



PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

CARBON FEE & REBATE

- QUESTIONNAIRE -

October 2020

Sample Provided by: Nielsen Scarborough

Sample Size: Full Sample: 4,828 Registered Voters

Sample A: 2,415; Sample B : 2,413

Field Dates: September 17 – October 1, 2020

Margin of Error: +/- 1.4% (Full Sample)

+/- 2.0% (½ Sample A,B)

[FULL SAMPLE]

One of the challenges we face today is that the way we produce energy can have negative impacts on the environment. In this survey, we would like to introduce some proposals for changing the way energy is produced and used to:

- reduce air pollution
- reduce the production of greenhouse gases

We will give you some background on these issues, introduce you to both sides of the debate on these proposals, and then give you a chance to make your recommendations. Your views will then be forwarded to your representatives in Congress and other agencies in the government, to give them a clearer sense of what the American people think should be done.

[Priority Health]

One debate is about how high a priority it should be for the government to work to reduce the air pollution that has negative effects on health.

Some forms of energy production—especially the burning of coal and to a lesser extent natural gas—contribute to soot and smog. These can contribute to increased asthma attacks, bronchitis, heart attacks and even premature deaths. These negative health effects also have economic consequences, as they result in lower productivity and lost workdays.

Over the last few decades, laws were passed, especially the Clean Air Act, which required these air pollutants to be reduced. As a result, negative public health effects were reduced as well. However, there is still significant air pollution that has negative health effects, with related economic consequences, which could be avoided with lower levels of pollution.

Here is an argument in favor of the position that it should be a **high priority** to further reduce air pollution.

Q1. We have a responsibility to try to improve the conditions of thousands of people, especially the elderly and children, who are suffering from the negative health effects of poor air quality. While over the last 50 years there have been reductions in pollution, there are still tens of thousands of deaths every year due to air pollution. And in recent years air pollution has been increasing, as well as the number of days with unhealthy air. Government research has shown that every dollar invested in cleaning up the air produces \$30 in benefits from reduced health costs and more productivity.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
2020 National	33.7%	38.5%	72.2%	17.1%	10.3%	27.4%	0.4%
Republicans	10.0%	39.5%	49.5%	31.0%	19.1%	50.1%	0.4%
Democrats	55.0%	36.3%	91.3%	5.2%	3.2%	8.4%	0.3%
Independents	30.1%	41.9%	72.0%	17.8%	9.5%	27.3%	0.7%
Cook's PVI (D-R) 2020							
Very red	26.9%	42.6%	69.5%	18.2%	12.2%	30.4%	0.1%
Somewhat red	30.7%	34.2%	64.9%	19.4%	14.7%	34.1%	0.9%
Lean red	31.8%	38.4%	70.2%	18.1%	11.2%	29.3%	0.5%
Lean blue	35.8%	37.6%	73.4%	19.2%	7.0%	26.2%	0.4%
Somewhat blue	36.4%	37.7%	74.1%	15.1%	10.8%	25.9%	0.0%
Very blue	42.5%	40.2%	82.7%	12.1%	4.7%	16.8%	0.5%

Here is an argument in favor of the position that it should be a **low priority** to further reduce air pollution.

Q2. There is already a lot of legislation in place that has improved air quality and will keep improving it for the next decade. Air pollution has decreased a lot. Over the last 50 years, there has been nearly a 75% reduction in the most common types of pollution. Meanwhile, government bureaucrats keep moving the goal posts and imposing new regulations. All this ends up costing a lot-- hurting the economy and costing jobs. Trying to reduce air pollution further would only produce very minor benefits and it is simply not worth the extra cost.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
2020 National	17.7%	25.9%	43.6%	26.3%	29.4%	55.7%	0.7%
Republicans	31.7%	37.5%	69.2%	21.6%	8.9%	30.5%	0.4%
Democrats	6.6%	14.0%	20.6%	29.7%	48.8%	78.5%	0.8%
Independents	16.3%	31.5%	47.8%	27.4%	23.8%	51.2%	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R) 2020							
Very red	19.7%	29.5%	49.2%	26.3%	24.4%	50.7%	0.1%
Somewhat red	21.8%	26.5%	48.3%	21.2%	29.2%	50.4%	1.3%
Lean red	17.9%	24.9%	42.8%	26.9%	29.5%	56.4%	0.7%
Lean blue	14.2%	28.2%	42.4%	25.9%	31.0%	56.9%	0.7%
Somewhat blue	16.2%	24.4%	40.6%	30.1%	28.3%	58.4%	1.0%
Very blue	16.0%	22.1%	38.1%	27.3%	34.4%	61.7%	0.2%

Q3. So now, please select how high a priority it should be for the government to work to reduce the air pollution that has negative effects on health.

	Very high priority	Somewhat high priority	Very / Somewhat	Low priority	Not at all a priority	Low / Not at all	Ref/DK
2020 National	47.2%	31.1%	78.3%	18.0%	3.3%	21.3%	0.3%
Republicans	16.4%	37.6%	54.0%	38.7%	7.1%	45.8%	0.2%
Democrats	74.2%	23.5%	97.7%	1.6%	0.2%	1.8%	0.4%
Independents	44.4%	36.7%	81.1%	15.7%	2.9%	18.6%	0.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R) 2020							
Very red	38.6%	34.5%	73.1%	22.1%	4.5%	26.6%	0.2%
Somewhat red	42.8%	28.9%	71.7%	22.8%	4.8%	27.6%	0.6%
Lean red	43.2%	33.5%	76.7%	20.3%	3.0%	23.3%	0.0%
Lean blue	45.2%	33.7%	78.9%	16.9%	3.9%	20.8%	0.2%
Somewhat blue	53.3%	29.9%	83.2%	14.0%	2.1%	16.1%	0.6%
Very blue	62.7%	25.5%	88.2%	10.3%	1.3%	11.6%	0.3%

[Priority Greenhouse Gas Reduction]

Another debate is about how high a priority it should be for the government to work to further reduce greenhouse gases, especially carbon dioxide. Carbon dioxide is the primary greenhouse gas; and the process of reducing carbon dioxide also reduces other greenhouse gases and other forms of air pollution that have negative health effects.

In 2001, at the request of the administration of President George W. Bush, the National Academies of Science did a major study that concluded: “Greenhouse gases are accumulating in Earth’s atmosphere as a result of human activities, causing surface air temperatures and subsurface ocean temperatures to rise.”

Later, in 2010 the National Academies of Science reviewed and published a survey of 1,372 climate scientists and found that 97% agreed with this conclusion.

This conclusion was also confirmed by the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—a panel of over two thousand climate scientists from 154 countries around the world, often referred to as the IPCC.

The effect of the increase of greenhouse gases has been studied extensively. In 2018 a consortium of US Government agencies and outside experts produced the Fourth National Climate Assessment. It reviewed existing studies and concluded again that as a result of increasing greenhouse gases, global average temperatures have gone up significantly over the last few decades.

This Assessment also concluded that this increase in temperature has resulted in various negative consequences, such as more severe storms, droughts, wildfires, and rising sea levels, which have led to the destruction of homes, businesses, infrastructure and farmland, as well as famine, water scarcity and the mass movement of refugees. All of these consequences were projected to increase substantially in coming decades.

However, there continue to be some debates about such issues as:

- how much climate change is occurring?
- how much risk it poses?
- How much it is due to the gases from human energy production as opposed to natural weather cycles,
- how effective it is to reduce greenhouse gases, especially carbon dioxide, and whether doing so is economically feasible

Some members of Congress question whether reducing these gases will help reduce the problem of climate change, and some question whether climate change is a real problem that needs to be addressed.

While nearly all climate scientists say that climate change is a problem and that reducing gases from energy production is important, there are a small number of climate scientists who contest this view.

Nonetheless, the US government, going back to the George H.W. Bush administration have made it an objective to limit greenhouse gases, especially carbon dioxide.

Also, in response to challenges, the Supreme Court concluded that the evidence is ample that greenhouse gases are pollutants and thus the government should regulate them according to the Clean Air Act. As a result of these government policies, as well as other factors such as the decrease in the price of renewable energy, the production of greenhouse gas emissions in the US have declined about 12% over the last 15 years.

At the same time, there continues to be a debate within the government about how high a priority it should be for the government to work to further reduce greenhouse gases.

Here is an argument in favor of the position that further reducing the production of greenhouse gases should be a high priority.

Q4. The overwhelming majority of climate scientists agree greenhouse gases contribute to climate change and this poses major threats. Already we are seeing hotter and dryer weather contributing to a major increase in wildfires that have created billions of dollars in damage. Sea levels are rising, which will eventually flood coastal areas. Rising temperatures will hurt crops in major farming areas. Without action, government analysts predict these changes will cause the US economy to contract by several percent. Furthermore, taking action will benefit the economy by increasing energy efficiency. Clearly, we should put a high priority on reducing the production of greenhouse gases.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
2020 National	48.2%	26.5%	74.7%	13.5%	11.3%	24.8%	0.4%
Republicans	18.9%	29.9%	48.8%	27.1%	23.8%	50.9%	0.3%
Democrats	75.4%	20.3%	95.7%	2.3%	1.4%	3.7%	0.6%
Independents	42.0%	34.9%	76.9%	12.9%	9.8%	22.7%	0.4%
Cook's PVI (D-R) 2020							
Very red	38.9%	30.3%	69.2%	16.0%	14.4%	30.4%	0.4%
Somewhat red	44.5%	24.9%	69.4%	16.0%	14.3%	30.3%	0.3%
Lean red	48.0%	22.8%	70.8%	15.6%	13.0%	28.6%	0.6%
Lean blue	48.3%	29.2%	77.5%	12.1%	9.7%	21.8%	0.7%
Somewhat blue	50.5%	29.0%	79.5%	10.6%	9.6%	20.2%	0.4%
Very blue	60.3%	24.3%	84.6%	9.3%	5.8%	15.1%	0.3%

Here is an argument for the position that further reducing greenhouse gases should be a low priority:

Q6. There are scientists who question how much climate change is occurring, how much human energy production contributes to it, and whether the risk is important enough to warrant major action. We should continue to research the issue. But, it would be premature to take economically costly steps to change the way we produce energy. US energy costs are relatively low and thus increasing the cost of energy would undermine an American competitive advantage, harm the economy, and cost jobs. It would also hurt people in some parts of the economy, like the coal industry, much more than others, which would not be fair.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
2020 National	18.1%	25.3%	43.4%	23.6%	32.3%	55.9%	0.7%
Republicans	32.3%	36.5%	68.8%	20.8%	9.9%	30.7%	0.5%
Democrats	6.5%	13.1%	19.6%	24.3%	54.9%	79.2%	1.2%
Independents	17.5%	32.4%	49.9%	27.5%	22.6%	50.1%	0.1%
Cook's PVI (D-R) 2020							
Very red	19.4%	28.8%	48.2%	26.6%	24.2%	50.8%	1.0%
Somewhat red	22.8%	24.2%	47.0%	22.3%	30.6%	52.9%	0.1%
Lean red	16.6%	26.4%	43.0%	21.4%	35.4%	56.8%	0.2%
Lean blue	16.9%	24.7%	41.6%	24.3%	33.2%	57.5%	0.9%
Somewhat blue	18.2%	25.3%	43.5%	24.1%	32.0%	56.1%	0.4%
Very blue	14.7%	21.7%	36.4%	23.2%	38.9%	62.1%	1.5%

Here is another argument for the position that further reducing the production of greenhouse gases should be a high priority.

Q5. Over and above the need to reduce greenhouse gases, there are many good reasons for the US to invest in clean energy and energy efficiency. Cleaner air is important for health, brings down health costs, and improves the quality of life. Clean energy has created hundreds of thousands of jobs—far more than for coal, oil and gas combined. And there is more we can do. Other countries like China are investing twice as much as the US in green energy technologies and it is important for the US to stay competitive in what's clearly

becoming the main source of energy for the future. The world is moving to cleaner energy and the US should be ahead of the curve, not dragging behind.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
2020 National	47.9%	26.9%	74.8%	13.5%	9.2%	22.7%	2.5%
Republicans	21.6%	30.5%	52.1%	26.0%	19.5%	45.5%	2.4%
Democrats	72.2%	21.0%	93.2%	2.7%	1.1%	3.8%	3.0%
Independents	42.1%	34.0%	76.1%	14.4%	7.8%	22.2%	1.6%
Cook's PVI (D-R) 2020							
Very red	42.7%	25.5%	68.2%	16.7%	12.7%	29.4%	2.4%
Somewhat red	45.5%	27.0%	72.5%	12.5%	11.6%	24.1%	3.4%
Lean red	44.7%	27.2%	71.9%	16.6%	9.0%	25.6%	2.5%
Lean blue	48.7%	27.6%	76.3%	13.9%	7.4%	21.3%	2.4%
Somewhat blue	48.4%	29.1%	77.5%	12.9%	7.8%	20.7%	1.8%
Very blue	58.8%	24.8%	83.6%	8.2%	5.5%	13.7%	2.7%

Here is another argument for the position that further reducing greenhouse gases should be a low priority:

Q7. The whole effort to reduce carbon dioxide will result in an expanded role for government. There will be even more government bureaucrats making new rules and telling businesses what they can and cannot do. This can slow the economy, which makes it harder for businesses to work to find innovative ways to reduce greenhouse gases. If people want to reduce greenhouse gases, then they can change their own behavior or demand the companies that they buy products from change their ways. The government does not have to be involved in every change that people want to make. Some people just like expanding the role of government even when there are better alternatives.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
2020 National	20.1%	24.3%	44.4%	21.3%	32.0%	53.3%	2.3%
Republicans	37.4%	31.2%	68.6%	18.4%	10.6%	29.0%	2.5%
Democrats	6.2%	14.8%	21.0%	22.2%	54.2%	76.4%	2.5%
Independents	18.6%	33.4%	52.0%	25.2%	21.6%	46.8%	1.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R) 2020							
Very red	24.3%	27.8%	52.1%	21.2%	24.9%	46.1%	1.7%
Somewhat red	24.8%	24.8%	49.6%	17.3%	30.8%	48.1%	2.3%
Lean red	19.0%	23.0%	42.0%	19.8%	35.4%	55.2%	2.8%
Lean blue	18.8%	22.7%	41.5%	22.1%	33.1%	55.2%	3.3%
Somewhat blue	17.5%	24.1%	41.6%	23.4%	33.1%	56.5%	1.9%
Very blue	15.6%	23.3%	38.9%	23.8%	35.6%	59.4%	1.8%

Q8. So now, please select how high a priority you think it should be for the government to work to further reduce greenhouse gases, especially carbon dioxide?

	Very high priority	Somewhat high priority	Very / Somewhat	Low priority	Not at all a priority	Low / Not at all	Ref/DK
2020 National	50.0%	24.4%	74.4%	18.3%	6.9%	25.2%	0.3%
Republicans	18.0%	26.7%	44.7%	40.0%	14.8%	54.8%	0.5%
Democrats	79.5%	18.3%	97.8%	1.5%	0.4%	1.9%	0.2%
Independents	43.6%	34.9%	78.5%	14.6%	6.7%	21.3%	0.2%

Cook's PVI (D-R) 2020

Very red	40.4%	26.1%	66.5%	23.6%	9.5%	33.1%	0.4%
Somewhat red	45.3%	23.4%	68.7%	22.5%	8.6%	31.1%	0.3%
Lean red	47.9%	22.5%	70.4%	22.3%	7.0%	29.3%	0.3%
Lean blue	50.8%	26.8%	77.6%	14.7%	7.2%	21.9%	0.5%
Somewhat blue	53.0%	27.1%	80.1%	14.6%	5.1%	19.7%	0.3%
Very blue	64.7%	20.9%	85.6%	10.4%	4.0%	14.4%	0.1%

[SEPARATE RESPONDENTS INTO TWO RANDOMLY SELECTED SAMPLES: A,B]**[Carbon Fee and Rebate]****[SAMPLE A]**

We are now going to look at a major proposal that seeks to reduce both air pollution and greenhouse gases. This proposal is called the carbon fee and rebate plan.

Briefly stated, here is how it works:

Currently, when companies burn coal, oil, or natural gas and emit greenhouse gases into the air they do not pay any fee for doing so. According to this proposal companies would be charged such a fee. The government would not keep the money from this fee but would distribute it to all citizens equally.

The idea is that the fee will motivate companies to be more energy-efficient and to shift to energy sources that do not produce carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. Still, it is likely that the overall price of energy will go up some. But for most individuals the rebate they get would be at least as much as the increased cost of energy.

[Carbon Fee]

Here is how the plan works in more detail.

Companies that produce coal, oil or natural gas, would be charged a fee of \$35 for each ton of carbon dioxide emitted from the coal, oil and gas that they burn, and an equivalent amount for other greenhouse gases.

Companies will make some efforts to reduce their carbon production, but studies by the government indicate these companies would likely pass much of this increased cost on to consumers. The studies estimate that consumers' energy costs would likely be affected as follows:

- The price of electricity for the average home would go up about \$12 more per month
- The price of gasoline would go up about 31 cents per gallon
- The price of heating an average home with natural gas would go up about \$10 a month

Businesses would also face these increased costs and it is assumed that some or all of those costs would be passed onto consumers in the form of higher prices for some products and services, such as airline travel.

The goal is to produce the following changes:

- Utility companies that generate electricity would shift more quickly to sources of energy that do not produce carbon, such as wind and solar, or that at least produce less carbon, such as natural gas. They would also become more efficient in energy production.
- Utility companies would start investing more in clean energy sources.
- People and businesses would be more motivated to do things like buying electric cars and putting solar panels on their roofs.
- People and businesses would be encouraged to make a greater effort to save energy, like holding a video meeting instead of flying across the country.

Also, as more people and businesses use cleaner forms of energy, it would be produced on a larger scale, and thus the price of cleaner energy would **continue to** go down which would further encourage its use.

Q9. If utility companies were charged a carbon fee for the energy they produce, how effective do you think it would be in encouraging them to use energy sources that produce less carbon dioxide and to be more energy efficient?

	Very	Somewhat	Very / Somewhat	Just a little	Not at all	Just a little / Not at all	Ref/DK
National	27.8%	34.0%	61.8%	22.8%	15.0%	37.8%	0.4%
Republicans	14.3%	28.2%	42.5%	32.1%	25.4%	57.5%	0.0%
Democrats	39.5%	39.3%	78.8%	14.0%	6.2%	20.2%	0.9%
Independents	26.7%	32.7%	59.4%	25.3%	15.3%	40.6%	0.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	25.4%	33.9%	59.3%	21.1%	19.6%	40.7%	0.0%
Somewhat red	25.9%	30.1%	56.0%	26.2%	17.4%	43.6%	0.4%
Lean red	24.4%	36.0%	60.4%	24.9%	14.6%	39.5%	0.0%
Lean blue	26.0%	33.2%	59.2%	23.8%	16.2%	40.0%	0.8%
Somewhat blue	31.8%	34.1%	65.9%	19.3%	14.4%	33.7%	0.5%
Very blue	34.9%	36.7%	71.6%	21.3%	6.2%	27.5%	0.9%

Q10. If a carbon fee were adopted, how effective do you think it would be in encouraging companies in general to be more energy efficient and to use alternative energy systems?

	Very	Somewhat	Very / Somewhat	Just a little	Not at all	Just a little / Not at all	Ref/DK
National	27.3%	37.0%	64.3%	22.4%	13.1%	35.5%	0.3%
Republicans	13.8%	31.8%	45.6%	31.1%	23.1%	54.2%	0.0%
Democrats	39.9%	40.8%	80.7%	14.7%	4.1%	18.8%	0.6%
Independents	24.1%	38.2%	62.3%	23.3%	14.3%	37.6%	0.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	24.5%	38.7%	63.2%	19.9%	17.0%	36.9%	0.0%
Somewhat red	23.5%	35.3%	58.8%	24.9%	16.1%	41.0%	0.2%
Lean red	27.1%	35.0%	62.1%	22.6%	15.3%	37.9%	0.0%
Lean blue	25.2%	33.6%	58.8%	27.8%	12.4%	40.2%	0.9%
Somewhat blue	27.6%	41.0%	68.6%	19.6%	11.3%	30.9%	0.5%
Very blue	36.5%	39.5%	76.0%	18.4%	5.3%	23.7%	0.3%

Q10a. If a carbon fee were adopted, how effective do you think it would be in encouraging individuals to be more energy efficient?

	Very	Somewhat	Very / Somewhat	Just a little	Not at all	Just a little / Not at all	Ref/DK
National	25.0%	34.4%	59.4%	23.9%	16.4%	40.3%	0.4%
Republicans	12.8%	27.3%	40.1%	32.1%	27.8%	59.9%	0.0%
Democrats	34.5%	41.1%	75.6%	17.6%	6.1%	23.7%	0.7%
Independents	26.7%	32.6%	59.3%	22.2%	18.2%	40.4%	0.3%

Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	22.3%	32.3%	54.6%	24.9%	20.5%	45.4%	0.0%
Somewhat red	19.4%	35.0%	54.4%	25.8%	19.7%	45.5%	0.2%
Lean red	22.9%	38.0%	60.9%	21.3%	17.7%	39.0%	0.1%
Lean blue	22.2%	33.4%	55.6%	26.7%	16.2%	42.9%	1.5%
Somewhat blue	28.8%	31.7%	60.5%	27.3%	11.9%	39.2%	0.3%
Very blue	35.9%	36.0%	71.9%	18.1%	9.9%	28.0%	0.2%

[Rebate]

Now, let's look at how the rebate would work:

All of the money the government raises from the fee on carbon dioxide would be distributed to all citizens equally in the form of a monthly check. It is estimated that each person would receive about \$37.50 each month or about \$450 per person each year.

Adults with children would get an additional half-size check (about \$225) per child.

For most people -- well over half -- the amount of the rebate would be more than enough to cover their increased costs due to the carbon fee (including all goods and services affected by the carbon fee, as well as direct energy costs).

People with different income levels would be affected differently. This is because people with lower income levels tend to spend less money on energy and other products and services. Those with higher incomes tend to spend much more.

Here is a chart showing government estimates of how **individuals** in different income levels could be affected annually by the carbon fee and rebate, on average:

	INCOME LEVEL			
	LOW Less than \$25,000	MIDDLE \$25,000 - \$40,000	UPPER-MIDDLE \$40,000 - \$65,000	HIGH More than \$65,000
Average increased costs due to fee	\$100	\$250	\$450	\$850
Rebate	\$450	\$450	\$450	\$450
Overall Annual Effect	+\$350	+\$200	\$0	-\$400

These amounts are for individuals. For households with more than one person, both the costs and the rebate would be larger.

According to the proposal, as the price of clean energy continues to get lower and the amount of carbon being produced goes down, both the carbon fee and the rebate will eventually be ended.

[Costs]

There have been a number of studies conducted by the government and other organizations on the likely effects of such a carbon fee and rebate plan. Let's look first at the negative effects or costs:

As people and companies use less carbon producing energy, there are likely to be some job losses, especially in coal and also oil industries. In communities where these producers of coal and oil have been the primary source of jobs, when they get cut back, this reduces the economic activity throughout the community and can result in additional job losses.

Also, businesses that have high energy costs may be hurt.

At the same time, jobs will be gained in energy industries that produce less carbon dioxide, and also from the manufacture and sale of products and services that save energy.

In addition, many people will spend the additional income from their rebate, causing job increases. On balance, including jobs lost and jobs gained, some analysts estimate that the unemployment rate will go up, while others estimate that it will go down. But they agree that the change will be very small. As we will discuss later, if assistance were given to workers and communities, the overall number of jobs lost would be lower.

[Benefits]

Now, let’s look at the health and environmental benefits.

The reduction of air pollution that would come with reduction in carbon dioxide, would have positive health effects. The government estimates by 2030, this reduction would result in at least:

- **2,600** fewer premature deaths a year
- **127,000** fewer asthma attacks and asthma-related illnesses in children a year
- **1,400** fewer heart attacks a year
- **1,700** fewer hospital admissions a year
- **130,000** fewer lost workdays a year
- **130,000** fewer missed school days a year

Also, scientists say that with less carbon dioxide going into the atmosphere there would be less of an increase in storms, hurricanes, flooding, tornadoes, heat waves, and droughts. Therefore, the following negative effects would be lessened:

- damage to homes, businesses, and roads, bridges and other infrastructure
- lost farm crops
- deaths and injuries from severe weather

By avoiding the health and weather effects that would otherwise occur, economists estimate that by 2030 the country would save between \$20 billion and \$40 billion each year.

We would now like you to evaluate some arguments for and against the carbon fee and rebate plan. Here is an argument in favor of the proposal:

Q11. Reducing carbon emissions is important for our health and for the environment. Economists, business leaders and climate experts—both Republicans and Democrats—agree that a carbon fee is the best solution. It is the least burdensome approach for businesses and requires less bureaucracy. It simply encourages businesses and individuals to switch to cleaner fuels and more energy-saving practices, rather than letting them pollute at no cost. It also motivates businesses to make innovations. Several countries have put in place carbon fees and they have helped to lower their greenhouse gas emissions.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	35.9%	36.8%	72.7%	13.1%	13.2%	26.3%	0.9%
Republicans	14.8%	33.8%	48.6%	22.0%	28.0%	50.0%	1.4%
Democrats	55.8%	37.1%	92.9%	5.2%	1.3%	6.5%	0.6%
Independents	30.7%	42.6%	73.3%	14.3%	11.7%	26.0%	0.7%
Cook’s PVI (D-R)							
Very red	28.1%	37.9%	66.0%	13.5%	18.2%	31.7%	2.2%
Somewhat red	33.7%	31.7%	65.4%	16.5%	17.7%	34.2%	0.5%
Lean red	34.1%	39.0%	73.1%	9.8%	16.0%	25.8%	1.1%
Lean blue	36.8%	34.1%	70.9%	17.8%	11.3%	29.1%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	35.3%	43.5%	78.8%	11.3%	9.6%	20.9%	0.3%
Very blue	47.8%	37.1%	84.9%	9.5%	4.7%	14.2%	0.9%

Here is an argument against the proposal:

Q12. A carbon fee will make coal and oil so expensive that people will stop using it and many coal and oil companies will go out of business. This will result in people losing their jobs in those industries. Some older workers may never get a job again because it is harder for them to be retrained into a new line of work. It will also hurt the general economy in areas of the country where coal and oil industries are big, driving more people out of work. It is unfair that these workers and their communities take the brunt of this plan.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	21.0%	29.7%	50.7%	25.0%	23.4%	48.4%	0.9%
Republicans	36.8%	33.2%	70.0%	20.3%	9.4%	29.7%	0.2%
Democrats	7.1%	25.3%	32.4%	28.2%	38.4%	66.6%	1.0%
Independents	22.5%	33.3%	55.8%	27.1%	15.2%	42.3%	1.8%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	28.1%	29.1%	57.2%	23.1%	18.3%	41.4%	1.4%
Somewhat red	24.8%	26.0%	50.8%	23.1%	25.4%	48.5%	0.6%
Lean red	19.4%	30.7%	50.1%	26.8%	22.9%	49.7%	0.2%
Lean blue	20.7%	26.9%	47.6%	26.3%	25.1%	51.4%	1.0%
Somewhat blue	17.5%	33.6%	51.1%	26.5%	21.6%	48.1%	0.8%
Very blue	15.1%	32.0%	47.1%	24.3%	27.2%	51.5%	1.3%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q13. The fact is that the world is moving toward cleaner energy and US companies should get ahead of the curve in meeting this demand. China is already ahead of the US in some green energy areas and the US could easily fall further and further behind. A carbon fee will increase demand in the US for clean energy and energy savings technology, and this will help US companies move more aggressively into meeting this demand at home and abroad. This will create new high paying jobs for American workers, stimulate the US economy, and create a cleaner environment.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	36.6%	32.8%	69.4%	16.2%	13.1%	29.3%	1.4%
Republicans	13.2%	29.9%	43.1%	27.3%	27.8%	55.1%	1.8%
Democrats	60.5%	30.4%	90.9%	6.7%	1.2%	7.9%	1.2%
Independents	26.1%	44.5%	70.6%	16.4%	12.1%	28.5%	1.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	31.8%	32.6%	64.4%	18.1%	15.8%	33.9%	1.7%
Somewhat red	33.3%	31.2%	64.5%	14.3%	20.6%	34.9%	0.7%
Lean red	36.1%	31.8%	67.9%	17.9%	12.5%	30.4%	1.7%
Lean blue	32.1%	32.8%	64.9%	20.6%	12.7%	33.3%	1.9%
Somewhat blue	35.5%	41.3%	76.8%	12.0%	10.7%	22.7%	0.5%
Very blue	50.9%	27.4%	78.3%	14.8%	4.8%	19.6%	2.0%

Here is another argument against:

Q14. The US has been one of the more aggressive countries in the world, reducing greenhouse gas emissions from 2005 to 2017 by nearly 20% on a per person basis. But the truth is that globally greenhouse gas emissions continued to go up as many other countries, such as China and India, continued to increase. The US right now only produces 14% of all greenhouse gases. Going through a big effort to get it down further will be very costly and do little good in the big picture.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	24.5%	30.6%	55.1%	24.6%	19.1%	43.7%	1.2%
Republicans	44.4%	35.3%	79.7%	13.6%	5.7%	19.3%	1.0%
Democrats	7.1%	24.1%	31.2%	34.3%	33.1%	67.4%	1.4%
Independents	26.5%	37.1%	63.6%	23.4%	12.1%	35.5%	1.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	27.2%	33.6%	60.8%	21.2%	16.5%	37.7%	1.5%
Somewhat red	28.4%	27.6%	56.0%	25.0%	18.3%	43.3%	0.6%
Lean red	27.3%	28.3%	55.6%	25.7%	18.2%	43.9%	0.5%
Lean blue	26.2%	29.1%	55.3%	18.8%	23.6%	42.4%	2.3%
Somewhat blue	19.1%	37.3%	56.4%	27.0%	15.7%	42.7%	0.9%
Very blue	18.6%	29.2%	47.8%	28.8%	21.8%	50.6%	1.6%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q15. It is true that the US only produces 14% of greenhouse gases, but we also represent only 4% of the world population; we emit far more per person than the vast majority of countries. Also, the US is a major world leader. If the US fails to do its part in dealing with greenhouse gases, it is much less likely that other countries will do their part too--they may simply say "why bother trying?" If the US does its part, others are more likely to follow. We are all in this together.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	33.9%	34.2%	68.1%	16.1%	14.1%	30.2%	1.6%
Republicans	13.6%	28.0%	41.6%	25.6%	31.3%	56.9%	1.4%
Democrats	53.0%	37.4%	90.4%	6.6%	1.0%	7.6%	2.0%
Independents	29.1%	39.4%	68.5%	20.0%	10.7%	30.7%	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	31.7%	33.6%	65.3%	18.7%	15.1%	33.8%	0.9%
Somewhat red	32.0%	29.6%	61.6%	17.6%	19.7%	37.3%	1.1%
Lean red	31.0%	33.4%	64.4%	15.0%	17.8%	32.8%	2.8%
Lean blue	31.7%	35.9%	67.6%	17.0%	14.5%	31.5%	0.9%
Somewhat blue	33.6%	37.8%	71.4%	15.4%	9.8%	25.2%	3.4%
Very blue	43.3%	37.1%	80.4%	12.7%	6.1%	18.8%	0.8%

Here is another argument against:

Q16: The government should not try to control the behavior of people and businesses through taxes. If people want to reduce their carbon emissions, then they can use their power as a consumer or business leader to buy or make products that are more environmentally friendly. This is already widely happening and is contributing to the US' reduction in emissions. The government should step aside and let people and businesses make the changes they think are best. The government does not need to be involved in every problem.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	22.9%	24.8%	47.7%	23.3%	27.8%	51.1%	1.3%
Republicans	40.8%	31.1%	71.9%	18.4%	8.6%	27.0%	1.0%
Democrats	7.3%	16.1%	23.4%	27.2%	48.0%	75.2%	1.4%
Independents	24.1%	33.1%	57.2%	23.6%	17.6%	41.2%	1.7%

Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	27.8%	27.8%	55.6%	21.6%	22.2%	43.8%	0.6%
Somewhat red	26.7%	21.9%	48.6%	22.3%	28.5%	50.8%	0.7%
Lean red	23.0%	19.9%	42.9%	24.9%	30.9%	55.8%	1.3%
Lean blue	20.9%	30.8%	51.7%	21.0%	26.2%	47.2%	1.0%
Somewhat blue	22.9%	24.4%	47.3%	25.4%	24.2%	49.6%	3.1%
Very blue	15.0%	25.8%	40.8%	24.1%	33.9%	58.0%	1.1%

Q17. So now, let's review the basics of the proposal:

1. The government would charge companies that produce coal, oil or natural gas, a fee based on the amount of carbon dioxide, and other greenhouse gasses, emitted when the fuels they produce are burned. This amount would be equal to \$35 per ton of carbon dioxide produced.
2. All of the money collected from that fee would then be given to all citizens equally in the form of a monthly rebate check. The amount would total about \$450 per person each year or \$37.50 per month. For nearly all low- and middle-income people, the amount of the rebate would be more than the amount needed to cover their increased costs due to the fee.

How acceptable do you find this proposal on a scale of 0-10, where 0=Not at all acceptable, 5=Just tolerable and 10=very acceptable?

	Median	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
National	5.8	31.5%	12.8%	55.6%	0.1%
Republicans	3.6	55.9%	15.0%	29.1%	0.0%
Democrats	7.7	9.9%	8.2%	81.8%	0.1%
Independents	5.3	34.1%	19.7%	45.9%	0.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	5.3	37.0%	16.1%	47.0%	0.0%
Somewhat red	5.2	39.6%	9.9%	50.4%	0.1%
Lean red	5.7	33.8%	10.6%	55.3%	0.3%
Lean blue	5.6	33.8%	11.1%	54.7%	0.3%
Somewhat blue	6.1	26.5%	14.0%	59.5%	0.1%
Very blue	6.9	15.5%	16.2%	68.3%	0.0%

Q18. So, in conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	61.9%	37.7%	0.4%
Republicans	31.7%	67.9%	0.5%
Democrats	87.4%	12.2%	0.5%
Independents	61.9%	38.1%	0.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	53.8%	45.7%	0.5%
Somewhat red	53.9%	46.1%	0.0%
Lean red	60.1%	39.9%	0.0%
Lean blue	61.0%	38.8%	0.2%
Somewhat blue	68.6%	30.8%	0.6%
Very blue	76.9%	21.9%	1.2%

[Suspend Existing Regulations on Emissions]

We are now going to look at a different proposal that some Members of Congress and industry leaders have proposed.

Currently in Congress, there is a proposal, if a carbon-fee-and-rebate plan were to be adopted:

- to **suspend most existing regulations** requiring energy companies to limit their carbon emissions
- the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) would not be allowed to impose any **new regulations** on carbon dioxide emissions

For example, this provision would suspend requirements that coal-fired power plants produce less carbon dioxide emissions. However, if the carbon fee and rebate does not result in a substantial reduction in carbon dioxide emissions, the regulations would be put back in place sooner. Once targets for emissions reductions have been met, these provisions would expire.

Here is an argument in favor of these added provisions:

Q19. If industries are going to take on the burden of the carbon fee, they should be given the maximum amount of flexibility to deal with it and be innovative. Regulations dictate what the companies must do and limit their options. The pressure of the carbon fee is enough to prompt them to produce cleaner energy. This will also help to get the industry leaders on board with the plan.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	16.0%	40.0%	56.0%	26.6%	17.2%	43.8%	0.2%
Republicans	11.6%	42.9%	54.5%	25.6%	19.4%	45.0%	0.5%
Democrats	18.4%	35.5%	53.9%	29.2%	16.7%	45.9%	0.2%
Independents	18.9%	45.2%	64.1%	22.1%	13.8%	35.9%	0.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	16.0%	41.7%	57.7%	23.3%	18.1%	41.4%	0.8%
Somewhat red	15.7%	34.6%	50.3%	32.5%	17.3%	49.8%	0.0%
Lean red	12.1%	42.0%	54.1%	27.4%	18.3%	45.7%	0.2%
Lean blue	15.9%	38.2%	54.1%	27.5%	18.1%	45.6%	0.3%
Somewhat blue	18.4%	41.6%	60.0%	25.4%	14.5%	39.9%	0.0%
Very blue	18.5%	41.6%	60.1%	23.8%	16.1%	39.9%	0.0%

Here is an argument against:

Q20. Reducing carbon emissions down to the necessary levels will require us to use every tool in the toolbox, which includes regulations. Regulations have proven to be very effective. The Clean Air Act has resulted in a nearly 75% reduction in air pollution. Without regulations, companies may simply decide it's more cost effective to just pay the carbon fee and do the polluting that the regulations currently prohibit. This could eliminate the benefit of the carbon fee.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	31.4%	40.7%	72.1%	17.2%	10.3%	27.5%	0.4%
Republicans	21.3%	44.2%	65.5%	21.3%	12.6%	33.9%	0.6%
Democrats	41.5%	36.5%	78.0%	12.3%	9.5%	21.8%	0.2%
Independents	27.5%	43.8%	71.3%	21.2%	7.1%	28.3%	0.5%

Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	25.3%	43.5%	68.8%	17.5%	13.6%	31.1%	0.0%
Somewhat red	33.3%	36.6%	69.9%	19.8%	9.9%	29.7%	0.5%
Lean red	32.1%	42.5%	74.6%	15.1%	9.6%	24.7%	0.6%
Lean blue	30.8%	43.7%	74.5%	15.4%	9.1%	24.5%	1.0%
Somewhat blue	27.3%	43.1%	70.4%	18.6%	10.7%	29.3%	0.4%
Very blue	38.8%	35.3%	74.1%	17.5%	8.3%	25.8%	0.0%

Q21. So, again, if a carbon fee and rebate is adopted, this proposal would:

- **suspend** most **existing regulations** requiring energy companies to limit their carbon emissions
- not allow the EPA to impose any **new regulations** on carbon dioxide emissions

How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	Median	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
National	3.9	53.0%	18.6%	28.3%	0.1%
Republicans	4.2	49.0%	18.4%	32.2%	0.4%
Democrats	3.3	60.5%	16.7%	22.8%	0.0%
Independents	4.5	42.6%	23.8%	33.6%	0.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	3.9	52.4%	22.3%	25.4%	0.0%
Somewhat red	3.5	59.1%	15.9%	24.9%	0.0%
Lean red	3.8	55.6%	14.5%	29.3%	0.6%
Lean blue	3.7	52.1%	21.5%	26.4%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	4.2	47.0%	20.9%	32.0%	0.0%
Very blue	4.1	49.9%	18.0%	32.1%	0.0%

Q22. So, in conclusion, do you favor or oppose this second proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	33.9%	65.5%	0.6%
Republicans	33.2%	66.4%	0.4%
Democrats	30.2%	69.0%	0.8%
Independents	44.7%	54.9%	0.4%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	33.7%	66.1%	0.3%
Somewhat red	28.0%	71.8%	0.2%
Lean red	29.1%	69.9%	1.0%
Lean blue	33.8%	65.5%	0.8%
Somewhat blue	41.7%	58.1%	0.2%
Very blue	38.5%	60.5%	1.0%

[Other Purposes for Funds]

Some people argue that not all of the money from the fee should go back to the citizens, but that some of it should be used for other purposes. We will now look at three proposals being considered in Congress.

[Transition Assistance for Coal Workers]

As discussed, the carbon fee would result in the increase in the price of fuels that produce a lot of carbon, especially coal, but also oil and natural gas.

This would result in some businesses that produce, distribute, and use those fuels laying off workers or closing down.

For example, coal is the fuel that produces the most carbon dioxide and so it is likely that more coal mines would go out of business and those coal workers would lose their jobs.

While there will be many new jobs created in low-carbon and renewable energy industries, many people who lose their job will not readily find a new one in the area where they live.

Currently in Congress, there is a proposal, if a carbon-fee-and-rebate plan were to be adopted, to use 5% of the money raised—about \$10 billion a year—to help workers who lose their jobs, and communities that are negatively affected, as a result of the carbon fee.

This money would be used to give workers who lose their jobs:

- extra unemployment benefits
- protection of their current health and pension benefits
- job training and education to help them transition to a new job

Also, communities that are hurt by the carbon fee, such as areas that rely a lot on coal, would be provided money to:

- fund development projects in order to create jobs
- help those who have especially high increases in energy prices

If this program were to be adopted, it would reduce the amount of the rebate that people receive (originally \$450) by about \$20 a year.

Here is an argument in favor of this proposal:

Q23. Reducing the amount of air pollution and greenhouse gases would benefit all Americans. However, any time that our economy makes a big change, some people and communities get hurt. It is only fair that, as a society, we devote some money to help people transition into new jobs as quickly as possible. Also, investing in job training and development projects would ensure that communities stay afloat and are brought into the new clean energy economy. Doing this would reduce the rebate very little but would provide enormous benefit to those who need it.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	33.3%	36.5%	69.8%	15.1%	14.4%	29.5%	0.7%
Republicans	12.1%	34.7%	46.8%	25.9%	26.5%	52.4%	0.9%
Democrats	52.9%	36.3%	89.2%	6.6%	3.6%	10.2%	0.7%
Independents	28.9%	41.1%	70.0%	13.7%	15.9%	29.6%	0.5%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	27.6%	36.7%	64.3%	15.9%	18.6%	34.5%	1.2%
Somewhat red	33.1%	34.8%	67.9%	14.8%	17.0%	31.8%	0.3%
Lean red	29.2%	40.1%	69.3%	17.7%	12.6%	30.3%	0.5%
Lean blue	31.0%	36.5%	67.5%	14.2%	18.2%	32.4%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	36.2%	35.5%	71.7%	15.2%	11.1%	26.3%	2.0%
Very blue	44.2%	36.7%	80.9%	10.6%	8.2%	18.8%	0.4%

Here is an argument against:

Q24. This proposal is yet another government program. Government programs like this already exist, such as the Appalachian Regional Commission, and often those dollars are redirected for political purposes rather than helping the communities they are intended for. Regardless, such programs reduce people's incentive to go out and find a job; and if necessary, move to where the new jobs are. Getting people into these new jobs is the responsibility of workers and companies, not the government. Businesses know what they need and can offer

training for the necessary skills. Government investment in development projects sounds good, but it is really better for the market to decide where investments should be made.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	23.9%	30.9%	54.8%	24.5%	19.9%	44.4%	0.7%
Republicans	43.7%	32.3%	76.0%	16.8%	6.3%	23.1%	0.8%
Democrats	7.3%	26.4%	33.7%	31.1%	34.4%	65.5%	0.8%
Independents	24.0%	39.1%	63.1%	24.3%	12.4%	36.7%	0.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	25.4%	36.0%	61.4%	23.3%	14.3%	37.6%	1.0%
Somewhat red	30.6%	27.5%	58.1%	23.9%	17.6%	41.5%	0.3%
Lean red	24.7%	28.9%	53.6%	27.0%	18.8%	45.8%	0.5%
Lean blue	23.6%	32.6%	56.2%	21.8%	21.3%	43.1%	0.7%
Somewhat blue	22.6%	26.7%	49.3%	29.8%	19.7%	49.5%	1.3%
Very blue	15.2%	33.7%	48.9%	21.7%	29.0%	50.7%	0.4%

Q25. So, here again is the proposal:

If a carbon-fee-and-rebate plan were to be adopted, 5% of the money raised—about \$10 billion a year—would be used to give workers who lose their jobs:

- extra unemployment benefits
- protection of their current health and pension benefits
- job training and education to help them transition to a new job

Also, communities that are hurt by the carbon fee, such as areas that rely a lot on coal, would be provided money to:

- fund development projects in order to create jobs
- help those who have especially high increases in energy prices

If this program were to be adopted, it would reduce the amount of the rebate that people receive (originally \$450) by about \$20 a year.

How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	Median	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
National	5.6	30.0%	16.7%	53.1%	0.2%
Republicans	3.7	54.0%	16.8%	28.8%	0.4%
Democrats	7.3	11.1%	14.6%	74.2%	0.1%
Independents	5.7	26.7%	22.1%	51.1%	0.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	4.9	35.8%	17.6%	46.4%	0.2%
Somewhat red	5.4	33.7%	14.7%	51.1%	0.6%
Lean red	5.6	30.2%	17.9%	51.9%	0.0%
Lean blue	5.6	32.1%	19.4%	48.5%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	5.9	28.9%	13.6%	57.6%	0.0%
Very blue	6.7	17.5%	17.8%	64.6%	0.2%

Q26. So, in conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	58.6%	40.8%	0.5%
Republicans	31.8%	67.8%	0.4%
Democrats	81.4%	18.2%	0.5%
Independents	58.0%	40.9%	1.1%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	51.7%	47.8%	0.4%
Somewhat red	54.9%	44.2%	0.8%
Lean red	55.0%	44.4%	0.6%
Lean blue	57.2%	42.8%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	63.7%	36.1%	0.2%
Very blue	72.3%	27.2%	0.6%

[Research, Development and Deployment]

Another proposal is to use 5% of the revenue from the carbon fee—about \$10 billion a year—to provide loans and technical assistance to support the development and production of new technologies to:

- improve energy efficiency
- improve the production, storage and distribution of clean energy

This would reduce the amount of the rebate that people receive (originally \$450) by about \$20 a year.

Here is an argument in favor:

Q27. A lot of the new technologies that we need to quickly reduce carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases require long-term investments that may not pay off quickly. Thus, in many cases private investors are not willing to make those investments. Therefore, because these investments will benefit everybody, the government should be ready to step in and jump start the process. Using a small amount of the carbon fee to invest in clean energy will make the transition to a clean energy economy much quicker and will give the US a big advantage in the clean energy business.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	23.4%	39.0%	62.4%	20.8%	15.4%	36.2%	1.4%
Republicans	8.2%	30.1%	38.3%	30.1%	29.7%	59.8%	1.8%
Democrats	37.0%	45.2%	82.2%	12.9%	3.8%	16.7%	1.2%
Independents	21.1%	42.3%	63.4%	21.0%	14.6%	35.6%	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	17.3%	38.3%	55.6%	22.1%	21.1%	43.2%	1.2%
Somewhat red	21.5%	37.2%	58.7%	20.8%	19.4%	40.2%	1.0%
Lean red	18.8%	42.6%	61.4%	23.0%	13.5%	36.5%	2.2%
Lean blue	28.3%	33.8%	62.1%	21.8%	15.9%	37.7%	0.2%
Somewhat blue	30.0%	36.3%	66.3%	19.0%	12.1%	31.1%	2.6%
Very blue	26.4%	45.2%	71.6%	18.0%	9.7%	27.7%	0.7%

Here is an argument against:

Q28. The government should not be in the business of deciding what technologies are the most promising. Private companies are in a better position to make bets on technologies that are the most promising and they will target the investments in a smarter way because they actually have to make their money back, unlike the government. The carbon fee will be enough of a push to get the private sector to start investing money into

new technologies. We should not reduce the amount of the rebate: the money should go to the people who can use it as they see fit.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	24.3%	33.9%	58.2%	25.7%	15.4%	41.1%	0.7%
Republicans	38.3%	35.9%	74.2%	20.3%	5.2%	25.5%	0.4%
Democrats	10.7%	30.1%	40.8%	32.1%	26.0%	58.1%	1.1%
Independents	28.8%	39.2%	68.0%	21.2%	10.3%	31.5%	0.5%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	23.6%	36.4%	60.0%	26.3%	13.2%	39.5%	0.6%
Somewhat red	27.2%	34.1%	61.3%	24.9%	13.3%	38.2%	0.5%
Lean red	26.2%	36.1%	62.3%	21.1%	16.3%	37.4%	0.3%
Lean blue	23.7%	30.3%	54.0%	28.4%	16.8%	45.2%	0.8%
Somewhat blue	24.3%	29.3%	53.6%	30.7%	13.9%	44.6%	1.9%
Very blue	20.3%	35.0%	55.3%	25.0%	19.5%	44.5%	0.2%

Q29. So, here again is the proposal:

Use 5% of the revenue from the carbon fee—about \$10 billion a year—to provide loans and technical assistance to support the development and production of new technologies to:

- improve energy efficiency
- improve the production, storage, and distribution of clean energy

This would reduce the amount of the rebate that people receive (originally \$450) by about \$20 a year.

How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	Median	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
National	5.3	33.1%	17.8%	49.0%	0.1%
Republicans	3.7	55.1%	16.3%	28.5%	0.1%
Democrats	7.3	13.4%	17.4%	69.0%	0.2%
Independents	5.7	36.3%	21.8%	41.9%	0.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	4.8	38.6%	19.5%	41.6%	0.3%
Somewhat red	5.1	36.9%	18.0%	45.1%	0.0%
Lean red	5.2	35.3%	16.6%	48.1%	0.0%
Lean blue	5.3	34.2%	17.6%	48.2%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	5.6	29.5%	15.5%	54.9%	0.0%
Very blue	6.1	23.1%	18.3%	58.4%	0.2%

Q30. So, in conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	53.9%	45.5%	0.6%
Republicans	28.4%	71.2%	0.4%
Democrats	76.6%	22.8%	0.6%
Independents	50.7%	48.5%	0.8%

Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	46.3%	53.6%	0.1%
Somewhat red	50.5%	48.5%	1.0%
Lean red	50.1%	49.7%	0.2%
Lean blue	50.0%	49.2%	0.8%
Somewhat blue	60.8%	38.4%	0.8%
Very blue	67.4%	32.3%	0.3%

[Infrastructure]

Another proposal is to use 20% of the money from the carbon fee—about \$40 billion a year—to invest in infrastructure to make it more energy efficient and resilient.

This includes rebuilding or upgrading:

- the electric grid,
- water systems,
- government buildings,
- roads and bridges.

This investment would be used to make infrastructure:

- more energy-efficient
- more capable of withstanding major storms, floods, and other severe weather events

In addition, it would include developing:

- more public transportation
- new clean energy systems like charging stations for electric cars

This would reduce the amount of the rebate that people receive (originally \$450) by about \$90 a year.

Here is an argument in favor:

Q31. A lot of the infrastructure in this country is in terrible condition - it is dangerous and vulnerable to being destroyed by major storms or floods. Poor roads make cars use more gas, old buildings leak heat, and the outdated electric grid wastes energy. We need to make our infrastructure more energy-efficient and resilient. And if we don't do it now, we will end up spending even more money when the infrastructure falls apart. We also need to invest in more and better public transportation and new clean energy systems. Using some of the revenue from the carbon fee for these purposes is a wise investment.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	37.2%	34.7%	71.9%	15.4%	12.1%	27.5%	0.6%
Republicans	16.4%	35.9%	52.3%	24.0%	23.2%	47.2%	0.5%
Democrats	54.9%	32.6%	87.5%	8.7%	2.9%	11.6%	0.9%
Independents	36.2%	37.5%	73.7%	14.2%	11.7%	25.9%	0.4%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	34.6%	35.9%	70.5%	14.5%	14.8%	29.3%	0.1%
Somewhat red	34.7%	30.5%	65.2%	18.6%	16.1%	34.7%	0.1%
Lean red	35.4%	35.4%	70.8%	14.5%	13.9%	28.4%	0.8%
Lean blue	38.3%	37.4%	75.7%	14.2%	9.6%	23.8%	0.4%
Somewhat blue	37.0%	32.0%	69.0%	20.6%	9.5%	30.1%	0.8%
Very blue	42.8%	38.7%	81.5%	9.8%	7.2%	17.0%	1.5%

Here is an argument against:

Q32. Most infrastructure is owned and operated by states and cities. They need to rely less on the federal government and more on themselves. Local government knows best what they need to spend on. If the citizens of different states and cities want to invest in their own infrastructure, they can redirect spending to that or raise their taxes. The federal government should not be responsible for everything in this country. Furthermore, reducing the rebate by \$90 would mean that middle class people will lose a lot of the cushion against the price increases that come from the carbon fee.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	22.1%	31.4%	53.5%	25.3%	20.6%	45.9%	0.5%
Republicans	35.3%	34.1%	69.4%	23.3%	6.9%	30.2%	0.5%
Democrats	9.7%	26.9%	36.6%	28.3%	34.5%	62.8%	0.5%
Independents	25.5%	37.2%	62.7%	22.1%	14.9%	37.0%	0.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	24.4%	32.3%	56.7%	25.5%	17.8%	43.3%	0.1%
Somewhat red	21.7%	34.0%	55.7%	22.3%	21.9%	44.2%	0.1%
Lean red	25.0%	30.5%	55.5%	22.3%	22.1%	44.4%	0.2%
Lean blue	24.2%	29.6%	53.8%	24.8%	20.3%	45.1%	1.0%
Somewhat blue	21.3%	32.2%	53.5%	27.8%	17.9%	45.7%	0.8%
Very blue	16.2%	28.9%	45.1%	30.5%	23.9%	54.4%	0.6%

Q33. So, here again is the proposal:

Use 20% of the money from the carbon fee—about \$40 billion a year—to invest in infrastructure to make it more energy efficient and resilient. This would reduce the amount of the rebate that people receive (originally \$450) by about \$90 a year.

How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	Median	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
National	5.6	32.3%	15.7%	51.7%	0.3%
Republicans	3.9	51.8%	16.1%	31.6%	0.5%
Democrats	7.1	15.2%	13.2%	71.2%	0.3%
Independents	5.3	33.8%	21.0%	45.2%	0.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	4.9	39.4%	18.4%	42.0%	0.1%
Somewhat red	5.4	34.3%	15.5%	50.1%	0.2%
Lean red	5.4	34.8%	13.7%	51.5%	0.1%
Lean blue	5.5	33.3%	15.0%	51.3%	0.3%
Somewhat blue	5.6	30.8%	16.1%	52.7%	0.5%
Very blue	6.5	20.4%	15.6%	63.3%	0.7%

Q34. So, in conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	56.7%	42.4%	0.9%
Republicans	35.5%	64.0%	0.4%
Democrats	75.8%	23.5%	0.7%
Independents	53.5%	44.4%	2.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	49.7%	48.5%	1.8%
Somewhat red	55.6%	44.0%	0.5%
Lean red	55.0%	44.8%	0.2%
Lean blue	55.1%	44.3%	0.6%
Somewhat blue	56.8%	42.7%	0.5%
Very blue	69.3%	29.1%	1.6%

[Re-Ask Rebate Proposal]

[RESPONDENTS WERE ONLY SHOWN PROPOSALS THEY FAVORED (Q26, Q30 OR Q34)]

Q35. Suppose the proposal for a carbon fee and rebate were to include the following provisions:

- Use 5% of the money from the carbon fee to provide assistance to workers and communities hurt by the carbon fee, reducing the rebate by \$20. **(Display If Q26=Favor)**
- Use 5% of the money from the carbon fee for research and development of new technologies to improve energy efficiency and the production, storage and distribution of clean energy and to help bring them to market, reducing the rebate by \$20. **(Display If Q30=Favor)**
- Use 20% of the funds from the carbon fee to invest in infrastructure to make it more energy efficient and resilient, reducing the rebate by \$90. **(Display If Q34=Favor)**

Would you then favor or oppose the carbon fee and rebate proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK	Favor carbon fee on Q18	Total favor w/mitigations
National	10.0%	4.5%	0.1%	61.90%	71.9%
Republicans	13.7%	6.8%	0.4%	31.70%	45.4%
Democrats	7.3%	2.0%	0.0%	87.40%	94.7%
Independents	9.2%	5.8%	0.0%	61.90%	71.1%
Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	11.1%	4.2%	0.0%	53.80%	64.9%
Somewhat red	10.4%	7.1%	0.0%	53.90%	64.3%
Lean red	12.2%	2.4%	0.2%	60.10%	72.3%
Lean blue	6.5%	5.8%	0.6%	61.00%	67.5%
Somewhat blue	8.9%	4.6%	0.0%	68.60%	77.5%
Very blue	10.0%	2.8%	0.0%	76.90%	86.9%

###