

PWS RCAC PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY

November 2006

RCAC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY	i
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii -xix
QUESTIONNAIRE AND FREQUENCIES	1-27
CROSTABULATION TABLES:	
Area's of Alaska – Column percents	28-41
Number of Radio Ads Heard – Column percents	42-55
PWS RCAC's Rating – Column percents.....	56-69
PWS RCAC's Rating – Row percents	70-78
Sample Year – Column percents.....	79-89

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

This project was fielded November 2006. A total of five hundred one adults resident in the Prince William Sound RCAC's service area were surveyed. Respondents were selected through a random digit dial methodology.

The sample was stratified into three geographic areas of the state, with an unweighted distribution as follows:

Area of Alaska	Sample	Error rate
Kodiak	167	$\pm 7.5\%$
Kenai Peninsula	162	$\pm 7.7\%$
Prince William Sound	172	$\pm 7.4\%$

Data was weighted to assign each of the area strata to their proper population proportions, with a final weighted distribution as follows:

Area of Alaska	Sample	Percent
Kodiak	88	17.6%
Kenai Peninsula	368	73.4%
Prince William Sound	45	9.0%

A 501 sample in this total sampling area, stratified in this fashion, yields overall frequency results that are subject to a maximum margin of error of $\pm 5.8\%$ at 95% confidence. In other words, we can be 95% sure that our weighted results for the total sample differ from their true population proportions by no more than 5.8% on either side.

Fielding for this survey was conducted by telephone from our centralized facility in Anchorage. Collected data has been data entered, verified, checked for accuracy, coded, weighted and processed using SPSS, a standard statistical package for survey research. The elements of this report include the questionnaire in its final form collated with the frequency results for each question, and a crosstabulation section that breaks the sample down into core demographic groups.

Quality control measures were taken to ensure as high a response rate as possible for this study. These included supervision of interviewers, limitation of the calling set, repeated callbacks, post-interview quality control surveys, and calling at various times of day and evening over the course of the fielding period. As a result, we can be very confident of the accuracy of results within the statistical margin of error.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RCAC's rating

Q: OK, I'm going to read you a short list of organizations. Please tell me if your feelings towards them are very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, or very negative, or if you have never heard of them.

Prince William Sound RCAC score a positive-negative rating in this 2006 survey of 44.2% positive, 7.2% negative, 12.5% neutral, 36.1% who?.

	2003	2004	2005	2006
Very positive	11.5%	18.7%	15.7%	18.0%
Somewhat positive	26.5%	19.9%	24.2%	26.2%
Neutral	14.8%	16.0%	13.8%	12.5%
Somewhat negative	3.2%	2.1%	3.0%	4.0%
Very negative	1.6%	0.8%	1.5%	3.2%
Who?	42.3%	42.5%	41.7%	36.1%
MEAN	2.75	2.93	2.85	2.81

This is a good improvement from last year. The overall positive rating is up from 38.1% in 2003, 38.7% in 2004, 40.0% in 2005, to 44.2% now. The Who? rating has also declined for the first time under 40%. But with this increased awareness goes an increased negative rating, up to 7.2% this year, and largely due to the increased strength of the negative, we see the mean rating dropping.

All in all, though, quite significant progress.

Regional comparisons

The following tables show the regional comparisons of RCAC's rating in the last four surveys:

KENAI PENINSULA	2003	2004	2005	2006
Positive	37.4%	33.2%	36.6%	39.8%
Negative	4.9%	2.9%	4.1%	7.6%
Neutral	20.0%	17.2%	14.2%	12.9%
Who?	37.8%	46.7%	45.1%	39.7%
MEAN	2.70	2.86	2.81	2.75

Kenai shows a record high positive at just under 40%, but a record high negative too at 7.6%.

PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND	2003	2004	2005	2006
Positive	61.9%	69.0%	56.5%	63.9%
Negative	7.4%	5.7%	7.5%	10.0%
Neutral	12.7%	8.3%	14.9%	13.6%
Who?	18.0%	17.0%	21.1%	12.4%
MEAN	3.00	3.15	3.01	2.93

Prince William Sound, RCAC's traditional strong area, maintains a high positive in the 60's, scores a record low Who? at 12%, but has a negative that hits double digits for the first time. Mean rating drops below 3.0 for the first time.

KODIAK	2003	2004	2005	2006
Positive	25.4%	46.1%	45.6%	52.2%
Negative	2.3%	1.2%	4.4%	4.1%
Neutral	21.5%	14.7%	11.9%	10.2%
Who?	50.8%	37.9%	38.2%	33.5%
MEAN	2.73	3.03	2.91	2.97

Great results in Kodiak. Positive up over 50% for the first time (compared with 25% in 2003), neutral and Who? ratings both dropping to record lows, and a negative that is holding low.

Result comparisons 2003-2006:

Oil industry's rating:

	2003	2004	2005	2006
Positive	75.1%	70.7%	60.3%	64.3%
Negative	11.0%	19.2%	30.1%	23.5%
Neutral	13.9%	10.1%	9.6%	12.2%
MEAN SCORE (0-4)	2.89	2.74	2.42	2.60

Perhaps surprisingly, we see a recovery from the very steep decline measured between 2003 and 2005. 2006, of course, was the year of the pipeline spill on the North Slope and all the negative publicity that stemmed from that event, but despite this, the industry's positive rating rose four points, and the negative dropped seven compared with 2005.

Likelihood of similar spill:

Q: Do you think an incident on the scale of the Exxon Valdez spill is more likely to happen today, less likely to happen, or just as likely to happen as it was in 1989?

	2003	2004	2005	2006
More likely	3.5%	1.9%	3.8%	3.4%
Less likely	67.8%	58.4%	61.9%	60.4%
No difference/Not sure	27.9%	39.0%	34.4%	36.1%

No significant change here.

Concern about oil transportation:

Q: How concerned are you about oil being transported through waterways near where you live, very concerned, somewhat concerned or not at all concerned?

	2003	2004	2005	2006
Very concerned	28.3%	34.6%	33.3%	29.4%
Somewhat concerned	42.5%	37.1%	35.9%	37.9%
Not at all concerned	29.2%	28.3%	29.9%	32.1%

There has been no significant change in this result since 2003. However, it is notable that the very concerned percent has dropped back down below 30% and the not at all concerned percent has risen above 30% for the first time.

Oil industry grade for preventing spills:

Q: On a scale of A, B, C, D or F, what grade would you give the oil industry for working to prevent a similar incident from happening again?

	2003	2004	2005	2006
A	19.5%	18.2%	14.2%	13.0%
B	42.3%	33.9%	35.1%	35.9%
C	26.1%	32.2%	29.5%	32.4%
D	6.4%	9.8%	11.0%	12.5%
F	2.3%	3.5%	2.9%	4.0%
Not sure	3.4%	2.5%	7.3%	2.2%
MEAN SCORE (0-4)	2.73	2.55	2.50	2.42

Unlike with the oil industry's overall rating, we do see this one continue to decline... A's are down again, D's and F's are up, and the mean rating is down significantly compared with last year.

Oil industry grade for being prepared to clean up spill:

Q: On a scale of A, B, C, D or F, what grade would you give the oil industry for being prepared to clean up a similar spill if it should happen again?

	2003	2004	2005	2006
A	21.9%	18.6%	13.3%	16.0%
B	37.0%	29.4%	34.7%	36.5%
C	22.0%	28.3%	20.6%	27.1%
D	8.0%	12.5%	14.8%	10.2%
F	5.0%	4.7%	7.7%	8.2%
Not sure	6.2%	6.4%	8.8%	2.1%
MEAN SCORE (0-4)	2.67	2.48	2.34	2.43

This result is better... total A's and B's are back up over 50%, total D's and F's are back under 20%, and the mean rating is improved from last year. Big decrease also in the "not sure" result.

RCAC grade for preventing spills:

Q: On a scale of A, B, C, D or F, what grade would you give the Prince William Sound RCAC for working to prevent a similar incident to the Exxon Valdez spill from happening again?

	2003	2004	2005	2006
A	11.1%	19.6%	17.3%	20.1%
B	31.8%	29.2%	30.2%	32.3%
C	14.4%	15.0%	16.8%	21.1%
D	3.1%	3.3%	3.5%	7.8%
F	0.4%	0.7%	1.3%	1.2%
Not sure	39.3%	32.1%	30.9%	17.5%
MEAN SCORE (0-4)	2.82	2.94	2.85	2.76

Significant change here for the RCAC grade, most notably in the percent of respondents who were “Not sure”... which declined from a high of 39% in 2003, down to 17% now. As with the overall RCAC rating, increasing awareness increases the positive... A’s and B’s are up over 50% for the first time, but also increases the negative... D’s and F’s hit 9% this year. As a result, we see the mean grade decline.

Environmentalist-Developmentalist scale:

Let’s check our 7-point “development” scale...

Q: Where would you put yourself on a scale from 1 to 7, where a 1 is a strong environmentalist opposed to excessive development, and a 7 is an advocate of development opposed to excessive environmental controls?

	2003	2004	2005	2006
Environmental (1-3)	26.3%	27.1%	34.9%	38.0%
Equal (4)	31.5%	31.5%	18.1%	22.4%
Developmental (5-7)	41.2%	39.3%	46.2%	39.7%
MEAN SCORE (1-7)	4.29	4.21	4.20	4.05

This is a fascinating result. We would expect, in a time span as short as the few years we see here, to see opinion on issues change quite freely... but wouldn’t expect a variable like this one, which really defines much more deeply how one views the world, to change as quickly. The increase on the environmental end of the scale is continuous and undeniable, from 26.3% in 2003 up to 38.0% now. What is perhaps most notable is the difference between the environmentalist and developmentalist percents... in all four surveys, more respondents identify themselves on the developmentalist end of the scale than the environmental end, but the gap has closed this year to near parity.

RCAC good thing or bad thing?

Q: After the Exxon Valdez spill, a group called the Prince William Sound Regional Citizens' Advisory Council or RCAC was established, to monitor oil industry operations and to participate in decisions about the transportation of North Slope crude in Alaska waters. Do you think the establishment of the Prince William Sound RCAC was a good thing or a bad thing for Alaska?

	2003	2004	2005	2006
Good thing	79.3%	79.2%	82.7%	84.4%
Bad thing	3.8%	2.5%	2.7%	6.6%
Don't know	16.9%	18.3%	14.6%	9.0%

We see the theme of this survey repeated... awareness is up, and positive results are up... but with it, you've made yourself known to a few enemies.

Importance series I

Q: I am now going to read you a list of things that could be done to help prevent oil spills from happening in waterways near where you live. Tell me on a scale of 1 to 5, how important you think each thing is, where a 5 is very important, and a 1 is not at all important?

The following table shows the comparison of the mean scores for each item between this year and prior years:

	2003	2004	2005	2006
Using radar technology to help oil tankers avoid icebergs	4.58	4.71	4.70	4.76
Using only double hulled oil tankers	4.65	4.70	4.64	4.72
Keeping citizens involved in decisions about oil transportation and oil spill prevention	4.04	4.09	4.10	4.19
Require that every loaded oil tanker crossing Prince William Sound be escorted by two rescue tugs	NA	NA	4.04	4.09

All importance means are highs for the last four surveys.

Importance series II

Q: Now I'm going to read you a list of things that could be done to help deal with oil spills if they should happen in the future. Tell me again on a scale of 1 to 5, how important you think each thing is.

	2003	2004	2005	2006
Developing new technology for removing oil	4.53	4.68	4.57	4.61
Preparing detailed protection plans in advance for local sensitive areas like clamming beaches and salmon streams	4.49	4.61	4.65	4.62
Stockpiling oil spill containment and oil removal supplies in communities that might be hit by spilled oil	4.45	4.56	4.51	4.54
Training local residents to clean up oil spills	4.15	4.18	4.08	4.31
Hiring, training and equipping commercial fishing vessels to clean up oil spills	4.03	4.11	4.04	4.14
Maintain a fleet of at least 10 tugs in Prince William Sound for cleaning up oil spills	NA	NA	3.84	3.81

The most significant change is the rise in “training local residents to clean up oil spills” which scores its highest mean score of 4.31, significantly higher than prior years.

True-False Statements

Twelve statements were read to respondents as in past years, who were asked to indicate if they thought each statement was true or false. Six are true, six are false.

Q: I'd now like to measure what you know about the RCAC. I am going to read you a list of 12 statements about the RCAC. Trouble is, six of these statements are true and six are false. For each one, please tell me whether you think the statement is true or false. If you're not sure, give it your best guess.

True statements

	2003	2004	2005	2006
The RCAC produces a community Disaster Guidebook with coping strategies for social problems created by a large technical disaster like an oil spill:				
True	62.0%	60.7%	66.4%	68.5%
False	18.2%	17.5%	25.1%	13.8%
Not sure	19.8%	21.8%	8.5%	17.7%
The RCAC conducts research into harmful aquatic species transported in the ballast water of tankers:				
True	52.0%	58.6%	59.4%	55.8%
False	29.1%	22.6%	32.5%	29.1%
Not sure	18.9%	18.8%	8.0%	15.1%
The RCAC monitors and detects environmental impacts from day to day operations of oil tankers and the Valdez Marine Terminal:				
True	61.7%	64.9%	74.5%	65.9%
False	19.6%	15.5%	19.7%	19.4%
Not sure	18.7%	19.5%	5.8%	14.7%
The RCAC is mostly funded by Alyeska Pipeline:				
True	47.9%	38.1%	37.2%	34.9%
False	31.8%	38.0%	53.9%	46.8%
Not sure	20.3%	23.9%	8.9%	18.3%
The RCAC works to reduce air pollution caused by oil tankers and the Valdez Marine Terminal:				
True	47.2%	43.6%	47.5%	41.5%
False	34.4%	37.2%	45.3%	41.1%
Not sure	18.4%	19.2%	7.2%	17.4%

	2003	2004	2005	2006
The RCAC conducts Marine Fire Response training for Local communities and fire departments:				
True	39.9%	35.7%	41.1%	36.4%
False	41.1%	41.8%	49.9%	46.8%
Not sure	19.0%	22.5%	9.0%	16.8%

False statements

	2003	2004	2005	2006
The RCAC is mostly funded by the State of Alaska:				
True	23.7%	34.5%	36.4%	32.5%
False	54.7%	46.9%	56.8%	48.6%
Not sure	21.5%	18.6%	6.8%	18.9%
The RCAC is mostly funded by environmental groups:				
True	21.1%	29.3%	35.0%	32.5%
False	60.0%	52.2%	57.8%	50.1%
Not sure	18.9%	18.5%	7.2%	17.4%
The RCAC is responsible for clean up operations should another large oil spill occur in Prince William Sound or the Gulf of Alaska:				
True	37.7%	35.2%	43.4%	36.3%
False	43.1%	49.4%	50.8%	51.2%
Not sure	19.3%	15.4%	5.8%	12.5%
The RCAC conducts on-going clean up operations from the Exxon Valdez oil spill:				
True	31.6%	41.2%	44.0%	35.9%
False	50.1%	39.9%	49.4%	47.5%
Not sure	18.3%	19.0%	6.7%	16.6%
The RCAC monitors oil industry operations on the North Slope of Alaska:				
True	35.9%	38.4%	36.5%	36.5%
False	44.9%	41.0%	56.0%	48.1%
Not sure	19.1%	20.6%	7.4%	15.4%
The RCAC monitors environmental impacts along the 800 miles of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline:				
True	49.2%	48.3%	47.8%	42.8%
False	32.1%	34.1%	46.0%	43.9%
Not sure	18.6%	17.6%	6.2%	13.3%

A few results show very interesting changes. And just a note before we look at these... there are differences in how the samples from year to year treat our invitation to guess the answers to this question... last year's results had very low not sures... this year they're back up to more normal levels. As we compare results from year to year, it is best to look at the difference between the true and false percents.

The following notable results look at the change in this difference over the four surveys...

“The RCAC is mostly funded by Alyeska Pipeline”

2003 – True +16.1%
2004 – True +0.1%
2005 – False +16.7%
2006 – False +11.9%

The very surprising turnaround between 2003 and 2005 has been confirmed with another solid false result this year.

“The RCAC works to reduce air pollution caused by oil tankers and the Valdez Marine Terminal”

2003 – True +12.8%
2004 – True +6.4%
2005 – True +2.2%
2006 – True +0.4%

Steady closing of this result. Despite the RCAC's challenge to the oil industry over air pollution in Valdez that occurred around the time of the fielding of this survey.

“The RCAC conducts Marine Fire Response training for Local communities and fire departments”

2003 – False +1.2%
2004 – False +6.1%
2005 – False +8.8%
2006 – False +10.4%

A steady increase in the perception of this statement as false.

“The RCAC is mostly funded by environmental groups”

2003 – False +38.9%
2004 – False +22.9%
2005 – False +22.8%
2006 – False +17.6%

It seems that with greater awareness of the RCAC comes the decreased perception that this statement is false.

“The RCAC is responsible for clean up operations should another large oil spill occur in Prince William Sound or the Gulf of Alaska”

2003 – False +5.4%
2004 – False +14.2%
2005 – False +7.4%
2006 – False +14.9%

This result is bouncing around a bit... but we see the correct identification of this statement as false again this year, with the largest gap of 14.9%. Also, the percentage of the survey sample that correctly identifies this statement as false has increased steadily to a high of 51.2%.

“The RCAC conducts on-going clean up operations from the Exxon Valdez oil spill”

2003 – False +18.5%
2004 – True +1.3%
2005 – False +5.4%
2006 – False +11.6%

We saw a bizarre turnaround between 2003 and 2004 where the majority of respondents suddenly decided this statement was true. But this has dropped back off, and we're almost back to where we started in 2003.

“The RCAC monitors oil industry operations on the North Slope of Alaska”

2003 – False +9.0%
2004 – False +2.6%
2005 – False +19.5%
2006 – False +11.6%

Some strange fluctuations on this result, with much more awareness of the false nature of the statement the last couple of years.

“The RCAC monitors environmental impacts along the 800 miles of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline”

2003 – True +17.1%
2004 – True +14.2%
2005 – True +1.8%
2006 – False +1.1%

Very interesting result here... with a consistent trend towards more respondents being aware the statement is false.

Like in past years, we calculate our “knowledge score” by giving one point for every correct answer, and subtracting a point for every wrong answer. The knowledge score has tracked as follows:

Knowledge score out of 12:

	2003	2004	2005	2006
<0	16.6%	23.4%	24.9%	21.5%
Zero	31.6%	24.1%	21.8%	23.7%
1-4	26.4%	31.1%	31.4%	33.9%
5-12	25.4%	21.3%	21.9%	20.8%
MEAN SCORE	2.22	1.65	1.73	1.74

Still not making any sign of a recovery upwards in terms of the mean knowledge score.

By region, we see the following knowledge score means...

	2003	2004	2005	2006
Kodiak	1.53	1.64	1.48	1.76
Kenai Peninsula	2.22	1.44	1.65	1.53
Prince William Sound	3.20	3.40	2.90	3.47

These results are indicative of how the Kenai Peninsula results dominate the sample post-weights... we actually see four-year highs in the knowledge score in PWS and in Kodiak, but because Kenai has dipped a little, the overall movement in the mean is negligible.

Importance of hydrocarbon project

Q: The Prince William Sound RCAC currently conducts an ongoing scientific data project to maintain a detailed portrait of the hydrocarbons in the Prince William Sound environment. Then, if there's another spill, scientists will be able to compare pre-spill and post-spill environments to assess how much damage has actually occurred. How important would you say a project like this is, absolutely vital, very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not at all important?

	2003	2004	2005	2006
Absolutely vital	27.1%	24.8%	20.8%	26.5%
Very important	40.7%	41.4%	45.9%	39.6%
Somewhat important	24.3%	25.2%	26.8%	26.9%
Not very important	3.5%	4.6%	4.2%	2.3%
Not at all important	2.6%	3.2%	2.1%	2.7%
Don't know	1.9%	0.9%	0.1%	2.1%

While we see fluctuations in the individual responses, the overall result hasn't changed much at all in the four years. The combined "absolutely vital" and "very important" result has stayed consistently in the 66-68% range, and the "not very important" and "not at all important" has stayed in the 6-8% range.

Believability of information sources:

Q: If another major oil spill happened in your area, how believable would you say each of the following sources of information on the spill would be? Rate each of these information sources on a scale of 1 to 5, where a 5 means they are a very believable source of information, and a 1 means they are not at all believable.

The following table shows comparisons for the mean scores for each source:

	2003	2004	2005	2006
US Coast Guard	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.56
RCAC	3.94	4.03	3.94	4.06
DEC	3.66	3.82	3.68	3.71
Oil Industry	2.91	2.90	2.91	2.88
News media	NA	2.80	2.79	2.87

RCAC's believability score is at a four-year high. The oil industry's believability is at a four-year low, though that is probably overstating things.

Use of dispersants

Respondents were asked what they think of dispersant use...

Q: Which of the following statements comes nearest to your opinion on the use of chemical dispersants in connection with oil spills:

A: Chemical dispersants should be used to clean up oil spills

B: Chemical dispersants should not be used to clean up oil spills

C: More research is needed to decide if chemical dispersants should be used to clean up oil spills

D: I don't know enough about chemical dispersants to have a proper opinion

	2003	2004	2005	2006
Should be used	9.2%	12.1%	14.1%	13.9%
Should not be used	11.4%	8.3%	6.6%	10.1%
More research needed	38.8%	40.6%	35.5%	41.9%
I don't know enough	38.6%	37.3%	43.4%	34.0%
Don't know	2.0%	1.7%	0.3%	0.1%

Though probably not significant, the gap between the “should be used” and “should not be used” results, which had been widening up until 2005 in favor of “should be used”, has closed somewhat.

Concern about...

Q: I am now going to read you a list of potential pollution risks to Alaska's air, water and wildlife. Taking into account how likely you think each one is to happen, tell me how concerned you are about each of them on a scale of 1 to 5, where a 5 is very concerned and a 1 is not at all concerned.

	2003	2004	2005	2006
Crude oil spills like the Exxon Valdez oil spill	4.00	4.18	4.12	3.97
Spills of non-crude oil, such as engine fuel from large vessels	3.86	3.87	3.97	3.86
Minor but continuous pollution from routine shipping and industrial operations	3.77	3.80	3.76	3.68
Invasion of Alaska waters by harmful plants or animals arriving in the ballast water of large ships	3.73	3.87	3.88	3.91
Release of air pollution at the tanker terminal in Valdez	3.31	3.29	3.38	3.44

Not much change here... interesting that the concern about a Valdez spill has taken a dip this year, down below the 4.0 mark. Also interesting that invasion by harmful species continues to rise, now into second place and within 0.06 of the Exxon Valdez result.

Effectiveness of news sources

Q: If the Prince William Sound RCAC needed to communicate news information to you, what would be the most effective means? Rate each of these methods of getting news to you on a 1 to 5 scale, where a 5 is a very effective means, and a 1 is not at all effective.

	2003	2004	2005	2006
A story in your local paper	3.76	3.70	3.76	3.68
A story on your local radio news	3.69	3.54	3.66	3.78
A story on television news	3.59	3.67	3.48	3.43
Local public meetings	3.04	3.04	3.15	2.93
Radio ads	NA	3.00	3.15	3.11
Word of mouth from friends and neighbors	2.86	2.80	3.03	2.95
Information on the Internet	2.77	2.80	2.73	3.14
E-mail	NA	NA	2.67	2.90

Most notable in these results is the rise of the effectiveness of the internet and e-mail as information sources. Even though we are a decade or more removed from the point at which saturation was effectively reached in terms of computer ownership and internet connectivity, we are still only now seeing the rise of the Internet as an information source, and as a tool for other behaviors like shopping activity.

Observer reads in the last 12 months:

Q: How many times in the last year have you read the Prince William Sound RCAC's quarterly newsletter, The Observer?

	2003	2004	2005	2006
None	77.0%	80.8%	75.0%	77.9%
One or more	23.0%	19.2%	25.0%	22.1%
MEAN	0.45	0.35	0.49	0.38
READER MEAN	1.96	1.82	1.96	1.74

We see a drop back down from 2005's high result of 25.0% readership... that show it probably to be just sample fluctuation. Pretty consistent results over the years.

Employment

Q: Are you or is anyone in your household an employee of _____?

	2003	2004	2005	2006
Local state or federal government	21.0%	22.8%	27.7%	21.6%
The fishing industry	30.0%	22.1%	21.0%	20.0%
The oil and gas industry	19.2%	18.3%	15.3%	17.0%
The tourism industry	14.6%	15.4%	11.1%	10.6%

New questions for 2006

The following questions were added to this survey for the first time...

Q: How do you think the Prince William Sound RCAC's effectiveness today compares to past years? Do you think the RCAC is more effective today than it has been in the past, less effective today, or do you think it's about the same?

	Percent
More effective	25.5%
Less effective	6.5%
About the same	47.1%
Not sure	20.9%

Q: How many times in the last 30 days do you recall hearing ads on the radio for the Prince William Sound RCAC?

	Percent
None	66.8%
One or more	32.7%
Not sure	0.5%

Effectiveness of radio campaign

Looking at differences between those that heard radio and those that didn't...

RCAC's RATING	Heard radio	Didn't hear radio
Positive	67.2%	33.4%
Negative	6.0%	7.9%
Neutral	8.5%	13.9%
Who?	18.3%	44.8%
MEAN	3.07	2.63

The perennial argument of... is someone positive to RCAC because they heard ads or did they hear ads because they're positive to RCAC?... rears its head, but there is no question there's a very strong relationship between hearing ads and positive perceptions of RCAC.

A full set of crosstabs by this variable has been included in this report, on Pages 36-49.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- ✚ Results for RCAC continue to improve steadily year-to-year, with notable evidence of the benefits of the ongoing RCAC radio campaign.

- ✚ Several improvements have been noted...

Positive rating up from 40.0% to 44.2%
Who? rating down from 41.7% to 36.1%
RCAC grade A's and B's up from 47.5% to 52.5%
RCAC grade "Not sure" down from 30.9% to 17.5%

- ✚ However, this increase in awareness has also brought some less desirable results...

Negative rating up from 4.5% to a high of 7.2%
RCAC grade D's and F's up from 4.8% to a high of 9.0%
Establishment of RCAC a "bad thing", up from 2.7% to 6.6%

- ✚ It's a mixed year for the oil industry...

The industry's negative rating is down after a steep slide, from 30.1% to 23.5%
However, the oil industry grade for preventing spills GPA continues to fall, down from 2.73 to 2.42 since 2003
Oil industry prepared to clean up spills GPA also continues to fall, down from 2.67 to 2.34

- ✚ The communications strategies the RCAC have implemented in recent years continue to have a positive effect in increasing and improving the profile of the RCAC among the public. Work to continue and maintain, or even expand these efforts. Just a third of respondents had heard RCAC radio ads, and these respondents show a greatly elevated opinion and awareness of RCAC. Don't be nervous about increased negatives... fight them, and fight the false impressions that people have.

Thank you for the opportunity to conduct this research. Any questions concerning the contents of this report should be directed to Ivan Moore at 907-278-4600 or by e-mail at ivan@ivanmoorerresearch.com

**FREQUENCIES AND
CROSSTABULATION TABLES**

**PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY
IVAN MOORE RESEARCH
TEL: 278-4600**

Hi, my name is _____ and I'm calling for Ivan Moore Research, an Alaska public opinion research firm. We're conducting a brief public opinion survey with residents in the Prince William Sound, Kenai Peninsula and Kodiak areas today that should take a few minutes. Your responses are important to us, they will be treated in complete confidence, and we'd really appreciate your participation if that's OK with you.

S1. Is this a residential telephone?
IF "YES" THEN CONTINUE...
IF "NO" THEN TERMINATE...

S2. Are you eighteen or older?
IF "YES" THEN CONTINUE...
IF "NO" THEN ASK FOR SOMEONE WHO IS...

1. I'm going to read you a short list of organizations. Please tell me if your feelings towards them are very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, or very negative, or if you have never heard of them.

US Coast Guard:

U.S. COAST GUARD'S RATING:			
	Count	%	
Very positive	412	82.2%	
Somewhat positive	76	15.2%	
Neutral	9	1.8%	
Somewhat negative	3	.7%	
Very negative	0	.0%	Mean = 3.790

Spill Escort Response Vessel System or SERVS:

SPILL ESCORT RESPONSE VESSEL SERVICE'S RATING:			
	Count	%	
Very positive	191	38.2%	
Somewhat positive	137	27.3%	
Neutral	30	6.1%	
Somewhat negative	13	2.6%	
Very negative	8	1.6%	
Who?	122	24.3%	Mean = 3.295

Prince William Sound Regional Citizens' Advisory Council or RCAC:

PWSRCAC'S RATING:			
	Count	%	
Very positive	90	18.0%	
Somewhat positive	131	26.2%	
Neutral	62	12.5%	
Somewhat negative	20	4.0%	
Very negative	16	3.2%	
Who?	181	36.1%	Mean = 2.810

Alyeska Pipeline Company:

ALYESKA PIPELINE COMPANY'S RATING:		
	Count	%
Very positive	92	18.3%
Somewhat positive	221	44.1%
Neutral	68	13.5%
Somewhat negative	71	14.1%
Very negative	15	3.0%
Who?	35	6.9%

Mean = 2.650

The Oil Industry:

OIL INDUSTRY'S RATING:		
	Count	%
Very positive	131	26.1%
Somewhat positive	192	38.2%
Neutral	61	12.2%
Somewhat negative	83	16.6%
Very negative	35	6.9%

Mean = 2.601

State of Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation:

STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION'S RATING:		
	Count	%
Very positive	112	22.4%
Somewhat positive	169	33.6%
Neutral	67	13.4%
Somewhat negative	103	20.6%
Very negative	21	4.2%
Who?	29	5.8%

Mean = 2.524

1B. (IF POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE TO RCAC, THEN ASK...) Why are you positive/negative to RCAC?

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:	
	Positive	Negative
	Col %	Col %
REASON FOR RCAC OPINION:		
Bad organization		7.0%
Because it has to do with gas	.2%	
They are trying to help/helpful	1.7%	
Need protection from oil	.2%	
What I hear on the radio, commitment to doing things right	.9%	
Agency helps prevent oil spills	1.2%	
I know people in the community, advocate vs. politics	.2%	
They provide a good service	1.3%	
Stakeholder representation	1.0%	
I read something that sat well		1.5%
I just feel positive towards them	.2%	
Good effort/trying their best	2.9%	
Good for environment/environmental protection	4.1%	
Too political		6.2%
Seems like a waste		7.0%
Familiar with them and they do a good job	1.1%	
I have personal contact and can vouch for their credibility	.2%	
Diverse	1.1%	
Add a false lack of trust		.8%
Because you get advice	.9%	
Oil industry needs oversight/watchdogs	11.1%	
I work with them	.1%	
I've heard good things	1.8%	
Represents the RCAC	.1%	
Have a worthy cause	.1%	
Not accountable enough to the population		.8%
They are made up of a diverse group of interests	.1%	
John is devoted to keeping oil spills to a minimum	.1%	
I like where they came from and their mission	1.1%	
I know someone/people who work for them	2.5%	
Strong research program	.1%	
Keep water transportation safe in PWS	.2%	
Citizen involvement/give citizens a voice/citizen input	5.4%	
Good idea	1.0%	
Similar mission	1.0%	
Environmental wackos/too environmental		7.8%
On the ball	.9%	
Hard workers	1.2%	
Not necessary		7.8%
Whiners		.6%
Can't stand ads, they're arrogant		1.4%

(continued)

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:	
	Positive	Negative
	Col %	Col %
They inform the public and do a good job	.5%	
What I've read in the paper	.2%	
Good public relation	.1%	
Good oil spill clean up	2.1%	
Their goal is good, but sometimes needs better direction	.1%	
I don't know that much about them	.2%	.6%
Somebody has got to be there, and I'm glad they are	1.1%	
Don't see enough enforcement		7.0%
Need improvement	.2%	
Good publicity	.2%	
Doing a lot of good	2.2%	
Way they publicize things can be harmful to the community		.8%
They are against initiating a new pipeline, new jobs and oil		5.7%
Good for the economy and Alaska	1.1%	
Helpful	1.2%	
Too many things that they don't belong in		.8%
Good work/good job	11.0%	
Nothing behind them		1.4%
Response	1.1%	
We need their protection	.2%	
Fulfill their role in the area	.1%	
I like what they do	.4%	
They way they do things is negative		.8%
Making a job of sticking their nose where it doesn't belong		.7%
Make public aware of impact on environment	1.0%	
Upgrade services and operation	.2%	
Good thing, but not effective		1.5%
Great council of citizens	1.2%	
I don't know, just not negative	.5%	
Not much of an opinion	.2%	
They are aware of what's going on	.1%	
Meetings with them are okay	.1%	
Prevent work opportunity for Alaskans		.7%
Not impressed		.6%
Good to have feedback groups	1.1%	
They are a very well in-tune organization:	.2%	
Necessary group	1.4%	
Knows people that do good things to prevent oil spills	.2%	
Good company/great organization	.3%	
Doing good under difficult situation	.1%	
They keep everything in check/checks and balances	.6%	
I read their literature	.2%	
Political joke		.8%
Reaching out	.2%	
They are trying to do better things	.2%	

(continued)

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:	
	Positive	Negative
	Col %	Col %
Pursued spill compensation and oversaw distribution of funds	.2%	
Hear a lot from the RCAC and they are getting the word out	.2%	
Spending frivolously		.8%
Just because they exist	1.1%	
I used to work for the RCAC	.1%	
All we have	.1%	
Know what they are doing, would just like to know more	.1%	
Do well for community	1.7%	
Don't like what they do, they don't take care of the animals		6.4%
Inform oil companies about keeping the water safe	1.0%	
John Devens' friend	.1%	
Good to have/good thing	.5%	
Important for the people	.1%	
There is some use for them	.1%	
I think they could push a little harder	.2%	1.4%
Not too sure if they do their job right		.8%
I work for the oil industry	.1%	
Valdez needs people regulating the terminal	.1%	
They've done a lot of work over the last 20 years	.2%	
Live in region	.1%	
Good presentations	.2%	
Doing work to protect public	.1%	
Strong impact	1.0%	
Without them the oil industry would run muck	.1%	
What they've done about double-hulled tankers is great	.1%	
Staff heavy for what they do		.6%
Don't have a lot of information	.9%	
I have helped with the Exxon Valdez spill	1.4%	
Involved, keeps industry safe	.1%	
Important job	1.3%	
Not doing anything for the community		1.4%
Waste of money		7.0%
Good commercials	.9%	
Not sure	12.4%	19.4%
Total	86.0%	14.0%

1C. (IF POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE TO COAST GUARD, THEN ASK...) Why are you positive/negative to the U.S. Coast Guard?

	U.S. COAST GUARD'S RATING:	
	Positive	Negative
	Col %	Col %
REASON FOR COAST GUARD OPINION:		
Save lives/life savers	6.1%	
Help a lot of people/help us	1.7%	
We have a lot of friends that work for the USCG	3.1%	
Live in a Coast Guard town	.2%	
Do a good job/great job	24.7%	
Good cause/good service	1.2%	
I like search and rescue/ good search and rescue	6.9%	
Helped to save a plane that was down	.1%	
Active duty/I'm in the USCG	1.9%	
Depend on them	.8%	
USCG is not aligned with the oil industries	.5%	
Worked for them and my son was a pilot. They give their all	.1%	
Excellent job with training, education, and benefits	.1%	
Family members involved, know what there are out there doing	.1%	
Give a lot of help to border patrol and rescue operations	.5%	
Protect us/protect coastline/protect country	6.9%	
Safety factor	1.5%	
Terrific organization, worked with them	.5%	
Very good, I work for the USCG	.1%	
Good timing	.1%	
Diversity	.6%	
They are everywhere	.5%	
Pros	.6%	
For what they do	.4%	
A big part of Alaska	.1%	
Respond to any emergency/always respond to disasters	.2%	
We are a Coast Guard family	.6%	
Saved a friend of mine/they saved me	1.8%	
Active in community/good service in the community	1.4%	
Vital services	1.6%	
I work with them/I worked with them	.2%	
I admire what they do	.1%	
Collectively they are a nuisance	.1%	
Saved my husband, they were quick and very effective	.0%	
Couple of instances, their behavior and language was vulgar	.0%	
Service good most of the time. Always room for improvement	.5%	
They are faced with danger and do their job very well	.9%	

(continued)

	U.S. COAST GUARD'S RATING:	
	Positive	Negative
	Col %	Col %
Not in Alaska, rest of the U.S. has had some bad responses		70.6%
Reputation	.9%	
Help people in the Seward area	.5%	
I had family members in the military, so I support the USCG	.4%	
Need them/they're necessary	1.2%	
Good experiences with the Coast Guard	.5%	
I'm a fisherman/husband's a fisherman	1.7%	
Biggest base is in Kodiak/base in Kodiak	.4%	
Too much dysfunction		14.6%
I support government agencies	.4%	
I believe in their mission	.9%	
I live in Kodiak	.2%	
Awesome phenomenal services	.1%	
Very positive presence	.6%	
Hard workers	.5%	
They do search and rescue, help economy in Kodiak	.1%	
Save our fishermen/help fishermen/keep fishermen safe	.7%	
Just a good outfit	.5%	
Security	.1%	
Family/ Family ties	1.0%	
Very important for Alaska	.5%	
My husband retired from the USCG/my father served	.7%	
I have seen what they do	.6%	
Not kind toward residential community		6.8%
Need improvement	.1%	
Work hard with all organizations in state	.1%	
Work for everybody	.1%	
They sacrifice	.1%	
Quick response to emergencies	.5%	
Risk their lives	.9%	
Selfless service	.6%	
Deserving of praise	.0%	
Do a lot for the industry	.1%	
Ex-USCG/ex-military	4.0%	
Works well with fishing and public safety	.1%	
My husband works for the USCG/my dad works for the USCG	1.3%	
Have a great presence here and are trying to do a decent job	.1%	
They're military/part of the armed forces	.9%	
Bring economic value to the community, are very supportive	.0%	
Their primary function is security of the terminal	.1%	
Defense/defend our country	.7%	
Have done a lot for Prince William Sound	.0%	

(continued)

	U.S. COAST GUARD'S RATING:	
	Positive	Negative
	Col %	Col %
I live in Valdez they do a good job	.0%	
Aware of safety on water ways in Alaska	.5%	
Appreciate what they do	.1%	
We are very lucky to have them here	.1%	
Public safety	.1%	
Above and beyond life saving	.1%	
Take care of us	.0%	
Keep everyone safe	.5%	
Needed for health and welfare of Alaskans, and environment	.1%	
Good organization	.0%	
Good watchdog	.1%	
They are here in Kodiak and are helpful	.1%	
Department of Transportation water	.1%	
Good services help economy, fisherman and boats	.1%	
Out there to help keep our water safe	.1%	
Economically good for community and a good social force	.1%	
Works with school near base. Have known many families	.1%	
Largest Coast Guard base and they do an excellent job	.1%	
Too heavy handed		7.9%
Tripled in Valdez and they are doing a lot here	.1%	
Only somewhat because I feel they hassle sportsfishermen	.0%	
Mainly in the summertime they keep things in order	.1%	
Help the villages in emergencies/help rural villages	.2%	
Fell flat on their ass prior to Exxon Valdez	.0%	
Home base right here, I know all about their activity	.0%	
Good for communication, police the waters	.1%	
Functional	.5%	
Good employer	.1%	
Retired crab fisherman	.1%	
We live in the community where they are	.1%	
First response we need them	.0%	
Someone has to do it and I don't want to	.0%	
Help the economy in Kodiak	.1%	
Helps schools	.1%	
Likes Navy	.4%	
I drive oil spill response boats for them	.1%	
They might save me someday	.1%	
Do a lot of good things	.1%	
Real heroes	.1%	

(continued)

	U.S. COAST GUARD'S RATING:	
	Positive	Negative
	Col %	Col %
Form of safety serve public drug control on water	.5%	
Taught it	.1%	
They are in the media more	.4%	
They are the only way out	.1%	
Multiple valuable duties that are performed diligently	.5%	
Our first line of defense	.0%	
Respectful, you can count on them	.1%	
Boat owner	.5%	
Dedication	.5%	
Enforce what's going on out there	.5%	
A lot of new programs tighter enforcement of regulations	.5%	
Patriotism, good service, positive influence	.0%	
Nice to have	.1%	
I work on ships	.5%	
Positive overview	.5%	
Not sure	1.2%	
Total	99.3%	.7%

2. How concerned are you about oil being transported through waterways near where you live, very concerned, somewhat concerned or not at all concerned?

	CONCERN ABOUT OIL TRANSPORTATION:	
	Count	%
Very concerned	147	29.4%
Somewhat concerned	190	37.9%
Not at all concerned	161	32.1%
Not sure	3	.6%

3. Do you think an incident on the scale of the Exxon Valdez spill is more likely to happen today, less likely to happen, or just as likely to happen as it was in 1989?

	LIKELINESS OF LARGE OIL SPILL TODAY:	
	Count	%
More likely	17	3.4%
Less likely	303	60.4%
No difference	178	35.5%
Not sure	3	.6%

4. On a scale of A, B, C, D or F, what grade would you give the oil industry for working to prevent a similar incident from happening again?

		OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT:		
		Count	%	
A		65	13.0%	
B		179	35.9%	
C		161	32.4%	
D		62	12.5%	
F		20	4.0%	
Not sure		11	2.2%	Mean = 2.424

5. On a scale of A, B, C, D or F, what grade would you give the oil industry for being prepared to clean up a similar spill if it should happen again?

		OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR BEING PREPARED TO CLEAN UP A SIMILAR SPILL:		
		Count	%	
A		80	16.0%	
B		182	36.5%	
C		135	27.1%	
D		51	10.2%	
F		41	8.2%	
Not sure		10	2.1%	Mean = 2.428

6. After the Exxon Valdez spill, a group called the Prince William Sound Regional Citizens' Advisory Council or RCAC was established, to monitor oil industry operations and to participate in decisions about the transportation of North Slope crude in Alaska waters. Do you think the establishment of the Prince William Sound RCAC was a good thing or a bad thing for Alaska?

		ESTABLISHMENT OF RCAC A GOOD THING OR BAD THING?		
		Count	%	
Good thing		415	84.4%	
Bad thing		32	6.6%	
Not sure		44	9.0%	

7. On a scale of A, B, C, D or F, what grade would you give the Prince William Sound RCAC for working to prevent a similar incident to the Exxon Valdez spill from happening again?

		RCAC GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT:		
		Count	%	
A		96	20.1%	
B		155	32.3%	
C		101	21.1%	
D		37	7.8%	
F		6	1.2%	
Not sure		84	17.5%	Mean = 2.756

8. How do you think the Prince William Sound RCAC's effectiveness today compares to past years? Do you think the RCAC is more effective today than it has been in the past, less effective today, or do you think it's about the same?

RCAC MORE EFFECTIVE TODAY?		
	Count	%
More effective	121	25.5%
Less effective	31	6.5%
About the same	223	47.1%
Not sure	99	20.9%

9. I am now going to read you a list of things that could be done to help prevent oil spills from happening in waterways near where you live. Tell me on a scale of 1 to 5, how important you think each thing is, where a 5 is very important, and a 1 is not at all important.

Using radar technology to help oil tankers avoid ice bergs:

IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING TECHNOLOGY TO HELP OIL TANKERS AVOID ICEBERGS:		
	Count	%
Not at all important	8	1.5%
2	3	.6%
3	13	2.6%
4	55	10.9%
Very important	415	82.8%
Not sure	8	1.6%

Mean = 4.757

Using only double-hulled oil tankers:

IMPORTANCE OF USING DOUBLE-HULLED TANKERS IN PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND:		
	Count	%
Not at all important	3	.6%
2	8	1.7%
3	30	6.0%
4	41	8.2%
Very important	407	81.2%
Not sure	11	2.3%

Mean = 4.716

Keeping citizens involved in decisions about oil transportation and oil spill prevention:

IMPORTANCE OF CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN OIL TRANSPORTATION/SPILL PREVENTION:	
Count	%
Not at all important	18 3.5%
2	24 4.8%
3	83 16.5%
4	99 19.7%
Very important	278 55.5%
Not sure	0 .0%
Mean = 4.189	

Require that every loaded oil tanker crossing Prince William Sound be escorted by two rescue tugs:

IMPORTANCE OF REQUIRING ESCORT BY TWO RESCUE TUGS:	
Count	%
Not at all important	25 4.9%
2	30 6.1%
3	83 16.6%
4	89 17.7%
Very important	264 52.7%
Not sure	10 2.0%
Mean = 4.094	

10. Now I'm going to read you a list of things that could be done to help deal with oil spills if they should happen in the future. Tell me again on a scale of 1 to 5, how important you think each thing is.

Preparing detailed protection plans in advance for local sensitive areas like clamming beaches and salmon streams:

IMPORTANCE OF PREPARING DETAILED PROTECTION PLANS:	
Count	%
Not at all important	9 1.8%
2	1 .1%
3	38 7.5%
4	75 14.9%
Very important	377 75.1%
Not sure	3 .5%
Mean = 4.622	

Developing new technology for removing oil:

		IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING NEW TECHNOLOGY FOR REMOVING OIL:	
		Count	%
Not at all important		5	1.0%
2		6	1.1%
3		47	9.3%
4		64	12.7%
Very important		375	74.7%
Not sure		6	1.2%
			Mean = 4.610

Stockpiling oil spill containment and oil removal supplies in communities that might be hit by spilled oil:

		IMPORTANCE OF STOCKPILING OIL SPILL CONTAINMENT SUPPLIES:	
		Count	%
Not at all important		7	1.4%
2		8	1.5%
3		48	9.6%
4		80	16.0%
Very important		353	70.5%
Not sure		5	1.0%
			Mean = 4.542

Training local residents to clean up oil spills:

		IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING LOCAL RESIDENTS TO CLEAN UP OIL SPILLS:	
		Count	%
Not at all important		11	2.2%
2		23	4.7%
3		76	15.2%
4		79	15.7%
Very important		312	62.3%
			Mean = 4.311

Hiring, training and equipping commercial fishing vessels to clean up oil spills:

		IMPORTANCE OF USING FISHING VESSELS TO CLEAN UP OIL:	
		Count	%
Not at all important		22	4.5%
2		24	4.8%
3		77	15.3%
4		109	21.6%
Very important		262	52.3%
Not sure		7	1.5%
			Mean = 4.143

Maintain a fleet of at least 10 tugs in Prince William Sound for cleaning up oil spills:

IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING A FLEET OF 10 TUGS:		
	Count	%
Not at all important	40	8.0%
2	39	7.7%
3	96	19.1%
4	95	18.9%
Very important	203	40.5%
Not sure	29	5.7%

Mean = 3.808

11. I'd now like to measure what you know about the RCAC. I am going to read you a list of 12 statements about the RCAC. Trouble is, six of these statements are true and six are false. For each one, please tell me whether you think the statement is true or false. If you're not sure, give it your best guess. OK, here we go...**(READ STATEMENTS)**

The RCAC monitors and detects environmental impacts from day to day operations of oil tankers and the Valdez Marine Terminal:

RCAC MONITORS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AT VALDEZ TERMINAL:		
	Count	%
True	328	65.9%
False	96	19.4%
Not sure	73	14.7%

The RCAC conducts ongoing clean-up operations from the Exxon Valdez oil spill:

RCAC CONDUCTS ONGOING CLEAN-UP OPERATIONS:		
	Count	%
True	179	35.9%
False	236	47.5%
Not sure	83	16.6%

The RCAC works to reduce air pollution caused by oil tankers and the Valdez Marine Terminal:

RCAC WORKS TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION AT VALDEZ:		
	Count	%
True	206	41.5%
False	204	41.1%
Not sure	86	17.4%

The RCAC is mostly funded by Alyeska Pipeline:

RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY ALYESKA PIPELINE:		
	Count	%
True	172	34.9%
False	231	46.8%
Not sure	90	18.3%

The RCAC produces a community Disaster Guidebook with coping strategies for social problems created by a large technical disaster like an oil spill:

RCAC PRODUCES A COMMUNITY DISASTER GUIDEBOOK:		
	Count	%
True	335	68.5%
False	67	13.8%
Not sure	86	17.7%

The RCAC monitors environmental impacts along the 800 miles of the Trans-Alaska pipeline:

RCAC MONITORS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ALONG PIPELINE:		
	Count	%
True	209	42.8%
False	214	43.9%
Not sure	65	13.3%

The RCAC is mostly funded by the State of Alaska:

RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY THE STATE OF ALASKA:		
	Count	%
True	159	32.5%
False	237	48.6%
Not sure	92	18.9%

The RCAC conducts Marine Fire Response training for local communities and fire departments:

RCAC CONDUCTS MARINE FIRE RESPONSE TRAINING:		
	Count	%
True	177	36.4%
False	228	46.8%
Not sure	82	16.8%

The RCAC monitors oil industry operations on the North Slope of Alaska:

RCAC MONITORS OIL INDUSTRY OPERATIONS ON NORTH SLOPE:		
	Count	%
True	176	36.5%
False	232	48.1%
Not sure	75	15.4%

The RCAC conducts research into harmful aquatic species transported in the ballast water of tankers:

RCAC CONDUCTS BALLAST WATER RESEARCH:		
	Count	%
True	270	55.8%
False	141	29.1%
Not sure	73	15.1%

The RCAC is responsible for clean up operations should another large oil spill occur in Prince William Sound or the Gulf of Alaska:

RCAC RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEAN UP SHOULD ANOTHER SPILL OCCUR:		
	Count	%
True	175	36.3%
False	246	51.2%
Not sure	60	12.5%

The RCAC is mostly funded by environmental groups:

RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS:		
	Count	%
True	156	32.5%
False	241	50.1%
Not sure	84	17.4%

THE FOLLOWING KNOWLEDGE SCORE WAS CALCULATED FROM THE RESULTS OF THE TWELVE TRUE-FALSE STATEMENTS, GIVING ONE POINT FOR EACH CORRECT ANSWER AND SUBTRACTING ONE POINT FOR EACH INCORRECT ANSWER:

KNOWLEDGE SCORE:		
	Count	%
<0	108	21.5%
Zero	119	23.7%
1-4	170	33.9%
5-12	104	20.8%

Mean = 1.74

12. The Prince William Sound RCAC currently conducts an ongoing scientific data project to maintain a detailed portrait of the hydrocarbons in the Prince William Sound environment. Then, if there's another spill, scientists will be able to compare pre-spill and post-spill environments to assess how much damage has actually occurred. How important would you say a project like this is, absolutely vital, very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not at all important?

IMPORTANCE OF SCIENTIFIC DATA PROJECT:		
	Count	%
Absolutely vital	132	26.5%
Very important	198	39.6%
Somewhat important	134	26.9%
Not very important	11	2.3%
Not at all important	13	2.7%
Not sure	11	2.1%

13. If another major oil spill happened in your area, how believable would you say each of the following sources of information on the spill would be? Rate each of these information sources on a scale of 1 to 5, where a 5 means they are a very believable source of information, and a 1 means they are not at all believable.

The US Coast Guard:

BELIEVABILITY OF U.S. COAST GUARD:		
	Count	%
Not at all believable	4	.8%
2	5	1.1%
3	32	6.3%
4	123	24.6%
Very believable	336	67.1%
Not sure	1	.1%

Mean = 4.564

The Prince William Sound Regional Citizens' Advisory Council:

BELIEVABILITY OF PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND RCAC:		
	Count	%
Not at all believable	12	2.4%
2	17	3.3%
3	81	16.2%
4	188	37.6%
Very believable	181	36.1%
Not sure	22	4.5%

Mean = 4.063

The State of Alaska Dept of Environmental Conservation:

BELIEVABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION:		
	Count	%
Not at all believable	29	5.9%
2	35	6.9%
3	116	23.1%
4	189	37.7%
Very believable	130	26.0%
Not sure	3	.5%
		Mean = 3.714

The Oil Industry:

BELIEVABILITY OF THE OIL INDUSTRY:		
	Count	%
Not at all believable	99	19.8%
2	83	16.6%
3	151	30.2%
4	107	21.3%
Very believable	58	11.5%
Not sure	3	.6%
		Mean = 2.879

The news media:

BELIEVABILITY OF NEWS MEDIA:		
	Count	%
Not at all believable	83	16.6%
2	98	19.5%
3	179	35.7%
4	84	16.8%
Very believable	58	11.5%
		Mean = 2.871

14. Which of the following statements comes nearest to your opinion on the use of chemical dispersants in connection with oil spills:

OPINION ON CHEMICAL DISPERSANTS:		
	Count	%
Dispersants should be used	70	13.9%
Dispersants should not be used	51	10.1%
More research needed	210	41.9%
Don't know enough	171	34.0%
Not sure	1	.1%

15. I am now going to read you a list of potential pollution risks to Alaska's air, water and wildlife. Taking into account how likely you think each one is to happen, tell me how concerned you are about each of them on a scale of 1 to 5, where a 5 is very concerned and a 1 is not at all concerned.

Crude oil spills like the Exxon Valdez oil spill:

CONCERN ABOUT CRUDE OIL SPILLS LIKE THE EXXON VALDEZ:		
	Count	%
Not at all concerned	31	6.2%
2	43	8.6%
3	82	16.4%
4	92	18.5%
Very concerned	246	49.4%
Not sure	5	.9%
		Mean = 3.971

Invasion of Alaska waters by harmful plants or animals arriving in the ballast water of large ships:

CONCERN ABOUT INVASION ON ALASKA WATERS BY HARMFUL PLANTS OR ANIMALS:		
	Count	%
Not at all concerned	22	4.5%
2	42	8.4%
3	93	18.6%
4	130	26.1%
Very concerned	201	40.3%
Not sure	10	2.1%
		Mean = 3.914

Spills of non-crude oil, such as engine fuel from large vessels:

CONCERN ABOUT SPILLS OF NON-CRUDE OIL:		
	Count	%
Not at all concerned	23	4.6%
2	39	7.8%
3	104	20.8%
4	144	28.9%
Very concerned	182	36.6%
Not sure	6	1.2%
		Mean = 3.862

Minor but continuous oil pollution from routine shipping and industrial operations:

CONCERN ABOUT MINOR BUT CONTINUOUS OIL POLLUTION:		
	Count	%
Not at all concerned	24	4.8%
2	53	10.6%
3	138	27.8%
4	117	23.5%
Very concerned	160	32.2%
Not sure	5	1.0%
		Mean = 3.685

Release of air pollution at the tanker terminal in Valdez:

CONCERN ABOUT RELEASE OF AIR POLLUTION AT THE VALDEZ TANKER TERMINAL:		
	Count	%
Not at all concerned	54	10.8%
2	62	12.5%
3	103	20.6%
4	136	27.3%
Very concerned	123	24.7%
Not sure	21	4.1%
		Mean = 3.444

16. If the Prince William Sound RCAC needed to communicate news information to you, what would be the most effective means? Rate each of these methods of getting news to you on a 1 to 5 scale, where a 5 is a very effective means, and a 1 is not at all effective.

A story on your local radio news:

EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON YOUR LOCAL RADIO NEWS:		
	Count	%
Not at all effective	62	12.5%
2	33	6.5%
3	74	14.8%
4	114	23.0%
Very effective	215	43.2%
		Mean = 3.778

A story in your local paper:

EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY IN YOUR LOCAL PAPER:		
	Count	%
Not at all effective	50	10.1%
2	37	7.4%
3	102	20.4%
4	144	29.0%
Very effective	164	33.1%
		Mean = 3.676

A story on the television news:

EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON THE TELEVISION NEWS:		
	Count	%
Not at all effective	91	18.2%
2	52	10.4%
3	89	17.9%
4	82	16.5%
Very effective	182	36.6%
Not sure	2	.4%
		Mean = 3.431

Information on the Internet:

EFFECTIVENESS OF INFORMATION ON THE INTERNET:		
	Count	%
Not at all effective	97	19.5%
2	64	12.9%
3	108	21.8%
4	124	24.8%
Very effective	102	20.6%
Not sure	2	.5%

Mean = 3.142

Radio ads:

EFFECTIVENESS OF RADIO ADS:		
	Count	%
Not at all effective	96	19.4%
2	69	13.9%
3	126	25.4%
4	92	18.6%
Very effective	112	22.6%
Not sure	1	.2%

Mean = 3.111

Word of mouth from friends and neighbors:

EFFECTIVENESS OF WORD OF MOUTH FROM FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS:		
	Count	%
Not at all effective	89	18.0%
2	99	20.0%
3	137	27.6%
4	87	17.6%
Very effective	84	16.8%

Mean = 2.953

Local public meetings:

EFFECTIVENESS OF LOCAL PUBLIC MEETINGS:		
	Count	%
Not at all effective	117	23.6%
2	76	15.2%
3	120	24.1%
4	91	18.2%
Very effective	94	18.8%
Not sure	1	.1%

Mean = 2.935

E-mail:

		EFFECTIVENESS OF E-MAIL:		
		Count	%	
Not at all effective		128	25.8%	Mean = 2.905
2		73	14.8%	
3		111	22.3%	
4		80	16.2%	
Very effective		101	20.4%	
Not sure		3	.5%	

17. How many times in the last year have you read the Prince William Sound RCAC's quarterly newsletter, The Observer?

		NUMBER OF TIMES IN THE LAST YEAR YOU READ THE OBSERVER:		
		Count	%	
None		386	77.9%	Mean = .385
Once or more		109	22.1%	

18. In the last 6 months, how many times have you visited the Prince William Sound RCAC's web site, www.pwsrcac.org?

		NUMBER OF WEBSITE VISITS LAST SIX MONTHS:		
		Count	%	
None		462	93.4%	Mean = .162
Once or more		32	6.5%	
Not sure		0	.1%	

19. How many times in the last 30 days do you recall hearing ads on the radio for the Prince William Sound RCAC?

		NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:		
		Count	%	
None		330	66.8%	Mean = 1.328
Once or more		161	32.7%	
Not sure		3	.5%	

20. Where would you put yourself on a scale from 1 to 7, where a 1 is a strong environmentalist opposed to excessive development, and a 7 is an advocate of development opposed to excessive environmental controls?

	ENVIRONMENTAL- DEVELOPMENTAL SCALE:	
	Count	%
Opposed to excessive development	40	8.1%
2	41	8.2%
3	107	21.6%
4	110	22.4%
5	116	23.4%
6	31	6.4%
Advocate of development	49	9.9%
		Mean = 4.032

21. Which radio station do you listen to most often? Second most often?

	FIRST CHOICE RADIO STATION:	
	Count	%
NONE	53	10.7%
KCDV	4	.8%
KLAM	9	1.9%
KBBI	39	7.8%
KGTL	10	2.0%
KMJG	5	1.0%
KWVV	15	3.1%
KDLL	8	1.6%
KWHQ	7	1.4%
KMXT	29	5.8%
KRXX	17	3.5%
KVOK	18	3.6%
KPFN	5	.9%
KKIS	21	4.3%
KPEN	11	2.3%
KSLD	9	1.9%
KSRM	90	18.1%
KCHU	9	1.8%
KVAK	34	6.8%
KAFC	5	1.0%
KASH	2	.4%
KATB	3	.5%
KBFX	1	.1%
KBRJ	1	.1%
KDBZ	2	.5%
KEAG/KOOL	2	.4%
KENI	12	2.5%
KFQD	12	2.4%
KGOT	4	.8%
KLEF	2	.4%
KLOV	2	.3%
KMXS	1	.1%
KNBA	2	.4%
KQEZ	2	.4%
KRPM	2	.5%
KRUA	3	.6%
KSKA/KAKM	16	3.2%
KWHL	2	.4%
KYMG	3	.5%
XM RADIO	3	.6%
KXBA	3	.5%
KWMD	4	.9%
KNLS	2	.4%
KXKM	0	.0%
Don't know	14	2.7%

Second most often?

	SECOND CHOICE RADIO STATION:	
	Count	%
NONE	260	52.2%
KCDV	2	.5%
KLAM	4	.8%
KBBI	3	.5%
KGTL	3	.6%
KWVV	7	1.5%
KDLL	12	2.3%
KWHQ	5	.9%
KMXT	13	2.6%
KRXX	10	2.1%
KVOK	11	2.3%
KPFN	8	1.6%
KSWD	1	.1%
KKIS	6	1.3%
KPEN	14	2.8%
KSLD	2	.4%
KSRM	12	2.3%
KCHU	5	1.1%
KVAK	17	3.3%
KAFC	6	1.3%
KASH	5	1.0%
KATB	3	.5%
KBRJ	5	.9%
KBYR	8	1.5%
KDBZ	2	.5%
KENI	12	2.4%
KFQD	12	2.5%
KGOT	1	.2%
KHAR	2	.4%
KLOV	1	.2%
KMBQ	2	.4%
KRPM	3	.5%
KRUA	0	.1%
KSKA/KAKM	3	.6%
KUDO	5	.9%
KWHL	3	.5%
KXBA	3	.5%
KWMD	3	.5%
MOODY	2	.4%
Don't know	25	5.0%

Third most often?

	THIRD CHOICE RADIO STATION:	
	Count	%
Don't listen	394	79.2%
KBBI	3	.5%
KMJG	4	.7%
KWVV	5	1.0%
KWHQ	2	.5%
KMXT	6	1.2%
KRXX	1	.2%
KVOK	3	.5%
KKIS	5	.9%
KPEN	3	.5%
KSRM	5	1.0%
KCHU	1	.2%
KVAK	2	.4%
KAFC	0	.1%
KASH	3	.5%
KATB	0	.0%
KBRJ	3	.5%
KBYR	3	.5%
KEAG/ KOOL	4	.9%
KENI	5	1.0%
KFQD	5	1.0%
KGOT	2	.4%
KJHA	1	.1%
KMBQ	0	.1%
KRPM	2	.5%
KSKA/KAKM	1	.1%
KWHL	0	.0%
CSN	3	.5%
Not sure	35	7.0%

22. Are you or is anyone in your household an employee of _____?

Local, state or federal government:

	ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN GOVERNMENT?	
	Count	%
Yes	108	21.6%
No	390	78.4%

The oil and gas industry:

	ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN OIL AND GAS?	
	Count	%
Yes	85	17.0%
No	413	83.0%

The tourism industry:

	ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN TOURISM?	
	Count	%
Yes	53	10.6%
No	445	89.4%

The fishing industry:

	ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN FISHING?	
	Count	%
Yes	99	20.0%
No	398	80.0%

23. How many years and months have you lived in _____ (NAME COMMUNITY)?

	LENGTH OF RESIDENCY IN COMMUNITY:	
	Count	%
Less than 8 years	141	28.5%
8-20 years	149	30.0%
20 years or more	206	41.5%

Mean = 19.0 years

24. In what year were you born?

	AGE OF RESPONDENT:	
	Count	%
18-36	114	23.3%
37-47	108	22.1%
48+	266	54.6%

Mean = 48.6 years

25. Are you married or single?

	MARITAL STATUS:	
	Count	%
Married	341	67.9%
Single	161	32.1%

26. GENDER...

	GENDER OF RESPONDENT:	
	Count	%
Male	251	50.0%
Female	251	50.0%

That completes the survey. I have a telephone number for Ivan Moore Research that you can call with any comments, compliments or complaints. Would you like the number? (907-278-4600)

Thank you very much for your help. Goodbye.

THE FOLLOWING VARIABLES WERE CALCULATED FROM MEASURED DATA:

	AREAS OF ALASKA:	
	Count	%
Kodiak	88	17.6%
Kenai	368	73.4%
PWS	45	9.0%

	MARITAL STATUS BY GENDER:	
	Count	%
Married males	170	34.0%
Married females	170	34.0%
Single males	80	16.0%
Single females	81	16.1%

	AREAS OF ALASKA:			Total
	Kodiak	Kenai	PWS	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
OIL INDUSTRY'S RATING:				
Positive	49.8%	68.8%	55.8%	64.3%
Negative	36.0%	19.2%	33.6%	23.5%
Neutral	14.2%	12.0%	10.6%	12.2%
ALYESKA PIPELINE COMPANY'S RATING:				
Positive	54.5%	63.1%	73.0%	62.4%
Negative	19.8%	16.4%	18.6%	17.2%
Neutral	16.7%	13.5%	7.3%	13.5%
Who?	9.0%	7.1%	1.1%	6.9%
PWSRCAC'S RATING:				
Positive	52.2%	39.8%	63.9%	44.2%
Negative	4.1%	7.6%	10.0%	7.2%
Neutral	10.2%	12.9%	13.6%	12.5%
Who?	33.5%	39.7%	12.4%	36.1%
U.S. COAST GUARD'S RATING:				
Positive	98.2%	97.4%	96.8%	97.5%
Negative	.6%	.7%	1.2%	.7%
Neutral	1.2%	1.9%	2.0%	1.8%
SPILL ESCORT RESPONSE VESSEL SERVICE'S RATING:				
Positive	51.5%	66.7%	83.2%	65.5%
Negative	4.7%	3.7%	6.0%	4.1%
Neutral	10.3%	5.1%	6.0%	6.1%
Who?	33.5%	24.5%	4.9%	24.3%
STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION'S RATING:				
Positive	64.9%	52.1%	70.4%	56.0%
Negative	14.3%	28.7%	13.7%	24.8%
Neutral	13.1%	13.8%	10.6%	13.4%
Who?	7.7%	5.4%	5.3%	5.8%
CONCERN ABOUT OIL TRANSPORTATION:				
Very concerned	31.8%	28.2%	34.6%	29.4%
Somewhat concerned	42.6%	36.2%	42.6%	37.9%
Not at all concerned	25.0%	35.0%	22.1%	32.1%
Not sure	.6%	.6%	.7%	.6%
LIKELINESS OF LARGE OIL SPILL TODAY:				
More likely	3.6%	3.3%	4.0%	3.4%
Less likely	54.2%	60.8%	69.3%	60.4%
No difference	38.5%	35.9%	26.6%	35.5%
Not sure	3.7%			.6%
Total	17.6%	73.4%	9.0%	100.0%

	AREAS OF ALASKA:			Total
	Kodiak	Kenai	PWS	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT:				
A/B	42.8%	49.9%	52.7%	48.9%
C	40.2%	31.0%	28.2%	32.4%
D/F	14.5%	16.6%	19.1%	16.5%
Not sure	2.5%	2.4%		2.2%
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR BEING PREPARED TO CLEAN UP A SIMILAR SPILL:				
A/B	49.9%	53.4%	50.2%	52.5%
C	29.0%	26.6%	27.5%	27.1%
D/F	15.1%	18.7%	22.4%	18.4%
Not sure	6.0%	1.4%		2.1%
ESTABLISHMENT OF RCAC A GOOD THING OR BAD THING?				
Good thing	86.8%	83.1%	90.8%	84.4%
Bad thing	2.4%	7.9%	4.2%	6.6%
Not sure	10.8%	9.1%	5.1%	9.0%
RCAC GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT:				
A/B	51.9%	51.0%	64.9%	52.5%
C	26.4%	19.9%	20.1%	21.1%
D/F	3.6%	10.6%	6.7%	9.0%
Not sure	18.0%	18.5%	8.4%	17.5%
RCAC MORE EFFECTIVE TODAY?				
More effective	32.4%	24.0%	23.9%	25.5%
Less effective	6.0%	6.1%	11.0%	6.5%
About the same	43.2%	48.1%	47.2%	47.1%
Not sure	18.4%	21.9%	18.0%	20.9%
IMPORTANCE OF CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN OIL TRANSPORTATION/SPILL PREVENTION:				
Important (4-5)	76.9%	74.6%	76.2%	75.2%
3	14.3%	16.8%	18.7%	16.5%
Not important (1-2)	8.8%	8.6%	4.6%	8.3%
Not sure			.5%	.0%
IMPORTANCE OF USING DOUBLE-HULLED TANKERS IN PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND:				
Important (4-5)	87.4%	89.7%	91.1%	89.4%
3	9.6%	5.3%	4.7%	6.0%
Not important (1-2)	1.2%	2.6%	2.4%	2.3%
Not sure	1.8%	2.4%	1.8%	2.3%
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING TECHNOLOGY TO HELP OIL TANKERS AVOID ICEBERGS:				
Important (4-5)	92.8%	93.6%	95.7%	93.7%
3	3.0%	2.5%	2.6%	2.6%
Not important (1-2)	3.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.1%
Not sure	1.2%	1.9%	.7%	1.6%
IMPORTANCE OF REQUIRING ESCORT BY TWO RESCUE TUGS:				
Important (4-5)	65.9%	70.1%	81.9%	70.4%
3	19.7%	16.3%	13.2%	16.6%
Not important (1-2)	11.4%	11.8%	3.1%	11.0%
Not sure	3.0%	1.8%	1.7%	2.0%
Total	17.6%	73.4%	9.0%	100.0%

	AREAS OF ALASKA:			Total
	Kodiak	Kenai	PWS	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
IMPORTANCE OF STOCKPILING OIL SPILL CONTAINMENT SUPPLIES:				
Important (4-5)	91.7%	84.2%	95.4%	86.5%
3	7.1%	11.0%	3.6%	9.6%
Not important (1-2)	1.2%	3.6%	.5%	2.9%
Not sure		1.2%	.5%	1.0%
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING NEW TECHNOLOGY FOR REMOVING OIL:				
Important (4-5)	90.6%	85.8%	94.9%	87.4%
3	7.6%	10.5%	3.4%	9.3%
Not important (1-2)	1.2%	2.4%	1.1%	2.1%
Not sure	.6%	1.4%	.5%	1.2%
IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING LOCAL RESIDENTS TO CLEAN UP OIL SPILLS:				
Important (4-5)	80.5%	75.5%	92.5%	77.9%
3	12.4%	17.0%	5.8%	15.2%
Not important (1-2)	7.1%	7.5%	1.7%	6.9%
IMPORTANCE OF USING FISHING VESSELS TO CLEAN UP OIL:				
Important (4-5)	83.4%	70.4%	84.1%	74.0%
3	10.1%	17.2%	10.6%	15.3%
Not important (1-2)	6.5%	10.4%	4.5%	9.2%
Not sure		1.9%	.7%	1.5%
IMPORTANCE OF PREPARING DETAILED PROTECTION PLANS:				
Important (4-5)	89.3%	89.6%	94.6%	90.0%
3	9.5%	7.4%	4.8%	7.5%
Not important (1-2)	.6%	2.4%	.5%	1.9%
Not sure	.6%	.6%		.5%
IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING A FLEET OF 10 TUGS:				
Important (4-5)	65.4%	56.4%	72.1%	59.4%
3	19.2%	20.0%	12.2%	19.1%
Not important (1-2)	11.3%	17.5%	10.1%	15.7%
Not sure	4.2%	6.1%	5.6%	5.7%
RCAC MONITORS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AT VALDEZ TERMINAL:				
True	67.3%	66.0%	63.1%	65.9%
False	23.0%	17.0%	31.7%	19.4%
Not sure	9.7%	17.0%	5.2%	14.7%
RCAC CONDUCTS ONGOING CLEAN-UP OPERATIONS:				
True	39.5%	36.6%	23.2%	35.9%
False	52.6%	43.4%	71.1%	47.5%
Not sure	7.9%	20.0%	5.7%	16.6%
RCAC WORKS TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION AT VALDEZ:				
True	41.1%	39.0%	62.6%	41.5%
False	50.4%	40.2%	30.5%	41.1%
Not sure	8.5%	20.8%	7.0%	17.4%
Total	17.6%	73.4%	9.1%	100.0%

	AREAS OF ALASKA:			Total
	Kodiak	Kenai	PWS	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY ALYESKA PIPELINE:				
True	43.3%	30.3%	56.0%	34.9%
False	46.3%	48.3%	35.3%	46.8%
Not sure	10.4%	21.3%	8.7%	18.3%
RCAC PRODUCES A COMMUNITY DISASTER GUIDEBOOK:				
True	76.8%	67.8%	58.3%	68.5%
False	17.7%	10.3%	33.7%	13.8%
Not sure	5.5%	21.9%	8.1%	17.7%
RCAC MONITORS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ALONG PIPELINE:				
True	48.3%	41.5%	42.4%	42.8%
False	45.6%	42.4%	51.7%	43.9%
Not sure	6.1%	16.0%	5.9%	13.3%
RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY THE STATE OF ALASKA:				
True	38.4%	31.5%	29.0%	32.5%
False	52.5%	45.7%	64.6%	48.6%
Not sure	9.1%	22.8%	6.4%	18.9%
RCAC CONDUCTS MARINE FIRE RESPONSE TRAINING:				
True	44.5%	34.8%	33.3%	36.4%
False	47.6%	45.1%	59.1%	46.8%
Not sure	7.9%	20.2%	7.7%	16.8%
RCAC MONITORS OIL INDUSTRY OPERATIONS ON NORTH SLOPE:				
True	47.8%	33.9%	35.1%	36.5%
False	43.6%	47.9%	57.9%	48.1%
Not sure	8.6%	18.2%	7.0%	15.4%
RCAC CONDUCTS BALLAST WATER RESEARCH:				
True	56.5%	54.5%	64.9%	55.8%
False	37.4%	27.3%	27.7%	29.1%
Not sure	6.1%	18.2%	7.5%	15.1%
RCAC RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEAN UP SHOULD ANOTHER SPILL OCCUR:				
True	40.8%	37.8%	16.2%	36.3%
False	53.7%	47.0%	78.7%	51.2%
Not sure	5.5%	15.2%	5.2%	12.5%
RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS:				
True	27.1%	35.3%	20.8%	32.5%
False	65.6%	43.5%	71.7%	50.1%
Not sure	7.3%	21.1%	7.5%	17.4%
KNOWLEDGE SCORE:				
<0	22.3%	22.3%	13.5%	21.5%
Zero	20.3%	25.9%	12.9%	23.7%
1-4	39.5%	32.6%	33.7%	33.9%
5-12	17.9%	19.1%	39.8%	20.8%
Total	17.6%	73.4%	9.0%	100.0%

	AREAS OF ALASKA:			Total
	Kodiak	Kenai	PWS	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
IMPORTANCE OF SCIENTIFIC DATA PROJECT:				
Absolutely vital	29.4%	26.2%	23.5%	26.5%
Very important	42.5%	37.9%	47.5%	39.6%
Somewhat important	25.1%	27.9%	22.3%	26.9%
Not very important	1.2%	2.4%	3.2%	2.3%
Not at all important		3.3%	2.9%	2.7%
Not sure	1.8%	2.4%	.6%	2.1%
BELIEVABILITY OF THE OIL INDUSTRY:				
Believable (4-5)	27.8%	34.2%	30.6%	32.7%
3	35.5%	29.6%	25.0%	30.2%
Not believable (1-2)	35.5%	35.7%	44.3%	36.4%
Not sure	1.2%	.6%		.6%
BELIEVABILITY OF PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND RCAC:				
Believable (4-5)	80.3%	71.5%	78.0%	73.6%
3	15.5%	16.9%	11.2%	16.2%
Not believable (1-2)	3.0%	6.2%	6.9%	5.7%
Not sure	1.2%	5.3%	3.9%	4.5%
BELIEVABILITY OF U.S. COAST GUARD:				
Believable (4-5)	92.2%	92.2%	86.5%	91.7%
3	6.0%	5.9%	10.6%	6.3%
Not believable (1-2)	1.2%	1.9%	2.9%	1.8%
Not sure	.6%			.1%
BELIEVABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION:				
Believable (4-5)	73.5%	60.8%	68.2%	63.7%
3	19.9%	23.8%	23.7%	23.1%
Not believable (1-2)	6.6%	14.9%	7.5%	12.8%
Not sure		.6%	.6%	.5%
BELIEVABILITY OF NEWS MEDIA:				
Believable (4-5)	36.3%	27.1%	22.3%	28.3%
3	31.8%	36.1%	39.2%	35.7%
Not believable (1-2)	31.9%	36.8%	38.5%	36.1%
OPINION ON CHEMICAL DISPERSANTS:				
Dispersants should be used	11.3%	14.5%	13.9%	13.9%
Dispersants should not be used	7.8%	10.1%	14.7%	10.1%
More research needed	37.9%	42.6%	43.5%	41.9%
Don't know enough	43.0%	32.8%	26.7%	34.0%
Not sure			1.3%	.1%
Total	17.5%	73.5%	9.0%	100.0%

	AREAS OF ALASKA:			Total
	Kodiak	Kenai	PWS	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
CONCERN ABOUT CRUDE OIL SPILLS LIKE THE EXXON VALDEZ:				
Concerned (4-5)	71.3%	66.6%	71.7%	67.9%
3	15.9%	17.3%	10.2%	16.4%
Not concerned (1-2)	12.8%	14.9%	18.1%	14.8%
Not sure		1.3%		.9%
CONCERN ABOUT SPILLS OF NON-CRUDE OIL:				
Concerned (4-5)	70.1%	65.4%	58.6%	65.6%
3	24.4%	19.5%	24.7%	20.8%
Not concerned (1-2)	4.2%	13.9%	16.1%	12.4%
Not sure	1.3%	1.3%	.6%	1.2%
CONCERN ABOUT MINOR BUT CONTINUOUS OIL POLLUTION:				
Concerned (4-5)	59.1%	55.3%	53.0%	55.8%
3	27.6%	27.7%	28.6%	27.8%
Not concerned (1-2)	12.7%	15.7%	18.4%	15.4%
Not sure	.6%	1.3%		1.0%
CONCERN ABOUT INVASION ON ALASKA WATERS BY HARMFUL PLANTS OR ANIMALS:				
Concerned (4-5)	65.7%	66.9%	64.0%	66.5%
3	17.2%	19.1%	17.2%	18.6%
Not concerned (1-2)	15.2%	11.5%	18.8%	12.8%
Not sure	1.8%	2.4%		2.1%
CONCERN ABOUT RELEASE OF AIR POLLUTION AT THE VALDEZ TANKER TERMINAL:				
Concerned (4-5)	46.8%	51.6%	65.0%	52.0%
3	27.0%	18.8%	23.2%	20.6%
Not concerned (1-2)	23.1%	24.7%	11.8%	23.3%
Not sure	3.1%	4.9%		4.1%
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON THE TELEVISION NEWS:				
Effective (4-5)	52.7%	53.7%	48.8%	53.1%
3	16.6%	17.7%	22.3%	17.9%
Not effective (1-2)	30.6%	28.0%	28.8%	28.6%
Not sure		.6%		.4%
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY IN YOUR LOCAL PAPER:				
Effective (4-5)	68.9%	60.3%	63.1%	62.1%
3	18.3%	21.5%	15.5%	20.4%
Not effective (1-2)	12.8%	18.1%	21.4%	17.5%
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON YOUR LOCAL RADIO NEWS:				
Effective (4-5)	64.6%	66.1%	69.7%	66.2%
3	19.5%	13.3%	17.7%	14.8%
Not effective (1-2)	15.9%	20.6%	12.6%	19.0%
Total	17.3%	73.6%	9.1%	100.0%

	AREAS OF ALASKA:			Total
	Kodiak	Kenai	PWS	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
EFFECTIVENESS OF LOCAL PUBLIC MEETINGS:				
Effective (4-5)	40.0%	34.3%	54.2%	37.1%
3	31.3%	22.8%	20.7%	24.1%
Not effective (1-2)	28.1%	43.0%	25.1%	38.8%
Not sure	.6%			.1%
EFFECTIVENESS OF WORD OF MOUTH FROM FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS:				
Effective (4-5)	45.6%	30.8%	42.6%	34.4%
3	23.3%	28.8%	26.2%	27.6%
Not effective (1-2)	31.0%	40.4%	31.2%	37.9%
EFFECTIVENESS OF INFORMATION ON THE INTERNET:				
Effective (4-5)	45.4%	45.4%	45.7%	45.4%
3	21.6%	21.9%	21.3%	21.8%
Not effective (1-2)	33.0%	32.1%	33.1%	32.4%
Not sure		.6%		.5%
EFFECTIVENESS OF RADIO ADS:				
Effective (4-5)	47.5%	37.5%	58.8%	41.1%
3	24.4%	26.2%	21.0%	25.4%
Not effective (1-2)	27.5%	36.3%	19.6%	33.3%
Not sure	.6%		.6%	.2%
EFFECTIVENESS OF E-MAIL:				
Effective (4-5)	36.9%	34.9%	49.8%	36.6%
3	24.7%	22.7%	14.2%	22.3%
Not effective (1-2)	38.4%	41.8%	35.3%	40.6%
Not sure		.6%	.6%	.5%
NUMBER OF TIMES IN THE LAST YEAR YOU READ THE OBSERVER:				
None	74.1%	82.4%	49.2%	77.9%
Once or more	25.9%	17.6%	50.8%	22.1%
NUMBER OF WEBSITE VISITS LAST SIX MONTHS:				
None	94.4%	94.2%	85.0%	93.4%
Once or more	5.6%	5.8%	14.4%	6.5%
Not sure			.6%	.1%
NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:				
None	57.4%	70.6%	53.4%	66.8%
Once or more	39.5%	29.4%	46.6%	32.7%
Not sure	3.1%			.5%
ENVIRONMENTAL-DEVELOPMENTAL SCALE:				
Environmentalist (1-3)	41.3%	37.5%	35.6%	38.0%
4	27.3%	20.4%	28.5%	22.4%
Developmentalist (5-7)	31.4%	42.1%	35.8%	39.7%
Total	17.3%	73.6%	9.1%	100.0%

	AREAS OF ALASKA:			Total
	Kodiak	Kenai	PWS	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
FIRST CHOICE RADIO STATION:				
Don't listen	14.2%	10.3%	7.2%	10.7%
KCDV			9.1%	.8%
KLAM			20.9%	1.9%
KBBI		10.5%		7.8%
KGTL	1.2%	2.5%		2.0%
KMJG		1.4%		1.0%
KWVV	1.2%	3.9%		3.1%
KDLL		2.1%	1.2%	1.6%
KWHQ		1.9%		1.4%
KMXT	30.1%	.6%	1.1%	5.8%
KRXX	17.6%	.6%		3.5%
KVOK	20.8%			3.6%
KPFN		1.3%		.9%
KKIS		5.8%		4.3%
KPEN	3.1%	2.3%		2.3%
KSLD		2.6%		1.9%
KSRM		24.6%		18.1%
KCHU	.6%		18.9%	1.8%
KVAK	2.5%	4.3%	35.4%	6.8%
KAFC		1.3%	.5%	1.0%
KASH		.6%		.4%
KATB		.7%		.5%
KBFX	.6%			.1%
KBRJ	.6%			.1%
KDBZ		.6%		.5%
KEAG/ KOOL		.6%		.4%
KENI		3.3%		2.5%
KFQD		3.2%	1.2%	2.4%
KGOT		1.1%		.8%
KLEF		.6%		.4%
KLOV	1.8%			.3%
KMXS	.6%			.1%
KNBA		.6%		.4%
KQEZ		.6%		.4%
KRPM		.6%		.5%
KRUA		.7%	.7%	.6%
KSKA/KAKM	1.2%	3.8%	2.8%	3.2%
KWHL		.6%		.4%
KYMGM		.7%		.5%
XM RADIO	.6%	.6%		.6%
KXBA		.6%	.5%	.5%
KWMD		1.2%		.9%
KNLS		.6%		.4%
KXKM			.5%	.0%
Not sure	3.1%	3.0%		2.7%
Total	17.3%	73.6%	9.1%	100.0%

	AREAS OF ALASKA:			Total
	Kodiak	Kenai	PWS	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
SECOND CHOICE RADIO STATION:				
Don't listen	48.2%	53.1%	53.4%	52.2%
KCDV			5.1%	.5%
KLAM	.6%		7.4%	.8%
KBBI		.7%		.5%
KGTL	.6%	.6%	.7%	.6%
KWVV	3.0%	1.3%		1.5%
KDLL		3.1%	.6%	2.3%
KWHQ		1.3%		.9%
KMXT	12.7%	.6%		2.6%
KRXX	6.2%	1.3%		2.1%
KVOK	10.4%	.6%		2.3%
KPFN	1.2%	1.9%		1.6%
KSWD	.6%			.1%
KKIS		1.7%		1.3%
KPEN	3.0%	3.1%		2.8%
KSLD		.6%		.4%
KSRM		3.1%		2.3%
KCHU			11.9%	1.1%
KVAK		2.5%	16.2%	3.3%
KAFC		1.7%	.5%	1.3%
KASH	.6%	1.2%		1.0%
KATB		.7%		.5%
KBRJ	.6%	1.1%		.9%
KBYR		2.0%	.6%	1.5%
KDBZ		.6%		.5%
KENI		3.2%		2.4%
KFQD		3.3%	.5%	2.5%
KGOT	.6%		.5%	.2%
KHAR		.6%		.4%
KLOV	1.2%			.2%
KMBQ		.6%		.4%
KRPM		.7%		.5%
KRUA			.7%	.1%
KSKA/KAKM	.6%	.6%	.6%	.6%
KUDO		1.3%		.9%
KWHL		.7%		.5%
KXBA		.7%		.5%
KWMD		.7%		.5%
MOODY		.6%		.4%
Not sure	9.8%	4.3%	1.2%	5.0%
Total	17.4%	73.6%	9.0%	100.0%

	AREAS OF ALASKA:			Total
	Kodiak	Kenai	PWS	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
THIRD CHOICE RADIO STATION:				
Don't listen	77.4%	79.0%	83.9%	79.2%
KBBI		.7%		.5%
KMJG	1.2%	.7%		.7%
KWVV	.6%	1.2%		1.0%
KWHQ		.6%		.5%
KMXT	1.8%	1.2%		1.2%
KRXX	1.2%			.2%
KVOK	3.1%			.5%
KKIS		1.3%		.9%
KPEN	.6%	.6%		.5%
KSRM		1.4%		1.0%
KCHU			2.1%	.2%
KVAK			4.6%	.4%
KAFC			.6%	.1%
KASH		.7%		.5%
KATB			.5%	.0%
KBRJ		.7%		.5%
KBYR		.7%		.5%
KEAG/ KOOL		1.2%		.9%
KENI		1.3%	.5%	1.0%
KFQD		1.3%		1.0%
KGOT		.6%		.4%
KJHA	.6%			.1%
KMBQ			.6%	.1%
KRPM		.6%		.5%
KSKA/KAKM			1.1%	.1%
KWHL			.5%	.0%
CSN		.7%		.5%
Not sure	13.4%	5.6%	5.4%	7.0%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN GOVERNMENT?				
Yes	41.9%	15.1%	35.4%	21.6%
No	58.1%	84.9%	64.6%	78.4%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN OIL AND GAS?				
Yes	4.2%	19.1%	24.1%	17.0%
No	95.8%	80.9%	75.9%	83.0%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN TOURISM?				
Yes	9.2%	10.6%	13.8%	10.6%
No	90.8%	89.4%	86.2%	89.4%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN FISHING?				
Yes	28.1%	16.1%	36.3%	20.0%
No	71.9%	83.9%	63.7%	80.0%
Total	17.4%	73.6%	9.0%	100.0%

	AREAS OF ALASKA:			Total
	Kodiak	Kenai	PWS	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
LENGTH OF RESIDENCY IN COMMUNITY:				
Less than 8 years	31.9%	27.9%	26.8%	28.5%
8-20 years	27.1%	30.8%	29.2%	30.0%
20 years or more	40.9%	41.3%	44.0%	41.5%
AGE OF RESPONDENT:				
18-36	31.3%	21.4%	23.4%	23.3%
37-47	23.3%	22.1%	20.1%	22.1%
48+	45.4%	56.5%	56.5%	54.6%
MARITAL STATUS:				
Married	71.3%	67.3%	66.9%	67.9%
Single	28.7%	32.7%	33.1%	32.1%
GENDER OF RESPONDENT:				
Male	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Female	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
MARITAL STATUS BY GENDER:				
Married males	35.6%	33.7%	33.4%	34.0%
Married females	35.6%	33.6%	33.4%	34.0%
Single males	14.4%	16.3%	16.6%	16.0%
Single females	14.4%	16.4%	16.5%	16.1%
Total	17.6%	73.4%	9.0%	100.0%

	AREAS OF ALASKA:			Group Total
	Kodiak	Kenai	PWS	Mean
	Mean	Mean	Mean	
OIL INDUSTRY'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	2.18	2.75	2.23	2.60
ALYESKA PIPELINE COMPANY'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	2.47	2.68	2.78	2.65
PWSRCAC'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	2.97	2.75	2.93	2.81
U.S. COAST GUARD'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	3.85	3.78	3.75	3.79
SPILL ESCORT RESPONSE VESSEL SERVICE'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	3.11	3.32	3.37	3.29
STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	2.80	2.43	2.80	2.52
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT - MEAN (0-4):	2.35	2.44	2.44	2.42
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR BEING PREPARED TO CLEAN UP A SIMILAR SPILL - MEAN (0-4):	2.43	2.43	2.40	2.43
RCAC GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT - MEAN (0-4):	2.79	2.72	2.91	2.76
IMPORTANCE OF CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN OIL TRANSPORTATION/SPILL PREVENTION - MEAN (1-5):	4.19	4.19	4.23	4.19
IMPORTANCE OF USING DOUBLE-HULLED TANKERS IN PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND - MEAN (1-5):	4.65	4.73	4.69	4.72
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING TECHNOLOGY TO HELP OIL TANKERS AVOID ICE BERGS - MEAN (1-5):	4.67	4.77	4.78	4.76
IMPORTANCE OF REQUIRING ESCORT BY TWO RESCUE TUGS - MEAN (1-5):	4.01	4.07	4.45	4.09
IMPORTANCE OF STOCKPILING OIL SPILL CONTAINMENT SUPPLIES - MEAN (1-5):	4.73	4.47	4.73	4.54
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING NEW TECHNOLOGY FOR REMOVING OIL - MEAN (1-5):	4.71	4.56	4.77	4.61
IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING LOCAL RESIDENTS TO CLEAN UP OIL SPILLS - MEAN (1-5):	4.37	4.25	4.66	4.31
IMPORTANCE OF USING FISHING VESSELS TO CLEAN UP OIL - MEAN (1-5):	4.30	4.06	4.47	4.14
IMPORTANCE OF PREPARING DETAILED PROTECTION PLANS - MEAN (1-5):	4.65	4.60	4.77	4.62
IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING A FLEET OF 10 TUGS - MEAN (1-5):	3.98	3.73	4.10	3.81

	AREAS OF ALASKA:			Group Total
	Kodiak	Kenai	PWS	Mean
	Mean	Mean	Mean	
BELIEVABILITY OF THE OIL INDUSTRY - MEAN (1-5):	2.83	2.91	2.74	2.88
BELIEVABILITY OF PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND RCAC - MEAN (1-5):	4.26	4.01	4.13	4.06
BELIEVABILITY OF U.S. COAST GUARD - MEAN (1-5):	4.63	4.57	4.41	4.56
BELIEVABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION - MEAN (1-5):	4.04	3.61	3.89	3.71
BELIEVABILITY OF NEWS MEDIA - MEAN (1-5):	3.10	2.83	2.75	2.87
CONCERN ABOUT CRUDE OIL SPILLS LIKE THE EXXON VALDEZ - MEAN (1-5):	4.05	3.94	4.04	3.97
CONCERN ABOUT SPILLS OF NON-CRUDE OIL - MEAN (1-5):	4.01	3.84	3.72	3.86
CONCERN ABOUT MINOR BUT CONTINUOUS OIL POLLUTION - MEAN (1-5):	3.70	3.69	3.61	3.68
CONCERN ABOUT INVASION ON ALASKA WATERS BY HARMFUL PLANTS OR ANIMALS - MEAN (1-5):	3.82	3.95	3.79	3.91
CONCERN ABOUT RELEASE OF AIR POLLUTION AT THE VALDEZ TANKER TERMINAL - MEAN (1-5):	3.39	3.40	3.89	3.44
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON THE TELEVISION NEWS - MEAN (1-5):	3.37	3.46	3.33	3.43
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY IN YOUR LOCAL PAPER - MEAN (1-5):	3.93	3.62	3.68	3.68
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON YOUR LOCAL RADIO NEWS - MEAN (1-5):	3.86	3.73	4.01	3.78
EFFECTIVENESS OF LOCAL PUBLIC MEETINGS - MEAN (1-5):	3.17	2.81	3.48	2.94
EFFECTIVENESS OF WORD OF MOUTH FROM FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS - MEAN (1-5):	3.29	2.84	3.20	2.95
EFFECTIVENESS OF INFORMATION ON THE INTERNET - MEAN (1-5):	3.11	3.14	3.22	3.14
EFFECTIVENESS OF RADIO ADS - MEAN (1-5):	3.34	2.98	3.71	3.11
EFFECTIVENESS OF E-MAIL - MEAN (1-5):	2.97	2.84	3.32	2.91

	AREAS OF ALASKA:			Group Total
	Kodiak	Kenai	PWS	Mean
	Mean	Mean	Mean	
NUMBER OF TIMES IN THE LAST YEAR YOU READ THE OBSERVER - MEAN:	.44	.29	1.06	.38
NUMBER OF WEBSITE VISITS LAST SIX MONTHS - MEAN:	.12	.15	.35	.16
ENVIRONMENTAL-DEVELOPMENTAL SCALE - MEAN:	3.79	4.09	4.02	4.03
LENGTH OF RESIDENCY IN COMMUNITY - MEAN:	20.08	18.51	21.14	19.02
MEAN AGE OF RESPONDENT:	45.32	49.55	47.53	48.62
TRUE-FALSE KNOWLEDGE SCORE:	1.76	1.53	3.47	1.74

	NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:			Total
	None	Once or more	Not sure	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
AREAS OF ALASKA:				
Kodiak	14.9%	20.9%	100.0%	17.3%
Kenai	77.9%	66.1%		73.6%
PWS	7.2%	12.9%		9.1%
OIL INDUSTRY'S RATING:				
Positive	66.7%	59.5%	60.2%	64.3%
Negative	21.7%	26.9%	39.8%	23.5%
Neutral	11.6%	13.6%		12.2%
ALYESKA PIPELINE COMPANY'S RATING:				
Positive	63.5%	59.8%	39.8%	62.2%
Negative	17.7%	16.5%	19.7%	17.3%
Neutral	10.4%	20.1%	20.8%	13.6%
Who?	8.4%	3.6%	19.7%	6.9%
PWSRCAC'S RATING:				
Positive	33.4%	67.2%	59.5%	44.6%
Negative	7.9%	6.0%		7.2%
Neutral	13.9%	8.5%	19.7%	12.2%
Who?	44.8%	18.3%	20.8%	36.1%
U.S. COAST GUARD'S RATING:				
Positive	97.2%	98.0%	100.0%	97.4%
Negative	1.1%			.7%
Neutral	1.8%	2.0%		1.8%
SPILL ESCORT RESPONSE VESSEL SERVICE'S RATING:				
Positive	62.8%	70.5%	79.9%	65.4%
Negative	4.2%	4.0%		4.1%
Neutral	5.3%	8.0%		6.2%
Who?	27.7%	17.6%	20.1%	24.4%
STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION'S RATING:				
Positive	53.9%	60.8%	79.9%	56.3%
Negative	25.6%	21.9%		24.3%
Neutral	13.0%	14.7%	20.1%	13.6%
Who?	7.4%	2.6%		5.8%
CONCERN ABOUT OIL TRANSPORTATION:				
Very concerned	24.4%	38.3%	40.8%	29.0%
Somewhat concerned	40.1%	33.0%	59.2%	37.9%
Not at all concerned	35.5%	26.8%		32.4%
Not sure		1.9%		.6%
LIKELINESS OF LARGE OIL SPILL TODAY:				
More likely	2.3%	5.5%		3.4%
Less likely	64.5%	51.3%	79.9%	60.3%
No difference	32.4%	42.8%	20.1%	35.7%
Not sure	.8%	.3%		.7%
Total	66.8%	32.7%	.5%	100.0%

	NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:			Total
	None	Once or more	Not sure	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT:				
A/B	50.1%	47.1%	39.5%	49.1%
C	29.1%	39.4%	20.8%	32.4%
D/F	17.4%	13.6%	39.8%	16.3%
Not sure	3.4%			2.2%
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR BEING PREPARED TO CLEAN UP A SIMILAR SPILL:				
A/B	49.8%	58.3%	60.2%	52.7%
C	29.5%	22.5%		27.1%
D/F	17.6%	19.2%	20.1%	18.2%
Not sure	3.0%		19.7%	2.1%
ESTABLISHMENT OF RCAC A GOOD THING OR BAD THING?				
Good thing	79.7%	94.5%	100.0%	84.7%
Bad thing	7.5%	3.8%		6.2%
Not sure	12.8%	1.6%		9.0%
RCAC GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT:				
A/B	45.2%	65.9%	80.3%	52.4%
C	22.5%	19.6%		21.4%
D/F	9.5%	6.9%		8.6%
Not sure	22.7%	7.7%	19.7%	17.6%
RCAC MORE EFFECTIVE TODAY?				
More effective	21.7%	33.1%	60.2%	25.7%
Less effective	6.5%	6.9%		6.6%
About the same	46.2%	48.6%	39.8%	47.0%
Not sure	25.5%	11.4%		20.6%
IMPORTANCE OF CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN OIL TRANSPORTATION/SPILL PREVENTION:				
Important (4-5)	77.2%	71.1%	100.0%	75.3%
3	14.6%	20.0%		16.2%
Not important (1-2)	8.2%	9.0%		8.4%
Not sure	.1%			.0%
IMPORTANCE OF USING DOUBLE-HULLED TANKERS IN PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND:				
Important (4-5)	87.9%	91.8%	100.0%	89.2%
3	6.2%	6.1%		6.1%
Not important (1-2)	3.3%	.5%		2.3%
Not sure	2.6%	1.6%		2.3%
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING TECHNOLOGY TO HELP OIL TANKERS AVOID ICEBERGS:				
Important (4-5)	93.6%	93.7%	100.0%	93.7%
3	2.1%	3.6%		2.6%
Not important (1-2)	2.6%	1.1%		2.1%
Not sure	1.7%	1.6%		1.7%
IMPORTANCE OF REQUIRING ESCORT BY TWO RESCUE TUGS:				
Important (4-5)	67.5%	76.1%	100.0%	70.5%
3	18.8%	11.8%		16.5%
Not important (1-2)	11.4%	10.5%		11.0%
Not sure	2.3%	1.6%		2.0%
Total	66.8%	32.7%	.5%	100.0%

	NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:			Total
	None	Once or more	Not sure	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
IMPORTANCE OF STOCKPILING OIL SPILL CONTAINMENT SUPPLIES:				
Important (4-5)	85.6%	88.7%	100.0%	86.7%
3	10.3%	8.9%		9.8%
Not important (1-2)	3.3%	2.4%		2.9%
Not sure	.8%			.6%
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING NEW TECHNOLOGY FOR REMOVING OIL:				
Important (4-5)	89.1%	84.5%	100.0%	87.7%
3	7.7%	11.9%		9.1%
Not important (1-2)	2.2%	2.0%		2.1%
Not sure	1.0%	1.6%		1.2%
IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING LOCAL RESIDENTS TO CLEAN UP OIL SPILLS:				
Important (4-5)	75.9%	82.0%	100.0%	78.0%
3	17.3%	11.8%		15.4%
Not important (1-2)	6.8%	6.2%		6.6%
IMPORTANCE OF USING FISHING VESSELS TO CLEAN UP OIL:				
Important (4-5)	72.0%	79.1%	100.0%	74.5%
3	18.3%	10.2%		15.6%
Not important (1-2)	7.5%	10.5%		8.5%
Not sure	2.2%	.2%		1.5%
IMPORTANCE OF PREPARING DETAILED PROTECTION PLANS:				
Important (4-5)	91.7%	87.2%	100.0%	90.3%
3	6.1%	10.9%		7.6%
Not important (1-2)	1.4%	1.9%		1.6%
Not sure	.8%			.5%
IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING A FLEET OF 10 TUGS:				
Important (4-5)	56.9%	65.8%	80.3%	59.9%
3	20.0%	17.7%		19.2%
Not important (1-2)	16.2%	13.0%		15.1%
Not sure	6.9%	3.5%	19.7%	5.8%
RCAC MONITORS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AT VALDEZ TERMINAL:				
True	65.3%	67.9%	60.2%	66.1%
False	16.4%	24.2%	39.8%	19.1%
Not sure	18.3%	7.9%		14.8%
RCAC CONDUCTS ONGOING CLEAN-UP OPERATIONS:				
True	38.4%	29.9%	60.2%	35.7%
False	40.6%	61.7%	39.8%	47.5%
Not sure	21.0%	8.4%		16.7%
RCAC WORKS TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION AT VALDEZ:				
True	40.0%	45.5%	40.8%	41.8%
False	36.0%	49.7%	59.2%	40.6%
Not sure	24.0%	4.8%		17.5%
Total	66.4%	33.1%	.5%	100.0%

	NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:			Total
	None	Once or more	Not sure	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY ALYESKA PIPELINE:				
True	30.7%	42.7%	80.3%	35.0%
False	45.7%	49.2%	19.7%	46.7%
Not sure	23.6%	8.2%		18.3%
RCAC PRODUCES A COMMUNITY DISASTER GUIDEBOOK:				
True	67.2%	72.7%	100.0%	69.2%
False	10.4%	18.2%		13.0%
Not sure	22.5%	9.1%		17.9%
RCAC MONITORS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ALONG PIPELINE:				
True	42.7%	42.7%	40.5%	42.7%
False	40.5%	49.8%	59.5%	43.8%
Not sure	16.8%	7.4%		13.5%
RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY THE STATE OF ALASKA:				
True	28.4%	40.7%	79.9%	32.8%
False	46.6%	51.5%	20.1%	48.1%
Not sure	25.0%	7.8%		19.1%
RCAC CONDUCTS MARINE FIRE RESPONSE TRAINING:				
True	33.2%	42.7%	80.3%	36.7%
False	45.3%	49.1%	19.7%	46.4%
Not sure	21.4%	8.2%		16.9%
RCAC MONITORS OIL INDUSTRY OPERATIONS ON NORTH SLOPE:				
True	36.8%	33.7%	60.2%	35.9%
False	44.4%	57.0%	39.8%	48.7%
Not sure	18.8%	9.2%		15.5%
RCAC CONDUCTS BALLAST WATER RESEARCH:				
True	47.9%	69.6%	60.5%	55.3%
False	31.9%	24.5%	39.5%	29.5%
Not sure	20.2%	5.8%		15.2%
RCAC RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEAN UP SHOULD ANOTHER SPILL OCCUR:				
True	32.5%	42.8%	40.5%	36.1%
False	50.7%	52.5%	59.5%	51.3%
Not sure	16.8%	4.8%		12.6%
RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS:				
True	35.1%	26.6%	40.5%	32.2%
False	42.8%	64.2%	59.5%	50.2%
Not sure	22.0%	9.2%		17.5%
KNOWLEDGE SCORE:				
<0	23.9%	15.5%	39.5%	21.2%
Zero	27.9%	14.6%	20.8%	23.5%
1-4	30.8%	41.5%	19.7%	34.2%
5-12	17.4%	28.4%	20.1%	21.0%
Total	66.8%	32.7%	.5%	100.0%

	NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:			Total
	None	Once or more	Not sure	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
IMPORTANCE OF SCIENTIFIC DATA PROJECT:				
Absolutely vital	22.6%	32.7%	60.5%	26.1%
Very important	41.1%	37.3%	39.5%	39.9%
Somewhat important	27.9%	26.5%		27.3%
Not very important	2.2%	1.4%		1.9%
Not at all important	3.1%	1.9%		2.7%
Not sure	3.1%	.2%		2.1%
BELIEVABILITY OF THE OIL INDUSTRY:				
Believable (4-5)	35.1%	28.2%	20.8%	32.8%
3	31.5%	28.2%	39.5%	30.5%
Not believable (1-2)	32.4%	43.6%	39.8%	36.1%
Not sure	1.0%			.6%
BELIEVABILITY OF PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND RCAC:				
Believable (4-5)	67.5%	86.0%	100.0%	73.7%
3	19.4%	10.4%		16.4%
Not believable (1-2)	6.4%	3.5%		5.4%
Not sure	6.7%	.2%		4.5%
BELIEVABILITY OF U.S. COAST GUARD:				
Believable (4-5)	92.2%	90.6%	100.0%	91.7%
3	5.9%	7.3%		6.3%
Not believable (1-2)	1.8%	2.1%		1.9%
Not sure	.2%			.1%
BELIEVABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION:				
Believable (4-5)	63.7%	64.9%	79.9%	64.2%
3	22.2%	22.9%	20.1%	22.4%
Not believable (1-2)	14.1%	10.8%		12.9%
Not sure	.1%	1.4%		.5%
BELIEVABILITY OF NEWS MEDIA:				
Believable (4-5)	27.7%	29.1%	40.5%	28.2%
3	34.9%	37.5%	59.5%	35.9%
Not believable (1-2)	37.5%	33.4%		35.9%
OPINION ON CHEMICAL DISPERSANTS:				
Dispersants should be used	11.4%	19.5%		14.0%
Dispersants should not be used	10.2%	10.6%		10.3%
More research needed	45.8%	33.9%	59.5%	42.0%
Don't know enough	32.6%	35.9%	40.5%	33.7%
Not sure	.1%	.2%		.1%
Total	66.8%	32.7%	.5%	100.0%

	NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:			Total
	None	Once or more	Not sure	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
CONCERN ABOUT CRUDE OIL SPILLS LIKE THE EXXON VALDEZ:				
Concerned (4-5)	63.1%	76.5%	80.3%	67.6%
3	20.8%	7.8%	19.7%	16.6%
Not concerned (1-2)	14.6%	15.7%		14.9%
Not sure	1.4%			.9%
CONCERN ABOUT SPILLS OF NON-CRUDE OIL:				
Concerned (4-5)	62.5%	70.4%	100.0%	65.3%
3	22.9%	17.4%		21.0%
Not concerned (1-2)	13.5%	10.7%		12.5%
Not sure	1.1%	1.5%		1.2%
CONCERN ABOUT MINOR BUT CONTINUOUS OIL POLLUTION:				
Concerned (4-5)	50.3%	65.7%	80.3%	55.5%
3	32.1%	19.4%	19.7%	27.9%
Not concerned (1-2)	16.6%	13.6%		15.5%
Not sure	.9%	1.3%		1.0%
CONCERN ABOUT INVASION ON ALASKA WATERS BY HARMFUL PLANTS OR ANIMALS:				
Concerned (4-5)	62.8%	72.6%	100.0%	66.2%
3	20.5%	15.6%		18.8%
Not concerned (1-2)	14.3%	10.4%		12.9%
Not sure	2.5%	1.3%		2.1%
CONCERN ABOUT RELEASE OF AIR POLLUTION AT THE VALDEZ TANKER TERMINAL:				
Concerned (4-5)	52.0%	50.3%	80.3%	51.6%
3	20.8%	20.8%	19.7%	20.8%
Not concerned (1-2)	21.6%	27.6%		23.4%
Not sure	5.6%	1.3%		4.2%
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON THE TELEVISION NEWS:				
Effective (4-5)	57.8%	42.7%	79.2%	53.0%
3	14.4%	25.3%	20.8%	18.0%
Not effective (1-2)	27.1%	32.0%		28.6%
Not sure	.6%			.4%
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY IN YOUR LOCAL PAPER:				
Effective (4-5)	59.2%	66.8%	100.0%	61.9%
3	24.3%	13.3%		20.6%
Not effective (1-2)	16.5%	20.0%		17.5%
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON YOUR LOCAL RADIO NEWS:				
Effective (4-5)	60.3%	77.4%	80.3%	66.0%
3	15.5%	13.6%	19.7%	14.9%
Not effective (1-2)	24.2%	9.0%		19.1%
Total	66.8%	32.7%	.5%	100.0%

	NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:			Total
	None	Once or more	Not sure	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
EFFECTIVENESS OF LOCAL PUBLIC MEETINGS:				
Effective (4-5)	32.8%	44.3%	60.5%	36.7%
3	22.9%	26.7%	19.7%	24.1%
Not effective (1-2)	44.1%	29.0%	19.7%	39.1%
Not sure	.2%			.1%
EFFECTIVENESS OF WORD OF MOUTH FROM FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS:				
Effective (4-5)	34.4%	33.2%	40.5%	34.0%
3	28.8%	26.0%	20.1%	27.9%
Not effective (1-2)	36.8%	40.8%	39.5%	38.1%
EFFECTIVENESS OF INFORMATION ON THE INTERNET:				
Effective (4-5)	47.9%	40.9%	80.3%	45.8%
3	18.5%	28.7%		21.7%
Not effective (1-2)	33.6%	30.4%	19.7%	32.5%
EFFECTIVENESS OF RADIO ADS:				
Effective (4-5)	31.8%	58.4%	80.3%	40.8%
3	25.9%	25.2%	19.7%	25.6%
Not effective (1-2)	42.1%	16.4%		33.4%
Not sure	.2%			.2%
EFFECTIVENESS OF E-MAIL:				
Effective (4-5)	38.4%	33.0%	59.5%	36.7%
3	22.1%	22.8%	20.8%	22.3%
Not effective (1-2)	39.4%	44.2%	19.7%	40.9%
Not sure	.1%			.1%
NUMBER OF TIMES IN THE LAST YEAR YOU READ THE OBSERVER:				
None	86.2%	61.0%	80.3%	78.0%
Once or more	13.8%	39.0%	19.7%	22.0%
NUMBER OF WEBSITE VISITS LAST SIX MONTHS:				
None	96.6%	87.0%	100.0%	93.5%
Once or more	3.4%	12.8%		6.5%
Not sure		.2%		.1%
ENVIRONMENTAL-DEVELOPMENTAL SCALE:				
Environmental (1-3)	37.0%	39.2%	20.1%	37.6%
4	22.2%	22.8%	20.8%	22.4%
Developmentalist (5-7)	40.8%	38.0%	59.2%	40.0%
Total	66.6%	32.9%	.5%	100.0%

	NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:			Total
	None	Once or more	Not sure	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
FIRST CHOICE RADIO STATION:				
Don't listen	13.1%	4.3%		10.2%
KCDV	1.0%	.5%		.8%
KLAM	1.6%	2.6%		1.9%
KBBI	4.1%	15.4%		7.8%
KGTL	3.0%			2.0%
KMJG	1.5%			1.0%
KWVW	3.8%	1.6%		3.1%
KDLL	.8%	3.5%		1.6%
KWHQ	2.1%			1.4%
KMXT	4.3%	8.7%	20.1%	5.8%
KRXX	3.0%	4.2%		3.4%
KVOK	2.7%	4.6%	59.2%	3.6%
KPFN		2.8%		.9%
KKIS	4.1%	4.7%		4.3%
KPEN	2.6%	1.6%		2.3%
KSLD	1.3%	3.1%		1.9%
KSRM	18.5%	18.0%		18.2%
KCHU	.7%	3.9%		1.8%
KVAK	6.0%	8.4%	20.8%	6.8%
KAFC	1.5%			1.0%
KASH	.6%			.4%
KATB	.8%			.5%
KBFX	.2%			.1%
KBRJ	.2%			.1%
KDBZ	.7%			.5%
KEAG/ KOOL	.6%			.4%
KENI	2.2%	3.0%		2.5%
KFQD	2.8%	1.7%		2.5%
KGOT	1.3%			.8%
KLEF	.7%			.5%
KLOV	.5%			.3%
KMXS		.3%		.1%
KNBA	.7%			.5%
KQEZ		1.4%		.5%
KRPM	.7%			.5%
KRUA	.9%			.6%
KSKA/KAKM	3.8%	2.2%		3.3%
KWHL		1.4%		.5%
KYMJ	.8%			.5%
XM RADIO	.8%			.6%
KXBA	.7%	.2%		.5%
KWMD	1.3%			.9%
KNLS	.6%			.4%
KXKM	.1%			.0%
Not sure	3.2%	1.9%		2.8%
Total	66.8%	32.7%	.5%	100.0%

	NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:			Total
	None	Once or more	Not sure	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
SECOND CHOICE RADIO STATION:				
Don't listen	56.9%	42.3%	40.5%	52.1%
KCDV	.1%	1.1%		.5%
KLAM	.9%	.5%		.8%
KBBI	.8%			.5%
KGTL	.6%	.2%	19.7%	.6%
KWVV	.5%	3.5%		1.5%
KDLL	2.0%	3.1%		2.4%
KWHQ	.6%	1.6%		.9%
KMXT	2.1%	3.6%	19.7%	2.6%
KRXX	1.7%	2.9%		2.1%
KVOK	1.8%	3.3%		2.3%
KPFN	.7%	3.5%		1.6%
KSWD		.3%		.1%
KKIS	.6%	2.7%		1.3%
KPEN	3.8%	1.0%		2.9%
KSLD	.6%			.4%
KSRM	2.1%	2.8%		2.3%
KCHU	.7%	2.0%		1.1%
KVAK	3.0%	3.9%		3.3%
KAFC	1.9%	.1%		1.3%
KASH	1.5%			1.0%
KATB		1.6%		.5%
KBRJ	1.4%			.9%
KBYR	.8%	3.1%		1.5%
KDBZ	.7%			.5%
KENI	2.9%	1.4%		2.4%
KFQD	1.5%	4.5%		2.5%
KGOT		.1%		.0%
KHAR	.6%			.4%
KLOV	.2%	.3%		.2%
KMBQ	.6%			.4%
KRPM	.8%			.5%
KRUA	.1%			.1%
KSKA/KAKM		1.8%		.6%
KUDO	1.4%			.9%
KWHL	.8%			.5%
KXBA		1.6%		.5%
KWMD	.8%			.5%
MOODY	.7%			.5%
Not sure	3.8%	7.2%	20.1%	5.0%
Total	66.8%	32.6%	.5%	100.0%

	NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:			Total
	None	Once or more	Not sure	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
THIRD CHOICE RADIO STATION:				
Don't listen	84.1%	68.8%	79.9%	79.1%
KBBI		1.6%		.5%
KMJG	.2%	1.9%		.7%
KWVV	.2%	2.7%		1.0%
KWHQ	.7%			.5%
KMXT	.2%	3.3%		1.2%
KRXX		.7%		.2%
KVOK	.5%	.7%		.5%
KKIS	.8%	1.3%		.9%
KPEN	.6%	.3%		.5%
KSRM	.8%	1.6%		1.0%
KCHU	.1%	.4%		.2%
KVAK	.3%	.5%		.4%
KAFC		.2%		.1%
KASH		1.6%		.5%
KATB	.1%			.0%
KBRJ	.8%			.5%
KBYR	.8%			.5%
KEAG/ KOOL	1.3%			.9%
KENI	.1%	2.8%		1.0%
KFQD	1.5%			1.0%
KGOT		1.4%		.5%
KJHA		.3%		.1%
KMBQ	.1%			.1%
KRPM		1.4%		.5%
KSKA/KAKM		.3%		.1%
KWHL		.1%		.0%
CSN	.8%			.5%
Not sure	6.4%	8.1%	20.1%	7.0%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN GOVERNMENT?				
Yes	20.5%	23.2%	59.5%	21.6%
No	79.5%	76.8%	40.5%	78.4%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN OIL AND GAS?				
Yes	15.0%	21.7%		17.1%
No	85.0%	78.3%	100.0%	82.9%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN TOURISM?				
Yes	9.1%	13.3%	20.1%	10.5%
No	90.9%	86.7%	79.9%	89.5%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN FISHING?				
Yes	16.5%	26.3%	60.2%	20.0%
No	83.5%	73.7%	39.8%	80.0%
Total	66.8%	32.7%	.5%	100.0%

	NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:			Total
	None	Once or more	Not sure	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	
LENGTH OF RESIDENCY IN COMMUNITY:				
Less than 8 years	35.1%	15.5%	20.1%	28.6%
8-20 years	26.3%	38.5%	19.7%	30.2%
20 years or more	38.7%	46.1%	60.2%	41.2%
AGE OF RESPONDENT:				
18-36	24.3%	21.8%		23.4%
37-47	20.3%	25.6%	59.2%	22.2%
48+	55.4%	52.6%	40.8%	54.4%
MARITAL STATUS:				
Married	66.4%	71.8%	79.2%	68.2%
Single	33.6%	28.2%	20.8%	31.8%
GENDER OF RESPONDENT:				
Male	45.4%	60.4%	59.2%	50.4%
Female	54.6%	39.6%	40.8%	49.6%
MARITAL STATUS BY GENDER:				
Married males	29.0%	44.3%	59.2%	34.2%
Married females	37.4%	27.5%	20.1%	34.1%
Single males	16.4%	16.2%		16.2%
Single females	17.2%	12.0%	20.8%	15.5%
Total	66.8%	32.7%	.5%	100.0%

	NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:			Group Total
	None	Once or more	Not sure	Mean
	Mean	Mean	Mean	
OIL INDUSTRY'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	2.65	2.51	2.21	2.60
ALYESKA PIPELINE COMPANY'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	2.67	2.61	2.25	2.65
PWSRCAC'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	2.63	3.07	2.75	2.82
U.S. COAST GUARD'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	3.77	3.83	3.80	3.79
SPILL ESCORT RESPONSE VESSEL SERVICE'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	3.28	3.31	3.75	3.29
STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	2.48	2.63	3.20	2.54
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT - MEAN (0-4):	2.43	2.42	2.00	2.43
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR BEING PREPARED TO CLEAN UP A SIMILAR SPILL - MEAN (0-4):	2.43	2.44	2.75	2.43
RCAC GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT - MEAN (0-4):	2.61	2.99	3.00	2.76
IMPORTANCE OF CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN OIL TRANSPORTATION/SPILL PREVENTION - MEAN (1-5):	4.23	4.10	4.61	4.19
IMPORTANCE OF USING DOUBLE-HULLED TANKERS IN PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND - MEAN (1-5):	4.67	4.79	4.80	4.71
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING TECHNOLOGY TO HELP OIL TANKERS AVOID ICE BERGS - MEAN (1-5):	4.74	4.79	5.00	4.76
IMPORTANCE OF REQUIRING ESCORT BY TWO RESCUE TUGS - MEAN (1-5):	4.01	4.25	4.80	4.09
IMPORTANCE OF STOCKPILING OIL SPILL CONTAINMENT SUPPLIES - MEAN (1-5):	4.52	4.56	5.00	4.54
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING NEW TECHNOLOGY FOR REMOVING OIL - MEAN (1-5):	4.64	4.56	5.00	4.61
IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING LOCAL RESIDENTS TO CLEAN UP OIL SPILLS - MEAN (1-5):	4.27	4.40	4.80	4.32
IMPORTANCE OF USING FISHING VESSELS TO CLEAN UP OIL - MEAN (1-5):	4.12	4.26	4.41	4.17
IMPORTANCE OF PREPARING DETAILED PROTECTION PLANS - MEAN (1-5):	4.66	4.58	5.00	4.63
IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING A FLEET OF 10 TUGS - MEAN (1-5):	3.75	3.97	4.75	3.83

	NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:			Group Total
	None	Once or more	Not sure	Mean
	Mean	Mean	Mean	
BELIEVABILITY OF THE OIL INDUSTRY - MEAN (1-5):	2.97	2.71	2.62	2.88
BELIEVABILITY OF PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND RCAC - MEAN (1-5):	3.97	4.25	4.60	4.07
BELIEVABILITY OF U.S. COAST GUARD - MEAN (1-5):	4.59	4.50	4.60	4.56
BELIEVABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION - MEAN (1-5):	3.67	3.80	4.60	3.72
BELIEVABILITY OF NEWS MEDIA - MEAN (1-5):	2.81	2.99	3.81	2.87
CONCERN ABOUT CRUDE OIL SPILLS LIKE THE EXXON VALDEZ - MEAN (1-5):	3.91	4.07	4.41	3.96
CONCERN ABOUT SPILLS OF NON-CRUDE OIL - MEAN (1-5):	3.77	4.02	4.61	3.85
CONCERN ABOUT MINOR BUT CONTINUOUS OIL POLLUTION - MEAN (1-5):	3.59	3.85	4.41	3.68
CONCERN ABOUT INVASION ON ALASKA WATERS BY HARMFUL PLANTS OR ANIMALS - MEAN (1-5):	3.82	4.05	4.80	3.91
CONCERN ABOUT RELEASE OF AIR POLLUTION AT THE VALDEZ TANKER TERMINAL - MEAN (1-5):	3.48	3.33	4.01	3.43
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON THE TELEVISION NEWS - MEAN (1-5):	3.54	3.18	4.39	3.43
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY IN YOUR LOCAL PAPER - MEAN (1-5):	3.65	3.69	4.61	3.67
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON YOUR LOCAL RADIO NEWS - MEAN (1-5):	3.54	4.25	4.41	3.77
EFFECTIVENESS OF LOCAL PUBLIC MEETINGS - MEAN (1-5):	2.74	3.28	3.42	2.92
EFFECTIVENESS OF WORD OF MOUTH FROM FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS - MEAN (1-5):	2.97	2.86	3.42	2.94
EFFECTIVENESS OF INFORMATION ON THE INTERNET - MEAN (1-5):	3.18	3.06	4.21	3.14
EFFECTIVENESS OF RADIO ADS - MEAN (1-5):	2.80	3.70	4.41	3.10
EFFECTIVENESS OF E-MAIL - MEAN (1-5):	2.96	2.76	3.60	2.90

	NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:			Group Total
	None	Once or more	Not sure	Mean
	Mean	Mean	Mean	
NUMBER OF TIMES IN THE LAST YEAR YOU READ THE OBSERVER - MEAN:	.23	.70	.20	.38
NUMBER OF WEBSITE VISITS LAST SIX MONTHS - MEAN:	.10	.28	.00	.16
ENVIRONMENTAL-DEVELOPMENTAL SCALE - MEAN:	4.09	3.97	4.19	4.05
LENGTH OF RESIDENCY IN COMMUNITY - MEAN:	17.86	20.96	34.04	18.95
MEAN AGE OF RESPONDENT:	48.79	48.03	50.55	48.55
TRUE-FALSE KNOWLEDGE SCORE:	1.45	2.46	2.01	1.78

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
AREAS OF ALASKA:					
Kodiak	20.8%	10.1%	14.4%	16.3%	17.6%
Kenai	66.2%	77.4%	75.7%	80.6%	73.4%
PWS	13.0%	12.5%	9.8%	3.1%	9.0%
OIL INDUSTRY'S RATING:					
Positive	61.1%	55.6%	57.4%	72.3%	64.3%
Negative	29.2%	34.6%	23.8%	14.1%	23.5%
Neutral	9.7%	9.9%	18.8%	13.5%	12.2%
ALYESKA PIPELINE COMPANY'S RATING:					
Positive	61.9%	60.7%	52.2%	66.9%	62.4%
Negative	23.3%	25.9%	18.3%	7.5%	17.2%
Neutral	10.6%	7.6%	29.5%	12.7%	13.5%
Who?	4.2%	5.7%		12.9%	6.9%
U.S. COAST GUARD'S RATING:					
Positive	96.1%	99.2%	98.8%	98.3%	97.5%
Negative	1.4%	.8%		.1%	.7%
Neutral	2.5%		1.2%	1.5%	1.8%
SPILL ESCORT RESPONSE VESSEL SERVICE'S RATING:					
Positive	78.3%	68.8%	63.4%	49.9%	65.5%
Negative	3.0%	24.0%	1.1%	2.6%	4.1%
Neutral	5.5%	1.5%	15.5%	4.4%	6.1%
Who?	13.2%	5.7%	19.9%	43.1%	24.3%
STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION'S RATING:					
Positive	62.1%	16.4%	55.6%	56.5%	56.0%
Negative	24.7%	65.9%	25.1%	16.7%	24.8%
Neutral	9.7%	17.7%	19.3%	14.9%	13.4%
Who?	3.5%			11.9%	5.8%
CONCERN ABOUT OIL TRANSPORTATION:					
Very concerned	35.4%	18.9%	34.9%	22.3%	29.4%
Somewhat concerned	40.5%	20.7%	36.6%	38.7%	37.9%
Not at all concerned	23.8%	60.3%	28.5%	37.8%	32.1%
Not sure	.4%			1.2%	.6%
LIKELINESS OF LARGE OIL SPILL TODAY:					
More likely	4.8%	5.3%	2.1%	1.8%	3.4%
Less likely	55.2%	53.4%	60.7%	68.1%	60.4%
No difference	39.5%	41.3%	36.4%	29.2%	35.5%
Not sure	.5%		.9%	.9%	.6%
Total	44.2%	7.2%	12.5%	36.1%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT:					
A/B	43.8%	54.9%	47.0%	54.8%	48.9%
C	35.8%	30.6%	26.3%	30.6%	32.4%
D/F	18.5%	14.6%	25.8%	11.1%	16.5%
Not sure	1.9%		.9%	3.5%	2.2%
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR BEING PREPARED TO CLEAN UP A SIMILAR SPILL:					
A/B	49.0%	68.8%	35.2%	59.5%	52.5%
C	27.3%	19.8%	33.5%	26.0%	27.1%
D/F	22.6%	11.4%	28.8%	10.8%	18.4%
Not sure	1.0%		2.5%	3.7%	2.1%
ESTABLISHMENT OF RCAC A GOOD THING OR BAD THING?					
Good thing	91.8%	66.1%	92.6%	76.0%	84.4%
Bad thing	3.4%	33.9%	5.6%	5.2%	6.6%
Not sure	4.7%		1.7%	18.9%	9.0%
RCAC GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT:					
A/B	72.8%	19.7%	55.6%	30.6%	52.5%
C	17.0%	29.4%	25.2%	23.3%	21.1%
D/F	5.6%	49.5%	5.1%	6.1%	9.0%
Not sure	4.6%	1.4%	14.2%	40.0%	17.5%
RCAC MORE EFFECTIVE TODAY?					
More effective	28.3%	27.4%	20.6%	23.1%	25.5%
Less effective	5.7%	20.7%	5.3%	4.9%	6.5%
About the same	53.9%	37.7%	54.7%	37.1%	47.1%
Not sure	12.0%	14.2%	19.4%	34.9%	20.9%
IMPORTANCE OF CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN OIL TRANSPORTATION/SPILL PREVENTION:					
Important (4-5)	80.2%	62.2%	73.6%	72.1%	75.2%
3	13.3%	11.8%	23.8%	18.9%	16.5%
Not important (1-2)	6.5%	25.4%	2.5%	9.0%	8.3%
Not sure		.6%			.0%
IMPORTANCE OF USING DOUBLE-HULLED TANKERS IN PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND:					
Important (4-5)	93.2%	76.7%	82.2%	89.7%	89.4%
3	6.1%	15.6%	10.0%	2.6%	6.0%
Not important (1-2)	.5%	7.8%	4.4%	2.7%	2.3%
Not sure	.1%		3.3%	5.0%	2.3%
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING TECHNOLOGY TO HELP OIL TANKERS AVOID ICEBERGS:					
Important (4-5)	94.0%	84.5%	98.0%	93.5%	93.7%
3	1.7%	14.9%	1.2%	1.8%	2.6%
Not important (1-2)	3.1%	.7%	.8%	1.6%	2.1%
Not sure	1.1%			3.1%	1.6%
IMPORTANCE OF REQUIRING ESCORT BY TWO RESCUE TUGS:					
Important (4-5)	76.8%	48.1%	71.8%	66.5%	70.4%
3	13.4%	15.1%	23.2%	18.6%	16.6%
Not important (1-2)	9.2%	36.2%	1.7%	11.3%	11.0%
Not sure	.6%	.6%	3.3%	3.6%	2.0%
Total	44.2%	7.2%	12.5%	36.1%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
IMPORTANCE OF STOCKPILING OIL SPILL CONTAINMENT SUPPLIES:					
Important (4-5)	93.6%	76.7%	90.2%	78.5%	86.5%
3	2.9%	21.3%	9.8%	15.4%	9.6%
Not important (1-2)	3.4%	1.4%		3.6%	2.9%
Not sure		.7%		2.5%	1.0%
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING NEW TECHNOLOGY FOR REMOVING OIL:					
Important (4-5)	86.9%	77.3%	94.4%	87.6%	87.4%
3	10.3%	16.3%	5.6%	8.0%	9.3%
Not important (1-2)	1.6%	5.7%		2.7%	2.1%
Not sure	1.1%	.7%		1.7%	1.2%
IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING LOCAL RESIDENTS TO CLEAN UP OIL SPILLS:					
Important (4-5)	80.2%	61.1%	82.1%	77.1%	77.9%
3	13.4%	10.0%	17.1%	17.8%	15.2%
Not important (1-2)	6.4%	28.9%	.9%	5.1%	6.9%
IMPORTANCE OF USING FISHING VESSELS TO CLEAN UP OIL:					
Important (4-5)	80.9%	59.5%	75.1%	67.9%	74.0%
3	12.3%	23.6%	12.2%	18.5%	15.3%
Not important (1-2)	6.8%	9.9%	12.7%	10.8%	9.2%
Not sure		7.0%		2.7%	1.5%
IMPORTANCE OF PREPARING DETAILED PROTECTION PLANS:					
Important (4-5)	87.9%	82.9%	94.2%	92.7%	90.0%
3	8.8%	10.8%	5.8%	5.9%	7.5%
Not important (1-2)	2.4%	6.4%		1.1%	1.9%
Not sure	.9%			.3%	.5%
IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING A FLEET OF 10 TUGS:					
Important (4-5)	66.0%	44.5%	45.8%	59.0%	59.4%
3	14.7%	19.4%	29.3%	20.9%	19.1%
Not important (1-2)	13.0%	34.7%	18.7%	14.3%	15.7%
Not sure	6.3%	1.4%	6.2%	5.8%	5.7%
RCAC MONITORS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AT VALDEZ TERMINAL:					
True	68.6%	75.9%	69.1%	59.5%	65.9%
False	27.9%	8.7%	10.8%	13.8%	19.4%
Not sure	3.5%	15.4%	20.1%	26.7%	14.7%
RCAC CONDUCTS ONGOING CLEAN-UP OPERATIONS:					
True	32.4%	44.1%	32.4%	39.9%	35.9%
False	60.6%	41.9%	51.1%	31.0%	47.5%
Not sure	7.0%	14.0%	16.5%	29.1%	16.6%
RCAC WORKS TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION AT VALDEZ:					
True	47.4%	62.2%	46.4%	28.3%	41.5%
False	43.2%	29.5%	43.7%	40.1%	41.1%
Not sure	9.5%	8.4%	9.9%	31.6%	17.4%
Total	44.7%	7.3%	12.2%	35.8%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY ALYESKA PIPELINE:					
True	43.8%	48.1%	39.6%	19.5%	34.9%
False	48.4%	37.1%	47.0%	46.7%	46.8%
Not sure	7.8%	14.8%	13.4%	33.9%	18.3%
RCAC PRODUCES A COMMUNITY DISASTER GUIDEBOOK:					
True	82.2%	64.5%	61.2%	54.2%	68.5%
False	10.5%	20.7%	12.8%	16.9%	13.8%
Not sure	7.3%	14.8%	26.0%	28.9%	17.7%
RCAC MONITORS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ALONG PIPELINE:					
True	41.5%	33.1%	30.4%	50.9%	42.8%
False	53.7%	51.5%	57.3%	24.7%	43.9%
Not sure	4.8%	15.4%	12.3%	24.4%	13.3%
RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY THE STATE OF ALASKA:					
True	31.3%	31.4%	34.1%	33.6%	32.5%
False	57.0%	60.2%	48.3%	35.5%	48.6%
Not sure	11.7%	8.4%	17.7%	30.9%	18.9%
RCAC CONDUCTS MARINE FIRE RESPONSE TRAINING:					
True	39.5%	34.9%	40.0%	31.3%	36.4%
False	52.0%	48.2%	41.0%	41.8%	46.8%
Not sure	8.5%	17.0%	19.0%	27.0%	16.8%
RCAC MONITORS OIL INDUSTRY OPERATIONS ON NORTH SLOPE:					
True	28.8%	33.5%	31.1%	49.2%	36.5%
False	61.7%	58.1%	55.8%	25.1%	48.1%
Not sure	9.5%	8.4%	13.1%	25.7%	15.4%
RCAC CONDUCTS BALLAST WATER RESEARCH:					
True	68.0%	39.3%	49.6%	45.4%	55.8%
False	23.6%	45.9%	33.5%	31.2%	29.1%
Not sure	8.4%	14.8%	16.9%	23.4%	15.1%
RCAC RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEAN UP SHOULD ANOTHER SPILL OCCUR:					
True	33.8%	29.9%	40.2%	39.8%	36.3%
False	61.4%	61.7%	46.8%	36.6%	51.2%
Not sure	4.8%	8.4%	13.0%	23.6%	12.5%
RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS:					
True	32.6%	30.7%	24.4%	35.8%	32.5%
False	57.9%	47.4%	58.2%	37.3%	50.1%
Not sure	9.6%	21.8%	17.4%	26.9%	17.4%
KNOWLEDGE SCORE:					
<0	17.4%	22.0%	10.1%	30.5%	21.5%
Zero	10.9%	26.7%	27.6%	37.5%	23.7%
1-4	39.8%	29.9%	36.6%	26.6%	33.9%
5-12	31.9%	21.4%	25.7%	5.4%	20.8%
Total	44.2%	7.2%	12.5%	36.1%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
IMPORTANCE OF SCIENTIFIC DATA PROJECT:					
Absolutely vital	30.5%	17.0%	22.4%	25.0%	26.5%
Very important	42.8%	19.2%	32.8%	42.1%	39.6%
Somewhat important	22.0%	32.1%	44.8%	25.7%	26.9%
Not very important	2.7%	9.2%		1.2%	2.3%
Not at all important	.1%	22.6%		2.7%	2.7%
Not sure	2.0%			3.4%	2.1%
BELIEVABILITY OF THE OIL INDUSTRY:					
Believable (4-5)	28.8%	30.1%	33.3%	37.9%	32.7%
3	24.0%	31.1%	32.2%	37.0%	30.2%
Not believable (1-2)	47.3%	38.8%	34.6%	23.4%	36.4%
Not sure				1.7%	.6%
BELIEVABILITY OF PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND RCAC:					
Believable (4-5)	88.3%	56.9%	63.2%	62.7%	73.6%
3	10.1%	17.8%	24.1%	20.5%	16.2%
Not believable (1-2)	1.6%	18.4%	8.1%	7.4%	5.7%
Not sure		7.0%	4.6%	9.4%	4.5%
BELIEVABILITY OF U.S. COAST GUARD:					
Believable (4-5)	93.5%	98.6%	86.4%	90.0%	91.7%
3	5.7%	1.4%	6.6%	8.1%	6.3%
Not believable (1-2)	.8%		7.0%	1.7%	1.8%
Not sure				.3%	.1%
BELIEVABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION:					
Believable (4-5)	64.4%	47.2%	49.8%	70.9%	63.7%
3	21.8%	24.5%	34.2%	20.5%	23.1%
Not believable (1-2)	12.7%	28.3%	16.0%	8.6%	12.8%
Not sure	1.1%				.5%
BELIEVABILITY OF NEWS MEDIA:					
Believable (4-5)	28.4%	14.2%	24.8%	32.1%	28.3%
3	40.7%	17.4%	37.5%	32.5%	35.7%
Not believable (1-2)	30.9%	68.4%	37.7%	35.4%	36.1%
OPINION ON CHEMICAL DISPERSANTS:					
Dispersants should be used	16.6%	27.2%	19.6%	5.9%	13.9%
Dispersants should not be used	14.9%	9.4%	4.5%	6.4%	10.1%
More research needed	37.9%	40.2%	40.7%	47.4%	41.9%
Don't know enough	30.4%	22.5%	35.1%	40.3%	34.0%
Not sure	.1%	.8%			.1%
Total	44.1%	7.2%	12.5%	36.2%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
CONCERN ABOUT CRUDE OIL SPILLS LIKE THE EXXON VALDEZ:					
Concerned (4-5)	78.0%	45.4%	68.3%	59.8%	67.9%
3	11.4%	21.8%	19.6%	20.5%	16.4%
Not concerned (1-2)	9.7%	32.8%	12.0%	18.4%	14.8%
Not sure	.9%			1.4%	.9%
CONCERN ABOUT SPILLS OF NON-CRUDE OIL:					
Concerned (4-5)	71.2%	51.0%	66.3%	61.4%	65.6%
3	20.0%	11.4%	25.1%	22.2%	20.8%
Not concerned (1-2)	8.8%	37.6%	4.9%	14.4%	12.4%
Not sure			3.8%	2.0%	1.2%
CONCERN ABOUT MINOR BUT CONTINUOUS OIL POLLUTION:					
Concerned (4-5)	65.4%	26.2%	50.0%	51.9%	55.8%
3	25.8%	21.3%	36.5%	28.5%	27.8%
Not concerned (1-2)	8.8%	52.5%	10.2%	17.8%	15.4%
Not sure			3.3%	1.7%	1.0%
CONCERN ABOUT INVASION ON ALASKA WATERS BY HARMFUL PLANTS OR ANIMALS:					
Concerned (4-5)	71.6%	52.3%	67.0%	62.8%	66.5%
3	19.4%	21.3%	19.9%	16.7%	18.6%
Not concerned (1-2)	9.0%	26.5%	9.8%	15.9%	12.8%
Not sure			3.3%	4.6%	2.1%
CONCERN ABOUT RELEASE OF AIR POLLUTION AT THE VALDEZ TANKER TERMINAL:					
Concerned (4-5)	54.3%	27.8%	47.3%	55.6%	52.0%
3	25.6%	10.6%	27.5%	14.1%	20.6%
Not concerned (1-2)	17.6%	55.9%	21.0%	24.4%	23.3%
Not sure	2.4%	5.7%	4.2%	5.9%	4.1%
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON THE TELEVISION NEWS:					
Effective (4-5)	49.2%	57.3%	54.5%	56.6%	53.1%
3	23.7%	4.4%	13.8%	15.0%	17.9%
Not effective (1-2)	27.2%	38.3%	31.7%	27.3%	28.6%
Not sure				1.2%	.4%
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY IN YOUR LOCAL PAPER:					
Effective (4-5)	66.8%	70.3%	54.2%	57.3%	62.1%
3	20.8%	6.8%	28.1%	20.1%	20.4%
Not effective (1-2)	12.4%	22.9%	17.7%	22.6%	17.5%
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON YOUR LOCAL RADIO NEWS:					
Effective (4-5)	71.2%	42.0%	53.4%	69.3%	66.2%
3	14.0%	30.8%	26.2%	8.5%	14.8%
Not effective (1-2)	14.8%	27.2%	20.4%	22.2%	19.0%
Total	44.2%	7.3%	12.6%	35.9%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
EFFECTIVENESS OF LOCAL PUBLIC MEETINGS:					
Effective (4-5)	43.8%	23.5%	41.0%	30.1%	37.1%
3	26.2%	9.5%	28.7%	22.7%	24.1%
Not effective (1-2)	29.9%	67.1%	30.3%	46.9%	38.8%
Not sure				.3%	.1%
EFFECTIVENESS OF WORD OF MOUTH FROM FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS:					
Effective (4-5)	33.0%	28.3%	36.3%	36.7%	34.4%
3	27.7%	23.5%	29.4%	27.8%	27.6%
Not effective (1-2)	39.3%	48.2%	34.3%	35.5%	37.9%
EFFECTIVENESS OF INFORMATION ON THE INTERNET:					
Effective (4-5)	50.1%	43.0%	38.9%	42.4%	45.4%
3	22.1%	20.6%	24.5%	20.6%	21.8%
Not effective (1-2)	27.7%	36.4%	32.9%	37.0%	32.4%
Not sure			3.7%		.5%
EFFECTIVENESS OF RADIO ADS:					
Effective (4-5)	44.8%	25.6%	39.2%	40.4%	41.1%
3	23.5%	45.0%	22.2%	24.9%	25.4%
Not effective (1-2)	31.5%	29.4%	38.6%	34.4%	33.3%
Not sure	.1%			.3%	.2%
EFFECTIVENESS OF E-MAIL:					
Effective (4-5)	44.0%	44.5%	20.8%	31.4%	36.6%
3	23.7%	3.5%	32.5%	20.8%	22.3%
Not effective (1-2)	32.1%	52.0%	43.1%	47.8%	40.6%
Not sure	.1%		3.7%		.5%
NUMBER OF TIMES IN THE LAST YEAR YOU READ THE OBSERVER:					
None	69.2%	57.3%	76.6%	93.5%	77.9%
Once or more	30.8%	42.7%	23.4%	6.5%	22.1%
NUMBER OF WEBSITE VISITS LAST SIX MONTHS:					
None	91.0%	90.0%	90.6%	98.0%	93.4%
Once or more	9.0%	9.2%	9.4%	2.0%	6.5%
Not sure		.8%			.1%
NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:					
None	50.0%	72.9%	76.2%	83.1%	66.8%
Once or more	49.2%	27.1%	22.9%	16.6%	32.7%
Not sure	.7%		.9%	.3%	.5%
ENVIRONMENTAL-DEVELOPMENTAL SCALE:					
Environmentalist (1-3)	38.4%	16.5%	56.6%	35.3%	38.0%
4	25.2%	6.5%	20.8%	22.6%	22.4%
Developmentalist (5-7)	36.4%	77.0%	22.7%	42.1%	39.7%
Total	44.1%	7.3%	12.6%	36.0%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
FIRST CHOICE RADIO STATION:					
Don't listen	4.4%	15.8%	11.9%	16.9%	10.7%
KCDV	1.1%	1.4%	1.2%	.3%	.8%
KLAM	2.8%	2.8%	1.7%	.7%	1.9%
KBBI	12.6%		10.7%	2.3%	7.8%
KGTL			8.2%	2.8%	2.0%
KMJG	1.1%			1.4%	1.0%
KWVV	3.4%	7.0%		2.8%	3.1%
KDLL	3.7%				1.6%
KWHQ	1.1%			2.5%	1.4%
KMXT	9.6%	2.9%		3.7%	5.8%
KRXX	2.4%		2.5%	5.8%	3.5%
KVOK	4.3%	4.3%	6.8%	1.5%	3.6%
KPFN	.9%			1.4%	.9%
KKIS	6.6%			3.7%	4.3%
KPEN	1.0%		4.2%	3.7%	2.3%
KSLD	3.3%	5.7%			1.9%
KSRM	14.2%	19.7%	14.2%	24.0%	18.1%
KCHU	3.2%	2.4%	1.2%	.3%	1.8%
KVAK	8.7%	4.6%	4.0%	5.8%	6.8%
KAFC	1.0%	7.0%		.1%	1.0%
KASH				1.2%	.4%
KATB				1.4%	.5%
KBFX			.9%		.1%
KBRJ				.3%	.1%
KDBZ				1.3%	.5%
KEAG/ KOOL				1.2%	.4%
KENI	1.1%	14.0%	3.7%	1.3%	2.5%
KFQD	1.4%	6.2%		3.8%	2.4%
KGOT				2.3%	.8%
KLEF	1.0%				.4%
KLOV			2.5%		.3%
KMXS	.2%				.1%
KNBA				1.2%	.4%
KQEZ	1.0%				.4%
KRPM				1.3%	.5%
KRUA			4.0%	.2%	.6%
KSKA/KAKM	3.9%	6.3%	7.7%	.1%	3.2%
KWHL			3.6%		.4%
KYMG			4.0%		.5%
XM RADIO	1.3%				.6%
KXBA				1.4%	.5%
KWMD	2.0%				.9%
KNLS				1.2%	.4%
KXKM	.1%				.0%
Not sure	2.6%		6.9%	2.1%	2.7%
Total	44.3%	7.3%	12.6%	35.8%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
SECOND CHOICE RADIO STATION:					
Don't listen	52.8%	47.8%	47.8%	54.0%	52.2%
KCDV	.8%		.4%	.1%	.5%
KLAM	1.3%	1.4%	.8%		.8%
KBBI	1.1%				.5%
KGTL	.1%		.8%	1.2%	.6%
KWVV	2.8%		.8%	.3%	1.5%
KDLL	3.4%			2.4%	2.3%
KWHQ	2.1%				.9%
KMXT	2.9%	1.4%	5.8%	1.5%	2.6%
KRXX	3.9%		1.7%	.3%	2.1%
KVOK	4.2%	1.4%	1.7%	.3%	2.3%
KPFN	1.6%		3.6%	1.2%	1.6%
KSWD	.2%				.1%
KKIS	.9%	5.7%	3.6%		1.3%
KPEN	.7%		4.0%	5.6%	2.8%
KSLD				1.2%	.4%
KSRM	2.1%	7.0%	3.3%	1.3%	2.3%
KCHU	1.6%	.8%	1.2%	.4%	1.1%
KVAK	2.0%	.8%	2.0%	5.9%	3.3%
KAFC	1.0%	5.7%		1.2%	1.3%
KASH	1.0%		.9%	1.3%	1.0%
KATB	1.1%				.5%
KBRJ			.8%	2.3%	.9%
KBYR	2.2%	.8%		1.4%	1.5%
KDBZ			3.7%		.5%
KENI		6.2%	4.0%	4.0%	2.4%
KFQD	2.3%	7.0%		2.7%	2.5%
KGOT	.1%			.3%	.2%
KHAR				1.2%	.4%
KLOV	.2%			.3%	.2%
KMBQ				1.2%	.4%
KRPM		7.0%			.5%
KRUA	.1%				.1%
KSKA/KAKM	1.3%				.6%
KUDO				2.6%	.9%
KWHL		7.0%			.5%
KXBA	1.1%				.5%
KWMD				1.4%	.5%
MOODY	1.0%				.4%
Not sure	3.8%		13.0%	4.7%	5.0%
Total	44.3%	7.3%	12.6%	35.9%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
THIRD CHOICE RADIO STATION:					
Don't listen	80.5%	84.7%	69.8%	79.8%	79.2%
KBBI	1.1%				.5%
KMJG	1.4%			.3%	.7%
KWVW	1.0%		.9%	1.2%	1.0%
KWHQ				1.3%	.5%
KMXT	1.4%		.9%	1.2%	1.2%
KRXX	.2%		.8%		.2%
KVOK	1.0%			.3%	.5%
KKIS			3.3%	1.4%	.9%
KPEN		1.4%		1.2%	.5%
KSRM	1.1%			1.4%	1.0%
KCHU	.4%				.2%
KVAK	.8%			.1%	.4%
KAFC	.1%				.1%
KASH	1.1%				.5%
KATB				.1%	.0%
KBRJ			4.0%		.5%
KBYR			4.0%		.5%
KEAG/ KOOL	1.0%			1.2%	.9%
KENI	2.1%		.4%		1.0%
KFQD				2.7%	1.0%
KGOT	1.0%				.4%
KJHA	.2%				.1%
KMBQ	.1%				.1%
KRPM				1.3%	.5%
KSKA/KAKM	.1%		.4%		.1%
KWHL	.1%				.0%
CSN		7.0%			.5%
Not sure	5.0%	6.9%	15.5%	6.4%	7.0%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN GOVERNMENT?					
Yes	25.3%	11.7%	16.3%	20.9%	21.6%
No	74.7%	88.3%	83.7%	79.1%	78.4%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN OIL AND GAS?					
Yes	17.1%	15.6%	16.7%	17.3%	17.0%
No	82.9%	84.4%	83.3%	82.7%	83.0%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN TOURISM?					
Yes	10.6%	11.9%	4.4%	12.6%	10.6%
No	89.4%	88.1%	95.6%	87.4%	89.4%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN FISHING?					
Yes	27.7%	14.3%	18.5%	12.2%	20.0%
No	72.3%	85.7%	81.5%	87.8%	80.0%
Total	44.3%	7.3%	12.5%	35.9%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
LENGTH OF RESIDENCY IN COMMUNITY:					
Less than 8 years	17.3%	17.8%	40.3%	40.3%	28.5%
8-20 years	37.2%	31.2%	19.4%	24.7%	30.0%
20 years or more	45.5%	51.1%	40.3%	35.0%	41.5%
AGE OF RESPONDENT:					
18-36	21.9%	9.9%	13.7%	31.5%	23.3%
37-47	24.5%	14.3%	38.4%	14.7%	22.1%
48+	53.5%	75.9%	47.9%	53.8%	54.6%
MARITAL STATUS:					
Married	69.9%	79.2%	64.5%	64.5%	67.9%
Single	30.1%	20.8%	35.5%	35.5%	32.1%
GENDER OF RESPONDENT:					
Male	59.3%	66.4%	45.2%	36.9%	50.0%
Female	40.7%	33.6%	54.8%	63.1%	50.0%
MARITAL STATUS BY GENDER:					
Married males	44.3%	53.5%	28.3%	19.4%	34.0%
Married females	25.6%	25.7%	36.2%	45.1%	34.0%
Single males	15.0%	12.9%	16.9%	17.5%	16.0%
Single females	15.1%	7.9%	18.6%	18.0%	16.1%
Total	44.2%	7.2%	12.5%	36.1%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Group Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Mean
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
OIL INDUSTRY'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	2.43	2.33	2.54	2.88	2.60
ALYESKA PIPELINE COMPANY'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	2.49	2.47	2.55	2.94	2.65
PWSRCAC'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	3.41	.55	2.00	.	2.81
U.S. COAST GUARD'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	3.75	3.69	3.87	3.83	3.79
SPIILL ESCORT RESPONSE VESSEL SERVICE'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	3.43	2.57	3.25	3.30	3.29
STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	2.58	1.39	2.51	2.72	2.52
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT - MEAN (0-4):	2.31	2.63	2.30	2.57	2.42
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR BEING PREPARED TO CLEAN UP A SIMILAR SPILL - MEAN (0-4):	2.30	2.92	2.09	2.60	2.43
RCAC GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT - MEAN (0-4):	3.05	1.55	2.78	2.54	2.76
IMPORTANCE OF CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN OIL TRANSPORTATION/SPILL PREVENTION - MEAN (1-5):	4.31	3.68	4.24	4.13	4.19
IMPORTANCE OF USING DOUBLE-HULLED TANKERS IN PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND - MEAN (1-5):	4.78	4.42	4.61	4.74	4.72
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING TECHNOLOGY TO HELP OIL TANKERS AVOID ICE BERGS - MEAN (1-5):	4.73	4.65	4.87	4.77	4.76
IMPORTANCE OF REQUIRING ESCORT BY TWO RESCUE TUGS - MEAN (1-5):	4.27	3.35	4.22	3.98	4.09
IMPORTANCE OF STOCKPILING OIL SPILL CONTAINMENT SUPPLIES - MEAN (1-5):	4.66	4.44	4.65	4.37	4.54
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING NEW TECHNOLOGY FOR REMOVING OIL - MEAN (1-5):	4.65	4.40	4.69	4.57	4.61
IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING LOCAL RESIDENTS TO CLEAN UP OIL SPILLS - MEAN (1-5):	4.34	3.82	4.53	4.30	4.31
IMPORTANCE OF USING FISHING VESSELS TO CLEAN UP OIL - MEAN (1-5):	4.29	3.98	4.07	4.02	4.14
IMPORTANCE OF PREPARING DETAILED PROTECTION PLANS - MEAN (1-5):	4.62	4.39	4.74	4.63	4.62
IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING A FLEET OF 10 TUGS - MEAN (1-5):	3.99	3.20	3.50	3.82	3.81

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Group Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Mean
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
BELIEVABILITY OF THE OIL INDUSTRY - MEAN (1-5):	2.62	2.98	2.88	3.18	2.88
BELIEVABILITY OF PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND RCAC - MEAN (1-5):	4.33	3.67	3.85	3.86	4.06
BELIEVABILITY OF U.S. COAST GUARD - MEAN (1-5):	4.59	4.75	4.39	4.56	4.56
BELIEVABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION - MEAN (1-5):	3.70	3.04	3.43	3.96	3.71
BELIEVABILITY OF NEWS MEDIA - MEAN (1-5):	2.93	2.14	2.77	2.98	2.87
CONCERN ABOUT CRUDE OIL SPILLS LIKE THE EXXON VALDEZ - MEAN (1-5):	4.24	3.20	3.97	3.79	3.97
CONCERN ABOUT SPILLS OF NON-CRUDE OIL - MEAN (1-5):	4.01	3.33	3.99	3.74	3.86
CONCERN ABOUT MINOR BUT CONTINUOUS OIL POLLUTION - MEAN (1-5):	3.90	2.75	3.79	3.57	3.68
CONCERN ABOUT INVASION ON ALASKA WATERS BY HARMFUL PLANTS OR ANIMALS - MEAN (1-5):	4.03	3.39	3.95	3.86	3.91
CONCERN ABOUT RELEASE OF AIR POLLUTION AT THE VALDEZ TANKER TERMINAL - MEAN (1-5):	3.54	2.34	3.57	3.50	3.44
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON THE TELEVISION NEWS - MEAN (1-5):	3.39	3.30	3.43	3.51	3.43
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY IN YOUR LOCAL PAPER - MEAN (1-5):	3.85	3.68	3.51	3.52	3.68
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON YOUR LOCAL RADIO NEWS - MEAN (1-5):	3.98	3.24	3.55	3.72	3.78
EFFECTIVENESS OF LOCAL PUBLIC MEETINGS - MEAN (1-5):	3.18	2.34	3.16	2.67	2.94
EFFECTIVENESS OF WORD OF MOUTH FROM FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS - MEAN (1-5):	2.90	2.67	3.16	3.00	2.95
EFFECTIVENESS OF INFORMATION ON THE INTERNET - MEAN (1-5):	3.29	3.04	2.99	3.03	3.14
EFFECTIVENESS OF RADIO ADS - MEAN (1-5):	3.24	2.90	3.04	3.01	3.11
EFFECTIVENESS OF E-MAIL - MEAN (1-5):	3.17	2.89	2.64	2.67	2.91

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Group Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Mean
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
NUMBER OF TIMES IN THE LAST YEAR YOU READ THE OBSERVER - MEAN:	.51	.77	.47	.12	.38
NUMBER OF WEBSITE VISITS LAST SIX MONTHS - MEAN:	.18	.14	.35	.08	.16
ENVIRONMENTAL-DEVELOPMENTAL SCALE - MEAN:	3.90	5.23	3.49	4.15	4.03
LENGTH OF RESIDENCY IN COMMUNITY - MEAN:	20.17	23.98	18.59	16.75	19.02
MEAN AGE OF RESPONDENT:	48.03	53.85	50.20	47.68	48.62
TRUE-FALSE KNOWLEDGE SCORE:	2.95	2.53	2.34	-.10	1.74

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	
OIL INDUSTRY'S RATING:					
Positive	42.0%	6.2%	11.1%	40.7%	64.3%
Negative	54.9%	10.6%	12.7%	21.8%	23.5%
Neutral	35.1%	5.8%	19.1%	40.0%	12.2%
ALYESKA PIPELINE COMPANY'S RATING:					
Positive	43.8%	7.0%	10.4%	38.8%	62.4%
Negative	60.1%	10.9%	13.3%	15.7%	17.2%
Neutral	34.6%	4.1%	27.2%	34.1%	13.5%
Who?	26.7%	6.0%		67.3%	6.9%
U.S. COAST GUARD'S RATING:					
Positive	43.6%	7.3%	12.6%	36.5%	97.5%
Negative	85.3%	7.9%		6.8%	.7%
Neutral	61.3%		8.3%	30.5%	1.8%
SPILL ESCORT RESPONSE VESSEL SERVICE'S RATING:					
Positive	52.8%	7.6%	12.1%	27.5%	65.5%
Negative	31.9%	42.0%	3.5%	22.6%	4.1%
Neutral	40.1%	1.8%	31.9%	26.2%	6.1%
Who?	24.0%	1.7%	10.2%	64.1%	24.3%
STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION'S RATING:					
Positive	49.1%	2.1%	12.4%	36.5%	56.0%
Negative	43.9%	19.1%	12.6%	24.4%	24.8%
Neutral	32.1%	9.5%	18.0%	40.4%	13.4%
Who?	26.3%			73.7%	5.8%
CONCERN ABOUT OIL TRANSPORTATION:					
Very concerned	53.2%	4.6%	14.8%	27.4%	29.4%
Somewhat concerned	47.2%	3.9%	12.0%	36.9%	37.9%
Not at all concerned	32.8%	13.6%	11.1%	42.6%	32.1%
Not sure	26.9%			73.1%	.6%
LIKELINESS OF LARGE OIL SPILL TODAY:					
More likely	62.0%	11.2%	7.5%	19.3%	3.4%
Less likely	40.4%	6.4%	12.5%	40.8%	60.4%
No difference	49.1%	8.4%	12.8%	29.7%	35.5%
Not sure	33.6%		16.5%	49.9%	.6%
Total	44.2%	7.2%	12.5%	36.1%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT:					
A/B	39.6%	8.1%	12.1%	40.2%	48.9%
C	48.9%	6.9%	10.2%	34.0%	32.4%
D/F	49.8%	6.4%	19.6%	24.1%	16.5%
Not sure	38.9%		4.8%	56.3%	2.2%
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR BEING PREPARED TO CLEAN UP A SIMILAR SPILL:					
A/B	41.4%	9.5%	8.4%	40.6%	52.5%
C	44.8%	5.3%	15.5%	34.4%	27.1%
D/F	54.7%	4.5%	19.7%	21.1%	18.4%
Not sure	20.6%		15.1%	64.3%	2.1%
ESTABLISHMENT OF RCAC A GOOD THING OR BAD THING?					
Good thing	49.0%	5.8%	13.4%	31.9%	84.4%
Bad thing	23.7%	38.0%	10.5%	27.8%	6.6%
Not sure	23.6%		2.3%	74.0%	9.0%
RCAC GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT:					
A/B	64.2%	2.8%	13.4%	19.6%	52.5%
C	37.3%	10.5%	15.1%	37.1%	21.1%
D/F	28.6%	41.6%	7.1%	22.6%	9.0%
Not sure	12.2%	.6%	10.2%	76.9%	17.5%
RCAC MORE EFFECTIVE TODAY?					
More effective	50.7%	8.2%	10.3%	30.7%	25.5%
Less effective	40.2%	24.2%	10.4%	25.2%	6.5%
About the same	52.4%	6.1%	14.8%	26.7%	47.1%
Not sure	26.4%	5.2%	11.9%	56.5%	20.9%
IMPORTANCE OF CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN OIL TRANSPORTATION/SPILL PREVENTION:					
Important (4-5)	47.1%	6.0%	12.2%	34.7%	75.2%
3	35.6%	5.1%	18.0%	41.3%	16.5%
Not important (1-2)	34.6%	22.2%	3.8%	39.4%	8.3%
Not sure		100.0%			.0%
IMPORTANCE OF USING DOUBLE-HULLED TANKERS IN PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND:					
Important (4-5)	46.1%	6.2%	11.5%	36.3%	89.4%
3	45.0%	18.6%	20.7%	15.6%	6.0%
Not important (1-2)	9.5%	24.2%	23.9%	42.4%	2.3%
Not sure	2.1%		18.2%	79.7%	2.3%
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING TECHNOLOGY TO HELP OIL TANKERS AVOID ICEBERGS:					
Important (4-5)	44.4%	6.5%	13.0%	36.1%	93.7%
3	28.9%	40.8%	5.7%	24.6%	2.6%
Not important (1-2)	65.5%	2.3%	5.0%	27.2%	2.1%
Not sure	31.0%			69.0%	1.6%
IMPORTANCE OF REQUIRING ESCORT BY TWO RESCUE TUGS:					
Important (4-5)	48.2%	4.9%	12.7%	34.2%	70.4%
3	35.7%	6.5%	17.4%	40.3%	16.6%
Not important (1-2)	37.0%	23.8%	1.9%	37.3%	11.0%
Not sure	12.9%	2.2%	20.4%	64.5%	2.0%
Total	44.2%	7.2%	12.5%	36.1%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	
IMPORTANCE OF STOCKPILING OIL SPILL CONTAINMENT SUPPLIES:					
Important (4-5)	47.8%	6.4%	13.0%	32.8%	86.5%
3	13.5%	15.9%	12.7%	57.9%	9.6%
Not important (1-2)	52.2%	3.5%		44.3%	2.9%
Not sure		5.0%		95.0%	1.0%
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING NEW TECHNOLOGY FOR REMOVING OIL:					
Important (4-5)	43.9%	6.4%	13.5%	36.2%	87.4%
3	48.8%	12.6%	7.5%	31.1%	9.3%
Not important (1-2)	34.2%	19.7%		46.1%	2.1%
Not sure	43.4%	4.2%		52.4%	1.2%
IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING LOCAL RESIDENTS TO CLEAN UP OIL SPILLS:					
Important (4-5)	45.5%	5.7%	13.1%	35.7%	77.9%
3	38.9%	4.7%	14.0%	42.4%	15.2%
Not important (1-2)	41.2%	30.3%	1.5%	27.0%	6.9%
IMPORTANCE OF USING FISHING VESSELS TO CLEAN UP OIL:					
Important (4-5)	48.4%	5.8%	12.7%	33.2%	74.0%
3	35.3%	11.1%	9.9%	43.7%	15.3%
Not important (1-2)	32.6%	7.7%	17.1%	42.5%	9.2%
Not sure		34.0%		66.0%	1.5%
IMPORTANCE OF PREPARING DETAILED PROTECTION PLANS:					
Important (4-5)	43.1%	6.6%	13.0%	37.2%	90.0%
3	51.7%	10.3%	9.7%	28.4%	7.5%
Not important (1-2)	55.2%	23.7%		21.2%	1.9%
Not sure	79.5%			20.5%	.5%
IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING A FLEET OF 10 TUGS:					
Important (4-5)	49.1%	5.4%	9.6%	35.9%	59.4%
3	34.0%	7.3%	19.1%	39.6%	19.1%
Not important (1-2)	36.4%	15.9%	14.8%	32.9%	15.7%
Not sure	48.3%	1.8%	13.5%	36.4%	5.7%
RCAC MONITORS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AT VALDEZ TERMINAL:					
True	46.3%	8.4%	13.2%	32.2%	65.9%
False	64.2%	3.3%	7.0%	25.5%	19.4%
Not sure	10.5%	7.6%	17.1%	64.7%	14.7%
RCAC CONDUCTS ONGOING CLEAN-UP OPERATIONS:					
True	40.1%	8.9%	11.3%	39.7%	35.9%
False	56.8%	6.4%	13.5%	23.3%	47.5%
Not sure	18.8%	6.1%	12.5%	62.6%	16.6%
RCAC WORKS TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION AT VALDEZ:					
True	51.0%	10.9%	13.6%	24.5%	41.5%
False	46.9%	5.2%	13.0%	34.9%	41.1%
Not sure	24.4%	3.5%	7.0%	65.1%	17.4%
Total	44.7%	7.3%	12.2%	35.8%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	
RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY ALYESKA PIPELINE:					
True	56.3%	10.1%	13.8%	19.8%	34.9%
False	46.5%	5.8%	12.2%	35.4%	46.8%
Not sure	19.2%	6.0%	8.9%	65.9%	18.3%
RCAC PRODUCES A COMMUNITY DISASTER GUIDEBOOK:					
True	54.4%	7.0%	10.9%	27.7%	68.5%
False	34.5%	11.1%	11.4%	42.9%	13.8%
Not sure	18.8%	6.2%	18.0%	57.0%	17.7%
RCAC MONITORS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ALONG PIPELINE:					
True	44.0%	5.7%	8.7%	41.5%	42.8%
False	55.6%	8.7%	16.0%	19.7%	43.9%
Not sure	16.2%	8.5%	11.3%	63.9%	13.3%
RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY THE STATE OF ALASKA:					
True	43.8%	7.1%	12.9%	36.2%	32.5%
False	53.2%	9.2%	12.2%	25.5%	48.6%
Not sure	28.1%	3.3%	11.5%	57.1%	18.9%
RCAC CONDUCTS MARINE FIRE RESPONSE TRAINING:					
True	49.5%	7.1%	13.6%	29.8%	36.4%
False	50.6%	7.6%	10.8%	30.9%	46.8%
Not sure	23.0%	7.5%	13.9%	55.6%	16.8%
RCAC MONITORS OIL INDUSTRY OPERATIONS ON NORTH SLOPE:					
True	36.2%	6.9%	10.5%	46.4%	36.5%
False	58.8%	9.0%	14.2%	17.9%	48.1%
Not sure	28.2%	4.1%	10.4%	57.3%	15.4%
RCAC CONDUCTS BALLAST WATER RESEARCH:					
True	55.8%	5.3%	10.9%	28.0%	55.8%
False	37.2%	11.8%	14.1%	36.9%	29.1%
Not sure	25.5%	7.4%	13.8%	53.3%	15.1%
RCAC RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEAN UP SHOULD ANOTHER SPILL OCCUR:					
True	42.8%	6.2%	13.6%	37.3%	36.3%
False	55.2%	9.1%	11.3%	24.4%	51.2%
Not sure	17.8%	5.0%	12.8%	64.4%	12.5%
RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS:					
True	46.1%	7.1%	9.2%	37.5%	32.5%
False	53.2%	7.1%	14.3%	25.4%	50.1%
Not sure	25.3%	9.4%	12.4%	52.9%	17.4%
KNOWLEDGE SCORE:					
<0	35.7%	7.3%	5.9%	51.1%	21.5%
Zero	20.2%	8.1%	14.5%	57.2%	23.7%
1-4	51.9%	6.4%	13.4%	28.4%	33.9%
5-12	67.9%	7.4%	15.4%	9.3%	20.8%
Total	44.2%	7.2%	12.5%	36.1%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	
IMPORTANCE OF SCIENTIFIC DATA PROJECT:					
Absolutely vital	51.0%	4.6%	10.6%	33.8%	26.5%
Very important	47.9%	3.5%	10.4%	38.2%	39.6%
Somewhat important	36.2%	8.6%	20.9%	34.2%	26.9%
Not very important	52.6%	29.2%		18.2%	2.3%
Not at all important	2.1%	61.4%		36.5%	2.7%
Not sure	41.8%			58.2%	2.1%
BELIEVABILITY OF THE OIL INDUSTRY:					
Believable (4-5)	38.8%	6.6%	12.7%	41.9%	32.7%
3	35.0%	7.4%	13.3%	44.3%	30.2%
Not believable (1-2)	57.3%	7.7%	11.8%	23.2%	36.4%
Not sure				100.0%	.6%
BELIEVABILITY OF PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND RCAC:					
Believable (4-5)	52.9%	5.6%	10.7%	30.8%	73.6%
3	27.6%	7.9%	18.6%	45.9%	16.2%
Not believable (1-2)	12.3%	23.2%	17.6%	47.0%	5.7%
Not sure		11.3%	12.8%	75.9%	4.5%
BELIEVABILITY OF U.S. COAST GUARD:					
Believable (4-5)	45.0%	7.8%	11.7%	35.5%	91.7%
3	39.4%	1.6%	13.0%	46.0%	6.3%
Not believable (1-2)	20.1%		47.4%	32.6%	1.8%
Not sure				100.0%	.1%
BELIEVABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION:					
Believable (4-5)	44.6%	5.3%	9.7%	40.3%	63.7%
3	41.7%	7.7%	18.5%	32.2%	23.1%
Not believable (1-2)	43.9%	16.0%	15.7%	24.4%	12.8%
Not sure	100.0%				.5%
BELIEVABILITY OF NEWS MEDIA:					
Believable (4-5)	12.5%	1.0%	3.1%	11.6%	28.3%
3	18.0%	1.3%	4.7%	11.8%	35.7%
Not believable (1-2)	13.6%	4.9%	4.7%	12.8%	36.1%
OPINION ON CHEMICAL DISPERSANTS:					
Dispersants should be used	52.8%	14.2%	17.7%	15.4%	13.9%
Dispersants should not be used	65.0%	6.7%	5.6%	22.8%	10.1%
More research needed	40.0%	6.9%	12.1%	41.0%	41.9%
Don't know enough	39.5%	4.8%	12.9%	42.9%	34.0%
Not sure	50.0%	50.0%			.1%
Total	44.1%	7.2%	12.5%	36.2%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	
CONCERN ABOUT CRUDE OIL SPILLS LIKE THE EXXON VALDEZ:					
Concerned (4-5)	50.8%	4.9%	12.7%	31.7%	67.9%
3	30.6%	9.7%	15.0%	44.7%	16.4%
Not concerned (1-2)	29.1%	16.1%	10.2%	44.6%	14.8%
Not sure	44.9%			55.1%	.9%
CONCERN ABOUT SPILLS OF NON-CRUDE OIL:					
Concerned (4-5)	48.0%	5.7%	12.7%	33.6%	65.6%
3	42.5%	4.0%	15.1%	38.3%	20.8%
Not concerned (1-2)	31.4%	22.0%	4.9%	41.7%	12.4%
Not sure			39.4%	60.6%	1.2%
CONCERN ABOUT MINOR BUT CONTINUOUS OIL POLLUTION:					
Concerned (4-5)	51.9%	3.4%	11.3%	33.5%	55.8%
3	41.1%	5.6%	16.5%	36.9%	27.8%
Not concerned (1-2)	25.4%	24.8%	8.3%	41.5%	15.4%
Not sure			40.1%	59.9%	1.0%
CONCERN ABOUT INVASION ON ALASKA WATERS BY HARMFUL PLANTS OR ANIMALS:					
Concerned (4-5)	47.7%	5.7%	12.7%	34.0%	66.5%
3	46.1%	8.3%	13.4%	32.2%	18.6%
Not concerned (1-2)	31.0%	15.0%	9.6%	44.4%	12.8%
Not sure			20.0%	80.0%	2.1%
CONCERN ABOUT RELEASE OF AIR POLLUTION AT THE VALDEZ TANKER TERMINAL:					
Concerned (4-5)	46.2%	3.9%	11.4%	38.4%	52.0%
3	54.9%	3.8%	16.8%	24.6%	20.6%
Not concerned (1-2)	33.5%	17.5%	11.3%	37.7%	23.3%
Not sure	26.2%	10.0%	12.7%	51.0%	4.1%
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON THE TELEVISION NEWS:					
Effective (4-5)	41.0%	7.8%	12.9%	38.3%	53.1%
3	58.5%	1.8%	9.7%	30.1%	17.9%
Not effective (1-2)	42.0%	9.7%	13.9%	34.3%	28.6%
Not sure				100.0%	.4%
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY IN YOUR LOCAL PAPER:					
Effective (4-5)	47.6%	8.2%	11.0%	33.2%	62.1%
3	44.9%	2.4%	17.3%	35.4%	20.4%
Not effective (1-2)	31.3%	9.5%	12.7%	46.4%	17.5%
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON YOUR LOCAL RADIO NEWS:					
Effective (4-5)	47.6%	4.6%	10.1%	37.6%	66.2%
3	41.8%	15.1%	22.2%	20.8%	14.8%
Not effective (1-2)	34.3%	10.4%	13.5%	41.8%	19.0%
Total	44.2%	7.3%	12.6%	35.9%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	
EFFECTIVENESS OF LOCAL PUBLIC MEETINGS:					
Effective (4-5)	52.3%	4.6%	13.9%	29.2%	37.1%
3	48.2%	2.9%	15.0%	33.9%	24.1%
Not effective (1-2)	34.1%	12.6%	9.8%	43.5%	38.8%
Not sure				100.0%	.1%
EFFECTIVENESS OF WORD OF MOUTH FROM FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS:					
Effective (4-5)	42.4%	6.0%	13.3%	38.4%	34.4%
3	44.4%	6.2%	13.4%	36.1%	27.6%
Not effective (1-2)	45.8%	9.2%	11.3%	33.6%	37.9%
EFFECTIVENESS OF INFORMATION ON THE INTERNET:					
Effective (4-5)	48.8%	6.9%	10.8%	33.6%	45.4%
3	45.0%	6.9%	14.2%	33.9%	21.8%
Not effective (1-2)	37.9%	8.2%	12.8%	41.1%	32.4%
Not sure			100.0%		.5%
EFFECTIVENESS OF RADIO ADS:					
Effective (4-5)	48.2%	4.5%	12.0%	35.3%	41.1%
3	41.0%	12.9%	11.0%	35.2%	25.4%
Not effective (1-2)	41.9%	6.4%	14.6%	37.1%	33.3%
Not sure	35.2%			64.8%	.2%
EFFECTIVENESS OF E-MAIL:					
Effective (4-5)	53.2%	8.8%	7.1%	30.8%	36.6%
3	47.1%	1.2%	18.3%	33.5%	22.3%
Not effective (1-2)	35.0%	9.3%	13.3%	42.4%	40.6%
Not sure	10.9%		89.1%		.5%
NUMBER OF TIMES IN THE LAST YEAR YOU READ THE OBSERVER:					
None	39.5%	5.4%	11.9%	43.2%	77.9%
Once or more	62.3%	14.1%	12.9%	10.7%	22.1%
NUMBER OF WEBSITE VISITS LAST SIX MONTHS:					
None	43.4%	7.0%	11.8%	37.8%	93.4%
Once or more	61.2%	10.3%	17.6%	10.9%	6.5%
Not sure		100.0%			.1%
NUMBER OF RADIO ADS HEARD LAST 30 DAYS:					
None	33.4%	7.9%	13.9%	44.8%	66.8%
Once or more	67.2%	6.0%	8.5%	18.3%	32.7%
Not sure	59.5%		19.7%	20.8%	.5%
ENVIRONMENTAL-DEVELOPMENTAL SCALE:					
Environmental (1-3)	44.5%	3.2%	18.8%	33.4%	38.0%
4	49.7%	2.1%	11.8%	36.4%	22.4%
Developmentalist (5-7)	40.4%	14.2%	7.2%	38.2%	39.7%
Total	44.1%	7.3%	12.6%	36.0%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	
FIRST CHOICE RADIO STATION:					
Don't listen	18.3%	10.8%	14.1%	56.9%	10.7%
KCDV	58.5%	12.5%	17.9%	11.1%	.8%
KLAM	64.7%	10.9%	11.1%	13.4%	1.9%
KBBI	71.9%		17.4%	10.7%	7.8%
KGTL			51.0%	49.0%	2.0%
KMJG	50.0%			50.0%	1.0%
KWVV	50.1%	16.7%		33.3%	3.1%
KDLL	100.0%				1.6%
KWHQ	36.6%			63.4%	1.4%
KMXT	73.6%	3.6%		22.8%	5.8%
KRXX	30.5%		9.1%	60.4%	3.5%
KVOK	53.1%	8.6%	23.6%	14.7%	3.6%
KPFN	44.9%			55.1%	.9%
KKIS	68.5%			31.5%	4.3%
KPEN	19.0%		23.1%	57.9%	2.3%
KSLD	77.9%	22.1%			1.9%
KSRM	34.8%	7.9%	9.9%	47.4%	18.1%
KCHU	76.8%	9.4%	8.4%	5.4%	1.8%
KVAK	56.8%	4.9%	7.5%	30.8%	6.8%
KAFC	44.5%	50.6%		4.9%	1.0%
KASH				100.0%	.4%
KATB				100.0%	.5%
KBFX			100.0%		.1%
KBRJ				100.0%	.1%
KDBZ				100.0%	.5%
KEAG/ KOOL				100.0%	.4%
KENI	20.7%	41.3%	19.0%	19.0%	2.5%
KFQD	25.3%	18.4%		56.3%	2.4%
KGOT				100.0%	.8%
KLEF	100.0%				.4%
KLOV			100.0%		.3%
KMXS	100.0%				.1%
KNBA				100.0%	.4%
KQEZ	100.0%				.4%
KRPM				100.0%	.5%
KRUA			89.0%	11.0%	.6%
KSKA/KAKM	54.1%	14.2%	30.1%	1.5%	3.2%
KWHL			100.0%		.4%
KYMG			100.0%		.5%
XM RADIO	100.0%				.6%
KXBA				100.0%	.5%
KWMD	100.0%				.9%
KNLS				100.0%	.4%
KXKM	100.0%				.0%
Not sure	41.6%		31.4%	27.0%	2.7%
Total	44.3%	7.3%	12.5%	35.9%	100.0%

	PWSRCAC'S RATING:				Total
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Who?	Col %
	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN GOVERNMENT?					
Yes	52.0%	3.9%	9.4%	34.7%	21.6%
No	42.2%	8.2%	13.4%	36.3%	78.4%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN OIL AND GAS?					
Yes	44.5%	6.7%	12.3%	36.5%	17.0%
No	44.3%	7.4%	12.6%	35.8%	83.0%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN TOURISM?					
Yes	44.1%	8.2%	5.2%	42.5%	10.6%
No	44.3%	7.2%	13.4%	35.1%	89.4%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN FISHING?					
Yes	61.3%	5.2%	11.6%	21.9%	20.0%
No	40.1%	7.8%	12.7%	39.4%	80.0%
LENGTH OF RESIDENCY IN COMMUNITY:					
Less than 8 years	26.8%	4.5%	17.8%	50.9%	28.5%
8-20 years	54.7%	7.6%	8.1%	29.6%	30.0%
20 years or more	48.5%	9.0%	12.2%	30.4%	41.5%
AGE OF RESPONDENT:					
18-36	42.4%	3.1%	7.5%	47.0%	23.3%
37-47	49.9%	4.8%	22.1%	23.2%	22.1%
48+	44.2%	10.3%	11.2%	34.3%	54.6%
MARITAL STATUS:					
Married	45.5%	8.4%	11.8%	34.3%	67.9%
Single	41.5%	4.7%	13.8%	40.1%	32.1%
GENDER OF RESPONDENT:					
Male	52.5%	9.6%	11.3%	26.7%	50.0%
Female	35.9%	4.8%	13.7%	45.6%	50.0%
MARITAL STATUS BY GENDER:					
Married males	57.6%	11.4%	10.4%	20.7%	34.0%
Married females	33.3%	5.4%	13.3%	48.0%	34.0%
Single males	41.5%	5.8%	13.1%	39.6%	16.0%
Single females	41.4%	3.6%	14.4%	40.6%	16.1%
AREAS OF ALASKA:					
Kodiak	52.2%	4.1%	10.2%	33.5%	17.6%
Kenai	39.8%	7.6%	12.9%	39.7%	73.4%
PWS	63.9%	10.0%	13.6%	12.4%	9.0%
Total	44.2%	7.2%	12.5%	36.1%	100.0%

	SAMPLE YEAR:	
	2005	2006
	Col %	Col %
AREAS OF ALASKA:		
Kodiak	17.6%	17.6%
Kenai	73.4%	73.4%
PWS	9.0%	9.0%
OIL INDUSTRY'S RATING:		
Positive	60.3%	64.3%
Negative	30.1%	23.5%
Neutral	9.6%	12.2%
ALYESKA PIPELINE COMPANY'S RATING:		
Positive	63.0%	62.4%
Negative	16.8%	17.2%
Neutral	14.7%	13.5%
Who?	5.5%	6.9%
PWSRCAC'S RATING:		
Positive	40.0%	44.2%
Negative	4.5%	7.2%
Neutral	13.8%	12.5%
Who?	41.7%	36.1%
U.S. COAST GUARD'S RATING:		
Positive	96.9%	97.5%
Negative	1.3%	.7%
Neutral	1.8%	1.8%
Who?	.1%	
SPILL ESCORT RESPONSE VESSEL SERVICE'S RATING:		
Positive	49.7%	65.5%
Negative	4.4%	4.1%
Neutral	7.3%	6.1%
Who?	38.6%	24.3%
STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION'S RATING:		
Positive	59.9%	56.0%
Negative	18.9%	24.8%
Neutral	13.8%	13.4%
Who?	7.4%	5.8%
CONCERN ABOUT OIL TRANSPORTATION:		
Very concerned	33.3%	29.4%
Somewhat concerned	35.9%	37.9%
Not at all concerned	29.9%	32.1%
Not sure	.9%	.6%
LIKELINESS OF LARGE OIL SPILL TODAY:		
More likely	3.8%	3.4%
Less likely	61.9%	60.4%
No difference	33.4%	35.5%
Not sure	1.0%	.6%
Total	50.3%	49.7%

	SAMPLE YEAR:	
	2005	2006
	Col %	Col %
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT:		
A/B	49.3%	48.9%
C	29.5%	32.4%
D/F	13.9%	16.5%
Not sure	7.3%	2.2%
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR BEING PREPARED TO CLEAN UP A SIMILAR SPILL:		
A/B	48.0%	52.5%
C	20.6%	27.1%
D/F	22.6%	18.4%
Not sure	8.8%	2.1%
ESTABLISHMENT OF RCAC A GOOD THING OR BAD THING?		
Good thing	82.7%	84.4%
Bad thing	2.7%	6.6%
Not sure	14.6%	9.0%
RCAC GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT:		
A/B	47.5%	52.5%
C	16.8%	21.1%
D/F	4.8%	9.0%
Not sure	30.9%	17.5%
IMPORTANCE OF CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN OIL TRANSPORTATION/SPILL PREVENTION:		
Important (4-5)	71.3%	75.2%
3	18.6%	16.5%
Not important (1-2)	9.8%	8.3%
Not sure	.3%	.0%
IMPORTANCE OF USING DOUBLE-HULLED TANKERS IN PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND:		
Important (4-5)	87.2%	89.4%
3	7.9%	6.0%
Not important (1-2)	2.0%	2.3%
Not sure	2.9%	2.3%
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING TECHNOLOGY TO HELP OIL TANKERS AVOID ICEBERGS:		
Important (4-5)	91.8%	93.7%
3	4.4%	2.6%
Not important (1-2)	2.4%	2.1%
Not sure	1.4%	1.6%
IMPORTANCE OF REQUIRING ESCORT BY TWO RESCUE TUGS:		
Important (4-5)	67.8%	70.4%
3	19.7%	16.6%
Not important (1-2)	9.8%	11.0%
Not sure	2.8%	2.0%
Total	50.3%	49.7%

	SAMPLE YEAR:	
	2005	2006
	Col %	Col %
IMPORTANCE OF STOCKPILING OIL SPILL CONTAINMENT SUPPLIES:		
Important (4-5)	86.3%	86.5%
3	9.3%	9.6%
Not important (1-2)	3.8%	2.9%
Not sure	.6%	1.0%
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING NEW TECHNOLOGY FOR REMOVING OIL:		
Important (4-5)	88.7%	87.4%
3	6.2%	9.3%
Not important (1-2)	4.5%	2.1%
Not sure	.6%	1.2%
IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING LOCAL RESIDENTS TO CLEAN UP OIL SPILLS:		
Important (4-5)	72.6%	77.9%
3	16.3%	15.2%
Not important (1-2)	10.2%	6.9%
Not sure	.9%	
IMPORTANCE OF USING FISHING VESSELS TO CLEAN UP OIL:		
Important (4-5)	73.7%	74.0%
3	15.5%	15.3%
Not important (1-2)	9.1%	9.2%
Not sure	1.7%	1.5%
IMPORTANCE OF PREPARING DETAILED PROTECTION PLANS:		
Important (4-5)	92.2%	90.0%
3	5.0%	7.5%
Not important (1-2)	2.7%	1.9%
Not sure	.2%	.5%
IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING A FLEET OF 10 TUGS:		
Important (4-5)	59.0%	59.4%
3	21.2%	19.1%
Not important (1-2)	12.0%	15.7%
Not sure	7.8%	5.7%
RCAC MONITORS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AT VALDEZ TERMINAL:		
True	74.5%	65.9%
False	19.7%	19.4%
Not sure	5.8%	14.7%
RCAC CONDUCTS ONGOING CLEAN-UP OPERATIONS:		
True	44.0%	35.9%
False	49.4%	47.5%
Not sure	6.7%	16.6%
RCAC WORKS TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION AT VALDEZ:		
True	47.5%	41.5%
False	45.3%	41.1%
Not sure	7.2%	17.4%
Total	50.6%	49.4%

	SAMPLE YEAR:	
	2005	2006
	Col %	Col %
RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY ALYESKA PIPELINE:		
True	37.2%	34.9%
False	53.9%	46.8%
Not sure	8.9%	18.3%
RCAC PRODUCES A COMMUNITY DISASTER GUIDEBOOK:		
True	66.4%	68.5%
False	25.1%	13.8%
Not sure	8.5%	17.7%
RCAC MONITORS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ALONG PIPELINE:		
True	47.8%	42.8%
False	46.0%	43.9%
Not sure	6.2%	13.3%
RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY THE STATE OF ALASKA:		
True	36.4%	32.5%
False	56.8%	48.6%
Not sure	6.8%	18.9%
RCAC CONDUCTS MARINE FIRE RESPONSE TRAINING:		
True	41.1%	36.4%
False	49.9%	46.8%
Not sure	9.0%	16.8%
RCAC MONITORS OIL INDUSTRY OPERATIONS ON NORTH SLOPE:		
True	36.5%	36.5%
False	56.0%	48.1%
Not sure	7.4%	15.4%
RCAC CONDUCTS BALLAST WATER RESEARCH:		
True	59.4%	55.8%
False	32.5%	29.1%
Not sure	8.0%	15.1%
RCAC RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEAN UP SHOULD ANOTHER SPILL OCCUR:		
True	43.4%	36.3%
False	50.8%	51.2%
Not sure	5.8%	12.5%
RCAC IS MOSTLY FUNDED BY ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS:		
True	35.0%	32.5%
False	57.8%	50.1%
Not sure	7.2%	17.4%
KNOWLEDGE SCORE:		
<0	24.9%	21.5%
Zero	21.8%	23.7%
1-4	31.4%	33.9%
5-12	21.9%	20.8%
Total	50.3%	49.7%

	SAMPLE YEAR:	
	2005	2006
	Col %	Col %
IMPORTANCE OF SCIENTIFIC DATA PROJECT:		
Absolutely vital	20.8%	26.5%
Very important	45.9%	39.6%
Somewhat important	26.8%	26.9%
Not very important	4.2%	2.3%
Not at all important	2.1%	2.7%
Not sure	.1%	2.1%
BELIEVABILITY OF THE OIL INDUSTRY:		
Believable (4-5)	31.9%	32.7%
3	34.9%	30.2%
Not believable (1-2)	32.7%	36.4%
Not sure	.6%	.6%
BELIEVABILITY OF PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND RCAC:		
Believable (4-5)	66.5%	73.6%
3	22.6%	16.2%
Not believable (1-2)	7.3%	5.7%
Not sure	3.7%	4.5%
BELIEVABILITY OF U.S. COAST GUARD:		
Believable (4-5)	88.5%	91.7%
3	10.5%	6.3%
Not believable (1-2)	.9%	1.8%
Not sure	.1%	.1%
BELIEVABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION:		
Believable (4-5)	60.4%	63.7%
3	26.9%	23.1%
Not believable (1-2)	12.0%	12.8%
Not sure	.7%	.5%
BELIEVABILITY OF NEWS MEDIA:		
Believable (4-5)	29.1%	28.3%
3	33.9%	35.7%
Not believable (1-2)	37.0%	36.1%
Not sure	.1%	
OPINION ON CHEMICAL DISPERSANTS:		
Dispersants should be used	14.1%	13.9%
Dispersants should not be used	6.6%	10.1%
More research needed	35.5%	41.9%
Don't know enough	43.4%	34.0%
Not sure	.3%	.1%
Total	50.2%	49.8%

	SAMPLE YEAR:	
	2005	2006
	Col %	Col %
CONCERN ABOUT CRUDE OIL SPILLS LIKE THE EXXON VALDEZ:		
Concerned (4-5)	70.4%	67.9%
3	18.4%	16.4%
Not concerned (1-2)	11.3%	14.8%
Not sure		.9%
CONCERN ABOUT SPILLS OF NON-CRUDE OIL:		
Concerned (4-5)	69.0%	65.6%
3	22.4%	20.8%
Not concerned (1-2)	8.5%	12.4%
Not sure	.1%	1.2%
CONCERN ABOUT MINOR BUT CONTINUOUS OIL POLLUTION:		
Concerned (4-5)	60.6%	55.8%
3	25.8%	27.8%
Not concerned (1-2)	12.8%	15.4%
Not sure	.8%	1.0%
CONCERN ABOUT INVASION ON ALASKA WATERS BY HARMFUL PLANTS OR ANIMALS:		
Concerned (4-5)	65.7%	66.5%
3	21.4%	18.6%
Not concerned (1-2)	12.3%	12.8%
Not sure	.7%	2.1%
CONCERN ABOUT RELEASE OF AIR POLLUTION AT THE VALDEZ TANKER TERMINAL:		
Concerned (4-5)	44.9%	52.0%
3	31.1%	20.6%
Not concerned (1-2)	21.2%	23.3%
Not sure	2.8%	4.1%
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON THE TELEVISION NEWS:		
Effective (4-5)	55.5%	53.1%
3	19.7%	17.9%
Not effective (1-2)	24.8%	28.6%
Not sure		.4%
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY IN YOUR LOCAL PAPER:		
Effective (4-5)	62.4%	62.1%
3	23.1%	20.4%
Not effective (1-2)	14.5%	17.5%
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON YOUR LOCAL RADIO NEWS:		
Effective (4-5)	59.6%	66.2%
3	20.9%	14.8%
Not effective (1-2)	19.5%	19.0%
Total	50.2%	49.8%

	SAMPLE YEAR:	
	2005	2006
	Col %	Col %
EFFECTIVENESS OF LOCAL PUBLIC MEETINGS:		
Effective (4-5)	39.6%	37.1%
3	25.0%	24.1%
Not effective (1-2)	34.8%	38.8%
Not sure	.5%	.1%
EFFECTIVENESS OF WORD OF MOUTH FROM FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS:		
Effective (4-5)	37.0%	34.4%
3	27.4%	27.6%
Not effective (1-2)	35.5%	37.9%
Not sure	.1%	
EFFECTIVENESS OF INFORMATION ON THE INTERNET:		
Effective (4-5)	32.7%	45.4%
3	21.4%	21.8%
Not effective (1-2)	44.7%	32.4%
Not sure	1.3%	.5%
EFFECTIVENESS OF RADIO ADS:		
Effective (4-5)	45.2%	41.1%
3	24.3%	25.4%
Not effective (1-2)	30.4%	33.3%
Not sure	.1%	.2%
EFFECTIVENESS OF E-MAIL:		
Effective (4-5)	34.6%	36.6%
3	14.5%	22.3%
Not effective (1-2)	50.0%	40.6%
Not sure	.9%	.5%
NUMBER OF TIMES IN THE LAST YEAR YOU READ THE OBSERVER:		
None	75.0%	77.9%
Once or more	25.0%	22.1%
NUMBER OF WEBSITE VISITS LAST SIX MONTHS:		
None	93.0%	93.4%
Once or more	7.0%	6.5%
Not sure		.1%
ENVIRONMENTAL-DEVELOPMENTAL SCALE:		
Environmental (1-3)	34.9%	38.0%
4	18.1%	22.4%
Developmentalist (5-7)	46.1%	39.7%
Not sure	.9%	
Total	50.4%	49.6%

	SAMPLE YEAR:	
	2005	2006
	Col %	Col %
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN GOVERNMENT?		
Yes	27.7%	21.6%
No	72.3%	78.4%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN OIL AND GAS?		
Yes	15.3%	17.0%
No	84.7%	83.0%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN TOURISM?		
Yes	11.1%	10.6%
No	88.9%	89.4%
ANYONE IN HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYED IN FISHING?		
Yes	21.0%	20.0%
No	79.0%	80.0%
LENGTH OF RESIDENCY IN COMMUNITY:		
Less than 8 years	30.1%	28.5%
8-20 years	35.2%	30.0%
20 years or more	34.7%	41.5%
AGE OF RESPONDENT:		
18-36	21.6%	23.3%
37-47	25.1%	22.1%
48+	53.3%	54.6%
MARITAL STATUS:		
Married	66.1%	67.9%
Single	33.9%	32.1%
GENDER OF RESPONDENT:		
Male	50.0%	50.0%
Female	50.0%	50.0%
MARITAL STATUS BY GENDER:		
Married males	33.1%	34.0%
Married females	33.1%	34.0%
Single males	16.9%	16.0%
Single females	16.9%	16.1%
Total	50.3%	49.7%

	SAMPLE YEAR:	
	2005	2006
	Mean	Mean
OIL INDUSTRY'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	2.42	2.60
ALYESKA PIPELINE COMPANY'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	2.65	2.65
PWSRCAC'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	2.85	2.81
U.S. COAST GUARD'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	3.74	3.79
SPILL ESCORT RESPONSE VESSEL SERVICE'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	3.11	3.29
STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION'S RATING - MEAN (0-4):	2.54	2.52
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT - MEAN (0-4):	2.50	2.42
OIL INDUSTRY GRADE FOR BEING PREPARED TO CLEAN UP A SIMILAR SPILL - MEAN (0-4):	2.34	2.43
RCAC GRADE FOR WORKING TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENT - MEAN (0-4):	2.85	2.76
IMPORTANCE OF CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN OIL TRANSPORTATION/SPILL PREVENTION - MEAN (1-5):	4.10	4.19
IMPORTANCE OF USING DOUBLE-HULLED TANKERS IN PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND - MEAN (1-5):	4.64	4.72
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING TECHNOLOGY TO HELP OIL TANKERS AVOID ICE BERGS - MEAN (1-5):	4.69	4.76
IMPORTANCE OF REQUIRING ESCORT BY TWO RESCUE TUGS - MEAN (1-5):	4.04	4.09
IMPORTANCE OF STOCKPILING OIL SPILL CONTAINMENT SUPPLIES - MEAN (1-5):	4.51	4.54
IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING NEW TECHNOLOGY FOR REMOVING OIL - MEAN (1-5):	4.57	4.61
IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING LOCAL RESIDENTS TO CLEAN UP OIL SPILLS - MEAN (1-5):	4.08	4.31
IMPORTANCE OF USING FISHING VESSELS TO CLEAN UP OIL - MEAN (1-5):	4.04	4.14
IMPORTANCE OF PREPARING DETAILED PROTECTION PLANS - MEAN (1-5):	4.65	4.62
IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING A FLEET OF 10 TUGS - MEAN (1-5):	3.84	3.81

	SAMPLE YEAR:	
	2005	2006
	Mean	Mean
BELIEVABILITY OF THE OIL INDUSTRY - MEAN (1-5):	2.91	2.88
BELIEVABILITY OF PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND RCAC - MEAN (1-5):	3.94	4.06
BELIEVABILITY OF U.S. COAST GUARD - MEAN (1-5):	4.44	4.56
BELIEVABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION - MEAN (1-5):	3.68	3.71
BELIEVABILITY OF NEWS MEDIA - MEAN (1-5):	2.79	2.87
CONCERN ABOUT CRUDE OIL SPILLS LIKE THE EXXON VALDEZ - MEAN (1-5):	4.12	3.97
CONCERN ABOUT SPILLS OF NON-CRUDE OIL - MEAN (1-5):	3.97	3.86
CONCERN ABOUT MINOR BUT CONTINUOUS OIL POLLUTION - MEAN (1-5):	3.76	3.68
CONCERN ABOUT INVASION ON ALASKA WATERS BY HARMFUL PLANTS OR ANIMALS - MEAN (1-5):	3.88	3.91
CONCERN ABOUT RELEASE OF AIR POLLUTION AT THE VALDEZ TANKER TERMINAL - MEAN (1-5):	3.38	3.44
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON THE TELEVISION NEWS - MEAN (1-5):	3.48	3.43
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY IN YOUR LOCAL PAPER - MEAN (1-5):	3.75	3.68
EFFECTIVENESS OF A STORY ON YOUR LOCAL RADIO NEWS - MEAN (1-5):	3.66	3.78
EFFECTIVENESS OF LOCAL PUBLIC MEETINGS - MEAN (1-5):	3.06	2.94
EFFECTIVENESS OF WORD OF MOUTH FROM FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS - MEAN (1-5):	3.03	2.95
EFFECTIVENESS OF INFORMATION ON THE INTERNET - MEAN (1-5):	2.73	3.14
EFFECTIVENESS OF RADIO ADS - MEAN (1-5):	3.15	3.11
EFFECTIVENESS OF E-MAIL - MEAN (1-5):	2.67	2.91

	SAMPLE YEAR:	
	2005	2006
	Mean	Mean
NUMBER OF TIMES IN THE LAST YEAR YOU READ THE OBSERVER - MEAN:	.49	.38
NUMBER OF WEBSITE VISITS LAST SIX MONTHS - MEAN:	.16	.16
ENVIRONMENTAL-DEVELOPMENTAL SCALE - MEAN:	4.20	4.03
LENGTH OF RESIDENCY IN COMMUNITY - MEAN:	17.71	19.02
MEAN AGE OF RESPONDENT:	47.79	48.62
TRUE-FALSE KNOWLEDGE SCORE:	1.73	1.74