

Ryan Walch and Trudy Ann Cameron (2018)

University of Oregon, Internal Carbon-Pricing Program Survey

As outlined in your invitation to this survey, the University of Oregon needs your input before making an important policy decision about whether to implement an internal carbon-pricing program for the university (and if so, what kind).

Our study uses this survey to consult with a large sample of current students, faculty, staff and administrators at the University of Oregon, as well as a sample from Oregon's general public.

Before we get started, however, we need to cover a long screen of official information, and get your *explicit* consent to participate in this study (at the bottom of the next page). Thank you for your patience with this part.



Powered by Qualtrics

If a continuation page contains nothing more than the "Back" and "Next" buttons, it has been deleted.

This sample survey does not include ALL of the possible branches that a respondent might pursue, conditional on their answers to different questions. It is merely an example of one "instance" of the survey, for one set of randomized projects.

The numbers in each choice table differ for each alternative and for each respondent. They are designed to span the range of most reasonable possibilities for carbon-pricing programs at the University of Oregon.

Risks or Discomforts to the Research Subject: There are no known risks associated with participation in this survey.

Benefits to the Subject or Others: There are no direct benefits specific to you as an individual research subject. However, as someone with a stake in the success of the university, we hope that you are willing to participate in a study designed to help decision-makers understand more about the range of preferences across the community.

Alternative Procedures: There are no other viable ways for researchers to learn in advance about the preferences of our particular community with respect to potential internal carbon pricing programs. The experiences of private companies in the United States, or abroad, may not translate readily to our context.

Confidentiality of Records: There is minimal risk to confidentiality from participation in this study. Your survey responses will be associated with your email address only temporarily. Your individual survey responses will not be shared with the University of Oregon beyond the research team involved in this study. The final data set for this study will contain no email addresses or personally identifiable information.

Details of identity protection methods: If you are affiliated with the University of Oregon, an anonymous case-number will be assigned to your set of survey responses. Then:

1. A list containing only email addresses and these case-numbers (no survey response data) will be supplied to the UO Office of Institutional Research (OIR).
2. Using the email information, OIR will match your survey case-number to your basic demographic categories from the University's database (but not your name, address, or other personally identifiable information).
3. OIR will then delete all of the email addresses from the file and send the research team a list of demographic category data indexed only by anonymous case-numbers.

4. The survey research team will match the demographic categories by anonymous case-number to your survey responses, then the file that contains the cross-walk between emails and anonymous case-numbers will be deleted.

The resulting de-identified dataset will be stored on a FERPA-compliant secure server at the University of Oregon. Even if someone, somehow, managed to gain unauthorized access to the final dataset on the secure server, it would be extremely difficult (although potentially not impossible in rare cases) to figure out which survey responses came from which person.

Study Procedures: If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete a 20- to 30-minute survey. We will first explain the different ways in which internal carbon-pricing programs can be set up. Think of this training section as a “voter information pamphlet” (if you live in a state where the public often gets to vote on a ballot measure or a public referendum). At several points, we will check to make sure this information is clear.

Next, we will ask you to consider a number of different types of possible internal carbon pricing programs for the University of Oregon. You will be asked to make between four and six choices among alternative carbon pricing programs. In every case, you may choose “no program” if that seems like the best option for you.

We will then gather some information that will help us group your answers, broadly, with those of others who are like you.

If you do not manage to finish the survey in one sitting, you may return to the same link and pick up where you left off. When you finish the survey, you may enter for a chance to win a prize by providing your contact information.

Questions About this Survey? This survey is being coordinated by researchers located at the University of Oregon. The project is funded jointly by the university’s Office of Sustainability, Campus Planning and Facilities Management and by the Department of Economics. If you have questions or concerns about this survey, or about the study that will use the data it collects, please contact the research team: Professor Trudy Ann Cameron, Mikesell Professor of Environmental and Resource Economics, Department of Economics, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 97403-1285 (cameron@uoregon.edu), or project manager Ryan Walch, Ph.D. candidate, Department of Economics, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 97403-1285 (rwalch@uoregon.edu).

Questions About the Protection of Research Subjects? The University of Oregon's Research Compliance Services can be reached at researchcompliance@uoregon.edu, or at 541-346-2510.

Participation in this Study is Voluntary. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of any benefits to which the subject is otherwise entitled, and the subject may discontinue participation at any time.

Are you eligible and willing to be a participant in this study? By clicking Yes, you certify that you are at least 18 years or older, and you consent to have the information you provide used in this study.

 Yes No

Powered by Qualtrics

Your response on the last screen qualifies you to take this survey. We care about the quality of our data. In order for us to get the most accurate measures of your opinions, it is important that you thoughtfully provide your best answers to each question in this survey. Do you commit to thoughtfully provide your best answers to each question in this survey?

I will provide thoughtful and honest answers

I will not provide thoughtful and honest answers

I can't promise either way



Powered by Qualtrics

Among some of society's worthwhile goals listed below, please indicate which are your **THREE highest** personal priorities. (Your choices do not imply that you believe the *other* goals are unimportant, only that the three goals you have selected are your highest priorities.)

Improve education

Conserve natural resources

Improve public health

Reduce poverty, hunger

Prevent climate change

Prevent violence, crime



Powered by Qualtrics

Background information: Burning of fossil fuels (for example, coal, oil, diesel, natural gas, gasoline and jet fuel) accounts for a large share of “greenhouse gases” of HUMAN origin.

Almost all climate scientists agree that human activities that produce these gases are causing Earth’s climate to change.

Some people, however, remain unconvinced.



Powered by Qualtrics

Carbon emissions are produced as a **byproduct** of the operation of a university campus, and because of the activities of its students or employees.

Over how wide a geographic area will any negative effects of these carbon emissions *eventually* be felt?

Only in the local neighborhood of the university

Mostly in the same state where the university is located

Mostly in the same country where the university is located

Globally, all around the world



Powered by Qualtrics

Correct. Greenhouse gases (such as carbon dioxide) have global effects.



Powered by Qualtrics

IF society decides that it is important to reduce carbon emissions stemming from human activities, one way to do this is to **make it no longer “free”** to release carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the earth’s atmosphere.

If people had to pay when they release carbon, they might think twice about whether they could **save money** by figuring out how to release **less carbon** into the atmosphere.

There are several types of policies that can make it costly to release carbon. In general, these are called **“carbon pricing”** policies.

If people are not willing or able to reduce their carbon emissions, paying a price **creates a revenue stream** that can be used to reduce **other** carbon emissions.



Powered by Qualtrics

Large-scale **government-sponsored carbon-pricing programs** have already been implemented in other parts of the world:

- The European Union's Emissions Trading System
- The Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative in the Northeast U.S.
- Quebec's carbon cap-and-trade program
- British Columbia's carbon tax

Were you previously aware of any of these programs?

Yes

No



Powered by Qualtrics

California already has a statewide carbon cap-and-trade program (joint with the Canadian province of Quebec). Washington and Oregon have been actively considering whether to price carbon, but neither state has done so yet.

For this survey, assume NO state-wide program to price carbon will happen in Oregon. (We agree that your attitude toward carbon pricing at the University of Oregon might change if state-level carbon prices were implemented.)

Were you aware of California's carbon cap-and-trade program, or that the states of Washington and Oregon have been considering some type of carbon-pricing program?

 Yes No

Powered by Qualtrics

The major carbon-pricing programs we noted above are typically administered by *governments*. However, roughly **500 individual U.S. businesses** have voluntarily added **internal carbon-pricing** to their accounting procedures. An internal carbon-pricing program charges projects or divisions inside the firm for the amount of carbon emissions they generate.

Some of the **reasons** businesses give for their decision to use internal carbon pricing are:

- To *signal* the company's commitment to sustainability
- To *prepare* for possible mandatory carbon pricing
- To *raise money internally* for large projects to reduce carbon emissions
- To create *financial incentives* for changes that reduce carbon emissions

[Optional extra info](#)



Powered by Qualtrics

Verify your understanding: For what reasons might a private company (or an institution like a university) consider setting up an **internal** carbon-pricing program? Select **ALL** that apply.

To signal the organization's **commitment to sustainability**

To be ready if **state-wide or national** carbon pricing starts in the future

To create a **financial incentive** for decisions that will reduce carbon emissions

To **raise money** for projects that will reduce carbon emissions



Powered by Qualtrics

Yes, correct. Internal carbon-pricing programs can be put in place for all of those reasons.



Powered by Qualtrics

The **carbon-reduction benefits** from a carbon-pricing program are **global**.

However, a decision to adopt internal carbon pricing could potentially help the university itself (and perhaps the community and the state where it is located) by:

- Reducing some local co-pollutants, such as nitrogen oxides and sulfur dioxide, that also result from the burning of fossil fuels
- Enhancing the university's reputation for leadership in sustainability
- Giving the university an edge in recruiting talented students and faculty with a strong interest in climate science and climate policy
- Making the area more attractive to green industries (and the jobs they might bring)

These effects are not guaranteed, of course. They are possibilities.



Powered by Qualtrics

If we wanted to put a price on ***all carbon emissions associated with a university***, we would need comprehensive measures of the carbon content of:

- All fossil fuels used by the university
- All the goods and services consumed by everyone in the course of activities related to the university.

Precision carbon pricing for the university would be *very* hard to implement.

- It is impossible to meter each person's exact contribution to total university emissions
- Some people can shift some activities off campus to avoid paying the carbon price

At best, we could price *just the most significant* categories of university-related carbon emissions. This study will focus on:

- **Energy use in buildings**
- **University-sponsored air travel**



Powered by Qualtrics

The **exact type** of a carbon-pricing program for the University of Oregon (if any) has yet to be decided. Thus we will ask you to think carefully about a number of **different possible programs**. (Everyone who participates in this study will see a different set of programs.)

Each program will be described in terms of:

- The program's overall reduction in the university's net carbon emissions
- How the costs of the program will be shared
- How the money raised by the program will be spent
- The unavoidable cost of the program to you, personally

We have designed your set of programs so that **some are small, others are moderate**, and **some may seem like just too much**.

First, however, we will **prepare you carefully** for these choice tasks. We will use the features of your **Program A** as a training example. (**Program A** is just one of the programs you will be asked to vote on.)



Powered by Qualtrics

IMPORTANT: You will **always have the option to vote for “No Program.”** Reasonable people may vote for “No Program” (in some or all cases) if they:

- Cannot afford the personal costs of the program(s)
- Do not believe that the benefits of the program(s) are worth the costs
- Believe that the university should have other priorities

Assume that each program, if implemented, would **remain in effect indefinitely**. If Oregon (or the federal government) implements a mandatory carbon-pricing program, however, the university’s program would be **re-evaluated**.



Powered by Qualtrics

Consider your choices carefully: The university plans to *use the results of this study* to help decide **whether** to implement a carbon pricing program and, if so, **what type**.



Powered by Qualtrics

Some facts about UO's carbon footprint: Counting both part-time and full-time categories, the university currently has about **23,600 students**, and about **4,500 faculty and staff**.

The most recent estimate of the university's carbon emissions related to energy use and transportation (but NOT counting the carbon content of other purchased products) is **about 61,000 metric tons** of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions.

This survey will focus on the **two** most significant sources of carbon emissions that would be the easiest for a university to cover with an internal carbon pricing program:

1. Building energy use, fuelled by natural gas, produces the equivalent of about

- 24,200 metric tons of carbon dioxide each year
- 40% of total university-related carbon emissions

2. Air travel produces the equivalent of about

- 27,300 metric tons of carbon dioxide each year
- 45% of total university-related carbon emissions



Powered by Qualtrics

In this section, the rows (or blocks) of the summary table that are being discussed on the current page are added to the table and highlighted with a bright yellow background that does not show up in this pdf document

The first feature is the program's **expected carbon-reduction benefit**, expressed as the **percentage reduction** in the university's overall carbon footprint. Carbon reductions can be achieved:

- by on-campus carbon reduction projects
- potentially through the purchase of carbon “offsets”, where the university pays for carbon emissions to be reduced somewhere else

The **first row in each summary table** will look something like this:

Program: A

Effectiveness:

% carbon decrease 10



Powered by Qualtrics

As the second feature: **How might the costs of an internal carbon-pricing program be shared?** There are several possibilities. We'll explain them one at a time:

1. A flat fee per year. This fee:

- Would be charged to all types of students at the university, and all employees (faculty, staff and administrators)
- Would not be tied directly to the specific carbon emissions of each person.
- Will directly raise the cost of attending university, and for some students, it could be a real hardship.

Program: A

Effectiveness:

% carbon decrease 10

Cost shares (sum=100%):

% student/employee fees 10

% air travel fees 40

% building energy fees 30

% by state taxpayers 20



Powered by Qualtrics

2. An air travel component: A charge for all *university-sponsored* air travel (i.e. paid for, or reimbursed by, the university). At the University of Oregon, this type of air travel accounts for about 27,300 tons of carbon emissions each year. **People who pay for their own air travel would *not* have to pay this fee**, but this charge would affect:

A. Travel to conferences by faculty and student researchers, and by administrators

[Optional extra info](#)

B. Travel to away games by sports teams, and travel for other student activities

[Optional extra info](#)

Program: A

Effectiveness:

% carbon decrease 10

Cost shares (sum=100%):

% student/employee fees 10

% air travel fees 40

% building energy fees 30

% by state taxpayers 20



Powered by Qualtrics

Verify your understanding: Many out-of-state and foreign students are far away from their families while they are at university. If the university's carbon-pricing program involves an air-travel carbon fee, will these students have to pay a carbon fee when they fly home to visit their families?



Powered by Qualtrics

Correct. Carbon fees would apply only to air travel that is paid for (or reimbursed by) the university. Privately paid air travel would not be affected.



Powered by Qualtrics

3. A building energy use component: This would be an **indirect charge on everyone** involved with the university. For each campus building, there would be a fee per ton of carbon produced by the energy used for heating, air conditioning, lighting, etc.

- Departments or programs that occupy a building's offices, classrooms, labs, etc., would be billed for carbon according to their share of the building's floor space (*including residence halls*)
- There would be separate metering of heavier energy use by food-preparation areas, laboratory equipment, etc., billed to the users responsible for that specific activity

Even if some carbon-pricing program would not charge carbon fees *directly* to a specific group, everyone in the university community would still bear some of the costs **indirectly** if the program involved a fee for building energy use.

[Optional extra info](#)

Program: A

Effectiveness:

% carbon decrease 10

Cost shares (sum=100%):

% student/employee fees 10

% air travel fees 40

% building energy fees 30

% by state taxpayers 20



Verify your understanding: Suppose a specific carbon-pricing program does *not* involve any direct student/employee “fees” for carbon. Consider a student who is *not* part of a team or group for which the university typically pays for air travel. **Will that student be able to *completely* avoid the cost of that carbon-pricing program?**



Powered by Qualtrics

Correct. Building energy-use fees for carbon emissions will potentially affect everyone who is associated with a department or program at the university that occupies any space on campus. These are *indirect* costs for students and everyone else. Air travel carbon fees paid by other groups on campus may also filter down to almost everyone, to some extent. The university could raise tuition to cover some of these costs, or reduce other services.



Powered by Qualtrics

4. Indirect costs to Oregon taxpayers: Oregon's taxpayers subsidize part of the cost of operating the state's public universities. Putting a price on carbon at the university (where carbon has been un-priced so far) would result in additional explicit costs in the university's budget. Some of the increased cost could ultimately trickle down to affect Oregon taxpayers.

Program: A

Effectiveness:

% carbon decrease 10

Cost shares (sum=100%):

% student/employee fees 10

% air travel fees 40

% building energy fees 30

% by state taxpayers 20



Powered by Qualtrics

As a third feature of these programs, you may wish to consider: **How the money will be spent.** Any carbon pricing program will create revenue. The different carbon pricing programs you see may spend shares of the money they collect in *three* different ways.

1. To pay for major carbon-reduction projects *at the university*, for example:

- Switching from natural gas boilers to electric boilers that run on green electricity
- Retrofitting existing buildings with energy-conserving technologies
- Requiring higher energy-efficiency goals than construction codes and university standards currently specify, for new and remodeled campus buildings.

Program: A

Effectiveness:

% carbon decrease 10

Cost shares (sum=100%):

% student/employee fees 10

% air travel fees 40

% building energy fees 30

% by state taxpayers 20

Spending shares (sum=100%):

% on carbon projects 70

% academic programs 20

% to pay for offsets 10



2. Some of the money could also **support the university's academic programs**. For example, programs for undergraduate students, designed to:

- Improve Education Abroad opportunities
- Improve educational experiences
- Increase the pool of Financial Aid for students from low-income families and under-represented groups
- Reduce the size of other usual fees

The money could also be spent on faculty and graduate students, to:

- Attract and keep high-quality faculty and to support research
- Improve training for graduate students (at universities with graduate programs)

Some types of educational experiences can themselves lead individuals to choose careers focused on emissions reductions and/or to reduce their personal carbon emissions.

Program: A

Effectiveness:

% carbon decrease 10

Cost shares (sum=100%):

% student/employee fees 10

% air travel fees 40

% building energy fees 30

% by state taxpayers 20

Spending shares (sum=100%):

% on carbon projects 70

% academic programs 20

% to pay for offsets

10



Powered by Qualtrics

3. Some of the money could also (potentially) be used to **pay for certified carbon reductions *somewhere else in the world* (called “carbon offsets”)**. Offsets work because it doesn’t matter *where* carbon emissions are cut back (in terms of *global* carbon concentrations), as long as *somebody* cuts back.

Assume there are no legal or political considerations that would prevent your institution from spending money on high-quality verifiable carbon offsets.

Program: A

Effectiveness:

% carbon decrease 10

Cost shares (sum=100%):

% student/employee fees 10

% air travel fees 40

% building energy fees 30

% by state taxpayers 20

Spending shares (sum=100%):

% on carbon projects 70

% academic programs 20

% to pay for offsets 10



Finally, your opinion about each program will probably depend on **how much it would cost you each year**, all told, after you have done what you can to adapt to the program.

Assume that you will pay these costs for as long as you remain at the university.

REMEMBER: These costs may be **direct fees** and/or **indirect costs**, such as building energy-use fees (that filter down to everyone who benefits from the use of campus buildings, including residence halls), or higher air-travel costs for other programs that end up affecting you if they are covered by higher fees and/or reductions in other services.

Program: A

Effectiveness:

% carbon decrease 10

Cost shares (sum=100%):

% student/employee fees 10

% air travel fees 40

% building energy fees 30

% by state taxpayers 20

Spending shares (sum=100%):

% on carbon projects 70

% academic programs 20

% to pay for offsets 10

Unavoidable cost to you:

Dollars per year 86

A

Caution: In surveys like this one, people sometimes do not fully consider their future expenses. On each occasion where you are asked to vote on these internal carbon-pricing programs, please think very carefully about what you would have to give up, if the program in question were to be put in place at the University of Oregon.

Always ask yourself: “If this program is actually adopted at UO, would that outcome be a problem for me?” If you would not be happy, you should **vote against the program** (as you would likely do on a secret ballot in a real vote).



Powered by Qualtrics

This screen presents your FIRST choice task. For each choice task, imagine that the options being offered are the ONLY ones available.

Please consider all the features of Program A, and **vote as if this were a real and secret ballot**. If the program would be *just too costly* for you—given what it would accomplish and how it would work—you should feel free to vote “No.” (We need to understand people’s *true* preferences if we are to help the university make good decisions.)

To review the explanation for a given feature, click any blue text. **Vote at the bottom of this screen.**

Program: A

Effectiveness:

[% carbon decrease](#) 10

Cost shares (sum=100%):

[% student/employee fees](#) 10

[% air travel fees](#) 40

[% building energy fees](#) 30

[% by state taxpayers](#) 20

Spending shares (sum=100%):

[% on carbon projects](#) 70

[% academic programs](#) 20

[% to pay for offsets](#) 10

Unavoidable cost to you:

[Dollars per year](#) 86

A

If Program A were put to a vote, I would vote:



Powered by Qualtrics

Here is a second choice task. Assume Program A is NOT available, **only Program B.** (Please try to make each choice independently from any other choice you are asked to consider.)

Again, vote as if this were a real and secret ballot, and feel free to vote “No” if this program would NOT be right for you, personally.

Program: B

Effectiveness:

% carbon decrease 15

Cost shares (sum=100%):

% student/employee fees 90

% air travel fees 0

% building energy fees 0

% by state taxpayers 10

Spending shares (sum=100%):

% on carbon projects 90

% academic programs 0

% to pay for offsets 10

Unavoidable cost to you:

Dollars per year 103

B

If Program B were the only program to be put to a vote, I would vote:

Yes

No



Powered by Qualtrics

Now suppose that neither Program A nor Program B is available. Instead, there are **two new and different programs on the same ballot**.

Your options are **Program C, Program D, or Neither Program**. If neither Program C nor Program D seems attractive enough to justify its cost to you, personally, you should again feel free to vote for “Neither Program” (if you would vote that way on a real and secret ballot).

Vote for ONE of these THREE options (including Neither Program) at the bottom of the screen.

	C	D
Programs: C D		
Effectiveness:		
% carbon decrease	20	45
Cost shares (sum=100%):		
% student/employee fees	40	0
% air travel fees	10	40
% building energy fees	30	40
% by state taxpayers	20	20
Spending shares (sum=100%):		
% on carbon projects	90	70
% academic programs	0	20
% to pay for offsets	10	10
Unavoidable cost to you:		
Dollars per year	121	170
	C	D

If these were the **ONLY** two programs available, I would vote for:

Program C

Program D

Neither Program



Powered by Qualtrics

Now suppose that your preferred option, Program D, is **not available**. If you were asked to choose instead between just Program C and No Program, how would you vote?

Program: C

Effectiveness:

% carbon decrease 20

Cost shares (sum=100%):

% student/employee fees 40

% air travel fees 10

% building energy fees 30

% by state taxpayers 20

Spending shares (sum=100%):

% on carbon projects 90

% academic programs 0

% to pay for offsets 10

Unavoidable cost to you:

Dollars per year 121

C

If Program C were the only program available, I would vote:

Yes

No

These are the last two programs that we will ask you to consider. They are different again. Suppose that NONE of the previous Programs (A, B, C or D) are available.

Your options are now **Program E**, **Program F**, or **Neither Program**. If neither Program E nor Program F seems attractive enough to justify its cost to you, personally, you should again feel free to vote for “Neither Program” (if you would vote that way on a real and secret ballot).

Vote for ONE of these THREE options (including Neither Program) at the bottom of the screen.

	Programs:	E	F
Effectiveness:			
% carbon decrease		45	10
Cost shares (sum=100%):			
% student/employee fees		10	70
% air travel fees		40	0
% building energy fees		40	20
% by state taxpayers		10	10
Spending shares (sum=100%):			
% on carbon projects		90	80
% academic programs		10	0
% to pay for offsets		0	20
Unavoidable cost to you:			
Dollars per year		173	34
		E	F

If these were the only two programs available, I would vote for:

Program E

Program F

Neither Program



Powered by Qualtrics

Now suppose that your preferred option, Program F, is **not available**. This is your final program choice. If you were asked to choose instead between just Program E and No Program, how would you vote?

Program: E

Effectiveness:

% carbon decrease 45

Cost shares (sum=100%):

% student/employee fees 10

% air travel fees 40

% building energy fees 40

% by state taxpayers 10

Spending shares (sum=100%):

% on carbon projects 90

% academic programs 10

% to pay for offsets 0

Unavoidable cost to you:

Dollars per year 173

E

If Program E were the only program available, I would vote:

Yes

No

Think back over all of your program choices. Which program features were **especially important to you**? Check as many as apply.

% carbon decrease

% of cost borne as student/faculty fees

% of cost borne as air travel fees

% of cost borne as building energy fees

% of cost borne by state taxpayers

% of money collected spent on carbon-reduction projects at the university

% of money collected spent on academic programs

% of money collected spent on carbon reductions elsewhere (offsets)

Unavoidable cost to you each year



Your level of concern about climate change can be affected by **where you have lived during your lifetime**. Have you lived for more than a few months, in total, in any of these places? Check all that apply.

A coastal area subject to flooding during storms

An inland area subject to river flooding or flash floods

A region that experiences frequent hurricanes or hurricane warnings

A region where tornado warnings are common

A region where water use restrictions are common

An agricultural region where droughts have caused significant damage to crops or livestock

A region that has sometimes been threatened by wildfire

A area subject to severe winter storms and/or extreme cold

A developing country with limited preparedness for natural disasters

Other (please explain)

During your lifetime, have you (or have any close family members or friends) been **personally harmed** by any of those weather-related hazards? ("Damage" includes property and agricultural losses.)

No or not sure

Minor damage

Moderate damage but no injury

Severe damage and/or minor injury

Severe damage and major injury or death

Other (please explain)



Powered by Qualtrics

During the last 12 months, have you personally experienced any of the following extreme weather-related events? Select all that apply.

Coastal flooding due to storms

River-related flooding or a flash flood

Hurricane or hurricane warning

Tornado or tornado warning

Severe drought with restrictions on water use

Wildfire that has threatened your dwelling or workplace

Smoke from wildfire in your region

Severe winter storms or extreme cold

Heat wave (extreme heat lasting three days or longer)

Other (please explain)

Overall, the wording of this survey made it seem that the researchers conducting this study really wanted me to choose:

Some **carbon-pricing programs**, rather than No Program

No Program, rather than some carbon-pricing program

The best alternative for me, personally, based on all of the features of the programs

Not sure / couldn't tell



Powered by Qualtrics

This survey will now ask you a set of 5 standard and straightforward questions about your general attitude toward the issue of climate change.

Your answers in this section will help us benchmark your preferences over potential carbon-pricing programs so that your efforts in completing this survey (and the insights produced by our study) can be helpful to decisions about internal carbon pricing by other institutions besides just the University of Oregon.

“Global warming” refers to the idea that the world’s average temperature has been increasing over the past 150 years, may be increasing more in the future, and that the world’s climate may change as a result.

How important is the issue of global warming to you personally?

Extremely important

Very important

Somewhat important

Not too important

Not at all important



How worried are you about global warming?

Very worried

Somewhat worried

Not very worried

Not at all worried



Powered by Qualtrics

How much do you think global warming will harm you personally?

A great deal

A moderate amount

Only a little

Not at all

Don't know



Powered by Qualtrics

How much do you think global warming will harm future generations of people?

A great deal

A moderate amount

Only a little

Not at all

Don't know



Powered by Qualtrics

How many of your friends share your views on global warming?

 None A few Some Most All

Powered by Qualtrics

The next (and final) section of the survey asks questions that will help us group your survey answers with those of others who are like you.



Powered by Qualtrics

What is your **MAIN** role in relation to the university? Select **ONE** answer.

Current and continuing student

Graduating senior in final term

Faculty member

Staff member

Student employee or graduate employee

Administrator

Parent/guardian of a current student

Prospective future student, or parent/guardian of such a student or students

Former student, faculty, staff or administrator

Member of a household that pays taxes in this state

Other (please specify)

None of the above

Do you have **any secondary role(s)** in relation to the university? Click all that apply.

Current and continuing student

Graduating senior in final term

Faculty member

Staff member

Student employee or graduate employee

Administrator

Parent/Guardian of current student

Prospective future student, or parent/guardian of such a student or students

Former student, faculty, staff or administrator

Member of a household that pays taxes in this state

Other (please specify)

None of the above

Which of the following categories best describes your **employment status**? [Categories to match U.S. Census Bureau]

Student (no paid employment)

Self-employed or small business owner

Employee, working full-time

Employee, working part-time

Not employed, looking for work

Not employed, NOT looking for work

Retired

Disabled, not able to work

Other (please specify)

Prefer not to say

What is the total annual income of the HOUSEHOLD in which you live? [Brackets to match U.S. Census Bureau]

Less than \$20,000

\$20,000 to \$24,999

\$25,000 to 29,999

\$30,000 to \$49,999

\$50,000 to \$74,999

\$75,000 to \$99,999

\$100,000 to \$124,999

\$125,000 to \$149,999

\$150,000 to \$174,999

\$175,000 to \$199,999

\$200,000 or more

Prefer not to say



Powered by Qualtrics

Would you like to be entered into a drawing to win one of 20 gift certificates for use at the Duck Store, valued at \$50 each?

Yes (enter your preferred email address or your mailing address)

No thanks



Powered by Qualtrics

We thank you for your time spent taking this survey.
Your response has been recorded.

Powered by Qualtrics