

AMERICAN VIEWPOINT®

American Viewpoint, Inc.
1199 North Fairfax Street • Suite 808
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-3325
www.amview.com

To: Interested Parties
From: Randall Gutermuth
Re: Key Findings from Recent Survey
Date: August 9, 2017

The following outlines the key findings from a national survey of likely 2018 voters commissioned by NRDC. Interviews were conducted June 28-July 2, 2017. The margin of error for the full sample (n=1000) is +/- 3.1% at the 95% confidence level and the margin of error among sub-groups is greater. Approximately 40% of interviews were conducted with a cell phone sample of those who can't be reached on a landline.

There are several indicators in the data showing a need for greater attention to the environment by the Trump Administration and Congress.

- Most respondents (75%) believe the Federal government spends too little or about the right amount to protect the environment. A majority of respondents (50%) believe that the Federal government spends too little on protecting the environment, with 22% believing too much is spent and 25% saying spending is about right.
- Similarly, most respondents (61%) believe that there aren't enough regulations or the right amount of regulations to protect the environment. A plurality of respondents (40%) believe that the Federal government generally does not have enough regulations on businesses to protect the environment, with 35% believing there are too many regulations on businesses meant to protect the environment and 21% saying the amount of regulations are about right.

There is a great deal of resistance to various cuts in the proposed budget related to the environment.

- As seen in the table below, a majority of respondents oppose each of the following proposed cuts in the budget.

	Total		Strongly
	Favor	Oppose	Favor / Oppose
*President Trump's budget eliminates programs to help businesses and individuals make energy efficiency improvements such as adding insulation or upgrading heating systems. Do you favor or oppose eliminating these energy efficiency programs?	29%	67%	16% / 51%
*President Trump's budget reduces funding for researching and development of renewable energy technologies like wind and solar. Do you favor or oppose reducing this funding for renewable energy?	30%	66%	18% / 53%
President Trump's budget proposes reducing funding for NOAA , the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. This agency provides forecasts and early warnings for natural disasters, programs to defend coastal communities from storm damage, and protects our fish and wildlife. Do you favor or oppose this change?	30%	65%	16% / 48%
President Trump's budget proposes reducing funding for programs that focus on eliminating pollution in low income and minority communities . Do you favor or oppose this change?	33%	61%	19% / 47%
President Trump's budget reduces public investment in infrastructure like airports, bridges and highways , and establishes incentives for state and local governments to sell those assets to private companies. Do you favor or oppose this change to infrastructure spending and private control of public assets?	34%	60%	19% / 46%
President Trump's budget proposes reducing funding for the Environmental Protection Agency . Do you favor or oppose this change?	37%	59%	27% / 48%
President Trump's budget proposes reduces funding for researching solutions to address climate change . Do you favor or oppose this change?	39%	59%	29% / 48%
President Trump's budget proposes reducing Federal funding for commuter rail and rapid transit lines . Do you favor or oppose this change to public transportation funding?	34%	59%	18% / 42%
President Trump's budget proposes the leasing of some public lands and oceans to private companies to expand drilling and fracking for oil, coal, and natural gas. Do you favor or oppose this leasing of some public lands for oil and gas extraction?	41%	55%	27% / 46%

- The greatest level of opposition is seen for eliminating energy efficiency programs and reducing funding for renewable energy.

*These results are based on callbacks to n=593 respondents conducted August 5-8, 2017. The margin of error is +/- 4.02% at the 95% confidence level.

A majority of respondents continue to oppose the proposed budget cuts related to the government.

	Total		Strongly
	Favor	Oppose	Favor / Oppose
<p>*Energy Efficiency Programs -- ► Supporters of eliminating these energy efficiency programs say that at a time of record debt taxpayers shouldn't be helping to subsidize businesses and individuals who purchase energy-efficient appliances and equipment.</p> <p>► Opponents of eliminating these energy efficiency programs say that Federal investments have helped make it more affordable for consumers and businesses to optimize their energy use, helping both improve the environment and lower their energy bills.</p>	33%	63%	18% / 46%
<p>*R&D for Renewable Tech. -- ► Supporters of eliminating these renewable energy programs say that at a time of record debt, taxpayers shouldn't be supporting new energy research and development when the private sector can lead this effort.</p> <p>► Opponents of eliminating these renewable energy programs say that Federal investments have helped make it more affordable for consumers and businesses to secure renewable energy, helping to create one of the fastest-growing energy sectors in terms of new jobs and reducing air pollution.</p>	36%	61%	22% / 48%
<p>Pollution -- ► Supporters of reducing funding for these programs say that we all have an equal right to clean air and safe water. The Federal government shouldn't prioritize the safety of any one specific group and should set priorities based on the threats, not by race and income.</p> <p>► Opponents of reducing funding for programs to protect low-income and minority communities from pollution say that more enforcement and pollution reduction programs are needed because families in these communities are consistently exposed to more health-threatening air and water pollution than other places.</p>	34%	61%	20% / 47%
<p>NOAA -- ► Supporters of reducing funding for NOAA say that the federal government can't continue footing such a large bill for this agency. Taxpayers in the Heartland shouldn't be forced to pay for programs that only benefit the coasts.</p> <p>► Opponents of reducing funding say that earlier warnings for natural disasters, buffering homes and businesses from storms, and protecting fish and wildlife are critical services that keep Americans safe and our economy strong.</p>	33%	61%	17% / 43%
<p>Oceans/Public Lands -- ► Supporters of leasing some public lands to private companies for oil and gas extraction say that we must take advantage of all of the resources available and that opening up drilling and fracking in these areas will create tens of thousands of jobs, reduce gas and home heating prices and reduce America's dependence on foreign oil from companies that don't have our interests in mind.</p> <p>► Opponents of leasing some public lands for oil, coal, and gas extraction say that America's national landmarks, parks and shorelines should be preserved. We have many decades worth of fossil fuels already available and we must make smarter energy choices by investing in renewable energy that are clean and provide good, domestic jobs.</p>	41%	56%	25% / 46%
<p>EPA Funding -- ► Supporters of reducing funding for the EPA say that Obama-era environmental regulations have put American companies at a disadvantage to the rest of the world. With these burdensome regulations being rolled back, the EPA doesn't need as much money to fund enforcement.</p> <p>► Opponents of reducing funding for the EPA say that the agency plays a vital role in enforcing safeguards that protect our air and water. These cuts to the EPA will jeopardize enforcement and make it harder to make sure that the air and water our families need is clean and healthy.</p>	39%	55%	26% / 46%
<p>Climate Change Research -- ► Supporters of reducing funding for climate change research say that with record deficits, it's time for Congress to tighten their belts just like families have to do and that the country faces bigger problems and more important priorities.</p> <p>► Opponents of reducing funding for climate change solutions say that failing to address climate change puts current and future generations at risk, and that clean energy investments will reduce pollution and create jobs.</p>	44%	52%	31% / 42%

- Note that this opposition isn't just among Democrats, but also among Independents, as well as a significant portion of Republicans.

Paired Statements	Total		Republican		Independent		Democrat	
	Favor	Oppose	Favor	Oppose	Favor	Oppose	Favor	Oppose
*Eliminate Energy Efficiency Programs	33%	63%	57%	39%	33%	64%	13%	84%
*R&D for Renewable Tech.	36%	61%	59%	34%	38%	60%	13%	85%
Reduce Pollution in Low Income Communities	34%	61%	63%	31%	33%	62%	9%	88%
NOAA	33%	61%	54%	40%	33%	60%	14%	81%
Expanded Leasing of Oceans & Public Lands	41%	56%	76%	23%	36%	58%	16%	82%
EPA Funding	39%	55%	69%	23%	38%	57%	12%	84%
Climate Change Research	44%	52%	73%	24%	43%	53%	18%	79%

*These results are based on callbacks to n=593 respondents conducted August 5-8, 2017. The margin of error is +/- 4.02% at the 95% confidence level.