

**TO:** Interested Parties  
**FROM:** Corrie Hunt, Jay Campbell & Geoff Garin  
**DATE:** June 12, 2025  
**RE:** Survey Finds Pennsylvania Voters Want Democrats to Fight Budget Bill Cuts to Clean Energy

---

*Hart Research conducted a survey of 419 registered voters in Pennsylvania from June 3-9, 2025. The survey, sponsored by Climate Power, assessed public reaction to the Republican budget bill's proposed elimination of clean energy investments and tested what voters want Democratic leaders in Congress to do in response.*

1. **Voters see the Republican budget bill's energy plan as a direct threat to their wallets, energy reliability, and the broader economy.**
  - After learning about the energy policies in the budget bill, 60% of voters say the plan would hurt average Americans, and 59% say it would hurt them and their families personally. Women under 50 (71%) are especially likely to expect it to hurt them personally, but concern cuts across groups, including a majority of white voters without a college degree (56%).
  - 61% of voters expect electricity prices to rise if the Republican budget bill passes. Majorities of Democrats (81%) and swing voters (67%) expect electricity prices to go up, while even Republicans see more harm than benefit (38% prices up vs 36% down).
  - 55% of voters believe the bill would hurt the reliability of the electric grid, including 78% of Democrats and 61% of swing voters. Similarly, by a 14-point margin, voters say the bill would hurt the overall U.S. economy (55% hurt, 41% benefit).
2. **Meeting America's rising energy needs is a priority for voters. They see clean energy as a key part of the solution, and they overwhelmingly oppose Republican efforts to cut it from the budget bill.**
  - Seven in 10 (70%) voters say Congress should not eliminate clean energy investments in the budget bill, including 50% who feel strongly. Opposition cuts across party lines: 93% of Democrats, 45% of Republicans, and 76% of swing voters oppose these cuts.
  - Before hearing any details, voters already lean against the Republican budget bill overall (48% oppose, 37% support, 14% unsure). Once voters learn more what clean energy programs would be eliminated and what's at stake, opposition jumps to 67%.
  - Voters want Democrats to take a stand to protect clean energy investments in local clean energy production and manufacturing. Fully 63% say they would feel positive toward their Democratic senator if they fought to protect clean energy investments in these areas, including 85% of Democrats and 65% of swing voters.
  - 64% of voters believe that it is very important for elected leaders to meet our country's growing energy demands. To do so, voters support federal elected leaders increasing the production of clean and renewable energy (60%) by a 29-point margin rather than increasing drilling for oil and gas (31%). A strong majority of Democrats (88%) and over half of swing voters (54%) feel the same way.

### 3. **Clean energy investments have crossover appeal, with many Republican voters opposed to cuts in the budget bill.**

- Half of Republicans (49%) say it's very or fairly important for the United States to increase its use of clean and renewable energy sources like wind power and solar energy. A similar share (45%) say Congress should protect clean energy investments in the budget bill.
- When Republicans hear details about the energy cuts (shown in point #4 below), majorities of Republicans want Democrats to oppose key elements: 62% want Democrats to oppose increasing families' energy costs by ending clean energy programs, rebates, and incentives, and another 61% want Democrats to oppose provisions that would reduce the reliability of the U.S. electric grid.
- There is little political risk for Democrats in taking on this fight: only 15% of voters overall would feel negative toward their Democratic senator if they fought to protect clean energy investments, and Republicans are supportive as well (40% positive, 26% negative) on this point.

### 4. **Rising energy costs and threats to the reliability of the grid in the Republican budget bill spark the strongest voter backlash.**

- Large majorities of voters want Democrats to oppose seven energy-related provisions in the Republican budget bill. The strongest reactions center on outcomes that would increase families' energy costs and reduce the reliability of the electric grid.

*% saying Democrats should oppose things the Republican budget bill would do*

	Should definitely oppose this	Should probably oppose this		% Top 3 MOST want Democrats to oppose
Increase families' energy costs by ending clean energy programs, rebates, and incentives	56%	22%	78%	50
Reduce the reliability of the U.S. electric grid by eliminating upgrades to it	48%	26%	74%	33
Eliminate tax credits for renewable energy projects like solar power and wind	41%	25%	66%	29
Get rid of tax credits that help people make their homes more energy-efficient and afford energy-efficient appliances	43%	22%	65%	29
Open up millions of acres of public lands to drilling, mining, and logging, which have been protected	45%	20%	64%	44
Protect corporate subsidies and special tax breaks for oil and gas companies	37%	23%	60%	26
Get rid of the tax credit that lowers the cost of buying an electric car	31%	26%	57%	26

- Public land giveaways to fossil fuel, mining, and logging companies also generate a lot of concern—this part of the bill is second only to families' energy costs in terms of what Pennsylvanians most want congressional Democrats to oppose.
- While Democrats want their elected leaders in Congress to oppose the full slate of outcomes, they feel most strongly about protecting public lands (55%). Swing voters emphasize both energy costs (57%) and public lands (45%).

5. **Voters' concerns on cost and reliability give Democrats strong frames to defend clean energy, while national security and energy dominance create an opening to go on offense against a core Republican argument.**
- Three messages stand out as the most effective frames for opposing efforts to eliminate clean energy investments:
    - **[RELIABILITY]** *We've seen what happens when there is severe heat, ice storms, and other dangerous extreme weather: thousands of people lose power. Lives are put at risk and businesses lose millions of dollars. Eliminating these investments would leave the electric grid weaker and more vulnerable when we need it most.*
    - **[NATIONAL SECURITY]** *No foreign country should be able to threaten or control America's energy supply. To protect our national security and energy dominance, we need to produce as much energy as possible here at home. American-made clean energy keeps both money and power here in the U.S., not overseas.*
    - **[COSTS]** *With energy prices already high, now is the time to produce more energy--not less--to drive down those costs. Cutting clean energy means America produces less energy overall, and that means families will pay even more to keep the lights on. Repealing clean energy investments could increase energy costs by \$110 per family starting next year.*
  - The reliability and cost arguments are most persuasive with Democrats. The national security frame generates the strongest response from Republicans and swing voters and offers a potential opening to neutralize one of Trump's perceived strengths on energy.