



**To: American Energy Alliance**  
**From: The Winston Group**  
**Subject: Colorado Survey Summary**  
**Date: July 22, 2014**

## Environment of the State

In the state of Colorado, there is dissatisfaction with the economy and the President's performance.

- Attitudes about the direction of the economy tend to be negative (43-48 right direction - wrong track).
- As a result of concern about the economy, voters' priority for the Obama administration is improving the economy and job creation (46%), with debt/deficit spending second (32%). Energy regulations (17%) are farther down the list.

### Which of the following should be the top priority for the Obama administration right now? (CHOOSE TWO)

Improving the economy and job creation	<b>46</b>
Getting our debt and deficit spending under control	<b>32</b>
Immigration reform	<b>28</b>
Obamacare, including both fixing or replacing the law	<b>21</b>
Foreign challenges, like what is happening in Iraq and Afghanistan	<b>19</b>
Regulations that get us away from coal and toward different energy sources	<b>17</b>
Addressing gay marriage and abortion	<b>7</b>

- The Colorado electorate tends to disapprove of President Obama's job performance (46-50 approve-disapprove). Among independents, the President's job approval is particularly unfavorable (37-58).
- Likelihood to vote in the Senate race is high (8.26 on a scale of 1-9 with 1 being not voting and 9 being absolutely voting).

## EPA Regulations

In terms of the state of the environment, only 9% of the state views the environment as excellent (9%), while most tend to view it as either good (38%) or fair (41%). 10% view it as poor.

Looking specifically at an EPA regulation to require a 30% reduction in carbon emissions, initially 57% of the state supported it, while 36% opposed. After hearing statements about the regulation, voters were opposed 44-50.

<b>Last month in June, the Environmental Protection Agency proposed regulations that will require a 30% reduction in carbon emissions by 2030. Generally speaking do you support or oppose this proposed regulation?</b>	Before Statements	After Statements
Strongly Support	<b>37</b>	<b>27</b>
Somewhat Support	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>
Somewhat Oppose	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>
Strongly Oppose	<b>27</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>TOTAL SUPPORT</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>TOTAL OPPOSE</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>50</b>

Among key groups, initial support is generally positive:

- Independents, 51-41
- Women, 64-28
- Hispanics, 59-30

Statements that caused voters to be less supportive of the regulation included that the Obama administration gets to choose what level of reduction each state is supposed to achieve (4.00); it is estimated that there will be 224,000 fewer jobs every year until 2030 (4.41), and that the regulation will cause energy use and production to go to countries with lower environmental standards like India and China (4.60).

**Statements ranked on a scale of 1-9, with 1 being that it makes you much less supportive of the regulation, 5 neutral and 9 much more supportive of the regulation.**

	Mean	More Supportive	Less Supportive	Do Not Believe
<b>The Obama administration gets to choose what level of reduction each state is supposed to achieve.</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, it is estimated that there will be 224,000 fewer jobs every year until 2030.</b>	<b>4.41</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>If this regulation goes into effect, many say that it will cause energy use and production, along with the jobs they support, to go to countries with lower environmental standards, like China and India, which would end up hurting the environment.</b>	<b>4.60</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Up to one-third of the 1000 coal-fired facilities will have to close because of this regulation. Together, these power plants supply 40% of the nation's energy.</b>	<b>4.68</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>At a time when the US economy is already shrinking, we can't afford these regulations. According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, regulations of this type are expected to increase household electricity rates and lead to a loss of \$500 a year in disposable household income – an impact that will hurt the low income and middle class the most.</b>	<b>4.70</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>There is currently no limit on how much carbon can be pumped into the air by manufacturers and power plants.</b>	<b>4.97</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>The changes will not do much, if anything to change the climate. Even if the US were to eliminate all carbon dioxide emissions, which includes coal, the earth's temperature is predicted to change by less than 0.17 degrees Celsius in the year 2100.</b>	<b>5.01</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>According to the EPA's own numbers, in the last four decades, emissions have fallen 72 percent in the US.</b>	<b>5.36</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>15</b>

<b>Some say the added benefits of this regulation will be to protect public health by preventing thousands of premature deaths and up to 150,000 asthma attacks in children.</b>	<b>5.66</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>President Obama believes we have a moral obligation to act on climate change.</b>	<b>5.71</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>14</b>

After hearing the battery of statements, support drops from 57-36 (+21) to 44-50 (-6).

Among key groups, support for the regulation among women decreases to 64-28 (+36) to 49-45 (+4); among Independents, support goes from 51-41 (+10) to 37-57 (-20); among Hispanics, from 59-30 (+29) to 29-66 (-37).

## Political Impact of Keystone Pipeline

Opposition to the Keystone Pipeline is not a position that Colorado voters would view favorably. Nearly half (46%) Colorado voters say they would be less likely to support a Senate candidate who opposed the Pipeline, and only 25% say it would cause them to be more likely to support.

### More/less likely to support a candidate for US Senate if he or she opposes construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline, or would it have no impact?

More likely	<b>25</b>
Less likely	<b>46</b>
No impact	<b>28</b>

Key groups such as Independents would be particularly unfavorable to a candidate who opposed the Pipeline (18-52 more-less likely, 30% no impact); among women, 36% would be less likely to support a candidate with that position, while only 31% would be more likely to support (31% no impact). Among Hispanics, it would tend to have no impact (52%) but opposing the Pipeline would not be a positive for a candidate (14-32 more-less likely).

In sum, voters in Colorado are concerned about the economy and want that to be the priority among issues, so the economic impacts of the EPA regulation and opposition to the Keystone Pipeline are likely to give Colorado voters significant concern about the proposed measures.

## **Methodology**

July 16-18, 2014

500 Registered Voters

Margin of Error +/-4.4