



PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

Energy & The Environment Consultation - QUESTIONNAIRE -

SURVEY FIELDIED BY: Nielsen Scarborough
SAMPLE SIZE: 2,700 Respondents

FIELD DATES: February 1 - 14, 2023
MARGIN OF ERROR: +/- 1.9%

One of the challenges we face today is that the way we produce energy can have impacts on air quality and greenhouse gases. In this survey, we will introduce some proposals for changing the way energy is produced and used to:

- reduce air pollution;
- reduce the production of greenhouse gases.

As you will see, there are debates about these proposals, for a variety of reasons. We will give you some background on these issues, introduce you to the different sides of the debates on these proposals, and then give you a chance to make your recommendations.

[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. At the same time, proposals for reducing air pollution come with some economic costs.

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 / Don't Know
National	27.6%	40.0%	67.6%	16.7%	14.4%	31.1%	1.3%
Republicans	8.7%	35.5%	44.2%	28.4%	25.5%	53.9%	1.9%
Democrats	47.3%	42.3%	89.6%	6.5%	3.1%	9.6%	0.8%
Independents	25.6%	44.6%	70.2%	13.5%	15.1%	28.6%	1.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	18.7%	39.0%	57.7%	21.8%	20.2%	42.0%	0.3%
Somewhat red	24.3%	37.2%	61.5%	22.4%	14.8%	37.2%	1.4%
Lean red	22.8%	43.2%	66.0%	18.1%	14.9%	33.0%	1.1%
Lean blue	27.1%	39.1%	66.2%	15.3%	17.0%	32.3%	1.5%
Somewhat blue	33.9%	41.0%	74.9%	11.0%	12.9%	23.9%	1.2%
Very blue	38.4%	40.1%	78.5%	12.1%	7.3%	19.4%	2.2%

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 / Don't Know
National	21.4%	28.1%	49.5%	24.7%	25.6%	50.3%	0.2%
Republicans	38.1%	37.6%	75.7%	17.6%	6.8%	24.4%	0.0%
Democrats	6.5%	17.3%	23.8%	32.3%	43.7%	76.0%	0.3%
Independents	17.7%	31.1%	48.8%	23.7%	27.0%	50.7%	0.5%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	27.0%	33.8%	60.8%	20.8%	18.4%	39.2%	0.0%
Somewhat red	23.3%	31.1%	54.4%	22.0%	23.6%	45.6%	0.0%
Lean red	21.9%	27.6%	49.5%	29.1%	21.0%	50.1%	0.3%
Lean blue	21.8%	29.9%	51.7%	24.6%	23.5%	48.1%	0.3%
Somewhat blue	21.3%	21.8%	43.1%	25.5%	31.1%	56.6%	0.3%
Very blue	12.7%	25.5%	38.2%	24.7%	36.9%	61.6%	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	Total convincing	Low priority	Not at all a priority	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
National	38.1%	33.4%	71.5%	22.2%	6.2%	28.4%	0.0%
Republicans	12.3%	31.8%	44.1%	44.0%	11.8%	55.8%	0.1%
Democrats	63.0%	34.0%	97.0%	2.9%	0.1%	3.0%	0.0%
Independents	40.3%	35.8%	76.1%	16.5%	7.4%	23.9%	0.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	29.5%	32.3%	61.8%	27.8%	10.3%	38.1%	0.0%
Somewhat red	32.5%	32.1%	64.6%	29.2%	6.2%	35.4%	0.0%
Lean red	36.0%	32.7%	68.7%	24.5%	6.8%	31.3%	0.0%
Lean blue	36.1%	35.5%	71.6%	22.7%	5.6%	28.3%	0.2%
Somewhat blue	43.7%	33.5%	77.2%	16.9%	5.9%	22.8%	0.0%
Very blue	51.5%	33.9%	85.4%	11.3%	3.3%	14.6%	0.0%

[PRIORITY GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION]

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

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.¹ 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. At the same time, some people, including some members of Congress, question whether climate change is a problem that needs to be addressed, or if reducing human-created greenhouse gases will really help address the problem of climate change.

¹ EPA. (2018). [Fourth National Climate Assessment](#)

Thus, 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. Nearly all climate scientists agree greenhouse gases contribute to climate change and this poses major threats. Already we are seeing hotter and drier weather contributing to a major increase in wildfires that have created billions of dollars in damage.² 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 / Don't Know
National	40.8%	28.2%	69.0%	14.7%	15.3%	30.0%	1.0%
Republicans	15.1%	28.6%	43.7%	26.7%	28.9%	55.6%	0.8%
Democrats	67.6%	26.7%	94.3%	2.9%	2.0%	4.9%	0.8%
Independents	38.4%	30.5%	68.9%	14.2%	14.8%	29.0%	2.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	28.5%	28.0%	56.5%	19.8%	22.1%	41.9%	1.6%
Somewhat red	35.7%	24.5%	60.2%	19.4%	19.1%	38.5%	1.3%
Lean red	35.0%	33.3%	68.3%	13.9%	17.3%	31.2%	0.6%
Lean blue	42.3%	27.7%	70.0%	14.4%	14.7%	29.1%	0.9%
Somewhat blue	49.2%	26.4%	75.6%	12.3%	11.0%	23.3%	1.2%
Very blue	52.6%	29.4%	82.0%	9.0%	8.0%	17.0%	1.0%

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

Q5. 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 / Don't Know
National	20.3%	27.1%	47.4%	23.0%	29.4%	52.4%	0.2%
Republicans	36.3%	38.5%	74.8%	17.4%	7.6%	25.0%	0.2%
Democrats	4.4%	15.3%	19.7%	27.8%	52.4%	80.2%	0.2%
Independents	20.3%	28.1%	48.4%	24.7%	26.8%	51.5%	0.1%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	26.9%	30.7%	57.6%	24.0%	18.4%	42.4%	0.0%
Somewhat red	25.5%	28.1%	53.6%	20.1%	26.2%	46.3%	0.2%
Lean red	19.7%	27.0%	46.7%	28.0%	25.1%	53.1%	0.2%
Lean blue	20.1%	29.5%	49.6%	22.3%	28.1%	50.4%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	17.2%	24.1%	41.3%	21.6%	37.0%	58.6%	0.1%
Very blue	12.6%	23.9%	36.5%	21.4%	41.4%	62.8%	0.6%

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

Q6. 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 technologies³ 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.

² Env. Res. Let. (2021) [Consensus revisited: quantifying scientific agreement on climate change and climate expertise among Earth scientists, 10 years later](#)

³ UNEP. (2019) [Global Trends in Renewable Energy Investments 2019](#)

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
National	40.7%	29.9%	70.6%	13.9%	14.2%	28.1%	1.3%
Republicans	17.1%	31.0%	48.1%	23.8%	26.9%	50.7%	1.2%
Democrats	64.8%	28.0%	92.8%	4.0%	1.6%	5.6%	1.6%
Independents	39.5%	31.8%	71.3%	13.6%	14.3%	27.9%	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	29.6%	31.3%	60.9%	17.2%	20.4%	37.6%	1.5%
Somewhat red	35.9%	30.0%	65.9%	18.8%	14.7%	33.5%	0.7%
Lean red	36.1%	32.4%	68.5%	13.9%	17.0%	30.9%	0.7%
Lean blue	44.0%	26.3%	70.3%	13.8%	14.9%	28.7%	1.1%
Somewhat blue	44.4%	31.2%	75.6%	11.3%	11.8%	23.1%	1.3%
Very blue	53.4%	28.7%	82.1%	8.4%	6.8%	15.2%	2.8%

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 / Don't Know
National	24.1%	24.4%	48.5%	21.4%	29.9%	51.3%	0.3%
Republicans	44.0%	32.8%	76.8%	16.2%	6.9%	23.1%	0.1%
Democrats	5.2%	14.6%	19.8%	25.6%	54.1%	79.7%	0.4%
Independents	21.9%	27.4%	49.3%	23.5%	27.0%	50.5%	0.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	33.5%	27.5%	61.0%	18.5%	20.1%	38.6%	0.3%
Somewhat red	27.4%	26.9%	54.3%	21.0%	24.4%	45.4%	0.2%
Lean red	24.3%	26.8%	51.1%	21.5%	27.1%	48.6%	0.3%
Lean blue	24.2%	25.6%	49.8%	21.2%	29.1%	50.3%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	21.1%	20.7%	41.8%	22.5%	35.5%	58.0%	0.2%
Very blue	14.9%	18.3%	33.2%	22.8%	43.3%	66.1%	0.7%

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	Total priority	Low priority	Total Not at all a priority	Low -- Not at all	Refused / Don't Know
National	41.8%	26.4%	68.2%	21.4%	10.2%	31.6%	0.1%
Republicans	12.0%	25.3%	37.3%	43.3%	19.4%	62.7%	0.0%
Democrats	73.0%	23.5%	96.5%	2.5%	0.7%	3.2%	0.2%
Independents	38.6%	35.0%	73.6%	15.1%	11.0%	26.1%	0.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	30.8%	27.3%	58.1%	27.4%	14.4%	41.8%	0.1%
Somewhat red	35.0%	24.4%	59.4%	29.4%	11.0%	40.4%	0.2%
Lean red	38.8%	25.9%	64.7%	24.7%	10.6%	35.3%	0.0%
Lean blue	41.0%	28.4%	69.4%	19.9%	10.6%	30.5%	0.1%
Somewhat blue	48.8%	25.5%	74.3%	15.9%	9.9%	25.8%	0.0%
Very blue	56.1%	27.5%	83.6%	11.0%	4.8%	15.8%	0.5%

[TAX CREDITS]

Let's turn now to some policies for the government to encourage individuals and companies to adopt technologies to:

- produce more low-carbon energy (i.e. energy that is not from fossil fuels, such as solar, wind, and nuclear energy);
- increase energy efficiency and thus reduce emissions from fossil fuels.

One way that the government can encourage people and companies to adopt low-carbon 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. There is a debate about whether the government should provide such tax credits. Here is an **argument in favor**:

Q9. 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 / Don't Know
National	29.3%	40.2%	69.5%	17.2%	12.6%	29.8%	0.6%
Republicans	13.5%	33.8%	47.3%	27.8%	24.0%	51.8%	0.9%
Democrats	44.3%	45.4%	89.7%	8.6%	1.2%	9.8%	0.5%
Independents	31.3%	42.8%	74.1%	12.9%	12.8%	25.7%	0.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	17.5%	40.8%	58.3%	22.2%	18.6%	40.8%	0.9%
Somewhat red	27.1%	38.9%	66.0%	20.5%	12.5%	33.0%	1.1%
Lean red	29.2%	36.2%	65.4%	18.7%	15.5%	34.2%	0.4%
Lean blue	31.6%	38.8%	70.4%	15.6%	13.5%	29.1%	0.5%
Somewhat blue	29.4%	46.1%	75.5%	14.2%	9.7%	23.9%	0.5%
Very blue	38.5%	42.3%	80.8%	12.7%	6.1%	18.8%	0.4%

Here is a **counter argument**:

Q10. 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 / Don't Know
National	28.1%	32.3%	60.4%	23.3%	16.2%	39.5%	0.0%
Republicans	47.1%	32.1%	79.2%	16.9%	3.9%	20.8%	0.0%
Democrats	9.3%	31.0%	40.3%	31.2%	28.4%	59.6%	0.1%
Independents	27.8%	35.7%	63.5%	20.0%	16.5%	36.5%	0.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	36.0%	35.4%	71.4%	18.3%	10.3%	28.6%	0.0%
Somewhat red	32.7%	32.4%	65.1%	21.5%	13.3%	34.8%	0.1%
Lean red	29.9%	29.4%	59.3%	26.2%	14.5%	40.7%	0.0%
Lean blue	26.6%	33.2%	59.8%	23.5%	16.7%	40.2%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	25.2%	33.6%	58.8%	22.2%	18.8%	41.0%	0.1%
Very blue	18.2%	31.5%	49.7%	26.8%	23.5%	50.3%	0.0%

[BIOGAS]

One tax credit is for biogas facilities, primarily on farms and landfills. Biogas facilities convert methane into energy, which is emitted by animal and farming waste, as well as by certain types of trash in landfills. Methane is a greenhouse gas that is responsible for a significant amount of climate change and is 20 times more harmful than carbon dioxide. Thus, biogas both produces energy and

reduces methane emissions. Using animal waste to make biogas also means that such animal waste is not being dumped into rivers or other waterways.

Q11. Using the scale below, how acceptable do you find the tax credit equal to 30% of startup costs to build biogas facilities?⁴

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
National	37.4%	15.6%	46.9%	0.1%
Republicans	51.0%	17.9%	31.1%	0.0%
Democrats	22.5%	13.0%	64.4%	0.1%
Independents	40.3%	16.4%	43.0%	0.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)				
Very red	45.4%	13.6%	41.0%	0.0%
Somewhat red	39.2%	15.9%	44.9%	0.0%
Lean red	39.8%	15.9%	44.1%	0.2%
Lean blue	37.7%	15.6%	46.7%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	34.4%	15.9%	49.5%	0.2%
Very blue	28.9%	16.7%	54.1%	0.2%

Q12. So, in conclusion, do you approve or disapprove of this tax credit?

	Approve	Disapprove	Refused / Don't Know
National	68.3%	31.5%	0.3%
Republicans	49.5%	50.2%	0.4%
Democrats	87.0%	12.8%	0.2%
Independents	68.4%	31.3%	0.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	60.4%	39.6%	0.0%
Somewhat red	66.7%	32.5%	0.8%
Lean red	66.0%	34.0%	0.0%
Lean blue	66.1%	33.4%	0.5%
Somewhat blue	73.4%	26.6%	0.0%
Very blue	76.3%	23.4%	0.3%

Another way to reduce air pollution and greenhouse gases is to have more electric cars and trucks, which produce much less emissions than gas-powered cars. As you may know, there is a policy to encourage the purchase of electric vehicles by providing tax credits. For a **new** electric car that was produced mostly in the US that costs less than \$55,000, or truck that costs less than \$80,000, a tax credit of up to \$7,500 for individuals earning under \$150,000 (married couples earning under \$300,000).

Q13. How acceptable do you find this tax credit for a **new** electric vehicle?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
National	45.6%	11.5%	42.5%	0.4%
Republicans	67.1%	10.6%	22.1%	0.3%
Democrats	22.4%	11.3%	66.0%	0.3%
Independents	49.6%	14.2%	35.6%	0.7%
Cook's PVI (D-R)				
Very red	57.2%	11.2%	31.5%	0.0%
Somewhat red	50.2%	12.1%	37.0%	0.7%
Lean red	53.2%	11.6%	35.0%	0.2%
Lean blue	43.6%	12.2%	44.0%	0.2%
Somewhat blue	37.4%	9.8%	51.9%	0.9%
Very blue	33.1%	12.1%	54.6%	0.2%

⁴ White House. (2022) [Guidebook to the Inflation Reduction Act's Investments in Clean Energy and Climate Action](#); for summary see Bipartisan Policy Center. (2022) [Inflation Reduction Act Summary](#).

Q14. So, in conclusion, do you approve or disapprove of this tax credit for a **new** electric vehicle?

	Approve	Disapprove	Refused / Don't Know
National	58.6%	41.2%	0.2%
Republicans	33.9%	66.0%	0.1%
Democrats	84.9%	14.9%	0.2%
Independents	55.4%	44.1%	0.6%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	46.1%	53.8%	0.2%
Somewhat red	51.4%	48.1%	0.5%
Lean red	52.9%	46.9%	0.2%
Lean blue	60.7%	39.1%	0.1%
Somewhat blue	67.8%	32.0%	0.2%
Very blue	71.5%	28.5%	0.0%

For a **used** electric car or truck that was produced mostly in the US, a tax credit of up to \$4,000 for individuals earning under \$75,000 (married couples under \$150,000).

Q15. How acceptable do you find this tax credit for a **used** electric vehicle?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
National	44.4%	12.7%	42.9%	0.1%
Republicans	64.9%	11.9%	23.2%	0.0%
Democrats	21.4%	13.0%	65.4%	0.2%
Independents	49.7%	13.7%	36.6%	0.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)				
Very red	56.4%	11.1%	32.5%	0.0%
Somewhat red	50.4%	11.8%	37.7%	0.1%
Lean red	49.3%	12.9%	37.8%	0.0%
Lean blue	42.9%	13.0%	44.0%	0.1%
Somewhat blue	36.6%	12.5%	50.8%	0.0%
Very blue	32.1%	14.5%	53.0%	0.3%

Q16. So, in conclusion, do you approve or disapprove of this tax credit for a **used** electric vehicle?

	Approve	Disapprove	Refused / Don't Know
National	59.8%	39.8%	0.4%
Republicans	35.2%	64.0%	0.8%
Democrats	86.1%	13.8%	0.2%
Independents	56.0%	43.9%	0.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	45.5%	53.3%	1.2%
Somewhat red	53.7%	46.3%	0.0%
Lean red	55.5%	44.1%	0.4%
Lean blue	62.4%	36.9%	0.8%
Somewhat blue	69.0%	30.8%	0.1%
Very blue	69.9%	29.9%	0.1%

For businesses purchasing a heavy-duty electric vehicle (like an 18-wheeler truck) that was produced mostly in the US, a tax credit of between \$7,500 and \$40,000 depending on the size.

Q17. How acceptable do you find this tax credit for a heavy-duty electric vehicle?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
National	40.8%	11.7%	47.3%	0.2%
Republicans	61.2%	11.7%	26.8%	0.3%
Democrats	18.9%	10.6%	70.3%	0.1%
Independents	44.1%	13.7%	42.1%	0.1%
Cook's PVI (D-R)				
Very red	53.1%	10.9%	36.0%	0.0%
Somewhat red	45.1%	13.5%	40.5%	0.9%
Lean red	46.3%	12.1%	41.6%	0.0%
Lean blue	39.9%	11.6%	48.3%	0.2%
Somewhat blue	34.9%	9.7%	55.3%	0.0%
Very blue	26.5%	11.6%	61.8%	0.0%

Q18. So, in conclusion, do you approve or disapprove of this tax credit for a heavy-duty electric vehicle?

	Approve	Disapprove	Refused / Don't Know
National	63.1%	36.7%	0.3%
Republicans	39.7%	60.2%	0.1%
Democrats	87.0%	12.6%	0.4%
Independents	61.8%	37.9%	0.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	48.8%	51.0%	0.2%
Somewhat red	56.4%	43.0%	0.5%
Lean red	59.0%	40.9%	0.2%
Lean blue	64.3%	35.7%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	72.1%	27.8%	0.2%
Very blue	76.4%	23.1%	0.5%

[REGULATION]

[Standards: Energy Efficiency Standards – Pro and Con]

Another method the government can use to reduce the amount of emissions is to require manufacturers to meet higher efficiency standards for new cars and trucks. Here is an **argument in favor**:

Q19. Having higher energy efficiency standards and energy diversity is the quickest and most direct way to reduce carbon dioxide and other pollutants. We can't rely on businesses to increase short-term costs and make the necessary long-run changes on their own accord. It is fairer because all businesses and consumers bear the costs equally. When everyone is required to meet higher standards, it prevents some companies from getting a free ride on the efforts of environmentally responsible businesses. Furthermore, it's good for everyone because it prompts businesses to take steps that save consumers and other businesses money in the long run.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
National	27.6%	39.9%	67.5%	17.7%	13.9%	31.6%	1.0%
Republicans	10.4%	35.7%	46.1%	28.5%	24.8%	53.3%	0.6%
Democrats	46.1%	42.3%	88.4%	8.4%	2.6%	11.0%	0.6%
Independents	24.7%	44.0%	68.7%	14.4%	14.4%	28.8%	2.5%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	18.3%	38.9%	57.2%	23.4%	18.8%	42.2%	0.6%
Somewhat red	23.0%	40.3%	63.3%	19.9%	16.0%	35.9%	0.7%
Lean red	26.0%	38.1%	64.1%	20.5%	14.4%	34.9%	1.0%
Lean blue	28.8%	38.7%	67.5%	15.9%	16.0%	31.9%	0.7%
Somewhat blue	31.4%	41.9%	73.3%	15.4%	10.5%	25.9%	0.8%
Very blue	36.4%	42.9%	79.3%	11.1%	7.5%	18.6%	2.1%

Here is an **argument against**:

Q20. Having the government require businesses to follow strict standards creates expensive and inefficient bureaucracies, and it can restrict consumers' right to choose what they want to buy. It is better to let the market guide the process. Since there is money to be made in creating more efficient products and buildings, well-run businesses will take these steps on their own, and in the most cost-effective way.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't Know
National	22.3%	30.2%	52.5%	24.4%	23.0%	47.4%	0.2%
Republicans	39.6%	36.0%	75.6%	17.4%	6.8%	24.2%	0.2%
Democrats	4.7%	22.6%	27.3%	31.8%	40.7%	72.5%	0.1%
Independents	22.6%	34.1%	56.7%	23.3%	19.9%	43.2%	0.1%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	27.5%	34.7%	62.2%	22.5%	15.3%	37.8%	0.0%
Somewhat red	26.5%	30.4%	56.9%	23.9%	19.2%	43.1%	0.0%
Lean red	22.6%	31.7%	54.3%	25.3%	20.3%	45.6%	0.1%
Lean blue	19.5%	31.5%	51.0%	24.4%	24.6%	49.0%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	22.4%	25.3%	47.7%	24.7%	26.9%	51.6%	0.6%
Very blue	14.3%	28.5%	42.8%	25.5%	31.4%	56.9%	0.3%

[CAFE STANDARDS]

The government is proposing to gradually raise the requirements for the fuel efficiency of cars and light trucks:

By 2027, new cars and light trucks would need to get 20-30% more miles per gallon (mpg) on average than cars and light trucks being made today.⁵

For cars: this would be a gradual increase to an average of 59 miles per gallon by 2027.

For light trucks: this would be a gradual increase to an average of 42 miles per gallon by 2027.

This proposal would increase the cost of a new car or light truck by an average of \$1,100. However, owners would save an average of \$1,400 in lower fuel costs over the life of the car or light truck.⁶

The government also estimates that increasing fuel efficiency to this level would have other economic benefits that they estimate to be about \$95 billion over the next 30 years. These include reductions in healthcare spending from reduced air pollution, and reduced costs from reductions in the effects of climate change such as extreme weather events.⁷

Q21. How acceptable do you find this proposal to require automakers to raise the average fuel efficiency of cars to 59 miles per gallon and for light trucks to 42 miles per gallon by 2027?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
National	33.2%	10.4%	56.2%	0.1%
Republicans	51.1%	14.3%	34.5%	0.1%
Democrats	14.6%	7.4%	78.0%	0.1%
Independents	34.9%	8.8%	56.2%	0.1%
Cook's PVI (D-R)				
Very red	41.5%	12.0%	46.5%	0.0%
Somewhat red	37.8%	13.4%	48.5%	0.3%
Lean red	38.0%	10.0%	52.0%	0.0%
Lean blue	33.0%	8.4%	58.4%	0.2%
Somewhat blue	23.1%	11.4%	65.5%	0.0%
Very blue	26.5%	7.9%	65.6%	0.0%

⁵ Federal Register. (2022) [Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards for Model Years 2024–2026 Passenger Cars and Light Trucks](#), Table II-4

⁶ *ibid*, p. 25724; an estimated fuel saving of \$1,700, undiscounted, was concluded by another report: NHTSA. (2022) [Final Rulemaking for Model Years 2024-2026 Light-Duty Vehicle Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards](#)

⁷ *ibid*, Table I-10

Q22. So, in conclusion, do you favor or oppose requiring automakers to raise the average fuel efficiency of cars to 59 miles per gallon and for light trucks to 42 miles per gallon by 2027?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know
National	70.5%	28.8%	0.7%
Republicans	50.0%	49.2%	0.8%
Democrats	90.5%	8.5%	1.0%
Independents	71.3%	28.6%	0.1%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	62.6%	36.9%	0.6%
Somewhat red	65.8%	33.2%	0.9%
Lean red	65.2%	33.6%	1.2%
Lean blue	71.1%	28.1%	0.8%
Somewhat blue	79.2%	20.4%	0.4%
Very blue	78.6%	20.8%	0.6%

###