

**THE LONG ISLAND CENTER FOR SOCIO-ECONOMIC POLICY**

**A PROFILE OF THE LONG ISLAND MANUFACTURING SECTOR**

**PREPARED FOR**

**THE LONG ISLAND FORUM FOR TECHNOLOGY**

**FRANK OTTO, PRESIDENT  
BILL WAHLIG, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

**PREPARED BY**

**DR. MARTIN R. CANTOR, CPA**

**November 2012**

The Long Island Center for Socio-Economic Policy  
Director, Dr. Martin R. Cantor, CPA  
28 Woodmont Road  
Melville, New York 11747  
Tel: (631) 491-1388  
Fax: (631) 491-6744  
E-Mail: [EcoDev1@aol.com](mailto:EcoDev1@aol.com)  
WEB SITE: [WWW.MARTINCANTOR.COM](http://WWW.MARTINCANTOR.COM)

## Introduction

A major factor keeping Long Island in the economic doldrums is that the region is becoming more of a service-sector economy. More jobs are being created in the lower-paying retail, health care and tourism sectors, while the higher-paying manufacturing and construction industries continue to shed jobs.

Thus, while the number of jobs created in the lower-paying sectors is outpacing the number of jobs lost elsewhere, the economic impact is smaller. This is because a service-sector economy reliant on lower-paying jobs has a smaller multiplier effect, which means that these jobs spin off fewer secondary jobs. Job losses in the higher-paying manufacturing and construction sectors result in an incrementally greater loss of secondary jobs. So, while there is some good news, a look behind the numbers reveals that the economic news is not that good.

Given the direction that the Long Island economy is heading, it is critical that efforts to create jobs in the emerging value-added industry sectors such as biotechnology, energy, technology, cyber security and advanced manufacturing be successful.

But it will take more than luck. It will take financing and a place where these emerging companies can grow and prosper while bucking the higher costs in property taxes, wages and energy that sap much of the profits from businesses operating on Long Island.

Additionally, for these businesses to grow on Long Island, they must attract interested venture capitalists. The hidden danger is that venture capitalists and inventors of new technology often seek to make profits from their intellectual and monetary capital rather than from the manufacturing of the inventions. This often results in selling the technology to an off-Long Island manufacturer, which defeats the purpose of regional job-creation strategies.

Let's not forget that in a global economy, intellectual capital can be manufactured anywhere costs are lower and profits are higher. Inventors are more loyal to their ideas and the profits that can be made from them – either from selling the development rights or the patents themselves – than they are to the area where the ideas were developed.

This makes Long Island's plans to emerge from a service economy more difficult. Thus, for Long Island's economy to grow, we can't let the ideas that are developed here be manufactured elsewhere.

The purpose of this study is to determine the current needs of Long Island's manufacturing and technology sectors necessary to sustain their current businesses and employment levels and the future needs required to expand and grow their businesses and employment bases here on Long Island and not elsewhere. The manufacturing sectors surveyed were Bio-tech; Defense-Aerospace-Homeland Security; Food; Medical Devices; Pharmaceuticals; and Test and Measurement.

This study examined the relationships between these manufacturing companies and the years operated on Long Island, annual gross revenues, increase or decrease in gross revenues, employees, increase or decrease in employees, wages paid, increase or decrease in wages paid, and whether they had pension plans and health plans.

Also examined were the relationships of these manufacturing companies and the importance of raising capital; their banking relationships; the importance to their businesses of government, taxes and regulations, energy costs, identifying new markets, exporting, finding qualified employees, and investment in workforce development; their current view of the Long Island economy and manufacturing sector; and any relocation plans from Long Island that they might have.

The benefit of this study is that it will provide an opportunity for LIFT to self-assess its' strategic plan and subsequently develop its economic development plan and associated legislative priorities that will assist the growth of Long Island's manufacturing and technology sectors. Participation in this study involves no risks, with responses confidential and anonymous

## Research Questions

The following questions guided this study.

### Research Question One

For the total of returned surveys of the Long Island manufacturing sector, what were the relationships between these manufacturing companies and the years operated on Long Island, annual gross revenues, increase or decrease in gross revenues, employees, increase or decrease in employees, wages paid, increase or decrease in wages paid, and whether they had pension plans and health plans.

Also examined were the relationships of these manufacturing companies and the importance of raising capital; their banking relationships; the importance to their businesses of government, taxes and regulations, energy costs, identifying new markets, exporting, finding qualified employees, and investment in workforce development; their current view of the Long Island economy and manufacturing sector; and any relocation plans from Long Island that they might have.

#### Research Question Two

For the Bio-tech, Defense-Aerospace-Homeland Security, Food, Medical Devices, Pharmaceuticals, and Test and Measurement elements of the Long Island manufacturing sector, what were the distributions and relationships between these manufacturing companies as differentiated by the years in business on Long Island, annual gross revenues, increase or decrease in gross revenues, employees, increase or decrease in employees, wages paid, increase or decrease in wages paid, and whether they had pension plans and health plans.

Also examined were the relationships between these manufacturing companies of the importance of raising capital; their banking relationships; the importance to their businesses of government taxes and regulations, energy costs, identifying new markets, exporting, finding qualified employees, and investment in workforce development; their current view of the Long Island economy and manufacturing sector; and any relocation plans from Long Island that they might have.

#### Research Question Three

What were the relationships in the Bio-tech, Defense-Aerospace-Homeland Security, Food, Medical Devices, Pharmaceuticals, and Test and Measurement elements of the Long Island manufacturing sector with gross revenues, increase in revenues, amount of employees, wages paid, increase in wages, years in business, and increase in employees?

#### Research Question Four

How did the Bio-tech, Defense-Aerospace-Homeland Security, Food, Medical Devices, Pharmaceuticals, and Test and Measurement elements of the Long Island manufacturing sector and the years in business, gross revenues, gross revenue increases, amount of employees,

employee wages paid and amount of employee wage increases predict the increase in the amount of employees?

### Description of Subjects

This study examined Long Island manufacturing companies in the industry categories of Bio-Tech, Defense-Aerospace-Homeland Security, Food, Medical Devices, Pharmaceuticals, and Test and Measurement.

The companies were purposefully selected by amount of employees and gross revenues, resulting in a total population to be sampled of 1,013 companies in six industry categories.

The subjects in this study were the chief executive or chief operating officers of each selected company in the 1,013 purposefully selected industry categories of Bio-Tech, Defense-Aerospace-Homeland Security, Food, and Medical Devices. Respondents were placed one of six industry categories and contrasted as to their years in business, gross revenues, increase or decrease in gross revenues, amount of employees, increase or decrease in their employees, total payroll, increase or decrease in their payroll, and whether or not they provide a pension plan or health care benefits. Respondent companies remained anonymous and confidential. Responses were coded so the respective company characteristics could be associated with the industry categories.

### Description of the Respondents

Of the 1,013 surveys mailed to the selected chief executives and chief operating officers of the purposefully selected companies, 160 (16 percent) were returned as unable to be delivered due to relocation of the company or the chief executive or chief operating officer. Of the remaining 853 purposefully selected sample, 38 (4 percent) were in Bio-Tech, 467 (55 percent) were in Defense-Aerospace-Homeland Security, 69 (8 percent) were in Food, 110 (13 percent) were in Medical Devices, 76 (9 percent) were in Pharmaceuticals, and 93 (11 percent) were in Test and Measurement.

Of the purposefully selected sample responses received from each industry category, Bio-Tech received 3 of 38 (8 percent), Defense-Aerospace-Homeland Security 58 of 467 (13 percent), Food 3 of 69 (4 percent), Medical Devices 12 of 110 (11 percent), Pharmaceuticals 2 of 76 (3 percent), and Test and Measurement 13 of 93 (14 percent).

Of the 91 (11 percent) survey responses received from the remaining 853 purposefully selected sample, 3 (3 percent) came from Bio-Tech, 58 (64 percent) from Defense-Aerospace-Homeland Security, 3 (3 percent) from Food, 12 (14 percent) from Medical Devices, 2 (2 percent) from Pharmaceuticals, and 13 (14 percent) from Test and Measurement. Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for the 91 survey respondents.

## Descriptive Statistics

### Company Category of Respondents

Table 1: Frequency of Responses - Company Category

Company Category	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	3	3.3	3.3	3.3
2	58	63.7	63.7	67.0
3	3	3.3	3.3	70.3
Valid 4	12	13.2	13.2	83.5
5	2	2.2	2.2	85.7
6	13	14.3	14.3	100.0
Total	91	100.0	100.0	
Missing System	0	0.0		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Bio-Tech, 2=Defense-Aerospace-Homeland Security, 3=Food, 4=Medical Devices, 5=Pharmaceuticals, 6=Test and Measurements.

### Years In Business

Of the 89 companies who reported their years in business, they ranged from one year to 70 years in business, had a mean years in business of 37.13 years and a median years of business of 35 years. 96.6 percent of the respondents had been operating between 12 and 70 years, with 3.4 percent having between in operations between three and ten years. Table 2 illustrates the descriptive statistics of the applicable 89 companies.

Table 2: Frequency of Responses - Years In Business

Years In Operation	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
3	1	1.0	1.1	1.1
8	1	1.0	1.1	2.2
10	1	1.0	1.1	3.4
12	3	3.1	3.4	6.7
13	1	1.0	1.1	7.9
16	2	2.0	2.2	10.1
18	1	1.0	1.1	11.2
20	4	4.1	4.5	15.7
21	1	1.0	1.1	16.9
22	2	2.0	2.2	19.1
23	2	2.0	2.2	21.3
25	6	6.1	6.7	28.1
27	1	1.0	1.1	29.2
28	4	4.1	4.5	33.7
30	3	3.1	3.4	37.1
32	1	1.0	1.1	38.2
33	3	3.1	3.4	41.6
34	3	3.1	3.4	44.9
35	4	4.1	4.5	49.4
Valid 39	4	4.1	4.5	53.9
40	6	6.1	6.7	60.7
44	2	2.0	2.2	62.9
45	4	4.1	4.5	67.4
47	3	3.1	3.4	70.8
48	1	1.0	1.1	71.9
49	2	2.0	2.2	74.2
50	6	6.1	6.7	80.9
51	2	2.0	2.2	83.1
53	2	2.0	2.2	85.4
55	2	2.0	2.2	87.6
56	2	2.0	2.2	89.9
59	1	1.0	1.1	91.0
60	3	3.1	3.4	94.4
61	1	1.0	1.1	95.5
62	1	1.0	1.1	96.6
63	1	1.0	1.1	97.8
66	1	1.0	1.1	98.9
70	1	1.0	1.1	100.0
Total	89	90.8	100.0	
Missing System	9	9.2		
Total	98	100.0		

## Data Gathering Techniques

All survey respondents and their specific responses were kept confidential. The relationships between these manufacturing companies and the years operated on Long Island, annual gross revenues, increase or decrease in gross revenues, employees, increase or decrease in employees, wages paid, increase or decrease in wages paid, and whether they had pension plans and health plans were ascertained by way of a survey that was distributed by U.S. Mail.

Other variables for the manufacturing companies ascertained by the survey were the importance of raising capital; their banking relationships; the importance to their businesses of government taxes and regulations, energy costs, identifying new markets, exporting, finding qualified employees, and investment in workforce development; their current view of the Long Island economy and manufacturing sector; and any relocation plans from Long Island that they might have.

Included with the mailed survey packet to the chief executives or chief operating officers of the purposefully selected sample of 1,013 manufacturing companies in the Bio-Tech, Defense-Aerospace-Homeland, Food, Medical Devices, Pharmaceutical, and Test and Measurement industry categories was a letter from LIFT President Frank Otto asking them in advance for their assistance and instructions on how to complete the survey. The letter of invitation to participate explained the guarantee of confidentiality and anonymity. The survey was individually addressed with preprinted labels addressed to the chief executives and chief operating officers of the purposefully selected manufacturing companies with a self-addressed return envelope to LIFT economic consultant Dr. Martin R. Cantor, CPA.

## Instrumentation

A survey (Appendix A) gathered data from 91 chief executives or chief operating officers of the purposefully selected sample of Bio-Tech, Defense-Aerospace-Homeland, Food, Medical Devices, Pharmaceutical, and Test and Measurement manufacturing companies. A five-point Likert Scale was used by respondents to report their business practices and strategies. The Likert Scale for all items was 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Disagree, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree.

The survey was comprised of two parts. Part one consisted of 26 questions designed to obtain from survey respondents the importance of raising capital; their banking relationships; the importance to their businesses of government taxes and regulations, energy costs, identifying



new markets, exporting, finding qualified employees, and investment in workforce development; their current view of the Long Island economy and manufacturing sector; and any relocation plans from Long Island that they might have.

Part 2 consisted of five parts designed to obtain the years survey respondents operated on Long Island, annual gross revenues, increase or decrease in gross revenues, employees, increase or decrease in employees, wages paid, increase or decrease in wages paid, and whether they had pension plans and health plans.

### Research Question One

For the total of returned surveys of the Long Island manufacturing sector, what were the relationships between the these manufacturing companies and the years operated on Long Island, annual gross revenues, increase or decrease in gross revenues, employees, increase or decrease in employees, wages paid, increase or decrease in wages paid, and whether they had pension plans and health plans.

Also what were the relationships of these manufacturing companies and the importance of raising capital; their banking relationships; the importance to their businesses of government, taxes and regulations, energy costs, identifying new markets, exporting, finding qualified employees, and investment in workforce development; their current view of the Long Island economy and manufacturing sector; and any relocation plans from Long Island that they might have.

## **Respondent Descriptives**

### Gross Revenue of Survey Respondents

The respondents were divided into two categories, those with gross revenues less than five million dollars and those with gross revenues more than five million dollars. Of the 88 companies in Table 3.1 identifying their gross revenues, 43.2 percent had gross revenues less than five million dollars and 56.8 percent reported gross revenues greater than five million dollars.

Table 3.1: 2011 Gross Revenues of Survey Respondents

Gross Revenues	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	38	41.8	43.2	43.2
Valid 2	50	54.9	56.8	100.0
Total	88	96.7	100.0	
Missing System	3	3.3		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Gross Revenues less than \$5 million, 2=Gross Revenues more than \$5 million

### Increase in Gross Revenues

Of the 91 survey respondents 84 reported whether their companies experience gross revenue increases between 2010 and 2011. Table 3.2 reflects that of the 84 companies, 36 companies or 42.9 percent reported that their gross revenues had decreased from 2010 and 53.6 percent or 45 companies reported that their company gross revenues had increased.

Table 3.2: Year to Year Increase in Gross Revenues From 2010

Gross Revenues	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	36	39.6	42.9	42.9
Valid 2	45	49.5	53.6	96.4
3	3	3.3	3.6	100.0
Total	84	92.4	100.0	
Missing System	7	7.6		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Year to Year Decrease in Gross Revenues, 2=Year to Year Increase in Gross Revenues  
3=No Increase in Gross Revenues

### Company Employees

Of the 91 respondents, 88 companies reported the amount of their employees, ranging from one employee to 1,500. Table 3.3 illustrates that half of the companies have between one and 29 employees and the remaining half have between 30 and 1,500 employees. The reporting companies represent approximately 9,205 employees, or 12.7 percent of Long Island's current manufacturing sector workforce.

Table 3.3: 2011 Company Employees

Amount of Employees	Company	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	1	1.0	1.1	1.1
3	1	1.0	1.1	2.3
4	2	2.0	2.3	4.5
5	2	2.0	2.3	6.8
6	1	1.0	1.1	8.0
8	2	2.0	2.3	10.2
10	5	5.1	5.7	15.9
11	1	1.0	1.1	17.0
12	1	1.0	1.1	18.2
13	4	4.1	4.5	22.7
15	4	4.1	4.5	27.3
16	2	2.0	2.3	29.5
17	2	2.0	2.3	31.8
18	4	4.1	4.5	36.4
19	1	1.0	1.1	37.5
20	3	3.1	3.4	40.9
22	2	2.0	2.3	43.2
23	2	2.0	2.3	45.5
25	1	1.0	1.1	46.6
26	1	1.0	1.1	47.7
29	1	1.0	1.1	48.9
30	2	2.0	2.3	51.1
32	1	1.0	1.1	52.3
35	1	1.0	1.1	53.4
37	1	1.0	1.1	54.5
40	2	2.0	2.3	56.8
41	1	1.0	1.1	58.0
43	1	1.0	1.1	59.1
45	1	1.0	1.1	60.2
50	4	4.1	4.5	64.8
53	1	1.0	1.1	65.9
65	1	1.0	1.1	67.0
68	1	1.0	1.1	68.2
70	2	2.0	2.3	70.5
74	1	1.0	1.1	71.6
78	1	1.0	1.1	72.7
79	1	1.0	1.1	73.9
80	1	1.0	1.1	75.0
86	1	1.0	1.1	76.1
100	2	2.0	2.3	78.4
105	1	1.0	1.1	79.5
112	1	1.0	1.1	80.7
116	1	1.0	1.1	81.8
125	1	1.0	1.1	83.0
130	1	1.0	1.1	84.1
140	1	1.0	1.1	85.2
150	2	2.0	2.3	87.5
160	1	1.0	1.1	88.6
175	1	1.0	1.1	89.8
190	1	1.0	1.1	90.9
220	1	1.0	1.1	92.0
260	1	1.0	1.1	93.2
285	1	1.0	1.1	94.3
375	1	1.0	1.1	95.5
400	1	1.0	1.1	96.6

Valid

	1000	1	1.0	1.1	97.7
	1500	2	2.0	2.3	100.0
	Total	88	89.8	100.0	
Missing	System	10	10.2		
Total		98	100.0		

### Increase in Employees From 2010

Seventy-eight companies responded as to their hiring of employees, with 27 or 34.6 percent reporting that their employee workforce decreased from 2010 to 2011. Thirty-one companies or 39.7 percent reported increases in their employees while 20 companies or 25.7 percent of respondents reported no change in their employees.

Table 3.4: Year to Year Employee Increase/Decrease From 2010

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	27	29.7	34.6	34.6
Valid 2	31	34.1	39.7	74.3
Valid 3	20	22.0	25.7	100.0
Total	78	85.8	100.0	
Missing System	13	14.2		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Year to Year Decrease in Employees, 2=Year to Year Increase in Employees  
3=No Increase in Employees

### Total 2011 Wages Paid

Sixty-two companies of the 91 surveyed responded that they paid \$200,554,361 in wages to their employees in 2011. Table 3.5 illustrates that the total of wages by the median of 31 companies totaled \$23,484,513 and range between \$81,000 and \$1,865,000. The 31 companies above the median paid a total of \$177,069,848 in wages to their employees in 2011, ranging between \$2,000,000 and \$55,000,000.

Table 3.5: Total 2011 Wages Paid

Wages Paid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
81000	1	1.0	1.6	1.6
207873	1	1.0	1.6	3.2
340000	1	1.0	1.6	4.8
Valid 343000	1	1.0	1.6	6.5
380000	1	1.0	1.6	8.1
475000	1	1.0	1.6	9.7
500000	2	2.0	3.2	12.9
550000	1	1.0	1.6	14.5

572000	1	1.0	1.6	16.1
639022	1	1.0	1.6	17.7
700000	1	1.0	1.6	19.4
904000	1	1.0	1.6	21.0
936856	1	1.0	1.6	22.6
1000000	3	3.1	4.8	27.4
1060500	1	1.0	1.6	29.0
1079000	2	2.0	3.2	32.3
1100000	1	1.0	1.6	33.9
1300000	2	2.0	3.2	37.1
1400000	1	1.0	1.6	38.7
1474000	1	1.0	1.6	40.3
1500000	2	2.0	3.2	43.5
1577000	1	1.0	1.6	45.2
1636262	1	1.0	1.6	46.8
1864000	1	1.0	1.6	48.4
1865000	1	1.0	1.6	50.0
2000000	3	3.1	4.8	54.8
2500000	2	2.0	3.2	58.1
2700000	1	1.0	1.6	59.7
3100000	1	1.0	1.6	61.3
3500000	1	1.0	1.6	62.9
3600000	1	1.0	1.6	64.5
4000000	6	6.1	9.7	74.2
4800000	2	2.0	3.2	77.4
5564613	1	1.0	1.6	79.0
6000000	3	3.1	4.8	83.9
6500000	1	1.0	1.6	85.5
7200000	1	1.0	1.6	87.1
7969000	1	1.0	1.6	88.7
9000000	2	2.0	3.2	91.9
9496235	1	1.0	1.6	93.5
10000000	1	1.0	1.6	95.2
10140000	1	1.0	1.6	96.8
24000000	1	1.0	1.6	98.4
55000000	1	1.0	1.6	100.0
Total	62	63.3	100.0	
Missing System	36	36.7		
Total	98	100.0		

### Increase in Employee Wages from 2010

Sixty-nine of the 91 survey respondents reported whether the wages of their employees increased from 2010 to 2011. Table 3.6 indicates that employee wages in 21 or 30.4 percent of the responding companies decreased in 2011 while 39 or 56.6 percent of the companies reported higher employee wages. Nine or 13.0 percent of the companies reported that the wages of their employees remained unchanged. These results correlated to Table 3.4 which illustrated that 34.6 percent of the responding companies reported employee reductions and 39.7 percent reported employee increases.

Table 3.6: Year to Year Increase in Employee Wages From 2010

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	21	23.1	30.4	30.4
Valid 2	39	42.9	56.6	87.0
Valid 3	9	9.9	13.0	100.0
Total	69	75.9	100.0	
Missing System	22	24.1		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Year to Year Decrease in Employees, 2=Year to Year Increase in Employees  
3=No Increase in Employees

### Pension Benefits and Health Benefits

Tables 3.7 and 3.8 reflect the fringe benefits provided by the survey respondents. With nearly all companies responding, pension benefits were found to be provided by 57 companies or 63.3 percent of the respondents with health care being provided by 82 companies or 92.1 percent of respondents.

Table 3.7: Pension Benefits Provided by Company

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	57	62.6	63.3	63.3
Valid 2	33	36.3	36.7	100.0
Total	90	98.9	100.0	
Missing System	1	1.1		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Yes, 2= No

Table 3.8: HealthCare Benefits Provided by Company

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	82	90.1	92.1	92.1
Valid 2	7	7.7	7.9	100.0
Total	89	97.8	100.0	
Missing System	2	2.2		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Yes, 2=No

## Capital Formation

With all 91 companies in the sample responding, Table Q1.1 indicates that capital formation was important to 82 or 90.1 percent of respondents. While capital was important to the responding companies as Table Q2.1 illustrates only 22 companies or 24.4 percent of the 90 respondents have attempted to raise capital while 68 companies or 75.6 percent of the respondents have not attempted to raise capital. One of the indicators why more respondents did not attempt to raise is the level of difficulty. Table Q3.1 sheds some light on the problem of raising capital. With only 49 companies responding 25 companies or 51 percent agreed or strongly agreed that they were successful in raising capital.

Q1.1: Capital is Important to My Company's Growth

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	5	5.5	5.5	5.5
2	4	4.4	4.4	9.9
Valid 3	21	23.0	23.1	33.0
4	30	32.1	33.0	65.9
5	31	34.0	34.0	100.0
Total	90	99.0	100.0	
Missing System	1	1.0		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Q2.1: Company Attempted to To Raise Capital

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	22	24.2	24.4	24.4
Valid 2	68	74.7	75.6	100.0
Total	90	98.9	100.0	
Missing System	1	1.1		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Yes, 2=No.

Q3.1: Company Successful In Raising Capital

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	12	13.2	24.5	24.5
2	6	6.6	12.2	36.7
3	6	6.6	12.2	49.0
Valid 4	11	12.1	22.4	71.4
5	14	15.4	28.6	100.0
Total	49	53.9	100.0	
Missing System	42	46.1		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

#### Importance of Bank Lending to Company

Tables Q4.1, Q5.1 and Q6.1 illustrate the importance of bank lending to respondent companies growth and the success that the respondents have had in obtaining that financing. Sixty-five or 73 percent of respondents reported in Table Q4.1 that bank lending was important to the growth of their company. Yet the results in Table Q5.1 reflect that respondents were nearly evenly split as to whether they have tried to obtain bank lending, with 42 companies or 48.3 percent of the 87 respondents saying that they have tried to obtain bank financing with a 45 companies or 51.7 percent saying that they have not.

Shedding light on the complexity of the bank financing issue are the results reflected in Table Q6.1. Of the 91 survey respondents 32 companies or 35.2 percent did not respond as to their success in getting bank financing. Of the remaining 59 companies, 33 companies reported their success in obtaining bank financing. The 33 companies represented 35.7 percent of the 91 respondents and 59.3 percent of those companies responding to the question as to their success in obtaining bank financing.



Q4.1: Bank Lending Important to Company Growth

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	13	14.3	14.6	14.6
2	11	12.1	12.4	27.0
3	21	23.1	23.6	50.6
4	21	23.1	23.6	74.2
5	23	25.2	25.8	100.0
Total	89	97.8	100.0	
Missing System	2	2.2		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Q5.1: Has Company Tried to Obtain Bank Lending in Past Year

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	42	46.1	48.3	48.3
2	45	49.5	51.7	100.0
Total	87	95.6	100.0	
Missing System	4	4.4		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Yes, 2=No.

Q6.1: Successful in Getting Bank Financing

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	13	14.3	22.0	22.0
2	6	6.6	10.2	32.2
3	5	5.5	8.5	40.7
4	13	14.3	22.0	62.7
5	22	24.1	37.3	100.0
Total	59	64.8	100.0	
Missing System	32	35.2		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

## Local, State and Federal Taxes and Energy Costs Important to Company Growth

Tables Q7.1, Q8.1, Q9.1, and Q10.1 illustrate what respondents feel about the impact of property taxes and energy costs on the growth of their company. As would be expected there was agreement as to the impact of these factors on their businesses. Eighty-five companies or 93.4 percent of the 91 respondents in Table Q7.1 agreed that property taxes were important to the growth of their company, as did 79 companies or 88.8 percent of the 89 survey respondents in Table Q8.1 who agreed that New York State business taxes were important to their company's growth. Table 9.1 presents the agreement of 85 companies or 93.4 percent of the 91 respondents as to the importance of reducing Federal taxes to their company's growth, as were the 87 companies or 95.6 of the 91 respondents in Table Q10.1 who agreed that energy costs financially impact the finances of their companies.

Q7.1: Property Tax Relief Important to Company Profits

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	2	2.2	2.2	2.2
2	4	4.4	4.4	6.6
3	15	16.5	16.5	23.1
Valid 4	23	25.3	25.3	48.4
5	47	51.6	51.6	100.0
Total	91	100.0	100.0	
Missing System	0	0.0		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Q8.1: New York Business Taxes Important to Company Growth

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	5	5.6	5.6	5.6
2	5	5.6	5.6	11.2
3	12	13.1	13.5	24.7
Valid 4	24	26.3	27.0	51.7
5	43	47.2	48.3	100.0
Total	89	97.8	100.0	
Missing System	2	2.2		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Q9.1: Reducing Federal Taxes Important Company Growth

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	2	2.2	2.2	2.2
2	4	4.4	4.4	6.6
3	9	9.9	9.9	16.5
4	20	22.0	22.0	38.5
5	56	61.5	61.5	100.0
Total	91	100.0	100.0	
Missing System	0	0.0		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Q10.1: Energy Costs Financially Impacts Company Finances

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	1	1.1	1.1	1.1
2	3	3.3	3.3	4.4
3	12	13.2	13.2	17.6
4	30	33.0	33.0	50.5
5	45	49.4	49.4	100.0
Total	91	100.0	100.0	
Missing System	0	0.0		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Growth Strategies: Identifying New Markets and Finding Qualified Employees

Tables Q11.1 and Q12.1 illustrates how important identifying new markets and finding qualified employees are to the growth of the responding companies. In Table Q11.1, 83 or 92.2 percent of the 90 respondents agreed that identifying new markets was important to the growth of their company. Also agreeing that finding new employees was important to company growth was 87 companies or 95.6 percent of the 91 respondents in Table Q12.1.

Q11.1: Identifying New Markets Important To Company Growth

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	2	2.2	2.2	2.2
2	5	5.5	5.6	7.8
3	17	18.7	18.9	26.7
4	22	24.2	24.4	51.1
5	44	48.3	48.9	100.0
Total	90	98.9	100.0	
Missing System	1	1.1		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Q12.1: Finding Qualified Employees Important to Company Growth

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	2	2.2	2.2	2.2
2	2	2.2	2.2	4.4
3	12	13.2	13.2	17.6
4	23	25.3	25.3	42.9
5	52	57.1	57.1	100.0
Total	91	100.0	100.0	
Missing System	0	0.0		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Government Impact on Business Growth

Tables Q13.1, Q14.1 and Q15.1 present the role that New York State and Long Island governments play in creating an atmosphere where business can grow. Table Q13.1 reflects that 72 or 90.1 percent of the 80 companies who responded to this question agreed that complying with New York State regulations was burdensome to their company. Agreeing that Long Island governments are not business friendly was 83 companies or 92.3 percent of the 90 respondents in Table Q14.1. These results are supported by 62 or 69.6 percent of the 89 respondents in Table Q15.1 who agreed that Long Island government is not important to the growth of their company.

Q13.1: Complying With New York Regulations Burdensome for Company

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	1	1.0	1.3	1.3
2	7	7.7	8.8	10.0
Valid 3	28	30.8	35.0	45.0
4	17	18.7	21.3	66.3
5	27	29.7	33.8	100.0
Total	80	87.9	100.0	
Missing System	11	12.1		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Q14.1: Long Island Governments are Business Friendly

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	15	16.5	16.7	16.7
2	24	26.4	26.7	43.3
Valid 3	44	48.3	48.9	92.2
4	6	6.6	6.7	98.9
5	1	1.1	1.1	100.0
Total	90	98.9	100.0	
Missing System	1	1.1		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Q15.1: Long Island Government Important To Company Growth

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	6	6.6	6.7	6.7
2	21	23.1	23.6	30.3
Valid 3	35	38.5	39.3	69.7
4	17	18.7	19.1	88.8
5	10	10.9	11.2	100.0
Total	89	97.8	100.0	
Missing System	2	2.2		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

## The Long Island Economy

Respondents were asked whether the Long Island Economy had improved during the past year. Table Q16.1 illustrates that with 91 companies responding, 62 or 68.1 percent agreed that the Long Island economy has not improved during 2011, with another 25 companies or 25.5 percent not having strong opinions of whether the economy had improved. Only four companies or 4.4 percent of respondents agreed that the Long Island economy had improved.

When asked whether the Long Island economy will improve over the next five years the respondents were nearly evenly divided. Of the 88 respondents, 26 or 29.5 percent disagreed that the economy would improve with 20 companies or 22.7 percent agreeing that the economy would improve. Forty-two of the respondents or 47.7 percent did not have strong opinions that the Long Island economy will improve over the next five years.

Q16.1: Long Island Economy Has Improved During Past Year

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	15	16.5	16.5	16.5
2	47	51.6	51.6	68.1
3	25	27.5	27.5	95.6
Valid 4	2	2.2	2.2	97.8
5	2	2.2	2.2	100.0
Total	91	100.0	100.0	
Missing System	0	0.0		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Q17.1: Long Island Economy Will Improve Over Next Five Years

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	9	9.9	10.2	10.2
2	17	18.7	19.3	29.5
3	42	46.1	47.7	77.3
Valid 4	17	18.7	19.3	96.6
5	3	3.3	3.4	100.0
Total	88	96.7	100.0	
Missing System	3	3.3		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

## Technology and Innovation

Technology and innovation has become integral to business profitability and employee productivity. Table Q18.1 reflects that of all 91 companies responding to this question. Seventy-five companies or 82.4 percent agreed that their companies depend on technology innovation.

Q18.1: Company Depends On Technology Innovation

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	6	6.6	6.6	6.6
2	10	11.0	11.0	17.6
3	21	23.0	23.0	40.6
4	23	25.3	25.3	65.9
5	31	34.1	34.1	100.0
Total	91	100.0	100.0	
Missing System	0	0.0		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

## The Manufacturing Sector: Relocation, Growth, or Contraction

The relocation plans of Long Island manufacturing companies and the current and future state of Long Island manufacturing are presented in Tables Q19.1, Q20.1, Q21.1, and Q22.1.

In Table Q 19.1, of the 91 companies responding, 58 or 63.7 percent said that their companies would not relocate from Long Island over the next five years. However 33 companies or 36.3 percent of the respondents somewhat agreed to strongly agreed that they would relocate.

Supporting these results were the 90 respondents in Table 20.1 where 49 companies or 54.4 percent somewhat or strongly agreed that Long Island's high costs will force their companies to relocate from Long Island. The remaining 41 companies or 45.6 agreed that they would stay. What is clear is that there is danger that Long Island can lose a significant portion of its manufacturing sector if costs of operating on Long Island don't change.

Further evidence of weakness in the manufacturing sector was found in Table Q21.1 where 63 companies or 70 percent of the 90 respondents disagreed that Long Island's manufacturing sector will grow over the next five years. Only three respondents or 3.3 percent agreed that the manufacturing sector would grow. The remaining 24 or 26.7 percent of respondents somewhat

agreed that manufacturing would grow; hardly a ringing endorsement of the future of Long Island manufacturing.

Another indicator of the weakness in the manufacturing sector was found in Table Q22.1 were 50 companies or 56.2 percent of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed that Long Island’s manufacturing sector would contract over the next five years. While 39 companies or 43.8 percent of the 89 respondents felt that the region’s manufacturing sector would not contract, having more than half the respondents feeling that there would be contraction does not bode well for Long Island manufacturing and the regional economy.

Manufacturing is critical to any regional economy because the sector has the highest economic multiplier and the wages paid to manufacturing employees are some of the region’s highest.

Q19.1: Company Will Relocate From Long island Over Next Five Years

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	30	33.0	33.0	33.0
2	28	30.7	30.7	63.7
3	17	18.7	18.7	82.4
Valid 4	8	8.8	8.8	91.2
5	8	8.8	8.8	100.0
Total	91	100	100.0	
Missing System	0	0.0		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Q20.1: Long Island’s High Costs Will Force Company Relocation

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	16	17.6	17.8	17.8
2	25	27.5	27.8	45.6
Valid 3	22	24.1	24.4	70.0
4	13	14.3	14.4	84.4
5	14	15.4	15.6	100.0
Total	90	98.9	100.0	
Missing System	1	1.1		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree



Q21.1: Long Island's Manufacturing Sector Will Grow Over Next Five Years

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	19	20.9	21.1	21.1
2	44	48.4	48.9	70.0
Valid 3	24	26.3	26.7	96.7
4	3	3.3	3.3	100.0
Total	90	98.9	100.0	
Missing System	1	1.1		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Q22.1: Long Island Manufacturing Sector Will Contract Over Next Five Years

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2	18	19.8	20.2	20.2
3	21	23.1	23.6	43.8
Valid 4	28	30.7	31.5	75.3
5	22	24.2	24.7	100.0
Total	89	97.8	100.0	
Missing System	2	2.2		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

### Exporting

Exporting is another critical area for regional economic growth. The more a manufacturing company produces and exports the more jobs are created and the greater the economic impact generated on Long Island.

Table Q23.1 illustrates that exporting already is part of the strategic growth plan of Long Island companies with 61 or 67.0 percent of the 91 respondents agreeing that it was. The results also illustrate that there is growth potential for Long Island exporting with 30 companies, or 33.0 percent of respondents not including exporting in their company strategic plans.

Q23.1: Exporting Part of Company Strategic Growth Plan

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	18	19.8	19.8	19.8
2	12	13.2	13.2	33.0
3	16	17.6	17.6	50.5
Valid 4	26	28.6	28.6	79.1
5	19	20.8	20.8	100.0
Total	91	100.0	100.0	
Missing System	0	0.0		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Workforce Development

Long Island employers are always seeking qualified employees and often comment that they can't find enough. Part of the process of having qualified employees includes the continuous training of existing workers, or workforce development, and the creation of a pool of future workers through internships and summer employment for high school and college students. The importance of qualified employees to the growth of their businesses is quantified in Tables Q24.1, Q25.1 and Q26.1.

Table Q24.1 indicates that 82 companies or 90.1 percent of the 91 respondents agree that workforce development training is integral to the growth of their company. Supporting the importance that respondents place on workforce development training is Table Q25.1 which indicates that of the 89 respondents, 66 companies or 74.0 percent invest in workforce development training.

Developing a pool of future employees by investing in internships and summer employment for college students was found to be important to the survey respondents. Table 26.1 reflects that of 88 respondents, 50 companies or 56.8 percent invest in internships and summer employment for college students, however 38 companies or 43.2 percent of respondents do not.

Q24.1: Workforce Development Integral to Company Growth

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	2	2.2	2.2	2.2
2	7	7.7	7.7	9.9
Valid 3	32	35.1	35.1	45.0
4	30	33.0	33.0	78.0
5	20	22.0	22.0	100.0
Total	91	100.0	100.0	
Missing System	0	0.0		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Q25.1: Company Invests in Workforce Development Training

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	6	6.6	6.7	6.7
2	17	18.7	19.1	25.8
Valid 3	30	33.0	33.7	59.6
4	22	24.1	24.7	84.3
5	14	15.4	15.6	100.0
Total	89	97.8	100.0	
Missing System	2	2.2		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Q26.1: Company Invests in Internships and Summer Employment for College Students

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	14	15.4	15.9	15.9
2	24	26.4	27.3	43.2
Valid 3	25	27.5	28.4	71.6
4	13	14.2	14.8	86.4
5	12	13.2	13.6	100.0
Total	88	96.7	100.0	
Missing System	3	3.3		
Total	91	100.0		

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

## Research Question Two

For the Bio-tech, Defense-Aerospace-Homeland Security, Food, Medical Devices, Pharmaceuticals, and Test and Measurement elements of the Long Island manufacturing sector, what were the distributions and relationships between these manufacturing companies as differentiated by the years in business on Long Island, annual gross revenues, increase or decrease in gross revenues, employees, increase or decrease in employees, wages paid, increase or decrease in wages paid, and whether they had pension plans and health plans.

Also examined were the relationships between these manufacturing companies and the importance of raising capital; their banking relationships; the importance to their businesses of government, taxes and regulations, energy costs, identifying new markets, exporting, finding qualified employees, and investment in workforce development; their current view of the Long Island economy and manufacturing sector; and any relocation plans from Long Island that they might have.

While the responses to Research Question One presented in Tables 1 through Table 3.8 and Tables Q1.1 through Table Q26.1 (Pages 9 to 27) illustrates the views of the entire sample of 91 respondents, the responses to Research Question Two disaggregates the answers to Research Question One into the individual responding manufacturing sectors. Thus the descriptive statistics and respondent descriptives, where applicable are now reflected in Tables 4.1 through Table 4.3 and Tables Q1.2 through Table Q26.2.1 (Pages 28 to 47).

The disaggregation of the data for the entire sample into Defense-Aero Space-Homeland Security (Defense) provides a more detailed illustration of that sector categorized into companies with gross revenues under \$5 million and companies with gross revenues exceeding \$5 million. These companies are further categorized into companies that have had success in increasing revenues with the results illustrated in the following tables and the ensuing discussion.

### Capital Formation for Defense Companies with Increased Revenues

All of the Defense companies with revenues either under \$5 million and 86.6 percent of companies with revenues over \$5 million agreed that capital was important to their company, while all of the companies in each revenue group disagreed that they had attempted to raise capital. Of those companies that had attempted to raise capital, 83.3 percent of the under \$5 million revenue companies and all the over \$5 million revenue companies agreed that they were successful in raising capital (Tables Q1.2.1, Q2.2.1, Q3.2.1).

### Importance of Bank Lending to their Company for Defense Companies with Increased Revenues

Bank lending was important 70 percent of defense companies with under \$5 million in revenues and 86.7 percent to defense companies with over \$5 million in revenues, with 66.7 percent of the over \$5 million revenue companies attempting to obtain bank financing while 60 percent of the under \$5 million revenue companies had not. Of those attempting to get bank financing 85.7 percent of under \$5 million revenue companies and all the over \$5 million revenue companies responded that they had been successful (Tables Q4.2.1, Q5.2.1, Q6.2.1).

### Local, State, and Federal Taxes and Energy Costs Important to Growth of Defense Companies with Increased Revenue

All the Defense companies with increased revenues and revenues under and over \$5 million agreed that property tax relief and reducing Federal taxes were important to the growth of their companies and their company profits. Additionally, 88.8 percent of companies with under \$5 million in revenues and 93.3 percent of companies with revenues over \$5 million agreed that New York State business taxes were important to the growth of their company. That energy costs impacted company finances were agreed to by all of the companies with revenues under \$5 million and 93.3 percent of companies with over \$5 million in revenues (Tables Q7.2.1, Q8.2.1, Q9.2.1, Q10.2.1).

### Growth Strategies for Defense Companies with Increased Revenues: Identifying New Markets and Finding Qualified Employees

Finding new markets were important to the growth of 90 percent of the companies with under \$5 million in revenues and all of the companies with over \$5 million in revenues, with all of the companies in both revenue categories agreeing that finding qualified employees were important to their company's growth (Tables Q11.2.1, Q12.2.1).

### Government Impact on Business Growth of Defense Companies with Increased Revenues

That compliance with New York State regulations was burdensome for Defense companies was agreed to by 85.7 percent of companies with under \$5 million of revenues and by 92.8 percent of companies with more than \$5 million in revenues. There was somewhat agreement that Long Island governments were business friendly by 66.7 percent of companies with under \$5 million and 73.3 percent of companies with over \$5 million in revenues, while 33.3 percent of companies under \$5 million in revenues and 26.7 percent of companies over \$5 million in

revenues disagreed that Long Island governments were business friendly. Yet 75 percent of companies with revenues under \$5 million and 66.7 percent of companies with over \$5 million in revenues agreed that Long Island governments were important to the growth of their company (Tables Q13.2.1, Q14.2.1, Q15.2.1).

#### The Long Island Economy as Viewed by Defense Companies with Increased Revenues

According to 60 percent of companies with under \$5 million in revenues and 66.7 percent of companies with revenues over \$5 million the Long Island economy had not improved during the past year. However, that the Long Island economy will improve during the next five years was agreed to by 80 percent of companies with under \$5 million in revenues and by 86.7 percent of companies with over \$5 million in revenues (Tables Q16.2.1, Q17.2.1).

#### Technology Innovation Importance to Growth of Defense Companies with Increased Revenues

There was agreement by 90 percent of the companies with revenues under \$5 million and 80 percent of the companies with over \$5 million in revenues that technology and innovation was important to the growth of their company (Table Q18.2.1).

#### Relocation, Growth, or Contraction for Defense Companies with Increased Revenues

Seventy percent of companies with revenues under \$5 million and 66.7 percent of companies with revenues over \$5 million would not relocate from Long Island during the next five years. However, 66.7 percent of companies with revenues over \$5 million said Long Island's high costs would force their company to relocate away from Long Island while companies with under \$5 million were evenly divided (Tables Q19.2.1, Q20.2.1).

The Long Island manufacturing sector will not grow during the next five years was agreed to by 80 percent of companies with over \$5 million in revenues while companies with revenues under \$5 million were evenly divided. Offering similar views where 86.7 percent of the companies with revenues over \$5 million and 60 percent of companies with under \$5 million in revenues who agreed that manufacturing will contract over the next five years (Tables Q 21.2.1, Q22.2.1).

#### Exporting Part of Strategic Growth Plan of Defense Companies with Increased Revenues

Eighty percent of companies with revenues exceeding \$5 million responded that exporting was part of the strategic growth plan of their company, while 70 percent of companies with

revenues less than \$5 million said that exporting was not part of their growth plan (Table Q23.2.1).

#### Workforce Development Integral to Growth of Defense Companies with Increased Revenues

Workforce development was integral to growth was agreed to by 90 percent of companies with revenues under \$5 million and 86.7 percent of companies with gross revenues over \$5 million. Affirming these responses were 80 percent of companies with revenues under \$5 million and 86.7 percent of companies with revenues over \$5 million who agreed that they invested in workforce development (Tables Q24.2.1, Q25.2.1).

#### Internships and College Summer Employment-Defense Companies with Increased Revenues

Seventy percent of companies with revenues under \$5 million responded that they did not invest in internships and college student summer employment programs while 73.3 percent of companies with revenues exceeding \$5 million invested in both initiatives (Table Q26.2.1).

#### Conclusion

By focusing on the responses of the Defense-Aero Space-Homeland Security companies that have succeeded increasing their gross revenues exhibited a pattern of business decisions indicative of a company that has succeed in the Long Island economy. These differences often differed between companies with under \$5 million in revenues and those larger companies with revenues over \$5 million.

**Table 4.1: Change In Gross Revenues From 2010**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Decreased	(10) 43.5%	(15) 45.5%	(5) 83.3%	(1) 16.7%	(4) 66.7%	-0-
Increased	(10) 43.5%	(15) 45.5%	(1) 16.7%	(4) 66.6%	(2) 33.3%	(7) 100.0%
No Change	(1) 4.3%	(2) 6.0 %	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Did Not Respond	(2) 8.7%	(1) 3.0 %	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Table 4.2: Change In Company Employees from 2010**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Decreased	(9) 39.2%	(7) 21.2%	-0-	(2) 33.3%	(3) 50.0%	(2) 28.6%
Increased	(4) 17.4%	(15) 45.5%	-0-	(2) 33.3%	(1) 16.7%	(5) 71.4%
No Change	(7) 30.4%	(8) 24.2%	-0-	-0-	(2) 33.3%	-0-
Did Not Respond	(3) 13.0%	(3) 9.1%	-0-	(2) 33.4%	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	-0-	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Table 4.3: Changes in Employee Wages From 2010**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Decreased	(7) 30.4%	(8) 24.2%	(3) 50.0%	(2) 33.3%	(1) 16.7%	-0-
Increased	(7) 30.4%	(18) 54.5%	(2) 33.3%	(1) 16.7%	(3) 50.0%	(5) 71.4%
No Change	(4) 17.4%	(1) 3.0%	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(2) 28.6%
Did Not Respond	(5) 21.8%	(6) 18.3%	(1) 16.7%	(3) 50.0%	(1) 16.6%	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%



### Q1.2: Capital is Important To My Company's Growth

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(1) 4.3%	(3) 9.1%	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-
Disagree	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(2) 33.3%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Somewhat Agree	(5) 21.7%	(7) 21.2%	(2) 33.3%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	(2) 28.5%
Agree	(7) 30.4%	(11) 33.3%	-0-	(2) 33.3%	(2) 33.3%	(3) 42.9%
Strongly Agree	(10) 43.5%	(12) 36.4%	(3) 50.00	(1) 16.7%	(2) 33.3%	(1) 14.3%
Did Not Respond	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.00%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

### Q1.2.1: Companies With Increased Revenues - Capital is Important To My Company

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	(2) 13.3%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Somewhat Agree	(3) 30.0%	(2) 13.3%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(2) 28.5%
Agree	(3) 30.0%	(5) 33.3%	-0-	(2) 50.0%	(1) 50.0%	(3) 42.9%
Strongly Agree	(4) 40.0%	(6) 40.0%	(1) 100.00	-0-	(1) 50.0%	(1) 14.3%
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.00%	(4) 100.0%	(2) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

### Q2.2: Company Attempted to Raise Capital in 2011

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(3) 13.0%	(8) 24.2%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	(3) 50.0%	(2) 28.6%
Disagree	(20) 87.0%	(24) 72.7%	(5) 83.3%	(5) 83.3%	(3) 55.0%	(5) 71.4%
Somewhat Agree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Agree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Strongly Agree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Did Not Respond	-0-	(1) 3.1%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.00	(7) 100.0%

**Q2.2.1: Companies With Increased Revenues-Company Attempted to Raise Capital in 2011**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	(4) 26.7%	-0-	-0-	(1) 50.0%	(2) 28.6%
Disagree	(10) 100.0%	(11) 73.3%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(1) 50.0%	(5) 71.4%
Somewhat Agree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Agree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Strongly Agree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(2) 100.00	(7) 100.0%

**Q3.2: Company Successful in Raising Capital**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(1) 4.4%	(2) 6.1%	(3) 50.0%	-0-	(3) 50.0%	(1) 14.3%
Disagree	(2) 8.7%	(1) 3.0%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(2) 33.3%	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(3) 13.0%	(3) 9.1%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Agree	(5) 21.7%	(3) 9.1%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Strongly Agree	(1) 4.4%	(10) 30.3%	-0-	-0-	-0-	(2) 28.6%
Did Not Respond	(11) 47.8%	(14) 42.4%	(3) 50.0%	(4) 66.6%	(1) 16.7%	(3) 42.8%
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q3.2.1: Companies With Increased Revenues - Company Successful in Raising Capital**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	(1) 100.0%	-0-	(1) 100.0%	(1) 25.0%
Disagree	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(1) 16.7%	(1) 11.1%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Agree	(4) 66.6%	(2) 22.2%	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 25.0%
Strongly Agree	-0-	(6) 66.7%	-0-	-0-	-0-	(2) 50.0%
Total	(6) 100.0%	(9) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	-0-	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%

**Q4.2: Bank Lending Is Important To Company Growth**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(2) 8.7%	(4) 12.1%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	(2) 28.6%
Disagree	(2) 8.7%	(4) 12.1%	(1) 16.7%	(2) 33.2%	-0-	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(5) 21.7%	(6) 18.2%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	(2) 33.2%	(4) 57.1%
Agree	(8) 34.9%	(6) 18.2%	(1) 16.6%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 14.3%
Strongly Agree	(5) 21.7%	(13) 39.4%	(3) 50.0%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	-0-
Did Not Respond	(1) 4.3%	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q4.2.1: Company With Increased Revenue-Bank Lending Important To Company Growth**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(2) 20.0%	(1) 6.7%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(2) 28.6%
Disagree	(1) 10.0%	(1) 6.7%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(2) 20.0%	(3) 20.0%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 57.1%
Agree	(2) 20.0%	(4) 26.7%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Strongly Agree	(3) 30.0%	(6) 40.0%	(1) 100.0%	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q5.2: Has Company Tried To Obtain Bank Lending in Past Year**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Yes	(7) 30.4%	(20) 60.6%	(3) 50.0%	(2) 33.3%	(3) 50.0%	(2) 28.6%
No	(15) 65.3%	(12) 36.4%	(3) 50.0%	(3) 50.0%	(2) 33.3%	(5) 71.4%
Did Not Respond	(1) 4.3%	(1) 3.0%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q5.2.1: Company With Increased Revenues-Company Tried To Get Bank Lending in 2011**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Yes	(4) 40.0%	(10) 66.7%	(1) 100.0%	(1) 33.3%	(1) 50.0%	(2) 28.6%
No	(6) 60.0%	(5) 33.3%	-0-	(2) 66.7%	(1) 50.0%	(5) 71.4%
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(3) 100.0%	(2) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q6.2:Successful In Getting Bank Financing**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(1) 4.4%	(2) 6.1%	(2) 33.3%	-0-	(4) 66.6%	(2) 28.6%
Disagree	(3) 13.0%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(1) 4.4%	(2) 6.1%	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(1) 14.3%
Agree	(5) 21.7%	(5) 15.2%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Strongly Agree	(2) 8.7%	(15) 45.5%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Did Not Respond	(11) 47.8%	(9) 27.1%	(2) 33.3%	(3) 49.9%	(1) 16.7%	(2) 28.5%
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q6.2.1 Companies With Increased Revenues - Successful In Getting Bank Financing**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	(1) 100.0%	-0-	(1) 100.0%	(2) 40.0%
Disagree	(1) 14.3%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(1) 14.3%	(1) 8.3%	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 20.0%
Agree	(4) 57.1%	(2) 16.7%	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 20.0%
Strongly Agree	(1) 14.3%	(9) 75.0%	-0-	(1) 100.0%	-0-	(1) 20.0%
Total	(7) 100.0%	(12) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(5) 100.0%

**Q7.2: Property Tax Relief Important To Company Profit**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-
Disagree	(2) 8.7%	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(4) 17.4%	(4) 12.1%	(1) 16.7%	(2) 33.3%	-0-	(2) 28.6%
Agree	(5) 21.7%	(6) 18.2%	(1) 16.7%	(2) 33.3%	(2) 33.3%	(2) 28.6%
Strongly Agree	(12) 52.2%	(23) 69.7%	(4) 66.6%	(1) 16.7%	(3) 50.0%	(5) 42.8%
Did Not Respond	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q7.2.1: Company With Increase Revenue-Prop. Tax Relief Important To Company Profit**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	-0-
Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(1) 10.0%	(2) 13.3%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(2) 28.6%
Agree	(4) 40.0%	(3) 20.0%	-0-	(2) 50.0%	-0-	(2) 28.6%
Strongly Agree	(5) 50.0%	(10) 66.7%	-0-	-0-	(2) 100.0%	(3) 42.8%
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(2) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q8.2: New York Business Taxes Important To Company Growth**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(1) 4.4%	(1) 3.0%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-
Disagree	(1) 4.4%	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(3) 13.0%	(3) 9.1%	-0-	(2) 33.2%	(2) 33.3%	(2) 28.6%
Agree	(6) 26.1%	(7) 21.2%	(2) 33.3%	(1) 16.7%	(3) 50.0%	(2) 28.6%
Strongly Agree	(11) 47.8%	(22) 66.7%	(2) 33.3%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	(3) 42.8%
Did Not Respond	(1) 4.3%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q8.2.1:Company With Increase Revenue-N Y Business Tax Importnt To Company Growth**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(1) 11.2%	(1) 6.7%	(1) 100.0%	(1) 25.0%	-0-	-0-
Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	-0-
Somewhat Agree	-0-	(2) 13.3%	-0-	-0-	(2) 100.0%	(2) 28.6%
Agree	(4) 44.4%	(4) 21.2%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(2) 28.6%
Strongly Agree	(4) 44.4%	(10) 66.7%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(3) 42.8%
Total	(9) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(2) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q9.2: Reducing Federal Taxes Important To Company Growth**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-
Disagree	(2) 8.7%	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(1) 4.3%	(3) 9.1%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	(3) 42.9%
Agree	(6) 26.1%	(4) 12.1%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.6%	(1) 16.7%	(2) 28.6%
Strongly Agree	(14) 60.9%	(26) 78.8%	(5) 83.3%	(2) 33.3%	(3) 50.0%	(2) 28.5%
Did Not Respond	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q9.2.1:Company with Increase Revenue-Reducng Federal Tx Import To Company Growth**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	-0-
Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 25.0%	(1) 50.0%	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(1) 10.0%	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 50.0%	(3) 42.9%
Agree	(3) 30.0%	(3) 20.0%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(2) 28.6%
Strongly Agree	(6) 60.0%	(12) 80.0%	(1) 100.0%	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(2) 28.5%
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(2) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q10.2: Energy Costs Impact Company Finances**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	(1) 3.0%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-	-0-
Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(1) 14.3%
Somewhat Agree	(3) 13.0%	(5) 15.2%	-0-	(2) 33.3%	(1) 16.6%	-0-
Agree	(8) 34.8%	(9) 27.3%	(2) 33.3%	(3) 50.0%	-0-	(6) 85.7%
Strongly Agree	(12) 52.2%	(18) 54.5%	(3) 50.0%	(1) 16.7%	(4) 66.7%	-0-
Did Not Respond	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q10.2.1: Company With Increased Revenues - Energy Costs Impact Company Finances**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	(1) 6.7%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 50.0%	(1) 14.3%
Somewhat Agree	(2) 20.0%	(3) 20.0%	-0-	(2) 50.0%	-0-	-0-
Agree	(3) 30.0%	(2) 13.3%	-0-	(2) 50.0%	-0-	(6) 85.7%
Strongly Agree	(5) 50.0%	(9) 60.0%	(1) 100.0%	-0-	(1) 50.0%	-0-
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(2) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q11.2: Identifying New Markets Important To Company Growth**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(1) 4.3%	(1) 3.0%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-	-0-
Disagree	(2) 8.7%	(1) 3.0%	(2) 33.3%	-0-	-0-	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(3) 13.0%	(7) 21.2%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 14.3%
Agree	(6) 26.2%	(7) 21.2%	-0-	(4) 66.7%	-0-	(2) 28.6%
Strongly Agree	(11) 47.8%	(17) 51.6%	(3) 50.0%	(1) 16.6%	(5) 83.3%	(4) 57.1%
Did Not Respond	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q11.2.1: Company with Increase Revenue- Find New Mkts Important To Company Growth**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Disagree	(1) 10.0%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(3) 30.0%	(4) 26.7%	-0-	-0-	(1) 50.0%	(1) 14.3%
Agree	(3) 30.0%	(2) 13.3%	-0-	(3) 75.0%	-0-	(2) 28.6%
Strongly Agree	(3) 30.0%	(9) 60.0%	(1) 100.0%	(1) 25.0%	(1) 50.0%	(4) 57.1%
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(2) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q12.2: Finding Qualified Employees Important To Company Growth**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Somewhat Agree	(2) 8.7%	(3) 9.1%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(1) 14.3%
Agree	(5) 21.7%	(9) 27.3%	(1) 16.6%	-0-	(3) 50.0%	-0-
Strongly Agree	(16) 69.6%	(21) 63.6%	(4) 66.7%	(3) 50.0%	(2) 33.3%	(4) 57.1%
Did Not Respond	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.6%	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q12.2.1: Company with Increase Revenue-Qualified Employee Impor To Company Growth**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Somewhat Agree	-0-	(1) 6.7%	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Agree	(2) 20.0%	(2) 13.3%	-0-	(2) 50.0%	-0-	-0-
Strongly Agree	(8) 80.0%	(12) 80.0%	(1) 100.0%	(1) 25.0%	(2) 100.0%	(4) 57.1%
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(2) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%



**Q13.2: Complying With NY State Regulations Burdensome For Company**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Disagree	(2) 8.7%	(2) 6.1%	-0-	-0-	(3) 50.0%	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(3) 13.0%	(11) 33.3%	(2) 33.3%	(4) 66.7%	-0-	(4) 57.1%
Agree	(4) 17.4%	(5) 15.2%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(3) 50.0%	(2) 28.6%
Strongly Agree	(6) 26.1%	(13) 39.4%	(4) 66.7%	(1) 16.6%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Did Not Respond	(8) 34.8%	(2) 6.0%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q13.2.1: Companies with Increase Revenue: NYS Regs Compliance Burdensome For Comp.**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Disagree	(1) 14.3%	(1) 7.2%	-0-	-0-	(1) 50.0%	-0-
Somewhat Agree	-0-	(5) 35.7%	-0-	(4) 100.0%	-0-	(4) 57.1%
Agree	(2) 28.6%	(3) 21.4%	-0-	-0-	(1) 50.0%	(2) 28.6%
Strongly Agree	(4) 57.1%	(5) 35.7%	(1) 100.0%	-0-	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Total	(7) 100.0%	(14) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(2) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q14.2: Long Island Governments are Business Friendly**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(3) 13.0%	(3) 9.1%	(2) 33.3%	-0-	(3) 50.0%	-0-
Disagree	(4) 17.4%	(8) 24.2%	(2) 33.3%	(3) 50.0%	(1) 16.7%	(4) 57.1%
Somewhat Agree	(14) 60.9%	(19) 57.6%	(2) 33.4%	(3) 50.0%	(1) 16.6%	(2) 28.6%
Agree	(1) 4.4%	(3) 9.1%	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-
Strongly Agree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Did Not Respond	(1) 4.3%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q14.2.1: Company with Increase Revenue:Long Island Governments are Business Friendly**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(1) 11.1%	(1) 6.7%	(1) 100.0%	-0-	-0-	-0-
Disagree	(2) 22.2%	(3) 20.0%	-0-	(2) 50.0%	(1) 50.0%	(4) 57.1%
Somewhat Agree	(6) 66.7%	(10) 66.6%	-0-	(2) 50.0%	(1) 50.0%	(2) 28.6%
Agree	-0-	(1) 6.7%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Strongly Agree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Total	(9) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(2) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q15.2: Long Island Government Important to Company Growth**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(1) 4.3%	(1) 3.0%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 14.3%
Disagree	(5) 21.8%	(8) 24.2%	(1) 16.7%	(3) 50.0%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 14.3%
Somewhat Agree	(7) 30.4%	(10) 30.3%	(3) 50.0%	(2) 33.3%	(3) 50.0%	(5) 71.4%
Agree	(5) 21.7%	(7) 21.2%	(1) 16.6%	-0-	(1) 16.6%	-0-
Strongly Agree	(3) 13.1%	(7) 21.3%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Did Not Respond	(2) 8.7%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q15.2.1:Company with Increase Revenue-Long Island Gov Important to Company Growth**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 25.0%	(1) 50.0%	(1) 14.3%
Disagree	(2) 25.0%	(5) 33.3%	-0-	(2) 50.0%	(1) 50.0%	(1) 14.3%
Somewhat Agree	(3) 37.5%	(3) 20.0%	(1) 100.0%	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(5) 71.4%
Agree	(1) 12.5%	(2) 13.4%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Strongly Agree	(2) 25.0%	(5) 33.3%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(8) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q16.2: Long Island Economy Has Improved During Past Year**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(3) 13.0%	(4) 12.1%	(4) 66.7%	-0-	(2) 33.3%	-0-
Disagree	(14) 60.9%	(18) 54.6%	(1) 16.7%	(3) 50.0%	(3) 50.0%	(3) 42.9%
Somewhat Agree	(5) 21.7%	(11) 33.3%	-0-	(2) 33.3%	(1) 16.7%	(3) 42.8%
Agree	(1) 4.4%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Strongly Agree	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.6%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-
Did Not Respond	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q16.2.1: Company with Increase Revenue-L I Economy Improved During Past Year**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	(1) 6.7%	-0-	-0-	(1) 50.0%	-0-
Disagree	(6) 60.0%	(9) 60.0%	-0-	(2) 50.0%	(1) 50.0%	(3) 42.9%
Somewhat Agree	(3) 30.0%	(5) 33.3%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(3) 42.9%
Agree	(1) 10.0%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Strongly Agree	-0-	-0-	(1) 100.0%	(1) 25.0%	-0-	-0-
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(2) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q17.2: Long Island Economy Will Improve Over Next Five Years**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(1) 4.4%	(1) 3.0%	(2) 33.3%	-0-	(2) 33.3%	-0-
Disagree	(5) 21.7%	(5) 15.2%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	(2) 33.3%	(3) 42.9%
Somewhat Agree	(11) 47.8%	(18) 54.5%	(1) 16.7%	(4) 66.7%	(1) 16.7%	(3) 42.8%
Agree	(6) 26.1%	(6) 18.2%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 14.3%
Strongly Agree	-0-	(1) 3.0%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.6%	-0-	-0-
Did Not Respond	-0-	(2) 6.1%	(1) 16.6%	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q17.2.1: Company with Increase Revenue-LI Economy Will Improve Over Next Five Years**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 50.0%	-0-
Disagree	(2) 20.0%	(2) 13.3%	-0-	-0-	-0-	(3) 42.9%%
Somewhat Agree	(4) 40.0%	(10) 66.7 %	-0-	(2) 50.0%	(1) 50.0%	(3) 42.8%
Agree	(4) 40.0%	(3) 20.0%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Strongly Agree	-0-		(1) 100.0%	(1) 25.0%	-0-	-0-
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q18.2: Company Growth Depends on Technology Innovation**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(1) 4.3%	(4) 12.1%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-
Disagree	(1) 4.4%	(5) 15.2%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(7) 30.4%	(4) 12.1%	(3) 50.0%	(2) 33.3%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 14.3%
Agree	(10) 43.5%	(4) 12.1%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	(2) 33.3%	(2) 28.6%
Strongly Agree	(4) 17.4%	(16) 48.5%	(1) 16.6%	(2) 33.3%	(3) 50.0%	(4) 57.1%
Did Not Respond	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q18.2.1: Company with Increase Revenue-Comp. Growth Depend on Technolgy Innovation**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	(1) 6.7%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Disagree	(1) 10.0%	(2) 13.3%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(3) 30.0%	(2) 13.3%	-0-	(2) 50.0%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Agree	(5) 50.0%	(3) 20.0%	-0-	-0-	(1) 50.0%	(2) 28.6%
Strongly Agree	(1) 10.0%	(7) 46.7%	(1) 100.0%	(2) 50.0%	(1) 50.0%	(4) 57.1%
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(2) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q19.2: Company Will Relocate From Long Island Over Next Five Years**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(12) 52.2%	(9) 27.3%	(2) 33.3%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Disagree	(3) 13.0%	(11) 33.3%	-0-	(4) 66.7%	(4) 66.7%	(4) 57.1%
Somewhat Agree	(6) 26.1%	(7) 21.1%	(2) 33.3%	-0-	-0-	(2) 28.6%
Agree	(1) 4.3%	(4) 12.2%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-	-0-
Strongly Agree	(1) 4.4%	(2) 6.1%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.6%	(2) 33.3%	-0-
Did Not Respond	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q19.2.1: Company with Increase Revenue-Company Will Relocate From LI Ovr Nxt 5 Yrs**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(6) 60.0%	(4) 26.7%	(1) 100.0%	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Disagree	(1) 10.0%	(6) 40.0%	-0-	(2) 50.0%	(1) 50.0%	(4) 57.1%
Somewhat Agree	(2) 20.0%	(2) 13.3%	-0-	-0-	-0-	(2) 28.6%
Agree	(1) 10.0%	(2) 13.3%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Strongly Agree	-0-	(1) 6.7%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	(1) 50.0%	-0-
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(2) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q20.2: Long Island High Costs Will Force Company Relocation**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(5) 21.7%	(4) 12.1%	(2) 33.3%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Disagree	(5) 21.8%	(8) 24.2%	(1) 16.7%	(3) 50.0%	(3) 50.0%	(3) 42.9%
Somewhat Agree	(7) 30.4%	(10) 30.3%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	-0-
Agree	(4) 17.4%	(5) 15.2%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-	(1) 14.2%
Strongly Agree	(2) 8.7%	(6) 18.2%	(1) 16.6%	-0-	(2) 33.3%	(2) 28.6%
Did Not Respond	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.6%	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q20.2.1: Company with Increase Revenue- L I High Costs Will Force Company Relocation**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(4) 40.0%	(1) 6.6%	(1) 100.0%	(1) 33.3%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Disagree	(1) 10.0%	(4) 26.7%	-0-	(1) 33.4%	-0-	(3) 42.9%
Somewhat Agree	(4) 40.0%	(7) 46.7%	-0-	(1) 33.3%	(1) 50.0%	-0-
Agree	(1) 10.0%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 14.2%
Strongly Agree	-0-	(3) 20.0%	-0-	-0-	(1) 50.0%	(2) 28.6%
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(3) 100.0%	(2) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q21.2: Long Island Manufacturing Sector Will Grow Over Next Five Years**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(1) 4.4%	(8) 24.2%	(2) 33.3%	(1) 16.7%	(2) 33.3%	(3) 42.9%
Disagree	(12) 52.2%	(16) 48.5%	(2) 33.3%	(4) 66.7%	(2) 33.3%	(3) 42.8%
Somewhat Agree	(9) 39.1%	(7) 21.2%	(2) 33.4%	(1) 16.6%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 14.3%
Agree	(1) 4.3%	(1) 3.0%	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-
Strongly Agree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Did Not Respond	-0-	(1) 3.1%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q21.2.1: Company with Increase Revenue- L I Mfg Sector Will Grow Over Next Five Years**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	(2) 13.3%	(2) 33.3%	(1) 16.7%	(2) 33.3%	(3) 42.9%
Disagree	(5) 50.0%	(10) 66.7%	(2) 33.3%	(4) 66.7%	(2) 33.3%	(3) 42.8%
Somewhat Agree	(4) 40.0%	(3) 20.0%	(2) 33.4%	(1) 16.6%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 14.3%
Agree	(1) 10.0%	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-
Strongly Agree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(10) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q22.2: Long Island Manufacturing Sector Will Contract Over Next Five Years**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Disagree	(6) 26.1%	(7) 21.2%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(8) 34.8%	(5) 15.2%	(1) 16.7%	(2) 33.3%	(3) 50.0%	(1) 14.3%
Agree	(5) 21.7%	(10) 30.3%	(2) 33.3%	(2) 33.3%	(2) 33.3%	(5) 71.4%
Strongly Agree	(3) 13.1%	(10) 30.3%	(3) 50.0%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Did Not Respond	(1) 4.3%	(1) 3.0%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q22.2.1: Company with Increase Revenue- L I Mfg Sector Will Contract Over Next 5 Years**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Disagree	(4) 40.0%	(2) 13.3%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(2) 20.0%	(3) 20.0%	(1) 16.7%	(2) 33.3%	(3) 50.0%	(1) 14.3%
Agree	(3) 30.0%	(7) 46.7%	(2) 33.3%	(2) 33.3%	(2) 33.3%	(5) 71.4%
Strongly Agree	(1) 10.0%	(3) 20.0%	(3) 50.0%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q23.2: Exporting Is Part Of Company Strategic Growth Plan**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(7) 30.4%	(4) 12.1%	(2) 33.3%	-0-	-0-	(2) 28.6%
Disagree	(6) 26.1%	(3) 9.1%	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(6) 26.1%	(5) 15.2%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-
Agree	(2) 8.7%	(13) 39.4%	-0-	(4) 66.7%	(3) 50.0%	(2) 28.5%
Strongly Agree	(2) 8.7%	(8) 24.2%	(3) 50.0%	(1) 16.6%	(2) 33.3%	(3) 42.9%
Did Not Respond	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q23.2.1:Company with Increase Revenue-Export Part Of Company Strategic Growth Plan**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(5) 50.0%	(2) 13.3%	(1) 100.0%	-0-	-0-	(2) 28.6%
Disagree	(2) 20.0%	(1) 6.7%	-0-	-0-	(1) 50.0%	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(3) 20.0%	(2) 13.3%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Agree	(1) 10.0%	(6) 40.0%	-0-	(3) 75.0%	-0-	(2) 28.5%
Strongly Agree	-0-	(4) 26.7%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	(1) 50.0%	(3) 42.9%
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(2) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q24.2: Workforce Development Integral To Company Growth**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-
Disagree	(1) 4.4%	(2) 6.1%	(3) 50.0%	-0-	-0-	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(8) 34.8%	(8) 24.2%	(1) 16.7%	(3) 50.0%	(5) 83.3%	(3) 42.9%
Agree	(11) 47.8%	(12) 36.4%	(2) 33.3%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	(2) 28.6%
Strongly Agree	(3) 13.0%	(11) 33.3%	-0-	(1) 16.6%	(1) 16.7%	(2) 28.5%
Did Not Respond	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q24.2.1:Company with Increase Revenue-W/force Develop Integral To Company Growth**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Disagree	(1) 10.0%	(2) 13.3%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Somewhat Agree	(2) 20.0%	(3) 20.0%	-0-	(2) 50.0%	(1) 50.0%	(3) 42.9%
Agree	(7) 70.0%	(4) 26.7%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(2) 28.6%
Strongly Agree	-0-	(6) 40.0%	(1) 100.0%	(1) 25.0%	(1) 50.0%	(2) 28.5%
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(2) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%



**Q25.2: Company Invests In Workforce Development Training**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	(3) 50.0%	(2) 33.3%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Disagree	(7) 30.4%	(4) 12.1%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.7%	(1) 14.3%
Somewhat Agree	(7) 30.4%	(11) 33.3%	(1) 16.7%	(2) 33.3%	(3) 50.0%	(1) 14.3%
Agree	(7) 30.5%	(8) 24.2%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(3) 42.9%
Strongly Agree	(1) 4.3%	(10) 30.4%	-0-	(1) 16.7%	(1) 16.6%	(1) 14.2%
Did Not Respond	(1) 4.4%	-0-	(1) 16.6%	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q25.2.1: Company with Increase Revenue-Company Invests In Wrkforce Develop Training**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	-0-	-0-	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Disagree	(2) 20.0%	(2) 13.3%	-0-	-0-	(1) 25.0%	(1) 14.3%
Somewhat Agree	(5) 50.0%	(4) 26.7%	(1) 100.0%	(2) 50.0%	(2) 50.0%	(1) 14.3%
Agree	(3) 30.0%	(3) 20.0%	-0-	-0-	(1) 25.0%	(3) 42.9%
Strongly Agree	-0-	(6) 40.0%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(1) 14.2%
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(4) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q26.2: Company Invests In Internships and College Student Summer Employment**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
Gross Revenues	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(3) 13.0%	(2) 6.1%	-0-	(3) 50.0%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Disagree	(10) 43.5%	(6) 18.2%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	(4) 66.7%	(1) 14.3%
Somewhat Agree	(7) 30.4%	(7) 21.2%	(3) 50.0%	(2) 33.3%	(1) 16.7%	(5) 71.4%
Agree	(1) 4.4%	(10) 30.3%	(1) 16.7%	-0-	(1) 16.6%	-0-
Strongly Agree	-0-	(8) 24.2%	(1) 16.6%	-0-	-0-	-0-
Did Not Respond	(2) 8.7%	-0-	-0-	(1) 16.7%	-0-	-0-
Total	(23) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

**Q26.2.1: Company with Increased Revenues-Company Invests In Internships and College Student Summer Employment**

Company Category	Defense-AeroSpace-Homeland Security		Medical Devices		Test and Measurement	
	Under \$5 Million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million	Under \$5 million	Over \$5 million
	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %	(Respond) %
Strongly Disagree	(2) 20.0%	(1) 6.7%	(1) 100.0%	(1) 25.0%	-0-	(1) 14.3%
Disagree	(5) 50.0%	(3) 20.0%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	(4) 66.7%	(1) 14.3%
Somewhat Agree	(3) 30.0%	(2) 13.3%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	(1) 16.7%	(5) 71.4%
Agree	-0-	(4) 26.7%	-0-	(1) 25.0%	(1) 16.6%	-0-
Strongly Agree	-0-	(5) 33.3%	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	(10) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(1) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(6) 100.0%	(7) 100.0%

### Research Question Three

What were the relationships of the Bio-tech, Defense-Aerospace-Homeland Security, Food, Medical Devices, Pharmaceuticals, and Test and Measurement elements of the Long Island manufacturing sector with gross revenues, increase in revenues, amount of employees, wages paid, increased in raises, years in business, and increase in employees? A Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis was used to examine these relationships and appears in Table A.

Table A: Pearson Product Correlation Matrix

	N=88							
	Employee Increase	Wage Increase	Revenue Increase	Years in Business	Gross Revenues	Employee Amount	Wages Paid	Company Category
Employee Increase	1							
Wage Increase	.708**	1						
Revenue Increase	.321**	.495**	1					
Years In Business	.116	.126	.193	1				
Revenue	-.002	-.002	.210	.084	1			
Employee Amount	-.157	-.138	-.044	.133	.315**	1		
Wages Paid	-.011	.022	.140	-.117	.334**	.625**	1	
Company Category	-.117	.158	.028	.087	.000	-.094	-.197	1

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

The results of the Pearson product moment correlation matrix appear in Table A. The correlation table indicates a weak relationship (4% variance) exists between gross revenues and gross revenue increases. Thus the more gross revenues a company made there was a slight chance that that company would experience future gross revenue increases.

The correlation matrix further showed strong relationships between company employee growth and increased employee wages paid (50% variance), company employee growth and increase in revenues (10% variance), employee wage increases and increase in revenues (25%

variance), gross revenues and the amount of employees (10% variance), gross revenues and wages paid (11% variance) and the amount of employees and the wages paid (39% variance).

These strong relationships led to the conclusion that increasing gross revenues can lead to more employees hiring as well as increased employee wages. LIFT’s program of bringing markets to manufacturing is a program critical to the expansion of the manufacturing sector of the Long Island economy.

#### Research Question Four

How did the Bio-tech, Defense-Aerospace-Homeland Security, Food, Medical Devices, Pharmaceuticals, and Test and Measurement elements of the Long Island manufacturing sector and the years in business, gross revenues, gross revenue increases, amount of employees, employee wages paid and amount of employee wage increases predict the increase in the amount of employees?

Table B presents a stepwise multiple regression model that was used to calculate the extent to which the company manufacturing category, years in business, gross revenues, increase in gross revenues, amount of employees, and employee wage increases predict the increase in the amount of employees.

Table B: Stepwise Multiple Regression-Increase in the Amount of Employees

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate	Change Statistics R Square Change
1	.626(a)	.392	.379	.609	.392
2	.686(b)	.470	.448	.574	.078

a Predictors (Constant) WageIncrease

b Predictors (Constant) WageIncrease, CompanyCategory

Table B indicates that increase in employee wages predicted 39 percent of the variance in the increase in the amount of employees, with manufacturing company category accounting for another 8 percent.

Table C presents a stepwise multiple regression model that was used to calculate the extent to which the company manufacturing category, gross revenues, and increase in gross revenues, predict the increase in the amount of employees. The results are consistent with the results in

Table B in that revenue increases provides the funds for wage increases which attracts employees to the company.

Table C: Stepwise Multiple Regression-Increase in the Amount of Employees

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate	Change Statistics R Square Change
3	.321	.103	.091	.736	.103

a Predictors (Constant) GrossRevenueIncrease

As Table A reflects, there is a correlation with the predictors of increasing the amount of employees and increased company gross revenue increases, again validating LIFT’s program of bringing markets to the manufacturing sector.

### Conclusion

This survey reveals that there is a definable indication of the manufacturing sectors unrest with Long Island’s high property taxes and energy costs, high Federal taxes, New York State’s burdensome regulations and taxes, lack of government support for business, and difficulty in raising capital and securing bank financing.

The data for all respondents and especially those who have increased their business revenues as well as creating jobs reflects that Long Island has to address these issues in order to retain these companies and prevent further erosion of Long Island’s manufacturing base. The survey results reflect that respondents agree that Long Island’s high costs may force Long Island’s successful companies to relocate.

Results also indicated a sense of pessimism in the growth of the manufacturing sector with respondents agreeing that the manufacturing sector will contract over the next five years. The combination of Long Island’s high costs, having companies thinking about leaving Long Island along with the feeling that the manufacturing sector will not grow but will contract projects future decline of the Long Island economy. The importance to stemming the pessimism and further erosion of the manufacturing sector can’t be understated.

However the survey did find that strong relationships existed between company employee growth and increased employee wages paid (50% variance), company employee growth and increase in revenues (10% variance), employee wage increases and increase in revenues (25%

variance), gross revenues and the amount of employees (10% variance), gross revenues and wages paid (11% variance) and the amount of employees and the wages paid (39% variance).

Survey results also reflected the extent to which the company manufacturing category, years in business, gross revenues, increase in gross revenues, amount of employees, and employee wage increases predict the increase in the amount of employees.

In a stepwise multiple regression model an increase in employee wages predicted 39 percent of the variance in the increase in the amount of employees, with manufacturing company category accounting for another 8 percent. Additionally the company manufacturing category, gross revenues, and increase in gross revenues, predict the increase in the amount of employees. The results are consistent in that revenue increases provides the funds for wage increases which attracts employees to the company.

These strong relationships support the conclusion that increasing gross revenues and employee wages can lead to more employees being hiring. LIFT's programs of bringing markets to manufacturing companies and identifying new capital sources for business growth such as the Small Business Investment Company and an expanded Federal loan guarantee program for manufacturers are critical to the expansion of the manufacturing sector of the Long Island economy.

**APPENDIX A**

Long Island Forum for Technology  
 Morelli Homeland Security Center  
 Bethpage, New York

Manufacturing and Technology Company Needs Survey

Part 1

Please indicate (by circling the appropriate number based on the scale below) the degree to which you agree or disagree with the needs and strategic plan of your company. For the questions that require a Yes or No response please circle the appropriate response.

Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Somewhat Agree 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
---------------------------	---------------	------------------------	------------	------------------------

- |     |   |           |
|-----|---|-----------|
| 1.  | Capital is important to my company’s growth?                          | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2.  | Have you attempted to raise capital in the past year?                 | Yes No    |
| 3.  | My company was successful in raising capital.                         | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4.  | Bank lending is important to my company’s growth?                     | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5.  | Have you tried to obtain bank lending in the past year?               | Yes No    |
| 6.  | Seeking bank financing was successful.                                | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7.  | Property tax relief is important to my company’s profits?             | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8.  | New York State Business Taxes are important to my company’s growth.   | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9.  | Reducing Federal Business Taxes are important to my company’s growth? | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. | Energy costs financially impact my company’s finances.                | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 11. | Identifying new markets are important to my company’s growth.         | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 12. | Finding qualified employees is important to my company’s growth.      | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 13. | Complying with NY State regulations are burdensome for my company.    | 1 2 3 4   |

Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Somewhat Agree 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
---------------------------	---------------	------------------------	------------	------------------------

- |     |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14. | Long Island's governments are business friendly.                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. | Long Island governments are important to my business growth.                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. | Long Island's economy has improved during the past year.                           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. | Long Island's economy will improve over the next five years.                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. | My business growth depends on technology innovation.                               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. | My business will relocate off Long Island during the next five years.              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. | Long Island's high costs will force the relocation of my company.                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. | Long Island's manufacturing sector will expand during the next five years.         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. | Long Island's manufacturing sector will become smaller during the next five years. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. | Exporting is party of my company's strategic growth plan.                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. | Workforce development is integral to my company's growth.                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. | My company invests in workforce development training.                              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. | My company invests in internships and summer employment for college students.      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

## Part 2

Please answer the following questions by filling in the blank.

1. How many years has your company operated on Long Island?

\_\_\_\_\_

2. What are the annual gross revenues for 2011?



Less than \$5 million \_\_\_\_ More than \$5 million \_\_\_\_

This is an Increase \_\_\_\_ Decrease \_\_\_\_ from 2010.

3. How many employees did your company employ in 2011?

Employees \_\_\_\_\_ This is an Increase \_\_\_\_ or Decrease \_\_\_\_ from 2010.

4. What was the total paid for wages in 2011?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ This is an Increase \_\_\_\_ or Decrease \_\_\_\_ from 2010.

5. Did you provide: Pension benefits Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

Health insurance Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

**Dr. MARTIN R. CANTOR, CPA**  
**Director, Long Island Center for Socio-Economic Policy**  
**28 Woodmont Road, Melville, New York 11747**

[www.martincantor.com](http://www.martincantor.com)

**Tel: (631) 491-1388 - Fax: (631) 491-6744-E - Mail: EcoDev1@aol.com**

Martin R. Cantor has a Bachelor of Science Degree in Accounting from Brooklyn College of the City University of New York, a Master of Arts Degree in Interdisciplinary Studies from Hofstra University focusing on the socio-economic relationships between education, household income, community and workforce development, and a Doctor of Education Degree from Dowling College. He has served as Suffolk County Economic Development Commissioner (New York State's largest suburban county), brought Computer Associates to Suffolk County, and created over 23,000 jobs with an estimated \$1.4 billion annual payroll economic impact. He has served as: Chief Economist-New York State Assembly Subcommittee for the Long Island Economy; Senior Fellow at the White Plains, New York based Institute for Socioeconomic Studies - a public policy think tank concentrating on poverty in America and senior citizen quality of life; Chair and Chief Economist of the Long Island Development Corp; a building trades labor/management arbitrator; a consultant to the Nassau Interim Financial Authority; a faculty member in the Brooklyn College Department of Economics; Executive Director of the Patchogue Village Business Improvement District; and Director of Economic Development and Chief Economist for Sustainable Long Island, and the Long Island Fund for Sustainable Development, providing financial, technical assistance to businesses and not-for-profit organizations His work is included in the *National Tax Rebate-A New America With Less Government*, and has prepared downtown revitalization plans for Long Island and New York City neighborhoods featuring arts districts, economic restructuring, waterfront projects and community organizing. He was the architect of the Nassau County Comptroller's debt restructuring plan for resolving Nassau County's fiscal crisis; has been a Long Island Business Journal columnist; has authored: federal, state and local legislation; economic impact analyses; analysis of Long Island's economic, demographic, employment, tax, and educational bases; a convention center feasibility study; taxpayer cost of acquiring open space; and health care reform; and Director of Dowling College's Long Island Economic and Social Policy Institute; and an Adjunct Associate Professor of Economics

He is a Certified Public Accountant in private practice; Director of the Long Island Center for Socio-Economic Policy, a consulting economist and economic development consultant to public officials, counties, towns, villages, Industrial Development Agencies, and communities; and Chairman of the Suffolk County Judicial Facilities Agency which financed the acquisition of the Cohalan State Court Complex and the construction of the Suffolk County Jail in Yaphank. He provides economic and business commentary on television and radio; is Co-host of Focus 55, a public affairs program on Channel 55, is a columnist for the Long Island Business News, Long Island's largest business weekly, and Networking Newspaper for Women, has appeared in the New York Times, Newsday, and LI Pulse, and has been syndicated nationally by Newsday, Bridge News and Knight-Ridder/Tribune News Service. He is an Honorary Member of Delta Mu Delta - The National Honor Society in Business Administration and has been recognized by the National Association of Counties for innovative uses of Industrial Revenue Bonds, for international trade promotion initiatives, for downtown revitalization policies, and for minority business incubator initiatives. He was invited by Dr. William Julius Wilson of Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government to present his paper entitled *Race Neutral Sustainable Economic Development*. He is the author of the recently published *Long Island, The Global Economy and Race: The Aging of America's First Suburb*.