



S1. Are you at least 18 years old and registered to vote in [STATE]?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
Yes	100%	100%	100%	100%
No	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-	-	-	-

S2. As you may know, there will be an election for U.S. Congress and other offices in November. How likely are you to vote in the election for U.S. Congress? Will you definitely vote, probably vote, are the chances 50-50, probably not vote, or definitely not vote? Or have you already voted?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
Definitely	70%	72%	64%	78%
Probably	12	10	16	12
Chance 50-50	11	11	12	7
Probably not	3	1	5	1
Definitely not	2	2	1	*
Already voted	2	4	1	2

P1. When it comes to politics, do you generally think of yourself as a strong Democrat, not very strong Democrat, strong Republican, not very strong Republican, an independent, or some other political party? [IF INDEPENDENT/OTHER] Do you think of yourself as closer to the Democratic Party or the Republican Party?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
Strong Democrat	26%	31%	19%	24%
Weak Democrat	13	15	10	12
Independent / Closer to the Democrats	6	9	6	7
Independent	12	8	13	12
Independent / Closer to the Republicans	4	10	5	5
Weak Republican	15	14	21	21
Strong Republican	24	13	26	20
VOL: (Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-
DEMOCRAT (NET)	39%	46	29	36
INDEPENDENT (NET)	22	27	24	24
REPUBLICAN (NET)	39	27	47	40
DEMOCRAT W/ LEANERS (NET)	45%	55	36	43
REPUBLICAN W/ LEANERS (NET)	42	37	52	45

P2. How important is politics to your personal identity?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
Very important	33%	41%	22%	28%
Somewhat important	41	33	49	40
Not too important	17	21	22	24
Not at all important	9	5	7	7
IMPORTANT (NET)	74%	74	71	69
NOT IMPORTANT (NET)	26	26	29	31

B2. The following is a list of priorities for the federal government. How important of a priority do you think each should be?

	HIGH PRIORITY			NOT A PRIORITY		NET	
	One of top	Important but not top	A lower priority	Not a priority	Should not be done at all	HIGH PRIORITY	NOT A PRIORITY
• Improving the economy and reducing inflation.....							
Nationwide RV	77%	19	3	1	1	96%	2
Illinois RV	81%	15	3	1	-	96%	1
Missouri RV	80%	18	1	1	-	98%	1
Wisconsin RV	78%	19	1	1	1	97%	2
• [SPLIT A] Ensuring access to safe drinking water for all Americans.....							
Nationwide RV	59%	33	6	1	1	91%	2
Illinois RV	52%	40	8	*	-	92%	*
Missouri RV	59%	32	9	*	-	91%	*
Wisconsin RV	60%	30	9	-	1	90%	1
• Reducing crime.....							
Nationwide RV	57%	33	8	1	1	90%	2
Illinois RV	63%	29	6	2	-	92%	2
Missouri RV	54%	39	5	2	*	93%	2
Wisconsin RV	61%	29	7	3	-	90%	3
• Bringing down the cost of health care and prescription drugs.....							
Nationwide RV	54%	36	6	3	1	90%	4
Illinois RV	54%	37	7	2	*	91%	2
Missouri RV	58%	36	4	*	1	95%	1
Wisconsin RV	55%	38	6	-	1	93%	1
• [SPLIT B] Ensuring access to affordable drinking water for all Americans.....							
Nationwide RV	49%	38	9	3	1	88%	4
Illinois RV	47%	36	10	7	*	83%	7
Missouri RV	50%	37	12	*	-	87%	*
Wisconsin RV	60%	27	12	1	-	87%	1
• Improving education.....							
Nationwide RV	42%	45	9	2	1	88%	3
Illinois RV	43%	40	14	2	*	83%	3
Missouri RV	41%	46	12	*	-	87%	*
Wisconsin RV	43%	49	6	1	*	92%	1
• Addressing climate change.....							
Nationwide RV	39%	30	15	12	5	69%	16
Illinois RV	43%	33	13	9	3	76%	11
Missouri RV	28%	32	26	12	3	60%	15
Wisconsin RV	33%	34	17	13	3	67%	16
• Addressing income inequality.....							
Nationwide RV	32%	39	17	9	2	71%	12
Illinois RV	35%	36	21	6	1	72%	8
Missouri RV	29%	38	18	11	5	67%	16
Wisconsin RV	25%	44	16	12	3	69%	15

Q13. Overall, how would you describe the amount you pay regularly for water utilities?

	<u>Nationwide RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin RV</u>
Very affordable	26%	23%	22%	19%
Somewhat affordable	42	45	50	48
Somewhat unaffordable	17	16	17	20
Very unaffordable	5	8	5	2
Don't know enough to say	9	7	6	11
AFFORDABLE (NET).....	68%	68	72	67
NOT AFFORDABLE (NET).....	23	24	22	22

B3. For each of the following, please indicate whether you think it is getting better or getting worse.

		<u>Getting better</u>	<u>Staying the same</u>	<u>Getting worse</u>
• Access to safe drinking water across the country				
	Nationwide RV	26%	48	26
	Illinois RV	25%	48	27
	Missouri RV	25%	48	27
	Wisconsin RV	26%	40	34
• The level and frequency of toxic chemicals such as lead in drinking water systems				
	Nationwide RV	26%	47	27
	Illinois RV	29%	49	21
	Missouri RV	25%	49	26
	Wisconsin RV	26%	42	32
• Access to safe drinking water in low-income communities				
	Nationwide RV	23%	51	26
	Illinois RV	14%	54	32
	Missouri RV	19%	46	35
	Wisconsin RV	22%	45	33

Q17. How big of a problem do you think lead pipes in U.S. drinking water systems are?

	<u>Nationwide RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin RV</u>
A crisis	15%	17%	11%	15%
A major problem	55	56	54	41
A minor problem	26	26	31	43
Not a problem	4	1	4	*
CRISIS/ MAJOR PROBLEM (NET).....	70%	73	65	57
MINOR/ NOT A PROBLEM (NET).....	30	27	35	43

Q18. How big of a problem do you think lead pipes in your state's drinking water systems are?

	<u>Nationwide RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin RV</u>
A crisis	11%	12%	5%	12%
A major problem	40	40	45	34
A minor problem	40	43	38	49
Not a problem	9	5	12	6
CRISIS/ MAJOR PROBLEM (NET).....	51%	52	49	45
MINOR/ NOT A PROBLEM (NET).....	49	48	51	55

Q19. How worried are you about exposure to toxic chemicals, such as lead, in your home tap water?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
Extremely worried.....	19%	20%	13%	15%
Somewhat worried.....	37	37	30	31
Somewhat less worried.....	21	26	30	24
Not at all worried.....	19	16	23	31
No opinion/neutral.....	4	1	3	*
WORRIED (NET).....	56%	57	43	46
LESS/NOT WORRIED (NET).....	40	42	54	54

V1. Based on what you know, do you support or oppose updating a rule from the Environmental Protection Agency that would require water utilities to replace all of their lead pipes within the next 10 years?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
Strongly support.....	55%	56%	50%	45%
Somewhat support.....	37	40	43	49
Somewhat oppose.....	7	4	6	7
Strongly oppose.....	2	*	1	-
SUPPORT (NET).....	91%	96	92	93
OPPOSE (NET).....	9	4	8	7

POL1. Would you have a more or less favorable opinion towards a policymaker who supports an EPA rule that requires water utilities to replace all of their lead pipes in the next 10 years or less, or would it not make a difference in your opinion of them?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
Much more favorable.....	36%	37%	32%	30%
Somewhat more favorable.....	33	40	34	31
No difference.....	28	22	32	40
Somewhat less favorable.....	2	1	2	*
Much less favorable.....	1	-	-	-
MORE FAVORABLE (NET).....	69%	77	66	60
LESS FAVORABLE (NET).....	3	1	2	*

As you may or may not know, drinking water across the country is frequently carried to homes through pipes that contain lead which contaminates our water and threatens the health of residents.

Three decades ago, Congress banned the installment of lead water pipes, but allowed existing lead pipes to remain in use. Today, as many as 12 million lead pipes still carry drinking water to millions of homes every day. The EPA – which is responsible for ensuring safe drinking water across the country – currently has a rule that allows most lead pipes to remain in use, and gives the most lead-contaminated water utilities more than 30 years to replace their lead pipes. However, there is a proposal to update the current lead rule that would require all lead pipes to be replaced by water utilities in the next 10 years.

v2. After reading this information, do you support or oppose updating a rule from the Environmental Protection Agency that would require water utilities to replace all of their lead pipes within the next 10 years?

	<u>Nationwide RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin RV</u>
Strongly support	56%	57%	57%	50%
Somewhat support	37	34	37	39
Somewhat oppose.....	6	7	5	9
Strongly oppose	1	2	1	2
SUPPORT (NET).....	93%	91	94	89
OPPOSE (NET).....	7	9	6	11

B4. Below is a list of provisions a reformed EPA rule may include. Please indicate if you support or oppose each item.

	<u>SUPPORT</u>		<u>OPPOSE</u>		<u>NET</u>	
	<u>Strongly</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>Strongly</u>	<u>SUPPORT</u>	<u>OPPOSE</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water utilities should be required to ensure that no one's tap water has an unsafe level of lead. 						
Nationwide RV	71%	22	5	1	94%	6
Illinois RV	74%	21	4	*	96%	4
Missouri RV	69%	28	1	2	97%	3
Wisconsin RV	67%	25	5	3	92%	8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water utilities should be required to rigorously monitor lead levels in areas that are at high-risk for lead exposure. 						
Nationwide RV	71%	24	4	1	95%	5
Illinois RV	72%	22	5	1	94%	6
Missouri RV	67%	29	2	1	96%	4
Wisconsin RV	70%	26	4	*	95%	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water utilities should be required to treat their water in ways that will reduce the amount of lead contamination in water. 						
Nationwide RV	68%	26	4	1	94%	6
Illinois RV	76%	19	4	1	95%	5
Missouri RV	67%	31	1	*	98%	2
Wisconsin RV	62%	32	6	-	94%	6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water utilities should be required to identify and disclose all lead pipes that are currently in use. 						
Nationwide RV	68%	25	6	1	93%	7
Illinois RV	76%	17	7	*	92%	8
Missouri RV	62%	36	2	*	98%	2
Wisconsin RV	67%	26	6	1	93%	7

B4. Below is a list of provisions a reformed EPA rule may include. Please indicate if you support or oppose each item.

	SUPPORT		OPPOSE		NET	
	Strongly	Some	Some	Strongly	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water utilities should institute water sampling protocols that fully capture lead levels in tap water and should be banned from using methods that minimize detections of lead..... 						
Nationwide RV	66%	28	5	1	94%	6
Illinois RV	72%	21	6	1	93%	7
Missouri RV	64%	31	4	1	95%	5
Wisconsin RV	66%	28	4	1	94%	6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water utilities should help schools and daycare centers install water filters to remove lead in their drinking water..... 						
Nationwide RV	64%	26	8	2	90%	10
Illinois RV	72%	21	6	*	93%	7
Missouri RV	63%	28	6	2	91%	9
Wisconsin RV	65%	25	7	2	90%	10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water utilities should be required to fully replace all lead pipes on public and private property..... 						
Nationwide RV	58%	30	10	2	88%	12
Illinois RV	67%	26	6	2	93%	7
Missouri RV	50%	42	6	2	92%	8
Wisconsin RV	50%	32	15	3	82%	18
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water utilities should be required to replace lead pipes at a rate of at least 10% per year..... 						
Nationwide RV	56%	35	8	1	91%	9
Illinois RV	58%	36	5	*	94%	6
Missouri RV	53%	39	5	3	92%	8
Wisconsin RV	52%	34	14	1	86%	14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water utilities should fund the full cost of replacing all lead pipes..... 						
Nationwide RV	54%	30	13	3	84%	16
Illinois RV	50%	38	10	2	88%	12
Missouri RV	40%	39	18	3	79%	21
Wisconsin RV	44%	30	22	4	74%	26

B5. Below is a list of statements on water infrastructure. Please indicate if you agree or disagree with each statement.

	AGREE		DISAGREE		NET	
	Strongly	Some	Some	Strongly	AGREE	DISAGREE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The federal government, along with water utilities and states, need to ensure access to safe drinking water..... 						
Nationwide RV	69%	24	6	2	93%	7
Illinois RV	73%	23	3	1	96%	4
Missouri RV	66%	24	5	4	91%	9
Wisconsin RV	70%	23	6	1	93%	7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [SPLIT B] The federal government, along with water utilities and states, should replace all existing lead pipes..... 						
Nationwide RV	60%	29	8	3	89%	11
Illinois RV	54%	39	5	1	93%	7
Missouri RV	44%	41	9	5	85%	15
Wisconsin RV	62%	26	11	*	88%	12

B5. Below is a list of statements on water infrastructure. Please indicate if you agree or disagree with each statement.

	AGREE		DISAGREE		NET	
	Strongly	Some	Some	Strongly	AGREE	DISAGREE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The federal government should help fund and secure resources for states and communities that need assistance replacing lead pipes. 						
Nationwide RV	58%	31	8	3	90%	10
Illinois RV	67%	26	7	1	92%	8
Missouri RV	52%	36	6	5	88%	12
Wisconsin RV	58%	28	12	2	86%	14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [SPLIT A] The federal government, along with water utilities and states, need to replace all existing underground lead pipes serving homes with their drinking water regardless of whether they travel under private or public property. 						
Nationwide RV	57%	30	11	2	87%	13
Illinois RV	67%	26	5	1	94%	6
Missouri RV	49%	34	15	2	83%	17
Wisconsin RV	47%	39	10	4	86%	14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investments in water infrastructure should be targeted to communities that have been underserved for far too long. 						
Nationwide RV	54%	32	11	2	86%	14
Illinois RV	58%	24	14	4	82%	18
Missouri RV	53%	33	13	1	85%	15
Wisconsin RV	45%	41	14	*	86%	14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure investments should be directed to water systems with the greatest number of lead pipes. 						
Nationwide RV	52%	40	7	2	91%	9
Illinois RV	58%	36	5	1	95%	5
Missouri RV	46%	44	9	1	91%	9
Wisconsin RV	44%	47	9	*	91%	9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Even if water costs customers somewhat more, it's important for water utilities to get rid of lead pipes and to reduce lead levels in tap water. 						
Nationwide RV	50%	36	10	4	86%	14
Illinois RV	52%	37	8	3	88%	12
Missouri RV	45%	38	12	5	83%	17
Wisconsin RV	42%	45	12	1	86%	14

Q35. [TIMING] Thinking about the proposed rule you read about, who do you agree with more?

	<u>Nationwide RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin RV</u>
Supporters of the proposal say U.S. water infrastructure is outdated and no American should have to face severe health risks from water contaminated by lead pipes. They say the current EPA rule, which allows utilities to leave most lead pipes in use and lets highly lead-contaminated systems more than 30 years of continued lead pipe use, falls short. We need a better plan that will solve this issue sooner.	68%	79%	62%	71%
Opponents of the proposal say access to safe water is important, but we already have a rule in place that will replace lead pipes if they are found to cause ongoing lead contamination above the EPA's acceptable level. They say the current rule puts the U.S. on a path to safe water for all without overburdensome government regulations and unnecessary costs.	32	21	38	29

Q36. [RISING COSTS] Thinking about the proposed rule you read about, who do you agree with more?

	<u>Nationwide RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin RV</u>
Supporters of the proposal who say access to safe drinking water is a basic human right. They say no person in America should be forced to drink contaminated water that exposes them to severe health risks, and the EPA has the responsibility to put American lives and health ahead of the costs to water utilities.	79%	77%	74%	76%
Opponents of the proposal who say forcing water utilities to replace all lead pipes, regardless of location or levels of lead exposure, is unnecessary and will cause many utilities to go bankrupt or raise prices on consumers.	21	23	26	24

Q37. [UTILITY RESPONSIBILITY] Thinking about the proposed rule you read about, who do you agree with more?

	<u>Nationwide RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin RV</u>
Supporters of the proposal who say that it was the water utilities who installed or approved of these lead pipes years ago, and it should be their responsibility to pay for replacing them.	73%	74%	71%	71%
Opponents of the proposal who say forcing water utilities to replace all lead pipes, regardless of location or levels of lead exposure, is unnecessary and will cause many utilities to go bankrupt or raise prices on consumers.	27	26	29	29

Q38. [PRIVATE PROPERTY] Thinking about the proposed rule you read about, who do you agree with more?

	<u>Nationwide RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin RV</u>
Supporters of the proposal who say that exposure to lead poses serious health risks that cannot be ignored, and that's why any lead pipe replacement plan should pay for 100% of the cost to replace the lead pipes providing water to homes, no matter whether the pipes are under public property or under someone's front yard. Otherwise, low-income families and people who rent will still have to drink water from these lead pipes.	80%	85%	85%	76%
Opponents of the proposal who say replacing all lead pipes will burden water utilities, and that they shouldn't be required to remove the part of a lead service line that is under private property or under someone's front yard - they say individual homeowners should pay for that.	20	15	15	24

Q39. [JUSTICE] Thinking about the proposed rule you read about, who do you agree with more?

	<u>Nationwide RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin RV</u>
Supporters of the proposal who say U.S. water infrastructure is severely outdated, especially in low-income areas and communities of color who are disproportionately impacted by contaminated water. They say access to safe drinking water should not be determined by how much money someone makes.	68%	81%	62%	69%
Opponents of the proposal say access to safe water is important, but we already have a rule in place that will replace lead pipes if they are shown to cause lead contamination in excess of the EPA's acceptable level. This proposal is simply a radical transfer of wealth from working Americans to liberal ideologues who will hurt American consumers in the name of phony environmental justice.	32	19	38	31

[PROGRAMMING NOTE: POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE MESSAGING SECTIONS WERE ROTATED WITH V3 IN BETWEEN]

B6. Below are some statements from supporters of the proposal to replace lead pipes across the country. Please indicate whether each statement is a convincing reason to support the proposal.

	CONVINCING		Not convincing	NET
	Very	Some		CONVINCING
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [CHILDREN] Young children are especially vulnerable to lead. A dose of lead that would have little effect on an adult can have a significant effect on a child. In children, low levels of lead exposure have been linked to brain damage, learning disabilities, slowed growth, lower IQ, and impaired hearing. In fact, more than half a million children in the U.S. have elevated levels of lead in their blood..... 				
Nationwide RV	66%	29	5	95%
Illinois RV	67%	32	2	98%
Missouri RV	63%	34	2	98%
Wisconsin RV	64%	33	3	97%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [LOCALIZE-MO] Missouri has the fourth-highest number of lead pipes per capita in the U.S. with an estimated 330,000 or more lead pipes carrying drinking water to Missourians daily - many of whom may not suspect their tap water could be contaminated with lead and elected officials have not made significant progress toward fixing this problem. 				
Missouri RV	57%	36	7	93%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [HUMAN RIGHT] Safe drinking water is a basic human right. No person in America should be forced to drink or cook with poisoned water that exposes them to severe health risks. While other countries have established more rigorous limits on lead levels in their water, U.S. policymakers have failed to protect Americans from excessive lead exposure. 				
Nationwide RV	64%	28	8	92%
Illinois RV	64%	26	10	90%
Missouri RV	56%	34	10	90%
Wisconsin RV	58%	32	10	90%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [IF ILLINOIS/SPLIT A] [LOCALIZE-IL] Illinois has more lead pipes than any other state in the nation. This means that families and children are more at risk of exposure to unsafe drinking water than anywhere else in the country - in fact, studies show that nearly 700,000 or more homes in Illinois are served by lead pipes, putting children and families at risk. Many of the Illinois residents may not even suspect their tap water could be contaminated with lead and elected officials have not made significant progress toward fixing this problem. 				
Illinois RV	68%	29	3	97%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [HEALTH] Studies show there is no safe level of lead in drinking water. Today, lead pipes expose millions of Americans to long-term serious health risks - including cardiovascular complications, decreased kidney function, and reproductive problems in both men and women..... 				
Nationwide RV	57%	33	10	90%
Illinois RV	59%	31	10	90%
Missouri RV	51%	41	8	92%
Wisconsin RV	55%	27	18	82%

B6. Below are some statements from supporters of the proposal to replace lead pipes across the country. Please indicate whether each statement is a convincing reason to support the proposal.

	CONVINCING		Not convincing	NET CONVINCING
	Very	Some		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [IF ILLINOIS/SPLIT B] [LOCALIZE-CHICAGO] Illinois has more lead pipes than any other state in the nation and elected officials have not made significant progress toward fixing this problem. In two years, the city of Chicago has replaced less than one tenth of one percent of the 400,000 lead pipes despite other cities with similar lead problems replacing their lead pipes at a much faster rate. 				
Illinois RV	59%	33	8	92%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [NO SHORTCUTS] If we want safe drinking water, we must get lead out of our water delivery systems. There are no shortcuts, and we can no longer afford to kick the can down the road. We need to act now to fix our water infrastructure because the longer we wait, the more expensive it will be to solve the problem when it becomes an even bigger public health crisis. 				
Nationwide RV	56%	35	10	90%
Illinois RV	65%	27	8	92%
Missouri RV	50%	36	14	86%
Wisconsin RV	50%	39	11	89%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [EQUALITY/JUSTICE] Communities of color and low-income communities are disproportionately impacted by contaminated water that results from outdated, inadequate, or failing infrastructure. Access to safe drinking water should not be a privilege for the few. No one should have to suffer from lead contamination and the severe health risks it causes just because they live in the wrong zip code. 				
Nationwide RV	55%	31	13	87%
Illinois RV	56%	33	11	89%
Missouri RV	50%	33	17	83%
Wisconsin RV	52%	34	14	86%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [LOCALIZE-WI] Wisconsin has the highest number of lead pipes per capita in the U.S. with an estimated 329,000 or more lead pipes carrying drinking water to Wisconsinites daily - many of whom may not suspect their tap water could be contaminated with lead and elected officials have not made significant progress toward fixing this problem. 				
Wisconsin RV	52%	36	12	88%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [EPA LIMITS] The Environmental Protection Agency is responsible for ensuring safe drinking water across the country, but the EPA's current rule on lead in water falls short. The U.S. rule sets no maximum amount of lead exposure allowed from tap water, unlike many other industrialized nations, and studies show that lead levels in many Americans' drinking water needs to be sharply lowered to prevent lead poisoning among young children. 				
Nationwide RV	52%	40	8	92%
Illinois RV	50%	46	4	96%
Missouri RV	55%	38	7	93%
Wisconsin RV	42%	46	12	88%

v3. After reading this information, do you support or oppose updating a rule from the Environmental Protection Agency that would require water utilities to replace all of their lead pipes within the next 10 years?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Heard Only</u>	
					<u>Positives</u>	<u>Negatives</u>
Strongly support	53%	63%	47%	42%	61%	46%
Somewhat support	34	25	40	46	31	37
Somewhat oppose.....	9	11	11	7	7	12
Strongly oppose	4	1	2	6	2	5
SUPPORT (NET).....	87%	88	87	87	92	83
OPPOSE (NET).....	13	12	13	13	8	17

Below is a statement from opponents of the proposal to replace lead pipes across the country. Please indicate whether this statement raises concerns for you about the proposal.

Access to safe water is important, but we already have rules in place to monitor lead levels and replace pipes that cause danger. Requiring water utilities to replace all existing pipes regardless of location or lead exposure is unnecessary, inefficient, and expensive. Water utilities that we rely on will go bankrupt in the process and those that don't will be forced to raise prices on consumers – leading to skyrocketing water bills. This is just another example of burdensome and underfunded government mandates that will harm taxpayers and raise prices on American families.

Q49. Does this statement raise concerns for you about the proposal?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
Major concerns	45%	48%	44%	48%
Minor concerns	41	40	45	42
No concerns at all.....	14	11	10	10
RAISES CONCERN (NET)	86%	89	90	90

v4. Sometimes in surveys like these people change their minds and sometimes they do not. After reading this information, do you support or oppose updating a rule from the Environmental Protection Agency that would require water utilities to replace all of their lead pipes within the next 10 years?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Heard First</u>	
					<u>Positives</u>	<u>Negatives</u>
Strongly support	52%	58%	44%	44%	54%	51%
Somewhat support	36	34	38	47	35	37
Somewhat oppose.....	7	8	13	5	8	7
Strongly oppose	4	1	5	5	3	5
SUPPORT (NET).....	89%	91	82	91	89	88
OPPOSE (NET).....	11	9	18	9	11	12

POL2. Would you have a more or less favorable opinion towards a policymaker who supports an EPA rule to replace all lead pipes in the next 10 years or less, or would it not make a difference in your opinion of them?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Heard First</u>	
					<u>Positives</u>	<u>Negatives</u>
Much more favorable.....	35%	45%	34%	33%	35%	36%
Somewhat more favorable	33	29	37	35	34	32
No difference	26	22	20	24	24	27
Somewhat less favorable	4	4	9	6	5	3
Much less favorable	2	1	*	1	2	2
MORE FAVORABLE (NET)	69%	73	71	69	69	68
LESS FAVORABLE (NET)	6	4	9	7	7	5

Now there are just a few final questions for statistical purposes.

D100. Are you:

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
A man	47%	47%	47%	47%
A woman.....	53	53	53	53
Self-describe.....	*	-	*	-

DAGE. What is your age?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
18-29	17%	16%	17%	8%
30-44	26	26	26	27
45-54	15	16	15	16
55-64	17	17	17	20
65+.....	25	25	26	29

DRACE. Derived Race

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
Black/African American	12%	14%	10%	6%
White/Caucasian	70	69	85	89
Hispanic/Latino	12	16	3	3
Asian/Asian American	4	1	2	1
Pacific Islander	1	-	-	-
Native American/American Indian/Indigenous	2	-	*	1
Middle Eastern/North African	*	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-
VOL: (Don't know/Refused).....	-	-	-	-

D303. Hispanics and Latinos have their roots in many different countries. To what country or countries do you or your family trace your ancestry?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
Mexico	45%	20%	24%	100%
Puerto Rico	26	37	79	-
Cuba	1	*	-	-
Argentina	3	-	-	-
Belize	*	*	-	-
Bolivia	-	-	-	-
Brazil	*	-	-	-
Chile	-	-	-	-
Colombia	4	-	-	-
Costa Rica	*	-	16	-
Dominican Republic	3	-	-	-
Ecuador	1	-	-	-
El Salvador	2	-	27	-
Guatemala	-	-	-	-
Honduras	-	-	-	-
Nicaragua	2	-	-	-
Panama	4	-	-	-
Paraguay	-	-	-	-
Peru	2	-	16	-
Spain	16	34	16	-
Uruguay	-	-	-	-
Venezuela	2	-	-	-
Other Country	6	21	-	-
Don't know/Not sure	1	-	3	-

D304. People in America of African descent have their roots in many different regions of the world. To what region of the world do you or your family trace your ancestry?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
The Caribbean	6%	4%	5%	4%
Africa	48	76	45	76
Central America	13	5	18	20
South America	5	2	-	-
Another region of the world	3	-	-	-
Don't know/Not sure	27	17	35	4

D102. What is the last grade of school or level of education you completed?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
Did not complete high school	3%	3%	2%	1%
Graduated high school	30	22	30	22
Attended technical/vocational school	6	2	7	7
Attended some college but no degree	18	22	21	28
Graduated two-year college with Associate's degree	10	15	11	10
Graduated four-year college with Bachelor's degree	23	24	21	26
Obtained Master's, PhD, or other professional degree (MD, DMD, etc.)	9	12	9	6

D112. Are you the parent or guardian of a child under the age of 18?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
Yes	27%	29%	30%	33%
No	73	71	70	67

D105. When it comes to politics, do you generally think of yourself as:

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
Very liberal.....	15%	15%	16%	13%
Somewhat liberal.....	16	22	14	16
Moderate	36	45	30	32
Somewhat conservative	18	10	26	26
Very conservative.....	15	7	14	13
LIBERAL (NET).....	31%	37	30	28
CONSERVATIVE (NET).....	33	18	40	40

D142. Do you own or rent the house or apartment where you live?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
Own	58%	62%	65%	68%
Rent.....	38	33	33	31
Other.....	3	5	2	2

D140. Which best describes the area in which you live?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
City	27%	18%	20%	23%
Suburban area.....	44	63	42	33
Small town.....	11	6	13	17
Rural area.....	18	12	26	27

D900. And, for statistical purposes only, what would you say is your total annual family income before taxes?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
Less than \$30,000.....	27%	27%	31%	21%
\$30,000 - \$59,999.....	34	33	37	26
\$60,000 - \$99,999.....	23	25	15	29
\$100,000 - \$199,999.....	13	12	14	21
\$200,000 - \$399,999.....	1	3	1	-
\$400,000 and above.....	*	-	*	1
Prefer not to say.....	2	-	2	2

D311. How would you describe yourself?

	<u>Nationwide</u> <u>RV</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u> <u>RV</u>
Working class.....	28%	24%	42%	21%
Lower middle class.....	25	26	17	31
Middle class.....	39	43	35	40
Upper middle class.....	6	7	6	7
Financially better off than that.....	2	*	-	-

VH20. Thinking back, in the November 2020 general election for President, who did you vote for? Or did you not vote in that election?

	<u>Nationwide</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u>
	<u>RV</u>			<u>RV</u>
Voted for Democrat Joe Biden	46%	52%	35%	49%
Voted for Republican Donald Trump	41	36	48	47
Voted for someone else	2	1	4	1
Did not vote	9	11	13	4

REGION. Region

	<u>Nationwide</u>	<u>Illinois RV</u>	<u>Missouri RV</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u>
	<u>RV</u>			<u>RV</u>
Northeast	18%	-	-	-
Midwest	22	100	100	100
South	39	-	-	-
West	22	-	-	-