

Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg

Americans Worried About Global Warming, Bush Not Doing Enough

Summary

Americans are growing increasingly concerned about what could be considered competing concerns – maintaining a healthy natural environment and cheap available energy – and would like to see the federal government take a more aggressive stance on both, according to the latest Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg poll. If there is conflict, and most Americans do not believe that safeguarding the environment automatically conflicts with economic growth, most would pick the green alternative.

The survey of 1478 adults nationwide, with a margin of sampling error of plus or minus three percentage points, found Americans concerned that the U.S. is seriously off on the wrong track when it comes to ensuring a healthy environment for the future and overwhelmingly convinced that global warming is a serious problem. Most think the Bush administration is doing too little to clean up the environment and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and they don't trust U.S. business to protect the environment on their own. The public is looking to the federal government, rather than the states to take action to reduce the country's carbon dioxide emissions and they support government investment in renewable and alternative forms of energy.

This has been a long hot summer, creating a record consumption of energy in many locations, and gasoline prices have stayed well above last year's average. Most in the survey reported taking a financial hit from the higher cost of heating, cooling and driving, forcing them to either conserve or cut back spending in other areas. They would like to see the government reduce U.S. dependency on foreign oil by investing in alternative energy sources. Coming in a distant second, but still ranking above other options like raising fuel taxes or increasing fuel efficiency, was the relaxation of environmental standards for drilling to increase the flow of U.S. oil. The survey also found Americans still opposed to the idea of tapping oil reserves in the environmentally sensitive Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska, but growing increasingly more willing to entertain the idea, as well as more supportive of building nuclear power plants to help combat global warming.

The public tends to agree with George W. Bush that new technologies, rather than the imposition of restrictions on businesses and car manufacturers, are the way to go when thinking about the country's environmental and energy needs, but even so, they are not enthusiastic about how the president has handled environmental issues so far. A majority said the administration is doing too little to protect the environment and while the country gave him a somewhat divided 47% disapprove to 41% job approval in that area, his record on the environment inspires more passion in the negative than the positive—nearly twice as many disapproved strongly as approved strongly. In addition, nearly three out of five say he's not done enough to deal with global warming. And it isn't just Bush, it is his party as well. By more than two to one, Americans said they look to Democrats in Congress to do a better job than their Republican counterparts when it comes to protecting the environment.

Global Warming

Many scientists believe that greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide act as a kind of greenhouse for the Earth, reflecting heat back into the atmosphere. Concentration of "greenhouse gases" that cause this effect are rising steadily and many contend that human activities such as deforestation and the use of fossil fuels is the cause. They say that unless concentrations of greenhouse gases are reduced, the increased global temperatures

resulting from all that trapped heat will melt the polar ice caps and cause disastrous weather changes, flooding, and disruption of animal habitats.

Global warming has been the subject of continuing political debate in Congress, with some, especially those on the right, contending that human activities are not to blame for global warming. That is also the case among the public, the survey found. While overall the majority said that global warming is a serious problem and even a majority of Republicans said they are taking climate change seriously, more than twice as many Democrats as Republicans said that global warming is a *very* serious problem, and a 57% majority of Democrats attribute it to human activity, compared to barely over a third of Republicans.

Overall, concern about global warming has risen nationwide over the past five years, along with awareness of the issue. In March 2001, The Los Angeles Times poll asked a similar question, and found just over two-thirds overall saying it was a serious problem at that time. Today, 73% nationwide say it is a serious problem. The public is becoming more aware of the issue – the proportion of those who hadn't heard enough about it to offer an opinion or weren't sure dropped 10 points over that time, from 18% in 2001 to 8% today.

Concern about global warming is sharpening with awareness – the proportion who said that global warming is a *very* serious problem increased from 33% in 2001 to 43% today. However, in a sharp underscoring of the partisan nature of the issue, the proportion of Republicans who consider global warming a serious problem has *dropped* seven points in the last half decade – from 61% to 54% -- while the proportion of concerned Democrats is approaching consensus, having risen sixteen points over that same period of time to nearly nine out of ten. Independents side with Democrats on this matter, by 81% who say it is serious, to 14% who say it is not.

From what you have heard or read, do you think global warming is a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, not too much of a problem or not a problem at all, or haven't you heard enough about this to say?

	----- 7/2006 -----				----- 4/2001 [†] -----			
	<u>All</u>	<u>Dem</u>	<u>Ind</u>	<u>Rep</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Dem</u>	<u>Ind</u>	<u>Rep</u>
Serious problem (net)	<u>73</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>61</u>
Very serious problem	43	57	48	23	33	40	31	23
Somewhat serious problem	31	31	33	31	35	32	41	38
Not a serious problem (net)	<u>19</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>29</u>
Not too much problem	11	4	9	19	8	6	2	16
Not a problem at all	8	1	5	18	6	1	6	13
Haven't heard/ Not sure	8	7	5	9	18	22	20	10

[†] Source: Los Angeles Times poll #458 4/2001

Natural Causes vs. Human Activity

Even though a larger proportion of the nation overall now call global warming a serious problem, the proportion who do not believe that it is entirely caused by human activities has increased as well. It may be that arguments such as that made by U.S. Sen. James M. Inhofe (R-Okla), who in 2003 called global warming "the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the American people" and attributed climate change to natural causes, have made inroads into public opinion in the past half decade.

In 2001, a full three out of five attributed global warming to human activity but that number has dropped to below half (47%) today, while at the same time the 20% who said it was a natural phenomenon in 2001 has swelled to nearly a third (32%) today. About the same proportion then and now said it can be attributed to a combination of human and natural sources. This year, President Bush said that both natural and human activities add greenhouse gases to the environment, and questioned whether scientists know enough about the problem to draw definitive conclusions.

That global warming is caused by human activity has continued to be a matter of faith for people under thirty—more than three in five both then and now believed that is the case. By comparison, the proportion of those 30 years old or older who believe that has dropped 15 points - from 60% then to 45% now. Democrats are also holding on fairly

firmly onto the idea, at 57% now compared to 63% in 2001, while Independents have dropped from 60% to 51% and Republicans from 55% to 36% today.

Do you think [global warming] is caused more by human activities, such as driving cars and burning fuel, or is it caused more by natural changes in the climate?

	----- 7/2006 -----						----- 4/2001 [†] -----					
	<u>All</u>	<u>Dem</u>	<u>Ind</u>	<u>Rep</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Dem</u>	<u>Ind</u>	<u>Rep</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Human activities	47	57	51	36	62	45	60	63	60	55	63	60
Natural climate changes	32	25	25	45	24	34	20	16	16	26	17	20
Both (volunteered)	16	15	18	13	11	16	15	15	22	14	19	14
Don't Know	5	3	6	6	3	5	5	6	2	5	1	6

[†]Source: Los Angeles Times poll #458 4/2001

Record-setting heat in July nationwide as well as recent big storms like Katrina have fueled speculation that global warming is to blame. In general, most Americans don't attribute the recent dramatic weather to global warming – just over a third nationwide did so, compared to 46% who said global warming is not to blame and 9% who weren't sure. Younger people are the most inclined to believe that global warming is to blame– 45% of those under age 30 blamed climate change for the recent weather compared to 35% of people ages 30 to 64. Most skeptical of all are those of retirement age – only 28% saw the global hand of an overheating atmosphere in the drowned city of New Orleans and the scorching heat of summer.

Political Ramifications

George W. Bush and the Republicans in Congress have come under increasing criticism from Democrats and environmental activists for not completely acknowledging global warming as a serious issue. During his first term, Bush questioned the science behind climate change. This past June, in a speech on the topic of global warming, Bush acknowledged climate warming trends but stopped short of attributing the problem to human activity and called for market-based and technological solutions to emissions control.

By a ten percentage point margin, more Americans say the country is on the wrong track when it comes to ensuring a healthy environment for the future than see it as moving in the right direction and they rate Bush negatively on his record on the environment. In addition, the public is more than twice as likely to pick Democrats over Republicans as the party more likely to do a better job in Congress on environmental issues. Even 30% of Republicans picked the other party, along with 77% of Democrats and just under a third of independents. Only 17% of independents picked Republicans as the best guardians of the environment, with 23% saying “neither party” and 28% not sure.

The public tends to agree with those who criticize Bush for neglecting to work to preserve the environment, the survey found, with only his most partisan base behind him. More than seven in 10 of those who consider global warming a problem are critical of the Bush administration on the issues, while the vast majority of those who do not consider it a problem (most of whom are self-described conservatives and/or Republican) think Bush is doing just enough. Partisanship plays a big role, of course, with roughly three out of four Democrats overall saying Bush has done too little on the environment compared to only three in 10 Republicans. Independents again side with the Democrats on this one, with nearly three in five saying he has not done enough.

When it comes to (**protecting the environment/reducing global warming**), is the Bush administration doing too much, too little, or just the right amount?

		Party Affiliation			Global Warming*:	
	<u>All</u>	<u>Dem</u>	<u>Ind</u>	<u>Rep</u>	Serious <u>Problem</u>	Not a <u>Problem</u>
<i>Protecting the environment</i>						
Too much	3	3	4	4	3	5
Too little	56	74	57	30	67	19
Right amount	36	20	31	60	26	70
Don't know	5	3	8	6	4	6
<i>Reducing global warming</i>						
Too much	3	1	-	5	1	10
Too little	58	79	65	33	72	15
Right amount	29	14	23	48	20	62
Don't know	10	6	11	14	7	13

* summarized for brevity, see attached tables for actual question wording

Energy Costs, Regulations, and Availability

Most of the public said that they have been forced to either conserve energy or cut back spending in order to pay higher energy bills over the last six months, so cost and availability of energy are having a direct impact on people's lives. When asked to pick among a selection of ideas for reducing U.S. dependence on foreign oil, a majority said that they think the government should invest in alternative energy sources such as wind or solar power. This was the most popular idea by far, outpacing the next most popular alternative - relaxing environmental regulations on drilling for new oil reserves – by more than two to one (52% - 20%.) An additional 8% supported an increase in gasoline taxes or the imposition of regulations that would force better mileage standards for passenger vehicles, while only 6% said they liked the idea of building more nuclear power plants best.

Nuclear Power Plants

Interest in building nuclear power plants waned in the U.S. after the Three Mile Island and Chernobyl incidents in the 1970's and 80's but concern over global climate change coupled with the need to expand U.S. energy options has helped renew interest in nuclear power among government officials and environmental activists. Nuclear power plants have safety issues and require the long-term disposal of radioactive waste, but they do not add greenhouse gases to the environment and they reduce dependency on gas-emitting fossil fuels.

Even though the public ranked nuclear power very low in the list of options for decreasing U.S. dependency on foreign oil, the survey found that there is strong support for nuclear power when it is framed as a means of combating global warming. When asked if they would support the use of nuclear power as a source of energy to reduce dependency on fossil fuels which emit greenhouse gases, three out of five said yes, including about a third who said they would strongly support it. Public support for nuclear power as a way to combat global warming has increased nine points since 2001. At that time, just over half supported the idea.

Emissions of Greenhouse Gases

Most Americans (78%) want the federal government do more to address the issue of reducing carbon dioxide emissions, which have been linked to increased global temperature, and they would be willing to pay higher energy costs to see that happen. Even roughly three out of five of those who think global warming is due to natural causes would like to see the government do more to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. When asked specifically if it would be better for the government to place a cap on vehicle and business emissions, or to actively encourage development of new technologies, the public was five times as likely to choose the idea of new technologies. This is basically the position that the Bush administration has been advocating – voluntary caps and market incentives for development of technological answers. In a follow up question, more than four out of five of those who said they think the government should do more to reduce emissions said that they would still say so even if such actions resulted in higher energy prices.

Several states, including California, have set regulatory caps on emissions of greenhouse gases that are stricter than those imposed nationwide. State governors have been taking action on a local basis in response to what they portray as foot-dragging on national emissions control by the federal government. As a case in point, the Los Angeles Times reported on Tuesday that California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed what may be a largely symbolic agreement with British Prime Minister Tony Blair, agreeing "...to work together to curb greenhouse emissions, promote cleaner-burning fuels and collaborate on research to fight global warming."¹

The survey found that a seventeen point majority – 54% to 37% -- think it is the role of the federal government to set a minimum emissions standard for the whole country, rather than letting individual states handle regulations as they see fit. Republicans split almost evenly on this idea (47% states to 45% federal), compared to Democrats who were more than twice as likely (62% to 29%) to want central government regulations rather than a patchwork of state laws. Independents agreed with Democrats on this issue by a smaller 11 point margin - 52% to 41%.

Most Americans do not trust businesses to protect the environment without government regulation – almost three out of four said that businesses will cut corners and damage the environment if not regulated, while 22% said that most businesses can be trusted and the government should intervene only in the worst cases. The public is optimistic, however, that protecting the environment does not have to conflict with economic growth, long a contention of those who are looking to dismantle or weaken environmental protection laws. Almost three times as many said it does not have to conflict as said that it does (70% compared to 25%). When there is conflict, about three in five said that protecting the environment should be the top priority.

Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge

When respondents were told that drilling in Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWAR) could supply enough fuel to last the U.S. six months to three years, 51% agreed with opponents who oppose drilling on the grounds that it would damage the environment in an unspoiled part of the country. Forty-five percent agreed with supporters of drilling who say that the country needs to do whatever is required to expand oil supplies. About two in five strongly disapprove of drilling in ANWAR, compared to 28% who strongly approve. Even a majority of those who said they are feeling the pinch of higher energy prices were opposed to drilling.

However, opposition to drilling in ANWAR is softening some, the survey found. In 2001, opponents outranked supporters of drilling by more than twenty points -- 55% to 34% -- while in the current survey the margin is a much tighter 6 points, with support rising eleven points and opposition declining four.

Strongest opposition to drilling in ANWAR today is found among young people: 66% of 18 to 29 year olds were opposed along with 60% of 30 to 44 year olds, compared to 46% of 45 to 64 year olds and 37% of those over sixty-five. Also, among those living in the East (57%) and West (65%) compared to those in the Midwest (50%) and South (41%). Women are opposed by 55% to 40% while men are split - 50% favor compared to 47% opposed.

National Parks and Forests

Nearly three quarters of the public have visited national parks and roughly a quarter say they go every year, according to the poll. Most favor limiting or restricting access to popular national parks in order to protect natural habitats and wildlife over providing more access to over-crowded public natural places by adding roads or opening up further parklands to snowmobiles and ATVs. Just over three in four said they favor limitations on access, compared to 18% who would like to give the public greater access.

Majorities across the country oppose greater access to parklands, varying only by degree. Opposition is greatest in the New England area, where 92% favored restrictions, and lowest in the "Deep South" i.e. Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia and South Carolina where nearly three in 10 favor greater access for more roads and vehicles on public lands. However, opposition is still a strong nearly two-thirds in that area.

In 2004, President Bush canceled a nationwide ban on logging and road building in the national forests that Bill Clinton had put in place before leaving office in 2000. Bush asked each state to designate which forest areas should be protected, and which should be opened to logging and road building. The public split, with 45% each lining up

¹ *Governor, Blair Reach Environmental Accord*, Deborah Schoch and Janet Wilson, Los Angeles Times, 8/1/2006

behind whether the federal government, or individual states should make the decision about what forests to protect. Democrats sided with a national approach by 55% to 34% while Republicans favored giving individual states' the right to manage their own forests by 58% to 33%. Independents were more split, but tending toward a national approach by 47% to 43%.

Analysis by Jill Darling Richardson

Results from the Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg Poll
July 28 through August 1, 2006
(The Environment)

Guide to Column Headings

ALL	All adults
DEM	Self-described Democrats
IND	Self-described Independents
REP	Self-described Republicans
MEN	Males
WOM	Females
18-29	18-to-29 year-olds
30+	30-year-olds and older

Note:

(vol.) indicates of voluntarily response

‘-’ indicates of less than 0.5%

Q3. Do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling environmental issues? (IF APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE) Do you (approve/disapprove) strongly or do you (approve/disapprove) somewhat?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Approve (net)	<u>41</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>41</u>
Approve strongly	<u>17</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>17</u>
Approve somewhat	<u>25</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>24</u>
Disapprove (net)	<u>47</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>46</u>
Disapprove somewhat	<u>14</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>14</u>
Disapprove strongly	<u>33</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>32</u>
Don't know	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>13</u>

Q16. Thinking now about the energy costs for your household, such as heating, air conditioning, electricity and gasoline prices. Has there been a rise in your household energy costs over the last six months, or not? (IF YES) Has the rise in your household energy costs made you cut back spending on other things, or have you tried to conserve energy, or have you not done either of those things?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Cut/conserve (net)	<u>75</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>76</u>
Yes, needed to cut back	<u>12</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>12</u>
Yes, tried to conserve energy	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>29</u>
Yes, have done both (cut back and conserve) (vol.)	<u>33</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>35</u>
Does not apply (net)	<u>13</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>12</u>
No rise in costs	<u>12</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>11</u>
Don't pay energy bills (vol.)	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>
No, don't need to cut back or conserve	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>
Don't know	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>

(ORDER OF ACTIONS ROTATED)

Q17. As you may know, the United States depends on foreign countries for oil. Which of the following would be the best way for the U.S. to reduce reliance on foreign oil: increase the gasoline tax, or have government invest in alternative energy sources, such as wind and solar power, or permit more nuclear power plants to be built, or relax environmental standards for more drilling for oil and gas, or impose stricter mileage standards to increase fuel efficiency for automobiles even if the cost of some cars may increase, or is there something else that the U.S. can do to reduce reliance on foreign countries for oil?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Increase gasoline tax	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
Government investment in								
Alternative energy sources	<u>52</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>49</u>
Permit more nuclear power plants	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>
Relax environmental standards for more drilling for oil and gas	<u>20</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>22</u>
Impose stricter mileage standards to increase fuel efficiency	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>
Other	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>
All of these (vol.)	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
None of these (vol.)	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>2</u>
Don't know	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>

Q45. When it comes to ensuring a healthy environment for the future, do you think the United States is going in the right direction or is it seriously off on the wrong track?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Right direction	41	26	34	64	46	37	38	42
Wrong track	51	68	60	27	48	54	55	50
Don't know	8	6	6	9	6	9	7	8

(ORDER OF NEXT TWO QUESTIONS IS ROTATED)

Q46. When it comes to protecting the environment, is the Bush administration doing too much, or too little, or just the right amount to protect the environment?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Too much	3	3	4	4	4	2	5	3
Too little	56	74	57	30	56	56	58	55
Right amount	36	20	31	60	36	36	31	37
Don't know	5	3	8	6	4	6	6	5

Q47. When it comes to reducing global warming in particular, is the Bush administration doing too much, or too little, or just the right amount to reduce global warming?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Too much	3	1	1	5	5	1	2	3
Too little	58	79	65	33	57	59	57	58
Right amount	29	14	23	48	30	27	29	29
Don't know	10	6	11	14	8	13	12	10

Q48. Which political party do you think does a better job in Congress when it comes to handling environmental issues, the Democrats or the Republicans?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Democrats	50	77	32	30	49	52	55	50
Republicans	22	3	17	46	25	20	28	21
Neither (vol.)	12	6	23	11	15	9	5	13
Don't know	16	14	28	13	11	19	12	16

Q49. Generally speaking, do you think improving the environment conflicts with economic growth, or do you think improving the environment does not have to conflict with economic growth? (IF CONFLICTS WITH ECONOMIC GROWTH) Do you think it conflicts always, or most of the time, or some of the time?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Conflict (net)	<u>25</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>23</u>
Always	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>
Most of the time	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>
Some of the time	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>10</u>
Does not have to conflict	<u>70</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>71</u>
Don't know	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>

Q50. Whether or not you personally think improving the environment conflicts with economic growth, if there is conflict, which should take priority -- improving the environment, or economic growth?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Environment	<u>57</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>58</u>
Economy	<u>35</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>34</u>
Don't know	<u>8</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>

ORDER OF ARGUMENTS ROTATED)

Q51. Which of the following statements comes closer to your view: "Many businesses can be trusted to take good care of the nation's natural resources, and the government should intervene only in the worst cases," or "Many businesses will cut corners and damage the environment unless strong government rules and regulations are in place"?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Businesses can be trusted	<u>22</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>22</u>
Businesses will cut corners	<u>75</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>75</u>
Don't know	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>

Q52. As you may know, scientists have found evidence that the earth's climate is warming. From what you have heard or read, do you think global warming is a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, not too much of a problem or not a problem at all, or haven't you heard enough about this to say?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Problem (net)	<u>73</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>73</u>
Very serious problem	<u>43</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>43</u>
Somewhat serious problem	<u>31</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>30</u>
Not a problem (net)	<u>19</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>20</u>
Not too much of a problem	<u>11</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>
Not a problem at all	<u>8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>
Haven't heard or read	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>5</u>
Don't know	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>2</u>

Q53. What do you think is causing global warming? Do you think it is caused more by human activities, such as driving cars and burning fuel, or is it caused more by natural changes in the climate?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Caused by human activities	<u>47</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>45</u>
Caused by natural changes in climate	<u>32</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>34</u>
Both (vol.)	<u>16</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>16</u>
Haven't heard enough (vol.)	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
Don't know	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>

Q54. In particular, what do you think is causing the recent big storms like Katrina and hotter than normal temperatures? Do you think they are caused by global warming, or do you think they are caused by natural changes in the climate?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Caused by global warming	<u>36</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>34</u>
Caused by natural changes in climate	<u>46</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>48</u>
Both (vol.)	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>
Haven't heard enough (vol.)	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Don't know	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>

Q55. As you may know, there is evidence linking higher levels of carbon dioxide to increased global temperature. Do you believe that the federal government should do more to address the issue of reducing carbon dioxide emissions, or not? (IF SHOULD NOT DO MORE) Is that because you think the government is doing enough to reduce emissions already, or because you think the government shouldn't get involved in trying to reduce carbon dioxide emissions? (IF SHOULD DO MORE) Is the best approach to put a cap on carbon dioxide emissions on vehicles and businesses, or is the best approach to create market incentives to encourage development of new technologies that will reduce carbon dioxide emissions?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Enough (net)	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>16</u>
Government is doing enough	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>
Government should stay out	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>
Do more (net)	<u>78</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>77</u>
Government should cap carbon dioxide emissions	<u>11</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>11</u>
Government should set market incentives to develop new technologies	<u>56</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>53</u>
Both (vol.)	<u>12</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>13</u>
Don't know	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7</u>

(ASKED OF THOSE WHO THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD TAKE ACTION)

Q56. If you knew that government action to reduce carbon dioxide emissions would result in higher energy prices, would you still say that the government should do more to reduce emissions, or not?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Government should still do more	<u>84</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>86</u>
Changed mind	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>8</u>
Don't know	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>

(ASKED OF EVERYONE)

Q57. One suggestion for reducing the problem of global warming is to increase the use of nuclear power as a source of energy and to decrease the use of fossil fuels, such as oil and natural gas. Would you, personally, support or oppose the increased use of nuclear power as a source of energy in order to prevent global warming? (IF SUPPORT OR OPPOSE) Do you strongly (support/oppose) that or only somewhat (support/oppose) that?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Support (net)	<u>61</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>59</u>
Strongly support	<u>32</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>31</u>
Somewhat support	<u>29</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>28</u>
Oppose (net)	<u>30</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>33</u>
Somewhat oppose	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>13</u>
Strongly oppose	<u>18</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>20</u>
Don't know	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>

(ORDER OF ARGUMENTS IN TEXT ROTATED)

Q58. As you may know, several states have taken action to curtail emissions that contribute to global warming because they say the federal government is not doing enough to address the issue. Do you think it is better to allow individual states to set their own emissions standards, or do you think that the federal government should set a minimum standard for the whole country?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Role of the states	37	29	41	47	41	34	34	38
Role of the federal government	54	62	52	45	53	55	57	53
Both (vol.)	6	7	3	5	4	7	7	6
Don't know	3	2	4	3	2	4	2	3

Q59. By any chance, have you seen the movie, "An Inconvenient Truth" which is a documentary about global warming narrated by Al Gore, or not? (IF YES) Do you think the documentary is an exaggeration of the issues of global warming, or do you think it is an accurate portrayal of the issues of global warming, or don't you think it goes far enough in portraying the issues of global warming?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Haven't seen movie	96	94	99	96	95	96	94	96
Exaggeration of global warming	1	–	–	2	1	1	1	1
Accurate portrayal of global warming	3	6	1	1	3	3	5	2
Doesn't go far enough on global warming	–	–	–	1	1	–	–	1

(ORDER OF ARGUMENTS IN TEXT IS ROTATED)

Q60. As you may know, geologists estimate that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska could supply enough oil to fuel U.S. consumption for between six months and three years. Supporters of drilling say the country needs to do whatever it can to expand oil supplies. Opponents of drilling say it would damage the environment in an unspoiled part of the country. What do you think? Do you approve or disapprove of drilling for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska? (IF APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE) Do you (approve/disapprove) strongly or (approve/disapprove) somewhat?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Approve (net)	45	32	43	60	50	40	32	47
Strongly approve	28	16	31	39	32	24	13	30
Somewhat approve	17	16	13	21	18	16	19	17
Disapprove (net)	51	64	53	35	47	55	66	49
Somewhat disapprove	12	12	11	12	8	14	18	11
Strongly disapprove	39	52	42	23	39	40	48	38
Don't know	4	4	4	5	3	5	2	4

As you may know, national parks are publicly owned lands which include historical sites such as battlefields and settlements as well as places of natural beauty such as Yellowstone and the Grand Canyon.

Q61. Have you ever visited a national park, or not? (IF YES) How often do you visit national parks: at least once a year, once every couple of years or rarely?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Visited (net)	74	70	75	79	80	70	66	76
Yes: at least once a year	23	21	24	25	25	21	22	23
Yes: once every couple of years	23	24	23	24	26	21	21	24
Yes: but rarely	28	25	28	30	29	28	24	29
No: never visited a national park	25	30	23	21	20	29	33	23
Don't know	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	1

COMBINED RESPONSES FROM Q61

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Often	46	45	47	48	51	42	43	47
Rarely	53	55	51	52	49	57	57	52
Don't know	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	1

Q62. As you may know, some national parks are very popular and draw large crowds. In managing those parks, officials must decide between providing more access to the public by adding roads and opening up more parkland to motorized recreational vehicles, such as snowmobiles and ATV's or All Terrain Vehicles, or protecting natural habitats and wildlife. Should officials give the public more access by opening up parkland, or should officials limit or restrict such access?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
Public more access	18	16	18	22	21	17	24	18
Limit or restrict access	77	81	81	71	74	80	75	78
Don't know	5	3	1	7	5	3	1	4

Q63. As you may know, former President Clinton ordered a nationwide ban on logging and road building on nearly 60 million acres of national forests. In 2004, George W. Bush cancelled the ban and asked each state to propose specific national forest areas to protect. Do you think it is better to allow individual states to designate which national forest areas to protect from logging and road building, or do you think the federal government should set the level of protection in national forests for the entire country?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>DEM</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>REP</u>	<u>MEN</u>	<u>WOM</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30+</u>
States decide which forest to protect	45	34	43	58	47	43	44	45
Federal government decide which forests to protect	45	55	47	33	43	46	48	44
Both (vol.)	6	7	6	6	6	7	5	7
Don't know	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4

How the Poll Was Conducted

The Los Angeles Times / Bloomberg Poll contacted 1,478 adults nationwide by telephone July 28 through August 1, 2006. Telephone numbers were chosen from a list of all exchanges in the nation, and random digit dialing techniques allowed listed and unlisted numbers to be contacted. Multiple attempts were made to contact each number. Adults were weighted slightly to conform with their respective census figures for sex, race, age, education and region. The margin of sampling error for both samples is plus or minus 3 percentage points in either direction. For certain subgroups, the error margin may be somewhat higher. Poll results may also be affected by factors such as question wording and the order in which questions are presented.