

CIRCULATING COPY
Sea Grant Depository



**ELITE ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE
MARSHLANDS IN SOUTH CAROLINA**

by
Earl O. Kline
Frank Petrusak
William Moore

Technical Report Number 5
South Carolina Sea Grant

May, 1977
SC-SG-77-5

ELITE ATTITUDES TOWARD MARSHLANDS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

BY

Earl O. Kline
Professor of Political Science

Frank Petrusak
Associate Professor of Political Science

William Moore
Assistant Professor of Political Science

This work is a result of research sponsored by NOAA Office of Sea Grant, Department of Commerce, under Grant #SG-151-74. The U. S. Government is authorized to produce and distribute reprints for governmental purposes notwithstanding any copyright notation that may appear hereon.

DECISION MAKING ELITES AND
COASTAL CAROLINA MARSHLANDS
A Census of Knowledge,
Opinions, and Perceptions

Introduction

Since 1964 the South Carolina legislature has attempted to regulate and control the use and development of the state's marshlands, but to no avail. Legislation has been introduced and hearings have been held which have allowed interested parties such as property owners, developers, conservationists, and representatives from state agencies to present their views. Three major issues have emerged from the intense dialogue: private versus public ownership of marshlands; the desirability of land use management and regulation; and the problem of deciding whether an existing state agency or a new agency should coordinate state programs related to the marsh.

In dealing with these marshland issues, members of the legislature do not have the benefit of research services or outside sources of information concerning the marsh. Thus, they are vulnerable to the conflicting pressures of a few individuals and groups claiming to monopolize the truth about coastal wetlands. The average citizen also lacks knowledge on the subject and is bewildered by the cross fire of arguments and claims. There is little communication between the legislators, leaders of key interest groups, decision makers in state agencies currently administering marshland programs, and the general public. Moreover, little effort is made on the part of state decision makers to involve the public or to systematically consider public opinion in decision making.

Resolving the problems related to marsh use and development is crucial since the state's economy partially depends on its coastal resources. Moreover, the state faces the prospect of increased federal intervention and control as Washington turns its attention to developing offshore resources. The difficulties of planning marsh usage are aggravated by increased development of the coast by private developers in such forms as housing and industry. The South Carolina Water Resources Commission described the situation well in its six volume report on marsh utilization in 1969. The report termed the tidelands an "unmanageable giant with economic potential" and noted that pressures involved in the struggle for marsh control were "reaching a point of disaster." Commissioner Clair P. Guess stated that "unless we bring about a program of orderly development of the tidelands, we'll be in a mess in the future." He added, "the protection of South Carolina

tidelands has been piecemeal and less than satisfactory." ¹

It is with this background of marsh-related events and concerns that this study was conducted in late 1973 and early 1974. The major purpose was to go beneath the acrimonious debate in the mass media and on the floor of the legislature to consider systematically the opinions, information levels, and perceptions of decision-making elites regarding marsh use and development. The study proposed to verify no elaborate model of decision making nor did it attempt to chronicle the events of marsh controversies in complete case studies. Instead, it focused on mapping the microcosm of opinions and perceptions that decision makers and elites bring to the marshland debates. The authors believe that the results of the survey will supply useful input for political decision making in the Carolinas and -- most importantly -- will suggest some common political problems and potentials of marsh development for other sections of the United States.

Methodology

Survey research was utilized to ascertain the attitudes of the elite toward the marshlands. The geographical area examined consists of South Carolina's coastal counties of Horry, Georgetown, Charleston, Colleton, Beaufort, and Jasper. A list of the elite universe was developed by canvassing several sources: newspapers, particularly the files of The State (Columbia, S. C.) and The News and Courier (Charleston, S. C.); membership lists of conservation and civic organizations; and conversations with real estate brokers and developers and state and local officials. From this list, a quota sample of 200 names was drawn and 190 interviews were conducted between April and June, 1973.

A typology of the decision-making elite was developed and used in the coastal counties. The following categories were represented in each county subsample:

- 1) Local officeholders, such as mayors, city and county managers, commissioners, and city and county councilmen.
- 2) Local bureaucrats, such as city and county planning commissioners and city and county health officers.

¹Columbia, (S.C.) 19 December 1969

3) Members of local legislative delegations, specifically, state senators and representatives.

4) Bankers and financiers, such as executives of major South Carolina banks.

5) Real estate brokers and developers, for example, representatives of the major development companies specializing in plantation and coastal properties.

6) Leaders of conservation and civic organizations, such as the South Carolina Environmental Coalition, Audubon Society, League of Women Voters, and the Baruch Foundation.

7) Businessmen, such as shrimpers, heads of seafood cooperatives, seafood processors, and sport fishermen.

8) Newspaper, magazine, and television editors, present in the coastal areas of the state.

In addition to members of these elite categories within the coastal counties, the following were also interviewed: The editor of The State; state presidents of civic and conservation groups such as the League of Women Voters and the South Carolina Environmental Coalition; key senators and representatives other than those from the coastal counties; and officials from state agencies, such as the Health Department, State Geologist Office, State Development Board, and the Attorney General's office.

A combination of open and closed ended questions was used to determine the elite's level of information and opinions concerning the state's marsh and marsh-related issues. Specifically, questions were devised to trace the amount of the respondent's knowledge, for example, by requesting him to define "marsh." A second set of questions concerned three key issues: The Sanders Tideland Bill, related to the question of coastal zone management; the Wando River controversy, a controversy concerning the location of a state port facility near Charleston; and the BASF dispute, which centered around the plans of a German chemical company to locate a plant on the marsh near Port Royal, S. C. Views of respondents about marshland regulation by the government, including zoning and ownership of the marsh, were examined in another section of the questionnaire. Other questions sought to determine elite preferences for future marsh use.

Finally, several questions elicited socio-economic information from respondents. The final version of the questionnaire consisted of 42 questions.

Characteristics of the Elite

In constructing the elite universe, careful attention was given to include politicians, interest group leaders, and other coastal residents involved and interested in the use of the marsh. The final universe of 189 included the types of elites noted in Table 1.

Table 1
Types of Elites Included in Survey

Conservationists.....	16%	(31)
Investors and Realtors.....	15%	(29)
State and Local Bureaucrats...	14%	(26)
Local Political Officeholders.	13%	(24)
Owners of Marshland Property..	11%	(21)
Businessmen.....	11%	(21)
Bankers and Money Lenders.....	7%	(13)
State Political Officeholders.	6%	(12)
Newspapers Editors.....	6%	(12)
Other.....	1%	(1)
	100%	(190)

Regional, state, and local leaders most intensely involved in marsh use and development, such as conservationists and bureaucrats, which were more heavily represented than groups with less involvement, such as newspaper editors. Intensity of involvement was defined in terms of time and effort devoted to marsh issues.

Not surprisingly, the elite registered a high level of socio-economic status. Professional and technical occupations accounted for 57 percent of those interviewed. Another 32 percent were managers, officials or proprietors of businesses. Two percent were farmers and two percent were employed as salesmen or clerical workers. No farm workers or operatives were included in the elite universe.

The high Socio-Economic Status was sustained in the incomes and education of the elite. About 41 percent reported incomes over \$25,000 per year, 15 percent fell in the \$20,000 to \$24,999 range, and 15 percent were within the \$15,000 to \$19,999 range. Only 12 percent of the elite made less than \$15,000 per year. Almost 46 percent of those interviewed had completed four years or more of college training. In both income and education the elite is a typical of South Carolinians.

Overall "involvement" of the respondents in marshland-related activities was modestly high. The activities considered as measures of involvement were: owning property for investment purposes, belonging to organizations concerned with marsh use, residing on marsh, owning a business located on the marsh, and being a frequent visitor to the marsh. Most respondents said they visited the marsh frequently and 46 percent indicated belonging to organizations concerned with marsh use. Only 13 percent said they owned businesses located on marshland.

The five separate measures of involvement were combined into a single measure ranging from 0 (no involvement) to 5 (intense involvement). For each "yes" answer to a relevant question on the survey form, respondent was scored "1". The score became the measure of involvement for each person. The distribution of scores for the universe, found in Table 2, illustrates the moderate involvement of the elite.

Table 2
Overall Marsh Involvement of Elite

(5) Intense Involvement.....	9%	(18)
(4) Moderately Intense Involvement.....	24%	(45)
(3) Moderate Involvement.....	36%	(68)
(2) Moderately Weak Involvement.....	22%	(42)
(1) Weak Involvement.....	8%	(16)
(0) No Involvement.....	1%	(2)
	100%	(190)

Much of the intensity and magnitude of the elite's involvement with marshland stems from personal economic interests in tideland property. Of the total universe, 47 percent reported owning marshland; and of the owners, 48 percent said they owned it for investment purposes. Part of the elite's concern for the marsh probably resulted from issues generated by coastal land use. For example, the controversy surrounding conservation may elicit responses from the conservationists, involve state and local politicians, and concern the newspapermen who write about the resulting political battles.

The remainder of the personal profile of the respondents showed that most are male and white, live in urban centers, reside in Charleston county, and tend to identify with the Democratic party. With the exception of conservationists, the elite is a masculine and white universe. Only 6 percent are females and most of these 55 percent come from the conservationist category. The categories of the elite, especially the political and business related types contain few women or blacks.

Predominance of urban, coastal people in the elite is seen in Tables 3 and 4. Selection of certain types of groupings within white categories dictates the urban bias. Most businessmen investing in or dealing with the marshlands gravitate toward the Charleston economic community. Politicians, journalists, and investors are more frequently found in urban centers. Only certain businessmen, such as shrimpers, and owners of plantations, would be characterized as rural residents.

Table 3
Counties in Which Elites Reside*
(Metro area)

Charleston (rural).....	53%	(101)
Beaufort.....	20%	(37)
Colleton (rural).....	2%	(4)
Horry (rural).....	6%	(12)
Georgetown.....	10%	(17)
Noncoastal.....	7%	(12)
Don't know or no answer.....	1%	(1)
	99%	(190)

*Totals 99% due to rounding error.

Table 4
Rural Urban Location of Elites' Residences*

Central City Coastal.....	62%	(117)
Central City Interior (Columbia).....	12%	(22)
Suburban Coastal.....	12%	(23)
Suburban Interior (Walterboro).....	1%	(2)
Rural Coastal.....	12%	(22)
Rural Interior.....	1%	(2)
Don't know or no answer.....	1%	(2)

101% (190)

*Totals 101% due to rounding error.

Considering the high Socio-Economics Status of the elite, its members are quite independent in their political party identifications. Thirty eight percent reported they are Democrats, and 21 percent said they are Republicans. About one-third classified themselves as independents. Adding the "don't knows" and "apoliticals" to this category produces a total of 41 percent of the respondents who did not express a party preference.

Levels of Information and Affect concerning Marshland

Not surprisingly, the study revealed that the elite possess a "fairly accurate" knowledge of what marshlands are and strong, positive feelings about the importance of these lands. In order to ascertain level of knowledge, those interviewed were asked to define "marshland." The majority

response (65%) was that the marsh consists of the area between the mean high and low water marks, as well as adjacent land containing marsh vegetation. Twenty-seven percent defined the marshlands more narrowly, stating that the marsh includes the area between mean high and low water marks. This definition corresponds to the official one developed by the South Carolina State Attorney General. Most of the "sub-elites" in our elite typology preferred the broader definition; real estate brokers and developers usually chose the narrow definition.

There was almost unanimous agreement among respondents that marshlands are a key asset for South Carolina. Ninety-seven stated that marshlands are valuable; only one percent said they are not. Generally, elite members cited the importance of the marsh as a source of marine life in justifying their positive answers. Others noted the potential of the marsh for economic development, the aesthetic value of the marsh, the marshlands as a source of tax revenue and the recreation potential of the marsh.

Issues: The Sanders Tideland Bill

The respondents' high level of general information concerning the marsh does not consistently correlate with high levels of information and understanding of political issues generated by the marsh. One recent controversy in South Carolina concerns a bill introduced in the State House by Representative Alex Sanders, entitled the "South Carolina Coastal Zone and Tidelands Management Protection Act." The purpose of the bill, which was not passed was to promote land use management with the controlling reins in the hands of an appointed state commission.

The Sanders measure proposed the creation of a seven-member Environmental Protection Commission as an administrative and policy-making body. An executive director with expertise in planning and environmental science would be hired to head the professional staff.

The ability to sustain certain types of vegetation, not the location of mean tidal marks, would be the yardstick for defining the tidelands. The Sanders bill also would delegate broad power to local governments, reserving to the Environmental Protection Commission sole jurisdiction only in areas determined to be "critical." The language authorizing determination of "critical areas" is very broad.

The bill also would set up a permit issue system to control man-made changes in the wetlands. Such permits might be required 20 or more miles inland from the sea. Also, the bill mandates a management program for administering land and water use to protect ecological, cultural, historic, and aesthetic values while responding to the needs for economic development. One of the most controversial features of the bill is that governing boards would determine what land and water would be permitted and would set the land use priorities.

Elite Reaction to the Sanders Bill

Approximately 520-thirds of the elite sample interviewed in our survey said they were familiar with the Sanders Tideland Bill. As might be expected, state officeholders constituted the one elite category most familiar with the proposed legislation. Eleven out of the twelve reported they were familiar with it. Three-fourths of the conservationists were also aware of the measure.

There was little difference between owners and nonowners of marshland property in terms of familiarity with the bill. Those who were least familiar were bankers and local government officeholders. As expected, familiarity thus seems related to proximity to governmental decision making, especially at the state level, and the saliency of the issue to the particular groups to which elite members belong.

Of those familiar with the Sanders Bill, 49 percent favored it while 31 percent opposed it. Some of those who favored the bill did so because they felt that it would supply better overall regulation through a master plan. However, about two-thirds of those who favored the measure did not have a reason for their response.

Individuals who opposed the bill did so for a variety of reasons. The most common criticisms were that the proposed law would lead to excess government, that it would promote up-state interference in lowcountry affairs, or that it was too restrictive. Thus, the opposition centered on the relationship between government and the individual instead of on the concept of conservation.

When one examines the different types of elites and their support for the Sanders Bill, an interesting picture emerges. The strongest support came from the conservationists and state and local government officials. Pluralities of three of the elites (local officeholders, plantation and marshland owners, and other businessmen) provided the strongest opposition.

There was also strong support for the Sanders Bill from those who belong to an organization concerned with use of the Marshland. Here 62 percent favored the bill while those who did not belong to such organizations opposed the bill.

Owners were less enthusiastic than non-owners in their support for the bill. Fifty-four percent of the owners who felt that they would not be free to do as they wish with their property supported the Sanders Bill. Of those who owned property for investment purposes, 49 percent favored the bill and 51 percent opposed it. In contrast, a plurality of those who owned land for purposes other than investment favored the bill.

It is interesting to note that those who have a residence located on the marshlands were less supportive of the Sanders Bill than those not living on the marsh. A plurality of the former favored the measure while 49 percent voiced support for the bill.

A cross tabulation of the Sanders Bill responses and results from the question asking which level of government should control the marshlands showed that the greatest support for legislation came from those who felt that the federal government should exercise control. Sixty-eight percent of those favoring federal control over development supported the bill while 55 percent of those who endorsed state control favored the measure. The greatest opposition to the Sanders Bill came from those who felt that local government should develop and control the marsh.

In conclusion, several generalizations can be made concerning support and opposition for the Sanders Bill. First, the information level of the elite regarding the bill was limited. The elite was aware of the bill, but few gave specific reasons for support or opposition. Positions for or against the bill were based on vague perceptions of the measure.

Second, positive attitudes toward the bill seemed related to a desire to preserve the marshlands and/or to promote a regulatory philosophy of government. Those who are conservationists knew the conservation orientation of the bill, although they were unaware of the specifics. They supported the measure as an instrument for improving the environment. Also, stronger support came from those elements within the elite who were not opposed to the federal or state government exercising control over the marsh.

Third, those elements of the elite who are opposed to government regulation and centralized government, whether federal or state, were more likely to oppose the Sanders Bill. Much of the opposition to the bill is not related to conservation; rather it reflects predispositions about politics and government regulation.

Issue: The BASF Controversy

In 1969 the American subsidiary of a West German dye and chemical company, Badische Anilin and Soda Fabrik (BASF) bought a tract of land four miles from Hilton Head, S. C., with plans to build a \$200 million chemical and industrial complex. It promised employment for 1,800 construction workers and suggested that satellite industries would create another 7,500 permanent positions for the area. The plan was originally endorsed by Governor Robert McNair, the Beaufort, S. C. Chamber of Commerce, the Beaufort area NAACP, and the director of the local poverty program. Opposition was mobilized by resort owners as well as black shrimpers and oystermen. As a result of the opposition, plans for the development were cancelled.

Elite Reactions:

A sizeable portion of the elite (entire sample) was familiar with the controversy surrounding the BASF project. The major issues involved in the dispute were pollution, conservation, the economic development of Beaufort, and the preservation of the seafood industry. A survey of elites by county revealed little difference in local awareness. Even respondents from counties remote to Hilton Head and Beaufort were aware of the controversy, suggesting the significance of the BASF problem to the elite of coastal Carolina.

Most people interviewed indicated that the state government played no significant role in helping or hurting the BASF project (56%). Twenty-two percent said they "did not know" and only 22 percent perceived the state as playing any role in resolving the problem. Owners of marshland for investment purposes were less likely to minimize the role of the state than nonowners. Specifically, 48 percent of the investment owners and 61 percent of the non-owners asserted that the state played no role in settling the issue.

In summary, the decision making elite was aware of the BASF controversy and sensitive to the issues involved.

In addition, a majority was aware that the role of the state in resolving the controversy was minimal. Such a high level of familiarity was probably related to intense news coverage of this issue by the mass media. Findings regarding the elites' reaction to the State Ports Authority's proposed Wando River port facility lends to this thesis.

Issue: The State Ports Authority Wando Decision

The South Carolina State Ports Authority (SPA) controversy dates back to 1972 when the authority, planning for future expansion, purchased 561 acres of land on the Wando River in Charleston County for \$1,500,000. Since then, four feasibility studies have been conducted and the South Carolina General Assembly, upon the recommendation of the State Budget and Control Board, authorized \$68,000,000 in general obligation bonds for capital improvements at the Port of Charleston. Of that amount, \$56,000,000 is earmarked for the Wando project. In addition to the SPA land purchase, other groups expecting future industrial expansion in the area have purchased adjacent lands.

Supporters of the project assert that the SPA is planning ahead to meet future needs and is trying to remain competitive with other South Atlantic ports. Opponents of the project feel that there is no need for expansion at the present time and that the project will produce an unacceptable amount of traffic on the Cooper River bridges, especially tractor-trailer rigs. Opponents also believe that the industrial development on the Wando River will be ecologically detrimental and aesthetically devastating. In order to ascertain the feelings and beliefs of the elite, several questions were asked concerning the proposed port expansion.

The elite was generally aware of the SPA controversy. Seventy-two percent were familiar with it; twenty-three percent were not. In comparison with BASF, the respondents were less aware of this issue. Overall, 67 percent were familiar with both issues. Geographic location seems to be an important factor affecting issue recognition. The members of the elite located in Charleston County, the site of the controversy, were most familiar with the Wando issue (See Table 5).

Table 5
Familiarity with Wando Expansion Issue

	County				
	Chas.	Beauf.	Horry	G'town	Collt.
Yes	92%(88)	49%(17)	55%(6)	65%(11)	25%(1)
No	8%(8)	51%(18)	45%(5)	35%(6)	75%(3)
	100%(96)	100%(35)	100%(11)	100%(17)	100%(4)

The most frequently cited issue involved in the controversy was economic development of the state, conservation, and prevention of pollution. Examining responses by the categories, all types of respondents agreed that economic development was an issue in the controversy. Regarding conservation, large percentages of all elite categories, with the exception of bankers and real estate men, agreed that this was an issue.

Similar results were evident for pollution. Here all elite types agreed by large margins that pollution was an issue except for bankers, real estate developers, and local government office holders. Another issue cited was the main-aining of property values, noted by nine percent of the respondents.

Thus, in general, the coastal Carolina elite was aware of the SPA controversy; however, as one moves farther away from the site of the problem, familiarity decreased markedly. Second, there was general agreement as to the issues involved. But bankers and real estate developers (and, in one case, local government officeholders) disagreed with other elites on the issue of conservation and pollution. One might speculate that those most supportive of expansion of the SPA facilities and those who have a vested interest in such expansion are most likely to minimize conservation and pollution issues.

Government Regulation of the Marshland

It was discovered that respondents generally reject laissez-faire notions of free property and free enterprise and support government regulation of marshland. For example, 93 percent favored government restriction of how the marshland is used. Even those property owners among the elite, whose economic self interests should encourage a "free use" philosophy, believed in regulation. Twenty percent felt property owners and developers should be restricted in their land use.

A more important indicator of the elite's regulation orientation was the failure to approve the statement "A marsh owner should be free to do what he wants with his property." Seventy-three percent rejected the statement. However, the respondents were less willing to reject specific types of owner development.

For example, local politicians and realtors supported filling and dredging.

How should government conduct its regulation? The elite believed state and local government should be the focus of controls (See Table 6).

Table 6

Level of Government that Should Control and Develop Marshlands

Government	Percent	Number
Federal.....	16	(31)
State.....	50	(95)
Local.....	19	(36)
State & Local.....	4	(8)
State & Federal.....	5	(10)
Individual Person.....	2	(3)
Federal, State & Local....	1	(2)
None.....	1	(1)
Don't know or no answer.....	2	(4)
	100	(190)

According to respondents, state and local governments are most competent to oversee development and use of the marsh and offer the prospect of better coordination of control activities and are considered responsive regulators because they are "closer to the people." Only 16 percent approved the Federal government as the control agency.

Favoring state over individual control tends to correlate with elite approval of state ownership (see Table 7). Even the most free enterprise-oriented elite who favor private ownership tended to support state supervised development. One-fourth of those approve of state control. The elite thus leans heavily toward the state political system as a mechanism for supervising, even dictating, the development of the marsh.

As the center for control, 48 percent felt the state should work through existing agencies rather than create a new governmental unit devoted only to marsh development. The departments or agencies state government mentioned by respondents already deal with functions or problems related to marsh use. For example, "fish and game" and "wildlife resources" agencies were mentioned by 21 percent of the respondents. Thirteen percent listed a "water resources" agency.

Of those respondents favoring a new agency, most preferred an organization that clearly supports the existing political system. Twenty-six percent believed the executive of a new agency should be selected by the state legislature, and 23 percent favored choice by the governor. A few listed more unusual modes of selection removed from traditional political control. Three percent, for instance, favored operation of the agency by professional technicians named in the authorizing legislation. However exotic in composition, the new agency should have decisive control over marsh use and development, according to the respondents. Eighty-four per-

cent of those favoring a new agency believed in consolidating existing programs under such an organization.

The elite would extend government control to many kinds of marsh related activities. Significant majorities (75 percent and over) of the respondents favored control of: offshore drilling, offshore mining, waste dumping, and the seafood industry regulated, such as the use of sand dunes, sport fishing, aquaculture, treasure hunting, development of wild-life sanctuaries, and use of navigable waterways. Majorities of all types of the elite support this extensive range of regulatory activities.

A significant tool for state regulation of marsh development, the leasing permit, was overwhelmingly favored by the respondents. Seventy-three percent favored such permits, which would ensure government ownership but allow private development through negotiated leases. This peculiar combination of government control and free enterprise appealed to an elite concerned with both overall regulation of marsh and, to a lesser extent, with their own personal, financial ties to the marsh (see Table 10).

The regulation orientation of the elite was probably a by-product of personal political philosophies favoring controlled land use. Respondents readily answered open ended, probing questions with specific "control" concepts. For example, only 2 percent could list no reason for supporting or not supporting controlled development of the marshland. The responses to the question of "why" tended to cluster about specific and restrictive rationale, such as planned use and conservation.

The opposite of the regulatory philosophy, free use, was found among some of the respondents. As revealed in Table 11, those members of the elite who believed owners are free to do what they want with their property also supported filling and dredging, evidence of a free enterprise orientation. More clearly, however, 49 percent of the respondents rejected both filling and dredging and the free use of property. In contrast, only 18 percent favored both.

Personal self-interest likely tempers the control mentality and pushed some respondents into taking positions inconsistent with a government regulation position. Property owners, who have a financial stake in public control of their land, tended to favor filling and dredging (see Table 12). Likewise, urban members of the sample, who can more easily perceive the economic value of marsh in the city setting, tended to favor filling and dredging (see Table 13).

In summary, the respondents viewed their relation and government's relation to the marsh according to the following perceptual models:

- 1) Free enterprise. Those members of the elite, who comprise a small minority, were conscious of free enterprise as an ideal. They advocated free use of property by owners whether or not they themselves possessed property.
- 2) Modified regulatory. Those elite generally favored regulation but rejected it when questioned about specific examples or types of regulation. Many were property owners who probably see government regulation and development as a good idea when applied to other people but not when applied to themselves.
- 3) Regulatory. Regulators advocated government intervention and control as a personal belief and accepted specific types of regulation. They are ideologically consistent: faith in government accompanies faith in such control devices as zoning.

Government Regulation: Zoning

Examining zoning as a specific example of government regulation, the survey found that respondents favored systematic land use regulation. In response to the question, "Should the marshlands be controlled by zoning?", 83 percent said "yes" and 15 percent answered "no." A sizeable majority from all categories of elites favored zoning. The strongest support came from state government officeholders; state and local bureaucrats, newspaper editors, and local government officeholders. Marshland owners and real estate investors were slightly less supportive of zoning. In comparing the categories of owners and nonowners of marshland for investment purposes, nonowners voiced stronger support for zoning than other owners. Seventy-one percent of the owners supported zoning. A plurality of 34 percent felt that all coastal counties should be subject to zoning. Another sizeable group, 28 percent, believed that marshland and adjacent lands should be subject to zoning. Twenty percent of the respondents favored zoning of marsh alone. The greatest support for zoning all coastal counties (50 percent) came from local officeholders. A plurality of conservationists and real estate developers also favored this type of zoning. In contrast, a plurality of owners felt that only the marshlands should be zoned.

All categories of elites were strongly in favor of extending zoning to regulate uses of property adjoining the marsh.

For example, 70 percent believed that land surrounding estuaries should be zoned. Sixty-seven percent felt zoning should be extended to ocean-covered lands within the three-mile limit. Surprisingly, owners of marsh for investment purposes favored such zoning more strongly than individuals not owning land as investments.

As might be expected, respondents' perceptions of what constitutes marshland affected attitudes toward zoning. Those respondents who defined the marshlands more broadly ("the area between the mean high and low water marks as well as adjacent land containing marsh vegetation") were more likely to favor the extension of zoning to the estuaries than those who defined the marsh in a more narrow sense as the "area between the mean high and low water marks."

The elite tends to favor state control over zoning. Thirty-three percent advocated a state operated zoning system; 21 percent desired a county run system. Those most likely to favor state zoning were bureaucrats and conservationists. In contrast, developers favored the county over the state. Even a fourth of those favoring local ownership approved state control. The elite thus leaned heavily toward the state political system as a mechanism supervising the development of marsh.

Ownership of Marshland

The elite's support of government regulation of the marsh is also seen in answers to questions concerning ownership of marshland. Analysis of responses to the question "Who should own the marshlands?" revealed that 34 percent of the respondents favored state ownership and 27 percent favored individual ownership. Combining the individual-state and state ownership categories, the percentage of respondents favoring some type of state control increases to 45 percent.

As expected, property owners preferred individual ownership of marsh, but 27 percent ranked state ownership second and 15 percent indicated state-individual ownership as a third choice. Non-owners ranked state ownership first, individual ownership second and county third. Respondents not living on the marsh favored state ownership over private and county ownership; individuals living on marsh property advocated private ownership.

A breakdown of answers to the ownership questions by type of elite produced some unexpected results. Supposedly reform minded (conservationists) favored individual over state ownership. The strongest support for government ownership came from state or local bureaucrats. Advocates of private control were those respondents who tend to profit from or are philosophically committed to private ownership property in the economy, e.g., businessmen, investors, and plantation owners.

In general, then, the elite tends to favor control of the marsh by government, the state generally being the first choice as the regulatory agent. While the elite advocated regulation, they are generally opposed to relinquishing private ownership of the marshlands. When asked about donating land to the state for public use or to private organization to promote conservation, the elite tended to respond negatively, with 34 percent against donating to a private organization. Even if the state would agree to purchase marshlands, only 34 percent would agree to such sales.

The types of elites most willing to donate their lands are plantation owners, real estate developers and investors, and state and local bureaucrats. Surprisingly, conservationists opposed giving away their land, although they were more willing to donate their land to the state than to a private organization. (See Table 15). The general mood of distrust of private organizations by marsh owners was reflected in the finding that a majority of those who are members of groups concerned with marshlands are opposed to organization than were nonmembers.

Analyzing opposition to government ownership in terms of the socio-economic status of respondents, the largest resistance is found in Charleston County, where 45 percent of county respondents opposed public ownership. Opposition in a rural county, Beaufort, was smallest. Elites from all income brackets responded negatively to public ownership, with the largest opposition coming from those in the \$25,000 and above category and most support coming from those at the below \$10,000 level.

Although the data indicate the respondents' determination to retain their private property, strong support for government regulation and control is also evident. Some members of the legislature and interest group leaders have promoted the impression that owners favor no state control and that conservationists desire regulation. This stereotype is invalid. Conservationists were no more willing to donate land than members of other elites. In addition, 93 percent of the respondents favored restricting how commercial developers used the marsh.

The mixture of private ownership and public regulation orientations of the elite was accompanied by a high level of awareness and knowledge about the marsh. In reply to the question "Who should a marshland owner consult in state government if he has a problem?", 32 percent indicated a bureaucratic agency, 26 percent the attorney general, 14 percent the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries and 9 percent the governor. Property owners tended to favor the attorney general, since many of their problems have concerned titles, claims and jurisdictional disputes.

Most respondents were able to identify a single level of government exercising major control over the marshland. Fifty-one percent mentioned the Federal government as the controlling agent, 30 percent listed the state government. Whichever level indicated, respondents stressed the importance of the authority and/or power of the level as a reason for their answers.

Government control over the marsh is generally associated with specific departments and agencies. For example, the Army Corps of Engineers is viewed as a principal agent of Federal control. The major agents of state influence are perceived as the attorney general and the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries. However, few respondents could associate specific marshland programs with these agencies. Only 14 percent could identify a single program, 69 percent were able to identify one or more government agency.

Priorities for Use of the Marshland

Looking to the future of the state's marshlands, the elite's concern for the marsh as a public resource was obvious. Fifty-six percent indicated conservation as a first priority; 13 percent indicated preservation of aesthetic beauty. Other public uses, such as recreation, obtained a lower ranking. Private uses tended to be listed as "last priorities" for marshland uses in the future. Forty-three percent of the respondents ranked industrial use in their last place.

How would development for conservation shape the marshlands in the future? A large majority of those who identified conservation as a first priority desire zoning for all coastal counties, favor restricting commercial developers, do not believe owners should be free to do what they want with their property, and are opposed to filling and dredging. Conservationists are thus consistent in holding a public use philosophy. Realization of such goals would call for more government control.

In comparison to other long term problems faced by South Carolina, marsh conservation and development were not considered important by respondents. Only 2 percent indicated that conservation was a major problem. Twenty-seven percent viewed education as the state's leading trouble area and 21 percent placed economic development at the top of the problem list. However, 22 percent of the sample considered all problems indicated in the questionnaire (poverty, economic development, education, marsh use, conservation, and energy) to be of equal importance. In terms of the state's political agenda, conservation thus ranks low. Yet preservation of the marsh is not inconsistent with emphasis on solving the problem of economic development, unless development includes expansion of industry into the marsh.

Conclusions

The decision-making elite's microcosm of opinions and perceptions concerning the coastal Carolina marsh consists of the following key components:

Level of Information and Affect Toward Marsh

Elites are knowledgeable about the marshland as demonstrated by their ability to define marsh according to definitions suggested in the survey questionnaire. In addition, respondents report that they are aware of key marsh-related issues, such as the Sanders Tidelands Bill, the proposed chemical factory in Beaufort County, and the State Ports Authority (Wando River) controversy in Charleston. However, the elite tends to lack specific information about the history and current status of these issues. Also, the elite manifests positive feelings about the coastal marsh, 97 percent consider the marsh to be important to the people of South Carolina.

Government Regulation

Development and use of the marshland should be regulated by the government according to the respondents. Forty-five percent believe that government should directly own and control the marsh. State government, working through an existing agency such as an "interior" or "wildlife" agency, must sometimes restrict free use of property for the sake of coordinated, systematic use of marshland. Respondents strongly support two instruments of government regulation: zoning and leasing permits. In addition, the elite believes state government should closely supervise economic development of offshore areas adjacent to the marshland.

An average of 81 percent of the respondents indicated that offshore drilling, ports, mining, waste dumping, and seafood harvesting should be regulated by state government.

Ownership of the Marshland

Although committed to government regulation of marsh development, many members of the elite -- especially property owners -- the property-owning respondents are willing to donate their land to the state for public use. Even fewer would give their property to a private organization, such as the Sierra Club, to ensure its preservation.

Priorities for Future Use of the Marsh

Looking to the future, respondents tend to favor conservation and preservation of the marsh, partly because of the aesthetic value associated with such land. Fifty-five percent of the elite rated conservation and aesthetic uses as first or second priorities for the future. Much lower priority is given to commercial use. For example, 43 percent of the elite ranked industrial use as the lowest priority.

The Relationship of Marshland to Conservation and Other Problems of South Carolina

Among all the problems confronting South Carolina, respondents do not believe preservation and controlled development of the marsh are among the most important. More urgency is attached to improving the state's education system and economy. However, a significant number of the elite (22 percent) rated conservation equal to all other problems in importance. The elite is thus concerned with a wide range of problems in the state, and conservation of marsh resources ranks among them.

TABLE 8
OWNERSHIP AND REGULATION OF MARSH:

Level of Government That Should Have Major Control Over Development and Use of Marshlands	Who Should Own Marshland?							State Individual & Federal	Don't Know or No Answer
	State	County	Private Individuals	Individuals and State	Federal Government	People with Legal Title	State Individual & Federal		
Federal	15% (10)	0% (0)	19% (10)	10% (2)	60% (3)	0% (0)	21% (3)	18% (3)	
State	66% (42)	25% (3)	42% (22)	52% (11)	0% (0)	50% (2)	50% (7)	41% (7)	
Local	13% (8)	50% (6)	23% (21)	14% (3)	20% (1)	25% (1)	7% (1)	24% (4)	
Local & State	2% (1)	8% (1)	6% (3)	14% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
State & Federal	5% (3)	8% (1)	0% (0)	10% (2)	20% (1)	0% (0)	14% (2)	6% (1)	
Individual	0% (0)	8% (1)	4% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
Federal, State & Local	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	6% (1)	
None	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
Don't Know or No Answer	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	25% (1)	7% (1)	6% (1)	
TOTALS	101% ^A (64)	99% ^A (12)	100% (52)	100% (21)	100% (5)	100% (4)	100% (14)	100% (17)	

A - Does not total 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 9

ELITE ATTITUDES REGARDING OFFSHORE ACTIVITIES: REGULATION OF PORTS

Favor Regulation of Ports?	Elites					
	State Government Officeholders	Local Government Officeholders	Plantation and Marshland Owners	Real Estate Investors and Developers	Bankers and Financiers	Conservationists
Yes	92% (11)	36% (15)	71% (15)	86% (25)	92% (12)	77% (24)
No	8% (1)	29% (7)	0% (0)	10% (3)	8% (1)	10% (3)
Don't Know or No Answer	0% (0)	8% (2)	29% (6)	4% (1)	8% (0)	13% (4)
Totals	100% (12)	100% (24)	100% (21)	100% (29)	100% (13)	100% (31)
	State and Local Government Bureaucrats	Newspaper Editors or Publishers	Other Businessmen	TOTALS		
Yes	77% (20)	92% (11)	71% (15)	78% (148)		
No	19% (5)	8% (1)	5% (1)	12% (22)		
Don't Know or No Answer	4% (1)	0% (0)	24% (5)	10% (19)		
Totals	100% (26)	100% (12)	100% (21)	100% (189)		

TABLE 10

FREE ENTERPRISE VIEWS OF MARSH INVESTORS AND NON INVESTORS

Should Owner Be Free to do What He Wants With Property?	<u>Own Marshland for Investment Purposes</u>			<u>TOTALS</u>
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Don't Know or No Answer</u>	
Yes	11% (21)	13% (24)	1% (2)	25% (47)
No	11% (20)	59% (112)	3% (6)	73% (138)
Don't Know or No Answer	<u>1% (1)</u>	<u>3% (4)</u>	<u>0% (0)</u>	<u>3% (5)</u>
TOTALS	23% (42)	24% (140)	4% (8)	101% ^A (190)

A - Doesn't total 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 11

FREE USE OR REGULATION OF MARSH?

SHOULD MARSH BE DREDGED AND FILLED?

Should Owner of Marshland Be Free to do What He Wants to With His Property?	<u>SHOULD MARSH BE DREDGED AND FILLED?</u>			<u>TOTALS</u>
	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW OR NO ANSWER</u>	
Yes	18% (34)	5% (9)	2% (4)	25% (47)
No	22% (42)	47% (89)	4% (7)	73% (138)
Don't Know or No Answer	<u>1% (2)</u>	<u>1% (1)</u>	<u>1% (2)</u>	<u>3% (5)</u>
TOTALS	41% (78)	52% (99)	7% (13)	101% ^A (190)

A - Doesn't total 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 12

POSITIONS ON CONTROL AND MARSHLAND FILLING AND DREDGING:
AN INCONSISTENT PHILOSOPHY

Levels of Government That Should Control and Develop Marshlands

Do You Favor Filling and Dredging of Marshlands?	Federal	State	Local	State & Local	State & Federal	Individual	Federal, State & Local	None	Don't Know or No Answer
Yes	35% (11)	34% (32)	58% (21)	50% (4)	50% (5)	67% (2)	50% (1)	100%(1)	25% (1)
No	55% (17)	61% (58)	33% (12)	50% (4)	40% (4)	33% (1)	50% (1)	0%(0)	50% (2)
Don't Know or No Answer	10% (3)	5% (4)	9% (3)	0% (0)	10% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0%(0)	25% (1)
TOTALS	100% (31)	101% ^A (95)	100% (36)	100% (8)	100% (10)	100% (3)	100% (2)	100%(1)	100% (4)

A - Doesn't total 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 13

HOW PROPERTY INVESTORS (AND NON INVESTORS)

PERCEIVE FILLING AND DREDGING

Own Marshland for Investment Purposes

<u>Favor Filling and Dredging</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Don't Know or No Answer</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Yes	14% (26)	27% (51)	1% (1)	41% (78)
No	6% (12)	42% (80)	4% (7)	52% (99)
Don't Know or No Answer	<u>2% (4)</u>	<u>4% (9)</u>	<u>0% (0)</u>	<u>7% (13)</u>
Totals	22% (42)	74% (140)	5% (8)	100% (190)

TABLE 14

SUPPORT FOR FILLING AND DREDGING
BY COUNTY OF RESIDENCE

<u>Favor Filling & Dredging</u>	<u>Charleston</u>	<u>Beaufort</u>	<u>Horry</u>	<u>Georgetown</u>	<u>Colleton</u>	<u>Non Coastal</u>	<u>Don't Know or No Answer</u>
Yes	53% (54)	38% (14)	25% (3)	18% (3)	25% (1)	17% (3)	0% (0)
No	41% (41)	54% (20)	67% (8)	71% (12)	75% (3)	78% (4)	100% (1)
Don't Know or No Ans.	<u>6% (6)</u>	<u>8% (3)</u>	<u>8% (1)</u>	<u>12% (2)</u>	<u>0% (0)</u>	<u>6% (1)</u>	<u>0% (0)</u>
Totals	100% (101)	100% (37)	100% (12)	101% ^A (17)	100% (4)	101% ^A (8)	100% (1)

A - Does not Total 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 15

ELITES' OPINIONS REGARDING WHO SHOULD OWN MARSHLAND

Who Should Own Marsh?	Elite								
	State Office-holder	Local Office-holder	Marsh Owner	Investors & Realtors	Bankers and Financiers	Conservationists	State & Local Bureaucrats	Newspaper Editors	Businessmen
State	50% (6)	25% (6)	29% (6)	34% (10)	46% (6)	23% (7)	54% (14)	33% (4)	24% (5)
County	0% (0)	8% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (1)	10% (3)	12% (3)	25% (3)	48% (10)
Private Individuals	25% (3)	17% (4)	34% (7)	38% (11)	31% (4)	26% (8)	12% (3)	8% (1)	0% (0)
Private Individuals & State	8% (1)	25% (6)	5% (1)	17% (5)	8% (1)	13% (4)	0% (0)	8% (1)	10% (2)
Federal Government	0% (0)	4% (1)	0% (0)	3% (1)	8% (1)	0% (0)	8% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)
People with Legal Title	0% (0)	4% (1)	10% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Private Individuals, State, Federal Government	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (3)	3% (1)	0% (0)	13% (4)	12% (3)	8% (1)	10% (2)
Don't Know or No Ans.	17% (2)	17% (4)	10% (2)	3% (1)	0% (0)	13% (4)	4% (1)	17% (2)	10% (2)
Totals	100% (12)	100% (24)	100% (21)	100% (21)	100% (29)	100% (13)	100% (26)	100% (12)	100% (21)

TABLE 16

PRIORITIES FOR FUTURE USE OF MARSHLAND

Use	Priority Rating*		
	First	Second	Last
Aesthetic	13% (25)	24% (45)	6% (12)
Industrial Development	1% (2)	5% (10)	43% (81)
Housing Development	0% (1)	4% (8)	9% (18)
Conservation	56% (106)	21% (40)	0% (0)
Recreation	7% (14)	25% (47)	3% (5)
Seafood Cultivation	1% (2)	0% (1)	0% (1)
All Uses Are of Equal Priority	3% (5)	2% (4)	3% (6)
No Development	8% (16)	8% (15)	15% (28)
DK or NA	10% (19)	11% (20)	21% (39)

*All percentages are percentages of all respondents. (N = 190)

APPENDIX I

Marshlands Questionnaire
and Frequency Distributions*

(Greeting: Introduce yourself as an interviewer for a federally sponsored "Sea Grant" Project studying the use of the marshlands.)

(Then say: I'm here today to find out your opinions concerning the marshlands in South Carolina. Your answer to my questions will be confidential.)

Section 1. Personal Information

(First, I would like to ask you some background questions about yourself.)

1. What is your formal title?

State Officeholder	6%	(12)
Local Officeholder	13%	(24)
Plantation or Marsh Owner	11%	(21)
Realtor or Investor	15%	(29)
Bankers and Financiers	7%	(13)
Conservationists	16%	(31)
State and Local Bureaucrats	14%	(26)
Editors and Publishers	6%	(12)
Other Businessmen	11%	(21)
Noncodable	1%	(1)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

2. What is your occupation?

(Probe to get exact nature of work).

Professional-Technical	56%	(107)
Farmers and Farm Managers	2%	(3)
Managers, Officials and Proprietors	32%	(60)
Clerical and Sales Workers	2%	(4)
Craftsmen and Kindred Workers	1%	(2)
Operatives	0%	(0)
Household and Service Workers	1%	(1)
Farm Laborers	1%	(1)
Students, Housewives, and Retired	6%	(12)
Don't Know or No Answer	0%	(0)
	<u>101%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

3. What is the address of your home residence?

Urban-Suburban-Rural Location

Central City Coastal	62%	(117)
Central City Interior	12%	(23)
Suburban Coastal	12%	(23)
Suburban Interior	1%	(2)
Rural Coastal	12%	(23)
Rural Interior	1%	(2)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

County

Charleston	53%	(101)
Beaufort	20%	(37)
Horry	6%	(12)
Georgetown	9%	(17)
Colleton	2%	(4)
NonCoastal	10%	(18)
Don't Know or No Answer	1%	(1)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

* Some percentages do not total 100 due to rounding.

4. (Here is a card which shows several income ranges. Please give me the number of the range which includes your total annual income.)

<u> </u> 1. Under \$4,999	1% (1)	<u> </u> 4. \$15,000-\$19,999	15% (28)
<u> </u> 2. \$5,000-\$9,999	3% (5)	<u> </u> 5. \$20,000-\$24,999	14% (26)
<u> </u> 3. \$10,000-14,999	8% (16)	<u> </u> 6. Above \$25,000	41% (77)
		<u> </u> 7. Don't Know or no answer	<u>19%</u> (37)
			<u>101%</u> (190)

5. How many years of schooling did you complete?

<u> </u> Less than 6 years	1% (1)	<u> </u> 1-2 years of college	10% (19)
<u> </u> 8 years	1% (2)	<u> </u> 3-4 years of college	26% (50)
<u> </u> 1-2 years of high school	5% (9)	<u> </u> Over 4 years of college	46% (87)
<u> </u> 3-4 years of high school	11% (21)	<u> </u> Don't Know or No Answer	<u>1%</u> (1)
			<u>101%</u> (190)

6. Most People in the United States identify with either the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. Which party would you say you identify with?

Republican	21% (39)
Independent	34% (64)
Democrat	38% (72)
American Independent	1% (1)
Apolitical	2% (3)
Don't Know or No Answer	3% (6)
Noncodable	<u>3%</u> (5)
	<u>102%</u> (190)

7. Do you own property that you would identify as marshland?

<u> </u> Yes	46% (88)
<u> </u> No	53% (101)
<u> </u> Don't Know or No Ans.	<u>1%</u> (1)
	<u>100%</u> (190)

8. (If yes, ask: What is the approximate market value of your property today?)

(This data not analyzed.)

(Note sex of respondent)

<u> </u> Male	94% (179)
<u> </u> Female	6% (11)
	<u>100%</u> (190)

(Note race of respondent)

<u> </u> White	98% (186)
<u> </u> Black	2% (3)
<u> </u> Oriental	<u>1%</u> (1)
	<u>101%</u> (190)

9. Which of the following statements apply to you? (Check all that apply)

 I own marshland property for investment purposes.

Yes	22% (42)
No	74% (140)
Don't Know or no answer	<u>4%</u> (8)
	<u>100%</u> (190)

_____ I belong to one or more organizations concerned with use of the marshlands.

Yes	45%	(86)
No	52%	(98)
Don't know or no answer	<u>3%</u>	<u>(6)</u>
	100%	(190)

_____ I have a private residence located on marshland property.

Yes	31%	(59)
No	64%	(121)
Don't know or no answer	<u>5%</u>	<u>(10)</u>
	100%	(190)

_____ I own a business located on marshland property.

Yes	13%	(25)
No	80%	(152)
Don't know or no answer	<u>7%</u>	<u>(13)</u>
	100%	(190)

_____ I am a frequent visitor to marshland property.

Yes	75%	(143)
No	23%	(43)
Don't know or no answer	<u>2%</u>	<u>(4)</u>
	100%	(190)

Section II. Definition

(In talking about the marshlands, one difficulty is knowing just exactly what is meant by the term "marshlands.")

10. Which of the following do you feel best defines the "marshlands"?

_____ Property fronting on beach or water.	1%	(1)
_____ The area between the mean high and low water marks.	27%	(51)
_____ The area between the mean high and low water marks as well as adjacent land containing marsh vegetation.	65%	(124)
_____ Other _____	7%	(13)
_____ Don't know or no answer	<u>1%</u>	<u>(1)</u>
	101%	(190)

11. Do you think the marshlands, as you define them, are a valuable asset for the people of South Carolina?

_____ Yes	97%	(185)
_____ No	2%	(2)
_____ Don't know or no answer	<u>2%</u>	<u>(3)</u>
	101%	(190)

(Probe: Why?)

Potential for Economic Development	7%	(13)
Source of Life Cycle	74%	(141)
Aesthetic Value	7%	(13)
Potential Tax Revenue	1%	(1)
Recreation Site	2%	(4)
Source of Income	1%	(1)
No Use	1%	(1)
Don't Know or no answer	8%	(16)
	<u>101%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

Section III. Control

(There is much disagreement about who should regulate the use of the marshlands.)

12. Should the marshlands be owned:

_____ By the state?	34%	(64)
_____ By the county?	6%	(12)
_____ By private individuals?	27%	(52)
_____ Other (Specify) _____		
Individual and State	11%	(21)
Federal Government	3%	(5)
People with Legal Title	2%	(4)
Individual and State and Federal Governments	7%	(14)
State and County	1%	(1)
Don't know or no answer	9%	(17)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

13. (If not state, then ask: Would you favor state ownership if the state settled for claims of private owners at a fair compensation?)

_____ Yes	34%	(65)
_____ No	29%	(56)
_____ Don't know or no answer	19%	(36)
Favor State Ownership	<u>17%</u>	<u>(33)</u>
	<u>99%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

14. Please identify as many government programs as you can that deal directly with the marshlands.

Identified Specific State Government Programs	2%	(4)
Identified Specific Federal Government Programs	2%	(4)
Identified Specific State and Federal Government Programs	9%	(18)
Identified Government Agencies	70%	(132)
Identified None	17%	(32)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

15. If an owner of marshland experiences a problem related to his property, who should he consult in the state government?

Courts	1%	(2)
Bureaucratic Agency	32%	(60)
Attorney General	26%	(49)
Budget and Control Board	1%	(2)
Wildlife and Fisheries Department	14%	(27)
State Representative or Governor	10%	(18)
State Environmental Protection Agency	4%	(8)
None	3%	(5)
Don't know or no answer	10%	(19)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

16. What level of government do you think has the major control over development and use of the marshland?

_____ Federal	16%	(31)
_____ State	50%	(95)
_____ Local	19%	(36)
_____ Other (Specify) _____		
State and Local	4%	(8)
State and Federal	5%	(10)
State, Federal and Local	1%	(2)
Individual	2%	(3)
None	1%	(1)
Don't know or no answer	2%	(4)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

(For any answer, ask why? Probe.)

Visibility of Regulatory Programs	14%	(26)
Proximity to People	7%	(14)
Controls Leasing Permits	1%	(2)
States Rights Argument	4%	(7)
Exerts Control or Exercises Power	25%	(48)
Possesses Ultimate Authority	29%	(55)
Amenable to Citizen Control	2%	(3)
Other Levels of Government Failed to Exercise Control	1%	(1)
Don't know or no answer	18%	(34)
	<u>101%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

17. What level of government do you think should have major control over development and use of the marshlands?

_____ Federal	16%	(31)
_____ State	50%	(95)
_____ Local	19%	(36)
_____ Other (Specify) _____		
State and Local	4%	(8)
State and Federal	5%	(10)
State, Federal and Local	1%	(2)
Individuals	2%	(3)
None	1%	(2)
Don't know or no answer	1%	(2)
	<u>99%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

(For any answer, ask Why? Probe.)

Protects Individual Rights	4%	(7)
Supplies Best Coordination	15%	(29)
State or Local Rights Argument	9%	(17)
Supplies Continuity and Planning	7%	(14)
Protects Marsh as a Natural Resource	3%	(5)
Proximity to People	26%	(51)
Treats People Most Equally	8%	(15)
Most Competent to Perform Job	17%	(33)
Don't know or no answer	15%	(29)
	<u>101%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

18. To the extent that it is responsible for use of the marshlands, do you think the state of South Carolina should work through an existing state agency or create a new agency for this task?

<u> </u> New Agency	32%	(61)
<u> </u> Existing Agency (Specify) _____		
Fish and Game Commission or Wildlife and Fisheries	21%	(40)
Water Resources Commission or Marine Resources	18%	(35)
Health Department Environmental Protection Agency or Coastal Zone Management Commission	7%	(13)
"General Services Agency"	1%	(1)
<u> </u> Other (Specify) _____		
Local Government	2%	(3)
Not Specified	10%	(18)
Don't know or no answer	10%	(19)
	<u>101%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

19. (If new agency, ask: How should members of the new agency be chosen?)

<u> </u> By the governor	7%	(14)
<u> </u> By the state legislature	3%	(5)
<u> </u> By the legislative delegations of the coastal counties	8%	(16)
<u> </u> By the county councils of the coastal counties	4%	(7)
<u> </u> By popular election	5%	(9)
<u> </u> Other (Specify) _____		
Professional Technicians	1%	(2)
Governor and County Council	2%	(4)
Not Favor New Agency	41%	(78)
Don't know or no answer	29%	(55)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

20. (If new agency, ask: Do you favor consolidation of existing programs under the new agency?)

<u> </u> Yes	27%	(51)
<u> </u> No	3%	(5)
<u> </u> Don't know or no answer	31%	(59)
<u> </u> Not Favor New Agency	40%	(75)
	<u>101%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

21. Which of the following offshore activities do you feel should be regulated by the state? (Check all that apply)

<u> </u> Offshore drilling		
Yes	78%	(148)
No	12%	(22)
Don't know or no answer	11%	(21)
	<u>101%</u>	<u>(190)</u>
<u> </u> Offshore ports		
Yes	78%	(149)
No	12%	(22)
Don't know or no answer	10%	(19)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>
<u> </u> Offshore mining		
Yes	78%	(149)
No	12%	(22)
Don't know or no answer	10%	(19)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>
<u> </u> Offshore waste dumping		
Yes	79%	(150)
No	13%	(24)
Don't know or no answer	8%	(16)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

_____ Seafood industry		
Yes	84%	(159)
No	8%	(15)
Don't know or no answer	8%	(16)
	100%	(190)
_____ Other (Specify) _____		
Shipping	1%	(2)
Sand Dunes	1%	(1)
Fishing Boats	1%	(1)
Sport Fishing	1%	(1)
Aquaculture	1%	(2)
Treasure Hunting	1%	(2)
Navigable Waterways	1%	(2)
Sandbars	1%	(1)

22. Do you favor a state system of leasing permits?

_____ Yes	73%	(139)
_____ No	17%	(32)
_____ Don't know or no answer	10%	(19)
	100%	(190)
(Probe: Why/)		
Protect Environment	9%	(17)
Control Development	38%	(73)
Produce Revenue	5%	(9)
Protect Individual Rights	3%	(6)
Violates Individual Rights	3%	(6)
Creates Tax Problems for Landowners	1%	(1)
Fair System	8%	(15)
Causes Political Corruption	7%	(13)
Don't know or no answer	26%	(50)
	101%	(190)

23. Are you familiar with the Sanders Tidelands Bill?

_____ Yes	64%	(121)
_____ No	34%	(65)
_____ Don't know or no answer	2%	(4)
	100%	(190)

24. The Bill provides for a State Development Council to develop a master plan and the issuance of permits for development in terms of the master plan. Do you favor this system?

_____ Yes	49%	(93)
_____ No	31%	(53)
_____ Don't know or no answer	21%	(39)
	101%	(190)

(Give reasons)

Promotes upstate interference in Lowcountry affairs	5%	(10)
Supplies no master plan <u>or</u> produces excess of government	9%	(18)
Does not define marshland	1%	(2)
Gives State an excess of power	3%	(5)
Supplies better overall regulation through master plan	73%	(24)
Too restrictive	4%	(8)
Will promote control of marshland by bureauracy	4%	(8)
Should be controlled by private individuals	1%	(1)
	100%	(190)

Section IV. Land Use

(Now I want to ask you some questions about how the marshlands are being used and developed.)

25. (Here is a list of priorities for use of the marshlands--Show card--Please rank these priorities starting with the one you feel most important--List rankings)

<u> </u> Aesthetic	
1st ranking	13% (25)
2nd ranking	24% (45)
Last ranking	6% (12)
<u> </u> Commercial development--Industrial	
1st ranking	1% (2)
2nd ranking	5% (10)
Last ranking	43% (81)
<u> </u> Commercial development-Housing	
1st ranking	1% (1)
2nd ranking	4% (8)
Last ranking	9% (18)
<u> </u> Conservation	
1st ranking	56% (106)
2nd ranking	21% (40)
Last ranking	0% (0)
<u> </u> Recreational Development	
1st ranking	7% (14)
2nd ranking	25% (47)
Last ranking	3% (5)
<u> </u> No Development	
1st ranking	7% (14)
2nd ranking	25% (47)
Last ranking	3% (5)
<u> </u> Other (Specify) _____	
Seafood Cultivation	
1st ranking	1% (2)
2nd ranking	1% (1)
Last ranking	3% (6)
<u> </u> Don't know or no answer	
1st ranking	10% (19)
2nd ranking	11% (20)
Last ranking	21% (39)

26. Should the marshlands be controlled by a zoning code?

<u> </u> Yes	83% (157)
<u> </u> No	15% (29)
<u> </u> Don't know or no answer	2% (5)
	100% (190)

27. (If yes, ask: What level of government should control zoning?)

<u> </u> Federal	7% (14)
<u> </u> State	33% (62)
<u> </u> Local (Specify which) _____	
County	21% (40)
Other than County	8% (15)
<u> </u> Other (Specify) _____	
State and Local	9% (17)
State and Federal	2% (4)
All Should Share Control	2% (4)
Does not favor zoning	8% (16)
<u> </u> Don't know or no answer	9% (18)
	99% (190)

28. (If yes, ask: What land areas should be subject to zoning regulation?) (Check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Marshlands alone	20% (38)
<input type="checkbox"/> Marshlands and adjacent lands	28% (55)
<input type="checkbox"/> All coastal counties	34% (65)
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
Whole State	1% (2)
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know or no answer	8% (15)
Does not favor zoning	<u>8%</u> (15)
	100% (190)

29. (If yes, ask: Should zoning regulation be extended to: land surrounding the estuaries?)

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	70% (133)
<input type="checkbox"/> No	11% (20)
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know or no answer	<u>20%</u> (37)
	99% (190)

30. To ocean covered land within the 3 mile limit?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	67% (128)
<input type="checkbox"/> No	12% (22)
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know or no answer	21% (40)

31. Do you favor the filling and dredging of marshlands?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	41% (78)
<input type="checkbox"/> No	52% (99)
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know or no answer	<u>7%</u> (13)
	100% (190)

32. Do you feel an owner of marshland property should be free to do whatever he wishes with his land?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	25% (48)
<input type="checkbox"/> No	73% (138)
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know or no answer	<u>2%</u> (4)
	100% (190)

(Probe: Why?)

Prevent abuse of land by owner	43% (81)
Prevent arbitrary state control	5% (9)
State owns property	4% (7)
Private ownership is basis of American economy	15% (28)
Need planned use of marshland	12% (22)
Marshland is in public trust	9% (17)
Conservation must be achieved	5% (10)
Don't know or no answer	<u>8%</u> (16)
	101% (190)

33. About two years ago, a controversy developed over location on the Beaufort Coast of a BASF petrochemical plant. Are you familiar with the debate surrounding BASF in Beaufort?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	91% (173)
<input type="checkbox"/> No	6% (12)
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know or no answer	<u>3%</u> (5)
	100% (190)

34. (If yes, what issues do you think were involved in the controversy?) (Check all that apply.)

_____ Conservation of coast and marshland		
Yes	70%	(133)
No	16%	(30)
Con't know or no answer	14%	(27)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>
_____ Prevention of pollution		
Yes	74%	(140)
No	12%	(23)
Don't know or no answer	14%	(27)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>
_____ Preservation of Seafood Industry		
Yes	69%	(131)
No	17%	(33)
Don't know or no answer	14%	(26)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>
_____ Economic development of Beaufort County		
Yes	72%	(137)
No	12%	(22)
Don't know or no answer	16%	(31)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>
_____ Other (Specify) _____		
Influence of local economic issues	14%	(27)
Air pollution	1%	(1)
Tourist trade	13%	(25)
Homeowner opposition	3%	(6)
Buying of votes by the "interests" corruption	2%	(3)
Self interest of politicians	1%	(2)
Water pollution	1%	(2)
Visual pollution	1%	(1)
Don't know or no answer	65%	(123)
	<u>101%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

35. What role, if any, do you think state government had in resolving this controversy?

Forced BASF to withdraw proposals	6%	(12)
Helped private interests to defeat other private interests	2%	(4)
Offered to buy land from BASF	1%	(2)
Worked with BASF to halt project	1%	(2)
Withdrew support from BASF	5%	(9)
Resolved the controversy with the help of the Army Corps of Engineers	1%	(1)
Primary role but no explanation	6%	(11)
No role	56%	(107)
Don't know or no answer	22%	(42)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

36. Recently there has been much debate about constructing a state port facility in the Wando River basin. Are you familiar with that controversy?

_____ Yes	72%	(137)
_____ No	23%	(44)
_____ Don't know or no answer	5%	(9)
	<u>100%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

37. What issues do you think comprise the basis of the controversy? (Check all that apply)

_____ Conservation of coast and marshland		
Yes	53%	(100)
No	15%	(28)
Don't know or no answer	33%	(62)
	<u>101%</u>	<u>(190)</u>

(Question 37 continued)

___ Prevention of pollution	
Yes	47% (89)
No	21% (39)
Don't know or no answer	33% (62)
	<u>101% (190)</u>
___ Economic development of South Carolina	
Yes	57% (109)
No	11% (21)
Don't know or no answer	32% (60)
	<u>100% (190)</u>
___ Other (Specify)	
Conflict of residential and industrial use	7% (14)
Visual pollution	2% (4)
"Political"	5% (10)
Traffic	5% (9)
Property values	9% (17)
Port Expansion	4% (8)
Seafood industry	1% (2)
Aesthetic	1% (2)
Don't know or no answer	65% (124)

38. Should the government restrict the way commercial developers use marshland property?

___ Yes	93% (177)
___ No	4% (8)
___ Don't know or no answer	3% (5)
	<u>100% (190)</u>

(Probe: Why?)

Oppose Commercial development generally	6% (11)
Desire planned use <u>or</u> desire prevention of individual abuse	42% (80)
Favor conservation of natural resources	32% (60)
Prevent arbitrary control	2% (4)
Not favor private ownership	1% (2)
Advocates private property rights	1% (2)
Prevent abuse by businessmen	2% (3)
Don't know or no answer	15% (28)
	<u>101% (190)</u>

39. Use of the marshlands is just one problem faced by the people of South Carolina. Which of these possible problem areas do you think must be solved first? (Check all that apply)

___ Level of poverty	8% (15)
___ Economic development	21% (40)
___ Quality of Education	27% (52)
___ Others (Specify) _____	
Use of marsh	8% (16)
Conservation	2% (4)
Energy	1% (1)
All equal	22% (41)
___ Don't know or no answer	11% (21)
	<u>101% (190)</u>