

# 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](mailto:fieldpoll@field.com)  
[www.field.com/fieldpollonline](http://www.field.com/fieldpollonline)

COPYRIGHT 2006 BY FIELD RESEARCH CORPORATION. FOR ADVANCE PUBLICATION BY SUBSCRIBERS ONLY.  
Release #2206

Release Date: **Friday, July 28, 2006**

## **VOTERS ARE SUPPORTING FOUR OF THE FIVE BOND PROPOSALS ON THE NOVEMBER BALLOT, ALTHOUGH NOT BY OVERWHELMING MARGINS.**

---

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 this November will be asked to decide the fate of five extremely large infrastructure bond proposals whose expenditures for a variety of projects in the aggregate would total \$42.6 billion.

Four of the bonds, Props. 1B, 1C, 1D and 1E were placed on the ballot by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger and the legislature. A fifth bond measure, Prop. 84, qualified for the ballot through a separate voter signature gathering campaign. Schwarzenegger has since announced his support for Prop. 84.

In its latest statewide survey of Californians likely to vote in the November general election, *The Field Poll* updated voter preferences regarding each of the bond proposals. The survey completed last week finds voters initially favoring four of the five bond proposals, although not by overwhelming margins.

### **Voter dispositions**

The largest of the bond issues, amounting to \$19.9 billion, is Proposition 1B, entitled "Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality and Port Security," and it is currently receiving the greatest level of support from voters. Prop. 1B is favored by a two to one margin (54% to 27%). While the margin in favor is quite large, its current 27-point plurality is a little smaller than a 33-point plurality found in a May *Field Poll* survey.

The second largest bond, \$10.4 billion, is Proposition 1D, entitled "Kindergarten through University Public Education Facilities." The current division of sentiment on Prop. 1D is 48% Yes and 37% No, similar to what it was last May.

The next largest bond is the \$5.4 billion Prop. 84, which was placed on the ballot by a variety of environment groups and is labeled "Water Quality, Safety and Supply, Flood Control, National

Resource Protection and Parke Improvement.” Currently voters favor it by an 18-point margin, 49% Yes and 31% No, and 20% are undecided.

Next in size is the \$4.1 billion Prop. 1E, the “Disaster Preparedness and Flood Protection” bond. The Yes side on 1E is now fourteen points ahead (47% to 33%), but the margin in favor of this proposal was greater in May (58% to 25%).

The smallest of the five bonds is Proposition 1C and calls for spending \$2.8 billion for “Housing and Emergency Shelter.” Last May voters were evenly divided on Prop. 1C – 39% Yes and 38% No. Now the No side is ahead 42% to 33%.

Analyzing the vote preferences by party reveals that Democrats and non-partisans are heavily in favor of each of the five bond proposals. However, a plurality of GOPers oppose each of the bond proposals except for Prop. 1B, where they divide evenly.

**Table 1**  
**Trend of voter preferences toward the four infrastructure bond proposals placed on the November 2006 election ballot by the Governor and the legislature (among likely general election voters)**

	July 2006			Late May 2006		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
<b>Prop. 1B, Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality and Port Security (\$19.9 billion)</b>						
<u>Total voters</u>	<u>54%</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>57%</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>19</u>
Democrats	63%	17	20	61%	17	22
Republicans	39%	38	23	53%	30	17
Non-partisan/other*	61%	28	11	53%	28	19
<b>Prop. 1D, Kindergarten through University Public Education Facilities (\$10.4 billion)</b>						
<u>Total voters</u>	<u>48%</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>48%</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>18</u>
Democrats	58%	26	16	57%	22	21
Republicans	31%	50	19	35%	50	15
Non-partisan/other*	54%	38	8	51%	29	20
<b>Prop. 1E, Disaster Preparedness and Flood Protection (\$4.1 billion)</b>						
<u>Total voters</u>	<u>47%</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>58%</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>17</u>
Democrats	51%	25	24	57%	16	17
Republicans	35%	42	23	49%	35	16
Non-partisan/other*	58%	33	9	52%	27	21
<b>Prop. 1C, Housing and Emergency Shelter (\$2.8 billion)</b>						
<u>Total voters</u>	<u>33%</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>39%</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>23</u>
Democrats	41%	33	26	50%	24	26
Republicans	17%	56	27	25%	58	17
Non-partisan/other*	42%	38	20	37%	36	27

\* Small sample size.

---

**Table 2**  
**Initial voter preferences on Prop. 84, the Water Quality, Safety**  
**and Supply, Flood Control, National Resource Protection**  
**and Park Improvement Bond (\$5.4 billion)**  
**(among likely general election voters)**

---

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
<u>Total voters</u>	<u>49%</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>20</u>
Democrats	58%	20	22
Republicans	33%	45	22
Non-partisan/other*	61%	27	12

---

\* Small sample size.

## Information About The Survey

### Sample Details

The findings in this report are based on a random sample survey of 384 likely voters in California's November general election. Interviewing was conducted by telephone in English and Spanish between the period July 10-23, 2006.

Sampling for this survey was divided into two parts. About half of the interviews were conducted using a random digit dial methodology, which randomly selects operating landline telephone exchanges within all area codes serving California households in proportion to population. Within each exchange, random samples of telephone numbers were created by adding random digits to each selected telephone exchange, giving each phone listing an equal chance of being selected and permitting access to all landline telephone numbers both listed and unlisted. The other half of the sample was developed from telephone listings of individual voters selected randomly from a statewide list of all registered voters in California. In this sample every *n*th voter was selected from the list at random for inclusion into the sample and interviews were attempted only with the specific voter selected.

In an effort to include "hard to reach" voters into each sample, up to 8 attempts were made to reach a voter at each telephone number dialed in each sample. Results from both samples were combined and weighted to conform to *Field Poll* estimates of the demographic and regional characteristics of the state's registered voter population.

According to statistical theory, 95% of the time results from the registered sample have a sampling error of +/- 5.0 percentage points. There are other possible sources of error in any survey other than sampling variability. Different results could occur because of differences in question wording, sampling, the sequencing of questions or through undetected omissions or errors in interviewing or data processing. Extensive efforts were made to minimize such potential errors.

### Questions Asked

I am going to read five statewide bond proposals that will appear on the November election ballot. For each, please tell me whether you would vote YES or NO if the election were being held today. (ITEMS READ IN ORDER, ASKING:) If the election were being held today, would you vote YES or NO on this bond proposal?

Proposition 1B, a 19.9 billion dollar bond for Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality and Port Security

Proposition 1C, a 2.8 billion dollar bond for Housing and Emergency Shelter

Proposition 1D, a 10.4 billion dollar bond for Kindergarten through University Public Education Facilities

Proposition 1E, a 4 billion dollar bond for Disaster Preparedness and Flood Protection

Proposition 84, a 5.4 billion dollar bond for Water Quality, Safety and Supply, Flood Control, Natural Resource Protection and Park Improvements