

CBRT Pepperdine Initiative Test 8

M4 Strategies

PROJ-12-07-951

Sample: 2115 Likely General Election California Voters

Versions: 1976 English | 139 Spanish

Mode: Online

Fielding Dates: 10/21/2012 – 10/28/2012

TOPLINE FINAL

Swing determined by Q16 for those who vote “A few more Republicans than Democrats”,
“Equally both parties”, or “A few more Democrats than Republicans”

Note – Percentages may not sum exactly to 100% due to rounding

Margin of error = +/- 3.0%

Data weighted by party, gender, age, ethnicity, geography, and education

We are conducting a public opinion poll about California public issues and would like to ask you some questions. This survey will take about 15 minutes to complete. You cannot stop the survey and restart later, so be sure you have enough time before starting.

Each time you are asked, answer all of the questions as best as you can, using the information you have at the time. There is no right or wrong answer.

To get started, click the CONTINUE button.

[SECTION: FIRST QUESTIONS]

1. First, are you over the age of 18 and registered to vote in the state of California?

Yes	100.0%
No	[TERMINATE]

2. Are you or anyone living in your household employed in the field of market research, as a member of the news media, or by a political party, political campaign, or a candidate running for or elected to public office?

Yes	[TERMINATE]
No	100.0%

3. A lot of times people are busy and do not vote. This November, there will be a general election for President, U.S. Senate, and other offices and issues. How likely are you to vote in that election? Will you definitely vote, probably vote, are the chances 50-50, will you probably not vote, or will you definitely not vote?

Definitely vote/already voted	90.0%
Probably vote	6.2%
50-50	3.8%
Probably not vote	[TERMINATE]
Definitely not vote	[TERMINATE]

[SECTION: STATE PERSPECTIVES PAGE]

4. Generally speaking, would you say California is on the right track, or is it off on the wrong track?

Right track	34.5%
Wrong track	65.5%

5. Right now, do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of President Barack Obama?

Very favorable	27.4%
Somewhat favorable	31.3%
Favorable	58.6%
Unfavorable	39.4%
Somewhat unfavorable	10.8%
Very unfavorable	28.6%
Don't have an opinion	2.0%

6. Right now, do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of Governor Jerry Brown?

Very favorable	10.1%
Somewhat favorable	34.0%
Favorable	44.1%
Unfavorable	46.9%
Somewhat unfavorable	23.4%
Very unfavorable	23.5%
Don't have an opinion	9.0%

7. Right now, do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of the California State Legislature?

Very favorable	2.9%
Somewhat favorable	17.8%
Favorable	20.7%
Unfavorable	68.3%
Somewhat unfavorable	34.9%
Very unfavorable	33.5%
Don't have an opinion	11.0%

8. If the election were tomorrow, for whom would you vote for U.S. President?

Barack Obama (D)	55.9%
Mitt Romney (R)	33.0%
Someone else	4.3%
Unsure	6.8%

9. If the election were tomorrow, for whom would you vote for U.S. Senate?

Dianne Feinstein (D)	51.3%
Elizabeth Emken (R)	31.7%
Unsure	17.0%

[SECTION: BALLOT INITIATIVE INSTRUCTIONS PAGE]

This November, voters will be asked to consider 11 ballot initiatives, Propositions 30 through 40. Below is the official ballot label for each initiative, as prepared by the Attorney General of the State of California. You may scroll up and down the page and read all of the ballot labels before you vote.

Before each election, California voters are also mailed an official state VOTER GUIDE that contains more information about the propositions, including a QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE for all 11 propositions, an official TITLE AND SUMMARY prepared by the Attorney General, and ANALYSIS of the proposal's impact prepared by the state LEGISLATIVE ANALYST, and ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST prepared by each campaign.

BEFORE VOTING, YOU CAN ACCESS THESE RESOURCES BY CLICKING THE LABELS ON THE LEFT SIDE OF YOUR SCREEN. You may spend as much or as little time reviewing the resources as you like before voting.

<p>30 - TEMPORARY TAXES TO FUND EDUCATION. GUARANTEED LOCAL PUBLIC SAFETY FUNDING. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.</p> <p>Increases taxes on earnings over \$250,000 for seven years and sales taxes by 1/4 cent for four years, to fund schools. Guarantees public safety realignment funding. Fiscal Impact: Increased state tax revenues through 2018-19, averaging about \$6 billion annually over the next few years. Revenues available for funding state budget. In 2012-13, planned spending reductions, primarily to education programs, would not occur.</p>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>49.2%</td> <td>No</td> <td>42.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>26.3%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>29.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>10.0%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>4.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>13.0%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>8.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>7.8%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	49.2%	No	42.9%	Strongly Yes	26.3%	Strongly No	29.4%	Somewhat Yes	10.0%	Somewhat No	4.7%	Leaning Yes	13.0%	Leaning No	8.8%		Unsure	7.8%	
Yes	49.2%	No	42.9%																		
Strongly Yes	26.3%	Strongly No	29.4%																		
Somewhat Yes	10.0%	Somewhat No	4.7%																		
Leaning Yes	13.0%	Leaning No	8.8%																		
	Unsure	7.8%																			
<p>31 - STATE BUDGET. STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE.</p> <p>Establishes two-year state budget. Sets rules for offsetting new expenditures, and Governor budget cuts in fiscal emergencies. Local governments can alter application of laws governing state-funded programs. Fiscal Impact: Decreased state sales tax revenues of \$200 million annually, with corresponding increases of funding to local governments. Other, potentially more significant changes in state and local budgets, depending on future decisions by public officials.</p>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>37.8%</td> <td>No</td> <td>36.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>10.4%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>16.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>10.6%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>7.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>16.8%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>12.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>25.5%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	37.8%	No	36.8%	Strongly Yes	10.4%	Strongly No	16.4%	Somewhat Yes	10.6%	Somewhat No	7.7%	Leaning Yes	16.8%	Leaning No	12.7%		Unsure	25.5%	
Yes	37.8%	No	36.8%																		
Strongly Yes	10.4%	Strongly No	16.4%																		
Somewhat Yes	10.6%	Somewhat No	7.7%																		
Leaning Yes	16.8%	Leaning No	12.7%																		
	Unsure	25.5%																			
<p>32 - POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY PAYROLL DEDUCTION. CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</p> <p>Prohibits unions from using payroll-deducted funds for political purposes. Applies same use prohibition to payroll deductions, if any, by corporations or government contractors. Prohibits union and corporate contributions to candidates and their committees. Prohibits government contractor contributions to elected officers or their committees. Fiscal Impact: Increased costs to state and local government, potentially exceeding \$1 million annually, to implement and enforce the measure's requirements.</p>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>44.7%</td> <td>No</td> <td>44.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>28.4%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>30.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>7.7%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>5.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>8.6%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>8.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>10.5%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	44.7%	No	44.8%	Strongly Yes	28.4%	Strongly No	30.5%	Somewhat Yes	7.7%	Somewhat No	5.9%	Leaning Yes	8.6%	Leaning No	8.4%		Unsure	10.5%	
Yes	44.7%	No	44.8%																		
Strongly Yes	28.4%	Strongly No	30.5%																		
Somewhat Yes	7.7%	Somewhat No	5.9%																		
Leaning Yes	8.6%	Leaning No	8.4%																		
	Unsure	10.5%																			
<p>33- AUTO INSURANCE COMPANIES. PRICES BASED ON DRIVER'S HISTORY OF INSURANCE COVERAGE. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</p> <p>Changes current law to allow insurance companies to set prices based on whether the driver previously carried auto insurance with any insurance company. Allows proportional discount for drivers with some prior coverage. Allows increased cost for drivers without history of continuous coverage. Fiscal Impact: Probably no significant fiscal effect on state insurance premium tax revenues.</p>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>48.8%</td> <td>No</td> <td>37.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>20.0%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>21.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>12.8%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>6.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>16.0%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>9.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>13.8%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	48.8%	No	37.4%	Strongly Yes	20.0%	Strongly No	21.1%	Somewhat Yes	12.8%	Somewhat No	6.5%	Leaning Yes	16.0%	Leaning No	9.8%		Unsure	13.8%	
Yes	48.8%	No	37.4%																		
Strongly Yes	20.0%	Strongly No	21.1%																		
Somewhat Yes	12.8%	Somewhat No	6.5%																		
Leaning Yes	16.0%	Leaning No	9.8%																		
	Unsure	13.8%																			
<p>34 – DEATH PENALTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</p> <p>Repeals death penalty and replaces it with life imprisonment without possibility of parole. Applies retroactively to existing death sentences. Directs \$100 million to law enforcement agencies for investigations of homicide and rape cases. Fiscal Impact: Ongoing state and county criminal justice savings of about \$130 million annually within a few years, which could vary by tens of millions of dollars. One-time state costs of \$100 million for local law enforcement grants.</p>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>41.3%</td> <td>No</td> <td>47.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>22.1%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>31.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>9.3%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>8.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>9.9%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>8.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>10.8%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	41.3%	No	47.9%	Strongly Yes	22.1%	Strongly No	31.7%	Somewhat Yes	9.3%	Somewhat No	8.2%	Leaning Yes	9.9%	Leaning No	8.0%		Unsure	10.8%	
Yes	41.3%	No	47.9%																		
Strongly Yes	22.1%	Strongly No	31.7%																		
Somewhat Yes	9.3%	Somewhat No	8.2%																		
Leaning Yes	9.9%	Leaning No	8.0%																		
	Unsure	10.8%																			
<p>35 - HUMAN TRAFFICKING. PENALTIES. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</p> <p>Increases prison sentences and fines for human trafficking convictions. Requires convicted human traffickers to register as sex offenders. Requires registered sex offenders to disclose Internet activities and identities. Fiscal Impact: Costs of a few million dollars annually to state and local governments for addressing human trafficking offenses. Potential increased annual fine revenue of a similar amount, dedicated primarily for human trafficking victims.</p>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>76.5%</td> <td>No</td> <td>13.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>50.0%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>5.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>14.2%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>3.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>12.3%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>4.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>9.8%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	76.5%	No	13.7%	Strongly Yes	50.0%	Strongly No	5.5%	Somewhat Yes	14.2%	Somewhat No	3.8%	Leaning Yes	12.3%	Leaning No	4.3%		Unsure	9.8%	
Yes	76.5%	No	13.7%																		
Strongly Yes	50.0%	Strongly No	5.5%																		
Somewhat Yes	14.2%	Somewhat No	3.8%																		
Leaning Yes	12.3%	Leaning No	4.3%																		
	Unsure	9.8%																			

<p>36 – THREE STRIKES LAW. REPEAT FELONY OFFENDERS. PENALTIES. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</p> <p>Revises law to impose life sentence only when new felony conviction is serious or violent. May authorize re-sentencing if third strike conviction was not serious or violent. Fiscal Impact: Ongoing state correctional savings of around \$70 million annually, with even greater savings (up to \$90 million) over the next couple of decades. These savings could vary significantly depending on future state actions.</p>	<table> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>67.4%</td> <td>No</td> <td>22.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>32.2%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>12.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>18.0%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>4.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>17.2%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>5.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsure</td> <td>10.6%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	67.4%	No	22.0%	Strongly Yes	32.2%	Strongly No	12.3%	Somewhat Yes	18.0%	Somewhat No	4.2%	Leaning Yes	17.2%	Leaning No	5.5%	Unsure	10.6%		
Yes	67.4%	No	22.0%																		
Strongly Yes	32.2%	Strongly No	12.3%																		
Somewhat Yes	18.0%	Somewhat No	4.2%																		
Leaning Yes	17.2%	Leaning No	5.5%																		
Unsure	10.6%																				
<p>37 - GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOODS. LABELING. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</p> <p>Requires labeling of food sold to consumers made from plants or animals with genetic material changed in specified ways. Prohibits marketing such food, or other processed food, as "natural." Provides exemptions. Fiscal Impact: Increased annual state costs from a few hundred thousand dollars to over \$1 million to regulate the labeling of genetically engineered foods. Additional, but likely not significant, governmental costs to address violations under the measure.</p>	<table> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>39.1%</td> <td>No</td> <td>50.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>22.3%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>31.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>8.0%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>8.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>8.8%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>10.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsure</td> <td>10.5%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	39.1%	No	50.5%	Strongly Yes	22.3%	Strongly No	31.6%	Somewhat Yes	8.0%	Somewhat No	8.8%	Leaning Yes	8.8%	Leaning No	10.0%	Unsure	10.5%		
Yes	39.1%	No	50.5%																		
Strongly Yes	22.3%	Strongly No	31.6%																		
Somewhat Yes	8.0%	Somewhat No	8.8%																		
Leaning Yes	8.8%	Leaning No	10.0%																		
Unsure	10.5%																				
<p>38 - TAX TO FUND EDUCATION AND EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</p> <p>Increases taxes on earnings using sliding scale, for twelve years. Revenues go to K-12 schools and early childhood programs, and for four years to repaying state debt. Fiscal Impact: Increased state tax revenues for 12 years-roughly \$10 billion annually in initial years, tending to grow over time. Funds used for schools, child care, and preschool, as well as providing savings on state debt payments.</p>	<table> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>33.0%</td> <td>No</td> <td>54.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>12.8%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>34.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>8.6%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>9.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>11.6%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>10.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsure</td> <td>12.8%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	33.0%	No	54.1%	Strongly Yes	12.8%	Strongly No	34.6%	Somewhat Yes	8.6%	Somewhat No	9.0%	Leaning Yes	11.6%	Leaning No	10.6%	Unsure	12.8%		
Yes	33.0%	No	54.1%																		
Strongly Yes	12.8%	Strongly No	34.6%																		
Somewhat Yes	8.6%	Somewhat No	9.0%																		
Leaning Yes	11.6%	Leaning No	10.6%																		
Unsure	12.8%																				
<p>39 - TAX TREATMENT FOR MULTISTATE BUSINESSES. CLEAN ENERGY AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY FUNDING. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</p> <p>Requires multistate businesses to pay income taxes based on percentage of their sales in California. Dedicates revenues for five years to clean/efficient energy projects. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues of \$1 billion annually, with half of the revenues over the next five years spent on energy efficiency projects. Of the remaining revenues, a significant portion likely would be spent on schools.</p>	<table> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>54.5%</td> <td>No</td> <td>28.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>22.0%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>15.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>15.6%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>5.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>16.9%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>7.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsure</td> <td>17.0%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	54.5%	No	28.5%	Strongly Yes	22.0%	Strongly No	15.4%	Somewhat Yes	15.6%	Somewhat No	5.7%	Leaning Yes	16.9%	Leaning No	7.4%	Unsure	17.0%		
Yes	54.5%	No	28.5%																		
Strongly Yes	22.0%	Strongly No	15.4%																		
Somewhat Yes	15.6%	Somewhat No	5.7%																		
Leaning Yes	16.9%	Leaning No	7.4%																		
Unsure	17.0%																				
<p>40 - REDISTRICTING. STATE SENATE DISTRICTS. REFERENDUM.</p> <p>A "Yes" vote approves and a "No" vote rejects, new State Senate districts drawn by the Citizens Redistricting Commission. If rejected, districts will be adjusted by officials supervised by the California Supreme Court. Fiscal Impact: Approving the referendum would have no fiscal impact on the state and local governments. Rejecting the referendum would result in a one-time cost of about \$1 million to the state and counties.</p>	<table> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>48.2%</td> <td>No</td> <td>24.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>21.0%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>10.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>12.8%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>5.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>14.4%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>9.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsure</td> <td>27.0%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	48.2%	No	24.8%	Strongly Yes	21.0%	Strongly No	10.3%	Somewhat Yes	12.8%	Somewhat No	5.0%	Leaning Yes	14.4%	Leaning No	9.6%	Unsure	27.0%		
Yes	48.2%	No	24.8%																		
Strongly Yes	21.0%	Strongly No	10.3%																		
Somewhat Yes	12.8%	Somewhat No	5.0%																		
Leaning Yes	14.4%	Leaning No	9.6%																		
Unsure	27.0%																				

Proposition 30

	Total	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Latino
Strongly Yes	26.3%	10.0%	41.1%	19.8%	18.5%	39.4%
Somewhat Yes	10.0%	6.4%	13.8%	8.0%	6.9%	13.0%
Leaning Yes	13.0%	10.3%	14.4%	14.4%	15.6%	12.4%
Yes	49.2%	26.6%	69.2%	42.2%	41.0%	64.8%
No	42.9%	68.8%	22.2%	46.7%	50.4%	27.4%
Leaning No	8.8%	11.1%	6.6%	10.2%	12.8%	10.1%
Somewhat No	4.7%	6.1%	2.9%	6.5%	6.6%	2.9%
Strongly No	29.4%	51.6%	12.7%	30.0%	30.9%	14.3%
Unsure	7.8%	4.6%	8.6%	11.1%	8.6%	7.9%

Proposition 31

	Total	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Latino
Strongly Yes	10.4%	13.1%	9.7%	7.9%	9.7%	9.4%
Somewhat Yes	10.6%	12.3%	10.5%	7.9%	9.2%	11.8%
Leaning Yes	16.8%	16.6%	17.3%	15.7%	16.1%	17.4%
Yes	37.8%	42.0%	37.5%	31.5%	34.9%	38.6%
No	36.8%	36.8%	35.3%	39.8%	39.8%	33.0%
Leaning No	12.7%	9.4%	14.2%	14.8%	16.0%	13.4%
Somewhat No	7.7%	9.4%	6.4%	7.9%	8.9%	10.1%
Strongly No	16.4%	18.0%	14.7%	17.1%	14.9%	9.6%
Unsure	25.5%	21.2%	27.1%	28.6%	25.2%	28.4%

Proposition 32

	Total	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Latino
Strongly Yes	28.4%	47.8%	17.0%	22.7%	25.7%	23.1%
Somewhat Yes	7.7%	7.8%	6.3%	9.8%	9.1%	7.7%
Leaning Yes	8.6%	10.4%	7.2%	9.2%	10.7%	9.7%
Yes	44.7%	66.0%	30.5%	41.7%	45.5%	40.6%
No	44.8%	28.7%	58.4%	41.7%	42.8%	47.9%
Leaning No	8.4%	6.8%	10.1%	7.6%	7.7%	13.5%
Somewhat No	5.9%	5.3%	6.6%	5.8%	6.5%	7.1%
Strongly No	30.5%	16.5%	41.7%	28.3%	28.6%	27.3%
Unsure	10.5%	5.4%	11.1%	16.7%	11.7%	11.5%

Proposition 33

	Total	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Latino
Strongly Yes	20.0%	30.1%	14.9%	14.3%	19.3%	18.7%
Somewhat Yes	12.8%	13.1%	12.8%	12.3%	13.0%	10.2%
Leaning Yes	16.0%	16.0%	16.2%	16.1%	17.8%	20.3%
Yes	48.8%	59.1%	43.9%	42.7%	50.1%	49.2%
No	37.4%	30.6%	42.2%	38.4%	35.7%	36.2%
Leaning No	9.8%	8.1%	10.6%	11.1%	11.5%	12.1%
Somewhat No	6.5%	5.8%	7.2%	6.4%	6.1%	6.1%
Strongly No	21.1%	16.8%	24.4%	20.9%	18.1%	17.9%
Unsure	13.8%	10.2%	13.9%	18.9%	14.2%	14.6%

Proposition 34

	Total	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Latino
Strongly Yes	22.1%	10.6%	30.3%	21.8%	17.0%	23.6%
Somewhat Yes	9.3%	6.5%	11.7%	8.5%	10.7%	11.0%
Leaning Yes	9.9%	7.5%	10.9%	11.5%	10.2%	13.0%
Yes	41.3%	24.6%	52.9%	41.9%	38.0%	47.6%
No	47.9%	68.2%	35.9%	42.8%	49.4%	40.8%
Leaning No	8.0%	7.3%	8.7%	7.9%	10.0%	12.4%
Somewhat No	8.2%	11.1%	6.2%	8.2%	8.9%	7.3%
Strongly No	31.7%	49.8%	21.0%	26.6%	30.5%	21.2%
Unsure	10.8%	7.2%	11.2%	15.4%	12.6%	11.5%

Proposition 35

	Total	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Latino
Strongly Yes	50.0%	52.2%	51.9%	43.3%	43.9%	47.4%
Somewhat Yes	14.2%	14.5%	13.7%	14.9%	14.8%	15.8%
Leaning Yes	12.3%	10.7%	12.7%	13.8%	14.7%	14.1%
Yes	76.5%	77.4%	78.4%	72.1%	73.4%	77.3%
No	13.7%	15.3%	12.1%	14.0%	14.9%	10.3%
Leaning No	4.3%	4.1%	4.3%	4.9%	4.9%	3.9%
Somewhat No	3.8%	4.7%	3.7%	2.6%	3.7%	2.9%
Strongly No	5.5%	6.5%	4.1%	6.5%	6.2%	3.5%
Unsure	9.8%	7.2%	9.5%	13.9%	11.7%	12.4%

Proposition 36

	Total	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Latino
Strongly Yes	32.2%	22.9%	40.4%	28.4%	30.4%	30.5%
Somewhat Yes	18.0%	17.5%	19.0%	16.8%	17.2%	21.2%
Leaning Yes	17.2%	17.8%	17.2%	16.5%	17.0%	18.2%
Yes	67.4%	58.2%	76.6%	61.7%	64.6%	69.9%
No	22.0%	34.4%	13.5%	21.5%	23.6%	16.3%
Leaning No	5.5%	5.5%	5.0%	6.6%	6.9%	6.7%
Somewhat No	4.2%	6.5%	2.0%	5.6%	4.4%	2.6%
Strongly No	12.3%	22.4%	6.4%	9.4%	12.3%	7.0%
Unsure	10.6%	7.4%	9.9%	16.8%	11.8%	13.8%

Proposition 37

	Total	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Latino
Strongly Yes	22.3%	16.1%	26.2%	23.9%	17.9%	30.9%
Somewhat Yes	8.0%	4.5%	10.4%	7.8%	6.6%	6.5%
Leaning Yes	8.8%	6.1%	10.4%	9.8%	10.1%	11.2%
Yes	39.1%	26.8%	47.0%	41.5%	34.7%	48.6%
No	50.5%	66.6%	42.2%	42.9%	53.6%	38.9%
Leaning No	10.0%	9.7%	10.3%	10.1%	13.0%	13.9%
Somewhat No	8.8%	10.3%	9.2%	6.1%	9.8%	5.4%
Strongly No	31.6%	46.5%	22.8%	26.7%	30.8%	19.6%
Unsure	10.5%	6.7%	10.8%	15.6%	11.7%	12.5%

Proposition 38

	Total	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Latino
Strongly Yes	12.8%	5.2%	19.1%	11.6%	10.8%	25.0%
Somewhat Yes	8.6%	4.9%	11.7%	7.8%	8.3%	8.6%
Leaning Yes	11.6%	8.0%	14.5%	11.1%	11.4%	16.6%
Yes	33.0%	18.1%	45.4%	30.6%	30.5%	50.2%
No	54.1%	73.8%	40.7%	51.7%	55.3%	33.2%
Leaning No	10.6%	9.7%	11.1%	10.9%	13.0%	11.6%
Somewhat No	9.0%	10.2%	8.1%	9.4%	8.6%	5.0%
Strongly No	34.6%	54.0%	21.6%	31.3%	33.8%	16.6%
Unsure	12.8%	8.0%	13.9%	17.8%	14.2%	16.6%

Proposition 39

	Total	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Latino
Strongly Yes	22.0%	14.0%	29.3%	19.2%	20.2%	28.7%
Somewhat Yes	15.6%	12.1%	19.3%	13.7%	17.4%	14.2%
Leaning Yes	16.9%	12.4%	19.1%	19.3%	16.9%	20.7%
Yes	54.5%	38.5%	67.7%	52.2%	54.6%	63.6%
No	28.5%	48.6%	14.1%	27.3%	29.6%	16.0%
Leaning No	7.4%	10.2%	5.2%	8.2%	9.7%	7.0%
Somewhat No	5.7%	8.0%	3.5%	6.6%	8.6%	2.7%
Strongly No	15.4%	30.3%	5.4%	12.6%	11.3%	6.3%
Unsure	17.0%	12.9%	18.2%	20.5%	15.8%	20.3%

Proposition 40

	Total	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Latino
Strongly Yes	21.0%	23.2%	20.7%	17.9%	17.7%	15.1%
Somewhat Yes	12.8%	13.8%	13.2%	10.5%	12.2%	9.9%
Leaning Yes	14.4%	15.5%	13.8%	14.1%	14.6%	17.0%
Yes	48.2%	52.5%	47.7%	42.5%	44.6%	41.9%
No	24.8%	26.1%	22.8%	27.7%	29.5%	25.2%
Leaning No	9.6%	6.9%	9.8%	13.9%	13.2%	13.3%
Somewhat No	5.0%	5.9%	4.3%	5.2%	6.0%	5.8%
Strongly No	10.3%	13.4%	8.8%	8.6%	10.3%	6.0%
Unsure	27.0%	21.4%	29.4%	29.8%	26.0%	32.9%

10. For which propositions do you recall seeing an advertisement in the past two weeks? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

Prop 30	68.1%
Prop 31	18.0%
Prop 32	65.6%
Prop 33	28.3%
Prop 34	19.5%
Prop 35	11.4%
Prop 36	13.1%
Prop 37	57.9%
Prop 38	42.3%
Prop 39	20.4%
Prop 40	7.0%
None of the above	12.3%

11. For which propositions do you recall reading, seeing, or hearing a news media story or discussion in the past two weeks? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

Prop 30	54.9%
Prop 31	18.6%
Prop 32	50.5%
Prop 33	21.3%
Prop 34	21.7%
Prop 35	13.4%
Prop 36	17.3%
Prop 37	41.1%
Prop 38	33.2%
Prop 39	15.3%
Prop 40	7.3%
None of the above	26.2%

12. Upon which resources did you rely on to decide or inform the choices you entered on the survey? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

Friends – word of mouth	29.7%
Official voter information guide	67.3%
Mailers	16.8%
TV advertisements	29.4%
Radio advertisements	11.4%
Print advertisements	9.7%
Professional association	10.6%
Newspapers	30.9%
Internet	39.6%
Other news sources	19.3%
Canvassers/people at door	1.8%
Other	11.9%

13. Which resource was your PRIMARY source to decide or inform the choices you entered on the survey?

Friends – word of mouth	6.4%
Official voter information guide	41.3%
Mailers	2.6%
TV advertisements	8.1%
Radio advertisements	1.4%
Print advertisements	0.7%
Professional association	2.5%
Newspapers	6.6%
Internet	14.5%
Other news sources	5.4%
Canvassers	0.3%
Other	10.2%

14. Have the Presidential debates influenced how you may vote?

I am much more likely to support Governor Romney	15.4%
I am somewhat more likely to support Governor Romney	5.5%
Governor Romney	20.9%
President Obama	30.0%
I am somewhat more likely to support President Obama	8.3%
I am much more likely to support President Obama	21.7%
I have followed the debates but they will not influence my vote	33.1%
I have not followed the debates	16.1%

15. What is your current party registration?

Republican	33.0%
Democratic	45.0%
No Party Preference/Independent	21.0%
Another political party	1.0%

16. Which of the following best describes how you have voted in recent elections:

Straight Republican	9.7%
Mostly Republican	17.4%
A few more Republicans than Democrats	7.1%
Equally both parties	8.7%
A few more Democrats than Republicans	8.3%
Mostly Democratic	26.1%
Straight Democratic	18.2%
Other/prefer third party	4.4%

17. How would you describe your political ideology?

Very conservative	10.9%
Somewhat conservative	24.3%
Somewhat liberal	24.2%
Very liberal	12.2%
Moderate/Independent	21.7%
Libertarian	3.0%
Other	3.7%

18. Are you male or female?

Male	48.4%
Female	51.6%

19. Which of the following categories reflects your age?

17 and under	[TERMINATE]
18 to 29	12.6%
30 to 39	13.1%
40 to 49	20.0%
50 to 59	28.0%
60 and above	26.4%

20. Which of the following best describes you:

White/Non-Hispanic	68.3%
Latino/Hispanic	16.7%
Black/African American	6.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	8.0%
Other	1.0%

21. Are you or your spouse or partner a current or retired member of a public or private labor union?

Yes, public employee union	14.8%
Yes, private employee union	6.3%
Yes, both	1.9%
No	77.0%

22. Compared to recent presidential elections, are you more or less interested in the outcome of the coming election?

Much more interested	46.5%
Somewhat more interested	20.3%
Leaning more interested	10.8%
More interested	77.6%
I'm neutral	14.3%
Less interested	8.1%
Leaning less interested	2.8%
Somewhat less interested	2.0%
Much less interested	3.3%

23. What is the last year of schooling that you have completed?

High school graduate or less	16.8%
Non-college post high school / Technical School	3.2%
Some-college/Two-year college/Associate's degree	33.5%
Four-year college graduate/Bachelor's degree	24.9%
Post-graduate school	21.7%

24. In which part of California do you reside?

Los Angeles	26.9%
Orange County	9.8%
Inland Empire	10.0%
San Diego	8.9%
Central Valley	17.4%
Central Coast	3.0%
Bay Area	21.0%
Northern/Sierra	3.1%

"Bay Area" is Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma Counties.

"North/Sierra" is Alpine, Amador, Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, El Dorado, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Yolo, and Yuba Counties.

"Central Coast" is Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz and Ventura Counties.

"Central Valley" is Calaveras, Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, Sacramento, San Benito, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tulare, and Tuolumne Counties.

"Inland Empire" is Imperial, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties.

Orange County, Los Angeles and San Diego are each independent counties.

25. This election, do you plan to vote at your local polling place, or do you plan to vote by mail?

I have already voted by mail	20.3%
I plan to vote by mail	37.0%
I plan to vote at a polling place	42.8%