

**PPIC Statewide Survey:
Special Survey on Land Use**
part of the Growth, Land Use, and Environment Series

in collaboration with the
The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
The James Irvine Foundation
The David and Lucile Packard Foundation

Mark Baldassare
Senior Fellow and Survey Director

November 2001

**Public
Policy
Institute of
California**

Preface

The PPIC Statewide Survey consists of an ongoing series of surveys designed to provide policymakers, the media, and the general public with objective, advocacy-free information on the opinions and public policy preferences of residents throughout the state of California. Begun in April 1998, the surveys have generated a database that includes the responses of over 42,000 Californians.

This is the twenty-first PPIC Statewide Survey and the second in a new series of surveys launched in May 2001 that focuses on population growth, land use, and the environment. This series – which is carried out in addition to the traditional PPIC surveys – is conducted in collaboration with The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, The James Irvine Foundation, and The David and Lucile Packard Foundation. There will be a total of eight surveys in the series – two per year for four years. The intent of the surveys is to inform policymakers, encourage discussion, and raise public awareness about the growth, land use, and environment issues facing the state. The current survey focuses in particular on public perceptions and policy preferences regarding land use and development.

This survey report presents the responses of 2,002 adult residents throughout the state. It examines in detail the public's views on local, regional, and statewide issues related to growth, land use, and development. More specifically, it focuses on the following:

- Local land use issues, including actual and ideal housing and communities, satisfaction with housing and community conditions, attitudes toward local government activities in the realm of land use, and preferences for local policies regarding land use and development.
- Regional land use issues, including the seriousness of problems such as traffic congestion, housing affordability, growth and development, and the availability of jobs; the perceptions of local governments' abilities to respond to regional land use issues; knowledge and reactions to regional land use terms such as "sprawl" and "smart growth," and preferences for regional land use policy options.
- State land use issues, including the seriousness of problems such as development in suburban fringes, and coastal, farm, and mountain areas; the state government's effectiveness in responding to land use issues; the state government's abilities to plan for future growth; preferences for the state government's involvement in land use issues; and reactions to government funding and taxes for land use issues such as open space, farmland preservation, and transportation.
- Social, economic, and political trends that may have direct and indirect consequences on growth and land use attitudes, including perceptions of the state's most important problem, overall consumer mood, ratings of elected officials, security issues raised by the terrorist attacks, and the political significance of land use issues on local and state races in 2002.
- Variations in land use and growth-related perceptions, attitudes, and policy preferences across the four major regions of the state (the Central Valley, San Francisco Bay area, Los Angeles area, and the rest of Southern California), between Latinos and non-Hispanic whites, and across age, socioeconomic, and political spectrums.

Copies of this report or other PPIC Statewide Surveys may be ordered by e-mail (order@ppic.org) or phone (415-291-4400). The reports are also posted on the publications page of the PPIC web site (www.ppic.org).

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Preface | i |
| Press Release | v |
| Local Land Use Issues | 1 |
| Regional Land Use Issues | 7 |
| State Land Use Issues | 11 |
| Social, Economic, and Political Trends | 17 |
| Survey Methodology | 23 |
| Survey Questions and Results | 25 |
| Survey Advisory Committee | 31 |

Press Release

ECONOMY, SECURITY RAISE FEARS BUT FAIL TO DAMPEN OUTLOOK Many Californians Worried About Their Safety; Despite Weak Economy, Strong Support for Local Slow Growth Measures and State Bonds

SAN FRANCISCO, California, November 13, 2001 — The rapidly slowing economy and a growing sense of concern about personal safety have reshuffled the priorities of many Californians, according to a new survey released today by the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) and The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. However, residents refuse to let today's uncertain climate dampen their overall outlook. In fact, Californians are more positive in the wake of the 9/11 tragedy about the state's prospects than they were just three months ago.

Today, Californians rate the economy as the most important issue facing the state (18%), followed by terrorism and security issues (14%), the electricity crisis (13%), and education (12%). In contrast, only 5 percent of residents in July rated the economy as the most pressing problem, while 56 percent named electricity and 9 percent education. Fifty-nine percent of residents now say they expect the state to face bad times financially in the next year, up from 50 percent in July and 38 percent in January. And while Californians appear less concerned than the nation as a whole about security issues, four in 10 residents also say that the recent terrorist attacks on America have shaken their personal sense of safety and security a great deal (15%) or fair amount (27%).

Despite their worries, Californians are much more likely to have a positive outlook overall about the state than they did just three months ago: 60 percent of residents now say that the state is headed in the right direction – similar to survey responses during the strongest years of economic growth – compared to 44 percent in July. “Californians are facing some profound new concerns at the moment, but these circumstances do not appear to have fundamentally shaken their confidence,” says PPIC Statewide Survey Director Mark Baldassare. “If anything, confidence in government – both at the state and national levels – has been strengthened.”

Indeed, support for Governor Gray Davis has increased substantially: 54 percent of Californians say they approve of the way he is handling his job, compared to 44 percent in July. Davis receives even higher marks for his handling of terrorism and security issues in the state: 62 percent of state residents approve, including 51 percent of Republicans. While Davis has received a bump since July, President George W. Bush's ratings have soared: 80 percent of Californians say they approve of his performance as president, compared to 47 percent three months ago. And 83 percent of residents say they approve of the way Bush is handling the issue of terrorism, including 77 percent of Democrats.

Have Terrorism, Economic Woes Changed Attitudes About Public Spaces, Land Use?

The majority of Californians say that recent terrorist attacks have not made them worry about their safety in urban settings and public places, including high rise buildings (51%), downtown areas of large cities (53%), mass transit (55%), and suburban stores and malls (68%). However, four in ten residents do say they have some concerns about being in such places, and nearly one in five say they now worry “a lot” about their safety in high rise buildings (22%), large downtown centers (19%), and on mass transit (18%).

The state's weak economy does not appear to have dampened interest in larger growth and land use issues. Fifty-five percent of residents say they would vote for a local initiative that would slow the pace of development in their community, even if it meant less economic growth – similar to survey responses in

more prosperous times. Most Californians also say they will be thinking about growth and land use issues when they cast their ballots in 2002. Eighty-nine percent say that candidates' positions on these issues are "very" (40%) or "somewhat" (49%) important in statewide races, and 91 percent say growth and land use issues are important when it comes to local races.

Californians are also inclined to support a March 2002 proposition that would provide state bond funds for open space, parks, and other land use projects. Seventy-four percent say they would vote yes on this \$2.6 billion state bond measure. Two in three say they support another March 2002 proposition that would dedicate the state's gasoline sales tax to transportation projects.

"Californians are clearly thinking about the consequences of growth and land use decisions for their quality of life," says Paul Brest, President of The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. "The key is to create more opportunities for participation in the decisionmaking process, especially at the local level." Today, many Californians say they know little (34%) or nothing (13%) about the approval process for local growth and land use decisions in their community.

Other Key Findings on Land Use, Growth

- ***Coastal Concerns*** (page 11)

Nearly four in 10 residents see growth and development along the California coast as a "big" problem, and three in 10 (32%) see it as somewhat of a problem.

- ***Water: Farmland First*** (page 13)

Forty-two percent of Californians say that maintaining the water supply for farms and agriculture should be the most important priority for future water planning, while fewer cite protecting wildlife habitats and natural areas (31%) and providing water for new homes and development (20%).

- ***Open Space, Closed Wallets*** (page 16)

While they favor using taxpayer money to buy undeveloped land to keep it free from commercial and residential development (55%), residents oppose paying higher local taxes to do so (56%).

About the Survey

The survey on land use is a special edition of the PPIC Statewide Survey. It is the second in a four-year, multisurvey series on growth, land use, and the environment being produced in collaboration with The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, The James Irvine Foundation, and The David and Lucile Packard Foundation. The purpose of this series is to inform policymakers, encourage discussion, and raise public awareness about the critical growth, development, and environmental challenges facing the state. Findings of the current survey are based on a telephone survey of 2,002 California adult residents interviewed from October 22 to October 31, 2001. Interviews were conducted in English or Spanish. The sampling error for the total sample is +/- 2%. For more information on survey methodology, see page 23.

Dr. Mark Baldassare is a senior fellow and program director at PPIC, where he holds the Arjay and Frances Miller Chair in Public Policy. He is founder and director of the PPIC Statewide Survey, which he has conducted since 1998. Dr. Baldassare is the author of numerous books, including *California in the New Millennium: The Changing Social and Political Landscape* (University of California Press, 2000).

PPIC is a private, nonprofit organization dedicated to objective, nonpartisan research on economic, social, and political issues that affect Californians. The Institute was established in 1994 with an endowment from William R. Hewlett. This report will appear on PPIC's website (www.ppic.org) on November 13.

###

Local Land Use Issues

Housing: Reality and Ideals

The “American Dream” of living in a single-family detached home is alive and well in California: An overwhelming majority of adults (84%) would prefer to live in such a dwelling, and 65 percent actually do. Californians seem to be even more enamored of this dream than other Americans. In the Fannie Mae national survey conducted in 1997, 71 percent of Americans said that a single-family home was their ideal and 60 percent said they lived in one.

In California today, homeownership and living in a single-family detached home are almost synonymous: 87 percent of people who own their residence live in single-family homes, and slightly more (91%) would prefer a single-family home. In contrast, two in three renters currently live in apartments (50%) or attached dwellings (13%). However, 74 percent of them would prefer to live in a single-family home.

Across all of the major regions, residents overwhelmingly prefer to live in single-family homes. However, Central Valley residents are more likely than others to live in detached dwellings. People living in the coastal urban areas – such as the San Francisco Bay area and Los Angeles – are the most likely to live in apartments and attached dwellings.

Across all demographic categories in the state, at least eight in 10 Californians say they would most prefer to live in a single-family detached dwelling. Although Latinos are less likely than non-Hispanic whites to live in a single-family detached home (60% to 69%), preference for this type of dwelling is about equal in both groups. The percentage of Californians living in single-family homes increases sharply with age, annual household income, years at current residence, and presence of children. Apartment dwelling is more common among young, lower income, newer residents and people who have no children in the home.

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|---|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| <i>Is the place where you currently live a</i> | | | | | | |
| Single-family detached home | 65% | 73% | 63% | 61% | 64% | 60% |
| Attached home | 10 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 9 |
| Apartment | 21 | 15 | 23 | 26 | 19 | 27 |
| Other | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| <i>Would you most prefer to live in a</i> | | | | | | |
| Single-family detached home | 84% | 88% | 82% | 83% | 84% | 85% |
| Attached home | 6 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 5 |
| Apartment | 6 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 6 |
| Other | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| Don't know | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Place of Residence: Reality and Ideals

Californians currently live in and prefer to live in more urban surroundings than Americans as a whole (according to the Fannie Mae national survey conducted in 1997). Californians are more likely than Americans to live in or near a large city (50% to 41%) and to prefer to do so (40% to 33%). Americans are more likely to live in a small town or rural area (35% to 23%) and prefer to do so (46% to 32%).

Nevertheless, a high percentage of urban Californians would prefer to live elsewhere. About half of Californians live in (25%) or near (25%) a large city. Of the other half, one in four lives in a medium-to-small size city, and one in four lives in a small town or rural area. More people live in or near large cities than would prefer to live there (50% to 40%), while fewer people live in small towns and rural areas than would prefer to live there (23% to 32%).

The percentage of residents living in or near large cities is highest in Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay area, while the percentage of residents living in small towns or rural areas is highest in the Central Valley. The differences between actually living in or near large cities and preferring to live there are greatest for residents of Los Angeles (69% to 51%) and the San Francisco Bay area (57% to 44%). In contrast, fewer Central Valley residents live in small towns or rural areas than would prefer to live there (36% to 45%).

Californians in small towns and rural areas are more likely (79%) than other Californians to be living where they prefer to live. Fewer than half (48%) of those living in large cities say that is their preference, and more than half the people who would prefer to live in a small town or rural area are now living in large cities, suburbs near large cities, or medium-to-small size cities.

A higher percentage of younger, upper-income, more educated residents than others live in or near large cities and prefer to live in or near large cities. Latinos are more likely than non-Hispanic whites to live in large cities (31% to 22%) and to prefer to live in large cities (21% to 14%).

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|---|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| <i>Do you live in a ...</i> | | | | | | |
| Large city | 25% | 16% | 27% | 37% | 25% | 31% |
| Suburb near a large city | 25 | 16 | 30 | 32 | 23 | 15 |
| Medium-to-small-sized city | 27 | 32 | 28 | 21 | 29 | 34 |
| Small town | 14 | 21 | 10 | 7 | 12 | 13 |
| Rural area | 9 | 15 | 5 | 3 | 11 | 7 |
| <i>Would you most prefer to live in a ...</i> | | | | | | |
| Large city | 17% | 9% | 20% | 23% | 15% | 21% |
| Suburb near a large city | 23 | 14 | 24 | 28 | 26 | 15 |
| Medium-to-small-sized city | 27 | 32 | 27 | 25 | 26 | 33 |
| Small town | 16 | 23 | 16 | 10 | 15 | 17 |
| Rural area | 16 | 22 | 12 | 12 | 16 | 12 |
| Other, Don't know | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Residential Satisfaction

Although many Californians are not living in the kind of residence or locale they prefer, most are satisfied with their residential surroundings. However, they are more likely to be very satisfied with their housing than with the community where they live.

Overall, 91 percent of residents express satisfaction with their housing, and 60 percent are “very satisfied.” Eighty-seven percent are satisfied with their city or community, with 47 percent describing themselves as “very satisfied.” In all, very few residents say they are highly dissatisfied with either their homes or their communities.

There is little variation in satisfaction with housing or community across regions of the state. However, there are ethnic differences. Latinos are less likely than non-Hispanic whites to say they are very satisfied with their housing (55% to 64%), but both groups express similar satisfaction with their communities.

Homeowners are much more satisfied than renters with housing (74% to 38%) and with community (52% to 41%). Satisfaction with housing also varies with type of dwelling: Most people who live in single family homes (71%) are very satisfied with their current housing, while fewer than half living in attached dwellings (48%) and apartments (35%) express this degree of contentment. Satisfaction with both housing and community increases with age, higher education, higher income levels, and years at the current residence.

Despite the preference for living in smaller-sized communities, there are no major differences in the proportion of residents reporting high levels of community satisfaction when we compare those living in large cities (45%), suburbs near large cities (50%), medium-to-small size cities (45%), small towns (52%), and rural areas (50%).

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|--|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| <i>How satisfied are you with your house or apartment?</i> | | | | | | |
| Very satisfied | 60% | 59% | 58% | 59% | 60% | 55% |
| Somewhat satisfied | 31 | 33 | 31 | 30 | 32 | 33 |
| Somewhat dissatisfied | 6 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 6 |
| Very dissatisfied | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 6 |
| <i>How satisfied are you with your city or community?</i> | | | | | | |
| Very satisfied | 47% | 51% | 48% | 46% | 48% | 48% |
| Somewhat satisfied | 40 | 37 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 42 |
| Somewhat dissatisfied | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 6 |
| Very dissatisfied | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 |

Making Housing and Community Choices

Californians are conflicted about maintaining their ideal housing choice when they are confronted with the realities of traffic congestion and the desire to live in a convenient location.

On the one hand, half of them would not choose to live in a single-family detached home in the suburbs if it meant living further from work and having a long commute. This tradeoff is least acceptable in the San Francisco Bay area, where traffic congestion receives the worst ratings in the state. Interestingly, about half in all demographic groups, including renters, reject this tradeoff. However, among those who prefer a single-family home or living in a suburb, almost half would accept the tradeoff. Three in four residents also indicated they would be willing to live in a smaller home, if they had a shorter commute to work. This tradeoff of less housing space for a more convenient location was preferred across demographic groups and regions of the state.

On the other hand, two-thirds would not choose to live in multi-story, multi-family housing, even if it meant they could walk to shops, schools, and mass transit. Overall, 32 percent said they would accept that tradeoff, but this acceptance varied across groups. Public support for this tradeoff was somewhat higher among renters, lower-income residents, younger adults, and Latinos. Among people who prefer to live in single-family homes, only one in four would accept this tradeoff; among those who do live in single-family homes, only one in five would accept it. The option of convenient multi-family housing was least preferred in the Central Valley and most favored in the Los Angeles area.

"Would you choose to live in a single-family detached home with a backyard in the suburbs – if it means you would live far from work and have a long commute?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|-----------------------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| Yes | 42% | 44% | 31% | 48% | 44% | 48% |
| No | 50 | 48 | 59 | 46 | 50 | 47 |
| Don't work (<i>volunteered</i>) | 5 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| Don't know | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |

"Would you choose to live in multi-story, multi-family housing – such as a condo or apartment – if it means you could walk to shops, schools, and mass transit?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|------------|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| Yes | 32% | 23% | 34% | 39% | 30% | 39% |
| No | 67 | 76 | 64 | 60 | 69 | 60 |
| Don't know | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Local Governance

Although most Californians are satisfied with their current residences, fewer trust their city government to do what is right on land use and growth issues. More than a majority of residents would like to set limits on local development in their communities.

Overall, about half of Californians trust their city government's judgment on land use and growth issues. However, San Francisco Bay area residents are more likely than others to express little or no trust in their city governments on land use issues. They are also the most likely to support a local initiative that would slow down the pace of growth. Central Valley residents are the least likely to favor a slow-growth initiative that could slow down the economy.

There are no differences in ratings of distrust across community types, between homeowners and renters, between Latinos and non-Hispanic whites, or across age, education, and income groups. Among the voting groups, independent voters (44%) are less likely than Democrats (51%) and Republicans (53%) to trust their city governments on land use issues always or most of the time. Support for slow-growth initiatives is similar across various groups, except that it rises with income.

Given the weak confidence in city government, one might assume that many Californians would support a local initiative to slow down the pace of development. What is surprising is that the level of support stands at 55 percent, at a time when the economy is weakening, even when people are reminded that this proposal may result in slower economic growth. This is higher than May 2001 (51%) and nearly the same as June 2000 (58%) – despite the fact that economic confidence is at a lower point today than earlier.

"How often do you trust your city government to do what is right when it comes to the local land use and growth issues facing your city or community?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|---|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| Always | 8% | 10% | 7% | 10% | 6% | 12% |
| Most of the time | 42 | 42 | 38 | 43 | 45 | 42 |
| Only sometimes | 36 | 34 | 41 | 35 | 35 | 34 |
| Never | 10 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 9 |
| Don't live in a city (<i>volunteered</i>) | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Don't know | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

"If an election were held today, would you vote yes or no on a local initiative that would slow down the pace of development in your city or community, even if this meant having less economic growth?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|------------|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| Yes | 55% | 49% | 60% | 53% | 57% | 53% |
| No | 38 | 45 | 34 | 40 | 38 | 40 |
| Don't know | 7 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 7 |

Knowledge and Involvement

Californians are quite willing to express opinions about how their cities handle growth and to vote on development initiatives, but, evidently, this willingness is not based on substantial knowledge or a great deal of experience.

Almost half of residents say they know “very little” or “nothing” about the approval process for local growth and land use decisions. Even among voters, four in 10 say they know little or nothing about how these decisions are made. Latinos (60%) are more likely than non-Hispanic whites (42%) to have little or no knowledge about these matters. The larger the community size, the less people know about how decisions are made. Only one in eight residents say they have “a lot” of knowledge of the local process. The percentage of Californians who indicate knowledge of the approval process increases with age, education, income, homeownership, and length of residence in the community. Those who know the most about the process and those who know the least about the process are the most distrustful of their city’s handling of this issue. There is little variation across regions.

Only one in three residents has been personally involved in local land use and growth decisions. Four in 10 residents have no experience in this domain. Again, there are no differences across regions. The overwhelming majority of voters say they have had little or no direct experience. Latinos (50%) are more likely than non-Hispanic whites (36%) to be inexperienced. The percentage of residents indicating involvement increases with age, education, income, homeownership, and years at residence. Those with the most involvement in the process are more distrustful of government.

"How much do you know about the approval process for local growth and land use decisions in your city or community?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| A lot | 13% | 14% | 13% | 12% | 11% | 9% |
| Only some | 39 | 41 | 43 | 34 | 38 | 30 |
| Very little | 34 | 32 | 31 | 37 | 35 | 42 |
| Nothing | 13 | 13 | 11 | 16 | 15 | 18 |
| Don't know | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

"How often have you been personally involved in local land use and growth decisions in your city or community – such as attending meetings, signing petitions, or writing letters to officials?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| A lot | 6% | 6% | 7% | 5% | 6% | 3% |
| Sometimes | 29 | 31 | 29 | 28 | 29 | 23 |
| Hardly ever | 25 | 23 | 27 | 25 | 25 | 24 |
| Never | 40 | 40 | 37 | 42 | 40 | 50 |

Regional Land Use Issues

Regional Land Use Problems

Many Californians perceive traffic congestion (53%) and affordable housing (43%) as big problems in their region; somewhat fewer rate lack of opportunities for well-paying jobs (30%) and growth and development (29%) as that severe. Although San Francisco Bay area residents are more concerned than others about traffic and housing, that concern has dropped about 10 points since the May 2001 survey. A lower percentage of Central Valley residents than others view traffic, housing, or growth as big problems; however, a higher percentage of them are concerned about job opportunities. Latinos are more likely (44%) than non-Hispanic whites (25%) to say that the lack of job opportunities is a big problem; however, these two groups give similar ratings to traffic, housing, and growth problems.

"In your region today, how much of a problem is ..."

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|---|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| Traffic congestion | | | | | | |
| Big problem | 53% | 29% | 71% | 64% | 51% | 50% |
| Somewhat of a problem | 27 | 34 | 22 | 23 | 31 | 27 |
| Not a problem | 19 | 37 | 6 | 13 | 17 | 22 |
| Don't know | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| The availability of housing you can afford | | | | | | |
| Big problem | 43% | 27% | 65% | 41% | 37% | 46% |
| Somewhat of a problem | 27 | 27 | 22 | 29 | 27 | 27 |
| Not a problem | 29 | 45 | 12 | 29 | 34 | 26 |
| Don't know | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| The lack of opportunities for well-paying jobs | | | | | | |
| Big problem | 30% | 34% | 27% | 28% | 29% | 44% |
| Somewhat of a problem | 36 | 37 | 37 | 36 | 35 | 33 |
| Not a problem | 29 | 27 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 20 |
| Don't know | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| Population growth and development | | | | | | |
| Big problem | 29% | 24% | 32% | 29% | 31% | 29% |
| Somewhat of a problem | 37 | 34 | 40 | 39 | 38 | 34 |
| Not a problem | 33 | 42 | 27 | 30 | 29 | 35 |
| Don't know | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Regional Land Use Terms

"Sprawl" and "smart growth" are regional land use terms often used by policymakers, environmental groups, and urban planners. Yet, two in three Californians are unfamiliar with those terms. Among those who have heard of them, 25 percent have a negative opinion of sprawl and 21 percent have a positive opinion of smart growth.

San Francisco Bay area residents are more likely than others to have heard of sprawl (51%), and they are the most likely to have negative opinions of it (39%). Los Angeles residents are the least likely to recognize this term (29%) and the least likely to be negative about it (16%). Latinos are less likely to recognize the term sprawl than are non-Hispanic whites (85% to 53%). Knowledge of the term is higher among registered voters and increases in relation to age, education, income, and homeownership. Among voters, more than half of Californians say they are unfamiliar with sprawl.

Fewer Californians (34%) have heard of the term smart growth than have heard of the term sprawl (38%). Although San Francisco Bay area residents were more likely than others to have heard of sprawl, they were no more likely to have heard of smart growth. There are no regional differences in awareness of smart growth, though there is a slight tendency for Northern and Central California residents to have a more favorable opinion than Southern California residents of it.

Latinos are less likely than non-Hispanic whites to have heard of smart growth (75% to 63%). Awareness of the term is higher among those who are registered to vote, homeowners, and among older, more educated, and higher-income residents. Still, over six in 10 California voters say they have not heard of the term smart growth. Favorable opinions towards smart growth are similar among Democrats, Republicans, and independent voters.

"I'm going to ask you about regional land use terms. Have you heard about sprawl and smart growth?"
(If yes: "Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of it?")

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|----------------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| <i>Sprawl</i> | | | | | | |
| Yes, favorable | 7% | 7% | 6% | 7% | 7% | 4% |
| Yes, unfavorable | 25 | 24 | 39 | 16 | 20 | 8 |
| Yes, don't know | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 3 |
| No | 62 | 63 | 49 | 71 | 67 | 85 |
| <i>Smart growth</i> | | | | | | |
| Yes, favorable | 21% | 23% | 25% | 18% | 18% | 13% |
| Yes, unfavorable | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4 |
| Yes, don't know | 8 | 11 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 8 |
| No | 66 | 61 | 64 | 71 | 68 | 75 |

Local or Regional Response to Regional Issues?

Californians are more likely to favor having local governments get together rather than going it alone to work on land use and growth issues (59% to 35%). Democrats (64%) are more likely than Republicans (54%) or independents (56%) to say that local governments should take a regional approach to solving land use issues. Residents who identify traffic congestion, housing affordability, and development as big problems in their region are also more likely than others to favor a regional approach to land use planning. There are no differences in this attitude across demographic groups.

There is less public support, however, for requiring city governments to build their fair share of new housing for lower-income families in the region. A slight majority favor this idea, while nearly as many believe that city governments should decide what kind of new housing they want built. Latinos (62%) are more likely than non-Hispanic whites (46%) to want cities to build their fair share of lower-income housing. Democrats (59%) and independent voters (54%) are much more likely than Republicans (31%) to take this view. Older, upper-income, more educated residents and homeowners are most in favor of allowing city governments to decide this issue. There are no regional differences in support for requiring lower-income housing.

"Do you think that the city and county governments in your region should get together and agree on land use and growth issues, or should each city and county government in the region decide land use and growth issues on its own?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|---|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| Local governments should get together | 59% | 59% | 62% | 57% | 59% | 64% |
| Local government should decide on its own | 35 | 36 | 32 | 37 | 36 | 32 |
| Both (<i>volunteered</i>) | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Don't know | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 |

"Is the first or the second statement closer to your views?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|--|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| City governments should be required to build their fair share of new housing for lower income families in a region | 51% | 53% | 51% | 53% | 49% | 62% |
| City governments should decide how much and what kind of new housing they want built in their cities | 45 | 43 | 45 | 44 | 47 | 35 |
| Don't know | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |

Regional Policy Choices

More than half of California residents (54%) think that new housing should be approved by local governments only if there are jobs nearby, in order to reduce traffic congestion. Forty-two percent think that new housing should be approved even if there are no jobs nearby, to increase the housing supply. Los Angeles is the only region where residents are evenly divided on this policy choice. Even among those who considered finding affordable housing in the region a “big problem,” most (53%) agree that local government should build new housing only if there are jobs nearby. There are no differences across voter groups, racial and ethnic groups, or demographic groups.

Residents are divided about where new growth in the region should take place: 49 percent believe that growth should occur in undeveloped areas and 46 percent believe that growth should be steered to already developed areas. These results are similar to Americans’ attitudes in a June 2000 national survey by Penn, Schoen, and Berland. The findings are also consistent with a PPIC Statewide Survey conducted in May 2001. San Francisco Bay area residents are more likely than others to think that growth should occur in already developed areas. A higher percentage of those with higher incomes and more education prefer to steer growth to developed areas.

"Is the first or the second statement closer to your views?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|---|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| Local governments should approve new housing only if there are many jobs nearby, to reduce traffic congestion | 54% | 60% | 57% | 48% | 53% | 56% |
| Local governments should approve new housing even if there are not many jobs nearby, to increase the housing supply | 42 | 37 | 37 | 47 | 41 | 41 |
| Don't know | 5 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 3 |

"Do you think it is better ...?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|---|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| To allow growth in undeveloped areas if people want to live there | 49% | 50% | 42% | 52% | 53% | 53% |
| To steer growth to already developed areas | 46 | 46 | 52 | 43 | 42 | 43 |
| Don't know | 5 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 |

State Land Use Issues

State's Land Use Problems

Californians express varying degrees of concern about statewide land issues such as growth and development along the coast, in the suburban fringes, in the Central Valley and other farmlands, and in the Sierras and mountain areas. Growth and development along the California Coast is seen as a big problem by the highest percentage of residents (37%), followed by development on the suburban fringes of metropolitan areas (25%), growth in the Central Valley and other agricultural areas (23%), and growth in the Sierras and other California mountain ranges (15%). People living in Southern California outside of Los Angeles – including San Diego and Orange County – are the most likely to see growth and development along the coast as a big problem. Northern California residents – including the San Francisco Bay area and Central Valley – are the most likely to identify growth in the Central Valley and other agricultural areas as a big problem. San Francisco Bay area residents are also more concerned than others about development of the state's suburban fringes.

"How much of a problem is growth and development in the _____ today?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|--|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| California Coast | | | | | | |
| Big problem | 37% | 33% | 30% | 35% | 46% | 28% |
| Somewhat of a problem | 32 | 31 | 38 | 33 | 28 | 36 |
| Not a problem | 19 | 20 | 21 | 21 | 16 | 23 |
| Don't know | 12 | 16 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 13 |
| Outer suburbs of metropolitan regions | | | | | | |
| Big problem | 25% | 26% | 33% | 18% | 25% | 19% |
| Somewhat of a problem | 41 | 39 | 41 | 41 | 43 | 42 |
| Not a problem | 24 | 24 | 18 | 29 | 24 | 26 |
| Don't know | 10 | 11 | 8 | 12 | 8 | 13 |
| Central Valley, agricultural areas | | | | | | |
| Big problem | 23% | 32% | 30% | 16% | 17% | 20% |
| Somewhat of a problem | 32 | 37 | 29 | 31 | 33 | 33 |
| Not a problem | 28 | 26 | 25 | 32 | 29 | 30 |
| Don't know | 17 | 5 | 16 | 21 | 21 | 17 |
| Sierras, other California mountains | | | | | | |
| Big problem | 15% | 18% | 15% | 17% | 12% | 16% |
| Somewhat of a problem | 32 | 34 | 36 | 31 | 28 | 29 |
| Not a problem | 33 | 38 | 32 | 29 | 37 | 36 |
| Don't know | 20 | 10 | 17 | 23 | 23 | 19 |

State Government's Effectiveness

When it comes to state government's effectiveness in handling land use and growth issues, Californians face something of a quandary: Half of them believe that government is not doing enough on this front, but 38 percent have very little or no confidence in government's ability to handle the issues.

Overall, about one in three residents think the state is doing just enough to manage the issues, while fewer than one in 10 residents think that it is doing too much in this policy arena. These results recall those in a PPIC Statewide Survey in June 2000, which found that 50 percent of residents felt that the state government was not doing enough to protect the environment.

Today, San Francisco Bay area residents are more likely than others to think state government should do more on land use issues. There are no major differences between demographic groups or between Latinos and non-Hispanic whites, but the preference for a more active state government does increase with education. Democrats (58%) are more likely than Republicans (43%) to want more state action, and the views of independent voters (51%) fall in between.

But is state government equal to the task? Only one in eight have a lot of confidence that state government can effectively plan for growth and land use issues, half have only some confidence, and four in 10 have very little or no confidence. More Latinos than non-Hispanic whites have a lot of confidence (19% to 9%). Republicans (53%) are less likely than Democrats (63%) or independent voters (60%) to have at least some confidence. There are no differences across regions or between age, education, or income groups in confidence in state government's ability to plan for the future.

"Do you think that the state government is currently doing more than enough, just enough, or not enough to manage land use and growth issues in California?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| More than enough | 8% | 9% | 7% | 6% | 8% | 7% |
| Just enough | 35 | 37 | 28 | 36 | 36 | 42 |
| Not enough | 50 | 48 | 55 | 50 | 49 | 46 |
| Don't know | 7 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 5 |

"How much confidence do you have in the state government's ability to plan for the land use and growth issues affecting California's future, including building the necessary roads and infrastructure?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|-------------|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| A lot | 12% | 14% | 10% | 14% | 12% | 19% |
| Only some | 48 | 44 | 48 | 49 | 48 | 48 |
| Very little | 28 | 31 | 28 | 26 | 29 | 24 |
| None | 10 | 10 | 12 | 9 | 11 | 8 |
| Don't know | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 |

State Planning for the Future

While many residents want to limit growth and development, and many doubt that state government can plan for growth, three in four Californians agree that the state government should accommodate future growth by building more roads and infrastructure. This attitude holds across regions and demographic groups. To place these findings in context, a PPIC Statewide Survey in May 2001 found that most Californians consider growth inevitable, whether or not roads and other infrastructure are built.

The distribution of water has been a controversial issue in California for most of its modern history. When residents are reminded that water is a finite resource in the state and are given three choices for using it, most say that the number one priority should be farms and agriculture (42%), while protecting wildlife and natural areas ranks second (31%), and providing water for new residents and homes ranks last (20%). Not surprisingly, Central Valley residents are the most likely to rank agriculture as the top priority for water use planning. In Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay area, agriculture and environmental protection are fairly even. The percent supporting water for homes is generally consistent across all demographic groups and regions, although slightly lower in the Central Valley.

"Is the first or the second statement closer to your views? The state government should ..."

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|--|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| Accommodate future growth by building more roads and infrastructure | 74% | 76% | 70% | 76% | 77% | 78% |
| Discourage future growth by not building more roads and infrastructure | 22 | 21 | 25 | 21 | 20 | 19 |
| Don't know | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

"We have a limited amount of water supply available in California. Which of the following do you think should be the most important priority in making plans to prepare for the state's future?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|--|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| Maintaining the water supply for farms and agriculture | 42% | 59% | 39% | 35% | 41% | 37% |
| Protecting wildlife habitats and natural areas | 31 | 19 | 36 | 35 | 30 | 32 |
| Providing water for new homes and development | 20 | 15 | 19 | 22 | 22 | 24 |
| Other | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Don't know | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |

State Involvement in Land Use Issues

Californians are evenly divided when asked if local governments in a region should decide land use and growth issues, or if the state government should provide some basic guidelines on local development. Central Valley residents are most inclined to have each local government determine its land use planning, while Los Angeles residents are most in favor of having the state government offer guidelines. Latinos are more likely than non-Hispanic whites (58% to 47%), and Democrats are more likely than Republicans (55% to 44%) to want the state government involved. There are no other demographic differences in attitudes toward state involvement in planning.

Overall, most Californians believe that the state should maintain current land use and environmental restrictions, even if it increases the cost of new housing. Majority support for this view is evident in every region but is strongest in the San Francisco Bay area – the most expensive housing market in the state. Whites are more likely than Latinos (59% to 43%), and homeowners are more likely than renters (57% to 47%), to support maintaining the current restrictions. Support also increases with education and income.

"Is the first or the second statement closer to your views?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|---|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| The state government should give local governments planning guidelines for how the region should be developed | 50% | 45% | 49% | 55% | 52% | 58% |
| Each local government in a region should decide land use and growth issues on its own | 47 | 54 | 46 | 42 | 45 | 39 |
| Don't know | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|---|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| The state should maintain current land use and environmental restrictions, even if it increases the cost of new housing | 53% | 52% | 62% | 50% | 51% | 43% |
| The state should ease current land use and environmental restrictions, to increase the supply of new housing | 43 | 46 | 35 | 46 | 45 | 52 |
| Don't know | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 |

State Propositions on March 2002 Ballot

Californians are currently highly approving of a proposition that would provide state bond funds for open space, parks, and other land use projects. A proposition that would dedicate the state's gasoline tax to transportation projects also enjoys strong support.

Some political observers believe that a weakening state economy may limit support for state bond measures in 2002. However, despite a steep drop in consumer confidence, 74 percent of Californians would vote yes on the \$2.6 billion state bond measure for parks and open space. There is solid support for this proposition across voter groups, regions of the state, and demographic groups. However, voter attitudes may shift in response to campaign information and fiscal and economic factors. For instance, public knowledge of the state's billion-dollar budget deficit could have a dampening effect on voter attitudes toward state bond measures.

Two in three Californians also support a state proposition that would dedicate the state's gasoline sales tax to transportation projects. This state proposition calls for specified uses of the gasoline sales taxes on transportation projects and includes a formula for dividing the funds among state government, local governments, and mass transit programs. There is strong support for this state proposition across voter groups, demographic groups, and regions. Once again, support might decline during a campaign; for instance, information on how the state gasoline sales tax is currently allocated may have an effect on the strong support currently in evidence.

"A state proposition on the March 2002 ballot – The California Clean Water, Clean Air, and Coastal Preservation Act – would provide \$2.6 billion in state bonds to purchase, protect, and preserve park, coastal, and agricultural lands. If an election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this initiative?"

| | All Adults | Party Registration | | | All Voters | Latino Voters |
|-------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| | | Democrat | Republican | Other voters | | |
| Yes | 74% | 84% | 62% | 74% | 75% | 82% |
| No | 18 | 10 | 30 | 18 | 18 | 11 |
| Don't know | 8 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 |

"Another state proposition on the March 2002 ballot – Transportation Funding: Sales and Use Tax Revenues – would require the revenue from sales taxes collected at the gas pump to be used only for transportation purposes. The sales tax funds would be allocated in this manner: 40 percent for state transportation programs, 40 percent for cities and counties, and 20 percent for mass transit. If an election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this initiative?"

| | All Adults | Party Registration | | | All Voters | Latino Voters |
|-------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| | | Democrat | Republican | Other voters | | |
| Yes | 65% | 67% | 67% | 61% | 66% | 68% |
| No | 27 | 27 | 26 | 29 | 27 | 28 |
| Don't know | 8 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 4 |

Taxpayer Funding for Open Space

A majority of Californians (55%) support the concept of using taxpayer money to purchase open space to keep it free from development. A similar 57 percent had expressed this land use policy position in a PPIC Statewide Survey in June 2000. In other words, this funding preference has remained steady, even as the economy has weakened in the past year and a half. Support is stronger among Democratic and independent voters than Republicans; it is highest in the San Francisco Bay Area (62%) and lowest in the Central Valley (45%). A lower percentage of Latinos (47%) than non-Hispanic whites (59%) favor using taxpayer money to purchase open space. Californians are more likely than Americans as a whole (55% to 44%) to favor the use of taxpayer money to buy undeveloped land, according to a national survey conducted by Yankelovich partners in 1999.

Opposition to taxpayer funding reaches 56 percent when we mention the prospects of raising local taxes to purchase undeveloped land. A majority in all voter groups oppose increasing their local taxes to maintain open space, although Republicans are the most opposed. Only in the San Francisco Bay area are residents divided on this issue (48% to 49%); elsewhere in the state, there is strong opposition to higher taxes. This proposal receives more support among upper-income (51%) and college-educated residents (48%). Renters and homeowners are equally opposed to paying higher taxes. Among the staunchest opponents are adults 55 and older (60%), although 54 percent of other age groups are opposed.

There appears to be a significant drop off in Californians' support for land purchases when taxpayer funding is specifically mentioned. For instance, Californians are much more likely to support the state bond measure, "The California Clean Water, Clean Air, and Coastal Preservation Act," than they are to support the use of taxpayer money to buy undeveloped land (74% to 55%), or to favor paying higher taxes so that local governments can buy undeveloped land (74% to 41%).

"Do you favor or oppose using taxpayer money to buy undeveloped land to keep it free from commercial and residential development?"

| | All Adults | Party Registration | | | All Voters | Latino Voters |
|------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| | | Democrat | Republican | Other voters | | |
| Favor | 55% | 59% | 47% | 62% | 52% | 48% |
| Oppose | 42 | 37 | 50 | 35 | 43 | 51 |
| Don't know | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 |

"Do you favor or oppose paying higher local taxes so that your local government could buy undeveloped land and keep it free from development?"

| | All Adults | Party Registration | | | All Voters | Latino Voters |
|------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| | | Democrat | Republican | Other voters | | |
| Favor | 41% | 46% | 36% | 44% | 37% | 37% |
| Oppose | 56 | 51 | 61 | 53 | 58 | 62 |
| Don't know | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 |

Social, Economic, and Political Trends

Most Important Problem

Priorities have changed dramatically since the September 11th attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. Today, Californians rate the economy as the most important issue facing the state (18%), followed by terrorism and security issues (14%), the electricity problem (13%), and public schools (12%). Immigration and all other issues are mentioned by 5 percent or less.

In the two previous PPIC Statewide Surveys, electricity was far and away the most important problem, according to 56 percent of state residents in July and 43 percent in May. In contrast, terrorism has never before been an issue at all in the Statewide Surveys, and the economy – despite stumbling for at least a year – has never before reached beyond single digits.

Residents of Los Angeles county (20%) and of the San Francisco Bay Area (22%) are more likely than residents of the Central Valley or the rest of Southern California (14% each) to mention the economy as the most important issue, but less likely to mention the electricity problem. Terrorism is most salient to those in the Central Valley (17%) and Los Angeles (19%).

September 11th seems to have had a stronger effect on Latinos. They are much more likely than non-Hispanic whites to be concerned about terrorism (22% to 11%). Although they are also more concerned about the economy (23% to 15%), the difference is actually smaller than in previous PPIC Statewide Surveys. Concern about terrorism declines with higher income and more education.

"Thinking about the state as a whole, what do you think is the most important issue facing California today?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|--|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| Jobs, the economy, unemployment | 18% | 14% | 22% | 20% | 14% | 23% |
| Terrorism, security issues | 14 | 17 | 11 | 19 | 12 | 22 |
| Electricity costs, supply, prices | 13 | 17 | 11 | 8 | 16 | 8 |
| Schools, education | 12 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 11 | 13 |
| Immigration, illegal immigration | 5 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 4 |
| Environment, pollution | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Growth, population, overpopulation | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Housing costs, housing availability | 3 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Crime, gangs | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Poverty, the poor, the homeless, welfare | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| State government, governor, legislature | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Taxes, cutting taxes | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Traffic and transportation | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| Water | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Other | 9 | 9 | 8 | 12 | 9 | 7 |
| Don't know | 8 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 9 |

Economic Confidence

Californians are more pessimistic about the state's economy during the next 12 months than they were in July; but, paradoxically, they are much more likely to think the state is going in the right direction.

Fifty-nine percent now say that bad financial times lie ahead, compared to 50 percent in July and only 38 percent in January. Pessimism about the economy increases slightly with lower income; women (62%) are more negative than men (55%); non-Hispanic whites (61%) are more negative than Latinos (54%). The San Francisco Bay area is still the least optimistic, with 28 percent seeing good times ahead, compared to at least 33 percent in every other area of the state.

Despite growing concern about terrorism and the economy, Californians are much more likely than they were just three months ago to believe that the state is heading in the right direction. Only 44 percent were positive about the overall direction in May and July; today, 60 percent feel that way. Support for California's general direction is now at levels similar to those during the strongest years of economic growth. This is consistent with trends in recent national surveys: Americans today are more likely than before September 11th to say the nation is headed in the right direction.

Residents of the San Francisco Bay area (52%) and the Central Valley (57%) are least likely to say things are headed in the right direction. Latinos (64%) are slightly more likely than non-Hispanic whites (59%) to take a positive outlook on the state of the state. There are few other demographic differences, although the young (66%) are more likely than the old (57%) to think things are going in the right direction in California today.

"Do you think that during the next 12 months we will have good times financially or bad times?"

| <u>All Adults</u> | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|------------|
| | Sep 99 | Dec 99 | Feb 00 | Aug 00 | Jan 01 | May 01 | July 01 | Oct 01 |
| Good times | 72% | 76% | 78% | 72% | 51% | 38% | 41% | 32% |
| Bad times | 23 | 19 | 15 | 21 | 38 | 56 | 50 | 59 |
| Don't know | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 6 | 9 | 9 |

"Do you think things in California are generally going in the right direction or the wrong direction?"

| | Sep 98 | Dec 98 | Sep 99 | Dec 99 | Feb 00 | Aug00 | Oct 00 | Jan 01 | May 01 | Jul 01 | Oct 01 |
|------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------------|
| Right direction | 57% | 63% | 61% | 62% | 65% | 62% | 59% | 62% | 44% | 44% | 60% |
| Wrong direction | 34 | 28 | 34 | 31 | 27 | 30 | 32 | 29 | 48 | 47 | 29 |
| Don't know | 9 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 11 |

Terrorism and Security Issues

Although Californians are concerned about terrorism and safety issues since the September 11th attack, most are not highly worried at this time. When asked how much the terrorist attacks have shaken their sense of personal security, 15 percent say “a great deal.” By contrast, a Wirthlin Worldwide survey in September found 36 percent of Americans saying their sense of security was shaken “a great deal.” Women, lower income, and less educated residents are more worried than others. Latinos are more likely than non-Hispanic whites to express a great deal of concern (25% to 10%).

"How much, if at all, have the terrorist attacks shaken your own personal sense of safety and security?"

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|--------------|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| Great deal | 15% | 16% | 15% | 17% | 13% | 25% |
| Fair amount | 27 | 25 | 28 | 27 | 28 | 25 |
| Not too much | 38 | 39 | 38 | 39 | 35 | 36 |
| Not at all | 20 | 20 | 19 | 17 | 24 | 14 |

Governor's Ratings

Governor Gray Davis is more popular now than when we last rated his performance: 54 percent approve of his overall performance in office now, compared to 44 percent in July. Support among partisans has increased fairly consistently across the board. Davis has even higher marks for his handling of terrorism and security issues in California than he does for his overall job performance. Even half of Republicans approve of Davis' performance on terrorism and security issues.

| | All Adults | Party Registration | | | Not Registered to Vote | Latino |
|---|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|------------------------|--------|
| | | Democrat | Republican | Other Voters | | |
| <i>Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Gray Davis is handling his job as governor of California?</i> | | | | | | |
| Approve | 54% | 67% | 35% | 51% | 61% | 66% |
| Disapprove | 36 | 26 | 59 | 37 | 22 | 25 |
| Don't know | 10 | 7 | 6 | 12 | 17 | 9 |
| <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% | 51% | 59% | 66% | 68% |
| Disapprove | 19 | 14 | 28 | 20 | 15 | 17 |
| Don't know | 19 | 17 | 21 | 21 | 19 | 15 |

President's Ratings

While Gray Davis has gotten a boost since July, George Bush's ratings have soared. Eighty percent of Californians approve of his performance, an increase of 33 points over the 47 percent he received in the early summer. Nevertheless, public support in California is still lower than in the rest of the country, where 87 percent approve of Bush, according to a CBS/*New York Times* poll in October 2001.

There are differences across voter groups: 95 percent of Republicans approve of the president's job performance, compared to 71 percent of Democrats and 74 percent of independent voters. However, the increase in support for Bush among Democrats has been significant: Their approval has gone up by 46 points since July (25% to 71%). Independent voters' approval of the president has increased by 32 points (42% to 74%). Republican support is 15 points higher today than in July (95% to 80%).

Latinos (79%) and non-Hispanic whites (82%) are equally happy with Bush's performance. There are few demographic differences, although respondents 18 to 34 are somewhat less likely than older respondents to say they approve of the president's performance in office (75% to 82%).

Ratings for Bush's performance on terrorism and security issues are, as for Davis, somewhat higher: 83 percent approve of his efforts. High percentages of public support are found across all demographic groups, among almost all Republicans (96%) and three in four Democrats and independent voters.

| | All Adults | Party Registration | | | | Latino |
|---|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|------------------------|--------|
| | | Democrat | Republican | Other Voters | Not Registered to Vote | |
| <i>Do you approve or disapprove of the way that George W. Bush is handling his job as president?</i> | | | | | | |
| Approve | 80% | 71% | 95% | 74% | 79% | 79% |
| Disapprove | 16 | 24 | 4 | 21 | 14 | 15 |
| Don't know | 4 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 6 |
| <i>Do you approve or disapprove of the way that President Bush is handling the issue of terrorism and security?</i> | | | | | | |
| Approve | 83% | 77% | 96% | 77% | 79% | 82% |
| Disapprove | 14 | 19 | 3 | 18 | 17 | 14 |
| Don't know | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 |

Land Use, Terrorism, and Security Issues

Have the attacks led to more fears about safety in urban settings and public places? Four in 10 residents have some concerns about being in high rises, downtown areas, and mass transit, while one in three have some worries about suburban malls. However, fewer residents have great concerns: About one in five Californians say they now worry “a lot” about their safety in high-rise buildings (22%) downtown areas (19%), and using mass transit (18%). A lower percentage say they worry a lot about visiting suburban shopping malls and stores (13%). At least half of residents say they are not at all concerned about their safety in these urban and public settings.

San Francisco Bay area residents are less likely than others to worry a lot about their safety in high rise buildings, downtown areas, or on mass transit, and they are also the least likely to say they have any safety concerns about being in suburban stores. Latinos are more likely than non-Hispanic whites to be concerned about their safety. Women are also more concerned than men about their safety in these settings. Those living in large cities are no more worried than others about their safety in urban settings.

"Have the terrorist attacks made you worry about your safety ..."

| | All Adults | Region | | | | Latino |
|---|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | Central Valley | SF Bay Area | Los Angeles | Other Southern California | |
| In high rise buildings | | | | | | |
| Yes, a lot | 22% | 25% | 16% | 28% | 21% | 35% |
| Yes, only somewhat | 21 | 14 | 25 | 20 | 22 | 20 |
| No | 51 | 53 | 55 | 48 | 52 | 41 |
| Don't go to high rises (<i>volunteered</i>) | 6 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| In downtown areas of large cities | | | | | | |
| Yes, a lot | 19% | 21% | 14% | 23% | 20% | 33% |
| Yes, somewhat | 24 | 21 | 26 | 24 | 25 | 25 |
| No | 53 | 53 | 56 | 51 | 52 | 39 |
| Don't go to downtown areas (<i>volunteered</i>) | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| On mass transit and trains | | | | | | |
| Yes, a lot | 18% | 18% | 14% | 20% | 18% | 28% |
| Yes, only somewhat | 23 | 22 | 27 | 22 | 20 | 23 |
| No | 55 | 55 | 54 | 52 | 57 | 44 |
| Don't use mass transit (<i>volunteered</i>) | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 |
| In suburban stores and shopping malls | | | | | | |
| Yes, a lot | 13% | 13% | 11% | 14% | 12% | 25% |
| Yes, only somewhat | 19 | 17 | 14 | 21 | 21 | 24 |
| No | 68 | 68 | 73 | 64 | 66 | 51 |
| Don't go to shopping malls (<i>volunteered</i>) | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

Political Importance of Land Use and Growth Issues

Many Californians say they will take growth and land use issues into account when they cast ballots in 2002. Candidates' positions on these issues are even more important to voters in local than in statewide races.

Forty percent of residents say that the candidates' positions on land use and growth issues are very important in their thinking about the governor's race and other statewide races. Nine in 10 Californians say these types of issues are at least somewhat important, while only one in 10 residents rate the issues as unimportant. Democrats (45%) are more likely than Republicans (36%) or independent voters (38%) to say that the statewide candidates' positions on growth and land use issues are very important.

When thinking about local elections, the state's residents place even more importance on land use and growth issues. Almost half of California voters (48%) say the candidates' positions on these issues are very important to them in local races for city and county elected offices. Nine in 10 California voters say these issues are at least somewhat important. Democrats (52%) are more likely than Republicans (44%) or independent voters (43%) to say they are very important, and the issues are about equally important to Latinos and non-Hispanic whites.

"In thinking about the governor's race and other statewide races in 2002, how important to you are the candidates' positions on land use and growth issues?"

| | All Adults | Party Registration | | | All Voters | Latino |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------|
| | | Democrat | Republican | Other Voters | | |
| Very important | 40% | 45% | 36% | 38% | 41% | 40% |
| Somewhat important | 49 | 47 | 53 | 52 | 50 | 48 |
| Not important | 9 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 8 |
| Don't know | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |

"In thinking about the local races in 2002 – such as city and county elected offices – how important to you are the candidates' positions on land use and growth issues?"

| | All Adults | Party Registration | | | All Voters | Latino |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------|
| | | Democrat | Republican | Other Voters | | |
| Very important | 46% | 52% | 44% | 43% | 48% | 44% |
| Somewhat important | 45 | 42 | 45 | 48 | 45 | 47 |
| Not important | 7 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 7 |
| Don't know | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 |

Survey Methodology

The PPIC Statewide Survey is directed by Mark Baldassare, a senior fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California, with research assistance from Lisa Cole and Eric McGhee. The survey was conducted in collaboration with The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, The James Irvine Foundation, and The David and Lucile Packard Foundation; however, the survey methodology and questions and content of the report were solely determined by Mark Baldassare.

The findings of this survey are based on a telephone survey of 2,002 California adult residents interviewed from October 22 to 31, 2001. Interviewing took place on weekend days and weekday nights, using a computer-generated random sample of telephone numbers, ensuring 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 five 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 20 minutes to complete. Interviewing was conducted in English or Spanish. Maria Tello translated the survey into 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 2,002 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 1,514 registered voters is +/- 2.5%. 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; moreover, the growth of the Central Valley and “Other Southern California” regions have given them increasing political significance.

We present specific results for Latinos because they account for about one in four of the state's adult population and constitute one of the fastest growing voter groups. The sample sizes for the African American and Asian subgroups were not large enough for separate statistical analysis. We contrast the opinions of Democrats and Republicans with “other” or “independent” registered voters. This third category includes those who are registered to vote as “decline to state” as well as a fewer number who say they are members of other political parties.

In some cases, we use earlier PPIC Statewide Surveys to analyze trends over time. National comparisons are from national surveys by Hart and Teeter in 1997; Yankelovich Partners in 1999; Penn, Schoen and Berland in 2000; and CBS/*New York Times* and Wirthlin Worldwide in 2001.

PPIC STATEWIDE SURVEY: SPECIAL SURVEY ON LAND USE ISSUES

OCTOBER 22-31, 2001

2,002 CALIFORNIA ADULT RESIDENTS; ENGLISH AND SPANISH

MARGIN OF ERROR +/- 2% AT 95% CONFIDENCE LEVEL FOR TOTAL SAMPLE

1. Do you think things in California are generally going in the right direction or the wrong direction?

60% right direction
29 wrong direction
11 don't know

2. Turning to economic conditions in California, do you think that during the next 12 months we will have good times financially or bad times?

32% good times
59 bad times
9 don't know

3. Thinking about the state as a whole, what do you think is the most important issue facing California today? (*code, don't read*)

18% jobs, the economy, unemployment
14 terrorism, security issues
13 electricity costs, supply, prices
12 schools, education
5 immigration, illegal immigration
3 environment, pollution
3 growth, population, overpopulation
3 housing costs, housing availability
2 crime, gangs
2 poverty, the poor, the homeless, welfare
2 state government, governor, legislature
2 taxes, cutting taxes
2 traffic and transportation
2 water
9 other (*specify*)
8 don't know

Next, I would like to ask you some questions about where you live.

4. Is the place where you currently live a single-family detached home, an attached home such as a condo or townhouse, an apartment, or another type of dwelling?

65% single-family detached home
10 attached home
21 apartment
4 other

5. Would you most prefer to live in a single-family detached home, an attached home such as a condo or townhouse, an apartment, or another type of dwelling?

84% single-family detached home
6 attached home
6 apartment
3 other
1 don't know

6. Overall, how satisfied are you with the house or apartment you live in—very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

60% very satisfied
31 somewhat satisfied
6 somewhat dissatisfied
3 very dissatisfied

7. Do you live in a large city, in a suburb near a large city, in a medium-to-small-sized city, in a small town not near a city, or in a rural area?

25% large city
25 suburb near a large city
27 medium-to-small-sized city
14 small town not near a city
9 rural area

8. Would you most prefer to live in a large city, in a suburb near a large city, in a medium-to-small-sized city, in a small town not near a city, or in a rural area?

17% large city
23 suburb near a large city
27 medium-to-small-sized city
16 small town not near a city
16 rural area
1 other/don't know

9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the city or community you live in—very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

47% very satisfied
40 somewhat satisfied
9 somewhat dissatisfied
4 very dissatisfied

10. How often do you trust your city government to do what is right when it comes to local land use and growth issues facing your city or community—always, most of the time, only sometimes, or never?

8% always
42 most of the time
36 only sometimes
10 never
1 don't live in a city
3 don't know

11. If an election were held today, would you vote yes or no on a local initiative that would slow down the pace of development in your city or community, even if this meant having less economic growth?

55% yes
38 no
7 don't know

12. How much do you know about the approval process for local growth and land use decisions in your city or community—a lot, only some, very little, or nothing?

13% a lot
39 only some
34 very little
13 nothing
1 don't know

13. How often have you been personally involved in local land use and growth decisions in your city or community—such as attending meetings, signing petitions, or writing letters to officials—a lot, sometimes, hardly ever, or never?

6% a lot
29 sometimes
25 hardly ever
40 never

People say there are tradeoffs in choosing a local community to live in, meaning that you have to give up some things in order to have other things that you want. How do you feel about these tradeoffs—other things being equal? (*rotate questions 14-17*)

14. Would you choose to live in a small single-family detached home—if it means you could live close to work and have a short commute?

74% yes
18 no
5 don't work
3 don't know

15. Would you choose to live in a dense neighborhood where single-family homes are close together—if it means you could be near parks and greenbelt areas?

47% yes
50 no
3 don't know

16. Would you choose to live in multi-story, multi-family housing—such as a condo or apartment—if it means you could walk to shops, schools, and mass transit?

32% yes
67 no
1 don't know

17. Would you choose to live in a single-family detached home with a backyard in the suburbs—if it means you would live far from work and have a long commute?

42% yes
50 no
5 don't work
3 don't know

Next, we are interested in your opinions about the region or broader geographic area that you live in. I am going to read to you a list of problems other people have told us about. For each one, please tell me if you think it is a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem in your region. (*rotate questions 18 to 21*)

18. How about traffic congestion on freeways and major roads?

53% big problem
27 somewhat of a problem
19 not a problem
1 don't know

19. How about population growth and development?

29% big problem
37 somewhat of a problem
33 not a problem
1 don't know

20. How about the availability of housing you can afford?

43% big problem
27 somewhat of a problem
29 not a problem
1 don't know

21. How about the lack of opportunities for well-paying jobs?

30% big problem
36 somewhat of a problem
29 not a problem
5 don't know

22. Overall, how much confidence do you have that the city and county governments in your region can effectively deal with the land use and growth issues facing the broader geographic area you live in—a lot, some, or not much?

16% a lot
 54 some
 28 not much
 2 don't know

23. Do you think that the city and county governments in your region should get together and agree on land use and growth issues, or should each city and county government in the region decide land use and growth issues on its own?

59% local governments should get together
 35 local government should decide on its own
 2 both (*volunteered*)
 4 don't know

24. Next, I'm going to ask you about regional land use terms. Not everyone will have heard of these. Have you heard about sprawl? (*if yes: Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of it?*)

7% yes, favorable
 25 yes, unfavorable
 6 yes, don't know
 62 no

25. How about smart growth? (*if yes: Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of it?*)

21% yes, favorable
 5 yes, unfavorable
 8 yes, don't know
 66 no

People have different ideas about regional land use and growth issues. Please tell me if the first statement or the second statement in the following questions comes closer to your views—even if neither is exactly right. (*rotate questions 26-29*)

26. (A) Local governments should approve new housing, only if there are many jobs nearby, to reduce traffic congestion; (B) Local governments should approve new housing, even if there are not many jobs nearby, to increase the housing supply.

54% approve new housing only if there are nearby jobs
 42 approve new housing even if there are no nearby jobs
 4 don't know

27. (A) City governments should be required to build their fair share of new housing for lower-income families in the region; (B) City governments should decide how much and what kind of new housing they want built in their cities.

51% build fair share of lower-income housing
 45 decide what type of housing to build
 4 don't know

28. If you had to choose, which is more important: (A) The ability of individuals to do what they want with the land they own; (B) The ability of government to regulate residential and commercial development for the common good.

56% individuals to do what they want
 41 government to regulate development
 3 don't know

29. Do you think it is better: (A) To allow growth in undeveloped areas if people want to live there; (B) To steer growth to already developed areas?

49% allow growth in undeveloped areas
 46 steer growth to already developed areas
 5 don't know

I'd like to ask some questions about the state as a whole. I am going to read to you a list of state land use and growth issues. Please tell me if you think each of the following is a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem in California today. (*rotate questions 30-33*)

30. How much of a problem is growth and development on the California Coast?

37% big problem
 32 somewhat of a problem
 19 not a problem
 12 don't know

31. How much of a problem is growth and development in the Sierras and other California mountain ranges?

15% big problem
 32 somewhat of a problem
 33 not a problem
 20 don't know

32. How much of a problem is growth and development in Central Valley farmlands and other California agricultural areas?

23% big problem
 32 somewhat of a problem
 28 not a problem
 17 don't know

33. How much of a problem is growth and development in the outer suburban fringes of the state's metropolitan regions?

- 25% big problem
- 41 somewhat of a problem
- 24 not a problem
- 10 don't know

34. Do you think that the state government is currently doing more than enough, just enough, or not enough to manage land use and growth issues in California?

- 8% more than enough
- 35 just enough
- 50 not enough
- 7 don't know

35. How much confidence do you have in the state government's ability to plan for the land use and growth issues affecting California's future—including building the necessary roads and infrastructure—a lot, only some, very little, or none?

- 12% a lot
- 48 only some
- 28 very little
- 10 none
- 2 don't know

People have different ideas about state land use and growth issues. Please tell me if the first statement or the second statement in the following questions comes closer to your views—even if neither is exactly right. (rotate questions 36-38)

36. (A) Each local government in a region should decide land use and growth issues on its own; (B) The state government should give local governments planning guidelines for how the region should be developed.

- 47% local government decides land use
- 50 state government provides planning guidelines
- 3 don't know

37. (A) The state government should accommodate future growth by building more roads and infrastructure; (B) The state government should discourage future growth by not building more roads and infrastructure.

- 74% state government accommodate growth
- 22 state government discourage growth
- 4 don't know

38. (A) The state should ease current land use and environmental restrictions to increase the supply of new housing; (B) The state should maintain current land use and environmental restrictions, even if it increases the cost of new housing.

- 43% ease current restrictions
- 53 maintain current restrictions
- 4 don't know

39. We have a limited amount of water supply available in California. Which of the following do you think should be the most important priority for water policy in making plans to prepare for the state's future: (A) maintaining the water supply for farms and agriculture; (B) providing water for new homes and development; (C) protecting wildlife habitats and natural areas?

- 42% farms and agriculture
- 31 wildlife and natural areas
- 20 homes and residents
- 4 other answer
- 3 don't know

40. A state proposition on the March 2002 ballot, "The California Clean Water, Clean Air, and Coastal Preservation Act," would provide \$2.6 billion in state bonds to purchase, protect, and preserve park, coastal, and agricultural lands. If an election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this initiative?

- 74% yes
- 18 no
- 8 don't know

41. On another topic, do you favor or oppose using taxpayer money to buy undeveloped land to keep it free from commercial and residential development?

- 55% favor
- 42 oppose
- 3 don't know

42. On another topic, do you favor or oppose paying higher local taxes so that your local government could buy undeveloped land and keep it free from development?

- 41% favor
- 56 oppose
- 3 don't know

43. Another state proposition on the March 2002 ballot, "Transportation Funding: Sales and Use Tax Revenues," would require the revenue from sales taxes collected at the gas pump to be used only for transportation purposes. The sales tax funds would be allocated in this manner: 40 percent for state transportation programs, 40 percent for cities and counties, and 20 percent for mass transit. If an election were held today, would you vote yes or no on this initiative?

- 65% yes
- 27 no
- 8 don't know

44. On a related topic, thinking about the governor's race and other statewide races in 2002, how important to you are the candidate's positions on land use and growth issues—very important, somewhat important, or not important?

40% very important
49 somewhat important
9 not important
2 don't know

45. In thinking about local races in 2002—such as city and county elected offices- how important to you are the candidate's positions on land use and growth issues—very important, somewhat important, or not important?

46% very important
45 somewhat important
7 not important
2 don't know

46. On another topic, overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that Gray Davis is handling his job as governor of California?

54% approve
36 disapprove
10 don't know

47. Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Governor Davis is handling the issue of terrorism and security?

62% approve
19 disapprove
19 don't know

48. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that George W. Bush is handling his job as president?

80% approve
16 disapprove
4 don't know

49. Do you approve or disapprove of the way that President Bush is handling the issue of terrorism and security?

83% approve
14 disapprove
3 don't know

Next, we are interested in how the terrorist attacks on America are affecting feelings about safety and security. Have these terrorist attacks made you worry about...
(rotate questions 50-53)

50. Your safety in high-rise buildings? (if yes, a lot or only somewhat?)

22% yes, a lot
21 yes, only somewhat
51 no
6 don't go to high-rise buildings

51. Your safety on mass transit and trains? (if yes, a lot or only somewhat?)

18% yes, a lot
23 yes, only somewhat
55 no
4 don't use mass transit

52. Your safety in downtown areas of large cities? (if yes, a lot or only somewhat?)

19% yes, a lot
24 yes, only somewhat
53 no
4 don't go to downtown areas

53. Your safety in suburban stores and shopping malls? (if yes, a lot or only somewhat?)

13% yes, a lot
19 yes, only somewhat
68 no
0 don't go to shopping malls

54. How much, if at all, have the terrorist attacks shaken your own personal sense of safety and security—a great deal, a fair amount, not too much, or not at all?

15% great deal
27 fair amount
38 not too much
20 not at all

55. On another topic, some people are registered to vote and others are not. Are you absolutely certain you are registered to vote? (if yes: Are you registered as a Democrat, a Republican, another party, or as an independent?)

35% yes, Democrat
27 yes, Republican
4 yes, other party
13 yes, independent
21 no, not registered

56. Would you consider yourself to be politically very liberal, somewhat liberal, middle-of-the-road, somewhat conservative, or very conservative?

10% very liberal
22 somewhat liberal
32 middle-of-the-road
25 somewhat conservative
10 very conservative
1 don't know

[57-65: Demographic questions]

PPIC STATEWIDE SURVEY

Advisory Committee

Angela Blackwell

President
Policy Link

Paul Brest

President
The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

Mollyann Brodie

Vice President
Kaiser Family Foundation

Bruce E. Cain

Director
Institute of Governmental Studies
University of California, Berkeley

Dennis A. Collins

President
The James Irvine Foundation

Matt Fong

Attorney
Sheppard Mullin

William Hauck

President
California Business Roundtable

Sherry Bebitch Jeffe

Senior Scholar
School of Policy, Planning, and Development
University of Southern California

Monica Lozano

President and Chief Operating Officer
La Opinión

Donna Lucas

President
NCG Porter Novelli

Max Neiman

Director
Center for Social and
Behavioral Research
University of California, Riverside

Dan Rosenheim

News Director
KPIX-TV

Richard Schlosberg

President and CEO
The David and Lucile
Packard Foundation

Carol Stogsdill

President
Stogsdill Consulting

Cathy Taylor

Vice President and Editorial
Commentary Director
Orange County Register

Raymond L. Watson

Vice Chairman of the Board
The Irvine Company

Carol Whiteside

President
Great Valley Center