PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS AND CONCERN ABOUT RUNOFF POLLUTION

SUMMARY FINDINGS FOR THE

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS
- (cont.) -

Background

As part of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control's (DHEC) Bureau of Water's Section 319 Nonpoint Source Program, the department commissioned the University of South Carolina's Institute for Public Service and Policy Research (IPSPR) to conduct a survey of the South Carolina public. The purpose of this survey was to examine public awareness and perceptions of runoff pollution and behaviors related to it.

Topics to be included in this survey were identified by DHEC staff. These included perceptions of the impact of various factors on water quality, awareness of water runoff, and behaviors such as use of fertilizers on yards and gardens, use of pesticides, disposal of yard waste, disposal of hazardous chemicals, septic systems, and clean up of dog waste, and preferred methods for getting information about protecting water quality.

The questionnaire was developed by IPSPR staff, in consultation with DHEC. After the questionnaire had initially been developed, a pretest was conducted to determine whether or not the questions could be easily understood by respondents, if the order of the questions seemed logical to the interviewers and respondents, or if it contained other identifiable weaknesses. The results of this pretest were used in making revisions to the questionnaire that was used in this study. (A copy of this questionnaire is provided in Appendix A.)

Respondents to be interviewed for this survey were selected from a random sample of households with telephones in the state using random-digit dialing. Within households, a respondent 18 years of age or older was randomly chosen so that the results are representative of the state's adult (age 18 or older) population. To avoid biasing the sample in favor of households that can be reached on multiple phone numbers, each case is weighted inversely to its probability of being

included in the sample. The data are also weighted to correct any potential biases in the sample on the basis of age, race, sex, and number of adults in the household (see Appendix A, Note 1).

Interviewing for this study was conducted between November 14 and December 18, 2002. A total of 503 fully completed interviews and 10 partially completed interviews were conducted. The response rate for this survey was 57.5%.

This survey has a potential for sampling error due to the fact that not all residents of the state were interviewed. For all questions that were answered by five hundred (500) or so respondents the potential for error is +/- 4.4%. Results for questions answered by significantly fewer than 500 respondents and results for subgroups of the population have a potential for larger variation than those for the entire sample.

This report provides a summary of the findings for this survey. In addition to providing the major findings for the complete sample, comparisons across demographic subgroups – sex, race, age, education, income, type of area in which respondents live, and region of the state – are presented in order to identify significant differences on these questions. As part of this survey respondents were asked whether they lived next to a body of water; 23.9% of those interviewed reported they lived next to a body of water; in this report, this variable is treated as a background characteristic to examine its effect on polluted runoff awareness and related behaviors. Significant differences across subgroups (determined as $p<.05$) are highlighted in bold in the tables.

Opinions on Environmental Issues

The first questions in this survey assessed the public's awareness of sources of wastewater pollution (Table 1). The majority of South Carolinians believe that what people do on land affects nearby bodies of water; 58.7% thought it had a great deal of effect and 26.9%

TABLE 1

AWARENESS OF SOURCES OF RUNOFF POLLUTION

	A Great Deal	Some-What	Not Too Much	Not at All	N
How much does what people do on the land affect bodies of water	58.7	26.9	9.8	4.6	503
Shrubs and trees protect water quality	54.9	32.1	8.8	4.2	501

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N
Inspection and clean out of septic tanks protects water quality	37.5	50.8	9.8	1.9	499
Pet waste is a source of bacteria in water	25.6	52.5	19.4	2.5	502
Fertilizers/pesticides affect bodies of water	36.2	50.4	12.3	1.1	504

	True	False	Do Not Know	N
Most storm drain water is treated	17.6	28.3	54.2	513
Farms and cities cause more water pollution than industry	23.5	30.8	45.7	512

	Yes	No	Do Not Know	N
Knows where rainwater flows from property	47.0	47.0	6.0	513

felt people's actions affected the water somewhat. There is also general consensus that shrubs and trees protect water quality, with 54.9% believing they provide a great deal of protection and 32.1% feeling that trees and shrubs protect water quality somewhat. Most South Carolina adults (88.3%) also agree or strongly agree that regular inspection and clean out of septic tanks protects water quality. Pet waste is recognized by the majority of those surveyed as a source of bacteria in water (25.6% strongly agree; 52.5% agree). Use of fertilizers and pesticides is also thought to be a significant source of wastewater pollution by most South Carolinians, with 36.2% strongly agreeing that such use can harm local bodies of water and another 50.4% agreeing with this statement.

While South Carolinians generally agree that activities on land impact water quality, they are less knowledgeable about specific actions that might have an impact on water quality. When asked if most water that goes down storm drains is treated before it is released into the nearest river, over half of the respondents said they did not know, 28.3% said it is not treated and 17.6% believed that storm drain water is treated. On the question of whether runoff from farms and cities causes more water pollution than industrial facilities, 45.7% did not know, 23.5% believed it was true that farms and cities create more water pollution than industrial facilities, and 30.8% said this was false. Almost half of the respondents to this survey said they knew into which body of water the rain runoff from their property flows.

There were a number of significant differences among demographic groups in their opinions on these questions (see Appendix B, Tables B-1 to B-8 for complete breakdowns). The largest differences on these items were between men and women. Females were more likely than males to believe what people do on land affects nearby bodies of water a great deal (65.5% to 50.8%). Women were also more likely than men to strongly agree that inspection and clean out

of septic tanks is necessary to protect water quality (44.5% to 29.7%) and that pet waste can be a source of bacteria in water (32.0% to 18.6%), and to agree (92.0% to 80.5%) that fertilizers and pesticides can harm local bodies of water. Women were also significantly more likely than men to say that they did not know if stormwater is treated (66.2% to 41.0%) or if farms and cities are a more significant source of water pollution than industrial facilities (50.9% to 39.7%). A much higher percentage of men than women (60.5% to 34.6%) reported they knew the body of water into which runoff from rainwater in their neighborhood flowed.

Blacks and whites also differed significantly on several of these questions. Whites were much more likely than blacks to believe that shrubs and trees along waterways protect water quality "a great deal" (59.3% to 46.9%), while a much higher percentage of blacks than whites strongly agreed that pet waste can be a source of bacteria for nearby streams and bodies of water (32.2% to 22.6%). A higher percentage of blacks than whites said they did not know if stormwater was treated (62.6% to 52.0%) or if runoff from farms cities causes more water pollution than industrial facilities (51.7% to 43.1%). Whites were more likely to believe that stormwater is not treated before it is released and that runoff from farms and cities does not cause more water pollution than industrial facilities. Slightly more than half of white respondents knew the body of water into which runoff from their neighborhood flowed, while 67.3% of blacks did not.

There were fewer and less consistent differences on these items across age groups. Younger respondents were more likely to believe that what people do on land has somewhat or a great deal of effect on nearby bodies of water. On the other hand, those age 46 or older were significantly more likely than younger respondents to believe that shrubs and trees along waterways protect water quality. Age groups differences on the question of the impact of

inspection and cleaning of septic tanks were also significant, with the views of those ages 46 to 64 distinct from those in other age groups. The oldest respondents (65 and over) were also much more likely than those in the younger age groups to report knowing the body of water into which runoff from their neighborhood flows.

Level of education also has a significant influence on South Carolina residents' knowledge about wastewater pollution and its sources. The vast majority of those with a college degree (96.4%) believed that what people do on land has an effect on nearby bodies of water, compared to 59.1% of those with less than a high school diploma. Those with a college degree were also more likely to think that shrubs and trees along waterways can protect water quality.

Across income groups, respondents with family incomes under $30,000 were more likely to feel that what people do on land affects nearby bodies of water "not too much" or "not at all." In addition, a higher percentage of respondents from lower income families did not know whether stormwater was treated before being released. Respondents from higher income families were more likely than those with lower incomes to know the body of water into which runoff from their neighborhood flows.

Across regions of the state, those living in the Lowcountry were the least likely to disagree or strongly disagree with the statement "…fertilizers and pesticides used on your property can harm local bodies of water." Lowcountry residents (56.0%) were also more likely than from the Upstate (49.2%) or the Midlands (37.4%) to know the body of water into which runoff from their neighborhood flowed.

There was only one significant difference by type of area in which respondents lived. Residents in suburban (67.3%) or urban (62.7%) areas are significantly more likely than those

from rural areas (50.7%) to believe what people do on land has a great effect on nearby bodies of water.

Living near a body of water also made a significant difference on one of these items. As might be expected, those who live near a body of water were more likely to know the body of water into which runoff from their property flowed (58.3% to 43.7%).

Environmental Behaviors

In addition to their perceptions of stormwater runoff pollution and awareness of factors that contribute to it, respondents were asked about behaviors related to runoff pollution, including use of fertilizers on yards and gardens, disposing of yard clippings, use of pesticides, ownership of a septic system, and cleaning up of pet waste. This section describes the experiences of the South Carolina population in these areas.

Lawn Fertilization. Table 2 presents the results for the questions related to lawn fertilization. Approximately one-third of South Carolina residents reported having fertilized their lawn in the past 12 months; on average, those who fertilize their lawn do so slightly less than twice a year. Those who fertilize their lawn were also asked what methods they used to determine how much fertilizer to apply. The most frequent method reported was reading the label information on the fertilizer (84.1%). Approximately 30% of respondents asked their friends and neighbors, contacted the extension service, or consulted with a garden or home center in deciding how much fertilizer to apply. Slightly more than one-fifth of the respondents said they had gotten recommendations of a lawn care company, while slightly less than 20% reported "fertilizing their lawn until it is green." About 10% said they used some other method to determine how much fertilizer to use, including their own judgment, using the fertilizer spreader calibration, general reading, searching the Internet and taking agricultural classes.

TABLE 2

LAWN FERTILIZATION

	Yes	No	N
A. "Has your lawn been fertilized in the past 12 months?"	32.4	67.6	483

B. Methods Used in Deciding How Much Fertilizer to Apply

	Yes	No	N
Label Information	84.1	15.9	134
Ask Friends/Neighbors	34.4	65.6	134
Consult Extension Service	30.2	69.8	134
Consult Garden/Home Center	29.4	70.6	134
Recommendation of Lawn Care Company	22.4	77.6	134
Fertilize Until Lawn is Green	18.4	81.6	134
Some Other Method*	9.3	90.7	134

*Other methods used included own judgment; using spreader calibration; the condition of the grass; general reading; the Internet; and taking agricultural classes.

As shown in Table 3, men were more likely than women to report that their yard had been fertilized in the past 12 months, and a higher percentage of whites (35.6%) than blacks (22.5%) reported fertilizing their yard. There were also differences across education groups and levels of family income, with those with more education or from higher income families more likely to have fertilized their lawn. Respondents from rural areas (24.8%) were less likely than those from urban areas (37.3%) or the suburbs (37.5%) to have had their yard fertilized.

There were few significant differences across demographic groups on the methods used in deciding how much fertilizer to use (see Appendix B, Tables B-10 through B-15).[1] Respondents with less than a high school education were less likely to report using label information in determining how much fertilizer to use and more likely to ask their friends or neighbors, to fertilize their lawn until it was green, or to get the recommendations of a lawn care company. Those with family incomes under $15,000 were least likely to have contacted an extension service, while those with incomes in the $30,000 to $50,000 range were most likely to seek information from this source. Women were also more likely than men to have contacted an extension service. Blacks were twice as likely as whites to have gotten a recommendation from a lawn care company in determining how much fertilizer to apply to their lawn.

There were no significant differences detected on these questions across age groups, type of area in which respondents lived, region, or whether or not respondents lived near a body of water.

Disposal of Yard Clippings. Respondents were next asked, "Do you typically compost or recycle yard clippings, such as leaves, grass, and the like." Slightly more than half of the

[1] Since these questions were asked only of those respondents who had fertilized their lawn in the past 12 months, the number of cases for several subgroups is relatively small. As a result, while the reported differences are statistically significant, they should be interpreted with caution.

TABLE 3

FERTILIZED YARD IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	32.4	67.6	483
SEX			
Male	**42.6**	**57.4**	**235**
Female	**23.0**	**77.0**	**248**
RACE			
Black	**22.5**	**77.5**	**138**
White	**35.6**	**64.4**	**323**
AGE			
18 - 29	36.8	63.2	95
30 - 45	31.7	68.3	142
46 - 64	26.4	73.6	144
65 and Over	35.9	64.1	78
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	**22.4**	**77.6**	**67**
High School Diploma	**25.8**	**74.2**	**128**
Some College	**31.4**	**68.6**	**140**
College Degree	**42.6**	**57.4**	**129**
INCOME			
Under $15,000	**22.7**	**77.3**	**44**
$15,000-$29,999	**17.2**	**82.8**	**93**
$30,000-$49,999	**26.0**	**74.0**	**100**
$50,000 and Over	**47.8**	**52.2**	**138**
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	**37.3**	**62.7**	**110**
Suburban	**37.5**	**62.5**	**152**
Rural	**24.8**	**75.2**	**206**
REGION			
Upstate	32.6	67.4	178
Midlands	36.0	64.0	172
Lowcountry	27.7	72.3	130
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	36.4	63.6	110
No	30.9	69.1	362

respondents to this survey reported composting or recycling yard clippings (Table 4). Females, whites, those with incomes of $50,000 or more, and respondents living near a body of water were significantly more likely to say they compost or recycle their yard clippings (Appendix B, Table B-16).

Respondents who said they did not compost or recycle their yard clippings were asked how they disposed of them. As indicated in Table 4, South Carolina residents dispose of yard clippings in a number of ways. Among those who do not compost or recycle, the most frequent method of disposing of yard clippings is that the city or county picks them up. A number of households report that they leave clippings on the yard as mulch, and a roughly equal number burn them. Other methods of disposal include taking them to the dump, disposing them with the household garbage, and putting them in the woods. A complete listing of responses to this item is provided in Table 4.

Pesticide Use. Twenty-five percent of South Carolinians report that pesticides have been applied to their lawn or garden in the past 12 months (Table 5). As was the case with fertilizer use, the most frequently used method for deciding how much pesticide to apply is to read the label information (84.2%). About 40% said they had applied pesticides until the pests were gone and a similar percentage consulted with a garden or home center. Another method was to ask friends or neighbors (used by 35.0%), and 28.0% sought the recommendations of the extension service; 6.1% used some other method to determine how much pesticide to apply.

There were several group differences in the use of pesticides, the largest of which was across income groups (see Table 6). Only 7.5% of those with family incomes under $15,000 reported applying pesticides to their yard; this percentage increased to 15.1% among those with incomes in the $15,000 to $30,000 range, 20.2% for those with incomes from $30,000 to

TABLE 4
DISPOSAL OF YARD CLIPPINGS

	Yes	No	N
A. "Do you typically compost or recycle yard clippings, such as leaves, grass, and the like?"	52.7	47.3	474

B. How Disposes of Yard Clippings	N
City/County picks them up	73
Leave/mulch on yard	38
Burn them	34
Take to dump	13
Dispose of with household garbage	12
Puts in the woods	10
Lawn maintenance takes care of them	9
Disposes of them in a ditch	6
Puts in a dumpster	3
Leave at curbside	2
Hauls them off (place not specified)	2
Takes to a landfill	2
Dumps on a vacant lot	2
County picks up large stuff, composts the rest	1
Rakes them up and dries them out	1
Puts them in a ditch or burns them	1

TABLE 5

PESTICIDE USE

	Yes	No	N
A. "Have pesticides been applied to your garden or yard in the past 12 months?"	25.4	74.6	474

B. Methods Used in Deciding How Much Pesticide to Apply

	Yes	No	N
Label Information	84.2	15.8	111
Apply Until Pest Are Gone	42.6	57.4	111
Consult Garden/Home Center	40.3	59.7	111
Ask Friends/Neighbors	35.0	65.0	111
Consulted Extension Service	28.0	72.0	111
Some Other Method*	6.1	93.9	111

*Other methods used included reference information from the University of Georgia; using ammonia to get rid of ants; other family member takes care of it; the Internet; knowledge from prior use; and help from the gardener.

TABLE 6

USED PESTICIDES IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	25.4	74.6	474
SEX			
Male	28.8	71.2	229
Female	22.1	77.9	244
RACE			
Black	**18.1**	**81.9**	**138**
White	**27.4**	**72.6**	**314**
AGE			
18 - 29	25.8	74.2	89
30 - 45	22.2	77.8	144
46 - 64	22.0	78.0	141
65 and Over	32.9	67.1	76
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	16.4	83.6	67
High School Diploma	29.1	70.9	127
Some College	25.2	74.8	135
College Degree	25.0	75.0	128
INCOME			
Under $15,000	**7.5**	**92.5**	**40**
$15,000-$29,999	**15.1**	**84.9**	**93**
$30,000-$49,999	**20.2**	**79.8**	**99**
$50,000 and Over	**33.8**	**66.2**	**136**
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	22.7	77.3	110
Suburban	30.1	69.9	146
Rural	22.7	77.3	203
REGION			
Upstate	**19.8**	**80.2**	**177**
Midlands	**26.3**	**73.7**	**167**
Lowcountry	**32.5**	**67.5**	**126**
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	**40.7**	**59.3**	**108**
No	**20.8**	**79.2**	**355**

$50,000, and 33.8% among those with incomes of $50,000 or more. In addition to these distinctions across income groups, there were also differences between blacks and whites, across regions of the state, and by whether respondents lived near a body of water. A higher percentage of whites (27.4%) than blacks (18.1%) had pesticides applied to their yard in the past twelve months. Respondents from the Lowcountry (32.5%) were more likely than those from the Midlands (26.3%) or the Upstate (19.8%) to have used pesticides, while a higher percentage of those who lived near a body of water (40.7%) than those who did not (20.8%) reported pesticide use.

There were few significant differences among various demographic groups as to where they got information on how much pesticide to use.[2] Those ages 18 to 29 were less likely than those in other age groups to use label information and more likely to ask their friends or neighbors for advice on pesticide use. Respondents with less than a high school education were also less likely to read the label in determining how much pesticide to apply. Respondents from rural areas (58.1%) were much more likely than those from urban (21.7%) or suburban (33.3%) areas to have consulted a garden or home center for advice on pesticide use. Close to 40% of those from rural areas contacted the extension service concerning pesticide use, compared to only 15.4% of those from the suburbs.

Disposal of Hazardous Chemical Products. The next environmentally-related behavior about which respondents to this survey were questioned was disposal of hazardous chemical products. Those interviewed were asked, "How do you dispose of products such as paints, paint thinners, cleaners, pesticides, and varnishes ... Do you pour them down the drain, pour them on the ground, pour them in a ditch, pour them down a storm drain, pour them in the street, put them

[2] As was the case for the group comparisons on fertilizer user, the number of cases for several subgroups is relatively small and, consequently, reported differences should be interpreted with caution.

in the trash, or do you dispose of such substances in some other way?" Responses to this item are presented in Table 7.

As these figures demonstrate, close to one-third of South Carolinians say they dispose of such substances by putting them in the trash, approximately one-fourth take them to a recycling center, and 21.9% take such products to the landfill and dispose of them as directed. Beyond these three predominant ways of disposing hazardous chemicals, South Carolinians report disposing of these substances in a number of other ways. Slightly more than 5% indicated that they did not dispose of these products, but rather used them until they were finished, and 2.4% replied that someone else disposed of such products for their household. Among other ways of disposing of hazardous chemicals, 2.3% reported that the city picks them up, 2.1% pour such products out on the ground, 1.7% pour them down the drain, 1.4% have a special trash service that picks them up, and 1.1% put them in a dumpster. Other responses to this question included storing them at home (1.0%), pouring them in a ditch (0.8%), pouring down a storm drain (0.5%), putting them in the toilet (0.3%), and pouring them in the street (0.3%).

The data presented in Table 8 demonstrate that there are several differences among subgroups in the way they dispose of these products. One of the largest differences is across age groups. Those ages 18 to 29 are more likely to report disposing of such products in the trash or in some other way; this youngest group is much less likely to dispose of such products in a landfill or to recycle them.

A much higher percentage of black than white respondents (40.8% to 27.9%) put such products in the trash, while whites were more likely to either take such products to a landfill or to

TABLE 7

DISPOSAL OF PRODUCTS SUCH AS PAINTS, PAINT THINNERS, CLEANERS, PESTICIDES, AND VARNISHES

Method of Disposal	%	N
Put in the trash	31.4	135
Take to recycling center	24.1	94
Take to landfill and dispose as directed	21.9	94
Use them until finished	5.5	24
Someone else disposes of them	2.4	11
City picks up	2.3	10
Pour on the ground	2.1	9
Pour down the drain	1.7	7
A special trash service picks it up	1.4	6
Put in a dumpster	1.1	5
Store them at home	1.0	4
Pour in a ditch	0.8	4
Dispose of according to directions	0.6	3
Pour down a storm drain	0.5	2
Painters/workers take it away	0.5	2
Disposes of at work	0.4	2
Put in can and burn it	0.3	1
Fill it with sand	0.3	1
Give it to someone else to use	0.3	1
Put it in the toilet	0.3	1
Take them to the store	0.3	1
Disposes per city regulations	0.3	1
Pour in the street	0.3	1
Take to the chemical plant	0.2	1
Take away (place not specified)	0.1	1
Trash compactor	0.1	1

TABLE 8
DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS CHEMICAL PRODUCTS
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Put In Trash	Recycling Center	Landfill	Other	N
TOTAL:	31.4	24.1	21.9	22.6	429
SEX					
Male	29.0	25.0	24.0	22.0	200
Female	33.5	23.0	20.0	23.5	230
RACE					
Black	**40.8**	**18.3**	**17.5**	**23.3**	**120**
White	**27.9**	**25.8**	**24.2**	**22.1**	**298**
AGE					
18 - 29	**45.1**	**11.0**	**13.2**	**30.8**	**91**
30 - 45	**22.3**	**36.4**	**24.8**	**16.5**	**121**
46 - 64	**31.3**	**23.7**	**25.2**	**19.8**	**131**
65 and Over	**33.3**	**15.3**	**25.0**	**26.4**	**72**
EDUCATION					
Less than High School	**34.5**	**6.9**	**19.0**	**39.7**	**58**
High School Diploma	**35.0**	**22.2**	**23.9**	**18.8**	**117**
Some College	**26.4**	**33.9**	**24.8**	**14.9**	**121**
College Degree	**33.3**	**22.0**	**18.7**	**26.0**	**123**
INCOME					
Under $15,000	**36.6**	**19.5**	**12.2**	**31.7**	**41**
$15,000-$29,999	**37.2**	**15.1**	**22.1**	**25.6**	**86**
$30,000-$49,999	**37.4**	**25.3**	**14.3**	**23.1**	**91**
$50,000 and Over	**23.1**	**30.0**	**30.0**	**16.9**	**130**
TYPE OF AREA					
Urban	**41.8**	**16.4**	**17.3**	**24.5**	**110**
Suburban	**31.1**	**19.3**	**25.2**	**24.4**	**135**
Rural	**26.0**	**31.6**	**22.0**	**20.3**	**177**
REGION					
Upstate	27.1	25.2	28.4	19.4	155
Midlands	34.0	23.1	21.8	21.1	147
Lowcountry	35.0	22.8	13.8	28.5	123
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER					
Yes	29.6	26.9	20.4	23.1	108
No	32.4	22.5	22.5	22.5	315

recycle them. Similarly, respondents who lived in urban areas were more likely to dispose of these products by putting them in the trash. Respondents with family incomes of $50,000 or more were more likely to recycle such products or to take them to a landfill, while across education groups, it was those with some college education who were less likely to dispose of these products by putting them in the trash and more likely to recycle them of take them to a landfill.

Septic System. As the data displayed in Table 9 indicate, more than half of South Carolinians live in a residence served by a septic system. Of those with septic systems, 17.4% reported that their system has been inspected within the past year, 30.2% within the past 1 to 2 years, 27.1% within the past 3 to 5 years, and 25.3% last had their septic system inspected six or more years ago.

When asked if they had ever gotten any advice on how to maintain their septic system, slightly less than half indicated that they had. Of those who have gotten information on maintaining their septic system, almost half have received advice from a pumping service, 24.5% consulted books or magazines, 23.9% asked friends or neighbors, 20.8% contacted their local health department, 6.4% got advice from another governmental agency, and 2.7% got information over the Internet. In addition, a large percentage of those who had gotten advice on how to maintain a septic system – 38.3% – reported getting information on septic system maintenance from some other source. These included TV or infomercials (12); the person or company that installed the system (9); a plumber (6); relatives (3); DHEC (3); FEMA (2); and a hardware store (2).

There were a several differences in the types of demographic groups whose homes were served by a septic system (see Table 10). As would be expected, a considerably higher

TABLE 9

SEPTIC SYSTEM USE AND BEHAVIORS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

	Yes	No	N
A. "Is your home served by a septic system?"	55.7	44.3	482

B. Last Time Septic System Inspected

	%	N
Within the past year	17.4	38
1 to 2 years ago	30.2	66
3 to 5 years ago	27.1	59
6 or more years ago	25.3	55

	Yes	No	N
C. "Have you ever gotten any advice on how to maintain a septic system?"	46.4	53.6	263

D. Where gotten advice on how to maintain a septic system

	Yes	No	N
Pumping Service	48.6	51.4	122
Some Other Method*	38.3	61.7	122
Books or Magazines	24.5	75.5	122
Ask Friends/Neighbors	23.9	76.1	122
Local Health Department	20.8	79.2	122
Other Government Agency	6.4	93.6	122
Internet	2.7	97.3	122

*Other method used included TV/infomercial; person or company who installed the system; a plumber; relatives; DHEC; FEMA; hardware store employees; a mail flyer; the builder of the house; a chemical company; the landlord; and training in waste water treatment.

TABLE 10
HOME SERVED BY A SEPTIC SYSTEM
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL	55.7	44.3	482
SEX			
Male	56.3	43.7	231
Female	55.2	44.8	252
RACE			
Black	59.3	40.7	135
White	54.4	45.6	331
AGE			
18 - 29	**52.0**	**48.0**	**98**
30 - 45	**59.6**	**40.4**	**141**
46 - 64	**63.2**	**36.8**	**144**
65 and Over	**38.8**	**61.3**	**80**
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	**50.0**	**50.0**	**68**
High School Diploma	**71.4**	**28.6**	**133**
Some College	**58.0**	**42.0**	**138**
College Degree	**38.5**	**61.5**	**130**
INCOME			
Under $15,000	59.5	40.5	42
$15,000-$29,999	62.0	38.0	92
$30,000-$49,999	54.4	45.6	103
$50,000 and Over	48.9	51.1	141
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	**26.9**	**73.1**	**119**
Suburban	**40.3**	**59.7**	**149**
Rural	**82.4**	**17.6**	**205**
REGION			
Upstate	**62.8**	**37.2**	**180**
Midlands	**61.6**	**38.4**	**164**
Lowcountry	**38.8**	**61.2**	**134**
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	**64.0**	**36.0**	**111**
No	**52.9**	**47.1**	**365**

percentage of those from rural areas (82.4%) than those living in the suburbs (40.3%) or urban areas (26.9%) reported having a septic system. In addition, there were regional differences on this question, with those from the Upstate (62.8%) or the Midlands (61.6%) more likely to have a septic system than those from the Lowcountry (38.8%). Respondents between the ages of 46 and 64 were more likely to have a septic system, while the lowest percentage of septic system use was found among those age 65 or older. Across education groups, college graduates were less likely than those with less education to have a home serviced by a septic system.

There was only one significant group difference on the question of whether respondents had ever gotten advice on how to maintain a septic system. The percentage who had gotten such advice increased as age increased, ranging from 24.5% among those ages 18 to 29 to 67.7% among those age 65 or older (see Appendix B, Table B-18).

In terms of where different groups have gotten advice about how to maintain a septic system, only a few significant differences were found (see Appendix B, Tables B-19 through B-24). Blacks were more than twice as likely than whites to have gotten advice from a local health department concerning their septic system (36.7% vs. 16.3%). Similarly, the percentage who had gotten septic maintenance advice from the local health department went from zero among those in urban areas to 17.2% of those from the suburbs and 27.4% among those living in rural areas. A higher percentage of residents of the Lowcountry (39.1%) than those living in the Midlands (18.2%) or the Upstate (14.8%) reported getting advice from the local health department. Respondents with less than a high school education were much more likely than those with more education to have consulted some other governmental agency about septic system maintenance.

While about 30% of those from rural or suburban areas got advice on septic systems from books or magazines, no residents from urban areas reported using this source. Residents of the

Lowcountry were significantly more likely than those from the Midlands or the Upstate to report having gotten such advice on maintaining a septic system from a pumping service. South Carolinians who live near a body of water were much more likely to report using the Internet to find information about their septic system (8.3%) than were those who do not live near water (1.2%)..

Dog Waste Disposal. About half of South Carolina adults own a dog. Among dog owners, slightly more than one-fourth claim that they always clean up dog waste on their own property and a similar number reported that they never clean up after their dog. Approximately 20% said they clean up after their dog on their own property most of the time, a similar percentage said they clean up occasionally, and 6.4% do so rarely. A larger percentage of South Carolina dog owners report cleaning up after their dog on walks, with 43.3% reporting cleaning up dog waste on walks all of the time, 13.7% most of the time, 13.3% occasionally, 6.8% rarely, and 22.8% never (Table 11).

Among demographic groups, whites, rural residents and those residing in the Upstate were significantly more likely to report they never clean up dog waste on their own property (see Appendix B, Table B-25). A higher percentage of females and residents of the Lowcountry reported that they always clean up after their dog when walking them (see Appendix B, Table B-26).

When asked whether various methods would increase the likelihood that they would clean up after their dog, a majority of dog owners said that they each of the five alternatives asked about would make it more likely that they would clean up after their pet (Table 11). Approximately 80% said that a law or ordinance requiring clean-up would make it more likely they would do so, and a similar percentage reported that a $50 fine would increase the likelihood

TABLE 11
DOG OWNERSHIP AND BEHAVIORS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

	Yes	No	N
A. "Do you own a dog?"	47.4	52.6	505

B. Clean Up After Dog On Own Property

	%	N
All of the time	26.7	63
Most of the time	19.4	46
Occasionally	19.9	47
Rarely	6.4	15
Never	27.6	65

C. Clean Up After Walking Dog

	%	N
All of the time	43.3	61
Most of the time	13.7	19
Occasionally	13.3	19
Rarely	6.8	10
Never	22.8	32

D. More Likely To Clean Up After Dog If ...

	Yes	No	N
A Law or Ordinance	81.0	19.0	177
$50 Fine	80.6	19.4	178
Simple, Sanitary Method	74.6	25.4	177
Neighbor Complaints	69.8	30.2	178

Convenient Disposal Locations	67.6	32.4	176

of clean-up. Three-fourths of dog owners say having a simple and sanitary method of pet waste disposal would increase the likelihood they would clean up after their dogs, and almost 70% said neighbor complaints or convenient disposal locations would affect their decision as to whether or not to clean up after their pet.

There were few statistically significant differences among demographic subgroups as to what would be effective in increasing the likelihood a respondent would clean up after their dog. There was a significant difference among age groups on the impact of a $50 fine, with the percentage who felt this would make them more likely to pick up after their dog ranging from 95.0% among those ages 18 to 29 to 66.7% of those age 65 or older. Respondents with less education were more likely than those with some college education or more to feel that having convenient disposal locations would increase their likelihood of picking up their dog's waste. Similarly, a higher percentage of residents of the Lowcountry (82.4%) than those from the Upstate (70.1%) or Midlands (56.9%) thought that convenient disposal locations would increase their likelihood of cleaning up after their dog. While the large majority of dog owners said that a law or ordinance requiring clean up would lead them to do so, this was more evident among those from the suburbs (92.2%) than those from urban (85.7%) or rural (75.8%) areas. (Appendix B, Tables B-27 through B-31 provide the breakdowns of the responses to these items by demographic characteristics).

Methods for Getting Information About Protecting Water Quality

The last series of questions in this survey asked respondents to rate a variety of methods that could be used to disseminate information to residents of South Carolina about protecting water quality. Of the nine proposed methods, the most popular was public service announcements (PSAs) with over seventy percent rating PSAs as being a very good or good

method for getting information about protecting water quality (see Table 12). A mailed brochure was the second highest rated method (60.4% very good or good) and almost half of the respondents felt community newsletters or free videos were very good or good ways to disseminate information on this topic. Less popular methods included local newspapers (46.8% very good or good), public access cable shows (46.1%), the Internet (45.3%), radio call-in shows (34.6%), or a weekend training workshop (28.8%).

There were a number of significant differences among subgroups in their views of the effectiveness of various ways for disseminating information about protecting water quality (see Appendix B, Tables B-32 through B-40). Among the most important of these were the differences between men and women. Females were significantly more likely than males to feel that distributing information on protecting water quality through mailed brochures, community newsletters, local newspapers, or the Internet would be effective. Significantly more male than female respondents rated public cable access television shows as a poor or very poor way idea to distribute information on this topic.

A significantly higher percentage of blacks than whites thought that several of these methods would be effective in providing this information. Combining the very good and good responses, the following percentages of blacks and whites thought that different methods were good ways of getting this information to the public: public service announcements (blacks, 77.7%; whites, 70.3%); free videos (61.2%; 44.5%); local newspapers (54.1%; 43.0%); public access cable shows (53.9%; 42.8%); the Internet (56.8%; 40.7%); and week-end training workshops (41.0%; 23.7%).

In general, South Carolinians with a college degree were less likely than those with less education to believe that these suggested methods were good ways of distributing information

TABLE 12

METHODS FOR GETTING INFORMATION ABOUT PROTECTING WATER QUALITY

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	N
Public Service Announcements	22.2	50.5	14.3	10.1	2.9	497
Mailed Brochures	15.3	45.1	19.7	15.7	4.2	495
Community Newsletter	11.3	38.1	26.5	20.5	3.6	488
Free Video	17.1	32.2	19.4	24.6	6.7	495
Local Newspapers	8.9	37.9	26.8	20.2	6.2	494
Public Access Cable Show	6.7	39.4	24.6	22.2	7.1	487
Internet	10.7	34.6	18.0	27.3	9.3	478
Radio Call-in Show	5.8	28.8	27.2	28.5	9.8	490
Weekend Training Workshop	8.1	20.7	19.2	38.2	13.8	493

about preventing water pollution. This was particularly the case for methods such as week-end training workshops, mailed brochures, public access cable television, radio call-in shows, and free videos.

Respondents under age 30 were least likely to think that mailed brochures were a very good way to distribute this information, while younger people were more likely to believe that the Internet was a good way to let the public know about preventing water pollution.

Respondents in different income groups had varying opinions concerning the best ways to disseminate information about protecting water quality. Those in the lower income brackets (under $30,000) were significantly more likely than wealthier respondents to feel local newspapers would be a good or very good method of information distribution on this topic. Almost a quarter of those with household incomes of less than $15,000 rated distributing free videos as a very poor option, while less than 6% of the respondents in higher income brackets gave this option the lowest rating. Low-income respondents were also more likely than those with higher incomes to feel that public service announcements were a very poor technique to distribute such information. On the other hand, these respondents in the lowest income category were significantly more positive about receiving information on water pollution prevention via the Internet, with 25% rating this option as very good compared to 12.9% of those with incomes of $15,000 to $29,999, 5.8% of those with incomes in the $30,000 to $49,999 range, and 12.1% of those with incomes of $50,000 or more. Those in the highest income bracket ($50,000 or more) were the most likely to rate weekend trainings was a poor or very poor idea. A radio call-in program on protecting water quality was rated more positively by those with incomes between $15,000 and $29,999 than those with incomes of less than $15,000 or $30,000 or more.

Summary

The results of this survey demonstrate that South Carolinians generally acknowledge that what people do on land can have a significant affect on nearby bodies of water. They also believe that septic tank inspections can protect water quality, that fertilizers and pesticides can harm water quality, that pet waste can be a source of bacteria in bodies of water, and that shrubs and trees along banks can protect water quality.

They are less aware as to whether or not storm drain water is treated before being released into rivers or whether cities and farms are more significant sources of water pollution than industrial facilities. About half of South Carolina adults said they knew the body of water into which runoff water from their neighborhood flowed.

A third of South Carolina residents report having fertilized their lawns in the past 12 months and approximately one-fourth had used pesticides on their yards or gardens. Slightly more than half say they typically compost or recycle yard clippings.

About one-third of South Carolinians say that they dispose of products such as paints, paint thinners, cleaners, pesticides, and varnishes by putting them in the trash; approximately one-fourth take such items to a recycling center and 21.9% say they take these types of products to a landfill and dispose of them as directed. Blacks, younger people, those with family incomes under $50,000 and those from urban areas were more likely to report disposing of such products by putting them in the trash.

About half of South Carolina residents own a dog. Approximately one-fourth of them clean up after their dog all of the time on their own property, and 43.3% say they clean up all the time when they walk their dog. A large majority of dog owners felt that each of five strategies

for encouraging them to clean up after their dog – particularly a law or ordinance requiring it or a $50 fine – would increase the likelihood they would do so.

South Carolinians generally believe that there are a number of good methods for getting information to the public about protecting water quality. Public service announcements were thought to be the most effective means of providing such information, followed by mailed brochures, community newsletters, and free videos. Weekend training workshops and radio call-in shows were least likely to be rated as good or very good ways of distributing such information to the public.

Appendix A

Field Version of Questionnaire

Note 1: Weighting Used in Analysis

Note 2: Counties Used in Regional Analyses

SURVEY RESEARCH LABORATORY
PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS AND CONCERN ABOUT RUNOFF POLLUTION
Field Version 11/14/02

"Hello, this is _____ calling for the University of South Carolina. This month the University is conducting a confidential study of public opinion in South Carolina and we'd really appreciate your help and cooperation."

"First, let me make sure I've dialed the correct phone number ... "Is this _____?"

"My first questions are about environmental issues."

1. "In your opinion, how much does what people do on the land affect nearby bodies of water ... a great deal, somewhat, not too much, or not at all?"

    1. GREAT DEAL
    2. SOMEWHAT
    3. NOT TOO MUCH
    4. NOT AT ALL
    5. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "In general ...")

2. "How much do shrubs and trees left along the banks of creeks, streams and lakes protect water quality... a great deal, somewhat, not too much, or not at all?"

    1. GREAT DEAL
    2. SOMEWHAT
    3. NOT TOO MUCH
    4. NOT AT ALL
    5. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "In general ...")

3. "Inspection and routine clean out of septic tanks is necessary to protect the water quality of nearby bodies of water. Do you ..." (READ 1 THRU 4)

    1. strongly agree,
    2. agree,
    3. disagree, or
    4. strongly disagree
    5. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "In general ...")

4. "Pet waste can be a source of bacteria for nearby streams and bodies of water. Do you ..." (READ 1 THRU 4)

    1. strongly agree,
    2. agree,
    3. disagree, or
    4. strongly disagree
    5. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "In general ...")

5. "Even if you don't live right next to a creek, river or lake, fertilizers and pesticides used on your property can harm local bodies of water. Do you ..." (READ 1 THRU 4)

    1. strongly agree,
    2. agree,
    3. disagree, or
    4. strongly disagree
    5. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "In general ...")

"The next two questions are true or false questions."

6. "In most cities and towns in South Carolina, water that goes down storm drains is treated at water treatment plants before it is released into the nearest river ... is this true, false, or are you not sure about this?"

    1. TRUE
    2. FALSE
    3. DON'T KNOW (DO NOT PROBE)

7. "In South Carolina, runoff from farms and cities causes more water pollution than industrial facilities ... is this true, false, or are you not sure about this?"

    1. TRUE
    2. FALSE
    3. DON'T KNOW (DO NOT PROBE)

8. "When it rains in your neighborhood, do you know which body of water the runoff from rainwater flows into?

    1. YES
    2. NO
    3. DON'T KNOW (DO NOT PROBE)

9. "Has your yard been fertilized in the past twelve months?"

1. YES
2. NO ---------- GO TO Q.12
3. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "Has it been fertilized even once?") -- GO TO Q.12
4. DOESN'T HAVE A YARD (VOLUNTEERED) ---------- GO TO Q.16

10. "How many times (has your yard been fertilized in the past twelve months)?"

_____ _____ RECORD NUMBER

98. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "Just approximately ...")

11. "Have you ever used any of the following in deciding how much fertilizer to apply to your yard?"

a. "label information"

1. YES
2. NO
3. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "Have you ever used this to decide?")
4. DOES NOT MAKE DECISION (E.G., OTHER FAMILY MEMBER/ SOMEONE ELSE RESPONSIBLE) ---------- GO TO Q.12
5. LAWN CARE SERVICE RESPONSIBLE --------- GO TO Q.12

	YES	NO	DK
b. "consulting with the garden or home center"	1	2	3
c. "the recommendations of the extension service"	1	2	3
d. "asking your friends or neighbors"	1	2	3
e. "fertilizing until your lawn is green"	1	2	3
f. "the recommendations of a lawn care company"	1	2	3
g. "do you use some other method to decide how much fertilizer to apply to your yard"	1	2	3

SPECIFY: _____

12. "Do you typically compost or recycle yard clippings, such as leaves, grass, and the like?"

1. YES ---------- GO TO Q.14
2. NO
3. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "Do you usually compost or recycle?") – GO TO Q.14
4. NO YARD/NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR YARD CLIPPINGS (VOL) – GO TO Q.14

13. "How do you dispose of your yard clippings ... does the city or county pick them up, do you dispose of them in a ditch, do you burn them, do you dispose of them with household garbage, or do you dispose of them is some other way?"

1. CITY OR COUNTY PICKS UP
2. DISPOSE OF THEM IN A DITCH
3. BURN
4. DISPOSE OF WITH HOUSEHOLD TRASH
5. OTHER (SPECIFY): _____
6. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "How do you dispose of your yard clippings most frequently?")

14. "Have pesticides been applied to your garden or yard in the past twelve months?"

1. YES
2. NO ---------- GO TO Q.16
3. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "Have you applied any pesticides?") GO TO Q.16
4. DOESN'T HAVE A GARDEN OR YARD (VOLUNTEERED) -GO TO Q.16

15. "Have you ever used any of the following in deciding how much pesticide to apply?"

a. "label information"

1. YES
2. NO
3. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "Have you ever used this to decide?")
4. DOES NOT MAKE DECISION (E.G., OTHER FAMILY MEMBER/ SOMEONE ELSE RESPONSIBLE) ---------- GO TO Q.16
5. LAWN CARE SERVICE RESPONSIBLE --------- GO TO Q.16

	YES	NO	DK
b. "consulting with the garden or home center"	1	2	3
c. "the recommendations of the extension service"	1	2	3
d. "asking your friends or neighbors"	1	2	3
e. "applying until the pest is gone"	1	2	3
f. "do you use some other method to decide how much pesticide to apply to your yard?"	1	2	3

SPECIFY: _____

16. "How do you dispose of products such as paints, paint thinners, cleaners, pesticides, and varnishes ... Do you pour them down the drain, pour them on the ground, pour them in a ditch, pour them down a storm drain, pour them in the street, put them in the trash, or do you dispose of such substances in some other way?"

    1. POUR DOWN THE DRAIN
    2. POUR ON THE GROUND
    3. POUR IN A DITCH
    4. POUR DOWN A STORM DRAIN
    5. POUR IN THE STREET
    6. PUT THEM IN THE TRASH
    7. USE THEM UNTIL FINISHED (VOL.)
    8. OTHER (SPECIFY) _____
    9. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "How do you generally dispose of such substances?")

17. "Is your home served by a septic system?"

    1. YES
    2. NO ---------- GO TO Q.21
    3. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: REPEAT QUESTION) GO TO Q.21

18. "How many years has it been since your septic system was last inspected?"

    _____ _____ RECORD YEARS

    00. WITHIN THE LAST YEAR
    98. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "Just approximately ...")

19. "Have you ever gotten any advice on how to maintain a septic system?"

    1. YES
    2. NO ---------- GO TO Q.21
    3. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "Have you ever gotten any advice?") – GO TO Q.21

20. "From which of the following have you gotten advice on how to maintain a septic system?"

	YES	NO	DK
a. the local health department	1	2	3
b. some other government agency	1	2	3
c. your friends or neighbors	1	2	3
d. a pumping service	1	2	3
e. books or magazines	1	2	3
f. the Internet	1	2	3
g did you get advice on how to maintain a septic system from any other source	1	2	3

SPECIFY: _____

21. "Do you own a dog?"

1. YES
2. NO ---------- GO TO Q.25
3. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: REPEAT QUESTION) GO TO Q.25

22. "When your dog is on your property, do you clean up after them all of the time, most of the time, occasionally, rarely, or never?"

1. ALL OF THE TIME
2. MOST OF THE TIME
3. OCCASIONALLY
4. RARELY
5. NEVER
6. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "In general ...")

23. "And when you walk your dog, do you clean up after them all of the time, most of the time, occasionally, rarely, or never?"

1. ALL OF THE TIME
2. MOST OF THE TIME
3. OCCASIONALLY
4. RARELY
5. NEVER
6. DOES NOT WALK DOG (VOL.)
7. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "In general ...")

(ASK ONLY IF RESPONSE TO Q.22 OR Q.23 IS OCCASIONALLY, RARELY, OR NEVER)

24. "Which, if any, of the following factors would make it more likely that you would clean up after your dog more often?"

	YES	NO	DK
a. convenient disposal locations at parks or along trails	1	2	3
b. a fine of 50 dollars	1	2	3
c. a simple, sanitary collection method, such as a pooper scooper	1	2	3
d. complaints of neighbors	1	2	3
e. a law or ordinance requiring clean-up	1	2	3

25. "Do you live next to a creek, stream, river, lake, or pond – that is, does your property adjoin some body of water?"

1. YES
2. NO ---------- GO TO Q.27
3. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: REPEAT QUESTION) GO TO Q.27

26. "Do you have an area of trees and shrubs between your home and the body of water next to you or do you have lawn up to the edge of the water?"

1. AREA OF TREES AND SHRUBS BETWEEN
2. LAWN UP TO THE EDGE
3. OTHER (SPECIFY): _____
4. DON'T KNOW (PROBE: "How would you describe it?")

27. "I'm going to read several methods for getting information to you on how you can protect water quality. For each of them, I'd like for you to tell me if this is a very good, good, fair, poor, or very poor method of getting information to you about protecting water quality."

	VG	G	F	P	VP	DK
a. brochures mailed to your home	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. supplements in the local newspaper	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. community newsletter articles	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. a free educational video	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. public service announcements on television	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. an Internet website	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. a weekend training workshop	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. a radio call in show	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. public access cable shows	1	2	3	4	5	6

"Now, a few final questions..."

28. "What is your age?"

_____ CODE EXACT NUMBER OF YEARS (E.G., 45)

96. NINETY-SIX YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER
97. REFUSED
98. DK

29. "Do you live in an urban, suburban, or rural area of South Carolina?"

1. URBAN (INSIDE CITY LIMITS)
2. SUBURBAN (JUST OUTSIDE CITY LIMITS)
3. RURAL (AWAY FROM A CITY)
4. DK (PROBE: "How would you describe it?")

30. "What is the highest grade of school or year of college that you actually finished and got credit for?"

_____ RECORD GRADE

00. NO FORMAL SCHOOLING
98. DK

31. "What is your race?" (PROBE BY READING CHOICES IF NECESSARY)

1. BLACK; AFRICAN-AMERICAN
2. WHITE; CAUCASIAN
3. HISPANIC; PUERTO RICAN; MEXICAN OR SPANISH-AMERICAN
4. NATIVE AMERICAN; AMERICAN INDIAN
5. ASIAN; ORIENTAL
6. OTHER (SPECIFY): _____

32. "So that we can be sure we're getting a cross-section of all people, I'd like you to estimate your family's total income for 2001, before taxes were taken out. Include wages, social security, welfare and any other income. Into which of the following categories does it fall? As with all of the interview, this information will be strictly confidential. Was it ...

(READ CHOICES)

01. Less than $5,000
02. $5,000 - 9,999
03. $10,000 - 14,999
04. $15,000 - 19,999
05. $20,000 - 24,999
06. $25,000 - 29,999
07. $30,000 - 34,999
08. $35,000 - 39,999
09. $40,000 - 44,999
10. $45,000 - 49,999
11. $50,000 - 74,999
12. $75,000 - 99,999
13. $100,000 and over

14. REFUSED
15. DK

33. "Not counting cell phones, business lines, extension phones, faxes, or modems -- on how many different telephone numbers can your household be reached?"

_____ RECORD NUMBER

7. SEVEN OR MORE
8. DK

34. "Including yourself, how many people aged 18 or older are currently living in your household?"

_____ RECORD NUMBER

7. SEVEN OR MORE
8. DK

35. "And what is your zip code?" RECORD _____

"That's all the questions I have. Thank you for you cooperation."

36. RECORD SEX: 1. MALE 2. FEMALE

Note 1
Weights Used in Analysis

Several weighting variables for the Polluted Runoff Awareness and Behavior Survey data have been created and added to the data file. The first is a weight to adjust for households that can be reached on more than one telephone number. This weight has been developed so that such households are not overrepresented in the sample. This weight should be applied to the data whenever households are the desired unit of analysis.

The second weighting variable adjusts for the fact that the sampling unit in the survey was the household rather than the individual respondent. It also adjusts for multiple telephone households. When the individual is the appropriate unit of analysis rather than the household, this weight should be used.

The third weighting variable makes additional adjustments to the individual weight for underrepresentation of various demographic groups in the population due to either nonresponse or to the fact that certain households do not have a telephone. The degree of underrepresentation is assessed by comparing the demographic data from the survey with population estimates provided by the U.S. Census Bureau. This weight should always be used to ensure that a representative sample for making estimates of the true population figures for South Carolina.

Note 2
Counties Used in Regional Analyses

Upstate	Midlands	Lowcountry
Abbeville	Aiken	Beaufort
Anderson	Allendale	Berkeley
Cherokee	Bamberg	Charleston
Chester	Barnwell	Colleton
Fairfield	Calhoun	Dillon
Greenville	Clarendon	Dorchester
Greenwood	Chesterfield	Florence
Lancaster	Darlington	Georgetown
Laurens	Edgefield	Hampton
Newberry	Kershaw	Horry
Oconee	Lee	Jasper
Pickens	Lexington	Marion
Spartanburg	Marlboro	Williamsburg
Union	McCormick	
York	Orangeburg	
	Richland	
	Saluda	
	Sumter	

Appendix B

Breakdowns by Demographic Characterisics

TABLE B-1
WHAT PEOPLE DO ON LAND AFFECT NEAR BY BODIES OF WATER
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	A Great Deal	Some-What	Not Too Much	Not at All	N
TOTAL:	58.7	26.9	9.8	4.6	503
SEX					
Male	**50.8**	**31.8**	**12.3**	**5.1**	**236**
Female	**65.5**	**22.8**	**7.5**	**4.1**	**267**
RACE					
Black	56.9	22.9	13.2	6.9	144
White	60.1	27.7	8.6	3.6	336
AGE					
18 - 29	**61.8**	**34.5**	**3.6**	**0.0**	**110**
30 - 45	**59.9**	**27.2**	**6.8**	**6.1**	**147**
46 - 64	**60.0**	**20.7**	**14.5**	**4.8**	**145**
65 and Over	**52.7**	**24.3**	**16.2**	**6.8**	**74**
EDUCATION					
Less than High School	**42.4**	**16.7**	**28.8**	**12.1**	**66**
High School Diploma	**53.7**	**26.5**	**11.8**	**8.1**	**136**
Some College	**61.3**	**30.3**	**6.3**	**2.1**	**142**
College Degree	**71.4**	**25.0**	**2.9**	**0.7**	**140**
INCOME					
Under $15,000	**66.0**	**8.0**	**24.0**	**2.0**	**50**
$15,000-$29,999	**56.0**	**24.0**	**14.0**	**6.0**	**100**
$30,000-$49,999	**66.3**	**24.0**	**5.8**	**3.8**	**104**
$50,000 and Over	**58.5**	**33.8**	**4.9**	**2.8**	**142**
TYPE OF AREA					
Urban	**62.7**	**24.6**	**9.5**	**3.2**	**126**
Suburban	**67.3**	**25.0**	**1.9**	**5.8**	**156**
Rural	**50.7**	**28.6**	**15.8**	**4.9**	**203**
REGION					
Upstate	23.9	48.8	25.5	1.9	322xx
Midlands	29.4	52.2	17.1	1.2	245xx
Lowcountry	40.8	36.7	20.8	1.7	240xx
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER					
Yes	60.8	29.2	6.7	3.3	120
No	58.0	26.1	10.5	5.4	371

TABLE B-2

SHRUBS AND TREES PROTECT WATER QUALITY
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	A Great Deal	Some-What	Not Too Much	Not at All	N
TOTAL:	54.9	32.1	8.8	4.2	501
SEX					
Male	54.2	32.4	8.8	4.6	238
Female	55.5	31.9	8.7	3.8	263
RACE					
Black	**46.9**	**32.9**	**11.9**	**8.4**	**143**
White	**59.3**	**31.4**	**6.6**	**2.7**	**334**
AGE					
18 - 29	**49.1**	**40.0**	**9.1**	**1.8**	**110**
30 - 45	**50.0**	**34.2**	**12.3**	**3.4**	**146**
46 - 64	**63.6**	**28.0**	**4.9**	**3.5**	**143**
65 and Over	**61.8**	**19.7**	**7.9**	**10.5**	**76**
EDUCATION					
Less than High School	**53.7**	**20.9**	**16.4**	**9.0**	**67**
High School Diploma	**56.3**	**33.3**	**5.2**	**5.2**	**135**
Some College	**50.7**	**32.1**	**15.0**	**2.1**	**140**
College Degree	**62.1**	**32.9**	**2.1**	**2.9**	**140**
INCOME					
Under $15,000	42.0	40.0	12.0	6.0	50
$15,000-$29,999	54.1	27.6	13.3	5.1	98
$30,000-$49,999	59.0	33.3	5.7	1.9	105
$50,000 and Over	57.9	33.6	6.4	2.1	140
TYPE OF AREA					
Urban	50.4	33.1	10.2	6.3	127
Suburban	56.2	34.6	5.2	3.9	153
Rural	58.0	28.8	10.2	2.9	205
REGION					
Upstate	56.8	28.4	10.4	4.4	183
Midlands	50.0	38.5	9.2	2.3	174
Lowcountry	57.6	29.5	6.5	6.5	139
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER					
Yes	65.0	24.8	7.7	2.6	117
No	51.8	34.2	9.2	4.9	371

TABLE B-3

INSPECTION AND CLEAN OUT OF SEPTIC TANKS NECESSARY
TO PROTECT WATER QUALITY BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N
TOTAL:	37.5	50.8	9.8	1.9	499
SEX					
Male	**29.7**	**53.8**	**13.1**	**3.4**	**236**
Female	**44.5**	**48.3**	**6.8**	**0.4**	**263**
RACE					
Black	43.8	49.3	6.2	0.7	146
White	34.8	51.5	11.3	2.4	328
AGE					
18 - 29	**38.7**	**56.8**	**4.5**	**0.0**	**111**
30 - 45	**37.9**	**51.0**	**6.9**	**4.1**	**145**
46 - 64	**40.6**	**44.1**	**14.7**	**0.7**	**143**
65 and Over	**31.5**	**57.5**	**8.2**	**2.7**	**73**
EDUCATION					
Less than High School	**29.0**	**60.9**	**8.7**	**1.4**	**69**
High School Diploma	**35.3**	**44.9**	**16.2**	**3.7**	**136**
Some College	**42.6**	**50.0**	**6.6**	**0.7**	**136**
College Degree	**38.4**	**52.9**	**8.0**	**0.7**	**138**
INCOME					
Under $15,000	34.7	51.0	6.1	8.2	49
$15,000-$29,999	43.0	53.0	4.0	0.0	100
$30,000-$49,999	42.5	46.2	9.4	1.9	106
$50,000 and Over	35.3	51.1	11.5	2.2	139
TYPE OF AREA					
Urban	42.4	48.8	8.0	0.8	125
Suburban	39.7	50.0	9.6	0.6	156
Rural	32.2	52.5	11.9	3.5	202
REGION					
Upstate	36.5	48.9	12.9	1.7	178
Midlands	35.8	54.2	8.9	1.1	179
Lowcountry	41.3	48.6	7.2	2.9	138
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER					
Yes	40.2	46.2	10.3	3.4	117
No	36.8	51.6	10.0	1.6	370

TABLE B-4

PET WASTE CAN BE A SOURCE OF BACTERIA IN WATER
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N
TOTAL:	25.6	52.5	19.4	2.5	502
SEX					
Male	**18.6**	**51.1**	**25.7**	**4.6**	**237**
Female	**32.0**	**53.8**	**13.5**	**0.8**	**266**
RACE					
Black	**32.2**	**55.5**	**12.3**	**0.0**	**146**
White	**22.6**	**52.7**	**21.1**	**3.6**	**332**
AGE					
18 - 29	24.8	56.9	18.3	0.0	109
30 - 45	23.8	52.4	19.0	4.8	147
46 - 64	26.6	51.0	21.7	0.7	143
65 and Over	28.6	57.1	9.1	5.2	77
EDUCATION					
Less than High School	29.0	50.7	15.9	4.3	69
High School Diploma	24.6	51.4	19.6	4.3	138
Some College	20.7	59.3	19.3	0.7	140
College Degree	30.4	48.9	18.5	2.2	135
INCOME					
Under $15,000	26.0	44.0	24.0	6.0	50
$15,000-$29,999	33.3	52.5	12.1	2.0	99
$30,000-$49,999	26.7	52.4	17.1	3.8	105
$50,000 and Over	24.3	55.9	17.6	2.2	136
TYPE OF AREA					
Urban	19.8	61.1	16.7	2.4	126
Suburban	31.8	46.8	19.5	1.9	154
Rural	24.3	52.9	19.4	3.4	206
REGION					
Upstate	21.6	54.6	20.5	3.2	185
Midlands	30.3	44.6	22.9	2.3	175
Lowcountry	24.5	60.4	12.9	2.2	139
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER					
Yes	27.6	56.0	13.8	2.6	116
No	24.9	51.6	21.1	2.4	374

TABLE B-5

FERTILIZERS AND PESTICIDES USED ON YOUR PROPERTY CAN HARM LOCAL BODIES OF WATER BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N
TOTAL:	36.2	50.4	12.3	1.1	504
SEX					
Male	**32.8**	**47.7**	**17.4**	**2.1**	**241**
Female	**39.4**	**52.7**	**7.6**	**0.4**	**264**
RACE					
Black	41.4	47.3	11.0	0.7	146
White	35.5	51.3	12.2	0.9	335
AGE					
18 - 29	38.0	44.4	17.6	0.0	108
30 - 45	37.8	50.0	10.1	2.0	148
46 - 64	38.4	49.3	12.3	0.0	146
65 and Over	35.1	59.7	3.9	1.3	77
EDUCATION					
Less than High School	27.5	55.1	14.5	2.9	69
High School Diploma	34.8	52.6	10.4	2.2	135
Some College	38.7	50.7	10.6	0.0	142
College Degree	41.7	45.3	12.9	0.0	139
INCOME					
Under $15,000	39.2	52.9	3.9	3.9	51
$15,000-$29,999	44.4	44.4	10.1	1.0	99
$30,000-$49,999	30.5	56.2	13.3	0.0	105
$50,000 and Over	43.0	45.1	10.6	1.4	142
TYPE OF AREA					
Urban	40.3	49.2	9.7	0.8	124
Suburban	40.1	49.7	10.2	0.0	157
Rural	31.9	50.7	15.5	1.9	207
REGION					
Upstate	**31.5**	**51.6**	**14.7**	**2.2**	**186**
Midlands	**38.6**	**46.6**	**14.8**	**0.0**	**176**
Lowcountry	**40.0**	**52.9**	**5.7**	**1.4**	**140**
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER					
Yes	39.5	48.7	10.1	1.7	119
No	35.6	50.8	12.6	1.1	374

TABLE B-6

MOST STORM DRAIN WATER IS TREATED
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	True	False	Do Not Know	N
TOTAL:	17.6	28.3	54.2	513
SEX				
Male	**18.0**	**41.0**	**41.0**	**244**
Female	**17.1**	**16.7**	**66.2**	**269**
RACE				
Black	**21.8**	**15.6**	**62.6**	**147**
White	**14.6**	**33.3**	**52.0**	**342**
AGE				
18 - 29	21.8	29.1	49.1	110
30 - 45	16.8	28.9	54.4	149
46 - 64	15.5	23.0	61.5	148
65 and Over	15.2	31.6	53.2	79
EDUCATION				
Less than High School	18.8	27.5	53.6	69
High School Diploma	11.6	26.1	62.3	138
Some College	22.2	29.9	47.9	144
College Degree	16.3	29.8	53.9	141
INCOME				
Under $15,000	**14.0**	**14.0**	**72.0**	**50**
$15,000-$29,999	**18.2**	**17.2**	**64.6**	**99**
$30,000-$49,999	**17.9**	**32.1**	**50.0**	**106**
$50,000 and Over	**17.6**	**39.4**	**43.0**	**142**
TYPE OF AREA				
Urban	17.2	24.2	58.6	128
Suburban	20.8	30.2	49.1	159
Rural	14.4	39.7	56.0	209
REGION				
Upstate	13.4	34.4	52.2	186
Midlands	18.8	25.4	55.8	181
Lowcountry	21.8	23.9	54.2	142
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER				
Yes	10.1	39.5	50.4	119
No	19.1	25.1	55.8	382

TABLE B-7
RUNOFF FROM FARMS AND CITIES CAUSES MORE WATER POLLUTION THAN INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	True	False	Do Not Know	N
TOTAL:	23.5	30.8	45.7	511
SEX				
Male	**25.5**	**35.1**	**39.7**	**242**
Female	**21.9**	**27.1**	**50.9**	**269**
RACE				
Black	**23.8**	**24.5**	**51.7**	**147**
White	**23.5**	**33.4**	**43.1**	**341**
AGE				
18 - 29	30.0	30.0	40.0	110
30 - 45	20.8	34.2	45.0	149
46 - 64	21.5	30.2	48.3	149
65 and Over	22.8	27.8	49.4	79
EDUCATION				
Less than High School	24.6	30.4	44.9	69
High School Diploma	20.3	39.9	39.9	138
Some College	25.0	29.2	45.8	144
College Degree	24.3	25.0	50.7	140
INCOME				
Under $15,000	**30.0**	**28.0**	**42.0**	**50**
$15,000-$29,999	**24.2**	**28.3**	**47.5**	**99**
$30,000-$49,999	**21.9**	**37.1**	**41.0**	**105**
$50,000 and Over	**26.8**	**29.3**	**43.7**	**142**
TYPE OF AREA				
Urban	26.8	22.0	51.2	127
Suburban	25.9	27.8	46.2	158
Rural	19.6	39.2	41.1	209
REGION				
Upstate	24.7	29.6	45.7	186
Midlands	21.8	32.4	45.8	179
Lowcountry	24.6	29.6	45.8	142
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER				
Yes	21.7	35.8	42.5	120
No	24.5	28.9	46.6	380

TABLE B-8
KNOW WHICH BODY OF WATER THE RUNOFF FROM NEIGHBORHOOD PROPERTY FLOWS INTO BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	Do Not Know	N
TOTAL:	46.9	47.0	6.0	513
SEX				
Male	**60.5**	**36.2**	**3.3**	**243**
Female	**34.6**	**56.9**	**8.6**	**269**
RACE				
Black	**32.7**	**62.6**	**4.8**	**147**
White	**52.6**	**40.9**	**6.4**	**342**
AGE				
18 - 29	**40.5**	**54.1**	**5.4**	**111**
30 - 45	**39.2**	**55.4**	**5.4**	**148**
46 - 64	**48.6**	**43.2**	**8.1**	**148**
65 and Over	**63.8**	**31.3**	**5.0**	**80**
EDUCATION				
Less than High School	40.6	50.7	8.7	69
High School Diploma	47.1	45.7	7.2	138
Some College	47.6	45.5	6.9	145
College Degree	51.1	46.8	2.1	141
INCOME				
Under $15,000	**36.0**	**60.0**	**4.0**	**50**
$15,000-$29,999	**38.4**	**50.5**	**11.1**	**99**
$30,000-$49,999	**45.7**	**50.5**	**3.8**	**105**
$50,000 and Over	**57.0**	**40.8**	**2.1**	**142**
TYPE OF AREA				
Urban	45.0	50.4	4.7	129
Suburban	48.1	48.1	3.8	158
Rural	48.1	43.3	8.6	210
REGION				
Upstate	**49.2**	**44.3**	**6.5**	**185**
Midlands	**37.4**	**56.6**	**6.0**	**182**
Lowcountry	**56.0**	**39.0**	**5.0**	**141**
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER				
Yes	**58.3**	**36.7**	**5.0**	**120**
No	**43.7**	**50.0**	**6.3**	**382**

TABLE B-9

FERTILIZED YARD IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	32.4	67.6	483
SEX			
Male	**42.6**	**57.4**	**235**
Female	**23.0**	**77.0**	**248**
RACE			
Black	**22.5**	**77.5**	**138**
White	**35.6**	**64.4**	**323**
AGE			
18 - 29	36.8	63.2	95
30 - 45	31.7	68.3	142
46 - 64	26.4	73.6	144
65 and Over	35.9	64.1	78
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	**22.4**	**77.6**	**67**
High School Diploma	**25.8**	**74.2**	**128**
Some College	**31.4**	**68.6**	**140**
College Degree	**42.6**	**57.4**	**129**
INCOME			
Under $15,000	**22.7**	**77.3**	**44**
$15,000-$29,999	**17.2**	**82.8**	**93**
$30,000-$49,999	**26.0**	**74.0**	**100**
$50,000 and Over	**47.8**	**52.2**	**138**
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	**37.3**	**62.7**	**110**
Suburban	**37.5**	**62.5**	**152**
Rural	**24.8**	**75.2**	**206**
REGION			
Upstate	32.6	67.4	178
Midlands	36.0	64.0	172
Lowcountry	27.7	72.3	130
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	36.4	63.6	110
No	30.9	69.1	362

TABLE B-10

EVER USED LABEL INFORMATION TO DECIDE HOW MUCH FERTILIZER TO USE
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	84.1	15.9	134
SEX			
Male	82.4	17.6	91
Female	88.4	11.6	43
RACE			
Black	79.2	20.8	24
White	85.0	15.0	100
AGE			
18 - 29	72.4	27.6	29
30 - 45	90.5	9.5	42
46 - 64	78.1	21.9	32
65 and Over	95.2	4.8	21
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	**53.3**	**46.7**	**15**
High School Diploma	**80.8**	**19.2**	**26**
Some College	**89.5**	**10.5**	**38**
College Degree	**89.4**	**10.6**	**47**
INCOME			
Under $15,000	85.7	14.3	7
$15,000-$29,999	75.0	25.0	12
$30,000-$49,999	96.2	3.8	26
$50,000 and Over	85.5	14.5	55
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	86.5	13.5	37
Suburban	88.9	11.1	45
Rural	77.8	22.2	45
REGION			
Upstate	90.4	9.6	52
Midlands	83.3	16.7	54
Lowcountry	73.1	26.9	26
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	82.4	17.6	34
No	84.5	15.5	97

TABLE B-11

EVER CONSULTED A GARDEN/HOME CENTER TO DECIDE HOW MUCH FERTILIZER TO USE BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	29.4	70.6	134
SEX			
Male	30.8	69.2	91
Female	27.9	72.1	43
RACE			
Black	37.5	62.5	24
White	30.0	70.0	100
AGE			
18 - 29	17.2	82.8	29
30 - 45	33.3	66.7	42
46 - 64	31.3	68.8	32
65 and Over	47.6	52.4	21
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	33.3	66.7	15
High School Diploma	23.1	76.9	26
Some College	28.9	71.1	38
College Degree	38.3	61.7	47
INCOME			
Under $15,000	28.6	71.4	7
$15,000-$29,999	50.0	50.0	12
$30,000-$49,999	34.6	65.4	26
$50,000 and Over	30.9	69.1	55
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	37.8	62.2	37
Suburban	33.3	66.7	45
Rural	24.4	75.6	45
REGION			
Upstate	32.1	67.9	53
Midlands	31.5	68.5	54
Lowcountry	15.4	84.6	26
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	35.3	64.7	34
No	28.1	71.9	69

TABLE B-12

EVER CONTACTED AN EXTENSTION SERVICE TO DECIDE HOW MUCH FERTILIZER TO USE BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	30.2	69.8	134
SEX			
Male	**24.4**	**75.6**	**90**
Female	**41.9**	**58.1**	**43**
RACE			
Black	20.0	80.0	25
White	31.7	68.3	101
AGE			
18 - 29	20.0	80.0	30
30 - 45	29.3	70.7	41
46 - 64	33.3	66.7	33
65 and Over	42.9	57.1	21
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	14.3	85.7	14
High School Diploma	34.6	65.4	26
Some College	23.7	76.3	38
College Degree	36.2	63.8	47
INCOME			
Under $15,000	**0.0**	**100.0**	**7**
$15,000-$29,999	**33.3**	**66.7**	**12**
$30,000-$49,999	**50.0**	**50.0**	**26**
$50,000 and Over	**26.8**	**73.2**	**56**
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	29.7	70.3	37
Suburban	22.7	77.3	44
Rural	33.3	66.7	45
REGION			
Upstate	23.1	76.9	52
Midlands	40.7	59.3	54
Lowcountry	23.1	76.9	26
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	23.5	76.5	34
No	32.3	67.7	96

TABLE B-13

EVER ASKED FRIENDS OR NEIGHBORS TO DECIDE HOW MUCH FERTILIZER TO USE BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	34.4	65.6	134
SEX			
Male	36.3	63.7	91
Female	30.2	69.8	43
RACE			
Black	48.0	52.0	25
White	30.7	69.3	101
AGE			
18 - 29	41.4	58.6	29
30 - 45	41.5	58.5	41
46 - 64	18.2	81.8	33
65 and Over	42.9	57.1	21
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	**64.3**	**35.7**	**14**
High School Diploma	**42.3**	**57.7**	**26**
Some College	**26.3**	**73.7**	**38**
College Degree	**26.1**	**73.9**	**46**
INCOME			
Under $15,000	42.9	57.1	7
$15,000-$29,999	41.7	58.3	12
$30,000-$49,999	26.9	73.1	26
$50,000 and Over	32.7	67.3	55
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	29.7	70.3	37
Suburban	29.9	71.1	45
Rural	40.9	59.1	44
REGION			
Upstate	26.9	73.1	52
Midlands	35.8	64.2	53
Lowcountry	46.2	53.8	26
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	47.1	52.9	34
No	30.2	69.8	96

TABLE B-14

EVER FERTILIZED UNTIL LAWN WAS GREEN TO DECIDE HOW MUCH FERTILIZER TO USE BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	18.4	81.6	134
SEX			
Male	17.8	82.2	90
Female	18.6	81.4	43
RACE			
Black	29.2	70.8	24
White	16.0	84.0	100
AGE			
18 - 29	20.0	80.0	30
30 - 45	16.7	83.3	42
46 - 64	21.9	87.1	32
65 and Over	19.0	81.0	21
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	**46.7**	**53.3**	**15**
High School Diploma	**30.8**	**69.2**	**26**
Some College	**21.6**	**78.4**	**37**
College Degree	**0.0**	**100.0**	**46**
INCOME			
Under $15,000	42.9	57.1	7
$15,000-$29,999	23.1	76.9	13
$30,000-$49,999	15.4	84.6	26
$50,000 and Over	14.3	85.7	56
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	13.5	86.5	37
Suburban	11.4	88.6	44
Rural	28.9	71.1	45
REGION			
Upstate	13.5	86.5	52
Midlands	14.8	85.2	54
Lowcountry	30.8	69.2	26
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	26.5	73.5	34
No	15.5	84.5	97

TABLE B-15

RECOMMENDATION FROM LAWN CARE COMPANY TO DECIDE HOW MUCH FERTILIZER TO USE BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	22.4	77.6	134
SEX			
Male	26.4	73.6	91
Female	14.0	86.0	43
RACE			
Black	**41.7**	**58.3**	**24**
White	**19.8**	**80.2**	**101**
AGE			
18 - 29	41.4	58.6	29
30 - 45	26.2	73.8	42
46 - 64	15.2	84.8	33
65 and Over	14.3	85.7	21
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	**46.7**	**53.3**	**15**
High School Diploma	**7.7**	**92.3**	**26**
Some College	**23.7**	**76.3**	**38**
College Degree	**27.7**	**72.3**	**47**
INCOME			
Under $15,000	0.0	100.0	7
$15,000-$29,999	41.7	58.3	12
$30,000-$49,999	23.1	76.9	26
$50,000 and Over	25.5	74.5	55
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	18.9	81.1	37
Suburban	25.0	75.0	44
Rural	24.4	75.6	45
REGION			
Upstate	20.8	79.2	53
Midlands	22.2	77.8	54
Lowcountry	29.6	70.4	27
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	32.4	67.6	34
No	19.6	80.4	97

TABLE B-16

COMPOST OR RECYCLE YARD CLIPPINGS
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	52.7	47.3	474
SEX			
Male	**46.9**	**53.1**	**228**
Female	**58.1**	**41.9**	**246**
RACE			
Black	**45.7**	**54.3**	**138**
White	**56.5**	**43.5**	**313**
AGE			
18 - 29	49.4	50.6	89
30 - 45	55.2	44.8	143
46 - 64	56.3	43.7	142
65 and Over	42.5	57.5	73
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	53.8	46.2	65
High School Diploma	52.7	47.3	129
Some College	55.2	44.8	134
College Degree	52.4	47.6	126
INCOME			
Under $15,000	**44.2**	**55.8**	**43**
$15,000-$29,999	**51.6**	**48.4**	**93**
$30,000-$49,999	**43.3**	**56.7**	**97**
$50,000 and Over	**64.4**	**35.6**	**135**
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	52.8	47.2	108
Suburban	54.1	45.9	146
Rural	53.2	46.8	203
REGION			
Upstate	53.1	46.9	177
Midlands	50.3	49.7	169
Lowcountry	55.6	44.4	124
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	**61.9**	**38.1**	**105**
No	**50.1**	**49.9**	**357**

TABLE B-17

USED PESTICIDES IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	25.4	74.6	474
SEX			
Male	28.8	71.2	229
Female	22.1	77.9	244
RACE			
Black	**18.1**	**81.9**	**138**
White	**27.4**	**72.6**	**314**
AGE			
18 - 29	25.8	74.2	89
30 - 45	22.2	77.8	144
46 - 64	22.0	78.0	141
65 and Over	32.9	67.1	76
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	16.4	83.6	67
High School Diploma	29.1	70.9	127
Some College	25.2	74.8	135
College Degree	25.0	75.0	128
INCOME			
Under $15,000	**7.5**	**92.5**	**40**
$15,000-$29,999	**15.1**	**84.9**	**93**
$30,000-$49,999	**20.2**	**79.8**	**99**
$50,000 and Over	**33.8**	**66.2**	**136**
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	22.7	77.3	110
Suburban	30.1	69.9	146
Rural	22.7	77.3	203
REGION			
Upstate	**19.8**	**80.2**	**177**
Midlands	**26.3**	**73.7**	**167**
Lowcountry	**32.5**	**67.5**	**126**
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	**40.7**	**59.3**	**108**
No	**20.8**	**79.2**	**355**

TABLE B-18

EVER USED LABEL INFORMATION TO DECIDE HOW MUCH PESTICIDE TO USE
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	84.2	15.8	111
SEX			
Male	79.7	20.3	59
Female	90.2	9.8	51
RACE			
Black	88.0	12.0	25
White	85.7	14.3	77
AGE			
18 - 29	**61.1**	**38.9**	**18**
30 - 45	**93.5**	**6.5**	**31**
46 - 64	**90.0**	**10.0**	**30**
65 and Over	**90.9**	**9.1**	**22**
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	**54.5**	**45.5**	**11**
High School Diploma	**82.9**	**17.1**	**35**
Some College	**90.6**	**9.4**	**32**
College Degree	**92.6**	**7.4**	**27**
INCOME			
Under $15,000	75.0	25.0	4
$15,000-$29,999	92.9	7.1	14
$30,000-$49,999	88.9	11.1	18
$50,000 and Over	90.2	9.8	41
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	87.0	13.0	23
Suburban	92.1	7.9	38
Rural	81.4	18.6	43
REGION			
Upstate	88.2	11.8	34
Midlands	86.0	14.0	43
Lowcountry	76.5	23.5	34
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	85.4	14.6	41
No	82.4	17.6	68

TABLE B-19

EVER CONSULTED A GARDEN/HOME CENTER TO DECIDE HOW MUCH PESTICIDE TO USE
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	40.3	59.7	111
SEX			
Male	39.0	61.0	59
Female	42.3	57.7	52
RACE			
Black	52.0	48.0	25
White	39.0	61.0	77
AGE			
18 - 29	57.9	42.1	19
30 - 45	32.3	67.7	31
46 - 64	40.0	60.0	30
65 and Over	40.9	59.1	22
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	36.4	63.6	11
High School Diploma	37.1	62.9	35
Some College	51.6	48.4	31
College Degree	34.6	65.4	26
INCOME			
Under $15,000	50.0	50.0	4
$15,000-$29,999	38.5	61.5	13
$30,000-$49,999	55.6	44.4	18
$50,000 and Over	39.0	61.0	41
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	**21.7**	**78.3**	**23**
Suburban	**33.3**	**66.7**	**39**
Rural	**58.1**	**41.9**	**43**
REGION			
Upstate	47.1	52.9	34
Midlands	31.0	69.0	42
Lowcountry	45.7	54.3	35
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	47.6	52.4	42
No	36.8	63.2	68

TABLE B-20

EVER CONTACTED AN EXTENSTION SERVICE TO DECIDE HOW MUCH PESTICIDE TO USE BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	28.0	72.0	111
SEX			
Male	27.1	72.9	59
Female	29.4	70.6	51
RACE			
Black	20.0	80.0	25
White	32.1	67.9	78
AGE			
18 - 29	22.2	77.8	18
30 - 45	12.9	87.1	31
46 - 64	30.0	70.0	30
65 and Over	45.5	54.5	22
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	0.0	100.0	11
High School Diploma	37.1	62.9	35
Some College	29.0	71.0	31
College Degree	23.1	76.9	26
INCOME			
Under $15,000	33.3	66.7	3
$15,000-$29,999	21.4	78.6	14
$30,000-$49,999	50.0	50.0	18
$50,000 and Over	22.0	78.0	41
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	**30.4**	**69.6**	**23**
Suburban	**15.4**	**84.6**	**39**
Rural	**39.5**	**60.5**	**43**
REGION			
Upstate	18.2	81.8	33
Midlands	31.0	69.0	42
Lowcountry	32.4	67.6	34
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	31.7	68.3	41
No	26.5	73.5	68

TABLE B-21

EVER ASKED FRIENDS OR NEIGHBORS TO DECIDE HOW MUCH PESTICIDE TO USE
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	35.0	65.0	111
SEX			
Male	33.9	66.1	59
Female	36.5	63.5	52
RACE			
Black	48.0	52.0	25
White	29.5	70.5	78
AGE			
18 - 29	**61.1**	**38.9**	**18**
30 - 45	**22.6**	**77.4**	**31**
46 - 64	**40.0**	**60.0**	**30**
65 and Over	**22.7**	**77.3**	**22**
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	36.4	63.6	11
High School Diploma	29.4	70.6	34
Some College	34.4	65.6	32
College Degree	34.6	65.4	26
INCOME			
Under $15,000	33.3	66.7	3
$15,000-$29,999	30.8	69.2	13
$30,000-$49,999	22.2	77.8	18
$50,000 and Over	41.5	58.5	41
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	26.1	73.9	23
Suburban	28.2	71.8	39
Rural	44.2	55.8	43
REGION			
Upstate	47.1	52.9	34
Midlands	23.8	76.2	42
Lowcountry	37.1	62.9	35
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	43.9	56.1	41
No	29.4	70.6	68

TABLE B-22

EVER APPLIED PESTICIDES UNTIL THE PESTS WERE GONE TO DECIDE HOW MUCH PESTICIDE TO USE BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	42.6	57.4	111
SEX			
Male	37.3	62.7	59
Female	48.1	51.9	52
RACE			
Black	52.0	48.0	25
White	42.3	57.7	78
AGE			
18 - 29	16.7	83.3	18
30 - 45	48.4	51.6	31
46 - 64	46.7	53.3	30
65 and Over	54.5	45.5	22
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	27.3	72.7	11
High School Diploma	51.4	48.6	35
Some College	53.1	46.9	32
College Degree	30.8	69.2	26
INCOME			
Under $15,000	50.0	50.0	4
$15,000-$29,999	42.9	57.1	14
$30,000-$49,999	44.4	55.6	18
$50,000 and Over	34.1	65.9	41
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	58.3	41.7	24
Suburban	35.9	64.1	39
Rural	46.5	53.5	43
REGION			
Upstate	52.9	47.1	34
Midlands	30.2	69.8	43
Lowcountry	47.1	52.9	34
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	53.7	46.3	41
No	36.8	63.2	68

TABLE B-23

EVER GOTTEN ADVICE ON SEPTIC SYSTEM MAINTENANCE
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	46.4	53.6	263
SEX			
Male	48.8	51.2	129
Female	43.7	56.3	135
RACE			
Black	37.5	62.5	80
White	49.1	50.9	175
AGE			
18 - 29	**24.5**	**75.5**	**49**
30 - 45	**37.3**	**62.7**	**83**
46 - 64	**57.3**	**42.7**	**89**
65 and Over	**67.7**	**32.3**	**31**
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	41.2	58.8	34
High School Diploma	47.3	52.7	93
Some College	45.0	55.0	80
College Degree	46.8	53.2	47
INCOME			
Under $15,000	36.0	64.0	25
$15,000-$29,999	52.7	47.3	55
$30,000-$49,999	34.5	65.5	55
$50,000 and Over	47.8	52.2	138
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	46.9	53.1	32
Suburban	50.0	50.0	58
Rural	44.0	56.0	166
REGION			
Upstate	49.1	50.9	110
Midlands	44.0	56.0	100
Lowcountry	46.0	54.0	50
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	52.2	47.8	67
No	44.8	55.2	192

TABLE B-24

WHERE GOT ADVICE ON SEPTIC SYSTEM - LOCAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	20.8	79.2	122
SEX			
Male	15.9	84.1	63
Female	26.7	73.3	60
RACE			
Black	**36.7**	**63.3**	**30**
White	**16.3**	**83.7**	**86**
AGE			
18 - 29	16.7	83.3	12
30 - 45	25.8	74.2	31
46 - 64	17.6	82.4	51
65 and Over	31.8	68.2	22
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	23.1	76.9	13
High School Diploma	15.9	84.1	44
Some College	31.4	68.6	35
College Degree	13.0	87.0	23
INCOME			
Under $15,000	33.3	66.7	9
$15,000-$29,999	24.1	75.9	29
$30,000-$49,999	20.0	80.0	20
$50,000 and Over	12.5	87.5	32
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	**0.0**	**100.0**	**15**
Suburban	**17.2**	**82.8**	**29**
Rural	**27.4**	**72.6**	**73**
REGION			
Upstate	**14.8**	**85.2**	**54**
Midlands	**18.2**	**81.8**	**44**
Lowcountry	**39.1**	**60.9**	**23**
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	22.9	77.1	35
No	20.0	80.0	85

TABLE B-25

WHERE GOT ADVICE ON SEPTIC SYSTEM – OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	6.4	93.6	122
SEX			
Male	9.5	90.5	63
Female	3.4	96.6	59
RACE			
Black	3.4	96.6	29
White	7.1	92.9	85
AGE			
18 - 29	8.3	91.7	12
30 - 45	6.5	93.5	31
46 - 64	7.8	92.2	51
65 and Over	9.5	90.5	21
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	**28.6**	**71.4**	**14**
High School Diploma	**0.0**	**100.0**	**44**
Some College	**5.6**	**94.4**	**36**
College Degree	**4.5**	**95.5**	**22**
INCOME			
Under $15,000	0.0	100.0	9
$15,000-$29,999	10.3	89.7	29
$30,000-$49,999	5.3	94.7	19
$50,000 and Over	6.3	93.8	32
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	6.7	93.3	15
Suburban	6.9	93.1	29
Rural	8.2	91.8	73
REGION			
Upstate	**12.7**	**87.3**	**55**
Midlands	**2.3**	**97.7**	**44**
Lowcountry	**0.0**	**100.0**	**23**
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	8.6	91.4	35
No	4.7	95.3	85

TABLE B-26

WHERE GOT ADVICE ON SEPTIC SYSTEM – FRIENDS/NEIGHBORS
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	23.9	76.1	122
SEX			
Male	30.2	69.8	63
Female	16.9	83.1	59
RACE			
Black	36.7	63.3	30
White	19.8	80.2	86
AGE			
18 - 29	8.3	91.7	12
30 - 45	25.8	74.2	31
46 - 64	25.5	74.5	51
65 and Over	28.6	71.4	21
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	30.8	69.2	13
High School Diploma	22.7	77.3	44
Some College	25.7	74.3	35
College Degree	18.2	81.8	22
INCOME			
Under $15,000	44.4	55.6	9
$15,000-$29,999	31.0	69.0	29
$30,000-$49,999	26.3	73.7	19
$50,000 and Over	18.8	81.3	32
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	20.0	80.0	15
Suburban	10.3	89.7	29
Rural	30.1	69.9	73
REGION			
Upstate	20.4	79.6	54
Midlands	27.3	72.7	44
Lowcountry	25.0	75.0	24
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	25.7	74.3	35
No	23.3	76.7	86

TABLE B-27

WHERE GOT ADVICE ON SEPTIC SYSTEM – PUMPING SERVICE
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	48.6	51.4	122
SEX			
Male	46.0	54.0	63
Female	51.7	48.3	60
RACE			
Black	43.3	56.7	30
White	52.3	47.7	86
AGE			
18 - 29	50.0	50.0	12
30 - 45	45.2	54.8	31
46 - 64	58.8	41.2	51
65 and Over	33.3	66.7	21
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	53.8	46.2	13
High School Diploma	46.5	53.5	43
Some College	48.6	51.4	35
College Degree	59.1	40.9	22
INCOME			
Under $15,000	44.4	55.6	9
$15,000-$29,999	57.1	42.9	28
$30,000-$49,999	47.4	52.6	19
$50,000 and Over	46.9	53.1	32
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	64.3	35.7	14
Suburban	55.2	44.8	29
Rural	45.2	54.8	73
REGION			
Upstate	**38.9**	**61.1**	**54**
Midlands	**47.7**	**52.3**	**44**
Lowcountry	**73.9**	**26.1**	**23**
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	45.7	54.3	35
No	50.6	49.4	85

TABLE B-28

WHERE GOT ADVICE ON SEPTIC SYSTEM – BOOKS/MAGAZINES
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	24.5	75.5	122
SEX			
Male	28.6	71.4	63
Female	20.3	79.7	59
RACE			
Black	30.0	70.0	30
White	24.4	75.6	86
AGE			
18 - 29	0.0	100.0	12
30 - 45	20.0	80.0	30
46 - 64	27.5	72.5	51
65 and Over	38.1	61.9	21
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	23.1	76.9	13
High School Diploma	32.6	67.4	43
Some College	19.4	80.6	36
College Degree	22.7	77.3	22
INCOME			
Under $15,000	25.0	75.0	8
$15,000-$29,999	24.1	75.9	29
$30,000-$49,999	15.8	84.2	19
$50,000 and Over	31.3	68.8	32
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	**0.0**	**100.0**	**15**
Suburban	**31.0**	**69.0**	**29**
Rural	**28.8**	**71.2**	**73**
REGION			
Upstate	27.3	72.7	55
Midlands	25.6	74.4	43
Lowcountry	13.0	87.0	23
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	34.3	65.7	35
No	20.9	79.1	86

TABLE B-29

WHERE GOT ADVICE ON SEPTIC SYSTEM – INTERNET
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	2.7	97.3	122
SEX			
Male	3.2	96.8	63
Female	3.3	96.7	60
RACE			
Black	0.0	100.0	30
White	3.5	96.5	85
AGE			
18 - 29	0.0	100.0	12
30 - 45	0.0	100.0	31
46 - 64	5.9	94.1	51
65 and Over	0.0	100.0	21
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	0.0	100.0	14
High School Diploma	2.3	97.7	44
Some College	5.7	94.3	35
College Degree	0.0	100.0	22
INCOME			
Under $15,000	0.0	100.0	9
$15,000-$29,999	0.0	100.0	29
$30,000-$49,999	5.3	94.7	19
$50,000 and Over	3.1	96.9	32
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	0.0	100.0	15
Suburban	0.0	100.0	29
Rural	4.1	95.9	73
REGION			
Upstate	3.7	96.3	54
Midlands	2.3	97.7	43
Lowcountry	0.0	100.0	23
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	**8.3**	**91.7**	**36**
No	**1.2**	**98.8**	**86**

TABLE B-30

CLEAN UP AFTER DOG – ON OWN PROPERTY
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	All of the time	Some of the time	Occasionally	Rarely	Never	N
TOTAL:	26.7	19.5	19.9	6.4	27.5	238
SEX						
Male	22.0	16.0	25.0	8.0	29.0	100
Female	30.4	21.7	15.9	5.8	26.1	138
RACE						
Black	**44.4**	**24.4**	**17.8**	**2.2**	**11.1**	**45**
White	**22.5**	**17.1**	**21.4**	**7.5**	**31.6**	**187**
AGE						
18 - 29	29.8	8.5	23.4	8.5	29.8	47
30 - 45	19.5	23.0	24.1	4.6	28.7	87
46 - 64	27.5	21.7	14.5	8.7	27.5	69
65 and Over	44.4	18.5	14.8	3.7	18.5	27
EDUCATION						
Less than High School	25.0	25.0	25.0	3.6	21.4	28
High School Diploma	23.1	21.5	16.9	4.6	33.8	65
Some College	29.3	14.7	20.0	9.3	26.7	75
College Degree	27.7	20.0	21.5	7.7	23.1	65
INCOME						
Under $15,000	29.2	12.5	33.3	8.3	16.7	24
$15,000-$29,999	24.4	33.3	20.0	4.4	17.8	45
$30,000-$49,999	26.4	13.2	22.6	5.7	32.1	53
$50,000 and Over	26.7	13.3	18.7	6.7	34.7	75
TYPE OF AREA						
Urban	**33.3**	**28.6**	**21.4**	**0.0**	**16.7**	**42**
Suburban	**29.2**	**22.2**	**22.2**	**6.9**	**19.4**	**72**
Rural	**22.2**	**14.5**	**18.8**	**8.5**	**35.9**	**117**
REGION						
Upstate	**20.8**	**18.8**	**16.8**	**5.0**	**38.6**	**101**
Midlands	**24.7**	**16.0**	**28.4**	**12.3**	**18.5**	**81**
Lowcountry	**41.5**	**24.5**	**13.2**	**0.0**	**20.8**	**53**
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER						
Yes	24.0	18.0	16.0	4.0	38.0	50
No	27.7	19.0	21.2	7.1	25.0	184

TABLE B-31

CLEAN UP AFTER DOG – AFTER WALKING
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	All of the time	Some of the time	Occasionally	Rarely	Never	N
TOTAL:	43.3	13.7	13.3	6.8	22.8	141
SEX						
Male	**30.0**	**11.7**	**15.0**	**10.0**	**33.3**	**60**
Female	**53.1**	**14.8**	**12.3**	**4.9**	**14.8**	**81**
RACE						
Black	33.3	14.8	22.2	7.4	22.2	27
White	47.3	13.6	10.0	5.5	23.6	110
AGE						
18 - 29	37.5	15.6	15.6	6.3	25.0	32
30 - 45	46.6	6.9	17.2	8.6	20.7	58
46 - 64	44.4	22.2	2.8	2.8	27.8	36
65 and Over	50.0	20.0	10.0	0.0	20.0	10
EDUCATION						
Less than High School	54.5	9.1	27.3	0.0	9.1	11
High School Diploma	50.0	15.6	12.5	3.1	18.8	32
Some College	36.0	12.0	14.0	8.0	30.0	50
College Degree	46.7	15.6	8.9	6.7	22.2	45
INCOME						
Under $15,000	50.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	16
$15,000-$29,999	25.9	22.2	22.2	7.4	22.2	27
$30,000-$49,999	37.5	15.6	9.4	6.3	31.3	32
$50,000 and Over	60.0	8.9	8.9	4.4	17.8	45
TYPE OF AREA						
Urban	44.8	17.2	3.4	3.4	31.0	29
Suburban	52.9	9.8	15.7	5.9	15.7	51
Rural	36.8	15.8	14.0	7.0	26.3	57
REGION						
Upstate	**41.8**	**16.4**	**9.1**	**5.5**	**27.3**	**55**
Midlands	**28.0**	**14.0**	**24.0**	**10.0**	**24.0**	**50**
Lowcountry	**66.7**	**9.1**	**6.1**	**3.0**	**15.2**	**33**
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER						
Yes	48.4	9.7	9.7	6.5	25.8	31
No	42.2	15.6	12.8	7.3	22.0	109

TABLE B-32

MORE LIKELY TO CLEAN UP AFTER DOG – CONVENIENT DISPOSAL LOCATIONS
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	67.6	32.4	176
SEX			
Male	63.6	36.4	77
Female	70.7	29.3	99
RACE			
Black	83.3	16.7	30
White	65.7	34.3	143
AGE			
18 - 29	75.0	25.0	40
30 - 45	66.1	33.9	62
46 - 64	75.0	25.0	48
65 and Over	50.0	50.0	20
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	**82.6**	**17.4**	**23**
High School Diploma	**75.0**	**25.0**	**48**
Some College	**59.6**	**40.4**	**57**
College Degree	**66.7**	**33.3**	**45**
INCOME			
Under $15,000	81.0	19.0	21
$15,000-$29,999	75.8	24.2	33
$30,000-$49,999	64.3	35.7	42
$50,000 and Over	71.2	28.8	52
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	75.0	25.0	28
Suburban	72.0	28.0	50
Rural	65.6	34.4	93
REGION			
Upstate	**70.1**	**29.9**	**77**
Midlands	**56.9**	**43.1**	**65**
Lowcountry	**82.4**	**17.6**	**34**
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	71.8	28.2	39
No	66.4	33.6	137

TABLE B-33

MORE LIKELY TO CLEAN UP AFTER DOG – $50 FINE
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	80.6	19.4	178
SEX			
Male	81.0	19.0	79
Female	80.8	19.2	99
RACE			
Black	78.1	21.9	32
White	81.8	18.2	143
AGE			
18 - 29	**95.0**	**5.0**	**40**
30 - 45	**82.3**	**17.7**	**62**
46 - 64	**76.0**	**24.0**	**50**
65 and Over	**66.7**	**33.3**	**21**
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	88.0	12.0	25
High School Diploma	80.9	19.1	47
Some College	78.9	21.1	57
College Degree	82.2	17.8	45
INCOME			
Under $15,000	77.3	22.7	22
$15,000-$29,999	91.2	8.8	34
$30,000-$49,999	90.2	9.8	41
$50,000 and Over	75.0	25.0	52
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	89.7	10.3	29
Suburban	86.5	13.5	52
Rural	75.5	24.5	94
REGION			
Upstate	84.2	15.8	76
Midlands	79.1	20.9	67
Lowcountry	76.5	23.5	34
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	77.5	22.5	40
No	81.3	18.7	139

TABLE B-34

MORE LIKELY TO CLEAN UP AFTER DOG – SIMPLE, SANITARY METHOD AVAILABLE
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	74.6	25.4	177
SEX			
Male	69.6	30.4	79
Female	78.6	21.4	98
RACE			
Black	87.5	12.5	32
White	71.3	28.7	143
AGE			
18 - 29	82.5	17.5	40
30 - 45	69.4	30.6	62
46 - 64	78.0	22.0	50
65 and Over	66.7	33.3	21
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	70.8	29.2	24
High School Diploma	77.1	22.9	48
Some College	70.7	29.3	58
College Degree	77.3	22.7	44
INCOME			
Under $15,000	85.7	14.3	21
$15,000-$29,999	81.8	18.2	33
$30,000-$49,999	70.7	29.3	41
$50,000 and Over	76.9	23.1	52
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	79.3	20.7	29
Suburban	78.4	21.6	51
Rural	70.5	29.5	95
REGION			
Upstate	71.4	28.6	77
Midlands	78.8	21.2	66
Lowcountry	73.5	26.5	34
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	78.9	21.1	38
No	73.4	26.6	139

TABLE B-35

MORE LIKELY TO CLEAN UP AFTER DOG – NEIGHBOR COMPLAINTS
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	69.8	30.2	178
SEX			
Male	67.5	32.5	80
Female	71.7	28.3	99
RACE			
Black	78.1	21.9	32
White	68.1	31.9	144
AGE			
18 - 29	77.5	22.5	40
30 - 45	75.8	24.2	62
46 - 64	62.0	38.0	50
65 and Over	63.6	36.4	22
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	54.2	45.8	24
High School Diploma	68.8	31.3	48
Some College	73.7	26.3	57
College Degree	77.8	22.2	45
INCOME			
Under $15,000	52.4	47.6	21
$15,000-$29,999	76.5	23.5	34
$30,000-$49,999	70.7	29.3	41
$50,000 and Over	76.9	23.1	52
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	65.5	34.5	29
Suburban	82.4	17.6	51
Rural	65.3	34.7	95
REGION			
Upstate	74.0	26.0	77
Midlands	68.7	31.3	67
Lowcountry	61.8	38.2	34
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	74.4	25.6	39
No	68.3	31.7	139

TABLE B-36

MORE LIKELY TO CLEAN UP AFTER DOG – LAW OR ORDINANCE
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	81.0	19.0	177
SEX			
Male	78.2	21.8	78
Female	82.8	17.2	99
RACE			
Black	87.5	12.5	32
White	80.4	19.6	143
AGE			
18 - 29	92.7	7.3	41
30 - 45	80.6	19.4	62
46 - 64	80.0	20.0	50
65 and Over	71.4	28.6	21
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	83.3	16.7	24
High School Diploma	83.3	16.7	48
Some College	78.9	21.1	57
College Degree	82.2	17.8	45
INCOME			
Under $15,000	71.4	28.6	21
$15,000-$29,999	87.9	12.1	33
$30,000-$49,999	80.5	19.5	41
$50,000 and Over	84.9	15.1	53
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	**85.7**	**14.3**	**28**
Suburban	**92.2**	**7.8**	**51**
Rural	**75.8**	**24.2**	**95**
REGION			
Upstate	83.1	16.9	77
Midlands	80.0	20.0	65
Lowcountry	77.1	22.9	35
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER			
Yes	82.5	17.5	40
No	80.4	19.6	138

TABLE B-37

GETTING INFORMATION ABOUT PROTECTING WATER QUALITY – MAILED BROCHURES
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	N
TOTAL:	15.3	45.1	19.7	15.7	4.2	495
SEX						
Male	**12.9**	**41.2**	**22.3**	**20.6**	**3.0**	**233**
Female	**17.6**	**48.5**	**17.2**	**11.5**	**5.3**	**262**
RACE						
Black	16.6	44.1	23.4	13.8	2.1	145
White	14.5	46.4	18.0	15.7	5.3	338
AGE						
18 - 29	**8.1**	**36.9**	**27.9**	**19.8**	**7.2**	**111**
30 - 45	**17.0**	**55.8**	**18.4**	**6.1**	**2.7**	**147**
46 - 64	**16.3**	**45.6**	**17.0**	**18.4**	**2.7**	**147**
65 and Over	**21.8**	**39.7**	**14.1**	**17.9**	**6.4**	**78**
EDUCATION						
Less than High School	**25.4**	**38.8**	**19.4**	**9.0**	**7.5**	**67**
High School Diploma	**16.8**	**51.1**	**13.9**	**16.8**	**1.5**	**137**
Some College	**13.8**	**52.4**	**15.2**	**13.1**	**5.5**	**145**
College Degree	**10.0**	**35.7**	**30.0**	**20.7**	**3.6**	**140**
INCOME						
Under $15,000	**9.8**	**43.1**	**13.7**	**21.6**	**11.8**	**51**
$15,000-$29,999	**21.2**	**45.5**	**18.2**	**12.1**	**3.0**	**99**
$30,000-$49,999	**11.2**	**49.5**	**26.2**	**8.4**	**4.7**	**107**
$50,000 and Over	**11.9**	**46.9**	**20.3**	**17.5**	**3.5**	**143**
TYPE OF AREA						
Urban	**13.4**	**37.0**	**18.9**	**28.3**	**2.4**	**127**
Suburban	**14.6**	**48.7**	**22.2**	**10.8**	**3.8**	**158**
Rural	**16.6**	**48.3**	**18.0**	**11.7**	**5.4**	**205**
REGION						
Upstate	17.9	46.4	17.3	16.2	2.2	179
Midlands	13.4	45.9	25.0	11.0	4.7	172
Lowcountry	15.0	42.9	15.7	20.0	6.4	140
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER						
Yes	16.7	46.7	19.2	14.2	3.3	120
No	14.7	44.8	20.0	16.0	4.5	375

TABLE B-38

GETTING INFORMATION ABOUT PROTECTING WATER QUALITY – LOCAL NEWSPAPERS
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	N
TOTAL:	8.9	37.9	26.8	20.2	6.2	494
SEX						
Male	**3.9**	**36.9**	**25.8**	**25.3**	**8.2**	**233**
Female	**13.4**	**38.9**	**27.5**	**15.6**	**4.6**	**262**
RACE						
Black	**10.3**	**43.8**	**30.1**	**11.6**	**4.1**	**146**
White	**8.3**	**34.7**	**25.2**	**24.3**	**7.4**	**337**
AGE						
18 - 29	12.6	28.8	26.1	27.0	5.4	111
30 - 45	6.8	35.4	30.6	17.7	9.5	147
46 - 64	8.3	43.8	23.6	19.4	4.9	144
65 and Over	10.1	41.8	26.6	19.0	2.5	79
EDUCATION						
Less than High School	**11.8**	**35.3**	**26.5**	**22.1**	**4.4**	**68**
High School Diploma	**11.7**	**51.8**	**19.0**	**12.4**	**5.1**	**137**
Some College	**7.7**	**41.5**	**24.6**	**21.1**	**4.9**	**142**
College Degree	**5.0**	**21.4**	**37.9**	**27.1**	**8.6**	**140**
INCOME						
Under $15,000	**20.0**	**30.0**	**24.0**	**12.0**	**14.0**	**50**
$15,000-$29,999	**10.0**	**44.0**	**26.0**	**15.0**	**5.0**	**100**
$30,000-$49,999	**5.7**	**39.0**	**27.6**	**22.9**	**4.8**	**105**
$50,000 and Over	**8.4**	**30.1**	**27.3**	**25.2**	**9.1**	**143**
TYPE OF AREA						
Urban	7.0	37.2	26.4	21.7	7.8	129
Suburban	8.2	31.4	32.7	22.6	5.0	159
Rural	10.3	43.3	23.2	17.2	5.9	203
REGION						
Upstate	**7.9**	**42.1**	**21.3**	**23.6**	**5.1**	**178**
Midlands	**7.6**	**39.5**	**32.6**	**13.4**	**7.0**	**172**
Lowcountry	**11.4**	**30.0**	**27.1**	**24.3**	**7.1**	**140**
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER						
Yes	10.1	35.3	27.7	21.0	5.9	119
No	8.6	38.6	26.5	19.8	6.4	373

TABLE B-39

GETTING INFORMATION ABOUT PROTECTING WATER QUALITY – COMMUNITY NEWSLETTER BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	N
TOTAL:	11.3	38.1	26.5	20.5	3.6	488
SEX						
Male	**5.4**	**34.8**	**29.0**	**26.3**	**4.5**	**224**
Female	**16.3**	**40.7**	**24.3**	**15.6**	**3.0**	**263**
RACE						
Black	14.9	39.2	29.7	13.5	2.7	148
White	10.0	38.4	25.1	23.0	3.6	331
AGE						
18 - 29	13.5	37.8	26.1	20.7	1.8	111
30 - 45	13.0	41.1	24.7	17.1	4.1	146
46 - 64	9.0	34.5	29.0	24.8	2.8	145
65 and Over	11.0	43.8	26.0	13.7	5.5	73
EDUCATION						
Less than High School	16.2	33.8	22.1	23.5	4.4	68
High School Diploma	7.3	41.6	26.3	21.9	2.9	137
Some College	12.9	45.7	23.6	16.4	1.4	140
College Degree	11.0	30.1	33.1	21.3	4.4	136
INCOME						
Under $15,000	16.3	46.9	18.4	12.2	6.1	49
$15,000-$29,999	11.2	40.8	22.4	20.4	5.1	98
$30,000-$49,999	14.6	40.8	26.2	16.5	1.9	103
$50,000 and Over	8.5	34.5	32.4	21.8	2.8	142
TYPE OF AREA						
Urban	13.0	35.8	28.5	21.1	1.6	123
Suburban	9.6	38.9	28.0	21.7	1.9	157
Rural	11.9	39.6	24.8	18.8	5.0	202
REGION						
Upstate	**14.3**	**34.3**	**22.9**	**26.3**	**2.3**	**175**
Midlands	**8.3**	**43.2**	**26.0**	**18.3**	**4.1**	**169**
Lowcountry	**11.4**	**37.9**	**32.1**	**13.6**	**5.0**	**140**
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER						
Yes	9.3	37.3	32.2	19.5	1.7	118
No	11.9	38.4	24.6	20.8	4.3	370

TABLE B-40

GETTING INFORMATION ABOUT PROTECTING WATER QUALITY – FREE VIDEO
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	N
TOTAL:	17.1	32.2	19.4	24.6	6.7	495
SEX						
Male	17.5	29.1	20.1	26.9	6.4	234
Female	16.9	34.9	18.8	22.6	6.9	261
RACE						
Black	**20.4**	**40.8**	**21.1**	**12.2**	**5.4**	**147**
White	**16.0**	**28.5**	**18.7**	**29.7**	**7.1**	**337**
AGE						
18 - 29	**14.5**	**21.8**	**22.7**	**30.0**	**10.9**	**110**
30 - 45	**16.3**	**40.8**	**19.0**	**19.7**	**4.1**	**147**
46 - 64	**23.0**	**32.4**	**16.2**	**24.3**	**4.1**	**148**
65 and Over	**11.8**	**32.9**	**22.4**	**25.0**	**7.9**	**76**
EDUCATION						
Less than High School	**25.0**	**30.9**	**13.2**	**22.1**	**8.8**	**68**
High School Diploma	**19.6**	**39.9**	**16.7**	**18.8**	**5.1**	**138**
Some College	**20.8**	**34.7**	**21.5**	**18.8**	**4.2**	**144**
College Degree	**7.1**	**22.9**	**23.6**	**37.1**	**9.3**	**140**
INCOME						
Under $15,000	**16.0**	**34.0**	**8.0**	**20.0**	**22.0**	**50**
$15,000-$29,999	**23.2**	**34.3**	**21.2**	**19.2**	**2.0**	**99**
$30,000-$49,999	**21.0**	**32.4**	**22.9**	**22.9**	**1.0**	**105**
$50,000 and Over	**14.8**	**27.5**	**21.1**	**31.0**	**5.6**	**142**
TYPE OF AREA						
Urban	13.2	27.9	20.9	31.8	6.2	129
Suburban	14.0	33.1	20.4	25.5	7.0	157
Rural	21.8	34.0	18.0	19.9	6.3	206
REGION						
Upstate	18.0	32.0	17.4	28.7	3.9	178
Midlands	16.2	35.8	20.2	20.8	6.9	173
Lowcountry	17.0	28.4	19.9	24.8	9.9	141
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER						
Yes	**24.6**	**27.1**	**22.9**	**21.2**	**4.2**	**118**
No	**14.7**	**33.6**	**18.4**	**25.9**	**7.5**	**126**

TABLE B-41

GETTING INFORMATION ABOUT PROTECTING WATER QUALITY –
PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCMENTS BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	N
TOTAL:	22.2	50.5	14.3	10.1	2.9	497
SEX						
Male	19.7	48.1	18.0	12.0	2.1	233
Female	24.4	53.1	10.7	8.4	3.4	262
RACE						
Black	**27.7**	**50.0**	**16.2**	**4.7**	**1.4**	**148**
White	**19.4**	**50.9**	**13.5**	**12.4**	**3.8**	**340**
AGE						
18 - 29	22.7	49.1	15.5	8.2	4.5	110
30 - 45	29.7	48.0	12.8	8.1	1.4	148
46 - 64	19.6	56.1	12.8	8.8	2.7	148
65 and Over	13.9	49.4	16.5	16.5	3.8	79
EDUCATION						
Less than High School	**26.8**	**36.6**	**14.1**	**12.7**	**9.9**	**71**
High School Diploma	**23.4**	**59.9**	**8.8**	**5.8**	**2.2**	**137**
Some College	**25.7**	**48.6**	**13.2**	**11.1**	**1.4**	**144**
College Degree	**16.3**	**51.1**	**19.9**	**11.3**	**1.4**	**141**
INCOME						
Under $15,000	**26.0**	**50.0**	**10.0**	**4.0**	**10.0**	**50**
$15,000-$29,999	**35.4**	**50.5**	**7.1**	**7.1**	**0.0**	**99**
$30,000-$49,999	**22.6**	**53.8**	**16.0**	**5.7**	**1.9**	**106**
$50,000 and Over	**16.2**	**46.5**	**21.1**	**14.8**	**1.4**	**142**
TYPE OF AREA						
Urban	19.5	53.1	13.3	11.7	2.3	128
Suburban	24.2	45.2	17.2	9.6	3.8	157
Rural	22.7	53.1	12.1	9.7	2.4	207
REGION						
Upstate	**22.2**	**52.8**	**15.0**	**9.4**	**0.6**	**180**
Midlands	**23.1**	**45.1**	**18.5**	**11.0**	**2.3**	**173**
Lowcountry	**21.4**	**54.3**	**8.6**	**9.3**	**6.4**	**140**
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER						
Yes	23.5	50.4	12.6	10.9	2.5	119
No	21.8	50.4	14.9	9.8	3.2	377

TABLE B-42

GETTING INFORMATION ABOUT PROTECTING WATER QUALITY – INTERNET
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	N
TOTAL:	10.7	34.6	18.0	27.3	9.3	478
SEX						
Male	**4.5**	**34.1**	**16.6**	**34.5**	**10.3**	**223**
Female	**16.1**	**35.3**	**19.2**	**21.2**	**8.2**	**225**
RACE						
Black	**12.1**	**44.7**	**17.0**	**22.0**	**4.3**	**141**
White	**10.1**	**30.6**	**18.7**	**29.1**	**11.6**	**327**
AGE						
18 - 29	**16.2**	**34.2**	**17.1**	**28.8**	**3.6**	**111**
30 - 45	**15.1**	**40.4**	**19.9**	**19.9**	**4.8**	**146**
46 - 64	**5.6**	**35.2**	**19.0**	**29.6**	**10.6**	**142**
65 and Over	**4.4**	**22.1**	**16.2**	**32.4**	**25.0**	**68**
EDUCATION						
Less than High School	**16.7**	**30.3**	**16.7**	**25.8**	**10.6**	**66**
High School Diploma	**3.8**	**45.5**	**20.5**	**21.2**	**9.1**	**132**
Some College	**15.8**	**33.8**	**15.8**	**25.2**	**9.4**	**139**
College Degree	**10.0**	**25.7**	**19.3**	**35.7**	**9.3**	**140**
INCOME						
Under $15,000	**25.0**	**22.9**	**16.7**	**20.8**	**14.6**	**48**
$15,000-$29,999	**12.9**	**41.9**	**18.3**	**18.3**	**8.6**	**93**
$30,000-$49,999	**5.8**	**34.0**	**25.2**	**27.2**	**7.8**	**103**
$50,000 and Over	**12.1**	**34.8**	**17.7**	**29.8**	**5.7**	**141**
TYPE OF AREA						
Urban	12.2	41.5	11.4	28.5	6.5	123
Suburban	10.9	30.8	24.4	25.6	8.3	156
Rural	9.7	33.2	17.3	27.6	12.2	196
REGION						
Upstate	8.9	37.9	14.8	30.8	7.7	169
Midlands	9.1	34.5	24.2	23.0	9.1	165
Lowcountry	14.3	31.4	15.0	27.9	11.4	140
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER						
Yes	10.4	41.7	17.4	20.0	10.4	115
No	10.8	32.1	18.3	29.9	8.9	361

TABLE B-43

GETTING INFORMATION ABOUT PROTECTING WATER QUALITY –
WEEKEND TRAINING WORKSHOP BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	N
TOTAL:	8.1	20.7	19.2	38.2	13.8	493
SEX						
Male	7.3	15.9	18.9	43.8	14.2	233
Female	8.8	24.9	19.5	33.3	13.4	261
RACE						
Black	**13.2**	**27.8**	**27.8**	**23.6**	**7.6**	**144**
White	**6.2**	**17.5**	**16.0**	**43.5**	**16.9**	**388**
AGE						
18 - 29	7.3	19.3	19.3	39.4	14.7	109
30 - 45	10.3	20.5	23.3	33.6	12.3	146
46 - 64	6.8	20.3	16.9	39.9	16.2	148
65 and Over	9.0	24.4	19.2	37.2	10.3	78
EDUCATION						
Less than High School	**11.4**	**30.0**	**14.3**	**34.3**	**10.0**	**70**
High School Diploma	**11.0**	**25.0**	**16.9**	**35.3**	**11.8**	**136**
Some College	**10.3**	**16.6**	**23.4**	**38.6**	**11.0**	**145**
College Degree	**1.4**	**16.5**	**19.4**	**41.7**	**20.9**	**139**
INCOME						
Under $15,000	**6.0**	**28.0**	**14.0**	**28.0**	**24.0**	**50**
$15,000-$29,999	**15.5**	**26.8**	**22.7**	**28.9**	**6.2**	**97**
$30,000-$49,999	**9.5**	**21.9**	**20.0**	**39.0**	**9.5**	**105**
$50,000 and Over	**5.7**	**17.0**	**16.3**	**46.8**	**14.2**	**141**
TYPE OF AREA						
Urban	7.0	24.2	17.2	39.1	12.5	128
Suburban	8.4	16.8	18.1	40.0	16.8	155
Rural	8.7	21.3	21.7	36.2	12.1	207
REGION						
Upstate	**7.8**	**17.2**	**19.4**	**45.6**	**10.0**	**180**
Midlands	**11.8**	**22.9**	**15.3**	**35.3**	**14.7**	**170**
Lowcountry	**4.3**	**21.6**	**24.5**	**31.7**	**18.0**	**139**
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER						
Yes	**14.4**	**14.4**	**26.3**	**33.1**	**11.9**	**118**
No	**6.1**	**22.5**	**17.1**	**39.8**	**14.4**	**374**

TABLE B-44

GETTING INFORMATION ABOUT PROTECTING WATER QUALITY –
RADIO CALL-IN SHOW BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	N
TOTAL:	5.8	28.8	27.2	28.5	9.8	490
SEX						
Male	5.7	24.3	26.1	32.6	11.3	230
Female	5.8	32.7	28.1	25.0	8.5	260
RACE						
Black	4.8	33.8	30.3	25.5	5.5	145
White	6.6	25.7	26.0	30.1	11.6	335
AGE						
18 - 29	7.3	32.1	25.7	29.4	5.5	109
30 - 45	4.1	30.8	30.8	24.0	10.3	146
46 - 64	6.1	25.7	27.0	31.1	10.1	148
65 and Over	6.8	23.0	23.0	33.8	13.5	74
EDUCATION						
Less than High School	**16.2**	**30.9**	**23.5**	**22.1**	**7.4**	**68**
High School Diploma	**2.2**	**36.6**	**29.1**	**25.4**	**6.7**	**134**
Some College	**5.6**	**28.5**	**24.3**	**32.6**	**9.0**	**144**
College Degree	**4.3**	**19.3**	**30.7**	**31.4**	**14.3**	**140**
INCOME						
Under $15,000	**4.0**	**30.0**	**30.0**	**22.0**	**14.0**	**50**
$15,000-$29,999	**8.1**	**41.4**	**23.2**	**26.3**	**1.0**	**99**
$30,000-$49,999	**11.2**	**22.4**	**29.0**	**29.9**	**7.5**	**107**
$50,000 and Over	**2.9**	**22.9**	**32.9**	**31.4**	**10.0**	**140**
TYPE OF AREA						
Urban	4.7	28.3	29.9	31.5	5.5	127
Suburban	7.1	22.7	29.9	26.6	13.6	154
Rural	5.8	33.5	23.3	28.2	9.2	206
REGION						
Upstate	6.7	21.8	30.2	33.5	7.8	179
Midlands	5.9	32.0	26.6	24.3	11.2	169
Lowcountry	4.3	33.1	25.2	27.3	10.1	139
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER						
Yes	6.0	29.3	34.5	22.4	7.8	116
No	5.9	28.2	25.2	30.3	10.5	373

TABLE B-45

GETTING INFORMATION ABOUT PROTECTING WATER QUALITY –
PUBLIC ACCESS CABLE SHOW BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	N
TOTAL:	6.7	39.4	24.6	22.2	7.1	487
SEX						
Male	**5.2**	**37.1**	**20.5**	**27.5**	**9.6**	**229**
Female	**8.1**	**41.5**	**27.9**	**17.4**	**5.0**	**258**
RACE						
Black	**9.1**	**44.8**	**27.3**	**16.1**	**2.8**	**143**
White	**6.0**	**36.8**	**23.4**	**24.6**	**9.3**	**334**
AGE						
18 - 29	4.5	39.1	23.6	28.2	4.5	110
30 - 45	6.1	42.2	25.9	19.0	6.8	147
46 - 64	6.2	40.4	23.3	21.2	8.9	146
65 and Over	13.7	37.0	21.9	19.2	8.2	73
EDUCATION						
Less than High School	**12.9**	**44.3**	**22.9**	**11.4**	**8.6**	**70**
High School Diploma	**6.7**	**46.7**	**24.4**	**15.6**	**6.7**	**135**
Some College	**8.5**	**40.4**	**19.9**	**24.1**	**7.1**	**141**
College Degree	**2.9**	**29.0**	**29.7**	**31.9**	**6.5**	**138**
INCOME						
Under $15,000	12.0	44.0	14.0	22.0	8.0	50
$15,000-$29,999	7.4	47.4	24.2	17.9	3.2	95
$30,000-$49,999	8.5	40.6	24.5	17.0	9.4	106
$50,000 and Over	4.9	34.5	29.6	26.8	4.2	142
TYPE OF AREA						
Urban	7.3	40.3	27.4	20.2	4.8	124
Suburban	5.2	40.0	27.7	20.6	6.5	155
Rural	7.8	38.5	20.0	24.9	8.8	205
REGION						
Upstate	6.1	43.0	17.9	26.3	6.7	179
Midlands	8.5	36.4	27.3	20.0	7.9	165
Lowcountry	5.7	36.9	30.5	19.9	7.1	141
LIVE NEAR A BODY OF WATER						
Yes	8.5	40.7	22.0	20.3	8.5	118
No	6.3	38.9	25.5	22.8	6.5	368

APPENDIX C

LIVE NEAR BODY OF WATER
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

TABLE C-1

LIVE NEXT TO CREEK, STREAM, RIVER, LAKE, OR POND
RADIO CALL-IN SHOW BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	23.8	76.2	503
SEX			
Male	26.1	73.9	238
Female	21.9	78.1	265
RACE			
Black	18.9	81.1	148
White	26.4	73.6	345
AGE			
18 - 29	27.0	73.0	111
30 - 45	21.5	78.5	149
46 - 64	24.8	75.2	149
65 and Over	22.8	77.2	79
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	22.9	77.1	70
High School Diploma	26.6	73.4	139
Some College	24.1	75.9	145
College Degree	22.0	78.0	141
INCOME			
Under $15,000	11.8	88.2	51
$15,000-$29,999	23.0	77.0	100
$30,000-$49,999	24.3	75.7	107
$50,000 and Over	27.3	72.7	143
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	**21.7**	**78.3**	**129**
Suburban	**18.1**	**81.9**	**160**
Rural	**30.1**	**69.9**	**209**
REGION			
Upstate	26.8	73.2	183
Midlands	19.3	80.7	176
Lowcountry	26.4	73.6	140

TABLE C-2

AREA OF TREES AND SHRUBS BETWEEN HOME AND BODY OF WATER
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Yes	No	N
TOTAL:	79.2	20.8	119
SEX			
Male	82.3	17.7	62
Female	75.4	24.6	57
RACE			
Black	92.9	7.1	28
White	76.7	23.3	90
AGE			
18 - 29	83.3	16.7	30
30 - 45	75.0	25.0	32
46 - 64	83.8	16.2	37
65 and Over	70.6	29.4	17
EDUCATION			
Less than High School	82.4	17.6	17
High School Diploma	81.1	18.9	37
Some College	85.7	14.3	35
College Degree	66.7	33.3	30
INCOME			
Under $15,000	**57.1**	**42.9**	**7**
$15,000-$29,999	**95.7**	**4.3**	**23**
$30,000-$49,999	**80.8**	**19.2**	**26**
$50,000 and Over	**73.7**	**26.3**	**38**
TYPE OF AREA			
Urban	65.5	34.3	29
Suburban	75.0	25.0	28
Rural	87.3	12.7	63
REGION			
Upstate	91.7	8.3	48
Midlands	85.3	14.7	34
Lowcountry	59.5	40.5	37