



## Public Support for Stricter Air Pollution Limits

### Findings of a National Survey for NRDC

January 2011

#### Overview

Voters are receptive to the idea of the EPA setting stronger air pollution limits in the U.S., and show little support for Congressional efforts to stand in the way, according to the January 2011 survey by Belden Russonello & Stewart LLC for the Natural Resources Defense Council. BRS conducted a nationally representative telephone survey of 900 registered voters, including an oversample of 100 Latinos, from January 10 through 17, 2011. The margin of sampling error is plus or minus 3.3 percentage points at the 95% confidence level. The findings and recommendations below also build on eight focus groups conducted in December among swing voters in Las Vegas, Boston, Harrisburg, and Cleveland.

Nearly all of the news is positive for supporters of the EPA issuing stricter air pollution limits under the Clean Air Act:

**1. Voters reject the idea that EPA restrictions are too costly and want the EPA to do more.**

Voters are more likely to want the EPA to “do more to hold polluters accountable and protect the air and water” (66%) than to believe it “does too much and places too many costly restrictions on businesses and individuals” (29%).

**2. Stricter limits enjoy broad support.** Two-thirds (68%) favor “the EPA setting new standards with stricter limits on air pollution,” including 84% of Democrats, 67% of Independents, and 50% of Republicans. Support is stronger when the pollutants are specified, including “toxic chemicals such as mercury, lead, and arsenic” (76% favor), “carbon dioxide” (73%), or smog (71%). Here, support for stricter limits cuts across party lines. Majorities of Democrats, Republicans and Independents support stricter limits on toxic chemicals (D: 83% support, R: 66%, I: 79%); carbon dioxide (D: 83%, R: 63%, I: 73%); and smog (D: 83% support, R: 60%, I: 78%).

3. **The data reveal support for regulating carbon dioxide, even in the context of global warming.** Voters support the EPA’s ability to regulate carbon dioxide even when informed that “the EPA is planning to set limits on carbon dioxide to address global warming.” Only a third (32%) says that “Congress should stop the EPA from setting these limits,” while more than six in ten (64%) say it should not. Over half also reject the idea that “the EPA has no authority to regulate carbon dioxide because it has no direct impact on the environment or people’s health” (58% say this is a not very good or poor reason to oppose new air pollution standards).

4. **Messages in favor of new, stronger standards are more broadly persuasive than messages against.** The top messages in favor are:

- “We need to hold big polluters accountable and not allow them to block strong safeguards that would protect our health and quality of life” (59% very good reason to support the EPA’s new air pollution standards);
- “Reducing air pollution will prevent tens of thousands of deaths a year in the U.S. from lung infections, heart attacks, and other diseases” (57%); and
- “The new standards will update the Clean Air Act and end loopholes to make sure all companies are playing by the same rules” (56%).
- The strongest message specifically on carbon dioxide is that “we need the new air pollution standards because there is currently no limit on the amount of carbon dioxide that companies can release” (51%).

The top message against action is: “In a time of record budget deficits, we should be reducing spending and making government smaller, not increasing government spending and regulations.” Only four in ten (41%) say this statement is a very good reason to oppose the EPA’s new air pollution standards. All other opposition messages receive a third or less saying they are very good reasons to oppose the new standards.

5. **Advocates have strong answers for claims that regulations will hurt jobs and the economy.** Fewer than four in ten (36%) agree that “the new EPA standards will cost the U.S. jobs because the increased cost to businesses will encourage them to move jobs overseas,” while six in ten (61%) agree that “the new EPA standards will create more jobs because it will encourage innovation and investment in new technology.” Answering the jobs argument with “we need the new EPA standards because we can’t put a dollar value on preventing tens of thousands of asthma attacks and saving thousands of lives a year” is equally persuasive (61% agree).

6. **Supporters of stronger pollution limits have more credibility than opponents.** President Obama (49% positive, 36% negative) and the EPA (39%, 22%) are viewed more favorably than Republicans in Congress (35%, 37%). In addition, the people and organizations voters are most likely to say they trust for “information on EPA air pollution standards” include:

- The American Lung Association (51% trust a great deal);
- The Centers for Disease Control, or CDC (49%);
- The American Academy of Pediatrics (45%);
- Scientists at the EPA (43%);
- University scientists (41%);
- The American Public Health Association (39%); and
- Nurses (36%).

Businesses that support the standards have more credibility (21% a great deal, 55% some, 10% not at all) than businesses that oppose the standards (five percent a great deal, 35% some, 35% not at all). Finally, trust on this issue is quite low for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (eight percent trust a great deal, 22% not at all) and Tea Party leaders (seven percent a great deal, 41% not at all).

7. **Voters show little appetite for Congressional interference.** Seven in ten (71%) say that “scientists at the EPA should decide what pollution limits are needed, not politicians,” while only a quarter (24%) says that “our elected representatives in Congress should decide what pollution limits are needed, not government bureaucrats.” Confidence in the EPA over Congress crosses party lines (D: 81% EPA should decide; R: 61%; I: 69%).

When presented with messages on both sides, a majority of voters (58%) agrees that “Congress should not stop the EPA from doing its job to reduce life-threatening pollution. They should stand up for clean air and the health of our families rather than joining with polluting campaign contributors like the oil and coal industries.” Only four in ten (39%) agree that “Congress should stop the EPA from overstepping its bounds. Now is not the time to put in place new regulations that will be expensive, hard for companies to follow, and send jobs overseas.”

## Communications Recommendations

### 1. Talk about “updating Clean Air Act standards”

Invoke the Clean Air Act as often as you can, and talk about “updating” pollution limits rather than creating “new” rules. We have long found that the Clean Air Act is viewed very favorably, and the recent focus groups revealed that putting new EPA pollution limits in the context of the Clean Air Act is helpful in gaining voters’ support. In addition, many say that “updating” an existing framework means we are starting from a place of progress rather than creating a whole new set of regulations. They also imagine that it will be easier for companies to comply, and see updates as less bureaucratic and burdensome than new rules. Talking about updating existing rules pre-empts the question of why action was not taken before. Voters believe that even the best system will need to be updated periodically as our knowledge increases and technology changes.

### 2. Keep communications focused on the goal of protecting Americans’ health

We have consistently found over the years that the primary reason voters worry about air pollution is that they believe it causes health problems and want to protect themselves and their families. The results of this survey reflect that finding, with one of the top tier messages highlighting the lives that could be saved with action.

### 3. Identify who or what is standing in the way

The other top-tier messages point to another need in communications – to explain why rules that would protect our health have not already been put in place. We find in focus groups that voters often assume that there are already protections in place. Two targets to blame for why it is necessary to act now are “loopholes” that mean all companies do not have to follow the same rules and “big polluters” or “dirty energy companies” who have been blocking progress.

### 4. Be specific about threats

It is more compelling to talk about limiting specific toxic threats such as mercury, arsenic and lead than to talk about limiting pollution more generally, and it is more persuasive to talk about restricting “carbon dioxide” pollution than the more general “global warming pollution” or “greenhouse gasses.”

### 5. Inform that currently “no limit” on carbon dioxide

If you are communicating on the need for limits on carbon dioxide, the most persuasive concept to emphasize is that there is currently no limit on the amount of carbon dioxide companies are allowed to release. The health impacts of global warming are not rejected by

voters, so they can be used as an answer if attacked, but they are less persuasive as a lead message.

## 6. Answering attacks on jobs and the economy

In response to the claim that the new standards will hurt jobs and the economy, voters respond very positively to the assertion that the new standards will create jobs and spur innovation instead. We always recommend, however, that communications quickly return to the offensive ground – and rather than defending that the rules will not hurt jobs, make the other side defend continuing the status quo that allows air pollution to shorten our lives and make us sick.

## Language and terms

Use:

- ✓ Update/improve Clean Air Act standards: suggests that the EPA is not starting from scratch but is building on standards that are already working.
- ✓ Enforcement
- ✓ Safeguards/standards: sound less burdensome and bureaucratic than rules/regulations.
- ✓ Life-threatening pollution
- ✓ Health-threatening pollution
- ✓ Toxic: instantly communicates a danger to health.
- ✓ Carbon pollution or carbon dioxide
- ✓ Lessen the impact of global warming

Avoid:

- Set **new** standards/make **new** rules
- Poison: connects to household chemicals instead of pollution.
- Global warming pollution
- Greenhouse gases

## Dos and Don'ts

DO	DON'T
Keep the focus on preventing pollution that harms people's health	Spend too much time on the other side's themes, such as jobs
Talk about limits on specific pollutants, such as mercury, lead, arsenic, or carbon dioxide	Leave your communications vague, about "pollution" in general
Say we have the technology to reduce pollution; highlight examples of companies using it	Get into the details of specific technologies
Point out that there is currently <u>no limit</u> on the amount of carbon dioxide pollution that can be released	Communicate on carbon dioxide in terms of global warming
Use two to four examples that show the impact of pollution on health or health care costs	Overwhelm with more than four examples
Use specific numbers if you can, <i>i.e.</i> smog pollution causes 3,700 deaths a year	Use softer assertions such as something being "associated with" cancer
Cite university studies or other independent research	Rely solely on EPA research
Talk about "leveling the playing field" by closing loopholes and making all polluters follow the same rules	
Blame "big polluters" who have been blocking stronger standards	



## 2011 NRDC EPA Survey

Telephone interviews conducted January 10-17, 2010 by landline and cell phone  
 N=900 registered voters, including an oversample of 100 Latinos  
 The data have been weighted by race, age, region, and education  
 Margin of sampling error is ± 3.3 percentage points  
 Percents may add to 99% or 101% due to rounding  
 \* indicates less than 1%; -- indicates zero

Hello, my name is \_\_\_ and I am an interviewer with BRS, an opinion research firm. We are conducting a public opinion survey and your telephone number was selected at random. We are not selling anything. May I please speak to the registered voter in your household who had a birthday most recently? **IF NECESSARY ARRANGE FOR A CALL BACK AND RECORD DATE AND TIME. REPEAT INTRO AS NECESSARY.**

S1. Are you registered to vote at your current address?	Yes	100%
	No	<b>TERM</b>
	DK/REF	<b>TERM</b>

First, please tell me if you have very positive, somewhat positive, neutral, somewhat negative, or very negative views of each of the following people and organizations. If you don't know enough to have an opinion, just say so. (RANDOMIZE)

	Very pos.	Smwht pos.	Neutral	Smwht neg.	Very neg.	DK/REF
Q1. President Obama	28%	21	14	15	21	1
Q2. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, or EPA	12%	27	24	12	10	15
Q3. Republicans in Congress	11%	24	22	18	19	6
Q4. Democrats in Congress	14%	25	16	20	20	5

Q5. Which point of view on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, or EPA, do you agree with more?	Strongly EPA needs to do more	39%
	Somewhat EPA needs to do more	27
ROTATE: The people who say that the EPA needs to do more to hold polluters accountable and protect the air and water? OR The people who say that the EPA does too much and places too many costly restrictions on businesses and individuals? (ACCEPT VOLUNTEERED RESPONSE "NEITHER") (IF "DO MORE" OR "TOO MUCH:") Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?	Somewhat EPA does too much	12
	Strongly EPA does too much	17
	Neither (vol.)	3
	DK/REF	3

Q6. Do you favor or oppose the EPA setting new standards with stricter limits on air pollution? WAIT FOR RESPONSE. Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?	Strongly favor	38%
	Somewhat favor	30
	Somewhat oppose	12
	Strongly oppose	15
	DK/REF	5

Here is some more information on the new air pollution standards the EPA is proposing. Please tell me if you favor or oppose each of the following: (READ ITEM - WAIT FOR RESPONSE.) Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat? RANDOMIZE Q7-Q9

	Strngly favor	Smwht favor	Smwht oppose	Strngly oppose	DK/REF
Q7. Requiring stricter limits on the amount of toxic chemicals such as mercury, lead, and arsenic that coal power plants and other industrial facilities release.	56%	20	9	12	3
Q8. Limiting the amount of carbon dioxide that power plants and other industrial facilities release.	49%	24	11	14	1
Q9. Requiring stricter limits on the amount of smog that cars, trucks, and industrial facilities release.	41%	30	12	14	2

Q10. The EPA is planning to set limits on carbon dioxide to address global warming. Do you believe Congress should stop the EPA from setting these limits or not? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) Do you feel this way strongly or only somewhat?	Strongly Congress should stop EPA	23%
	Somewhat Congress should stop EPA	9
	Somewhat Congress should not stop EPA	20
	Strongly Congress should not stop EPA	44
	DK/REF	4

Q11. The new chairman of the committee in the U.S. Congress that deals with environmental issues says he wants to – quote – declare war on the EPA’s proposed limits for emissions of carbon dioxide, smog, and other pollutants because Congress should protect jobs and the economy by stopping the EPA from implementing stricter rules. Does this sound like a step in the right direction or a step in the wrong direction for the U.S.? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?	Strongly right direction	22%
	Somewhat right direction	16
	Somewhat wrong direction	18
	Strongly wrong direction	38
	DK/REF	5

Q12. Which point of view do you agree with more? ROTATE: Congress should not stop the EPA from doing its job to reduce life-threatening pollution. They should stand up for clean air and the health of our families rather than join with polluting campaign contributors like the oil and coal industries. OR Congress should stop the EPA from overstepping its bounds. Now is not the time to put in place new regulations that will be expensive, hard for companies to follow, and send jobs overseas. (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?	Strongly Congress should not stop EPA	42%
	Somewhat Congress should not stop EPA	16
	Somewhat Congress should stop EPA	12
	Strongly Congress should stop EPA	27
	DK/REF	2

---

#### ROTATE BLOCK A AND BLOCK B

BLOCK A. Here are some reasons that people give for supporting the EPA's new air pollution standards. For each, please tell me if it is a very good reason, a somewhat good reason, not a very good reason, or a poor reason for supporting the new standards. RANDOMIZE

	Very good	Smwht good	Not very good	Poor	DK/REF
Q13a. SPLIT SAMPLE, n=418: We need to update the Clean Air Act standards because there is currently NO LIMIT on the amount of carbon dioxide that companies can release.	49%	26	12	12	1
Q13b. SPLIT SAMPLE, N=482: We need the new air pollution standards because there is currently NO LIMIT on the amount of carbon dioxide that companies can release.	51%	22	8	17	3
Q14. Pollution from coal-fired power plants causes 100 billion dollars a year in health costs for families living near these plants.	51%	22	13	13	2
Q15. Reducing toxic air pollution will prevent tens of thousands of asthma attacks every year.	51%	25	11	12	1
Q16. Reducing air pollution will prevent tens of thousands of deaths a year in the U.S. from lung infections, heart attacks, and other diseases.	57%	21	9	12	1
Q17. If we do not address carbon pollution, heat-related health problems, such as the 35,000 deaths in a heat wave in Europe in 2003, will get worse.	40%	24	15	20	1
Q18. If we do not put a limit on carbon dioxide emissions it will be harder to reduce smog pollution to safe levels, and we will have a longer pollen season that makes allergies more severe.	41%	29	15	14	1
Q19a. SPLIT SAMPLE, N=418: We need to hold big polluters accountable and not allow them to block strong safeguards that would protect our health and quality of life.	59%	27	5	8	*
Q19b. SPLIT SAMPLE, N=482: We need to hold dirty energy companies accountable and not allow them to block strong safeguards that would protect our health and quality of life.	58%	25	7	9	1

(cont.) Here are some reasons that people give for supporting the EPA's new air pollution standards. For each, please tell me if it is a very good reason, a somewhat good reason, not a very good reason, or a poor reason for supporting the new standards. RANDOMIZE

	Very good	Smwht good	Not very good	Poor	DK/REF
Q20a. SPLIT SAMPLE, N=418 The new standards will update the Clean Air Act and end loopholes and grandfather clauses, to make sure all companies are playing by the same rules.	54%	29	5	11	1
Q20b. SPLIT SAMPLE, N=482 The new standards will update the Clean Air Act and end loopholes to make sure all companies are playing by the same rules.	56%	27	7	9	1

BLOCK B. Here are some reasons that people give for opposing the EPA's new air pollution standards. For each, please tell me if it is a very good reason, a somewhat good reason, not a very good reason, or a poor reason for OPPOSING the new standards. RANDOMIZE

	Very good	Smwht good	Not very good	Poor	DK/REF
Q21. Given the weak economy and lack of jobs, now is not the time for the EPA to impose new rules that will be costly and difficult for companies to obey.	33%	25	19	21	1
Q22. The EPA is overreaching by attempting to impose over two hundred new rules on large and small businesses.	26%	26	22	23	2
Q23. The increased costs to businesses from the new standards will hurt manufacturing in the U.S. and cost the U.S. tens of thousands of jobs.	33%	24	20	21	1
Q24. Electric companies will raise their rates to cover the cost of new technology, and consumers may see an increase in costs of ten percent or more.	26%	25	24	24	1
Q25. Regulating carbon dioxide will create large costs for businesses and consumers and it is uncertain whether it will do anything to stop global warming.	30%	24	20	24	2
Q26. The EPA has no authority to regulate carbon dioxide because it has no direct impact on the environment or people's health.	17%	22	21	37	3
Q27. In a time of record budget deficits, we should be reducing spending and making government smaller, not increasing government spending and regulations.	41%	23	16	20	1

Q28a. SPLIT SAMPLE: Please tell me which point of view you agree with more. The new EPA standards will cost the U.S. jobs because the increased cost to businesses will encourage them to move jobs overseas? OR The new EPA standards will create more jobs because it will encourage innovation and investment in new technology? WAIT FOR RESPONSE. Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?	Strongly standards will cost jobs	27%
	Somewhat standards will cost jobs	9
	Somewhat standards will create jobs	18
	Strongly standards will create jobs	43
	DK/REF	4

Q28b. SPLIT SAMPLE: Please tell me which point of view you agree with more. The new EPA standards will cost the U.S. jobs because the increased cost to businesses will encourage them to move jobs overseas? OR We need the new EPA standards because we can't put a dollar value on preventing tens of thousands of asthma attacks and saving thousands of lives a year. WAIT FOR RESPONSE. Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?	Strongly standards will cost jobs	28%
	Somewhat standards will cost jobs	9
	Somewhat need standards	23
	Strongly need standards	38
	DK/REF	2

Q29. (n=876) Which do you find more believable? ROTATE: Businesses that say that the new EPA standards will be too hard on companies because they have to install expensive new technology? OR Businesses that say that the new EPA standards will NOT be too hard to follow because the technology exists and many companies are using it already? WAIT FOR RESPONSE. Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?	Strongly new standards will be too hard	23%
	Somewhat new standards will be too hard	17
	Somewhat new standards will not be too hard	22
	Strongly new standards will not be too hard	34
	DK/REF	3

Q30. Now I am going to ask you again: Do you favor or oppose the EPA setting new standards with stricter limits on air pollution? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?	Strongly favor	42%
	Somewhat favor	25
	Somewhat oppose	11
	Strongly oppose	21
	DK/REF	1

Please tell me if you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. WAIT FOR RESPONSE. Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?

	Strngly agree	Smwht agree	Smwht disagree	Strngly disagree	DK/REF
Q31a. SPLIT SAMPLE, n=407. A congressman who votes to stop the EPA from setting new air pollution limits is in the pocket of big polluters and their paid lobbyists	32%	23	17	23	5

(cont.) Please tell me if you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. WAIT FOR RESPONSE. Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?

	<b>Strngly agree</b>	<b>Smwht agree</b>	<b>Smwht disagree</b>	<b>Strngly disagree</b>	<b>DK/REF</b>
Q31b. SPLIT SAMPLE, N=468. A congressman who votes to stop the EPA from setting new air pollution limits is giving into special interests	33%	19	26	20	2
Q32, N=875. A congressman who votes to stop the EPA from setting new air pollution limits is putting people at risk for asthma attacks, lung infections, and deaths	37%	22	18	22	2
Q33a. SPLIT SAMPLE, n=407: A congressman who votes to stop the EPA from setting new air pollution limits is putting public health in danger	38%	19	22	20	1
Q33b. SPLIT SAMPLE, N=468: A congressman who votes to stop the EPA from setting new air pollution limits is putting corporate profits ahead of public health	40%	18	18	21	2
Q34, N=875 A congressman who votes to stop the EPA from setting new air pollution limits is reducing government overspending and bureaucracy	25%	28	21	23	3
Q35, N=875 A congressman who votes to stop the EPA from setting new air pollution limits is saving jobs	24%	22	24	28	2
Q36a. SPLIT SAMPLE, N=407 A congressman who votes to stop the EPA from setting new air pollution limits is extreme	18%	19	29	30	3
Q36b. SPLIT SAMPLE. A congressman who votes to stop the EPA from setting new air pollution limits is reasonable	23%	29	19	28	1

Q37. Which point of view do you agree with more? ROTATE: Those who say that our elected representatives in Congress should decide what pollution limits are needed, not government bureaucrats? OR Those who say that scientists at the EPA should decide what pollution limits are needed, not politicians. WAIT FOR RESPONSE. Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?	Strongly representatives should decide	15%
	Somewhat representatives should decide	9
	Somewhat EPA scientists should decide	20
	Strongly EPA scientists should decide	51
	DK/REF	5

How much would you personally trust each of the following people and organizations for information on EPA air pollution standards: a great deal, some, not very much, or not at all? RANDOMIZE

	<b>Great deal</b>	<b>Some</b>	<b>Not very much</b>	<b>Not at all</b>	<b>DK/REF</b>
Q38. Scientists at the EPA	43%	38	9	9	1
Q39. University scientists	41%	44	8	5	2

(cont.) How much would you personally trust each of the following people and organizations for information on EPA air pollution standards: a great deal, some, not very much, or not at all? RANDOMIZE

	Great deal	Some	Not very much	Not at all	DK/REF
Q40. The American Lung Association	51%	40	5	4	1
Q41. The American Public Health Association	39%	47	5	4	5
Q42. Tea Party leaders	7%	29	18	41	4
Q43. The American Academy of Pediatrics	45%	43	6	5	1
Q44a. SPLIT SAMPLE, n=418 Businesses that oppose the standards	5%	35	24	35	1
Q44b, n=482 SPLIT SAMPLE: Businesses that support the standards	21%	55	13	10	1
Q45. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce	8%	47	22	22	2
Q46. Scientists at environmental organizations	41%	40	8	10	1
Q47. Nurses	36%	45	10	7	2
Q48. The Centers for Disease Control, or CDC	49%	41	4	5	1

Now I have a few questions about you to help us classify your questionnaire.

IDEO. In terms of your political outlook, do you usually consider yourself: READ CATEGORIES; REVERSE ORDER; DO NOT READ DK/REF.	Very conservative	15%
	Somewhat conservative	26
	Middle of the road	34
	Somewhat liberal	15
	Very liberal	8
	DK/REF	2

PARTY. Regardless of how you are registered to vote, do you consider yourself to be a [ROTATE: a Democrat, a Republican], an independent, or something else?	Democrat	36%
	Republican	27
	Independent	33
	Something else (specify)	2
	DK/REF	2

EDUC. What was the last grade of school you completed? READ ONLY IF NECESSARY	Less than high school	8%
	High school graduate	28
	Some college/technical/2-year	31
	College grad/BA or BS/4-year	21
	Post-grad work/JD/MBA/Ph.D/ Masters	11
	DK/REF	1

BIRTHYR. In what year were you born? RECORD EXACT RESPONSE	18-34	26%
	35-44	16
AGECAT. (IF BIRTHYR=DK/REF) Are you between...	45-54	20
	55-64	17
	65+	20
	DK/REF	*
<hr/>		
HISP. Do you consider yourself Hispanic or Latino(a)?	White/Caucasian	72%
RACE1. [IF HISP=NO, DK, REF] Would you say you are white, black or African-American, Asian or Pacific Islander, Native American or something else?	Black/African American	13
	Hispanic/Latino(a)	11
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1
	Native American	1
	Something else (specify)	*
	DK/REF	2
<hr/>		
INC. Stop me when I come to the category in which your total HOUSEHOLD income fell before taxes last year. Your best estimate is fine. READ RESPONSE OPTIONS	Less than \$25,000	21%
	\$25,000 up to \$50,000	26
	\$50,000 up to \$75,000	16
	\$75,000 up to \$100,000	12
	\$100,000 or more	17
	DK/REF	9
<hr/>		
GENDER (DO NOT ASK)	Male	48%
	Female	52
<hr/>		