



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

## Environment of the State

In the state of Montana, voters are dissatisfied with the direction of the economy and the President's job performance.

- Attitudes about the direction of the economy tend to be negative (34-59 right direction - wrong track). Clearly there is concern in the state about the economy, as the state's voters want the administration's priority to be improving the economy and job creation (43%) over other issues.

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

Improving the economy and job creation	<b>43</b>
Getting our debt and deficit spending under control	<b>35</b>
Immigration reform	<b>29</b>
Obamacare, including both fixing or replacing the law	<b>25</b>
Foreign challenges, like what is happening in Iraq and Afghanistan	<b>22</b>
Regulations that get us away from coal and toward different energy sources	<b>16</b>
Addressing gay marriage and abortion	<b>5</b>

- The Montana electorate disapproves of President Obama's job performance (33-59 approve-disapprove).
- Voters are engaged in this year's Senate race, as likelihood to vote is 8.24 on a scale of 1-9, with 1 being that you will not be voting and 9 being that you absolutely will be voting.

## EPA Regulations

In terms of the state of the environment, only 12% of the state views the environment as excellent, while most tend to view it as either good (42%) or fair (35%). 11% percent view it as poor.

In terms of perception about the EPA proposed regulations, initially there was some soft support (57-38).

<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>29</b>	<b>20</b>
Somewhat Support	<b>28</b>	<b>20</b>
Somewhat Oppose	<b>14</b>	<b>16</b>
Strongly Oppose	<b>24</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>TOTAL SUPPORT</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>TOTAL OPPOSE</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>55</b>

Among key groups, there was initial support:

- Independents, 58-37
- Women, 59-34

Voters were read a series of statements and asked to rank each one on a scale of 1-9 with 1 being that the statement caused them to be much less supportive of the regulation, 5 neutral, and 9 much more supportive.

Statements that caused voters to be less supportive included that the Obama administration gets to choose what level of reduction each state is supposed to achieve (3.92); it is estimated that there will be 224,000 fewer jobs until 2030 (4.30), and that the regulation will cause energy use and production to go to countries with lower environmental standards like India and China (4.74).

**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>3.92</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>39</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>4.30</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>17</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>4.74</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>31</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>4.89</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>13</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>4.92</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>19</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>4.94</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>There is currently no limit on how much carbon can be pumped into the air by manufacturers and power plants.</b>	<b>5.05</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>According to the EPA's own numbers, in the last four decades, emissions have fallen 72 percent in the US.</b>	<b>5.11</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>President Obama believes we have a moral obligation to act on climate change.</b>	<b>5.52</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>12</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>5.57</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>15</b>
-------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

After hearing the statements, overall support decreased from 57-38 (+19) to 40-55 (-15). Among Independents, support went from 58-37 (+21) to 33-60 (-24). Among women, support dropped from 59-34 (+25) to 39-53 (-14).

While there is openness to the concept behind the regulation, the economic impact of the regulation needs to be effectively conveyed; given existing concern about the economy, once voters understand the economic impact, support decreases.

## **Methodology**

July 16-18, 2014

500 Registered Voters

Margin of Error +/-4.4