

Coping with Homeland Security in California: Surveys of City Officials and State Residents

Mark Baldassare

Public Policy Institute of California

Christopher Hoene

National League of Cities

Jonathan Cohen

Public Policy Institute of California

Paper prepared for the session on "Cities and Homeland Security," League of California Cities annual conference, Long Beach, CA, October 4, 2002.

**Public
Policy
Institute of
California**

The Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) is a private operating foundation established in 1994 with an endowment from William R. Hewlett. The Institute is dedicated to improving public policy in California through independent, objective, nonpartisan research.

PPIC's research agenda focuses on three program areas: population, economy, and governance and public finance. Studies within these programs are examining the underlying forces shaping California's future, cutting across a wide range of public policy concerns, including education, health care, immigration, income distribution, welfare, urban growth, and state and local finance.

PPIC was created because three concerned citizens – William R. Hewlett, Roger W. Heyns, and Arjay Miller – recognized the need for linking objective research to the realities of California public policy. Their goal was to help the state's leaders better understand the intricacies and implications of contemporary issues and make informed public policy decisions when confronted with challenges in the future. PPIC does not take or support positions on any ballot measure or state and federal legislation nor does it endorse or support any political parties or candidates for public office.

David W. Lyon is founding President and Chief Executive Officer of PPIC. Raymond L. Watson is Chairman of the Board of Directors.

Public Policy Institute of California

500 Washington Street, Suite 800 • San Francisco, California 94111

Telephone: (415) 291-4400 • Fax: (415) 291-4401

info@ppic.org • www.ppic.org

Summary

This report presents the results of the first comprehensive analysis of the ways in which city officials and citizens in California are responding to homeland security issues. The findings are based on two large surveys. The first was conducted in July and August 2002 by the National League of Cities, which sent a direct mail and fax survey to city officials in all of California's 478 cities; a total of 317 surveys were completed and returned, for a 66 percent response rate. The second was conducted in August 2002 by the Public Policy Institute of California, which directed a telephone survey of 2,014 adult residents throughout the state.

The surveys offer a "snapshot in time," when city officials and state residents are in the early stages of assessing the new realities confronting local governments a year after the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington, D.C. As federal and state policymakers contemplate the future of homeland security, the opinions expressed in these surveys should prove helpful in identifying local issues and perceived needs. Some of the findings and the conclusions we draw from them are presented below.

- Many city officials are concerned about homeland security, especially with respect to cyber-terrorism and biological and chemical attacks; yet issues such as public safety and crime, the economy, and infrastructure are seen as more immediately important.
- Most cities have addressed biological and chemical attacks in their contingency plans, but few have paid much attention to cyber-terrorism, even though many believe the risk of cyber-terrorism is greater.
- There appears to be a greater spirit of cooperation within city agencies, and between local, state, and federal governments since the terrorist attacks.
- Many city officials say that local spending on public safety and security has increased since September 11th and that they are thus less able to meet their city's financial needs. Yet, most also believe that their local residents would not support higher taxes to increase terrorism readiness. In this context, city officials are asking for state and federal funding to train emergency response personnel, purchase emergency equipment, and pay for threat prevention and detection efforts.
- Local, state, and federal officials need to be sensitive to the fact that small, medium, and large cities have differing perceptions of and needs for homeland security.
- Most state residents see terrorism as a problem for California, and many consider power plants and the water supply to be potential targets. However, few residents worry a lot about being a victim of terrorism, and it is also rare for Californians to think that local residents have grown further apart since the September 11th attacks.
- The public gives positive ratings to governments and elected officials at the federal, state, and local levels for their homeland security efforts to date. Residents also express confidence in their local police and fire departments and in public health agencies.
- A solid majority of state residents support a new cabinet-level Department of Homeland Security; however, only a slim majority would support a local tax hike to improve terrorism readiness in their police, fire, and public health agencies.
- Local, state, and federal officials need to recognize that certain residents are more likely to fear terrorist attacks than others. In particular, we found greater concern about terrorism and security in Latinos, lower-income residents, less-educated residents, and those living in the more urban regions of the state.

Contents

Summary	i
Introduction	1
Survey of California City Officials	3
Survey of California Residents	11
Appendix	
A. Survey Methodology: City Officials	19
Survey Questionnaire	21
B. Survey Methodology: State Residents	25
Survey Questionnaire	27

Introduction

The September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks have imposed new realities on America's local governments, suddenly and violently awakened last year to the need to provide for local homeland security. Such a broad task involves, among other things, finding additional resources to develop and update preparedness and response plans, maintaining higher security levels in public buildings and spaces, and trying to facilitate seamless coordination of homeland security efforts across multiple layers of federal, state, and local government agencies. In California, local governments are considering and planning for potential threats to public safety on a variety of fronts, including threats to bridges, airports, power plants, and the water supply. This expansion of local government responsibilities is occurring at a time when local governments are fiscally strained, and in an era of contentious intergovernmental relations.

To gauge the preparedness of local governments, the National League of Cities sent a survey to the city managers of all California cities. A total of 317 questionnaires were returned in July and August 2002, for a 66 percent response rate. The responses from city officials were analyzed for differences across regions of the state and between cities of various population sizes. The survey was looking for answers to the following questions:

- What are the specific concerns of city officials regarding the threats of terrorist attacks, and how do concerns about terrorism compare with other local issues? What types of terrorist attacks are addressed in city government planning efforts, and what are the obvious gaps in preparedness, given the specific threats perceived?
- How much collaboration do city officials think there is within their city's agencies and between their city and other city, county, state, and federal governments?
- How significant are the economic and fiscal implications of homeland security efforts, and do city officials believe that local voters support higher taxes for this purpose? What do city officials consider to be their highest priorities for federal and state funding supporting their local homeland security efforts?

We compare the responses of city officials with the responses of over 2,000 California residents interviewed through a *PPIC Statewide Survey* in August. Citizen responses were analyzed for trends over time and differences across the state's major regions and political and demographic groups. We present results for Latinos, as well as all adults, because Latinos account for about 28 percent of the state's adult population. The sample sizes for the African American and Asian subgroups were not large enough for separate statistical analysis. Our questions focused on the following issues:

- How serious a threat is terrorism in California today, and what do residents consider to be the potential targets for terrorist attacks in the state? To what degree do residents perceive themselves and family members to be in danger of terrorist attacks, and how have community relations changed since September 11th?
- How good a job is city government doing in response to the terrorist threat, and how much confidence is there in the readiness of local public agencies? Will residents support higher taxes to increase the readiness of local police, fire, and public health departments?
- How do Californians rate the performance of the president and the governor in terms of their handling of terrorism and homeland security issues? What is the perception of the federal government's role in homeland security, and are state residents supportive of a new cabinet-level Department of Homeland Security?

Survey of California City Officials

Terrorism and Security in California

One year after September 11th, city officials in California are most concerned about cyber-terrorism and biological and chemical attacks: Four in ten say they are very or moderately concerned about these threats—cyber-terrorism (40%), biological attacks (38%), chemical attacks (35%). One in four are at least moderately concerned about a range of other possibilities, including the threat of an airplane being used as a bomb or missile, as occurred in New York and Washington, D.C., on September 11th.

The top three concerns noted above are the same for city officials in all sizes of cities. However, concern about terrorist attacks increases as city population size increases. In the largest cities (those with populations of 100,000 or more), the threat of cyber-terrorism is of greatest concern, with nearly two in three city officials (65%) saying they are at least moderately concerned about cyber attacks. In the smallest cities (those with populations of less than 10,000 people), the threat of a dirty bomb combining nuclear and radiological elements also rated among the highest concerns of city officials (20%).

Cyber-terrorism and biological and chemical attacks were also the top concerns across different regions of California. City officials in the Central Valley (38%), San Francisco Bay Area (51%), Los Angeles (44%), and other parts of Southern California (42%) list cyber-terrorism as their greatest concern. Bay Area officials also rate biological attacks as of equal concern (51%), whereas city officials in the Southern California region outside of Los Angeles County (37%) list the threat of a car or truck bomb among their top concerns.

**"How concerned are you about the following terrorist attacks over the next year in your locality?"
(% responding "very concerned" or "moderately concerned")**

	All Cities	Population Size			
		< 10,000	10,000 - 49,999	50,000 - 99,999	> 100,000
Cyber-terrorism	40%	20%	35%	55%	65%
Biological	38	24	34	53	49
Chemical	35	21	29	48	51
Car or truck bomb	27	11	27	33	43
Combination (dirty bomb)	27	20	25	33	35
Airplane used as bomb	26	16	26	28	39
Individual/suicide bomb	25	10	23	33	41
Radiological	21	13	20	28	25
Nuclear	17	10	17	24	18

Homeland Security in Context

Although city officials are significantly concerned about potential terrorist activities, they are even more concerned about a variety of other issues in their municipality. They are much more likely to say they are very or moderately concerned about crime (78%), the threat of natural disasters (63%), and economic conditions, such as business shutdowns (56%) and unemployment (54%), than the threat of terrorist attacks. Four in ten say they are very or moderately concerned about acts of discrimination or hate crimes (39%) and the loss of public confidence (39%)—about the same percentage who say they are very or moderately concerned about cyber-terrorism and biological and chemical attacks.

Moreover, although terrorism and emergency planning rate high among city officials' priorities, these problems are not among the three most important issues they say they are facing. Public safety is listed as the most important current issue (64%), followed by economic conditions (47%) and infrastructure investment (38%). By contrast, terrorism prevention and preparedness is cited by only one in four city officials (25%) as the most important issue.

As was the case for the various types of terrorism noted in the preceding section, the mention of terrorism in general as one of the most important issues increases with city population size. While public safety is listed as the most important issue by 67 percent of city officials in cities over 100,000 in population, the second most important issue is terrorism (39%), followed by economic conditions (31%). Among cities under 100,000 in population, the three issues listed as most important are the same as for cities overall. Economic conditions rate more highly in general for cities under 50,000 in population than for cities with larger populations. Infrastructure investment (56%) is the most important issue for cities under 10,000 in population.

The three most important issues listed by city officials across regions in California are similar as for cities overall. The only regional difference worth noting is that terrorism is ranked among the three top issues in the San Francisco Bay Area (38%).

When asked about the three most important issues to address over the next two years, city officials named the same issues as were currently important—public safety (39%), infrastructure investment (39%), and economic conditions (37%). Similarly, terrorism was cited by 22 percent of respondents.

"Which three issues are currently most important to address in your city?"

	All Cities	Population Size			
		< 10,000	10,000 - 49,999	50,000 - 99,999	> 100,000
Public safety and crime	64%	44%	68%	78%	67%
Economic conditions	47	52	55	39	31
Infrastructure investment	38	56	37	33	20
Terrorism	25	14	23	30	39

Emergency Planning in Cities

Except for cyber-terrorism, most of the specifically-mentioned concerns about terrorist attacks seem to be addressed in the emergency planning efforts of cities. In most cases, the percentage of city officials who say that a specific type of terrorist threat is addressed in their city's planning efforts is larger than the percentage of officials who say they are concerned about that threat. For example, 63 percent of city officials say their plans address the threat of biological attacks, compared to 38 percent who say they are at least moderately concerned about this type of attack. Similarly, 58 percent of city officials report that chemical attacks are addressed in their planning efforts, compared to 35 percent who list chemical attacks as a major concern.

However, a significant gap exists between city plans for dealing with cyber-terrorism and the level of concern surrounding this threat: Only 22 percent of city officials say cyber attacks are included in their planning efforts, compared to 40 percent who list these attacks as a serious concern.

The findings are similar across city size and region. The gap between the level of city officials' concerns and city planning efforts is particularly notable among larger cities and cities located in the Bay Area. Although 65 percent of city officials in cities with more than 100,000 residents say they are moderately or very concerned about the threat of cyber-terrorist attacks, only 39 percent say such threats are addressed in their planning efforts. Similarly, 55 percent of officials in cities with 50,000 - 99,999 residents list cyber-terrorism as a major threat, with only 27 percent saying this problem is addressed in their plans. In the San Francisco Bay Area, home to Silicon Valley and one of the nation's largest concentrations of cyber-related infrastructure, 51 percent of city officials say they are moderately or very concerned about the threat of cyber attacks, but only 23 percent of city officials say that cyber-terrorism is addressed in their emergency planning efforts.

Comparison of responses to "How concerned are you about the threat of terrorist attacks in your city over the next year?" and "What types of terrorist attacks are addressed in your city's planning efforts?"

	Very or Moderately Concerned	Addressed in Planning Efforts
Cyber-terrorism	40%	22%
Biological	38	63
Chemical	35	58
Car or truck bomb	27	36
Combination (dirty bomb)	27	26
Airplane used as bomb	26	48
Individual/suicide bomb	25	25
Radiological	21	36
Nuclear	17	36

Facilities Requiring Protection

As city officials continue to refine their emergency plans, one of their key tasks will be to identify facilities and infrastructure in the city and its surroundings that might be potential targets. Among facilities that need to be protected within the cities themselves, water supplies were most often cited by city officials (81%), followed by government buildings (73%), transportation facilities such as bridges, tunnels, and roads (63%), schools and universities (60%), information technology infrastructure (50%), and hospitals (48%).

Other types of facilities that are mentioned less frequently by city officials include ports (17%), power plants (16%), high-rise buildings (16%), stadiums and arenas (15%), military facilities (9%), and other federal facilities such as research labs (11%).

When asked what needed to be protected in nearby areas, the facilities at the top of the list were those that tend to be regional in the services they provide, such as ports of entry (39%), hospitals (38%), water supplies (36%), transportation facilities (36%), power plants (33%), information technology infrastructure (29%), and government buildings (29%). Half of city officials also cite the need to protect nearby military bases (30%) and other federal facilities (21%).

As a whole, the infrastructure and facilities that are mentioned most often within and around cities include water supplies, government buildings, transportation facilities, schools and universities, hospitals, and information technology infrastructure.

Local water supplies are at the top of the list of facilities that people say need to be secured, regardless of city size and region. However, nearly all of these facilities are more prevalent in larger cities and are much more likely to be mentioned in the largest cities than in the smallest cities, especially information technology infrastructure (65% to 26%), federal facilities (49% to 1%), stadiums and arenas (47% to 3%), other large buildings such as high-rises (47% to 4%), and power plants (37% to 6%). Across regions, city officials in Southern California outside of Los Angeles County identify water supplies (87%) and power plants (26%) more often than officials do in other regions.

"What facilities and infrastructure need to be secured and protected in your city or nearby in the surrounding area?"

	In City	Nearby
Water supplies	81%	36%
Government buildings	73	29
Transportation facilities	63	36
Schools/universities	60	28
Information technology	50	30
Hospitals	48	38
Ports of entry (airports, harbors)	17	39

Regional Collaboration and Local Coordination

City officials give high marks to the overall level of collaboration and coordination occurring between levels of government, agencies, and other organizations in their region; and they give their own city high marks in this regard as well.

Fifty percent of city officials rate coordination efforts across levels of government in their region as high or very high. City officials in the Southern California region outside of Los Angeles County are most likely to rate regional coordination efforts as very high (31%), compared to the San Francisco Bay Area (17%), the Central Valley (10%), and Los Angeles (10%). Cities with populations under 10,000 are least likely to give high or very high ratings to regional coordination (35%), compared to cities with populations between 10,000 and 49,999 (53%), cities with populations between 50,000 and 99,999 (63%), and cities with populations greater than 100,000 (51%).

Three in four city officials (77%) rate coordination efforts across city departments and agencies in their cities as either high or very high. City officials in the Southern California region outside of Los Angeles County (52%) and in the San Francisco Bay Area (51%) are more likely to give very high ratings to these efforts than are city officials in Los Angeles County (25%) and the Central Valley (39%). Larger cities with populations of between 50,000 and 99,999 people (50%) and populations over 100,000 people (45%) are most likely to give very high marks to within-city coordination efforts.

	All Cities	Region			
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California
<i>How would you rate the extent of collaboration and coordination across levels of government, agencies, and other organizations in your region?</i>					
Very low	2%	2%	3%	1%	3%
Low	9	12	9	10	6
Moderate	36	41	32	35	29
High	34	31	38	41	31
Very high	16	10	17	10	31
Don't know	3	4	1	3	0
<i>How would you rate the extent of coordination and collaboration among city departments and agencies in your city?</i>					
Very low	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%
Low	3	2	1	9	0
Moderate	19	16	13	17	22
High	37	38	33	49	26
Very high	40	39	51	25	52
Don't know	1	3	2	1	0

Intergovernmental Coordination

The terrorist attacks of September 11th seem to have inspired a new respect in cities for the value of coordination across levels of government. Most city officials report increased levels of coordination across all levels of government since September 11th. But coordination has increased the most at the local level: 77 percent of city officials report increased coordination between their cities and both other city governments and county governments. Seventy percent also report that they have increased their coordination with the state government. Although coordination between city governments and the federal government increased the least, a majority of city officials (56%) nevertheless report an increase in cooperation.

Coordination across all levels of government increases with city population size, although most markedly with the federal government. City officials in the Central Valley report lower levels of coordination with all levels of government. San Francisco Bay Area city officials report the highest level of coordination with other city governments (85%), while Los Angeles city officials report the highest levels of coordination with the county (84%) and state governments (75%). Los Angeles city officials are also the least likely to report increased coordination with the federal government (49%).

"Since September 11, how much has your city increased its coordination with the following?"
 (% responding "a fair amount," "a good amount," or "a great deal")

	All Cities	Region			
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California
Other cities	77%	69%	85%	78%	81%
County	77	71	80	84	79
State	70	62	72	75	69
Federal	56	52	65	49	60

Fiscal Impact of 9-11

Many California cities are experiencing fiscal fallout from September 11th and these effects increase with city size. Thirty-one percent of city officials report that they are less able to meet financial needs since September 11th—undoubtedly reflecting a downturn in the economy, as well as the effects of the terrorist attacks and homeland security issues. Four in ten also say that spending on public safety and security has increased over the same period (39%) and will likely increase in the future (43%). Of the largest cities, 61 percent report increased levels of spending for public safety after September 11th, compared to 34 percent of cities with populations under 10,000 and 29 percent of cities with populations between 10,000 and 49,999. City officials in the San Francisco Bay Area are most likely to report they are less able to meet financial needs (35%), while city officials in the Central Valley are more likely to report increases in public safety spending since the September 11th terrorist attacks (44% currently; 49% in the future).

	All Cities	Region			
		< 10,000	10,000 - 49,999	50,000 - 99,999	> 100,000
"Less able to meet financial needs"	31%	24%	28%	41%	39%
"Increased public safety spending since 9-11"	39	34	29	49	61
"Public safety spending will increase in the future"	43	34	40	47	59

While city officials report increased fiscal stress on both the revenue and expenditure sides of their budgets, they are not optimistic about public support for additional local taxes and fees to fund homeland security efforts. Only 16 percent of city officials think that public support for new *taxes* is likely; 64 percent believe it is unlikely. Only 20 percent believe the public would support additional *fees*. However, results of the *PPIC Statewide Survey*, covered in the next section of this report, suggest that officials may be more pessimistic than is justified—at least in the matter of sales taxes.

The majority of city officials in all regions anticipate opposition to additional taxes and fees. However, the perception that support is unlikely or very unlikely is stronger in the Central Valley (69%) and the Southern California region outside of Los Angeles County (66%) than in the San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles County (58% for both). Belief that the public is likely to support new taxes is particularly low in the Southern California region outside of Los Angeles (8%). Anticipated opposition to taxes and fees is stronger in smaller cities: 70 percent of cities with populations under 10,000 say that such support is unlikely or very unlikely for taxes, and 71 percent say the same with respect to fees.

"What is the likelihood that your city's residents would support additional local taxes for security?"

	All Cities	Region			
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California
Very likely	2%	3%	1%	4%	0%
Likely	14	16	19	15	8
Unlikely	42	53	33	39	45
Very unlikely	22	16	25	19	21
Don't know	20	12	22	23	26

Priorities for Federal and State Support

Given the fiscal stress cities are experiencing and a perceived lack of public support for raising taxes and fees, cities would certainly welcome additional funding from federal and state government. But what are their highest priorities for fiscal and other types of assistance? City officials put the highest priority for federal and state funding on training emergency response personnel (65%), purchasing emergency equipment (63%), threat prevention and detection efforts (54%), and personnel support (53%). Additionally, they would like to see federal and state assistance, other than funding, focused on providing technical assistance for emergency preparedness and coordinating region-wide planning.

There are a few significant differences in priorities for federal and state funding related to city population size. Cities with populations under 10,000 rank federal and state funding for protecting infrastructure as a higher priority (57%) than do cities with populations over 50,000 (31%). The smaller cities are also more likely than cities of over 100,000 to have a high priority for focusing funding for technical assistance on emergency preparedness (33%).

Some regional differences are also evident in priorities for federal and state funding. In the Southern California cities outside of Los Angeles County, there is more of an emphasis than elsewhere on funding for threat prevention and detection (66%). The San Francisco Bay Area's city officials are more likely than others to emphasize funding for training personnel (74%) and emergency equipment (71%). City officials in the Central Valley (61%) and Los Angeles (61%) place greater emphasis than others do on funding for personnel support.

"What should be the highest priorities for future federal and state funding to support homeland security? Outside of funding, in what areas could the federal and state government focus other types of assistance?"

	Funding	Other Assistance
Training for personnel	65%	35%
Emergency equipment	63	21
Threat prevention and detection	54	44
Personnel support	53	23
Protecting infrastructure	40	35
Coordinating region-wide planning	30	51
Technical assistance - emergency preparedness	23	52

Survey of California Residents

Homeland Security in California

We have seen how local government officials perceive and respond to the fallout from September 11th, but what of the state's residents—the citizens whose safety government seeks to ensure? The *PPIC Statewide Survey* found that Californians are less concerned than they were at the end of 2001, but still troubled. A year after the September 11th attacks, 64 percent of Californians rate terrorism and security as somewhat of a problem or a big problem. This is down from the levels reported in the *PPIC Statewide Surveys* in January 2002 (69%) and December 2001 (73%).

Perceptions of the problem vary regionally and across demographic groups. Los Angeles residents are more likely than residents of other regions to rate terrorism and security as a problem. Latinos (38%) are much more likely than non-Hispanic whites (18%) to see these issues as a big problem, as are people with lower incomes and less education. Women are more likely than men to say that terrorism and security are at least somewhat of a problem (69% to 59%).

"How much of a problem is terrorism and security in California today?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Big problem	23%	22%	17%	29%	24%	38%
Somewhat of a problem	41	38	41	41	41	36
Not much of a problem	34	38	38	27	33	25
Don't know	2	2	4	3	2	1

Perceived Terrorist Targets in California

When state residents consider what targets terrorists might strike, they worry most about power plants and water supplies (37%), followed by airports and airplanes (17%), high-rise buildings and downtown areas (10%), and roads, bridges, and tunnels (9%). In a recent national survey, 25 percent of Americans identified airplanes and airports as the most worrisome terrorist target.

Power plants and water supplies top the list of concerns about potential terrorist targets in every region. However, residents of the Central Valley (40%) and the Southern California region outside of Los Angeles (43%) are the most worried about these facilities. As for other targets, Los Angeles residents are the most likely to be worried about airports and airplanes (21%) and San Francisco Bay Area residents about roads, bridges, and tunnels (21%). Latinos are much more likely than non-Hispanic whites to worry most about airports and airplanes (24% to 13%).

Public worry about airports and airplanes as terrorist targets tends to be higher among young, less educated, and lower-income residents than among others. Conversely, mention of power plants and water supplies increases with age, education, and income.

"What do you worry most about in terms of terrorist targets in California?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Power plants and water supplies	37%	40%	31%	32%	43%	34%
Airports and airplanes	17	17	13	21	17	24
High-rise buildings and downtown areas	10	8	10	13	8	12
Roads, bridges, and tunnels	9	10	21	5	3	6
Boats and seaports	4	2	3	5	6	3
Buses and trains	2	2	2	3	2	3
All of the above (<i>volunteered</i>)	4	4	4	3	5	4
Something else	11	10	9	13	11	10
Don't know	6	7	7	5	5	4

Personal Fears and Local Impacts

Although 64 percent of Californians believe terrorism is a problem for the state, far fewer are concerned that it will strike them personally: 35 percent are very worried or somewhat worried that they or someone in their family will fall prey to a terrorist attack. Sixty-five percent are not too worried or not at all worried, a level similar to that found in the *PPIC Statewide Survey* in January 2002 (64%) and December 2001 (62%).

Who is most likely to worry that they or their families might be victimized by terrorist attacks? Los Angeles residents are considerably more likely than people in other regions to be either somewhat or very worried (44%). Latinos (33%) are much more likely than non-Hispanic whites (4%) to have this fear. Younger, less educated, and lower-income adults; women; and people with children in their homes are more likely than others to worry about being victims.

Six in 10 Californians say that the September 11th terrorist attacks have had no effect on community relations. However, those who believe there has been an impact are much more likely to say that local residents have grown closer rather than further apart. The perception that residents have grown closer is stronger among Republicans and conservatives; people who are younger, less educated, and have lower incomes; and people who have children in the household. Few Californians in any region of the state, demographic group, or political category report that local residents have grown further apart since September 11th.

"How worried are you that you or someone in your family will be the victim of a terrorist attack?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Very worried	12%	13%	10%	18%	9%	33%
Somewhat worried	23	20	21	26	26	29
Not too worried	38	38	42	32	40	25
Not at all worried	27	29	27	24	25	13

"As a result of September 11th, would you say the residents of your local area have grown closer together, grown further apart, or has there been no change?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Closer together	36%	37%	31%	35%	38%	40%
Further apart	3	3	3	3	2	5
No change	59	58	63	60	58	53
Don't know	2	2	3	2	2	2

Ratings of City Government and Local Public Agencies

We have seen how local officials look at issues of homeland security, but how do residents rate the response of local governments and local public agencies?

Fifty-two percent rate the response of their city government as either excellent (14%) or good (38%); 29 percent rate the response as fair, and 9 percent rate it poor. In all of the state's major regions and demographic groups, pluralities give city government excellent or good ratings on this measure. Latinos are more likely than non-Hispanic whites to give their city governments an excellent or good job rating (59% to 50%). Democrats (54%), Republicans (52%), and independent voters (48%) are equally likely to give city governments an excellent or good rating for response to the threat of terrorist attacks.

Looking at specific kinds of response, solid majorities of Californians express confidence in the readiness of local public agencies to respond to the threat of terrorist attacks: 90 percent have some or a great deal of confidence in their local fire department, 74 percent in their local police department, and 69 percent in their local public health agencies. Relatively few Californians say they have very little or no confidence in these three types of local public agencies. Latinos are more likely than others to express a great deal of confidence in local public health agencies. There are small differences in public confidence across the state's regions, political groups, and demographic categories.

"Overall, how would you rate your city government's response to the threat of terrorist attacks since September 11th—excellent, good, fair, or poor?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Excellent	14%	16%	10%	15%	15%	20%
Good	38	36	36	42	41	39
Fair	29	29	30	28	26	30
Poor	9	9	11	9	7	6
Don't know, not in a city	10	10	13	6	11	5

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
<i>How much confidence do you have in your local fire department in terms of its readiness to respond to the threat of terrorist attacks?</i>						
A great deal	55%	56%	50%	58%	57%	57%
Some	35	32	39	35	35	34
Very little/None	7	10	9	6	5	9
Don't know	3	2	2	1	3	0

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
How much confidence do you have in your local police department in terms of providing security in response to the threat of terrorist attacks?						
A great deal	30%	30%	27%	32%	31%	34%
Some	44	41	46	45	45	42
Very little/None	24	28	23	22	21	23
Don't know	2	1	4	1	3	1
How much confidence do you have in your local public health agencies in terms of their readiness to respond?						
A great deal	23%	25%	21%	24%	24%	30%
Some	46	43	49	45	48	41
Very little/None	26	26	25	27	22	28
Don't know	5	6	5	4	6	1

Willingness to Raise Local Taxes

A slim majority of Californians (52%) would be willing to raise their sales tax to increase funding for police, fire, and public health agencies as part of an effort to increase terrorism readiness. Support for such a tax increase is somewhat higher in Los Angeles and the rest of Southern California than elsewhere in the state. It is also somewhat higher among Democrats (56%) than among Republicans (51%) and independent voters (48%), and among Latinos (58%) than among non-Hispanic whites (51%). Support for the increase varies only slightly across age, education, and income groups.

It is interesting to contrast the overall results on the public's willingness to raise sales taxes reported here to the city officials survey findings reviewed in the previous section of the report: 16 percent of city officials think that public support for new taxes is likely, while 66 percent believe it is unlikely.

In a *PPIC Statewide Survey* in January 2002, 60 percent of Californians said they would vote "yes," while 35 percent said they would vote "no," on a potential state ballot measure to raise the state sales tax from 6 percent to 6 ¼ percent to increase funding for police, fire, and medical agencies by about \$1 billion a year as part of an effort to increase terrorism readiness.

"Suppose that your local government said it needed to raise the sales tax to increase funding for police, fire, and public health agencies as part of an effort to increase terrorism readiness. Would you favor or oppose a higher sales tax for this purpose?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Favor	52%	49%	49%	55%	56%	58%
Oppose	44	46	46	42	39	37
Don't know	4	5	5	3	5	5

Approval Ratings for the President and Governor

Californians give President George W. Bush and Governor Gray Davis high marks for their handling of terrorism and homeland security issues. In fact, they give both executives higher ratings on this issue than on overall job performance.

Seventy percent of Californians approve of the way the president is handling terrorism and security issues, which is higher than the 64 percent who approve of his overall job performance. Residents across the state rate the president highly on terrorism and security issues, regardless of geographic region, age, income, and education; and Latinos are even more likely than non-Hispanic whites (75% to 70%) to approve of Bush's performance on terrorism and security issues. However, there are significant differences in approval ratings between Republicans (88%) and Democrats (57%). Moreover, the president's approval rating on terrorism and security issues has declined from highs of 83 percent in November 2001, 85 percent in December 2001, and 85 percent in January 2002

Sixty-two percent of Californians say they approve of the job that Governor Gray Davis is doing on terrorism and security issues in California— not as high as the president's ratings on this issue but higher than the governor's overall job approval rating of 52 percent. A majority of adult residents in every region of the state, and across age, income, and education groups, like the job that Davis is doing with regard to terrorism and security issues. Latinos (72%) are much more likely than non-Hispanic whites (58%) to approve this aspect of his performance. As with the president's ratings, there is a partisan gap: Davis has higher approval ratings on handling terrorism among Democrats (69%) than among Republicans (50%). Although the governor's approval rating on terrorism and security issues has slipped modestly from January 2002 (68%), it was the same in August 2002 as in November 2001 (62%).

	All Adults	Party Registration			Latino
		Democrat	Republican	Independent	
<i>Do you approve or disapprove of the way that President Bush is handling the issue of terrorism and security?</i>					
Approve	70%	57%	88%	63%	75%
Disapprove	26	38	10	33	21
Don't know	4	5	2	4	4
<i>Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Governor Davis is handling the issue of terrorism and security in California?</i>					
Approve	62%	69%	50%	61%	72%
Disapprove	22	16	34	21	19
Don't know	16	15	16	18	9

The Federal Role in Homeland Security

The majority of Californians (55%) express at least some confidence that federal agencies can prevent future terrorist attacks in which large numbers of Americans are killed. National public opinion is similar: In June 2002, a *Newsweek* Poll found that 58 percent of Americans shared this confidence in U.S. intelligence and law enforcement agencies. Across California regions, residents of the San Francisco Bay Area have less confidence in federal agencies. Across demographic groups, public confidence declines with age, education, and income. Republicans are more likely than Democrats, and conservatives more likely than liberals, to say they have confidence that federal agencies can prevent future terrorist attacks.

When asked which is the greater concern, Californians say they are more concerned that the government will enact anti-terrorism laws excessively restricting civil liberties (51%) than that the government will fail to enact tough new anti-terrorism laws (41%). The Pew Research Center reports that in June 2002, Americans were more concerned about the civil liberties of average people (49%) than about enacting too few tough laws (35%). (In the January 2002 *PPIC Statewide Survey*, a similar 51 percent of Californians were more concerned about too many new laws and 37 percent with too few.) Republicans (38%) are much less concerned than Democrats (56%) that tough new laws would excessively restrict civil liberties. Older and more conservative Californians also worry less than younger and more liberal residents about the possibilities of reducing civil liberties. Concern about new laws restricting civil liberties is higher in the San Francisco Bay Area than in the state's other major regions.

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
<i>How confident are you that U.S. intelligence and law enforcement agencies will be able to prevent future terrorist attacks?</i>						
Very confident	10%	11%	6%	13%	11%	18%
Somewhat confident	45	49	42	42	48	42
Not too confident	30	24	33	32	30	29
Not at all confident	14	13	18	12	11	10
Don't know	1	3	1	1	0	1

"In general, which concerns you more right now, that ...?"

	All Adults	Party Registration			Latino
		Democrat	Republican	Independent	
Government will fail to enact strong anti-terrorism laws	41%	36%	53%	35%	40%
Government will enact new anti-terrorism laws that excessively restrict the average person's civil liberties	51	56	38	58	53
Don't know	8	8	9	7	7

Department of Homeland Security

Should the United States establish a cabinet-level Department of Homeland Security? Among Californians, the score is 60 percent in favor, 32 percent opposed. Support for the proposed department is lower in California than it is nationally: 73 percent of all Americans in a CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll conducted at about the same time as the August *PPIC Statewide Survey* said that the department should be created.

Majorities of Californians across all political groups, demographic categories, and major geographic regions support the new department. However, Republicans are more supportive than Democrats; and support is higher among people who are younger, have lower incomes and less education, and have children in the household. Latinos are particularly supportive of the proposal, as are nonvoters, non-native citizens, and non-citizens. Only in the San Francisco Bay Area are residents nearly divided in their support for the department (50% to 43%).

"Do you think that the U.S. Congress should or should not pass legislation to create a new cabinet department of Homeland Security?"

	All Adults	Party Registration			Non-voters
		Democrat	Republican	Independent	
Should	60%	55%	65%	58%	67%
Should not	32	38	26	35	23
Don't know	8	7	9	7	10

"Do you think that the U.S. Congress should or should not pass legislation to create a new cabinet department of Homeland Security?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Should	60%	65%	50%	66%	60%	73%
Should not	32	27	43	27	31	21
Don't know	8	8	7	7	9	6

Survey Methodology: City Officials

The results of the city officials survey are from the *State of America's Cities Survey*, which is directed by Chris Hoene, research manager at the National League of Cities, with research assistance from Christiana Brennan. Jennifer Lewis at the League of California Cities also provided expertise and assistance. A survey of local officials in California cities on homeland security issues was commissioned by the Public Policy Institute of California and cosponsored by the League of California Cities and the California State Association of Counties. The findings in this report are based on a direct mail and fax survey sent in July and August 2002 to city officials in all 478 cities in California. The survey on homeland security was sent to city managers, at the suggestion of the League of California Cities. City managers were chosen for this survey because they hold the highest administrative position in the city and are highly familiar with the city's day-to-day operations and budgetary issues. We use the same survey questionnaire that was also mailed to city officials throughout the United States and to county officials in California. Questionnaires were returned to the Survey Research Laboratory at the University of Illinois at Chicago where they were compiled and coded. The survey data were analyzed at the National League of Cities and the Public Policy Institute of California.

The number of usable responses totaled 317, for a response rate of 66 percent. Throughout the report, we refer to cities of different population sizes— less than 10,000; 10,000-49,999; 50,000-99,999; and 100,000 or more. We also make comparisons across four regions, relying on the definitions used in the PPIC Statewide Surveys — Central Valley, San Francisco Bay Area, Los Angeles, and Other Southern California—as described in the survey methodology that appears on page 25.

The survey is representative of the responses of city officials in cities across California. The survey responses are closely comparable to the distribution of cities across the state by population size and region. The findings do not change significantly when we use statistical weighting to correct for a slight over-representation of cities of 100,000 or more.

City population	% of 478 cities statewide	% of 317 survey responses
<10,000	26%	22%
10,000 - 49,999	44%	42%
50,000 - 99,999	18%	20%
>100,000	12%	16%

Region	% of 478 cities statewide	% of 317 survey responses
Central Valley	19%	19%
SF Bay Area	21%	22%
Los Angeles	19%	22%
Other Southern California	23%	20%
Other	18%	17%



**NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES
LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES
CALIFORNIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES**

[Note: Responses from 317 city officials in July and August 2002]

The objective of this survey is to accurately gauge the perceptions of local officials on Homeland Security. Without your help, we cannot present a complete picture. If you have any questions about the questionnaire, contact Dr. Christopher Hoene at hoene@nlc.org or (202) 626-3172.

HOMELAND SECURITY AND LOCAL CONDITIONS

6. How concerned are you about the following possibilities over the next year in your locality (very concerned, moderately concerned, mildly concerned, or not very concerned)? *(check one in each row)*

	<u>Very</u>	<u>Moderately</u>	<u>Mildly</u>	<u>Not Very</u>
a. Threat of terrorist attack				
1. Car or truck bomb	11%	16%	37%	36%
2. Biohazard/biological	10	28	39	23
3. Chemical	8	27	39	26
4. Nuclear	3	14	35	48
5. Radiological	4	17	35	44
6. Combination (dirty bomb)	4	23	36	37
7. Cyber-terrorism	13	27	39	21
8. Individual/suicide bomb	8	17	31	44
9. Airplane used as bomb	5	21	31	43
b. Traditional crime	27	51	16	6
c. Job layoffs and unemployment	21	33	31	15
d. Business shutdowns/decline	22	34	28	16
e. Natural disaster	19	44	27	10
f. Acts of discrimination/hate crimes	9	30	42	19
g. Loss of public confidence	14	25	31	30

7. Of the issues listed below, which three are currently most important to address in your locality and which will be the most important to address over the next two years? *(check three boxes in each column)*

	<u>Currently</u>	<u>Next 2 years</u>
a. Investing in terrorism prevention, preparedness, and training	25%	22%
b. Investing in general public safety and crime prevention	64	39
c. Improving economic conditions	47	37
d. Increasing the availability of affordable housing	18	23
e. Revitalizing and redeveloping neighborhoods	21	21
f. Supporting local and regional development strategies	15	21
g. Investing in infrastructure (roads/transit, water, sewer)	38	39
h. Investing in public education and other supports for children, youth, families	17	23
i. Protecting natural resources and local environmental quality	13	14
j. Cost and availability of health services	9	8
k. Local relations with the community	22	12
l. Relationship with state and federal government	11	13

Homeland Security Planning

8. Has your local government integrated the national Homeland Security Advisory System (the color-coded system developed by the U.S. Office of Homeland Security) into its planning efforts? *(check one)*
25% Yes 41% No 22% We are working on it 12% Don't know
9. What types of terrorist attacks are addressed in your local government's planning efforts? *(check all that apply)*
- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| a. Car or truck bomb | 36% |
| b. Biohazard/biological | 63 |
| c. Chemical | 58 |
| d. Nuclear | 36 |
| e. Radiological | 36 |
| f. Combination (dirty bomb) | 26 |
| g. Cyber-terrorism | 22 |
| h. Individual/suicide bomb | 25 |
| i. Airplane crash | 48 |
10. What facilities and infrastructure need to be secured and protected in your locality or nearby in the surrounding area? *(check all that apply in each column)*
- | | <u>Locality</u> | <u>Nearby</u> |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| a. Water supplies | 81% | 36% |
| b. Ports of entry (airports, harbors) | 17 | 39 |
| c. Transportation infrastructure (roads, bridges, rail lines, tunnels) | 63 | 36 |
| d. Military facilities | 9 | 30 |
| e. Other federal facilities (buildings, nuclear plants, research labs) | 11 | 21 |
| f. Schools/universities | 60 | 28 |
| g. International borders | 3 | 8 |
| h. Government buildings (city, county, state, or federal) | 73 | 29 |
| i. Stadiums, arenas, and convention centers | 15 | 25 |
| j. Other large buildings (high-rises), landmarks, monuments | 16 | 20 |
| k. Communications and technology infrastructure | 50 | 30 |
| l. Power plants | 16 | 33 |
| m. Hospitals/medical facilities | 48 | 38 |
11. Have Homeland Security concerns begun to affect and change local government activities in areas other than security planning (such as, for example, economic development)? *(check one)*
7% Yes 70% No 23% Don't know

Collaboration and Coordination

12. How would you rate the extent of collaboration and coordination across levels of government, agencies, and other organizations in your region? *(check one)*
2% Very low 9% Low 36% Moderate 34% High 16% Very high 3% Don't know
13. How would you rate the extent of coordination and collaboration among local departments and agencies in your local government? *(check one)*
0% Very low 3% Low 19% Moderate 37% High 40% Very high 1% Don't know

14. How would you rate the efforts to coordinate and collaborate by each of the following levels of government, agencies, and other organizations in your region? (check one per row)

	<u>Very low</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Very high</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
a. City governments	1%	6%	30%	38%	25%	0%
b. County governments	1	8	31	35	20	5
c. State government	3	17	46	23	8	3
d. Federal government	7	29	34	16	8	6
f. MPO's/COGs	3	13	21	15	4	44
g. Nonprofits	10	21	29	17	2	21
h. Private sector/business	11	25	32	16	2	14
i. Neighborhoods	12	24	33	21	4	6
j. Civic groups	12	22	32	21	3	10
k. Media	8	20	33	22	5	12

15. Since September 11th, how much has your local government increased its coordination with the following? (check one per row)

	<u>A great deal</u>	<u>A good amount</u>	<u>A fair amount</u>	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
a. Other cities	7%	24%	46%	21%	2%
b. Other counties	12	25	40	19	4
c. State government	6	22	42	26	4
d. Federal government	6	16	34	37	7
f. MPO's/COG's	2	6	20	32	40
g. Nonprofits	2	6	29	48	15
h. Business/Private sector	3	9	33	42	13
i. Neighborhoods	4	17	36	38	5
j. Civic groups	4	14	36	39	7
k. Media	4	13	35	41	7

16. What is the likelihood of increased collaboration and coordination across levels of government, agencies, and other organizations in the following activities? (check one per row)

	<u>Very likely</u>	<u>Likely</u>	<u>Unlikely</u>	<u>Very unlikely</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
a. Evacuation	32%	52%	10%	2%	4%
b. Transportation routing	30	53	10	3	4
c. Public health facilities	32	51	10	2	5
d. Communications capacity	32	54	7	3	4
e. Technology systems	19	56	16	2	7
f. Protecting infrastructure	25	55	13	1	6
g. Working with media	18	58	16	2	6
h. Public information efforts	26	57	9	2	6

Local Government and the Public

17. Does your local government have a formal plan for informing the public and disseminating information in future emergencies?

74% Yes 8% No 16% A strategy is being developed 2% Don't know

18. To what extent are local residents involved in discussions and decisions about Homeland Security activities?

1% A great deal 9% A good amount 44% Only a fair amount 40% None at all 6% Don't know

19. Since September 11th, has there been a change in the level of public concern expressed about any of the following? (*check one per row*)

	Increased <u>concern</u>	Decreased <u>concern</u>	No <u>change</u>	Don't <u>know</u>
a. Infringing upon civil liberties	20%	4%	71%	5%
b. Racial and ethnic profiling	24	5	67	4
c. Tension among racial and ethnic groups	14	2	78	6

Economic and Fiscal Implications

20. What was the impact of September 11th on your local government's ability to meet its financial needs? (*check one*)

31% less able 1% better able 63% little or no change 5% Don't know

21. What was the impact of September 11th on local government spending on public safety and security? (*check one*)

5% significantly increased 34% increased 58% little or no change 2% decreased 1% Don't know

22. Compared to public safety and security spending prior to September 11th, what will be the impact of September 11th on local spending on public safety and security in the future? (*check one*)

5% significantly increase 38% increase 50% little or no change 2% decreased 5% Don't know

23. What is the likelihood that local residents would support additional local taxes and/or fees for Homeland Security? (*check one in each row*)

	<u>Very likely</u>	<u>Likely</u>	<u>Unlikely</u>	<u>Very unlikely</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
a. Taxes	2%	14%	42%	22%	20%
b. Fees	3%	17%	39%	20%	21%

Future Needs

24. Where should be the highest priorities for future federal and state funding to support local Homeland Security? Outside of funding, in what areas could federal and state government focus other types of assistance? (*check three in each column*)

	<u>Funding</u>	<u>Other Assistance</u>
a. Threat prevention and detection	54%	44%
b. Emergency equipment and apparel	63	21
c. Protecting infrastructure	40	35
d. Training for local emergency response personnel	65	35
e. Technical assistance on local preparedness planning	23	52
f. Personnel support (additional personnel and overtime)	53	23
g. Coordinating region-wide planning efforts	30	51

25. We would like to hear from you about the specific needs of your locality. Please attach additional information and fax, mail, or email to Chris Hoene using the information below.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION!!!

Survey Methodology: State Residents

The results of the state residents survey are from the *PPIC Statewide Survey: Californians and Their Government* series, which is directed by Mark Baldassare, research director at the Public Policy Institute of California, with assistance in research and writing from Jonathan Cohen, survey research manager; and Dorie Apollonio and Lisa Cole, survey research associates. The findings in this report are based on a telephone survey of 2,014 California adult residents interviewed between August 14 and August 21, 2002. Interviewing took place on weekday nights and weekend days, using a computer-generated random sample of telephone numbers that ensured that both listed and unlisted telephone numbers were called. All telephone exchanges in California were eligible for calling. Telephone numbers in the survey sample were called up to ten times to increase the likelihood of reaching eligible households. Once a household was reached, an adult respondent (18 or older) was randomly chosen for interviewing by using the “last birthday method” to avoid biases in age and gender. Each interview took an average of 18 minutes to complete. Interviewing was conducted in English or Spanish.

We used recent U.S. Census and state figures to compare the demographic characteristics of the survey sample with characteristics of California’s adult population. The survey sample was closely comparable to the census and state figures. The survey data in this report were statistically weighted to account for any demographic differences.

The sampling error for the total sample of 2,014 adults is +/- 2 percent at the 95 percent confidence level. This means that 95 times out of 100, the results will be within 2 percentage points of what they would be if all adults in California were interviewed. The sampling error for subgroups is larger. The sampling error for the 1,549 registered voters is +/- 2.5 percent. The sampling error for the 993 likely voters is +/- 3 percent. Sampling error is just one type of error to which surveys are subject. Results may also be affected by factors such as question wording, question order, and survey timing.

Throughout the report, we refer to four geographic regions. “Central Valley” includes Butte, Colusa, Fresno, Glenn, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, Placer, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Shasta, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Tulare, Yolo, and Yuba Counties. “SF Bay Area” includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma Counties. “Los Angeles” refers to Los Angeles County, and “Other Southern California” includes the mostly suburban regions of Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and San Diego Counties. These four regions were chosen for analysis because they are the major population centers of the state, accounting for approximately 90 percent of the state population.

We present specific results for Latinos because they account for about 28 percent of the state’s adult population. The sample sizes for the African American and Asian subgroups are not large enough for separate statistical analysis. We contrast the opinions of registered Democrats, Republicans, and independents. The “independents” category includes those who are registered to vote as “decline to state.”

In some cases, we compare PPIC Statewide Survey responses to responses recorded in national surveys conducted by *Newsweek* in June 2002, *ABC News/ Washington Post* in July 2002, *Fox News Opinion Dynamics Poll* in June 2002, *CNN/USA Today/Gallup* in June and August 2002, and *Pew Research Center* in June 2002. We used earlier PPIC Statewide Surveys to analyze trends over time in California.

PPIC Statewide Survey: Californians and Their Government
August 14 – August 21, 2002
2,014 California Adults Residents, English and Spanish

[Note: Questions and responses on homeland security are presented below. The complete set of survey questions and responses for the PPIC August survey is available at www.ppic.org]

24. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that George W. Bush is handling his job as president of the United States?
- 64% approve
 - 32 disapprove
 - 4 don't know
25. Do you approve or disapprove of the way that President Bush is handling the issue of terrorism and security?
- 70% approve
 - 26 disapprove
 - 4 don't know
28. Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Gray Davis is handling his job as governor of California?
- 51% approve
 - 42 disapprove
 - 7 don't know
29. Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Governor Davis is handling the issue of terrorism and security in California?
- 62% approve
 - 22 disapprove
 - 16 don't know
44. Do you think that the U.S. Congress should or should not pass legislation to create a new cabinet department of Homeland Security?
- 60% should
 - 32 should not
 - 8 don't know
45. In general, which concerns you more right now—that the government will fail to enact strong anti-terrorism laws, or that the government will enact new anti-terrorism laws that excessively restrict the average person's civil liberties?
- 41% government will fail to enact strong anti-terrorism laws
 - 51 laws will excessively restrict the average person's civil liberties
 - 8 don't know
46. How confident are you that U.S. intelligence and law enforcement agencies will be able to prevent future terrorist attacks in the United States in which large numbers of Americans are killed—very confident, somewhat confident, not too confident, or not at all confident?
- 10% very confident
 - 45 somewhat confident
 - 30 not too confident
 - 14 not at all confident
 - 1 don't know
47. How much of a problem is terrorism and security in California today? Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not much of a problem?
- 23% big problem
 - 41 somewhat of a problem
 - 34 not much of a problem
 - 2 don't know
48. What do you worry most about in terms of terrorist targets in California—airports and airplanes; boats and seaports; buses and trains; high-rise buildings and downtown areas; roads, bridges, and tunnels; power plants and water supplies; or something else? (*rotate choices*)
- 37% power plants and water supplies
 - 17 airports and airplanes
 - 10 high-rise buildings and downtown areas
 - 9 roads, bridges, and tunnels
 - 4 boats and seaports
 - 2 buses and trains
 - 11 something else (*specify*)
 - 4 all of the above
 - 6 don't know
49. How worried are you that you or someone in your family will be the victim of a terrorist attack—very worried, somewhat worried, not too worried, or not at all worried?
- 12% very worried
 - 23 somewhat worried
 - 38 not too worried
 - 27 not at all worried

50. Overall, how would you rate your city government's response to the threat of terrorist attacks since September 11th—excellent, good, fair, or poor?

14% excellent
38 good
29 fair
9 poor
3 not applicable, don't live in a city
7 don't know

51. How much confidence do you have in your local police department in terms of providing security in response to the threat of terrorist attacks—a great deal, some, very little, or none?

30% a great deal
44 some
16 very little
8 none
2 don't know

52. How much confidence do you have in your local fire department in terms of their readiness to respond to the threat of terrorist attacks—a great deal, some, very little, or none?

55% a great deal
35 some
6 very little
1 none
3 don't know

53. How much confidence do you have in your local public health agencies in terms of their readiness to respond to the threat of terrorist attacks—a great deal, some, very little, or none?

23% a great deal
46 some
20 very little
6 none
5 don't know

54. Suppose that your local government said it needed to raise the sales tax to increase funding for police, fire, and public health agencies as part of an effort to increase terrorism readiness. Would you favor or oppose a higher sales tax for this purpose?

52% favor
44 oppose
4 don't know

55. As a result of September 11th, would you say the residents of your local area have grown closer together, grown further apart, or has there been no change?

36% residents have grown closer together
3 residents have grown further apart
59 there has been no change
2 don't know

56. Thinking ahead to the anniversary of the September 11th terrorist attacks, do you plan to treat that day as any other day, or do you plan to take precautions against terrorist attacks, such as not fly on airplanes or avoid large cities or crowds?

74% treat as any other day
25 take precautions
1 don't know

57. Do you expect to do anything special in memory of the victims of September 11th—such as take a moment of silent prayer, gather with friends, or attend a memorial service?

77% yes
22 no
1 don't know

58. Do you expect to display the flag or other American symbols on September 11th?

75% yes
23 no
2 don't know

PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA

Board of Directors

Raymond L. Watson, *Chair*

Vice Chairman of the Board
The Irvine Company

William K. Coblentz

Partner
Coblentz, Patch, Duffy & Bass, LLP

Edward K. Hamilton

Chairman
Hamilton, Rabinovitz & Alschuler, Inc.

Walter B. Hewlett

Director
Center for Computer Assisted Research
in the Humanities

David W. Lyon

President and CEO
Public Policy Institute of California

Cheryl White Mason

Chief, Civil Liability Management
Office of the City Attorney
Los Angeles, California

Arjay Miller

Dean Emeritus
Graduate School of Business
Stanford University

Ki Suh Park

Design and Managing Partner
Gruen Associates

A. Alan Post

Former State Legislative Analyst
State of California

Constance L. Rice

Co-Director
The Advancement Project

Thomas C. Sutton

Chairman & CEO
Pacific Life Insurance Company

Cynthia A. Telles

Department of Psychiatry
UCLA School of Medicine

Carol Whiteside

President
Great Valley Center

Harold M. Williams

President Emeritus
The J. Paul Getty Trust
and Of Counsel
Skadden, Arps, Slate,
Meagher & Flom LLP

Advisory Council

Clifford W. Graves

Vice Chancellor, Physical Planning
University of California, Merced

Elizabeth G. Hill

Legislative Analyst
State of California

Hilary W. Hoynes

Associate Professor
Department of Economics
University of California, Davis

Andrés E. Jiménez

Director
California Policy Research Center
University of California, Berkeley

Rudolf Nothenberg

Chief Administrative Officer (Retired)
City and County of San Francisco

Manuel Pastor

Professor, Latin American & Latino Studies
University of California, Santa Cruz

Peter Schrag

Contributing Editor
Sacramento Bee

James P. Smith

Senior Economist
RAND

PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA

500 Washington Street, Suite 800 • San Francisco, California 94111

Phone: (415) 291-4400 • Fax: (415) 291-4401

www.ppic.org • info@ppic.org