

# 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 2007 survey of 37.8% positive, 5.6% negative, 19.7% neutral, 36.9% who?. These positive and negative numbers combine the "very" and "somewhat" categories in the table below.

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very positive	11.5%	18.7%	15.7%	18.0%	15.9%
Somewhat positive	26.5%	19.9%	24.2%	26.2%	21.9%
Neutral	14.8%	16.0%	13.8%	12.5%	19.7%
Somewhat negative	3.2%	2.1%	3.0%	4.0%	3.4%
Very negative	1.6%	0.8%	1.5%	3.2%	2.2%
Who?	42.3%	42.5%	41.7%	36.1%	36.9%
<b>MEAN</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>2.73</b>

The positive rating had climbed in recent years, up over 40% last year for the first time, but has relapsed back to just under 38% this year. However, the negative sits at 5.6%, which is also down from last year. What we see is a significant rise in the neutrals this year to 19.7%, a five-year high. Importantly, the Who? rating remains consistent.

Admittedly, this is not a great result for this year, but does not give us reason for panic. Things to consider:

- 1) It is not positive to negative movement, but a movement of both positive and negative to neutral
- 2) Much of the change could quite easily happen just through random error, and is not necessarily all "real" change
- 3) Much of the drop in the positive and rise in the neutral occurs in Kenai... and while it might partly be due to random fluctuation, it makes sense for us to take note of this and move advertising dollars more into this region next year

Kenai represents the great majority of our survey sample each year, and ultimately if overall numbers are to change significantly in a positive direction, we need to focus on this population. A look at the regional comparisons on the next page illustrate this.

## Regional comparisons

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

KENAI PENINSULA	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Positive	37.4%	33.2%	36.6%	39.8%	31.7%
Negative	4.9%	2.9%	4.1%	7.6%	7.1%
Neutral	20.0%	17.2%	14.2%	12.9%	20.5%
Who?	37.8%	46.7%	45.1%	39.7%	40.8%
<b>MEAN</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.57</b>

Here's where the problem lies, with the positive down over 8 points since last year. Kenai forms the dominant part of the sample too, representing over 70% of the area so any change in this area has a great impact on the overall results.

PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Positive	61.9%	69.0%	56.5%	63.9%	69.4%
Negative	7.4%	5.7%	7.5%	10.0%	3.9%
Neutral	12.7%	8.3%	14.9%	13.6%	15.9%
Who?	18.0%	17.0%	21.1%	12.4%	10.8%
<b>MEAN</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>3.07</b>

Prince William Sound, shows the best result in any of our surveys... the highest positive, the lowest negative and the lowest Who?

KODIAK	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Positive	25.4%	46.1%	45.6%	52.2%	47.0%
Negative	2.3%	1.2%	4.4%	4.1%	0.6%
Neutral	21.5%	14.7%	11.9%	10.2%	18.1%
Who?	50.8%	37.9%	38.2%	33.5%	34.2%
<b>MEAN</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>3.03</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>3.06</b>

And nice results in Kodiak too. Positive not as high as last year, but higher than all other years... negative almost non-existent... Who? as low as last year, maintaining the recent decline, and the mean at a five-year high. Kenai is our problem this year.

## Result comparisons 2003-2007:

### Oil industry's rating:

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Positive	75.1%	70.7%	60.3%	64.3%	63.5%
Negative	11.0%	19.2%	30.1%	23.5%	27.0%
Neutral	13.9%	10.1%	9.6%	12.2%	9.5%
<b>MEAN SCORE (0-4)</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>2.42</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>2.49</b>

We saw steep decline in the oil industry's numbers between 2003 and 2005, saw a recovery of sorts last year, but this year is back down again. The numbers are not as bad as the low point of 2005, but they're not far off.

### 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	2007
More likely	3.5%	1.9%	3.8%	3.4%	2.0%
Less likely	67.8%	58.4%	61.9%	60.4%	58.9%
No difference/Not sure	27.9%	39.0%	34.4%	36.1%	39.0%

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	2007
Very concerned	28.3%	34.6%	33.3%	29.4%	32.5%
Somewhat concerned	42.5%	37.1%	35.9%	37.9%	35.8%
Not at all concerned	29.2%	28.3%	29.9%	32.1%	31.7%

Really very little significant change in this result. The "not at all concerned" percent had climbed above 30% for the first time last year, and has stayed there.

## 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	2007
A	19.5%	18.2%	14.2%	13.0%	16.4%
B	42.3%	33.9%	35.1%	35.9%	35.4%
C	26.1%	32.2%	29.5%	32.4%	29.7%
D	6.4%	9.8%	11.0%	12.5%	8.7%
F	2.3%	3.5%	2.9%	4.0%	5.9%
Not sure	3.4%	2.5%	7.3%	2.2%	3.9%
<b>MEAN SCORE (0-4)</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.42</b>	<b>2.50</b>

This variable has halted its decline for the first time. The D's and F's total had run 8.7%, 13.3%, 13.9% and 16.5% between 2003 and 2006, but has dropped back down to 14.6% this year. However, the F's percent has continued to climb.

## 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	2007
A	21.9%	18.6%	13.3%	16.0%	15.3%
B	37.0%	29.4%	34.7%	36.5%	35.6%
C	22.0%	28.3%	20.6%	27.1%	25.8%
D	8.0%	12.5%	14.8%	10.2%	11.1%
F	5.0%	4.7%	7.7%	8.2%	7.7%
Not sure	6.2%	6.4%	8.8%	2.1%	4.5%
<b>MEAN SCORE (0-4)</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>2.34</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>2.42</b>

This result is treading water compared with last year's result. Not as bad as it was back in 2005, though.

## 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	2007
A	11.1%	19.6%	17.3%	20.1%	17.4%
B	31.8%	29.2%	30.2%	32.3%	35.0%
C	14.4%	15.0%	16.8%	21.1%	22.4%
D	3.1%	3.3%	3.5%	7.8%	3.6%
F	0.4%	0.7%	1.3%	1.2%	1.0%
Not sure	39.3%	32.1%	30.9%	17.5%	20.6%
<b>MEAN SCORE (0-4)</b>	<b>2.82</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>2.81</b>

A's and B's exactly the same this year as last. However, our burgeoning D's and F's from last year is back down to the levels of prior years.

## 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	2007
Environmental (1-3)	26.3%	27.1%	34.9%	38.0%	36.1%
Equal (4)	31.5%	31.5%	18.1%	22.4%	24.0%
Developmental (5-7)	41.2%	39.3%	46.2%	39.7%	39.9%
<b>MEAN SCORE (1-7)</b>	<b>4.29</b>	<b>4.21</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>4.05</b>	<b>4.08</b>

This is a fascinating result. Over the years, the population has changed from one which was overwhelmingly "developmental" in its outlook. Over the years the gap between the 1-3's and the 5-7's has closed to the point now where it is in parity. However, the movement has stopped, with this year's results quite similar to last year.

## 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	2007
Good thing	79.3%	79.2%	82.7%	84.4%	85.0%
Bad thing	3.8%	2.5%	2.7%	6.6%	4.2%
Don't know	16.9%	18.3%	14.6%	9.0%	10.7%

Nice result... the change is not big, but the “good thing” percent is up to a five-year high.

## What used to be the importance series

In prior years, we had asked respondents to rate the importance of the following nine items. This year we changed the question to ask whether people thought the things were being done...

**Q: I am now going to read you a list of things that may be effective in preventing and dealing with oil spills in waterways near where you live. I'd like you to tell me to the best of your knowledge if you think these things are currently being done, yes or no. Be careful, some of these things may be happening, some may not.**

	Yes	No
Using radar technology to help oil tankers avoid icebergs	85.0%	7.0%
Stockpiling oil spill containment and oil removal supplies in communities that might be hit by spilled oil	75.7%	16.6%
Developing new technology for removing oil	73.9%	18.0%
Preparing detailed protection plans in advance for local sensitive areas like clamming beaches and salmon streams	72.1%	18.3%
Hiring, training and equipping commercial fishing vessels to clean up oil spills	65.1%	26.8%
Keeping citizens involved in decisions about oil transportation and oil spill prevention	63.6%	31.8%
Using only double hulled oil tankers	62.9%	25.5%
Training local residents to clean up oil spills	60.4%	33.4%
Requiring that every loaded oil tanker crossing Prince William Sound be escorted by two rescue tugs	58.4%	28.3%
Maintaining a fleet of at least 10 tugs in Prince William Sound for cleaning up oil spills	44.3%	32.6%

Interesting results. Ranging from almost universal knowledge that radar technology is used, down to a minority knowledge that a fleet of tugs is maintained to deal with potential spills.

## 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	2007
The RCAC produces a community Disaster Guidebook with coping strategies for social problems created by a large technical disaster like an oil spill:					
True	<b>62.0%</b>	<b>60.7%</b>	<b>66.4%</b>	<b>68.5%</b>	<b>67.4%</b>
False	18.2%	17.5%	25.1%	13.8%	23.9%
Not sure	19.8%	21.8%	8.5%	17.7%	8.7%
The RCAC conducts research into harmful aquatic species transported in the ballast water of tankers:					
True	<b>52.0%</b>	<b>58.6%</b>	<b>59.4%</b>	<b>55.8%</b>	<b>55.2%</b>
False	29.1%	22.6%	32.5%	29.1%	33.3%
Not sure	18.9%	18.8%	8.0%	15.1%	11.5%
The RCAC monitors and detects environmental impacts from day to day operations of oil tankers and the Valdez Marine Terminal:					
True	<b>61.7%</b>	<b>64.9%</b>	<b>74.5%</b>	<b>65.9%</b>	<b>72.7%</b>
False	19.6%	15.5%	19.7%	19.4%	18.8%
Not sure	18.7%	19.5%	5.8%	14.7%	8.4%
The RCAC is mostly funded by Alyeska Pipeline:					
True	<b>47.9%</b>	<b>38.1%</b>	<b>37.2%</b>	<b>34.9%</b>	<b>37.6%</b>
False	31.8%	38.0%	53.9%	46.8%	51.1%
Not sure	20.3%	23.9%	8.9%	18.3%	11.3%
The RCAC works to reduce air pollution caused by oil tankers and the Valdez Marine Terminal:					
True	<b>47.2%</b>	<b>43.6%</b>	<b>47.5%</b>	<b>41.5%</b>	<b>39.4%</b>
False	34.4%	37.2%	45.3%	41.1%	48.7%
Not sure	18.4%	19.2%	7.2%	17.4%	11.9%

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
The RCAC conducts Marine Fire Response training for Local communities and fire departments:					
True	<b>39.9%</b>	<b>35.7%</b>	<b>41.1%</b>	<b>36.4%</b>	<b>44.5%</b>
False	41.1%	41.8%	49.9%	46.8%	44.5%
Not sure	19.0%	22.5%	9.0%	16.8%	11.1%

### False statements

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
The RCAC is mostly funded by the State of Alaska:					
True	23.7%	34.5%	36.4%	32.5%	38.5%
False	<b>54.7%</b>	<b>46.9%</b>	<b>56.8%</b>	<b>48.6%</b>	<b>51.2%</b>
Not sure	21.5%	18.6%	6.8%	18.9%	10.3%
The RCAC is mostly funded by environmental groups:					
True	21.1%	29.3%	35.0%	32.5%	32.0%
False	<b>60.0%</b>	<b>52.2%</b>	<b>57.8%</b>	<b>50.1%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>
Not sure	18.9%	18.5%	7.2%	17.4%	10.5%
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%	43.2%
False	<b>43.1%</b>	<b>49.4%</b>	<b>50.8%</b>	<b>51.2%</b>	<b>50.0%</b>
Not sure	19.3%	15.4%	5.8%	12.5%	6.9%
The RCAC conducts on-going clean up operations from the Exxon Valdez oil spill:					
True	31.6%	41.2%	44.0%	35.9%	47.5%
False	<b>50.1%</b>	<b>39.9%</b>	<b>49.4%</b>	<b>47.5%</b>	<b>44.3%</b>
Not sure	18.3%	19.0%	6.7%	16.6%	8.2%
The RCAC monitors oil industry operations on the North Slope of Alaska:					
True	35.9%	38.4%	36.5%	36.5%	38.3%
False	<b>44.9%</b>	<b>41.0%</b>	<b>56.0%</b>	<b>48.1%</b>	<b>52.3%</b>
Not sure	19.1%	20.6%	7.4%	15.4%	9.4%
The RCAC monitors environmental impacts along the 800 miles of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline:					
True	49.2%	48.3%	47.8%	42.8%	46.1%
False	<b>32.1%</b>	<b>34.1%</b>	<b>46.0%</b>	<b>43.9%</b>	<b>43.1%</b>
Not sure	18.6%	17.6%	6.2%	13.3%	10.8%

The following notable results look at the change in this difference between true and false over the five 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%  
2007 – False +13.5%

The solid false result is maintained 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%  
2007 – False +9.3%

This has been a profound turnaround... from solid majority true back in 2003, to now a solid false result.

**“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%  
2007 – True + 3.0%

There had been a steady trend moving away from a solid true perception, but this year's results ends the trend.

## Knowledge score out of 12:

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
<0	16.6%	23.4%	24.9%	21.5%	26.7%
Zero	31.6%	24.1%	21.8%	23.7%	23.8%
1-4	26.4%	31.1%	31.4%	33.9%	30.4%
5-12	25.4%	21.3%	21.9%	20.8%	19.2%
MEAN SCORE	2.22	1.65	1.73	1.74	1.49

Not good results this year. People just aren't getting it. The mean is down to a new low, the percent of respondents who get more wrong than right has increased to a high, and the "knowledgeable" group, the 5-12's has nudged below 20% for the first time.

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

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Kodiak	1.53	1.64	1.48	1.76	0.78
Kenai Peninsula	2.22	1.44	1.65	1.53	1.45
Prince William Sound	3.20	3.40	2.90	3.47	3.24

Kenai's results are down again, but it's Kodiak's results that have taken a dive.

## 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	2007
Absolutely vital	27.1%	24.8%	20.8%	26.5%	23.1%
Very important	40.7%	41.4%	45.9%	39.6%	47.8%
Somewhat important	24.3%	25.2%	26.8%	26.9%	21.3%
Not very important	3.5%	4.6%	4.2%	2.3%	4.6%
Not at all important	2.6%	3.2%	2.1%	2.7%	2.7%
Don't know	1.9%	0.9%	0.1%	2.1%	0.5%

This is a good result... it may seem consistent, but if we look at the total of “vital” and “very important” responses, we see a trend of 67.8%, 66.2%, 66.7%, 66.1% and now 70.9%. Not a significant move but up over 70% for the first time.

## 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	2007
US Coast Guard	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.56	4.39
RCAC	3.94	4.03	3.94	4.06	3.93
DEC	3.66	3.82	3.68	3.71	3.84
Oil Industry	2.91	2.90	2.91	2.88	2.84
News media	NA	2.80	2.79	2.87	2.80

RCAC's mean is back down below 4.0, but the Coast Guard believability is down too. DEC is up to a five-year high point.

## 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	2007
Should be used	9.2%	12.1%	14.1%	13.9%	9.8%
Should not be used	11.4%	8.3%	6.6%	10.1%	9.7%
More research needed	38.8%	40.6%	35.5%	41.9%	32.4%
I don't know enough	38.6%	37.3%	43.4%	34.0%	48.1%
Don't know	2.0%	1.7%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%

We see the gap between “should be used” and “should not be used” close again to near parity this year.

## 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	2007
Crude oil spills like the Exxon Valdez oil spill	4.00	4.18	4.12	3.97	4.13
Spills of non-crude oil, such as engine fuel from large vessels	3.86	3.87	3.97	3.86	3.86
Minor but continuous pollution from routine shipping and industrial operations	3.77	3.80	3.76	3.68	3.66
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	3.71
Release of air pollution at the tanker terminal in Valdez	3.31	3.29	3.38	3.44	3.37

We saw the “cruse oil spill” result dip below 4.0 for the first time last year, but it’s back up this year.

### 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	2007
A story in your local paper	3.76	3.70	3.76	3.68	3.71
A story on your local radio news	3.69	3.54	3.66	3.78	3.66
A story on television news	3.59	3.67	3.48	3.43	3.33
Local public meetings	3.04	3.04	3.15	2.93	2.91
Radio ads	NA	3.00	3.15	3.11	3.14
Word of mouth from friends and neighbors	2.86	2.80	3.03	2.95	2.93
Information on the Internet	2.77	2.80	2.73	3.14	3.12
E-mail	NA	NA	2.67	2.90	2.98

A few interesting things... first, e-mail increases again, and Internet maintains its position up above 3.0. Their effectiveness will continue to rise. It’s also interesting to note the continued decline in the perceived effectiveness of TV news.

### 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	2007
None	77.0%	80.8%	75.0%	77.9%	78.0%
One or more	23.0%	19.2%	25.0%	22.1%	22.0%
MEAN	0.45	0.35	0.49	0.38	0.44
READER MEAN	1.96	1.82	1.96	1.74	2.02

Consistent results, but the reader mean has at least seen an increase that pushes it up over 2 reads per respondent per year.

## Employment

**Q: Are you or is anyone in your household an employee of \_\_\_\_\_?**

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Local state or federal government	21.0%	22.8%	27.7%	21.6%	24.7%
The fishing industry	30.0%	22.1%	21.0%	20.0%	19.9%
The oil and gas industry	19.2%	18.3%	15.3%	17.0%	20.5%
The tourism industry	14.6%	15.4%	11.1%	10.6%	12.1%

The decline of fishing continues, dipping under 20% of households for the first time. Also, in a possible explanation of why the results this year seem somewhat worse, we see oil and gas up over 20% for the first time.

## New questions that were added last year

The following questions were added to this survey for the first time last year, and reasked this year...

**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?**

	2006	2007
More effective	25.5%	22.7%
Less effective	6.5%	6.7%
About the same	47.1%	43.6%
Not sure	20.9%	27.0%

Not much difference... still strong balance towards the "more effective" side. Higher "not sure" though.

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

	2006	2007
None	66.8%	71.4%
One or more	32.7%	27.8%
Not sure	0.5%	0.8%

# CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Frankly, not a good year results wise... RCAC's positive rating has taken a dip this year from 44% to 38%, with much of the fallout coming in Kenai. It should be noted that since this inception of this survey many years ago, the methodology has called for doing roughly equal samples in each of our three areas. We do slightly more in the Kenai area because of its larger population... resulting in a split as follows:

AREA	Sample	Error rate
Kodiak	166	$\pm 7.6\%$
Kenai Peninsula	185	$\pm 7.2\%$
Prince William Sound	158	$\pm 7.6\%$

- The results are then weighted up to provide for a population proportionate sample. But the point is, the final weighted sample ends up being over 70% represented by the Kenai third, and how goes Kenai, goes the total sample. Kenai's results were down this year, and as a result our results suffered.
- Our "knowledge score" has also taken a slide this year. While we've seen a trend in recent years of RCAC's profile and scores rising, we've seen a steady erosion in the level of awareness people have about what it is that the RCAC do, and what they don't do.
  - In terms of recommendations for the future, we really have got to address these two issues. If the RCAC's mission does serve to total service area that we survey in these projects, then communications efforts have to focus on the largest population area, the Kenai Peninsula. You should make solid efforts between now and next year to raise awareness of RCAC, and its profile in this area. Raise those numbers, and the overall numbers will rise.
  - And if we consider the measurement of our true-false series to encapsulate what we think people "should" know about RCAC, then we need to start focusing on communicating that knowledge.

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@ivanmooreresearch.com](mailto:ivan@ivanmooreresearch.com)