

CBRT Pepperdine Initiative Test 2
M4 Strategies
#12-07-945
Sample: 873 Likely General Election California Voters
Mode: Online
Fielding Dates: 7/30/2012 – 8/1/2012
TOPLINE Final

Swing determined by those who vote “A few more Republicans than Democrats”, “Equally both parties”, or “A few more Democrats than Republicans”
Margin of error = +/- 3.3% at 95th percent confidence interval

We are conducting a public opinion poll about California public issues and would like to ask you some questions. This survey will take about 10 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	89.1%
Probably vote	7.6%
50-50	3.3%
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	26.9%
Wrong track	73.1%

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

Very favorable	22.4%
Somewhat favorable	32.1%
Favorable	54.5%
Unfavorable	44.3%
Somewhat unfavorable	12.9%
Very unfavorable	31.4%
Don't have an opinion	1.1%

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

Very favorable	8.2%
Somewhat favorable	33.5%
Favorable	41.7%
Unfavorable	50.8%
Somewhat unfavorable	25.3%
Very unfavorable	25.6%
Don't have an opinion	7.5%

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

Very favorable	0.7%
Somewhat favorable	14.3%
Favorable	15.0%
Unfavorable	76.7%
Somewhat unfavorable	36.5%
Very unfavorable	40.2%
Don't have an opinion	8.3%

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

Barack Obama (D)	52.5%
Mitt Romney (R)	34.2%
Someone else	5.7%
Unsure	7.5%

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

Dianne Feinstein (D)	45.9%
Elizabeth Emken (R)	33.6%
Unsure	20.6%

[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 '14 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>52.5%</td> <td>No</td> <td>42.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>22.5%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>24.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>13.7%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>5.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>16.3%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>11.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>5.3%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	52.5%	No	42.2%	Strongly Yes	22.5%	Strongly No	24.8%	Somewhat Yes	13.7%	Somewhat No	5.5%	Leaning Yes	16.3%	Leaning No	11.9%		Unsure	5.3%	
Yes	52.5%	No	42.2%																		
Strongly Yes	22.5%	Strongly No	24.8%																		
Somewhat Yes	13.7%	Somewhat No	5.5%																		
Leaning Yes	16.3%	Leaning No	11.9%																		
	Unsure	5.3%																			
<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>40.7%</td> <td>No</td> <td>34.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>6.2%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>9.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>11.4%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>8.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>23.1%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>16.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>24.9%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	40.7%	No	34.4%	Strongly Yes	6.2%	Strongly No	9.6%	Somewhat Yes	11.4%	Somewhat No	8.5%	Leaning Yes	23.1%	Leaning No	16.4%		Unsure	24.9%	
Yes	40.7%	No	34.4%																		
Strongly Yes	6.2%	Strongly No	9.6%																		
Somewhat Yes	11.4%	Somewhat No	8.5%																		
Leaning Yes	23.1%	Leaning No	16.4%																		
	Unsure	24.9%																			
<p>32 - POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY PAYROLL DEDUCTION. CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</p> <p>Restricts unions from using payroll-deducted funds for political purposes. Applies same use restrictions to payroll deductions, if any, by corporations or government contractors. Restricts union and corporate contributions to candidates and their committees. Limits 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>62.7%</td> <td>No</td> <td>28.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>27.8%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>13.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>14.5%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>5.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>20.3%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>9.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>9.1%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	62.7%	No	28.2%	Strongly Yes	27.8%	Strongly No	13.3%	Somewhat Yes	14.5%	Somewhat No	5.3%	Leaning Yes	20.3%	Leaning No	9.6%		Unsure	9.1%	
Yes	62.7%	No	28.2%																		
Strongly Yes	27.8%	Strongly No	13.3%																		
Somewhat Yes	14.5%	Somewhat No	5.3%																		
Leaning Yes	20.3%	Leaning No	9.6%																		
	Unsure	9.1%																			
<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>60.9%</td> <td>No</td> <td>24.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>18.1%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>9.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>15.9%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>8.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>26.8%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>7.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>14.2%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	60.9%	No	24.9%	Strongly Yes	18.1%	Strongly No	9.0%	Somewhat Yes	15.9%	Somewhat No	8.0%	Leaning Yes	26.8%	Leaning No	7.9%		Unsure	14.2%	
Yes	60.9%	No	24.9%																		
Strongly Yes	18.1%	Strongly No	9.0%																		
Somewhat Yes	15.9%	Somewhat No	8.0%																		
Leaning Yes	26.8%	Leaning No	7.9%																		
	Unsure	14.2%																			
<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>35.9%</td> <td>No</td> <td>55.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>16.6%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>37.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>9.4%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>8.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>9.9%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>9.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>8.3%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	35.9%	No	55.7%	Strongly Yes	16.6%	Strongly No	37.8%	Somewhat Yes	9.4%	Somewhat No	8.2%	Leaning Yes	9.9%	Leaning No	9.7%		Unsure	8.3%	
Yes	35.9%	No	55.7%																		
Strongly Yes	16.6%	Strongly No	37.8%																		
Somewhat Yes	9.4%	Somewhat No	8.2%																		
Leaning Yes	9.9%	Leaning No	9.7%																		
	Unsure	8.3%																			
<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>83.6%</td> <td>No</td> <td>9.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>50.7%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>1.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>14.3%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>2.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>18.6%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>4.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>7.2%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	83.6%	No	9.2%	Strongly Yes	50.7%	Strongly No	1.9%	Somewhat Yes	14.3%	Somewhat No	2.5%	Leaning Yes	18.6%	Leaning No	4.9%		Unsure	7.2%	
Yes	83.6%	No	9.2%																		
Strongly Yes	50.7%	Strongly No	1.9%																		
Somewhat Yes	14.3%	Somewhat No	2.5%																		
Leaning Yes	18.6%	Leaning No	4.9%																		
	Unsure	7.2%																			

<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 border="0"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>77.9%</td> <td>No</td> <td>15.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>28.6%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>5.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>24.6%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>3.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>24.7%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>6.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsure</td> <td>6.6%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	77.9%	No	15.5%	Strongly Yes	28.6%	Strongly No	5.5%	Somewhat Yes	24.6%	Somewhat No	3.7%	Leaning Yes	24.7%	Leaning No	6.2%	Unsure	6.6%		
Yes	77.9%	No	15.5%																		
Strongly Yes	28.6%	Strongly No	5.5%																		
Somewhat Yes	24.6%	Somewhat No	3.7%																		
Leaning Yes	24.7%	Leaning No	6.2%																		
Unsure	6.6%																				
<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 border="0"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>69.4%</td> <td>No</td> <td>21.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>33.6%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>6.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>17.8%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>4.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>17.9%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>10.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsure</td> <td>8.9%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	69.4%	No	21.8%	Strongly Yes	33.6%	Strongly No	6.8%	Somewhat Yes	17.8%	Somewhat No	4.7%	Leaning Yes	17.9%	Leaning No	10.3%	Unsure	8.9%		
Yes	69.4%	No	21.8%																		
Strongly Yes	33.6%	Strongly No	6.8%																		
Somewhat Yes	17.8%	Somewhat No	4.7%																		
Leaning Yes	17.9%	Leaning No	10.3%																		
Unsure	8.9%																				
<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 border="0"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>42.4%</td> <td>No</td> <td>47.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>10.9%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>25.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>13.4%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>9.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>18.1%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>13.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsure</td> <td>10.0%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	42.4%	No	47.7%	Strongly Yes	10.9%	Strongly No	25.3%	Somewhat Yes	13.4%	Somewhat No	9.3%	Leaning Yes	18.1%	Leaning No	13.1%	Unsure	10.0%		
Yes	42.4%	No	47.7%																		
Strongly Yes	10.9%	Strongly No	25.3%																		
Somewhat Yes	13.4%	Somewhat No	9.3%																		
Leaning Yes	18.1%	Leaning No	13.1%																		
Unsure	10.0%																				
<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 border="0"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>61.7%</td> <td>No</td> <td>27.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>17.6%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>12.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>19.7%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>6.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>24.4%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>7.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsure</td> <td>11.3%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	61.7%	No	27.1%	Strongly Yes	17.6%	Strongly No	12.4%	Somewhat Yes	19.7%	Somewhat No	6.8%	Leaning Yes	24.4%	Leaning No	7.8%	Unsure	11.3%		
Yes	61.7%	No	27.1%																		
Strongly Yes	17.6%	Strongly No	12.4%																		
Somewhat Yes	19.7%	Somewhat No	6.8%																		
Leaning Yes	24.4%	Leaning No	7.8%																		
Unsure	11.3%																				
<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 border="0"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>45.3%</td> <td>No</td> <td>25.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>13.0%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>8.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>13.0%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>5.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>19.3%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>10.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsure</td> <td>29.6%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	45.3%	No	25.1%	Strongly Yes	13.0%	Strongly No	8.8%	Somewhat Yes	13.0%	Somewhat No	5.6%	Leaning Yes	19.3%	Leaning No	10.7%	Unsure	29.6%		
Yes	45.3%	No	25.1%																		
Strongly Yes	13.0%	Strongly No	8.8%																		
Somewhat Yes	13.0%	Somewhat No	5.6%																		
Leaning Yes	19.3%	Leaning No	10.7%																		
Unsure	29.6%																				

Proposition 30

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	8.2%	36.1%	15.8%	18.6%	22.5%
Somewhat Yes	7.8%	15.9%	18.0%	15.3%	13.7%
Leaning Yes	11.9%	19.6%	16.1%	19.3%	16.3%
Yes	27.9%	71.6%	49.9%	53.2%	52.5%
No	67.0%	22.3%	45.9%	43.4%	42.2%
Leaning No	15.4%	7.7%	15.2%	11.7%	11.9%
Somewhat No	8.0%	4.8%	3.6%	5.9%	5.5%
Strongly No	43.6%	9.8%	27.0%	25.8%	24.8%
Unsure	5.1%	6.1%	4.3%	3.5%	5.3%

Proposition 31

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	7.1%	6.1%	5.0%	8.6%	6.2%
Somewhat Yes	6.8%	11.9%	17.5%	12.5%	11.4%
Leaning Yes	23.8%	26.0%	16.0%	21.5%	23.1%
Yes	37.7%	44.0%	38.5%	42.6%	40.7%
No	32.1%	34.7%	36.9%	34.4%	34.4%
Leaning No	15.2%	17.1%	17.4%	18.7%	16.4%
Somewhat No	6.5%	9.8%	8.6%	3.7%	8.5%
Strongly No	10.3%	7.8%	10.9%	12.1%	9.6%
Unsure	30.2%	21.3%	24.6%	23.0%	24.9%

Proposition 32

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	38.1%	17.6%	32.7%	32.9%	27.8%
Somewhat Yes	16.1%	13.9%	12.8%	14.2%	14.5%
Leaning Yes	19.8%	22.8%	16.3%	17.3%	20.3%
Yes	74.0%	54.4%	61.7%	64.5%	62.7%
No	20.1%	34.2%	28.7%	28.4%	28.2%
Leaning No	6.4%	12.7%	8.2%	9.0%	9.6%
Somewhat No	4.1%	6.2%	5.4%	4.0%	5.3%
Strongly No	9.6%	15.3%	15.2%	15.5%	13.3%
Unsure	5.9%	11.5%	9.6%	7.1%	9.1%

Proposition 33

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	16.3%	21.6%	14.2%	21.9%	18.1%
Somewhat Yes	18.4%	12.4%	19.0%	14.1%	15.9%
Leaning Yes	27.1%	25.9%	28.8%	29.5%	26.8%
Yes	61.8%	59.9%	62.1%	65.4%	60.9%
No	23.0%	25.6%	25.7%	25.2%	24.9%
Leaning No	9.8%	7.1%	7.1%	7.0%	7.9%
Somewhat No	6.6%	8.7%	9.0%	7.1%	8.0%
Strongly No	6.5%	9.8%	9.6%	11.1%	9.0%
Unsure	15.3%	14.5%	12.2%	9.3%	14.2%

Proposition 34

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	5.7%	21.0%	23.4%	17.7%	16.6%
Somewhat Yes	6.6%	10.5%	11.7%	7.8%	9.4%
Leaning Yes	7.2%	10.7%	12.4%	8.9%	9.9%
Yes	19.5%	42.2%	47.5%	34.5%	35.9%
No	74.0%	49.3%	41.8%	58.8%	55.7%
Leaning No	11.6%	10.4%	5.7%	11.3%	9.7%
Somewhat No	9.4%	6.4%	10.1%	7.3%	8.2%
Strongly No	52.9%	32.5%	26.0%	40.2%	37.8%
Unsure	6.5%	8.5%	10.6%	6.7%	8.3%

Proposition 35

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	51.7%	52.7%	46.2%	47.7%	50.7%
Somewhat Yes	15.3%	14.5%	12.5%	11.1%	14.3%
Leaning Yes	19.0%	21.2%	11.9%	18.4%	18.6%
Yes	86.0%	88.4%	70.7%	77.2%	83.6%
No	6.1%	7.0%	18.5%	11.5%	9.2%
Leaning No	3.5%	4.1%	8.9%	6.3%	4.9%
Somewhat No	1.3%	2.0%	5.4%	3.2%	2.5%
Strongly No	1.4%	.9%	4.2%	2.1%	1.9%
Unsure	7.9%	4.6%	10.9%	11.3%	7.2%

Proposition 36

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	18.4%	36.7%	27.4%	32.5%	28.6%
Somewhat Yes	19.5%	27.2%	26.7%	20.4%	24.6%
Leaning Yes	29.9%	21.6%	22.8%	26.9%	24.7%
Yes	67.9%	85.6%	76.9%	79.9%	77.9%
No	24.1%	8.1%	17.7%	16.2%	15.5%
Leaning No	6.7%	4.9%	8.1%	9.4%	6.2%
Somewhat No	7.0%	1.6%	3.2%	2.5%	3.7%
Strongly No	10.4%	1.6%	6.4%	4.4%	5.5%
Unsure	8.0%	6.3%	5.4%	3.9%	6.6%

Proposition 37

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	26.6%	38.5%	33.2%	37.2%	33.6%
Somewhat Yes	14.6%	19.9%	19.3%	18.0%	17.8%
Leaning Yes	19.6%	18.7%	12.9%	12.9%	17.9%
Yes	60.7%	77.1%	65.3%	68.0%	69.4%
No	27.6%	13.1%	31.7%	23.1%	21.8%
Leaning No	10.6%	7.3%	16.5%	11.3%	10.3%
Somewhat No	5.3%	3.3%	6.9%	3.3%	4.7%
Strongly No	11.7%	2.5%	8.3%	8.5%	6.8%
Unsure	11.7%	9.7%	3.0%	8.9%	8.9%

Proposition 38

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	3.2%	17.1%	9.5%	8.2%	10.9%
Somewhat Yes	7.3%	18.3%	13.0%	8.9%	13.4%
Leaning Yes	9.9%	23.3%	19.5%	17.9%	18.1%
Yes	20.4%	58.7%	42.0%	35.0%	42.4%
No	68.0%	31.2%	51.6%	51.0%	47.7%
Leaning No	16.3%	11.3%	12.4%	16.7%	13.1%
Somewhat No	9.5%	10.3%	7.1%	9.2%	9.3%
Strongly No	42.2%	9.5%	32.2%	25.1%	25.3%
Unsure	11.6%	10.2%	6.4%	14.0%	10.0%

Proposition 39

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	8.4%	21.8%	21.9%	19.4%	17.6%
Somewhat Yes	13.8%	26.0%	15.8%	15.8%	19.7%
Leaning Yes	21.0%	27.9%	23.2%	24.0%	24.4%
Yes	43.2%	75.7%	60.9%	59.2%	61.7%
No	42.4%	13.0%	32.2%	28.1%	27.1%
Leaning No	11.0%	5.5%	7.7%	8.2%	7.8%
Somewhat No	9.6%	3.9%	9.0%	9.2%	6.8%
Strongly No	21.8%	3.6%	15.5%	10.7%	12.4%
Unsure	14.3%	11.3%	6.9%	12.6%	11.3%

Proposition 40

	Rep	Dem	DTS/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	14.2%	12.3%	13.0%	11.9%	13.0%
Somewhat Yes	8.7%	12.4%	21.3%	11.5%	13.0%
Leaning Yes	20.0%	20.6%	15.1%	24.2%	19.3%
Yes	42.9%	45.4%	49.4%	47.7%	45.3%
No	28.5%	22.3%	24.6%	27.8%	25.1%
Leaning No	11.0%	11.1%	9.4%	14.3%	10.7%
Somewhat No	4.7%	6.5%	4.2%	3.3%	5.6%
Strongly No	12.8%	4.8%	11.1%	10.3%	8.8%
Unsure	28.6%	32.3%	26.0%	24.5%	29.6%

[SECTION: DEMOGRAPHICS]

10. What is your current party registration?

Republican	32.8%
Democratic	45.0%
Decline to State/Independent	21.2%
Another political party	.9%

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

Straight Republican	8.9%
Mostly Republican	22.0%
A few more Republicans than Democrats	8.0%
Equally both parties	6.5%
A few more Democrats than Republicans	7.1%
Mostly Democratic	29.2%
Straight Democratic	16.4%
Other/prefer third party	1.9%

12. How would you describe your political ideology?

Very conservative	8.2%
Somewhat conservative	29.2%
Somewhat liberal	25.9%
Very liberal	13.1%
Moderate/Independent	19.4%
Libertarian	2.1%
Other	2.1%

13. Are you male or female?

Male	47.7%
Female	52.3%

14. Which of the following categories reflects your age?

18 to 29	12.9%
30 to 39	13.6%
40 to 49	20.2%
50 to 59	27.4%
60 and above	25.9%

15. Which of the following best describes you:

White/Non Hispanic	67.7%
Latino/Hispanic	17.3%
Black/African American	5.5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	8.2%
Other	1.2%

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

Yes, public employee union	13.2%
Yes, private employee union	5.7%
Yes, both	2.6%
No	78.5%

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

1 st -11 th grade	.5%
High school graduate	8.7%
Non-college post high school / Technical School	4.6%
Some-college/Two-year college/Associate's degree	42.0%
Four-year college graduate/Bachelor's degree	26.6%
Post-graduate school	17.7%

18. In which part of California do you reside?

Los Angeles	26.7%
Orange County	10.2%
Inland Empire	9.7%
San Diego	8.9%
Central Valley	16.0%
Central Coast	2.9%
Bay Area	22.1%
Northern/Sierra	3.5%

*"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.