RUTGERS
Eagleton Center for
Public Interest Polling

Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers University–New Brunswick
191 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901

eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu
poll@eagleton.rutgers.edu
848-932-8940

EMBARGO FOR MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2024 @ 5:00 AM

CONTACT:
Ashley Koning, Director
Office: 848-932-8940
Cell: 908-872-1186
akoning@rutgers.edu

All news releases are available at https://eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu/press_releases/. Follow the Rutgers-Eagleton Poll on Facebook and X (formerly known as Twitter)

Half of New Jerseyans Oppose Electric Vehicles Mandate, See Environmental and Health Advantages but Economic Drawbacks

More than half say they are not likely to consider buying an EV

NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J. (February 19, 2024) – Half of New Jersey residents do not support plans to phase out the sale of new gas-powered vehicles completely by 2035, as announced by Gov. Murphy last November, according to the latest Rutgers-Eagleton Poll.

While those polled in December see the policy's environmental and health benefits, they are concerned about the costs on both a state and personal level – and more than half say they would not be likely to buy an electric vehicle.

"Even as a dozen or so states across the country adopt the same regulations, New Jerseyans are divided on the matter of electric vehicles and the impact they will have," said Ashley Koning, an assistant research professor and director of the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (ECPIP) at Rutgers University–New Brunswick. "It is an issue that is heavily influenced not only by partisanship but also by a hesitancy that likely stems from a widespread lack of information about the vehicles themselves and what the policy entails – not to mention the financial implications and the notable change this would cause in people's everyday lives."

Residents are slightly more likely to oppose than support the Advanced Clean Car II (ACCII) program, with a plurality in the strong opposition camp: 19 percent strongly support it, 24 percent somewhat support it, 15 percent somewhat oppose, and 35 percent strongly oppose it.

Despite opposition, majorities of New Jerseyans anticipate the policy will have a positive impact on the state's air quality (58 percent) and residents' health (51 percent). About a quarter say it will have no impact either way for each (22 percent and 26 percent, respectively).

Residents aren't as optimistic about the mandate's impact on the state's and their own fiscal well-being, however. When it comes to New Jersey's economy, 30 percent think the policy will have a positive impact and 44 percent say it will have a negative impact; 12 percent think it won't have an impact either way.

New Jerseyans are even less optimistic about the policy's impact on their personal finances: 19 percent believe it will have a positive effect, whereas 47 percent say negative; 25 percent say it will have no impact on them either way.

Demographics play a significant role in how New Jerseyans feel about the issue. Support for the 2035 mandate is strongest among Democrats (68 percent) and reaches a majority for groups who historically lean Democratic, such as Black residents (53 percent); residents who are multiracial or of backgrounds other than white, Black, or Hispanic (57 percent); those age 18 to 34 years old (53 percent); urbanites (55 percent); and those who have done graduate work (56 percent). Republicans are the least likely of any group to support the mandate (15 percent) and the most likely – by far – to oppose it (80 percent).

A majority of nearly every demographic sees the policy's positive impact on air quality, with the exception of Republicans (38 percent positive) and residents living in the southwestern region of the state (49 percent positive). Democrats (75 percent) and those 18 to 34 years old (70 percent) are most likely to believe the policy would have a positive impact. A plurality or majority of most groups see the benefit the policy would have when it comes to residents' health, with the exception of Republicans (26 percent positive).

More feel the policy would negatively impact the state's economy and their personal finances than believe it would have a positive impact, however. The only groups where more are positive than negative about impact on the state economy are Democrats (42 percent) and Black residents (37 percent).

No group is more positive than negative about the policy's impact on their own wallets, with positivity in any single demographic reaching no higher than 25 percent.

Over half not likely to purchase an EV

Fifty-six percent say they would be "not very likely" (21 percent) or "not at all likely" (35 percent) to consider buying an EV; 23 percent would be "somewhat likely," 13 percent would be "very likely," 3 percent say they already have one, and 4 percent are unsure.

A plurality of those who say they wouldn't likely consider an EV say so because of associated costs (29 percent); coming in a distant second, residents who are unlikely to buy an EV also cite concerns over how long and how often one needs to charge their car (12 percent), followed by a lack of infrastructure and charging stations (10 percent).

Democrats are the only group in which more than half say they would be likely to buy an electric car (18 percent "very likely" and 34 percent "somewhat likely"), while independents (21

percent "not very likely," 37 percent "not at all likely") and especially Republicans (22 percent "not very likely," 59 percent "not at all likely") feel the exact opposite.

Socioeconomic status plays a role – likelihood of considering an EV increases as household income increases. The same pattern appears by educational attainment; likelihood increases as attainment increases.

"Despite both federal and state-level incentives in recent years to encourage electric vehicle purchases, few already have one, and the rest of New Jerseyans are split as to whether or not they want one – even in light of the new policy," said Jessica Roman, a research associate at ECPIP. "The desire to own one may be a partisan issue, but the ability to comply can be a real economic issue for many New Jerseyans – or is at least perceived to be so."

Just under half would be less likely to vote for an ACCII-supportive candidate

Residents are also somewhat mixed when it comes to potentially voting for a candidate who supports the EV mandate. Twenty percent say they would be more likely to vote for a candidate running for office in New Jersey if they supported the policy, 45 percent say they would be less likely, and 30 percent say it would make no difference to their vote. Republicans (76 percent), white residents (52 percent), and 50- to 64-year-olds (57 percent) would be firmly against a candidate who supports the policy, with a majority in each of these groups saying it would negatively affect their vote.

"Electric vehicles may become a tricky issue for candidates in election cycles to come – depending on which side of the aisle the candidate is on and the makeup of their electorate," said Koning. "Those demographics who are historically more likely to turn out to vote are also the same groups most opposed to a candidate who supports the 2035 policy. And those groups who are most supportive of such a candidate are already squarely in Democrats' camp."

Results are from a statewide poll of 1,657 adults contacted through multiple modes, including by live interviewer on landline and cell phone, MMS text invitation to web, and the probability-based Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel from Dec. 13 to Dec. 23. The full sample has a margin of error of +/- 2.8 percentage points. The registered voter subsample contains 1,451 registered voters and has a margin of error of +/- 3.0 percentage points.

# # #

Broadcast interviews: Rutgers University–New Brunswick has broadcast-quality television and radio studios available for remote live or taped interviews with Rutgers experts. For more information, contact Jessica Ronan-Frisch at jronan@eagleton.rutgers.edu.

ABOUT RUTGERS UNIVERSITY–NEW BRUNSWICK

Rutgers University–New Brunswick is where Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, began more than 250 years ago. Ranked among the world's top 60 universities, Rutgers's flagship university is a leading public research institution and a member of the prestigious Association of

American Universities. It is home to internationally acclaimed faculty and has 12 degree-granting schools and a Division I Athletics program. It is the Big Ten Conference's most diverse university. Through its community of teachers, scholars, artists, scientists and healers, Rutgers is equipped as never before to transform lives.

ABOUT THE EAGLETON CENTER FOR PUBLIC INTEREST POLLING

Home of the Rutgers-Eagleton Poll, the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (ECPIP) was established in 1971 and is the oldest and one of the most respected university-based statewide polling operations in the United States. Now in its 52nd year and with the publication of over 200 polls, ECPIP's mission is to provide scientifically sound, nonpartisan information about public opinion. To read more about ECPIP and view all of our press releases, published research and data archive, please visit our website: eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu. You can also visit our Facebook and Twitter.

ABOUT THE EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS

The Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling is a unit of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University–New Brunswick. The Eagleton Institute studies how American politics and government work and change, analyzes how the democracy might improve and promotes political participation and civic engagement. The Institute explores state and national politics through research, education and public service, linking the study of politics with its day-to-day practice. To learn more about Eagleton programs and expertise, visit eagleton.rutgers.edu.

ABOUT THE RUTGERS-EAGLETON/SSRS GARDEN STATE PANEL

The Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel is a probability-based panel of New Jersey adults age 18 or older. Members are recruited randomly based on statewide representative ABS (Address Based Sample) design. The ABS sample is drawn from the Delivery Sequence File (DSF) maintained by the U.S. Postal Service. Population coverage of the DSF is in the 98%-99% range. During the recruitment process, full demographic information on panelists is collected. This data is stored securely and used to determine eligibility for specific studies (if needed). The Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel is a multi-mode panel. Internet households participate via web while all non-internet households (including those who have internet but are unwilling to take surveys online) participate via phone. Panelists also have the option of taking surveys in their preferred language (English or Spanish).

QUESTIONS AND TABLES START ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE

Questions and Tables

The questions covered in this release are listed below. Column percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. Respondents are New Jersey adults; all percentages are of weighted results. Interpret groups with samples sizes under 100 with extreme caution.

EV1 New Jersey will require car manufacturers to increasingly make new cars, light-duty trucks, and SUVs electric over the next decade and will phase out the sale of new gas-powered cars completely by 2035. New Jersey residents would still be able to buy and drive gas- and diesel-powered vehicles manufactured before 2035. Residents would also be able to purchase gas- and diesel-powered vehicles manufactured in 2035 or beyond out of state if it meets certain exhaust emissions standards.

To what extent do you support or oppose this policy?

Strongly support	19%
Somewhat support	24%
Somewhat oppose	15%
Strongly oppose	35%
Don't know	6%
Unweighted N=	1653

	Party ID			**Gender**		**Race or Ethnicity**				**Age**			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Strongly supp	33%	15%	5%	23%	17%	18%	24%	18%	23%	22%	18%	14%	24%
Somewhat supp	35%	24%	10%	22%	27%	21%	29%	26%	34%	31%	27%	18%	22%
Somewhat opp	12%	18%	15%	11%	19%	14%	15%	19%	16%	14%	16%	16%	16%
Strongly opp	14%	38%	65%	40%	30%	43%	22%	29%	19%	23%	33%	48%	35%
DK	6%	6%	4%	4%	7%	3%	10%	8%	8%	10%	5%	4%	3%
Unwt N=	602	656	382	854	787	1073	159	212	180	438	358	455	400

	Income				**Region**					**Education**			
	<$50K	$50K-<$100K	$100K-<$150K	$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Strongly supp	19%	21%	21%	19%	26%	22%	15%	19%	12%	16%	17%	21%	26%
Somewhat supp	22%	26%	23%	27%	29%	26%	21%	20%	25%	24%	21%	23%	30%
Somewhat opp	18%	17%	16%	11%	15%	15%	15%	14%	17%	18%	16%	14%	11%
Strongly opp	32%	33%	36%	38%	25%	30%	43%	41%	44%	34%	41%	37%	28%
DK	9%	3%	4%	5%	5%	7%	6%	6%	3%	8%	5%	5%	5%
Unwt N=	333	456	297	423	225	616	256	285	271	381	392	409	468

EV2 How much of a positive or negative impact do you think this will have on … ?

The air quality in New Jersey

Very positive	22%
Somewhat positive	36%
Somewhat negative	7%
Very negative	6%
No impact either way	22%
Don't know	6%
Unweighted N=	1649

	Party ID			**Gender**		**Race or Ethnicity**				**Age**			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Very pos	34%	19%	9%	24%	22%	21%	22%	23%	29%	29%	20%	16%	25%
Somewhat pos	41%	36%	29%	35%	38%	34%	36%	41%	39%	41%	37%	36%	31%
Somewhat neg	7%	7%	8%	6%	8%	7%	9%	6%	8%	9%	8%	6%	5%
Very neg	4%	7%	8%	5%	7%	5%	8%	6%	7%	5%	6%	9%	3%
No impact	9%	25%	37%	27%	17%	26%	17%	17%	17%	12%	22%	26%	30%
DK	4%	6%	9%	4%	8%	7%	7%	7%	1%	5%	6%	7%	6%
Unwt N=	602	653	381	850	787	1072	157	211	180	437	357	453	400

	Income				**Region**					**Education**			
	<$50K	$50K-<$100K	$100K-<$150K	$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Very pos	23%	22%	23%	25%	28%	23%	21%	21%	19%	19%	20%	24%	29%
Somewhat pos	31%	39%	38%	37%	38%	41%	33%	28%	37%	38%	32%	40%	37%
Somewhat neg	9%	7%	9%	4%	7%	7%	5%	7%	7%	9%	8%	4%	5%
Very neg	8%	5%	7%	4%	5%	6%	4%	9%	5%	7%	6%	5%	4%
No impact	20%	22%	20%	23%	17%	18%	29%	26%	26%	18%	26%	24%	21%
DK	10%	4%	3%	6%	5%	5%	7%	10%	5%	9%	8%	3%	3%
Unwt N=	330	456	295	423	223	614	256	285	271	378	392	408	468

New Jersey residents' health

Very positive	18%
Somewhat positive	33%
Somewhat negative	8%
Very negative	6%
No impact either way	26%
Don't know	8%
Unweighted N=	1649

	Party ID			**Gender**		**Race or Ethnicity**				**Age**			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Very pos	29%	16%	5%	18%	19%	17%	25%	20%	19%	22%	15%	15%	22%
Somewhat pos	40%	33%	21%	33%	33%	30%	29%	34%	44%	39%	36%	26%	32%
Somewhat neg	4%	8%	15%	7%	9%	9%	10%	7%	6%	8%	8%	9%	8%
Very neg	4%	6%	11%	5%	7%	6%	6%	10%	5%	7%	7%	8%	4%
No impact	13%	29%	40%	30%	21%	31%	22%	16%	19%	16%	25%	35%	27%
DK	9%	8%	8%	6%	10%	7%	8%	13%	7%	8%	9%	8%	8%
Unwt N=	600	656	381	851	786	1073	157	212	179	435	358	455	399

	Income				Region					Education			
	<$50K	$50K-<$100K	$100K-<$150K	$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Very pos	21%	19%	18%	18%	24%	20%	15%	18%	12%	15%	17%	17%	25%
Somewhat pos	26%	37%	33%	35%	35%	36%	32%	25%	34%	33%	30%	34%	36%
Somewhat neg	12%	6%	9%	5%	8%	7%	9%	9%	8%	10%	9%	7%	5%
Very neg	7%	6%	7%	5%	4%	7%	4%	8%	8%	8%	7%	5%	5%
No impact	22%	25%	26%	29%	18%	23%	29%	30%	29%	22%	28%	31%	23%
DK	11%	6%	8%	8%	10%	7%	10%	9%	7%	12%	8%	6%	5%
Unwt N=	330	455	296	424	223	615	256	284	271	378	393	410	466

New Jersey's economy

Very positive	9%
Somewhat positive	21%
Somewhat negative	21%
Very negative	23%
No impact either way	12%
Don't know	14%
Unweighted N=	1647

	Party ID			**Gender**		**Race or Ethnicity**				**Age**			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Very pos	12%	8%	4%	10%	7%	6%	15%	12%	10%	8%	11%	5%	10%
Somewhat pos	30%	20%	10%	22%	20%	18%	22%	26%	27%	29%	19%	16%	20%
Somewhat neg	18%	22%	26%	18%	25%	22%	19%	22%	21%	22%	20%	24%	18%
Very neg	8%	24%	45%	28%	18%	28%	14%	18%	17%	16%	23%	29%	22%
No impact	14%	11%	10%	12%	12%	13%	17%	8%	10%	11%	11%	12%	15%
DK	18%	15%	6%	11%	17%	14%	13%	14%	15%	14%	16%	13%	14%
Unwt N=	599	654	381	851	784	1069	158	213	178	436	358	455	396

	Income				Region					Education			
	<$50K	$50K-<$100K	$100K-<$150K	$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Very pos	12%	9%	8%	7%	15%	9%	6%	9%	4%	11%	6%	6%	10%
Somewhat pos	19%	24%	19%	21%	22%	25%	18%	16%	20%	21%	16%	22%	26%
Somewhat neg	21%	21%	23%	21%	20%	20%	24%	23%	21%	23%	25%	18%	17%
Very neg	20%	20%	27%	24%	15%	20%	28%	27%	29%	20%	29%	26%	18%
No impact	13%	14%	10%	12%	16%	10%	13%	11%	14%	10%	12%	13%	14%
DK	14%	12%	13%	16%	12%	16%	12%	14%	13%	14%	13%	15%	15%
Unwt N=	329	455	296	422	222	614	256	285	270	379	392	409	464

Your personal finances

Very positive	6%
Somewhat positive	13%
Somewhat negative	24%
Very negative	23%
No impact either way	25%
Don't know	10%
Unweighted N=	1645

	Party ID			**Gender**		**Race or Ethnicity**				**Age**			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Very pos	6%	5%	6%	6%	6%	5%	8%	9%	4%	6%	7%	5%	6%
Somewhat pos	17%	12%	6%	11%	14%	10%	16%	13%	21%	17%	13%	9%	11%
Somewhat neg	24%	21%	28%	23%	24%	24%	20%	25%	24%	26%	23%	24%	21%
Very neg	10%	27%	38%	25%	21%	27%	16%	19%	18%	20%	23%	30%	18%
No impact	31%	24%	16%	26%	24%	27%	30%	21%	23%	21%	21%	23%	36%
DK	12%	10%	6%	8%	11%	8%	10%	13%	11%	10%	13%	7%	8%
Unwt N=	600	652	380	849	784	1071	158	208	179	436	357	454	396

	Income				Region					Education			
	<$50K	$50K-<$100K	$100K-<$150K	$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Very pos	10%	5%	5%	4%	9%	5%	6%	6%	5%	7%	5%	5%	6%
Somewhat pos	12%	14%	12%	13%	19%	14%	12%	7%	9%	15%	8%	14%	14%
Somewhat neg	23%	24%	29%	21%	17%	22%	24%	27%	29%	24%	25%	24%	22%
Very neg	25%	23%	22%	20%	15%	21%	27%	29%	27%	23%	28%	23%	17%
No impact	20%	23%	23%	33%	26%	27%	25%	19%	26%	20%	24%	26%	33%
DK	10%	11%	9%	9%	14%	11%	6%	12%	5%	11%	11%	9%	8%
Unwt N=	328	454	297	422	222	613	255	284	271	378	392	408	464

EV3 If a candidate running for office in New Jersey supported this mandate to make all vehicles electric by 2035, would this make you more likely to vote for the candidate, less likely, or would the candidate's position on it make no difference to your vote?

More likely	20%
Less likely	45%
Makes no difference	30%
Don't know	5%
Unweighted N=	1650

	Party ID			**Gender**		**Race or Ethnicity**				**Age**			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
More likely	34%	16%	6%	23%	18%	19%	22%	18%	25%	27%	19%	12%	23%
Less likely	22%	47%	76%	47%	42%	52%	28%	39%	37%	32%	44%	57%	44%
No diff	38%	31%	15%	27%	33%	25%	45%	35%	35%	35%	31%	27%	29%
DK	6%	5%	3%	3%	7%	4%	5%	8%	3%	7%	5%	4%	3%
Unwt N=	601	655	381	851	787	1072	158	213	179	439	358	454	397

	Income				**Region**					**Education**			
	<$50K	$50K-<$100K	$100K-<$150K	$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
More likely	20%	20%	21%	21%	27%	20%	19%	18%	16%	17%	16%	21%	28%
Less likely	40%	45%	49%	43%	32%	41%	52%	48%	54%	47%	49%	46%	35%
No diff	34%	31%	25%	32%	32%	34%	24%	30%	27%	31%	33%	28%	30%
DK	7%	4%	4%	4%	8%	4%	5%	4%	3%	5%	2%	5%	7%
Unwt N=	332	456	297	421	224	614	254	286	272	381	392	407	467

EV4 How likely would you be to consider buying an electric vehicle – one that runs on electricity rather than gas – or do you already have one?

Note: Analysis and tables for this question are based only on respondents recruited via live phone interviewing or the Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel.

Very likely	13%
Somewhat likely	23%
Not very likely	21%
Not at all likely	35%
Already have	3%
Don't know	4%
Unweighted N=	1119

	Party ID			**Gender**		**Race or Ethnicity**				**Age**			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Very	18%	12%	4%	12%	14%	12%	15%	12%	15%	14%	17%	10%	10%
Somewhat	34%	21%	11%	25%	21%	19%	32%	25%	29%	32%	23%	17%	22%
Not very	21%	21%	22%	19%	24%	22%	19%	24%	19%	22%	19%	22%	23%
Not at all	18%	37%	59%	36%	34%	42%	23%	30%	24%	22%	30%	46%	40%
Already have	5%	4%	1%	4%	3%	3%	2%	3%	7%	4%	5%	2%	4%
DK	4%	5%	3%	4%	5%	2%	8%	7%	6%	6%	6%	3%	2%
Unwt N=	407	458	244	584	534	713	125	148	110	263	253	313	288

	Income				**Region**					**Education**			
	<$50K	$50K-<$100K	$100K-<$150K	$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Very	14%	10%	13%	15%	15%	11%	8%	16%	14%	11%	12%	15%	14%
Somewhat	16%	26%	25%	29%	27%	25%	29%	18%	17%	17%	21%	28%	34%
Not very	23%	23%	23%	17%	20%	25%	15%	15%	24%	26%	23%	16%	16%
Not at all	36%	37%	32%	31%	29%	32%	39%	42%	38%	39%	38%	35%	22%
Already have	0%	3%	4%	8%	6%	3%	5%	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%	11%
DK	10%	1%	2%	1%	4%	3%	3%	8%	5%	6%	5%	3%	3%
Unwt N=	257	318	186	274	165	434	151	174	195	295	274	272	276

EV4A In just a few words, what is the MAIN reason why you are not likely to consider buying an electric car?
Note: This question was only asked of respondents who indicated they were not very likely or not likely at all to consider buying an electric vehicle, per EV4.

Cost	29%
Concerns over charging (including time, frequency, mileage off a charge)	12%
Lack of infrastructure (charging stations, electrical grid, etc.)	10%
Concerns about production of vehicles/vehicle parts/vehicles themselves being harmful for environment	9%
Prefer gas-powered vehicles or hybrid vehicles/think they are better than electric vehicles	7%
Tech concerns/don't trust/too new/don't know enough	6%
Just no interest/don't want	6%
Concerns about safety and reliability (including accidents/fires)	4%
Don't drive/don't drive much	3%
Concerns about charger at home (where to put, etc.)	2%
Inconvenient or impractical	2%
Not in market for car	2%
Concerns about government imposition/control	2%
Concerns regarding power outages and related ability to charge	1%
Other	6%
Don't know	<1%
Unweighted N=	595

Methodology

This Rutgers-Eagleton Poll was conducted from December 13 to 23, 2023 with a scientifically selected random sample of 1,657 New Jersey adults, 18 or older. Three samples were used for this study – a dual-frame RDD landline and cell samples, a separate cell RDD sample, and sample from the Rutgers-Eagleton/Garden State Panel.

The Rutgers-Eagleton/Garden State Panel is a probability-based panel of New Jersey adults age 18 or older. Members are recruited randomly based on statewide representative ABS (Address Based Sample) design. ABS sample is drawn from the Delivery Sequence File (DSF) maintained by the U.S. Postal Service. Population coverage of the DSF is in the 98%-99% range. During the recruitment process, full demographic information on panelists is collected. The Rutgers/SSRS Garden State Panel is a multi-mode panel. For this poll, only Internet households were invited to participate via web; non-internet households were not included.

This study employed three recruitment methods: calling with live interviewers (n=521), one-to-one push-to-web texting (n=532), and web recruitment (n=604). Distribution of recruitment method in this sample is:

Call	31%
Text-to-Web	22%
Web	37%

Each of the three samples was base weighted and calibrated separately. The three samples were also combined and calibrated together, overall and by form.

The data were weighted to be representative of the residential adult population of New Jersey. The weighting balances sample demographics to target population parameters. The sample is balanced, by form and overall, to match parameters for sex, age, education, race/ethnicity, region and phone use. The sex, age, education, race/ethnicity, and region parameters were derived from 2022 American Community Survey PUMS data. The phone use parameter was derived from estimates provided by the National Health Interview Survey Early Release Program.[1]

The base weight for the dual-frame RDD sample corrects for different probabilities of selection across the telephone samples associated with the number of adults in each household and each respondent's telephone usage patterns. This adjustment also accounts for the overlapping landline and cell sample frames and the relative sizes of each frame and each sample.[2]

Base weights for the Garden State Panel were the base weights associated with the initial recruitment sampling and the sampling from the panel for this particular data collection. The base weights for the RDD cell sample were set to 1.0.

The final stage of weighting calibrates sample demographics, overall and by form, to match target population benchmark distributions. This weighting was accomplished using SPSSINC RAKE, an SPSS

[1] NCHS, National Health Interview Survey, 2018–2020; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2017–2019.

[2] Buskirk, T. D., & Best, J. (2012). Venn Diagrams, Probability 101 and Sampling Weights Computed for Dual Frame Telephone RDD Designs. Journal of Statistics and Mathematics, 15, 3696-3710.

extension module that simultaneously balances the distributions of all variables using the GENLOG procedure. Weights were trimmed to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on survey estimates. The use of these weights in statistical analysis ensures that the demographic characteristics of the sample closely approximate the demographic characteristics of the target population.

Post-data collection statistical adjustments require analysis procedures that reflect departures from simple random sampling. We calculate the effects of these design features so that an appropriate adjustment can be incorporated into tests of statistical significance when using these data. The so-called "design effect" or *deff* represents the loss in statistical efficiency that results from a disproportionate sample design and systematic non-response. The total sample design effect for this survey is 1.39.

All surveys are subject to sampling error, which is the expected probable difference between interviewing everyone in a population versus a scientific sampling drawn from that population. Sampling error should be adjusted to recognize the effect of weighting the data to better match the population. In this poll, the simple sampling error for 1,657 New Jersey adults is +/-2.4 percentage points at a 95 percent confidence interval. The design effect[3] is 1.39, making the adjusted margin of error +/- 2.8 percentage points. Thus, if 50 percent of New Jersey adults in this sample favor a particular position, we would be 95 percent sure that the true figure is between 47.2 and 52.8 percent (50 +/- 2.8) if all New Jersey adults had been interviewed, rather than just a sample.

Sampling error is only one possible source of error in a survey estimate. Sampling error does not consider other sources of variation inherent in public opinion studies, such as selection bias, non-response bias, question wording, context effects, or reporting accuracy, which may contribute additional error.

This Rutgers-Eagleton Poll was fielded by SSRS through the Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel, Braun Research, Inc., using live interviewers, and Response Now using one-to-one push-to-web texting. Sample was provided by Dynata. The questionnaire was developed and all data analyses were completed in house by the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (ECPIP). Jessica Roman assisted with analysis and preparation of this report. The Rutgers-Eagleton Poll is paid for and sponsored by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, a non-partisan academic center for the study of politics and the political process. Full questionnaires are available on request and can also be accessed through our archives at eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu. For more information, please contact poll@eagleton.rutgers.edu.

[3] Post-data collection statistical adjustments require analysis procedures that reflect departures from simple random sampling. We calculate the effects of these design features so that an appropriate adjustment can be incorporated into tests of statistical significance when using these data. The so-called "design effect" or *deff* represents the loss in statistical efficiency that results from a disproportionate sample design and systematic non-response.

Weighted Demographics
1,657 New Jersey Adults 18+
Overall Margin of Error = +/- 2.8 percentage points

Please note: Totals may equal slightly more or less than 100% due to rounding.

		deff	MOE
Man	49%	1.38	+/- 3.9%
Woman	51%	1.39	+/- 4.1%
18-34	27%	1.45	+/- 5.6%
35-49	24%	1.32	+/- 5.9%
50-64	27%	1.39	+/- 5.4%
65+	22%	1.36	+/- 5.7%
Democrat	36%	1.41	+/- 4.7%
Independent	42%	1.37	+/- 4.5%
Republican	22%	1.38	+/- 5.9%
HS or Less	32%	1.27	+/- 5.7%
Some College	26%	1.36	+/- 5.8%
College Grad	20%	1.35	+/- 5.6%
Grad Work	22%	1.32	+/- 5.2%

		deff	MOE
White	55%	1.34	+/- 3.5%
Black	12%	1.32	+/- 8.9%
Hispanic	20%	1.28	+/- 7.6%
Other	14%	1.28	+/- 8.3%
<50K	25%	1.38	+/- 6.3%
50K-<100K	31%	1.42	+/- 5.5%
100K-<150K	19%	1.37	+/- 6.7%
150K+	25%	1.35	+/- 5.5%
Urban	16%	1.36	+/- 7.6%
Suburb	35%	1.38	+/- 4.6%
Exurban	14%	1.39	+/- 7.2%
Phil/South	18%	1.38	+/- 6.8%
Shore	17%	1.39	+/- 7.0%