



SURVEY RESEARCH REPORT

Natural Gas Association of Georgia

2026 Georgia General Election

815

LIKELY VOTERS

734

EFFECTIVE N

1.11

DESIGN EFFECT

±3.6%

MARGIN OF ERROR

A survey of 815 likely Georgia general-election voters, conducted July 29 through August 1, 2026, finds a competitive race for governor, with Keisha Lance Bottoms leading Rick Jackson 46.4% to 44.9%, while 7.7% remain undecided. In the Public Service Commission contests both races are effectively tied. Peter Hubbard leads Fitz Johnson 39.4% to 38.4% in District 3, while District 5, Sheila Edwards leads with 40.2% over Josh Tolbert at 38.1%. Nearly one in five voters remains undecided in each PSC race.

Energy affordability is the public's central concern. A 53.5% majority says keeping household energy bills affordable should be state leaders' highest energy priority. Voters also strongly support preserving consumer choice between natural gas and electricity, 74.1%, and expanding and modernizing natural-gas infrastructure where additional capacity is needed, 75.3%. Another 73.4% support encouraging renewable natural-gas projects, while 56.7% favor maintaining a diverse energy mix, including natural gas, nuclear, solar, hydropower, battery storage, and other sources, as Georgia's electricity demand grows.

For inquiries, email contact@quantusinsights.org or visit quantusinsights.org.

SECTION ONE

Weighted Sample Composition

The table below reports the demographic profile of the weighted sample on which every result in this report rests. Because a single set of weights is applied across all questions, each question in the report is estimated on this identical profile of 815 likely voters.

GENDER

Men		47.0%
Women		53.0%

AGE

18-29		13.0%
30-44		23.0%
45-64		39.0%
65+		25.0%

RACE / ETHNICITY

White		60.0%
Black		29.0%
Hispanic		6.0%
Asian		3.0%
Other		2.0%

EDUCATION

HS / Some college		60.0%
College		25.0%
Postgraduate		15.0%

PARTY IDENTIFICATION

Democrat		37.0%
Republican		38.0%
Independent		25.0%

METRO TYPE

Suburban		50.0%
Rural		22.0%
Urban		22.0%
Town		6.0%

01 Overall, do you feel Georgia is headed in the right direction or off on the wrong track?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION — GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

		GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
	Total	Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
Right direction	36.3	41.6	31.6	32.7	37.4	35.9	37.8	41.9	28.3	35.2	15.8	16.4
Wrong track	42.3	40.0	44.4	49.2	41.0	42.6	39.5	39.5	45.5	40.7	60.2	59.5
Not sure	21.4	18.4	24.0	18.1	21.5	21.6	22.7	18.6	26.2	24.0	24.0	24.1

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).

CROSSTABULATION — EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE


		EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
	Total	HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Right direction	36.3	33.0	41.3	41.1	13.2	59.7	34.9	35.7	41.6	33.0	34.0
Wrong track	42.3	44.9	37.4	40.0	63.6	23.4	39.5	42.5	43.8	43.7	30.0
Not sure	21.4	22.1	21.2	18.9	23.2	16.8	25.6	21.7	14.6	23.4	36.1

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

Q2 Which THREE issues are most important to you as a Georgia voter?

Respondents' highest-priority issue.

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION — GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

	Total	GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
		Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
Education	11.9	10.1	13.5	24.9	16.9	8.3	6.2	10.7	10.4	30.9	14.3	10.7
Economy and jobs	25.4	24.8	25.8	23.3	25.8	28.4	21.3	24.6	29.7	21.2	17.9	7.3
Inflation and cost of living	34.5	32.0	36.7	19.7	34.3	36.8	38.8	35.8	31.8	37.7	26.2	38.8
Energy costs and reliability	2.5	2.4	2.6	1.4	1.5	2.7	3.8	2.9	2.2	0.0	0.0	8.0
Healthcare	5.3	5.2	5.3	6.9	5.4	5.1	4.5	5.2	6.6	3.6	0.0	0.0
Housing affordability	2.2	2.7	1.8	4.3	3.8	1.0	1.7	2.1	1.3	0.0	12.9	9.5
Crime and public safety	3.2	4.9	1.7	0.0	4.5	3.3	3.6	4.1	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Immigration	3.0	3.8	2.4	2.0	0.7	3.2	5.5	3.4	2.1	0.0	6.8	9.3
Election integrity	3.8	4.3	3.4	3.4	2.0	4.0	5.6	3.5	4.7	6.5	0.0	0.0
Environment and clean water	2.3	2.6	2.1	3.6	1.9	2.0	2.4	2.5	2.1	0.0	0.0	8.5
Taxes and government spending	2.8	3.5	2.2	1.4	2.5	2.6	4.2	3.2	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
National security	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	0.8	1.0	0.7	3.2	0.0	0.6	0.6	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	7.8
Not sure	2.0	2.3	1.8	5.9	0.7	1.7	1.8	0.8	3.2	0.0	21.8	0.0

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).

Q2 — CONTINUED


CROSSTABULATION — EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE

		EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
	Total	HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Education	11.9	13.6	7.9	12.0	15.5	7.5	13.4	11.5	11.3	12.6	15.1
Economy and jobs	25.4	26.2	21.3	28.7	25.4	30.2	17.9	23.2	26.4	31.1	18.3
Inflation and cost of living	34.5	35.7	37.3	25.2	37.9	30.2	36.0	36.5	35.9	27.9	36.7
Energy costs and reliability	2.5	1.9	2.5	5.3	2.1	4.2	0.7	1.9	3.3	3.9	0.0
Healthcare	5.3	4.3	7.9	4.8	7.6	4.3	3.4	7.7	4.0	1.6	3.8
Housing affordability	2.2	3.0	1.3	0.8	2.1	1.1	4.1	2.5	0.6	3.9	0.0
Crime and public safety	3.2	3.1	2.3	5.2	0.4	5.8	3.4	3.2	2.9	2.5	6.7
Immigration	3.0	1.9	4.3	5.2	1.7	4.8	2.3	2.8	2.7	4.7	0.0
Election integrity	3.8	2.5	5.6	6.2	3.1	4.4	4.0	5.3	2.5	1.5	5.0
Environment and clean water	2.3	1.7	4.1	1.6	1.8	0.5	5.9	1.0	1.7	5.0	5.0
Taxes and government spending	2.8	2.6	3.1	3.5	0.8	4.7	3.1	2.5	4.6	2.7	0.0
National security	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0
Other	0.8	0.5	1.8	0.5	0.4	1.2	0.9	0.6	2.4	0.0	0.0
Not sure	2.0	3.1	0.3	0.9	1.3	0.9	4.9	1.3	1.2	2.7	9.4

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

03 When Georgia leaders make energy policy, which of the following should be their highest priority?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION — GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

		GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
	Total	Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
Keeping household energy bills affordable	53.5	50.5	56.2	37.0	51.5	59.1	55.2	56.7	49.3	43.1	58.5	42.3
Maintaining reliable energy service	15.0	18.6	11.8	17.5	15.4	10.0	21.0	15.7	11.7	32.4	0.0	12.6
Preserving consumer choice	5.2	5.7	4.8	1.7	6.1	5.3	6.2	5.0	6.5	2.9	0.0	7.7
Supporting jobs and economic growth	14.1	14.1	14.1	19.5	18.8	15.1	5.5	11.8	19.9	21.6	0.0	0.0
Reducing pollution and emissions	8.7	8.2	9.2	18.6	6.3	6.6	9.1	7.5	10.0	0.0	19.8	37.4
Not sure	3.4	2.8	3.9	5.6	1.7	3.9	3.0	3.3	2.5	0.0	21.7	0.0

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).


CROSSTABULATION — EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE

		EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
	Total	HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Keeping household energy bills affordable	53.5	58.0	49.9	41.8	51.6	59.1	47.9	53.0	63.3	42.9	61.1
Maintaining reliable energy service	15.0	11.7	17.8	23.3	10.0	15.3	21.7	16.3	9.4	17.6	14.8
Preserving consumer choice	5.2	4.6	4.5	9.0	3.8	5.8	6.4	7.1	1.4	6.2	0.0
Supporting jobs and economic growth	14.1	14.2	16.5	9.8	15.6	15.9	9.3	12.4	16.0	18.8	4.7
Reducing pollution and emissions	8.7	7.1	9.6	13.8	15.6	2.6	7.9	8.1	8.4	12.0	3.5
Not sure	3.4	4.4	1.7	2.2	3.3	1.3	6.7	3.1	1.5	2.5	15.8

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

04 When thinking about your household expenses, which one concerns you the most right now?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION — GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

		GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
	Total	Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
Healthcare	21.2	22.1	20.4	13.8	18.5	24.2	22.9	22.9	16.0	29.7	20.8	19.4
Housing	19.1	18.2	20.0	35.6	26.0	15.7	9.6	15.9	25.6	22.1	13.0	21.5
Groceries	31.4	33.4	29.5	32.8	25.8	30.0	38.0	32.1	32.1	19.4	32.4	32.4
Electricity	9.9	7.6	11.9	4.9	12.7	10.7	8.6	9.9	10.1	13.4	0.0	11.3
Natural gas	1.0	1.1	0.9	0.0	2.6	1.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	4.6	5.2	0.0
Insurance	7.9	8.7	7.3	5.5	6.8	6.8	12.0	8.3	7.2	10.8	6.9	0.0
Internet or phone service	2.1	1.7	2.5	0.0	2.6	3.1	1.4	3.2	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Transportation	2.1	2.9	1.5	3.0	2.1	2.2	1.6	1.6	3.4	0.0	0.0	9.5
Another expense	1.6	1.7	1.5	0.0	0.7	2.1	2.5	2.4	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not sure	3.7	2.6	4.6	4.4	2.3	4.3	3.5	3.1	3.6	0.0	21.5	5.7

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).


CROSSTABULATION — EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE

		EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
	Total	HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Healthcare	21.2	18.2	25.8	25.5	21.5	19.7	23.1	20.6	24.3	19.4	21.5
Housing	19.1	22.2	17.7	9.2	20.2	19.5	17.0	20.4	13.8	23.4	12.2
Groceries	31.4	31.2	29.6	34.9	31.7	33.8	27.2	31.7	32.6	28.6	34.2
Electricity	9.9	10.2	8.9	10.2	11.8	7.9	10.1	5.7	11.8	16.5	13.6
Natural gas	1.0	1.1	0.7	1.0	2.1	0.5	0.0	1.3	0.7	0.8	0.0
Insurance	7.9	8.0	8.7	6.3	3.7	11.4	8.8	11.0	8.3	2.8	0.0
Internet or phone service	2.1	1.7	2.2	3.6	1.2	1.9	3.9	1.8	1.5	2.9	4.0
Transportation	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.3	3.1	0.8	2.8	2.2	3.0	1.8	0.0
Another expense	1.6	0.7	2.2	4.1	1.3	2.9	0.0	1.9	0.8	0.7	5.1
Not sure	3.7	4.5	2.1	2.8	3.5	1.5	7.1	3.4	3.2	3.1	9.5

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

05 Which of the following best describes how you usually vote?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION — GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

	Total	GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
		Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
Mostly or only for Republicans	30.7	33.9	27.9	17.4	20.7	38.3	35.1	42.4	10.5	24.2	8.5	26.8
A few more Republicans than Democrats	7.3	7.5	7.1	8.8	9.2	7.8	3.9	7.3	6.7	15.5	0.0	0.0
Independent or vote for the person, not the party	20.2	26.0	15.1	18.2	25.3	15.4	24.3	19.9	21.6	9.4	37.7	18.1
A few more Democrats than Republicans	5.7	4.2	7.1	7.6	8.2	4.0	5.0	4.9	6.6	6.1	12.1	7.4
Mostly or only for Democrats	31.3	24.7	37.2	40.4	33.3	30.5	25.9	22.9	47.8	38.5	20.1	38.9
Not sure	4.8	3.7	5.7	7.5	3.4	3.9	5.8	2.6	6.9	6.3	21.6	8.7

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).


CROSSTABULATION — EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE

	Total	EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
		HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Mostly or only for Republicans	30.7	29.0	36.6	28.0	0.0	80.9	0.0	30.0	47.4	15.3	32.1
A few more Republicans than Democrats	7.3	7.8	4.8	9.0	0.0	19.1	0.0	9.8	3.5	5.4	7.1
Independent or vote for the person, not the party	20.2	19.5	20.8	22.3	0.0	0.0	81.0	21.5	18.2	23.0	7.4
A few more Democrats than Republicans	5.7	5.0	6.3	7.6	15.4	0.0	0.0	5.1	7.3	5.0	7.3
Mostly or only for Democrats	31.3	32.5	28.7	30.9	84.6	0.0	0.0	29.8	18.8	47.9	28.8
Not sure	4.8	6.3	2.6	2.3	0.0	0.0	19.0	3.8	4.9	3.3	17.3

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

06 Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of Keisha Lance Bottoms?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION — GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

	Total	GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
		Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
Very favorable	20.3	16.3	23.9	16.9	20.2	22.3	24.1	13.9	38.1	19.6	25.1	13.0
Somewhat favorable	21.7	21.4	21.9	31.7	25.6	16.9	20.4	19.9	26.2	27.2	13.4	7.0
Somewhat unfavorable	9.6	8.1	11.0	7.3	8.1	11.5	9.2	8.5	8.2	12.2	16.3	44.7
Very unfavorable	24.4	33.5	16.4	5.3	19.3	30.7	29.3	33.0	10.1	20.8	0.0	20.3
Heard of her, no opinion	13.3	11.5	14.9	23.3	17.3	7.6	13.4	13.7	11.4	20.2	19.8	0.0
Never heard of her	9.4	6.6	11.9	15.5	9.5	10.9	3.7	11.0	5.9	0.0	25.4	15.1
NET FAVORABLE	42.0	37.7	45.8	48.6	45.8	39.2	44.4	33.8	64.3	46.8	38.5	20.0
NET UNFAVORABLE	34.0	41.5	27.4	12.6	27.4	42.2	38.5	41.6	18.4	33.0	16.3	65.0

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).


CROSSTABULATION — EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE

	Total	EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
		HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Very favorable	20.3	21.9	21.0	21.2	44.1	4.0	14.9	21.7	21.7	20.8	22.6
Somewhat favorable	21.7	21.8	17.7	28.1	33.6	8.0	24.9	23.2	13.6	28.5	13.5
Somewhat unfavorable	9.6	9.1	9.2	12.3	4.7	15.4	8.1	12.4	5.8	7.7	7.5
Very unfavorable	24.4	21.8	31.7	22.8	2.7	49.6	18.3	23.9	31.3	18.2	26.5
Heard of her, no opinion	13.3	13.8	13.3	11.5	12.2	9.2	21.2	12.1	15.2	15.7	7.5
Never heard of her	9.4	11.7	7.0	4.2	2.6	13.8	12.7	6.7	12.4	9.0	22.3
NET FAVORABLE	42.0	43.7	38.7	49.2	77.7	12.0	39.8	44.9	35.3	49.4	36.1
NET UNFAVORABLE	34.0	30.9	40.9	35.1	7.4	65.0	26.4	36.3	37.1	25.9	34.0

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

07 Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of Rick Jackson?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION — GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

	Total	GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
		Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
Very favorable	15.0	16.9	13.2	10.3	15.6	15.0	16.7	18.6	9.2	8.1	8.5	20.2
Somewhat favorable	21.6	26.9	16.9	25.0	13.5	25.2	21.5	24.6	12.2	43.3	5.2	25.4
Somewhat unfavorable	10.7	11.3	10.1	2.9	9.9	9.9	16.6	10.1	14.3	4.2	7.3	0.0
Very unfavorable	25.7	21.0	30.0	21.8	27.4	23.4	30.0	23.0	32.2	22.7	17.1	37.4
Heard of him, no opinion	13.1	11.4	14.6	22.4	14.0	13.5	6.9	12.5	15.8	14.8	0.0	8.2
Never heard of him	13.9	12.5	15.2	17.6	19.5	13.0	8.4	11.2	16.4	6.9	62.0	8.8
NET FAVORABLE	36.5	43.8	30.1	35.3	29.1	40.3	38.1	43.2	21.3	51.4	13.7	45.6
NET UNFAVORABLE	36.4	32.3	40.1	24.6	37.3	33.3	46.6	33.1	46.5	26.9	24.4	37.4

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).


CROSSTABULATION — EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE

	Total	EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
		HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Very favorable	15.0	14.3	18.5	11.5	2.7	30.9	8.9	12.8	22.4	13.1	12.6
Somewhat favorable	21.6	18.2	26.8	26.6	5.5	41.0	15.9	23.0	25.3	18.6	6.3
Somewhat unfavorable	10.7	11.4	9.1	10.4	9.3	7.7	17.3	11.8	8.6	7.4	20.8
Very unfavorable	25.7	24.6	23.3	34.2	55.4	3.2	16.2	25.1	17.3	35.0	27.9
Heard of him, no opinion	13.1	14.8	12.7	6.9	10.0	9.9	22.6	12.7	17.1	9.1	16.5
Never heard of him	13.9	16.7	9.6	10.3	17.2	7.3	19.1	14.5	9.2	16.8	15.9
NET FAVORABLE	36.5	32.5	45.3	38.1	8.1	71.9	24.8	35.8	47.7	31.7	18.9
NET UNFAVORABLE	36.4	36.0	32.4	44.7	64.7	10.8	33.5	36.9	25.9	42.4	48.7

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

08 If the election for governor were held today, for whom would you vote?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION — GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

	Total	GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
		Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
Keisha Lance Bottoms, the Democrat	46.4	40.0	52.1	51.1	52.7	37.7	37.1	81.3	95.8	89.6	86.4	85.2
Rick Jackson, the Republican	44.9	52.1	38.5	30.7	30.5	47.7	51.6	11.4	0.8	4.7	4.3	5.7
Another candidate	1.0	0.7	1.3	3.3	2.8	2.9	3.1	1.5	1.2	1.9	2.8	1.5
Undecided	7.7	7.3	8.1	14.9	14.0	11.7	8.2	5.8	2.2	3.8	6.5	7.6

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).


CROSSTABULATION — EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE

	Total	EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
		HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Keisha Lance Bottoms, the Democrat	46.4	33.9	41.6	46.4	94.8	3.4	37.0	39.1	29.4	60.0	38.7
Rick Jackson, the Republican	44.9	53.2	45.9	41.3	1.2	88.3	24.1	49.9	59.1	27.7	41.1
Another candidate	1.0	2.7	3.1	1.5	0.5	3.5	5.2	2.3	2.2	3.2	11.2
Undecided	7.7	10.2	9.4	10.8	3.5	4.9	33.7	8.7	9.4	9.1	8.9

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

09 Before today, how much had you heard about the Georgia Public Service Commission?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION – GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

		GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
	Total	Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
A great deal	20.9	25.4	16.9	26.7	21.5	18.0	21.7	20.4	23.6	15.6	16.4	20.1
Some	45.4	46.3	44.6	47.0	54.6	41.1	42.9	49.0	37.1	51.9	37.3	48.7
Not much	23.1	20.7	25.1	17.0	17.9	26.5	25.5	20.3	29.1	19.1	32.0	16.3
Nothing at all	10.7	7.6	13.4	9.3	6.0	14.4	9.8	10.3	10.3	13.4	14.3	15.0

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).


CROSSTABULATION – EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE

		EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
	Total	HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
A great deal	20.9	18.0	22.1	30.1	23.1	18.3	21.6	22.4	15.4	25.2	12.3
Some	45.4	44.9	48.1	42.8	44.1	48.0	43.4	45.6	46.9	45.8	36.3
Not much	23.1	25.8	21.1	15.5	23.3	24.4	20.6	21.8	26.2	20.0	33.2
Nothing at all	10.7	11.2	8.7	11.6	9.5	9.3	14.4	10.1	11.5	9.0	18.2

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

010 What should be the Georgia Public Service Commission's highest priority?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION — GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

	Total	GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
		Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
Keeping utility rates affordable	53.4	52.3	54.4	38.6	51.6	59.9	52.7	57.7	48.6	46.8	48.8	19.6
Maintaining reliable service	14.3	19.1	10.0	5.8	16.5	10.9	21.9	14.2	11.5	30.6	10.0	14.8
Protecting consumers	9.6	8.3	10.7	18.9	11.6	7.8	5.6	8.2	11.4	19.2	0.0	9.8
Carefully reviewing new infrastructure projects	6.0	4.8	7.1	7.4	3.7	5.8	7.7	5.7	7.2	0.0	0.0	24.2
Supporting economic growth	5.4	6.3	4.6	6.9	10.4	4.4	1.6	4.5	8.8	0.0	6.0	0.0
Expanding renewable energy	6.8	5.2	8.3	12.1	3.7	6.2	8.0	7.1	6.6	3.4	0.0	22.7
Not sure / something else	4.5	3.9	5.0	10.2	2.6	5.0	2.6	2.6	5.9	0.0	35.3	8.8

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).

CROSSTABULATION — EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE

	Total	EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
		HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Keeping utility rates affordable	53.4	57.6	49.8	42.7	56.9	58.9	39.8	54.0	56.5	44.3	70.8
Maintaining reliable service	14.3	11.9	14.5	23.7	7.6	18.5	17.7	15.5	11.9	16.2	5.7
Protecting consumers	9.6	8.9	11.9	8.2	10.4	5.4	14.6	8.5	12.2	11.9	0.0
Carefully reviewing new infrastructure projects	6.0	5.5	6.6	7.1	4.8	5.7	8.3	6.7	6.4	5.6	0.0
Supporting economic growth	5.4	4.8	6.5	6.2	3.5	7.8	4.6	4.5	5.8	6.2	8.4
Expanding renewable energy	6.8	5.4	8.3	9.9	13.9	2.2	3.4	7.8	3.3	9.0	4.2
Not sure / something else	4.5	6.0	2.4	2.2	2.9	1.4	11.6	3.0	4.0	6.7	10.9

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

Q11

If the election for Public Service Commissioner, District 3, were held today, for whom would you vote?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION — GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

	Total	GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
		Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	82	228	310	196	494	239	49	25	8
Peter Hubbard, the Democrat	39.4	35.2	43.1	44.1	42.2	33.8	36.5	30.6	71.2	44.5	54.2	46.3
Fitz Johnson, the Republican	38.4	43.6	33.7	34.8	33.5	37.9	34.4	47.1	12.7	29.5	20.1	18.6
Another candidate	2.1	2.7	1.6	3.0	1.1	2.0	2.4	1.1	2.5	4.1	0.0	8.8
Undecided	20.1	18.5	21.6	18.2	23.1	26.3	26.6	21.2	13.7	21.9	25.7	26.3

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=25), Other (n=8).

CROSSTABULATION — EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE

	Total	EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
		HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	522	187	106	302	310	204	481	8	318	8
Peter Hubbard, the Democrat	39.4	32.7	36.9	41.0	81.8	2.3	26.4	35.8	25.8	57.7	24.7
Fitz Johnson, the Republican	38.4	41.8	41.4	34.1	0.5	79.7	20.5	36.1	45.0	23.6	41.6
Another candidate	2.1	2.3	1.1	1.5	2.2	1.7	2.4	2.2	1.7	0.8	6.3
Undecided	20.1	23.3	20.7	23.4	15.5	16.3	50.7	25.9	27.5	17.9	27.4

Small base — interpret with caution: Rural (n=8), Town (n=8).

Q12

If the election for Public Service Commissioner, District 5, were held today, for whom would you vote?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION — GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

	Total	GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
		Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	82	204	326	204	489	236	49	24	16
Shelia Edwards, the Democrat	40.2	35.2	44.6	58.1	46.6	33.8	38.9	30.6	73.8	46.5	52.6	46.2
Josh Tolbert, the Republican	38.1	44.3	32.5	24.1	28.4	40.3	36.8	46.8	6.3	32.6	19.3	18.6
Another candidate	1.4	1.5	1.3	0.0	2.4	1.0	2.1	1.3	2.0	0.0	0.0	8.8
Undecided	20.4	19.0	21.6	17.8	22.6	25.0	22.3	21.4	17.9	20.9	28.0	26.4

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).

CROSSTABULATION — EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE


	Total	EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
		HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Shelia Edwards, the Democrat	40.2	38.2	41.9	41.7	85.9	3.8	27.3	39.4	27.4	56.7	41.1
Josh Tolbert, the Republican	38.1	38.0	37.8	32.0	1.5	78.2	21.3	35.9	49.8	22.0	29.2
Another candidate	1.4	1.7	0.8	1.1	0.4	2.4	1.6	1.4	1.7	1.6	0.0
Undecided	20.4	22.1	19.5	25.2	12.2	15.6	49.8	23.3	21.2	19.7	29.7

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

Q13 Does your household currently use natural gas for any of the following?

Primary household use of natural gas.

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION – GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

	Total	GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
		Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
Cooking	32.8	37.7	28.4	39.2	38.2	33.3	23.6	25.4	39.5	66.5	39.6	44.8
Heating water	14.7	14.5	14.9	17.8	14.3	13.3	15.6	19.1	8.5	5.4	8.1	9.2
Heating the home	9.4	9.3	9.4	6.5	7.9	8.4	13.8	10.2	9.2	7.9	0.0	7.0
Clothes dryer	1.3	2.4	0.4	6.2	0.0	0.8	0.8	1.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Generator or another appliance	1.8	1.0	2.6	1.6	3.5	2.1	0.0	2.2	0.9	3.5	0.0	0.0
My household does not use natural gas	34.4	29.5	38.7	21.0	29.0	35.9	44.0	36.7	34.5	12.5	32.8	30.7
Not sure	5.6	5.6	5.7	7.7	7.2	6.3	2.1	5.3	5.0	4.3	19.5	8.3

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).

CROSSTABULATION – EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE

	Total	EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
		HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Cooking	32.8	33.5	31.5	32.2	37.2	33.0	25.8	38.4	19.7	40.3	6.4
Heating water	14.7	12.6	17.3	18.8	12.7	12.2	21.4	20.7	2.8	9.9	25.8
Heating the home	9.4	8.1	10.0	13.3	5.6	11.4	11.9	11.2	9.2	6.5	5.6
Clothes dryer	1.3	0.5	3.2	1.4	1.5	0.0	3.1	1.6	0.0	0.9	5.5
Generator or another appliance	1.8	1.5	3.2	0.6	1.1	0.6	4.7	0.5	3.5	3.6	0.0
My household does not use natural gas	34.4	37.0	31.3	28.9	34.5	38.8	27.5	23.7	57.6	30.7	51.6
Not sure	5.6	6.7	3.5	4.9	7.4	3.9	5.6	4.0	7.2	8.0	5.0


Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

Q14

If natural-gas service were available at your home, how likely would you be to consider using it?

Asked of respondents whose household does not use natural gas.

Base: respondents whose household does not use natural gas · n = 280 · effective n = 186 · design effect 1.506 · design-adjusted margin of error ±7.2 points



CROSSTABULATION — GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

	Total	GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
		Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=280	132	148	36	64	109	70	168	81	17	8	6
Very likely	23.0	29.7	17.1	22.8	21.7	23.8	23.1	20.5	31.4	0.0	0.0	81.6
Somewhat likely	30.0	23.7	35.6	36.3	36.7	32.5	16.7	30.0	29.2	59.2	0.0	0.0
Not too likely	13.7	13.5	13.9	11.2	17.2	9.8	17.8	16.1	8.0	15.6	26.5	0.0
Not at all likely	19.6	17.4	21.5	3.1	19.0	19.5	28.9	22.1	16.8	0.0	35.0	18.4
Not sure	13.7	15.7	11.9	26.6	5.5	14.4	13.6	11.3	14.7	25.2	38.5	0.0

Small base — interpret with caution: 18–29 (n=36), Hispanic (n=17), Asian (n=8), Other (n=6).

CROSSTABULATION — EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE

	Total	EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
		HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=280	168	70	42	104	106	70	140	62	62	17
Very likely	23.0	17.3	37.4	21.7	21.3	22.9	25.7	25.6	10.2	33.8	8.7
Somewhat likely	30.0	39.4	7.2	30.3	35.0	31.2	20.8	33.7	35.5	17.0	26.5
Not too likely	13.7	8.5	14.5	33.2	17.8	11.7	10.6	11.9	15.1	12.8	26.8
Not at all likely	19.6	16.5	33.0	9.5	16.4	25.3	15.5	21.5	26.6	3.2	38.1
Not sure	13.7	18.3	7.9	5.2	9.5	8.9	27.3	7.2	12.6	33.2	0.0

Small base — interpret with caution: Postgraduate (n=42), Town (n=17).

Q15

Before today, did you know that U.S. households using natural gas typically save an average of \$1030 on their energy bills?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION – GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

	Total	GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
		Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
Yes	29.0	34.8	23.9	30.0	38.8	26.2	23.8	27.7	32.9	27.8	8.2	46.0
No	71.0	65.2	76.1	70.0	61.2	73.8	76.2	72.3	67.1	72.2	91.8	54.0

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).

CROSSTABULATION – EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE

	Total	EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
		HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Yes	29.0	28.4	28.3	32.6	24.6	30.4	33.4	31.8	24.7	31.1	13.4
No	71.0	71.6	71.7	67.4	75.4	69.6	66.6	68.2	75.3	68.9	86.6

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

Q16

Before today, were you aware that natural gas delivered directly to a home is about 92% efficient, while natural gas converted into electricity is about 38% efficient?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION – GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

	Total	GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
		Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
Yes	24.2	29.9	19.2	24.8	37.0	20.6	17.9	22.6	27.5	26.7	12.3	38.1
No	75.8	70.1	80.8	75.2	63.0	79.4	82.1	77.4	72.5	73.3	87.7	61.9

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).

CROSSTABULATION – EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE


	Total	EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
		HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Yes	24.2	24.6	22.7	25.1	18.4	26.1	30.1	24.9	22.0	29.6	7.5
No	75.8	75.4	77.3	74.9	81.6	73.9	69.9	75.1	78.0	70.4	92.5

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

017

Do you support or oppose protecting the ability of homeowners and businesses to choose natural gas when it is available?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION — GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

	Total	GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
		Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
Strongly support	50.1	57.7	43.3	44.8	36.2	53.0	61.0	56.8	39.5	41.7	25.5	61.8
Somewhat support	24.0	24.0	24.1	30.7	32.2	21.1	17.6	22.6	26.2	22.2	42.8	13.0
Somewhat oppose	5.3	3.8	6.7	10.1	11.3	2.5	1.6	3.2	7.2	19.0	0.0	8.6
Strongly oppose	4.8	5.5	4.1	3.8	5.5	5.9	2.9	3.5	7.3	3.4	12.0	0.0
Not sure	15.9	9.0	21.9	10.6	14.7	17.6	16.9	14.0	19.7	13.7	19.7	16.6
NET SUPPORT	74.1	81.7	67.3	75.5	68.4	74.0	78.6	79.4	65.7	63.9	68.3	74.8
NET OPPOSE	10.1	9.3	10.7	13.8	16.8	8.4	4.5	6.6	14.6	22.4	12.0	8.6

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).

CROSSTABULATION — EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE


	Total	EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
		HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Strongly support	50.1	46.4	56.6	53.5	36.5	64.9	47.5	53.7	53.0	43.1	34.6
Somewhat support	24.0	23.0	23.0	29.8	29.0	20.8	21.6	23.3	26.9	24.2	18.6
Somewhat oppose	5.3	6.8	2.6	3.7	7.0	3.3	5.7	4.9	3.0	7.9	7.6
Strongly oppose	4.8	6.0	2.8	3.4	6.8	2.9	4.5	4.8	1.7	7.2	6.8
Not sure	15.9	17.7	15.1	9.6	20.6	8.1	20.6	13.3	15.4	17.6	32.4
NET SUPPORT	74.1	69.5	79.6	83.3	65.5	85.6	69.1	77.0	79.9	67.3	53.2
NET OPPOSE	10.1	12.8	5.3	7.1	13.9	6.2	10.3	9.7	4.7	15.1	14.4

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

Q18

Would you support or oppose expanding and modernizing natural-gas infrastructure in areas where additional capacity is needed?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION — GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

	Total	GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
		Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
Strongly support	37.1	44.4	30.6	29.0	27.8	42.5	41.5	40.4	30.6	43.2	14.9	48.1
Somewhat support	38.2	39.0	37.4	44.3	51.3	33.4	30.4	37.2	38.7	39.6	55.3	27.9
Somewhat oppose	5.5	3.4	7.3	3.8	7.5	4.5	6.0	5.1	7.3	4.9	0.0	0.0
Strongly oppose	3.5	2.6	4.2	4.5	0.9	2.4	7.0	2.9	4.6	3.6	0.0	10.0
Not sure	15.8	10.5	20.4	18.4	12.5	17.2	15.1	14.4	18.8	8.8	29.7	14.1
NET SUPPORT	75.3	83.5	68.0	73.3	79.1	75.8	71.9	77.6	69.3	82.8	70.3	75.9
NET OPPOSE	9.0	6.0	11.6	8.2	8.4	6.9	13.0	8.0	11.9	8.5	0.0	10.0

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).

CROSSTABULATION — EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE


	Total	EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
		HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Strongly support	37.1	33.9	46.8	33.8	30.5	49.3	28.4	41.2	33.6	35.4	22.3
Somewhat support	38.2	39.8	34.1	38.2	35.9	40.5	37.9	37.3	42.8	35.4	38.6
Somewhat oppose	5.5	4.4	5.2	10.5	8.5	2.6	5.4	6.1	5.7	5.3	0.0
Strongly oppose	3.5	2.8	3.6	6.1	4.6	0.4	6.5	3.3	3.1	3.8	5.0
Not sure	15.8	19.1	10.3	11.5	20.6	7.1	21.7	12.1	14.8	20.1	34.1
NET SUPPORT	75.3	73.7	80.9	72.0	66.4	89.8	66.4	78.5	76.4	70.8	60.9
NET OPPOSE	9.0	7.1	8.8	16.5	13.0	3.1	11.9	9.4	8.8	9.1	5.0

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

Q19

Would you support or oppose encouraging more renewable natural-gas projects in Georgia?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION — GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

	Total	GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
		Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
Strongly support	35.1	37.5	32.9	26.6	41.4	31.8	38.9	37.2	33.7	34.5	11.9	29.2
Somewhat support	38.3	42.2	34.9	41.6	37.9	37.4	38.6	38.4	38.0	38.9	35.2	43.9
Somewhat oppose	6.9	6.8	7.1	11.6	7.8	5.8	5.4	6.7	5.2	19.9	8.0	0.0
Strongly oppose	0.9	0.7	1.1	0.0	0.9	1.3	0.8	0.9	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not sure	18.7	12.8	24.0	20.3	12.0	23.7	16.3	16.9	21.7	6.8	44.9	26.9
NET SUPPORT	73.4	79.7	67.8	68.2	79.3	69.1	77.5	75.6	71.7	73.4	47.1	73.1
NET OPPOSE	7.9	7.5	8.2	11.6	8.7	7.2	6.2	7.5	6.6	19.9	8.0	0.0

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).

CROSSTABULATION — EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE


	Total	EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
		HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Strongly support	35.1	31.6	41.4	38.7	41.0	31.6	31.6	37.4	27.7	36.9	36.1
Somewhat support	38.3	39.1	38.6	34.7	32.8	42.8	39.8	39.1	37.0	42.5	22.2
Somewhat oppose	6.9	7.9	4.7	6.8	6.1	8.1	6.3	6.3	9.5	5.6	7.8
Strongly oppose	0.9	0.7	1.5	1.0	1.6	0.9	0.0	0.4	1.6	1.8	0.0
Not sure	18.7	20.7	13.8	18.8	18.4	16.7	22.2	16.9	24.2	13.2	33.9
NET SUPPORT	73.4	70.7	80.0	73.4	73.8	74.3	71.5	76.5	64.7	79.4	58.3
NET OPPOSE	7.9	8.6	6.2	7.7	7.8	8.9	6.3	6.6	11.1	7.5	7.8

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

020

As Georgia's electricity demand grows, which approach should the state emphasize?

Base: all respondents · n = 815 · effective n = 734 · design effect 1.110 · design-adjusted margin of error ±3.6 points



CROSSTABULATION — GENDER · AGE · RACE / ETHNICITY

	Total	GENDER		AGE				RACE / ETHNICITY				
		Men	Women	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
	n=815	383	432	106	187	318	204	489	236	49	24	16
Continue using a diverse mix that includes natural gas, nuclear power, solar power, battery storage and other sources	56.7	60.3	53.6	55.0	55.1	56.7	59.1	61.0	49.0	58.4	33.3	70.2
Move more quickly toward relying primarily on solar energy and battery storage	24.4	23.2	25.5	20.4	34.4	21.2	22.4	21.1	28.3	36.8	33.1	17.3
Neither approach	5.0	6.1	4.1	8.7	2.6	2.9	8.7	5.1	5.9	0.0	0.0	12.5
Not sure	13.8	10.5	16.8	15.9	7.8	19.2	9.8	12.7	16.8	4.8	33.6	0.0

Small base — interpret with caution: Hispanic (n=49), Asian (n=24), Other (n=16).

CROSSTABULATION — EDUCATION · PARTY IDENTIFICATION · METRO TYPE

	Total	EDUCATION			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			METRO TYPE			
		HS / Some col.	College	Grad	Dem	Rep	Ind	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Town
	n=815	489	204	122	302	310	204	408	179	179	49
Continue using a diverse mix that includes natural gas, nuclear power, solar power, battery storage and other sources	56.7	52.7	66.7	56.3	49.2	68.4	50.2	58.3	57.0	53.5	54.8
Move more quickly toward relying primarily on solar energy and battery storage	24.4	24.9	17.6	33.9	35.2	18.7	17.3	25.4	18.4	30.9	14.9
Neither approach	5.0	5.9	4.3	2.8	4.2	3.8	8.2	4.2	5.8	7.4	0.0
Not sure	13.8	16.5	11.4	6.9	11.4	9.2	24.4	12.1	18.9	8.2	30.3

Small base — interpret with caution: Town (n=49).

METHODOLOGY

Survey Design and Methodology

POPULATION	Likely voters in the 2026 Georgia general election. The sampling universe consisted of active registered voters who had participated in at least one of the previous four general elections. For the SMS-to-mobile portion of the survey, likely-voter status was determined using Quantus Insights’ proprietary turnout model. The model estimates each voter’s probability of participating based on general-election voting history, demographic characteristics, partisan-lean indicators, and geographic information available in the voter file. The resulting turnout scores were used to define and weight the likely-voter population. No separate survey screening question was administered to these respondents.
FIELD PERIOD	For the online portion of the sample, likely-voter eligibility was determined using a survey screening question. July 29 to August 3, 2026
MODE	The survey was conducted using a mixed-mode methodology consisting of an online panel (n=300) and SMS-to-mobile interviews (n=515).
SAMPLING	The SMS-to-mobile sample was drawn using stratified random sampling from the eligible voter-file universe and matched to available mobile telephone records. The online portion was collected through Dynata’s online panel and screened for eligibility.
WEIGHTING	Results were weighted using iterative proportional fitting, or raking, to align the sample with benchmarks for Georgia’s likely general-election electorate by age, sex, race, education, metro type, media market, and general-election voting frequency. Race was based on the voter-registration field and weighted as White, Black, Hispanic, Asian and Other where sample sizes permitted reliable separate weighting. Weights were trimmed to limit the influence of individual respondents.
MARGIN OF ERROR	Margins of error are design-adjusted and reported separately for each question. The statewide sample has a design-adjusted margin of error of ±3.6 percentage points at the 95% confidence level, based on a design effect of 1.110 and an effective sample size of 734.
ROUNDING	Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.
CONTACT	Quantus Insights · contact@quantusinsights.org · quantusinsights.org