



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

Environment of the State

Like voters nationally, Iowa voters are concerned about the direction of the economy and the President's performance, which presents a competitive environment.

- Attitudes about the direction of the economy tend to be neutral (46-46 right direction - wrong track).
- Reflecting concerns about the economy, Iowa voters want the administration's priority to be improving the economy and job creation (45%).

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

Improving the economy and job creation	45
Getting our debt and deficit spending under control	33
Obamacare, including both fixing or replacing the law	28
Immigration reform	25
Foreign challenges, like what is happening in Iraq and Afghanistan	18
Regulations that get us away from coal and toward different energy sources	13
Addressing gay marriage and abortion	4

- The Iowa electorate tends to disapprove of President Obama's job performance (41-55 approve-disapprove), reflecting national trends in the President's job approval.
- Likelihood to vote is high (7.82 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 8% of the state views the environment as excellent, while most tend to view it as either good (36%) or fair (44%). 12% percent view it as poor.

In terms of the proposed EPA regulation, there is openness to the concept (64-31 support-oppose), but as we have observed in other states, once voters become more informed about implications of the regulation, support decreases.

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?	Before Statements After Statements	
	Strongly Support	33
Somewhat Support	30	23
Somewhat Oppose	11	19
Strongly Oppose	20	29
TOTAL SUPPORT	64	44
TOTAL OPPOSE	31	48

Voters were read a series of statements about the regulation both in support and opposing the regulation. Statements that caused them to be less supportive of the regulation were that the Obama administration gets to choose what level of reduction each state is supposed to achieve (3.99), that estimates show that there will be 224,000 fewer jobs every year until 2030 (4.56), and that the regulation may cause energy use and production to go to countries like China and India (4.70).

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
The Obama administration gets to choose what level of reduction each state is supposed to achieve.	3.99	19	41	17
According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, it is estimated that there will be 224,000 fewer jobs every year until 2030.	4.56	25	36	18

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.	4.70	29	32	14
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.	4.77	24	28	19
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.	4.78	26	31	9
There is currently no limit on how much carbon can be pumped into the air by manufacturers and power plants.	4.86	26	28	19
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.	5.06	33	31	9
According to the EPA's own numbers, in the last four decades, emissions have fallen 72 percent in the US.	5.28	32	22	10
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.	5.58	43	25	11
President Obama believes we have a moral obligation to act on climate change.	5.58	43	27	9

After hearing the battery of statements, support for the regulation decreased from 64-31 (+23) to 44-48 (-4). Among key groups, support among Independents went from 65-31 (+34) to 43-50 (-7). Among women, support decreased from 72-20 (+52) to 50-39 (+11).

Opposition to Keystone Pipeline

On the issue of the Keystone Pipeline, voters would be more unfavorable to a candidate who opposed the Pipeline (27-41 more-less likely, 31% no impact), so taking the position of opposing the Pipeline is likely to be a negative for a candidate in Iowa.

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	27
Less likely	41
No impact	31

Methodology

July 18-20

500 Registered Voters

Margin of Error +/- 4.4