

UC Berkeley

IGS Poll

Title

Tabulations Reporting California Likely Voter Preferences on State Ballot Propositions

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3167k0wk>

Journal

Berkeley IGS Poll

Author

DiCamillo, Mark

Publication Date

2026-09-25



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 Reporting California Likely Voter Preferences
on State Ballot Propositions**

by the

Berkeley IGS Poll

Institute of Governmental Studies

University of California, Berkeley

September 15-20, 2026

Introduction

The statistical tabulations in this volume are based on a *Berkeley IGS Poll* completed by the Institute of Governmental Studies (IGS) at the University of California, Berkeley. The findings are based on a *Berkeley IGS Poll* completed by the Institute of Governmental Studies (IGS) at the University of California, Berkeley. The poll was conducted online in English and Spanish September 15-20, 2026, among 6,898 registered voters in California, including 4,512 who were considered likely to vote in the state's November 2026 general election. Funding for the poll was provided in part by the *Los Angeles Times* and the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund.

Data collection was completed by distributing email and text message invitations to stratified random samples of the state's registered voters. Each email or text invited voters to participate in a non-partisan survey conducted by the University and provided a link to the IGS website where the survey questionnaire was housed. Reminders were distributed to non-responding voters and an opt out link was provided for voters not wishing to receive further invitations.

Samples of the state's registered voters were provided to IGS by Political Data, Inc., a leading supplier of registered voter lists in California and were derived from information contained on the state's voter registration rolls, which is a public document. The samples were stratified by age and gender to obtain a proper balance of survey respondents. A separate random sample of Spanish-speakers was drawn from the pool of registered voters who requested that their official voting materials be sent to them in Spanish to enable the survey to assess voter opinions among the state's Spanish-speaking voters.

To protect the anonymity of respondents, voters' email addresses, cell phone numbers and all other personally identifiable information derived from their voter record were purged from the data file and replaced with a unique and anonymous identification number during data processing. After the completion of data collection, post-stratification weights were applied to the survey data file to align the sample of registered voters surveyed to population characteristics of registered voters statewide and within major regions of the state on a wide range of variables. More information about the survey methods used by the *Berkeley IGS Poll* can be found on the poll's website at <https://www.igs.berkeley.edu/research/berkeley-igs-poll>.

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)

LA City (City of Los Angeles)

Not LA City (all areas within LA County not in LA City)

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)

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

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)

San Francisco 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.)

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 Professors Eric Schickler and 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. Veteran pollster Mark DiCamillo serves as director of the *Berkeley IGS Poll*. For a complete listing of stories issued by the *Berkeley IGS Poll* go to <https://www.igs.berkeley.edu/research/berkeley-igs-poll>.

September 2026 Berkeley IGS Poll - Statewide Likely Voters

Table 1: Q10. PROPOSITION 3. PROVIDES PERMANENT FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS AND HEALTH CARE BY EXTENDING EXISTING TAX ON HIGH INCOMES. INITIATIVE CONSITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Makes permanent existing voter-approved tax rate for individuals earning over \$371,000 (adjusted annually for inflation. Allocates tax revenues to public education. Fiscal Impact: Maintains \$5 billion to \$15 billion of annual state income tax revenue by making a temporary tax increase on high-income earners permanent instead of letting it expire in 2031. Supporters: California Teachers Association; CA School Nurses Organization; California State PTA; Planned Parenthood Affiliates of CA. Opponents: California Taxpayers Association; Family Business Association of California; California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 3? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Region										Party Registration			Political identifiers			Likely voting method				
	Total	LA County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Em- pire	Central Coast	Central Val- ley (to- tal)	Sacramen- to North Val- ley	San Joaquin Val- ley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/ Sier- ras	Democrat	Republican	No party pref- er- ence/ other	MAGA	Progressive	Democrat So- cial- ist	By mail	Drop box	Return bal- lot to vot- ing cen- ter	In per- son or be- fore 11/3
unweighted n	2578.00	527.00	278.00	192.00	211.00	192.00	426.00	247.00	179.00	682.00	70.00	1443.00	559.00	576.00	337.00	1293.00	818.00	920.00	962.00	262.00	379.00
weighted n	2261.00	523.00	184.00	201.00	249.00	145.00	393.00	217.00	177.00	519.00	47.00	1056.00	602.00	603.00	445.00	932.00	565.00	801.00	746.00	256.00	410.00
Yes	0.54	0.64	0.53	0.46	0.44	0.55	0.47	0.49	0.44	0.57	0.52	0.78	0.13	0.52	0.13	0.83	0.89	0.59	0.63	0.51	0.32
No	0.34	0.26	0.31	0.46	0.39	0.34	0.41	0.40	0.44	0.28	0.32	0.09	0.76	0.34	0.78	0.09	0.03	0.28	0.23	0.40	0.58
Undecided	0.13	0.10	0.15	0.08	0.17	0.11	0.12	0.11	0.13	0.15	0.16	0.13	0.10	0.14	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.14	0.14	0.10	0.10

Table 2: Q10. PROPOSITION 3. PROVIDES PERMANENT FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS AND HEALTH CARE BY EXTENDING EXISTING TAX ON HIGH INCOMES. INITIATIVE CONSITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Makes permanent existing voter-approved tax rate for individuals earning over \$371,000 (adjusted annually for inflation. Allocates tax revenues to public education. Fiscal Impact: Maintains \$5 billion to \$15 billion of annual state income tax revenue by making a temporary taxc increase on high-income earners permanent instead of letting it expire in 2031. Supporters: California Teachers Association; CA School Nurses Organization; California State PTA; Planned Parenthood Affiliates of CA. Opponents: California Taxpayers Association; Family Business Association of California; California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 3? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Gender		Age							Race/Ethnicity				Generation		
		Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65 or older (net)	65-74	75 or older	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Black	Asian/Pac Isle	1st generation	2nd generation	3rd+ generation
unweighted n	2578.00	1158.00	1420.00	464.00	480.00	407.00	616.00	611.00	339.00	272.00	1544.00	550.00	92.00	337.00	319.00	603.00	1646.00
weighted n	2261.00	1141.00	1120.00	244.00	331.00	327.00	571.00	788.00	441.00	347.00	1249.00	524.00	127.00	350.00	321.00	494.00	1440.00
Yes	0.54	0.49	0.59	0.73	0.66	0.57	0.43	0.49	0.52	0.45	0.54	0.54	0.58	0.54	0.46	0.62	0.52
No	0.34	0.41	0.26	0.15	0.25	0.32	0.42	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.35	0.30	0.25	0.35	0.40	0.25	0.35
Undecided	0.13	0.10	0.16	0.12	0.09	0.11	0.16	0.13	0.10	0.16	0.11	0.16	0.17	0.12	0.14	0.12	0.13

Table 3: Q10. PROPOSITION 3. PROVIDES PERMANENT FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS AND HEALTH CARE BY EXTENDING EXISTING TAX ON HIGH INCOMES. INITIATIVE CONSITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Makes permanent existing voter-approved tax rate for individuals earning over \$371,000 (adjusted annually for inflation. Allocates tax revenues to public education. Fiscal Impact: Maintains \$5 billion to \$15 billion of annual state income tax revenue by making a temporary taxc increase on high-income earners permanent instead of letting it expire in 2031. Supporters: California Teachers Association; CA School Nurses Organization; California State PTA; Planned Parenthood Affiliates of CA. Opponents: California Taxpayers Association; Family Business Association of California; California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 3? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Education					Household income				Marital status			Religious preference				
	Total	High school grad or less	Some college/trade school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$39,999	\$40,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married	Protestant Christian	Catholic	Other religion	Atheist	No preference
unweighted n	2578.00	202.00	578.00	965.00	831.00	343.00	697.00	819.00	659.00	1525.00	354.00	693.00	648.00	403.00	275.00	475.00	771.00
weighted n	2261.00	261.00	812.00	768.00	419.00	333.00	651.00	748.00	478.00	1349.00	395.00	513.00	705.00	394.00	237.00	318.00	601.00
Yes	0.54	0.48	0.50	0.58	0.57	0.66	0.53	0.51	0.51	0.49	0.51	0.68	0.37	0.45	0.59	0.80	0.63
No	0.34	0.30	0.39	0.31	0.30	0.17	0.31	0.39	0.38	0.40	0.31	0.20	0.50	0.40	0.33	0.08	0.23
Undecided	0.13	0.22	0.11	0.11	0.14	0.17	0.15	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.18	0.12	0.13	0.15	0.08	0.11	0.13

Table 4: Q10. PROPOSITION 3. PROVIDES PERMANENT FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS AND HEALTH CARE BY EXTENDING EXISTING TAX ON HIGH INCOMES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Makes permanent existing voter-approved tax rate for individuals earning over \$371,000 (adjusted annually for inflation. Allocates tax revenues to public education. Fiscal Impact: Maintains \$5 billion to \$15 billion of annual state income tax revenue by making a temporary tax increase on high-income earners permanent instead of letting it expire in 2031. Supporters: California Teachers Association; CA School Nurses Organization; California State PTA; Planned Parenthood Affiliates of CA. Opponents: California Taxpayers Association; Family Business Association of California; California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 3? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Political ideology						Union HH		Tenure		2024 vote for President				Vote preference for Governor		
	Total	Strongly con- serva- tive	Somewhat con- serva- tive	Moderate	Somewhat liberal	Strongly liberal	Yes	No	Own	Renter/ other	Didn't vote	Voted	Harris	Trump	Becerra	Hilton	Undecided
unweighted n	2578.00	279.00	272.00	539.00	581.00	904.00	670.00	1907.00	1421.00	1152.00	216.00	2362.00	1628.00	560.00	1719.00	647.00	212.00
weighted n	2261.00	347.00	309.00	582.00	461.00	559.00	544.00	1717.00	1318.00	938.00	300.00	1961.00	1165.00	719.00	1310.00	771.00	180.00
Yes	0.54	0.11	0.19	0.44	0.76	0.91	0.57	0.53	0.46	0.65	0.69	0.51	0.76	0.11	0.79	0.12	0.44
No	0.34	0.78	0.72	0.37	0.08	0.02	0.35	0.33	0.42	0.21	0.16	0.36	0.11	0.79	0.08	0.78	0.31
Undecided	0.13	0.11	0.09	0.19	0.16	0.07	0.08	0.14	0.12	0.14	0.15	0.12	0.13	0.10	0.13	0.10	0.24

Table 5: Q11. PROPOSITION 4. REPEALS PROHIBITION AGAINST PUBLIC FUNDING OF ELECTION CAMPAIGNS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE. Repeals prohibition on state and local governments offering public funding of candidate election campaigns. Public funding programs may not use funds earmarked for education, transportation, or public safety. Fiscal impact: Ongoing costs to the state of a few hundred thousand dollars each ear for the Fair Political Practices Commission to answer questions from state and local governments about public campaign finance programs. Supporters: League of Women Voters of CA; California Nurses Association; Mental Health Advocacy; Social Security Works; Consumer Watchdog. Opponents: California Taxpayers Assn; Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn.; Family Business Assn. of California; United Latinos Action. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 4? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Party Registration			Political identifiers			Likely voting method			
		LA County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento North Valley	San Joaquin Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sier-ras	Democrat	Republican	No party preference/other	MAGA	Progressive	Democrat/Socialist	By mail	Drop box	Return ballot to voting center	In person or before 11/3
unweighted n	2517.00	545.00	270.00	190.00	196.00	178.00	445.00	270.00	175.00	622.00	71.00	1404.00	562.00	551.00	318.00	1273.00	826.00	898.00	911.00	284.00	367.00
weighted n	2251.00	585.00	204.00	185.00	246.00	135.00	408.00	247.00	162.00	439.00	49.00	1075.00	605.00	571.00	409.00	953.00	610.00	781.00	738.00	288.00	376.00
Yes	0.35	0.36	0.36	0.25	0.27	0.41	0.30	0.27	0.34	0.44	0.29	0.50	0.10	0.32	0.13	0.54	0.57	0.38	0.42	0.27	0.21
No	0.35	0.32	0.37	0.42	0.42	0.41	0.41	0.42	0.38	0.25	0.45	0.17	0.66	0.37	0.65	0.17	0.16	0.33	0.29	0.40	0.49
Undecided	0.30	0.32	0.27	0.33	0.31	0.18	0.30	0.31	0.28	0.31	0.27	0.33	0.24	0.30	0.23	0.28	0.27	0.30	0.28	0.33	0.29

Table 6: Q11. PROPOSITION 4. REPEALS PROHIBITION AGAINST PUBLIC FUNDING OF ELECTION CAMPAIGNS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE. Repeals prohibition on state and local governments offering public funding of candidate election campaigns. Public funding programs may not use funds earmarked for education, transportation, or public safety. Fiscal impact: Ongoing costs to the state of a few hundred thousand dollars each ear for the Fair Political Practices Commission to answer questions from state and local governments about public campaign finance programs. Supporters: League of Women Voters of CA; California Nurses Association; Mental Health Advocacy; Social Security Works; Consumer Watchdog. Opponents: California Taxpayers Assn; Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn.; Family Business Assn. of California; United Latinos Action. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 4? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Gender		Age							Race/Ethnicity				Generation		
Total	Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65 or older (net)	65-74	75 or older	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Black	Asian/Pac Isle	1st generation	2nd generation	3rd+ generation
unweighted n	2517.00	1053.00	1464.00	465.00	434.00	415.00	606.00	597.00	338.00	259.00	1468.00	556.00	105.00	317.00	305.00	1584.00
weighted n	2251.00	1071.00	1180.00	251.00	306.00	362.00	537.00	795.00	459.00	337.00	1250.00	527.00	129.00	310.00	515.00	1376.00
Yes	0.35	0.31	0.38	0.36	0.35	0.33	0.34	0.36	0.33	0.39	0.35	0.35	0.40	0.37	0.34	0.34
No	0.35	0.42	0.29	0.26	0.28	0.35	0.35	0.42	0.43	0.39	0.38	0.35	0.22	0.36	0.28	0.38
Undecided	0.30	0.26	0.33	0.38	0.37	0.32	0.31	0.22	0.23	0.22	0.27	0.31	0.38	0.27	0.38	0.28

Table 7: Q11. PROPOSITION 4. REPEALS PROHIBITION AGAINST PUBLIC FUNDING OF ELECTION CAMPAIGNS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE. Repeals prohibition on state and local governments offering public funding of candidate election campaigns. Public funding programs may not use funds earmarked for education, transportation, or public safety. Fiscal impact: Ongoing costs to the state of a few hundred thousand dollars each ear for the Fair Political Practices Commission to answer questions from state and local governments about public campaign finance programs. Supporters: League of Women Voters of CA; California Nurses Association; Mental Health Advocacy; Social Security Works; Consumer Watchdog. Opponents: California Taxpayers Assn; Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn.; Family Business Assn. of California; United Latinos Action. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 4? (Statewide Likely Voters)

		Education				Household income				Marital status			Religious preference				
	Total	High school grad or less	Some college/trade school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$39,999	\$40,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married	Protestant Christian	Catholic	Other religion	Atheist	No preference
unweighted n	2517.00	189.00	602.00	870.00	851.00	375.00	661.00	819.00	614.00	1480.00	349.00	679.00	618.00	409.00	235.00	434.00	815.00
weighted n	2251.00	271.00	830.00	731.00	414.00	356.00	630.00	743.00	473.00	1343.00	397.00	502.00	675.00	394.00	197.00	321.00	659.00
Yes	0.35	0.32	0.32	0.33	0.44	0.41	0.38	0.31	0.34	0.33	0.41	0.34	0.21	0.31	0.43	0.46	0.43
No	0.35	0.33	0.37	0.36	0.34	0.27	0.33	0.39	0.40	0.38	0.34	0.30	0.48	0.38	0.28	0.23	0.29
Undecided	0.30	0.34	0.31	0.31	0.22	0.32	0.29	0.30	0.26	0.29	0.25	0.35	0.30	0.31	0.29	0.31	0.28

Table 8: Q11. PROPOSITION 4. REPEALS PROHIBITION AGAINST PUBLIC FUNDING OF ELECTION CAMPAIGNS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE. Repeals prohibition on state and local governments offering public funding of candidate election campaigns. Public funding programs may not use funds earmarked for education, transportation, or public safety. Fiscal impact: Ongoing costs to the state of a few hundred thousand dollars each ear for the Fair Political Practices Commission to answer questions from state and local governments about public campaign finance programs. Supporters: League of Women Voters of CA; California Nurses Association; Mental Health Advocacy; Social Security Works; Consumer Watchdog. Opponents: California Taxpayers Assn; Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn.; Family Business Assn. of California; United Latinos Action. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 4? (Statewide Likely Voters)

		Political ideology					Union HH		Tenure		2024 vote for President				Vote preference for Governor		
	Total	Strongly conservative	Somewhat conservative	Moderate	Somewhat liberal	Strongly liberal	Yes	No	Own	Renter/other	Didn't vote	Voted	Harris	Trump	Becerra	Hilton	Undecided
unweighted n	2517.00	239.00	282.00	546.00	531.00	912.00	686.00	1827.00	1420.00	1089.00	218.00	2299.00	1582.00	531.00	1667.00	628.00	222.00
weighted n	2251.00	292.00	338.00	592.00	427.00	595.00	543.00	1704.00	1331.00	908.00	323.00	1928.00	1155.00	672.00	1308.00	730.00	213.00
Yes	0.35	0.12	0.14	0.25	0.41	0.62	0.41	0.33	0.31	0.40	0.33	0.35	0.49	0.11	0.50	0.10	0.25
No	0.35	0.69	0.64	0.39	0.21	0.10	0.33	0.36	0.41	0.27	0.30	0.36	0.18	0.67	0.18	0.68	0.31
Undecided	0.30	0.19	0.22	0.36	0.38	0.27	0.26	0.31	0.27	0.33	0.37	0.29	0.33	0.22	0.31	0.23	0.45

Table 9: Q12. PROPOSITION 39. PROHIBITS CITIZENS FROM VOTING UNLESS THEY PRESENT GOVERNMENT-ISSUED IDENTIFICATION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Invalidates mail ballots that do not have last four digits of designated government-issued identification number written on envelope. Prohibits in-person voting without presenting government-issued identification. Fiscal Impact: Costs of between tens of millions of dollars and low hundreds of millions of dollars each year to implement new voting requirements. Supporters: The Transparency Foundation; Latino American Political Assn.; Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn.; CA Women’s Leadership Assn. Opponents: ACLU California Action; Common Cause; League of Women Voters of California. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 39? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Party Registration			Political identifiers			Likely voting method			
		LA County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento North Valley	San Joaquin Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sieras	Democrat	Republican	No party preference/other	MAGA	Progressive	Democrat/Socialist	By mail	Drop box	Return ballot to voting center	In person before 11/3
unweighted n	5096.00	1072.00	548.00	382.00	407.00	371.00	871.00	517.00	354.00	1304.00	141.00	2848.0	1121.00	1127.00	655.00	2566.00	1644.00	1819.00	1873.00	546.00	746.00
weighted n	4512.00	1108.00	388.00	387.00	495.00	280.00	802.00	463.00	339.00	957.00	95.00	2132.0	1207.00	1174.00	854.00	1885.00	1175.00	1582.00	1484.00	544.00	786.00
Yes	0.39	0.33	0.41	0.50	0.50	0.38	0.49	0.43	0.56	0.27	0.43	0.1	0.92	0.37	0.95	0.11	0.07	0.34	0.26	0.45	0.68
No	0.52	0.58	0.50	0.43	0.43	0.52	0.45	0.51	0.36	0.62	0.46	0.8	0.05	0.51	0.02	0.82	0.85	0.57	0.66	0.45	0.26
Undecided	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.10	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.11	0.11	0.1	0.04	0.11	0.03	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.10	0.06

Table 10: Q12. PROPOSITION 39. PROHIBITS CITIZENS FROM VOTING UNLESS THEY PRESENT GOVERNMENT-ISSUED IDENTIFICATION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Invalidates mail ballots that do not have last four digits of designated government-issued identification number written on envelope. Prohibits in-person voting without presenting government-issued identification. Fiscal Impact: Costs of between tens of millions of dollars and low hundreds of millions of dollars each year to implement new voting requirements. Supporters: The Transparency Foundation; Latino American Political Assn.; Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn.; CA Women’s Leadership Assn. Opponents: ACLU California Action; Common Cause; League of Women Voters of California. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 39? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Gender		Age							Race/Ethnicity				Generation		
		Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65 or older (net)	65-74	75 or older	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Black	Asian/Pac Isle	1st generation	2nd generation	3rd+ generation
unweighted n	5096.00	2211.00	2885.00	930.00	914.00	822.00	1222.00	1208.00	677.00	531.00	3013.00	1106.00	197.00	654.00	624.00	1203.00	3231.00
weighted n	4512.00	2212.00	2300.00	495.00	637.00	689.00	1108.00	1583.00	900.00	683.00	2500.00	1050.00	256.00	660.00	656.00	1008.00	2816.00
Yes	0.39	0.43	0.35	0.27	0.34	0.39	0.46	0.40	0.42	0.37	0.39	0.41	0.25	0.37	0.48	0.32	0.40
No	0.52	0.50	0.54	0.58	0.57	0.52	0.46	0.53	0.51	0.56	0.54	0.50	0.56	0.51	0.43	0.56	0.53
Undecided	0.09	0.07	0.11	0.14	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.09	0.19	0.12	0.09	0.12	0.07

Table 11: Q12. PROPOSITION 39. PROHIBITS CITIZENS FROM VOTING UNLESS THEY PRESENT GOVERNMENT-ISSUED IDENTIFICATION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Invalidates mail ballots that do not have last four digits of designated government-issued identification number written on envelope. Prohibits in-person voting without presenting government-issued identification. Fiscal Impact: Costs of between tens of millions of dollars and low hundreds of millions of dollars each year to implement new voting requirements. Supporters: The Transparency Foundation; Latino American Political Assn.; Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn.; CA Women’s Leadership Assn. Opponents: ACLU California Action; Common Cause; League of Women Voters of California. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 39? (Statewide Likely Voters)

		Education				Household income				Marital status			Religious preference				
	Total	High school grad or less	Some college/trade school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$39,999	\$40,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married	Protestant Christian	Catholic	Other religion	Atheist	No preference
unweighted n	5096.00	391.00	1181.00	1835.00	1682.00	718.00	1358.00	1638.00	1273.00	3005.00	703.00	1373.00	1266.00	812.00	510.00	910.00	1586.00
weighted n	4512.00	532.00	1642.00	1498.00	833.00	688.00	1281.00	1491.00	951.00	2692.00	792.00	1015.00	1380.00	789.00	435.00	639.00	1261.00
Yes	0.39	0.47	0.46	0.34	0.29	0.34	0.38	0.42	0.37	0.42	0.41	0.30	0.63	0.50	0.32	0.08	0.24
No	0.52	0.40	0.45	0.57	0.65	0.55	0.52	0.51	0.55	0.50	0.51	0.58	0.29	0.39	0.59	0.85	0.66
Undecided	0.09	0.13	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.12	0.10	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.08	0.11	0.08	0.07	0.09

Table 12: Q12. PROPOSITION 39. PROHIBITS CITIZENS FROM VOTING UNLESS THEY PRESENT GOVERNMENT-ISSUED IDENTIFICATION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Invalidates mail ballots that do not have last four digits of designated government-issued identification number written on envelope. Prohibits in-person voting without presenting government-issued identification. Fiscal Impact: Costs of between tens of millions of dollars and low hundreds of millions of dollars each year to implement new voting requirements. Supporters: The Transparency Foundation; Latino American Political Assn.; Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn.; CA Women’s Leadership Assn. Opponents: ACLU California Action; Common Cause; League of Women Voters of California. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 39? (Statewide Likely Voters)

		Political ideology					Union HH		Tenure		2024 vote for President				Vote preference for Governor		
	Total	Strongly conservative	Somewhat conservative	Moderate	Somewhat liberal	Strongly liberal	Yes	No	Own	Renter/other	Didn’t vote	Voted	Harris	Trump	Becerra	Hilton	Undecided
unweighted n	5096.00	518.00	554.00	1085.00	1112.00	1817.00	1356.00	3735.00	2841.00	2242.00	434.00	4662.00	3211.00	1091.00	3387.00	1275.00	434.00
weighted n	4512.00	638.00	647.00	1174.00	888.00	1154.00	1087.00	3421.00	2648.00	1846.00	623.00	3889.00	2320.00	1391.00	2618.00	1501.00	393.00
Yes	0.39	0.91	0.87	0.43	0.09	0.03	0.39	0.39	0.44	0.32	0.28	0.41	0.09	0.93	0.08	0.94	0.40
No	0.52	0.05	0.08	0.44	0.79	0.91	0.53	0.52	0.48	0.58	0.60	0.51	0.79	0.04	0.82	0.03	0.40
Undecided	0.09	0.03	0.05	0.13	0.13	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.10	0.12	0.08	0.11	0.03	0.10	0.03	0.19

Table 13: Q13. PROPOSITION 40. IMPOSES ONE-TIME TAX ON CERTAIN TAXPAYERS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Imposes 5% tax on certain taxpayers with assets over \$1 billion; revenue primarily for health care. Exempts revenues from constitutional requirements for school funding and spending limit. Fiscal Impact: Temporary increase of tens of billions of dollars spread over several years from wealth tax on billionaires. Possible ongoing decrease of less than \$1 billion per year in income tax revenue from billionaires. Supporters: U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders; SEIU United Healthcare Workers West. Opponents: California Primary Care Association; California Schools Boards Association; California Taxpayers Association. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 40? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Party Registration			Political identifiers			Likely voting method			
		LA 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	No party preference/other	MAGA	Progressive	Democrat/Socialist	By mail	Drop box	Return ballot to voting center	In person before 11/3
unweighted n	5096.00	1072.00	548.00	382.00	407.00	371.00	871.00	517.00	354.00	1304.00	141.00	2848.00	1121.00	1127.00	655.00	2566.00	1644.00	1819.00	1873.00	546.00	746.00
weighted n	4512.00	1108.00	388.00	387.00	495.00	280.00	802.00	463.00	339.00	957.00	95.00	2132.00	1207.00	1174.00	854.00	1885.00	1175.00	1582.00	1484.00	544.00	786.00
Yes	0.45	0.53	0.48	0.37	0.42	0.48	0.38	0.39	0.37	0.47	0.36	0.65	0.11	0.45	0.10	0.72	0.82	0.49	0.51	0.42	0.32
No	0.42	0.34	0.39	0.51	0.47	0.41	0.49	0.47	0.52	0.38	0.50	0.20	0.80	0.41	0.83	0.15	0.07	0.38	0.34	0.44	0.59
Undecided	0.13	0.14	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.13	0.14	0.11	0.16	0.13	0.16	0.09	0.14	0.07	0.13	0.10	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.09

Table 14: Q13. PROPOSITION 40. IMPOSES ONE-TIME TAX ON CERTAIN TAXPAYERS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Imposes 5% tax on certain taxpayers with assets over \$1 billion; revenue primarily for health care. Exempts revenues from constitutional requirements for school funding and spending limit. Fiscal Impact: Temporary increase of tens of billions of dollars spread over several years from wealth tax on billionaires. Possible ongoing decrease of less than \$1 billion per year in income tax revenue from billionaires. Supporters: U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders; SEIU United Healthcare Workers West. Opponents: California Primary Care Association; California Schools Boards Association; California Taxpayers Association. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 40? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Gender		Age							Race/Ethnicity				Generation		
		Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65 or older (net)	65-74	75 or older	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Black	Asian/Pac Isle	1st generation	2nd generation	3rd+ generation
unweighted n	5096.00	2211.00	2885.00	930.00	914.00	822.00	1222.00	1208.00	677.00	531.00	3013.00	1106.00	197.00	654.00	624.00	1203.00	3231.00
weighted n	4512.00	2212.00	2300.00	495.00	637.00	689.00	1108.00	1583.00	900.00	683.00	2500.00	1050.00	256.00	660.00	656.00	1008.00	2816.00
Yes	0.45	0.41	0.49	0.68	0.61	0.50	0.40	0.34	0.36	0.30	0.41	0.52	0.53	0.52	0.44	0.54	0.42
No	0.42	0.48	0.35	0.18	0.29	0.38	0.46	0.52	0.50	0.55	0.47	0.35	0.27	0.34	0.42	0.32	0.45
Undecided	0.13	0.10	0.16	0.14	0.10	0.12	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.13	0.12	0.20	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.13

Table 15: Q13. PROPOSITION 40. IMPOSES ONE-TIME TAX ON CERTAIN TAXPAYERS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Imposes 5% tax on certain taxpayers with assets over \$1 billion; revenue primarily for health care. Exempts revenues from constitutional requirements for school funding and spending limit. Fiscal Impact: Temporary increase of tens of billions of dollars spread over several years from wealth tax on billionaires. Possible ongoing decrease of less than \$1 billion per year in income tax revenue from billionaires. Supporters: U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders; SEIU United Healthcare Workers West. Opponents: California Primary Care Association; California Schools Boards Association; California Taxpayers Association. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 40? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Education				Household income				Marital status			Religious preference				
		High school grad or less	Some college/trade school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$39,999	\$40,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married	Protestant/Christian	Catholic	Other religion	Atheist	No preference
unweighted n	5096.00	391.00	1181.00	1835.00	1682.00	718.00	1358.00	1638.00	1273.00	3005.00	703.00	1373.00	1266.00	812.00	510.00	910.00	1586.00
weighted n	4512.00	532.00	1642.00	1498.00	833.00	688.00	1281.00	1491.00	951.00	2692.00	792.00	1015.00	1380.00	789.00	435.00	639.00	1261.00
Yes	0.45	0.44	0.43	0.50	0.43	0.56	0.49	0.42	0.39	0.41	0.40	0.60	0.26	0.39	0.48	0.69	0.57
No	0.42	0.38	0.45	0.38	0.44	0.26	0.38	0.46	0.48	0.46	0.45	0.26	0.61	0.48	0.37	0.17	0.30
Undecided	0.13	0.18	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.17	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.12	0.14	0.14	0.12	0.13	0.15	0.15	0.13

Table 16: Q13. PROPOSITION 40. IMPOSES ONE-TIME TAX ON CERTAIN TAXPAYERS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Imposes 5% tax on certain taxpayers with assets over \$1 billion; revenue primarily for health care. Exempts revenues from constitutional requirements for school funding and spending limit. Fiscal Impact: Temporary increase of tens of billions of dollars spread over several years from wealth tax on billionaires. Possible ongoing decrease of less than \$1 billion per year in income tax revenue from billionaires. Supporters: U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders; SEIU United Healthcare Workers West. Opponents: California Primary Care Association; California Schools Boards Association; California Taxpayers Association. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 40? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Political ideology					Union HH		Tenure		2024 vote for President				Vote preference for Governor		
		Strongly conservative	Somewhat conservative	Moderate	Somewhat liberal	Strongly liberal	Yes	No	Own	Renter/other	Didn't vote	Voted	Harris	Trump	Becerra	Hilton	Undecided
unweighted n	5096.00	518.00	554.00	1085.00	1112.00	1817.00	1356.00	3735.00	2841.00	2242.00	434.00	4662.00	3211.00	1091.00	3387.00	1275.00	434.00
weighted n	4512.00	638.00	647.00	1174.00	888.00	1154.00	1087.00	3421.00	2648.00	1846.00	623.00	3889.00	2320.00	1391.00	2618.00	1501.00	393.00
Yes	0.45	0.10	0.15	0.36	0.60	0.81	0.51	0.43	0.36	0.59	0.61	0.43	0.61	0.11	0.66	0.09	0.47
No	0.42	0.82	0.79	0.47	0.21	0.08	0.38	0.43	0.51	0.27	0.27	0.44	0.21	0.82	0.19	0.83	0.34
Undecided	0.13	0.08	0.06	0.18	0.18	0.12	0.11	0.14	0.13	0.14	0.12	0.13	0.17	0.08	0.16	0.07	0.19

Table 17: Q14. PROPOSITION 41. PROHIBITS NEW STATE TAXES THAT EXCLUDE REVENUES FROM STATE SPENDING LIMIT. REQUIRES AUDITS FOR NEW STATE SPECIAL TAXES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Nullifies state taxes enacted after January 1, 2026 that exempt their revenues from voter-approved state spending limit. Requires pre-election and recurring audits of programs funded by new special taxes. Fiscal Impact: The net fiscal effect is unknown as it depends on future decisions by voters, the legislature, and other policymakers. Supporters: CA Society of Certified Public Accountants (CALCPAs); CalAsian Chamber of Commerce, California Taxpayers Association (CalTax). Opponents: U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders, SEIU United Healthcare Workers West. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 41? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Party Registration			Political identifiers			Likely voting method			
		LA County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento North Valley	San Joaquin Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sier-ras	Democrat	Republican	No party preference/other	MAGA	Progressive	Democrat Socialist	By mail	Drop box	Return ballot to voting center	In person or before 11/3
unweighted n	5096.00	1072.00	548.00	382.00	407.00	371.00	871.00	517.00	354.00	1304.00	141.00	2848.00	1121.00	1127.00	655.00	2566.00	1644.00	1819.00	1873.00	546.00	746.00
weighted n	4512.00	1108.00	388.00	387.00	495.00	280.00	802.00	463.00	339.00	957.00	95.00	2132.00	1207.00	1174.00	854.00	1885.00	1175.00	1582.00	1484.00	544.00	786.00
Yes	0.37	0.33	0.37	0.43	0.45	0.38	0.45	0.44	0.46	0.30	0.41	0.15	0.77	0.38	0.78	0.14	0.10	0.36	0.27	0.39	0.57
No	0.33	0.38	0.30	0.33	0.31	0.35	0.28	0.27	0.28	0.34	0.24	0.50	0.07	0.29	0.06	0.54	0.65	0.34	0.39	0.32	0.22
Undecided	0.30	0.29	0.34	0.24	0.24	0.27	0.28	0.28	0.27	0.36	0.35	0.36	0.17	0.32	0.15	0.32	0.26	0.30	0.34	0.29	0.21

Table 18: Q14. PROPOSITION 41. PROHIBITS NEW STATE TAXES THAT EXCLUDE REVENUES FROM STATE SPENDING LIMIT. REQUIRES AUDITS FOR NEW STATE SPECIAL TAXES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Nullifies state taxes enacted after January 1, 2026 that exempt their revenues from voter-approved state spending limit. Requires pre-election and recurring audits of programs funded by new special taxes. Fiscal Impact: The net fiscal effect is unknown as it depends on future decisions by voters, the legislature, and other policymakers. Supporters: CA Society of Certified Public Accountants (CALCPAs); CalAsian Chamber of Commerce, California Taxpayers Association (CalTax). Opponents: U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders, SEIU United Healthcare Workers West. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 41? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Gender			Age							Race/Ethnicity				Generation		
	Total	Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65 or older (net)	65-74	75 or older	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Black	Asian/Pac Isle	1st generation	2nd generation	3rd+ generation
unweighted n	5096.00	2211.00	2885.00	930.00	914.00	822.00	1222.00	1208.00	677.00	531.00	3013.00	1106.00	197.00	654.00	624.00	1203.00	3231.00
weighted n	4512.00	2212.00	2300.00	495.00	637.00	689.00	1108.00	1583.00	900.00	683.00	2500.00	1050.00	256.00	660.00	656.00	1008.00	2816.00
Yes	0.37	0.45	0.31	0.24	0.30	0.38	0.41	0.42	0.42	0.43	0.38	0.40	0.20	0.35	0.48	0.33	0.37
No	0.33	0.32	0.34	0.40	0.43	0.36	0.30	0.28	0.29	0.26	0.32	0.34	0.43	0.33	0.26	0.37	0.33
Undecided	0.30	0.24	0.36	0.36	0.27	0.27	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.31	0.30	0.26	0.37	0.31	0.26	0.31	0.30

Table 19: Q14. PROPOSITION 41. PROHIBITS NEW STATE TAXES THAT EXCLUDE REVENUES FROM STATE SPENDING LIMIT. REQUIRES AUDITS FOR NEW STATE SPECIAL TAXES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Nullifies state taxes enacted after January 1, 2026 that exempt their revenues from voter-approved state spending limit. Requires pre-election and recurring audits of programs funded by new special taxes. Fiscal Impact: The net fiscal effect is unknown as it depends on future decisions by voters, the legislature, and other policymakers. Supporters: CA Society of Certified Public Accountants (CALCPAs); CalAsian Chamber of Commerce, California Taxpayers Association (CalTax). Opponents: U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders, SEIU United Healthcare Workers West. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 41? (Statewide Likely Voters)

		Education				Household income				Marital status			Religious preference				
	Total	High school grad or less	Some college/trade school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$39,999	\$40,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married	Protestant Christian	Catholic	Other religion	Atheist	No preference
unweighted n	5096.00	391.00	1181.00	1835.00	1682.00	718.00	1358.00	1638.00	1273.00	3005.00	703.00	1373.00	1266.00	812.00	510.00	910.00	1586.00
weighted n	4512.00	532.00	1642.00	1498.00	833.00	688.00	1281.00	1491.00	951.00	2692.00	792.00	1015.00	1380.00	789.00	435.00	639.00	1261.00
Yes	0.37	0.44	0.40	0.35	0.32	0.28	0.37	0.41	0.39	0.41	0.39	0.28	0.54	0.50	0.34	0.11	0.26
No	0.33	0.25	0.31	0.34	0.37	0.37	0.35	0.32	0.29	0.32	0.31	0.38	0.19	0.24	0.36	0.57	0.40
Undecided	0.30	0.31	0.28	0.30	0.31	0.35	0.28	0.27	0.32	0.28	0.31	0.35	0.27	0.25	0.30	0.32	0.34

Table 20: Q14. PROPOSITION 41. PROHIBITS NEW STATE TAXES THAT EXCLUDE REVENUES FROM STATE SPENDING LIMIT. REQUIRES AUDITS FOR NEW STATE SPECIAL TAXES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Nullifies state taxes enacted after January 1, 2026 that exempt their revenues from voter-approved state spending limit. Requires pre-election and recurring audits of programs funded by new special taxes. Fiscal Impact: The net fiscal effect is unknown as it depends on future decisions by voters, the legislature, and other policymakers. Supporters: CA Society of Certified Public Accountants (CALCPAs); CalAsian Chamber of Commerce, California Taxpayers Association (CalTax). Opponents: U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders, SEIU United Healthcare Workers West. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 41? (Statewide Likely Voters)

		Political ideology					Union HH		Tenure		2024 vote for President				Vote preference for Governor		
	Total	Strongly conservative	Somewhat conservative	Moderate	Somewhat liberal	Strongly liberal	Yes	No	Own	Renter/other	Didn't vote	Voted	Harris	Trump	Becerra	Hilton	Undecided
unweighted n	5096.00	518.00	554.00	1085.00	1112.00	1817.00	1356.00	3735.00	2841.00	2242.0	434.00	4662.00	3211.00	1091.00	3387.00	1275.00	434.00
weighted n	4512.00	638.00	647.00	1174.00	888.00	1154.00	1087.00	3421.00	2648.00	1846.0	623.00	3889.00	2320.00	1391.00	2618.00	1501.00	393.00
Yes	0.37	0.79	0.75	0.43	0.14	0.06	0.37	0.38	0.43	0.3	0.25	0.39	0.15	0.79	0.14	0.79	0.37
No	0.33	0.08	0.10	0.20	0.43	0.65	0.39	0.31	0.28	0.4	0.41	0.32	0.47	0.06	0.49	0.06	0.26
Undecided	0.30	0.14	0.15	0.37	0.43	0.30	0.24	0.31	0.30	0.3	0.34	0.29	0.38	0.15	0.37	0.15	0.37

Table 21: Support for Propositions 40 and 41 (Statewide Likely Voters)

If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 41?	If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 40?			
	Total	Yes	No	Undecided
unweighted n	5096.00	2708.00	1733.00	655.00
weighted n	4512.00	2043.00	1873.00	596.00
Yes	0.37	0.16	0.67	0.17
No	0.33	0.57	0.13	0.13
Undecided	0.30	0.27	0.20	0.70

Table 22: Q15. PROPOSITION 42. PROHIBITS NEW STATE PERSONAL PROPERTY TAXES AND CERTAIN RETROACTIVE STATE TAXES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Prohibits any new state tax (1) imposed on the ownership of personal property (all things people own other than real estate), or (2) that applies retroactively based on taxpayer's past activities. Nullifies taxes enacted after January 1, 2026 that conflict with this measure. Fiscal Impact: Possibility that tax revenues will not go up as much in the future. Supporters: CA Professional Firefighters; State Building & Construction Trades Council of CA; AMVETS Department of CA. Opponents: U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders, SEIU United Healthcare Workers West. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 42? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Party Registration			Political identifiers			Likely voting method			
		LA County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento North Valley	San Joaquin Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sier-ras	Democrat	Republican	No party preference/other	MAGA	Progressive	Democrat/Socialist	By mail	Drop box	Return ballot to voting center	In person or before 11/3
unweighted n	5096.00	1072.00	548.00	382.00	407.00	371.00	871.00	517.00	354.00	1304.00	141.00	2848.00	1121.00	1127.00	655.00	2566.00	1644.00	1819.00	1873.00	546.00	746.00
weighted n	4512.00	1108.00	388.00	387.00	495.00	280.00	802.00	463.00	339.00	957.00	95.00	2132.00	1207.00	1174.00	854.00	1885.00	1175.00	1582.00	1484.00	544.00	786.00
Yes	0.43	0.36	0.43	0.53	0.50	0.45	0.50	0.46	0.56	0.35	0.54	0.19	0.83	0.44	0.85	0.17	0.13	0.42	0.31	0.47	0.63
No	0.34	0.42	0.32	0.30	0.28	0.37	0.27	0.28	0.25	0.37	0.23	0.51	0.06	0.32	0.06	0.58	0.66	0.35	0.42	0.33	0.22
Undecided	0.23	0.22	0.24	0.18	0.22	0.17	0.23	0.25	0.19	0.28	0.23	0.29	0.11	0.23	0.09	0.25	0.21	0.23	0.27	0.21	0.15

Table 23: Q15. PROPOSITION 42. PROHIBITS NEW STATE PERSONAL PROPERTY TAXES AND CERTAIN RETROACTIVE STATE TAXES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Prohibits any new state tax (1) imposed on the ownership of personal property (all things people own other than real estate), or (2) that applies retroactively based on taxpayer's past activities. Nullifies taxes enacted after January 1, 2026 that conflict with this measure. Fiscal Impact: Possibility that tax revenues will not go up as much in the future. Supporters: CA Professional Firefighters; State Building & Construction Trades Council of CA; AMVETS Department of CA. Opponents: U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders, SEIU United Healthcare Workers West. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 42? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Gender			Age							Race/Ethnicity				Generation		
	Total	Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65 or older (net)	65-74	75 or older	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Black	Asian/Pac Isle	1st generation	2nd generation	3rd+ generation
unweighted n	5096.00	2211.00	2885.00	930.00	914.00	822.00	1222.00	1208.00	677.00	531.00	3013.00	1106.00	197.00	654.00	624.00	1203.00	3231.00
weighted n	4512.00	2212.00	2300.00	495.00	637.00	689.00	1108.00	1583.00	900.00	683.00	2500.00	1050.00	256.00	660.00	656.00	1008.00	2816.00
Yes	0.43	0.50	0.36	0.28	0.34	0.41	0.49	0.48	0.49	0.46	0.44	0.43	0.32	0.40	0.53	0.34	0.44
No	0.34	0.34	0.35	0.44	0.44	0.38	0.28	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.34	0.35	0.38	0.37	0.27	0.40	0.34
Undecided	0.23	0.16	0.29	0.28	0.21	0.21	0.23	0.22	0.21	0.24	0.22	0.22	0.30	0.23	0.20	0.25	0.23

Table 24: Q15. PROPOSITION 42. PROHIBITS NEW STATE PERSONAL PROPERTY TAXES AND CERTAIN RETROACTIVE STATE TAXES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Prohibits any new state tax (1) imposed on the ownership of personal property (all things people own other than real estate), or (2) that applies retroactively based on taxpayer’s past activities. Nullifies taxes enacted after January 1, 2026 that conflict with this measure. Fiscal Impact: Possibility that tax revenues will not go up as much in the future. Supporters: CA Professional Firefighters; State Building & Construction Trades Council of CA; AMVETS Department of CA. Opponents: U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders, SEIU United Healthcare Workers West. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 42? (Statewide Likely Voters)

		Education				Household income				Marital status			Religious preference				
	Total	High school grad or less	Some college/trade school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$39,999	\$40,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married	Protestant Christian	Catholic	Other religion	Atheist	No preference
unweighted n	5096.00	391.00	1181.00	1835.00	1682.00	718.00	1358.00	1638.00	1273.00	3005.00	703.00	1373.00	1266.00	812.00	510.00	910.00	1586.00
weighted n	4512.00	532.00	1642.00	1498.00	833.00	688.00	1281.00	1491.00	951.00	2692.00	792.00	1015.00	1380.00	789.00	435.00	639.00	1261.00
Yes	0.43	0.48	0.48	0.39	0.37	0.35	0.43	0.46	0.43	0.46	0.45	0.32	0.62	0.54	0.37	0.15	0.31
No	0.34	0.26	0.31	0.37	0.41	0.37	0.36	0.34	0.32	0.33	0.31	0.40	0.18	0.27	0.40	0.58	0.42
Undecided	0.23	0.25	0.21	0.24	0.22	0.28	0.22	0.20	0.24	0.21	0.24	0.28	0.19	0.19	0.23	0.26	0.27

Table 25: Q15. PROPOSITION 42. PROHIBITS NEW STATE PERSONAL PROPERTY TAXES AND CERTAIN RETROACTIVE STATE TAXES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Prohibits any new state tax (1) imposed on the ownership of personal property (all things people own other than real estate), or (2) that applies retroactively based on taxpayer’s past activities. Nullifies taxes enacted after January 1, 2026 that conflict with this measure. Fiscal Impact: Possibility that tax revenues will not go up as much in the future. Supporters: CA Professional Firefighters; State Building & Construction Trades Council of CA; AMVETS Department of CA. Opponents: U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders, SEIU United Healthcare Workers West. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 42? (Statewide Likely Voters)

		Political ideology					Union HH		Tenure		2024 vote for President				Vote preference for Governor		
	Total	Strongly conservative	Somewhat conservative	Moderate	Somewhat liberal	Strongly liberal	Yes	No	Own	Renter/other	Didn’t vote	Voted	Harris	Trump	Becerra	Hilton	Undecided
unweighted n	5096.00	518.00	554.00	1085.00	1112.00	1817.00	1356.00	3735.00	2841.00	2242.00	434.00	4662.00	3211.00	1091.00	3387.00	1275.00	434.00
weighted n	4512.00	638.00	647.00	1174.00	888.00	1154.00	1087.00	3421.00	2648.00	1846.00	623.00	3889.00	2320.00	1391.00	2618.00	1501.00	393.00
Yes	0.43	0.86	0.84	0.51	0.19	0.07	0.41	0.44	0.49	0.34	0.30	0.45	0.21	0.85	0.18	0.86	0.43
No	0.34	0.07	0.07	0.21	0.47	0.69	0.39	0.33	0.28	0.43	0.43	0.33	0.49	0.06	0.52	0.05	0.26
Undecided	0.23	0.08	0.09	0.28	0.34	0.25	0.21	0.24	0.23	0.23	0.27	0.22	0.31	0.09	0.30	0.09	0.30

Table 26: Support for Propositions 40 and 42 (Statewide Likely Voters)

If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 42?	If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 40?			
	Total	Yes	No	Undecided
unweighted n	5096.00	2708.00	1733.00	655.00
weighted n	4512.00	2043.00	1873.00	596.00
Yes	0.43	0.20	0.75	0.20
No	0.34	0.59	0.12	0.19
Undecided	0.23	0.21	0.13	0.61

Table 27: Q16. PROPOSITION 43. LIMITS VOTERS' ABILITY TO RAISE REVENUES FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Limits voters' ability to pass voter-approved local special taxes by increasing percentage of votes needed to approve such ballot measure from a majority (over 50%) to two-thirds, beginning January 1, 2027. Fiscal Impact: Possibility that local government tax revenues will not go up as much in the future due to a higher vote threshold for certain taxes. Supporters: California Taxpayers Association; Family Business Association of California; California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce. Opponents: California Professional Firefighters; California Federation of Teachers; Nurse Alliance of SEIU CA. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 43? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Region											Party Registration			Political identifiers		Likely voting method				
Total	LA 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	No party preference/other	MAGA	Progressive	Democrat/ Socialist	By mail	Drop box	Return ballot to voting center	In person or before 11/3
unweighted n	5096.00	1072.00	548.00	382.00	407.00	371.00	871.00	517.00	354.00	1304.00	141.00	2848.00	1121.00	1127.00	655.00	2566.00	1644.00	1819.00	1873.00	546.00	746.00
weighted n	4512.00	1108.00	388.00	387.00	495.00	280.00	802.00	463.00	339.00	957.00	95.00	2132.00	1207.00	1174.00	854.00	1885.00	1175.00	1582.00	1484.00	544.00	786.00
Yes	0.31	0.27	0.32	0.38	0.32	0.33	0.37	0.36	0.38	0.24	0.29	0.15	0.55	0.32	0.58	0.14	0.11	0.31	0.24	0.33	0.41
No	0.40	0.44	0.38	0.32	0.39	0.41	0.35	0.34	0.35	0.46	0.36	0.52	0.20	0.39	0.20	0.58	0.61	0.40	0.48	0.39	0.31
Undecided	0.29	0.28	0.31	0.30	0.29	0.26	0.29	0.30	0.27	0.30	0.35	0.32	0.25	0.28	0.22	0.28	0.28	0.30	0.28	0.28	0.28

Table 28: Q16. PROPOSITION 43. LIMITS VOTERS' ABILITY TO RAISE REVENUES FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Limits voters' ability to pass voter-approved local special taxes by increasing percentage of votes needed to approve such ballot measure from a majority (over 50%) to two-thirds, beginning January 1, 2027. Fiscal Impact: Possibility that local government tax revenues will not go up as much in the future due to a higher vote threshold for certain taxes. Supporters: California Taxpayers Association; Family Business Association of California; California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce. Opponents: California Professional Firefighters; California Federation of Teachers; Nurse Alliance of SEIU CA. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 43? (Statewide Likely Voters)

	Gender		Age							Race/Ethnicity				Generation		
Total	Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65 or older (net)	65-74	75 or older	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Black	Asian/Pac Isle	1st generation	2nd generation	3rd+ generation
unweighted n	5096.00	2211.00	2885.00	930.00	914.00	822.00	1222.00	1208.00	677.00	531.00	3013.00	1106.00	197.00	654.00	624.00	3231.00
weighted n	4512.00	2212.00	2300.00	495.00	637.00	689.00	1108.00	1583.00	900.00	683.00	2500.00	1050.00	256.00	660.00	1008.00	2816.00
Yes	0.31	0.38	0.23	0.12	0.22	0.32	0.35	0.36	0.36	0.35	0.33	0.30	0.19	0.24	0.36	0.32
No	0.40	0.41	0.40	0.52	0.48	0.42	0.34	0.37	0.36	0.38	0.39	0.41	0.44	0.39	0.42	0.40
Undecided	0.29	0.21	0.37	0.35	0.29	0.26	0.30	0.28	0.28	0.27	0.28	0.29	0.37	0.25	0.34	0.28

Table 29: Q16. PROPOSITION 43. LIMITS VOTERS' ABILITY TO RAISE REVENUES FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Limits voters' ability to pass voter-approved local special taxes by increasing percentage of votes needed to approve such ballot measure from a majority (over 50%) to two-thirds, beginning January 1, 2027. Fiscal Impact: Possibility that local government tax revenues will not go up as much in the future due to a higher vote threshold for certain taxes. Supporters: California Taxpayers Association; Family Business Association of California; California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce. Opponents: California Professional Firefighters; California Federation of Teachers; Nurse Alliance of SEIU CA. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 43? (Statewide Likely Voters)

		Education				Household income				Marital status			Religious preference				
	Total	High school grad or less	Some college/trade school	College graduate (BA)	Post-graduate education	Less than \$39,999	\$40,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married	Protestant/Christian	Catholic	Other religion	Atheist	No preference
unweighted n	5096.00	391.00	1181.00	1835.00	1682.00	718.00	1358.00	1638.00	1273.00	3005.00	703.00	1373.00	1266.00	812.00	510.00	910.00	1586.00
weighted n	4512.00	532.00	1642.00	1498.00	833.00	688.00	1281.00	1491.00	951.00	2692.00	792.00	1015.00	1380.00	789.00	435.00	639.00	1261.00
Yes	0.31	0.32	0.31	0.30	0.29	0.22	0.29	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.29	0.22	0.40	0.39	0.23	0.14	0.26
No	0.40	0.36	0.38	0.40	0.47	0.44	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.37	0.45	0.31	0.34	0.47	0.59	0.43
Undecided	0.29	0.32	0.30	0.29	0.25	0.33	0.31	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.34	0.34	0.29	0.27	0.30	0.27	0.31

Table 30: Q16. PROPOSITION 43. LIMITS VOTERS' ABILITY TO RAISE REVENUES FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Limits voters' ability to pass voter-approved local special taxes by increasing percentage of votes needed to approve such ballot measure from a majority (over 50%) to two-thirds, beginning January 1, 2027. Fiscal Impact: Possibility that local government tax revenues will not go up as much in the future due to a higher vote threshold for certain taxes. Supporters: California Taxpayers Association; Family Business Association of California; California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce. Opponents: California Professional Firefighters; California Federation of Teachers; Nurse Alliance of SEIU CA. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 43? (Statewide Likely Voters)

		Political ideology					Union HH		Tenure		2024 vote for President				Vote preference for Governor		
	Total	Strongly conservative	Somewhat conservative	Moderate liberal	Somewhat liberal	Strongly liberal	Yes	No	Own	Renter/other	Didn't vote	Voted	Harris	Trump	Becerra	Hilton	Undecided
unweighted n	5096.00	518.00	554.00	1085.00	1112.00	1817.00	1356.00	3735.00	2841.00	2242.00	434.00	4662.00	3211.00	1091.00	3387.00	1275.00	434.00
weighted n	4512.00	638.00	647.00	1174.00	888.00	1154.00	1087.00	3421.00	2648.00	1846.00	623.00	3889.00	2320.00	1391.00	2618.00	1501.00	393.00
Yes	0.31	0.60	0.56	0.35	0.15	0.07	0.30	0.31	0.37	0.21	0.19	0.32	0.16	0.59	0.15	0.59	0.27
No	0.40	0.18	0.22	0.32	0.49	0.64	0.46	0.38	0.36	0.46	0.53	0.38	0.50	0.18	0.54	0.19	0.33
Undecided	0.29	0.21	0.22	0.33	0.36	0.29	0.24	0.31	0.27	0.32	0.28	0.29	0.33	0.23	0.32	0.22	0.40