PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

- 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.

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	Ref / DK
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)							
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	Ref / DK
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)							
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
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)							
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%

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	Ref / DK
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)							
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	Ref / DK
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)							
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	Ref / DK
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)							
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	Ref / DK
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)							
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
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)							
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]

[SAMPLE A]

Q9-35: (Held for future release)

[SAMPLE B]

Let's turn now to some policy proposals. There is a debate about whether the government should provide assistance to individuals and companies to help them adopt new technologies to produce clean energy and increase energy efficiency. There are two ways this can be done:

- *Q36-39: (Held for future release)*
- Providing tax incentives

Another way that the government can encourage people and companies to adopt clean energy or energy-saving technologies is to provide them tax incentives.

As you may know, a **tax credit** reduces the total amount of taxes a person or company owes. For example, if a person owes $5,000 in taxes and gets a $1,000 tax credit, then they will only owe $4,000.

Currently, there are a number of such tax credits in place to encourage people and companies to adopt clean energy or energy-saving technologies. Most will expire within the next couple of years but could be renewed. Thus, there is a debate about whether the government should provide such tax credits.

Here is an argument in favor of the government providing such tax credits:

Q40. Clean energy and energy-saving technologies are not being adopted as fast as they could be, nor as fast as they need to be for us to have cleaner air and to forestall the dangers of climate change. Companies and people are not adopting them because they require upfront costs and there is uncertainty about how well they will pay off. Yet, we all benefit when these technologies are adopted. And the benefits for society outweigh the cost of the tax incentives. So, it is in our collective interest to encourage more companies and people to adopt these technologies, moving us all more quickly into a cleaner energy future.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	35.4%	42.5%	**77.9%**	14.0%	7.8%	**21.8%**	0.3%
Republicans	15.8%	42.6%	**58.4%**	24.7%	16.6%	**41.3%**	0.4%
Democrats	53.9%	40.2%	**94.1%**	5.2%	0.5%	**5.7%**	0.1%
Independents	30.4%	47.8%	**78.2%**	13.6%	7.8%	**21.4%**	0.4%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	31.5%	40.3%	**71.8%**	18.2%	9.9%	**28.1%**	0.1%
Somewhat red	30.8%	43.4%	**74.2%**	12.5%	12.2%	**24.7%**	1.2%
Lean red	37.1%	40.6%	**77.7%**	15.0%	7.3%	**22.3%**	0.0%
Lean blue	31.9%	46.7%	**78.6%**	13.3%	8.0%	**21.3%**	0.0%
Somewhat blue	40.0%	42.5%	**82.5%**	12.8%	4.6%	**17.4%**	0.0%
Very blue	41.1%	42.3%	**83.4%**	11.7%	4.5%	**16.2%**	0.4%

Here is a counter-argument:

Q41. If people or companies think that it is important to adopt these new green technologies, that's fine. But, we should not all be expected to help them pay for it. We need to remember that the government's energy-related incentives are not free. In 2019 these tax credits cost the government over $20 billion. That money has to come from somewhere. Many of these companies and individuals have the means to cover the costs of their preferred energy technologies without getting tax breaks.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	18.5%	30.6%	**49.1%**	28.0%	22.4%	**50.4%**	0.5%
Republicans	30.6%	38.4%	**69.0%**	22.5%	8.1%	**30.6%**	0.5%
Democrats	7.9%	22.9%	**30.8%**	31.7%	36.9%	**68.6%**	0.6%
Independents	19.5%	33.4%	**52.9%**	30.6%	16.2%	**46.8%**	0.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	25.3%	33.1%	**58.4%**	23.1%	18.4%	**41.5%**	0.1%
Somewhat red	21.5%	28.8%	**50.3%**	27.9%	21.2%	**49.1%**	0.5%
Lean red	19.3%	28.5%	**47.8%**	26.6%	24.3%	**50.9%**	1.3%
Lean blue	13.1%	35.3%	**48.4%**	28.6%	23.1%	**51.7%**	0.0%
Somewhat blue	12.3%	28.9%	**41.2%**	35.9%	22.2%	**58.1%**	0.7%
Very blue	17.3%	29.4%	**46.7%**	28.0%	24.8%	**52.8%**	0.4%

Q42. So, how acceptable do you find the idea of providing tax credits to encourage people and companies to adopt clean energy or energy-saving technologies?

	Median	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
National	6.8	16.5%	14.1%	69.1%	0.3%
Republicans	5.2	31.3%	19.4%	48.7%	0.6%
Democrats	8.2	3.5%	8.2%	88.2%	0.1%
Independents	6.6	17.8%	17.5%	64.3%	0.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	6.2	21.9%	18.4%	59.4%	0.2%
Somewhat red	6.5	18.4%	16.3%	64.9%	0.4%
Lean red	6.8	20.2%	8.6%	70.1%	1.0%
Lean blue	7.1	11.4%	12.6%	76.0%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	6.9	14.6%	15.5%	69.9%	0.0%
Very blue	7.3	10.3%	12.9%	76.5%	0.3%

We will now consider a number of specific proposed tax credits. In most cases the amount of the credit depends on how clean the energy is or how much energy savings is produced, up to a maximum. These proposals are based on tax credits that are in place and will expire soon, but they also have some new proposed features.

Here are some proposed tax credits for companies that produce energy, such as utilities or gasoline companies. Please select whether you favor or oppose each one.

Q43a. A tax credit up to 30% of the cost of equipment that produces clean energy, such as solar panels or wind turbines, or stores clean energy.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	74.5%	24.6%	0.9%
Republicans	57.5%	41.3%	1.2%
Democrats	90.5%	8.8%	0.7%
Independents	70.2%	29.1%	0.7%

Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	66.0%	32.7%	1.3%
Somewhat red	72.7%	26.9%	0.4%
Lean red	75.3%	24.4%	0.3%
Lean blue	78.2%	20.1%	1.7%
Somewhat blue	79.2%	20.5%	0.3%
Very blue	78.2%	20.5%	1.3%

Q43b. A tax credit for the amount of electricity produced with clean energy, equal to up to 5-10% of the average retail cost of electricity.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	75.9%	23.0%	1.1%
Republicans	62.3%	36.8%	0.9%
Democrats	89.1%	10.1%	0.8%
Independents	71.4%	26.5%	2.1%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	72.2%	26.7%	1.2%
Somewhat red	72.4%	27.0%	0.6%
Lean red	76.1%	22.8%	1.1%
Lean blue	78.1%	21.0%	0.9%
Somewhat blue	81.3%	18.5%	0.2%
Very blue	77.2%	20.4%	2.4%

Q43c. A tax credit of up to $1 per gallon for the production of transportation fuel that produces 25% fewer emissions than the current average.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	62.2%	36.7%	1.1%
Republicans	49.6%	49.7%	0.7%
Democrats	73.5%	25.4%	1.0%
Independents	60.2%	37.7%	2.1%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	55.6%	43.8%	0.6%
Somewhat red	59.3%	39.6%	1.1%
Lean red	66.5%	32.3%	1.2%
Lean blue	66.2%	32.5%	1.2%
Somewhat blue	65.9%	34.1%	0.0%
Very blue	61.7%	35.9%	2.4%

[Residential Buildings]
Here are some proposed tax credits for homeowners or owners of residential buildings, like apartment complexes, who make energy-saving upgrades. For each one, please select whether you favor or oppose it:
Q44a. A tax credit up to $3,000 for building a new energy-efficient home or residential building.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	79.4%	18.6%	2.0%
Republicans	69.5%	27.9%	2.6%
Democrats	88.3%	9.8%	1.8%
Independents	77.5%	21.1%	1.3%

Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	79.7%	19.0%	1.3%
Somewhat red	75.6%	21.8%	2.6%
Lean red	78.0%	18.5%	3.4%
Lean blue	77.8%	19.5%	2.7%
Somewhat blue	81.6%	16.6%	1.7%
Very blue	83.8%	15.7%	0.6%

Q44b. A tax credit up to $6,500 for making energy-saving improvements such as fuel-efficient lighting, doors, windows, or insulation.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	77.5%	20.5%	2.0%
Republicans	69.5%	28.1%	2.4%
Democrats	86.6%	11.5%	2.0%
Independents	71.6%	26.8%	1.6%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	75.7%	23.3%	1.0%
Somewhat red	71.8%	25.7%	2.6%
Lean red	77.3%	19.5%	3.2%
Lean blue	83.0%	14.8%	2.2%
Somewhat blue	79.7%	18.2%	2.1%
Very blue	79.5%	19.3%	1.2%

Q44c. A tax credit up to $1,500 for installing a new energy-efficient heating or air conditioning system.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	83.9%	14.2%	2.0%
Republicans	74.7%	22.7%	2.7%
Democrats	92.5%	6.0%	1.5%
Independents	81.7%	16.7%	1.6%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	82.4%	16.3%	1.3%
Somewhat red	80.6%	16.9%	2.6%
Lean red	83.2%	14.0%	2.7%
Lean blue	82.9%	14.9%	2.2%
Somewhat blue	86.8%	11.4%	1.8%
Very blue	87.9%	10.9%	1.2%

[Commercial Buildings]
Here are some proposed tax credits for owners of commercial buildings, such as offices of factories, who make energy-saving upgrades. For each one, please select whether you favor or oppose it:

Q45a. A tax credit up to $4.75 per square foot for building new energy-efficient commercial buildings.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	72.0%	26.4%	1.6%
Republicans	60.9%	37.2%	2.0%
Democrats	83.2%	15.3%	1.6%
Independents	67.3%	31.5%	1.2%

Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	66.7%	32.3%	1.1%
Somewhat red	66.3%	31.5%	2.2%
Lean red	73.1%	25.0%	1.9%
Lean blue	75.4%	23.3%	1.3%
Somewhat blue	78.7%	19.7%	1.7%
Very blue	74.3%	24.1%	1.7%

Q45b. A tax credit up to $9.25 per square foot for making energy-saving improvements to commercial buildings that reduce energy.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	65.7%	32.6%	1.7%
Republicans	52.4%	45.5%	2.2%
Democrats	78.1%	20.3%	1.6%
Independents	62.9%	36.3%	0.8%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	61.3%	37.0%	1.7%
Somewhat red	57.8%	40.1%	2.1%
Lean red	67.3%	30.9%	1.8%
Lean blue	69.5%	28.7%	1.8%
Somewhat blue	68.5%	30.0%	1.5%
Very blue	72.0%	27.0%	1.0%

We are now going to look at some possible **new** tax credits for companies that invest in, install, and sell energy from new and innovative "first-of-its-kind" clean energy technology. When the technology becomes more established and popular the tax credit is reduced. For each one, please select whether you favor or oppose it:

Q46a. A tax credit up to 30% for an investment in the development of first-of-its-kind clean energy technology to produce, store or distribute energy.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	71.1%	27.7%	1.2%
Republicans	57.0%	42.6%	0.3%
Democrats	83.3%	14.9%	1.8%
Independents	70.4%	28.3%	1.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	66.3%	32.1%	1.6%
Somewhat red	66.4%	32.8%	0.9%
Lean red	68.5%	30.0%	1.5%
Lean blue	74.0%	25.4%	0.7%
Somewhat blue	79.5%	20.3%	0.2%
Very blue	74.4%	23.8%	1.8%

Q46b. A tax credit up to 40% of the cost of installing first-of-its-kind clean energy technology.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	64.5%	34.3%	1.3%
Republicans	47.4%	51.9%	0.7%
Democrats	79.0%	19.2%	1.8%
Independents	64.1%	34.8%	1.1%

Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	60.9%	38.1%	1.0%
Somewhat red	59.4%	39.8%	0.7%
Lean red	64.3%	34.2%	1.5%
Lean blue	66.8%	30.9%	2.3%
Somewhat blue	69.0%	30.7%	0.3%
Very blue	68.2%	30.1%	1.7%

Q46c. A tax credit up to 60% of the sales price of clean energy produced using first-of-its-kind technology.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	55.4%	43.5%	1.2%
Republicans	40.3%	59.2%	0.5%
Democrats	67.4%	30.8%	1.7%
Independents	56.7%	42.1%	1.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	51.2%	47.1%	1.7%
Somewhat red	50.4%	48.5%	1.0%
Lean red	53.9%	45.3%	0.9%
Lean blue	58.9%	39.6%	1.5%
Somewhat blue	61.0%	38.8%	0.2%
Very blue	58.5%	39.8%	1.7%

Lastly, here are some possible **new** tax credits that have been proposed for electric vehicles. For each one, please select whether you favor or oppose it:

Q47a. For manufacturers of fully electric buses, a tax credit equal to 10% of the sales price of each bus sold.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	68.7%	29.5%	1.8%
Republicans	52.3%	46.1%	1.6%
Democrats	84.0%	13.9%	2.1%
Independents	64.7%	33.6%	1.6%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	61.6%	36.9%	1.5%
Somewhat red	65.8%	32.1%	2.1%
Lean red	63.3%	32.9%	3.8%
Lean blue	72.7%	26.5%	0.8%
Somewhat blue	74.5%	23.5%	2.0%
Very blue	76.0%	23.4%	0.6%

Q47b. For people buying cars, a tax credit of $7,500 for purchasing a new electric car.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	63.3%	34.8%	2.0%
Republicans	42.9%	55.4%	1.6%
Democrats	80.0%	17.8%	2.2%
Independents	64.1%	34.0%	1.9%

Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	58.9%	39.9%	1.2%
Somewhat red	58.8%	39.2%	2.0%
Lean red	58.4%	37.4%	4.2%
Lean blue	69.3%	29.9%	0.8%
Somewhat blue	65.7%	32.3%	2.0%
Very blue	70.7%	28.1%	1.1%

Q47c. For people earning $30,000 or less, a tax credit of $5,000 for purchasing a used electric car.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	64.4%	33.7%	1.9%
Republicans	42.1%	56.4%	1.5%
Democrats	83.7%	14.1%	2.2%
Independents	63.0%	35.3%	1.8%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	58.4%	40.6%	1.0%
Somewhat red	58.3%	39.6%	2.1%
Lean red	62.9%	34.5%	2.7%
Lean blue	67.1%	31.8%	1.1%
Somewhat blue	66.9%	30.3%	2.8%
Very blue	75.1%	23.5%	1.5%

Naturally, many people will only buy electric cars if they can have access to charging stations. For example, people who live in an apartment building or condo may not have a way to charge their car. Having more charging stations would encourage people to buy electric cars. Therefore, to encourage apartment buildings and companies to build charging stations, the following tax credit has been proposed:

Q48. Do you favor or oppose the following proposal?

A tax credit of up to 75% of the cost of installing a charging station that can be used by anyone.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	65.6%	33.3%	1.0%
Republicans	45.8%	53.4%	0.9%
Democrats	81.6%	17.6%	0.8%
Independents	67.3%	30.8%	1.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	57.4%	40.8%	1.9%
Somewhat red	60.3%	38.3%	1.4%
Lean red	63.8%	35.6%	0.5%
Lean blue	69.5%	29.5%	1.0%
Somewhat blue	67.7%	31.1%	1.2%
Very blue	76.8%	23.0%	0.2%

[Do If Q48 = oppose (2) or SKIP]

Q48a: Would you favor a tax credit of 50%?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK	Approve of 75% Credit on Q48	Total favor
National	7.5%	26.5%	0.4%	65.6%	73.1%
Republicans	8.2%	45.4%	0.7%	45.8%	54.0%
Democrats	7.6%	10.7%	0.2%	81.6%	89.2%
Independents	6.0%	26.4%	0.3%	67.3%	73.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	9.4%	33.0%	0.2%	57.4%	66.8%
Somewhat red	7.4%	32.2%	0.2%	60.3%	67.7%
Lean red	6.4%	28.8%	1.0%	63.8%	70.2%
Lean blue	7.4%	22.8%	0.3%	69.5%	76.9%
Somewhat blue	10.5%	21.5%	0.4%	67.7%	78.2%
Very blue	4.7%	18.4%	0.1%	76.8%	81.5%

###