

CBRT Pepperdine Initiative Test  
M4 Strategies  
PROJ-12-07-948  
Sample: 802 Likely General Election California Voters  
Mode: Online  
Fielding Dates: 09/09/2012 – 09/12/2012  
TOPLINE FINAL

Swing determined by Q17 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 = +/- 3.5% at 95<sup>th</sup> percent confidence interval

Data weighted by Party, Gender, Ethnicity, Education, Geography, Age

-----  
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	90.1%
Probably vote	6.2%
50-50	3.7%
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	33.2%
Wrong track	66.8%

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

Very favorable	27.5%
Somewhat favorable	30.3%
<b>Favorable</b>	<b>57.8%</b>
<b>Unfavorable</b>	<b>40.8%</b>
Somewhat unfavorable	12.4%
Very unfavorable	28.4%
Don't have an opinion	1.4%

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

Very favorable	9.5%
Somewhat favorable	38.0%
<b>Favorable</b>	<b>47.4%</b>
<b>Unfavorable</b>	<b>46.8%</b>
Somewhat unfavorable	21.9%
Very unfavorable	24.9%
Don't have an opinion	5.8%

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

Very favorable	1.6%
Somewhat favorable	16.1%
<b>Favorable</b>	<b>17.7%</b>
<b>Unfavorable</b>	<b>74.2%</b>
Somewhat unfavorable	35.8%
Very unfavorable	38.5%
Don't have an opinion	8.1%

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

Barack Obama (D)	55.4%
Mitt Romney (R)	33.4%
Someone else	4.2%
Unsure	6.9%

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

Dianne Feinstein (D)	52.4%
Elizabeth Emken (R)	30.4%
Unsure	17.3%

[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><b>30 - TEMPORARY TAXES TO FUND EDUCATION. GUARANTEED LOCAL PUBLIC SAFETY FUNDING. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.</b></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><b>Yes</b></td> <td><b>54.4%</b></td> <td><b>No</b></td> <td><b>39.9%</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>20.9%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>23.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>15.4%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>5.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>18.2%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>10.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>5.7%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>54.4%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>39.9%</b>	Strongly Yes	20.9%	Strongly No	23.7%	Somewhat Yes	15.4%	Somewhat No	5.6%	Leaning Yes	18.2%	Leaning No	10.6%		Unsure	5.7%	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>54.4%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>39.9%</b>																		
Strongly Yes	20.9%	Strongly No	23.7%																		
Somewhat Yes	15.4%	Somewhat No	5.6%																		
Leaning Yes	18.2%	Leaning No	10.6%																		
	Unsure	5.7%																			
<p><b>31 - STATE BUDGET. STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE.</b></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><b>Yes</b></td> <td><b>41.2%</b></td> <td><b>No</b></td> <td><b>36.7%</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>7.0%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>9.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>11.0%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>8.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>23.2%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>18.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>22.0%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>41.2%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>36.7%</b>	Strongly Yes	7.0%	Strongly No	9.6%	Somewhat Yes	11.0%	Somewhat No	8.8%	Leaning Yes	23.2%	Leaning No	18.3%		Unsure	22.0%	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>41.2%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>36.7%</b>																		
Strongly Yes	7.0%	Strongly No	9.6%																		
Somewhat Yes	11.0%	Somewhat No	8.8%																		
Leaning Yes	23.2%	Leaning No	18.3%																		
	Unsure	22.0%																			
<p><b>32 - POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY PAYROLL DEDUCTION. CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</b></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><b>Yes</b></td> <td><b>53.0%</b></td> <td><b>No</b></td> <td><b>37.1%</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>24.6%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>19.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>14.0%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>6.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>14.4%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>10.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>9.9%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>53.0%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>37.1%</b>	Strongly Yes	24.6%	Strongly No	19.7%	Somewhat Yes	14.0%	Somewhat No	6.5%	Leaning Yes	14.4%	Leaning No	10.9%		Unsure	9.9%	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>53.0%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>37.1%</b>																		
Strongly Yes	24.6%	Strongly No	19.7%																		
Somewhat Yes	14.0%	Somewhat No	6.5%																		
Leaning Yes	14.4%	Leaning No	10.9%																		
	Unsure	9.9%																			
<p><b>33- AUTO INSURANCE COMPANIES. PRICES BASED ON DRIVER'S HISTORY OF INSURANCE COVERAGE. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</b></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><b>Yes</b></td> <td><b>55.4%</b></td> <td><b>No</b></td> <td><b>33.7%</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>13.8%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>12.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>17.0%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>6.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>24.6%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>14.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>10.9%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>55.4%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>33.7%</b>	Strongly Yes	13.8%	Strongly No	12.5%	Somewhat Yes	17.0%	Somewhat No	6.9%	Leaning Yes	24.6%	Leaning No	14.3%		Unsure	10.9%	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>55.4%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>33.7%</b>																		
Strongly Yes	13.8%	Strongly No	12.5%																		
Somewhat Yes	17.0%	Somewhat No	6.9%																		
Leaning Yes	24.6%	Leaning No	14.3%																		
	Unsure	10.9%																			
<p><b>34 – DEATH PENALTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</b></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><b>Yes</b></td> <td><b>42.5%</b></td> <td><b>No</b></td> <td><b>50.5%</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>21.8%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>29.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>10.4%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>9.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>10.4%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>11.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>7.0%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>42.5%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>50.5%</b>	Strongly Yes	21.8%	Strongly No	29.9%	Somewhat Yes	10.4%	Somewhat No	9.2%	Leaning Yes	10.4%	Leaning No	11.3%		Unsure	7.0%	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>42.5%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>50.5%</b>																		
Strongly Yes	21.8%	Strongly No	29.9%																		
Somewhat Yes	10.4%	Somewhat No	9.2%																		
Leaning Yes	10.4%	Leaning No	11.3%																		
	Unsure	7.0%																			
<p><b>35 - HUMAN TRAFFICKING. PENALTIES. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</b></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><b>Yes</b></td> <td><b>84.2%</b></td> <td><b>No</b></td> <td><b>9.6%</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>47.3%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>3.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>18.0%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>2.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>18.9%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>3.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Unsure</td> <td>6.2%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>84.2%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>9.6%</b>	Strongly Yes	47.3%	Strongly No	3.6%	Somewhat Yes	18.0%	Somewhat No	2.4%	Leaning Yes	18.9%	Leaning No	3.7%		Unsure	6.2%	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>84.2%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>9.6%</b>																		
Strongly Yes	47.3%	Strongly No	3.6%																		
Somewhat Yes	18.0%	Somewhat No	2.4%																		
Leaning Yes	18.9%	Leaning No	3.7%																		
	Unsure	6.2%																			

<p><b>36 – THREE STRIKES LAW. REPEAT FELONY OFFENDERS. PENALTIES. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</b></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><b>Yes</b></td> <td><b>81.1%</b></td> <td><b>No</b></td> <td><b>13.1%</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>31.1%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>6.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>23.3%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>2.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>26.6%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>3.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsure</td> <td>5.9%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>81.1%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>13.1%</b>	Strongly Yes	31.1%	Strongly No	6.8%	Somewhat Yes	23.3%	Somewhat No	2.6%	Leaning Yes	26.6%	Leaning No	3.7%	Unsure	5.9%		
<b>Yes</b>	<b>81.1%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>13.1%</b>																		
Strongly Yes	31.1%	Strongly No	6.8%																		
Somewhat Yes	23.3%	Somewhat No	2.6%																		
Leaning Yes	26.6%	Leaning No	3.7%																		
Unsure	5.9%																				
<p><b>37 - GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOODS. LABELING. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</b></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><b>Yes</b></td> <td><b>66.8%</b></td> <td><b>No</b></td> <td><b>26.3%</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>32.4%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>8.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>14.6%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>6.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>19.8%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>10.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsure</td> <td>6.9%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>66.8%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>26.3%</b>	Strongly Yes	32.4%	Strongly No	8.8%	Somewhat Yes	14.6%	Somewhat No	6.6%	Leaning Yes	19.8%	Leaning No	10.8%	Unsure	6.9%		
<b>Yes</b>	<b>66.8%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>26.3%</b>																		
Strongly Yes	32.4%	Strongly No	8.8%																		
Somewhat Yes	14.6%	Somewhat No	6.6%																		
Leaning Yes	19.8%	Leaning No	10.8%																		
Unsure	6.9%																				
<p><b>38 - TAX TO FUND EDUCATION AND EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</b></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><b>Yes</b></td> <td><b>43.4%</b></td> <td><b>No</b></td> <td><b>46.9%</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>12.7%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>24.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>11.7%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>8.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>19.1%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>14.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsure</td> <td>9.7%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>43.4%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>46.9%</b>	Strongly Yes	12.7%	Strongly No	24.0%	Somewhat Yes	11.7%	Somewhat No	8.8%	Leaning Yes	19.1%	Leaning No	14.1%	Unsure	9.7%		
<b>Yes</b>	<b>43.4%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>46.9%</b>																		
Strongly Yes	12.7%	Strongly No	24.0%																		
Somewhat Yes	11.7%	Somewhat No	8.8%																		
Leaning Yes	19.1%	Leaning No	14.1%																		
Unsure	9.7%																				
<p><b>39 - TAX TREATMENT FOR MULTISTATE BUSINESSES. CLEAN ENERGY AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY FUNDING. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</b></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><b>Yes</b></td> <td><b>57.2%</b></td> <td><b>No</b></td> <td><b>29.2%</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>18.9%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>14.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>14.8%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>4.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>23.5%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>11.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsure</td> <td>13.6%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>57.2%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>29.2%</b>	Strongly Yes	18.9%	Strongly No	14.2%	Somewhat Yes	14.8%	Somewhat No	4.0%	Leaning Yes	23.5%	Leaning No	11.0%	Unsure	13.6%		
<b>Yes</b>	<b>57.2%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>29.2%</b>																		
Strongly Yes	18.9%	Strongly No	14.2%																		
Somewhat Yes	14.8%	Somewhat No	4.0%																		
Leaning Yes	23.5%	Leaning No	11.0%																		
Unsure	13.6%																				
<p><b>40 - REDISTRICTING. STATE SENATE DISTRICTS. REFERENDUM.</b></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><b>Yes</b></td> <td><b>43.9%</b></td> <td><b>No</b></td> <td><b>26.3%</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Yes</td> <td>13.5%</td> <td>Strongly No</td> <td>7.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Somewhat Yes</td> <td>13.1%</td> <td>Somewhat No</td> <td>4.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leaning Yes</td> <td>17.2%</td> <td>Leaning No</td> <td>13.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsure</td> <td>29.8%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>43.9%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>26.3%</b>	Strongly Yes	13.5%	Strongly No	7.9%	Somewhat Yes	13.1%	Somewhat No	4.5%	Leaning Yes	17.2%	Leaning No	13.9%	Unsure	29.8%		
<b>Yes</b>	<b>43.9%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>26.3%</b>																		
Strongly Yes	13.5%	Strongly No	7.9%																		
Somewhat Yes	13.1%	Somewhat No	4.5%																		
Leaning Yes	17.2%	Leaning No	13.9%																		
Unsure	29.8%																				

### Proposition 30

	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	4.7%	32.3%	20.5%	15.5%	20.9%
Somewhat Yes	2.5%	22.4%	20.5%	13.6%	15.4%
Leaning Yes	12.1%	22.4%	19.6%	20.3%	18.2%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>19.3%</b>	<b>77.1%</b>	<b>60.6%</b>	<b>49.4%</b>	<b>54.4%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>75.7%</b>	<b>16.4%</b>	<b>34.7%</b>	<b>46.4%</b>	<b>39.9%</b>
Leaning No	16.2%	7.4%	9.3%	16.3%	10.6%
Somewhat No	9.1%	3.5%	4.4%	8.7%	5.6%
Strongly No	50.4%	5.5%	21.0%	21.3%	23.7%
Unsure	5.0%	6.5%	4.7%	4.2%	5.7%

### Proposition 31

	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	7.1%	6.8%	6.8%	7.2%	7.0%
Somewhat Yes	9.3%	11.2%	13.1%	13.6%	11.0%
Leaning Yes	25.8%	20.4%	24.6%	26.5%	23.2%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>42.2%</b>	<b>38.5%</b>	<b>44.5%</b>	<b>47.2%</b>	<b>41.2%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>37.4%</b>	<b>37.0%</b>	<b>35.3%</b>	<b>37.8%</b>	<b>36.7%</b>
Leaning No	18.2%	19.8%	15.1%	17.0%	18.3%
Somewhat No	7.7%	9.7%	8.9%	9.6%	8.8%
Strongly No	11.5%	7.4%	11.3%	11.2%	9.6%
Unsure	20.4%	24.6%	20.2%	15.0%	22.0%

### Proposition 32

	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	36.7%	14.1%	27.4%	27.5%	24.6%
Somewhat Yes	13.3%	12.5%	19.0%	14.9%	14.0%
Leaning Yes	13.1%	15.2%	15.2%	14.5%	14.4%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>63.2%</b>	<b>41.8%</b>	<b>61.6%</b>	<b>56.9%</b>	<b>53.0%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>29.1%</b>	<b>45.1%</b>	<b>32.1%</b>	<b>32.4%</b>	<b>37.1%</b>
Leaning No	7.7%	15.7%	6.0%	11.0%	10.9%
Somewhat No	5.8%	6.5%	7.3%	7.0%	6.5%
Strongly No	15.6%	22.9%	18.8%	14.4%	19.7%
Unsure	7.7%	13.1%	6.4%	10.6%	9.9%

### Proposition 33

	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	14.8%	11.6%	16.1%	18.8%	13.8%
Somewhat Yes	20.8%	15.7%	14.6%	14.5%	17.0%
Leaning Yes	25.4%	22.9%	27.7%	25.7%	24.6%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>61.0%</b>	<b>50.2%</b>	<b>58.3%</b>	<b>59.0%</b>	<b>55.4%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>31.2%</b>	<b>36.9%</b>	<b>29.7%</b>	<b>34.3%</b>	<b>33.7%</b>
Leaning No	11.3%	17.2%	11.9%	13.4%	14.3%
Somewhat No	5.5%	7.7%	7.6%	7.5%	6.9%
Strongly No	14.4%	12.1%	10.2%	13.4%	12.5%
Unsure	7.8%	12.9%	12.0%	6.6%	10.9%

### Proposition 34

	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	10.2%	27.7%	27.1%	15.0%	21.8%
Somewhat Yes	9.0%	11.1%	10.9%	8.5%	10.4%
Leaning Yes	7.6%	11.8%	10.8%	9.4%	10.4%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>26.7%</b>	<b>50.6%</b>	<b>48.8%</b>	<b>32.8%</b>	<b>42.5%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>68.6%</b>	<b>40.5%</b>	<b>44.4%</b>	<b>61.6%</b>	<b>50.5%</b>
Leaning No	8.9%	14.4%	8.8%	11.6%	11.3%
Somewhat No	12.0%	7.0%	10.0%	11.3%	9.2%
Strongly No	47.7%	19.0%	25.6%	38.6%	29.9%
Unsure	4.7%	8.9%	6.8%	5.6%	7.0%

### Proposition 35

	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	49.3%	45.1%	49.4%	44.5%	47.3%
Somewhat Yes	12.3%	20.9%	20.3%	19.6%	18.0%
Leaning Yes	21.8%	18.3%	16.2%	16.5%	18.9%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>83.4%</b>	<b>84.3%</b>	<b>85.9%</b>	<b>80.6%</b>	<b>84.2%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>11.9%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>8.4%</b>	<b>14.1%</b>	<b>9.6%</b>
Leaning No	2.9%	4.1%	3.3%	6.4%	3.7%
Somewhat No	2.6%	2.3%	2.1%	3.7%	2.4%
Strongly No	6.4%	1.9%	3.0%	3.9%	3.6%
Unsure	4.7%	7.3%	5.7%	5.4%	6.2%

### Proposition 36

	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	23.5%	34.9%	34.3%	25.9%	31.1%
Somewhat Yes	23.1%	20.9%	29.1%	22.3%	23.3%
Leaning Yes	29.6%	28.8%	17.5%	28.9%	26.6%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>76.2%</b>	<b>84.6%</b>	<b>80.8%</b>	<b>77.1%</b>	<b>81.1%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>15.8%</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>13.1%</b>
Leaning No	4.5%	2.6%	5.3%	2.5%	3.7%
Somewhat No	3.3%	2.5%	1.6%	3.5%	2.6%
Strongly No	9.5%	3.6%	8.9%	12.2%	6.8%
Unsure	6.5%	6.7%	3.3%	4.7%	5.9%

### Proposition 37

	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	20.4%	35.9%	43.6%	28.2%	32.4%
Somewhat Yes	12.5%	17.8%	10.6%	14.4%	14.6%
Leaning Yes	24.3%	19.2%	14.7%	20.0%	19.8%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>57.3%</b>	<b>73.0%</b>	<b>69.0%</b>	<b>62.6%</b>	<b>66.8%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>35.5%</b>	<b>19.7%</b>	<b>25.1%</b>	<b>30.4%</b>	<b>26.3%</b>
Leaning No	13.9%	7.6%	11.4%	15.9%	10.8%
Somewhat No	6.7%	6.8%	6.4%	4.0%	6.6%
Strongly No	14.8%	5.3%	7.4%	10.6%	8.8%
Unsure	7.3%	7.3%	5.9%	7.0%	6.9%

### Proposition 38

	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	5.9%	18.0%	11.0%	8.3%	12.7%
Somewhat Yes	4.6%	15.7%	14.1%	11.9%	11.7%
Leaning Yes	8.3%	28.4%	16.8%	19.7%	19.1%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>18.8%</b>	<b>62.0%</b>	<b>41.8%</b>	<b>39.9%</b>	<b>43.4%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>74.1%</b>	<b>26.3%</b>	<b>48.4%</b>	<b>53.4%</b>	<b>46.9%</b>
Leaning No	16.8%	10.3%	18.5%	15.5%	14.1%
Somewhat No	9.7%	7.2%	10.9%	11.8%	8.8%
Strongly No	47.6%	8.8%	18.9%	26.1%	24.0%
Unsure	7.2%	11.7%	9.8%	6.7%	9.7%

### Proposition 39

	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	7.7%	25.9%	20.8%	15.1%	18.9%
Somewhat Yes	9.8%	17.1%	17.4%	13.6%	14.8%
Leaning Yes	20.9%	26.0%	21.5%	26.0%	23.5%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>38.3%</b>	<b>69.0%</b>	<b>59.7%</b>	<b>54.6%</b>	<b>57.2%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>50.5%</b>	<b>14.4%</b>	<b>28.5%</b>	<b>30.5%</b>	<b>29.2%</b>
Leaning No	13.4%	8.8%	12.3%	12.1%	11.0%
Somewhat No	5.6%	2.0%	5.8%	3.5%	4.0%
Strongly No	31.5%	3.6%	10.3%	14.9%	14.2%
Unsure	11.2%	16.6%	11.8%	14.8%	13.6%

### Proposition 40

	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Total
Strongly Yes	8.9%	16.7%	14.0%	14.6%	13.5%
Somewhat Yes	8.3%	14.4%	17.4%	16.5%	13.1%
Leaning Yes	17.4%	17.4%	17.3%	20.5%	17.2%
<b>Yes</b>	<b>34.6%</b>	<b>48.5%</b>	<b>48.8%</b>	<b>51.6%</b>	<b>43.9%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>29.7%</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>26.4%</b>	<b>23.9%</b>	<b>26.3%</b>
Leaning No	9.1%	16.3%	15.7%	16.6%	13.9%
Somewhat No	6.5%	3.0%	4.9%	3.6%	4.5%
Strongly No	14.0%	4.4%	5.8%	3.7%	7.9%
Unsure	35.7%	27.8%	24.9%	24.5%	29.8%



10. Please read the following statements about the high speed rail project and indicate which statement you agree with most:

	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Total
We should keep funding the high speed rail project because it is creating badly needed jobs and because we need an economical and environmentally-friendly way to move people up and down our growing state.	19.9%	52.0%	41.7%	27.6%	39.0%
We should stop the high speed rail project because the taxpayer price tag has exploded from the advertised \$10 billion to nearly \$70 billion and we need to pay down our state debt and prioritize funding programs like education.	66.0%	30.5%	36.9%	57.1%	43.6%
Unsure/Don't know	14.1%	17.4%	21.4%	15.3%	17.4%

11. The California Legislature recently passed legislation designed to reform the California public employee pension system by increasing the retirement age for new employees, capping annual pension payouts at \$132,120, eliminating system abuses and increasing the amount public employees must contribute to their retirement. Please read the following statements and indicate which one you agree with most:

	Rep	Dem	NPP/Ind	Swing	Total
This legislation goes too far because it takes away the rights and promises of basic financial security made to the teachers, police officers, firefighters and nurses who have dedicated their lives to public service.	10.4%	25.7%	10.6%	21.2%	17.7%
This legislation is a balanced solution because it provides a sensible reform that saves taxpayers \$78 billion over the next 30 years and helps get our state and cities on a path of fiscal solvency.	21.1%	33.9%	36.2%	27.9%	30.1%
This legislation does not go far enough to solve the pension crisis and addresses less than 10% of the state's more than \$270 billion in unfunded pension costs.	53.2%	17.3%	39.4%	40.0%	33.8%
Unsure/Don't know	15.3%	23.1%	13.8%	10.9%	18.4%

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

Prop 30	21.1%
Prop 31	6.8%
Prop 32	14.4%
Prop 33	4.1%
Prop 34	6.3%
Prop 35	4.2%
Prop 36	4.8%
Prop 37	8.8%
Prop 38	6.0%
Prop 39	3.8%
Prop 40	3.5%
None of the above	64.7%

13. 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	29.3%
Official voter information guide	43.1%
Mailers	9.9%
TV advertisements	14.7%
Radio advertisements	9.3%
Print advertisements	7.7%
Professional association	7.5%
Newspapers	39.4%
Internet	44.5%
Other news sources	28.1%
Canvassers/people at door	.8%
Other	17.7%

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

Friends – word of mouth	6.3%
Official voter information guide	24.6%
Mailers	.7%
TV advertisements	3.3%
Radio advertisements	1.6%
Print advertisements	.4%
Professional association	2.0%
Newspapers	14.3%
Internet	18.9%
Other news sources	9.8%
Canvassers	.2%
Other	17.9%

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

Vote at polling place	39.2%
Vote by mail	54.5%
Not sure	6.3%

16. What is your current party registration?

Republican	33.0%
Democratic	45.0%
No Party Preference/Independent	21.0%
Another political party	.9%

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

Straight Republican	10.1%
Mostly Republican	17.8%
A few more Republicans than Democrats	6.9%
Equally both parties	8.7%
A few more Democrats than Republicans	7.6%
Mostly Democratic	28.7%
Straight Democratic	18.3%
Other/prefer third party	1.9%

18. How would you describe your political ideology?

Very conservative	11.5%
Somewhat conservative	22.0%
Somewhat liberal	27.1%
Very liberal	14.7%
Moderate/Independent	19.6%
Libertarian	4.3%
Other	.8%

19. Are you male or female?

Male	48.2%
Female	51.8%

20. Which of the following categories reflects your age?

17 and under	[TERMINATE]
18 to 29	13.1%
30 to 39	12.9%
40 to 49	20.1%
50 to 59	27.8%
60 and above	26.1%

21. Which of the following best describes you:

White/Non Hispanic	69.2%
Latino/Hispanic	17.1%
Black/African American	5.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	7.8%
Other	.9%

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

Yes, public employee union	16.1%
Yes, private employee union	6.6%
Yes, both	2.1%
No	75.2%

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

1 <sup>st</sup> -11 <sup>th</sup> grade	1.4%
High school graduate	15.6%
Non-college post high school / Technical School	2.9%
Some-college/Two-year college/Associate's degree	33.3%
Four-year college graduate/Bachelor's degree	24.6%
Post-graduate school	22.3%

24. In which part of California do you reside?

Los Angeles	26.7%
Orange County	9.9%
Inland Empire	10.1%
San Diego	9.2%
Central Valley	16.6%
Central Coast	2.9%
Bay Area	21.7%
Northern/Sierra	3.0%

"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.