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Together With:
## Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fielded by:</th>
<th>Precision Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Dates:</td>
<td>February 22 – March 30, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size:</td>
<td>518 Adult Residents of Maryland’s 8th Congressional District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin of Error:</td>
<td>+/- 4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of Topics

- **Assessing Priorities:** Reducing Air Pollution / Greenhouse Gases
- **Carbon Fee & Rebate**
- **Transition Assistance for Coal Workers**
- **Green Banks**
- **Tax Credits**
- **Energy Efficiency Standards:** Cars / Trucks / Power Companies
ASSESSING PRIORITIES

Reducing Air Pollution
Reducing Air Pollution

**ARGUMENT: HIGH PRIORITY**
- People suffering from negative health effects of poor air quality
- Tens of thousands of deaths / year
- Good ROI re: health costs / productivity

**ARGUMENT: LOW PRIORITY**
- Many regulations already in place
- Air pollution already reduced
- Cost a lot, hurts economy
- Costs jobs

**MD-8 Overall**
- Democrat: 91
- Republican: 64
- Convincing: 82

**MD-8 Overall**
- Democrat: 46
- Republican: 74
- Convincing: 57
How high a priority should it be for the government to work to reduce the air pollution that has negative effects on health?

**MD-8 Overall**
- Very / Somewhat High Priority: 84
- Low / Not at All a Priority: 15

**Republican**
- Very / Somewhat High Priority: 66
- Low / Not at All a Priority: 35

**Democrat**
- Very / Somewhat High Priority: 94
- Low / Not at All a Priority: 5

**US Overall**
- Very / Somewhat High Priority: 78
- Low / Not at All a Priority: 21

**Republican**
- Very / Somewhat High Priority: 54
- Low / Not at All a Priority: 46

**Democrat**
- Very / Somewhat High Priority: 98
- Low / Not at All a Priority: 2
ASSESSING PRIORITIES

Reducing Greenhouse Gases
Reducing Greenhouse Gases

ARGUMENT: HIGH PRIORITY

- Most climate scientists agree GHGs pose major threats
- Must act now to prevent costly damage

ARGUMENT: LOW PRIORITY

- Some scientists disagree
- More research needed before major changes are made which may hurt the economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CONVINCING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD-8 Overall</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CONVINCING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD-8 Overall</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reducing Greenhouse Gases

ARGUMENT: HIGH PRIORITY
- Cleaner air brings down health costs
- Clean energy has created more jobs than fossil fuel
- World is moving to cleaner energy and the US should be ahead

ARGUMENT: LOW PRIORITY
- Will expand role of government
- New regulations will stifle growth
- If people want to reduce GHGs they can change own behavior or use purchasing power

CONVINCING

MD-8 Overall
- Democrat: 95
- Republican: 68
- Overall: 83

MD-8 Overall
- Democrat: 44
- Republican: 78
- Overall: 54
Reducing Greenhouse Gases

How high a priority should it be for the government to work to further reduce greenhouse gases, especially carbon dioxide?

MD-8 Overall
- Very / Somewhat High Priority: 84
- Low / Not at All a Priority: 15

Republican
- Very / Somewhat High Priority: 65
- Low / Not at All a Priority: 32

Democrat
- Very / Somewhat High Priority: 93
- Low / Not at All a Priority: 6

US Overall
- Very / Somewhat High Priority: 74
- Low / Not at All a Priority: 25

Republican
- Very / Somewhat High Priority: 45
- Low / Not at All a Priority: 55

Democrat
- Very / Somewhat High Priority: 98
- Low / Not at All a Priority: 2
CARBON FEE & REBATE PLAN
• Impose $35 fee/ton of CO$_2$ and other GHGs on fossil fuel production

• Fee will *encourage companies to shift to clean energy alternatives*

• Assume many costs will be passed to consumers:
  - **Electricity** for average home: up about $12/month
  - **Gasoline**: up about 31 cents/gallon
  - **Heating** average home with **natural gas**: up about $10/month

• Impacted businesses may also pass their increased costs to consumers
All money raised from fee would be distributed to all citizens equally

- **Each person:** monthly check of about $37.50 ($450/year)

- **Parents** would get about $225/year **per child**

- For most, rebate would **exceed increased costs** due to carbon fee
• Utility companies would shift more quickly to clean energy, become more efficient

• Motivate people/businesses to do things like buy electric cars, put solar panels on their roofs, hold video meetings rather than flying
Carbon Fee & Rebate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

• Reducing GHGs important for health and environment
• Experts agree: carbon fee is best solution

ARGUMENT AGAINST

• Coal and oil will become too costly; some companies will go bankrupt
• Unfair to coal workers and their communities who will suffer

CONVINCING

MD-8 Overall

Republican

Democrat

83

77

88

60

77

51
Carbon Fee & Rebate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

- Demand for clean energy and energy-saving tech will grow
- Will create new high paying jobs

ARGUMENT AGAINST

- US has cut GHGs more than many countries, but global emissions keep growing
- Big reduction effort will be costly and do little good in the big picture

CONVINCING

MD-8 Overall
- Democrat: 89
- Republican: 68

MD-8 Overall
- Democrat: 50
- Republican: 79
Carbon Fee & Rebate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

- US has large carbon footprint and is a global leader
- If US doesn’t take action, it’s unlikely others will

ARGUMENT AGAINST

- Wrong for government to control behavior through taxes
- Those who want to reduce GHGs should buy/make more environmentally friendly products

CONVINCING

MD-8 Overall

Democrat: 87
Republican: 66

55

MD-8 Overall

Democrat: 44
Republican: 73
Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

**MD-8 Overall**
- **FAVOR**: 73

**US Overall**
- **FAVOR**: 62

**Republican**
- **FAVOR**: 55
- **Democrat**: 81

**Democrat**
- **FAVOR**: 87
TRANSITION ASSISTANCE FOR COAL WORKERS
Transition Assistance for Coal Workers

Help coal workers who are losing their jobs.

Workers who lose their jobs would receive:

• extra unemployment benefits
• protection of current health, pension benefits
• job training
Transition Assistance for Coal Workers

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR**

- Need to ensure no one gets left behind in transition to clean energy
- Only fair to help those who get hurt

**ARGUMENT AGAINST**

- Programs already exist and are prone to corruption
- Getting people into jobs is responsibility of workers / companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CONVINCING</th>
<th>CONVINCING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD-8 Overall</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you favor or oppose government assistance to help coal workers who lose their jobs?

- FAVOR
  - MD-8 Overall: 84
  - Republican: 75
  - Democrat: 89
The Federal government would provide $35 billion to create a national green bank to help fund clean energy projects.
Green Banks

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

- All green banks have been successful and reinvested repaid loans
- Every $1 invested by a green bank attracts $3-6 of private investment

ARGUMENT AGAINST

- Government should not risk investing taxpayer money
- If private market won’t loan money for green projects, they may not be a good idea

CONVINCING

MD-8 Overall

Democrat: 91
Republican: 78

MD-8 Overall

Democrat: 49
Republican: 78
Green Banks

Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FAVOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD-8 Overall</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Overall</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLEAN ENERGY TAX CREDITS
Tax Credits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

- Clean energy and energy-saving tech isn’t being adopted fast enough to address climate change
- Benefits of speeding up clean energy transition outweigh costs of tax credits

ARGUMENT AGAINST

- Adopting clean energy tech is great but taxpayers shouldn’t foot the bill
- Many companies can afford them without tax breaks.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

CONVINCING

MD-8 Overall

Republican

Democrat

85

75

91

ARGUMENT AGAINST

CONVINCING

MD-8 Overall

Republican

Democrat

56

73

51

MD-8 Overall

Republican

Democrat
How acceptable do you find the idea of providing tax credits to encourage people and companies to adopt clean energy or energy-saving technologies?

**ASSESSMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tolerable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MD-8 Overall</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US Overall</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost of **equipment that produces clean energy**, such as solar panels or wind turbines, or stores clean energy: **up to 30%**

Amount of **electricity produced with clean energy**: equal to **up to 5-10%** of the average retail cost of electricity

Production of **transportation fuel** that produces **25% fewer emissions** than the current average: **up to $1 per gallon**
### Tax Credits

#### RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FAVOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD-8 Overall</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US National</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Building a **new energy-efficient home** or residential building: up to $3,000

#### Making **energy-saving improvements** such as fuel-efficient lighting, doors, windows, or insulation: up to $6,500

#### Installing a **new energy-efficient heating or air conditioning system**: up to $1,500
Building **new energy-efficient commercial buildings**: up to $4.75 per square foot

Making **energy-saving improvements to commercial buildings** that reduce energy: up to $9.25 per square foot
Manufacturers of fully electric buses: a tax credit for the sale price of each bus sold: equal to 10%

For purchasing a new electric car: a tax credit of $7,500

For people earning $30,000 or less purchasing a used electric car: a tax credit of $5,000
The cost of **installing a charging station** for electric vehicles that can be used by anyone: **up to 75%**

*The cost of **installing a charging station** for electric vehicles that can be used by anyone: **up to 50%**

*Asked of those that OPPOSE a tax credit of up to 75% of the cost of installing a charging station that can be used by anyone.
ENERGY EFFICIENCY STANDARDS
**Energy Efficiency Standards**

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR**
- Businesses won’t make necessary changes on their own
- Higher standards are fair because businesses and consumers bear costs equally

**ARGUMENT AGAINST**
- Regulations create more bureaucracies and restrict consumer choice
- Better to let the market guide the process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CONVINCING (MD-8 Overall)</th>
<th>CONVINCING (Republican)</th>
<th>CONVINCING (Democrat)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By 2027, require newly built cars and light trucks to get **20-30% more MPG**

- Would ultimately *increase cost of vehicle*

- Owner would *save an estimated $1,000* over the car’s lifetime
Higher Efficiency Standards for New Cars and Light Trucks

Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

- MD-8 Overall: 78
- Republican: 68
- Democrat: 86
Require electric companies to have a minimum portion of their electricity come from renewable sources that produce little or no air pollution or GHGs, such as solar, wind, or biogas.
Electric Companies: Minimum Renewable Requirement

Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

**FAVOR**

- **MD-8 Overall**: 78
- **Republican**: 60
- **Democrat**: 90

- **US Overall**: 74
- **Republican**: 56
- **Democrat**: 89
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