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ABSTRACT

This study measured residential attitudes and perceptions in Ontario County, New York. The purpose for the study is to better understand residential concerns so that they may be incorporated into the planning process for future tourism development endeavors. These residential attitudes need to be identified with respect to preferences for more or less tourism. Planners can avoid residential road blocks to development if they know what concerns residents have towards tourism development.

A brief history of modern travel was provided for the reader as a framework for understanding what developments led to potentials and problems in tourism today. The shift in present studies is moving from the tourist to the resident. Tourist impacts are both beneficent and malign.

Tourism planners today have many interests to consider. Aside from environmental and economic considerations, developers today must also be cognizant of social impacts resulting from tourism development. Residents specifically experience these social impacts. As a result, the need for a study to measure residents attitudes is a prudent step in the initial stages of development and planning.

A description of the questionnaire and research design is mentioned in the study. The research has been done in such a way that it would be easy to replicate the study in other areas. General and specific results were looked at for the purpose of identifying any existing regional differences.
Through travel, we gain renewed understanding of other cultures and people. Tourism, in its highest form, is a quest for knowledge. Touring is an information-gathering process; it has the ability to inform and instruct - to teach Americans about the civilization to which they belong and about other civilizations that share this planet.

-Donna Frame, Under Secretary of the United States Travel and Tourism Administration, 1990
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Tourism has evolved from a "build it and they will come" attitude to a more planned approach taking the community into consideration. The reasons for the shift in planning and development is due to the build up of tourist areas which turned out to be failures. Today, tourism development faces environmental regulations, zoning laws, and other societal concerns.

Although promotion plays a major role to attract visitors to an area, the planning of the site is now of more import. Tourism needs to take on a more holistic approach to development. As such, there is a greater need for cooperation between government agencies, industry, and residents of the community, or region being impacted by tourism development.

Planning efforts need to take an integrative approach. The planning and management of growth is commonly termed "sustainable development." Planning, therefore, is a key concept in the tourism development arena.
Current literature points out the need to take residents into consideration when planning. Tourism planning went from being operations driven to being market driven and consumer oriented. The residents nearest the tourism site both affect tourism, and are affected by tourism. "It is expected that involvement of those affected in the formulation of tourism plans will help build support for the plans and trust and confidence among planners, the general public, and the private hospitality industry, leading to better understanding of the tourism development impacts and the need for planning" (Loukissas, 1983, 19).

Residents affect tourism because it is their "place" that is being visited. The indigenous population either lives near a natural or man-made resource/attraction (body of water, mountains, amusement parks, etc.) or have something to offer which is of cultural or historical significance. It is this "place-making" which residents contribute to.

The affects of tourism are evident. Tourism creates jobs and brings in other businesses needed to support
tourism (hotels, restaurants, information centers, shopping centers, etc.). When multiplier effects are taken into account, the income generated by tourism can be considerable.

Why then would residents be opposed to tourism development? "To a host population, tourism is often a mixed blessing: the tourist industry creates jobs and increases cash flow but the tourists themselves can become a physical as well as a social burden, especially as their numbers increase" (Smith, 1989, 11). Tourism could have a damaging affect on the physical and cultural environment. If the infrastructure is not built to sustain tourism's impact, it could lead to traffic congestions, as well as, encroachment on local residents.

The key is the residents. Of what value is a tourist site where local residents are not in favor of its development? The residents are part of the cultural make up and attraction of the tourist area. The indigenous population defines this culture. The dissolution of this culture can be accelerated through outside contact.
As such, it is important to include the residents in the strategic planning process and to determine what their perceptions are towards tourism and tourists in their area. Strategic planning involves a systemic approach which includes input from administrators, governments, businesses, and above all residents. It is safe to assume, therefore, that tourism potential is, in some part, governed by the receptivity of the residents towards tourism.

Background and Study Area

Ontario County, New York is the area being studied (see Figure 1.1). Ontario County is growing rapidly. This growth involves more than just tourism. The reason why people moved there (aesthetic beauty) is starting to be encroached upon. Residents see development coming in. Planners feel there could be a way to develop the county and not give up what residents have there. Information is needed to develop a plan and vision.
Ontario County's tourism growth is reflected in Appendix A. Table 1.1 is a "snap shot" of Appendix A, and demonstrates the upward trend in the growth of lodging and dining industry taxable sales almost doubled from 1981-1993.

Source: NYS Department of Taxation and Finance
lodging and dining in Ontario County. Taxable sales almost doubled in the twelve year time period. Ontario County's tax portion of sales paralleled this growth.

The annual average employment in the travel industries also increased (see Table 1.2 below). The increase in the travel employment index increased by 42% between 1976 and 1992. During the same time period, there was an increase of 1,304 jobs. This increase reflects the growth of tourism in the county, and a need to plan for future tourism growth.

The events that led to the development of this study are important to note because it will allow the reader to better understand the purpose of the study. This research is a cooperative venture between the Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) and the Ontario County Tourism Bureau (OCTB).
Missing Page
draft report\textsuperscript{1} on a tourism development plan for Ontario County, NY (Dawson, et. al., 1994). In the draft report, an assessment about tourism potential and problems for Ontario County is discussed.

The assessment has some projects that the tourism industry should push forward. In pushing these forward, OCTB wants to make sure they're not going to run into a residential road block, therefore, resident input is important. Residential input is needed to avoid political issues and sustain the perceived residential attitude toward tourism.

After the draft report was reviewed by a committee of county board members, the committee identified strong controversial subjects. These controversial areas would be more saleable if they had research to support it. Valerie Knoblauch believed that there is a need to prove to "locals" that the committee's conclusions are more than just a "gut" feeling. Statistical insight rather than gut feeling will

\textsuperscript{1}As of the writing of this thesis, the report was still in draft form. Information in the final draft may have changed since then.
ensure that development choices are not just a personal position from the executive director's point of view. As a result, that some measurement of resident perceptions on tourism development was necessary to establish a benchmark on which to base future planning endeavors.

The report on tourism development for Ontario County was very thorough in its inventory, market analysis, framework for tourism development, and its identification of tourism sectors. However, it pointed out the need for additional research because the depth in the research was either not their, or not available.

Three areas in need of research were identified, they are as follows:

1. Design and conduct a detailed inventory of private and public sector facilities, programs, and services.

2. Design and conduct studies of existing and potential markets for Ontario County.

3. Design and conduct a survey of Ontario County residents to measure their interests activities, concerns about tourism development, and preferences for tourism development.
Statement of Purpose

This study focuses on the third area identified above. The study intends to explore general and specific feelings from Ontario County residents concerning additional tourism development. The purpose of this study is to identify the areas of residential concerns regarding tourism. Tourism developers of Ontario County can then strategically execute their tourism development plan for future economic growth.

Statement of Problem

Tourism planners are uncertain about the direction of tourism development in an area and its acceptance by local residents. How do residents view tourism and its impact on their communities? How will resident attitudes change decision-making policy?

In the past inadequate attention to qualitative socioeconomic impacts has been a major reason why many tourism development plans are not implemented...Recently concern has moved from a narrow focus on physical and promotional planning facilitating the growth of tourism to a broader, more balanced approach recognizing the needs and views of not only developers but also the wider community...Participation by residents is fundamental to the process of [tourism] planning (Dowling, 1993, 52).
The problem of assessing residential view for tourism development exists today in many communities. Specifically, it is occurring in Ontario County, New York. Tourism planners are unclear as to the residential views on tourism in Ontario County. These residential views need to be identified with respect to their preferences for more or less tourism development throughout the county.

**Scope and Limitations of the Study**

This study impacts a "bigger picture." It involves a five-year strategic planning process which the Ontario County Tourism Bureau is developing. Broader issues in the strategic plan include the following:

- organizations/relationships,
- further tourism research,
- product development,
- marketing issues, and
- further tourism awareness.

This study provides a base for these broader issues. Residents of Ontario County will be affected, the question is how. The study will be limited to Ontario County, as such, the perceptions and attitudes found from residents are
particular to Ontario County, and general to residential views.

The study is also limited in that attitudes change over time. Residents' feelings will change towards tourism in five years. Because future perceptions are impossible, or at best extremely difficult to forecast, the study is an assessment of residents at the present time.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The phenomenon known as tourism is multifaceted and multidimensional. Tourism's complexity is reflected by the lack of agreement on tourism's definition (Mill and Morrison, 1992; Gunn, 1994b; Gilbert, 1990; Przeclawski, 1993). Definitions of tourism have been technical, spatial, holistic, social, and more. For this thesis, tourism refers to the activity that occurs when tourists travel (Mill and Morrison, 1992).

Besides the general lack of a consensus on a formal definition, the literature points to drastic changes in the development of tourism activity. These changes are discussed in the first section. The second section of this study identifies potentials and problems associated with tourism development. Section three explains the relevance of research in tourism development. The fourth section of the literature review addresses the role of the resident in the tourism development process.
Beginnings of Modern Travel

From the 1820's - 1920's people began to travel elsewhere besides work. International travel during this era was exclusively for the prominent and the rich. The so-called "upper-class" began traveling to "getaways" surrounding large urban cities. Railroads were very active at the time, and they provided easy access to the nearby Appalachian mountains. Inns were growing in numbers all over the mountain sides; sometimes the railroads built them.

The period from the 1930's to the 1950's marked the marketing orientation of travel and tourism towards the middle class consumer. Summer rentals became very popular. Mass followed class, i.e., the growing middle class could afford to have the same luxuries as the upper-class. Second home ownership was growing, particularly in mountainous areas. Farmlands were being sold, and land near rivers, ponds, and lakes were being bought. The development of seaside resorts became popular.
The decade of the 1960's was very important in terms of tourism development. Tourism initiatives were explored in the international arena. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) helps to develop the third world. OECD established tourism as a way of income to build up the economy in the third world. There was, however, no data for who goes where. This concern for data collection was also shared by the United Nations.

As a result, in 1963, the World Tourism Organization (WTO) was established in Madrid, Spain. WTO's main objective was to collect data of travel flow. Tourism USA describes WTO's function as studying "problems, trends, developments and socioeconomic changes which effect tourism on a worldwide basis" (1991, 214). Collection of data from every country included the following:

1. points of origin,
2. length of stay,
3. reason for travel, and
4. number of people in party.
The 1960's also marked an increase in travel by the middle class because they had more time to travel (leisure time), and more discretionary income. The invention of the jet plane increased travel and tourism. Jet planes doubled the carrying capacity of flights. Time from origin to destination was cut in half. The cost of travel was low, and accessibility was greater to all areas of the world.

By the late 1960's, the automobile became the predominant mode of middle class travel. In 1961, the Federal Highway Act was passed and state and interstate highways were built to facilitate car travel. The advantages of an automobile were that they could be owned, and you can leave and stop when you want. People could travel longer distances, and trips became cost-effective if one travels with more than one person. Railways gave way to airways and highways. Mass tourism had begun.

After the 1960's

Infrastructure improvements, increases in real income, leisure time, and technological innovations led to increased
opportunities for tourism, both domestically and internationally. Deregulation of airlines and buses in the United States provided competitive pricing strategies. Market segmentation research began to target specific markets in tourism. Packaged tours, cruises, and large amusement parks became very popular.

International travel went from 69.3 million travelers in 1960 to 425 million in 1990. Expenditures increased from $6.9 billion in 1960 to $230 billion in 1990 (Eadington and Smith, 1992, 2). Tourism is the largest employer in the world today. In the United States:

Travel and tourism is the second largest private employer in the nation, accounting for 8.7% of total non agricultural payroll employment. Travel and tourism is the first, second, and third largest employers in 39 states the largest employer in 15 states, the second largest in 12 states, and the third largest in 12 states. The major beneficiaries in terms of dollars spent there are California, New York, Texas, and New Jersey (Mill and Morrison, 1992, 7).
Potentials and Problems in Tourism Development

Tourism's initial focus in development was on the physical and promotional. Places wanted to "beautify" their surroundings. Attractions were both manmade and natural. A large part of tourism's budget went into marketing and advertising.

The potential that tourism development provides to a community is mainly one of economic benefits. Tourism also contributes to the preservation of cultural, historical, and natural sites. Tourism is receiving increased recognition among rural communities as a way to diversify their economic base due to location, climate, and the decline in traditional employers such as agriculture, manufacturing, and mining (Allen, Hafer, Long, Perdue, 1993; Gunn 1994a; Kariel 1989; Lankford and Howard, 1994; Perdue, Long, Allen, 1987). Figure 2.1, below, is a pictorial representation of tourism's economic effect on a community.

Four benefits of tourism have been identified and are reflected in Figure 2.1 below. They are the following:
1. Tourism's primary benefit is job creation through hotels, restaurants, retail establishments, and transportation.

2. The second benefit of tourism is its multiplier effect as direct and indirect tourism expenditure is recycled through the local economy.

3. Tourism's third benefit stems from state and local tax revenues that tourists provide.


**Figure 2.1**

Tourism and Your Community

Despite tourism's many benefits, not all tourism has been beneficial to local communities. Researchers have noted that tourism development has both positive and negative impacts (McCool and Martin, 1994; Murphy, 1985; Ritchie, 1988). Uncontrolled or ill-managed tourism development can cause detrimental impacts to the host community. 

The most notable negative impacts of tourism development has are physical and social. Physical impacts include, but are not limited to the following:

1. overcrowding of an area,
2. destruction of aesthetic beauty/natural landscape,
3. traffic problems,
4. pollution (architectural, natural, noise),
5. ecological destruction.

During the early years of tourism development and planning (postwar boom) there was no concern for infrastructure, and no regard for environmental considerations. As a result, overdevelopment (over building) took place, particularly with respect to hotels concentrated in one area. There was no concern for design, as well as no agency regulating businesses.
Table 2.1

Index of Tourist Irritation

1. The level of euphoria

People are enthusiastic and thrilled by tourist development. They welcome the stranger and there is a mutual feeling of satisfaction. There are opportunities for locals and money flows in along with the tourist.

2. The level of apathy

As the industry expands people begin to take the tourist for granted. He rapidly becomes a target for profit-taking and contact on the personal plane begins to become more formal.

3. The level of irritation

This will begin when the industry is nearing the saturation point or is allowed to pass a level at which the locals cannot handle the numbers without expansion of facilities.

4. The level of antagonism

The irritations have become more overt. People now see the tourist as the harbinger of all that is bad. 'Taxes have gone up because of the tourists.' 'They have no respect for property.' 'They are bent on destroying all that is fine in our town.' Mutual politeness has now given way to antagonism and the tourist is 'ripped off.'

5. The final level

All this while people have forgotten that what they cherished in the first place was what drew the tourist, but in the wild scramble to develop they overlooked this and allowed the environment to change. What they now must learn to live with is the fact that their ecosystem will never be the same again. They might still be able to draw tourists but of a very different type from those they so happily welcomed in early years. If the destination is large enough to cope with mass tourism it will continue to thrive.

Today, however, the so-called "green" revolution made planning and development much more conscious and cautious of environmental concerns. "The risks are particularly acute in areas of rapid, intensive tourist growth and in delicate, 'special' environments. There are environmental limits to the development of tourism" (Mathieson and Wall, 1982, 132).

A few years ago, those with a "green" approach to our planet and development were seen as cranks, their organizations as marginal. Since then, partly as a result of the success of their efforts in putting their views across and partly because of the remarkable impact of the Bruntland Commission, itself a sign of the times, we have all been "greened" to a greater or lesser extent (de Kadt, 1992, 48-49).

Social impacts of tourism refer to changes in the quality of life of host populations (residents) at tourist destinations. These social impacts can be both positive and negative. The best example found in the literature is an index of tourist irritation developed by G.V. Doxey (see Table 2.1). The index suggests that resident attitudes towards tourists may be directly related to the level of tourism development in the host community.
Tourism is a paradox of sorts. Tourism development can be both benevolent and malign. What approaches exist to developing responsible tourism? How can we properly plan tourism development? A study of the literature suggests that there have been attempts by researchers and academics to answer these questions. This is the focus of the next section. Specific emphasis in the literature search has been placed on rural tourism development.

As the largest industry in the world, the attempt to lure today's tourists and the money they spend - to a particular destination has become a major activity of state and local economic planning: tourism development (Martin, 1987, 48).

Relevant Studies on Tourism Development

In a recent article, Jafar Jafari, founder and president of the International Academy for the study of tourism, made an interesting observation. He "observed that tourism research of the 1960s focused on the positive aspects of tourism, the '70s emphasized the negative, while the '80s had a balanced level and systematic approach" (Lankford and Howard, 1994, 123). Research in the '90s has expanded further, and it is taking a more systemic approach to planning.
Gunn identified four distinct research approaches in tourism; (1) to describe and inventory, (2) to test, (3) to predict, forecast, and (4) to model or simulate (1994a,4-5).

Research has been conducted on approaches to responsible tourism development. Herbert G. Kariel (1989, 12) recommends the concept of "soft tourism" as a method for living harmoniously with tourism. The soft tourism suggestion is an attempt to solve a dilemma most rural residents face; no community should grow so large as to be overwhelmed by tourists, but there's a desire for continued growth. "The soft approach to tourism, stressing small-scale developments rather than large-scale hotels and other facilities, suggests educating the tourists about proper behavior [in the community](Kariel, 1989, 5).

An article examined some adverse effects of tourism development and how it affected feelings of community attachment (McCool and Martin, 1994). The researchers concluded that results between community attachment and attitudes were anything but clear. A tourism impact attitude scale (TIAS) was developed in response to the need
for standardized measurement of resident attitudes toward tourism development (Lankford and Howard, 1994).

The majority of the literature points to comprehensive planning efforts to deal with the complexity of the tourism phenomenon. "Comprehensive tourism planning, then, should attempt to optimize not only the economic but also the social and environmental benefits of tourism, while minimizing tourism's deleterious effects" (Allen, Long, Perdue, Kieselbach, 1990, 16). One approach to tourism planning is gaming simulations. The Tourism Activity Game (TAG), a board simulation game was considered a "means to educate and involve the public and the industry in community tourism planning" (Loukissas, 1983, 19).

Tourism planning and development theories and methodologies abound in the literature. Gunn identifies three principle sectors that need to maintain close cooperation for successful integrative tourism planning ventures; (1) governments, (2) non-profit organizations, and (3) commercial enterprise. Tourism's dynamic nature allows for variances over time. For example, the former approach
to tourism was to promote and build. Today's approach is more comprehensive in nature and more controllable (to some extent). The focus on tourism research has changed as well.

Tourism research initially focused on the tourist because of his/her economic impact. Social and cultural impacts led to research on tourist-resident relationships. The focus of this thesis is on the residents of rural host communities and their perceptions and attitudes towards tourism development. This is the focus of the next and last section of the literature review.

The Role of the Resident in the Planning Process

Studies on residential attitudes and perceptions are not as numerous as studies of tourist perceptions, but the importance of involving the resident in the tourism planning process is becoming more important. Residents are being questioned on a variety of issues concerning tourism development. These issues include environmental impacts (Dowling, 1993; Liu, Sheldon, Var, 1987), local developmental plans (Blakely, 1994), community life (Allen,

When marketing places, tourism planners (developers) must promote internally to their own citizens (Kotler, et.al., 1993, 212). Citizen participation and involvement are essential elements for a successful long-term tourism development and planning process. Residents need to be informed and consulted during the initial stages of any tourism development plan.

Why the need for the study of residential attitudes and perceptions? Tourism has an impact (social, economic, cultural) on many public groups (politicians, residents, business owners) who are entitled to know about tourism development in their area. Public attitudes in host communities must create a hospitable environment for tourists and tourism in general.

Expenditures of tax dollars by a state or [local] agency to promote tourism are wasted if the local residents are hostile toward tourists. If hostility prevails, the promotional monies are better spent to educate residents on the benefits
of tourism to their economies. Furthermore, if the underlying reasons for negative attitudes can be identified, active attempts can be made to rectify or at least minimize the negative effects for the tourism industry (Davis, 1988, et.al., 2).

Public participation, then, was developed as a response to improper planning and development. Researchers in tourism are stressing views of residents and recognizing the need to include the local community in the initial planning stages. "Consequently, a holistic approach to planning is necessary since one cannot separate environmental aspects from economic and social ones" (Liu, Sheldon, Var, 1987, 19).

The need for a more scientific approach has led researchers to the development of many models and tools for data collection. The best and most reliable method is the representative survey method. A survey helps to establish an unbiased consensus. "A reasonable degree of consensus is needed for long-term success and this can only be achieved where the planners have a thorough knowledge of the views held by the host population" (Ritchie, 1988, 199).
The choice of survey method for gathering resident inputs into the policy formulation process may raise questions in some minds concerning the value of this approach as compared with a frequently used alternative, namely, the public meeting. In this regard, the author feels that the input derived from such 'public meetings' is by its nature highly selective. As a result, the views obtained by this approach may be misleading, in that they reflect the positions of a potentially biased group or groups of individuals. In contrast, an objective, statistically representative survey is more likely to provide an accurate measure of a given population's views on issues to tourism development (Ritchie, 1988, 200).

The methodology employed in developing and implementing a survey is the subject of the next chapter. It discusses how the study was conducted and what procedures were followed. Chapter III discusses the sampling technique used as well as the strategies employed.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

Ontario County is found in the Finger Lakes region of western New York. It has a population of about 95,000 residents. The county is predominantly rural, and is at the heart of New York's wine country.

The research methodology used was descriptive in nature. A perception/assessment study of Ontario County's residential population was needed to understand their preferences for development and recreational interests. This was a preliminary step in establishing a more effective tourism development plan.

The study was conducted in Ontario County, New York from May 31st to June 30th, 1994. The timing of the survey was critical because it took place at the beginning of the tourism season for Ontario County. The tourism impact, therefore, was not a major factor, presenting less bias towards answers.
**Study Area/Region**

Dawson, et.al. (1994) identified four tourism destination zones (see Figure 3.1). The zones are as follows:

1. **Zone 1:** Rochester/Victor Zone  
2. **Zone 2:** Thruway Corridor Zone  
3. **Zone 3:** Canandaigua/Bristol Hills Zone  
4. **Zone 4:** Geneva/Agritourism Zone

The researcher attempted to make the number of samples sent proportional to each zone. As Figure 3.1 indicates, the zones in ascending order are the Thruway Corridor Zone, the Rochester/Victor Zone, and the Geneva/Agritourism Zone. The Canandaigua/Bristol Hills Zone is the largest Zone by both area and population.
Figure 3.1
Ontario County Tourism Destination Zones

Source: Dawson, et.al. 1994: 5.
Population and Sample Size

The population for this study will be the adult residents of Ontario County. The total adult population is 71,310 (see Table 3.1). Appendix B discloses how this number was obtained, as well as, the breakdown of males and females. The adult population is considered 18 years or older. Based on the 71,310 adult residents, the sample size will be 382 residents (Krejcie, 607).

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Category</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>34552</td>
<td>36758</td>
<td>71310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors</td>
<td>12102</td>
<td>11689</td>
<td>23791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Co</td>
<td>46654</td>
<td>48447</td>
<td>95101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Krejcie, 607
Development of the Questionnaire

The research instrument used was the questionnaire. The response format for the questionnaire was designed to combine two approaches; the likert-type format and the checklist format (see Appendix C). "The benefit of the checklist method is the ease with which customers can respond to the items" (Hayes, 1992, 56).

The likert-type format is based on a disagree to agree continuum. The scale looked like the following:

```
SD  D  DK  A  SA
```

SD = Strongly Disagree
D = Disagree
DK = Don't Know
A = Agree
SA = Strongly Agree

Rather than circling a numerical value, the researcher felt it was easier for a respondent to check off a box.

A variety of methods is available for presenting a series of response categories for the respondent to check an answer to a given question. It has been my experience that boxes [italics added] adequately spaced apart are the best...boxes can be generated easily and neatly (Babbie, 1990, 136).
The scale was a five-point scale with "strongly agree" having a value of 5, and "strongly disagree" having a value of 1 on the continuum. It was decided that a five-point scale would be used over a seven-point scale because "reliability seems to level off after five scale points, suggesting minimal incremental utility of using more than five scale points" (Hayes, 1992, 59).

The questionnaire was not pilot-tested. However, studies conducted over the past few years had been looked at to determine what kinds of questions should be asked, and what areas should concern tourism developers (Purdue, Long, and Allen 1987; Davis, Allen, and Cosenza 1988; Lankford and Howard 1994). This helped in establishing the general topic areas of the questionnaire. The general topic areas include the following:

- negative tourism development perceptions,
- positive tourism development perceptions,
- support for additional tourism development,
- support for restrictive tourism development, and
- the perceived future of the community.
Questions on the research instrument referred to both demographic (age, sex, employment, residency) and psychographic (views, attitudes, perceptions) information. The questionnaires were sequentially numbered, and these numbers were then annotated on a master list so that they could be tracked (this is discussed in greater detail in the next section). Analysis of the data, as far as correlations, means, frequencies, ANOVA, etc., was performed by SPSS-X.

Construction of the Mailing List

Two strategies were considered for the sampling on a county-wide basis. The first strategy was to use the county's tax rolls. This sampling technique would cover everyone who owned land. The advantages of this approach is that you will get second-home owners, as well as, taxpayers who will want a say in the county's development plan. The disadvantage is that it does not include people who rent.

The second strategy involved the use of the phone book. The advantages of this approach is that renters, as well as
owners, would be listed. The disadvantages are that not everyone is listed, and addresses may have changed. A random selection process from the phone book allowed everyone equal probability of being sampled. The latter approach was chosen as the better approach. The phone book would provide better access to all residents.

The mailing list needed to represent each of the tourism zones. Table 3.2, below, shows the relationship between the cities/towns that were chosen, and the tourism zone. The largest city is Canandaigua, followed by Geneva and Victor.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cities and Towns within each Tourism Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Victor/Farmington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Canandaigua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Honeyoye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Holcomb/Bloomfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Naples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
The determination of how many samples were sent to each area is directly correlated to the number of pages in the phone book for each town/city. In the larger size phone books, three columns were considered a page. In the smaller size phone books, four columns were considered a page.

Table 3.3 and Figure 3.2 (below) show the distribution of samples by region, and the percentage represented in each zone.

The number of samples were determined to be representative of each region, both by geography and
Figure 3.2
% of Respondents by Zone

population. The selection and recording of the names involved a systematic sampling technique. In each column identified in the phone book for that town, the 10th person from the top of the column would be selected. This allowed for no biases by alphabet or gender. However, the phone book is male-dominated. The researcher tried to compensate for this by choosing a female whenever a married couple was listed.

The tenth listing must meet the following requirements:

1. It cannot be a business address.
2. The address must have a street number.
3. There must be a full first name, no initials.
If any of the above requirements are not met, the next person listed that met the requirements was selected. The names of were compiled into a mailing list of 382 names (see Appendix C) for the mailing list collection and tracking tool.

After the names of the respondents were collected, a six-digit identification number was used to track the number of respondents. These numbers appeared on the bottom, right corner of the questionnaire, and on the master list of all correspondents' names. The first two digits represented the number (01-09) allocated to a specific town/city. For example, Bloomfield was assigned the number "01," Canandaigua "04," Clifton Springs "07," etc. (see Table 3.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town/City</th>
<th>Assigned Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield/Holcomb</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeyoye</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley/Rushville</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canandaigua</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor/Farmington</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Springs/Phelps</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last four digits in the six-digit combination represented the number (0001-0382) allocated to a specific survey participant. For example, John Smith may be assigned the number "0213." If he was from Naples, the questionnaire's six-digit code would be: 050213.

The purpose for the six-digit code was two-fold. First, it served the purpose of identifying who had returned the questionnaire so that the respondent may be checked off, and a follow-up questionnaire would not be sent out.

Survey Procedures and Implementation

In order to ensure a good response rate, the researcher used techniques suggested by the total design method for surveys (TDM). The advantage of the TDM is that the focus is not on the prospective respondent, rather, it focuses on technique (Dillman, 1978, 8). Everything prescribed by the TDM was not followed due to monetary and time constraints. The basic concepts, however, were applied and the response rate was more than satisfactory.
The mailing procedure involved the following steps:

- the mailing of a postcard,
- the mailing of a cover letter and questionnaire,
- the mailing of a follow-up letter and replacement questionnaire and thank you postcards.

The first mailing involved the use of a postcard to notify residents/participants that a questionnaire will be arriving. The postcard acted as an announcement so that residents would be more receptive to the questionnaire. A sense of community involvement will be mentioned to encourage participation (see Appendix C).

One week after the postcards were sent, the cover letter and questionnaire were mailed out. The questionnaire was one paper printed on the front and back to save on mailing costs. A mailing date early in the week was recommended (Dillman, 1978, 180). This made it possible for questionnaires forwarded to a new address to arrive within the same week.

The return window given was 12 days. The cover letter had both the project director's and OCTB executive director's signature.
The final touch is to add a real signature to each respondent's letter, using what is descriptively called the "pressed blue point pen" method... It is simple, although somewhat time consuming. Each letter is signed on a soft surface with sufficient pressure applied to the ballpoint pen that indentations in the paper are made. Tubbing one's finger over the back of the page provides unmistakable evidence that the signature is real, and has neither been preprinted or applied by means of a signature machine. Of the many aspects of personalization used in processing cover letters, this remains one of the most important, because it is the most difficult to imitate by mass production methods (Dillman, 1978,173).

The purpose for the "authentic signature is to try to give each cover letter a more personal feel to it. The cover letters will provide information on why the study is being conducted, what the information will be used for, and how their name was chosen (see Appendix C).

If any surveys were returned for incorrect addresses within the first three days, an attempt was made to call the resident to ask for a new address. If the resident could not be contacted, or would not participate, then the next person in the phone book was mailed out a survey. The number mailed remained at 382.
The follow up mailing occurred 12 days after the initial survey was mailed. This follow up letter acted as a reminder. Surveys used in the first mailing were printed on blue paper, the follow up questionnaire was printed on green paper. The purpose of the follow up letter was to provide an incentive (see Appendix C). The incentive was that OCTB would send the participants a copy of the survey results.

The next chapter begins with the collection of surveys. It also discusses the results of the survey. The findings are both descriptive and inferential in nature.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter is partitioned into three distinct stages for the purpose of organizing data into manageable forms. The first stage is an overview of the county's perceptions and responses, as well as, tests conducted on the survey. Stage II discusses the varying perceptions between individual cities and towns. The third stage is concerned with the assimilation of socio-demographic information. Most of the statistics are descriptive in nature.

Stage I

Survey Response

A total of 382 questionnaires were mailed in the initial mailing. Of the 382 questionnaires mailed, 40 were returned and could not be delivered due to wrong addresses, death, wrong name, etc. Six surveys were not used because
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town/City Samples Sent</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield/Holcomb</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeoye</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley/Rushville</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canandaigua</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor/Farmington</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Springs/Phelps</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester/Shortsville</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

- Samples Sent: 382
- Samples Returned: 205
- Unusable Samples: 6

**Total Usable Surveys**: 336

**Total Returned Surveys**: 205

**Total Response Rate**: 61.01%
they were insufficiently completed. This brought the total number of questionnaires to 336 (see Table 4.1 above).

The return of 205 responses represented a response rate of 61.01% (205/336). "[As a rough guide,] a response rate of at least 50 percent is generally considered adequate for analysis and reporting. A response rate of 60 percent is considered good, and a response rate of 70 percent or more is very good" (Babbie, 1990, 182).

Returns were tracked in order to see the effects of the follow-up letter and survey. The follow-up letter, with a new questionnaire, proved highly successful in achieving a good response rate. As Table 4.2 illustrates, 140 total returns arrived after the first return window (June 9 June 17). This only represented a 41.67% response rate. After the follow-up letter (June 20), the response rate increased to 61.01%.
Table 4.2
Rate of Response for Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month of June</th>
<th>No. of Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend
- Total Returns
- Daily Returns

Note: The response rate is derived by dividing total returns by the amount of surveys sent (336).
Analysis on Survey Responses

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to examine the difference between the means. The difference was significant at the .05 level. The ANOVA examines the variance of a dependent variable for the whole sample created on the basis of some independent variables. It is, in effect, a simultaneous examination of all the variables. For example, "tourism increases the quality of life" could be the dependent variable, and "town/city nearest to resident" could be the independent variable.

The calculations were performed by the statistical program SPSS-X. Because we were looking for differences at the .05 level, the significance between groups (given by SPSS-X) would have to be higher than .05. If it is less than .05, then the ANOVA suggested that there is a significant variance between groups (towns in this case).
Three such significant variances occurred. They were in the following variables:

- future of county looks bright,
- years as a resident of Ontario County, and
- tourism increases traffic.

The variances suggested in the above three variables indicate a discrepancy between the means (averages) of the cities. The most significant discrepancy was in the variable "tourism increases traffic" at .001 (very much under .05). The other two variables were much closer to the .05 level.

Since it was found that there were significant differences between the means, a Schéffé test was conducted. The Schéffé test is used to identify the difference(s) between groups (Downie and Heath, 1970, 221). There were 108 comparisons made for the 27 means (9 means by 3 variables). For the purpose of this thesis, it is not necessary to include an explanation of the Schéffé procedure. It suffices to say that none of the means differed significantly at the five percent level. This test was used to confirm the reliability of the data. As a result, analysis of the collected data was performed without accounting for significant differences.
Figure 4.1
Perceptions of Negative Tourism Impacts
By Ontario County Residents

Legend
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- Agree/Strongly Agree

- Tourists Benefit More Than Residents From Tourism
  - 28.8%
  - 47.8%
  - 23.4%

- Tourism Increases Crime
  - 38.0%
  - 55.1%
  - 6.9%

- Tourism Increases Traffic
  - 12.7%
  - 12.7%

- Tourism Reduces Quality of Outdoor Recreation
  - 74.6%
  - 16.1%
  - 64.9%
Overview of Residential Attitudes/Perceptions Towards Tourism Development in Ontario County

The survey instrument identified five general topic areas (mentioned earlier in Chapter III). The first area was concerned with negative perceptions of tourism development. Statements 5b, 5d, 5f, and 5h (see Appendix C and D for statements in the questionnaire) were used to reflect residents' perceptions on negative impacts of tourism development (see Figure 4.1).

Of the four negative perceptions being measured, increased traffic is the most problematic. Figure 4.1 shows that an overwhelming 74.7% agree or strongly agree that traffic increases as a result of tourism development. One factor could be that roads may need to be widened to handle the influx of tourists. The perception here needs to be noted as a very negative impact of tourism.

The category of "agree/strongly agree" (A/SA) on the other three negative perceptions (crime, tourists, quality of outdoors) were lower than the "don't know" (DK) and
Figure 4.2
Perceptions of Positive Tourism Impacts
By Ontario County Residents

Legend
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Tourism Provides Employment Opportunities
- 11.2% Disagree/Strongly Disagree
- 9.3% Don't Know
- 79.5% Agree/Strongly Agree

Tourism Increases Quality of Life
- 15.2% Disagree/Strongly Disagree
- 33.7% Don't Know
- 51.1% Agree/Strongly Agree

Tourism Increases Recreation
- 6.4% Disagree/Strongly Disagree
- 7.3% Don't Know
- 86.3% Agree/Strongly Agree

Tourism Helps Preserve Sites
- 14.7% Disagree/Strongly Disagree
- 20.5% Don't Know
- 64.8% Agree/Strongly Agree
"disagree/strongly disagree" (D/SD) categories. This could indicate that residents don't view these as negative impacts, at least not yet. Residents, therefore, don't view crime as a major issue in present tourism development efforts.

The statements in 5a, 5c, 5e, and 5g measured positive perceptions of residents. The largest agreement was on tourism's role in increasing recreational opportunities, 86.3% believe tourism increases recreation. Figures 4.1 and 4.2 (above) point to an overall positive impact of tourism in Ontario County. Additionally, 86.3% of the participants are not employed in tourism, yet 79.5% agree that tourism provides employment opportunities.

Support for additional tourism development (Figure 4.3) was measured by responding to the statements in 5i and 5k. Appearance and the improvement of the local economy were identified earlier as benefits of tourism development. Of special note, is the perception residents have on the increase of tourists in Ontario County. An overwhelming 87.3% of respondents agree that an increase in tourists helps the economy.
Figure 4.3
Support for Additional Tourism
By Ontario County Residents
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- 23.4%
- 16.6%
- 60.0%

Increase in Tourists Helps Economy
- 87.3%
- 4%
- 9.3%

Legend
- Disagree/Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- Agree/Strongly Agree
Figure 4.4
Support for Restriction of Tourism
By Ontario County Residents
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Because support was very high for additional tourism development, it was expected that support for restrictive tourism would be low. The statements measuring perceptions on restrictive tourism were 5j and 5l. The results for these two questions (see Figure 4.4 above) reflect a strong sense of uncertainty.

The largest percentage of respondents answered in the DK category. This could indicate one of two things. First, it could mean that the public needs to be educated more on the affects (positive and negative) tourism could have on the cost of living. Second, most respondents may have answered "don't know" because the wording of the question may not have been clear. Whichever the case, a slightly larger percentage disagreed that tourism increases the cost of living, again, indicating a more positive stance.

Similarly, residents did not know (42%) whether non-residents should develop tourism within the county. A larger number of residents (36.1%) agreed that non-residents should develop tourism in the county. This could indicate that there is a willingness to make cooperative ventures
with "outsiders." If this is the case, it corresponds with the overall positive view toward tourism development. This, however, is purely speculation on the part of the author.

The last statement (5m) was used to measure how residents perceive their future in Ontario County (see Figure 4.5 below). The largest percentage (55.6%) agreed that the future of the county looks bright. The statement served the purpose of identifying whether there is a general feeling of optimism or pessimism. The optimistic outlook is the prevailing attitude which is reflected economically by the low percentage of unemployed respondents (2.0%).

The majority of residents took their last vacation outside of New York State (71.1%, see Table 4.3). Only 7.3% of the respondents took their vacation in Ontario County. These startling figures surface some questions. For example, why is there such a large number vacationing out of state? How can we increase the number of residents vacationing closer to home? Is there any relationship to socio-demographic information (discussed in Stage III).
Figure 4.5
Residential Views on Ontario County's Future Looking Bright
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Table 4.3
Last Vacation Taken by Ontario County Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>% in Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario County</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger Lakes Region</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside New York State</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information on whether or not residents were employed in tourism was not a significant factor. However, the tourism/travel related employment makes up approximately 13% of Ontario County's employment. The survey closely resembles the number employed in tourism at 11.2%.

Stage II

Introduction

The immensity of the data gathered (45 pages) on the regional differences within the county will not be included in its entirety in this section of the chapter. For the purposes of this thesis, specific areas needing further attention have been identified.\(^1\) Furthermore, it is the intention of the author to identify differing view points throughout Ontario County. Not all towns/cities are mentioned.

\(^1\)A print out of all collected data is kept by the OCTB.
Naples

Only seven residents responded from Naples. This represented a 31.82% response rate, the lowest of all the cities and towns. Naples has a very well-developed tourism industry. Because of this, it was thought that Naples would be the most favorable towards tourism development. However, a review of the data paints a surprising picture.

Naples residents had the highest percentage of residents vacationing within Ontario County (28.6%). None of the respondents were employed in tourism. All the participants in the survey have lived in Naples longer than 10 years (10-15 years 42.9%, 15 or more years 57.1%).

Perhaps, one of the most significant findings relating to Naples is the statement concerned with tourism "benefitting tourists more than residents." Naples had the second highest agreement (42.9%), and Manchester/Shortsville had the highest agreement (44%). Furthermore, Naples highly agreed that crime (28.6%) and traffic (100% agreed) are a problem.
All these findings suggest that Naples feels negative towards further tourism development. However, 100% agreed that an increase in tourists helps the economy. Naples is reaching, or may have reached, its saturation point. They are definitely beyond the third level of irritation (see Table 3.1). Expansion of facilities may be needed, or less promotion of the area.

Additionally, 71.4% of Naples residents did not know if tourism helps preserve sites. This is significant because it could mean that they are not experiencing this particular positive impact. The aesthetic beauty of the area may be deteriorating.

Geneva

A large percentage of Geneva residents (37.5%) did not know whether tourism benefits the tourist more than the resident. There is a need, therefore, to educate these residents on who benefits from tourism. Geneva highly disagreed (75%) that crime increased as a result of tourism. They also had the largest disagreement on traffic as a
problem (37.5%). This could indicate that Geneva is not feeling the effects of tourism (beneficial or malign). Geneva also feels the strongest about non-residents developing tourism (50%).

Geneva's peculiarities could be linked to their perception of the future. The largest percentage of disagreement with the future of the county looking bright was found in Geneva (41.6%). This suggests a predominantly pessimistic outlook in the city. Additionally, Geneva has the largest retired population (29.2%).

**Canandaigua**

Canandaigua, like Naples, also has a large tourism industry. Given the weighted nature of the sample, the majority of the respondents came from Canandaigua. They did not, however, represent the largest response rate for a city. In fact, Canandaigua was behind Victor/Farmington (71.67%), Honeoye (63.64%), and Clifton Springs/Phelps (63.33%) in the response rate category.
The largest percentage of residents travelling out of New York State was found in Canandaigua (83.3%). This could be because 56.7% of Canandaigua residents have lived in Canandaigua for 15 or more years, and they may want to see other areas. Canandaigua residents felt strongest about tourism increasing the quality of life (56.6%). This is indicative of the fact that Canandaigua is experiencing the affects (beneficial) of tourism development (a sharp contrast between Geneva).

Other Notables

- **Honeoye** - highest percentage of residents employed in tourism (28.6%).

- **Clifton Springs/Phelps** - highest percentage of residents living in the county 15 or more years (84.2%).

- **Bloomfield/Holcomb** - 100% agree or strongly agree that tourism provides employment opportunities (followed closely by Manchester/Shortsville with 89.9%).

- **Victor/Farmington** - largest percentage of returned surveys (71.67%).
Stanley/Rushville - 57.1% of residents did not know if tourism increases the quality of life (highest uncertainty rate for this particular variable).

Honeoye/Canandaigua - both towns/cities were about evenly split on whether tourism increases the cost of living.

Bloomfield/Holcomb - most optimistic about the future of Ontario County, 69.2% agree that the county looks bright.

**Stage III**

**Introduction**

The purpose of this section is to identify similarities and differences across demographic segments. "In practical terms, the identification of such differences enables planners to appeal to, and enlist, the support of highly positive segments of people. Conversely, it permits the anticipation of points of resistance, which need to be addressed if tourism development is to go ahead successfully" (Ritchie, 1988, 210).
Male/Female Comparisons and Length of Residency

The initial sample of 382 mailings had 263 males and 119 females. This represented a 68.85% and a 31.15% (respectively) representation of the sample (see Table 4.4 and Table 4.6). This was not reflective of the census data, nor was it intended to be due to the random nature of the sample. The larger percentage of males was a result of more male listings in the phonebook.

| Table 4.4 |
| History of Sexes Throughout Survey Process |
| Sex | Initial Mailing | After Returns | Actual Response | Response Rate |
| Male | 263 | 230 | 129 | 56.1% |
| Female | 119 | 106 | 76 | 71.7% |
| TOTAL 382 | 336 | 205 |

| Table 4.5 |
| Sex of Respondents Compared to U.S. Census |
| Sex | No. of Respondents | Percent | 1990 U.S. Census |
| Male | 129 | 62.9% | 48.4% |
| Female | 76 | 37.1 | 51.6 |
| TOTAL | 205 | 100.0% | 100.0% |
To compensate for the fact that more males than females were sampled, consistency in the amount of males/females was looked at throughout the survey process (see Table 4.6). The number of males to females remained relatively the same as a percentage of the sample. Females (71.7%) responded more to the questionnaire than did the males (56.1%)

A comparison was made on differences in the views between men and women. Overall, the perceptions of males and females differed little. However, there were some exceptions. For example, 48.4% of females have lived in

Table 4.6
% of Sexes Throughout Survey Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Mailing</th>
<th>After Returns</th>
<th>Actual Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>68.85</td>
<td>66.56</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>31.15</td>
<td>33.44</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ontario County 10 years or less. Conversely, 79.1% of males lived in Ontario County 10 years or more. In a study conducted by McCool and Martin (1994), the results concerning the relationship between length of residency and attitudes toward tourism development were anything but clear. The differences between "new comers" and "old timers" were not significant in relation to their views. This is in agreement with McCool and Martin's findings.

Females were slightly more positive about tourism's role in the improved appearance of the community (69.7% vs. 54.2% for men). Males were more positive about tourism's role in site preservation (69% vs 57.9% for females). A larger percentage of males were aged 46 and over (60.5%). Conversely, the larger percentage of females were aged 45 and under (57.9%). This closely correlates to the length of residency, and it shows consistency in the data because the younger females have lived in Ontario County less years.
Age of Respondents

The age cohorts (18-30, 31-45, 46-60, 60+), when compared to the 1990 U.S. Census, were somewhat similar, specifically the 31-45 age cohort and the 60 and over cohort (see Table 4.7). Overall, the older the population, the higher the tendency to respond positively towards tourism development. This may be a result of more time for leisure and recreation as older residents retire (see Table 4.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>1990 U.S. Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30 (18-29)*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45 (30-44)*</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-60 (45-59)*</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Age groups used in Census
Table 4.8

Work Status by Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Status</th>
<th>18-30 Cohort</th>
<th>31-45 Cohort</th>
<th>46-60 Cohort</th>
<th>60+ Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Ontario County, New York is developing a five-year strategic plan. Additional research was needed in assessing how residents feel towards tourism development. This will help in directing positive efforts to communities who will be impacted by tourism development.

The purpose of this study was to identify some areas of concern and general and specific attitudes regarding further tourism development. The study was successful in this regard. The importance of residential views cannot be overlooked, nor undervalued.

This study presented a tourist irritation index as a benchmark for signs of negative impacts. The index annotated five levels of irritation which a community goes through during various stages of tourism growth. It was later referred to when discussing perceptions/attitudes in Naples.
A variety of current literature was looked at for inquiry into other residential attitude tests, specifically relating to rural areas whenever possible. Current literature suggests an increase in the study of residential populations in the tourism development process. Extensive collaboration is needed between the private and public sectors. Public participation, in particular, is considered an essential part of the planning process.

After a background on the development of modern-day tourism, potentials and problems in tourism development were looked at. Benefits, as well as, negative impacts were considered to provide a fair assessment of tourism growth. Today's tourism planners must consider economic, social, political, and environmental concerns when developing responsible tourism. A more systemic approach was said to be needed for the 1990s and beyond. This systemic approach involves the residents as an important part of the planning process.

A key section of the report focused on the development of the questionnaire/research tool. The questionnaire was
designed to measure specific attitudes. Procedures for mailing and design followed the total design methods prescribed by Don Dillman.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to test if groups were significantly different from each other at the .05 level. A Scheffe test was then performed on groups to determine where the differences were between groups, and if they were significantly different.

Finally, an analysis of the findings was performed so that conclusions may be made. Most of the statistics were descriptive in nature. The findings were broken up into three stages. The stages identified general areas of interest to developers, specific areas of interest, and demographic assimilation.

Conclusions

The study concluded that there is a strong positive perception towards tourism at the general level, i.e., the county. However, there were specific areas (Geneva, Naples
and Canandaigua) which varied enough to warrant individual attention. In general, Ontario County finds itself in the same situation as many other rural areas developing tourism. Ontario County is seeking to develop while maintaining its traditional values.

It is obvious to the researcher that Geneva did not view traffic as a problematic result of tourism development. This could be because Geneva's infrastructure can handle touristic impact. Geneva has much larger transportation arteries than Naples which viewed traffic as very problematic. Infrastructure is a consideration that should not be overlooked when planning. Additionally, Geneva has a large elderly population (29.2%) which have needs that should be addressed in regards to tourism.

The assessment helped in identifying county-wide differences in perceptions of tourism. It was also useful in that the study can serve as a base for which other research can be conducted. If used correctly, tourism planners could utilize this study as a tool for integration residential concerns with long-term planning.
As a result of a response rate of 61.01%, it can be concluded that residents are disposed to share their views. This is in direct contrast to a typical information tool - the public/town meeting. The motivation to participate in this survey is intrinsic and it appeals to a resident's sense of community involvement. It could be viewed as a more accurate alternative to public forums, albeit a more costly alternative.

The author would be remiss if the methodology was not mentioned. The methodology used for this study was a sound one because it adhered to a prescribed method of designing mail surveys. Furthermore, it is can be easily replicated which would allow for more expansive research. If properly administered, it could provide tourism planners an accurate assessment of residential attitudes towards tourism development.

Finally, there is much more support for additional tourism than there is for the restriction of tourism. It was also concluded that there is a slightly optimistic view
to the perceived future of Ontario County. Additionally, there is a larger and younger female population, as well as, a growing senior citizen population, both of which are more optimistic than their male and younger constituents, respectively.

Recommendations for Further Study

Social research, unlike a controlled laboratory experiment, cannot be looked at as something which can be self-contained. Continued research is needed to develop trends which allow for better forecasting and development of tourism plans. What follows are areas which have been identified as needing further consideration on the part of the tourism planner.

The study clearly identified areas of concern for tourism planners. One of the areas identified was the affect tourism has on the cost of living. Residents may not know about the multiplier effect tourism could have in their area. Education is an integral part of development because it keeps the public informed on issues.
Another area of concern is the large amount of vacationing that exists outside of Ontario County. How can tourism planners encourage more vacationing in their own backyard? One recommendation is a column or section in the local/county newspaper dedicated to tourism and travel within Ontario County. This section could be used as an educational tool as well.

Aside from education, if the researcher were to prioritize resident concerns, it is evident that the first priority should be infrastructure. The infrastructure has to be adequately developed to sustain continued tourism growth. Traffic is a major concern, specifically in Naples and Canandaigua. However, parking problems, market exposure problems, and reinvestments are issues which cause frustration amongst residents. These are not related to tourism directly, but may affect tourism and the tourist indirectly.

The results from this study indicate a need for future research. This study should be used as a baseline or
starting point. Its conclusions are not final because perceptions may change over time. As a result, the research reflects present perceptions. Follow-up surveys are needed to track trends in attitudes. It is recommended that future studies be conducted in intervals of 2 to 3 years.

Something which was not asked in the study was how residents felt towards certain proposed projects for development. A suggestion for future research is to evaluate residential perceptions on specific tourism, economic, and social endeavors. In Ontario County's case, for example, a study of how residents feel towards the proposed sites for outlet malls should be conducted if time and money allow for it.

Measuring residential perceptions is key for developmental support. However, administration of this survey instrument to different populations (businesses) is recommended so that differing views from the private and public sectors may be obtained. The role of research as a tool is an ongoing process. The importance of research is that it provides statistical information which could be used
in establishing sound policies for long-term planning. Research can also provide non-statistical information. This information (comments) cannot be measured, but it does reflect residential concerns (see Appendix D). In this respect, and within this context, it is hoped that the present study will be used to influence appropriate planning of Ontario County's "blue print" for growth.
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Appendix A

Tourism Growth in Ontario County
### TRACKING THE GROWTH IN ONTARIO COUNTY'S INVESTMENT IN TOURISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>TOTAL LOADING/DINING Taxable Sales</th>
<th>TOTAL SALES TAX 7%</th>
<th>State Portion Sales Tax 8%</th>
<th>Ontario County Tax Portion 12%</th>
<th>Formula Commitment 12%</th>
<th>Total County Revenue 56%</th>
<th>Four Seasons Budget Ontario County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>3/78 2/79</td>
<td>$33,761,000</td>
<td>$2,361,870</td>
<td>$1,349,660</td>
<td>$1,012,230</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>3/79 2/80</td>
<td>$34,578,000</td>
<td>$2,420,660</td>
<td>$1,383,120</td>
<td>$1,337,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$40,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>3/80 2/81</td>
<td>$36,495,000</td>
<td>$2,534,650</td>
<td>$1,459,800</td>
<td>$1,096,850</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>3/81 2/82</td>
<td>$39,092,000</td>
<td>$2,736,440</td>
<td>$1,563,680</td>
<td>$1,172,760</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>$36,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>3/82 2/83</td>
<td>$42,047,000</td>
<td>$2,943,290</td>
<td>$1,681,880</td>
<td>$1,261,410</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>3/83 2/84</td>
<td>$44,640,000</td>
<td>$3,266,800</td>
<td>$1,855,600</td>
<td>$1,399,200</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>3/84 2/85</td>
<td>$51,873,000</td>
<td>$3,631,110</td>
<td>$2,074,920</td>
<td>$1,556,190</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3/86 2/87</td>
<td>$57,879,000</td>
<td>$4,051,530</td>
<td>$2,315,160</td>
<td>$1,756,200</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3/87 2/88</td>
<td>$59,146,000</td>
<td>$4,140,220</td>
<td>$2,395,840</td>
<td>$1,774,300</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3/88 2/89</td>
<td>$63,417,000</td>
<td>$4,439,190</td>
<td>$2,536,680</td>
<td>$1,902,510</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3/89 2/90</td>
<td>$66,968,000</td>
<td>$4,547,760</td>
<td>$2,598,720</td>
<td>$1,949,040</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3/90 2/91</td>
<td>$66,394,000</td>
<td>$4,675,580</td>
<td>$2,655,760</td>
<td>$1,991,820</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>-xxx</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### County: ONTARIO  
Industry: TOTAL TRAVEL INDUSTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (1st Qtr)</th>
<th>Reporting Units (1st Otr)</th>
<th>Annual Average Employment</th>
<th>Total Payroll ($000)</th>
<th>Average Pay ($)</th>
<th>Index of Employment (1976=100.0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>3,071</td>
<td>14,562.0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>3,195</td>
<td>15,901.0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>104.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>3,241</td>
<td>17,217.4</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>105.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>3,444</td>
<td>18,979.2</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>112.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>3,194</td>
<td>18,650.9</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>104.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>19,498.3</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>102.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>3,040</td>
<td>19,637.3</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>3,309</td>
<td>22,138.6</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>107.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>3,504</td>
<td>23,037.1</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>114.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>3,643</td>
<td>24,303.1</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>118.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>3,509</td>
<td>26,020.1</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>114.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>3,771</td>
<td>29,167.2</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>122.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>3,855</td>
<td>32,554.0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>125.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>3,975</td>
<td>34,667.1</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>129.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>4,351</td>
<td>38,899.8</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>141.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>4,344</td>
<td>41,787.6</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>141.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>4,375</td>
<td>43,922.5</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>142.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change (1976-92): 1,304  

| Source: NYS Department of Taxation and Finance, and NYS Department of Economic Development. |
Appendix B

1990 U.S. Census on Ontario County
1990 CENSUS DATA ON ONTARIO COUNTY

Breakdown of Minors (under age 17) By Age and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 1</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>1421</td>
<td>1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and 4</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>2057</td>
<td>2078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>3174</td>
<td>3156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12,102</td>
<td>11,689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown of Adults By Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number of Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 19</td>
<td>3086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 - 24</td>
<td>3710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>7379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>7939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Breakdown of Adults By Age Groups (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number of Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>7930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td>7419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>5611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td>4415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>4080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 61</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 64</td>
<td>2533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 69</td>
<td>3922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 74</td>
<td>3236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - 79</td>
<td>2471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 84</td>
<td>1597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>1278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Combined Adult Age Group Totals and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohorts</th>
<th>Number of Adults</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 29</td>
<td>17282</td>
<td>24.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 44</td>
<td>23288</td>
<td>32.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 59</td>
<td>14103</td>
<td>19.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>16637</td>
<td>23.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>71,310</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Breakdown of Populations (Total, Adult, and Minors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number in Population</th>
<th>Percent of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Male Population</td>
<td>46654</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female Population</td>
<td>48447</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>95101</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Adult Male Population (Total Male Pop. - Total Male Minors) = 34,552

Total Adult Female Population (Total Female Pop. - Total Female Minors) = 36,758

Summary

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>95,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Adult Population</td>
<td>71,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minor Population</td>
<td>23,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Adult Males</td>
<td>34,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Adult Females</td>
<td>36,758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All information was taken from the 1990 U.S. Census
Appendix C

Cover Letters, Questionnaires, and Survey Tools
## Sample of Mailing List and Tracking Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing List ID</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Postal</th>
<th>Home Phone</th>
<th>Return date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.10001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greetings!! This postcard is sent to you from the Ontario County Tourism Bureau. This summer we are asking a select group of Ontario County residents to participate in a community survey to find out how you feel about tourism development in your county. Within a week, you will be receiving a questionnaire. We ask for your community involvement and help in answering some questions so that we may accurately plan for future tourism efforts in Ontario County. We are involving residents because we feel your opinions are important to Ontario County's future tourism planning.

Thank You.

Edwin

Valerie

John Doe
123 Lake Rd
Any City, NY
12345
Sample of Cover Letter for Initial Survey

John Doe
123 Lake Rd.
Any City, NY 12345

June 6, 1994

Dear John:

The attached questionnaire concerned with tourism development in Ontario County is part of a county-wide study being carried on cooperatively between Ontario County Tourism Bureau and the Rochester Institute of Technology. This study is concerned specifically with determining how residents in Ontario County view tourism development. We don't know how residents feel about tourism development, and believe it is important that your voices be heard. The results of this study will help to provide crucial data to be used in future tourism development endeavors.

We have randomly selected you and a few others in the county to respond to the enclosed survey. Only by obtaining the opinions of residents, such as yourself, can we accurately determine community acceptance of tourism development. We guarantee that all information will be held in the strictest of confidence.

The number at the lower, right hand corner on the back of the questionnaire is an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so that we may check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned.

The survey should take 6 minutes of your time to complete. It will be appreciated if you can complete the questionnaire prior to June 17th, 1994, and return it in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope to Ontario County Tourism Bureau.

Our sincere thanks and appreciation.

Edwin Gomez
Project Director
Rochester Institute of Technology

Valerie Knoblauch
Executive Director
Ontario County Tourism Bureau
Sample of Cover Letter for Follow-Up Mailing and Questionnaire

John Doe
123 Lake Rd
Any City, NY 12345

June 20, 1994

Dear John:

About two weeks ago, a survey seeking your opinion on tourism development in Ontario County was mailed to you. As of today, we have not yet received your completed questionnaire.

We have undertaken this study because of the belief that resident opinions should be taken into account in the planning and development of tourism in their communities.

We are writing to you again because of the significance each questionnaire has to the usefulness of this study and future community development. Your name was selected through a scientific sampling process in which every resident in Ontario County had an equal chance of being selected. This means that 1 out of every 235 people in Ontario County are being asked to complete this questionnaire.

In order for the results of this study to be truly representative of the opinions of all Ontario County residents, it is essential that each person in the sample return their questionnaire.

If you have already completed and returned the survey, please disregard this letter. Thank you for your cooperation in this important matter.

If not, we ask that you take a few minutes to complete the survey. In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed. Please return the survey by the end of the week of June 26, 1994.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated. Should you have any questions, please call us toll free at 1-800-654-9798. Thank you.

Edwin Gomez
Project Director
Rochester Institute of Technology

Valerie Knoblauch
Executive Director
Ontario County Tourism Bureau

P.S. Many residents have asked if they can have a copy of the results sent to them. They will be made available to respondents as a token of our appreciation. We hope to have them out sometime next month.
Please read and answer every question carefully. The survey should be returned in the enclosed envelope, before June 17th, 1994. Once again, thank you for your time in this very important matter.

1. Do you reside in Ontario County?
   - YES
   - NO

   If yes, please indicate the nearest town/city to which you live:

   - Bloomfield/Holcomb
   - Canandaigua
   - Clifton Springs/Phelps
   - Geneva
   - Honeoye
   - Naples
   - Manchester/Shortsville
   - Stanley/Rushville
   - Victor/Farmington

2. Where did you take your last vacation?
   - within Ontario County
   - within Finger Lakes Region
   - within New York state
   - outside of New York state

3. Do you think you're employed in a tourism-related position?
   - YES
   - NO

4. How many years have you been a resident of Ontario County?
   - less than 5 years
   - 10 - 15 years
   - 5 - 10 years
   - 15 or more years

5. Beside each of the statements presented below, please indicate the extent to which you strongly disagree (SD), disagree (D), don't know (DK), agree (A), or strongly agree (SA).

   a. The tourism industry provides many employment opportunities.
      - SD
      - D
      - DK
      - A
      - SA

   b. Tourism in our county benefit the tourists more than they benefit the residents.
      - SD
      - D
      - DK
      - A
      - SA

   c. Tourism has increased the quality of life in Ontario County.
      - SD
      - D
      - DK
      - A
      - SA

   d. Tourism has increased the number of crimes in this area.
      - SD
      - D
      - DK
      - A
      - SA

*****Please continue on the reverse side.
Indicate the extent to which you strongly disagree (SD), disagree (D), don't know (DK), agree (A), or strongly agree (SA).

e. Tourism development increases the number of recreational opportunities.  

f. Tourism development increases traffic problems.  

g. Tourism development helps in the preservation of natural and cultural sites.  

h. Tourism reduces the quality of outdoor recreation.  

i. The development of tourist attractions and facilities has improved the appearance of this community.  

j. Tourism development increases the cost of living.  

k. Increasing the number of tourists visiting the area improves the local economy.  

l. Non-residents should be encouraged to develop tourist attractions.  

m. The future of this county looks bright.  

6. Are you male or female?  □ MALE □ FEMALE  

7. Please indicate your age.  □ 18 to 30 years  □ 31 to 45 years  
   □ 46 to 60 years  □ 61 years or older  

8. Indicate your work status.  □ Employed □ Retired  
   □ Unemployed □ Full-time home maker  

Is there anything else you would like to tell us which might help in our future efforts to understand how residents feel about the issue of tourism development?  THANK YOU!!
Appendix D

Thank You Letter, Survey Results and Additional Comments From Ontario County Residents
Sample of Thank You Letter

August 1, 1994

Dear Resident:

In mid June we sent you a survey to determine Ontario County residents’ perceptions of tourism development. In the letter we promised to share the results of the survey with those who responded.

The purpose of this letter is twofold: to thank you for your consideration in responding and to fulfill our promise to share the results. The results have been analyzed and recommendations made by Ed Gomez as part of his graduate thesis. His work involved nearly 150 pages of analysis. A copy of the complete report (thesis) will be available in our office after Labor Day. Please call us and let us know if you would like to stop in and see more detail(s) on any category.

Thank you again for your participation and interest. We feel strongly that residents' attitudes toward tourism are critical to the appropriate growth of tourism. We appreciate your sharing your insights with us.

Edwin Gomez          Valerie Knoblauch
Project Director      Executive Director
Rochester Institute of Technology Ontario County Tourism Bureau
Summary of Survey Results for Ontario County

Origin of Respondent By City/Town

Legend
- Finger Lakes Region
- Ontario County
- New York State
- Outside of NY State

Where Last Vacation was Taken By Ontario County Residents
Residents indicated the extent to which they strongly disagreed (SD), disagreed (D), don't know (DK), agree (A), and strongly agree (SA) with the following statements.****All numbers represent percentages.

Statement 5a.

The tourism industry provides many employment opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 5b.

Tourism in our county benefit the tourists more than they benefit the residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 5c.

Tourism has increased the quality of life in Ontario County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement 5d.

Tourism has increased the number of crimes in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 5e.

Tourism development increases the number of recreational opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 5f.

Tourism development increases traffic problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 5g.

Tourism development helps in the preservation of natural and cultural sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement 5h.

Tourism reduces the quality of outdoor life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 5i.

The development of tourist attractions and facilities has improved the appearance of this community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 5j.

Tourism development increases the cost of living.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 5k.

Increasing the number of tourists visiting the area improves the local economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement 5l.

Non-residents should be encouraged to develop tourist attractions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 5m.

The future of the county looks bright.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age of Survey Participants

- 18 - 30 years: 27.6%
- 31 - 45 years: 25.8%
- 46 - 60 years: 35.1%
- 61 and Over: 11.2%

Work Status of Survey Participants

- Employed: 70.2%
- Homemaker: 24.9%
- Retired: 2.0%
- Unemployed: 2.9%
Additional Comments Provided By Residents

HONEBOYE

Ontario County (Canandaigua) does **NOT** need a tacky outlet mall on prime lake property destroying the wonderful asset given to Ontario County by nature. Money talks, but Wilmorit should be told **NO!** Allow nothing tacky, like a mall.

We have basically destroyed that which brought tourists, the beauty of the area. Go out in any lake except Hemlock & Conesus and all you see are houses, cottages and water boats.

I think the beauty of Ontario County lies in the preservation of nature reserves, parks and historical landmarks. I don't think further development is necessary or else the area will lose its character.

County government should be much more supportive of park & recreational development. I find it ludicrous that the county does not support the Ontario Pathways trail system. With population and economic growth, we must provide more recreational opportunities for residents & tourists. Seems the towns provide some parks while the county daddles. Is there a master plan and what is the County Planning Dept. doing to promote park development.

STANLEY/RUSHVILLE

Prices in stores seem to rise in the tourist season.

We are very fortunate to have the natural resources here. This is a beautiful & historical county. One does not fully appreciate this until you move away--& then come back!

Lake front idea is great! New shopping mall could be a catalyst for future developments of Lake front.
CANANDAIGUA

You can't expect to attract tourists when the most attractive feature... the lake has a chain link fence and ugly lake front buildings. Looks more like a concentration camp than a tourist attraction.

Ontario County's biggest problem is unemployment. Tourism Bureau should find ways and means to improve this situation.

The lake shore is our greatest natural resource and it is a disgrace - it's time to either move forward with Wilmorite or move forward without them. Besides the Shell (upcoming concerts are poor at best), Sonnenburg & the track, why else would anyone come here? Thank you for the opportunity to participate.

The Outlet Center at Rosepark is an abuse of Lake front property. An outlet/shopping center can be anywhere; there's only a little Lake front left. The lake is our greatest asset!

Traffic on Rt. 332 is out of control during any season and I will be moving out of Canandaigua to eliminate this frustration.

Tearing down Roseland for condos was a bad mistake. Instead the amusement park should have been refurbished. More information should have been collected and studies concerning the Wilmorite Corp. P.S. We need a Friendly's Restaurant.

Tourism can be an asset until its development becomes deleterious to the historic and scenic ambiance of the community.

A blind poll such as this is an effective way to determine residential opinion. I would suggest that in the future a place for suggestions (i.e. development/promotion of our heritage) be included.

The lake, access to it for all, and the views from...
Canandaigua to Naples are the most important to tourist development!

I would like to see Rosepark and or Kershaw park improved, beautified with business and shops and swimming (not housing) to utilize the beauty of lakes attraction for residents as well as tourists.

As tourism in this county develops, so too, must access by way of major roadway improvements I.E. 332 into Cdga. We have not been informed of any final plans on this issue. In addition, efforts to develop Lake shore Drive in Cdga (a prime piece of real estate) should be strengthened. What wasted tourism opportunity this road presents!

Look to other areas where tourism is strongly promoted i.e.: Lancaster, Pa, Mystic, CT; Cape May, NJ; Gettysburg, Pa; Lake Placid, NY; all of Vermont state. They have taken it to a higher level.

I think the tourism industry is good for this county. We just need to be wise and good stewards of our beautiful area. Traffic problems are probably a natural result of seasonal tourism and if kept to a reasonable limit can probably be tolerated by the residents in return for the benefits.

Depends upon other factors if development not incorporated with city planning/growth problems arise. There are many natural & historic that could be developed (with proper planning) that would serve tourists & residents alike.

We have more than we need of tasteless shopping plazas. Search for a community developer with imagination and invite the monied members of our community to share in the investment in an upscale future.

Tourism if successful nearly always increases the economy of an area - If people visit Ontario County they will spend money which benefits merchants and hopefully help to pay the costs of parks and other county facilities. If not the cost of entry for non-residents could be increased to compensate for the operation costs.
Help do something to get Rosepark moving. Clean out trailers & develop Kershaw area. A real embarrassment to our Lake front.

As a resident the tourism development should be voted on within the community. I love having places to go and things to do all the seasons long, but I do not want to do them in crowded or high risk situations. I like them family oriented and relaxed. Things to bring in close residents more than from other states.

Your questions do not begin to address the problems in Canandaigua which has become Henrietta On The Lake. The visitors I have spoken to were amazed at how it has deteriorated. Especially the Lake shore Drive area. From the sound of proposed plans, the lake will be completely shut out from view for tourists.

Referenda to permit casino gambling in NY state and more specifically in the Finger Lakes area, should be strongly resisted. I have no problem with gambling on Indian reservations.

Rt. 332 should be widened - many friends from out of the county complain when visiting. Also there is no good time to drive that road it can take as many as 25 minutes from outskirts of Canandaigua to the thruway. A lot of dangerous sudden stops. Could you all do something?

Controlled tourism is an asset. Quality only. Discount plaza is not tourism. For the kind of taxes we pay, tourists tend the abuse the quality of life, spoil the lake, dump debris, buy fast food and run. Unless it is quality or expensive tourism. Which I don't think gives me anything for the 12,000 a year taxes I pay for a small two bedroom home.

Of course tourist spend money and help the local economy however the quality of life for residents can be negatively affected by increased traffic, etc. Also, I would mention that I have a wife, Sue. I am sure she would have appreciated being asked to participate in the survey.
NAPLES

A good economy is bored on the principle of morality, free enterprise personal responsibilities and private property. Love of money and things is the roots of all evil which is encompassing the whole nation.

VICTOR/FARMINGTON

Lake shore Drive is an eye sore. I hope it is overhauled. One of our best potential views & tourist attractions (the Lake front) looks the worst! Eck! Downtown Canandaigua is shaping up nicely. Some exterior facelifts & new awnings would be nice. I.E. buildings. with plastic look Flying Star Diner & on S. Main, Lawn Repair shop. Very unique stores.

The environment must be considered in tourism development. Its not worth the tax $$ or increase in local economy if we damage the environment (including 50 yrs. down the road) or decrease the quality of life (fresh air/non-congested driving conditions, farm land and safety!)

When situated in the heart of the Finger Lakes, how can a county like Ontario not be into tourist development! The lakes area treasure for all to enjoy, with access for all, not just residents ! I would prefer to see natural & historic tourist attractions rather than contrived theme parks or amusement park ideas! Expanding walking trails is a good case in point & will increase tourism, if done right.

Simple questionnaire(s) could be available at tourist sites...in exchange for percent off admission ( if applicable).
This kind of development has to be in co-operation with land owners who might be affected. Full information and education of the public must be provided and public input actively sought! None of these announcements in the paper then a poorly attended meeting at the town hall. Actively means send mailings, knock out doors personally to explain your proposals.

I think more entertainment businesses should develop. So there is more things to do so that it keeps young kids entertained instead of getting in trouble.

Regards to item 1. this should happen as long as the attractions themselves are done in a tasteful manner. Income earned from attractions should help rejuvenate the community.

I don't think the residents of the Finger Lakes know what we have here--you have to get the word out!

Communities across the country are rapidly becoming homogeneous-they look the same; the same stores, franchises, cheap attractions proliferate. The accent for this county should be on preserving/enhancing its natural beauty, developing more public park property around Canandaigua Lake and stemming the cancer that has ruined Rt. 332. Tourists shouldn't be steered toward Awl-Mart & Wegmans but to the main streets and unique businesses struggling to survive.

Quality of life/living (low crime rate, minimum traffic, low noise level, low light pollution, low taxes, good schools) is far more important than developing tourism in Ontario County. I will vote against any development that threatens the quality of life/living in Victor area.

Residents should be encouraged to develop tourist attractions, there by, increasing pride, income, appearance and quality of life in our local communities. Tourism traffic, such as for the Race Track and concerts needs to be rerouted. There are too many traffic jams and tie-ups due to it.
We wouldn't mind more tourist if they could do something about traffic on 96 & stop building all the ugly shopping centers. We don't need any more.

More people are getting interested in walking tour & path climbing, a challenge I don't find here--nearby, Niagara Falls Canada does.

The development of major tourist attractions (such as water parks or large amusement parks) must be located apart from residential areas. Site selection is critical & suitable locations are becoming more & more difficult to find. People don't want their property values adversely affected from development of large tourism attractions.

CLIFTON SPRINGS/PHELPS

Keep all lakes, trees, etc. as clean & beautiful as possible. This is a gorgeous area.

Any improvements or developments or historical preservations in the area benefit all of us, residents and tourists alike.

I think it is a great idea. Ontario County has A lot to offer and it would be great for the economy.
GENEVA

The tourism potential of Ontario County has barely been touched with Seneca, Canandaigua and Honeyoye Lakes being in the county nothing has been done to exploit their benefits. This area is a gold mine of tourism industry we need the people in govt county to get the gains along with the money. You need to spend some to make A lot more!

Yes, I feel that the grocery stores raise there prices when the tourist start coming at cottages, etc. Why do local residents have to suffer because of this-especially people on limited income.

Our greatest natural resource is Seneca Lake. We have to understand how valuable it is and develop the Lake front area with a sensitivity to its history, its beauty. We should not artificially create a destination site that offers no logical relationship to this areas natural characteristics.

Development of lake fronts should be done without retail or service industries. It should be done using natural development.

Tourism facilities should be available & accessible to residents. Jet skis should be banned from our lakes. Public outdoor concerts should be increased.

This is probably common, but as a FL resident I think we need some big draws in our area. Unfortunately besides the wineries in my opinion we still don't have any.

Go see Cour a Laine, Idaho to see how to use natural beauty and isolation to attract tourism.

I feel very strong about tourism development but first we must clean up the trash that roams the streets. And all the drug addicts and their dealers!
I wish there was something that could have been done to preserve Roseland Park, something similar would be nice.

(Development of tourist attractions???) I don't see any of this in Canandaigua or other Ontario County areas. Canandaigua needs life very bad, they have the tools to make something of Cda., but very poor government.