Conducted by Ipsos using the probability-based KnowledgePanel®
A survey of the registered voters (ages 18+) in 164 counties
Interview dates: June 7-June 21, 2024

Number of interviews, adults: 632

Margin of error for the total sample: +/- 5.53 percentage points at the 95% confidence level

NOTE: All results show percentages among all respondents, unless otherwise labeled. Reduced bases are weighted values.

*NOTE: * = less than 0.5%, - = no respondents*

Annotated Questionnaire:

1. First, how familiar, if at all, are you with the sage-grouse?

	Total
Know only the name	43%
Know a fair amount	28%
Know a lot	5%
I've never heard of the sage-grouse.	23%
Skipped	*

2. How much, if at all, have you heard about recent efforts to protect the sage-grouse and sagebrush to ensure the continued health of all species that rely on this environment?

	Total
A lot	4%
Some	15%
Just a little	22%
Nothing at all	59%
Skipped	-
A lot/some (Net)	*19%*
Just a little/nothing at all (Net)	*81%*

3. How important do you believe it is to protect the sage-grouse's habitat?

	Total
Very important	41%
Somewhat important	52%
Not important at all	7%
Skipped	*
Very/somewhat (Net)	*93%*

4. Recently, the Bureau of Land Management, a public lands management agency that oversees the use of lands and habitats throughout the interior West, proposed plans to conserve the habitat for the declining sage-grouse population. Its proposal would be to restrict the development of specific public lands to ensure long-term habitat protection for the bird. Based on this description, do you support or oppose these plans?

	Total
Strongly support	38%
Somewhat support	32%
Uncertain	22%
Somewhat oppose	5%
Strongly oppose	3%
Skipped	*
Total support (Net)	70%
Total oppose (Net)	8%

5. Regarding the proposed plans, which of the following statements comes closest to your views, even if none of the statements describe your views perfectly:

	Total
The currently proposed plans are fine as is and don't need any changes.	25%
Stronger public land protections would help not only the sage-grouse, but also fuel economic development through more opportunities for hunting, wildlife viewing, and camping.	59%
Fewer public land protections would help to ensure economic growth by enabling more energy development.	14%
Skipped	2%

This Pew Charitable Trusts poll was conducted by Ipsos June 7 to June 21, 2024, using the probability-based KnowledgePanel®. This poll is based on a probability sample of 632 registered voters in 164 counties across the United States. If you have questions regarding the survey, please contact Laurel Williams (lwilliams3@pewtrusts.org).

The survey was conducted using KnowledgePanel, the first and most well-established online probability-based panel that is representative of the adult U.S. population. Our recruitment process employs a scientifically developed address-based sampling methodology using the latest Delivery Sequence File of the U.S. Postal Service—a database with full coverage of all delivery points in the U.S. Households invited to join the panel are randomly selected from all available households in the U.S. Persons in the sampled households are invited to join and participate in the panel. Those selected who do not already have internet access are provided a tablet and internet connection at no cost to the panel member. Those who join the panel and who are selected to participate in a survey are sent a unique password-protected login used to complete surveys online. As a result of our recruitment and sampling methodologies, samples from KnowledgePanel cover all households regardless of their phone or internet status, and findings can be reported with a margin of sampling error and projected to the general population. KnowledgePanel members receive a per-survey incentive, usually the equivalent of $1 (though for some it is $2) in points, that can be redeemed for cash or prizes.

The margin of sampling error is plus or minus 5.53 percentage points at the 95% confidence level for results based on the entire sample of registered voters. The margin of sampling error takes into account the design effect, which was 2.02. The margin of sampling error is higher and varies for results based on subsamples. Sampling error is only one potential source of error. There may be other unmeasured nonsampling error in this or any poll. In our reporting of the findings, percentage points are rounded off to the nearest whole number. As a result, percentages in a given table column may total slightly higher or lower than 100%. In questions that permit multiple responses, columns may total substantially more than 100%, depending on the number of different responses offered by each respondent.

Respondents are unable to complete the survey more than once; after completing the survey one time, respondents no longer have access to the survey. Four respondents were removed from the final data for refusing more than one-third of the survey items they were shown. Ipsos did not code any open-ended responses. Data was inputted for demographics used in weighting if the respondent declined to answer. Ipsos did not conduct any additional data imputation for this study.

All forms of public opinion research are subject to unmeasured error that cannot be eliminated. When a probability-based panel like KnowledgePanel is used, Ipsos employs the total survey error approach to identify and minimize error due to coverage error, sampling error, nonresponse error, measurement error, and data processing and editing error. Coverage error is addressed in our KnowledgePanel recruitment strategies. Sampling error is addressed in recruitment and at the time of sample selection for each study. Nonresponse error is reduced in recruitment, study sampling, panel management strategies (including communication, incentive, and retention protocols), and weighting of the final data. These strategies support the computation of sampling error to estimate the extent to which the results from the sample might differ from population values. To reduce measurement error, our research staff evaluates questionnaires in terms of item flow, wording, and response formats to provide respondent-friendly surveys and elicit high-quality data. Additionally, we conduct a quality control review of data processing steps and any data cleaning to minimize errors.

The study was conducted in both English and Spanish. In the first step, design weights for KnowledgePanel assignees were computed to reflect their selection probabilities. In the second step, the aforementioned design weights for KnowledgePanel respondents—before any screenings and terminations—were weighted to the following geodemographic distributions of the 18 and over population from the 164 specified counties using an iterative proportional fitting (raking) procedure. The needed benchmarks were obtained from the five-year 2018 to 2022 American Community Survey.

1. Gender (Male, Female) by age (18-44, 45-59, 60+)
2. Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White, Non-Hispanic Black/Other/2+ Races, Hispanic)
3. State (South Dakota/Wyoming, North Dakota/Montana, Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, Utah, Oregon/California)
4. Education (High school or less, Some college, Bachelor's degree or higher)
5. Household income (under $25K, $25K-$49,999, $50K-$74,999, $75K-$99,999, $100K and over)
6. Language dominance (English-dominant Hispanic, Bilingual/Spanish-dominant Hispanic, Non-Hispanic)

Below are the demographic distributions.

1. Gender by age

	Total
18-44 Male	25%
18-44 Female	24%
45-59 Male	11%
45-59 Female	11%
60+ Male	14%
60+ Female	15%

2. Race

	Total
Non-Hispanic White	80%
Non-Hispanic Black, Other, or 2+ Races	7%
Hispanic	12%

3. Education

	Total
High school or less	34%
Some college	36%
Bachelor's degree or higher	30%

4. Household income

	Total
Under $25,000	10%
$25,000-$49,999	15%

$50,000-$74,999	17%
$75,000-$99,999	15%
$100,000 and over	43%

5. Region

	Total
South Dakota/Wyoming	10%
North Dakota/Montana	9%
Colorado	13%
Idaho	22%
Nevada	14%
Utah	23%
Oregon/California	9%

6. State

	Total
California	2%
Colorado	13%
Idaho	22%
Montana	9%
North Dakota	*
Nevada	14%
Oregon	7%
South Dakota	*
Utah	23%
Wyoming	10%

7. Language dominance

	Total
English-dominant Hispanic	5%
Bilingual or Spanish-dominant Hispanic	7%
Non-Hispanic	88%

8. Party ID

	Total
Republican	54%
Democrat	35%
Independent/Other	11%