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Methodology

• Survey conducted July 26 – August 3, 2014
• Interviews on landline and wireless phones with 434 randomly-selected Iowa registered voters
• Margin of sampling error of +/-4.7%
Exploring Energy Issues
Voters most strongly support increased use of energy efficiency, wind, and solar.

Here is a list of specific sources of energy. Please tell me whether you would support or oppose increasing use of that source of energy to meet your state’s future needs.

- Energy efficiency: 97% support, 2% oppose
- Wind: 93% support, 6% oppose
- Solar: 91% support, 8% oppose
Support for increased energy efficiency is nearly unanimous, across party lines...

**Energy Efficiency by Party**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Energy</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Somewhat Support</th>
<th>Total Oppose</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here is a list of specific sources of energy. Please tell me whether you would support or oppose increasing use of that source of energy to meet your state’s future needs. Split Sample
...among both men and women...

**Energy Efficiency by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Somewhat Support</th>
<th>Total Oppose</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6% Here is a list of specific sources of energy. Please tell me whether you would support or oppose increasing use of that source of energy to meet your state’s future needs. Split Sample
...across all age cohorts...

Energy Efficiency by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Somewhat Support</th>
<th>Total Oppose</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-49</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
...and among voters of all income levels.

**Energy Efficiency by Income**

- **Strongly Support**
- **Somewhat Support**
- **Total Oppose**
- **DK/NA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Somewhat Support</th>
<th>Total Oppose</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$25,000</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$50,000</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$75,000</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$100,000</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6h. Here is a list of specific sources of energy. Please tell me whether you would support or oppose increasing use of that source of energy to meet your state’s future needs. Split Sample
Voters of all parties back more use of wind power in Iowa.

Wind by Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Somewhat Support</th>
<th>Total Oppose</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support for increased use of wind also cuts across income groups.

Wind by Income

- Strongly Support
- Somewhat Support
- Total Oppose
- DK/NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Somewhat Support</th>
<th>Total Oppose</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$25,000</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$50,000</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$75,000</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$100,000</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More than four in five voters of all parties back increased use of solar.

Solar by Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Somewhat Support</th>
<th>Total Oppose</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More than nine in ten voters, regardless of gender, back more use of solar.

**Solar by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Somewhat Support</th>
<th>Total Oppose</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Solid majorities of all age cohorts would like to see more use of solar in Iowa.

**Solar by Age**

- **18-49**
  - Strongly Support: 92%
  - Somewhat Support: 69%
  - Total Oppose: 8%
  - DK/NA: 0%

- **50-64**
  - Strongly Support: 92%
  - Somewhat Support: 55%
  - Total Oppose: 7%
  - DK/NA: 1%

- **65+**
  - Strongly Support: 89%
  - Somewhat Support: 55%
  - Total Oppose: 8%
  - DK/NA: 3%
All income groups back more use of solar power.

Solar by Income

- Strongly Support
- Somewhat Support
- Total Oppose
- DK/NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Somewhat Support</th>
<th>Total Oppose</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$25,000</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$50,000</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$75,000</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$100,000</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Voters see many benefits to renewables.

Thinking about renewable energy like wind and solar power, please tell me if you think each of the following phrases describe renewable energy – very well, somewhat well, not very well, or not at all well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very Well</th>
<th>Somewhat Well</th>
<th>Not Very Well</th>
<th>Not At All Well</th>
<th>No Opin./DK/NA</th>
<th>Total Well</th>
<th>Total Not Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allow us to be more self-reliant for energy</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will help to make our energy supply more secure</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An increasing source of good jobs</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The best power source for our state</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasingly able to replace coal and fossil fuels</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We ought to try to get our energy from as many diverse sources as we can, rather than primarily relying on just a few.

Rather than using more coal, we should move toward cleaner sources of energy.
Voters would rather reduce the need for fossil fuels by expanding the use of energy efficiency and renewables.

Which of the following do you think should be the highest priority for meeting America’s energy needs?

- Reducing our need for oil, natural gas and coal by increasing energy efficiency and expanding our use of clean and renewable energy (61%)
- Drilling and digging for more oil, natural gas, and coal within the United States (27%)
- Both/Neither/DK/NA (11%)
Voters of all parties support an approach to energy that shifts away from fossil fuels.

*Highest Priority for Meeting America’s Energy Needs by Party*

- **Drilling and Digging**
  - Democrats: 12%
  - Independents: 10%
  - Republicans: 41%

- **Reducing Need for Oil**
  - Democrats: 78%
  - Independents: 59%
  - Republicans: 46%

- **Both/Neither/DK/NA**
  - Democrats: 10%
  - Independents: 11%
  - Republicans: 13%

9. Which of the following do you think should be the highest priority for meeting America’s energy needs?
Likewise, they prefer developing transportation choices to pursuing more fossil fuels.

Which of the following do you think should be the highest priority for improving transportation in the United States?

Developing more diverse and affordable transportation choices, including buses, light rail, and cars that run on cleaner fuels – such as biofuels and electric cars

OR

Developing new oil fields and building pipelines, in order to get more Canadian tar sands petroleum to fuel our cars and trucks

Both/Neither/DK/NA
Energy and the Economy
Voters see renewables as a bigger contributor to their economy than coal or natural gas.

Thinking about the economy in your state, how important is each of the following industries to the economy in your state: one of the most important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable energy, including wind and solar power</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers and high technology</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural gas drilling</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism and recreation</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shale gas drilling</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal mining</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Thinking about the economy in your state, how important is each of the following industries to the economy in your state: one of the most important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important? Split Sample
Voters believe increasing the use of renewable energy and energy efficiency projects will create new jobs.

Increasing the use of clean, renewable energy sources like wind and solar power.

Energy efficiency projects like weatherizing and insulating buildings, and upgrading appliances and technology in homes and businesses.

- **Will create new jobs in Iowa**: 77%
- **Will not affect jobs in Iowa**: 10%
- **Will cost jobs in Iowa**: 7%
- **All/None/DK**: 6%

- **87% Believe It Either Does Not Affect/Creates Jobs**
- **89% Believe It Either Does Not Affect/Creates Jobs**

Q10 & Q12. Split Sample
...and reduce energy costs.

Increasing the use of clean, renewable energy sources like wind and solar power.

Energy efficiency projects like weatherizing and insulating buildings, and upgrading appliances and technology in homes and businesses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Will reduce energy costs in Iowa</th>
<th>73% Believe It Either Does Not Affect/Reduces Costs</th>
<th>80% Believe It Either Does Not Affect/Reduces Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will not affect</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energy costs in Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will increase</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energy costs in Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All/None/DK</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11 & Q13. Split Sample
Policy Proposals
I should have the right to put solar on my own home and pay for it how I choose.

Utilities should be able to block residential customers from installing solar power, energy storage and other similar systems on their property.

Voters reject efforts to block consumer access to renewable energy.
We should ensure that all utilities and electricity customers in our state are subject to the same clean, renewable energy requirements.

Our state should build additional electrical transmission lines so that our state can have greater access to wind-generated electricity.

Voters have strong feelings about the way clean energy should be generated.
I would like to read you some ideas related to energy that might be proposed by people in Iowa. Please tell me whether it sounds like something you would support or oppose. Not Part of Split Sample

Voters like the idea of an expanded solar requirement.

Requiring that Iowa get 5% of its electricity from solar power

- Strongly support: 39%
- Somewhat support: 32%
- Somewhat oppose: 12%
- Strongly oppose: 13%
- DK/NA: 4%

Total Support: 71%
Total Oppose: 26%
Most voters, regardless of party, back the idea of getting five percent of Iowa’s energy from solar.
They also support a wide range of other policy proposals to increase clean energy use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making it more affordable for residents and businesses to install solar</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power at their homes or businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in retraining workers to work in clean energy jobs such as</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wind and solar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing state government investment in the development of clean,</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>renewable energy sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing requirements for utilities to invest in energy efficiency</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvements in homes and businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing down older coal-burning power plants and replacing them with</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greater use of renewable energy and energy efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requiring utilities to double the amount of renewable energy they</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They also support a wide range of other policy proposals to increase clean energy use.
Most voters would be willing to pay a little extra on their energy bills to promote clean energy and energy efficiency.

In some – but not all – cases, using more clean and renewable energy may cost more money in the short term. Would you be willing to pay an additional (HALF SAMPLE: $4)/(HALF SAMPLE: $1) per month to ensure that more of your energy comes from clean and renewable sources?

**$4 Per Month**
- Very willing: 36%
- Somewhat willing: 39%
- Somewhat unwilling: 9%
- Very unwilling: 15%
- DK/NA: 0%
- Total Willing: 75%
- Total Unwilling: 24%

**$1 Per Month**
- Very willing: 6%
- Somewhat willing: 29%
- Somewhat unwilling: 6%
- Very unwilling: 10%
- DK/NA: 3%
- Total Willing: 81%
- Total Unwilling: 16%

**Total**
- Very willing: 7%
- Somewhat willing: 34%
- Somewhat unwilling: 7%
- Very unwilling: 13%
- DK/NA: 2%
- Total Willing: 78%
- Total Unwilling: 20%
Federal Carbon Pollution Rules
Voters view the EPA favorably.

The Environmental Protection Agency

- Strongly approve: 24%
- Somewhat approve: 29%
- Somewhat disapprove: 14%
- Strongly disapprove: 14%
- Never heard of: 3%
- Heard of can't rate: 17%

Total Approve: 52%
Total Disapprove: 28%
In principle, voters like the idea of carbon pollution limits.

Limiting the amount of carbon pollution from power plants

Implementing the Environmental Protection Agency’s carbon pollution standards

---|---|---|---|---
80% | 49% | 31% | 6% | 11%
64% | 33% | 30% | 8% | 19% | 9%
Even a plurality of GOP voters backs the carbon pollution standards.

Support for EPA Carbon Pollution Standards, by Party

- Total Support
- Total Oppose
- DK/NA

Democrats: 82%
Independents: 63%
Republicans: 45%
Pluralities of voters in all income groups support them as well.

Support for EPA Carbon Pollution Standards, by Income

- **Total Support**
- **Total Oppose**
- **DK/NA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Total Support</th>
<th>Total Oppose</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$25,000</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$50,000</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$75,000</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$100,000</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to read you some ideas related to energy that might be proposed by people in Iowa. Please tell me whether it sounds like something you would support or oppose. Split Sample.
Given arguments on each side, voters support the plan.

When it comes to the new limits on carbon dioxide emissions being set by the Obama administration and the EPA, which comes closer to your point of view?

**Supporters** say action is needed because coal plants are a major source of carbon pollution. These reductions will mean cleaner air and reduce the health care costs associated with asthma and respiratory diseases by billions of dollars. Significantly lowering carbon pollution is the critical step in addressing climate change and the natural disasters and property damage it causes. These reductions will help create a new generation of clean energy and jobs.

**Opponents** say coal plant carbon emissions have already dropped over the last decade and this action will mean fewer jobs. The compliance costs for electric companies will be three times more expensive than any current EPA regulation, which means higher prices. Consumers and businesses will both end up paying more for electricity. These regulations will mean only a small change to the global climate as carbon emissions in China, India, and other developing countries will continue to rise.

Both/Neither/DK/NA
Messaging for Candidates
Solid majorities of voters from all party back a candidate who favors clean energy.

Preferred Candidate Energy Position by Party

- **Democrats**: 93% for More Renewables, 3% Traditional Sources, 4% Both/Neither/DK/NA
- **Independents**: 73% for More Renewables, 19% Traditional Sources, 7% Both/Neither/DK/NA
- **Republicans**: 58% for More Renewables, 34% Traditional Sources, 9% Both/Neither/DK/NA

21b. In thinking about the election for state office in your area later this year, I am going to read you a series of pairs of descriptions of different candidates. Please tell me which candidate in each pair you think you would be most likely to vote for:
The argument that we already generate enough power is not a persuasive reason to avoid use of renewables.

In thinking about the election for state office in your area later this year, I am going to read you a series of pairs of descriptions of different candidates. Please tell me which candidate in each pair you think you would be most likely to vote for:

A candidate who says that no matter how much electricity we already generate, we still should increase our use of wind and solar power to make a transition to cleaner energy

OR

A candidate who says our state already generates more electricity than it needs, and it makes no sense to increase the use of wind and solar power

Both/Neither/DK/NA

79% 13% 9%
Voters also favor a candidate who wants a transition to renewables.

In thinking about the election for state office in your area later this year, I am going to read you a series of pairs of descriptions of different candidates. Please tell me which candidate in each pair you think you would be most likely to vote for:

A candidate who wants to promote more use of clean, renewable energy – like wind and solar power – in Iowa

OR

A candidate who wants to continue to rely on coal, natural gas or nuclear power to meet Iowa's energy needs

Both/Neither/DK/NA
The strongest positioning for a candidate focuses on middle-income job creation.

In thinking about the elections for state office this November, please tell me how a candidate taking each of the following positions would impact your vote – would it make you more likely or less likely to vote for that candidate, or would it not make much difference in your vote decision?

A candidate who wants to improve the economy by creating more middle-income jobs in the clean energy and clean technology industries, and training Iowa workers to fill them

A candidate who wants to improve the economy by creating more middle-income jobs in the clean energy and clean technology industries

A candidate who wants to reduce government red tape so consumers can choose rooftop solar and any form of financing it

A candidate who wants to promote more use of renewable energy – like wind and solar power

A candidate who wants to make Iowa a leader in developing innovative clean energy technologies
The only negative profile focuses on a candidate who wants to cut support for clean energy.

A candidate who will work to expand transportation options and provide more alternatives to driving, like light rail buses, and more opportunities to walk and bike

A candidate who supports state laws requiring utilities to use more clean energy and increase their energy efficiency

A candidate who wants to stop taxpayer support for oil and gas companies

A candidate who wants to reduce government red tape so that there can be more oil and gas development in your state

A candidate who wants to keep energy prices low, regardless of where the energy comes from

A candidate who wants to stop taxpayer support for solar and wind energy companies

---

20. In thinking about the elections for state office this November, please tell me how a candidate taking each of the following positions would impact your vote – would it make you more likely or less likely to vote for that candidate, or would it not make much difference in your vote decision? Split Sample
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