

# 2023 Community Health Assessment Forest, Oneida, and Vilas Counties

## Comparison Report







2023 Community Health Assessment - Forest, Oneida, and Vilas  
Counties - Comparison Report

This report was authored by Catalyst at the University of  
Wisconsin-Stout.

### Acknowledgements

This work would not be possible without the commitment of time  
and support from health departments in the participating  
counties: Forest, Oneida, and Vilas counties.

# CONTENTS

Comparisons.....	12
Overall Community Thoughts.....	13
Table 1. Overall community thoughts.....	13
Table 2. Overall community thoughts by sex at birth.....	14
Table 3. Overall community thoughts by age.....	14
Table 4. Overall community thoughts by race.....	16
Table 5. Overall community thoughts by ethnicity.....	16
Table 6. Overall community thoughts by language.....	17
Table 7. Overall community thoughts by employment status.....	17
Table 8. Overall community thoughts by income.....	18
Table 9. Community items by sex at birth – Forest County.....	19
Table 10. Community items by age – Forest County.....	19
Table 11. Community items by race – Forest County.....	20
Table 12. Community items by ethnicity – Forest County.....	21
Table 13. Community items by language – Forest County.....	22
Table 14. Community items by employment status – Forest County.....	22
Table 15. Community items by income – Forest County.....	23
Table 16. Community items by sex at birth – Oneida County.....	23
Table 17. Community items by age – Oneida County.....	24
Table 18. Community items by race – Oneida County.....	25
Table 19. Community items by ethnicity – Oneida County.....	26
Table 20. Community items by language – Oneida County.....	27
Table 21. Community items by employment status – Oneida County.....	27
Table 22. Community items by income – Oneida County.....	28
Table 23. Community items by sex at birth – Vilas County.....	28
Table 24. Community items by age – Vilas County.....	29
Table 25. Community items by race – Vilas County.....	30
Table 26. Community items by ethnicity – Vilas County.....	31
Table 27. Community Items by language – Vilas County.....	31
Table 28. Community Items by employment status – Vilas County.....	32
Table 29. Community Items by income – Vilas County.....	32
Top Five Community Strengths.....	34
Table 30. Top 5 community strengths.....	34
Table 31. Top 5 community strengths by age.....	35
Table 32. Top 5 community strengths by income.....	36

Table 33. Top 5 community strengths by age – Forest County.....	36
Table 34. Top 5 community strengths by income – Forest County .....	37
Table 35. Top 5 community strengths by age – Oneida County .....	38
Table 36. Top 5 community strengths by income – Oneida County .....	39
Table 37. Top 5 community strengths by age – Vilas county .....	40
Table 38. Top 5 community strengths by income – Vilas County .....	41
Top 5 Areas for Improvement .....	42
Table 39: Top 5 areas for improvement .....	42
Table 40. Top 5 areas for improvement by age.....	43
Table 41. Top 5 areas for improvement by income .....	44
Table 42. Top 5 areas for improvement by age – Forest County.....	45
Table 43. Top 5 areas for improvement by income – Forest County.....	46
Table 44. Top 5 areas for improvement by age – Oneida County.....	46
Table 45. Top 5 areas for improvement by income – Oneida County.....	47
Table 46. Top 5 areas for improvement by age – Vilas County.....	48
Table 47. Top 5 areas for improvement by income – Vilas County.....	49
Personal Health Concerns.....	51
Table 48. Personal health concerns by COVID .....	51
Table 49. Personal health concerns by income .....	51
Table 50. Personal health concerns by insurance .....	52
Table 51. Personal health concerns by COVID – Forest County .....	53
Table 52. Personal health concerns by income – Forest County.....	53
Table 53. Personal health concerns by insurance – Forest County .....	54
Table 54. Personal health concerns by COVID – Oneida County.....	55
Table 55. Personal health concerns by income – Oneida County .....	55
Table 56. Personal health concerns by insurance – Oneida County.....	56
Table 57. Personal health concerns by COVID – Vilas County .....	57
Table 58. Personal health concerns by income – Vilas County.....	57
Table 59. Personal health concerns by insurance – Vilas County.....	58
Safety .....	59
Table 60. Safety concerns by income .....	59
Table 61. Safety concerns by age.....	59
Table 62. Safety concerns by mental health.....	59
Table 63. Safety concerns by disability.....	60
Table 64. Safety concerns by income – Forest County.....	60
Table 65. Safety concerns by age – Forest County .....	60
Table 66. Safety concerns by mental health – Forest County.....	61

Table 67. Safety concerns by disability – Forest County .....	61
Table 68. Safety concerns by income – Oneida County.....	61
Table 69. Safety concerns by age – Oneida County.....	61
Table 70. Safety concerns by mental health – Oneida County.....	62
Table 71. Safety concerns by disability – Oneida County.....	62
Table 72. Safety concerns by income – Vilas County .....	62
Table 73. Safety concerns by age – Vilas County .....	63
Table 74. Safety concerns by mental health – Vilas County.....	63
Table 75. Safety concerns by disability – Vilas County .....	63
Disability .....	64
Table 76. Disability by personal health concerns.....	64
Table 77. Disability by insurance.....	64
Table 78. Disability by age.....	65
Table 79. Disability by income.....	65
Table 80. Disability by job status.....	65
Table 81. Disability by personal health concerns – Forest County.....	66
Table 82. Disability by insurance – Forest County .....	66
Table 83. Disability by age – Forest County .....	67
Table 84. Disability by income – Forest County .....	67
Table 85. Disability by job status – Forest County.....	67
Table 86. Disability by personal health concerns – Oneida County .....	68
Table 87. Disability by insurance – Oneida County .....	68
Table 88. Disability by age – Oneida County .....	69
Table 89. Disability by income – Oneida County .....	69
Table 90. Disability by job status – Oneida County .....	69
Table 91. Disability by personal health concerns – Vilas County.....	70
Table 92. Disability by insurance – Vilas County.....	70
Table 93. Disability by age – Vilas County.....	71
Table 94. Disability by income – Vilas County .....	71
Table 95. Disability by job status – Vilas County.....	71
COVID.....	72
Table 96. COVID by personal mental health .....	72
Table 97. COVID by personal physical health .....	72
Table 98. COVID by personal insurance .....	72
Table 99. COVID by personal mental health – Forest County.....	73
Table 100. COVID by personal physical health – Forest County .....	73
Table 101. COVID by personal insurance – Forest County.....	73



Table 102. COVID by personal mental health – Oneida County.....	74
Table 103. COVID by personal physical health – Oneida County.....	74
Table 104. COVID by personal insurance – Oneida County .....	74
Table 105. COVID by personal mental health – Vilas County.....	75
Table 106. COVID by personal physical health – Vilas County.....	75
Table 107. COVID by personal insurance – Vilas County.....	75
Access to Mental Health Care.....	77
Table 108. Access to mental health care by sexual orientation .....	77
Table 109. Access to mental health care by age .....	77
Table 110. Access to mental health care by race .....	77
Table 111. Access to mental health care by ethnicity .....	78
Table 112. Access to mental health care by language.....	78
Table 113. Access to mental health care by income .....	78
Table 114. Access to mental health care by education.....	78
Table 115. Access to mental health care by number of jobs.....	79
Table 116. Access to mental health care by employed.....	79
Table 117. Access to mental health care by reported disability .....	79
Table 118. Access to mental health care by reported illness.....	79
Table 119. Personal health concerns by COVID.....	80
Table 120. Access to mental health care by sexual orientation – Forest County .....	81
Table 121. Access to mental health care by age – Forest County .....	81
Table 122. Access to mental health care by race – Forest County .....	81
Table 123. Access to mental health care by ethnicity – Forest County.....	82
Table 124. Access to mental health care by language – Forest County.....	82
Table 125. Access to mental health care by income – Forest County.....	82
Table 126. Access to mental health care by education – Forest county.....	82
Table 127. Access to mental health care by number of jobs – Forest County.....	83
Table 128. Access to mental health care by employed – Forest County .....	83
Table 129. Access to mental health care by reported disability – Forest County.....	83
Table 130. Access to mental health care by reported illness – Forest County .....	83
Table 131. Personal health concerns by COVID – Forest County.....	84
Table 132. Access to mental health care by sexual orientation – Oneida County .....	85
Table 133. Access to mental health care by age – Oneida County .....	85
Table 134. Access to mental health care by race – Oneida County .....	85
Table 135. Access to mental health care by ethnicity – Oneida County.....	86
Table 136. Access to mental health care by language – Oneida County.....	86
Table 137. Access to mental health care by income – Oneida County.....	86

Table 138. Access to mental health care by education – Oneida County.....	86
Table 139. Access to mental health care by number of jobs – Oneida County.....	87
Table 140. Access to mental health care by employed – Oneida County.....	87
Table 141. Access to mental health care by reported disability – Oneida County.....	87
Table 142. Access to mental health care by reported illness – Oneida County.....	87
Table 143. Personal health concerns by COVID – Oneida County.....	88
Table 144. Access to mental health care by sexual orientation – Vilas County.....	89
Table 145. Access to mental health care by age – Vilas County.....	89
Table 146. Access to mental health care by race – Vilas County.....	89
Table 147. Access to mental health care by ethnicity – Vilas County.....	90
Table 148. Access to mental health care by language – Vilas county.....	90
Table 149. Access to mental health care by income – Vilas County.....	90
Table 150. Access to mental health care by education – Vilas County.....	90
Table 151. Access to mental health care by number of jobs – Vilas County.....	91
Table 152. Access to mental health care by employed – Vilas County.....	91
Table 153. Access to mental health care by reported disability – Vilas County.....	91
Table 154. Access to mental health care by reported illness – Vilas County.....	92
Table 155. Personal health concerns by COVID – Vilas County.....	92
Social and Economic Factors.....	94
Table 156. Social and economic factors by income.....	94
Table 157. Social and economic factors by ethnicity.....	94
Table 158. Social and economic factors by race.....	95
Table 159. Social and economic factors by education.....	95
Table 160. Social and economic factors by age.....	95
Table 161. Social and economic factors by income – Forest County.....	96
Table 162. Social and economic factors by ethnicity – Forest County.....	96
Table 163. Social and economic factors by race – Forest County.....	97
Table 164. Social and economic factors by education – Forest County.....	97
Table 165. Social and economic factors by age – Forest County.....	98
Table 166. Social and economic factors by income – Oneida County.....	98
Table 167. Social and economic factors by ethnicity – Oneida County.....	99
Table 168. Social and economic factors by race – Oneida County.....	99
Table 169. Social and economic factors by education – Oneida County.....	100
Table 170. Social and economic factors by income – Vilas County.....	100
Table 171. Social and economic factors by age – Oneida County.....	101
Table 172. Social and economic factors by ethnicity – Vilas County.....	101
Table 173. Social and economic factors by race – Vilas County.....	102

Table 174. Social and economic factors by education – Vilas County .....	102
Table 175. Social and economic factors by age – Vilas County .....	103
Environmental Health Factors .....	104
Table 176. Environmental health factors by income .....	104
Table 177. Environmental health factors by ethnicity .....	104
Table 178. Environmental health factors by race .....	105
Table 179. Environmental health factors by education .....	105
Table 180. Environmental health factors by income – Forest County .....	105
Table 181. Environmental health factors by ethnicity – Forest County .....	106
Table 182. Environmental health factors by race – Forest County .....	106
Table 183. Environmental health factors by education – Forest county .....	107
Table 184. Environmental health factors by income – Oneida County .....	107
Table 185. Environmental health factors by ethnicity – Oneida County .....	108
Table 186. Environmental health factors by race – Oneida County .....	108
Table 187. Environmental health factors by education – Oneida County .....	109
Table 188. Environmental health factors by income – Vilas County .....	109
Table 189. Environmental health factors by ethnicity – Vilas County .....	110
Table 190. Environmental health factors by race – Vilas County .....	110
Table 191. Environmental health factors by education – Vilas County .....	111
Physical Environment Factors .....	112
Table 192. Physical environment factors by income .....	112
Table 193. Physical environment factors by ethnicity .....	112
Table 194. Physical environment factors by race .....	113
Table 195. Physical environment factors by education .....	113
Table 196. Environmental health factors by age .....	114
Table 197. Physical environment factors by income – Forest County .....	114
Table 198. Physical environment factors by ethnicity – Forest County .....	115
Table 199. Physical environment factors by race – Forest County .....	115
Table 200. Physical environment factors by education – Forest County .....	116
Table 201. Environmental health factors by age – Forest County .....	116
Table 202. Physical environment factors by income – Oneida County .....	117
Table 203. Physical environment factors by ethnicity – Oneida County .....	117
Table 204. Physical environment factors by race – Oneida County .....	118
Table 205. Physical environment factors by education – Oneida County .....	118
Table 206. Environmental health factors by age – Oneida County .....	119
Table 207. Physical environment factors by income – Vilas County .....	119
Table 208. Physical environment factors by ethnicity – Vilas county .....	120



Table 209. Physical environment factors by race – Vilas County.....	120
Table 210. Physical environment factors by education – Vilas County.....	121
Table 211. Environmental health factors by age – Vilas County.....	121
Sexual Orientation.....	122
Table 212. Sexual orientation by personal mental health.....	122
Table 213. Sexual orientation by housing.....	122
Table 214. Sexual orientation by social economic factors.....	122
Table 215. Sexual orientation by personal mental health – Forest County.....	123
Table 216. Sexual orientation by housing – Forest County.....	123
Table 217. Sexual orientation by social economic factors – Forest County.....	124
Table 218. Sexual orientation by personal mental health – Oneida County.....	124
Table 219. Sexual orientation by housing – Oneida County.....	124
Table 220. Sexual orientation by social economic factors – Oneida County.....	125
Table 221. Sexual orientation by personal mental health – Vilas County.....	125
Table 222. Sexual orientation by housing – Vilas County.....	126
Table 223. Sexual orientation by social economic factors – Vilas County.....	126
Income.....	127
Table 224. Income by housing situation.....	127
Table 225. Income by housing needs met.....	127
Table 226. Income by housing stability concerns.....	127
Table 227. Income by access to reliable transportation.....	127
Table 228. Income by job status.....	128
Table 229. Income by number of jobs.....	128
Table 230. Income factors by age.....	128
Table 231. Income by housing situation – Forest County.....	128
Table 232. Income by housing needs met – Forest County.....	129
Table 233. Income by housing stability concerns – Forest County.....	129
Table 234. Income by access to reliable transportation – Forest County.....	129
Table 235. Income by job status – Forest County.....	129
Table 236. Income by number of jobs – Forest County.....	130
Table 237. Income factors by age – Forest County.....	130
Table 238. Income by housing situation – Oneida County.....	130
Table 239. Income by housing needs met – Oneida County.....	130
Table 240. Income by housing stability concerns – Oneida County.....	131
Table 241. Income by access to reliable transportation – Oneida County.....	131
Table 242. Income by job status – Oneida County.....	131
Table 243. Income by number of jobs – Oneida County.....	131

Table 244. Income factors by age – Oneida County.....	132
Table 245. Income by housing situation – Vilas County.....	132
Table 246. Income by housing needs met – Vilas county.....	132
Table 247. Income by housing stability concerns – Vilas County.....	132
Table 248. Income by access to reliable transportation – Vilas County.....	133
Table 249. Income by job status – Vilas County.....	133
Table 250. Income by number of jobs – Vilas County.....	133
Table 251. Income factors by age – Vilas County.....	133
Food Assistance.....	134
Table 252. Social / Economic Factors by Food Stamp Status.....	134
Table 253. Overall community thoughts by Food Stamp Status.....	134
Table 254. Personal Health by Food Stamp Status.....	135
Table 255. Personal health concerns (worried) by food stamp status.....	135
Table 256. Safety concerns by Food Stamp Status.....	136
Table 257. Food Stamp Status by age.....	136
Table 258. Food Stamp Status by race.....	136
Table 259. Food Stamp Status by ethnicity.....	136
Table 260. Food Stamp Status by education.....	137
Table 261. Social / Economic Factors by Food Stamp Status - Forest County.....	137
Table 262. Overall community thoughts by Food Stamp Status – Forest County.....	137
Table 263. Personal Health by Food Stamp Status - Forest County.....	138
Table 264. Personal health concerns (worried) by food stamp status - Forest County.....	138
Table 265. Safety concerns by food stamp status - Forest County.....	139
Table 266. Income factors by age - Forest County.....	139
Table 267. Food stamp status by race - Forest County.....	139
Table 268. Food stamp status by ethnicity – Forest County.....	139
Table 269. Food stamp status by education - Forest county.....	140
Table 270. Social / economic factors by food stamp status – Oneida County.....	140
Table 271. Overall community thoughts by food stamp status – Oneida County.....	140
Table 272. Personal health by food stamp status – Oneida County.....	141
Table 273. Personal health concerns (worried) by food stamp status – Oneida County.....	141
Table 274. Safety concerns by food stamp status - Oneida County.....	142
Table 275. Income factors by age – Oneida county.....	142
Table 276. Food stamp status by race – Oneida county.....	142
Table 277 Food stamp status by ethnicity – Oneida County.....	143
Table 278. Food stamp status by education – Oneida county.....	143
Table 279. Social / economic factors by food stamp status - Vilas County.....	143

Table 280. Overall community thoughts by food stamp status - Vilas County .....	144
Table 281. Personal Health by food stamp status – Vilas County.....	144
Table 282. Personal health concerns (worried) by food stamp status – Vilas County.....	144
Table 283. Safety concerns by Food Stamp Status - Vilas County.....	145
Table 284. Food stamp status by age – Vilas County .....	145
Table 285. Food stamp status by race – Vilas county .....	146
table 286. Food stamp status by ethnicity – Vilas County.....	146
Table 287. Food stamp status by education - Vilas county.....	146
Cancer .....	147
Table 288. Cancer status by age.....	147
Table 289. Cancer status by race.....	147
Table 290. Cancer status by ethnicity .....	147
Table 291. Cancer status by education .....	147
Table 292. Cancer status by income .....	148
Table 293. Cancer status by age – Forest County.....	148
Table 294. Cancer status by race – Forest County.....	148
Table 295. Cancer status by ethnicity – Forest County.....	148
Table 296. Cancer status by Education – Forest County .....	149
Table 297. Cancer status by income – Forest County.....	149
Table 298. Cancer status by age – Oneida county.....	149
Table 299. Cancer status by race – Oneida County.....	150
Table 300. Cancer status by ethnicity – Oneida county.....	150
Table 301. Cancer status by education – Oneida County .....	150
Table 302. Cancer status by income – Oneida County .....	150
Table 303. Cancer status by age – Vilas County .....	151
Table 304. Cancer status by race – Vilas County.....	151
Table 305. Cancer status by ethnicity – Vilas County.....	151
Table 306. Cancer status by education – Vilas county.....	151
Table 307. Cancer status by income – Vilas County .....	152



## Comparisons

Income, was used for a variety of comparisons. For purposes of this report, the United Way's ALICE research was recognized as being the best measure of financial hardship in Wisconsin. The United Way of Wisconsin is dedicated to addressing human needs, improving lives, and creating lasting, positive change across Wisconsin. As part of their effort, they have collaborated with the National United for ALICE project and created ALICE or Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed, which is a body of research meant to better define, measure, and understand financial hardship within a population. The general philosophy behind ALICE is that the federal poverty guidelines (FPL) are so understated that the government and other nonprofit agencies use multiples of the FPL to determine eligibility for assistance programs. For example, to qualify for an Economic Hardship Deferment for student loans, your income, while working full time, must fall within 150% of the FPL for your income and family size. ALICE research fills that void by calculating exactly how much it would cost for a family of a given size to survive in a given economic climate, as organized by counties and regions.

ALICE research generates multiple measures that relate to each other to better explain the degree to which financial hardship is being endured. First, ALICE calculates a survival budget that describes, in detail, exactly how much a family of a given size can expect to spend on living expenses to "survive" economically. The budget adjusts based on family size and offers separate estimates for seniors. The sum of the budget, in conjunction with family size and age (to a lesser extent) create an ALICE threshold, which represents the absolute minimum income level necessary for survival on a household budget without the aid of public assistance. ALICE research then sets a threshold, based on the survival budget, to define a population as living above or below the average cost of living to income ratio, in the context of age and family size. Those living below the ALICE threshold **do not** earn enough to afford basic necessities.

## Overall Community Thoughts

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1= *Strongly disagree* and 5= *Strongly agree*. The results are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1. OVERALL COMMUNITY THOUGHTS

	FOREST M (SD)	ONEIDA M (SD)	VILAS M (SD)	COMBINED M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.16 (1.07)	4.09 (1.01)	4.13 (1.03)	4.12 (1.03)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	4.02 (.98)	3.93 (1.04)	4.07 (.97)	3.99 (1.01)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.89 (1.19)	3.77 (1.29)	3.86 (1.14)	3.83 (1.22)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.18 (1.22)	3.22 (1.21)	3.26 (1.19)	3.21 (1.21)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.49 (1.11)	3.57 (1.05)	3.59 (1.13)	3.55 (1.09)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.52 (1.28)	3.01 (1.30)	2.96 (1.34)	2.84 (1.32)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.97 (1.02)	3.69 (1.03)	3.80 (1.09)	3.81 (1.05)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.98 (.99)	4.07 (.95)	4.14 (.79)	4.06 (.97)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.33 (1.07)	3.40 (1.07)	3.32 (1.06)	3.36 (1.07)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.15 (1.12)	4.21 (1.09)	4.01 (1.19)	4.15 (1.13)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.51 (1.16)	3.37 (1.14)	3.46 (1.16)	3.44 (1.15)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.72 (1.16)	2.35 (1.21)	2.41 (1.26)	2.49 (1.21)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Responses were sorted by sex at birth. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1= *Strongly disagree* and 5= *Strongly agree*. The results are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2. OVERALL COMMUNITY THOUGHTS BY SEX AT BIRTH

	MALE M (SD)	FEMALE M (SD)	OTHER M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.02 (1.08)	4.18 (1.02)	4.20 (.44)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	4.01 (.97)	4.00 (1.02)	3.00 (.87)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.76 (1.19)	3.88 (1.23)	2.75 (1.50)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.38 (1.15)	3.17 (1.22)	2.50 (1.73)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.62 (.99)	3.53 (1.13)	3.50 (1.73)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	3.22 (1.29)	2.72 (1.33)	2.50 (1.73)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.90 (1.03)	3.79 (1.06)	3.75 (.50)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.96 (1.01)	4.08 (.97)	4.00 (.00)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.54 (1.07)	3.31 (1.07)	3.50 (1.73)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	3.97 (1.16)	4.21 (1.10)	4.00 (.82)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.55 (1.16)	3.38 (1.16)	3.00 (1.41)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.86 (1.25)	2.34 (1.96)	2.00 (1.41)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Responses were sorted by age. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=*Strongly disagree* and 5=*Strongly agree*. The results are shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3. OVERALL COMMUNITY THOUGHTS BY AGE

	UNDER 18 M (SD)	18-25 M (SD)	26-40 M (SD)	41-55 M (SD)	56-65 M (SD)	66-75 M (SD)	75+ M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	3.33 (1.51)	3.9 (.97)	4.00 (.98)	4.26 (.90)	4.17 (1.17)	4.17 (1.09)	4.29 (1.11)



I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.05 (1.23)	3.66 (1.10)	3.88 (.96)	4.02 (.91)	4.01 (1.06)	4.28 (.96)	4.32 (1.09)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.83 (1.17)	3.45 (1.24)	3.64 (1.22)	3.83 (1.22)	3.97 (1.20)	4.07 (1.18)	4.35 (1.04)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	2.17 (.75)	3.32 (1.24)	3.06 (1.17)	3.06 (1.14)	3.30 (1.28)	3.31 (1.23)	3.84 (1.09)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.17 (1.17)	3.67 (1.00)	3.48 (1.06)	3.39 (1.14)	3.53 (1.09)	3.76 (1.06)	3.99 (1.03)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	1.83 (.41)	3.18 (1.25)	2.90 (1.33)	2.42 (1.29)	2.75 (1.28)	3.05 (1.28)	3.50 (1.29)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	2.67 (1.03)	3.79 (1.06)	3.74 (.99)	3.70 (1.04)	3.85 (1.09)	3.91 (1.04)	4.35 (1.01)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	2.50 (1.23)	3.82 (1.03)	3.80 (.94)	4.09 (.91)	4.28 (.95)	4.25 (.92)	4.47 (.92)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	2.67 (1.37)	3.52 (1.04)	3.29 (1.06)	3.23 (1.05)	3.34 (1.09)	3.47 (1.04)	3.81 (1.09)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.33 (1.63)	4.12 (1.12)	4.14 (.99)	4.10 (1.13)	4.14 (1.23)	4.17 (1.23)	4.29 (1.22)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.33 (1.37)	3.86 (1.05)	3.52 (1.34)	3.33 (1.20)	3.25 (1.12)	3.40 (1.12)	3.50 (1.23)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.17 (.75)	2.95 (1.15)	2.69 (1.26)	2.27 (1.17)	2.20 (1.19)	2.38 (1.07)	2.81 (1.25)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=*Strongly disagree* and 5=*Strongly agree*. Participants were asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native*: \_\_, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other*: \_\_). Race was recoded to *White* and *Non-white*. The results are shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4. OVERALL COMMUNITY THOUGHTS BY RACE

	WHITE M (SD)	NON-WHITE M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.16 (1.02)	3.83 (1.12)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	4.04 (.99)	3.36 (1.06)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.88 (1.20)	3.40 (1.30)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.21 (1.20)	3.20 (1.28)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.55 (1.10)	3.57 (1.04)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.79 (1.32)	3.19 (1.32)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.83 (1.03)	3.65 (1.17)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	4.11 (.94)	3.60 (1.09)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.34 (1.06)	3.51 (1.13)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.17 (1.12)	3.95 (1.19)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.41 (1.16)	3.72 (1.09)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.44 (1.19)	2.89 (1.31)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Participants were asked to report their ethnicity (1=Hispanic/Latino, 2=Not Hispanic/Latino). The results are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5. OVERALL COMMUNITY THOUGHTS BY ETHNICITY

	HISPANIC/ LATINO M (SD)	NOT HISPANIC/ LATINO M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	3.81 (.96)	4.14 (1.04)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.70 (1.00)	4.00 (1.01)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.41 (1.15)	3.84 (1.23)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.50 (1.17)	3.17(1.21)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.78 (.92)	3.52 (1.10)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	3.70 (1.16)	2.76 (1.31)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.79 (1.13)	3.79 (1.05)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.75 (1.16)	4.06 (.10)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.77 (.99)	3.31 (1.06)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	3.91 (1.17)	4.16 (1.13)

THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.80 (1.01)	3.41 (1.16)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	3.34 (1.19)	2.41 (1.18)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Participants were asked to report '*What language(s) do you speak at home?*' Responses to this item were 1=**English**, 2=**Spanish**, 3=**Hmong**, 4=**Mandarin**, 5=**Other**: \_\_. Language was recoded to **English** and **Other**. The results are shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6. OVERALL COMMUNITY THOUGHTS BY LANGUAGE

	ENGLISH M (SD)	OTHER M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.13 (1.03)	3.88 (1.27)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	4.00 (1.00)	3.72 (1.37)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.84 (1.21)	3.40 (1.58)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.20 (1.21)	3.24 (1.33)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.54 (1.09)	3.96 (.89)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.83 (1.32)	2.80 (1.35)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.80 (1.05)	3.96 (1.01)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	4.05 (.97)	4.13 (1.19)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.34 (1.07)	4.08 (.98)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.15 (1.13)	4.16 (1.11)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.43 (1.16)	3.72 (1.24)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.48 (1.21)	2.64 (1.25)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Participants were asked to indicate their employment status (1=**I do not work**, 2=**Work # Hours per week-fill in:\_\_\_**, 3=**Unemployed**, 4=**Retired**, 5=**Student**, 6=**Military**, 7=**Homemaker**, 8=**Unable to work due to disability**, 9=**Other:\_\_\_**). Employment status was recoded to **Employed** and **Not employed**. The results are shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7. OVERALL COMMUNITY THOUGHTS BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	EMPLOYED M (SD)	NOT EMPLOYED M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.17 (.96)	4.03 (1.16)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.98 (.97)	4.03 (1.07)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.86 (1.17)	3.77 (1.32)



PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.13 (1.20)	3.36 (1.23)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.47 (1.08)	3.69 (1.09)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.70 (1.31)	3.10 (1.31)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.78 (1.01)	3.86 (1.13)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.99 (.97)	4.18 (.98)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.31 (1.06)	3.46 (1.08)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.13 (1.10)	4.18 (1.18)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.45 (1.17)	3.42 (1.13)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.42 (1.23)	2.62 (1.17)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Responses were sorted by annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. The results are shown in Table 8.

TABLE 8. OVERALL COMMUNITY THOUGHTS BY INCOME

	BELOW ALICE M (SD)	ABOVE ALICE M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	3.91 (1.16)	4.12 (.98)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.73 (1.19)	4.05 (.91)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.04 (1.34)	4.03 (1.11)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.08 (1.29)	3.14 (1.14)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.55 (1.12)	3.48 (1.09)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.93 (1.31)	2.74 (1.32)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.58 (1.18)	3.83 (1.00)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.87 (1.12)	4.09 (.91)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.36 (1.10)	3.30 (1.07)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.11 (1.15)	4.17 (1.10)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.29 (1.13)	3.47 (1.16)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.51 (1.19)	2.46 (1.22)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Responses were sorted by sex at birth for Forest County. The results are shown in Table 9.

TABLE 9. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY SEX AT BIRTH – FOREST COUNTY

	MALE M (SD)	FEMALE M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.15 (1.04)	4.19 (1.08)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	4.14 (.87)	3.94 (1.03)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.90 (1.13)	3.90 (1.21)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.46 (1.13)	3.06 (1.21)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.65 (.96)	3.36 (1.16)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.92 (1.27)	2.31 (1.23)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	4.08 (.92)	3.89 (1.05)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.98 (1.04)	3.91 (1.00)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.58 (1.01)	3.20 (1.10)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.12 (1.02)	4.07 (1.17)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.44 (1.23)	3.50 (1.15)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.97 (1.19)	2.59 (1.15)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Responses were sorted by age for Forest County. The results are shown in Table 10.

TABLE 10. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY AGE – FOREST COUNTY

	UNDER 18 M (SD)	18-25 M (SD)	26-40 M (SD)	41-55 M (SD)	56-65 M (SD)	66-75 M (SD)	75+ M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	3.60 (1.52)	4.33 (.84)	4.13 (.95)	4.33 (1.04)	3.95 (1.38)	4.18 (.97)	4.08 (1.12)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.40 (1.34)	3.86 (.80)	3.93 (1.07)	4.09 (.91)	4.05 (1.00)	3.88 (1.13)	4.48 (.77)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.60 (1.14)	3.72 (1.12)	3.66 (1.25)	4.03 (1.17)	3.98 (1.09)	3.85 (1.33)	4.32 (.99)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL	2.20 (.84)	3.42 (1.30)	2.97 (1.20)	2.94 (1.11)	3.41 (1.32)	3.29 (1.22)	4.00 (.87)

ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE							
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.00 (1.23)	3.67 (1.09)	3.44 (1.13)	3.31 (1.13)	3.59 (1.08)	3.47 (1.13)	3.83 (1.05)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.00 (.00)	2.74 (1.12)	2.58 (1.30)	2.07 (1.15)	2.63 (1.30)	2.45 (1.30)	3.28 (1.40)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	2.40 (.89)	4.19 (.76)	3.86 (1.11)	3.81 (.96)	4.04 (1.10)	4.09 (.97)	4.64 (.70)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	2.20 (1.10)	3.86 (1.01)	3.70 (1.00)	4.00 (.92)	4.22 (.98)	4.26 (.83)	4.60 (.65)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.00 (1.23)	3.77 (.95)	3.15 (1.07)	3.13 (1.03)	3.48 (1.14)	3.41 (1.08)	3.71 (1.08)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.20 (1.79)	4.30 (.96)	4.04 (1.09)	4.17 (1.15)	4.23 (1.08)	3.97 (1.21)	4.25 (1.15)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.47 (1.52)	4.05 (.95)	3.70 (1.10)	3.44 (1.19)	3.23 (1.19)	3.06 (1.10)	3.25 (1.23)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.20 (.84)	3.14 (1.16)	2.75 (1.19)	2.51 (1.07)	2.59 (1.26)	2.76 (1.06)	2.96 (1.12)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Participants were asked to report their race (1=White, 2=Asian, 3=Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander, 4=African American/Black, 5=American Indian or Alaska Native: \_\_, 6=Two or more races, 7=Other: \_\_). Race was recoded as White and Non-white. The results are shown in Table 11.

TABLE 11. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY RACE – FOREST COUNTY

	WHITE M (SD)	NON-WHITE M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.18 (1.05)	4.04 (1.22)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	4.03 (.99)	3.86 (.98)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.90 (1.17)	3.76 (1.28)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.18 (1.20)	3.12 (1.36)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.47 (1.11)	3.57 (1.14)

MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.46 (1.25)	2.82 (1.38)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.99 (1.00)	3.82 (1.15)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	4.00 (.98)	3.71 (1.10)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.30 (1.07)	3.53 (1.10)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.17 (1.07)	4.00 (1.35)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.46 (1.16)	3.86 (1.08)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.72 (1.13)	2.73 (1.30)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Participants were asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). The results are shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY ETHNICITY – FOREST COUNTY

	HISPANIC/ LATINO M (SD)	NOT HISPANIC/ LATINO M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.29 (.85)	4.16 (1.07)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	4.12 (.70)	3.99 (1.01)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.94 (1.14)	3.86 (1.20)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.65 (1.12)	3.11 (1.21)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.76 (1.03)	3.45 (1.12)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	3.35 (1.17)	2.44 (1.24)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	4.41 (.87)	3.91 (1.03)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.88 (1.15)	3.94 (.99)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.82 (1.07)	3.28 (1.07)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.12 (1.22)	4.16 (1.11)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	4.18 (.81)	3.48 (1.16)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	3.41 (1.33)	2.65 (1.13)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Participants were asked to report '*What language(s) do you speak at home?*' Responses to this item were 1=*English*, 2=*Spanish*, 3=*Hmong*, 4=*Mandarin*, 5=*Other:\_\_\_*. Language was recoded to *English* and *Other*. The results are shown in Table 13.

TABLE 13. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY LANGUAGE – FOREST COUNTY

	ENGLISH M (SD)	OTHER M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.16 (1.07)	4.17 (1.19)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	4.01 (.99)	4.25 (.97)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.88 (1.18)	3.83 (1.47)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.13 (1.22)	4.17 (.84)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.45 (1.12)	4.33 (.49)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.49 (1.27)	3.00 (1.35)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.95 (1.02)	4.42 (.90)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.96 (.99)	4.36 (1.03)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.29 (1.07)	4.50 (.52)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.14 (1.12)	4.42 (.90)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.48 (1.16)	4.25 (.97)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.70 (1.16)	3.17 (1.03)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Participants were asked to indicate their employment status (1=*I do not work*, 2=*Work # Hours per week-fill in:\_\_\_*, 3=*Unemployed*, 4=*Retired*, 5=*Student*, 6=*Military*, 7=*Homemaker*, 8=*Unable to work due to disability*, 9=*Other:\_\_\_*). Employment status was recoded to *Employed* and *Not employed*. The results are shown in Table 14.

TABLE 14. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS – FOREST COUNTY

	EMPLOYED M (SD)	NOT EMPLOYED M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.22 (1.00)	4.02 (1.22)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	4.00 (.99)	4.05 (.97)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.89 (1.15)	3.85 (1.27)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.08 (1.22)	3.38 (1.20)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.47 (1.09)	3.50 (1.17)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.47 (1.25)	2.59 (1.32)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.91 (1.00)	4.09 (1.07)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.84 (1.01)	4.28 (.89)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.30 (1.08)	3.40 (1.08)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.16 (1.09)	4.12 (1.18)



THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.62 (1.14)	3.23 (1.17)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.70 (1.19)	2.73 (1.08)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Responses were sorted by annual household income for Forest County. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. The results are shown in Table 15.

TABLE 15. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY INCOME – FOREST COUNTY

	BELOW ALICE M (SD)	ABOVE ALICE M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	3.91 (1.25)	4.21 (1.01)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.83 (1.08)	4.12 (.94)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.14 (1.38)	4.05 (1.04)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.23 (1.32)	3.07 (1.11)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.45 (1.24)	3.43 (1.15)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.53 (1.26)	2.44 (1.30)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.81 (1.17)	4.03 (.96)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.74 (1.17)	4.05 (.93)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.35 (1.04)	3.25 (1.09)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.28 (1.07)	4.18 (1.08)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.32 (1.27)	3.59 (1.13)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.72 (1.15)	2.72 (1.16)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Responses were sorted by sex at birth for Oneida County. The results are shown in Table 16.

TABLE 16. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY SEX AT BIRTH – ONEIDA COUNTY

	MALE M (SD)	FEMALE M (SD)	OTHER M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	3.91 (1.07)	4.17 (.98)	4.50 (.71)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.84 (1.07)	4.01 (1.04)	2.50 (.71)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.58 (1.34)	3.83 (1.28)	3.0 (1.41)

PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.29 (1.19)	3.25 (1.23)	1.00 (.00)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.58 (.99)	3.63 (1.06)	2.50 (2.12)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	3.22 (1.31)	3.03 (1.32)	2.50 (2.12)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.76 (1.08)	3.71 (1.06)	3.50 (.71)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.90 (1.04)	4.14 (.93)	--
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.61 (1.03)	3.39 (1.08)	2.50 (2.12)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	3.89 (1.24)	4.34 (1.0)	4.50 (.70)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.55 (1.12)	3.31 (1.17)	2.0 (1.41)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.79 (1.26)	2.24 (1.21)	1.00 (.00)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Responses were sorted by age for Oneida County. The results are shown in Table 17.

TABLE 17. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY AGE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	UNDER 18 M (SD)	18-25 M (SD)	26-40 M (SD)	41-55 M (SD)	56-65 M (SD)	66-75 M (SD)	75+ M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	--	3.64 (.99)	3.92 (.97)	4.24 (.74)	4.26 (1.08)	4.21 (1.13)	4.36 (1.22)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	--	3.41 (1.25)	3.76 (.96)	4.01 (.88)	3.99 (1.12)	4.38 (.83)	4.09 (1.36)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	--	3.08 (1.67)	3.57 (1.27)	3.76 (1.30)	3.93 (1.28)	4.22 (1.09)	4.24 (1.20)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	--	3.38 (1.29)	3.03 (1.17)	3.16 (1.18)	3.19 (1.22)	3.41 (1.21)	3.67 (1.19)

MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	--	3.97 (.84)	3.43 (.98)	3.40 (1.12)	3.52 (1.08)	3.85 (.98)	4.03 (1.05)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	--	3.41 (1.27)	2.98 (1.32)	2.64 (1.33)	2.87 (1.25)	3.37 (1.12)	3.78 (1.18)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	--	3.49 (1.21)	3.62 (.92)	3.66 (1.09)	3.73 (1.05)	3.88 (1.00)	3.97 (1.21)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	--	3.77 (1.01)	3.84 (.90)	4.16 (.89)	4.29 (.94)	4.28 (.97)	4.19 (1.15)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	--	3.54 (1.07)	3.34 (1.02)	3.36 (1.05)	3.32 (1.12)	3.49 (1.05)	3.81 (1.18)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	--	4.11 (1.06)	4.25 (.91)	4.09 (1.12)	4.24 (1.23)	4.33 (1.20)	4.21 (1.36)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	--	3.67 (1.11)	3.34 (1.14)	3.27 (1.20)	3.26 (1.07)	3.57 (1.15)	3.55 (1.21)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	--	2.72 (1.17)	2.50 (1.27)	2.19 (1.26)	2.10 (1.11)	2.30 (1.02)	2.67 (1.27)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Participants were then asked to report their race (1=White, 2=Asian, 3=Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander, 4=African American/Black, 5=American Indian or Alaska Native: \_\_, 6=Two or more races, 7=Other: \_\_). Race was recoded as White and Non-white. The results are shown in Table 18.

TABLE 18. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY RACE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	WHITE M (SD)	NON-WHITE M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.13 (1.02)	3.78 (.82)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.98 (1.03)	3.53 (1.00)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.83 (1.27)	3.29 (1.28)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.17 (1.21)	3.55 (1.12)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.57 (1.06)	3.67 (.88)

MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.95 (1.30)	3.65 (1.17)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.70 (1.04)	3.65 (1.01)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	4.12 (.94)	3.69 (.98)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.35 (1.07)	3.84 (1.01)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.22 (1.12)	4.18 (.83)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.33 (1.15)	3.78 (1.05)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.25 (1.16)	3.35 (1.20)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Participants were asked to report their ethnicity (1=Hispanic/Latino, 2=Not Hispanic/Latino). The results shown in Table 19.

TABLE 19. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY ETHNICITY – ONEIDA COUNTY

	HISPANIC/ LATINO M (SD)	NOT HISPANIC/ LATINO M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	3.59 (.85)	4.14 (1.01)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.54 (1.00)	3.96 (1.04)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.15 (1.04)	3.82 (1.29)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.54 (1.14)	3.16 (1.21)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.85 (.75)	3.55 (1.07)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	3.90 (1.10)	2.91 (1.29)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.64 (1.11)	3.70 (1.03)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.67 (1.11)	4.09 (.94)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.82 (.85)	3.35 (1.08)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	3.79 (1.06)	4.23 (1.11)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.74 (.94)	3.33 (1.17)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	3.41 (1.07)	2.24 (1.16)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Participants were asked to report 'What language(s) do you speak at home?' Responses to this item were 1=English, 2=Spanish, 3=Hmong, 4=Mandarin, 5=Other:\_\_. Language was recoded to English and Other. The results are shown in Table 20.

TABLE 20. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY LANGUAGE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	ENGLISH M (SD)	OTHER M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.11 (1.00)	3.45 (1.37)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.95 (1.03)	3.45 (1.51)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.79 (1.27)	3.18 (1.66)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.22 (1.21)	2.55 (1.13)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.57 (1.05)	3.64 (1.12)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	3.02 (1.31)	2.64 (1.36)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.70 (1.03)	3.45 (1.44)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	4.07 (.95)	4.00 (1.41)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.39 (1.07)	3.73 (1.27)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.21 (1.11)	4.27 (.91)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.37 (1.43)	3.27 (1.42)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.35 (1.21)	2.36 (1.29)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Participants were asked to indicate their employment status (1=I do not work, 2=Work # Hours per week-fill in:\_\_\_ 3=Unemployed, 4=Retired, 5=Student, 6=Military, 7=Homemaker, 8=Unable to work due to disability, 9=Other:\_\_\_). Employment status was recoded to *Employed* and *Not employed*. The results are shown in Table 21.

TABLE 21. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS – ONEIDA COUNTY

	EMPLOYED M (SD)	NOT EMPLOYED M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.14 (.93)	4.04 (1.11)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.95 (.98)	3.93 (1.11)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.80 (1.23)	3.73 (1.35)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.14 (1.19)	3.31 (1.24)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.45 (1.06)	3.78 (1.00)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.81 (1.30)	3.25 (1.25)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.67 (1.00)	3.74 (1.11)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	4.06 (.92)	4.09 (1.01)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.33 (1.04)	3.52 (1.10)



I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.17 (1.09)	4.27 (1.12)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.31 (1.16)	3.47 (1.11)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.24 (1.22)	2.53 (1.17)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Responses were sorted by annual household income for Oneida County. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. The results are shown in Table 22.

TABLE 22. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY INCOME – ONEIDA COUNTY

	BELOW ALICE M (SD)	ABOVE ALICE M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	3.91 (1.13)	4.08 (.95)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.65 (1.23)	3.97 (.92)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	2.97 (1.33)	3.99 (1.20)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.08 (1.23)	3.11 (1.18)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.58 (1.05)	3.48 (1.02)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	3.18 (1.28)	2.83 (1.28)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.57 (1.12)	2068 (.99)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.98 (1.07)	4.06 (.90)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.44 (1.15)	3.32 (1.05)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.10 (1.13)	4.24 (1.06)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.27 (1.07)	3.36 (1.17)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.39 (1.19)	3.32 (1.20)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Responses were sorted by sex at birth for Vilas County. The results are shown in Table 23.

TABLE 23. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY SEX AT BIRTH – VILAS COUNTY

	MALE M (SD)	FEMALE M (SD)	OTHER M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.03 (1.12)	4.17 (1.02)	4.0 (.00)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	4.09 (.91)	4.11 (.94)	3.50 (.71)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.85 (1.03)	3.93 (1.15)	2.50 (2.12)

PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.39 (1.14)	3.19 (1.21)	4.00 (.00)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.62 (1.02)	3.57 (1.19)	4.50 (.71)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	3.61 (1.21)	2.70 (1.35)	2.50 (2.12)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.89 (1.07)	3.81 (1.09)	4.00 (.00)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	4.03 (.94)	4.21 (.98)	4.00 (.00)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.38 (1.21)	3.29 (.97)	4.50 (.71)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	3.91 (1.22)	4.12 (1.17)	3.50 (.71)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.71 (1.11)	3.34 (1.20)	4.00 (.00)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.82 (1.31)	2.18 (1.19)	3.00 (1.41)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Responses were sorted by age for Vilas County. The results are shown in Table 24.

TABLE 24. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY AGE – VILAS COUNTY

	18-25 M (SD)	26-40 M (SD)	41-55 M (SD)	56-65 M (SD)	66-75 M (SD)	75+ M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	3.90 (.98)	3.96 (1.05)	4.20 (.94)	4.25 (1.07)	4.10 (1.17)	4.55 (.69)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.69 (1.23)	4.15 (.58)	3.93 (.99)	4.00 (1.04)	4.44 (.97)	4.64 (.67)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.55 (1.30)	3.83 (.93)	3.63 (1.13)	4.04 (1.18)	4.00 (1.19)	4.73 (.47)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.10 (1.11)	3.33 (1.10)	3.10 (1.09)	3.36 (1.35)	3.15 (1.27)	4.00 (1.27)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.24 (.95)	3.69 (1.15)	3.52 (1.19)	3.49 (1.14)	3.85 (1.11)	4.18 (.98)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	3.52 (1.24)	3.33 (1.29)	2.62 (1.33)	2.66 (1.33)	3.00 (1.36)	3.18 (1.25)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.62 (1.08)	3.88 (.94)	3.58 (1.09)	3.88 (1.15)	3.79 (1.17)	4.82 (.41)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.83 (1.10)	3.92 (.96)	4.12 (.96)	4.33 (.97)	4.18 (.93)	5.00 (.00)

MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.14 (1.06)	3.44 (1.15)	3.17 (1.06)	3.23 (1.00)	3.49 (1.02)	4.00 (.89)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	3.86 (1.36)	4.04 (.99)	4.02 (1.11)	3.88 (1.34)	4.08 (1.29)	4.64 (.92)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.83 (1.10)	3.69 (1.15)	3.25 (1.22)	3.26 (1.14)	3.41 (1.04)	3.91 (1.30)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	3.00 (1.10)	3.15 (1.27)	2.00 (1.09)	1.98 (1.17)	2.21 (1.11)	2.91 (1.51)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Participants were then asked to report their race (1=White, 2=Asian, 3=Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander, 4=African American/Black, 5=American Indian or Alaska Native: \_\_, 6=Two or more races, 7=Other: \_\_). Race was recoded as White and Non-white. The results for Vilas County are shown in Table 25.

TABLE 25. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY RACE – VILAS COUNTY

	WHITE M (SD)	NON-WHITE M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.19 (.96)	2.45 (1.34)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	4.16 (.91)	3.41 (1.25)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.97 (1.07)	2.96 (1.26)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.33 (1.18)	2.70 (1.24)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.63 (1.12)	3.37 (1.15)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.95 (1.36)	3.04 (1.29)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.87 (1.03)	3.33 (1.41)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	4.26 (.88)	3.22 (1.22)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.38 (1.04)	2.89 (1.16)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.08 (1.17)	3.44 (1.31)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.48 (1.17)	3.37 (1.15)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.43 (1.26)	2.33 (1.27)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=Hispanic/Latino, 2=Not Hispanic/Latino). The results for Vilas County are shown in Table 26.

TABLE 26. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY ETHNICITY – VILAS COUNTY

	HISPANIC/ LATINO M (SD)	NOT HISPANIC/ LATINO M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	3.88 (1.36)	4.13 (1.03)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.63 (1.41)	4.09 (.95)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.50 (1.41)	3.87 (1.13)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.00 (1.41)	3.26 (1.18)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.50 (1.41)	3.58 (1.11)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	3.50 (1.41)	2.94 (1.35)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.88 (1.46)	3.79 (1.08)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.88 (1.55)	4.17 (.94)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.38 (1.41)	3.29 (1.02)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.00 (1.60)	4.01 (1.18)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.25 (1.49)	3.46 (1.15)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.88 (1.46)	2.40 (1.23)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Participants were then asked to report 'What language(s) do you speak at home?' Responses to this item were 1=English, 2=Spanish, 3=Hmong, 4=Mandarin, 5=Other:\_\_. Language was recoded to English and Other. The results for Vilas County are shown in Table 27.

TABLE 27. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY LANGUAGE – VILAS COUNTY

	ENGLISH M (SD)	OTHER M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.12 (1.03)	4.50 (.71)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	4.09 (.96)	2.00 (1.41)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.88 (1.13)	2.00 (1.41)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.27 (1.19)	1.50 (.71)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.60 (1.14)	3.50 (.71)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.97 (1.34)	2.50 (2.12)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.80 (1.09)	4.00 (.00)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	4.15 (.98)	3.50 (.71)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.32 (1.06)	3.50 (.71)

I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.02 (1.18)	2.00 (1.41)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.47 (1.17)	3.00 (.00)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.43 (1.26)	1.00 (.00)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Participants were asked to indicate their employment status (1=*I do not work*, 2=*Work # Hours per week-fill in:\_\_\_*, 3=*Unemployed*, 4=*Retired*, 5=*Student*, 6=*Military*, 7=*Homemaker*, 8=*Unable to work due to disability*, 9=*Other:\_\_\_*). Employment status was recoded to *Employed* and *Not employed*. The results for Vilas County are shown in Table 28.

TABLE 28. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS – VILAS COUNTY

	EMPLOYED M (SD)	NOT EMPLOYED M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	4.16 (.96)	4.04 (1.19)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	4.00 (.93)	4.26 (1.06)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.91 (1.07)	3.78 (1.29)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.18 (1.17)	3.44 (1.26)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.52 (1.11)	3.74 (1.18)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.86 (1.37)	3.18 (1.27)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.78 (1.04)	3.85 (1.22)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	4.10 (.97)	4.28 (1.00)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.28 (1.08)	3.40 (1.02)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.02 (1.14)	4.00 (1.33)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.41 (1.19)	3.58 (1.08)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.31 (1.24)	2.67 (1.30)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Responses were sorted by annual household income for Vilas County. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. The results for Vilas County are shown in Table 29.

TABLE 29. COMMUNITY ITEMS BY INCOME – VILAS COUNTY

	BELOW ALICE M (SD)	ABOVE ALICE M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	3.89 (1.09)	4.10 (1.02)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.76 (1.28)	4.12 (.85)



I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.05 (1.31)	4.09 (1.01)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	2.82 (1.39)	3.27 (1.10)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.63 (1.08)	3.53 (1.13)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.97 (1.35)	2.95 (1.35)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.16 (1.28)	3.90 (1.01)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.81 (1.18)	4.20 (.91)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.18 (1.09)	3.33 (1.07)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	3.84 (1.31)	4.03 (1.18)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.26 (1.06)	3.53 (1.16)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.45 (1.27)	2.39 (1.29)

## Top Five Community Strengths

Participants were asked to select which items they believed to be the top 5 strengths in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Results are shown in Table 30. The three highest rated combined strengths were *clean environment (air, water, 59%)*, *access to community parks and green spaces (48%)*, and *opportunity to practice spiritual beliefs (42%)*, respectively.

TABLE 30. TOP 5 COMMUNITY STRENGTHS

RESPONSE OPTIONS	FOREST N (%)	ONEIDA N (%)	VILAS N (%)	COMBINED N (%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	254 (66.7%)	260 (51.4%)	153 (62.2%)	667 (58.6%)
ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	183 (48.0%)	241 (47.6%)	124 (50.4%)	548 (48.2%)
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	161 (42.3%)	221 (43.7%)	96 (39.0%)	478 (42%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	158 (41.5%)	178 (35.2%)	77 (31.3%)	413 (36.3%)
GOOD SCHOOLS	96 (25.2%)	189 (37.4%)	119 (48.4%)	404 (35.5%)
COMMUNITY SAFETY	112 (29.4%)	194 (38.3%)	91 (37.0%)	397 (34.9%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	139 (36.5%)	122 (24.1%)	78 (31.7%)	339 (29.8%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	109 (28.6%)	131 (25.9%)	48 (19.5%)	288 (25.3%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	79 (20.7%)	111 (21.9%)	51 (20.7%)	241 (21.2%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	37 (9.7%)	131 (25.9%)	52 (21.1%)	220 (19.3%)
ROAD SAFETY	66 (17.3%)	90 (17.8%)	57 (23.2%)	213 (18.7%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	57 (15.0%)	57 (11.3%)	21 (8.5%)	135 (11.9%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	22 (5.8%)	68 (13.4%)	29 (11.8%)	119 (10.5%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	30 (7.9%)	55 (10.9%)	30 (12.2%)	115 (10.1%)
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	28 (7.3%)	53 (10.5%)	16 (6.5%)	97 (8.5%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	34 (8.9%)	29 (5.7%)	30 (12.2%)	93 (8.2%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	46 (12.1%)	29 (5.7%)	23 (9.3%)	98 (8.6)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	21 (5.5%)	49 (9.7%)	18 (7.3%)	88 (7.7%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	22 (5.8%)	25 (4.9%)	15 (6.1%)	62 (5.4%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	12 (3.1%)	31 (6.1%)	12 (4.9%)	55 (4.8%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	17 (4.5%)	15 (3.0%)	12 (4.9%)	44 (3.9%)
OTHER	11 (2.9%)	16 (3.2%)	11 (4.5%)	38 (3.3%)

Participants were asked to select which items they believed to be the top 5 strengths in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Results were sorted by age and are shown in Table 31.

TABLE 31. TOP 5 COMMUNITY STRENGTHS BY AGE

RESPONSE OPTIONS	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	1 (.5%)	18 (9.0%)	42 (21.1%)	44 (22.1%)	42 (21.1%)	29 (14.6%)	23 (11.6%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	--	38 (9.0%)	112 (26.5%)	103 (24.4%)	84 (19.9%)	55 (13.0%)	30 (7.1%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	2 (.5%)	41 (9.8%)	122 (29.1%)	116 (27.7%)	78 (18.6%)	42 (10.0%)	18 (4.3%)
ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	--	24 (23.3%)	33 (32.0%)	18 (17.5%)	14 (13.6%)	7 (6.8%)	7 (6.8%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	3 (.5%)	45 (8.0%)	153 (27.1%)	144 (25.5%)	115 (20.4%)	80 (14.2%)	25 (4.4%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	1 (.3%)	24 (7.7%)	83 (26.6%)	75 (24.0%)	69 (22.1%)	46 (14.7%)	14 (4.5%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	1 (0.9%)	19 (16.8%)	32 (28.3%)	22 (19.5%)	19 (16.8%)	8 (7.1%)	12 (10.6%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	1 (.2%)	31 (7.4%)	143 (34.2%)	102 (24.4%)	79 (18.9%)	43 (10.3%)	19 (4.5%)
COMMUNITY SAFETY	--	14 (15.1%)	25 (26.9%)	22 (23.7%)	18 (19.4%)	10 (10.8%)	4 (4.3%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	--	11 (13.4%)	29 (35.4%)	18 (22.0%)	16 (19.5%)	5 (6.1%)	3 (3.7%)
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	3 (.8%)	20 (5.3%)	87 (23.0%)	108 (28.6%)	79 (20.9%)	53 (14.0%)	28 (7.4%)
GOOD SCHOOLS	3 (1.3%)	37 (15.9%)	71 (30.5%)	55 (23.6%)	34 (14.6%)	24 (10.3%)	9 (3.9%)
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	--	18 (31.0%)	19 (32.8%)	12 (20.7%)	1 (1.7%)	5 (8.6%)	3 (5.2%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	1 (.4%)	41 (15.4%)	86 (32.2%)	53 (19.9%)	43 (16.1%)	33 (12.4%)	10 (3.7%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	2 (1.6%)	14 (11.3%)	39 (31.5%)	29 (23.4%)	20 (16.1%)	16 (12.9%)	4 (3.2%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	3 (.7%)	38 (9.2%)	132 (32.0%)	106 (25.7%)	73 (17.7%)	42 (10.2%)	18 (4.4%)
ROAD SAFETY	4 (2.1%)	22 (11.5%)	52 (27.2%)	34 (17.8%)	31 (16.2%)	32 (16.8%)	16 (8.4%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	4 (1.6%)	20 (7.9%)	78 (30.8%)	61 (24.1%)	54 (21.3%)	25 (9.9%)	11 (4.3%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	--	13 (11.5%)	32 (28.3%)	23 (20.4%)	24 (21.2%)	12 (10.6%)	9 (8.0%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	--	22 (7.3%)	57 (18.9%)	89 (29.6%)	73 (24.3%)	45 (15.0%)	15 (5.0%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	1 (.7%)	19 (13.3%)	43 (30.1%)	33 (23.1%)	26 (18.2%)	16 (11.2%)	5 (3.5%)
OTHER	--	2 (5.3%)	9 (23.7%)	13 (34.2%)	9 (23.7%)	3 (7.9%)	2 (5.3%)

Participants were asked to select which items they believed to be the top 5 strengths in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Results were sorted by annual household income and are shown in Table 32. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*.

TABLE 32. TOP 5 COMMUNITY STRENGTHS BY INCOME

RESPONSE OPTIONS	BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	40 (26.3%)	112 (73.7%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	81 (25.6%)	236 (74.4%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	87 (28.3%)	220 (71.7%)
ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	22 (28.2%)	56 (71.8%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	107 (26.3%)	300 (73.7%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	67 (28.5%)	168 (71.5%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	18 (23.1%)	60 (76.9%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	64 (21.1%)	240 (78.9%)
COMMUNITY SAFETY	16 (25.4%)	47 (74.6%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	21 (29.2%)	51 (70.8%)
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	65 (25.2%)	193 (74.8%)
GOOD SCHOOLS	49 (31.6%)	106 (68.4%)
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	16 (35.6%)	29 (64.4%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	51 (24.4%)	158 (75.6%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	29 (30.2%)	67 (69.8%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	62 (20.1%)	247 (79.9%)
ROAD SAFETY	45 (32.8%)	92 (67.2%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	35 (21.3%)	129 (78.7%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	23 (27.4%)	61 (72.6%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	35 (17.0%)	171 (83.0%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	26 (24.3%)	81 (75.7%)
OTHER	9 (32.1%)	19 (67.9%)

Participants were asked to select which items they believed to be the top 5 strengths in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Results were sorted by age for Forest County and are shown in Table 33.

TABLE 33. TOP 5 COMMUNITY STRENGTHS BY AGE – FOREST COUNTY

RESPONSE OPTIONS	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	3 (1.9%)	17 (11.0%)	43 (27.7%)	34 (21.9%)	28 (18.1%)	13 (8.4%)	17 (11.0%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	1 (1.3%)	4 (5.1%)	23 (29.5%)	11 (14.1%)	20 (25.6%)	10 (12.8%)	9 (11.5%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	1 (2.8%)	5 (13.9%)	9 (25.0%)	4 (11.1%)	4 (11.1%)	7 (19.4%)	6 (16.7%)

ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	3 (1.7%)	13 (7.2%)	56 (30.9%)	67 (37.0%)	32 (17.7%)	9 (5.0%)	1 (.6%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	--	7 (21.9%)	11 (34.4%)	7 (21.9%)	2 (6.3%)	4 (12.5%)	1 (3.1%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	--	3 (15.0%)	8 (40.0%)	3 (15.0%)	1 (5.0%)	2 (10.0%)	3 (15.0%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	3 (1.2%)	22 (8.7%)	63 (25.0%)	76 (30.2%)	47 (18.7%)	26 (10.3%)	15 (6.0%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	--	6 (35.3%)	7 (41.2%)	1 (5.9%)	--	1 (5.9%)	2 (11.8%)
COMMUNITY SAFETY	2 (1.8%)	15 (13.5%)	25 (22.5%)	30 (27.0%)	21 (18.9%)	13 (11.7%)	5 (4.5%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	1 (.9%)	19 (17.4%)	33 (30.3%)	33 (30.3%)	10 (9.2%)	8 (7.3%)	5 (4.6%)
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	--	7 (25.0%)	9 (32.1%)	4 (14.3%)	6 (21.4%)	2 (7.1%)	--
GOOD SCHOOLS	--	2 (2.1%)	6 (6.4%)	24 (25.5%)	28 (29.8%)	21 (22.3%)	6 (6.4%)
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	4 (2.5%)	13 (8.2%)	31 (19.5%)	54 (34.0%)	28 (17.6%)	17 (10.7%)	12 (7.5%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	3 (6.5%)	8 (17.4%)	17 (37.0%)	9 (19.6%)	4 (8.7%)	4 (8.7%)	1 (2.2%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	--	13 (9.4%)	41 (29.5%)	35 (25.2%)	19 (13.7%)	18 (12.9%)	13 (9.4%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	--	6 (28.6%)	9 (42.9%)	2 (9.5%)	2 (9.5%)	1 (4.8%)	1 (4.8%)
ROAD SAFETY	--	9 (13.6%)	23 (34.8%)	19 (28.8%)	8 (12.1%)	2 (3.0%)	5 (7.6%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	1 (1.8%)	10 (17.5%)	21 (36.8%)	15 (26.3%)	7 (12.3%)	2 (3.5%)	1 (1.8%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	--	5 (17.2%)	12 (41.4%)	7 (24.1%)	2 (6.9%)	1 (3.4%)	2 (6.9%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	--	5 (23.8%)	3 (14.3%)	3 (14.3%)	4 (19.0%)	1 (4.8%)	5 (23.8%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	1 (9.1%)	2 (18.2%)	2 (18.2%)	1 (9.1%)	2 (18.2%)	1 (9.1%)	2 (18.2%)
OTHER	--	--	4 (36.4%)	5 (45.5%)	1 (9.1%)	1 (9.1%)	--

Participants were asked to select which items they believed to be the top 5 strengths in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Results were sorted by annual household income for Forest County and are shown in Table 34. Income was recoded to **Below ALICE** and **Above ALICE**.

TABLE 34. TOP 5 COMMUNITY STRENGTHS BY INCOME – FOREST COUNTY

RESPONSE OPTIONS	BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	26 (26.3%)	73 (73.7%)



ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	15 (34.1%)	29 (65.9%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	9 (39.1%)	14 (60.9%)
ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	28 (22.2%)	98 (77.8%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	8 (34.8%)	15 (65.2%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	7 (53.8%)	6 (46.2%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	43 (24.7%)	131 (75.3%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	5 (55.6%)	4 (44.4%)
COMMUNITY SAFETY	17 (22.4%)	59 (77.6%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	20 (27.8%)	52 (72.2%)
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	3 (15.8%)	16 (84.2%)
GOOD SCHOOLS	12 (17.6%)	56 (82.4%)
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	31 (32.3%)	65 (67.7%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	12 (37.5%)	20 (62.5%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	26 (26.0%)	74 (74.0%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	10 (66.7%)	5 (33.3%)
ROAD SAFETY	9 (20.0%)	36 (80.0%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	8 (23.5%)	26 (76.5%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	8 (38.1%)	13 (61.9%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	5 (38.5%)	8 (61.5%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	3 (50.0%)	3 (50.0%)
OTHER	4 (44.4%)	5 (55.6%)

Participants were asked to select which items they believed to be the top 5 strengths in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Results were sorted by age for Oneida County and are shown in Table 35.

TABLE 35. TOP 5 COMMUNITY STRENGTHS BY AGE – ONEIDA COUNTY

RESPONSE OPTIONS	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	--	14 (7.9%)	42 (23.7%)	42 (23.7%)	35 (19.8%)	29 (16.4)	15 (8.5%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	--	9 (8.1%)	23 (20.7%)	23 (20.7%)	21 (18.9%)	24 (21.6%)	11 (9.9%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	--	13 (9.9%)	34 (26.0%)	26 (19.8%)	22 (16.8%)	20 (15.3%)	16 (12.2%)
ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	--	13 (5.4%)	83 (34.6%)	64 (26.7%)	53 (22.1%)	23 (9.6%)	4 (1.7%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	--	3 (10.3%)	13 (44.8%)	4 (13.8%)	2 (6.9%)	4 (13.8%)	3 (10.3%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	--	8 (16.7%)	22 (45.8%)	6 (12.5%)	4 (8.3%)	2 (4.2%)	6 (12.5%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	--	13 (5.0%)	73 (28.3%)	58 (22.5%)	62 (24.0%)	40 (15.5%)	12 (4.7%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	--	3 (20.0%)	5 (33.3%)	3 (20.0%)	3 (20.0%)	--	1 (6.7%)

COMMUNITY SAFETY	1 (.5%)	10 (5.2%)	58 (30.1%)	41 (21.2%)	47 (24.4%)	23 (11.9%)	13 (6.7%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	1 (.8%)	6 (4.6%)	43 (33.1%)	23 (17.7%)	27 (20.8%)	21 (16.2%)	9 (6.9%)
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	--	2 (3.8%)	26 (49.1%)	10 (18.9%)	10 (18.9%)	3 (5.7%)	2 (3.8%)
GOOD SCHOOLS	--	13 (6.9%)	48 (25.4%)	45 (23.8%)	36 (19.0%)	31 (16.4%)	16 (8.5%)
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	1 (.5%)	12 (5.5%)	49 (22.4%)	48 (21.9%)	52 (23.7%)	39 (17.8%)	18 (8.2%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	--	6 (20.7%)	15 (51.7%)	5 (17.2%)	1 (3.4%)	1 (3.4%)	1 (3.4%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	1 (.8%)	11 (9.1%)	38 (31.4%)	28 (23.1%)	21 (17.4%)	16 (13.2%)	6 (5.0%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	--	4 (17.4%)	8 (34.8%)	8 (34.8%)	2 (8.7%)	--	1 (4.3%)
ROAD SAFETY	--	3 (3.3%)	39 (43.3%)	19 (21.1%)	18 (20.0%)	5 (5.6%)	6 (6.7%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	--	10 (18.2%)	21 (38.2%)	13 (23.6%)	5 (9.1%)	4 (7.3%)	2 (3.6%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	--	3 (5.5%)	16 (29.1%)	12 (21.8%)	6 (10.9%)	12 (21.8%)	6 (10.9%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	1 (1.5%)	8 (11.8%)	23 (33.8%)	10 (14.7%)	10 (14.7%)	12 (17.6%)	4 (5.9%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	--	3 (9.7%)	8 (25.8%)	4 (12.9%)	8 (25.8%)	6 (19.4%)	2 (6.5%)
OTHER	--	--	4 (26.7%)	4 (26.7%)	5 (33.3%)	2 (13.3%)	--

Participants were asked to select which items they believed to be the top 5 strengths in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Results were sorted by annual household income for Oneida County and are shown in Table 36. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*.

TABLE 36. TOP 5 COMMUNITY STRENGTHS BY INCOME – ONEIDA COUNTY

RESPONSE OPTIONS	BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	35 (27.6%)	92 (72.4%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	21 (28.4%)	53 (71.6%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	30 (32.6%)	62 (67.4%)
ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	30 (15.9%)	159 (84.1%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	8 (32.0%)	17 (68.0%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	17 (47.2%)	19 (52.8%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	46 (23.5%)	150 (76.5%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	1 (11.1%)	8 (88.9%)
COMMUNITY SAFETY	33 (22.6%)	113 (77.4%)

COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	31 (31.3%)	68 (68.7%)
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	8 (21.1%)	30 (78.9%)
GOOD SCHOOLS	40 (28.4%)	101 (71.6%)
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	42 (25.1%)	125 (74.9%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	9 (33.3%)	18 (66.7%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	26 (29.9%)	61 (70.1%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	8 (44.4%)	10 (55.6%)
ROAD SAFETY	16 (21.3%)	59 (78.7%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	13 (29.5%)	31 (70.5%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	13 (27.7%)	34 (72.3%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	20 (39.2%)	31 (60.8%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	8 (34.8%)	15 (65.2%)
OTHER	2 (20.0%)	8 (80.0%)

Participants were asked to select which items they believed to be the top 5 strengths in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Results were sorted by age for Vilas County and are shown in Table 37.

TABLE 37. TOP 5 COMMUNITY STRENGTHS BY AGE – VILAS COUNTY

RESPONSE OPTIONS	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	9 (11.7%)	20 (26.0%)	7 (9.1%)	19 (24.7%)	16 (20.8%)	6 (7.8%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	12 (23.5%)	12 (23.5%)	7 (13.7%)	5 (9.8%)	12 (23.5%)	3 (5.9%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	15 (28.8%)	9 (17.3%)	7 (13.5%)	11 (21.2%)	7 (13.5%)	3 (5.8%)
ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	13 (10.5%)	26 (21.0%)	33 (26.6%)	33 (26.6%)	18 (14.5%)	1 (.8%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	11 (36.7%)	9 (30.0%)	3 (10.0%)	3 (10.0%)	3 (10.0%)	1 (3.3%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	4 (22.2%)	5 (27.8%)	2 (11.1%)	2 (11.1%)	4 (22.2%)	1 (5.6%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	4 (2.6%)	23 (15.0%)	44 (28.8%)	43 (28.1%)	30 (19.6%)	9 (5.9%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	1 (8.3%)	5 (41.7%)	3 (25.0%)	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.3%)	--
COMMUNITY SAFETY	7 (7.7%)	19 (20.9%)	25 (27.5%)	26 (28.6%)	11 (12.1%)	3 (3.3%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	4 (8.3%)	6 (12.5%)	13 (27.1%)	15 (31.3%)	6 (12.5%)	4 (8.3%)
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	3 (18.8%)	5 (31.3%)	5 (31.3%)	2 (12.5%)	1 (6.3%)	--
GOOD SCHOOLS	9 (7.6%)	18 (15.1%)	41 (34.5%)	33 (27.7%)	15 (12.6%)	3 (2.5%)
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	9 (9.4%)	9 (9.4%)	24 (25.0%)	29 (30.2%)	17 (17.7%)	8 (8.3%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	10 (43.5%)	5 (21.7%)	2 (8.7%)	2 (8.7%)	4 (17.4%)	--

SENSE OF BELONGING	11 (14.1%)	14 (17.9%)	16 (20.5%)	17 (21.8%)	12 (15.4%)	8 (10.3%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	6 (4.0%)	5 (33.3%)	1 (6.7%)	3 (20.0%)	--	--
ROAD SAFETY	8 (14.0%)	15 (26.3%)	12 (21.1%)	8 (14.0%)	11 (19.3%)	3 (5.3%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	2 (9.5%)	7 (33.3%)	8 (38.1%)	3 (14.3%)	--	1 (4.8%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	3 (10.0%)	12 (40.0%)	1 (3.3%)	8 (26.7%)	3 (10.0%)	3 (10.0%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	2 (6.9%)	5 (17.2%)	8 (27.6%)	4 (13.8%)	9 (31.0%)	1 (3.4%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	1 (8.3%)	3 (25.0%)	1 (8.3%)	3 (25.0%)	3 (25.0%)	1 (8.3%)
OTHER	--	--	4 (36.4%)	7 (63.6%)	--	--

Participants were asked to select which items they believed to be the top 5 strengths in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Results were sorted by annual household income for Vilas County and are shown in Table 38. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*.

TABLE 38. TOP 5 COMMUNITY STRENGTHS BY INCOME – VILAS COUNTY

RESPONSE OPTIONS	BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	17 (28.8%)	42 (71.2%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	14 (33.3%)	28 (66.7%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	13 (32.5%)	27 (67.5%)
ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	14 (14.3%)	84 (85.7%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	7 (25.9%)	20 (74.1%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	5 (29.4%)	12 (70.6%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	22 (19.1%)	93 (80.9%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	1 (10.0%)	9 (90.0%)
COMMUNITY SAFETY	16 (23.9%)	51 (76.1%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	9 (23.1%)	30 (76.9%)
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	1 (9.1%)	10 (90.9%)
GOOD SCHOOLS	11 (12.5%)	77 (87.5%)
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	13 (17.8%)	60 (82.2%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	4 (21.1%)	15 (78.9%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	6 (11.1%)	48 (88.9%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	2 (16.7%)	10 (83.3%)
ROAD SAFETY	9 (22.5%)	31 (77.5%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	2 (13.3%)	13 (86.7%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	4 (19.0%)	17 (81.0%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	6 (31.6%)	13 (68.4%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	2 (28.6%)	5 (71.4%)
OTHER	4 (40.0%)	6 (60.0%)

## Top 5 Areas for Improvement

Participants were asked to rank which items they believed to be the top 5 areas for growth in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Results are shown in Table 39. Values in the table represent the number of times a response option was selected. The three highest rated areas for improvement combined across the three counties were *access to safe and affordable housing* (50%), *access to affordable health care* (37%), and *access to affordable healthy foods* (37%), respectively.

TABLE 39: TOP 5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

RESPONSE OPTIONS	FOREST N (%)	ONEIDA N (%)	VILAS N (%)	COMBINED N (%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	146 (38.3%)	290 (57.3%)	132 (53.7%)	568 (49.9%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	108 (28.3%)	189 (37.4%)	128 (52.0%)	425 (37.3%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	177 (46.5%)	153 (30.2%)	90 (36.6%)	420 (36.9%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILDCARE	132 (34.6%)	202 (39.9%)	85 (34.6%)	419 (36.8%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	145 (38.1%)	177 (35.0%)	91 (37.0%)	413 (36.3%)
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	131 (34.4%)	168 (33.2%)	80 (32.5%)	379 (33.3%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	99 (26.0%)	135 (26.7%)	79 (32.1%)	313 (27.5%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	126 (33.1%)	106 (20.9%)	71 (28.9%)	303 (26.6%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	70 (18.4%)	137 (27.1%)	60 (24.4%)	267 (23.5%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	96 (25.2%)	116 (22.9%)	43 (17.5%)	255 (22.4%)
GOOD SCHOOLS	115 (30.2%)	88 (17.4%)	33 (13.4%)	236 (20.7%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	63 (16.5%)	85 (16.8%)	54 (22.0%)	202 (17.8%)
ROAD SAFETY	55 (14.4%)	102 (20.2%)	35 (14.2%)	192 (16.9%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	55 (14.4%)	66 (13.0%)	22 (8.9%)	143 (12.6%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	47 (12.3%)	49 (9.7%)	28 (11.4%)	124 (10.9%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	33 (8.7%)	66 (13.0%)	16 (6.5%)	115 (10.1%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	50 (13.1%)	44 (8.7%)	19 (7.7%)	113 (9.9%)
ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	36 (9.4%)	39 (7.7%)	30 (12.2%)	105 (9.2%)
COMMUNITY SAFETY	35 (9.2%)	43 (8.5%)	16 (6.5%)	94 (8.3%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	17 (4.5%)	54 (10.7%)	12 (4.9%)	83 (7.3%)

OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	19 (5.0%)	17 (3.4%)	22 (8.9%)	58 (5.1%)
OTHER	9 (2.4%)	19 (3.8%)	10 (4.1%)	38 (3.3%)

Participants were asked to rank which items they believed to be the top 5 areas for growth in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Results were sorted by age and are shown in Table 40.

TABLE 40. TOP 5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT BY AGE

RESPONSE OPTIONS	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	1 (.5%)	18 (9.0%)	42 (21.1%)	44 (22.1%)	42 (21.1%)	29 (14.6%)	23 (11.6%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	--	38 (9.0%)	112 (26.5%)	103 (24.4%)	84 (19.9%)	55 (13.0%)	30 (7.1%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	2 (.5%)	41 (9.8%)	122 (29.1%)	116 (27.7%)	78 (18.6%)	42 (10.0%)	18 (4.3%)
ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	--	24 (23.3%)	33 (32.0%)	18 (17.5%)	14 (13.6%)	7 (6.8%)	7 (6.8%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	3 (.5%)	45 (8.0%)	153 (27.1%)	144 (25.5%)	115 (20.4%)	80 (14.2%)	25 (4.4%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	1 (.3%)	24 (7.7%)	83 (26.6%)	75 (24.0%)	69 (22.1%)	46 (14.7%)	14 (4.5%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	1 (.9%)	19 (16.8%)	32 (28.3%)	22 (19.5%)	19 (16.8%)	8 (7.1%)	12 (10.6%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	1 (.2%)	31 (7.4%)	143 (34.2%)	102 (24.4%)	79 (18.9%)	43 (10.3%)	19 (4.5%)
COMMUNITY SAFETY	--	14 (15.1%)	25 (26.9%)	22 (23.7%)	18 (19.4%)	10 (10.8%)	4 (4.3%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	--	11 (13.4%)	29 (35.4%)	18 (22.0%)	16 (19.5%)	5 (6.1%)	3 (3.7%)
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	3 (.8%)	20 (5.3%)	87 (23.0%)	108 (28.6%)	79 (20.9%)	53 (14.0%)	28 (7.4%)
GOOD SCHOOLS	3 (1.3%)	37 (15.9%)	71 (30.5%)	55 (23.6%)	34 (14.6%)	24 (10.3%)	9 (3.9%)
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	--	18 (31.0%)	19 (32.8%)	12 (20.7%)	1 (1.7%)	5 (8.6%)	3 (5.2%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	1 (.4%)	41 (15.4%)	86 (32.2%)	53 (19.9%)	43 (16.1%)	33 (12.4%)	10 (3.7%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	2 (1.6%)	14 (11.3%)	39 (31.5%)	29 (23.4%)	20 (16.1%)	16 (12.9%)	4 (3.2%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	3 (.7%)	38 (9.2%)	132 (32.0%)	106 (25.7%)	73 (17.7%)	42 (10.2%)	18 (4.4%)
ROAD SAFETY	4 (2.1%)	22 (11.5%)	52 (27.2%)	34 (17.8%)	31 (16.2%)	32 (16.8%)	16 (8.4%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	4 (1.6%)	20 (7.9%)	78 (30.8%)	61 (24.1%)	54 (21.3%)	25 (9.9%)	11 (4.3%)

COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	--	13 (11.5%)	32 (28.3%)	23 (20.4%)	24 (21.2%)	12 (10.6%)	9 (8.0%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	--	22 (7.3%)	57 (18.9%)	89 (29.6%)	73 (24.3%)	45 (15.0%)	15 (5.0%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	1 (.7%)	19 (13.3%)	43 (30.1%)	33 (23.1%)	26 (18.2%)	16 (11.2%)	5 (3.5%)
OTHER	--	2 (5.3%)	9 (23.7%)	13 (34.2%)	9 (23.7%)	3 (7.9%)	2 (5.3%)

Participants were asked to rank which items they believed to be the Top 5 areas for growth in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Results were sorted by annual household income and are shown in Table 41. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*.

TABLE 41. TOP 5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT BY INCOME

RESPONSE OPTIONS	BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	40 (26.3%)	112 (73.7%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	81 (25.6%)	236 (74.4%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	87 (28.3%)	220 (71.7%)
ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	22 (28.2%)	56 (71.8%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	107 (26.3%)	300 (73.7%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	67 (28.5%)	168 (71.5%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	18 (23.1%)	60 (76.9%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	64 (21.1%)	240 (78.9%)
COMMUNITY SAFETY	16 (25.4%)	47 (74.6%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	21 (29.2%)	51 (70.8%)
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	65 (25.2%)	193 (74.8%)
GOOD SCHOOLS	49 (31.6%)	106 (68.4%)
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	16 (35.6%)	29 (64.4%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	51 (24.4%)	158 (75.6%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	29 (30.2%)	67 (69.8%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	62 (20.1%)	247 (79.9%)
ROAD SAFETY	45 (32.8%)	92 (67.2%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	35 (21.3%)	129 (78.7%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	23 (27.4%)	61 (72.6%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	35 (17.0%)	171 (83.0%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	26 (24.3%)	81 (75.7%)
OTHER	9 (32.1%)	19 (67.9%)

Participants were asked to rank which items they believed to be the Top 5 areas for growth in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Results were sorted by age for Forest County and are shown in Table 42.



TABLE 42. TOP 5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT BY AGE – FOREST COUNTY

RESPONSE OPTIONS	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	1 (1.7%)	4 (6.7%)	11 (18.3%)	14 (23.3%)	11 (18.3%)	7 (11.7%)	12 (20.0%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	--	10 (9.4%)	23 (21.7%)	34 (32.1%)	21 (19.8%)	9 (8.5%)	9 (8.5%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	2 (1.1%)	18 (10.2%)	53 (30.1%)	54 (30.7%)	27 (15.3%)	14 (8.0%)	8 (4.5%)
ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	--	6 (17.1%)	13 (37.1%)	6 (17.1%)	3 (8.6%)	3 (8.6%)	4 (11.4%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	3 (2.1%)	18 (12.4%)	39 (26.9%)	40 (27.6%)	27 (18.6%)	14 (9.7%)	4 (2.8%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	1 (1.0%)	11 (11.22%)	27 (27.6%)	29 (29.6%)	16 (16.3%)	9 (9.2%)	5 (5.1%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	1 (3.1%)	8 (25.0%)	12 (37.5%)	3 (9.4%)	3 (9.4%)	--	5 (15.6%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	1 (.8%)	13 (9.9%)	45 (34.4%)	41 (31.3%)	22 (16.8%)	8 (6.1%)	1 (.8%)
COMMUNITY SAFETY	--	3 (8.8%)	11 (32.4%)	8 (23.5%)	7 (20.6%)	3 (8.8%)	2 (5.9%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	--	1 (6.3%)	5 (31.3%)	2 (12.5%)	3 (18.8%)	2 (12.5%)	3 (18.8%)
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	3 (2.3%)	9 (6.9%)	32 (24.4%)	42 (32.1%)	23 (17.6%)	16 (12.2%)	6 (4.6%)
GOOD SCHOOLS	2 (1.8%)	18 (15.9%)	33 (29.2%)	29 (25.7%)	15 (13.3%)	12 (10.6%)	4 (3.5%)
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	--	8 (42.1%)	5 (26.3%)	2 (10.5%)	--	2 (10.5%)	2 (10.5%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	--	16 (22.9%)	24 (34.3%)	15 (21.4%)	10 (14.3%)	2 (2.9%)	3 (4.3%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	2 (4.3%)	5 (10.6%)	17 (36.2%)	11 (23.4%)	6 (12.8%)	3 (6.4%)	3 (6.4%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	3 (2.1%)	20 (13.9%)	50 (34.7%)	39 (27.1%)	19 (13.2%)	8 (5.6%)	5 (3.5%)
ROAD SAFETY	3 (5.5%)	6 (10.9%)	15 (27.3%)	10 (18.2%)	8 (14.5%)	6 (10.9%)	7 (12.7%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	3 (3.2%)	8 (8.4%)	29 (30.5%)	23 (24.2%)	18 (18.9%)	11 (11.6%)	3 (3.2%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	--	6 (12.0%)	18 (36.0%)	8 (16.0%)	8 (16.0%)	5 (10.0%)	5 (10.0%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	--	12 (9.6%)	26 (20.8%)	43 (34.4%)	26 (20.8%)	12 (9.6%)	6 (4.8%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	--	8 (14.5%)	20 (36.4%)	13 (23.6%)	7 (12.7%)	4 (7.3%)	3 (5.5%)
OTHER	--	--	3 (33.3%)	3 (33.3%)	1 (11.1%)	--	2 (22.2%)

Participants were asked to rank which items they believed to be the top 5 areas for growth in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Results were sorted by annual household income for Forest County and are shown in Table 43. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*.

TABLE 43. TOP 5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT BY INCOME – FOREST COUNTY

RESPONSE OPTIONS	BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	10 (26.3%)	28 (73.7%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	23 (28.8%)	57 (71.3%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	36 (30.0%)	84 (70.0%)
ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	9 (37.5%)	15 (62.5%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	27 (29.7%)	64 (70.3%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	23 (34.8%)	43 (65.2%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	3 (15.8%)	16 (84.2%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	20 (22.2%)	70 (77.8%)
COMMUNITY SAFETY	7 (21.2%)	26 (78.8%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	6 (42.9%)	8 (57.1%)
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	22 (26.5%)	61 (73.5%)
GOOD SCHOOLS	23 (34.3%)	44 (65.7%)
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	8 (66.7%)	4 (33.3%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	17 (34.0%)	33 (66.0%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	9 (26.5%)	25 (73.5%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	23 (23.7%)	74 (76.3%)
ROAD SAFETY	9 (25.7%)	26 (74.3%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	12 (21.4%)	44 (78.6%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	11 (28.9%)	27 (71.1%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	16 (20.3%)	63 (79.7%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	9 (23.7%)	29 (76.3%)
OTHER	2 (28.6%)	5 (71.4%)

Participants were asked to rank which items they believed to be the top 5 areas for growth in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Results were sorted by age for Oneida County and are shown in Table 44.

TABLE 44. TOP 5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT BY AGE – ONEIDA COUNTY

RESPONSE OPTIONS	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	--	5 (5.9%)	21 (24.7%)	16 (18.8%)	18 (21.2%)	15 (17.6%)	10 (11.8%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	--	14 (7.4%)	66 (35.1%)	39 (20.7%)	31 (16.5%)	24 (12.8%)	14 (7.4%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	--	8 (5.2%)	54 (35.3%)	36 (23.5%)	33 (21.6%)	15 (9.8%)	7 (4.6%)

ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	--	4 (10.5%)	17 (44.7%)	7 (18.4%)	7 (18.4%)	1 (2.6%)	2 (5.3%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	--	15 (5.2%)	90 (31.3%)	69 (24.0%)	51 (17.7%)	45 (15.6%)	18 (6.3%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	--	7 (5.2%)	41 (30.4%)	34 (25.2%)	28 (20.7%)	21 (15.6%)	4 (3.0%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	--	7 (10.8%)	15 (23.1%)	15 (23.1%)	15 (23.1%)	7 (10.8%)	6 (9.2%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	--	13 (6.4%)	77 (38.1%)	38 (18.8%)	35 (17.3%)	26 (12.9%)	13 (6.4%)
COMMUNITY SAFETY	--	10 (23.3%)	10 (23.3%)	11 (25.6%)	7 (16.3%)	4 (9.3%)	1 (2.3%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	--	8 (14.8%)	16 (29.6%)	16 (29.6%)	11 (20.4%)	3 (5.6%)	--
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	--	8 (4.8%)	42 (25.1%)	43 (25.7%)	34 (20.4%)	23 (13.8%)	17 (10.2%)
GOOD SCHOOLS	1 (1.1%)	11 (12.6%)	29 (33.3%)	17 (19.5%)	15 (17.2%)	9 (10.3%)	5 (5.7%)
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	--	2 (11.8%)	6 (35.3%)	7 (41.2%)	--	1 (5.9%)	1 (5.9%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	1 (.7%)	14 (10.2%)	45 (32.8%)	27 (19.7%)	25 (18.2%)	22 (16.1%)	3 (2.2%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	--	3 (6.1%)	14 (28.6%)	13 (26.5%)	10 (20.4%)	9 (18.4%)	--
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	--	10 (5.6%)	64 (36.2%)	40 (22.6%)	30 (16.9%)	24 (13.6%)	9 (5.1%)
ROAD SAFETY	1 (1.0%)	9 (8.9%)	32 (31.7%)	17 (16.8%)	16 (15.8%)	18 (17.8%)	8 (7.9%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	1 (.9%)	9 (7.8%)	41 (35.7%)	24 (20.9%)	25 (21.7%)	10 (8.7%)	5 (4.3%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	--	5 (11.4%)	10 (22.7%)	10 (22.7%)	12 (27.3%)	4 (9.1%)	3 (6.8%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	--	8 (7.6%)	20 (19.0%)	26 (24.8%)	25 (23.8%)	19 (18.1%)	7 (6.7%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	1 (1.5%)	7 (10.6%)	18 (27.3%)	15 (22.7%)	14 (21.2%)	9 (13.6%)	2 (3.0%)
OTHER	--	2 (10.5%)	4 (21.1%)	5 (26.3%)	6 (31.6%)	2 (10.5%)	--

Participants were asked to rank which items they believed to be the top 5 areas for growth in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Results were sorted by annual household income for Oneida County and are shown in Table 45. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*.

TABLE 45. TOP 5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT BY INCOME – ONEIDA COUNTY

RESPONSE OPTIONS	BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	20 (29.0%)	49 (71.0%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	38 (26.4%)	106 (73.6%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	37 (31.1%)	82 (68.9%)

ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	8 (26.7%)	22 (73.3%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	63 (29.3%)	152 (70.7%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	33 (30.8%)	74 (69.2%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	11 (22.9%)	37 (77.1%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	37 (24.3%)	115 (75.7%)
COMMUNITY SAFETY	7 (21.2%)	26 (78.8%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	12 (25.5%)	35 (74.5%)
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	34 (27.6%)	89 (72.4%)
GOOD SCHOOLS	18 (28.1%)	46 (71.9%)
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	3 (23.1%)	10 (76.9%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	24 (22.4%)	83 (77.6%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	15 (40.5%)	22 (59.5%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	33 (22.6%)	113 (77.4%)
ROAD SAFETY	28 (38.4%)	45 (61.6%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	17 (21.3%)	63 (78.8%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	7 (21.9%)	25 (78.1%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	11 (13.9%)	68 (86.1%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	13 (25.0%)	39 (75.0%)
OTHER	3 (23.1%)	10 (76.9%)

Participants were asked to rank which items they believed to be the Top 5 areas for growth in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Results were sorted by age for Vilas County and are shown in Table 46.

TABLE 46. TOP 5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT BY AGE – VILAS COUNTY

RESPONSE OPTIONS	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	9 (16.7%)	10 (18.5%)	14 (25.9%)	13 (24.1%)	7 (13.0%)	1 (1.9%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	14 (10.9%)	23 (18.0%)	30 (23.4%)	32 (25.0%)	22 (17.2%)	7 (5.5%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	15 (16.7%)	15 (16.7%)	26 (28.9%)	18 (20.0%)	13 (14.4%)	3 (3.3%)
ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	14 (46.7%)	3 (10.0%)	5 (16.7%)	4 (13.3%)	3 (10.0%)	1 (3.3%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	12 (9.1%)	24 (18.2%)	35 (26.5%)	37 (28.0%)	21 (15.9%)	3 (2.3%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	6 (7.6%)	15 (19.0%)	12 (15.2%)	25 (31.6%)	16 (20.3%)	5 (6.3%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	4 (25%)	5 (31.3%)	4 (25.0%)	1 (6.3%)	1 (6.3%)	1 (6.3%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	5 (5.9%)	21 (24.7%)	23 (27.1%)	22 (25.9%)	9 (10.6%)	5 (5.9%)
COMMUNITY SAFETY	1 (6.3%)	4 (25.0%)	3 (18.8%)	4 (25.0%)	3 (18.8%)	1 (6.3%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	2 (16.7%)	8 (66.7%)	--	2 (16.7%)	--	--

GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	3 (3.8%)	13 (16.3%)	23 (28.8%)	22 (27.5%)	14 (17.5%)	5 (6.3%)
GOOD SCHOOLS	8 (24.2%)	9 (27.3%)	9 (27.3%)	4 (12.1%)	3 (9.1%)	--
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	8 (36.4%)	8 (36.4%)	3 (13.6%)	1 (4.5%)	2 (9.1%)	--
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	11 (18.3%)	17 (28.3%)	11 (18.3%)	8 (13.3%)	9 (15.0%)	4 (6.7%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	6 (21.4%)	8 (28.6%)	5 (17.9%)	4 (14.3%)	4 (14.3%)	1 (3.6%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	8 (8.8%)	18 (19.8%)	27 (29.7%)	24 (26.4%)	10 (11.0%)	4 (4.4%)
ROAD SAFETY	7 (20.0%)	5 (14.3%)	7 (20.0%)	7 (20.0%)	8 (22.9%)	1 (2.9%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	3 (7.0%)	8 (18.6%)	14 (32.6%)	11 (25.6%)	4 (9.3%)	3 (7.0%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	2 (10.5%)	4 (21.1%)	5 (26.3%)	4 (21.1%)	3 (15.8%)	1 (5.3%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	2 (2.8%)	11 (15.5%)	20 (28.2%)	22 (31.0%)	14 (19.7%)	2 (2.8%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	4 (18.2%)	5 (22.7%)	5 (22.7%)	5 (22.7%)	3 (13.6%)	--
OTHER	--	2 (20.0%)	5 (50.0%)	2 (20.0%)	1 (10.0%)	--

Participants were asked to rank which items they believed to be the top 5 areas for growth in their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=**Strongly disagree** and 5=**Strongly agree**. Results were sorted by annual household income for Vilas County and are shown in Table 47. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*.

TABLE 47. TOP 5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT BY INCOME – VILAS COUNTY

RESPONSE OPTIONS	BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
ABILITY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN MY HOME OR CHOSEN COMMUNITY AS I GET OLDER	10 (22.2%)	35 (77.8%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE (FAMILY DOCTOR)	20 (21.5%)	73 (78.5%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTHY FOODS	14 (20.6%)	54 (79.4%)
ACCESS TO COMMUNITY PARKS AND GREEN SPACES	5 (20.8%)	19 (79.2%)
ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	17 (16.8%)	84 (83.2%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION	11 (17.7%)	51 (82.3%)
CLEAN ENVIRONMENT (AIR, WATER)	4 (36.4%)	7 (63.6%)
ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE	7 (11.3%)	55 (88.7%)
COMMUNITY SAFETY	2 (25.0%)	6 (75.0%)
COMMUNITY SPACES ARE INCLUSIVE TO PEOPLE OF ALL IDENTITIES	3 (27.3%)	8 (72.7%)
GOOD JOBS AND STRONG ECONOMY	9 (17.3%)	43 (82.7%)
GOOD SCHOOLS	8 (33.3%)	16 (66.7%)
OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS	5 (25.0%)	15 (75.0%)
RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY	10 (19.2%)	42 (80.8%)
SENSE OF BELONGING	5 (20.0%)	20 (80.0%)

ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	6 (9.1%)	60 (90.9%)
ROAD SAFETY	8 (27.6%)	21 (72.4%)
POSITIVE TEEN/YOUTH/FAMILY ACTIVITIES	6 (21.4%)	22 (78.6%)
COMMUNITY SUPPORT GROUPS	5 (35.7%)	9 (64.3%)
ELDERLY CARE OPTIONS	8 (16.7%)	40 (83.3%)
SERVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS	4 (23.5%)	13 (76.5%)
OTHER	4 (50.0%)	4 (50.0%)

## Personal Health Concerns

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1= *Not worried*, 2= *Worried*, and 3= *No opinion*. Participants were also asked ' *How has your physical health changed overall since COVID?* This item was measured using 1= *Better*, 2= *About the same*, 3= *Worse*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried about their physical health since COVID. Results are shown in Table 48.

TABLE 48. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS BY COVID

		BETTER N (%)	SAME N (%)	WORSE N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	37 (21.8%)	81 (47.6%)	52 (30.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	64 (7.6%)	560 (66.1%)	223 (26.3%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	23 (20.4%)	52 (46.0%)	38 (33.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	80 (8.8%)	594 (65.3%)	236 (25.9%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	24 (14.1%)	82 (48.2%)	64 (37.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	75 (9.1%)	547 (66.6%)	199 (24.2%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	24 (9.4%)	125 (48.8%)	107 (41.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	77 (10.7%)	493 (68.3%)	152 (21.1%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	26 (23.6%)	44 (40.0%)	40 (36.4%)
	NOT WORRIED	79 (8.7%)	596 (65.7%)	232 (25.6%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	26 (10.3%)	95 (37.7%)	131 (52.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	75 (10.2%)	539 (73.2%)	122 (16.6%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	40 (12.0%)	161 (48.3%)	132 (39.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	59 (8.7%)	489 (71.7%)	134 (19.6%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	36 (10.4%)	185 (56.3%)	124 (35.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	65 (9.7%)	448 (67.1%)	155 (23.2%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	26 (28.0%)	36 (38.7%)	31 (33.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	73 (8.0%)	603 (65.8%)	241 (26.3%)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1= *Not worried*, 2= *Worried*, and 3= *No opinion*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried about their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Results are shown in Table 49.

TABLE 49. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS BY INCOME

		BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	34 (25.8%)	98 (74.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	141 (23.4%)	462 (76.6%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	25 (25.0%)	75 (75.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	158 (24.9%)	477 (75.1%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	52 (42.3%)	71 (57.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	126 (21.4%)	463 (78.6%)



MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	66 (34.0%)	128 (66.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	103 (20.2%)	407 (79.8%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	22 (24.4%)	68 (75.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	159 (24.3%)	494 (75.7%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	57 (28.4%)	144 (71.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	114 (22.4%)	396 (77.6%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	66 (25.2%)	196 (74.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	110 (23.5%)	358 (76.5%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	57 (22.2%)	200 (77.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	116 (24.7%)	354 (75.3%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	23 (29.5%)	55 (70.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	154 (23.3%)	506 (76.7%)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*.

Participants were also asked '*Do you have health insurance?*' This item originally was measured using 1=*Yes, it meets my needs and is affordable*, 2=*Yes, but it does not meet my needs*, 3=*Yes, but it is not affordable*, 4=*Yes, but it is not affordable and does not meet my needs*, and 5=*I do not have health insurance*. We recoded this item to *Has insurance* and *No insurance*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried and whether they had or did not have insurance. Results are shown in Table 50.

TABLE 50. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS BY INSURANCE

		HAS INSURANCE N (%)	NO INSURANCE N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	160 (93.0%)	12 (7.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	842 (98.4%)	14 (1.6%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	104 (90.4%)	11 (9.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	904 (98.6%)	13 (1.4%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	165 (95.4%)	8 (4.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	814 (98.4%)	13 (1.6%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	248 (95.0%)	13 (5.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	715 (98.8%)	9 (1.2%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	102 (91.1%)	10 (8.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	901 (98.5%)	14 (1.5%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	241 (94.9%)	13 (5.1%)
	NOT WORRIED	736 (98.9%)	8 (1.1%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	320 (95.2%)	16 (4.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	680 (99.0%)	7 (1.0%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	339 (96.9%)	11 (3.1%)
	NOT WORRIED	658 (98.1%)	13 (1.9%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	83 (87.4%)	12 (12.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	914 (98.9%)	10 (1.1%)

Participants from Forest County were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*. Participants were also asked '*How has your physical health changed overall since COVID?*' This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried about their physical health since COVID. Results are shown in Table 51.

TABLE 51. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS BY COVID – FOREST COUNTY

		BETTER N (%)	SAME N (%)	WORSE N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	12 (23.5%)	26 (51.0%)	13 (25.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	18 (6.3%)	196 (67.7%)	74 (26.0%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	8 (27.6%)	16 (55.2%)	5 (17.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	23 (7.5%)	203 (66.1%)	81 (26.4%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	6 (14.0%)	20 (46.5%)	17 (39.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	21 (7.6%)	189 (68.2%)	67 (24.2%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	7 (9.3%)	37 (49.3%)	31 (41.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	24 (9.6%)	172 (69.1%)	53 (21.3%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	7 (26.9%)	13 (50.0%)	6 (23.1%)
	NOT WORRIED	25 (8.0%)	209 (67.2%)	77 (24.8%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	10 (13.7%)	23 (31.5%)	40 (54.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	24 (9.5%)	187 (73.9%)	42 (16.6%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	13 (11.6%)	55 (49.1%)	44 (39.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	19 (8.3%)	167 (72.6%)	44 (19.1%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	11 (9.7%)	65 (57.5%)	37 (32.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	20 (9.0%)	152 (68.2%)	51 (22.9%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	7 (33.3%)	9 (42.9%)	5 (23.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	22 (7.0%)	211 (67.4%)	80 (25.6%)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried about their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Responses are shown in Table 52.

TABLE 52. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS BY INCOME – FOREST COUNTY

		BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	14 (41.2%)	20 (58.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	42 (22.6%)	144 (77.4%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	9 (39.1%)	14 (60.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	49 (24.9%)	148 (75.1%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	17 (58.6%)	12 (41.4%)
	NOT WORRIED	41 (23.0%)	137 (77.0%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	22 (44.9%)	27 (55.1%)
	NOT WORRIED	35 (21.5%)	128 (78.5%)

USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	11 (57.9%)	8 (42.1%)
	NOT WORRIED	50 (24.4%)	155 (75.6%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	18 (37.5%)	30 (62.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	37 (22.6%)	127 (77.4%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	18 (24.3%)	56 (75.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	40 (26.3%)	112 (73.7%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	19 (24.7%)	58 (75.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	39 (27.1%)	105 (72.9%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	7 (46.7%)	8 (53.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	49 (23.8%)	157 (76.2%)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*.

Participants were also asked '*Do you have health insurance?*' This item originally was measured using 1=*Yes, it meets my needs and is affordable*, 2=*Yes, but it does not meet my needs*, 3=*Yes, but it is not affordable*, 4=*Yes, but it is not affordable and does not meet my needs*, and 5=*I do not have health insurance*. We recoded this item to *Has insurance* and *No insurance*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried and whether they had or did not have insurance. Responses are shown in Table 53.

TABLE 53. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS BY INSURANCE – FOREST COUNTY

		HAS INSURANCE N (%)	NO INSURANCE N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	51 (100.0%)	--
	NOT WORRIED	283 (97.6%)	7 (2.4%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	28 (96.6%)	1 (3.4%)
	NOT WORRIED	306 (98.4%)	5 (1.6%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	43 (100.0%)	--
	NOT WORRIED	276 (98.6%)	4 (1.4%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	73 (96.1%)	3 (3.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	248 (98.8%)	3 (1.2%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	26 (100.0%)	--
	NOT WORRIED	308 (97.8%)	7 (2.2%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	71 (97.3%)	2 (2.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	253 (98.4%)	4 (1.6%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	109 (96.5%)	4 (3.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	230 (98.7%)	3 (1.3%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	113 (99.1%)	1 (.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	219 (97.3%)	6 (2.7%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	20 (95.2%)	1 (4.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	311 (98.4%)	5 (1.6%)

Participants from Oneida County were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No*

*opinion.* Participants were also asked ‘*How has your physical health changed overall since COVID?*’ This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried about their physical health since COVID. Results are shown in Table 54.

TABLE 54. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS BY COVID – ONEIDA COUNTY

		BETTER N (%)	SAME N (%)	WORSE N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	14 (18.2%)	38 (49.4%)	25 (32.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	29 (7.6%)	248 (64.6%)	107 (27.9%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	7 (13.2%)	25 (47.2%)	21 (39.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	35 (8.5%)	264 (63.9%)	114 (27.6%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	11 (13.1%)	40 (47.6%)	33 (39.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	33 (9.0%)	239 (65.3%)	94 (25.7%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	9 (7.6%)	63 (52.9%)	47 (39.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	33 (10.4%)	209 (65.9%)	75 (23.7%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	9 (16.7%)	23 (42.6%)	22 (40.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	34 (8.4%)	260 (63.9%)	113 (27.8%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	8 (6.2%)	50 (38.8%)	71 (55.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	32 (10.0%)	233 (72.8%)	55 (17.2%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	15 (10.5%)	70 (49.0%)	58 (40.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	24 (7.8%)	214 (69.3%)	71 (23.0%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	13 (8.4%)	82 (53.2%)	59 (38.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	28 (9.2%)	197 (65.0%)	78 (25.7%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	10 (23.8%)	18 (42.9%)	14 (33.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	32 (7.6%)	266 (63.5%)	121 (28.9%)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried about their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Responses from Oneida County are shown in Table 55.

TABLE 55. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS BY INCOME – ONEIDA COUNTY

		BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	12 (20.0%)	48 (80.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	73 (25.5%)	213 (74.5%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	12 (25.0%)	36 (75.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	77 (25.7%)	223 (74.3%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	24 (40.7%)	35 (59.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	61 (22.1%)	215 (77.9%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	31 (32.6%)	64 (67.4%)
	NOT WORRIED	46 (20.0%)	184 (80.0%)
	WORRIED	7 (16.3%)	36 (83.7%)

USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	NOT WORRIED	79 (25.9%)	226 (74.1%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	31 (27.7%)	81 (72.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	52 (23.1%)	173 (76.9%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	32 (25.8%)	92 (74.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	52 (24.3%)	162 (75.7%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	28 (23.1%)	93 (76.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	56 (25.3%)	165 (74.7%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	13 (37.1%)	22 (62.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	78 (24.9%)	235 (75.1%)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*.

Participants were also asked '*Do you have health insurance?*' This item originally was measured using 1=*Yes, it meets my needs and is affordable*, 2=*Yes, but it does not meet my needs*, 3=*Yes, but it is not affordable*, 4=*Yes, but it is not affordable and does not meet my needs*, and 5=*I do not have health insurance*. We recoded this item to *Has insurance* and *No insurance*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried and whether they had or did not have insurance. Responses from Oneida County are shown in Table 56.

TABLE 56. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS BY INSURANCE – ONEIDA COUNTY

		HAS INSURANCE N (%)	NO INSURANCE N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	73 (92.4%)	6 (7.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	384 (99.0%)	4 (1.0%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	49 (89.1%)	6 (10.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	413 (99.0%)	4 (1.0%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	83 (95.4%)	4 (4.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	364 (98.6%)	5 (1.4%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	119 (96.7%)	4 (3.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	315 (99.1%)	3 (.9%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	52 (92.9%)	4 (7.1%)
	NOT WORRIED	407 (99.0%)	4 (1.0%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	125 (95.4%)	6 (4.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	321 (99.1%)	3 (.9%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	139 (95.9%)	6 (4.1%)
	NOT WORRIED	310 (99.4%)	2 (.6%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	153 (96.8%)	5 (3.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	301 (98.7%)	4 (1.3%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	38 (86.4%)	6 (13.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	420 (99.3%)	3 (.7%)

Participants from Vilas County were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*. Participants were also asked '*How has your physical health changed overall since COVID?*' This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried about their physical health since COVID. Results are shown in Table 57.

TABLE 57. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS BY COVID – VILAS COUNTY

		BETTER N (%)	SAME N (%)	WORSE N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	11 (26.2%)	17 (40.5%)	14 (33.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	17 (9.6%)	119 (66.9%)	42 (23.6%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	8 (25.8%)	11 (35.5%)	12 (38.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	22 (11.6%)	127 (66.8%)	41 (21.6%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	7 (16.3%)	22 (51.2%)	14 (32.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	21 (11.8%)	119 (66.9%)	38 (21.3%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	8 (12.9%)	25 (40.3%)	29 (46.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	20 (12.8%)	112 (71.8%)	24 (15.4%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	10 (33.3%)	8 (26.7%)	12 (40.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	20 (10.6%)	127 (67.2%)	42 (22.2%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	8 (16.0%)	22 (44.0%)	20 (40.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	19 (11.7%)	119 (73.0%)	25 (15.3%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	12 (15.4%)	36 (46.2%)	30 (38.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	16 (11.2%)	108 (75.5%)	19 (13.3%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	12 (15.4%)	38 (48.7%)	28 (35.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	17 (12.0%)	99 (69.7%)	26 (18.3%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	9 (30.0%)	9 (30.0%)	12 (40.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	19 (10.3%)	126 (68.1%)	40 (21.6%)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried about their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Responses from Vilas County are shown in Table 58.

TABLE 58. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS BY INCOME – VILAS COUNTY

		BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	8 (21.1%)	30 (78.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	26 (19.8%)	105 (80.2%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	4 (13.8%)	25 (86.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	32 (23.2%)	106 (76.8%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	24 (17.8%)	111 (82.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	11 (31.4%)	24 (68.6%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	13 (26.0%)	37 (74.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	22 (18.8%)	95 (81.2%)

USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	4 (14.3%)	24 (85.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	30 (21.0%)	113 (79.0%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	8 (19.5%)	33 (80.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	25 (20.7%)	96 (79.3%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	16 (25.0%)	48 (75.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	18 (17.6%)	84 (82.4%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	10 (16.9%)	49 (83.1%)
	NOT WORRIED	21 (20.0%)	84 (80.0%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	3 (10.7%)	25 (89.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	27 (19.1%)	114 (80.9%)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*.

Participants were also asked '*Do you have health insurance?*' This item originally was measured using 1=*Yes, it meets my needs and is affordable*, 2=*Yes, but it does not meet my needs*, 3=*Yes, but it is not affordable*, 4=*Yes, but it is not affordable and does not meet my needs*, and 5=*I do not have health insurance*. We recoded this item to *Has insurance* and *No insurance*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried and whether they had or did not have insurance. Responses from Vilas County are shown in Table 59.

TABLE 59. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS BY INSURANCE – VILAS COUNTY

		HAS INSURANCE N (%)	NO INSURANCE N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	36 (85.7%)	6 (14.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	175 (98.3%)	3 (1.7%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	27 (87.1%)	4 (12.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	185 (97.9%)	4 (2.1%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	39 (90.7%)	4 (9.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	174 (97.8%)	4 (2.2%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	56 (90.3%)	6 (9.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	152 (98.1%)	3 (1.9%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	24 (80.0%)	6 (20.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	186 (98.4%)	3 (1.6%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	45 (90.0%)	5 (10.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	162 (99.4%)	1 (.6%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	72 (92.3%)	6 (7.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	140 (98.6%)	2 (1.4%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	73 (93.6%)	5 (6.4%)
	NOT WORRIED	138 (97.9%)	3 (2.1%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	25 (83.3%)	5 (16.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	183 (98.9%)	2 (1.1%)



## Safety

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1=*Yes*, 2=*No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3=*No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4=*No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5=*No, other*). Safety was recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*. Responses compared participants safety concerns and their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Response frequencies are shown in Table 60.

TABLE 60. SAFETY CONCERNS BY INCOME

	BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
SAFE	172 (23.8%)	552 (76.2%)
NOT SAFE	36 (48.6%)	38 (51.4%)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1=*Yes*, 2=*No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3=*No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4=*No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5=*No, other*). Safety was recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*. Responses compared participants safety concerns and age. Response frequencies are shown in Table 61.

TABLE 61. SAFETY CONCERNS BY AGE

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
SAFE	5 (.5%)	94 (9.3%)	280 (27.6%)	239 (23.6%)	195 (19.2%)	136 (13.4%)	65 (6.4%)
NOT SAFE	1 (1.0%)	18 (18.2%)	32 (32.3%)	27 (27.3%)	12 (12.1%)	6 (6.1%)	3 (3.0%)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1=*Yes*, 2=*No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3=*No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4=*No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5=*No, other*). Safety was recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*.

Participants were asked: '*How would you rate your own mental health?*' Responses were rated on a 5-point scale (1=*Very Healthy*, 2=*Healthy*, 3=*Somewhat Healthy*, 4=*Unhealthy*, 5=*Very Unhealthy*).

Responses compared those who were *Safe* and *Not safe* and mental health scores. Results are shown in Table 62.

TABLE 62. SAFETY CONCERNS BY MENTAL HEALTH

	MENTAL HEALTH M (SD)
SAFE	2.26 (.09)
NOT SAFE	2.85 (.95)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1=*Yes*, 2=*No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3=*No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4=*No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5=*No, other*). Safety was recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*.

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*. Responses compared those who were *Safe* and *Not safe* and disability status. Results are shown in Table 63.

TABLE 63. SAFETY CONCERNS BY DISABILITY

	REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)	NO DISABILITY N (%)
SAFE	264 (25.8%)	759 (74.2%)
NOT SAFE	53 (53.0%)	47 (47.0%)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1=*Yes*, 2=*No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3=*No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4=*No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5=*No, other*). Safety was recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*. Responses compared participants safety concerns and their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 64.

TABLE 64. SAFETY CONCERNS BY INCOME – FOREST COUNTY

	BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
SAFE	58 (25.9%)	166 (74.1%)
NOT SAFE	12 (54.5%)	10 (45.5%)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1=*Yes*, 2=*No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3=*No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4=*No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5=*No, other*). Safety was recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*. Responses compared participants safety concerns and age in Forest County. Results are shown in Table 65.

TABLE 65. SAFETY CONCERNS BY AGE – FOREST COUNTY

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
SAFE	4 (1.2%)	39 (11.4%)	99 (28.9%)	92 (26.8%)	53 (15.5%)	33 (9.6%)	23 (6.7%)
NOT SAFE	1 (3.4%)	5 (17.2%)	9 (31.0%)	8 (27.6%)	4 (13.8%)	2 (6.9%)	--

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1=*Yes*, 2=*No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3=*No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4=*No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5=*No, other*). Safety was recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*.

Participants were asked: '*How would you rate your own mental health?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1=*Very Healthy*, 2=*Healthy*, 3=*Somewhat Healthy*, 4=*Unhealthy*, 5=*Very Healthy*).

Responses for Forest County compared those who were *Safe* and *Not safe* and mental health scores. Results are shown in Table 66.

TABLE 66. SAFETY CONCERNS BY MENTAL HEALTH – FOREST COUNTY

	M (SD)
SAFE	2.31 (.87)
NOT SAFE	2.97 (.94)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1= *Yes*, 2= *No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3= *No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4= *No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5= *No, other*). Safety was recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*.

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*. Responses compared those who were *Safe* and *Not safe* and disability status. Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 67.

TABLE 67. SAFETY CONCERNS BY DISABILITY – FOREST COUNTY

	REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)	NO DISABILITY N (%)
SAFE	81 (23.2%)	268 (76.8%)
NOT SAFE	15 (51.7%)	14 (48.3%)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1= *Yes*, 2= *No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3= *No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4= *No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5= *No, other*). Safety was recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*. Responses compared participants safety concerns and their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 68.

TABLE 68. SAFETY CONCERNS BY INCOME – ONEIDA COUNTY

	BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
SAFE	81 (24.2%)	254 (75.8%)
NOT SAFE	15 (50.0%)	18 (50.0%)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1= *Yes*, 2= *No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3= *No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4= *No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5= *No, other*). Safety was recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*. Responses compared participants safety concerns and age. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 69.

TABLE 69. SAFETY CONCERNS BY AGE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
SAFE	1 (.2%)	29 (6.5%)	139 (31.0%)	97 (21.6%)	88 (19.6%)	65 (14.5%)	30 (6.7%)
NOT SAFE	--	10 (20.0%)	17 (34.0%)	11 (22.0%)	6 (12.0%)	3 (6.0%)	3 (6.0%)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1=*Yes*, 2=*No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3=*No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4=*No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5=*No, other*). Safety was recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*.

Participants were asked: '*How would you rate your own mental health?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1=*Very Healthy*, 2=*Healthy*, 3=*Somewhat Healthy*, 4=*Unhealthy*, 5=*Very Healthy*).

Responses for Oneida County compared those who were *Safe* and *Not safe* and mental health scores. Results are shown in Table 70.

TABLE 70. SAFETY CONCERNS BY MENTAL HEALTH – ONEIDA COUNTY

	M (SD)
SAFE	2.29 (.87)
NOT SAFE	2.75 (.94)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1=*Yes*, 2=*No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3=*No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4=*No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5=*No, other*). Safety was recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*.

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*. Responses compared those who were *Safe* and *Not safe* and disability status. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 71.

TABLE 71. SAFETY CONCERNS BY DISABILITY – ONEIDA COUNTY

	REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)	NO DISABILITY N (%)
SAFE	129 (28.5%)	323 (71.5%)
NOT SAFE	34 (66.7%)	17 (33.36%)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1=*Yes*, 2=*No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3=*No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4=*No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5=*No, other*). Safety was recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*. Responses compared participants safety concerns and their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 72.

TABLE 72. SAFETY CONCERNS BY INCOME – VILAS COUNTY

	BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
SAFE	33 (20.0%)	132 (80.0%)
NOT SAFE	6 (37.5%)	10 (62.5%)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1=*Yes*, 2=*No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3=*No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4=*No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5=*No, other*). Safety was recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*. Responses compared participants safety concerns and age. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 73.

TABLE 73. SAFETY CONCERNS BY AGE – VILAS COUNTY

	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
SAFE	26 (11.7%)	42 (18.9%)	50 (22.5%)	54 (24.3%)	38 (17.1%)	12 (5.4%)
NOT SAFE	3 (15.0%)	6 (30.0%)	8 (40.0%)	2 (10.0%)	1 (5.0%)	--

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1= *Yes*, 2= *No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3= *No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4= *No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5= *No, other*). Safety was recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*.

Participants were asked: '*How would you rate your own mental health?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1= *Very Healthy*, 2= *Healthy*, 3= *Somewhat Healthy*, 4= *Unhealthy*, 5= *Very Healthy*).

Responses for Vilas County compared those who were *Safe* and *Not safe* and mental health scores. Results are shown in Table 74.

TABLE 74. SAFETY CONCERNS BY MENTAL HEALTH – VILAS COUNTY

	M (SD)
SAFE	2.12 (.80)
NOT SAFE	2.95 (1.00)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses were on a 5-point scale (1= *Yes*, 2= *No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3= *No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4= *No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5= *No, other*). Safety was recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*.

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*. Responses compared those who were *Safe* and *Not safe* and disability status. Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 75.

TABLE 75. SAFETY CONCERNS BY DISABILITY – VILAS COUNTY

	REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)	NO DISABILITY N (%)
SAFE	54 (24.3%)	168 (75.7%)
NOT SAFE	4 (20.0%)	16 (80.0%)

## Disability

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1= *Not worried*, 2= *Worried*, and 3= *No opinion*. Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried and disability status. Response frequencies are shown in Table 76.

TABLE 76. DISABILITY BY PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS

		REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)	NO DISABILITY N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	74 (42.8%)	99 (57.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	209 (24.3%)	652 (75.7%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	37 (31.9%)	79 (68.1%)
	NOT WORRIED	241 (26.1%)	681 (73.9%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	120 (69.0%)	54 (31.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	152 (18.3%)	680 (81.7%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	129 (49.0%)	134 (51.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	135 (18.5%)	593 (81.5%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	53 (47.3%)	59 (52.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	219 (23.8%)	701 (76.2%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	105 (41.3%)	149 (58.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	155 (20.7%)	594 (79.3%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	112 (33.3%)	224 (66.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	163 (23.6%)	528 (76.4%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	119 (33.9%)	232 (66.1%)
	NOT WORRIED	156 (23.1%)	518 (76.9%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	49 (51.6%)	46 (48.4%)
	NOT WORRIED	228 (24.5%)	701 (75.5%)

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*.

Participants were also asked '*Do you have health insurance?*' This item was measured using 1= *Yes, it meets my needs and is affordable*, 2= *Yes, but it does not meet my needs*, 3= *Yes, but it is not affordable*, 4= *Yes, but it is not affordable and does not meet my needs*, and 5= *I do not have health insurance*. We recoded to *Has insurance* and *No insurance*.

Responses compared disability status and insurance status. Response frequencies are shown in Table 77.

TABLE 77. DISABILITY BY INSURANCE

	REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)	NO DISABILITY N (%)
HAS HEALTH INSURANCE	303 (27.7%)	789 (72.3%)

NO HEALTH INSURANCE	12 (42.9%)	16 (57.1%)
---------------------	------------	------------

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*. Responses compared disability status and age. Response frequencies are shown in Table 78.

TABLE 78. DISABILITY BY AGE

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
REPORTED DISABILITY	--	27 (24.1%)	84 (26.8%)	50 (18.7%)	59 (28.2%)	55 (38.7%)	39 (55.7%)
NO DISABILITY	6 (100.0%)	85 (75.9%)	228 (73.2%)	218 (81.3%)	150 (71.8%)	87 (61.3%)	31 (44.3%)

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*. Responses compared disability status and annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Response frequencies are shown in Table 79.

TABLE 79. DISABILITY BY INCOME

	BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
REPORTED DISABILITY	93 (44.3%)	121 (20.4%)
NO DISABILITY	117 (55.7%)	471 (79.6%)

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*.

Participants were asked to indicate their employment status (1=*I do not work*, 2=*Work # Hours per week-fill in:\_\_\_*, 3=*Unemployed*, 4=*Retired*, 5=*Student*, 6=*Military*, 7=*Homemaker*, 8=*Unable to work due to disability*, 9=*Other:\_\_\_*). Employment status was recoded to *Employed* and *Not employed*.

Responses compared disability status and employment status; frequencies are shown in Table 80.

TABLE 80. DISABILITY BY JOB STATUS

	EMPLOYED N (%)	UNEMPLOYED N (%)
REPORTED DISABILITY	144 (19.5%)	168 (44.6%)
NO DISABILITY	595 (80.5%)	209 (55.4%)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*. Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried and disability status. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 81.



TABLE 81. DISABILITY BY PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS – FOREST COUNTY

		REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)	NO DISABILITY N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	19 (37.3%)	32 (62.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	65 (22.3%)	226 (77.7%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	4 (13.8%)	25 (86.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	78 (25.0%)	234 (75.0%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	31 (72.1%)	12 (27.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	50 (17.8%)	231 (82.2%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	38 (49.4%)	39 (50.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	43 (17.1%)	208 (82.9%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	12 (46.2%)	14 (53.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	70 (22.2%)	246 (77.8%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	25 (34.2%)	48 (65.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	52 (20.2%)	206 (79.8%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	38 (33.6%)	75 (66.4%)
	NOT WORRIED	47 (20.1%)	187 (79.9%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	31 (27.0%)	84 (73.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	48 (21.3%)	177 (78.7%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	7 (33.3%)	14 (66.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	76 (24.0%)	241 (76.0%)

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*.

Participants were also asked '*Do you have health insurance?*' This item was measured using 1=*Yes, it meets my needs and is affordable*, 2=*Yes, but it does not meet my needs*, 3=*Yes, but it is not affordable*, 4=*Yes, but it is not affordable and does not meet my needs*, and 5=*I do not have health insurance*. We recoded this item *Has insurance* and *No insurance*.

Responses compared disability status and insurance status. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 82.

TABLE 82. DISABILITY BY INSURANCE – FOREST COUNTY

	REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)	NO DISABILITY N (%)
HAS HEALTH INSURANCE	93 (25.1%)	278 (74.9%)
NO HEALTH INSURANCE	2 (28.6%)	5 (71.4%)

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*. Responses compared disability status and age. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 83.

TABLE 83. DISABILITY BY AGE – FOREST COUNTY

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
REPORTED DISABILITY	--	11 (25.0%)	18 (16.7%)	17 (17.0%)	18 (31.6%)	16 (45.7%)	15 (60.0%)
NO DISABILITY	5 (100.0%)	33 (75.0%)	90 (83.3%)	83 (83.0%)	39 (68.4%)	19 (54.3%)	10 (40.0%)

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*. Responses compared disability status and annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 84.

TABLE 84. DISABILITY BY INCOME – FOREST COUNTY

	BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
REPORTED DISABILITY	31 (44.3%)	39 (55.7%)
NO DISABILITY	32 (18.2%)	144 (81.8%)

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*.

Participants were asked to indicate their employment status (1=*I do not work*, 2=*Work # Hours per week-fill in:\_\_\_* 3=*Unemployed*, 4=*Retired*, 5=*Student*, 6=*Military*, 7=*Homemaker*, 8=*Unable to work due to disability*, 9=*Other:\_\_\_*). Employment status was recoded to *Employed* and *Not employed*.

Responses compared disability status and employment status. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 85.

TABLE 85. DISABILITY BY JOB STATUS – FOREST COUNTY

	EMPLOYED N (%)	UNEMPLOYED N (%)
REPORTED DISABILITY	45 (16.8%)	223 (83.2%)
NO DISABILITY	51 (46.8%)	58 (53.2%)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*. Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried and disability status. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 86.

TABLE 86. DISABILITY BY PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS – ONEIDA COUNTY

		REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)	NO DISABILITY N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	42 (53.2%)	37 (46.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	104 (26.7%)	285 (73.3%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	22 (40.0%)	33 (60.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	122 (29.2%)	296 (70.8%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	65 (74.7%)	22 (25.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	75 (20.3%)	295 (79.7%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	67 (54.5%)	56 (45.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	67 (21.0%)	252 (79.0%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	30 (53.6%)	26 (46.4%)
	NOT WORRIED	112 (27.2%)	300 (72.8%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	62 (47.3%)	69 (52.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	76 (23.4%)	249 (76.6%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	53 (36.6%)	92 (63.4%)
	NOT WORRIED	90 (28.8%)	223 (71.2%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	65 (41.1%)	93 (58.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	82 (26.8%)	224 (73.2%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	32 (72.7%)	12 (27.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	116 (27.4%)	308 (72.6%)

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*.

Participants were also asked '*Do you have health insurance?*' This item was measured using 1=*Yes, it meets my needs and is affordable*, 2=*Yes, but it does not meet my needs*, 3=*Yes, but it is not affordable*, 4=*Yes, but it is not affordable and does not meet my needs*, and 5=*I do not have health insurance*. We recoded this to *Has insurance* and *No insurance*.

Responses compared disability status and insurance status. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 87.

TABLE 87. DISABILITY BY INSURANCE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)	NO DISABILITY N (%)
HAS HEALTH INSURANCE	158 (32.2%)	333 (67.8%)
NO HEALTH INSURANCE	5 (45.5%)	6 (54.5%)

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*. Responses compared disability status and age. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 88.

TABLE 88. DISABILITY BY AGE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
REPORTED DISABILITY	--	14 (35.9%)	53 (33.8%)	27 (25.0%)	24 (25.3%)	25 (36.8%)	18 (54.5%)
NO DISABILITY	1 (100.0%)	25 (64.1%)	104 (66.2%)	81 (75.0%)	71 (74.7%)	43 (63.2%)	15 (45.5%)

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*. Responses compared disability status and annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 89.

TABLE 89. DISABILITY BY INCOME – ONEIDA COUNTY

	BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
REPORTED DISABILITY	46 (45.5%)	55 (54.5%)
NO DISABILITY	67 (24.6%)	205 (75.4%)

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*.

Participants were asked to indicate their employment status (1=*I do not work*, 2=*Work # Hours per week-fill in:\_\_\_* 3=*Unemployed*, 4=*Retired*, 5=*Student*, 6=*Military*, 7=*Homemaker*, 8=*Unable to work due to disability*, 9=*Other:\_\_\_*). Employment status was recoded to *Employed* and *Not employed*.

Responses compared disability status and employment status. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 90.

TABLE 90. DISABILITY BY JOB STATUS – ONEIDA COUNTY

	EMPLOYED N (%)	NOT EMPLOYED N (%)
REPORTED DISABILITY	70 (23.3%)	231 (76.7%)
NO DISABILITY	89 (45.6%)	106 (54.4%)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*. Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried and disability status. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 91.

TABLE 91. DISABILITY BY PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS – VILAS COUNTY

		REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)	NO DISABILITY N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	13 (30.2%)	30 (69.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	40 (22.1%)	141 (77.9%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	11 (34.4%)	21 (65.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	41 (21.4%)	151 (78.6%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	24 (54.5%)	20 (45.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	27 (14.9%)	154 (85.1%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	24 (38.1%)	39 (61.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	25 (15.8%)	133 (84.2%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	11 (36.7%)	19 (63.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	37 (19.3%)	155 (80.7%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	18 (36.0%)	32 (64.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	27 (16.3%)	139 (83.7%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	21 (26.9%)	57 (73.1%)
	NOT WORRIED	26 (18.1%)	118 (81.9%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	23 (29.5%)	55 (70.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	26 (18.2%)	117 (81.8%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	10 (33.3%)	20 (66.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	36 (19.1%)	152 (80.9%)

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*.

Participants were also asked '*Do you have health insurance?*' This item originally was measured using 1=*Yes, it meets my needs and is affordable*, 2=*Yes, but it does not meet my needs*, 3=*Yes, but it is not affordable*, 4=*Yes, but it is not affordable and does not meet my needs*, and 5=*I do not have health insurance*. We recoded this to *Has insurance* and *No insurance*.

Responses compared disability status and insurance status. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 92.

TABLE 92. DISABILITY BY INSURANCE – VILAS COUNTY

	REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)	NO DISABILITY N (%)
HAS HEALTH INSURANCE	52 (22.6%)	178 (77.4%)
NO HEALTH INSURANCE	5 (50.0%)	5 (50.0%)

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*. Responses compared disability status and age. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 93.

TABLE 93. DISABILITY BY AGE – VILAS COUNTY

	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
REPORTED DISABILITY	2 (6.9%)	13 (27.1%)	6 (10.0%)	17 (29.8%)	14 (35.9%)	6 (50.0%)
NO DISABILITY	27 (93.1%)	35 (72.9%)	54 (90.0%)	40 (70.2%)	25 (64.1%)	6 (50.0%)

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*. Responses compared disability status and annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 94.

TABLE 94. DISABILITY BY INCOME – VILAS COUNTY

	BELOW ALICE N (%)	ABOVE ALICE N (%)
REPORTED DISABILITY	16 (41.0%)	23 (59.0%)
NO DISABILITY	22 (15.3%)	122 (84.7%)

Participants were asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded to *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*.

Participants were asked to indicate their employment status (1= *I do not work*, 2= *Work # Hours per week-fill in:\_\_\_*, 3= *Unemployed*, 4= *Retired*, 5= *Student*, 6= *Military*, 7= *Homemaker*, 8= *Unable to work due to disability*, 9= *Other:\_\_\_*). Employment status was recoded to *Employed* and *Not employed*.

Responses compared disability status and employment status. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 95.

TABLE 95. DISABILITY BY JOB STATUS – VILAS COUNTY

	EMPLOYED N (%)	NOT EMPLOYED N (%)
REPORTED DISABILITY	29 (17.1%)	141 (82.9%)
NO DISABILITY	28 (38.4%)	45 (61.6%)

## COVID

Participants were asked: '*How would you rate your own mental health?*' Responses correspond to a 5-point scale (1=*Very Healthy*, 2=*Healthy*, 3=*Somewhat Healthy*, 4=*Unhealthy*, 5=*Very Healthy*).

Participants were also asked '*How has your mental health changed overall since COVID?*'. This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Responses compared the impact of COVID-19 and participants mental health score. Results are shown in Table 96.

TABLE 96. COVID BY PERSONAL MENTAL HEALTH

	MENTAL HEALTH M (SD)
BETTER	1.91 (.79)
ABOUT THE SAME	2.11 (.80)
WORSE	3.00 (.73)

Participants were asked '*How has your mental health changed overall since COVID?*'. This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Participants were asked: '*How would you rate your own physical health?*' Responses for this item correspond to a 5-point scale (1=*Very Healthy*, 2=*Healthy*, 3=*Somewhat Healthy*, 4=*Unhealthy*, 5=*Very Healthy*).

Responses compared the impact of COVID-19 and participants physical health. Shown in Table 97.

TABLE 97. COVID BY PERSONAL PHYSICAL HEALTH

	PHYSICAL HEALTH M (SD)
BETTER	3.93 (.82)
ABOUT THE SAME	3.75 (.75)
WORSE	3.50 (.84)

Participants were asked '*How has your mental health changed overall since COVID?*'. This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Participants were asked '*Do you have health insurance?*' This item originally was measured using 1=*Yes, it meets my needs and is affordable*, 2=*Yes, but it does not meet my needs*, 3=*Yes, but it is not affordable*, 4=*Yes, but it is not affordable and does not meet my needs*, and 5=*I do not have health insurance*. We recoded this item to *Has insurance* and *No insurance*.

Responses compared the impact of COVID-19 and insurance status. Response frequencies for are shown in Table 98.

TABLE 98. COVID BY PERSONAL INSURANCE

	HAS INSURANCE N (%)	NO INSURANCE N (%)
BETTER	112 (99.1%)	1 (0.9%)
ABOUT THE SAME	690 (98.2%)	13 (1.8%)
WORSE	278 (95.5%)	13 (4.5%)



Participants were asked: '*How would you rate your own mental health?*' Responses correspond to a 5-point scale (1=*Very Healthy*, 2=*Healthy*, 3=*Somewhat Healthy*, 4=*Unhealthy*, 5=*Very Healthy*).

Participants were also asked '*How has your mental health changed overall since COVID?*'. This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Responses compared the impact of COVID-19 and participants mental health scores. Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 99.

TABLE 99. COVID BY PERSONAL MENTAL HEALTH – FOREST COUNTY

	MENTAL HEALTH M (SD)
BETTER	1.92 (.77)
ABOUT THE SAME	2.16 (.79)
WORSE	3.05 (.83)

Participants were asked '*How has your mental health changed overall since COVID?*'. This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Participants were asked: '*How would you rate your own physical health?*' Responses for this item correspond to a 5-point scale (1=*Very Healthy*, 2=*Healthy*, 3=*Somewhat Healthy*, 4=*Unhealthy*, 5=*Very Healthy*).

Responses compared the impact of COVID-19 and participants physical health. Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 100.

TABLE 100. COVID BY PERSONAL PHYSICAL HEALTH – FOREST COUNTY

	PHYSICAL HEALTH M (SD)
BETTER	4.06 (.79)
ABOUT THE SAME	3.68 (.72)
WORSE	3.52 (.86)

Participants were asked '*How has your mental health changed overall since COVID?*'. This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Participants were also asked '*Do you have health insurance?*' This item originally was measured using 1=*Yes, it meets my needs and is affordable*, 2=*Yes, but it does not meet my needs*, 3=*Yes, but it is not affordable*, 4=*Yes, but it is not affordable and does not meet my needs*, and 5=*I do not have health insurance*. We recoded this item to *Has insurance* and *No insurance*.

Responses compared the impact of COVID-19 and insurance status. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 101.

TABLE 101. COVID BY PERSONAL INSURANCE – FOREST COUNTY

	HAS INSURANCE N (%)	NO INSURANCE N (%)
BETTER	36 (100%)	--
ABOUT THE SAME	236 (97.1%)	7 (2.9%)

WORSE	93 (100.0%)	--
-------	-------------	----

Participants were asked: '*How would you rate your own mental health?*' Responses correspond to a 5-point scale (1=*Very Healthy*, 2=*Healthy*, 3=*Somewhat Healthy*, 4=*Unhealthy*, 5=*Very Healthy*).

Participants were also asked '*How has your mental health changed overall since COVID?*'. This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Responses compared the impact of COVID-19 and participants mental health scores. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 102.

TABLE 102. COVID BY PERSONAL MENTAL HEALTH – ONEIDA COUNTY

	MENTAL HEALTH M (SD)
BETTER	1.85 (.84)
ABOUT THE SAME	2.11 (.80)
WORSE	3.01 (.69)

Participants were asked '*How has your mental health changed overall since COVID?*'. This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Participants were asked: '*How would you rate your own physical health?*' Responses for this item correspond to a 5-point scale (1=*Very Healthy*, 2=*Healthy*, 3=*Somewhat Healthy*, 4=*Unhealthy*, 5=*Very Healthy*).

Responses compared the impact of COVID-19 and participants physical health. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 103.

TABLE 103. COVID BY PERSONAL PHYSICAL HEALTH – ONEIDA COUNTY

	PHYSICAL HEALTH M (SD)
BETTER	3.94 (.85)
ABOUT THE SAME	3.72 (.75)
WORSE	3.48 (.82)

Participants were asked '*How has your mental health changed overall since COVID?*'. This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Participants were also asked '*Do you have health insurance?*' This item originally was measured using 1=*Yes, it meets my needs and is affordable*, 2=*Yes, but it does not meet my needs*, 3=*Yes, but it is not affordable*, 4=*Yes, but it is not affordable and does not meet my needs*, and 5=*I do not have health insurance*. We recoded this item to *Has insurance* and *No insurance*.

Responses compared the impact of COVID-19 and insurance status. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 104.

TABLE 104. COVID BY PERSONAL INSURANCE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	HAS INSURANCE N (%)	NO INSURANCE N (%)
BETTER	46 (97.9%)	1 (2.1%)

ABOUT THE SAME	305 (99.0%)	3 (1.0%)
WORSE	135 (95.7%)	6 (4.3%)

Participants were asked: '*How would you rate your own mental health?*' Responses correspond to a 5-point scale (1=*Very Healthy*, 2=*Healthy*, 3=*Somewhat Healthy*, 4=*Unhealthy*, 5=*Very Healthy*).

Participants were also asked '*How has your mental health changed overall since COVID?*'. This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Responses compared the impact of COVID-19 and participants mental health score. Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 105.

TABLE 105. COVID BY PERSONAL MENTAL HEALTH – VILAS COUNTY

	MENTAL HEALTH M (SD)
BETTER	2.00 (.74)
ABOUT THE SAME	2.00 (.81)
WORSE	2.85 (.65)

Participants were asked '*How has your mental health changed overall since COVID?*'. This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Participants were asked: '*How would you rate your own physical health?*' Responses for this item correspond to a 5-point scale (1=*Very Healthy*, 2=*Healthy*, 3=*Somewhat Healthy*, 4=*Unhealthy*, 5=*Very Healthy*).

Responses compared the impact of COVID-19 and participants physical health. Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 106.

TABLE 106. COVID BY PERSONAL PHYSICAL HEALTH – VILAS COUNTY

	PHYSICAL HEALTH M (SD)
BETTER	3.77 (.82)
ABOUT THE SAME	3.93 (.79)
WORSE	3.51 (.87)

Participants were asked '*How has your mental health changed overall since COVID?*'. This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Participants were also asked '*Do you have health insurance?*' This item originally was measured using 1=*Yes, it meets my needs and is affordable*, 2=*Yes, but it does not meet my needs*, 3=*Yes, but it is not affordable*, 4=*Yes, but it is not affordable and does not meet my needs*, and 5=*I do not have health insurance*. We recoded this item to *Has insurance* and *No insurance*.

Responses compared the impact of COVID-19 and insurance status. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 107.

TABLE 107. COVID BY PERSONAL INSURANCE – VILAS COUNTY

	HAS INSURANCE N (%)	NO INSURANCE N (%)
--	------------------------	-----------------------

BETTER	30 (100.0%)	--
ABOUT THE SAME	149 (98.0%)	3 (2.0%)
WORSE	50 (87.7%)	7 (12.3%)

## Access to Mental Health Care

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report their sexual orientation (1=*Asexual*, 2=*Bisexual*, 3=*Gay*, 4=*Lesbian*, 5=*Pansexual*, 6=*Queer*, 7=*Straight/heterosexual*, 8=*Sexual orientation not listed:\_\_\_*, 9=*Prefer not to answer*). Sexual orientation was recoded *Straight or Heterosexual* and *LGBTQ or Unknown*.

Responses compared access to a mental health care provider to participants sexual orientation. Frequency of responses are shown in Table 108.

TABLE 108. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY SEXUAL ORIENTATION

	STRAIGHT OR HETEROSEXUAL N (%)	LGBTQ OR UNKNOWN N (%)
YES	588 (65.6%)	65 (68.4%)
NO	309 (34.4%)	30 (31.6%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Responses compared access to a mental health care provider and age. Response frequencies for are shown in Table 109.

TABLE 109. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY AGE

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
YES	3 (50.0%)	81 (72.3%)	197 (63.5%)	156 (58.6%)	144 (71.3%)	94 (70.7%)	39 (63.9%)
NO	3 (50.0%)	31 (27.7%)	113 (36.5%)	110 (41.4%)	58 (28.7%)	39 (29.3%)	22 (36.1%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native: \_\_\_*, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other: \_\_\_*). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Response frequencies for are shown in Table 110.

TABLE 110. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY RACE

	WHITE N (%)	NON-WHITE N (%)
YE	617 (63.9%)	98 (78.4%)
NO	348 (36.1%)	27 (21.6%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Response frequencies for are shown in Table 111.

TABLE 111. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY ETHNICITY

	HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)
YES	54 (84.4%)	629 (63.8%)
NO	10 (15.6%)	357 (36.2%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report '*What language(s) do you speak at home?*' Responses to this item were 1=*English*, 2=*Spanish*, 3=*Hmong*, 4=*Mandarin*, 5=*Other:\_\_\_*. Language was recoded to *English* and *Other*. Response frequencies for are shown in Table 112.

TABLE 112. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY LANGUAGE

	ENGLISH N (%)	OTHER N (%)
YES	695 (65.1%)	18 (72.0%)
NO	372 (34.9%)	7 (28.0%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Responses compared access to a mental health care provider to annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Response frequencies are shown in Table 113.

TABLE 113. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY INCOME

	ABOVE ALICE N (%)	BELOW ALICE N (%)
YES	375 (63.9%)	135 (66.2%)
NO	212 (36.1%)	69 (33.8%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Response frequencies are shown in Table 114.

TABLE 114. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY EDUCATION

	DEGREE N (%)	NO DEGREE N (%)
YES	430 (63.9%)	282 (67.8%)
NO	243 (36.1%)	134 (32.2%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Participants were then asked to report the number of jobs they work (1=*1 job*, 2=*2 jobs*, 3=*jobs*, 4=*4 or more jobs*, 5=*I do not work*). Response frequencies are shown in Table 115.

TABLE 115. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY NUMBER OF JOBS

	1 JOB N (%)	2 JOBS N (%)	3 JOBS N (%)	4 JOBS + N (%)	DO NOT WORK N (%)
YES	421 (65.5%)	88 (62.9%)	10 (43.5%)	3 (50.0%)	181 (69.1%)
NO	222 (34.5%)	52 (37.1%)	13 (56.5%)	3 (50.0%)	81 (30.9%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were asked to indicate their employment status (1=*I do not work*, 2=*Work # Hours per week-fill in:\_\_\_*, 3=*Unemployed*, 4=*Retired*, 5=*Student*, 6=*Military*, 7=*Homemaker*, 8=*Unable to work due to disability*, 9=*Other:\_\_\_*). Employment status was recoded to *Employed* and *Not employed*. Response frequencies are shown in Table 116.

TABLE 116. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY EMPLOYED

	EMPLOYED N (%)	NOT EMPLOYED N (%)
YES	473 (64.5%)	237 (67.1%)
NO	260 (35.5%)	116 (32.9%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Participants were then asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*. Response frequencies are shown in Table 117.

TABLE 117. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY REPORTED DISABILITY

	REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)	NO REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)
YES	192 (61.9%)	525 (66.7%)
NO	118 (38.1%)	262 (33.3%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Participants were then asked to report if they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had one of the following illnesses reported in Table 118. Response frequencies are shown in Table 118.

TABLE 118. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY REPORTED ILLNESS

	YES N (%)	NO N (%)
ADULT-ONSET ASTHMA	57 (67.1%)	28 (32.9%)
HYPERTENSION OR HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE	192 (66.7%)	96 (33.3%)
OVERWEIGHT OR OBESITY	245 (61.4%)	154 (38.6%)



ANXIETY	199 (60.7%)	129 (39.3%)
DEPRESSION	162 (58.3%)	116 (41.7%)
POST TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER (PTSD)	54 (60.7%)	35 (39.3%)
OTHER MENTAL ILLNESS	19 (65.5%)	10 (34.5%)
CANCER	51 (69.9%)	22 (30.1%)
ANGINA OR CORONARY ARTERY DISEASE	18 (60.0%)	12 (40.0%)
CONGESTIVE HEART FAILURE	13 (50.0%)	13 (50.0%)
DIABETES OR HIGH BLOOD SUGAR	100 (71.4%)	40 (28.6%)
HIGH CHOLESTEROL	169 (70.4%)	71 (29.6%)
CHRONIC OBSTRUCTIVE PULMONARY DISEASE (COPD)	21 (60.0%)	14 (40.0%)
MEMORY LOSS	21 (67.7%)	10 (32.3%)
DEMENTIA	2 (50.0%)	2 (50.0%)
ATTENTION DEFICIT DISORDER (ADD) OR ATTENTION DEFICIT/HYPERACTIVITY DISORDER (ADHD)	37 (56.1%)	29 (43.9%)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*. Participants were also asked '*How has your physical health changed overall since COVID?*' This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried about their physical health since COVID. Shown in Table 119.

TABLE 119. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS BY COVID

		YES N (%)	NO N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	117 (68.8%)	53 (31.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	537 (64.1%)	301 (35.9%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	77 (67.5%)	37 (32.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	580 (64.5%)	319 (35.5%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	120 (69.8%)	52 (30.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	514 (63.5%)	295 (36.5%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	171 (66.0%)	88 (34.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	460 (64.9%)	249 (35.1%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	85 (76.6%)	26 (23.4%)
	NOT WORRIED	573 (63.7%)	326 (36.3%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	150 (59.3%)	103 (40.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	489 (67.4%)	236 (32.6%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	187 (56.0%)	147 (44.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	470 (70.3%)	199 (29.7%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	206 (59.4%)	141 (40.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	443 (67.7%)	211 (32.3%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	61 (64.9%)	33 (35.1%)
	NOT WORRIED	592 (65.2%)	316 (34.8%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report their sexual orientation (1=*Asexual*, 2=*Bisexual*, 3=*Gay*, 4=*Lesbian*, 5=*Pansexual*, 6=*Queer*, 7=*Straight/heterosexual*, 8=*Sexual orientation not listed:\_\_\_*, 9=*Prefer not to answer*). Sexual orientation was recoded *Straight or Heterosexual* and *LGBTQ or Unknown*.

Responses compared access to a mental health care provider to participants sexual orientation. Frequency of responses for Forest county are shown in Table 120.

TABLE 120. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY SEXUAL ORIENTATION – FOREST COUNTY

	STRAIGHT OR HETEROSEXUAL N (%)	LGBTQ OR UNKNOWN N (%)
YES	198 (65.3%)	22 (71.0%)
NO	105 (34.7%)	9 (29.0%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Responses compared access to a mental health care provider and age. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 121.

TABLE 121. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY AGE – FOREST COUNTY

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
YES	2 (40.0%)	30 (68.2%)	75 (70.1%)	56 (56.6%)	42 (76.4%)	22 (64.7%)	12 (63.2%)
NO	3 (60.0%)	14 (31.8%)	32 (29.9%)	43 (43.4%)	13 (23.6%)	12 (35.3%)	7 (36.8%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native: \_\_\_*, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other: \_\_\_*). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 122.

TABLE 122. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY RACE – FOREST COUNTY

	WHITE N (%)	NON-WHITE N (%)
YES	202 (64.1%)	38 (77.6%)
NO	113 (35.9%)	11 (22.4%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 123.

TABLE 123. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY ETHNICITY – FOREST COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)
YES	13 (76.5%)	213 (64.2%)
NO	4 (23.5%)	119 (35.8%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report '*What language(s) do you speak at home?*' Responses to this item were 1=*English*, 2=*Spanish*, 3=*Hmong*, 4=*Mandarin*, 5=*Other*.... Language was recoded to *English* and *Other*. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 124.

TABLE 124. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY LANGUAGE – FOREST COUNTY

	ENGLISH N (%)	OTHER N (%)
YES	231 (65.3%)	9 (75.0%)
NO	123 (34.7%)	3 (25.0%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Responses compared access to a mental health care provider to annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 125.

TABLE 125. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY INCOME – FOREST COUNTY

	ABOVE ALICE N (%)	BELOW ALICE N (%)
YES	109 (63.0%)	52 (74.3%)
NO	64 (37.0%)	18 (25.7%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 126.

TABLE 126. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY EDUCATION – FOREST COUNTY

	DEGREE N (%)	NO DEGREE N (%)
YES	146 (68.5%)	93 (62.0%)
NO	67 (31.5%)	57 (38.0%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Participants were then asked to report the number of jobs they work (1=*1 job*, 2=*2 jobs*, 3=*3 jobs*, 4=*4 or more jobs*, 5=*I do not work*). Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 127.

TABLE 127. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY NUMBER OF JOBS – FOREST COUNTY

	1 JOB N (%)	2 JOBS N (%)	3 JOBS N (%)	4 JOBS + N (%)	DO NOT WORK N (%)
YES	144 (66.4%)	38 (60.3%)	3 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	50 (70.4%)
NO	73 (33.6%)	25 (39.7%)	3 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	21 (29.6%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Participants were asked to indicate their employment status (1=*I do not work*, 2=*Work # Hours per week- fill in:\_\_\_*, 3=*Unemployed*, 4=*Retired*, 5=*Student*, 6=*Military*, 7=*Homemaker*, 8=*Unable to work due to disability*, 9=*Other:\_\_\_*). Employment status was recoded *Employed* and *Not employed*. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 128.

TABLE 128. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY EMPLOYED – FOREST COUNTY

	EMPLOYED N (%)	NOT EMPLOYED N (%)
YES	172 (64.7%)	68 (68.0%)
NO	94 (35.3%)	32 (32.0%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Participants were then asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 129.

TABLE 129. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY REPORTED DISABILITY – FOREST COUNTY

	REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)	NO REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)
YES	55 (59.8%)	186 (67.6%)
NO	37 (40.2%)	89 (32.4%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Participants were then asked to report if they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had one of the following illnesses reported in Table 130. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 130.

TABLE 130. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY REPORTED ILLNESS – FOREST COUNTY

	YES N (%)	NO N (%)
ADULT-ONSET ASTHMA	15 (62.5%)	9 (37.5%)
HYPERTENSION OR HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE	66 (71.7%)	26 (28.3%)
OVERWEIGHT OR OBESITY	86 (61.0%)	55 (39.0%)
ANXIETY	71 (59.7%)	48 (40.3%)

DEPRESSION	61 (62.2%)	37 (37.8%)
POST TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER (PTSD)	22 (66.7%)	11 (33.3%)
OTHER MENTAL ILLNESS	7 (63.6%)	4 (36.4%)
CANCER	15 (71.4%)	6 (28.6%)
ANGINA OR CORONARY ARTERY DISEASE	4 (50.0%)	4 (50.0%)
CONGESTIVE HEART FAILURE	1 (20.0%)	4 (80.0%)
DIABETES OR HIGH BLOOD SUGAR	29 (72.5%)	11 (27.5%)
HIGH CHOLESTEROL	60 (73.2%)	22 (26.8%)
CHRONIC OBSTRUCTIVE PULMONARY DISEASE (COPD)	4 (44.4%)	5 (55.6%)
MEMORY LOSS	3 (50.0%)	3 (50.0%)
DEMENTIA	--	--
ATTENTION DEFICIT DISORDER (ADD) OR ATTENTION DEFICIT/HYPERACTIVITY DISORDER (ADHD)	13 (56.5%)	10 (43.5%)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*. Participants were also asked '*How has your physical health changed overall since COVID?*' This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried about their physical health since COVID. Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 131.

TABLE 131. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS BY COVID – FOREST COUNTY

		YES N (%)	NO N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	36 (72.0%)	14 (28.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	175 (62.3%)	106 (37.7%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	23 (79.3%)	6 (20.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	191 (63.2%)	111 (36.8%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	30 (69.8%)	13 (30.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	172 (63.2%)	100 (36.8%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	50 (66.7%)	25 (33.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	156 (63.7%)	89 (36.3%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	24 (92.3%)	2 (7.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	193 (62.9%)	114 (37.1%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	47 (64.4%)	26 (25.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	161 (64.9%)	87 (35.1%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	64 (57.1%)	48 (42.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	157 (69.8%)	68 (30.2%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	71 (62.8%)	42 (37.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	145 (66.8%)	72 (33.2%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	14 (66.7%)	7 (33.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	197 (64.2%)	110 (35.8%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report their sexual orientation (1=*Asexual*, 2=*Bisexual*, 3=*Gay*, 4=*Lesbian*, 5=*Pansexual*, 6=*Queer*, 7=*Straight/heterosexual*, 8=*Sexual orientation not listed:\_\_\_*, 9=*Prefer not to answer*). Sexual orientation was recoded *Straight or Heterosexual* and *LGBTQ or Unknown*.

Responses compared access to a mental health care provider to participants sexual orientation. Frequency of responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 132.

TABLE 132. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY SEXUAL ORIENTATION – ONEIDA COUNTY

	STRAIGHT OR HETEROSEXUAL N (%)	LGBTQ OR UNKNOWN N (%)
YES	272 (68.0%)	31 (37.4%)
NO	128 (32.0%)	15 (32.6%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Responses compared access to a mental health care provider and age. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 133.

TABLE 133. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY AGE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
YES	1 (100.0%)	28 (71.8%)	100 (64.5%)	70 (64.8%)	65 (69.9%)	46 (74.2%)	21 (63.6%)
NO	--	11 (28.2%)	55 (35.5%)	38 (35.2%)	28 (30.1%)	16 (25.8%)	12 (36.4%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native: \_\_\_*, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other: \_\_\_*). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 134.

TABLE 134. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY RACE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	WHITE N (%)	NON-WHITE N (%)
YES	293 (66.3%)	38 (77.6%)
NO	149 (33.7%)	11 (22.4%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 135.

TABLE 135. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY ETHNICITY – ONEIDA COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)
YES	34 (87.2%)	287 (65.5%)
NO	5 (12.8%)	151 (34.5%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report '*What language(s) do you speak at home?*' Responses to this item were 1=*English*, 2=*Spanish*, 3=*Hmong*, 4=*Mandarin*, 5=*Other:\_\_\_*. Language was recoded to *English* and *Other*. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 136.

TABLE 136. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY LANGUAGE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	ENGLISH N (%)	OTHER N (%)
YES	322 (67.2%)	7 (63.6%)
NO	157 (32.8%)	4 (36.4%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Responses compared access to a mental health care provider to annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 137.

TABLE 137. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY INCOME – ONEIDA COUNTY

	ABOVE ALICE N (%)	BELOW ALICE N (%)
YES	177 (65.3%)	62 (63.3%)
NO	94 (34.7%)	36 (36.7%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*aster's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 138.

TABLE 138. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY EDUCATION – ONEIDA COUNTY

	DEGREE N (%)	NO DEGREE N (%)
YES	197 (63.8%)	132 (72.9%)
NO	112 (36.2%)	49 (27.1%)



Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Participants were then asked to report the number of jobs they work (1=*1 job*, 2=*2 jobs*, 3=*3 jobs*, 4=*4 or more jobs*, 5=*I do not work*). Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 139.

TABLE 139. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY NUMBER OF JOBS – ONEIDA COUNTY

	1 JOB N (%)	2 JOBS N (%)	3 JOBS N (%)	4 JOBS + N (%)	DO NOT WORK N (%)
YES	117 (65.8%)	40 (71.4%)	3 (60.0%)	2 (66.7%)	102 (69.4%)
NO	92 (34.2%)	16 (28.6%)	2 (40.0%)	1 (33.3%)	45 (30.6%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Participants were asked to indicate their employment status (1=*I do not work*, 2=*Work # Hours per week- fill in:\_\_\_*, 3=*Unemployed*, 4=*Retired*, 5=*Student*, 6=*Military*, 7=*Homemaker*, 8=*Unable to work due to disability*, 9=*Other:\_\_\_*). Employment status was recoded to *Employed* and *Not employed*. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 140.

TABLE 140. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY EMPLOYED – ONEIDA COUNTY

	EMPLOYED N (%)	NOT EMPLOYED N (%)
YES	202 (67.8%)	126 (67.0%)
NO	96 (32.2%)	62 (33.0%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Participants were then asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 141.

TABLE 141. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY REPORTED DISABILITY – ONEIDA COUNTY

	REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)	NO REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)
YES	104 (64.2%)	228 (68.7%)
NO	58 (35.8%)	104 (31.3%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Participants were then asked to report if they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had one of the following illnesses reported in Table 142. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 142.

TABLE 142. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY REPORTED ILLNESS – ONEIDA COUNTY

	YES N (%)	NO N (%)
ADULT-ONSET ASTHMA	33 (73.3%)	12 (26.7%)
HYPERTENSION OR HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE	94 (68.6%)	43 (31.4%)
OVERWEIGHT OR OBESITY	114 (64.8%)	62 (35.2%)

ANXIETY	96 (62.3%)	58 (37.7%)
DEPRESSION	82 (59.4%)	56 (40.6%)
POST TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER (PTSD)	27 (60.0%)	18 (40.0%)
OTHER MENTAL ILLNESS	11 (68.8%)	5 (31.3%)
CANCER	24 (66.7%)	12 (33.3%)
ANGINA OR CORONARY ARTERY DISEASE	9 (56.3%)	7 (43.8%)
CONGESTIVE HEART FAILURE	10 (58.8%)	7 (41.2%)
DIABETES OR HIGH BLOOD SUGAR	55 (75.3%)	18 (24.7%)
HIGH CHOLESTEROL	78 (75.0%)	26 (25.0%)
CHRONIC OBSTRUCTIVE PULMONARY DISEASE (COPD)	13 (86.7%)	2 (13.3%)
MEMORY LOSS	13 (86.7%)	2 (13.3%)
DEMENTIA	--	2 (100.0%)
ATTENTION DEFICIT DISORDER (ADD) OR ATTENTION DEFICIT/HYPERACTIVITY DISORDER (ADHD)	22 (61.1%)	14 (38.9%)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1= *Not worried*, 2= *Worried*, and 3= *No opinion*. Participants were also asked '*How has your physical health changed overall since COVID?*' This item was measured using 1= *Better*, 2= *About the same*, 3= *Worse*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried about their physical health since COVID. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 143.

TABLE 143. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS BY COVID – ONEIDA COUNTY

		YES N (%)	NO N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	59 (75.6%)	19 (24.4%)
	NOT WORRIED	255 (66.8%)	127 (33.2%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	36 (66.7%)	18 (33.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	277 (67.4%)	134 (32.6%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	63 (73.3%)	23 (26.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	239 (65.8%)	124 (34.2%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	87 (71.3%)	35 (28.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	207 (66.3%)	105 (33.7%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	43 (78.2%)	12 (21.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	268 (66.2%)	137 (33.8%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	74 (56.9%)	56 (43.1%)
	NOT WORRIED	228 (71.7%)	90 (28.3%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	81 (56.3%)	63 (43.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	222 (72.5%)	84 (27.5%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	96 (61.5%)	60 (38.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	210 (70.0%)	90 (30.0%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	29 (67.4%)	14 (32.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	282 (67.6%)	135 (32.4%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report their sexual orientation (1=*Asexual*, 2=*Bisexual*, 3=*Gay*, 4=*Lesbian*, 5=*Pansexual*, 6=*Queer*, 7=*Straight/heterosexual*, 8=*Sexual orientation not listed:\_\_\_*, 9=*Prefer not to answer*). Sexual orientation was recoded *Straight or Heterosexual* and *LGBTQ or Unknown*.

Responses compared access to a mental health care provider to participants sexual orientation. Frequency of responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 144.

TABLE 144. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY SEXUAL ORIENTATION – VILAS COUNTY

	STRAIGHT OR HETEROSEXUAL N (%)	LGBTQ OR UNKNOWN N (%)
YES	118 (60.8%)	12 (66.7%)
NO	76 (39.2%)	6 (33.3%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Responses compared access to a mental health care provider and age. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 145.

TABLE 145. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY AGE – VILAS COUNTY

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	75+ N (%)
YES	--	23 (79.3%)	22 (45.8%)	30 (50.8%)	37 (68.5%)	26 (70.3%)	6 (66.7%)
NO	--	6 (20.7%)	26 (54.2%)	29 (49.2%)	17 (31.5%)	11 (29.7%)	3 (33.3%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native: \_\_\_*, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other: \_\_\_*). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 146.

TABLE 146. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY RACE – VILAS COUNTY

	WHITE N (%)	NON-WHITE N (%)
YES	122 (58.7%)	22 (81.5%)
NO	86 (41.3%)	5 (18.5%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 147.

TABLE 147. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY ETHNICITY – VILAS COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)
YES	7 (87.5%)	129 (59.7%)
NO	1 (12.5%)	87 (40.3%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report '*What language(s) do you speak at home?*' Responses to this item were 1=*English*, 2=*Spanish*, 3=*Hmong*, 4=*Mandarin*, 5=*Other:\_\_\_*. Language was recoded to *English* and *Other*. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 148.

TABLE 148. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY LANGUAGE – VILAS COUNTY

	ENGLISH N (%)	OTHER N (%)
YES	142 (60.7%)	2 (100.0%)
NO	92 (39.3%)	--

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Responses compared access to a mental health care provider to annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 149.

TABLE 149. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY INCOME – VILAS COUNTY

	ABOVE ALICE N (%)	BELOW ALICE N (%)
YES	89 (62.2%)	21 (58.3%)
NO	54 (37.8%)	15 (41.7%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*.

Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 150.

TABLE 150. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY EDUCATION – VILAS COUNTY

	DEGREE N (%)	NO DEGREE N (%)
YES	87 (57.6%)	57 (67.1%)
NO	64 (42.4%)	28 (32.9%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Participants were then asked to report the number of jobs they work (1=*1 job*, 2=*2 jobs*, 3=*3 jobs*, 4=*4 or more jobs*, 5=*I do not work*). Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 151.

TABLE 151. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY NUMBER OF JOBS – VILAS COUNTY

	1 JOB N (%)	2 JOBS N (%)	3 JOBS N (%)	4 JOBS + N (%)	DO NOT WORK N (%)
YES	100 (63.7%)	10 (47.6%)	4 (33.3%)	--	29 (65.9%)
NO	57 (36.3%)	11 (52.4%)	8 (66.7%)	1 (100.0%)	15 (34.1%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Participants were asked to indicate their employment status (1=*I do not work*, 2=*Work # Hours per week- fill in:\_\_\_*, 3=*Unemployed*, 4=*Retired*, 5=*Student*, 6=*Military*, 7=*Homemaker*, 8=*Unable to work due to disability*, 9=*Other:\_\_\_*). Employment status was recoded to *Employed* and *Not employed*. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 152.

TABLE 152. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY EMPLOYED – VILAS COUNTY

	EMPLOYED N (%)	NOT EMPLOYED N (%)
YES	99 (58.6%)	43 (66.2%)
NO	70 (41.4%)	22 (33.8%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Participants were then asked to indicate which type(s) of disability they have. Disability was recoded *Reported disability* and *No reported disability*. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 153.

TABLE 153. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY REPORTED DISABILITY – VILAS COUNTY

	REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)	NO REPORTED DISABILITY N (%)
YES	33 (58.9%)	111 (61.7%)
NO	23 (41.1%)	69 (38.3%)

Participants were asked if they have access to a mental health care provider when necessary (e.g., counselor / social worker / therapist / etc.). Responses indicated *Yes* and *No*. Participants were then asked to report if they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had one of the following illnesses reported in Table 154. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 154.

TABLE 154. ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE BY REPORTED ILLNESS – VILAS COUNTY

	YES N (%)	NO N (%)
ADULT-ONSET ASTHMA	9 (56.3%)	7 (43.8%)
HYPERTENSION OR HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE	32 (54.2%)	27 (45.8%)
OVERWEIGHT OR OBESITY	45 (54.9%)	37 (45.1%)
ANXIETY	32 (58.2%)	23 (41.8%)
DEPRESSION	19 (45.2%)	23 (54.8%)
POST TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER (PTSD)	5 (45.5%)	6 (54.5%)
OTHER MENTAL ILLNESS	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)
CANCER	12 (75.0%)	4 (25.0%)
ANGINA OR CORONARY ARTERY DISEASE	5 (83.3%)	1 (16.7%)
CONGESTIVE HEART FAILURE	2 (50.0%)	2 (50.0%)
DIABETES OR HIGH BLOOD SUGAR	16 (59.3%)	11 (40.7%)
HIGH CHOLESTEROL	31 (57.4%)	23 (42.6%)
CHRONIC OBSTRUCTIVE PULMONARY DISEASE (COPD)	4 (36.4%)	7 (63.6%)
MEMORY LOSS	5 (50.0%)	5 (50.0%)
DEMENTIA	2 (100.0%)	--
ATTENTION DEFICIT DISORDER (ADD) OR ATTENTION DEFICIT/HYPERACTIVITY DISORDER (ADHD)	2 (28.6%)	5 (71.4%)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*. Participants were also asked '*How has your physical health changed overall since COVID?*' This item was measured using 1=*Better*, 2=*About the same*, 3=*Worse*.

Responses related to various health statements were compared between those who were worried and not worried about their physical health since COVID. Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 155.

TABLE 155. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS BY COVID – VILAS COUNTY

		YES N (%)	NO N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	22 (52.4%)	20 (47.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	107 (61.1%)	68 (38.9%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	18 (58.1%)	13 (41.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	112 (60.2%)	74 (39.8%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	27 (62.8%)	16 (37.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	103 (59.2%)	71 (40.8%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	34 (54.8%)	28 (45.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	97 (63.8%)	55 (36.2%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	18 (60.0%)	12 (40.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	112 (59.9%)	75 (40.1%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	29 (58.0%)	21 (42.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	100 (62.9%)	59 (37.1%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	42 (53.8%)	36 (46.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	91 (65.9%)	47 (34.1%)

PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	39 (50.0%)	39 (50.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	88 (64.2%)	49 (35.8%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	18 (60.0%)	12 (40.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	113 (61.4%)	71 (38.6%)



## Social and Economic Factors

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1= *Not concerned at all* and 5= *Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their annual income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Responses related to various social/economic factors were compared to participants annual household income. Results are shown in Table 156.

TABLE 156. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY INCOME

	BELOW ALICE M (SD)	ABOVE ALICE M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.60 (1.16)	2.56 (1.08)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.32 (1.34)	2.35 (1.25)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.23 (1.27)	2.09 (1.21)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.21 (1.27)	2.28 (1.31)
CHILD CARE	2.14 (1.43)	2.43 (1.45)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.92 (1.33)	2.34 (1.30)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.34 (1.34)	2.20 (1.21)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	1.94 (1.29)	1.96 (1.20)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1= *Not concerned at all* and 5= *Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1= *Hispanic/Latino*, 2= *Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses are shown in Table 157.

TABLE 157. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY ETHNICITY

	HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.83 (1.04)	2.51 (1.09)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.92 (1.12)	2.22 (1.26)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.68 (1.16)	1.99 (1.19)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.84 (1.44)	2.14 (1.26)
CHILD CARE	2.89 (1.25)	2.20 (1.43)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	3.14 (1.39)	2.38 (1.30)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.75 (1.27)	2.13 (1.21)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	2.84 (1.33)	1.83 (1.16)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1= *Not concerned at all* and 5= *Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their race (1= *White*, 2= *Asian*, 3= *Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4= *African American/Black*, 5= *American Indian or Alaska Native: \_\_\_*, 6= *Two or more races*, 7= *Other: \_\_\_*). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses are shown in Table 158.

TABLE 158. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY RACE

	WHITE M (SD)	NON-WHITE M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.48 (1.08)	2.85 (1.18)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.016 (1.23)	2.91 (1.27)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	1.94 (1.16)	2.67 (1.27)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.10 (1.24)	2.70 (1.44)
CHILD CARE	2.15 (1.41)	2.80 (1.42)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.32 (1.29)	3.09 (1.31)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.07 (1.18)	2.78 (1.30)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	1.79 (1.13)	1.72 (1.32)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses are shown in Table 159.

TABLE 159. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY EDUCATION

	DEGREE M (SD)	NO DEGREE M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.54 (1.09)	2.50 (1.10)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.34 (1.28)	2.11 (1.22)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.08 (1.20)	1.92 (1.180)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.26 (1.32)	2.04 (1.19)
CHILD CARE	2.38 (1.47)	1.99 (1.33)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.37 (1.29)	2.46 (1.34)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.21 (1.24)	2.04 (1.17)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	1.93 (1.20)	1.80 (1.19)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Responses compared concerns about social/economic factors and age. Response frequencies for are shown in Table 160

TABLE 160. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY AGE

	UNDER 18 M (SD)	18-25 M (SD)	26-40 M (SD)	41-55 M (SD)	56-65 M (SD)	66-75 M (SD)	OVER 75 M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.00 (1.10)	2.56 (1.13)	2.43 (1.19)	2.59 (1.10)	2.61 (1.04)	2.64 (.89)	2.18 (.97)

RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.33 (1.75)	2.77 (1.22)	2.46 (1.34)	2.15 (1.20)	1.96 (1.72)	2.15 (1.16)	1.88 (1.22)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.00 (1.55)	2.74 (1.25)	2.47 (1.30)	1.93 (1.16)	1.49 (.77)	1.64 (.89)	1.46 (.83)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	1.67 (1.03)	2.60 (1.26)	2.46 (1.37)	2.11 (1.34)	1.93 (1.12)	1.80 (1.00)	1.85 (1.06)
CHILD CARE	1.67 (.82)	2.95 (1.26)	2.96 (1.40)	2.14 (1.43)	1.59 (1.10)	1.44 (1.07)	1.41 (.92)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	1.50 (.84)	2.84 (1.33)	2.87 (1.33)	2.44 (1.31)	2.02 (1.10)	1.86 (1.12)	1.74 (1.09)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.00 (1.10)	2.68 (1.22)	2.58 (1.34)	2.11 (1.20)	1.69 (.90)	1.68 (.90)	1.68 (.90)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	1.50 (1.23)	2.66 (1.40)	2.25 (1.32)	1.77 (1.12)	1.40 (.78)	1.50 (.81)	5.51 (.99)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1= *Not concerned at all* and 5= *Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their annual income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Responses related to various social/economic factors were compared to participants annual household income for Forest County are shown in Table 161.

TABLE 161. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY INCOME – FOREST COUNTY

	BELOW ALICE M (SD)	ABOVE ALICE M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.68 (1.18)	2.37 (1.04)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.50 (1.34)	2.18 (1.18)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.57 (1.34)	1.90 (1.13)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.39 (1.39)	2.09 (1.25)
CHILD CARE	2.33 (1.52)	2.41 (1.47)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	3.01 (1.41)	2.15 (1.18)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.60 (1.48)	2.13 (1.17)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	2.17 (1.33)	1.82 (1.07)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1= *Not concerned at all* and 5= *Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1= *Hispanic/Latino*, 2= *Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 162.

TABLE 162. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY ETHNICITY – FOREST COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	3.12 (.99)	2.44 (1.07)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.71 (.99)	2.17 (1.22)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.82 (1.29)	1.98 (1.17)

CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.76 (1.52)	2.09 (1.24)
CHILD CARE	3.12 (1.32)	2.23 (1.45)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	3.06 (1.56)	2.29 (1.25)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.71 (1.40)	2.15 (1.20)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	2.50 (1.51)	1.81 (1.09)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native*: \_\_, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other*: \_\_). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses for Forest county are shown in Table 163.

TABLE 163. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY RACE – FOREST COUNTY

	WHITE M (SD)	NON-WHITE M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.41 (1.05)	2.79 (1.20)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.08 (1.16)	2.83 (1.28)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	1.93 (1.15)	2.47 (1.24)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.05 (1.21)	2.47 (1.42)
CHILD CARE	2.23 (1.45)	2.54 (1.44)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.23 (1.24)	2.80 (1.34)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.08 (1.17)	2.65 (1.28)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	1.78 (1.07)	2.16 (1.31)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 164.

TABLE 164. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY EDUCATION – FOREST COUNTY

	DEGREE M (SD)	NO DEGREE M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.47 (1.05)	2.46 (1.13)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.22 (1.21)	2.13 (1.19)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.00 (1.16)	2.03 (1.22)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.20 (1.27)	1.97 (1.22)
CHILD CARE	2.36 (1.50)	2.15 (1.37)

NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.26 (1.23)	2.38 (1.32)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.14 (1.17)	2.18 (1.25)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	1.87 (1.10)	1.79 (1.14)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Responses compared concerns about social/economic factors and age. Response frequencies for are shown in Table 165

TABLE 165. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY AGE – FOREST COUNTY

	UNDER 18 M (SD)	18-25 M (SD)	26-40 M (SD)	41-55 M (SD)	56-65 M (SD)	66-75 M (SD)	OVER 75 M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.00 (1.23)	2.57 (1.21)	2.38 (1.22)	2.54 (1.04)	2.51 (.95)	2.70 (.85)	2.13 (.85)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, ARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	1.80 (1.30)	2.53 (1.33)	2.35 (1.32)	2.22 (1.09)	1.82 (1.07)	2.09 (1.01)	1.75 (1.11)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.00 (1.73)	2.64 (1.33)	2.37 (1.29)	1.85 (1.07)	1.47 (.80)	1.85 (.87)	1.35 (.71)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	1.80 (1.10)	2.55 (1.44)	2.37 (1.32)	2.08 (1.25)	1.57 (.83)	1.94 (1.21)	1.75 (.94)
CHILD CARE	1.80 (.84)	2.98 (1.36)	2.99 (1.45)	2.19 (1.44)	1.60 (1.12)	1.21 (.74)	1.13 (.46)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	1.60 (.89)	2.82 (1.32)	2.81 (1.32)	2.03 (1.05)	1.19 (1.07)	2.13 (1.24)	1.56 (1.16)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.20 (1.10)	2.48 (1.30)	2.50 (1.41)	2.02 (1.06)	1.68 (.95)	2.16 (.97)	1.63 (.77)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	1.60 (1.34)	2.45 (1.45)	2.15 (1.23)	1.67 (.87)	1.47 (.87)	1.52 (.71)	1.36 (.91)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their annual income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Responses related to various social/economic factors were compared to participants annual household income for Oneida County are shown in Table 166.

TABLE 166. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY INCOME – ONEIDA COUNTY

	BELOW ALICE M (SD)	ABOVE ALICE M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.54 (1.16)	2.52 (1.09)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.24 (1.31)	2.38 (1.30)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.08 (1.23)	2.12 (1.22)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.14 (1.30)	2.31 (1.33)
CHILD CARE	2.02 (1.35)	2.42 (1.46)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.92 (1.30)	2.44 (1.35)

SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.22 (1.28)	2.21 (1.19)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	1.85 (1.25)	1.94 (1.17)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1= *Not concerned at all* and 5= *Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1= *Hispanic/Latino*, 2= *Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 167.

TABLE 167. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY ETHNICITY – ONEIDA COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.68 (1.04)	2.45 (1.10)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	3.05 (1.17)	2.21 (1.25)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.61 (1.08)	1.95 (1.18)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.92 (1.48)	2.12 (1.27)
CHILD CARE	2.82 (1.23)	2.15 (1.42)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	3.21 (1.32)	2.43 (1.34)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.82 (1.23)	2.08 (1.20)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	2.97 (1.24)	1.78 (1.13)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1= *Not concerned at all* and 5= *Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their race (1= *White*, 2= *Asian*, 3= *Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4= *African American/Black*, 5= *American Indian or Alaska Native*: \_\_, 6= *Two or more races*, 7= *Other*: \_\_). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 168.

TABLE 168. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY RACE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	WHITE M (SD)	NON-WHITE M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.42 (1.09)	2.94 (1.10)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.18 (1.24)	3.06 (1.14)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	1.89 (1.12)	3.09 (1.21)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.08 (1.23)	3.10 (1.56)
CHILD CARE	2.09 (1.37)	3.13 (1.39)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.37 (1.30)	3.55 (1.23)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.01 (1.13)	3.17 (1.34)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	1.74 (1.09)	3.06 (1.39)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 169.

TABLE 169. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY EDUCATION – ONEIDA COUNTY

	DEGREE M (SD)	NO DEGREE M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.46 (1.11)	2.49 (1.08)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.35 (1.29)	2.16 (1.21)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.08 (1.19)	1.88 (1.16)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.21 (1.33)	2.15 (1.26)
CHILD CARE	2.37 (1.44)	1.89 (1.30)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.45 (1.34)	2.55 (1.35)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.22 (1.25)	1.99 (1.13)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	1.92 (1.17)	1.81 (1.22)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their annual income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Responses related to various social/economic factors were compared to participants annual household income for Vilas County are shown in Table 170.

TABLE 170. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY INCOME – VILAS COUNTY

	BELOW ALICE M (SD)	ABOVE ALICE M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.63 (1.17)	2.88 (1.04)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.18 (1.39)	2.51 (1.33)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.03 (1.17)	2.25 (1.27)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.05 (.93)	2.45 (1.32)
CHILD CARE	2.08 (1.42)	2.48 (1.44)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.76 (1.28)	2.36 (1.34)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.16 (1.20)	2.26 (1.30)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	1.74 (1.31)	2.17 (1.38)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Responses compared concerns about social/economic factors and age. Response frequencies for are shown in Table 171.

TABLE 171. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY AGE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	18-25 M (SD)	26-40 M (SD)	41-55 M (SD)	56-65 M (SD)	66-75 M (SD)	OVER 75 M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.37 (1.15)	2.28 (1.12)	2.63 (1.15)	2.56 (1.02)	2.67 (.95)	2.25 (1.08)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.97 (1.15)	2.44 (1.29)	2.12 (1.26)	1.97 (1.14)	2.24 (1.19)	1.90 (1.19)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.63 (1.26)	2.37 (1.25)	2.00 (1.24)	1.48 (.79)	1.71 (.97)	1.48 (.85)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.71 (1.39)	2.33 (1.35)	2.22 (1.47)	1.94 (1.11)	1.83 (.97)	2.10 (1.19)
CHILD CARE	2.79 (1.32)	2.84 (1.40)	2.17 (1.44)	1.51 (1.00)	1.54 (1.15)	1.61 (1.10)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	3.32 (1.23)	2.83 (1.37)	2.67 (1.39)	2.02 (1.103)	1.82 (1.10)	1.97 (1.10)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.63 (1.22)	2.50 (1.25)	2.23 (1.31)	1.72 (.89)	1.51 (.86)	1.90 (1.06)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	2.63 (1.40)	2.10 (1.23)	1.96 (1.33)	1.37 (.71)	1.47 (.75)	1.79 (1.15)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1= *Not concerned at all* and 5= *Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1= *Hispanic/Latino*, 2= *Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 172.

TABLE 172. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY ETHNICITY – VILAS COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.88 (1.13)	2.74 (1.09)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.75 (1.17)	2.31 (1.35)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.75 (1.39)	2.09 (1.23)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.63 (1.19)	2.24 (1.26)
CHILD CARE	2.75 (1.28)	2.24 (1.43)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	3.00 (1.51)	2.40 (1.10)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.50 (1.31)	2.18 (1.25)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	2.88 (1.46)	1.95 (1.32)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1= *Not concerned at all* and 5= *Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their race (1= *White*, 2= *Asian*, 3= *Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4= *African American/Black*, 5= *American Indian or Alaska Native*: \_\_, 6= *Two or more races*, 7= *Other*: \_\_). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 173.



TABLE 173. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY RACE – VILAS COUNTY

	WHITE M (SD)	NON-WHITE M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.72 (1.06)	2.81 (1.30)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.25 (1.30)	2.77 (1.51)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.06 (1.23)	2.31 (1.26)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.23 (1.27)	2.38 (1.06)
CHILD CARE	2.17 (1.42)	2.65 (1.36)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.36 (1.32)	2.76 (1.17)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.15 (1.26)	2.31 (1.05)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	1.88 (1.28)	2.54 (1.53)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 174.

TABLE 174. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY EDUCATION – VILAS COUNTY

	DEGREE M (SD)	NO DEGREE M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.82 (1.07)	2.59 (1.10)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.51 (1.33)	1.97 (1.27)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.22 (1.27)	1.84 (1.15)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.44 (1.35)	1.93 (.98)
CHILD CARE	2.40 (1.47)	1.92 (1.28)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.37 (1.29)	2.43 (1.34)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.31 (1.31)	1.92 (1.08)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	2.04 (1.38)	1.79 (1.20)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Responses compared concerns about social/economic factors and age. Response frequencies for are shown in Table 175.

TABLE 175. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS BY AGE – VILAS COUNTY

	18-25 M (SD)	26-40 M (SD)	41-55 M (SD)	56-65 M (SD)	66-75 M (SD)	OVER 75 M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.79 (.94)	3.06 (1.16)	2.62 (1.12)	2.80 (1.17)	2.53 (.83)	2.09 (.94)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, ABUSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.86 (1.09)	2.79 (1.38)	2.07 (1.26)	2.09 (1.33)	2.03 (1.24)	2.09 (1.58)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	3.03 (1.09)	3.02 (1.36)	1.95 (1.17)	1.50 (.71)	1.34 (.67)	1.64 (1.03)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.55 (.69)	3.11 (1.36)	1.97 (1.25)	2.27 (1.27)	1.63 (.82)	1.36 (.67)
CHILD CARE	3.10 (1.05)	3.29 (1.25)	2.00 (1.39)	1.71 (1.21)	1.47 (1.16)	1.50 (1.08)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.24 (1.24)	3.13 (1.25)	2.70 (1.38)	2.14 (1.14)	1.70 (1.05)	1.50 (.85)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	3.07 (1.03)	3.04 (1.41)	2.03 (1.19)	1.66 (.86)	1.61 (.79)	1.18 (.41)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	3.00 (1.28)	3.00 (1.56)	1.58 (1.03)	1.36 (.80)	1.53 (.98)	1.09 (.30)

## Environmental Health Factors

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about environmental health factors in our community.*' Responses were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their annual income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Responses related to various environmental health factors were compared to participants annual household income. Shown in Table 176.

TABLE 176. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY INCOME

	ABOVE ALICE M (SD)	BELOW ALICE M (SD)
UNCLEAN / UNSAFE DRINKING WATER (PFAS, LEAD, NITRATES, ARSENIC, BACTERIA)	2.42 (1.36)	2.39 (1.34)
RADON	2.09 (1.20)	1.96 (1.07)
MOSQUITO CARRIED DISEASES	2.32 (1.13)	2.24 (1.13)
TICK BORNE DISEASES	2.98 (1.12)	2.63 (1.15)
POOR AIR QUALITY	1.95 (1.22)	2.07 (1.24)
UNSAFE / UNCLEAR RIVER, CREEK, LAKE WATER	2.25 (1.28)	2.28 (1.27)
GROUNDWATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE	2.18 (1.28)	2.26 (1.28)
OLD OR FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS	2.24 (1.20)	2.19 (1.25)
LEAD BASED PAINT HAZARDS	1.91 (1.16)	2.07 (1.27)
FOOD BORNE OUTBREAKS / UNSAFE FOOD	2.02 (1.19)	2.16 (1.21)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about environmental health factors in our community.*' Responses were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses are shown in Table 177.

TABLE 177. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY ETHNICITY

	HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)
UNCLEAN / UNSAFE DRINKING WATER (PFAS, LEAD, NITRATES, ARSENIC, BACTERIA)	2.80 (1.30)	2.32 (1.34)
RADON	2.70 (1.20)	1.99 (1.14)
MOSQUITO CARRIED DISEASES	2.71 (1.18)	2.25 (1.13)
TICK BORNE DISEASES	3.03 (1.21)	2.85 (1.16)
POOR AIR QUALITY	2.83 (1.37)	1.88 (1.18)
UNSAFE / UNCLEAR RIVER, CREEK, LAKE WATER	3.05 (1.25)	2.17 (1.25)
GROUNDWATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE	2.80 (1.24)	2.13 (1.24)
OLD OR FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS	2.91 (1.26)	2.14 (1.20)
LEAD BASED PAINT HAZARDS	2.83 (1.27)	1.85 (1.15)
FOOD BORNE OUTBREAKS / UNSAFE FOOD	2.84 (1.34)	1.98 (1.17)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about environmental health factors in our community.*' Responses were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native*: \_\_, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other*: \_\_). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses are shown in Table 178.

TABLE 178. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY RACE

	WHITE M (SD)	NON-WHITE M (SD)
UNCLEAN / UNSAFE DRINKING WATER (PFAS, LEAD, NITRATES, ARSENIC, BACTERIA)	2.28 (1.33)	2.86 (1.32)
RADON	1.96 (1.12)	2.58 (1.22)
MOSQUITO CARRIED DISEASES	2.22 (1.11)	2.67 (1.26)
TICK BORNE DISEASES	2.82 (1.15)	2.95 (1.25)
POOR AIR QUALITY	1.83 (1.15)	2.80 (1.43)
UNSAFE / UNCLEAR RIVER, CREEK, LAKE WATER	2.13 (1.23)	2.93 (1.37)
GROUNDWATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE	2.08 (1.21)	2.90 (1.17)
OLD OR FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS	2.08 (1.17)	2.92 (1.32)
LEAD BASED PAINT HAZARDS	1.82 (1.13)	2.62 (1.30)
FOOD BORNE OUTBREAKS / UNSAFE FOOD	1.95 (1.15)	2.73 (1.37)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about environmental health factors in our community.*' Responses were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses are shown in Table 179.

TABLE 179. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY EDUCATION

	DEGREE M (SD)	NO DEGREE M (SD)
UNCLEAN / UNSAFE DRINKING WATER (PFAS, LEAD, NITRATES, ARSENIC, BACTERIA)	2.42 (1.37)	2.21 (1.26)
RADON	2.10 (1.20)	1.92 (1.05)
MOSQUITO CARRIED DISEASES	2.33 (1.17)	2.16 (1.07)
TICK BORNE DISEASES	2.97 (1.15)	2.61 (1.15)
POOR AIR QUALITY	1.97 (1.26)	1.89 (1.15)
UNSAFE / UNCLEAR RIVER, CREEK, LAKE WATER	2.26 (1.31)	2.16 (1.21)
GROUNDWATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE	2.19 (1.28)	2.14 (1.22)
OLD OR FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS	2.24 (1.24)	2.09 (1.19)
LEAD BASED PAINT HAZARDS	1.90 (1.18)	1.92 (1.18)
FOOD BORNE OUTBREAKS / UNSAFE FOOD	2.02 (1.22)	2.05 (1.18)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about environmental health factors in our community.*' Responses were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their annual income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Responses related to various environmental health factors were compared to participants annual household income. Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 180.

TABLE 180. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY INCOME – FOREST COUNTY

	ABOVE ALICE M (SD)	BELOW ALICE M (SD)
UNCLEAN / UNSAFE DRINKING WATER (PFAS, LEAD, NITRATES, ARSENIC, BACTERIA)	1.77 (1.08)	2.14 (1.21)

RADON	1.71 (1.00)	1.96 (1.07)
MOSQUITO CARRIED DISEASES	2.01 (.99)	2.20 (1.18)
TICK BORNE DISEASES	2.63 (1.06)	2.63 (1.24)
POOR AIR QUALITY	1.62 (1.05)	2.17 (1.29)
UNSAFE / UNCLEAR RIVER, CREEK, LAKE WATER	1.88 (1.08)	2.27 (1.33)
GROUNDWATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE	1.72 (1.01)	2.39 (1.43)
OLD OR FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS	2.01 (1.10)	2.17 (1.22)
LEAD BASED PAINT HAZARDS	1.72 (1.00)	2.23 (1.37)
FOOD BORNE OUTBREAKS / UNSAFE FOOD	1.81 (1.11)	2.26 (1.23)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about environmental health factors in our community.*' Responses were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 181.

TABLE 181. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY ETHNICITY – FOREST COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)
UNCLEAN / UNSAFE DRINKING WATER (PFAS, LEAD, NITRATES, ARSENIC, BACTERIA)	2.47 (1.23)	1.85 (1.14)
RADON	2.47 (1.01)	1.78 (1.02)
MOSQUITO CARRIED DISEASES	2.65 (1.22)	2.04 (1.04)
TICK BORNE DISEASES	2.94 (1.20)	2.62 (1.14)
POOR AIR QUALITY	3.06 (1.39)	1.66 (1.06)
UNSAFE / UNCLEAR RIVER, CREEK, LAKE WATER	3.12 (1.41)	1.93 (1.14)
GROUNDWATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE	2.71 (1.36)	1.88 (1.14)
OLD OR FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS	2.82 (1.24)	1.99 (1.13)
LEAD BASED PAINT HAZARDS	2.88 (1.41)	1.76 (1.07)
FOOD BORNE OUTBREAKS / UNSAFE FOOD	2.94 (1.52)	1.89 (1.13)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about environmental health factors in our community.*' Responses were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native*: \_\_, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other*: \_\_). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 182.

TABLE 182. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY RACE – FOREST COUNTY

	WHITE M (SD)	NON-WHITE M (SD)
UNCLEAN / UNSAFE DRINKING WATER (PFAS, LEAD, NITRATES, ARSENIC, BACTERIA)	1.80 (1.10)	2.41 (1.32)
RADON	1.74 (.98)	2.33 (1.18)
MOSQUITO CARRIED DISEASES	2.04 (1.03)	2.37 (1.17)

TICK BORNE DISEASES	2.60 (1.11)	2.84 (1.28)
POOR AIR QUALITY	1.61 (1.00)	2.61 (1.47)
UNSAFE / UNCLEAR RIVER, CREEK, LAKE WATER	1.87 (1.08)	2.78 (1.48)
GROUNDWATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE	1.78 (1.05)	2.82 (1.48)
OLD OR FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS	1.94 (1.09)	2.63 (1.40)
LEAD BASED PAINT HAZARDS	1.73 (1.05)	2.41 (1.40)
FOOD BORNE OUTBREAKS / UNSAFE FOOD	1.85 (1.10)	2.65 (1.42)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about environmental health factors in our community.*' Responses were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses for Forest county are shown in Table 183.

TABLE 183. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY EDUCATION – FOREST COUNTY

	DEGREE M (SD)	NO DEGREE M (SD)
UNCLEAN / UNSAFE DRINKING WATER (PFAS, LEAD, NITRATES, ARSENIC, BACTERIA)	1.88 (1.18)	1.89 (1.10)
RADON	1.81 (1.07)	1.83 (.98)
MOSQUITO CARRIED DISEASES	2.08 (1.07)	2.07 (1.01)
TICK BORNE DISEASES	2.71 (1.12)	2.50 (1.14)
POOR AIR QUALITY	1.72 (1.14)	1.77 (1.11)
UNSAFE / UNCLEAR RIVER, CREEK, LAKE WATER	1.99 (1.20)	1.99 (1.15)
GROUNDWATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE	1.87 (1.16)	2.00 (1.18)
OLD OR FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS	2.08 (1.19)	1.96 (1.11)
LEAD BASED PAINT HAZARDS	1.75 (1.06)	1.91 (1.22)
FOOD BORNE OUTBREAKS / UNSAFE FOOD	1.88 (1.14)	2.04 (1.21)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about environmental health factors in our community.*' Responses were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their annual income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Responses related to various environmental health factors were compared to participants annual household income. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 184.

TABLE 184. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY INCOME – ONEIDA COUNTY

	ABOVE ALICE M (SD)	BELOW ALICE M (SD)
UNCLEAN / UNSAFE DRINKING WATER (PFAS, LEAD, NITRATES, ARSENIC, BACTERIA)	2.82 (1.36)	2.66 (1.44)
RADON	2.22 (1.24)	1.93 (1.02)
MOSQUITO CARRIED DISEASES	2.37 (1.10)	2.27 (1.11)
TICK BORNE DISEASES	3.11 (1.14)	2.66 (1.13)

POOR AIR QUALITY	2.13 (1.23)	2.05 (1.22)
UNSAFE / UNCLEAR RIVER, CREEK, LAKE WATER	2.42 (1.31)	2.31 (1.20)
GROUNDWATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE	2.47 (1.29)	2.18 (1.17)
OLD OR FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS	2.31 (1.22)	2.20 (1.31)
LEAD BASED PAINT HAZARDS	2.02 (1.18)	2.02 (1.21)
FOOD BORNE OUTBREAKS / UNSAFE FOOD	2.07 (1.17)	2.04 (1.15)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about environmental health factors in our community.*' Responses were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 185.

TABLE 185. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY ETHNICITY – ONEIDA COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)
UNCLEAN / UNSAFE DRINKING WATER (PFAS, LEAD, NITRATES, ARSENIC, BACTERIA)	2.92 (1.33)	2.72 (1.37)
RADON	2.77 (1.27)	2.08 (1.16)
MOSQUITO CARRIED DISEASES	2.71 (1.14)	2.32 (1.12)
TICK BORNE DISEASES	3.13 (1.24)	2.95 (1.16)
POOR AIR QUALITY	2.76 (1.30)	2.05 (1.22)
UNSAFE / UNCLEAR RIVER, CREEK, LAKE WATER	3.08 (1.16)	2.33 (1.29)
GROUNDWATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE	2.90 (1.21)	2.35 (1.25)
OLD OR FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS	2.95 (1.28)	2.20 (1.23)
LEAD BASED PAINT HAZARDS	2.85 (1.16)	1.92 (1.19)
FOOD BORNE OUTBREAKS / UNSAFE FOOD	2.82 (1.21)	1.99 (1.16)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about environmental health factors in our community.*' Responses were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native*: \_\_, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other*: \_\_). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 186.

TABLE 186. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY RACE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	WHITE M (SD)	NON-WHITE M (SD)
UNCLEAN / UNSAFE DRINKING WATER (PFAS, LEAD, NITRATES, ARSENIC, BACTERIA)	2.66 (1.38)	3.35 (1.15)
RADON	2.05 (1.14)	2.88 (1.24)
MOSQUITO CARRIED DISEASES	2.27 (1.08)	3.02 (1.30)
TICK BORNE DISEASES	2.92 (1.15)	3.21 (1.29)
POOR AIR QUALITY	2.00 (1.19)	3.13 (1.38)
UNSAFE / UNCLEAR RIVER, CREEK, LAKE WATER	2.30 (1.27)	3.20 (1.29)

GROUNDWATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE	2.32 (1.24)	3.08 (1.20)
OLD OR FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS	2.16 (1.21)	3.18 (1.24)
LEAD BASED PAINT HAZARDS	1.90 (1.17)	2.90 (1.20)
FOOD BORNE OUTBREAKS / UNSAFE FOOD	1.97 (1.14)	2.88 (1.35)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about environmental health factors in our community.*' Responses were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 187.

TABLE 187. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY EDUCATION – ONEIDA COUNTY

	DEGREE M (SD)	NO DEGREE M (SD)
UNCLEAN / UNSAFE DRINKING WATER (PFAS, LEAD, NITRATES, ARSENIC, BACTERIA)	2.83 (1.39)	2.56 (1.31)
RADON	2.22 (1.21)	1.99 (1.10)
MOSQUITO CARRIED DISEASES	2.40 (1.13)	2.25 (1.12)
TICK BORNE DISEASES	3.07 (1.14)	2.73 (1.19)
POOR AIR QUALITY	2.12 (1.27)	2.09 (1.23)
UNSAFE / UNCLEAR RIVER, CREEK, LAKE WATER	2.43 (1.32)	2.35 (1.27)
GROUNDWATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE	2.45 (1.27)	2.30 (1.22)
OLD OR FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS	2.32 (1.25)	2.17 (1.25)
LEAD BASED PAINT HAZARDS	2.02 (1.22)	1.97 (1.20)
FOOD BORNE OUTBREAKS / UNSAFE FOOD	2.06 (1.22)	2.05 (1.14)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about environmental health factors in our community.*' Responses were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their annual income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Responses related to various environmental health factors were compared to participants annual household income. Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 188.

TABLE 188. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY INCOME – VILAS COUNTY

	ABOVE ALICE M (SD)	BELOW ALICE M (SD)
UNCLEAN / UNSAFE DRINKING WATER (PFAS, LEAD, NITRATES, ARSENIC, BACTERIA)	2.46 (1.38)	2.13 (1.28)
RADON	2.31 (1.28)	2.05 (1.18)
MOSQUITO CARRIED DISEASES	2.58 (1.27)	2.24 (1.13)
TICK BORNE DISEASES	3.18 (1.08)	2.55 (1.06)
POOR AIR QUALITY	2.03 (1.31)	1.92 (1.24)
UNSAFE / UNCLEAR RIVER, CREEK, LAKE WATER	2.39 (1.34)	2.21 (1.34)
GROUNDWATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE	2.19 (1.38)	2.24 (1.26)



OLD OR FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS	2.38 (1.27)	2.21 (1.17)
LEAD BASED PAINT HAZARDS	1.94 (1.26)	1.92 (1.19)
FOOD BORNE OUTBREAKS / UNSAFE FOOD	2.18 (1.30)	2.27 (1.35)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about environmental health factors in our community.*' Responses were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 189.

TABLE 189. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY ETHNICITY – VILAS COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)
UNCLEAN / UNSAFE DRINKING WATER (PFAS, LEAD, NITRATES, ARSENIC, BACTERIA)	2.88 (1.36)	2.25 (1.31)
RADON	2.88 (1.36)	2.13 (1.22)
MOSQUITO CARRIED DISEASES	2.88 (1.46)	2.42 (1.24)
TICK BORNE DISEASES	2.75 (1.17)	2.99 (1.15)
POOR AIR QUALITY	2.63 (1.77)	1.87 (1.22)
UNSAFE / UNCLEAR RIVER, CREEK, LAKE WATER	2.75 (1.49)	2.23 (1.29)
GROUNDWATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE	2.50 (1.20)	2.08 (1.30)
OLD OR FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS	2.88 (1.36)	2.25 (1.23)
LEAD BASED PAINT HAZARDS	2.63 (1.60)	1.84 (1.17)
FOOD BORNE OUTBREAKS / UNSAFE FOOD	2.75 (1.67)	2.09 (1.25)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about environmental health factors in our community.*' Responses were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native*: \_\_, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other*: \_\_). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses for Vilas county are shown in Table 190.

TABLE 190. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY RACE – VILAS COUNTY

	WHITE M (SD)	NON-WHITE M (SD)
UNCLEAN / UNSAFE DRINKING WATER (PFAS, LEAD, NITRATES, ARSENIC, BACTERIA)	2.20 (1.30)	2.81 (1.36)
RADON	2.09 (1.21)	2.50 (1.18)
MOSQUITO CARRIED DISEASES	2.38 (1.24)	2.62 (1.27)
TICK BORNE DISEASES	2.95 (1.18)	2.69 (1.09)
POOR AIR QUALITY	1.80 (1.20)	2.58 (1.39)
UNSAFE / UNCLEAR RIVER, CREEK, LAKE WATER	2.17 (1.29)	2.69 (1.29)
GROUNDWATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE	2.01 (1.26)	2.73 (1.43)
OLD OR FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS	2.14 (1.198)	2.96 (1.28)
LEAD BASED PAINT HAZARDS	1.79 (1.16)	2.50 (1.24)
FOOD BORNE OUTBREAKS / UNSAFE FOOD	2.05 (1.25)	2.62 (1.36)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about environmental health factors in our community.*' Responses were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 191.

TABLE 191. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY EDUCATION – VILAS COUNTY

	DEGREE M (SD)	NO DEGREE M (SD)
UNCLEAN / UNSAFE DRINKING WATER (PFAS, LEAD, NITRATES, ARSENIC, BACTERIA)	2.37 (1.34)	2.07 (1.26)
RADON	2.24 (1.27)	1.93 (1.09)
MOSQUITO CARRIED DISEASES	2.55 (1.31)	2.16 (1.07)
TICK BORNE DISEASES	3.15 (1.16)	2.53 (1.08)
POOR AIR QUALITY	2.00 (1.36)	1.69 (0.99)
UNSAFE / UNCLEAR RIVER, CREEK, LAKE WATER	2.32 (1.37)	2.04 (1.15)
GROUNDWATER POLLUTANTS FROM AGRICULTURE	2.11 (1.33)	2.04 (1.24)
OLD OR FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS	2.29 (1.26)	2.13 (1.17)
LEAD BASED PAINT HAZARDS	1.88 (1.25)	1.84 (1.08)
FOOD BORNE OUTBREAKS / UNSAFE FOOD	2.13 (1.29)	2.07 (1.23)

## Physical Environment Factors

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their annual income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Responses related to various physical environmental factors were compared to participants annual household income. Shown in Table 192.

TABLE 192. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS BY INCOME

	ABOVE ALICE M (SD)	BELOW ALICE M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.38 (1.10)	2.39 (1.17)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.21 (1.13)	2.31 (1.14)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.41 (1.26)	2.25 (1.18)
LACK OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.37 (1.27)	2.16 (1.30)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	2.02 (1.21)	1.92 (1.13)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	2.02 (1.19)	2.00 (1.13)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	2.01 (1.22)	2.03 (1.23)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.23 (1.26)	2.30 (1.19)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	1.89 (1.26)	1.83 (1.15)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses are shown in Table 193.

TABLE 193. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS BY ETHNICITY

	HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.87 (1.16)	2.30 (1.11)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.88 (1.24)	2.14 (1.10)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.64 (1.30)	2.28 (1.22)
LACK OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.67 (1.43)	2.21 (1.26)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	2.73 (1.45)	1.87 (1.12)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	3.00 (1.37)	1.95 (1.13)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	3.00 (1.37)	1.90 (1.17)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.91 (1.32)	2.18 (1.22)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	2.70 (1.36)	1.80 (1.20)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native*: \_\_, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other*: \_\_). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses are shown in Table 194.

TABLE 194. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS BY RACE

	WHITE M (SD)	NON-WHITE M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.26 (1.09)	2.88 (1.22)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.10 (1.09)	2.84 (1.23)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.22 (1.21)	2.90 (1.29)
LACK OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.15 (1.24)	2.86 (1.35)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	1.82 (1.09)	2.81 (1.42)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	1.91 (1.10)	2.83 (1.41)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	1.86 (1.12)	2.86 (1.49)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.15 (1.19)	2.80 (1.39)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	1.77 (1.18)	2.49 (1.38)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses are shown in Table 195.

TABLE 195. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS BY EDUCATION

	DEGREE M (SD)	NO DEGREE M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.36 (1.12)	2.28 (1.12)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.25 (1.15)	2.09 (1.09)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.43 (1.26)	2.09 (1.15)
LACK OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.35 (1.30)	2.05 (1.21)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	1.96 (1.19)	1.88 (1.14)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	2.03 (1.18)	1.99 (1.17)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	1.99 (1.24)	1.94 (1.18)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.22 (1.26)	2.22 (1.19)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	1.91 (1.30)	1.77 (1.11)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Responses compared concerns about the physical environment and age. Responses are shown in Table 196.

TABLE 196. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY AGE

	UNDER 18 M (SD)	18-25 M (SD)	26-40 M (SD)	41-55 M (SD)	56-65 M (SD)	66-75 M (SD)	OVER 75 M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.33 (.82)	2.82 (1.14)	2.55 (1.18)	2.23 (1.10)	2.12 (1.00)	2.09 (1.05)	2.01 (1.03)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.00 (1.10)	2.45 (1.29)	2.45 (1.20)	2.16 (1.12)	1.94 (.93)	1.99 (1.01)	1.85 (.94)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	1.50 (.55)	2.42 (1.31)	2.67 (1.25)	2.31 (1.27)	1.96 (1.06)	2.14 (1.15)	1.77 (.99)
LACK OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	1.83 (1.17)	2.47 (1.40)	2.61 (1.30)	2.22 (1.28)	1.90 (1.13)	2.04 (1.15)	1.62 (.97)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	1.83 (.98)	2.39 (1.43)	2.34 (1.29)	1.84 (1.11)	1.46 (.79)	1.70 (.98)	1.49 (.74)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	2.33 (1.03)	2.54 (1.43)	2.36 (1.28)	1.96 (1.12)	1.57 (.84)	1.78 (.96)	1.59 (.92)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	1.67 (1.03)	2.37 (1.46)	2.31 (1.33)	1.79 (1.08)	1.62 (.95)	1.91 (1.16)	1.72 (1.02)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	3.17 (.75)	2.56 (1.40)	2.51 (1.31)	2.07 (1.17)	1.88 (1.02)	2.21 (1.17)	1.93 (1.09)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	1.00 (.00)	2.19 (1.38)	2.12 (1.35)	1.74 (1.17)	1.63 (1.05)	1.66 (1.07)	1.65 (1.12)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their annual income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Responses related to various physical environmental factors were compared to participants annual household income. Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 197.

TABLE 197. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS BY INCOME – FOREST COUNTY

	ABOVE ALICE M (SD)	BELOW ALICE M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.28 (1.10)	2.56 (1.25)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.23 (1.08)	2.43 (1.17)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.38 (1.30)	2.37 (1.24)
LACK OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.33 (1.23)	2.39 (1.39)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	2.03 (1.23)	2.06 (1.20)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	2.01 (1.14)	2.23 (1.19)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	1.98 (1.19)	1.91 (1.16)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.05 (1.23)	2.20 (1.35)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	1.51 (.99)	1.70 (1.12)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 198.

TABLE 198. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS BY ETHNICITY – FOREST COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	3.00 (1.21)	2.31 (1.12)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.88 (.99)	2.22 (1.10)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.59 (1.37)	2.27 (1.23)
LACK OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.82 (1.51)	2.24 (1.22)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	2.65 (1.54)	1.91 (1.12)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	3.00 (1.50)	2.05 (1.09)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	3.00 (1.41)	1.92 (1.15)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.88 (1.32)	2.08 (1.24)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	2.38 (1.15)	1.50 (1.01)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native*: \_\_, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other*: \_\_). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 199.

TABLE 199. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS BY RACE – FOREST COUNTY

	WHITE M (SD)	NON-WHITE M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.27 (1.08)	2.83 (1.36)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.17 (1.07)	2.69 (1.23)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.21 (1.21)	2.82 (1.36)
LACK OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.20 (1.23)	2.65 (1.39)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	1.86 (1.09)	2.65 (1.47)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	2.05 (1.10)	2.57 (1.38)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	1.89 (1.10)	2.67 (1.57)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.04 (1.23)	2.53 (1.37)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	1.47 (.97)	2.15 (1.35)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate*

*degree/technical school, 6= Bachelor's degree, 7= Master's degree, 8= Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.).* Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 200.

TABLE 200. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS BY EDUCATION – FOREST COUNTY

	DEGREE M (SD)	NO DEGREE M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.40 (1.13)	2.25 (1.14)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.39 (1.13)	2.03 (1.05)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.43 (1.30)	2.07 (1.13)
LAKE OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.38 (1.29)	2.09 (1.18)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	2.02 (1.21)	1.87 (1.11)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	2.11 (1.16)	2.09 (1.12)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	2.02 (1.25)	1.94 (1.12)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.07 (1.27)	2.15 (1.23)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	1.58 (1.11)	1.53 (.95)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Responses compared concerns about the physical environment and age. Response for Forest County are shown in Table 201.

TABLE 201. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY AGE – FOREST COUNTY

	UNDER 18 M (SD)	18-25 M (SD)	26-40 M (SD)	41-55 M (SD)	56-65 M (SD)	66-75 M (SD)	OVER 75 M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.40 (.89)	2.73 (1.38)	2.56 (1.20)	2.26 (1.03)	2.09 (1.01)	2.18 (1.03)	1.83 (.92)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	1.80 (1.10)	2.50 (1.35)	2.50 (1.14)	2.24 (1.02)	2.00 (1.04)	2.03 (1.05)	1.71 (.75)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	1.60 (.55)	2.52 (1.44)	2.56 (1.25)	2.28 (1.22)	1.91 (1.12)	2.44 (1.33)	1.58 (.78)
LAKE OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.00 (1.23)	2.52 (1.50)	2.60 (1.33)	2.23 (1.15)	1.89 (1.07)	2.18 (1.22)	1.54 (.72)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	1.60 (.89)	2.38 (1.55)	2.31 (1.24)	1.82 (1.00)	1.57 (.93)	1.88 (1.16)	1.46 (.72)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	2.20 (1.10)	2.68 (1.47)	2.42 (1.20)	1.95 (.94)	1.80 (.98)	2.03 (1.19)	1.29 (.55)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	1.40 (.89)	2.50 (1.52)	2.23 (1.27)	1.79 (1.05)	1.73 (.92)	2.06 (1.35)	1.50 (.72)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	3.00 (.71)	2.67 (1.60)	2.27 (1.34)	1.81 (1.02)	1.91 (1.07)	2.39 (1.35)	1.57 (.90)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	1.00 (.00)	2.29 (1.60)	1.69 (1.13)	1.42 (.82)	1.29 (.76)	1.47 (.90)	1.13 (.34)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their annual income. Income was

recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Responses related to various physical environmental factors were compared to participants annual household income. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 202.

TABLE 202. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS BY INCOME – ONEIDA COUNTY

	ABOVE ALICE M (SD)	BELOW ALICE M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.37 (1.02)	2.40 (1.12)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.17 (1.12)	2.22 (1.04)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.48 (1.23)	2.19 (1.16)
LACK OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.49 (1.27)	2.07 (1.21)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	2.04 (1.17)	1.86 (1.08)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	2.03 (1.16)	1.89 (1.05)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	2.03 (1.20)	2.08 (1.22)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.36 (1.24)	2.35 (1.13)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	1.97 (1.27)	1.90 (1.13)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 203.

TABLE 203. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS BY ETHNICITY – ONEIDA COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.69 (1.06)	2.28 (1.08)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.85 (1.25)	2.08 (1.08)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.64 (1.31)	2.34 (1.22)
LACK OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.66 (1.42)	2.29 (1.27)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	2.82 (1.39)	1.88 (1.11)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	3.11 (1.27)	1.92 (1.10)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	3.05 (1.36)	1.90 (1.16)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.92 (1.29)	2.32 (1.19)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	2.74 (1.43)	1.89 (1.23)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native*: \_\_, 6=*Two or more races*,



7=*Other: \_\_\_*). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 204.

TABLE 204. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS BY RACE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	WHITE M (SD)	NON-WHITE M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.26 (1.07)	2.81 (1.05)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.05 (1.06)	3.04 (1.22)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.27 (1.21)	3.12 (1.18)
LACK OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.22 (1.25)	3.12 (1.35)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	1.84 (1.07)	3.02 (1.39)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	1.90 (1.06)	3.13 (1.42)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	1.86 (1.10)	3.18 (1.50)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.27 (1.15)	3.14 (1.38)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	1.85 (1.20)	2.88 (1.41)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 205.

TABLE 205. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS BY EDUCATION – ONEIDA COUNTY

	DEGREE M (SD)	NO DEGREE M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.29 (1.06)	2.35 (1.11)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.20 (1.15)	2.08 (1.05)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.52 (1.25)	2.09 (1.16)
LACK OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.48 (1.32)	2.02 (1.18)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	2.01 (1.19)	1.89 (1.11)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	2.06 (1.17)	1.95 (1.14)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	2.05 (1.25)	1.92 (1.17)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.37 (1.21)	2.34 (1.20)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	2.01 (1.32)	1.88 (1.16)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Responses compared concerns about the physical environment and age. Response for Oneida County are shown in Table 206.

TABLE 206. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY AGE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	18-25 M (SD)	26-40 M (SD)	41-55 M (SD)	56-65 M (SD)	66-75 M (SD)	OVER 75 M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.57 (.84)	2.43 (1.11)	2.35 (1.14)	2.15 (1.02)	2.09 (1.00)	2.18 (1.13)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.53 (1.18)	2.26 (1.17)	2.20 (1.21)	1.89 (.87)	2.00 (.98)	1.97 (1.06)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.51 (1.17)	2.68 (1.24)	2.44 (1.29)	1.89 (1.05)	2.18 (1.16)	2.06 (1.17)
LACK OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.74 (1.35)	2.59 (1.26)	2.33 (1.39)	1.99 (1.13)	2.06 (1.15)	1.85 (1.20)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	2.68 (1.44)	2.26 (1.24)	1.96 (1.20)	1.41 (.65)	1.70 (.91)	1.59 (.84)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	2.72 (1.45)	2.20 (1.23)	2.06 (1.21)	1.57 (.78)	1.78 (.85)	1.94 (1.13)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	2.45 (1.50)	2.20 (1.31)	1.89 (1.13)	1.61 (.95)	1.96 (1.09)	1.97 (1.20)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.79 (1.14)	2.54 (1.24)	2.33 (1.29)	1.95 (1.06)	2.28 (1.06)	2.31 (1.18)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	2.18 (1.23)	2.21 (1.37)	1.94 (1.27)	1.62 (1.06)	1.67 (1.01)	2.00 (1.37)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their annual income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Responses related to various physical environmental factors were compared to participants annual household income. Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 207.

TABLE 207. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS BY INCOME – VILAS COUNTY

	ABOVE ALICE M (SD)	BELOW ALICE M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.55 (1.24)	2.08 (1.09)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.25 (1.22)	2.33 (1.31)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.32 (1.28)	2.18 (1.14)
LACK OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.20 (1.29)	1.97 (1.35)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	1.97 (1.28)	1.82 (1.12)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	2.00 (1.31)	1.87 (1.17)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	1.99 (1.31)	2.13 (1.36)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.23 (1.31)	2.33 (1.06)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	2.22 (1.40)	1.90 (1.27)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned*

at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 208.

TABLE 208. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS BY ETHNICITY – VILAS COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	3.50 (1.41)	2.31 (1.17)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	3.00 (1.77)	2.15 (1.15)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.75 (1.28)	2.17 (1.19)
LACK OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.38 (1.41)	2.02 (1.25)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	2.50 (1.69)	1.80 (1.16)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	2.50 (1.60)	1.83 (1.22)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	2.75 (1.49)	1.85 (1.21)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.88 (1.64)	2.08 (1.21)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	3.13 (1.46)	2.08 (1.32)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native*: \_\_, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other*: \_\_). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 209.

TABLE 209. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS BY RACE – VILAS COUNTY

	WHITE M (SD)	NON-WHITE M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.26 (1.16)	3.08 (1.28)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.11 (1.15)	2.74 (1.23)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.13 (1.19)	2.67 (1.33)
LACK OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	1.94 (1.25)	2.74 (1.26)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	1.71 (1.13)	2.70 (1.38)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	1.75 (1.17)	2.78 (1.40)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	1.80 (1.21)	2.63 (1.28)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.03 (1.19)	2.67 (1.33)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	2.06 (1.35)	2.41 (1.25)

Participants were asked: '*Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*.

Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate*

*degree/technical school, 6= Bachelor's degree, 7= Master's degree, 8= Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.). Education was recoded No degree and Degree. Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 210.*

TABLE 210. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS BY EDUCATION – VILAS COUNTY

	DEGREE M (SD)	NO DEGREE M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	2.41 (1.24)	2.21 (1.11)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.15 (1.16)	2.22 (1.22)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.24 (1.22)	2.10 (1.20)
LAKE OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.03 (1.25)	2.02 (1.31)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	1.78 (1.167)	1.88 (1.25)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	1.84 (1.20)	1.91 (1.30)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	1.83 (1.20)	2.00 (1.31)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.11 (1.29)	2.11 (1.10)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	2.18 (1.42)	1.96 (1.17)

Participants were asked: *'Please rate the degree to which you're concerned about the physical environment in our community.'* Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned* at all and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Responses compared concerns about the physical environment and age. Response for Vilas County are shown in Table 211.

TABLE 211. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FACTORS BY AGE – VILAS COUNTY

	18-25 M (SD)	26-40 M (SD)	41-55 M (SD)	56-65 M (SD)	66-75 M (SD)	OVER 75 M (SD)
TRASH / LITTER IN PUBLIC AREAS	3.30 (.99)	2.90 (1.29)	1.97 (1.10)	2.09 (.98)	2.03 (1.15)	1.91 (.94)
LACK OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES	2.28 (1.36)	2.94 (1.30)	1.95 (1.08)	1.94 (.90)	1.95 (1.06)	1.82 (.98)
LACK OF SIDEWALKS / WALKING PATHS	2.14 (1.30)	2.90 (1.26)	2.13 (1.33)	2.11 (1.02)	1.82 (.90)	1.33 (.49)
LAKE OF BIKE LANES / BIKE PATHS	2.03 (1.24)	2.71 (1.38)	2.00 (1.28)	1.77 (1.19)	1.87 (1.10)	1.17 (.39)
LACK OF SAFE PLACES FOR RECREATION / PARKS	2.00 (1.20)	2.69 (1.49)	1.67 (1.10)	1.44 (.86)	1.55 (.95)	1.25 (.45)
UNSAFE NEIGHBORHOODS / CRIME	2.10 (1.29)	2.77 (1.51)	1.82 (1.27)	1.36 (.72)	1.55 (.86)	1.25 (.45)
UNSAFE / ABANDONED BUILDINGS	2.07 (1.33)	2.85 (1.40)	1.60 (1.03)	1.52 (.97)	1.68 (1.12)	1.50 (.91)
UNSAFE ROADS / HIGHWAYS	2.10 (1.35)	2.94 (1.37)	2.05 (1.10)	1.73 (.90)	1.92 (1.19)	1.58 (.90)
OVERDEVELOPMENT / TOO MANY NEW BUILDINGS	2.07 (1.28)	2.79 (1.41)	1.92 (1.37)	1.96 (1.19)	1.81 (1.29)	1.75 (1.06)

## Sexual Orientation

Participants were then asked to report their sexual orientation (1=*Asexual*, 2=*Bisexual*, 3=*Gay*, 4=*Lesbian*, 5=*Pansexual*, 6=*Queer*, 7=*Straight/heterosexual*, 8=*Sexual orientation not listed: \_\_\_*, 9=*Prefer not to answer*). Sexual orientation was recoded *Straight or Heterosexual* and *LGBTQ or Unknown*.

Participants were then asked: '*How would you rate your own mental health?*' Responses correspond to a 5-point scale (1=*Very Healthy*, 2=*Healthy*, 3=*Somewhat Healthy*, 4=*Unhealthy*, 5=*Very Healthy*). Responses are shown in Table 212.

TABLE 212. SEXUAL ORIENTATION BY PERSONAL MENTAL HEALTH

	MENTAL HEALTH M (SD)
STRAIGHT OR HETEROSEXUAL	2.29 (.87)
LGBTQ OR UNKNOWN	2.66 (.96)

Participants were then asked to report their sexual orientation (1=*Asexual*, 2=*Bisexual*, 3=*Gay*, 4=*Lesbian*, 5=*Pansexual*, 6=*Queer*, 7=*Straight/heterosexual*, 8=*Sexual orientation not listed: \_\_\_*, 9=*Prefer not to answer*). Sexual orientation was recoded *Straight or Heterosexual* and *LGBTQ or Unknown*.

Participants were then asked to indicate what their current housing situation is like (1=*I have housing and I'm not worried about losing it*, 2=*I have housing and I'm worried about losing it*, 3=*do not have housing (staying with others, in a hotel, in a shelter)*, 4=*I do not have housing (living on the street, park, or car)*). Responses are shown in Table 213.

TABLE 213. SEXUAL ORIENTATION BY HOUSING

	YES, WORRIED N (%)	YES, NOT WORRIED N (%)	NO, WITH OTHERS N (%)	NO, LIVING ON STREET N (%)
STRAIGHT OR HETEROSEXUAL	86 (84.3%)	806 (92.4%)	19 (65.5%)	--
LGBTQ OR UNKNOWN	16 (15.7%)	66 (7.6%)	10 (34.5%)	1 (100.0%)

Participants were then asked to report their sexual orientation (1=*Asexual*, 2=*Bisexual*, 3=*Gay*, 4=*Lesbian*, 5=*Pansexual*, 6=*Queer*, 7=*Straight/heterosexual*, 8=*Sexual orientation not listed: \_\_\_*, 9=*Prefer not to answer*). Sexual orientation was recoded *Straight or Heterosexual* and *LGBTQ or Unknown*.

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Responses related to various social/economic factors were compared with participants sexual orientation. Responses are shown in Table 214.

TABLE 214. SEXUAL ORIENTATION BY SOCIAL ECONOMIC FACTORS

	STRAIGHT OR HETEROSEXUAL M (SD)	LGBTQ OR UNKNOWN M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.51 (1.09)	2.70 (1.09)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.23 (1.22)	2.65 (1.48)

FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.02 (1.20)	2.30 (1.22)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.16 (1.27)	2.38 (1.29)
CHILD CARE	2.24 (1.42)	2.51 (1.52)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.37 (1.30)	2.76 (1.43)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.16 (1.22)	2.23 (1.21)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	1.89 (1.19)	1.89 (1.21)

Participants were then asked to report their sexual orientation (1=*Asexual*, 2=*Bisexual*, 3=*Gay*, 4=*Lesbian*, 5=*Pansexual*, 6=*Queer*, 7=*Straight/heterosexual*, 8=*Sexual orientation not listed: \_\_\_*, 9=*Prefer not to answer*). Sexual orientation was recoded *Straight or Heterosexual* and *LGBTQ or Unknown*.

Participants were then asked: '*How would you rate your own mental health?*' Responses correspond to a 5-point scale (1=*Very Healthy*, 2=*Healthy*, 3=*Somewhat Healthy*, 4=*Unhealthy*, 5=*Very Unhealthy*). Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 215.

TABLE 215. SEXUAL ORIENTATION BY PERSONAL MENTAL HEALTH – FOREST COUNTY

	MENTAL HEALTH M (SD)
STRAIGHT OR HETEROSEXUAL	2.35 (.87)
LGBTQ OR UNKNOWN	2.68 (1.05)

Participants were then asked to report their sexual orientation (1=*Asexual*, 2=*Bisexual*, 3=*Gay*, 4=*Lesbian*, 5=*Pansexual*, 6=*Queer*, 7=*Straight/heterosexual*, 8=*Sexual orientation not listed: \_\_\_*, 9=*Prefer not to answer*). Sexual orientation was recoded *Straight or Heterosexual* and *LGBTQ or Unknown*.

Participants were then asked to indicate what their current housing situation is like (1=*I have housing and I'm not worried about losing it*, 2=*I have housing and I'm worried about losing it*, 3=*I do not have housing (staying with others, in a hotel, in a shelter)*, 4=*I do not have housing (living on the street, park, or car)*). Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 216.

TABLE 216. SEXUAL ORIENTATION BY HOUSING – FOREST COUNTY

	YES, WORRIED N (%)	YES, NOT WORRIED N (%)	NO, WITH OTHERS N (%)	NO, LIVING ON STREET N (%)
STRAIGHT OR HETEROSEXUAL	26 (92.9%)	279 (91.8%)	6 (66.7%)	--
LGBTQ OR UNKNOWN	2 (7.1%)	25 (8.2%)	3 (33.3%)	--

Participants were then asked to report their sexual orientation (1=*Asexual*, 2=*Bisexual*, 3=*Gay*, 4=*Lesbian*, 5=*Pansexual*, 6=*Queer*, 7=*Straight/heterosexual*, 8=*Sexual orientation not listed: \_\_\_*, 9=*Prefer not to answer*). Sexual orientation was recoded *Straight or Heterosexual* and *LGBTQ or Unknown*.

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Responses related to various social/economic factors were compared with participants sexual orientation. Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 217.

TABLE 217. SEXUAL ORIENTATION BY SOCIAL ECONOMIC FACTORS – FOREST COUNTY

	STRAIGHT OR HETEROSEXUAL M (SD)	LGBTQ OR UNKNOWN M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.45 (1.10)	2.57 (1.01)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.19 (1.20)	2.32 (1.30)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	1.98 (1.18)	2.41 (1.30)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.08 (1.24)	2.39 (1.38)
CHILD CARE	2.28 (1.45)	2.47 (1.33)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.25 (1.24)	2.65 (1.56)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.16 (1.22)	2.39 (1.28)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	1.85 (1.11)	1.84 (1.07)

Participants were then asked to report their sexual orientation (1=*Asexual*, 2=*Bisexual*, 3=*Gay*, 4=*Lesbian*, 5=*Pansexual*, 6=*Queer*, 7=*Straight/heterosexual*, 8=*Sexual orientation not listed: \_\_\_*, 9=*Prefer not to answer*). Sexual orientation was recoded *Straight or Heterosexual* and *LGBTQ or Unknown*.

Participants were then asked: '*How would you rate your own mental health?*' Responses correspond to a 5-point scale (1=*Very Healthy*, 2=*Healthy*, 3=*Somewhat Healthy*, 4=*Unhealthy*, 5=*Very Unhealthy*). Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 218.

TABLE 218. SEXUAL ORIENTATION BY PERSONAL MENTAL HEALTH – ONEIDA COUNTY

	MENTAL HEALTH M (SD)
STRAIGHT OR HETEROSEXUAL	2.29 (.86)
LGBTQ OR UNKNOWN	2.74 (.98)

Participants were then asked to report their sexual orientation (1=*Asexual*, 2=*Bisexual*, 3=*Gay*, 4=*Lesbian*, 5=*Pansexual*, 6=*Queer*, 7=*Straight/heterosexual*, 8=*Sexual orientation not listed: \_\_\_*, 9=*Prefer not to answer*). Sexual orientation was recoded *Straight or Heterosexual* and *LGBTQ or Unknown*.

Participants were then asked to indicate what their current housing situation is like (1=*I have housing and I'm not worried about losing it*, 2=*I have housing and I'm worried about losing it*, 3=*I do not have housing (staying with others, in a hotel, in a shelter)*, 4=*I do not have housing (living on the street, park, or car)*). Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 219.

TABLE 219. SEXUAL ORIENTATION BY HOUSING – ONEIDA COUNTY

	YES, WORRIED N (%)	YES, NOT WORRIED N (%)	NO, WITH OTHERS N (%)	NO, LIVING ON STREET N (%)
STRAIGHT OR HETEROSEXUAL	39 (78.0%)	352 (92.4%)	11 (73.3%)	--
LGBTQ OR UNKNOWN	11 (22.0%)	29 (7.6%)	4 (26.7%)	1 (100.0%)

Participants were then asked to report their sexual orientation (1=*Asexual*, 2=*Bisexual*, 3=*Gay*, 4=*Lesbian*, 5=*Pansexual*, 6=*Queer*, 7=*Straight/heterosexual*, 8=*Sexual orientation not listed: \_\_\_*, 9=*Prefer not to answer*). Sexual orientation was recoded *Straight or Heterosexual* and *LGBTQ or Unknown*.

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Responses related to various social/economic factors were compared with participants sexual orientation. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 220.

TABLE 220. SEXUAL ORIENTATION BY SOCIAL ECONOMIC FACTORS – ONEIDA COUNTY

	STRAIGHT OR HETEROSEXUAL M (SD)	LGBTQ OR UNKNOWN M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.46 (1.09)	2.67 (1.11)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.22 (1.20)	2.93 (1.47)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	1.99 (1.20)	2.31 (1.13)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.18 (1.32)	2.46 (1.21)
CHILD CARE	2.19 (1.40)	2.76 (1.57)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.46 (1.33)	2.72 (1.43)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.15 (1.22)	2.28 (1.15)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	1.89 (1.19)	1.93 (1.18)

Participants were then asked to report their sexual orientation (1=*Asexual*, 2=*Bisexual*, 3=*Gay*, 4=*Lesbian*, 5=*Pansexual*, 6=*Queer*, 7=*Straight/heterosexual*, 8=*Sexual orientation not listed: \_\_\_*, 9=*Prefer not to answer*). Sexual orientation was recoded *Straight or Heterosexual* and *LGBTQ or Unknown*.

Participants were then asked: '*How would you rate your own mental health?*' Responses correspond to a 5-point scale (1=*Very Healthy*, 2=*Healthy*, 3=*Somewhat Healthy*, 4=*Unhealthy*, 5=*Very Unhealthy*). Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 221.

TABLE 221. SEXUAL ORIENTATION BY PERSONAL MENTAL HEALTH – VILAS COUNTY

	MENTAL HEALTH M (SD)
STRAIGHT OR HETEROSEXUAL	2.17 (.87)
LGBTQ OR UNKNOWN	2.44 (.78)

Participants were then asked to report their sexual orientation (1=*Asexual*, 2=*Bisexual*, 3=*Gay*, 4=*Lesbian*, 5=*Pansexual*, 6=*Queer*, 7=*Straight/heterosexual*, 8=*Sexual orientation not listed: \_\_\_*, 9=*Prefer not to answer*). Sexual orientation was recoded *Straight or Heterosexual* and *LGBTQ or Unknown*.

Participants were then asked to indicate what their current housing situation is like (1=*I have housing and I'm not worried about losing it*, 2=*I have housing and I'm worried about losing it*, 3=*I do not have housing (staying with others, in a hotel, in a shelter)*, 4=*I do not have housing (living on the street, park, or car)*). Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 222.



TABLE 222. SEXUAL ORIENTATION BY HOUSING – VILAS COUNTY

	YES, WORRIED N (%)	YES, NOT WORRIED N (%)	NO, WITH OTHERS N (%)	NO, LIVING ON STREET N (%)
STRAIGHT OR HETEROSEXUAL	21 (87.5%)	175 (93.6%)	2 (40.0%)	--
LGBTQ OR UNKNOWN	3 (12.5%)	12 (6.4%)	3 (60.0%)	--

Participants were then asked to report their sexual orientation (1=*Asexual*, 2=*Bisexual*, 3=*Gay*, 4=*Lesbian*, 5=*Pansexual*, 6=*Queer*, 7=*Straight/heterosexual*, 8=*Sexual orientation not listed: \_\_\_*, 9=*Prefer not to answer*). Sexual orientation was recoded *Straight or Heterosexual* and *LGBTQ or Unknown*.

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Responses related to various social/economic factors were compared with participants sexual orientation. Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 223.

TABLE 223. SEXUAL ORIENTATION BY SOCIAL ECONOMIC FACTORS – VILAS COUNTY

	STRAIGHT OR HETEROSEXUAL M (SD)	LGBTQ OR UNKNOWN M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.69 (1.06)	3.00 (1.19)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.32 (1.31)	2.50 (1.72)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.13 (1.24)	2.11 (1.37)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.24 (1.23)	2.17 (1.38)
CHILD CARE	2.28 (1.39)	1.94 (1.59)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.36 (1.31)	3.06 (1.21)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.19 (1.24)	1.83 (1.20)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	1.97 (1.31)	1.89 (1.53)

## Income

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were then asked to indicate what their current housing situation is like (1=*I have housing and I'm not worried about losing it*, 2=*I have housing and I'm worried about losing it*, 3=*I do not have housing (staying with others, in a hotel, in a shelter)*, 4=*I do not have housing (living on the street, park, or car)*). Response frequencies are shown in Table 224.

TABLE 224. INCOME BY HOUSING SITUATION

	YES, WORRIED N (%)	YES, NOT WORRIED N (%)	NO, WITH OTHERS N (%)	NO, LIVING ON STREET N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	44 (50.6%)	537 (78.9%)	10 (41.7%)	--
BELOW ALICE	43 (49.4%)	144 (21.1%)	14 (58.3%)	1 (100.0%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were also asked to report whether their housing met their needs (1=*Yes*, 2=*No*). Response frequencies are shown in Table 225.

TABLE 225. INCOME BY HOUSING NEEDS MET

	YES N (%)	NO N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	558 (94.3%)	34 (5.7%)
BELOW ALICE	161 (78.5%)	44 (21.5%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were also asked to report if they had concerns about not having stable housing within the next 3 months (1=*Yes*, 2=*No*). Response frequencies are shown in Table 226.

TABLE 226. INCOME BY HOUSING STABILITY CONCERNS

	YES N (%)	NO N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	52 (8.9%)	531 (91.1%)
BELOW ALICE	47 (23.3%)	155 (76.7%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants then reported whether they had reliable transportation (1=*Yes*, 2=*No*). Response frequencies are shown in Table 227.

TABLE 227. INCOME BY ACCESS TO RELIABLE TRANSPORTATION

	YES N (%)	NO N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	574 (77.0%)	17 (33.3%)
BELOW ALICE	171 (23.0%)	34 (66.7%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were then asked to indicate their employment status (1=*I do not work*, 2=*Work # Hours per week- fill in:\_\_\_* 3=*Unemployed*, 4=*Retired*, 5=*Student*, 6=*Military*, 7=*Homemaker*, 8=*Unable to work due to disability*, 9=*Other:\_\_\_*). Employment status was recoded to *Employed* and *Not employed*. Response frequencies are shown in Table 228.

TABLE 228. INCOME BY JOB STATUS

	EMPLOYED N (%)	NOT EMPLOYED N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	454 (81.4%)	136 (56.4%)
BELOW ALICE	104 (18.6%)	105 (43.6%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were then asked to report the number of jobs they work (1=*1 job*, 2=*2 jobs*, 3=*3 jobs*, 4=*4 or more jobs*, 5=*I do not work*). Response frequencies are shown in Table 229.

TABLE 229. INCOME BY NUMBER OF JOBS

	1 JOB N (%)	2 JOBS N (%)	3 JOBS N (%)	4 JOBS + N (%)	DO NOT WORK N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	389 (81.2%)	82 (77.4%)	16 (88.9%)	1 (33.3%)	101 (54.0%)
BELOW ALICE	90 (18.8%)	24 (22.6%)	2 (11.1%)	2 (66.7%)	86 (46.0%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Income was compared across age groups. Response frequencies are shown in Table 230.

TABLE 230. INCOME FACTORS BY AGE

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	OVER 75 N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	2 (0.3%)	49 (8.3%)	204 (34.5%)	160 (27.1%)	107 (18.1%)	52 (8.8%)	17 (2.9%)
BELOW ALICE	1 (0.5%)	26 (12.4%)	58 (27.6%)	33 (15.7%)	36 (17.1%)	38 (18.1%)	18 (8.6%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were then asked to indicate what their current housing situation is like (1=*I have housing and I'm not worried about losing it*, 2=*I have housing and I'm worried about losing it*, 3=*I do not have housing (staying with others, in a hotel, in a shelter)*, 4=*I do not have housing (living on the street, park, or car)*). Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 231.

TABLE 231. INCOME BY HOUSING SITUATION – FOREST COUNTY

	YES, WORRIED N (%)	YES, NOT WORRIED N (%)	NO, WITH OTHERS N (%)	NO, LIVING ON STREET N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	9 (36.0%)	163 (76.2%)	3 (50.0%)	--
BELOW ALICE	16 (64.0%)	51 (23.8%)	3 (50.0%)	--

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were also asked to report whether their housing met their needs (1=*Yes*, 2=*No*). Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 232.

TABLE 232. INCOME BY HOUSING NEEDS MET – FOREST COUNTY

	YES N (%)	NO N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	172 (74.5%)	4 (26.7%)
BELOW ALICE	59 (25.5%)	11 (73.3%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were also asked to report if they had concerns about not having stable housing within the next 3 months (1=*Yes*, 2=*No*). Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 233.

TABLE 233. INCOME BY HOUSING STABILITY CONCERNS – FOREST COUNTY

	YES N (%)	NO N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	10 (5.9%)	159 (94.1%)
BELOW ALICE	19 (27.5%)	50 (72.5%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants then reported whether they had reliable transportation (1=*Yes*, 2=*No*). Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 234.

TABLE 234. INCOME BY ACCESS TO RELIABLE TRANSPORTATION – FOREST COUNTY

	YES N (%)	NO N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	173 (73.9%)	2 (18.2%)
BELOW ALICE	61 (26.1%)	9 (81.8%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were then asked to indicate their employment status (1=*I do not work*, 2=*Work # Hours per week- fill in:\_\_\_* 3=*Unemployed*, 4=*Retired*, 5=*Student*, 6=*Military*, 7=*Homemaker*, 8=*Unable to work due to disability*, 9=*Other:\_\_\_*). Employment status was recoded to *Employed* and *Not employed*. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 235.

TABLE 235. INCOME BY JOB STATUS – FOREST COUNTY

	EMPLOYED N (%)	NOT EMPLOYED N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	141 (76.6%)	35 (56.5%)
BELOW ALICE	43 (23.4%)	27 (43.5%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were then asked to report the number of jobs they work (1=*1 job*, 2=*2 jobs*, 3=*3 jobs*, 4=*4 or more jobs*, 5=*I do not work*). Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 236.

TABLE 236. INCOME BY NUMBER OF JOBS – FOREST COUNTY

	1 JOB N (%)	2 JOBS N (%)	3 JOBS N (%)	4 JOBS + N (%)	DO NOT WORK N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	109 (76.2%)	36 (76.6%)	4 (80.0%)	--	26 (55.3%)
BELOW ALICE	34 (23.8%)	11 (23.4%)	1 (20.0%)	--	21 (44.7%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Income was compared across age groups. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 237.

TABLE 237. INCOME FACTORS BY AGE – FOREST COUNTY

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	OVER 75 N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	2 (1.1%)	11 (6.2%)	67 (38.2%)	57 (32.5%)	25 (14.2%)	8 (4.5%)	5 (2.8%)
BELOW ALICE	--	8 (11.4%)	23 (32.8%)	10 (14.2%)	12 (17.1%)	11 (15.7%)	6 (.08%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were then asked to indicate what their current housing situation is like (1=*I have housing and I'm not worried about losing it*, 2=*I have housing and I'm worried about losing it*, 3=*I do not have housing (staying with others, in a hotel, in a shelter)*, 4=*I do not have housing (living on the street, park, or car)*). Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 238.

TABLE 238. INCOME BY HOUSING SITUATION – ONEIDA COUNTY

	YES, WORRIED N (%)	YES, NOT WORRIED N (%)	NO, WITH OTHERS N (%)	NO, LIVING ON STREET N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	24 (57.1%)	243 (78.4%)	5 (38.5%)	--
BELOW ALICE	18 (42.9%)	67 (21.6%)	8 (61.5%)	1 (100.0%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were also asked to report whether their housing met their needs (1=*Yes*, 2=*No*). Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 239.

TABLE 239. INCOME BY HOUSING NEEDS MET – ONEIDA COUNTY

	YES N (%)	NO N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	247 (77.7%)	25 (50.0%)
BELOW ALICE	71 (22.3%)	25 (50.0%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were also asked to report if they had concerns about not having stable housing within the next 3 months (1=*Yes*, 2=*No*). Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 240.

TABLE 240. INCOME BY HOUSING STABILITY CONCERNS – ONEIDA COUNTY

	YES N (%)	NO N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	28 (10.4%)	242 (89.6%)
BELOW ALICE	23 (24.2%)	72 (75.8%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants then reported whether they had reliable transportation (1= *Yes*, 2= *No*). Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 241.

TABLE 241. INCOME BY ACCESS TO RELIABLE TRANSPORTATION – ONEIDA COUNTY

	YES N (%)	NO N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	260 (76.7%)	12 (41.4%)
BELOW ALICE	79 (23.3%)	17 (58.6%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were then asked to indicate their employment status (1= *I do not work*, 2= *Work # Hours per week- fill in:\_\_\_* 3= *Unemployed*, 4= *Retired*, 5= *Student*, 6= *Military*, 7= *Homemaker*, 8= *Unable to work due to disability*, 9= *Other:\_\_\_*). Employment status was recoded to *Employed* and *Not employed*. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 242.

TABLE 242. INCOME BY JOB STATUS – ONEIDA COUNTY

	EMPLOYED N (%)	NOT EMPLOYED N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	195 (82.3%)	75 (56.4%)
BELOW ALICE	42 (17.7%)	58 (43.6%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were then asked to report the number of jobs they work (1= *1 job*, 2= *2 jobs*, 3= *3 jobs*, 4= *4 or more jobs*, 5= *I do not work*). Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 243.

TABLE 243. INCOME BY NUMBER OF JOBS – ONEIDA COUNTY

	1 JOB N (%)	2 JOBS N (%)	3 JOBS N (%)	4 JOBS + N (%)	DO NOT WORK N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	173 (82.4%)	33 (73.3%)	3 (100.0%)	1 (50.0%)	60 (55.6%)
BELOW ALICE	37 (17.6%)	12 (26.7%)	--	1 (50.0%)	48 (44.4%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Income was compared across age groups. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 244.

TABLE 244. INCOME FACTORS BY AGE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	OVER 75 N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	0 (0.0%)	17 (6.3%)	102 (37.5%)	68 (25.0%)	50 (18.4%)	28 (10.3%)	7 (2.6%)
BELOW ALICE	1 (1.0%)	10 (9.9%)	30 (29.7%)	18 (17.8%)	15 (14.9%)	17 (16.8%)	10 (9.9%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were then asked to indicate what their current housing situation is like (1=*I have housing and I'm not worried about losing it*, 2=*I have housing and 'm worried about losing it*, 3=*I do not have housing (staying with others, in a hotel, in a shelter)*, 4=*I do not have housing (living on the street, park, or car)*). Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 245.

TABLE 245. INCOME BY HOUSING SITUATION – VILAS COUNTY

	YES, WORRIED N (%)	YES, NOT WORRIED N (%)	NO, WITH OTHERS N (%)	NO, LIVING ON STREET N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	11 (55.0%)	131 (83.4%)	2 (40.0%)	--
BELOW ALICE	9 (45.0%)	26 (16.6%)	3 (60.0%)	--

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were also asked to report whether their housing met their needs (1=*Yes*, 2=*No*). Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 246.

TABLE 246. INCOME BY HOUSING NEEDS MET – VILAS COUNTY

	YES N (%)	NO N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	139 (81.8%)	5 (38.5%)
BELOW ALICE	31 (18.2%)	8 (61.5%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were also asked to report if they had concerns about not having stable housing within the next 3 months (1=*Yes*, 2=*No*). Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 247.

TABLE 247. INCOME BY HOUSING STABILITY CONCERNS – VILAS COUNTY

	YES N (%)	NO N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	14 (9.7%)	130 (90.3%)
BELOW ALICE	5 (13.2%)	33 (86.8%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants then reported whether they had reliable transportation (1=*Yes*, 2=*No*). Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 248.

TABLE 248. INCOME BY ACCESS TO RELIABLE TRANSPORTATION – VILAS COUNTY

	YES N (%)	NO N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	141 (82.0%)	3 (27.3%)
BELOW ALICE	31 (18.0%)	8 (72.7%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were then asked to indicate their employment status (1=*I do not work*, 2=*Work # Hours per week- fill in:\_\_\_* 3=*Unemployed*, 4=*Retired*, 5=*Student*, 6=*Military*, 7=*Homemaker*, 8=*Unable to work due to disability*, 9=*Other:\_\_\_*). Employment status was recoded to *Employed* and *Not employed*. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 249.

TABLE 249. INCOME BY JOB STATUS – VILAS COUNTY

	EMPLOYED N (%)	NOT EMPLOYED N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	118 (86.1%)	26 (56.5%)
BELOW ALICE	19 (13.9%)	20 (43.5%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Participants were then asked to report the number of jobs they work (1=*1 job*, 2=*2 jobs*, 3=*3 jobs*, 4=*4 or more jobs*, 5=*I do not work*). Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 250.

TABLE 250. INCOME BY NUMBER OF JOBS – VILAS COUNTY

	1 JOB N (%)	2 JOBS N (%)	3 JOBS N (%)	4 JOBS + N (%)	DO NOT WORK N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	107 (84.9%)	13 (92.9%)	9 (90.0%)	--	15 (46.9%)
BELOW ALICE	19 (15.1%)	1 (7.1%)	1 (10.0%)	1 (100.0%)	17 (53.1%)

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Income was compared across age groups. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 251.

TABLE 251. INCOME FACTORS BY AGE – VILAS COUNTY

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	OVER 75 N (%)
ABOVE ALICE	21 (7.7%)	35 (12.9%)	35 (12.9%)	32 (11.8%)	16 (5.9%)	5 (1.8%)	144 (52.9%)
BELOW ALICE	8 (7.9%)	5 (5.0%)	5 (5.0%)	9 (8.9%)	10 (9.9%)	2 (2.0%)	39 (38.6%)



## Food Assistance

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1= *Not concerned at all* and 5= *Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. The results are presented in Table 252.

TABLE 252. SOCIAL / ECONOMIC FACTORS BY FOOD STAMP STATUS

	RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.81 (1.14)	2.45 (1.06)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.61 (1.30)	2.17 (1.23)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.72 (1.31)	1.86 (1.10)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.68 (1.38)	2.05 (1.21)
CHILD CARE	2.69 (1.40)	2.12 (1.40)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	3.13 (1.30)	2.25 (1.26)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.75 (1.32)	2.01 (1.14)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	2.60 (1.42)	1.71 (1.06)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1= *Strongly disagree* and 5= *Strongly agree*. Participants were then asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. The results are presented in Table 253.

TABLE 253. OVERALL COMMUNITY THOUGHTS BY FOOD STAMP STATUS

	RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	3.77 (1.05)	4.20 (1.01)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.62 (1.04)	4.07 (.98)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.04 (1.20)	4.01 (1.15)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.30 (1.25)	3.19 (1.20)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.65 (1.08)	3.53 (1.08)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	3.32 (1.31)	2.73 (1.30)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.67 (1.13)	3.84 (1.03)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.68 (1.04)	4.14 (.93)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.51 (1.09)	3.33 (1.05)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	3.97 (1.14)	4.19 (1.21)

THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.54 (1.09)	3.42 (1.16)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	3.00 (1.23)	2.37 (1.17)

Participants were asked: '*How would you rate your own physical health.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Very unhealthy* at all and 5=*Very healthy*. Participants were then asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. The results are presented in Table 254.

TABLE 254. PERSONAL HEALTH BY FOOD STAMP STATUS

	RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)
PERSONAL HEALTH	3.54 (.89)	3.74 (.76)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*. Participants were then asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Table 255 shows the number of people who indicated they were worried about a given health item.

TABLE 255. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS (WORRIED) BY FOOD STAMP STATUS

		RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS N (%)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	77 (47.2%)	93 (10.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	93 (39.1%)	760 (84%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	50 (25.4%)	63 (7%)
	NOT WORRIED	117 (59.4%)	797 (88.2%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	71 (36%)	99 (11%)
	NOT WORRIED	93 (47.2%)	733 (81.2%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	81 (41.5%)	176 (19.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	81 (41.5%)	642 (71.4%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	64 (32.8%)	44 (4.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	106 (54.4%)	808 (89.8%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	83 (42.3%)	169 (18.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	80 (40.8%)	662 (73.1%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	74 (37.6%)	259 (28.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	91 (46.2%)	595 (65.5%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	72 (36.9%)	276 (30.4%)
	NOT WORRIED	90 (46.2%)	581 (64.1%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	53 (27%)	39 (4.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	108 (55.1%)	814 (90.1%)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses originally correspond to a 5-point scale (1=*Yes*, 2=*No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3=*No, I experience*

*neighborhood violence or crime*, 4=*No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5=*No, other*). We recoded to *Safe* and *Not safe*. Responses compared participants safety concerns and their *Food Stamps* status. Response frequencies are shown in Table 256.

TABLE 256. SAFETY CONCERNS BY FOOD STAMP STATUS

	RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS N (%)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS N (%)
SAFE	162 (80.6%)	850 (93.4%)
NOT SAFE	39 (19.4%)	60 (6.6%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Food stamp status was then compared across age groups. The results for are presented in Table 257.

TABLE 257. FOOD STAMP STATUS BY AGE

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	OVER 75 N (%)
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	1 (.05%)	45 (22.6%)	87 (43.7%)	27 (13.6%)	19 (9.5%)	14 (7.0%)	6 (3.0%)
NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	5 (0.6%)	67 (7.4%)	223 (24.6%)	240 (26.5%)	185 (20.4%)	125 (13.8%)	62 (6.8%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native*: \_\_, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other*: \_\_). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses are shown in Table 258.

TABLE 258. FOOD STAMP STATUS BY RACE

	WHITE N (%)	NON-WHITE N (%)
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	134 (67.7%)	64 (32.3%)
NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	847 (93.4%)	60 (6.6%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses are shown in Table 259.

TABLE 259. FOOD STAMP STATUS BY ETHNICITY

	HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	39 (20.7%)	149 (79.3%)
NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	25 (2.9%)	851 (97.1%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses for are shown in Table 260.

TABLE 260. FOOD STAMP STATUS BY EDUCATION

	DEGREE N (%)	NO DEGREE N (%)
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	74 (37.2%)	125 (62.8%)
NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	606 (67.0%)	299 (33.0%)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1= *Not concerned at all* and 5= *Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. The results for Forest County are presented in Table 261.

TABLE 261. SOCIAL / ECONOMIC FACTORS BY FOOD STAMP STATUS - FOREST COUNTY

	RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.91 (1.14)	2.39 (1.05)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.64 (1.32)	2.10 (1.16)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.79 (1.39)	1.86 (1.07)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.50 (1.44)	2.03 (1.19)
CHILD CARE	2.67 (1.42)	2.20 (1.44)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.93 (1.36)	2.19 (1.21)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.77 (1.37)	2.03 (1.13)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	2.42 (1.39)	1.73 (1.02)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1= *Strongly disagree* and 5= *Strongly agree*. Participants were then asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. The results for Forest County are presented in Table 262.

TABLE 262. OVERALL COMMUNITY THOUGHTS BY FOOD STAMP STATUS – FOREST COUNTY

	RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	3.93 (1.11)	4.20 (1.06)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.67 (.96)	4.07 (.97)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.05 (1.17)	4.02 (1.13)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.42 (1.38)	3.12 (1.18)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.64 (1.25)	3.46 (1.08)

MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	2.87 (1.41)	2.45 (1.24)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.75 (1.17)	4.00 (.99)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.50 (1.11)	4.05 (.95)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.45 (1.11)	3.31 (1.05)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.04 (1.18)	4.17 (1.10)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.65 (1.15)	3.50 (1.14)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	3.04 (1.12)	2.67 (1.15)

Participants were asked: '*How would you rate your own physical health.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Very unhealthy* at all and 5=*Very healthy*. Participants were then asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. The results for Forest County are presented in Table 263.

TABLE 263. PERSONAL HEALTH BY FOOD STAMP STATUS - FOREST COUNTY

	RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)
PERSONAL HEALTH	3.66 (1.01)	3.68 (.72)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*. Participants were then asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Table 264 shows the number of people who indicated they were worried about a given health item for Forest County .

TABLE 264. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS (WORRIED) BY FOOD STAMP STATUS - FOREST COUNTY

		RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS N (%)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	15 (26.8%)	36 (11.4%)
	NOT WORRIED	30 (53.6%)	259 (82%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	8 (14.3%)	21 (6.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	32 (57.1%)	278 (88.5%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	17 (30.9%)	26 (8.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	24 (43.6%)	255 (81.5%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	15 (26.8%)	60 (19.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	28 (50%)	223 (71.5%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	13 (23.2%)	12 (3.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	32 (57.1%)	283 (90.1%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	16 (29.1%)	57 (18.1%)
	NOT WORRIED	25 (45.5%)	231 (73.3%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	16 (28.6%)	97 (30.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	28 (50%)	205 (64.5%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	17 (30.9%)	97 (30.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	27 (49.1%)	198 (62.5%)

ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	8 (14.3%)	13 (4.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	30 (53.6%)	285 (91.1%)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses originally correspond to a 5-point scale (1=*Yes*, 2=*No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3=*No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4=*No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5=*No, other*). We recoded responses to *Safe* and *Not safe*. Responses compared participants safety concerns and their *Food Stamps* status. Response frequencies for Forest County are shown in Table 265.

TABLE 265. SAFETY CONCERNS BY FOOD STAMP STATUS - FOREST COUNTY

	RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS N (%)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS N (%)
SAFE	47 (83.9%)	299 (93.7%)
NOT SAFE	9 (16.1%)	26 (6.3%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Food stamp status was then compared across age groups. The results for Forest County are presented in Table 266.

TABLE 266. INCOME FACTORS BY AGE - FOREST COUNTY

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	OVER 75 N (%)
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	1 (1.8%)	11 (19.6%)	27 (48.2%)	6 (10.7%)	3 (5.4%)	6 (10.7%)	2 (3.6%)
NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	4 (1.3%)	33 (10.5%)	81 (25.7%)	94 (29.8%)	53 (16.8%)	29 (9.2%)	21 (6.7%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native: —*, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other: —*). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 267.

TABLE 267. FOOD STAMP STATUS BY RACE - FOREST COUNTY

	WHITE N (%)	NON-WHITE N (%)
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	39 (69.6%)	17 (30.4%)
NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	284 (89.9%)	32 (10.1%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 268.

TABLE 268. FOOD STAMP STATUS BY ETHNICITY – FOREST COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	8 (15.4%)	44 (84.6%)
NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	9 (3.0%)	295 (97.0%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 269.

TABLE 269. FOOD STAMP STATUS BY EDUCATION - FOREST COUNTY

	DEGREE N (%)	NO DEGREE N (%)
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	17 (30.4%)	39 (69.6%)
NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	201 (63.8%)	114 (36.2%)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. The results for Oneida County are presented in Table 270.

TABLE 270. SOCIAL / ECONOMIC FACTORS BY FOOD STAMP STATUS – ONEIDA COUNTY

	RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	2.70 (1.16)	2.39 (1.06)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.62 (1.30)	2.17 (1.22)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.65 (1.29)	1.82 (1.08)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.78 (1.41)	2.00 (1.21)
CHILD CARE	2.65 (1.42)	2.05 (1.37)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	3.28 (1.28)	2.26 (1.27)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.78 (1.33)	1.95 (1.10)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	2.67 (1.45)	1.65 (.99)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=*Strongly disagree* and 5=*Strongly agree*. Participants were then asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. The results for Oneida County are presented in Table 271.

TABLE 271. OVERALL COMMUNITY THOUGHTS BY FOOD STAMP STATUS – ONEIDA COUNTY

	RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	3.77 (1.01)	4.19 (.98)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.63 (1.04)	4.03 (1.01)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.03 (1.23)	3.99 (1.21)

PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.33 (1.18)	3.19 (1.21)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.71 (.96)	3.55 (1.05)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	3.57 (1.23)	2.86 (1.27)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.70 (1.06)	3.70 (1.02)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.83 (.96)	4.15 (.92)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.63 (1.04)	3.34 (1.06)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	4.07 (1.02)	4.25 (1.11)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.48 (1.04)	3.34 (1.16)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	2.98 (1.26)	2.18 (1.13)

Participants were asked: '*How would you rate your own physical health.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Very unhealthy* at all and 5=*Very healthy*. Participants were then asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. The results for Oneida County are presented in Table 272.

TABLE 272. PERSONAL HEALTH BY FOOD STAMP STATUS – ONEIDA COUNTY

	RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)
PERSONAL HEALTH	3.50 (.82)	3.71 (.77)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*. Participants were then asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Table 273 shows the number of people who indicated they were worried about a given health item for Oneida County .

TABLE 273. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS (WORRIED) BY FOOD STAMP STATUS – ONEIDA COUNTY

		RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS N (%)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	45 (41.3%)	34 (8.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	52 (47.7%)	334 (86.5%)
MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	28 (25.7%)	27 (7.0%)
	NOT WORRIED	69 (63.3%)	346 (89.4%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	42 (38.2%)	44 (11.4%)
	NOT WORRIED	53 (48.2%)	315 (81.6%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	41 (38.3%)	72 (18.8%)
	NOT WORRIED	50 (46.7%)	276 (71.9%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	37 (34.6%)	19 (4.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	59 (55.1%)	350 (90.9%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	46 (42.2%)	80 (20.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	51 (46.8%)	276 (71.5%)



CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	41 (37.6%)	103 (26.6%)
	NOT WORRIED	51 (46.8%)	260 (67.2%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	39 (36.1%)	118 (30.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	52 (48.1%)	252 (65.1%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	29 (26.9%)	15 (3.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	67 (62%)	354 (91.5%)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses originally correspond to a 5-point scale (1=*Yes*, 2=*No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3=*No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4=*No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5=*No, other*). We recoded responses to be *Safe* and *Not safe*. Responses compared participants safety concerns and their *Food Stamps* status. Response frequencies for Oneida County are shown in Table 274.

TABLE 274. SAFETY CONCERNS BY FOOD STAMP STATUS - ONEIDA COUNTY

	RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS N (%)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS N (%)
SAFE	87 (77.7%)	362 (93.3%)
NOT SAFE	25 (22.3%)	26 (6.7%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Food stamp status was then compared across age groups. The results for Oneida County are presented in Table 275.

TABLE 275. INCOME FACTORS BY AGE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	OVER 75 N (%)
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	----	22 (20.0%)	48 (43.6%)	17 (15.5%)	12 (10.9%)	8 (7.3%)	3 (2.7%)
NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	1 (0.3%)	17 (4.4%)	108 (27.9%)	91 (23.5%)	81 (20.9%)	59 (15.2%)	30 (7.8%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native: \_\_*, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other: \_\_*). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 276.

TABLE 276. FOOD STAMP STATUS BY RACE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	WHITE N (%)	NON-WHITE N (%)
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	76 (69.7%)	33 (30.3%)
NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	371 (95.9%)	16 (4.1%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 277.

TABLE 277 FOOD STAMP STATUS BY ETHNICITY – ONEIDA COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	26 (24.8%)	79 (75.2%)
NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	13 (3.4%)	364 (96.6%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 278.

TABLE 278. FOOD STAMP STATUS BY EDUCATION – ONEIDA COUNTY

	DEGREE N (%)	NO DEGREE N (%)
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	51 (46.4%)	59 (53.6%)
NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	262 (68.1%)	123 (31.9%)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they are concerned about the several social/economic factors. Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Not concerned at all* and 5=*Extremely concerned*. Participants were then asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. The results for Vilas County are presented in Table 279.

TABLE 279. SOCIAL / ECONOMIC FACTORS BY FOOD STAMP STATUS - VILAS COUNTY

	RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)
AGING RELATED HEALTH CONCERNS	3.00 (1.04)	2.68 (1.08)
RACE / ETHNIC RELATIONS, IMMIGRATION, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION	2.53 (1.24)	2.28 (1.34)
FAMILY ISSUES (EX. DIVORCE, PARENTING)	2.88 (1.26)	1.19 (1.18)
CAREGIVER SUPPORT	2.63 (1.12)	2.17 (1.24)
CHILD CARE	2.84 (1.34)	2.12 (1.41)
NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES AND FOOD	2.97 (1.23)	2.30 (1.30)
SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	2.63 (1.21)	2.08 (1.23)
VIOLENCE IN THE HOME OR COMMUNITY	2.66 (1.35)	1.80 (1.52)

Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with the following statements regarding their community. Questions are based on a 5-point scale, where 1=*Strongly disagree* and 5=*Strongly agree*. Participants were then asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. The results for Vilas County are presented in Table 280.

TABLE 280. OVERALL COMMUNITY THOUGHTS BY FOOD STAMP STATUS - VILAS COUNTY

	RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)
THERE ARE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO COME TOGETHER IN MY COMMUNITY (SUCH AS PLACES OF WORSHIP, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LIBRARIES, AND/OR PARKS)	3.53 (1.07)	4.22 (.94)
I CAN GENERALLY MANAGE THE NORMAL STRESSES OF LIFE	3.50 (1.19)	4.17 (.90)
I HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR MY BASIC NEEDS	3.06 (1.19)	4.01 (1.06)
PEOPLE ARE TREATED RESPECTFULLY, REGARDLESS OF RACE, CULTURE, RELIGION, GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, INCOME LEVEL, DISABILITY, OR AGE	3.00 (1.24)	3.29 (1.19)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF ELDERLY PEOPLE	3.44 (1.19)	3.63 (1.12)
MY COMMUNITY HAS ACCESS TO A VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (SUCH AS PUBLIC BUSES, TAXIS, BIKES, BIKE LANES, TRAILS, AND SIDEWALKS)	3.19 (1.20)	2.92 (1.37)
I FEEL LIKE I BELONG IN MY COMMUNITY	3.42 (1.17)	3.86 (1.07)
I FEEL SAFE IN MY COMMUNITY	3.44 (1.13)	4.25 (.92)
MY COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	3.19 (1.17)	3.34 (1.04)
I HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNET	3.50 (1.36)	4.10 (1.14)
THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO EXPLORE INTERESTS AND PARTICIPATE IN POSITIVE ACTIVITIES	3.53 (1.16)	3.43 (1.17)
HOUSES AND APARTMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE AFFORDABLE AND LIVABLE	3.00 (1.34)	2.29 (1.21)

Participants were asked: '*How would you rate your own physical health.*' Response options were based on a 5-point scale where 1=*Very unhealthy* at all and 5=*Very healthy*. Participants were then asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. The results for Vilas County are presented in Table 281.

TABLE 281. PERSONAL HEALTH BY FOOD STAMP STATUS – VILAS COUNTY

	RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS M (SD)
PERSONAL HEALTH	3.48 (.90)	3.86 (.81)

Participants were asked to consider their level of concern with various health related statements. This item was measured using three response options: 1=*Not worried*, 2=*Worried*, and 3=*No opinion*. Participants were then asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Table 282 shows the number of people who indicated they were worried about a given health item for Vilas County .

TABLE 282. PERSONAL HEALTH CONCERNS (WORRIED) BY FOOD STAMP STATUS – VILAS COUNTY

		RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS N (%)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS N (%)
SMOKING CIGARETTES OR USING COMMERCIAL TOBACCO	WORRIED	17 (53.1%)	23 (11.3%)
	NOT WORRIED	11 (34.4%)	167 (82.3%)

MY OWN ALCOHOL USE	WORRIED	14 (43.8%)	15 (7.4%)
	NOT WORRIED	16 (50%)	173 (85.2%)
MY OWN DISABILITY	WORRIED	12 (37.5%)	29 (14.2%)
	NOT WORRIED	16 (50%)	163 (79.9%)
MY OWN CHRONIC DISEASE	WORRIED	16 (50%)	44 (21.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	12 (37.5%)	143 (70.4%)
USING SUBSTANCES (MARIJUANA, METH, COCAINE, MISUSE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS)	WORRIED	14 (43.8%)	13 (6.5%)
	NOT WORRIED	15 (46.9%)	175 (87.1%)
MY OWN MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES	WORRIED	16 (50%)	32 (15.7%)
	NOT WORRIED	9 (28.1%)	155 (76%)
CONSUMING HEALTHY NUTRITIOUS FOODS	WORRIED	17 (53.1%)	59 (28.9%)
	NOT WORRIED	12 (37.5%)	130 (63.7%)
PARTICIPATING IN ANY FORM OF DAILY EXERCISE	WORRIED	16 (50%)	61 (30%)
	NOT WORRIED	11 (34.4%)	131 (64.5%)
ENGAGING IN SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (THAT CAN LEAD TO AN STI, HIV, OR AN UNPLANNED PREGNANCY)	WORRIED	16 (50%)	11 (5.4%)
	NOT WORRIED	11 (34.4%)	175 (86.2%)

Participants were asked: '*Do you feel safe at home or in our community?*' Responses originally correspond to a 5-point scale (1=*Yes*, 2=*No, I experience spouse or partner violence*, 3=*No, I experience neighborhood violence or crime*, 4=*No, there are harmful conditions in my home*, 5=*No, other*). We recoded responses to be *Safe* and *Not safe*. Responses compared participants safety concerns and their *Food Stamps* status. Response frequencies for Vilas County are shown in Table 283.

TABLE 283. SAFETY CONCERNS BY FOOD STAMP STATUS - VILAS COUNTY

	RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS N (%)	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS N (%)
SAFE	28 (84.4%)	189 (93.1%)
NOT SAFE	5 (15.6%)	14 (6.9%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Food stamp status was then compared across age groups. The results for Vilas County are presented in Table 284.

TABLE 284. FOOD STAMP STATUS BY AGE – VILAS COUNTY

	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	OVER 75 N (%)
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	12 (36.4%)	12 (36.4%)	4 (12.1%)	4 (12.1%)	--	1 (3.0%)
NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	17 (8.3%)	34 (16.6%)	55 (26.8%)	51 (24.9%)	37 (18.0%)	11 (5.4%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native: \_\_*, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other: \_\_*). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 285.

TABLE 285. FOOD STAMP STATUS BY RACE – VILAS COUNTY

	WHITE N (%)	NON-WHITE N (%)
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	19 (57.6%)	14 (42.4%)
NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	192 (94.1%)	12 (5.9%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 286.

TABLE 286. FOOD STAMP STATUS BY ETHNICITY – VILAS COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	5 (16.1%)	26 (83.9%)
NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	3 (1.5%)	192 (98.5%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they received *Food Stamps*. Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*aster's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 287.

TABLE 287. FOOD STAMP STATUS BY EDUCATION - VILAS COUNTY

	DEGREE N (%)	NO DEGREE N (%)
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	6 (18.2%)	27 (81.8%)
NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS	143 (69.8%)	61 (30.2%)

## Cancer

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Responses were then compared across age groups. The results are presented in Table 288.

TABLE 288. CANCER STATUS BY AGE

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	OVER 75 N (%)
HAS CANCER	--	--	6 (7.8%)	12 (15.6%)	21 (27.3%)	21 (27.3%)	17 (22.1%)
DOES NOT HAVE CANCER	6 (.6%)	112 (10.7%)	307 (29.4%)	256 (24.5%)	188 (18.0%)	121 (11.6%)	53 (5.1%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native*: \_\_, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other*: \_\_). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses are shown in Table 289.

TABLE 289. CANCER STATUS BY RACE

	WHITE N (%)	NON-WHITE N (%)
HAS CANCER	73 (94.8%)	4 (5.2%)
DOES NOT HAVE CANCER	920 (88.2%)	123 (11.8%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses are shown in Table 290.

TABLE 290. CANCER STATUS BY ETHNICITY

	HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)
HAS CANCER	1 (1.4%)	73 (98.6%)
DOES NOT HAVE CANCER	63 (6.3%)	940 (93.7%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses are shown in Table 291.

TABLE 291. CANCER STATUS BY EDUCATION

	DEGREE N (%)	NO DEGREE N (%)
HAS CANCER	47 (61.8%)	29 (38.2%)
DOES NOT HAVE CANCER	639 (61.3%)	404 (38.7%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Income was compared across groups. The results are presented in Table 292.

TABLE 292. CANCER STATUS BY INCOME

	ABOVE ALICE N (%)	BELOW ALICE N (%)
HAS CANCER	21 (60.0%)	18 (40.0%)
DOES NOT HAVE CANCER	565 (74.6%)	192 (25.4%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Responses were then compared across age groups. The results for Forest County are presented in Table 293.

TABLE 293. CANCER STATUS BY AGE – FOREST COUNTY

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	OVER 75 N (%)
HAS CANCER	--	--	5 (22.7%)	5 (22.7%)	6 (27.3%)	3 (13.6%)	3 (13.6%)
DOES NOT HAVE CANCER	5 (1.4%)	44 (12.5%)	103 (29.3%)	95 (27.0%)	51 (14.5%)	32 (9.1%)	22 (6.3%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native*: \_\_, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other*: \_\_). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses for Forest county are shown in Table 294.

TABLE 294. CANCER STATUS BY RACE – FOREST COUNTY

	WHITE N (%)	NON-WHITE N (%)
HAS CANCER	20 (90.9%)	2 (9.1%)
DOES NOT HAVE CANCER	306 (86.7%)	47 (13.3%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 295.

TABLE 295. CANCER STATUS BY ETHNICITY – FOREST COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)
HAS CANCER	--	21 (100%)
DOES NOT HAVE CANCER	17 (5.0%)	320 (95.0%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*aster's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses for Forest County are shown in Table 296.

TABLE 296. CANCER STATUS BY EDUCATION – FOREST COUNTY

	DEGREE N (%)	NO DEGREE N (%)
HAS CANCER	13 (61.9%)	8 (38.1%)
DID NOT REPORT HAVING CANCER	206 (58.4%)	147 (41.6%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Income was compared across groups. The results for Forest County are presented in Table 297.

TABLE 297. CANCER STATUS BY INCOME – FOREST COUNTY

	ABOVE ALICE N (%)	BELOW ALICE N (%)
HAS CANCER	6 (46.2%)	7 (53.8%)
DID NOT REPORT HAVING CANCER	170 (73.0%)	63 (27.0%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Responses were then compared across age groups. The results for Oneida County are presented in Table 298.

TABLE 298. CANCER STATUS BY AGE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	UNDER 18 N (%)	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	OVER 75 N (%)
HAS CANCER	--	--	1 (2.7%)	6 (16.2%)	10 (27.0%)	11 (29.7%)	9 (24.3%)
DID NOT REPORT HAVING CANCER	1 (-2%)	39 (8.4%)	156 (33.6%)	102 (22.0%)	85 (18.3%)	57 (12.3%)	24 (5.2%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native: \_\_*, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other: \_\_*). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 299.



TABLE 299. CANCER STATUS BY RACE – ONEIDA COUNTY

	WHITE N (%)	NON-WHITE N (%)
HAS CANCER	36 (97.3%)	1 (2.7%)
DID NOT REPORT HAVING CANCER	415 (89.4%)	49 (10.6%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 300.

TABLE 300. CANCER STATUS BY ETHNICITY – ONEIDA COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)
HAS CANCER	38 (8.4%)	41.4 (91.6%)
DID NOT REPORT HAVING CANCER	1 (2.9%)	34 (97.1%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses for Oneida County are shown in Table 301.

TABLE 301. CANCER STATUS BY EDUCATION – ONEIDA COUNTY

	DEGREE N (%)	NO DEGREE N (%)
HAS CANCER	23 (62.2%)	14 (37.8%)
DID NOT REPORT HAVING CANCER	292 (63.1%)	171 (36.9%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Income was compared across groups. The results for Oneida County are presented in Table 302.

TABLE 302. CANCER STATUS BY INCOME – ONEIDA COUNTY

	ABOVE ALICE N (%)	BELOW ALICE N (%)
HAS CANCER	13 (65.0%)	7 (35.0%)
DID NOT REPORT HAVING CANCER	259 (73.4%)	94 (26.6%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Responses were then compared across age groups. The results for Vilas County are presented in Table 303.

TABLE 303. CANCER STATUS BY AGE – VILAS COUNTY

	18-25 N (%)	26-40 N (%)	41-55 N (%)	56-65 N (%)	66-75 N (%)	OVER 75 N (%)
HAS CANCER	--	--	1 (5.6%)	5 (27.8%)	7 (38.9%)	5 (27.8%)
DID NOT REPORT HAVING CANCER	29 (12.8%)	48 (21.1%)	59 (26.0%)	52 (22.9%)	32 (14.1%)	7 (3.1%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Participants were then asked to report their race (1=*White*, 2=*Asian*, 3=*Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islander*, 4=*African American/Black*, 5=*American Indian or Alaska Native*: \_\_, 6=*Two or more races*, 7=*Other*: \_\_). Race was recoded *White* and *Non-white*. Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 304.

TABLE 304. CANCER STATUS BY RACE – VILAS COUNTY

	WHITE N (%)	NON-WHITE N (%)
HAS CANCER	17 (94.4%)	1 (5.6%)
DID NOT REPORT HAVING CANCER	199 (88.1%)	27 (11.9%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Participants were then asked to report their ethnicity (1=*Hispanic/Latino*, 2=*Not Hispanic/Latino*). Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 305.

TABLE 305. CANCER STATUS BY ETHNICITY – VILAS COUNTY

	HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)	NOT HISPANIC/LATINO N (%)
HAS CANCER	--	18 (100%)
DID NOT REPORT HAVING CANCER	6 (3.7%)	206 (96.3%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Participants were then asked to report their highest level of education (1=*8th Grade or less*, 2=*Some high school- no diploma*, 3=*High school diploma or GED*, 4=*Some college, no degree*, 5=*Associate degree/technical school*, 6=*Bachelor's degree*, 7=*Master's degree*, 8=*Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)*). Education was recoded *No degree* and *Degree*. Responses for Vilas County are shown in Table 306.

TABLE 306. CANCER STATUS BY EDUCATION – VILAS COUNTY

	DEGREE N (%)	NO DEGREE N (%)
HAS CANCER	11 (61.1%)	7 (38.9%)
DID NOT REPORT HAVING CANCER	141 (62.1%)	86 (37.9%)

Participants were asked to report their whether they had ever been told by a health care provider that they had cancer. Participants were asked to report their annual household income. Income was recoded to *Below ALICE* and *Above ALICE*. Income was compared across groups. The results for Vilas County are presented in Table 307.

TABLE 307. CANCER STATUS BY INCOME – VILAS COUNTY

	ABOVE ALICE N (%)	BELOW ALICE N (%)
HAS CANCER	8 (66.7%)	4 (33.3%)
DID NOT REPORT HAVING CANCER	136 (79.5%)	35 (20.5%)