



To: American Energy Alliance
From: The Winston Group
Subject: North Carolina Survey Summary
Date: July 24, 2014

Environment of the State

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

- Voter outlook toward the direction of the economy tends to be negative (36-55 right direction - wrong track).
- The top priority among the electorate is improving the economy and job creation (49%).

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

Improving the economy and job creation	49
Getting our debt and deficit spending under control	31
Immigration reform	25
Obamacare, including both fixing or replacing the law	27
Foreign challenges, like what is happening in Iraq and Afghanistan	16
Regulations that get us away from coal and toward different energy sources	11
Addressing gay marriage and abortion	5

- They also tend to disapprove of the President's job performance (41-55 approve-disapprove).
- Voters are engaged in this year's Senate race, as likelihood to vote is 7.94 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 4% of the state views the environment as excellent, while most tend to view it as either good (35%) or fair (47%). 14% view it as poor.

When asked about the proposed EPA regulations, there was initially an openness to the emission reduction rule (59-32 support-oppose).

- There was stronger support among Independents (63-31), women (61-29), and young voters (67-23).

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	29	24
Somewhat Support	31	20
Somewhat Oppose	14	21
Strongly Oppose	17	27
TOTAL SUPPORT	59	44
TOTAL OPPOSE	32	48

Voters were then 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. As a way to measure overall credibility of the statement they were allowed to respond that they did not believe the statement at all.

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 (4.29); it is estimated that there will be 224,000 fewer jobs until 2030 (4.52), and that the regulation will increase household electricity rates and lead to a loss of \$500 a year in disposable household income (4.72).

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.	4.29	23	34	18

<p>According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, it is estimated that there will be 224,000 fewer jobs every year until 2030.</p>	4.52	23	33	18
<p>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.</p>	4.72	30	34	12
<p>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.</p>	4.82	29	32	15
<p>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.</p>	4.99	30	29	9
<p>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.</p>	5.15	28	23	18
<p>There is currently no limit on how much carbon can be pumped into the air by manufacturers and power plants.</p>	5.34	33	22	21
<p>According to the EPA's own numbers, in the last four decades, emissions have fallen 72 percent in the US.</p>	5.42	32	20	12
<p>President Obama believes we have a moral obligation to act on climate change.</p>	5.69	43	25	11
<p>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.</p>	6.03	47	19	12

After hearing the statements, overall support decreased from 59-32 (+27) to 44-48 (-4).

- Among Independents, support went from 63-31 (+32) to 50-46 (+4).
- Among women, support dropped from 61-29 (+32) to 43-47 (-4).
- Young voters still supported the measure 63-35 (+28), a drop in support from the original 67-23 (+44), but there was significant support remaining.

Political Impact of a Carbon Tax

Voters are more unfavorable on the issue of carbon taxes—nearly half (48%) of respondents said they would be less likely to vote for a candidate who supports a carbon tax, while 24% say they would be more likely to support such a candidate and 25% say there would be no impact on their vote.

Would you be more likely or less likely to support a candidate for US Senate if he or she supports a carbon tax, or would it have no impact?

More likely	24
Less likely	48
No impact	25

- Among women, 22% are more likely to support a candidate who supports a carbon tax and 43% are less likely (31% no impact)
- 26% of Independents are more likely to support and 52% are less likely (19% no impact).
- 18-34 year olds are split 30-37-32 more-less-no impact.

Overall, voters display a mild concern about environmental issues that is generally outweighed by worries about the economic impact of the EPA's proposed regulations. Independents and women tend to be more open to environmental regulation than the state as a whole, but in a state that is conscious of the challenges the economy faces, North Carolina voters are responsive to arguments that convey the economic impacts the EPA regulations would have.

Methodology

July 19-21, 2014
500 Registered Voters
Margin of Error +/-4.4