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

Survey on Energy and the Environment

– MICHIGAN QUESTIONNAIRE –

Field Dates:	July 10-19, 2024	
Sample Size:	Michigan: 627 Adults	National: 1,195 Adults
Confidence Interval:	Michigan: +/- 4.4%	National: +/- 3.2%
Sample Provided by:	Multiple online opt-in panels, including Cint, Dynata and Prodege. Sample collection and quality control was managed by QuantifyAI under the direction of the University of Maryland's Program for Public Consultation.	

[Language—Respondents are allowed to change the language of the survey by clicking the "en español" button on the far upper left part of the screen]
To take the survey in English, please click Next.

Para realizar la encuesta en español, haga clic en el botón de idioma de la esquina superior derecha.

[Note: Single lines indicate respondents were presented questions/text on a new screen. Footnotes denote sources, but were not presented to the respondent]

This survey will address US policies about energy and the environment.

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 gasses

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.

First, we are going to ask you a few questions about yourself, such as your age, ethnicity, income, and education.
This information is important because it allows us to make sure we have a representative sample of citizens.

PRIVACY NOTICE: The answers to these questions and all of your personal information will be kept **completely anonymous and confidential. We are both ethically committed to protecting your privacy, and as part of the University of Maryland we are legally required to do so**.

[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 / Don't know
Michigan	29.7%	49.4%	**79.1%**	14.9%	2.9%	**17.8%**	3.1%
GOP	17.8%	52.7%	**70.5%**	21.0%	5.9%	**26.9%**	2.6%
Dem.	44.1%	44.6%	**88.7%**	6.7%	0.6%	**7.3%**	4.0%
National	33.7%	48.8%	**82.5%**	10.1%	3.9%	**14.0%**	3.6%
GOP	24.0%	52.5%	**76.5%**	14.1%	5.7%	**19.8%**	3.7%
Dem.	45.7%	43.4%	**89.1%**	6.1%	1.4%	**7.5%**	3.4%
Indep.	23.1%	55.9%	**79.0%**	10.7%	6.4%	**17.1%**	3.9%

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. People working in oil and coal industries can lose their jobs and this can hurt local economies. 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
Michigan	18.8%	36.0%	**54.8%**	27.1%	15.2%	**42.3%**	2.9%
GOP	22.8%	46.2%	**69.0%**	23.7%	5.1%	**28.8%**	2.1%
Dem.	15.9%	24.9%	**40.8%**	29.8%	25.6%	**55.4%**	3.9%
National	22.2%	36.7%	**58.9%**	24.9%	14.2%	**39.1%**	2.1%
GOP	29.1%	41.4%	**70.5%**	22.5%	5.9%	**28.4%**	1.1%
Dem.	16.9%	32.6%	**49.5%**	26.1%	21.6%	**47.7%**	2.8%
Indep.	18.0%	35.5%	**53.5%**	28.8%	15.3%	**44.1%**	2.4%

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 Priority	Somewhat Low Priority	Not at all a Priority	Total Low/Not a Priority	Refused / Don't know
Michigan	36.5%	43.6%	**80.1%**	17.7%	2.1%	**19.8%**	0.0%
GOP	23.0%	41.3%	**64.3%**	31.7%	4.0%	**35.7%**	0.0%
Dem.	52.2%	44.6%	**96.8%**	3.2%	0.0%	**3.2%**	0.0%
National	45.8%	38.7%	**84.5%**	12.9%	2.3%	**15.2%**	0.2%
GOP	33.3%	40.8%	**74.1%**	21.9%	4.0%	**25.9%**	0.0%
Dem.	59.8%	35.1%	**94.9%**	4.5%	0.1%	**4.6%**	0.5%
Indep.	37.6%	44.8%	**82.4%**	13.1%	4.6%	**17.7%**	0.0%

Demographic Results for Michigan								
		Very high priority	Somewhat high priority	Very - Somewhat high priority	Low priority	Not at all a priority	Low - Not at all a priority	Ref/DK
Gender	Men	35.5%	40.9%	**76.4%**	20.0%	3.7%	**23.7%**	0.0%
	Women	37.5%	46.3%	**83.8%**	15.5%	0.7%	**16.2%**	0.0%

Age	18-29	46.3%	46.1%	**92.4%**	7.6%	0.0%	**7.6%**	0.0%
	30-49	34.4%	51.1%	**85.5%**	13.4%	1.2%	**14.6%**	0.0%
	50-64	35.7%	40.9%	**76.6%**	22.2%	1.2%	**23.4%**	0.0%
	65 or older	31.8%	34.8%	**66.6%**	27.2%	6.2%	**33.4%**	0.0%
Income	Less than $50,000	45.1%	37.4%	**82.5%**	14.6%	2.9%	**17.5%**	0.0%
	$50-100,000	39.1%	38.9%	**78.0%**	20.5%	1.5%	**22.0%**	0.0%
	$100-150,000	27.1%	50.6%	**77.7%**	18.4%	3.8%	**22.2%**	0.0%
	More than $150,000	31.1%	51.0%	**82.1%**	17.2%	0.6%	**17.8%**	0.0%
Education	High School or less	39.7%	39.9%	**79.6%**	17.3%	3.1%	**20.4%**	0.0%
	Some college	38.9%	39.9%	**78.8%**	19.1%	2.2%	**21.3%**	0.0%
	College degree	29.3%	52.0%	**81.3%**	17.4%	1.3%	**18.7%**	0.0%

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.

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 gasses are accumulating in Earth's atmosphere as a result of human activities, causing surface air temperatures and subsurface ocean temperatures to rise."

This conclusion has also been confirmed by the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—a panel of over two thousand climate scientists from 154 countries around the world, including the US.[1]

The effect of the increase of greenhouse gasses produced by burning fossil fuels – like coal, oil and natural gas – has been studied extensively. A group of US government agencies and outside experts regularly produce a Climate Assessment. It has consistently found that greenhouse gasses are causing the climate to change, and global average temperatures to rise.

This Assessment continues to conclude that this increase in temperature has resulted in various negative consequences, such as more severe storms, droughts, wildfires, and rising sea levels. These have led to the destruction of homes, businesses, infrastructure and farmland, as well as famine, water scarcity and the creation of millions of refugees. All of these consequences are projected to increase substantially in the coming decades.

While nearly all climate scientists say that climate change is a problem and that reducing carbon emissions from energy production is important, there are some climate scientists who contest this view.

Some members of Congress question whether climate change is a real problem that needs to be addressed. Others question whether climate change is due to human causes and whether reducing carbon emissions will help reduce the problem of climate change. Others argue that the costs of changing the way energy is produced are too high, and outweigh the benefits.

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 gasses.

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

Q4. The overwhelming majority of climate scientists agree greenhouse gasses 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 are hurting 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 gasses.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
Michigan	41.0%	36.2%	**77.2%**	13.9%	5.2%	**19.1%**	3.7%

[1] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), "Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report," Summary for Policymakers (WMO, UNEP)

GOP	24.0%	39.6%	**63.6%**	22.4%	10.7%	**33.1%**	3.4%
Dem.	59.3%	31.9%	**91.2%**	3.8%	0.9%	**4.7%**	4.1%
National	44.4%	35.6%	**80.0%**	10.5%	5.2%	**15.7%**	4.4%
GOP	29.3%	40.6%	**69.9%**	16.7%	9.7%	**26.4%**	3.7%
Dem.	61.6%	28.1%	**89.7%**	4.0%	1.4%	**5.4%**	4.9%
Indep.	33.2%	45.5%	**78.7%**	12.8%	3.9%	**16.7%**	4.7%

Here is an argument for the position that further reducing greenhouse gasses 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 harm the economy, cost jobs, and undermine Americans' standards of living. 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
Michigan	16.4%	37.8%	**54.2%**	26.0%	16.6%	**42.6%**	3.2%
GOP	21.9%	48.7%	**70.6%**	20.6%	6.2%	**26.8%**	2.6%
Dem.	11.8%	27.3%	**39.1%**	29.0%	27.7%	**56.7%**	4.2%
National	21.9%	37.0%	**58.9%**	21.0%	17.5%	**38.5%**	2.6%
GOP	28.5%	42.1%	**70.6%**	19.1%	8.6%	**27.7%**	1.7%
Dem.	16.9%	31.7%	**48.6%**	21.3%	27.3%	**48.6%**	2.8%
Indep.	17.3%	38.7%	**56.0%**	26.4%	12.5%	**38.9%**	5.1%

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

Q6. Over and above the need to reduce greenhouse gasses, 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[2] 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 / Don't know
Michigan	38.6%	38.0%	**76.6%**	15.4%	5.2%	**20.6%**	2.8%
GOP	25.7%	40.1%	**65.8%**	22.0%	10.2%	**32.2%**	2.1%
Dem.	54.9%	34.3%	**89.2%**	5.8%	1.0%	**6.8%**	3.9%
National	42.7%	39.6%	**82.3%**	10.6%	4.5%	**15.1%**	2.6%
GOP	29.5%	42.5%	**72.0%**	16.0%	8.9%	**24.9%**	3.1%
Dem.	57.4%	34.4%	**91.8%**	4.9%	0.9%	**5.8%**	2.5%
Indep.	33.9%	48.7%	**82.6%**	13.1%	3.1%	**16.2%**	1.3%

Here is another argument for the position that further reducing greenhouse gasses 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 gasses. If people want to reduce greenhouse gasses, 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

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

Michigan	19.5%	34.3%	**53.8%**	26.9%	17.0%	**43.9%**	2.3%
GOP	24.4%	43.6%	**68.0%**	24.4%	5.9%	**30.3%**	1.7%
Dem.	14.6%	23.4%	**38.0%**	29.5%	29.1%	**58.6%**	3.5%
National	25.3%	34.0%	**59.3%**	22.5%	15.8%	**38.3%**	2.5%
GOP	33.5%	39.1%	**72.6%**	19.9%	6.0%	**25.9%**	1.6%
Dem.	19.3%	28.9%	**48.2%**	24.8%	24.3%	**49.1%**	2.7%
Indep.	19.3%	35.6%	**54.9%**	22.8%	17.9%	**40.7%**	4.4%

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

	Very High Priority	Somewhat High Priority	Total Priority	Somewhat Low Priority	Not at all a Priority	Total Low/Not a Priority	Refused / Don't know
Michigan	39.6%	37.0%	**76.6%**	19.9%	3.1%	**23.0%**	0.4%
GOP	21.4%	36.7%	**58.1%**	36.2%	5.4%	**41.6%**	0.3%
Dem.	60.8%	33.5%	**94.3%**	4.4%	0.7%	**5.1%**	0.6%
National	44.2%	36.2%	**80.4%**	14.5%	4.4%	**18.9%**	0.7%
GOP	28.8%	36.8%	**65.6%**	24.2%	9.4%	**33.6%**	0.8%
Dem.	59.6%	34.4%	**94.0%**	5.5%	0.0%	**5.5%**	0.5%
Indep.	40.8%	40.4%	**81.2%**	14.3%	3.5%	**17.8%**	1.0%

Demographic Results for Michigan								
		Very high priority	Somewhat high priority	Very - Somewhat high priority	Low priority	Not at all a priority	Low - Not at all a priority	Ref/DK
Gender	Men	39.1%	36.6%	**75.7%**	20.1%	3.6%	**23.7%**	0.6%
	Women	40.0%	37.5%	**77.5%**	19.7%	2.6%	**22.3%**	0.3%
Age	18-29	49.6%	36.0%	**85.6%**	13.0%	1.4%	**14.4%**	0.0%
	30-49	41.7%	40.3%	**82.0%**	15.1%	2.5%	**17.6%**	0.5%
	50-64	32.0%	38.1%	**70.1%**	25.8%	4.1%	**29.9%**	0.0%
	65 or older	36.2%	32.6%	**68.8%**	25.8%	4.2%	**30.0%**	1.2%
Income	Less than $50,000	41.6%	38.6%	**80.2%**	16.0%	2.7%	**18.7%**	1.0%
	$50-100,000	42.3%	34.7%	**77.0%**	19.7%	2.8%	**22.5%**	0.5%
	$100-150,000	31.2%	40.0%	**71.2%**	22.5%	6.3%	**28.8%**	0.0%
	More than $150,000	40.4%	35.9%	**76.3%**	22.4%	1.3%	**23.7%**	0.0%
Education	High School or less	39.2%	38.7%	**77.9%**	20.4%	1.3%	**21.7%**	0.4%
	Some college	37.9%	37.9%	**75.8%**	19.1%	4.7%	**23.8%**	0.4%
	College degree	40.6%	34.4%	**75.0%**	21.3%	3.2%	**24.5%**	0.5%

One way the US has reduced carbon emissions has been increasing the production of energy from sources that do not produce carbon emissions, such as renewables (including solar, wind, and hydropower) and nuclear power. This carbon-free energy has replaced some of the energy from fossil fuels like coal, oil and natural gas.

Currently, 79% of the energy used in the US comes from fossil fuels. Energy that produces no carbon emissions accounts for the rest: Renewables make up 12% and nuclear energy makes up 8%.

Energy used for transportation (cars, buses, planes) comes mostly from fossil fuels. In comparison, energy used to generate electricity comes from more carbon-free sources.

The use of carbon-free energy has been increasing in the US as it has become cheaper to produce. Currently, most carbon-free energy is cheaper to produce than most fossil fuel energy, and experts say that this trend will continue.

In order to reduce carbon emissions, the US has passed laws that provide tax credits to encourage businesses and individuals to:

- increase the production and use of energy that produces less carbon emissions
- Improve their energy-efficiency

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

These tax credits have been widely used, and are estimated to reduce government revenues by about $100 billion a year.

Before looking at specific tax credits, here are arguments for and against the government providing such tax credits.

Here is an argument in favor:

Q9. Clean energy and energy-saving technologies are being adopted and reducing both air pollution and greenhouse gasses, thanks to these tax credits that jump-started their production. Companies and people were not adopting them because they required large upfront costs. But now, the clean energy market is booming and the US is a global leader. We all benefit when these technologies are adopted, and the benefits to society far outweigh the cost. So, it is in all of our interest to continue these tax credits, which move us all more quickly into a future with cleaner air, and less climate change.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
Michigan	32.1%	44.3%	**76.4%**	14.4%	5.6%	**20.0%**	3.6%
GOP	19.4%	45.6%	**65.0%**	21.2%	9.9%	**31.1%**	3.9%
Dem.	45.6%	43.1%	**88.7%**	7.7%	0.6%	**8.3%**	3.0%
National	36.5%	44.4%	**80.9%**	12.7%	3.6%	**16.3%**	2.8%
GOP	25.2%	46.4%	**71.6%**	19.1%	7.0%	**26.1%**	2.3%
Dem.	48.8%	40.4%	**89.2%**	7.0%	0.5%	**7.5%**	3.4%
Indep.	30.6%	51.8%	**82.4%**	11.9%	3.7%	**15.6%**	2.0%

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 tax credits are not free. They can cost the government $100 billion a year, which is a lot of lost revenue at a time when we already have a large deficit.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
Michigan	21.1%	38.0%	**59.1%**	25.2%	14.2%	**39.4%**	1.5%
GOP	26.6%	44.8%	**71.4%**	20.3%	7.2%	**27.5%**	1.1%
Dem.	17.3%	30.4%	**47.7%**	29.5%	21.2%	**50.7%**	1.7%
National	25.5%	34.9%	**60.4%**	26.0%	12.5%	**38.5%**	1.1%
GOP	32.4%	38.6%	**71.0%**	23.0%	5.2%	**28.2%**	0.8%
Dem.	19.5%	30.8%	**50.3%**	29.3%	19.7%	**49.0%**	0.8%
Indep.	23.9%	37.5%	**61.4%**	24.3%	10.9%	**35.2%**	3.3%

Q11. So, how acceptable do you find the idea of the government providing tax credits to encourage businesses and individuals to:

- increase the production and use of energy that produces less carbon emissions
- Improve their energy-efficiency

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
Michigan	24.1%	21.9%	53.4%	0.7%
GOP	32.4%	26.3%	40.9%	0.3%
Dem.	17.0%	12.4%	69.7%	0.9%
National	27.1%	15.9%	57.0%	0.0%
GOP	34.3%	18.2%	47.6%	0.0%
Dem.	16.1%	11.6%	72.2%	0.0%
Indep.	42.3%	23.4%	34.4%	0.0%

[Specific Tax Credits]

We will now consider a number of specific 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.

Here are some tax credits for companies that produce energy.

For each one, please select whether you favor keeping the tax credit at its current level, favor increasing it, or repealing it.

Q12a. 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

	Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Michigan	25.7%	61.9%	12.3%	0.1%	87.6%
GOP	18.3%	60.4%	21.0%	0.3%	78.7%
Dem.	35.3%	60.4%	4.4%	0.0%	95.7%
National	29.6%	58.6%	11.2%	0.7%	88.2%
GOP	25.4%	57.1%	17.0%	0.6%	82.5%
Dem.	35.6%	58.5%	5.2%	0.7%	94.1%
Indep.	22.3%	63.6%	13.0%	1.1%	85.9%

Demographic Results for Michigan						
		Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Gender	Men	27.9%	57.9%	14.0%	0.3%	85.8%
	Women	23.6%	65.8%	10.6%	0.0%	89.4%
Age	18-29	34.2%	56.5%	9.2%	0.0%	90.7%
	30-49	27.2%	62.7%	10.1%	0.0%	89.9%
	50-64	18.6%	67.5%	13.9%	0.0%	86.1%
	65 or older	23.9%	59.5%	16.0%	0.6%	83.4%
Income	Less than $50,000	24.1%	66.4%	9.5%	0.0%	90.5%
	$50-100,000	27.1%	60.1%	12.8%	0.0%	87.2%
	$100-150,000	22.9%	63.6%	13.5%	0.0%	86.5%
	More than $150,000	28.0%	57.8%	13.7%	0.6%	85.8%
Education	High School or less	23.6%	66.6%	9.7%	0.0%	90.2%
	Some college	26.3%	58.0%	15.7%	0.0%	84.3%
	College degree	25.5%	61.1%	12.9%	0.4%	86.6%

Q12b. 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

	Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Michigan	32.4%	55.2%	12.2%	0.1%	87.6%
GOP	20.8%	58.5%	20.4%	0.3%	79.3%
Dem.	45.7%	49.5%	4.8%	0.0%	95.2%
National	36.3%	51.4%	11.2%	1.1%	87.7%
GOP	29.9%	54.2%	15.2%	0.8%	84.1%
Dem.	45.1%	46.8%	7.2%	0.9%	91.9%
Indep.	26.4%	58.9%	12.2%	2.5%	85.3%

Demographic Results for Michigan						
		Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Gender	Men	30.7%	54.3%	14.8%	0.2%	85.0%
	Women	34.2%	56.1%	9.7%	0.0%	90.3%
Age	18-29	32.0%	57.8%	10.2%	0.0%	89.8%
	30-49	36.7%	55.4%	8.0%	0.0%	92.1%
	50-64	33.7%	53.4%	12.9%	0.0%	87.1%
	65 or older	25.9%	54.9%	18.8%	0.5%	80.8%
Income	Less than $50,000	34.8%	53.9%	11.3%	0.0%	88.7%
	$50-100,000	28.4%	56.4%	15.2%	0.0%	84.8%
	$100-150,000	34.9%	54.8%	9.8%	0.6%	89.7%

	More than $150,000	32.9%	55.7%	11.4%	0.0%	88.6%
Education	High School or less	28.8%	60.7%	10.5%	0.0%	89.5%
	Some college	29.9%	55.5%	14.6%	0.0%	85.4%
	College degree	38.6%	48.6%	12.4%	0.4%	87.2%

Q12c. A tax credit of up to $1 per gallon for the production of transportation fuel that produces 25% fewer emissions than the current average

	Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Michigan	27.4%	51.7%	20.9%	0.0%	79.1%
GOP	19.7%	50.9%	29.4%	0.0%	70.6%
Dem.	37.1%	50.0%	12.9%	0.0%	87.1%
National	32.8%	50.5%	16.2%	0.5%	83.3%
GOP	24.5%	51.6%	23.1%	0.8%	76.1%
Dem.	42.3%	48.8%	8.6%	0.4%	91.1%
Indep.	26.6%	53.3%	20.1%	0.0%	79.9%

Demographic Results for Michigan						
		Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Gender	Men	26.2%	53.2%	20.6%	0.0%	79.4%
	Women	28.6%	50.2%	21.2%	0.0%	78.8%
Age	18-29	29.5%	42.7%	27.9%	0.0%	72.2%
	30-49	27.4%	55.9%	16.7%	0.0%	83.3%
	50-64	26.0%	51.9%	22.1%	0.0%	77.9%
	65 or older	27.3%	53.6%	19.2%	0.0%	80.9%
Income	Less than $50,000	26.3%	54.4%	19.3%	0.0%	80.7%
	$50-100,000	27.2%	49.8%	23.0%	0.0%	77.0%
	$100-150,000	24.2%	60.1%	15.7%	0.0%	84.3%
	More than $150,000	31.5%	44.2%	24.3%	0.0%	75.7%
Education	High School or less	23.5%	52.0%	24.5%	0.0%	75.5%
	Some college	31.1%	51.6%	17.3%	0.0%	82.7%
	College degree	26.4%	52.7%	20.9%	0.0%	79.1%

Here are some 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 keeping the tax credit at its current level, favor increasing it, or repealing it:

Q13a. A tax credit up to $3,000 for building a new energy-efficient home or residential building

	Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Michigan	36.9%	51.7%	11.1%	0.3%	88.6%
GOP	26.1%	57.2%	15.9%	0.8%	83.3%
Dem.	49.7%	43.1%	7.2%	0.0%	92.8%
National	36.5%	50.8%	11.9%	0.7%	87.3%
GOP	31.2%	52.2%	16.1%	0.6%	83.4%
Dem.	43.9%	48.6%	6.7%	0.8%	92.5%
Indep.	28.1%	54.1%	16.8%	1.1%	82.2%

Demographic Results for Michigan						
		Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Gender	Men	40.5%	48.6%	10.3%	0.7%	89.1%
	Women	33.3%	54.8%	11.8%	0.0%	88.1%
Age	18-29	42.0%	46.9%	11.1%	0.0%	88.9%

	30-49	39.1%	50.9%	9.7%	0.3%	90.0%
	50-64	35.6%	54.8%	9.6%	0.0%	90.4%
	65 or older	30.9%	53.8%	14.4%	0.9%	84.7%
Income	Less than $50,000	30.2%	55.9%	13.1%	0.8%	86.1%
	$50-100,000	40.2%	50.6%	9.2%	0.0%	90.8%
	$100-150,000	36.1%	54.8%	8.6%	0.6%	90.9%
	More than $150,000	40.8%	46.1%	13.1%	0.0%	86.9%
Education	High School or less	31.2%	60.7%	8.1%	0.0%	91.9%
	Some college	39.1%	44.0%	16.2%	0.7%	83.1%
	College degree	40.8%	49.3%	9.6%	0.4%	90.1%

Q13b. A tax credit up to $6,500 for making energy-saving improvements such as fuel-efficient lighting, doors, windows, or insulation

	Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Michigan	30.1%	57.7%	12.0%	0.2%	87.8%
GOP	26.3%	55.5%	17.7%	0.5%	81.8%
Dem.	36.4%	59.6%	4.1%	0.0%	96.0%
National	31.0%	55.2%	13.1%	0.8%	86.2%
GOP	28.9%	52.7%	17.6%	0.8%	81.6%
Dem.	35.8%	56.1%	7.7%	0.4%	91.9%
Indep.	21.0%	60.1%	17.0%	1.8%	81.1%

Demographic Results for Michigan						
		Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Gender	Men	31.8%	56.1%	11.6%	0.4%	87.9%
	Women	28.4%	59.2%	12.4%	0.0%	87.6%
Age	18-29	33.5%	49.5%	17.1%	0.0%	83.0%
	30-49	32.2%	59.3%	8.5%	0.0%	91.5%
	50-64	31.1%	59.1%	9.8%	0.0%	90.2%
	65 or older	23.2%	61.2%	14.6%	0.9%	84.4%
Income	Less than $50,000	29.7%	54.3%	15.1%	0.8%	84.0%
	$50-100,000	29.2%	59.5%	11.3%	0.0%	88.7%
	$100-150,000	28.2%	59.9%	11.9%	0.0%	88.1%
	More than $150,000	33.1%	57.5%	9.4%	0.0%	90.6%
Education	High School or less	26.8%	61.5%	11.7%	0.0%	88.3%
	Some college	32.2%	53.5%	13.7%	0.7%	85.7%
	College degree	30.5%	59.5%	10.0%	0.0%	90.0%

Q13c. A tax credit up to $1,500 for installing a new energy-efficient heating or air conditioning system

	Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Michigan	39.3%	51.7%	8.6%	0.4%	91.0%
GOP	29.7%	56.8%	12.6%	0.9%	86.5%
Dem.	49.9%	45.7%	4.4%	0.0%	95.6%
National	39.1%	49.5%	10.7%	0.6%	88.6%
GOP	34.6%	49.8%	14.8%	0.8%	84.4%
Dem.	44.5%	48.4%	6.4%	0.7%	92.9%
Indep.	34.9%	52.9%	12.2%	0.0%	87.8%

Demographic Results for Michigan						
		Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Gender	Men	37.5%	51.0%	10.7%	0.7%	88.5%

	Women	41.1%	52.4%	6.6%	0.0%	93.5%
Age	18-29	38.2%	51.1%	10.0%	0.7%	89.3%
	30-49	46.6%	46.6%	6.7%	0.0%	93.2%
	50-64	36.2%	56.2%	7.6%	0.0%	92.4%
	65 or older	34.2%	54.0%	10.9%	0.9%	88.2%
Income	Less than $50,000	35.3%	53.7%	9.7%	1.3%	89.0%
	$50-100,000	39.2%	53.0%	7.9%	0.0%	92.2%
	$100-150,000	38.1%	54.1%	7.8%	0.0%	92.2%
	More than $150,000	45.1%	46.0%	8.9%	0.0%	91.1%
Education	High School or less	31.9%	60.8%	6.8%	0.4%	92.7%
	Some college	40.1%	48.0%	11.2%	0.7%	88.1%
	College degree	47.0%	45.4%	7.5%	0.0%	92.4%

Here are some 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 keeping the tax credit at its current level, favor increasing it, or repealing it:

Q14a. A tax credit up to $4.75 per square foot for building new energy-efficient commercial buildings

	Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Michigan	28.7%	59.5%	11.6%	0.3%	88.2%
GOP	20.4%	60.5%	18.3%	0.7%	80.9%
Dem.	38.8%	55.9%	5.3%	0.0%	94.7%
National	30.9%	57.1%	11.2%	0.8%	88.0%
GOP	27.9%	55.7%	15.6%	0.8%	83.6%
Dem.	35.7%	57.9%	5.6%	0.9%	93.6%
Indep.	23.8%	58.8%	16.8%	0.6%	82.6%

Demographic Results for Michigan						
		Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Gender	Men	30.1%	56.5%	13.4%	0.0%	86.6%
	Women	27.3%	62.3%	9.8%	0.6%	89.6%
Age	18-29	43.0%	47.3%	9.7%	0.0%	90.3%
	30-49	26.6%	60.6%	12.9%	0.0%	87.2%
	50-64	27.2%	67.3%	5.5%	0.0%	94.5%
	65 or older	20.7%	60.2%	17.8%	1.3%	80.9%
Income	Less than $50,000	31.6%	52.7%	14.6%	1.1%	84.3%
	$50-100,000	29.0%	61.3%	9.7%	0.0%	90.3%
	$100-150,000	20.4%	68.2%	11.3%	0.0%	88.6%
	More than $150,000	31.5%	57.9%	10.6%	0.0%	89.4%
Education	High School or less	27.4%	62.1%	9.7%	0.9%	89.5%
	Some college	29.5%	56.8%	13.7%	0.0%	86.3%
	College degree	28.0%	60.8%	11.2%	0.0%	88.8%

Q14b. A tax credit up to $9.25 per square foot for making energy-saving improvements to commercial buildings that reduce energy

	Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Michigan	24.5%	56.6%	18.7%	0.3%	81.1%
GOP	18.9%	55.4%	25.7%	0.0%	74.3%
Dem.	32.1%	57.0%	10.3%	0.6%	89.1%
National	27.9%	55.5%	15.7%	0.9%	83.4%
GOP	25.7%	55.1%	18.4%	0.7%	80.8%
Dem.	30.3%	56.3%	12.3%	1.1%	86.6%
Indep.	26.3%	53.9%	19.1%	0.6%	80.2%

Demographic Results for Michigan						
		Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Gender	Men	28.8%	51.2%	19.9%	0.1%	80.0%
	Women	20.4%	61.7%	17.4%	0.4%	82.1%
Age	18-29	31.3%	54.6%	14.1%	0.0%	85.9%
	30-49	25.9%	59.2%	14.9%	0.0%	85.1%
	50-64	21.4%	58.3%	19.2%	1.0%	79.7%
	65 or older	20.2%	52.9%	26.9%	0.0%	73.1%
Income	Less than $50,000	25.1%	57.7%	16.2%	1.0%	82.8%
	$50-100,000	27.9%	51.7%	20.4%	0.0%	79.6%
	$100-150,000	16.7%	62.2%	21.1%	0.0%	78.9%
	More than $150,000	25.8%	56.9%	17.2%	0.0%	82.7%
Education	High School or less	22.4%	60.7%	16.7%	0.1%	83.1%
	Some college	29.4%	49.0%	21.0%	0.7%	78.4%
	College degree	20.9%	60.4%	18.7%	0.0%	81.3%

Lastly, here are tax credits for electric vehicles. For each one, please select whether you favor keeping the tax credit at its current level, favor increasing it, or repealing it:

Q15a. For manufacturers of fully electric buses, a tax credit equal to 10% of the sales price of each bus sold

	Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Michigan	27.4%	52.6%	19.8%	0.2%	80.0%
GOP	19.1%	48.6%	31.8%	0.6%	67.7%
Dem.	36.6%	55.4%	8.0%	0.0%	92.0%
National	32.6%	50.1%	16.4%	0.9%	82.7%
GOP	25.4%	48.9%	25.3%	0.4%	74.3%
Dem.	41.8%	50.3%	6.5%	1.4%	92.1%
Indep.	23.4%	53.5%	22.4%	0.6%	76.9%

Demographic Results for Michigan						
		Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Gender	Men	28.1%	49.5%	22.0%	0.5%	77.6%
	Women	26.8%	55.6%	17.6%	0.0%	82.4%
Age	18-29	28.1%	52.0%	19.9%	0.0%	80.1%
	30-49	28.1%	57.4%	14.5%	0.0%	85.5%
	50-64	24.8%	54.8%	19.9%	0.5%	79.6%
	65 or older	28.6%	44.5%	26.5%	0.4%	73.1%
Income	Less than $50,000	27.9%	54.5%	17.6%	0.0%	82.4%
	$50-100,000	29.6%	50.6%	19.8%	0.0%	80.2%
	$100-150,000	23.4%	52.5%	23.5%	0.5%	75.9%
	More than $150,000	27.4%	52.9%	19.1%	0.6%	80.3%
Education	High School or less	26.6%	51.5%	21.9%	0.0%	78.1%
	Some college	26.4%	54.3%	19.3%	0.0%	80.7%
	College degree	29.0%	50.8%	19.4%	0.8%	79.8%

Q15b. For people earning less than $150,000, a tax credit of up to $7,500 for purchasing a new electric car

	Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Michigan	32.9%	42.4%	24.6%	0.1%	75.3%

GOP	24.0%	38.0%	37.6%	0.4%	62.0%
Dem.	43.8%	45.6%	10.5%	0.0%	89.4%
National	32.0%	47.3%	19.8%	0.8%	79.3%
GOP	24.9%	44.5%	30.1%	0.4%	69.4%
Dem.	41.2%	47.8%	10.3%	0.7%	89.0%
Indep.	23.0%	54.8%	19.3%	2.8%	77.8%

Demographic Results for Michigan						
		Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Gender	Men	32.3%	41.7%	25.7%	0.3%	74.0%
	Women	33.5%	43.0%	23.5%	0.0%	76.5%
Age	18-29	35.2%	43.8%	21.0%	0.0%	79.0%
	30-49	36.1%	46.2%	17.2%	0.5%	82.3%
	50-64	29.2%	44.7%	26.1%	0.0%	73.9%
	65 or older	30.7%	33.6%	35.7%	0.0%	64.3%
Income	Less than $50,000	30.6%	47.1%	22.3%	0.0%	77.7%
	$50-100,000	29.4%	41.6%	29.0%	0.0%	71.0%
	$100-150,000	33.2%	42.0%	24.9%	0.0%	75.2%
	More than $150,000	39.7%	38.2%	21.5%	0.6%	77.9%
Education	High School or less	28.1%	48.4%	23.5%	0.0%	76.5%
	Some college	32.6%	36.2%	31.2%	0.0%	68.8%
	College degree	38.0%	41.5%	20.0%	0.5%	79.5%

Q15c. For people earning less than $75,000, a tax credit of up to $4,000 for purchasing a used electric car

	Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Michigan	37.0%	40.2%	22.9%	0.0%	77.2%
GOP	24.0%	39.8%	36.2%	0.0%	63.8%
Dem.	50.8%	39.1%	10.1%	0.0%	89.9%
National	36.6%	43.3%	18.7%	1.5%	79.9%
GOP	29.1%	41.4%	28.3%	1.3%	70.5%
Dem.	46.2%	42.3%	9.5%	2.0%	88.5%
Indep.	27.1%	53.4%	19.5%	0.0%	80.5%

Demographic Results for Michigan						
		Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Gender	Men	37.5%	39.6%	22.9%	0.0%	77.1%
	Women	36.4%	40.8%	22.9%	0.0%	77.2%
Age	18-29	39.4%	40.9%	19.6%	0.0%	80.3%
	30-49	41.1%	43.0%	15.9%	0.0%	84.1%
	50-64	30.8%	45.9%	23.3%	0.0%	76.7%
	65 or older	36.0%	29.7%	34.3%	0.0%	65.7%
Income	Less than $50,000	36.5%	45.3%	18.2%	0.0%	81.8%
	$50-100,000	37.9%	37.8%	24.4%	0.0%	75.7%
	$100-150,000	37.0%	38.0%	24.9%	0.0%	75.0%
	More than $150,000	36.2%	39.2%	24.6%	0.0%	75.4%
Education	High School or less	34.0%	47.0%	19.0%	0.0%	81.0%
	Some college	35.8%	36.7%	27.5%	0.0%	72.5%
	College degree	41.5%	35.5%	23.1%	0.0%	77.0%

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 put into law:

Please select whether you favor keeping the tax credit at its current level, favor increasing it, or repealing it:

Q16. tax credit of up to 30% of the cost of installing a charging station that can be used by anyone

	Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Michigan	31.2%	48.1%	20.6%	0.1%	79.3%
GOP	18.4%	48.0%	33.6%	0.0%	66.4%
Dem.	43.6%	47.6%	8.5%	0.2%	91.2%
National	29.3%	52.2%	17.3%	1.2%	81.5%
GOP	23.9%	48.9%	26.5%	0.6%	72.8%
Dem.	37.7%	52.6%	8.2%	1.4%	90.3%
Indep.	17.5%	61.2%	19.2%	2.1%	78.7%

Demographic Results for Michigan						
		Increase	Keep at Current Level	Repeal	Refused / DK	Increase – Keep Same
Gender	Men	31.3%	45.0%	23.5%	0.2%	76.3%
	Women	31.2%	51.0%	17.8%	0.0%	82.2%
Age	18-29	27.8%	55.1%	17.1%	0.0%	82.9%
	30-49	35.5%	47.3%	17.2%	0.0%	82.8%
	50-64	30.0%	50.8%	18.9%	0.4%	80.8%
	65 or older	29.9%	40.2%	29.9%	0.0%	70.1%
Income	Less than $50,000	32.6%	47.7%	19.8%	0.0%	80.3%
	$50-100,000	28.7%	51.6%	19.7%	0.0%	80.3%
	$100-150,000	22.9%	55.0%	21.6%	0.5%	77.9%
	More than $150,000	39.6%	38.5%	21.8%	0.0%	78.1%
Education	High School or less	27.6%	52.3%	20.2%	0.0%	79.9%
	Some college	31.7%	44.9%	23.4%	0.0%	76.6%
	College degree	34.2%	45.2%	20.3%	0.3%	79.4%

Another method the government can use to reduce emissions is to reduce energy usage by requiring businesses to meet **higher energy-efficiency standards** for new products (such as cars, trucks, buildings and appliances.)

Here is an argument **in favor** of establishing higher energy efficiency standards:

Q17. Having higher energy efficiency standards 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
Michigan	26.9%	45.9%	**72.8%**	17.3%	5.3%	**22.6%**	4.6%
GOP	18.7%	42.1%	**60.8%**	24.3%	9.7%	**34.0%**	5.2%
Dem.	37.4%	47.7%	**85.1%**	8.4%	1.6%	**10.0%**	4.8%
National	30.8%	46.1%	**76.9%**	14.1%	4.4%	**18.5%**	4.6%
GOP	20.9%	45.2%	**66.1%**	19.8%	8.3%	**28.1%**	5.8%
Dem.	42.0%	45.6%	**87.6%**	8.5%	1.0%	**9.5%**	2.9%
Indep.	23.7%	50.9%	**74.6%**	15.2%	3.6%	**18.8%**	6.5%

Here is an argument **against** establishing higher energy efficiency standards:

Q18. 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, which costs consumers less in the long-run, 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
Michigan	21.1%	38.4%	**59.5%**	27.8%	10.9%	**38.7%**	1.7%
GOP	25.9%	49.2%	**75.1%**	19.0%	4.9%	**23.9%**	1.1%
Dem.	16.5%	29.4%	**45.9%**	34.7%	16.9%	**51.6%**	2.5%
National	22.2%	43.4%	**65.6%**	21.8%	11.4%	**33.2%**	1.2%
GOP	26.0%	47.8%	**73.8%**	19.0%	6.1%	**25.1%**	1.1%
Dem.	19.8%	38.4%	**58.2%**	23.8%	16.8%	**40.6%**	1.2%
Indep.	17.9%	46.7%	**64.6%**	24.1%	9.7%	**33.8%**	1.6%

There is currently a government regulation that requires car companies to gradually raise the fuel efficiency of new cars and light trucks:

By 2027, new cars and light trucks need to get about 20 to 30% more miles per gallon (mpg) on average than cars and light trucks made in 2022[3]:

- For cars: increase from an average of 47 mpg to an average of 59 mpg in 2027
- For light trucks: increase from an average of 33 mpg to an average of 42 mpg in 2027

It is estimated that this will increase the initial cost of a car, but owners would save money in lower fuel costs. Overall, by 2027, owners of a new car or light truck will save an average of $1,000 over the lifetime of the car.[4] And over time, the benefits are expected to outweigh the costs even more.

Less emissions would slow climate change and reduce air pollution which would improve people's health, both which save society as a whole money.

Overall, taking into account both the increased costs of meeting these new standards and the benefits of less emissions, society as a whole would save around $110 billion.[5]

So, here again is the regulation:

By 2027, new cars and light trucks need to get about 20 to 30% more miles per gallon (mpg) on average than cars and light trucks made in 2022:

- For cars: increase from an average of 47 mpg in 2022 to an average of 59 mpg in 2027
- For light trucks: increase from an average of 33 mpg in 2022 to an average of 42 mpg in 2027

Q19. How acceptable do you find this regulation?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
Michigan	30.7%	20.0%	47.1%	2.2%
GOP	41.8%	17.3%	39.6%	1.3%
Dem.	19.7%	18.8%	58.4%	3.1%
National	24.6%	20.1%	55.3%	0.0%
GOP	33.5%	20.6%	46.0%	0.0%
Dem.	13.9%	17.4%	68.8%	0.0%

[3] Department of Transportation. (2021) Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards for Model Years 2024-2026 Passenger Cars and Light Trucks, p. 54
[4] EPA. (2021) EPA Finalizes Greenhouse Gas Standards for Passenger Vehicles, Paving Way for a Zero-Emissions Future
[5] Department of Transportation. (2021) Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards for Model Years 2024-2026 Passenger Cars and Light Trucks, Table I-10 (using Alternative 2.5, which DOT concludes is the most feasible, p. 21)

Indep.	33.2%	28.2%	38.5%	0.0%

Q20. Do you favor or oppose the regulation to gradually raise the fuel efficiency of light cars and trucks through 2027?

	Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Michigan	68.0%	31.4%	0.6%
GOP	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%
Dem.	81.9%	17.6%	0.6%
National	70.1%	29.0%	0.9%
GOP	61.0%	38.4%	0.6%
Dem.	80.9%	18.3%	0.9%
Indep.	62.4%	36.1%	1.5%

Demographic Results for Michigan				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Gender	Men	68.7%	30.8%	0.5%
	Women	67.3%	32.0%	0.7%
Age	18-29	72.6%	26.1%	1.3%
	30-49	69.6%	30.4%	0.0%
	50-64	68.1%	30.9%	1.1%
	65 or older	61.8%	37.8%	0.4%
Income	Less than $50,000	67.9%	30.3%	1.7%
	$50-100,000	65.3%	34.2%	0.5%
	$100-150,000	69.3%	30.7%	0.0%
	More than $150,000	70.3%	29.7%	0.0%
Education	High School or less	65.5%	33.4%	1.1%
	Some college	70.4%	28.8%	0.8%
	College degree	71.5%	28.5%	0.0%

Now we are going to turn to a policy about drilling for oil and gas off the coasts of the US, known as offshore drilling.

Offshore drilling is currently taking place in some areas off the coasts of Texas, California and Alaska. About 15% of oil and 2% of gas in the US is produced from offshore drilling.[6]

Every year, the federal government decides which offshore areas, if any, they will allow companies to drill for oil or gas. The government then sells or renews leases to companies to drill in those areas.

In response to a series of major damaging oil spills, including the Santa Barbara spill in 1969 and the Exxon Valdez in 1989, laws have been enacted banning offshore oil drilling in several areas.

There is some debate about whether the government should grant and renew leases in a way that would increase or decrease the amount of oil being drilled offshore, or keep it about the same as is currently drilled.

The government estimates that there are substantial amounts of oil and gas in the offshore areas which are not currently open for drilling. However, if those areas are opened for drilling, it may take several years before any oil or gas is produced.

Here is an argument for the government working to increase the amount of offshore drilling:

Q21. If oil companies drill in these offshore areas they will generate substantial new economic activity and revenues. Building and operating the oil rigs will create jobs along these coasts, diversifying the local economies. The oil company's payments for leases will produce additional federal revenue that could be used to offset negative environmental effects, and even upgrade the environmental quality of the coastlines.

[6] NRDC. (2024) Offshore Drilling 101

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
Michigan	23.5%	45.0%	**68.5%**	23.0%	7.3%	**30.3%**	1.2%
GOP	29.8%	48.7%	**78.5%**	16.7%	4.2%	**20.9%**	0.7%
Dem.	18.4%	42.9%	**61.3%**	25.9%	11.2%	**37.1%**	1.6%
National	25.0%	43.8%	**68.8%**	19.7%	10.1%	**29.8%**	1.2%
GOP	30.4%	46.7%	**77.1%**	16.8%	5.3%	**22.1%**	0.8%
Dem.	21.3%	43.1%	**64.4%**	20.2%	14.1%	**34.3%**	1.3%
Indep.	20.7%	36.9%	**57.6%**	27.8%	12.2%	**40.0%**	2.5%

Here is an argument for the government working to keep the amount of offshore drilling the same:

Q22. Offshore drilling is important for our energy supply. But it is at some environmental cost. At this point, we already produce enough energy to meet our energy needs given America's consumption of oil and gas. Should we need more energy in the future, there are other ways to meet those needs that pose less risk to the environment, in addition to creating more unsightly oil platforms.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
Michigan	22.3%	43.2%	**65.5%**	22.8%	10.4%	**33.2%**	1.2%
GOP	16.0%	36.7%	**52.7%**	30.1%	16.4%	**46.5%**	0.8%
Dem.	26.8%	50.2%	**77.0%**	15.3%	6.0%	**21.3%**	1.6%
National	27.3%	42.5%	**69.8%**	20.3%	8.1%	**28.4%**	1.8%
GOP	23.9%	36.5%	**60.4%**	26.3%	11.7%	**38.0%**	1.5%
Dem.	34.4%	45.7%	**80.1%**	14.7%	4.0%	**18.7%**	1.2%
Indep.	13.8%	50.6%	**64.4%**	20.2%	10.7%	**30.9%**	4.7%

Here is an argument for the government working to decrease the amount of offshore drilling:

Q23. Continuing to drill off our coasts increases the risk of even more devastating oil spills like the Deepwater Horizon oil spill that permanently damage our environment, destroy local economies, and cost billions to clean up. Small oil spills also occur all the time. This pollution undermines the multi-billion-dollar tourism industry. We can get our energy from safer sources that keep our waters and air clean. It is time to ramp down this high-risk drilling.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
Michigan	29.9%	39.1%	**69.0%**	20.9%	9.0%	**29.9%**	1.2%
GOP	20.0%	34.8%	**54.8%**	26.7%	18.1%	**44.8%**	0.4%
Dem.	42.8%	42.9%	**85.7%**	11.8%	0.7%	**12.5%**	1.7%
National	32.2%	40.5%	**72.7%**	18.4%	7.6%	**26.0%**	1.3%
GOP	23.1%	37.3%	**60.4%**	25.7%	13.3%	**39.0%**	0.7%
Dem.	43.1%	41.4%	**84.5%**	11.2%	2.7%	**13.9%**	1.6%
Indep.	23.6%	47.7%	**71.3%**	19.6%	6.8%	**26.4%**	2.3%

Q24. In conclusion, when the government is making decisions about selling and renewing leases for offshore drilling, should it have the goal of:
[ARO]

1. Increasing the amount of offshore drilling
2. Keeping it about the same
3. Reducing the amount of offshore drilling

	Increase offshore drilling	Keep about the same	Reduce offshore drilling	Refused / DK	Reduce – Keep Same
Michigan	23.2%	46.0%	30.0%	0.8%	76.0%
GOP	36.2%	45.7%	17.1%	0.9%	62.8%
Dem.	11.5%	45.6%	42.6%	0.3%	88.2%

National	22.9%	47.0%	28.6%	1.4%	75.6%
GOP	34.7%	46.3%	18.0%	1.0%	64.3%
Dem.	13.5%	46.7%	39.0%	0.8%	85.7%
Indep.	17.5%	50.5%	27.0%	5.0%	77.5%

Demographic Results for Michigan						
		Increase	**Keep at Current Level**	**Reduce**	**Refused / DK**	**Reduce – Keep Same**
Gender	Men	29.8%	43.2%	26.1%	0.8%	69.3%
	Women	16.8%	48.7%	33.7%	0.7%	82.4%
Age	18-29	22.4%	45.9%	30.9%	0.8%	76.8%
	30-49	17.0%	54.2%	27.5%	1.2%	81.7%
	50-64	23.9%	49.3%	26.8%	0.0%	76.1%
	65 or older	31.2%	31.9%	35.9%	1.0%	67.8%
Income	Less than $50,000	19.0%	49.9%	30.3%	0.8%	80.2%
	$50-100,000	24.1%	42.3%	32.6%	1.0%	74.9%
	$100-150,000	24.3%	47.3%	28.5%	0.0%	75.8%
	More than $150,000	25.9%	45.4%	27.6%	1.1%	73.0%
Education	High School or less	23.0%	50.3%	26.4%	0.3%	76.7%
	Some college	22.0%	42.5%	33.9%	1.6%	76.4%
	College degree	24.9%	44.7%	29.9%	0.4%	74.6%

Methodology

Fielding and Sample Size
The Michigan survey was fielded online July 10-19, 2024 by the Program for Public Consultation (PPC) at the University of Maryland's School of Public Policy, with a representative non-probability sample of 627 adults in Michigan. Sample was obtained from multiple online opt-in panels, including Cint, Prodege and Dynata. The confidence interval is +/- 4.4%. The overall response rate was 3.8%.

Pre-Stratification and Weighting
The sample was pre-stratified and weighted by age, race, ethnicity, gender, education, household income, metro/non-metro status, marital status and home ownership using benchmarks from the Census Bureau's 2022 American Community Survey and 2023 Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement. The maximum weight applied was 4.4.

Sample Collection
Sample collection was managed by QuantifyAI with oversight from PPC. Samples were drawn from multiple large online panels, including Cint, Prodege, and Dynata, whose members are recruited using non-probability sampling methods. The selected sample was invited to participate via email invitation, push notification, or SMS for cell phone users. Respondents were offered cash or cash-equivalent incentives to participate in the survey.

Data Collection and Privacy
Survey responses were collected directly on the Alchemer platform. Only respondents with a provided link could take the survey, using their computer or mobile phone.

Alchemer ensures that data is collected in adherence to the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation policies for data privacy and security, as well as the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA).

Quality Control
Quality control measures in the sample collection process to disqualify duplicate respondents and survey bots included:

- checking respondents' IP addresses to determine if there are duplicate respondents
- employing an "operating system & Web browser check" to determine if there are any cross-panel duplicates
- using hCaptcha to detect and disqualify survey bots.

Quality control measures within the survey disqualify dishonest or mischievous respondents, as well as survey bots, included:

- an attention-check question, e.g. Select the word that does not belong. [Tuesday]; [Friday]; [April]; [Wednesday]

- an honesty question, e.g. What have you done in the past week? Select all that apply. [Won a gold medal at the Olympics]; [Watched TV]; [Got a license to operate a Class SSGN submarine]; [Read a book]
- a speed limit, which disqualified respondents who moved through the first quarter of the survey at a pace roughly triple the average reading speed.

Lastly, respondents were removed from the sample who answered less than half the substantive questions, or who engaged in straight-lining.