

CBRT Pepperdine Initiative Test

M4 Strategies

#12-06-927

Sample: 812 Likely General Election California Voters

Mode: Online

Fielding Dates: 7/16-7/17

TOPLINE Final

Data was weighted based on age, geography, gender, ethnicity,
party, and education

Swing determined by those who vote "A few more Republicans than Democrats", "Equally both parties", or "A few more Democrats than Republicans"

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	91.1%
Probably vote	7.5%
50-50	1.4%
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?

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Right track	8.8%	41.9%	23.7%	22.5%	26.9%
Wrong track	91.2%	58.1%	76.3%	77.5%	73.1%

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

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Very favorable	1.5%	40.0%	18.2%	9.8%	22.5%
Somewhat favorable	11.6%	45.4%	30.3%	30.2%	31.0%
Favorable	13.1%	85.4%	48.5%	40.0%	53.5%
Unfavorable	86.2%	14.0%	47.1%	55.6%	45.0%
Somewhat unfavorable	15.4%	8.8%	28.8%	30.8%	15.2%
Very unfavorable	70.8%	5.2%	18.3%	24.7%	29.8%
Don't have an opinion	.7%	.6%	4.5%	4.4%	1.4%

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

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Very favorable	.7%	16.5%	3.6%	2.1%	8.4
Somewhat favorable	14.0%	51.3%	35.7%	29.4%	35.7
Favorable	14.7%	67.7%	39.3%	31.5%	44.1
Unfavorable	81.1%	23.5%	49.8%	61.3%	48.2
Somewhat unfavorable	32.7%	17.5%	29.8%	33.4%	25.5
Very unfavorable	48.5%	6.0%	19.9%	27.9%	22.7
Don't have an opinion	4.2%	8.8%	10.9%	7.2%	7.7

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

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Very favorable	.2%	1.4%	1.7%	.7%	1.1%
Somewhat favorable	2.8%	27.1%	5.9%	5.7%	14.4%
Favorable	3.0%	28.4%	7.6%	6.3%	15.5%
Unfavorable	94.0%	64.1%	85.1%	88.4%	78.5%
Somewhat unfavorable	31.6%	41.5%	40.7%	38.6%	37.8%
Very unfavorable	62.4%	22.6%	44.4%	49.8%	40.7%
Don't have an opinion	3.0%	7.5%	7.3%	5.3%	6.0%

8. If the election were tomorrow, for whom would you vote for U.S. President? [ROTATE A/B]

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Barack Obama (D)	10.0%	84.1%	49.1%	36.5%	51.9%
Mitt Romney (R)	75.6%	6.2%	22.2%	33.1%	32.6%
Someone else	3.4%	2.3%	12.4%	8.1%	5.2%
Unsure	11.0%	7.4%	16.2%	22.3%	10.3%

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

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Dianne Feinstein (D)	11.1%	80.9%	38.9%	33.7%	48.9%
Elizabeth Emken (R)	69.6%	4.3%	26.7%	33.8%	30.4%
Unsure	19.3%	14.8%	34.4%	32.5%	20.7%

[SECTION: BALLOT INITIATIVE INSTRUCTIONS PAGE]

There are a number of initiatives that will appear on the November 2012 ballot. This survey allows you to read the official Title and Summary of these ballot initiatives and tell us whether you are more likely to support or oppose the initiative. The Title and Summary explanations for each initiative have been prepared by the Attorney General of the State of California.

There are multiple initiatives on the page. You can scroll up and down and read each one before you vote on any, or you can vote after reading each one. However, your votes on each initiative are not set until you continue to the next page, so if you want to change a previous vote you may do so before moving to the next page.

Hit the CONTINUE button when you are ready.

[BEGIN 'BALLOT INITIATIVE' PAGE]

For each of the following initiatives, please read the title and summary and tell us whether you are more likely to support or oppose the initiative. There are 11 initiatives, Propositions 30 through 40.

You may read all of the initiatives on this page before you choose your responses. Remember, these initiatives will appear on the November 2012 ballot and the Title and Summary explanations were prepared by the Attorney General of the State of California.

PROPOSITION 30

Temporary Taxes to Fund Education. Guaranteed Local Public Safety Funding. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.

- Increases personal income tax on annual earnings over \$250,000 for seven years.
- Increases sales and use tax by ¼ cent for four years. Allocates temporary tax revenues 89 percent to K-12 schools and 11 percent to community colleges.
- Bars use of funds for administrative costs, but provides local school governing boards discretion to decide, in open meetings and subject to annual audit, how funds are to be spent.
- Guarantees funding for public safety services realigned from state to local governments.

Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local government:

- Increased state revenues over the next seven fiscal years.
- Estimates of the revenue increases vary—from \$6.8 billion to \$9 billion for 2012-13 and from \$5.4 billion to \$7.6 billion, on average, in the following five fiscal years, with lesser amounts in 2018-19.
- These revenues would be available to (1) pay for the state's school and community college funding requirements, as increased by this measure, and (2) address the state's budgetary problem by paying for other spending commitments.
- Limitation on the state's ability to make changes to the programs and revenues shifted to local governments in 2011, resulting in a more stable fiscal situation for local governments.

10. If the election were today, would you vote yes or vote no on Proposition 30?

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	2.5%	34.9%	16.0%	11.2%	20.2%
Somewhat Yes	9.3%	24.8%	14.0%	18.7%	17.3%
Leaning Yes	15.4%	19.2%	23.2%	19.2%	18.7%
Yes	27.2%	78.9%	53.3%	49.1%	56.2%
No	67.1%	16.9%	42.7%	45.9%	39.2%
Leaning No	12.4%	8.7%	9.9%	14.2%	10.1%
Somewhat No	4.3%	4.4%	9.1%	7.0%	5.4%
Strongly No	50.5%	3.8%	23.7%	24.7%	23.6%
Unsure	5.7%	4.2%	4.1%	5.0%	4.6%

PROPOSITION 31

State Budget. State and Local Government. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute.

- Establishes two-year state budget cycle.
- Prohibits Legislature from creating expenditures of more than \$25 million unless offsetting revenues or spending cuts are identified.
- Permits Governor to cut budget unilaterally during declared fiscal emergencies if Legislature fails to act.
- Requires performance reviews of all state programs. Requires performance goals in state and local budgets.
- Requires publication of all bills at least three days prior to legislative vote.
- Gives counties power to alter state statutes or regulations related to spending unless Legislature or state agency vetoes changes within 60 days.

Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local government:

- Decreased state revenues and commensurate increased local revenues, probably in the range of about \$200 million annually, beginning in 2013-14.
- Potential decreased state program costs or increased state revenues resulting from changes in the fiscal authority of the Legislature and Governor.
- Increased state and local costs of tens of millions of dollars annually to implement new budgeting practices.
- Over time, these costs would moderate and potentially be offset by savings from improved program efficiencies.

11. If the election were today, would you vote yes or vote no on Proposition 31?

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	9.1%	4.9%	12.5%	8.0%	7.9%
Somewhat Yes	10.9%	16.8%	9.1%	13.9%	13.6%
Leaning Yes	28.9%	27.8%	34.2%	32.2%	29.5%
Yes	48.8%	49.5%	55.9%	54.0%	51.0%
No	31.3%	35.8%	33.2%	29.5%	33.5%
Leaning No	13.5%	25.6%	18.8%	16.6%	20.0%
Somewhat No	4.1%	5.9%	7.8%	3.9%	5.7%
Strongly No	13.7%	4.4%	6.7%	9.1%	7.9%
Unsure	19.9%	14.7%	10.9%	16.4%	15.5%

PROPOSITION 32

Prohibits Political Contributions by Payroll Deduction. Prohibitions on Contributions to Candidates. Initiative Statute.

- Restricts union political fundraising by prohibiting use of payroll-deducted funds for political purposes.
- Same use restriction would apply to payroll deductions, if any, by corporations or government contractors.
- Permits voluntary employee contributions to employer or union committees if authorized yearly, in writing.
- Prohibits unions and corporations from contributing directly or indirectly to candidates and candidate-controlled committees.
- Other political expenditures remain unrestricted, including corporate expenditures from available resources not limited by payroll deduction prohibition.
- Limits government contractor contributions to elected officers or officer-controlled committees.

Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local government:

- Increased state implementation and enforcement costs of up to hundreds of thousands of dollars annually, potentially offset in part by revenues from fines.

12. If the election were today, would you vote yes or vote no on Proposition 32?

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	26.9%	16.5%	29.1%	29.5%	23.2%
Somewhat Yes	20.6%	18.7%	13.9%	14.0%	18.2%
Leaning Yes	19.1%	20.8%	14.1%	21.7%	18.6%
Yes	66.5%	56.1%	57.1%	65.2%	60.0%
No	24.4%	32.1%	29.6%	25.3%	28.9%
Leaning No	6.8%	12.6%	11.5%	10.0%	10.3%
Somewhat No	6.7%	6.7%	7.6%	10.1%	7.0%
Strongly No	10.8%	12.8%	10.4%	5.2%	11.6%
Unsure	9.1%	11.8%	13.3%	9.5%	11.1%

PROPOSITION 33

Changes Law to Allow Auto Insurance Companies to Set Prices Based on a Driver's History of Insurance Coverage. Initiative Statute.

- Changes current law to permit insurance companies to set prices based on whether the driver previously carried auto insurance with any insurance company.
- Allows insurance companies to give proportional discounts to drivers with some prior insurance coverage.
- Will allow insurance companies to increase cost of insurance to drivers who have not maintained continuous coverage.
- Treats drivers with lapse as continuously covered if lapse is due to military service or loss of employment, or if lapse is less than 90 days.

Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local government:

- Probably no significant fiscal effect on state insurance premium tax revenues.

13. If the election were today, would you vote yes or vote no on Proposition 33?

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	18.2%	15.6%	14.4%	13.3%	16.5%
Somewhat Yes	16.6%	22.0%	15.8%	19.4%	18.7%
Leaning Yes	26.7%	19.9%	28.9%	32.1%	24.0%
Yes	61.5%	57.6%	59.1%	64.7%	59.3%
No	21.8%	32.7%	30.4%	22.9%	28.7%
Leaning No	6.7%	14.3%	8.9%	9.3%	10.7%
Somewhat No	4.5%	7.6%	4.8%	2.3%	6.1%
Strongly No	10.6%	10.8%	16.7%	11.3%	11.9%
Unsure	16.7%	9.7%	10.5%	12.3%	12.0%

PROPOSITION 34

Death Penalty Repeal. Initiative Statute.

- Repeals death penalty as maximum punishment for persons found guilty of murder and replaces it with life imprisonment without possibility of parole.
- Applies retroactively to persons already sentenced to death.
- Requires persons found guilty of murder to work while in prison, with their wages to be applied to any victim restitution fines or orders against them.
- Creates \$100 million fund to be distributed to law enforcement agencies to help solve more homicide and rape cases.

Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local government:

- Net savings to the state and counties that could amount to the high tens of millions of dollars annually on a statewide basis due to the elimination of the death penalty.
- One-time state costs totaling \$100 million from 2012-13 through 2015-16 to provide funding to local law enforcement agencies.

14. If the election were today, would you vote yes or vote no on Proposition 34?

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	6.1%	28.2%	21.7%	15.7%	19.7%
Somewhat Yes	7.5%	16.0%	9.7%	6.8%	11.8%
Leaning Yes	11.6%	12.5%	22.0%	15.1%	14.1%
Yes	25.2%	56.8%	53.5%	37.5%	45.5%
No	60.5%	38.5%	41.8%	50.5%	46.7%
Leaning No	10.8%	12.1%	8.2%	11.0%	10.7%
Somewhat No	7.7%	5.6%	9.1%	10.3%	7.1%
Strongly No	42.0%	20.8%	24.6%	29.2%	28.9%
Unsure	14.3%	4.7%	4.7%	12.0%	7.8%

PROPOSITION 35

Human Trafficking. Penalties. Sex Offender Registration. Initiative Statute.

- Increases criminal penalties for human trafficking, including prison sentences up to 15-years-to-life and fines up to \$1,500,000.
- Fines collected to be used for victim services and law enforcement.
- Requires person convicted of trafficking to register as sex offender.
- Requires sex offenders to provide information regarding Internet access and identities they use in online activities.
- Prohibits evidence that victim engaged in sexual conduct from being used against victim in court proceedings.
- Requires human trafficking training for police officers.

Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local government:

- Potential one-time local government costs of up to a few million dollars on a statewide basis, and lesser additional costs incurred each year, due to the new mandatory training requirements for certain law enforcement officers.
- Minor increase to state and local governments on the costs of incarcerating and supervising human trafficking offenders.
- Unknown amount of additional revenue from new criminal fees, likely not to exceed the low millions of dollars annually, which would fund services for human trafficking victims.

15. If the election were today, would you vote yes or vote no on Proposition 35?

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	41.6%	51.7%	57.0%	46.7%	49.3%
Somewhat Yes	22.3%	19.7%	17.8%	17.1%	20.2%
Leaning Yes	19.6%	20.1%	14.5%	24.4%	18.7%
Yes	83.4%	91.5%	89.2%	88.2%	88.2%
No	9.4%	4.2%	5.2%	5.0%	6.4%
Leaning No	4.6%	2.5%	4.6%	3.3%	3.6%
Somewhat No	3.7%	1.1%	.4%	1.4%	1.8%
Strongly No	1.2%	.5%	.2%	.3%	1.0%
Unsure	7.2%	4.3%	5.6%	6.8%	5.4%

PROPOSITION 36

Three Strikes Law. Sentencing for Repeat Felony Offenders. Initiative Statute.

- Revises three strikes law to impose life sentence only when new felony conviction is serious or violent.
- Authorizes re-sentencing for offenders currently serving life sentences if third strike conviction was not serious or violent and judge determines sentence does not pose unreasonable risk to public safety.
- Continues to impose life sentence penalty if third strike conviction was for certain non-serious, non-violent sex or drug offenses or involved firearm possession.
- Maintains life sentence penalty for felons with non-serious, non-violent third strike if prior convictions were for rape, murder, or child molestation.

Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local government:

- State savings related to prison and parole operations that potentially range in the high tens of millions of dollars annually in the short run, possibly exceeding \$100 million annually in the long run.
- Increased state and county costs in the millions to low tens of millions of dollars annually in the first few years, likely declining substantially in future years, for state court activities and county jail, community supervision, and court-related activities.

16. If the election were today, would you vote yes or vote no on Proposition 36?

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	9.9%	29.3%	30.8%	25.1%	23.1%
Somewhat Yes	23.5%	23.4%	23.8%	22.9%	23.4%
Leaning Yes	23.8%	28.9%	18.1%	25.4%	25.3%
Yes	57.2%	81.6%	72.8%	73.4%	71.7%
No	29.7%	12.5%	15.7%	15.1%	19.0%
Leaning No	10.9%	6.4%	4.2%	6.5%	7.3%
Somewhat No	4.1%	3.7%	5.9%	5.5%	4.5%
Strongly No	14.8%	2.4%	5.6%	3.1%	7.2%
Unsure	13.1%	5.9%	11.5%	11.5%	9.3%

PROPOSITION 37

Genetically Engineered Foods. Mandatory Labeling. Initiative Statute.

- Requires labeling on raw or processed food offered for sale to consumers if made from plants or animals with genetic material changed in specified ways.
- Prohibits labeling or advertising such food as “natural.”
- Exempts foods that are: certified organic; unintentionally produced with genetically engineered material; made from animals fed or injected with genetically engineered material but not genetically engineered themselves; processed with or containing only small amounts of genetically engineered ingredients; administered for treatment of medical conditions; sold for immediate consumption such as in a restaurant; or alcoholic beverages.

Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local government:

- Potential increase in state administrative costs of up to one million dollars annually to monitor compliance with the disclosure requirements specified in the measure.
- Unknown, but potentially significant, costs for the courts, the Attorney General, and district attorneys due to litigation resulting from possible violations to the provisions of this measure.

17. If the election were today, would you vote yes or vote no on Proposition 37?

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	15.9%	30.5%	37.0%	26.4%	27.2%
Somewhat Yes	19.1%	21.8%	16.3%	18.8%	19.6%
Leaning Yes	17.1%	19.5%	17.3%	14.8%	18.1%
Yes	52.2%	71.7%	70.6%	60.0%	64.9%
No	33.2%	17.1%	22.6%	27.7%	23.9%
Leaning No	12.8%	9.3%	7.4%	10.9%	10.1%
Somewhat No	9.8%	5.0%	10.2%	9.5%	7.6%
Strongly No	10.5%	2.8%	5.0%	7.3%	6.2%
Unsure	14.6%	11.2%	6.8%	12.2%	11.3%

PROPOSITION 38

Tax for Education and Early Childhood Programs. Initiative Statute.

- Increases personal income tax rates for annual earnings over \$7,316 using sliding scale from .4% for lowest individual earners to 2.2% for individuals earning over \$2.5 million, ending after twelve years.
- During first four years, 60% of revenues go to K-12 schools, 30% to repaying state debt, and 10% to early childhood programs.
- Thereafter, allocates 85% of revenues to K-12 schools, 15% to early childhood programs.
- Provides K-12 funds on school specific, per-pupil basis, subject to local control, audits, and public input.
- Prohibits state from directing or using new funds.

Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local government:

- Increased state personal income tax revenues beginning in 2013 and ending in 2024.
- Estimates of the revenue increases vary from \$10 billion to \$11 billion per fiscal year beginning in 2013-14, tending to increase over time.
- The 2012-13 revenue increase would be about half this amount.
- Until the end of 2016-17, 60 percent of revenues would be dedicated to K-12 education and 10 percent would be provided to early care and education programs.
- These allocations would supplement existing funding for these programs
- In 2017-18 and subsequent years, 85 percent would be provided to K-12 education and 15 percent to early care and education.
- General Fund savings on debt-service costs of about \$1.5 billion in 2012-13 and \$3 billion in 2013-14, with savings tending to grow thereafter until the end of 2016-17.
- In 2015-16 and subsequent years with stronger growth in state personal income tax revenues, some of the revenues raised by this measure—several hundred million dollars per year— would be used for debt-service costs, resulting in state savings.

18. If the election were today, would you vote yes or vote no on Proposition 38?

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	2.0%	11.4%	6.7%	3.9%	7.2%
Somewhat Yes	4.3%	13.8%	12.7%	7.1%	10.5%
Leaning Yes	8.0%	24.6%	16.9%	17.4%	17.3%
Yes	14.2%	49.8%	36.3%	28.5%	35.0%
No	75.1%	37.8%	55.7%	61.5%	54.2%
Leaning No	14.2%	11.4%	11.2%	7.5%	12.1%
Somewhat No	11.5%	15.4%	14.2%	21.7%	14.0%
Strongly No	49.4%	11.1%	30.3%	32.2%	28.1%
Unsure	10.7%	12.3%	8.0%	10.1%	10.8%

PROPOSITION 39

Tax Treatment for Multistate Businesses. Clean Energy and Energy Efficiency Funding. Initiative Statute.

- Requires multistate businesses to calculate their California income tax liability based on the percentage of their sales in California.
- Repeals existing law giving multistate businesses an option to choose a tax liability formula that provides favorable tax treatment for businesses with property and payroll outside California.
- Dedicates \$550 million annually for five years from anticipated increase in revenue for the purpose of funding projects that create energy efficiency and clean energy jobs in California.

Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local government:

- Approximately \$500 million in additional state General Fund revenues in 2012-13 and \$1 billion each year thereafter from requiring a single sales factor formula for corporate taxes, with about half of the additional annual revenues from 2013-14 through 2017-18 supporting energy efficiency and alternative energy projects.
- Increased Proposition 98 minimum funding guarantee for K-14 schools of roughly \$225 million annually from 2012-13 through 2017-18 and by roughly \$500 million each year thereafter, as a result of additional state General Fund revenues.

19. If the election were today, would you vote yes or vote no on Proposition 39?

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	6.9%	23.8%	24.1%	13.9%	18.4%
Somewhat Yes	9.9%	16.7%	15.1%	13.8%	14.0%
Leaning Yes	17.0%	28.4%	20.2%	29.0%	23.0%
Yes	33.8%	68.8%	59.4%	56.7%	55.4%
No	49.1%	12.1%	25.9%	32.4%	27.2%
Leaning No	12.9%	5.6%	11.1%	12.1%	9.1%
Somewhat No	6.9%	5.5%	2.4%	7.4%	5.4%
Strongly No	29.4%	.9%	12.4%	12.9%	12.8%
Unsure	17.1%	19.1%	14.7%	10.9%	17.4%

PROPOSITION 40

Redistricting. State Senate Districts. Referendum.

- State Senate districts are revised every ten years following federal census.
- This year, the voter-approved California Citizens Redistricting commission revised the boundaries of the 40 Senate Districts.
- A YES vote will ratify the senate district boundaries drawn by the voter-approved California Citizens Redistricting Commission.
- A NO vote will reject the senate district boundaries drawn by the voter-approved California Citizens Redistricting Commission and instead require court-appointed officials to set interim boundaries for use in the next statewide election.

Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local government:

- A NO vote will overturn the boundaries drawn by the Citizens Redistricting Commission and require the boundaries to be redrawn, costing the state hundreds of thousands to one million dollars.

20. If the election were today, would you vote yes or vote no on Proposition 40?

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	12.7%	24.2%	21.9%	17.4%	19.7%
Somewhat Yes	15.9%	17.8%	11.9%	16.8%	16.0%
Leaning Yes	18.1%	20.3%	20.7%	19.5%	19.9%
Yes	46.7%	62.4%	54.5%	53.6%	55.7%
No	24.4%	18.3%	24.3%	25.1%	21.5%
Leaning No	10.7%	10.4%	11.1%	12.2%	10.6%
Somewhat No	5.5%	3.8%	3.2%	6.6%	4.2%
Strongly No	8.2%	4.1%	10.0%	6.4%	6.8%
Unsure	28.9%	19.3%	21.1%	21.3%	22.8%

[SECTION: DEMOGRAPHICS]

Just have a few more questions about you for statistical purposes...

21. What is your current party registration?

Republican	32.6%
Democratic	45.2%
Decline to State/Independent	21.1%
Another political party	1.1%

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

Straight Republican	6.9%
Mostly Republican	20.9%
A few more Republicans than Democrats	8.5%
Equally both parties	7.9%
A few more Democrats than Republicans	8.4%
Mostly Democratic	28.2%
Straight Democratic	16.7%
Other/prefer third party	2.5%

23. How would you describe your political ideology?

Very conservative	8.2%
Somewhat conservative	29.4%
Somewhat liberal	25.1%
Very liberal	14.0%
Moderate/Independent	18.6%
Libertarian	2.6%
Other	2.1%

24. Are you male or female?

Male	47.7%
Female	52.3%

25. Which of the following categories reflects your age?

18 to 29	13.0%
30 to 39	12.9%
40 to 49	19.6%
50 to 59	28.7%
60 and above	25.8%

26. Which of the following best describes you:

White/Non Hispanic	68.6%
Latino/Hispanic	17.1%
Black/African American	5.5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	7.8%
Other	1.0%

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

Yes, public employee union	16.4%
Yes, private employee union	7.8%
Yes, both	2.2%
No	73.6%

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

1 st -11 th grade	1.9%
High school graduate	14.0%
Non-college post high school / Technical School	4.5%
Some-college/Two-year college/Associate's degree	30.3%
Four-year college graduate/Bachelor's degree	24.7%
Post-graduate school	24.6%

29. In which part of California do you reside?

Los Angeles	26.4%
Orange County	9.0%
Inland Empire	10.0%
San Diego	9.4%
Central Valley	16.9%
Central Coast	3.3%
Bay Area	21.9%
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.