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Political Environment
Voters are split on the direction of Minnesota, but GOPers and Inds believe things have gotten off on the wrong track.

“Generally speaking, would you say that things in Minnesota are going in the right direction, or have they pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track?”

Overall

- Right Direction: 48%
- Wrong Track: 52%

By Party

- Base GOP (18%): Right Direction 12%, Wrong Track 88%
- Soft/Lean GOP (21%): Right Direction 22%, Wrong Track 78%
- Ind (16%): Right Direction 38%, Wrong Track 62%
- Soft/Lean Dem (22%): Right Direction 34%, Wrong Track 66%
- Base Dem (23%): Right Direction 88%, Wrong Track 12%
Joe Biden is twelve points underwater in the state, and a whopping 46 points negative among Independent voters.

"Do you approve or disapprove of the job Joe Biden is doing as President?"

**Overall**
- Total Approve: 44%*
- Total Disapprove: 56%

**By Party**
- Base GOP: -88, Strongly Approve 94%, Somewhat Approve 6%
- Soft/Lean GOP: -88, Strongly Approve 94%, Somewhat Approve 6%
- Ind: -46, Strongly Approve 73%, Somewhat Approve 27%
- Soft/Lean Dem: +42, Strongly Approve 71%, Somewhat Approve 29%
- Base Dem: +90, Strongly Approve 95%, Somewhat Approve 5%

*Denotes Rounding.
Domestic Energy
Voters believe MN should put more emphasis on a variety of sources, especially solar power, wind power, and renewable natural gas.

“Do you think that, as a state, Minnesota should put more emphasis, less emphasis, or about the same emphasis as it does now on producing domestic energy from each of the following sources.”
MN voters are divided on using clean coal and nuclear power but they are solidly against regular coal.

“Do you think that, as a state, Minnesota should put more emphasis, less emphasis, or about the same emphasis as it does now on producing domestic energy from each of the following sources.”

- **Renewable Hydrogen**
  - More Emphasis: 46%
  - Same: 41%
  - Less Emphasis: 14%

- **Clean Coal**
  - More Emphasis: 39%
  - Same: 33%
  - Less Emphasis: 28%

- **Nuclear Power**
  - More Emphasis: 29%
  - Same: 36%
  - Less Emphasis: 35%

- **Biomass**
  - More Emphasis: 57%
  - Same: 19%
  - Less Emphasis: 18%

- **Coal**
  - More Emphasis: 54%
  - Same: 28%
  - Less Emphasis: 18%
Republicans are most supportive of increasing production of renewable natural gas and natural gas.

*Emphasis On Domestic Energy Among Republicans (38%)*
Republicans also support clean coal and 40% are in favor of putting more emphasis on nuclear power.

*Emphasis On Domestic Energy Among Republicans (38%)*
Majorities of Inds believe more emphasis should be put on all of these energy sources.

*Emphasis On Domestic Energy Among Independents (16%)*
Despite support for other energy forms, Inds are split on nuclear power and are solidly against coal.

*Emphasis On Domestic Energy Among Independents (16%)*
Minnesota voters are likely to believe the Dem party will do a better job handling these issues, but more than 30% say the GOP would best handle energy issues.

“Now please read the list of issues below and indicate which party you think would do a better job the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, or both about the same? If you think that neither would do a good job, please indicate that below.”
Independent voters aren’t overly confident in either party.

Which Party Would Do A Better Job Among Independents (16%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>GOP</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Environment</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Issues</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Energy Issues</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candidates & Elections
By nearly 3:1, voters say it is important a candidate for political office supports clean energy initiatives.

“How important is it to you that a candidate for political office supports clean energy initiatives? Is it…”

Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Important</td>
<td>74%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Not Important</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Too Important</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not At All Important</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base GOP (18%)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft/Lean GOP (21%)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind (16%)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft/Lean Dem (22%)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Dem (23%)</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes Rounding.
The candidate who promotes an all-of-the-above strategy is the clear favorite over the coal/natural gas candidate.

“And, for whom would you vote…”

Candidate B says that Minnesota should focus on an all-of-the-above energy strategy that includes clean energy sources such as wind and solar power in addition to coal and natural gas. Candidate B says that by lowering our dependence on fossil fuels, we can help keep the air and water cleaner, and growing the clean energy industry in Minnesota will create thousands of jobs and help grow our economy as it has in other states.

Candidate A says that Minnesota should focus on having its energy needs met by coal and natural gas because it is less expensive than so-called clean energy sources. Candidate A says that coal and natural gas remain quite plentiful and have gotten cleaner and less expensive and that spending on clean energy is a waste of money.

71%

29%
Fully 8-in-10 voters would be more likely to support a GOP candidate who embraces an innovation-based approach to dealing with climate change, but support for the candidate is soft.

“Would you be more likely or less likely to support a Republican candidate who embraces an innovation-based approach to addressing climate change?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total More Likely</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Less Likely</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much More Likely</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Less Likely</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Likely</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Less Likely</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fully 8-in-10 in 10 voters would be more likely to support a GOP candidate who embraces an innovation-based approach to dealing with climate change, but support for the candidate is soft.
Soft GOPers are most likely to be interested in a GOP candidate who addresses climate change.

**GOP Candidate Who Addresses Climate Change by Party**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>More Likely</th>
<th>Less Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base GOP (18%)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft/Lean GOP (21%)</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind (16%)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft/Lean Dem (22%)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Dem (23%)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*More Likely* and *Less Likely* indicate the percentage of respondents who are more or less likely to vote for a candidate who addresses climate change, respectively.
Two in three voters say climate change is important to their vote in the upcoming election.

“How important is the issue of climate change to your vote in the November 2022 election?”

- Very Important: 32%
- Somewhat Important: 34%
- Not Too Important: 21%
- Not At All Important: 13%

Total Important: 66%
Total Not Important: 34%
Voters support a candidate who is for clean energy development and believes human activity is contributing to climate change.

“Thinking ahead to future elections... would you vote for or against elected officials or candidates who support clean energy development like solar and wind, or would it make no difference to your vote?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total For</th>
<th>Total Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely For</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably For</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably Against</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely Against</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Are you more likely or less likely to support a candidate for public office who believes human activity is contributing to climate change?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total More Likely</th>
<th>Total Less Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much More Likely</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat More Likely</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Less Likely</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Less Likely</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The correlation of human activity and climate change is more polarizing than clean energy development.

Supporting Candidates by Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Type</th>
<th>More Likely/For</th>
<th>Less Likely/Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base GOP (18%)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft/Lean GOP (21%)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind (16%)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft/Lean Dem (22%)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Dem (23%)</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Human Activity/Climate Change

-28 +8 +34 +80 +92

Clean Energy Development

-28 +28 +55 +83 +85

26% 26% 48% 20% 58% 3% 87% 4% 91% 6%

More Likely/For | Less Likely/Against
Energy Approaches
“Minnesota should pursue an all-of-the-above energy strategy, which means lowering our heavy dependence on fossil fuels over time and allowing an increase in electricity generation from renewable energy sources as well as more energy efficiency, and I support taking action to accelerate the development and use of clean energy in Minnesota.”
Fully 80% of MN voters agree the state should pursue an all-of-the-above energy strategy.

“Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with that statement.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Agree</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Disagree</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support for the strategy is highest with Democrats, but majorities of Republicans support the approach, too.

*MN Should Pursue An All-Of-The-Above Energy Strategy by Party*
Voters would more than 3:1 want rooftop solar panels installed on their property if they could afford it.

“If you could afford to do it, would you want rooftop solar panels installed on your property to generate all or nearly all of your electricity?”

79% Yes

21% No
Voters most agree with accelerating clean energy so we can have cleaner/healthier air and rely less on other states/countries.

“Now please read a few statements about why some people want to accelerate the growth of clean energy, by speeding up the development of sources of renewable energy like wind and solar power. After you read each statement, please indicate whether you agree or disagree with that statement.”

**Ranked by % Strongly Agree**

**We should accelerate the growth of clean energy so that we can have cleaner, healthier air and less pollution in our state and communities.^^**

- Strongly Agree: 47%
- Total Agree: 84%
- Strongly Disagree: 6%
- Total Disagree: 16%

**We should accelerate the growth of clean energy so that we can produce more of our own electricity in Minnesota and rely less on importing from other states and countries, increasing our energy independence and security.^^**

- Strongly Agree: 44%
- Total Agree: 85%
- Strongly Disagree: 15%

**We should accelerate the growth of clean energy so that Minnesota can be a national leader in the competition for economic development and good-paying jobs.^^**

- Strongly Agree: 38%
- Total Agree: 79%
- Strongly Disagree: 6%
- Total Disagree: 21%

^Split Sample A, N=296; ^^Split Sample B, N=304.
MN voters are also receptive to messages on competition, innovation, and job creation.

“Now please read a few statements about why some people want to accelerate the growth of clean energy, by speeding up the development of sources of renewable energy like wind and solar power. After you read each statement, please indicate whether you agree or disagree with that statement.”

**Ranked by % Strongly Agree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota should give businesses and consumers more choices about how to transition away from burning fossil fuels in order to drive innovation and competitive pricing.^^</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should accelerate the growth of clean energy to allow American innovation and entrepreneurs to drive economic growth and job creation.^</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>82%*</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota should accelerate the growth of clean energy in order to help conserve God’s creation.^^</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>33%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes Rounding; ^Split Sample A, N=296; ^^Split Sample B, N=304.*
Voters clearly prefer competitive approaches over mandates or taxes when it comes to increasing clean energy.

“To increase clean energy production, would you prefer…”

71% Approaches like competition that allow markets and businesses to provide more clean energy production

15% Government mandates, subsidies, and quotas

...or...

14% A price or tax put on carbon emissions
Even Democrats prefer competitive approaches.

erox To Increase Energy Production by Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Type</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Government Mandates</th>
<th>Tax On Carbon Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base GOP (18%)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft/Lean GOP (21%)</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind (16%)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft/Lean Dem (22%)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Dem (23%)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even Democrats prefer competitive approaches.
Voters say it is most important to invest in efficiency programs, strengthen community solar projects, and stop local barriers.

“Now please read a list of policies that advocates have prioritized to help expand Minnesota’s commitment to clean energy. After you read each one, please indicate whether you think that policy is very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not important at all.”

**Ranked by % Very Important**

- **Encourage utilities to invest more in efficiency programs to reduce the amount of power we need to generate and purchase.**
  - Very Important: 45%
  - Total Important: 88%
  - Not At All Important: 12%

- **Strengthen community solar projects that provide customers more choices about how to purchase solar energy at the lowest cost.**
  - Very Important: 44%
  - Total Important: 84%
  - Not At All Important: 5%

- **Stop local barriers such as Homeowners Associations from putting unreasonable restrictions on installing rooftop solar panels.**
  - Very Important: 44%
  - Total Important: 80%
  - Not At All Important: 5%

Legend:
- Very Important
- Total Important
- Not At All Important
- Total Not Important
More than 40% of voters also say it is very important to streamline the process for installing renewable energy sources.

“Now please read a list of policies that advocates have prioritized to help expand Minnesota’s commitment to clean energy. After you read each one, please indicate whether you think that policy is very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not important at all.”

**Ranked by % Very Important**

Streamline the process for installing renewable energy sources like wind and solar.

- Very Important: 42%
- Total Important: 81%
- Not At All Important: 6%
- Total Not Important: 19%

Permit third-party sales of electricity from outside the monopoly utility so that customers can have more choice to shop for the lowest-cost option.

- Very Important: 35%
- Total Important: 81%
- Not At All Important: 19%

Net metering policies are a specific type of billing that allows homeowners and farmers to invest in their own renewable energy by paying them for extra energy they generate but do not use.

- Very Important: 33%
- Total Important: 84%
- Not At All Important: 16%

*Denotes Rounding.*
A small majority of voters would prefer to have additional options for electricity.

“And, are you satisfied with your options for electricity, or do you prefer to have additional options for getting electricity?”

47% Satisfied

53% Prefer Additional Options
Climate Change
By a three to one margin, voters favor the gov’t taking steps to reduce emissions that cause global climate change.

“Do you favor or oppose the government taking steps to reduce emissions of gases like carbon dioxide and methane emissions that cause global climate change?”

- Total Favor: 75%
- Total Oppose: 25%

- Strongly Favor: 41%
- Strongly Oppose: 10%
- Somewhat Oppose: 15%
- Somewhat Favor: 34%
More than 60% of soft GOPers and nearly 40% of base GOPers favor government action.

Gov’t Taking Steps To Reduce Emissions by Party

-24  +26  +50  +88  +90

Base GOP (18%)  Soft/Lean GOP (21%)  Ind (16%)  Soft/Lean Dem (22%)  Base Dem (23%)

Favor  Oppose

62%  38%  63%  37%  75%  25%  94%  6%  95%  5%

Minnesota Statewide Clean Energy Online Survey – August 16-24, 2022
A solid majority of voters believe climate change is a threat and more than 40% believe it is an **extreme** threat.

“Please read the following statements about the impact of climate change on society, and after you read each one, please indicate which statement is closest to your own opinion...”

- **43%** Climate change is an extreme threat.
- **27%** Climate change is a threat to be considered.
- **20%** Climate change is a minor threat.
- **9%** Climate change is not at all a threat.
Putting more efforts into research and development is the most popular approach to dealing with climate change.

“Assuming climate change is caused by humans, which do you think is the best way to deal with the issue...”

- **26%**
  - Putting more efforts into research, development, and innovation of clean energy sources

- **16%**
  - Improving market structure and incentives to allow clean energy technologies to more fairly compete

- **7%**
  - Increased regulations to force businesses to comply with carbon emission standards

- **6%**
  - Phasing out the use of fossil fuels such as coal, oil, and gas

- **2%**
  - Joining international agreements such as the Paris Climate Accord

- **43%**
  - All of the above
Nuclear Energy
Two-thirds of MN voters believe nuclear energy should be included as part of the state’s clean energy mix.

“Please read the following statement and indicate whether you agree or disagree with that statement: Nuclear energy should be included and prioritized as part of Minnesota’s clean energy mix.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Agree</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Disagree</td>
<td>34%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes Rounding.
Including nuclear energy in the state’s mix is a nonpartisan issue.

Nuclear Energy Should Be Included and Prioritized by Party

Base GOP (18%)
- Agree: 74%
- Disagree: 26%

Soft/Lean GOP (21%)
- Agree: 68%
- Disagree: 32%

Ind (16%)
- Agree: 67%
- Disagree: 33%

Soft/Lean Dem (22%)
- Agree: 62%
- Disagree: 38%

Base Dem (23%)
- Agree: 62%
- Disagree: 38%
A majority of voters favor using more nuclear energy as a power source in Minnesota.

“Do you favor or oppose using more nuclear power as a source of energy in Minnesota?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Favor</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Favor</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Oppose</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Favor</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Oppose</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Republicans are more likely to support using more nuclear power, while Dems are split.

Using More Nuclear Power by Party

Base GOP (18%): 72% Favor, 28% Oppose
Soft/Lean GOP (21%): 65% Favor, 35% Oppose
Ind (16%): 54% Favor, 46% Oppose
Soft/Lean Dem (22%): 50% Favor, 50% Oppose
Base Dem (23%): 50% Favor, 50% Oppose
MN voters are split on whether we need nuclear power to reduce carbon emissions.

“Do you believe or not believe the following statement: To reduce carbon emissions, we need nuclear power.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Top Groups – Yes, Believe (48%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Ind Men 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men 18-54 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men w/o Degrees 62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GOP Men 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Conservative 58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men w/ Degrees 58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men 55+ 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northeast Region 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base GOP 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dem Men 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ind 54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>Age 45-54 53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A plurality of voters believe that nuclear power stations are somewhat dangerous for the environment.

“In general, do you think that nuclear power stations are...”

12% Extremely dangerous for the environment

18% Very dangerous for the environment

39% Somewhat dangerous for the environment

25% Not very dangerous for the environment

6% Not dangerous at all for the environment
Base Republicans are the most likely to say nuclear power stations are not dangerous.

_Nuclear Power Stations Safety by Party_
Clean Energy
Voters believe it is more important to protect property owners’ ability to produce energy on their land than to protect their leasing rights.

“Now, please read the list below of policies that supporters have proposed to help expand Minnesota’s commitment to clean energy. After you read each one, please indicate whether you think that policy is... very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important.”

Ranked by % Very Important

- Protecting property owners' ability to produce energy on their land: 46% Very Important, 90% Total Important, 10% Not At All Important.
- Protecting property owners' rights to lease their land for renewable energy production: 39% Very Important, 88% Total Important, 12%* Not At All Important.

*Denotes Rounding.
Protecting land use and land rights are nonpartisan issues.

Protecting Owners Rights by Party

- Base GOP (18%): +64%
- Soft/Lean GOP (21%): +86%
- Ind (16%): +74%
- Soft/Lean Dem (22%): +84%
- Base Dem (23%): +84%

Produce On Their Land

- Total Important: 92%
- Total Not Important: 8%

Lease Their Land

- Total Important: 90%
- Total Not Important: 10%

Protecting land use and land rights are nonpartisan issues.
A majority of voters are not likely to consider an electric vehicle when they make their next vehicle purchase.

“When you make your next vehicle purchase, how likely are you to consider purchasing an electric vehicle…”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th></th>
<th>Top Groups – Very Likely (14%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Likely</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Biden Strongly Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Not Likely</td>
<td>55%*</td>
<td>Base Dem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not At All Likely

Not Very Likely

Somewhat Likely

Very Likely

Not At All Likely 29%

Not Very Likely 27%

Somewhat Likely 31%

Very Likely 14%

*Bene Denotes Rounding.
Rare Metal Mining
“Thinking now about clean energy... As you may know, solar panels, wind turbines, and catalytic converters for hybrid cars require rare metals such as copper and nickel that currently are mined in countries like the Congo, China, and Russia, where children and underpaid workers are sometimes used to do the mining under dangerous conditions. Northeast Minnesota also has those metals, and mining those metals are supported by unions because in Minnesota the rare metals would be responsibly and safely mined by highly paid union workers.”
Some people say the mining for rare metals such as copper and nickel should be done in Northeast Minnesota so that we are NOT dependent on children and underpaid adults working in dangerous conditions in countries that are hostile to the United States. They say that if we want to transition to clean energy, we should use rare metals safely mined in America, which would create good union jobs at high wages.

Other people say the mining for rare metals such as copper and nickel should not be done in Northeast Minnesota because there is too much risk of pollution in our lakes and land. They say that even if it means slowing our transition to clean energy, the United States should continue to import rare metals from other countries.

Voters are twice as likely to agree mining should be done in the state than import rare metals from other countries.

“Please read the two statements below about mining for rare metals in Northeast Minnesota, and after you read each one, please indicate which one comes closest to your own opinion.”

67%

33%
Voters across party lines agree that mining for rare metals should be done in Minnesota.

*Mining For Rare Metals by Party*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Type</th>
<th>Should Be Done</th>
<th>Should Not Be Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base GOP (18%)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft/Lean GOP (21%)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind (16%)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft/Lean Dem (22%)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Dem (23%)</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voters across party lines agree that mining for rare metals should be done in Minnesota.
Support for mining is highest in the Northeast.

**Mining For Rare Metals by Region**

- **West/Northwest (18%)**
  - Should Be Done: 71%
  - Should Not Be Done: 29%

- **Northeast (12%)**
  - Should Be Done: 72%
  - Should Not Be Done: 28%

- **Collar Counties (27%)**
  - Should Be Done: 65%
  - Should Not Be Done: 35%

- **Minneapolis/St. Paul (31%)**
  - Should Be Done: 64%
  - Should Not Be Done: 36%

- **South (11%)**
  - Should Be Done: 70%
  - Should Not Be Done: 30%
Nearly 80% of MN voters would be more likely to support clean energy if the Northeast became an important part of the supply chain.

“Would you be more likely or less likely to supporting transitioning to clean energy if Northeast Minnesota became an important part of the supply chain for the mined rare metals such as copper and nickel that are used for wind turbines, solar panels, and catalytic converters?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much More Likely</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat More Likely</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Less Likely</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Less Likely</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total More Likely</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Less Likely</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Voters across party lines say they would be more supportive.

If Northeast MN Became An Important Part Of The Supply Chain by Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Type</th>
<th>More Likely</th>
<th>Less Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base GOP (18%)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft/Lean GOP (21%)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind (16%)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft/Lean Dem (22%)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Dem (23%)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voters across party lines say they would be more supportive.
Voters across the state are overwhelmingly supportive.

If Northeast MN Became An Important Part Of The Supply Chain by Region

- West/Northwest (18%)
  - More Likely: 82%
  - Less Likely: 18%

- Northeast (12%)
  - More Likely: 81%
  - Less Likely: 19%

- Collar Counties (27%)
  - More Likely: 78%
  - Less Likely: 22%

- Minneapolis/St. Paul (31%)
  - More Likely: 76%
  - Less Likely: 24%

- South (11%)
  - More Likely: 77%
  - Less Likely: 23%
THE BOTTOM LINE

There is strong overall support for expanding the use of clean energy in Minnesota. The challenge facing these organizations is that base Republicans are still skeptical of clean energy policies.

For example, the three domestic energy options most popular with voters overall are solar power, wind power, and renewable natural gas. Among Republicans, however, it is renewable natural gas, natural gas, and clean coal. Independents rate solar, renewable natural gas, and wind the highest – far different than GOPers.

Independents are also more likely to look like Democrats than Republicans when asked how important it is that a candidate for office supports clean energy initiatives. These differences are replete throughout the survey.

The all of the above message polls great with soft GOPers and Independents, but not so much with base GOPers. Republicans DO respond well to the idea of competition driving more clean energy production.
THE BOTTOM LINE

Clean energy is not as controversial among base Republicans as climate change, however. Soft Republicans are much closer to Independents on most of these issues, including climate change, than they are to base GOPers.

Base GOPers do back including nuclear energy as part of the state’s clean energy mix. Nuclear does relatively well across party lines, although it definitely polls better with GOPers.

Rare metal mining in Northeast Minnesota does well across party lines, with base GOPers particularly supportive. It also receives strong backing in the Northeast, though support is solid across the state.
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