



University of California, Berkeley
Institute of Governmental Studies
109 Moses Hall, #2370
Berkeley, CA 94720-2370
Tel: 510-642-1473
Fax: 510-642-3020
Email: igs@berkeley.edu

**Tabulations from a late-October 2022 Poll of
California Likely Voters about the Election for Governor and
Five Propositions on the Statewide General Election Ballot**

by the
Berkeley IGS Poll
Institute of Governmental Studies
University of California, Berkeley

October 25-31, 2022

Introduction

The statistical tabulations in this volume are based on a *Berkeley IGS Poll* completed online in English and Spanish October 25-31, 2022 among 7,602 California registered voters, including 5,972 likely voters. The survey was conducted by the Institute of Governmental Studies (IGS) at the University of California, Berkeley. Funding for the poll was provided in part by the *Los Angeles Times*.

The survey distributed email invitations to stratified random samples of the state's registered voters. The latest poll also included an oversampling of registered voters in Los Angeles County, administered using the same methods, to enable the poll to examine specific issues of interest to voters in Los Angeles County for the *Times*. After the completion of data collection, the results were weighted to realign the Los Angeles County oversample to its actual share of the statewide registered voter population.

Each email invited voters to participate in a non-partisan survey conducted by the University and provided a link to the IGS website where the survey was housed. Reminder emails were distributed to non-responding voters and an opt out link was provided for voters not wishing to participate and not wanting to receive further email invitations.

Samples of registered voters with email addresses were provided to IGS by Political Data, Inc., a leading supplier of registered voter lists in California. The email addresses of voters were derived from information contained on the state's official voter registration rolls. Prior to the distribution of the emails, the overall sample was stratified by age and gender in an attempt to obtain a proper balance of survey respondents.

To protect the anonymity of survey respondents, voters' email addresses and all other personally identifiable information derived from the original voter listing were purged from the data file and replaced with a unique and anonymous identification number during data processing. Post-stratification weights were applied to align the overall sample of the registered voters to population characteristics of the registered voters statewide and across major regions of the state.

The sampling error associated with the results from the survey are difficult to calculate precisely due to the effects of sample stratification and the post-stratification weighting. Nevertheless, it is likely that the results from the overall sample of likely voters are subject to a sampling error of approximately +/- 2 percentage points at the 95% confidence level.

Regional definitions referenced in this report

The results from the state's geographic regions referenced in this volume are comprised of the following counties:

Los Angeles County (Los Angeles County)

Orange County (Orange County)

San Diego County (San Diego County)

Inland Empire (Riverside, San Bernardino and Imperial counties)

Central Coast (Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Monterey, Santa Cruz and San Benito counties)

SF Bay Area (Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, Marin, Napa, Sonoma, Solano, San Mateo, Santa Clara).

North Coast/Sierras (Del Norte, Siskiyou, Modoc, Humboldt, Trinity, Lassen, Mendocino, Plumas, Sierra, Nevada, Lake, Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mono, Mariposa, Inyo counties.)

Sacramento Valley (Shasta, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba, Placer, Sutter, Yolo, El Dorado, and Sacramento counties)

San Joaquin Valley (San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Madera, Fresno, Kings, Tulare, and Kern counties)

Central Valley (net) (includes all counties in the Sacramento Valley and San Joaquin Valley referenced above)

About the Institute of Governmental Studies

The Institute of Governmental Studies (IGS) is an interdisciplinary organized research unit that pursues a vigorous program of research, education, publication and public service. A component of the University of California system's flagship Berkeley campus, IGS is the oldest organized research unit in the UC system and the oldest public policy research center in the state. IGS's co-directors are Professor Eric Schickler and Associate Professor G. Cristina Mora.

IGS conducts periodic surveys of public opinion in California on matters of politics and public policy through its *Berkeley IGS Poll*. The poll seeks to provide a broad measure of contemporary public opinion, and to generate data for subsequent scholarly analysis. The director of the *Berkeley IGS Poll* is Mark DiCamillo. For a complete listing of stories issued by the *Berkeley IGS Poll* go to <https://www.igs.berkeley.edu/research/berkeley-igs-poll>.

Late October 2022 Berkeley IGS Poll — Statewide Likely Voters

Table 1: Q4A/Q4B Below are the candidates in the election for Governor of California. If you were voting today for Governor for whom would you vote?/Below are the candidates in the election for Governor of California. For whom did you vote for Governor of California? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Party Registration				Likely Voters		
		Los Angeles County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento Valley	South Joaquin Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sieras	Democrat	Republican	NPP/other	Other	NPP	Likely voter	Not likely voter
unweighted n	5972.00	2842.00	413.00	302.00	404.00	275.00	575.00	347.00	228.00	1057.00	104.00	3661.00	969.00	1342.00	352.00	990.00	5972.00	0
weighted n	4997.00	1177.00	478.00	433.00	585.00	288.00	884.00	427.00	457.00	1015.00	138.00	2387.00	1360.00	1251.00	286.00	965.00	4997.00	0
Gavin Newsom, Governor, Democrat	0.58	0.65	0.56	0.46	0.46	0.64	0.45	0.50	0.40	0.72	0.54	0.89	0.07	0.53	0.40	0.57	0.58	0
Brian Dahle, Senator/Farmer, Republican	0.37	0.29	0.41	0.48	0.49	0.25	0.50	0.45	0.55	0.25	0.45	0.07	0.89	0.39	0.48	0.36	0.37	0
Other (write-in candidate)	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.06	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
Undecided/refused	0.04	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.07	0.11	0.06	0.04	0

Table 2: Q4A/Q4B Below are the candidates in the election for Governor of California. If you were voting today for Governor for whom would you vote?/Below are the candidates in the election for Governor of California. For whom did you vote for Governor of California? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Gender		Age								Race								Nativity		Union member in household		
	Total	Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+ (net)	65-74	75+	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Spanish-dominant (Latino)	English-dominant (Latino)	Black	Asian/Pac Isle	American/Native American	Tribal affiliation	No tribal affiliation	US	Another country	Yes	No
unweighted n	5972.00	2878.00	3093.00	711.00	913.00	912.00	1687.00	1749.00	1110.00	639.00	3378.00	1321.00	310.00	1002.00	539.00	614.00	103.00	35.00	69.00	4900.00	1062.00	1327.00	4618.00
weighted n	4997.00	2362.00	2635.00	522.00	755.00	787.00	1360.00	1572.00	1030.00	542.00	2936.00	1182.00	415.00	761.00	269.00	541.00	78.00	38.00	40.00	4019.00	976.00	999.00	3989.00
Gavin Newsom, Governor, Democrat	0.58	0.54	0.61	0.63	0.60	0.58	0.55	0.57	0.58	0.54	0.55	0.58	0.64	0.54	0.79	0.64	0.66	0.69	0.63	0.57	0.60	0.58	0.58
Brian Dahle, Senator/Farmer, Republican	0.37	0.42	0.33	0.29	0.35	0.37	0.40	0.40	0.37	0.45	0.41	0.34	0.26	0.39	0.16	0.30	0.23	0.22	0.24	0.38	0.34	0.38	0.37
Other (write-in candidate)	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Undecided/refused	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.04

Table 3: Q4A/Q4B Below are the candidates in the election for Governor of California. If you were voting today for Governor for whom would you vote?/Below are the candidates in the election for Governor of California. For whom did you vote for Governor of California? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Political ideology					Education					Household income					Tenure				
		Strongly conservative	Somewhat conservative	Moderate	Somewhat liberal	Strongly liberal	Not a high school graduate	High school graduate	Some college/school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000-\$39,999	\$40,000-\$59,999	\$60,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$149,999	\$150,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Own	Rent	Other
unweighted n	5972.00	442.00	714.00	1693.00	1469.00	1636.00	60.00	389.00	1457.00	2044.00	2003.00	357.00	537.00	661.00	1207.00	1164.00	744.00	1137.00	3469.00	2043.00	436.00
weighted n	4997.00	642.00	890.00	1506.00	950.00	1001.00	109.00	598.00	2051.00	1348.00	881.00	380.00	619.00	714.00	1027.00	940.00	515.00	697.00	2873.00	1722.00	397.00
Gavin Newsom, Governor, Democrat	0.58	0.09	0.18	0.58	0.88	0.94	0.57	0.51	0.53	0.62	0.68	0.77	0.55	0.58	0.56	0.56	0.55	0.59	0.52	0.66	0.64
Brian Dahle, Senator/Farmer, Republican	0.37	0.87	0.76	0.36	0.06	0.03	0.16	0.45	0.43	0.33	0.29	0.14	0.39	0.37	0.40	0.41	0.43	0.35	0.44	0.29	0.29
Other (write-in candidate)	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01
Undecided/refused	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.21	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.07

Table 4: Q4A/Q4B Below are the candidates in the election for Governor of California. If you were voting today for Governor for whom would you vote?/Below are the candidates in the election for Governor of California. For whom did you vote for Governor of California? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Marital status					Voting in Nov 2020 election					Party identification									
	Total	Married	Not married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married	Non-voter	Voted (net)	Biden voter	Trump voter	Other voter	Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/other (net)	Lean Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other
unweighted n	5972.00	3112.00	493.00	976.00	1356.00	505.00	5467.00	4142.00	985.00	340.00	4232.00	2555.00	1672.00	1237.00	516.00	717.00	1777.00	847.00	442.00	487.00
weighted n	4997.00	2783.00	378.00	859.00	965.00	465.00	4532.00	2812.00	1641.00	80.00	2826.00	1622.00	1202.00	1733.00	825.00	905.00	1552.00	614.00	508.00	430.00
Gavin Newsom, Governor, Democrat	0.58	0.53	0.69	0.57	0.66	0.62	0.57	0.90	0.03	0.21	0.93	0.96	0.89	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.47	0.90	0.03	0.37
Brian Dahle, Senator/Farmer, Republican	0.37	0.42	0.26	0.40	0.26	0.30	0.38	0.06	0.92	0.55	0.04	0.02	0.06	0.91	0.93	0.88	0.45	0.04	0.95	0.45
Other (write-in candidate)	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.03
Undecided/refused	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.18	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.07	0.05	0.02	0.14

Table 5: Q4A/Q4B Below are the candidates in the election for Governor of California. If you were voting today for Governor for whom would you vote?/Below are the candidates in the election for Governor of California. For whom did you vote for Governor of California? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Voting pref for Gov			Voting pref on Prop 1			Voting pref on Prop 26			Voting pref on Prop 27			Voting pref on Prop 30			Voting pref on Prop 31		
		Newsom	Dahle	Undecided/refused/other	Yes	No	Undecided/refused	Yes	No	Undecided/refused	Yes	No	Undecided/refused	Yes	No	Undecided/refused	Yes	No	Undecided/refused
unweighted n	5972.00	4316	1410	246.00	4475.00	1110.00	387.00	1725.00	3247.00	1000.00	1131.00	4080.00	761.00	3030.00	2306.00	636.00	3844.00	1589.00	539.00
weighted n	4997.00	2885	1871	241.00	3177.00	1347.00	473.00	1499.00	2639.00	860.00	1076.00	3207.00	714.00	2365.00	2073.00	559.00	2877.00	1605.00	515.00
Gavin Newsom, Governor, Democrat	0.58	1	0	0.00	0.82	0.11	0.26	0.61	0.54	0.63	0.59	0.56	0.63	0.82	0.30	0.57	0.70	0.39	0.49
Brian Dahle, Senator/Farmer, Republican	0.37	0	1	0.00	0.14	0.85	0.57	0.35	0.42	0.30	0.35	0.40	0.28	0.15	0.65	0.31	0.26	0.56	0.40
Other (write-in candidate)	0.01	0	0	0.25	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.02
Undecided/refused	0.04	0	0	0.75	0.03	0.02	0.16	0.02	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.07	0.03	0.03	0.10	0.03	0.03	0.09

Table 6: Q5A(1)/Q5B(1) Regardless of [whom you support]/[whom you supported in the election for Governor], is your opinion of Gavin Newsom, Governor, generally favorable or unfavorable, or don't you know enough about him to say? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Party Registration				Likely Voters		
		Los Angeles County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento Valley	San Joaquin Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sier-ras	Democrat	Republican	NPP/other	Other	NPP	Likely voter	Not likely voter
unweighted n	5972.00	2842.00	413.00	302.00	404.00	275.00	575.00	347.00	228.00	1057.00	104.00	3661.00	969.00	1342.00	352.00	990.00	5972.00	0
weighted n	4997.00	1177.00	478.00	433.00	585.00	288.00	884.00	427.00	457.00	1015.00	138.00	2387.00	1360.00	1251.00	286.00	965.00	4997.00	0
Favorable (net)	0.55	0.62	0.49	0.43	0.44	0.58	0.43	0.46	0.41	0.71	0.53	0.84	0.09	0.49	0.42	0.51	0.55	0
Strongly favorable	0.29	0.33	0.28	0.24	0.23	0.32	0.20	0.18	0.21	0.36	0.29	0.48	0.02	0.21	0.17	0.23	0.29	0
Somewhat favorable	0.26	0.28	0.21	0.19	0.21	0.26	0.23	0.27	0.20	0.35	0.24	0.36	0.07	0.27	0.25	0.28	0.26	0
Unfavorable (net)	0.42	0.35	0.48	0.53	0.50	0.41	0.54	0.53	0.55	0.26	0.47	0.13	0.88	0.47	0.52	0.46	0.42	0
Somewhat unfavorable	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.06	0.07	0.11	0.09	0.12	0.06	0.07	0.03	0.06	0.06	0.14	0.08	0.16	0.08	0
Strongly unfavorable	0.34	0.26	0.38	0.47	0.43	0.30	0.45	0.41	0.49	0.19	0.44	0.06	0.82	0.33	0.44	0.30	0.34	0
No opinion	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.06	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.03	0

Table 7: Q5A(1)/Q5B(1) Regardless of [whom you support]/[whom you supported in the election for Governor], is your opinion of Gavin Newsom, Governor, generally favorable or unfavorable, or don't you know enough about him to say? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Gender		Age						Race								Nativity		Union member in household			
		Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+ (net)	65-74	75+	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Spanish dom- i- nant (Latino)	English dom- i- nant/bilingual (Latino)	Black	Asian/ Pac Isle	Amer- ican/ Na- tive Amer	Tribal fil- i- a- tion	No tribal fil- i- a- tion	US	Another coun- try	Yes	No
unweighted n	5972.00	2878.00	3093.00	711.00	913.00	912.00	1687.00	1749.00	1110.00	639.00	3378.00	1321.00	310.00	1002.00	539.00	614.00	103.00	35.00	69.00	4900.00	1062.00	1327.00	4618.00
weighted n	4997.00	2362.00	2635.00	522.00	755.00	787.00	1360.00	1572.00	1030.00	542.00	2936.00	1182.00	415.00	761.00	269.00	541.00	78.00	38.00	40.00	4019.00	976.00	999.00	3989.00
Favorable (net)	0.55	0.52	0.58	0.60	0.51	0.55	0.54	0.56	0.58	0.54	0.53	0.54	0.59	0.50	0.74	0.60	0.69	0.76	0.62	0.54	0.58	0.54	0.55
Strongly favorable	0.29	0.28	0.30	0.20	0.21	0.30	0.30	0.35	0.34	0.37	0.26	0.32	0.35	0.30	0.50	0.26	0.42	0.53	0.32	0.28	0.34	0.29	0.29
Somewhat favorable	0.26	0.24	0.28	0.40	0.30	0.25	0.24	0.22	0.24	0.17	0.27	0.21	0.24	0.20	0.24	0.34	0.26	0.23	0.30	0.27	0.24	0.26	0.26
Unfavorable (net)	0.42	0.45	0.38	0.33	0.47	0.40	0.43	0.42	0.41	0.44	0.45	0.38	0.27	0.45	0.19	0.37	0.31	0.23	0.38	0.43	0.35	0.44	0.41
Somewhat unfavorable	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.14	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.06	0.15	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.08
Strongly unfavorable	0.34	0.39	0.29	0.21	0.33	0.32	0.36	0.37	0.36	0.39	0.39	0.29	0.15	0.37	0.13	0.22	0.28	0.23	0.34	0.35	0.26	0.35	0.33
No opinion	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.08	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.08	0.14	0.05	0.07	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.07	0.02	0.04

Table 8: Q5A(1)/Q5B(1) Regardless of [whom you support]/[whom you supported in the election for Governor], is your opinion of Gavin Newsom, Governor, generally favorable or unfavorable, or don't you know enough about him to say? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Political ideology					Education					Household income					Tenure				
		Strongly con- ser- va- tive	Somewhat con- ser- va- tive	Moderate	Somewhat lib- eral	Strongly lib- eral	Not a high school graduate	High school graduate	Some college/traditional school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000-\$39,999	\$40,000-\$59,999	\$60,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$149,999	\$150,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Own	Rent	Other
unweighted n	5972.00	442.00	714.00	1693.00	1469.00	1636.00	60.00	389.00	1457.00	2044.00	2003.00	357.00	537.00	661.00	1207.00	1164.00	744.00	1137.00	3469.00	2043.00	436.00
weighted n	4997.00	642.00	890.00	1506.00	950.00	1001.00	109.00	598.00	2051.00	1348.00	881.00	380.00	619.00	714.00	1027.00	940.00	515.00	697.00	2873.00	1722.00	397.00
Favorable (net)	0.55	0.09	0.20	0.56	0.83	0.89	0.49	0.48	0.50	0.59	0.65	0.67	0.55	0.54	0.54	0.53	0.55	0.51	0.62	0.55	
Strongly favorable	0.29	0.07	0.08	0.29	0.43	0.48	0.32	0.28	0.27	0.30	0.32	0.34	0.30	0.29	0.31	0.29	0.26	0.27	0.32	0.28	
Somewhat favorable	0.26	0.02	0.12	0.27	0.39	0.40	0.16	0.19	0.23	0.29	0.33	0.33	0.25	0.26	0.23	0.25	0.27	0.30	0.24	0.30	
Unfavorable (net)	0.42	0.86	0.79	0.39	0.15	0.10	0.45	0.45	0.46	0.39	0.33	0.25	0.38	0.40	0.43	0.45	0.46	0.44	0.47	0.33	
Somewhat unfavorable	0.08	0.03	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.07	0.12	0.05	0.08	0.10	0.07	0.13	0.07	0.10	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.09	0.07	0.10	
Strongly unfavorable	0.34	0.83	0.70	0.29	0.05	0.03	0.33	0.39	0.38	0.29	0.26	0.12	0.31	0.31	0.35	0.39	0.40	0.35	0.41	0.24	
No opinion	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.07	0.08	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.08	0.06	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.05	

Table 9: Q5A(1)/Q5B(1) Regardless of [whom you support]/[whom you supported in the election for Governor], is your opinion of Gavin Newsom, Governor, generally favorable or unfavorable, or don't you know enough about him to say? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Marital status					Voting in Nov 2020 election					Party identification									
		Married	Not married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married	Non-voter	Voted (net)	Biden voter	Trump voter	Other voter	Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/other (net)	Lean Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other	
unweighted n	5972.00	3112.00	493.00	976.00	1356.00	505.00	5467.00	4142.00	985.00	340.00	4232.00	2555.00	1672.00	1237.00	516.00	717.00	1777.00	847.00	442.00	487.00	
weighted n	4997.00	2783.00	378.00	859.00	965.00	465.00	4532.00	2812.00	1641.00	80.00	2826.00	1622.00	1202.00	1733.00	825.00	905.00	1552.00	614.00	508.00	430.00	
Favorable (net)	0.55	0.53	0.57	0.55	0.60	0.58	0.55	0.84	0.07	0.20	0.87	0.92	0.80	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.42	0.79	0.04	0.35	
Strongly favorable	0.29	0.28	0.30	0.35	0.25	0.28	0.29	0.46	0.01	0.09	0.48	0.59	0.33	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.17	0.33	0.01	0.14	
Somewhat favorable	0.26	0.25	0.27	0.20	0.35	0.30	0.26	0.38	0.05	0.11	0.38	0.32	0.47	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.25	0.46	0.03	0.22	
Unfavorable (net)	0.42	0.44	0.39	0.42	0.36	0.37	0.42	0.14	0.90	0.66	0.11	0.06	0.18	0.87	0.89	0.86	0.55	0.20	0.93	0.59	
Somewhat unfavorable	0.08	0.06	0.15	0.07	0.13	0.10	0.08	0.09	0.05	0.15	0.07	0.03	0.13	0.07	0.03	0.10	0.13	0.16	0.07	0.17	
Strongly unfavorable	0.34	0.38	0.24	0.35	0.23	0.27	0.34	0.04	0.85	0.51	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.80	0.85	0.76	0.41	0.04	0.86	0.41	
No opinion	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.14	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.06	

Table 10: Q5A(1)/Q5B(1) Regardless of [whom you support]/[whom you supported in the election for Governor], is your opinion of Gavin Newsom, Governor, generally favorable or unfavorable, or don't you know enough about him to say? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Voting pref for Gov			Voting pref on Prop 1		Voting pref on Prop 26		Voting pref on Prop 27		Voting pref on Prop 30		Voting pref on Prop 31							
	Total	Newsom	Dahle	Undecided/Yes re- fused/ other	No	Undecided/Yes re- fused	No	Undecided/Yes re- fused	No	Undecided/Yes re- fused	No	Undecided/Yes re- fused	No	Undecided/ re- fused					
unweighted n	5972.00	4316.00	1410.00	246.00	4475.00	1110.00	387.00	1725.00	3247.00	1000.00	1131.00	4080.00	761.00	3030.00	2306.00	636.00	3844.00	1589.00	539.00
weighted n	4997.00	2885.00	1871.00	241.00	3177.00	1347.00	473.00	1499.00	2639.00	860.00	1076.00	3207.00	714.00	2365.00	2073.00	559.00	2877.00	1605.00	515.00
Favorable (net)	0.55	0.91	0.04	0.19	0.77	0.11	0.31	0.58	0.51	0.61	0.56	0.54	0.59	0.76	0.31	0.57	0.67	0.36	0.46
Strongly favorable	0.29	0.50	0.01	0.01	0.41	0.05	0.15	0.32	0.27	0.29	0.32	0.28	0.28	0.40	0.16	0.28	0.35	0.20	0.20
Somewhat favorable	0.26	0.41	0.04	0.18	0.36	0.07	0.16	0.26	0.24	0.32	0.24	0.26	0.30	0.35	0.15	0.29	0.32	0.16	0.27
Unfavorable (net)	0.42	0.07	0.93	0.61	0.20	0.85	0.61	0.40	0.46	0.33	0.42	0.44	0.31	0.22	0.67	0.33	0.31	0.60	0.47
Somewhat unfavorable	0.08	0.06	0.09	0.22	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.10	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.11
Strongly unfavorable	0.34	0.01	0.84	0.38	0.12	0.77	0.54	0.31	0.38	0.27	0.32	0.36	0.23	0.11	0.61	0.27	0.23	0.52	0.36
No opinion	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.20	0.02	0.04	0.08	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.10	0.03	0.02	0.10	0.02	0.04	0.06

Table 11: Q5A(2)/Q5B(2) Regardless of [whom you support]/[whom you supported in the election for Governor], is your opinion of Brian Dahle, Senator/Farmer, generally favorable or unfavorable, or don't you know enough about him to say? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Party Registration				Likely Voters		
		Los Angeles County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento Valley	San Joaquin Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sieras	Democrat	Republican	NPP/other	Other	NPP	Likely voter	Not likely voter
unweighted n	5972.00	2842.00	413.00	302.00	404.00	275.00	575.00	347.00	228.00	1057.00	104.00	3661.00	969.00	1342.00	352.00	990.00	5972.00	0
weighted n	4997.00	1177.00	478.00	433.00	585.00	288.00	884.00	427.00	457.00	1015.00	138.00	2387.00	1360.00	1251.00	286.00	965.00	4997.00	0
Favorable (net)	0.34	0.27	0.38	0.42	0.42	0.24	0.46	0.41	0.52	0.23	0.43	0.10	0.77	0.31	0.39	0.29	0.34	0
Strongly favorable	0.16	0.13	0.16	0.20	0.19	0.10	0.23	0.21	0.26	0.12	0.25	0.04	0.41	0.11	0.15	0.10	0.16	0
Somewhat favorable	0.18	0.14	0.21	0.22	0.23	0.14	0.23	0.20	0.26	0.11	0.18	0.06	0.36	0.20	0.24	0.19	0.18	0
Unfavorable (net)	0.24	0.23	0.25	0.17	0.18	0.34	0.24	0.29	0.19	0.27	0.34	0.35	0.05	0.25	0.22	0.26	0.24	0
Somewhat unfavorable	0.09	0.08	0.14	0.06	0.06	0.12	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.13	0.13	0.02	0.11	0.09	0.12	0.09	0
Strongly unfavorable	0.15	0.15	0.11	0.11	0.12	0.22	0.14	0.19	0.10	0.17	0.21	0.22	0.03	0.14	0.13	0.14	0.15	0
No opinion	0.42	0.50	0.37	0.42	0.40	0.42	0.30	0.30	0.29	0.50	0.23	0.55	0.17	0.44	0.39	0.45	0.42	0

Table 12: Q5A(2)/Q5B(2) Regardless of [whom you support]/[whom you supported in the election for Governor], is your opinion of Brian Dahle, Senator/Farmer, generally favorable or unfavorable, or don't you know enough about him to say? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Gender		Age							Race								Nativity		Union member in household		
		Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+ (net)	65-74	75+	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Spanish dominant (Latino)	English dominant (Latino)	Black	Asian/Pac Isle	American/Native American	Tribal	No affiliation	US	Another country	Yes	No
unweighted n	5972.00	2878.00	3093.00	711.00	913.00	912.00	1687.00	1749.00	1110.00	639.00	3378.00	1321.00	310.00	1002.00	539.00	614.00	103.00	35.00	69.00	4900.00	1062.00	1327.00	4618.00
weighted n	4997.00	2362.00	2635.00	522.00	755.00	787.00	1360.00	1572.00	1030.00	542.00	2936.00	1182.00	415.00	761.00	269.00	541.00	78.00	38.00	40.00	4019.00	976.00	999.00	3989.00
Favorable (net)	0.34	0.39	0.30	0.26	0.31	0.32	0.36	0.37	0.35	0.39	0.35	0.35	0.38	0.34	0.18	0.27	0.33	0.27	0.39	0.34	0.34	0.32	0.34
Strongly favorable	0.16	0.18	0.14	0.07	0.12	0.17	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.15	0.11	0.17	0.11	0.11	0.13	0.22	0.05	0.16	0.17	0.13	0.17
Somewhat favorable	0.18	0.20	0.15	0.19	0.19	0.15	0.17	0.19	0.17	0.22	0.18	0.20	0.27	0.17	0.08	0.15	0.20	0.05	0.34	0.18	0.17	0.19	0.17
Unfavorable (net)	0.24	0.25	0.23	0.34	0.28	0.26	0.19	0.23	0.24	0.19	0.25	0.21	0.12	0.26	0.24	0.24	0.43	0.50	0.37	0.26	0.16	0.26	0.24
Somewhat unfavorable	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.13	0.12	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.05	0.11	0.07	0.11	0.26	0.42	0.11	0.10	0.06	0.08	0.10
Strongly unfavorable	0.15	0.15	0.14	0.21	0.16	0.15	0.12	0.15	0.16	0.12	0.16	0.12	0.07	0.14	0.17	0.13	0.17	0.08	0.25	0.16	0.10	0.19	0.14
No opinion	0.42	0.36	0.47	0.40	0.42	0.42	0.44	0.41	0.40	0.41	0.40	0.44	0.50	0.40	0.58	0.50	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.40	0.50	0.41	0.42

Table 13: Q5A(2)/Q5B(2) Regardless of [whom you support]/[whom you supported in the election for Governor], is your opinion of Brian Dahle, Senator/Farmer, generally favorable or unfavorable, or don't you know enough about him to say? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Political ideology					Education					Household income					Tenure				
		Strongly con- ser- va- tive	Somewhat con- ser- va- tive	Moderate	Somewhat lib- eral	Strongly lib- eral	Not a high school graduate	High school graduate	Some college/traditional school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000-\$39,999	\$40,000-\$59,999	\$60,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$149,999	\$150,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Own	Rent	Other
unweighted n	5972.00	442.00	714.00	1693.00	1469.00	1636.00	60.00	389.00	1457.00	2044.00	2003.00	357.00	537.00	661.00	1207.00	1164.00	744.00	1137.00	3469.00	2043.00	436.00
weighted n	4997.00	642.00	890.00	1506.00	950.00	1001.00	109.00	598.00	2051.00	1348.00	881.00	380.00	619.00	714.00	1027.00	940.00	515.00	697.00	2873.00	1722.00	397.00
Favorable (net)	0.34	0.80	0.65	0.33	0.06	0.05	0.20	0.46	0.39	0.29	0.23	0.20	0.42	0.32	0.33	0.36	0.37	0.31	0.38	0.29	0.23
Strongly favorable	0.16	0.54	0.28	0.11	0.01	0.03	0.12	0.23	0.17	0.16	0.09	0.10	0.18	0.12	0.17	0.18	0.17	0.16	0.20	0.11	0.11
Somewhat favorable	0.18	0.25	0.37	0.22	0.05	0.02	0.08	0.23	0.22	0.12	0.14	0.10	0.24	0.21	0.16	0.18	0.20	0.14	0.18	0.18	0.13
Unfavorable (net)	0.24	0.06	0.07	0.21	0.35	0.46	0.13	0.21	0.22	0.26	0.29	0.36	0.22	0.19	0.25	0.24	0.24	0.25	0.22	0.26	0.34
Somewhat unfavorable	0.09	0.03	0.03	0.09	0.15	0.14	0.05	0.08	0.09	0.12	0.09	0.09	0.11	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.11
Strongly unfavorable	0.15	0.03	0.05	0.11	0.19	0.32	0.08	0.12	0.14	0.15	0.20	0.27	0.11	0.12	0.15	0.15	0.14	0.15	0.13	0.16	0.24
No opinion	0.42	0.14	0.28	0.46	0.59	0.49	0.67	0.34	0.38	0.45	0.48	0.44	0.35	0.48	0.42	0.40	0.39	0.44	0.40	0.45	0.42

Table 14: Q5A(2)/Q5B(2) Regardless of [whom you support]/[whom you supported in the election for Governor], is your opinion of Brian Dahle, Senator/Farmer, generally favorable or unfavorable, or don't you know enough about him to say? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Marital status				Voting in Nov 2020 election					Party identification									
		Married	Not married/divorced/separated/live together	Single/never married	Other	Non-voter	Voted (net)	Biden voter	Trump voter	Other voter	Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/other (net)	Lean Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other
unweighted n	5972.00	3112.00	493.00	976.00	1356.00	505.00	5467.00	4142.00	985.00	340.00	4232.00	2555.00	1672.00	1237.00	516.00	717.00	1777.00	847.00	442.00	487.00
weighted n	4997.00	2783.00	378.00	859.00	965.00	465.00	4532.00	2812.00	1641.00	80.00	2826.00	1622.00	1202.00	1733.00	825.00	905.00	1552.00	614.00	508.00	430.00
Favorable (net)	0.34	0.37	0.24	0.37	0.25	0.34	0.34	0.09	0.76	0.43	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.78	0.83	0.74	0.35	0.05	0.73	0.32
Strongly favorable	0.16	0.20	0.10	0.17	0.08	0.15	0.16	0.02	0.41	0.09	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.40	0.50	0.30	0.15	0.01	0.34	0.14
Somewhat favorable	0.18	0.18	0.14	0.21	0.17	0.19	0.18	0.07	0.35	0.34	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.38	0.33	0.43	0.20	0.04	0.39	0.19
Unfavorable (net)	0.24	0.22	0.35	0.20	0.31	0.26	0.24	0.35	0.05	0.19	0.37	0.36	0.38	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.24	0.42	0.02	0.22
Somewhat unfavorable	0.09	0.09	0.16	0.06	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.13	0.02	0.09	0.14	0.13	0.16	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.10	0.16	0.01	0.10
Strongly unfavorable	0.15	0.13	0.19	0.14	0.20	0.14	0.15	0.22	0.03	0.10	0.23	0.23	0.22	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.14	0.26	0.01	0.12
No opinion	0.42	0.41	0.40	0.42	0.44	0.41	0.42	0.56	0.19	0.38	0.56	0.57	0.56	0.18	0.12	0.23	0.42	0.53	0.25	0.46

Table 15: Q5A(2)/Q5B(2) Regardless of [whom you support]/[whom you supported in the election for Governor], is your opinion of Brian Dahle, Senator/Farmer, generally favorable or unfavorable, or don't you know enough about him to say? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Voting pref for Gov			Voting pref on Prop 1		Voting pref on Prop 26		Voting pref on Prop 27		Voting pref on Prop 30		Voting pref on Prop 31							
	Total	Newsom	Dahle	Undecided/Yes re- fused/ other	No	Undecided/Yes re- fused	No	Undecided/Yes re- fused	No	Undecided/Yes re- fused	No	Undecided/Yes re- fused	No	Undecided/ re- fused					
unweighted n	5972.00	4316.00	1410.00	246.00	4475.00	1110.00	387.00	1725.00	3247.00	1000.00	1131.00	4080.00	761.00	3030.00	2306.00	636.00	3844.00	1589.00	539.00
weighted n	4997.00	2885.00	1871.00	241.00	3177.00	1347.00	473.00	1499.00	2639.00	860.00	1076.00	3207.00	714.00	2365.00	2073.00	559.00	2877.00	1605.00	515.00
Favorable (net)	0.34	0.06	0.80	0.15	0.15	0.75	0.44	0.32	0.38	0.26	0.35	0.36	0.22	0.16	0.56	0.28	0.23	0.52	0.36
Strongly favorable	0.16	0.01	0.41	0.03	0.05	0.42	0.18	0.13	0.19	0.14	0.16	0.17	0.13	0.06	0.27	0.16	0.10	0.26	0.19
Somewhat favorable	0.18	0.04	0.39	0.12	0.10	0.33	0.26	0.19	0.19	0.12	0.20	0.19	0.09	0.10	0.28	0.12	0.13	0.26	0.17
Unfavorable (net)	0.24	0.37	0.04	0.22	0.34	0.05	0.14	0.24	0.23	0.28	0.22	0.25	0.22	0.34	0.14	0.20	0.29	0.16	0.22
Somewhat unfavorable	0.09	0.14	0.02	0.11	0.13	0.03	0.06	0.10	0.09	0.11	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.13	0.06	0.09	0.11	0.07	0.12
Strongly unfavorable	0.15	0.23	0.02	0.11	0.21	0.03	0.08	0.14	0.14	0.17	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.21	0.08	0.11	0.19	0.09	0.10
No opinion	0.42	0.57	0.16	0.63	0.52	0.19	0.42	0.44	0.39	0.47	0.43	0.39	0.56	0.50	0.30	0.52	0.47	0.32	0.42

Table 16: Q6A/B PROPOSITION 1: CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO REPRODUCTIVE FREEDOM. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends California’s Constitution to expressly include an individual’s fundamental right to reproductive freedom, which includes the fundamental right to choose to have an abortion and the fundamental right to choose or refuse contraceptives. This amendment does not narrow or limit the existing rights to privacy and equal protection under the California Constitution. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect because reproductive rights already are protected by state law. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 1? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Party Registration				Likely Voters		
		Los Angeles County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento Valley	San Joaquin Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sieras	Democrat	Republican	NPP/other	Other	NPP	Likely voter	Not likely voter
unweighted n	5972.00	2842.00	413.00	302.00	404.00	275.00	575.00	347.00	228.00	1057.00	104.00	3661.00	969.00	1342.00	352.00	990.00	5972.00	0
weighted n	4997.00	1177.00	478.00	433.00	585.00	288.00	884.00	427.00	457.00	1015.00	138.00	2387.00	1360.00	1251.00	286.00	965.00	4997.00	0
Yes	0.64	0.67	0.61	0.59	0.54	0.72	0.54	0.61	0.48	0.76	0.50	0.86	0.25	0.62	0.51	0.65	0.64	0
No	0.27	0.23	0.32	0.32	0.31	0.22	0.36	0.31	0.40	0.17	0.36	0.08	0.61	0.26	0.30	0.24	0.27	0
Undecided/refused	0.09	0.10	0.06	0.08	0.14	0.06	0.11	0.09	0.12	0.07	0.14	0.06	0.13	0.12	0.19	0.10	0.09	0

Table 17: Q6A/B PROPOSITION 1: CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO REPRODUCTIVE FREEDOM. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends California’s Constitution to expressly include an individual’s fundamental right to reproductive freedom, which includes the fundamental right to choose to have an abortion and the fundamental right to choose or refuse contraceptives. This amendment does not narrow or limit the existing rights to privacy and equal protection under the California Constitution. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect because reproductive rights already are protected by state law. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 1? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Gender		Age						Race								Nativity		Union member in household			
		Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+ (net)	65-74	75+	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Spanish dominant (Latino)	English dominant (Latino)	Black	Asian/Pac Isle	Amer Indian/Native Amer	Tribal affiliation	No tribal affiliation	US	Another country	Yes	No
unweighted n	5972.00	2878.00	3093.00	711.0	913.00	912.00	1687.00	1749.00	1110.00	639.00	3378.00	1321.00	310.00	1002.00	539.00	614.00	103.00	35.00	69.00	4900.00	1062.00	1327.00	4618.00
weighted n	4997.00	2362.00	2635.00	522.0	755.00	787.00	1360.00	1572.00	1030.00	542.00	2936.00	1182.00	415.00	761.00	269.00	541.00	78.00	38.00	40.00	4019.00	976.00	999.00	3989.00
Yes	0.64	0.59	0.67	0.7	0.68	0.65	0.62	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.65	0.54	0.44	0.59	0.72	0.76	0.69	0.68	0.71	0.65	0.56	0.66	0.63
No	0.27	0.31	0.23	0.2	0.24	0.25	0.28	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.28	0.31	0.39	0.27	0.16	0.13	0.23	0.22	0.23	0.26	0.30	0.28	0.27
Undecided/refused	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.1	0.08	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.15	0.17	0.14	0.12	0.11	0.08	0.10	0.06	0.08	0.13	0.06	0.10

Table 18: Q6A/B PROPOSITION 1: CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO REPRODUCTIVE FREEDOM. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends California’s Constitution to expressly include an individual’s fundamental right to reproductive freedom, which includes the fundamental right to choose to have an abortion and the fundamental right to choose or refuse contraceptives. This amendment does not narrow or limit the existing rights to privacy and equal protection under the California Constitution. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect because reproductive rights already are protected by state law. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 1? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Political ideology					Education					Household income						Tenure			
		Strongly con- ser- va- tive	Somewhat con- ser- va- tive	Moderate	Somewhat lib- eral	Strongly lib- eral	Not a high school graduate	High school graduate	Some college/school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000-\$39,999	\$40,000-\$59,999	\$60,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$149,999	\$150,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Own	Rent	Other
unweighted n	5972.00	442.00	714.00	1693.00	1469.00	1636.00	60.00	389.00	1457.00	2044.00	2003.00	357.00	537.00	661.00	1207.00	1164.00	744.00	1137.00	3469.00	2043.00	436.00
weighted n	4997.00	642.00	890.00	1506.00	950.00	1001.00	109.00	598.00	2051.00	1348.00	881.00	380.00	619.00	714.00	1027.00	940.00	515.00	697.00	2873.00	1722.00	397.00
Yes	0.64	0.14	0.30	0.67	0.90	0.96	0.45	0.51	0.61	0.67	0.74	0.74	0.59	0.59	0.64	0.64	0.62	0.70	0.60	0.68	0.65
No	0.27	0.75	0.55	0.20	0.05	0.03	0.23	0.34	0.29	0.25	0.20	0.18	0.26	0.30	0.26	0.29	0.26	0.26	0.30	0.23	0.21
Undecided/refused	0.09	0.12	0.14	0.13	0.06	0.02	0.32	0.14	0.09	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.14	0.11	0.10	0.07	0.12	0.04	0.09	0.09	0.14

Table 19: Q6A/B PROPOSITION 1: CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO REPRODUCTIVE FREEDOM. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends California’s Constitution to expressly include an individual’s fundamental right to reproductive freedom, which includes the fundamental right to choose to have an abortion and the fundamental right to choose or refuse contraceptives. This amendment does not narrow or limit the existing rights to privacy and equal protection under the California Constitution. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect because reproductive rights already are protected by state law. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 1? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Marital status					Voting in Nov 2020 election					Party identification									
		Married	Not married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married	Non-voter	Voted (net)	Biden voter	Trump voter	Other voter	Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/other (net)	Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other	
unweighted n	5972.00	3112.00	493.00	976.00	1356.00	505.00	5467.00	4142.00	985.00	340.00	4232.00	2555.00	1672.00	1237.00	516.00	717.00	1777.00	847.00	442.00	487.00	
weighted n	4997.00	2783.00	378.00	859.00	965.00	465.00	4532.00	2812.00	1641.00	80.00	2826.00	1622.00	1202.00	1733.00	825.00	905.00	1552.00	614.00	508.00	430.00	
Yes	0.64	0.58	0.84	0.63	0.72	0.63	0.64	0.88	0.22	0.48	0.89	0.90	0.88	0.24	0.20	0.29	0.59	0.93	0.22	0.56	
No	0.27	0.32	0.11	0.26	0.20	0.23	0.27	0.07	0.63	0.32	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.61	0.66	0.57	0.29	0.04	0.60	0.27	
Undecided/refused	0.09	0.10	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.13	0.09	0.05	0.15	0.20	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.12	0.04	0.17	0.17	

Table 20: Q6A/B PROPOSITION 1: CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO REPRODUCTIVE FREEDOM. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends California’s Constitution to expressly include an individual’s fundamental right to reproductive freedom, which includes the fundamental right to choose to have an abortion and the fundamental right to choose or refuse contraceptives. This amendment does not narrow or limit the existing rights to privacy and equal protection under the California Constitution. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect because reproductive rights already are protected by state law. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 1? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Voting pref for Gov			Voting pref on Prop 1		Voting pref on Prop 26		Voting pref on Prop 27		Voting pref on Prop 30		Voting pref on Prop 31							
	Total	Newsom	Dahle	Undecided/Yes	No	Undecided/Yes	No	Undecided/Yes	No	Undecided/Yes	No	Undecided/Yes	No	Undecided/Yes					
unweighted n	5972.00	4316.00	1410.00	246.00	4475	1110	387	1725.00	3247.00	1000.00	1131.00	4080.00	761.00	3030.00	2306.00	636.00	3844.00	1589.00	539.00
weighted n	4997.00	2885.00	1871.00	241.00	3177	1347	473	1499.00	2639.00	860.00	1076.00	3207.00	714.00	2365.00	2073.00	559.00	2877.00	1605.00	515.00
Yes	0.64	0.90	0.24	0.48	1	0	0	0.70	0.59	0.66	0.65	0.63	0.63	0.83	0.42	0.59	0.74	0.48	0.52
No	0.27	0.05	0.61	0.19	0	1	0	0.23	0.34	0.13	0.25	0.30	0.15	0.11	0.48	0.13	0.20	0.42	0.17
Undecided/refused	0.09	0.04	0.14	0.34	0	0	1	0.07	0.07	0.22	0.09	0.07	0.22	0.05	0.09	0.28	0.06	0.10	0.31

Table 21: Q7A/B PROPOSITION 26: ALLOWS IN-PERSON ROULETTE, DICE GAMES, SPORTS WAGERING ON TRIBAL LANDS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Also allows sports wagering at certain horseracing tracks; private lawsuits to enforce certain gambling laws. Directs revenues to General Fund, problem-gambling programs, enforcement. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues, possibly reaching tens of millions of dollars annually. Some of these revenues would support increased state regulatory and enforcement costs that could reach the low tens of millions of dollars annually. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Propostion 26? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Party Registration				Likely Voters		
		Los Angeles County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento/Valley	San Joaquin Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sieras	Democrat	Republican	NPP/Other	Other	NPP	Likely voter	Not likely voter
unweighted n	5972.00	2842.00	413.00	302.00	404.00	275.00	575.00	347.00	228.00	1057.00	104.00	3661.00	969.00	1342.00	352.00	990.00	5972.00	0
weighted n	4997.00	1177.00	478.00	433.00	585.00	288.00	884.00	427.00	457.00	1015.00	138.00	2387.00	1360.00	1251.00	286.00	965.00	4997.00	0
Yes	0.30	0.33	0.34	0.26	0.32	0.28	0.27	0.33	0.20	0.29	0.28	0.32	0.23	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.30	0
No	0.53	0.49	0.53	0.56	0.51	0.58	0.57	0.49	0.65	0.50	0.57	0.49	0.64	0.47	0.51	0.46	0.53	0
Undecided/refused	0.17	0.18	0.13	0.17	0.17	0.14	0.16	0.17	0.15	0.21	0.15	0.19	0.13	0.18	0.15	0.20	0.17	0

Table 22: Q7A/B PROPOSITION 26: ALLOWS IN-PERSON ROULETTE, DICE GAMES, SPORTS WAGERING ON TRIBAL LANDS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Also allows sports wagering at certain horseracing tracks; private lawsuits to enforce certain gambling laws. Directs revenues to General Fund, problem-gambling programs, enforcement. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues, possibly reaching tens of millions of dollars annually. Some of these revenues would support increased state regulatory and enforcement costs that could reach the low tens of millions of dollars annually. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Propostion 26? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Gender		Age					Race							Nativity		Union member in household							
	Total	Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+ (net)	65-74	75+	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Spanish dom- i- nant (Latino)	English dom- i- nant/bilingual (Latino)	Black	Asian/ Pac Isle	Amer In- dian/ Na- tive	Tribal af- filia- tion	No tribal af- filia- tion	US	Another coun- try	Yes	No	
unweighted n	5972.00	2878.00	3093.00	711.00	913.00	912.00	1687.00	1749.00	1110.00	639.00	3378.00	1321.00	310.00	1002.00	539.0	614.00	103.00	35.00	69.00	4900.00	1062.00	1327.00	4618.00	3989.00
weighted n	4997.00	2362.00	2635.00	522.00	755.00	787.00	1360.00	1572.00	1030.00	542.00	2936.00	1182.00	415.00	761.00	269.0	541.00	78.00	38.00	40.00	4019.00	976.00	999.00	3989.00	3989.00
Yes	0.30	0.35	0.26	0.34	0.42	0.37	0.29	0.21	0.22	0.18	0.27	0.36	0.31	0.39	0.3	0.32	0.49	0.57	0.41	0.30	0.29	0.28	0.31	0.31
No	0.53	0.52	0.54	0.39	0.41	0.40	0.55	0.68	0.64	0.74	0.57	0.45	0.53	0.41	0.5	0.45	0.45	0.43	0.48	0.53	0.53	0.55	0.52	0.52
Undecided/refused	0.17	0.14	0.20	0.28	0.17	0.23	0.16	0.12	0.14	0.07	0.15	0.19	0.16	0.20	0.2	0.23	0.06	0.00	0.11	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17

Table 23: Q7A/B PROPOSITION 26: ALLOWS IN-PERSON ROULETTE, DICE GAMES, SPORTS WAGERING ON TRIBAL LANDS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Also allows sports wagering at certain horseracing tracks; private lawsuits to enforce certain gambling laws. Directs revenues to General Fund, problem-gambling programs, enforcement. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues, possibly reaching tens of millions of dollars annually. Some of these revenues would support increased state regulatory and enforcement costs that could reach the low tens of millions of dollars annually. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Propostion 26? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Political ideology				Education				Household income						Tenure						
		Strongly con- ser- va- tive	Somewhat con- ser- va- tive	Moderate	Somewhat lib- eral	Strongly lib- eral	Not a high school graduate	High school graduate	Some college	College grad- uate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000-\$39,999	\$40,000-\$59,999	\$60,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$149,999	\$150,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Own	Rent	Other	
unweighted n	5972.00	442.00	714.00	1693.00	1469.00	1636.00	60.00	389.00	1457.00	2044.00	2003.00	357.00	537.00	661.00	1207.00	1164.00	744.00	1137.00	3469.00	2043.00	436.00	397.00
weighted n	4997.00	642.00	890.00	1506.00	950.00	1001.00	109.00	598.00	2051.00	1348.00	881.00	380.00	619.00	714.00	1027.00	940.00	515.00	697.00	2873.00	1722.00	397.00	397.00
Yes	0.30	0.20	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.33	0.21	0.29	0.34	0.26	0.29	0.24	0.31	0.30	0.29	0.36	0.27	0.30	0.28	0.34	0.28	0.28
No	0.53	0.66	0.61	0.49	0.52	0.45	0.70	0.51	0.50	0.55	0.56	0.48	0.50	0.53	0.54	0.52	0.53	0.54	0.57	0.47	0.44	0.44
Undecided/refused	0.17	0.14	0.08	0.20	0.18	0.23	0.09	0.20	0.16	0.19	0.15	0.28	0.19	0.16	0.17	0.12	0.19	0.16	0.15	0.18	0.18	0.28

Table 24: Q7A/B PROPOSITION 26: ALLOWS IN-PERSON ROULETTE, DICE GAMES, SPORTS WAGERING ON TRIBAL LANDS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Also allows sports wagering at certain horseracing tracks; private lawsuits to enforce certain gambling laws. Directs revenues to General Fund, problem-gambling programs, enforcement. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues, possibly reaching tens of millions of dollars annually. Some of these revenues would support increased state regulatory and enforcement costs that could reach the low tens of millions of dollars annually. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Propostion 26? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Marital status					Voting in Nov 2020 election					Party identification									
	Total	Married	Not married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married	Non-voter	Voted (net)	Biden voter	Trump voter	Other voter	Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/other (net)	Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other
unweighted n	5972.00	3112.00	493.00	976.00	1356.00	505.00	5467.00	4142.00	985.00	340.00	4232.00	2555.00	1672.00	1237.00	516.00	717.00	1777.00	847.00	442.00	487.00
weighted n	4997.00	2783.00	378.00	859.00	965.00	465.00	4532.00	2812.00	1641.00	80.00	2826.00	1622.00	1202.00	1733.00	825.00	905.00	1552.00	614.00	508.00	430.00
Yes	0.30	0.29	0.35	0.26	0.33	0.32	0.30	0.31	0.27	0.26	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.26	0.25	0.27	0.30	0.31	0.27	0.32
No	0.53	0.54	0.48	0.61	0.44	0.47	0.53	0.49	0.60	0.54	0.48	0.49	0.47	0.61	0.64	0.59	0.53	0.48	0.61	0.50
Undecided/refused	0.17	0.16	0.17	0.13	0.23	0.21	0.17	0.20	0.12	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.22	0.13	0.11	0.14	0.18	0.22	0.12	0.18

Table 25: Q7A/B PROPOSITION 26: ALLOWS IN-PERSON ROULETTE, DICE GAMES, SPORTS WAGERING ON TRIBAL LANDS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Also allows sports wagering at certain horseracing tracks; private lawsuits to enforce certain gambling laws. Directs revenues to General Fund, problem-gambling programs, enforcement. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues, possibly reaching tens of millions of dollars annually. Some of these revenues would support increased state regulatory and enforcement costs that could reach the low tens of millions of dollars annually. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Propostion 26? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Voting pref for Gov			Voting pref on Prop 1		Voting pref on Prop 26		Voting pref on Prop 27		Voting pref on Prop 30		Voting pref on Prop 31						
		Newsom	Dahle	Undecided/refused/other	Yes	No	Undecided/Yes	No	Undecided/Yes	No	Undecided/Yes	No	Undecided/Yes	No	Undecided/Yes				
unweighted n	5972.00	4316.00	1410.00	246.00	4475.00	1110.00	387.00	1725	3247	1000	1131.00	4080.00	761.00	3030.00	2306.00	636.00	3844.00	1589.00	539.00
weighted n	4997.00	2885.00	1871.00	241.00	3177.00	1347.00	473.00	1499	2639	860	1076.00	3207.00	714.00	2365.00	2073.00	559.00	2877.00	1605.00	515.00
Yes	0.30	0.32	0.28	0.25	0.33	0.25	0.24	1	0	0	0.74	0.19	0.13	0.38	0.24	0.21	0.27	0.35	0.28
No	0.53	0.49	0.59	0.49	0.49	0.67	0.37	0	1	0	0.19	0.73	0.12	0.44	0.68	0.31	0.57	0.54	0.25
Undecided/refused	0.17	0.19	0.14	0.26	0.18	0.08	0.39	0	0	1	0.07	0.08	0.75	0.18	0.08	0.48	0.15	0.11	0.47

Table 26: Q&A/B PROPOSITION 27: ALLOWS ONLINE AND MOBILE SPORTS WAGERING OUTSIDE TRIBAL LANDS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Allows Indian tribes and affiliated businesses to operate online/mobile sports wagering outside tribal lands. Directs revenues to regulatory costs, homelessness programs, nonparticipating tribes. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues, possibly in the hundreds of millions of dollars but not likely to exceed \$500 million annually. Some revenues would support state regulatory costs, possibly reaching the mid-tens of millions of dollars annually. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 27? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Party Registration				Likely Voters		
		Los Angeles County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento Valley	South Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sieras	Democrat	Republican	NPP/other	Other	NPP	Likely voter	Not likely voter
unweighted n	5972.00	2842.00	413.00	302.00	404.00	275.00	575.00	347.00	228.00	1057.00	104.00	3661.00	969.00	1342.00	352.00	990.00	5972.00	0
weighted n	4997.00	1177.00	478.00	433.00	585.00	288.00	884.00	427.00	457.00	1015.00	138.00	2387.00	1360.00	1251.00	286.00	965.00	4997.00	0
Yes	0.22	0.26	0.25	0.19	0.20	0.22	0.15	0.17	0.13	0.22	0.24	0.22	0.17	0.26	0.26	0.25	0.22	0
No	0.64	0.59	0.62	0.67	0.65	0.65	0.72	0.69	0.74	0.62	0.70	0.64	0.71	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.64	0
Undecided/refused	0.14	0.16	0.13	0.14	0.15	0.13	0.13	0.14	0.12	0.16	0.06	0.15	0.11	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.14	0

Table 27: Q&A/B PROPOSITION 27: ALLOWS ONLINE AND MOBILE SPORTS WAGERING OUTSIDE TRIBAL LANDS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Allows Indian tribes and affiliated businesses to operate online/mobile sports wagering outside tribal lands. Directs revenues to regulatory costs, homelessness programs, nonparticipating tribes. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues, possibly in the hundreds of millions of dollars but not likely to exceed \$500 million annually. Some revenues would support state regulatory costs, possibly reaching the mid-tens of millions of dollars annually. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 27? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Gender		Age							Race								Nativity		Union member in household		
		Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+ (net)	65-74	75+	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Spanish dominant (Latino)	English dominant (Latino)	Black	Asian/Pac Isle	Amer Indian/Native Amer	Tribal affiliation	No tribal affiliation	US country	Another country	Yes	No
unweighted n	5972.00	2878.00	3093.00	711.00	913.00	912.00	1687.00	1749.00	1110.00	639.00	3378.00	1321.00	310.00	1002.00	539.00	614.00	103.00	35.00	69.00	4900.00	1062.00	1327.00	4618.00
weighted n	4997.00	2362.00	2635.00	522.00	755.00	787.00	1360.00	1572.00	1030.00	542.00	2936.00	1182.00	415.00	761.00	269.00	541.00	78.00	38.00	40.00	4019.00	976.00	999.00	3989.00
Yes	0.22	0.26	0.18	0.29	0.34	0.26	0.19	0.12	0.14	0.10	0.19	0.28	0.24	0.30	0.27	0.20	0.22	0.09	0.35	0.22	0.21	0.22	0.22
No	0.64	0.63	0.66	0.47	0.49	0.54	0.66	0.81	0.79	0.85	0.70	0.52	0.58	0.49	0.55	0.57	0.74	0.91	0.57	0.65	0.62	0.64	0.64
Undecided/refused	0.14	0.11	0.17	0.24	0.16	0.19	0.15	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.10	0.20	0.18	0.21	0.17	0.23	0.04	0.00	0.08	0.13	0.18	0.14	0.14

Table 28: Q8A/B PROPOSITION 27: ALLOWS ONLINE AND MOBILE SPORTS WAGERING OUTSIDE TRIBAL LANDS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Allows Indian tribes and affiliated businesses to operate online/mobile sports wagering outside tribal lands. Directs revenues to regulatory costs, homelessness programs, nonparticipating tribes. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues, possibly in the hundreds of millions of dollars but not likely to exceed \$500 million annually. Some revenues would support state regulatory costs, possibly reaching the mid-tens of millions of dollars annually. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 27? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Political ideology					Education					Household income						Tenure				
	Total	Strongly con- serv- va- tive	Somewha con- serv- va- tive	Moderat	Somewha lib- eral	Strongly lib- eral	Not a high school graduate	High school graduate	Some col- lege/trad- school	College grad- uate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000-\$39,999	\$40,000-\$59,999	\$60,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$149,999	\$150,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Own	Rent	Other
unweighted n	5972.00	442.00	714.00	1693.00	1469.00	1636.00	60.00	389.00	1457.00	2044.00	2003.00	357.00	537.00	661.00	1207.00	1164.00	744.00	1137.00	3469.00	2043.00	436.00
weighted n	4997.00	642.00	890.00	1506.00	950.00	1001.00	109.00	598.00	2051.00	1348.00	881.00	380.00	619.00	714.00	1027.00	940.00	515.00	697.00	2873.00	1722.00	397.00
Yes	0.22	0.17	0.21	0.24	0.21	0.22	0.29	0.25	0.23	0.18	0.19	0.23	0.19	0.20	0.22	0.24	0.17	0.24	0.18	0.28	0.19
No	0.64	0.72	0.70	0.61	0.61	0.61	0.56	0.59	0.62	0.68	0.69	0.55	0.66	0.62	0.63	0.69	0.67	0.64	0.71	0.56	0.54
Undecided/refused	0.14	0.11	0.09	0.15	0.18	0.16	0.15	0.17	0.14	0.14	0.12	0.22	0.15	0.18	0.15	0.07	0.16	0.12	0.11	0.16	0.27

Table 29: Q8A/B PROPOSITION 27: ALLOWS ONLINE AND MOBILE SPORTS WAGERING OUTSIDE TRIBAL LANDS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Allows Indian tribes and affiliated businesses to operate online/mobile sports wagering outside tribal lands. Directs revenues to regulatory costs, homelessness programs, nonparticipating tribes. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues, possibly in the hundreds of millions of dollars but not likely to exceed \$500 million annually. Some revenues would support state regulatory costs, possibly reaching the mid-tens of millions of dollars annually. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 27? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Marital status					Voting in Nov 2020 election					Party identification									
	Total	Married	Not mar- ried/ live to- gether	Separated/ divorced/ wid- owed	Single/ never mar- ried	Non- voter	Voted (net)	Biden voter	Trump voter	Other voter	Democrat (net)	Strong Demo- crat	Not strong Demo- crat	Republican (net)	Strong Re- pub- lican	Not strong Re- pub- lican	Independent/ other (net)	Democrat	Lean Re- pub- lican	Pure Inde- pen- dent/other
unweighted n	5972.00	3112.00	493.00	976.00	1356.00	505.00	5467.00	4142.00	985.00	340.00	4232.00	2555.00	1672.00	1237.00	516.00	717.00	1777.00	847.00	442.00	487.00
weighted n	4997.00	2783.00	378.00	859.00	965.00	465.00	4532.00	2812.00	1641.00	80.00	2826.00	1622.00	1202.00	1733.00	825.00	905.00	1552.00	614.00	508.00	430.00
Yes	0.22	0.21	0.26	0.14	0.27	0.25	0.21	0.22	0.19	0.25	0.22	0.21	0.23	0.20	0.19	0.20	0.22	0.22	0.18	0.25
No	0.64	0.66	0.58	0.75	0.52	0.59	0.65	0.62	0.70	0.58	0.62	0.62	0.61	0.70	0.70	0.69	0.64	0.61	0.72	0.58
Undecided/refused	0.14	0.13	0.16	0.11	0.21	0.16	0.14	0.16	0.11	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.15	0.17	0.09	0.17

Table 30: Q8A/B PROPOSITION 27: ALLOWS ONLINE AND MOBILE SPORTS WAGERING OUTSIDE TRIBAL LANDS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Allows Indian tribes and affiliated businesses to operate online/mobile sports wagering outside tribal lands. Directs revenues to regulatory costs, homelessness programs, nonparticipating tribes. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues, possibly in the hundreds of millions of dollars but not likely to exceed \$500 million annually. Some revenues would support state regulatory costs, possibly reaching the mid-tens of millions of dollars annually. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 27? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Voting pref for Gov			Voting pref on Prop 1			Voting pref on Prop 26			Voting pref on Prop 27			Voting pref on Prop 30			Voting pref on Prop 31		
		Newsom	Dahle	Undecided/ re-fused/ other	Undecided/ Yes	No	Undecided/ Yes	No	Undecided/ Yes	No	Undecided/ Yes	No	Undecided/ Yes	No	Undecided/ Yes	No	Undecided/ re-fused	No	Undecided/ re-fused
unweighted n	5972.00	4316.00	1410.00	246.00	4475.00	1110.00	387.00	1725.00	3247.00	1000.00	1131	4080	761	3030.00	2306.00	636.00	3844.00	1589.00	539.00
weighted n	4997.00	2885.00	1871.00	241.00	3177.00	1347.00	473.00	1499.00	2639.00	860.00	1076	3207	714	2365.00	2073.00	559.00	2877.00	1605.00	515.00
Yes	0.22	0.22	0.20	0.24	0.22	0.20	0.21	0.53	0.08	0.09	1	0	0	0.27	0.17	0.15	0.18	0.29	0.18
No	0.64	0.62	0.69	0.49	0.64	0.72	0.46	0.41	0.89	0.29	0	1	0	0.59	0.76	0.42	0.70	0.62	0.40
Undecided/refused	0.14	0.16	0.11	0.27	0.14	0.08	0.33	0.06	0.03	0.62	0	0	1	0.15	0.06	0.43	0.12	0.09	0.42

Table 31: Q9A/B PROPOSITION 30: PROVIDES FUNDING FOR PROGRAMS TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION AND PREVENT WILDFIRES BY INCREASING TAX ON PERSONAL INCOME OVER \$2 MILLION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allocates tax revenues to zero-emission vehicle purchase incentives, vehicle charging stations, and wildfire prevention. Fiscal Impact: Increased state tax revenue ranging from \$3.5 billion to \$5 billion annually, with the new funding used to support zero-emission vehicle programs and wildfire response and prevention activities. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 30? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Party Registration				Likely Voters		
		Los Angeles County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento/Valley	North Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sieras	Democrat	Republican	NPP/other	Other	NPP	Likely voter	Not likely voter
unweighted n	5972.00	2842.00	413.00	302.00	404.00	275.00	575.00	347.00	228.00	1057.00	104.00	3661.00	969.00	1342.00	352.00	990.00	5972.00	0
weighted n	4997.00	1177.00	478.00	433.00	585.00	288.00	884.00	427.00	457.00	1015.00	138.00	2387.00	1360.00	1251.00	286.00	965.00	4997.00	0
Yes	0.47	0.48	0.48	0.42	0.42	0.55	0.42	0.43	0.40	0.54	0.54	0.65	0.16	0.46	0.36	0.50	0.47	0
No	0.41	0.38	0.42	0.48	0.49	0.34	0.47	0.48	0.47	0.35	0.39	0.23	0.74	0.42	0.56	0.38	0.41	0
Undecided/refused	0.11	0.14	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.13	0.11	0.07	0.12	0.10	0.11	0.07	0.13	0.11	0

Table 32: Q9A/B PROPOSITION 30: PROVIDES FUNDING FOR PROGRAMS TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION AND PREVENT WILDFIRES BY INCREASING TAX ON PERSONAL INCOME OVER \$2 MILLION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allocates tax revenues to zero-emission vehicle purchase incentives, vehicle charging stations, and wildfire prevention. Fiscal Impact: Increased state tax revenue ranging from \$3.5 billion to \$5 billion annually, with the new funding used to support zero-emission vehicle programs and wildfire response and prevention activities. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 30? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Gender		Age							Race							Nativity		Union member in household				
	Total	Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+ (net)	65-74	75+	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Spanish-dominant (Latino)	English-dominant/bilingual (Latino)	Black	Asian/Pac Isle	Amer-Indian/Native Amer	Tribal affiliation	No tribal affiliation	US	Another country	Yes	No
unweighted n	5972.00	2878.00	3093.00	711.00	913.00	912.00	1687.00	1749.00	1110.00	639.00	3378.00	1321.00	310.00	1002.00	539.00	614.00	103.00	35.00	69.00	4900.00	1062.00	1327.00	4618.00
weighted n	4997.00	2362.00	2635.00	522.00	755.00	787.00	1360.00	1572.00	1030.00	542.00	2936.00	1182.00	415.00	761.00	269.00	541.00	78.00	38.00	40.00	4019.00	976.00	999.00	3989.00
Yes	0.47	0.44	0.50	0.59	0.51	0.52	0.44	0.42	0.41	0.42	0.44	0.51	0.58	0.47	0.52	0.55	0.51	0.61	0.42	0.46	0.51	0.46	0.48
No	0.41	0.47	0.37	0.30	0.39	0.33	0.44	0.49	0.48	0.50	0.46	0.34	0.25	0.40	0.35	0.33	0.39	0.39	0.41	0.43	0.35	0.45	0.41
Undecided/refused	0.11	0.09	0.13	0.11	0.10	0.15	0.12	0.10	0.11	0.08	0.09	0.15	0.17	0.13	0.13	0.12	0.09	0.00	0.18	0.10	0.14	0.09	0.12

Table 33: Q9A/B PROPOSITION 30: PROVIDES FUNDING FOR PROGRAMS TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION AND PREVENT WILDFIRES BY INCREASING TAX ON PERSONAL INCOME OVER \$2 MILLION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allocates tax revenues to zero-emission vehicle purchase incentives, vehicle charging stations, and wildfire prevention. Fiscal Impact: Increased state tax revenue ranging from \$3.5 billion to \$5 billion annually, with the new funding used to support zero-emission vehicle programs and wildfire response and prevention activities. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 30? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Political ideology					Education					Household income					Tenure				
		Strongly conservative	Somewhat conservative	Moderate	Somewhat liberal	Strongly liberal	Not a high school graduate	High school graduate	Some college	College graduate (BA)	Post-graduate education	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000-\$39,999	\$40,000-\$59,999	\$60,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$149,999	\$150,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Own	Rent	Other
unweighted n	5972.00	442.00	714.00	1693.00	1469.00	1636.00	60.00	389.00	1457.00	2044.00	2003.00	357.00	537.00	661.00	1207.00	1164.00	744.00	1137.00	3469.00	2043.00	436.00
weighted n	4997.00	642.00	890.00	1506.00	950.00	1001.00	109.00	598.00	2051.00	1348.00	881.00	380.00	619.00	714.00	1027.00	940.00	515.00	697.00	2873.00	1722.00	397.00
Yes	0.47	0.19	0.23	0.47	0.63	0.73	0.45	0.40	0.47	0.48	0.52	0.65	0.48	0.51	0.47	0.47	0.43	0.41	0.42	0.56	0.5
No	0.41	0.69	0.70	0.40	0.24	0.18	0.25	0.44	0.43	0.41	0.39	0.17	0.37	0.35	0.44	0.48	0.47	0.49	0.48	0.33	0.3
Undecided/refused	0.11	0.13	0.07	0.13	0.13	0.09	0.30	0.16	0.10	0.11	0.09	0.18	0.16	0.14	0.09	0.06	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.2

Table 34: Q9A/B PROPOSITION 30: PROVIDES FUNDING FOR PROGRAMS TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION AND PREVENT WILDFIRES BY INCREASING TAX ON PERSONAL INCOME OVER \$2 MILLION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allocates tax revenues to zero-emission vehicle purchase incentives, vehicle charging stations, and wildfire prevention. Fiscal Impact: Increased state tax revenue ranging from \$3.5 billion to \$5 billion annually, with the new funding used to support zero-emission vehicle programs and wildfire response and prevention activities. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 30? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Marital status					Voting in Nov 2020 election					Party identification									
	Total	Married	Not married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married	Non-voter	Voted (net)	Biden voter	Trump voter	Other voter	Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/other (net)	Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other
unweighted n	5972.00	3112.00	493.00	976.00	1356.00	505.00	5467.00	4142.00	985.00	340.00	4232.00	2555.00	1672.00	1237.00	516.00	717.00	1777.00	847.00	442.00	487.00
weighted n	4997.00	2783.00	378.00	859.00	965.00	465.00	4532.00	2812.00	1641.00	80.00	2826.00	1622.00	1202.00	1733.00	825.00	905.00	1552.00	614.00	508.00	430.00
Yes	0.47	0.43	0.58	0.46	0.57	0.52	0.47	0.65	0.17	0.32	0.67	0.65	0.69	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.43	0.71	0.15	0.37
No	0.41	0.46	0.32	0.43	0.31	0.35	0.42	0.23	0.74	0.51	0.21	0.21	0.22	0.72	0.73	0.71	0.48	0.20	0.78	0.51
Undecided/refused	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.13	0.14	0.11	0.12	0.09	0.18	0.12	0.13	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.12

Table 35: Q9A/B PROPOSITION 30: PROVIDES FUNDING FOR PROGRAMS TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION AND PREVENT WILDFIRES BY INCREASING TAX ON PERSONAL INCOME OVER \$2 MILLION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allocates tax revenues to zero-emission vehicle purchase incentives, vehicle charging stations, and wildfire prevention. Fiscal Impact: Increased state tax revenue ranging from \$3.5 billion to \$5 billion annually, with the new funding used to support zero-emission vehicle programs and wildfire response and prevention activities. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 30? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Voting pref for Gov			Voting pref on Prop 1		Voting pref on Prop 26		Voting pref on Prop 27		Voting pref on Prop 30		Voting pref on Prop 31	
		Newsom	Dahle	Undecided/refused/other	Yes	No	Undecided/Yes	No	Undecided/Yes	No	Undecided/Yes	No	Undecided/Yes	No
unweighted n	5972.00	4316.00	1410.00	246.00	4475.00	1110.00	387.00	1725.00	3247.00	1000.00	1131.00	4080.00	761.00	3030
weighted n	4997.00	2885.00	1871.00	241.00	3177.00	1347.00	473.00	1499.00	2639.00	860.00	1076.00	3207.00	714.00	2365
Yes	0.47	0.67	0.18	0.35	0.62	0.20	0.26	0.59	0.40	0.49	0.59	0.43	0.48	1
No	0.41	0.22	0.72	0.37	0.28	0.74	0.41	0.33	0.54	0.19	0.34	0.49	0.18	0
Undecided/refused	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.28	0.10	0.06	0.33	0.08	0.07	0.31	0.08	0.07	0.34	0

Table 36: Q10A/B PROPOSITION 31: REFERENDUM ON 2020 LAW THAT WOULD PROHIBIT THE RETAIL SALE OF CERTAIN FLAVORED TOBACCO PRODUCTS. A “Yes” vote approves, and a “No” vote rejects, a 2020 law prohibiting retail sale of certain flavored tobacco products. Fiscal Impact: Decreased state tobacco tax revenues ranging from tens of millions of dollars annually to around \$100 million annually. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 31? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Party Registration				Likely Voters		
		Los Angeles County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento/Valley	South Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sieras	Democrat	Republican	NPP/other	Other	NPP	Likely voter	Not likely voter
unweighted n	5972.00	2842.00	413.00	302.00	404.00	275.00	575.00	347.00	228.00	1057.00	104.00	3661.00	969.00	1342.00	352.00	990.00	5972.00	0
weighted n	4997.00	1177.00	478.00	433.00	585.00	288.00	884.00	427.00	457.00	1015.00	138.00	2387.00	1360.00	1251.00	286.00	965.00	4997.00	0
Yes	0.58	0.59	0.59	0.53	0.49	0.61	0.54	0.56	0.51	0.64	0.62	0.69	0.43	0.52	0.46	0.53	0.58	0
No	0.32	0.31	0.35	0.36	0.39	0.31	0.35	0.31	0.39	0.24	0.31	0.22	0.48	0.34	0.37	0.33	0.32	0
Undecided/refused	0.10	0.10	0.06	0.11	0.12	0.08	0.11	0.12	0.10	0.12	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.14	0.17	0.14	0.10	0

Table 37: Q10A/B PROPOSITION 31: REFERENDUM ON 2020 LAW THAT WOULD PROHIBIT THE RETAIL SALE OF CERTAIN FLAVORED TOBACCO PRODUCTS. A “Yes” vote approves, and a “No” vote rejects, a 2020 law prohibiting retail sale of certain flavored tobacco products. Fiscal Impact: Decreased state tobacco tax revenues ranging from tens of millions of dollars annually to around \$100 million annually. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 31? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Gender			Age						Race								Nativity		Union member in household			
	Total	Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+ (net)	65-74	75+	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Spanish i-nant (Latino)	English i-nant/bilingual (Latino)	Black	Asian/Pac Isle	Amer Indian/Native Amer	Tribal fili-tion	No tribal af-fili-tion	US	Another country	Yes	No
unweighted n	5972.00	2878.00	3093.00	711.00	913.00	912.00	1687.0	1749.00	1110.00	639.00	3378.00	1321.00	310.00	1002.00	539.00	614.00	103.00	35.00	69.00	4900.00	1062.00	1327.00	4618.00
weighted n	4997.00	2362.00	2635.00	522.00	755.00	787.00	1360.0	1572.00	1030.00	542.00	2936.00	1182.00	415.00	761.00	269.00	541.00	78.00	38.00	40.00	4019.00	976.00	999.00	3989.00
Yes	0.58	0.52	0.63	0.56	0.43	0.50	0.6	0.67	0.66	0.68	0.59	0.54	0.54	0.53	0.57	0.62	0.62	0.75	0.49	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.57
No	0.32	0.40	0.25	0.30	0.43	0.38	0.3	0.27	0.28	0.25	0.31	0.35	0.37	0.35	0.34	0.27	0.32	0.24	0.39	0.32	0.33	0.33	0.32
Undecided/refused	0.10	0.07	0.13	0.15	0.14	0.13	0.1	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.10	0.11	0.09	0.12	0.09	0.11	0.06	0.01	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.11

Table 38: Q10A/B PROPOSITION 31: REFERENDUM ON 2020 LAW THAT WOULD PROHIBIT THE RETAIL SALE OF CERTAIN FLAVORED TOBACCO PRODUCTS. A “Yes” vote approves, and a “No” vote rejects, a 2020 law prohibiting retail sale of certain flavored tobacco products. Fiscal Impact: Decreased state tobacco tax revenues ranging from tens of millions of dollars annually to around \$100 million annually. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 31? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Political ideology						Education					Household income						Tenure			
	Total	Strongly con- serva- tive	Somewhat con- serva- tive	Moderate	Somewhat lib- eral	Strongly lib- eral	Not a high school graduate	High school graduate	Some college/traditional school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000-\$39,999	\$40,000-\$59,999	\$60,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$149,999	\$150,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Own	Rent	Other
unweighted n	5972.00	442.00	714.00	1693.00	1469.00	1636.00	60.00	389.00	1457.00	2044.00	2003.00	357.00	537.00	661.00	1207.00	1164.00	744.00	1137.00	3469.00	2043.00	436.00
weighted n	4997.00	642.00	890.00	1506.00	950.00	1001.00	109.00	598.00	2051.00	1348.00	881.00	380.00	619.00	714.00	1027.00	940.00	515.00	697.00	2873.00	1722.00	397.00
Yes	0.58	0.41	0.45	0.57	0.70	0.69	0.55	0.52	0.53	0.59	0.70	0.56	0.53	0.58	0.57	0.58	0.61	0.62	0.59	0.57	0.47
No	0.32	0.48	0.47	0.32	0.21	0.20	0.37	0.37	0.36	0.30	0.23	0.32	0.34	0.30	0.36	0.32	0.30	0.29	0.31	0.33	0.36
Undecided/refused	0.10	0.11	0.08	0.11	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.07	0.12	0.13	0.12	0.07	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.17

Table 39: Q10A/B PROPOSITION 31: REFERENDUM ON 2020 LAW THAT WOULD PROHIBIT THE RETAIL SALE OF CERTAIN FLAVORED TOBACCO PRODUCTS. A “Yes” vote approves, and a “No” vote rejects, a 2020 law prohibiting retail sale of certain flavored tobacco products. Fiscal Impact: Decreased state tobacco tax revenues ranging from tens of millions of dollars annually to around \$100 million annually. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 31? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Marital status					Voting in Nov 2020 election					Party identification									
	Total	Married	Not married/ live to- gether	Separated/ divorced/ widowed	Single/ never married	Non-voter	Voted (net)	Biden voter	Trump voter	Other voter	Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/other (net)	Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other
unweighted n	5972.00	3112.00	493.00	976.00	1356.00	505.00	5467.00	4142.00	985.00	340.00	4232.00	2555.00	1672.00	1237.00	516.00	717.00	1777.00	847.00	442.00	487.00
weighted n	4997.00	2783.00	378.00	859.00	965.00	465.00	4532.00	2812.00	1641.00	80.00	2826.00	1622.00	1202.00	1733.00	825.00	905.00	1552.00	614.00	508.00	430.00
Yes	0.58	0.57	0.60	0.64	0.54	0.55	0.58	0.69	0.39	0.44	0.69	0.72	0.66	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.51	0.65	0.37	0.47
No	0.32	0.33	0.31	0.29	0.32	0.33	0.32	0.22	0.49	0.35	0.22	0.19	0.24	0.48	0.52	0.45	0.36	0.23	0.51	0.37
Undecided/refused	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.07	0.14	0.12	0.10	0.09	0.12	0.21	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.07	0.14	0.13	0.12	0.12	0.16

Table 40: Q10A/B PROPOSITION 31: REFERENDUM ON 2020 LAW THAT WOULD PROHIBIT THE RETAIL SALE OF CERTAIN FLAVORED TOBACCO PRODUCTS. A “Yes” vote approves, and a “No” vote rejects, a 2020 law prohibiting retail sale of certain flavored tobacco products. Fiscal Impact: Decreased state tobacco tax revenues ranging from tens of millions of dollars annually to around \$100 million annually. If you were voting today, how would/did you vote on Proposition 31? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Voting pref for Gov			Voting pref on Prop 1			Voting pref on Prop 26			Voting pref on Prop 27			Voting pref on Prop 30			Voting pref on Prop 31			
	Total	Newsom	Dahle	Undecided/ Yes	No	Undecided/ Yes	No	Undecided/ Yes	No	Undecided/ Yes	No	Undecided/ Yes	No	Undecided/ Yes	No	Undecided/ Yes	No	Undecided/ re-fused/ other	
unweighted n	5972.00	4316.00	1410.00	246.00	4475.00	1110.00	387.00	1725.00	3247.00	1000.00	1131.00	4080.00	761.0	3030.00	2306.00	636.00	3844	1589	539
weighted n	4997.00	2885.00	1871.00	241.00	3177.00	1347.00	473.00	1499.00	2639.00	860.00	1076.00	3207.00	714.0	2365.00	2073.00	559.00	2877	1605	515
Yes	0.58	0.70	0.41	0.45	0.67	0.43	0.34	0.52	0.62	0.51	0.48	0.62	0.5	0.70	0.47	0.43	1	0	0
No	0.32	0.22	0.48	0.32	0.24	0.50	0.33	0.38	0.33	0.20	0.43	0.31	0.2	0.22	0.46	0.24	0	1	0
Undecided/refused	0.10	0.09	0.11	0.23	0.08	0.07	0.33	0.10	0.05	0.28	0.09	0.06	0.3	0.08	0.07	0.33	0	0	1