

# UC Berkeley

## IGS Poll

### Title

Tabulations from an Early August 2024 Poll of California Likely Voters About Voting Preferences on Several Statewide Ballot Propositions

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3zk9q5px>

### Author

DiCamillo, Mark

### Publication Date

2024-08-16



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](mailto:igs@berkeley.edu)

**Tabulations from an Early August 2024 Poll of  
California Likely Voters About Voting Preferences  
on Several Statewide Ballot Propositions**

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

**July 31-August 11, 2024**

## Introduction

The statistical tabulations in this volume are based on a *Berkeley IGS Poll* completed online in English and Spanish July 31 – August 11, 2024 among 3,765 Californians considered likely to vote in the state’s November 2024 general election. 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 poll was conducted by distributing email invitations to stratified random samples of the state’s registered voters. 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 receive further email invitations.

Samples of California registered voters with email addresses were derived from information contained on the official voter registration rolls and provided to IGS by Political Data, Inc., a leading supplier of registered voter lists.

To protect the anonymity of 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. In addition, after the completion of data collection, post-stratification weights were applied to the survey data file to align the sample of registered voters to population characteristics of the registered voters 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 the post-stratification weighting. Nevertheless, it is likely that findings based on the likely voter subsample 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)

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)

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.)

## **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 veteran pollster Mark DiCamillo. For a complete listing of stories issued by the *Berkeley IGS Poll* and a more detailed description of the methods used to conduct each survey go to <https://www.igs.berkeley.edu/research/berkeley-igs-poll>.

## August 2024 Berkeley IGS Poll — Likely Voters

Table 1: Q17a **PROPOSITION 32. RAISES MINIMUM WAGE. INITIATIVE STATUTE:** This measure increases the minimum wage in California—currently, \$15 per hour for businesses with 26 or more employees, and \$14 per hour for smaller businesses—by \$1 per year until it reaches \$18 per hour. Thereafter, the minimum wage will annually adjust for inflation. In periods of decreased economic activity, or General Fund deficit, the Governor may suspend annual increase up to two times, thereby extending timeline for reaching \$18 per hour. Fiscal impact: Unclear change in annual state and local tax revenues. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 32? (Likely Voters)

	Region											Urbanicity			Party Registration				Likely Voters		
	Total	Los Angeles 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	Urban	Suburban	Rural/na	Dem	Rep	NPP	Other	NPP / other	Likely	Not likely
unweighted n	3765.00	1136.00	367.0	253.00	336.00	243.00	591.00	318.00	273.00	741.00	98.00	1600.00	1599.00	566.00	1885.00	1142.00	542.00	196.00	738.00	3765.00	0
weighted n	3516.00	851.00	318.0	319.00	395.00	230.00	604.00	306.00	298.00	717.00	83.00	1494.00	1521.00	502.00	1640.00	987.00	640.00	249.00	890.00	3516.00	0
Yes	0.52	0.53	0.5	0.43	0.49	0.53	0.49	0.56	0.41	0.60	0.57	0.57	0.49	0.45	0.74	0.17	0.51	0.49	0.51	0.52	0
No	0.34	0.29	0.4	0.40	0.36	0.37	0.40	0.31	0.49	0.28	0.24	0.28	0.37	0.42	0.13	0.71	0.29	0.39	0.32	0.34	0
Undecided	0.14	0.18	0.1	0.17	0.15	0.09	0.11	0.12	0.10	0.13	0.19	0.15	0.14	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.20	0.12	0.18	0.14	0

Table 2: Q17a **PROPOSITION 32. RAISES MINIMUM WAGE. INITIATIVE STATUTE:** This measure increases the minimum wage in California—currently, \$15 per hour for businesses with 26 or more employees, and \$14 per hour for smaller businesses—by \$1 per year until it reaches \$18 per hour. Thereafter, the minimum wage will annually adjust for inflation. In periods of decreased economic activity, or General Fund deficit, the Governor may suspend annual increase up to two times, thereby extending timeline for reaching \$18 per hour. Fiscal impact: Unclear change in annual state and local tax revenues. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 32? (Likely Voters)

	Gender			Age						Race / Ethnicity						Nativity of Voter						
	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/ bilin-gual (Latino)	Black	Asian/ Pac Isle	Amer In-dian/ Na-tive Amer	US	Another coun-try (net)	Both par-ents US born	One par-ent US born	Neither par-ent US born
unweighted n	3765.00	1830.00	1933.00	458.00	433.00	509.00	1146.00	1219.00	739.00	480.00	2062.00	860.00	284.00	573.00	256.00	314.00	64.00	2992.00	641.00	22.00	37.00	579.00
weighted n	3516.00	1666.00	1851.00	460.00	563.00	596.00	888.00	1009.00	626.00	383.00	1830.00	896.00	199.00	692.00	183.00	456.00	90.00	2883.00	584.00	24.00	31.00	526.00
Yes	0.52	0.48	0.56	0.60	0.58	0.45	0.55	0.47	0.45	0.51	0.49	0.56	0.71	0.51	0.77	0.51	0.65	0.50	0.65	0.86	0.76	0.64
No	0.34	0.39	0.29	0.27	0.30	0.40	0.32	0.37	0.38	0.35	0.38	0.31	0.16	0.36	0.14	0.32	0.21	0.37	0.21	0.11	0.17	0.22
Undecided	0.14	0.13	0.15	0.13	0.13	0.15	0.13	0.16	0.17	0.14	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.09	0.17	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.02	0.07	0.14

Table 3: Q17a **PROPOSITION 32. RAISES MINIMUM WAGE. INITIATIVE STATUTE:** This measure increases the minimum wage in California—currently, \$15 per hour for businesses with 26 or more employees, and \$14 per hour for smaller businesses—by \$1 per year until it reaches \$18 per hour. Thereafter, the minimum wage will annually adjust for inflation. In periods of decreased economic activity, or General Fund deficit, the Governor may suspend annual increase up to two times, thereby extending timeline for reaching \$18 per hour. Fiscal impact: Unclear change in annual state and local tax revenues. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 32? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Political Ideology					Education				Household Income					Tenure		
		Strongly con-servative	Somewhat con-servative	Moderate	Somewhat liberal	Strongly liberal	High school or less	Some college/trade 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-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Owner	Renter / Other
unweighted n	3765.00	380.00	628.00	1150.00	743.00	734.00	402.00	984.00	1174.00	1077.00	208.00	280.00	422.00	735.00	1202.00	691.00	2255.00	1510.00
weighted n	3516.00	387.00	646.00	1062.00	764.00	602.00	522.00	1285.00	1048.00	610.00	244.00	295.00	503.00	696.00	1024.00	629.00	1973.00	1544.00
Yes	0.52	0.18	0.22	0.49	0.72	0.87	0.54	0.52	0.48	0.58	0.57	0.73	0.62	0.51	0.44	0.49	0.44	0.62
No	0.34	0.75	0.63	0.32	0.13	0.07	0.32	0.35	0.35	0.32	0.17	0.18	0.27	0.35	0.42	0.41	0.42	0.23
Undecided	0.14	0.07	0.15	0.19	0.15	0.06	0.13	0.13	0.16	0.11	0.26	0.10	0.11	0.15	0.14	0.10	0.13	0.15

Table 4: Q17a **PROPOSITION 32. RAISES MINIMUM WAGE. INITIATIVE STATUTE:** This measure increases the minimum wage in California—currently, \$15 per hour for businesses with 26 or more employees, and \$14 per hour for smaller businesses—by \$1 per year until it reaches \$18 per hour. Thereafter, the minimum wage will annually adjust for inflation. In periods of decreased economic activity, or General Fund deficit, the Governor may suspend annual increase up to two times, thereby extending timeline for reaching \$18 per hour. Fiscal impact: Unclear change in annual state and local tax revenues. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 32? (Likely Voters)

	Union Affiliation			Marital Status				Party Identification									
	Total	Yes	No	Married	Not married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married	Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/Lean other (net)	Lean Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other
unweighted n	3765.00	880.00	2755.00	1965.00	262.00	642.00	763.00	2217.00	1258.00	957.00	1137.00	550.00	586.00	1099.00	490.00	325.00	283.00
weighted n	3516.00	847.00	2622.00	1785.00	286.00	580.00	814.00	2051.00	1083.00	963.00	1204.00	581.00	623.00	1084.00	508.00	359.00	216.00
Yes	0.52	0.60	0.50	0.46	0.58	0.60	0.59	0.73	0.80	0.65	0.19	0.18	0.20	0.43	0.66	0.12	0.41
No	0.34	0.29	0.36	0.41	0.30	0.24	0.28	0.13	0.07	0.20	0.69	0.70	0.69	0.42	0.19	0.76	0.40
Undecided	0.14	0.11	0.14	0.14	0.12	0.16	0.13	0.14	0.13	0.15	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.15	0.16	0.13	0.19



Table 5: Q17b PROPOSITION 33. EXPANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS’ AUTHORITY TO ENACT RENT CONTROL ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE: Current state law generally prevents cities and counties from limiting the initial rental rate that landlords may charge to new tenants in all types of housing, and from limiting rent increases for existing tenants in (1) residential properties that were first occupied after February 1, 1995; (2) single-family homes; and (3) condominiums. This measure would repeal that state law and would prohibit the state from limiting the right of cities and counties to maintain, enact or expand residential rent-control ordinances. Fiscal impact: Overall, a potential reduction in state and local revenues in the high tens of millions of dollars per year over time. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 33? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Urbanicity			Party Registration					Likely Voters	
		Los Angeles 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	Urban	Sub-urban	Rural/na	Dem	Rep	NPP	Other	NPP / other	Likely	Not likely
unweighted n	3765.00	1136.00	367.00	253.00	336.00	243.00	591.00	318.00	273.00	741.00	98.00	1600.00	1599.00	566.00	1885.00	1142.00	542.00	196.00	738.00	3765.00	0
weighted n	3516.00	851.00	318.00	319.00	395.00	230.00	604.00	306.00	298.00	717.00	83.00	1494.00	1521.00	502.00	1640.00	987.00	640.00	249.00	890.00	3516.00	0
Yes	0.40	0.42	0.43	0.37	0.45	0.27	0.42	0.46	0.38	0.37	0.51	0.42	0.39	0.35	0.51	0.24	0.34	0.46	0.37	0.40	0
No	0.34	0.32	0.34	0.32	0.32	0.40	0.36	0.31	0.42	0.35	0.23	0.32	0.33	0.44	0.23	0.51	0.33	0.35	0.34	0.34	0
Undecided	0.26	0.26	0.23	0.31	0.23	0.33	0.22	0.23	0.21	0.28	0.26	0.26	0.28	0.21	0.26	0.24	0.33	0.19	0.29	0.26	0

Table 6: Q17b PROPOSITION 33. EXPANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS’ AUTHORITY TO ENACT RENT CONTROL ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE: Current state law generally prevents cities and counties from limiting the initial rental rate that landlords may charge to new tenants in all types of housing, and from limiting rent increases for existing tenants in (1) residential properties that were first occupied after February 1, 1995; (2) single-family homes; and (3) condominiums. This measure would repeal that state law and would prohibit the state from limiting the right of cities and counties to maintain, enact or expand residential rent-control ordinances. Fiscal impact: Overall, a potential reduction in state and local revenues in the high tens of millions of dollars per year over time. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 33? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Gender		Age							Race / Ethnicity							Nativity of Voter				
		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-Indian/Native Amer	US	Another country (net)	Both parents US born	One parent US born	Neither parent US born
unweighted n	3765.00	1830.00	1933.00	458.00	433.00	509.00	1146.00	1219.00	739.00	480.00	2062.00	860.00	284.00	573.00	256.00	314.00	64.00	2992.00	641.00	22.00	37.00	579.00
weighted n	3516.00	1666.00	1851.00	460.00	563.00	596.00	888.00	1009.00	626.00	383.00	1830.00	896.00	199.00	692.00	183.00	456.00	90.00	2883.00	584.00	24.00	31.00	526.00
Yes	0.40	0.39	0.41	0.51	0.55	0.44	0.37	0.27	0.26	0.29	0.35	0.48	0.44	0.49	0.56	0.38	0.60	0.40	0.40	0.16	0.46	0.41
No	0.34	0.39	0.29	0.24	0.17	0.30	0.39	0.46	0.48	0.41	0.39	0.27	0.24	0.28	0.22	0.35	0.18	0.35	0.28	0.71	0.30	0.26
Undecided	0.26	0.21	0.30	0.25	0.28	0.26	0.24	0.27	0.26	0.30	0.26	0.25	0.32	0.23	0.22	0.26	0.22	0.24	0.32	0.13	0.24	0.33

Table 7: Q17b PROPOSITION 33. EXPANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS' AUTHORITY TO ENACT RENT CONTROL ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE: Current state law generally prevents cities and counties from limiting the initial rental rate that landlords may charge to new tenants in all types of housing, and from limiting rent increases for existing tenants in (1) residential properties that were first occupied after February 1, 1995; (2) single-family homes; and (3) condominiums. This measure would repeal that state law and would prohibit the state from limiting the right of cities and counties to maintain, enact or expand residential rent-control ordinances. Fiscal impact: Overall, a potential reduction in state and local revenues in the high tens of millions of dollars per year over time. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 33? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Political Ideology					Education				Household Income					Tenure		
		Strongly conservative	Somewhat conservative	Moderate	Somewhat liberal	Strongly liberal	High school or less	Some college/trade 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-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Owner	Renter / Other
unweighted n	3765.00	380.00	628.00	1150.00	743.00	734.00	402.00	984.00	1174.00	1077.00	208.00	280.00	422.00	735.00	1202.00	691.00	2255.00	1510.00
weighted n	3516.00	387.00	646.00	1062.00	764.00	602.00	522.00	1285.00	1048.00	610.00	244.00	295.00	503.00	696.00	1024.00	629.00	1973.00	1544.00
Yes	0.40	0.30	0.26	0.34	0.46	0.65	0.43	0.37	0.43	0.38	0.51	0.53	0.43	0.44	0.38	0.27	0.29	0.54
No	0.34	0.54	0.45	0.37	0.28	0.14	0.25	0.39	0.33	0.36	0.17	0.19	0.32	0.33	0.36	0.49	0.45	0.19
Undecided	0.26	0.15	0.30	0.29	0.26	0.21	0.32	0.24	0.24	0.27	0.32	0.27	0.25	0.23	0.26	0.24	0.25	0.27

Table 8: Q17b PROPOSITION 33. EXPANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS' AUTHORITY TO ENACT RENT CONTROL ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE: Current state law generally prevents cities and counties from limiting the initial rental rate that landlords may charge to new tenants in all types of housing, and from limiting rent increases for existing tenants in (1) residential properties that were first occupied after February 1, 1995; (2) single-family homes; and (3) condominiums. This measure would repeal that state law and would prohibit the state from limiting the right of cities and counties to maintain, enact or expand residential rent-control ordinances. Fiscal impact: Overall, a potential reduction in state and local revenues in the high tens of millions of dollars per year over time. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 33? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Union Affiliation		Marital Status				Party Identification									
		Yes	No	Married	Not married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married	Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/Lean other (net)	Lean Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other
unweighted n	3765.00	880.00	2755.00	1965.00	262.00	642.00	763.00	2217.00	1258.00	957.00	1137.00	550.00	586.00	1099.00	490.00	325.00	283.00
weighted n	3516.00	847.00	2622.00	1785.00	286.00	580.00	814.00	2051.00	1083.00	963.00	1204.00	581.00	623.00	1084.00	508.00	359.00	216.00
Yes	0.40	0.43	0.39	0.34	0.51	0.37	0.51	0.50	0.54	0.45	0.24	0.29	0.20	0.34	0.44	0.16	0.39
No	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.40	0.33	0.33	0.23	0.24	0.20	0.30	0.51	0.48	0.55	0.41	0.33	0.58	0.34
Undecided	0.26	0.23	0.26	0.26	0.16	0.29	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.24	0.23	0.26	0.25	0.23	0.25	0.27

Table 9: Q17c PROPOSITION 36. ALLOWS FELONY CHARGES AND INCREASES SENTENCES FOR CERTAIN DRUG AND THEFT CRIMES. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allows felony charges for possessing certain drugs, including fentanyl, and for thefts under \$950—both currently chargeable only as misdemeanors—with two prior drug or two prior theft convictions, as applicable. Defendants who plead guilty to felony drug possession and complete treatment can have charges dismissed. Increases sentences for other specified drug and theft crimes. Increased prison sentences may reduce savings that currently fund mental health and drug treatment programs, K-12 schools, and crime victims; any remaining savings may be used for new felony treatment program. Fiscal impact: Increased local criminal justice system costs potentially in the tens of millions of dollars annually. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 36? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Urbanicity			Party Registration					Likely Voters	
		Los Angeles 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	Urban	Sub-urban	Rural/na	Dem	Rep	NPP	Other	NPP / other	Likely	Not likely
unweighted n	3765.00	1136.00	367.00	253.00	336.00	243.00	591.00	318.00	273.00	741.00	98.00	1600.00	1599.00	566.00	1885.00	1142.00	542.00	196.00	738.00	3765.00	0
weighted n	3516.00	851.00	318.00	319.00	395.00	230.00	604.00	306.00	298.00	717.00	83.00	1494.00	1521.00	502.00	1640.00	987.00	640.00	249.00	890.00	3516.00	0
Yes	0.56	0.55	0.52	0.56	0.56	0.52	0.65	0.60	0.70	0.51	0.67	0.52	0.57	0.64	0.48	0.69	0.53	0.59	0.55	0.56	0
No	0.23	0.24	0.21	0.17	0.27	0.30	0.20	0.25	0.15	0.25	0.18	0.23	0.24	0.22	0.29	0.17	0.18	0.23	0.19	0.23	0
Undecided	0.21	0.21	0.27	0.27	0.17	0.18	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.24	0.15	0.25	0.20	0.14	0.23	0.13	0.29	0.18	0.26	0.21	0

Table 10: Q17c PROPOSITION 36. ALLOWS FELONY CHARGES AND INCREASES SENTENCES FOR CERTAIN DRUG AND THEFT CRIMES. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allows felony charges for possessing certain drugs, including fentanyl, and for thefts under \$950—both currently chargeable only as misdemeanors—with two prior drug or two prior theft convictions, as applicable. Defendants who plead guilty to felony drug possession and complete treatment can have charges dismissed. Increases sentences for other specified drug and theft crimes. Increased prison sentences may reduce savings that currently fund mental health and drug treatment programs, K-12 schools, and crime victims; any remaining savings may be used for new felony treatment program. Fiscal impact: Increased local criminal justice system costs potentially in the tens of millions of dollars annually. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 36? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Gender		Age							Race / Ethnicity							Nativity of Voter				
		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 Islander	Amer Indian/Native Amer	US	Another country (net)	Both parents US born	One parent US born	Neither parent US born
unweighted n	3765.00	1830.00	1933.00	458.00	433.00	509.00	1146.00	1219.00	739.00	480.00	2062.00	860.00	284.00	573.00	256.00	314.00	64.00	2992.00	641.00	22.00	37.00	579.00
weighted n	3516.00	1666.00	1851.00	460.00	563.00	596.00	888.00	1009.00	626.00	383.00	1830.00	896.00	199.00	692.00	183.00	456.00	90.00	2883.00	584.00	24.00	31.00	526.00
Yes	0.56	0.61	0.52	0.40	0.51	0.47	0.62	0.65	0.64	0.67	0.57	0.59	0.66	0.57	0.47	0.50	0.68	0.55	0.63	0.72	0.40	0.64
No	0.23	0.22	0.24	0.33	0.26	0.33	0.19	0.14	0.16	0.11	0.22	0.23	0.10	0.27	0.29	0.25	0.28	0.25	0.16	0.09	0.07	0.17
Undecided	0.21	0.17	0.24	0.28	0.23	0.19	0.18	0.20	0.20	0.21	0.21	0.17	0.23	0.15	0.25	0.24	0.05	0.20	0.21	0.18	0.53	0.19

Table 11: Q17c PROPOSITION 36. ALLOWS FELONY CHARGES AND INCREASES SENTENCES FOR CERTAIN DRUG AND THEFT CRIMES. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allows felony charges for possessing certain drugs, including fentanyl, and for thefts under \$950—both currently chargeable only as misdemeanors—with two prior drug or two prior theft convictions, as applicable. Defendants who plead guilty to felony drug possession and complete treatment can have charges dismissed. Increases sentences for other specified drug and theft crimes. Increased prison sentences may reduce savings that currently fund mental health and drug treatment programs, K-12 schools, and crime victims; any remaining savings may be used for new felony treatment program. Fiscal impact: Increased local criminal justice system costs potentially in the tens of millions of dollars annually. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 36? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Political Ideology					Education				Household Income					Tenure		
		Strongly conservative	Somewhat conservative	Moderate	Somewhat liberal	Strongly liberal	High school or less	Some college/trade 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-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Owner	Renter / Other
unweighted n	3765.00	380.00	628.00	1150.00	743.00	734.00	402.00	984.00	1174.00	1077.00	208.00	280.00	422.00	735.00	1202.00	691.00	2255.00	1510.00
weighted n	3516.00	387.00	646.00	1062.00	764.00	602.00	522.00	1285.00	1048.00	610.00	244.00	295.00	503.00	696.00	1024.00	629.00	1973.00	1544.00
Yes	0.56	0.69	0.70	0.66	0.47	0.29	0.56	0.59	0.56	0.49	0.58	0.47	0.50	0.58	0.59	0.58	0.60	0.51
No	0.23	0.20	0.15	0.12	0.27	0.47	0.18	0.26	0.22	0.24	0.26	0.28	0.31	0.18	0.21	0.23	0.21	0.26
Undecided	0.21	0.10	0.15	0.22	0.26	0.24	0.26	0.15	0.21	0.27	0.16	0.25	0.19	0.24	0.20	0.18	0.19	0.23

Table 12: Q17c PROPOSITION 36. ALLOWS FELONY CHARGES AND INCREASES SENTENCES FOR CERTAIN DRUG AND THEFT CRIMES. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allows felony charges for possessing certain drugs, including fentanyl, and for thefts under \$950—both currently chargeable only as misdemeanors—with two prior drug or two prior theft convictions, as applicable. Defendants who plead guilty to felony drug possession and complete treatment can have charges dismissed. Increases sentences for other specified drug and theft crimes. Increased prison sentences may reduce savings that currently fund mental health and drug treatment programs, K-12 schools, and crime victims; any remaining savings may be used for new felony treatment program. Fiscal impact: Increased local criminal justice system costs potentially in the tens of millions of dollars annually. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 36? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Union Affiliation		Marital Status			Party Identification										
		Yes	No	Married	Not married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married	Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/Lean Democrat (net)	Lean Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other
unweighted n	3765.00	880.00	2755.00	1965.00	262.00	642.00	763.00	2217.00	1258.00	957.00	1137.00	550.00	586.00	1099.00	490.00	325.00	283.00
weighted n	3516.00	847.00	2622.00	1785.00	286.00	580.00	814.00	2051.00	1083.00	963.00	1204.00	581.00	623.00	1084.00	508.00	359.00	216.00
Yes	0.56	0.53	0.57	0.63	0.43	0.63	0.42	0.46	0.45	0.48	0.72	0.73	0.72	0.58	0.46	0.75	0.58
No	0.23	0.31	0.21	0.19	0.40	0.19	0.30	0.28	0.29	0.27	0.15	0.14	0.16	0.22	0.27	0.14	0.22
Undecided	0.21	0.15	0.22	0.19	0.17	0.17	0.28	0.25	0.26	0.25	0.12	0.13	0.12	0.20	0.27	0.10	0.20