Occasional Papers

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

Mark Baldassare
Christopher Hoene
Jonathan Cohen

Presented at the League of California Cities annual conference,
Session on Policies and Plans for Dealing with Terrorism,
Sacramento, California
September 9, 2003

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.

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

Copyright © 2003 by Public Policy Institute of California
All rights reserved
San Francisco, CA

Short sections of text, not to exceed three paragraphs, may be quoted without written permission provided that full attribution is given to the source and the above copyright notice is included.

PPIC does not take or support positions on any ballot measure or on any local, state, or federal legislation, nor does it endorse, support, or oppose any political parties or candidates for public office.

Research publications reflect the views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the staff, officers, or Board of Directors of the Public Policy Institute of California.

Contents

Summary iii

Introduction 1

Survey of California City Officials 3

Survey of California Residents 11

Appendix A
- **Survey Methodology: City Officials** 17
- **Survey Questionnaire** 19

Appendix B
- **Survey Methodology: State Residents** 23
- **Survey Questionnaire** 25

Summary

This report presents the second in a series of comprehensive analyses of the ways in which California city officials and California adult residents are responding to homeland security issues. The findings are based on two large surveys. The first was conducted in July and August 2003 by the League of California Cities, which sent a direct mail survey to city officials in all of California's 478 cities; a total of 294 surveys were completed and returned, for a 62 percent response rate. The second survey was conducted in August 2003 by the Public Policy Institute of California, which directed a telephone interview of 2,001 adult residents throughout the state. Both of the surveys draw comparisons with a survey of city officials conducted in July and August 2002 and a telephone survey of 2,014 adult residents statewide in August 2002.

The surveys offer a "snapshot in time," when city officials and state residents are in the process of implementing ways to cope with the new realities confronting local governments two years 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 continue to be concerned about homeland security, especially with respect to cyberterrorism, biological and chemical attacks, and car or truck bombs; yet issues such as public safety and crime, the economy, and infrastructure continue to be seen as more immediately important.
- Most cities have addressed biological and chemical attacks in their contingency plans, but fewer have paid much attention to cyberterrorism and car or truck bombs.
- Many city officials say that local spending on public safety and security has increased since September 11th, and an overwhelming majority say that their local economic and fiscal conditions are weaker.
- Most city officials believe that their local residents would not support higher taxes or fees to increase terrorism readiness. In this context, many city officials are asking for federal funding for homeland security and say their greatest need is for federal grants to pay for training, equipment, and overtime.
- There appears to be increased coordination across all levels of government since September 11th. Over the past year, coordination with counties particularly increased, according to city officials.
- While city officials rate the coordination within city government and across local governments in their region as high, they give lower ratings to statewide coordination and collaboration.
- Larger cities express higher concerns and are more involved in homeland security than smaller cities.
- Most residents are confident that U.S. intelligence and law enforcement agencies can prevent a terrorist attack; however, many are concerned about how anti-terrorism measures may affect civil liberties.
- Many Californians believe that the war with Iraq has contributed at least somewhat to the long-term security of the United States. However, opinions vary widely according to political party.
- The public continues to rate the president in positive terms regarding terrorism and security issues, although the ratings are lower than a year ago. Today, there are large differences across political parties.
- Most state residents see terrorism as a problem for California, while fewer residents worry a lot about being a victim of terrorism. Opinions on these issues have changed very little in the past year.
- Most Californians give positive ratings to their city governments for homeland security efforts, and residents express confidence in their local police, fire departments, and public health agencies.
- The public continues to narrowly support a local tax increase to pay for increased terrorism readiness.
- We continue to find greater concern about terrorism and security issues among Latinos, lower-income residents, less-educated residents, and those living in the more urban regions of the state.

Introduction

Two years after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, local governments nationwide continue to confront new realities in the need to provide for local homeland security. Among the added responsibilities are 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 the national, state, and local governments are in fiscal straits and in an era of contentious federal-state-local relations.

To gauge the preparedness of local governments, the League of California Cities sent a survey to the city managers of all California cities. A total of 294 questionnaires were returned in July and August 2003, for a 62 percent response rate. The responses from city officials were analyzed for differences across 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?
- What are the current fiscal and economic conditions of cities in California today, and how significant are the economic and fiscal implications of homeland security efforts? Do city offiicals believe that local voters would support higher taxes and fees to increase homeland security efforts?
- Have cities received federal funding for homeland security, are they applying for such funding, and do they anticipate receiving assistance in the future? What do city officials consider to be their highest priorities for federal and state funding supporting their local efforts?
- How much collaboration do city officials think there is within their city's agencies and between city, county, state, and federal governments? Has government coordination increased since September 11th?

We compare the responses of city officials with the responses of over 2,000 California residents interviewed through a *PPIC Statewide Survey* in August 2003. Citizen responses were analyzed for trends over time and differences across the state's major regions and political and demographic groups. We compare the results for Latinos and non-Hispanic whites; however, 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 much confidence do Californians express in the federal government's role in homeland security? How do residents view the war in Iraq relative to terrorist threats at home? How do Californians rate the performance of the president in terms of handling terrorism and homeland security?
- How serious a threat is terrorism in California today? To what degree do residents perceive themselves and family members to be in danger of terrorist attacks?
- 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 police, fire, and public health agencies? Will residents support higher taxes to increase the readiness of local police, fire, and public health departments?

Homeland Security in Context

Two years after September 11th, terrorism continues to rate high among city officials' priorities in California. However, this problem is not among the three most important issues they say they are facing. Public safety is listed as the most important current issue (69%), followed by economic conditions (59%) and infrastructure investment (45%). By contrast, 27 percent of city officials cite terrorism as the most important issue.

The mention of terrorism increases with city population size. Public safety is listed as the most important issue by 78 percent of city officials in cities over 100,000 in population, followed by economic conditions (56%). The third most important issue is terrorism (44%). Among cities under 100,000 in population, the three issues listed as most important are the same as for cities overall. Infrastructure investment (59%) ranks near the most important issue for cities under 10,000 in population.

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 (52%), economic conditions (50%), and infrastructure investment (38%). Similarly, terrorism was cited by 22 percent of respondents.

Overall, economic conditions rate as a much higher concern for city officials in 2003 (59%) than in 2002 (47%). City officials in the larger cities are particularly more likely to be concerned about economic conditions in 2003 than in 2002 (60% compared to 39% for cities between 50,000 and 99,999 in population, and 56% compared to 31% for cities over 100,000 in population). Concerns about infrastructure investment needs also are on the rise, increasing in particular for cities between 10,000 and 49,999 in population (45% in 2003, 37% in 2002) and cities between 50,000 and 99,999 in population (51% in 2003, 33% in 2002).

"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	69%	66%	64%	71%	78%
Economic conditions	59	62	59	60	56
Infrastructure investment	45	59	45	51	29
Terrorism	27	22	21	29	44

Concerns About Terrorism

City officials in California continue to be most concerned about cyberterrorism and biological and chemical attacks: Four in ten say they are very or moderately concerned about these threats—cyberterrorism (41%), biological attacks (39%), chemical attacks (38%). One in three cite a car or truck bomb as at least a moderate security concern, representing an increase compared to the 2002 survey (27% to 32%).

One in five is at least moderately concerned about a range of other possibilities, including the threat of an airplane being used as a bomb or missile, reflecting a decline compared to the 2002 survey (26% to 18%).

The top three concerns noted above are the same for city officials in all sizes of cities. For the largest cities (i.e., those over 100,000 in population) the threat of a car or truck bomb now rates highest at 63 percent – compared to 43 percent and a fourth ranking in the 2002 survey.

Concern about all types of terrorist attacks tends to increase as city population size increases. For instance, in the largest cities, the threats of biological (57%) and chemical (56%) terrorism are of much greater concern than among the smallest cities. Overall, the prospect of an airplane being used as a bomb, as in the case of September 11th, now appears to be less of a threat according to California city officials, decreasing in particular between 2002 and 2003 for cities between 10,000 and 49,999 (from 26% to 14%) and cities between 50,000 and 99,999 (from 28% to 13%).

"How concerned are you about the following possibilities over the next year in your city?"
(% responding "very concerned" or "moderately concerned")

	All Cities	Population Size			
		< 10,000	10,000 - 49,999	50,000 - 99,999	> 100,000
Cyberterrorism	41%	25%	38%	52%	52%
Biological	39	27	37	39	57
Chemical	38	28	34	37	56
Car or truck bomb	32	13	29	28	63
Airplane used as bomb	18	13	14	13	36
Individual/suicide bomb	23	6	20	28	43
Radiological	22	11	18	25	44
Nuclear	13	8	14	8	21

Emergency Planning in Cities

It is important to note that about two in three city officials say they have plans for chemical and biological attacks, yet only half say they have plans for car or truck bombs, and only three in 10 say they have plans for cyberterrorism.

Except for cyberterrorism, most of the concerns about specific types of terrorist attacks seem to be addressed in the emergency planning efforts of cities. In other words, 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, 67 percent of city officials say their plans address the threat of biological attacks, compared to 39 percent who say they are at least moderately concerned about this type of attack. Similarly, 66 percent of city officials report that chemical attacks are addressed in their planning efforts, compared to 38 percent who list chemical attacks as a major concern. The findings were similar for the 2002 survey.

However, in 2002 a significant gap was evident between city plans for dealing with cyberterrorism and the level of concern surrounding this threat: Only 22 percent of city officials said cyber attacks were included in their planning efforts, compared to 40 percent who said they were at least moderately concerned about such attacks. This gap still exists in 2003, but has decreased: 30 percent of city officials say cyber attacks are included in their emergency planning efforts, compared to 42 percent who list cyber attacks as a moderate or serious concern.

The gap between the level of city officials' concerns and city planning efforts with respect to cyberterrorism is evident for all city sizes. Although 52 percent of city officials in cities with more than 100,000 residents say they are moderately or very concerned about the threat of cyberterrorist attacks, only 36 percent say such threats are addressed in their planning efforts. Similarly, 52 percent of officials in cities with 50,000 - 99,999 residents list cyberterrorism as a major threat, with only 35 percent saying this problem is addressed in their plans. For cities with 10,000 – 49,999 residents, 38 percent of city officials say cyberterrorism is a serious concern, compared to 29 percent who say it's addressed in city plans. While city officials in cities under 10,000 in population are less likely to list cyberterrorism as a major threat (25%), only 17 percent say that such a threat is included in city plans.

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	41%	30%
Biological	39	67
Chemical	38	66
Car or truck bomb	32	49
Airplane used as bomb	18	53
Individual/suicide bomb	23	37
Radiological	22	46
Nuclear	13	43

Fiscal Conditions and Homeland Security

What is the economic and fiscal context in which California cities are being asked to provide for the increased needs of homeland security efforts? California cities have been operating under deteriorating economic and fiscal conditions. Eighty-five percent of city officials report that they are less able to meet financial needs this year than during the previous year. City officials in larger cities with populations over 100,000 are particularly more likely to say that they are less able to meet financial needs (96%) compared to cities of other sizes (79% for cities under 10,000 in population, 87% for cities between 10,000 and 49,999, and 79% for cities between 50,000 and 99,999).

The percentage of city officials reporting worsening fiscal conditions has increased dramatically from 2002 when 31 percent of city officials reported that they were less able to meet financial needs —undoubtedly reflecting a downturn in the economy. Three in four city officials (77%) report that their local economy is weaker this year than last year, with little difference by city size.

Moreover, the fiscal condition of cities is also affected by the additional responsibilities and costs associated with local homeland security activities. Nearly half (46%) of city officials report that their city has increased public safety spending since September 11th, up from 39 percent reporting such spending increases in 2002. Of the largest cities, 73 percent (61% in 2002) report increased levels of spending for public safety after 9-11, compared to 25 percent of cities with populations under 10,000 (34% in 2002), 39 percent of cities with populations between 10,000 and 49,999 (29% in 2002), and 59 percent of cities with populations between 50,000 and 99,999 (49% in 2002).

Faced with declining overall fiscal health, cities are left with few options to cover the costs of added homeland security responsibilities. One response has been to shift resources from elsewhere in city government. One in four city officials (23%) report that their cities have shifted resources within public safety departments and agencies (police, fire, EMT) to cover homeland security needs. The percentage increases by city size, with one in two city officials (51%) in cities with more than 100,000 in population reporting shifting public safety resources. Similarly, 15 percent of city officials report that their city has shifted resources from other departments – outside of public safety – to cover homeland security responsibilities. The percentage again increases by city size, with one in three (33%) in the larger cities reporting shifts from other departments.

In some cities, declining economic and fiscal conditions are necessitating cuts that make meeting added homeland security needs all the more difficult. Seventeen percent of six city officials report that their cities have laid off public safety personnel in 2002 or 2003, including 21 percent in the larger cities with 100,000 or more population.

	All Cities	Population Size			
		< 10,000	10,000 - 49,999	50,000 - 99,999	> 100,000
"Less able to meet financial needs"	85%	79%	87%	79%	96%
"Local economy is weaker"	77	76	79	76	75
"Increased public safety spending since 9-11"	46	25	39	59	73
"Shifted resources within public safety departments"	23	2	17	26	51
"Shifted resources from other departments"	15	8	10	17	33
"Laid off public safety personnel"	17	10	20	9	21

Support for Tax and Fee Increases

One option for helping cities cope with increased fiscal stress and homeland security responsibilities might be local taxes or fees. However, city officials are not optimistic about public support for additional local taxes and fees to fund homeland security efforts. In fact, they are even less optimistic about such support than they were in 2002.

Only 6 percent of city officials think that public support for new *taxes* is likely, compared to 16 percent in 2002; 78 percent believe it is unlikely, compared to 64 percent in 2002. Only nine percent believe the public would support additional *fees*, compared to 20 percent in 2002.

Anticipated support for taxes and fees is similar across all sizes of cities in 2003. Significantly, city officials in the largest cities express more uncertainty about whether or not their voters would support higher taxes and 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.

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

	All Cities	Population Size			
		< 10,000	10,000 - 49,999	50,000 - 99,999	> 100,000
Very likely	1%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Likely	5	6	4	6	5
Unlikely	49	48	53	57	34
Very unlikely	29	32	28	28	30
Don't know	16	15	16	9	30

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

	All Cities	Population Size			
		< 10,000	10,000 - 49,999	50,000 - 99,999	> 100,000
Very likely	1%	0%	1%	0%	2%
Likely	8	11	7	7	5
Unlikely	46	40	47	59	33
Very unlikely	28	32	28	24	31
Don't know	17	17	18	9	29

Federal Aid and Assistance

Given the fiscal stress cities are experiencing and a perceived lack of public support for raising taxes and fees, cities are turning to the federal government for aid and assistance. Four in 10 city officials report that their cities have received financial assistance from the federal government for homeland security efforts. Larger cities with populations over 100,000 (58%) and between 50,000 and 99,999 (54%) are more likely to have received funding than cities with populations between 10,000 and 49,999 (34%) and under 10,000 (14%).

Two in three city officials (68%) report that their cities have applied for, or are in the process of applying for, federal funding, with larger cities (93% of those over 100,000 in population and 80%of those between 50,000 and 99,999) again more likely to say they have applied or are applying. A majority of city officials (54%) expect to receive federal funding. However, only 31 percent of cities under 10,000 in population are anticipating funding compared to 77 percent of cities over 100,000 in population.

What are the highest priorities for fiscal and other types of federal assistance? City officials place the highest priority on training emergency response personnel (74%), purchasing emergency equipment (72%), and personnel support for overtime (51%) and salaries (43%). Cities with populations under 10,000 are less likely to list overtime as a high priority (34%) than are cities with populations between 10,000 and 49,999 (57%), between 50,000 and 99,999 (60%), and over 100,000 (69%). The smaller cities are, however, more likely to place a high priority on permanent salary needs (53%) compared to cities over 100,000 in population (42%).

	All Cities	Population Size			
		< 10,000	10,000 - 49,999	50,000 - 99,999	> 100,000
"Received financial assistance from the federal government"	39%	14%	34%	54%	58%
"Applied/applying for federal funding"	68	49	62	80	93
"Anticipate receiving federal funding"	54	31	51	67	77

"If the federal government were to provide your city with a grant or other funding for homeland security activities, in what three areas does your city government have the greatest need?"

	All Cities	Population Size			
		< 10,000	10,000 - 49,999	50,000 - 99,999	> 100,000
Training	74%	76%	77%	71%	71%
Equipment	72	70	70	76	78
Overtime	51	34	57	60	69
Permanent salaries	43	53	43	29	42
Supplies	30	30	33	33	22
Benefits	9	9	10	4	9
Temporary help	6	6	6	7	2
Travel	3	2	5	2	0

Intergovernmental Coordination

While adequate federal and state funding support for local homeland security efforts remains in question, city officials nevertheless report increased coordination among levels of government in dealing with homeland security needs. Results from the 2002 survey revealed that the terrorist attacks of September 11th seemed to have inspired a new respect in cities for the value of coordination across levels of government. That respect continues in 2003, with particular increases in coordination between cities and counties.

Most city officials report increased levels of coordination across all levels of government since September 11th. However, coordination has increased the most at the local level: 92 percent of city officials report increased coordination with counties and 82 percent report increased coordination between their cities and other city governments. Increased coordination with counties today is noteworthy, since it is particularly higher than the percentage reporting increased coordination in 2002 (77%). Seven in ten city officials also report that they have increased their coordination with the state government (72%), and with public health agencies (69%). Although coordination between city governments and the federal government increased the least, a majority of city officials (55%) nevertheless report an increase in cooperation.

Coordination across all levels of government tends to increase with city population size, most markedly with the state and federal government. Nine in ten city officials (88%) in cities over 100,000 in population report increased coordination with state government compared to 57 percent of city officials in cities under 10,000 in population. Similarly, 73 percent of city officials in larger cities with populations over 100,000 report increased coordination with the federal government compared to 40 percent for cities with populations under 10,000. Coordination among smaller cities with populations under 10,000 has increased the least (58%) compared to all other city sizes, perhaps reflecting greater distances between some of the small, rural cities in the state. Cities with populations between 50,000 and 99,999 were most likely to report increased coordination with public health agencies (87%).

"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	Population Size			
		< 10,000	10,000 - 49,999	50,000 - 99,999	> 100,000
Other cities	82%	58%	87%	88%	85%
Counties	92	89	90	94	95
State	72	57	71	81	88
Federal	55	40	48	68	73
Public health agencies	69	62	68	87	75

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. However, they give lower ratings to statewide coordination and collaboration.

Three in five city officials rate coordination efforts across levels of government in their region as high. Cities with populations over 100,000 are more likely to give high ratings to regional coordination (78%), compared to cities with populations under 10,000 (52%), cities between 10,000 and 49,999 (57%), and cities with populations between 50,000 and 99,999 (56%). Compared to 2002, cities over 100,000 in population were much more likely to give high or very high ratings to regional coordination (78% in 2003, compared to 51% in 2002).

Seventy-two percent of city officials rate coordination efforts across city departments and agencies in their cities as either high or very high. Smaller cities with populations under 10,000 (64%) were less likely to give high marks to within-city coordination efforts than cities with populations of between 10,000 and 49,999 (71%), cities with populations between 50,000 and 99,999 (74%), and cities with populations over 100,000 people (73%).

Overall ratings for statewide coordination are considerably lower than for local or regional coordination. Fewer than one in three city officials rates statewide coordination across levels of government, agencies, and other organizations as high. Larger cities are more likely than smaller cities to give high marks to statewide coordination.

	All Cities	Population Size			
		< 10,000	10,000 - 49,999	50,000 - 99,999	> 100,000
How would you rate the extent of collaboration and coordination across levels of government, agencies, and other organizations in your region?					
Low	3%	4%	4%	4%	0%
Moderate	35	38	36	39	23
High	60	52	57	56	78
Don't know	2	6	2	0	0
How would you rate the extent of coordination and collaboration among city departments and agencies in your city?					
Low	5%	8%	6%	2%	3%
Moderate	22	21	24	25	23
High	72	64	71	74	73
Don't know	1	6	0	0	3
How would you rate the extent of collaboration and coordination across levels of government, agencies, and other organizations statewide?					
Low	17%	26%	16%	15%	7%
Moderate	48	37	54	43	49
High	31	26	26	37	39
Don't know	4	3	4	5	5

U.S. Homeland Security

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? At the second anniversary of the September 11th terrorist attacks, Californians are about as confident as they were a year ago that U.S. intelligence and law enforcement agencies will be able to prevent future terrorist attacks. Today, 58 percent of state residents say they are very (14%) or somewhat (44%) confident on this score, while another 40 percent say they are not too confident (28%) or not at all confident (12%). In the August 2002 survey, taken two months before the president signed a bill creating the Homeland Security Department, the percentages were almost the same. Republicans (74%) are more likely than Democrats (47%) or independents (60%), and Latinos (60%) are about as likely as whites (57%), to say they are very or somewhat confident that U.S. agencies will prevent future attacks.

"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?"

	All Adults	Party Registration			Latinos
		Dem	Rep	Ind	
Very confident	14%	7%	21%	13%	16%
Somewhat confident	44	40	53	47	44
Not too confident	28	33	19	27	27
Not at all confident	12	19	6	11	12
Don't know	2	1	1	2	1

Many Californians continue to be concerned about how antiterrorism measures may affect civil liberties. Asked whether they are more concerned that the government will fail to enact strong antiterrorism laws or that the government will enact new antiterrorism laws that excessively restrict the average person's civil liberties, 54 percent say they are more concerned about the effect on civil liberties. Thirty-four percent say they are more concerned that the government will fail to enact strong antiterrorism laws. In August 2002, 51 percent were concerned about civil liberties. Concern about civil liberties is higher among San Francisco Bay Area (64%) and Los Angeles (55%) residents than among residents of the Central Valley (46%) or Other Southern California (49%). Majorities of Democrats (61%) and independents (57%) express concern about laws restricting civil liberties, while 47 percent of Republicans are concerned that the government will fail to enact tough antiterrorism laws. Liberals (65%) and moderates (54%) are more concerned with civil liberties, while conservatives are split on this issue (42% to 44%).

"In general, which concerns you more right now …"

	All Adults	Party Registration			Latinos
		Dem	Rep	Ind	
Laws will excessively restrict the average person's civil liberties	54%	61%	40%	57%	55%
Government will fail to enact strong antiterrorism laws	34	28	47	32	32
Don't know	12	11	13	11	13

U.S Security and Involvement in Iraq

Californians are divided over the value of U.S. involvement in Iraq. Forty-seven percent of Californians say the war in Iraq is worth the toll it has taken in American lives and other kinds of costs, while 46 percent say it is not worth these costs. These views are similar to those of the nation as a whole: Nationally, 49 percent say the Iraq war is worth the costs and 45 percent say it is not (based on a July *Time*/CNN poll). Once again, the partisan differences in California are highly significant: 74 percent of Republicans and 49 percent of independents believe the war is worth the costs, while 61 percent of Democrats say it is not. Moderates are split on this issue (45% worth it; 47% not worth it), while a majority of conservatives (65%) say it is worth the costs and a majority of liberals say it is not (64%). Residents with household incomes of $40,000 or less are more likely than residents in households with higher incomes to say it is not worth the costs. Men are more likely than women (50% to 44%), and whites are more likely than Latinos (53% to 41%), to say the war is worth the costs.

"In your view, is the war against Iraq worth the toll it has taken in American lives and other kinds of costs, or isn't the war worth these costs?"

	All Adults	Party Registration			Latinos
		Dem	Rep	Ind	
Worth the costs	47%	33%	74%	49%	41%
Not worth the costs	46	61	20	44	53
Don't know	7	6	6	7	6

Thinking about the future effects of the war against Iraq, six in 10 Californians (59%) say the war contributed a great deal (31%) or some (28%) to the long-term security of the United States, while 34 percent say it did not. Nationally, the numbers are almost exactly the same, with 33 percent saying it contributed a great deal, 29 percent saying it contributed some, and 35 percent saying it did not contribute to the long-term security of the United States (based on a July *Washington Post*/ABC News poll).

Although majorities of California residents across political parties think the war did contribute to long-term security, Democrats (46%) are more likely than Republicans (21%) and independents (30%) to say it did not. Once again, the San Francisco Bay Area is the region with the highest percentage of residents (46%) who say the war in Iraq did not contribute to long-term security. Whites are more likely than Latinos to say the war did not improve the nation's security outlook (36% to 30%). Seventy-four percent of those residents who think the war did not contribute to the long-term security of the country also say the war was not worth all the costs.

"Do you think the war with Iraq did or did not contribute to the long-term security of the United States?
***If response is "it did"*: "Is that a great deal or some?"**

	All Adults	Party Registration			Latinos
		Dem	Rep	Ind	
Contributed a great deal	31%	22%	45%	36%	36%
Contributed some	28	26	28	28	30
Did not contribute	34	46	21	30	30
Don't know	7	6	6	6	4

Approval Ratings: President Bush

Fifty-three percent of Californians say they approve of the way that George W. Bush is handling his job as president of the United States. This rating is similar to the 55 percent national approval rating found in a recent CBS News poll. The president's California rating has not changed in recent months. However, it is lower than a year ago: In the August 2002 survey, 64 percent of Californians said they approved of his job performance. California Republicans overwhelmingly support the president (84%), and a majority of independents (54%) give him a positive job rating. However, nearly two-thirds of the state's Democrats (63%) disapprove of his performance. Latinos (53%) are about as likely as whites (57%) to be satisfied with the president's performance.

California residents are almost evenly divided over Bush's handling of the situation in Iraq: Fifty percent say they approve and 45 percent say they disapprove. This approval rating is 7 points lower than the 57 percent of Americans who said they approved of his position in a recent CBS News poll. In California, Republicans give the president a much higher approval rating than Democrats on his handling of the situation (79% to 33%). However, Republicans give the president lower marks for this than for his overall job performance. Men are more likely than women (55% to 46%) to say they approve of the president's actions in Iraq.

State residents give the president his highest marks for handling terrorism and homeland security: Sixty-two percent say they approve of the president's efforts in this area. However, this is lower than the 70 percent who approved in the August 2002 survey. Forty-four percent of Democrats, 63 percent of independents, and 87 percent of Republicans approve of Bush's performance in this area. In every region but one, a majority of residents say they approve of Bush's handling of this issue: In the San Francisco Bay Area, a majority (51%) disapprove.

"Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that George W. Bush is handling …"

		All Adults	Party Registration			Latinos
			Dem	Rep	Ind	
… his job as president of the United States?	Approve	53%	32%	84%	54%	53%
	Disapprove	42	63	14	39	40
	Don't know	5	5	2	7	7
… the situation in Iraq?	Approve	50%	33%	79%	52%	46%
	Disapprove	45	63	18	44	48
	Don't know	5	4	3	4	6
… terrorism and homeland security?	Approve	62%	44%	87%	63%	62%
	Disapprove	33	51	10	31	30
	Don't know	5	5	3	6	8

State Homeland Security

Six in ten state residents (61%) see terrorism and security in California as a big problem (22%) or somewhat of a problem (39%). These findings are similar to those in the August 2002 survey, when 64 percent saw terrorism and security as at least somewhat of a state problem. However, the concern today is significantly lower than the 73 percent expressed in the December 2001 survey. Across the state, Los Angeles residents (25%) express more concern than residents of other regions, while San Francisco Bay Area residents are the most likely to say terrorism and security do not present much of a problem (41%). These results are also similar to those of a year ago.

Latinos are more likely than whites to see this issue as a big problem in California (29% to 18%). While majorities across party lines say terrorism and security represent at least somewhat of a problem, independents are most likely to say it is not much of a problem (39%). Californians with only a high school education or less are more likely than those with a college degree to see it as a big problem in the state today (29% to 17%).

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

	All Adults	Region				Latinos
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Big problem	22%	22%	16%	25%	22%	29%
Somewhat of a problem	39	38	39	39	42	37
Not much of a problem	36	35	41	33	34	31
Don't know	3	5	4	3	2	3

Four in ten Californians (41%) say they are very (14%) or somewhat (27%) worried that they or someone in their family will be a victim of a terrorist attack, while 59 percent say they are not too worried (34%) or not at all worried (25%). State residents gave similar responses in the August 2002 survey and in the December 2001 survey. Latinos are much more concerned about becoming a victim of terrorist attack than whites (60% to 30%). Men are more likely than women to say they are not at all concerned (30% to 20%). Younger, less educated, and lower-income residents are more worried than older, more-educated, and more-affluent residents that they or someone in their family will become a victim of terrorism.

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

	All Adults	Region				Latinos
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Very worried	14%	13%	10%	18%	13%	30%
Somewhat worried	27	25	25	29	26	30
Not too worried	34	32	37	31	34	25
Not at all worried	25	30	26	21	26	15
Don't know	0	0	2	1	1	0

Local Agencies and Homeland Security

Faced with frequent alerts about possible terrorist attacks and heightened national security, Californians have a lot of confidence that their local public agencies are prepared to respond: Seventy-one percent say they have some or a great deal of confidence in their local public health agencies, 77 percent in their local police department, and 90 percent in their fire department. The level of Californians' confidence in these agencies is similar to that in the August 2002 survey.

Compared to residents of other regions in the state, Los Angeles and Other Southern California residents are the most likely to say they have a great deal of confidence in their local government agencies.

"How much confidence do you have in …"

			Region				
		All Adults	Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	Latinos
… your local fire department in terms of its readiness to respond to the threat of new terrorist attacks?	**A great deal**	50%	50%	40%	52%	55%	50%
	Some	40	41	47	38	34	39
	Very little/ None	8	8	10	8	9	10
	Don't know	2	1	3	2	2	1
… your local police department in terms of providing security in response to the threat of terrorist attacks?	**A great deal**	30%	29%	24%	30%	35%	36%
	Some	47	48	51	47	43	40
	Very little/ None	20	20	22	20	19	23
	Don't know	3	3	3	3	3	1
… your local public health agencies in terms of their readiness to respond to the threat of new terrorist attacks?	**A great deal**	22%	24%	18%	22%	24%	25%
	Some	49	48	53	50	47	45
	Very little/ None	24	23	24	25	24	28
	Don't know	5	5	5	3	5	2

City Governments and Homeland Security

While many state residents have a great deal of confidence in their local fire, police, and public health agencies, fewer have a similarly high level of trust in their city governments. Almost half of Californians (48%) think their city governments are reasonably prepared to respond to the threat of a terrorist attack: Fourteen percent give an "excellent" rating and 34 percent give a "good" rating to their city governments. However, four in ten say their cities are not that well prepared (33 percent give a "fair" rating and 8 percent give a "poor" rating). City government ratings are lower in the San Francisco Bay area than in the other major regions of the state. Latinos and whites give similarly positive evaluations of their perceptions of city government's level of preparation for terrorist attacks. Republicans (54%) are more likely than Democrats (48%) or independent voters (46%) to give excellent or good ratings. Californians gave their city governments similar ratings a year ago on this dimension.

"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%	16%	16%
Good	34	37	34	35	33	30
Fair	33	29	34	34	33	37
Poor	8	8	9	9	7	11
Don't know, not in a city	11	10	13	7	11	6

Willingness to Increase Local Taxes

In the context of the state government's budget deficit, 51 percent of Californians, and 51 percent of likely voters, would be willing to pay a higher local sales tax to increase local government funding for police, fire, and public health agencies as part of an effort to increase terrorism readiness, while 45 percent would oppose the tax hike. A year ago, Californians expressed similar levels of support for such a tax increase.

Today, Central Valley (57%) and Other Southern California (53%) residents are the most likely to support the tax increase, while 51 percent of residents in the San Francisco Bay area are opposed. There are no significant differences between Latinos and whites on support for a local tax increase. Across parties, Democrats (55%) are the most likely to favor a higher sales tax for this purpose, followed by Republicans (51%) and independents (47%).

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: 6 percent of city officials think that public support for new taxes is likely, while 78 percent believe it is unlikely.

"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	51%	57%	46%	51%	53%	51%
Oppose	45	40	51	46	41	44
Don't know	4	3	3	3	6	5

Appendix A

Survey Methodology: City Officials

The results of the city officials survey are from the *Homeland Security Survey* conducted by the League of California Cities, with the assistance of the National League of Cities. The 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. Survey efforts were overseen by Chris Hoene, research manager at the National League of Cities, and Frances Medema at the League of California Cities. The findings in this report are based on a direct mail and fax survey sent in July and August 2003 to city officials in all 478 cities in California. The survey 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. In many instances, the survey was completed by emergency services directors at the request of the city managers. The survey builds upon a similar survey effort conducted in July and August 2002, with many questions asked in both the 2002 and 2003 surveys. Questionnaires were returned to the National League of Cities 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 294, for a response rate of 62 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.

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 overrepresentation of cities of 100,000 or more and a slight underrepresentation of cities of 10,000 or less.

City Population	% of 478 Cities Statewide	% of 294 Survey Responses
<10,000	26	19
10,000 - 49,999	44	46
50,000 - 99,999	18	20
>100,000	12	16

LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES
CALIFORNIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES
Homeland Security Survey

[Note: Responses from 294 city officials in July and August 2002]

The objective of this survey is to gauge the perceptions of California city officials, and the costs of city and county activities, with respect to Homeland Security. The Director of Homeland Security in the Governor's Office has asked for our help in estimating these costs to help make the case for more federal support for the State of California and local governments. Without your help, we cannot present a complete picture.

1. Name_____ 2. Title_____

3. Name of your city or county _____

4. Phone number: (_____) _____ 5. E-mail:_____

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL CONDITIONS

6. Overall, would you say that the local economy of your city/county…*(circle one in each row)*

	Weaker	Stronger
a. is **weaker** or **stronger** this fiscal year than last fiscal year?	77%	23%
b. will be **weaker** or **stronger** in the next fiscal year compared to this fiscal year?	64%	36%

7. Overall, would you say that your city/county government is better or less able to… *(circle one in each row)*

	Better Able	Less Able
a. meet **financial needs** this fiscal year than last fiscal year?	15%	85%
b. address its **financial needs** in the next fiscal year compared to this fiscal year?	16%	84%

8. What has been the impact of September 11 on city/county government **spending on public safety and security**? *(circle one)*

4% significantly increased 42% increased 51% little or no change 2% decreased 1% Don't know

9. Does your city/county government increase **public safety/security activities** when the U.S. Homeland Security Advisory System (the 5-color coded system developed by the Department of Homeland Security) is elevated, such as when it was raised from yellow to orange during the war in Iraq?

52% Yes 46% No 2% Don't know

10. What is the likelihood that your city's/county's residents would support additional local taxes and/or fees for Homeland Security? *(circle one in each row)*

	Very likely	Likely	Unlikely	Very unlikely	Don't know
a. Taxes	1%	5%	49%	29%	16%
b. Fees	1%	8%	46%	28%	17%

11. How much has your city/county government spent on homeland security-related activities in the following areas in FY2002 and FY2003? How much does your city anticipate spending (budgeted) on these activities in FY2004?

	FY2001-2002 (07/01/01 – 06/30/02)	**FY2002-2003** (07/01/02 – 06/30/03)	**FY2003-2004** (07/01/03 – 06/30/04)
a. Permanent Salaries	_____,000	_____,000	_____,000
b. Temporary Help	_____,000	_____,000	_____,000
c. Overtime	_____,000	_____,000	_____,000
d. Benefits	_____,000	_____,000	_____,000
e. Supplies	_____,000	_____,000	_____,000
f. Training	_____,000	_____,000	_____,000
g. Equipment	_____,000	_____,000	_____,000
h. Travel	_____,000	_____,000	_____,000

12. If the federal government were to provide your city/county with a **grant or other funding for homeland security activities**, in what **three areas** does your city/county government have the greatest need?

a.	Permanent salaries	43%
b.	Temporary help	6%
c.	Overtime	51%
d.	Benefits	9%
e.	Supplies	30%
f.	Training	74%
g.	Equipment	72%
h.	Travel	3%

13. Has your city/county government received **any financial assistance** from the federal government for Homeland Security-related activities? *(circle one)*

39% Yes 55% No *(SKIP TO Q14)* 6% Don't know *(SKIP TO Q14)*

a. If "yes," how much? _____,000

The federal government has recently approved additional funding for states and localities through a series of grants for **state homeland security, high-threat urban areas, state critical infrastructure, communications interoperability,** and **other activities.**

14. Has or will your city/county government **apply for federal funding** under any of these programs? *(circle one)*

68% Yes 15% No 17% Don't know

15. Does your city/county government **anticipate receiving federal funding** as part of any of these programs? *(circle one)*

54% Yes 21% No 25% Don't know

16. Since the start of FY2002, has your city/county had to **lay off public safety personnel,** or will your city/county have to do so in this fiscal year? *(circle one)*

17% Yes 72% No 11% Don't know

HOMELAND SECURITY AND OTHER LOCAL CONCERNS

17. As a city/county official, how **concerned** are you about the following possibilities over the next year **in your city/county** (very concerned, moderately concerned, mildly concerned, or not very concerned)? *(circle one)*

	Very	Moderately	Mildly	Not Very
a. Car or truck bomb	8%	24%	28%	40%
b. Biohazard/biological	8	31	36	25
c. Chemical	10	28	35	27
d. Nuclear	4	9	21	66
e. Radiological (dirty bomb)	5	17	34	44
f. Cyber-terrorism	13	28	31	28
g. Individual/suicide bomb	7	16	30	47
h. Airplane used as bomb	4	14	28	54

18. Of the issues listed below, **which three are most important** to address in your city/county? *(check three)*

		Currently	2 years
a.	Investing in terrorism prevention, preparedness, and training	27%	22%
b.	Investing in general public safety and crime prevention	69	52
c.	Improving the capacity of the public health system to respond to emergencies	15	16
d.	Improving economic conditions	59	50
e.	Increasing the availability of affordable housing	13	17
f.	Revitalizing and redeveloping neighborhoods	15	13
g.	Supporting local and regional development strategies	16	20
h.	Investing in infrastructure (roads/transit, water, sewer)	45	38
i.	Investing in public education, other supports for children, youth, and families	13	14
j.	Protecting natural resources and local environmental quality	8	10
k.	Relationship with state and federal government	9	3
m.	Other *(please list)*_____		

HOMELAND SECURITY PLANNING

19. Has your city/county government integrated the national **Homeland Security Advisory System** (the color coded system developed by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security) into its planning efforts? *(circle one)*

48% Yes 26% No 21% We are working on it 5% Don't Know

20. What types of **threats or emergencies** are addressed in your city/county government's planning efforts? *(check all that apply)*

a.	Car or truck bomb	49%
b.	Biohazard/biological	67
c.	Chemical	66
d.	Nuclear	43
e.	Radiological (dirty bomb)	46
f.	Cyber-terrorism	30
g.	Individual/suicide bomb	37
h.	Airplane crash	53
i.	Other *(please list)*_____	

21. Does your city/county government have a formal **plan for informing the public** and disseminating information in future emergencies? *(circle one)*

63% Yes 11% No 23% A strategy is being developed 3% Don't know

22. Has your city/county government **shifted resources from other departments** or areas of city/county government to cover increasing Homeland Security-related needs and costs? *(circle one)*

15% Yes 80% No 5% Don't Know

23. Has your city/county government shifted **resources from/within other public safety departments** (police, fire, EMS) to cover increasing Homeland Security-related needs and costs? *(circle one)*

23% Yes 71% No 6% Don't Know

COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION

24. How would you rate the extent of coordination and collaboration across levels of government, agencies, and other organizations **statewide**? *(circle one)*

17% Low 48% Moderate 24% High 7% Very High 4% Don't know

25. How would you rate the extent of coordination and collaboration across levels of government, agencies, and other organizations **in your region**? *(circle one)*

3% Low 35% Moderate 37% High 23% Very High 2% Don't know

26. How would you rate the extent of coordination and collaboration among departments and agencies **in your city/county government**? *(circle one)*

5% Low 22% Moderate 39% High 33% Very High 1% Don't know

27. Since September 11, how much has your city/county government increased its coordination with the following? *(circle one per row)*

	A great deal	A good amount	A fair amount	Not at all	Don't know	N/A
a. City governments	15%	30%	37%	13%	2%	3%
b. County governments	15	37	40	5	3	0
c. State government	5	20	47	23	4	1
d. Federal government	5	13	37	37	7	1
e. Public health agencies	4	26	39	21	8	2

28. Has your city/county taken action on the Patriot Act? *(circle one)*

3% Action to affirm/support 6% Action to denounce 72% No Action 19% Don't Know

All information will be shared with state and federal agencies involved with homeland security unless anonymity is requested, and will otherwise be kept confidential. **29. Keep my city/county information anonymous** 35%

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION!!!

The National League of Cities is providing research support to this survey. Please return the survey using the stamped, pre-addressed envelope or mail to Chris Hoene, Research Manager, National League of Cities, 1301 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20004.

Appendix B

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 Renatta DeFever and Eliana Kaimowitz, survey research associates.

The findings in this report are based on a telephone survey of 2,001 California adult residents interviewed between August 8 and August 17, 2003. 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 2,001 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 1,540 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*, *Time*/CNN, *Washington Post*/ABC News, CBS News, and CNN/*USA Today*/Gallup. We used earlier PPIC Statewide Surveys to analyze trends over time in California.

PPIC STATEWIDE SURVEY
AUGUST 8—AUGUST 17, 2003
2,001 CALIFORNIA ADULT RESIDENTS; ENGLISH AND SPANISH
MARGIN OF ERROR +/- 2% AT 95% CONFIDENCE LEVEL FOR TOTAL SAMPLE

[***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]***

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

    53% approve
    42 disapprove
    5 don't know

[rotate questions 27 and 28]

27. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that George W. Bush is handling the situation in Iraq?

    50% approve
    45 disapprove
    5 don't know

28. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that George W. Bush is handling terrorism and homeland security issues?

    62% approve
    33 disapprove
    5 don't know

29. How well do you think U.S. efforts to establish security and rebuild Iraq have gone since major combat ended on May 1st—very well, somewhat well, not too well, or not at all well?

    13% very well
    38 somewhat well
    27 not too well
    19 not at all well
    3 don't know

30. In your view, is the war against Iraq worth the toll it has taken in American lives and other kinds of costs, or isn't the war worth these costs?

    47% worth it
    46 not worth it
    7 don't know

31. Before the war began, do you think that the Bush Administration did or did not intentionally exaggerate its evidence that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction such as biological or chemical weapons?

    53% did exaggerate
    40 did not exaggerate
    7 don't know

32. Do you think the war with Iraq did or did not contribute to the long-term security of the United States? (*if response is "it did"*: Is that a great deal or some?)

    31% contributed a great deal
    28 contributed some
    34 did not contribute
    7 don't know

33. On another topic, 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?

    14% very confident
    44 somewhat confident
    28 not too confident
    12 not at all confident
    2 don't know

34. In general, which concerns you more right now—that the government will fail to enact strong antiterrorism laws or that the government will enact new anti-terrorism laws that excessively restrict the average person's civil liberties?

    54% laws will excessively restrict the average person's civil liberties
    34 government will fail to enact strong antiterrorism laws
    12 don't know

35. 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?

22%	big problem
39	somewhat of a problem
36	not much of a problem
3	don't know

36. 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?

14%	very worried
27	somewhat worried
34	not too worried
25	not at all worried

37. 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
34	good
33	fair
8	poor
3	don't live in a city *(volunteered)*
8	don't know

[rotate questions 38 to 40]

38. 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
47	some
15	very little
5	none
3	don't know

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

50%	a great deal
40	some
6	very little
2	none
2	don't know

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

22%	a great deal
49	some
19	very little
5	none
5	don't know

41. 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?

51%	favor
45	oppose
4	don't know

PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA

Board of Directors

Raymond L. Watson, *Chairman*
Vice Chairman of the Board
The Irvine Company

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
Los Angeles City Attorney's Office

Arjay Miller
Dean Emeritus
Graduate School of Business
Stanford University

Ki Suh Park
Design and Managing Partner
Gruen Associates

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

Advisory Council

Mary C. Daly
Research Advisor
Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco

Clifford W. Graves
General Manager
Department of Community Development
City of Los Angeles

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
Office of the President

Daniel A. Mazmanian
C. Erwin and Ione Piper Dean and Professor
School of Policy, Planning, and Development
University of Southern California

Dean Misczynski
Director
California Research Bureau

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
The 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