

UC Berkeley

IGS Poll

Title

Release #2026-20 State Ballot Propositions

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3w14s99c>

Journal

Berkeley IGS Poll

Author

DiCamillo, Mark

Publication Date

2026-09-25



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

Release #2026-20

Friday, September 25, 2026

***Support for Propositions 39 (Voter ID) and 40 (Billionaires Tax) dips
But another wealth tax measure, Proposition 3, that would make permanent an existing
tax on high income earners holds a solid 20-point lead.***

by Mark DiCamillo
Director, *Berkeley IGS Poll*

The latest *Berkeley IGS Poll* asked California likely voters their voting preference on seven of the fourteen state propositions to appear on the November election ballot by presenting voters with the verbatim text of the titles and summaries along with the major backers and opponents of each measure.

The poll finds more voters now lining up against Proposition 39, the voter ID initiative than did so six weeks ago. It currently trails by a 13-point margin (52% to 39%) compared to a somewhat smaller 9-point deficit in August.

Two of this year's statewide ballot measures relate to taxing upper income voters and the poll finds big differences in voter preferences between the two. The one grabbing the most attention is the so-called billionaires tax that would impose a one-time tax on taxpayers with assets over \$1 billion. But a second tax-related ballot measure, Proposition 3, calls for making permanent an existing state tax on high income earners. Voter opinions on Proposition 40 are divided with 45% supporting its passage, while nearly as many (42%) are opposed. By contrast, Proposition 3 is backed by a wide 20-point margin, with 54% of voters intending to vote Yes and 34% saying they will be voting No.

The poll probed voter reactions to Proposition 40's two counter initiatives, Propositions 41 and 42, placed on the ballot by opponents of the billionaires tax. The results indicate that while supporters outnumber opponents on both counter measures, neither receives majority support and large proportions are undecided.

Another tax-related ballot measure Proposition 43 to increase the vote threshold required to approve local special taxes from a simple majority to a two-thirds vote is trailing by a 9-point margin. At present 40% say they would vote No, 31% would vote Yes, with a large proportion (29%) undecided.

Many voters (30%) are also undecided when asked about Proposition 4 to repeal the state's current prohibition on offering public funding of candidate election campaigns. Voting preferences are currently evenly divided with 35% intending to vote Yes and 35% voting No.

These findings come from the latest *Berkeley IGS Poll* conducted online September 15-20, 2026, in English and Spanish among a stratified random sample 4,512 Californians considered likely to vote in the upcoming November statewide elections.

<i>Table 1</i> Likely voter preferences regarding seven of the fourteen state propositions on the November 2026 general election ballot	
	%
<u>Proposition 3:</u> Provides permanent funding for schools and health care by extending an existing tax on high incomes.	
Yes voters	54
No voters	34
Undecided	13
<u>Proposition 4:</u> Repeals prohibition against public funding of election campaigns.	
Yes voters	35
No voters	35
Undecided	30
<u>Proposition 39:</u> Prohibits citizens from voting unless they present government-issued identification.	
Yes voters	39
No voters	52
Undecided	9
<u>Proposition 40:</u> Imposes one-time tax on certain taxpayers with assets over \$1 billion.	
Yes voters	45
No voters	42
Undecided	13
<u>Proposition 41:</u> Prohibits new state taxes that exclude revenues from state spending limit.	
Yes voters	37
No voters	33
Undecided	30
<u>Proposition 42:</u> Prohibits new personal property taxes and certain retroactive state taxes passed after January 2026.	
Yes voters	43
No voters	34
Undecided	23
<u>Proposition 43:</u> Limits voters' ability to raise revenues for local government by increasing vote threshold needed to approve local special taxes.	
Yes voters	31
No voters	40
Undecided	29

IGS Co-Director G. Cristina Mora notes, “The findings suggest tough news for Proposition 40 proponents. With less than 50 percent support this close to the election, ballot measures for new taxes tend not to pass, as undecided voters likely break towards ‘no.’ Unless we see meaningful pushes in marketing and canvassing aimed at reaching younger voters, and others who often stay home during midterm elections, the climb looks quite steep. At the same time, canvassing against Proposition 39 has seemed to successfully link the initiative to the Trump agenda and this has made the proposition less likely to pass.”

Support for Proposition 40 declines slightly from six weeks ago

The latest *Berkeley IGS Poll* updated an earlier August IGS poll on Proposition 40 the so-called Billionaire's Tax that would impose a one-time tax on taxpayers with assets over \$1 billion. The results show that slightly fewer voters (45%) are backing the initiative while nearly as many (42%) are intending to vote No side. This narrow 3-point lead compares to a 7-point Yes side advantage it held among likely voters six weeks ago (48% to 41%).

Large partisan differences characterize support and opposition to Proposition 40, with Democrats supporting it greater than three to one, while Republicans are opposed nearly eight to one. The views of non-partisan voters are similar to those of the overall electorate. Yet, Yes side support for the proposition has declined five points among its primary backers, both Democrats and non-partisans, since August.

Support for Proposition 40 varies considerably by age, with twice as many voters under age 30 (68%) on the Yes side than voters 65 or older (34%). There is also a gender gap in voting preferences with female voters favoring the initiative while males are opposed. Voters of color are also more supportive of Proposition 40 than whites.

<i>Table 2</i>						
Comparing likely voters preferences on <u>Proposition 40</u>, to impose a one-time tax on certain taxpayers with assets over \$1 billion in mid-September and early August						
	Mid-September			Early August		
	Voting Yes %	Voting No %	Undecided %	Voting Yes %	Voting No %	Undecided %
Total likely voters	45	42	13	48	41	11
<u>Party registration</u>						
Democrats	65	20	16	70	16	14
Republicans	11	80	9	12	80	8
No Party Preference/other	45	41	14	50	39	11
<u>Age</u>						
18-29	68	18	14	75	15	10
30-39	61	29	10	56	30	14
40-49	50	37	12	52	40	8
50-64	40	46	14	44	45	11
65 or older	34	52	14	40	47	13
<u>Gender</u>						
Male	41	48	10	42	48	10
Female	49	35	16	53	34	13
<u>Race/ethnicity</u>						
White non-Hispanic	41	47	13	40	46	14
Latino	52	35	12	60	31	9
Asian/Pacific Islander	52	34	14	56	36	8
Black	53	27	20	60	25	15

While both of Proposition 40's counter initiatives hold small leads, neither receives majority support and large proportions are undecided

The two counter initiatives to Proposition 40 placed on the ballot by its opponents hold early leads in the latest poll but neither receives majority support with many voters undecided. Currently 43% of likely voters say they would vote Yes on Proposition 42 to prohibit new state personal property taxes other than real estate and nullify retroactive taxes like Proposition 40 passed after January 2026. About one in three (34%) say they would vote No and 23% are undecided. Fewer voters (37%) are backing a second counter measure to the billionaires tax, Proposition 41, that would prohibit enactment of new tax measures passed after January 2026 whose revenues are excluded from the state spending limit, while 33% are opposed and 30% are undecided.

Like voter preferences on Proposition 40, there are large partisan differences in support and opposition to its two counter measures, with Republican voters solidly on the Yes side and Democratic voters opposed. And not surprisingly, preferences on both counter measures are highly correlated with voting preferences on Proposition 40. Voters now intending to vote Yes on Proposition 40 are opposing both counter measures by wide margins, while voters opposed to Proposition 40 are solidly on the Yes side of both counter measures.

Table 3

Likely voter preferences on Proposition 41 to prohibit new state taxes that exclude revenues from state spending limit and Proposition 42 to prohibiting new state personal property taxes and certain retroactive state taxes approved after January 2026

	Proposition 41			Proposition 42		
	Voting Yes %	Voting No %	Undecided %	Voting Yes %	Voting No %	Undecided %
Total likely voters	37	33	30	43	34	23
<u>Party registration</u>						
Democrats	15	50	36	19	51	29
Republicans	77	7	17	83	6	11
No Party Preference/other	38	29	32	44	32	23
<u>Vote on Proposition 40</u>						
Yes voter on Prop. 40	16	57	27	20	59	21
No voter on Prop. 40	67	13	20	75	12	13
Undecided voters	17	13	70	20	19	61

Support for Proposition 39, the voter ID initiative, also dips

Slightly more than half of the state's likely voters (52%) say they intend to vote No on Proposition 39, the voter ID initiative that would prohibit citizens from voting unless they can provide a government-issued identification card or number when voting, while 39% are backing it. This 13-point deficit is slightly greater than the 9-point deficit observed by the poll in early August.

The characteristics of voter preferences on Proposition 39 are similar in both polls, with greater than nine in ten Republicans voting Yes, while about eight in ten Democrats are opposed. Non-partisan voters are also lining up in opposition to the initiative.

Opposition is also broad-based across major demographic subgroups of the electorate, with majorities or near majorities of voters opposed across all major age, gender and race/ethnicity subgroups.

However, large differences in voting preferences on the initiative are seen in relation to voters' educational background, as those with fewer years of formal education, most supportive of the initiative, while majorities of college graduates, and two in three voters with a post graduate degree, are opposed.

<i>Table 4</i> Comparing likely voter preferences on <u>Proposition 39</u> to prohibit citizens from voting unless they present government-issued identification (mid-September vs. early August)						
	Mid-September			Early August		
	Voting Yes %	Voting No %	Undecided %	Voting Yes %	Voting No %	Undecided %
Total likely voters	39	52	9	42	51	7
<u>Party registration</u>						
Democrats	10	80	10	12	80	8
Republicans	92	5	4	93	4	3
No Party Preference/other	37	51	11	36	54	10
<u>Age</u>						
18-29	27	58	14	28	60	12
30-39	34	57	9	35	59	6
40-49	39	52	9	46	44	10
50-64	46	46	8	46	48	6
65 or older	40	53	7	43	50	7
<u>Gender</u>						
Male	43	50	7	47	47	6
Female	35	54	11	37	54	9
<u>Race/ethnicity</u>						
White non-Hispanic	39	55	6	43	49	8
Latino	41	50	9	42	52	6
Asian/Pacific Islander	37	51	12	40	52	8
Black	25	56	19	31	59	10
<u>Education</u>						
High school graduate or less	47	40	13	43	46	11
Some college/trade school	46	45	8	49	44	6
College graduate (BA)	34	57	9	40	52	8
Post graduate work	29	65	6	31	62	7

Partisanship colors voting preferences on Propositions 3, 4 and 43

Voters support Proposition 3 to extend the existing state tax on high income earners by a wide 20-point margin, 54% to 34%. Just 13% are undecided. By contrast, voters oppose Proposition 43 to increase the voting threshold required for voters to approve local special taxes 40% to 31%, while many voters (29%) remain undecided. A large proportion of voters (30%) are also undecided when asked about Proposition 4 to repeal the prohibition against public funding of political campaigns, and of those offering a preference voters are evenly divided, with 35% voting Yes and 35% voting No.

Wide partisan differences characterize voting preferences on each measure. Democrats are currently backing both Proposition 3 and 4 but opposing Proposition 43., while the reverse is true among Republican voters.

Table 5

Likely voter preferences on Proposition 3, to extend the existing tax on high income earners, Proposition 4, to repeal the prohibition against public funding of election campaigns, and Proposition 43, to increase voting thresholds to approve state and local special taxes

	Voting Yes %	Voting No %	Undecided %
Proposition 3: Provides permanent funding for schools and health care by extending existing tax on high incomes.			
<u>Total likely voters</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>13</u>
Democrats	78	9	13
Republicans	13	76	10
No Party Preference/others	52	34	14
Proposition 4: Repeals prohibition against public funding of election campaigns.			
<u>Total likely voters</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>30</u>
Democrats	50	17	33
Republicans	10	66	24
No Party Preference/others	32	37	30
Proposition 43: Limits voters' ability to raise revenues for local government services.			
<u>Total likely voters</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>29</u>
Democrats	15	52	32
Republicans	55	20	25
No Party Preference/others	32	39	28

About the Survey

The findings in this report 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 6,989 registered voters, of whom a weighted subset of 4,512 were considered likely to vote in the state's upcoming November general election. The overall likely voter sample was randomly subdivided into two matching weighted subsamples of 2,261 and 2,251 likely voters, respectively, when asked for their voting preferences about Propositions 3 and 4. Funding for the poll was provided in part by the *Los Angeles Times* and the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund.

Data collection for the poll 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 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 state and local voter registration rolls, which are public documents. The sample was stratified by age and gender to obtain a proper balance of survey respondents.

To protect the anonymity of respondents, the personally identifiable information of each voter that was listed on their voting record was purged from the data file and replaced with a unique and anonymous identification number during data processing. In addition, after the completion of data collection, post-stratification weights were applied to the data file to align the overall sample to population characteristics of registered voters both statewide and within major regions of the state.

The sampling error associated with the survey results is difficult to calculate precisely because of sample stratification and post-stratification weighting. Nevertheless, it is likely that findings from the overall likely voter sample have an approximate sampling error of +/- 2 percentage points at the 95% confidence level, while findings from the two random subsamples of likely voters have an approximate sampling error of +/- 3 percentage points.

Questions asked

California's November general election will include 14 different statewide ballot propositions. Below are the official ballot titles and summaries of some of them as they will appear on the ballot. Please indicate how you would vote on each if the election were held today.

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?

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 year 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?

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?

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?

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?

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?

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 measures 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?

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 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, which is disseminated widely, 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>.