of over 800 crosstabulation subgroup distributions included in the graphs in this section of this report). *Statistically significant* relationships between variables, or differences between subgroup distributions, may be identified by using the descriptions and examples shown in Appendix III of this report, and inspection of the detailed cross-tabulation tables included in Appendix II.

For further explanation of the statistical concepts of "Margin of Error" and "Statistical Significance," to assist the reader in best interpreting and utilizing the presented information, please refer to Appendix III of this report – "Technical Comments – Assistance in Interpretation of the Statistical Results."

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

The rationale behind providing so many analyses (statistics) for every survey question included in this study is that one never fully understands the information contained in a reported statistic without "framing" that statistic. Framing involves adding a richer perspective to the value of some reported statistic. For example, consider if Lewis County residents were asked the survey question: "When considering you or your family's personal financial situation has it gotten better, stayed about the same, or gotten worse in the past 12 months?", and the result is that 44.1% of the Lewis County participants responded with *gotten worse*. (Table 34) So what does this 44.1% really mean? Often-times communitybased researchers will describe the process of "framing" a statistic as completing as many as possible of the six following comparisons (frames) to better understand a reported statistic from a sample:

- <u>Within Response Distribution</u> (Is it a majority? 4:1 ratio? "Three times more likely to respond with "better" than "worse"?)
- <u>Trend Across Time</u> (Has it increased? Decreased?)
- <u>Compare to Target/Benchmark</u> (Compare to an agency or community's goal or target?)
- <u>Compare to A Regional Average Result</u> (Compare to some regional average or similar counties?)
- Ranking Among Similar Variables
 (Among many different similar locations, characteristics, options, or attributes, that all use the same response scale, is this specific item ranked first? last?)
- <u>Cross-tabulations by Potential Explanatory Variables</u>
 (Different political ideological people differ in opinion or behavior? Age-dependent? Gender-dependent? Education-dependent? Income-dependent?)

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

Table 10 – Cultural/Entertainment Opportunities

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	4.1% _a	5.7% _a	1.5% _b	3.1%
	Good	31.8% _a	30.2% _a	25.3% _a	28.7%
Cultural and	Fair	40.0% _a	37.7% _a	40.0% _a	39.7%
opportunities	Poor	19.1% _a	24.2% _{a,b}	30.5% _b	24.8%
	Don't Know	5.0% _a	2.2% _a	2.7% _a	3.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	430	348	389	1167

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:



	0%	10% 20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
II North Country Participants	3%	29%			40%			25%	4
Jefferson County	4%	32%			40	%		19%	5%
Lewis County	6%	30%			38%			24%	
St. Lawrence County	2%	25%			40%			31%	
Males	3%	34%			39	1%		20%	49
Females	3%	24%			41%			29%	3
Age 18-39	4%	32%			34%			24%	5%
Age 40-59	1%	22%		429	6			33%	
Age 60-69	2%	32%			44	1%		1	9% :
Age 70+	5%	30%			2	46%		139	% 7%
No College	2%	31%			36%			25%	6%
Some College	4%	24%			42%			28%	
4+ Year Degree	3%	32%			4	4%			19%
Under \$50,000 HH Income	4%	27%			38%			24%	7%
50,000-\$100,000 HH Income	2%	25%			45%			26%	
Over \$100,000 HH Income	1%	30%			45%			239	%
Active Military in HH	6%		12%			26%		16%	10%
No AM in Household	2%	27%			42%			26%	
White	3%	27%			42%			25%	3
Non-white	4%	40%				27%		22%	7%
Conservative	2%	28%			41%			23%	5%
Middle of the Road	3%	28%			42%			25%	
Liberal	5%	32%				43%			20%
Unsure Politically	2%	31%			29%		3	1%	7%

Table 11 – Cost of Energy

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	2.9% _a	2.1% _a	2.9% _a	2.8%
	Good	19.6% _a	16.4% _a	19.2% _a	19.1%
Cost of Energy	Fair	33.5% _a	35.3% _a	34.5% _a	34.1%
COSt OF Energy	Poor	38.9% _a	41.8% _a	39.8% a	39.6%
	Don't Know	5.1% _a	4.4% _a	3.7% _a	4.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	429	348	389	1166

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



<u>Trend Analysis – Rate of "Poor" – By County:</u>



			Со	st of Energy	(3-count	y region co	ombined)				
	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
All North Country Participants	3%	19%			34%			4	10%		4%
Jefferson County	3%	20%			34%			3	9%		5%
Lewis County	2%	16%			35%			42	%		4%
St. Lawrence County	3%	19%			34%				40%		4%
Males	3%	24%			31	%			36%		5%
Females	2%	14%		37	7%			43	%		4%
Age 18-39	3%	24%			35	%			30%		9%
Age 40-59	3%	16%			34%				47%		1%
Age 60-69	3%	14%		3	6%			4	16%		1%
Age 70+	2%	20%			33%			409	%		5%
No College	3%	22%			28%			40%			7%
Some College	2%	14%		37	7%			44	%		3%
4+ Year Degree	3%	23%				43%			30%		1%
Under \$50,000 HH Income	2%	18%		28%	6			43%		1	D%
\$50,000-\$100,000 HH Income	4%	14%			38%				43%		2%
Over \$100,000 HH Income	2%	21%			40%	5			37%		0%
Active Military in HH	6%		26%			31%		22%		16%	
No AM in Household	2%	18%			35%				42%		3%
White	3%	18%			33%			4:	2%		4%
Non-white	2%	26%				39%			21%	129	6
Conservative	1 <mark>%</mark>	14%		36%				45%			4%
Middle of the Road	3%	20%			32%			3	9%		5%
Liberal	4%	23%				41%			29%		2%
Unsure Politically	5%	24	1%		285	6		3	7%		6%
				Excellent	Good Fair	Poor Dor	n't know				

Table 12 – Healthcare Access

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	12.8% _a	8.6% _a	3.5% _b	8.2%
	Good	31.0% _a	38.3% _a	32.5% _a	32.5%
Health care	Fair	30.6% _a	41.6% _a	32.0% _a	32.4%
access	Poor	22.1% _a	9.5% _b	31.4% _c	24.9%
	Don't Know	3.5% _a	2.0% _{a,b}	0.6% _b	2.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	432	348	389	1169

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



<u>Trend Analysis – Rate of "Excellent or Good" – By County:</u>





Table 13 – Healthcare Quality

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	11.5% _a	10.1% _a	2.6% _b	7.3%
	Good	30.7% _a	42.2% _b	30.8% _a	32.0%
Health care	Fair	33.6% _a	33.7% _a	40.5% _a	36.7%
quality	Poor	20.5% _{a,b}	11.6% _a	24.4% _b	21.3%
	Don't Know	3.6% _a	2.3% _a	1.7% _a	2.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	431	348	387	1166

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)



Page 24 of 59

Table 14 – Access to Higher Education

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	16.0% _a	12.1% _a	24.9% _b	19.5%
	Good	41.2% _a	41.7% _a	44.7% _a	42.8%
Access to	Fair	27.3% _a	27.8% _{a,b}	20.7% _b	24.4%
education	Poor	8.6% _a	15.7% _b	7.3% _a	8.8%
	Don't Know	6.9% _a	2.7% _{a,b}	2.3% _b	4.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	430	346	387	1163

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:





Table 15 – Public Outdoor Recreational Opportunities

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	20.0% _a	31.6% _b	17.6% _a	20.2%
	Good	40.5% _a	45.5% _a	36.8% _a	39.4%
Public outdoor	Fair	26.2% _a	14.7% _b	28.8% _a	26.1%
opportunities	Poor	11.9% _a	7.7% _a	14.0% _a	12.4%
	Don't Know	1.4% _a	0.4% _a	2.8% _a	1.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	432	348	389	1169

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:





Table 16 – Quality of the Environment

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	17.1% _a	30.5% _b	16.7% _a	18.3%
	Good	47.7% _a	53.5% _a	46.0% _a	47.6%
Quality of the	Fair	25.9% _a	13.6% _b	25.9% _a	24.6%
environment	Poor	8.2% _{a,b}	2.2% _a	11.3% _b	9.0%
	Don't Know	1.1% _a	0.2% _a	0.1% _a	0.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	432	347	389	1168

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:





Table 17 – County Government

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	5.4% _a	3.1% _{a,b}	1.0% _b	3.2%
	Good	26.5% _a	32.4% _{a,b}	34.4% _b	30.7%
County	Fair	35.7% _a	37.7% _a	37.3% _a	36.6%
government	Poor	19.4% _a	18.9% _a	18.3% _a	18.9%
	Don't Know	12.9% _a	7.9% _a	9.1% _a	10.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	432	348	389	1169

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)

		County G	overnm	ent (3-coun	ty region	combine	d)				
	0%	10% 20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%		80%	90%	1
All North Country Participants	3%	31%			37%				19%		11%
Jefferson County	5%	27%			36%			1	19%		13%
Lewis County	3%	32%			38%				19%		8%
St. Lawrence County	1%	34%			37%				18%		9%
Males	5%	31%			37%				17%		10%
Females	1%	31%		36%					20%		11%
Age 18-39	5%	26%		29	6		18%			22%	
Age 40-59	1%	28%			41%				27%		4%
Age 60-69	2%	41%				41%				12%	5%
Age 70+	5%	39%	5			4:	L%			129	% 3%
No College	4%	29%			35%				21%		12%
Some College	2%	27%			39%				20%		11%
4+ Year Degree	2%	42%				35%			13	%	9%
Under \$50,000 HH Income	5%	33%			26%			18%		189	6
\$50,000-\$100,000 HH Income	3%	28%			45%				189	6	7%
Over \$100,000 HH Income	3%	31%			39%				20%		7%
Active Military in HH	12%	24%			29%		6%		30	0%	
No AM in Household	2%	32%			38%				20%		8%
White	3%	32%			37%				20%		9%
Non-white	8%	27%			34%			8%	1	23%	
Conservative	5%	36%				36%			179	6	7%
Middle of the Road	2%	28%			39%				19%		12%
Liberal	2%	28%			45%				14%		12%
Unsure Politically	3%	29%		255	6		269	6		17	%

Page 28 of 59

Table 18 – City, Village, or Town Government

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	5.1% _a	3.2% _a	3.1% _a	4.0%
	Good	26.1% _a	42.2% _b	36.1% _b	32.3%
I own and	Fair	34.9% _a	33.3% _a	33.4% _a	34.0%
aovernment	Poor	20.9% _a	12.5% _a	20.7% _a	19.9%
5	Don't Know	13.0% _a	8.8% _{a,b}	6.7% _b	9.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	433	349	389	1171

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)



Page 29 of 59

Table 19 – Real Estate Taxes

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	2.1% _a	2.1% _a	1.7% _a	1.9%
	Good	12.6% _a	11.3% _a	14.1% _a	13.1%
Real estate	Fair	32.2% _a	34.1% _a	31.6% _a	32.1%
taxes	Poor	36.8% a	42.3% _{a,b}	45.5% _b	41.3%
	Don't Know	16.4% _a	10.3% _{a,b}	7.1% _b	11.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	432	347	389	1168

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Poor" - By County:



			Real	Estate Taxe	s (3-count	y region of	combined)				
	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	1
ll North Country Participants	2%	13%		32%				41%			12%
Jefferson County	2%	13%		32%			3	7%		16%	
Lewis County	2%	11%		34%				42%			10%
St. Lawrence County	2%	14%		32%				45%			7%
Males	2%	14%		35%				39%			10%
Females	2%	12%		30%			43	\$%		13	3%
Age 18-39	3%	12%		30%			32%			23%	
Age 40-59	1%	11%		32%				52%			5%
Age 60-69	1%	17%			39%				42%		2%
Age 70+	3%	16%		3	4%			40%			8%
No College	3%	11%		29%			40%			17%	
Some College	1%	12%		32%				47%			8%
4+ Year Degree	2%	18%			41%				32%		7%
Under \$50,000 HH Income	2%	13%		29%			35%			21%	
50,000-\$100,000 HH Income	0 <mark>%</mark>	12%		37%				43%			7%
Over \$100,000 HH Income	1%	12%		36%				48%			3%
Active Military in HH		9%	15%	2	3%		21%		32%	5	
No AM in Household	1%	13%		34%				44%			9%
White	2%	12%		32%				42%			12%
Non-white	2%	18%			35%			31%		14	4%
Conservative	1%	11%		30%				48%			10%
Middle of the Road	2%	14%		33%				40%			10%
Liberal	1%	18%			34%			33%		14	1%
Unsure Politically	4%	10%		32%			36%			18%	

Table 20 – Policing and Crime Control

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	9.5% _a	12.3% _a	7.8% _a	9.0%
	Good	36.2% _a	49.6% _b	36.1% _a	37.6%
Policing and	Fair	37.4% _a	24.3% _b	33.3% _{a,b}	34.1%
crime control	Poor	11.2% _a	10.1% _a	22.8% _b	16.3%
	Don't Know	5.6% _a	3.7% _a	0.0% ¹	2.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	431	348	389	1168

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)

			Policing and	Crime C	ontrol (3-co	ounty reg	gion combi	ned)				
	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%		90%	1009
All North Country Participants	9%			38%			34%	i			16%	3%
Jefferson County	10%			36%			37	%			11%	6%
Lewis County	12%				50%			24%			10%	4%
St. Lawrence County	8%		3	5%			33%				23%	0%
Males	12%			41%				31%			13%	3%
Females	6%		35%				38%			1	8%	3%
Age 18-39	11%			34%			35%			1	5%	4%
Age 40-59	6%		34%				40%			4	17%	3%
Age 60-69	10%			47%				26%			17%	0%
Age 70+	10%			46%				30%			12%	2%
No College	9%		3	4%			37%			1	.6%	4%
Some College	8%			38%			32%			1	9%	3%
4+ Year Degree	10%			46%				31%			12%	2%
Under \$50,000 HH Income	9%			37%			32%			18	%	4%
\$50,000-\$100,000 HH Income	6%		379	6			37%				19%	1%
Over \$100,000 HH Income	11%			38%				35%			15%	1%
Active Military in HH	16	5%		28%			37%			7%	129	6
No AM in Household	8%			39%			33%	i			18%	2%
White	9%			39%			33%	i			17%	3%
Non-white	13%			34%				41%			7%	5%
Conservative	13%			39%				30%			18%	1%
Middle of the Road	8%			38%			37	%			14%	3%
Liberal	4%		4	4%				36%			13%	3%
Unsure Politically	10%		27%			1	35%		:	22%		6%
			= 6	xcellent 🔳 G	Good Fair	Poor Do	on't know					

Page 31 of 59

Table 21 – Availability of Good Jobs

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	6.9% _a	5.6% _a	0.6% _b	3.9%
	Good	25.5% _a	29.7% _a	15.3% _b	21.4%
Availability of	Fair	31.5% _a	32.8% _a	36.3% _a	33.8%
good jobs	Poor	27.5% _a	27.5% _a	45.8% _b	35.6%
	Don't Know	8.6% _a	4.4% _{a,b}	2.0% _b	5.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	433	348	388	1169

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:



		Ava	ailability	of Good .	lobs (3-co	unty regior	n combi	ned)			
	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100
All North Country Participants	4%	21%			34%				36%		5%
Jefferson County	7%		25%			32%			27%		9%
Lewis County	6%		30%			33%			27%		4%
St. Lawrence County	1%	15%		36%				46	5%		2%
Males	6%	23	3%		3	2%			31%		7%
Females	2%	18%			36%				40%		4%
Age 18-39	6%	19%			35%				32%		8%
Age 40-59	2%	21%			31%			4	3%		3%
Age 60-69	2%	21%			42%				32%		3%
Age 70+	5%	20	5%		3	0%			34%		6%
No College	5%	21%			31%			3	6%		7%
Some College	3%	22%			34%				38%		4%
4+ Year Degree	3%	21%			40%				33%		4%
Under \$50,000 HH Income	7%	209	6		31%			3	6%		7%
\$50,000-\$100,000 HH Income	2%	20%			38%				35%		5%
Over \$100,000 HH Income	2%	17%			40%				39%		2%
Active Military in HH		13%	16%		32	%		17%		22%	
No AM in Household	2%	22%			34%				39%		3%
White	3%	21%			34%				38%		5%
Non-white	1	2%	26%			34%			18%		11%
Conservative	5%	24%	6		3	4%			32%		5%
Middle of the Road	4%	19%			32%			39	9%		5%
Liberal	2%	22%			33%				41%		2%
Unsure Politically	1%	19%			40%				31%		8%
			E	cellent 🔳 Go	od Fair	Poor Don't	know				

Table 22 – Shopping Opportunities

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	10.9% _a	4.9% _{a,b}	2.0% _b	6.3%
	Good	34.7% _a	34.4% _a	15.0% _b	25.9%
Shopping	Fair	36.2% _a	38.8% _a	32.4% _a	34.8%
opportunities	Poor	16.4% _a	21.8% _a	49.9% _b	31.9%
	Don't Know	1.9% _a	0.1% _a	0.6% _a	1.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	431	348	387	1166

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)



Page 33 of 59

Table 23 – Quality of K-12 Education

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	13.0% _a	19.3% _a	6.3% _b	10.7%
	Good	37.2% _a	56.3% _b	50.5% _b	45.2%
Quality of K-12	Fair	25.1% _a	11.1% _b	24.0% _a	23.1%
education	Poor	7.3% _a	7.2% _{a,b}	13.1% _b	9.8%
	Don't Know	17.5% _a	6.1% _b	6.2% _b	11.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	432	349	388	1169

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:



		Quality o	of K-12 Ed	ucation	(3-county	region	combir	ned)				
(0% 10%	20%	30%	40	% 50	%	60%	70%	80%		90%	100
All North Country Participants	11%		45%					23%		10%		11%
Jefferson County	13%		37%				25%	7%	17%			
Lewis County	19%				56%				11%		7%	6%
St. Lawrence County	6%		50%					24%				6%
Males	11%			49%			20%			9% 11%		11%
Females	10%		42%	i.			1		11%		10%	
Age 18-39	12%		42%				19%	19% 12%			16%	
Age 40-59	9%		46%					29%			0%	6%
Age 60-69	11%		52%					18%			10% 8%	
Age 70+	10%		48%					24%			6% 12%	
No College	11%		42%				22%	22% 12'			13%	
Some College	9%		48%					24%				11%
4+ Year Degree	12%		50%					22%			%	8%
Under \$50,000 HH Income	10%		40%				24%		9%		16%	
\$50,000-\$100,000 HH Income	9%		48%					24%		12%		8%
Over \$100,000 HH Income	12%		52%				24%			9%	4%	
Active Military in HH	15%		24%		14%	10%	6		38%			
No AM in Household	10%			49%				24%		9%	6	7%
White	11%		45%				24%		10%		10%	
Non-white	10%		50%					15% 8%			17%	
Conservative	9%		52%				17%		14%		8%	
Middle of the Road	13%			44%				24%		7%	:	11%
Liberal	13%			45%				23%	4	%	15%	é
Unsure Politically	5%	33%				35%			15%		13	\$%
			Excellent	Good	Fair 🔳 Poor	🔳 Don't kr	iow					

Table 24 – Overall State of the Local Economy

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	2.1% _a	3.8% _a	0.0% ¹	1.4%
	Good	17.7% _a	24.9% _a	18.2% _a	18.7%
The overall	Fair	43.6% _a	39.2% _{a,b}	33.7% _b	38.7%
local economy	Poor	30.4% _a	28.1% _a	47.2% _b	37.7%
	Don't Know	6.2% _a	4.0% _a	0.9% _b	3.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	429	348	388	1165

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:



0	1%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
l North Country Participants	1%	19%		39%				38%			4%	
Jefferson County	2%	18%			44%			30%			6%	
Lewis County	4%	25%		39%				28%			4%	
St. Lawrence County 0	%	18%		34%				47	1%			
Males	2%	21%			4	16%			27%		4%	
Females 1	.%	16%		32%				48%			3%	
Age 18-39	2%	19%			39%			33%			6%	
Age 40-59	1%	14%		34%				48%				
Age 60-69	1%	24%		36%				39%				
Age 70+	1%	23%				51%				23%	2%	
No College	1%	18%	39%						37%		4%	
Some College	1%	15%	37%					43%			3%	
4+ Year Degree	1%	27%	41%					29%			2%	
Under \$50,000 HH Income	2%	17%		37%				40	%		5%	
50,000-\$100,000 HH Income 1	.%	15%	44%					38%			1%	
Over \$100,000 HH Income	L%	19%		41%				38%			2%	
Active Military in HH	5%		27%			35%		159	%	17%		
No AM in Household	L%	18%			39%				41%		2%	
White	1%	17%			40%			39%			3%	
Non-white	4%		35%			31%	5		24%		7%	
Conservative	1%	18%			39%				38%		3%	
Middle of the Road	1%	17%		41%				36%			4%	
Liberal	1%	19%		45%			32%			3%		
Unsure Politically 0	%	24%		:	26%			46%			4%	
Table 25 – Availability of Care for the Elderly

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	3.3% _a	3.3% _a	2.2% _a	2.8%
	Good	20.1% _a	29.8% _a	20.5% _a	21.3%
Availability of	Fair	31.1% _a	34.4% _a	31.4% _a	31.6%
elderly	Poor	27.2% _a	22.1% _a	41.1% _b	32.9%
	Don't Know	18.4% _a	10.5% _a	4.8% _b	11.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	430	348	388	1166

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis – Rate of "Excellent or Good" – By County:



	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	1
I North Country Participants	3%	21%			32%			33%		1	1%
Jefferson County	3%	20%			31%			27%	_	18%	
Lewis County	3%		30%			34%			22%		10%
St. Lawrence County	2%	20%			31%			41%			5%
Males	4%		28%			33%			22%	12	%
Females	1%	15%		30%				43%		1	1%
Age 18-39	4%		25%		29%	%		22%		20%	
Age 40-59	1%	15%		35%				40%			9%
Age 60-69	3%	21%			30%			41%			5%
Age 70+	4%	2	4%		31%	6			37%		39
No College	3%	24	%		31%			33%			9%
Some College	3%	20%			32%		17	33%		17	2%
4+ Year Degree	3%	19%			32%			31%		15%	
Under \$50,000 HH Income	5%	19%			26%			39%		1	2%
0,000-\$100,000 HH Income	2%	20%			36%			32%		1	1%
Over \$100,000 HH Income	2%	21%			33%			30%		139	6
Active Military in HH	10%		21%		18%	10%			42%		
No AM in Household	2%	22%			34%			35%	6		7%
White	2%	21%			31%			34%		1	1%
Non-white	6%		25%			33%		18%		18%	
Conservative	2%	21%			34%			34%			9%
Middle of the Road	5%	21	%		31%			32%		1	1%
Liberal	2%	23%			30%			28%		17%	
Unsure Politically	1%	22%			30%			36%		17	2%
				Excollent G	ood Enir	Boor Don't	know	7.543			and the second se

Table 26 – Availability of Housing

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	4.3% _a	4.4% _a	1.1% _b	2.9%
	Good	21.4% _a	31.8% _b	23.3% _{a,b}	23.4%
Availability of	Fair	33.7% _a	28.4% _a	37.0% _a	34.6%
housing	Poor	30.3% _a	26.6% _a	34.6% _a	31.8%
	Don't Know	10.3% _a	8.9% _{a,b}	4.1% _b	7.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	430	347	388	1165

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:



			Availabilit	y of Housin	g (3-cou	nty region	combined)				
	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	1
Il North Country Participants	3%	23%			35%				32%		7%
Jefferson County	4%	21%			34%			30%	6		10%
Lewis County	4%		32%			28%			27%		9%
St. Lawrence County	1%	23%			37%				35%		4%
Males	5%		29%			35%			23%		8%
Females	1%	19%		33%				41%			6%
Age 18-39	5%	2	4%		329	6		3	0%		9%
Age 40-59	1%	21%			36%			3	36%		6%
Age 60-69	3%	26	%			36%			29%		6%
Age 70+	1%	27%			34%	6			31%		7%
No College	3%	20%		30	%			39%			9%
Some College	3%	24%			31	8%			29%		7%
4+ Year Degree	3%		31%			38%			23%		5%
Under \$50,000 HH Income	4%	15%		34%				37%			10%
50,000-\$100,000 HH Income	1%	22%			39%				31%		6%
Over \$100,000 HH Income	4%		30%			35%			27%		4%
Active Military in HH	9%		21%		25%		18%		2	8%	
No AM in Household	2%	24%			36%				34%		4%
White	2%	23%			34%				34%		7%
Non-white	6%		34%			29%			20%		10%
Conservative	3%	21%			37%			3	10%		9%
Middle of the Road	3%	26	%		3	4%			32%		5%
Liberal	3%	20%			39%				34%		4%
Unsure Politically	2%	25%			27%			33%			13%
			E E	xcellent 🔳 Good	Fair	Poor Don't	know				

Table 27 – Availability of Childcare

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	2.8% _a	2.7% _a	1.5% _a	2.2%
	Good	13.2% _a	16.7% _a	11.8% _a	12.9%
Availability of	Fair	22.0% _a	26.0% _{a,b}	30.4% _b	26.2%
childcare	Poor	29.3% _a	27.4% _a	34.5% _a	31.4%
	Don't Know	32.7% _a	27.2% _{a,b}	21.9% _b	27.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	431	347	386	1164

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:



			Availabili	ty of Chi	Idcare	e (3-c	ounty regi	on combi	ned)			
	0%	10%	20%	30%		40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	10
ll North Country Participants	2%	13%		26%				31%			27%	
Jefferson County	3%	13%		22%			29%			33%		
Lewis County	3%	17%		269	%			27%			27%	
St. Lawrence County	1%	12%		30%				35%			22%	
Males	2%	18%			28%			21%		30	1%	
Females	2%	8%	24%				1	42%			24%	
Age 18-39	5%	15%		24%	6			31%			25%	
Age 40-59	0 <mark>%</mark>	13%		30%				35%			22%	
Age 60-69	0%	12%	23	%			34%	6		30	1%	
Age 70+	1%	9%	25%				25%			40%		
No College	4%	13%		22%			:	31%		30)%	
Some College	1%	13%		30%				31%			25%	
4+ Year Degree	1%	13%		27%				34%			25%	
Under \$50,000 HH Income	2%	13%		21%			29%			35%		
50,000-\$100,000 HH Income	1%	9%		33%				35%			21%	
Over \$100,000 HH Income	1%	16%		26%				34%			24%	
Active Military in HH		13%	2	3%		9%		20%		34%		
No AM in Household	0%	11%		29%				33%			26%	
White	2%	10%	2	6%			;	34%		3	28%	
Non-white	6%		32%				27%		11%		24%	
Conservative	1%	13%		27%				31%		2	9%	
Middle of the Road	2%	10%	3	27%				33%		:	28%	
Liberal	2%	14%		20%				39%			25%	
Unsure Politically	6%		21%			26%		2	2%		25%	
				Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor Do	on't know				

Table 28 – Availability of Behavioral Health Services

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	8.1% _a	3.6% _{a,b}	3.8% _b	5.7%
	Good	21.8% _a	27.1% _a	19.3% _a	21.3%
Availability of	Fair	29.2% _a	29.9% _a	28.9% _a	29.2%
health services	Poor	24.4% _a	25.2% _a	29.2% _a	26.6%
	Don't Know	16.5% _a	14.2% _a	18.9% _a	17.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	425	346	385	1156

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)

	A	vailability o	f Behavio	oral Heal	th Service	es (3-co	unty re	egion co	mbined))		
	0%	10% 2	0%	30%	40%	50%	60%	%	70%	80%	90%	10
All North Country Participants	6%	21%			29%				27%	_	17%	
Jefferson County	8%	229	%		29%				24%		17%	
Lewis County	4%	27%			30%	6			25%		14%	
St. Lawrence County	4%	19%		2	9%			29%			19%	
Males	7%	2!	5%		27	%			20%		20%	
Females	4%	17%		32	%				32%		15%	
Age 18-39	12%		22%			29%			20%		16%	
Age 40-59	2%	20%		27%				35%			15%	
Age 60-69	2%	20%		299	6			30%			19%	
Age 70+	2%	21%			34%			205	%		22%	
No College	8%	229	6		28%				23%		19%	
Some College	5%	22%			28%				31%		14%	
4+ Year Degree	2%	19%		33	%			27%			20%	
Under \$50,000 HH Income	10%		27%		:	22%			25%		17%	
50,000-\$100,000 HH Income	5%	14%		3	8%				30%		14%	
Over \$100,000 HH Income	2%	22%			30%			299	%		18%	
Active Military in HH	1	17%	229	%		27%			13%		21%	
No AM in Household	4%	21%			30%				28%		17%	
White	4%	20%			30%			27	%		18%	
Non-white	11%		33%				25%			20%	12%	
Conservative	4%	17%		29%				27%			22%	
Middle of the Road	9%	2	3%		299	6			26%		14%	
Liberal	4%	22%			31%				29%		14%	
Unsure Politically	5%	22%			30%			2	3%		20%	
			Exce	llent 🔳 Good	f Fair I	Poor ■Do	on't know					

Page 39 of 59

Table 29 – The Downtown of Watertown

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	3.7% _a	-	-	3.7%
	Good	30.2% _a	-	-	30.2%
The downtown	Fair	40.2% _a	-	-	40.2%
of Watertown	Poor	19.3% _a	-	-	19.3%
	Don't Know	6.6% _a	-	-	6.6%
	Total	100.0%	-	-	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	416	-	-	416

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:

(this question only included for Jefferson County)

Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:



Jefferson County Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)

		The Downtown of Wa	atertown (only Jeffe	rson Co	unty par	ticipant	s)			
	0%	10% 20%	30% 4	0%	50%	60%	70%	80%		90%	100
All North Country Participants	4%	30%			40%				19%		7%
Jefferson County	4%	30%			40%				19%		7%
Lewis County											
St. Lawrence County											
Males	6%	28%			41%			1	L6%		8%
Females	2%	33%			38%				24%		4%
Age 18-39	7%	24%			42%			20	%		8%
Age 40-59	0%	29%			42%			2	25%		4%
Age 60-69	0%	43%				36%			14%		8%
Age 70+	3%	46%					36%			12%	2%
No College	4%	25%			45%			18	%		9%
Some College	3%	32%			34%			26%	6		5%
4+ Year Degree	3%	41%				41%				13%	2%
Under \$50,000 HH Income	7%	22%		37%				22%		12	%
\$50,000-\$100,000 HH Income	0%	41%				39%				18%	1%
Over \$100,000 HH Income	2%	30%			47%				179	6	4%
Active Military in HH	10%	18%		35%			:	24%		13%	,
No AM in Household	2%	34%			439	6			18%		3%
White	2%	33%			40%				20%		4%
Non-white	10%	18%			45%			12%		14%	
Conservative	2%	33%			40%				20%		5%
Middle of the Road	3%	32%			40%				20%		5%
Liberal	7%	30%				45%			11	%	6%
Unsure Politically	7%	18%		42%				24%		1	10%
		Excelle	ent 📕 Good 👘	Fair Poor	🔳 Don't kr	now					

Page 40 of 59

Table 30 – Overall Quality of Life in the Area

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	9.4% _a	12.7% _a	4.1% _b	7.4%
	Good	39.8% _a	55.3% _b	37.9% _a	40.6%
The overall quality of life in	Fair	37.2% _{a,b}	26.0% _a	38.6% _b	36.6%
the area	Poor	12.5% _a	5.3% _a	18.6% _b	14.4%
	Don't Know	1.1% _a	0.7% _a	0.8% _a	0.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	428	330	367	1125

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Excellent or Good" - By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)

	0%	Overall Quality of Life in the Area (3-	county region combined)	00% 100
	0%	10% 20% 30% 40%	50% 60% 70% 80%	90% 100:
All North Country Participants	7%	41%	37%	14% 1%
Jefferson County	9%	40%	37%	12% 1%
Lewis County	13%	55%	26%	5% 1%
St. Lawrence County	4%	38%	39%	19% 1%
Males	9%	44%	34%	12% 1%
Females	5%	37%	39%	17% 1%
Age 18-39	7%	34%	43%	15% 2%
Age 40-59	7%	36%	38%	19% 1%
Age 60-69	5%	55%	29%	11% 0%
Age 70+	12%	54%	27%	7% 1%
No College	9%	38%	36%	16% 1%
Some College	6%	40%	36%	17% 1%
4+ Year Degree	6%	49%	37%	6% 2%
Under \$50,000 HH Income	9%	34%	39%	17% 0%
\$50,000-\$100,000 HH Income	4%	43%	35%	16% 1%
Over \$100,000 HH Income	5%	47%	41%	6% 1%
Active Military in HH	10%	30%	45%	10% 4%
No AM in Household	7%	42%	35%	15% 0%
White	7%	42%	36%	14% 1%
Non-white	11%	32%	42%	15% 1%
Conservative	9%	46%	35%	9% 0%
Middle of the Road	7%	37%	38%	17% 1%
Liberal	5%	44%	38%	11% 1%
Unsure Politically	8%	32%	35%	24% 1%
		Excellent Good Fair Po	oor 🔳 Don't know	

Page 41 of 59

Section 3.2 – Additional Tracked Resident Opinions and Characteristics

Table 31 – Generally speaking, would you say things in this <u>country</u> are heading in the right or wrong direction?

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Right direction	14.9% _a	10.6% _a	13.4% _a	13.8%
Direction of the Country	Wrong direction	68.2% _a	80.2% _b	75.7% _b	72.9%
	Don't Know	16.9% _a	9.2% _{a,b}	10.8% _b	13.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	424	347	388	1159

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Wrong Direction" - By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)



Page 42 of 59

Table 32 – Generally speaking, would you say things in <u>New York State</u> are heading in the right or wrong direction?

2023 Survey Results:

			Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
		Right direction	18.8% _a	13.4% _a	19.4% _a	18.5%
	Direction of New York State	Wrong direction	61.5% _a	78.8% _b	69.6% _b	67.1%
		Don't Know	19.7% _a	7.8% _b	11.0% _b	14.5%
		Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Sample Sizes	424	346	388	1158
	New York State	Don't Know Total Sample Sizes	19.7% _a 100.0% 424	7.8% _b 100.0% 346	11.0% _b 100.0% 388	14.5% 100.0% 1158

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis – Rate of "Wrong Direction" – By County:



Generally speaking, would you say things in New York State are heading in the right or wrong										
	0% 10%	20%	direction? (3	3-county r	egion combine	ed) ‱	70%	80%	90%	100
All North Country Participants	18%				67%					14%
Jefferson County	19%				62%				20%	
Lewis County	13%			79%					8%	
St. Lawrence County	19%				70%					11%
Males	20%				66%					15%
Females	17%				68%					15%
Age 18-39	23%		56%						21%	
Age 40-59	14%		76%							10%
Age 60-69	19%		74%					7%		
Age 70+	17%		68%						15%	
No College	19%		62%				189	%		
Some College	16%		73%					11%		
4+ Year Degree	21%		66%					13%		
Under \$50,000 HH Income	22%				58%				21%	
\$50,000-\$100,000 HH Income	17%				76%					8%
Over \$100,000 HH Income	12%				76%					12%
Active Military in HH	27%				37%			36%		
No AM in Household	17%				71%					11%
White	17%				70%					13%
Non-white	29	%			47%				24%	
Conservative	4%				86%					9%
Middle of the Road	19%				68%					13%
Liberal			54%				29%		17	7%
Unsure Politically	16%			55%	6				29%	
			Right Direction	n 🛛 Wrong D	irection Don't kn	ow				
				Page 43 of	59					

Table 33 – Generally speaking, would you say things in <u>your county</u> are heading in the right or wrong direction?

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
Direction of Your County	Right direction	33.6% _a	37.2% _a	33.3% _a	33.9%
	Wrong direction	32.0% _a	41.3% _{a,b}	47.1% _b	39.8%
	Don't Know	34.4% _a	21.5% _b	19.6% _b	26.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	424	347	387	1158

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis – Rate of "Right Direction" – By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)



Page 44 of 59

Table 34 – When considering your family's personal financial situation- has it gotten better, stayed about the same, or gotten worse in the past 12 months?

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
Has you or your family's personal financial situation gotten better, stayed about the same, or gotten worse in the past 12 months?	Better	9.9% _a	11.0% _a	12.3% _a	11.1%
	Same	48.1% _a	42.8% _a	48.9% _a	47.9%
	Worse	38.1% _a	44.1% _a	38.4% _a	38.9%
	t Don't Know	4.0% _a	2.1% _{a,b}	0.4% _b	2.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	424	345	386	1155

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Worse" - By County:



When	When considering your family's personal financial situation- has it gotten better, stayed about										
	the sar	ne, or gott	en worse in th	e past	12 mon ំ	ths? (3-county	region cor	nbined) ^{80%}	90%	100%
All North Country Participants	11%			48%					39%		2%
Jefferson County	10%		48%					38%		4%	
Lewis County	11%		43%						44%		2%
St. Lawrence County	12%			49%					38%		0%
Males	14%			44%					38%		3%
Females	8%		5	1%					39%		1%
Age 18-39	12%			50%					33%		5%
Age 40-59	13%		42%					46%		0%	
Age 60-69	9%		50%				41%		0%		
Age 70+	8%		55%				36%		0%		
No College	9%		52%					36%		3%	
Some College	10%		41%					47%		1%	
4+ Year Degree	18	3%	52%					29%		1%	
Under \$50,000 HH Income	8%		47%						41%		4%
\$50,000-\$100,000 HH Income	8%		48%						42%		1%
Over \$100,000 HH Income		23%			40%				36%		1%
Active Military in HH	14%		4	1%				34%		:	12%
No AM in Household	11%			49%					39%		1%
White	9%		49	9%					40%		2%
Non-white		24%			40%				27%		8%
Conservative	10%		42%						47%		1%
Middle of the Road	10%		53%				35%		1%		
Liberal	18	3%			51%				30%		1%
Unsure Politically	7%		47%					38%	6		8%
			Better	Same	Worse	Don't k	now				

Table 35 – Do you believe that your county is a good place to grow old? (appropriate supports, elder friendly)?

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Very good	16.7% _a	20.9% _a	14.7% _a	16.3%
Do you believe	Fairly good	41.7% _a	50.2% _a	39.7% _a	41.7%
that your county	Not very good	20.3% _a	18.6% _a	25.2% _a	22.3%
is a good place	Definitely not good	13.6% _{a,b}	6.3% _a	17.7% _b	14.6%
to grow old?	Don't know	7.7% _a	4.0% _{a,b}	2.8% _b	5.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	425	347	388	1160

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Very Good" - By County:





Table 36 – "The presence of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum since 1985 has improved the overall quality of life of North Country citizens."

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
"The presence of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum	Strongly Agree	37.6% _a	29.0% _a	18.0% _b	27.9%
	Agree	33.2% _a	45.1% _b	42.1% _b	38.5%
	Disagree	7.4% _a	8.5% _a	5.0% _a	6.4%
improved the overall	Strongly Disagree	2.7% _a	0.4% _a	1.7% _a	2.0%
quality of life of North Country citizens."	Neutral/No Opinion	19.0% _a	17.0% _a	33.1% _b	25.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	424	342	377	1143
	Sample Sizes	424	342	377	1143

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Agree" - By County:





Table 37 – How many times have you crossed the border to eastern Ontario during the past year?

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	None	72.9% _a	90.7% _b	71.4% _a	74.1%
How many times have	1-2 times	15.1% _a	8.1% _a	14.7% _a	14.2%
you crossed the	3-5 times	6.5% _a	0.8% _b	6.3% _a	5.8%
Ontario during the	More than 5 times	3.5% _a	0.2% _a	7.6% _b	5.0%
past year?	Not sure	1.9% _a	0.2% _{a,b}	0.1% _b	0.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	425	342	387	1154

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "At least one visit" - By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)



Page 48 of 59

Table 38 – How severe of an issue do you believe crime is in your community?

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Major	19.1% _a	6.7% _b	26.9% _c	21.3%
How severe of an	Moderate	38.3% _a	44.2% _a	33.8% _a	36.9%
issue do you believe	Minor	31.4% _a	41.1% _a	32.3% _a	32.8%
crime is in your	Not at all	5.9% _a	7.6% _a	5.2% _a	5.7%
community?	Don't know	5.3% _a	0.4% _b	1.9% _b	3.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	423	345	387	1155

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Major Issue" - By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)



Page **49** of **59**

Table 39 – How severe of an issue do you believe poverty is in your community?

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Major	36.6% _a	30.4% _a	47.1% _b	40.7%
How severe of an	Moderate	39.9% _a	48.4% _a	37.3% _a	39.7%
issue do you believe	Minor	13.2% _a	16.5% _a	12.4% _a	13.2%
poverty is in your	Not at all	2.7% _a	1.7% _a	2.4%a	2.5%
community?	Don't know	7.6% _a	3.1% _{a,b}	0.7% _b	4.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	424	342	384	1150

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis – Rate of "Major Issue" – By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)



Page 50 of 59

Table 40 – How severe of an issue do you believe mental health is in your community?

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Major	35.7% _{a,b}	28.8% _a	41.8% _b	37.7%
How severe of an	Moderate	38.1% _a	46.8% _a	35.3% _a	37.8%
issue do you believe	Minor	13.9% _a	15.4% _a	11.1% _a	12.8%
mental health is in	Not at all	2.1% _a	0.8% _a	4.8%a	3.2%
your community?	Don't know	10.2% _a	8.2% _a	6.9% _a	8.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	423	344	386	1153

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Major Issue" - By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)



Page 51 of 59

Table 41 – How severe of an issue do you believe alcohol abuse is in your community?

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Major	35.7% _a	24.6% _a	32.0% _a	32.9%
How severe of an	Moderate	37.5% _a	47.1% _a	41.5% _a	40.3%
issue do you believe	Minor	14.9% _a	18.1% _a	15.0% _a	15.3%
alcohol abuse is in	Not at all	2.0% _a	0.5% _a	4.4% _a	2.9%
your community?	Don't know	9.8% _a	9.8% _a	7.1% _a	8.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	423	343	387	1153

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Major Issue" - By County:





Table 42 – How severe of an issue do you believe *heroin, or other opiate, abuse* is in your community?

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Major	56.2% _a	35.3% _b	56.9% _a	54.3%
How severe of an	Moderate	21.0% _a	32.6% _b	26.4% _{a,b}	24.7%
Issue do you belleve	Minor	9.0% _{a,b}	15.1% _a	5.5% _b	8.1%
opiate, abuse is in	Not at all	3.2% _a	0.5% _a	4.6% _a	3.6%
your community?	Don't know	10.5% _{a,b}	16.5% _a	6.6% _b	9.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	423	344	387	1154

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Major Issue" - By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)

How severe of an issue do you believe heroin, or other opiate, abuse is in your community? (3-county region combined) 10% 20% 30% 40% 100 50% 709 All North Country Participants 54% 25% 4% Jefferson County 56% 21% 3% 33% Lewis County 15% St. Lawrence County 57% 26% 5% 5% Males 23% Females 26% Age 18-39 55% 22% Age 40-59 25% 10% 3% Age 60-69 30% 5% 1% Age 70+ 25% No College 21% 25% Some College 2% 4+ Year Degree Under \$50,000 HH Income 18% \$50,000-\$100,000 HH Income 30% 7% 1% Over \$100,000 HH Income 28% 1% 5% 55% 11% Active Military in HH 6% No AM in Household 25% White 25% Non-white 12% Conservative 27% Middle of the Road 239 2% Liberal 34% 4% 5% 11% **Unsure Politically** 58% 17% 4% Major Issue Moderate Issue Minor Issue Nat at all an Issue Don't Know

Table 43 – How severe of an issue do you believe *prescriptive drug abuse* is in your community?

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Major	39.6% _a	24.4% _b	36.5% _a	36.6%
How severe of an	Moderate	29.3% _a	39.0% _a	35.5% _a	33.1%
ISSUE do you belleve	Minor	11.7% _{a,b}	18.5% _a	9.4% _b	11.4%
abuse is in your	Not at all	3.5% _a	0.9% _a	4.6% _a	3.7%
community?	Don't know	15.9% _a	17.2% _a	14.0% _a	15.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	423	341	387	1151





Trend Analysis - Rate of "Major Issue" - By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)



Page 54 of 59

Table 44 – Attitude Regarding Women's Reproductive Rights – Pro-life vs. Pro-choice Statement A: "Choosing abortion is a woman's right, and society should protect that right." Statement B: "Abortion is morally wrong, and society should prohibit it." *Which do you agree with?*

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
Attitude Regarding	Strongly A	55.2% _a	48.7% _a	54.2% _a	54.1%
Women's	Somewhat A	22.9% _a	17.4% _a	21.3% _a	21.6%
Reproductive Rights:	Somewhat B	10.2% _a	14.1% _a	10.0% _a	10.6%
A= Woman's Right;	Strongly B	11.7% _a	19.8% _a	14.4% _a	13.8%
B=Morally wrong	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	405	337	373	1115

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis – Rate of "Woman's right" – By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)



Page 55 of 59

Table 45 – Employment Status – Current Occupation

2023 Survey Results:

Jefferson St. Lawrence 3-County Region Lewis Retired Not currently employ 22.1%_a 29.5%_{a,b} 26.3% 29.6%_b 1.4% 0.0%1 2.5% 1.8% 4.9%_a 2.9%_{a,b} 2.0%b 3.4% 1.2%_a 6.1%_b 1.1%_a 1.7% Student Military 20.1%_a 1.8%_b 0.2%_b 9.1% Managerial Medical 1.5% 4.4% 3.4% 3.6% Professional/Technic Sales 3.1%_a 6.2%_{a,b} 10.2%_t 6.6% 6.9%_a 9.0%_a 5.1%_a 6.3% Vhat is your 2.0%_a 6.3%_b 3.1%_{a,b} 2.9% urrent Sales ccupation? Clerical Service Blue-col 1.5%, 4.6% 6.7% 5.2% 4.4%_a 4.6%_a 4.3%_a 4 4% 5.4%_a 13.2%_b 16.6%_b 11.3% Teacher/Education 5.6%_a 5.6%_a 5.6%_a 5.6% Self-employed Not Sure 7.0%_a 10.3% 6.5% 5.1% 0.0%¹ 0.0%¹ 0.3%_a 0.1% 6.8%_a 1.4%_a 4.3%_a 5.0% 0.0%¹ 0.0% Other Total 0.0%¹ 0.0%¹ 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 419 346 383 1148



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Retired" - By County:





Table 46 – Political Beliefs

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Conservative	30.5% _a	39.8% _a	32.7% _a	32.5%
Delitical	Middle of the Road	45.6% _a	37.0% _{a,b}	32.0% _b	38.6%
Political Beliefs	Liberal	9.6% _a	15.1% _{a,b}	19.0% _b	14.4%
Bellete	Don't Know	14.2% _a	8.2% _a	16.2% _a	14.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	409	345	380	1134

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis - Rate of "Middle of the Road" - By County:





Table 47 – What do you think is the single largest issue that is facing residents of the North Country right now?

2023 Survey Results:

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Inflation/Cost of Living	23.8% _a	37.8% _b	29.5% _{a,b}	28.0%
What do you	Unemployment/Jobs	10.3% _a	7.2% _a	14.8% _a	12.0%
think is the	Affordable Housing	10.4% _a	4.5% _a	7.6% _a	8.4%
single largest	Homelessness	12.0% _a	2.0% _b	3.9% _b	7.1%
facing residents	Drugs	5.2% _a	5.4% _a	8.4% _a	6.7%
of the North	Crime	4.6% _a	1.4% _a	9.0% _b	6.2%
Country right	Healthcare	4.7% _a	4.1% _a	7.8% _a	6.1%
now?	Other Issues	29.1% _a	37.5% _a	19.0% _b	25.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	388	335	373	1096

North Country County Comparison – Graphically:



Trend Analysis – Rate of "Inflation/Cost of Living" – By County:



Regional Three-county Combined Cross-tabulations (using 2023 data): (county-specific detailed cross-tabulations in Appendix II)



Page 58 of 59

Section 4 - Final Comments

This report is a presentation of the information collected from approximately 21,500 interviews of adult residents of Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence Counties, New York conducted between 2000 and 2023. 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 1220 Coffeen Street Watertown, NY 13601 Telephone: (315) 786-2264

Joel LaLone, Director jlalone@sunyjefferson.edu www.sunyjefferson.edu/community/community-studies/

The Twenty-fifth Annual North Country Survey of the Communities is tentatively scheduled for October 2024.

Appendix I Detailed County-specific 2000-2023 Trends in Tabular Format

Section 3.1 – Community Quality-of-Life Indicators

Indicator	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Avg.
Access o h gher educat on	68	63	64	63	63	61	60	63	65	61	63	59	61	60	65	58	67	71	75	67	-	69	60	57	64
Public outdoor ec ea ona oppor uni es	65	61	61	63	61	62	62	63	64	61	56	60	62	60	64	69	64	68	68	-	-	59	60	60	62
Policing and clime contiol	66	66	64	65	64	58	64	61	65	64	63	61	64	59	63	61	72	59	67	-	69	-	49	46	62
The ove a qua y of e n he a ea	64	50	56	56	53	57	60	65	62	54	58	55	58	60	54	63	66	67	66	62	66	60	50	49	59
Shopping oppor uni es	56	51	46	48	52	57	69	71	71	57	59	62	64	64	63	67	64	62	62	-	-	50	45	46	58
Qua yo K 12 educat on	63	58	61	55	58	58	56	59	63	60	57	55	54	52	55	49	66	67	65	61	59	-	52	50	58
Qua y of he env onment	53	52	53	50	56	53	50	50	49	49	51	48	53	52	51	52	73	68	67	65	71	-	65	65	56
Ava abi yofhousng	-	-	-	-	-	37	39	46	50	55	57	51	48	56	64	63	66	58	58	51	-	-	27	26	50
Hea hca e qual y	49	45	51	49	50	50	51	50	51	44	47	47	48	49	46	47	52	56	59	52	58	-	43	42	49
Hea h care access	51	44	47	47	45	47	48	49	49	41	43	43	46	47	44	49	54	56	59	-	-	67	44	44	48
City, village, o Town gove nment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	48	46	45	-	-	-	34	31	41
Cul ura ente anment oppor uni es	40	36	40	38	39	39	38	43	44	38	39	38	43	40	41	47	32	50	49	35	-	-	34	36	40
County gove nment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	45	41	41	35	-	36	30	32	37
Ava ab yocare o he eldely	-	-	-	-	34	36	41	36	38	32	31	36	43	46	45	42	43	39	39	-	-	33	22	23	37
Ava ab yo behavoa healh servces	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38	42	35	-	-	33	24	30	34
The Downtown of Wa e own	30	26	24	27	23	26	27	26	28	43	43	42	40	35	39	47	25	36	40	35	-	-	34	34	33
Availability o childca e	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	41	39	-	-	27	15	16	30
The ove al sate o he ocal economy	28	16	18	18	20	24	29	31	24	15	19	19	23	23	23	32	23	36	36	32	35	28	24	20	25
Ava abi yofgood obs	17	7	9	10	11	15	20	25	20	9	14	11	15	15	13	18	17	23	28	25	32	30	32	32	19
Cos of ene gy	8	7	9	7	9	8	7	8	8	9	9	8	9	12	7	21	27	35	30	-	-	-	11	23	13
Rea esta e axes	15	11	10	9	11	12	10	8	10	10	10	12	11	12	9	11	11	20	23	17	-	20	15	15	13

 Table 7 – SUMMARY of "Trends" in Jefferson County – Years 2000-2023 – All 21 Quality-of-life Indicators

 Compared Across Time and to the Long-term Average – Rate of Responding "Excellent or Good"

Table 8 – SUMMARY of "Trends" in Lewis County – Years 2007-2023 – All 20 Quality-of-life Indicators Compared Across Time and to the Long-term Average – Rate of Responding "Excellent or Good"

Indicator	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Avg
Qua y of he env onment	83	89	90	90	86	91	84	86	90	83	85	88	-	86	79	78	84	86
Quayo K 12 education	82	84	85	84	80	87	75	73	83	85	80	79	-	78	76	65	76	80
Public outdoor ec ea ona opporuni es	78	80	78	70	74	83	73	75	72	72	74	-	70	-	66	69	77	74
Theovea qua yof e n heaea	74	82	73	78	73	77	71	75	77	81	77	79	74	78	66	54	68	74
Policing and cime contiol	70	77	69	78	74	75	68	73	66	72	64	-	74	76	62	56	62	70
Hea hcaequal y	74	75	71	70	64	79	68	71	69	63	70	61	-	65	55	51	52	66
Hea h care access	63	64	63	66	61	72	58	55	66	61	72	-	68	-	53	43	47	61
Avaab yocare o he eldely	55	64	62	65	61	70	54	65	57	57	54	-	46	-	39	26	33	54
Ava abi yofhousng	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63	60	61	54	-	-	42	25	36	49
City, village, o Town gove nment	48	53	45	44	51	52	42	43	45	54	49	-	55	-	39	42	45	47
Access o h gher educat on	-	-	38	42	36	46	41	37	45	49	47	46	56	-	42	53	54	45
County gove nment	43	46	33	32	41	39	35	40	45	44	45	44	-	-	39	38	35	40
Shopping oppor uni es	35	40	35	33	28	38	31	36	34	36	39	-	34	-	28	28	39	34
Ava ab yo behavo a healh servces	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	37	41	-	35	-	27	25	31	33
Culura ente anment oppor uni es	27	34	26	29	31	35	29	30	27	29	41	31	-	-	27	26	36	31
Availability o childca e	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43	42	42	-	27	-	21	18	19	30
The ove al sate o he ocal economy	35	21	21	23	19	30	19	24	31	30	36	45	35	37	29	20	29	28
Cos of ene gy	22	22	26	22	31	30	30	26	31	38	43	-	35	-	21	14	19	27
Rea esta e axes	25	22	18	19	20	27	22	16	21	21	28	24	-	-	18	17	13	21
Ava abi yofgood obs	17	13	11	13	10	13	16	16	15	16	24	26	25	25	36	36	35	20

 Table 9 – SUMMARY of "Trends" in St. Lawrence County – Years 2015-2023 – All 20 Quality-of-life Indicators

 Compared Across Time and to the Long-term Average – Rate of Responding "Excellent or Good"

Indicator	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Avg.
Access to higher education	77	72	71	75	80	-	71	75	70	74
Quality of the environment	73	67	70	71	76	71	-	73	63	71
Quality of K-12 education	65	67	72	69	72	60	-	49	57	64
Public outdoor recreational opportunities	66	60	67	66	-	-	58	59	54	61
The overall quality of life in the area	61	59	60	64	69	55	55	51	42	57
Policing and crime control	66	54	64	65	-	60	-	45	44	57
Healthcare quality	59	57	49	50	54	44	-	42	33	49
Health care access	53	52	50	50	-	-	56	42	36	48
Availability of housing	55	48	47	44	51	-	-	30	24	43
City, village, or Town government	-	39	38	39	-	-	-	38	39	39
Availability of care for the elderly	45	38	41	36	-	-	21	20	23	32
County government	35	26	30	32	34	-	34	29	35	32
Cultural/entertainment opportunities	27	31	35	36	36	-	-	27	27	31
Availability of behavioral health services	34	30	36	37	-	-	27	24	23	30
Availability of childcare	35	34	40	31	-	-	21	16	13	27
Cost of energy	34	32	30	28	-	-	30	12	22	27
Shopping opportunities	21	20	18	12	-	-	28	21	17	20
The overall state of the local economy	18	19	21	16	22	16	25	10	18	18
Real estate taxes	22	18	19	19	15	-	12	13	16	17
Availability of good jobs	10	12	15	15	16	13	25	28	16	17

Table 10 – Cultural/Entertainment Opportunities

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%	5%	4%	4%	4%	5%	4%	4%	5%	5%	7%	8%	8%	-	-	5%	4%	5%	Excellent	8%	4%
Good	36%	32%	36%	34%	35%	35%	34%	38%	39%	34%	35%	34%	38%	36%	37%	42%	27%	43%	41%	27%	-	-	29%	32%	35%	Good	43%	27%
Ex+Good	40%	36%	40%	38%	39%	39%	38%	43%	44%	38%	39%	38%	43%	40%	41%	47%	32%	50%	49%	35%	-	-	34%	36%	40%	Ex+Good	50%	32%
Fair	32%	32%	32%	32%	34%	33%	33%	31%	31%	32%	31%	31%	31%	32%	31%	31%	49%	36%	35%	39%	-	-	39%	40%	34%	Fair	49%	31%
Poor	25%	30%	25%	27%	25%	23%	26%	24%	22%	26%	25%	28%	23%	26%	25%	21%	17%	11%	12%	24%	-	-	22%	19%	23%	Poor	30%	11%
Don't Know	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	2%	3%	3%	5%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	4%	3%	-	-	4%	5%	3%	Don't know	5%	2%
																									100%			
rend Analysis – Detailed Results for Lewis County: Normalize 2007 2008 2010 2011 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 Average Maximum Minimut																												
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023								Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	5%	6%	4%	3%	4%	4%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	-	-	3%	4%	6%								4%	Excellent	6%	2%
Good	22%	28%	22%	26%	28%	32%	27%	27%	24%	26%	38%	27%	-	-	24%	22%	30%								27%	Good	38%	22%
Ex+Good	27%	34%	26%	29%	32%	36%	29%	30%	27%	29%	41%	31%			27%	26%	36%								3 1%	Ex+Good	41%	26%
Fair	46%	40%	43%	43%	41%	42%	46%	38%	43%	43%	44%	36%	-	-	45%	46%	38%								42%	Fair	46%	36%
Poor	26%	24%	28%	25%	23%	22%	23%	30%	29%	24%	13%	29%	-	-	23%	24%	24%								24%	Poor	30%	13%
Don't know	2%	3%	3%	3%	5%	0%	2%	2%	1%	3%	2%	3%	-	-	5%	5%	2%								3%	Don't know	5%	0%
																		-							100%			
Trend Analy	ysis – I	Detaile	d Re	sults	for S	St. La	wrei	nce C	ount	<u>y:</u>																		
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023																Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	5%	7%	6%	9%	7%	-	-	5%	2%																6%	Excellent	9%	2%
Good	22%	24%	29%	27%	29%	-	-	22%	25%																25%	Good	29%	22%
Ex+Good	27%	31%	35%	36%	36%	-	-	27%	27%	[3 1%	Ex+Good	36%	27%
Fair	43%	41%	40%	31%	31%	-	-	44%	40%																39%	Fair	44%	31%
Poor	26%	25%	22%	29%	31%	-	-	28%	31%																27%	Poor	31%	22%
Don't know	3%	3%	3%	4%	2%	-	-	1%	3%																3%	Don't know	4%	1%
																									100%			

Table 11 – Cost of Energy

Trend Analy	<u>ysis – I</u>	Detaile	ed Re	sults	for .	Jeffe	rson	Cour	<u>1ty :</u>																			
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	5%	6%	-			1%	3%	2%	Excellent	6%	1%
Good	7%	6%	8%	6%	8%	7%	6%	7%	7%	8%	8%	7%	8%	11%	6%	18%	26%	30%	24%			-	10%	20%	11%	Good	30%	6%
Ex+Good	8%	7%	9%	7%	9%	8%	7%	8%	8%	9%	9%	8%	9%	12%	7%	21%	27%	35%	30%	-	-	-	11%	23%	13%	Ex+Good	35%	7%
Fair	25%	22%	28%	24%	28%	24%	21%	24%	23%	26%	28%	23%	26%	33%	23%	37%	38%	39%	36%	-		-	30%	33%	28%	Fair	39%	21%
Poor	62%	66%	56%	61%	56%	63%	69%	62%	66%	61%	56%	66%	58%	51%	65%	39%	27%	20%	26%	-		-	49%	39%	53%	Poor	69%	20%
Don't Know	5%	5%	7%	8%	7%	5%	4%	7%	3%	3%	6%	2%	5%	5%	5%	3%	9%	7%	8%	-		-	10%	5%	6%	Don't know	10%	2%
																									100%			
Trend Analy	ysis –	Detaile	d Re	sults	for l	Lewis	s Coi	unty:										_										
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	l							Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	2%	3%	2%	3%	4%	3%	3%	1%	4%	4%	5%	-	2%	-	3%	2%	2%								3%	Excellent	5%	1%
Good	20%	19%	24%	19%	28%	27%	27%	25%	27%	34%	38%	-	32%	-	18%	12%	16%								24%	Good	38%	12%
Ex+Good	22%	22%	26%	22%	32%	30%	30%	26%	31%	38%	43%	-	34%	-	21%	14%	18%	[27%	Ex+Good	43%	14%
Fair	31%	30%	32%	33%	29%	32%	43%	44%	39%	38%	38%	-	38%	-	41%	31%	35%								36%	Fair	44%	29%
Poor	44%	48%	38%	40%	36%	36%	25%	29%	29%	21%	14%	-	22%	-	36%	53%	42%								34%	Poor	53%	14%
Don't know	3%	0%	3%	6%	4%	3%	3%	1%	2%	3%	5%	-	5%	-	2%	3%	4%								3%	Don't know	6%	0%
																		-							100%			
Trend Analy	ysis –	Detaile	d Re	sults	for S	St. La	awrei	nce C	ount	<u>y:</u>																		
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023																Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	6%	5%	9%	3%	-	-	7%	1%	3%																5%	Excellent	9%	1%

Excellent	6%	5%	9%	3%	-	-	7%	1%	3%	
Good	28%	27%	21%	25%	-	-	23%	11%	19%	
Ex+Good	34%	32%	30%	28%	-	-	30%	12%	22%	
Fair	34%	39%	41%	42%	-	-	46%	34%	34%	
Poor	30%	26%	24%	29%	-	-	21%	51%	40%	
Don't know	1%	3%	5%	1%	_	_	4%	4%	4%	

100	1%	
Aver	age	Maximur
5%	6 Excellent	9%
229	% Good	28%
279	% Ex+Good	34%
399	% Fair	46%
329	% Poor	51%
3%	6 Don't know	5%
100	%	

Table 12 – Healthcare Access

Trend Analysis - Detailed Results for Jefferson County:

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	е
Excellent	8%	6%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	6%	6%	6%	7%	7%	6%	6%	11%	13%	17%			17%	7%	13%	8%	Excellent
Good	43%	38%	40%	40%	38%	40%	41%	42%	42%	35%	37%	37%	39%	40%	38%	43%	43%	43%	42%	-		50%	37%	31%	40%	Good
Ex+Good	51%	44%	47%	47%	45%	47%	48%	49%	49%	41%	43%	43%	46%	47%	44%	49%	54%	56%	59%	-	-	67%	44%	44%	48%	Ex+Good
Fair	29%	30%	30%	29%	30%	31%	29%	28%	28%	31%	30%	30%	31%	29%	29%	34%	32%	26%	25%	-		25%	33%	31%	30%	Fair
Poor	17%	22%	19%	20%	18%	15%	20%	18%	20%	23%	22%	22%	21%	20%	22%	15%	13%	14%	11%	-		5%	19%	22%	18%	Poor
Don't Know	3%	3%	4%	4%	8%	6%	4%	5%	3%	6%	5%	4%	3%	4%	5%	2%	2%	4%	5%	-		3%	4%	3%	4%	Don't kno
																									່ 100%	

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for Lewis County:

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	15%	16%	12%	20%	16%	18%	14%	11%	14%	14%	19%	-	13%	-	9%	7%	9%
Good	48%	48%	51%	46%	46%	55%	44%	45%	52%	47%	53%	-	55%	-	45%	36%	38%
Ex+Good	63%	64%	63%	66%	62%	73%	58%	56%	66%	61%	72%	-	68%	-	54%	43%	47%
Fair	27%	24%	24%	26%	25%	17%	28%	32%	24%	23%	20%	-	21%	-	28%	42%	42%
Poor	9%	11%	11%	7%	12%	10%	11%	12%	8%	14%	7%	-	9%	-	17%	13%	9%
Don't know	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	0%	3%	0%	2%	2%	1%	-	3%	-	1%	2%	2%

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for St. Lawrence County :

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	8%	8%	9%	14%	-	-	11%	7%	3%
Good	45%	44%	41%	36%	-	-	45%	35%	33%
Ex+Good	53%	52%	50%	50%	-	-	56%	42%	36%
Fair	30%	27%	31%	29%	-	-	32%	38%	32%
Poor	15%	18%	18%	20%	-	-	13%	20%	31%
Don't know	2%	2%	1%	1%	-	-	0%	0%	1%

	Maximum	Minimum
ow	8%	2%
	23%	5%
	34%	25%
1	67%	41%
	50%	31%
t	17%	6%

Maximum Minimum

11%

12% 34%

21%

Average	2	Maximum	Minimum
14%	Excellent	20%	7%
47%	Good	55%	36%
61%	Ex+Good	73%	43%
27%	Fair	42%	17%
11%	Poor	17%	7%
2%	Don't know	3%	0%
100%			
Average	2	Maximum	Minimum
Average 9%	e Excellent	Maximum 14%	Minimum 3%
Averago 9% 40%	e Excellent Good	Maximum 14% 45%	Minimum 3% 33%
Average 9% 40% 48%	e Excellent Good Ex+Good	Maximum 14% 45% 56%	Minimum 3% 33% 36%
Average 9% 40% 48% 31%	e Excellent Good Ex+Good Fair	<i>Maximum</i> 14% 45% 56% 38%	Minimum 3% 33% 36% 27%
Average 9% 40% 48% 31% 19%	e Excellent Good Ex+Good Fair Poor	Maximum 14% 45% 56% 38% 31%	Minimum 3% 33% 36% 27% 13%
Average 9% 40% 48% 31% 19% 1%	Excellent Good Ex+Good Fair Poor Don't know	Maximum 14% 45% 56% 38% 31% 2%	Minimum 3% 33% 36% 27% 13% 0%

Table 13 – Healthcare Quality

Trend Anal	/sis – i	Detaile	еа ке	suits	tor .	Jeffel	rson	Cou	<u>nty :</u>						1	-								_				
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	е	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	8%	7%	8%	8%	7%	7%	9%	8%	9%	6%	7%	7%	7%	8%	7%	8%	9%	14%	13%	11%	15%		8%	11%	9%	Excellent	15%	6%
Good	41%	38%	43%	41%	43%	43%	42%	42%	42%	38%	40%	40%	41%	41%	39%	39%	43%	42%	46%	41%	43%		35%	31%	41%	Good	46%	31%
Ex+Good	49%	45%	51%	49%	50%	50%	51%	50%	51%	44%	47%	47%	48%	49%	46%	47%	52%	56%	59%	52%	58%		43%	42%	49%	Ex+Good	59%	42%
Fair	29%	32%	32%	30%	31%	31%	30%	30%	30%	32%	31%	32%	32%	31%	31%	33%	27%	32%	27%	31%	33%		35%	34%	31%	Fair	35%	27%
Poor	18%	21%	15%	17%	13%	13%	17%	16%	17%	21%	18%	19%	17%	18%	19%	19%	16%	10%	10%	13%	8%		18%	21%	16%	Poor	21%	8%
Don't Know	3%	3%	3%	3%	6%	6%	3%	3%	2%	3%	5%	3%	3%	3%	4%	1%	4%	3%	4%	5%	1%	-	4%	4%	3%	Don't know	6%	1%
																									100%			
Trend Anal	/sis –	Detaile	ed Re	sults	for l	ewis	s Coi	inty:																				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023								Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	24%	23%	19%	20%	19%	17%	20%	13%	18%	16%	17%	11%	-	13%	11%	10%	10%								16%	Excellent	24%	10%
Good	50%	52%	52%	51%	45%	62%	48%	57%	51%	47%	54%	50%	-	53%	43%	41%	42%								50%	Good	62%	41%
Ex+Good	74%	75%	71%	71%	64%	79%	68%	70%	69%	63%	71%	61%	-	66%	54%	51%	52%								66%	Ex+Good	79%	51%
Fair	20%	15%	19%	22%	23%	15%	22%	20%	23%	29%	22%	27%	-	22%	25%	29%	34%								23%	Fair	34%	15%
Poor	4%	7%	8%	7%	11%	6%	8%	10%	6%	8%	7%	11%	-	11%	19%	15%	12%								9 %	Poor	19%	4%
Don't know	2%	4%	2%	1%	3%	0%	2%	0%	2%	1%	1%	2%	-	2%	2%	5%	2%								2%	Don't know	5%	0%
																		-							100%			
Trend Anal	/sis –	Detaile	d Re	sults	for S	St. La	awrei	nce C	ount	<u>y:</u>																		
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023																Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	14%	11%	8%	13%	8%	4%	-	4%	3%																8%	Excellent	14%	3%
Good	45%	46%	41%	37%	46%	40%	-	38%	31%																41%	Good	46%	31%
Ex+Good	59%	57%	49%	50%	54%	44%	-	42%	34%	[49%	Ex+Good	59%	34%
Fair	29%	31%	35%	30%	30%	36%	-	36%	41%																34%	Fair	41%	29%
Poor	11%	12%	15%	19%	13%	19%	-	22%	24%																17%	Poor	24%	11%
Don't know	2%	1%	1%	0%	2%	1%	-	0%	2%																1%	Don't know	2%	0%
																									100%			

Table 14 – Access to Higher Education

Trend Analysis - Detailed Results for Jefferson County:

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	19%	17%	17%	17%	16%	15%	16%	17%	18%	16%	17%	15%	16%	16%	18%	17%	19%	23%	24%	21%		23%	16%	16%	18%	Excellent	24%	15%
Good	49%	46%	47%	46%	47%	46%	44%	46%	47%	45%	46%	44%	45%	44%	47%	41%	48%	48%	51%	46%		46%	44%	41%	46%	Good	51%	41%
Ex+Good	68%	63%	64%	63%	63%	61%	60%	63%	65%	61%	63%	59%	61%	60%	65%	58%	67%	71%	75%	67%		69%	60%	57%	64%	Ex+Good	75%	57%
Fair	22%	24%	23%	23%	25%	26%	24%	23%	22%	25%	23%	25%	24%	24%	22%	29%	27%	21%	16%	25%		21%	24%	27%	24%	Fair	29%	16%
Poor	7%	11%	9%	10%	9%	10%	12%	10%	9%	11%	11%	13%	10%	11%	9%	9%	4%	6%	6%	5%		6%	10%	9%	9%	Poor	13%	4%
Don't Know	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	3%	4%	4%	4%	5%	4%	4%	3%	3%	4%	4%		4%	6%	7%	4%	Don't know	7%	3%
																									100%			

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for Lewis County	Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for Lewi	s County
--	--	----------

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	-	-	8%	9%	6%	13%	8%	8%	7%	9%	11%	6%	10%	-	7%	11%	12%
Good	-	-	30%	33%	31%	33%	33%	29%	38%	40%	36%	40%	46%	-	35%	42%	42%
Ex+Good	-	-	38%	42%	37%	46%	41%	37%	45%	49%	47%	46%	56%	-	42%	53%	54%
Fair	-	-	27%	28%	21%	28%	28%	28%	28%	28%	27%	26%	23%	-	36%	28%	28%
Poor	-	-	31%	27%	37%	25%	28%	32%	25%	21%	22%	24%	18%	-	19%	15%	16%
Don't know	-	-	5%	3%	5%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	4%	3%	3%	-	3%	4%	3%

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for St. Lawrence County :

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	32%	37%	32%	29%	33%	-	32%	28%	25%
Good	45%	35%	39%	46%	47%	_	39%	47%	45%
Ex+Good	77%	72%	71%	75%	80%		71%	75%	70%
Fair	16%	19%	10%	17%	14%		17%	16%	21%
Poor	E%	79/	70/	6%	E%		0%	70/	70/
	5%	1 /0	1 /0	0 /0	5 /0		9 /0	1 /0	1 /0
Don't know	2%	3%	2%	2%	1%	- 1	3%	2%	2%

Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
9%	Excellent	13%	6%
36%	Good	46%	29%
45%	Ex+Good	56%	37%
27%	Fair	36%	21%
24%	Poor	37%	15%
3%	Don't know	5%	2%
100%			
Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
31%	Excellent	37%	25%
43%	Good	47%	35%
74%	Ex+Good	80%	70%
17%	Fair	21%	14%
7%	Poor	9%	5%
2%	Don't know	3%	1%
100%			

Table 15 – Public Outdoor Recreational Opportunities

Trend Analy	sis – <i>I</i>	Detaile	ed Re	<u>sults</u>	for .	leffe	rson	Cour	<u>1ty :</u>																			
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	е	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	17%	15%	15%	15%	13%	14%	16%	16%	17%	14%	14%	14%	14%	14%	16%	16%	24%	27%	27%	-		19%	23%	20%	17%	Excellent	27%	13%
Good	48%	46%	46%	48%	48%	48%	46%	47%	47%	47%	42%	46%	48%	46%	48%	53%	40%	41%	41%	-		40%	37%	41%	45%	Good	53%	37%
Ex+Good	65%	61%	61%	63%	61%	62%	62%	63%	64%	61%	56%	60%	62%	60%	64%	69%	64%	68%	68%	-		59%	60%	61%	62%	Ex+Good	69%	56%
Fair	22%	24%	24%	23%	25%	24%	23%	22%	21%	25%	24%	25%	24%	25%	22%	21%	22%	23%	24%	-		27%	21%	26%	24%	Fair	27%	21%
Poor	12%	14%	14%	12%	12%	11%	13%	12%	12%	13%	16%	14%	12%	14%	11%	9%	12%	8%	7%	-		9%	16%	12%	12%	Poor	16%	7%
Don't Know	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	3%	2%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	1%	2%	-		5%	3%	1%	2%	Don't know	5%	1%
																									100%			
Trend Analy	sis – L	Detaile	d Re	sults	for L	.ewis	ς Οοι	<u>ınty :</u>																				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023								Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	46%	42%	41%	34%	28%	30%	36%	36%	35%	36%	38%	-	32%	-	30%	31%	32%								35%	Excellent	46%	28%
Good	32%	38%	37%	36%	47%	53%	38%	40%	36%	36%	36%	-	39%	-	37%	38%	46%								39%	Good	53%	32%
Ex+Good	78%	80%	78%	70%	75%	83%	74%	76%	71%	72%	74%	-	71%	-	67%	69%	78%	[74%	Ex+Good	83%	67%
Fair	17%	12%	14%	22%	16%	9%	16%	11%	18%	20%	17%	-	19%	-	20%	20%	15%								16%	Fair	22%	9%
Poor	5%	6%	8%	7%	7%	7%	9%	12%	9%	6%	7%	-	9%	-	11%	10%	8%								8 %	Poor	12%	5%
Don't know	0%	3%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	-	2%	1%	0%								1%	Don't know	3%	0%
																		-							100%			
Trend Analy	sis – <i>L</i>	Detaile	d Re	sults	for S	St. La	wrer	ice C	ount	<u>y:</u>																		
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023																Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	32%	23%	21%	30%	-	-	19%	27%	18%																24%	Excellent	32%	18%
Good	34%	37%	46%	36%	-	-	39%	32%	37%																37%	Good	46%	32%
Ex+Good	66%	60%	67%	66%	-	-	58%	59%	55%	Í															62%	Ex+Good	67%	55%
Fair	22%	27%	21%	20%	-	-	25%	27%	29%																24%	Fair	29%	20%
Poor	11%	11%	11%	14%	-	-	16%	14%	14%																13%	Poor	16%	11%
Don't know	1%	2%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	3%																1%	Don't know	3%	1%

Table 16 – Quality of the Environment

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for Jefferson County:

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Average	e
Excellent	10%	9%	9%	9%	10%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	8%	9%	9%	9%	11%	14%	18%	19%	16%	24%		21%	17%	12%	Excellent
Good	43%	43%	44%	41%	46%	44%	41%	41%	40%	40%	42%	40%	44%	43%	42%	41%	59%	50%	48%	49%	47%	-	44%	48%	44%	Good
Ex+Good	53%	52%	53%	50%	56%	53%	50%	50%	49%	49%	51%	48%	53%	52%	51%	52%	73%	68%	67%	65%	71%		65%	65%	56%	Ex+Good
Fair	33%	34%	34%	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%	34%	32%	34%	34%	33%	33%	38%	21%	25%	25%	26%	25%		26%	26%	31%	Fair
Poor	13%	13%	11%	15%	8%	11%	14%	15%	16%	16%	14%	16%	12%	12%	14%	9%	5%	7%	7%	6%	3%		6%	8%	11%	Poor
Don't Know	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%	0%	1%	1%	3%	0%		2%	1%	2%	Don't know
																									100%	

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for Lewis County:

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	37%	39%	35%	34%	30%	37%	35%	37%	36%	32%	33%	27%	-	40%	28%	25%	31%
Good	46%	50%	55%	55%	56%	55%	49%	48%	53%	52%	52%	61%	-	46%	51%	53%	54%
Ex+Good	83%	89%	90%	89%	86%	92%	84%	85%	89%	84%	85%	88%	-	86%	79%	78%	85%
Fair	15%	7%	9%	8%	12%	8%	14%	9%	9%	13%	13%	10%	-	13%	18%	19%	14%
Poor	3%	3%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	4%	1%	3%	2%	2%	-	1%	2%	3%	2%
Don't know	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	-	1%	1%	1%	0%

Trend Analysis - Detailed Results for St. Lawrence County :

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	27%	20%	19%	21%	20%	22%	-	27%	17%
Good	46%	47%	51%	50%	56%	49%	-	46%	46%
Ex+Good	73%	67%	70%	71%	76%	71%	-	73%	63%
Fair	20%	26%	20%	22%	15%	24%	-	22%	26%
Poor	6%	7%	9%	7%	8%	5%	-	3%	11%
Don't know	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	-	2%	0%

Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
34%	Excellent	40%	25%
52%	Good	61%	46%
86%	Ex+Good	92%	78%
12%	Fair	19%	7%
2%	Poor	4%	1%
1%	Don't know	1%	0%
100%			
Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
22%	Excellent	27%	17%
49%	Good	56%	46%
71%	Ex+Good	76%	63%
22%	Fair	26%	15%
7%	Poor	11%	3%
1%	Don't know	2%	0%

Maximum Minimum 24%

59%

73%

38%

16%

3%

8%

40%

48%

21%

3%

0%

100%

Table 17 - County Government (preceding 2016, "Local Government" was the survey question)

Trend Analy	/SIS – I	Detaile	ed Re	sults	tor .	Jeffe	rson	Cou	<u>nty:</u>		_				1	-					_			_				
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	e	Maximum	Minimun
Excellent	-		- I	-	-		-		-		-			-		-	2%	7%	6%	3%		4%	4%	5%	4%	Excellent	7%	2%
Good	-	-	-	-	-		-		-	-	-		-	-		-	43%	34%	35%	32%	-	32%	26%	27%	33%	Good	43%	26%
Ex+Good	-	-	-	-	-		-		-	-	-		-	-		-	45%	41%	41%	35%	-	36%	30%	32%	37%	Ex+Good	45%	30%
Fair	-	-	-	-	-		-		-	-	-		-	-		-	33%	36%	35%	36%	-	35%	35%	36%	35%	Fair	36%	33%
Poor	-	-	-	-	-		-		-	-	-		-	-		-	12%	12%	13%	15%	-	17%	20%	19%	15%	Poor	20%	12%
Don't Know			-	-	-		-				-			-		-	10%	11%	11%	14%		11%	15%	13%	12%	Don't know	15%	10%
																									100%			
Trend Analy	/sis – I	Detaile	ed Re	sults	for l	Lewis	s Col	unty										_										
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	3 2014	1 2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	l							Averag	e	Maximum	Minimun
Excellent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	3%	6%	-	-	3%	3%	3%								4%	Excellent	6%	3%
Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40%	42%	37%	-	-	36%	34%	32%								37%	Good	42%	32%
Ex+Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44%	45%	43%	-	-	39%	37%	35%	[41%	Ex+Good	45%	35%
Fair	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35%	37%	36%	-	-	34%	36%	38%								36%	Fair	38%	34%
Poor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%	11%	14%	-	-	23%	18%	19%								16%	Poor	23%	11%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8%	8%	7%	-	-	4%	9%	8%								7%	Don't know	9%	4%
																									100%			
Trend Analy	/sis – I	Detaile	ed Re	sults	for S	St. La	awrei	nce (Count	ty:																		
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2 2023																Averag	e	Maximum	Minimun
Excellent	4%	2%	4%	2%	3%	-	4%	2%	1%																3%	Excellent	4%	1%
Good	32%	24%	26%	30%	31%	- 1	30%	27%	34%																29%	Good	34%	24%
Ex+Good	36%	26%	30%	32%	34%	I - I	34%	29%	35%	í – –															32%	Ex+Good	36%	26%
Fair	38%	37%	47%	38%	45%	- 1	41%	41%	37%																41%	Fair	47%	37%
Poor	17%	27%	21%	23%	12%	-	20%	23%	18%																20%	Poor	27%	12%
Don't know	9%	10%	3%	7%	8%	-	5%	7%	9%																7%	Don't know	10%	3%
																									100%			

Table 18 - Your City, Town, or Village Government Government (preceding 2016, "Local Government" was the survey question)

Trend Analy	sis – <i>L</i>	Detaile	d Re	sults	for .	leffer	rson	Cour	nty:																_	
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Average	2
Excellent														-			5%	8%	8%				5%	5%	6%	Excellent
Good			-	-	-		-		-		-		-	-		-	43%	38%	37%			-	29%	26%	35%	Good
Ex+Good			-	-	-		-				-			-			48%	46%	45%	-		-	34%	31%	41%	Ex+Good
Fair			-		-		-				-			-			35%	34%	32%				36%	35%	34%	Fair
Poor			-		-		-				-			-			13%	11%	14%				16%	21%	15%	Poor
Don't Know							-										6%	9%	9%				14%	13%	10%	Don't kno

Trend Analy	sis – C	Detaile	d Re	sults	for L	.ewis	: Cou	nty:									
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$															3%	
Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49%	43%	-	51%	-	34%	38%	42%
Ex+Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	55%	50%	-	55%	-	39%	42%	45%
Fair	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29%	37%	-	29%	-	41%	40%	33%
Poor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	9%	-	10%	-	15%	13%	12%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	5%	-	6%	-	5%	6%	9%

Trend Analysis - Detailed Results for St. Lawrence County :

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	-	6%	4%	5%	-	-	-	8%	3%
Good	-	33%	34%	34%	-	-	-	30%	36%
Ex+Good	-	39%	38%	39%	-	-	-	38%	39%
Fair	-	31%	34%	37%	-	-	-	33%	33%
Poor	-	24%	25%	21%	-	-	-	21%	21%
Don't know	-	6%	2%	3%	-	-	-	8%	7%

5 1	10%	Don't know	14%	6%
1	00%			
Av	erag	e	Maximum	Minimum
	5%	Excellent	7%	3%
4	13%	Good	51%	34%
4	18%	Ex+Good	55%	39%
3	35%	Fair	41%	29%
1	12%	Poor	15%	9%
	6%	Don't know	9%	5%
1	00%			
Av	erag	e	Maximum	Minimum
	5%	Excellent	8%	3%
3	33%	Good	36%	30%
3	39%	Ex+Good	39%	38%
ŝ	34%	Fair	37%	31%
2	22%	Poor	25%	21%
	F0/		Q0/	2%
	5%	Don't know	070	270

Maximum Minimum 8%

43%

48%

36%

21%

5%

26%

31%

32%

Table 19 – Real Estate Taxes

Trend Anal	ysis – I	Detaile	ed Re	sults	for .	Jeffe	rson	Cou	nty:			_									-			_				
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	3%	5%	3%		2%	3%	2%	2%	Excellent	5%	0%
Good	13%	10%	9%	8%	10%	11%	9%	7%	9%	9%	9%	10%	10%	11%	8%	11%	11%	17%	18%	14%		18%	12%	13%	11%	Good	18%	7%
Ex+Good	15%	11%	10%	9%	11%	12%	10%	8%	10%	10%	10%	12%	11%	12%	9%	11%	11%	20%	23%	17%	-	20%	15%	15%	13%	Ex+Good	23%	8%
Fair	35%	32%	32%	30%	32%	34%	31%	29%	31%	31%	31%	31%	34%	35%	31%	37%	34%	33%	32%	36%	-	35%	34%	32%	33%	Fair	37%	29%
Poor	36%	45%	42%	44%	40%	35%	47%	49%	48%	49%	39%	49%	43%	40%	50%	43%	37%	30%	30%	31%	-	31%	35%	37%	40%	Poor	50%	30%
Don't Know	13%	12%	16%	17%	17%	19%	12%	14%	11%	10%	19%	9%	12%	12%	11%	9%	17%	17%	15%	17%		14%	16%	16%	14%	Don't know	19%	9%
																									100%			
Trend Anal	ysis – I	Detaile	ed Re	sults	s for l	Lewis	s Col	unty :																				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023								Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	2%	3%	1%	2%	1%	0%	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%	2%	-	-	3%	2%	2%								2%	Excellent	3%	0%
Good	23%	19%	17%	17%	18%	26%	21%	16%	19%	19%	25%	23%	-	-	15%	15%	11%								19%	Good	26%	11%
Ex+Good	25%	22%	18%	19%	19%	26%	23%	17%	21%	21%	28%	25%	-	-	18%	17%	13%	[21%	Ex+Good	28%	13%
Fair	37%	36%	36%	33%	37%	32%	32%	38%	38%	39%	38%	37%	-	-	36%	35%	34%								36%	Fair	39%	32%
Poor	33%	37%	42%	41%	37%	34%	38%	40%	33%	35%	24%	31%	-	-	40%	42%	42%								37%	Poor	42%	24%
Don't know	5%	6%	5%	8%	7%	7%	8%	6%	8%	5%	10%	8%	-	-	6%	6%	10%								7%	Don't know	10%	5%
																		_							100%			
Trend Anal	ysis – I	Detaile	ed Re	sults	for s	St. La	awrei	nce C	Count	<u>v:</u>																		
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023																Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	3%	2%	1%	2%	3%	-	2%	2%	2%	1															2%	Excellent	3%	1%
Good	19%	16%	17%	17%	12%	-	11%	11%	14%																15%	Good	19%	11%
Ex+Good	22%	18%	18%	19%	15%	-	13%	13%	16%	Í –															17%	Ex+Good	22%	13%
Fair	32%	28%	32%	35%	42%	-	41%	36%	32%																35%	Fair	42%	28%
Poor	35%	45%	38%	38%	34%	-	39%	43%	45%																40%	Poor	45%	34%
Don't know	11%	8%	11%	7%	9%	-	8%	9%	7%																9%	Don't know	11%	7%
										-															100%			
Don't know	11%	8%	11%	7%	9%	-	8%	9%	7%	1															9% 100%	Don't know	11%	

Table 20 – Policing and Crime Control

Trend Analysis - Detailed Results for Jefferson County:

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	e
Excellent	16%	17%	14%	16%	14%	13%	17%	16%	18%	14%	16%	15%	15%	15%	15%	18%	14%	12%	16%		26%		9%	10%	15%	Excellent
Good	50%	49%	50%	49%	50%	45%	47%	45%	47%	50%	47%	46%	49%	44%	48%	43%	58%	47%	51%	-	43%	-	40%	36%	47%	Good
Ex+Good	66%	66%	64%	65%	64%	58%	64%	61%	65%	64%	63%	61%	64%	59%	63%	61%	72%	59%	67%	-	69%	-	49%	46%	62%	Ex+Good
Fair	25%	24%	25%	24%	25%	28%	24%	26%	23%	26%	25%	26%	25%	27%	26%	29%	21%	26%	23%	-	22%	-	36%	37%	26%	Fair
Poor	8%	8%	8%	7%	7%	10%	9%	10%	8%	8%	9%	10%	8%	12%	9%	9%	5%	10%	5%		6%	-	10%	11%	9%	Poor
Don't Know	2%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	4%	3%	2%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	4%	5%		4%		6%	6%	3%	Don't know
																									100%	

Trend Analy	sis – <i>L</i>	Detaile	d Re	sults	for L	.ewis	Cou	nty:									
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	19%	23%	16%	18%	14%	20%	15%	14%	14%	20%	18%	-	15%	23%	11%	10%	12%
Good	51%	54%	53%	60%	60%	55%	53%	59%	52%	52%	46%	-	59%	52%	52%	46%	50%
Ex+Good	70%	77%	69%	78%	74%	75%	68%	73%	66%	72%	64%	-	74%	75%	63%	56%	62%
Fair	23%	16%	21%	16%	18%	17%	26%	21%	23%	20%	27%	-	17%	18%	28%	28%	24%
Poor	6%	7%	10%	4%	7%	7%	4%	6%	12%	7%	7%	-	8%	5%	9%	12%	10%
Don't know	1%	1%	0%	2%	1%	1%	3%	0%	0%	1%	2%	-	2%	1%	0%	4%	4%

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for St. Lawrence County :

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	16%	11%	18%	19%	-	13%	-	9%	8%
Good	50%	43%	46%	46%	-	47%	-	36%	36%
Ex+Good	66%	54%	64%	65%	-	60%	-	45%	44%
Fair	28%	33%	24%	22%	-	31%	-	36%	33%
Poor	6%	14%	10%	13%	-	8%	-	18%	23%
Don't know	0%	0%	1%	0%	-	1%	-	2%	0%

Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
16%	Excellent	23%	10%
53%	Good	60%	46%
70%	Ex+Good	78%	56%
21%	Fair	28%	16%
8%	Poor	12%	4%
1%	Don't know	4%	0%
100%			
Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
13%	Excellent	19%	8%
43%	Good	50%	36%
57%	Ex+Good	66%	44%
30%	Fair	36%	22%
13%	Poor	23%	6%
1%	Don't know	2%	0%

100%

Maximum Minimum 26%

58% 72%

37%

12%

6%

9% 36%

46%

21%

5%

Table 21 – Availability of Good Jobs

Trend Anal	/sis – I	Detaile	ed Re	sults	for .	Jeffe	rson	Cou	<u>1ty :</u>																			
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	4%	5%	5%	5%	9%	3%	8%	7%	2%	Excellent	9%	0%
Good	16%	7%	9%	10%	11%	14%	19%	24%	19%	9%	13%	11%	14%	14%	12%	17%	13%	18%	23%	20%	23%	27%	24%	25%	16%	Good	27%	7%
Ex+Good	17%	7%	9%	10%	11%	15%	20%	25%	20%	9%	14%	11%	15%	15%	13%	18%	17%	23%	28%	25%	32%	30%	32%	32%	19%	Ex+Good	32%	7%
Fair	30%	25%	27%	27%	28%	31%	31%	32%	30%	27%	28%	28%	29%	30%	28%	35%	38%	38%	35%	36%	35%	34%	33%	32%	31%	Fair	38%	25%
Poor	51%	66%	60%	60%	57%	52%	45%	39%	47%	61%	54%	59%	51%	52%	55%	43%	43%	32%	29%	32%	28%	29%	27%	27%	46%	Poor	66%	27%
Don't Know	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%	3%	4%	4%	3%	6%	8%	8%	5%	7%	8%	9%	4%	Don't know	9%	2%
																									100%			
Trend Analy	/sis – I	Detaile	ed Re	sults	for l	Lewis	s Coι	unty :																				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023								Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	2%	1%	2%	3%	0%	0%	3%	0%	2%	2%	2%	1%	4%	3%	10%	6%	6%								3%	Excellent	10%	0%
Good	15%	12%	9%	11%	10%	13%	12%	16%	13%	14%	22%	25%	22%	22%	26%	30%	30%								18%	Good	30%	9%
Ex+Good	17%	13%	11%	14%	10%	13%	15%	16%	15%	16%	24%	26%	26%	25%	36%	36%	36%								21%	Ex+Good	36%	10%
Fair	41%	40%	31%	28%	29%	43%	29%	30%	36%	41%	39%	40%	43%	44%	31%	35%	33%								36%	Fair	44%	28%
Poor	41%	45%	56%	55%	57%	44%	53%	53%	48%	43%	34%	32%	29%	27%	31%	25%	27%								41%	Poor	57%	25%
Don't know	2%	3%	2%	4%	4%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	3%	4%	2%	4%	4%								2%	Don't know	4%	1%
																									100%			
Trend Analy	/sis – I	Detaile	ed Re	sults	for S	St. La	awrei	nce C	ount	<u>y:</u>																		
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023																Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	1%	4%	3%	2%	2%	1%	7%	6%	1%																3%	Excellent	7%	1%
Good	9%	8%	12%	13%	14%	12%	18%	22%	15%																14%	Good	22%	8%
Ex+Good	10%	12%	15%	15%	16%	13%	25%	28%	16%																17%	Ex+Good	28%	10%
Fair	32%	26%	27%	33%	41%	34%	32%	30%	36%																32%	Fair	41%	26%
Poor	56%	62%	58%	52%	42%	52%	43%	41%	46%																50%	Poor	62%	41%
Don't know	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%																1%	Don't know	2%	1%
																									101%			

Table 22 – Shopping Opportunities

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for Jefferson County:

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	е
Excellent	15%	13%	10%	12%	12%	14%	22%	23%	23%	15%	17%	17%	18%	19%	19%	25%	16%	19%	15%			13%	10%	11%	16%	Excellent
Good	41%	38%	36%	36%	40%	43%	47%	48%	48%	42%	42%	45%	46%	45%	44%	42%	48%	43%	47%	-		37%	35%	35%	42%	Good
Ex+Good	56%	51%	46%	48%	52%	57%	69%	71%	71%	57%	59%	62%	64%	64%	63%	67%	64%	62%	62%	-		50%	45%	46%	58%	Ex+Good
Fair	28%	30%	32%	30%	29%	28%	22%	21%	21%	28%	26%	27%	26%	24%	24%	21%	29%	29%	26%	-		31%	34%	36%	27%	Fair
Poor	14%	18%	21%	21%	15%	12%	7%	6%	6%	14%	13%	11%	9%	9%	10%	10%	6%	8%	11%	-		16%	17%	16%	12%	Poor
Don't Know	1%	1%	2%	1%	4%	3%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%	-		3%	4%	2%	2%	Don't kno

Trend Analysis	– Detailed Resul	ts for Lewis County	<u>/:</u>

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	7%	12%	6%	3%	3%	5%	9%	5%	5%	8%	6%	-	7%	-	5%	6%	5%
Good	29%	28%	29%	29%	25%	33%	22%	31%	29%	28%	33%	-	27%	-	23%	22%	34%
Ex+Good	36%	40%	35%	32%	28%	38%	31%	36%	34%	36%	39%	-	34%	-	28%	28%	39%
Fair	33%	34%	38%	35%	42%	38%	46%	37%	38%	38%	40%	-	40%	-	39%	46%	39%
Poor	31%	26%	26%	32%	29%	24%	22%	27%	28%	26%	21%	-	24%	-	32%	26%	22%
Don't know	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-	2%	-	1%	1%	0%

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for St. Lawrence County :

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	5%	3%	5%	4%	-	-	11%	5%	2%
Good	16%	17%	13%	8%	-	-	17%	16%	15%
Ex+Good	21%	20%	18%	12%	-	-	28%	21%	17%
Fair	29%	33%	28%	25%	-	-	33%	37%	32%
Poor	49%	45%	53%	63%	-	-	40%	42%	50%
Don't know	1%	1%	1%	0%	-	-	0%	0%	1%

	2%	Don't know	4%	1%
	100%			
A	lverag	е	Maximum	Minimum
	6%	Excellent	12%	3%
	28%	Good	34%	22%
	34%	Ex+Good	40%	28%
	39%	Fair	46%	33%
	26%	Poor	32%	21%
	1%	Don't know	2%	0%
	100%			
,		-		
^	verag	e	iviaximum	wiinimum
	5%	Excellent	11%	2%
	15%	Good	17%	8%
	20%	Ex+Good	28%	12%
	31%	Fair	37%	25%
	49%	Poor	63%	40%

1% Don't know 100% Maximum Minimum

10% 35%

45%

21%

6%

25%

48% 71%

36%

21%

1%

Table 23 – Quality of K-12 Education

Trend Analy	/sis – I	Detaile	d Re	sults	for .	Jeffe	rson	Cour	<u>nty:</u>																			
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	18%	15%	15%	15%	14%	14%	15%	16%	17%	14%	15%	13%	14%	13%	15%	11%	15%	20%	18%	17%	18%	-	10%	13%	15%	Excellent	20%	10%
Good	45%	43%	46%	40%	44%	44%	41%	43%	46%	46%	42%	42%	40%	39%	40%	38%	51%	47%	47%	44%	41%	-	42%	37%	43%	Good	51%	37%
Ex+Good	63%	58%	61%	55%	58%	58%	56%	59%	63%	60%	57%	55%	54%	52%	55%	49%	66%	67%	65%	61%	59%		52%	50%	58%	Ex+Good	67%	49%
Fair	20%	24%	22%	22%	20%	21%	21%	21%	21%	25%	25%	27%	26%	26%	27%	31%	22%	15%	18%	20%	21%	-	23%	25%	23%	Fair	31%	15%
Poor	5%	7%	5%	7%	4%	5%	6%	5%	5%	6%	7%	8%	8%	8%	9%	11%	5%	5%	4%	6%	9%	-	11%	7%	7%	Poor	11%	4%
Don't Know	13%	11%	12%	16%	18%	15%	16%	15%	11%	9%	11%	10%	12%	13%	9%	10%	7%	13%	13%	13%	12%	-	14%	17%	13%	Don't know	18%	7%
																									100%			
Trend Analy	/sis – I	Detaile	d Re	sults	for l	Lewis	s Col	<u>inty :</u>						-														
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023								Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	37%	33%	39%	36%	27%	24%	29%	26%	30%	34%	31%	27%	-	32%	23%	20%	19%								29%	Excellent	39%	19%
Good	45%	51%	46%	49%	53%	63%	46%	48%	53%	51%	49%	52%	-	46%	53%	45%	56%	ļ							50%	Good	63%	45%
Ex+Good	82%	84%	85%	85%	80%	87%	75%	74%	83%	85%	80%	79%	-	78%	76%	65%	75%	l							80%	Ex+Good	87%	65%
Fair	12%	11%	6%	8%	10%	10%	13%	21%	10%	9%	12%	10%	-	14%	13%	21%	11%								12%	Fair	21%	6%
Poor	3%	1%	2%	1%	4%	1%	5%	3%	5%	3%	3%	6%	-	3%	6%	9%	7%								4%	Poor	9%	1%
Don't know	3%	4%	7%	7%	6%	2%	7%	2%	3%	3%	5%	5%	-	4%	5%	5%	6%								5%	Don't know	7%	2%
																									100%			
Trend Analy	/sis – I	Detaile	d Re	sults	for	St. La	awrei	nce C	ount	<u>y:</u>																		
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023																Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	13%	18%	20%	18%	13%	12%	-	10%	6%																14%	Excellent	20%	6%
Good	52%	49%	52%	51%	59%	48%	-	39%	50%																50%	Good	59%	39%
Ex+Good	65%	67%	72%	69%	72%	60%	-	49%	56%																64%	Ex+Good	72%	49%
Fair	24%	21%	18%	19%	17%	27%	-	34%	24%																23%	Fair	34%	17%
Poor	4%	6%	8%	6%	7%	6%	-	11%	13%																8%	Poor	13%	4%
Don't know	6%	6%	2%	6%	5%	8%	-	6%	6%																6%	Don't know	8%	2%
										_															100%			

Table 24 – Overall State of the Local Economy

Trend Analysis - Detailed Results for Jefferson County:

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	4%	4%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	6%	3%	2%	2%	3%	Excellent	6%	2%
Good	25%	14%	16%	16%	18%	22%	25%	27%	21%	13%	17%	17%	21%	20%	20%	29%	20%	32%	32%	29%	29%	25%	22%	18%	22%	Good	32%	13%
Ex+Good	28%	16%	18%	18%	20%	24%	29%	31%	24%	15%	19%	19%	23%	23%	23%	32%	23%	36%	36%	32%	35%	28%	24%	20%	25%	Ex+Good	36%	15%
Fair	40%	36%	37%	37%	39%	41%	40%	41%	38%	36%	38%	38%	39%	39%	39%	45%	54%	41%	40%	39%	43%	45%	39%	44%	40%	Fair	54%	36%
Poor	30%	47%	43%	43%	38%	32%	30%	26%	35%	48%	40%	42%	36%	37%	37%	21%	21%	17%	17%	21%	18%	19%	33%	30%	32%	Poor	48%	17%
Don't Know	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	3%	6%	7%	7%	5%	8%	5%	6%	3 %	Don't know	8%	1%

Trend Analy	vsis – Detailed	Results for L	ewis County:

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	2%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	4%	2%	3%	4%	5%	2%	2%	3%	1%	2%	4%
Good	33%	21%	20%	22%	18%	30%	15%	22%	28%	27%	31%	43%	33%	34%	28%	18%	25%
Ex+Good	35%	21%	21%	23%	19%	31%	19%	24%	31%	31%	36%	45%	35%	37%	29%	20%	29%
Fair	44%	42%	35%	35%	37%	38%	51%	48%	38%	44%	43%	34%	48%	43%	45%	43%	39%
Poor	19%	34%	44%	41%	43%	30%	30%	26%	29%	24%	20%	20%	15%	18%	24%	32%	28%
Don't know	2%	3%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	3%	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	4%	4%

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for St. Lawrence County :

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%	3%	4%	2%	0%
Good	17%	18%	18%	14%	20%	13%	21%	8%	18%
Ex+Good	18%	19%	21%	16%	22%	16%	25%	10%	18%
Fair	41%	37%	42%	41%	36%	43%	40%	40%	34%
Poor	39%	42%	35%	42%	39%	40%	33%	47%	47%
Don't know	2%	1%	1%	1%	4%	1%	1%	4%	1%

100%			
Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
2%	Excellent	5%	0%
26%	Good	43%	15%
29%	Ex+Good	45%	19%
42%	Fair	51%	34%
28%	Poor	44%	15%
2%	Don't know	4%	1%
100%			
Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
2%	Excellent	4%	0%
16%	Good	21%	8%
18%	Ex+Good	25%	10%
39%	Fair	43%	34%
40%	Poor	47%	33%
2%	Don't know	4%	1%
100%			

Table 25 – Availability of Care for the Elderly

Trend Anal	<u>/sis – I</u>	Detaile	ea Re	suits	tor .	ettel	rson	Cour	<u>nty:</u>								-			-	-	-	-	-	L			
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	e	Maximum	Minimun
Excellent			-	-	4%	4%	6%	4%	5%	3%	3%	4%	6%	7%	7%	8%	7%	6%	10%	-		4%	3%	3%	5%	Excellent	10%	3%
Good	-		-	-	30%	32%	35%	32%	33%	29%	28%	32%	37%	39%	38%	34%	36%	33%	29%	-	-	29%	19%	20%	31%	Good	39%	19%
Ex+Good	-		-	-	34%	36%	41%	36%	38%	32%	31%	36%	43%	46%	45%	42%	43%	39%	39%	-	-	33%	22%	23%	37%	Ex+Good	46%	22%
Fair	-		-	-	24%	26%	25%	26%	25%	29%	28%	30%	28%	26%	27%	26%	26%	27%	31%	-	-	28%	29%	31%	27%	Fair	31%	24%
Poor	-		-	-	13%	14%	14%	16%	15%	20%	20%	19%	15%	13%	17%	15%	17%	17%	13%	-	-	17%	24%	27%	17%	Poor	27%	13%
Don't Know					28%	24%	20%	22%	22%	19%	21%	14%	14%	15%	12%	17%	15%	17%	17%	-		23%	25%	18%	19%	Don't know	28%	12%
																									100%			
Trend Analy	ysis – I	Detaile	d Re	sults	for L	.ewis	s Col	unty:																				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	l							Averag	e	Maximum	Minimun
Excellent	12%	18%	12%	16%	9%	18%	15%	14%	10%	11%	9%	-	8%	-	7%	3%	3%								11%	Excellent	18%	3%
Good	43%	46%	50%	49%	52%	52%	39%	51%	47%	46%	45%	-	38%	-	32%	23%	30%								43%	Good	52%	23%
Ex+Good	55%	64%	62%	65%	61%	70%	54%	65%	57%	57%	54%	-	46%	-	39%	26%	33%	[54%	Ex+Good	70%	26%
Fair	26%	17%	22%	21%	20%	18%	28%	22%	31%	28%	30%	-	31%	-	31%	36%	34%								26%	Fair	36%	17%
Poor	8%	12%	9%	8%	6%	7%	10%	6%	10%	9%	10%	-	16%	-	23%	29%	22%								12%	Poor	29%	6%
Don't know	10%	7%	7%	7%	14%	5%	8%	7%	2%	6%	6%	-	7%	-	7%	10%	10%								8%	Don't know	14%	2%
																									100%			
Trend Analy	ysis – I	Detaile	d Re	sults	for S	St. La	awrei	nce C	ount	<u>y:</u>																		
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023																Averag	e	Maximum	Minimun
Excellent	10%	7%	2%	5%	-	-	3%	4%	2%																5%	Excellent	10%	2%
Good	35%	31%	39%	31%	-	-	18%	16%	20%																27%	Good	39%	16%
Ex+Good	45%	38%	41%	36%	-	-	21%	20%	22%	[32%	Ex+Good	45%	20%
Fair	30%	33%	31%	31%	-	-	36%	33%	31%																32%	Fair	36%	30%
Poor	18%	22%	17%	25%	-	-	32%	36%	41%																27%	Poor	41%	17%
Don't know	7%	7%	11%	9%	-	-	11%	11%	5%																9%	Don't know	11%	5%
																									100%			

Table 26 – Availability of Housing

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for Jefferson County:

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	е
Excellent						11%	13%	15%	16%	16%	17%	15%	14%	16%	19%	19%	15%	15%	15%	11%			5%	4%	14%	Excellent
Good					-	26%	26%	31%	34%	39%	40%	36%	34%	40%	45%	44%	51%	43%	43%	40%		-	22%	21%	36%	Good
Ex+Good					-	37%	39%	46%	50%	55%	57%	51%	48%	56%	64%	63%	66%	58%	58%	51%		-	27%	25%	50%	Ex+Good
Fair					-	19%	15%	15%	15%	18%	18%	19%	18%	18%	17%	17%	22%	24%	24%	25%		-	34%	34%	21%	Fair
Poor					-	40%	41%	34%	31%	23%	20%	24%	29%	20%	14%	13%	9%	11%	9%	13%		-	26%	30%	23%	Poor
Don't Know				-		5%	5%	4%	4%	5%	5%	6%	5%	5%	4%	7%	4%	8%	9%	11%			12%	10%	6%	Don't know

Trend Analy	sis – C	Detaile	d Re	sults	for L	ewis	Cou	nty:									
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	9%	8%	9%	-	-	5%	4%	4%
Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51%	50%	53%	45%	-	-	37%	22%	32%
Ex+Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63%	59%	61%	54%	-	-	42%	26%	36%
Fair	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26%	28%	20%	32%	-	-	32%	40%	28%
Poor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	8%	10%	9%	-	-	18%	26%	27%
Don't know	-	-	- 1	-	-	-	- 1	-	5%	4%	10%	6%	-	-	8%	8%	9%

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for St. Lawrence County :

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	9%	9%	5%	5%	9%	-	-	3%	1%
Good	46%	39%	42%	39%	42%	-	-	27%	23%
Ex+Good	55%	48%	47%	44%	51%	-	-	30%	24%
Fair	31%	30%	35%	33%	33%	-	-	33%	37%
Poor	10%	17%	14%	20%	9%	-	-	29%	35%
Don't know	4%	5%	4%	3%	6%	-	-	8%	4%

100%			
Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
7%	Excellent	12%	4%
41%	Good	53%	22%
49%	Ex+Good	63%	26%
29%	Fair	40%	20%
15%	Poor	27%	7%
7%	Don't know	10%	4%
100%			
Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
6%	Excellent	9%	1%
37%	Good	46%	23%
43%	Ex+Good	55%	24%
33%	Fair	37%	30%
19%	Poor	35%	9%
5%	Don't know	8%	3%

100%

Maximum Minimum 19%

51%

66%

34%

41%

12%

4%

21%

25%

15%

9%

Table 27 – Availability of Childcare

Trend Analy	<u>/sis – l</u>	Detaile	ed Re	sults	for .	Jeffer	rson	Cou	<u>1ty :</u>																			
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	е	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent					-		-							-		-	5%	8%	8%	-		6%	4%	3%	6%	Excellent	8%	3%
Good				-	-		-	-	-		-			-			39%	33%	31%			21%	11%	13%	25%	Good	39%	11%
Ex+Good				-	-		-	-			-			-			44%	41%	39%	-		27%	15%	16%	30%	Ex+Good	44%	15%
Fair				-	-		-	-			-			-			23%	30%	21%			26%	23%	22%	24%	Fair	30%	21%
Poor			-	-	-		-	-	-		-		-			-	9%	8%	11%	-		18%	27%	29%	17%	Poor	29%	8%
Don't Know					-		-							-		-	24%	21%	29%			29%	36%	33%	29%	Don't know	36%	21%
																									100%			
Trend Analy	/sis – I	Detaile	ed Re	sults	for l	Lewis	ς ΟΟΙ	inty:																				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	l							Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	5%	5%	-	3%	-	3%	1%	3%								4%	Excellent	5%	1%
Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39%	38%	37%	-	24%	-	18%	17%	17%								27%	Good	39%	17%
Ex+Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44%	43%	42%	-	27%	-	21%	18%	20%								31%	Ex+Good	44%	18%
Fair	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30%	29%	26%	-	22%	-	26%	30%	26%								27%	Fair	30%	22%
Poor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%	8%	11%	-	22%	-	35%	30%	27%								21%	Poor	35%	8%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	21%	20%	-	29%	-	18%	22%	27%								22%	Don't know	29%	15%
																		_							100%			
Trend Analy	/sis – I	Detaile	ed Re	sults	for s	St. La	wrei	ice C	ount	<u>¥:</u>																		
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023																Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	5%	4%	3%	3%	-	-	3%	2%	1%																3%	Excellent	5%	1%
Good	30%	30%	37%	28%	-	-	18%	14%	12%																24%	Good	37%	12%
Ex+Good	35%	34%	40%	31%	-	-	21%	16%	13%	ĺ.															27%	Ex+Good	40%	13%
Fair	28%	30%	27%	34%	-	-	33%	32%	30%																31%	Fair	34%	27%
Poor	17%	17%	15%	17%	-	-	23%	33%	35%																22%	Poor	35%	15%
Don't know	21%	18%	18%	18%	-	-	23%	18%	22%																20%	Don't know	23%	18%
																									100%			

Table 28 – Availability of Behavioral Health Services

Trend Analysis - Detailed Results for Jefferson County:

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent							-							-	-		4%	8%	7%			6%	4%	8%	6%	Excellent	8%	4%
Good			-	-	-		-				-			-		-	34%	34%	28%	-		27%	20%	22%	28%	Good	34%	20%
Ex+Good			-	-	-		-	-			-			-		-	38%	42%	35%	-		33%	24%	30%	34%	Ex+Good	42%	24%
Fair			-	-	-		-	-			-			-		-	28%	26%	27%	-		22%	28%	29%	27%	Fair	29%	22%
Poor			-	-	-		-	-			-			-		-	17%	18%	19%	-		21%	27%	24%	21%	Poor	27%	17%
Don't Know				-	-		-				-			-			17%	14%	18%			23%	21%	17%	18%	Don't know	23%	14%
																									100%			

Trend Analy	/sis – D	etailed	Results	for	Lewis	Cou	inty:	
					_	-		

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	8%	7%	-	4%	-	2%	3%	4%
Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29%	28%	35%	-	31%	-	25%	21%	27%
Ex+Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35%	36%	42%	-	35%	-	27%	24%	31%
Fair	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31%	29%	28%	-	26%	-	29%	32%	30%
Poor	-	-	-	- 1	-	-	-	-	16%	18%	17%	-	19%	-	23%	29%	25%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	- 1	-		18%	17%	15%	-	21%	_	21%	15%	14%

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for St. Lawrence County :

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Excellent	5%	3%	6%	5%	-	-	7%	6%	4%
Good	29%	27%	30%	32%	_	_	20%	18%	19%
Ex+Good	34%	30%	36%	37%	_	_	27%	24%	23%
Fair	30%	32%	30%	31%	_		31%	30%	29%
Poor	20%	20%	20%	20%	_		27%	28%	20%
Donit know	17%	10%	14%	120/			16%	100/	10%

Average	e	Maximum	Minimum
5%	Excellent	8%	2%
28%	Good	35%	21%
33%	Ex+Good	42%	24%
29%	Fair	32%	26%
21%	Poor	29%	16%
17%	Don't know	21%	14%
100%			
Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Average 5%	e Excellent	Maximum 7%	Minimum 3%
Average 5% 25%	e Excellent Good	Maximum 7% 32%	<i>Minimum</i> 3% 18%
Average 5% 25% 30%	e Excellent Good Ex+Good	Maximum 7% 32% 37%	Minimum 3% 18% 23%
Average 5% 25% 30% 30%	e Excellent Good Ex+Good Fair	Maximum 7% 32% 37% 32%	<i>Minimum</i> 3% 18% 23% 29%
Average 5% 25% 30% 30% 23%	e Excellent Good Ex+Good Fair Poor	Maximum 7% 32% 37% 32% 29%	Minimum 3% 18% 23% 29% 20%
Average 5% 25% 30% 23% 16%	e Excellent Good Ex+Good Fair Poor Don't know	Maximum 7% 32% 37% 32% 29% 19%	Minimum 3% 18% 23% 29% 20% 12%

Table 29 – The Downtown of Watertown

Trend Analysis - Detailed Results for Jefferson County:																												
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Excellent	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	5%	5%	5%	4%	3%	4%	7%	2%	5%	6%	6%			3%	4%	4%	Excellent	7%	2%
Good	27%	24%	22%	25%	21%	24%	25%	24%	25%	38%	38%	37%	36%	32%	35%	40%	23%	31%	34%	29%		-	31%	30%	30%	Good	40%	21%
Ex+Good	30%	26%	24%	27%	23%	26%	27%	26%	28%	43%	43%	42%	40%	35%	39%	47%	25%	36%	40%	35%			34%	34%	33%	Ex+Good	47%	23%
Fair	34%	34%	34%	34%	34%	34%	34%	33%	33%	33%	34%	35%	36%	36%	35%	32%	43%	40%	35%	43%			39%	40%	36%	Fair	43%	32%
Poor	34%	38%	39%	34%	39%	37%	34%	36%	36%	19%	19%	20%	21%	24%	23%	18%	26%	21%	21%	15%			21%	19%	27%	Poor	39%	15%
Don't Know	2%	2%	3%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	3%	4%	4%	4%	3%	4%	4%	3%	5%	4%	4%	8%			6%	7%	4%	Don't know	8%	2%
																									100%			

Table 30 – Overall Quality of Life in the Area

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	е	Maximum	Minimur
cellent	9%	6%	7%	7%	6%	7%	8%	10%	9%	7%	8%	7%	7%	8%	7%	7%	8%	12%	13%	11%	18%	13%	6%	9%	9%	Excellent	18%	6%
od	55%	44%	49%	49%	47%	50%	52%	55%	53%	47%	50%	48%	51%	52%	47%	56%	58%	55%	53%	51%	48%	47%	44%	40%	50%	Good	58%	40%
r+Good	64%	50%	56%	56%	53%	57%	60%	65%	62%	54%	58%	55%	58%	60%	54%	63%	66%	67%	66%	62%	66%	60%	50%	49%	59%	Ex+Good	67%	49%
ir	28%	33%	32%	32%	34%	32%	29%	26%	27%	32%	31%	32%	31%	31%	31%	27%	28%	22%	26%	27%	24%	30%	34%	37%	30%	Fair	37%	22%
br	7%	15%	10%	11%	11%	9%	9%	7%	8%	12%	10%	12%	9%	9%	12%	9%	5%	8%	7%	9%	9%	8%	13%	12%	10%	Poor	15%	5%
n't Know	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	0%	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%	3%	1%	2%	Don't know	3%	0%
																									100%			
rend Analys	sis – <i>C</i>)etaile	d Re	<u>sults</u>	for L	ewis	<u>s Coi</u>	<u>ınty :</u>																				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023								Averag	е	Maximum	Minimun
xcellent	22%	21%	18%	18%	18%	14%	22%	22%	20%	20%	23%	19%	14%	23%	14%	12%	13%								18%	Excellent	23%	12%
ood	52%	61%	55%	61%	55%	64%	49%	53%	57%	61%	54%	60%	60%	55%	52%	42%	55%								56%	Good	64%	42%
x+Good	74%	82%	73%	79%	73%	78%	71%	75%	77%	81%	77%	79%	74%	78%	66%	54%	68%								74%	Ex+Good	82%	54%
air	21%	13%	20%	19%	20%	20%	25%	17%	21%	17%	17%	18%	22%	17%	27%	37%	26%								21%	Fair	37%	13%
oor	5%	4%	6%	3%	7%	3%	4%	8%	2%	2%	6%	3%	3%	5%	7%	7%	5%								5%	Poor	8%	2%
on't know	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%								0%	Don't know	1%	0%
																		-							100%			
Frend Analys	sis – <i>L</i>	Detaile	d Re	sults	for S	St. La	wrei	ice C	ount	<u>¥:</u>																		
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023																Averag	e	Maximum	Minimun
Excellent	15%	13%	12%	16%	12%	11%	12%	6%	4%																11%	Excellent	16%	4%
Bood	46%	46%	48%	48%	57%	44%	43%	45%	38%																46%	Good	57%	38%
x+Good	61%	59%	60%	64%	69%	55%	55%	51%	42%																57%	Ex+Good	69%	42%
air	29%	32%	30%	27%	22%	34%	30%	33%	39%																31%	Fair	39%	22%
oor	9%	8%	9%	7%	8%	10%	14%	13%	19%																11%	Poor	19%	7%
Don't know	0%	0%	1%	2%	0%	1%	1%	3%	1%																1%	Don't know	3%	0%
																									100%			

Section 3.2 – Additional Tracked Resident Opinions and Characteristics

Table 31 – Would you say things in this country are heading in the right or wrong direction?

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for Jefferson County:

	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Right	33%	26%	17%	15%	23%	Right	33%	15%
Wrong	50%	50%	62%	68%	58%	Wrong	68%	50%
Don't Know	17%	25%	21%	17%	20%	Don't Know	25%	17%
Trend Analy	sis – <i>L</i>	Detaile	d Re	sults	Lewis County:			
	2019	2020	2021	2022	3 Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Right direction	42%	32%	11%	12%	22%	Right	42%	11%
Wrong direction	43%	50%	78%	76%	% 65%	Wrong	80%	43%
Don't Know	15%	19%	11%	12%	6 13%	Don't Know	19%	9%
Trend Analy	eie – <i>l</i>)otaila	d Ro	culte	st Lawrence County:			
Trend Analy	2019	2020	2021	2022	3 Average	0	Maximum	Minimum
Right	39%	27%	33%	12%	25%	Riaht	30%	17%
Wrong	48%	54%	49%	72%	25% %	Wrona	76%	48%
Don't know	14%	20%	18%	16%	16%	Don't Know	20%	11%
Table 32 - Would you say things in New York State are heading in the right or wrong direction?

Trend Analy	sis – Det	ailed Res	its for Jefferson County:		
	2021 20	022 2023	Average	Maximum	Minimum
Right	22% 19	9% 19%	20%	Right 22%	19%
Wrong	55% 62	2% 62%	60%	Wrong 62%	55%
Don't Know	23% 20	0% 20%	21%	Don't Know 23%	20%
Trend Analy	sis – Det	ailed Res	Its for Lewis County:		
	2021 20	022 2023	Average	Maximum	Minimum
Right direction	16% 14	4% 13%	14%	Right 16%	13%
Wrong direction	75% 77	7% 79%	77%	Wrong 79%	75%
Don't Know	10% 9	9% 8%	<i>9</i> %	Don't Know 10%	8%
Trend Analy	sis – Det	ailed Res	Its for St. Lawrence County:		
	2021 20	022 2023	Average	Maximum	Minimum
Right	34% 17	7% 19%	23%	Right 34%	17%
Wrong	50% 71	1% 70%	64%	Wrong 71%	50%
Don't know	16% 11	1% 11%	13%	Don't Know 16%	11%
-					

Table 33 – Would you say things in your county are heading in the right or wrong direction?

Trend Analysis - Detailed Results for Jefferson County:

	2020	2021	2022	2023		Avera	je	Maximum	Minimum
Right	43%	41%	39%	34%		39%	Right	43%	34%
Wrong	23%	26%	33%	32%		29%	Wrong	33%	23%
Don't Know	34%	33%	28%	34%		32%	Don't Know	34%	28%
					-				
Trend Analy	sis – <i>L</i>	Detaile	d Re	sults	for	Lewis County:			
	2019	2020	2021	2022	202	3 Avera	je	Maximum	Minimum
Right direction	61%	49%	35%	41%	37%	45%	Right	61%	35%
Wrong direction	18%	30%	31%	35%	41%	% 31%	Wrong	41%	18%
Don't Know	22%	21%	34%	24%	22%	25%	Don't Know	34%	21%
-									
Irend Analy	sis – <i>L</i>	etaile	а ке	suits	tor	St. Lawrence County :			
	2020	2021	2022	2023		Avera	je	Maximum	Minimum
Right	36%	39%	25%	33%		33%	Right	39%	25%
Wrong	34%	37%	50%	47%		42%	Wrong	50%	34%
Don't know	30%	25%	26%	20%		25%	Don't Know	30%	20%

Table 34 - When considering your family's personal financial situation- has it gotten better, stayed about the same, or gotten worse in the past 12 months?

Trend Analy	<u>sis – I</u>	Detaile	ed Re	sults	for .	Jeffer	rson	Cour	<u> 1ty :</u>											
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Avera	ge	Maximum	Minimum
Better	33%	24%	26%	20%	16%	24%	28%	30%	25%	25%	27%	30%	13%	17%	14%	10%	23%	Better	33%	10%
Same	43%	45%	50%	52%	64%	50%	52%	49%	56%	56%	54%	49%	66%	62%	42%	48%	52%	Same	66%	42%
Worse	24%	31%	23%	29%	21%	24%	20%	21%	18%	14%	13%	17%	20%	19%	42%	38%	23%	Worse	42%	13%
Don't Know	1%	0%	2%	0%	0%	2%	0%	1%	1%	5%	6%	5%	1%	3%	2%	4%	2%	Don't Know	6%	0%
Trend Analy	sis – I	Detaile	d Re	sults	for L	ewis	s Cou	<u>inty :</u>												
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Avera	ge	Maximum	Minimum
Better	12%	11%	12%	12%	14%	18%	13%	18%	17%	21%	19%	31%	14%	12%	11%	11%	15%	Better	31%	11%
Same	48%	55%	55%	57%	61%	53%	65%	62%	63%	69%	64%	53%	63%	53%	36%	43%	56%	Same	69%	36%
Worse	40%	34%	30%	30%	25%	28%	22%	18%	19%	9%	16%	14%	23%	34%	52%	44%	27%	Worse	52%	9%
Don't Know	0%	0%	3%	1%	0%	1%	0%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	Don't Know	3%	0%
Trend Analy	sis – <i>L</i>	Detaile	ed Re	sults	for S	St. La	wren	ice C	ount	<u>¥:</u>										
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023								Avera	ge	Maximum	Minimum
Better	25%	24%	17%	29%	26%	8%	13%	11%	12%								18%	Better	29%	8%
Same	57%	56%	62%	60%	51%	61%	66%	28%	49%								54%	Same	66%	28%
Worse	18%	19%	17%	11%	21%	31%	19%	60%	38%								26%	Worse	60%	11%
Don't know	1%	1%	4%	0%	2%	1%	3%	1%	0%								1%	Don't Know	4%	0%

Table 35 – Do you believe that your county is a good place to grow old? (appropriate supports, elder friendly)

Trend Analysis - Detailed Results for Jefferson County:

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Very good	33%	35%			-		-		-					17%
Fairly good	43%	38%			-		-		-		-			42%
Not very good	16%	15%	-	-	-	-	-		-		-		-	20%
Definitely not good	4%	6%	-	-	-	-	-		-		-		-	14%
Don't know	4%	6%			-		-							8%

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for Lewis County:

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Very good	49%	42%			-		-		-		-			21%
Fairly good	41%	40%			-		-				-			50%
Not very good	3%	6%	-	-	-		-		-		-		-	19%
Definitely not good	2%	8%	-	-	-	-	-		-		-		-	6%
Don't know	4%	5%		-	-		-		-		-		-	4%

Trend Analysis - Detailed Results for St. Lawrence County :

	2023
Very good	15%
Fairly good	40%
Not very good	25%
Definitely not good	18%
Don't know	3%

28%	Very good	35%	17%
41%	Fairly good	43%	38%
17%	Not very good	20%	15%
8%	Definitely not good	14%	4%
6%	Don't know	8%	4%
Average	e	Maximum	Minimum
37%	Very good	49%	21%
44%	Fairly good	50%	40%
9 %	Not very good	19%	3%
5%	Definitely not good	8%	2%
4%	Don't know	5%	4%
Average	e	Maximum	Minimum
15%	Very good	15%	15%
40%	Fairly good	40%	40%
25%	Not very good	25%	25%
18%	Definitely not good	18%	18%
3%	Don't know	3%	3%

Maximum Minimum

Average

Table 36 – "The presence of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum since 1985 has improved the overall quality of life of North Country citizens."

Trend Analysis - Detailed Results for Jefferson County:

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Strongly Agree	38%	39%	36%	37%	40%	36%	38%	39%	-		-	28%	49%	36%	24%			-	-	-	38%
Agree	45%	43%	41%	45%	42%	41%	38%	36%	-		-	50%	34%	50%	43%				-	-	33%
Disagree	7%	7%	10%	6%	8%	12%	12%	10%			-	10%	8%	7%	13%				-	-	7%
Strongly Disagree	1%	3%	3%	1%	1%	3%	4%	6%			-	3%	1%	1%	3%			-	-	-	3%
Neutral/No Opinion	9%	8%	10%	11%	8%	8%	8%	10%	-		-	12%	8%	7%	17%			-	-	-	19%

Trend Analy	<u>Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for Lewis County:</u>																
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Strongly Agree	17%	16%	25%					24%		28%	21%						29%
Agree	50%	44%	46%					55%		50%	49%						45%
Disagree	20%	21%	18%					10%		9%	9%						9%
Strongly Disagree	4%	6%	3%					2%	-	2%	3%						0%
Neutral/No	9%	14%	9%					9%		11%	19%						17%

Trend Analysis - Detailed Results for St. Lawrence County :

	2023
Strongly Agree	18%
Agree	42%
Disagree	5%
Strongly Disagree	2%
Neutral/No Opinion	33%

Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
37%	Strongly Agree	49%	24%
42%	Agree	50%	33%
9%	Disagree	13%	6%
3%	Strongly Disagree	6%	1%
10%	Neutral/No Opinion	19%	7%

Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
23%	Strongly Agree	29%	16%
48%	Agree	55%	44%
14%	Disagree	21%	9%
3 %	Strongly Disagree	6%	0%
13%	Neutral/No Opinion	19%	9%

Averag	е	Maximum	Minimum
18%	Strongly Agree	18%	18%
42%	Agree	42%	42%
5%	Disagree	5%	5%
2%	Strongly Disagree	2%	2%
33%	Neutral/No Opinion	33%	33%

Table 37 – How many times have you crossed the border to eastern Ontario during the past year?

Trend Analy	vsis – I	Detaile	d Re	sults	for .	Jeffe	rson	Cou	<u>nty:</u>																_			
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
None	39%	33%	50%	49%	48%	56%	66%	64%	74%	67%	80%	73%	79%	-					-	-		-		73%	61%	None	80%	33%
1-2 times	27%	36%	25%	24%	25%	22%	21%	18%	13%	20%	13%	14%	13%	-	-	-		-	-	-		-		15%	20%	1-2 times	36%	13%
3-5 times	15%	12%	13%	13%	13%	9%	6%	9%	5%	6%	4%	5%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-		7%	9%	3-5 times	15%	4%
More than 5 times	19%	19%	13%	14%	14%	13%	8%	9%	8%	7%	3%	7%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%	10%	More than 5 times	19%	3%
Not sure	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%						-	-		-		2%	0%	Not sure	2%	0%
Trend Analy	/sis – 1 2023	Detaile	ed Re	sults	for L	Lewis	s Col	unty :																	Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
None	91%	1																							91%	None	91%	91%
1-2 times	8%																								8%	1-2 times	8%	8%
3-5 times	1%																								1%	3-5 times	1%	1%
More than 5 times	0%																								0%	More than 5 times	0%	0%
Not sure	0%																								0%	Not sure	0%	0%
Trend Analy	/sis – /	Detaile	ed Re	sults	for S	St. La	awrei	nce C	Count	<u>v:</u>															Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
None	71%																								71%	None	71%	71%
1-2 times	15%																								15%	1-2 times	15%	15%
3-5 times	6%																								6%	3-5 times	6%	6%
More than 5 times	8%																								8%	More than 5 times	8%	8%
Not sure	0%	l.																							0%	Not sure	0%	0%

Table 38 – How severe of an issue do you believe crime is in your community?

naly	<u>/sis – I</u>	Detaile	d Re	<u>sults</u>	for J	effer	rson (<u>sunty:</u>			
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	023	Averag	e	Maximur
or	27%	33%			-		-	9%	26%	Major	33%
lerate	32%	38%	-	-	-		-	8%	36%	Moderate	38%
nor	33%	22%	-	-	-		-	1%	29%	Minor	33%
ot at all	2%	3%	-	-	-		-	5%	4%	Not at all	6%
										D	70/
0on't Know	7%	4%			-		-		5%	Don't know	1%
on't Know rend Analy	7% ysis – 1 2016	4% Detaile 2017	 ed Re 2018	 sults 2019	 for L 2020	 .ewis 2021	 : Cou 2022	5% 1 <u>/ :</u> 123	5% Averag	Don't know	7% Maximum
on't Know rend Analy ajor	7% ysis – <i>L</i> 2016 26%	4% Detaile 2017 24%	 ed Re 2018	 sults 2019 	 for L 2020 	 ewis 2021	 Cou 2022 	5% 123 1%	5% Averag 19%	Don't know e Major	7% Maximum 26%
on't Know rend Analy ajor oderate	7% ysis – L 2016 26% 36%	4% Detaile 2017 24% 39%	 ed Re 2018 	 sults 2019 	 for L 2020 	 ewis 2021 	 <u>Cou</u> 2022 	<u>fy :</u> b23 '% 4%	5% Averag 19% 40%	Don't know le Major Moderate	7% Maximum 26% 44%
rend Analy ajor oderate nor	7% vsis – L 2016 26% 36% 32%	4% Detaile 2017 24% 39% 31%	 ed Re 2018 	 sults 2019 	 for L 2020 	 ewis 2021 	 2022 	<u>fy :</u> 123 1% 4% 1%	5% Averag 19% 40% 35%	e Major Moderate Minor	7% Maximum 26% 44% 41%
on't Know rend Analy ajor oderate nor ot at all	7% 2016 26% 36% 32% 3%	4% Detaile 2017 24% 39% 31% 3%	 ed Re 2018 	 sults 2019 	 for L 2020 	 ewis 2021 	 2022 	5% (<u>7)</u> (%) 4% 1% (%)	5% Averag 19% 40% 35% 5%	e Major Moderate Minor Not at all	7% Maximum 26% 44% 41% 8%

Trend Analysis - Detailed Results for St. Lawrence County :

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Major	26%	40%					-	27%
Moderate	42%	37%			-		-	34%
Minor	27%	19%			-		-	32%
Not at all	4%	2%			-		-	5%
Don't Know	0%	1%			-		-	2%

Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
31%	Major	40%	26%
38%	Moderate	42%	34%
26%	Minor	32%	19%
4%	Not at all	5%	2%
1%	Don't Know	2%	0%

Table 39 – How severe of an issue do you believe poverty is in your community?

Trend Analy	sis – <i>L</i>	Detaile	d Re	sults	for .	Jeffer	rson	Cou					
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Ave	rag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Major	31%	42%	33%					37%	3	5%	Major	42%	31%
Moderate	41%	36%	36%		-		-	40%	3	3%	Moderate	41%	36%
Minor	20%	14%	18%	-	-		-	13%	1	5%	Minor	20%	13%
Not at all	7%	3%	4%	-	-		-	3%		%	Not at all	7%	3%
Don't Know	1%	6%	10%				-	8%		%	Don't Know	10%	1%
Trend Analy	sis – L	Detaile	d Re	sults	for l	Lewis	s Col	unty :					
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Ave	rag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Major	44%	41%			-		-	30%	3	8%	Major	44%	30%
Moderate	31%	36%		-	-		-	48%	3	3%	Moderate	48%	31%
Minor	16%	17%	-	-	-		-	17%	1	7%	Minor	17%	16%
Not at all	5%	5%			-		-	2%		%	Not at all	5%	2%
Don't Know	4%	1%		-	-		-	3%	:	%	Don't Know	4%	1%
Trend Analy	sis – L	Detaile	d Re	sults	for S	St. La	awrei	nce C					
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Ave	rag	e	Maximum	Minimum
Major	53%	66%	48%		-		-	47%	5	1%	Major	66%	47%
Moderate	33%	24%	38%	-	-		-	37%	3	3%	Moderate	38%	24%
Minor	12%	7%	12%		-		-	12%	1	1%	Minor	12%	7%
Not at all	2%	2%	2%		-		-	2%		%	Not at all	2%	2%
Don't Know	0%	1%	1%		-		-	1%	:	%	Don't Know	1%	0%

Table 40 – How severe of an issue do you believe mental health is in your community?

Trend Analy	sis – <i>L</i>	Detaile	d Re	sults	for .	Jeffer	rson	Cour					
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Ave	rage		Maximum	Minimu
Major	26%	32%						36%	3.	1%	Major	36%	26%
Moderate	35%	34%		-	-		-	38%	30	5%	Moderate	38%	34%
Minor	29%	18%		-	-		-	14%	20	0%	Minor	29%	14%
Not at all	2%	5%		-	-		-	2%	3	%	Not at all	5%	2%
Don't Know	8%	12%		-	-			10%	10	0%	Don't Know	12%	8%
Trend Analy	sis – <i>L</i>	Detaile	d Re	sults	for L	Lewis	s Col	unty:					
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2 2023	Ave	rage		Maximum	Minimu
Major	27%	24%		-				29%	2	7%	Major	29%	24%
Moderate	32%	38%		-	-		-	47%	3	9%	Moderate	47%	32%
Minor	28%	28%		-	-		-	15%	24	1%	Minor	28%	15%
Not at all	5%	2%		-	-		-	1%	3	%	Not at all	5%	1%
Don't Know	8%	8%		-	-		-	8%	8	%	Don't Know	8%	8%
Trond Analy	eie _ /	Dotaila	d Po	culte	for	S+ 1 -	awrou	nco (
Trend Andry	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2 2023	Ave	rage		Maximum	Minimu
Major	21%	37%			-		-	42%	3.	3%	Major	42%	21%
Moderate	42%	39%		-	-		-	35%	3	9%	Moderate	42%	35%
Minor	25%	19%		-	-		-	11%	1	3%	Minor	25%	11%
Not at all	2%	2%		-	-		-	5%	3	%	Not at all	5%	2%
Don't Know	9%	4%		-				7%	7	%	Don't Know	9%	4%

Table 41 – How severe of an issue do you believe alcohol abuse is in your community?

Trend Analy	ysis – I	Detaile	d Re	sults	for .	leffer	rson	Cour					
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Ave	rage	e	Maximum	Minim
Major	35%	47%	36%		-			36%	3	9%	Major	47%	35
Moderate	32%	31%	33%	-	-		-	38%	3	4%	Moderate	38%	3:
Minor	20%	13%	15%	-	-		-	15%	1	6%	Minor	20%	13
Not at all	2%	2%	5%	-	-		-	2%	3	3%	Not at all	5%	2
Don't Know	11%	7%	12%		-		-	10%	1	0%	Don't Know	12%	7
							-						
Trend Analy	ysis – I	Detaile	d Re	sults	for L	ewis	s Col	unty :					
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2 2023	Ave	rage	e	Maximum	Minim
Major	38%	44%		-	-		-	25%	3	6%	Major	44%	2
Moderate	38%	38%			-		-	47%	4	1%	Moderate	47%	3
Minor	18%	12%	-	-	-		-	18%	1	6%	Minor	18%	1
Not at all	1%	2%	-	-	-		-	1%	2	1%	Not at all	2%	1
Don't Know	5%	4%			-		-	10%	(5%	Don't Know	10%	4
						_							
Trend Analy	ysis – I	Detaile	d Re	sults	for S	St. La	awrei	nce C					
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2 2023	Ave	rage	e	Maximum	Minin
Major	36%	51%	46%		-		-	32%	4	1%	Major	51%	3
Moderate	40%	33%	33%	-	-		-	42%	3	7%	Moderate	42%	3
Minor	15%	11%	15%	-	-		-	15%	1	4%	Minor	15%	1
Not at all	3%	1%	4%		-		-	4%	ŝ	3%	Not at all	4%	1
Don't Know	6%	4%	3%		-		-	7%	1	;%	Don't Know	7%	3

Table 42 – How severe of an issue do you believe heroin, or other opiate, abuse is in your community?

Trend Analy	sis – <i>L</i>	Detaile	d Re	sults	for .	leffei	rson	Cour
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Major	65%	75%	59%	-	-		-	56%
Moderate	16%	11%	17%		-		-	21%
Minor	11%	6%	8%	-	-		-	9%
Not at all	2%	2%	4%	-	-		-	3%
Don't Know	7%	7%	12%	-	-		-	11%
Turnel America					I			
rena Analy		Jetalle	a Re	sults	TOP L	ewis	5 00	unty
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	202
Major	62%	68%		-	-		-	35%
Moderate	17%	20%		-	-		-	33%
Minor	12%	6%		-	-		-	15%
Not at all	2%	1%		-	-		-	1%
Don't Know	7%	5%		-	-		-	16%
Trend Analy	sis – <i>I</i>	Detaile	d Re	sults	for S	St. La	awre	nce (
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Major	61%	71%	65%		-		-	57%
Moderate	17%	16%	20%		-		-	26%
Minor	11%	8%	6%	-	-		-	5%
Not at all	4%	2%	0%	-	-	-	-	5%
Don't Know	7%	3%	9%	-	-		-	7%

Table 43 – How severe of an issue do you believe prescriptive drug abuse is in your community?

Trend Analys	sis – D	<u>etaile</u>	d Re:	sults	for .	leffer	son County : Average Average	je	Maximum	Minimum
							43%	Major	46%	40%
							27%	Moderate	29%	25%
							11%	Minor	12%	10%
							4%	Not at all	4%	3%
							16%	Don't Know	16%	15%
Trend Analys	sis – D	etaile	d Re	sults	for L	.ewis	County:			
	2023						Avera	je	Maximum	Minimum
Major	24%						24%	Major	24%	24%
Moderate	39%						39%	Moderate	39%	39%
Minor	19%						19%	Minor	19%	19%
Not at all	1%						1%	Not at all	1%	1%
Don't Know	17%						17%	Don't Know	17%	17%
Trend Analy	sis – D 2018	<u>etaile</u> 2019	d Re:	sults 2021	for 9	St. Lav 2023	wrence County : Average	je	Maximum	Minimum
Major	58%				-	37%	48%	Major	58%	37%
Moderate	22%				-	35%	29%	Moderate	35%	22%
Minor	7%					9%	8%	Minor	9%	7%
Not at all	3%				-	5%	4%	Not at all	5%	3%
Don't Know	10%					14%	12%	Don't Know	14%	10%

Table 44 – Women's Reproductive Healthcare

Which of the following two statements do you agree more with even if only a little more, Statement A or Statement B, which is your personal opinion? Statement A: "Choosing abortion is a woman's right, and society should protect that right." Statement B: "Abortion is morally wrong, and society should prohibit it."

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for Jefferson County:

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Avera	<i>je</i>	Maximum	Minim
	51%	49%		-	55%	52%	Strongly A	55%	4
17%		16%		-	23%	1 9 %	Somewhat A	23%	:
11%	l	13%		-	10%	11%	Somewhat B	13%	
21%		22%			12%	18%	Strongly B	22%	
4	2018 49%	2019 48%	2020 41%	2021	2022	223 Average 376 477%	ge Strongly A	Maximum 49%	٨
si:	s – D	0etaile	d Re:	sults	for L	vis County:	10	Maximum	м
l	17%	15%	19%		-	17%	Somewhat A	19%	
	.	10%	12%			1770	Somewhat B	14%	
9%	<i>*</i>	10 /0	12/0		-	11/0		14/0	

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Strongly A	55%	54%		-	54%
Somewhat A	14%	18%	-	-	21%
Somewhat B	9%	11%	-	-	10%
Strongly B	22%	17%			14%

Averag	e	Maximum	Minimun
54%	Strongly A	55%	54%
18%	Somewhat A	21%	14%
10%	Somewhat B	11%	9%
18%	Strongly B	22%	14%

Table 45 – Employment Status – Current Occupation

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Retired	17%	18%	18%	19%	17%	21%	17%	17%	17%	22%	19%	18%	25%	23%	21%	22%
Unemployed	8%	11%	12%	8%	4%	8%	4%	2%	4%	1%	4%	3%	6%	4%	2%	1%
Homemaker	8%	6%	8%	6%	6%	5%	7%	6%	5%	4%	3%	4%	4%	6%	7%	5%
Student	3%	8%	5%	10%	5%	6%	15%	7%	7%	3%	3%	3%	9%	2%	3%	1%
Military	6%	7%	12%	3%	9%	5%	2%	16%	9%	20%	20%	18%	7%	19%	20%	20%
Managerial	7%	7%	2%	4%	4%	3%	4%	5%	7%	5%	5%	5%	4%	2%	6%	4%
Medical	7%	6%	6%	5%	3%	6%	9%	7%	5%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	7%	3%
Professional/Tec hnical	10%	7%	9%	9%	6%	11%	6%	4%	10%	4%	5%	4%	5%	7%	5%	7%
Sales	6%	5%	4%	4%	10%	9%	5%	4%	7%	7%	5%	4%	4%	3%	3%	2%
Clerical	3%	2%	2%	4%	4%	2%	2%	3%	1%	3%	3%	4%	3%	6%	5%	5%
Service Blue	10%	6%	9%	7%	10%	11%	9%	9%	11%	9%	5%	8%	3%	4%	5%	4%
Collar/Productio	8%	12%	8%	12%	13%	6%	15%	15%	5%	6%	11%	10%	7%	5%	5%	5%
 Teacher/Educati on	4%	5%	3%	5%	4%	6%	3%	4%	8%	6%	6%	6%	6%	4%	4%	6%
Self employed			1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	4%	4%	6%	4%	5%	7%
Disabled				3%	2%	1%	2%	0%	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	5%	3%	7%
Not sure	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	3%	2%	1%	0%

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for Lewis County:

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Retired	21%	21%	22%	21%	23%	24%	23%	25%	24%	24%	33%	29%	27%	27%	28%	29%
Not employed	7%	5%	6%	7%	3%	8%	6%	2%	3%	9%	8%	3%	6%	2%	3%	0%
Homemaker	8%	6%	6%	4%	8%	7%	3%	5%	4%	4%	3%	3%	3%	5%	5%	3%
Student	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	3%	5%	7%	4%	3%	5%	3%	1%	3%	6%
Military	1%	1%	2%	5%	1%	0%	0%	0%	3%	2%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Managerial	4%	5%	5%	6%	3%	4%	1%	4%	3%	2%	3%	4%	3%	6%	4%	2%
Medical	5%	7%	7%	9%	4%	5%	6%	7%	8%	6%	8%	5%	7%	5%	6%	6%
Professional/T echnical	6%	9%	7%	6%	8%	4%	4%	2%	4%	3%	3%	5%	5%	5%	6%	9%
Sales	4%	3%	6%	3%	2%	2%	4%	8%	3%	3%	3%	6%	2%	4%	5%	6%
Clerical	3%	3%	6%	6%	6%	3%	2%	3%	2%	2%	5%	3%	3%	3%	6%	2%
Service	6%	6%	3%	4%	6%	4%	2%	6%	3%	5%	4%	3%	4%	5%	2%	5%
Blue Collar	14%	13%	11%	21%	17%	20%	25%	19%	19%	17%	8%	13%	15%	11%	12%	13%
Teacher/Educa tion	7%	5%	5%	5%	4%	4%	8%	5%	6%	6%	8%	6%	6%	7%	3%	6%
Self employed	12%	14%	11%	2%	11%	9%	7%	5%	7%	8%	4%	10%	10%	13%	9%	10%
Not sure	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	3%	1%	1%	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Disabled	0%	0%	2%	1%	3%	2%	3%	3%	5%	4%	5%	3%	5%	5%	8%	1%

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for St. Lawrence County :

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Retired	25%	23%	27%	30%	31%	28%	30%
Unemployed	8%	2%	6%	2%	7%	1%	3%
Homemaker	3%	2%	3%	4%	4%	4%	2%
Student	5%	5%	2%	5%	6%	6%	1%
Military	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Managerial	3%	4%	5%	5%	4%	6%	3%
Medical	6%	6%	5%	8%	6%	6%	10%
Professional/Tec hnical	5%	10%	5%	9%	8%	4%	5%
Sales	4%	7%	8%	2%	3%	2%	3%
Clerical	4%	3%	4%	5%	5%	5%	7%
Service	11%	11%	3%	1%	5%	10%	4%
Blue Collar/Productio	10%	11%	12%	12%	9%	9%	17%
n Teacher/Educati on	6%	6%	7%	6%	7%	10%	6%
Self-employed	5%	3%	6%	6%	3%	4%	5%
Disabled	2%	6%	2%	4%	3%	3%	4%
Not sure	0%	1%	4%	0%	0%	2%	0%

Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
19%	Retired	25%	17%
5%	Unemployed	12%	1%
6%	Homemaker	8%	3%
6%	Student	15%	1%
12%	Military	20%	2%
5%	Managerial	7%	2%
6%	Medical	9%	3%
7%	Professional/Technical	11%	4%
5%	Sales	10%	2%
3%	Clerical	6%	1%
8%	Service	11%	3%
9%	Blue Collar/Production	15%	5%
5%	Teacher/Education	8%	3%
3%	Self-employed	7%	1%
3%	Disabled	7%	0%
1%	Not sure	3%	0%

Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
25%	Retired	33%	21%
5%	Not employed	9%	0%
5%	Homemaker	8%	3%
3%	Student	7%	1%
1%	Military	5%	0%
4%	Managerial	6%	1%
6%	Medical	9%	4%
5%	Professional/Technical	9%	2%
4%	Sales	8%	2%
4%	Clerical	6%	2%
4%	Service	6%	2%
16%	Blue Collar	25%	8%
6%	Teacher/Education	8%	3%
9 %	Self-employed	14%	2%
1%	Not sure	3%	0%
3%	Disabled	8%	0%

Average	2	Maximum	Minimum
28%	Retired	31%	23%
4%	Unemployed	8%	1%
3%	Homemaker	4%	2%
4%	Student	6%	1%
0%	Military	3%	0%
4%	Managerial	6%	3%
7%	Medical	10%	5%
7%	Professional/Technical	10%	4%
4%	Sales	8%	2%
5%	Clerical	7%	3%
6%	Service	11%	1%
11%	Blue Collar/Production	17%	9%
7%	Teacher/Education	10%	6%
5%	Self-employed	6%	3%
3%	Disabled	6%	2%
1%	Not sure	4%	0%

Table 46 – Political Beliefs

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for Jefferson County:																			
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Very Conservative	6%	8%	9%	3%	6%	3%	6%	6%	5%	6%	4%	2%	9%	6%	9%	7%	5%	4%	7%
Conservative	29%	30%	27%	18%	25%	26%	28%	25%	21%	29%	22%	32%	26%	28%	23%	25%	25%	28%	24%
Middle of the Road	43%	40%	47%	39%	42%	33%	31%	40%	52%	49%	50%	46%	37%	36%	39%	43%	42%	47%	46%
Liberal	18%	15%	13%	14%	17%	11%	16%	11%	10%	8%	10%	10%	9%	10%	10%	13%	11%	9%	7%
Very Liberal	4%	7%	5%	2%	2%	2%	4%	4%	5%	1%	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	4%	1%	3%	3%
Don't Know	0%	0%	0%	24%	9%	24%	15%	15%	7%	7%	12%	8%	18%	16%	15%	9%	15%	10%	14%

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for Lewis County:

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Very Conservative	8%	6%	9%	7%	7%	6%	7%	4%	8%	9%	5%	6%	7%	9%	6%	7%
Conservative	29%	30%	27%	28%	26%	27%	28%	24%	29%	33%	33%	31%	27%	28%	27%	33%
Middle of the Road	42%	39%	41%	45%	53%	44%	36%	55%	37%	39%	42%	47%	44%	43%	45%	37%
Liberal	11%	10%	9%	10%	6%	11%	8%	9%	12%	8%	7%	9%	9%	8%	8%	12%
Very Liberal	0%	3%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	3%	2%	1%	3%
Don't Know	9%	11%	12%	8%	5%	12%	20%	8%	12%	10%	12%	6%	9%	10%	13%	8%

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for St. Lawrence County :

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Very Conservative	4%	4%	9%	5%	7%	8%	4%	8%	9%
Conservative	22%	23%	27%	26%	23%	25%	26%	25%	24%
Middle of the Road	43%	44%	38%	39%	42%	43%	36%	41%	32%
Liberal	10%	17%	17%	14%	15%	10%	18%	12%	14%
Very Liberal	3%	1%	3%	2%	7%	5%	5%	6%	5%
Don't Know	18%	11%	6%	14%	6%	9%	11%	8%	16%

Averag	е	Maximum	Minimun
6%	Very Conservative	9%	2%
26%	Conservative	32%	18%
42%	Middle of the Road	52%	31%
12%	Liberal	18%	7%
3%	Very Liberal	7%	1%
11%	Don't Know	24%	0%

,

Averag	2	Maximum	Minimum		
7%	Very Conservative	9%	4%		
29%	Conservative	33%	24%		
43%	Middle of the Road	55%	36%		
9%	Liberal	12%	6%		
2%	Very Liberal	3%	0%		
10%	Don't Know	20%	5%		

Averag	e	Maximum	Minimum
6%	Very Conservative	9%	4%
25%	Conservative	27%	22%
40%	Middle of the Road	44%	32%
14%	Liberal	18%	10%
4%	Very Liberal	7%	1%
11%	Don't Know	18%	6%

Table 47 – What do you think is the single largest issue that is facing residents of the North Country right now?

Trend Analysis - Detailed Results for Jefferson County:

2	2022	2023	Average M	Maximum	٨
	34%	24%	29% Inflation/Cost of Living	34%	
1	5%	10%	8% Unemployment/Jobs	10%	
	10%	10%	10% Affordable Housing	10%	
ss	5%	12%	9% Homelessness	12%	
	4%	5%	5% Drugs	5%	
	4%	5%	5% Crime	5%	
	6%	5%	6% Healthcare	6%	
	32%	29%	31% Other Issues	32%	

Trend Analysis – Detailed Results for Lewis County :

	2022	2023
Inflation/Cost of Living	55%	38%
Unemploymen t/Jobs	8%	7%
Affordable Housing	5%	5%
Homelessness	2%	2%
Drugs	2%	5%
Crime	3%	1%
Healthcare	3%	4%
Other Issues	22%	38%

Trend Analysis - Detailed Results for St. Lawrence County :

	2022	2023
Inflation/Cost of Living	43%	30%
Unemployment/J obs	9%	15%
Affordable Housing	5%	8%
Homelessness	2%	4%
Drugs	1%	8%
Crime	4%	9%
Healthcare	5%	8%
Other Issues	31%	19%

47%	Inflation/Cost of Living	55%	38%
8%	Unemployment/Jobs	8%	7%
5%	Affordable Housing	5%	5%
2%	Homelessness	2%	2%
4%	Drugs	5%	2%
2%	Crime	3%	1%
4%	Healthcare	4%	3%
30%	Other Issues	38%	22%
_			
Average	e	waximum	wiinimum
37%	Inflation/Cost of Living	43%	30%

Maximum Minimum

Average

37%	Inflation/Cost of Living	43%	30%
12%	Unemployment/Jobs	15%	9%
7%	Affordable Housing	8%	5%
3 %	Homelessness	4%	2%
5%	Drugs	8%	1%
7%	Crime	9%	4%
7%	Healthcare	8%	5%
25%	Other Issues	31%	19%

Appendix II Detailed 2023 Demographic Cross-tabulations in Tabular Format Region-wide Combined and County-specific Statistical Tests of Significance Included

Table 10	Table 10		Ger	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve	4	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	sc	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	3.1% ¹	2.8% _a	3.1% _a	4.0% _a	1.1% _a	2.2% _a	4.5% _a	1.7% _a	4.0% _a	3.0% _a	4.0% _a	1.9% _a	1.3% _a	6.3% _a	2.3% _b	2.6% _a	4.3% _a	2.1% _a	2.8% _a	5.0% _a	2.2% _a
Cultural and entertainment	Good	28.7% ¹	33.7% _a	24.0% _b	32.5% _a	22.4% _b	32.3% _{a,b}	29.9% _{a,b}	31.0% _a	24.2% _a	31.6% _a	27.1% _a	25.3% _a	29.5% _a	42.0% _a	26.8% _b	27.3% _a	39.6% _b	28.2% _a	27.7% _a	31.6% _a	30.9% _a
	Fair	39.7% ¹	39.3% _a	40.8% _a	34.1% _a	42.3% _{a,b}	43.5% _{a,b}	45.9% _b	36.1% _a	42.3% _a	44.4%a	38.4% _a	44.7% _a	44.6% _a	26.4% _a	42.2% _b	42.4%a	27.5% _b	41.2% _a	42.3% _a	42.9% _a	28.7% _b
opportunities	Poor	24.8% ¹	20.0% _a	29.0% _b	24.3% _a	33.2% _b	19.3% _{a,c}	13.1% _c	24.9% _{a,b}	27.7% _a	19.3% _b	24.0% _a	26.1% _a	22.8% _a	15.5% _a	26.2% _b	24.6% _a	21.8% _a	23.1% _a	24.7% _a	20.3% _a	31.5% _a
	Don't Know	3.6% ¹	4.2% _a	3.2% _a	5.1% _a	1.0% _b	2.7% _{a,b}	6.6% _a	6.2% _a	1.8% _b	1.8% _b	6.6% _a	2.0% _b	1.8% _b	9.8% _a	2.5% _b	3.1% _a	6.7% _b	5.5% _a	2.5% _{a,b}	0.2% _b	6.7% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1167	471	677	214	340	311	287	223	518	413	307	401	258	99	1020	1047	72	391	467	181	92

		Jefferson County	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	4.1% ¹	4.6%a	2.6%a	5.1% _a	1.3% _a	3.1% _a	4.4%a	2.5% _a	4.7% _a	3.3% _a	6.1% _a	2.7% _a	0.6% _a	7.4% _a	2.4% _b	3.5% _a	5.1% _a	3.5%a	4.0% _a	4.5% _a	1.3% _a
Cultural and entertainment	Good	31.8% ¹	40.2% _a	23.4% _b	38.1% _a	19.8% _b	31.0% _{a,b}	40.4% _a	35.0% _a	29.8% _a	30.3% _a	28.3% _a	32.9% _a	31.5% _a	41.1% _a	28.7% _b	28.5% _a	47.6% _b	41.9% _a	26.4% _b	22.5% _{a,b}	36.2% _{a,b}
	Fair	40.0% ¹	33.6% _a	47.6% _b	33.6% _a	49.1% _b	47.2% _{a,b}	39.5% _{a,b}	38.4% _a	40.2% _a	46.1% _a	32.9% _a	46.1% _{a,b}	53.4% _b	25.5% _a	45.5% _b	45.7% _a	16.8% _b	37.8% _a	43.4% _a	49.0% _a	31.8% _a
opportunities	Poor	19.1% ¹	15.0% _a	22.9% _b	16.5% _{a,b}	28.9% _a	15.1% _{a,b}	5.4% _b	16.4% _a	22.7% _a	16.9% _a	24.2% _a	15.2% _a	11.4% _a	14.2% _a	20.8% _a	18.2% _a	19.4% _a	11.5% _a	23.2% _a	23.2% _a	15.9% _a
	Don't Know	5.0% ¹	6.6%a	3.5%a	6.8% _{a,b}	0.9% _a	3.5% _{a,b}	10.3% _b	7.8% _a	2.7% _a	3.4% _a	8.4% _a	3.2% _a	3.1% _a	11.7% _a	2.6% _b	4.1% _a	11.0% _ь	5.3% _{a,b}	3.1% _a	0.9% _{a,b}	14.9% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	430	192	227	123	104	98	95	77	189	154	122	149	92	81	330	357	46	140	176	53	38

		Lewis County	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	el .	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
Cultural and entertainment	Excellent	5.7% ¹	3.7% _a	7.5%a	10.7% _a	3.3% _a	2.4%a	5.6% _a	5.0% _a	5.7% _a	7.5% _a	1.7% _a	2.8% _a	7.0%a	0.0% ²	5.3% _a	4.5% _a	23.3% _b	1.9% _a	4.3% _a	7.9% _{a,b}	26.0% _b
	Good	30.2% ¹	28.1% _a	31.8% _a	30.5% _{a,b}	25.2% _a	44.3% _b	24.3% _{a,b}	32.3% _a	30.5% _a	24.4% _a	29.0% _a	33.9% _a	26.4% _a	0.0% ²	31.4% _a	30.9% _a	30.6% _a	29.6% _a	28.1% _a	40.4% _a	21.1% _a
	Fair	37.7% ¹	40.1%a	35.5% _a	37.2% _a	33.4% _a	33.7% _a	52.0% _a	34.7% _a	42.0% _a	38.1% _a	47.0%a	37.1% _a	42.8% _a	53.6% _a	37.5% _a	38.0% _a	37.5% _a	44.3% _a	39.9% _{a,b}	19.9% _b	30.8% _{a,b}
opportunities	Poor	24.2% ¹	23.8% _a	24.8% _a	21.6% _{a,b}	34.3% _a	19.0% _{a,b}	14.0% _b	23.8% _a	21.4% _a	30.0% _a	19.3% _a	26.0% _a	23.8% _a	46.4% _a	24.9% _a	25.8% _a	8.5% _a	20.7% _a	25.6% _a	31.8% _a	22.1% _a
	Don't Know	2.2% ¹	4.3%a	0.3% _b	0.0% ²	3.8%a	0.5% _a	4.1% _a	4.2%a	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	3.0% _a	0.3%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.9% _a	0.9% _a	0.0% ²	3.5% _a	2.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	348	129	217	43	113	95	96	73	157	118	80	123	72	9	321	327	13	133	140	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Gen	der		Age G	iroups		E	ducation Leve	1	A	nnual HH Incoi	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
Cultural and entertainment	Excellent	1.5% ¹	0.7% _a	2.3% _a	1.3% _a	0.4% _a	1.4% _a	4.4% _a	0.0% ²	3.1% _a	1.7% _a	1.9% _a	1.1% _a	0.9% _a	0.0% ²	1.5% _a	1.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.9% _a	4.6% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	25.3% ¹	28.2% _a	22.6% _a	25.4% _a	23.9% _a	29.6% _a	23.9% _a	26.4% _{a,b}	17.8% _a	34.4% _b	25.1% _a	16.9% _a	28.3% _a	54.2% _a	24.2% _b	25.4% _a	26.6% _a	15.3% _a	29.3% _{a,b}	34.4% _b	27.8% _{a,b}
	Fair	40.0% ¹	45.1% _a	35.8% _a	34.0% _a	38.9% _a	43.5% _a	48.7% _a	34.2% _a	44.3% _a	44.1% _a	43.4% _a	45.6% _a	36.8% _a	27.2% _a	40.7% _a	40.6% _a	45.2% _a	43.4% _a	41.5% _a	44.4% _a	25.9% _a
opportunities	Poor	30.5% ¹	24.3% _a	35.5% _b	35.3% _a	36.5% _a	22.6% _a	18.3% _a	34.2% _a	33.6% _{a,b}	19.1% _b	24.6%a	35.0% _a	33.1% _a	18.6% _a	30.7% _a	29.9% _a	28.3% _a	34.2% _a	26.5% _{a,b}	16.5% _b	45.5% _a
	Don't Know	2.7% ¹	1.7% _a	3.7% _a	4.0% _a	0.4% _a	2.8% _a	4.7% _a	5.2% _a	1.2% _a	0.6%a	5.0%a	1.4% _a	0.9%a	0.0% ²	2.9% _a	2.9% _a	0.0% ²	6.2% _a	1.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.8% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	389	150	233	48	123	118	96	73	172	141	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	118	151	75	36

Table 11	Tr-County Combined	Gender	Age Groups	Education Level	Annual HH Income	Active Military in HH	Race/Ethnicity	Political Beliefs

I Obio 11																						
	1	All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	2.8% ¹	3.5%a	2.2% _a	2.7% _a	3.4%a	3.1% _a	2.0%a	2.9% _a	2.4%a	3.1%a	1.8% _a	3.6%a	2.3% _a	6.2% _a	2.4% _b	2.9% _a	1.9% _a	0.5% _a	3.3% _b	4.0% _b	5.0% _b
Cost of Energy	Good	19.1% ¹	24.4% _a	13.9% _b	23.6% _a	15.8% _b	13.8% _b	19.9% _{a,b}	21.8% _a	13.7% _b	22.5% _a	17.8% _a	14.1% _a	20.5% _a	25.7% _a	18.0% _b	18.1% _a	26.1% _b	14.4% _a	19.9% _{a,b}	23.0% _{a,b}	24.3% _b
	Fair	34.1% ¹	30.8% _a	36.8% _b	34.7% _a	33.7% _a	35.8% _a	32.6% _a	28.1% _a	36.5% _b	43.4% _b	27.9% _a	37.7% _b	39.8% _b	30.8% _a	34.8% _a	33.2% _a	39.1% _a	36.1% _a	32.4% _a	41.4% _a	27.5% _a
	Poor	39.6% ¹	36.1% _a	43.3% _b	30.3% _a	46.6% _b	46.4% _b	40.0% _{a,b}	40.1% _a	44.0% _a	29.8% _b	42.8% _a	42.9% _a	37.1% _a	21.6% _a	42.3% _b	42.2% _a	21.2% _b	44.7% _a	39.2% _{a,b}	29.4% _b	37.3% _{a,b}
	Don't Know	4.4% ¹	5.2% _a	3.7% _a	8.7% _a	0.6% _b	0.9% _{b,c}	5.4% _{a,c}	7.0% _a	3.3% _b	1.1% _b	9.8% _a	1.7% _b	0.3% _b	15.7% _a	2.6% _b	3.6% _a	11.8% _b	4.3% _a	5.1% _a	2.2% _a	5.8% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1166	470	677	213	340	312	287	223	517	413	306	401	257	98	1020	1045	72	391	466	181	92

.

		Jefferson County	Ge	nder		Age C	Groups			Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political B	eliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	2.9% ¹	4.0% _a	1.9% _a	5.0% _a	0.3% _a	2.9% _a	1.6% _a	3.3% _a	3.1% _a	1.1% _a	2.5% _a	4.5% _a	0.5% _a	7.3% _a	1.5% _b	3.0% _a	1.3% _a	0.0% ²	3.6% _a	7.9% _a	2.0% _a
	Good	19.6% ¹	27.3% _a	11.1% _b	25.7% _a	9.6% _b	12.8% _{a,b}	25.9% _a	24.7% _a	12.1% _b	20.9% _{a,b}	24.7% _a	13.2% _b	18.5% _{a,b}	24.5% _a	17.6% _a	18.4% _a	22.2% _a	12.2% _a	22.9% _a	23.9% _a	23.4% _a
Cost of Eperatu	Fair	33.5% ¹	33.9% _a	32.5% _a	29.1% _a	37.2% _a	42.9% _a	31.3% _a	28.7% _a	34.8% _a	42.1% _a	26.7% _a	35.1% _a	41.4% _a	31.7% _a	33.9% _a	30.6% _a	45.4% _b	39.6% _a	27.0% _a	31.5% _a	41.2% _a
Cost of Energy	Poor	38.9% ¹	27.9% _a	51.0% _b	29.9% _a	52.8% _b	39.4% _{a,b}	39.3% _{a,b}	36.3% _a	45.3% _a	33.7% _a	33.5% _a	46.2% _a	39.4% _a	17.8% _a	46.1% _b	44.2% _a	17.2% _b	44.1% _a	41.1% _{a,b}	34.7% _{a,b}	23.4% _b
	Don't Know	5.1% ¹	6.8% _a	3.5% _a	10.3% _a	0.0% ²	2.0%a	1.9%a	7.0% _a	4.7% _a	2.2% _a	12.6% _a	1.1% _b	0.2% _b	18.6% _a	1.0% _b	3.7% _a	13.8% _b	4.1%a	5.4% _a	2.0% _a	10.0% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	429	190	228	123	104	98	95	77	188	154	121	149	92	80	330	355	46	139	176	53	38

		Lewis County	Gei	nder		Age G	roups			Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	2.1% ¹	1.3% _a	2.8% _a	0.0% ²	3.7% _a	0.7% _a	3.6% _a	1.1% _a	2.1% _a	4.8% _a	1.6% _a	1.7% _a	3.4% _a	0.0% ²	2.2% _a	2.2% _a	1.3% _a	2.2% _a	2.0% _a	3.2% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	16.4% ¹	18.1% _a	14.4% _a	20.3% _{a,b}	9.5% _a	17.0% _{a,b}	24.2% _b	12.4% _a	21.2% _a	18.6% _a	19.4% _a	13.6% _a	20.7% _a	0.0% ²	16.1% _a	16.5% _a	14.7% _a	16.3% _a	18.1% _a	19.4% _a	0.8% _a
Cost of Energy	Fair	35.3% ¹	29.9% _a	40.0% _b	38.2% _a	30.7% _a	35.9% _a	38.8% _a	35.3% _a	31.2% _a	42.4% _a	26.2% _a	38.6% _{a,b}	49.7% _b	51.3% _a	35.5% _a	36.3% _a	29.6% _a	34.9% _a	33.7% _a	37.2% _a	42.7% _a
obst of Energy	Poor	41.8% ¹	50.7% _a	34.3% _b	28.9% _a	53.7% _b	46.5% _{a,b}	31.8% _a	43.6% _a	43.4% _a	34.2% _a	52.5%a	43.9% _{a,b}	26.2% _b	48.7% _a	41.4% _a	40.2% _a	54.4% _a	44.0% _a	46.2% _a	28.1% _a	37.6% _a
	Don't Know	4.4% ¹	0.0% ²	8.5% _a	12.7% _a	2.4% _b	0.0% ²	1.6% _b	7.6% _a	2.1% _b	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	2.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	4.8% _a	4.7% _a	0.0% ²	2.5% _a	0.0% ²	12.1% _b	18.9% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	348	130	216	42	113	96	96	73	157	118	80	123	71	9	321	327	13	134	139	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve	1	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	2.9% ¹	3.4% _a	2.4% _a	0.0% ²	5.9% _a	4.0% _a	1.8% _a	3.0% _a	1.8% _a	4.6% _a	1.0% _a	3.4% _a	3.7% _a	0.0% ²	3.1% _a	3.0% _a	2.9% _a	0.5%a	3.2% _{a,b}	2.2% _{a,b}	8.2% _b
	Good	19.2% ¹	22.8% _a	16.3% _a	21.5% _a	22.6% _a	13.5% _a	14.6% _a	21.6% _a	13.7% _a	25.0% _a	8.9% _a	15.0% _{a,b}	22.3% _b	37.0% _a	18.7% _a	18.1% _a	34.8% _b	15.6%a	16.4% _a	23.3% _a	28.0% _a
Cost of Energy	Fair	34.5% ¹	27.8% _a	40.0% _b	41.6% _a	31.4% _a	30.2% _a	31.9% _a	25.5% _a	39.2% _b	44.9% _b	29.6% _a	39.7% _a	36.5% _a	22.2% _a	35.4% _a	34.6% _a	29.1% _a	33.5% _a	39.6% _a	47.1% _a	14.2% _b
Coat of Energy	Poor	39.8% ¹	41.1% _a	38.5% _a	31.0% _a	39.5% _{a,b}	51.8% _b	42.7% _{a,b}	43.1% _a	43.0% _a	25.1% _b	52.3% _a	40.0% _a	37.0% _a	40.8% _a	39.6% _a	41.0% _a	23.4% _b	45.4% _a	34.6% _a	27.1% _a	49.0% _a
	Don't Know	3.7% ¹	4.8% _a	2.7% _a	5.9% _{a,b}	0.6% _a	0.4% _{a,b}	8.9% _b	6.8% _a	2.3% _a	0.4% _a	8.3% _a	2.0% _a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	3.3% _a	3.3% _a	9.8% _a	5.0%a	6.2% _a	0.4% _a	0.7% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	389	150	233	48	123	118	96	73	172	141	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	118	151	75	36

Table 12		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	Groups			Education Leve	el	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 12		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	8.2% ¹	12.0% _a	4.6% _b	12.9% _a	2.9% _b	9.2% _a	7.3% _{a,b}	11.4% _a	5.8% _b	5.8% _b	16.3% _a	2.8% _b	3.7% _b	19.6% _a	6.7% _b	7.3% _a	17.0% _b	8.6% _a	10.2% _a	5.8% _a	5.3% _a
	Good	32.5% ¹	35.1% _a	29.7% _a	25.8% _a	30.5% _{a,b}	37.5% _{b,c}	46.6% _c	33.8% _a	29.7% _a	34.0% _a	30.2% _a	28.7% _a	31.9% _a	22.5% _a	33.3% _b	33.3% _a	25.8% _a	33.9% _a	30.0% _a	32.8% _a	34.2% _a
Health care access	Fair	32.4% ¹	28.7% _a	36.2% _b	31.9% _{a,b}	37.0% _a	32.0% _{a,b}	25.0% _b	29.2% _a	34.7% _a	34.9% _a	28.7% _a	39.7% _b	34.5% _{a,b}	28.4% _a	33.4% _a	33.5% _a	25.2% _a	35.0% _a	33.3% _{a,b}	35.0% _{a,b}	23.2% _b
riealth care access	Poor	24.9% ¹	21.4% _a	28.1% _b	24.9% _a	28.9% _a	21.2% _a	21.0% _a	23.4% _a	28.3% _a	22.8% _a	23.0% _a	27.2% _a	27.5% _a	21.2% _a	25.5% _a	24.1% _a	27.3% _a	21.3% _a	25.3% _a	25.1% _a	30.8% _a
	Don't Know	2.0% ¹	2.8% _a	1.3% _a	4.6% _a	0.8% _b	0.2% _b	0.0% _b	2.3% _a	1.4% _a	2.6%a	1.9% _a	1.6% _a	2.5%a	8.3% _a	1.1% _b	1.7% _a	4.7% _b	1.2% _a	1.3% _a	1.4% _{a,b}	6.6% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1169	473	677	216	340	313	285	224	518	414	308	401	259	101	1020	1048	72	391	467	181	93

r		lofforcon	1		1				1			1										
		Jenerson	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		County			L					-												
		All	Malo	Fomalo	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	90	4+VD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 -	Over \$100.000	Voc. AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIROC	Concervative	Middle of the	Liboral	Don't Know
		Participants	maie	remaie	10-00	40-55	00-05	10:	100	50	4:10	00 10 \$30,000	\$100,000	0461 \$100,000	163, AM III III		Winte	Bil 00	Conservative	Road	Liberal	Dontratiow
	Excellent	12.8% ¹	19.7% _a	6.0% _b	18.0% _a	4.9% _b	14.1% _{a,b}	13.1% _{a,b}	19.5% _a	7.3% _b	8.4% _{a,b}	23.3% _a	4.9% _b	3.8% _b	23.1% _a	9.9% _b	10.8% _a	26.4% _b	17.2% _a	13.0% _a	7.0% _a	8.9% _a
	Good	31.0% ¹	32.6% _a	28.1% _a	19.3% _a	38.6% _b	35.6% _{a,b}	47.9% _b	29.4% _a	25.8% _a	40.7% _a	21.7% _a	37.9% _b	30.5% _{a,b}	20.7% _a	32.8% _b	32.6% _a	17.1% _b	32.6% _a	27.9% _a	25.1% _a	35.0% _a
Health care access	Fair	30.6% ¹	23.4% _a	38.1% _b	33.5% _a	30.4% _a	30.2% _a	19.7% _a	28.4% _a	33.3% _a	31.3% _a	29.9% _a	34.6% _a	35.1% _a	26.1% _a	32.6% _a	33.3% _a	18.8% _b	32.6% _a	31.3% _a	40.7% _a	21.2% _a
riealth care access	Poor	22.1% ¹	19.4% _a	25.7% _a	21.7% _a	26.1% _a	19.7% _a	19.3% _a	19.6% _{a,b}	30.5% _a	14.4% _b	21.4% _a	18.5% _a	28.1% _a	20.2% _a	23.2% _a	20.4% _a	30.1% _a	14.6% _a	25.2% _a	23.6% _a	26.4% _a
	Don't Know	3.5% ¹	4.9% _a	2.1% _a	7.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.4% _b	0.0% ²	3.1% _a	3.1% _a	5.3% _a	3.7% _a	4.1% _a	2.5% _a	9.9% _a	1.5% _b	2.9% _a	7.6% _a	3.0% _a	2.5% _a	3.5% _a	8.5% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	432	193	228	125	104	99	94	78	190	154	123	150	93	83	330	358	46	140	176	53	39

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		1	Education Leve	el .	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	8.6% ¹	7.8% _a	9.5% _a	8.5% _a	5.6%a	11.7% _a	11.5% _a	10.1% _a	6.4% _a	8.5% _a	10.5% _a	4.7% _a	5.9% _a	0.0% ²	9.1% _a	9.2% _a	0.0% ²	6.3% _a	5.9% _a	13.8% _{a,b}	22.9% _b
	Good	38.3% ¹	44.6% _a	31.8% _b	34.1% _{a,b}	28.2% _a	47.4% _b	53.4% _{b,c}	36.4% _a	40.9% _a	38.6% _a	45.1% _{a,b}	29.9% _a	51.7% _b	7.6%a	39.3% _a	39.5% _a	31.6% _a	46.4% _a	36.1% _a	35.9% _{a,b}	9.6% _b
Health care access	Fair	41.6% ¹	35.2% _a	48.0% _b	37.1% _{a,b}	52.7% _a	39.6% _{a,b}	29.0% _b	43.3% _a	41.4% _a	37.9% _a	34.9% _a	56.1% _b	32.4% _a	65.9% _a	41.3% _a	41.5% _a	56.4% _a	40.1% _a	47.5% _a	32.0% _a	42.8% _a
riealth care access	Poor	9.5% ¹	12.4% _a	7.0% _a	12.9% _a	13.5% _a	1.3% _b	5.8% _{a,b}	7.2% _a	11.2% _a	12.4% _a	9.6% _a	9.4% _a	10.0%a	26.4% _a	8.1% _a	7.6% _a	12.0% _a	7.2% _a	10.5% _a	15.0% _a	6.4% _a
	Don't Know	2.0% ¹	0.0% ²	3.8% _a	7.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.3% _b	2.9% _a	0.2% _a	2.6%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	2.2% _a	2.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	3.3% _a	18.3% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	348	130	216	43	113	96	95	73	156	119	80	122	72	9	321	327	13	133	140	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve		A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	3.5% ¹	4.9% _a	2.2% _a	6.8% _a	0.4% _b	4.6% _{a,b}	2.2% _{a,b}	3.1% _a	4.4% _a	2.8% _a	8.7% _a	0.5% _b	3.2% _{a,b}	0.0% ²	3.7% _a	3.7% _a	2.5% _a	1.4%a	7.5% _a	3.6% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	32.5% ¹	35.5% _a	30.7% _a	33.0% _{a,b}	24.2% _a	35.9% _{a,b}	44.0% _b	37.6% _a	31.0% _a	26.7% _a	37.8% _a	20.7% _b	29.3% _{a,b}	36.4% _a	32.2% _a	32.3% _a	40.6% _a	31.4% _a	31.0% _a	35.9% _a	36.5% _a
Health care access	Fair	32.0% ¹	32.9%a	31.5% _a	28.6% _a	38.4% _a	31.0% _a	27.7% _a	25.9% _a	34.6% _a	37.6% _a	25.8% _a	39.6% _a	34.3% _a	36.8% _a	32.2% _a	31.7% _a	32.3% _a	35.7% _a	31.9% _a	32.7% _a	22.4% _a
riealth care access	Poor	31.4% ¹	25.6% _a	35.6% _b	31.6% _a	35.3% _a	28.5% _a	26.2% _a	32.0% _a	30.0% _a	32.9% _a	27.7% _a	39.2% _a	30.3% _a	26.8% _a	31.3% _a	31.7% _a	24.6% _a	31.5% _a	29.5% _a	27.8% _a	37.6% _a
	Don't Know	0.6% ¹	1.1%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	2.9% _a	0.0% ²	0.6%a	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	3.5%a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	389	150	233	48	123	118	96	73	172	141	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	118	151	75	36

Table 12		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	Groups		I	Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 15		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	7.3% ¹	11.1% _a	3.8% _b	8.2% _a	5.6% _a	8.4% _a	8.5% _a	9.8% _a	5.0% _b	6.5% _{a,b}	12.4% _a	2.9% _b	4.8% _b	14.1% _a	6.4% _b	7.1% _a	11.9% _ь	7.1% _a	6.4% _a	7.6% _a	9.9% _a
	Good	32.0% ¹	33.9% _a	29.6% _a	28.2% _a	26.0% _a	41.6% _b	43.9% _b	30.7% _a	30.8% _a	36.3% _a	32.1% _a	29.8% _a	29.3% _a	33.1% _a	31.3% _a	32.3% _a	32.0% _a	34.9% _a	29.8% _a	34.4% _a	27.2% _a
Health care quality	Fair	36.7% ¹	34.9% _a	39.2% _a	37.8% _{a,b}	40.6% _a	28.2% _b	33.8% _{a,b}	37.6% _a	36.9% _a	34.4% _a	34.2% _a	42.5% _a	37.2% _a	29.5% _a	37.9% _a	36.7% _a	39.4% _a	39.2% _a	37.1% _a	37.6% _a	28.9% _a
Health care quality	Poor	21.3% ¹	16.3% _a	25.8% _b	19.4% _a	27.7% _b	21.2% _{a,b}	12.9% _a	18.5% _a	25.7% _b	19.8% _{a,b}	17.6% _a	22.0% _{a,b}	28.6% _b	13.7% _a	22.6% _b	21.7% _a	11.1%ь	18.2% _a	23.6% _a	18.2% _a	27.2% _a
	Don't Know	2.6% ¹	3.7% _a	1.6% _b	6.4% _a	0.1% _b	0.6% _b	0.8% _b	3.4% _a	1.7% _a	2.9%a	3.7% _a	2.9% _a	0.1% _b	9.6%a	1.8% _b	2.3% _a	5.5% _b	0.6%a	3.2% _b	2.3% _{a,b}	6.8% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1166	470	677	213	339	313	286	221	518	414	307	400	258	99	1020	1046	71	393	463	180	93

		Jefferson County	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	el	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	11.5% ¹	18.6% _a	4.2% _b	11.6% _a	11.2% _a	12.6% _a	12.6% _a	18.1% _a	5.6% _b	8.1% _{a,b}	20.6% _a	3.4% _b	5.5% _b	16.9% _a	10.3% _a	10.8% _a	19.7% _b	11.7% _a	9.3% _a	9.7% _a	20.2% _a
	Good	30.7% ¹	30.8% _a	28.8% _a	28.1% _a	29.2% _a	31.5% _a	38.9% _a	27.0% _a	28.3% _a	40.2% _a	30.9%a	31.6% _a	23.9% _a	30.3% _a	29.5% _a	29.7% _a	32.8% _a	34.6% _a	28.8% _a	24.8% _a	25.0% _a
Health care quality	Fair	33.6% ¹	30.5% _a	37.6% _a	34.9% _a	30.8% _a	31.2% _a	37.8% _a	35.9% _a	34.4% _a	28.2% _a	26.7% _a	42.0% _b	40.1% _{a,b}	30.0% _a	34.7% _a	35.0% _a	25.6% _a	37.0% _a	33.9% _a	29.2% _a	29.4% _a
fiearch care quality	Poor	20.5% ¹	14.8% _a	27.3% _b	17.2% _a	28.8% _a	24.7% _a	10.8% _a	15.8% _a	28.5% _b	17.7% _{a,b}	15.2% _a	20.4% _{a,b}	30.5% _b	11.4% _a	24.1% _b	21.6%a	12.8% _a	15.3% _a	23.1% _a	29.4% _a	21.7% _a
	Don't Know	3.6% ¹	5.2% _a	2.1% _a	8.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	3.2% _a	3.1% _a	5.8% _a	6.6% _a	2.7% _a	0.0% ²	11.4% _a	1.4% _b	2.9% _a	9.1% _b	1.4%_	4.9% _a	6.9% _a	3.6% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	431	193	227	123	104	99	95	76	190	155	122	149	93	81	331	357	46	141	175	52	39

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		1	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	10.1% ¹	11.7% _a	8.9% _a	12.0% _a	1.9% _b	15.6% _a	18.0% _a	12.3% _a	5.2% _a	12.8% _a	8.9%a	6.3% _a	10.6% _a	0.0% ²	9.9% _a	10.6% _a	0.0% ²	11.7% _a	6.4% _a	11.1% _a	18.3% _a
	Good	42.2% ¹	44.0% _a	39.9% _a	34.7% _a	36.3% _a	49.0% _a	56.2% _a	41.1% _a	41.6% _a	46.0% _a	52.3%a	36.7% _a	53.9% _a	7.6%a	44.4% _b	43.0% _a	41.8% _a	46.7% _a	42.4% _a	40.2% _a	20.7% _a
Health care quality	Fair	33.7% ¹	28.1% _a	39.1% _b	37.5% _{a,b}	41.0% _a	28.8% _{a,b}	19.6% _b	35.3% _a	37.2% _a	23.9% _a	25.1% _a	47.6% _b	23.8% _a	52.8% _a	33.2% _a	34.4% _a	37.2% _a	33.8% _a	34.0% _a	30.6% _a	39.3% _a
riealth care quality	Poor	11.6% ¹	16.2% _a	7.8% _b	8.2% _a	20.0% _a	6.2% _a	5.9% _a	8.4% _a	15.2% _a	14.1% _a	13.7% _a	8.9% _a	11.0% _a	39.6% _a	10.0% _b	9.5% _a	21.0% _a	7.8% _a	16.3% _a	14.7% _a	3.4% _a
	Don't Know	2.3% ¹	0.0% ²	4.4%a	7.6% _a	0.8% _b	0.3% _{a,b}	0.3% _{a,b}	2.9% _a	0.9% _a	3.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	2.5% _a	2.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.9% _a	3.3% _{a,b}	18.3% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	348	129	217	42	113	96	96	73	156	119	80	123	72	9	322	328	12	134	139	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		I	Education Leve		A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	2.6% ¹	3.1% _a	2.2% _a	2.9% _a	1.9% _a	2.9% _a	3.0% _a	0.5% _a	4.3% _a	3.6% _a	3.0% _a	1.5% _a	3.0% _a	0.0% ²	2.5% _a	2.9%a	0.0% ²	1.7% _a	2.3% _a	6.0% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	30.8% ¹	34.8% _a	27.6% _a	27.3% _{a,c}	20.5% _a	47.4% _b	44.2% _{b,c}	31.4% _a	31.0% _a	30.5% _a	29.5% _a	26.4% _a	29.6% _a	53.9% _a	29.7% _b	31.7% _a	29.4% _a	31.7% _a	27.6% _a	37.4% _a	29.9% _a
Health care quality	Fair	40.5% ¹	41.2% _a	40.7% _a	41.6% _{a,b}	48.8% _a	25.7% _b	34.8% _{a,b}	40.1% _a	39.1% _a	42.7% _a	45.3% _a	41.6% _a	37.1% _a	22.8% _a	41.5% _a	38.8% _a	63.7% _b	42.8% _a	42.4% _a	42.7% _a	27.2% _a
riealth care quality	Poor	24.4% ¹	17.8% _a	29.1% _b	24.4% _a	28.8% _a	22.9% _a	16.4% _a	24.2% _a	25.2% _a	23.1% _a	21.3% _a	26.9% _a	30.3% _a	23.3% _a	24.5% _a	24.8% _a	6.9% _b	23.8% _{a,b}	26.3% _{a,b}	13.9% _a	34.8% _b
	Don't Know	1.7% ¹	3.1% _a	0.5% _a	3.9% _a	0.0% ²	1.1%a	1.5% _a	3.8% _a	0.5%a	0.0% ²	0.9% _a	3.7%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.8% _a	1.8%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.4% _a	0.0% ²	8.1% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	387	148	233	48	122	118	95	72	172	140	105	128	93	9	367	361	13	118	149	75	36

Table 14		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	Groups		I	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 14		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	19.5% ¹	20.1% _a	19.3% _a	20.6% _{a,b}	14.3% _a	21.0% _{a,b}	27.7% _b	18.1% _a	19.7% _a	22.6% _a	23.2% _a	16.1% _b	17.7% _{a,b}	19.5% _a	19.8% _a	19.5% _a	21.1% _a	16.6% _a	25.1% _b	14.1% _a	18.1% _{a,b}
	Good	42.8% ¹	42.6%a	43.5% _a	40.3% _{a,b}	37.9% _a	49.9% _b	51.8% _{b,c}	35.8% _a	47.1% _b	49.9% _b	33.1% _a	48.0% _b	48.4% _b	31.8% _a	44.1% _b	44.0% _a	37.4% _a	50.5% _a	38.0% _b	56.7% _a	24.4% _c
Access to higher education	Fair	24.4% ¹	22.8% _a	24.8% _a	24.2% _{a,b}	31.8% _a	19.2% _{b,c}	13.0% _c	27.6% _a	23.3% _{a,b}	18.9% _b	28.2% _a	23.3% _a	22.4% _a	25.9% _a	24.4% _a	23.1% _a	27.0% _a	22.0% _a	23.2% _a	22.1% _{a,b}	34.9% _b
Access to higher education	Poor	8.8% ¹	8.2% _a	9.7% _a	8.6% _{a,b}	13.6% _a	3.6% _b	5.3% _{b,c}	11.6% _a	6.8% _b	6.8% _{a,b}	9.6%a	7.2% _a	8.8% _a	5.5%a	9.3% _a	9.5% _a	5.0% _a	6.0%a	10.7% _a	6.2% _a	11.6% _a
	Don't Know	4.4% ¹	6.3% _a	2.7% _b	6.4% _a	2.4% _b	6.3% _{a,b}	2.1% _{a,b}	6.9% _a	3.1% _b	1.8% _b	5.9% _a	5.3% _a	2.7% _a	17.3% _a	2.5% _b	3.9% _a	9.5% _b	4.9% _{a,b}	3.0% _a	0.9% _a	11.0% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1163	470	674	212	340	311	285	223	515	412	305	399	257	99	1016	1043	72	389	463	181	93

		Jefferson County	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		-	Education Leve		A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	16.0% ¹	16.1% _a	16.2% _a	17.0% _a	9.7% _a	19.5% _a	23.8% _a	18.0% _a	12.7% _a	16.8% _a	20.1% _a	16.5% _a	10.0% _a	19.6% _a	15.2% _a	15.8% _a	20.6% _a	11.1% _a	20.7% _a	15.6% _a	11.8% _a
	Good	41.2% ¹	41.3% _a	41.1% _a	34.3% _a	41.8% _{a,b}	57.3% _b	48.0% _{a,b}	33.3% _a	47.7% _b	47.0% _{a,b}	29.9%a	49.7% _b	46.4% _b	29.6%a	43.8% _b	43.0% _a	29.8% _b	58.4% _a	36.5% _b	41.6% _{a,b}	15.0% _c
Access to higher education	Fair	27.3% ¹	25.4% _a	28.3% _a	29.7% _a	31.2% _a	15.5% _a	18.5% _a	28.5% _a	26.7% _a	24.8% _a	31.6% _a	21.4% _a	24.3% _a	27.8% _a	27.5% _a	25.3% _a	31.3% _a	23.5% _a	24.0% _a	32.8% _a	41.8% _a
Access to higher education	Poor	8.6% ¹	7.6%a	10.1% _a	7.0% _a	15.6% _a	3.7% _a	5.0%a	10.9% _a	6.6% _a	7.8% _a	11.0% _a	3.2% _b	13.8% _a	2.5%a	10.8% _b	10.2% _a	2.8% _b	2.4% _a	13.4% _b	7.3% _{a,b}	10.0% _{a,b}
	Don't Know	6.9% ¹	9.7% _a	4.2% _b	12.0% _a	1.6% _b	4.0% _{a,b}	4.6% _{a,b}	9.2% _a	6.3% _a	3.7% _a	7.5% _a	9.2% _a	5.5% _a	20.5% _a	2.8% _b	5.7% _a	15.5% _b	4.6% _a	5.5% _a	2.6% _a	21.4% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	430	192	227	123	104	99	94	78	189	153	122	148	93	81	330	357	46	140	174	53	39

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	el .	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	12.1% ¹	15.2% _a	8.3% _b	10.8% _a	11.9% _a	10.8% _a	14.8% _a	14.4% _a	11.0% _a	8.3% _a	6.5% _a	7.1% _a	11.8% _a	4.1%a	10.8% _a	10.5% _a	20.7% _a	13.2% _a	11.2% _a	7.0% _a	21.5% _a
	Good	41.7% ¹	43.4% _a	40.6% _a	42.8% _{a,b}	31.2% _a	45.4% _{a,b}	57.4% _b	48.9% _a	30.2% _b	42.5% _{a,b}	45.1% _a	52.7% _a	38.3% _a	18.0% _a	43.0% _a	42.1% _a	48.3% _a	45.9% _a	38.7% _a	39.0% _a	37.3% _a
Access to higher education	Fair	27.8% ¹	20.6%a	34.7% _b	22.2% _{a,b}	36.7% _a	29.7% _{a,b}	16.5% _b	18.4% _a	41.5% _b	29.0% _{a,b}	28.2% _a	29.6% _a	33.9% _a	21.7% _a	29.0% _a	28.6% _a	11.1% _a	27.8% _a	29.8% _a	28.4% _a	19.5% _a
Access to higher education	Poor	15.7% ¹	17.6% _a	14.2% _a	24.2% _a	19.0% _{a,b}	6.0% _b	7.7% _{b,c}	14.5% _a	15.1% _a	19.8% _a	13.5% _a	9.2% _a	16.0% _a	56.2% _a	14.8% _b	15.9% _a	19.9% _a	8.5%a	18.5% _{a,b}	24.9% _b	21.1% _{a,b}
	Don't Know	2.7% ¹	3.2% _a	2.2% _a	0.0% ²	1.1% _a	8.1% _b	3.6% _{a,b}	3.8% _a	2.3% _a	0.4% _a	6.8% _a	1.4% _b	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	2.4% _a	2.9% _a	0.0% ²	4.6%a	1.8% _a	0.7% _a	0.6% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	346	128	216	42	113	94	96	73	155	118	79	122	71	9	319	325	13	133	138	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		E	ducation Leve	el	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	24.9% ¹	25.5% _a	25.0% _a	27.2% _a	18.7% _a	25.2% _a	34.0% _a	19.3% _a	28.1% _a	31.1% _a	30.6% _a	18.2% _a	26.3% _a	21.2% _a	25.4% _a	25.1% _a	22.1% _a	22.7% _{a,b}	35.0% _a	14.8% _b	23.0% _{a,b}
	Good	44.7% ¹	43.8% _a	46.4% _a	48.0% _a	36.3% _a	45.2% _a	53.1% _a	34.6% _a	50.0% _b	54.1% _b	34.7% _a	45.4% _a	52.2% _a	47.7% _a	44.5% _a	45.4% _a	49.6% _a	44.5% _a	39.9% _a	67.7% _b	30.7% _a
Access to higher education	Fair	20.7% ¹	20.6% _a	19.0% _a	17.0% _a	31.0% _b	19.1% _{a,b}	8.2% _a	29.3% _a	16.3% _b	11.3% _b	23.9% _a	23.3% _a	18.4% _a	14.7% _a	20.9% _a	19.7% _a	21.4% _a	18.8% _a	20.2% _a	15.5% _a	30.9% _a
Access to higher education	Poor	7.3% ¹	6.7% _a	8.2% _a	7.8% _a	10.5% _a	2.8% _a	4.8% _a	11.5% _a	5.3% _a	3.1% _a	7.0% _a	10.1% _a	2.7% _a	16.5% _a	6.8% _a	7.3% _a	6.9% _a	8.6% _a	4.8% _a	2.1% _a	11.9% _a
	Don't Know	2.3% ¹	3.4% _a	1.4% _a	0.0% ²	3.4% _a	7.6% _a	0.0% ²	5.3% _a	0.3% _b	0.4% _{a,b}	3.8% _a	3.0% _a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	2.4% _a	2.5% _a	0.0% ²	5.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	3.5% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	387	150	231	47	123	118	95	72	171	141	104	129	93	9	367	361	13	116	151	75	36

Table 15		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 15		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	20.2% ¹	24.8% _a	14.9% _b	18.5% _a	19.6% _a	24.4% _a	19.7% _a	15.2% _a	21.8% _b	26.1% _b	20.9% _a	14.1% _b	26.7% _a	21.1% _a	19.8% _a	19.7% _a	21.0% _a	26.2% _a	16.5% _{b,c}	23.8% _{a,b}	11.2% _c
	Good	39.4% ¹	41.2% _a	38.6% _a	34.7% _a	38.8% _{a,b}	45.7% _{a,b}	47.5% _b	41.4% _a	36.7% _a	41.2% _a	34.4% _a	43.7% _b	38.2% _{a,b}	43.9% _a	38.5% _a	39.3% _a	45.4% _a	39.5% _a	40.7% _a	36.0% _a	39.2% _a
Public outdoor recreational	Fair	26.1% ¹	26.5% _a	25.4% _a	28.3% _a	25.8% _a	23.3% _a	22.7% _a	23.7% _a	27.2% _a	28.7% _a	22.2% _a	34.0% _b	25.6% _{a,b}	22.8% _a	26.6% _a	26.6% _a	24.3% _a	23.8% _a	25.3% _a	36.7% _b	23.4% _a
opportunities	Poor	12.4% ¹	5.2% _a	19.5% _b	16.0% _a	14.4% _{a,c}	5.6% _b	7.1% _{b,c}	17.1% _a	12.5% _a	3.2% _b	18.6% _a	7.8% _b	7.2% _b	9.0%a	13.4% _a	12.5% _a	6.9% _a	9.8% _a	14.8% _{a,c}	2.8% _b	22.4% _c
	Don't Know	1.9% ¹	2.2% _a	1.7% _a	2.5% _a	1.2% _a	1.0% _a	3.0% _a	2.5% _a	1.9% _a	0.9% _a	3.9% _a	0.3% _b	2.3% _{a,b}	3.1% _a	1.7% _a	2.0% _a	2.3% _a	0.7% _a	2.8% _a	0.6%a	3.8% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1169	472	678	215	340	313	286	224	518	414	307	402	259	100	1021	1048	72	392	467	181	93

		Jefferson County	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	6	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	20.0% ¹	26.4% _a	11.3% _b	17.0% _a	18.5% _a	23.4% _a	24.7% _a	13.9% _a	20.2% _{a,b}	27.9% _b	20.5% _a	14.3% _a	23.1% _a	23.6% _a	18.4% _a	18.3% _a	25.3% _a	25.8% _a	15.2% _a	24.8% _a	13.3% _a
	Good	40.5% ¹	42.8% _a	39.5% _a	38.5% _a	41.9% _a	47.4% _a	42.5% _a	43.0% _a	38.9% _a	40.7% _a	33.0% _a	50.8% _b	44.4% _{a,b}	43.5% _a	38.7% _a	40.6% _a	42.9% _a	45.3% _a	38.0% _a	41.0% _a	41.0% _a
Public outdoor recreational	Fair	26.2% ¹	24.3% _a	27.7% _a	27.9% _a	26.4% _a	21.0% _a	23.5% _a	25.8% _a	27.4% _a	25.0% _a	25.0% _a	28.2% _a	27.7% _a	21.8% _a	28.3% _a	27.5% _a	23.2% _a	23.0% _a	27.1% _a	31.7% _a	28.5% _a
opportunities	Poor	11.9% ¹	5.8% _a	19.3% _b	14.9% _a	12.9%a	6.7% _a	6.4% _a	15.5% _a	12.0% _a	5.4% _a	18.7% _a	6.6% _b	4.1% _b	7.4%a	14.2% _a	11.7% _a	8.6% _a	5.1% _a	17.7% _ь	2.5% _{a,b}	15.9% _{a,b}
	Don't Know	1.4% ¹	0.7% _a	2.2% _a	1.8% _a	0.3% _a	1.5% _a	2.9% _a	1.7% _a	1.4% _a	1.0% _a	2.7% _a	0.2% _a	0.7% _a	3.7% _a	0.4% _b	1.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.9% _a	2.1% _a	0.0% ²	1.3% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	432	193	228	124	104	99	95	78	189	155	122	150	93	82	331	358	46	141	176	53	39

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve	el .	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	31.6% ¹	39.7% _a	23.6% _b	41.6% _a	28.9% _{a,b}	34.2% _{a,b}	18.9% _b	32.0% _a	31.0% _a	31.9% _a	17.9% _a	20.8% _a	48.8% _b	9.0%a	31.8% _a	30.7% _a	28.5% _a	33.4% _a	26.3% _a	31.6% _a	47.9% _a
	Good	45.5% ¹	44.3% _a	47.2% _a	40.7% _a	43.4% _a	43.1% _a	60.2% _a	54.4% _a	33.1% _b	43.9% _{a,b}	56.9% _a	50.2% _a	38.3% _a	28.5% _a	45.6% _a	45.9% _a	54.2% _a	42.8% _a	51.7% _a	35.9% _a	47.7% _a
Public outdoor recreational	Fair	14.7% ¹	10.1% _a	19.0% _b	9.0% _a	20.7% _a	13.7% _a	12.4% _a	9.3% _a	21.4% _b	17.2% _{a,b}	15.9% _a	18.8% _a	10.5% _a	24.7% _a	14.8% _a	15.5% _a	4.7% _a	13.2% _a	13.5% _a	30.0% _b	0.0% ²
opportunities	Poor	7.7% ¹	5.9% _a	9.4% _a	8.7% _a	7.0% _a	8.2% _a	7.0% _a	4.4%a	13.5% _b	6.4% _{a,b}	8.9% _a	9.9%a	2.4% _a	37.8% _a	7.4% _b	7.6% _a	12.6% _a	10.5% _a	8.1% _a	1.8% _a	3.8% _a
	Don't Know	0.4% ¹	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	1.5% _a	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	0.6% _a	0.4% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.1%a	0.4% _a	0.7% _a	0.6%a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	348	129	217	43	113	96	95	73	157	118	80	123	72	9	321	327	13	133	140	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Gei	nder		Age G	roups		I	Education Leve	ł	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	17.6% ¹	19.8% _a	15.9% _a	16.1% _a	18.2% _a	22.2% _a	16.3% _a	11.8% _a	21.3% _a	23.2% _a	22.0% _{a,b}	12.2% _a	25.7% _b	6.8%a	18.1% _a	18.1% _a	12.3% _a	24.3% _a	15.5% _{a,b}	21.8% _a	4.9% _b
	Good	36.8% ¹	38.9% _a	35.5% _a	28.5% _a	35.1% _{a,b}	45.1% _{a,b}	47.7% _b	35.9% _a	35.3% _a	41.0% _a	31.5% _a	36.1% _a	32.4% _a	49.5% _a	36.7% _a	36.4% _a	48.6% _a	33.4% _a	41.4% _a	33.6% _a	36.7% _a
Public outdoor recreational	Fair	28.8% ¹	32.7% _a	25.0% _a	32.6% _a	26.7% _a	28.0% _a	24.9% _a	25.7% _a	28.2% _a	34.7% _a	20.1% _a	42.8% _b	26.5% _{a,b}	28.9% _a	28.1% _a	28.5% _a	29.1% _a	27.6% _a	26.2% _a	40.6% _a	21.9% _a
opportunities	Poor	14.0% ¹	4.4% _a	22.2% _b	19.0% _a	17.7% _{a,b}	4.0% _b	7.6% _{a,b}	22.6% _a	12.7% _a	0.4% _b	20.3% _a	8.3% _b	11.0% _{a,b}	14.7% _a	14.1% _a	14.5% _a	3.1% _a	14.0% _a	12.6% _a	3.1% _a	30.3% _b
	Don't Know	2.8% ¹	4.3%a	1.4% _a	3.9% _a	2.4% _a	0.7% _a	3.5% _a	4.1%a	2.5% _a	0.8%a	6.1% _a	0.5% _b	4.3% _{a,b}	0.0% ²	3.0% _a	2.5% _a	6.9%a	0.8% _a	4.3% _a	0.9% _a	6.3% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	389	150	233	48	123	118	96	73	172	141	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	118	151	75	36

Table 16		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	Groups		I	Education Leve	əl	4	Annual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 16		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	18.3% ¹	19.6% _a	16.6% _a	15.9% _a	16.6% _a	21.5% _a	23.8% _a	10.2% _a	21.8% _b	28.0% _b	16.8% _a	17.2% _a	25.5% _b	17.6% _a	18.4% _a	18.0% _a	20.7% _a	19.6% _a	19.7% _a	23.4% _a	5.9% _b
	Good	47.6% ¹	47.5% _a	47.7% _a	44.3% _a	44.6% _a	59.8% _b	47.8% _{a,b}	46.8% _a	46.0% _a	51.2% _a	43.0% _a	48.5% _a	47.0% _a	38.5% _a	48.5% _b	49.2% _a	36.9% _b	52.9% _a	42.4% _b	54.2% _{a,b}	43.5% _{a,b}
Quality of the environment	Fair	24.6% ¹	25.0% _a	24.0% _a	28.1% _a	27.7% _a	14.9% _b	20.8% _{a,b}	31.0% _a	22.9% _b	15.4% _b	26.4% _a	26.0% _a	21.7% _a	29.6% _a	24.4% _a	24.5% _a	26.6% _a	20.9% _a	30.7% _b	16.5% _a	25.4% _{a,b}
quality of the environment	Poor	9.0% ¹	7.3%a	11.0% _b	10.5% _a	11.0% _a	3.6% _b	7.3% _{a,b}	11.4% _a	9.0% _{a,b}	4.5% _b	12.7% _a	8.2% _{a,b}	5.8% _b	10.4% _a	8.7% _a	7.8% _a	15.2% _b	6.2% _a	6.3% _a	5.7% _a	24.6% _b
	Don't Know	0.5% ¹	0.5%a	0.6%a	1.2% _a	0.1% _a	0.2% _a	0.3% _a	0.5% _a	0.4% _a	0.8% _a	1.0% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	3.8% _a	0.1% _b	0.6% _a	0.7% _a	0.4% _a	0.8%a	0.2% _a	0.6% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1168	472	677	214	339	313	287	222	518	415	308	401	259	100	1022	1048	72	392	466	180	93

		Jefferson County	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups		-	Education Leve		A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	17.1% ¹	17.9% _a	15.0% _a	13.4% _a	19.6% _a	16.5% _a	21.4% _a	11.3% _a	18.8% _{a,b}	22.9% _b	13.4% _a	19.2% _a	23.9% _a	20.4% _a	15.7% _a	16.0% _a	20.8% _a	18.3% _a	16.8% _a	21.8% _a	8.8% _a
	Good	47.7% ¹	47.6% _a	47.6% _a	44.8% _{a,b}	40.7% _a	64.7% _b	56.2% _{a,b}	41.5% _a	51.0% _a	56.1% _a	44.3% _a	50.6% _a	48.6% _a	36.8% _a	51.2% _b	50.0% _a	35.4% _b	58.9% _a	40.0% _b	55.4% _{a,b}	44.0% _{a,b}
Quality of the environment	Fair	25.9% ¹	25.7% _a	26.9% _a	31.4% _a	28.3% _a	15.1% _a	14.2% _a	35.4% _a	23.2% _b	11.9% _b	27.3% _a	27.6% _a	21.5% _a	28.3% _a	25.8% _a	25.4% _a	31.0% _a	19.1% _a	33.7% _b	7.8% _a	27.0% _{a,b}
quality of the environment	Poor	8.2% ¹	7.7% _a	9.3%a	8.2% _a	11.2% _a	3.6% _a	7.8% _a	10.6% _a	6.3% _a	7.3% _a	13.2% _a	2.0% _b	6.1% _{a,b}	10.0% _a	7.3%a	7.3% _a	11.7% _a	3.1% _a	8.0% _{a,b}	14.2% _{a,b}	18.9% _b
	Don't Know	1.1% ¹	1.1% _a	1.2% _a	2.2% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	1.2% _a	0.7% _a	1.9% _a	1.7% _a	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	4.5% _a	0.1% _b	1.2% _a	1.1% _a	0.7% _a	1.5% _a	0.6% _a	1.3% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	432	194	227	124	104	99	95	77	190	155	123	149	93	82	331	357	47	141	176	52	39

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	el .	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	30.5% ¹	32.9% _a	27.6% _a	38.1% _a	20.1% _b	36.1% _{a,b}	32.8% _{a,b}	23.2% _a	37.4% _b	37.2% _{a,b}	25.1% _a	25.5% _a	30.7% _a	9.0%a	31.1% _a	30.9% _a	22.7% _a	32.6% _a	24.9% _a	37.2% _a	34.0% _a
	Good	53.5% ¹	51.3% _a	56.1% _a	48.1% _a	55.4% _a	59.1% _a	52.0% _a	65.8% _a	45.0% _b	37.2% _b	59.5% _a	57.7% _a	56.8% _a	28.5% _a	53.9% _a	54.0% _a	42.5% _a	53.2% _a	52.9% _a	50.5% _a	65.3% _a
Quality of the environment	Fair	13.6% ¹	13.1% _a	14.3% _a	10.7% _{a,b}	22.9% _a	4.3% _b	10.8% _{a,b}	9.6% _a	14.0% _{a,b}	22.9% _b	13.1% _a	14.9% _a	12.5% _a	62.5% _a	12.5% _b	12.7% _a	34.8% _b	10.1% _a	20.5% _a	11.8% _a	0.6%a
equality of the environment	Poor	2.2% ¹	2.7% _a	1.7% _a	3.1% _a	1.7% _a	0.5% _a	3.6% _a	1.4% _a	3.2% _a	2.3% _a	2.3% _a	1.9% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	2.3% _a	2.3% _a	0.0% ²	3.9%a	1.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Don't Know	0.2% ¹	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.9%a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.1%a	0.0% ²	0.2%a	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	347	128	217	42	112	96	96	72	156	119	80	123	72	9	322	328	12	133	139	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Gei	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	16.7% ¹	18.4% _a	15.3% _a	15.2% _a	13.1% _a	21.1% _a	23.2% _a	5.5% _a	21.3% _b	30.8% _b	19.4% _a	13.4% _a	26.0% _a	2.2% _a	17.5% _a	16.5% _a	20.2% _a	17.1% _a	22.4% _a	21.4% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	46.0% ¹	46.7% _a	45.6% _a	43.0% _a	45.2% _a	56.0% _a	40.7% _a	47.0% _a	41.5% _a	49.8% _a	38.1% _a	44.3% _a	43.6% _a	50.9% _a	45.1% _a	47.3% _a	38.8% _a	47.4% _a	42.9% _a	54.3% _a	40.4% _a
Quality of the environment	Fair	25.9% ¹	27.0% _a	23.9% _a	26.9% _a	28.5% _a	18.0% _a	28.1% _a	32.4% _a	24.5% _{a,b}	17.0% _b	28.0% _a	27.6% _a	23.8% _a	32.2% _a	26.1% _a	26.6% _a	17.5% _a	25.6% _a	29.4% _a	21.2% _a	27.0% _a
quality of the environment	Poor	11.3% ¹	7.9% _a	15.0% _b	14.9% _a	13.2% _a	4.5% _a	7.9% _a	15.0% _a	12.6% _a	2.4% _b	14.3% _a	14.8% _a	6.7% _a	14.7% _a	11.3% _a	9.5% _a	23.5% _b	9.7% _a	5.4% _a	3.0% _a	32.6% _b
	Don't Know	0.1% ¹	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	389	150	233	48	123	118	96	73	172	141	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	118	151	75	36

Table 17	,	Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	Groups		I	Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 17		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	3.2% ¹	5.0% _a	1.5% _b	5.0% _a	0.9% _b	1.7% _{a,b}	5.0% _a	4.0% _a	2.5% _a	2.4% _a	4.7% _a	2.5% _a	2.9% _a	11.7% _a	2.0% _b	2.5% _a	8.2% _b	4.7% _a	2.4% _a	1.7% _a	3.3% _a
	Good	30.7% ¹	30.6% _a	31.3% _a	25.6% _a	27.7% _a	40.6% _b	39.5% _b	28.5% _a	27.5% _a	41.5% _b	32.9% _a	28.5% _a	30.6% _a	24.0% _a	31.6% _a	31.5% _a	26.8% _a	35.8% _a	27.7% _a	28.3% _a	29.4% _a
County government	Fair	36.6% ¹	37.5% _a	35.7% _a	29.2% _a	40.9% _b	41.0% _b	40.6% _b	34.9% _a	39.1% _a	34.6% _a	25.9% _a	44.6% _b	38.5% _b	28.7% _a	37.7% _b	37.1% _a	34.2% _a	35.8% _{a,b}	39.0% _a	44.8% _a	24.7% _b
oounty government	Poor	18.9% ¹	16.9% _a	20.2% _a	18.1% _a	26.5% _b	12.1% _a	11.8% _a	20.6% _a	20.3% _{a,b}	12.9% _b	18.3% _a	17.7% _a	20.5% _a	6.1% _a	20.5% _b	19.5% _a	7.8% _b	16.6% _{a,b}	19.4% _{a,b}	13.5% _a	25.6% _b
	Don't Know	10.7% ¹	10.0% _a	11.4% _a	22.1% _a	3.9% _b	4.6% _b	3.1% _b	12.1% _a	10.7% _a	8.5% _a	18.2% _a	6.7% _b	7.4% _b	29.5% _a	8.2% _b	9.3%a	23.1% _b	7.1% _a	11.5% _{a,b}	11.7% _{a,b}	17.1% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1169	472	678	214	340	313	287	224	518	414	308	402	258	101	1021	1048	72	392	466	181	93

		Jefferson County	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	5.4% ¹	8.9%a	1.9% _b	8.9% _a	1.1% _b	2.0% _{a,b}	7.1% _{a,b}	7.6% _a	3.5% _a	3.6% _a	7.9%a	4.0%a	5.2% _a	13.8% _a	2.9% _b	4.3% _a	11.7% _b	8.7% _a	3.5% _a	1.0% _a	7.6% _a
	Good	26.5% ¹	28.1% _a	24.8% _a	22.2% _a	27.7% _a	38.1% _a	27.2% _a	20.1% _a	27.5% _{a,b}	39.0% _b	27.2% _a	28.3% _a	26.4% _a	22.0%a	28.0% _a	28.2% _a	16.5% _b	29.7% _a	23.7% _a	25.0% _a	27.0% _a
County government	Fair	35.7% ¹	33.2% _a	37.7% _a	31.7% _a	32.8% _a	39.5% _a	48.4% _a	38.1% _a	34.1% _a	31.3% _a	24.4% _a	48.1% _b	29.2% _a	28.0% _a	37.5% _a	36.5% _a	29.1% _a	37.6% _a	34.8% _a	47.0% _a	26.2% _a
County government	Poor	19.4% ¹	16.6% _a	23.0% _a	15.2% _a	30.5% _b	15.6% _{a,b}	15.3% _{a,b}	19.1% _a	24.6% _a	11.8% _a	19.3% _{a,b}	11.3% _a	26.1% _b	4.4% _a	24.4% _b	22.2% _a	7.5% _b	18.4% _a	22.2% _a	11.0% _a	19.0% _a
	Don't Know	12.9% ¹	13.1% _a	12.7% _a	21.9% _a	8.0% _b	4.8% _b	2.0% _b	15.1% _a	10.4% _a	14.3% _a	21.2% _a	8.2% _b	13.1% _{a,b}	31.7% _a	7.2% _b	8.8% _a	35.2% _b	5.6% _a	15.8% _b	15.9% _{a,b}	20.3% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	432	193	228	124	104	99	95	78	190	154	123	150	92	83	330	357	47	140	176	53	39

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve		A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	3.1% ¹	4.0% _a	2.3% _a	3.8% _a	2.5% _a	1.9% _a	4.6% _a	1.1% _a	4.5% _a	5.8% _a	2.6%a	3.1% _a	3.9% _a	0.0% ²	3.1% _a	3.0% _a	1.5% _a	4.5%a	2.9% _a	1.5% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	32.4% ¹	28.4% _a	35.7% _a	29.5% _a	27.9% _a	34.8% _a	43.3% _a	31.5% _a	29.0% _a	40.3% _a	40.6%a	29.1% _a	35.1% _a	26.6% _a	33.2% _a	32.7% _a	37.0% _a	35.9% _a	33.1% _a	20.5% _a	35.8% _a
County government	Fair	37.7% ¹	38.3% _a	37.0% _a	26.6% _a	38.7% _{a,b}	51.1% _b	35.9% _{a,b}	39.3% _a	36.7% _a	35.5% _a	34.1%a	41.9% _a	39.8% _a	52.8% _a	37.9% _a	37.8% _a	42.4% _a	32.0% _a	43.5% _a	38.0% _a	37.4% _a
County government	Poor	18.9% ¹	24.7% _a	13.9% _b	11.8% _a	30.9% _b	10.0% _a	15.0% _{a,b}	21.3% _a	18.1% _a	13.9% _a	18.4% _a	20.9% _a	16.8% _a	4.6% _a	18.1% _a	17.9% _a	19.1% _a	25.0% _a	18.3% _a	14.4% _a	0.0% ²
	Don't Know	7.9% ¹	4.6%a	11.0% _b	28.3% _a	0.0% ²	2.2% _b	1.3% _b	6.8% _a	11.7% _a	4.5% _a	4.3%a	5.1% _a	4.5% _a	16.0% _a	7.7% _a	8.5% _a	0.0% ²	2.7% _a	2.2% _a	25.5% _b	26.7% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	348	129	217	42	113	96	96	73	156	119	80	123	72	9	322	328	12	134	139	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Ge	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	1.0% ¹	1.1% _a	0.9%a	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	1.4% _a	3.6% _a	1.0% _a	1.2% _a	0.6% _a	1.2% _a	1.1% _a	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	0.8% _a	2.5% _a	1.1% _a	0.7% _a	2.1% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	34.4% ¹	33.7% _a	36.2% _a	29.4% _{a,b}	27.7% _a	44.4% _{a,b}	47.1% _b	36.6% _{a,b}	27.2% _a	44.1% _b	38.5% _a	28.5% _a	33.7% _a	36.4% _a	34.0% _a	34.2% _a	44.3% _a	41.2% _a	31.7% _a	31.5% _a	30.7% _a
County government	Fair	37.3% ¹	41.7% _a	33.4% _a	26.3% _a	48.4% _b	39.1% _{a,b}	36.3% _{a,b}	30.2% _a	44.3% _b	37.4% _{a,b}	26.0% _a	42.4% _b	46.8% _b	29.2% _a	37.9% _a	37.4% _a	42.3% _a	35.4% _{a,b}	43.5% _a	45.0% _a	21.8% _b
County government	Poor	18.3% ¹	15.4% _a	19.2% _a	23.1% _a	22.0% _a	9.9% _a	8.6% _a	21.8% _a	16.6% _a	13.7% _a	17.1% _a	22.1% _a	16.0% _a	16.9% _a	18.0% _a	17.6% _a	6.9% _a	12.4% _a	15.8% _a	14.6% _a	34.4% _b
	Don't Know	9.1% ¹	8.1%a	10.4% _a	21.2% _a	1.5% _b	5.3% _b	4.4% _b	10.4% _a	10.7% _a	4.1% _a	17.2% _a	5.9% _b	2.8% _b	17.5% _a	9.0%a	10.0% _a	4.0%a	9.9% _a	8.3% _a	6.9% _a	13.1% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	389	150	233	48	123	118	96	73	172	141	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	118	151	75	36

Table 10		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	6	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table To		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	4.0% ¹	4.3% _a	3.8% _a	5.5% _a	1.5% _b	4.6% _{a,b}	5.0% _{a,b}	3.0% _a	5.0% _a	4.2% _a	4.7% _a	2.8% _a	5.0% _a	8.9% _a	3.2% _b	3.3% _a	7.6% _b	6.0% _a	3.8% _{a,b}	2.9% _{a,b}	0.8% _b
	Good	32.3% ¹	30.9% _a	34.2% _a	23.4% _a	31.0% _a	45.8% _b	43.3% _b	31.9% _a	29.8% _a	37.7% _a	26.5% _a	36.0% _b	31.1% _{a,b}	23.2% _a	33.4% _b	33.7% _a	26.0% _a	37.1% _a	31.2% _a	29.5% _a	25.5% _a
City, Town, or Village	Fair	34.0% ¹	35.6% _a	32.6% _a	31.0% _a	39.8% _a	33.4% _a	29.8% _a	33.6% _a	33.8% _a	34.5% _a	28.5% _a	39.6% _b	29.9% _{a,b}	28.5% _a	34.8%a	34.2% _a	32.4% _a	34.8% _{a,c,d}	32.3% _{a,b}	46.1% _c	26.4% _{b,d}
government	Poor	19.9% ¹	19.1% _a	20.4% _a	20.4% _a	24.8% _a	11.1% _b	18.4% _{a,b}	20.8% _a	20.8% _a	17.4% _a	21.6% _{a,b}	16.1% _a	28.6% _b	8.4% _a	21.9% _b	20.4% _a	13.2% _b	15.1% _a	21.8% _a	12.8% _a	33.0% _b
	Don't Know	9.7% ¹	10.2% _a	9.0%a	19.6% _a	3.0% _b	5.1% _b	3.4% _b	10.7% _a	10.5% _a	6.3% _a	18.7% _a	5.5% _b	5.4% _b	31.0% _a	6.6% _b	8.3% _a	20.8% _b	7.0%a	10.8% _{a,b}	8.7% _{a,b}	14.3% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1171	474	678	216	340	313	287	224	519	415	308	402	259	101	1022	1049	73	393	467	181	93

		Jefferson County	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	5.1% ¹	6.2% _a	4.1%a	7.8% _a	1.3% _a	3.4% _a	6.3% _a	6.1% _a	4.3% _a	3.7% _a	8.0% _a	4.4%a	2.7% _a	10.5% _a	3.4% _b	4.3% _a	8.5% _a	7.8%a	3.8% _a	6.3% _a	1.4% _a
	Good	26.1% ¹	23.7% _a	28.8% _a	16.9% _a	26.3% _a	53.6% _b	31.0% _{a,b}	23.2% _a	27.3% _a	30.4% _a	17.8% _a	36.2% _b	26.2% _{a,b}	20.5%a	27.6% _a	28.5% _a	13.0% _b	30.2% _a	26.6% _a	19.6% _a	14.7% _a
City, Town, or Village	Fair	34.9% ¹	35.5% _a	34.1% _a	33.9% _a	34.4% _a	29.9% _a	42.3% _a	33.1% _a	36.3% _a	35.7% _a	29.4% _a	37.0% _a	28.4% _a	28.4% _a	36.3% _a	33.9% _a	35.9% _a	38.9% _a	31.9% _a	47.7% _a	28.0% _a
government	Poor	20.9% ¹	18.4% _a	24.2% _a	18.7% _a	32.3% _b	10.1% _a	16.0% _{a,b}	23.3% _a	20.0% _a	18.3% _a	23.2% _{a,b}	13.0% _a	34.7% _b	7.2% _a	26.2% _b	24.0%a	10.9% _b	17.0% _a	23.7% _a	13.7% _a	29.7% _a
	Don't Know	13.0% ¹	16.2% _a	8.8% _b	22.7% _a	5.6% _b	3.0% _b	4.3% _b	14.3% _a	12.1% _a	12.0% _a	21.7% _a	9.3% _b	8.0% _b	33.5% _a	6.4% _b	9.3% _a	31.6% _b	6.0% _a	13.9% _{a,b}	12.7% _{a,b}	26.2% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	433	194	228	125	104	99	95	78	190	155	123	150	93	83	331	358	47	141	176	53	39

		Lewis County	Gei	nder		Age G	roups			Education Leve	H	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	sc	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	3.2% ¹	3.0% _a	3.5% _a	2.6% _a	2.3% _a	4.1%a	5.0% _a	1.7% _a	4.8% _a	4.3% _a	1.0% _a	2.2% _a	2.6% _a	0.0% ²	2.5% _a	2.4% _a	13.9% _b	2.7% _a	3.8% _a	2.8% _a	3.8% _a
	Good	42.2% ¹	41.3% _a	43.0% _a	37.0% _a	38.6% _a	41.0% _a	57.6% _a	43.5% _{a,b}	32.3% _a	55.6% _b	44.8%a	47.7% _a	44.4% _a	29.6% _a	43.9% _a	43.9% _a	32.4% _a	48.3% _a	43.5% _a	28.1% _a	32.5% _a
City, Town, or Village	Fair	33.3% ¹	33.0% _a	33.4% _a	21.7% _a	42.0% _b	44.6% _b	20.9% _a	37.1% _a	32.1% _a	25.7% _a	31.7% _a	41.3%a	24.0% _a	49.8% _a	32.9% _a	33.6% _a	37.0% _a	29.6% _a	35.1% _a	42.0% _a	27.8% _a
government	Poor	12.5% ¹	17.3% _a	8.3% _b	11.2% _a	14.8% _a	7.6% _a	15.3% _a	10.8% _a	17.4% _a	8.4% _a	18.3% _a	3.1% _b	22.1% _a	4.6% _a	12.0% _a	10.6% _a	16.7% _a	15.3% _a	14.4% _a	2.2% _a	8.5% _a
	Don't Know	8.8% ¹	5.4%a	11.9% _b	27.6% _a	2.3% _b	2.6% _b	1.3% _b	6.8% _a	13.4% _a	6.0%a	4.4%a	5.7%a	6.9% _a	16.0% _a	8.7% _a	9.5% _a	0.0% ²	4.1% _a	3.2% _a	24.9% _b	27.3% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	349	130	217	43	113	96	96	73	157	119	80	123	72	9	322	328	13	134	140	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve		A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	3.1% ¹	2.6% _a	3.7% _a	2.9% _a	1.5% _a	5.8% _a	4.2% _a	0.0% ²	5.7% _a	4.7% _a	1.2% _a	1.6% _a	7.6% _a	0.0% ²	3.3% _a	2.8% _a	5.1% _a	5.3% _a	3.8% _a	1.2% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	36.1% ¹	35.9% _a	36.9% _a	29.7% _a	32.9% _a	40.9% _a	48.2% _a	37.8% _a	31.7% _a	40.7% _a	33.7% _a	32.7% _a	33.1% _a	39.5% _a	35.4% _a	35.7% _a	48.7% _a	40.0% _a	34.1% _a	34.7% _a	33.8% _a
City, Town, or Village	Fair	33.4% ¹	36.2% _a	31.0% _a	28.9% _{a,b}	43.8% _a	32.9% _{a,b}	23.3% _b	33.1% _a	31.9% _a	35.2% _a	26.9% _a	41.3% _a	32.5% _a	26.1% _a	34.1% _a	34.7% _a	25.4% _a	32.6% _a	32.0% _a	46.1% _a	24.8% _a
government	Poor	20.7% ¹	20.2% _a	19.9% _a	24.6% _a	21.0% _a	12.9% _a	21.0% _a	21.0% _a	22.3% _a	18.4% _a	20.4% _a	22.1% _a	24.1% _a	16.9% _a	20.9% _a	19.7% _a	16.8% _a	13.3% _a	21.3% _{a,b}	14.5% _a	38.9% _b
	Don't Know	6.7% ¹	5.0% _a	8.5% _a	13.8% _a	0.9% _b	7.5% _{a,b}	3.4% _{a,b}	8.1%a	8.4% _a	1.0% _a	17.8% _a	2.3% _b	2.6% _b	17.5% _a	6.3% _a	7.2% _a	4.0%a	8.8% _a	8.8% _a	3.6% _a	2.5% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	389	150	233	48	123	118	96	73	172	141	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	118	151	75	36

Table 10		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	Groups		I	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	Ethnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	1.9% ¹	1.6% _a	2.4% _a	3.1% _a	0.9% _a	0.8% _a	2.6% _a	2.6% _a	0.8% _a	2.0% _a	2.1% _a	0.5% _a	1.1% _a	9.0% _a	0.9% _b	1.9% _a	2.3% _a	0.8% _a	2.2% _{a,b}	1.3% _{a,b}	4.2% _b
	Good	13.1% ¹	14.3% _a	11.6% _a	12.5% _a	10.7% _a	16.7% _a	16.1% _a	11.4% _a	12.5% _a	17.6% _a	13.1% _a	11.7% _a	11.6% _a	15.4% _a	12.6% _a	12.4% _a	18.2% _a	11.1% _a	13.6% _a	17.9% _a	9.8% _a
Roal actate taxes	Fair	32.1% ¹	35.2% _a	29.7% _b	29.9% _a	32.0% _a	38.7% _a	33.5% _a	29.0% _a	31.7% _a	41.0% _b	29.2% _a	37.4% _b	36.3% _{a,b}	22.7% _a	33.9% _b	32.0% _a	35.1% _a	30.3% _a	33.4% _a	34.3% _a	31.8% _a
iteal estate taxes	Poor	41.3% ¹	38.9% _a	42.9% _a	31.7% _a	51.8% _b	41.6% _{a,b}	40.1% _{a,b}	40.3% _{a,b}	46.6% _a	32.4% _b	34.8% _a	43.2% _{a,b}	47.7% _b	20.6% _a	43.8% _b	42.0%a	30.8% _b	48.1% _a	40.4% _{a,b}	32.6% _b	35.8% _{b,c}
	Don't Know	11.6% ¹	10.1% _a	13.5% _a	22.8% _a	4.6% _b	2.3% _b	7.7% _b	16.7% _a	8.3% _b	7.0% _b	20.8% _a	7.3% _b	3.4% _b	32.4% _a	8.9% _b	11.7% _a	13.7% _a	9.7% _a	10.5% _{a,b}	13.9% _{a,b}	18.4% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1168	471	678	215	340	312	286	224	517	414	307	402	258	101	1020	1047	72	393	464	181	93

		Jefferson County	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	2.1% ¹	2.7% _a	1.5%a	2.7% _a	1.6% _a	0.9% _a	3.1%a	2.3% _a	1.0% _a	2.8% _a	3.3% _a	0.6% _a	2.1% _a	5.2% _a	1.2% _b	2.0% _a	3.5% _a	0.6% _a	3.6% _a	1.7% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	12.6% ¹	13.9% _a	9.8% _a	11.4% _{a,b}	7.6% _a	22.5% _b	16.2% _{a,b}	11.8% _a	11.0% _a	15.8% _a	13.1% _a	13.4% _a	8.9% _a	15.2% _a	11.1% _a	10.6% _a	19.8% _b	11.3% _a	12.3% _a	19.4% _a	7.6% _a
Real actate taxes	Fair	32.2% ¹	34.8% _a	30.3% _a	30.3% _a	33.5% _a	33.7% _a	38.3% _a	29.7% _a	29.7% _a	44.2% _a	30.1% _a	35.0% _a	43.2% _a	25.2% _a	34.9% _a	32.8% _a	30.3% _a	35.6% _a	27.7% _a	28.3% _a	43.0% _a
iteal estate taxes	Poor	36.8% ¹	29.8% _a	43.9% _b	27.4% _a	50.0% _b	38.3% _{a,b}	35.2% _{a,b}	32.7% _a	46.6% _b	26.9% _a	27.8% _a	38.1% _a	41.3% _a	17.3% _a	42.5% _b	38.6% _a	24.3% _b	41.0% _a	38.6% _a	26.3% _a	28.1% _a
	Don't Know	16.4% ¹	18.7% _a	14.5% _a	28.3% _a	7.4% _b	4.7% _b	7.2% _b	23.5% _a	11.7% _b	10.3% _b	25.7% _a	12.9% _b	4.5% _b	37.1% _a	10.3% _b	15.9% _a	22.1% _a	11.6% _a	17.8% _a	24.4% _a	21.4% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	432	193	228	125	104	99	94	78	190	154	123	150	92	83	330	357	47	141	175	53	39

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		I	Education Leve	I	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	2.1% ¹	0.8% _a	3.2% _a	1.2% _a	1.9% _a	0.6% _a	5.3% _a	1.9% _a	0.7% _a	4.8% _a	2.7% _a	0.7% _a	2.1% _a	0.0% ²	1.9% _a	1.8% _a	1.5% _a	1.4% _a	1.4% _a	6.7% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	11.3% ¹	12.9%a	10.0% _a	9.5% _a	9.2% _a	10.4% _a	19.2% _a	8.1% _a	11.7% _a	18.7% _a	19.1% _a	8.9%a	15.3% _a	0.0% ²	10.6% _a	11.7% _a	5.3% _a	15.1% _a	10.4% _a	7.8% _a	0.6%a
Pool actata taxae	Fair	34.1% ¹	27.7% _a	38.8% _b	30.6% _{a,b}	27.5% _a	51.3% _b	33.3% _{a,b}	29.9% _a	36.6% _a	40.4% _a	35.8% _a	38.8% _a	40.7% _a	51.2% _a	34.9% _a	34.2% _a	45.4% _a	27.3% _a	42.9% _b	39.0% _{a,b}	19.8% _{a,b}
iteal estate taxes	Poor	42.3% ¹	54.0%a	32.6% _b	29.7% _a	58.6% _b	34.1% _a	36.0% _a	48.5% _a	40.8% _{a,b}	29.2% _b	34.1% _a	49.2% _a	34.7% _a	32.8% _a	41.9% _a	41.2% _a	47.8% _a	53.8% _a	41.1% _a	19.4% _b	35.2% _{a,b}
	Don't Know	10.3% ¹	4.6%a	15.3% _b	28.9% _a	2.8% _b	3.7% _b	6.2% _b	11.6% _a	10.2% _a	6.9% _a	8.4% _a	2.5%a	7.2% _a	16.0% _a	10.7% _a	11.0%a	0.0% ²	2.4%a	4.2% _a	27.0% _b	44.4% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	347	128	217	42	113	95	96	73	155	119	79	123	72	9	321	327	12	134	138	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Gei	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	oliefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	1.7% ¹	0.5% _a	2.9% _a	4.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	1.5% _a	3.2% _a	0.7% _a	0.6% _a	0.4% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	34.9% _a	0.4% _b	1.9% _a	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	8.3% _b
	Good	14.1% ¹	15.0% _a	13.7% _a	14.4% _a	13.8% _a	14.0% _a	15.2% _a	11.9% _a	14.0% _a	19.1% _a	12.0% _a	10.9% _a	13.3% _a	19.0% _a	14.1% _a	14.3% _a	17.1% _a	9.7% _a	16.3% _a	19.2% _a	12.8% _a
Post actata taxae	Fair	31.6% ¹	37.4% _a	26.7% _b	29.3% _a	31.9% _a	38.9% _a	30.2% _a	28.0% _a	32.6% _a	38.2% _a	26.7% _a	39.0% _a	29.0% _a	1.7% _a	33.0% _b	30.7% _a	42.5% _a	26.5% _a	38.7% _a	36.3% _a	23.8% _a
iteal estate taxes	Poor	45.5% ¹	44.9% _a	44.6% _a	38.0% _a	51.6% _a	46.4% _a	44.6% _a	46.0% _a	47.9% _a	38.2% _a	43.6% _a	45.8% _a	56.1% _a	39.7% _a	45.1% _a	45.1% _a	40.4% _a	52.8% _a	42.6% _a	38.3% _a	42.4% _a
	Don't Know	7.1% ¹	2.2% _a	12.1% _b	14.2% _a	2.8% _b	0.0% ²	8.5% _{a,b}	10.9% _a	4.8% _a	4.0%a	17.2% _a	3.9% _b	1.6% _b	4.7%a	7.4%a	8.1% _a	0.0% ²	10.2% _a	2.0% _b	6.2% _{a,b}	12.7% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	389	150	233	48	123	118	96	73	172	141	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	118	151	75	36

Table 20		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	Groups			Education Leve	əl	А	Annual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 20		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	9.0% ¹	11.9% _a	6.1% _b	11.0% _a	6.1% _a	9.6% _a	9.9% _a	9.2% _a	8.3% _a	9.7% _a	9.2% _a	6.3% _a	11.1%"	16.4% _a	8.0% _b	8.5% _a	13.2% _a	12.5% _a	7.5% _{a,b}	3.8% _b	10.4% _{a,b}
	Good	37.6% ¹	40.8% _a	34.8% _b	34.5% _{a,c}	33.5% _a	46.8% _b	45.9% _{b,c}	33.5% _a	37.8% _{a,b}	45.8% _b	36.6%a	37.3% _a	38.1% _a	28.1% _a	39.2% _b	38.9% _a	33.6% _a	38.6% _{a,b}	38.4% _{a,b}	44.4% _a	26.9% _b
Boliging and grime control	Fair	34.1% ¹	30.9% _a	37.9% _b	34.6% _{a,b}	40.0% _a	25.8% _b	30.3% _{a,b}	37.3% _a	32.5% _a	31.0% _a	32.3% _a	36.7% _a	34.7% _a	37.0% _a	33.4% _a	33.0% _a	41.3% _a	29.8% _a	37.0% _a	35.7% _a	35.2% _a
Folicing and crime control	Poor	16.3% ¹	13.5% _a	18.3% _b	15.6% _a	17.4% _a	17.4% _a	12.4% _a	16.5% _{a,b}	18.8% _a	11.5% _b	18.3% _a	18.5% _a	14.9% _a	6.9% _a	17.7% _b	16.9% _a	6.9% _b	17.8% _a	13.7% _a	13.0% _a	21.9% _a
	Don't Know	2.9% ¹	2.9%a	2.9%a	4.4% _a	3.0% _a	0.4%a	1.5%a	3.6% _a	2.7% _a	1.9% _a	3.6%a	1.2% _a	1.2% _a	11.7% _a	1.7% _b	2.6%a	4.9% _a	1.3% _a	3.4% _{a,b}	3.0% _{a,b}	5.5% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1168	471	678	213	340	313	287	223	517	415	306	402	259	99	1022	1049	70	393	466	181	92

		Jefferson County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		E	Education Leve	I	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	9.5% ¹	12.4% _a	6.4% _b	11.7% _a	4.5% _a	12.0% _a	10.2% _a	7.0% _a	10.6% _a	11.9% _a	10.1% _a	9.8% _a	8.9% _a	13.5% _a	8.3% _a	8.7% _a	14.7% _a	15.4% _a	8.3% _a	2.1% _a	4.2% _a
	Good	36.2% ¹	38.9% _a	33.1% _a	32.8% _a	35.0% _a	44.3% _a	44.9% _a	31.0% _a	38.0% _a	45.5% _a	32.5% _a	32.7% _a	42.7% _a	29.0% _a	39.3% _a	38.3% _a	29.2% _a	41.6% _a	35.4% _{a,b}	44.8% _a	19.3% _b
Policing and crime control	Fair	37.4% ¹	34.5% _a	41.3% _a	38.0% _a	42.7% _a	30.5% _a	32.3% _a	45.8% _a	33.6% _{a,b}	27.2% _b	35.7% _a	46.9% _a	32.0% _a	40.8% _a	35.2% _a	34.9% _a	46.1% _a	31.7% _a	38.3% _a	33.8%"	52.0% _a
r olicing and crime control	Poor	11.2% ¹	8.1% _a	14.0% _a	10.4% _a	11.3% _a	12.2% _a	8.5% _a	9.0% _a	13.1% _a	11.1% _a	14.8% _a	7.5% _a	15.1% _a	2.8% _a	13.9% _b	12.8% _a	1.8% _b	8.7% _a	11.5% _a	16.6% _a	11.3% _a
	Don't Know	5.6% ¹	6.2% _a	5.1% _a	7.0% _a	6.5% _a	1.0% _a	4.0% _a	7.1% _a	4.7% _a	4.4% _a	6.9% _a	3.1% _a	1.4% _a	13.9% _a	3.3% _b	5.2% _a	8.2% _a	2.7% _a	6.4% _{a,b}	2.6% _{a,b}	13.2% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	431	192	228	123	104	99	95	77	189	155	121	150	93	81	331	358	45	141	176	53	38

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve	el .	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	12.3% ¹	13.2% _a	10.4% _a	14.5% _a	7.9% _a	17.3% _a	12.5% _a	12.2% _a	10.7% _a	15.2% _a	9.2% _{a,b}	7.9%a	23.1% _b	10.4% _a	12.9% _a	11.8% _a	22.7% _a	14.8% _a	8.1% _a	18.2% _a	8.3% _a
	Good	49.6% ¹	52.8% _a	47.5% _a	44.4% _a	52.4% _a	48.2% _a	53.7% _a	52.3% _a	42.5% _a	54.6% _a	43.0% _a	61.2% _b	45.9% _{a,b}	7.1%a	51.6% _b	51.6% _a	29.9% _a	53.3% _a	53.7% _a	35.7% _a	38.1% _a
Policing and crime control	Fair	24.3% ¹	19.4% _a	29.0% _b	21.3% _a	25.1% _a	30.9% _a	18.8% _a	21.2% _a	31.0% _a	21.3% _a	30.8% _a	22.1% _a	20.1% _a	71.2% _a	23.7% _b	23.2% _a	47.3% _b	21.7% _{a,b}	27.3% _{a,b}	12.7% _a	45.2% _b
r olicing and crime control	Poor	10.1% ¹	13.7% _a	7.0% _b	9.9% _a	11.8% _a	3.3% _a	14.5% _a	11.4% _a	8.8% _a	8.9% _a	15.4% _a	8.9%a	4.1% _a	11.2% _a	7.8% _a	9.4% _a	0.0% ²	8.6% _a	10.5% _a	14.0% _a	8.5% _a
	Don't Know	3.7% ¹	0.9%a	6.1% _b	9.9% _a	2.7% _a	0.3%a	0.5%a	2.9% _a	7.0% _a	0.0% ²	1.7% _a	0.0% ²	6.7% _a	0.0% ²	4.0% _a	3.9% _a	0.0% ²	1.4% _a	0.4% _a	19.4% _b	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	348	129	217	42	113	96	96	73	156	119	80	123	72	9	322	328	12	134	139	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		E	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Incor	ne	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/Et	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	7.8% ¹	11.2% _a	4.7% _b	9.3% _a	7.0% _a	5.3% _a	9.0% _a	10.5% _a	5.7% _a	6.4% _a	8.1% _a	3.0% _a	10.9% _a	34.9% _a	6.7% _b	7.5% _a	9.4% _a	9.2% _{a,b}	6.3% _{a,b}	1.9% _a	15.6% _b
	Good	36.1% ¹	39.9% _a	33.1% _a	34.9% _{a,b}	27.3% _a	48.4% _b	44.6% _{a,b}	30.8% _a	36.6% _a	44.2% _a	40.3% _a	34.8% _a	32.4% _a	25.9% _a	36.1% _a	36.1% _a	41.7% _a	31.4% _a	38.4% _a	46.0% _a	31.7% _a
Policing and crime control	Fair	33.3% ¹	29.8% _a	37.1% _a	32.4% _{a,b}	41.6%a	20.5% _b	32.0% _{a,b}	33.1% _a	31.7% _a	36.8% _a	28.4% _a	31.9% _a	40.0% _a	8.1% _a	34.3% _b	33.9% _a	32.3% _a	30.5% _a	37.8% _a	41.1% _a	20.6% _a
r olicing and crime control	Poor	22.8% ¹	19.1% _a	25.2% _a	23.4% _a	24.1% _a	25.8% _a	14.5% _a	25.6% _a	26.1% _a	12.6% _a	23.1% _a	30.3% _a	16.8% _a	31.1% _a	22.9% _a	22.5% _a	16.6% _a	28.8% _a	17.5% _{a,b}	11.0% _b	32.1% _a
	Don't Know	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	389	150	233	48	123	118	96	73	172	141	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	118	151	75	36

Table 24		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	Groups		I	Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 21		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	3.9% ¹	6.1% _a	1.9% _b	6.0% _a	2.3% _a	1.6% _a	4.8% _a	5.2% _a	3.0% _a	2.7% _a	6.7% _a	1.6% _b	1.6% _b	13.2% _a	2.1% _b	2.6% _a	12.0% _b	4.9% _a	4.2% _a	1.6% _a	1.3% _a
	Good	21.4% ¹	23.5% _a	18.4% _b	18.9% _a	21.3% _a	21.1% _a	26.1% _a	20.7% _a	21.7% _a	20.5% _a	20.4%a	19.7% _a	17.2% _a	16.1% _a	21.6% _a	20.6% _a	25.7% _a	24.0% _a	18.7% _a	22.1% _a	18.9% _a
Availability of good jobs	Fair	33.8% ¹	32.4% _a	35.9% _a	35.2% _a	30.7% _a	41.8% _a	29.7% _a	31.3% _a	33.6% _a	39.9% _a	30.8%a	38.2% _a	39.8% _a	31.6% _a	34.4% _a	34.2% _a	33.5% _a	33.9% _a	32.4% _a	33.4% _a	40.2% _a
Availability of good jobs	Poor	35.6% ¹	31.1% _a	40.2% _b	32.1% _a	42.7% _b	32.4% _{a,b}	33.6% _{a,b}	35.9% _a	37.7% _a	32.6% _a	35.6% _a	35.4% _a	38.9% _a	17.3% _a	39.0% _b	38.0% _a	18.0% _b	31.9% _a	39.4% _a	40.6% _a	31.4% _a
	Don't Know	5.2% ¹	7.0% _a	3.6% _b	7.8% _a	3.0% _b	3.1% _{a,b}	5.7% _{a,b}	6.8% _a	4.0% _a	4.3% _a	6.5%a	5.2% _a	2.5% _a	21.7% _a	2.9% _b	4.6% _a	10.8% _ь	5.3%a	5.3% _a	2.3% _a	8.1% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1169	473	677	216	339	313	286	224	518	414	308	401	258	101	1020	1047	73	393	465	181	93

		Jefferson County	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups		E	ducation Leve	H	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/Et	thnicity		Political Be	oliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	6.9% ¹	10.8% _a	2.9% _b	10.6% _a	2.2% _b	1.1% _{a,b}	11.4% _{a,b}	9.7% _a	5.3% _a	3.4% _a	12.6% _a	3.5% _b	0.8% _b	15.6% _a	3.7% _b	4.6% _a	18.4% _b	8.3% _a	7.8% _a	2.5% _a	1.2% _a
	Good	25.5% ¹	28.2% _a	20.4% _a	20.4% _a	25.2% _a	28.3% _a	37.3% _a	25.1% _a	24.8% _a	24.4% _a	24.9% _a	24.4% _a	18.1% _a	18.6%a	26.6% _a	25.4% _a	24.5% _a	29.9% _a	19.0% _a	35.5% _a	24.8% _a
Availability of good jobs	Fair	31.5% ¹	30.2% _a	34.1% _a	28.5% _a	31.2% _a	47.0% _a	29.2% _a	28.8% _a	34.6% _a	34.5% _a	25.3% _a	37.2% _{a,b}	44.6% _b	25.2% _a	34.3% _a	31.9% _a	28.0% _a	34.5% _a	30.9% _a	21.0% _a	37.3% _a
Availability of good jobs	Poor	27.5% ¹	18.0% _a	38.2% _b	26.9% _a	35.4% _a	20.9% _a	18.8% _a	25.5% _a	28.1% _a	31.1% _a	26.3% _a	25.2% _a	31.7% _a	15.6% _a	31.9% _b	30.8% _a	11.6% _b	21.0% _a	33.5% _a	39.5% _a	18.0% _a
	Don't Know	8.6% ¹	12.7% _a	4.4% _b	13.6% _a	6.0% _a	2.8% _a	3.3% _a	10.9% _a	7.2% _a	6.7% _a	10.8% _a	9.7% _a	4.8% _a	24.9% _a	3.6% _b	7.3% _a	17.5% _b	6.4% _a	8.8% _a	1.4% _a	18.7% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	433	194	228	125	104	99	95	78	190	155	123	150	93	83	331	358	47	141	176	53	39

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		E	ducation Leve		A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	5.6% ¹	5.9% _a	5.4% _a	5.3% _a	5.0%a	7.3% _a	5.6% _a	7.1% _a	4.4%a	3.9% _a	3.4% _a	1.5% _a	3.3% _a	0.0% ²	4.3% _a	3.5% _a	13.9% _b	7.4% _{a,b}	1.0% _a	7.9% _{a,b}	12.8% _b
	Good	29.7% ¹	32.5% _a	26.9% _a	27.9% _a	32.3% _a	30.4% _a	26.7% _a	27.5% _a	29.5% _a	35.7% _a	25.3% _a	31.8% _a	37.3% _a	15.0% _a	30.6% _a	29.8% _a	33.3% _a	31.5% _a	32.1% _a	23.2% _a	20.4% _a
Availability of good jobs	Fair	32.8% ¹	27.7% _a	37.1% _a	33.5% _{a,b}	26.0%a	30.9% _{a,b}	46.5% _b	36.1% _a	27.1% _a	33.7% _a	34.9%a	36.6% _a	47.0% _a	17.6% _a	33.5% _a	34.1% _a	21.5% _a	36.7% _a	34.4% _a	23.1% _a	25.6% _a
Availability of good jobs	Poor	27.5% ¹	31.4% _a	24.2% _a	25.9% _a	35.8% _a	23.6% _a	17.6% _a	22.9%a	38.2% _b	21.1% _{a,b}	28.8% _a	29.6% _a	10.4% _b	67.4% _a	26.8% _b	27.8% _a	31.4% _a	20.4% _a	30.9% _a	31.0% _a	40.6% _a
	Don't Know	4.4% ¹	2.4% _a	6.3% _a	7.4%a	0.8%a	7.8%a	3.6%a	6.4% _a	0.8% _a	5.5%a	7.7% _a	0.5% _b	2.0% _{a,b}	0.0% ²	4.9% _a	4.8%a	0.0% ²	4.0% _{a,b}	1.6% _a	14.8% _b	0.6% _{a,b}
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	348	130	216	43	113	96	95	73	156	119	80	122	72	9	321	327	13	134	139	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve	1	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	0.6% ¹	1.1% _a	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	1.6% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	1.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	2.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	1.0%a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Good	15.3% ¹	16.2% _a	14.3% _a	15.2% _a	15.0% _a	12.6% _a	18.1% _a	14.1% _a	17.2% _a	13.5% _a	13.8% _a	12.5% _a	12.4% _a	0.0% ²	15.7% _a	13.9% _a	26.9% _b	16.4% _a	14.4% _a	15.2% _a	13.7% _a
Availability of good jobs	Fair	36.3% ¹	35.8% _a	37.3% _a	44.5% _a	31.6% _a	40.9% _a	25.9% _a	32.6% _a	34.1% _a	46.3% _a	36.8% _a	39.6% _a	33.8% _a	75.2% _a	34.7% _b	36.3% _a	45.4% _a	32.5% _a	34.0% _a	41.5% _a	44.6%a
Availability of good jobs	Poor	45.8% ¹	44.9% _a	46.2% _a	40.3% _a	50.8% _a	44.2% _a	48.1% _a	50.8% _a	46.6% _a	36.5% _a	48.6% _a	45.3% _a	51.4% _a	20.1% _a	47.2% _b	47.0% _a	27.7% _b	45.4% _a	50.1% _a	43.0% _a	41.7% _a
	Don't Know	2.0% ¹	2.0%a	2.1% _a	0.0% ²	1.1%a	2.0% _{a,b}	8.0% _b	2.6%a	1.6%a	1.8%a	0.9% _a	2.6%a	0.4%a	4.7%a	2.0% _a	2.1%a	0.0% ²	4.7% _a	1.4% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	388	149	233	48	122	118	96	73	172	140	105	129	93	9	368	362	13	118	150	75	36

Table 22		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 22		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	6.3% ¹	9.3% _a	3.3% _b	7.7% _a	5.9% _a	5.1% _a	4.5% _a	8.2% _a	4.4% _a	4.9% _a	8.8% _a	2.2% _b	4.6% _{a,b}	12.6% _a	5.3% _b	5.7% _a	10.5% _b	6.9% _a	5.4% _a	3.9% _a	9.4% _a
	Good	25.9% ¹	28.5% _a	22.9% _b	25.3% _a	21.8% _a	30.3% _a	31.3% _a	26.6% _a	27.3% _a	21.7% _a	28.4% _a	20.0% _b	25.3% _{a,b}	28.3% _a	25.0% _a	25.3% _a	29.6% _a	29.4% _a	22.8% _a	23.4% _a	25.6% _a
Shopping opportunities	Fair	34.8% ¹	32.1% _a	38.5% _b	38.1% _a	32.5% _a	34.1% _a	32.4% _a	37.4% _a	29.5% _b	40.2% _a	35.8% _a	39.3% _a	34.5% _a	38.3% _a	34.8% _a	34.7% _a	38.7% _a	35.7% _a	36.4% _a	28.5% _a	35.5% _a
Shopping opportunities	Poor	31.9% ¹	29.0% _a	34.2% _a	27.2% _a	39.3% _b	30.3% _{a,b}	29.7% _{a,b}	26.6% _a	37.7% _b	32.2% _{a,b}	26.0% _a	36.8% _b	34.7% _{a,b}	15.8%a	34.4% _b	33.0% _a	20.3% _b	26.9% _a	33.8% _{a,b}	43.7% _b	28.9% _a
	Don't Know	1.1% ¹	1.2% _a	1.1% _a	1.7% _a	0.5% _a	0.2% _a	2.2% _a	1.2% _a	1.2% _a	1.0% _a	1.0% _a	1.7% _a	0.9%a	5.0%a	0.5% _b	1.2% _a	1.0% _a	1.2% _a	1.6% _a	0.5%a	0.6%a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1166	469	678	212	340	312	287	222	517	414	307	400	258	99	1020	1046	71	392	465	180	92

		Jefferson Countv	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	9	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	10.9% ¹	15.1% _a	6.4% _b	11.5% _a	10.3% _a	10.2% _a	10.5% _a	13.8% _a	9.3% _a	6.2% _a	16.5% _a	5.0% _b	5.4% _{a,b}	15.0% _a	9.8% _a	10.2% _a	17.2% _a	12.3% _a	9.2% _a	12.2% _a	12.4% _a
	Good	34.7% ¹	39.3% _a	28.8% _b	31.9% _a	31.1% _a	42.3% _a	44.2% _a	33.5% _a	38.8% _a	29.5% _a	36.4%a	33.2% _a	32.6% _a	26.3% _a	36.1% _a	36.0%a	28.6% _a	43.6% _a	27.6% _b	28.5% _{a,b}	36.4% _{a,b}
Shopping opportunities	Fair	36.2% ¹	30.4% _a	43.6% _b	38.8% _a	38.1% _a	29.3% _a	31.6% _a	37.9% _a	31.5% _a	43.0% _a	33.5% _a	37.0% _a	43.3% _a	38.8% _a	36.5% _a	35.8% _a	38.0% _a	31.2% _a	41.0% _a	40.1% _a	34.5% _a
Shopping opportunities	Poor	16.4% ¹	13.1% _a	19.5% _a	14.7% _a	19.9% _a	17.6% _a	11.2% _a	13.0% _a	17.8% _a	19.9% _a	11.6%a	21.9% _a	17.8% _a	14.0% _a	17.2% _a	15.9% _a	14.6% _a	11.4% _a	19.5% _a	17.7% _a	15.3% _a
	Don't Know	1.9% ¹	2.2% _a	1.7% _a	3.1% _a	0.6% _a	0.6% _a	2.5% _a	1.8% _a	2.6% _a	1.3% _a	1.9% _a	2.9% _a	0.9% _a	6.0% _a	0.4% _b	2.2% _a	1.6% _a	1.5% _a	2.7% _a	1.4% _a	1.4% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	431	192	228	123	104	99	95	76	190	155	123	148	93	81	331	357	46	140	176	53	38

		Lewis County	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups		1	Education Leve	I	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	4.9% ¹	5.9% _a	4.1% _a	1.1% _a	6.9% _a	5.6% _a	5.5% _a	5.8% _a	3.3% _a	5.1% _a	2.6%a	1.9%a	6.0% _a	0.0% ²	3.8% _a	3.7% _a	1.5% _a	9.6% _a	2.0% _b	2.1% _{a,b}	0.0% ²
	Good	34.4% ¹	35.7% _a	33.1% _a	37.9% _a	26.4% _a	36.5% _a	43.7% _a	37.2% _a	27.9% _a	38.3% _a	52.4% _a	26.0% _b	46.1% _a	34.2% _a	35.0% _a	35.1% _a	32.5% _a	31.6% _a	40.3% _a	34.1% _a	22.6% _a
Shopping opportunities	Fair	38.8% ¹	37.3% _a	40.1% _a	29.9% _a	41.1% _a	47.7% _a	36.1% _a	36.9% _a	44.8% _a	33.9% _a	31.9%a	54.3% _b	31.6%a	9.0%a	39.3% _a	39.3% _a	45.7% _a	47.3% _a	34.5% _a	27.8% _a	36.4% _a
onopping opportunities	Poor	21.8% ¹	21.1% _a	22.6% _a	31.1% _a	25.6% _{a,b}	10.1% _b	14.1% _{a,b}	20.2% _a	23.9% _a	22.3% _a	12.9% _a	17.8% _a	16.3% _a	56.8% _a	21.8% _b	21.8% _a	20.3% _a	11.4% _a	23.2% _{a,b}	35.6% _b	40.4% _{b,c}
	Don't Know	0.1% ¹	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.2%a	0.4% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.1%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.5%a	0.6%a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	348	129	217	42	113	96	96	73	156	119	80	123	72	9	322	328	12	134	139	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Gei	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve	1	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	2.0% ¹	4.0% _a	0.3% _b	3.9% _a	1.9% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	3.1% _a	0.0% ²	3.5% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	3.5% _a	0.0% ²	2.2% _a	2.3% _a	0.0% ²	1.3% _{a,b}	1.1% _a	0.0% ²	8.1% _b
	Good	15.0% ¹	15.6% _a	14.8% _a	14.1% _a	12.6% _a	18.8% _a	19.0% _a	16.6% _a	16.2% _a	10.6% _a	13.1% _a	8.0% _a	14.4% _a	39.5% _a	14.2% _b	13.3% _a	30.9% _b	16.0% _a	11.1% _a	18.6% _a	17.2% _a
Shopping opportunities	Fair	32.4% ¹	32.6% _a	33.3% _a	38.7% _a	25.5% _a	33.7% _a	32.0% _a	36.9% _a	24.3% _a	38.9% _a	39.4% _a	37.2% _a	26.9% _a	40.4% _a	32.4% _a	32.6% _a	38.9% _a	36.2% _a	30.6% _a	22.8% _a	36.3% _a
onopping opportunities	Poor	49.9% ¹	47.4% _a	50.8% _a	43.3% _a	59.3% _a	46.7% _a	46.7% _a	42.4% _a	59.5% _b	45.9% _{a,b}	47.2% _a	53.7% _a	54.2% _a	20.1% _a	50.6% _b	51.0% _a	30.2% _b	45.3% _a	56.5% _a	58.6% _a	38.4% _a
	Don't Know	0.6% ¹	0.4% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.6%a	0.0% ²	2.4% _a	1.0% _a	0.0% ²	1.0%a	0.0% ²	1.1%a	1.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.6%a	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	1.2% _a	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	387	148	233	47	123	117	96	73	171	140	104	129	93	9	367	361	13	118	150	74	36

Table 22		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	el	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 23		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	10.7% ¹	10.9% _a	10.5% _a	12.1% _a	9.2% _a	11.2% _a	10.1% _a	11.2% _a	9.1% _a	12.2% _a	10.4% _a	9.1% _a	11.6% _a	14.8% _a	10.3% _a	10.8% _a	10.1% _a	9.5% _{a,b}	13.0% _a	12.7% _{a,b}	4.7% _b
	Good	45.2% ¹	48.9% _a	42.5% _b	41.5% _a	45.8% _a	52.5% _a	47.9% _a	41.9% _a	47.7% _a	50.0% _a	39.9% _a	47.5% _{a,b}	52.0% _b	23.5% _a	48.7% _b	45.4% _a	50.0% _a	52.0% _a	44.3% _{a,b}	45.1% _{a,b}	33.0% _b
Quality of K 12 education	Fair	23.1% ¹	19.9% _a	26.2% _b	19.2% _a	29.0% _b	18.0% _a	23.9% _{a,b}	22.2% _a	24.4% _a	21.7% _a	24.4%a	23.5% _a	23.6% _a	13.8% _a	24.1% _b	23.8% _a	14.8% _b	16.7% _a	24.1% _{a,b}	22.7% _{a,b}	34.6% _b
Quality of K-12 education	Poor	9.8% ¹	9.3%a	10.7% _a	11.7% _a	9.7% _a	10.0% _a	6.0%a	12.1% _a	7.9% _a	8.5% _a	9.4% _a	12.3% _a	8.6%a	9.8% _a	9.5% _a	10.2% _a	7.8% _a	13.8% _a	7.3% _b	4.0% _b	14.6% _a
	Don't Know	11.2% ¹	11.0% _a	10.2% _a	15.5% _a	6.3% _b	8.4% _{a,b}	12.1% _{a,b}	12.7% _a	10.9% _a	7.6% _a	16.0% _a	7.5% _b	4.2% _b	38.1% _a	7.4% _b	9.8% _a	17.3% _ь	8.1% _a	11.3% _a	15.5% _a	13.2% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1169	473	677	214	340	313	287	222	519	415	308	401	259	99	1022	1048	72	393	467	181	91

		Jefferson County	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	1	А	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	13.0% ¹	12.8% _a	13.2% _a	14.4% _a	10.5% _a	18.5% _a	7.5% _a	16.2% _a	10.5% _a	9.2% _a	13.4% _a	13.3% _a	9.1% _a	12.2% _a	13.5% _a	12.5% _a	14.7% _a	12.6% _a	14.8% _a	16.2% _a	3.1% _a
	Good	37.2% ¹	39.5% _a	35.2% _a	31.7% _a	38.1% _a	46.7% _a	49.8% _a	30.1% _a	40.8% _{a,b}	48.9% _b	24.8% _a	45.0% _b	52.4% _b	23.6% _a	41.8% _b	39.0% _a	29.3% _a	48.4% _a	37.1% _a	26.8% _{a,b}	17.2% _b
Quality of K-12 education	Fair	25.1% ¹	18.9% _a	32.0% _b	20.4% _a	35.7% _b	17.2% _{a,b}	24.4% _{a,b}	25.9% _a	24.9% _a	23.7% _a	29.5% _a	19.1% _a	26.6% _a	15.3% _a	27.7% _b	26.4% _a	17.4% _a	17.3% _a	26.6% _{a,b}	29.4% _{a,b}	37.8% _b
quality of N=12 education	Poor	7.3% ¹	9.4% _a	5.4% _a	8.2% _a	6.7% _a	11.1% _a	2.5% _a	7.5% _a	6.1% _a	9.5% _a	7.9% _a	10.3% _a	7.0% _a	7.4%a	7.5% _a	6.8% _a	11.4% _a	7.8%a	5.8% _a	6.5% _a	14.2% _a
	Don't Know	17.5% ¹	19.4% _a	14.3% _a	25.3% _a	9.0% _b	6.5% _b	15.8% _{a,b}	20.3% _a	17.6% _a	8.7% _a	24.5% _a	12.3% _b	5.0% _b	41.5% _a	9.5% _b	15.2% _a	27.2% _b	13.9% _a	15.7% _a	21.0% _a	27.7% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	432	193	228	124	104	99	95	77	190	155	123	149	93	82	331	358	46	141	176	53	38

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	el .	Ar	nual HH Incor	ne	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	19.3% ¹	16.1% _a	21.3% _a	26.2% _a	15.3% _a	16.2% _a	21.2% _a	17.5% _a	22.4% _a	18.8% _a	11.3% _a	14.4% _a	32.2% _b	0.0% ²	20.1% _a	20.6% _a	4.6% _a	19.5% _a	20.1% _a	16.1% _a	22.1% _a
	Good	56.3% ¹	59.9% _a	53.8% _a	53.1% _a	59.5% _a	55.0% _a	56.3% _a	61.2% _a	48.2% _a	57.4% _a	57.4% _{a,b}	65.6% _a	45.6% _b	15.0% _a	58.4% _b	57.0% _a	58.8% _a	55.2% _a	53.7% _a	64.4% _a	56.9% _a
Quality of K-12 education	Fair	11.1% ¹	7.2% _a	14.7% _b	9.3% _a	14.5% _a	8.5% _a	8.7% _a	9.2% _a	14.9% _a	9.7% _a	10.3% _a	10.1% _a	8.3% _a	13.7% _a	10.4% _a	11.0% _a	17.3% _a	11.5% _a	12.0% _a	2.9% _a	20.4% _a
quality of R-12 education	Poor	7.2% ¹	12.0% _a	2.9% _b	4.1% _a	8.9% _a	8.5% _a	6.8% _a	7.6% _a	7.8% _a	5.0% _a	6.9% _a	7.2% _a	8.0% _a	37.8% _a	5.3% _b	4.7% _a	19.3% _b	8.6%a	9.3% _a	1.8% _a	0.0% ²
	Don't Know	6.1% ¹	4.9% _a	7.3% _a	7.2% _{a,b}	1.7% _a	11.8% _b	7.1% _{a,b}	4.5% _a	6.8% _a	9.1%a	14.0% _a	2.7% _b	5.9% _{a,b}	33.6% _a	5.8% _b	6.7% _a	0.0% ²	5.2%a	4.9% _a	14.8% _a	0.6%a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	349	130	217	43	113	96	96	73	157	119	80	123	72	9	322	328	13	134	140	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	el	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	6.3% ¹	7.7% _a	5.1% _a	6.1% _a	6.5% _a	3.8% _a	9.1%a	3.9% _a	4.9% _{a,b}	13.5% _b	6.4% _a	4.4% _a	10.0% _a	42.6% _a	5.5% _b	6.7% _a	2.9% _a	3.6% _a	8.4% _a	10.3% _a	3.6% _a
	Good	50.5% ¹	56.0% _a	46.4% _a	52.9% _a	48.7% _a	56.3% _a	44.3% _a	48.7% _a	54.1% _a	49.4% _a	55.2% _a	44.7% _a	52.9% _a	25.0% _a	51.6% _a	48.1% _a	84.6% _b	54.3% _a	51.6% _a	50.3% _a	43.6% _a
Quality of K-12 education	Fair	24.0% ¹	23.9% _a	23.6% _a	19.4% _a	27.1% _a	21.5% _a	27.4% _a	22.1% _a	26.0% _a	22.4% _a	20.8% _a	30.7% _a	23.6% _a	0.0% ²	24.6% _a	24.7% _a	10.0% _a	17.8% _a	24.2% _a	23.2% _a	33.7% _a
quality of R-12 education	Poor	13.1% ¹	8.6% _a	17.8% _b	18.0% _a	12.5% _a	9.6% _a	8.3% _a	18.3% _a	9.5% _a	8.4% _a	11.8% _a	15.2% _a	10.2% _a	25.2% _a	12.0% _a	14.7% _a	0.0% ²	20.7% _a	8.9% _{a,b}	3.2% _b	16.8% _a
	Don't Know	6.2% ¹	3.8% _a	7.1% _a	3.6% _a	5.2% _a	8.8%a	10.8% _a	6.9% _a	5.4%a	6.3%a	5.8% _a	4.9%a	3.2% _a	7.2% _a	6.3% _a	5.8% _a	2.5% _a	3.6% _a	6.9% _a	12.9% _a	2.3%a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	388	150	232	47	123	118	96	72	172	141	105	129	94	8	369	362	13	118	151	75	35

Table 24		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	Groups		I	Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 24		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	1.4% ¹	2.2% _a	0.6% _b	2.1% _a	0.8% _a	1.1% _a	1.0% _a	1.3% _a	1.4% _a	1.0% _a	2.3% _a	0.6% _a	0.7% _a	5.4% _a	0.6% _b	1.0% _a	3.5% _b	1.4% _a	1.2% _a	1.4% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	18.7% ¹	20.7% _a	16.4% _a	18.7% _{a,b}	13.9% _a	23.7% _b	22.8% _{a,b}	17.9% _a	14.7% _a	26.7% _b	16.6% _a	15.4% _a	18.7% _a	27.1% _a	17.6% _b	16.5% _a	34.6% _b	18.2% _a	17.1% _a	19.0% _a	23.9% _a
The overall state of the loca	al Fair	38.7% ¹	45.9% _a	32.2% _b	39.3% _a	34.3% _a	36.0% _a	51.4% _b	39.3% _a	37.3% _a	41.1% _a	36.6% _a	44.2% _a	40.9% _a	35.0% _a	38.9% _a	40.1% _a	31.3% _a	38.9% _a	41.1% _a	44.6% _a	26.4% _b
economy	Poor	37.7% ¹	27.2% _a	47.6% _b	33.5% _{a,c}	48.3% _b	39.1% _{a,b}	23.0% _c	37.1% _{a,b}	43.2% _a	29.0% _b	39.6% _a	38.5% _a	38.1% _a	15.1% _a	41.2% _b	39.1% _a	23.9% _b	38.4% _a	36.3% _a	31.9% _a	45.7% _a
	Don't Know	3.6% ¹	4.1%a	3.1%a	6.4% _a	2.7% _{a,b}	0.2% _b	1.8% _{a,b}	4.4%a	3.5% _a	2.2% _a	5.0% _a	1.3% _b	1.6% _{a,b}	17.4% _a	1.7% _b	3.2% _a	6.6% _a	3.1% _a	4.2% _a	3.1% _a	3.9% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1165	470	676	214	339	311	286	221	517	414	305	400	259	99	1018	1045	71	392	466	180	91

		Jefferson County	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	6	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	2.1% ¹	3.6% _a	0.6% _b	3.4% _a	0.4% _a	2.5% _a	1.2% _a	2.0% _a	2.4% _a	1.0% _a	4.5% _a	0.2% _a	0.6% _a	6.5% _a	0.7% _b	1.5% _a	4.6% _a	1.7% _a	1.7% _a	3.3% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	17.7% ¹	21.4% _a	12.8% _b	15.2% _a	13.4% _a	22.3% _a	27.7% _a	15.1% _a	16.2% _a	23.3% _a	19.3% _a	18.2% _a	15.5% _a	21.0% _a	16.4% _a	15.1% _a	27.3% _b	19.3% _{a,b}	12.0% _a	20.9% _{a,b}	30.2% _b
The overall state of the loca	al Fair	43.6% ¹	48.5% _a	39.2% _a	47.0% _a	34.8% _a	46.5% _a	52.0% _a	47.7% _a	40.9% _a	43.1% _a	38.6% _a	45.4% _a	47.8% _a	41.1% _a	44.0% _a	44.0% _a	41.9% _a	43.0% _a	45.5% _a	46.1% _a	37.4% _a
economy	Poor	30.4% ¹	18.3% _a	43.2% _b	23.9% _a	46.5% _b	28.7% _{a,b}	18.1% _a	26.7% _a	34.9% _a	29.5% _a	29.1% _a	33.8% _a	34.6% _a	12.0% _a	36.7% _b	33.9% _a	15.1% _b	30.8% _a	33.5% _a	27.0% _a	22.8% _a
	Don't Know	6.2% ¹	8.3% _a	4.2% _a	10.4% _a	4.8% _a	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	8.4% _a	5.5% _a	3.2% _a	8.5% _a	2.4% _a	1.4% _a	19.5% _a	2.2% _b	5.5% _a	11.1% _a	5.1% _a	7.2% _a	2.8% _a	9.6% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	429	191	227	123	103	98	95	76	189	154	121	148	93	81	329	356	45	141	175	52	37

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		E	ducation Leve		A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	3.8% ¹	5.1% _a	2.7% _a	3.8% _a	5.3%a	0.7% _a	4.5% _a	3.6% _a	3.2% _a	5.3% _a	0.0% ²	3.8% _a	4.6%a	0.0% ²	3.1% _a	2.8% _a	15.0% _b	5.0%a	3.3% _a	4.1% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	24.9% ¹	24.8% _a	24.0% _a	23.7% _{a,b}	17.0% _a	39.8% _b	25.9% _{a,b}	24.2% _a	21.9% _a	31.6% _a	22.2% _a	21.5% _a	35.4% _a	52.0%a	25.6% _a	23.7% _a	53.0% _b	27.7% _a	23.6% _a	19.2% _a	28.5% _a
The overall state of the loc	al Fair	39.2% ¹	41.2% _a	38.0% _a	34.3% _a	41.7% _a	31.1% _a	49.9% _a	40.7% _a	41.2% _a	32.2% _a	46.7% _a	44.6% _a	37.7% _a	12.1% _a	39.9% _a	42.2% _a	5.2% _b	41.5% _a	43.6% _a	31.3% _a	20.0% _a
economy	Poor	28.1% ¹	27.4% _a	29.2% _a	26.0% _a	34.3% _a	28.4% _a	19.0% _a	28.6% _a	29.9% _a	24.1% _a	28.9% _a	29.3% _a	16.4% _a	19.9% _a	27.6% _a	27.0% _a	26.7% _a	25.7% _a	27.0% _{a,b}	26.0% _{a,b}	50.8% _b
	Don't Know	4.0% ¹	1.5% _a	6.2% _b	12.2% _a	1.7% _b	0.0% ²	0.8% _b	2.9% _a	3.8% _a	6.9% _a	2.2% _a	0.7% _a	5.9%a	16.0% _a	3.9% _a	4.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.2%a	2.4% _a	19.4% _b	0.6% _{a,b}
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	348	129	217	43	113	95	96	73	156	119	80	123	72	9	321	327	13	134	140	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve	el	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹
	Good	18.2% ²	19.2% _a	17.9% _a	22.5% _a	13.5% _a	19.9% _a	18.4% _a	18.9% _{a,b}	11.8% _a	28.9% _b	12.0% _a	11.6% _a	18.4% _a	60.5% _a	16.6% _b	16.0% _a	44.3% _b	14.3% _a	22.2% _a	18.1% _a	18.6% _a
The overall state of the loca	al Fair	33.7% ²	44.3%a	24.3% _b	29.9% _a	32.0% _{a,b}	29.1% _{a,b}	51.4% _b	30.2% _a	33.1% _a	41.2% _a	31.9% _a	43.1% _a	35.0% _a	1.6%a	34.9% _b	36.2% _a	17.1% _b	34.3% _{a,b}	34.3% _{a,b}	46.5% _a	18.8% _b
economy	Poor	47.2% ²	36.2% _a	56.5% _b	47.6% _a	53.4% _a	50.6% _a	27.5% _b	50.3% _a	53.6% _a	29.6% _b	55.0% _a	44.7% _a	45.6% _a	33.3% _a	47.7% _a	46.9% _a	38.6% _a	49.3% _{a,b}	42.9% _{a,b}	35.4% _a	62.6% _b
	Don't Know	0.9% ²	0.4%a	1.4% _a	0.0% ¹	1.1%a	0.4%a	2.7% _a	0.6% _a	1.5%a	0.3% _a	1.1% _a	0.7%a	0.9%a	4.7%a	0.7% _a	1.0% _a	0.0% ¹	2.1% _a	0.6%a	0.0% ¹	0.0% ¹
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	388	150	232	48	123	118	95	72	172	141	104	129	94	9	368	362	13	117	151	75	36

Table 25		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 25		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	2.8% ¹	4.4% _a	1.3% _b	4.4% _a	0.7% _b	2.6% _{a,b}	3.6% _{a,b}	2.9% _a	2.6% _a	2.5% _a	4.7% _a	1.7% _a	1.8% _a	9.6% _a	1.9% _b	2.3% _a	6.3% _b	1.7% _a	4.6% _a	2.0% _a	0.6% _a
	Good	21.3% ¹	28.1% _a	15.0% _b	25.5% _a	15.5% _b	21.3% _{a,b}	24.5% _{a,b}	24.3% _a	19.7% _a	18.8% _a	18.8% _a	19.7% _a	21.1% _a	21.3% _a	21.7% _a	21.3% _a	24.8% _a	21.0% _a	20.9% _a	23.2% _a	22.0% _a
Availability of care for the	Fair	31.6% ¹	33.5% _a	29.7% _a	28.6% _a	35.3% _a	30.1% _a	31.4% _a	30.9% _a	32.4% _a	31.9% _a	26.0%a	36.4% _b	33.5% _{a,b}	17.8% _a	33.7% _b	31.3% _a	32.8% _a	34.3% _a	31.0% _a	30.1% _a	29.7% _a
elderly	Poor	32.9% ¹	21.7% _a	43.4% _b	21.9% _a	39.7% _b	41.4% _b	37.4% _b	32.9% _a	33.3% _a	31.5% _a	39.0% _a	31.6% _a	30.2% _a	9.6% _a	35.4% _b	34.3% _a	18.3% _b	33.8% _a	32.4% _a	27.7% _a	36.0% _a
	Don't Know	11.4% ¹	12.4% _a	10.6% _a	19.7% _a	8.9% _b	4.6% _b	3.1% _b	9.0%a	12.1% _{a,b}	15.3% _b	11.5%a	10.6% _a	13.4% _a	41.8% _a	7.3% _b	10.8% _a	17.8% _b	9.2% _a	11.2% _a	16.9% _a	11.7% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1166	470	677	213	340	311	287	222	517	414	307	400	258	98	1020	1046	71	392	465	181	92

		Jefferson Countv	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	1	А	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Mili	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	3.3% ¹	5.0% _a	1.6% _a	5.1% _a	0.9% _a	5.4% _a	0.6% _a	4.5% _a	2.4% _a	1.4% _a	7.1% _a	1.1% _b	0.2% _{a,b}	8.5% _a	1.7% _b	2.4% _a	9.4% _b	1.1%a	5.2% _a	3.6% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	20.1% ¹	25.5% _a	14.7% _b	20.8% _a	15.3% _a	25.2% _a	25.0% _a	23.1% _a	18.4% _a	17.6% _a	18.5% _a	23.5% _a	20.1% _a	18.8% _a	21.0% _a	18.8% _a	26.4% _a	26.0% _a	19.8% _a	12.8% _a	12.8% _a
Availability of care for the	Fair	31.1% ¹	30.5% _a	30.6% _a	29.6% _a	30.6% _a	26.4% _a	39.0% _a	33.3% _a	28.6% _a	29.5% _a	26.1% _a	33.6% _a	34.7% _a	20.1% _a	34.3% _b	31.5% _a	21.6% _a	35.5% _a	27.9% _a	20.1% _a	38.1% _a
elderly	Poor	27.2% ¹	17.3% _a	38.0% _b	15.0% _a	39.9% _b	36.7% _b	32.2% _b	23.0% _a	30.9% _a	30.0% _a	29.7% _a	24.2% _a	23.8% _a	6.5% _a	32.8% _b	30.6% _a	12.9% _b	22.0% _a	29.2% _a	36.9% _a	26.2% _a
	Don't Know	18.4% ¹	21.6% _a	15.1% _a	29.5% _a	13.2% _b	6.2% _b	3.2% _b	16.0% _a	19.6% _a	21.4% _a	18.6% _a	17.7% _a	21.2% _a	46.1% _a	10.3% _b	16.8% _a	29.7% _b	15.4% _a	17.9% _a	26.6% _a	22.9% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	430	192	227	122	104	99	95	76	189	155	122	148	93	80	331	357	45	140	175	53	38

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		E	ducation Leve		A	nual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	3.3% ¹	3.9% _a	2.9% _a	4.1% _a	2.7% _a	2.4% _a	4.4%a	1.7% _a	3.8% _a	6.6% _a	1.7% _a	3.1% _a	3.9% _a	0.0% ²	3.4% _a	2.6% _a	12.6% _b	2.9%a	3.1% _a	2.2% _a	8.9% _a
	Good	29.8% ¹	38.4% _a	21.1% _b	26.0% _{a,b}	22.9% _a	41.5% _b	36.0% _{a,b}	33.5% _a	27.0% _a	24.9% _a	32.0%a	25.6% _a	36.0% _a	26.6%a	30.6% _a	29.6% _a	39.3% _a	28.0%a	32.0% _a	33.8% _a	19.1% _a
Availability of care for the	Fair	34.4% ¹	32.3% _a	36.7% _a	27.0% _a	37.3% _a	35.0% _a	39.0% _a	34.1% _a	37.6% _a	29.5% _a	39.2% _a	38.2% _a	30.1% _a	34.5% _a	34.0% _a	34.3% _a	41.4% _a	37.8% _a	36.9% _a	16.5% _b	38.9% _{a,b}
elderly	Poor	22.1% ¹	19.5% _a	24.7% _a	13.7% _a	33.4% _b	20.2% _{a,b}	12.9% _a	19.7% _a	22.9% _a	26.9% _a	21.1% _a	26.5% _a	21.4% _a	15.8% _a	21.1% _a	22.1% _a	6.8% _a	27.0% _a	22.5% _a	12.5% _a	14.9% _a
	Don't Know	10.5% ¹	6.0% _a	14.6% _b	29.2% _a	3.6% _b	0.9% _b	7.6% _b	11.0% _a	8.7% _a	12.1% _a	6.0%a	6.6%a	8.6% _a	23.1% _a	10.8% _a	11.4% _a	0.0% ²	4.3%a	5.5% _{a,c}	35.0% _b	18.3% _{b,c}
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	348	129	217	43	113	95	96	73	156	119	80	123	72	9	321	327	13	134	140	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	el	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	2.2% ¹	3.8% _a	0.7% _b	3.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	5.6% _a	1.6% _a	2.6% _a	2.7% _a	2.2% _a	1.9% _a	2.9% _a	17.5%a	1.6% _b	2.2% _a	0.0% ²	2.0%a	4.2% _a	1.2% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	20.5% ¹	28.3% _a	13.6% _b	31.6% _a	13.6% _b	11.9% _b	21.1% _{a,b}	22.9% _a	19.3% _a	18.7% _a	16.5% _a	15.2% _a	19.2% _a	34.9% _a	20.2% _a	21.3% _a	20.0% _a	14.4% _a	19.2% _a	26.3% _a	29.8% _a
Availability of care for the	Fair	31.4% ¹	36.8% _a	27.2% _b	27.6% _a	38.6% _a	31.7% _a	24.0% _a	27.5% _a	34.7% _a	34.6% _a	23.2% _a	38.2% _b	33.0% _{a,b}	1.6%a	33.2% _b	30.4% _a	50.8% _b	32.1% _a	33.5% _a	37.7% _a	21.8% _a
elderly	Poor	41.1% ¹	26.7% _a	53.1% _b	32.4% _a	41.1% _a	51.5% _a	47.4% _a	46.8% _a	37.6% _a	33.9% _a	54.2% _a	38.8% _b	37.9% _{a,b}	26.8% _a	40.8% _a	40.7% _a	29.1% _a	46.3% _a	39.5% _{a,b}	26.2% _b	46.4% _{a,b}
	Don't Know	4.8% ¹	4.4%a	5.4% _a	4.9% _a	6.6% _a	4.4% _a	1.8% _a	1.4% _a	5.7% _{a,b}	10.2% _b	3.8% _a	6.0%a	7.0% _a	19.3% _a	4.2% _b	5.4%a	0.0% ²	5.3%a	3.5% _a	8.6% _a	1.9%a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	388	149	233	48	123	117	96	73	172	140	105	129	93	9	368	362	13	118	150	75	36

Table 26		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	Groups		I	Education Leve	H	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 20		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	2.9% ¹	4.6% _a	1.2% _b	4.9% _a	1.5% _b	2.7% _{a,b}	1.2% _{a,b}	2.8% _a	2.7% _a	3.1% _a	4.1% _a	1.1% _b	4.0% _{a,b}	9.1% _a	2.0% _b	2.4% _a	6.3% _b	3.1% _a	2.8% _a	2.7% _a	2.1% _a
	Good	23.4% ¹	28.7% _a	18.5% _b	23.6% _a	20.9% _a	26.2% _a	26.5% _a	19.7% _a	24.0% _{a,b}	30.8% _b	15.0%a	22.4% _b	30.0% _b	21.0% _a	23.8% _a	22.6% _a	34.2% _b	20.9% _a	26.2% _a	20.2% _a	24.9% _a
Availability of housing	Fair	34.6% ¹	35.1% _a	33.0% _a	32.4% _a	35.7% _a	36.2% _a	33.7% _a	30.1% _a	37.7% _b	38.0% _{a,b}	33.9% _a	39.1% _a	35.0% _a	24.7% _a	35.8% _b	34.5% _a	28.6% _a	36.9% _a	33.7% _a	38.7% _a	27.1% _a
Availability of flotialing	Poor	31.8% ¹	23.1% _a	41.1% _b	29.9% _a	36.1% _a	29.0% _a	31.4% _a	38.8% _a	28.5% _b	23.1% _b	37.4%a	31.2% _{a,b}	27.1% _b	17.7% _a	33.9% _b	33.8% _a	20.3% _b	30.1% _a	32.2% _a	33.9% _a	33.2% _a
	Don't Know	7.4% ¹	8.5% _a	6.2% _a	9.2% _a	5.9% _a	5.9%a	7.1%a	8.7% _a	7.0% _a	4.9%a	9.6% _a	6.2% _{a,b}	4.0% _b	27.5% _a	4.4% _b	6.8% _a	10.5% _a	8.9% _{a,b}	5.1% _a	4.4% _a	12.8% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1165	469	677	214	340	311	285	222	517	413	306	400	259	99	1018	1045	71	391	467	180	91

		Jefferson County	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	el	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	4.3% ¹	7.3% _a	1.4% _b	7.4% _a	0.4% _b	6.6% _{a,b}	0.6% _{a,b}	5.2% _a	4.5% _a	1.6% _a	7.4% _a	1.8% _a	2.8% _a	10.9% _a	2.3% _b	3.3% _a	8.9% _b	3.4% _a	4.6% _a	5.1% _a	3.8% _a
	Good	21.4% ¹	24.6% _a	18.5% _a	20.1% _a	18.2% _a	25.4% _a	30.9% _a	16.2% _a	25.5% _a	26.2% _a	18.0% _a	18.8% _a	29.2% _a	15.9% _a	23.4% _a	20.7% _a	27.5% _a	26.2% _a	17.2% _a	20.5% _a	21.9% _a
Availability of bouging	Fair	33.7% ¹	36.3% _a	29.6% _a	27.7% _a	37.6% _a	40.3% _a	34.7% _a	32.6% _a	30.4% _a	40.0% _a	28.3% _a	41.2% _a	28.1% _a	28.4% _a	34.5% _a	31.7% _a	32.6% _a	35.0% _a	33.9% _a	27.8% _a	31.9% _a
Availability of housing	Poor	30.3% ¹	19.1% _a	43.0% _b	28.9% _a	37.1% _a	24.8% _a	28.3% _a	35.2% _a	27.4% _a	26.8% _a	30.3% _a	30.6% _a	34.1% _a	15.2% _a	35.4% _b	35.1% _a	13.2% _b	25.2% _{a,b}	37.4% _a	41.6% _a	15.7% _b
	Don't Know	10.3% ¹	12.8% _a	7.5% _a	15.9% _a	6.7% _a	2.8% _a	5.5% _a	10.8% _a	12.2% _a	5.4% _a	15.9% _a	7.7% _a	5.9% _a	29.5% _a	4.4% _b	9.1% _a	17.8% _b	10.3% _a	6.8% _a	5.0% _a	26.7% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	430	192	227	123	104	99	94	76	190	154	122	148	93	81	330	357	45	140	176	53	37

		Lewis County	Gei	nder		Age G	roups		E	ducation Leve		A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	4.4% ¹	4.7% _a	4.2% _a	5.6% _a	4.6%a	1.1% _a	5.8% _a	3.6% _a	4.3% _a	6.5% _a	3.5% _a	1.9%a	6.2% _a	0.0% ²	4.7% _a	3.5% _a	20.7% _b	3.5%a	1.9% _a	10.8% _a	8.3% _a
	Good	31.8% ¹	39.0% _a	24.5% _b	27.3% _a	27.7% _a	38.1% _a	39.5% _a	32.4% _a	31.5% _a	30.5% _a	26.5% _a	34.7% _a	42.2% _a	15.1% _a	32.9% _a	31.5% _a	32.7% _a	34.6% _a	38.8% _a	23.0% _a	0.7% _b
Availability of housing	Fair	28.4% ¹	26.4% _a	30.4% _a	20.7% _a	31.7% _a	28.8% _a	32.6% _a	24.8% _a	32.0% _a	31.3% _a	38.1% _a	30.5% _a	27.5% _a	18.0% _a	28.1% _a	28.7% _a	34.0% _a	27.7% _a	32.9% _a	17.7% _a	30.9% _a
Availability of floubiling	Poor	26.6% ¹	25.1% _a	28.3% _a	35.4% _a	28.6% _{a,b}	22.7% _{a,b}	13.3% _b	24.5% _a	29.3% _a	27.5% _a	21.5% _a	29.3% _a	21.9% _a	62.8% _a	26.1% _b	28.1% _a	12.6% _a	22.9% _a	25.0% _a	36.2% _a	35.4% _a
	Don't Know	8.9% ¹	4.8% _a	12.7% _b	11.0% _a	7.3%a	9.3%a	8.7% _a	14.7% _a	2.9% _b	4.2% _{a,b}	10.4% _a	3.7% _a	2.1% _a	4.1% _a	8.1% _a	8.1% _a	0.0% ²	11.3% _a	1.4% _b	12.3% _a	24.7% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	347	128	217	43	113	95	95	73	156	118	79	123	72	9	320	326	13	134	140	52	18

		St. Lawrence County	Gei	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	1.1% ¹	1.9% _a	0.4% _a	1.5% _a	1.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	3.7% _a	0.3% _a	0.3% _a	4.7% _a	0.0% ²	1.1% _a	1.2% _a	0.0% ²	2.8% _a	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Good	23.3% ¹	30.6% _a	17.0% _b	27.6% _a	21.4% _a	23.2% _a	20.1% _a	19.6% _a	21.1% _{a,b}	35.2% _b	8.9% _a	22.2% _b	28.3% _b	52.3% _a	22.0% _b	22.0% _a	45.4% _b	11.9% _a	35.1% _b	19.6% _{a,b}	30.1% _b
Availability of boueing	Fair	37.0% ¹	36.0% _a	36.8% _a	40.7% _a	35.1% _a	35.2% _a	33.3% _a	29.0% _a	45.7% _b	37.7% _{a,b}	39.8% _a	39.8% _a	42.9% _a	3.3%a	38.7% _b	38.3% _a	21.4% _a	41.5% _{a,b}	33.6% _{a,b}	48.2% _a	23.1% _b
Availability of housing	Poor	34.6% ¹	26.6% _a	42.5% _b	30.2% _a	37.3% _a	34.2% _a	38.1% _a	46.5% _a	29.4% _b	18.8% _b	49.4% _a	32.2% _b	21.5% _b	25.0% _a	34.7% _a	34.0% _a	33.1% _a	36.8% _a	26.8% _a	29.6% _a	46.0% _a
	Don't Know	4.1% ¹	5.0%a	3.3%a	0.0% ²	4.7% _a	7.4%a	7.9% _a	4.8%a	3.1% _a	4.6%a	1.6% _a	5.6%a	2.7% _a	19.3% _a	3.6% _b	4.4% _a	0.0% ²	7.0%a	3.9% _a	2.6%a	0.8%a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	388	149	233	48	123	117	96	73	171	141	105	129	94	9	368	362	13	117	151	75	36

Table 27		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	Groups		I	Education Leve	el	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 27		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	2.2% ¹	2.2% _a	2.3% _a	5.2% _a	0.4% _b	0.3% _b	0.5% _b	3.6% _a	1.0% _b	0.9% _{a,b}	2.5% _a	1.1% _a	0.9% _a	13.3% _a	0.5% _b	1.5% _a	5.5% _b	0.7% _a	2.1% _{a,b}	1.8% _{a,b}	6.0% _b
	Good	12.9% ¹	18.4% _a	7.9% _b	14.8% _a	13.3% _a	12.4% _a	9.2%a	13.3% _a	12.7% _a	13.4% _a	12.9%a	9.2% _a	15.6% _a	23.2% _a	11.3% _b	10.5% _a	32.3% _b	13.0% _{a,b}	9.7% _a	13.6% _{a,b}	21.2% _b
Availability of abildeare	Fair	26.2% ¹	28.4% _a	24.0% _a	24.2% _a	30.0% _a	23.4% _a	25.1% _a	22.5% _a	30.2% _b	26.9% _{a,b}	20.6%a	33.5% _b	25.8% _{a,b}	9.0% _a	28.7% _b	25.7% _a	27.0% _a	27.0% _a	27.2% _a	20.3% _a	26.0% _a
Availability of childcare	Poor	31.4% ¹	20.9% _a	41.6% _b	30.5% _a	34.6% _a	33.9% _a	24.9% _a	30.6% _a	31.1% _a	33.9% _a	28.9% _a	35.0% _a	33.6% _a	20.3% _a	33.1% _b	34.3% _a	11.2% _b	30.5% _{a,b}	32.9% _{a,b}	39.5% _a	22.1% _b
	Don't Know	27.3% ¹	30.0% _a	24.3% _b	25.3% _a	21.7% _a	30.0% _{a,b}	40.2% _b	29.9% _a	25.0% _a	24.9% _a	35.2% _a	21.3% _b	24.1% _b	34.2% _a	26.4% _b	28.0% _a	24.0% _a	28.7% _a	28.1% _a	24.8% _a	24.6% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1164	471	674	214	339	309	287	223	514	414	306	399	258	100	1016	1043	72	392	464	181	91

		Jefferson County	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	2.8% ¹	3.9% _a	1.7% _a	6.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	4.7% _a	1.4% _a	0.4% _a	4.8%a	2.5% _a	0.5% _a	10.2% _a	0.5% _b	1.3% _a	8.1% _b	0.8%a	3.4% _a	3.6% _a	4.0% _a
	Good	13.2% ¹	20.1% _a	6.4% _b	17.8% _a	9.6% _a	13.2% _a	6.8% _a	15.9% _a	9.9% _a	14.5% _a	17.4%a	10.4% _a	9.8% _a	27.6% _a	8.5% _b	8.1% _a	39.3% _b	17.2% _{a,b}	8.6% _a	4.4% _a	24.8% _b
Availability of childcare	Fair	22.0% ¹	22.6% _a	20.5% _a	14.8% _a	24.4% _{a,b}	32.3% _b	29.5% _{a,b}	18.1% _a	24.3% _a	26.0% _a	20.9% _a	21.6% _a	23.4% _a	10.1% _a	25.8% _b	23.6% _a	9.8% _b	27.3% _a	19.0% _a	18.3% _a	21.2% _a
Availability of childcare	Poor	29.3% ¹	17.9% _a	42.6% _b	28.4% _a	33.9% _a	34.7% _a	19.1% _a	25.3% _a	33.5% _a	32.5% _a	19.6%a	40.0% _b	34.7% _b	18.1% _a	32.7% _b	33.3% _a	13.9% _b	24.9% _{a,b}	35.7% _a	45.2% _a	10.8% _b
	Don't Know	32.7% ¹	35.5% _a	28.8% _a	32.9% _{a,b}	32.1% _{a,b}	19.2% _a	44.6% _b	36.1% _a	30.9% _a	26.4% _a	37.2% _a	25.5% _a	31.6% _a	34.1% _a	32.4% _a	33.8% _a	28.8% _a	29.9% _a	33.2% _a	28.5% _a	39.2% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	431	193	227	123	104	99	95	77	189	155	123	148	93	82	330	357	46	141	175	53	38

		Lewis County	Gei	nder		Age G	roups		E	Education Leve	I	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	2.7% ¹	2.7% _a	2.7% _a	5.3% _a	1.6%a	0.3% _a	4.0%a	1.3% _a	3.8% _a	4.4%a	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	4.1% _a	0.0% ²	1.9% _a	1.8% _a	12.6% _b	1.6%a	3.1% _a	6.2% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	16.7% ¹	17.7% _a	15.9% _a	11.2% _a	18.0% _a	23.5% _a	14.4% _a	17.2% _a	14.8% _a	18.5% _a	16.5% _a	17.6% _a	17.8% _a	0.0% ²	18.0% _a	17.8% _a	3.4% _a	14.9% _{a,b}	16.6% _{a,b}	27.5% _a	2.1% _b
Availability of childcare	Fair	26.0% ¹	30.3% _a	22.5% _a	25.8% _{a,b}	35.1% _a	15.2% _b	20.4% _{a,b}	26.9% _a	25.8% _a	24.1%a	18.8% _a	36.1% _b	24.6% _{a,b}	24.1% _a	25.1% _a	24.1% _a	31.8% _a	33.1% _a	25.4% _{a,b}	10.3% _b	23.3% _{a,b}
Availability of childcare	Poor	27.4% ¹	23.7% _a	31.0% _a	31.2% _a	34.3%a	18.2% _a	18.5% _a	20.0% _a	32.6% _{a,b}	37.3% _b	20.6%a	28.6% _a	38.9% _a	53.8% _a	28.4% _a	27.6% _a	37.1% _a	26.4% _a	32.4% _a	16.2% _a	31.6% _a
	Don't Know	27.2% ¹	25.5%a	27.9% _a	26.5% _a	10.9% _b	42.7% _a	42.8% _a	34.6% _a	23.0% _{a,b}	15.7% _ь	44.1% _a	17.0% _b	14.6% _b	22.2%a	26.7% _a	28.7%a	15.1% _a	23.9% _a	22.4% _a	39.8% _a	43.0% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	347	129	216	43	113	94	96	73	155	119	80	122	72	9	320	326	13	134	139	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Gei	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve		A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	1.5% ¹	0.3% _a	2.7% _a	4.0% _a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	3.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	34.9% _a	0.1% _b	1.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	8.4% _b
	Good	11.8% ¹	16.8% _a	7.3% _b	11.5% _a	15.3% _a	8.3% _a	9.6% _a	9.6% _a	14.9% _a	11.1% _a	6.4% _a	5.9% _a	20.5% _b	0.0% ²	11.9% _a	10.8% _a	24.3% _b	8.6% _a	9.1% _a	15.5% _a	20.7% _a
Availability of childcare	Fair	30.4% ¹	34.1% _a	27.6% _a	36.3% _a	33.4% _a	18.7% _a	23.2% _a	25.8% _a	36.6% _a	28.3% _a	20.5% _a	42.3% _b	28.3% _{a,b}	0.0% ²	31.8% _a	27.9% _a	56.2% _b	25.0% _a	39.0% _a	23.2% _a	30.3% _a
Availability of childcare	Poor	34.5% ¹	23.5% _a	43.3% _b	33.3% _a	35.3% _a	38.0% _a	30.6% _a	39.2% _a	28.7% _a	34.5% _a	42.4% _a	32.7% _a	31.5% _a	28.3% _a	34.4% _a	36.9% _a	2.5% _b	37.0% _a	29.2% _a	41.2% _a	30.2% _a
	Don't Know	21.9% ¹	25.4% _a	19.1% _a	15.0% _a	15.6%a	34.9% _b	36.5% _b	22.2%a	19.9% _a	25.5% _a	30.7% _a	19.0%a	18.9% _a	36.8% _a	21.8% _a	22.8% _a	16.9%a	29.0% _a	22.7% _{a,b}	20.0% _{a,b}	10.5% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	386	149	231	48	122	116	96	73	170	140	103	129	93	9	366	360	13	117	150	75	35

Table 20		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	Groups		I	Education Leve	H	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 20		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	5.7% ¹	7.3% _a	4.2% _b	11.5% _a	2.1% _b	2.4% _b	2.5% _b	7.8% _a	5.3% _{a,b}	1.9% _b	9.9% _a	4.6% _b	1.7% _b	16.7% _a	4.4% _b	4.4% _a	10.5% _b	3.5% _a	8.6% _b	3.8% _{a,b}	4.9% _{a,b}
	Good	21.3% ¹	25.0% _a	17.1% _b	22.1% _a	20.3% _a	19.6% _a	21.4% _a	22.3% _a	21.6% _a	18.6% _a	26.6%a	14.1% _ь	22.1% _a	22.0% _a	21.2% _a	19.9% _a	32.8% _b	17.5% _a	22.8% _a	22.5% _a	22.5% _a
Availability of behavioral	Fair	29.2% ¹	27.4% _a	31.7% _a	29.5% _a	27.2% _a	29.1% _a	34.0% _a	28.3% _a	28.0% _a	33.5% _a	21.7% _a	37.7% _b	29.6% _{a,b}	27.1% _a	29.7% _a	30.0% _a	25.3% _a	29.4% _a	28.8% _a	30.8% _a	29.5% _a
health services	Poor	26.6% ¹	20.2% _a	32.4% _b	20.5% _a	35.2% _b	29.8% _{a,b}	19.8% _a	22.5% _a	31.2% _b	26.6% _{a,b}	24.6%a	29.6% _a	28.5% _a	12.9% _a	28.0% _b	27.4% _a	19.6% _a	27.2% _a	25.8% _a	29.1% _a	23.4% _a
	Don't Know	17.3% ¹	20.1% _a	14.6% _b	16.4% _a	15.2% _a	19.0% _a	22.4% _a	19.0% _a	14.0% _a	19.5% _a	17.1% _a	14.0% _a	18.0% _a	21.2% _a	16.8% _a	18.4% _a	11.9% _a	22.4% _a	14.0% _b	13.8% _{a,b}	19.7% _{a,b}
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1156	468	669	210	338	311	282	220	512	411	301	399	257	95	1013	1037	70	388	463	179	91

		Jefferson	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	el	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	sc	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	8.1% ¹	11.1% _a	5.2% _b	13.1% _a	3.8% _b	5.4% _{a,b}	4.5% _{a,b}	13.5% _a	4.9% _b	1.8% _b	13.2% _a	8.4% _{a,b}	2.0% _b	19.1% _a	5.2% _b	5.8% _a	16.9% _b	7.1% _a	10.9% _a	2.3% _a	5.4% _a
	Good	21.8% ¹	27.2% _a	14.8% _b	22.3% _a	22.2% _a	21.1% _a	18.6% _a	24.7% _a	20.8%a	16.7% _a	26.8% _a	14.6% _b	23.6% _{a,b}	21.3% _a	21.4% _a	20.3% _a	27.2% _a	19.3% _a	19.4% _a	21.8% _a	28.9% _a
Availability of behavioral	Fair	29.2% ¹	29.6% _a	30.3% _a	29.7% _a	25.8% _a	33.3% _a	34.4% _a	28.4% _a	29.2% _a	34.0% _a	24.2% _a	36.0% _a	33.4% _a	29.5% _a	30.8% _a	30.6% _a	25.1% _a	37.0% _a	29.0% _a	19.6% _a	22.6% _a
health services	Poor	24.4% ¹	15.0% _a	34.2% _b	17.9% _a	32.7% _b	28.7% _{a,b}	21.3% _{a,b}	21.2% _a	29.8% _a	20.3% _a	23.3% _a	29.2% _a	19.3% _a	9.0%a	28.1% _b	26.2% _a	16.0% _a	23.2% _a	23.8% _a	34.0% _a	24.3% _a
	Don't Know	16.5% ¹	17.1% _a	15.5% _a	17.0% _a	15.5% _a	11.5% _a	21.2% _a	12.1% _a	15.2% _{a,b}	27.2% _b	12.5% _a	11.7% _a	21.8% _a	21.1% _a	14.6% _a	17.1% _a	14.8% _a	13.5% _a	16.9% _a	22.4% _a	18.7% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	425	190	224	121	102	99	93	76	186	153	119	147	92	78	328	353	44	137	175	52	38

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		E	ducation Leve		Ar	nual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	3.6% ¹	3.3% _a	3.8% _a	6.5% _a	3.5% _a	2.5% _a	0.7% _a	0.6% _a	5.4% _b	8.0% _b	0.9%a	3.3% _a	5.9% _a	0.0% ²	3.3% _a	3.0% _a	8.1% _a	3.5%a	2.4% _a	8.5% _a	0.0% ²
	Good	27.1% ¹	23.6% _a	30.6% _a	34.2% _a	22.8%a	24.4% _a	27.6% _a	30.9% _a	24.6% _a	21.6% _a	22.5%a	25.2% _a	20.9% _a	0.0% ²	28.6% _a	28.4% _a	14.7% _a	22.4% _a	25.5% _a	35.9% _a	38.2% _a
Availability of behavioral	Fair	29.9% ¹	32.6% _a	27.4% _a	30.9% _a	25.5% _a	29.2% _a	38.8% _a	30.9% _a	30.4% _a	26.8% _a	29.5% _{a,b}	39.1% _a	19.0% _b	50.6% _a	30.3% _a	30.3% _a	36.7% _a	27.5% _a	33.1% _a	20.1% _a	47.6% _a
health services	Poor	25.2% ¹	21.1% _a	28.6% _a	20.8% _{a,b}	35.9%a	21.6% _{a,b}	14.5% _b	20.7% _a	28.0% _a	32.1% _a	29.8% _a	19.6% _a	32.8% _a	31.8% _a	24.0% _a	25.2% _a	9.9% _a	31.1% _a	23.4% _a	21.1% _a	12.9% _a
	Don't Know	14.2% ¹	19.4% _a	9.5% _b	7.6% _a	12.3% _{a,b}	22.3% _b	18.4% _{a,b}	16.8% _a	11.7% _a	11.5% _a	17.3% _a	12.8% _a	21.5% _a	17.6% _a	13.8% _a	13.1% _a	30.7% _b	15.6% _a	15.5% _a	14.4% _a	1.2% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	346	129	215	42	113	95	95	72	156	118	79	123	71	9	319	325	13	134	138	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		I	Education Leve		A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	3.8% ¹	4.3% _a	3.4% _a	10.5% _a	0.4% _b	0.0% ²	1.5% _{a,b}	3.9% _a	5.6% _a	0.6% _a	7.7% _a	2.0% _a	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	4.0% _a	3.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.4%a	7.0% _b	3.6% _{a,b}	5.0% _{a,b}
	Good	19.3% ¹	23.1% _a	15.8% _a	19.4% _a	18.0% _a	17.0% _a	21.8% _a	17.3% _a	21.7% _a	19.7% _a	27.2% _a	10.7% _b	21.1% _{a,b}	34.0% _a	19.3% _a	17.3% _a	45.0% _b	14.4% _a	26.8% _a	20.1% _a	14.8% _a
Availability of behavioral	Fair	28.9% ¹	23.9% _a	34.1% _b	28.9% _a	28.8% _a	25.8% _a	32.5% _a	27.5% _a	26.3% _a	34.4% _a	17.1% _a	38.6% _b	28.1% _{a,b}	0.0% ²	28.7% _a	29.3% _a	24.0% _a	23.1% _a	27.3% _a	37.8% _a	33.1% _a
health services	Poor	29.2% ¹	25.4% _a	31.7% _a	23.9% _a	37.1% _a	33.2% _a	20.1% _a	24.4% _a	33.1% _a	31.2% _a	25.2% _a	32.7% _a	36.3% _a	43.5% _a	28.9% _a	28.9% _a	27.0% _a	29.7% _a	29.3% _a	28.5% _a	24.0% _a
	Don't Know	18.9% ¹	23.3% _a	15.1% _b	17.3% _a	15.7% _a	24.1%a	24.1% _a	26.9% _a	13.4% _b	14.1% _{a,b}	22.8% _a	16.0%a	13.9% _a	22.5%a	19.2% _a	20.9% _a	4.0% _b	32.4% _a	9.5% _b	9.9% _b	23.1% _{a,b}
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	385	149	230	47	123	117	94	72	170	140	103	129	94	8	366	359	13	117	150	74	35

Table 20		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	Groups		I	Education Leve	əl	A	Annual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	Ethnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 29		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	3.7% ¹	5.7% _a	1.5% _b	7.0% _a	0.3% _b	0.0% ²	3.2% _{a,b}	4.1% _a	3.1% _a	2.7% _a	7.4% _a	0.3% _b	1.9% _{a,b}	9.6% _a	1.9% _b	2.3% _a	10.1% _ь	1.7% _a	3.0% _a	6.8% _a	6.6% _a
	Good	30.2% ¹	28.3% _a	33.1% _a	23.6% _a	29.2% _{a,b}	42.5% _b	46.0% _{b,c}	24.7% _a	31.8% _{a,b}	41.1% _b	22.2% _a	41.1% _b	30.1% _{a,b}	17.9% _a	33.7% _b	33.0% _a	18.5% _b	33.1% _a	32.2% _a	30.5% _a	18.2% _a
The downtown of	Fair	40.2% ¹	41.3% _a	38.2% _a	41.7% _a	41.5% _a	35.9% _a	35.9% _a	44.8% _a	33.9% _a	41.2% _a	36.8% _a	39.4% _a	47.4% _a	35.4% _a	42.8% _a	40.1% _a	44.9% _a	40.5% _a	39.9% _a	45.3% _a	41.8% _a
Watertown	Poor	19.3% ¹	16.3% _a	23.6% _b	20.1% _a	24.6% _a	13.6% _a	12.5% _a	17.6% _{a,b}	26.0% _a	13.4% _b	22.0% _a	18.1% _a	17.1% _a	23.6% _a	18.2% _a	20.4% _a	12.2% _a	19.8% _a	19.9% _a	11.2% _a	23.7% _a
	Don't Know	6.6% ¹	8.4% _a	3.6% _b	7.6% _a	4.3% _a	8.0%a	2.4%a	8.9% _a	5.1% _{a,b}	1.6% _b	11.6% _a	1.1% _b	3.6% _{a,b}	13.5% _a	3.5% _b	4.2% _a	14.3% _b	5.0%a	4.9% _a	6.2% _a	9.7% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	416	186	220	121	97	95	94	76	185	146	118	145	87	79	319	344	45	133	173	49	38

		Jefferson Countv	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	3.7% ¹	5.7% _a	1.5% _b	7.0% _a	0.3% _b	0.0% ²	3.2% _{a,b}	4.1% _a	3.1% _a	2.7% _a	7.4% _a	0.3% _b	1.9% _{a,b}	9.6%a	1.9% _b	2.3% _a	10.1% _b	1.7% _a	3.0% _a	6.8% _a	6.6% _a
	Good	30.2% ¹	28.3% _a	33.1% _a	23.6% _a	29.2% _{a,b}	42.5% _b	46.0% _{b,c}	24.7% _a	31.8% _{a,b}	41.1% _b	22.2% _a	41.1% _b	30.1% _{a,b}	17.9% _a	33.7% _b	33.0% _a	18.5% _b	33.1% _a	32.2% _a	30.5% _a	18.2% _a
The downtown of	Fair	40.2% ¹	41.3% _a	38.2% _a	41.7% _a	41.5% _a	35.9% _a	35.9% _a	44.8% _a	33.9% _a	41.2% _a	36.8% _a	39.4% _a	47.4% _a	35.4% _a	42.8% _a	40.1% _a	44.9% _a	40.5% _a	39.9% _a	45.3% _a	41.8% _a
Watertown	Poor	19.3% ¹	16.3% _a	23.6% _a	20.1% _a	24.6% _a	13.6% _a	12.5% _a	17.6% _a	26.0% _a	13.4% _a	22.0%a	18.1% _a	17.1% _a	23.6% _a	18.2% _a	20.4% _a	12.2% _a	19.8% _a	19.9% _a	11.2% _a	23.7% _a
	Don't Know	6.6% ¹	8.4% _a	3.6% _b	7.6% _a	4.3% _a	8.0% _a	2.4% _a	8.9% _a	5.1% _a	1.6% _a	11.6% _a	1.1% _b	3.6% _{a,b}	13.5% _a	3.5% _b	4.2% _a	14.3% _b	5.0% _a	4.9% _a	6.2% _a	9.7% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	416	186	220	121	97	95	94	76	185	146	118	145	87	79	319	344	45	133	173	49	38

Table 20		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	H	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 30		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	7.4% ¹	9.2% _a	5.5% _b	6.7% _a	7.2% _a	5.2% _a	11.7% _a	9.2% _a	5.9% _a	6.1% _a	9.5% _a	3.8% _b	5.0% _{a,b}	10.4% _a	7.1% _a	7.0% _a	11.1% _a	9.0% _a	7.0% _a	5.0% _a	8.0% _a
	Good	40.6% ¹	44.3%a	37.4% _b	33.6% _a	35.9% _a	55.4% _b	54.1% _b	37.7% _a	39.8% _{a,b}	49.3% _b	33.9% _a	43.2% _b	46.8% _b	30.1% _a	41.8% _b	42.1%a	31.9% _b	46.4% _a	36.8% _b	44.3% _{a,b}	31.5% _b
The overall quality of life in	Fair	36.6% ¹	33.9% _a	39.4% _a	42.7% _a	37.6% _{a,b}	28.5% _b	26.9% _{b,c}	36.5% _a	36.1% _a	36.6% _a	39.3% _a	35.5% _a	41.1% _a	44.8%a	35.3% _b	36.1% _a	41.6% _a	35.4% _a	37.9% _a	38.0% _a	35.1% _a
the area	Poor	14.4% ¹	11.8% _a	16.6% _b	15.3% _a	18.7% _a	10.8% _{a,b}	6.8% _b	16.1% _a	17.2% _a	6.4% _b	16.9% _a	16.5% _a	5.6% _b	10.5%a	15.4% _a	13.8% _a	14.8% _a	8.8% _a	17.2% _{b,c}	11.3% _{a,b}	24.3% _c
	Don't Know	0.9% ¹	0.8% _a	1.1% _a	1.7% _a	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.5%a	0.5% _a	1.0% _a	1.6% _a	0.5% _a	1.1% _a	1.5% _a	4.2% _a	0.5% _b	1.0%a	0.5% _a	0.5%a	1.1% _a	1.4% _a	1.0%a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1125	456	651	210	327	301	273	214	496	404	297	388	255	96	985	1008	70	371	453	176	91

		Jefferson Countv	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		I	Education Leve	4	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	9.4% ¹	12.5% _a	5.9% _b	9.0% _a	11.3% _a	6.4% _a	8.7% _a	12.2% _a	6.6% _a	7.5% _a	12.2% _a	5.5% _a	5.5% _a	12.1%a	8.6% _a	8.7% _a	14.4% _a	10.3% _a	7.8% _a	9.4% _a	13.2% _a
	Good	39.8% ¹	43.1% _a	36.1% _a	30.7% _a	36.2% _a	57.8% _b	64.3% _b	33.3% _a	44.4% _a	46.6% _a	27.6%a	50.7% _b	46.8% _b	27.2% _a	42.9% _b	42.3% _a	25.4% _b	48.9% _a	35.1% _a	37.1% _a	31.9% _a
The overall quality of life in	Fair	37.2% ¹	34.5% _a	39.9% _a	45.4% _a	34.1% _{a,b}	27.0% _{a,b}	23.8% _b	40.0% _a	33.4% _a	36.5% _a	39.5% _a	33.9% _a	41.6% _a	47.6% _a	33.9% _b	35.2% _a	45.1% _a	37.4% _a	37.8% _a	41.4% _a	32.2% _a
the area	Poor	12.5% ¹	9.2% _a	16.7% _b	12.8% _{a,b}	18.4% _a	8.8% _{a,b}	2.2% _b	13.3% _a	14.7% _a	8.1% _a	19.7% _a	8.0% _b	6.1% _b	9.0%a	14.4% _a	12.6% _a	14.2% _a	3.0%a	17.9% _b	12.1% _{a,b}	20.2% _b
	Don't Know	1.1% ¹	0.8% _a	1.5% _a	2.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	1.2% _a	0.9% _a	1.3% _a	0.9% _a	2.0% _a	0.0% ²	4.1% _a	0.2% _b	1.2% _a	0.9% _a	0.4% _a	1.4% _a	0.0% ²	2.5% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	428	190	228	123	102	99	95	77	189	154	123	147	93	80	330	357	45	140	175	53	38

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	1	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	12.7% ¹	14.4% _a	10.6% _a	16.4% _a	10.3% _a	6.1% _a	18.5% _a	17.1% _a	9.9%a	6.2% _a	7.7% _a	9.7% _a	6.2% _a	0.0% ²	13.2% _a	13.1% _a	10.2% _a	12.9% _a	9.5% _a	7.2% _a	36.5% _b
	Good	55.3% ¹	54.0% _a	56.6% _a	52.6% _a	49.9% _a	66.7% _a	59.6% _a	53.0% _a	54.1% _a	63.1% _a	54.0% _a	55.9% _a	79.5% _b	20.1% _a	55.0% _a	54.0% _a	70.1% _a	64.1% _a	55.2% _a	55.2% _a	19.0% _b
The overall quality of life in	Fair	26.0% ¹	25.7% _a	26.7% _a	21.6% _a	34.3% _a	22.6% _a	18.5% _a	27.6% _a	27.2% _a	20.4% _a	26.5% _{a,b}	33.0% _a	12.2% _b	49.5% _a	26.2% _a	26.5%a	19.8% _a	20.6% _a	27.3% _a	29.8% _a	36.0% _a
the area	Poor	5.3% ¹	5.9% _a	4.8% _a	7.4% _a	5.4% _a	4.7% _a	2.4% _a	2.3% _a	8.2% _a	7.6% _a	11.4% _a	1.2% _b	2.0% _{a,b}	30.4% _a	4.8% _b	5.6% _a	0.0% ²	2.2% _a	7.8% _a	4.5% _a	8.5% _a
	Don't Know	0.7% ¹	0.0% ²	1.4% _a	2.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	2.7% _a	0.4%a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.3%a	0.2% _a	3.3% _a	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	330	122	206	42	109	88	90	67	150	113	75	118	70	8	307	310	12	121	135	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		E	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Excellent	4.1% ¹	4.6% _a	3.7% _a	1.6% _a	2.7% _{a,b}	4.1% _{a,b}	12.2% _b	3.6% _a	4.4% _a	4.8% _a	6.2% _a	0.9%a	4.3% _a	0.0% ²	4.4% _a	3.8% _a	5.6% _a	6.4%a	5.2% _a	2.2% _a	0.3% _a
	Good	37.9% ¹	43.4% _a	33.7% _a	34.0% _a	31.9% _a	50.5% _a	45.0% _a	38.2% _{a,b}	32.2% _a	48.9% _b	37.9% _a	33.5% _a	40.4% _a	52.9% _a	37.7% _a	38.8% _a	38.1% _a	38.8% _a	33.8% _a	45.7% _a	32.7% _a
The overall quality of life in	Fair	38.6% ¹	35.1% _a	42.2% _a	43.1% _a	41.4% _a	31.4% _a	31.4% _a	35.1% _a	40.7% _a	40.2% _a	41.7% _a	37.5% _a	46.3% _a	24.3% _a	38.6% _a	39.3% _a	38.5% _a	37.7% _a	41.1% _a	38.0% _a	37.3% _a
the area	Poor	18.6% ¹	15.9% _a	19.6% _a	20.4% _a	22.5% _a	14.0% _a	11.5% _a	23.0% _a	21.5% _a	4.5% _b	14.2% _a	27.6% _b	5.8% _a	17.3% _a	18.7% _a	17.1% _a	17.7% _a	16.4% _a	19.0% _a	12.3% _a	29.6% _a
	Don't Know	0.8% ¹	1.0% _a	0.7% _a	1.0% _a	1.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.3% _a	1.5%a	0.0% ²	0.5%a	3.1% _a	5.5%a	0.7% _a	0.9% _a	0.0% ²	0.6%a	0.9% _a	1.7% _a	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	367	144	217	45	116	114	88	70	157	137	99	123	92	8	348	341	13	110	143	70	35

Table 21		Tr-County Combined	Ger	nder		Age G	Groups		E	ducation Leve	I	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 51		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Right direction	13.8% ¹	13.5% _a	14.1% _a	17.6% _a	8.7% _b	13.3% _{a,b}	14.8% _{a,b}	13.1% _a	10.0% _a	21.1% _b	15.3% _a	11.7% _a	11.5% _a	22.5% _a	11.9% _b	11.7% _a	26.7% _b	7.0% _a	16.0% _b	22.8% _b	12.1% _{a,b}
Direction of the Country	Wrong direction	72.9% ¹	70.7% _a	74.9% _a	60.7% _a	83.9% _b	80.2% _b	74.6% _b	70.6% _a	79.8% _b	66.1% _a	63.4% _a	79.3% _b	80.3% _b	44.1% _a	77.5% _b	76.6% _a	53.0% _b	86.3% _a	71.0% _b	61.5% _{b,c}	59.4% _c
Direction of the country	Don't Know	13.3% ¹	15.8% _a	11.0% _b	21.7% _a	7.4% _b	6.4% _b	10.5% _b	16.2% _a	10.3% _b	12.8% _{a,b}	21.3% _a	9.0% _b	8.2% _b	33.4% _a	10.6% _b	11.8% _a	20.3% _b	6.7% _a	13.0% _b	15.7% _b	28.5% _c
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1159	474	672	215	338	311	286	223	515	414	307	401	259	100	1021	1048	73	391	466	181	92

		Jefferson County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve		A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Right direction	14.9% ¹	15.1% _a	14.3% _a	18.0% _a	10.7% _a	11.3% _a	15.5% _a	13.6% _a	13.8% _a	17.6% _a	14.3% _a	13.8% _a	11.8% _a	21.1% _a	10.9% _b	11.4% _a	27.0% _b	7.3%a	13.1% _a	34.8% _b	18.1% _{a,b}
Direction of the Country	Wrong direction	68.2% ¹	61.8% _a	75.5% _b	55.7% _a	81.7% _b	82.8% _b	69.3% _{a,b}	62.7% _a	75.0% _b	70.1% _{a,b}	53.7% _a	78.7% _b	82.0% _b	42.6% _a	78.1% _b	76.2% _a	42.7% _b	81.4% _a	72.4% _{a,b}	51.6% _{b,c}	39.0% _c
Direction of the obtainly	Don't Know	16.9% ¹	23.1% _a	10.1% _b	26.4% _a	7.6% _b	6.0% _b	15.1% _{a,b}	23.7% _a	11.2% _b	12.3% _{a,b}	32.0% _a	7.4% _b	6.2% _b	36.3% _a	11.1% _b	12.4% _a	30.3% _b	11.3% _a	14.4% _a	13.5% _a	42.9% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	424	194	225	124	103	98	95	77	188	155	122	149	93	82	330	357	47	140	176	53	38

		Lewis County	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	el .	A	nnual HH Incor	ne	Active Mili	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 -	Over \$100 000	Yes AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the	Liberal	Don't Know
		Participants	indie	remaie	10 00	40 00		101			4118	00 10 400,000	\$100,000	0101 \$100,000	100, 740 1111		TTILLE	500	o onio on valino	Road	Elborta	Bontraion
	Right direction	10.6% ¹	11.4% _a	10.0% _a	10.2% _{a,b}	4.8% _a	20.0% _b	12.2% _{a,b}	12.1% _a	6.1% _a	13.9% _a	11.6% _a	10.5% _a	12.7% _a	0.0% ²	10.8% _a	10.9% _a	1.3% _a	7.9% _a	10.6% _a	21.0% _a	0.6% _a
Direction of the Country	Wrong direction	80.2% ¹	79.7% _a	81.1% _a	77.0% _a	91.7% _b	69.3% _a	73.9% _a	81.0% _a	80.5% _a	77.8% _a	79.2% _a	77.7% _a	85.4% _a	80.9% _a	80.3% _a	81.0% _a	65.6% _a	86.2% _a	76.6% _{a,b}	66.4% _b	96.0% _a
Direction of the oountry	Don't Know	9.2% ¹	9.0%a	9.0%a	12.8% _{a,b}	3.5% _a	10.6% _{a,b}	14.0% _b	6.8% _a	13.4% _a	8.3% _a	9.1% _a	11.7% _a	1.9% _a	19.1%a	8.8% _a	8.1% _a	33.1% _b	5.9%a	12.8% _a	12.6% _a	3.4% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	347	130	215	43	113	95	95	73	155	119	80	123	72	9	322	328	13	134	139	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups		E	ducation Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Incor	ne	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	oliefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Right direction	13.4% ¹	12.2% _a	15.0% _a	18.5% _a	8.1% _a	13.0% _a	15.0% _a	12.9% _a	7.2% _a	26.0% _b	17.4% _a	10.3% _a	11.0% _a	34.9% _a	12.9% _b	12.1% _a	29.8% _b	6.4% _a	21.6% _b	17.3% _{a,b}	8.6% _{a,b}
Direction of the Country	Wrong direction	75.7% ¹	78.1% _a	72.7% _a	64.4% _a	83.6% _b	81.5% _{a,b}	78.5% _{a,b}	76.0% _a	84.0%a	59.7% _b	72.2% _a	80.2% _a	77.6% _a	47.7% _a	76.4% _b	75.7% _a	70.2% _a	90.8% _a	67.5% _b	65.4% _b	71.7% _b
Direction of the country	Don't Know	10.8% ¹	9.7% _a	12.3% _a	17.1% _a	8.2% _a	5.5% _a	6.4% _a	11.1% _a	8.8% _a	14.3% _a	10.4% _a	9.5% _a	11.4% _a	17.5% _a	10.7% _a	12.2% _a	0.0% ²	2.8% _a	10.9% _{a,b}	17.3% _b	19.7% _{b,c}
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	388	150	232	48	122	118	96	73	172	140	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	117	151	75	36

Table 22		Tr-County Combined	Ger	nder		Age G	Groups		E	ducation Leve	I	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	hnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 52		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Right direction	18.5% ¹	19.9% _a	17.1% _a	22.6% _a	14.3% _b	19.4% _{a,b}	16.6% _{a,b}	19.3% _a	16.2% _a	20.7% _a	21.7% _a	16.6% _{a,b}	12.1% _b	26.9% _a	17.3% _b	17.0% _a	28.7% _b	4.5% _a	18.6% _b	54.3% _c	15.8% _b
Direction of New York State	Wrong direction	67.1% ¹	65.6% _a	68.2% _a	56.2% _a	75.6% _b	74.1% _b	67.9% _b	62.4% _a	72.8% _b	66.4% _{a,b}	57.6%a	75.6% _b	75.6% _b	36.8% _a	71.3% _b	69.8% _a	47.4% _b	86.3% _a	68.4% _b	28.7% _c	55.4% _d
Direction of New York State	Don't Know	14.5% ¹	14.5%a	14.7% _a	21.1% _a	10.1% _{b,c}	6.5% _b	15.5% _{a,c}	18.3% _a	11.0% _b	12.8% _{a,b}	20.7% _a	7.8% _b	12.4% _b	36.3% _a	11.3% _b	13.2% _a	23.9% _b	9.3%a	13.0% _a	17.0% _{a,b}	28.8% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1158	473	672	214	338	311	286	223	514	414	307	401	259	100	1021	1047	72	391	465	180	93

		Jefferson County	Ger	nder		Age G	Broups		E	ducation Leve	1	A	nnual HH Incor	ne	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Right direction	18.8% ¹	18.6% _a	18.3% _a	19.8% _a	17.0% _a	21.3% _a	16.8% _a	23.5% _a	14.0% _a	16.2% _a	23.4% _a	18.5% _a	11.0% _a	25.0% _a	16.9% _a	14.8% _a	35.1% _b	4.0%a	21.4% _b	47.3% _c	24.6% _{b,c}
Direction of New York State	Wrong direction	61.5% ¹	60.3% _a	63.3% _a	51.5% _a	69.7% _b	69.0% _{a,b}	70.5% _{a,b}	51.6%a	69.5% _b	69.1% _b	50.2% _a	71.0% _b	73.1% _b	35.1% _a	70.2% _b	69.4% _a	28.4% _b	79.9% _a	64.2% _b	29.7% _c	30.6% _c
Direction of New York State	Don't Know	19.7% ¹	21.1%a	18.3% _a	28.7% _a	13.3% _b	9.7% _b	12.7% _{a,b}	24.9% _a	16.5%a	14.6% _a	26.4%a	10.5% _b	15.9% _{a,b}	39.9% _a	12.9% _b	15.8%a	36.5% _b	16.0%a	14.5% _a	23.1% _{a,b}	44.7% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	424	194	225	124	103	98	95	77	188	155	122	149	93	82	330	356	47	140	176	52	39

		Lewis County	Gei	nder		Age G	roups			Education Leve	el .	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 -	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the	Liberal	Don't Know
		Participants											\$100,000							Road		
	Right direction	13.4% ¹	8.4% _a	18.0% _b	24.7% _a	11.0% _b	5.7% _b	11.0% _{a,b}	10.1% _a	14.2% _a	20.7% _a	7.4% _a	12.4% _{a,b}	22.3% _b	0.0% ²	13.6% _a	13.6% _a	4.5% _a	4.7% _a	9.2%a	52.2% _b	0.6%a
Direction of New York State	Wrong direction	78.8% ¹	84.3% _a	73.6% _b	69.3% _a	83.6% _{a,b}	87.3% _b	72.8% _{a,b}	83.2% _a	79.1% _{a,b}	66.9% _b	80.8% _a	79.6% _a	72.8% _a	85.0% _a	78.4% _a	79.6% _a	64.6% _a	91.1% _a	79.6% _b	36.7% _c	96.2% _{a,b}
Direction of New York State	Don't Know	7.8% ¹	7.3% _a	8.3% _a	6.0% _a	5.4% _a	6.9% _a	16.2% _a	6.7% _a	6.7% _a	12.4% _a	11.9% _a	8.0% _a	4.9% _a	15.0% _a	8.0% _a	6.8% _a	30.8% _b	4.2%a	11.3% _a	11.1% _a	3.2% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	346	129	215	42	113	95	95	73	154	119	80	123	72	9	322	328	12	134	138	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	I	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Right direction	19.4% ¹	23.9% _a	15.7% _b	26.0% _a	12.8% _b	22.1% _{a,b}	17.9% _{a,b}	17.7% _a	18.6% _a	25.0% _a	22.5% _a	16.2% _a	11.1% _a	43.0% _a	18.6% _b	19.8% _a	20.0% _a	4.8% _a	17.4% _b	57.8% _c	10.1% _{a,b}
Direction of New York State	Wrong direction	69.6% ¹	66.9% _a	71.2% _a	60.1% _a	78.5% _b	74.0% _{a,b}	64.8% _{a,b}	67.4% _a	74.6% _a	63.8% _a	62.2% _a	78.3% _b	78.4% _{a,b}	39.5% _a	70.5% _b	67.7% _a	80.0% _a	90.6% _a	71.1% _b	26.7% _c	71.5% _b
Direction of New York State	Don't Know	11.0% ¹	9.3% _a	13.1% _a	13.9% _a	8.7% _a	3.9% _a	17.3% _a	14.9% _a	6.8% _a	11.2% _a	15.3% _a	5.5% _b	10.5% _{a,b}	17.5% _a	10.9% _a	12.4% _a	0.0% ²	4.6% _a	11.5% _{a,b}	15.5% _{a,b}	18.4% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	388	150	232	48	122	118	96	73	172	140	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	117	151	75	36

Table 22		Tr-County Combined	Gen	ıder		Age G	Groups		E	ducation Leve	4	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	hnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 55		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Right direction	33.9% ¹	34.8% _a	33.3% _a	30.2% _a	31.6% _a	39.3% _{a,b}	44.1% _b	30.9% _a	34.2% _{a,b}	40.1% _b	32.8% _a	33.6% _a	30.9% _a	29.3% _a	34.1% _a	34.4% _a	30.4% _a	33.8% _a	34.9% _a	44.1% _a	17.9% _b
Direction of Your County	Wrong direction	39.8% ¹	37.5% _a	41.6% _a	34.3% _a	48.1% _b	43.5% _{a,b}	33.4% _a	36.7% _a	45.6% _b	35.7% _a	34.6% _a	46.1% _b	43.1% _{a,b}	18.2% _a	43.5% _b	41.4% _a	28.5% _b	42.7% _a	39.3% _a	36.4% _a	39.9% _a
Direction of Your County	Don't Know	26.4% ¹	27.7% _a	25.1% _a	35.5% _a	20.3% _b	17.2% _b	22.5% _b	32.4% _a	20.3% _b	24.2% _{a,b}	32.6% _a	20.3% _b	26.0% _{a,b}	52.5% _a	22.4% _b	24.3% _a	41.1% _b	23.5% _a	25.8% _a	19.5% _a	42.2% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1158	473	672	215	337	311	286	223	514	414	307	400	259	100	1020	1047	72	390	465	181	93

		Jefferson County	Gen	ıder		Age G	roups		E	Education Leve	el	A	nnual HH Incor	ne	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Right direction	33.6% ¹	33.6% _a	33.2% _a	26.3% _a	39.0% _{a,b}	45.7% _b	37.2% _{a,b}	33.3% _a	30.1% _a	40.1% _a	29.2% _a	39.1% _a	29.2% _a	22.1% _a	37.0% _b	36.2% _a	19.3% _b	35.6% _{a,b}	30.9% _{a,b}	49.2% _a	21.7% _b
Direction of Your County	Wrong direction	32.0% ¹	25.2% _a	40.1% _b	25.6% _a	35.7% _{a,b}	46.8% _b	33.3% _{a,b}	24.1% _a	41.5% _b	34.1% _{a,b}	27.4% _a	33.5% _a	41.4% _a	17.5% _a	37.5% _b	35.0% _a	20.4% _b	34.7% _a	35.8% _a	28.9% _a	19.6% _a
Direction of Your County	Don't Know	34.4% ¹	41.2%a	26.7% _b	48.0% _a	25.3% _b	7.5% _c	29.5% _{a,b}	42.6% _a	28.4% _b	25.9% _b	43.4%a	27.3% _b	29.4% _{a,b}	60.4% _a	25.5% _b	28.8% _a	60.3% _b	29.8% _a	33.2% _a	21.9%a	58.7% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	424	194	225	124	103	98	95	78	187	155	122	149	93	82	330	357	46	139	176	53	39

		Lewis County	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	el .	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Right direction	37.2% ¹	29.5% _a	43.9% _b	42.1% _a	32.1% _a	37.5% _a	40.3% _a	35.7% _a	35.1% _a	44.3% _a	33.3% _a	36.3% _a	48.4% _a	18.0% _a	38.1% _a	38.2% _a	8.6% _b	32.8% _a	38.2% _{a,b}	53.7% _b	24.2% _{a,b}
Direction of Your County	Wrong direction	41.3% ¹	47.8% _a	35.3% _b	37.2% _a	48.9% _a	35.2% _a	38.1% _a	43.7% _a	42.4% _a	33.3% _a	41.1% _a	40.3% _a	34.8% _a	42.4% _a	41.2% _a	41.1% _a	54.4% _a	43.0% _a	44.5% _a	25.6% _a	48.7% _a
Direction of Your County	Don't Know	21.5% ¹	22.7% _a	20.7% _a	20.7% _a	19.0% _a	27.3% _a	21.6% _a	20.6% _a	22.4% _a	22.4% _a	25.6% _a	23.4% _a	16.8% _a	39.6% _a	20.8% _a	20.7% _a	37.0% _a	24.2% _a	17.3% _a	20.7% _a	27.0% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	347	130	215	43	113	95	95	73	155	119	80	123	72	9	322	328	13	134	139	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups		E	ducation Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Incor	ne	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	oliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Right direction	33.3% ¹	37.3% _a	30.6% _a	33.2% _{a,b}	25.2% _a	34.7% _{a,b}	49.9% _b	27.1% _a	37.7% _a	39.2% _a	37.2% _a	28.2% _a	29.1% _a	76.7% _a	31.0% _b	31.8% _a	53.7% _b	32.5% _a	39.6% _a	39.7% _a	14.0% _b
Direction of Your County	Wrong direction	47.1% ¹	48.3% _a	44.6% _a	45.4% _{a,b}	58.4% _a	43.4% _{a,b}	32.2% _b	48.1%a	50.0%a	37.7% _a	42.3% _a	58.3% _b	46.3% _{a,b}	18.6% _a	48.5% _b	47.1% _a	39.4% _a	49.8% _a	42.7% _a	42.1% _a	56.2% _a
Direction of Your County	Don't Know	19.6% ¹	14.4% _a	24.8% _b	21.4% _a	16.4% _a	21.8% _a	17.8% _a	24.8% _a	12.3% _b	23.1% _{a,b}	20.5% _a	13.6% _a	24.6% _a	4.7% _a	20.4% _a	21.1% _a	6.9% _b	17.7% _a	17.7% _a	18.2% _a	29.9% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	387	149	232	48	121	118	96	72	172	140	105	128	94	9	368	362	13	117	150	75	36

Table 24		Tr-County Combined	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	el	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 34		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Better	11.1% ¹	13.9% _a	8.5% _b	12.2% _a	12.5% _a	9.0% _a	8.1% _a	8.5% _a	10.3% _a	17.9% _b	7.7% _a	8.3% _a	23.4% _b	13.6% _a	10.8% _a	9.5% _a	24.5% _b	10.4% _{a,c,d}	10.0% _{a,b}	18.1% _c	6.8% _{b,d}
Has you or your family's personal financial situation	Same	47.9% ¹	44.5% _a	51.0% _b	49.7% _{a,b}	41.6% _a	50.1% _{a,b}	55.5% _b	51.7% _a	41.2% _b	52.2% _a	46.9% _a	48.1% _a	40.0% _a	40.8% _a	49.2% _a	48.6% _a	40.5% _a	41.7% _a	53.1% _b	51.0% _{a,b}	47.0% _{a,b}
gotten better, stayed about	Worse	38.9% ¹	38.4% _a	39.4% _a	32.6% _a	45.5% _b	40.9% _{a,b}	36.5% _{a,b}	36.3% _a	47.1% _b	29.0% _a	40.9% _a	42.4% _a	35.5% _a	34.0% _a	39.2% _a	40.4% _a	27.4% _b	47.0% _a	35.4% _b	29.6% _b	38.0% _{a,b}
the same, or gotten worse i the past 12 months?	n Don't Know	2.2% ¹	3.3% _a	1.1% _b	5.5% _a	0.3% _b	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	3.4% _a	1.4% _a	0.9% _a	4.4% _a	1.1% _b	1.0% _{a,b}	11.7% _a	0.8% _b	1.5% _a	7.7% _b	0.9%a	1.4% _a	1.3%a	8.2% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1155	471	671	214	338	310	284	223	513	412	308	400	259	100	1019	1045	72	391	464	181	92

		Jefferson County	Gei	nder		Age G	roups		I	Education Leve	el	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	oliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Better	9.9% ¹	13.4% _a	6.0% _b	14.2% _a	6.7% _a	9.6% _a	1.7% _a	7.5% _a	9.7% _a	14.4% _a	9.3% _a	6.0% _a	21.6% _b	14.8% _a	8.6%a	8.0% _a	20.2% _b	10.0% _a	9.5%a	6.9% _a	10.0% _a
personal financial situation	Same	48.1% ¹	42.4% _a	53.9% _b	47.9% _a	43.9% _a	52.9% _a	53.5% _a	50.1% _a	45.2% _a	48.8% _a	43.8%a	45.4% _a	46.8% _a	40.1% _a	50.9% _a	48.3% _a	40.6% _a	35.8% _a	59.1% _b	60.8% _b	28.3% _a
gotten better, stayed about	Worse	38.1% ¹	37.5% _a	39.1% _a	29.5% _a	48.9% _b	37.5% _{a,b}	44.8% _{a,b}	35.6% _a	43.2% _a	35.1% _a	38.5%a	45.7% _a	31.7% _a	31.3% _a	39.7% _a	41.3% _a	26.8% _b	52.0% _a	28.9% _b	32.3% _{a,b}	44.9% _{a,b}
the same, or gotten worse in the past 12 months?	Don't Know	4.0% ¹	6.7% _a	1.0% _b	8.4% _a	0.6% _b	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	6.8% _a	1.9% _a	1.6% _a	8.4% _a	2.9% _a	0.0% ²	13.8% _a	0.9% _b	2.5% _a	12.4% _b	2.2% _a	2.5% _a	0.0% ²	16.8% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	424	193	226	124	103	99	94	77	189	154	123	149	93	82	330	357	47	141	176	53	38

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		I	Education Leve	I	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Better	11.0% ¹	15.4% _a	7.2% _b	8.8% _a	13.3% _a	11.1% _a	9.2% _a	8.0% _a	11.2% _a	18.0% _a	6.4% _a	12.0% _{a,b}	21.0% _b	0.0% ²	11.9% _a	10.1% _a	32.5% _b	13.2% _a	10.2% _a	10.3% _a	3.8% _a
Has you or your family's personal financial situation	Same	42.8% ¹	31.6% _a	52.6% _b	45.4% _a	40.0% _a	36.9% _a	52.0% _a	46.6% _a	33.4% _a	48.8% _a	54.3% _a	43.3% _a	36.0% _a	50.2% _a	42.8% _a	43.8% _a	34.0% _a	36.2% _a	44.3% _{a,b}	60.7% _b	37.3% _{a,b}
gotten better, stayed about	Worse	44.1% ¹	51.6%a	37.5% _b	38.6% _a	46.0%a	52.0% _a	38.8% _a	42.4% _{a,b}	54.7% _a	31.2% _b	37.7% _a	44.7% _a	43.0% _a	49.8% _a	43.4% _a	43.9% _a	33.5% _a	50.6%a	44.4% _{a,b}	29.0% _b	41.3% _{a,b}
the same, or gotten worse in the past 12 months?	Don't Know	2.1% ¹	1.4% _a	2.7% _a	7.2% _a	0.6% _b	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	2.9% _a	0.7% _a	2.1% _a	1.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	2.0% _a	2.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.1% _a	0.0% ²	17.7% _b
•	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	345	128	215	42	113	94	95	73	153	119	80	123	72	9	321	327	12	134	138	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Ge	nder		Age G	Broups		1	Education Leve	el	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	oliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	sc	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Better	12.3% ¹	14.1% _a	11.0% _a	10.1% _a	17.3% _a	7.8% _a	12.2% _a	9.7% _a	10.6% _{a,b}	21.1% _b	6.0% _a	9.2% _a	25.6% _b	8.1% _a	12.3% _a	10.6% _a	31.2% _b	9.9% _a	10.6% _a	25.1% _b	4.5% _a
Has you or your family's personal financial situation	Same	48.9% ¹	49.7% _a	47.9% _a	53.1% _a	40.2% _a	51.8% _a	57.8% _a	54.9% _a	39.1% _b	56.2% _a	49.4% _{a,b}	51.7% _a	34.5% _b	43.4% _a	49.5%a	50.1% _a	41.1% _a	48.7% _a	47.4% _a	44.3% _a	63.6% _a
gotten better, stayed about	Worse	38.4% ¹	36.3% _a	40.2% _a	35.6% _a	42.6%a	40.4% _a	30.0% _a	35.4% _a	49.2% _b	22.7% _a	44.7% _a	39.1% _a	37.7% _a	48.5% _a	37.8% _a	38.7% _a	27.7% _a	41.3% _a	42.0% _a	28.4% _a	31.9%a
the same, or gotten worse i the past 12 months?	n Don't Know	0.4% ¹	0.0% ²	0.8%a	1.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	2.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	2.3% _a	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	386	150	230	48	122	117	95	73	171	139	105	128	94	9	368	361	13	116	150	75	36

Table 25		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	H	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 35		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Very good	16.3% ¹	18.9% _a	13.8% _b	17.1% _{a,b}	12.0% _a	14.3% _a	25.9% _b	22.1% _a	13.5% _b	9.0% _b	17.5% _a	10.7% _b	9.5% _b	12.6% _a	16.8% _a	15.6% _a	18.9% _a	19.4% _a	17.1% _a	15.1% _{a,b}	6.8% _b
	Fairly good	41.7% ¹	43.2% _a	40.4% _a	40.5% _a	39.3% _a	50.5% _a	40.4% _a	36.7% _a	45.5% _b	46.6% _b	40.5%a	45.0% _a	43.7% _a	39.2% _a	42.1% _a	42.8% _a	37.9% _a	47.2% _a	40.2% _a	36.5% _a	40.2% _a
Do you believe that your	Not very good	22.3% ¹	19.4% _a	24.5% _b	16.5% _a	26.5% _b	26.2% _b	24.3% _{a,b}	19.4% _a	20.0% _a	31.4% _b	16.9%a	24.7% _b	27.4% _b	16.4% _a	22.9% _a	23.4% _a	14.1% _b	20.1% _a	21.4% _a	28.8% _a	24.0% _a
grow old?	Definitely not good	14.6% ¹	12.4% _a	17.2% _b	18.5% _a	16.7% _a	7.2% _b	8.1% _b	14.8% _{a,b}	17.5% _a	9.7% _b	19.1% _a	15.8% _a	12.7% _a	14.3% _a	14.9% _a	13.9% _a	18.1% _a	10.2% _a	18.4% _b	11.8% _{a,b}	16.5% _{a,b}
	Don't know	5.1% ¹	6.0% _a	4.1%a	7.5% _a	5.5% _{a,b}	1.7% _b	1.3% _{b,c}	7.1% _a	3.6% _a	3.2% _a	6.0%a	3.8% _a	6.7% _a	17.5% _a	3.3% _b	4.3% _a	11.0% _b	3.0%a	3.0% _a	7.7% _{a,b}	12.5% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1160	473	674	216	338	311	286	224	516	413	308	402	258	101	1021	1048	73	391	466	181	93

		Jefferson County	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		1	Education Leve	6	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Very good	16.7% ¹	18.5% _a	15.1% _a	19.7% _a	12.2% _a	14.8% _a	18.8% _a	21.2% _a	14.7% _a	9.8% _a	14.1%a	13.2% _a	13.4% _a	11.5% _a	18.4% _a	16.6% _a	14.9% _a	18.7% _a	17.0% _a	12.7% _a	10.4% _a
	Fairly good	41.7% ¹	43.9% _a	38.6% _a	36.4% _a	44.3% _a	50.6% _a	46.1% _a	33.7% _a	47.0% _b	50.0% _b	39.9% _a	50.7% _a	43.6% _a	37.6% _a	43.1% _a	41.1% _a	44.8% _a	53.8%a	38.7% _{a,b}	34.1% _{a,b}	30.3% _b
Do you believe that your	Not very good	20.3% ¹	15.9% _a	25.5% _b	16.8% _a	20.2% _a	27.4% _a	27.6% _a	18.7% _a	17.8% _a	28.9% _a	16.6% _a	20.6% _a	24.3% _a	16.3% _a	21.3% _a	22.6% _a	12.9% _a	12.9% _a	20.4% _a	41.0% _b	25.2% _{a,b}
grow old?	Definitely not good	13.6% ¹	12.3% _a	15.2% _a	16.5% _a	16.3% _a	4.4%a	5.0%a	14.8% _a	16.5% _a	6.2% _a	20.1% _a	10.4% _{a,b}	7.8% _b	14.4% _a	13.5% _a	14.1% _a	9.8% _a	8.6% _a	18.5% _a	6.7% _a	14.4% _a
	Don't know	7.7% ¹	9.4% _a	5.6% _a	10.7% _a	7.0% _a	2.8% _a	2.4% _a	11.6% _a	3.9% _b	5.1% _{a,b}	9.3% _a	5.1% _a	10.9% _a	20.2% _a	3.7% _b	5.7% _a	17.6% _b	6.0% _a	5.4% _a	5.5% _{a,b}	19.7% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	425	193	227	125	103	98	95	78	189	154	123	150	92	83	330	357	47	140	176	53	39

		Lewis County	Gei	nder		Age G	Groups		1	Education Leve		A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Very good	20.9% ¹	25.7% _a	15.5% _b	15.6% _a	16.7% _a	17.9% _a	40.4% _b	21.7% _a	20.1% _a	20.1% _a	23.3% _a	17.2% _a	18.8% _a	25.5% _a	20.6% _a	20.2% _a	13.9% _a	28.0%a	17.2% _a	15.4% _a	11.7% _a
	Fairly good	50.2% ¹	47.0%a	53.6% _a	46.9% _a	52.7% _a	58.6% _a	40.0% _a	52.0% _a	44.3% _a	55.4% _a	43.3%a	58.2% _a	56.4%a	38.3% _a	49.9% _a	50.0% _a	66.9% _a	47.6% _a	53.3% _a	50.7% _a	50.3% _a
Do you believe that your	Not very good	18.6% ¹	17.9% _a	19.5% _a	19.2% _a	21.7% _a	12.8% _a	18.5% _a	18.5% _a	21.8% _a	13.9% _a	18.5% _a	16.9% _a	21.1% _a	9.0%a	19.7% _a	19.7% _a	9.3% _a	20.4% _a	19.3% _a	16.9% _a	11.3% _a
grow old?	Definitely not good	6.3% ¹	8.0%a	4.9% _a	5.2% _a	7.6% _a	10.5% _a	0.9% _a	5.0% _a	9.6% _a	4.3% _a	13.1% _a	4.3% _b	3.4% _{a,b}	11.2% _a	6.1% _a	6.1% _a	5.2% _a	3.4%a	9.1% _a	10.9% _a	0.0% ²
	Don't know	4.0% ¹	1.4%a	6.4% _b	13.1% _a	1.4% _b	0.2% _b	0.3% _b	2.9% _a	4.2% _a	6.3% _a	1.7% _a	3.4% _a	0.3% _a	16.0% _a	3.7% _a	4.1%a	4.7% _a	0.6%a	1.2% _a	6.0% _{a,b}	26.7% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	347	130	215	43	113	95	95	73	155	119	80	123	72	9	322	328	13	134	139	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Very good	14.7% ¹	17.9% _a	12.2% _a	13.8% _{a,b}	10.5% _a	12.9% _{a,b}	27.2% _b	23.1% _a	10.9% _b	5.8% _b	20.5% _a	6.8% _b	4.0% _b	17.5%a	14.7% _a	13.6% _a	26.9% _b	17.5% _a	17.2% _a	16.1% _{a,b}	3.2% _b
you believe that your	Fairly good	39.7% ¹	41.6% _a	38.7% _a	44.9% _a	31.6% _a	48.0% _a	36.5% _a	35.5% _a	44.3% _a	41.5% _a	40.7% _a	36.8% _a	41.4% _a	49.4% _a	39.5% _a	42.5% _a	20.9% _b	41.2% _a	38.5% _a	34.9% _a	47.3% _a
Do you believe that your	Not very good	25.2% ¹	23.4% _a	24.8% _a	15.5% _a	33.0% _b	29.4% _{a,b}	23.4% _{a,b}	20.4% _a	21.6% _a	37.6% _b	17.0% _a	30.2% _b	31.5% _{a,b}	18.4% _a	24.7% _a	25.2% _a	17.1% _a	26.6% _a	23.4% _a	25.2% _a	24.5% _a
grow old?	Definitely not good	17.7% ¹	13.6% _a	22.2% _b	23.8% _a	19.5% _a	8.4% _a	12.1% _a	17.6% _a	20.1% _a	14.2% _a	19.0% _a	23.2% _a	19.1% _a	14.7% _a	18.1% _a	15.6% _a	35.1% _b	13.8% _a	20.9% _a	14.5% _a	20.4% _a
ow old?	Don't know	2.8% ¹	3.6% _a	2.1% _a	2.0% _a	5.3% _a	1.3% _a	0.7% _a	3.5% _a	3.1% _a	0.8% _a	2.8%a	2.9%a	4.1%a	0.0% ²	2.9% _a	3.1% _a	0.0% ²	1.0%a	0.0% ²	9.2% _b	4.6% _{a,b}
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	388	150	232	48	122	118	96	73	172	140	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	117	151	75	36

Table 26		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	roups		I	Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 30		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Strongly Agree	27.9% ¹	31.3% _a	25.1% _b	26.6% _a	25.9% _a	31.7% _a	32.4% _a	28.6% _a	26.7% _a	29.3% _a	22.2% _a	33.5% _b	31.6% _b	27.4% _a	27.9% _a	28.7% _a	22.0% _a	33.9% _a	30.7% _a	17.0% _b	17.9% _b
"The presence of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort	Agree	38.5% ¹	37.2% _a	40.0% _a	29.6% _a	43.2% _b	41.8% _b	47.4% _b	31.5% _a	41.6% _b	47.5% _b	39.9% _a	38.6% _a	41.7% _a	32.7% _a	39.3% _a	38.4% _a	41.7% _a	36.8% _a	37.8% _a	51.1% _b	30.4% _a
Drum since 1985 has	Disagree	6.4% ¹	6.3% _a	6.4%a	6.0% _a	7.4% _a	4.3%a	6.8% _a	7.3% _a	6.0% _a	5.0%a	7.0% _a	6.3% _a	5.7% _a	6.4%a	6.3% _a	6.5% _a	5.2% _a	3.0% _a	7.0% _{a,b}	11.0% _b	7.7% _{a,b}
improved the overall quality of life of North Country	Strongly Disagree	2.0% ¹	1.9% _a	1.9%a	0.6% _a	4.0% _b	1.5% _{a,b}	1.5% _{a,b}	2.7% _a	1.5% _a	1.0% _a	1.5% _{a,b}	0.3% _a	4.7% _b	0.0% ²	2.1% _a	1.9% _a	2.0% _a	1.0%a	1.7% _a	2.2% _a	4.4% _a
citizens."	Neutral/No Opinion	25.1% ¹	23.3% _a	26.6% _a	37.3% _a	19.5% _b	20.7% _b	11.9% _b	30.0% _a	24.1% _{a,b}	17.3% _b	29.4% _a	21.2% _b	16.2% _b	33.4% _a	24.5% _b	24.6% _a	29.1% _a	25.4% _a	22.8% _a	18.7% _a	39.7% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1143	464	666	211	333	307	283	219	508	410	305	395	257	99	1010	1035	70	386	459	179	92

		Jefferson County	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	I	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Strongly Agree	37.6% ¹	39.4% _a	36.2% _a	35.3% _a	41.4% _a	35.8% _a	39.2% _a	41.0% _a	32.7% _a	39.4% _a	24.9% _a	51.7% _b	38.9% _{a,b}	31.2% _a	39.6% _a	39.8% _a	32.0% _a	44.0% _a	40.3% _a	24.3% _{a,b}	21.0% _b
"The presence of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort	Agree	33.2% ¹	32.1% _a	34.3% _a	23.8% _a	37.6% _{a,b}	46.4% _b	45.6% _{b,c}	25.4% _a	35.0% _{a,b}	47.6% _b	34.5% _a	34.2% _a	38.1% _a	27.0% _a	35.0% _a	34.4% _a	26.2% _a	38.0% _{a,b}	26.0% _a	54.8% _b	34.4% _{a,b}
Drum since 1985 has	Disagree	7.4% ¹	4.5% _a	10.7% _b	7.8% _a	6.9% _a	5.2% _a	9.4% _a	7.8% _a	8.9% _a	3.9% _a	9.0% _a	5.6% _a	7.2% _a	7.2% _a	7.7% _a	7.1% _a	8.4% _a	4.3% _a	9.5% _a	4.5% _a	9.9% _a
improved the overall quality of life of North Country	Strongly Disagree	2.7% ¹	1.7% _a	3.3% _a	1.0% _a	3.4% _a	3.9% _a	4.0%a	2.4% _a	3.5% _a	0.7% _a	2.5% _a	0.8% _a	4.0%a	0.0% ²	3.0% _a	2.1% _a	3.2% _a	2.4%a	1.4% _a	7.1% _a	3.4% _a
citizens."	Neutral/No Opinion	19.0% ¹	22.3% _a	15.5% _a	32.0% _a	10.7% _b	8.8% _b	1.9% _b	23.3% _a	19.9% _{a,b}	8.4% _b	29.0% _a	7.7% _b	11.8% _b	34.5% _a	14.7% _b	16.5% _a	30.2% _b	11.3% _a	22.7% _{a,b}	9.3% _{a,b}	31.4% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	424	193	226	123	103	99	95	77	189	155	123	149	93	81	331	357	46	141	176	52	39

		Lewis County	Gei	nder		Age G	roups		E	ducation Leve	el .	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Strongly Agree	29.0% ¹	40.3% _a	18.3% _b	19.2% _a	31.7% _{a,b}	39.4% _b	26.1% _{a,b}	37.0% _a	21.3% _b	22.1% _{a,b}	21.9% _a	28.9% _a	34.9% _a	30.1% _a	27.7% _a	27.4% _a	35.0% _a	39.8% _a	19.2% _b	25.2% _{a,b}	27.8% _{a,b}
"The presence of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort	Agree	45.1% ¹	35.2% _a	54.3% _b	48.3% _a	47.7% _a	30.7% _a	50.6% _a	39.2% _a	54.2% _b	44.9% _{a,b}	41.4% _a	55.1% _a	55.0% _a	53.9% _a	46.7% _a	45.6% _a	56.5% _a	43.5% _a	46.4% _a	47.1% _a	46.8% _a
Drum since 1985 has	Disagree	8.5% ¹	10.2% _a	7.1% _a	5.9% _a	7.5% _a	11.2% _a	11.2% _a	10.1% _a	6.0% _a	8.6% _a	13.0% _a	3.1% _b	3.9% _{a,b}	16.0% _a	7.9%a	8.8% _a	0.0% ²	4.1% _a	14.1% _b	5.3% _{a,b}	10.3% _{a,b}
improved the overall quality of life of North Country	Strongly Disagree	0.4% ¹	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.9% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
citizens."	Neutral/No Opinion	17.0% ¹	13.6% _a	20.3% _a	26.7% _a	12.2% _b	18.4% _{a,b}	12.1% _{a,b}	13.7% _a	18.6% _a	22.4% _a	23.4% _a	12.8% _{a,b}	6.2% _b	0.0% ²	17.4% _a	17.8% _a	8.5% _a	12.5% _a	19.4% _a	22.4% _a	15.1% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	342	128	212	41	112	93	95	71	153	118	79	121	72	9	319	325	11	133	137	52	17

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		E	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Strongly Agree	18.0% ¹	20.1% _a	16.6% _a	16.1% _{a,b}	10.8% _a	26.0% _b	29.3% _{b,c}	13.2% _a	22.1% _a	21.2% _a	18.8% _a	19.6% _a	24.1% _a	3.9% _a	18.9% _a	19.2% _a	2.5% _b	22.4% _a	20.3% _a	12.2% _a	14.2% _a
"The presence of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort	Agree	42.1% ¹	43.4% _a	41.8% _a	34.1% _a	46.9% _a	41.3% _a	47.9% _a	35.7% _a	45.3% _a	47.9% _a	46.4% _a	37.7% _a	42.5% _a	64.0% _a	40.8% _a	40.0% _a	68.0% _b	33.6% _{a,c}	52.3% _b	50.2% _{a,b}	25.3% _c
Drum since 1985 has	Disagree	5.0% ¹	7.3% _a	2.2% _b	3.5% _a	7.8% _a	1.5% _a	3.8% _a	5.9% _a	3.2% _a	5.2% _a	3.2% _a	7.8% _a	4.6% _a	0.0% ²	4.9% _a	5.3% _a	0.0% ²	1.3% _a	1.4%a	14.9% _b	5.5% _{a,b}
improved the overall quality	Strongly Disagree	1.7% ¹	2.4% _a	1.1% _a	0.0% ²	5.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	3.6% _a	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	6.3% _b	0.0% ²	1.8% _a	2.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	2.2% _a	0.4% _a	5.7% _a
citizens."	Neutral/No Opinion	33.1% ¹	26.8% _a	38.2% _b	46.3% _a	29.1% _b	31.2% _{a,b}	19.0% _b	41.5% _a	29.4% _{a,b}	24.6% _b	31.2% _a	34.8% _a	22.5% _a	32.2% _a	33.6% _a	33.6% _a	29.4% _a	42.7% _a	23.8% _b	22.2% _b	49.2% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	377	143	228	47	118	115	93	71	166	137	103	125	92	9	360	353	13	112	146	75	36

Table 27		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 37		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	None	74.1% ¹	74.2% _a	73.9% _a	69.6% _a	75.2% _{a,b}	74.4% _{a,b}	83.0% _b	81.1% _a	75.6% _a	57.5% _b	80.0% _a	73.9% _a	55.1% _b	62.4% _a	75.6% _b	76.0% _a	62.9% _b	76.5% _a	73.8% _a	68.8% _a	77.3% _a
How many times have you	1-2 times	14.2% ¹	13.8% _a	14.5% _a	18.5% _a	11.7% _{a,b}	13.2% _{a,b}	9.0% _b	9.7% _a	14.7% _a	22.5% _b	12.3% _a	13.8% _a	25.0% _b	16.0% _a	14.1% _a	14.0% _a	13.2% _a	11.8% _a	14.9% _a	19.2% _a	11.3% _a
crossed the border to	3-5 times	5.8% ¹	5.5%a	6.3%a	6.1% _a	6.0% _a	5.2% _a	5.6%a	4.8% _a	4.4%a	10.6% _b	3.3% _a	5.8% _{a,b}	8.7% _b	12.9% _a	4.8% _b	5.6% _a	7.5% _a	5.4%a	6.1% _a	7.5% _a	4.9%a
eastern Ontario during the	More than 5 times	5.0% ¹	5.4%a	4.6%a	3.9% _a	7.0% _a	6.6% _a	2.3%a	2.8% _a	4.9% _{a,b}	9.4% _b	2.5%a	6.2% _b	10.5% _b	4.0% _a	5.2% _a	3.8% _a	13.2% _b	5.4%a	3.7% _a	4.6%a	6.5% _a
past year r	Not sure	0.9% ¹	1.1%a	0.7%a	1.9% _a	0.1% _a	0.6% _a	0.2%a	1.6% _a	0.4% _a	0.1% _a	1.9% _a	0.4% _a	0.7% _a	4.7% _a	0.3% _b	0.6%a	3.2% _b	0.8% _a	1.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1154	472	669	213	336	310	286	222	513	412	306	401	259	100	1018	1046	70	390	465	181	91

		Jefferson County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	None	72.9% ¹	70.1% _a	76.4% _a	69.8% _a	72.4% _a	76.4% _a	83.8% _a	72.1% _a	77.4% _a	67.9% _a	77.3% _a	72.2% _{a,b}	57.4% _b	62.6% _a	76.2% _b	76.6% _a	61.1% _b	74.2% _a	73.0% _a	66.2% _a	76.1% _a
How many times have you	1-2 times	15.1% ¹	15.5% _a	14.2% _a	18.9% _a	11.0% _a	13.8% _a	9.8% _a	14.7% _a	12.3% _a	19.8% _a	13.3% _a	12.2% _a	27.3% _b	18.9% _a	13.9% _a	13.4% _a	19.6% _a	9.6%a	15.4% _a	21.4% _a	18.6% _a
crossed the border to	3-5 times	6.5% ¹	7.5% _a	5.5% _a	5.4% _a	10.9% _a	3.5% _a	4.3% _a	5.8% _a	6.6% _a	8.2% _a	4.2% _a	10.6% _a	5.5% _a	9.5% _a	5.7% _a	5.6% _a	10.5% _a	7.6% _a	6.6% _a	11.3% _a	1.5% _a
eastern Ontario during the	More than 5 times	3.5% ¹	4.6%a	2.4%a	2.3% _a	5.7% _a	4.6%a	2.1% _a	3.8% _a	2.9% _a	4.1%a	1.5% _a	4.3% _{a,b}	8.2% _b	3.4%a	3.5% _a	3.1% _a	3.6% _a	6.9% _a	1.9% _a	1.1% _a	3.8% _a
past year r	Not sure	1.9% ¹	2.2% _a	1.6% _a	3.6% _a	0.0% ²	1.7% _a	0.0% ²	3.6% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	3.7% _a	0.7% _a	1.6% _a	5.6% _a	0.7% _b	1.3% _a	5.3% _b	1.7% _a	3.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	425	194	226	124	103	99	95	78	189	154	122	150	93	82	331	358	46	141	176	53	38

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups			Education Leve		A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	None	90.7% ¹	93.2% _a	88.3% _a	83.7% _a	90.7% _a	96.6% _a	93.6% _a	93.7% _a	88.1% _a	87.6% _a	98.4% _a	88.0% _b	85.3% _b	100.0% ²	90.9% _a	91.9% _a	74.1% _b	93.8% _a	92.1% _a	81.9% _a	88.9% _a
ow many times have you	1-2 times	8.1% ¹	5.9% _a	10.3% _a	14.7% _a	7.7% _a	2.7% _a	6.1% _a	6.3% _a	8.4% _a	12.1% _a	0.9%a	10.1% _b	14.7% _b	0.0% ²	8.3% _a	6.9% _a	25.9% _b	6.0%a	6.6% _a	15.5% _a	11.1% _a
crossed the border to	3-5 times	0.8% ¹	0.1% _a	1.4% _a	1.6% _a	0.9%a	0.0% ²	0.3%a	0.0% ²	2.3% _a	0.3% _a	0.7% _a	1.6%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.9% _a	2.6% _a	0.0% ²
eastern Ontario during the	More than 5 times	0.2% ¹	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
ast year?	Not sure	0.2% ¹	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.6%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	342	128	212	41	112	93	95	71	153	118	79	122	72	9	318	325	11	132	138	53	17

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		E	Education Leve	I	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	None	71.4% ¹	74.1% _a	68.0% _a	66.9% _a	73.6% _a	66.2% _a	79.7% _a	87.1% _a	71.4% _b	41.1% _c	79.5% _a	71.6% _a	47.0% _b	54.8% _a	71.6% _a	71.6% _a	64.8% _a	73.5% _a	69.8% _a	67.4% _a	77.1% _a
How many times have you	1-2 times	14.7% ¹	13.9% _a	15.9% _a	18.6% _a	13.4% _a	15.8% _a	9.1% _a	5.4% _a	18.2% _b	27.3% _b	13.4% _a	16.0% _a	24.8% _a	0.0% ²	15.6% _a	16.2% _a	0.0% ²	15.6% _a	16.4% _a	18.8% _a	5.2% _a
crossed the border to	3-5 times	6.3% ¹	4.6%a	8.2% _a	7.8% _a	3.2% _a	8.1% _a	7.8% _a	5.1% _a	2.8% _a	15.1% _b	2.8% _a	2.9% _a	13.4% _b	37.0% _a	5.1% _b	6.8% _a	2.9% _a	5.0% _a	6.7% _a	6.6% _a	8.3%a
eastern Ontario during the	More than 5 times	7.6% ¹	7.4% _a	7.9% _a	6.6% _a	9.9% _a	9.9% _a	3.0% _a	2.5% _a	7.7% _{a,b}	16.3% _b	4.4% _a	9.3% _{a,b}	14.8% _b	8.1% _a	7.7% _a	5.3% _a	32.3% _b	5.7% _a	7.1% _a	7.2% _a	9.5% _a
past year r	Not sure	0.1% ¹	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.3%a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.2%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	387	150	231	48	121	118	96	73	171	140	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	117	151	75	36
Table 20		Tr-County Combined	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		E	ducation Leve	H	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
---------------------------	--------------	-----------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------------	----------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	--------------------	--------------------
Table So		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	21.3% ¹	21.3% _a	21.3% _a	17.2% _a	20.8% _a	31.8% _b	21.4% _{a,b}	24.1% _a	21.9% _a	14.2% _b	22.4% _a	20.7% _a	20.6% _a	19.4% _a	21.8% _a	21.0% _a	22.1% _a	25.6% _a	17.6% _b	9.1% _b	33.4% _a
	Moderate	36.9% ¹	33.8% _a	39.4% _a	31.7% _a	40.7% _a	35.5% _a	42.6% _a	34.0% _a	36.8% _a	42.4% _a	30.7% _a	43.2% _b	37.1% _{a,b}	18.0% _a	39.6% _b	39.6% _a	19.0% _b	37.2% _a	41.5% _a	37.5% _a	23.9% _b
How severe of an issue do	Minor	32.8% ¹	35.2% _a	30.8% _a	35.3% _a	35.3% _a	27.9% _a	28.2% _a	30.4% _a	34.5% _a	35.9% _a	34.2% _a	30.8% _a	35.8% _a	30.6% _a	33.3% _a	32.5% _a	37.2% _a	30.7% _a	32.4% _a	46.0% _b	25.7% _a
community?	Not at all	5.7% ¹	5.9%a	5.7% _a	8.7% _a	2.7% _b	3.4% _{a,b}	7.2% _{a,b}	6.9% _a	4.6%a	5.4% _a	6.0% _a	2.8% _a	6.3% _a	15.2% _a	4.2% _b	4.8%a	11.2% _b	3.5% _a	6.7% _a	6.4% _a	8.2% _a
	Don't know	3.2% ¹	3.6%a	2.8%a	7.1% _a	0.5% _b	1.5% _b	0.7% _b	4.6% _a	2.2% _a	2.1% _a	6.8% _a	2.5% _b	0.3% _b	16.8% _a	1.1% _b	2.1% _a	10.5% _b	3.0% _a	1.7% _a	1.0% _a	8.7% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1155	470	672	214	334	312	286	223	513	413	307	400	259	100	1019	1048	71	392	464	181	91

		Jefferson County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	6	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	19.1% ¹	19.5% _a	18.4% _a	15.0% _a	16.5% _{a,b}	33.8% _b	21.6% _{a,b}	27.1% _a	12.7% _b	11.5% _b	23.7% _a	14.1% _a	14.5% _a	19.3% _a	19.4% _a	19.0% _a	19.1% _a	21.1% _{a,b}	14.4% _a	8.6% _a	36.5% _b
	Moderate	38.3% ¹	38.0%a	39.3% _a	33.4% _a	42.8% _a	36.6% _a	50.7% _a	34.7% _a	41.7% _a	41.2% _a	30.4% _a	48.1% _b	37.3% _{a,b}	19.4% _a	44.4% _b	44.8% _a	11.1% _b	43.2% _a	40.5% _a	46.9% _a	15.7% _b
How severe of an issue do	Minor	31.4% ¹	27.5% _a	35.4% _a	31.2% _a	37.2% _a	29.6% _a	22.1% _a	25.4% _a	34.6% _a	39.5% _a	30.4% _a	29.0% _a	43.0% _a	30.7% _a	31.7% _a	29.6% _a	37.8% _a	29.2% _a	34.0% _a	39.2% _a	23.5% _a
community?	Not at all	5.9% ¹	7.0%a	4.7%a	10.0% _a	3.0% _a	0.0% ²	3.7% _a	5.7% _a	7.6%a	3.6% _a	7.2% _a	2.8% _a	4.6% _a	10.8% _a	4.4% _b	3.4% _a	16.9% _b	3.9% _a	7.8% _a	1.7% _a	7.7% _a
	Don't know	5.3% ¹	7.9% _a	2.2% _b	10.4% _a	0.4% _b	0.0% ²	2.0% _{a,b}	7.0% _a	3.4% _a	4.1% _a	8.3% _a	5.9% _a	0.6% _a	19.9% _a	0.2% _b	3.2% _a	15.1% _b	2.6% _a	3.3% _a	3.5% _{a,b}	16.6% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	423	191	227	124	101	99	95	78	187	155	122	149	93	82	329	358	45	141	175	53	38

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve	el .	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	6.7% ¹	10.2% _a	3.6% _b	10.2% _a	4.2% _a	3.0% _a	11.2% _a	7.5% _a	5.7% _a	6.6%a	10.5% _a	4.8% _a	3.9% _a	52.8% _a	4.8% _b	6.2% _a	19.3% _b	7.0% _{a,b}	4.9%a	3.7% _{a,b}	21.4% _b
	Moderate	44.2% ¹	39.6% _a	47.7% _a	31.0% _a	53.0% _b	45.6% _{a,b}	42.7% _{a,b}	47.7% _a	42.7% _a	37.9% _a	39.6% _a	44.0% _a	31.5% _a	27.1% _a	44.1% _a	45.6% _a	25.1% _a	44.2% _a	44.0% _a	53.4% _a	22.3% _a
How severe of an issue do	Minor	41.1% ¹	38.5% _a	44.0% _a	47.0% _a	34.9% _a	43.9% _a	42.5% _a	36.3% _a	45.1% _a	46.2% _a	43.6% _a	47.2% _a	45.6% _a	4.1%a	44.9% _b	41.3% _a	54.2% _a	35.7% _a	47.4% _a	36.7% _a	50.9% _a
community?	Not at all	7.6% ¹	11.7% _a	3.9% _b	11.7% _a	7.1% _a	7.0% _a	3.6% _a	8.4% _a	5.3% _a	9.4% _a	6.3% _{a,b}	3.0% _a	19.0% _ь	16.0%a	5.8% _a	6.5% _a	1.3% _a	12.4% _a	3.4% _b	6.3% _{a,b}	5.4% _{a,b}
	Don't know	0.4% ¹	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.8%a	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.7%a	0.3%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	345	129	214	42	112	95	95	72	155	118	80	122	72	9	321	327	13	134	138	53	17

		St. Lawrence County	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	el	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	26.9% ¹	25.9% _a	28.4% _a	21.4% _a	28.8% _a	38.8% _a	23.8% _a	25.6% _{a,b}	33.9% _a	18.3% _b	23.3% _a	30.2% _a	29.5% _a	14.7% _a	27.6% _a	26.5% _a	27.7% _a	35.4% _a	25.7% _{a,b}	10.4% _b	32.0% _a
	Moderate	33.8% ¹	28.1% _a	37.5% _a	29.6% _a	35.7% _a	31.5% _a	36.9% _a	29.4% _a	31.0% _a	44.6% _a	29.1% _a	38.9% _a	37.9% _a	7.9% _a	35.0% _b	33.4% _a	32.1% _a	29.6% _a	42.2% _a	29.7% _a	30.9% _a
How severe of an issue do	Minor	32.3% ¹	42.6%a	23.2% _b	38.6% _a	33.9%a	21.7% _a	28.8% _a	34.1% _a	32.2% _a	30.2% _a	37.0% _a	28.1% _a	27.2% _a	34.3% _a	31.8% _a	32.8% _a	33.7% _a	30.5% _a	25.8% _a	51.2% _b	25.1% _a
community?	Not at all	5.2% ¹	3.4% _a	7.0% _a	6.4% _{a,b}	1.3% _a	5.1% _{a,b}	10.5% _b	7.7% _a	1.7% _b	6.3% _{a,b}	4.4% _a	2.8% _a	5.5% _a	43.0% _a	3.7% _b	5.6% _a	2.5% _a	0.4% _a	6.3% _{a,b}	8.7% _b	8.9% _{b,c}
	Don't know	1.9% ¹	0.0% ²	3.9% _a	4.0% _a	0.4% _a	2.9% _a	0.0% ²	3.2% _a	1.3% _a	0.6%a	6.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.9% _a	1.7% _a	4.0% _a	4.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	3.0% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	387	150	231	48	121	118	96	73	171	140	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	117	151	75	36

Table 20		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	Groups			Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 39		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	40.7% ¹	35.8% _a	45.6% _b	40.1% _a	43.1% _a	39.3% _a	39.7% _a	39.4% _a	40.1% _a	44.5% _a	44.3% _a	41.8% _a	36.9% _a	27.2% _a	43.3% _b	42.4% _a	28.2% _b	30.3% _a	43.1% _b	58.4% _c	42.0% _{a,b}
	Moderate	39.7% ¹	39.5% _a	39.7% _a	34.0% _a	43.5% _b	42.0% _{a,b}	42.9% _{a,b}	37.5% _a	40.6% _a	42.4% _a	32.7% _a	47.0% _b	46.6% _b	32.1% _a	40.1% _a	39.6% _a	39.2% _a	48.6% _a	36.8% _b	29.4% _b	35.1% _b
How severe of an issue do	Minor	13.2% ¹	16.4% _a	10.0% _b	16.4% _a	9.4% _b	14.8% _{a,b}	11.1% _{a,b}	13.2% _a	14.8% _a	10.4% _a	13.9% _a	8.9%a	15.3% _a	15.0% _a	13.1% _a	12.8% _a	18.8% _a	15.9% _a	13.1% _a	11.3% _a	9.8% _a
your community?	Not at all	2.5% ¹	3.2%a	1.7%a	4.5% _a	0.0% _b	1.9% _{a,b}	2.9%a	4.4%a	1.5% _b	0.1% _b	4.3% _a	0.2% _b	0.7% _b	11.9% _a	1.1% _b	1.9%a	7.3% _b	0.8%a	2.9% _a	0.2% _a	7.7% _b
	Don't know	4.0% ¹	5.1%a	2.9%a	5.1% _a	3.9% _a	2.0%a	3.4%a	5.5%a	2.9% _a	2.6%a	4.8%a	2.1% _{a,b}	0.5% _b	13.9% _a	2.4% _b	3.4% _a	6.5% _a	4.4%a	4.1% _a	0.6%a	5.5%a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1150	468	669	213	335	311	282	221	511	412	305	399	258	100	1015	1043	71	387	463	181	92

		Jefferson County	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	36.6% ¹	30.2% _a	44.2% _b	34.8% _a	38.9% _a	36.9% _a	38.1% _a	37.1% _a	36.7% _a	36.0% _a	39.5% _a	35.6% _a	32.2% _a	24.7% _a	40.9% _b	39.9% _a	24.4% _b	26.2% _a	38.9% _{a,b}	55.5% _b	44.1% _{a,b}
	Moderate	39.9% ¹	40.5% _a	38.7% _a	33.1% _a	45.3% _a	49.6% _a	42.8% _a	38.4% _a	37.5% _a	47.0% _a	33.3% _a	50.9% _b	43.8% _{a,b}	35.5% _a	40.9% _a	40.0%a	35.6% _a	54.2% _a	34.6% _b	35.3% _{a,b}	25.0% _b
How severe of an issue do	Minor	13.2% ¹	15.5% _a	10.9% _a	17.4% _a	7.7% _a	11.2% _a	12.6% _a	9.7% _a	18.4% _a	12.3% _a	13.9% _{a,b}	9.0% _a	21.3% _b	14.8% _a	12.9% _a	12.6% _a	18.7% _a	11.4% _a	16.4% _a	6.6% _a	12.2% _a
your community?	Not at all	2.7% ¹	4.7%a	0.5% _b	5.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	1.6% _a	3.9% _a	2.7% _a	0.0% ²	5.9% _a	0.0% ²	1.6% _a	8.6%a	0.8% _b	0.9%a	11.8% _b	1.2% _a	2.8% _a	0.6% _a	7.2% _a
	Don't know	7.6% ¹	9.1% _a	5.7% _a	9.4% _a	8.1% _a	1.7% _a	4.9% _a	10.9% _a	4.7% _a	4.7% _a	7.4% _a	4.4% _a	1.1% _a	16.4% _a	4.5% _b	6.7% _a	9.5% _a	7.0% _a	7.2% _a	2.0% _a	11.5% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	424	192	227	124	102	99	95	78	188	155	123	149	93	82	330	358	46	141	175	53	39

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		E	ducation Leve		A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	30.4% ¹	28.3% _a	32.1% _a	27.7% _a	37.0% _a	28.2% _a	23.5% _a	25.2% _a	34.9% _a	35.7% _a	28.9% _a	27.9% _a	40.5% _a	34.9% _a	31.6% _a	31.7% _a	2.4% _b	29.9% _a	36.2% _a	29.9% _{a,b}	3.1% _b
	Moderate	48.4% ¹	46.5% _a	50.1% _a	56.1% _a	45.6%a	41.0% _a	52.7% _a	52.8% _a	43.2% _a	46.3% _a	35.6% _a	55.1% _b	36.9% _{a,b}	65.1% _a	46.7% _a	49.1%a	28.5% _a	49.0% _a	43.1% _a	52.3% _a	63.0% _a
How severe of an issue do	Minor	16.5% ¹	19.0% _a	14.4% _a	13.9% _a	14.8% _a	22.3% _a	15.8% _a	16.1% _a	16.5% _a	17.4% _a	23.1% _a	14.6% _a	22.6% _a	0.0% ²	17.9% _a	14.9% _a	53.1% _b	13.8% _a	17.8% _a	17.3% _a	24.6% _a
your community?	Not at all	1.7% ¹	3.0% _a	0.5% _a	2.3% _a	0.3% _a	2.6% _a	2.4% _a	1.8% _a	2.2% _a	0.6%a	5.7% _a	0.3% _b	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.7% _a	1.7% _a	1.5% _a	1.7% _a	2.3% _a	0.5% _a	0.7% _a
	Don't know	3.1% ¹	3.2% _a	3.0% _a	0.0% ²	2.2% _a	5.9% _a	5.6% _a	4.2% _a	3.2% _a	0.0% ²	6.7% _a	2.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	2.1% _a	2.5% _a	14.4% _b	5.6% _{a,b}	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	8.6% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	342	127	213	41	112	95	93	72	153	117	79	122	71	9	319	325	12	132	137	53	17

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	ıder		Age G	roups		I	Education Leve		A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	47.1% ¹	43.5% _a	50.3% _a	49.4% _a	48.2% _a	44.7% _a	45.2% _a	45.9% _a	44.4% _a	54.5% _a	53.6% _a	50.6% _a	40.6% _a	41.4% _a	47.9% _a	47.4% _a	38.3% _a	34.4% _a	50.8% _{a,b}	65.5% _b	44.1% _{a,b}
	Moderate	37.3% ¹	36.9% _a	38.1% _a	31.2% _a	41.5% _a	36.1% _a	40.4% _a	32.2% _a	43.1% _a	37.2% _a	31.3% _a	41.6% _{a,b}	51.2% _b	4.7% _a	38.0% _b	36.9% _a	47.1% _a	43.3% _a	38.1% _{a,b}	22.0% _b	40.8% _{a,b}
How severe of an issue do	Minor	12.4% ¹	16.7% _a	8.2% _b	15.4% _a	9.4% _a	15.4% _a	8.8% _a	16.2% _a	11.0% _a	7.1%a	12.1% _a	7.3% _a	8.2% _a	19.0%a	12.2% _a	12.4% _a	14.6% _a	20.8%a	7.2% _b	12.5% _{a,b}	6.2% _{a,b}
your community?	Not at all	2.4% ¹	1.7% _a	3.2% _a	4.0% _a	0.0% ²	2.7% _a	4.0% _a	5.7% _a	0.3% _b	0.0% ²	2.0%a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	34.9% _a	1.2% _b	2.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	3.1% _a	0.0% ²	8.9% _a
	Don't know	0.7% ¹	1.3% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.9% _a	1.1% _a	1.6% _a	0.0% ²	1.3% _a	1.3% _a	1.0%a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	1.6% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	384	149	229	48	121	117	94	71	170	140	103	128	94	9	366	360	13	114	151	75	36

Table 10		Tr-County Combined	Ger	nder		Age G	Groups		I	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 40		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	37.7% ¹	32.6% _a	43.2% _b	47.1% _a	34.9% _b	29.6% _b	26.4% _b	30.8% _a	42.5% _b	43.2% _b	38.1% _a	37.8% _a	40.8% _a	31.8% _a	38.6% _a	38.6% _a	28.5% _b	34.7% _a	40.8% _a	38.8% _a	34.4% _a
	Moderate	37.8% ¹	39.5% _a	35.3% _a	30.8% _a	43.4% _b	43.4% _b	38.7% _{a,b}	39.2% _a	34.4% _a	41.0% _a	31.4% _a	43.5% _b	42.5% _b	33.2% _a	38.1% _a	38.5% _a	33.5% _a	42.8% _a	35.6% _{a,b}	42.1% _a	26.6% _b
How severe of an issue do	Minor	12.8% ¹	14.6% _a	11.4% _a	14.1% _a	9.5% _a	16.3% _a	13.6% _a	13.7% _{a,b}	14.6% _a	8.2% _b	16.2% _a	11.6% _a	9.2% _a	13.4% _a	13.1% _a	12.4% _a	16.7% _a	12.5% _a	14.3% _a	8.9% _a	15.2% _a
in your community?	Not at all	3.2% ¹	3.9% _a	2.6%a	3.2% _a	3.5% _a	0.7% _a	5.2%a	6.3% _a	0.9% _b	0.6% _b	4.1% _a	1.0% _b	0.3% _b	10.9% _a	2.1% _b	2.0%a	12.3% _b	2.4%a	1.2% _a	4.4% _{a,b}	9.4% _b
	Don't know	8.5% ¹	9.4% _a	7.5%a	4.8% _a	8.6% _{a,b}	10.0% _{a,b}	16.1% _b	9.9% _a	7.5% _a	7.1% _a	10.2% _a	6.1% _a	7.2% _a	10.7% _a	8.1% _a	8.5% _a	9.0%a	7.7% _a	8.1% _a	5.7% _a	14.4% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1153	469	671	212	335	312	285	223	513	411	307	400	258	100	1018	1046	72	392	463	179	92

		Jefferson County	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	6	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	35.7% ¹	30.5% _a	41.4% _b	37.2% _a	34.4% _a	41.2% _a	24.7% _a	32.5% _a	41.3% _a	32.6% _a	36.7% _a	37.0% _a	28.3% _a	30.1% _a	37.7% _a	37.1% _a	26.1% _a	31.7% _a	37.9% _a	31.5% _a	41.6% _a
	Moderate	38.1% ¹	38.5% _a	37.5% _a	36.4% _a	43.0% _a	33.5% _a	39.9% _a	38.8% _a	33.4% _a	45.1% _a	30.6% _a	42.5% _{a,b}	51.3% _b	36.8% _a	38.1% _a	38.6%a	37.5% _a	45.3% _a	36.2% _{a,b}	46.0% _a	20.0% _b
How severe of an issue do	Minor	13.9% ¹	15.3% _a	12.7% _a	15.1% _a	10.2% _a	17.5% _a	14.9% _a	15.1% _a	15.0% _a	9.9% _a	19.5% _a	10.9% _a	9.4% _a	15.3% _a	13.7% _a	12.9% _a	20.9% _a	15.5% _a	15.2% _a	11.2% _a	10.9% _a
in your community?	Not at all	2.1% ¹	3.7%a	0.4% _b	2.7% _a	2.1% _a	1.6% _a	0.6% _a	3.3% _a	1.6% _a	0.6%a	4.4%a	0.6%a	0.6% _a	5.1%a	1.1% _b	1.1%a	6.5% _b	0.2% _a	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	11.8% _b
	Don't know	10.2% ¹	12.0% _a	8.1% _a	8.5% _a	10.3% _a	6.1% _a	20.0% _a	10.3% _a	8.7% _a	11.8% _a	8.7% _a	9.0% _a	10.3% _a	12.7% _a	9.4% _a	10.3% _a	9.0% _a	7.4% _a	10.0% _a	11.3%_	15.7% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	423	191	227	124	102	99	94	78	188	154	123	149	92	82	329	357	46	141	174	53	39

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		E	ducation Leve		A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	28.8% ¹	21.1% _a	36.3% _b	29.7% _a	34.9% _a	24.1% _a	21.1% _a	23.9% _a	33.0% _a	33.9% _a	27.1% _a	26.5% _a	40.9% _a	45.4% _a	26.5% _a	28.9% _a	12.6% _a	28.2% _a	35.3% _a	18.9% _a	20.5% _a
	Moderate	46.8% ¹	47.2% _a	45.8% _a	52.5% _a	43.2% _a	43.3% _a	49.8% _a	49.6% _a	41.8% _a	48.5% _a	48.8% _a	44.6% _a	36.7% _a	45.6% _a	49.1% _a	48.8% _a	29.7% _a	44.6% _a	41.7% _a	60.2% _a	55.6% _a
How severe of an issue do	Minor	15.4% ¹	19.1% _a	12.2% _a	12.8% _a	13.1% _a	19.9% _a	18.5% _a	16.6% _a	15.3% _a	12.3% _a	10.7% _a	22.1% _a	17.9% _a	9.0%a	16.5% _a	14.2% _a	31.3% _b	16.7% _a	17.9% _a	10.6% _a	5.3% _a
in your community?	Not at all	0.8% ¹	1.3% _a	0.3% _a	2.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.8%a	0.0% ²	2.1% _a	0.5%a	2.3% _a	0.1% _a	0.3%a	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.7% _a	1.3% _a	1.5%a	0.1% _a	0.5% _a	0.7% _a
	Don't know	8.2% ¹	11.3% _a	5.4% _b	2.8% _a	8.7% _a	12.4% _a	9.8% _a	9.8% _a	7.8% _a	4.8% _a	11.0% _a	6.6% _a	4.3% _a	0.0% ²	7.1% _a	7.4% _a	25.1% _b	9.0% _a	5.0% _a	9.8% _a	17.9% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	344	129	213	41	112	95	95	72	155	117	80	122	72	9	321	327	13	134	138	52	17

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		I	Education Leve	el	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	41.8% ¹	37.5% _a	46.6% _a	63.9% _a	35.2% _b	21.9% _b	29.0% _b	30.9% _a	45.8% _b	55.1% _b	42.2% _a	41.5% _a	52.4% _a	40.4% _a	42.2% _a	42.5% _a	35.4% _a	39.4% _a	46.4% _a	46.5% _a	29.7% _a
	Moderate	35.3% ¹	38.9% _a	30.7% _a	19.2% _a	43.9% _b	51.5% _b	35.0% _{a,b}	36.7% _a	33.8% _a	35.5% _a	28.8%a	44.1% _b	35.3% _{a,b}	8.6% _a	35.6% _b	35.8% _a	26.9% _a	39.9% _a	33.0% _a	36.6% _a	29.4% _a
How severe of an issue do	Minor	11.1% ¹	12.7% _a	10.0% _a	12.9% _a	8.0% _a	14.3% _a	11.4% _a	11.5% _a	14.2% _a	5.7% _a	13.0% _a	9.4%a	7.4% _a	1.6% _a	11.8% _a	11.5% _a	6.9% _a	8.5% _a	12.2% _a	7.5% _a	19.8% _a
in your community?	Not at all	4.8% ¹	4.7% _a	5.1% _a	4.1% _a	5.7% _a	0.0% ²	9.6% _a	11.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.6% _b	3.9%a	1.6% _a	0.0% ²	49.5%a	3.1% _b	3.0% _a	24.3% _b	4.6% _a	2.1% _a	7.5% _a	8.3% _a
	Don't know	6.9% ¹	6.2% _a	7.6% _a	0.0% ²	7.2% _a	12.3% _a	14.9% _a	9.5% _a	6.2% _a	3.2% _a	12.0% _a	3.5% _b	4.9% _{a,b}	0.0% ²	7.3% _a	7.2%a	6.5% _a	7.6%a	6.4% _a	2.0% _a	12.8% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	386	149	231	47	121	118	96	73	170	140	104	129	94	9	368	362	13	117	151	74	36

Table 44		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 41		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	32.9% ¹	29.3% _a	36.6% _b	38.3% _a	27.9% _b	31.4% _{a,b}	30.1% _{a,b}	36.0% _a	30.3% _a	30.5% _a	37.0% _a	32.4% _a	28.6% _a	39.7% _a	32.0% _a	33.0% _a	29.1% _a	35.0% _a	31.5% _a	31.4% _a	34.5% _a
	Moderate	40.3% ¹	41.6%a	38.9% _a	38.0% _a	42.6% _a	42.7% _a	38.7% _a	33.7% _a	46.1% _b	44.2% _b	32.1% _a	49.5% _b	48.7% _b	26.7% _a	42.5% _b	42.0% _a	32.2% _b	43.9% _a	42.1% _a	46.5% _a	18.3% _b
How severe of an issue do	Minor	15.3% ¹	18.5% _a	12.1% _b	12.2% _a	17.9% _a	17.3% _a	16.5% _a	15.2% _a	15.0% _a	16.4% _a	16.5%a	13.7% _a	15.6% _a	13.1% _a	15.5% _a	14.7% _a	22.2% _b	14.6% _{a,b}	16.5% _{a,b}	9.0% _a	21.3% _b
in your community?	Not at all	2.9% ¹	3.9% _a	2.0%a	4.8% _a	2.4% _a	0.5%a	2.0%a	5.4% _a	1.5% _b	0.3% _b	2.5% _a	0.5% _a	0.2% _a	9.6% _a	2.0% _b	2.0% _a	9.0% _b	0.5% _a	0.9%a	4.9% _b	12.1% _b
	Don't know	8.6% ¹	6.7% _a	10.5% _b	6.6% _a	9.1% _a	8.1% _a	12.7% _a	9.7% _a	7.1% _a	8.6% _a	12.0%a	3.9% _b	6.9% _{a,b}	10.9% _a	8.1% _a	8.3% _a	7.5% _a	6.1%a	8.9% _{a,b}	8.2% _{a,b}	13.8% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1153	469	671	212	335	311	286	223	512	412	308	399	259	99	1019	1046	71	390	463	181	92

		Jefferson County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve	I	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	35.7% ¹	36.5% _a	34.9% _a	39.0% _a	34.5% _a	32.5% _a	27.8% _a	41.3% _a	30.3% _a	32.1% _a	38.9% _a	37.0% _a	29.1% _a	40.8% _a	34.9% _a	34.9% _a	35.9% _a	32.1% _a	34.8% _{a,b}	31.8% _{a,b}	53.0% _b
	Moderate	37.5% ¹	33.6% _a	42.5% _a	35.7% _a	33.5% _a	54.5% _a	37.3% _a	29.9% _a	43.7% _b	44.5% _{a,b}	28.5% _a	45.9% _b	49.6% _b	26.5% _a	41.0% _b	41.9%a	23.3% _b	47.4% _a	38.6% _a	38.3% _a	7.1% _b
How severe of an issue do	Minor	14.9% ¹	18.1% _a	10.9% _b	12.2% _a	23.3% _a	7.0% _a	15.5% _a	16.5% _a	13.2% _a	14.7% _a	17.7% _a	10.2% _a	11.9% _a	15.3% _a	14.0% _a	13.0% _a	26.3% _b	15.2% _a	13.6% _a	18.8% _a	18.0% _a
in your community?	Not at all	2.0% ¹	3.2%a	0.8%a	3.1% _a	0.0% ²	1.1% _a	3.7% _a	1.9% _a	3.4% _a	0.0% ²	3.7% _a	1.2% _a	0.4%a	5.9%a	0.8% _b	0.7%a	6.5% _b	0.6%a	0.9% _a	2.0% _{a,b}	8.5% _b
	Don't know	9.8% ¹	8.6% _a	10.9% _a	10.1% _a	8.7% _a	4.9% _a	15.8% _a	10.4% _a	9.4% _a	8.6% _a	11.1%_	5.7% _a	8.9% _a	11.6% _a	9.2% _a	9.5% _a	8.0% _a	4.8% _a	12.0% _a	9.1% _a	13.4% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	423	192	226	123	102	99	95	78	188	154	123	148	93	81	330	357	46	140	175	53	39

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		E	ducation Leve	I	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	24.6% ¹	17.8% _a	30.4% _b	27.1% _a	20.7% _a	25.2% _a	28.7% _a	25.8% _a	25.9% _a	19.6% _a	31.4% _a	22.2% _a	18.2% _a	19.9% _a	25.1% _a	26.5% _a	0.0% ²	21.3% _a	30.7% _a	19.7% _a	23.9% _a
	Moderate	47.1% ¹	52.0% _a	42.5% _a	41.4% _a	56.3%a	39.7% _a	44.9% _a	47.2% _a	48.9%a	43.6% _a	32.3% _a	50.9% _b	54.3% _b	80.1% _a	46.8% _b	48.1% _a	31.2% _a	50.3% _a	42.1% _a	57.7% _a	29.0% _a
How severe of an issue do	Minor	18.1% ¹	20.5% _a	16.1% _a	18.5% _a	15.0% _a	24.8% _a	15.1% _a	14.4% _a	19.5% _a	24.7% _a	22.5%a	22.2% _a	19.2% _a	0.0% ²	19.3% _a	17.4% _a	38.6% _b	18.0% _a	21.0% _a	8.0% _a	24.6% _a
in your community?	Not at all	0.5% ¹	0.8% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	2.4% _a	0.8% _a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	1.6%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.5% _a	1.5% _a	1.0%a	0.0% ²	0.5%a	0.7% _a
	Don't know	9.8% ¹	8.9% _a	10.7% _a	13.0% _a	8.1% _a	9.9% _a	8.8% _a	11.8% _a	5.3% _a	12.1% _a	12.1% _a	4.8% _a	8.4% _a	0.0% ²	8.3% _a	7.5% _a	28.7% _b	9.5% _a	6.2% _a	14.1% _a	21.8% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	343	127	214	41	112	94	95	72	153	118	80	122	72	9	320	326	12	133	137	53	17

		St. Lawrence County	Gen	ıder		Age G	roups		I	Education Leve		A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	32.0% ¹	24.5% _a	39.7% _b	39.4% _a	24.4% _a	32.4% _a	32.1% _a	33.2% _a	31.2% _a	31.3% _a	35.7% _a	31.3% _a	30.1% _a	35.8% _a	31.3% _a	32.9% _a	20.6% _a	41.7% _a	27.1% _{a,b}	33.5% _{a,b}	19.8% _b
	Moderate	41.5% ¹	47.5% _a	34.6% _b	40.6% _a	46.7% _a	34.2% _a	38.0% _a	34.0% _a	47.8% _b	44.0% _{a,b}	36.5%a	52.0% _b	46.8% _{a,b}	19.7% _a	42.6% _a	40.5% _a	48.3% _a	38.7% _{a,b}	47.0% _a	48.3% _{a,b}	26.8% _b
How severe of an issue do	Minor	15.0% ¹	18.5% _a	12.1% _a	11.2% _a	14.1% _a	23.2% _a	17.6% _a	14.1% _a	15.7% _a	16.2% _a	13.6% _a	14.4% _a	18.4% _a	1.6%a	15.7% _a	15.6% _a	12.5% _a	13.1% _{a,c,d}	19.2% _{a,b}	4.3% _c	23.8% _{b,d}
in your community?	Not at all	4.4% ¹	5.3% _a	3.6% _a	7.8% _a	5.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	10.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.6% _b	1.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	34.9%a	3.2% _b	3.5% _a	14.6% _b	0.2%a	1.1% _{a,b}	7.2% _{b,c}	16.4% _c
	Don't know	7.1% ¹	4.1% _a	10.0% _b	0.9% _a	9.8% _b	10.2% _b	11.6% _b	8.4% _a	5.3% _a	7.9%a	13.0% _a	2.2% _b	4.7% _{a,b}	8.1%a	7.2% _a	7.4%a	4.0% _a	6.2% _a	5.5% _a	6.7% _a	13.3% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	387	150	231	48	121	118	96	73	171	140	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	117	151	75	36

Table 42		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	el	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 42		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	54.3% ¹	54.1% _a	54.8% _a	55.0% _a	54.6% _a	53.2% _a	51.3% _a	58.8% _a	51.7% _{a,b}	48.2% _b	59.1% _a	54.5% _a	55.4% _a	39.3% _a	56.2% _b	57.0% _a	33.5% _b	56.5% _a	53.9% _a	46.8% _a	57.8% _a
How severe of an issue do	Moderate	24.7% ¹	23.4% _a	25.7% _a	22.3% _a	25.2% _a	30.4% _a	24.8% _a	21.1% _a	25.2% _{a,b}	32.0% _b	18.3% _a	29.9% _b	27.8% _b	22.3% _a	25.4% _a	24.9%a	23.7% _a	26.8% _{a,b}	23.2% _{a,b}	33.6% _a	17.1% _b
you believe heroin, or other	Minor	8.1% ¹	9.2% _a	7.1% _a	7.4% _a	10.0% _a	5.0% _a	9.5%a	5.6% _a	10.7% _b	9.2% _{a,b}	5.9% _a	6.9% _a	10.9% _a	6.4% _a	8.5% _a	7.5% _a	11.9% _a	9.1%a	10.3% _a	4.2% _a	4.1% _a
opiate, abuse is in your	Not at all	3.6% ¹	4.6%a	2.6%a	5.7% _a	3.3% _{a,b}	0.8% _b	1.5% _{a,b}	6.0% _a	2.5% _b	0.4% _b	3.8% _a	0.5% _b	1.4% _{a,b}	11.2% _a	2.3% _b	2.4%a	12.4% _b	0.7% _a	2.2% _{a,b}	4.5% _{b,c}	12.1% _c
community :	Don't know	9.4% ¹	8.6%a	9.8%a	9.6% _a	6.9% _a	10.7% _a	12.9% _a	8.6% _a	9.9% _a	10.2% _a	13.0% _a	8.3% _{a,b}	4.6% _b	20.8% _a	7.6% _b	8.2% _a	18.4% _b	6.8% _a	10.4% _a	10.8% _a	8.9%a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1154	471	670	213	335	312	285	223	513	412	306	401	258	99	1018	1046	71	391	464	181	92

		Jefferson County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	I	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	56.2% ¹	57.5% _a	55.2% _a	55.9% _a	55.5% _a	60.9% _a	53.0% _a	66.1% _a	47.1% _b	49.9% _b	56.4% _a	58.0% _a	54.8% _a	39.4% _a	61.9% _b	60.6% _a	33.0% _b	60.5% _a	55.0% _a	44.4% _a	60.4% _a
How severe of an issue do	Moderate	21.0% ¹	19.2% _a	23.3% _a	18.2% _a	22.1% _a	23.4% _a	27.2% _a	15.5% _a	24.0% _{a,b}	28.4% _b	15.7% _a	26.6% _a	25.3% _a	24.3%a	19.9% _a	22.1% _a	18.9% _a	25.6% _{a,b}	19.0% _{a,b}	33.7% _a	11.0% _b
you believe heroin, or other	Minor	9.0% ¹	7.7% _a	10.6% _a	7.1% _a	13.2% _a	7.2% _a	9.0% _a	6.5% _a	13.0% _a	8.0% _a	7.2% _a	5.5% _a	12.5% _a	6.6% _a	9.8% _a	7.1% _a	16.1% _b	6.4% _a	10.6% _a	10.1% _a	8.8% _a
opiate, abuse is in your	Not at all	3.2% ¹	5.0%a	1.4% _b	4.8% _a	2.4% _a	0.0% ²	3.1% _a	3.4% _a	5.0%a	0.0% ²	5.8% _a	1.0% _a	3.2% _a	7.8%a	1.4% _b	1.7% _a	10.7% _b	1.6% _a	2.9% _a	0.0% ²	8.5% _a
community r	Don't know	10.5% ¹	10.7% _a	9.5% _a	13.9% _a	6.8% _a	8.6% _a	7.7% _a	8.5% _a	11.0% _a	13.7% _a	14.9% _a	8.9% _{a,b}	4.2% _b	21.9% _a	7.0% _b	8.5% _a	21.2% _b	5.9% _a	12.6% _a	11.9% _a	11.3% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	423	191	227	123	102	99	95	78	187	155	122	149	93	81	330	358	45	141	175	53	39

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups			Education Leve	el .	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Mili	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	35.3% ¹	32.1% _a	38.1% _a	27.0% _a	34.7% _{a,b}	35.1% _{a,b}	48.7% _b	40.8% _a	33.7% _a	24.2% _a	41.6% _a	31.1% _a	23.8% _a	33.4% _a	34.8% _a	36.9% _a	14.5% _b	35.0% _a	41.3% _a	21.2% _a	37.1% _a
How severe of an issue do	Moderate	32.6% ¹	36.0% _a	29.3% _a	37.1% _a	33.7% _a	30.1% _a	26.1% _a	30.8% _a	32.2% _a	37.7% _a	24.7% _a	36.6% _a	36.1% _a	40.1% _a	33.5% _a	33.7% _a	17.3% _a	31.9% _a	27.5% _a	41.8% _a	41.1% _a
you believe heroin, or other	Minor	15.1% ¹	20.1% _a	10.7% _b	16.1% _a	17.3% _a	10.1% _a	15.1% _a	10.1% _a	18.0% _{a,b}	22.7% _b	12.4% _a	19.0% _a	24.3% _a	26.6% _a	15.8% _a	13.9% _a	41.8% _b	17.6% _a	18.5% _a	7.3% _a	0.0% ²
opiate, abuse is in your	Not at all	0.5% ¹	0.0% ²	0.9% _a	1.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	1.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.9% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.4% _a	1.3% _a	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	2.3% _a	0.7% _a
community i	Don't know	16.5% ¹	11.9% _a	21.1% _b	18.6% _a	14.3% _a	24.1% _a	9.8% _a	18.3% _a	15.5% _a	13.9% _a	21.3%a	12.5% _a	15.8% _a	0.0% ²	15.4% _a	15.0% _a	25.1% _a	15.3% _a	12.8% _a	27.4% _a	21.0% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	344	130	212	42	112	95	94	72	155	117	79	123	71	9	319	325	13	133	138	53	17

		St. Lawrence County	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	4	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	56.9% ¹	55.8% _a	58.6% _a	58.7% _a	59.1% _a	52.6% _a	50.7% _a	56.2% _a	59.7% _a	51.8% _a	65.9% _a	57.8% _a	62.0% _a	39.3% _a	56.8% _a	59.0% _a	37.3% _b	59.3% _a	55.9% _a	53.1% _a	57.8% _a
How severe of an issue do	Moderate	26.4% ¹	24.9% _a	27.1% _a	25.3% _a	25.5% _a	36.1% _a	22.8% _a	24.3% _a	24.9% _a	34.3% _a	20.2% _a	30.9% _a	28.4% _a	6.8% _a	27.7% _a	25.1% _a	33.1% _a	26.5% _a	27.8% _a	32.0% _a	19.8% _a
you believe heroin, or other	Minor	5.5% ¹	8.3% _a	2.9% _b	6.2% _a	5.3% _a	1.7% _a	8.4% _a	3.3% _a	7.0% _a	7.4%a	3.0% _a	4.8% _a	6.8% _a	1.6%a	5.8% _a	6.2% _a	0.0% ²	9.0%a	7.7% _a	0.6% _a	0.5%a
opiate, abuse is in your	Not at all	4.6% ¹	5.3% _a	4.1% _a	7.8% _a	5.0% _a	1.4% _a	0.7% _a	10.3% _a	0.6% _b	0.6% _b	2.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	34.9% _a	3.5% _b	3.5% _a	17.1% _b	0.2% _a	1.8% _{a,b}	7.2% _{b,c}	16.4% _c
community i	Don't know	6.6% ¹	5.8% _a	7.4% _a	2.0% _a	5.0% _a	8.3% _{a,b}	17.3% _b	5.9% _a	7.8% _a	5.9%a	9.0%a	6.6%a	2.8% _a	17.5% _a	6.3% _a	6.2% _a	12.5% _a	5.1%a	6.8% _a	7.1% _a	5.5%a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	387	150	231	48	121	118	96	73	171	140	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	117	151	75	36

Table 12		Tr-County Combined	Ger	nder		Age G	Groups		I	Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 45		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	36.6% ¹	35.3% _a	38.5% _a	45.7% _a	33.4% _b	34.0% _{b,c}	22.0% _c	41.8% _a	33.2% _b	31.8% _b	40.5% _a	34.5% _a	40.2% _a	32.9% _a	37.0% _a	36.9% _a	31.3% _a	35.0% _a	37.7% _{a,b}	28.2% _a	47.5% _b
How severe of an issue do	Moderate	33.1% ¹	32.8% _a	32.9% _a	26.3% _a	38.8% _b	33.8% _{a,b}	37.9% _b	31.6% _a	31.0% _a	38.8% _a	27.3% _a	39.5% _b	32.3% _{a,b}	25.4% _a	34.2% _b	34.2% _a	26.2% _a	38.2% _a	30.8% _{a,b}	40.8% _a	21.0% _b
you believe prescriptive	Minor	11.4% ¹	12.5% _a	10.5% _a	8.4% _a	12.6% _a	13.2% _a	14.8% _a	8.8% _a	14.1% _b	12.4% _{a,b}	10.3% _a	11.0% _a	12.5% _a	6.5% _a	12.2% _b	11.6% _a	12.2% _a	10.9%a	14.6% _a	8.2% _a	6.9% _a
drug abuse is in your	Not at all	3.7% ¹	4.7% _a	2.8%a	5.7% _a	3.7% _a	1.1% _a	1.4% _a	6.1% _a	2.8% _{a,b}	0.4% _b	4.3% _a	0.4% _b	1.4% _{a,b}	11.2% _a	2.5% _b	2.6%a	12.4% _b	0.6%a	2.7% _{a,b}	4.6% _{b,c}	12.1% _c
community !	Don't know	15.2% ¹	14.8% _a	15.4% _a	13.9% _a	11.4% _a	17.9% _{a,b}	23.9% _b	11.7% _a	18.8% _b	16.5% _{a,b}	17.6% _a	14.6% _a	13.7% _a	24.0% _a	14.1% _b	14.7% _a	17.9% _a	15.4% _a	14.2% _a	18.2% _a	12.6% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1151	467	671	212	334	312	284	223	511	411	307	399	257	99	1017	1046	70	391	463	179	92

		Jefferson County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	39.6% ¹	40.5% _a	39.3% _a	47.9% _a	34.7% _{a,b}	38.2% _{a,b}	21.6% _b	51.1% _a	30.5% _b	30.8% _b	42.1% _a	38.0% _a	38.6% _a	37.1% _a	41.2% _a	40.8% _a	31.3% _a	39.0% _{a,b}	39.6% _{a,b}	24.1% _a	54.7% _b
How severe of an issue do	Moderate	29.3% ¹	28.6% _a	29.9% _a	21.1% _a	35.9% _b	28.3% _{a,b}	44.8% _b	26.9% _a	25.5% _a	40.0% _a	21.6%a	39.6% _b	29.3% _{a,b}	24.8% _a	29.8% _a	32.0% _a	20.1% _a	39.6% _a	24.9% _{b,c}	44.6% _{a,b}	9.4% _c
you believe prescriptive	Minor	11.7% ¹	9.7% _a	14.1% _a	6.8% _a	19.8% _b	12.6% _{a,b}	11.2% _{a,b}	9.2% _a	15.7% _a	10.6% _a	9.6% _a	9.8% _a	13.8% _a	7.2% _a	13.5% _a	10.9% _a	17.6% _a	5.8% _a	16.5% _b	8.3% _{a,b}	11.6% _{a,b}
drug abuse is in your	Not at all	3.5% ¹	5.0% _a	1.9%a	4.8% _a	3.4% _a	0.0% ²	2.8% _a	3.4% _a	5.7% _a	0.0% ²	6.5%a	0.6% _b	3.2% _{a,b}	7.8%a	1.7% _b	2.0% _a	10.7% _b	1.2% _a	3.7% _{a,b}	0.0% ²	8.5% _b
community r	Don't know	15.9% ¹	16.2% _a	14.8% _a	19.4% _a	6.2% _b	20.9% _a	19.6% _a	9.4% _a	22.6% _b	18.6% _{a,b}	20.1% _a	12.0% _a	15.2% _a	23.2% _a	13.9% _b	14.3% _a	20.4% _a	14.4% _a	15.3% _a	23.0% _a	15.7% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	423	191	227	123	102	99	95	78	187	155	122	149	93	81	330	358	45	141	175	53	39

		Lewis County	Gei	nder		Age G	roups			Education Leve		A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	24.4% ¹	21.6% _a	27.2% _a	17.5% _a	29.3% _a	25.5% _a	23.0% _a	30.2% _a	19.5% _a	17.9% _a	31.0% _a	17.7% _a	23.8% _a	11.2% _a	24.0% _a	24.3% _a	9.5% _a	24.1% _{a,c,d}	28.8% _{a,b}	8.2% _c	37.1% _{b,d}
How severe of an issue do	Moderate	39.0% ¹	43.5% _a	34.0% _a	33.6% _a	40.4% _a	38.2% _a	43.5% _a	41.5% _a	38.5% _a	33.2% _a	30.5%a	45.4% _a	27.2% _a	70.7% _a	38.5% _a	39.5% _a	33.7% _a	36.2% _a	37.2% _a	54.2% _a	30.8% _a
you believe prescriptive	Minor	18.5% ¹	21.8% _a	15.8% _a	25.0% _a	15.8% _a	17.1% _a	16.9% _a	14.4% _a	19.5% _a	27.3% _a	17.9% _a	21.6% _a	28.8% _a	10.4% _a	19.3% _a	18.3% _a	29.8% _a	21.3% _a	21.0% _a	8.6% _a	10.3% _a
drug abuse is in your	Not at all	0.9% ¹	1.0% _a	0.9% _a	1.2% _a	0.0% ²	2.9% _a	0.3% _a	0.9% _a	0.6% _a	1.5% _a	1.8%a	0.9%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.9% _a	0.9% _a	1.4% _a	0.1% _a	1.2%a	2.4% _a	0.7% _a
community :	Don't know	17.2% ¹	12.1% _a	22.1% _b	22.7% _a	14.5% _a	16.3% _a	16.3% _a	13.0% _a	21.9% _a	20.0% _a	18.8% _a	14.4% _a	20.2% _a	7.6%a	17.3% _a	17.1% _a	25.7% _a	18.2% _a	11.8% _a	26.7% _a	21.0% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	341	126	213	41	111	95	93	72	153	116	80	121	70	9	318	325	12	133	137	51	17

		St. Lawrence County	Gei	nder		Age G	roups		E	Education Leve	4	A	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Major	36.5% ¹	32.9% _a	40.5% _a	47.6% _a	33.4% _{a,b}	33.2% _{a,b}	21.9% _b	35.2% _a	38.5% _a	35.7% _a	40.3% _a	36.1% _a	44.8% _a	9.8%a	36.8% _b	36.7% _a	34.4% _a	34.5% _a	37.6% _a	34.0% _a	42.3% _a
How severe of an issue do	Moderate	35.5% ¹	34.6% _a	35.4% _a	32.0% _a	40.9% _a	36.9% _a	31.6% _a	33.9% _a	34.5% _a	39.0% _a	33.8% _a	38.0% _a	36.1% _a	21.6% _a	36.5% _a	34.8% _a	36.1% _a	37.5% _a	37.1% _a	36.4% _a	29.8% _a
you believe prescriptive	Minor	9.4% ¹	13.1% _a	5.8% _b	7.6% _a	5.7% _a	12.5% _a	16.9% _a	6.8% _a	11.6% _a	10.9% _a	9.6% _a	9.1% _a	8.1% _a	1.6%a	9.6% _a	10.6%a	0.0% ²	12.4% _a	10.2% _a	8.1% _a	2.5%a
drug abuse is in your	Not at all	4.6% ¹	5.3% _a	4.1% _a	7.8% _a	5.0% _a	1.4% _a	0.7% _a	10.3% _a	0.6% _b	0.6% _b	2.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	34.9% _a	3.5% _b	3.5% _a	17.1% _b	0.2% _a	1.8% _{a,b}	7.2% _{b,c}	16.4% _c
community :	Don't know	14.0% ¹	14.0% _a	14.3% _a	4.9% _a	15.0% _b	16.0% _{a,b}	28.9% _b	13.7% _a	14.8% _a	13.8% _a	14.3% _a	16.8% _a	11.1% _a	32.2% _a	13.6% _b	14.4% _a	12.5% _a	15.4% _a	13.3% _a	14.2% _a	9.1%a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	387	150	231	48	121	118	96	73	171	140	105	129	94	9	369	363	13	117	151	75	36

Table 44		Tr-County Combined	Ger	nder		Age G	Groups			Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 44		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Strongly A	54.1% ¹	45.8% _a	61.6% _b	53.1% _a	57.5% _a	55.0% _a	48.7% _a	53.0% _a	53.4% _a	56.7% _a	54.2% _a	53.2% _a	52.5% _a	45.4% _a	54.9% _b	54.4% _a	48.1% _a	35.1% _a	59.1% _b	86.7% _c	50.2% _b
Womens Reproductive	Somewhat A	21.6% ¹	22.3% _a	21.4% _a	27.0% _a	15.7% _b	15.9% _{b,c}	25.9% _{a,c}	18.3% _a	22.7% _{a,b}	26.4% _b	20.9% _a	21.5% _a	25.4% _a	32.9% _a	20.3% _b	20.6% _a	31.7% _b	21.1% _{a,b}	26.8% _a	11.5% _b	16.2% _{a,b}
Rights: A=Woman's Right;	Somewhat B	10.6% ¹	15.1% _a	6.2% _b	6.3% _a	12.8% _b	16.9% _b	10.5% _{a,b}	11.6% _a	10.5% _a	8.9% _a	8.8% _a	9.7% _a	13.0% _a	7.8% _a	11.1% _a	10.7% _a	12.8% _a	17.7% _a	7.2% _b	0.1% _c	15.1% _a
B=Morally wrong	Strongly B	13.8% ¹	16.8% _a	10.8% _b	13.6% _a	14.1% _a	12.2% _a	14.8% _a	17.2% _a	13.4% _{a,b}	7.9% _b	16.0%a	15.5% _a	9.0% _a	14.0% _a	13.7% _a	14.3% _a	7.4% _b	26.1% _a	6.9% _b	1.7% _b	18.4% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1115	450	653	203	327	300	277	214	491	404	300	390	251	94	995	1017	65	380	454	177	87

		Jefferson Countv	Gei	nder		Age G	roups		I	Education Leve	el	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Strongly A	55.2% ¹	43.3% _a	67.0% _b	54.4% _a	55.3% _a	61.2% _a	51.2% _a	54.9% _a	56.0% _a	54.4% _a	54.6% _a	55.9% _a	53.9% _a	43.1% _a	58.5% _b	55.3% _a	47.1% _a	34.5% _a	68.1% _b	77.9% _b	42.3% _a
Womens Reproductive	Somewhat A	22.9% ¹	24.7% _a	21.4% _a	31.0% _a	13.6% _b	12.0% _b	26.8% _{a,b}	20.2% _a	24.7% _a	25.2% _a	21.1%a	22.7% _a	28.0% _a	33.8% _a	19.8% _b	21.5% _a	31.9% _a	22.0% _a	23.8% _a	21.0% _a	21.4% _a
Rights: A=Woman's Right;	Somewhat B	10.2% ¹	15.9% _a	4.5% _b	6.0% _a	14.5% _a	13.9% _a	13.2% _a	13.6% _a	5.6%a	11.1% _a	10.0% _a	12.1% _a	7.9% _a	7.7% _a	11.2% _a	10.3% _a	12.9% _a	16.9% _a	3.9% _b	0.0% ²	23.8% _a
B=Morally Wrong	Strongly B	11.7% ¹	16.1% _a	7.1% _b	8.7% _a	16.6% _a	12.8% _a	8.7% _a	11.3% _a	13.7% _a	9.3% _a	14.3% _a	9.4% _a	10.2% _a	15.5% _a	10.5% _a	12.8% _a	8.2% _a	26.6% _a	4.2% _b	1.1% _b	12.5% _{a,b}
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	405	181	219	119	99	94	89	73	177	151	118	143	88	78	318	343	42	135	170	52	37

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve		Ar	nnual HH Incor	ne	Active Milit	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Strongly A	48.7% ¹	43.0% _a	53.2% _a	61.8% _a	40.3% _b	46.9% _{a,b}	50.4% _{a,b}	46.2% _a	51.1% _a	50.7% _a	45.8% _a	51.4% _a	49.5% _a	58.4% _a	49.3% _a	49.9% _a	46.1% _a	33.2% _a	53.5% _b	76.3% _c	55.2% _{a,b,c}
Womens Reproductive	Somewhat A	17.4% ¹	13.6% _a	21.1% _a	11.3% _a	18.6% _a	22.8% _a	17.1% _a	16.4% _a	16.0% _a	21.9% _a	29.2% _a	12.5% _b	12.5% _{a,b}	0.0% ²	17.9% _a	16.9% _a	30.8% _a	15.9% _a	22.7% _a	11.4% _a	9.5% _a
Rights: A=Woman's Right;	Somewhat B	14.1% ¹	17.6% _a	11.2% _a	18.9% _a	13.9% _a	9.9% _a	12.0% _a	12.5% _a	15.3% _a	16.2% _a	6.8% _a	17.2% _a	20.0% _a	41.6% _a	14.0% _b	14.3% _a	17.0% _a	11.3% _{a,b}	18.8% _{a,c}	1.1% _b	33.5% _c
B=Morally Wrong	Strongly B	19.8% ¹	25.9% _a	14.5% _b	8.0% _a	27.2% _b	20.5% _{a,b}	20.5% _{a,b}	24.8% _a	17.5% _a	11.1% _a	18.2% _a	18.9% _a	18.0% _a	0.0% ²	18.9% _a	19.0% _a	6.0% _a	39.6% _a	5.0% _b	11.3% _b	1.8% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	337	125	210	39	110	93	94	71	149	117	78	121	72	9	316	321	11	132	138	50	16

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Strongly A	54.2% ¹	48.9% _a	58.6% _a	49.6% _a	63.8% _a	52.6% _a	46.6% _a	52.9% _a	51.4% _a	60.3% _a	55.5% _a	51.6% _a	51.8% _a	64.6% _a	53.4% _a	54.6% _a	50.4% _a	36.3% _a	48.1% _a	92.6% _b	57.0% _a
Womens Reproductive	Somewhat A	21.3% ¹	21.8% _a	21.4% _a	24.3% _a	16.6% _a	16.8% _a	27.7% _a	16.7% _a	22.4% _a	28.6% _a	19.0% _a	22.9% _a	25.7% _a	32.5% _a	21.3% _a	20.8% _a	31.4% _a	21.9% _{a,c}	32.2% _a	7.1% _b	12.2% _{b,c}
Rights: A=Woman's Right;	Somewhat B	10.0% ¹	13.8% _a	6.6% _b	4.4%a	11.0% _{a,b}	21.4% _b	8.3% _{a,b}	9.0% _a	14.0% _a	5.2% _a	7.9% _{a,b}	5.9%a	16.3% _b	0.0% ²	10.4% _a	10.2% _a	12.0% _a	20.4% _a	8.4% _b	0.0% ²	4.8% _b
B=Morally Wrong	Strongly B	14.4% ¹	15.4% _a	13.4% _a	21.7% _a	8.6% _b	9.2% _{a,b}	17.4% _{a,b}	21.4% _a	12.2% _{a,b}	5.9% _b	17.7% _{a,b}	19.7% _a	6.2% _b	2.9% _a	14.8% _a	14.4% _a	6.2% _a	21.4% _a	11.2% _a	0.3% _b	26.0% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	373	144	224	45	118	113	94	70	165	136	104	126	91	7	361	353	12	113	146	75	34

Table 15		Tr-County Combined	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		I	Education Leve	H	A	nnual HH Incor	ne	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
Table 45		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Retired	26.3% ¹	29.4% _a	23.3% _b	0.7% _a	11.3% _b	60.4% _c	86.7% _d	29.4% _a	25.1% _a	22.1% _a	32.6% _a	28.2% _a	10.7% _b	0.9% _a	29.5% _b	28.5% _a	12.2% _b	33.0% _a	24.8% _a	27.0% _a	13.2% _b
what is your current occupation?	Not retired	73.7% ¹	70.6% _a	76.7% _b	99.3% _a	88.7% _b	39.6% _c	13.3% _d	70.6% _a	74.9% _a	77.9% _a	67.4% _a	71.8% _a	89.3% _b	99.1% _a	70.5% _b	71.5%a	87.8% _b	67.0% _a	75.2% _a	73.0% _a	86.8% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1148	469	670	213	335	310	285	221	512	411	307	400	258	99	1020	1047	71	392	466	180	91

		Jefferson Countv	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	el	A	nnual HH Incor	ne	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Retired	22.1% ¹	23.8% _a	20.5% _a	1.3% _a	14.3% _b	53.5% _c	84.5% _d	22.5% _a	22.8% _a	20.4% _a	21.9% _{a,b}	26.9% _a	9.6% _b	0.0% ²	27.9% _a	25.2% _a	8.2% _b	29.3% _a	18.1% _a	29.9% _a	14.2% _a
occupation?	Not retired	77.9% ¹	76.2% _a	79.5% _a	98.7% _a	85.7% _b	46.5% _c	15.5% _d	77.5% _a	77.2% _a	79.6% _a	78.1% _{a,b}	73.1% _a	90.4% _b	100.0% ²	72.1% _a	74.8% _a	91.8% _b	70.7% _a	81.9% _a	70.1% _a	85.8% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	419	190	225	123	101	98	94	76	187	153	122	148	93	81	329	356	45	141	175	53	37

		Lewis County	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Retired	29.5% ¹	32.0% _a	27.1% _a	0.0% ²	3.2% _a	56.9% _b	92.3% _c	42.7% _a	19.9% _b	12.8% _b	58.7% _a	23.5% _b	9.3% _b	32.6% _a	28.5% _a	29.4% _a	32.8% _a	37.2% _a	31.8% _a	10.9% _b	14.4% _{a,b}
occupation?	Not retired	70.5% ¹	68.0% _a	72.9% _a	100.0% ²	96.8% _a	43.1% _b	7.7% _c	57.3% _a	80.1% _b	87.2% _b	41.3% _a	76.5% _b	90.7% _b	67.4% _a	71.5%a	70.6% _a	67.2% _a	62.8% _a	68.2% _a	89.1% _b	85.6% _{a,b}
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	346	129	215	42	112	96	95	72	156	118	80	123	72	9	322	328	13	133	140	52	18

		St. Lawrence County	Gei	nder		Age G	roups			Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Incor	ne	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Retired	29.6% ¹	34.7% _a	24.9% _b	0.0%2	10.8% _a	67.0% _b	86.7% _c	32.8% _a	28.3% _a	25.8% _a	40.7% _a	30.5% _a	11.9% _b	1.6% _a	31.0% _b	31.3% _a	16.3% _a	35.1% _a	32.1% _a	28.7% _{a,b}	12.3% _b
What is your current occupation?	Not retired	70.4% ¹	65.3% _a	75.1% _b	100.0% ²	89.2% _a	33.0% _b	13.3% _c	67.2% _a	71.7% _a	74.2% _a	59.3% _a	69.5% _a	88.1% _b	98.4% _a	69.0% _b	68.7%a	83.7% _a	64.9% _a	67.9% _a	71.3% _{a,b}	87.7% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	383	150	230	48	122	116	96	73	169	140	105	129	93	9	369	363	13	118	151	75	36

Table 16		Tr-County Combined	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		I	Education Leve	H	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 40		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Conservative	32.5% ¹	38.6% _a	26.8% _b	26.0% _a	31.7% _{a,c}	44.0% _b	39.8% _{b,c}	34.8% _a	32.8% _a	27.6% _a	28.9% _a	36.5% _a	35.8% _a	27.6% _a	32.9% _a	34.4% _a	22.7% _b	100.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Middle of the Road	38.6% ¹	33.1% _a	43.6% _b	35.4% _a	42.0% _a	39.2% _a	38.4% _a	33.6% _a	41.4% _b	44.5% _b	40.0%a	35.2% _a	43.0% _a	31.5% _a	39.8% _a	38.2% _a	43.2% _a	0.0% ²	100.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
Political Beliefs	Liberal	14.4% ¹	12.4% _a	16.3% _a	16.7% _a	11.8% _a	11.3% _a	17.7% _a	9.3% _a	15.2% _b	24.3% _c	13.8% _a	15.1% _a	14.1% _a	9.0% _a	15.1% _a	15.1% _a	9.9%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	100.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Don't Know	14.5% ¹	15.8% _a	13.3% _a	22.0% _a	14.5% _b	5.5% _c	4.0% _c	22.3% _a	10.6% _b	3.6% _c	17.3% _a	13.2% _{a,b}	7.1% _b	31.8% _a	12.2% _b	12.3%a	24.3% _b	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	100.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1134	463	664	211	332	305	283	223	500	410	303	399	257	95	1011	1035	68	393	467	181	93

		Jefferson County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		I	Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Conservative	30.5% ¹	38.1% _a	22.5% _b	25.1% _a	30.6% _a	40.4% _a	40.8% _a	27.5% _a	32.8% _a	33.5% _a	21.9% _a	36.1% _b	38.2% _b	25.8% _a	32.4% _a	33.7% _a	19.3% _b	100.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Middle of the Road	45.6% ¹	34.9% _a	57.8% _b	46.7% _a	48.4% _a	46.0%a	36.1% _a	45.0% _a	47.2% _a	44.6% _a	46.9%a	43.6% _a	47.4% _a	33.2% _a	50.0% _b	47.3% _a	43.0% _a	0.0% ²	100.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
Political Beliefs	Liberal	9.6% ¹	5.1% _a	13.6% _b	8.9% _a	7.4% _a	8.4% _a	18.8% _a	6.4% _a	9.6% _{a,b}	16.7% _b	8.8%a	10.2% _a	9.6% _a	9.0%a	9.0% _a	10.1% _a	5.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	100.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Don't Know	14.2% ¹	21.8% _a	6.1% _b	19.4% _a	13.7% _a	5.1% _a	4.3% _a	21.2% _a	10.5% _b	5.2% _b	22.4% _a	10.0% _b	4.9% _b	32.0% _a	8.7% _b	8.9% _a	32.0% _b	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	100.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	409	187	220	120	101	94	93	77	181	151	120	147	92	77	324	349	43	141	176	53	39

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		I	Education Leve	1	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Conservative	39.8% ¹	46.6% _a	34.2% _b	21.7% _a	44.6% _b	48.4% _b	46.2% _b	46.2% _a	34.2% _a	32.7% _a	36.2% _a	47.9% _a	38.2% _a	22.6%a	39.0% _a	40.6% _a	19.4% _a	100.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Middle of the Road	37.0% ¹	36.5% _a	37.2% _a	28.0% _a	37.1% _a	45.2% _a	41.0% _a	31.6% _a	40.6% _a	44.5% _a	42.1% _a	33.3% _a	45.5% _a	52.3%a	37.1% _a	35.6% _a	64.1% _b	0.0% ²	100.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
Political Beliefs	Liberal	15.1% ¹	8.8% _a	20.3% _b	26.0% _a	16.6% _{a,b}	4.5% _b	8.3% _{b,c}	11.8% _a	16.7% _a	21.0% _a	16.0%a	12.4% _a	16.4% _a	16.0%a	15.3% _a	15.8% _a	4.0%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	100.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Don't Know	8.2% ¹	8.1% _a	8.3% _a	24.3% _a	1.7% _b	1.9% _b	4.5% _b	10.4% _a	8.5% _a	1.8% _a	5.6% _a	6.3% _a	0.0% ²	9.0%a	8.7% _a	8.1% _a	12.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	100.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	345	128	215	43	112	95	94	73	153	119	79	123	72	9	320	325	13	134	140	53	18

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		1	Education Leve	el	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Conservative	32.7% ¹	37.3% _a	28.9% _a	28.0% _a	29.2% _a	45.4% _a	37.5% _a	39.2% _a	32.5% _{a,b}	21.0% _b	36.3% _a	33.8% _a	33.1% _a	39.5% _a	31.9% _a	33.5% _a	29.5% _a	100.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Middle of the Road	32.0% ¹	30.4% _a	32.2% _a	21.8% _a	37.8% _b	32.1% _{a,b}	39.4% _{a,b}	22.3% _a	36.3% _b	44.4% _b	30.7% _a	28.6% _a	38.5% _a	17.5%a	32.7% _a	30.8% _a	40.1% _a	0.0% ²	100.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
Political Beliefs	Liberal	19.0% ¹	20.8% _a	17.7% _a	25.2% _a	14.2% _a	15.7% _a	19.3% _a	11.6% _a	20.0% _{a,b}	32.2% _b	19.5% _a	19.9% _a	17.8% _a	8.1% _a	19.7% _a	19.3% _a	18.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	100.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Don't Know	16.2% ¹	11.5% _a	21.1% _b	24.9% _a	18.7% _{a,b}	6.9% _{b,c}	3.8% _c	27.0% _a	11.2% _b	2.4% _b	13.4% _a	17.7% _a	10.5% _a	34.9% _a	15.7% _b	16.3% _a	11.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	100.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	380	148	229	48	119	116	96	73	166	140	104	129	93	9	367	361	12	118	151	75	36

Table 47		Tr-County Combined	Gei	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	əl	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
Table 47		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Immigration	2.3% ¹	3.7% _a	1.0% _b	0.4% _a	4.2% _b	1.9% _{a,b}	2.9% _{a,b}	2.3% _a	2.5% _a	1.9% _a	1.0% _a	1.0% _a	4.7% _b	0.8% _a	2.5% _a	2.3% _a	2.0% _a	5.9% _a	0.7% _b	0.2% _b	0.6% _{a,b}
	Protecting democracy	3.5% ¹	3.6% _a	3.5%a	1.8% _a	2.4% _{a,b}	6.7% _b	6.7% _{b,c}	2.0%a	4.6% _a	4.8%a	3.2% _a	3.8%a	3.7% _a	0.0% ²	3.8% _a	3.6%a	2.3% _a	4.6% _a	3.9% _a	2.4% _a	1.3% _a
	COVID-19	0.5% ¹	0.4%a	0.7% _a	0.3% _a	0.3% _a	1.8% _a	0.3%a	0.7% _a	0.7% _a	0.0%a	0.1% _a	0.4% _a	1.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	0.5% _a	1.4% _a	1.2%a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% _a
	Abortion	0.3% ¹	0.2% _a	0.5%a	0.5% _a	0.0%a	1.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.6%a	0.2% _a	0.1%a	0.0% ²	0.2%a	0.1%a	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.4%a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.2% _a	1.2% _a	0.0% ²
	Inflation/Cost of Living	28.0% ¹	24.9% _a	30.6% _b	27.0% _a	27.9% _a	25.3% _a	32.4% _a	27.5% _a	28.4% _a	28.0% _a	29.7% _a	27.4% _a	30.5% _a	19.7% _a	28.8% _a	29.0% _a	21.2% _a	36.4% _a	23.0% _b	21.6% _b	26.2% _{a,b}
	Unemployment/Low Wage Jobs	12.0% ¹	14.1% _a	10.3% _a	13.4% _a	13.9% _a	8.2% _a	9.8%a	14.7% _a	8.8% _b	12.5% _{a,b}	9.2% _a	13.8% _a	13.4% _a	18.9% _a	11.5% _b	11.7% _a	15.3% _a	8.3% _a	10.3% _a	14.8% _{a,b}	24.2% _b
	Homelessness	7.1% ¹	5.6% _a	8.8% _b	8.1% _a	7.0% _a	3.6% _a	9.4%a	9.2% _a	5.4% _a	6.1% _a	10.1% _a	3.8% _b	3.8% _b	2.5% _a	7.2% _a	7.8% _a	1.5% _b	4.8% _a	10.7% _b	4.9% _{a,b}	4.6% _{a,b}
	Climate change	1.0% ¹	1.5%a	0.6% _a	1.1% _a	0.1% _a	1.8% _a	2.0%a	0.7% _a	0.8% _a	2.1% _a	1.0%a	0.9% _a	1.2% _a	0.0% ²	1.1% _a	1.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.4% _a	3.3% _a	0.0% ²
	Healthcare (mental, physical)	6.1% ¹	4.3% _a	7.1%a	8.2% _a	4.2% _a	5.5% _a	6.0%a	4.9% _a	6.0% _a	8.5% _a	7.2% _a	6.2% _a	6.1% _a	12.6% _a	5.5% _b	5.5%a	8.4% _a	5.8% _a	5.6% _a	8.4% _a	6.2% _a
	Racial inequality	0.8% ¹	0.5% _a	1.0% _a	1.1% _a	0.8% _a	0.9% _a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	1.1% _a	0.7% _a	1.1% _a	0.5% _a	0.2% _a	1.2% _a	0.7% _a	0.4% _a	4.0% _b	0.0% ²	1.2% _a	1.4% _a	0.0% ²
	Schools	0.7% ¹	0.7% _a	0.7% _a	0.7% _a	0.4% _a	0.9% _a	1.3% _a	0.5% _a	1.2% _a	0.4% _a	0.3%a	0.8% _a	0.5%a	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.5%a	1.3% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²
	Affordable housing	8.4% ¹	5.3% _a	11.5% _b	7.4% _a	10.4% _a	9.9% _a	5.4% _a	6.8% _a	9.4% _a	10.1% _a	6.8% _a	11.4% _a	7.1% _a	6.5% _a	8.8% _a	8.0% _a	12.2% _a	4.4% _a	12.4% _b	11.5% _{b,c}	3.9% _{a,c}
	Crime	6.2% ¹	6.5%a	6.2% _a	4.5% _a	7.0% _{a,b}	10.6% _b	4.4% _{a,b}	6.0% _a	7.3% _a	5.0%a	3.9% _a	8.2% _{a,b}	9.9% _b	1.5% _a	6.8% _a	7.1%a	1.2% _b	7.2% _a	4.9%a	5.7% _a	8.4% _a
	Too much gun	2.9% ¹	3.0% _a	2.7% _a	1.6% _a	3.1% _a	2.3% _a	4.5% _a	2.0% _a	4.9% _a	1.3% _a	3.3% _a	2.5% _a	4.1% _a	2.7% _a	2.9% _a	2.8% _a	4.2% _a	4.6% _a	3.3% _a	0.6% _a	0.5% _a
What do you think is the single largest issue that is	Not enough gun regulation	0.8% ¹	0.1% _a	1.5% _b	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	2.1% _a	1.7% _a	0.5% _a	0.9% _a	1.2% _a	1.2% _a	0.8% _a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	1.2% _a	1.7% _a	0.1% _a
facing residents of the Nort Country right now?	th Taxes	0.9% ¹	1.2% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	3.9% _b	0.4% _{a,b}	1.4% _a	0.8% _a	0.3% _a	1.7% _a	1.1% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	1.1% _a	0.8% _a	1.1% _a	0.7%a	0.8% _a	1.1% _a	1.9% _a
	Drugs	6.7% ¹	8.6%a	4.7% _b	10.7% _a	5.2% _b	4.6% _{a,b}	2.8% _b	6.1% _a	7.5% _a	5.3% _a	8.2% _a	5.5% _a	4.1% _a	2.5% _a	7.0% _a	6.4% _a	6.0% _a	3.0%a	8.9% _b	6.6% _{a,b}	9.4% _b
	The Economy	2.7% ¹	3.1% _a	2.3% _a	1.2% _a	5.3% _b	2.4% _{a,b}	1.0% _{a,b}	3.1% _a	1.4% _a	4.0%a	2.0% _a	1.8% _a	3.0% _a	2.4% _a	2.6% _a	2.2% _a	7.4% _b	2.9% _{a,c,d}	1.4% _{a,b}	6.7% _c	0.7% _{b,d}
	Government Disfunction	4.2% ¹	6.6% _a	1.9% _b	4.9% _a	3.8% _a	3.0% _a	4.8%a	5.5%a	3.4% _a	3.1% _a	3.3% _a	5.0%a	4.7% _a	1.1% _a	4.5% _a	4.8% _a	0.4% _b	4.8% _a	3.2% _a	1.9%a	8.5% _a
	Poverty	1.2% ¹	1.4% _a	1.0% _a	1.9% _a	0.6% _a	0.6% _a	1.7% _a	1.3% _a	1.2% _a	1.1% _a	1.6% _a	1.8% _a	0.2% _a	6.2% _a	0.8% _b	1.2% _a	1.3% _a	2.3% _a	0.9% _a	0.7% _a	0.0% ²
	Nothing to do	1.1% ¹	1.6% _a	0.6% _a	2.7% _a	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	0.2% _a	1.2% _a	0.7% _a	1.6% _a	1.6% _a	1.1% _a	0.1% _a	6.9% _a	0.6% _b	0.6% _a	4.9% _b	0.1% _a	1.9% _b	1.6% _{a,b}	0.0% ²
	Moral issues	0.4% ¹	0.6%a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	1.4% _a	0.1% _a	0.6%a	0.3% _a	0.2% _a	0.7% _a	0.3% _a	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.5%a	0.0% ²	0.6%a	0.5% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²
	Weather	0.6% ¹	0.8% _a	0.3% _a	1.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	0.7% _a	0.6% _a	0.1% _a	1.5% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	4.8% _a	0.2% _b	0.4% _a	1.4% _a	0.4% _a	0.8% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²
	Elderly issues	0.2% ¹	0.1% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.2% _a	0.5% _a	0.1% _a	0.1% _a	0.4% _a	0.1% _a	0.2% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	People will not work	0.2% ¹	0.2% _a	0.1% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% _a	0.5% _a	0.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.4% _a	0.2% _a	0.1% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.1% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²
	Infrastructure/Water Main Break	0.6% ¹	1.2% _a	0.0% _b	1.3% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0%a	0.7% _a	0.6% _a	0.5% _a	0.9% _a	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	7.3% _a	0.0% _b	0.6%a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.0% _a	0.6% _{a,b}	3.2% _b
	Ignorance	0.1% ¹	0.1% _a	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.0% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% _a	0.5% _a	0.0% ²
	Transportation	0.3% ¹	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	2.3% _a	0.1% _b	0.1% _a	1.9% _b	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Childcare	0.1% ¹	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.1% _a	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Population decrease	0.2% ¹	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.0% _a	1.8% _b	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.2% _a	0.2% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1096	439	645	181	327	305	275	210	488	392	283	386	255	68	995	1009	57	377	441	175	79

		Jefferson County	Ge	nder		Age G	roups		1	Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Immigration	3.7% ¹	6.4% _a	1.1% _b	0.8% _a	8.1% _b	3.1% _{a,b}	3.4% _{a,b}	4.6% _a	3.6% _a	2.0% _a	0.9% _a	1.8% _a	7.0% _a	0.9% _a	4.4% _a	3.6% _a	4.1% _a	10.6% _a	0.6% _b	0.0% ²	1.6% _{a,b}
	Protecting democracy	3.2% ¹	4.4% _a	2.0% _a	1.4% _a	0.0% ²	7.8% _{a,b}	11.2% _b	2.5% _a	3.8% _a	3.6% _a	2.6% _a	4.3% _a	2.0% _a	0.0% ²	3.9% _a	3.7% _a	0.0% ²	7.3% _a	1.5% _b	2.4% _{a,b}	0.0% ²
	COVID-19	1.1% ¹	1.0% _a	1.2% _a	0.6%a	0.6% _a	4.4%a	0.0% ²	1.5%a	1.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	2.3%a	0.0% ²	1.4% _a	0.9% _a	2.9% _a	2.7% _a	0.6%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Abortion	0.1% ¹	0.0% ²	0.3%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Inflation/Cost of Living	23.8% ¹	21.3% _a	25.5% _a	23.6% _a	29.2% _a	16.4% _a	20.5% _a	16.2% _a	27.7% _b	33.1% _b	14.5% _a	28.6% _b	35.5% _b	15.8% _a	25.6% _a	24.0% _a	25.1% _a	31.4% _a	20.3% _a	19.6% _a	20.8% _a
	Unemployment/Low Wage Jobs	10.3% ¹	10.3% _a	10.5% _a	10.4% _a	13.6% _a	6.6% _a	7.3% _a	15.7% _a	5.5% _b	8.0% _{a,b}	9.1% _a	13.9% _a	10.0% _a	19.9% _a	8.6% _b	9.6% _a	14.0% _a	5.5% _a	7.2% _a	18.7% _{a,b}	28.2% _b
	Homelessness	12.0% ¹	7.8% _a	16.2% _b	14.8% _a	9.3% _a	5.5% _a	17.0% _a	14.0% _a	9.8% _a	12.0% _a	16.4% _a	5.1% _b	5.9% _{a,b}	2.8% _a	13.0% _b	13.2% _a	3.1% _a	4.1% _a	16.3% _b	16.4% _{a,b}	11.0% _{a,b}
	Climate change	1.4% ¹	2.7% _a	0.2% _b	1.9%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	4.6% _a	0.6%a	1.3% _a	3.2% _a	1.7% _a	0.3% _a	2.3%a	0.0% ²	1.7% _a	1.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.8% _a	5.6% _a	0.0% ²
	Healthcare (mental, physical)	4.7% ¹	6.1% _a	3.4%a	6.4% _a	0.9% _a	6.6% _a	6.3% _a	5.7% _a	2.6% _a	6.3% _a	9.1% _a	3.6% _a	2.8% _a	12.9% _a	2.7% _b	3.2% _a	16.7% _b	5.8%a	3.7% _a	2.6% _a	8.2% _a
	Racial inequality	1.2% ¹	0.5% _a	1.9% _a	1.9% _a	1.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	2.6% _a	0.0% ²	2.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.4% _a	1.2% _a	0.6% _a	5.6% _b	0.0% ²	1.5% _a	2.6% _a	0.0% ²
	Schools	0.8% ¹	0.6% _a	1.0%a	1.3% _a	0.0% ²	2.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.9% _a	0.6% _a	0.6% _a	1.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	1.0% _a	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	1.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Affordable housing	10.4% ¹	3.8% _a	16.9% _b	5.6% _a	15.1% _b	15.2% _{a,b}	9.6% _{a,b}	11.5% _a	9.8% _a	9.5% _a	7.9% _a	14.5% _a	8.3% _a	5.1% _a	11.7% _a	11.6% _a	1.9% _b	7.2% _a	16.8% _a	2.6% _a	2.6% _a
	Crime	4.6% ¹	4.9% _a	4.3% _a	4.8% _a	2.9% _a	6.0% _a	6.1% _a	3.1% _a	8.3% _a	1.1% _a	4.8% _a	3.8% _a	8.7% _a	1.6% _a	5.4% _a	5.1% _a	2.4% _a	4.8% _a	5.3% _a	4.2% _a	0.0% ²
	regulation	1.4% ¹	2.2% _a	0.6% _a	1.0% _a	0.7% _a	0.6% _a	4.8% _a	0.6% _a	2.2% _a	1.5% _a	2.3% _a	0.5% _a	1.5% _a	2.9% _a	1.1% _a	1.5% _a	0.7% _a	2.1% _a	0.8% _a	2.1% _a	1.3% _a
What do you think is the single largest issue that is	Not enough gun regulation	1.3% ¹	0.2% _a	2.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	5.4% _a	2.2% _a	1.2% _a	1.1% _a	1.9% _a	2.4% _a	0.9% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.4% _a	1.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	2.0% _a	3.0% _a	0.0% ²
Country right now?	Taxes	1.5% ¹	2.1% _a	0.9%a	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	7.4% _b	1.0% _{a,b}	2.0%a	1.5% _a	0.3% _a	2.0% _a	2.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.8% _a	1.1% _a	2.2% _a	0.5% _a	0.7% _a	3.9% _a	4.8% _a
	Drugs	5.2% ¹	7.6% _a	2.3% _b	8.4%a	2.8% _a	2.7% _a	1.3% _a	5.7% _a	3.9% _a	4.9% _a	8.3% _a	4.0% _a	2.6%a	2.8% _a	5.5% _a	5.5% _a	0.0% ²	2.1% _a	6.9%a	4.3% _a	5.4% _a
	The Economy	2.0% ¹	1.1% _a	2.9% _a	1.0% _a	3.6% _a	3.3% _a	0.0% ²	1.2% _a	1.0% _a	5.4% _a	2.3% _a	2.1% _a	2.8% _a	2.1% _a	1.8% _a	2.1% _a	2.0% _a	3.4% _a	1.5% _a	2.6% _a	0.0% ²
	Government Disfunction	4.5% ¹	7.3% _a	1.8% _b	4.1% _a	6.5% _a	2.7% _a	3.1% _a	4.8% _a	5.2% _a	2.6% _a	4.4% _a	3.6% _a	7.7% _a	1.2% _a	5.2% _a	5.3% _a	0.0% ²	5.9% _a	3.8% _a	0.0% ²	7.2% _a
	Poverty	1.7% ¹	2.2% _a	1.2% _a	3.4% _a	0.4% _a	1.0% _a	0.0% ²	1.7% _a	2.3% _a	0.7% _a	1.2% _a	4.0% _a	0.0% ²	6.7% _a	0.7% _b	1.7% _a	1.9% _a	3.9% _a	1.1% <u>a</u>	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Nothing to do	1.8% ¹	2.4% _a	1.3% _a	3.9% _a	0.0% ²	1.7% _a	0.0% ²	2.8% _a	1.3% _a	0.8% _a	3.5% _a	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	7.7% _a	0.6% _b	0.5% _a	9.7% _b	0.0% ²	3.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Moral issues	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Weather	0.9%	1.9% _a	0.0% ²	2.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.7% _a	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	2.2%	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	5.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.6%_	2.1%	0.0% ²
	Elderly issues	0.2%1	0.2% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.3%a	0.0% ²	0.8%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.5%a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.0%2	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	People will not work Infrastructure/Water	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2
	Main Break	1.4%	2.9%a	0.0%2	2.6% _a	0.3%a	0.0%2	0.0%2	1.7% _a	1.2% _a	1.1% _a	1.8%a	0.3% _a	0.0%2	8.1%a	0.0%2	1.4% _a	0.0%2	0.7%a	0.0%2	2.1% _{a,b}	8.2% _b
	Ignorance	0.1%	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0% ²	0.8%a	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.5% _a	0.0%2	0.3% _a	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.1% _a	0.1% _a	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	1.1%_	0.0%2
	Transportation	0.4%1	0.0% ²	0.9%a	0.0% ²	1.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.1%_	0.0% ²	0.0%2	0.0% ²	1.4%a	0.0% ²	2.6%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	3.9% _a	0.0% ²	1.0%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Childcare	0.0%2	0.0% ²	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0%2	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0%2	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Population decrease	0.5%'	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	0.0%2	1.3%	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0%2	1.3%	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.0% ²	0.0%2	0.0%2	0.6%	0.1%	3.6% _b	0.0%2	0.0% ²	4.1% _a	0.6%
<u> </u>	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.00r	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	160	100.0%	100.0%
L	unweighted n	300	109	215	9/	30	30	92	69	1/0	140	104	129	90	55	321	341	32	133	100	50	30

		Lewis County	Ge	nder		Age G	roups		I	Education Leve	el 🛛	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	eliefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Immigration	2.4% ¹	2.8% _a	2.1% _a	0.0% ²	1.8% _a	2.7%_	6.9% _a	2.5% _a	2.0% _a	3.1% _a	4.0% _a	1.2% _a	5.2% _a	0.0% ²	2.7% _a	2.6% _a	0.0% ²	3.2% _a	2.3%_	1.8% _a	0.0% ²
	Protecting democracy	5.9% ¹	7.5%a	4.5%a	1.4% _a	8.4% _a	5.5% _a	7.6%a	7.1% _a	4.5% _a	5.1% _a	5.6%a	5.6%a	2.7%a	0.0% ²	4.8% _a	4.3%a	9.0%a	5.8%a	7.6%a	4.6% _a	0.0% ²
	COVID-19	0.3% ¹	0.0% ²	0.6%a	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.5%a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.9% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	1.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.3%a	0.0% ²	0.5%a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.8%a
	Abortion	2.4% ¹	1.7% _a	3.1%a	5.9%a	0.3% _b	4.0% _{a,b}	0.0% ²	4.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	2.6%a	2.6%a	0.0% ²	2.0%a	0.0% ²	10.7% _b	0.0% ²
	Inflation/Cost of Living	37.8% ¹	32.3% _a	42.8% _b	38.2% _a	36.5% _a	40.6%a	36.0% _a	39.3% _a	37.6% _a	34.5% _a	43.7% _a	41.1% _a	33.4% _a	53.4%a	40.0% _a	39.7% _a	22.3% _a	34.4% _a	37.9% _a	40.7% _a	51.9% _a
	Unemployment/Low Wage Jobs	7.2% ¹	8.5% _a	6.2% _a	10.2% _a	6.5% _a	7.7% _a	4.3%a	3.2% _a	9.1% _{a,b}	14.3% _b	8.9% _a	3.1%a	11.7% _a	0.0% ²	6.3% _a	6.8% _a	12.7% _a	3.0% _a	10.4% _a	8.8% _a	11.8% _a
	Homelessness	2.0% ¹	1.7% _a	2.2% _a	1.2% _a	2.2% _a	4.4%a	0.0% ²	1.7% _a	2.5% _a	1.9% _a	0.7%a	1.1% _a	3.4%a	0.0% ²	2.0% _a	2.2% _a	0.0% ²	1.6%a	3.5%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Climate change	1.4% ¹	1.0% _a	1.9% _a	1.6% _a	0.7% _a	3.2% _a	0.7% _a	1.2% _a	2.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.8% _a	2.1% _a	0.0% ²	1.6% _a	1.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	2.5% _a	3.2% _a	0.0% ²
	Healthcare (mental, physical)	4.1% ¹	1.9% _a	6.3% _b	8.0% _a	4.2% _a	0.3%a	3.2% _a	3.8% _a	3.3% _a	6.4% _a	1.0% _a	6.8% _a	6.9% _a	35.0% _a	3.6% _b	4.3%a	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	4.3% _{a,b}	14.2% _b	0.0% ²
	Racial inequality	1.5% ¹	3.0% _a	0.2% _b	1.7% _a	0.3% _a	4.9% _a	0.0% ²	2.1% _a	0.0% ²	2.8% _a	1.7% _a	2.5% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	1.7% _a	0.6% _a	18.3% _b	0.0% ²	3.8% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²
	Schools	0.6% ¹	0.7% _a	0.4%a	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	0.5%a	0.5%a	0.0% ²	1.1% _a	1.1% _a	0.4% _a	0.9% _a	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.6%a	0.6%a	0.0% ²	0.8%a	0.0% ²	1.4% _a	0.0% ²
	Affordable housing	4.5% ¹	3.0% _a	5.1% _a	4.9% _a	3.4% _a	5.7% _a	4.7% _a	1.7% _a	6.0% _{a,b}	8.9% _b	4.0% _a	2.5% _a	7.1% _a	0.0% ²	4.8% _a	4.1% _a	12.7% _a	3.4% _a	4.5% _a	4.6% _a	10.5% _a
	Crime	1.4% ¹	1.5% _a	1.4%a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	1.2% _{a,b}	5.8% _b	2.0% _a	0.8% _a	1.0% _a	3.2% _a	0.6% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	1.6% _a	0.0% ²	2.6%a	1.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Too much gun regulation	8.4% ¹	10.1% _a	6.9% _a	1.6% _a	11.7% _b	6.0% _{a,b}	13.8% _b	8.9% _a	11.5% _a	1.6% _a	10.6% _a	9.3% _a	5.6% _a	5.5% _a	8.2% _a	7.8% _a	12.7% _a	13.4% _a	7.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
What do you think is the single largest issue that is	Not enough gun regulation	0.3% ¹	0.2% _a	0.5%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	1.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.8% _a	0.4% _a	0.4%a	0.5%a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.5%a	1.0%a
facing residents of the Nort Country right now?	th Taxes	2.3% ¹	1.6% _a	3.0%a	0.0% ²	3.3% _a	5.4% _a	0.3% _a	4.1% _a	0.2% _a	1.6% _a	8.1% _a	0.0% ²	2.0%a	0.0% ²	2.6% _a	2.5% _a	0.0% ²	2.3%a	3.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.8% _a
	Drugs	5.4% ¹	8.0% _a	3.1%a	9.8% _a	5.8% _a	3.5% _a	0.6%a	6.6% _a	5.7% _a	1.9% _a	2.3% _a	6.4% _a	1.0% _a	0.0% ²	5.0%a	5.8% _a	0.0% ²	8.2% _{a,c}	0.8% _b	2.0% _{a,b}	22.4% _c
	The Economy	1.2% ¹	0.7% _a	1.7% _a	0.0% ²	1.4% _a	1.0% _a	2.4% _a	0.6% _a	2.2% _a	1.1% _a	1.1% _a	0.5% _a	2.1% _a	0.0% ²	1.3% _a	1.3% _a	0.0% ²	1.6%a	0.5% _a	1.8% _a	0.8% _a
	Government Disfunction	6.7% ¹	12.0% _a	2.0% _b	12.2% _a	5.9% _a	2.2% _a	6.0% _a	7.2% _a	5.2% _a	8.0% _a	0.8% _a	9.8% _b	12.1% _b	0.0% ²	6.8% _a	6.9% _a	6.9% _a	11.3% _a	5.1% _a	1.3% _a	0.0% ²
	Poverty	1.0% ¹	0.6% _a	1.4%a	1.2% _a	1.1% _a	0.0% ²	1.7% _a	0.6% _a	0.9% _a	2.3% _a	0.0% ²	1.7% _a	0.0% ²	6.1% _a	1.0% _a	0.8%a	5.3% _a	0.3%a	1.6% _a	1.8% _a	0.0% ²
	Nothing to do	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Moral issues	1.0% ¹	0.0% ²	1.9%a	0.0% ²	2.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	1.8% _a	0.2% _a	0.2% _a	0.4% _a	2.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.1% _a	1.0% _a	0.0% ²	2.4%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Weather	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Elderly issues	0.3% ¹	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.5% _a	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	People will not work	0.7% ¹	1.3% _a	0.2%a	2.3% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	1.8% _a	0.9% _a	2.3% _a	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.8%a	0.0% ²	1.5%a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Infrastructure/Water Main Break	0.2% ¹	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.2% _a	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²
	Ignorance	0.3% ¹	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.1%a	1.4% _a	0.0% ²
	Transportation	0.2% ¹	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Childcare	0.4% ¹	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	1.5% _a	0.6% _a	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Population decrease	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	335	126	207	41	110	92	91	72	147	116	77	122	72	7	314	318	12	131	137	50	15

		St. Lawrence County	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups			Education Leve	Ы	A	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	sc	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Immigration	0.9% ¹	1.3% _a	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	1.5% _a	0.8% _a	1.6% _a	0.0% ²	1.6% _a	1.6% _a	0.5% _a	0.4% _a	2.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.9% _a	1.1% _a	0.0% ²	2.5% _a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Protecting democracy	3.3% ¹	1.9% _a	4.7% _a	2.3% _a	2.8% _a	6.2% _a	3.3% _a	0.0% ²	5.4% _a	5.8% _a	3.4% _a	3.0% _a	5.3% _a	0.0% ²	3.4% _a	3.3% _a	4.0% _a	1.9%a	6.1% _a	2.1% _a	2.4% _a
	COVID-19	0.1% ¹	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.5%a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Abortion	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Inflation/Cost of Living	29.5% ¹	26.4% _a	32.3% _a	29.1% _a	24.4% _a	27.8% _a	39.9% _a	35.0% _a	27.1% _a	22.2% _a	42.7% _a	22.5% _b	25.3% _b	54.5% _a	28.7% _a	30.8% _a	16.6% _a	41.6% _a	22.2% _b	18.9% _b	27.2% _{a,b}
	Unemployment/Low Wage Jobs	14.8% ¹	19.0% _a	11.1% _b	17.8% _a	16.1% _a	9.8% _a	12.9% _a	17.2% _a	11.8% _a	16.0% _a	9.5% _a	16.7% _a	16.8% _a	14.2% _a	14.9% _a	14.8% _a	17.1% _a	12.6% _a	14.4% _a	14.1% _a	22.8% _a
	Homelessness	3.9% ¹	4.4% _a	3.6% _a	1.1% _a	6.4% _a	1.7% _a	6.4% _a	6.8% _a	2.1% _a	1.9% _a	5.6% _a	3.5% _a	2.0% _a	0.0% ²	4.0% _a	4.5% _a	0.0% ²	6.5% _a	5.4% _a	0.4% _a	0.6% _a
	Climate change	0.6% ¹	0.5% _a	0.6%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	2.8% _a	0.6%a	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	1.6% _a	0.4% _a	1.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	2.2% _a	0.0% ²
	Healthcare (mental, physical)	7.8% ¹	3.3% _a	10.9% _b	10.6% _a	7.1% _a	6.1% _a	6.6% _a	4.5% _a	9.9% _a	10.9% _a	6.6% _a	8.2% _a	8.9% _a	0.0% ²	8.0% _a	8.0% _a	0.0% ²	7.4% _a	8.5% _a	10.0% _a	5.5% _a
	Racial inequality	0.2% ¹	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.9% _a	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	0.0% ²
	Schools	0.6% ¹	0.9% _a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	2.4% _a	1.1% _a	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.9% _a	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	2.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Affordable housing	7.6% ¹	7.3% _a	7.9% _a	10.2% _a	8.2% _a	7.0% _a	2.7% _a	3.8% _a	9.8% _a	10.9% _a	6.2% _a	11.3% _a	6.1% _a	24.7% _a	7.4% _a	5.8% _a	23.9% _b	2.3% _a	9.0% _{a,b}	16.9% _b	4.2% _{a,b}
	Crime	9.0% ¹	9.2% _a	9.2% _a	4.9% _a	12.2% _{a,b}	17.0% _b	2.9% _a	10.2% _a	7.8% _a	9.3% _a	3.0% _a	14.0% _b	12.8% _b	0.0% ²	9.3% _a	10.3% _a	0.0% ²	10.9% _a	5.6% _a	7.5% _a	15.3% _a
	regulation	2.9% ¹	2.1% _a	3.6% _a	2.3% _a	2.9% _a	2.5% _a	1.9%a	1.2% _a	6.1%a	1.0% _a	2.9%a	2.4%a	6.1%a	0.0% ²	3.0% _a	2.6% _a	6.9%a	4.0%a	5.4%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
What do you think is the single largest issue that is	Not enough gun regulation	0.4% ¹	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	1.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.6% _a	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	1.4% _a	0.0% ²
facing residents of the Nor Country right now?	th Taxes	0.1% ¹	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Drugs	8.4% ¹	9.7% _a	7.5% _a	13.8% _a	6.9% _a	6.3% _a	4.5% _a	6.2% _a	11.3% _a	6.3% _a	9.2% _a	6.6% _a	6.0% _a	0.0% ²	8.7% _a	7.3% _a	13.8% _a	2.2% _a	13.9% _b	8.5% _{a,b}	10.8% _{a,b}
	The Economy	3.7% ¹	5.6% _a	2.0%a	1.7% _a	7.7% _a	2.0% _a	1.3% _a	5.8% _a	1.7% _a	3.4% _a	1.8% _a	2.0%a	3.4%a	6.6%a	3.4% _a	2.5% _a	14.6% _b	2.9% _a	1.4% _a	9.5% _a	1.1% _a
	Government Disfunction	3.3% ¹	4.7% _a	2.0% _a	4.5% _a	1.0% _a	3.5% _a	5.7% _a	5.7% _a	1.3% _a	2.4% _a	2.8% _a	4.9% _a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	3.4% _a	3.8% _a	0.0% ²	1.7% _a	1.8% _a	2.9% _a	10.3% _a
	Poverty	0.8% ¹	0.9% _a	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.5% _a	0.5% _a	2.9% _a	1.1% _a	0.2% _a	1.2% _a	2.4%a	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.9% _a	0.0% ²	1.4% _a	0.6% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²
	Nothing to do	0.7% ¹	1.3% _a	0.1% _a	1.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	2.6% _a	0.0% ²	1.7% _a	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.3% _a	2.6% _a	0.0% ²
	Moral issues	0.7% ¹	1.2% _a	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	2.9% _a	0.0% ²	0.9% _a	0.7% _a	0.4% _a	1.4% _a	0.0% ²	1.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.6% _a	1.3% _a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²
	Weather	0.4% ¹	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	2.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	0.3% _a	1.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.1% _a	3.1% _b	0.9% _a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.0% ²
	Elderly issues	0.1% ¹	0.0% ²	0.1%a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	People will not work	0.2% ¹	0.2% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.7% _a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.4% _a	0.0% ²
	Infrastructure/Water Main Break	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Ignorance	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Transportation	0.1% ¹	0.0% ²	0.2% _a	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.1% _a	0.1% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Childcare	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Population decrease	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
L	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	373	144	223	43	119	115	92	69	165	136	102	125	93	6	360	350	13	113	144	75	34

Table 47	(sorted, only	Tr-County Combined	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		1	Education Leve	əl	А	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Mili	tary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
issues with 6	%+)	All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Inflation/Cost of Living	28.0% ¹	24.9% _a	30.6% _b	27.0% _a	27.9% _a	25.3% _a	32.4% _a	27.5% _a	28.4% _a	28.0% _a	29.7% _a	27.4% _a	30.5% _a	19.7% _a	28.8% _a	29.0% _a	21.2% _a	36.4% _a	23.0% _b	21.6% _b	26.2% _{a,b}
	Unemployment/Jobs	12.0% ¹	14.1% _a	10.3% _a	13.4% _a	13.9% _a	8.2% _a	9.8% _a	14.7% _a	8.8% _b	12.5% _{a,b}	9.2% _a	13.8% _a	13.4% _a	18.9% _a	11.5% _b	11.7% _a	15.3% _a	8.3% _a	10.3% _a	14.8% _{a,b}	24.2% _b
	Affordable Housing	8.4% ¹	5.3% _a	11.5% _b	7.4% _a	10.4% _a	9.9% _a	5.4% _a	6.8% _a	9.4% _a	10.1% _a	6.8% _a	11.4% _a	7.1% _a	6.5% _a	8.8% _a	8.0%a	12.2% _a	4.4% _a	12.4% _b	11.5% _{b,c}	3.9% _{a,c}
What do you think is the	Homelessness	7.1% ¹	5.6% _a	8.8% _b	8.1% _a	7.0% _a	3.6% _a	9.4% _a	9.2% _a	5.4% _a	6.1%a	10.1% _a	3.8% _b	3.8% _b	2.5% _a	7.2% _a	7.8% _a	1.5% _b	4.8% _a	10.7% _ь	4.9% _{a,b}	4.6% _{a,b}
single largest issue that is facing residents of the Nort	h Drugs	6.7% ¹	8.6% _a	4.7% _b	10.7% _a	5.2% _b	4.6% _{a,b}	2.8% _b	6.1% _a	7.5% _a	5.3% _a	8.2% _a	5.5% _a	4.1%a	2.5% _a	7.0% _a	6.4% _a	6.0% _a	3.0% _a	8.9% _b	6.6% _{a,b}	9.4% _b
Country right now?	Crime	6.2% ¹	6.5% _a	6.2% _a	4.5% _a	7.0% _{a,b}	10.6% _b	4.4% _{a,b}	6.0% _a	7.3% _a	5.0%a	3.9% _a	8.2% _{a,b}	9.9% _b	1.5% _a	6.8% _a	7.1% _a	1.2% _b	7.2% _a	4.9% _a	5.7% _a	8.4% _a
	Healthcare	6.1% ¹	4.3% _a	7.1% _a	8.2% _a	4.2% _a	5.5% _a	6.0% _a	4.9% _a	6.0% _a	8.5% _a	7.2% _a	6.2% _a	6.1%a	12.6% _a	5.5% _b	5.5% _a	8.4% _a	5.8%a	5.6% _a	8.4% _a	6.2% _a
	Other Issues	25.4% ¹	30.8% _a	20.8% _b	20.7% _a	24.5% _{a,b}	32.4% _b	29.7% _{a,b}	24.7% _a	27.1% _a	24.5% _a	24.9% _a	23.6% _a	25.1% _a	35.8% _a	24.5% _b	24.5% _a	34.1% _b	30.0% _a	24.1% _{a,b}	26.6% _{a,b}	17.0% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	1096	439	645	181	327	305	275	210	488	392	283	386	255	68	995	1009	57	377	441	175	79

		Jefferson Countv	Ge	nder		Age G	iroups		E	Education Leve	el	Ar	nnual HH Incor	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Inflation/Cost of Living	23.8% ¹	21.3% _a	25.5% _a	23.6% _a	29.2% _a	16.4% _a	20.5% _a	16.2% _a	27.7% _b	33.1% _b	14.5% _a	28.6% _b	35.5% _b	15.8% _a	25.6% _a	24.0% _a	25.1% _a	31.4% _a	20.3% _a	19.6% _a	20.8% _a
	Unemployment/Jobs	10.3% ¹	10.3% _a	10.5% _a	10.4% _a	13.6% _a	6.6% _a	7.3% _a	15.7% _a	5.5% _b	8.0% _{a,b}	9.1% _a	13.9% _a	10.0% _a	19.9% _a	8.6% _b	9.6% _a	14.0% _a	5.5%a	7.2% _a	18.7% _{a,b}	28.2% _b
	Affordable Housing	10.4% ¹	3.8% _a	16.9% _b	5.6% _a	15.1% _b	15.2% _{a,b}	9.6% _{a,b}	11.5% _a	9.8% _a	9.5% _a	7.9%a	14.5% _a	8.3% _a	5.1%a	11.7% _a	11.6% _a	1.9% _b	7.2%a	16.8% _a	2.6% _a	2.6% _a
What do you think is the	Homelessness	12.0% ¹	7.8% _a	16.2% _b	14.8% _a	9.3% _a	5.5% _a	17.0% _a	14.0% _a	9.8% _a	12.0% _a	16.4% _a	5.1% _b	5.9% _{a,b}	2.8%a	13.0% _b	13.2% _a	3.1% _a	4.1%a	16.3% _b	16.4% _{a,b}	11.0% _{a,b}
single largest issue that is facing residents of the North	Drugs	5.2% ¹	7.6%a	2.3% _b	8.4% _a	2.8% _a	2.7% _a	1.3% _a	5.7% _a	3.9% _a	4.9%a	8.3% _a	4.0%a	2.6% _a	2.8%a	5.5%a	5.5% _a	0.0% ²	2.1% _a	6.9% _a	4.3% _a	5.4% _a
Country right now?	Crime	4.6% ¹	4.9%a	4.3% _a	4.8%a	2.9%a	6.0% _a	6.1% _a	3.1% _a	8.3% _a	1.1% _a	4.8% _a	3.8%a	8.7% _a	1.6%a	5.4%a	5.1%a	2.4% _a	4.8%a	5.3% _a	4.2% _a	0.0% ²
	Healthcare	4.7% ¹	6.1%a	3.4% _a	6.4% _a	0.9% _a	6.6% _a	6.3% _a	5.7% _a	2.6% _a	6.3% _a	9.1% _a	3.6% _a	2.8% _a	12.9% _a	2.7% _b	3.2% _a	16.7% _b	5.8%a	3.7% _a	2.6% _a	8.2% _a
	Other Issues	29.1% ¹	38.3% _a	20.8% _b	26.1% _a	26.1% _a	41.0% _a	31.9% _a	28.0% _a	32.5% _a	25.2% _a	30.0% _a	26.5% _a	26.1% _a	39.0% _a	27.5% _a	27.8% _a	36.7% _a	39.0% _a	23.5% _b	31.6% _{a,b}	23.7% _{a,b}
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	388	169	215	97	98	98	92	69	176	140	104	139	90	55	321	341	32	133	160	50	30

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		E	ducation Leve	1	Ar	nnual HH Inco	me	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Inflation/Cost of Living	37.8% ¹	32.3% _a	42.8% _b	38.2% _a	36.5% _a	40.6% _a	36.0% _a	39.3% _a	37.6% _a	34.5% _a	43.7% _a	41.1% _a	33.4% _a	53.4% _a	40.0% _a	39.7% _a	22.3% _a	34.4% _a	37.9% _a	40.7% _a	51.9% _a
	Unemployment/Jobs	7.2% ¹	8.5% _a	6.2% _a	10.2% _a	6.5% _a	7.7% _a	4.3% _a	3.2% _a	9.1% _{a,b}	14.3% _b	8.9% _a	3.1% _a	11.7% _a	0.0% ²	6.3% _a	6.8% _a	12.7% _a	3.0% _a	10.4% _a	8.8% _a	11.8% _a
	Affordable Housing	4.5% ¹	3.0% _a	5.1% _a	4.9% _a	3.4% _a	5.7% _a	4.7% _a	1.7% _a	6.0% _{a,b}	8.9% _b	4.0%a	2.5%a	7.1% _a	0.0% ²	4.8%a	4.1%a	12.7% _a	3.4% _a	4.5%a	4.6% _a	10.5% _a
What do you think is the	Homelessness	2.0% ¹	1.7%a	2.2% _a	1.2% _a	2.2%a	4.4%a	0.0% ²	1.7% _a	2.5%a	1.9% _a	0.7% _a	1.1%a	3.4% _a	0.0% ²	2.0%a	2.2% _a	0.0% ²	1.6% _a	3.5% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
single largest issue that is facing residents of the North	Drugs	5.4% ¹	8.0% _a	3.1% _a	9.8% _a	5.8% _a	3.5% _a	0.6%a	6.6% _a	5.7% _a	1.9% _a	2.3% _a	6.4% _a	1.0% _a	0.0% ²	5.0%a	5.8% _a	0.0% ²	8.2% _{a,c}	0.8% _b	2.0% _{a,b}	22.4% _c
Country right now?	Crime	1.4% ¹	1.5% _a	1.4% _a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	1.2% _{a,b}	5.8% _b	2.0% _a	0.8% _a	1.0% _a	3.2% _a	0.6% _a	0.8% _a	0.0% ²	0.8% _a	1.6% _a	0.0% ²	2.6% _a	1.0% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²
	Healthcare	4.1% ¹	1.9% _a	6.3% _b	8.0% _a	4.2% _a	0.3% _a	3.2% _a	3.8% _a	3.3% _a	6.4% _a	1.0% _a	6.8% _a	6.9% _a	35.0% _a	3.6% _b	4.3% _a	0.0% ²	1.0% _a	4.3% _{a,b}	14.2% _b	0.0% ²
	Other Issues	37.5% ¹	43.1% _a	32.9% _a	27.8% _a	41.1% _a	36.6% _a	45.4% _a	41.8% _a	35.0% _a	31.0% _a	36.0% _a	38.3% _a	35.7% _a	11.6% _a	37.6% _a	35.6% _a	52.2% _a	45.9% _a	37.6% _a	29.8% _{a,b}	3.4% _b
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	335	126	207	41	110	92	91	72	147	116	77	122	72	7	314	318	12	131	137	50	15

		St. Lawrence County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		E	ducation Leve	6	A	nnual HH Inco	ne	Active Milit	ary in HH	Race/E	thnicity		Political Be	liefs	
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	SC	4+YD	Up to \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Yes, AM in HH	No AM in HH	White	BIPOC	Conservative	Middle of the Road	Liberal	Don't Know
	Inflation/Cost of Living	29.5% ¹	26.4% _a	32.3% _a	29.1% _a	24.4% _a	27.8% _a	39.9% _a	35.0% _a	27.1% _a	22.2% _a	42.7% _a	22.5% _b	25.3% _b	54.5%a	28.7% _a	30.8% _a	16.6% _a	41.6% _a	22.2% _b	18.9% _b	27.2% _{a,b}
	Unemployment/Jobs	14.8% ¹	19.0% _a	11.1% _b	17.8% _a	16.1% _a	9.8% _a	12.9% _a	17.2% _a	11.8% _a	16.0% _a	9.5%a	16.7% _a	16.8% _a	14.2% _a	14.9% _a	14.8% _a	17.1% _a	12.6% _a	14.4% _a	14.1% _a	22.8% _a
	Affordable Housing	7.6% ¹	7.3% _a	7.9% _a	10.2% _a	8.2% _a	7.0% _a	2.7% _a	3.8% _a	9.8% _a	10.9% _a	6.2% _a	11.3% _a	6.1% _a	24.7% _a	7.4% _a	5.8% _a	23.9% _b	2.3% _a	9.0% _{a,b}	16.9% _b	4.2% _{a,b}
What do you think is the	Homelessness	3.9% ¹	4.4%a	3.6% _a	1.1% _a	6.4% _a	1.7% _a	6.4% _a	6.8% _a	2.1% _a	1.9%a	5.6%a	3.5% _a	2.0% _a	0.0% ²	4.0%a	4.5% _a	0.0% ²	6.5%a	5.4% _a	0.4% _a	0.6% _a
facing residents of the Nort	h Drugs	8.4% ¹	9.7% _a	7.5% _a	13.8% _a	6.9% _a	6.3% _a	4.5%a	6.2% _a	11.3% _a	6.3% _a	9.2% _a	6.6%a	6.0%a	0.0% ²	8.7% _a	7.3% _a	13.8% _a	2.2% _a	13.9% _b	8.5% _{a,b}	10.8% _{a,b}
Country right now?	Crime	9.0% ¹	9.2% _a	9.2% _a	4.9% _a	12.2% _{a,b}	17.0% _b	2.9% _a	10.2% _a	7.8% _a	9.3% _a	3.0% _a	14.0% _b	12.8% _b	0.0% ²	9.3% _a	10.3% _a	0.0% ²	10.9% _a	5.6% _a	7.5% _a	15.3% _a
	Healthcare	7.8% ¹	3.3% _a	10.9% _b	10.6% _a	7.1%a	6.1% _a	6.6%a	4.5% _a	9.9%a	10.9% _a	6.6%a	8.2% _a	8.9% _a	0.0% ²	8.0%a	8.0% _a	0.0% ²	7.4%a	8.5% _a	10.0% _a	5.5% _a
	Other Issues	19.0% ¹	20.8% _a	17.5% _a	12.5% _a	18.7% _a	24.2% _a	24.1% _a	16.2% _a	20.3% _a	22.5% _a	17.1% _a	17.2% _a	22.1% _a	6.6% _a	19.1% _a	18.5% _a	28.6% _a	16.6% _a	21.0% _a	23.7% _a	13.8% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	373	144	223	43	119	115	92	69	165	136	102	125	93	6	360	350	13	113	144	75	34

Appendix III - Technical Comments – Assistance in Interpretation of the Statistical Results in this Report

The results of this study will be disseminated to, and utilized in decision-making by, a very wide array of readers – who, no doubt, have a very wide array of statistical backgrounds. The following comments are provided to give guidance for interpretation of the presented findings so that readers with less-than-current statistical training might maximize the use of the information contained in the 24th Annual North Country Survey of the Community.

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

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

To illustrate the above-described concepts of margin of error and confidence intervals, recall that the 2023 margin of error for this survey has been earlier stated in Table 3 in the Methodology section in this report as approximately ± 3.2 percentage points. Therefore, when a percentage is observed in one of the included tables of statistics in this report, the appropriate interpretation is that we are 95% confident that if <u>all</u> North Country adult residents were surveyed (rather than only the 1,171 that were actually surveyed), the percentage that would result for all residents would be within ± 3.2 percentage points of the sample percentage that we surveyed, calculated, and reported in this study. For example, in Table 16, it can be observed that 18.3% of the sample of 1,168 adults (3 of the 1,171 participants omitted this survey question) report that they believe that the quality of the environment in their county is "Excellent". With this sample result, one could infer with 95% confidence that if all North Country adults were asked - somewhere between 15.1% and 21.5% of the population of approximately 190,000 adults in the North Country believe that the quality of the environment in their county is "Excellent" (started with the 18.3% that was found in the sample and added-and-subtracted a margin of error of ±3.2%). This resulting interval (15.1%–21.5%) is known as a **95% Confidence Interval**. The consumer of this report should use this pattern when attempting to generalize any of these survey findings for survey questions that were answered by all \approx 1.171 participants in this study to the entire adult population of the North Country in 2023. When attempting to generalize results for survey questions which had smaller sample sizes (the result of either screening questions, or participants refusing to answer certain questions, or investigating smaller demographic subgroups, such as only those over the age of 60), the resulting margin of error will be larger than ±3.2 percentage points. Table 3 presented earlier in this report, provides approximate margin of error values that should be used with sample sizes of less than n=1,171.

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

The introductory example above relating to *the quality of the environment* used a margin of error of $\pm 3.2\%$, as a result of an illustration that used all 1,171 participants in this study. However, again, the margin of error when using the sample results in this study to construct a confidence interval to estimate a population percentage will <u>not</u> always be $\pm 3.2\%$. There is not one universal value of a margin of error that can be precisely calculated and used for the results for every

question included in this survey, or for that matter, any multiple-question survey. Calculation methods used in this study for generating the margin of error depend upon the following factors (which include three factors in addition to the sample-size factor that has been mentioned earlier in Table 3):

- 1. The **sample size** is the number of adults who validly answered the survey question. The sample size will not always be n=1,171 since individuals have a right to omit any question. Additionally, some survey questions were only posed after screening questions. In general, the smaller the sample size then the larger the margin of error, and conversely, the larger the sample size then the smaller the margin of error.
- 2. The *sample proportion or percentage* is the calculated percentage of the sample who responded with the answer or category of interest (i.e. responded "Agree"). This percentage can vary from 0%-100%, and, of course, will change from question to question throughout the survey. In general, the further that a sample percentage varies from 50%, in either direction (approaching either 0% or 100%), the smaller the margin of error, and conversely, the closer that the actual sample percentage is to 50% then the larger the resulting margin of error. As an example, if 160 out of 400 sampled residents "Agree" with some posed statement, then the sample proportion would be (160÷400=0.4=40%)
- 3. The *confidence level* used in generalizing the results of the sample to the population that the sample represented. In this study, the standard confidence level used in survey research, 95% confidence level, will be used for all survey questions.
- 4. The design effect (DEFF) is a factor used in the calculation of the margin of error that compensates for the impact upon the size of the margin of error of having a sample whose demographic distributions do not well-parallel the distributions of the entire population that the sampling is attempting to represent. In general, the further that the sample demographic distributions deviate from the population distributions then the larger the design effect (margin of error), and conversely, the closer that the sample demographic distributions parallel the population distributions then the smaller the design effect reflects the magnitude of the impact that reliance upon weighting of sample results will have upon the reliability of population estimates. Note that the design effect for this study is approximately 2.0.

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

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

Where n=sample size = # valid responses to the survey question
p=sample percentage for the survey question (between 0%-100%)
1.96 = the standard normal score associated with the 95% confidence level
DEFF = the design effect

W

and
$$DEFF = \frac{n \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n}$$

with wi=the post-stratification weight associated with ith of the 1,171 sampled individuals

An example of using this Margin of Error formula would be that if 300 residents are sampled and validly answer some survey question, and 60 of those 300 residents report that they "Strongly Agree" with some statement, then the sample proportion is p=(60/300)=0.2=20%. Therefore the margin of error for this sample (whose n is only 300) that has a sample proportion that deviates quite largely from 50%, is found by: (please refer to Table 48 to verify)

$$ME = 1.96 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{p(100-p)}{n}} \cdot \sqrt{DEFF} = 1.96 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{(20)(100-20)}{300}} \cdot \sqrt{2.0} = 6.4\%$$

Since the sample size varies (in fact, could conceivably be different for every question included in the survey) and the sample percentage varies (also, could conceivably be different for every question included in the survey) the following table (Table 48) has been provided for the reader to determine the correct margin of error to use whenever constructing a confidence interval using the sample data presented in this study. This table was generated using the ME formula shown above.

Table 48 – More Detailed Margins of Error for Varying Sample Sizes and
Varying Sample Proportions

							١	/aryin	ig Sar	nple \$	Sizes	(n=))						
Varying Sample %'s:	30	50	100	150	200	250	300	349	389	400	433	500	600	700	800	900	1000	1100	1171
2%	7.1%	5.5%	3.9%	3.2%	2.7%	2.5%	2.2%	2.1%	2.0%	1.9%	1.9%	1.7%	1.6%	1.5%	1.4%	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%	1.1%
4%	9.9%	7.7%	5.4%	4.4%	3.8%	3.4%	3.1%	2.9%	2.8%	2.7%	2.6%	2.4%	2.2%	2.1%	1.9%	1.8%	1.7%	1.6%	1.6%
6%	12.0%	9.3%	6.6%	5.4%	4.7%	4.2%	3.8%	3.5%	3.3%	3.3%	3.2%	2.9%	2.7%	2.5%	2.3%	2.2%	2.1%	2.0%	1.9%
8%	13.7%	10.6%	7.5%	6.1%	5.3%	4.8%	4.3%	4.0%	3.8%	3.8%	3.6%	3.4%	3.1%	2.8%	2.7%	2.5%	2.4%	2.3%	2.2%
10%	15.2%	11.8%	8.3%	6.8%	5.9%	5.3%	4.8%	4.5%	4.2%	4.2%	4.0%	3.7%	3.4%	3.1%	2.9%	2.8%	2.6%	2.5%	2.4%
12%	16.4%	12.7%	9.0%	7.4%	6.4%	5.7%	5.2%	4.8%	4.6%	4.5%	4.3%	4.0%	3.7%	3.4%	3.2%	3.0%	2.8%	2.7%	2.6%
14%	17.6%	13.6%	9.6%	7.9%	6.8%	6.1%	5.6%	5.1%	4.9%	4.8%	4.6%	4.3%	3.9%	3.6%	3.4%	3.2%	3.0%	2.9%	2.8%
16%	18.6%	14.4%	10.2%	8.3%	7.2%	6.4%	5.9%	5.4%	5.2%	5.1%	4.9%	4.5%	4.1%	3.8%	3.6%	3.4%	3.2%	3.1%	3.0%
18%	19.4%	15.1%	10.6%	8.7%	7.5%	6.7%	6.1%	5.7%	5.4%	5.3%	5.1%	4.8%	4.3%	4.0%	3.8%	3.5%	3.4%	3.2%	3.1%
20%	20.2%	15.7%	11.1%	9.1%	7.8%	7.0%	6.4%	5.9%	5.6%	5.5%	5.3%	5.0%	4.5%	4.2%	3.9%	3.7%	3.5%	3.3%	3.2%
22%	21.0%	16.2%	11.5%	9.4%	8.1%	7.3%	6.6%	6.1%	5.8%	5.7%	5.5%	5.1%	4.7%	4.3%	4.1%	3.8%	3.6%	3.5%	3.4%
24%	21.6%	16.7%	11.8%	9.7%	8.4%	7.5%	6.8%	6.3%	6.0%	5.9%	5.7%	5.3%	4.8%	4.5%	4.2%	3.9%	3.7%	3.6%	3.5%
26%	22.2%	17.2%	12.2%	9.9%	8.6%	7.7%	7.0%	6.5%	6.2%	6.1%	5.8%	5.4%	5.0%	4.6%	4.3%	4.1%	3.8%	3.7%	3.6%
28%	22.7%	17.6%	12.4%	10.2%	8.8%	7.9%	7.2%	6.7%	6.3%	6.2%	6.0%	5.6%	5.1%	4.7%	4.4%	4.1%	3.9%	3.8%	3.6%
30%	23.2%	18.0%	12.7%	10.4%	9.0%	8.0%	7.3%	6.8%	6.4%	6.4%	6.1%	5.7%	5.2%	4.8%	4.5%	4.2%	4.0%	3.8%	3.7%
32%	23.6%	18.3%	12.9%	10.6%	9.1%	8.2%	7.5%	6.9%	6.6%	6.5%	6.2%	5.8%	5.3%	4.9%	4.6%	4.3%	4.1%	3.9%	3.8%
34%	24.0%	18.6%	13.1%	10.7%	9.3%	8.3%	7.6%	7.0%	6.7%	6.6%	6.3%	5.9%	5.4%	5.0%	4.6%	4.4%	4.2%	4.0%	3.8%
36%	24.3%	18.8%	13.3%	10.9%	9.4%	8.4%	7.7%	7.1%	6.7%	6.7%	6.4%	6.0%	5.4%	5.0%	4.7%	4.4%	4.2%	4.0%	3.9%
38%	24.6%	19.0%	13.5%	11.0%	9.5%	8.5%	7.8%	7.2%	6.8%	6.7%	6.5%	6.0%	5.5%	5.1%	4.8%	4.5%	4.3%	4.1%	3.9%
40%	24.8%	19.2%	13.6%	11.1%	9.6%	8.6%	7.8%	7.3%	6.9%	6.8%	6.5%	6.1%	5.5%	5.1%	4.8%	4.5%	4.3%	4.1%	4.0%
42%	25.0%	19.3%	13.7%	11.2%	9.7%	8.7%	7.9%	7.3%	6.9%	6.8%	6.6%	6.1%	5.6%	5.2%	4.8%	4.6%	4.3%	4.1%	4.0%
44%	25.1%	19.5%	13.8%	11.2%	9.7%	8.7%	7.9%	7.4%	7.0%	6.9%	6.6%	6.2%	5.6%	5.2%	4.9%	4.6%	4.4%	4.1%	4.0%
46%	25.2%	19.5%	13.8%	11.3%	9.8%	8.7%	8.0%	7.4%	7.0%	6.9%	6.6%	6.2%	5.6%	5.2%	4.9%	4.6%	4.4%	4.2%	4.0%
48%	25.3%	19.6%	13.8%	11.3%	9.8%	8.8%	8.0%	7.4%	7.0%	6.9%	6.7%	6.2%	5.7%	5.2%	4.9%	4.6%	4.4%	4.2%	4.0%
50%	25.3%	19.6%	13.9%	11.3%	9.8%	8.8%	8.0%	7.4%	7.0%	6.9%	6.7%	6.2%	5.7%	5.2%	4.9%	4.6%	4.4%	4.2%	4.1%
52%	25.3%	19.6%	13.8%	11.3%	9.8%	8.8%	8.0%	7.4%	7.0%	6.9%	6.7%	6.2%	5.7%	5.2%	4.9%	4.6%	4.4%	4.2%	4.0%
54%	25.2%	19.5%	13.8%	11.3%	9.8%	8.7%	8.0%	7.4%	7.0%	6.9%	6.6%	6.2%	5.6%	5.2%	4.9%	4.6%	4.4%	4.2%	4.0%
56%	25.1%	19.5%	13.8%	11.2%	9.7%	8.7%	7.9%	7.4%	7.0%	6.9%	6.6%	6.2%	5.6%	5.2%	4.9%	4.6%	4.4%	4.1%	4.0%
58%	25.0%	19.3%	13.7%	11.2%	9.7%	8.7%	7.9%	7.3%	6.9%	6.8%	6.6%	6.1%	5.6%	5.2%	4.8%	4.6%	4.3%	4.1%	4.0%
60%	24.8%	19.2%	13.6%	11.1%	9.6%	8.6%	7.8%	7.3%	6.9%	6.8%	6.5%	6.1%	5.5%	5.1%	4.8%	4.5%	4.3%	4.1%	4.0%
62%	24.6%	19.0%	13.5%	11.0%	9.5%	8.5%	7.8%	7.2%	6.8%	6.7%	6.5%	6.0%	5.5%	5.1%	4.8%	4.5%	4.3%	4.1%	3.9%
64%	24.3%	18.8%	13.3%	10.9%	9.4%	8.4%	7.7%	7.1%	6.7%	6.7%	6.4%	6.0%	5.4%	5.0%	4.7%	4.4%	4.2%	4.0%	3.9%
66%	24.0%	18.6%	13.1%	10.7%	9.3%	8.3%	7.6%	7.0%	6.7%	6.6%	6.3%	5.9%	5.4%	5.0%	4.6%	4.4%	4.2%	4.0%	3.8%
68%	23.6%	18.3%	12.9%	10.6%	9.1%	8.2%	7.5%	6.9%	6.6%	6.5%	6.2%	5.8%	5.3%	4.9%	4.6%	4.3%	4.1%	3.9%	3.8%
70%	23.2%	18.0%	12.7%	10.4%	9.0%	8.0%	7.3%	6.8%	6.4%	6.4%	6.1%	5.7%	5.2%	4.8%	4.5%	4.2%	4.0%	3.8%	3.7%
72%	22.7%	17.6%	12.4%	10.2%	8.8%	7.9%	7.2%	6.7%	6.3%	6.2%	6.0%	5.6%	5.1%	4.7%	4.4%	4.1%	3.9%	3.8%	3.6%
74%	22.2%	17.2%	12.2%	9.9%	8.6%	7.7%	7.0%	6.5%	6.2%	6.1%	5.8%	5.4%	5.0%	4.6%	4.3%	4.1%	3.8%	3.7%	3.6%
76%	21.6%	16.7%	11.8%	9.7%	8.4%	7.5%	6.8%	6.3%	6.0%	5.9%	5.7%	5.3%	4.8%	4.5%	4.2%	3.9%	3.7%	3.6%	3.5%
78%	21.0%	16.2%	11.5%	9.4%	8.1%	7.3%	6.6%	6.1%	5.8%	5.7%	5.5%	5.1%	4.7%	4.3%	4.1%	3.8%	3.6%	3.5%	3.4%
80%	20.2%	15.7%	11.1%	9.1%	7.8%	7.0%	6.4%	5.9%	5.6%	5.5%	5.3%	5.0%	4.5%	4.2%	3.9%	3.7%	3.5%	3.3%	3.2%
82%	19.4%	15.1%	10.6%	8.7%	7.5%	6.7%	6.1%	5.7%	5.4%	5.3%	5.1%	4.8%	4.3%	4.0%	3.8%	3.5%	3.4%	3.2%	3.1%
84%	18.6%	14.4%	10.2%	8.3%	7.2%	6.4%	5.9%	5.4%	5.2%	5.1%	4.9%	4.5%	4.1%	3.8%	3.6%	3.4%	3.2%	3.1%	3.0%
86%	17.6%	13.6%	9.6%	7.9%	6.8%	6.1%	5.6%	5.1%	4.9%	4.8%	4.6%	4.3%	3.9%	3.6%	3.4%	3.2%	3.0%	2.9%	2.8%
88%	16.4%	12.7%	9.0%	7.4%	6.4%	5.7%	5.2%	4.8%	4.6%	4.5%	4.3%	4.0%	3.7%	3.4%	3.2%	3.0%	2.8%	2.7%	2.6%
90%	15.2%	11.8%	8.3%	6.8%	5.9%	5.3%	4.8%	4.5%	4.2%	4.2%	4.0%	3.7%	3.4%	3.1%	2.9%	2.8%	2.6%	2.5%	2.4%
92%	13.7%	10.6%	7.5%	6.1%	5.3%	4.8%	4.3%	4.0%	3.8%	3.8%	3.6%	3.4%	3.1%	2.8%	2.7%	2.5%	2.4%	2.3%	2.2%
94%	12.0%	9.3%	6.6%	5.4%	4.7%	4.2%	3.8%	3.5%	3.3%	3.3%	3.2%	2.9%	2.7%	2.5%	2.3%	2.2%	2.1%	2.0%	1.9%
96%	9.9%	7.7%	5.4%	4.4%	3.8%	3.4%	3.1%	2.9%	2.8%	2.7%	2.6%	2.4%	2.2%	2.1%	1.9%	1.8%	1.7%	1.6%	1.6%
98%	7.1%	5.5%	3.9%	3.2%	2.7%	2.5%	2.2%	2.1%	2.0%	1.9%	1.9%	1.7%	1.6%	1.5%	1.4%	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%	1.1%
Average	20.2%	15.7%	11.1%	9.0%	7.8%	7.0%	6.4%	5.9%	5.6%	5.5%	5.3%	5.0%	4.5%	4.2%	3.9%	3.7%	3.5%	3.3%	3.2%

Illustration of how to use Table 48 to determine the correct margin of error when investigating subgroups:

To estimate the percentage in the entire population of *Lewis County adults* who believe that the *overall state of the local economy* is *at least good (Excellent or Good)* one must simply refer to Table 24 and it can be observed that 28.7% of the 348 sampled Lewis County participants replied with *at least good* (3.8% indicated *Excellent*, while another 24.9% indicated *Good*). Reference to Table 48 on the preceding page indicates that the appropriate margin of error would be $\pm 6.7\%$ (used p=28%, the closest to 28.7% that is shown in Table 48; and used n=349, the closest to 348 that is included in Table 48). Therefore, we can be 95% confident that if <u>all</u> Lewis County adults were to evaluate the *state of the local economy* the resulting percentage who would indicate *at least good* among this population would be within $\pm 6.7\%$ of the 28.7% found in our sample. The interpretation of this would be that we are 95% confident that among <u>all</u> Lewis County adults the percentage who believe that the *state of the local economy* is *at least good* would be somewhere between 22.0% and 35.4%. Note that this margin of error of 6.7 percentage points is larger than the earlier-cited study margin of error of approximately 3.2 percentage points as a result of there being only 348 adults in this county-specific sample (n=348, not 1,171, for this example). Also, please note that readers who desire a greater level of accuracy than this estimated margin of error that has been excerpted from Table 48, one may directly calculate the exact margin of error using p=28.7 and n=348 and DEFF=2.0 in the ME formula shown on page 123.

Significance Testing – Testing for Statistically Significant Trends, Differences, and Relationships

The technical discussion of statistical techniques above has focused on the statistical inference referred to as *estimation* – construction of confidence intervals using the margins of error described in the tables shown on preceding pages. To take full advantage of the data collected in this study, other statistical techniques are of value. Tests for significant trends over time within the North Country, tests for <u>differences between the three annually studied North Country counties</u>, tests for <u>significantly correlated factors</u> with measured variables, and tests to <u>compare response distributions for similarly-scaled variables within the North Country data in 2023</u> are presented as well.

A comment or two regarding "statistical significance" could help readers of varying quantitative backgrounds most appropriately interpret the results of what has been statistically analyzed. Again, because the data for the 24th Annual North Country Survey of the Community is based on a *sample* of 1,171 adult residents, as opposed to obtaining information from every single adult resident in the three counties, there must be a method of determining whether an observed relationship or difference in the *sample* survey data is likely to continue to hold true if *every* adult resident of the region were, in fact, interviewed. To make this determination, *tests of statistical significance* are standard practice in evaluating sample survey data.

For example, if the *sample* data shows that male residents are more likely to report that *the quality of the environment* is *Excellent* in Lewis County than female residents (32.9% vs. 27.6%, respectively, Table 16 in Appendix II), the researcher would want to know if this higher satisfaction with *the quality of the environment* among male residents would still be present if they interviewed *every* Lewis County adult rather than just the sample of 349 Lewis County adults who were actually interviewed. To answer this question, the researcher uses a *test of statistical significance*. The outcome of a test of statistical significance will be that the result is either "not statistically significant" or the result is "statistically significant."

The meaning of "not statistically significant" is that if the sample were repeated many more times (in this case that would mean many more different groups of n=349 randomly selected adults from the approximately 20,000 adults in Lewis County), then the results of these samples would <u>not</u> consistently show that male residents are more likely to report that *the quality of the environment* is *Excellent* in Lewis County than female residents; some samples would have males higher and some would have females higher. In this case, the researcher could <u>not</u> report *with high levels of confidence* that the male satisfaction rate is statistically significantly different from the female rate. Rather, in this case the difference found between males and females in the one actually selected sample of size n=349 Lewis County residents would be interpreted as small enough that it could be due simply to the random chance of sampling – <u>not statistically significant</u>. Again, the determination of "how far apart is far enough apart to be statistically significant?" is calculated by using sampling distributions and the margins of error described earlier. These tools allow the measurement of how far apart sample subgroups must be to be interpreted as a very *unlikely* difference to occur simply by random chance (if one assumes that the population values for the subgroups are, in fact, equal).

Conversely, the meaning of "statistically significant" is that if the sample were repeated many more times, then the results of these samples would consistently show that male Lewis County adults are more likely to report *the quality of the environment* is *Excellent* than females; and further, if *every* adult were interviewed, we are confident that the population "perceived as *Excellent*" rate among males would be higher than the rate among females. 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, using the standard confidence level of 95%, an interpretation of "not statistically significant" means that the size of the observed sample difference would naturally be expected to 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 (if one assumes that the population values for the subgroups are, in fact, equal) – instead, it is considered a "real" difference. In statistical vocabulary and notation, this would be represented as a p-value of less than 5% (p<0.05).

<u>Correlated Explanatory Variables – How does one decide if there is a "statistically significant"</u> <u>correlation?</u>

Throughout this report, cross-tabulation comparisons for "relationships between collected variables" have been completed. With investigations for *relationships between variables*, the focus is the identification of correlations *between* variables – is the result for some survey question different when looking at various subgroups (or, levels) of some other variable? Again, referring to the "quality of the environment" scenario, one could observe in Table 16 in Appendix II that the "Excellent" rate among males is 32.9%, and compare this to the rate among females (which is only 27.6%). A very small difference between these within-subgroup rates (or, proportions) could be small enough to quite likely occur simply due to the random chance of sampling when the real population values for all males and all females in the county are equal – found to be <u>not</u> a statistically significant difference (p>0.05). Conversely, a very large difference between these within-subgroup proportions could be large enough to be quite *un*likely to occur simply due to the random chance of sampling when the real population values for all males and all females in the county are equal – found to be not a statistically significant difference (p>0.05). Conversely, a very large difference between these within-subgroup proportions could be large enough to be quite *un*likely to occur simply due to the random chance of sampling when the real population values for all males and all females in the county are equal – found to be a statistically significant difference (p<0.05).

How does one determine if the observed difference in rates (or, percentages) when comparing subgroups is large enough to be statistically significant, or so small that it is not statistically significant? The rule that should be applied to determine statistical significance is:

- 1. Sample percentages in the same row and subtable (comparing demographic subgroups) <u>not sharing</u> the same subscript <u>are</u> significantly different at p< .05.
- 2. Sample percentages in the same row and subtable (comparing demographic subgroups) <u>sharing</u> the same subscript <u>are not</u> significantly different at p< .05.

All tests have been completed using the two-proportion z-test. Subsequent cell adjustment for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost sub-table using the Bonferroni Multiple Comparison corrections has been completed when necessary. Tests assume equal variances. All results for all significance tests are reported in the associated cross-tabulation contingency tables using APA-style subscripts. As an example, the demographic cross-tabulations for satisfaction with *"quality of the environment"* for Lewis County

As an example, the demo	grapine cros	5 labula		Sausiaou		quanty of		onnon		5 Obunity
in 2023 are shown below (and, al	so later in th	is report	this is T	able 16 i	n Appen	dix II):				
	Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	iroups		E	ducation Leve	ŧ
	All	Malo	Female	18-30	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	90	4+VD

		Lewis County	Ger	nder		Age G	roups		E	ducation Leve	el
		All Participants	Male	Female	18-39	40-59	60-69	70+	HSG	sc	4+YD
	Excellent	30.5% ¹	32.9% _a	27.6% _a	38.1% _a	20.1% _b	36.1% _{a,b}	32.8% _{a,b}	23.2% _a	37.4% _b	37.2% _{a,b}
	Good	53.5% ¹	51.3% _a	56.1% _a	48.1% _a	55.4% _a	59.1% _a	52.0% _a	65.8% _a	45.0% _b	37.2% _b
Quality of the environment	Fair	13.6% ¹	13.1% _a	14.3% _a	10.7% _{a,b}	22.9% _a	4.3% _b	10.8% _{a,b}	9.6% _a	14.0% _{a,b}	22.9% _b
	Poor	2.2% ¹	2.7% _a	1.7% _a	3.1% _a	1.7% _a	0.5% _a	3.6% _a	1.4% _a	3.2% _a	2.3% _a
	Don't Know	0.2% ¹	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.0% ²	0.9% _a	0.0% ²	0.3% _a	0.4% _a
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unweighted n	347	128	217	42	112	96	96	72	156	119

This cross-tabulation table for Lewis County shows that in 2023, 32.9% of male participants rate *the quality of the environment* in the county as "Excellent", while only 27.6% of female participants do so, and since these two groups <u>do share</u> a subscript (males and females are both designated as "a"), the two groups <u>do not differ statistically significantly</u>. In 2023 in Lewis County, men are not significantly more nor less satisfied with *the quality of the environment* than are females (when "satisfaction" is defined as a rating of "Excellent"). The above-described process is the appropriate process to use whenever comparing subgroups within the data set that has been collected and analyzed within this study.

<u>Regional Comparisons – How does one decide if a county is "statistically significantly" different from</u> other counties?

The same concept of statistical significance that has described in the preceding pages regarding "Correlational Analyses" is also applied when a researcher attempts to complete a "Comparison among North Country Counties" in 2023. The focus now becomes the comparison of the 2023 county-specific results to one another. How does one determine if the observed difference in rates (or, percentages) when comparing counties is large enough to be statistically significant, or so small that it is not statistically significant? The rule that should be applied to determine statistical significance is:

- 1. Sample percentages in the same row and subtable (comparing demographic subgroups) <u>not sharing</u> the same subscript <u>are</u> significantly different at p< .05.
- Sample percentages in the same row and subtable (comparing demographic subgroups) <u>sharing</u> the same subscript <u>are not</u> significantly different at p< .05.

All tests have been completed using the two-proportion z-test. Subsequent cell adjustment for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost sub-table using the Bonferroni Multiple Comparison corrections has been completed when necessary. Tests assume equal variances. All results for all significance tests are reported in the associated cross-tabulation contingency tables using APA-style subscripts.

As an example, the county comparison cross-tabulations for satisfaction with "Overall State of the Local Economy" for this North Country study in 2023 are shown below (and, also in the body of the report this is Table 24):

		Jefferson	Lewis	St. Lawrence	3-County Region
	Excellent	2.1% a	3.8% _a	0.0% ¹	1.4%
	Good	17.7% _a	24.9% a	18.2% a	18.7%
The overall	Fair	43.6% _a	39.2% _{a,b}	33.7% _b	38.7%
local economy	Poor	30.4% _a	28.1% _a	47.2% _b	37.7%
·····,	Don't Know	6.2% a	4.0% _a	0.9% _b	3.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Sample Sizes	429	348	388	1165

This above cross-tabulation table shows that in 2023, 30.4% of Jefferson participants rate *Overall State of the Local Economy* in their county as "Poor", while only 28.1% of Lewis participants do so, however, a much larger 47.2% of St. Lawrence participants do so. Since these three counties <u>do not share</u> a subscript (Jefferson and Lewis are "a", while St. Lawrence is "b"), the groups <u>do differ statistically significantly</u>. In 2023 in St. Lawrence County residents are significantly more likely to rate the *Overall State of the Local Economy* as "Poor" than are residents of either of the other two counties, and Jefferson and Lewis do not differ from one another. The above-described process is the appropriate process to use whenever comparing counties within the data set that has been collected and analyzed within this study.

Trend Analysis – How does one decide if a county has "statistically significantly" changed over time?

Whenever possible in this report, comparisons are made between the current results and the results in earlier community studies completed in each county. The research question that is being investigated in these comparisons is, "Has there been any statistically significant change in attitudes or behaviors among the adult residents in the county between 2000 and 2023?"

When interpreting the comparisons that have been provided, the reader should consider the following factors. The *Center for Community Studies* also completed the earlier studies. The earlier studies used sampling methodology that was very similar to that which was utilized in the present 2023 study, as well as similar post-stratification weighting procedures. However, the earlier survey instruments that were used are not exactly the same instrument that has been used in 2023. Therefore, only the questions/items that were also measured in earlier studies are available for trend analysis to compare with the current results. With the similar methodologies and weighting procedures that have been applied, it is valid to make comparisons between the studies – observe changes or trends. The sample sizes for each of the twenty-four years of the Annual Surveys of the Community are summarized earlier in Table 4.

The same concept of statistical significance that has described in the preceding pages regarding "Correlational Analyses" and "Comparison among North Country Counties" in 2023 is also applied when a researcher attempts to complete a trend analysis. The focus now becomes the comparison of the 2023 results to earlier results (rather than the comparison of counties to each other in a year, illustrated earlier). The technique that is recommended in this study to determine whether a statistically significant trend has occurred in a county is to apply the following method that has also been recommended by the New York State Department of Health in its presentation of the Expanded Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS). The NYSDOH 2009 Expanded BRFSS (on page 12 of 151 in that report) cites the following:

"When the confidence intervals of two estimates of the same indicator from different areas (or, subgroups) do not overlap, they may be said to be statistically significantly different, i.e., these differences are unlikely related to chance and are considered true differences. If there is any value that is included in both intervals, the two estimates are not statistically significantly different."

In other words, first the reader must identify the specific response choice of interest. For example, is one interested in only investigating use "Excellent", or is one more interested in collapsing the two possible response choices of "Excellent" and "Good" together into a response choice group that could be referred to as "At Least Good"? Then, after observing the sample sizes for the years to be compared (in Table 4 of this report), one may refer to Table 48 in this study to identify the correct *approximate* margins of error (or directly calculate these margins of error with more accuracy and precision using the ME formula shown and demonstrated on page 123) if estimating proportions (or, "percentages" or "rates") for differing years. With these margins of error, two separate confidence intervals may be constructed, one for each year, and the overlap-vs.-non-overlap rule recommended above by the NYSDOH may be applied to determine whether the observed sample difference between years should be considered statistically significant. This technique for testing for statistical significance does include the design effect in measuring the standard error.

To illustrate a trend analysis, please consider the "*Quality of K-12 Education*" variable for <u>St. Lawrence</u> County. Reference to Table 23 in Appendix I of this report shows that:

- **In 2015:** in St. Lawrence County: n=442 participants (found in Table 4 earlier in this report), and in Table 23 in Appendix I p=65% responded *Excellent or Good*; therefore, from Table 48 the approximate margin of error is ±6.4%. The resulting confidence interval for 2015 is: 65%±6.4%, or **(58.6%,71.4%).**
- **In 2023:** in St. Lawrence County: n=388 participants, and in Table 23 in Appendix I p=56% responded *Excellent or Good*; therefore, from Table 48 the approximate margin of error is ±7.0%. The resulting confidence interval for 2023 is: 56%±7.0%, or **(49.0%,63.0%).**

Since these two confidence intervals <u>do</u> overlap, the difference between 2015 and 2023 in St. Lawrence County (the nine-year trend) <u>is not</u> considered statistically significant. In other words, based upon the sample data collected in this survey, the rate of evaluating the "*Quality of K-12 Education*" in St. Lawrence County as "*Excellent or Good*" <u>has not</u> changed significantly between 2015 and 2023. The 56% rate of responding *Excellent or Good* in 2023 is not far enough away from (below) the 65% rate found in 2015 to be a statistically significant change, this 9% difference is not tremendously unlikely to occur by random chance if the satisfaction rates in the entire adult population in the county are truly the same in these two compared years.

Comparing Similarly-scaled Variables (Survey Items):

Finally, to determine whether or not a difference observed between two similarly-measured items is statistically significant, the same significant testing method as that which was shown for trend analyses and county comparisons has been applied in this study. The focus now becomes the comparison of the level of satisfaction, or support, or whatever is measured for various similarly-scaled survey items ... for example, is there statistically significantly more (or less) satisfaction for one item versus another? Again, first the reader must identify the specific response choice of interest. For example, is one interested in only investigating "Every day", or is one more interested in collapsing the two possible response choices of "Every day and Most days" together into a response choice group that could be referred to as "At Least Most Days"? Then, one may refer to Table 48 in this study to identify the correct *approximate* margins of error (or directly calculate these margins of error with more accuracy and precision using the ME formula shown and demonstrated on page 115) if estimating proportions (or, "percentages" or "rates") for differing survey questions that are measured on the same scale. With these margins of error, two separate confidence intervals may be constructed, one for each issue, and the overlap-vs.-non-overlap rule recommended above by the NYSDOH may be applied to determine whether or not the observed sample difference between the survey items should be considered statistically significant. This technique for testing for statistical significance does include the design effect in measuring the standard error.

To illustrate a comparison of strength of support for two separate survey items, please consider the following two direction-of-______ survey items among all North Country participants in 2023 – "Generally speaking, would you say things in the country are heading in the right or wrong direction?" (Table 31, in Section 3.2), and "Generally speaking, would you say things in your country are heading in the right or wrong direction?" (Table 33, in Section 3.2).

- **Country:** in 2023 from Table 31, n=1,159 participants and p=13.8% responded "Right Direction"; therefore from Table 48 the approximate margin of error is ±2.8%. The resulting confidence interval for "Country Right Direction" in 2023 is: 13.8%±2.8%, or (11.0%,16.6%).
- **County:** in 2023 from Table 33, n=1,158 participants and p=33.9% responded "Right Direction"; therefore from Table 48 the approximate margin of error is ±3.8%. The resulting confidence interval for "County Right Direction" in 2023 is: 33.9%±3.8%, or **(30.1%,37.7%).**

Since these two confidence intervals <u>do not</u> overlap, the difference in rate of responding "Generally speaking, things in my county are heading in the right direction" (33.9%) and the rate of responding "Generally speaking, things in the country are heading in the right direction" (13.8%) in 2023 among North Country adults <u>is</u> considered statistically significant. The 33.9% rate found for the *country* is far enough away from (above) the 13.8% rate found for the *country* to be a statistically significant difference, this 20.1% difference in responding "Right Direction" is very *un*likely to occur by random chance if the rates in the entire North Country adult population are truly the same for these two compared similarly-scaled types of attitudes.

Finally, the preceding comments regarding statistically significant differences between subgroups, statistically significant differences between North Country Counties, statistically significant changes between study years, and statistically significant differences between like-scaled variables are comments addressing *statistical significance* ... which, of course, is not one-and-the-same as *practical significance*. The reader should be reminded that statistical significance addresses the concept of *probability*, as follows – "is this difference likely to occur in a sample of size n=1,171

if there is no difference in the entire sampled populations... could the result simply be due to chance?" However, practical significance is an interpretation that is left to the subject area expert, since practical significance addresses the concept of <u>usefulness</u>, as follows – "is this result useful in the real world?" A difference identified in a sample may be statistically significant without being practically significant, however, a difference identified in a sample may *not* be practically significant without being statistically significant.

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

Appendix IV – The 2023 Survey Instrument



24th Annual North Country Survey of the Community

The Center for Community Studies at JCC is conducting the 24th Annual North Country Survey of the Community. We do this survey every year and are interested in your opinions about the quality of life and future direction of the region. Do you have a few minutes to do a survey for us?

Q1: Please rate each of the following characteristics of your county as either EXCELLENT, GOOD, FAIR, or POOR. (check the boxes, please)

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	DK
Cultural and entertainment opportunities					
Cost of energy					
Health care access					
Health care quality					
Access to higher education					
Public outdoor recreational opportunities					
Quality of the environment					
County government					
Town and village government					
Real estate taxes					
Policing and crime control					
Availability of good jobs					
Shopping opportunities					
Quality of K-12 education					
The overall state of the local economy					
Availability of care for the elderly					
Availability of housing					
Availability of childcare					
Availability of behavioral health services					
The downtown of Watertown					
The overall quality of life in the area					

Our next group questions relate to other aspects of life in the North Country such as personal financial situation, resident attitudes, and characteristics. These questions are tracked in the county and asked regularly as part of our annual survey.

Q2. Generally speaking, would you say that things in this COUNTRY are heading in the:

Right direction Wrong direction Don't Know/Not sure

Q3. Generally speaking, would you say that things in NEW YORK STATE are heading in the:

_ Right direction Wrong direction Don't Know/Not sure

Q4. Generally speaking, would you say that things in **<u>YOUR COUNTY</u>** are heading in the: Right direction Wrong direction Don't Know/Not sure

Q5. When considering you or your family's personal financial situation - has it gotten BETTER, stayed about the SAME, or gotten WORSE in the past 12 months? _____ Better ____ Same _____ Worse _____ Not Sure

Q6: Do you believe your county is a good place to grow old? (appropriate supports, elder friendly) ___ Very good

____ Fairly good ____ Not very good ____ Definitely not good DK

Q7: Do you agree or disagree that: "The presence of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum since 1985 has improved the overall quality of life of North Country citizens."

> ___ Strongly agree ____ Agree ____ Disagree ____ Strongly disagree No opinion

Q8: How many times have you crossed the border to eastern Ontario during the past year?

__None ____ 1-2 times ____ 3-5 times ____ More than 5 times ___ Not sure

Q9: How severe do you think each of the following issues are for your community, using a scale of: MAJOR ISSUE, MODERATE ISSUE, MINOR ISSUE, or NOT AT ALL AN ISSUE?

	Major	Moderate	Minor	Not an Issue	Not Sure
Crime					
Poverty					
Mental health					
Alcohol abuse					
Heroin, or other opiate, abuse					
Prescriptive drug abuse					

Q10: Next, for Statemen	t A and a Statement B, we	e are intere	sted in which	statement yo	u agree with	, even if only a little more, \boldsymbol{A} or $\boldsymbol{B},$ which is your
	Statement A	Strongly A	Somewhat A	Somewhat B	Strongly B	Statement B
	"Choosing abortion is a woman's right, and society should protect that right."					"Abortion is morally wrong, and society should prohibit it."
Q11: What do you think is	the single largest issue th	at is facing	residents of t	he North Cou	ntry right no	w?
The last few demograph	ic questions will help us	get a bette	er sense of th	ne general na	ature of the	people who have helped us with this project.
COUNTY: In what county	do you reside? Jeffers	sonl	_ewis St	. Lawrence		
TOWN: In what township	do you reside?					
AGE: Select the category Tee Fifti	in which your age falls. ns Twenties esSixties	Thirties Sevent	s F ies E	orties ighty or older	-	
EDUCATION: Select the e Les Higi	category in which your high s than a high school gradu h school graduate (Include ne college, no degree (incl	nest level of ate GED) ude tech sc	formal educa A E hool)G	ation falls. Associate Deg Bachelor's Deg Braduate Deg	ree gree ree	
POLITICAL BELIEFS: Ho	w would you classify your Very Conservativ Conservative	political bel e	liefs? _ Middle of th _ Liberal	e Road	Very I Don't	_iberal Know
OCCUPATION: What is y	our occupation?					
HOUSEHOLD COMPOSI	TION: Do any people unde	er the age o	f 18 are live i	n your houseł	nold?	
INCOME: Select the cate Up \$10 \$25	gory in which your yearly h to \$10,000 \$50, ,001 - \$25,000 \$75, ,001 - \$50,000 \$100	ousehold in 001 - \$75,0 001 - \$100,),001-\$125,	come falls: 00 000 000 Ove	er \$125,000		
MILITARY AFFILIATION:	Which of the following de You are active militar Someone else in the	escribes you y at FD household	ır affiliation wi is AM at FD	ith Fort Drum No c Not	? current/past sure	military affiliation at FD
FORT DRUM EMPLOYM you or a family member?	ENT: Is your residence in t	he North C	ountry curren	tly related to e	either civilia	n or military employment at Fort Drum, by either
RACE: How would you de	escribe yourself in regard to	o your race	or ethnicity?_			
SEX: What is your gender	?Male Female	Non-b	inaryO	ther: (Please	Specify)	
PHONE: Which of the follo	owing describes your phon ell Phone and Landline	e ownershi Landl	p? You have. ine Only	 Cell Only	,	
Thank you very much fo LaLone, Director of the (r helping us out this eve Center for Community St	ning. The r udies, 315∙	esults will b 786-2264 or	e released in commstudie	June. If yo s@sunyjef	u have any questions, please contact Mr. Joe ferson.edu. Have a great evening.