



PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

ENERGY & THE ENVIRONMENT

- Questionnaire -

March 2022

Fielded by: Precision Sample
Sample Size: 476 Residents of NJ-7 District

Field Dates: February 11 - March 14, 2022
Margin of Error: +/- 4.5%

One of the challenges we face today is that the way we produce energy can have negative impacts on the environment. In this survey, we would like to introduce some proposals for changing the way energy is produced and used to:

- reduce air pollution
- reduce the production of greenhouse gases

We will give you some background on these issues, introduce you to both sides of the debate on these proposals, and then give you a chance to make your recommendations. Your views will then be forwarded to your representatives in Congress and other agencies in the government, to give them a clearer sense of what the American people think should be done.

[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 / DK
NJ-7 Overall	30.1%	45.8%	75.9%	15.6%	6.2%	21.8%	2.2%
Republicans	19.3%	49.5%	68.8%	19.5%	10.4%	29.9%	1.3%
Democrats	43.1%	45.3%	88.4%	9.0%	1.5%	10.5%	1.2%
2020 National Results							
US National	33.7%	38.5%	72.2%	17.1%	10.3%	27.4%	0.4%
Republicans	10.0%	39.5%	49.5%	31.0%	19.1%	50.1%	0.4%
Democrats	55.0%	36.3%	91.3%	5.2%	3.2%	8.4%	0.3%

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 / DK
NJ-7 Overall	17.3%	37.5%	54.8%	28.6%	16.3%	44.9%	0.3%
Republicans	22.7%	45.6%	68.3%	23.1%	8.6%	31.7%	0.0%
Democrats	12.2%	27.7%	39.9%	34.8%	25.4%	60.2%	0.0%
2020 National Results							
US National	17.7%	25.9%	43.6%	26.3%	29.4%	55.7%	0.7%
Republicans	31.7%	37.5%	69.2%	21.6%	8.9%	30.5%	0.4%
Democrats	6.6%	14.0%	20.6%	29.7%	48.8%	78.5%	0.8%

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 High Priority	Somewhat Low Priority	Very Low Priority	Total Low Priority	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	37.0%	44.3%	81.3%	14.3%	3.6%	17.9%	0.7%
Republicans	19.0%	54.5%	73.5%	21.4%	4.6%	26.0%	0.5%
Democrats	58.9%	35.6%	94.5%	5.5%	0.0%	5.5%	0.0%
2020 National Results							
US National	47.2%	31.1%	78.3%	18.0%	3.3%	21.3%	0.3%
Republicans	16.4%	37.6%	54.0%	38.7%	7.1%	45.8%	0.2%
Democrats	74.2%	23.5%	97.7%	1.6%	0.2%	1.8%	0.4%

[Priority Greenhouse Gas Reduction]

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

In 2001, at the request of the administration of President George W. Bush, the National Academies of Science did a major study that concluded: "Greenhouse gases are accumulating in Earth's atmosphere as a result of human activities, causing surface air temperatures and subsurface ocean temperatures to rise."

Later, in 2010 the National Academies of Science reviewed and published a survey of 1,372 climate scientists and found that 97% agreed with this conclusion.

This conclusion was also confirmed by the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—a panel of over two thousand climate scientists from 154 countries around the world, often referred to as the IPCC.

The effect of the increase of greenhouse gases has been studied extensively. In 2018 a consortium of US Government agencies and outside experts produced the Fourth National Climate Assessment. It reviewed existing studies and concluded again that as a result of increasing greenhouse gases, global average temperatures have gone up significantly over the last few decades.

This Assessment also concluded that this increase in temperature has resulted in various negative consequences, such as more severe storms, droughts, wildfires, and rising sea levels, which have led to the destruction of homes, businesses, infrastructure and farmland, as well as famine, water scarcity and the mass movement of refugees. All of these consequences were projected to increase substantially in coming decades.

However, there continue to be some debates about such issues as:

- how much climate change is occurring?
- how much risk it poses?
- How much it is due to the gases from human energy production as opposed to natural weather cycles,
- how effective it is to reduce greenhouse gases, especially carbon dioxide, and whether doing so is economically feasible

Some members of Congress question whether reducing these gases will help reduce the problem of climate change, and some question whether climate change is a real problem that needs to be addressed.

While nearly all climate scientists say that climate change is a problem and that reducing gases from energy production is important, there are a small number of climate scientists who contest this view.

Nonetheless, the US government, going back to the George H.W. Bush administration have made it an objective to limit greenhouse gases, especially carbon dioxide.

Also, in response to challenges, the Supreme Court concluded that the evidence is ample that greenhouse gases are pollutants and thus the government should regulate them according to the Clean Air Act.

As a result of these government policies, as well as other factors such as the decrease in the price of renewable energy, the production of greenhouse gas emissions in the US have declined about 12% over the last 15 years.

At the same time, there continues to be a debate within the government about how high a priority it should be for the government to work to further reduce greenhouse gases.

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

Q4. The overwhelming majority of climate scientists agree greenhouse gases contribute to climate change and this poses major threats. Already we are seeing hotter and dryer weather contributing to a major increase in wildfires that have created billions of dollars in damage. Sea levels are rising, which will eventually flood coastal areas. Rising temperatures will hurt crops in major farming areas. Without action, government analysts predict these changes will cause the US economy to contract by several percent. Furthermore, taking action will benefit the economy by increasing energy efficiency. Clearly, we should put a high priority on reducing the production of greenhouse gases.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	40.2%	43.4%	83.6%	11.4%	3.9%	15.3%	1.1%
Republicans	22.8%	53.2%	76.0%	15.8%	7.0%	22.8%	1.2%
Democrats	62.2%	31.8%	94.0%	3.4%	1.4%	4.8%	1.2%
2020 National Results							
US National	48.2%	26.5%	74.7%	13.5%	11.3%	24.8%	0.4%
Republicans	18.9%	29.9%	48.8%	27.1%	23.8%	50.9%	0.3%
Democrats	75.4%	20.3%	95.7%	2.3%	1.4%	3.7%	0.6%

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 / DK
NJ-7 Overall	17.8%	40.1%	57.9%	26.0%	16.0%	42.0%	0.2%
Republicans	23.7%	54.0%	77.7%	16.5%	5.3%	21.8%	0.4%
Democrats	12.3%	23.7%	36.0%	38.4%	25.6%	64.0%	0.0%
2020 National Results							
US National	18.1%	25.3%	43.4%	23.6%	32.3%	55.9%	0.7%
Republicans	32.3%	36.5%	68.8%	20.8%	9.9%	30.7%	0.5%
Democrats	6.5%	13.1%	19.6%	24.3%	54.9%	79.2%	1.2%

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 technologies and it is important for the US to stay competitive in what’s clearly becoming the main source of energy for the future. The world is moving to cleaner energy and the US should be ahead of the curve, not dragging behind.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	44.7%	36.1%	80.8%	14.5%	4.4%	18.9%	0.2%
Republicans	30.0%	43.3%	73.3%	18.6%	7.8%	26.4%	0.4%
Democrats	63.6%	28.9%	92.5%	6.8%	0.6%	7.4%	0.1%
2020 National Results							
US National	47.9%	26.9%	74.8%	13.5%	9.2%	22.7%	2.5%
Republicans	21.6%	30.5%	52.1%	26.0%	19.5%	45.5%	2.4%
Democrats	72.2%	21.0%	93.2%	2.7%	1.1%	3.8%	3.0%

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 / DK
NJ-7 Overall	18.2%	36.5%	54.7%	28.0%	15.7%	43.7%	1.6%
Republicans	28.6%	43.6%	72.2%	21.0%	5.4%	26.4%	1.4%
Democrats	10.8%	24.6%	35.4%	35.4%	27.9%	63.3%	1.3%
2020 National Results							
US National	20.1%	24.3%	44.4%	21.3%	32.0%	53.3%	2.3%
Republicans	37.4%	31.2%	68.6%	18.4%	10.6%	29.0%	2.5%
Democrats	6.2%	14.8%	21.0%	22.2%	54.2%	76.4%	2.5%

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 High Priority	Somewhat Low Priority	Very Low Priority	Total Low Priority	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	43.2%	35.9%	79.1%	14.7%	5.9%	20.6%	0.3%
Republicans	26.3%	44.5%	70.8%	18.4%	10.0%	28.4%	0.8%
Democrats	65.1%	29.6%	94.7%	5.3%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%
2020 National Results							
US National	50.0%	24.4%	74.4%	18.3%	6.9%	25.2%	0.3%
Republicans	18.0%	26.7%	44.7%	40.0%	14.8%	54.8%	0.5%
Democrats	79.5%	18.3%	97.8%	1.5%	0.4%	1.9%	0.2%

We are now going to look at a major proposal that seeks to reduce both air pollution and greenhouse gases. This proposal is called the carbon fee and rebate plan.

Briefly stated, here is how it works:

Currently, when companies burn coal, oil, or natural gas and emit greenhouse gases into the air they do not pay any fee for doing so. According to this proposal companies would be charged such a fee. The government would not keep the money from this fee but would distribute it to all citizens equally.

The idea is that the fee will motivate companies to be more energy-efficient and to shift to energy sources that do not produce carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases.

Still, it is likely that the overall price of energy will go up some. But for most individuals the rebate they get would be at least as much as the increased cost of energy.

[Carbon Fee]

Here is how the plan works in more detail.

Companies that produce coal, oil or natural gas, would be charged a fee of \$35 for each ton of carbon dioxide emitted from the coal, oil and gas that they burn, and an equivalent amount for other greenhouse gases.

Companies will make some efforts to reduce their carbon production, but studies by the government indicate these companies would likely pass much of this increased cost on to consumers. The studies estimate that consumers' energy costs would likely be affected as follows:

- The price of electricity for the average home would go up about \$12 more per month
- The price of gasoline would go up about 31 cents per gallon
- The price of heating an average home with natural gas would go up about \$10 a month

Businesses would also face these increased costs and it is assumed that some or all of those costs would be passed onto consumers in the form of higher prices for some products and services, such as airline travel.

The goal is to produce the following changes:

- Utility companies that generate electricity would shift more quickly to sources of energy that do not produce carbon, such as wind and solar, or that at least produce less carbon, such as natural gas. They would also become more efficient in energy production.
- Utility companies would start investing more in clean energy sources.
- People and businesses would be more motivated to do things like buying electric cars and putting solar panels on their roofs.
- People and businesses would be encouraged to make a greater effort to save energy, like holding a video meeting instead of flying across the country.

Also, as more people and businesses use cleaner forms of energy, it would be produced on a larger scale, and thus the price of cleaner energy would **continue to** go down which would further encourage its use.

[Rebate]

Now, let's look at how the rebate would work:

All of the money the government raises from the fee on carbon dioxide would be distributed to all citizens equally in the form of a monthly check. It is estimated that each person would receive about \$37.50 each month or about \$450 per person each year.

Adults with children would get an additional half-size check (about \$225) per child.

For most people – well over half – the amount of the rebate would be more than enough to cover their increased costs due to the carbon fee (including all goods and services affected by the carbon fee, as well as direct energy costs).

People with different income levels would be affected differently. This is because people with lower income levels tend to spend less money on energy and other products and services. Those with higher incomes tend to spend much more.

Here is a chart showing government estimates of how **individuals** in different income levels could be affected annually by the carbon fee and rebate, on average:

	INCOME LEVEL			
	LOW Less than \$25,000	MIDDLE \$25,000 - \$40,000	UPPER-MIDDLE \$40,000 - \$65,000	HIGH More than \$65,000
Average increased costs due to fee	\$100	\$250	\$450	\$850
Rebate	\$450	\$450	\$450	\$450
Overall Annual Effect	+\$350	+\$200	\$0	-\$400

These amounts are for individuals. For households with more than one person, both the costs and the rebate would be larger.

According to the proposal, as the price of clean energy continues to get lower and the amount of carbon being produced goes down, both the carbon fee and the rebate will eventually be ended.

[Costs]

There have been a number of studies conducted by the government and other organizations on the likely effects of such a carbon fee and rebate plan.

Let's look first at the negative effects or costs:

As people and companies use less carbon producing energy, there are likely to be some job losses, especially in coal and also oil industries. In communities where these producers of coal and oil have been the primary source of jobs, when they get cut back, this reduces the economic activity throughout the community and can result in additional job losses.

Also, businesses that have high energy costs may be hurt.

At the same time, jobs will be gained in energy industries that produce less carbon dioxide, and also from the manufacture and sale of products and services that save energy.

In addition, many people will spend the additional income from their rebate, causing job increases.

On balance, including jobs lost and jobs gained, some analysts estimate that the unemployment rate will go up, while others estimate that it will go down. But they agree that the change will be very small.

As we will discuss later, if assistance were given to workers and communities, the overall number of jobs lost would be lower.

[Benefits]

Now, let's look at the health and environmental benefits.

The reduction of air pollution that would come with reduction in carbon dioxide, would have positive health effects. The government estimates by 2030, this reduction would result in at least:

- **2,600** fewer premature deaths a year
- **127,000** fewer asthma attacks and asthma-related illnesses in children a year
- **1,400** fewer heart attacks a year
- **1,700** fewer hospital admissions a year
- **130,000** fewer lost workdays a year
- **130,000** fewer missed school days a year

Also, scientists say that with less carbon dioxide going into the atmosphere there would be less of an increase in storms, hurricanes, flooding, tornadoes, heat waves, and droughts. Therefore, the following negative effects would be lessened:

- damage to homes, businesses, and roads, bridges and other infrastructure
- lost farm crops
- deaths and injuries from severe weather

By avoiding the health and weather effects that would otherwise occur, economists estimate that by 2030 the country would save between \$20 billion and \$40 billion each year.

We would now like you to evaluate some arguments for and against the carbon fee and rebate plan.

Here is an argument in favor of the proposal:

Q9. Reducing carbon emissions is important for our health and for the environment. Economists, business leaders and climate experts—both Republicans and Democrats—agree that a carbon fee is the best solution. It is the least burdensome approach for businesses and requires less bureaucracy. It simply encourages businesses and individuals to switch to cleaner fuels and more energy-saving practices, rather than letting them pollute at no cost. It also motivates businesses to make innovations. Several countries have put in place carbon fees and they have helped to lower their greenhouse gas emissions.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	30.2%	46.8%	77.0%	11.9%	9.3%	21.2%	1.7%
Republicans	18.1%	54.5%	72.6%	14.5%	12.6%	27.1%	0.3%
Democrats	46.9%	41.8%	88.7%	5.3%	4.0%	9.3%	1.9%
2020 National Results							
US National	35.9%	36.8%	72.7%	13.1%	13.2%	26.3%	0.9%
Republicans	14.8%	33.8%	48.6%	22.0%	28.0%	50.0%	1.4%
Democrats	55.8%	37.1%	92.9%	5.2%	1.3%	6.5%	0.6%

Here is an argument against the proposal:

Q10. A carbon fee will make coal and oil so expensive that people will stop using it and many coal and oil companies will go out of business. This will result in people losing their jobs in those industries. Some older workers may never get a job again because it is harder for them to be retrained into a new line of work. It will also hurt the general economy in areas of the country where coal and oil industries are big, driving more people out of work. It is unfair that these workers and their communities take the brunt of this plan.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	23.7%	36.8%	60.5%	22.9%	15.5%	38.4%	1.1%
Republicans	35.6%	39.9%	75.5%	17.7%	6.1%	23.8%	0.7%
Democrats	15.2%	33.6%	48.8%	28.6%	22.6%	51.2%	0.0%
2020 National Results							
US National	21.0%	29.7%	50.7%	25.0%	23.4%	48.4%	0.9%
Republicans	36.8%	33.2%	70.0%	20.3%	9.4%	29.7%	0.2%
Democrats	7.1%	25.3%	32.4%	28.2%	38.4%	66.6%	1.0%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q11. The fact is that the world is moving toward cleaner energy and US companies should get ahead of the curve in meeting this demand. China is already ahead of the US in some green energy areas and the US could easily fall further and further behind. A carbon fee will increase demand in the US for clean energy and energy savings technology, and this will help US companies move more aggressively into meeting this demand at home and abroad. This will create new high paying jobs for American workers, stimulate the US economy, and create a cleaner environment.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	32.9%	40.4%	73.3%	17.8%	8.5%	26.3%	0.4%
Republicans	24.7%	38.3%	63.0%	26.3%	10.4%	36.7%	0.3%
Democrats	45.1%	45.4%	90.5%	5.8%	3.3%	9.1%	0.5%
2020 National Results							
US National	36.6%	32.8%	69.4%	16.2%	13.1%	29.3%	1.4%
Republicans	13.2%	29.9%	43.1%	27.3%	27.8%	55.1%	1.8%
Democrats	60.5%	30.4%	90.9%	6.7%	1.2%	7.9%	1.2%

Here is another argument against:

Q12. The US has been one of the more aggressive countries in the world, reducing greenhouse gas emissions from 2005 to 2017 by nearly 20% on a per person basis. But the truth is that globally greenhouse gas emissions continued to go up as many other countries, such as China and India, continued to increase. The US right now only produces 14% of all greenhouse gases. Going through a big effort to get it down further will be very costly and do little good in the big picture.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	27.4%	34.0%	61.4%	25.7%	12.5%	38.2%	0.4%
Republicans	38.3%	36.1%	74.4%	19.0%	6.6%	25.6%	0.0%
Democrats	16.9%	33.0%	49.9%	32.9%	17.1%	50.0%	0.0%
2020 National Results							
US National	24.5%	30.6%	55.1%	24.6%	19.1%	43.7%	1.2%
Republicans	44.4%	35.3%	79.7%	13.6%	5.7%	19.3%	1.0%
Democrats	7.1%	24.1%	31.2%	34.3%	33.1%	67.4%	1.4%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q13. It is true that the US only produces 14% of greenhouse gases, but we also represent only 4% of the world population; we emit far more per person than the vast majority of countries. Also, the US is a major world leader. If the US fails to do its part in dealing with greenhouse gases, it is much less likely that other countries will do their part too--they may simply say "why bother trying?" If the US does its part, others are more likely to follow. We are all in this together.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	30.5%	41.5%	72.0%	18.7%	9.1%	27.8%	0.2%
Republicans	23.6%	42.2%	65.8%	23.9%	10.2%	34.1%	0.0%
Democrats	42.3%	40.2%	82.5%	13.0%	3.8%	16.8%	0.6%
2020 National Results							
US National	33.9%	34.2%	68.1%	16.1%	14.1%	30.2%	1.6%
Republicans	13.6%	28.0%	41.6%	25.6%	31.3%	56.9%	1.4%
Democrats	53.0%	37.4%	90.4%	6.6%	1.0%	7.6%	2.0%

Here is another argument against:

Q14. The government should not try to control the behavior of people and businesses through taxes. If people want to reduce their carbon emissions, then they can use their power as a consumer or business leader to buy or make products that are more environmentally friendly. This is already widely happening and is contributing to the US' reduction in emissions. The government should step aside and let people and businesses make the changes they think are best. The government does not need to be involved in every problem.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	20.9%	31.5%	52.4%	29.9%	17.4%	47.3%	0.3%
Republicans	34.1%	36.3%	70.4%	21.7%	7.6%	29.3%	0.2%
Democrats	11.3%	24.1%	35.4%	36.1%	27.9%	64.0%	0.5%
2020 National Results							
US National	22.9%	24.8%	47.7%	23.3%	27.8%	51.1%	1.3%
Republicans	40.8%	31.1%	71.9%	18.4%	8.6%	27.0%	1.0%
Democrats	7.3%	16.1%	23.4%	27.2%	48.0%	75.2%	1.4%

Q15. So now, let's review the basics of the proposal:

1. The government would charge companies that produce coal, oil or natural gas, a fee based on the amount of carbon dioxide, and other greenhouse gasses, emitted when the fuels they produce are burned. This amount would be equal to \$35 per ton of carbon dioxide produced.
2. All of the money collected from that fee would then be given to all citizens equally in the form of a monthly rebate check. The amount would total about \$450 per person each year or \$37.50 per month. For nearly all low- and middle-income people, the amount of the rebate would be more than the amount needed to cover their increased costs due to the fee.

How acceptable do you find this proposal on a scale of 0-10, where 0=Not at all acceptable, 5=Just tolerable and 10=very acceptable?

	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	At Least Tolerable	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	29.6%	14.9%	55.6%	70.5%	0.0%
Republicans	33.5%	13.8%	52.7%	66.5%	0.0%
Democrats	19.5%	12.1%	68.4%	80.5%	0.0%
2020 National Results					
US National	31.5%	12.8%	55.6%	68.4%	0.1%
Republicans	55.9%	15.0%	29.1%	44.1%	0.0%
Democrats	9.9%	8.2%	81.8%	90.0%	0.1%

Q16. So, in conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	65.0%	34.6%	0.4%
Republicans	53.3%	46.4%	0.3%
Democrats	80.4%	19.1%	0.5%
2020 National Results			
US National	61.9%	37.7%	0.4%
Republicans	31.7%	67.9%	0.5%
Democrats	87.4%	12.2%	0.5%

[Tax Incentives]

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

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

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

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

Q17. Clean energy and energy-saving technologies are not being adopted as fast as they could be, nor as fast as they need to be for us to have cleaner air and to forestall the dangers of climate change. Companies and people are not adopting them because they require upfront costs and there is uncertainty about how well they will pay off. Yet, we all benefit when these technologies are adopted. And the benefits for society outweigh the cost of the tax incentives. So, it is in our collective interest to encourage more companies and people to adopt these technologies, moving us all more quickly into a cleaner energy future.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	26.8%	45.4%	72.2%	18.0%	7.2%	25.2%	2.5%
Republicans	20.4%	48.6%	69.0%	19.3%	9.5%	28.8%	2.3%
Democrats	32.7%	49.8%	82.5%	12.6%	2.4%	15.0%	2.5%
2020 National Results							
US National	35.4%	42.5%	77.9%	14.0%	7.8%	21.8%	0.3%
Republicans	15.8%	42.6%	58.4%	24.7%	16.6%	41.3%	0.4%
Democrats	53.9%	40.2%	94.1%	5.2%	0.5%	5.7%	0.1%

Here is a counter-argument:

Q18. If people or companies think that it is important to adopt these new green technologies, that's fine. But, we should not all be expected to help them pay for it. We need to remember that the government's energy-related incentives are not free. In 2019 these tax credits cost the government over \$20 billion. That money has to come from somewhere. Many of these companies and individuals have the means to cover the costs of their preferred energy technologies without getting tax breaks.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	24.7%	40.3%	65.0%	24.2%	8.8%	33.0%	2.1%
Republicans	34.0%	42.7%	76.7%	21.3%	1.6%	22.9%	0.4%
Democrats	17.3%	37.6%	54.9%	28.0%	12.9%	40.9%	4.4%
2020 National Results							
US National	18.5%	30.6%	49.1%	28.0%	22.4%	50.4%	0.5%
Republicans	30.6%	38.4%	69.0%	22.5%	8.1%	30.6%	0.5%
Democrats	7.9%	22.9%	30.8%	31.7%	36.9%	68.6%	0.6%

Q19. So, how acceptable do you find the idea of providing tax credits to encourage people and companies to adopt clean energy or energy-saving technologies?

	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	At Least Tolerable	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	25.5%	13.6%	60.9%	74.5%	0.0%
Republicans	26.9%	11.3%	61.9%	73.2%	0.0%
Democrats	16.1%	12.9%	71.0%	83.9%	0.0%
2020 National Results					
US National	16.5%	14.1%	69.1%	83.2%	0.3%
Republicans	31.3%	19.4%	48.7%	68.1%	0.6%
Democrats	3.5%	8.2%	88.2%	96.4%	0.1%

**[Updated Existing Incentives]
[Energy Companies]**

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

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

Q20. A tax credit up to 30% of the cost of equipment that produces clean energy, such as solar panels or wind turbines, or stores clean energy.

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	71.2%	28.7%	0.1%
Republicans	65.5%	34.5%	0.0%
Democrats	83.5%	16.5%	0.0%
2020 National Results			
US National	74.5%	24.6%	0.9%
Republicans	57.5%	41.3%	1.2%
Democrats	90.5%	8.8%	0.7%

Q21. A tax credit for the amount of electricity produced with clean energy, equal to up to 5-10% of the average retail cost of electricity.

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	74.2%	25.0%	0.8%
Republicans	65.9%	33.7%	0.3%
Democrats	85.6%	14.1%	0.3%
2020 National Results			
US National	75.9%	23.0%	1.1%
Republicans	62.3%	36.8%	0.9%
Democrats	89.1%	10.1%	0.8%

Q22. A tax credit of up to \$1 per gallon for the production of transportation fuel that produces 25% fewer emissions than the current average.

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	69.7%	30.1%	0.1%
Republicans	62.5%	37.2%	0.3%
Democrats	79.7%	20.3%	0.0%
2020 National Results			
US National	62.2%	36.7%	1.1%
Republicans	49.6%	49.7%	0.7%
Democrats	73.5%	25.4%	1.0%

[Residential Buildings]

Here are some proposed tax credits for homeowners or owners of residential buildings, like apartment complexes, who make energy-saving upgrades. For each one, please select whether you favor or oppose it:

Q23. A tax credit up to \$3,000 for building a new energy-efficient home or residential building.

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	74.4%	25.4%	0.1%
Republicans	64.5%	35.5%	0.0%
Democrats	86.7%	13.0%	0.3%
2020 National Results			
US National	79.4%	18.6%	2.0%
Republicans	69.5%	27.9%	2.6%
Democrats	88.3%	9.8%	1.8%

Q24. A tax credit up to \$6,500 for making energy-saving improvements such as fuel-efficient lighting, doors, windows, or insulation.

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	78.1%	21.8%	0.2%
Republicans	72.8%	26.7%	0.4%
Democrats	86.8%	13.2%	0.0%
2020 National Results			
US National	77.5%	20.5%	2.0%
Republicans	69.5%	28.1%	2.4%
Democrats	86.6%	11.5%	2.0%

Q25. A tax credit up to \$1,500 for installing a new energy-efficient heating or air conditioning system.

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	83.2%	16.7%	0.1%
Republicans	76.4%	23.6%	0.0%
Democrats	90.8%	9.2%	0.0%
2020 National Results			
US National	83.9%	14.2%	2.0%
Republicans	74.7%	22.7%	2.7%
Democrats	92.5%	6.0%	1.5%

[Commercial Buildings]

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

Q26. A tax credit up to \$4.75 per square foot for building new energy-efficient commercial buildings.

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	75.8%	24.0%	0.2%
Republicans	72.4%	27.2%	0.4%
Democrats	81.6%	18.4%	0.0%
2020 National Results			
US National	72.0%	26.4%	1.6%
Republicans	60.9%	37.2%	2.0%
Democrats	83.2%	15.3%	1.6%

Q27. A tax credit up to \$9.25 per square foot for making energy-saving improvements to commercial buildings that reduce energy

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	71.3%	28.6%	0.1%
Republicans	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%
Democrats	75.3%	24.7%	0.0%
2020 National Results			
US National	65.7%	32.6%	1.7%
Republicans	52.4%	45.5%	2.2%
Democrats	78.1%	20.3%	1.6%

[Electric Vehicles]

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

Q28. For manufacturers of fully electric buses, a tax credit equal to 10% of the sales price of each bus sold.

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	71.9%	27.9%	0.1%
Republicans	62.0%	38.0%	0.0%
Democrats	84.2%	15.6%	0.2%
2020 National Results			
US National	68.7%	29.5%	1.8%
Republicans	52.3%	46.1%	1.6%
Democrats	84.0%	13.9%	2.1%

Q29. For people buying cars, a tax credit of \$7,500 for purchasing a new electric car.

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	71.7%	28.3%	0.0%
Republicans	59.5%	40.5%	0.0%
Democrats	85.4%	14.6%	0.0%
2020 National Results			
US National	63.3%	34.8%	2.0%
Republicans	42.9%	55.4%	1.6%
Democrats	80.0%	17.8%	2.2%

Q30. For people earning \$30,000 or less, a tax credit of \$5,000 for purchasing a used electric car.

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	67.9%	31.7%	0.3%
Republicans	58.7%	40.5%	0.9%
Democrats	81.5%	18.5%	0.0%
2020 National Results			
US National	64.4%	33.7%	1.9%
Republicans	42.1%	56.4%	1.5%
Democrats	83.7%	14.1%	2.2%

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

Q31. Do you favor or oppose the following proposal?

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

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	67.8%	32.2%	0.0%
Republicans	59.6%	40.4%	0.0%
Democrats	80.8%	19.2%	0.0%
2020 National Results			
US National	65.6%	33.3%	1.0%
Republicans	45.8%	53.4%	0.9%
Democrats	81.6%	17.6%	0.8%

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

Q32: Would you favor a tax credit of 50%?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK	Approve of 75% Credit on Q31	Total Favor
NJ-7 Overall	8.9%	23.3%	0.0%	67.8%	76.70%
Republicans	12.2%	28.1%	0.0%	59.6%	71.80%
Democrats	6.7%	12.4%	0.0%	80.8%	87.50%
2020 National Results					
US National	7.5%	26.5%	0.4%	65.6%	73.1%
Republicans	8.2%	45.4%	0.7%	45.8%	54.0%
Democrats	7.6%	10.7%	0.2%	81.6%	89.2%

Besides tax incentives, another method the government can use to reduce the amount of energy used is to require businesses to meet **higher efficiency standards** for new cars, trucks, buildings and appliances.

Q33. Here is an argument **in favor** of establishing higher energy efficiency standards:

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 / DK
NJ-7 Overall	30.4%	46.1%	76.5%	18.5%	3.3%	21.8%	1.7%
Republicans	22.1%	40.9%	63.0%	30.3%	5.4%	35.7%	1.3%
Democrats	40.1%	49.3%	89.4%	7.7%	0.2%	7.9%	2.6%
2016 National Results							
US National	25.1%	46.9%	72.0%	17.3%	9.4%	26.7%	1.3%
Republicans	12.0%	44.7%	56.7%	25.4%	16.9%	42.3%	1.1%
Democrats	38.7%	49.4%	88.1%	8.5%	1.8%	10.3%	1.6%

Q34. Here is an argument **against** establishing higher energy efficiency standards:

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 / DK
NJ-7 Overall	21.8%	38.6%	60.4%	26.9%	12.3%	39.2%	0.4%
Republicans	31.9%	43.9%	75.8%	18.0%	6.1%	24.1%	0.0%
Democrats	13.4%	33.1%	46.5%	33.6%	20.0%	53.6%	0.0%
2016 National Results							
US National	15.9%	36.8%	52.7%	28.2%	17.8%	46.0%	1.3%
Republicans	27.4%	44.8%	72.2%	21.0%	5.8%	26.8%	1.1%
Democrats	6.4%	29.5%	35.9%	33.9%	29.0%	62.9%	1.2%

There is a government proposal for gradually raising the requirements for the fuel efficiency of cars and light trucks:

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

- For cars: increase from an average of 47 mpg today to an average of 58 mpg in 2027
- For light trucks: increase from an average of 33 mpg today to an average of 42 mpg in 2027

This proposal would increase the initial cost of the 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. And over time, the benefits are expected to outweigh the costs even more.

It would also reduce air pollution which would improve people's health and so reduce total spending on healthcare. Overall, experts estimate that over the next 30 years, this proposal will have a net benefit to society of \$100 billion.

Q35. How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	At Least Tolerable	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	21.1%	17.7%	61.2%	78.9%	0.0%
Republicans	24.4%	21.3%	54.3%	75.6%	0.0%
Democrats	14.0%	14.9%	71.1%	86.0%	0.0%

Q36. Do you favor or oppose gradually raising the fuel efficiency of light cars and trucks through 2027?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	72.7%	26.8%	0.5%
Republicans	66.6%	32.7%	0.7%
Democrats	81.6%	18.4%	0.0%

Another option is for government to require electric companies to have a minimum portion of their electricity come from renewable sources that produce little or no air pollution or greenhouse gases, such as solar, wind, or bio-gas. State governments have established such minimums in 30 states, DC and Puerto Rico, and 8 states have voluntary requirements. The National Renewable Energy Laboratory estimates that currently they reduce greenhouse gases from power production for the entire US by 3.6%, and by 2030 they will reduce greenhouse gases by 7%.

Q37. How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	At Least Tolerable	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	18.3%	15.4%	66.3%	81.7%	0.0%
Republicans	22.5%	16.3%	61.2%	77.5%	0.0%
Democrats	9.2%	11.4%	79.4%	90.8%	0.0%

Q38. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose your own state requiring that electric companies have a minimum portion of their electricity come from renewable sources such as solar, wind or bio-gas?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	73.8%	24.8%	1.5%
Republicans	65.1%	34.1%	0.8%
Democrats	89.5%	10.4%	0.1%
2016 National Results			
US National	73.8%	24.9%	1.2%
Republicans	56.4%	42.1%	1.6%
Democrats	89.3%	9.7%	1.0%

Whether or not the government provides subsidies for clean energy, it is likely that some older coal plants will be shut and unlikely that new ones will be built, because cleaner forms of energy are now less expensive.

There is a proposal to help coal workers who lose their jobs, and communities that are negatively affected by the transition to clean energy. This money would be used to give workers who lose their jobs:

- extra unemployment benefits
- protection of their current health and pension benefits
- job training and education to help them transition to a new job

Here are two arguments:

Q39. Reducing the amount of air pollution and greenhouse gases would benefit all Americans. However, any time that our economy makes a big change, some people and communities get hurt. It is only fair that, as a society, we devote some money to help people transition into new jobs as quickly as possible. Also, investing in job training and development projects would ensure that communities stay afloat and are brought into the new clean energy economy.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	33.6%	46.0%	79.6%	12.6%	5.1%	17.7%	2.7%
Republicans	19.9%	48.8%	68.7%	15.7%	10.3%	26.0%	5.2%
Democrats	46.6%	42.7%	89.3%	8.9%	0.6%	9.5%	1.2%

Q40. This proposal is yet another government program. Government programs like this already exist, such as the Appalachian Regional Commission, and often those dollars are redirected for political purposes rather than helping the communities they are intended for. Such programs reduce people's incentive to go out and find a job; and if necessary, move to where the new jobs are. Getting people into these new jobs is the responsibility of workers and companies, not the government. It is really better for the market to decide where investments should be made.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	23.5%	36.6%	60.1%	30.9%	8.4%	39.3%	0.6%
Republicans	36.2%	42.5%	78.7%	17.6%	3.7%	21.3%	0.0%
Democrats	12.7%	31.3%	44.0%	42.2%	13.8%	56.0%	0.0%

Q41. Here again is the proposal:

Help coal workers who lose their jobs, and communities that are negatively affected by the transition to clean energy. This money would be used to give workers who lose their jobs:

- extra unemployment benefits
- protection of their current health and pension benefits
- job training and education to help them transition to a new job

How acceptable would you find this proposal?

	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	At Least Tolerable	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	17.2%	14.8%	68.0%	82.8%	0.0%
Republicans	21.9%	16.0%	62.2%	78.2%	0.0%
Democrats	8.2%	12.6%	79.2%	91.8%	0.0%

Q42. So now, do you favor or oppose government assistance to help coal workers who lose their jobs?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
NJ-7 Overall	77.4%	22.6%	0.0%
Republicans	72.0%	28.0%	0.0%
Democrats	85.3%	14.7%	0.0%

###