



PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

POLICE REFORM SURVEY PENNSYLVANIA'S 1ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT - QUESTIONNAIRE - AUGUST 2020

Fielded by: PA-1: Precision Sample
National: Nielsen Scarborough

Field Dates: PA-1: July 24 - August 9, 2020
National: July 2-9, 2020

Sample Size: PA-1: 437
National: 3,226

This survey will take about 30 minutes to answer. Since you have taken a survey with us before, you know that we will make no effort to sell anything to you and your answers will remain confidential. If at any time you find that you do not want to answer a question, feel free to skip it and move on to the next one.

[Introduction]

As you probably know there is much discussion these days about police and other law enforcement officers using force, especially deadly force against Black Americans. There have been incidents in which officers used force in ways that many people found excessive.

A number of proposals have been put forward in Congress to establish new rules for the use of force, especially deadly force, by law enforcement officers. There are also proposals to make officers more personally accountable for the way they use force and seek to counter possible racial bias in law enforcement.

These Congressional proposals would not directly regulate police departments. However, the Federal government can and does require that certain standards be met if police departments want to get Federal funding.

What follows are some of the proposals that would become part of the requirements for Federal funding. You will have a chance to evaluate arguments for and against them, and finally we will ask you whether you favor them or not.

[Policies Regarding the Use of Force]

[De-escalation and Use of Force as Last Resort]

Here is some background on the issue:

Here is a proposal currently being considered in Congress that seeks to reduce officers use of deadly force. It includes three parts.

1. All officers would receive training in tactics and techniques that are alternative to the use of deadly force including:

- Creating physical distance between the officer and the suspect
- Putting something between themselves and the suspect to make physical assault less likely
- Requesting other resources, such as more police officers or social workers who could help solve the problem

Officers would also have to be trained in what are called de-escalation techniques. The idea is to resolve the issue, restore order, get cooperation without having to resort to force. Some of these de-escalation techniques include:

- Talking with the suspect in a way that calms or defuses the situation

- Avoiding escalating the situation by threatening or provoking the suspect
- Waiting out the suspect

2. Officers would only be justified in using deadly force as a last resort, after reasonable alternatives have been exhausted, and when it would not create substantial risk of injury to a third person.

These policies are already in place in many police departments. This legislation would require that it be official policy for all departments that receive Federal funding.

This legislation would also affect criminal cases when an officer uses deadly force and is charged with manslaughter or murder. Currently, on the federal level and in most states, the judge or jury need only determine whether the officer **believed** that their use of deadly force was reasonable in that situation to protect themselves or others, and if so, the officer would not be convicted.

3. Under this proposal, the judge or jury would also have to determine:

- whether the officer had exhausted other alternative tactics and/or de-escalation techniques in order to solve the problem before resorting to deadly force
- whether the officer acted with gross negligence in a way that contributed to the need for deadly force

These would be taken into account in assessing whether the officer is guilty.

We will now evaluate arguments for and against this proposal. Here is an argument in favor of the proposal:

Q1. Every year around a thousand civilians—many of them unarmed—die from police shootings. Too many officers are quick to use deadly force, especially against Black Americans. Under existing law, when an officer kills a citizen—even an unarmed one—all they have to do is say that they **believed** that they were at risk of being severely injured or killed. In the case of Tamir Rice—a 12-year-old boy—he had a toy gun and the officers drove up to him and, without warning, shot him. If they believed the gun was real, they should have kept their distance and, from a protected position, told him to put down the “gun.” We need to require that officers learn and use better tactics when they are sent to calls involving possible weapons. They should only use deadly force as a last resort and should be held accountable if they wrongly injure or kill people.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	42.2%	43.2%	85.4%	8.2%	5.7%	13.9%	0.8%
PA-1 Republicans	28.6%	53.6%	82.2%	7.8%	10.0%	17.8%	0.0%
PA-1 Democrats	57.5%	34.9%	92.4%	3.6%	2.1%	5.7%	1.8%
U.S. National	42.3%	30.6%	72.9%	13.3%	12.9%	26.2%	0.9%
Republicans	20.1%	35.0%	55.1%	23.5%	20.8%	44.3%	0.6%
Democrats	63.8%	25.2%	89.0%	5.1%	4.8%	9.9%	1.0%
Independents	38.7%	33.7%	72.4%	11.4%	15.0%	26.4%	1.2%

***Note:** For the national sample, several of the questions were asked to only three-quarters of the sample. For Pennsylvania CD-1 everyone got all of the questions in the survey.

Here is an argument against the proposal:

Q2. Police officers put their lives on the line every day to protect us all. On average, about 150 officers die in the line of duty each year; many more are wounded or assaulted. They often deal with dangerous situations and violent criminals who attack them or members of the public. This requires split-second decision making. Officers are trained to first try to talk down a person and get their cooperation. But requiring them to do it can result in the officer hesitating and getting harmed or killed. If we put these limits on the officers, this will put their lives at even greater risk, which will make it harder to recruit new officers. Current officers may seek to avoid these dangerous situations that they are called to, which will weaken the effectiveness of the police in general. Furthermore, if criminals assume that officers have to be so cautious and timid, this will embolden the criminals to not comply with an officers' commands and to even resist arrest.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	31.6%	37.1%	68.7%	22.4%	8.2%	30.6%	0.7%
PA-1 Republicans	48.8%	38.4%	87.2%	11.3%	1.5%	12.8%	0.0%
PA-1 Democrats	18.9%	32.6%	51.5%	30.5%	16.3%	46.8%	1.7%
U.S. National	32.0%	28.5%	60.5%	21.8%	17.2%	39.0%	0.5%
Republicans	54.2%	32.0%	86.2%	9.5%	4.4%	13.9%	0.0%
Democrats	11.8%	25.2%	37.0%	33.6%	28.6%	62.2%	0.8%
Independents	32.5%	29.0%	61.5%	20.1%	17.7%	37.8%	0.7%

Here is an argument in favor of the proposal:

Q3. Several states and cities have changed their policies to require that officers use de-escalation and other techniques to ensure that deadly force is only used as a last resort--and have seen great results. Comprehensive studies have found the amount of police violence went down sharply, increasing the safety for citizens, including bystanders. Officers were found to be at less risk, and there was no evidence that they were less able or willing to use force when it was necessary to defend themselves. Police morale went up.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	45.2%	35.1%	80.3%	11.9%	7.7%	19.6%	0.2%
PA-1 Republicans	33.1%	37.9%	71.0%	16.3%	12.7%	29.0%	0.0%
PA-1 Democrats	59.2%	26.5%	85.7%	9.8%	4.1%	13.9%	0.4%
National	41.4%	38.1%	79.5%	12.5%	6.8%	19.3%	1.2%
Republicans	23.8%	45.0%	68.8%	19.0%	10.9%	29.9%	1.3%
Democrats	58.8%	30.3%	89.1%	6.6%	2.9%	9.5%	1.4%
Independents	38.0%	41.6%	79.6%	12.6%	7.3%	19.9%	0.5%

Here is an argument against the proposal:

Q4. If we are going to have officers risking their own lives and protecting us from our most dangerous criminals, they need to be able to act in ways they feel are necessary to protect themselves and others. Officers should not be punished for taking actions they believed were necessary and lifesaving at the time. Holding them criminally liable will entangle courts in endless second-guessing of police decisions made in split seconds under stress. The fear of getting charged will discourage officers from acting as needed to protect themselves or others, and from even becoming officers in the first place. We should do more to weed out bad actors, not further jeopardize the lives of all who wear the uniform.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
--	-----------------	---------------------	------------------	-----------------------	-------------------	--------------------	--------

PA-1 Overall	32.1%	36.5%	68.6%	19.6%	11.2%	30.8%	0.6%
PA-1 Republicans	53.1%	30.1%	83.2%	13.4%	3.5%	16.9%	0.0%
PA-1 Democrats	16.6%	38.5%	55.1%	24.8%	18.9%	43.7%	1.3%
U.S. National	29.3%	26.0%	55.3%	22.0%	22.0%	44.0%	0.7%
Republicans	51.5%	30.0%	81.5%	13.9%	4.1%	18.0%	0.6%
Democrats	9.6%	20.3%	29.9%	32.1%	37.1%	69.2%	0.9%
Independents	28.9%	30.9%	59.8%	15.9%	24.0%	39.9%	0.3%

[Final Recommendation]

Now that you have evaluated the arguments, here again is the proposal:

1. All officers would receive training in tactics and techniques that are alternative to the use of deadly force including:

- Creating physical distance between the officer and the suspect
- Putting something between themselves and the suspect to make physical assault less likely
- Requesting other resources, such as police officers or social workers who could help solve the problem

Officers would also have to be trained in what are called de-escalation techniques. The idea is to resolve the issue, restore order, get cooperation without having to resort to force. Some of these de-escalation techniques include:

- Talking with the suspect in a way that calms or defuses the situation
- Avoiding escalating the situation by threatening or provoking the suspect
- Waiting out the suspect

2. Officers would only be justified in using deadly force as a last resort, after reasonable alternatives have been exhausted, and when it would not create substantial risk of injury to a third person.

3. In criminal cases against an officer, the judge or jury would have to determine:

- whether the officer first used alternative tactics and/or de-escalation techniques in order to solve the problem before resorting to deadly force
- whether the officer acted with gross negligence in a way that contributed to the need for deadly force.

These would be taken into account in assessing whether the officer is guilty.

Q5. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you on the scale below. [Note: all 0-10 scale questions below will use this basic structure employing the following four-point scale]

	Median	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	6.8	15.2%	18.5%	66.3%	0.0%
PA-1 Republicans	5.9	20.7%	26.9%	52.4%	0.0%
PA-1 Democrats	7.7	8.5%	8.6%	82.9%	0.0%
U.S. National	6.6	20.7%	14.4%	64.6%	0.2%
Republicans	5.3	35.5%	18.3%	46.1%	0.1%
Democrats	7.9	5.8%	10.4%	83.5%	0.2%
Independents	6.2	24.3%	15.7%	59.4%	0.6%

Q6. So, in conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	78.0%	21.0%	1.0%
PA-1 Republicans	66.4%	32.2%	1.4%
PA-1 Democrats	88.4%	10.7%	1.0%
U.S. National	68.6%	30.8%	0.6%
Republicans	46.0%	52.9%	1.1%
Democrats	89.7%	10.1%	0.2%
Independents	66.6%	33.0%	0.3%

[Duty to Intervene]

Another important debate is whether, in the event that one officer is using excessive force, other officers should be expected to intervene to try to stop them. Many police departments already have such a requirement and provide training on when and how to intervene.

Here is a proposal currently being considered in Congress:

- Require police departments to adopt a policy that makes it a duty for officers to intervene when they perceive another officer is using excessive force
- Provide officers with training for when and how to intervene

Here is an argument in favor of the proposal:

Q7. When law enforcement officers use excessive force, in many cases there is another officer present. If we want to make sure that excessive force is not being used, one of the most effective things we can do is to make it a duty for officers to intervene. Officers should be expected to abide by the law just like everybody else, and their colleagues should have the responsibility to ensure that they do. If any officer violates the rules, this undermines all officers in the eyes of society. If the public sees officers holding each other accountable this will increase confidence in the integrity of all police officers. Police officers should be responsible for enforcing the law against everyone—including their own.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	53.3%	35.7%	89.0%	8.2%	2.5%	10.7%	0.3%
PA-1 Republicans	51.8%	35.7%	87.5%	9.6%	3.0%	12.6%	0.0%
PA-1 Democrats	60.1%	31.3%	91.4%	7.1%	0.7%	7.8%	0.8%
U.S. National	53.7%	31.6%	85.3%	8.7%	5.5%	14.2%	0.5%
Republicans	38.8%	40.8%	79.6%	13.6%	6.6%	20.2%	0.2%
Democrats	67.7%	22.7%	90.4%	4.1%	4.9%	9.0%	0.6%
Independents	51.5%	33.5%	85.0%	9.3%	4.8%	14.1%	0.9%

Here is an argument against the proposal:

Q8. When officers use force it is usually in dangerous and complex situations in which a suspect is violent or resists arrest. Another officer may come upon the scene where they don't know all the facts of the situation and cannot reliably determine whether the other officer is using appropriate force or not. It can make the situation more difficult and dangerous if they have to worry that another officer might suddenly intervene to stop them. Furthermore, officers frequently have to engage with bystanders or other suspects on the scene that may make it harder to determine whether another officer is using appropriate force. Officers should not be punished for failing to intervene when situations are so often murky.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
--	-----------------	---------------------	------------------	-----------------------	-------------------	--------------------	--------

PA-1 Overall	23.2%	34.4%	57.6%	30.1%	11.6%	41.7%	0.7%
PA-1 Republicans	35.2%	41.7%	76.9%	17.3%	4.8%	22.1%	1.1%
PA-1 Democrats	12.7%	27.1%	39.8%	41.0%	18.7%	59.7%	0.5%
U.S. National	14.9%	31.2%	46.1%	30.5%	23.2%	53.7%	0.2%
Republicans	25.6%	40.6%	66.2%	26.7%	7.1%	33.8%	0.1%
Democrats	5.5%	20.2%	25.7%	36.2%	38.0%	74.2%	0.1%
Independents	14.8%	37.3%	52.1%	25.3%	22.3%	47.6%	0.2%

[Final Recommendation]

So, again the proposal:

- Require police departments to adopt a policy that makes it a duty for officers to intervene when they perceive another officer is using excessive force
- Provide officers with training for when and how to intervene

Q9. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you on the scale below.

	Median	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	7.1	15.9%	10.1%	72.3%	1.8%
PA-1 Republicans	6.3	23.0%	14.9%	61.2%	0.9%
PA-1 Democrats	7.7	9.2%	7.0%	83.8%	0.0%
U.S. National	7.5	10.9%	10.4%	78.3%	0.4%
Republicans	6.6	18.3%	13.4%	68.0%	0.3%
Democrats	8.5	3.7%	6.0%	90.0%	0.3%
Independents	7.0	12.2%	14.6%	72.3%	0.9%

Q10. Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	83.4%	16.1%	0.4%
PA-1 Republicans	77.1%	22.4%	0.5%
PA-1 Democrats	89.4%	10.2%	0.5%
U.S. National	82.3%	16.6%	1.1%
Republicans	71.2%	26.9%	1.9%
Democrats	94.0%	5.7%	0.3%
Independents	78.1%	20.7%	1.2%

[Ban on Chokeholds and Neck Restraints]

In addition to changing the general policies on using force, there are several proposals for banning specific types of use of force.

As you may know there is much controversy about officers using chokeholds and other restraints that block the flow of blood or oxygen to the brain. These methods were the causes of the deaths of Eric Garner and George Floyd.

Here is a proposal currently being considered in Congress:

- Require states to prohibit the use of chokeholds and other restraints that prevent breathing or block the flow of blood or oxygen to the brain

Here is an argument in favor of prohibiting the use of chokeholds and similar restraints:

Q11. There are means to restrain a struggling suspect without using dangerous methods that unnecessarily put the suspect's life in danger. Chokeholds by police have led to needless deaths of too many civilians as well as caused brain

damage and strokes in others. Furthermore, when a suspect is being choked, they resist because they are trying to breathe, which is then used to justify using more force, including deadly force. Many police departments already prohibit chokeholds because they know it is wrong. They should be banned everywhere.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	58.9%	25.9%	84.8%	9.4%	5.2%	14.6%	0.7%
PA-1 Republicans	51.0%	30.5%	81.5%	11.8%	5.8%	17.6%	0.9%
PA-1 Democrats	68.9%	19.9%	88.8%	7.0%	3.4%	10.4%	0.8%
U.S. National	57.2%	24.4%	81.6%	10.0%	8.1%	18.1%	0.2%
Republicans	37.2%	35.8%	73.0%	15.6%	11.1%	26.7%	0.3%
Democrats	79.0%	12.5%	91.5%	3.5%	4.7%	8.2%	0.3%
Independents	50.0%	27.3%	77.3%	12.9%	9.8%	22.7%	0.0%

Here is an argument against:

Q12. Officers are often dealing with violent out of control people and they need all the tools available to them. If they cannot use chokeholds and similar restraints, they will have to use alternatives, like firearms, which are even more dangerous. Officers should not be denied these options as they may be needed in some circumstances. For example, when a violent individual physically attacks a police officer, the officer must do all they can to prevent that person from getting ahold of the officer's firearm, and a chokehold may be the only way of restraining the attacker.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	24.7%	32.3%	57.0%	24.4%	18.2%	42.6%	0.3%
PA-1 Republicans	46.4%	29.8%	76.2%	15.3%	8.5%	23.8%	0.0%
PA-1 Democrats	9.1%	32.5%	41.6%	31.5%	26.1%	57.6%	0.8%
U.S. National	18.4%	28.6%	47.0%	23.1%	29.6%	52.7%	0.3%
Republicans	30.5%	38.9%	69.4%	18.8%	11.7%	30.5%	0.1%
Democrats	6.2%	17.4%	23.6%	27.7%	48.2%	75.9%	0.5%
Independents	20.6%	32.4%	53.0%	21.7%	25.3%	47.0%	0.1%

[Final Recommendation]

Here again is the proposal:

- Require states to prohibit the use of chokeholds and other restraints that prevent breathing or block the flow of blood or oxygen to the brain.

Q13. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you on the scale below.

	Median	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	7.0	20.3%	10.9%	68.6%	0.2%
PA-1 Republicans	5.8	32.2%	13.3%	54.0%	0.5%
PA-1 Democrats	8.0	7.9%	8.2%	83.9%	0.0%
National	7.1	19.2%	11.7%	68.8%	0.3%
Republicans	5.7	31.3%	16.8%	51.7%	0.2%
Democrats	8.5	6.4%	6.1%	87.0%	0.5%
Independents	6.6	22.6%	13.9%	63.4%	0.1%

Q14. Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	74.7%	25.3%	0.0%
PA-1 Republicans	58.3%	41.7%	0.0%
PA-1 Democrats	87.9%	12.1%	0.0%
U.S. National	72.6%	26.5%	0.9%
Republicans	55.3%	43.5%	1.2%
Democrats	90.6%	8.9%	0.6%
Independents	68.4%	30.6%	1.0%

[Ban on No-Knock Warrants]

In addition to changing the general policies on using force, there are several proposals for banning specific types of use of force.

One method that has come under scrutiny is the use of no-knock warrants for drug cases. Another method that has come under scrutiny is the use of no-knock warrants for drug cases.

Warrants are provided by judges and allow the police to enter and search a home. “No-knock warrants” allow police to not knock on the door but to break into a suspect’s home. Such warrants allow the police not to announce that they are law enforcement officers before they enter, and not to wear uniforms or insignia that identify them.

A rationale for such no-knock warrants is that it allows officers to break into the home of someone suspected of dealing drugs. The idea is that the suspect will not have time to get guns that they can use against the officer or eliminate the evidence, for example, by flushing the drugs down a toilet.

Such no-knock warrants have become controversial because there have been a number of cases in which the police went to the wrong address and broke in. In the high-profile case of Breonna Taylor, she and her partner thought criminals were breaking-in, a violent exchange ensued, and Breonna Taylor was killed by an officer.

Here is a proposal currently being considered in Congress:

- Require local and state governments to ban the use of no-knock warrants for drug cases.

Here is an argument in favor:

Q15. No-knock warrants are highly dangerous. Too often they have resulted in innocent people being hurt or killed, and property destroyed. Officers have broken into the wrong house by accident. Innocents in the house, thinking there is a criminal breaking in, have used their 2nd amendment rights of self-defense. Officers have been killed. There are other means to appropriately investigate or apprehend suspects than breaking down their doors without warning.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	45.8%	31.2%	77.0%	14.3%	8.5%	22.8%	0.2%
PA-1 Republicans	37.9%	24.1%	62.0%	28.1%	9.9%	38.0%	0.0%
PA-1 Democrats	54.9%	33.5%	88.4%	4.8%	6.9%	11.7%	0.0%
U.S. National	47.1%	30.4%	77.5%	11.9%	10.0%	21.9%	0.6%
Republicans	32.7%	34.6%	67.3%	18.5%	13.6%	32.1%	0.6%
Democrats	60.1%	26.4%	86.5%	5.7%	7.0%	12.7%	0.8%
Independents	46.5%	31.2%	77.7%	12.6%	9.4%	22.0%	0.4%

Here is an argument against:

Q16. No-knock warrants can be used appropriately and effectively and should be allowed. Criminals can flush drugs and other evidence down a toilet or destroy computer evidence of a multi-million-dollar drug deal with a few quick keystrokes. If they know officers are at the door, it gives these dangerous criminals time to get guns to use or to set up triggered booby traps. We shouldn't hamstring officers' ability to protect themselves and/or to prevent destruction of essential evidence of a crime.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	26.7%	35.9%	62.6%	23.0%	14.1%	37.1%	0.3%
PA-1 Republicans	40.6%	31.4%	72.0%	13.4%	13.9%	27.3%	0.9%
PA-1 Democrats	14.7%	38.5%	53.2%	31.0%	15.8%	46.8%	0.0%
U.S. National	19.8%	31.2%	51.0%	23.9%	24.7%	48.6%	0.5%
Republicans	31.0%	37.5%	68.5%	20.1%	11.3%	31.4%	0.2%
Democrats	9.9%	26.2%	36.1%	27.0%	36.0%	63.0%	0.9%
Independents	19.7%	30.0%	49.7%	24.3%	25.8%	50.1%	0.2%

[Final Recommendation]

Here again is the proposal:

- Require local and state governments to ban the use of no-knock warrants for drug cases.

Q17. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you on the scale below.

	Median	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	5.9	31.7%	13.7%	53.8%	0.7%
PA-1 Republicans	4.9	49.5%	11.0%	38.9%	0.5%
PA-1 Democrats	7.0	14.4%	17.2%	67.3%	1.2%
U.S. National	6.3	25.8%	14.3%	59.3%	0.5%
Republicans	4.9	41.7%	15.7%	42.3%	0.3%
Democrats	7.6	11.1%	12.7%	75.5%	0.6%
Independents	6.1	27.1%	15.1%	56.9%	0.9%

Q18. Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	64.7%	34.5%	0.8%
PA-1 Republicans	46.8%	51.7%	1.5%
PA-1 Democrats	82.1%	17.4%	0.5%
U.S. National	64.8%	33.8%	1.4%
Republicans	45.3%	53.2%	1.6%
Democrats	81.8%	16.9%	1.4%
Independents	65.3%	33.6%	1.0%

[Increase Accountability]

[Amend Qualified Immunity]

So far, we have been talking mostly about cases when a law enforcement officer's use of force results in them being charged with a crime within the criminal justice system. We will now look at cases where an officer is charged in a civil case.

As you may know, civilians can sue law enforcement officers (as well as other government officials) if they violate their legal rights. An officer can violate a person's rights by using excessive force, such as hitting or shooting them when that was not necessary. Also, if an officer unnecessarily kills a civilian, their family can sue the officer.

If that person wins the civil court case, then they will receive money as compensation.

However, in fact, it is very rare that an officer is held liable. This is because there are laws and court rulings that provide officers what is called "qualified immunity."

This immunity is very controversial because there have been some cases in which an officer wounded or killed an unarmed civilian in a way that was widely perceived as unlawful, unjust, or unnecessary, but was not held liable as a result of this immunity.

We are now going to ask you to evaluate a proposal to make it more possible that officers would be held liable for using excessive force by modifying the rules for qualified immunity.

Currently, when an officer is sued for excessive use of force, they can be granted immunity if they say they were acting in **good faith**--not out of anger or racial hostility--and **believed** their actions were lawful, irrespective of how most others may view it. In many cases, a judge or jury has accepted this as a basis for dismissing the case.

The first part of a proposal currently being considered in Congress would no longer allow officers to be granted immunity solely on the basis that the officer says they were acting in good faith and believed their actions were lawful.

This would mean that the judge or jury must determine whether the officer's conduct was **in fact** lawful, irrespective of what the officer believed.

In addition, when an officer is sued for excessive use of force, they can be granted immunity if there have not been **previous cases** in which officers were held liable for the same conduct in **very similar circumstances**. In many cases a judge or jury has accepted this as a basis for dismissing the case.

The second part of a proposal would no longer allow officers to be granted immunity solely on the basis that there have not been previous cases in which other officers were held liable for the same conduct in very similar circumstances. This would make it more likely that the case will move forward, and that a judge or jury assesses whether the officer's use of force was unlawful -- whether or not there has been a similar case with similar circumstances.

Here is an argument in favor of these changes to the rules for giving officers qualified immunity.

Q19. There have been an extraordinary number of cases in which officers have not been held accountable after using excessive violence against civilians, simply because the officer could say they didn't think they were violating the law or because there wasn't a previous case holding an officer liable under virtually the same circumstances. Not understanding the law should not be an excuse for violating it -- especially for a police officer. No other person would ever be able to use that defense in court. Without any consequences, officers will continue to commit heinous acts against citizens. This is wrong and its causing people to lose faith in our system of justice.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	45.4%	37.7%	83.1%	11.8%	2.9%	14.7%	2.2%
PA-1 Republicans	35.6%	37.5%	73.1%	18.4%	5.2%	23.6%	3.3%
PA-1 Democrats	56.5%	35.0%	91.5%	6.3%	1.8%	8.1%	0.4%
U.S. National	42.3%	30.2%	72.5%	15.0%	12.1%	27.1%	0.4%
Republicans	20.0%	37.0%	57.0%	24.0%	18.6%	42.6%	0.5%
Democrats	62.3%	24.2%	86.5%	7.4%	5.9%	13.3%	0.3%
Independents	42.6%	30.4%	73.0%	14.0%	12.8%	26.8%	0.2%
Somewhat blue	45.5%	30.1%	75.6%	13.3%	10.9%	24.2%	0.2%

Here is an argument against:

Q20. Police officers often have to make split-second decisions in dangerous situations. Qualified immunity is necessary to give officers the ability to make reasonable, even if mistaken decisions without constantly worrying about getting sued. Without qualified immunity, police officers will become too timid and fail to take the appropriate action. They may use too much caution, and let a criminal get away, or worse, they may fail to use necessary force against a violent person that poses a risk to the officer or a bystander. When on the job, police officers should only have to consider how best to stop criminals and make their community safer, and not whether their actions will result in a long trial and bad publicity. Changing these laws will make our communities less safe and make it harder to recruit and retain good officers.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	23.3%	34.3%	57.6%	26.7%	14.1%	40.8%	1.5%
PA-1 Republicans	38.5%	37.4%	75.9%	19.0%	3.5%	22.5%	1.5%
PA-1 Democrats	13.6%	28.9%	42.5%	33.8%	23.3%	57.1%	0.4%
U.S. National	22.7%	26.9%	49.6%	25.2%	24.8%	50.0%	0.5%
Republicans	38.8%	35.1%	73.9%	18.4%	7.5%	25.9%	0.2%
Democrats	8.0%	20.2%	28.2%	31.7%	39.3%	71.0%	0.8%
Independents	23.2%	25.3%	48.5%	24.2%	27.1%	51.3%	0.2%

[Final Recommendation]

Now that you have evaluated the arguments, here again is the proposal:

- In cases where an officer is sued by a civilian for violating their rights by using excessive force, qualified immunity for officers would no longer be granted solely on the basis that:
 - the officer says they were acting in good faith and believed their actions were lawful;
 - there have not been previous cases in which other officers were held liable for the same conduct in very similar circumstances

Q21. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you on the scale below.

	Median	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	6.1	26.4%	17.4%	52.0%	4.2%
PA-1 Republicans	5.1	35.8%	23.5%	36.1%	4.6%
PA-1 Democrats	7.1	15.3%	13.6%	68.1%	3.0%
U.S. National	6.2	26.5%	15.2%	57.8%	0.6%
Republicans	4.6	43.0%	18.3%	38.0%	0.7%
Democrats	7.6	11.5%	12.0%	76.4%	0.2%
Independents	6.1	26.9%	16.0%	56.0%	1.1%

Q22. Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	62.9%	35.7%	1.4%
PA-1 Republicans	49.6%	49.2%	1.2%
PA-1 Democrats	74.8%	24.8%	0.4%
U.S. National	63.3%	35.4%	1.3%
Republicans	40.5%	57.9%	1.6%
Democrats	83.5%	15.1%	1.3%
Independents	63.6%	35.6%	0.8%

[National Registry of Police Misconduct]

Here is another proposal that seeks to increase accountability of law enforcement officers.

Currently, when a law enforcement officer has gotten multiple complaints for unlawful and/or abusive behavior or has been fired from a department for such behavior, they may go to another city or state and apply for a new position. The new city or state may not have access to information about this past behavior and their previous department is not required to and is often prevented from revealing such information to a new potential employer.

Here is a proposal currently being considered in Congress:

- Create a national database of police misconduct and require all law enforcement agencies to submit information about officer misconduct. This information would include:
 - complaints filed by civilians against a law enforcement officer
 - disciplinary action taken against an officer such as a suspension, and the reason for it
 - firing of an officer and the reason for it
 - lawsuits against an officer, and their outcome

This database would be available to all law enforcement agencies as well as other government agencies and the public.

Here is an argument in favor:

Q23. Any effort to increase transparency and accountability starts with knowing who the bad cops are. Police departments have a right to know the history of the people they hire and empower with deadly force. Without some way of ensuring that police departments can know the history of the officers they hire, bad cops can just go from city to city, acting abusively without consequence. Finally, this information is very useful in court cases when a judge or jury is trying to decide if an officer's misconduct was a one-time event, or if they have a history of unlawful behavior.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	63.8%	24.5%	88.3%	7.6%	2.4%	10.0%	1.6%
PA-1 Republicans	58.2%	24.1%	82.3%	12.9%	3.2%	16.1%	1.7%

PA-1 Democrats	72.3%	20.9%	93.2%	4.2%	2.1%	6.3%	0.4%
U.S. National	63.0%	23.8%	86.8%	6.4%	6.3%	12.7%	0.5%
Republicans	49.4%	33.4%	82.8%	8.7%	8.2%	16.9%	0.3%
Democrats	76.2%	15.0%	91.2%	3.1%	4.8%	7.9%	0.8%
Independents	60.6%	24.5%	85.1%	8.7%	5.8%	14.5%	0.3%

Here is an argument against:

Q24. Officers get unjustified complaints filed against them all the time. Officers get negative reports from people who are trying to come up with an excuse for the behavior that prompted their arrest by the officer, or they may have a personal grudge against the officer. A small mistake or wrongfully filed complaints, can result in getting blacklisted and difficulty in getting another job in law enforcement or elsewhere, which is unfair. This proposal singles out the police: no other government employee or official has a database of complaints or mistakes. It is also a violation of their privacy as this will be a public database. Officers just trying to protect our communities already have a lot of pressures on them and this will only add more.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	18.5%	30.1%	48.6%	30.6%	18.9%	49.5%	2.1%
PA-1 Republicans	27.7%	34.5%	62.2%	28.3%	7.3%	35.6%	2.2%
PA-1 Democrats	10.8%	25.4%	36.2%	33.8%	29.0%	62.8%	1.0%
U.S. National	15.3%	27.2%	42.5%	28.4%	28.3%	56.7%	0.7%
Republicans	25.1%	36.0%	61.1%	26.4%	12.0%	38.4%	0.6%
Democrats	6.3%	18.9%	25.2%	31.2%	42.9%	74.1%	0.6%
Independents	16.2%	28.5%	44.7%	26.2%	27.8%	54.0%	1.3%

[Final Recommendation]

Now that you have evaluated the arguments, here again is the proposal:

- Create a national database of police misconduct and require all law enforcement agencies to submit information about officer misconduct. This information would include:
 - complaints filed by civilians against a law enforcement officer
 - disciplinary action taken against an officer, such as a suspension, and the reason for it
 - firing of an officer and the reason for it
 - lawsuits against an officer, and their outcome

This database would be available to all law enforcement agencies as well as other government agencies and the public.

Q25. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you on the scale below.

	Median	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	7.2	14.2%	10.6%	68.7%	6.5%
PA-1 Republicans	6.5	17.9%	12.8%	61.1%	8.2%
PA-1 Democrats	8.0	6.9%	6.8%	81.1%	5.2%
U.S. National	7.5	12.2%	11.2%	76.2%	0.4%
Republicans	6.4	19.4%	14.6%	65.4%	0.5%
Democrats	8.5	4.3%	7.3%	88.1%	0.3%
Independents	7.3	15.5%	13.1%	70.9%	0.6%

Q26. Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	78.9%	19.8%	1.3%
PA-1 Republicans	72.5%	26.8%	0.7%
PA-1 Democrats	86.5%	12.8%	0.7%
U.S. National	80.5%	17.8%	1.7%
Republicans	69.9%	28.1%	2.0%
Democrats	91.5%	7.4%	1.1%
Independents	76.9%	20.5%	2.7%

[Independent Prosecution]

Here is another issue related to accountability.

When there is a criminal case against a law enforcement officer for using deadly force, in most cases the prosecutor is someone, who regularly works closely with the officer's department. Some people have a concern that these prosecutors have a conflict of interest. Such prosecutors rely on the cooperation and testimony of law enforcement officers of the agency when working to convict criminals.

To overcome a potential conflict of interest, a state can hire an independent prosecutor. An independent prosecutor is a person who does not regularly work with the law enforcement agency that employs the officer being investigated or charged. Here is a proposal currently being considered in Congress:

- Offer states federal funding to hire an independent prosecutor when investigating or charging a law enforcement officer for using deadly force.
- To receive this funding, the state must first put in place a policy **requiring** the use of an independent prosecutor in all such cases.

Here is an argument in favor of the proposal:

Q27. Because regular prosecutors often need to keep up a good relationship with the police departments they work with to prosecute ordinary cases, they often do not pursue charges against officers as aggressively as they do against other people. Many county prosecutors or District Attorneys are elected officials, who may choose to avoid prosecuting a police officer due to relationships or for political reasons. As a result, many officers who have allegedly unjustly injured or killed a person do not get charged with a crime. It is only fair that these cases be conducted by independent prosecutors, so there is no conflict of interest. This will result in more justice, and more confidence in the justice system.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	45.7%	36.9%	82.6%	8.9%	6.2%	15.1%	2.2%
PA-1 Republicans	42.1%	33.9%	76.0%	11.7%	8.9%	20.6%	3.3%
PA-1 Democrats	49.9%	36.6%	86.5%	7.2%	5.8%	13.0%	0.4%
U.S. National	46.1%	31.3%	77.4%	13.2%	8.6%	21.8%	0.7%
Republicans	26.5%	39.8%	66.3%	19.5%	13.4%	32.9%	0.8%
Democrats	64.6%	23.9%	88.5%	6.6%	4.4%	11.0%	0.4%
Independents	43.4%	31.2%	74.6%	15.7%	8.6%	24.3%	1.1%

Here is an argument against:

Q28. When bringing in an outside prosecutor, there is a risk that whoever chooses the prosecutor might have a political agenda to look tough or to punish officers unfairly. Also, they may not be part of that community, and thus would not be familiar with the police officers and the situation of the community they serve and protect. We should not assume that local prosecutors are biased in favor of police just because some people do not like the outcomes of the case.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	18.9%	33.6%	52.5%	32.2%	14.2%	46.4%	1.2%
PA-1 Republicans	28.6%	33.6%	62.2%	33.4%	3.7%	37.1%	0.7%
PA-1 Democrats	10.8%	29.7%	40.5%	34.6%	24.4%	59.0%	0.4%
U.S. National	15.4%	28.9%	44.3%	27.2%	27.4%	54.6%	1.2%
Republicans	25.6%	40.0%	65.6%	23.5%	9.8%	33.3%	1.0%
Democrats	5.9%	19.0%	24.9%	31.3%	42.6%	73.9%	1.2%
Independents	16.5%	28.7%	45.2%	25.0%	28.3%	53.3%	1.5%

[Final Recommendation]

Now that you have evaluated the arguments, here again is the proposal:

- Offer states federal funding to hire an independent prosecutor when investigating or charging a law enforcement officer for using deadly force.
- To receive this funding, the state must first put in place a policy **requiring** the use of an independent prosecutor in all such cases.

Q29. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you on the scale below.

	Median	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	6.6	18.1%	15.6%	61.3%	4.9%
PA-1 Republicans	5.9	26.1%	16.1%	53.4%	4.5%
PA-1 Democrats	7.3	11.5%	12.4%	72.3%	3.7%
U.S. National	6.7	19.2%	15.6%	63.7%	1.5%
Republicans	5.3	31.8%	19.0%	47.2%	2.0%
Democrats	8.0	7.1%	10.8%	81.1%	1.0%
Independents	6.3	21.4%	19.6%	57.3%	1.7%

Q30. Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	69.0%	28.5%	2.5%
PA-1 Republicans	60.9%	37.6%	1.5%
PA-1 Democrats	75.4%	21.9%	2.8%
U.S. National	69.6%	28.6%	1.8%
Republicans	51.8%	45.8%	2.4%
Democrats	86.3%	12.6%	1.1%
Independents	67.5%	30.5%	2.0%

[Body Cameras]

A key idea for making law enforcement officers more accountable for their actions is to increase the use of body cameras. It also helps with training, supervision, and documentation.

Currently, about half of all police departments do not have body cameras, and among those that do, not all of them require that they always be used.

Here is a proposal currently being considered in Congress:

- Require all police departments to have body cameras, to have their law enforcement officers wear them, and turn them on whenever they are responding to a police call or interacting with a suspect. Failure to do so would result in disciplinary action.

Here is an argument in favor of the proposal:

Q31. Requiring officers to use body cameras will make the process of law enforcement more transparent and will help hold police accountable. There is evidence this will result in a reduction in violence: research shows use of body cameras have reduced both police and civilian violence by substantial amounts. People's memory is often influenced by the heat of the moment and cameras provide a neutral view of events as they happened. Body cameras have also provided police with visual evidence of crimes being committed in real time.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	69.6%	23.8%	93.4%	3.5%	1.6%	5.1%	1.5%
PA-1 Republicans	63.0%	29.3%	92.3%	5.2%	1.8%	7.0%	0.7%
PA-1 Democrats	75.5%	18.8%	94.3%	3.1%	1.8%	4.9%	0.8%
U.S. National	69.2%	23.3%	92.5%	3.9%	3.1%	7.0%	0.5%
Republicans	62.8%	30.4%	93.2%	3.6%	2.6%	6.2%	0.5%
Democrats	77.5%	15.6%	93.1%	3.1%	2.9%	6.0%	0.8%
Independents	64.0%	25.4%	89.4%	6.3%	4.4%	10.7%	0.0%

Here is an argument against the proposal:

Q32. Body cameras cost a lot of money and studies show that they are not very effective. They create a false impression of objectivity: juries have interpreted them differently, based on how they were used by prosecutors and defense attorneys. In some cases, the body cameras haven't done well in capturing what actually happened, either because the footage was grainy, shaky, or only showed a limited view of the situation. Having this footage around creates a pressure to release it publicly: it could be used to humiliate citizens who have been caught in a stressful situation and might have acted in an embarrassing manner.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
--	-----------------	---------------------	------------------	-----------------------	-------------------	--------------------	--------

PA-1 Overall	12.5%	22.2%	34.7%	30.9%	33.0%	63.9%	1.4%
PA-1 Republicans	17.8%	26.0%	43.8%	33.6%	22.0%	55.6%	0.7%
PA-1 Democrats	6.7%	16.4%	23.1%	31.8%	44.3%	76.1%	0.8%
U.S. National	6.1%	20.9%	27.0%	31.7%	40.8%	72.5%	0.5%
Republicans	7.6%	28.2%	35.8%	36.5%	27.4%	63.9%	0.3%
Democrats	3.9%	14.1%	18.0%	28.5%	52.8%	81.3%	0.8%
Independents	8.1%	20.6%	28.7%	28.8%	42.1%	70.9%	0.5%

[Final Recommendation]

Now that you have evaluated the arguments, here again is the proposal:

- Require all police departments to have body cameras, to have their law enforcement officers wear them, and turn them on whenever they are responding to a police call or interacting with a suspect. Failure to do so would result in disciplinary action.

Q33. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you on the scale below.

	Median	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	7.9	9.8%	9.0%	78.1%	3.0%
PA-1 Republicans	7.1	14.9%	14.3%	68.2%	2.7%
PA-1 Democrats	8.6	5.5%	4.8%	87.5%	2.2%
U.S. National	8.1	6.4%	9.1%	83.7%	0.8%
Republicans	7.6	8.4%	10.8%	79.7%	1.1%
Democrats	8.7	3.9%	6.6%	89.0%	0.5%
Independents	7.9	7.7%	11.1%	80.3%	0.9%

Q34. Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	85.3%	12.4%	2.4%
PA-1 Republicans	78.4%	20.1%	1.5%
PA-1 Democrats	91.4%	6.3%	2.3%
U.S. National	89.3%	9.3%	1.4%
Republicans	85.4%	12.8%	1.9%
Democrats	94.4%	4.9%	0.7%
Independents	85.9%	12.0%	2.1%

[Address Implicit Bias]

As you may know, studies have found that, even in similar situations, officers use excessive force against minorities more than they do against white civilians. Black people are more than two times as likely to be shot and killed by officers than white people and are more likely to be unarmed when it happens.

Based on numerous studies, there is evidence that the problem here is not primarily that most officers have conscious negative attitudes toward minorities. Rather there is evidence that many officers -- like most people -- have what is called an "implicit bias." This is an unconscious negative attitude toward certain types of people that leads one to interpret their behavior in a more threatening way. This could, for example, lead an officer to be more likely to assume that someone from a particular race poses a danger and is getting ready to act violently against the officer, leading the officer to use deadly force preemptively.

Because the criminal justice system is supposed to treat every person equally, there is concern that implicit bias is resulting in minorities, especially Black Americans, being treated unfairly. Training methods have been developed to help people understand better how implicit bias may be affecting them and to consciously work to counter its effects.

Various law enforcement agencies have used these training methods with their officers. While some studies have found the training to be effective in reducing implicit bias, others have found it to be ineffective.

Here is a current proposal being considered in Congress:

- Require police departments to provide their officers training on implicit bias.

Here is an argument in favor of the proposal:

Q35. Studies show that nearly everybody has some implicit bias, whether they are white, black, men, women, liberal or conservative. In the justice system, everybody is supposed to get equal treatment. But evidence shows that police officers are more likely to use excessive force against people of color with potentially deadly consequences. Implicit bias training has been shown to be effective in a significant number of cases and with more experience it can become even more effective. Reducing bias in law enforcement is the right thing to do and will help renew confidence in the legal system.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	43.3%	35.1%	78.4%	12.4%	8.0%	20.4%	1.2%
PA-1 Republicans	34.8%	30.4%	65.2%	21.7%	12.5%	34.2%	0.7%
PA-1 Democrats	52.7%	34.3%	87.0%	7.8%	4.7%	12.5%	0.4%
U.S. National	39.2%	34.6%	73.8%	12.9%	12.4%	25.3%	0.9%
Republicans	18.7%	39.2%	57.9%	20.4%	20.6%	41.0%	1.1%
Democrats	59.6%	29.3%	88.9%	6.2%	4.4%	10.6%	0.4%
Independents	34.7%	37.2%	71.9%	12.7%	14.0%	26.7%	1.4%

Here is an argument against the proposal:

Q36. This implicit bias training costs public money and has not been proven to be consistently effective. We should not be taking time away from officers' real work of keeping communities safe. It is unfair to implicitly suggest that they are racists and cannot be trusted. Furthermore, if cops become uncertain about whether they should trust their own judgment, it may make them hesitate to take decisive action in the midst of a crisis situation, putting them and others present at greater risk.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	21.1%	27.3%	48.4%	25.4%	25.0%	50.4%	1.2%
PA-1 Republicans	33.9%	29.2%	63.1%	25.3%	10.9%	36.2%	0.7%
PA-1 Democrats	10.3%	25.0%	35.3%	25.3%	39.0%	64.3%	0.4%
U.S. National	13.8%	24.9%	38.7%	26.0%	34.2%	60.2%	1.1%
Republicans	23.7%	35.0%	58.7%	25.7%	14.4%	40.1%	1.1%
Democrats	4.0%	15.0%	19.0%	27.2%	52.5%	79.7%	1.2%
Independents	15.9%	26.5%	42.4%	23.9%	32.7%	56.6%	1.1%

[Final Recommendation]

Here again is the proposal:

- Require police departments to provide their officers training on implicit bias.

Q37. Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you on the scale below.

	Median	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	6.8	20.5%	12.7%	64.5%	2.3%
PA-1 Republicans	5.8	30.9%	15.6%	52.3%	1.2%
PA-1 Democrats	7.5	11.6%	10.3%	76.5%	1.6%
U.S. National	6.9	18.7%	14.6%	65.8%	0.9%
Republicans	5.4	31.8%	20.4%	47.1%	0.6%
Democrats	8.4	5.1%	8.8%	85.1%	0.9%
Independents	6.4	22.5%	16.0%	60.2%	1.3%

Q38. Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
PA-1 Overall	73.6%	23.6%	2.8%
PA-1 Republicans	63.9%	34.1%	2.0%
PA-1 Democrats	81.4%	15.7%	2.9%
U.S. National	71.5%	26.3%	2.2%
Republicans	53.4%	43.9%	2.7%
Democrats	89.3%	9.2%	1.5%
Independents	68.1%	29.1%	2.8%

###