

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

SOUTH CAROLINA

DIVISION OF RESEARCH



DISCUSSION PAPER

DEVELOPING A RURAL DEFINITION

ANALYSIS OF SOUTH CAROLINA COUNTIES

DEVELOPING A RURAL DEFINITION

Analysis of South Carolina Counties

By Braden Bunch

Overview¹

This report was undertaken to reexamine the South Carolina Department of Commerce's definition of a rural county and propose changes to the definition, if necessary. Upon examination, this study found that while the change to the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) definition of rural status, adopted in early 2007, improved the rural vs. urban classifications of South Carolina's counties when compared to the actual conditions on the ground, the method still has several rankings that belie the actual conditions in several South Carolina counties. Often these discrepancies involve counties that should clearly be considered rural being labeled as urban because of their proximity to a major metropolitan area.

With previous definitions, both used and considered, not resolving this issue, this report recommends the South Carolina Department of Commerce adjust its definition by adopting the Adjusted Population Density (APD) model, described within, in determining whether a county is considered rural. Using this mathematical formula, counties with an APD of 155 people per square mile or fewer would be considered rural. The result of this new definition, if adopted, would result in the number of rural counties in South Carolina increasing from 25 to 31, with seven counties previously considered urban becoming labeled and one county changing its classification from rural to urban.

Should the new APD definition be adopted, preliminary 2007 figures indicate that 25 percent of the state's population would live in rural areas, while 38 percent of the jobs and 23 percent of the capital investment recruited by the Department of Commerce would be

“The classification of people and territory as rural poses a number of challenges for researchers, policy makers, and program managers throughout the Federal system and beyond. Most Americans share a common image of rural—open countryside and small towns at some distance from large urban centers—but disagree on where and how to draw the line between rural and urban. Drawing such a line requires answering two questions: At what population threshold do rural places become urban? Where along the urban periphery do suburbs give way to rural territory?”

— Dr. John Cromartie and Shawn Bucholtz,
Geographers with the United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service

going to these areas. Under the current definition, 21 percent of the population lives in rural areas, receiving 34 percent of the jobs and nearly 15 percent of the capital investment.

¹ Braden Bunch
Discussion Paper DP-2008-001
South Carolina Department of Commerce
January, 2008

Also under the APD model, capital investment recruited into rural areas would top \$1 billion this year. Under the current definition, that figure would be around \$675 million.

History of the Definition of Rural at The Department of Commerce

Despite the frequent use of the term in state documents, studies and even department titles, South Carolina has never established a state-wide definition for what makes up a rural county. The word “rural” itself, let alone a definition of the term, doesn’t appear in the state Constitution, and although it appears in more than 60 different sections of the SC Code of Laws, a definition of rural is never established.¹

So, in December 2006, noticing irregularities while preparing its 2006 Capital Investment report, the South Carolina Department of Commerce (DOC) decided to re-evaluate the way a rural county was defined by the department. At that time, DOC was using the parameters established by the Job Tax Credit program, specifically by declaring any county designated Tier 1 or Tier 2 under the JTC system as a rural county (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: JTC (Past) Definition of Rural Counties



To an extent this definition worked, because following the JTC system, at least in its non-amended form, follows per capita income and unemployment rate figures, data sets that often reflect the rural economy. However, the JTC system was not designed for this purpose and ranks counties competitively, making sure there are always 12 counties in the lower tier.²

It’s this comparative system, without establishing specific standards as to what constitutes a rural county, which makes the JTC system vulnerable and can lead to some interesting results. For example, it’s commonly accepted that South Carolina has some very rural areas, with entire counties having as few as 10,000 people. However, population is not a factor taken into consideration using the JTC system, and even if the entire state of South Carolina was as densely populated as New York City, there would still be at least 12 counties considered rural using this definition.

In addition to this, the competitive nature of the JTC system - and the subsequent business subsidies attached to each ranking - opens the rankings to amendments by legislators in the General Assembly looking to bring extra benefits to their constituencies, whether or not there is a change in the actual conditions in the county. These changes - nearly always an effort to downgrade a county toward a lower tier in an attempt to recruit a potential company to a specific location – can, once again, give counties labels that appear to be in contrast to the actual conditions in the county. And the changes to JTC legislation can easily be made without regard for what such a change might have on the surrounding counties or the state as a whole.

Not only could these amendments to the JTC rankings give counties typically considered urban a “rural” label, but this could also force counties otherwise considered rural to appear urban when compared on paper. As Gov. Sanford stated in his veto of legislation that prevents counties from seeing their JTC level improve by more than one ranking in any one year, the system “seemingly incentivizes poor economic performance rather than rewarding success.”³ Although the gubernatorial veto was overridden, Sanford’s argument

goes to the heart of the difficulty of using a politically-influenced definition.

While perhaps not definitive, a quick, logical way to test an area's rurality is to simply look at the population of the area to see if the label associated with the county is

Questionable Classifications Under JTC system

Counties larger than 150,000 people considered rural: Aiken (pop. 151,800)

Counties smaller than 75,000 people considered urban: Calhoun (pop. 15,026), Colleton (pop. 39,467), Darlington (pop. 67,551), Edgefield (pop. 25,261), Georgetown (pop. 60,860)

matching up with conditions on the ground. For quick comparisons in this study, flags were raised when a county of less than 75,000 people was considered urban, or when a county of more than 150,000 was considered rural. This doesn't mean that a county with a population less than 75,000 couldn't be an urban county, especially if it has a smaller than average land area, but simply means that closer evaluation might be necessary. Using this quick comparison, under the JTC method the DOC used before, there were five counties smaller than 75,000 people being considered urban, and one county larger than 150,000 considered rural.

Because of these reasons, the DOC began evaluating three definitions, including the current JTC definition. The first new definition considered was to adopt the definition of rural as established in the "South Carolina Rural Health Report," published by the Office of Research and Statistics at the South Carolina Budget and Control Board (ORS) on their Website at the time.⁴ This definition said any county without a town or city with a population of at least 25,000 people would be considered rural. The BCB has another level to its

definition, labeling any South Carolina county without a town of at least 10,000 people as "very rural."

Ultimately, this definition was rejected by DOC, and in fact the page promoting the ORS definition has been removed from their Web site. The department has since begun working on a "rurality index". Staffers at ORS have also said the definition included in the "South Carolina Rural Health Report" was not used in other projects. Their office is currently working with a new model that ranks counties in South Carolina using urbanized area data from the 2000 census.

The second alternate definition, and the one eventually chosen, was based on the Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as determined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget.⁵ More specifically, any county not included in one of the 10 MSAs in South Carolina would be considered rural, as shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2: MSA Definition of Rural Counties



Using the new MSA definition improved some of the classifications that seemed to not agree with the known conditions on the ground. Colleton County, with a population less than 40,000 and Georgetown, a very spacious county with less than 60,000 people, were changed from being considered urban to rural. Aiken County, which had been made rural in the JTC rankings

via special legislation, returned to being considered urban.

Result of Switching from JTC to MSA Model

Counties changing from Urban to Rural status:

Beaufort, Colleton, Georgetown, Oconee

Counties changing from Rural to Urban status:

Aiken, Fairfield, Laurens

The new definition also provided another sought-after quality, namely stability. Not only would the definition remain constant, but it wasn't likely to be changed because of localized political circumstances.

Unfortunately, the MSA definition created its own problems, changing the classification of several counties

Questionable Classifications Under MSA Model

Counties larger than 150,000 people considered rural: none

Counties smaller than 75,000 people considered urban: Calhoun (pop. 15,026), Darlington (pop. 67,551), Edgefield (pop. 31,113), Fairfield (pop. 23,810), Kershaw (pop. 57,490), Laurens (pop. 70,374), Saluda (pop. 19,059)

that should not have been changed. Calhoun County, for example, became an urban county purely because of its proximity to Richland County, despite the fact that at 15,000 people it is the third-smallest county in the state.

So while the stability created by the new definition was a definite improvement, a closer examination of the results from the new definition appeared far from perfect, and it was determined to reexamine the definition once again.

Other Examinations

The DOC is not the only government entity having trouble defining rural. Earlier this year, a research team at the U.S. Department of Agriculture headed by geographer Dr. John Cromartie explored how different states and various governmental agencies defined rural.⁶ His team found that, much like the various definitions among different organizations in South Carolina, there was no encompassing definition used primarily across the country.

They also found there was a difficulty in drawing the "rural line" at either the city or county border. He wrote, "Definitions based on municipal boundaries may classify as rural much of what would typically be considered suburban. Definitions that delineate the urban periphery based on counties may include extensive segments of a county that many would consider rural."⁷

Ultimately, his team examined nine different methodologies, most of them using municipal and census tracts and not evaluating rural status on a countywide level, but his study also examined the MSA county method DOC currently uses, as well. Using these different methods they found anywhere from 17% to 63% of the country's population lived in a rural area, and when applying these different definitions to South Carolina, anywhere from 25% to 91% of the Palmetto State's residents would be considered living in a rural area.⁸

In the end, the researchers did not endorse any method over another, but further research found one of the defining characteristics, using an area's population density, did seem to be prevalent among several other states.

Rural Definitions in Other States

As stated before, simply looking at the population of an area, while providing a good rule of thumb, can at times be misleading. After all, there might be more people living in Alcolu than in some high-rise apartment buildings in New York City, but you wouldn't have trouble figuring out which was rural and which was urban once you looked at them. Still, some other states continue to use this method and, as you can see from the chart above, this type of definition could have varying levels of success in South Carolina, depending on where the bar was set.

Using Iowa's definition, only 1.6% of

South Carolina's population would live in a rural area, while New York's definition makes all but six South Carolina counties rural. This not only illustrates the difficulty in simply adopting another state's definition, but stresses the need for each state to set their own standards to match the general viewpoint of its own population. After all, many New Yorkers might believe that 40 of South Carolina's 46 counties are rural, while Iowans might believe South Carolina is filled with metropolitan areas.

Other states, including our neighbor North Carolina, go a step further than simply looking at the population levels and take land mass into the equation by using population density calculations to determine an area's rurality. Once the calculation is made, the calculated level appears to be set arbitrarily to best match the attitudes and conditions in the state. As the chart above shows, just like the flat population level systems, the amount of people that can be in a specific area and still

be considered rural varies greatly from state to state. If South Carolina adopted Pennsylvania's levels, only five of the state's 46 counties – Greenville, Richland, Spartanburg, Lexington and York – would be considered urban, ignoring large areas of the state currently considered urban by most South Carolinians, including Charleston, Horry, and the entire South Carolina coastline. At the same time, Washington's system gives South Carolina four times more urban

counties, including Darlington, Lancaster and Oconee Counties, areas of questionable urbanity. Still, the population density appears to be more logical definition to use of the two,

so it was determined to make the population density calculations and then, after examining the results, set the appropriate level for South Carolina to determine whether a county was rural.

Various State Definitions and Impact on South Carolina

State	Definition	SC counties	% SC pop.
Population level systems			
Florida ⁹	<75K people	30	25.2
Iowa ¹⁰	<20K people	5	1.6
New York ¹¹	<200K people	40	57.8

Questionable Classifications Under Population Density System

Counties larger than 150,000 people considered rural: Aiken (pop. 151,800), Berkeley (pop. 152,282)

Counties smaller than 75,000 people considered urban: none

Upon performing the initial calculations, however, it became apparent that large sections of federally-

controlled uninhabited areas were skewing the results for some of the state’s counties. But instead of abandoning the population density model, it seemed that using a variance, removing these areas from a county’s total area was the best way available to determine whether a county is rural or not.

Adjusting Population Density Model to Better Reflect County Conditions

Most South Carolina counties have some portion of their land set aside, away from potential development. For example, Berkeley County – the second-largest county in the state – has a large portion within its border occupied by Francis Marion National Forest. Using a straight “population/square miles” formula results in Berkeley County being labeled rural while Dorchester County, the next-door neighbor that seems to share many of the same characteristics, is considered urban.

To offset this dilemma, the vast areas of federally-owned, undevelopable land, including national forests and national wildlife refuges, were removed from each county’s total area. Military installations, with the exception of the non-residential compounds of McEntire Air National Guard installation in Richland County and the USAF Poinsett Electronic Bombing and Gunnery Range in Sumter County, were not removed. State-controlled property, which would be far easier for South Carolina to develop than federally-controlled land, was also not removed from the total acreage of each county.

Once the acreage of each federal property was removed from each county’s total land area and the county’s Adjusted Population Density, or APD, was calculated as shown in Figure 3. See attachment: *Acreage of non-residential federal properties removed from county land area figures* for a list of all of the areas removed from calculations.

This adjustment affected nearly half of the state’s counties, 21 to be exact, but significantly affected three counties, bringing Aiken, Berkeley and Sumter Counties

from the rural into the urban classification at the APD level established, lowering the number of rural counties under the proposed definition to 31.



Figure 3: ADP Proposed Definition

Setting the Final Line – One Last Look at the Counties

After examining the effects of removing the selected federal lands from the population density model, it was determined to recommend that the South Carolina Department of Commerce establish an APD of 155.0 or greater as the line separating South Carolina rural and urban counties. This placed the “urban/rural” line between Beaufort County, a rapidly-growing area that

Switching From MSA to APD Model

Counties changing from Urban to Rural

status: Calhoun, Kershaw, Darlington, Laurens, Edgefield, Saluda, Fairfield

Counties changing from Rural to Urban

status: Beaufort

Questionable Classifications Under APD System

Counties larger than 150,000 people
considered rural: none

Counties smaller than 75,000 people
considered urban: none

could easily be accepted as urban, and Greenwood
County, a slowly-growing area that most would

consider rural.

Setting the “urban/rural” line at this point in the new
system also results in no counties with a population
under 75,000 being considered urban and no counties
with a population larger than 150,000 people being
considered rural.

Effects of Using APD Rural Definition

Last year, while using the MSA method to determine

Rural County Definitions and 2006 Capital Investment

<u>Definition</u>	<u># rural counties</u>	<u>% Labor Force</u>	<u>% 2006 jobs created</u>	<u>% 2006 Capital Inv.</u>
MSA (current definition)	25	23.0	29.2	28.1
JTC Tier 1-2 (past definition)	23	20.8	25.3	21.9
APD (proposed definition)	31	26.2	38.3	37.4

Rural County Definitions and 2007 Project Recruitment

<u>Definition</u>	<u># rural counties</u>	<u>% Labor Force</u>	<u>% 2007 jobs created</u>	<u>% 2007 Projects</u>	<u>% 2007 Cap. Inv.</u>
MSA (current definition)	25	21.2	34.5	37.2	14.6
JTC Tier 1-2 (past definition)	23	19.8	38.7	40.1	16.1
APD (proposed definition)	31	24.9	38.2	48.3	23.1

Sources: Labor force percentage calculated based on the Nov. 2007 non-seasonally adjusted numbers from the South Carolina Employment Security Commission. Job and Capital Investment percentages based on Maximizer report as of 1/2/08.

rurality, the Department of Commerce said that in 2006, the state's rural population made up 23 percent of the state's labor force, but received 29 percent of the jobs and 28 percent of the capital investment recruited by the state. If we apply the APD definition to the 2006 numbers, the result is the state's rural population changes to 26 percent of the state's labor force, but received 38 percent of the jobs and 37 percent of the capital investment.

Looking at 2007's preliminary numbers it appears, using any definition, the overall percentage of the state's capital investment recruited by the DOC for its rural areas will drop, but that the percentage of jobs recruited for the rural labor force will increase substantially.

Should the new APD definition be adopted, preliminary 2007 figures indicate that 25 percent of the state's population would live in rural areas, while 38 percent of the jobs and 23 percent of the capital investment recruited by the Department of Commerce would be going to these areas. Under the current MSA definition, 21 percent of the population lives in rural areas, receiving 34 percent of the jobs and nearly 15 percent of the capital investment.

Should the DOC adopt the APD definition of a rural county, the department could also say that in both 2006 and 2007 more than \$1 Billion in capital investment was recruited to the state's rural counties.

Projected Stability in County APD Rankings

A look at the current population trends in South Carolina indicates that the current 15 urban counties are likely to remain the only urban counties until the next census figures are released sometime in 2011. This is despite the fact that South Carolina is one of the fastest growing states in the nation.

A report released Dec. 28, 2007, by the U.S. Census Bureau found that from July 1, 2006 to July 1, 2007, South Carolina was the 10th-fastest growing state in the nation, and third-fastest in the Southeast, with the

Palmetto State's population increasing by more than 71,000 people – or 1.8 percent – during the 12 month period.¹⁵

In a similar earlier report, by examining housing unit estimates, the Census Bureau found that South Carolina had three of the 50 fastest growing counties in the nation. Horry County led all South Carolina counties and was considered the 12th-fastest growing county in the nation from July 1, 2005 to July 1, 2006. Beaufort (40th) and Dorchester (48th) also made the list.¹⁶

Still, there is an outside possibility that two counties could change their status, although one of them would actually be decreasing in size.

Sumter County

With an APD around 157.5, Sumter County could see itself descend into rurality as it is one of the few large counties in South Carolina whose population, according to Census Bureau, is declining.

Using the current population growth trends reported by the U.S. Census Bureau estimates over the past three years, Sumter County could fall to a rural county in 2011, should it continue its current pattern of negative growth.¹⁷ However, the expected influx of military personnel into Sumter County with the pending expansion of Shaw Air Force Base would likely prevent this from happening.

Because of the state's strong growth, it's highly unlikely that any other counties currently considered urban could become rural. It is possible, however, that Greenwood County, with a current APD just under 153, could eventually be considered an urban county.

Greenwood County

With a current population just more than 68,000, Greenwood County doesn't at first glance appear to be a candidate for urban status. But when you consider Greenwood's County small size in land area – the county is the ninth-smallest in the state at 463 square miles - and the fact that a significant portion of the county is occupied by Sumter National Forest, it begins

appear plausible. For comparison, Greenwood County is nearly identical in size to Saluda County, a county with less than 10,000 within its borders.

For Greenwood County to be considered urban under the APD definition, it would need to grow by just less than 1,000 in the next census estimate. While possible, that would be a significant increase over recent years, when the county has been growing, on average, at around an estimated 400 people a year. Greenwood County does, however, have the potential to be considered an urban county under this new classification around 2010.

No other county is expected to see the amount of growth, either positive or negative, that would be needed to change its definition before the next census and the subsequent recalibration of county numbers is released. Since this census study is the same source for the annual county figures, which will be released sometime in early 2008, the new county figures will be compared to determine if any counties have changed their status, using the same APD model

Recent Label Changes Counties If APD System Is Adopted

Remain rural throughout the changes (17)

Abbeville; Allendale; Bamberg; Barnwell; Cherokee; Chesterfield; Clarendon; Dillon; Hampton; Lancaster; Lee; Marion; Marlboro; McCormick; Orangeburg; Union; Williamsburg

Remain urban (13)

Anderson; Berkeley; Charleston; Dorchester; Florence; Greenville; Horry; Lexington; Pickens; Richland; Spartanburg; Sumter; York

Rural to urban (2)

Aiken; Greenwood

Urban to rural (11)

Calhoun; Chester; Colleton; Darlington; Georgetown; Jasper; Kershaw; Laurens; Newberry; Oconee; Saluda

RUR (2)

Edgefield; Fairfield

URU (1)

Beaufort

See the attachment: *South Carolina county status under various rural definitions* to see the changes in the urban/rural ranking over the past few years.

References

- 1: South Carolina Legislature Online searchable Website: www.scstatehouse.net
- 2: South Carolina Code of Laws – Section 12-6-3360-1a: www.scstatehouse.net
- 3: Gov. Sanford’s veto message on S408,R-9.: www.scgovernor.com/uploads/upload/S.408.pdf
- 4: South Carolina State Budget and Control Board, Office of Research and Statistics report “*South Carolina Rural Health Report*”: (Note: no longer maintained online by ORS, but posted by separate organization) www.tellthesc.org/public/files/docs/SC20rural20health20report.pdf
- 5: U.S. Office of Management and Budget: www.census.gov/population/www/estimates/metroarea.html
- 6: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Data/RuralDefinitions/>
- 7: same as 6
- 8: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, “*Rural Population Indicators for South Carolina*”: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Data/Ruraldefinitions/SC.pdf>
- 9: “Growth of Nassau population”, Kevin Turner, Florida Times-Union, 5/7/07: http://www.jacksonville.com/tu-online/stories/050907/nen_168307313.shtml
- 10: Iowa State University, College of Family and Consumer Sciences: <http://www.hs.iastate.edu/news/archives/fcs/news/nn20042005/October/1006.shtml>
- 11: same as 10
- 12: “*Financial Institutions and Rural Economic Development*”, Speech by Joseph A. Smith, Jr., Acting Commissioner of Banks, State of North Carolina, 9/12/02: http://www.nccob.org/NR/rdonlyres/B9849FD4-0E4C-42ED-8D30-EDF6688C072D/0/RuralEconomicDevelopment_speech.pdf
- 13: The Center for Rural Pennsylvania: http://www.ruralpa.org/rural_urban.html
- 14: State of Washington legislation: <http://www.leg.wa.gov/pub/billinfo/2005-06/Pdf/Bills/Senate%20Bills/5863-s.pdf>
http://fortress.wa.gov/dshs/maa/download/Memos/2005Memos/05-45%20maa%20Phys_FamPractice.pdf
- 15: U.S. Census Bureau, National and State Population Estimates: <http://www.census.gov/popest/states/NST-ann-est.html>
- 16: “Housing Unit Estimates for the 100 Fastest Growing Counties With 5,000 or More Housing Units in 2006: July 1, 2005 to July 1, 2006 (HU-EST2006-06),” U.S. Census Bureau: <http://www.census.gov/popest/housing/HU-EST2006-top100.html>
- 17: “Estimates of Population Change for Counties and County Rankings: July 1, 2005 to July 1, 2006,” U.S. Census Bureau: <http://www.census.gov/popest/counties/CO-EST2006-03.html>

APD County Calculations							
		2006 Est.	removed area	Modified	Adjusted	Proposed	
	sq. mi.	Pop	(acres)	sq. mi	Population Density	(<155)	
Greenville	795	417166	0	795	524.74	Urban	0
Richland	772	348226	2400	768	453.27	Urban	0
Spartanburg	819	271087	0	819	331.00	Urban	0
Lexington	758	240160	0	758	316.83	Urban	0
York	696	199035	0	696	285.97	Urban	0
Charleston	1358	331917	72064	1245	266.51	Urban	0
Anderson	757	177963	0	757	235.09	Urban	0
Pickens	512	114446	0	512	223.53	Urban	0
Dorchester	577	118979	0	577	206.20	Urban	0
Horry	1255	238493	0	1255	190.03	Urban	0
Berkeley	1228	152282	193952	925	164.64	Urban	0
Florence	804	131297	0	804	163.30	Urban	0
Sumter	682	104430	12250	663	157.54	Urban	0
Aiken	1080	151800	72686	966	157.07	Urban	0
Beaufort	923	142045	7053	912	155.75	Urban	0
Greenwood	463	68213	10951	446	152.98	rural	68213
Cherokee	397	53886	0	397	135.73	rural	53886
Oconee	674	70567	84574	542	130.23	rural	70567
Darlington	567	67551	0	567	119.14	rural	67551
Lancaster	555	63628	0	555	114.65	rural	63628
Laurens	724	70374	20941	691	101.80	rural	70374
Orangeburg	1128	90845	0	1128	80.54	rural	90845
Kershaw	740	57490	0	740	77.69	rural	57490
Dillon	407	30984	0	407	76.13	rural	30984
Marion	494	34684	0	494	70.21	rural	34684
Newberry	647	37762	58974	555	68.06	rural	37762
Union	516	28306	62315	419	67.62	rural	28306
Barnwell	557	23265	118000	373	62.44	rural	23265
Marlboro	485	29152	0	485	60.11	rural	29152
Chesterfield	806	43191	46000	734	58.83	rural	43191
Georgetown	1035	60860	0	1035	58.80	rural	60860
Chester	586	32875	12642	566	58.06	rural	32875
Edgefield	507	25261	31113	458	55.11	rural	25261
Abbeville	511	25935	23349	475	54.66	rural	25935
Lee	411	20559	0	411	50.02	rural	20559
Clarendon	696	33339	0	696	47.90	rural	33339
Saluda	462	19059	4480	455	41.89	rural	19059
Bamberg	395	15678	0	395	39.69	rural	15678
Williamsburg	937	36105	0	937	38.53	rural	36105
Calhoun	392	15026	0	392	38.33	rural	15026
Hampton	563	21268	0	563	37.78	rural	21268
Colleton	1133	39467	0	1133	34.83	rural	39467
Fairfield	710	23810	11080	693	34.37	rural	23810
McCormick	394	10226	50023	316	32.38	rural	10226
Jasper	700	21809	14163	678	32.17	rural	21809
Allendale	413	10748	1300	411	26.15	rural	10748
		4321249					1181923
						Pop.(not LF)%	27.35%

Attachment: South Carolina County Status Under Various Rural Definitions

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

Attachment: Acreage of Non-Residential Federal Properties Removed From County Land Area Figures

Savannah River Site: total - 192,000 acres

Aiken: 72,686 acres

Allendale: 1,300 acres (est.)

Barnwell: 118,000 acres (est.)

Source: Aiken Chamber of Commerce: http://www.aikenchamber.net/public_affairs/csra-leadership.shtml

McEntire Air National Guard installation: total – 2,400 acres

Richland: 2,400 acres

Source: GlobalSecurity.org: <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/mcentire.htm>

Carolina Sandhills National Wildlife Refuge – 46,000 acres

Chesterfield: 46,000 acres

Source: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: http://www.fws.gov/carolinasandhills/Assets/PDF/Hunter_ed.pdf

Pinckney Island National Wildlife Refuge – 4,053 acres

Beaufort: 4,053 acres

Source: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: <http://www.fws.gov/pinckneyisland/>

Ernest F. Hollings ACE Basin National Wildlife Refuge – 11,815 acres

Charleston: 7,200 acres

Beaufort: 3,000 acres (est.)

Source: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: <http://www.fws.gov/southeast/pubs/facts/abscon.pdf>

Savannah National Wildlife Refuge – 29,174 acres

Jasper: 14,163 acres (total in S.C.)

Source: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: <http://www.fws.gov/savannah/facts.htm>

USAF Poinsett Electronic Bombing and Gunnery Range – 12,250 acres

Sumter: 12,250 acres

Source: *The State*: <http://www.thestate.com/463/story/66949.html>

Francis Marion & Sumter National Forests – 629,263 acres

Abbeville: 23,349 acres

Berkeley: 193,952 acres

Charleston: 64,864 acres

Chester: 12,642 acres

Edgefield: 31,113 acres

Fairfield: 11,080 acres

Greenwood: 10,951 acres

Laurens: 20,941 acres

McCormick: 50,023 acres

Newberry: 58,974 acres

Oconee: 84,574 acres

Saluda: 4,480 acres

Union: 62,315 acres

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture