

THE FIELD POLL

THE INDEPENDENT AND NON-PARTISAN SURVEY
OF PUBLIC OPINION ESTABLISHED IN 1947 AS
THE CALIFORNIA POLL BY MERVIN FIELD

Field Research Corporation

601 California Street, Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94108-2814
(415) 392-5763 FAX: (415) 434-2541
EMAIL: fieldpoll@field.com
www.field.com/fieldpollonline

FOR ADVANCE PUBLICATION BY SUBSCRIBERS ONLY.

COPYRIGHT 2007 BY FIELD RESEARCH CORPORATION.

Release #2256

Release Date and Time: **6:00 a.m., Thursday, December 27, 2007**

**LOW VOTER AWARENESS OF
PROPOSITIONS DEALING WITH TERM
LIMITS AND INDIAN GAMING.**

IMPORTANT: Contract for this service is subject to revocation if publication or broadcast takes place before release date or if contents are divulged to persons outside of subscriber staff prior to release time. (ISSN 0195-4520)

By Mark DiCamillo and Mervin Field

Apparently lost in the media focus on the presidential race are a number of statewide ballot propositions that California voters will be asked to decide within the next six weeks.

Just one in four (25%) likely February 5 primary election voters say they have seen or heard anything about Proposition 93, which would modify the state's existing term limit laws.

Awareness is also low (27%) regarding four referenda to approve or overturn four Indian casino compacts recently approved the state legislature and Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger and which will appear on the February ballot as Propositions 94, 95, 96, and 97.

When voters are read a summary of the measures' official ballot description, they are initially supportive by varying margins – 50% to 32% with regard to the term limits modification, and 39% to 33% in relation to the Indian gaming compacts. In each case, relatively large proportions are undecided.

These are the findings from the latest *Field Poll* of 866 likely voters in the upcoming February 5th primary election completed in mid-December.

Proposition 93 preference trend

Proposition 93 calls for reducing the total years a state legislator can serve in the Assembly and State Senate from 14 to 12 years, and allows a legislator to serve his or her entire 12 years in either legislative house. Should it pass, one of its consequences is that many of the state's current legislators, including the leaders in the Senate and Assembly, would avoid being termed out of office next year because they would be allowed to serve up to 12 years in their current legislative body.

In August, *The Field Poll* found a two-to-one majority (59% to 30%) of likely primary election voters supporting the initiative. In two subsequent measures taken in October and December support has declined to a somewhat lower five to three margin in favor.

Table 1
Trend of voter preferences toward Proposition 93, the "Limit on Legislators' Terms in Office" initiative
(among likely voters in the February 2008 primary)

	<u>December</u>	<u>October</u>	<u>August</u>
Would vote YES	50%	49%	59%
Would vote NO	32	31	30
Would vote NO	18	20	11

Subgroup differences in preferences

Support for Prop. 93 is lower among Democrats and political liberals than among Republicans and conservatives.

Half or more of the voters in each of the state's major geographic regions are supporting the initiative, with the exception of the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area, where opinions are about evenly divided.

Voters living in households that are affiliated with a labor union are also about evenly divided, while those with no union affiliation are more inclined to be in favor.

Table 2
**Current voter preferences toward Proposition 93, the "Limits
 on Legislators' Terms in Office" initiative – by subgroup
 (among likely voters in the February 2008 primary)**

	<u>Inclined to vote...</u>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
Statewide	50%	32	18
<u>Party</u>			
(.46) Democrats	47%	37	16
(.37) Republicans	56%	29	15
(.17) Non-partisans/others	47%	25	28
<u>Region</u>			
(.25) Los Angeles County	50%	27	23
(.18) Orange/San Diego	53%	31	16
(.13) Other Southern California	57%	33	10
(.17) Central Valley	55%	29	16
(.22) San Francisco Bay Area	41%	42	17
(.05) Other Northern California*	51%	27	22
<u>Political ideology</u>			
(.31) Conservative	55%	28	17
(.44) Middle-of-the-road	52%	31	17
(.25) Liberal	42%	38	20
<u>Gender</u>			
(.44) Male	48%	37	15
(.56) Female	52%	28	20
<u>Union affiliation</u>			
(.26) Yes	43%	40	17
(.74) No	53%	29	18
<u>Voting method</u>			
(.54) Precinct voter	50%	32	18
(.46) Mail ballot voter	51%	32	17

* Small sample base.

Indian gaming referenda

Voters will be asked to endorse or reject four gaming compacts recently approved by the state legislature and the governor that would expand the number of slot machines at four Southern California Indian casinos. These referenda will appear as Propositions 94, 95, 96 and 97 on the February ballot.

The current survey finds greater than one in four voters (28%) reporting no opinion about the various gaming compact referenda. Among those who do offer an opinion, supporters narrowly outnumber opponents, 39% to 33% statewide.

Pluralities of both Democrats and Republicans are in favor of the Indian gaming measures, while non-partisans are opposed by a four to three margin.

Voters living in Southern California, where the compacts would take effect, report somewhat greater support toward the four referenda than Central Valley and Bay Area voters.

Men are lining up in favor of the four referenda by a 46% to 32% margin, while women are evenly divided.

Precinct voters are more likely than voters who will be casting their ballots by mail to be supporting the measures.

There is a direct correlation between a voter's fundamental opinion about the idea of expanding Indian gaming in California and their views on the four propositions. Among the 41% of voters who favor expanding Indian casino gaming, there is strong support for the referenda on the order of four to one. On the other hand, among the 45% of voters who are against expanded gaming in general, opponents of Props. 94-97 outnumber supporters three to one.

Table 3
Voter preferences regarding four statewide referenda (Propositions 94-97)
after reading a summary of their official ballot label
(among likely voters in the February 2008 primary)

	<u>Inclined to vote...</u>		
	<u>Yes, to approve these compacts</u>	<u>No, to overturn these compacts</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
Statewide	39%	33	28
<u>Party</u>			
(.46) Democrats	39%	31	30
(.37) Republicans	43%	33	24
(.17) Non-partisans/others	32%	42	26
<u>Region</u>			
(.25) Los Angeles County	43%	30	27
(.18) Orange/San Diego	38%	34	28
(.13) Other Southern California	45%	35	20
(.17) Central Valley	38%	38	24
(.22) San Francisco Bay Area	36%	34	30
(.05) Other Northern California*	29%	21	50
<u>Gender</u>			
(.44) Male	46%	32	22
(.56) Female	34%	34	32
<u>Political ideology</u>			
(.31) Conservative	41%	38	21
(.44) Middle-of-the-road	41%	30	29
(.25) Liberal	35%	34	31
<u>Union affiliation</u>			
(.26) Yes	42%	35	23
(.74) No	39%	32	29
<u>Voting method</u>			
(.54) Precinct voter	43%	32	25
(.46) Mail ballot voter	36%	35	29
<u>Opinion of Indian gaming expansion</u>			
(.41) Favor	64%	16	20
(.45) Oppose	18%	52	30
(.14) Depends/no opinion	37%	25	38

* Small sample size.

Information About The Survey

Sample Details

The findings in this report are based on a random sample survey of 1,283 registered voters in California, of whom 866 can be considered likely to vote in the February 5th statewide primary election. Interviewing was conducted by telephone in English and Spanish December 10-17, 2007. Up to six attempts were made to reach and interview each randomly selected voter on different days and times of day during the interviewing period.

The sample was developed from telephone listings of individual voters selected at random from a statewide list of registered voters in California. Once a voter's name and telephone number has been selected, interviews are attempted only with the specified voter. Interviews can be conducted on either the voter's landline or cell phone, depending on the source of the telephone listing from the voter file. After the completion of interviewing, the results are weighted slightly to *Field Poll* estimates of the demographic and regional characteristics of the state's registered voter population.

Sampling error estimates applicable to any probability-based survey depends on the sample size. The maximum sampling error for results based on the overall sample of 866 likely voters is +/- 3.4 percentage points. The maximum sampling error is based on percentages in the middle of the sampling distribution (percentages around 50%). Percentages at either end of the distribution (percentages around 10% or around 90%) have a smaller margin of error. While there are other potential sources of error in surveys besides sampling error, the overall design and execution of the survey minimized the potential for these other sources of error. The maximum sampling error will be larger for analyses based on subgroups of the overall sample.

Questions Asked

Have you seen, read or heard anything about Proposition 93, a statewide ballot proposition having to do with term limits that will appear on the February 2008 primary election ballot?

(As you know) Proposition 93 is called the "Limits on Legislators' Terms in Office" initiative. It reduces the total amount of time a person may serve in the state legislature from 14 years to 12 years and allows a person to serve a total of 12 years either in the Assembly, the Senate or a combination of both. It provides a transition period to allow current members to serve a total of 12 consecutive years in the house in which they are currently serving, regardless of any prior service in another house. If the election were being held today, would you vote Yes or No on Proposition 93?

As you know, the state of California allows legal casino gaming, such as playing slot machines, dice, blackjack, and roulette, at casinos located on Indian tribal lands. Tax proceeds from these casinos are shared between the state government and the local governments where they are located. In general, do you favor or oppose expanding the number of casino gaming establishments on Indian tribal lands in California?

Have you seen, read or heard anything about four separate referendums to ratify amendments to four Indian gaming compacts that will appear on California's February primary election ballot as Propositions 94-97?

(As you know) these referendums are amendments to four Indian Gaming compacts. A "Yes" vote on each approves and a "No" vote rejects a law that ratifies an amendment to existing gaming compacts between the state and four Southern California Indian tribes. Fiscal impact: Net increase in annual state revenues from each referendum probably in the tens of millions of dollars, growing over time through the year 2030. If the election were being held today, would you vote Yes or No on Propositions 94 through 97?