

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
222 Sutter Street, Suite 700
San Francisco, CA 94108-4411
(415) 392-5763 FAX: (415) 434-2541
EMAIL: fieldpoll@field.com
www.field.com/fieldpollonline

COPYRIGHT 2004 BY FIELD RESEARCH CORPORATION. FOR ADVANCE PUBLICATION BY SUBSCRIBERS ONLY.

Release #2138

Gambling initiatives:

VOTERS OPPOSE PROP. 70 FOUR TO THREE. THREE TO ONE OPPOSITION TO PROP 68 BEFORE BACKERS SUSPENDED ADVERTISING.

Release Date: **Saturday, October 9, 2004**

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

California voters are displaying little enthusiasm for two statewide initiatives related to Indian gaming and gambling expansion.

Proposition 70 is a measure that would allow unlimited gambling on Indian lands in exchange for tribes giving 8.84% of their profits to the state. According to a just completed *Field Poll*, likely voters are dividing 43% No to 32% Yes, with 25% undecided.

Proposition 68 is an attempt to break the Indian tribes monopoly on Nevada style casinos in California. It would allow this state's existing cardroom and racetracks the right to install as many as 30,000 slot machines unless the Indian tribes agreed to giving up 25% of their casino profits. Voters are currently lining up on the No side by a 59% to 20% margin.

Proposition 70

Last August *The Field Poll* found voters narrowly opposed to Prop. 70 40% to 33%. During the interim, negative feelings have increased slightly to where 43% now say they would vote No and 32% would vote Yes.

The following reports how likely voters divide after being read a summary of Prop. 70's official ballot description that voters will see when they go to the polls to vote. Examining the state's demographic subgroups reveals that opposition spans most major voter blocs.

Table 1
Voter preferences regarding Prop. 70, the Tribal Gaming Compact, Exclusive Gaming Rights initiative
(among likely voters)

| | Would vote... | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>Undecided</u> |
| Total Statewide – Early October | 32% | 43 | 25 |
| Total Statewide – August | 33% | 40 | 27 |
| <u>Party</u> | | | |
| Democrats | 37% | 38 | 25 |
| Republicans | 26% | 51 | 23 |
| Non-partisans/others | 31% | 42 | 28 |
| <u>Gender</u> | | | |
| Male | 35% | 47 | 18 |
| Female | 29% | 40 | 31 |
| <u>Race/ethnicity</u> | | | |
| White non-Hispanic | 29% | 45 | 26 |
| Latino | 38% | 42 | 20 |
| Other | 38% | 39 | 23 |
| <u>Education</u> | | | |
| High school or less | 37% | 37 | 26 |
| Some college | 35% | 42 | 23 |
| College graduate | 30% | 43 | 27 |
| Post graduate degree | 25% | 50 | 25 |

Note: Subgroup findings are from the Early October survey.

Proposition 68

Last August voters were disinclined to endorse Prop. 68 by a 48% to 30% margin. Now, the proportion of voters opposed to the initiative has increased sharply to 59%, while just 20% remain in favor.

| Table 2 | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| Voter preferences regarding Prop. 68, the Non-Tribal, Commercial Gambling Expansion, Tribal Gaming Compact Amendments initiative (among likely voters) | | | |
| | Would vote... | | |
| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>Undecided</u> |
| Early October | 20% | 59 | 21 |
| August | 30% | 48 | 22 |
| <u>Party</u> | | | |
| Democrats | 24% | 52 | 24 |
| Republicans | 14% | 68 | 18 |
| Non-partisans/others | 23% | 58 | 19 |

As a result of huge sums of money that have been spent in support and opposition of these two initiatives, and the attendant heavy media play, voter awareness of these initiatives have increased to the point where nearly nine in ten (88%) report they have heard of them.

| Table 3 | | |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Voter awareness of the statewide initiatives on Indian gaming and gambling expansion (among likely voters) | | |
| | <u>Yes, have seen/heard</u> | <u>No, have not</u> |
| Early October | 88% | 12 |
| August | 50% | 50 |
| May* | 36% | 64 |

Note: May survey question was asked in reference to the initiative to require the governor to offer exclusive gaming rights to Indian tribes (Prop. 70).

Prop. 68 backers quitting

This week, after interviewing on *The Field Poll* survey had been completed, backers of Proposition 68 announced they would be suspending their advertising campaign in the face of the evidence that the prospects for passage of the measure were poor. Nevertheless, the measure will still appear on the ballot.

Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger had been campaigning against both Props. 68 and 70. His opposition relates to his view that passage of the initiatives would unravel the compacts that he has already signed with nine Indian tribes, calling for increased casino profit contributions to the state.

Information About The Survey

Sample Details

The results in this report are based on telephone interviews conducted in English and Spanish among a random sample of 586 Californians considered likely to vote in the November general election. Interviewing on these questions was conducted September 30 – October 3, 2004.

Sampling was carried out using a random digit dial methodology, which gives all voters including those whose phone number is listed or unlisted, an equal chance of being contacted. Up to four attempts were made to reach a randomly selected voter at each number dialed. After the completion of interviewing, the overall registered voter sample was weighted to *Field Poll* estimates of the characteristics of state's total registered voter population.

According to statistical theory, the overall results have a sampling error of +/- 4.1 percentage points at the 95% confidence level. There are other possible sources of error in any survey in addition to sampling variability. Different results could occur because of differences in question wording, sequencing or through omission or errors in sampling, interviewing or data processing. Extensive efforts were made to minimize such potential errors.

Questions Asked

Two initiatives on the November election ballot, Propositions 68 and 70, have to do with Indian gaming and gambling expansion. Have you seen, read or heard anything about these initiatives?

Proposition 68 is the "Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion, Tribal Gaming Compact Amendments" initiative. It authorizes tribal compact amendments. Unless they are accepted by the tribes, it authorizes casino gaming for sixteen non-tribal establishments, with a percentage of the gaming revenues to fund government services. Fiscal impact: Increased gambling revenues, potentially over 1 billion dollars annually, primarily to local governments for additional specified services. Depending on the outcome of tribal negotiations, potential loss of state revenue totaling hundreds of millions of dollars annually. If the election were being held today, would you vote YES or NO on Proposition 68?

Proposition 70 is the "Tribal Gaming Compact, Exclusive Gaming Rights" initiative. Upon the tribes request, the Governor must execute a 99-year compact. The tribes contribute a percentage of their net gaming income to state funds, in exchange for exclusive tribal casino gaming. Fiscal impact: Unknown effect on payments to the state from Indian tribes. Potential increase or decrease could be in the tens of millions to over a hundred million dollars annually. If the election were being held today, would you vote YES or NO on Proposition 70?