

# 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)

## FOR ADVANCE PUBLICATION BY SUBSCRIBERS ONLY.

COPYRIGHT 2006 BY FIELD RESEARCH CORPORATION.

Release #2217

Release Date: **Thursday, November 2, 2006**

### **VOTERS CLOSELY DIVIDED ON PROPS. 87, 86 AND 85 ONE WEEK BEFORE THE ELECTION.**

---

**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

The Yes and No side campaigns on Proposition 87, the alternative energy/tax on oil producers initiative, and Proposition 86, the cigarette tax initiative, have been waging huge television advertising campaigns in recent months, with voters now sharply divided in each contest.

In a survey completed October 23-30, *The Field Poll* finds the following results on Props. 86 and 87 and two other controversial statewide ballot propositions, Props. 85 and 90.

- On Prop. 87, the No side was holding on to a slim four-point lead (44% to 40%) one week before Election Day. This compares to a 3 percentage point Yes side advantage in a previous *Field Poll* conducted one month ago in late-September.
- Voter preferences are even more closely divided with regard to Proposition 86. In the current survey, 45% of likely voters were supporting the initiative and 45% were opposed. Another 10% were undecided. This even division in voter sentiment is down from a 13-point Yes side advantage in late-September.
- Another controversial ballot initiative that has been receiving far less attention is Proposition 85, the parental notification of teen abortion measure. The latest *Field Poll* finds that it too closely divides voter opinion. In the current survey, the Yes side held a slim three-point lead, 46% to 43%, with 11% undecided. One month ago voter opinions were 44% Yes and 45% No.
- Prop. 90, the government acquisition, regulation of private property initiative, was trailing in the latest survey 42% to 35%, although a relatively large proportion (23%) were undecided. In July Prop. 90 was favored by a 46% to 31% margin.

**Slim No-side advantage on Proposition 87, the alternative energy, tax on oil producers initiative**

A July *Field Poll* taken at the start of the campaign found likely voters initially supporting Prop. 87 by a five to three (52% to 31%) margin. Preferences were much closer in late September, when 44% of likely voters said they were on the Yes side and 41% intended to vote No. In the current survey, the No side has opened up a slim four percentage point lead, 44% to 40%, with one week remaining before the November 7 election.

There are big partisan differences in voter opinions about Prop. 87. Democrats are favoring Prop. 87 54% to 30%. Republicans are strongly opposed – 68% to 18%. Voters unaffiliated with the two major parties hold opinions more similar to the Democrats than the Republicans, and support the initiative 53% to 29%.

Voters living in coastal counties, which comprise 72% of all likely voters, narrowly favor the initiative, 44% to 40%. However, voters living in inland areas are opposed two to one.

Younger voters age 18-39 favor Prop. 87 44% to 38%, while middle-age voters are narrowly opposed. On the other hand, voters age 65 and over oppose the initiative 50% to 35%.

There are big differences in voter opinions about Prop. 87 by educational attainment. Voters with no more than a high school education are nearly two to one opposed. At the other end of the spectrum, voters who have a post-graduate degree are supporting the initiative 50% to 36%.

Those who have already voted absentee or plan to do so are opposing the measure 49% to 37%. Voters intending to cast ballots at their precinct polling place on Election Day are about evenly divided – 42% Yes and 41% No.

**Table 1**  
**Trend of voter preferences toward Proposition 87, the**  
**alternative energy, tax on oil producers initiative**  
**(among likely voters)**

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
<b>Late October</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>16</b>
Late September	44%	41	15
July	52%	31	17
<u>Party</u>			
Democrats	54%	30	16
Republicans	18%	68	14
Non-partisans/others	53%	29	18
<u>Region</u>			
Coastal	44%	40	16
Inland	28%	56	16
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	37%	51	12
Female	42%	38	20
<u>Age</u>			
18 – 39	44%	38	18
40 – 49	41%	44	15
50 – 64	41%	45	14
65 or older	35%	50	15
<u>Education</u>			
High school grad or less	28%	54	18
Some college/trade school	37%	46	17
College graduate	41%	43	16
Post graduate work	50%	36	14
<u>Voting method</u>			
Precinct voter	42%	41	17
Absentee voter	37%	49	14

*Note: All subgroups are from Late October survey.*

### **Voters evenly divided on Proposition 86, the cigarette tax initiative**

Last July, before the heavy ad war commenced on Prop. 86, the initiative was favored by a nearly two to one margin, 63% to 32%. That big lead in favor was reduced to a 53% to 40% margin by late September. Now, the contest is evenly divided-- 45% Yes and 45% No.

Among Democrats 53% are voting Yes and 39% No. Among Republicans the split is reversed -- 55% No and 35% Yes. Non-partisans are supporting the initiative 48% to 41%.

Current smokers, who would bear the brunt of Prop. 86's cigarette tax increase, are overwhelmingly opposed to Prop. 86 – 80% No and 10% Yes. Former smokers are also opposed but by a much narrower margin – 50% to 41%. A majority of those who have never smoked favor the initiative 53% to 37%.

There are big differences in voter preferences on Prop. 86 between coastal and inland voters. Coastal voters support the initiative by eleven points (51% Yes to 40% No). By contrast, voters living in inland counties are opposed nearly two to one (59% No to 31% Yes).

Men are narrowly opposed to Prop. 86, 47% to 45%, while a small plurality of women are backing it (46% to 42%).

By a 49% to 42% margin white non-Hispanics are lining up on the No side. By contrast, majorities of Latinos and other racial and ethnic voting groups favor the initiative.

Voters under age 40 are very supportive of Prop. 86, with 61% on the Yes side and 30% intending to vote No. However, opposition increases with age, and among voters age 65 or older it is opposed 55% to 36%.

Voters who are parents of children under age 18, who comprise about 30% to the likely electorate, favor the initiative 51% to 41%. But, voters who are not parents of a child oppose Prop. 86 47% to 43%.

There are no significant differences in the vote dispositions between absentee and precinct voters, with both groups about evenly divided in their voting preferences.

**Table 2**  
**Trend of voter preferences toward Proposition 86,**  
**the cigarette tax initiative**  
**(among likely voters)**

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
<b>Late October</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>10</b>
Late September	53%	40	7
July	63%	32	5
<u>Smoking status</u>			
Current smoker	10%	80	10
Former smoker	41%	50	9
Never smoked	53%	37	10
<u>Region</u>			
Coastal	51%	40	9
Inland	31%	59	10
<u>Party</u>			
Democrats	53%	39	8
Republicans	35%	55	10
Non-partisans/others	48%	41	11
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	45%	47	8
Female	46%	42	12
<u>Race/ethnicity</u>			
White non-Hispanic	42%	49	9
Latino	56%	39	5
Black/Asian/other	51%	33	16
<u>Age</u>			
18 – 39	61%	30	9
40 – 49	51%	40	9
50 – 64	39%	50	11
65 or older	36%	55	9
<u>Parent of child under 18</u>			
Yes	51%	41	8
No	43%	47	10
<u>Voting method</u>			
Precinct voter	46%	44	10
Absentee voter	44%	46	10

Note: All subgroups are from Late October survey.

### **Voters closely divided on Proposition 85, the parental notification of teen abortion initiative**

Voters have been closely divided with regard to the parental notification of teen abortion proposition, not only throughout the current campaign but also throughout the campaign for Prop. 73, a similar initiative narrowly rejected by California voters last year. A July *Field Poll* found 44% of likely voters inclined to vote Yes on Prop. 85 and 45% intending to vote No. Now, the division of voter sentiment slightly favors the Yes side, 46% to 43%.

There are a great many differences across subgroups of the voting population. For example, opinions toward the initiative are highly partisan, with Democrats opposed 56% to 33% and Republicans very much in favor – 67% Yes and 26% No. Non-partisan preferences divide 49% No and 36% Yes.

Voters living in coastal counties oppose the initiative 46% to 43%, while voters living in inland counties are strongly in favor 54% to 36%.

Men currently favor the initiative by ten points, 49% to 39%, but women are narrowly opposed 47% to 44%.

White non-Hispanic voters are narrowly opposed, while majorities of Latino and other racial and ethnic voters are on the Yes side.

Voters who are married or living together narrowly support the initiative, as do those who are separated or divorced. By contrast, those who have never married oppose it 49% to 35%.

Parents of children under 18 are backing Prop. 85 by nine points (51% to 42%), while non-parents are evenly divided.

One of the biggest points of differentiation in voter opinions regarding Prop. 85 relates to religion. Protestant and Catholics are strongly supporting Prop 85 by five to three margins. By contrast, voters affiliated with other religions or who have no religious preference are strongly opposed to the initiative.

Voters who identify themselves as born-again Christians, and who comprise about one-quarter of the electorate, are strongly backing the initiative nearly three to one, 70% to 24%. By contrast, other voters who are not born-again Christians are opposing Prop. 85 by a 51% to 39% margin.

**Table 3**  
**Trend of voter preferences toward Prop. 85, the parental  
 notification of teen abortion initiative**  
**(among likely voters)**

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
<b>Late October</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>11</b>
July	44%	45	11
<u>Region</u>			
Coastal	43%	46	11
Inland	54%	36	10
<u>Party</u>			
Democrats	33%	56	11
Republicans	67%	26	7
Non-partisan/other	36%	49	15
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	49%	39	12
Female	44%	47	9
<u>Race/ethnicity</u>			
White non-Hispanic	44%	46	10
Latino	58%	36	6
Black/Asian/other	51%	30	19
<u>Marital Status</u>			
Married/live together	48%	43	9
Separated/divorced	49%	43	8
Never married	35%	49	16
<u>Parent of child under 18</u>			
Yes	51%	42	7
No	44%	44	12
<u>Religion</u>			
Protestant	59%	33	8
Catholic	55%	33	12
Other religions	31%	57	12
No preference	20%	70	10
<u>Born-again Christian</u>			
Yes	70%	24	6
No	38%	51	11
<u>Voting method</u>			
Precinct voter	46%	43	11
Absentee voter	47%	43	10

*Note: All subgroups are from Late October survey. Not asked in Late September survey.*

**Voters moving to the No side on Proposition 90, the eminent domain initiative**

There has been a change in how voters are viewing the eminent domain initiative, Proposition 90. A July *Field Poll* found 46% intending to vote Yes, while 31% were on the No side. In the current survey, support has dropped to 35%, while opposition has increased to 42%. About one in four likely voters (23%) are undecided.

**Table 4**  
**Trend of voter preferences toward Prop. 90,**  
**the eminent domain initiative**  
**(among likely voters)**

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
<b>Late October</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>23</b>
July	46%	31	23
<u>Party</u>			
Democrats	35%	38	27
Republicans	40%	44	16
Non-partisan/other*	25%	49	26
<u>Political ideology</u>			
Conservative	43%	36	21
Middle-of-the-road	31%	46	23
Liberal*	32%	44	24
<u>Voting method</u>			
Precinct voter	35%	42	23
Absentee voter	35%	43	22

\* Small sample size.

Note: All subgroups are from Late October survey. Not asked in Late September survey.

## **Information About The Survey**

### **Sample Details**

The findings in this report are based on a random sample survey of 1,092 California registered voters, of whom 795 can be considered likely voters in the November general election. Interviewing was conducted by telephone in English and Spanish between the period October 23-30, 2006. In order to cover a broad range of issues and still minimize respondent fatigue, questions relating to Prop. 90 were administered to a random subsample of 394 likely voters. Questions about each of the other ballot propositions were administered to the overall sample of 795 likely voters.

The sample was developed from telephone listings of individual voters selected at random from a statewide list of registered voters in California. When drawing samples from registration-based lists, *The Field Poll* employs a stratified random selection procedure giving all voters with phone numbers within each of seven regions of the state and within each of four age categories an equal chance of being selected. Once a voter's name and telephone number are selected, interviews are attempted at the phone number dialed only with the specific voter selected.

In an attempt to include hard-to-reach voters, up to 6 attempts were made to reach and interview each randomly selected voter on different days and times of day during the interviewing period. Results from the overall registered voter sample were 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 overall likely voter sample have a sampling error of +/- 3.5 percentage points, while results from the random subsample 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, the rigor with which sampling procedures were implemented, as well as through undetected errors or omissions in interviewing or data processing. Extensive efforts were made to minimize such potential errors.

### **Questions Asked**

(As you know) Proposition 85 is the "Waiting Period and Parental Notification Before Termination of Minor's Pregnancy" initiative. It amends the California constitution prohibiting abortion for minors under the age of 18 until 48 hours after a physician notifies the minor's parent or legal guardian, except in a medical emergency or with parental waiver. It mandates various reporting requirements and authorizes monetary damages against physicians for violations. (Would) (Did) you vote YES or NO on Prop. 85?

(As you know) Proposition 86 is the "Tax on Cigarettes" initiative. It imposes an additional 2 dollars and 60 cents per pack excise tax on cigarettes and indirectly increases taxes on other tobacco products. It provides funding for various health programs, children's health coverage and tobacco-related programs. Fiscal impact: Increase in excise tax revenues of about 2.1 billion dollars annually in 2007-2008. Other potentially significant costs and savings for state and local governments due to program changes. (Would) (Did) you vote YES or NO on Prop. 86?

(As you know) Proposition 87 is the "Alternative Energy, Research, Production and Incentives; Tax on California Oil Producers" initiative. It establishes a 4 billion dollar program to reduce petroleum consumption through incentives for alternative energy, education and training that would be funded by a tax on California oil producers. Fiscal Impact: State oil tax revenues of 225 million to 485 million dollars annually for alternative energy programs totaling 4 billion dollars. State and local revenue reductions up to the low tens of millions of dollars annually. (Would) (Did) you vote YES or NO on Prop. 87?

(As you know) Proposition 90 is the "Government Acquisition, Regulation of Private Property" initiative. It bars state and local governments from condemning or damaging private property to promote other private uses, and limits government's authority to adopt certain land use, housing, consumer, environmental and workplace laws. Fiscal impact: Increased annual government costs to pay property owners for losses to their property associated with new laws and property acquisitions. (Would) (Did) you vote YES or NO on Prop. 90?