

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

001. list	[Personally Identifiable Information] [partial] (1 page)	09/15/1997	b(6)
-----------	--	------------	------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Staff Secretary
Todd Stern
OA/Box Number: 11210

FOLDER TITLE:

Events-September 15, [1997]

2019-0774-S
rs3400

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Events - Sept 15

ATTENDEES FOR MEETING WITH THE PRESIDENT REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1997

John Adams
Natural Resources Defense Council

Deb Callahan
League of Conservation Voters

Phil Clapp
Environmental Information Center

'97 SEP 15 PM2:44

Kathryn Fuller
World Wildlife Fund

Paul Hansen
Izaak Walton League

Gene Karpinski
U.S. Public Interest Research Group

Fred Krupp
Environmental Defense Fund

Jonathan Lash
World Resources Institute

Robert Musil
Physicians for Social Responsibility

Carl Pope
Sierra Club

Howard Ris
Union of Concerned Scientists

Mark Van Putten
National Wildlife Federation

Jule Waterman
Green Group

Paul Gorman
National Religious Partnership for the Environment

Events - Sept 15

'97 SEP 4 PM 6:24

GREEN GROUP MEMBERSAMERICAN OCEANS
CAMPAIGN

Robert Sulnick
Executive Director
725 Arizona Ave., Ste. 102
Santa Monica, CA 90401
Phone: (310) 576-6162
Fax: (310) 576-6170

AMERICAN RIVERS

Rebecca R. Wodder
President
1025 Vermont Ave., NW
Suite 720
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: (202) 547-6900
Fax: (202) 347-9240

CENTER FOR MARINE
CONSERVATION

Roger E. McManus
President
1725 DeSalle Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 429-5609
Fax: (202) 872-0619

DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE

Rodger Schlickeisen
President
1101 14th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: (202) 682-9400 x.279
Fax: (202) 682-1331

 ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE
FUND

Fred D. Krupp
Executive Director
257 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10010
Phone: (212) 505-2122
Fax: (212) 505-2375

ENVIRONMENTAL
INFORMATION CENTER

Phil Clapp
Executive Director
1200 18th Street, NW, 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 887-8800
Fax: (202) 887-8888

ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING
GROUP

Ken Cook
President
1718 Connecticut Ave., NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20009
Phone: (202) 667-6982
Fax: (202) 232-2592

FRIENDS OF THE EARTH

Brent Blackwelder
President
1025 Vermont Ave. NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: (202) 783-7400
Fax: (202) 783-0444

IZAACK WALTON LEAGUE

 Paul Hansen
Executive Director
707 Conservation Lane
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
Phone: (301) 548-0150
Fax: (301) 548-0149

 LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION
VOTERS

Deb Callahan
President
1707 L Street, NW, Suite 750
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 785-8683
Fax: (202) 835-0491

NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY

★ John Flicker
President
700 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10003-9501
Phone: (212) 979-3088
Fax: (212) 353-0377

**NATIONAL PARKS &
CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION**

Bill Watson
Interim Executive Officer
1776 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 223-6722
Fax: (202) 659-0650

**NATIONAL TRIBAL
ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL**

Jerry Pardilla
Executive Director
2221 Rio Grande, NW
Albuquerque, NM 87104
Phone: (505) 242-2175
Fax: (505) 242-2654

**NATIONAL TRUST FOR
HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

Richard Moe
President
1785 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 588-6135
Fax: (202) 588-6082

**NATIONAL WILDLIFE
FEDERATION**

★ Mark Van Putten
President & CEO
8925 Leesburg Pike
Vienna, VA 22184
Phone: (703) 790-4455
Fax: (703) 790-4330

**NATIVE AMERICAN
RIGHTS FUND**

John Echohawk
Executive Director
1506 Broadway
Boulder, CO 80302
Phone: (303) 447-8760
Fax: (303) 443-7776

**NATURAL RESOURCES
DEFENSE COUNCIL**

★ John Adams
Executive Director
40 West 20th Street
New York, NY 10011
Phone: (212) 727-2700
Fax: (212) 633-6935

**PHYSICIANS FOR SOCIAL
RESPONSIBILITY**

★ Robert K. Musil
Executive Director
1101 14th Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: (202) 898-0150
Fax: (202) 898-0172

**POPULATION ACTION
INTERNATIONAL**

Hugo Hoogenboom
President
1120 19th Street, NW, Suite 550
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 659-1833
Fax: (202) 293-1795

SCENIC AMERICA

Meg Maguire
President
21 Dupont Circle, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 833-4300
Fax: (202) 833-4304

SIERRA CLUB

★ Carl Pope
Executive Director
85 Second Street
Second Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105-3441
Phone: (415) 977-5500
Fax: (415) 977-5790

**SIERRA CLUB LEGAL
DEFENSE FUND**

Buck Parker
Interim President
180 Montgomery Street, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94104
Phone: (415) 627-6700
Fax: (415) 627-6740

THE TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND

Martin J. Rosen
President
116 New Montgomery, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
Phone: (415) 495-4014
Fax: (415) 495-4103

**UNION OF CONCERNED
SCIENTISTS**

★ Howard Ris
Executive Director
2 Brattle Square
Cambridge, MA 02238-9105
Phone: (617) 547-5552
Fax: (617) 864-9405

**UNITED STATES PUBLIC
INTEREST RESEARCH
GROUP (USPIRG)**

★ Gene Karpinski
Executive Director
218 D Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003
Phone: (202) 546-9707
Fax: (202) 546-2461

THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY

William H. Meadows
President
900 17th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
Phone: (202) 833-2300
Fax: (202) 429-2658

WORLD RESOURCES INSTITUTE

Jonathan Lash
President
1709 New York Avenue, NW, #700
Washington, DC 20006
Phone: (202) 638-6300
Fax: (202) 662-2511

WORLD WILDLIFE FUND

★ Kathryn S. Fuller
President
1250 24th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
Phone: (202) 778-9663
Fax: (202) 778-9637

ZERO POPULATION GROWTH

Peter Kostmayer
Executive Director
1400 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 332-2200
Fax: (202) 332-2302

Gene Karpinski - Chair

Julie Waterman - Project Coordinator
National Audubon Society
1901 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006-3405
Phone: (202) 861-2242
Fax: (202) 861-4290

June 15, 1997

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. list	[Personally Identifiable Information] [partial] (1 page)	09/15/1997	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Staff Secretary
Todd Stern
OA/Box Number: 11210

FOLDER TITLE:

Events-September 15, [1997]

2019-0774-S

rs3400

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

**ATTENDEES FOR PRESIDENT CLINTON MTG.
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1997**

12:45-1:30 mtg
12:25-12:40P pre. mtg

John Adams - Natural Resources Defense Council - (b)(6)

Deb Callahan - League of Conservation Voters -

Phil Clapp - Environmental Information Center -

Kathryn Fuller - World Wildlife Fund

Paul Hansen - Izaak Walton League -

Gene Karpinski - U.S. Public Interest Research Group -

Fred Krupp - Environmental Defense Fund -

Jonathan Lash - World Resources Institute -

Robert Musil - Physicians for Social Responsibility -

Carl Pope - Sierra Club -

Howard Ris - Union of Concerned Scientists -

Mark Van Patten - National Wildlife Federation

Julie Waterman - Green Group -

Kn's B.
100

Eventy - Sept 15
'97 SEP 14 PM7:01

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 14, 1997

Meeting with Environmental Leaders on Climate Change

DATE: September 15, 1997
LOCATION: Cabinet Room
TIME: 12:45 - 1:30 p.m.
FROM: Todd Stern & Katie McGinty

I. PURPOSE

To discuss climate change with leaders of the dozen major environmental organizations most engaged on the issue.

Meeting objectives: (1) To give the leaders of the environmental community an opportunity to talk to you directly about their views on climate change; (2) to demonstrate your personal engagement on the issue; (3) to make clear that you are committed to achieving a solid agreement in Kyoto and that you recognize Kyoto to be only the first step on the path toward solving the long-term problem; (4) to make clear your belief that the plan we put forward must both make a serious start on addressing the environmental problem while also being economically and politically realistic. (The truth is that negotiating a treaty that ends up rejected by the Senate would set the cause of climate change back much more than failing to reach a final agreement in Kyoto.)

II. BACKGROUND

This is your first meeting with the nation's environmental leadership since November 1995. The environmental community is very concerned about climate change, and a number of these leaders see the issue as their highest priority. Unlike the corporate CEOs you met with in August, they are likely to have coordinated their approach to you, and, even though there are real differences in how they see this issue (see attached rundown of the groups), they will speak with a fairly unified voice.

In general, they come at this issue from a perspective that is quite far away from even the moderate voices in big business, such as BP's John Browne. For example, on the issue of most importance to them -- the target and timetable -- these groups favor a very aggressive approach: 1990 levels by 2005. It is doubtful that even a target of 1990 by 2010 would garner much if any support from business.

It is imperative that you avoid making or implying any commitments to a specific target or timetable, even though these leaders may try to push you. As you will hear when you meet

Tuesday with a few of your advisors on this issue, the economic costs of a 1990/2010 target are very significant.

While members of this group hold different views about acceptable implementation mechanisms, you are likely to hear some support for flexible, market-based policies, such as emissions trading or so-called "joint implementation", though the Sierra Club, in particular, remains opposed to these tools.

You should also know that the group may argue that the politics favor tough action. They may share with you a poll that the World Wildlife Fund plans to release later this month, though WWF is concerned that it not leak yet. The poll indicates that people are concerned about climate change and especially about some of the impacts it might have; at the same time it suggests that people are not very enthused about many of the proposed solutions. (Poll attached)

Note: as you are probably aware, a coalition of industry groups launched an ad campaign on September 9, with the first ad attacking the notion that we would sign a treaty that "exempts" the developing countries of the world.

Topics of Discussion: We have attached suggested questions in order to get the dialogue going on several topics. The conversation is likely to be free flowing, but we recommend proceeding in roughly the following way:

General views: You should begin by making brief opening comments that articulate the principles that guide your approach to climate change (attached). You should start the discussion by turning to Gene Karpinski, Chair of the group. He will likely make some introductory remarks and then turn to Bud Ris from the Union of Concerned Scientists (the only scientist among the group) for his comments on the importance of this issue to the environmental community.

Targets and timetables: As noted, the group supports the EU's position on stringent early reductions and will call for a 2005 target. EDF's Fred Krupp is likely to take the lead on this issue. It would be appropriate to press them on what they see as the long-term differences environmentally of an aggressive early target (like 1990 in 2005 or 2010) as compared with a more gradual target (like 1990 in 2020) --in light of the potentially significantly greater economic costs of setting an early date. **You might let Larry Summers pursue this a bit. We have talked to him, and he is ready to do this.**

International issues: The toughest issue here concerns the way to handle developing countries. In a nutshell, the current negotiations are proceeding on the basis that developed countries must accept binding targets and timetables, but that developing countries do not need to do that. The Byrd Resolution, which passed 95-0 in July, in effect dismisses that approach and articulates the sense of the Senate that the U.S. should not sign any treaty in Kyoto *unless* the developing countries take on new commitments of their own (though those commitments could be different than developed country commitments). Both because it makes substantive, environmental sense and because of the clear message sent by the Senate, State has been

developing some new ideas of how to demand more from developing countries in a manner that doesn't derail the Kyoto negotiations. We have let people know -- in the business and environmental communities and on the Hill -- that we are working on some new developing country ideas, but have not shared anything yet.

Domestic policies: These are the domestic means -- such as emissions trading and technology -- for achieving whatever reductions we agree to. These groups have different ideas about acceptable measures. Some support domestic emissions trading, some a carbon tax of some kind, others an increase in CAFE standards for auto fuel efficiency. All tend to have an optimistic view about the speed at which new technologies can be developed and put in place, and this largely accounts for their lower estimates of the economic costs. Furthermore, they may suggest that past economic assessments of the costs of proposed environmental regulations are usually exaggerated because they fail sufficiently to account for the technological innovations that result from strong regulatory measures.

III. PARTICIPANTS

Pre-brief Participants:

Todd Stern, Katie McGinty, Gene Sperling, Dan Tarullo, Jim Steinberg, Jack Gibbons, Larry Summers, Carol Browner, Bruce Babbitt.

Meeting Participants:

Todd Stern, Katie McGinty, Gene Sperling, Dan Tarullo, Jim Steinberg, Jack Gibbons, Larry Summers, Carol Browner, Bruce Babbitt.

John Adams	Natural Resource Defense Council
Deb Callahan	League of Conservation Voters
Phil Clapp	Environmental Information Center
Kathryn Fuller	World Wildlife Fund
Paul Gorman	National Religious Partnership for the Environment
Paul Hansen	Izaak Walton League
Gene Karpinski	U.S. Public Interest Research Group
Fred Krupp	Environmental Defense Fund
Jonathan Lash	World Resources Institute
Robert Musil	Physicians for Social Responsibility
Carl Pope	Sierra Club
Howard (Bud) Ris	Union of Concerned Scientists
Mark VanPutten	National Wildlife Federation

IV. PRESS PLAN

Closed Press

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

- You and the Vice President enter the Cabinet Room.
- You make brief opening comments and lead discussion.
- You and the Vice President depart.

VI. REMARKS

Attached

'97 SEP 14 PM6:55

**Presidential Opening Remarks
Green Group Meeting on Climate Change
September 15, 1997**

Thank you all very much for coming.

Let me just say a couple of words before we begin what I hope will be a very productive discussion.

First, let me be clear that I am committed to addressing the climate change problem. Thanks to the Vice President and others, I am convinced of the science and of the need to act.

Second, I want you to know I am committed to getting an agreement in Kyoto that will work -- one that includes realistic and achievable binding targets, flexible implementation mechanisms, and solid commitments from developing countries. I will tell you right now that from the United States point of view, each of these three elements is vital.

Third, I am committed to engaging the American people on this issue and to developing public support for doing something about it. I can tell you that I do not believe that support is there yet, and without it we cannot move forward. I know you all are doing a great deal on this front, and I urge you to continue.

For our part, my cabinet will be participating in twenty or more events on climate change in the next few weeks. In fact, Secretaries Daley and Pena are in Pittsburgh as we speak doing a climate change event there, and Secretary Babbitt is leaving

Friday for a university tour, focused on the climate issue. In several weeks, we hope to bring in weather forecasters from across the country for a series of briefings here, and then on October 6 we will have the White House Conference on Climate Change.

Fourth and finally, let's remember that we cannot solve climate change in Kyoto. If there ever was a long-term problem, this is it. Our goal must be to take a meaningful step in the right direction, one that puts us squarely on a path toward stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases at a safe level. If we overreach and end up with an agreement that has insufficient domestic support, we risk setting the cause back rather than moving it forward. Likewise, we cannot merely kick the can down the road and leave this problem for the next generation.

I hope you will help me try to strike the right balance.

Discussion Points for Climate Change Meeting with Environmental Leaders

Welcome

- Thank you all for coming. (make brief statement of climate change principles --attached). [Mr. President, you should recognize the Vice President, who may also want to say a few words. Also if you recognize Secretary Babbitt and Administrator Browner, you may want to note that Secretaries Daley and Pena wanted to attend but had commitments to another *climate change* event in Pittsburgh.]

General Views [Recommend turning to Gene Karpinski, Chair of the Green Group.]

- You've just heard a little about the principles that guide my approach to this issue. But I'm most interested in hearing from you. **Gene, how do you see this issue right now, what do you think about our general approach? [Karpinski will likely make a few opening comments, then turn to Bud Ris, UCS, who will underscore the significance of the issue to the environmental community.]**

Binding Targets and Timetables

- As you know, the European Union has called for a 15% reduction from 1990 levels by the year 2010. I have to be honest in saying that we don't think that's realistic. I know you all support an early date for binding limits, and **I'd like to hear your views on the subject. [Fred Krupp, Environmental Defense Fund, likely to respond with strong push for a 2005 target]**

[Mr. President, you may want to allow Larry Summers to follow up a bit here. It is critical for this group to explain the environmental rationale for early and stringent reductions, given that the economic costs of such measures are likely to be substantially greater than those from a more gradual approach.]

International Measures

- Whatever the specific level, I understand the importance of binding targets for developed countries. But in reality that is only one piece of a larger agreement. We feel strongly that meaningful targets can only be met in an economically responsible manner if sufficient flexibility is provided. Furthermore, for any agreement to be environmentally justifiable, not to mention equitable, and result in a ratified treaty there must be meaningful developing country obligations. Will you help us work with other nations to build support for these flexible measures, and what do you think are appropriate commitments for developing countries?

We understand that despite some disparate views this group may be willing to express some

vague support for flexible measures. On developing countries, they will agree that participation is needed but will argue that we not push so hard as to endanger the Kyoto negotiations.

Domestic Policies -- Technology

- As we look to develop targets and timetables, we must consider a range of domestic implementation mechanisms for ensuring that such targets are met. Obviously, technology will play a vital role. What are your thoughts on how the Federal government can best spur technological innovation, and where do you see the best promise for developing clean energy options?

Domestic Policies -- Emissions Trading & Other Ideas

- Another area we are examining closely is domestic emissions trading. I understand that we have used a domestic trading scheme very effectively in addressing the problem of acid rain. Do you think there are useful parallels to draw here and how about an emissions trading regime for carbon dioxide? **[Fred Krupp at EDF is the major proponent of domestic trading]**
- Are there other ideas you have for concrete steps we can take in the near term to begin reducing emissions domestically? **[John Adams may suggest using the utility restructuring legislation as a vehicle to achieve reductions.]**

Outreach -- Asking for help

- Regardless of any differences we may have about specific policy choices, I think we can agree on the need to make this a serious issue with the American people. As I have mentioned, I and my Cabinet are fully engaged in this effort. I feel the White House Conference in October will also be a great help in this regard. But let me reiterate that we need your help. I know you don't have the financial resources of those who launched the multi-million dollar ad campaign last week. But your success in bringing the clean air issue home to people across the country speaks to your ability to get the message out.
- Knowing what a priority this issue is for this community, what, specifically, are you doing to educate the American people? **[Suggest turning to Carl Pope and/or John Adams. Both would like to share with you the outreach they've been doing].**
- It strikes me that the outdoor recreation community has a role to play as well. **[Suggest turning to Paul Hansen. He can highlight the work the outdoor recreation community has been doing - you should encourage them to be more vocal.]**

- The Vice President has mentioned to me that the religious community is also concerned about climate change. I'd be interested in to know how you deliver a message about global warming and what resonates with people. **[You should turn to Paul Gorman of the National Religious Partnership for the Environment. He will share with you the efforts of the religious community.]**

Conclusion

- I want to thank you all again for joining me today. This is certainly a tough issue, but one we all agree is extremely important.
- We must unite in our commitment to bring this issue to the American people -- to convince them that this is the time for action.
- I also want to reiterate my strong hopes of reaching an agreement in Kyoto. But let me be clear: we will not sign an agreement if it isn't the *right* agreement. It must include realistic and achievable binding targets, flexible implementation mechanisms, and commitments from developing countries, and it must be a treaty that is politically viable domestically.

BACKGROUND ON KEY CLIMATE PLAYERS

Following is a background paper on the key players who will be attending today's climate change meeting. This group is a subset of the "Green Group," a coalition of thirty of the leading national environmental organizations. Though all of the environmental leaders you will meet with today have an interest in climate change, there are divergent views between them. We have tried to summarize the key differences, moving roughly speaking, from right to left.

Environmental Defense Fund (Fred Krupp)

EDF is the most business-oriented and market-friendly of the green groups. They have been consistent advocates for the flexibility measures we support, such as emissions trading and joint implementation. They were very involved in helping to set up the domestic emissions trading system for sulfur dioxide (acid rain), which is widely regarded as a success story. EDF also has solid scientific credentials. Dr. Michael Oppenheimer, who works in their New York office, has been one of the leading scientific voices on this issue for years and accompanied the Vice President to Glacier National Park several weeks ago. EDF is one of the groups whose support will be critical if our ultimate climate change policy is to have environmental credibility. They are well respected by the national environmental media and have solid relations with key components of the business community. Fred Krupp has been EDF's CEO for over a decade and is very knowledgeable on the climate change issue.

World Resources Institute (Jonathan Lash)

WRI is the closest thing the environmental community has to a think tank. They are highly regarded as a source of information on global environmental trends, from forest destruction to air pollution. Climate change has been a central issue for WRI for years. Most recently, they produced a highly useful report summarizing the economic literature on climate change and suggesting that, given the right flexibility measures, significant emissions reductions could be achieved at little or no cost to the economy. Bob Repetto, the economist who co-authored the report, is one of the most credible voices arguing that tackling climate change makes solid economic sense if done properly. WRI also has a very good feel for the developing country side of the climate equation, both in terms of what such countries *must* do environmentally and *can* do realistically. Jonathan Lash is the Co-Chair of your Council on Sustainable Development and is also quite knowledgeable on the climate issue. WRI is another of the groups that might support a more middle ground U.S. position.

Natural Resources Defense Council (John Adams)

NRDC was started almost thirty years ago (by three Yale Law School graduates) as essentially the legal arm of the environmental community. They were instrumental in the passage of landmark environmental legislation such as the Clean Air Act. Their interest in climate change also goes way back. Senior scientist Dan Lashof is another one of the leading scientific experts on the issue from the environmental community and recently authored an

excellent Washington Post Op-Ed on the subject. He also joined the Vice President at Glacier. NRDC historically has been the leading proponent of a carbon or energy tax of some type to address this issue. However, after the unsuccessful effort to impose a BTU tax, they have backed off the tax issue and have indicated a greater degree of support for concepts like emissions trading. They are also advocates for using the utility restructuring legislation to achieve carbon limitation objectives. A last point is that they are optimistic about technology. They would argue that over the past 30 years, successful environmental legislation has driven technological innovation at a rate faster, and at a cost cheaper, than what economists predicted. John Adams, the senior member of the Green Group and it's past chair, has led NRDC since its inception.

World Wildlife Fund (Kathryn Fuller)

WWF is a very large, mainstream environmental organization, known for its focus on protecting endangered species and habitats. They have taken an increasingly large interest in climate change in recent years. In July, WWF released a report detailing the potential impact of climate change on U.S. national parks and protected areas. The report received some press attention and covers an area of the climate debate that has not been focused on much in the past. WWF has also commissioned a poll on climate change (they may reference this in the meeting) which shows public concern for the climate issue and a willingness to support corrective policies even if they are expensive. The poll also indicates, however, that people do not feel the issue is urgent. Kathryn Fuller has led the WWF for nearly a decade.

League of Conservation Voters (Deb Callahan)

The League of Conservation Voters is the bipartisan, political arm of the national environmental community. They endorse and work for and against candidates. LCV's sole mission is to gain grassroots support on behalf of national and state election candidates with strong environmental records. The LCV also publishes the *National Environmental Scorecard* which rates Congress on their environmental voting record and is seen as the definitive word on the environmental performance of every member in the House and Senate. In addition, they also put out a report card on the Administration -- climate will likely be one of the key items on which we will be graded.

Environmental Information Center (Phil Clapp)

EIC, established in 1995, was created with a mission to run public education campaigns to inform the American public about legislation in Congress that would compromise their health, safety, environment, and quality of life. EIC, with a large budget funded mostly from foundations (Pew Charitable Trusts), has been extremely effective in organizing grassroots support and using paid media to reach millions of Americans. Most recently, EIC has been hosting regional town meetings across the country on climate change and has been effective in galvanizing grassroots support on the issue. Phil Clapp, the founder and President, has been very vocal on a variety of issues these past two years - including the recent clean air standards. During the proposed clean air standards debate, Phil was quoted in a front page

story of the *New York Times* questioning the Vice President's commitment to these issues, which was unfortunate.

Sierra Club (Carl Pope)

The Sierra Club is the grassroots arm of the environmental movement. They also endorse and work on behalf of candidates. They have local, state, and regional chapters which can be quite effective in advocating for key environmental issues. Last year, the Club elected 24-year-old Adam Werbach as their Board President, and he has been successful in tapping in to the youth sector. On climate change, the Club has taken a hard line position in support of stringent binding targets. Furthermore, they have actively opposed the flexibility measures that we believe are critical to achieving emissions reductions cost effectively (i.e. emissions trading and, particularly, joint implementation). They believe these proposals are unworkable and afford too many loopholes to ensure real environmental gains (though they are unlikely to be negative on these issues in the meeting so as to preserve the appearance of unity). They instead have favored initiatives such as raising CAFE standards for auto efficiency. Carl Pope the club's executive director, like John Adams and Fred Krupp, is seen as one of the leading environmental voices in the country and was a very visible and effective spokesman during the clean air debate.

The descriptions below are in no particular order.

The Izaak Walton League of America (Paul Hansen)

Founded in 1922, the IWL is a national conservation organization whose 50,000 members nationwide protect and enjoy America's soil, air, woods, waters, and wildlife. (These are the hunters and fishermen.) The Ikes have a unique role to play in educating and mobilizing the recreation community on this issue.

The National Wildlife Federation (Mark Van Putten)

The mission of NWF is to educate and assist individuals and organizations to conserve wildlife and our natural resources. Founded in 1936, NWF has more than 4 million members and supporters.

Physicians for Social Responsibility (Robert Musil)

Founded in 1961, PSR is a national organization of over 20,000 health professionals and supporters working to promote arms control and international cooperation, reduce societal violence and its causes, and protect the environment worldwide. PSR should be encouraged to mobilize the health care community on the health impacts associated with climate change.

Union of Concerned Scientists (Howard "Bud" Ris)

UCS is dedicated to advancing responsible public policies in areas where science and technology play a critical role. Climate change is currently one of their greatest concerns and they are working to encourage responsible stewardship of the global environment, promote energy technologies that are renewable, safe, and cost effective, reform transportation policy, and promote sustainable agriculture. UCS conducts technical studies and public education campaigns and seeks to influence government policy at the local, state, federal, and international levels.

U.S. Public Interest Research Group (Gene Karpinski)

U.S. PIRG is the national lobbying office for state PIRGs around the country, representing nearly one million members. Each state PIRG sets their own agenda, but the work they do focuses primarily on environmental protection, hazardous waste cleanup and prevention, safe energy, consumer protection and open government. PIRG should also be encouraged to play a strong role in educating the American people on climate change. Gene Karpinski, in addition to serving as PIRG's executive director, is currently the chair of the Green Group.

The National Religious Partnership for the Environment (Paul Gorman)

The NRPE is a coalition of major American faith groups and affiliated agencies. The alliance consists of the U.S. Catholic Conference, the Evangelical Environmental Network, the Coalition on the Environment and Jewish life, and the National Council of Churches of Christ. The mission for the NRPE is to integrate issues of environmental sustainability and justice permanently across all areas of organized religious life.

Background on Issues

INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATIONS

The Framework Convention on Climate Change was signed at the Rio "Earth Summit" in 1992.

The current round of negotiations is scheduled to conclude in Kyoto this December. To date, the United States has advanced a three-part framework for the negotiations. We have argued for (1) binding emissions targets, (2) flexibility in achieving those targets (for example, through emissions trading among developed nations and "joint implementation" with developing nations), and (3) the participation of all countries. We have not yet proposed any specific targets or timetables. A relatively low-level negotiating session has been going on this week in Bonn and will continue next week.

Targets and Timetables

The European Union has proposed that developed nations cut back emissions 10-15% from 1990 levels by 2010. We have stated publicly that we believe this proposal is unrealistic. Other nations, including Australia, Japan and Canada, have expressed concerns about moving too far too fast, but have not put forward any specific targets. Several countries (including Australia, Japan and Norway) have supported "differentiated" targets, under which different developed countries would take on different obligations. The United States has opposed these proposals as unworkable.

Flexibility

The term "flexibility" has been used to refer to international emissions trading, joint implementation, banking and borrowing (applying extra emissions reductions from one period in another period) and multi-year targets (setting emissions targets for periods of two or more years, such as 2010-2020). Such policies can substantially reduce costs of compliance.

Our proposal for emissions trading among all developed countries has met with only limited support. However, the EU has proposed that its members be allowed to trade emissions among themselves (the "EU bubble"). We have insisted that all countries that all developed countries be allowed to trade emissions.

Closely related to international emissions trading is "joint implementation." In a typical case, a company in the developed world would invest in a renewable energy, energy efficiency or forestry project in a developing nation. Emissions avoided as a result of this investment could be applied to that company's obligations at home. Since emissions reductions are typically much cheaper in the developing world than they are in the developed world, significant efficiencies could result. Developing countries would gain benefits in the form of technology transfer and private sector

investment flows as well.

In spite of the potential benefits, most developed countries remain opposed to joint implementation (although support has grown significantly in Latin America). Many of these countries see joint implementation as a way for developed countries to avoid taking responsibility for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, some environmentalists are concerned that measuring project-based emissions reductions will be too difficult, and some in Congress are concerned that joint implementation will result in significant transfers of wealth overseas.

The U.S. business community has strongly supported joint implementation. Utilities have been among the most active participants in pilot projects to explore the feasibility of joint implementation.

Developing Country Commitments

This is the most difficult issue in the current round of negotiations. There is a vast gulf between the dialogue abroad (where the U.S. proposals for developing country participation are almost uniformly considered too aggressive) and at home (where Senator Byrd's resolution, calling for commitments beyond the U.S. proposal or the 1995 Berlin Mandate under which this treaty is being negotiated, passed the Senate recently 95-0).

Developed countries are responsible for more than 75% of the increase in greenhouse gas concentrations since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. In the decades ahead, however, emissions from developing countries are expected to grow sharply. By 2035, developing country emissions are expected to exceed those from the developing world.

Per capita emissions vary widely. Carbon emissions from the United States are roughly 5 tons per person; from the OECD as a whole, roughly 3.5 tons per person; and from developing countries as a whole, roughly 0.5 tons per person.

The 1992 climate treaty established differentiated levels of commitments for developed and developing countries. It called upon developed countries to take the lead in addressing climate change and to aim to return emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000. It called upon developing countries to adopt policies and measures to address climate change, but provided no aim for developing countries similar to the year 2000 goal. These differentiated commitments were intended to recognize both the unequal contribution of developed and developing countries to global greenhouse gas concentrations and the unequal capacity of those countries to control emissions.

In 1995, in Berlin, the Parties to the climate treaty agreed to negotiate further steps for controlling greenhouse gas emissions. The negotiating mandate calls on developed countries to set quantified emissions limits for the "medium term (e.g. 2005, 2010 and 2020)." In Berlin, the United States argued strongly that developing countries must participate meaningfully in negotiations over next

steps. There was little support for the U.S. position on this point, with many Parties noting the failure of most developed countries to take significant steps toward meeting the year 2000 goal. The Berlin Mandate states that there will be "no new commitments" for developing countries in the current round of negotiation, but that developing countries will be required to "advance the implementation of" their existing (non-binding) commitments.

In January, 1997, the U.S. submitted a draft protocol proposal. Provisions on developing countries included three elements, the most important of which is the "evolution" concept, which would require developing countries to enter into an agreement by 2005 to adopt legally binding emissions targets and would include a "graduation mechanism" under which developing countries would automatically incur obligations as their living standards increase.

DOMESTIC POLICIES

Your Cabinet and staff are currently in the process of shaping domestic policies options to address greenhouse gas emissions. Among the options receiving close attention are domestic emissions trading and technology programs.

Domestic Emissions Trading Programs

Under emissions trading programs (sometimes referred to as "cap and trade"), companies would be allowed to buy and sell the right to emit greenhouse gases. The US has had more experience with emissions trading than any other country. Examples include the Clean Air Act's acid rain program, under which utilities are allocated permits based on historical emissions of sulphur dioxide. Permits may be traded. Compliance costs under this program have been much less than expected, due to unforeseen factors. (Prior to passage, industry estimated compliance costs would be over \$1,000/ton. Government studies estimated costs would be around \$600/ton. Currently, allowances are trading on the Chicago Board of trade for around \$100/ton).

Among the issues to be addressed in designing a domestic emissions trading program:

- Where the constraint is imposed. A "primary fuel" trading program would limit the production or import of fossil fuels. A "sectoral" trading program would limit emissions from one or more key sectors (e.g., utilities, transport or heavy manufacturing).
- How permits are distributed. For example, permits could be parceled out to emitters based on historical emissions, auctioned, or some combination of the two. If auctioned, substantial revenues would be raised which, for example, could be recycled through a consumer and/or business tax cut, or used for transitional or technology programs).

An emissions trading program for greenhouse gases could potentially be bigger in scope (by an order of magnitude) than any existing emissions trading program. We are currently exploring

feasibility and implications.

Technology Programs

The cost of reducing greenhouse gas emissions between now and 2020 depends greatly on the ability to accelerate use of existing energy-efficient technologies. Over the longer-term, the solution to the climate change problem depends on developing and deploying new technologies that are even more efficient or are based on non-carbon energy sources.

A range of government programs might help accelerate technological change. Research and development programs generally aim to improve technologies by lowering production and operating costs. Large opportunities for cost-lowering research and development exist in buildings, transportation, combustion, renewables and sequestration (e.g., fuel cells, advanced industrial turbines, advanced diesel engines, and transportation biofuels). In addition, information dissemination programs assist businesses and consumers in identifying opportunities to reduce the energy intensity of their products or services (e.g., using more energy efficient light bulbs, insulation, appliances, etc.).

You have strongly supported technology programs with significant climate change benefits. Examples include:

Partnership for a New Generation Vehicle (PNGV)

The PNGV program joins the big three U.S. auto makers, federal agencies and many suppliers of materials and equipment in an effort to develop a more efficient car. The program's goal is to triple the fuel efficiency of passenger cars with no decrease in comfort or safety.

The Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP)

CCAP began in 1993 with a goal of returning total US greenhouse gas emissions to their 1990 levels by the year 2000. The plan includes about 50 initiatives covering all major greenhouse gas producing sectors of the US economy, including Energy Demand, Energy Supply, and Forestry. CCAP programs have reduced the rate of emissions growth, but not enough to achieve the programs goals. CCAP is a voluntary program that relies on partnerships and cooperation with industry and includes both government and private sector investment in new low-emissions, high-efficiency technologies. Agency participants include DOE, EPA, and USDA.

Biomass Energy Initiative

DOE and USDA are working with companies to demonstrate power projects for rural development and to improve technologies for converting crops to liquid and gaseous fuels. Pilot projects are running in New York, Minnesota and Iowa.

Million Solar Roofs Initiative

In your recent UN speech, you announced that DOE will lead an effort to place one million solar energy systems on the roofs of buildings and homes across the US by the year 2010. This will be accomplished by using existing federal grants, procurement, and other programs, and by working with local communities, businesses, state governments, utilities, and other groups to spur the sales of solar energy systems. In 2010, this initiative will avert emissions of carbon dioxide equivalent to those produced by 850,000 cars and will produce the same electrical generating capacity as 3-5 coal-fired power plants.

PCAST Energy R&D Panel

In response to your request, the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology is conducting a comprehensive and strategic review of U.S. energy R&D policies and practices "to ensure the United States has a program that addresses its energy and environmental needs for the next century". The group is examining energy efficiency, fossil, nuclear (fission and fusion), and renewable energy programs and budgets across the Federal government. Their assessment, including recommended actions, is expected by October.

Partnership for Advancing Technologies in Housing (PATH)

Our planned PATH initiative will have HUD, DOE, and NIST working with building suppliers, assemblers, insurance companies, and state and local regulators in an effort improve the quality of housing and meet ambitious environmental goals without increasing prices. Buildings are responsible for about a third of US greenhouse gas emissions (this total is rising) and 2/3 of US electricity consumption.

DOE's Industries of the Future Program

This is an industry/government partnership with the seven most energy-intensive U.S. industries, including chemicals, paper and pulp, steel, aluminum and petroleum. The program has reached technology agreements with each industry that focus the R&D expertise of our national labs on cutting energy use and pollution in each industry.

NATIONAL SURVEY
FREQUENCIES -- August 15, 1997

'97 SEP 14 PM6:55

Hello. My name is _____. I'm calling long distance from _____. We are conducting a public opinion survey and I would like to ask you some questions. We are not selling anything, and I won't ask you for a contribution or donation.

Could I please speak with the (male/female) 18 or older in your household who celebrated a birthday most recently?

SEX OF RESPONDENT

Male	48
Female	52

1. First, are you registered to vote at this address? [IF NO, ASK FOR A FAMILY MEMBER WHO IS. IF NONE, TERMINATE AND MARK TQ1 ON SAMPLE SHEET]
2. How much, if anything, have you heard or read about the issue of global warming? Would you say you have heard a great deal, some, not too much or nothing at all about global warming?

Great deal	25
some	46
not too much	21
nothing at all	8
don't know	0

3. Generally speaking, how serious of a threat do you think global warming is today, very serious, somewhat serious, not too serious, or not serious at all -- or don't you have an opinion on this?

very serious	24
somewhat serious	42
not too serious	12
not serious at all	7
don't know	14

4. Twenty years from now, how serious of a threat do you think global warming will be, very serious, somewhat serious, not too serious, or not serious at all -- or don't you have an opinion on this?

very serious	38
somewhat serious	23
not too serious	11
not serious at all	6
don't know	22

5. Do you think that global warming is an environmental problem that is happening now, do you think that global warming will happen in the future, or do you think that global warming will not happen -- or don't you have an opinion on this?

Happening now	50
will happen in future	24
will not happen	10
not sure/don't know	16

6. When cars, electric utilities [you-TILL-uh-teez] and some other industries burn oil, coal and gasoline they release carbon dioxide and other gases into the atmosphere. Some scientists say these gases trap heat in the atmosphere, causing the earth to warm. They say this makes the world hotter and increases the chances of all kinds of extreme weather. This effect is called global warming. Generally speaking, how serious of a threat do you think global warming is today, very serious, somewhat serious, not too serious, or not serious at all -- or don't you have an opinion on this?

very serious	29
somewhat serious	45
not too serious	14
not serious at all	7
don't know	5

7. And how serious of a threat do you think global warming will be in twenty years, very serious, somewhat serious, not too serious, or not serious at all -- or don't you have an opinion on this?

very serious	45
somewhat serious	27
not too serious	9
not serious at all	7
don't know	12

8. It has been proposed that the nations of the world agree to reduce their carbon dioxide emissions by 20 percent by the year 2005 in order to significantly slow down the rate of global warming. Do you favor or oppose this proposal or don't you have an opinion on this?
[IF FAVOR/OPPOSE, ASK:] Is that (favor/oppose) strongly or not so strongly?

Strong favor	55	72
not strong favor	17	
undecided	19	
not strong oppose	3	
strong oppose	6	9

9. Which comes closest to your own view:

[READ STATEMENTS/ROTATE STATEMENTS A AND B]

 A. President Clinton should not take action on global warming because there are too many real problems that need attention right now 30

 B. President Clinton should take action on global warming now because the problem is only getting worse and we cannot afford to take a wait-and-see approach 56

[READ LAST]

or don't you have an opinion on this? 14

10. Which of the following statements comes closest to your own point of view?

[READ STATEMENTS/ROTATE STATEMENTS A AND B]

 A. Stricter regulations on the emission of carbon dioxide from the use of oil, coal and gasoline would go too far, and hurt the economy and cost jobs ... 18

 B. Stricter regulations on the emission of carbon dioxide from the use of oil, coal and gasoline will help stop global warming, protect our health and safety, create new jobs through new technologies and are worth the cost 60

[READ LAST]

 I'm not sure about this 22

11. With whom do you agree more?

[READ STATEMENTS/ROTATE STATEMENTS A AND B—BEGIN FIRST STATEMENT WITH “SOME” AND SECOND STATEMENT WITH “OTHER”]

A. Some/Other people say that most scientist agree that global warming is real and already happening. They say the only scientists who do not believe global warming is happening are paid by big oil, coal and gasoline companies to find the results that will protect business interests, just like the tobacco industry scientists who said cigarettes don't cause cancer.

B. Other/Some people say that scientists disagree among themselves that global warming is happening. They say there is no real evidence that carbon dioxide emissions from coal, oil and gasoline are causing global warming.

With whom do you agree more, those who say global warming is happening or those who say global warming is not happening? **[IF ANSWER GIVEN:]** Do you agree strongly or not so strongly?

strongly happening	53
not so strongly happening	22
Undecided/Don't Know/Not Sure	9
not so strongly NOT happening	8
strongly NOT happening	7

12. If a candidate for political office spoke out in support of reducing the threat of global warming, would you think he was forward-thinking and speaking to a real problem or would you think he was too interested in environmental issues and ignoring bigger problems?

Forward thinking	60
Ignoring bigger problems	26
Don't know	14

13. Let's say you agreed with a particular candidate on most issues and were of the same political party, however, that candidate voted against efforts to reduce the threat of global warming. Would you be likely to vote for or against that candidate?

[IF FOR OR AGAINST, ASK:] Is that very likely or somewhat likely to vote (for/against)?

strongly for	19
somewhat for	22
somewhat against	19
strongly against	18
don't know	22

BEGIN SPLIT SAMPLE A

I'm going to list some specific problems that some people say could happen as a result of global warming. After each please tell me how concerned you would be about that particular item -- would it be one of the things that would concern you most, would it make you feel very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned or not concerned at all. If you are not sure how you feel about a particular item, please say so and we will go on.

One of Very Swht Not too Not
most concern concern concern at all dk

[ROTATE BATTERY BY QUESTION Q.14-Q.22]

14. the spread of infectious diseases	19	51	14	7	6	3
15. extinction of certain animal species like polar bears and sea turtles	13	38	28	10	9	2
16. more extreme weather conditions such as drought, blizzards and hurricanes	16	41	25	9	7	2
17. melting of the polar ice caps and glaciers causing the sea level to rise and the flooding of coastal communities	13	39	26	11	8	2
18. crop failures, food shortages and famine caused by droughts and floods	20	48	19	5	7	1
19. longer and hotter heat waves leading to more heat related deaths	15	38	29	9	7	2
20. disruption of our fragile ecological [echo-LODGE-ick-al] balance threatening the web of life	14	42	26	5	8	4
21. increased populations of pests and vermin, such as roaches, termites and rats	15	42	24	9	7	3
22. destruction of natural habitats, including oceans and national parks like Glacier National Park and the Everglades	17	46	23	6	7	1

ASK LAST

23. increased incidences of asthma and other respiratory problems	19	43	25	7	5	2
---	----	----	----	---	---	---

END SPLIT SAMPLE A. GO TO Q.34

BEGIN SPLIT SAMPLE B

I'm going to list some specific problems that some people say could happen as a result of global warming. After each please tell me how likely you think that problem is to occur as a result of global warming -- is that problem almost certain to happen, very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, or not likely at all to occur as a result a global warming? If you are not sure how you feel about a particular item, please say so and we will go on.

	Almst certain	Very likely	Smwt likely	Not too likely	Not at likely	DK
[ROTATE BATTERY BY QUESTION Q.24-Q.32]						
24. the spread of infectious diseases	12	20	26	16	11	15
25. extinction of certain animal species like polar bears and sea turtles	15	31	27	12	8	7
26. more extreme weather conditions such as drought, blizzards and hurricanes	22	32	25	7	9	5
27. melting of the polar ice caps and glaciers causing the sea level to rise and the flooding of coastal communities	19	30	28	12	8	4
28. crop failures, food shortages and famine caused by droughts and floods	19	30	28	12	7	4
29. longer and hotter heat waves leading to more heat related deaths	20	29	29	11	7	3
30. disruption of our fragile ecological [echo-LODGE-ick-al] balance threatening the web of life	17	30	27	13	7	7
31. increased populations of pests and vermin, such as roaches, termites and rats	12	21	23	17	10	17
32. destruction of natural habitats, including oceans and national parks like Glacier National Park and the Everglades	17	31	25	11	9	6
ASK LAST						
33. increased incidences of asthma and other respiratory problems	17	31	24	10	7	11

END SPLIT SAMPLE B. GO TO Q.34

RESUME ASKING EVERYONE

34. In trying to reduce the threat of global warming, do you think we should rely mainly on strict regulations to limit emissions of carbon dioxide, or do you think we should rely mainly on incentives that will cause the free market to discourage carbon dioxide pollution -- or don't you have an opinion on this?

[IF ANSWER GIVEN:] Do feel that way strongly or not so strongly?

Strongly regulations	31
Not so strongly regulations	6
Undecided	9
Not so strongly free market	9
Strongly free market	23
dk	21

35. Which comes closer to your own point of view:

[READ STATEMENTS/ROTATE STATEMENTS A AND B]

__A. The technology already exists to solve many of the problems that cause global warming, but big businesses like the oil and auto industries are preventing them from reaching consumers because it is more profitable to keep things the way they are 52

__B. Solving the problems that cause global warming will mean developing new technologies to reduce our use of oil, coal and gasoline, which will cost billions of dollars 29

[READ LAST]

or don't you have an opinion on this? 19

Now I'm going to list some of the specific proposals that have been made to decrease the use of oil, coal, and gasoline in order to reduce the threat of global warming. For each item I read, please tell me if you favor or oppose each one. If you aren't sure how you feel about any specific item, just say so and we will go on.
[FOLLOW ALL "FAVOR" OR "OPPOSE" WITH:] Do you strongly (FAVOR/OPPOSE) or only somewhat (FAVOR/OPPOSE) that?

[ROTATE BY QUESTION Q.36-Q.49]

SPLIT SAMPLE A

	strong favor	swhat favor	swhat oppose	strong oppose	DK
__36. Increase taxes on gasoline by 50 cents a gallon to discourage the use of oil, coal and gasoline, and in exchange, give every taxpayer a \$250 rebate on their income taxes	14	17	12	46	10

SPLIT SAMPLE B

__37. Increase taxes on gasoline by 75 cents a gallon to discourage the use of oil, coal and gasoline, and in exchange, give every taxpayer a \$375 rebate on their income taxes	11	14	14	52	9
--	----	----	----	----	---

RESUME ASKING EVERYONE

__38. Require companies to pay for the right to pollute at lower levels than they do now and use the money raised to develop new technologies that will reduce carbon dioxide emissions even further	36	31	11	16	7
--	----	----	----	----	---

__39. As part of the deregulation of the utility [you-TILL-uh-tee] industry, require utility companies to offer alternative energy services that are more efficient and environmentally clean, such as solar and wind power	54	28	6	6	6
---	----	----	---	---	---

__40. Establish a limit on the total amount of carbon dioxide pollution that can be emitted in the United States that is lower than current levels. Individual businesses would bid at a government auction for the rights to pollute. Businesses could buy and sell these pollution rights to one another on the free market. This would allow them to chose between reducing their carbon dioxide emissions or paying to continue to pollute	12	17	15	42	14
--	----	----	----	----	----

__41. Give cash incentives like tax credits and rebates to individual households that upgrade to more energy efficient appliances like refrigerators and air conditioners	59	26	5	7	3
---	----	----	---	---	---

SPLIT SAMPLE A

__42. Cut military spending and earmark the money instead for research and development of alternative fuels and technologies	22	19	20	32	7
--	----	----	----	----	---

ROTATE ONTO NEXT PAGE

strong favor	swhat favor	swhat oppose	strong oppose	DK
-----------------	----------------	-----------------	------------------	----

SPLIT SAMPLE B

43. Increase the tax on gasoline by 10 cents per gallon and earmark the money for research and development of alternative fuels and technologies	25	23	13	36	3
--	----	----	----	----	---

RESUME ASKING EVERYONE

44. Have the United Nations establish a worldwide limit on carbon dioxide emissions that is lower than current levels. Each U.N. member country would be allocated the right to discharge a certain amount of carbon dioxide pollution. Countries could buy and sell these pollution rights to one another. This would allow them to chose between reducing their carbon dioxide emissions or paying to continue to pollute	12	20	17	39	12
---	----	----	----	----	----

45. Provide tax incentives to utility [you-TILL-uh-tee] companies to encourage them to sell environmentally clean energy, such as solar and wind power, to consumers	52	29	7	8	5
--	----	----	---	---	---

46. Shift money from developing new highways and roads to building public transportation systems such as new bus routes and commuter railways	32	29	14	17	9
---	----	----	----	----	---

47. Prevent countries from using U.S. foreign aid to build factories and power plants that emit excessive carbon dioxide pollution, and instead, use this foreign aid to help these countries build environmentally clean power plants and factories	49	26	7	11	6
--	----	----	---	----	---

48. Increase taxes on industrial energy use by 5 percent	22	29	14	22	13
--	----	----	----	----	----

49. Require higher fuel efficiency and cleaner burning engines in all new cars	64	22	5	6	2
--	----	----	---	---	---

Now I'm going to read you the same list of proposals again and this time I would like you to tell me, how effective you think each proposal would be in decreasing the use of oil, coal and gasoline in order to reduce the threat of global warming. Would it be one of the most effective things that could be done to decrease the use of oil, coal and gasoline in order to reduce the threat of global warming, very effective, somewhat effective, not too effective, or not at all effective? If you are not sure about a particular item, just say so and we will go on.

[ROTATE BY QUESTIONS Q.50-Q.63]

SPLIT SAMPLE A

	One of most	very eff	swhat eff	not too eff	not at all	DK
__50. Increase taxes on gasoline by 50 cents a gallon to discourage the use of oil, coal and gasoline, and in exchange, give every taxpayer a \$250 rebate on their income taxes	6	11	26	22	30	6

SPLIT SAMPLE B

__51. Increase taxes on gasoline by 75 cents a gallon to discourage the use of oil, coal and gasoline, and in exchange, give every taxpayer a \$375 rebate on their income taxes	4	11	27	24	31	3
--	---	----	----	----	----	---

RESUME ASKING EVERYONE

__52. Require companies to pay for the right to pollute at lower levels than they do now and use the money raised to develop new technologies that will reduce carbon dioxide emissions even further	8	20	41	12	13	6
--	---	----	----	----	----	---

__53. As part of the deregulation of the utility [you-TILL-uh-tee] industry, require utility companies to offer alternative energy services that are more efficient and environmentally clean, such as solar and wind power	11	36	38	5	5	5
---	----	----	----	---	---	---

__54. Establish a limit on the total amount of carbon dioxide pollution that can be emitted in the United States that is lower than current levels. Individual businesses would bid at a government auction for the rights to pollute. Businesses could buy and sell these pollution rights to one another on the free market. This would allow them to chose between reducing their carbon dioxide emissions or paying to continue to pollute	4	13	31	18	26	8
--	---	----	----	----	----	---

__55. Give cash incentives like tax credits and rebates to individual households that upgrade to more energy efficient appliances like refrigerators and air conditioners	11	36	37	7	6	3
---	----	----	----	---	---	---

SPLIT SAMPLE A

__56. Cut military spending and earmark the money instead for research and development of alternative fuels and technologies	5	19	28	18	26	5
--	---	----	----	----	----	---

ROTATE ONTO NEXT PAGE

One Of most very eff swbat eff not too eff not at all DK

SPLIT SAMPLE B

__57. Increase the tax on gasoline by 10 cents per gallon and earmark the money for research and development of alternative fuels and technologies 6 20 34 16 21 3

RESUME ASKING EVERYONE

__58. Have the United Nations establish a worldwide limit on carbon dioxide emissions that is lower than current levels. Each member country would be allocated the right to discharge a certain amount of carbon dioxide pollution. Countries could buy and sell these pollution rights to one another. This would allow them to chose between reducing their carbon dioxide emissions or paying to continue to pollute 4 11 28 19 30 8

__59. Provide tax incentives to utility [you-TILL-uh-tee] companies to encourage them to sell environmentally clean energy, such as solar and wind power, to consumers 11 33 41 6 5 4

__60. Shift money from developing new highways and roads to building public transportation systems such as new bus routes and commuter railways 9 23 34 14 14 5

__61. Prevent countries from using US foreign aid to build factories and power plants that emit excessive carbon dioxide pollution, and instead, use this foreign aid to help these countries build environmentally clean power plants and factories 11 31 36 8 9 6

__62. Increase taxes on industrial energy use by 5 percent . . 7 17 36 17 16 7

__63. Require higher fuel efficiency and cleaner burning engines in all new cars 19 44 25 5 5 2

08/27/97 WED 10:40 FAX 202200011

SPLIT SAMPLE C

64. How willing would you be to pay 5 dollars more per month to buy environmentally clean energy such as solar and wind power from your electric utility company in order to cut down on emissions of carbon dioxide and reduce the threat of global warming -- very willing, somewhat willing, somewhat unwilling or very unwilling or don't you have an opinion on this?

very willing	44
somewhat willing	36
somewhat unwilling	5
very unwilling	9
not sure	7

END SPLIT SAMPLE C. GO TO Q.67

SPLIT SAMPLE D

65. How willing would you be to pay 10 dollars more per month to buy environmentally clean energy such as solar and wind power from your electric utility company in order to cut down on emissions of carbon dioxide and reduce the threat of global warming -- very willing, somewhat willing, somewhat unwilling or very unwilling or don't you have an opinion on this?

very willing	38
somewhat willing	34
somewhat unwilling	10
very unwilling	12
not sure	6

END SPLIT SAMPLE D. GO TO Q.67

SPLIT SAMPLE E

66. How willing would you be to pay 20 dollars more per month to buy environmentally clean energy such as solar and wind power from your electric utility company in order to cut down on emissions of carbon dioxide and reduce the threat of global warming -- very willing, somewhat willing, somewhat unwilling or very unwilling or don't you have an opinion on this?

very willing	25
somewhat willing	36
somewhat unwilling	11
very unwilling	18
not sure	10

END SPLIT SAMPLE E. GO TO Q.67

THANK YOU. THE REMAINING QUESTIONS ARE FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY.

06/27/97 WED 15:47 FAX 2025255711 THE MEMPHIS CHRONICLE

RESUME ASKING EVERYONE

67. Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an independent, or something else?

[IF REPUBLICAN OR DEMOCRAT ASK:] Do you consider yourself a strong (Republican/Democrat) or a not so strong (Republican/Democrat)?

[IF INDEPENDENT ASK:] Would you say that you lean more toward the Republicans or more toward the Democrats?

strong Republican	15	36
not so strong Republican	13	
indep. leans Republican	8	
independent	15	
indep. leans Democratic	7	
not so strong Democrat	14	
strong Democrat	17	38
dk/na/other	11	

68. Do you consider yourself very liberal, somewhat liberal, moderate, somewhat conservative, very conservative or haven't you thought much about this? [IF MODERATE ASK:] Do you tend to lean toward the liberal or conservative side?

very liberal	9
somewhat liberal	17
moderate, leans liberal	7
moderate	13
moderate, leans conservative	9
somewhat conservative	23
very conservative	11
dk/na	11

69. What is your age?

18-29	16
30-39	19
40-49	24
50-59	16
60+	24
na	2

70. What was the last level of schooling you completed?

less than high school graduate	4
high school graduate	26
some college	31
college graduate	25
post graduate	12
na	2

06/27/97 MED 18:47 FAX 2020100011

71. Are you Hispanic or of Spanish descent?

yes	7
no	90
dk	3

72. Are you black, white, Asian, or some other race?

black	9
white	79
Asian	2
other	7
na	4

73. Do you have children, 18 years old or younger living at home?

Yes	38
No	61
refused/NA	1

74. How would you describe the area in which you live--Do you live in a city with over a million people, in a smaller city, in a suburban area outside a city, in a small town, or in a rural area?

City (1 million+)	12
Smaller city	20
Suburban area	21
Small town	26
Rural area	20
(Don't Know)	1

75. Is your job or that of anyone in your household dependent on the oil industry, chemical industry or auto industry ?

yes	19
no	80
dk	1

76. In which of the following ranges does your family income fall?

below \$12,000	5
12 to 20 thousand	12
20 to 30 thousand	13
30 to 40 thousand	17
40 to 50 thousand	13
50 to 75 thousand	15
above 75 thousand	12
na	12

77. What is your zip code? _____

That completes our public opinion survey. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation, and have a pleasant (day/evening).