

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 #2356

STATE BALLOT PROPOSITIONS
YES SIDE MOVES AHEAD ON PROP. 19
(MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION). PLURALITY
CONTINUES TO OPPOSE PROP. 23, TO SUSPEND
AB32, THE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS LAW.
PROP. 25, TO ALLOW A MAJORITY VOTE TO
APPROVE STATE BUDGETS, REMAINS AHEAD
BUT ITS LEAD HAS DIMINISHED.

Release Date: Sunday, September 26, 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

With about six weeks remaining until the November 2 statewide election, slightly more likely voters in California now say they are inclined to vote Yes than No (49% to 42%) on Proposition 19, the initiative to legalize marijuana and tax its production, distribution, and sale. An earlier July Field Poll found the initiative trailing by four points.

Voters continue to oppose Proposition 23, the initiative to suspend AB32, the state's greenhouse gas reduction law until the state's unemployment rate drops below 5.5%. Opponents currently outnumber supporters by eleven points 45% to 34%, similar to twelve-point deficit in July.

By a 46% to 30% margin, likely voters remain supportive of Proposition 25, the initiative to allow the state legislature to pass budgets with a simple majority vote. However, this sixteen-point Yesside advantage is down significantly from a 45-point lead in July (65% to 20%). The proportion of undecided voters is also greater now than previously.

These are the findings of the latest *Field Poll* conducted by telephone in English and Spanish among 599 likely voters September 14-21, measuring voter awareness and preferences toward three of the eight statewide ballot propositions that voters will be asked to decide in the November election.

Much greater voter awareness of the marijuana initiative than the other propositions

Greater than eight in ten likely voters (84%) report having seen or heard about Prop. 19, the initiative to legalize marijuana in California and tax its proceeds. By contrast, fewer than four in ten of the probable electorate reports being aware of either Prop. 23 (37%) to suspend the state's greenhouse gas reduction law or Prop. 25 (39%) to allow the state legislature to approve budgets with a simple majority vote.

Table 1		
September 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)	84%	16
Prop. 25 (Majority Vote for State Budget / 2/3 Vote for Tax Increases)	39%	61
Prop. 23 (Suspends State's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Law)	37%	63

Big differences on Prop. 19 across voter subgroups

There are a number of big differences in voter preferences toward the marijuana initiative across major segments of the California voter population. For example...

- ... Six in ten Democrats (60%) and non-partisans (62%) are currently lining up on the Yes side, compared to just 27% among Republicans.
- While majorities of likely voters in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area (59%) and Los Angeles County (58%) are supporting the initiative, Central Valley voters are opposed nearly two to one. In addition, of the 71% of the electorate who reside in coastal counties, Prop. 19 is favored 54% to 38%. By contrast, inland county voters take an opposite view and are on the No side 52% to 37%.
- ... Those who will be voting by mail are evenly divided in their preferences (45% in favor and 44% opposed). On the other hand, precinct voters are favoring Prop. 19 52% to 40%.
- ... There is a gender gap in voting preferences on Prop. 19. Men are supporting the initiative by sixteen points (54% to 38%), while women are narrowly opposed 46% to 44%.
- ... Younger voters are among the strongest backers of the initiative. Voters under age 40 are on the Yes side 59% to 33% By contrast, voters age 65 or older are opposed 53% to 36%.

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

(among fixery voters)			
	Would vote		TI . 1 • 1 . 1
	Yes	No	Undecided
Total statewide – September 2010	49%	42	9
July 2010	44%	48	8
Party registration			
(.44) Democrats	60%	28	12
(.35) Republicans	27%	66	7
(.21) Non-partisans/others	62%	33	5
Region			
(.24) Los Angeles County	58%	37	5
(.32) Other Southern California	45%	44	11
(.17) Central Valley	30%	59	11
(.21) San Francisco Bay Area	59%	30	11
(.06) Other Northern California*	45%	49	6
Area			
(.71) Coastal counties	54%	38	8
(.29) Inland counties	37%	52	11
Gender			
(.47) Male	54%	38	8
(.53) Female	44%	46	10
Age			
(.24) 18 - 39	59%	33	8
(.21) 40 - 49	53%	38	9
(.31) 50 – 64	47%	43	10
(.24) 65 or older	36%	53	11
Race/ethnicity			
(.72) White non-Hispanic	50%	42	8
(.15) Latino*	46%	43	11
(.13) African-American/Asian-	47%	44	9
American/Native American*			
Voting method			
(.51) Mail ballot voter	45%	44	11
(.49) Precinct voter	52%	40	8
Voter awareness of Prop. 19			
(.84) Have seen or heard	50%	42	8
(.16) Haven't seen or heard*	39%	44	17

^{*} Small sample size

Note: Subgroup percentages are among likely voters in the September 2010 survey.

Most major voter segments are opposing Prop. 23

Most voter blocs are lining up on the No side on Prop. 23. The major exception is Republicans, who are supporting the initiative by a 47% to 33% margin. The voting segment most opposed to Prop. 23 are voters with a post-graduate education (65% No to 20% Yes).

Table 3

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

	Would vote		
	Yes	No	Undecided
Total statewide – September 2010	34%	45	21
July 2010	36%	48	16
Party registration			
(.44) Democrats	29%	51	20
(.35) Republicans	47%	33	20
(.21) Non-partisans/others	26%	54	20
Region			
(.24) Los Angeles County	26%	50	24
(.32) Other Southern California	39%	42	19
(.17) Central Valley	36%	37	27
(.21) San Francisco Bay Area	34%	51	15
(.06) Other Northern California*	41%	50	9
Gender			
(.47) Male	34%	51	15
(.53) Female	35%	40	25
Age			
(.24) 18 - 39	35%	46	19
(.21) 40 - 49	34%	51	15
(.31) $50-64$	38%	45	17
(.24) 65 or older	30%	41	29
Race/ethnicity			
(.72) White non-Hispanic	33%	48	19
(.15) Latino*	41%	38	21
(.13) African-American/Asian-	34%	41	25
American/Native American*			
Education			
(.17) High school or less	37%	34	29
(.32) Some college/trade school	39%	37	24
(.25) College graduate	43%	43	14
(.26) Post graduate work	20%	65	15
Voting method			
(.51) Mail ballot voter	35%	44	21
(.49) Precinct voter	34%	47	19
Voter awareness of Prop. 23			
(.37) Have seen or heard	33%	57	10
(.63) Haven't seen or heard	35%	39	26

^{*} Small sample size.

Prop. 25 remains ahead, but the size of its lead has been significantly reduced

In July likely voters were backing Prop. 25, the ballot measure to allow the state legislature to pass a budget with a simple majority vote, by a greater than three-to-one margin (65% to 20%). While the current poll finds a plurality of voters remaining on the Yes side on Prop. 25, its lead is down to sixteen points (46% to 30%), with a growing proportion (24%) undecided.

Majorities of Democrats and non-partisans remain supportive of Prop. 25 – Democrats by a greater than two to one margin (55% to 21%) and non-partisans by a five to three margin (53% to 33%). However, a plurality of Republicans (40%) is now inclined to vote No, while 30% are on the Yes side. Many Republicans (30%) are undecided.

Voters in the San Francisco Bay Area are supporting Prop. 25 greater than two to one (63% to 26%). Likely voters in the state's other major regions are supportive but by smaller margins.

Majorities of college graduates and those who have completed post graduate work are solidly backing the initiative, while those with fewer years of formal education are more divided.

Table 4
Voter preferences toward Proposition 25 changing the vote required to pass the state budget to a simple majority (among likely voters)

Total statewide – September 2010 46% 30 24 July 2010 65% 20 15 Party registration	(umong n	Would vote		
Party registration (.44) Democrats 55% 21 24 (.35) Republicans 30% 40 30 (.21) Non-partisans/others 53% 33 14				Undecided
Party registration	Total statewide – September 2010	46%	30	24
(.44) Democrats 55% 21 24 (.35) Republicans 30% 40 30 (.21) Non-partisans/others 53% 33 14 Region (.24) Los Angeles County 37% 31 32 (.32) Other Southern California 43% 28 29 (.17) Central Valley 43% 35 22 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area 63% 26 11 (.06) Other Northern California* 46% 38 16 Gender (.47) Male 49% 35 16 (.53) Female 43% 26 31 Age (.24) 18 – 39 45% 28 27 (.21) 40 – 49 51% 25 24 (.31) 50 – 64 48% 35 17 (.24) 65 or older 40% 29 31 Race/ethnicity (.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 24 American/Native American* Education (.17) High school or less 37% 31 31 <td>July 2010</td> <td>65%</td> <td>20</td> <td>15</td>	July 2010	65%	20	15
(.35) Republicans (.21) Non-partisans/others 53% 33 14 Region (.24) Los Angeles County 37% 31 32 (.32) Other Southern California 43% 28 29 (.17) Central Valley 43% 35 22 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area 63% 26 11 (.06) Other Northern California* 46% 38 16 Gender (.47) Male 49% 35 16 (.53) Female 43% 26 31 Age (.24) 18 – 39 45% 28 27 (.21) 40 – 49 51% 25 24 (.31) 50 – 64 48% 35 17 (.24) 65 or older 40% 29 31 Race/ethnicity (.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.13) African-American/Asian-American/Native American* Education (.17) High school or less 37% 31 31 (.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method (.51) Mail ballot voter 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25	Party registration			
(.21) Non-partisans/others 53% 33 14 Region (.24) Los Angeles County 37% 31 32 (.32) Other Southern California 43% 28 29 (.17) Central Valley 43% 35 22 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area 63% 26 11 (.06) Other Northern California* 46% 38 16 Gender (.47) Male 49% 35 16 (.53) Female 43% 26 31 Age (.24) 18 – 39 45% 28 27 (.21) 40 – 49 51% 25 24 (.31) 50 – 64 48% 35 17 (.24) 65 or older 40% 29 31 Race/ethnicity (.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.17) High school or less 37% 31 31 (.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50%	(.44) Democrats	55%	21	24
(.21) Non-partisans/others 53% 33 14 Region (.24) Los Angeles County 37% 31 32 (.32) Other Southern California 43% 28 29 (.17) Central Valley 43% 35 22 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area 63% 26 11 (.06) Other Northern California* 46% 38 16 Gender (.47) Male 49% 35 16 (.53) Female 43% 26 31 Age (.24) 18 – 39 45% 28 27 (.21) 40 – 49 51% 25 24 (.31) 50 – 64 48% 35 17 (.24) 65 or older 40% 29 31 Race/ethnicity (.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.17) High school or less 37% 31 31 (.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50%	(.35) Republicans	30%	40	30
(.24) Los Angeles County 37% 31 32 (.32) Other Southern California 43% 28 29 (.17) Central Valley 43% 35 22 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area 63% 26 11 (.06) Other Northern California* 46% 38 16 Gender (.47) Male 49% 35 16 (.53) Female 43% 26 31 Age (.24) 18 – 39 45% 28 27 (.21) 40 – 49 51% 25 24 (.31) 50 – 64 48% 35 17 (.24) 65 or older 40% 29 31 Race/ethnicity (.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.13) African-American/Asian-American/Native American* 44% 32 24 Education 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 <td< td=""><td></td><td>53%</td><td>33</td><td>14</td></td<>		53%	33	14
(.24) Los Angeles County 37% 31 32 (.32) Other Southern California 43% 28 29 (.17) Central Valley 43% 35 22 (.21) San Francisco Bay Area 63% 26 11 (.06) Other Northern California* 46% 38 16 Gender (.47) Male 49% 35 16 (.53) Female 43% 26 31 Age (.24) 18 – 39 45% 28 27 (.21) 40 – 49 51% 25 24 (.31) 50 – 64 48% 35 17 (.24) 65 or older 40% 29 31 Race/ethnicity (.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.13) African-American/Asian-American/Native American* 44% 32 24 Education 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 <td< td=""><td>Region</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Region			
(.32) Other Southern California		37%	31	32
(.17) Central Valley			28	29
(.21) San Francisco Bay Area (.06) Other Northern California* 46% 38 16 Gender (.47) Male 49% 35 16 (.53) Female 43% 26 31 Age (.24) 18 – 39 45% 28 27 (.21) 40 – 49 51% 25 24 (.31) 50 – 64 48% 35 17 (.24) 65 or older 40% 29 31 Race/ethnicity (.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.13) African-American/Asian-American/Native American* Education (.17) High school or less 37% 31 31 (.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method (.51) Mail ballot voter 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25			35	22
(.06) Other Northern California* 46% 38 16 Gender (.47) Male 49% 35 16 (.53) Female 43% 26 31 Age (.24) 18 – 39 45% 28 27 (.21) 40 – 49 51% 25 24 (.31) 50 – 64 48% 35 17 (.24) 65 or older 40% 29 31 Race/ethnicity (.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.13) African-American/Asian-American/Native American* Education (.17) High school or less 37% 31 31 (.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method (.51) Mail ballot voter 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25		63%	26	11
(.47) Male 49% 35 16 (.53) Female 43% 26 31 Age (.24) 18 – 39 45% 28 27 (.21) 40 – 49 51% 25 24 (.31) 50 – 64 48% 35 17 (.24) 65 or older 40% 29 31 Race/ethnicity (.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.13) African-American/Asian-American/Asian-American/Native American* 44% 32 24 Education 37% 31 31 31 (.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method (.51) Mail ballot voter 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25		46%	38	16
(.53) Female 43% 26 31 Age (.24) 18 – 39 45% 28 27 (.21) 40 – 49 51% 25 24 (.31) 50 – 64 48% 35 17 (.24) 65 or older 40% 29 31 Race/ethnicity (.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.13) African-American/Asian-American/Asian-American/Native American* 44% 32 24 Education 31 31 31 (.17) High school or less 37% 31 31 (.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method (.51) Mail ballot voter 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25	Gender			
(.53) Female 43% 26 31 Age (.24) 18 – 39 45% 28 27 (.21) 40 – 49 51% 25 24 (.31) 50 – 64 48% 35 17 (.24) 65 or older 40% 29 31 Race/ethnicity (.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.13) African-American/Asian-American/Asian-American/Native American* 44% 32 24 Education 31 31 31 (.17) High school or less 37% 31 31 (.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method (.51) Mail ballot voter 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25	(.47) Male	49%	35	16
(.24) 18 - 39 45% 28 27 (.21) 40 - 49 51% 25 24 (.31) 50 - 64 48% 35 17 (.24) 65 or older 40% 29 31 Race/ethnicity (.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.13) African-American/Asian-American/Native American* 44% 32 24 Education 37% 31 31 (.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method (.51) Mail ballot voter 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25		43%	26	31
(.24) 18 - 39 45% 28 27 (.21) 40 - 49 51% 25 24 (.31) 50 - 64 48% 35 17 (.24) 65 or older 40% 29 31 Race/ethnicity (.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.13) African-American/Asian-American/Native American* 44% 32 24 Education 37% 31 31 (.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method (.51) Mail ballot voter 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25	Age			
(.21) 40 – 49 51% 25 24 (.31) 50 – 64 48% 35 17 (.24) 65 or older 40% 29 31 Race/ethnicity (.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.13) African-American/Asian-American/Asian-American/Native American* 44% 32 24 American/Native American* 50% 31 31 31 (.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method (.51) Mail ballot voter 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25		45%	28	27
(.24) 65 or older 40% 29 31 Race/ethnicity (.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.13) African-American/Asian-American/Native American* 44% 32 24 Education 37% 31 31 (.17) High school or less 37% 35 27 (.25) College/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25	(.21) 40 – 49	51%	25	24
Race/ethnicity (.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.13) African-American/Asian-American/Native American* 44% 32 24 Education 37% 31 31 (.17) High school or less 37% 35 27 (.25) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25	(.31) 50 – 64	48%	35	17
(.72) White non-Hispanic 48% 29 23 (.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.13) African-American/Asian-American/Native American* 44% 32 24 Education 37% 31 31 (.17) High school or less 37% 35 27 (.22) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25	(.24) 65 or older	40%	29	31
(.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.13) African-American/Asian-American/Native American* 44% 32 24 Education 37% 31 31 (.17) High school or less 37% 31 31 (.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25	Race/ethnicity			
(.15) Latino* 38% 32 30 (.13) African-American/Asian-American/Native American* 44% 32 24 Education 37% 31 31 (.17) High school or less 37% 31 31 (.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25	(.72) White non-Hispanic	48%	29	23
American/Native American* Education 37% 31 31 (.17) High school or less 37% 31 31 (.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25		38%	32	30
Education 37% 31 31 (.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25	(.13) African-American/Asian-	44%	32	24
(.17) High school or less 37% 31 31 (.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method (.51) Mail ballot voter 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25	American/Native American*			
(.32) Some college/trade school 38% 35 27 (.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method (.51) Mail ballot voter 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25	Education			
(.25) College graduate 50% 30 20 (.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method	(.17) High school or less	37%	31	31
(.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method 45% 32 23 (.51) Mail ballot voter 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25	(.32) Some college/trade school	38%	35	27
(.26) Post graduate work 56% 23 21 Voting method 45% 32 23 (.51) Mail ballot voter 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25	(.25) College graduate	50%	30	20
(.51) Mail ballot voter 45% 32 23 (.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 Voter awareness of Prop. 25		56%	23	21
(.49) Precinct voter 46% 28 26 <u>Voter awareness of Prop. 25</u>	Voting method			
Voter awareness of Prop. 25	(.51) Mail ballot voter	45%	32	23
	(.49) Precinct voter	46%	28	26
(.39) Have seen or heard 57% 31 12	Voter awareness of Prop. 25			
		57%	31	12
(.61) Haven't seen or heard 39% 30	(.61) Haven't seen or heard	39%	30	31

^{*} Small sample size.

Note: Subgroup percentages are among likely voters in the September 2010 survey.

NOTE: We have appended a new California Opinion Index report that updates a number of Field Poll trend questions about voter attitudes on marijuana. These questions were included on the July 2010 Field Poll on behalf of The Sacramento Bee.

Information About The Survey

Methodological Details

The findings about preferences toward the statewide ballot propositions in this report are based on a *Field Poll* survey completed September 14-21, 2010 among a random sample of 857 registered voters, of whom 599 were considered likely to vote in California's upcoming general election.

Interviewing was conducted by telephone in English and Spanish using live interviewers working from Field Research Corporation's central location telephone interviewing facilities. Up to eight 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.

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, 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, race/ethnicity 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 +/- 4.1 percentage points at the 95% confidence level. 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, who is still an active advisor. The Poll 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

Have you seen, read or heard anything about Proposition 19, a statewide ballot proposition that would legalize marijuana under California law?

(As you know) Proposition 19 legalizes marijuana under California but not federal law and permits local governments to regulate and tax its commercial production, distribution and sale. Allows people 21 years or older to possess, cultivate, or transport marijuana for personal use. Fiscal impact: Depending on federal, state and local government actions, potential increased tax and fee revenues in the hundreds of millions of dollars annually and potential correctional savings of several tens of millions of dollars annually. If the election were being held today, would you vote YES or NO on Proposition 19?

Have you seen, read or heard anything about Proposition 23, a statewide ballot proposition to suspend implementation of the state air pollution control law, AB 32?

(As you know) Proposition 23 suspends implementation of the air pollution law, AB 32, requiring major sources of emissions to report and reduce greenhouse gas emissions that cause global warming until unemployment drops to 5.5 percent or less for a full year. Fiscal impact: Likely modest net increase in overall economic activity from suspension of greenhouse gases regulatory activity, resulting in a potentially significant net increase in state and local revenues. If the election were being held today, would you vote YES or NO on Proposition 23?

Have you seen, read or heard anything about Proposition 25, a statewide ballot proposition that changes the legislative vote requirement to pass budget and budget-related legislation?

(As you know) Proposition 25 changes the legislative vote requirement to pass budget and budget-related legislation from two-thirds to a simple majority and retains a two-thirds vote requirement for taxes. The legislature would also permanently forfeit daily salary and expenses until a budget bill passes. Fiscal impact: In some years, the contents of the state budget could be changed due to the lower legislative vote requirement, although the extent of changes would depend on the Legislature's future actions. If the election were being held today, would you vote YES or NO on Proposition 25?