

THE INDEPENDENT AND NON-PARTISAN SURVEY OF PUBLIC OPINION ESTABLISHED IN 1947 AS THE CALIFORNIA POLL BY MERVIN FIELD

Field Research Corporation

601 California Street, Suite 900 San Francisco, CA 94108-2814 (415) 392-5763 FAX: (415) 434-2541 EMAIL: fieldpoll@field.com www.field.com/fieldpollonline

COPYRIGHT 2010 BY FIELD RESEARCH CORPORATION.

Release #2342

STATE BALLOT PROPOSITIONS: MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION NARROWLY OPPOSED. LARGE MAJORITY FAVORS CHANGING VOTE NEEDED TO PASS STATE BUDGET. PLURALITIES OPPOSE SUSPENDING AB32, FAVOR WATER BONDS. Release Date: Friday, July 9, 2010

IMPORTANT: Contract for this service is subject to revocation if publication or broadcast takes place before release date or if contents are divulged to persons outside of subscriber staff prior to release time. (ISSN 0195-4520)

By Mark DiCamillo and Mervin Field

The latest *Field Poll* finds likely voters are lining up against Proposition 19, the marijuana legalization initiative, by a narrow 48% to 44% margin. Voters are also opposing Prop. 23, the initiative to suspend AB32, California's greenhouse gas reduction law 48% to 36%.

By a 65% to 20% margin voters are strongly supporting Prop. 25 which calls for requiring only a majority vote to approve the state budget while retaining a two-thirds vote to increase taxes. Prop. 18, the \$11.1 billion state bond measure to fund water supply and protection facilities, is supported by a 42% to 32% plurality.

In its most recent statewide survey *The Field Poll* measured current voter awareness and sentiment toward four of the ten propositions slated to appear on California's November general election ballot. The survey was conducted June 22-July 5 among 1,005 likely voters in California's upcoming November general election. To enable the poll to more closely examine the preferences of the state's racial/ethnic voter populations, the survey was conducted in six languages and dialects – English, Spanish, Cantonese, Mandarin, Korean and Vietnamese.

Voter awareness of four statewide ballot propositions varies widely

Voter awareness of the four ballot measures varies widely. Best known is Prop. 19, the marijuana legalization initiative. Greater than three in four likely voters (77%) report some familiarity with this measure. A majority of voters (56%) has also heard of Prop. 25, the measure to change the vote requirement needed to pass the state budget. Fewer have heard of two other propositions, with 39% aware of Prop. 23 to suspend AB 32, the state's greenhouse gas reduction law, and just 24% familiar with Prop. 18 relating to state water bonds.

Table 1

Voter awareness of four statewide ballot propositions on California's November general election ballot (among likely voters)

	Have seen, heard	Haven't seen or heard
Prop. 19 (Marijuana Legalization)	77%	23
Prop. 25 (Majority Vote for State Budget / 2/3 Vote for Tax Increases)	56%	44
Prop. 23 (Suspends State's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Law)	39%	61
Prop. 18 (Water Bonds)	24%	76

Prop. 19 (Marijuana Legalization)

Voter sentiment on Prop. 19 is closely divided, with more voters now opposing it (48%) than in favor (44%). Prop. 19 would allow people 21 years or older to possess, cultivate or transport marijuana for personal use and permit local governments to regulate and tax its commercial production and sales.

The three-fourths majority of voters who had some awareness of the measure prior to being surveyed are narrowly favoring its passage – 48% to 44%. However, Prop. 19 is opposed nearly two-to-one among the 23% of voters who had no prior awareness of the initiative.

There are large partisan differences in voting preferences on Prop. 19. While Democrats are backing it 53% to 38%, a two-to-one majority of Republicans (63% to 31%) are opposed. Non-partisans are evenly divided 46% to 46%.

There is majority support for Prop. 19's passage (53% Yes vs. 38% No) among voters in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. Los Angeles County voters are about evenly divided (46% Yes vs. 47% No). However, in all other regions of the state sentiment is running against Prop. 19 by margins ranging from six to eighteen percentage points.

Men are split on the measure (48% Yes vs. 47% No), while women are on the No side 50% to 41%.

A small plurality of white non-Hispanics (48% to 43%) favors Prop. 19's passage. However, each of the racial/ethnic subgroups measured in the survey – Latinos, African-Americans and Asian-Americans – are opposed to Prop. 19 by double-digit margins.

Voters age 18 – 29 age are supporting the marijuana initiative 52% to 39%. However, the survey finds that there are significant preference differences between younger voters who are white non-Hispanic and ethnic voters. While younger white non-Hispanic voters favor the initiative 53% to 35, younger ethnic voters oppose it five to four (52% to 45%).

Voters between ages 30-64 are generally divided in their preferences. However, voters age 65 and older are opposing the initiative by a big margin (57% to 33%).

Table 2
Voter preferences regarding Proposition 19,
the marijuana legalization initiative
(among likely voters)

(umong m	Would vote		
	Yes	No	Undecided
Total statewide	44%	48	8
Voter awareness of Prop. 19			
(.77) Have seen or heard	48%	44	8
(.23) Haven't seen or heard	32%	61	7
Party registration			
(.44) Democrats	53%	38	9
(.34) Republicans	31%	63	6
(.22) Non-partisans/others	46%	46	8
Region			
(.25) Los Angeles County	46%	47	7
(.18) San Diego/Orange	39%	54	7
(.14) Other Southern California	46%	52	2
(.16) Central Valley	36%	54	10
(.21) San Francisco Bay Area	53%	38	9
(.06) Other Northern California*	37%	49	14
<u>Gender</u>			
(.48) Male	48%	47	5
(.52) Female	41%	50	9
Age			
(.16) 18 - 29	52%	39	9
$(.13)\ 30 - 39$	46%	47	7
(.20) 40 - 49	45%	50	5
(.27) 50 - 64	48%	46	6
(.24) 65 or older	33%	57	10
Race/ethnicity			
(.69) White non-Hispanic	48%	43	9
(.18) Latino	36%	62	2
(.06) African-American	40%	52	8
(.07) Asian-American/other	33%	62	11
Age/ethnicity			
(.16) 18 – 39 White non-Hispanic	53%	35	12
(.34) 40 – 64 White non-Hispanic	51%	43	6
(.19) 65 or older White non-Hispanic	37%	52	11
(.13) 18 – 39 Ethnic voter	45%	52	3
(.13) 40 – 64 Ethnic voter	33%	61	6
(.05) 65 or older Ethnic voter	16%	81	3

^{*} Small sample size.

Prop. 25 (Majority Vote for State Budget/Retain a 2/3 Vote for Tax Increases)

A greater three-to-one majority of voters (65% to 20%) favors Prop. 25. This proposition calls for reducing the vote needed in the state legislature to pass a budget from a two-thirds majority to a simple (50% plus one) majority, while retaining a two-thirds vote to increase taxes.

The survey finds that majorities of Democrats, Republicans, non-partisans, conservatives, middle-of-the-roaders and liberals are currently supporting Prop. 25. There is also little difference in voter sentiments between those who had some prior awareness of the measure and those who did not.

Table 3

Voter preferences toward Proposition 25,
changing the vote required to pass the state budget from 2/3 to a simple majority, while retaining 2/3 vote to approve tax increases (among likely voters)

	Would vote		
	Yes	No	Undecided
Total statewide	65%	20	15
Awareness of Prop. 25			
(.56) Have seen or heard	65%	23	12
(.44) Haven't seen or heard	65%	18	17
Party registration			
(.44) Democrats	73%	15	12
(.34) Republicans	58%	25	17
(.22) Non-partisans/others	58%	25	17
Political ideology			
(.35) Conservative	55%	29	16
(.39) Middle-of-the-road	72%	14	14
(.26) Liberal	68%	19	13

Prop. 23 (Suspends State's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Law)

The Field Poll also tested voter sentiment toward Prop. 23, the initiative to suspend the state's greenhouse gas reduction law, AB32. The survey finds a plurality of voters (48% to 36%) are initially lining up against it.

Among the 39% of voters who had some awareness of Prop. 23 prior to being surveyed, opinions are about evenly divided (44% Yes vs. 45% No). However, voters who reported having no previous awareness of the initiative are lining up against it 50% to 31% when read a summary of its official description.

Democrats and non-partisans are most opposed to the initiative, while Republicans are in favor.

Pluralities of Republicans, voters age 30-39, those with no more than a high school education and African-Americans favor Prop. 23.

Table 4
Voter preferences toward Proposition 23 to suspend AB32, the state law that requires reduced greenhouse gas emissions (among likely voters)

Total statewide 7es No Undecided Voter awareness of Prop. 23 (.39) Have seen or heard 44% 45 11 (.61) Haven't seen or heard 31% 50 19 Party registration """">"""""""""""""""""""""""""""""""		Would vote			
Voter awareness of Prop. 23 (.39) Have seen or heard 44% 45 11 (.61) Haven't seen or heard 31% 50 19 Party registration (.44) Democrats 31% 57 12 (.34) Republicans 47% 33 20 (.22) Non-partisans/others 29% 53 18 Region (.25) Los Angeles County 37% 44 19 (.18) San Diego/Orange 43% 43 14 (.14) Other Southern California 32% 50 18 (.16) Central Valley 42% 42 16 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area 30% 58 12 (.06) Other Northern California* 23% 62 15 Gender (.48) Male 39% 51 10 (.52) Female 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 – 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 – 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 – 64 <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Undecided</th>				Undecided	
(.39) Have seen or heard (.61) Haven't seen or heard (.61) Haven't seen or heard 31% 50 19 Party registration (.44) Democrats (.34) Republicans (.22) Non-partisans/others 29% 53 18 Region (.25) Los Angeles County (.25) Los Angeles County (.18) San Diego/Orange 43% 43 14 (.14) Other Southern California 32% 50 18 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area (.20) Other Northern California* 23% 52 (.20) Other Northern California* 23% 52 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area (.22) Age (.48) Male (.52) Female 33% 51 10 (.52) Female 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 – 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 – 49 38% 444 18 (.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education (.20) High school or less (.34) Some college/trade school (.20) High school or less (.34) Some college/trade school (.20) High school or less (.34) Some college/trade school (.20) College graduate	Total statewide	36%	48	16	
(.39) Have seen or heard (.61) Haven't seen or heard (.61) Haven't seen or heard 31% 50 19 Party registration (.44) Democrats (.34) Republicans (.22) Non-partisans/others 29% 53 18 Region (.25) Los Angeles County (.25) Los Angeles County (.18) San Diego/Orange 43% 43 14 (.14) Other Southern California 32% 50 18 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area (.20) Other Northern California* 23% 52 (.20) Other Northern California* 23% 52 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area (.22) Age (.48) Male (.52) Female 33% 51 10 (.52) Female 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 – 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 – 49 38% 444 18 (.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education (.20) High school or less (.34) Some college/trade school (.20) High school or less (.34) Some college/trade school (.20) High school or less (.34) Some college/trade school (.20) College graduate	Voter awareness of Prop. 23				
Party registration (.44) Democrats 31% 57 12 (.34) Republicans 47% 33 20 (.22) Non-partisans/others 29% 53 18 Region (.25) Los Angeles County 37% 44 19 (.18) San Diego/Orange 43% 43 14 (.14) Other Southern California 32% 50 18 (.16) Central Valley 42% 42 16 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area 30% 58 12 (.06) Other Northern California* 23% 62 15 (.48) Male 39% 51 10 (.52) Female 33% 46 21 (.49) Male (.52) Female 33% 46 21 (.13) 30 - 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 - 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 - 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 (.27) 50 - 64 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 (.27) Asian /other 40% 43 17 (.29) High school or less 49% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 (.20) High school or less 49% 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16 (.24) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16 (.25) College graduate 34% 50 (.25) College graduate		44%	45	11	
(.44) Democrats 31% 57 12 (.34) Republicans 47% 33 20 (.22) Non-partisans/others 29% 53 18 Region (.25) Los Angeles County 37% 44 19 (.18) San Diego/Orange 43% 43 14 (.14) Other Southern California 32% 50 18 (.16) Central Valley 42% 42 16 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area 30% 58 12 (.06) Other Northern California* 23% 62 15 Gender (.48) Male 39% 51 10 (.52) Female 33% 46 21 Age (.16) 18 – 29 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 – 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 – 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 <tr< td=""><td>(.61) Haven't seen or heard</td><td>31%</td><td>50</td><td>19</td></tr<>	(.61) Haven't seen or heard	31%	50	19	
(.44) Democrats 31% 57 12 (.34) Republicans 47% 33 20 (.22) Non-partisans/others 29% 53 18 Region (.25) Los Angeles County 37% 44 19 (.18) San Diego/Orange 43% 43 14 (.14) Other Southern California 32% 50 18 (.16) Central Valley 42% 42 16 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area 30% 58 12 (.06) Other Northern California* 23% 62 15 Gender (.48) Male 39% 51 10 (.52) Female 33% 46 21 Age (.16) 18 – 29 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 – 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 – 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /othe	Party registration				
(.22) Non-partisans/others 29% 53 18 Region (.25) Los Angeles County 37% 44 19 (.18) San Diego/Orange 43% 43 14 (.14) Other Southern California 32% 50 18 (.16) Central Valley 42% 42 16 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area 30% 58 12 (.06) Other Northern California* 23% 62 15 Gender (.48) Male 39% 51 10 (.52) Female 33% 46 21 Age (.16) 18 – 29 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 – 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 – 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education (.20) High school or less 49% 29 22 (.34		31%	57	12	
Region (.25) Los Angeles County 37% 44 19 (.18) San Diego/Orange 43% 43 14 (.14) Other Southern California 32% 50 18 (.16) Central Valley 42% 42 16 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area 30% 58 12 (.06) Other Northern California* 23% 62 15 Gender (.48) Male 39% 51 10 (.52) Female 33% 46 21 Age (.16) 18 – 29 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 – 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 – 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40%	(.34) Republicans	47%	33	20	
(.25) Los Angeles County 37% 44 19 (.18) San Diego/Orange 43% 43 14 (.14) Other Southern California 32% 50 18 (.16) Central Valley 42% 42 16 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area 30% 58 12 (.06) Other Northern California* 23% 62 15 Gender (.48) Male 39% 51 10 (.52) Female 33% 46 21 Age (.16) 18 – 29 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 – 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 – 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 <		29%	53	18	
(.25) Los Angeles County 37% 44 19 (.18) San Diego/Orange 43% 43 14 (.14) Other Southern California 32% 50 18 (.16) Central Valley 42% 42 16 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area 30% 58 12 (.06) Other Northern California* 23% 62 15 Gender (.48) Male 39% 51 10 (.52) Female 33% 46 21 Age (.16) 18 – 29 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 – 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 – 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 <	Region				
(.18) San Diego/Orange 43% 43 14 (.14) Other Southern California 32% 50 18 (.16) Central Valley 42% 42 16 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area 30% 58 12 (.06) Other Northern California* 23% 62 15 Gender (.48) Male 39% 51 10 (.52) Female 33% 46 21 Age (.16) 18 – 29 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 – 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 – 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education (20) High school or less 49% 29 22 (.3		37%	44	19	
(.14) Other Southern California (.16) Central Valley (.21) San Francisco Bay Area (.06) Other Northern California* (.23% 62 15 Gender			43		
(.16) Central Valley 42% 42 16 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area 30% 58 12 (.06) Other Northern California* 23% 62 15 Gender (.48) Male 39% 51 10 (.52) Female 33% 46 21 Age (.16) 18 – 29 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 – 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 – 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16		32%	50	18	
(.21) San Francisco Bay Area 30% 58 12 (.06) Other Northern California* 23% 62 15 Gender (.48) Male 39% 51 10 (.52) Female 33% 46 21 Age (.16) 18 – 29 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 – 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 – 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education 49% 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16	· · · · ·	42%	42	16	
(.06) Other Northern California* 23% 62 15 Gender (.48) Male 39% 51 10 (.52) Female 33% 46 21 Age (.16) 18 – 29 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 – 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 – 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education (.20) High school or less 49% 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16		30%	58	12	
(.48) Male 39% 51 10 (.52) Female 33% 46 21 Age (.16) 18 – 29 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 – 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 – 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education 40% 43 17 Education 49% 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16		23%	62	15	
(.48) Male 39% 51 10 (.52) Female 33% 46 21 Age (.16) 18 – 29 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 – 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 – 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education 40% 43 17 Education 49% 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16	Gender				
(.52) Female 33% 46 21 Age (.16) 18 – 29 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 – 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 – 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education 49% 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16		39%	51	10	
(.16) 18 - 29 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 - 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 - 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 - 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16	· · · · ·				
(.16) 18 - 29 33% 56 11 (.13) 30 - 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 - 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 - 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16	Age				
(.13) 30 - 39 46% 40 14 (.20) 40 - 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 - 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education (.20) High school or less 49% 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16		33%	56	11	
(.20) 40 – 49 38% 44 18 (.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education (.20) High school or less 49% 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16					
(.27) 50 – 64 31% 52 17 (.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16					
(.24) 65 or older 35% 47 18 Race/ethnicity (.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education (.20) High school or less 49% 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16			52		
(.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education 29 22 (.20) High school or less 49% 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16	(.24) 65 or older	35%	47	18	
(.69) White non-Hispanic 33% 51 16 (.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education 29 22 (.20) High school or less 49% 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16	Race/ethnicity				
(.17) Latino 42% 45 13 (.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education (.20) High school or less 49% 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16		33%	51	16	
(.06) African-American 43% 29 28 (.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education Education (.20) High school or less 49% 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16					
(.07) Asian /other 40% 43 17 Education 29 22 (.20) High school or less 49% 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16					
Education 49% 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16					
(.20) High school or less 49% 29 22 (.34) Some college/trade school 36% 49 15 (.23) College graduate 34% 50 16					
(.34) Some college/trade school36%4915(.23) College graduate34%5016		49%	29	22	
(.23) College graduate 34% 50 16					
	(.23) Post graduate work				

^{*} Small sample size.

Prop. 18 (Water Bonds)

By a 42% to 32% margin voters are supporting Prop. 18, the \$11.1 billion water bond measure.

There is strong support for Prop. 18 (57% to 33%) among the one in four voters who reported having some prior awareness of the bond proposal. However, the three-quarters of voters not aware of the proposal are much more tentative -37% in favor, 31% opposed and 32% with no opinion.

Democrats back Prop. 18 by a greater than two to one margin. Republicans are opposed 44% to 30%.

Table 5
Voter preferences toward Proposition 18, \$11.1 Billion for state bonds to fund water supply and protection facilities and programs (among likely voters)

	Would vote		
	Yes	No	Undecided
Total statewide	42%	32	26
Awareness of Prop. 18			
(.24) Have seen or heard	57%	33	10
(.76) Haven't seen or heard	37%	31	32
Party registration			
(.44) Democrats	54%	24	22
(.34) Republicans	30%	44	26
(.22) Non-partisans/others	36%	27	37
Political ideology			
(.35) Conservative	27%	44	29
(.39) Middle-of-the-road	49%	26	25
(.26) Liberal	51%	23	26

(Note: Last week Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger and some legislative leaders called for removing Prop. 18 from the 2010 ballot and placing it instead on the 2012 election ballot. However, the full legislature has yet to act on this proposal.)

Information About The Survey

Methodological Details

The findings in this report are based on a *Field Poll* survey completed June 22 – July 5, 2010 among a representative sample of 1,005 likely voters in California's 2010 general election. In order to cover a broad range of issues and minimize respondent fatigue, some of the propositions measured in this survey were asked of a random subsample of 365 likely voters.

Interviewing was conducted by telephone using live interviewers working from Field Research Corporation's central location telephone interviewing facilities. To enable the survey to more closely examine the preferences of California's growing ethnic voter populations, the survey was conducted in six languages and dialects – English, Spanish, Cantonese, Mandarin, Korean and Vietnamese. In addition, for questions asked of all likely voters, the main statewide sample was supplemented with additional interviews among Chinese-American, Korean-American, and Vietnamese-American likely voters.

Up to six attempts were made to reach, screen and interview each randomly selected voter on different days and times of day during the interviewing period. Likely voters were identified after interviews were completed with a random sample of California registered voters and from listings of ethnic surnames of voters targeting Chinese-Americans, Korean-Americans and Vietnamese-Americans. All samples were provided by Voter Contact Services, a leading provider of registered voter samples to the survey research industry.

Interviewing was completed on either a voter's landline phone or a cell phone depending on the source of the telephone listing from the voter file. After the completion of interviewing results from the ethnic sample augments were weighted down to bring them into alignment with their proper shares of the state's registered voter population. In addition, the overall registered voter sample was weighted to *Field Poll* estimates of the characteristics of the registered voter population in California by region, age, gender and party registration.

Sampling error estimates applicable to the results of any probability-based survey depend on sample size as well as the percentage distribution being examined. The maximum sampling error estimates for results based on the overall likely voters sample is +/- 3.2 percentage points at the 95% confidence level, while findings based on the random subsample of likely voters have a sampling error of +/- 5.5 percentage points. The maximum sampling error is based on results in the middle of the sampling distribution (i.e., percentages at or near 50%). Percentages at either end of the distribution (those closer to 10% or 90%) have a smaller margin of error. Findings from subgroups of the overall sample have somewhat larger sampling error levels. There are other potential sources of error in surveys besides sampling error. However, the overall design and execution of the survey sought to minimize these other sources of error.

The Field Poll was established in 1947 as The California Poll by Mervin Field and has operated continuously since then as an independent, non-partisan survey of California public opinion. The poll receives annual funding from media subscribers of The Field Poll, from several California foundations, and from the University of California and California State University systems, who receive the raw data files from each Field Poll survey shortly after its completion for teaching and secondary research purposes.

Questions Asked

(ASKED OF ALL LIKELY VOTERS)

Have you seen, read or heard anything about a statewide ballot proposition that would change California law to legalize marijuana and allow it to be regulated and taxed?

(As you know) This proposition would allow people 21 years or older to possess, cultivate, or transport marijuana for personal use and would permit local governments to regulate and tax its commercial production and sales. It prohibits people from possessing marijuana on school grounds, using it in public or smoking it while minors are present, or providing it to anyone under 21 years old. Fiscal impact: Unknown but potentially major increase in state and local government revenues related to the production and sale of marijuana products. If the election were being held today, would you vote YES or NO on this proposition?

The Field Poll #2342
Friday, July 9, 2010 Page 8

Have you seen, read or heard anything about a statewide ballot proposition to suspend state air pollution control and greenhouse gas emission laws until unemployment is reduced in California?

(As you know) this proposition would suspend state laws requiring reduced greenhouse gas emissions that cause global warming until California's unemployment rate drops to 5.5 percent or less for four consecutive quarters. It requires the state to abandon its comprehensive greenhouse gas reduction program that includes increased renewable energy, cleaner fuel requirements and mandatory reporting and fees for major polluters such as power plants and oil refineries until the suspension is lifted. If the election were being held today, would you vote YES or NO on this proposition?

(ASKED OF A RANDOM SUBSAMPLE OF LIKELY VOTERS)

Have you seen, read or heard anything about a statewide bond proposal to fund water supply and protection facilities and programs?

(As you know) This proposition is called the Safe, Clean and Reliable Drinking Supply Bond Act. It would authorize the issuance of eleven point one billion dollars of state bonds to fund water supply and protection facilities and programs around the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and elsewhere across California. If the election were being held today, would you vote YES or NO on this bond proposal?

Have you seen, read or heard anything about a statewide ballot proposition to change the legislative vote requirement to pass the state budget from a two-thirds to simple majority vote?

(As you know) this proposition changes the legislative vote requirement necessary to pass the state budget from two-thirds to a simple majority, but retains the two-thirds vote requirement for tax increases. It also requires that if the legislature fails to pass a budget bill by June 15 all legislators will forfeit their pay each day until a budget bill is passed. If the election were being held today, would you vote YES or NO on this proposition?