



Survey on Energy and the Environment

– NATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE –

Field Dates: March 12-18, 2025

Sample Size: 809 Adults Nationally

Confidence Interval: National Sample: +/-3.7%

Samples 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]

[Note: Headings in [brackets] were not presented to respondents. They simply indicate topics and provide programming instructions. Single lines indicate respondents were presented questions/text on a new screen. Footnotes denote sources, but were not presented to the respondent]

Q1-12 have been held for future release

One of the challenges we face today is that the way we produce energy can have negative impacts on the health and environment.

We are going to introduce some proposals for changing the way energy is produced and used to:

- reduce air pollution
- reduce the production of greenhouse gasses

[Priority Health]

One debate is about how high a priority it should be for the government to work to reduce air pollution.

Some forms of energy production – especially burning coal – result in air pollution, which contribute to health issues (e.g. asthma, heart attacks) and reduce economic productivity.

Over the last few decades, pollution has gone down in large part due to regulations on energy. But there is still air pollution that causes avoidable health and economic problems.

Here is an argument in favor of it being a **high priority** to further reduce air pollution.

Investing in cleaner air benefits everyone, but especially vulnerable people like children and the elderly. Every dollar spent saves \$30 in health costs and increased productivity.

Here is an argument in favor of it being a **low priority** to further reduce air pollution.

Existing laws have already cut air pollution by 75% and will continue to do so. Stricter regulations create costs for the energy industry and can lead to job losses, while providing few additional benefits.

Q13. 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.

Q13	Somewhat		Total	Somewhat		Total	Refused /
	Very High Priority	High Priority		Low Priority	Not at all a Priority		
National	44%	36%	80%	15%	5%	20%	0%
GOP	38%	35%	74%	20%	7%	26%	0%
Dem.	51%	39%	90%	8%	2%	10%	0%
Indep.	41%	34%	74%	18%	8%	26%	0%
Demographics							
White	43%	34%	77%	18%	6%	23%	0%
Black	59%	32%	91%	6%	3%	9%	0%
Hispanic	41%	45%	86%	9%	5%	14%	0%
Men	48%	35%	83%	12%	5%	17%	0%
Women	39%	38%	78%	17%	5%	22%	0%
18-34	47%	37%	84%	12%	4%	16%	0%
35-44	57%	31%	87%	8%	5%	13%	0%
45-54	36%	42%	78%	18%	4%	22%	0%
55-64	39%	39%	78%	19%	3%	22%	0%
65+	39%	35%	73%	19%	8%	27%	0%
< \$30k	41%	35%	76%	13%	11%	24%	0%
\$30k-50k	40%	38%	78%	16%	5%	22%	0%
\$50k-75,000k	39%	43%	81%	14%	5%	19%	0%
\$75k-100k	34%	44%	78%	18%	4%	22%	0%
\$100k-150k	42%	36%	79%	19%	2%	21%	0%
> \$150k	60%	27%	87%	11%	2%	13%	0%
High School or less	41%	38%	78%	15%	6%	22%	0%
Some college	37%	41%	78%	17%	6%	22%	0%
Bachelor's degree	48%	32%	80%	18%	3%	20%	0%
Post grad degree	64%	29%	93%	5%	2%	7%	0%

[Priority GHGs]

Another debate is about how high a priority it should be for the government to work to further reduce greenhouse gases, especially carbon dioxide.

Studies by the National Academies of Science – under both Republican and Democratic Presidents – have concluded that greenhouse gases emitted by human activities are causing temperatures to rise globally.

Studies continue to show that increased temperatures have resulted in more severe storms, droughts, wildfires, and rising sea levels and these consequences are projected to increase substantially in the coming years.

Nearly all climate scientists agree that climate change is a problem and reducing greenhouse gases is necessary to slow it down.

But some climate scientists and elected officials disagree. Some question whether climate change is a real problem. Others question whether it is due to human causes and whether reducing carbon emissions will help reduce the problem of climate change.

Here is an argument in favor of it being a **high priority** to further reduce the production of greenhouse gases:

Reducing greenhouse gases is crucial to prevent the economic losses, extreme weather, and rising sea levels that climate change is causing. Cleaner energy boosts health, creates jobs, and keeps the U.S. competitive in a growing global market.

Here is an argument in favor of it being a **low priority** to further reduce the production of greenhouse gases:

Some scientists question the extent that human activity is causing climate change. Costly steps to change the way we produce energy can hurt the economy and cost jobs. If individuals and businesses want to take action they can do so without government involvement.

Q14. 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?

Q14	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
National	40%	35%	76%	16%	8%	24%	0%
GOP	33%	36%	69%	21%	11%	31%	0%
Dem.	50%	37%	87%	9%	4%	13%	1%
Indep.	35%	30%	65%	22%	12%	34%	1%
Demographics							
White	40%	33%	73%	19%	9%	28%	0%
Black	47%	38%	85%	10%	4%	14%	1%
Hispanic	41%	42%	83%	9%	7%	16%	1%
Men	43%	35%	78%	14%	8%	22%	1%
Women	37%	36%	73%	18%	8%	26%	0%
18-34	40%	36%	77%	14%	9%	23%	1%
35-44	48%	36%	83%	11%	5%	16%	1%
45-54	36%	41%	77%	18%	5%	23%	0%
55-64	37%	32%	69%	22%	8%	30%	1%
65+	39%	33%	72%	17%	11%	28%	0%
< \$30k	37%	36%	73%	16%	10%	27%	1%
\$30k-50k	39%	35%	74%	17%	9%	26%	0%
\$50k-75,000k	41%	35%	76%	19%	5%	24%	1%
\$75k-100k	34%	33%	67%	24%	9%	33%	0%
\$100k-150k	37%	34%	71%	19%	11%	30%	0%
> \$150k	50%	38%	88%	6%	5%	12%	1%
High School or less	38%	34%	71%	18%	10%	29%	0%
Some college	33%	37%	70%	20%	10%	29%	1%
Bachelor's degree	45%	36%	81%	15%	4%	19%	0%
Post grad degree	56%	37%	92%	3%	4%	7%	1%

[Tax Credits]

One way the US has reduced carbon emissions has been increasing the production of energy that does not produce carbon dioxide (e.g. wind, solar, nuclear).

The use of carbon-free energy has been increasing in the US. This is in part because most carbon-free energy is cheaper to produce than most fossil fuel energy.

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 fewer carbon emissions
- improve their energy-efficiency

(A **tax credit** reduces the total amount of taxes a business or individual owes. For example, if a business 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.

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

These tax credits have boosted clean energy adoption, reduced pollution and greenhouse gases, and made the U.S. a global leader in the clean energy market.

Here is an argument against:

If businesses or people think adopting these new green technologies is important, then they should foot the bill. These tax credits can cost the government \$100 billion a year, worsening the deficit.

We will now consider a number of specific tax credits.

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.

Q15a. 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

Q15a	Keep at current level				Increase / Keep same
	Increase	level	Repeal	Refused / DK	
National	29%	55%	15%	1%	84%
GOP	30%	50%	18%	1%	81%
Dem.	32%	59%	8%	1%	91%
Indep.	16%	61%	22%	1%	77%
Demographics					
White	28%	56%	15%	1%	84%
Black	29%	59%	10%	1%	89%
Hispanic	36%	49%	12%	2%	85%
Men	36%	47%	16%	2%	82%
Women	22%	64%	13%	1%	86%

18-34	31%	56%	13%	1%	87%
35-44	44%	41%	13%	2%	85%
45-54	27%	58%	12%	3%	85%
55-64	22%	60%	18%	0%	82%
65+	22%	60%	17%	1%	82%
< \$30k	16%	65%	16%	3%	81%
\$30k-50k	23%	61%	15%	1%	84%
\$50k-75,000k	25%	61%	14%	0%	86%
\$75k-100k	30%	53%	16%	1%	83%
\$100k-150k	36%	45%	18%	1%	81%
> \$150k	42%	48%	10%	0%	90%
High School or less	19%	61%	18%	2%	80%
Some college	24%	60%	15%	1%	84%
Bachelor's degree	36%	51%	13%	0%	87%
Post grad degree	61%	32%	5%	1%	93%

Q15b. 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

Q15b	Keep at current level				Increase / Keep same
	Increase	level	Repeal	Refused / DK	
National	33%	54%	12%	1%	87%
GOP	29%	53%	16%	2%	82%
Dem.	39%	53%	7%	1%	92%
Indep.	25%	63%	12%	0%	88%
Demographics					
White	32%	54%	13%	1%	87%
Black	36%	54%	8%	1%	91%
Hispanic	33%	54%	10%	3%	87%
Men	37%	49%	12%	2%	86%
Women	28%	59%	12%	1%	87%
18-34	40%	50%	10%	0%	90%
35-44	39%	51%	7%	3%	90%
45-54	31%	54%	13%	2%	85%
55-64	23%	59%	18%	0%	82%
65+	27%	59%	14%	1%	86%
< \$30k	22%	63%	12%	3%	85%
\$30k-50k	33%	57%	11%	0%	89%
\$50k-75,000k	33%	57%	9%	1%	91%
\$75k-100k	37%	54%	10%	0%	90%
\$100k-150k	38%	41%	19%	2%	79%
> \$150k	35%	53%	12%	0%	88%
High School or less	26%	58%	14%	2%	84%
Some college	31%	57%	12%	0%	88%
Bachelor's degree	42%	47%	12%	0%	88%
Post grad degree	42%	49%	7%	3%	91%

Q15c. A tax credit of up to \$1 per gallon for the production of transportation fuel that produces 25% fewer emissions than the current average

Q15c	Keep at current level				Increase / Keep same
	Increase	level	Repeal	Refused / DK	
National	29%	54%	16%	1%	83%
GOP	29%	50%	19%	2%	79%
Dem.	33%	57%	9%	1%	90%
Indep.	18%	56%	24%	1%	74%
Demographics					
White	29%	54%	17%	1%	82%
Black	27%	59%	12%	3%	86%
Hispanic	35%	48%	15%	3%	82%
Men	31%	51%	17%	2%	82%
Women	27%	57%	16%	1%	84%
18-34	34%	49%	16%	1%	83%
35-44	38%	48%	11%	3%	86%
45-54	23%	57%	17%	2%	81%
55-64	21%	60%	19%	0%	81%
65+	26%	57%	17%	1%	83%
< \$30k	16%	62%	17%	4%	78%
\$30k-50k	35%	49%	16%	0%	84%
\$50k-75,000k	25%	60%	13%	1%	85%
\$75k-100k	27%	54%	20%	0%	80%
\$100k-150k	32%	47%	19%	2%	79%
> \$150k	39%	49%	13%	0%	87%
High School or less	21%	59%	18%	3%	79%
Some college	26%	57%	17%	0%	83%
Bachelor's degree	38%	46%	15%	1%	84%
Post grad degree	48%	41%	9%	3%	89%

Here are some tax credits for homeowners or owners of residential buildings who make energy-saving upgrades.

Q16a. A tax credit up to \$3,000 for building a new energy-efficient home or residential building

Q16a	Keep at current level				Increase / Keep same
	Increase	level	Repeal	Refused / DK	
National	36%	53%	11%	0%	89%
GOP	34%	51%	15%	0%	85%
Dem.	42%	52%	6%	0%	94%
Indep.	22%	67%	11%	1%	88%
Demographics					
White	37%	53%	10%	0%	89%
Black	33%	56%	11%	0%	89%
Hispanic	40%	52%	8%	0%	92%

Men	44%	45%	11%	0%	89%
Women	28%	61%	10%	1%	89%
18-34	38%	53%	8%	0%	92%
35-44	47%	43%	9%	1%	90%
45-54	30%	57%	13%	1%	86%
55-64	29%	60%	12%	0%	88%
65+	33%	54%	13%	0%	87%
< \$30k	22%	68%	10%	1%	89%
\$30k-50k	34%	56%	10%	0%	90%
\$50k-75,000k	37%	52%	9%	1%	90%
\$75k-100k	35%	52%	13%	0%	87%
\$100k-150k	35%	49%	16%	0%	84%
> \$150k	50%	43%	7%	0%	93%
High School or less	23%	61%	15%	1%	84%
Some college	36%	55%	9%	0%	91%
Bachelor's degree	43%	48%	9%	0%	91%
Post grad degree	60%	34%	6%	0%	94%

Q16b. A tax credit up to \$6,500 for making energy-saving improvements such as fuel-efficient lighting, doors, windows, or insulation

Q16b	Keep at current level			Refused / DK	Increase / Keep same
	Increase	level	Repeal		
National	30%	55%	14%	1%	85%
GOP	29%	52%	18%	1%	81%
Dem.	35%	56%	9%	0%	91%
Indep.	22%	62%	15%	2%	84%
Demographics					
White	30%	55%	14%	1%	85%
Black	33%	54%	11%	2%	87%
Hispanic	32%	54%	14%	1%	85%
Men	33%	52%	14%	1%	85%
Women	27%	58%	14%	1%	86%
18-34	33%	54%	13%	0%	86%
35-44	39%	48%	10%	3%	87%
45-54	32%	53%	13%	1%	85%
55-64	23%	63%	14%	1%	85%
65+	25%	57%	18%	0%	82%
< \$30k	21%	62%	16%	2%	83%
\$30k-50k	28%	53%	18%	2%	81%
\$50k-75,000k	35%	54%	10%	1%	89%
\$75k-100k	38%	50%	13%	0%	88%
\$100k-150k	26%	58%	15%	2%	83%
> \$150k	36%	51%	13%	0%	87%
High School or less	24%	57%	18%	1%	81%
Some college	30%	57%	12%	1%	87%
Bachelor's degree	34%	54%	13%	0%	87%

Post grad degree	44%	46%	8%	2%	90%
------------------	-----	-----	----	----	-----

Q16c. A tax credit up to \$1,500 for installing a new energy-efficient heating or air conditioning system

Q16c	Keep at current level			Refused / DK	Increase / Keep same
	Increase	level	Repeal		
National	33%	53%	13%	1%	86%
GOP	31%	51%	17%	1%	82%
Dem.	41%	50%	8%	1%	91%
Indep.	18%	66%	15%	1%	84%
Demographics					
White	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
Black	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
Hispanic	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
Men	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
Women	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
18-34	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
35-44	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
45-54	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
55-64	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
65+	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
< \$30k	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
\$30k-50k	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
\$50k-75,000k	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
\$75k-100k	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
\$100k-150k	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
> \$150k	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
High School or less	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
Some college	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
Bachelor's degree	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%
Post grad degree	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%

Here are some tax credits for owners of commercial buildings, such as offices of factories, who make energy-saving upgrades.

Q17a. A tax credit up to \$4.75 per square foot for building new energy-efficient commercial buildings

Q17a	Keep at current level			Refused / DK	Increase / Keep same
	Increase	level	Repeal		
National	30%	56%	14%	0%	86%
GOP	31%	50%	19%	0%	81%
Dem.	35%	58%	8%	0%	92%
Indep.	17%	68%	15%	0%	85%
Demographics					
White	29%	55%	16%	0%	84%

Black	33%	57%	10%	0%	90%
Hispanic	37%	54%	9%	0%	91%
Men	36%	50%	14%	0%	86%
Women	25%	61%	14%	0%	86%
18-34	31%	57%	12%	0%	88%
35-44	42%	48%	9%	0%	91%
45-54	32%	55%	12%	1%	87%
55-64	22%	56%	22%	0%	78%
65+	25%	60%	15%	0%	85%
< \$30k	21%	65%	14%	1%	86%
\$30k-50k	26%	61%	13%	0%	87%
\$50k-75,000k	24%	63%	12%	0%	88%
\$75k-100k	32%	53%	14%	0%	86%
\$100k-150k	35%	44%	21%	0%	79%
> \$150k	42%	48%	10%	0%	90%
High School or less	22%	61%	17%	0%	83%
Some college	23%	63%	14%	0%	86%
Bachelor's degree	42%	45%	13%	0%	87%
Post grad degree	54%	39%	7%	0%	93%

Q17b. A tax credit up to \$9.25 per square foot for making energy-saving improvements to commercial buildings that reduce energy

Q17b	Keep at current level				Increase / Keep same
	Increase	level	Repeal	Refused / DK	
National	26%	57%	16%	1%	83%
GOP	26%	54%	19%	1%	80%
Dem.	30%	59%	12%	0%	88%
Indep.	16%	63%	21%	1%	79%
Demographics					
White	25%	57%	17%	1%	82%
Black	31%	55%	14%	1%	86%
Hispanic	28%	57%	14%	1%	85%
Men	30%	52%	17%	1%	82%
Women	23%	62%	15%	0%	85%
18-34	26%	59%	16%	0%	84%
35-44	34%	52%	12%	2%	86%
45-54	28%	57%	14%	1%	85%
55-64	19%	61%	19%	1%	80%
65+	25%	55%	20%	0%	80%
< \$30k	17%	68%	14%	1%	85%
\$30k-50k	24%	55%	21%	0%	79%
\$50k-75,000k	25%	61%	14%	0%	86%
\$75k-100k	34%	52%	15%	0%	85%
\$100k-150k	25%	53%	20%	2%	78%
> \$150k	34%	51%	15%	1%	85%
High School or less	22%	58%	19%	1%	81%

Some college	20%	62%	19%	0%	82%
Bachelor's degree	34%	53%	13%	0%	87%
Post grad degree	40%	47%	10%	4%	87%

Here are tax credits for electric vehicles.

Q18a. For people earning less than \$150,000, a tax credit of up to \$7,500 for purchasing a new electric car

Q18a	Keep at current level			Refused / DK	Increase / Keep same
	Increase	level	Repeal		
National	29%	48%	22%	0%	77%
GOP	30%	42%	29%	0%	71%
Dem.	33%	52%	14%	1%	85%
Indep.	14%	62%	24%	0%	76%
Demographics					
White	28%	48%	25%	0%	76%
Black	28%	55%	16%	1%	83%
Hispanic	36%	47%	17%	1%	83%
Men	36%	46%	18%	0%	82%
Women	22%	51%	27%	1%	73%
18-34	36%	52%	12%	0%	88%
35-44	44%	42%	15%	0%	85%
45-54	30%	49%	22%	0%	78%
55-64	15%	56%	29%	0%	71%
65+	19%	44%	37%	1%	63%
< \$30k	15%	60%	25%	1%	74%
\$30k-50k	19%	49%	31%	0%	68%
\$50k-75,000k	30%	51%	18%	0%	82%
\$75k-100k	34%	43%	23%	0%	77%
\$100k-150k	38%	41%	21%	0%	79%
> \$150k	38%	45%	17%	1%	82%
High School or less	21%	52%	27%	1%	73%
Some college	26%	48%	26%	0%	74%
Bachelor's degree	34%	49%	17%	0%	83%
Post grad degree	54%	37%	10%	0%	91%

Q18b. For people earning less than \$75,000, a tax credit of up to \$4,000 for purchasing a used electric car

Q18b	Keep at current level			Refused / DK	Increase / Keep same
	Increase	level	Repeal		
National	30%	49%	21%	1%	78%
GOP	26%	46%	27%	1%	73%
Dem.	38%	49%	13%	0%	87%
Indep.	18%	55%	25%	2%	73%
Demographics					

White	30%	46%	23%	0%	76%
Black	31%	53%	15%	2%	84%
Hispanic	35%	46%	18%	2%	81%
Men	37%	43%	19%	1%	80%
Women	23%	54%	23%	1%	77%
18-34	35%	50%	15%	1%	84%
35-44	33%	53%	13%	2%	86%
45-54	31%	49%	20%	0%	80%
55-64	20%	53%	27%	0%	73%
65+	27%	41%	32%	1%	68%
< \$30k	20%	56%	22%	2%	76%
\$30k-50k	29%	46%	25%	1%	74%
\$50k-75,000k	31%	52%	16%	0%	84%
\$75k-100k	31%	48%	21%	0%	79%
\$100k-150k	29%	48%	22%	2%	77%
> \$150k	38%	42%	20%	0%	80%
High School or less	22%	53%	25%	1%	75%
Some college	29%	49%	22%	0%	77%
Bachelor's degree	36%	46%	18%	0%	82%
Post grad degree	46%	41%	11%	2%	87%

Here is a tax credit to encourage building more charging stations (to enable more people to buy electric cars):

Q19. A tax credit of up to 30% of the cost of installing a charging station that can be used by anyone

Q19	Keep at current level				Increase / Keep same
	Increase	level	Repeal	Refused / DK	
National	30%	51%	19%	0%	81%
GOP	29%	45%	25%	0%	75%
Dem.	36%	53%	10%	0%	89%
Indep.	16%	65%	20%	0%	81%
Demographics					
White	30%	48%	22%	0%	78%
Black	25%	64%	12%	0%	88%
Hispanic	39%	49%	12%	0%	87%
Men	38%	46%	16%	0%	84%
Women	23%	56%	20%	0%	79%
18-34	33%	57%	10%	0%	90%
35-44	45%	45%	10%	0%	90%
45-54	31%	50%	20%	0%	80%
55-64	22%	52%	26%	0%	74%
65+	22%	49%	29%	0%	71%
< \$30k	20%	59%	22%	0%	78%
\$30k-50k	26%	55%	20%	0%	80%
\$50k-75,000k	26%	56%	18%	0%	82%
\$75k-100k	32%	49%	19%	0%	81%
\$100k-150k	37%	46%	17%	0%	83%

> \$150k	40%	43%	16%	0%	84%
High School or less	23%	57%	20%	0%	80%
Some college	27%	51%	22%	0%	78%
Bachelor's degree	36%	49%	15%	0%	85%
Post grad degree	52%	38%	10%	0%	90%

[CAFE Standards]

Another method the government can use to reduce emissions is to require businesses to meet higher energy-efficiency standards for new products (e.g. cars and appliances).

Here is an argument in favor:

Raising efficiency standards is the fastest way to cut pollution, while making sure that businesses share the cost equally, and providing consumers with long-term savings.

Here is an argument against:

Government rules create costly red tape and can limit consumer choice. The market left alone works better, as businesses already have incentives to make efficient, cost-saving products.

Here is a current regulation on car companies:

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

This will increase the cost of new cars, but save owners money in lower gas costs – a net saving of \$1,000 over the car's lifetime.

In conclusion, do you favor or oppose the regulation to gradually raise the fuel efficiency of light cars and trucks through 2027?

	Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
National	66%	32%	2%
GOP	63%	34%	2%
Dem.	73%	25%	1%
Indep.	56%	40%	4%
Demographics			
White	64%	34%	2%
Black	65%	30%	5%
Hispanic	73%	25%	2%
Men	74%	25%	2%
Women	59%	38%	3%
18-34	65%	32%	3%
35-44	76%	20%	4%
45-54	65%	33%	3%
55-64	65%	34%	2%
65+	62%	38%	1%

< \$30k	62%	35%	4%
\$30k-50k	60%	40%	0%
\$50k-75,000k	58%	40%	2%
\$75k-100k	71%	26%	3%
\$100k-150k	67%	30%	3%
> \$150k	78%	22%	1%
High School or less	56%	42%	3%
Some college	66%	32%	2%
Bachelor's degree	75%	22%	3%
Post grad degree	84%	15%	1%

[Offshore Drilling]

Now we are going to turn to a policy about drilling for oil and gas off US coasts, known as offshore drilling. This accounts for about 15% of oil and 2% of gas production in the US.

Every year, the federal government decides which offshore areas they will allow companies to drill in and sells or renews leases to companies to do so.

There is some debate about whether the government should grant and renew leases in a way that would increase or decrease the amount of offshore drilling.

Here is an argument for **increasing** the amount of offshore drilling:

Offshore drilling boosts the economy, creates coastal jobs, and generates federal revenue that can then be used to improve the environment.

Here is an argument for keeping the amount of offshore drilling the same:

Offshore drilling adds to our energy supply but can cause major damage to the environment. Since we are already meeting our oil and gas needs, safer alternatives should be prioritized.

Here is an argument for **decreasing** the amount of offshore drilling:

Offshore drilling risks even more disastrous spills that harm local economies and cost taxpayers billions to clean up. We can get our energy from safer sources that keep our water and air clean.

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

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

	Increasing the amount of offshore drilling	Keeping it about the same	Reducing the amount of offshore drilling	Ref/ DK	Reduce + Keep same
National	31%	41%	27%	1%	68%
GOP	46%	38%	16%	1%	54%
Dem.	16%	45%	40%	0%	84%

Indep.	28%	44%	27%	1%	70%
Demographic findings for national sample					
White	33%	41%	25%	1%	66%
Black	25%	52%	23%	0%	75%
Hispanic	31%	42%	27%	0%	69%
Men	38%	36%	26%	0%	62%
Women	25%	47%	28%	1%	74%
18-34	24%	48%	28%	1%	76%
35-44	33%	40%	27%	1%	67%
45-54	40%	39%	20%	1%	60%
55-64	32%	41%	27%	0%	68%
65 or older	35%	35%	30%	0%	65%
Less than \$30,000	26%	48%	24%	2%	72%
\$30-50,000	23%	44%	33%	0%	77%
\$50-75,000	25%	42%	33%	0%	75%
\$75-100,000	32%	44%	24%	0%	68%
\$100-150,000	40%	34%	26%	0%	60%
More than \$150,000	40%	36%	24%	1%	60%
High School or less	30%	46%	23%	1%	69%
Some college	29%	41%	30%	0%	71%
Bachelors degree	28%	40%	31%	1%	71%
Post graduate degree	46%	29%	25%	0%	54%

Thank you for taking this policymaking simulation. We greatly appreciate the time and thought you have put into this survey, and we hope you found it both enjoyable and informative.

Methodology

Fielding and Sample Size

The national survey was fielded to 809 adults online March 12-16, 2025 by the Program for Public Consultation (PPC) at the University of Maryland's School of Public Policy, with representative non-probability samples obtained from multiple online panels, including Cint, Dynata and Prodege.

The sample has a confidence interval is +/- 3.7%, calculated using the following formula:

Confidence interval = Square Root ((1+variance of the sample weights)/size of the sample)

The response rate was 7.34%.

Pre-Stratification and Weighting

The sample was pre-stratified and weighted by age, race, ethnicity, gender, education, household income, Census region, using benchmarks came from the Census Bureau's 2022 American Community Survey and 2023 Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

The average weight was 1.0 (minimum: 0.10; maximum 2.42)

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 Qualtrics platform. Only respondents with a provided link could take the survey, using their computer or mobile phone.

Privacy and security measures were taken to ensure that data was 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 to 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.