



PPIC
STATEWIDE
SURVEY
JUNE 2000

Special Survey

on Californians and the Environment

in collaboration with

The David and Lucile Packard Foundation

•••••

Mark Baldassare

Senior Fellow & Survey Director

Public
Policy
Institute of
California

Preface

This survey on Californians and the environment—a collaborative effort of the Public Policy Institute of California and the David and Lucile Packard Foundation—is a special edition of the PPIC Statewide Survey. The Packard Foundation provides grants to nonprofit organizations in several program areas, including conservation and population. This special edition presents the responses of 2,001 adult residents throughout the state and provides the first comprehensive, advocacy-free study of Californians' attitudes toward population growth, land use, and environmental issues.

The survey examines in detail the public's concerns about local, regional, and statewide issues; explores the extent to which the environmental concerns expressed today are evident in the interests and everyday habits of Californians; and measures the public's willingness to support policies designed to protect the land and natural resources from the impacts of future growth and development. Many of the policy choices offered in the survey require the public to weigh tradeoffs, some involving individuals' rights versus the common good, and others calling for financial and personal sacrifices. More specifically, we examine the following issues:

- Variations in perceptions, attitudes, and policy preferences across the four major regions of the state (Central Valley, San Francisco Bay area, Los Angeles area, and the rest of Southern California), between Latinos and non-Hispanic whites, and across age and the socioeconomic and political spectrum.
- Local and regional issues, including perceptions of current and future growth, traffic, and air pollution; the adequacy of local growth regulations; and the willingness to consider development restrictions in one's own region.
- State issues, including identification of the most important environmental issue, perceptions of specific problems, and opinions about the seriousness of environmental problems in general and the performance of the Governor and state government in handling environmental issues.
- Specific public policy issues, including support for environmental laws and regulations, local growth controls, taxpayer-supported open space purchases, and the purchase of undeveloped land by non-profit organizations.
- Personal interests and household activities, including membership in environmental groups, attention to environmental news, outdoor recreational activities such as hiking, and daily habits such as recycling and buying organic foods.

Copies of this report or other PPIC Statewide Surveys may be ordered by calling (800) 232-5343 [mainland U.S.] or (415) 291-4415 [Canada, Hawaii, overseas].

Contents

Preface	i
Press Release	v
Local and Regional Issues	1
State Issues	7
Public Policy	13
Personal Interests and Household Activities	23
Survey Methodology	29
Survey Questions and Results	31
Survey Advisory Committee	36

Press Release

STATE'S ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS POSE SERIOUS PERSONAL THREAT, RESIDENTS SAY

Strong Support for Growth Restrictions, Open Space Preservation Dwindles When Public Asked to Ante Up

SAN FRANCISCO, California, June 21, 2000 — It's the environment, stupid. California's unique natural resources are on the minds of residents this election year, with an overwhelming majority seeing environmental problems as a threat to their health and well-being, according to a new survey just released by the Public Policy Institute of California and the David and Lucile Packard Foundation. But while the public will make certain tradeoffs to deal with the growth-related issues driving their environmental anxiety, they would prefer to see someone else foot the bill.

The large-scale public opinion survey of 2,001 Californians found that seven in ten residents see today's environmental problems as a threat to their personal health and well-being, with one in four saying environmental problems are a "very serious" threat and almost half (45%) seeing them as a "somewhat serious" threat. When asked to identify the most important environmental issue facing the state, the top issue by far was air pollution (33%), followed distantly by growth (13%), pollution in general and water pollution (9% each), traffic (7%), and the water supply (6%).

Nearly half of Californians also say that soil and groundwater contamination (48%) and urban and agricultural runoff (47%) are "big problems" today. Four in ten think that suburban development harming wildlife is a big problem. Specific regional issues also raise considerable worry: About half say that ocean and beach pollution (53%) and growth and pollution damaging the Sierra Mountains' forests (45%) are big problems, and more than one in three have significant concerns about urban sprawl taking over farmlands in the Central Valley (39%) and the logging of old-growth redwoods in Northern California (34%). Solid majorities rate all of these environmental issues as at least "somewhat of a problem."

More Government?

Given their broad concern, Californians are less than impressed with their state government's efforts to protect the environment. Half of all residents believe the state is not doing enough in this arena. And Governor Davis — who receives strong ratings for his handling of economic issues — has failed to distinguish himself in a similar way on environmental issues. While 36 percent of residents approve of the way he is handling environmental issues, 28 percent disapprove and 36 percent say they don't know. Californians are also looking to their federal representatives for environmental leadership: Most (84%) say the presidential candidates' positions on growth, land use, and environmental issues are important to them, with 41 percent saying they are "very important."

"The successful candidate in California will be mindful of the concern Californians have for their state's environment and natural resources," said PPIC Statewide Survey Director Mark Baldassare. "Quality of life is a key issue in the Golden State, especially in this period of prosperity and growth."

Most Californians are willing to accept a greater degree of government involvement in protecting the environment, although Americans as a whole are more likely to hold this view. Fifty-seven percent of state residents agree with the statement that "stricter environmental laws and regulations are

worth the cost,” compared to 65 percent of Americans. A majority of Californians also say they are willing to make some tradeoffs in order to preserve the environment: 54 percent favor restricting oil drilling off the coast, even if this means higher gas prices, and 59 percent oppose building new housing if it threatens endangered species, even if the result is more expensive housing.

Public Likes Growth Limits, But Not the Price Tag

Population growth is a persistent and troubling theme in California today, adding to worries about natural resources and land use. Most Californians (81%) believe that their local population has been growing in recent years — 58 percent say it has been growing rapidly — and most expect this trend to continue into the next decade. While they are generally happy with current conditions in their region, residents clearly have qualms about the effects of future growth on their quality of life: A greater number believe that their region will be a worse place to live in 2010 than a better place (36% to 28%).

Most Californians say their area is already experiencing problems, although perceptions vary from region to region. Three in four say traffic congestion is a big problem, and 44 percent rate it as a big problem. In the San Francisco Bay area, 74 percent view traffic as a big problem, compared to 21 percent in the Central Valley and 47 percent in Los Angeles. Two in three Californians also cite growth and development and air pollution as problems, and about one in four rate each of these problems as serious.

Given the expectations and concerns about rapid growth, it is not surprising that residents support a variety of local and regional policies aimed at controlling growth and development in the future. A majority (58%) would support a local initiative that would slow the pace of development in their city or community, even if this meant less economic growth. Three in four Californians say that establishing growth boundaries around cities, encouraging job centers near existing housing, and restricting development in environmentally sensitive areas can be at least somewhat effective in improving their region’s quality of life over the next decade.

True to the strong support for slowing the pace of local development, most state residents (57%) like the idea of using public funds to buy undeveloped land in order to shield it from development. In fact, Californians are more likely than Americans in general (57% to 44%) to support this idea. But while they favor the concept of using taxpayer dollars to buy open space, Californians are ambivalent when confronted with the choice between using \$1 billion of the state budget surplus to reduce their taxes or to create a trust fund to purchase and preserve open space. Forty-nine percent of residents support the idea of starting a conservation trust fund, while 44 percent would take the tax cut. Further, a majority of residents (52%) say they would oppose a bond measure authorizing local government to buy land in order to preserve it from development if it meant paying higher property taxes. Public support for land conservation is overwhelming, however, when someone else is picking up the tab: Seventy-one percent favor the idea of nonprofit organizations using their money to buy undeveloped land to keep it free from development.

“These results underscore what we’ve found in our conservation work: A growing majority of California residents share a deep concern for the quality of their environment,” said Richard T. Schlosberg III, President and CEO of the David and Lucile Packard Foundation. “Clearly, Californians see conservation as best approached through a partnership between public and private agencies.”

Environment a High Priority for Latinos; Few Worries in Central Valley

Surprising ethnic and regional differences lurk beneath the broad public concern about the environment and growth and development. Overall, Latinos appear to be more concerned than the

public at large about environmental problems, with a greater number believing that those problems pose a very serious threat to their health and well-being (31% to 25%). They are also more likely to believe that specific environmental issues — such as coastal pollution and threatened forests in the Sierras — are big problems today and to say that the presidential candidates' views on environmental issues are very important to them. On the other hand, Latinos are also more likely than residents generally to support the way Governor Davis is handling environmental issues (52% to 36%), to believe that more oil drilling should be allowed off the California coast if this means lower gas prices (49% to 43%), and to believe that their region will be a better place to live ten years from now (37% to 28%). Interestingly, Latinos are also less likely to support using taxpayer dollars to buy and preserve undeveloped land (52% to 57%).

Although Central Valley residents are the most likely to say that the population of their city or community has grown — and will continue to grow — rapidly, they are also the least likely to see population growth and development as a big problem. They are also less likely than all Californians to view as big problems urban and agricultural runoff (34% to 47%), suburban development harming wildlife habitats (27% to 39%), and growth and pollution damaging the Sierras (37% to 45%). One issue — urban sprawl taking over farmlands — does register more strongly in the Central Valley than elsewhere in the state (49% to 39%). Like Republicans throughout California, Central Valley residents are less likely to support environmental laws and regulations, more likely to support individual property rights, and would choose a tax cut over the creation of a conservation trust fund.

“It is striking and disturbing that Central Valley residents — living in California’s most threatened and fast-growing region — see so little cause for concern or action,” said Baldassare.

About the Survey

The Californians and the Environment Survey — a collaborative effort of the Public Policy Institute of California and the David and Lucile Packard Foundation — is a special edition of the PPIC Statewide Survey. The Packard Foundation provides grants to nonprofit organizations in several program areas, including conservation and population. This survey provides the first comprehensive, advocacy-free study of Californians’ attitudes toward growth, land use, and environmental issues. Findings are based on a telephone survey of 2,001 California adult residents interviewed from May 22 to May 30, 2000. Interviews were conducted in English or Spanish. The sampling error for the total sample is +/- 2%. For additional information on survey methodology, see page 29.

Dr. Mark Baldassare is a senior fellow at PPIC. He is founder and director of the PPIC Statewide Survey, which he has conducted since 1998. For over two decades, he has conducted surveys for the University of California, Irvine, and major news organizations, including the Orange County Edition of the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Orange County Register*, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, KCAL-TV, and KRON-TV. Dr. Baldassare is the author of numerous books, including *California in the New Millennium: The Changing Social and Political Landscape* (University of California Press, 2000).

PPIC is a private, nonprofit organization dedicated to objective, nonpartisan research on economic, social, and political issues that affect the lives of Californians. The Institute was established in 1994 with an endowment from William R. Hewlett.

###

Local and Regional Issues

Local Population Growth

Local population growth is a persistent theme in California today, but the perception of growth varies in interesting ways across regions and community types. Most Californians (81%) believe that their local population has been growing in recent years, and 58 percent believe it has been growing rapidly. Very few (15%) think there has been no population growth, and even fewer (1%) believe their local population has declined.

Although people in all regions and community types perceive growth, the perception of rapid growth is greatest among residents of the Central Valley (68%) and the San Francisco Bay area (64%). It is also greater among people living in the surrounding Southern California region (59%) than it is in Los Angeles County (48%) itself. Across community types, the perception of rapid growth is greater for people in large cities (67%) than in suburbs (58%), less in small cities (53%) and lowest of all in rural areas (48%). Latinos and non-Hispanic whites (59% to 56%) have about the same perception of rapid growth in their communities.

As for the future, most people expect the current local population growth trends to continue. Eight in 10 Californians expect their local communities to grow in the next 10 years, and 54 percent expect them to grow rapidly. Those living in the Central Valley (67%) and the Southern California region outside of Los Angeles (59%) are more likely to expect rapid growth than those living in Los Angeles (45%) and the San Francisco Bay area (53%). And the expectation of rapid growth is greater in large cities (62%) than in suburbs (51%), small cities (50%), and rural areas (53%).

"In the past few years, do you think the population of your city or community has been growing rapidly, growing slowly, staying about the same, or declining?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Growing rapidly	58%	68%	64%	48%	59%	59%
Growing slowly	23	20	23	23	22	21
Staying the same	15	8	10	25	14	18
Declining	1	2	1	0	1	1
Don't know	3	2	2	4	4	1

Local Growth Control Initiatives

Although most residents rate their localities as excellent (32%) or good (45%) places to live and almost half (48%) say their local government’s efforts to regulate growth are adequate, worries about population growth affect their policy preferences. If faced with making a choice at the ballot box, many Californians (58%) say they would vote “yes” on a local initiative that would slow down the pace of development in their city or community, even if this meant less economic growth.

Across regions, support for local initiatives to slow growth is strongest in the San Francisco Bay area (65%) and weakest in the Central Valley (52%). Across community types, support is strongest in the suburbs (64%). Opposition to slow-growth initiatives is strongest in the Central Valley (44%); but even there, the majority express support for such initiatives.

Support varies across different population groups. It rises with age, income, and education, but a majority of all demographic groups say they would vote yes. Latinos (53%) are less likely than non-Hispanic whites (62%) to support a local slow-growth initiative. Women (60%) are slightly more likely than men (55%). Interestingly enough, there are no differences in support among Democrats (60%), Republicans (59%), and independent voters (58%).

Those who think that current growth regulations are not strict enough would overwhelmingly vote for a local growth control initiative (71%). Nevertheless, even among those who think current efforts are about right, a majority would also vote yes to slow down development (53%).

Among people who believe local population growth has been rapid in recent years, 62 percent would support a local growth control initiative. And for those who think their localities will grow rapidly in the next 10 years, 60 percent would vote yes.

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

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Yes	58%	52%	65%	57%	57%	53%
No	37	44	29	38	38	42
Don't know	5	4	6	5	5	5

Regional Problems

Californians are happy with the overall conditions in the broader region they live in, with most saying the quality of life in their region today is going either very well (29%) or somewhat well (56%). Still, most admit that their regions do have problems. For example, three in four say traffic congestion is a problem, and 44 percent rate it a “big problem.” Two in three cite growth and development and air pollution as problems, and about one in four rate each of these problems as serious.

San Francisco Bay area residents are more concerned than others about traffic congestion and growth and development. In that area, 74 percent view traffic congestion as a serious problem, compared with 21 percent in the Central Valley and 47 percent in Los Angeles. Similarly, nearly half of San Francisco Bay area residents view growth and development as a big problem in their region (47%), while fewer hold this perception in other regions of the state. Air pollution is more likely to be cited as a serious problem in Los Angeles (40%) than elsewhere in the state.

Traffic congestion is cited as a big problem by most of the residents in large cities (59%) and suburbs (55%). Growth is seen as a big problem by about one-third of big-city dwellers (33%) and suburbanites (31%). Serious complaints about traffic and growth are less common in small cities and rural areas. Air pollution is also more often noted as a big problem in large cities (40%) than in other types of communities. Non-Hispanic whites are more likely than Latinos to cite traffic (48% to 33%) and growth (31% to 16%) as big problems in their region, while there are no differences in perceptions of air pollution.

"How much of a problem is _____ / _____ / _____ in your region today?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
<i>Traffic congestion</i>						
Big problem	44%	21%	74%	47%	40%	34%
Somewhat of a problem	32	37	18	34	37	36
Not a problem	24	42	8	19	23	30
<i>Population growth and development</i>						
Big problem	27%	17%	47%	21%	27%	16%
Somewhat of a problem	39	36	34	46	36	42
Not a problem	33	45	19	32	36	41
Don't know	1	2	0	1	1	1
<i>Air pollution</i>						
Big problem	28%	28%	26%	40%	23%	29%
Somewhat of a problem	39	37	49	37	38	36
Not a problem	32	34	25	23	38	34
Don't know	1	1	0	0	1	1

The Region's Future

When asked about the future of their region, most people say they expect the population to grow rapidly, and relatively few expect their region to be a better place to live in 2010.

Across the state, 59 percent expect rapid regional growth in population in the next decade. People outside of Los Angeles, which is the most populous region today, are the most likely to expect rapid growth. The expectations of rapid growth in all regions, and even stronger trends in the Central Valley and Southern California region outside of Los Angeles, are in line with state demographers' forecasts.

Looking ahead, only 28 percent expect their region to be a better place to live in 2010 than it is today. Many (36%) think it will become worse, and 32 percent expect their regions to stay the same. San Francisco Bay area residents are the least optimistic about their region's future, with only 22 percent believing it will be a better place to live. Latinos (37%) are more optimistic than non-Hispanic whites (24%) that in 2010 their region will be a better place to live.

The expectation of rapid growth in a region is related to people's perceptions of regional problems. Those who see their regions growing rapidly in the next 10 years are much more likely than others to cite traffic (51%), growth (35%), and air pollution (33%) as big regional problems. Those who expect their region's population to grow rapidly are also more likely than others to say their region will be a worse place (45%) to live in 2010.

"Thinking about the next 10 years, do you think that the population in your region will grow rapidly, grow slowly, stay about the same, or decline?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Grow rapidly	59%	67%	62%	50%	64%	56%
Grow slowly	24	21	25	28	18	24
Stay about the same	14	10	10	19	15	17
Decline	2	1	2	1	2	1
Don't know	1	1	1	2	1	2

"Do you think that in 2010 your region will be a better place to live than it is now, a worse place to live than it is now, or will there be no change?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Better place	28%	34%	22%	27%	31%	37%
Worse place	36	31	43	35	38	29
No change	32	31	29	34	29	30
Don't know	4	4	6	4	2	4

Regional Policy Options

Faced with the prospect of population growth, most Californians believe that various proposals aimed at limiting where development occurs could improve the quality of life. Three in four say that establishing growth boundaries around cities, encouraging job centers around existing housing, and restricting development in environmentally-sensitive areas can be at least somewhat effective in improving their region's quality of life over the next decade. Thirty-three percent rate growth boundaries as very effective, while 41 percent rate job centers near housing and restricting development in environmentally-sensitive areas as very effective policy options for improving living conditions in their regions.

The response is similar across regions for establishing growth boundaries and encouraging job centers near existing housing. However, Central Valley residents are the least positive and San Francisco Bay area residents are the most positive that restricting development in environmentally-sensitive areas would be a very effective way to improve their region.

Those who expect their region to grow rapidly are more likely than others to say that restricting development in environmentally-sensitive areas (47%), encouraging job centers near existing housing (44%), and establishing growth boundaries (38%) are very effective ways to improve the quality of life.

"How effective do you think the following activities would be in improving the quality of life in your region over the next 10 years?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
<i>Establishing growth boundaries around cities beyond which new development would not be permitted</i>						
Very effective	33%	31%	34%	30%	34%	34%
Somewhat effective	42	41	42	43	43	46
Not effective	22	23	21	24	20	16
Don't know	3	5	3	3	3	4
<i>Encouraging the development of job centers near existing housing to reduce commute time for workers</i>						
Very effective	41%	41%	42%	40%	43%	47%
Somewhat effective	38	38	37	40	37	41
Not effective	19	19	19	19	19	12
Don't know	2	2	2	1	1	0
<i>Restricting development in order to preserve wetlands, rivers, and environmentally sensitive areas</i>						
Very effective	41%	33%	47%	44%	39%	39%
Somewhat effective	35	41	34	31	37	40
Not effective	21	23	17	22	21	17
Don't know	3	3	2	3	3	4

State Issues

Most Important Environmental Issue

When residents were asked to identify the most important environmental issue facing California, the top issue by far was air pollution (33%), followed distantly by growth (13%), pollution in general and water pollution (9% each), traffic (7%), and the water supply (6%). No other issues were mentioned by more than 4 percent of the public. Fewer than one in 10 could not identify any environmental issue.

Air pollution was named as the most important issue in every region of the state, across racial and ethnic groups, among men and women alike, for homeowners and renters, among those with and without children in the home, and in all age, income, educational, and political party groups. Perceptions about other important environmental issues did vary across regions. San Francisco Bay area residents were the most likely to mention growth (21%) and traffic (11%). Mention of growth as the biggest environmental issue also increased with age, income, and years of education.

Responses to this open-ended question did not vary much across types of communities or current or anticipated growth experiences. For every group, air pollution was the top issue. Suburban residents (16%) were more likely than those living in large cities (10%) and small cities (11%) to say that growth and development was the top environmental issue in the state.

"What do you think is the most important environmental issue facing California today?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Air pollution	33%	36%	30%	37%	32%	34%
Growth, development	13	9	21	11	12	8
Water, ocean, and beach pollution, MTBE	9	10	5	8	12	7
Pollution in general	9	7	7	12	9	11
Traffic congestion	7	4	11	5	7	5
Water supply	6	7	6	6	5	3
Toxic waste, pesticides, contamination of land	2	2	1	2	1	4
Loss of wilderness, open space	1	1	2	1	2	—
Loss of farmlands, agriculture	1	2	2	—	1	1
Logging, loss of redwoods and forests	1	2	1	—	—	1
Other*	9	10	8	8	9	10
Nothing, there is none	1	0	1	1	1	2
Don't know	8	10	5	8	9	14

* Includes several issues each mentioned by 1 percent or less, including floods; nuclear wastes and nuclear energy; ozone depletion; global warming; protecting wildlife and endangered species; preserving wetlands, lakes, rivers, streams, and other environmentally sensitive areas; landfills, garbage, sewage, and waste disposal; lack of parks and recreation areas.

Environmental Problems in the State

Californians are most likely to name air pollution as the biggest problem, but other environmental issues in the state raise concerns. Nearly half say that soil and groundwater contamination by toxics such as MTBE and urban and agricultural runoff pollution of lakes, rivers and streams are big problems in California today. Four in 10 think that suburban development harming wildlife and endangered species is a big problem. Eight in 10 rate these three environmental issues as at least somewhat of a problem.

Across regions, San Francisco Bay area residents are the most likely to say that groundwater and soil contamination is a big problem. Central Valley residents worry the least about the harmful effects of urban and agricultural runoff on water and of suburban development on wildlife habitats.

Latinos seem to be more worried than non-Hispanic whites about this set of statewide environmental issues. Latinos are more likely to rate soil and groundwater contamination (53% to 46%), pollution from urban and agricultural runoff (51% to 45%), and suburban development harming wildlife habitats (44% to 39%) as big environmental problems.

Democrats are more likely than Republicans to cite pollution from urban and agricultural runoff (51% to 37%), soil and groundwater contamination (49% to 39%), and suburban development harming wildlife habitats and endangered species (45% to 33%) as big problems. Women (43%) are more likely than men (36%) to say that suburban development harming wildlife habitats is a big problem. Those 55 and older (41%) are less likely than younger adults (49%) to view pollution from urban and agricultural runoff as a big problem. There are no differences across income groups.

"How much of a problem is _____ / _____ / _____ in California today?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
<i>MTBE and other toxic substances contaminating soil and groundwater</i>						
Big problem	48%	45%	57%	50%	40%	53%
Somewhat of a problem	32	37	28	29	37	31
Not a problem	8	10	6	6	10	8
Don't know	12	8	9	15	13	8
<i>Urban and agricultural runoff polluting lakes, rivers, and streams</i>						
Big problem	47%	34%	49%	53%	47%	51%
Somewhat of a problem	37	44	38	36	36	34
Not a problem	12	18	9	7	13	12
Don't know	4	4	4	4	4	3
<i>Suburban development harming wildlife habitats and endangered species</i>						
Big problem	39%	27%	43%	43%	42%	44%
Somewhat of a problem	40	45	41	39	37	39
Not a problem	18	25	13	15	18	14
Don't know	3	3	3	3	3	3

Environmental Problems in Specific Regions

Many Californians have concerns about environmental problems in specific regions of the state. About half say that ocean and beach pollution (53%) and growth and pollution damaging the Sierra Mountain's forests (45%) are big problems in California today. More than one in three have significant concerns about urban sprawl taking over farmlands in the Central Valley (39%) and the logging of old-growth redwoods in Northern California (34%).

Those living in Los Angeles (67%) and the rest of Southern California (63%) are the most likely to cite ocean and beach pollution as a big problem, while those in the San Francisco Bay area (48%) and the Central Valley (49%) are much more likely than others to say that urban sprawl taking over Central Valley farmlands is a big problem. Los Angeles residents (55%) worry the most about Sierra Mountain forests, while San Francisco Bay area residents (43%) are the most concerned about the logging of old-growth redwoods in Northern California. Latinos are more likely than non-Hispanic whites to say ocean and beach pollution (62% to 50%) and damage to the Sierra Mountain's forests (55% to 42%), while non-Hispanic whites are more likely than Latinos to express major concerns about urban sprawl taking over farmlands in the Central Valley (44% to 35%).

"How much of a problem is _____ / _____ / _____ in California today"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
<i>Ocean and beach pollution along the California coast</i>						
Big problem	53%	39%	35%	67%	63%	62%
Somewhat of a problem	36	39	51	28	30	29
Not a problem	7	11	10	3	5	5
Don't know	4	11	4	2	2	4
<i>Urban growth, air pollution damaging the forests in the Sierra Mountains</i>						
Big problem	45%	37%	43%	55%	42%	55%
Somewhat of a problem	37	41	40	31	40	33
Not a problem	11	17	9	7	10	7
Don't know	7	5	8	7	8	5
<i>Urban sprawl taking over farmlands in the Central Valley</i>						
Big problem	39%	49%	48%	34%	30%	35%
Somewhat of a problem	35	32	30	39	38	38
Not a problem	16	14	14	14	20	18
Don't know	10	5	8	13	12	9
<i>Logging of old-growth redwoods in Northern California</i>						
Big problem	34%	25%	43%	34%	31%	34%
Somewhat of a problem	33	34	31	36	31	33
Not a problem	19	27	19	14	19	17
Don't know	14	14	7	16	19	16

Personal Threat of the State’s Environmental Problems

Californians may notice environmental problems and even view them as significant, but how many see today’s environmental problems as a threat to their own health and well-being? Seven in 10 residents think environmental problems pose a threat, with one in four saying environmental problems in the state are a “very serious” threat to themselves, while almost half (45%) see them as a “somewhat serious” threat. About one-third say these problems aren’t a serious personal threat.

Los Angeles residents (34%) are the most likely to see environmental problems as a very serious threat to their lives. Those living in other areas of Southern California and in the Central Valley are the most likely to say that the personal threat of environmental problems is *not* too serious. Latinos worry more than non-Hispanic whites (31% to 22%) that environmental problems are a very serious problem for them.

The perceived personal threat of environmental problems varies by age and income: People under 35 years of age (30%) are more likely than those 55 and older (19%), and people earning under \$40,000 (31%) are more likely than those making \$80,000 or more (18%), to say that environmental problems pose a very serious threat to their own health and well-being. There are no differences by level of education or between men and women.

Democrats (26%) and independent voters (24%) are more likely than Republicans (18%) to say that environmental problems in California pose a very serious threat to their health and well-being. However, those individuals who are not registered to vote (32%) are the most likely of all to say that environmental problems are a very serious personal threat.

"Overall, how serious a threat to your own health and well-being are environmental problems in California today — very serious, somewhat serious, or not too serious?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Very serious	25%	21%	22%	34%	21%	31%
Somewhat serious	45	45	49	45	44	44
Not too serious	29	34	28	21	34	24
Don't know	1	0	1	0	1	1

Governor’s Report Card

When asked how they rate the job Gray Davis is doing as Governor, most Californians in PPIC Statewide Surveys earlier this year indicated they are generally pleased, and most approve of how he is handling issues like crime, budget and taxes, and schools. However, they give him better marks on economic issues than on environmental issues. There is a 20-point spread between those who approve (49%) and those who disapprove (29%) how he handles economic issues, and only 22 percent have no opinion. When it comes to the environment, there is an 8-point spread, with 36 percent approving, 28% disapproving, and 36 percent having no opinion about his handling of the issues.

In every region, residents are more likely to approve of the Governor's performance on economic issues than they are to approve of his performance on environmental issues. This difference persists across population and political groups: Latinos (62% to 52%) and non-Hispanic whites (44% to 32%) and Democrats (59% to 42%), Republicans (40% to 30%), and independent voters (43% to 33%) all give the governor higher marks for economic than environmental performance.

"Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Governor Gray Davis is handling
 _____ / _____ in California?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Environmental issues						
Approve	36%	38%	35%	39%	35%	52%
Disapprove	28	27	28	29	26	20
Don't know	36	35	37	32	39	28
Economic issues						
Approve	49%	47%	49%	54%	46%	62%
Disapprove	29	32	31	28	28	20
Don't know	22	21	20	18	26	18

	Party Registration			
	Democrat	Republican	Other Voters	Not Registered to Vote
Environmental issues				
Approve	42%	30%	33%	39%
Disapprove	27	33	33	18
Don't know	31	37	34	43
Economic issues				
Approve	59%	41%	43%	49%
Disapprove	25	38	36	19
Don't know	16	21	21	32

State Government's Efforts

Californians are not all that impressed with their state government's overall efforts in the environmental protection arena. Half believe the state government is not doing enough to protect the environment in California, 37 percent say it is doing just enough, and 9 percent believe it is doing more than enough.

The perception that state government efforts are inadequate is most common in the urban coastal areas of Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay area. Central Valley residents are the most satisfied with the state government's efforts.

Most Latinos (50%) and non-Hispanic whites (49%) believe the state government is not doing enough to protect the environment. Republicans (40%) are less likely than Democrats (55%) or independent voters (53%) to be critical of how much the state government is doing. Women are more likely than men (57% to 43%), and adults under 55 are more likely than those 55 and older (52% to 44%) to say the state government is not doing enough. There are no differences by education and income.

"Do you think the state government is doing more than enough, just enough, or not enough to protect the environment in California?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
More than enough	9%	12%	8%	6%	8%	10%
Just enough	37	41	36	33	40	37
Not enough	50	42	53	57	48	50
Don't know	4	5	3	4	4	3

	Party Registration			
	Democrat	Republican	Other Voters	Not Registered to Vote
More than enough	6%	13%	9%	9%
Just enough	36	42	34	35
Not enough	55	40	53	51
Don't know	3	5	4	5

Public Policy

Environmental Regulations

Most Californians agree with the pro-environmental statement that “stricter environmental laws and regulations are worth the cost” (57%), although Americans as a whole are more likely to hold this view.

Residents in the San Francisco Bay area (64%) are the most likely to say that stricter environmental laws are worth the cost, while Central Valley residents (46%) are the least supportive.

Most Californians in all political and demographic groups support environmental regulations. However, Democrats (64%) and independent voters (60%) are more supportive of environmental regulations than Republicans (53%). Non-Hispanic whites are more likely than Latinos (61% to 53%), women are more likely than men (60% to 55%), those earning \$40,000 a year or more are more likely than those earning under \$40,000 (63% to 53%), and younger adults are more likely than those 55 and older (60% to 49%) to say that environmental laws and regulations are worth the cost.

"Does the first statement or the second statement come closer to your views ..."

	<u>All Adults</u>	
	U.S.*	California
Stricter environmental laws and regulations cost too many jobs and hurt the economy	28%	37%
Stricter environmental laws and regulations are worth the cost	65	57
Don't know	7	6

* Source: National survey conducted by the Pew Research Center, 1999

	<u>Region</u>				
	Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	Latino
Stricter environmental laws cost too many jobs	47%	31%	34%	36%	40%
Stricter environmental laws worth the cost	46	64	60	58	53
Don't know	7	5	6	6	7

Global Warming

A solid majority (57%) of Californians believe that there is evidence to warrant either immediate action (22%) or some action (35%) to address global warming. Californians are more likely than the rest of the nation to think there is enough evidence of climate change to take some action (35% to 28%).

Democrats (66%) and independent voters (61%) are more likely than Republicans (47%) to believe there is enough evidence of climate change for at least some action to be taken.

San Francisco Bay area residents (65%) and Los Angeles residents (60%) are the most likely to say that there is enough evidence to take some action, while fewer living in the rest of the Southern California region (54%) and the Central Valley (52%) believe the facts call for some action.

Non-Hispanic whites are a little more likely than Latinos (59% to 54%) to think that the facts call for at least some actions to stop global climate change. College graduates are more likely than those with a high school education or less (63% to 51%), those earning \$40,000 or more a year are more likely than those earning less (62% to 52%), and younger adults are more likely than those 55 and older (61% to 46%) to think that there is enough evidence of global warming to elicit a response.

"From what you know about global climate change or global warming, which of the following four statements comes closest to your views?"

	<u>All Adults</u>	
	U.S.*	California
Global climate change has been established as a serious problem and immediate action is necessary	23%	22%
There is enough evidence that climate change is taking place and some action should be taken	28	35
We don't know enough about global climate change, and more research is necessary before we take any actions	32	33
Concern about global climate change is unnecessary	11	7
Other, don't know	6	3

* Source: National survey conducted by Hart and Teeter, 1999

	<u>Party Registration</u>				Latino
	Democrats	Republicans	Other Voters	Not Registered to Vote	
Global climate change is serious, take immediate action	27%	13%	25%	24%	20%
Enough evidence of climate change, take some action	39	34	36	31	34
We don't know enough about global climate change	28	40	29	35	37
Concern about global climate change is unnecessary	3	12	8	6	4
Other, don't know	3	1	2	4	5

Individual Rights on Land Use

When asked to choose between two values—individuals' property rights and government regulation of development—Californians favor property rights by 54 percent to 42 percent. However, Californians are more likely than Americans as a whole to prefer government regulation of development (42% to 25%).

Republicans (64%) and independents (60%) are more likely than Democrats (46%) to favor individual property rights over government regulation of development.

Public support for individual property rights is higher in the Central Valley (66%) than in Los Angeles (48%), the San Francisco Bay area (51%), and the rest of the Southern California region (55%).

Non-Hispanic whites are more likely than Latinos (56% to 49%) to choose property rights over government regulation of development. Men are more likely than women (58% to 50%), and homeowners are more likely than renters (56% to 51%) to favor individual property rights. College graduates are more likely than those who have not graduated from college (49% to 37%), and those earning \$80,000 or more are more likely than those earning less (46% to 41%) to favor government regulation of residential and commercial development.

“If you had to choose, which is more important ...”

	<u>All Adults</u>	
	U.S.*	California
The ability of individuals to do what they want with the land they own	69%	54%
The ability of government to regulate residential and commercial development for the common good	25	42
Don't know	6	4

* Source: National survey conducted by the Yankelovich Partners, 1999

	<u>Party Registration</u>				Latino
	Democrats	Republicans	Other Voters	Not Registered to Vote	
The ability of individuals to do what they want with the land they own	46%	64%	60%	50%	49%
The ability of government to regulate development	49	31	38	46	48
Don't know	5	5	2	4	3

Government Funding to Purchase Open Space

True to the strong support noted above for slowing down the pace of local development—most Californians (57%) like the idea of using public funds to buy undeveloped land in order to shield it from development. In fact, Californians are more likely than Americans in general (57% to 44%) to support this concept.

San Francisco Bay area residents (65%) are highly supportive of this idea, as are Los Angeles residents (56%) and those living elsewhere in Southern California (59%). Those living in the Central Valley (50%) only narrowly support the idea.

More Democrats (64%) than Republicans or independent voters (54% each) are in favor having the government purchase land with taxpayer money in order to keep it from being developed.

Though majorities in each group express support, non-Hispanic whites are more likely than Latinos (61% to 52%), and those with incomes of \$40,000 or more a year are more likely than those earning less (63% to 52%), to favor the idea of the government purchasing land to protect it. Those with a high school education or less (49%) are less likely than those with some college (57%) and a college degree (65%) to favor using government funding for this purpose. Those 35 to 54 years old (63%) are more likely than either younger adults (56%) or older adults (50%) to favor taxpayer funding of open space.

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

	<u>All Adults</u>	
	U.S.*	California
Favor	44%	57%
Oppose	49	37
Don't know	7	6

* Source: National survey conducted by the Yankelovich Partners, 1999

	<u>Region</u>				<u>Latino</u>
	<u>Central Valley</u>	<u>SF Bay Area</u>	<u>Los Angeles</u>	<u>Other Southern California</u>	
Favor	50%	65%	56%	59%	52%
Oppose	44	31	38	36	38
Don't know	6	4	6	6	10

Nonprofits' Money to Purchase Open Space

Public support is overwhelming when it comes to nonprofit organizations using their funds to purchase undeveloped land. Seventy-one percent of Californians favor the idea of nonprofit organizations using their money to buy undeveloped land to keep it free from development.

This result holds across political groups: 72 percent of Democrats, 71 percent of Republicans, and even more independent voters (78%) favor this use of nonprofit funds.

Strong majorities support this idea in every region: 79 percent in the San Francisco Bay area, 70 percent in Los Angeles, 69 percent in the rest of Southern California, and 65 percent in the Central Valley.

Support for this use of nonprofit funding is strong across all demographic groups, although there are differences. Non-Hispanic whites like this idea better than do Latinos (75% to 60%), and those with incomes of \$40,000 are more positive about it than those earning less (80% to 61%). Support is higher among younger adults than among those 55 and older (75% to 58%). There are no significant differences in levels of support between men and women (73% to 69%). Fifty-nine percent of respondents with no college education support such efforts by nonprofits, compared to 71 percent of those with some college and a remarkable 82 percent of those with a college degree or more.

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

	All Adults	Party Registration				Latino
		Democrats	Republicans	Other Voters	Not Registered to Vote	
Favor	71%	72%	71%	78%	65%	60%
Oppose	24	24	23	19	29	33
Don't know	5	4	6	3	6	7

	Region			
	Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California
Favor	65%	79%	70%	69%
Oppose	29	17	26	25
Don't know	6	4	4	6

State Conservation Trust to Purchase Open Space

Californians may like the concept of having taxpayer funding or nonprofits buy open space, but they are ambivalent when confronted with the choice between using \$1 billion of the state budget surplus for creating a conservation trust fund to purchase land or having lower taxes. Forty-nine percent of residents support the idea of starting a conservation trust fund (49%), while 44 percent would take the tax reduction.

San Francisco Bay Area residents (55%) and Los Angeles residents (52%) show the most support for starting a conservation trust fund, while those living in the rest of Southern California are equally divided between wanting their taxes cut and starting a conservation trust fund (47% to 46%). Residents in the Central Valley are least supportive of such a fund (43%) and, in fact, most favor a tax cut (52%).

Democrats (56%) are more likely than independent voters (49%) or Republicans (37%) to choose a conservation trust fund over tax relief as a way of using \$1 billion of the state budget surplus.

There are no differences between Latinos (52%) and non-Hispanic whites (50%) in their support of using the money for a conservation trust fund. Those under 55 are more likely than older adults to want to create such a fund (52% to 40%). Men are a little more likely than women to want a tax cut (47% to 41%). There are no differences across education or income groups.

"The state budget surplus may reach \$5 billion for the current year and \$8 billion for the next year. Most of the surplus funds will go to education and other state programs. Assuming that about \$1 billion is left, would you most prefer to use the remaining surplus on ..."

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Reducing your taxes	44%	52%	38%	41%	47%	43%
Creating a conservation trust fund to purchase lands for parks and open space	49	43	55	52	46	52
Other answer, don't know	7	5	7	7	7	5

	Party Registration			
	Democrats	Republicans	Other Voters	Not Registered to Vote
Reducing your taxes	35%	55%	46%	43%
Conservation trust fund	56	37	49	51
Don't know	9	8	5	6

Local Bond Measure to Purchase Open Space

When asked if they would approve a local bond measure that might require raising property taxes, support for using taxpayer funds to buy land to preserve it from development shrinks even further. Most Californians (52%) would vote “no” on a local bond measure to purchase open space, even though 57 percent had earlier supported the principle of using taxpayer money for this same purpose. Apparently, the government funding many had in mind would come at no additional cost to taxpayers like themselves.

Democrats (51%) only narrowly favor a local bond measure to purchase land, while Republicans (59%) and independent voters (53%) would vote against it.

San Francisco Bay Area residents give a bare majority of support to a local bond measure to purchase open space (51%), while those living in Los Angeles (53%) and the rest of Southern California (52%) are narrowly opposed. The largest majority who would vote against such a measure (57%) is found in the Central Valley.

Non-Hispanic whites are more likely than Latinos (47% to 42%) to support a local bond measure to purchase open space. Support rises with affluence and education, but only 50 percent of college graduates and 52 percent of those earning \$80,000 or more would vote yes. Support falls below a majority for both men (43%) and women (44%), and in all age groups. Renters are more likely than homeowners (48% to 40%) to support a local bond measure that would result in higher property taxes to help buy and preserve undeveloped land.

"If an election were held today, would you vote yes or no on a local bond measure that would allow local government to buy undeveloped land and keep it free from development, even if this meant paying higher property taxes?"

	All Adults	Party Registration				Latino
		Democrats	Republicans	Other Voters	Not Registered to Vote	
Yes	43%	51%	36%	44%	40%	42%
No	52	45	59	53	53	53
Don't know	5	4	5	3	7	5

	Region			
	Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California
Yes	38%	51%	43%	44%
No	57	44	53	52
Don't know	5	5	4	4

Oil Drilling Off the California Coast

Most Californians (54%) oppose more offshore oil drilling, even if it results in higher prices for gasoline, while 43 percent say that more oil drilling should be allowed if it means lower gasoline prices.

Democrats (60%) and independent voters (58%) are more likely than Republicans (50%) to say they oppose more drilling off the California coast.

Those living in the San Francisco Bay area (63%)—where drivers face the highest gasoline prices in the state today—are more opposed to having more offshore oil drilling than those living in Los Angeles (58%), the rest of Southern California (47%), and the Central Valley (50%).

Non-Hispanic whites are more likely than Latinos (57% to 48%) to oppose more drilling. Opposition to more offshore oil drilling increases with education (43% for no college versus 52% for some college and 65% for college graduates) and income (48% for under \$40,000 and 60% for \$40,000 or more). Younger adults are a little less likely than those 55 and older (50% to 54%), and women are slightly more likely than men (56% to 52%) to oppose more oil drilling off the coast.

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

	All Adults	Party Registration				Latino
		Democrats	Republicans	Other Voters	Not Registered to Vote	
More oil drilling off the California coast should be allowed if this means lower gasoline prices for California drivers	43%	36%	47%	40%	50%	49%
More oil drilling off the California coast should not be allowed, even if this means higher gasoline prices for California drivers	54	60	50	58	46	48
Don't know	3	4	3	2	4	3

	Region			
	Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California
Should allow oil drilling	47%	34%	39%	49%
Should not allow oil drilling	50	63	58	47
Don't know	3	3	3	4

Building New Housing in California

Consistent with their pro-environmental stands on regulations, most Californians (59%) oppose building new housing that threatens endangered species, even if this will make housing more expensive.

Six in 10 Democrats (63%) and independent voters (61%) oppose building new housing that threatens endangered species. While Republicans (53%) are also opposed, it is by a narrower margin.

Residents of the San Francisco Bay area—usually more inclined to favor the environmentalist position but also living in the most expensive housing market in the state—are indistinguishable from Central Valley residents on this issue, with 55 percent saying new housing should not be built if it threatens endangered species. Six in 10 living in Los Angeles and the rest of Southern Californians, on the other hand, would oppose new housing to save endangered species, even if it meant higher housing costs.

A majority in all demographic groups are opposed to building new housing that threatens endangered species. However, men are more likely than women (42% to 33%) and residents 55 and older are more likely than younger adults (46% to 34%) to say that new housing should be built even if it threatens endangered species. There are no differences between Latinos and non-Hispanic whites, across education or income groups or, perhaps most surprisingly, between homeowners and renters.

"Please tell me if the first statement or the second statement comes closer to your views ..."

	All Adults	Party Registration				Latino
		Democrats	Republicans	Other Voters	Not Registered to Vote	
New housing should be built to make housing more affordable for Californians, even if it threatens some endangered species	37%	33%	43%	37%	37%	37%
New housing should not be built if it threatens endangered species, even if it makes housing more expensive for Californians	59	63	53	61	59	59
Don't know	4	4	4	2	4	4

	Region			
	Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California
Housing should be built	41%	40%	34%	35%
Housing should not be built	55	55	63	61
Don't know	4	5	3	4

Personal Interests and Household Activities

Importance of Candidate Positions

Most Californians (84%) say the presidential candidates' positions on growth, land use, and environmental issues are important to them, and 41 percent say that they are "very important." Democrats (46%) are more likely than Republicans (30%) and independent voters (38%) to say environmental positions are very important. Those living in the San Francisco Bay area (42%) and Los Angeles (43%) are a little more likely than those living elsewhere in Southern California (38%) and the Central Valley (38%) to say that the presidential candidates' positions on environmental issues are very important to them. Latinos are more likely than non-Hispanic whites (54% to 37%) to rate growth, land use, and environmental issues as very important in thinking about the presidential election. Those with lower incomes and less education are also more likely to say that the candidates' positions on environmental issues are very important—49% of those with incomes below \$40,000 versus 37% with incomes from \$40,000 to \$80,000 and 33% with incomes of \$80,000 or more; 48% of those with no college education versus 39% of those with some college and 35% of those with a college degree. There are no age or gender differences.

"In thinking about the presidential election this year, how important are the candidates' positions on population growth, land use, and environmental issues?"

	All Adults	Party Registration				Latino
		Democrat	Republican	Other Voters	Not Registered to Vote	
Very important	41%	46%	30%	38%	47%	54%
Somewhat important	43	43	48	45	35	34
Not important	14	9	21	16	14	9
Don't know	2	2	1	1	4	3

Interest in Environmental News

More than eight in 10 Californians say they are interested in news and information about growth, land use, and environmental issues, while more than one in three are “very interested.” Very few express little or no interest in growth, land use, and environmental news. Strong interest in environmental news is a little more common in the Los Angeles (38%) and San Francisco Bay (36%) areas than in the Central Valley (31%) and the rest of Southern California (31%). Latinos are more likely than non-Hispanic whites to say they are very interested in environmental news (41% to 34%).

"How interested are you in news and information about population growth, land use, and environmental issues?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Very interested	35%	31%	36%	38%	31%	41%
Somewhat interested	48	48	49	46	53	43
Not too interested	12	14	12	12	12	12
Not at all interested	4	6	3	4	3	3
Don't know	1	1	0	0	1	1

News and Information Sources

When it comes to growth, land use, and environmental issues, Californians are equally likely to turn to newspapers as to television for news (37% to 36%). In looking at regional differences, newspapers take precedence over television for environmental news only in the San Francisco Bay Area (38% to 28%). Among Latinos, television leads newspapers by a wide margin (50% to 30%), while non-Hispanic whites favor newspapers over television by a narrower margin (40% to 32%). Californians with a high school education or less are much more likely to receive their environmental news by television than by newspapers (52% to 31%), as are people with incomes below \$40,000 (52% to 26%). All other education and income levels rely more on newspapers for environmental news.

"Where do you get most of your news about population growth, land use, and environmental issues?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Television	37%	44%	28%	37%	43%	50%
Newspapers	36	32	38	37	35	30
Magazines and newsletters	8	6	12	7	6	4
The Internet	7	5	7	8	7	4
Radio	5	5	6	6	3	5
Talking to people	5	6	5	3	4	6
Other, don't know	2	2	4	2	2	1

Environmental News Ratings

Two in three Californians are at least somewhat satisfied with the amount of news they receive on growth, land use, and environmental issues. However, only 13 percent report being “very satisfied” with regard to the quantity of this type of news. Central Valley residents are the most likely to say they are very satisfied with the amount of news coverage on these issues (16%), while San Francisco Bay area residents are the least likely (11%). Latinos and non-Hispanic whites (69% to 68%) are equally likely to say they are at least somewhat satisfied with the amount of news.

Seven in 10 Californians have at least some trust in the news they are receiving on growth, land use, and environmental issues. However, only one in eight has “a great deal “ of trust in the news coverage on these topics. There are no differences across regions, between Latinos and non-Hispanic whites, and across demographic groups. When asked to choose which sources about growth, land use, and environmental issues reported in the news media are most believable, Californians say that colleges and universities have the most credibility (33%), followed by nonprofit organizations (20%), environmental groups (18%), government (8%), business and industry (8%), and civic groups (7%).

"How satisfied are you with the amount of news coverage on population growth, land use, and environmental issues?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Very satisfied	13%	16%	11%	12%	14%	15%
Somewhat satisfied	55	55	56	55	57	54
Somewhat dissatisfied	23	23	24	25	22	23
Very dissatisfied	7	5	8	7	4	5
Don't know	2	1	1	1	3	3

Membership in Environmental Groups

The importance and interest that individuals attach to environmental issues does not, in most cases, translate into membership in environmental groups. One in nine Californians belongs to an environmental group. Participation is highest in the San Francisco Bay Area (14%) and lowest in the Central Valley (7%). Democrats (14%) have only slightly higher rates of membership than Republicans (11%). Latinos (9%) are only slightly less likely than non-Hispanic whites (12%) to say they belong to environmental groups. College graduates (18%) and those with average incomes of \$40,000 or more (15%) are more likely than others to belong to environmental groups.

"Do you belong to any environmental groups?"

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
Yes	11%	7%	14%	13%	10%	9%
No	89	93	86	87	90	91

Outdoor Leisure Activities

Californians' appreciation of the environment is evident in their leisure pursuits. Nearly four in five spend at least some of their leisure time at local parks, recreation areas, or beaches, and more than one in three do so on a regular basis. Two in three Californians say they at least sometimes take a trip to a national park or other scenic destination, while one on four does so on a frequent basis. More than four in 10 residents sometimes take day trips that involve hiking or mountain biking on unpaved trails (43%) or go on overnight backpacking or camping trips (38%). About one in seven regularly rough it on unpaved trails (15%) or overnight camping trips (12%).

San Francisco Bay Area residents are the most likely to spend their leisure time at local parks, recreation areas, or beaches and to take day trips that involve hiking and biking on unpaved trails. Los Angeles residents are the least likely to regularly take trips to national parks and scenic areas. Central Valley residents are the most likely to at least sometimes go on overnight camping and backpacking trips.

Latinos and non-Hispanic whites report similar levels of recreational activity when it comes to visiting local parks and beaches, taking trips to national parks and scenic areas, going on day trips that involve hiking or biking, or going on overnight trips that include camping or backpacking.

Men and women are equally likely to at least sometimes visit local parks and beaches (78% to 75%) and take trips to scenic areas (69% to 64%). However, women are more likely than men to say they "never" hike or bike on unpaved trails (39% to 26%) or go camping or backpacking (40% to 28%).

People under 55 are more likely than older adults to regularly go to local parks and beaches (42% to 25%), to take trips to national parks and scenic destinations (25% to 18%), to hike and bike on unpaved trails (17% to 9%), and to go camping or backpacking (15% to 6%).

Income and education also play a role in many of these outdoor recreational activities. People with incomes over \$80,000 and college graduates are the most likely to visit parks, take trips to scenic destinations, and go on day trips that involve hiking or biking on unpaved trails. However, there are no differences across income or education groups when it comes to overnight camping or backpacking.

"How often do you ..."

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
<i>Spend your leisure time at local parks, recreation areas, or beaches</i>						
Regularly	37%	31%	41%	35%	39%	39%
Sometimes	39	44	39	40	36	39
Hardly ever	20	21	16	20	21	19
Never	4	4	4	5	4	3
<i>Take a trip to a national park or other scenic destination</i>						
Regularly	23%	23%	25%	18%	25%	24%
Sometimes	44	46	46	44	40	40
Hardly ever	25	23	22	29	26	27
Never	8	8	7	9	9	9

"How often do you ..."

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
<i>Go on day trips that involve hiking or mountain biking on unpaved trails</i>						
Regularly	15%	11%	21%	10%	16%	15%
Sometimes	28	19	32	27	31	26
Hardly ever	24	29	23	24	25	29
Never	33	41	24	39	28	30
<i>Go on overnight trips that involve camping or backpacking</i>						
Regularly	12%	19%	9%	8%	13%	13%
Sometimes	26	30	28	24	23	26
Hardly ever	28	20	32	27	30	39
Never	34	31	31	41	34	32

Environmentally-Friendly Practices

Californians have a mixed record when it comes to environmentally-friendly practices in their daily lives. An overwhelming majority regularly recycle their newspapers, aluminum cans, or glass (78%). One in two routinely purchase recycled paper or plastic goods. However, only one in five regularly buy organic or pesticide-free foods or carpool on a regular basis.

When we compare the findings of our California survey with those of a national survey conducted by the Pew Research Center in 1997, we find that Californians are more likely than Americans as a whole to regularly recycle (78% to 69%), purchase recycled paper and plastics (49% to 40%), buy organic foods (22% to 17%), and carpool (21% to 16%).

There are few differences across regions of the state. San Francisco Bay area residents are the most likely to recycle regularly (90%). Central Valley residents—living in the agricultural heartland—are the least likely to buy organic foods at least some of the time (51%). About half of the residents in all regions say they regularly purchase recycled products. About half in all regions say they never carpool.

Non-Hispanic whites are more likely than Latinos to say they regularly recycle (83% to 69%). Latinos are more likely than non-Hispanic whites to say they routinely buy recycled paper and plastics (55% to 47%) and carpool (34% to 16%). Both groups are equally likely to buy organic and pesticide-free foods.

There are a few important differences in other demographic groups. People over the age of 55 (86%) are the most likely to regularly recycle, while those under 35 are the most likely to regularly carpool (29%). Women are a little more likely than men to routinely recycle (80% to 76%), buy recycled paper and plastic (53% to 45%), and carpool (23% to 18%). Recycling tends to increase with higher income and education, while carpooling declines with higher education and income.

Personal Interests and Household Activities

"In your household, how often do you ..."

	All Adults	Region				Latino
		Central Valley	SF Bay Area	Los Angeles	Other Southern California	
<i>Recycle newspapers, aluminum cans, or glass</i>						
Regularly	78%	75%	90%	73%	74%	69%
Sometimes	10	12	4	11	13	15
Hardly ever	5	6	1	7	4	6
Never	7	7	5	9	9	10
<i>Purchase recycled products when buying paper or plastic goods</i>						
Regularly	49%	48%	47%	50%	49%	55%
Sometimes	40	41	41	39	41	34
Hardly ever	7	6	8	8	7	9
Never	4	5	4	3	4	3
<i>Buy organic or pesticide-free foods</i>						
Regularly	22%	19%	21%	25%	20%	22%
Sometimes	35	32	40	33	37	35
Hardly ever	23	27	21	24	21	25
Never	20	22	18	18	22	18
<i>Carpool</i>						
Regularly	21%	23%	19%	21%	20%	34%
Sometimes	16	13	16	19	17	18
Hardly ever	11	10	13	10	12	13
Never	52	54	52	50	51	35

Survey Methodology

The PPIC Statewide Survey is directed by Mark Baldassare, a senior fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California, with research assistance from Eric McGhee and Christopher Hoene. The survey was conducted in collaboration with the David and Lucile Packard Foundation; however, the survey methodology and questions and the content of this report were solely determined by Mark Baldassare. The survey benefited from consultation with Michael Teitz at PPIC and Michael Mantell, Mark Valentine, and others who offered their expertise on behalf of the Packard Foundation.

The findings of this survey are based on a telephone survey of 2,001 California adult residents interviewed from May 22 to May 30, 2000. Interviewing took place on weekend days and weekday nights, using a computer-generated random sample of telephone numbers, ensuring that both listed and unlisted telephone numbers were called. All telephone exchanges in California were eligible for calling. Telephone numbers in the survey sample were called up to five times to increase the likelihood of reaching eligible households. Once a household was reached, an adult respondent (18 or older) was randomly chosen for interviewing by using the "last birthday method" to avoid biases in age and gender. Each interview took an average of 20 minutes to complete. Interviewing was conducted in English or Spanish. Maria Tello translated the survey into Spanish.

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

The sampling error for the total sample of 2,001 adults is +/- 2 percent at the 95 percent confidence level. This means that 95 times out of 100, the results will be within 2 percentage points of what they would be if all adults in California were interviewed. The sampling error for subgroups is larger. Sampling error is just one type of error to which surveys are subject. Results may also be affected by factors such as question wording, question order, and survey timing.

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

We present specific results for Latinos because they account for about 24 percent of the state's adult population and constitute one of the fastest growing voter groups. The sample sizes for the African American and Asian subgroups are not large enough for separate statistical analysis. We contrast the opinions of Democrats and Republicans with "other voters." This third category includes those who are registered to vote as "decline to state" or independents as well as a fewer number who say they are members of other political parties. In some cases, we compare PPIC Statewide Survey responses to responses recorded in national surveys conducted in 1997 and 1999 by the Pew Research Center, and 1999 national surveys by Hart and Teeter, and Yankelovich Partners. We used earlier PPIC Statewide Surveys to analyze trends over time in California.

STATEWIDE SURVEY: SPECIAL SURVEY ON THE ENVIRONMENT
MAY 22 – MAY 30, 2000
2,001 CALIFORNIA ADULT RESIDENTS; ENGLISH AND SPANISH
MARGIN OF ERROR +/- 2% AT 95% CONFIDENCE LEVEL FOR TOTAL SAMPLE

1. Which of the following best describes the place where you now live: Is it a large city, suburb, small city or town, or rural area?

30% large city
21 suburb
40 small city or town
9 rural area

2. Overall, how would you rate your city or community as a place to live? Would you say it is excellent, good, fair, or poor?

32% excellent
45 good
18 fair
5 poor

3. In the past few years, do you think the population of your city or community has been growing rapidly, growing slowly, staying about the same, or declining?

58% growing rapidly
23 growing slowly
15 staying about the same
1 declining
3 don't know

4. In the next 10 years, do you think that the population of your city or community will grow rapidly, grow slowly, stay about the same, or decline?

54% grow rapidly
25 grow slowly
18 stay about the same
1 decline
2 don't know

5. Do you think that government regulations in your city or community aimed at controlling growth are too strict, about right, or not strict enough?

10% too strict
48 about right
31 not strict enough
11 don't know

6. How much of a problem is traffic congestion in your region today: Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem?

44% big problem
32 somewhat of a problem
24 not a problem

7. How much of a problem is population growth and development in your region today: Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem?

27% big problem
39 somewhat of a problem
33 not a problem
1 don't know

8. How much of a problem is air pollution in your region today: Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem?

28% big problem
39 somewhat of a problem
32 not a problem
1 don't know

9. Thinking about the quality of life in your region, how do you think things are going—very well, somewhat well, somewhat badly, or very badly?

29% very well
56 somewhat well
10 somewhat badly
4 very badly
1 don't know

10. Thinking about the next 10 years, do you think that the population in your region will grow rapidly, grow slowly, stay about the same, or decline?

59% grow rapidly
24 grow slowly
14 stay about the same
2 decline
1 don't know

11. Overall, do you think that in 2010 your region will be a better place to live than it is now, a worse place to live than it is now, or will there be no change?

28% better place
36 worse place
32 no change
4 don't know

I'd like to ask you about ways to improve the quality of life in your region over the next 10 years. How effective do you think the following actions would be—very effective, somewhat effective or not effective?

(rotate q. 12-14)

12. Establishing growth boundaries around cities beyond which new development would not be permitted. Do you think this would be very effective, somewhat effective, or not effective at improving the quality of life in your region?

33% very effective
 42 somewhat effective
 22 not effective
 3 don't know

13. Encouraging the development of job centers near existing housing to reduce commute times for workers. Do you think this would be very effective, somewhat effective, or not very effective?

41% very effective
 38 somewhat effective
 19 not effective
 2 don't know

14. Restricting development in order to preserve wetlands, rivers, and other environmentally sensitive areas. Do you think this would be very effective, somewhat effective, or not very effective?

41% very effective
 35 somewhat effective
 21 not effective
 3 don't know

15. What do you think is the most important environmental issue facing California today? (*open-ended*)

33% air pollution
 12 growth, overpopulation
 9 pollution in general
 7 traffic congestion
 6 water supply
 6 water pollution of rivers, lakes, streams
 2 ocean and beach pollution
 1 protecting wildlife, endangered species
 1 preserving wetlands, sensitive areas
 1 loss of farmlands, agriculture
 1 loss of wilderness, open space
 1 sprawl, too much development
 1 toxic wastes, contamination of the land
 1 logging, loss of redwoods, protecting forests
 1 pesticides
 1 MTBE, gas in water supply
 1 landfills, garbage, sewage, waste
 6 other (specify)
 1 nothing, there is none
 8 don't know

Now, I am going to read you a list of environmental issues. Please tell me if you think each of the following is a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem in California today. (*rotate q. 16-22*)

16. How much of a problem is urban and agricultural runoff polluting lakes, rivers, and streams: Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem?

47% big problem
 37 somewhat of a problem
 12 not a problem
 4 don't know

17. How much of a problem is MTBE and other toxic substances contaminating soil and groundwater: Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem?

48% big problem
 32 somewhat of a problem
 8 not a problem
 12 don't know

18. How much of a problem is ocean and beach pollution along the California coast: Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem?

53% big problem
 36 somewhat of a problem
 7 not a problem
 4 don't know

19. How much of a problem is the logging of old-growth redwoods in Northern California: Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem?

34% big problem
 33 somewhat of a problem
 19 not a problem
 14 don't know

20. How much of a problem is urban sprawl taking over farmlands in the Central Valley: Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem?

39% big problem
 35 somewhat of a problem
 16 not a problem
 10 don't know

21. How much of a problem is suburban development harming wildlife habitats and endangered species: Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem?

39% big problem
 40 somewhat of a problem
 18 not a problem
 3 don't know

22. How much of a problem is urban growth and air pollution damaging the forests in the Sierra Mountains: Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem?
- 45% big problem
 - 37 somewhat of a problem
 - 11 not a problem
 - 7 don't know
23. Overall, how serious a threat to your own health and well-being are environmental problems in California today—very serious, somewhat serious, or not too serious?
- 25% very serious
 - 45 somewhat serious
 - 29 not too serious
 - 1 don't know
24. Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Governor Gray Davis is handling environmental issues in California?
- 36% approve
 - 28 disapprove
 - 36 don't know
25. Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Governor Gray Davis is handling economic issues in California?
- 49% approve
 - 29 disapprove
 - 22 don't know
26. Overall, do you think the state government is doing more than enough, just enough, or not enough to protect the environment in California?
- 9% more than enough
 - 37 just enough
 - 50 not enough
 - 4 don't know
- Please tell me if the first statement or the second statement in the following questions comes closer to your views—even if neither is exactly right. (*rotate q. 27 to 31 and rotate a and b in each question*)
27. (a) stricter environmental laws and regulations cost too many jobs and hurt the economy, (b) stricter environmental laws and regulations are worth the cost.
- 37% stricter environmental laws cost jobs
 - 57 stricter environmental laws worth the cost
 - 6 don't know
28. (a) more oil drilling off the California coast should be allowed if this means lower gasoline prices for California drivers, (b) more oil drilling off the California coast should not be allowed, even if this means higher gasoline prices for California drivers.
- 43% oil drilling should be allowed
 - 54 oil drilling should not be allowed
 - 3 don't know
29. (a) new housing should be built to make housing more affordable for Californians, even if it threatens some endangered species, (b) new housing should not be built if it threatens endangered species, even if it makes housing more expensive for Californians.
- 37% new housing should be built
 - 59 new housing should not be built
 - 4 don't know
30. The state budget surplus may reach \$5 billion for the current year and \$8 billion for the next year. Most of the surplus funds will go to education and other state programs. Assuming that about \$1 billion is left, would you most prefer to use the remaining surplus on (a) reducing your taxes or (b) creating a conservation trust fund to purchase lands for parks and open space.
- 44% reducing taxes
 - 49 creating conservation trust fund
 - 7 both
31. If you had to choose, which is more important. (*rotate a and b*): (a) the ability of individuals to do what they want with the land they own or (b) the ability of government to regulate residential and commercial development for the common good.
- 54% individuals do what they want
 - 42 government regulate development
 - 4 don't know
32. Do you favor or oppose using taxpayer money to buy undeveloped land to keep it free from commercial and residential development?
- 57% favor
 - 37 oppose
 - 6 don't know
33. Do you favor or oppose nonprofit organizations using their money to buy undeveloped land to keep it free from development?
- 71% favor
 - 24 oppose
 - 5 don't know

34. If an election were held today, would you vote yes or no on a local initiative that would slow down the pace of development in your city or community, even if this meant having less economic growth?
- 58% yes
 - 37 no
 - 5 don't know
35. If an election were held today, would you vote yes or no on a local bond measure allowing local government to buy undeveloped land and keep it free from development, even if this meant paying higher local property taxes?
- 43% yes
 - 52 no
 - 5 don't know
36. From what you know about global climate change or global warming, which of the following four statements comes closest to your views? (*rotate responses a, b, c, d*).
- 22% a) global climate change has been established as a serious problem and immediate action is necessary
 - 35 b) there is enough evidence that climate change is taking place and some action should be taken
 - 33 c) we don't know enough about global climate change, and more research is necessary before we take any actions
 - 7 d) concern about global climate change is unwarranted
 - 3 other, don't know
37. In thinking about the presidential election this year, how important are the candidates' positions on population growth, land use, and environmental issues in determining your vote? Are they very important, somewhat important, or not important to you?
- 41% very important
 - 43 somewhat important
 - 14 not important
 - 2 don't know
38. How interested are you in news and information about population growth, land use, and environmental issues—very interested, somewhat interested, not too interested, or not at all interested?
- 35% very interested
 - 48 somewhat interested
 - 12 not too interested
 - 4 not at all interested
 - 1 don't know
39. Where do you get most of your news and information about population growth, land use, and environmental issues? (*rotate*)
- 37% television
 - 36 newspapers
 - 8 magazines and newsletters
 - 7 the Internet
 - 5 radio
 - 5 talking to people
 - 2 other, don't know
40. Overall, how satisfied are you with the amount of news coverage on population growth, land use and environmental issues: Are you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?
- 13% very satisfied
 - 55 somewhat satisfied
 - 23 somewhat dissatisfied
 - 7 very dissatisfied
 - 2 don't know
41. Overall, how much do you trust the news coverage on population growth, land use and environmental issues—a great deal, some, very little, or not at all?
- 12% a great deal
 - 58 some
 - 22 very little
 - 7 not at all
 - 1 don't know
42. Which of the following sources of information on population growth, land use, and environmental issues do you find the most believable? (*rotate*)
- 33% colleges and universities
 - 20 nonprofit organizations
 - 17 environmental groups
 - 8 government
 - 8 business and industry
 - 7 civic groups
 - 7 other (*specify*), don't know

43. Do you yourself belong to any environmental groups, such as the Sierra Club, the National Audubon Society, or a state or local environmental organization?
- 11% yes
89 no
44. How often do you spend your leisure time at local public parks, recreation areas, or beaches—regularly, sometimes, hardly ever, or never?
- 37% regularly
39 sometimes
20 hardly ever
4 never
45. How often do you take a trip to a national park or other scenic destination—regularly, sometimes, hardly ever, or never?
- 23% regularly
44 sometimes
25 hardly ever
8 never
46. How often do you go on day trips that involve hiking or mountain biking on unpaved trails—regularly, sometimes, hardly ever, or never?
- 15% regularly
28 sometimes
24 hardly ever
33 never
47. How often do you go on overnight trips that involve camping or backpacking—regularly, sometimes, hardly ever, or never?
- 12% regularly
26 sometimes
28 hardly ever
34 never
48. In your household, how often do you recycle newspapers, aluminum cans, or glass—regularly, sometimes, hardly ever, or never?
- 78% regularly
10 sometimes
5 hardly ever
7 never
49. In your household, how often do you carpool—regularly, sometimes, hardly ever, or never?
- 21% regularly
16 sometimes
11 hardly ever
52 never
50. In your household, how often do you purchase recycled products when buying paper or plastic goods—regularly, sometimes, hardly ever, or never?
- 49% regularly
40 sometimes
7 hardly ever
4 never
51. In your household, how often do you buy organic or pesticide-free foods—regularly, sometimes, hardly ever, or never?
- 22% regularly
35 sometimes
23 hardly ever
20 never
52. Some people are registered to vote and others are not. Are you absolutely certain you are registered to vote? (*if yes: Are you registered as a Democrat, a Republican, another party, or as an independent or decline-to-state?*)
- 32% yes, Democrat
25 yes, Republican
3 yes, other party
17 yes, independent or "decline-to-state"
23 no, not registered
53. Would you consider yourself to be politically very liberal, somewhat liberal, middle-of-the-road, somewhat conservative, or very conservative?
- 10% very liberal
22 somewhat liberal
33 middle-of-the-road
25 somewhat conservative
10 very conservative
54. Generally speaking, how much interest would you say you have in politics—a great deal, a fair amount, only a little, or none?
- 19% a great deal
43 fair amount
30 only a little
8 none
55. Would you say you follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, some of the time, hardly ever, or never?
- 40% most of the time
44 some of the time
13 hardly ever
3 never
56. How often would you say you vote—always, nearly always, part of the time, seldom or never?
- 50% always
19 nearly always
11 part of the time
6 seldom
14 never

[Questions 57 – 64: Demographic Questions]

PPIC STATEWIDE SURVEY

Advisory Committee

Ruben Barrales

President
Joint Venture–Silicon Valley Network

Angela Blackwell

President
Policy Link

Paul Brest

President
The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

Mollyann Brodie

Vice President
Kaiser Family Foundation

Bruce E. Cain

Director
Institute of Governmental Studies
University of California, Berkeley

Dennis A. Collins

President
The James Irvine Foundation

Matt Fong

Attorney
Sheppard Mullin

William Hauck

President
California Business Roundtable

Sherry Bebitch Jeffe

Senior Associate
Claremont Graduate University

Monica Lozano

Associate Publisher and Executive Editor
La Opinión

Donna Lucas

President
NCG Porter Novelli

Max Neiman

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

Jerry Roberts

Managing Editor
San Francisco Chronicle

Dan Rosenheim

News Director
KRON-TV

Richard Schlosberg

President
The David and Lucile
Packard Foundation

Carol Stogsdill

Senior Vice President
APCO Associates

Cathy Taylor

Editorial Page Editor
Orange County Register

Raymond L. Watson

Vice Chairman of the Board
The Irvine Company

Carol Whiteside

President
Great Valley Center