



PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS NOVEMBER 2019 - QUESTIONNAIRE -

Fielded by: Nielsen Scarborough
Sample Size: 2,417 registered voters

Fielding Dates: October 22 - 30, 2019
Margin of Error: +/- 2.0%

Questions 1-10 to be released.

[Sustainable Development Goals]

Now we are going to turn to some of the challenges that the UN and its member countries, including the US, are addressing.

As you may know in 2000, all of the member countries of the United Nations (including the US), plus international agencies and international non-profit aid organizations came together and agreed on a set of worldwide goals to achieve by 2015. This included goals of:

- lowering the number of people in extreme poverty
- reducing hunger
- providing access to healthcare
- ensuring education for all children

and others. These were known as the Millennium Development Goals. Some of these goals were achieved. Most notable, the number of people living in extreme poverty was cut in half. But other goals were not fully met.

In 2015, another set of goals was developed with the aim of achieving them by 2030. These are known as the Sustainable Development Goals.

Q11. How familiar are you with the Millennium Development Goals or the Sustainable Development Goals?

	Very familiar	A little familiar	Familiar	Not so familiar	Not familiar at all	Unfamiliar	Ref/DK
National	5.7%	24.6%	30.3%	36.5%	33.1%	69.6%	0.1%
GOP	4.2%	22.6%	26.8%	36.8%	36.3%	73.1%	0.0%
Dem.	6.6%	26.8%	33.4%	37.3%	29.1%	66.4%	0.2%
Indep.	6.4%	23.8%	30.2%	34.0%	35.8%	69.8%	0.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	5.3%	25.4%	30.7%	42.5%	26.8%	69.3%	0.0%
Somewhat red	6.3%	20.9%	27.2%	35.2%	37.1%	72.3%	0.4%
Lean red	3.2%	25.6%	28.8%	39.6%	31.6%	71.2%	0.0%
Lean blue	6.2%	24.6%	30.8%	33.8%	35.5%	69.3%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	7.0%	24.3%	31.3%	32.2%	36.5%	68.7%	0.0%
Very blue	6.4%	29.5%	35.9%	33.7%	30.4%	64.1%	0.0%

Currently, there is some debate about whether the US should contribute more to these efforts to address international challenges including disaster relief, reducing hunger, access to clean drinking water, and so on.

[Pro: Moral]

Q12. The US is the wealthiest country in history, and it has a moral obligation to help improve the lot of the most disadvantaged. We have a long history of giving aid to people who need it the most, and we should continue that legacy. There is still essential work to be done: millions of people suffer from hunger, disease, and poverty, with many driven from their homes due to disasters and political conflict. The US government contributes just under one percent of the federal budget to these causes -- less than many other developed countries. We can do more--the need is great and we can afford it.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
National	24.9%	33.6%	58.5%	23.0%	17.7%	40.7%	0.8%
GOP	7.0%	29.4%	36.4%	31.7%	31.2%	62.9%	0.6%
Dem.	43.9%	36.8%	80.7%	13.9%	4.5%	18.4%	0.8%
Indep.	17.2%	34.8%	52.0%	26.6%	20.6%	47.2%	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	21.5%	32.0%	53.5%	25.7%	20.4%	46.1%	0.4%
Somewhat red	24.1%	32.3%	56.4%	23.5%	19.4%	42.9%	0.7%
Lean red	25.8%	33.7%	59.5%	22.3%	17.6%	39.9%	0.7%
Lean blue	24.8%	33.7%	58.5%	24.0%	16.1%	40.1%	1.4%
Somewhat blue	22.5%	37.3%	59.8%	21.9%	18.2%	40.1%	0.0%
Very blue	33.7%	32.4%	66.1%	20.2%	12.3%	32.5%	1.4%

[Con: Responsibility is at home, spend the money at home]

Q13. The US government has a moral obligation first and foremost to help its own citizens. Life expectancy in the US is actually going down, homelessness is going up, much of the infrastructure is in dire need of repair, and the country's main social safety net -- Social Security -- is running out of money. Spending tens of billions to help other countries when we are facing our own severe problems is irresponsible. Each country should focus on solving their own problems and encourage others to do the same.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
National	40.6%	29.2%	69.8%	18.2%	11.7%	29.9%	0.4%
GOP	63.8%	24.1%	87.9%	9.1%	3.0%	12.1%	0.0%
Dem.	20.0%	32.2%	52.2%	26.9%	20.0%	46.9%	0.9%
Indep.	40.5%	33.1%	73.6%	16.5%	10.0%	26.5%	0.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	45.5%	32.6%	78.1%	11.9%	9.6%	21.5%	0.4%
Somewhat red	44.5%	26.9%	71.4%	18.4%	9.3%	27.7%	0.9%
Lean red	43.7%	26.2%	69.9%	16.1%	14.0%	30.1%	0.0%
Lean blue	35.0%	28.9%	63.9%	24.7%	10.5%	35.2%	1.0%
Somewhat blue	39.8%	30.4%	70.2%	16.7%	13.0%	29.7%	0.0%
Very blue	31.8%	29.4%	61.2%	23.5%	15.3%	38.8%	0.0%

[Pro: Global Improvements Helps US]

Q14. We should think of aid programs as not only the moral thing to do, but an investment in the future. Contributing to help solve international problems and lift countries up benefits the US in many ways. Countries who get aid grow their economies, eventually becoming self-sufficient, and creating a market for US goods--11 out of America's 15 top trading partners were once receiving US foreign aid. When countries develop their economies and improve their democracies, they are less likely to have conflicts and their people are less likely to try to migrate to the US illegally.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
National	30.6%	38.9%	69.5%	18.8%	10.7%	29.5%	1.0%
GOP	12.4%	38.7%	51.1%	28.9%	19.1%	48.0%	1.0%
Dem.	50.4%	35.6%	86.0%	9.4%	3.1%	12.5%	1.4%
Indep.	21.1%	47.1%	68.2%	20.2%	11.1%	31.3%	0.4%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	25.1%	40.6%	65.7%	20.5%	11.7%	32.2%	2.2%
Somewhat red	29.1%	37.0%	66.1%	20.1%	12.8%	32.9%	1.0%
Lean red	30.8%	37.7%	68.5%	20.2%	11.0%	31.2%	0.3%
Lean blue	30.7%	40.2%	70.9%	19.7%	8.7%	28.4%	0.8%
Somewhat blue	32.8%	39.9%	72.7%	17.4%	9.7%	27.1%	0.3%
Very blue	38.3%	37.4%	75.7%	13.1%	9.6%	22.7%	1.6%

[Con: Aid Not Effective]

Q15. Lots of foreign aid is simply not very effective. Around a quarter of all World Bank aid projects end up not meeting their goals, according to the World Bank. Too much is wasted on bureaucracies here in the US. And the money that does get to foreign countries too often ends up in the pockets of corrupt foreign officials. There are numerous cases where countries received aid, but only got poorer. This happened all throughout Africa -- as aid increased many countries actually got poorer. When governments can rely on aid money instead of taxes from their own people, they become unaccountable to their people. Before the US starts giving more aid, these countries need to clean up their act. The US government may think it knows what is needed in these countries, but experience shows many efforts simply do not work.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
National	35.0%	34.8%	69.8%	20.3%	8.8%	29.1%	1.0%
GOP	56.5%	32.4%	88.9%	8.3%	2.1%	10.4%	0.6%
Dem.	17.9%	33.9%	51.8%	32.3%	14.4%	46.7%	1.5%
Indep.	30.1%	42.4%	72.5%	16.8%	9.9%	26.7%	0.8%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	38.3%	39.8%	78.1%	15.7%	5.3%	21.0%	0.8%
Somewhat red	36.0%	36.2%	72.2%	18.3%	8.2%	26.5%	1.3%
Lean red	36.4%	34.2%	70.6%	20.9%	8.0%	28.9%	0.5%
Lean blue	31.0%	30.8%	61.8%	26.4%	8.7%	35.1%	3.0%
Somewhat blue	34.0%	35.9%	69.9%	17.0%	12.8%	29.8%	0.3%
Very blue	31.6%	31.5%	63.1%	25.4%	11.3%	36.7%	0.2%

[Pro: Aid is Effective]

Q16. When we make a commitment to helping people get on their feet it can make a big difference. For example: International aid over the last 25 years has saved 700 million lives, helped reduce the number of malnourished people by almost half, and helped reduce the number in living extreme poverty by more than half. This is from health aid which has provided 500 million children vaccines and helped stop disease epidemics, and food aid which has provided nutritional meals to millions of children across the world and helped ensure their physical and mental development. Aid through education and economic development has helped people be more productive and escape poverty, which creates healthier and more stable economies and greater economic growth for everybody.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
National	34.6%	40.3%	74.9%	16.0%	7.7%	23.7%	1.4%
GOP	14.8%	45.5%	60.3%	24.2%	14.0%	38.2%	1.6%
Dem.	55.0%	33.9%	88.9%	7.3%	2.4%	9.7%	1.5%
Indep.	27.6%	44.7%	72.3%	19.6%	7.2%	26.8%	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	29.3%	45.7%	75.0%	15.4%	7.7%	23.1%	1.9%
Somewhat red	32.6%	37.8%	70.4%	17.1%	11.0%	28.1%	1.4%
Lean red	34.5%	39.9%	74.4%	17.2%	6.4%	23.6%	2.1%
Lean blue	35.8%	40.1%	75.9%	14.9%	8.8%	23.7%	0.4%
Somewhat blue	37.1%	39.5%	76.6%	17.7%	4.7%	22.4%	1.0%
Very blue	41.4%	38.3%	79.7%	11.6%	6.8%	18.4%	1.9%

[Con: Creates Dependency]

Q17. While aid may be able to produce some short terms gains, it can also create dependency. People get in the habit of expecting handouts. And when governments receive foreign aid, they do not need to rely on their people for taxes as much, which makes them become less accountable to their own citizens. By making goods more readily available at no cost or low cost, aid can actually undercut local producers, making it harder for them to make a sustainable business.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
National	28.1%	31.7%	59.8%	22.6%	16.4%	39.0%	1.1%
GOP	47.2%	36.2%	83.4%	11.3%	4.2%	15.5%	1.2%
Dem.	11.6%	24.7%	36.3%	33.4%	29.1%	62.5%	1.3%
Indep.	27.5%	39.5%	67.0%	20.5%	12.1%	32.6%	0.4%

Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	31.1%	35.4%	66.5%	17.3%	15.3%	32.6%	0.8%
Somewhat red	30.7%	31.1%	61.8%	21.6%	15.4%	37.0%	1.2%
Lean red	28.5%	30.0%	58.5%	23.0%	16.1%	39.1%	2.3%
Lean blue	26.2%	28.3%	54.5%	28.7%	16.0%	44.7%	0.8%
Somewhat blue	27.4%	33.8%	61.2%	21.5%	17.1%	38.6%	0.2%
Very blue	22.8%	30.4%	53.2%	24.8%	20.9%	45.7%	1.2%

We are now going to explore what needs to be done to meet these Sustainable Development goals, primarily for people in poor countries. In each case, there are steps that the governments in those low-income countries need to take. There are also steps that businesses need to take to invest in those low-income countries.

But, a critical element is additional aid that would be needed from the high-income countries. All of the high-income countries, including the US, participated in setting these goals. Since the goals were set, estimates were done to establish how much it would cost to meet these goals. So, the question now is whether the high-income countries will commit to contributing the necessary additional funds to meet the goals.

A proposed framework is to have all high-income companies contribute the same amount in terms of the percentage of their economy. That means the countries with larger economies would pay more. But all would be paying the same percentage of their economies.

For each goal we will tell you the estimate for how much additional aid will be required to meet that goal and what the US share would be, based on the size of its economy compared to the other high-income countries. There are various ways that the US could raise the necessary funds including increasing the US debt, cutting spending or raising taxes. For the sake of this exercise we will assume that the funds would be raised by increasing all Federal taxes equally (except those committed to Social Security and Medicare).

This would include the amount of Federal income taxes you pay. So, say that to meet a certain goal, the total of US taxes would need to go up 1%. This means that the total of your income taxes would go up 1%. So, say your income taxes are \$5,000 a year. A 1% increase would mean that you would pay an extra \$50 per year.

[Reducing Chronic Hunger]

One key goal is to eliminate chronic hunger. Chronic hunger means that people do not have enough food on a long term and persistent basis. It does not refer to hunger that might result from a natural disaster or an outbreak of a civil conflict. The UN estimates that about 815 million people, or about 11% of the world's population, are suffering from chronic hunger. This number has been going down in recent decades--in 1990 about one billion people suffered from chronic hunger.

Still, each year about 9 million people die as a result of starvation or hunger-related diseases. Addressing this challenge requires not only providing food directly, but helping to provide farmers with water, access to markets, agricultural equipment, and training in farming methods.

The UN estimates that eliminating nearly all chronic hunger by 2030 would require an additional \$93 billion a year until 2030. This would be for providing food and agricultural development, in addition to other anti-poverty programs. This would mean that 9 million fewer people would die each year. The US share of this amount would be about \$36 billion. This would require the total of US Federal taxes going up about 1.7%, which means your Federal taxes would go up by 1.7% as well.

Q18. So, if other countries would be willing to contribute their part to eliminate chronic hunger in the world by 2030, do you think the US should or should not be willing to contribute its part by contributing \$36 billion.

	Should be willing	Should not be willing	Ref/DK
National	65.4%	33.8%	0.8%
GOP	43.4%	55.7%	0.8%
Dem.	86.9%	12.2%	0.9%
Indep.	60.0%	39.4%	0.6%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	60.4%	38.9%	0.7%
Somewhat red	66.1%	33.4%	0.5%
Lean red	64.9%	33.7%	1.4%
Lean blue	63.8%	35.2%	1.0%
Somewhat blue	66.9%	32.7%	0.5%
Very blue	71.8%	27.3%	0.8%

[IF "SHOULD NOT WILLING" (Q18 = 2) OR SKIP, THEN PRESENT Q18a]

Q18a. As an alternative, do you think the US should be willing to commit to the goal of cutting chronic hunger **in half** by 2030, if other countries were willing as well? This would require the US to contribute \$18 billion, which could be done by increasing the total Federal taxes by 0.85%, including your Federal taxes.

	Should be willing	Should not be willing	Ref/DK
National	6.9%	27.0%	0.7%
GOP	9.5%	46.0%	1.0%
Dem.	3.8%	8.6%	0.6%
Indep.	8.5%	31.0%	0.5%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	5.1%	32.9%	1.5%
Somewhat red	7.5%	25.8%	0.6%
Lean red	6.4%	27.3%	1.4%
Lean blue	7.0%	29.2%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	8.5%	24.5%	0.2%
Very blue	6.3%	21.3%	0.6%

[Clean Drinking Water and Sanitation]

Another key goal is ensuring access clean water and a sanitary sewage system.

According to the UN's World Health Organization, 844 million people lack access to clean water, and 4.5 billion people lack a sanitary sewage system. As a result, people living in these conditions suffer from resulting infections. This results in illness and reduces their ability to work, thus reducing their incomes.

Approximately 500,000 people die each year from illnesses due to lack of clean water and sanitary sewage systems.

Addressing this challenge requires building dams, water treatment plants, water lines, and sewage systems to purify and distribute water, and to dispose of human waste.

The World Bank estimates that to provide universal access to clean water and sanitary sewage systems would require new commitments of additional \$107 billion a year. This would mean that 500,000 fewer people would die each year.

The US share of this amount would be about \$42 billion. This would require the total of US Federal taxes going up about 1.9%, which means your Federal taxes would go up by 1.9% as well.

Q19. So, if other countries would be willing to contribute their part to provide universal access to clean water and sanitary sewage systems by 2030, do you think the US should or should not be willing to contribute its part by contributing \$42 billion.

	Should be willing	Should not be willing	Ref/DK
National	61.2%	37.3%	1.5%
GOP	39.6%	59.6%	0.8%
Dem.	82.8%	15.4%	1.8%
Indep.	55.2%	42.7%	2.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	56.1%	43.6%	0.3%
Somewhat red	59.9%	39.0%	1.2%
Lean red	63.4%	34.1%	2.5%
Lean blue	60.5%	37.4%	2.1%
Somewhat blue	61.2%	37.3%	1.5%
Very blue	68.6%	29.7%	1.7%

[IF "SHOULD NOT WILLING" (Q19 = 2) OR SKIP, THEN PRESENT Q19a]

Q19a. As an alternative, do you think the US should be willing to commit to the goal of **cutting by half** the number of people who do not have access to clean water and sanitary sewage systems by 2030, if other countries were willing as well? This would require the US to contribute \$21 billion, which could be done by increasing the total Federal taxes by 0.95%, including your Federal taxes.

	Should be willing	Should not be willing	Ref/DK
National	9.0%	28.9%	0.9%
GOP	10.9%	48.2%	1.3%
Dem.	6.6%	9.9%	0.7%
Indep.	10.7%	33.8%	0.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	8.2%	34.5%	1.2%
Somewhat red	9.1%	29.1%	1.9%
Lean red	8.8%	26.9%	0.9%
Lean blue	9.7%	29.8%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	9.1%	29.4%	0.3%
Very blue	8.6%	22.2%	0.6%

[Vaccines]

Another key challenge is ensuring that every person gets the necessary vaccines, especially children.

Every year, millions of people die from diseases that could have been prevented by vaccinations. In 2017, about 20 million children did not receive regular life-saving vaccinations. Addressing this challenge requires providing communities with a steady supply of vaccines, getting doctors to areas that need them, and training new healthcare workers.

The World Health Organization estimates that to provide universal access to vaccines will cost an additional \$28 billion a year for ten years. They estimate that this could prevent the deaths of around 10 million people. The US share of this amount would be about \$11 billion. This would require the total of US Federal taxes going up about 0.5%, which means your Federal taxes would go up by 0.5% as well.

Q20. So, if other countries would be willing to contribute their part to provide universal access to vaccinations, do you think the US should or should not be willing to contribute its part by contributing \$11 billion.

	Should be willing	Should not be willing	Ref/DK
National	69.3%	29.9%	0.8%
GOP	51.1%	48.3%	0.6%
Dem.	87.4%	11.9%	0.7%
Indep.	64.4%	34.3%	1.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	63.9%	35.7%	0.4%
Somewhat red	67.5%	31.9%	0.6%
Lean red	70.5%	28.2%	1.3%
Lean blue	67.0%	31.9%	1.1%
Somewhat blue	74.2%	25.1%	0.6%
Very blue	75.0%	24.2%	0.7%

[IF "SHOULD NOT WILLING" (Q20 = 2) OR SKIP, THEN PRESENT Q20a]

Q20a. As an alternative, do you think the US should be willing to commit to the goal of **cutting by half** the number of people who do not have access to vaccinations, if other countries were willing as well? This would require the US to contribute \$5.5 billion, which could be done by increasing the total Federal taxes by 0.25%, including your Federal taxes.

	Should be willing	Should not be willing	Ref/DK
National	7.5%	22.2%	1.1%
GOP	10.4%	37.4%	1.1%
Dem.	4.4%	7.7%	0.5%
Indep.	8.5%	24.4%	2.6%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	8.1%	26.6%	1.4%
Somewhat red	8.2%	23.6%	0.8%
Lean red	6.5%	22.4%	0.6%
Lean blue	8.7%	22.5%	1.8%
Somewhat blue	7.8%	17.1%	0.9%
Very blue	4.5%	19.1%	1.4%

[Education]

Another key goal is providing education to all children. According to the UN there are about 264 million children who are not receiving education. This stunts their ability to be economically productive for their entire adult lives. Aid for education for children (kindergarten through 12th grade) goes towards building schools, providing educational materials, and training teachers. In the long run, because this would make people more economically productive, it would reduce the amount of hunger and poverty in the world.

The UN estimates that for all children to get education through 12th grade by 2030, high income nations would need to contribute an additional \$39 billion each year. The US share of this amount would be about \$14 billion. This would require the total of US Federal taxes going up about 0.6%, which means your Federal taxes would go up by 0.6% as well.

Q21. So, if other countries would be willing to contribute their part to ensure that all children get access to education through the 12th grade by 2030, do you think the US should or should not be willing to contribute its part by contributing \$14 billion.

	Should be willing	Should not be willing	Ref/DK
National	59.3%	40.1%	0.7%
GOP	33.5%	66.2%	0.3%
Dem.	83.6%	15.7%	0.8%
Indep.	55.8%	43.1%	1.1%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	51.8%	47.8%	0.4%
Somewhat red	61.4%	37.7%	0.9%
Lean red	56.8%	42.8%	0.4%
Lean blue	60.5%	38.1%	1.4%
Somewhat blue	59.5%	40.1%	0.4%
Very blue	69.5%	30.0%	0.6%

[IF "SHOULD NOT WILLING" (Q21 = 2) OR SKIP, THEN PRESENT Q21a]

Q21a. As an alternative, do you think the US should be willing to commit to the goal of **cutting by half** the number of children who do not get access to education through the 12th grade by 2030, if other countries were willing as well? This would require the US to contribute \$7 billion, which could be done by increasing the total Federal taxes by 0.3%, including your Federal taxes.

	Should be willing	Should not be willing	Ref/DK
National	9.1%	31.1%	0.5%
GOP	12.7%	53.0%	0.9%
Dem.	5.5%	10.6%	0.3%
Indep.	10.0%	33.7%	0.5%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	11.6%	35.3%	1.3%
Somewhat red	8.0%	30.3%	0.4%
Lean red	9.7%	32.6%	0.9%
Lean blue	9.6%	29.9%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	8.8%	31.5%	0.2%
Very blue	5.7%	24.7%	0.2%

[Energy]

Another key challenge is providing access to energy, primarily electricity. According to the World Bank, one billion people live without access to electricity. Gaining access to electricity is a major factor in reducing hunger, improving health, and eliminating poverty. Electric stoves reduce the use of unhealthy and environmentally harmful fuels, lighting enables children to study and connectivity enables more efficient economic production, especially for farmers.

Aid for energy goes towards building power plants (especially ones using renewable sources such as solar,) and electrical distribution grids; and training professionals to maintain these systems.

A World Bank report found that to provide access to electricity for everybody in the world by 2030 would require \$34 billion a year.

The US share of this amount would be about \$13 billion. This would require the total of US Federal taxes going up about 0.6%, which means your Federal taxes would go up by 0.6% as well.

Q22. So, if other countries would be willing to contribute their part to ensure that all people get access to energy, primarily electricity, by 2030, do you think the US should or should not be willing to contribute its part by contributing \$13 billion.

	Should be willing	Should not be willing	Ref/DK
National	52.5%	46.1%	1.5%
GOP	27.8%	70.7%	1.5%
Dem.	75.6%	22.6%	1.8%
Indep.	49.1%	50.1%	0.7%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	46.2%	52.3%	1.5%
Somewhat red	50.1%	48.0%	1.9%
Lean red	54.5%	45.1%	0.5%
Lean blue	51.2%	47.2%	1.6%
Somewhat blue	54.7%	42.9%	2.4%
Very blue	61.2%	37.9%	0.9%

[IF "SHOULD NOT WILLING" (Q22 = 2) OR SKIP, THEN PRESENT Q22a]

Q22a. As an alternative, do you think the US should be willing to commit to the goal of **cutting by half** the number of people who do not have access to energy by 2030? This would require the US to contribute \$6.5 billion, which could be done by increasing the total Federal taxes by 0.3%, including your Federal taxes.

	Should be willing	Should not be willing	Ref/DK
National	10.2%	36.3%	1.1%
GOP	11.2%	59.8%	1.1%
Dem.	9.5%	14.2%	0.7%
Indep.	9.7%	39.4%	1.8%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	9.6%	43.5%	0.7%
Somewhat red	13.0%	36.3%	0.6%
Lean red	7.8%	37.0%	0.8%
Lean blue	10.8%	34.6%	3.4%
Somewhat blue	9.6%	35.5%	0.3%
Very blue	10.2%	27.8%	0.8%

Thank you so much for completing the survey! Your response is very valuable to us.

###