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The PPIC Statewide Survey series provides policymakers, the media, and the general public with objective, advocacy-free information on the perceptions, opinions, and public policy preferences of California residents. Inaugurated in April 1998, the survey series has generated a database that includes the responses of more than 130,000 Californians. The current survey is the sixth in a series of special surveys on the California State Budget, begun in June 2003 and conducted in collaboration with The James Irvine Foundation.

At the same time that the state government faces the immediate challenge of addressing a persistent budget gap between state spending and state revenue, California is planning for a future that includes significant population growth. To cope with long-term issues involved in balancing the state budget and providing resources to expand and improve the state’s public schools, roads, water systems, and other infrastructure, structural reforms of the state and local finance system have been considered. Public opinion surveys offer the state’s lawmakers an opportunity to examine Californians’ views on various fiscal plans and on specific proposals for spending and taxes. Over the years, California voters have made significant fiscal decisions for the state at the ballot box. In 2006, the state’s voters will again have an important impact on the state and local fiscal system, since they will decide on state bond measures and tax and spending initiatives.

This survey series seeks to raise public awareness, inform decisionmakers, and stimulate public discussion about the current state budget and the underlying state and local finance system. This report presents the responses of 2,003 adult residents throughout the state on a wide range of issues:

- California state budget issues, including perceptions of the severity of the state budget situation and fiscal trends in the past two years, priorities for state spending, support for tax increases and for specific initiatives to earmark revenue increases for health and education, fiscal policy preferences, attitudes toward the governor’s State of the State address and related policy proposals, and overall satisfaction with the governor’s budget plan and related fiscal proposals.

- State issues, including perceptions of the most important problem in California, the general direction of the state, the outlook for the state’s economy, overall approval ratings of Governor Schwarzenegger and the state legislature, and approval ratings for the governor on specific issues. In addition, this survey examines attitudes toward infrastructure, including spending priorities, support for proposed state bonds, and preferred funding approaches.

- National issues, including overall approval ratings for President Bush and for his handling of terrorism and homeland security, the situation in Iraq, U.S. immigration policy and border patrols. Also included are attitudes toward the poor and poverty programs, and public concerns about avian (or bird) flu.

- The extent to which Californians may differ with regard to attitudes toward spending and taxes by party affiliation, demographics, race/ethnicity, and region of residence.

This is the 63rd PPIC Statewide Survey, which has included a number of special editions on the Central Valley (11/99, 3/01, 4/02, 4/03, 4/04), Los Angeles County (3/03, 3/04, 3/05), Orange County (9/01, 12/02, 12/03, 12/04), San Diego County (7/02), population (5/01, 12/05), land use (11/01, 11/02), housing (11/04), the environment (6/00, 6/02, 7/03, 11/03, 7/04, 7/05), the California state budget (6/03, 1/04, 5/04, 1/05, 5/05), California’s future (8/04), and California’s initiative process (08/05, 09/05, 10/05, 11/05).

Copies of this report may be ordered by e-mail (order@ppic.org) or phone (415-291-4400). Copies of this and earlier reports are posted on the publications page of the PPIC web site (www.ppic.org). For questions about the survey, please contact survey@ppic.org.
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SPECIAL SURVEY ON THE CALIFORNIA STATE BUDGET

DESPITE HIGH MARKS FOR BUDGET, INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN, CALIFORNIANS ARE COOL TOWARD GOVERNOR’S LEADERSHIP

Pessimism About State Finances, Lack of Confidence in Government Lingers

SAN FRANCISCO, California, January 26, 2006 — Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger’s approval ratings have turned upward following the release of his 2006-07 budget – and there is widespread support for his ambitious proposal to rebuild the state’s deteriorating infrastructure, according to a new survey released today by the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) with funding from The James Irvine Foundation. Still, Californians make it clear that their confidence in Schwarzenegger’s leadership is far from restored.

A positive sign for the governor is that a solid majority (60%) of residents say they are satisfied with the budget plan he released on January 10th. This is a much more favorable response than last year, when only 38 percent were satisfied and over half (55%) were dissatisfied. Even better for the governor, support for this year’s plan cuts across party lines, with majorities of Republicans (72%), independents (62%), and Democrats (51%) voicing approval.

But there’s a twist. Although Californians support the governor’s budget proposal, only 18 percent prefer his approach when it comes to making tough choices about the budget; 39 percent prefer the Democrats’ approach, and 23 percent prefer the Republicans’. Even among Republicans, a majority (53%) prefer that Republican lawmakers make the decisions rather than the governor (29%), and Democrats, not surprisingly, heavily favor Democratic lawmakers (70%) over the governor (10%).

“This is a striking example of just how cynical Californians have become toward government leadership – when they simultaneously like what a leader is saying but doubt that he can carry it out,” says PPIC statewide survey director Mark Baldassare. “These past few years of budget and political crises have fatigued voters and worn down their faith in elected officials.”

Policy Bull’s-Eye? Infrastructure Plan, Minimum Wage Hike Hit the Mark

A large majority (68%) of residents also support the central proposal of the governor’s State of the State address – spending $222 billion over 10 years to rebuild the state’s infrastructure without raising taxes. And this proposal has even greater bipartisan support than his budget plan (Republicans 72%, independents 71%, Democrats 64%). A second proposal presented in the address – to increase the state minimum wage from $6.75 to $7.75 by July 2007 – is also overwhelmingly embraced by residents (81%) and by large majorities across political parties (Democrats 91%, independents 81%, Republicans 66%).

How important are these successes and what do they mean politically? “The favorable response to the infrastructure plan, even at this stage, is an auspicious sign,” says Baldassare. “The question is whether the governor has, or will have, the political clout to see this grand ambition through.”

The Ratings Game: Governor’s Glass Is Half… Full?

Is the governor beginning to reconnect with residents and voters? Upticks in his job approval rating suggest he may be: Among all Californians, his overall rating climbed 7 points from October (33% to 40%), and his overall disapproval rating declined (58% to 52%). Among likely voters, approval also
jumped by 7 points (38% to 45%) and disapproval dropped (57% to 48%). Not surprisingly, strong partisan divisions surface, with far fewer Democrats (20%) than Republicans (72%) or independents (40%) feeling favorable toward the governor.

The improvement in his rating is modest, however, considering that the governor’s overall approval stood at 60 percent one year ago. Perhaps even more important, when asked how he is doing on specific issues, residents give him low marks. In fact, the only issue for which he receives a rating equal to or higher than his overall rating is crime and punishment (54% approval). His approval ratings on K-12 education (30%), state budget and taxes (35%), transportation and traffic congestion (38%), and jobs and the economy (39%) are lower.

However, although the governor’s overall approval rating is much lower today than it was earlier in his term, he still does better than the legislature: Only 29 percent of all Californians and 25 percent of likely voters approve of the job the legislature is doing. Moreover, nearly half (48%) of state residents do not believe the governor and legislature will be able to work together and accomplish a lot in the coming year (43% say they will).

Once Bitten, Twice Shy: Unexpected Revenue Surplus Leaves Residents Cold

Despite a slightly better view of the governor, Californians general outlook has soured. Today, 56 percent of residents say the state is going in the wrong direction, compared to 41 percent a year ago. A striking example of residents’ pessimism? The state’s recent revenue windfall has created the rosier budget picture since 2001, yet has only mildly lightened Californians’ budgetary angst: 61 percent still say the budget situation is a big problem, compared to 70 percent one year ago. Perhaps even more telling, nearly three-fourths (72%) do not believe the budget situation has improved at all in the past two years, despite the recent revenue surge.

Infrastructure Spending Priorities Clear; Strong Early Showing for Bond Measures

Skepticism about the benefit of the state’s revenue surplus aside, Californians often have different ideas about how the additional funding should be spent. Of the five types of public works programs outlined in Governor Schwarzenegger’s infrastructure plan, more residents believe education facilities (48%) should be the top priority over transportation projects (25%), water systems (17%), jails and prisons (3%), or courts (2%). These views are consistent with general spending priorities: Majorities of Californians think the state should spend more on K-12 education (71%) and roads and infrastructure (58%), while about one-quarter (24%) want more spent on corrections and prisons.

When it comes to transportation – a major component of the governor’s plan – there is no consensus about the most important type of project: 38 percent of residents say freeways and highways, 29 percent say transit systems, and 24 percent say local streets and roads. Many of the differences are regional. For example, residents of the San Francisco Bay Area (33%) are less likely than residents in the Central Valley (41%) or Southern California (47%) to rate freeways as the top priority.

Nevertheless, two infrastructure bonds proposed for next November’s statewide ballot are enjoying widespread support. Fifty-seven percent of likely voters support the governor’s $25 billion bond proposal to pay for school facilities and other infrastructure projects without new taxes. Even more (68%) support a $10 billion bond by Senate Pro Tem Don Perata, also for infrastructure projects and including no new taxes. With surplus revenues available, and bond proposals doing well, Californians have choices about how they’d like the state to pay for large-scale infrastructure projects – but there is no consensus about which method is best: Likely voters are divided between using surplus funds only (29%), issuing state bonds (23%), increasing user fees (20%), and increasing taxes (15%).

Tax Cigarettes… and the Rich

While most tax increases remain unpopular with residents, Californians favor raising cigarette taxes (71%) and taxes on high-income individuals (65%). Predictably, two citizen’s initiatives that seek to raise these taxes and are headed for 2006 ballots, are enjoying strong early support. One would raise
taxes on personal income above $400,000 annually to pay for universal preschool and is supported by 63 percent of likely voters. The other would increase taxes on a single pack of cigarettes by $2.60 to pay for children’s health insurance and other health programs and is supported by 64 percent of likely voters. “It’s never been very difficult to increase taxes for certain groups, such as smokers,” says Baldassare. “But sources of revenue based on small segments of the population will inevitably dry up. The difficult question is how to pay for the state’s growing population and infrastructure needs using sustainable, fiscally sound methods.”

More Key Findings

- **Bush and Iraq score low** (pages 13 and 14)
  Large majorities (65%) of Californians disapprove of President Bush’s handling of the situation in Iraq. Further, most say the effort is not going well (62%) and that it was not worth it to go to war (62%).

- **Immigration Policy: Leave border patrolling to government** (page 16)
  Far more residents want law enforcement, rather than citizen volunteers, to patrol U.S. borders (64% to 32%). Among Latinos, numbers are overwhelmingly in favor of law enforcement (84% to 12%).

- **Poverty paradox** (page 17)
  While majorities of Californians say poverty is a big problem (57%), and that it is government’s responsibility to take care of people who can’t take care of themselves (68%), only 39 percent believe the nation spends too little on assisting the poor. A majority (55%) say we spend the right amount or too much.

- **Avian Flu: Confidence in Feds mixed; personal anxiety low** (page 18)
  Residents are divided about whether or not the federal government can handle an outbreak of the avian flu (47% can, 49% cannot). But most (72%) are not worried about the disease affecting them.

About the Survey

This survey on the California state budget – made possible by funding from The James Irvine Foundation – is a special edition of the PPIC Statewide Survey. This is the sixth survey in a series intended to raise public awareness, inform decisionmakers, and stimulate public discussions about issues related to the California state budget and underlying fiscal system. Findings of this survey are based on a telephone survey of 2,003 California adult residents interviewed between January 11th and January 18th, 2006. Interviews were conducted in English and Spanish. The sampling error for the total sample is +/- 2%. The sampling error for subgroups is larger. For more information on methodology, see page 19.

Mark Baldassare is research director at PPIC, where he holds the Arjay and Frances Fearing Miller Chair in Public Policy. He is founder of the PPIC Statewide Survey, which he has directed since 1998. His recent book, *A California State of Mind: The Conflicted Voter in a Changing World*, is available at www.ppic.org.

PPIC is a private, nonprofit organization dedicated to improving public policy through objective, nonpartisan research on the economic, social, and political issues that affect Californians. The institute was established in 1994 with an endowment from William R. Hewlett. 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. This report will appear on PPIC’s website (www.ppic.org) on January 26. ###
Fiscal Perceptions

Many Californians are still expressing concern about the state’s budget situation even though the state has surplus funds this year due to an unexpected increase in tax revenues. After Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger released his fiscal 2006-2007 budget plan on January 10th, six in 10 adult residents, and 68 percent of likely voters say the gap between spending and revenues is a big problem for California. A somewhat higher proportion of adults, 70%, saw the state’s budget situation as a big problem in January 2004 and in January 2005, when the state faced a multi-billion dollar gap between spending and revenues.

Public concern about the state’s budget gap between spending and revenues is high across all regions of the state today. Democrats (65%), independents (63%) and Republicans (63%) hold similar perceptions, as do those who approve (60%) and disapprove (63%) of the governor’s job performance. Whites (66%) are more likely than Latinos (52%) to think the budget situation is a big problem, and concerns about the state’s fiscal situation increase with age, education, and income.

“Do you think the state budget situation in California—that is, the balance between government spending and revenues—is a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem for the people of California today?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>SF Bay Area</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Other Southern California</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big problem</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat of a problem</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a problem</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As further evidence of public concern about the state’s fiscal health, the majority of Californians say there has been no improvement in the state’s budget situation in the past two years. One in five adults says the state budget situation has improved, while seven in 10 say the situation is the same (39%) or worse (33%). Likely voters hold similar views. Residents in Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay Area are less likely than others to see improvement in state budget trends. Currently, 36 percent of Republicans say the budget has improved, compared to 14 percent of Democrats and 22 percent of independents. Those who approve of Schwarzenegger’s job performance (39%) are far more inclined to see improvement since 2004 than those who disapprove of his performance in office (9%).

“In the past two years, do you think the state budget situation has improved, gotten worse, or stayed the same?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotten worse</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spending Priorities

We also asked respondents if they think the state government should spend more money, less money, or the same amount of money on the four major categories of the state budget, as well as on roads and infrastructure, an issue that has been a focus of recent discussions by the governor and legislature.

Where are Californians most willing to see the state spend more money, given their concerns about the state budget situation today? Seven in 10 adults, and 66 percent of likely voters, think that the state should spend more money for K-12 public schools. However, Democrats (83%) and independents (73%) are much more likely than Republicans (50%) to favor increased state spending for K-12 public schools.

There is majority support for more spending on health and human services (61% adults, 55% likely voters) and higher education (56% adults, 51% likely voters). For these two categories, Democrats and independents are more supportive of increased spending than are Republicans. The only area in which the majority of adults, and voters in both parties, prefer to have either less or the same spending is prisons.

About six in 10 Californians want the state government to spend more money on roads and infrastructure (58% adults, 59% likely voters). For this spending area, there is solid support among Democrats (60%), Republicans (60%) and independents (55%) and across geographic regions. When last asked about roads and infrastructure in February 2003, just 27 percent of adults preferred more spending.

“For each area, please tell me if you think that the state government should spend more money than it does now, the same amount as now, or less money than now…”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How about the K through 12 public education system?</th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More money</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same amount of money</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less money</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How about health and human services?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More money</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same amount of money</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less money</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How about roads and other infrastructure projects?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More money</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same amount of money</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less money</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How about public colleges and universities?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More money</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same amount of money</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less money</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How about the state’s corrections system, including prisons?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More money</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same amount of money</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less money</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tax Preferences

Californians have often shown support for specific state tax increases in our surveys, especially if they are earmarked for purposes that they value, while they typically reject the types of state tax increases that would affect everyone. In the current survey, Californians strongly support tax increases aimed at those in the top tax bracket, and they also favor raising taxes on cigarette purchases, as ways to help pay for state spending. We also found strong support for raising taxes on high-income Californians in our January 2004 and January 2005 surveys (71%, 69%) and taxes for both alcohol and cigarette sales also had solid support (76%, 74%). In the same earlier surveys, Californians strongly objected to raising the state sales tax and vehicle license fees as ways to reduce the state’s gap between spending and revenue.

Today, as in earlier surveys, there is solid support among adults and likely voters for higher taxes on high-income residents (65%, 66%) and cigarette purchases (71%, 70%). Solid majorities across racial/ethnic and socioeconomic categories, and regions, support raising these two types of state taxes. While solid majorities across voter groups favor increasing taxes on cigarette purchases, Republicans are much more likely than others to oppose increasing taxes on high-income residents.

“Tax and fee increases could be used to help pay for state spending. For each of the following, please say if you favor or oppose the proposal…”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How about raising the top rate of the state income tax paid by the wealthiest Californians?</th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How about increasing taxes on the purchase of cigarettes?</th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Californians also show considerable interest in raising spending for education and health programs. An initiative headed for the June 2006 ballot that would increase taxes for high-income residents to pay for voluntary public preschool currently enjoys solid support among adults (66%) and likely voters (63%), similar to the overall level of support for raising taxes on the wealthy. Another initiative that may qualify for the November 2006 ballot would raise taxes on cigarettes to pay for health programs, and it also has strong support (69% adults, 64% likely voters), similar to general support for raising cigarette taxes. For both tax initiatives, Republicans are less supportive than other voters.

“How would you vote on these tax and spending initiatives if an election were held today?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How about increasing taxes by 1.7 percent on individual incomes above $400,000 dollars annually, and $800,000 dollars for couples, to pay for voluntary public preschool for all 4-year old children?</th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How about increasing taxes on the purchase of cigarettes by $2.60 per pack to pay for children’s health insurance, hospital emergency room care, and other health treatment and prevention programs?</th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
California State Budget

Fiscal Policy Preferences

While most Californians disapprove of the legislature’s job performance, they nevertheless prefer the legislature to the governor when it comes to making choices on the state budget. Thirty-nine percent prefer the Democrats in the legislature, 23 percent prefer Republicans in the legislature, and 18 percent prefer Governor Schwarzenegger. In contrast, our January 2004 survey found the governor (33%) was favored over the Democrats in the legislature (27%) and the Republicans in the legislature (17%) in making budget choices. In our January and May 2005 surveys, the voters preferred the Democrats in the legislature over the governor in making decisions about taxes and state funding, but for the first time, the current survey shows Republican legislators slightly favored over the governor in budget decisions.

Opinions about who should have the most say in budget decisions vary sharply across party lines. Democrats favor Democratic legislators over others by an overwhelming margin. Republican voters favor Republican legislators over Governor Schwarzenegger by a wide margin (53% to 29%), while they favored the governor in 2004 and 2005 surveys. Independents express no strong preference today, while they favored the governor over both Democratic and Republican legislators two years ago. Those who approve of Governor Schwarzenegger are mostly likely to want him to make the budget decisions (37%), while those who disapprove of him want the Democratic legislators to make fiscal choices (59%).

“When it comes to the tough choices involved in the state budget, both in deciding how much Californians should pay in taxes and how to fund state programs, whose approach do you most prefer?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor Schwarzenegger</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats in the legislature</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans in the legislature</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (volunteered)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Californians favor a state government with higher taxes and more services over lower taxes and fewer services by a 30-point margin today (61% to 31%). Likely voters also prefer higher taxes and more services by a 20-point margin (56% to 36%). The differences across political groups on this issue are large today: The majority of Democrats (76%) and independents (61%) prefer to pay higher taxes and have more services, while Republicans strongly prefer lower taxes and fewer services (59%). Whites (52%) are much less likely than Latinos (79%) to prefer the higher tax and higher services choice.

“When which of the following statements do you agree with more—I'd rather pay higher taxes and have a state government that provides more services, or I'd rather pay lower taxes and have a state government that provides fewer services?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher taxes and more services</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower taxes and fewer services</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State of the State Address

Governor Schwarzenegger’s third State of the State speech on January 5th received mixed reviews overall. Thirty-four percent say they had a favorable impression and 34 percent an unfavorable impression of the speech, and one in three adults say they haven’t heard enough about it (25%) or are undecided (7%). The governor’s State of the State address in 2005 was more positively perceived by adults last January (44% favorable, 32% unfavorable) as was his 2004 speech two years ago (42% favorable, 18% unfavorable). Among likely voters this year, 39 percent are favorable and 32 percent are unfavorable toward the 2006 speech, and overall favorability varies strongly across party groups (55% Republicans, 38%, independents, 24% Democrats).

Still, two of the specific proposals that the governor outlined in the speech are strongly supported by the public, and receive high levels of approval across party lines. The major theme of the State of the State address was the governor’s plan to spend $222 billion over 10 years on roads and other infrastructure, without raising taxes. Solid majorities approve of his infrastructure plan (68% adults, 64% likely voters). Consensus is high across party groups, major regions, and demographic groups. Solid support for this plan is evident among those who approve and disapprove of the governor (77%, 62%).

“Do you approve or disapprove of the governor’s plan to spend $222 billion over 10 years on infrastructure projects including surface transportation, education facilities, air quality, water and flood control, jails and prisons, and courts?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the governor’s proposal to increase the state’s minimum wage from $6.75 to $7.75 by July 2007 is overwhelmingly supported by adults (81% approve) and likely voters (77% approve). Across party groups, there is solid support for a minimum wage increase (91% Democrats, 66% Republicans, 81% independents), and approval is very high across regions and demographic groups.

Since the defeat of his package of reform initiatives in the November 2005 special election, Governor Schwarzenegger has said that he will seek to work together with the state legislature this year. After the election, three in four voters disapproved of the way the governor and legislature were working together. Today, Californians are divided when asked if the governor and legislature will be able to work together and accomplish a lot in the next year (43%, 48%). A minority of likely voters and of voters across political parties say the two sides will be able to find common ground in 2006. However, those who approve of Governor Schwarzenegger’s job performance (55%) are more likely than those who disapprove (34%) to say that the two sides will be able to work together and accomplish a lot this year.

“Do you think that Governor Schwarzenegger and the state legislature will be able to work together and accomplish a lot in the next year, or not?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, will be able to work together</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, will not be able to work together</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
California State Budget

Governor’s Budget Proposal

Governor Schwarzenegger released a budget plan for the 2006-2007 fiscal year on January 10th that includes increased state spending for K-12 public schools, for health and human services, for higher education, for corrections and prisons, and for transportation, without any new taxes. Californians respond favorably to this proposed budget, with 60 percent saying they are satisfied with it and 28 percent saying they are dissatisfied. Californians had much less favorable reactions to the governor’s budget last January (38% satisfied, 55% dissatisfied) and similar responses to his budget plan in January 2004 (57% satisfied, 30% dissatisfied). Satisfaction today is higher among Republicans and independents than among Democrats. Still, Democrats are considerably more satisfied with the governor’s budget plan than last January (51% to 21%). Overall, there is majority satisfaction with the budget plan across major regions and demographic groups.

“In general, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the Governor’s budget plan?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven’t heard anything about the budget (volunteered)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An unexpected surge in revenues provides surplus funds for next year’s budget. How should this additional money be spent? Californians look favorably on the governor’s plans to use the money to increase K-12 public education funding (78%), and to roll back tuition fee increases by increasing state funding for public colleges and universities (63%). Additionally, Californians favor reducing the amount of state debt (76%). Increasing spending for all of these purposes is strongly supported across all regions of the state, racial/ethnic groups, and all demographic groups. However, Democrats are more supportive of increased spending for K-12 and higher education than are Republicans and independents, while all three voter groups strongly support the use of surplus revenues to reduce the amount of debt.

“Do you favor or oppose using some of this additional money to…”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase K through 12 public education funding?</td>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oppose</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the amount of state debt?</td>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollback tuition fee increases by increasing funding for public colleges and universities?</td>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For complete question wording, see question 26 in the survey questionnaire, page 23.
Most Important Problem in 2006

When Californians were asked to name the one issue that is most important for the governor and legislature to work on this year, their top concern is education and schools (25%), followed by the state budget (12%), immigration (11%), and jobs and the economy (10%). Fewer than one in 10 adults name any other single issue, including health care, crime and gangs, and roads and infrastructure.

Compared to two years ago, when Governor Schwarzenegger was beginning his term in office, fewer residents today are naming as the top issue the state budget (31% to 12%) or the economy (21% to 10%), while more are mentioning education (15% to 25%). Similarly, one year ago, more residents mentioned fiscal or economic issues as the top priority, while a similar percentage last year and this year considered education the most important issue (22% to 25%).

Education is considered the top issue by residents in the Central Valley, Los Angeles, and the San Francisco Bay Area, while an equal percentage of residents in the Other Southern California region name immigration and education as the principal issues to be addressed by the governor and legislature. Latinos (25%) and whites (23%) are similar in mentioning education and schools as the top issue, while whites (17%) are more likely than Latinos (6%) to point to the state budget. The ranking of issues by likely voters is similar to all adults.

However, there are differences across political groups. Democrats are more likely than Republicans to mention education as the top priority (31% to 18%). In contrast, Republicans are more likely than Democrats to mention immigration as the most important issue (19% to 6%). Education is a top priority across all income groups and for those with and without children under eighteen years old. Mention of the state budget as the top policy priority for this year tends to increase with income, education, age, and homeownership.

A majority of residents believe that the state is headed in the wrong direction (56%) rather than the right direction (37%). However, the percentage who say the state is headed in the wrong direction varies somewhat across parties (61% Democrats, 55% independents, 49% Republicans). One year ago, 46 percent of adults said the state was headed in the right direction while 41 percent thought it was going in the wrong direction, similar to January 2004 (43% right direction, 40% wrong direction). Still, perceptions about the state of the state are more positive today than in October (30% right direction, 60% wrong direction). Perceptions of the state’s economy have also significantly improved (October: 32% good times, January: 48% good times).

### Top seven mentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top seven mentions</th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, schools</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State budget, deficit, taxes</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration, illegal immigration</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy, jobs, unemployment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care, costs</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime, gangs, drugs</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads, infrastructure</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Which one issue facing California today do you think is the most important for the governor and state legislature to work on in 2006?"
Job Performance Ratings for State Officials

The approval ratings for the legislature remain near historic lows: 29 percent of adults approve and 57 percent disapprove of the legislature’s overall job performance. The percent approving is slightly higher than it was immediately prior to the special election (October: 25% approve, 56% disapprove, 19% don’t know). One year ago, 37 percent approved and 50 percent disapproved of the legislature’s performance, similar to the 36 percent who approved and 46 percent who disapproved in January 2004. Today, the approval ratings of the state legislature are somewhat lower among likely voters than among all adults. Democrats are the most approving, while Republicans are the most disapproving in their overall assessments of the legislature; majorities across all political groups disapprove of the way the legislature is doing its job. Across the state’s regions, solid majorities disapprove of its performance. Approval ratings are higher among Latinos (33%) than among whites (26%).

“Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that the California legislature is handling its job?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governor Schwarzenegger’s approval ratings among all adults now stands at 40 percent approve and 52 percent disapprove, compared to 33 percent who approved and 58 percent who disapproved in our October survey. Among likely voters today, 45 percent approve and 48 percent disapprove of the way the governor is handling his job; among registered voters, 43 percent approve and 50 percent disapprove. The governor’s approval rating among adults is still much lower now than it was in January 2005 (60%) and in January 2004 (59%).

Sharp partisan differences are apparent in this month’s approval ratings. Republicans (72%) overwhelmingly approve of the governor’s job performance, while an equal proportion of Democrats disapprove (72%); independents are more divided (40% approve, 52% disapprove). Compared to the October survey, the governor’s standing has improved in all voter groups (Democrats: 12% to 20%; independents 31% to 40%; Republicans 69% to 72%). We continue to see a significant racial/ethnic gap in the governor’s ratings: Today, 51 percent of whites compared to 23 percent of Latinos approve of his performance in office. While a majority of residents in the San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles disapprove of the way the governor is handling his job, those in the Other Southern California region and the Central Valley are divided.

“Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that Arnold Schwarzenegger is handling his job as governor of California?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governor’s Report Card

Many Californians say they disapprove of the governor’s job performance when it comes to the specific issues of K-12 public schools (55%), the state budget and taxes (53%), and jobs and the economy (47%)—three of the top issues that Californians say they want their state’s officials to work on in 2006. As for a topic that the governor stressed in his State of the State address—traffic and transportation—the governor receives mixed reviews (38% approve, 41% disapprove). Of the five issues that we asked about, the governor receives the highest grade for his handling of crime and punishment issues (54% approve).

The governor’s approval ratings have significantly declined in some areas since our January 2005 survey when we asked about his handling of jobs and the economy (56% to 39%) and the state budget and taxes (48% to 35%), while his approval ratings with respect to K-12 public schools and traffic and transportation have not changed much. We did not ask about crime and punishment last year. Since May 2005, the governor’s ratings on schools and the budget have remained about the same, while approval with respect to his handling of transportation issues has increased by 10 points (28% to 38%).

Democrats are more critical of the governor’s handling of public schools than of his management of other issues. Across all party divisions, the governor receives his highest approval ratings on crime and punishment issues. San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles residents give the governor lower approval ratings than residents in the Central Valley and Other Southern California on all issues. Latinos give him lower approval ratings than whites on all issues.

When Gray Davis was running for reelection, his approval ratings in early 2002 were higher than Schwarzenegger’s approval ratings today on the economy, K-12 public schools, and the state budget. Davis’s approval ratings among adults in January 2002 were: crime and punishment (52% approve, 29% disapprove), jobs and the economy (45% approve, 39% disapprove), state budget and taxes (42% approve, 46% disapprove), K-12 public schools (39% approve, 40% disapprove), and transportation and traffic congestion (39% approve, 45% disapprove).

“Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Governor Schwarzenegger is handling …”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime and punishment issues</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The issue of jobs and the economy in California</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The issue of transportation and traffic congestion</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The issue of the state budget and taxes</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The state’s K-12 public education system</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Infrastructure Priorities

When asked which one of five types of public works projects in the governor’s infrastructure plan should receive top priority, education facilities are mentioned by 48 percent of adults, followed by surface transportation (25%), water systems and flood control (17%), jails and prisons (3%), and courts (2%). In previous PPIC Statewide Surveys, Californians also named education facilities as their top priority when given somewhat different lists of public works projects (40% in June 2004, 48% in November 2002). Although the governor’s infrastructure plan emphasizes spending on transportation, Californians in nearly all demographic groups rate education facilities as the top spending priority. Across party divisions, Republicans are more in line with Schwarzenegger’s spending priorities (39% transportation, 36% education) than are Democrats (54% education, 19% transportation) or independents (52% education, 26% transportation).

“Which of the following do you think should have the top priority for additional state funding?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>SF Bay Area</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Other Southern California</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education facilities</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface transportation</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water systems and flood control</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jails and prisons</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following trends in earlier PPIC Statewide Surveys, there is no consensus about the type of surface transportation project that should have top priority. While nearly four in ten adults (38%) say freeways and highways, over half name either public bus and transit systems (29%), local streets and roads (24%), or carpool lanes (7%). Freeways and highways are the top priority outside of the San Francisco Bay Area. Republicans are more likely than Democrats (51% to 33%), and whites are more likely than Latinos (41% to 34%) to name freeways and highways as the top priority. As income increases, residents are more likely to name freeways and highways, while mention of public buses and transit increases with education.

“Which of the following types of surface transportation projects do you think should have the top priority for additional state funding?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>SF Bay Area</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Other Southern California</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeways and highways</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public bus and transit systems</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local streets and roads</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool lanes</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Infrastructure Bonds

Californians strongly support an infrastructure bond proposal of about $25 billion that has been proposed by Governor Schwarzenegger for the 2006 statewide ballot as part of his 10-year investment plan. About six in 10 adults (65%) and likely voters (57%) say they would vote yes on this bond measure if an election were held today. Some differences emerge across political and demographic groups. Interestingly, Democrats (66%) and independents (70%) are more likely than Republicans (57%) to endorse Schwarzenegger’s proposal, while those who disapprove of the governor’s job performance (66%) are about as likely as those who approve (62%) to favor the $25 billion bond.

Support for this bond is greater in Los Angeles (68%) and Other Southern California (66%) than in the Central Valley or the San Francisco Bay Area (61% each). Latinos (78%) are much more likely than whites (57%) to say they would vote yes. Support declines with age, education, and income. Still, majorities in all political, regional, and demographic groups say they would vote yes on this state bond.

“If an election were held today, would you vote yes or no on a state bond of about 25 billion dollars for infrastructure projects such as education facilities, surface transportation, and water facilities to be paid through the state's general funds with no new taxes?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

California Senate President Pro Tem Don Perata (D-Oakland) is proposing an infrastructure bond measure of approximately $10 billion. An even greater majority of Californians (73%) and likely voters (68%) say they would vote yes on a $10 billion infrastructure bond that would be paid through the general fund and that would include no new taxes. Large majorities of independents (78%), Democrats (74%), and Republicans (69%) would vote yes on this infrastructure bond if an election were held today. Across regions, more residents in Los Angeles (77%), the Other Southern California region (75%) and the San Francisco Bay Area (72%) would vote yes than in the Central Valley (66%).

Majorities in all demographic groups would vote yes on this $10 billion bond measure. However, Latinos (80%) are more likely than whites (69%) to say they would vote yes. Support for this bond measure declines somewhat with age, homeownership, income, and education. Solid majorities would vote yes on this bond among both those who approve (74%) and disapprove (73%) of the governor and those who think the state is headed in the right direction (82%) and the wrong direction (68%).

“If an election were held today, would you vote yes or no on a state bond of about 10 billion dollars for infrastructure projects such as education facilities, surface transportation, and water facilities to be paid through the state's general fund with no new taxes?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Infrastructure Funding

How should the state government pay for more roads and other infrastructure projects? Despite considerable support for increasing spending on infrastructure, Californians are divided on how to pay for it. Three in ten adults (31%) and likely voters (29%) believe the state should use only surplus budget funds. Another 24 percent of adults (23% of likely voters) would prefer that the state issue bonds, and 17 percent (20% of likely voters) would prefer increasing user fees. Raising taxes to pay for more infrastructure is the least popular approach, favored by just 14 percent of adults and 15 percent of likely voters.

No single infrastructure funding method receives majority support in any political or demographic group. Republicans (35%) are more likely than Democrats (30%) or independents (28%) to prefer that the state use only surplus budget funds, while about one in four in each of these voter groups supports issuing state bonds. Residents in the Other Southern California region and Los Angeles (34% each) are more likely than those in the Central Valley (29%) and the San Francisco Bay Area (27%) to believe the state should use only surplus budget funds. Latinos are more likely than whites (36% to 28%) to name surplus funds, while whites are more likely than Latinos to name user fees (21% to 11%). Fewer than one in four in all political, regional, and demographic groups favor an increase in user fees or taxes.

“How would you most prefer that the state government increase the level of current funding for roads and other infrastructure projects?”

| Method                                      | All Adults | Party
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use only surplus budget funds</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue state bonds</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase user fees</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase taxes</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not increase current level of funding (volunteered)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not only is increasing state taxes for funding more infrastructure unpopular, but so is the idea of changing the two-thirds majority to a 55 percent majority vote for passing a local sales tax for transportation projects. A majority of adults (53%) and likely voters (58%) would vote no, while four in ten adults (41%) and likely voters (37%) would vote yes. Republicans (62%) and independents (56%) are more likely to reject this proposal than Democrats (45%), and whites (59%) are more likely to vote no than Latinos (41%). Californians were more inclined to change the two-thirds vote in November 2002 (49% yes, 45% no).

“What if there was a state measure that would change the two-thirds majority to a 55 percent majority for passing local sales tax for transportation projects. Would you vote yes or no?”

| Response         | All Adults | Party
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Issues

President’s Ratings

Heading into his State of the Union address on January 31st, President George W. Bush’s overall job approval rating among Californians is at 38 percent; 60 percent disapprove of his performance. Among likely voters, Bush’s approval rating is the same. The president’s approval rating today is eight points lower than it was a year ago (46% approved, 52% disapproved), and similar to PPIC’s October 2005 survey (36% approved, 60% disapproved). Since its high point of 79 percent in December 2001, the president’s approval rating has fallen 41 points. Californians’ approval of the president today is slightly lower than in the nation as a whole, according to a recent Gallup Poll (43% approve, 53% disapprove).

The president’s ratings vary sharply by party, with 76 percent of Republicans approving, and 83 percent of Democrats and 71 percent of independents disapproving. A strong majority in the San Francisco Bay Area (71%) and Los Angeles (66%) disapprove of Bush’s performance, while about half of Other Southern California and Central Valley residents approve (46% each).

The president’s ratings are higher for handling terrorism and homeland security issues (45% approve, 53% disapprove). Likely voters’ ratings are similar. Bush’s rating on this issue is virtually unchanged from PPIC’s August 2005 survey (46% approved, 49% disapproved), but approval is down sharply from its high point of 85 percent in January 2002. Californians’ ratings are similar to the nation’s, according to a November 2005 Newsweek Poll (45% approved, 49% disapproved). As with Bush’s overall rating, a strong majority of Republicans (77%) approve of the president’s handling of terrorism and homeland security, while a majority of Democrats (73%) and independents (63%) disapprove. Men are also somewhat more approving on this issue than are women (49% to 42%).

Bush’s ratings are much lower when it comes to his handling of the situation in Iraq (33% approve, 65% disapprove). Nationwide, 37 percent approve, according to a January 2006 CBS News Poll. Californians’ current sentiments on this issue are similar to a year ago (34% approved, 63% disapproved), but have declined since August 2003, when 50 percent approved of Bush’s actions. Californians’ approval ratings on this matter again divide sharply along partisan lines: 72 percent of Republicans approve, while 84 percent of Democrats and 75 percent of independents disapprove. A majority in all regions, racial/ethnic groups, and demographic categories disapprove of the president’s handling of Iraq, but approval is much higher among whites than Latinos (40% to 25%).

“Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that President Bush is handling...?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His job as president of the United States?</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism and homeland security issues?</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation in Iraq?</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Issues

U.S. Effort in Iraq

Californians remain pessimistic about the U.S. effort in Iraq, with 62 percent saying things are not going too well (25%) or not going at all well (37%) and 35 percent saying things are going very (8%) or somewhat well (27%). Likely voters’ views on the war are slightly more positive than the views of all Californians. A year ago, 30 percent of adults said things were going somewhat or very well, and 69 percent said not too well or not at all well. Today, the percentage of all adults who say things are not going at all well is only slightly lower than in August 2005 (40%), but is still significantly higher than in August 2003 (19%).

Opinions on Iraq are divided along party lines, with an overwhelming majority of Democrats (81%) and independents (70%) saying things are not going too well or not going at all well, and most Republicans saying things are going at least somewhat well (70%). Fewer than half of the respondents in any region are positive about the Iraq situation, with four in 10 in the San Francisco Bay Area (40%) and Los Angeles (45%) saying things are not going at all well. Latinos are more likely to hold this negative view than whites (44% to 32%), and women more than men (40% to 33%).

“In general, how would you say things are going for the U.S. in Iraq—very well, somewhat well, not too well, or not at all well?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>Rep</td>
<td>Ind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat well</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too well</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all well</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of California adults (62%) and likely voters (61%) continue to think it was not worth going to war in Iraq. These findings are similar to those in PPIC’s August 2004 (61% not worth it) and August 2005 (64% not worth it) surveys. In the nation as a whole, feelings are somewhat different. According to a January CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll, Americans nationwide (46%) are more likely than Californians (34%) to feel the war was worth it.

Again, most Democrats (80%) and independents (68%) think it was not worth going to war, while a majority of Republicans (72%) say it was. Fewer than half of the respondents in any region think the war was worth it, with assessments especially negative in the San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles (70% each saying not worth it) compared to elsewhere in the state. Latinos are considerably more negative than whites (71% to 56%), as are younger people and women.

“All in all, do you think it was worth going to war in Iraq, or not?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>Rep</td>
<td>Ind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, worth it</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, not worth it</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
U.S. Homeland Security

In the wake of news that the National Security Agency began a domestic spying program in 2002, Californians appear divided on the government’s anti-terrorism policies. Forty percent are concerned that the government has not gone far enough to protect the country, while 45 percent are concerned that the government’s anti-terrorism policies have gone too far in restricting the average person’s civil liberties. Concern that the government has gone too far is up nine points from PPIC’s August 2005 survey (36%). Californians are more worried than adults nationwide about the restriction of civil liberties. In a January Pew Research Center survey, 33 percent of adults nationwide expressed concern about this issue.

California Republicans (62%) are much more likely than Democrats and independents (31% each) to be concerned that the government’s policies have not gone far enough to protect the country. San Francisco Bay Area residents are most likely to say the government has gone too far (55%). Whites (45%) are much more likely than Latinos (33%) to worry that the government has not gone far enough; this view is also more prevalent among residents 55 and older and those with less than a college education.

Californians are also divided over whether it is necessary to give up some civil liberties in order to curb terrorism in this country (48% agree, 47% disagree). Californians are more likely than the nation as a whole to think that giving up civil liberties is necessary. According to a July 2005 Pew Research Center Survey, 40 percent nationwide believe this is necessary, while 53 percent do not.

The view that some civil liberties must be sacrificed to combat terrorism divides along party lines: Seven in 10 Republicans agree with it, but only 41 percent of Democrats and 48 percent of independents do. Agreement with this view is highest in Other Southern California (55%) and lowest in the San Francisco Bay Area (44%). Whites are more likely than Latinos to support this idea (51% to 43%), as are older and more affluent residents. Of those who say giving up some civil liberties is necessary, 53 percent are concerned that the government has not gone far enough to protect the country, while of those who say it is not necessary, 61 percent believe that the government has already gone too far.

““In order to curb terrorism in this country, do you think it is necessary to give up some civil liberties, or not?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Adults</td>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not gone far enough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gone too far</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither (volunteered)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Californians are also divided over whether it is necessary to give up some civil liberties in order to curb terrorism in this country (48% agree, 47% disagree). Californians are more likely than the nation as a whole to think that giving up civil liberties is necessary. According to a July 2005 Pew Research Center Survey, 40 percent nationwide believe this is necessary, while 53 percent do not.

The view that some civil liberties must be sacrificed to combat terrorism divides along party lines: Seven in 10 Republicans agree with it, but only 41 percent of Democrats and 48 percent of independents do. Agreement with this view is highest in Other Southern California (55%) and lowest in the San Francisco Bay Area (44%). Whites are more likely than Latinos to support this idea (51% to 43%), as are older and more affluent residents. Of those who say giving up some civil liberties is necessary, 53 percent are concerned that the government has not gone far enough to protect the country, while of those who say it is not necessary, 61 percent believe that the government has already gone too far.

““In order to curb terrorism in this country, do you think it is necessary to give up some civil liberties, or not?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Adults</td>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, it is necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, it is not necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Issues

Immigration Policy

Two important issues are emerging within the debate over immigration policy. One is the guest worker program proposed by President Bush. The other is related to the role that citizen volunteers, known as “Minutemen,” should play in patrolling the borders.

Californians strongly favor allowing illegal immigrants who have jobs in the United States to live and work here legally if they register with the government as a temporary guest worker. Seven in 10 Californians would support this policy, while 26 percent would oppose it. California mirrors the nation on this issue—a December 2005 *Time* Poll found 72 percent nationwide favor a guest worker program, with 24 percent opposed.

Support for a guest worker program is high among all political groups and across all regions of the state. More than two-thirds in all demographic groups would favor such a program, but support is higher among Latinos than whites (79% to 69%) and among foreign-born than among U.S.-born respondents (76% to 69%).

“Would you favor or oppose a program that would allow illegal immigrants who have jobs in the United States to live and work legally in the United States for a fixed period of time if they registered with the government as temporary guest workers so the U.S. government could keep track of them?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What about border patrols? Most Californians (64%) want the job of keeping illegal immigrants from crossing the borders to be left to government law enforcement, rather than allowing citizen Minutemen to do it (32%). Again, California mirrors the nation on this issue—an October 2005 CBS News Poll found that most Americans nationwide believe that the government (65%) rather than the Minutemen (31%) should patrol the border.

While a majority of Republicans (53%) support allowing Minutemen to patrol some borders, solid majorities of Democrats (73%) and independents (64%) are opposed to this practice. A majority of residents across all regions think patrolling should be left to the government; this opinion is more widely held in the Los Angeles area (72%) than in the Other Southern California region (54%). Latinos are far more likely than whites (84% to 53%) and the foreign-born are more likely than U.S.-born (79% to 58%) to oppose Minutemen patrols. Although support for the Minutemen falls below 50 percent in all demographic groups, it is higher among men than women (36% to 28%), and increases with age and income.

“Recently, citizen volunteers known as ‘Minutemen’ have been patrolling some borders to keep out illegal immigrants. Should citizen volunteers be allowed to patrol the borders, or should patrolling the borders be left to government law enforcement?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left to government</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Poverty

With Hurricane Katrina recently turning a spotlight on the issue of poverty, nearly nine in 10 Californians say that poverty is a big problem (57%) or somewhat of a problem (30%) in our society today. According to an October 2005 Kaiser Family Foundation survey, 58 percent of Americans nationwide said poverty was a big problem and 25 percent called it somewhat of a problem. While majorities in all political parties in California say poverty is at least somewhat of a problem, Democrats (71%) are far more likely than Republicans (42%) and independents (57%) to call it a big problem. Women are more likely than men to see it as a big problem (65% to 48%), but there is no difference between whites (55%) and Latinos (54%) or across education groups. Although concern about poverty declines with income, a majority in all income groups call it a big problem in society today.

“How big a problem is poverty in our society today?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big problem</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat of a problem</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small problem</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a problem at all</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Echoing their concerns about poverty, a majority of Californians agree (68%) that it is the responsibility of government to take care of those who can’t take care of themselves. Similarly, in PPIC’s February 2004 survey, 69 percent of Californians mostly or completely agreed with this idea. While Democrats (81%) and independents (65%) are most likely to hold this view, a majority of Republicans (51%) also agree with it. Solid majorities in all racial and demographic groups say the government should take care of the needy, with agreement greater among Latinos than whites (77% to 62%) and women than men (70% to 65%).

“How do you agree or disagree with the following statement: It is the responsibility of government to take care of people who can’t take care of themselves?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Likely Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly/completely agree</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly/completely disagree</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Californians are divided on the amount of money the nation spends on assisting the poor, with 39 percent saying we spend too little, 23 percent saying too much, and 32 percent saying about the right amount. These results are similar to a January 2001 Kaiser Family Foundation national survey (38% too little, 18% too much, 36% about right). Most Democrats (55%) say we spend too little, while 40 percent of independents and 18 percent of Republicans say this. When asked for their perceptions about poor people, 51 percent say they have hard lives because government benefits don’t go far enough, while 34 percent say they have it easy due to government benefits. Similarly, 47 percent of adults nationwide expressed the view that the poor have hard lives in an October 2005 Kaiser Family Foundation survey. Democrats (62%) are more likely than Republicans (31%) or independents (52%) to hold this view.
Avian Flu

Californians express little confidence that the federal government could handle an outbreak of avian flu. Nearly half (49%) are not too confident (27%) or not at all confident (22%) in the government, while 33 percent are somewhat confident. Only 14 percent are very confident. Views are similar across California’s regions. Nationwide, 43 percent are not too confident or not at all confident in the government on this issue, while 56 percent are very or somewhat confident, a CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll found in December 2005.

Confidence on this issue is greater among Republicans (57% very or somewhat confident) than Democrats (42%) or independents (39%). Confidence decreases with income and education. Latinos (59%) are more likely than whites (43%) to be very or somewhat confident in the federal government’s ability to handle a bird flu crisis.

“How confident are you that the federal government could handle an outbreak of ‘bird flu’ or ‘avian flu’ in this country—very confident, somewhat confident, not too confident, or not at all confident?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>SF Bay Area</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Other Southern California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very confident</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too confident</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all confident</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite uncertainty about the federal government’s abilities in this area, an overwhelming majority (72%) say they are not worried that they or someone in their family will be a victim of the bird flu virus. Nationwide, a similar 78 percent are not personally worried, according to the December 2005 CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll.

More than two in three Californians in all regions and political groups say they are not worried about the virus, with Republicans (81%) even less concerned than Democrats (72%) or independents (73%). Fears are considerably greater among Latinos than whites (49% to 15%) and are higher among younger people and those with less education and income. Personal concerns about being the victim of avian flu are somewhat higher among Californians who have children at home than those who do not (29% to 23%).

“Are you worried that you or someone in your family will be the victim of the bird flu virus, or not?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>All Adults</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>SF Bay Area</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Other Southern California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, worried</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, not worried</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither (volunteered)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Methodology

The PPIC Statewide Survey is directed by Mark Baldassare, research director and survey director at the Public Policy Institute of California, with assistance in research and writing from Dean Bonner, project manager for this survey, and survey research associates Lunna Lopes, Jennifer Paluch, and Sonja Petek. The survey was conducted with funding from The James Irvine Foundation and benefited from discussions with Irvine staff and grantees, as well as regional focus groups with voters, funded by the foundation; however, the survey methods, questions, and content of the report were solely determined by Mark Baldassare.

The findings of this survey are based on a telephone survey of 2,003 California adult residents interviewed between January 11 and January 18, 2006. 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 six times to increase the likelihood of reaching eligible households. Once a household was reached, an adult respondent (age 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. Accent on Languages translated the survey into Spanish with assistance from Renatta DeFever. Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc. conducted the telephone interviewing.

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 2,003 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 1,602 registered voters is +/- 2.5 percent. The sampling error for the 1,193 likely voters is +/- 3 percent. Sampling error is only 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, El Dorado, 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 30 percent of the state’s adult population and constitute one of the fastest growing voter groups. The sample sizes for African Americans and Asians are not large enough for separate statistical analysis. We do compare the opinions of registered Democrats, Republicans, and independents. The “independents” category includes those who are registered to vote as “decline to state.” We also include the responses of “likely voters”— those who are most likely to vote in the state’s elections.

We compare PPIC Statewide Survey responses earlier PPIC Statewide Surveys to analyze trends over time in California and to responses in national surveys conducted by ABC News/Washington Post, CBS News, CNN/USA Today/Gallup, Kaiser Family Foundation, Newsweek, Pew Research Center, and Time.
1. First, which one issue facing California today do you think is the most important for the Governor and State Legislature to work on in 2006?

25% education, schools  
12 state budget, deficit, state spending, taxes  
11 immigration, illegal immigration  
10 economy, jobs, unemployment  
  5 health care, health insurance, health costs  
  5 crime, gangs, drugs  
  3 roads and infrastructure  
  2 electricity costs, supply/energy crisis  
  14 other (specify)  
  13 don’t know

2. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that Arnold Schwarzenegger is handling his job as Governor of California?

40% approve  
52 disapprove  
8 don’t know

3. Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Governor Schwarzenegger is handling the issue of the state budget and taxes?

35% approve  
53 disapprove  
12 don’t know

4. Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Governor Schwarzenegger is handling the state’s kindergarten through twelfth grade public education system?

30% approve  
55 disapprove  
15 don’t know

5. Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Governor Schwarzenegger is handling the issue of transportation and traffic congestion?

38% approve  
41 disapprove  
21 don’t know

6. Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Governor Schwarzenegger is handling crime and punishment issues?

54% approve  
30 disapprove  
16 don’t know

7. Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Governor Schwarzenegger is handling the issue of jobs and the economy in California?

39% approve  
47 disapprove  
14 don’t know

8. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that the California legislature is handling its job?

29% approve  
57 disapprove  
14 don’t know

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

37% right direction  
56 wrong direction  
7 don’t know

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

48% good times  
42 bad times  
10 don’t know

11. On another issue, do you think the state budget situation in California—that is, the balance between government spending and revenues—is a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem for the people of California today?

61% big problem  
30 somewhat of a problem  
4 not a problem  
5 don’t know
In the past two years, do you think the state budget situation has improved, gotten worse, or stayed the same?

- 21% improved
- 33% gotten worse
- 39% stayed the same
- 7% don't know

Now, I am going to ask about specific areas where the State of California spends money. For each area, please tell me if you think that the state government should spend more money than it does now, the same amount as now, or less money than now.

[rotate questions 13 to 17]

13. How about the state's corrections system, including prisons?

- 24% more money
- 37% same amount of money
- 32% less money
- 7% don't know

14. How about the K through 12 public education system?

- 71% more money
- 19% same amount of money
- 8% less money
- 2% don't know

15. How about public colleges and universities?

- 56% more money
- 30% same amount of money
- 9% less money
- 5% don't know

16. How about health and human services?

- 61% more money
- 25% same amount of money
- 11% less money
- 3% don't know

17. How about roads and other infrastructure projects?

- 58% more money
- 31% same amount of money
- 8% less money
- 3% don't know

Tax and fee increases could be used to help pay for state spending. For each of the following, please say if you favor or oppose the proposal.

[rotate questions 18 and 19]

18. How about raising the top rate of the state income tax paid by the wealthiest Californians?

- 65% favor
- 32% oppose
- 3% don't know

19. How about increasing taxes on the purchase of cigarettes?

- 71% favor
- 27% oppose
- 2% don't know

Next, how would you vote on these tax initiatives if an election were held today?

[rotate questions 20 and 21]

20. How about increasing taxes on the purchase of cigarettes by $2.60 per pack to pay for children's health insurance, hospital emergency room care, and other health treatment and prevention programs? Would you vote yes or no?

- 69% yes
- 30% no
- 2% don't know

21. How about increasing taxes by 1.7 percent on individual incomes above $400,000 annually, and $800,000 for couples, to pay for voluntary public preschool for all 4-year old children? Would you vote yes or no?

- 66% yes
- 31% no
- 3% don't know

22. When it comes to the tough choices involved in the state budget, both in deciding how much Californians should pay in taxes and how to fund state programs, whose approach do you most prefer—[rotate] (1) Governor Schwarzenegger's, (2) the Democrats' in the legislature, [or] (3) the Republicans' in the legislature?

- 18% Governor Schwarzenegger's
- 39% Democrats'
- 23% Republicans'
- 1% other (specify)
- 4% none of them (volunteered)
- 15% don't know
23. And, in general, which of the following statements do you agree with more—I'd rather pay higher taxes and have a state government that provides more services, or I'd rather pay lower taxes and have a state government that provides fewer services?

- 61% higher taxes and more services
- 31% lower taxes and fewer services
- 8% don't know

24. Overall, do you have a favorable or an unfavorable impression of the plans and policies for California that Governor Schwarzenegger presented in his recent "state of the state" speech?

- 34% favorable
- 34% unfavorable
- 25% haven't heard about the speech (volunteered)
- 7% don't know

25. Do you think that Governor Schwarzenegger and the state legislature will be able to work together and accomplish a lot in the next year, or not?

- 43% yes, will be able to work together
- 48% no, will not be able to work together
- 9% don't know

25a. Do you approve or disapprove of the governor's plan to spend $222 billion over 10 years on infrastructure projects including surface transportation, education facilities, air quality, water and flood control, jails and prisons, and courts?

- 68% approve
- 23% disapprove
- 9% don't know

25b. Do you approve or disapprove of raising the minimum wage in California from $6.75 an hour to $7.75 an hour by July 2007?

- 81% approve
- 18% disapprove
- 1% don't know

26. Recently, Governor Schwarzenegger proposed a budget plan for the next fiscal year that includes increased spending on K to 12 public education, health and human services, higher education, corrections and prisons, and transportation. The plan includes no new taxes. In general, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the Governor's budget plan?

- 60% satisfied
- 28% dissatisfied
- 5% haven't heard anything about the budget (volunteered)
- 7% don't know

27. Do you favor or oppose using some of this additional money to reduce the amount of state debt?

- 76% favor
- 20% oppose
- 4% don't know

27a. Do you favor or oppose using some of this additional money to increase K through 12 public education funding?

- 78% favor
- 20% oppose
- 2% don't know

27b. Do you favor or oppose using some of this additional money to rollback tuition fee increases by increasing funding for public colleges and universities?

- 63% favor
- 32% oppose
- 5% don't know

28. Next, you may know the term "infrastructure" refers to a variety of public works projects. Which of the following do you think should have the top priority for additional state funding—surface transportation, education facilities, water systems and flood control, jails and prisons, or courts?

- 48% education facilities
- 25% surface transportation
- 17% water systems and flood control
- 3% jails and prisons
- 2% courts
- 1% other (specify)
- 4% don't know

29. Which of the following types of surface transportation projects do you think should have the top priority for additional state funding—freeways and highways, public bus and transit systems, carpool lanes, or local streets and roads?

- 38% freeways and highways
- 29% public bus and transit systems
- 24% local streets and roads
- 7% carpool lanes
- 1% other (specify)
- 1% don't know
30. If an election were held today, would you vote yes or no on a state bond of about $10 billion for infrastructure projects such as education facilities, surface transportation, and water facilities to be paid through the state's general fund with no new taxes?
   - 73% yes
   - 21 no
   - 6 don't know

31. If an election were held today would you vote yes or no on a state bond of about $25 billion for infrastructure projects such as education facilities, surface transportation, and water facilities to be paid through the state's general funds with no new taxes?
   - 65% yes
   - 28 no
   - 7 don't know

32. How would you most prefer that the state government increase the level of current funding for roads and other infrastructure projects—(1) increase taxes for all Californians; (2) increase user fees and charges; (3) issue state bonds paid for through the state's general fund [or] (4) use only surplus budget funds?
   - 31% use only surplus budget funds
   - 24 issue state bonds
   - 17 increase user fees
   - 14 increase taxes
   - 2 should not increase current level of funding (volunteered)
   - 2 other (specify)
   - 10 don't know

33. The local sales tax that is collected by local governments is one of the major funding sources for local transportation projects, and state law requires that it must be approved by two-thirds of the voters in a local election. What if there was a state measure that would change the two-thirds majority to a 55 percent majority for passing local sales tax for transportation projects. Would you vote yes or no?
   - 41% yes
   - 53 no
   - 6 don't know

34. Changing topics, overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that George W. Bush is handling his job as president of the United States?
   - 38% approve
   - 60 disapprove
   - 2 don't know

35. Do you approve or disapprove of the way that President Bush is handling terrorism and homeland security issues?
   - 45% approve
   - 53 disapprove
   - 2 don't know

36. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that President Bush is handling the situation in Iraq?
   - 33% approve
   - 65 disapprove
   - 2 don't know

37. In general, how would you say things are going for the U.S. in Iraq—very well, somewhat well, not too well, or not at all well?
   - 8% very well
   - 27 somewhat well
   - 25 not too well
   - 37 not at all well
   - 3 don't know

38. All in all, do you think it was worth going to war in Iraq, or not?
   - 34% yes, worth it
   - 62 no, not worth it
   - 4 don't know

39. What concerns you more about the government's anti-terrorism policies—[rotate] [1] that they have not gone far enough to protect the country [or] [2] that they have gone too far in restricting the average person's civil liberties?
   - 40% not gone far enough
   - 45 gone too far
   - 9 neither (volunteered)
   - 6 don't know

40. In order to curb terrorism in this country, do you think it is necessary to give up some civil liberties, or not?
   - 48% yes, it is necessary
   - 47 no, it is not necessary
   - 5 don't know

41. On another topic, would you favor or oppose a program that would allow illegal immigrants who have jobs in the United States to live and work legally in the United States for a fixed period of time if they registered with the government as temporary guest workers so the U.S. government could keep track of them?
   - 71% favor
   - 26 oppose
   - 3 don't know
42. Recently, citizen volunteers known as Minutemen have been patrolling some borders to keep out illegal immigrants. Should citizen volunteers be allowed to patrol the borders, or should patrolling the borders be left to government law enforcement?

- 32% allowed
- 64 left to government
- 4 don't know

43. Next, how big a problem is poverty in our society today? Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, a small problem, or not a problem at all?

- 57% big problem
- 30 somewhat of a problem
- 9 small problem
- 3 not a problem at all
- 1 don't know

43a. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: It is the responsibility of government to take care of people who can't take care of themselves. Do you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, or completely disagree with this statement?

- 23% completely agree
- 45 mostly agree
- 19 mostly disagree
- 9 completely disagree
- 4 don't know

44. Please indicate which statement comes closest to your own view, even if neither is exactly right. [rotate] (1) poor people have it easy because they can get government benefits without doing anything in return; [or] (2) poor people have hard lives because government benefits don't go far enough to help them live decently.

- 34% poor people have it easy
- 51 poor people have hard lives
- 11 neither (volunteered)
- 4 don't know

44a. In terms of the amount of money we as a country are spending on assistance to poor people in our society, do you think we are spending too much, too little, or about the right amount?

- 23% too much
- 39 too little
- 32 right amount
- 6 don't know

45. On another topic, how confident are you that the federal government could handle an outbreak of "bird flu" or "avian flu" in this country—very confident, somewhat confident, not too confident, or not at all confident?

- 14% very confident
- 33 somewhat confident
- 27 not too confident
- 22 not at all confident
- 4 don't know

46. Are you worried that you or someone in your family will be the victim of the bird flu virus, or not?

- 25% yes, worried
- 72 no, not worried
- 1 neither (volunteered)
- 2 don't know

47. Next, some people are registered to vote and others are not. Are you absolutely certain that you are registered to vote?

- 80% yes [ask q.48a]
- 19 no [skip to q.49a]
- 1 don't know

48a. Are you registered as a Democrat, a Republican, another party, or as an independent?

- 42% Democrat
- 34 Republican
- 5 another party (specify) [skip to q.50]
- 19 independent [ask q.49a]

49a. Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican Party or Democratic Party?

- 26% Republican party
- 43 Democratic party
- 23 neither (volunteered)
- 8 don’t know

50. Would you consider yourself to be politically:

- 9% very liberal
- 21 somewhat liberal
- 34 middle-of-the-road
- 23 somewhat conservative
- 11 very conservative
- 2 don’t know

[D1-D14: demographic questions]
The PPIC Statewide Survey Advisory Committee is a diverse group of experts who provide advice on survey issues. However, survey methods, questions, content, and timing are determined solely by PPIC.
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