**To:** Interested Parties
**From:** Global Strategy Group
**Date:** October 2026
**Re:** POLL RESULTS: Voters in key states want strong methane rules for oil and gas producers

A recent poll of likely 2026 voters in five key states (CA, CO, NM, PA and TX), conducted by Global Strategy Group on behalf of the Environmental Defense Fund, finds broad, bipartisan support for strong rules to curb methane emissions from upstream oil and gas producers. Voters see clear benefits for health, future generations, reducing waste, and holding oil and gas companies accountable. As a result, they would reward candidates who support these protections on the ballot.

## Key Findings

**Voters across these five states overwhelmingly support stricter standards for upstream methane emissions.** Across all five states, 72% are in favor of strong rules to reduce methane emissions from the oil and gas industry, with support above 70% in each state.

***Do you support or oppose your state adopting strong rules to reduce methane emissions from the oil and gas industry, including requiring regular inspections of low-producing oil and gas wells?***

| | Overall | CA | CO | NM | PA | TX |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Support** | 72% | 71% | 72% | 71% | 73% | 74% |
| **Oppose** | 27% | 28% | 27% | 28% | 25% | 25% |

**Support crosses geographic, demographic and party lines.** Majorities from every major demographic group are in favor of stronger methane protections, including nearly all Democrats (90% support), as well as most Independent (70%) and Republican (54%) voters. In addition, these rules are extremely popular among voters of color – especially Black voters (82% support) – and white college-educated voters.

***Do you support or oppose your state adopting strong rules to reduce methane emissions from the oil and gas industry, including requiring regular inspections of low-producing oil and gas wells?***

| | Support | Oppose | NET |
|---|---|---|---|
| Dem | 90 | 9 | +81 |
| Ind | 70 | 28 | +42 |
| Rep | 54 | 45 | +9 |
| White College | 74 | 24 | +50 |
| White Non-College | 69 | 30 | +39 |
| Black | 82 | 18 | +64 |
| Hispanic | 73 | 26 | +47 |

**Voters overwhelmingly believe that stronger rules will have wide-reaching benefits.** They expect these rules to have the biggest positive impact on reducing waste (+59), oil and gas accountability (+48), health (+53), and future generations (+45), in addition to smaller gains for the economy (+8) and long-term costs (+6).

***Impact of [STATE] Adopting Strong Rules To Reduce Methane Emissions***

| | Positive | Negative | NET |
|---|---|---|---|
| Reducing waste from the oil and gas industry | 69% | 10% | +59 |
| Accountability for oil and gas companies | 65% | 17% | +48 |
| The health of families like yours | 64% | 11% | +53 |
| Future generations of your family | 62% | 17% | +45 |
| (STATE)'s economy | 44% | 36% | +8 |
| The cost of energy in the long term | 43% | 37% | +6 |
| The economic competitiveness of oil and gas producers | 39% | 35% | +4 |

**Strong methane rules are a significant political winner – especially with center-right voters – giving policymakers cover to pursue ambitious standards.** Across these five states, Democrats currently lead the generic ballot by 9 points (50% to 41%). However, when we refocus the ballot around these methane rules by pitting a Democrat who supports strong methane rules versus a Republican who opposes them, that lead increases to 19 points (55% to 36%) – a net gain of 10 points for a supportive Democrat. The gains are actually largest with self-identified Republican voters.

**If the election for Congress were today, for which candidate would you vote?**

| | Overall | Dem | Ind | Rep | CA | CO | NM | PA | TX |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A Democrat who supports strong rules…** | 55% | 96% | 52% | 11% | 57% | 56% | 55% | 55% | 50% |
| **A Republican who opposes strong rules…** | 36% | 2% | 27% | 84% | 32% | 34% | 35% | 37% | 42% |
| **Net "Infused" Ballot** | **+19** | **+94** | **+25** | **-73** | **+25** | **+22** | **+20** | **+18** | **+8** |
| **Net Generic Ballot** | **+9** | **+94** | **+16** | **-92** | **+20** | **+12** | **+11** | **+8** | **-2** |
| **Lift** | **+10** | **0** | **+9** | **+19** | **+5** | **+10** | **+9** | **+10** | **+10** |

**Support extends to specific policies and ambitious standards – even when we acknowledge the possibility of slightly higher costs.** We tested six different specific proposals, including two variations of two of the proposals (see table below). All enjoyed over 60% support with most earning over 70% support. A requirement that oil and gas companies reduce methane emissions from oil and gas wells by 2035 receives the same high support whether it requires a reduction to "near zero" or a 75% reduction (73% and 72%, respectively).

| | Total Support | Total Oppose |
|---|---|---|
| Require oil and gas operators to use commercially-available technologies to measure methane emission levels at a random sample of their well sites. | 81% | 18% |
| Require oil and gas companies to reduce methane emissions from oil and gas wells to near zero by 2035. | 73% | 25% |
| Require oil and gas companies to reduce methane emissions from oil and gas wells by 75% by 2035. | 72% | 26% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Require oil and gas companies that fail to reduce methane emissions from oil and gas wells to near zero to pay a fee, with the proceeds used to offset energy costs for low-income households and upgrade equipment that cuts pollution. | 72% | 26% |
| Require power companies to purchase natural gas from companies that have reduced methane emissions from oil and gas wells to near-zero, as long as the price is about the same as other sources of natural gas. | 73% | 25% |
| Require power companies to purchase natural gas from companies that have reduced methane emissions from oil and gas wells to near-zero, even if that means a slight increase in the cost of natural gas. | 63% | 35% |

**A debate on low-producing wells shores up support for stronger methane rules.** After hearing a balanced debate on low-producing wells, voters say that they are more likely to support strong rules by a 51% to 26% margin (+25). *Full text of arguments in appendix.*

**Support for methane rules is extremely stable, even in the face of pointed arguments against these proposals.** After a balanced debate, overall support declines very modestly (from 72% to 70%), while strong support increases modestly (from 36% to 39%).

**ABOUT THIS POLL**

*Global Strategy Group conducted a multi-channel survey of 3,000 likely 2026 voters (n=600 per state) in California, Colorado, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, and Texas between September 14-24, 2026. Of the 3,000 interviews, 700 were conducted by telephone, 650 via text invitation to online survey, and 1,650 via web-based panel. The survey has a margin of error of +/- 1.8% for the total sample and +/- 4.0% for each of the statewide samples. Care has been taken to ensure the geographic, political, and demographic divisions of the likely electorate are properly represented.*

## APPENDIX

### Full Text of Methane Rules Debate Arguments

*Supporters of these policies say… Methane pollution is eighty times more potent than carbon pollution and toxic pollution released alongside methane increases the risk of cancer and worsens heart disease and asthma attacks, especially in children and the elderly. What's more, methane is the primary ingredient of natural gas. Methane leaks cause billions of dollars' worth of natural gas to be wasted every year. At a time when families already feel squeezed by high energy prices, this waste makes no sense. There are proven, cost-effective solutions to drastically reduce this waste and pollution. Other states have already adopted strong protections to cut pollution which have increased production and created jobs without increasing costs for consumers.*

*Opponents of these policies say… Stricter regulations of methane emissions will hurt [STATE]'s economy, raise energy prices, and cost jobs. Requiring oil and gas operators to virtually eliminate methane emissions at oil and gas wells would set an unrealistic and enormously expensive standard that would reduce domestic energy production, cause smaller operators to close, eliminate tens of thousands of jobs, and cause energy prices to skyrocket for families and businesses. That would mean higher prices on groceries, gas, and electricity at a time when Americans are already struggling with the cost of living.*

**Full Text of Low-Producing Wells Arguments**

*(Some/Others) say rules to limit methane pollution should include regular inspections at low-producing wells because those wells are responsible for about 60% of all methane pollution, despite only accounting for 5% of the nation's oil and gas production. And about 80% of these wells are owned by larger companies that can afford to do regular inspections.*

*(Some/Others) say the rules to limit methane emissions should NOT apply to low-producing oil and gas wells because these new burdensome regulations will force mom-and-pop producers in your state to cut jobs and raise energy prices for consumers, harming local businesses and working families.*