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Poll Goals:

1. Support for U.S. investment in clean energy and inclusion in stimulus packages
2. Impact of investment in addressing climate change

Methodology:
This poll was conducted between May 29-June 4, 2020 among a national sample of 1000 Voters in swing districts. The interviews were conducted online. Results from the full survey have a margin of error of plus or minus 3 percentage points.

Swing Districts:

- AZ-01
- CA-21
- CA-25
- CA-48
- GA-06
- IA-01
- IL-06
- IL-13
- IL-14
- ME-02
- MI-08
- MI-11
- MN-02
- NJ-02
- NJ-03
- NM-02
- NV-03
- NY-11
- NY-22
- PA-01
- PA-08
- PA-10
- SC-01
- TX-07
- TX-22
- VA-02
- VA-04
- VA-07

Sample Definitions:

- **Trump job approval swing**: Voters in swing districts who say they either somewhat approve or somewhat disapprove of the job President Donald Trump is doing in office.

- **Right Direction**: Voters in swing districts who believe the U.S. is moving in the right direction.

- **Wrong Track**: Voters in swing districts who believe the U.S. is on the wrong track.
Voters in swing districts say they support clean energy, including solar (86%), wind (80%), and clean energy industries at large (85%).

- Over half of voters in swing districts support all of the tested pieces for future stimulus packages, including proposals focused on drought resilience, electric vehicles, reducing methane pollution and other environmentally-focused initiatives.

And, voters in swing districts want to see the U.S. prioritize addressing climate change (70%).

- Thinking about specific measures, over half of voters in swing districts believe that addressing climate change can help solve concerning environmental threats, such as air pollution, drought, changes in rainfall, and flooding.
- And, seeking solutions to these environmental threats influences vote in swing districts. Half of more voters in swing districts say they would be more likely to vote for a member of Congress who is committed to addressing lead pipes (37%) and air pollution (29%).

Republican and Independent voters in swing districts support U.S. investment in clean energy.

- Support for U.S. investment in clean energy crosses party lines: Republicans (80%), Democrats (91%) and Independents (83%) all say they support U.S. investment.
- Half of Independents (51%) and Republicans (46%) say increased investment in clean energy would have a positive impact on their local economy.
- Half of Republican voters in swing districts (50%) say climate change should be a top priority in the U.S., while two-thirds of Independents (66%) say the same.
- Half of Republicans (56%) and two-thirds of Independents (67%) say they would be more likely to vote for a member of Congress who is committed to addressing lead pipes.
- Two-thirds of Republicans (64%) and 80% of Independents say they support replacing lead pipes.

Similarly, voters across generations and communities in swing districts support U.S. investment in clean energy.

- A majority of voters across generations and communities in swing districts support U.S. investment in clean energy, including half of voters across generations and over half of urban and suburban voters who say they strongly support U.S. investment.
- And, these voters say it is a priority for Congress to include clean energy in future stimulus packages.
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Three quarters or more of voters in swing districts say they support solar (86%), wind (80%), and clean energy industries at large (85%).

Do you support or oppose U.S. investment in each of the following industries?
Support for U.S. investment in clean energy crosses party lines. Republicans (80%) and Democrats (91%) say they support U.S. investment.

Do you support or oppose U.S. investment in each of the following industries?

**Clean energy industry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Somewhat support</th>
<th>Don't know/no opinion</th>
<th>Somewhat oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Total support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voters in swing districts</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat (no lean)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent (no lean)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican (no lean)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Women</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Obama + 2016 Trump voter</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitt Romney voters</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trump Job Approval Swing</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD/WT: Right Direction</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD/WT: Wrong Track</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A majority of voters in swing districts across key demographics support U.S. investment in clean energy.

Do you support or oppose U.S. investment in each of the following industries?

Clean energy industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Somewhat support</th>
<th>Don't know/no opinion</th>
<th>Somewhat oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voters in Swing Districts</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenZers: 1997-2012</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials: 1981-1996</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenXers: 1965-1980</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers: 1946-1964</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community: Urban</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community: Suburban</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community: Rural</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Women</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-collar family</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar family</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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More than half of voters in swing districts support all of the pieces tested for future coronavirus economic recovery packages.

Below are pieces under consideration for future coronavirus economic recovery packages. Do you support or oppose each of the following as pieces of a future coronavirus economic recovery package?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion of Environmental Priorities in Future Stimulus Packages</th>
<th>Total Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replace lead pipes in community water systems in cities, towns, suburbs, and rural areas across the country.</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the COVID-19 registry to track the impacts of COVID-19.</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide funding for reforestation and other wildfire prevention to protect communities and natural resources from wildfires.</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in clean U.S. manufacturing programs to support a more sustainable industrial sector.</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernize our electric grid.</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend existing tax incentives for clean energy (electric vehicles, Wind, Solar) development.</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace the nation’s leaky methane gas pipelines in urban areas while protecting customers from burdensome rate increases.</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shore up our coastline and river communities to better withstand increasingly frequent and intense storms and flooding.</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Policies divided between two slides.
More than half of voters in swing districts support all of the pieces tested for future coronavirus economic recovery packages.

Below are pieces under consideration for future coronavirus economic recovery packages. Do you support or oppose each of the following as pieces of a future coronavirus economic recovery package?

Continued

- **Support drought resilience with projects such as water delivery and irrigation infrastructure, restoration activities, and incentive payments for voluntary agricultural water use reductions and conservation activities.**
  - Strongly support: 29%
  - Somewhat support: 36%
  - Somewhat oppose: 9%
  - Strongly oppose: 8%
  - Don't Know / No Opinion: 18%
  - Total Support: 65%

- **Fund programs to reduce methane pollution and groundwater pollution by plugging abandoned wells.**
  - Strongly support: 29%
  - Somewhat support: 32%
  - Somewhat oppose: 14%
  - Strongly oppose: 9%
  - Don't Know / No Opinion: 16%
  - Total Support: 61%

- **Promote worker training to ensure economic security for all, especially for oil and gas producing communities, regions, and workers in transition.**
  - Strongly support: 27%
  - Somewhat support: 43%
  - Somewhat oppose: 10%
  - Strongly oppose: 5%
  - Don't Know / No Opinion: 15%
  - Total Support: 70%

- **Provide funding to states to support the cost of implementing leak detection and repair programs for unregulated oil and gas facilities.**
  - Strongly support: 26%
  - Somewhat support: 37%
  - Somewhat oppose: 9%
  - Strongly oppose: 10%
  - Don't Know / No Opinion: 17%
  - Total Support: 63%

- **Provide funding and tax incentives to support electric vehicles and accompanying charging infrastructure, including low-carbon public transit, zero-emission electric school buses, and American-made, zero-emission trucks.**
  - Strongly support: 26%
  - Somewhat support: 31%
  - Somewhat oppose: 12%
  - Strongly oppose: 15%
  - Don't Know / No Opinion: 15%
  - Total Support: 57%

- **Fund programs that modernize buildings with energy efficient features like electric cooking and heating.**
  - Strongly support: 26%
  - Somewhat support: 30%
  - Somewhat oppose: 14%
  - Strongly oppose: 14%
  - Don't Know / No Opinion: 15%
  - Total Support: 56%

*Policies divided between two slides.*
Two-thirds of Republicans say they support replacing lead pipes (64%), funding reforestation (64%), modernizing the electric grid (64%), and replacing methane pipelines (63%) in future coronavirus recovery packages.

Below are pieces under consideration for future coronavirus economic recovery packages. Do you support or oppose each of the following as pieces of a future coronavirus economic recovery package?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Somewhat support</th>
<th>Somewhat oppose</th>
<th>Total Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replace lead pipes in community water systems in cities, towns, suburbs, and rural areas across the country.</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the COVID-19 registry to track the impacts of COVID-19.</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide funding for reforestation and other wildfire prevention to protect communities and natural resources from wildfires.</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in clean U.S. manufacturing programs to support a more sustainable industrial sector.</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernize our electric grid.</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend existing tax incentives for clean energy (electric vehicles, Wind, Solar) development.</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace the nation’s leaky methane gas pipelines in urban areas while protecting customers from burdensome rate increases.</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Policies divided between two slides.
Two-thirds of Republicans also say they support working training for those in oil and gas communities (69%).

Below are pieces under consideration for future coronavirus economic recovery packages. Do you support or oppose each of the following as pieces of a future coronavirus economic recovery package?

Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion of Environmental Priorities in Future Stimulus Packages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shore up our coastline and river communities to better withstand increasingly frequent and intense storms and flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support drought resilience with projects such as water delivery and irrigation infrastructure, restoration activities, and incentive payments for voluntary agricultural water use reductions and conservation activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote worker training to ensure economic security for all, especially for oil and gas producing communities, regions, and workers in transition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide funding to states to support the cost of implementing leak detection and repair programs for unregulated oil and gas facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide funding and tax incentives to support electric vehicles and accompanying charging infrastructure, including low-carbon public transit, zero-emission electric school buses, and American-made, zero-emission trucks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund programs that modernize buildings with energy efficient features like electric cooking and heating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Policies divided between two slides.
As Congress moves to address the economic impacts of coronavirus, 70% of voters in swing districts say they support Congress investing in clean energy.

As Congress moves to address the economic impacts of the coronavirus pandemic, do you support or oppose Congress investing in clean energy?

- Strongly support: 34%
- Somewhat support: 36%
- Somewhat oppose: 11%
- Strongly oppose: 10%
- Don't know/no opinion: 10%
Half of Republicans (56%) and Mitt Romney voters (51%) in swing districts say they support investment in clean energy. A strong majority of Democrats (87%), Independents (68%), and Obama + Trump voters in swing districts say the same.

As Congress moves to address the economic impacts of the coronavirus pandemic, do you support or oppose Congress investing in clean energy?
Half of voters in swing districts (49%) say Congress should prioritize both the most immediate economic impacts of coronavirus and measures aimed at strengthening the economy long term.

As Congress moves to address the economic impacts of coronavirus, should it prioritize near term fixes designed to address our most immediate economic concerns or should it prioritize measures aimed at strengthening the economy over the long term?
Half of Democrats (55%) and the plurality of Republicans (42%) in swing districts agree that Congress should prioritize both the immediate economic impacts of coronavirus and long-term measures aimed at strengthening the economy.

As Congress moves to address the economic impacts of coronavirus, should it prioritize near term fixes designed to address our most immediate economic concerns or should it prioritize measures aimed at strengthening the economy over the long term?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prioritize the most immediate economic concerns</th>
<th>Prioritize measures aimed at strengthening the economy long term</th>
<th>Prioritize both the most immediate economic concerns and measures aimed at strengthening the economy long term</th>
<th>Don't know/no opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voters in Swing Districts</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat (no lean)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent (no lean)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican (no lean)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Women</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trump Job Approval Swing</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitt Romney voters</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Obama + 2016 Trump voter</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD/WT: Right Direction</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD/WT: Wrong Track</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A strong majority of voters say addressing climate change should be an important priority for the U.S. (70%).

How much of a priority should it be, if at all, for the U.S. to address climate change?

- 70%: A top priority
- 40%: An important but not top priority
- 15%: Not too important of a priority
- 12%: Not a priority at all
- 3%: Don’t know/no opinion
At least half of voters in swing districts predict that today’s investments to address climate change will have a positive impact on the future economy.

In five years, do you think today’s investments to address climate change will have a positive or negative impact on each of the following, or will today’s investments have no impact either way on each of the following?

Perceived Impacts of Investing in Climate Change Solutions

- **The U.S. economy**
  - Strong positive impact: 26%
  - Somewhat positive impact: 30%
  - No impact either way: 17%
  - Somewhat negative impact: 8%
  - Strong negative impact: 5%
  - Don’t know/no opinion: 14%
  - Total positive impact: 56%

- **Your state economy**
  - Strong positive impact: 23%
  - Somewhat positive impact: 30%
  - No impact either way: 20%
  - Somewhat negative impact: 8%
  - Strong negative impact: 5%
  - Don’t know/no opinion: 13%
  - Total positive impact: 53%

- **Your local economy**
  - Strong positive impact: 21%
  - Somewhat positive impact: 30%
  - No impact either way: 25%
  - Somewhat negative impact: 6%
  - Strong negative impact: 5%
  - Don’t know/no opinion: 13%
  - Total positive impact: 51%
The plurality of Independents (48%) and Obama + Trump voters (49%) in swing districts predict that today’s investments in climate change will have a positive impact on their local economy.

In five years, do you think today’s investments to address climate change will have a positive or negative impact on each of the following, or will today’s investments have no impact either way on each of the following?

Your local economy

![Perceived Impacts of Investing in Climate Change Solutions](image)

**Total positive impact**
- Voters in Swing Districts: 51%
- Democrat (no lean): 68%
- Independent (no lean): 48%
- Republican (no lean): 35%
- 2012 Obama + 2016 Trump Voters: 49%
Three-quarters of voters in swing districts say lead pipes (83%), increased drought (79%), air pollution (79%), changes in rainfall (76%), and hurricanes (75%) are all concerning.

Based on your own knowledge and experience, how concerning, if at all, do you find each of the following?

- Lead pipes poisoning the water they transport in more than 4,000 community water systems around the country. 83%
- Warmer, drier conditions and increased drought that leads to wildfires. 79%
- Changes in seasonal rainfall and the severity of heat waves that negatively impact crop yields. 76%
- Excessive air pollution in communities situated near highways, factories, and refineries. 79%
- Erosion, flooding, and increasingly powerful hurricanes in coastal areas. 75%
- Disappearance of jobs in historic oil and gas communities as energy needs and use shift. 59%

**Perceived Impacts of Investing in Climate Change Solutions**
Over half of Democrats, Republicans, and Independents find all of the environmental threats tested concerning.

Based on your own knowledge and experience, how concerning, if at all, do you find each of the following?

![Perceived Impacts of Investing in Climate Change Solutions](image-url)

- Lead pipes poisoning the water they transport in more than 4,000 community water systems around the country.
  - Democrats: 68% Very concerning, 21% Somewhat concerning, 5% Not too concerning, 9% Not at all concerning, 6% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Independents: 53% Very concerning, 29% Somewhat concerning, 4% Not too concerning, 12% Not at all concerning, 8% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Republicans: 40% Very concerning, 37% Somewhat concerning, 10% Not too concerning, 6% Not at all concerning, 8% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Total Concerning: 89%

- Warmer, drier conditions and increased drought that leads to wildfires.
  - Democrats: 64% Very concerning, 26% Somewhat concerning, 10% Not too concerning, 10% Not at all concerning, 7% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Independents: 41% Very concerning, 34% Somewhat concerning, 10% Not too concerning, 11% Not at all concerning, 5% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Republicans: 29% Very concerning, 42% Somewhat concerning, 15% Not too concerning, 7% Not at all concerning, 11% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Total Concerning: 90%

- Excessive air pollution in communities situated near highways, factories, and refineries.
  - Democrats: 60% Very concerning, 29% Somewhat concerning, 5% Not too concerning, 8% Not at all concerning, 6% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Independents: 41% Very concerning, 34% Somewhat concerning, 10% Not too concerning, 11% Not at all concerning, 5% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Republicans: 27% Very concerning, 44% Somewhat concerning, 15% Not too concerning, 8% Not at all concerning, 6% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Total Concerning: 89%

- Changes in seasonal rainfall and the severity of heat waves that negatively impact crop yields.
  - Democrats: 61% Very concerning, 27% Somewhat concerning, 4% Not too concerning, 6% Not at all concerning, 5% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Independents: 38% Very concerning, 36% Somewhat concerning, 11% Not too concerning, 10% Not at all concerning, 7% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Republicans: 29% Very concerning, 36% Somewhat concerning, 21% Not too concerning, 7% Not at all concerning, 6% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Total Concerning: 88%

- Erosion, flooding, and increasingly powerful hurricanes in coastal areas.
  - Democrats: 61% Very concerning, 28% Somewhat concerning, 5% Not too concerning, 3% Not at all concerning, 8% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Independents: 38% Very concerning, 31% Somewhat concerning, 12% Not too concerning, 7% Not at all concerning, 8% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Republicans: 25% Very concerning, 39% Somewhat concerning, 19% Not too concerning, 8% Not at all concerning, 6% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Total Concerning: 89%

- Disappearance of jobs in historic oil and gas communities as energy needs and use shift.
  - Democrats: 18% Very concerning, 34% Somewhat concerning, 28% Not too concerning, 10% Not at all concerning, 10% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Independents: 22% Very concerning, 36% Somewhat concerning, 20% Not too concerning, 9% Not at all concerning, 13% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Republicans: 31% Very concerning, 36% Somewhat concerning, 18% Not too concerning, 6% Not at all concerning, 8% Don’t know/no opinion
  - Total Concerning: 52%
A majority of voters believe that addressing climate change can help solve all of the issues tested.

Do you believe that addressing climate change could help solve the following issues, or not?

- Excessive air pollution in communities situated near highways, factories, and refineries.
- Warmer, drier conditions and increased drought that leads to wildfires.
- Changes in seasonal rainfall and the severity of heat waves that negatively impact crop yields.
- Erosion, flooding, and increasingly powerful hurricanes in coastal areas.
- Disappearance of jobs in historic oil and gas communities as energy needs and use shift.
Over half of Republicans say they believe addressing climate change can help solve excessive air pollution (60%).

*Do you believe that addressing climate change could help solve the following issues, or not?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warmer, drier conditions and increased drought that leads to wildfires.</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive air pollution in communities situated near highways, factories, and refineries.</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in seasonal rainfall and the severity of heat waves that negatively impact crop yields.</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion, flooding, and increasingly powerful hurricanes in coastal areas.</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappearance of jobs in historic oil and gas communities as energy needs and use shift</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Yes, definitely</th>
<th>Yes, maybe</th>
<th>No, maybe not</th>
<th>No, definitely not</th>
<th>Don’t know/no opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Democrats</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Republicans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmer, drier conditions and increased drought that leads to wildfires.</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive air pollution in communities situated near highways, factories, and refineries.</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in seasonal rainfall and the severity of heat waves that negatively impact crop yields.</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion, flooding, and increasingly powerful hurricanes in coastal areas.</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappearance of jobs in historic oil and gas communities as energy needs and use shift</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Half or more voters in swing districts say they would be more likely to vote for a member of Congress who is committed to addressing each of the issues tested.

Would you be more likely or less likely to vote for a member of Congress who is committed to addressing each of the following issues, or would it make no difference either way in your vote?

**Perceived Impacts of Investing in Climate Change Solutions**

- **Lead pipes poisoning the water they transport in more than 4,000 community water systems around the country.**
  - Much more likely: 37%
  - Somewhat more likely: 34%
  - No difference either way: 24%
  - Somewhat less likely: 4%
  - Much less likely: 71%

- **Excessive air pollution in communities situated near highways, factories, and refineries.**
  - Much more likely: 29%
  - Somewhat more likely: 33%
  - No difference either way: 30%
  - Somewhat less likely: 5%
  - Much less likely: 62%

- **Changes in seasonal rainfall and the severity of heat waves that negatively impact crop yields.**
  - Much more likely: 26%
  - Somewhat more likely: 31%
  - No difference either way: 32%
  - Somewhat less likely: 4%
  - Much less likely: 57%

- **Warmer, drier conditions and increased drought that leads to wildfires.**
  - Much more likely: 25%
  - Somewhat more likely: 31%
  - No difference either way: 32%
  - Somewhat less likely: 5%
  - Much less likely: 56%

- **Erosion, flooding, and increasingly powerful hurricanes in coastal areas.**
  - Much more likely: 24%
  - Somewhat more likely: 32%
  - No difference either way: 33%
  - Somewhat less likely: 4%
  - Much less likely: 56%

- **Disappearance of jobs in historic oil and gas communities as energy needs and use shift.**
  - Much more likely: 19%
  - Somewhat more likely: 32%
  - No difference either way: 38%
  - Somewhat less likely: 5%
  - Much less likely: 51%
Half of Republicans (56%) and two-thirds of Independents (67%) say they would be more likely to vote for a member of Congress who is committed to addressing lead pipes.

Would you be more likely or less likely to vote for a member of Congress who is committed to addressing each of the following issues, or would it make no difference either way in your vote?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Much more likely</th>
<th>Somewhat more likely</th>
<th>No difference either way</th>
<th>Somewhat less likely</th>
<th>Much less likely</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead pipes poisoning the water they transport in more than 4,000 community water systems around the country.</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmer, drier conditions and increased drought that leads to wildfires.</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive air pollution in communities situated near highways, factories, and refineries.</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in seasonal rainfall and the severity of heat waves that negatively impact crop yields.</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion, flooding, and increasingly powerful hurricanes in coastal areas.</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappearance of jobs in historic oil and gas communities as energy needs and use shift</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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