

# 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 #2219

**MAJORITIES OF VOTERS APPEAR  
READY TO APPROVE THE STATE'S  
INFRASTRUCTURE BONDS (PROPS.  
1B, 1C, 1D AND 1E).**

Release Date: **Saturday, November 4, 2006**

---

IMPORTANT: Contract for this service is subject  
to revocation if publication or broadcast takes  
place before release date. (ISSN 0195-4520)

---

by Mark DiCamillo and Mervin Field

During the last few months voter preferences have been remarkably stable in support of the five state bond proposals to be voted on in next week's election, which in the aggregate would amount to \$42.6 billion.

Four infrastructure bond proposals were put on the ballot by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger and the state legislature. They are Prop. 1B – Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality and Port Security – in the amount of \$19.9 billion; Prop. 1C – Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act – in the amount of \$2.8 billion; Prop. 1D – Kindergarten through University Public Education Facilities Bond Act – in the amount of \$10.5 billion; and, Prop. 1E – Disaster Preparedness and Flood Protection Bond Act – in the amount of \$4.0 billion.

A fifth bond measure, that the Governor has also endorsed, is Prop. 84 – Water Quality, Safety and Supply, Flood Control, Natural Resources Protection, Park Improvements. It calls for issuing \$5.4 billion in bond, and qualified for the ballot by a separate voter signature gathering effort.

A *Field Poll* survey completed eight days before the election found that each proposal was favored by majorities ranging from 51% to 56% , while fewer than one in three were opposing them (27% to 31%).

Further the survey revealed that almost one in three voters (31%) said they were inclined to vote Yes on all four infrastructure bonds (Props. 1B – 1E), while just one in eight (12%) said they'd likely be voting No on all of them. The voting pattern of the remaining 57% was either mixed – voting Yes on some, No on others – or undecided.

The findings in this survey are similar to three previous *Field Polls* taken since May on most of the bond proposals.

**Table 1**  
**Trend of voter preferences toward five statewide bond proposals on the November 2006 election ballot (among likely general election voters)**

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
<hr/>			
Prop. 1B – Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality and Port Security Bond			
<b>Late October</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>16</b>
September	52%	36	12
July	54%	27	19
Late May	57%	24	19
<hr/>			
Prop. 1C – Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act			
<b>Late October</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>19</b>
September	58%	28	14
July	33%	42	25
Late May	39%	38	23
<hr/>			
Prop. 1D – Kindergarten through University Public Education Facilities Bond Act			
<b>Late October</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>15</b>
September	52%	33	15
July	48%	37	15
Late May	48%	34	18
<hr/>			
Prop. 1E – Disaster Preparedness and Flood Protection Bond Act			
<b>Late October</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>20</b>
September	51%	36	13
July	47%	33	20
Late May	58%	25	17
<hr/>			
Prop. 84 – Water Quality, Safety and Supply, Flood Control, National Resource Protection and Park Improvement Bond			
<b>Late October</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>18</b>
September	50%	30	20
July	49%	31	20
Late May	N/A	N/A	N/A

N/A: Not asked

Note: The wording read to poll respondents changed in the September and late October polls to reflect the actual wording that voters will see on official ballots, referred to as the "ballot label." The ballot labels for each proposition were not available for prior poll measures.

### **Bloc voting on infrastructure bonds apparent**

An analysis of current voter preferences toward the four infrastructure bond proposals (Props. 1B – 1E) finds that 31% of all voters are inclined to vote Yes on each bond, while just 12% were voting No en bloc. Almost one-half of Democrats (41%) were voting Yes in favor of all four of the infrastructure bonds, while just 8% were voting No across-the-board. By contrast, just 19% of Republicans were voting Yes on all four bonds, while 18% were voting No as a block. Among non-partisans about a third (34%) were intending to vote Yes to all four bonds, while just 6% said they would cast an across-the-board No vote on them.

Liberals are more likely than others to say they will be voting Yes on all four of the infrastructure bonds. About half (49%) of liberals say they will do this, while just 3% intend to vote No en bloc. About one in three middle-of-the-road voters (32%) say they will vote Yes on all four of these bonds, compared to 10% who will be voting no. A slightly larger proportion of conservatives, on the other hand, intends to cast an across-the-board No vote on the infrastructure bonds (20%) than say they will vote Yes (17%).

Voters supporting Phil Angelides for Governor include more Yes bloc voters than those supporting Schwarzenegger, other candidates or are undecided in the governor's race. Among voters favoring Angelides, 47% say they will be voting Yes on all four infrastructure bonds. Among voters supporting Schwarzenegger's re-election or who are undecided or favor other candidates, only about half as many intend to vote Yes across-the-board on the bond proposals.

**Table 2**  
**Block voting with regard to voter preferences toward the**  
**four infrastructure bond proposals (Props. 1B – 1E)**  
**on the November election ballot**  
**(among likely voters)**

	<b><u>Voting YES</u></b> <b><u>on all four</u></b>	<b><u>Voting NO</u></b> <b><u>on all four</u></b>	<b><u>Mixed voting/</u></b> <b><u>undecided</u></b>
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>57</b>
<b><u>Party</u></b>			
Democrats	41%	8	51
Republicans	19%	18	63
Non-partisans/others	34%	6	60
<b><u>Political ideology</u></b>			
Conservative	17%	20	63
Middle-of-the-road	32%	10	58
Liberal	49%	3	48
<b><u>Preference for Governor</u></b>			
Schwarzenegger voter	22%	17	61
Angelides voter	47%	5	48
Other/undecided	25%	9	66
<b><u>Voting method</u></b>			
Precinct voter	29%	11	60
Absentee voter	34%	13	53

– 30 –

### **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, voter preferences regarding Prop. 84 were administered to a random subsample of 394 likely voters. Questions about the four infrastructure bonds (Props. 1B – 1E) were administered to the overall sample of 795 likely voters, but the summaries describing each bond differed between the two random subsamples. However, survey results from each version were similar and the results have been aggregated in this poll report.

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**

#### **FORM A QUESTIONS:**

I am going to read the summaries of the four state infrastructure bond proposals that appear on the November election ballot.

Proposition 1B is the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality and Port Security Bond Act. This act makes safety improvements and repairs to state highways, upgrades freeways to reduce congestion, repairs local streets and roads, upgrades highways along major transportation corridors, improves seismic safety of local bridges, expands public transit, helps complete the state's network of car pool lanes, reduces air pollution, and improves anti-terrorism security at shipping ports by providing a bond issue not to exceed 19.9 billion dollars. Fiscal impact: state costs of about 38.9 billion dollars with over 30 years to repay the bonds.

Proposition 1C is the Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act. Prop. 1C provides shelters for battered women and their children, clean and safe housing for low-income senior citizens; homeownership assistance for the disabled, military veterans, and working families; and repairs and adds accessibility improvements to apartments for families and disabled citizens. The state would issue bonds totaling about 2.8 billion dollars, paid from existing state funds at an average annual cost of 204 million dollars per year over 30 years. It requires publication of independent audited reports showing use of funds and limits administration and overhead costs.

Proposition 1D is the Kindergarten through University Public Education Facilities Bond Act. This 10.4 billion dollar bond issue will provide needed funding to relieve public school overcrowding, and to repair older schools. It will improve earthquake safety, and fund vocational educational facilities in public schools. Bond funds must be spent according to strict accountability measures. Funds will also be used to repair and upgrade existing public college and university buildings and to build new classrooms to accommodate the growing student enrollment in the California Community Colleges, the University of California, and the California State University. Fiscal Impact: State costs of about 20.3 billion dollars, with payments of about \$680 million per year.

Proposition 1E is the Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention Bond Act. This act rebuilds and repairs California's most vulnerable flood control structures to protect homes and prevent loss of life from flood-related disasters, including levee failures, flash floods, and mudslides. It protects California's drinking water supply system by rebuilding delta levees that are vulnerable to earthquakes and storms. It authorizes about 4 billion dollars in bonds. Fiscal Impact: State costs of about 8 billion dollars over 30 years to repay bonds. Reduction in local property tax revenues of potentially up to several million dollars annually.

#### **FORM B QUESTIONS:**

I am going to read the four state infrastructure bond proposals that will appear on the November election ballot. For each, please tell me whether you (would vote) (voted) YES or NO. (BONDS READ IN ORDER, ASKING:) (Would) (Did) 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

(As you know) Proposition 84, is the Water Quality, Safety and Supply, Flood Control, Natural Resource Protection, Park Improvements bonds initiative. It funds water, flood control, natural resources, park and conservation projects by authorizing about 5.4 billion dollars in general obligation bonds, and contains emergency drinking water safety provisions. Fiscal Impact: State cost of 10.5 billion dollars over 30 years to repay bonds. Reduced local property tax revenues of several million dollars annually. (Would) (Did) you vote YES or NO on Prop. 84?